SCANDINAVIAN JOURNAL OF BYZANTINE AND MODERN GREEK STUDIES

No 7 • 2021

SCANDINAVIAN JOURNAL
OF
BYZANTINE
AND
MODERN GREEK STUDIES

Vol. 7 2021

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

Printed by MediaTryck 2022
Layout: Bengt Pettersson

Contents

Articles

Book Reviews

Editorial

Scandinavian Journal of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies continues its good progress as a peer-reviewed journal in the field of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies. It is available online with free access to the scholarly and general public since 2015. Volume 7 of SJBMGS includes five studies: three that relate to Byzantium and two to Modern Greece. Ingela Nilsson in her study explores the literary voice of Constantine Manasses in his *Synopsis Chronike*. Georgian manuscript production and translation activity in the Christian East and the Byzantine Empire is the theme of Sandro Nikolaishvili's article. In a co-authored article, Charis Messis and Ingela Nilsson explore the *ixeutique* (hunting of small birds) as a practice and literary representation in Byzantium. Maria Kalinowska examines the reception of Kanaris and his fights in the Polish Romantic Poetry. Last but not least, the current volume includes an article by Lambros Baltsiotis dealing with the issue of conversions of Muslims during the Greek War of Independence. In the last section of SJBMGS you will find three book reviews by G. Kalpadakis, Y. Tzortzis and V. Sabatakakis respectively, discussing recently published studies on Modern Greek history.

We remind you that SJBMGS is open for unpublished articles and book reviews related to Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies in the fields of philology, linguistics, history and literature.

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.

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

The Literary Voice of a Chronicler: The *Synopsis Chronike* of Constantine Manasses*

Ingela Nilsson

While the chronicle has long been seen as an inferior form of historiography, void of literary ambition and individual expression, the Byzantine chronicle tradition – repetitive and 'traditional' as it may be – in fact offers a wide range of means to rewrite and understand the historical past. The chronicles may seem similar at first glance and they may be recycling the same material, adding little new to our knowledge of historical detail, but the Byzantine chronicle was produced in a cultural environment in which repetition of previous information was a way to strengthen and verify your own account all the while offering a new form of already known historical events. Recent scholarship has shown how even small narrative changes may offer us

* This article was written in 2014, during a research visit in Vienna sponsored by a grant from Hilda Kumlins stiftelse, and intended for *The Brill Companion to Byzantine Chronicles*, ed. R. Tocci. Due to the delay of that volume and the publication of my monograph on Manasses (Nilsson 2021), I have withdrawn the present article to publish it here for the benefit of readers who come across references to it in the monograph. It retains the form of a handbook article written quite a few years ago, but I hope it can still be of use to some readers interested in chroni-cles in general and Manasses in particular. I have updated the references to secondary literature for this version, revisions made within the frame of the research programme Retracing Connections (https://retracingconnections.org/), financed by Riksbankens Jubileumsfond (M19-0430:1). Finally, I would like to express my warmest thanks to Adam Goldwyn, Andreas Rhoby, Roger Scott and Nikos Zagklas for their careful reading of and useful remarks on successive drafts of this article along with many fruitful discussions, throughout the years, on Manasses and twelfth-century literature.

important insight into contemporary political, social or religious concerns.[1] With time, the Byzantine chronicle also changes and brings in more and more features from the neighbouring historiographical texts, becoming increasingly coloured by literary and rhetorical strategies. Thus the twelfth-century *Epitome Historion* by John Zonaras is very different from the chronicle of, for instance, Theophanes Confessor, taking a form that ties in with the Komnenian interest in ancient literature and narrative structure. The same century sees the composition of a work that takes us even further from what we may expect from a Byzantine chronicle: the *Synopsis Chronike* by Constantine Manasses.[2]

Manasses' work departs from the traditional chronicle form in a number of respects, the most significant of which is the metrical form: written in the fifteen-syllable political verse, the *Synopsis Chronike* takes a step towards the 'popular' literature of, for instance, *Digenis Akritas* and *Ptochoprodromos*, yet staying within the boundaries of learned language and historical content from the Creation of the world up to 1081. Manasses thus avoids narrating the history of the Komnenian dynasty – an enterprise he would never dare to undertake, as he explains in the very last verses of his work (6609-20). Perhaps this was a strategy wisely chosen by a writer on commission, depending – as we shall see – on the benevolence of imperial and aristocratic patrons. In addition to the verse form, the author employs an episodical narrative technique

[1] Roger Scott has been a pioneer in this regard; see e.g. the contributions in Scott 2012 and, more recently, Scott, Burke & Tuffin 2021. For a younger generation of scholars working on chronography from a literary perspective, see e.g. Goldwyn 2015; Kampianaki 2017, 2018 and 2020; Vilimonović 2021 – the latter probably the first study of Byzantine chronicles from a gender perspective and thus groundbreaking. For some other recent studies of the chronicle form, see Odorico 2021 and Wahlgren 2021.

[2] Ed. and modern Greek tr. Lampsidis 1996. Two translations into other languages have recently appeared, indicating the increasing interest in this text: Yuretich 2018 (English tr.); Paul & Rhoby 2019 (German tr.). Translations in this article are my own. For a general introduction to Manasses' chronicle, see Karpozilos 2009, 535-557, and Neville 2018, 200-204. The biography of Manasses will not be discussed here; for an updated survey of his life and authorship, see Paul & Rhoby 2019, 4-7; for a presentation of his life and functions at the court, Magdalino 1997, 161-165. On the place of the chronicle in the literary production of Manasses, see Nilsson 2021, esp. 145-153.

and a poetic language, both reminiscent of the contemporary novel, which has led scholars to describing the *Synopsis Chronike* as a literary or even novelistic chronicle.[3] While such a description does not say much about the actual character or function of the chronicle, there are indeed narrative and stylistic affinities between the novelistic writing of the Komnenian century and the chronicle by Manasses, who in fact was a novelist himself.[4] More important, the *Synopsis Chronike* clearly adheres to literary trends of the environment in which Manasses was active as a writer on commission for imperial and aristocratic circles, which explains the literary and poetic form of the chronicle, as well as the unusually frequent authorial comments inserted into the narrative. The present article is an attempt to show how these characteristics come to the fore in Manasses' literary recasting of history.

The authorial 'I' and his audience

Manasses wrote his chronicle for *sebastokratorissa* Eirene, married to *sebastokrator* Andronikos and thus sister-in-law of Emperor Manuel I Komnenos (1143-1180).[5] Since the *Synopsis Chronike* includes praise also of the young Manuel (v. 2507-12), his accession to the throne offers us a *terminus post quem*, whereas Irene's death ca. 1153 provides us with the latest possible date for the chronicle's composition.[6] Eirene was known to be a generous patroness of letters and she was involved with numerous writers of the period, including Theodore Prodromos and John Tzetzes. It is no surprise, then, that the *Synopsis Chronike* opens with a praise of Eirene's love of learning, as compared to the material desires of a greedy soul – her soul, by contrast, is imperial and most learned

[3] On the innovative and literary/novelistic aspects of the *Synopsis Chronike*, see Lampsidis 1996, xl-xlv; Reinsch 2002; Nilsson 2006 and 2019; Rhoby 2014.

[4] The novel, *Aristandros and Kallithea*, has been fragmentarily preserved in the form of excerpts from a later period; see Tsolakes 1967 and Mazal 1967 (with a reconstruction of the story), discussed in Nilsson 2021, 160-161.

[5] See Jeffreys 2014.

[6] A plausible scenario is that the work was written in portions, so that the references to Manuel were inserted after his ascention to the throne; see Lampsidis 1988; Paul & Rhoby, 7-9. Cf. Reinsch 2007, 266-267, dating the chronicle to 1150-1153.

(βασίλισσα καὶ φιλολογωτάτη), "always thirsting for knowledge, culture and education, / always clinging to books, delighting in literature".[7] Her wishes for this particular project are then stated as follows:

> Since you, as a foster child of learning, have desired / that a comprehensible and clear narrative should be composed for you, / teaching ancient history in a plain manner / – who reigned from the beginning and how far they reached, / over whom they ruled and for how many years – / I will take on the burden of this toil, / even though it is a difficult and burdensome task, involving much work; / for I am compensated for my efforts in this writing / by the size of your gifts and your generosity, / and the burning heat of my toil and travail / is cooled by your gifts, frequently bestowed.[8]

It seems, then, that both the form and content of the *Synopsis Chronike* depended on the wishes of the patron, and it appears that the dedication to the *sebastokratorissa* was not only a means to please her, but also part of a financial transaction between poet and patron.[9] After this statement, which seems to be reminding the patron of their agreement, the writer interrupts himself:

> But let me stop right here and now, / so that my discourse does not seem too flattering to some / and follows another voice, thus losing its goal. / Many have written histories and chronicles, / eager to

---

[7] Constantine Manasses, *Synopsis Chronike* 4-5 (Lampsidis): ἀεὶ διψῶσα γνώσεως καὶ λόγου καὶ παιδείας, / βίβλοις ἀεὶ προστέτηκας, ἐπεντρυφᾷς τοῖς λόγοις. A dedicatory poem in hexameters, likewise praising Irene, follows the chronicle in a number of manuscripts (but is printed before the chronicle in Lampsidis' edition); see Rhoby 2009, 323-325.

[8] Constantine Manasses, *Synopsis Chronike* 7-17 (Lampsidis): ἐπεὶ γοῦν ἐπεπόθησας οἷα τροφίμη λόγου / εὐσύνοπτόν σοι καὶ σαφῆ γραφὴν ἐκπονηθῆναι, / τρανῶς ἀναδιδάσκουσαν τὰς ἀρχαιολογίας / καὶ τίνες ἦρξαν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς καὶ μέχρι ποῦ προῆλθον / καὶ τίνων ἐβασίλευσαν καὶ μέχρις ἐτῶν πόσων, / ἡμεῖς ἀναδεξόμεθα τὸ βάρος τοῦ καμάτου, / κἂν δυσχερές, κἂν ἐπαχθὲς τὸ πρᾶγμα, κἂν ἐργῶδες· / παραμυθοῦνται γὰρ ἡμῶν τοὺς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις μόχθους / αἱ μεγαλοδωρίαι σου καὶ τὸ φιλότιμόν σου, / καὶ τὸν τοῦ κόπου καύσωνα καὶ τῆς ταλαιπωρίας / αἱ δωρεαὶ δροσίζουσι κενούμεναι συχνάκις. Cf. translation by Jeffreys 1974, 158.

[9] On patronage in the twelfth century, note the foundational article by Mullett 1984; more recently and with updated references, Nilsson 2021, esp. 86-91.

recount correctly and truthfully, / and yet they have composed them differently; / I, having selected those which seem / to be most accurate and more truthful, / shall fulfil your wish as best I can.[10]

We do not know who might have found the writer's comments on the *sebastokratorissa*'s generosity "too flattering", but in view of her involvement in various forms of patronage we may assume that her favours were in great demand; the situation for writers and intellectuals of the period was indeed competitive.[11] More interesting from a narrative perspective are the remarks on the individual choices made by the writer, indeed a sort of topos among historians – "accurate" and "truthful" are key concepts here – but nevertheless significant in view of what turns out to be the very personal inclusions and exclusions of Manasses, not always so truthful, according to our modern standards.[12]

The introductory part of the chronicle as a whole offers important information on the aim and function of Manasses' work: it is an historical account written according to the specific wishes of a patron, but based on the narrative choices and literary skills of the writer. The latter is indeed confirmed by the ensuing opening of the chronicle itself, consisting of an elaborate and poetic rewriting of the Creation, presented in the form of a long and dazzling garden ekphrasis, ending with the creation of Eve from Adam's rib (27-285). In accordance with the overall emphasis on art and nature in the episode, God is described not only as creator, but also as an artist and a gardener. As is often the case with Manasses – and indeed numerous other authors of the Komnenian period – he takes

[10] Constantine Manasses, *Synopsis Chronike* 18-26 (Lampsidis): Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐνταῦθά μοι καὶ μέχρι τούτου στήτω, / μή πως κολακικώτερος δόξῃ τισὶν ὁ λόγος / καὶ τὸν σκοπὸν καταλιπὼν ἄλλην ἀκούσῃ τρέχειν. / πολλῶν ἱστορησάντων δὲ καὶ χρονογραφησάντων / καὶ σπουδασάντων μὲν εἰπεῖν ὀρθῶς καὶ φιλαλήθως, / ἀλλήλοις ἀνομοίως δὲ ταῦτα συγγραψαμένων, / ἡμεῖς, προχειρισάμενοι τοὺς μάλιστα δοκοῦντας / τῆς ἀκριβείας ἔχεσθαι καὶ μᾶλλον ἀληθεύειν, / τὸ κατὰ δύναμιν ἡμῖν ἀποπληρώσομέν σοι.

[11] Cf. the recurring motif of *phthonos* (envy) in the chronicle and the 'autobiographical' note by narrator (3204-12), on which see Reinsch 2007 and Hinterberger 2011, esp. pp. 91-100; now also Nilsson 2021, esp. 148-169. On the role of envy in the context of poet and patron, see also Hinterberger 2013, 169.

[12] See Maisano 1985, esp. 338-39, and Rhoby 2014.

a well-established image and adapts it to suit his purposes; here, the image of God as a gardener is underlined within the frame of the garden ekphrasis and intertwined with the surrounding vegetal imagery. At the beginning of the episode, he is an artist, a creator, a wise and skilful worker (41: θεὸς ὁ καλλιτέχνης; 49-50: ὁ τεχνίτης ὁ παντοτέκτων, ὁ σοφός; 63: ὁ τεχνίτης … θεὸς ὁ παντεργάτης) and even a gardener of the heavenly garden of stars (133: φυτοσκάφος ὁ θεός). As more things are created and the artistic imagery on the whole increases, God's artistry is stressed in elaborate passages (e.g. 174–180) and then finally explained: he is indeed a gardener, but "He did not dig with his hands, He did not struggle with earth, / He did not work by touching the plants, but only with the Word".[13] The episode thus contains an intriguing parallel between the artistry of God and the artistry of the poet, both creating/composing by means of *logos* (word/narrative/culture).

By representing the Creation in the form of an ekphrasis, Manasses highlights the poetic character of the chronicle, while at the same time drawing attention to himself as the composer of a new kind of history. The emphasis on the creative skills of the writer also seems to imply an audience beyond the commissioner herself, consisting rather of learned peers of Manasses, appreciating this kind of intellectual pun. The *sebastokratorissa*'s involvement in literary circles indeed opens up the idea of an intended or primary reader/listener (the patron) being accompanied by a circle of learned aristocrats and/or intellectuals associated with the court. Works composed and performed in such environment would have had to meet the expectations of both commissioner and other listeners.[14]

---

[13] Constantine Manasses, *Synopsis Chronike* 183-84 (Lampsidis): οὐ σκαφευτρίαις ἐν χερσίν, οὐδὲ γαιομαχούσαις, / οὐδὲ παλάμαις φυτουργοῖς, ἀλλὰ τῷ λόγῳ μόνῳ. For the Creation episode, see Nilsson 2005, esp. pp. 129-137 and 140-46, and Karpozilos 2009, 542-543.

[14] Cf. Croke 2010, esp. p. 43. On performative aspects of Byzantine literature, causing us to speak of 'listeners' rather than 'readers', see also Marciniak 2007; Bourbouhakis 2010 and 2017, 125*-158*.

The question is whether we should understand also the metrical form of the *Synopsis Chronike* as part of that expectation. As already mentioned, the political verse has certain popular connotations, which seems to stand in stark contrast to the courtly environment in which we find the chronicle by Manasses, and indeed many other works of the twelfth century written in the same metre. The combination of political verse with a linguistic register that sometimes displays vernacular tendencies, led Odysseas Lampsidis – editor of the *Synopsis Chronike* and author of numerous studies on Manasses – to an interpretation of Manasses' chronicle as a popular work intended for a wider audience.[15] However, the language of Manasses clearly stays within the boundaries of learned Greek, even if the author makes use of some nonclassical forms,[16] and the work seems to contain too many learned allusions and references for a lowbrow audience. It is likely that the 'simple' form should be seen rather in light of the patroness and her wish for a "comprehensible and clear treatise … teaching ancient history in a plain manner". Popular connotations or not, the political verse was a common and appropriate medium for court poetry addressed to members of the imperial family, and *sebastokratorissa* Eirene had other works written for her in the same form.[17] Moreover, it is likely that Eirene was of Norman origin,[18] which would have created a need of comprehensive introductions to history and Greek learning.[19] It has also been suggested that the *sebastokratorissa* was particularly fond of garden imagery, which could explain the casting of the Creation in the form of a garden

[15] Lampsidis 1996, xliii.

[16] See Trapp 1993, 119.

[17] Jeffreys 1974, esp. 151-153 and 158; cf. Rhoby 2014, 393-394.

[18] Jeffreys & Jeffreys 1994; Rhoby 2009, 306-321.

[19] On the chronicle as a *Lehrgedicht*, see Rhoby 2014, 393; cf. Reinsch 2002, 84-85. For a recent study of didactic poetry, including Manasses, see Hörandner 2019; now also Nilsson 2021, esp. 116-117. Whereas Manasses presented Irene with a chronicle, John Tzetzes wrote a *Theogony* for her and Theodore Prodromos a grammar – together forming the very basis of Greek learning. On the grammar by Prodromos, see Zagklas 2011; on the relation between Manasses and Tzetzes, see Rhoby 2010, 167-168.

ekphrasis at the beginning of the chronicle.[20] Be that as it may, taken together with the introductory verses, the Creation passage can be read as a programmatic declaration for the entire chronicle, presenting both what kind of text and what kind of author the reader/listener may expect: a self-conscious creator of sophisticated *logos*, underlining the authorial act while staying within the contemporary horizon of expectation.

The ancient and the Byzantine tradition

In Byzantinists' scholarly quest for new historical details, the *Synopsis Chronike* does not seem to have much to offer; it is, as already mentioned, a 'novelistic' chronicle, an entertaining rewriting of already known historical events. It is, however, exactly in its capacity as a literary chronicle, written fairly late in the tradition, that Manasses' work can make a significant contribution to our understanding of the function of historical narrative and the adaptability of genre in Byzantium in general, and in twelfth-century Byzantium in particular. It is probably true, as Paul Magdalino has stated, that Manasses "writes only to entertain or to instruct on a very basic level",[21] but even if his chronicle offers pleasant reading (or indeed listening), the historical content has not always been simplified, but rather recast through narrative and rhetorical structures.[22] The techniques involved in this recasting are clearly related to the rewriting of ancient fiction that took place in the Komnenian period, but there is a crucial difference: as we have seen, Manasses never relinquishes the claim to historical truth.[23] His chronicle thus remains history, however 'novelistic', aesthetic, or entertaining the form.

Let us look at an historical episode of the *Synopsis Chronike* in order to see how all this works in practice. The eclectic approach of

[20] Magdalino 1997, 164. It should, however, be noted that garden imagery is very frequent in many authors throughout the Komnenian century; see e.g. Nilsson 2013.

[21] Magdalino 1997, 162.

[22] Cf. also Papaioannou 2010, 19, on Manasses as "blatantly indulgent in Psellian aesthetic pleasures", but no less part of the historiographical tradition.

[23] See Nilsson 2006. On the Komnenian novels as a key to understanding the literary trends of the period as a whole, see Nilsson 2014

Manasses and his predilection for entertaining and juicy stories as well as moralizing and didactic ones has left him with a number of narrative highlights, linked together in an episodic structure with less thrilling fillers.[24] Accordingly, important emperors with close links to Constantinople, such as Justinian I (527-565), receive more space and praise,[25] while minor emperors may be mentioned only briefly; we should note, though, that they are still usually inserted into the narrative and not simply annalistically enumerated as in more traditional chronicles.[26] In line with Manasses' interest in 'good stories', emperors associated with immoral or otherwise indecent behaviour, as well as truly bad or wicked emperors, receive more attention, supposedly triggering the imagination of both writer and audience.[27] We shall take an episode of the latter kind as our example: an incident set during the reign of Emperor Leo the Isaurian, also known as Leo the Iconoclast (717-741).[28]

Leo's reign covers 120 verses in the *Synopsis Chronike* (4116-4236), anticipated by the characterization that is offered at the beginning of the power struggle between Emperor Theodosios III and the usurper Leo – "a beastly person as regards both soul and name and manners",[29] signalling the gist of what will follow. The introductory verses of Leo's regin describe the violent storm that afflicted the Romans and the Church (4116-30), Leo's origins and his involvement with Jews (4131-60),[30] leading up to his heretical destruction of holy images and the resignation of Patriarch Germanos, forced away by the "raving mad Kerberos" (ὁ Κέρβερος ὁ λυσσητὴρ) (4161-75). With the help of his

[24] See Reinsch 2002; Nilsson 2006.

[25] See Scott, 2006; cf. Reinsch 2007, 266-267.

[26] A fourteenth-century scribe felt the need to 'correct' this, inserting verses with chronological information (102 in all) where he felt it was needed. See Lampsidis 1996, lxxi-lxxvi, and Reinsch 2002, 85.

[27] See now the excellent study of characterization as a stylistic device by Taxidis 2017.

[28] Historical aspects of Leo's reign or the iconoclastic controversy will not be addressed here; for a detailed study, see Brubaker & Haldon 2011, 69-105.

[29] Constantine Manasses, *Synopsis Chronike* 4099 (Lampsidis): ὁ καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ τοὔνομα καὶ τρόπους θηριώδης.

[30] On Leo's alleged Jewish and/or Muslim influence, see Brubaker & Haldon 2011, 105-17.

wolfpack Leo scatters the disciples and ravages the churches, causing darkness to descend upon the empire (4176-81); books and discourses of old have recounted these horrible things, says Manasses, but he will chose one single event to describe this evil emperor – "I shall reveal the Persian [Leo] by his robe and necklace, / the croaking crow by his black colour".[31] The gloomy and dramatic tone then swiftly changes and we find ourselves in a pleasant and light setting:

> Near the precincts of the Divine Wisdom / was a beautiful house built by emperors of old, / a splendid garden, one might say, of book-bearing trees, / a beautifully planted grove of manifold wisdom; / books were stored within, / about thirty-three thousand; / this great garden, this extensive grove, / was entrusted to a divine man, distinguished by his wisdom / and shining forth with rays of knowledge, more than any other / – another Adam, one could say, a godly caretaker of trees / taking pleasure in the beautifully growing trees of Eden / and gardener of plants that never wither.[32]

The contrast to the city just described could hardly be any sharper, as the reader/listener finds themself at the Patriarchal School, located in the vicinity of Hagia Sophia.[33] On a poetic level, we should note the garden metaphor, representing the library as a grove filled with trees, tended by a diligent gardener. The ekphrastic mode here is clearly reminiscent of the chronicle's opening description of Creation, an allusion further

---

[31] Constantine Manasses, *Synopsis Chronike* 4188-90 (Lampsidis): ἐγὼ δ' ἀπολεξάμενος ἓν ἀπὸ πάντων τούτων / τὸν Πέρσην ἐκ τοῦ κάνδυος καὶ τοῦ στρεπτοῦ γνωρίσω / καὶ κόρακα τὸν κρωκτικὸν ἐκ τῆς μελαντηρίας.

[32] Constantine Manasses, *Synopsis Chronike* 4191-4202 (Lampsidis): Τοῦ τεμενίσματος ἐγγὺς τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ Σοφίας / οἶκος λαμπρὸς δεδόμητο τοῖς πάλαι βασιλεῦσι, / κῆπος, ἂν εἴποι τις, ἀβρὸς βιβλιοφόρων δένδρων, / ἄλσος ἀγλαοφύτευτον παντοδαπῆς σοφίας· / βίβλοι γὰρ ἦσαν ἐν αὐτῷ προτεθησαυρισμέναι / εἰς τρισμυρίας φθάνουσαι πρὸς ἄλλαις τρισχιλίαις· / τὸν τηλικοῦτον κῆπον δὲ καὶ τὸ τοσοῦτον ἄλσος / θεῖος ἀνὴρ πεπίστευτο, προέχων ἐν σοφίᾳ / καὶ πλέον πάντων ταῖς αὐγαῖς τῆς γνώσεως ἐκλάμπων, / ἄλλος, ἂν εἴποι τις, Ἀδὰμ ἔνθεος δενδροκόμος / τοῖς τῆς Ἐδὲμ ἐπεντρυφῶν καλλιβλαστήτοις δένδροις / καὶ φυτευμάτων γεωργὸς τῶν μὴ μαραινομένων.

[33] On the location and function of the Patriarchal School, dating from the fifth century or earlier, see Browning 1962.

strengthened by the explicit reference to Adam, the "goodly caretaker" of Eden. The garden imagery is intermingled with that of learning, just as in the Creation episode discussed above, but the keyword here is *sophia* (wisdom) rather than *logos*, tying in with the setting close to Hagia Sophia, and probably also with the close relation between the school and the Church. The ekphrastic mode, depicting a harmonious and ideal environment, continues for a few more lines, depicting the twelve teachers working under the head librarian/gardener "like lieutenant generals under a noble general" as "shining stars and torches of the night / completing the number of the zodiac circle".[34] They worked unpaid, "these teachers of those who desire learning (*logos*)", removing the veil of obscurity (*skoteinologias*) from pagan as well as Christian writings,[35] and their leader was like a bright sun in their middle, surpassing them in virtue and offering counsel and knowledge to emperors.

This harmonious order is then brutally overthrown by the emperor, obviously provoked by the high status of this educational institution and its members. He first tries to snare them and have them as partners in his ungodly madness, but when neither threats nor gold can convince them he finally despairs. "How can I even narrate?", says the author, and then he goes on to do so:

> He plotted a malicious scheme, absurd, impious, / as would neither a savage Scythian, nor a Massagetan; / he piles up wood all around the house, / dry firewood, combustible, flammable fuel, / and he lights a bright fire and incinerates all / these holy men – alas! – and with them all the books. Woe, soul that hates goodness! Alas, savage mind! The terrible Leo was revealed by his claws. The most beautiful of all teachings were in there, / also one extraordinary scroll made from the

[34] Constantine Manasses, *Synopsis Chronike* 4204-06 (Lampsidis): καθάπερ ὑποστράτηγοι γενναίῳ στρατηγέτῃ, / ἀστέρες ἄντικρυς φαιδροὶ καὶ τῆς νυκτὸς δᾳδοῦχοι, ἐπλήρουν δὲ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ ζῳοφόρου κύκλου.

[35] Constantine Manasses, *Synopsis Chronike* 4207-4211 (Lampsidis): ἄμισθοι δ' ἦσαν παιδευταὶ τοῖς ἐρασταῖς τοῦ λόγου· / ἀφῄρουν γὰρ τὸ κάλυμμα τῆς σκοτεινολογίας, / ὁπόση τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς τερθρείας καὶ σαπρίας / ὁπόση τε τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς ἱεροπρεπεστάτης, / αὐτὸς δ' ἐν πᾶσιν ἔστιλβεν ἥλιος ὥσπερ γίγας.

intestine of a snake / carrying the Homeric poems in writing, / I mean the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.[36]

The wickedness of Leo – beyond that even of the inhuman Skythians and Massagetans[37] – is thus revealed to lie not primarily in his disdain for holy images, but above all in his hatred for wisdom and learning – he even goes so far as to sacrifice a precious manuscript of Homer! This is indeed a crime that is sure to cause indignation among Byzantines in general, but even more so in the learned circles of *sebastokratorissa* Eirene and Manasses, considering the great respect for ancient literature, not least Homer, in the Komnenian century. We may remind ourselves of the author's praise of Eirene in the opening verses, describing her as "most learned" (φιλολογωτάτη) with a soul "ever applying itself to books, delighting in literature", and note the contrast to Leo's behaviour and his "soul which hates beauty" (μισόκαλος ψυχή), his "savage mind". We should also note that this is the one event from Leo's reign that Manasses explicitly chooses to narrate, selecting suitable episodes in accordance with the intentions stated in the introductory verses.[38] The narrative structure of the episode depicting Leo's reign, culminating in this brutal burning of learned men and books (covering 45 of the 120 verses of the reign as a whole), thus appears to make a statement – one that goes beyond the traditional post-iconoclastic representation of Leo

[36] Constantine Manasses, *Synopsis Chronike* 4224-4236 (Lampsidis): … ἀλλὰ γὰρ πῶς ἐξείπω; / βουλὴν βουλεύεται σκαιάν, ἔκτοπον, ἀνοσίαν, / ἣν οὐδὲ Σκύθης ἄγριος, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Μασσαγέτης· / ὕλης σωρεύει φορυτὸν κύκλῳ περὶ τὸν οἶκον, / ὕλην ξηράν, εὐέξαπτον, δαδῖτιν, φρυγανῖτιν, / καὶ πῦρ ὑφάπτει λιπαρὸν καὶ καταφλέγει πάντας / τοὺς ἄνδρας, φεῦ, τοὺς ἱεροὺς καὶ σὺν αὐτοῖς τὰς βίβλους. / αἳ αἳ μισόκαλος ψυχή! φεῦ γνώμη θηριώδης! / ἐκ τῶν ὀνύχων ὁ δεινὸς πάντως ἐγνώσθη Λέων. / ἦσαν ἐκεῖ τὰ κάλλιστα πάντων τῶν παιδευμάτων, / καὶ τόμος εἷς ἐξαίσιος ἐκ δράκοντος ἐντέρου, / τὰς δέλτους τὰς Ὁμηρικὰς φέρων ἐγγεγραμμένας, / τὴν Ἰλιάδα τέ φημι καὶ τὰ τῆς Ὀδυσσείας.

[37] Cf. Her. 1.215-16. For Manasses and his use of Herodotos, see Jeffreys 1979, 213-214; Rhoby 2014, 402-403; Paul & Rhoby 2019, 22 and 51.

[38] Cf. v. 4188 (ἀπολεξάμενος) with v. 24 (προχειρισάμενοι).

as an enemy of ancient literature and enters, rather, the contemporary socio-cultural meaning of learning.[39]

In order to better understand to what extent Manasses' narrative choices are literary and innovative, let us compare this poetic and lively tableau with the same event in some other chronicles of the same period. Manasses draws from a number of chronographical sources that are used successively or in combination, and due to his poetic recasting it is sometimes rather difficult to determine exactly which source he has used.[40] For the Leo episode, two almost contemporary chronicles are of particular interest: the *Synopsis Historion*, written by George Kedrenos by the end of the eleventh century or the beginning of the twelfth century,[41] and the *Epitome Historion* by John Zonaras, written in the first part of the twelfth century.[42] Let us begin by looking at Kedrenos, who relates the burning of the school in relation to the riots by the Chalke gate, caused by Emperor Leo's famous removal of the icon of Christ.[43] It is not entirely clear whether it is the event as such, or just the location of the Chalke in relation to the Basilika, that guides the narrative structure of Kedrenos,[44] but the passage relevant to us runs as follows:

> By the Basilika cistern (as it is called) was a revered palace, in which, according to an ancient decree, an ecumenical teacher was installed with twelve disciples who were noble in word and deed. Partaking of all philosophical knowledge with the quickness and strength of their

[39] We may also note Manasses' possible position as a teacher at the Patriarchal School, though we do not know if he was already teaching there at the time when he wrote the *Synopsis Chronike*; see Polemis 1996", esp. 280, and cf. Nilsson 2021, 114-115 and 140-141. In either case, Manasses certainly moved in circles in which the school was held in high esteem, and he might have been a student there himself when he was young.

[40] On Manasses' use of sources, see Jeffreys 1979, 207-215; Lampsidis 1996, xlviii-xlix and lii-liv; Karpozilos 2009, 541; Kiapidou 2009; Rhoby 2014.

[41] On Kedrenos's chronicle, see Karpozilos 2009, 331-41; Scott, Burke & Tuffin 2021.

[42] On Zonaras' chronicle, see Grigoriadis 1998, 465-489; Mallan 2018; Vilimonović 2021

[43] On the Chalke icon and its role in the iconoclastic events, see Brubaker & Haldon 2011, 128-135.

[44] Cf. Theoph. 405, 4-14.

> nature, they pursued above all the divine wisdom of the Church. It was not considered righteous to do anything contrary to their view, even by emperors themselves. Konon [Leo] often called on them and tried to win them over to his own heresy. As they did not accept it but resisted him, he ordered that they be imprisoned there in dishonour, and after setting fire all around them during the night, the accursed man completely burned [them] along with their home, their many beautiful books and their sacred vessels.[45]

We recognize the basic details of the situation from the version of Manasses: a learned teacher (here with the title *oikoumenikos didaskalos*) is in charge of the school, assisted by twelve disciples; their wisdom – with an emphasis on their divine wisdom of the Church (ἐκκλησιαστικὴν θεοσοφίαν) – is so great that even emperors have to ask for their advice.[46] When Leo cannot convince them to take his heretic side, he locks them up and burns down the house, together with books and other valuable items. Whereas Manasses pays relatively little attention to the iconoclastic conflict per se, Kedrenos clearly saw fit to devote rather much space to this aspect of Leo's reign; by contrast, Manasses' version lacks almost entirely the theological emphasis.[47] If we compare this version with that of Zonaras, it seems that he follows Kedrenos rather closely:

---

[45] George Kedrenos, *Synopsis Historion* 476.3 (Tarataglia): πρὸς γὰρ τῇ Βασιλικῇ τῇ λεγομένῃ κινστέρνῃ παλάτιον ἦν σεμνόν, ἐν ᾧ κατὰ τύπον ἀρχαῖον οἰκουμενικὸς ἐκάθητο διδάσκαλος, ἔχων μαθητὰς λόγῳ καὶ βίῳ σεμνοὺς τὸν ἀριθμὸν ιβ΄. οὗτοι πᾶσαν λογικὴν ἐπιστήμην τάχει τε καὶ μεγέθει φύσεως μετερχόμενοι οὐχ ἥκιστα τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν μετιεσαν θεοσοφίαν, ὧν τῆς γνώμης χωρὶς οὐ θεμιτόν τι ποιεῖν ἐδόκει οὐδὲ τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν αὐτοῖς. τούτους ὁ Κόνων συχνῶς προσκαλούμενος ἐπείραζε πεῖσαι τῇ αὐτοῦ αἱρέσει. καταθέσθαι·μὴ καταδεχομένους δέ, ἀλλ' ἀντιπίπτοντας ἀτίμως κατακλεισθῆναι διεκελεύσατο ἐκεῖσε, διὰ δὲ τῆς νυκτὸς πῦρ κυκλόθεν ὑφάψας αὐταῖς ἑστίαις καὶ βίβλοις πολλαῖς καὶ καλαῖς καὶ σκεύεσιν ἱεροῖς ὁ μιαρὸς κατέκαυσεν.

[46] On the *oikoumenikos didaskalos*, head teacher of the Patriarchal School, see Browning 1962 and Speck 1974, esp. pp. 74-91.

[47] We may note that Manasses in general shows a slight interest in Church matters; see Rhoby 2014, 397, on the "untergeordnete Rolle" of Church politics in the chronicle.

> There was an imperial building in the so-called Basilika close to the Chalkoprateia, in which were kept numerous books of pagan as well as more noble and divine wisdom. This was the abode of the one who far surpassed all in letters, whom they call the ecumenical teacher; and he had twelve fellows who lived with him, they too taking part in intellectual learning to the highest degree.[48]

We recognize the *oikoumenikos didaskalos*, head of the patriarchal academy, with his twelve assistants, here explicitly engaged in both pagan and Christian learning. They function as teachers available for interested students, enjoying a public maintenance, and as advisors of the emperor, who tries to convince them of "his lewd opinion as regards the revered images".[49]

> Not only did they not share his faith, but they also tried very hard to make him change his opinion in this matter, on the one hand caressing the lionlike beast [Leo] and praying for his delivery, on the other resisting even more nobly and refuting his impiety. But he plugged his ears like a shield and did not listen to the voice of prayers, nor was he cured by the wise. Thus often meeting with them and failing to change their mind, he had them walk to their school – that is, that imperial house – and he ordered that much flammable firewood be gathered and put around the house as night had come, and in this way he burned down the house, along with the books and these wise and reverent men.[50]

---

[48] John Zonaras, *Epitome Historion* III, 259.18-26 (Büttner-Wobst): οἶκος ἦν ἐν τῇ καλουμένῃ Βασιλικῇ ἔγγιστα τῶν Χαλκοπρατίων βασίλειος, ἐν ᾧ καὶ βίβλοι τῆς τε θύραθεν σοφίας καὶ τῆς εὐγενεστέρας καὶ θειοτέρας πολλαὶ ἐναπέκειντο. ἦν δ' οὗτος ἀνέκαθεν τοῦ προύχοντος ἐν λόγοις κατοικητήριον, ὃν οἰκουμενικὸν ἐκάλουν διδάσκαλον· ὃς καὶ δώδεκα εἶχεν ἑτέρους συνοικοῦντας αὐτῷ, κἀκείνους τῆς λογικῆς παιδείας μετέχοντας κατὰ τὸ ἀκρότατον.

[49] John Zonaras, *Epitome Historion* III, 260.6-11: (Büttner-Wobst): τούτοις καὶ σιτήσεις ἀνεῖντο δημόσιαι … τὴν περὶ τῶν σεβαστῶν εἰκόνων γνώμην αὐτοῦ τὴν πονηρὰν …

[50] John Zonaras, *Epitome Historion* III, 260.11-26 (ed. Büttner-Wobst): οἱ δὲ οὐχ ὅσον οὐχ ὁμοδόξουν αὐτῷ, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸν μεταστῆσαι τῆς γνώμης ταύτης ἐπεχείρουν ὁλοσχερῶς, πῇ μὲν καταψῶντες τὸν θῆρα τὸν λεοντώνυμον καὶ κατεπᾴδοντες αὐτοῦ τὰ σωτήρια, πῇ δὲ γενναιότερον ἀντιβαίνοντες καὶ διελέγχοντες τὴν ἀσέβειαν. ὁ δὲ ὡσεὶ ἀσπὶς ἔβυε τὰ ὦτα καὶ φωνῆς ἐπᾳδόντων οὐκ ἤκουεν οὐδ' ἐφαρμακεύετο παρὰ

In line with Zonaras' general tendency, his version is longer and more detailed than that of Kedrenos, with more lively narrative elements and less focus on theological matters. It is not as literary and poetic as the garden scene depicted by Manasses, but rather another kind of personal reworking of the chronographical tradition. If we compare both versions to that of Manasses, a conspicuous detail is the simile used by the latter for the head teacher and his twelve colleagues: they are not indicated by formal titles, but as "a bright sun" and as "shining stars and torches of the night / completing the number of the zodiac circle". Just like the garden imagery, this poetic expression ties in with the opening ekphrasis and the Creation of the heaven, planets, and stars (100-138), and perhaps also with the contemporary interest in astrology.[51]

Since the burning of the school by Leo appears also in earlier chronicles, it could be argued that Manasses based his version on one of those. However, he frequently turns to both Kedrenos and Zonaras in other parts of his chronicle;[52] moreover, it is in these two chronicles that we find the grand finale of Manasses' episode – the destruction of the Homeric manuscripts. However, we have to leave Leo's reign and turn back to the fifth century and the short reign of Basiliskos (or rather his usurpation under Zeno in 475-476). Kedrenos offers the following account:

> When he [Basiliskos] had been proclaimed, there was a fire in the city which destroyed its most flourishing part. Starting in the middle of the Chalkoprateia it consumed both porticoes and everything adjacent to them, including what is known as the Basilika, in which there was a library that had 120 000 books, among which was a dragon's intestine 120 feet long upon which Homer's poems, namely the *Iliad* and the

τῶν σοφῶν. πολλάκις οὖν αὐτοῖς προσῳμιληκὼς καὶ τὴν αὐτῶν μετάθεσιν ἀπογνούς, τοὺς μὲν ἀφῆκεν εἰς τὴν σφετέραν πορευθῆναι διατριβήν, τὸν οἶκον ἐκεῖνον δηλαδὴ τὸν βασίλειον, αὐτὸς δὲ κελεύσας εὔπρηστον ὕλην συναχθῆναι πολλὴν καὶ πέριξ τοῦ οἴκου τεθεῖσαν ἀναφθῆναι νυκτός, οὕτω τόν τε οἶκον σὺν ταῖς βίβλοις καὶ τοὺς σοφοὺς ἐκείνους ἄνδρας καὶ σεβασμίους κατέκαυσε.

[51] Manasses wrote a poem on astrology and the zodiac for sebastokratorissa Irene; Miller 1872, 1-112. The authorship of this text has been disputed, but see Rhoby 2009, 321-329; now also Nilsson 2021, 117-124.

[52] See Jeffreys 1979, 209-11; Kiapidou 2009; Karpozilos 2009, 541.

> *Odyssey*, were written in gold letters, together with the story of the heroes' deeds.[53]

Zonaras narrates a very similar story: the fire starting at the Chalkoprateia and spreading to buildings nearby, reducing everything to ashes:

> […] indeed even the so-called Basilika, in which there was a library containing 120 000 books. Among them, it is said, was a snake's intestine, measuring 120 feet, with the poems of Homer, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, written in gold letters, which Malchos mentions in his account of the emperors.[54]

While Manasses mentions the reign of Basiliskos (2933-34) only in passing, he has lifted the fire destroying the library from that period and placed it in the reign of Leo III, clearly as a means of enhancing the latter's hostility towards books and learning.[55] By contrast, he has not adopted the tragic continuation of the fire narrated by both Kedrenos and Zonaras, spreading to the nearby palace of Lausos and incinerating an invaluable collection of ancient statues.[56] This may be somewhat

---

[53] George Kedrenos 384.3 (Tarataglia): τούτου δὲ ἀναγορευθέντος ὁ συμβὰς ἐμπρησμὸς κατὰ τὴν πόλιν τὸ ἀνθηρότατον μέρος διέφθειρεν· ἐν γὰρ τοῦ μέσου τῶν Χαλκοπρατίων ἀρξάμενος αὐτάς τε ἀνάλωσεν ἄμφω τὰς στοὰς καὶ τὰ προσεχῆ πάντα, τήν τε καλουμένην βασιλικήν, ἐν ᾗ ἀπέκειτο βιβλιοθήκη ἔχουσα βίβλους μυριάδας ιβ΄, μεθ' ὧν βιβλίων καὶ τὸ τοῦ δράκοντος ἔντερον ποδῶν ρκ΄, ἐν ᾧ ἦν γεγραμμένα τὰ τοῦ Ὁμήρου ποιήματα, ἥ τε Ἰλιὰς καὶ ἡ Ὀδύσσεια, χρυσέοις ἐγγεγραμμέναι τοῖς γράμμασι, μετὰ καὶ τῆς ἱστορίας τῆς τῶν ἡρώων πράξεως. Tr. Mango, Vickers & Francis 1992, 91 (revised).

[54] John Zonaras III, 131.1-8 (Büttner-Wobst): ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ αὐτὴν τὴν κεκλημένην Βασιλικήν, καθ' ἣν καὶ βιβλιοθήκη ἐτύγχανε δώδεκα μυριάδας βιβλίων ἀποκειμένων ἐν αὐτῇ ἔχουσα· ἐν οἷς ἀναγράφεται εἶναι καὶ δράκοντος ἔντερον, μήκους ὂν ποδῶν ἑκατὸν εἴκοσιν, ἔχον ἐγγεγραμμένα χρυσοῖς γράμμασι τὰ τοῦ Ὁμήρου ποιήματα, τήν τε Ἰλιάδα καὶ τὴν Ὀδύσσειαν, οὗ καὶ ὁ Μάλχος τὰ περὶ τούτων τῶν βασιλέων συγγραφόμενος μέμνηται. Tr. Mango, Vickers & Francis 1992, 91 (revised).

[55] This indicates that Manasses relied on Kedrenos and/or Zonaras rather than Leo 177.7-18 as indicated by Lampsidis 1996, 228-30, app., since Leo does not include the account of the destroyed manuscript. Cf. Karpozilos 2009, 545-546, and Rhoby 2014, 398-399.

[56] See Mango, Vickers & Francis 1992; Bardill 1997, esp. p. 85; Bassett 2004, 98-120 and 232-238.

surprising for an author so fond of description of works of art,[57] but such a narrative turn would have taken his focus away from the book and thus away from *logos*. Nor did he bother with the details of the book offered by his predecessors; that too might have disrupted the narrative flow,[58] and the names and titles would have been difficult to fit into the metre – an interesting indication of the limitation and yet dramatic potential of using verse.

The *Synopsis Chronike* apparently did not initiate a new trend in twelfth-century chronicle writing; no other chronicle in verse from the Komnenian period survives.[59] Manasses' versification stands out as a unique attempt to turn history into poetry, thus approaching the contemporary novels in both form and narrative technique. The difference from other chronicles of the same period is made very clear if we look at a successor of Manasses, as far as we know the only chronicler to have used Manasses as one of his sources: Michael Glykas.[60] Glykas' account of the burning of the school in Leo's reign may be seen as a return to Kedrenos or even earlier chronicles in its presentation of bare details:

> Also the following is a sign of Leo's ill-doing, in addition to the other things. Near the precincts of the Divine Wisdom was built a beautiful house, in which books were stored, numbering about 36 500, having as their custodian and protector a noble and wise man. There were under him other wondrous men, about twelve, teaching without reward those who wanted; they were so famous with regard to excellence that even emperors should not act without them. The evil [Leo] shares with them the ideas of his ungodly opinion, and when he cannot convince them he piles up around the divine church flammable firewood and

---

[57] On Manasses' ekphraseis of objects of art, see Nilsson 2005, esp. 121-126, and 2011. See now also Foskolou 2018 and Nilsson 2021, 35-46.

[58] On Kedrenos' "story of the heroes' deeds" as, possibly, the *Chrestomathia* of Proklos, see Allen 1912, 259. Malchos, indicated as a source by Zonaras, was a fifth-century historian, surviving only in fragments. According to the *Suda*, he described the fire and the destruction of the statues. For the latest edition and study of Malchos, see Cresci 1982.

[59] On the other Byzantine verse chronicle, written by Ephraim of Ainos in the early fourteenth century, see Nilsson 2019, 524-530.

[60] On the chronicle of Glykas, see Karpozilos 2009, 585-604.

lights a bright fire, and he incinerates all together, both the divine men and with them the books.[61]

It could be argued that Glykas has been using another primary source here, but the choice of words indicate that Manasses' version has indeed been consulted.[62] The prosaic brevity has, however, excluded all narrative detail and emotional pathos. As Manasses describes how Leo tries to convert the teachers of the school, he creates a dramatic suspense:

> These men, so respectable, living such honorable lives / overflowing with all sorts of graces / the emperor thus thirsted to catch in his nets / and have them as partners in his ungodly madness. / When he had instigated all kinds of wiles he was perturbed / – for he could not persuade them by fear or threats, / and when he tried with gold, an ally hard to beat, / he realized he was pursuing an eagle or shooting for the stars – / and finally despaired.[63]

Glykas leaves out such narrative devices and goes directly from the 'trying to convince' to the burning, as indeed also Kedrenos and Zonaras did. Manasses thus remains an exception in this and also as regards

---

[61] Michael Glykas, 522.6-18 (Bekker): Δεῖγμα δὲ τῆς τοῦ Λέοντος κακοπραγίας πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις καὶ τοῦτο. ἐγγὺς τοῦ τεμένους τῆς ἁγίας τοῦ θεοῦ σοφίας οἶκος δεδόμητο λαμπρός, ἐν ᾧ βίβλοι τεθησαυρισμέναι ἦσαν, τὸν ἀριθμὸν ὡσεὶ τρισμύριαι ἑξακισχίλιαι πρὸς ἄλλαις πεντακοσίαις, ἔχουσαι φύλακά τε καὶ προϊστάμενον ἄνδρα τίμιον καὶ σοφόν. ἦσαν δὲ καὶ ὑπ' αὐτὸν ἕτεροι ἄνδρες θαυμαστοί, ὡσεὶ ιβ΄, ἀμισθὶ τοὺς θέλοντας ἐκπαιδεύοντες· ὁ γοῦν κάκιστος κοινοῦται καὶ τούτοις τὰ τῆς ἀθέου γνώμης αὐτοῦ, καὶ μὴ ἔχων καταπειθεῖς εὑρεῖν αὐτοὺς ὕλην περισωρεύει εὐέξαπτον κύκλῳ τοῦ θείου ναοῦ, καὶ πῦρ ὑφάπτει λιπαρόν, καὶ πάντα ὁμοῦ καταφλέγει, τούς τε θείους ἐκείνους ἄνδρας καὶ σὺν αὐτοῖς τὰς βίβλους.

[62] Cf. also Karpozilos 2009, 541-542 and 594, and Rhoby 2014, 404-407, on the relation between Manasses and Glykas. We may also note that Glykas, just like Manasses, mentions the reign of Basiliskos only in passing.

[63] Constantine Manasses, *Synopsis Chronike* 4216-4224 (Lampsidis): τοιούτους οὖν σεμνοπρεπεῖς ὄντας καὶ σεμνοβίους / καὶ χύσει πελαγίζοντας παντοδαπῶν χαρίτων / ἐντὸς ἀρκύων συλλαβεῖν ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐδίψα / καὶ σχεῖν κἀκείνους κοινωνοὺς τῆς λύσσης τῆς δυσθέου. / ὡς δὲ κινήσας μηχανὰς ἁπάσας ἀπεκρούσθη / (οὐ γὰρ φοβῶν, οὐκ ἀπειλῶν ἴσχυσε τούτους πεῖσαι, / καὶ τῷ χρυσῷ χρησάμενος, συμμάχῳ δυσμαχήτῳ, / ἔγνω διώκων ἀετὸν ἢ βάλλων εἰς ἀστέρας), τὸ τελευταῖον ἀπογνούς, …

the emotional and dramatic tone, which may be compared rather to historical narratives with autobiographical elements, such as the *Alexiad* of Anna Komnena. It has been suggested that it was the verse form that allowed Manasses to narrate history in such an emotional manner, and the literary representation clearly allowed him to be both personal and dramatic.[64] In his versified version of the reign of Leo III, the focus has been moved from the theological questions of iconoclasm to emotional and intellectual aspects: the destruction of the library as an act of utter disrespect for letters. It could of course be argued that Manasses moved the event in order to rewrite history as such, believing that the Homeric manuscript had survived the fifth-century fire (or that that fire had never taken place) and was still kept in the library in Leo's reign, but it seems more likely that his primary concern has been a choice based on the narrative potential of the episode(s) within the frame of his own chronicle.[65] The recasting allowed Manasses to create yet another literary garden of Eden, echoing the garden of Creation in the opening section of the *Synopsis Chronike*, while at the same time expressing his – and his patron's – devotion to ancient literature and ancient wisdom.

The heritage of Manasses: literary history and historical literature

The passage discussed above may not provide us with new historical details, but rather confuse historians by suddenly presenting events in the wrong order. The narrative choices as such do, however, offer us important information on narrative awareness and literary preferences. And even if modern scholars do not agree with this way of writing history, not respecting the 'truth' and reminding us rather of fictional strategies, the verse chronicle of Manasses seems to have met with quite some interest in subsequent centuries. It is not difficult to imagine how his playful rewriting of chronographical matter – a clear and comprehensive treatise, according to the patron's wish – won an audience beyond the

[64] Scott 2006, 43; Rhoby 2014, 393-394.

[65] Cf. Karpozilos 2009, 545-546.

intellectual circles of the capital.[66] Guided by a competent and constantly present narrator, the reader/listener could sit back and enjoy known stories in a new form, often with an entertaining and/or didactic twist.

Even if Michael Glykas seems to have recast some of Manasses's verses back into prose in the twelfth century, a later 'continuator' of the *Synopsis Chronike* is witness to a narrative urge to pick up where Manasses left off. Only 79 political verses have survived, narrating events that took place during the Fourth Crusade; they accordingly do not allow us to draw any conclusions as to whether the Continuation in fact picked up where Manasses left off, but it has been convincingly shown that the content and order of events are drawn from the *History* of Niketas Choniates (ca. 1155-1215/16). Based on the dating of Choniates' work and the manuscript transmitting the verses, we can place the Continuation of Manasses in the first half of the thirteenth century.[67] In the same period, or somewhat later, someone also undertook to adapt Manasses' chronicle into prose, changing the linguistic register into vernacular Greek. Surviving in no less than 24 known manuscripts this paraphrase seems to have been popular, inspiring also continuations of the chronicle, in some cases even as far as to include the Turkish sultans.[68] The oldest manuscript dates to the fifteenth century, but it is possible that the first paraphrase of the *Synopsis Chronike* was written earlier than that, perhaps not very long after its composition. While such procedures have often been seen as a sign of the audience's lack of education, it is in fact likely that well known works in lower linguistic registers were appreciated also by learned readers, simply for being easier to read and less time consuming.[69]

---

[66] The large number of manuscripts witness of a wide circulation of the text, even if many of them belong to later periods; see Lampsidis 1996, lxxvi-cxlix.

[67] See Grégoire 1924, arguing for an early date (1204/5). Briefly on this matter from the perspective of Choniates, see Simpson 2013, 109-110; for an updated discussion of the composition process of Choniates' *History*, see 68-77.

[68] First discussed in Praechter 1895 and 1898, but note Genova 1993, adding new manuscripts and defining two redactions of the original paraphrase of Manasses' text. See also the recent edition by Iadevaia 2000-2008 (however not taking into account the manuscripts added by Genova).

[69] Cf. e.g. Horrocks 2010, 264, with Trapp 1993 and Davis 2013, esp. p. 163.

In light of the entertaining and literary character of the *Synopsis Chronike*, it is not surprising that it also seems to have influenced – or perhaps rather provided material for – works such as the vernacular romances the *Tale of Achilles* and the *Tale of Troy*, probably belonging to the fourteenth century. These late rewritings of Homeric heroes and deeds in a popular vein have met with little scholarly sympathy, but they do bear witness to the extreme tenacity of the Homeric tradition, and also to the proliferation of Manasses's chronicle.[70] Yet another indication is the *Iliad* composed by Konstantinos Hermoniakos, a *metaphrasis* commissioned by the despot of Epiros at some point between 1323 and 1335. This extensive rewriting of the Homeric epics into a lower linguistic register draws primarily on the twelfth-century *Allegories on the Iliad* by John Tzetzes, but Tzetzes has been combined with material from Manasses and ancient literature.[71] In the case of Manasses' inclusion in the Troy romances, it is of course one particular episode that has been used, namely his fairly long account of the Trojan War (1108-1470).[72] It is thus possible that late Byzantine writers had access to shorter or longer excerpts rather than the entire chronicle, something that is indicated also by the manuscript tradition and in particular the collections of excerpts from various periods.[73] Yet another witness to the wide diffusion of the *Synopsis Chronike* is its reception in the Slavonic tradition in the fourteenth century, most notably perhaps the translation into Bulgarian for Tsar Ivan Alexander, preserved in a richly illuminated manuscript now in the Vatican Library.[74]

Manasses' chronicle was also translated and circulated in the West, starting with the increasing interest for 'Roman' history and thereby also the Byzantine chronicles. The *Synopsis Chronike* was translated into

[70] Jeffreys 1979, 236-237; developed in Nilsson 2004 See now also Lavagnini 2016; Goldwyn & Nilsson 2019.

[71] Jeffreys 1975.

[72] On this episode, see Nilsson 2006, 23-26; Reinsch 2007; Karpozilos 2009, 558-583 (text and commentary).

[73] Lampsidis 1984 and 1985; Nilsson & Nyström 2009, esp. 52-59.

[74] For the text and images, see the facsimile publication *Constantine Manasses, Synopsis chroniki* and the notes of the translation by Yuretich 2018. For an analysis, see Boeck 2010 and 2015, with further references.

Latin in 1573, some forty years before the *editio princeps* (Meursius 1616). The translator was a certain Johannes Leunclavius (Löwenklau) (1541-1594), a German historian and orientalist who had studied Greek with Philip Melanchthon in Wittenberg and who translated also ancient authors such as Xenophon (1565) and Plutarch (1565).[75] A contemporary reader, Martin Crusius (Kraus) (1526-1607), a renowned Hellenist in Tübingen, produced a copy of Manasses' chronicle in 1578/79 and enjoyed it so much that he recommended it for, among other things, its clear and lucid style.[76] Manasses was not yet seen as a bad historian – because history was not yet seen as void of rhetorical devices – and the *Annales Constantini Manassis* in the Leunclavius translation must have circulated rather widely.

Let us return to the episode discussed above, the burning of the school along with all its books under Leo III, and take a brief look at a seventeenth-century reader of Manasses, the Danish physician and anatomist Thomas Bartholin (1616-1680). Bartholin was a learned man who had studied and travelled in Europe, gathering an impressive collection of books and manuscripts. In 1670 they all went up in flames as his estate was destroyed in a fire, and Bartholin composed a text addressing his sons, *De bibliothecae incendio* – in fact a sort of self-consolation in which he enumerated past destructions of important libraries. As he reaches the fire of the "Library of Constantinople", he brings up "the intestine of a dragon twenty feet long on which the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* of Homer had been written in letters of gold" (*draconis intestinum longum pedes 20, cui Homeri Ilias & Odyssea aureis litteris erant inscripta*) and the fact that some chronicles placed its destruction in the reign of Basiliskos. He, however, is prone to believe in a different version: that of the Annals of Manasses, placing the event in the reign of Leo the Isaurian. He then cites the entire passage (*Synopsis*

[75] The edition of Meursius included also the translation by Leunclavius; for a list of early editions and translations, see Lampsidis 1996, clv-clix. Some forty years after the appearance of the *editio princeps*, the chronicle appeared in the Paris *Corpus Byzantinae Historiae* (revised ed. by Meursius and tr. by Leunclavius).

[76] See Rhoby 2014, 392; Lampsidis 1988, 99. For the manuscript, see Lampsidis 1996, xcv.

Chronike 4188-4136) from the translation of Leunclavius (*ex versione Lewenclavii*), finishing with "This according to Constantinus" (*Tantum Constantinus*).[77] Manasses' version of this particular episode indeed seems to have been quite widely accepted, as even Edward Gibbon refers to it a century later. He places the fire of "the royal college of Constantinople" under the reign of Leo and goes on:

> In the pompous style of the age, the president of that foundation was named the Sun of Science: his twelve associates, the professors in the different arts and faculties, were the twelve signs of the zodiac; a library of thirty-six thousand five hundred volumes was open to their inquiries; and they could show an ancient manuscript of Homer, on a roll of parchment one hundred and twenty feet in length, the intestines, as it was fabled, of a prodigious serpent.[78]

Gibbon refers to Du Cagne in turn referring to Kedrenos, Zonaras, Glykas and Manasses, but as we have seen above this particular version of the event appears only in Manasses. One of the rewritings of Manasses has thus found its way into the modern era, where it still lingers in popular accounts of the legendary 'college' of Constantinople.[79]

A new way of looking at history in general has certainly appeared over the last few decades, and our scholarly attitude towards Byzantine chroniclers is clearly changing as our understanding of their own attitudes increases. We no longer see the boundary between history and chronicle in Byzantium as absolute, and there is nothing provoking in

---

[77] Thomas Bertholin, *De bibliothecae incendio*, 16-21. English tr. O'Malley 1961, 1-42, here 7-8.

[78] Gibbon 1841 (1788), 24.

[79] Cf. Manguel 2007, 70: "Principal among the schools of higher learning was the Royal College of Constantinople whose president was pompously called the Sun of Science, while his twelve assistants, the twelve professor of the various faculties, were known as the Twelve Signs of the Zodiac. The College possessed a library of over 35 000 volumes, including many Greek works, among them a manuscript of Homer written on a roll of parchment 20 feet long, said to be the intestines of a fabulous serpent."

stating that "history *is* literature".[80] Constantine Manasses broke free from the traditional form and wrote a literary chronicle. If chronicles are indeed to be seen as advocates of the Byzantine worldview,[81] perhaps in the case of the *Synopsis Chronike* we are dealing rather with an advocate of the twelfth-century view of literature. In spite of that – or perhaps thanks to the literary devices that such an endeavour entailed – his representation of history proved to be a long-lived story.

[80] Macrides 2010, xi.

[81] Tocci 2014, 62-63.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Constantine Manasses, *Synopsis Chronike*. Ed. O. Lampsidis, *Constantini Manassi Breviarium Chronicum*, 2 vols. [CFHB 36/1-2]. Athens 1996.

George Kedrenos, *Synopsis Historion*. Ed. L. Tartaglia, *Georgii Cedreni Historiarum Compendium*, 2 vols. Rome 2016.

John Zonaras, *Epitome Historion*. Ed. T. Büttner-Wobst, *Ioannis Zonarae epitomae historiarum libri xviii*, vol. 3. Bonn 1897.

Michael Glykas, *Chronicle*. Ed. I. Bekker, *Michaelis Glycae Annales*. Bonn 1836.

Thomas Bartholin, *De bibliothecae incendio. Dissertatio ad filios*. Copenhagen 1670.

Secondary sources

Allen, T. W. 1912. "Lives of Homer" *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 32, 250-260.

Bardill, J. 1997. "The Palace of Lausus and Nearby Monuments in Constantinople" *American Journal of Archaeology* 101, 67-95.

Bassett, S. 2004. *The Urban Image of Late Antique Constantinople*. Cambridge.

Boeck, E. 2010. "Engaging the Byzantine Past: Strategies of visualizing history in Sicily and Bulgaria", in R. Macrides (ed.), *History as Literature in Byzantium*. Farnham, 215-235.

— 2015. *Imagining the Byzantine Past: The Perception of History in the Illustrated Manuscripts of Skylitzes and Manasses.* Cambridge.

Bourbouhakis, E. C. 2010. "Rhetoric and Performance", in P. Stephenson (ed.), *The Byzantine World*. London & New York, 175-187.

— 2017. *'Not Composed in a Chance Manner': The Epitaphios for Manuel I Komnenos by Eustathios of Thessalonike*. Uppsala.

Browning, R. 1962. "The Patriarchal School at Constantinople in the Twelfth century" *Byzantion* 32, 167-202.

Brubaker, L. & J. Haldon. 2011. *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era, c. 680-850: A History*. Princeton, N.J.

Constantine Manasses, Synopsis chroniki: Codex Vaticano Slavo 2, 1344-45 (facsimile). Athens 2007.
Cresci, L. R. 1982. *Malco di Filadelfia: Frammenti*. Naples.
Croke, B. 2010. "Uncovering Byzantium's historiographical audience", in R. Macrides (ed.), *History as Literature in Byzantium*. Farnham, 25-53.
Davis, J. 2009. "The History Metaphrased: Changing Readership in the Fourteenth Century", in A. Simpson & S. Euthymiades (eds), *Niketas Choniates: A Historian and a Writer*. Geneva, 145-163.
Foskolou, V. 2018. "Decoding Byzantine Ekphraseis on Works of Art: Constantine Manasses's Description of Earth and its Audience" *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 111/1, 71-102.
Genova, N. 1993. "Vorläufige Bemerkungen über eine anonyme spätgriechische Prosaparaphrase des Konstantinos Manasses", in N. M. Panagiotakis (ed.), *Origini della letteratura Neogreca. Atti del Secondo Congresso Internazionale "Neograeca Medii Aevi" (Venezia, 7-10 novembre 1991)*, vol 2. Venice, 545-550.
Gibbon, E. 1841 [1788]. *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, vol 4. New York.
Goldwyn, A. 2015. "John Malalas and the Origins of the Allegorical and Novelistic Traditions of the Trojan War in Byzantium" *Troianalexandrina* 15, 23-49.
Goldwyn, A. & I. Nilsson. 2019. "Homeric Motifs and Narrative Techniques in Palaiologan Romances", in A. Goldwyn & I. Nilsson (eds), *Reading the Late Byzantine Romance: A Handbook*. Cambridge, 188–210.
Grégoire, H. 1924. "Un continuateur de Constantin Manassès et sa source", *Mélanges offerts à M. Gustave Schlumberger,* II. Paris, 272-281.
Grigoriadis, I. 1998. *Linguistic and literary studies in the Epitome Historion of John Zonaras*. Thessalonike.
Hinterberger, M. 2011. "Phthonos als treibende Kraft in Prodromos, Manasses und Bryennios" *Medioevo greco* 11, 83-106.
— 2013. *Mißgunst, Neid und Eifersucht in der byzantinischen Literatur*. Wiesbaden.

Hörandner, W. 2019. “Teaching with Verse in Byzantium”, in W. Hörandner, A. Rhoby & N. Zagklas (eds), *The Brill Companion to Byzantine Poetry*. Leiden, 459–486.
Horrocks, G. C. 2010 (2nd ed.). *Greek: A History of the Language and Its Speakers*. Chichester.
Iadevaia, F. (ed.) 2000-2008. *Anonymi Historia Imperatorum. Introduzione, testo critico, versione italiana, note e indici*, vol. 1 and 2a-c. Messina.
Jeffreys, E. 1975. “Constantine Hermoniakos and Byzantine Education” *Dodone* 4, 81-109.
— 1979. “The Attitudes of Byzantine Chroniclers towards Ancient History” *Byzantion*, 199-238.
— 2014. “The sebastokratorissa Irene as Patron”, in M. Mullett et al. (eds), *Female Founders in Byzantium and Beyond = Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* 60/61, 175-192.
Jeffreys, M. 1974. “The Nature and Origin of Political Verse” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 28, 141-195.
Jeffreys, E. & M. Jeffreys. 1994. “Who was Eirene the Sebastokratorissa?” *Byzantion* 64, 40-68.
Kampianaki, T. 2017. “Plutarch’s Lives in the Byzantine chronographic tradition: The chronicle of John Zonaras” *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 41/1, 15-29.
— 2018. “Preliminary observations on the reception of Flavius Josephus” *Byzantina Symmeikta* 28, 209-228.
— 2020. “Perceptions of Flavius Josephus in the Medieval Greek and Latin literary traditions” *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 60, 290-316.
Karpozilos, A. 2009. Βυζαντινοὶ ἱστορικοὶ καὶ χρονογράφοι. Τόμ. Γ΄ (11ος–12ος αἰ.). Athens.
Kiapidou, E.-S. 2009. “Ο λογοτέχνης Κωνσταντίνος Μανασσής συγγράφει *Σύνοψη Χρονική*. Οι πηγές του για την εξιστόρηση της πρωτοβυζαντινής περιόδου” in S. Kotzabassi & G. Mavromatis (eds), *Realia Byzantina*. Berlin & New York, 57-66.
Lampsidis, O. 1984. “Collectanea Planudea und die *Chronike Synopsis* von Konstantinos Manasses” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 77, 1-2.

— 1985. “Les ‘gnomologia’ tirés de la Chronique de K. Manassès” *Byzantion* 55, 118-145.
— 1988. “Zur Biographie von K. Manasses und zu seiner *Chronike Synopsis* (CS)” *Byzantion* 58, 97-111.
— (tr.) 2003. *Κωνσταντίνου Μανασσή, Σύνοψις Χρονική.* Athens.
Lavagnini, R. 2016. “Tales of the Trojan War: Achilles and Paris in Medieval Greek Literature”, in. C. Cupane & B. Krönung (eds), *Fictional Storytelling the Medieval Mediterranean and Beyond*. Leiden, 234-359.
Macrides, R. (ed.) 2010. *History as Literature in Byzantium*, Farnham.
Magdalino, P. 1997. “In Search of the Byzantine Courtier: Leo Choirosphaktes and Constantine Manasses”, in H. Maguire (ed.), *Byzantine Court Culture from 829 to 1204*. Washington D.C., 141-165.
Maisano, R. 1985. “Il problema della forma letteraria nei proemi storiografici bizantini” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 78, 329-343.
Mallan, C. T. 2018. “The Historian John Zonaras: Some Observations on His Sources and Methods”, in O. Devillers & B. Sebastiani (eds), *Les historiens grecs et romains: entre sources et modèles*. Bordeaux, 353-366.
Mango, C., M. Vickers & E. D. Francis. 1992. “The Palace of Lausus at Constantinople and its Collection of Ancient Statues” *Journal of the History of Collections* 4/1, 89-98.
Manguel, A. 2007. *Homer’s the Iliad and the Odyssey: A Biography*. London.
Marciniak, P. 2007. “Byzantine Theatron – A Place of Performance?”, in M. Grünbart (ed.), *Theatron. Rhetorische Kultur im Spätantike und Mittelalter*. Berlin, 277-286.
Mazal, O. 1967. *Der Roman des Konstantinos Manasses. Überlieferung, Rekonstruktion, Textausgabe der Fragmente*. Vienna.
Miller, E. 1872. *Poèmes astronomiques de Théodore Prodromos et de Jean Camatère*. Paris.
Mullett, M. 1984. “Aristocracy and Patronage in the Literary Circles of Comnenian Constantinople”, in M. Angold (ed.), *The Byzantine Aristocracy, IX to XIII Centuries*. Oxford, 173-201.
Neville, L. 2018. *Guide to Byzantine Historical Writing*. Cambridge.

Nilsson, I. 2004. “From Homer to Hermoniakos: Some considerations of Troy matter in Byzantine Literature” *Troianalexandrina* 4, 9-34.
— 2005. “Narrating Images in Byzantine Literature: The Ekphraseis of Konstantinos Manasses” *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 55, 121-146.
— 2006. “Discovering Literariness in the Past: Literature vs. History in the *Synopsis Chronike* of Konstantinos Manasses”, in P. Odorico, P. A. Agapitos & M. Hinterberger (eds), *L’ecriture de la mémoire: la litterarité de l’historiographie*. Paris, 15-31.
— 2011. “Constantine Manasses, Odysseus and the Cyclops: On Byzantine Appreciation of Pagan Art in the Twelfth Century” *Byzantinoslavica* 69, 123-136.
— 2013. “Nature Controlled by Artistry – The Poetics of the Literary Garden in Byzantium”, in H. Bodin & R. Hedlund (eds), *Byzantine Gardens and Beyond*. Uppsala, 15-29.
— 2014. *Raconter Byzance: la littérature au XIIe siècle*. Paris.
— 2019. “The Past as Poetry: Two Byzantine World Chronicles in Verse”, in A. Rhoby, W. Hörandner & N. Zagklas (eds), *The Brill Companion to Byzantine Poetry*. Leiden, 517-538.
— 2021. *Writer and Occasion in Twelfth-Century Byzantium: The Authorial Voice of Constantine Manasses*. Cambridge.
Nilsson, I. & E. Nyström. 2009. “To Compose, Read, and Use a Byzantine Text: Aspects of the Chronicle of Constantine Manasses” *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 33/1, 42-60.
Odorico, P. 2021. “What’s in a Name?”, in L. James, O. Nicholson & R. Scott (eds), *After the Text: Byzantine Enquiries in Honour of Margaret Mullett*. London, 85-94.
O’Malley, C. D. 1961. *Thomas Bartholin. The Burning of His Library and On Medical Travel*. Lawrence.
Papaioannou, S. 2010. “The aesthetic of history: from Theophanes to Eustathios”, in R. Macrides (ed.), *History as Literature in Byzantium*. Farnham, 3-21.
Paul, A. & A. Rhoby. 2019. *Konstantinos Manasses, Verschronik*. Stuttgart.

Polemis, I. D. 1996. “Fünf unedierte Texte des Konstantinos Manasses” *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici* 33, 279–292.
Praechter, K. 1895. “Eine vulgärgriechische Paraphrase der Chronik des Konstantinos Manasses” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 4, 272-313.
— 1898. “Zur vulgären Paraphrase des Konstantinos Manasses” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 7, 588–593.
Reinsch, D. R. 2002. “*Historia ancilla litterarum*? Zum literarischen Geschmack in der Komnenenzeit: Das Beispiel der *Synopsis Chronike* des Konstantinos Manasses”, in P. Odorico & P. A. Agapitos (eds), *Pour une «nouvelle» histoire de la littérature byzantine*, Paris, 81-94.
— 2007. “Die Palamedes-Episode in der *Synopsis Chronike* des Konstantinos Manasses und ihre Inspirationsquelle”, in M. Hinterberger & E. Schiffer (eds), *Byzantinische Sprachkunst. Studien zur byzantinischen Literatur gewidmet Wolfram Hörandner zum 65. Geburtstag*. Berlin, 266-276.
Rhoby, A. 2009 “Verschiedene Bemerkungen zur Sebastokratorissa Eirene und zu Autoren in ihrem Umfeld” *Nea Rome* 6, 305-336.
— 2010. “Ioannes Tzetzes als Auftragsdichter” *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 15, 155-170.
— 2014. “Quellenforschung am Beispiel der Chronik des Konstantinos Manasses”, in I. Pérez Martín & J. Signes Codoñer (eds), *Textual Transmission in Byzantium: Between Textual Criticism and Quellenforschung*. Turnhout, 391-415.
Scott, R. 2006. “Narrating Justinian: From Malalas to Manasses”, in J. Burke et al. (eds), *Byzantine Narrative*. Melbourne, 29-46.
— 2012. *Byzantine Chronicles and the Sixth Century*, Farnham.
Scott, R., J. Burke & P. Tuffin. 2021. “Kedrenos’ substitution for Theophanes’ chronicle”, in L. James, O. Nicholson & R. Scott (eds), *After the Text: Byzantine Enquiries in Honour of Margaret Mullett*. London, 95-114.
Simpson, A. 2013. *Niketas Choniates: A Historiographical Study*. Oxford.
Speck, P. 1974. *Die Kaiserliche Universität von Konstantinopel*. Munich.
Taxidis, I. 2017. “Ekphraseis of Persons with Deviational Behaviour in Constantine Manasses’ *Synopsis Chronike*” *Byzantina* 35, 145-159.

Tocci, R. 2014. “Questions of Authorship and Genre in Chronicles of the Middle Byzantine Period: the Case of Michael Psellos’ *Historia syntomos*”, in A. Pizzone (ed.), *The Author in Middle Byzantine Literature: Modes, Functions, and Identities*. Berlin, 61-75.

Trapp, E. 1993. “Learned and Vernacular Literature in Byzantium: Dichotomy or Symbiosis?” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 47, 115-129.

Tsolakes, E. 1967. *Συμβολὴ στὴ μελέτη τοῦ ποιητικοῦ ἔργου τοῦ Κωνσταντίνου Μανασσῆ καὶ κριτικὴ ἔκδοση τοῦ μυθιστορήματός του “Τὰ κατ’ Ἀρίστανδρον καὶ Καλλιθέα”*. Thessalonike.

Vilimonović, L. 2021. “Contextualizing gender in XII century Byzantine discourse: Women and power in Ioannes Zonaras’ *Epitome historiarum*”, *Glasnik Etnografskog instituta* 69/ 2, 365-387.

Wahlgren, S. 2021. “Byzantine Chronicles and Metaphrasis”, in A. Alwis, M. Hinterberger & E. Schiffer (eds), *Metaphrasis in Byzantine Literature*. Turnhout, 127-137.

Yuretich, L. 2018. *The Chronicle of Constantine Manasses*. Liverpool.

Zagklas, N. 2011. “A Byzantine Grammar Treatise Attributed to Theodoros Prodromos” *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 16, 77-86.

Georgian Manuscript Production and Translation Activities in the Christian East and Byzantine Empire

Sandro Nikolaishvili

The conversion to Christianity of three Caucasian states on the eastern fringes of the Roman Empire, Armenia, Kartli/Iberia, and Albania, was a turning point in the history of the Late Antique Caucasus.[1] In the 320s, King of Kartli Mirian III and his wife Nana became Christians as a consequence of apostolic activities of a Roman woman, named Nino.[2] According to the Georgian tradition, supported by Greek and Latin sources, King Mirian III wrote a letter to Emperor Constantine, informing him of his conversion and asking him to send high-ranking ecclesiastics to his kingdom.[3]

Accounts of correspondence between Mirian and Constantine notwithstanding, the evidence is thin that the emperor was involved in the conversion of the royal house of Kartli. Christianity came to Kartli from Syria and Jerusalem and Cappadocia rather than from the core of the Roman Empire. Archeological materials show that Christianization in Kartli had advanced long before the royal conversion. Christian burials and symbols related to Christianity that date to the third century have been found throughout Kartli.[4]

---

[1] The article is written within the frame of the research programme *Retracing Connections* (https://retracingconnections.org/) financed by Riksbankens Jubileumsfond (M19–0430:1).

[2] *Conversion of Kartli* (ed. Abuladze), 85–86.

[3] Ibid., 85.

[4] Braund 1994, 239.

The gradual advance of Christianity brought considerable change in the social and cultural life of Kartli. The invention of an original Georgian script in order to serve the divine liturgy in Georgian was among significant innovations caused by the Christianization.[5] Georgian was not a written language prior to the adoption of Christianity, and the creation of the original script enhanced the development of the Georgian literary and book culture. Thus, Christianity gave a strong impetus to the translation activities and manuscript production, which proliferated in the monasteries of Jerusalem and the Palestinian desert in the fifth and the sixth centuries.

Georgian Monks in the Holy Land

Christianity and the popularization of monasticism brought a significant number of Georgians to Palestine and Jerusalem, places associated with Christ's life and passion. By the beginning of the fifth century, Georgian monasticism thrived in the Holy Land due to the activities of Peter the Iberian (Georgian).[6] Peter was a member of Georgian royal house, and he spent his childhood at the imperial court of Emperor Theodosius II (r. 408–450) after his father sent him to Constantinople as a hostage. The young Georgian prince enjoyed certain privileges at the emperor's court; Empress Eudokia became Peter's patron, and he received a good education. In the long run, Peter's royal lineage and connections with the imperial court helped him to establish monasteries in the Holy Land and beyond.

After he arrived in Jerusalem, Peter, with his supporters, erected a hospice exclusively for Georgian pilgrims. Later, he founded the first Georgian monastery in the desert, not far from the Jordan River, and a second monastery in Jerusalem (in 428) in the area of Mount Zion, near the Tower of David.[7] The latter came to be called the "monastery of the Iberians" and was known for its charitable activities.[8]

---

[5] Signes Codoñer 2014, 131–138.
[6] Horn 2006, 93.
[7] Patrich 1995, 5.
[8] Horn 2006, 71; Patrich 1995, 5.

The monasteries established by Peter and his supporters in the Holy Land were active in the sixth century. *De Aedificiis* of Procopius of Caesarea testifies that Emperor Justinian I (r. 527–565) restored two Georgian monasteries, one in the desert of Jordan and the other in Jerusalem.[9]

In the 1950s, archeologist, V. Corbo and his team unearthed the remnants of the Georgian monastery and four mosaic Georgian inscriptions at Beir-el-Qutt (between Jerusalem and the desert of Jordan). The inscriptions in *asomtavruli script* were incorporated into the floors of the main Church and refectory.[10] For a long time, it was firmly believed that V. Corbo found the monastery established by Peter the Iberian and consequently the Georgian inscriptions were dated to the fifth century.[11] However, based on the comprehensive analysis of epigraphic, numismatic and ceramic finds, the scholars concluded that the monastery at Beir el-Qutt was founded between 532 and 552 and thus cannot be connected with Peter the Iberian.[12] From the Georgian inscriptions one learns that the monastery was dedicated to St. Theodorus of Tyron and was built by Abba Antonius.[13]

Georgian monastic communities multiplied in Palestine as new monasteries were established in the vicinity of Jerusalem. Soon after the foundation of the Lavra of Mar Saba in the Judean desert, Georgian monks settled in the Lavra. Mar Saba became the most important Georgian literary center in Late Antiquity. Georgian monks developed a particularly strong attachment to it through the centuries.[14] By the sixth century, Georgian monks had succeeded in building their church in Mar Saba and served the liturgy in Georgian.[15]

During the Byzantine-Sassanid wars, the Persians sacked the Lavra of Mar Saba in 614. A century later, in 796, the Arabs attacked and

---

9 *Georgika* II (ed. Qauxchishvili), 223.
10 Ameling 2018, 605.
11 Braund 1994, 285.
12 Ameling 2018, 605.
13 Ibid., 607.
14 Mgaloblishvili 2001, 229–230.
15 Menabde 1980, 26.

ransacked the monastery a second time. Despite these calamities and a changing political and religious landscape caused by the consolidation of Arab power in the Christian East, Georgian monks remained at Mar Saba.[16]

Mar Saba is one of the earliest attested centers of Georgian manuscript production in the Christian East and the place associated with the creation of the earliest Georgian liturgical-homiletic collection, *mravaltavi* (polykephala). In 864, a team of Sabaite monks finished working on the first dated Georgian *mravaltavi* manuscript. The manuscript has a long colophon in which the Georgian monks who worked on *mravaltavi* reveal their names.

> I, Makari of Mleta, son of Giorgi the Tall, was granted a privilege by the Lord to create this holy book of *mravaltavi* with the assistance of our spiritual brother Pimen of Kaxeti and my nephew Amona […] this book was written in the city of Jerusalem, in the Lavra of our holy father and great saint Saba, when God-loving Theodosius was Patriarch and virtuous and pious Solomon the *hegoumenos* of Saint Saba […] And I, poor Makari, donated this *mravaltavi* to the holiest Mountain of Sinai […].[17]

Makari's colophon attests that Georgians not only lived in Mar Saba around the 860s, but copied and worked on manuscripts. Makari clearly states that the *mravaltavi* manuscript was created for Mount Sinai. Based on the colophon testimony, it seems that in the ninth century particularly close ties were forged between the Georgian monks of Mar Saba and Mount Sinai and they cooperated and exchanged manuscripts.

---

[16] Ibid., 27.

[17] *Mravaltavi of Sinai* (ed. Shanidze), 280-281: .მე, მაკარი ლეთეთელი, ძჲ გიორგი გრძელისაჲ, ცოდვილი ფრიად, ღირს მყო ღმერთმან შესაქმედ წმიდისა ამის წიგნისა მრავალთავისა თანა-შეწევნითა ძმისა ჩუენისა სულიერად პიმენ კახისაჲთა და ჴელთ-წერითა დედის ძმისწულისა ჩემისა ამონა (...) დაიწერა ესე წიგნი იერუსალემს, ლავრასა დიდსა წმიდისა და ნეტარისა მამისა ჩუენისა საბაჲსსა დღეთა ღმრთის მოყუარისა თევდოსი პატრეაქისათა და საბა-წმიდას პატიოსნისა და სანატრელისა სოლომონ მამასახლისისა (...) და მე, გლახაკმან მაკარი, შევწირე წმიდაი ესე მრავალთავი წმიდათ-წმიდასა მთასა სინას...

The Georgian monks' attachment to the Lavra of Mar Saba is attested in the *Life of Ilarion Kartveli* (Georgian), a hagiographical text that portrays ninth-century events. According to the narrative, Ilarion, during a pilgrimage to the holy places of the Christian East, visited the Lavra of Saba and stayed there for seven years.[18]

Georgian monks in Mar Saba carried on with literary activities in the tenth century. At the very beginning of the century, Giorgi Tbileli created a manuscript (*Sin. Geo.* 97), containing Ephrem the Syrian's works in Georgian translation, which ended up on Mount Sinai.[19] It is not entirely clear, however, whether Giorgi Tbileli created the manuscript at the request of his Georgian peers from Sinai or whether it arrived on Mount Sinai sometime afterward.

In 925, an anonymous Sabaite Georgian monk finished a manuscript, *Sin. Geo.* 36, containing John Chrysostom's and John Moschos' works. The colophon names a certain Timothy, who helped with the translation, and also commemorates Leon, the patriarch of Jerusalem, and Timothy, a *hegoumenos* of Mar Saba.[20]

Ioane-Zosime, a renowned tenth-century Georgian monk, scribe, and editor, started his career at Mar Saba. Mainly interested in liturgical and hymnographical texts, Ioane-Zosime compiled a large body of works between 949 and 987.[21] In 973, Ioane-Zosime left Mar Saba and took shelter on Mount Sinai, where he continued to work on manuscripts. Only a few works with Ioane-Zosime's autograph from his time at Mar Saba survive; among them is *Iadgari* (*tropologion*), an anthology of liturgical hymns.[22]

Another piece of evidence corroborates that Mar Saba enjoyed huge authority among Georgian monks. In the ninth century, Grigol Xanʒteli, a leader of the monastic movement in Tao-Klarjeti, adopted the Sabaite typicon for the monasteries that he established. According to his vita, Grigol asked another monk, who was traveling to Jerusalem, to acquire

---

[18] *Life of Ilarion Kartveli* (ed. Abuladze), 13–14.

[19] Цагарели 1888, 231.

[20] Ibid., 233–234.

[21] Kekelidze 1980, 164–170; Rayfield 2013, 32.

[22] Kekelidze 1980, 168–169.

and translate the Sabaite typicon. When Grigol received the translated typicon, he had several copies made and sent them to the monasteries under his supervision.[23]

The Lavra of St. Chariton (Palavra) was another monastery in the Holy Land where Georgian monks settled in Late Antiquity. Despite incomplete information, a few surviving manuscripts record Georgian monks' literary activities. Particularly noteworthy among Georgian manuscripts that originated from Palavra is a collection of hagiographical texts – *Sin. Geo.* 11.[24] The manuscript dates to the tenth century, but it seems that several hagiographies in the manuscript had been translated in the eighth and the ninth centuries. It is not entirely clear if all the hagiographies in *Sin. Geo.* 11 were translated at Palavra or in other monasteries in the Holy Land. For instance, a note inserted at the end of the *Life of Athanasios* claims that the text was translated in Jerusalem by Saith and copied by Paul at the Lavra of Chariton.[25] As noted above, Georgian monastic communities in the Holy Land were connected with each other. Therefore, it is plausible that some of the hagiographies preserved in the manuscript *Sin. Geo.* 11 were translated elsewhere and monks of Palavra acquired these texts with the help of their Georgian peers who lived in other monasteries of the Holy Land.

Cooperation among Georgian monks in the Christian East is further exemplified by the colophon in the tenth-century manuscript. The colophon author, Symeon the Melodist, a monk from Mar Saba, says that he created the manuscript at the request of Theodore, a Georgian monk from the Lavra of Chariton.[26] Interestingly, this manuscript, which was made at Mar Saba for the Chariton Lavra, ended up on Mount Sinai.[27]

---

[23] Giorgi Merčule, *the Life of Grigol Xanʒteli* (ed.Abuladze), 264–265.

[24] Цагарели 1888, 216–217.

[25] Javakhishvili 1947, 28.

[26] Цагарели 1888, 225.

[27] Javakhishvili 1947, 107–109.

At the Periphery of the Christian East: Georgian monastic communities on Mount Sinai

Georgian monks seem to have reached Mount Sinai in the sixth century, but due to scarce evidence it is not easy to trace their activities for at least two centuries.[28] Nonetheless, twelve Georgian inscriptions carved on rocks near the Monastery of St. Catherine establish that Georgian pilgrims visited Sinai between the seventh and the ninth centuries.[29]

Georgian monks' presence on Sinai from the ninth century is somewhat better documented.[30] The primary sources that provide information about the Georgian monks' activities come mainly from manuscript colophons and commentaries written by the scribes. In the ninth century, monks from the Holy Land who had suffered from the increased Arab hostilities started to migrate to Mount Sinai. Georgian monks, like their peers, began to abandon Palestine for Sinai. Located towards the periphery of the Islamic core, Sinai was relatively well-defended from the intrusions of Arab militants.

In 973, Ioane-Zosime, hymnographer and scribe, escaped from Mar Saba with other Georgian monks and moved to Sinai. The Georgian monks carried manuscripts to continue literary activities on Sinai. At the monastery of St. Catherine, Ioane-Zosime created an important and unique work, *Synaxarion for the Months of the Year,* which unites the liturgical calendars of Constantinople, Mar Saba, and Jerusalem. This calendar contains rare information about monasticism, ecclesiastical organization, and liturgical practices of the Holy Land and Lavra of Mar Saba.[31] Ioane-Zosime was also famed as a hymnographer; he composed an original Georgian hymn: *Praise and Glorification of the Georgian Language*. This mystical hymn, imbued with numerological symbolism and scriptural references, elaborated the idea that humankind would be judged in Georgian during the second coming.[32]

---

[28] Meskhi 2013, 14.
[29] Ibid., 14.
[30] Menabde 1980, 45.
[31] Menabde 1980, 36; Kekelidze 1980, 167.
[32] Kekelidze 1980, 167; Rayfield 2013, 32–33.

By the tenth century, Georgian monks on Sinai had succeeded in founding a church dedicated to John the Apostle and a scriptorium, empowering them to translate texts and produce Georgian manuscripts.[33] Sources also attest to the existence of a Georgian library with a catalog listing the Georgian manuscripts.[34] An anonymous Georgian scribe tells interesting details about the Sinai library in his colophon. He relates that the library had a special room where a person could sit and use a manuscript, but it was not allowed to take it out and to read in a monastic cell.[35]

In the eleventh century, a team of learned Georgian monks was active on Sinai. Around 1074, a Georgian scribe, Michael, copied the Gospels (*Sin. Geo.* 19); he inserted two prayers in the manuscript that mention his peer Georgian scribes and copyists – Davit, Moses, Michael, and Simeon.[36] Giorgi Iceli was another eleventh-century learned Georgian monk from Sinai; the only information about him comes from his colophon at the end of the manuscript that he donated to the Sinai library.[37]

The manuscript colophons and commentaries do not convey any information about the relationship between the Georgian royal court and monastic communities of Sinai. The extent to which Georgian monks enjoyed the patronage of Georgian kings is challenging to ascertain before the reign of Davit IV (r. 1089–1125). In the first years of the twelfth century, King Davit IV founded another Georgian church on Sinai. According to his biographer, the king took good care of the church and provided it with money and books: "for on the mountain of Sinai, where Moses and Elias saw God, he built a monastery, and granted it many thousands of gold coins, loads of curtains, a complete set of ecclesiastic books, and holy vessels of refined gold."[38]

---

[33] Menabde 1980, 46; Meskhi 2013, 29.

[34] Menabde 1980, 58; Meskhi 2013, 67–68.

[35] Цагарели 1888, 218; Javakhishvili 1947, 124.

[36] Javakhishvili 1947, 42.

[37] Цагарели 1888, 229.

[38] *The Life of Davit* (ed. Šanidze), 208; Thomson 1996, 344: რამეთუ მთასა სინასა, სადა იხილეს ღმერთი მოსე და ელია, აღაშენა მონასტერი და წარსცა ოქროი მრავალათასეული და მოსაკიდელნი ოქსინონი და წიგნები საეკლესიოი სრულებით და სამსახურებელი სიწმიდეთაი ოქროისა რჩეულისაი. About

Sinai was undoubtedly one of the centers of Georgian manuscript production and translating activities throughout the centuries. In 1888, the Georgian historian and orientalist, A. Cagareli, visited Sinai and discovered ninety-three extant Georgian manuscripts.[39]

From Jerusalem to 'New Jerusalem': Relocation of Georgian monastic communities from the Holy Land to the Byzantine Empire

The Arab advance and the rise of Islam were a great challenge for the Eastern Christian world. Within decades after Prophet Mohammad's death, the Byzantine Empire's eastern provinces fell under Arab control. In the 650s, when Moawia was campaigning in the depths of Asia Minor and targeting Constantinople, the Arab general, Habib ibn Maslama forced Stephanos, ruler of Kartli/Iberia, into submission. Stephanos held the high-ranking Byzantine court dignity of *patrikios*, but he had to recognize the caliph's supremacy and agree to pay an annual tribute. According to the agreement reached between Stephanos and Maslama, the Christian faith in Kartli/Iberia would not be persecuted, but local Christians were free to convert to Islam if they wished to do so.[40] Arab rule may not have been harsh in Kartli/Iberia in the first decades of the conquest, but things started to change after the caliphate recovered from the first round of a civil war. To secure its position in the Caucasus and disable the imperial court of Byzantium to forge a political/military alliance with local Christian rulers, the caliphs started to send Arab military and civil officials to Kartli.

The decline of the Georgian princely house must have had a negative impact on the Georgian monastic communities of the Christian East; the rulers of Kartli probably became unable to patronize and support the Georgian monks. Furthermore, a new taxation system imposed by the Arabs on the conquered territories became a heavy burden for the

---

the Georgian church on Sinai built by the support of King Davit IV see: Meskhi 2013, 44–46.

[39] Цагарели 1888; Aleksidze, 2005.

[40] Rayfield 2012, 55; Lomouri, 2011, 235–236.

Georgian monastic communities of the Holy Land, Sinai, and the Black Mountain.

While the Georgian monastic communities declined in the Arab-controlled regions, Byzantium's core areas, such as Constantinople, Mount Olympus, and later Mount Athos, started to attract Georgian monks. Throughout the centuries, the Byzantine emperors took good care to enrich Constantinople with sacred objects and saints' relics and to found monasteries and churches to make the imperial capital the holiest city in Christendom.[41] The image of Constantinople as the holiest city was also cultivated among the Georgian monks and ecclesiastics. The Georgian accounts composed in the ninth and subsequent centuries referred to Constantinople as a "vessel of Christ," the "Second Jerusalem," and a "Holy City."

Mount Olympus in Bithynia was one of the first core regions of Byzantium that attracted Georgian monks as early as the ninth century. Due to the limited evidence, however, it is difficult to reconstruct much of the history of Georgian monasticism on Olympus. Despite some claims that Georgian monks managed to establish a monastery on Olympus, there is no evidence to support this claim.[42]

Two hagiographic narratives, the *Life of Ilarion Kartveli* (9th century) and the *Life of Ioane and Euthymios the Athonites* (11th century), are accounts that attest the presence of Georgian monks on the mountain between the ninth and the tenth centuries but provide little information about the activities and scale of the Georgian monastic communities. The *Life of Ilarion* relates only that Georgian monks were present on Olympus when Ilarion and his disciples arrived on the mountain. According to the hagiography, Ilarion left Georgia for Mount Olympus during the reign of Emperor Michael III (r. 840–867).[43]

Ioane and Euthymios the Athonites, a father and son who founded the Iviron monastery on Athos, started their monastic life on Mount Olympus. According to the *Life of Ioane and Euthymios*, after years of living on Olympus, Ioane's "fame had spread, and the Greeks, as well

[41] Mergiali-Sahas 2001, 42–60.

[42] Menabde 1980, 181.

[43] *Life of Ilarion Kartveli* (ed. Abuladze), 20.

as Georgians, showed him honor."[44] If this statement made by the author of the hagiography is true, Georgians were well represented on Mount Olympus by the 970s.

Three extant Georgian manuscripts from Mount Olympus attest that Georgian monks translated texts and were engaged in literary activities. The colophon of the earliest surviving Georgian manuscript from Olympus tells the following story:

> I poor Michael […] the least chosen among the priests, translated the Acts of Paul by order of my tutor Giorgi and with the help of Ioane […] this was written on the holy mountain of Ulumbo, at the place of saint Kosmas and Damiane in the time when Polyeuctus was patriarch in Constantinople and during the kingship of Nikephore.[45]

As colophon relates, during the reign of Emperor Nikephoros II Phokas (r. 963–969) a team of Georgian monks, supervised by a certain Giorgi, completed the translation of the Acts of Paul from Greek into Georgian.

In the second half of the ninth century, disciples of Ilarion Kartveli, with support from Emperor Basileios I (r. 867–886), founded the monastery of Romana on the outskirts of Constantinople.[46] Romana was the first Georgian monastery in the core of the Byzantine Empire. The *Life of Ilarion Kartveli* is the primary source that preserves invaluable information about the circumstances which allowed the Georgian monks to build the monastery. According to the narrative, Emperor Basileios offered to the Georgian monks to have their monastery. When the monks chose the place on the outskirts of Constantinople, the emperor ordered the construction of Romana. The hagiography relates that under

---

[44] Giorgi the Athonite, *the Life of Ioane and Euthymios* (ed. Abuladze), 44; Grdzelidze 2009, 56.

[45] *The Chronicles* (ed. Zhordania), 171: მე მიქაელ გლახაკმან (...) მოვიგე წმ. ესე პავლე განზრახვითა მოძღურისა ჩემისა გიორგისითა და შეწევნითა იოვანე კახისაჲთა. დაიწერა წმ. მთასა ოლინპოჲსასა საყოფელსა წ˜ისა კოზმან და დამიანეთასა, პატრიარქობასა კონსტანტინოპოლეს პოლიოვკტოჲსა, და მეფობასა ნიკიფორესსა.

[46] *Life of Ilarion Kartveli* (ed. Abuladze), 32–33.

Basileios' supervision the monastery was completed in a matter of months and the emperor donated valuable gifts and books.[47]

The monks of Romana, like their peers from Mount Olympus, were involved in literary activities. Only two manuscripts originating from Romana have come down to us. The earliest extant manuscript (A-134), dating to ca. 1066, was created under the supervision of Simeon Dvali and contains *The Climax* by John Climacus and two hagiographies.[48] The second manuscript (A-1335), the unique and richly illuminated Vani Gospels, was commissioned by Queen Tamar (r. 1084–1212) before the end of the twelfth century. Two Georgian monks from Romana are known to have worked on Vani Gospels: Ioane "Unworthy" and Michael, an illuminator of the manuscript.[49]

The Monastery of Iviron on Mount Athos

Even though Georgian monastic communities multiplied and grew strong in the core of Byzantium, the foundation of the Georgian monastery of Iviron on Mount Athos was of great significance. Soon after its foundation, Iviron became a significant center of translation activities and manuscript production. One of the primary goals of the Iviron monks was to disseminate translated texts and manuscripts to Georgia to provide the local churches and monasteries with Christian texts that were not available in Georgian translation.[50]

Ioane the Athonite, an aristocrat from Tao, was the first *hegoumenos* of Iviron, responsible for turning Iviron into a vital center of Georgian literary activities in the Byzantine Empire. Before taking monastic vows Ioane had been a close associate of Davit III *kouropalatēs*. As his biographer relates, Ioane was concerned that there were not enough books and manuscripts in Georgia. To supply the Georgian churches and monasteries with the required literature, Ioane encouraged his son, Euthymios to dedicate himself to translation activities.

---

[47] Ibid.
[48] Metreveli 1976, 151–154.
[49] Kekelidze 1954, 407–410.
[50] Metreveli 2012, 259–267.

> ‘My son the land of Kartli is in a great need of books for they lack many of them. I see what God has granted to you so make sure that with your efforts you multiply your gifts from God.’ Because Euthymios was obedient by nature, he at once followed his instruction and started translating, and everyone was amazed because such translations […] have neither been made in our language nor, I think, will be made.[51]

Without a doubt, Ioane and Euthymios facilitated the reception of Byzantine/Christian thought in the Georgian-speaking environment. Ioane the Athonite’s attempts to improve the cultural landscape of Georgia are attested in his preface to a manuscript of John Chrysostom’s commentaries on the Gospel of Mathew. Ioane relates:

> This work was not available before in our Georgian language […] whereas churches in Rome and Greece had multiple copies. Our land, unfortunately, not only did not possess this book, but many other books, too. Therefore, I, poor Ioane, the least chosen of all monks, was sad because of this matter and because the land of Kartli was so poor when it comes to books. I worked very hard, made a considerable effort, educated my son Euthymios in all-encompassing Greek learning, and directed him to translate books from Greek into Georgian.[52]

---

[51] Giorgi the Athonite, *The Life of Ioane and Euthymios* (ed. Abuladze), 61; Grdzelidze 2009, 67: ეტყვინ მამაი იოვანე ვითარმედ ‘შვილო ჩემო, ქართლისა ქუეყანაი დიდან ნაკლულევან არს წიგნთაგან და მრავალნი წიგნნი აკლან, და ვხედავ, რომელ ღმერთსა მოუმადლებია შენდა. აწ იღუაწე, რაითა, განამრავლო სასყიდელი შენი ღმრთისაგან.’ და იგი, ვითარცა იყო ყოველსავე ზედა მორჩილი, მოსწრაფედ შეუდგა ბრძანებასა მისსა და იწყო თარგმნად და ყოველნივე განაკვრვნა, რამეთუ ეგევითარი თარგმანი, გარეშე მათ პირველთასა, არღარა გამოჩინებულ არს ენასა ჩუენსა და ვჰგონებ, თუ არცაღა გამოჩინებად არს.

[52] *The Chronicles* (ed. Zhordania), 140–141: ხოლო ენასა ამას ჩნ˜სა ქართულსა. არავინ სადა პოვნილ იყო აქამომდე: რათამცა გამოეხუნეს წ˜ნი ესე წიგნი თარგმანებანი წ˜სა სახარებისანი: ა˜დ საბერძნეთისა ელსე ეკლესიანი და ჰრომისანი სავსე იყვნეს ამათგან: ხ˜ ჩ˜ნისა მას ქ˜ყანისანი ნაკლულევან: და არა ესეოდენ წიგნნი აკლდეს. ენასა ჩ˜ნსა (...) ამისთვის მე გლახაკი ესე და ნარჩევი ყ˜ლთა მონაზონთაჲ: იოანე მწუხარე ვიყავ ამის საქმისათჳს: რ˜ლ ესრეთ ნაკლულევან იყო ქყ˜ნაჲ ვაჩუენე და შვილი ჩემი ეფთჳმე გავსწავლე: სწავლითა ბერძნულითა სრულიად. და გამოთარგმანებად წარვჰმართე წიგნთა: ბერძულისაგან ქართულად.

The foundation of Iviron was closely linked with the turbulent events in the Byzantine Empire in the 970s. When Bardas Skleros rebelled and challenged Basileios II and Konstantinos VIII, Davit III *kouropalatēs*, ruler of Tao, sent military aid to support the emperors. The joint Byzantine and Georgian army defeated Bardas Skleros in 979 and neutralized the threat. In reward for the military support, the imperial court lavishly remunerated Ioane-Tornike, the Georgian army commander, and an aristocrat from the Čordvaneli family.[53] Ioane-Tornike had held the positions of *patrikios* and *synkellos* in the Byzantine administration, but he was a monk on Athos when the imperial court asked him to travel to Tao to persuade Davit *kouropalatēs* to support the government in Constantinople. Ioane-Tornike not only met the request of the imperial court and traveled to Tao, but he also agreed to command the Georgian expeditionary army against Skleros even though he was no longer a layman. The imperial court appreciated the Athonite monk's sacrifice. After the defeat of the main adversary of the empire, Ioane-Tornike received a vast amount of wealth and spoils of war.

> After Tornike had routed Skleros and returned [to Athos] with innumerable goods and wealth because the treasure alone exceeded 12 *kentenaria* together with some other fine things, he gave everything to his spiritual father Ioane, and denied himself completely, not keeping even smallest thing in his possession.[54]

Before Bardas Skleros' rebellion, Georgians had made at least two attempts to build a monastery on Athos, but emperors Ioannes Tzimiskes

---

[53] Giorgi the Athonite, *The Life of Ioane and Euthymios* (ed. Abuladze), 50; Grdzelidze 2009, 60.

[54] Ibid: ხოლო თორნიკ, ვინაითგან იოტა სკლიაროსი და კუალად აქავე მოიქცა ურიცხვთა საფასითა და განძითა, - რამეთუ უფროის ათორმეტისა კენდინარისა მოიღო განძი ოდენ, სხუათა ტურფათაგან კიდე, - რომელი-იგი ყოველივე მამისა თვსისა სულიერისა იოვანეს ხელთა მისცა და თავი თვსი სრულიად უარ-ყო და არაცა თუ მცირედი რაიმე დაუტევა ხელმწიფებასა ქუეშე თვსსა.

in 972 and Basileios II in 976 refused to grant them permission.[55] Hence, had not Davit III *kouropalatēs* supported the Byzantine emperors during the crisis of the 970s, Iviron might never have been established on Athos. After the victory over Skleros and his supporters, Emperor Basileios II granted Georgian monks permission to acquire land on Athos to build the monastery; in addition, the emperor donated lands and monasteries in the different parts of the empire to the Iviron.[56]

Iviron attracted Georgian ecclesiastics from all over Byzantium and Georgia. Ioane-Tornike, *ktetor* and the founder of Iviron, enlarged the community of the newly founded monastery by bringing Georgian monks and orphans from Tao-Klarjeti. As the first *hegoumenos* of Iviron, Ioane the Athonite did his best to invite prominent churchmen to the monastery. He was successful in persuading Ioane Grʒeliʒe and Arsen Ninocʻmindeli to leave the desert of Ponto and move to Athos. As it happened, these two monks were scribes and learned men, and Ioane thought to use their skills to turn Iviron into a center of manuscript production. In a manuscript colophon Ioane Grʒeliʒe and Arsen Ninocʻmindeli claim: "By order of God […] we poor sinners Arsen Ninocʻmindeli and Ioane Grʒeliʒe and Chrysostom copied holy books translated from Greek to Georgian by our holy illuminator father, Euthymios."[57]

The translation movement initiated and supervised by Ioane the Athonite was carried on by his successor and son, Euthymios, who became the second *hegoumenos* of the monastery. Under Euthymios' leadership, intellectual life thrived at Iviron, and the monastery became the primary hub of manuscript production from where translated Byzantine/Christian texts were widely disseminated in Georgia. The revival of Georgian literature in the eleventh and twelfth centuries was enhanced by the reception of the intellectual legacy of the Iviron monastic school.[58]

---

[55] Speake 2018, 56.

[56] Grdzelidze 2009, 29.

[57] Pantsulaia 1954, 76–84.

[58] Kekelidze 1945, 218; Metreveli 2012, 260.

Unlike his father, Ioane, Euthymios was educated in Constantinople and had an excellent knowledge of Greek. A member of an aristocratic family, he was a boy when he and other aristocratic children were sent to Constantinople after Emperor Basileios II requested hostages from Davit III *kouropalatēs*. Byzantine emperors often asked for hostages from Georgian rulers to guarantee and secure their loyalty and obedience to the imperial court. It is not an exaggeration to state that the education Euthymios received at the Byzantine imperial court turned him into an intellectual and prolific translator. Moreover, he can be considered a shining example of a cultural agent/broker who enhanced the cultural ties between Byzantium and Georgia through his intellectual activities. Narrative accounts confirm that at Davit III *kouropalatēs*' request, Euthymios and his team translated manuscripts and sent them to the ruler of Tao:

> Many of these books were sent to David *kouropalatēs*, who was faithful and therefore rejoiced and praised God, saying: 'Thanks be to God who in our times revealed a new Chrysostom.'
> And the king sent letter after letter with a plea to translate more books and to send them back to the East. And the beloved one translated without a break; he did not allow himself to rest but worked day and night like a bee on the sweet honey of divine books and through them our language and Church were sweetened. He translated so many books that it is hardly possible to count them [...][59]

[59] Giorgi the Athonite, *The Life of Ioane and Euthymios* (ed. Abuladze), 61–62; Grdzelidze 2009, 67–68: და მრავალნი წიგნნი წაესცნის წინაშე დავით პურაპალატისა, რომელნი-იგი იხილნა რაი, ვითარცა იყო მორწმუნე, სიახარულითა აღივსო, და ადიდებდა ღმრთსა და იტყოდა, ვითარმედ: 'მადლი ღმერთსა, რომელმან ჩუენთა ამათ ჟამთა ახალი ოქროპირი გამოაჩინა.' და ზედაის-ზედა მოუწერნ, რაითა თარგმნიდეს და წარსცემდეს. და იგი სანატრელი შეუსუენებელად თარგმნინ და რაითურთით არა სცემდა განსუენებასა თავსა თვსსა, არამედ დღე და ღამე ტკბილსა მას თაფლსა წიგნთა საღმრთოთასა შურებოდა, რომლისა მიერ დაატკბო ენაი ჩუენი და ეკლესიაი. რამეთუ თარგმნნა წიგნნი საღმრთონი რომელთა აღრიცხუვაი კნინღა-და შეუძლებელ არს.

In 1019 Euthymios renounced his position as *hegoumenos* of the Iviron monastery to dedicate himself fully to literary activities. He spent the rest of his life in his monastic cell, translating texts and working on manuscripts.[60]

After his death, Euthymios became known as a "new Chrysostom," enlightener of the Georgian church and a model of a learned monk and translator. The impressive number of Byzantine/Christian texts that Euthymios translated into Georgian was the main reason that he earned such fame and authority among Georgian ecclesiastics. Giorgi Mc'ire (Minor), a learned monk from the Iviron, paid tribute to Euthymios and lauded him as a "luminous star," "jewel of the nation," and a "new Chrysostom."

> Like a thirteenth apostle he cleansed our country completely from the deficiency mentioned above through his numerous translations of Holy Scripture […] And he also left us accounts of the rulers and canons of the Church, the bulwark of our faith. He left these copies which from this holy mountain and God-built Lavra reached our land and spread on our nation like the living springs of the heavenly river.[61]

Euthymios authored at least 160 translations that encompass all genres of ecclesiastical literature: biblical, exegetical, apocryphal, homiletic, canonical, dogmatic-polemical, and liturgical texts.[62] He also translated other authors and types of literature – Gregory the Theologian,

---

[60] Kekelidze 1980, 187.

[61] Giorgi Mc'ire, *The Life of Giorgi the Athonite* (ed. Abuladze), 111; Grdzelidze 2009, 124: და ვითარცა მეათცამეტემან მოციქულმან ქუეყანაი ჩუენი ამათ ზემოხსენებულთა ღუარძლთაგან სრულიად გაწმინდა მრავლად თარგმანებითა წმიდათა წერილთაითაი, ვითარცა დასაბამსავე სიტყვსა ჩუენისასა ვთქუეათ, და წესნი და კანონნი ეკლესიისანი დამამტკიცებელნი სარწმუნოებისა ჩუენისანი. ესე ყოველნი აღწერილად დაგვტევნა, რომელნი-იგი წმიდისა ამის მთისაგან და ღმრთივ-აღშენებულისა ლავრისა ვითარცა მდინარისაგან ედემეანისა ნაკადულნი ცხორებისანი პირსა ზედა ქუეყანისა და ნათესავისა ჩუენისასა მიეფინნეს.

[62] For a list of Euthymios' translations, see Kekelidze 1980, 194–213; Giorgi the Athonite, *The Life of Ioane and Euthymios* (ed. Abuladze), 62-64; Grdzelidze 2009, 68–71.

Maximus the Confessor, John of Damascus – which had not been available before in Georgian. For instance, before Euthymios translated the corpus of Gregory the Theologian's works, the Cappadocian father was represented in Georgian by only his two homilies ("On Epiphany" and "On Theology").[63] By introducing the Georgian audience to revered theologians and church fathers, Euthymios further enhanced the cultural orientation of the Georgian Church towards Constantinople. His translations and literary activities served to develop a Georgian literary language and bring it close to Byzantine standards.[64]

Another significant factor that enhanced the "Byzantinization" of Georgian religious culture was Euthymios's translation of Byzantine liturgical literature. Before the tenth century, the Georgian church followed the Jerusalem liturgical practice, but when Euthymios translated the *Synaxarion* of Constantinople, that was widely disseminated in the Georgian-speaking environment, the Georgian church gradually adopted the Constantinopolitan rite.[65] Among Euthymios' translations, the *Life of the Virgin Mary* is particularly valuable. The narrative is the earliest extant biography of Theotokos, the authorship of which Euthymios ascribes to a prominent Byzantine theologian, Maximus the Confessor. This work survives only in the Georgian translation; the Greek original narrative is lost.[66]

Euthymios was also the first among the Georgians to take an interest in metaphrastic hagiographies and translate saints' lives by Symeon Logothetes. Moreover, he adopted the metaphrastic method and applied it to *Barlaam and Ioasaph*, which he translated from Georgian into Greek. Euthymios's *Barlaam and Ioasaph* was not just a Greek translation of the Georgian *Balavariani*, but a new text, significantly enlarged and metaphrased, containing excerpts from various other works.[67]

After Euthymios' death, the Iviron monastery had to deal with severe problems for at least two decades. The crisis started after

---

[63] Bezarashvili 2013,100–101.

[64] Ibid., 102.

[65] Ibid., 101–102; Rayfield 2013, 26.

[66] For an English translation of the Georgian text see Shoemaker 2012, 36–156.

[67] Volk 2009, 101–15; Høgel 2019, 354-–364.

Giorgi Čordvaneli, the third *hegoumenos* of Iviron, was accused of conspiracy against Emperor Romanos III (r. 1028–1034). Supposedly, Giorgi supported a group of Romanos' opponents who had conspired to depose the emperor. As a result of the accusation against Čordvaneli, the imperial court withdrew its patronage and support, which left the monastery vulnerable. The Greek monks on Athos used the opportunity to attack and sack the Georgian monastery. During the 1040s, the Iviron gradually recovered. Georgian monks on the Black Mountain (in the environs of Antioch) were particularly concerned about the future of the Iviron and decided to send one of their peers, learned monk Giorgi on Athos.

Giorgi the Athonite started his career on the Black Mountain, earning respect and a good reputation because of his learnedness and exquisite translation skills. His supervisor, Giorgi the Recluse, sent him to Iviron with a special mission to complete the translation of the texts that Euthymios the Athonite had left unfinished. After arriving on the Holy Mountain, Giorgi the Athonite became the *hegoumenos* of Iviron. He succeeded in re-establishing the Byzantine imperial court's support and resuscitated Georgian manuscript production at the monastery. Under Giorgi's leadership, Iviron's renowned school of translation recovered. Between the 1040s and 1060s, Giorgi the Athonite translated a broad spectrum of literary works into Georgian, more than 100 Greek texts. Among his works are the "Great Synaxarion" and several metaphrastic hagiographies.[68]

Giorgi the Athonite was educated in Byzantium. Like Euthymios, he was sent to Constantinople as a hostage and spent more than a decade at the imperial court, where he received an up-to-date education. According to his vita, after Giorgi completed his studies, he was well versed in theology and rhetoric. Allegedly his erudition and in-depth knowledge of theology made an impression on Emperor Constantine X Doukas (r. 1059–1067) during polemics between the Latins and Byzantines held at the imperial palace.[69]

---

[68] Kekelidze 1980, 226–231.

[69] Giorgi Mc'ire, *The Life of Giorgi the Athonite* (ed. Abuladze), 178–180; Grdzelidze 2009, 144–145.

Unlike Euthymios the Athonite, who spent most of his life on the Holy Mountain, Giorgi the Athonite often traveled around the Byzantine Empire and Christian East. He visited places either for diplomatic purposes or to acquire manuscripts and translate texts. As his vita attests, Giorgi went to Constantinople twice, and both times he tried to secure political and financial support from the imperial court. Even in the imperial capital Giorgi continued working on translations and probably used the libraries of Constantinople to acquire rare and unique manuscripts. In the 1050s, Giorgi temporarily left Mount Athos and moved to the Black Mountain, where he stayed for two or three years, spending his time working on translations. From the Black Mountain, in the 1060s, Giorgi went to Georgia at the request of King Bagrat IV (r. 1027–1072), who wanted to reform the Georgian Church with his help. The *Life of Giorgi the Athonite* claims that Giorgi brought several manuscripts with him from the Black Mountain that were copied extensively throughout the Georgian kingdom. "His books were copied in many dioceses and monasteries, and he corrected many church orders he found deficient."[70] This example alone demonstrates how Giorgi the Athonite sought to improve the cultural and intellectual environment in his homeland. In addition, Giorgi gathered eighty orphan boys in Georgia and took them with him to Constantinople for a good education. According to his biography, when Giorgi arrived in the imperial capital, he met with Emperor Constantine X Doukas and entrusted him with the future of the orphans:

> Holy king, these orphans I have collected in the east and taught them the name of God. Now I present them to your majesty. Bring them up according to your judgment and have mercy upon them so that they may pray for your soul and for the long and prosperous life of your children.[71]

---

[70] Ibid., 173; 141.

[71] Giorgi Mc'ire, *The Life of Giorgi the Athonite* (ed. Abuladze),182; Grdzelidze 2009, 147: 'წმიდაო მეფეო, ესე ობოლნი აღმოსავლეთს შემიკრებიან და სახელი ღმრთისაი დამისწავებია და აწ წინაშე მეფობისა თქუენისა მომიყვანებია, ვითარცა ჯერ-გიჩნს, აღზარდე და შეიწყალენ მლოცველად სულისა თქუენისა და შვილთა თქუენთა მზეგრძელობისათჳს.'

An overview of Giorgi the Athonite's career and travels reveals how a learned monk in the Middle Ages could have a powerful impact on the cultural landscape of a place he visited. Giorgi arrived in Georgia with manuscripts/books that circulated widely and were copied in different parts of the kingdom. Furthermore, Giorgi continued his literary activities in Georgia for five years and tutored prince Giorgi (the future King Giorgi II).

The majority of the orphans that Giorgi took to Constantinople probably received a good education and became translators and copyists. Some may have joined the Georgian monastic communities of Byzantium, and the others may have returned to Georgia to continue literary activities. Giorgi the Athonite can safely be called a culture broker; through his translations and literary works he introduced and reinforced Byzantine traditions in the Georgian environment. He played a significant role in strengthening the links between Byzantium and Medieval Georgia.

Georgian Literary Activities on the Byzantine Periphery: The Black Mountain

The core of the Byzantine Empire, Athos, Olympus, and Constantinople was not the only place where Georgian monastic communities emerged. The Byzantine Empire's restoration of imperial control over Antioch and Northern Syria in the tenth century created favorable conditions for reviving monastic activities there. From the second quarter of the eleventh century, Georgian monks started to migrate from Tao and Klarjeti to Antioch. Georgian monastic communities and their intellectual activities flourished on the Black Mountain after the 1030s. Evidence suggests that Georgian monks arrived in the vicinity of Antioch in Late Antiquity, before the Arab conquest of the Christian East.

The earliest source that mentions Georgian monks on the Black Mountain is Theodoret of Cyrus's *Phylotheon Historion*. According to the text, Symeon the Stylite had many visitors, Georgians among them.[72]

[72] *Georgika I* (ed.Qauxchishvili), 225.

Further information about the Georgian monks comes from the *Life of Symeon Stylite the Younger*, whose hagiography claims that one day a crowd of Georgians arrived at the monastery founded by Symeon:

> A vast number of people, men, women, and children were approaching the monastery. They held crosses in their hands and were chanting and praying. When they were close to the mountain, the Holy Spirit appeared to Symeon and said: 'I know who these people are, they are Georgians who hold your name in great esteem, and they came to you with a great faith […] accept them in your monastery and let them be pious and God-serving.'[73]

Another hagiographical text, *The Life of Martha*, an account of Symeon the Younger's mother's life, confirms that Georgian monks lived and played prominent roles in the monastery founded by Symeon. This hagiography charges Georgian monks with an extraordinary mission. According to the narrative, after Martha's death, Symeon wholeheartedly wished to acquire parts of the True Cross and prayed to God for his wish to be fulfilled. After some time, Georgian monks arrived from Jerusalem and presented Symeon with a golden cross which held parts of the True Cross.[74] After the Arab conquest, the Georgian monastic communities dwindled in the region. There is no evidence to suggest that Georgian monks were present on the Black Mountain before the Byzantines regained control of Northern Syria during the reign of Nikephoros II Phokas (r. 963–969).

---

[73] *Life of Symeon Stylite the Younger* (ed. Kekelidze), 260: დღესა ერთსა იყო წ~დაჲ იგი განკჳრვებასა შ~ა. იხილა ერი დიდძალი ფ~დ მამათა და დედათაჲ და ყრმათაჲ. და აქუნდა ჴელთა მათთა ჯ~რები და მოვიდოდეს იგინი აღმოსავალით მისა ლითანიითა და ლოცვითა. რ~ლთა შესწირვიდეს ღ~თისა მიმართ. და სული წ~დაიჲ ჰფარვიდა მათ. ყ~ლსა მას ერსა. და თანაუვიდოდა და ვ~რ მოეახლნეს იგინი მთასა მას საკჳრველსა ჰრქუა სულმან წ~მან მონასა თჳსსა სჳმიონს:უწყო მეა ვინ არიან ესენი რ~ლნი მოსრულ არიან შენდა ესე არს ნათესავი ქართველთაჲ. რ˜ლნი გყუარობენ შენ სახელისა ჩემისათჳს და მოვიდოდიან შენდა ჟამითი-ჟამად სარწმუნოებითა დიდითა (…) და კ˜დ დაემკჳდრნენ მათგანნი მონასტერსაცა შინსა და იყვნენ იგინი მორწმუნე და კეთილად-მსახურ:.

[74] Garitte 1968, 285–286; Braund 1994, 285.

Scarce sources for the history of Georgian monasticism around Antioch in the eleventh century suggest that Georgian monks were active in more than ten monasteries of the region, including St. Symeon on Miraculous Mountain, and Mother of God of Kalipos.[75] Kalipos was the pre-eminent monastery and main hub of Georgian literary activities. Most of the extant Georgian manuscripts from the environs of Antioch were copied and composed at this monastery.[76]

The re-emergence of Georgian communities on the Black Mountain contributed to the revival of translation activities. The first wave of translation is associated with Giorgi the Recluse, who lived in a cave next to the St. Symeon monastery on Miraculous Mountain. Giorgi was a hermit, but also a learned man and translator who enhanced his fellow Georgian monks' literary activities.[77] He discovered the talent of Giorgi the Athonite and supervised his translations; in one of his colophons, Giorgi the Athonite states that his work was supervised by Giorgi the Recluse. After several years, Giorgi the Athonite moved to Athos and continued his intellectual activities at the monastery of Iviron.[78]

Georgian monastic communities scattered all over the Byzantine Empire were not isolated and communicated with each other, particularly Iviron on Athos and the monasteries of Black Mountain. Several examples are known of a manuscript being composed on Athos and sent to Black Mountain and vice versa. For instance, Giorgi the Recluse took good care to enlarge the Iviron monastery library and copied two texts for his peers on Athos. In the colophon of the manuscript, he relates the following: "I, poor monk Giorgi, have learned that the Holy Mountain did not have a *Life of Saint and Blessed Martha* and *Life of Saint Barlaam*; therefore, I decided to translate these works and donate them."[79] What is

[75] Djobadze 1976, 86.

[76] Djobadze 1976, 97.

[77] Menabde 1980, 152.

[78] Giorgi Mc'ire, *The Life of Giorgi the Athonite* (ed. Abuladze), 122-123; Grdzelidze 2009, 109–110.

[79] Menabde 1980, 154: მე, გლახაკსა ბერსა გიორგი დაყუდებულსა, მასმიოდა, ვითა ესე წმიდისა და დიდებულისა ნეტარისა მართაჲ ცხოვრებაჲ და წმიდისა ბარლაამისი მთაწმიდას არა არსო და ამის ჯერისათჳს ვინებე აღწერაჲ და მაგას ეკლესიასა შემოჭირვაჲ.

noteworthy in this colophon is that Giorgi was perfectly aware of which manuscripts the Iviron library needed.

The intensity of communication and cooperation between the Iviron and the Black Mountain monks is evident from another example. Giorgi the Recluse, hermit monk from the Black Mountain who never left his monastery, ordered a Georgian monk in Iviron, Giorgi Mc'ire, to write a biography of Giorgi the Athonite. As noted above, Giorgi the Recluse was Giorgi the Athonite's teacher and supervisor, who sent the latter to Athos to continue his monastic career there. Giorgi Mc'ire was Giorgi the Athonite's student, accompanying his master on his travels around the Christian East; an eyewitness of the events described in his hagiographical account, *The Life of Giorgi the Athonite*. The evidence suggests that Giorgi Mc'ire and Giorgi the Recluse exchanged letters and agreed on the details of the biography of Giorgi the Athonite. It is evident that Giorgi Mc'ire learned a great deal from Giorgi the Recluse about the early years of his protagonist's life and monastic activities on the Black Mountain.

A high point of Georgian literary and translation activities on the Black Mountain is associated with the name of Ephrem Mc'ire [Minor]. Little is known about Ephrem's life, but it seems that he was educated in Constantinople and later moved to the Black Mountain.[80] He was active in the monasteries of St. Symeon and Kastana in the second half of the eleventh century. In 1091, Ephrem became the leader of Kastana monastery and held the position until his death. Ephrem acquired a good knowledge of Greek in Constantinople, but learned the methods of translation on the Black Mountain. His teachers were the learned Georgian monks Anton T'beli and Saba Tuxareli.[81]

Ephrem's literary output is impressive. He translated over 120 texts from all genres of Byzantine literature, including metaphrastic hagiographies and the works of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite.[82] Ephrem raised translation techniques to a new level and developed

[80] Kekelidze 1980, 251–252.

[81] Kekelidze 1980, 253; Bezarashvili 2015, 337.

[82] Tvaltvadze 2010, 47–8; Bregadze 1971, 444.

philological theory to bring Georgian translated texts to perfection.[83] Ephrem's first rule was to translate the text into Georgian only from the original language. In his view, the translator had to follow the original text closely without adding or omitting anything. Ephrem, however, realized that a literal translation could make a Georgian text incomprehensible due to drastic differences between the Greek and Georgian languages. A translator had to be cautious and aware of this danger.[84]

Ephrem supplemented translated texts with commentaries and references, explaining the original text's grammatical, textual, and historical peculiarities. In his commentaries, inserted on the manuscript margins, Ephrem clarified why he chose to translate some parts of the text in a certain way. If a passage or sentence in the Georgian translation looked confusing for a reader, Ephrem indicated that it was the same in the Greek original. Ephrem did his best to explain and interpret confusing parts.[85] When Ephrem decided to work on a particular author and text, he first inquired if it was already translated into Georgian. Then he would try to acquire a copy and check the translation. Only after meticulous inspection would Ephrem decide whether it was necessary to translate the text into Georgian again.[86]

Ephrem took particular interest in studying the correlation between different redactions of the Gospels in Georgian translation. After a thorough philological scrutiny, he concluded that the oldest Georgian redactions diverged from the ones translated by Giorgi the Athonite in the eleventh century. Ephrem also compared the Georgian Gospels with the Greek originals, which revealed that Giorgi the Athonite's translation followed the original Greek Gospels more closely than the older Georgian redactions.[87]

Ephrem's strong belief in his philological method encouraged him to re-translate works by Euthymios the Athonite. As already noted, after his death Euthymios was respected as an exemplary translator and

---

[83] Bezarashvili 2015, 339.
[84] Kekelidze 1980, 253–4; Khintibidze 1996, 107.
[85] Kekelidze 1980, 254; Khintibidze 1996, 108–109.
[86] Kekelidze 1980, 254.
[87] Khintibidze 1996, 116–119.

illuminator of the Georgian Church. Nevertheless, Ephrem thought that the Athonite monk was sometimes too free in his translations. Euthymios was known for his reader-oriented method; he abridged or expanded some parts of the original text in the Georgian translation to make a text more comprehensible for a broad audience.[88] Furthermore, Euthymios also integrated the commentaries supplementing the Greek original texts into the Georgian translated text. Euthymios' approach shortened, interpolated, and compiled translations, not infrequently turning the Georgian text into a new version of the original.[89] Ephrem Mc'ire tried to justify Euthymios's method. In his words, the Athonite monk adapted and simplified the Georgian texts to enlighten immature and unsophisticated congregations unable to grasp complex texts meaningfully.[90] Ephrem praised Euthymios's style several times in his colophons as beautiful and refined and paid homage to the venerated Athonite monk for making complicated theological texts and ideas understandable for an audience not trained in theology and rhetoric. Nevertheless, Ephrem thought that Georgians had matured and became more enlightened in the decades after Euthymios' translations so it was necessary to develop a new approach that would transmit Byzantine/Christian thought better, in full scale, to a Georgian readership. Ephrem's new translations served this purpose.

Ephrem also revised some works of Giorgi the Athonite, equally as respected and learned as Euthymios. Ephrem held Giorgi in high esteem, referred to him as his teacher, and thought highly of the Gospels translated by Giorgi. Nonetheless, Ephrem was not satisfied with Giorgi's version of John Chrysostom's homilies on the Gospel of Matthew and translated the work again, adding his own commentaries.[91]

Ephrem's colophons and marginal notes reveal how carefully he approached the art of translation. One of his colophons relates that Ephrem was eager to translate Basil the Great's *Asceticon*. He knew that this work already existed in Georgian and tried to acquire a copy. He

---

[88] Bezarashvili 2013, 102; Kekelidze, *History of the Georgian Literature*, 188.

[89] Bezarashvili 2013, 104.

[90] Ibid., 103.

[91] Khintibidze 1996, 117.

waited for twelve years and lost hope of finding the manuscript, so he did his own translation.[92] There was another reason as to why Ephrem Mc'ire was so careful when translating Greek texts into Georgian. An accurate translation would not leave room for Greek ecclesiastics and monks to accuse Georgians of corrupting sacred texts or deviating from Orthodoxy. For instance, Byzantines not infrequently criticized Euthymios' style, followed by many Georgian learned monks, of expanding and abridging original texts in Georgian translations.

In the 1050s, Greek monks of the Black Mountain accused their Georgian peers of deviating from Orthodoxy and questioned the apostolic foundation of the Georgian Church. They appealed to the patriarch of Antioch, Theodosius III (1057–1059), beseeching him to take harsh measures against Georgians. The *Life of Giorgi the Athonite* narrates the story in the following way:

> Some people from the monastery of St. Symeon, full of envy, rose against us, Georgians, and wished to get rid of every Georgian at St. Symeon. And so, according to their malice, they decided in their hearts to accuse our holy and true faith of defilement. This was because they were trying to eradicate the Georgians entirely from this glorious Lavra, although they had been accepted there by St. Symeon himself. And with these evil thoughts, they went to see Patriarch Theodosius […] they knelt right in front of him and said […] "Have mercy on us, holy master, and save us from a great disaster and free us from vain and foreign men, for in our monastery there are sixty people, calling themselves Georgians, but we know neither what they think nor what is their faith." The patriarch was astonished to hear this and said: "how could it happen that the Georgians are not Orthodox?"[93]

---

[92] Kekelidze 1980, 254.

[93] Giorgi Mc'ire, *The Life of Giorgi the Athonite* (ed. Abuladze), 149-150; Grdzelidze 2009,126: რამეთუ კაცნი ვინმე სჳმეონ-წმიდელნი შურითა საეშმაკოჲთა აღიძრნეს ჩუენ ქართველთა ზედა და ენება, რაჲთამცა ნათესავი ჩუენი ძირითურთ აღმოჰფხურეს სჳმეონ-წმიდით და განიზრახეს გულარძნილებით, რაჲთა წმიდასა ამას და მართალსა სარწმუნოებასა ჩუენსა ბიწი რაჲ დასწამონ. და ესრემთაცა სრულიად აღმოგუფხურნეს დიდებულისა ამისგან ლავრისა პირველთაგან თჳთ წმიდისა სჳმეონის მიერ დამკჳდრებულნი. და ესრეთ ბოროტად შეიზრახნეს და წარვიდეს თევდოსი

Giorgi the Athonite was on Black Mountain when the tension between the Greeks and the Georgians peaked. He decided to defend the rights of Georgians and paid a visit to the patriarch of Antioch. During a polemic with the patriarch, Giorgi persuaded him to drop the charges against the Georgian monks and proved the Orthodoxy of the Georgians. Later, another issue was brought before Patriarch Theodosius III. This time, the Greek monks questioned the canonical right of the Georgian Church to be autocephalous. Giorgi the Athonite was again summoned to the court of the patriarch, where he was requested to recognize the subordination of the Georgian church to the Antiochian see. He was further advised to write a letter to King Bagrat IV (r. 1027–1072) and force him to admit the supremacy of the Antiochian patriarch over the Georgian Church.

> It must be so that your churches and hierarchs be shepherd under the authority of this apostolic see […] And you are capable of fulfilling this task since I know that your king will listen to you if you write to him and advise him for the better. And if he does not follow your advice, I shall write to all four of my fellow patriarchs, informing them of the self-devised legislation and obstinacy of your people and that they continue to claim autocephaly contrary to the apostolic canons, despite the fact that none of the Apostles reached their land.[94]

პატრეარქისა წინაშე, ვითარცა ახლად შემოსრულისა და წუთ უმეცარისა და დაცჳეს წინაშე რეცა მომჭირნედ და ჰრქუეს მას: „შეგუეწიენ, წმიდაო მეუფეო, და გჳსნენ დიდისა ჭირისაგან, და განგუათავისუფლენ კაცთაგან ამაოთა და უცხოთესლთა, რამეთუ არს მონასტერსა შინა ჩუენსა ვითარ სამეოცი კაცი, რომელნი ქართველად სახელად-იდებენ თავთა თჳსტა და არა უწყით, თუ რასა ზრახვენ, ანუ რაჲ არს სარწმუნოებაჲ მათი. და ესრეთ დორიასად ზოგი მონასტერი დაუპყრიეს.” და ესმა რაჲ ესე პატრეაქსა, დაუკჳრდა და ჰრქუა მათ: „და ვითარ ეგების ესე, რომელმცა ქართველნი არა მართლმადიდებელნი იყვნეს.”

[94] Giorgi Mc‘ire, *The Life of Giorgi the Athonite* (ed. Abuladze), 153; Grdzelidze 2009, 128: ჯერ-არს, რომელ ეკლესიანი და მღვდელთ-მოძღუარნი თქუენნი ჴელა ქუეშე სამოციქულოჲსა ამის საყდრისასა იმწყსებოდინ (...) და ესე შენგან შესაძლებელ არს, რამეთუ უწყრი, ვითარმედ გისმენს მეფე თქუენი, უკეთუ მიუწერო და აუწყო უმჯობესი. ხოლო უკუეთუ არა ისმინოს, მიუწერო ოთხთავე პატრიაქთა საყდრის-მოდგმათა ჩუენთა და ვაუწყო თჳთრჩულობაჲ და ქედფიცხ[ე]ლობაჲ ნათესავისა თქუენისაჲ, და ვითარმედ თჳნიერ სამოციქულოჲსა კანონისა თჳთ იმწყსებიან და მოციქულთაგანი არავინ მისრულ არს ქუეყანასა მათსა.

As the hagiographical text states, Patriarch Theodosius III denied the Georgian Church the right of autocephaly simply because no apostle had preached Christianity on the territory of Georgia. Giorgi the Athonite, in response, requested the Greek manuscript, *Visitations of the Apostle Andrew*, which turned out to contain an account proving that St. Andrew preached Christianity on Georgian territory. Giorgi the Athonite also reminded the Antiochian patriarch that one of the Twelve Apostles, Simon the Canaanite, was buried on the territory of western Georgia, at a place called Nik'opsia.[95] Giorgi also pointed out to the patriarch that, heresy and deviation from Orthodoxy had prevailed several times in the past in the Byzantine Empire, whereas the Georgian land and church had always stayed faithful to the true faith. "We were enlightened by the Holy Apostles, and since we have confessed One God, we have never renounced him, nor have our people ever been inclined towards heresy. Instead, we condemn and curse all apostates and heretics."[96]

Although Giorgi the Athonite settled the matter and defended the canonical right of the Georgian Church, about two decades later, when Ephrem Mc'ire was active on the Black Mountain, tensions escalated again between the Greeks and Georgians. Ephrem composed a historical and polemical narrative, *Report on the Conversion of the Georgians, and Books in which this is Mentioned*. In this work, Ephrem addressed the recurring problem that caused disagreement between the Georgian and Greek communities.[97] Ephrem decided to refute Byzantine accusations through their own authoritative Greek narratives and therefore based his literary piece on the accounts of Late Antique ecclesiastical historians. He did extensive research and found all the Greek texts that preserved information on the conversion of the Georgian royal family. He also used an apocryphal, *Visitations of the Apostle Andrew* to prove that one

[95] Giorgi Mc'ire, *The Life of Giorgi the Athonite* (ed. Abuladze), 154; Grdzelidze 2009, 129.

[96] Giorgi Mc'ire, *The Life of Giorgi the Athonite* (ed. Abuladze), 154; Grdzelidze 2009, 129: ამათ წმიდათა მოციქულთა განათლებულნი ვართ და ვინაჲთგან ერთი ღმერთი გჳცნობიეს, არღარა უარ-გჳყოფიეს და არცა ოდეს წვალებისა მიმართ მიდრეკილ არს ნათესავი ჩუენი. და ყოველთა უარის-მყოფელთა და მწვალებელთა შევაჩუენებთ და ვსწყევთ.

[97] Ephrem Mc'ire, *Report on the Conversion of the Georgians* (ed. Bregadze), 3–12.

of Christ's Apostles propagated Christianity in Georgia, thus buttressing the apostolic foundation of the Georgian church.[98] Although Ephrem's historical survey was written in Georgian, it is possible that he planned to translate it into Greek to make it accessible to a wider audience. The *Report on the Conversion of the Georgians* demonstrates that Ephrem was not only an eminent translator and theologian, but a historian as well.

The scale of Ephrem's literary activities and his output earned him great authority and fame not only among his fellow monks on the Black Mountain but in the Georgian kingdom as well. He was posthumously commemorated in the *synodikon* of the Ruis-Urbnisi church council convoked by order of King Davit IV (r. 1089–1125) in 1105 to reform the Georgian Church. King Davit IV closely monitored the council, and probably gave his consent to place Ephrem's name in the *synodikon* next to the names of Euthymios and Giorgi the Athonites.[99]

Back to the Holy City: The re-emergence of Georgian monasticism in Jerusalem

Although Constantinople and Mount Athos acquired the rank of holy places after the advance of Islam, the accounts written in the post-Arab conquest period attest that Georgians continued to make pilgrimages to Jerusalem. A ninth-century concise hagiography, the *Life and Martyrdom of K'onstanti*, relates that before his execution K'onstanti, a Georgian aristocrat, went to Jerusalem, where he worshipped at the holy places.[100] Ilarion Kartveli also visited Jerusalem and stayed at the Lavra of Mar Saba in the 860s. A group of Georgian monks is said to have made the pilgrimage to Jerusalem in the *Life of Grigol Xanʒteli*, a hagiography portraying events in the ninth century.[101] It is claimed that Giorgi the Athonite visited Jerusalem twice in his lifetime. The first visit took place when Giorgi lived in Georgia and had just started his

[98] Ibid, 012.
[99] *The Acts of the Ruis-Urbnisi Council* (ed. Gabidzashvili), 196.
[100] *Martyrdom of K'onstanti* (ed. Abuladze), 166.
[101] *Life of Grigol Xanʒteli* (ed. Abuladze), 265, 286.

monastic life and the second visit occurred when Giorgi was already an established authority at Iviron monastery. Both times the purpose of his travel to the holy city was pilgrimage rather than translation activities. It is noteworthy that neither hagiographical text mentions the monasteries established in Late Antiquity by Peter the Iberian and his peers. It is likely that Georgian monks had abandoned these monasteries after the advance of Islam.

The unification of the Georgian states into a single kingdom at the end of the tenth century increased the royal court's interest and involvement in the patronage of monasteries and monastic communities in the Christian East. During the rule of King Bagrat IV (r. 1027–1072), financial and political support from him and his mother, Queen Mariam, made it possible for Giorgi-P'roxore to establish the Georgian monastery of the Holy Cross in Jerusalem. The exceptional role of the Georgian royal court in the construction of the Holy Cross was reflected on the wall paintings of the monastery. In the eighteenth century, when the Georgian traveler Gabašvili visited Jerusalem, he saw frescoes of three Georgian kings on the northern wall of the monastery: Mirian III, the first Christian king of Kartli, Vaxt'ang Gorgasali, and Bagrat IV, founder and main patron of the Holy Cross.[102]

Giorgi-P'roxore, a learned monk, fostered scholarly activities at the Holy Cross and turned the monastery into the center of Georgian manuscript production. He could have been inspired by the examples of Iviron and the Black Mountain, where Georgian monks translated texts and produced manuscripts. Giorgi-P'roxore compiled and edited several manuscripts. One surviving manuscript with his autograph, a collection of male and female saints' lives, is preserved in the Bodleian Library in Oxford. In the colophon, Giorgi states:

> God made me, poor P'roxore, worthy to write the book about the saints who enlighten our souls. And I have completed, assembled, and

[102] Menabde 1980, 72–73.

donated this work with the Divine support and with the support of all saints, to the monastery of Holy Cross, which I have built.[103]

Manuscript colophons also document that Giorgi-P'roxore invited Georgian monks, mainly scribes and copyists, to the monastery he founded and supervised their work. The colophon to the manuscript (*Jer. Geo.* 14), containing the works of Basil the Great and Gregory of Nazianzus, completed in 1055, says:

> This holy book was written and completed […] in the monastery of Holy Cross, built by father P'roxore […] I unworthy Ioane Dvali with my hands and with the help of my blessed son, Michael, and by order of blessed man, Father Euthymios […] created this book.[104]

Particularly noteworthy among the works authored and supervised by Giorgi-P'roxore are liturgical manuscripts – the *Synaxarion*, *Parakliton*, and *Tveni* (December to February) – and a collection of saints' lives, known as "Pateric of Palestine." The latter contains the lives of saints associated with Jerusalem and the Holy Land.[105] Despite Giorgi-P'roxore's attempts to raise the fame of the monastery he founded, literary activities at the Holy Cross never attained the same scale as at Iviron or the Black Mountain. The monks of the Holy Cross were mainly concerned with copying and multiplying manuscripts rather than focused on translating Greek texts into Georgian.

Throughout the centuries, however, the monastery of the Holy Cross was a marker of the Georgian kings' prestige and power in the Holy Land. The Bagratid kings not only patronized the monastery but tried

---

[103] Peeters 1912, 302: ღირს მყო ღმერთმან მე, გლახაკი პროხორე დაწერად ამის სულთა განმანათლებელისა წმიდათა მოწამეთა წიგნისა და გავასრულე და შევმოსე და დავდევ ნებითა ღუთისაითა და შეწევნითა ყოველთა წმიდაჲთა ჩემ მიერ აღშენებულსა ეკლესიისა წმიდისა ჯუარისასა.

[104] Цагарели 1888, 173: დაიწერა და განსრულდა ესე წიგნი (...) მონასტერსა შ˜ა ჯუარისასა, რომელი აღაშენა წმ. მამამან პროხორი, ბრძანებითა და მოღუაწებითა კურთხეულისა კაცისა მამისა ეფთჳმისათა (...) ჴელითა უღირსისა ბერისა იოვანე დვალისაჲთა და შვილისა ჩემისა კურთხეულისა მიქელისათა.

[105] Menabde 1980, 84–86.

to secure its unique status within Jerusalem. At the end of the eleventh century, the Holy Cross was burned and destroyed after Seljuk-Turks captured Jerusalem, but around 1108, it was restored by the order and with the support of King Davit IV (r. 1089–1125).[106] After Jerusalem's fall to Saladin in 1187, the Holy Cross and its property were expropriated by the Muslims. Nevertheless, Queen Tamar (r. 1184–1212), during whose reign the Georgian kingdom reached the apex of its political and military power, sent an envoy to Saladin, and offered 20 000 dinars in return for granting liberty to the Holy Cross. In the twelfth century, Georgian monks of the Holy Cross continued copying manuscripts.[107]

The Georgian monks of the Holy Cross had a network of connections with their Georgian fellows from various monasteries of Byzantium and occasionally exchanged manuscripts with them. If we believe Giorgi the Athonite's vita, he knew Giorgi-P'roxore and they met each other in Jerusalem. Giorgi the Athonite arrived in Jerusalem with a special mission. He was persuaded by Queen Mariam, King Bagrat IV's mother, to travel from Constantinople to Jerusalem and deliver money to Giorgi-P'roxore so that he could finish the monastery of the Holy Cross. It is likely that Giorgi the Athonite also carried with him some manuscripts and was among the first to donate them to the library of the emerging Georgian monastery.

The manuscript colophons that are the primary sources for studying the networks among the Georgian monks of the Christian East confirm the exchange of manuscripts between the Holy Cross and the Black Mountain. For instance, Giorgi the Recluse, from the Black Mountain, copied the vita of St. Martha (Mother of Symeon the Younger) and sent it to the Holy Cross.[108]

Conclusion

In the fourth century, the conversion of the Georgian royal family and the subsequent advance of Christianity gave a powerful impetus for a

[106] *Life of Davit* (ed. Šanidze), 208; Thomson, 343.
[107] Menabde 1980, 96.
[108] Djobadze 1976, 25–32.

cultural transformation of Georgian society. The creation of the original Georgian alphabet and the flowering of monasticism in the Christian East were direct consequences of Christianization, which facilitated the reception of diverse Christian literature in Georgian. The evidence suggests that the first centers of Georgian manuscript production and translating activities emerged in the Holy Land and vicinity of Jerusalem.

While Georgian monasteries and monastic communities appeared in the Holy Land between the fourth and the fifth centuries, the early history of monasticism in Kartli/Iberia is *terra incognita*. The large monasteries in Kartli/Iberia were founded much later than in the Holy Land. According to the tradition, monasticism in eastern Georgia is associated with the arrival of "thirteen Syrian fathers" from Syria in the sixth century.[109] The monasteries founded by the Syrian fathers were modeled on the Syriac monastic tradition, which suggests that the monks in these monasteries would have adhered to asceticism and severe forms of mortification rather than focusing on manuscript production.[110]

Although it may seem paradoxical, the prominent centers of Georgian literary activities and manuscript productions were located in the Christian East and Byzantium, where monastic communities were more productive in translating texts than in Georgia. The history of the Georgian monastic communities in the Christian East demonstrates a high degree of cooperation, which resulted in the exchange of manuscripts and mobility among the monks. Manuscript colophons reveal that the Georgian monks of Mar Saba, St. Catherine's on Sinai, and the Lavra of Chariton forged connections and exchanged manuscripts as early as the ninth century.

The growth of the Georgian world's acquaintance with Byzantine culture and the large-scale reception of early Christian and Byzantine authors is closely linked with the flowering of literary activities on Mount Athos, Mount Olympus, Constantinople, and the Black Mountain. The Georgian monastic communities of the Byzantine Empire had even stronger connections with the Georgian monasteries and the royal court. All genres of translated Greek texts and manuscripts circulated

[109] Matitashvili 2018, 4–39.

[110] On a peculiarities of Syrian Monastic practices see: Patrich 1995, 22–28.

widely through various channels in Georgia, which further oriented the Georgian Church on Constantinople. In the eleventh-century Georgian monastic communities of the Black Mountain rose in prominence and succeeded in translating a wide range of texts by Early Christian and Byzantine authors. Nevertheless, some Georgians considered the Iviron Monastery on Mount Athos as the primary center of knowledge and manuscript production. Giorgi Mc'ire, learned monk and biographer of Giorgi the Athonite, lauded Iviron as the place "where the light of the knowledge of divinely spiritual books had shone through our holy father Euthymios and then through this blessed father Giorgi".[111]

[111] Giorgi Mc'ire, *The Life of Giorgi the Athonite* (ed. Abuladze), 174–175; Grdzelidze 2009, 142.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

[Athonite, Giorgi] გიორგი მთაწმინდელი, ცხოვრებაი იოვანესი და ეფთვიმესი. ძველი ქართული ჰაგიოგრაფიული ლიტერატურის ძეგლები, II [*The Life of Ioane and Euthymios. Corpus of Old Georgian Hagiographical Literature*, II] Ed. I. Abuladze. Tbilisi 1967. 38–207. English trans. T. Grdzelidze. *Georgian Monks on Mount Athos: Two Eleventh century Lives of the Hegoumenoi of Iviron*. London 2009, 53–96.

[*Georgika*] გეორგიკა, ბიზანტიელი მწერლები საქართველოს შესახებ, I [*the Byzantine Authors' Accounts about Georgia*, I]. Ed. & Tr. S. Qauxchishvili. Tbilisi 1961.

[*Georgika*] გეორგიკა, ბიზანტიელი მწერლები საქართველოს შესახებ, II [*the Byzantine Authors' Accounts about Georgia*, II]. Ed. & Tr. S. Qauxchishvili. Tbilisi 1965.

[Mc'ire, Ephrem] ეფრემ მცირე, უწყებაჲ მიზეზსა ქართველთა მოქცევისასა, თუ რომელთა წიგნთა შინა მოიჴსენების [*Report on the Conversion of the Georgians and Books in which this is Mentioned*]. Ed. T. Bregadze. Tbilisi 1959.

[Mc'ire, Giorgi] ცხოვრებაჲ გიორგი მთაწმიდელისაჲ. ძველი ქართული ჰაგიოგრაფიული ლიტერატურის ძეგლები, II [*The Life of Giorgi the Athonite. Corpus of Old Georgian Hagiographical Literature*, II] Ed. I. Abuladze. Tbilisi 1967. 101–207. English trans. T. Grdzelidze. *Georgian Monks on Mount Athos: Two Eleventh century Lives of the Hegoumenoi of Iviron*. London 2009, 97–162.

[Merčule, Giorgi] ცხოვრებაჲ გრიგოლ ხანძთელისაჲ. ძველი ქართული ჰაგიოგრაფიული ლიტერატურის ძეგლები, I [*The Life of Grigol Xanʒteli. Corpus of Old Georgian Hagiographical Literature*, I] Ed. I. Abuladze. Tbilisi 1963, 248–319.

[*Mravaltavi of Sinai*] სინური მრავალთავი. Ed. A. Shanidze. Tbilisi 1959.

[*The Acts of the Ruis-Urbnisi Council*] რუის-ურბნისის კრების ძეგლისწერა. Ed. E. Gabidzashvili. Tbilisi 1978.

[*The Conversion of Kartli*] მოქცევაჲ ქართლისაჲ. ძველი ქართული ჰაგიოგრაფიული ლიტერატურის ძეგლები, I [*Corpus of Old Georgian Hagiographical Literature*, I]Ed. I. Abuladze. Tbilisi 1963, 81–163.

[*The Chronicles and other Materials for Georgian History*, I] ქრონიკები და სხვა მასალა საქართველოს ისტორიისა, I. Ed. T. Zhordania. Tbilisi 1892.

[*The Life of Davit, King of Kings*] ცხოვრებაი მეფეთ–მეფისა დავითისი. Ed. M. Shanidze. Tbilisi 1992. English trans. R. Thomson, *Rewriting Caucasian History: The Medieval Armenian Adaptation of the Georgian Chronicles*. Oxford 1996, 309–353.

[*The Life of Ilarion Kartveli*] ცხოვრებაჲ და მოქალაქობაჲ ილარიონ ქართველისაჲ. ძველი ქართული ჰაგიოგრაფიული ლიტერატურის ძეგლები, II [*Corpus of Old Georgian Hagiographical Literature*, II]. Ed. I. Abuladze. Tbilisi 1967, 9-37.

[*The Life of Symeon Stylite the Younger*] ცხოვრებაჲ სჳმიონ მესუეტისაჲ. კიმენი,ქართულიჰაგიოგრაფიულიძეგლები[*Keimena,Monumenta Hagiographica Georgica*, I] Ed. K. Kekelidze. Tiflis 1918, 215–340.

[*The Martyrdom of K'onstanti*] ცხოვრებაჲ და წამებაჲ წმიდისა მოწამისაკოსტანტისიქართველისაჲძველიქართულიჰაგიოგრაფიული ლიტერატურის ძეგლები, I [*Corpus of Old Georgian Hagiographical Literature*, I]. Ed. I. Abuladze. Tbilisi 1963, 164–172.

Secondary Literature

Aleksidze, Z. et al. 2005. *Catalogue of the Georgian Manuscripts Discovered in 1975 at St. Catherine's Monastery on Mount Sinai*. Athens.

Ameling, W. et al. 2018. *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaeae/Palestinae: A Multi-lingual Corpus of the Inscriptions from Alexander to Muhammad*. Volume IV: *Iudaea/Idumaea*, Part 1:*2649–3324*. Berlin.

Bezarashvili, K. 2015. "Hellenophilism in Georgian Literature as Cultural Orientation towards Byzantine Thought: Ephrem Mtsire's Culture Orientation. Part I" *Scripta & e-Scripta* 14–15, 335–364.

— 2013. “From the Old Literary Tradition to Hellenophilism in Georgian Literature: Euthymios the Athonite” *Scripta & e-Scripta* 12, 102–110.

Braund, D. 1994. *Georgia in Antiquity: A History of Colchis and Transcaucasian Iberia 550bc–AD562*. Oxford.

Bregadze, T. 1971. ეფრემ მცირის ნათარგმნი ძეგლები [Translations by Ephrem Mc‘ire: A bibliography] *Mravaltavi* I, 429–460.

Djobadze, V. 1976. *Materials for the Study of Georgian Monasteries in the Western environs of Antioch and on the Orontes*. Louvain.

Garitte, G. 1968. *Version Géorgienne de la vie de Sainte Marthe* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium). Louvain.

Horn, C. 2006. *Asceticism and Christological Controversy in Fifth Century Palestine: the Character of Peter the Iberian*. Oxford.

Høgel, C. 2019. “Euthymios the Athonite, Greek-Georgian and Georgian-Greek translator – and Metaphrast?” *Mélanges Bernard Flusin = Travaux et Mémoires* 23/1, 353–364.

Javakhishvili, I. 1947. სინური ხელნაწერების აღწერა. [*Description of the Manuscripts from Sinai*]. Tbilisi.

Kekelidze, K. 1980. ძველი ქართული ლიტერატურის ისტორია, I. [*History of the Georgian Literature*, I]. Tbilisi.

Kekelidze, K. (ed). 1954. ქართულ ხელნაწერთა აღწერილობა: A კოლექცია, IV. [*Description of the Georgian Manuscripts: A collection*, vol. 4]. Tbilisi.

Kekelidze, K. 1945. კ. კეკელიძე, ეტიუდები ქართული ლიტერატურის ისტორიიდან [*Studies in Old Georgian Literature,* vol. 2]. Tbilisi.

Khintibidze, E. 1996. *Georgian-Byzantine Literary Contacts*. Amsterdam.

Lomouri, N. 2011. საქართველოს და ბიზანტიის იმპერიის ურთიერთობა [*Relations between Georgia and the Byzantine Empire: 4th –9th Centuries*]. Tbilisi.

Matitashvili, S. 2018. “The Monasteries founded by the Thirteen Syrian Fathers in Iberia: The Rise of Monasticism in Sixth-Century Georgia” *Studies in Late Antiquity* 2, 4–39.

Menabde, L. 1980. ძველი ქართული ლიტერატურის კერები [*Seats of Ancient Georgian Literature* II]. Tbilisi.

Mergiali-Sahas, S. 2001. “Byzantine Emperors and Holy Relics: Use and Misuse of Sanctity and Authority” *JÖB* 51, 42–60.

Meskhi, T. 2013. სინა და საქართველო: ახალი ფურცლები მრავალსაუკუნოვანი ისტორიისთვის [*Sinai and Georgia: New Pages of the Centuries-old History*]. Tbilisi.

Metreveli, E. 2012. “The Role of Athos in the History of Georgian Culture”, in Rapp and Crego (eds), *Languages and Cultures of Eastern Christianity: Georgian*. Ashgate, 259-267.

Metreveli, E. (ed). 1976. ქართულ ხელნაწერთა აღწერილობა: A კოლექცია, I/2 [*Description of the Georgian Manuscripts: A-Collection,* vol. I/2]. Tbilisi.

Mgaloblishvili, T. 2001. “The Georgian Sabaite (Sabatsminduri) Literary School and the Sabatsmindian Version of the Georgian *Mravaltavi* (Polykephalon)”, in J. Patrich (ed.) *The Sabaite Heritage in the Orthodox Church from the Fifth Century to Present*. Louvain. 229–230.

Patrich, J. 1995. *Sabas, Leader of Palestinian Monasticism: A Comparative Study in Eastern Monasticism, Fourth to Seventh Centuries.* Washington.

Pantsulaia, I. (ed) 1954. ათონის ივერიის მონასტრის ქართულ ხელნაწერთა კატალოგი [*Catalogue of the Georgian Manuscripts from the Monastery of Iviron on Mount Athos: A Collection,* vol. 4]. Tbilisi.

Peeters, P. 1912. “De codice Hiberico Bibliothecae Bodleianae Oxoniensis” *Analecta Bollandiana* 31, 301-318.

Rayfield, D. 2012. *Edge of Empires: A History of Georgia*. London.

Rayfield, D. 2013. *The Literature of Georgia: A History*. London.

Signes Codoñer, J. 2014. “New Alphabets for the Christian Nations”, in A. Heredero et al. (eds), *New Perspectives on Late Antiquity in the Eastern Roman Empire*. Newcastle, 131–138.

Shoemaker, S. 2012. *Maximus the Confessors*: *The Life of Virgin*. New Haven & London.

Speake, G. 2018. *A History of the Athonite Commonwealth: The Spiritual and Cultural Diaspora on Mount Athos*. Cambridge.

Цагарели, А 1888. *Памятники грузинской старины в Святой Земле и на Синае*. С- Петербург.

Tvaltvadze, D. 2010. "Some aspects of Georgian-Byzantine Cultural Relations According to the Colophons of Georgian Scholars in Antioch" *Pro Georgia: Journal of Kartvelian Studies* N20, 45–57.

Volk, R. 2009. *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskus,* Band VI/1: *Historia animae utilis de Barlaam et Ioasaph (spuria): Einführung*. Berlin.

L'*ixeutique* à Byzance: pratique et représentation littéraire*

Charis Messis & Ingela Nilsson

L'oisellerie, ou *ixeutique* (ἰξευτική, *aucupium* en latin), est l'une des trois catégories majeures de la chasse dans le monde ancien et byzantin.[1] Malgré le fait que le terme *ixeutique* provienne du mot ἰξός, qui signifie glu, cette forme de chasse emploie des procédés qui n'ont pas tous recours à l'usage de glu ; cette dénomination inclut aussi, de manière générale, la capture des oiseaux par d'autres méthodes que les gluaux.[2]

Pour les anciens et les Byzantins, la chasse comprenait tout rapport entretenu avec les animaux[3] ; selon l'animal capturé, ils catégorisaient celle-ci en *cynégétique* (θήρα) (chasse des mammifères et des grands

* Cet article peut être lu comme une enquête brève et actualisée de l'*ixeutique* dans la tradition gréco-romaine, ou comme une introduction à la nouvelle édition et traduction de la *Description de la capture des pinsons et des chardonnerets* de Constantin Manassès, à paraître dans le prochain volume du *Scandinavian Journal of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*. La rédaction de cet article a été entreprise dans le cadre du programme de recherche *Retracing Connections* (retracingconnections.org), financé par Riksbankens Jubileumsfond (M19-0430:1).

[1] Sur l'*ixeutique* à Byzance, Koukoulès 1952, 398-406 ; sur le monde gréco-romain, Lindner 1973, 151-119, et Vendries 2009 ; sur le monde arabe, Viré 1973. Sur les oiseaux à Byzance en général, Leontsini 2011 et 2013.

[2] La capture de très grands oiseaux, comme la grue, faisait souvent partie de la chasse et non de l'*ixeutique*, malgré le fait qu'il y avait des méthodes d'*ixeutique* destinées à sa capture. Cf. Anonyme, *Paraphrase de l'ixeutique de Denys* III.11 (Garzya) ; sur la chasse aux grues à Byzance, voir aussi Messis & Nilsson 2019, 37-41.

[3] Le grec fait la distinction entre le mot ἄγρα, terme général pour indiquer la capture des animaux, et κυνήγιον qui est un mot synonyme de θήρα, mais qui est utilisé dans un contexte plus général.

oiseaux), en *ixeutique* et en *halieutique* ou *pêche* (ἁλιεία).[4] Pour Oppien, un auteur du IIe siècle auquel sont attribués des traités sur au moins deux des types de chasse, la *cynégétique* et l'*halieutique*,[5] l'*ixeutique* est l'activité la moins fatigante et la plus plaisante par rapport aux deux autres : « le travail de l'oiseleur est sans doute bien doux ; il ne porte pour sa chasse ni épée, ni glaive, ni javelots armés d'airain »,[6] tandis que pour Denys, un auteur identifié soit à Denys le Périégète soit à un autre Denys ayant écrit un poème sur l'*ixeutique*, longtemps attribué à Oppien[7]

---

[4] Oppien, *Cynégétiques* I.47-48 (Papathomopoulos) : Τριχθαδίην θήρην θεὸς ὤπασεν ἀνθρώποισιν, / ἠερίην χθονίην τε καὶ εἰναλίην ἐρατεινήν ; Eutecnius, *Paraphrase* 172.28-29 (Papathomopoulos): ἡ θήρα τριττὴ πρὸς θεοῦ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, κατ' ἀέρα, κατὰ γῆν, κατὰ θάλατταν. Voir aussi Libanius, *Sur la chasse* 487.3-4 (Foerster) : θήρας τὸ μὲν ἔσχεν ἀήρ, τὸ δὲ ἔλαχε θάλασσα καὶ μετ' ἀμφότερα τελευτᾶν ἔγνωκεν ἤπειρος ... ἀέριος μὲν γὰρ καὶ ὅση πρὸς θάλατταν τέχνης μᾶλλον ἢ ῥώμης προσδεῖται, θήρα δὲ ἡ πρὸς ἤπειρον τέχνης μὲν οὐκ ἧττον, ὅτι μὴ μᾶλλον, ῥώμης δὲ μᾶλλον ἢ τέχνης δεῖται, ainsi que Psellos, *Lettres* 41.6-7 (Papaioannou) (à Dokeianos, neveu de l'empereur Isaac Comnène) : ἀπολαύεις πάντως τῶν φίλων κυνηγεσίων, τῶν ἐξ ἀέρος, τῶν ἀπὸ γῆς, (εἰπεῖν δὲ) καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ θαλάττης. Dans un poème de Léonidas de Tarante (*Anthologie Grecque* VI.13, Walz) trois frères qui offrent leurs filets à Pan personnifient les trois sortes de chasse : Pigrès, la chasse aux oiseaux, Damis, la chasse aux bêtes terrestres et Clitor, la pêche.

[5] Sur l'identité de cet auteur et sur la possibilité qu'il s'agisse de deux poètes indépendants, Oppien d'Apamée qui aurait écrit les *Halieutiques* et Oppien de Cilicie, qui aurait écrit les *Cynégétiques*, voir, outre les introductions des éditions citées, Hamblenne 1968 et Spatharakis 2004, 2-3.

[6] Oppien, *Cynégétiques* I.62-63 (tr. citée chez Vendries 2009, 119). Cf. aussi *Halieutiques* I.29-30 (Papathomopoulos): ὅσσοι δ' οἰονοῖσιν ἐφοπλίζονται ὄλεθρον/ ῥηϊδίη καὶ τοῖσι πέλει καὶ ὑπόψιος ἄγρη.

[7] Selon Suda, omicron 452 (Adler), Oppien est l'auteur d'un traité d'i*xeutique* en deux livres (Ὀππιανός, Κίλιξ, ἀπὸ Κωρύκου πόλεως, γραμματικὸς καὶ ἐποποιός, γεγονὼς ἐπὶ Μάρκου Ἀντωνίνου βασιλέως. Ἁλιευτικὰ ἐν βιβλίοις ε΄, Κυνηγετικὰ ἐν βιβλίοις δ΄, Ἰξευτικὰ βιβλία β΄), alors que Constantin Manassès, qui a consacré à Oppien une vie poétique, parle de trois traités mais en reconnaissant que seulement deux ont été conservés, les *Cynégétiques* et les *Haulieutiques* : *Life of Oppian* 25-30 (Colonna) (τὴν τῶν ἰχθύων ἔγραψεν ἄγραν τὴν ἐναλίαν, / τὴν τῶν θηρίων μετ' αὐτήν, εἶτα τὴν τῶν ὀρνέων / σὺν ἄλλοις πλείοσι, λεπταῖς καὶ βραχυτμήτοις βίβλοις, / ὥνπερ κατεκαυχήσατο χρόνος ὁ πανδαμάτωρ, / τούτων τῶν δύο τέλεον φεισάμενος καὶ μόνων / τῶν εἰς τὰ κυνηγέσια καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἐναλίαν). Sur ce texte, voir aussi Nilsson 2021, 124-130.

et dont le contenu est conservé dans une paraphrase byzantine du IX^e^ siècle qui figure dans le même manuscrit de Vienne que Dioscoride,[8]

> pour les oiseleurs, il n'y a pas de danger à redouter des oiseaux ou d'une telle chasse. En effet, ils ne sont pas forcés d'aller sur les crêtes des montagnes ou dans les ravins. Il leur suffit de parcourir joyeusement les plaines, les bois, et les prairies et d'écouter la douce voix des oiseaux qui chantent. Nul besoin d'épées, de massues ni de lances. Nul besoin de jeter les filets ni de lâcher les chiens. Ils se contentent de glu et de roseaux qui ouvrent à leur chasse la voie des airs.[9]

Cette vision de l'*ixeutique*, comme celle d'une chasse agréable, d'un passe-temps délassant et divertissant, est un choix particulier de la littérature et de l'art hellénistique et romain, ainsi qu'une réalité socio-économique précise. De ce que nous connaissons de la période gréco-romaine, cette chasse était pratiquée principalement par des esclaves ou par des professionnels de bas statut social[10] et sa finalité première était de pourvoir au ravitaillement avec le gibier capturé mais aussi de protéger par la même occasion les vignes et les oliviers des attaques de petits oiseaux.[11] Une seconde finalité, non moins importante, était la capture d'oiseaux chanteurs pour approvisionner le marché des villes ou, dans le cas des chasses serviles, pour en faire don aux riches collectionneurs qui organisaient la chasse ou payaient pour elle. L'investissement pour cette chasse, peu coûteuse en matériel, qui ne posait pas de questions

---

[8] Sur le Dioscoride de Vienne, voir Brubaker 2002 et Lazaris 2010.

[9] *Paraphrase de l'ixeutique de Denys* III.1 (Garzya) ; tr. fr., in Trinquier & Vendries 2009, 243-53, ici p. 253. Cf. Oppien, *Cynégétiques* I.62-66 et Eutecnius, *Paraphrase* 172.32-33 (Papathomopoulos) : εἰ γὰρ καὶ τῷ ἰξευτῇ θηρῶντι κάματος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡδονὴ τῷ καμάτῳ συγκέκραται ; voir aussi 173.7-12.

[10] L'oisellerie est une activité qui, au Moyen Age occidental, était aussi destinée aux pauvres (Van den Abele 2009, 238). Le contraire semble se passer dans le monde arabe où l'*ixeutique* est une activité royale, si on se fie au témoignage d'un auteur du XIII^e^ siècle, Abu al-Ruh 'Isa ibn All ibn Hasan al-Asadi, (chez Viré 1973, 7).

[11] Sur la consommation des petits oiseaux dans l'Antiquité grecque, voir Chandezon 2009, 79.

de droit de la propriété[12] et qui impliquait la participation d'esclaves et de paysans pauvres, démontre son caractère très éloigné du paradigme aristocratique et guerrier de la chasse au gros gibier, car elle ne requiert pas la force corporelle ou l'audace du chasseur mais son astuce, sa ruse, sa patience, son habileté et son ingéniosité, qualités qui siéent plutôt aux « pauvres diables » de paysans qu'aux héros guerriers.

Méthodes d'*ixeutique* à Byzance

Nous avons déjà évoqué la paraphrase anonyme d'un traité sur l'*ixeutique* attribué à Denys le Périégète. Ce traité parle des caractéristiques de plusieurs oiseaux et de la méthode appropriée pour les capturer, mais il consacre à la chasse aux gluaux une partie limitée, dans laquelle il présente aussi les outils qu'elle nécessite :

> Il suffit d'importer discrètement des filets à mailles fines et de très légères cages rondes. Il y a aussi des occasions où ils apportent en plus une branche sur laquelle ils ont préalablement fixé, tout autour, d'autres rameaux, ainsi que des oiseaux qu'ils ont apprivoisés pour en faire les auxiliaires de leur chasse … il faut en tout cas savoir varier les modes de capture suivant l'utilité, tantôt en se servant de glu, de crins de cheval, de filets de lin, de pièges ou de cages, tantôt en confectionnant des appâts, tantôt en montrant un appelant de la même espèce.[13]

Ce qui est souligné dans cette présentation générale est l'inventivité du chasseur, qui doit varier ses méthodes pour obtenir le résultat souhaité. Nous examinerons la plupart de ces procédés en suivant les descriptions plus circonstanciées de Constantin Manassès, auteur constantinopolitain du XII^e^ siècle,[14] et nous comparerons les renseignements qu'il donne à ceux des autres textes.

---

[12] Sur cet aspect, voir ci-dessous.

[13] *Paraphrase de l'ixeutique de Denys* III.1 (Garzya) ; tr. fr. in Trinquier & Vendries 2009, 253.

[14] Sur cet auteur et son œuvre, voir maintenant Nilsson 2021.

Le procédé de base consiste à enduire des tiges avec de la glu et attendre que les oiseaux tombent dans le piège. Dans sa *Description de la capture des pinsons et des chardonnerets*,[15] Manassès donne la description la plus complète dont nous disposons, pour Byzance, de la préparation des tiges :

> Ces baguettes étaient sans bourgeons et sans verdure propre (l'airain les avait auparavant polis). De petites branches de laurier s'étaient attachées à ces baguettes qui étaient entourées ainsi d'un feuillage étranger ; des jeunes pousses hétérogènes germaient sur elles. On rangeait ces baguettes en ordre (on imaginerait un parc de plantes). Certaines formaient un schéma rectangulaire et étaient entourées des touffes épaisses et abondantes de laurier ; les autres étaient posées en cercle ; toutes ces baguettes cependant avaient une chevelure de laurier. Sur cette surface, on faisait sortir des tiges fines enduits de glu qu'on attachait aux branches détachées des lauriers et on disposait avec beaucoup d'intelligence ce jeu amusant. (ch. 3)

Manassès parle des plantes artificielles composées de baguettes nues, de branches de laurier touffues et de tiges fines qui sortent du feuillage et qui sont enduites de glu. Certes, dans cette mise en scène de plante artificielle se trouvent des différences et des variétés, mais les détails ne retiennent pas l'attention de nos auteurs.[16] Manassès ne nous renseigne pas sur la préparation et la nature du gluant utilisé, mais d'autres textes nous en apprennent plus. Ainsi par exemple, commentant un passage de *l'Histoire des animaux* d'Aristote, Jean Philopone nous fournit des renseignements sur l'une des préparations possibles de la matière gluante, tirée d'un parasite du chêne : on dépose ce parasite dans des

[15] Edition précédente par Horna 1905 ; Messis & Nilsson publieront une nouvelle édition de ce texte dans la prochaine sortie de cette revue (2022) ; nous citons d'après cette édition.

[16] Voir, par ex., la lettre de Basile Pédiaditès (XII^{e}-XIII^{e} s.) qui contient une ekphrasis de la capture de petits oiseaux, lig.11-17 (Karpozilos) : μενοῦν γε δὴ καὶ λύγους … εὖ μάλα περικαλυφθέντας ἰξῷ, τοῖς ταῶν στρουθῶν οἰκίσκοις ἐμπείραντι, καί τινας κάμακας στοιβῇ φύλλων ἐνδύσαντι καὶ εἰς δένδρον ὑποκυρίσσαντι καὶ προσαρτηταῖς φυλλάσιν ἀποδενδρώσαντι εἰς στέλεχος λυγηρὸν εὖ μάλα πρὸς ὕψος ἀνέρπον καὶ τοῖς χειροτμήτοις δένδροις ἰξῷ κεκαλυμμένους ἐμπήξαντι δόνακας.

récipients remplis de fumier jusqu'à ce qu'il pourrisse ; on transforme ensuite cela en colle en le mélangeant avec de l'huile.[17] Manassès parle aussi des dégâts que l'humidité provoque à la glu et du besoin d'enduire plusieurs fois les tiges avec celle-ci (ch. 5).

A ce procédé de base, à savoir la présence de tiges gluantes, s'ajoutent différentes techniques pour appeler les oiseaux et les obliger à se diriger vers les tiges, techniques qui peuvent se multiplier par dizaines et qui ne sont redevables, comme on l'a déjà dit, qu'à l'ingéniosité et à l'inventivité du chasseur.

En premier lieu, on utilise comme appelants des oiseaux apprivoisés. Manassès parle de la présence « de cages tressées où étaient enfermés des petits oiseaux apprivoisés » (ch. 4), postées à distance ; par leur chant mélodieux, les oiseaux dans la cage invitent auprès d'eux les oiseaux volants.[18] Une variante de cette technique est la suivante :

> Il y avait une ficelle longue et lisse. L'une de ses extrémités était liée au bouquet des tiges entourées de laurier. A cette extrémité était aussi lié vivant un pinson femelle. Ce pinson était utilisé comme un appelant.[19] L'autre extrémité de la ficelle était confiée à un jeune garçon. Lorsque les pinsons s'approchaient en grand nombre, on aurait dit une armée très nombreuse, le jeune garçon remuait calmement la ficelle et incitait le misérable pinson femelle à voler. Elle, sans le vouloir, battait des

---

[17] Jean Philopone, *In libros de generatione animalium commentaria* 4.23-28 (Hayduck): ὁ δὲ ἰξὸς καθ' αὑτὸν μὲν οὐ γίνεται, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ δρυί· ἔστι γὰρ ὁ ἰξὸς ἐν τῇ δρυὶ ἔτι ὢν ὅμοιος τοῖς φύλλοις τοῦ κισσοῦ. τοῦτον οὖν συναγαγόντες οἱ ἰξευταὶ καὶ ἐν χύτρᾳ καινῇ ἐναποτιθέντες κατορύττουσιν αὐτὸν μετὰ τῆς χύτρας ἐν τῇ κόπρῳ, καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ σαπείς, εἶτα ἐλαίῳ μαλαχθεὶς ἀποτελεῖται ὁ ἐπαλειφόμενος ἰξὸς ἐν τοῖς κλαδίοις πρὸς τὴν τῶν στρουθῶν θήραν. Voir aussi Plutarque, *Marcius Coriolanus* 3.5. Dans le monde ancien romain et arabe médiéval, c'était le gui, un parasite vivant sur les branches de certains arbres, qui fournissait la matière première pour la préparation de la glu. Cf. aussi Viré 1973, 8.

[18] Voir aussi, *Paraphrase* III.4 (Garzya) et Pédiaditès, *Lettre* 7-10 (Karpozilos) : γεραιτάτους μόνον στρουθοὺς ἀνδραποδιστάς, συναιρουμένους σοι τῆς ἁλώσεως, ἐπί τινος ὑπαίθρου μετεωρίσαντι, οὓς κατοικιδίους ἔχουσι πλεκτοῖς οἰκίσκοις ἀπολεξάμενοι ἄνθρωποι, ὡς τοὺς ὁμοφύλους στρουθοὺς ἀνδραποδίζωσιν ἐν καιρῷ.

[19] Le terme utilisé ici, παλευτής, est un terme technique qui indique un oiseau dont on se sert comme appelant. Selon Hesychius, *Lexicon* pi 161 (Hansen) λέγονται γὰρ παλεύτριαι αὗται αἱ ἐξαπατῶσαι καὶ ὑπάγουσαι πρὸς ἑαυτὰ ἤγουν ἐνεδρεύουσαι.

ailes, elle s'efforçait à voler et attirait dans le piège les oiseaux de sa race. (ch. 9)

Dans le cas décrit, on utilise un appelant qui ne se trouve pas dans une cage mais qui dispose d'une liberté de mouvement qui, en vérité, est fallacieuse et pourrait duper même le plus intelligent des oiseaux volants.[20] L'oiseau lié à la ficelle est obligé de se mouvoir et il appelle ainsi ses congénères soit vers des tiges gluées soit vers des filets préparés d'avance.[21] On utilise parfois dans le rôle d'appelant une chouette, surtout s'il s'agit de capturer des alouettes.[22]

Manassès cite encore une méthode, celle employant des rapaces affaités :

> Un faucon aux ailes rapides pourchassait un chardonneret ; le faucon attaquait avec bruit, alors que le chardonneret fuyait ; l'un était assoiffé de le capturer, l'autre s'ingéniait pour s'échapper et il recourait à plusieurs circonvolutions en s'approchant de l'herbe et en faisant tout, comme s'il courait un danger mortel. Comme le faucon volait sottement de ci de là, soumis à l'émoi (son très bon estomac le pressait), il fut capturé par les tiges gluées et, en subissant plutôt qu'en agissant et en échouant à la chasse, il était devenu lui-même une proie ; celui qui s'élevait au-dessus des nuages, il y a peu de temps, était maintenant touché par les mains des petits enfants. (ch. 8)

Manassès ne semble pas bien comprendre le rôle que le faucon est invité à jouer dans de telles circonstances, à savoir ne pas attraper les oiseaux

---

[20] Cf. Themistius, *De l'amitié* 273c, (Downey, Norman & Schenkl) : καθάπερ οὖν ἐκεῖνοι φάττιά τε καὶ τρυγόνια τιθασσεύοντες διὰ τούτων τὰ ὁμόφυλα γοητεύουσι καὶ ἑκόντα ὑπάγονται εἰς τὸν ἰξὸν ἢ τοὺς βρόχους, ὧδε ἄρα δεῖ καὶ ἡμῖν <διὰ> τῶν ἤδη προηλωκότων φίλων τοὺς οὔπω τεθηρευμένους. οὐ γὰρ δὴ τῶν περιστερῶν μὲν αἱ ἐθάδες πολλάκις τινὰς καὶ ξένας ἐπάγονται ; côté latin, voir Martial, *Poèmes*, 14, 218 (texte Ker – tr. fr. Verger, Dubois, Mangeart) « Ce n'est pas seulement par des roseaux enduits de glu, mais encore par le chant, qu'on trompe l'oiseau, alors qu'une main silencieuse fait monter jusqu'à lui le perfide roseau ».

[21] Pédiaditès, *Lettre* 26-37 (Karpozilos), rapproche cette méthode de celle qui a recours à l'usage des filets.

[22] Paraphrase, III.17 (Garzya).

mais les paralyser de peur à sa seule vue et faciliter ainsi leur capture.[23] Il décrit en revanche une bataille aérienne dont la victime est le hautain faucon. Il manipule ainsi la réalité du terrain pour créer un exemple d'arrogance et de chute.

Manassès ne décrit pas une série de variantes, pour lesquelles d'autres auteurs sont plus explicites. Dans une lettre qui contient une ekphrasis de la capture des chardonnerets, Pédiaditès, dont nous parlerons par la suite, cite l'usage d'un roseau aboutissant à une tige enduite de glu et tenu à la main par un chasseur-amateur qui vise à capturer un nombre limité d'oiseaux ou un oiseau précis : « je rampais presque par terre et je ne me tenais pas debout afin que les oiseaux ne soient pas effrayés en me voyant ; avec le roseau que je tenais en main et qui aboutissait à une tige enduite de glu, j'ai touché l'aile de l'oiseau ».[24] Cela est plutôt la méthode utilisée par les enfants. Manassès ne cite pas non plus la méthode avec un nœud qui piège les oiseaux, méthode décrite par la *Paraphrase* de Denys:

---

[23] Sur l'usage du faucon, Oppien, *Cynégétique* I.64-66 (Papathomopoulos) : ἀλλ' αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ δρυμὰ συνέμπορος ἕσπετο κίρκος / καὶ δολιχαὶ θώμιγγες ὑγρός τε μελίχροος ἰξὸς / οἵ τε διηερίην δόνακες πατέουσιν ἀταρπόν ; une description beaucoup plus détaillée in *Paraphrase,* I.5 (tr. fr. in Trinquier & Vendries 2009, 253-254) : « on emmène un faucon que l'on place à la base de l'arbre. Pris de panique, les passereaux tentent de lui échapper en se cachant sous les feuilles. Ils regardent à la dérobée le faucon, bien que paralysés par la peur, comme des voyageurs qui, effrayés par l'apparition soudaine d'un brigand, n'osent, devant une vision si effrayante, ni reculer ni avancer. Telle est précisément, la crainte qui s'empare des passereaux à la vue du faucon. Le chasseur a alors tout loisir de faire choir de l'arbre les oiseaux qui se sont regroupés devant l'objet d'épouvante qu'on leur a présenté ». Martial, *Poèmes*, 14, 216 (Ker/ Verger, Dubois, Mangeart) précise que seuls les vieux faucons participent : « Jadis chasseur d'oiseaux, il n'est plus maintenant que le valet de l'oiseleur. Il prend toujours des oiseaux ; seulement il regrette que ce ne soit plus pour son compte ». Voir aussi Manuel Philès, *Des propriétés des animaux* 82 (Bersmann/ Caramico, v. 508-510) qui attribue cet usage aux Thraces : Περὶ κίρκων – Πολυπλόκους τείναντες ἐς θήραν βρόχους / Θρᾶκες μὲν ἠρεμοῦσιν, ὥστε λανθάνειν / κίρκοι δὲ συμμαχοῦντες αὐτοῖς ὑψόθεν / ἐκδειματοῦσι τὰ πτερωτὰ κνώδαλα.

[24] Pédiaditès, *Lettre* 64-68 (Karpozilos); voir aussi Pseudo-Grégoire de Nysse, *Deux sermons sur la création de l'homme*, cité par la suite, qui attribue explicitement cette activité aux enfants.

> On courbe vers le bas deux branches de myrte qu'on aura liées ensemble : on attache à l'une des branches un lacet de fil mince ; on fait passer le fil par un trou percé dans l'autre branche et on l'y bloque au moyen d'une petite cheville solide. La cheville fait office de perchoir pour les passereaux ; s'ils ont besoin de dormir et qu'ils s'y posent, la cheville glisse aisément hors du trou fait dans la branche et le lacet, en s'enroulant, enserre les pattes du passereau.[25]

Une autre méthode est celle avec laquelle on capture les merles et les rossignols, un filet comportant deux cerceaux ronds[26] ; Manassès ignore aussi l'usage du miroir ou celui du vin,[27] le fait d'enduire de glu le pis d'une chèvre pour capturer les mésanges (αἰγίθαλλον),[28] et d'autres méthodes encore, car toutes ces techniques étaient utilisées pour attraper des oiseaux plus grands, comme les perdrix, les cailles ou les palombes.

Manassès est en revanche l'un des rares auteurs qui nous renseigne sur le sort des oiseaux capturés et presque l'unique à nous dire que les oiseaux femelles étaient voués à la mort, tandis que certains oiseaux mâles étaient destinés à être collectionnés pour un usage personnel ou étaient vendus au marché, cependant que d'autres étaient mangés sur place lors d'un banquet improvisé offert aux participants et aux spectateurs (ch. 6).

L'*ixeutique* pouvait être pratiquée partout dans la nature, y compris sur la propriété d'autrui, pourvu que ce dernier ignore le fait ou ait donné son consentement. Les oiseaux capturés revenaient de droit à l'oiseleur. Le résumé le plus clair de toute la législation romaine sur la question, qui semble aussi avoir été en vigueur à Byzance, au moins en ce qui concerne les questions de propriété, nous est fourni au VI^e^ siècle par Théophile l'Antécesseur dans sa *Paraphrase des Instituts* :

---

[25] *Paraphrase de l'ixeutique de Denys* III.3 (Garzya); tr. fr. in Trinquier & Vendries 2009, 253.

[26] Description détaillée chez *Paraphrase* III.13 (Garzya).

[27] *Géoponiques*, 14.21 ; tr. fr. in Grélois & Lefort, 2012, 234 : « On capturera rapidement les perdrix si on leur jette en pâture de la farine de blé mouillée de vin. On prendra aisément tout oiseau si l'on dépose dans des vases du vin plutôt vineux mêlé d'eau ».

[28] *Paraphrase*, III.20.

> Les bêtes sauvages et les oiseaux, ainsi que les poissons, à savoir tous les animaux qui sont nés sur la terre, dans la mer ou dans le ciel, dès lors qu'ils sont capturés par quelqu'un commencent à faire partie de ses possessions, selon la loi des païens. Ce qui n'était auparavant la possession de personne, devient naturellement la possession de celui qui le capture pour la première fois. Il est indifférent qu'on chasse les bêtes sauvages ou les oiseaux sur son propre terrain ou sur un terrain étranger où on entre pour chasser ou pour pratiquer l'*ixeutique*. Si le propriétaire du terrain s'en aperçoit, il peut légitimement l'en empêcher, car le propriétaire a le droit d'empêcher le chasseur d'entrer dans son terrain. Si quelqu'un capture l'un des animaux cités, il le garde en sa possession tout le temps qu'il le détiendra. Si l'animal s'échappe et retrouve sa liberté naturelle, il cesse d'être en possession de celui qui l'a capturé et il deviendra la possession de celui qui le capturera de nouveau.[29]

Théophile explique formellement que l'oiseau capturé appartient à celui qui l'a capturé et que la chasse peut se pratiquer partout, même sur des terrains privés et sous certaines conditions (l'ignorance ou la permission du propriétaire) ; il ne traite pas cependant de la question de l'imposition sur le gibier. Une imposition est attestée pour l'époque médiobyzantine par une lettre de Théodore Stoudite, dans laquelle l'auteur applaudit la décision de l'impératrice Irène selon laquelle « l'archer, ou l'oiseleur, qui capture quelques oiseaux pour s'assurer la nourriture nécessaire doit vivre dignement, sans payer d'impôt »;[30] rien de précis cependant n'existe, qui confirmerait la nature de cet impôt et le moment à partir duquel ce produit devient imposable, à savoir le moment de la capture ou celui de la vente des oiseaux capturés. Le sens commun nous impose de considérer comme imposables, au cas où une telle éventualité existerait, les seuls oiseaux mis en vente.[31]

---

[29] Théophile, *Paraphrase des Instituts* 1.12 (Lokin et al.). Cf. aussi *Basilika* 60.21.13.

[30] Théodore Stoudite, *Lettres* 7.59-61 (Fatouros) : ὁ τοξότης ἢ ὁ ἰξευτής, οὕσπερ ἐθήρευσεν ὀλίγους τάχα ὄρνεις, ἐξ ὧν αὐτῷ ἡ ἀναγκαία τροφή, ἀλογοθέτητος διαμένων εὐζωήσειεν.

[31] Oikonomidès 1996, alors qu'il commente à plusieurs reprises la lettre de Stoudite (30-31, 38-39), ne commente pas le passage cité. Ailleurs (99-101), il cite une contribution en espèces qui prévoyait que le contribuable vende à l'Etat un nombre d'oiseaux

L'*ixeutique* dans la littérature gréco-romaine et byzantine

Au-delà d'une simple activité de chasse, l'*ixeutique* est très tôt devenue, comme nous l'avons déjà signalé, un sujet littéraire et artistique assez important. Insérée dans la thématique pastorale, elle a fourni une quantité non négligeable de traces picturales et elle est devenue ainsi un *topos* iconographique et littéraire de taille, en rapport avec la représentation idyllique de la nature.[32] En ce qui concerne son aspect littéraire, elle est une création de l'époque hellénistique et romaine. Lycophron[33] et Bion[34] sont les premiers auteurs grecs à se référer allusivement à cette sorte de chasse, alors que l'*ixeutique* a une présence beaucoup plus marquée et devient le cadre d'une rencontre amoureuse dans le roman le plus bucolique de l'Antiquité, *Daphnis et Chloé* de Longus (II^{e}/III^{e} s. après J.-C.). On y voit l'amoureux Daphnis, par un jour d'hiver très neigeux, commencer seul une chasse aux petits oiseaux pour se distraire en attendant l'apparition de sa bien-aimée :

> En se dépêchant, il arrive à la cour et, après avoir secoué la neige de ses jambes, il pose les collets et il étend la glu sur de longues baguettes. Puis il s'assied dans l'attente des oiseaux et de Chloé. Quant aux oiseaux, ils vinrent nombreux et il en prit suffisamment, si bien qu'il eut beaucoup de mal à les ramasser, à les tuer et à les plumer.[35]

Mais Chloé n'apparaît qu'après un revirement de la situation, qui permet aux amoureux de se retrouver et de reprendre la chasse, ensemble cette

---

domestiques et sauvages : « Il s'agirait d'animaux que les contribuables achètent pour les donner à l'État ou à ses représentants locaux ; donc, une contribution en espèces, visant à mieux garnir les écuries ou les bergeries de l'État ou des gouverneurs ou même visant à mieux garnir leurs tables (ou la table de l'empereur) ». Sur cette question, voir aussi Sinakos 2019, 79-80.

[32] Sur l'iconographie à l'époque impériale, voir Vendries 2009. Sur l'époque byzantine, voir par la suite.

[33] Lycophron, *Alexandra* 104-105 (Lambin) : καὶ δευτέραν εἰς ἄρκυν ὀθνείων βρόχων λῆϊτιν ἐμπταίσασαν ἰξευτοῦ πτερῷ.

[34] Bion, fr. 13 (Gow) : Ἰξευτὰς ἔτι κῶρος ἐν ἄλσεϊ δενδράεντι ὄρνεα θηρεύων τὸν ἀπότροπον εἶδεν Ἔρωτα ἑσδόμενον πύξοιο ποτὶ κλάδον.

[35] Longus, *Daphnis et Chloé* 3.6.1-2 (Vieillefond).

fois : « A nouveau, ils placent des collets, étendent de la glu et prennent un grand nombre d'oiseau. Ils se donnaient sans cesse le plaisir des baisers et la joie des bavardages ».[36] D'activité solitaire d'hiver, l'*ixeutique* se transforme en moment partagé où l'amour, les baisers et le bavardage joyeux brossent une image de bonheur.

Le rapport entre *ixeutique* et amour deviendra une des constantes du bucolisme littéraire.[37] Dans l'*Anthologie grecque*, par exemple, certains poèmes font explicitement ce lien, comme celui de Méléagre qui parle de ses yeux qui chassent comme des chiens les beaux garçons et sont enduits de la glu d'Aphrodite[38], ou comme celui de Rianos dans lequel l'auteur désire être un merle capturé par la glu et se retrouver dans les mains du beau Dexionicos.[39]

Dans d'autres poèmes la thématique de l'*ixeutique* est présentée sans rapport avec l'amour mais avec la chasse elle-même, comme dans un poème de Bianor où il est question de la punition d'un oiseleur ayant capturé une cigale – « chasse impie »,[40] mais aussi avec des offrandes faites à Pan, comme dans le poème de Léonidas de Tarante où trois frères

---

[36] Longus, *Daphnis et Chloé* 3.10.2-3 (Vieillefond).

[37] Sur ce sujet, voir Murgatroyd 1984 ; sur le rapport entre amour et chasse dans l'Antiquité, sans référence cependant à l'*ixeutique*, voir en général Schnapp 1997.

[38] *Anthologie grecque* XII.92.1-2 (Aubreton-Buffière-Irigoin) : Ὦ προδόται ψυχῆς, παίδων κύνες, αἰὲν ἐν ἰξῷ/ Κύπριδος, ὀφθαλμοί, βλέμματα χριόμενοι (« traîtres à mon âme, chiens en quête de garçons, vous, mes yeux dont le regard sans cesse est enduit de la glu de Cypris »). Le lien entre regard et glu, aussi chez Rianos, XII, 93.1-2 : ᾗ γὰρ ἂν ὄμμα/ ῥίψῃς, ὡς ἰξῷ τοῦτο προσαμπέχεται (il semble que la glu passe dans ton regard) et chez un poète anonyme, V 100.1-2 ; le lien entre baisers et glu, chez Méléagre, V, 96.1 (Waltz) : ἰξὸν ἔχεις τὸ φίλημα (ton baiser est de la glu) ; l'objet du désir en tant que glu chez Méléagre, XII, 132a. Sur les poèmes de l'*Anthologie* consacrés à la chasse, voir Prioux 2009.

[39] *Anthologie grecque* XII, 142 (Aubreton-Buffière-Irigoin) : Ἰξῷ Δεξιόνικος ὑπὸ χλωρῇ πλατανίστῳ/ κόσσυφον ἀγρεύσας εἶλε κατὰ πτερύγων·/ χὠ μὲν ἀναστενάχων ἀπεκώκυεν ἱερὸς ὄρνις./ ἀλλ' ἐγώ, ὦ φίλ' Ἔρως καὶ θαλεραὶ Χάριτες,/ εἴην καὶ κίχλη καὶ κόσσυφος, ὡς ἂν ἐκείνου/ ἐν χερὶ καὶ φθογγὴν καὶ γλυκὺ δάκρυ βάλω (« A la glu, dans un vert platane, Dexionicos captura un merle, le saisit par les ailes ; l'oiseau sacré gémissait, poussait des cris plaintifs. Mais, moi, cher Eros et vous Charites en fleur, puissé-je être grive ou merle ! Dans sa main, sa main à lui, je jetterai des cris, je verserai de douces larmes »).

[40] *Anthologie grecque* IX, 273 (Waltz).

qui offrent leurs filets à Pan personnifient les trois sortes de chasse,[41] ou comme dans un poème d'Antipatros où sont exposés les outils d'une chasse à l'oiseau, qui sont offerts à Pan :

> Ce vieux pan de hallier, ce piège fait d'un triple cordon, ces nœuds coulants en boyaux tressés, ces cages crevées de toutes parts, ces collets à ressorts, ces piquets dont la pointe a été aiguisée au feu, ce suc si tenace que sécrète le chêne et le preneur d'oiseaux, ce roseau trempé de glu, cette corde à trois torons qui déclenche un réseau caché, enfin ce filet qui retenait par le cou les grues criardes ; voilà, Pan qui guette du haut des sommets, l'offrande que t'a consacrée le chasseur Crambis, l'enfant de Néoladas, d'Orchomène en Arcadie.[42]

Pan est aussi présenté comme le protecteur de la chasse à la glu dans un poème de Satyros.[43] Le destinataire d'un poème de Marc l'Argentaire est un merle, qui est incité à fréquenter la vigne et à éviter les chênes car « le chêne, ne l'oublie pas, porte la glu funeste aux oiseaux ».[44] Deux poèmes, enfin, sont funéraires. Dans l'un, les oiseaux sont invités à exprimer leur joie pour la mort d'un oiseleur redoutable,[45] alors que l'autre, écrit par Isidore Aigéatès, est un hommage beau et émouvant à un honnête oiseleur qui gagnait son pain avec cette chasse, un hymne au paysan oiseleur :

> Avec sa glu et ses pipeaux, Eumèle se nourrissait des produits de l'air, et vivait pauvrement, mais dans l'indépendance. Jamais il ne baisa la main d'un riche pour en obtenir quelque bon morceau ; sa chasse suffisait à son luxe, et lui apportait le contentement. Après une vie

---

[41] *Anthologie grecque* VI, 13 (Waltz). Voir aussi Prioux 2009, 178 et 181 et note 4.

[42] *Anthologie grecque* VI, 109 (Waltz). Je cite d'après la traduction de Prioux 2009, 186.

[43] *Anthologie grecque* X, 11 (Irigoin - Maltomini) : Εἴτε σύ γ' ὀρνεόφοιτον ὑπὲρ καλαμῖδα παλύνας/ ἰξῷ ὀρειβατέεις, εἴτε λαγοκτονέεις,/ Πᾶνα κάλει. κυνὶ Πὰν λασίου ποδὸς ἴχνια φαίνει·/ σύνθεσιν ἀκλινέων Πὰν ἀνάγει καλάμων.

[44] *Anthologie grecque* IX, 87.7 (Waltz) : δρῦς γὰρ ἐπ' ὀρνίθεσσι φέρει τὸν ἀνάρσιον ἰξόν.

[45] *Anthologie grecque* VII, 171 (Waltz) Poème de Mnasaklos de Sikéon : Ἀμπαύσει καὶ τῆδε θοὸν πτερὸν ἱερὸς ὄρνις/ τᾶσδ' ὑπὲρ ἀδείας ἑζόμενος πλατάνου./ ὤλετο γὰρ Ποίμανδρος ὁ Μάλιος οὐδ' ἔτι νεῖται/ ἰξὸν ἐπ' ἀγρευταῖς χευάμενος καλάμοις.

de trois fois trente années, il repose ici, ayant laissé à ses fils pour héritage sa glu, ses brins de paille et ses appeaux.[46]

La chasse hivernale à la glu des petits oiseaux, comme celle présente dans le roman de Longus, apparaît aussi dans l'épistolographie de la période romaine impériale, mais avec une autre finalité : celle d'introduire un cadeau, qui consiste à offrir des petits oiseaux capturés. Ainsi, dans la collection des lettres fictives d'Alciphron, un auteur du II^{e} siècle de notre ère, une personne nommée Ambelion (« celui qui a un rapport avec la vigne ») adresse une lettre à Evergos (« celui qui effectue un bon travail »). Dans cette lettre se trouve une description assez détaillée des motifs et de la réalisation de la chasse à la glu :

L'hiver est dur cette année, nul ne peut sortir. La neige couvre la terre ; elle a blanchi les collines et les vallées. Il faut donc renoncer à travailler, bien qu'il soit honteux de demeurer oisif. Pour me distraire, j'ai essayé de regarder dehors. A peine ma porte fut-elle ouverte que j'aperçus, avec la neige qui tombait, tout un peuple de merles et de grives. J'avais de la glu préparée dans un vase, j'en ai vite enduit des branches de poiriers sauvages. Les oiseaux s'y précipitèrent en foule. Ils se trouvèrent pris aux rameaux. C'était vraiment plaisir de les voir, les uns suspendus par les ailes, les autres par la tête ou les pattes. J'ai choisi parmi eux vingt-cinq des meilleurs et des plus dodus. Je te les envoie. Les honnêtes gens doivent se partager les bonnes choses, quitte à faire enrager de mauvais voisins.[47]

Il s'agit ici d'une chasse sans autre finalité que le loisir de l'auteur, un passe-temps agréable qui se transforme en don à un ami.

La poésie romaine reprend ces thématiques et les exploite à sa propre manière. Pour ne citer qu'un seul poète, Martial, celui-ci fait référence à l'*ixeutique* en au moins trois occasions. Dans la première, il

[46] *Anthologie grecque* VII, 156 (Waltz) : Ἰξῷ καὶ καλάμοισιν ἀπ' ἠέρος αὐτὸν ἔφερβεν/ Εὔμηλος λιτῶς, ἀλλ' ἐν ἐλευθερίῃ·/ οὔποτε δ' ὀθνείην ἔκυσεν χέρα γαστρὸς ἕκητι·/ τοῦτο τρυφὴν κείνῳ, τοῦτ' ἔφερ' εὐφροσύνην./ τρὶς δὲ τριηκοστὸν ζήσας ἔτος ἐνθάδ' ἰαύει,/ παισὶ λιπὼν ἰξὸν καὶ πτερὰ καὶ καλάμους.

[47] Alciphron, *Lettres* II.27 (Schepers).

s'adresse à son cousin en parlant d'un cadeau potentiel, si les conditions lui sont favorables.[48] L'intérêt ici est que le poète latin semble mépriser les oiseaux qui font l'*ixeutique* des Grecs et des Byzantins (étourneaux, pinsons, passereaux). Il est évident que pour lui, l'*ixeutique* est une réminiscence littéraire plutôt qu'une observation de terrain ou une expérience vécue. Dans les deux autres occasions, comme nous avons vu en note, Martial se limite à donner des renseignements sur les méthodes de la chasse : l'usage d'un vieil épervier comme épouvantail et celle du chant comme moyen d'attirer les oiseaux, poèmes que nous avons cité en parlant des méthodes de l'*ixeutique*.

Le sommet de la sophistication littéraire du sujet de l'*ixeutique* en rapport avec les autres formes de chasse, situé cette fois dans le cadre d'un banquet extravagant qui renvoie au cœur même de la création artistique, culinaire et littéraire, est la *Cena Trimalcionis* dans le *Satiricon* de Pétrone.

> A ce moment arrivèrent des serviteurs qui placèrent sur les coussins des housses où étaient brodés des filets, des chasseurs à l'affût avec leurs épieux et tout un équipage de chasse. Nous ne savions encore où diriger nos conjectures, lorsqu'en dehors de la salle à manger s 'élève une clameur immense, et voici qu'une meute de chiens laconiens se met à courir en tous sens jusqu'autour de la table. A leur suite vint un dresseur portant un sanglier de première grandeur, et, qui plus est, coiffé d'un bonnet d'affranchi. A ses défenses pendaient deux corbeilles en feuilles de palmier, remplies l'une de dattes fraîches, l'autre de dattes sèches … Notre homme, tirant son couteau, en frappa violemment le flanc du sanglier, d'où ce coup fit envoler des grives. Des oiseleurs

[48] Martial, *Poèmes*, 9,54 (Ker/ tr. Verger, Dubois, Mangeart) : « Si j'avais à ma disposition les grives que le Picenum engraisse de ses olives ; s'il m'était permis de tendre mes filets dans les bois, de la Sabine ; s'il suffisait d'allonger mon roseau pour amener une proie légère, ou d'apprêter mes gluaux pour que maint oiseau vînt s'y prendre, je t'enverrais le cadeau consacré par l'usage pour fêter un parent qui m'est cher de préférence même à mon frère et à mon aïeul : mais nos campagnes n'entendent que le maigre étourneau, les plaintes du pinson, et le chant aigu du passereau qui fête le printemps. Ici le laboureur répond au salut de la pie, là-bas on voit le milan ravisseur s'élever pour monter au faîte des airs. Je me borne donc à t'offrir les chétifs produits de ma basse-cour ; si tu ne les repousses pas, je te traiterai souvent en parent ».

étaient là postés avec des gluaux, et ils eurent vite fait d'attraper les pauvres bêtes qui volaient effarées autour du triclinium. Puis, ayant fait apporter à chacun son oiseau, Trimalcion ajouta : 'Voyez donc de quels glands délicats ce porc sauvage faisait sa nourriture'.[49]

La chasse illusoire des bêtes, représentée sur les coussins, soulignée ensuite par la présence des chiens et dont la proie - le sanglier cuisiné et offert aux convives, est visible, cette chasse cède la place à une chasse réelle aux petits oiseaux, une chasse qui sied mieux à un décor citadin et à une ambiance festive. Le jeu de la chasse devient chasse de jeu dans ce banquet qui n'est qu'un « dinner theater »,[50] où l'on va « de la *cena* à la *scaena*, où les plats sont un prétexte à l'établissement d'une scénographie ».[51]

Parallèlement à la poésie et aux récits de la période gréco-romaine, le chasseur d'oiseaux à la glu a une présence remarquable dans les mythes liés à Esope et dans tout le corpus mythographique, qui fait des activités dans la nature un langage compréhensible pour parler de la morale humaine. Pour ne citer qu'un de ces contes qui démontre la familiarité avec cette activité :

Un oiseleur, prenant avec lui de la glu et ses gluaux, partit pour la chasse. Ayant aperçu une grive sur un arbre élevé, il se mit en tête de l'attraper. En conséquence, ayant ajusté ses bâtonnets les uns au bout des autres, il regardait fixement, tournant vers les airs toute son attention. Tandis qu'il levait ainsi la tête en l'air, il ne s'aperçut pas qu'il mettait le pied sur un aspic endormi, qui se retourna et lui lança un coup de dent. Et lui, se sentant mourir se dit : 'Malheureux que je suis ! Je voulais attraper une proie, et je ne me suis pas aperçu que je devenais moi-même la proie de la mort'. C'est ainsi qu'en ourdissant des embûches à son prochain on tombe le premier dans le malheur.[52]

---

[49] Pétrone, *Satiricon* 40 (Ernout). Sur cet épisode, voir aussi Dupont 2002, 105-6, qui relève les liens de la mise en scène de Trimalcion avec le platonisme ; Chandezon 2009, 83-4 ; Vendries 2009, 135.

[50] Jones 1991.

[51] Augier-Grimaud 2012, 2.

[52] Esope, *Fables* 137.61-2 (Chambry) ; pour d'autres cas, *ibid*., 138 aliter et Hausrath & Hunger, no 176 ; dans le corpus d'Authonius, *ibid*., no 4.

Dans cette fable, l'oiseleur devient l'exemple de l'homme qui utilise la ruse pour nuire à son prochain. Dans la plupart des autres fables, l'*ixeutique* continue à exemplifier l'ingéniosité et l'habileté humaines. La présence de la pratique de la chasse à la glu dans l'imaginaire de l'Antiquité tardive est confirmée aussi par l'imagerie d'*ixeutique* dans les onirocrites. Ainsi, pour Artémidore:

> des appeaux, de la glu, ramènent les voyageurs, permettent de retrouver les fuyards, de sauver des objets perdus et de mener à bien des projets, mais pas tous : les appeaux ramènent ce qui est lointain et à distance à qui s'en sert – c'est-à-dire à l'oiseleur – des oiseaux même bien éloignés, mais certains de ces oiseaux leur échappent.[53]

L'interprétation d'Artémidore au sujet de l'*ixeutique* est assez simple. Les gluaux et les appeaux ne renvoient pas à une signification profonde mais indiquent leur propre réalité et leur pouvoir d'attraction. La seule analogie est celle entre oiseaux migrateurs et voyageurs, esclaves en fuite, objets perdus et espoirs futurs. Les rêves qui contiennent des scènes d'*ixeutique* ne sont cependant pas toujours profitables aux rêveurs, car la chasse à la glu n'est pas toujours fructueuse.

Dans la littérature chrétienne à partir du IV^e^ s. l'*ixeutique* est déjà une image littéraire bien établie. Ainsi, par exemple, Grégoire de Nazianze fait référence à elle lorsqu'il brosse une *ekphrasis* du printemps en étalant la beauté de la nature et les activités des hommes,[54] tandis que pour Nil d'Ancyre c'est le chrétien, lorsqu'il recueille les fruits de ses prières et de ses veillées, qui est comparé à l'oiseleur. S'il est attentif, le bon chrétien, comme l'oiseleur, peut gagner l'ensemble de sa proie

---

[53] Artémidore, *Oneirocriticon* 2.19.1-4 (Pack) : Κάλαμοι ἰξευτικοὶ καὶ ἰξὸς τοὺς ἀποδήμους ἐπανάγουσι καὶ τοὺς δραπέτας εὑρίσκουσι καὶ τὰ ἀπολωλότα σώζουσι καὶ τὰ προσδοκώμενα τελειοῦσιν, ἀλλ' οὐ πάντα· τὰ μὲν γὰρ μακρόθεν καὶ διεστῶτα πρὸς τὸν χρώμενον ἄγουσι, τοῦτ' ἔστι πρὸς τὸν ἰξεύοντα, ἔνια δὲ τοὺς καλάμους καὶ διαφεύγει.

[54] Grégoire de Nazianze, *In novam Dominicam = Discours 44*, *PG* 36, 620A : Ἄρτι δὲ φυτὸν φυτουργὸς θεραπεύει, καὶ ἰξευτὴς καλάμους οἰκοδομεῖ, καὶ ὑποβλέπει πτόρθους, καὶ περιεργάζεται πτερὸν ὄρνιθος. Sur ce texte et les textes analogues, voir Loukaki 2013, 92-3.

ou se contenter d'une seule partie, ce qui est toujours mieux que rien.[55] Un discours attribué à Grégoire de Nysse ou à Basile le Grand utilise l'*ixeutique* que les enfants pratiquent comme un indice de la supériorité humaine face au monde animal:

> Rien n'empêche la raison humaine ; elle scrute attentivement ce qui se trouve dans les profondeurs de la mer, elle capture ce qui se trouve sur terre, elle surprend ce qui vole dans l'air. As-tu jamais vu comment un oiseau assis sur l'extrémité d'une branche se moque de l'homme ? Il se fie à ses ailes légères. Mais tu peux voir aussi qu'un enfant babillard pose un roseau sur un autre, il enduit leur bout avec de la glu et il cache ensuite dans les branches et les feuilles la présence de la glu ; lorsque le regard de l'oiseau se détourne, l'enfant capture l'être volant avec un attouchement léger et il fait prisonnier au moyen de la glu l'oiseau qui vole dans l'air.[56]

L'*ixeutique* n'est que le fruit de l'inventivité du cerveau humain, qui assure et exemplifie le pouvoir humain sur le monde des oiseaux.

Toute cette tradition littéraire reste cependant en sommeil à Byzance, de la période moyenne jusqu'au XII[e] siècle, à une exception près, celle que constitue la traduction en grec de la saga hagiographique de Barlaam et Joasaph. Dans ce recueil de contes orientaux se trouve un récit, où les païens sont comparés à un oiseleur ayant libéré un rossignol, à la condition que l'oiseau lui fournisse trois conseils importants. L'intérêt pour notre sujet n'est pas le message « utile à l'âme » que le récit contient, ni même la bêtise de l'oiseleur qui transgresse les conseils reçus par crédulité et avidité, mais le fait que le rossignol prenne la

---

[55] Nil d'Ancyre, *Lettres*, no I.27 (au sous-diacre Timothée), *PG* 79, 96.

[56] Pseudo-Grégoire de Nysse, *Deux sermons sur la création de l'homme* 19.14–20.9 (Hörner) : οὐδὲν γὰρ κατέχει τὸν λογισμόν. τὰ ἐν τῷ βυθῷ διερευνᾶται, τὰ ὑπὲρ γῆς θηρᾶται, τὰ ἐν τῷ ἀέρι προκαταλαμβάνεται. εἶδές ποτε ἐπ' ἄκρου κλάδου καθεζόμενον ὄρνεον καταγελῶν τῶν ἀνθρώπων; πέποιθε γὰρ τῇ κουφότητι τοῦ πτεροῦ. ἀλλ' ὅμως ἔστιν ἰδεῖν παῖδα ἀδολέσχην καλάμους καλάμοις ὑποβαλόντα καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἄκρον τῶν καλάμων ἰξὸν προσαρτήσαντα, εἶτα λανθανόντως διὰ τῶν κλάδων καὶ τῶν φύλλων κλέψαντα τοῦ ἰξοῦ τὴν παρουσίαν. καὶ †ἀπομετεωριζόμενον τὸ ὄμμα τοῦ ὀρνέου† μικρᾷ προσψαύσει ἐκράτησε τὸ ἀεροποροῦν, τὸ διὰ τοῦ αἰθέρος φερόμενον πτηνὸν δέσμιον ἰξῷ ἤγαγε.

parole et présente une argumentation raisonnée à propos de sa capture : « Quel profit pourrais-tu tirer, ô homme, par mon égorgement ? Tu ne pourras pas remplir ta panse avec moi ».[57] Ici, l'oiseau est capturé pour devenir nourriture et non pour faire partie d'une collection d'oiseaux chanteurs.

Au XII[e] siècle, le sujet de l'*ixeutique* réapparaît avec dynamisme, pas obligatoirement en raison d'une intensification éventuelle de la pratique de cette chasse, mais plutôt à cause d'un système d'éducation qui valorise des textes comme ceux attribués à Oppien ou les créations poétiques de l'Antiquité, mais aussi à cause de la nouvelle signification de la chasse en tant que loisir de cour à l'époque des Comnènes.[58] Deux tendances majeures président à la présentation du sujet : a) la présence de l'oiseleur dans les ekphraseis des mois ; b) les ekphraseis de l'*ixeutique* en tant que texte autonome, ou présentes dans l'épistolographie.

L'oiseleur est l'image typique dans les calendriers littéraires du mois d'octobre, « quand les oiseaux ressentent le froid et s'envolent pour un pays plus chaud ».[59] Ainsi, un poème d'attribution douteuse (Nicolas Calliclès ou Théodore Prodrome) présente octobre prononçant les paroles suivantes : « je capture les oiseaux et toutes sortes de petits volatiles / j'offre à la glu la nation des passereaux / et je prends beaucoup d'autres avec des filets »[60]. Cependant, l'image la plus accomplie de l'oiseleur dans un calendrier est celle présentée dans le roman d'Eumathe Macrémbolite, *Hysminè et Hysminias*:

---

[57] *Vie de Barlaam et Joasaph* 10.29-61 ; la citation, in 10.33-34 : Τί σοι ὄφελος, ἄνθρωπε, τῆς ἐμῆς σφαγῆς; οὐ δυνήσῃ γὰρ δι' ἐμοῦ τὴν σὴν ἐμπλῆσαι γαστέρα.

[58] Sur la chasse à l'époque comnène, Koukoulès 1932 ; Delobette 2005 ; Messis & Nilsson 2019, 29-37, surtout à propos de la fauconnerie.

[59] Macrémbolite, *Hysminè et Hysminias* 4.18.9 (Marcovich) : Ὁ μετ' αὐτὸν ἰξευτὴς ὑπαινίττεταί σοι τὸν χρόνον, καθ' ὃν τὰ πτηνὰ τὸν χειμῶνα φρίσσει καὶ μεταίρει πρὸς τὸ θερμότερον ; tr. fr., Meunier 1991, 77. Sur une représentation picturale du mois d'octobre comme oiseleur en Occident romain, datée du IV[e] siècle, voir Stern 1951, 227-229.

[60] Calliclès, *Poèmes* 37.43-45 (Romano) : Ὄρνεις μὲν αἱρῶ καὶ νεοσσῶν πᾶν γένος,/ Στρουθῶν δὲ μικρῶν ἔθνος ἰξῷ προσφέρω / ἄλλους τε πολλούς ἑλκύω πεδῶν βρόχοις. Sur ce poème et sur d'autres poèmes similaires, voir Eideneier 1970, surtout 370-373 (qui attribue le poème à Prodrome).

> Le jeune homme qui le suivait laissait pousser pour la première fois sa barbe… Il apportait des cages à moineaux, fabriquait un appât, tressait un piège à oiseaux, s'intéressait fort à eux, posait ses appâts dans toute la prairie, les moineaux se déployaient en bordure de celle-ci où un léger filet les faisait fréquemment tomber. L'oiseau ne voyait pas le piège, il n'éventait pas la ruse. Il regardait la prairie attirante, les moineaux qui avaient volé dans le filet, ceux qui chantaient gaiement dans leurs cages. Il se rapprochait de la prairie, des autres moineaux, et était pris au piège. Et l'oiseleur qui les avait pris les gardait captifs et se riait de leur sottise.[61]

La description de l'oiseleur est, en fait, une ekphrasis des peintures qui se trouvent dans le jardin d'Hysminè, à savoir une œuvre artistique dans un jardin paradisiaque. Nous trouvons des tableaux semblables dans les romans de l'époque paléologue, comme dans celui de *Livistros et Rhodamné* où le mois d'octobre est représenté dans le château de l'héroïne : « J'aperçois Octobre portant des cages pleines ; + les cages sont pleines de glu + et il allait à la chasse. Il tenait aussi une lettre qui disait, mon ami, ceci : 'Je guette et je traque pour capturer les petits oiseaux ; j'y trouve mon plaisir et mon délassement' ».[62] Il s'agit d'un choix assez tenace que le mois d'octobre soit représenté en oiseleur.[63]

---

[61] Macrémbolite, *Hysminè et Hysminias* 4.12 (Marcovich) ; tr. fr., Meunier 1991, 74.Sur la fonction des descriptions des mois dans le roman, voir Nilsson 2001, 126-130.

[62] Nous citons d'après la version du Vatican, v. 931-936 (Lendari) : Θωρῶ καὶ τὸν Ὀκτώβριον μὲ τὰ κλουβία γεμάτον, / + ὀξὸς νὰ γέμουν τὰ κλουβία +, εἰς τὸ κηνήγι πάγει· / ἐβάστα καὶ χαρτόπουλον καὶ ἔγραφεν οὕτως, φίλε: / 'τεχνεύομαι καὶ κυνηγῶ νὰ πιάσω τὰ πουλίτσα. / καὶ τοῦτο ἔχω εἰς τέρψη μου καὶ εἰς παραδιαβασμό μου'. Cf. aussi, *ibid*., p. 337-338 ; voir aussi, version A, v. 1156-1163 (Agapitos) le même texte avec des petites différences.

[63] Cela n'est pas unanime cependant. Dans l'*Ekphrasis des mois* de Manuel Philès (Miller, 341-342) nous n'avons aucune référence à l'*ixeutique* ; le mois d'octobre est présenté comme un chasseur qui tue oiseaux, lièvres et cerfs à l'aide de ses faucons et de ses chiens. Voir aussi le calendaire vernaculaire dans Constantinopolitanus Serail 35, copié en 1461 : Eideneier 1979. Il semble que la chasse à la glu soit passée de mode à cette époque et/ou que les représentations littéraires et iconographiques aient changé ; voir aussi ci-dessous.

En passant maintenant aux ekphraseis autonomes de l'*ixeutique*, le premier arrêt est Constantin Manassès, seul auteur byzantin a avoir consacré une longue ekphasis à cette sorte de chasse, comme il l'a fait aussi à propos de la chasse aux grues. Ses deux *ekphraseis*, fait unique dans la littérature byzantine conservée, sont consacrées au monde des oiseaux ; ni la chasse aux bêtes sauvages, que les moments forts de l'historiographie et de la poésie épique aiment à étaler, ni la pêche ne constituent des sujets littéraires dans les cercles littéraires où Manassès est actif. Dans l'introduction de notre nouvelle édition, nous présenterons le contenu de cette pièce et les techniques littéraires mises en œuvre par l'auteur.

A la fin du XII^e^ ou au début du XIII^e^ siècle, une nouvelle ekphrasis d'*ixeutique*, beaucoup plus limitée et insérée dans une lettre, est attribuée à Basile Pédiaditès, un savant constantinopolitain devenu métropolite de Corfou vers la fin du XII^e^ siècle et au moins jusqu'en 1219.[64] Dans une lettre adressée à un duc, ou à Doukas, et qui accompagne une offre de petits oiseaux capturés, l'auteur décrit les manières avec lesquelles ceux-ci sont capturés, manières déjà discutées ci-dessus, et achève sa lettre par la description de son jardin. Cette petite pièce confirme la liaison entre oiseaux, *ixeutique* et jardin dans l'imagerie littéraire byzantine. Le pic de l'intérêt pour l'*ixeutique* aux XI^e^-XII^e^ siècles est confirmé par la présence de scènes de chasse d'oiseaux dans les arts décoratifs à Byzance et surtout dans les enluminures de plusieurs manuscrits de cette époque.[65] En mots et en images, il s'agit d'un imaginaire qui, on l'a vu, traverse toute la tradition gréco-romaine et propose un univers narratif dans lequel auteurs et lecteurs peuvent entrer pour partager et goûter les plaisirs du chant des oiseaux et des plantes odorantes, mais aussi les joies culinaires données par des moineaux fraîchement capturés – un contraste qui peut nous sembler brutal plutôt qu'idyllique.

A partir du XII^e^ siècle, les traces littéraires de l'*ixeutique* diminuent considérablement. Les conditions littéraires ont changé, les goûts et les sensibilités ont évolué. L'*ixeutique* continue à être pratiquée, mais la

[64] Pour ce texte, voir Karpozilos 1981.

[65] Présentation des manuscrits et descriptions des images, Galavaris 1969, 153-1555 ; Karpozilos 1981, 291-293 ; Spatharakis 2004, 24-28 ; Leontsini 2011, 302-310.

littérature ne s'intéresse plus à elle que dans les rares moments où l'art de l'écriture rencontre l'art figuratif, – et cela de manière allusive –, comme dans le cas de l'ekphrasis d'une tapisserie royale parisienne, composée par l'empereur Manuel II Paléologue (1391-1425), qui peint une image de printemps ; ici cependant, il n'y a pas une description de capture d'oiseaux mais une parodie de celle-ci : les enfants dépeints sur la tapisserie essaient d'attraper, non pas des oiseaux mais des insectes : un garçon se sert de son bonnet comme d'un filet, un autre se jette sur les bestioles tandis qu'un autre attache des insectes à des fils légers pour jouer avec eux.[66] L'*ixeutique* retrouve pendant l'époque paléologue son statut de chasse « paysanne » et elle s'éclipse des salons littéraires de la capitale ou des autres villes de ce monde fragmenté.

[66] Manuel II, *Ekphrasis*, PG 156, 577-580 ; pour cette ekphrasis, voir Davis 2003, Peers 2003 et Nilsson 2014, 12-15.

Bibliographie

Sources primaires

Alciphron, *Lettres*. Ed. M. Schepers, *Alciphronis rhetoris epistularum libri iv*. Leipzig 1905.

Anonyme, *Paraphrase de l'ixeutique de Denys*. Ed. A. Garzya, *Dionysii Ixeutikon seu de aucupio libri tres in epitomen metro solutam redacti*. Leipzig 1963.

Anthologie grecque. Ed. P. Waltz, *Anthologie grecque. Tome II : Anthologie palatine, Livre V*. Paris 1926 ; ed. P. Waltz, *Anthologie grecque. Tome III : Anthologie palatine, Livre VI*. Paris 1931 ; ed. P. Waltz, *Anthologie grecque. Tome IV : Anthologie palatine, Livre VII*. Paris 1938 ; ed. P. Waltz, *Anthologie grecque. Tome VII : Anthologie palatine, Livre IX*. Paris 1957 ; ed. J. Irigoin – F. Maltomini, *Anthologie grecque. Tome IX : Anthologie palatine, Livre X*. Paris 2011 ; ed. F. Bouffière – J. Irigoin, *Anthologie grecque. Tome XI : Anthologie palatine, Livre XII*. Paris 1994.

Artémidore, *Oneirocriticon*. Ed. R. A. Pack, *Artemidori Daldiani Onirocriticon libri V*. Leipzig 1963

Basile Pédiaditès, *Lettre*. Ed. A. Karpozilos, « Βασιλείου Πεδιαδίτη, Ἔκφρασις ἀλώσεως ἀκανθίδων », *Ηπειρωτικά Χρονικά* 23 (1981), 284-298.

Bion. Ed. A. Gow, *Bucolici graeci*. Oxford 1952.

Calliclès, Poèmes. Ed. R. Romano, *Nicola Callicle Carmi*. Naples 1980.

Constantin Manassès, *Vie d'Oppien*. Ed. A. Colonna, « De Oppiani vita antiquissima », *Bollettino del Comitato per la preparazione della edizione nazionale dei classici greci e latini* 12 (1964), 33-40.

Esope, *Fables*. Ed. E. Chambry, *Esope Fables*. Paris 1927.

Esope, *Fables*. Ed. A. Hausrath & H. Hunger, *Aesop. Corpus fabularum Aesopicarum*, 2 vols. Leipzig 1959.

Eumathe Macrémbolite, *Hysminè et Hysminias*. Ed. M. Marcovich, *Eustathius Macrembolites De Hysmines et Hysminiae amoribus libri xi*. Munich & Leipzig 2001.

Eutecnius, *Paraphrase*. Ed. M. Papathomopoulos, *Oppianus Apameensis Cynegetica, Eutecnius sophistes paraphrasis metro soluta*. Leipzig 2003.

Hesychius, *Lexicon*. Ed. P.A. Hansen, *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon*, vol. III. Berlin &New York 2005.

Jean Philopone, *In libros de generatione animalium commentaria*. Ed. M. Hayduck, *Ioannis Philoponi (Michaelis Ephesii) in libros de generatione animalium commentaria*. Berlin 1903.

Libanius, *Sur la chasse*. Ed. R. Foerster, *Libanii Opera. VII. Progymnasmata – Argumenta orationum demosthenicarum* (Leipzig 1915), 487-389.

Livistros et Rhodamné. Ed. T. Lendari, *Ἀφήγησις Λιβίστρου καὶ Ροδάμνης (Livistros and Rodamne). The Vatican Version*. Athènes 2007; Ed. P. Agapitos, *Ἀφήγησις Λιβίστρου καὶ Ροδάμνης. Κριτική έκδοση τῆς διασκευῆς α*. Athènes 2006.

Longus, *Daphnis et Chloé*. Ed.-tr. J.-R. Vieillefond, *Longus Pastorales. Daphnis et Chloé*. Paris 2010[3].

Lycophron, *Alexandra*. Ed.-tr. G. Lambin, *L'Alexandra de Lycophron*. Rennes 2005.

Manuel II Paléologue, *Ekphrasis*. PG 156, 577-580.

Manuel Philès, *Des propriétés des animaux*. Ed. G. Bersmann, *Philes de animalium proprietate*. Utrecht 1730./ Ed. A. Caramico, *Manuele File, La proprietà degli animali* II. Naples 2006.

Manuel Philès, *Ekphrasis des mois.* Ed. E. Miller, *Manuelis Philae carmina,* v. I. Paris 1855.

Martial, *Poèmes*. Ed. W. Ker, *Martial Epigrams*, 2vols, London – New York 1920; tr. fr.. M. V. Verger, N.-A. Dubois et J. Mangeart, *Œuvres complètes de M. V. Martial.* Tome 2. Paris 1911.

Michael Psellos, *Lettres*. Ed. S. Papaioannou, *Michael Psellus, Epistulae*. Berlin & Boston 2019.

Oppien, *Cynégétiques*. Ed. M. Papathomopoulos, *Oppianus Apameensis Cynegetica, Eutecnius sophistes paraphrasis metro soluta*. Leipzig 2003.

Pétrone, *Satiricon*. Ed.-tr. A. Ernout, *Pétrone, Le Satiricon*. Paris 1962.

Pseudo-Grégoire de Nysse, *Deux sermons sur la création de l'homme*. Ed. H. Hörner, *Sermones de creatione hominis. Sermo de Paradiso*. Leiden 1972.

Suda. Ed. A. Adler, *Suidae Lexicon*, 5 vols. Leipzig 1935.

Themistius, Περὶ φιλίας. Ed. G. Downey, A.F. Norman & H. Schenkl, *Themistii orationes quae supersunt*. Leipzig 1971.
Théodore Stoudite, Lettres. Ed. G. Fatouros, *Theodori Studitae Epistulae*, vol. 2. Berlin & New York 1992.
Théophile, *Paraphrase*. Ed. J. Lokin et al., *Theophili Antecessoris Paraphrasis Institutionum*. Groningen 2010.
Vie de Barlaam et Joasaph. Ed. R. Volk, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos,* Band VI/I-II: *Historia animae utilis de Barlaam et Ioasaph (spuria)*. Berlin & New York 2009.

Sources secondaires

Anagnostakis, I., T. Kolias & E. Papadopoulou (éd.) 2019. *Ζώα και περιβάλλον στο Βυζάντιο (7ος–12ος αι.)*. Athènes.
Augier-Grimaud, J. 2012. « Nourriture et culture dans la Cena Trimalchionis : deux enjeux de puissance » *Camenulae* 8, 1-10.
Brubaker, L. 2002. « The Vienna Dioskorides and Anicia Juliana », in A. Littlewood, H. Maguire, J. Wolschke-Bulmahn (eds), *Byzantine Garden Culture*. Washington, D.C., 189-214.
Chandezon, C. 2009. « Le gibier dans le monde grec. Rôle alimentaire, économique et social », in Trinquier & Ventries 2009, 75-95.
Delobette, L. 2005. « L'empereur et la chasse à Byzance du XIe au XIIe siècle », in *La forêt dans tous ses états : de la Préhistoire à nos jours. Actes du colloque de l'Association interuniversitaire de l'Est, Dijon, 16-17 nov. 2001*. Besançon, 283-296.
Davis, J. 2003. « Manuel II Palaiologus' A Description of Spring in a Dyed, Woven Hanging », in Ch. Dendrinos *et al*. (éd.), *Porphyrogenita : Essays on the History and Literature of Byzantium and the Latin East in Honour of Julian Chrystomides*, Aldershot, 411-421.
Dupont, F. 2002. *Le plaisir et la loi. Du Banquet de Platon au Satiricon*. Paris.
Eideneier, H. 1979. « Ein byzantinisches Kalendergedicht in der Volkssprache » *Hellenika* 33, 368-419.
Galavaris, G. 1969. *The Illustrations of the Liturgical Homilies of Gregory Nazianzenus*. Princeton.

Gibson, C. 2008. *Libanius's Progymnasmata: Model Exercises in Greek Prose Composition and Rhetoric*. Atlanta.
Grélois, J. P. & J. Lefort. 2012. *Géoponiques [Cassianus Bassus]*. Paris.
Hamblenne, P. 1968. « La légende d'Oppien » *L'Antiquité classique* 37, 589-619.
Jones, C. P. 1991« Dinner Theater », in W. Slater (éd.), *Dining in a Classical Context*. Ann Arbor, 185-198.
Karpozilos, A. 1981. « Βασιλείου Πεδιαδίτη, Ἔκφρασις ἁλώσεως ἀκανθίδων » *Ηπειρωτικά Χρονικά* 23, 284-298.
Koukoulès, F. 1932. « Κυνηγετικὰ ἐκ τῆς ἐποχῆς τῶν Κομνηνῶν καὶ τῶν Παλαιολόγων » *Επετηρίς Εταιρείας Βυζαντινών Σπουδών* 9, 3–33.
— 1952. *Βυζαντινῶν Βίος καὶ Πολιτισμός*, vol. 5. Athènes.
Lazaris, S. 2010. « L'illustration des disciplines médicales dans l'Antiquité : hypothèses, enjeux, nouvelles interprétations », in M. Bernabò (éd.), *La Collezione di testi chirurgici di Niceta (Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 74.7). Tradizione medica classica a Bisanzio*. Rome, 99–109.
Leontsini, M. 2011. « Οικόσιτα, ωδικά και εξωτικά πτηνά. Αισθητική πρόσληψη και χρηστικές όψεις (7ος-11ος αι.) », in Anagnostakis, Kolias & Papadopoulou 2019, 285-317.
— 2013. « Hens, cockerels and other choice fowl: Everyday food and gastronomic pretensions in Byzantium », in I. Anaglostakis (éd.), *Flavours and Delights: Tastes and Pleisures of Ancient and Byzantine Cuisine*. Athènes, 113-131.
Lindner, K. 1973. *Beiträge zu Vogelfang und Falknerei im Altertum*. Berlin & New York.
Loukaki, M. 2013 « Ekphrasis earos. Le topos de la venue du printemps chez des auteurs byzantins » *Parekbolai* 3, 77-106.
Messis, C. & I. Nilsson. 2019. « The *Description of a Crane Hunt by Constantine Manasses*: Introduction, text and translation » *Scandinavian Journal of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 5 (2019), 9-89.
Meunier, F. (tr.) 1991. *Eumathios, Les amours homonymes*, Paris.
Murgatroyd, P. 1984. « Amatory Hunting, Fishing and Fowling » *Latomus* 43, 362-368.

Nilsson, I. 2001. *Erotic Pathos, Rhetorical Pleasure: Narrative technique and mimesis in Eumathios Makrembolites' Hysmine & Hysminias*, Uppsala.
— 2014. *Raconter Byzance : La littérature au XII^e siècle*, Paris.
— 2021. *Writer and Occasion in Twelfth-Century Byzantium: The Authorial Voice of Constantine Manasses*. Cambridge.
Oikonomidès, N. 1996. *Fiscalité et exemption fiscale à Byzance (IXe-XIe s.)*, Athènes.
Peers, G. 2003. « Manuel II Paleologos' Ekphrasis on a Tapestry in the Louvre: Word over Image » *Revue des études byzantines* 61, 201-214.
Prioux, E. 2009. « Le motif de la chasse dans les épigrammes de l'Anthologie grecque », in Trinquier & Vendries 2009, 177-194.
Schnapp, A. 1997. *Le chasseur et la cité. Chasse et érotique dans la Grèce ancienne*. Paris.
Sinakos, A. 2019. « Το κυνήγι κατά τη μέση βυζαντινή εποχή (7ος – 12ος αι.) », in Anagnostakis, Kolias & Papadopoulou 2019, 71-86.
Spatharakis, I. 2004. *The Illustrations of the Cynegetica in Venice Codex Marcianus Graecus Z 139*. Leiden.
Stern, H. 1951 « Représentations gallo-romaines des mois » *Gallia* 9, 21-30.
Trinquier, J. & C. Vendries (éd.) 2009. *Chasses antiques. Pratiques et représentations dans le monde gréco-romain (IIIe siècle av.-IVe siècle apr. J.-C.)*. Rennes.
Van den Abbele, B. 2009. « Un regard de médiéviste sur les chasses gréco-romaines » in Trinquier & Vendries 2009, 237-241.
Vendries, C. 2009. « L'auceps, les gluaux et l'appeau. A propos de la ruse et de l'habileté du chasseur d'oiseaux », in Trinquier & Vendries 2009, 119-140.
Viré, F. 1973. « La chasse à la glu (tadbīq) en Orient médieval » *Arabica* 20, 1-10.

I asked him about the secret he knew… (Juliusz Słowacki) Konstantinos Kanaris and his Fights in Polish Romantic Poetry*

Maria Kalinowska

On 24th August 1836, the Polish poet and philhellene Juliusz Słowacki (1809-1849) set off on his great journey to Greece and the Middle East. It was 15 years after the Greek Revolution broke out and five years after the failure of the Polish November Uprising (1830-1831). Słowacki, one of the two most important Polish Romantic poets, had been living in Western Europe since the Polish Uprising (1830) and, like many Polish political émigrés, could not return to Poland.[1]

Here, a historical digression is necessary: from the end of the eighteenth century, Poland remained under Russian, Austrian, and Prussian occupation; the entire nineteenth century was a time of subjugation for the Poles. At the same time, they tried to regain their independence throughout the 19th century through various underground movements and by organising national uprisings, which met with harsh repressions from the occupying authorities. The failure of these uprisings

* This work (translated by Joanna Dutkiewicz, Chloe Fagan) was completed as part of the framework of a research project financed by the Polish National Science Centre (registration number 2014/15/B/HS2/01360). An initial, shorter version of this paper was presented during the conference "Through the Pen of Others: Nineteenth-Century Views of Revolutionary Greece" (Athens, December 2021, Department of English Language and Literature, School of Philosophy, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens). I would like to thank Mrs Vana Maurianou (librarian), Naval War College (Athens) for her help.

[1] See about Słowacki in English: Cochran et al. 2009.

(e.g. 1794, 1830, 1848, 1863), in which the Polish people suffered brutal violence at the hands of the partitioning powers (especially Russia), only intensified the state of national subjugation.[2]

In this situation the example of Greece, which had regained its independence and formed a modern state, became an extremely attractive model for the Poles. This Greek example was all the more relevant to the Poles because the ancient history of Greece was regarded – in nineteenth-century Europe as well as Poland - as the cradle of European democracy, freedom, philosophy, and art had always served as a universally admired model, especially for the culture of the traditional Polish nobility which was the basis of Polish national culture.[3]

Słowacki set off from Otranto in Italy by ship for the country of the heirs to Leonidas and Themistocles,[4] and travelled via Corfu and Zante, to Patras, Corinth, Mycenae, and Athens. On Syros he waited around two weeks for the ship. At the time, this island was a major transport and trade hub; moreover, it might also have interested Słowacki because of its history: many refugees from the islands of Chios and Psara had found refuge in Hermoupolis. The poet mentioned the history of Psara many times in his Byronic poem *Lambro*, written a few years before his trip. From Syros Słowacki went on to Egypt, the Holy Land, and Lebanon.

This was a truly Romantic journey, similar to those previously undertaken by Chateaubriand, Byron and Lamartine. Every Romantic poet went on a journey: real or imaginary, in time or in space, travelling very far to exotic places, or seemingly only a short distance, but to a different, mysterious, and unknown world. A journey was the most popular Romantic metaphor for life, and life itself became a journey

---

[2] See Zamoyski 1999; Davies 1982.

[3] See Clair 1972 (2008); Droulia 2007; Beaton 2021. About Polish Philhellenism see Borowska, Kalinowska & Tomaszuk 2012; Kalinowska 2017. See also Mavroudis 1991.

[4] Referring to heroes from ancient Greek history was a very common practice in the whole of European Philhellenism. See about Romantic cult of Greece as a symbol of freedom: Stern 1969, 5-7; Highet 1967, 356 ff. In Polish Romantic Philhellenism, Leonidas enjoyed a very special place: he was a focal character in one of Słowacki's most important poems inspired by his Greek travels, *Agamemnon's Tomb*. See Kalinowska 2017; Cochran 2009.

for the Romantic, a sign of a restless existence, or a constant quest for truth and continued attempts to understand mysteries. Romantic travels took people to faraway, culturally different places, but also deep into the traveller's self. Most often, though, a Romantic journey combined both these aspects, and setting off implied learning about the external world just as much as exploring oneself and increasing one's sensitivity. In the Romantic period, a journey was a social fact, even a fashionable trend, but one that invoked various earlier forms of travelling. There is no question that the Romantic journey included noticeable elements of the Grand Tour – the educational trip taken by young upper-class men starting from the seventeenth century. In addition, the travels of the Romantics invoked the pilgrimage tradition found in many cultures, i.e. visiting holy sites, making one's way to the sacred centre of the world. The Romantics, especially or also Polish Romantics, experienced one other kind of travel as well: various forms of emigration or exile stemming from their country's political reality and its subjugation. In this, being exiled from their homeland due to historical circumstances became a sign of a very universal situation for Polish Romantic poets: humankind's eternal lack of roots on this earth; a sign of humanity, a symbol of the human fate, where those exiled on earth cannot live here in a more permanent way, but are travelling to a different, spiritual homeland as pilgrims. The Romantic journey, with its many different traditions and varied motivation, does have its specific qualities. First of all, there is the focus on the self, on the traveller's inner world and the very fact of travelling, which gives the Romantic artist greater sensitivity, a wider field of artistic inspiration and – very importantly – stimulation of the imagination that, in a way, multiplies reality. The Romantic journey involves breaking away from everyday life, stepping outside the present and outside commonplace and familiar places, going towards worlds imagined, spaces unknown and alluring, infinite in their cultural and geographic wealth, providing various models of existence and standards of humanity.[5]

However, it is not known whether Słowacki was just a Romantic traveller seeking poetic inspiration, or whether perhaps he was fulfilling

[5] See more Kalinowska 2011, 12-14 and 22-27. See also Kalinowska 2008, Przybylski 1982, Augustinos 1994 and Slowacki.al.uw.edu.pl.

a political mission in connection with the work of Prince Czartoryski and his circle. Prince Adam Jerzy Czartoryski was the most influential politician of Polish émigré circles;[6] as Russia's foreign minister in the times of Tsar Alexander I, he was subsequently sentenced to death by the Russians for taking part in the Polish uprising (1830-31). A correspondent of Kapodistrias, he was the "Philhellene", who had left his signature as the author of a political manifesto published in Marseille in 1830 but was inspired by the outbreak of the Greek Uprising. *Essai sur la diplomatie ou manuscrit d'un Philhellène* contained a programme for the creation of a universal political order based on the laws of nations and, above all, on ethical principles in relations between nations, and against violence.[7] Słowacki's travel companion, a Polish nobleman named Zenon Brzozowski (1806-1887), was involved in the political activities of Czartoryski and his family.[8] Two other noblemen who were Słowacki's companions and who may have played a role as political emissaries were the brothers Stefan (1815-1878) and Aleksander (1816-1893) Hołyński.[9]

There is no way of knowing if this was a Romantic journey to the roots of European civilisation and the source of Christianity, as well to the mysterious Orient, or whether it was a political mission, or both.[10] What is known, however, is that it was a pilgrimage – and not solely because the Polish poet's route included the empty Tomb of Jesus in Jerusalem, where Słowacki spent a night and experienced a deep spiritual breakthrough.[11] It was also first and foremost a journey in search of poetic

---

[6] See Kukiel 1955; Skowronek 1983; Zawadzki 1992; Axer 2011, 122-127.

[7] This manifesto was completed by 1827 with the title, *Essai sur la diplomatie ou manuscrit d'un Philhellène* (ed. Nicolas Toulouzan, founder of 'Société de la Morale chrétienne' and vice president of the Marseille Philhellenic Committee, published Marseille, 1830).

[8] See Głębocki 2019, 64-69.

[9] See *ibid.*, 70-79.

[10] See Libera 1993, 54-100; Głębocki 2019, 61-94.

[11] There is extensive literature in Polish on the spiritual ("mystical") breakthrough that occurred in Słowacki's life in the early 1840s. However, many researchers believe that this breakthrough in fact began during the poet's Eastern journey. The night spent at Christ's tomb in particular, according to the poet himself, was of critical

inspiration and a pilgrimage to Greece which Słowacki, in the spirit of the time, saw as the native land of Homer and the great Greek myths – a place which represented the "dreams of humankind",[12] but was regarded also as the land of heroes fighting for freedom. Hence, places of special importance on this journey included Salamis, Thermopylae and, seen from a distance, Lepanto and Missolonghi.

Słowacki documented his journey, which he treated as a unique experience, in a narrative poem that he entitled *Podróż do Ziemi* Świętej *z Neapolu* [*Journey to the Holy Land from Naples*], which he almost completed during his travels but never published. He only published one canto, *Agamemnon's Tomb* (written later, after his trip), which influenced the Polish national mentality for the next two centuries.[13] The rest of the poetic travelogue remained in manuscript form in a journal which he used to record sketches of poems, travel notes, and bills, drew pictures of the sights he visited and painted watercolours.[14] The travel notebook in which he wrote the poem about the Greek part of his travels, which many believed to have been destroyed by fire in Warsaw during the Nazi occupation, unexpectedly turned up 80 years later at a library in Moscow, where it was discovered by Professor Henryk Głębocki from

---

importance for his transformation. A poem Słowacki wrote at the time, starting with the words "And having abandoned the way of worldly delusions", is significant in this context. See Kiślak 2019 and the summary of the text [Transformation in the East: Religion and Existence] in Kalinowska et al. 2019, vol. 3, 445. "This study deals with the groundbreaking significance of Słowacki's journey to the East, addressing earlier research on the Raptularz wschodni [The Eastern Diary]. It then reconstructs the existential starting point of the journey and the poet's experience as his expedition progresses, firstly from the perspective of the anthropology of death. It tracks announcements of transformation, including the case of the falsified edition of Conversation with the Pyramids. The study also reasserts the importance of the poet's time in Jerusalem, documented by two lyrics, and considers Anhelli's place in the transformation of the poet's worldview. Słowacki's originality is shown in the context of the itineraries of other travelers to the East during this period.

[12] There is extensive scholarly literature on Słowacki's reception of Greek myths. He referred to them many times in his works and extracted deep archetypal content from them, similar to that described later by C. G. Jung.

[13] See Cochran et al. 2009. *Grób Agamemnona* [*Agamemnon's Tomb*] was published in Paris in 1840.

[14] See Kalinowska 2019.

the Jagiellonian University. The team which I had the honour of leading, published this journal in its entirety, treating the texts it contained as a Romantic open work,[15] a testimony to the poet's travel experience. Reproductions of the entire manuscript were made available for the first time and opened up several new lines of research, particularly concerning the poet's meeting with Konstantinos Kanaris. While the notebook contains numerous fragments of different poems, the only complete text contained within it is that of the "Greek poem". *Journey to the Holy Land from Naples* is composed of the following cantos: Canto 1. *Wyjazd z Neapolu* [Departure from Naples], Canto 3. *Statek parowy* [The Steamship], Canto 4. *Grecja* [Greece], Canto 5. *Podróż konna* [Journey on horseback], Canto 6. *Nocleg w Vostizzy* [A night's stay in Vostizza], Canto 7, *Megaspilleon klasztor* [Mega Spilaion Monastery]. Two further cantos were written later and added to the poem by the editors: Canto 8. Grób Agamemnona [*Agamemnon's Tomb*],[16] and Canto 9, untitled, inspired by his visit to Corinth.

Two encounters during his Greek travels were particularly important to Słowacki: a voyage which he happened to share by chance with Dionysios Solomos,[17] and a visit to Konstantinos Kanaris' home. The encounter with Solomos, who was already famous in Europe as the author of *Hymn to Liberty* and whose poetry Słowacki had admired for years, was a disappointment.[18] By contrast, his meeting with Kanaris confirmed his fascination with a hero whose life and deeds were admired in Europe, and who had been familiar to the Polish poet since his youth.

Słowacki's fascination with Kanaris had old and deep origins. It was already expressed in his earlier writings, when, as an émigré after the fall

---

[15] Kalinowska, M. et al. (eds) 2019, *"Raptularz wschodni" Juliusza Słowackiego. Edycja – studia – komentarze*. See in print: Maria Kalinowska and Ewa Łukaszyk, Juliusz Słowacki's "Notebook from His Travels to Greece and the East as a Romantic Open and Syncretic Work. Translating a Journey into Poetry".

[16] *Agamemnon's Tomb* was the long poem's only section published by Słowacki (1840); it functions as a separate poem and is given great importance in Polish culture.

[17] See Karagiorgos 2019.

[18] By this time, *Hymn to Liberty* (1823) had been translated into many languages and had become a symbol of the Greek independence struggle. See Tiktopoulou 1998; Amarantidou 2006, 249-263.

of the Polish November Uprising, he wrote the Byronic poem *Lambro*, whose storyline references the unsuccessful Greek uprising of 1770. In fact, *Lambro* invokes the realities of various Greek independence struggles (it includes allusions to Lambros Katsonis, but also to Rigas Feraios and Kanaris; it mentions the history of Morea, Psara and Hydra and their role during the revolution[19]) while also seeking to recount the Polish insurrection experience.

What is of most interest here, however, is how Słowacki's literary imagination was inspired by the young Kanaris' method of sea warfare, which fascinated him: fighting the enemy with the help of fire ships and setting fire to enemy ships. In his travel poem, Słowacki calls Kanaris "the master of two elements", and he uses this compelling union of the elements of water and fire from Kanaris' biography in *Lambro* to create a universal story about the fight between good and evil. Torn between what is good and a desire for vengeance, *Lambro*'s Byronic hero becomes an image of nineteenth-century man. The poem's setting is reminiscent of a painting by January Suchodolski, a Polish painter and November insurrectionist, also an acquaintance of Słowacki, who produced a painting referencing Kanaris' mode of fighting several years after *Lambro* was published. However, Słowacki's poem unfolds in even more apocalyptic scenery that brings to mind ultimate and universal choices between good and evil, while his protagonist, who turns from an insurgent into a corsair, reminds us of Byronic heroes of vengeance: "Here is my element — this grim darkness, / My thoughts already belong to the abyss".[20]

---

[19] These are most frequently very general references to the events of the 1821 Greek uprising widely known across Europe at that time. There is a vast academic literature on the topic available. See, for example Clair 1972 (2008); Tsigakou 1991; Beaton 2013.

[20] Słowacki 1952: "Oto mój żywioł – ta ciemność ponura,/ Już do otchłani myśl moja należy." (Canto 2, lines 620-621). This poem is representative of a major trend in Polish Romantic literature that referenced Byronic creations of "dark" characters who did not hesitate to resort to vengeance in their actions. Characterising Byron's characters, Mickiewicz, who was the most important Polish Romantic poet, defended them against accusations of godless and unethical conduct; in the introduction to his translation of *The Giaour*, Mickiewicz wrote that "Byron's people have a conscience" ("Ludzie Byrona mają sumnienie", Mickiewicz 1998, 150).

Thus, Słowacki's youthful fascination with Kanaris inspired him as a mature artist to create a Byronic hero, rebellious and vengeful, entangled in history, but also paying for revenge on his nation's enemy with the disintegration of his own personality. However, the real Kanaris had been first and foremost a moral model of a patriot for the young Słowacki; other heroes of the Greek Revolution had also been his great inspirations: Botsaris, Miaoulis, Tzavelas, the defenders of Missolonghi whose stories he came to know from his youthful reading.[21] In *Lambro* this fascinating "master of two elements", the historical Kanaris, is made into an anarchic hero, filled with vengeance and undergoing destruction.

It is thus not surprising that his meeting with Kanaris a few years after the publication of *Lambro* was a momentous event for the poet, one that he described in his narrative poem written in Greece, *Journey to the Holy Land from Naples*. It needs to be added that there are several reports of encounters with Kanaris by the nineteenth-century travellers wanting to meet the legendary hero of the Greek War of Independence who was famous throughout Europe. Kanaris' European fame is confirmed in the writings of Victor Hugo, for example.[22] In the context of Słowacki's journey, three accounts of meetings with Kanaris are especially significant: that of Prince Pückler-Muskau (1836),[23] whom Słowacki mentions and who travelled along a similar route a few months before the Polish poet, that of Gustave Flaubert (1850), and that of Polish aristocrat, writer and composer Władysław Tarnowski (1874). I shall return later to this other Polish traveller who visited Kanaris almost 40 years after Słowacki, because Tarnowski, an artist and participant in another anti-Russian Polish insurrection (the January Uprising, 1863-1864), met with Kanaris when Słowacki's poem was already well known and Słowacki's influence on Polish mentality and Polish poetry was enormous.

---

[21] As recalled by Słowacki in his travel poem.

[22] V. Hugo wrote the poem *Canaris* (1828) (part of *Les Orientales*) and the ode *À Canaris* (1832). See Tabaki-Iona 1993, 57-59.

[23] The prince visited Kanaris on his corvette near Patras. See Pückler-Muskau 1841, 73-75, 78-84.

What, then, does Słowacki write about Kanaris in his travel poem? What image of Kanaris do we find in *Journey to the Holy Land from Naples*? First of all, we need to look at the special form of this digressive poem written in sestina form, which is somewhat Byronic and Ariostan, which is governed by Romantic irony and whose variable tones stretch between the opposites of sublimity and comedy, melancholy and humour. The poem's varying rhythm reflects the pace of the traveller's changing impressions, the way he absorbs the images of Greece, his recording of his inner states, digressions about history and metaphysics, as well as the changeability and capriciousness of the relationship between the time of the narrative and the time of the journey.[24] The examples of such variations can be seen in for example the structure of the poem as a play of the sublime and the poet's distance towards himself. The stanza in which the poet writes a magnificent ode to Messolonghi and then just breaks this uplifted tone with a trivial observation of himself.[25]

It is not known exactly when or where Słowacki visited Kanaris. He writes that he was at his modest "clay cottage", which corresponds with the characteristics of architecture in the Cyclades. He most probably visited him on Syros, where Słowacki spent two weeks waiting for a ship to Egypt and writing his poem. However, there is no confirmation in other sources that Kanaris stayed on Syros in 1836, although it is likely.[26] Kanaris scholars write that after Kapodistrias' death (1832) he withdrew from political life for a period to the island of Syros.[27] While the archive in Hermoupolis cannot confirm with any certainty that Kapodistrias lived on Syros in the 1830s, this nonetheless seems highly probable. Most sources describe Kanaris' return to public life in 1837[28] and mention Aegina and Athens as his subsequent places of residence.

---

[24] See more on the specificity of this poem: Kalinowska 2008.

[25] See Leszczyński 2014.

[26] As confirmed by the opinion of the municipal archive in Hermoupolis (Kalinowska 2011, 329).

[27] These remarks about the early 1830s in Kanaris' life can be found in all his biographies and encyclopaedias in many languages, see for example: *Παγκόσμιο Βιογραφικό Λεξικό* 1985, 242; Photiadis 1988, 723, 726.

[28] See e.g. Fotiadis 1988 (2006), 723-728 and the entries in the most European encyclopaedias and dictionaries.

The Kanaris sources and biographies show a gap of several years after 1832. The hypothesis that Słowacki visited Kanaris on Syros is very tempting to researchers of the Polish poet. There are numerous reasons for that; for instance, there is evidence that Słowacki wrote his poem on Syros while waiting for a boat to Egypt. However, he first rewrote the earlier parts of the poem from his sketchbook. The manuscript got changed in this part of the text, where Słowacki writes:

"I am just returning from his [Kanaris] home".[29] To gives the impression of having been written *en route* – whereas earlier segments appear to have been copied from previous versions. In the manuscript of the poem in the travel notebook, it can be seen that the poem was written directly after his visit to Kanaris' home as it is full of deletions and indications of being the first draft.

There is also some ambiguity in the poem regarding Kanaris' status at the time of the visit: on the one hand, Słowacki writes about him as someone who has removed himself from politics and public life ("today calm he lives/ In a clay cottage, like Evander's home"),[30] while on the other he mentions seeing him "in Patras commanding the Greek flotilla"[31] (which would make this testimony similar to that left by Prince Pückler-Muskau in his memoirs[32]). All of the facts cited here and an analysis of the poem's manuscript enable us to hypothesise that Słowacki saw Kanaris in Patras as a fleet commander, and that they met at his home on Syros.

---

[29] Słowacki 2011. "Wierzę, że jeszcze żyje dziś Kanarys,/ Bo właśnie teraz wracam z jego domu" (Canto 4. lines 193-194).

[30] *Ibid.* "[…] dziś spokojny mięszka/ W domku glinianym jak domek Ewandra" (Canto 4. lines 200-201).

[31] *Ibid.* "W Patrassie grecką dowodzi flotyllą" (Canto 4, line 197).

[32] Pückler-Muskau travelled across Greece a few months before Słowacki, often following similar routes. In Patras, he attended a party on Kanaris' ship (see Pückler-Muskau 1841, 78-84). Słowacki spent just one day in Patras: it was where his voyage from Corfu and Zante ended. If he had gone to the meeting with Kanaris straight after disembarking, it might have confirmed the political nature of the meeting. There is no proof of Kanaris having lived in Patras. European Romantics, painters and poets alike, were more fascinated with the young Kanaris' battles, in which he used fire ships; his subsequent role as a war fleet commander seldom inspired the Romantic imagination.

How is Kanaris portrayed in Słowacki's poem? The fragments preceding the references to Kanaris are about Missolonghi and the Greek struggle viewed within a long series of freedom efforts against tyranny and violence: from antiquity to Europe of the time. The expressions Słowacki uses towards Kanaris include the following: "heavenly fāris", "burned by a bolt of fire", the one who "lived like a salamander", Kanaris –like the centaurs– appears to be "half man – and half fireship", "eyes full of lightning", "king of the flames", "the master of two elements/ With which he destroys – does he have the face of Angels?"[33]

These are questions the poet asks himself as he recalls his youth, when he excitedly read reports from the Greek insurgent struggle and wanted to be like the Greek heroes. Recounting his arrival at Kanaris' humble home, Słowacki compares his experience to the biblical "Jacob's dream": the patriarch Jacob dreamed of a ladder reaching to heaven, with angels ascending and descending it. In Słowacki's imagination, Jacob's dream is his own return to his youth and his reading of stories about the Greek Revolution and its heroes; he returned to his youth in Lithuania, and to the riverbank in the garden in Jaszuny,[34] "to read or to dream…/ And thus at one time I read the Greek's struggle."[35]

With his very detailed but also extremely poetic description of Kanaris' fighting that had made him famous all over Europe, the Polish poet returns to his youth, where Kanaris becomes a symbol of the young Słowacki's dreams of a splendid future. Recalling his youthful reading (about the heroic deeds of the new Greece's warriors, including the Ypsilantis brothers, Botsaris and Kanaris) during his journey, the poet builds an unusual image, its uniqueness lying in a merger of the microscopic elements of surrounding nature.[36] Perspective from which

---

[33] *Ibid.* in Polish: "błękitów farys", "od ogniowego opalony gromu", "żył jako salamandra", "oczy pełne błyskawicy". "A ów Kanarys zda się jak Centaury/ Na pół człowiekiem – a na pół brulotem./ Ten człowiek – śmiały... i pan dwóch żywiołów,/ Któremi niszczy – czy ma twarz Aniołów?" (Canto 4. Lines 321-324).

[34] The garden in the estate in Jaszuny (Jašiūnai), near Vilnius.

[35] Słowacki 2011. "[…] czytać albo marzyć…/ I tak czytałem niegdyś walkę Greka," (Canto 4. Lines 220-221).

[36] See Nawarecki 2012. Prof. A. Nawarecki (University of Silesia) started a line of research in Polish studies on poetic imagination that he called "micrology".

the reading and dreaming youth perceives nature around him (he is reading in the garden) and the broad historical panorama suggested by the Greek struggle about which he is reading. This creates a deeply internalised, fairy-tale-like vision in which blades of grass, crickets, flower petals, dewdrops, seen from close up by a boy hidden on a Lithuanian riverbank covered in blue flowers, larger than a man; and Kanaris, "the master of two elements" sailing across the big blue Greek sea, is reduced to the size of a grasshopper which "on a blade of yellow straw" "travels on a boat". At that moment, Hellas is thus presented as an area of youthful dreams about a heroic man and about a heroic self. At the same time, we can recognise Greek motifs connected with the uprising becoming internalized for Słowacki.

One of the most interesting poetic images which Słowacki uses in the poem's segment about Kanaris is that of resurrection in the religious sense to describe the moment when the nation regains independence. The nation's death is a sleep (the poet speaks of "the tomb of the deeply sleeping homeland")[37] that will end at the moment of the people's resurrection: "What great effort will be needed then/ To roll away our grave's stone –/ That marble filled with our suffering engraved,/ On which the children of the fallen pray".[38] This multidimensional metaphor refers to the continuing bondage suffered by Słowacki's homeland, but also to the already ended bondage of Kanaris' homeland: "I inquired of the secret he already knew,/ For he had rolled away gravestones himself".[39] Kanaris' fight, and indeed any freedom struggle, gains religious sanction here, and is compared to resurrection in a religious sense (a reference to Manzoni's ode on the Resurrection of Christ[40]).

---

[37] Słowacki 2011. "Bo sam odwalał kamienie grobowe/ Z grobu uśpionej głęboko ojczyzny" (Canto 5. Lines 16-17).

[38] *Ibid*. "Jakiegoż trzeba będzie wtenczas trudu,/ Aby odwalić nasz grobowy kamień.–/ Ów marmur, pełny naszych cierpień rytych,/ Na którym modlą się dzieci – zabitych" (Canto 5. Lines 9-12).

[39] *Ibid*. "Pytałem znanej mu już tajemnicy,/ Bo sam odwalał kamienie grobowe" (Canto 5. lines 15-16).

[40] Manzoni 1951, *La Risurrezione*, see lines 15–24: "Come a mezzo del cammino, / Riposato alla foresta, / Si risente il pellegrino, / E si scote dalla testa / Una foglia inaridita, / Che, dal ramo dipartita, / Lenta lenta vi ristè: // Tale il marmo inoperoso, / Che premea l'arca scavata / Gitt. via quel Vigoroso" (Manzoni 1951, 672)

One compelling idea that has not been considered by researchers yet is how the "grave's stone" is compared to marble covered with engraved sufferings; this inscription engraved with suffering might be understood as an element connecting the "Greek", ancient (pre-Christian?) tradition with Christ's order.

"I asked the Greek… but he no longer has that/ Prometheus chest with stolen fire. / My question was like Hamlet's/ Metaphysical word: does the soul dream?"[41] – this is a cryptic excerpt in which historical rebellion, often anarchic and opposed to Providence, turns into a question about the universal mystery of existence.

Słowacki's poem was first published in 1866,[42] after the poet's death. Almost 40 years after Słowacki's journey, in 1874, a Polish count called Władysław Tarnowski (1836-1878),[43] an eccentric traveller, composer and writer, and participant in the next brutally quashed national uprising (1863–1864), visited Konstantinos Kanaris in Athens. He described his impressions in a poem he entitled *Odwiedziny u Kanarisa. List z podróży do Ag… Gi…* [*Visiting Kanaris*, *The Letter from the journey to Ag… Gi…*] published in Lwów in 1876.[44] This work is nowhere as accomplished as Słowacki's poem, however, it offers intriguing testimony on the reception of *Journey to the Holy Land…* and, first and foremost, the reception of the person of Kanaris.[45] In this sense, it is a compelling example of an update to the Romantic parallel between the histories of Greece and Poland, and, above all, it evidences how Kanaris was assimilated into Polish culture through the framework of Romantic motifs and topics. The narrating subject of Tarnowski's poem visits a very old and ill Kanaris, who is more of a sage and prophet predicting

[41] "Pytałem Greka… ale w nim już nie ta/ Z kradzionym ogniem pierś Prometeusza./ Moje pytanie było jak Hamleta/ Metafizyczne słowo – czy śni dusza?" (Canto 5. Lines 19-22).

[42] Słowacki 1866.

[43] See Tarnowski 2020.

[44] Tarnowski 1876. In the Polish journal *Ruch Literacki*, where Tarnowski published his poem in 1876, there was also a brief note about a text by Spiridion Poggis (the Greek consul in Sardinia, the companion of Tarnowski), which was published in the Athenian journal *Εφημερίς* (1874).

[45] See Janion 2015, 46-49.

Poland's future than a fighting hero. He is the epitome of Greece's great tradition (resemblance to Socrates and a figure as if carved by Phidias), but he also reminds the visiting traveller of a Polish literary, legendary knight: Mohort. Mohort was the literary hero of a chivalric epic by Wincenty Pol (1807-1872),[46] a Polish Romantic poet. Pol created Mohort as a model of a Christian knight and patriot, who is an old defender of the homeland, especially the eastern borderlands of the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and the Christian faith, an inheritor of the great tradition of Polish King Jan III Sobieski, who defeated the Osman Empire and halted their invasion of Western Europe.[47] In Polish research *Mohort* is treated as a representative of the conservative noble tradition, but popular also in broader democratic circles in society.[48] In this poem *Mohort* is an old soldier and symbolises the ethos of patriotic duty important to Polish noble tradition.

Like Słowacki, Tarnowski also includes the motif of a question being put to Kanaris in his role of representing a nation with an ancient tradition that has regained its freedom. The old man – both the knight of old and, first and foremost, the sage and prophet, a man at the border between life and death – prophesying freedom for Poland, also using the structures of messianic thinking that were so characteristic of the Romantic period. This poem, similarly to Słowacki's, mentions the Greek insurgent struggle, while in the poem Kanaris appears to be familiar with Polish freedom heroes (Tadeusz Kościuszko). The day of his meeting with Kanaris, the Polish traveller assures, will "shine in my memories without end, / Like when the sun's fiery face falls into the depths of the sea".[49]

These Polish descriptions of Kanaris bear many likenesses and present a similar account of Kanaris' reception. Both continue the tradition of Victor Hugo from his poetry on Kanaris,[50] and both are

[46] Pol 1854.

[47] The victorious Battle of Vienna in 1683.

[48] See Pol 1922; Janion 1975.

[49] Tarnowski 1876."Dzień ten tak miłuję,/ Że mi będzie przyświecał w wspomnieniach bez końca,/ Jak w morską toń gdy spada ognista twarz słońca" (356).

[50] See note 23.

slightly distinct from that of Pückler-Muskau, who presents Kanaris as a clear-headed warrior, seaman, and politician, a very modest, low-profile, unobtrusive man, different from the great Romantic hero. However, both the Polish view and that of Pückler-Muskau share the same admiration for Kanaris. Two Polish descriptions of Kanaris contrast very markedly with the "cold" account of Gustave Flaubert, who saw a "real bourgeois" in Kanaris, very different from the Romantic legend that surrounded him.[51] Both these Polish descriptions of Kanaris present a comparable Romantic model deeply rooted in the Polish and European Romantic traditions.

Another interesting aspect of the comparison of these two descriptions of Kanaris by Słowacki and Tarnowski is how it demonstrates the heterogeneity of sources and motivations of Polish philhellenism. In both authors' oeuvres the specificity of Polish Romantic philhellenism is evident in the parallels between the descriptions of Polish and Greek aspirations for independence. Furthermore, Słowacki's philhellenism is connected with the European fascination with antiquity, while perhaps also being characterized by some of the rebellious and unmitigated aspects of the Byronic and Romantic idea of freedom. Tarnowski also refers to antiquity, however, he represents a more traditionalist mode: philhellenism, in his approach, is connected with the Polish tradition of defending the eastern borderlands of Europe and the continent's Christian values against the Ottoman threat.

[51] See Flaubert 1910, 133-134; Winock 2016, 129; Fotiadis 1988 (2006), 748-749.

Bibliography

Primary literature

Kalinowska, M. et al. (eds) 2019, *"Raptularz wschodni" Juliusza Słowackiego. Edycja – studia – komentarze*. Vol. 1. Podobizna autografu; vol. 2. Edycja - komentarz – objaśnienia; vol. 3. Studia i interpretacje. Warszawa.

Manzoni, A. 1951. *La Risurrezione*, in Idem, *Tutte le poesie*. Ed. A. Polvara, Milano.

Mickiewicz, A. 1998. *Przemowa tłumacza*, in Idem, *Giaur. Ułamki powieści tureckiej z Lorda Byrona*, in *idem*, *Dzieła*, vol. 2. Poematy. Warszawa.

Pol, Wincenty. *Mohort*. Rapsod rycerski z podania. Kraków 1854.

Pol, Wincenty. *Mohort*. Ed. A. Łucki. Kraków 1922.

Słowacki, Juliusz. *Lambro. Powstańca grecki*, in *idem*. *Dzieła wszystkie*. Ed. J. Kleiner, vol. 2, 11-58. Wrocław 1952.

Słowacki, Juliusz. *Pisma pośmiertne*. Ed. A. Małecki, vol. 1. Lwów 1866.

Słowacki, Juliusz. *Podróż do Ziemi Świętej z Neapolu*, in M. Kalinowska, "*Podróż do Ziemi Świętej z Neapolu*". *Glosy*. Gdańsk 2011.

Tarnowski, Władysław (pseudonym Ernest Buława). "Odwiedziny u Kanarisa. List z podróży do Ag… Gi…". *Ruch Literacki* 22, 355-356.

Tarnowski, Władysław (pseudonym Ernest Buława). *Artysta i cierpienie*; part 1. *Poematy, wiersze, artykuły, wybór listów, okoliczności śmierci*. Ed. M. Tarnowski. Łódź 2020.

Secondary literature

Amarantidou, W. 2006. *Juliusz Słowacki i Grecja nowożytna*. Łódź.

Augustinos, O. 1994. *French Odysseys. Greece in French Travel Literature from the Renaissance to the Romantic Era*. Baltimore & London.

Axer, J. 2011. "Reshaping the "Classical Tradition" to Question the European Political Order: Polish Case Studies", in G. Klaniczay, M. Werner & O. Gecser (eds), *Multiple Antiquities – Multiple Modernities. Ancient Histories in Nineteenth Century European Cultures*. Frankfurt & New York, 121-134.

Beaton, R. 2021. “Philhellenism”, in P. M. Ktromilides & Constantinos Tsoukalas (eds), *The Greek Revolution. A Critical Dictionary*. Cambridge MA & London.

Borowska, M., M. Kalinowska & J. Ławski (eds) 2007. *Filhellenizm w Polsce. Rekonesans*. Warszawa.

Borowska, M., M. Kalinowska & K. Tomaszuk (eds) 2012, *Filhellenizm w Polsce. Wybrane tematy*. Warszawa.

Clair, W. St. 1972 (2008). *That Greece Might Still Be Free: The Philhellenes in the War of Independence*, Open Books Publishers (original Oxford University Press 1972).

Cochran, P. et al. 2009. *Poland's Angry Romantic: Two Poems and a Play by Juliusz Słowacki*. Cambridge.

Davies, N. 1982. *God's Playground: a History of Poland*. Vol. 2: *1795 to the Present*. New York.

Droulia, L. 2007. “The Revival of the Greek Ideal and Philhellenism. A Perambulation”, in M. Borowska, M. Kalinowska & J. Ławski (eds), *Filhellenizm w Polsce. Rekonesans*. Warszawa, 25-38.

Εκπαιδευτική Ελληνική Εγκυκλοπαίδεια. Vol. 4. *Παγκόσμιο Βιογραφικό Λεξικό*, Athens 1985.

Flaubert, G. 1910. *Notes de Voyages*. Vol. 2. Paris.

Fotiadis, D. 1988 (2006 -10.edition). *Kanaris*. Athens.

Głębocki, H. 2019. "Uczestnicy, towarzysze i świadkowie podróży Juliusza Słowackiego na Wschód 1836–1837”, in M. Kalinowska, E. Kiślak & Z. Przychodniak (eds), *"Raptularz wschodni" Juliusza Słowackiego. Edycja – studia – komentarze*. Vol. 3. Studia i interpretacje. Warszawa, 61-94.

Highet, G. 1967. *The Classical Tradition. Greek and Roman Influences on Western Literature*. Oxford.

Janion, E. R. 2015. *Imaging Suli: Interactions between Philhellenic Ideas and Greek Identity Discourse*, Berlin.

Janion, M. 1975. “Wincenty Pol (1807-1872)”, in M. Janion, B. Zakrzewski & M. Dernałowicz (eds.), *Literatura krajowa w okresie romantyzmu 1831-1863*, vol. 1. Kraków, 467-518.

Kalinowska, M. 2008. “European Identity and Romantic Irony: Juliusz Słowacki’s Journey to Greece”, in W. Bracewell & A. Drace-Francis (eds.), *Under Eastern Eyes. A Comparative Introduction to East European Travel Writing on Europe. East Looks West*, vol. 2. Budapest & New York, 223-235.

Kalinowska, M. 2013. “Waning worlds and budding hopes. Anti-idyllic visions of antiquity in Polish Romanticism”, in Z. M. Torlone (ed.), *The Missing Link: Classical Reception the “Younger” Europe*. Oxford. *Classical Receptions Journal* 5 (3), 320-335.

— 2017. “Parallels Between Greece and Poland in Juliusz Słowacki’s Oeuvre”, in Z. Martirosova Torlone, D. La Course Munteanu & D. Dutsch (eds), *A Handbook to Classical Reception in Eastern and Central Europe*. Wiley-Blackwell, 207-222.

Kalinowska, M., E. Kiślak & Z. Przychodniak (eds) 2019. *"Raptularz wschodni” Juliusza Słowackiego. Edycja – studia – komentarze*. 2019. Vol. 3. Studia i interpretacje. Warszawa.

Kalinowska, M., M. Borowska & M. Chilińska (eds) 2021. *Wolność albo śmierć. Polscy filhelleni i powstanie greckie 1821. Wydano w roku 200. rocznicy powstania greckiego*. *Freedom or Death. Polish Philhellenes and the Greek Uprising of 1821. Published on the Bicentenary of the Greek Revolution*. Warszawa.

Karagiorgos, P. 2019. “The Polish Poet Słowacki and the Greek Poet Solomos”, in Kalinowska, Kiślak & Przychodniak (eds) 2019, 211-222.

Kiślak, E. 2019. “Przemiana na Wschodzie. Religia i egzystencja w perspektywie podróży i w świetle utworów *Raptularza*”, in Kalinowska, Kiślak & Przychodniak (eds) 2019, 9-34.

Kukiel, M. 1955. *Czartoryski and European Unity 1770-1861*. Princeton.

Leszczyński, M. 2014. *Lutnia szalonego barda. Metaliterackie aspekty poematów dygresyjnych Byrona i Słowackiego*. Toruń.

Libera, L. 1993. *Juliusza Słowackiego „Podróż do Ziemi Świętej z Neapolu”*. Poznań.

Mavroudis, E. 1991. “Philhellenism in Poland During the Greek Revolution 1821– 1828” *Balkan Studies* 31, 19–21.

Nawarecki, A. 2012. “Historia Grecji zanurzona w rzeczułce”, in J. Brzozowski, M. Skrzypczyk & M. Stanisz (eds), *Stolice i prowincje kultury. Księga jubileuszowa ofiarowana Profesor Alinie Kowalczykowej*. Warszawa, 328-337.
Pol, W. 1922. *Mohort*. A. Łucki (ed.). Kraków.
Przybylski, R. 1982. *Podróż Juliusza Słowackiego na Wschód*, Kraków.
Pückler-Muskau, H. von. 1841. *Südöstlicher Bildersaal*. Bd. 2-3. *Griechische Leiden*. Stuttgart.
Sinko, T. 1932. "Udział Polaków w bojach i pracach Hellady" *Przegląd Współczesny* 42, 277-300.
Skowronek, J. 1983. *Sprzymierzeńcy narodów bałkańskich*. Warszawa.
Stern, B. H. 1969. *The Rise of Romantic Hellenism in English Literature 1732-1786*. New York.
Tabaki-Iona, F. 1993. *Poésie philhellénique et périodiques de la restauration*. Athens.
Tiktopoulou, K. 1998. *Ο ύμνος εις την ελευθερίαν του Διονυσίου Σολωμού και οι ξενόγλωσσες μεταφράσεις του*. Thessaloniki.
Tsigakou, F. M. (ed.) 1991. *Through Romantic Eyes. European Images of Nineteenth-Century Greece from the Benaki Museaum*. Athens.
Winock, M. 2016. *Flaubert*. Transl. N. Elliott. Cambridge (MA) & London.
Zamoyski, A. 1999. *Holy Madness. Romantics, Patriots and Revolutionaries 1776 -1871*. New York & London.
Zawadzki, W. H. 1992. *A Man of Honour: Adam Czartoryski as a Statesman of Russia and Poland 1795-1831*. Oxford.

Conversions of Muslims during the Greek War of Independence: transitions from a Greek-Orthodox nation to a civic nation

Lambros Baltsiotis

The following paper is an attempt to present a few initial conclusions from the author's ongoing research concerning the *Neofotistoi* (Νεοφώτιστοι) or *Neofytoi* (Νεόφυτοι).[1] The term refers to Muslims who converted to Orthodox Christianity during and immediately after the cease of hostilities in the Greek War of Independence.[2] The period under examination begins in Spring 1821, when hostilities commenced, and ends in mid-1833, when Greek administrative authorities were established in every corner of the fledgling Greek state. However, the events that took place during the period that followed, when conversions to Christianity were still carried out, will not be examined for two reasons: firstly because the numbers of the conversions are rather insignificant and concerned either the leftover Muslim populations in Euboea[3] or populations that were emigrating to Greece, and secondly and most importantly, because these conversions were carried out within an established state which wielded at least a modicum of power over its territories. The focus of this discussion is to reveal what transpired during the turbulent years as part of an "ingenerate" process marking the behaviors and activities of the involved populations, as well as the policies that were implemented for the *Neofotistoi* and the reasons for their development during the first years after the establishment of the Greek state.

---

[1] *Neofotistos* (*Νεοφώτιστος*) and *Neofytos* (*Νεόφυτος*) in the singular. The feminine form of *Neofotistos* is *Neofotistē*.

[2] Here I will not be discussing conversions of a few Jews to Christianity which also occurred in the same periods.

[3] This matter has been thoroughly examined in Baltsiotis 2017, in particular 189–207.

The conversions that took place during the Greek War of Independence have been previously discussed in the relevant literature. The historians of the 19th century frequently mentioned the occurrence of conversions to a greater or lesser extent. Later, though, the dominant Greek national narrative led to the erasure of this issue since the aim to establish a link between Ancient Greeks and the citizens of the new state increasingly assumed greater significance. Discussing the conversions would cast doubt on the entire notion of the ancient Greek racial "origin" of the residents of the newly found state, since the narrative that was being formulated identified "origin" with a specific religion and a specific religious denomination. Moreover, a discussion on religious conversions would dispute the dividing lines between Greeks and Turks which had dominated not only public history, but also, up to the 1970s, academia as well.

Before 1970, I know of only one major study that referred extensively to the issue of conversions, namely that of Apostolos Vakalopoulos, published in 1941. Vakalopoulos focus, however, is on the practices of captivity during hostilities.[4] Despite the fact that references of conversions were not unheard of –especially in works pertaining to local history[5]– the issue had generally been relegated to the footnotes of academic texts. The contemporary academic researchers became familiar with the *Neofotistoi* issue through the dissertation of Georgios Nikolaou in 1997,[6] who first attempted to investigate the subject by delving into archival sources. The same author published an article on the specifics of the issue.[7] We owe our knowledge of conversions to his pioneering research. Additionally, there are also a few brief references in other academic texts dealing with more specialized subjects touching on the *Neofotistoi*.[8] Two recent papers –one by Stefanos Katsikas and Sakis Dimitriadis, the other by Evdoxios Doxiadis– attempt to examine

[4] Vakalopoulos 1941.

[5] For example, Kapsalēs 1957.

[6] Nikolaou 1997.

[7] Nikolaou 2006.

[8] For example, in legal studies, such as that by Georgios Nakos concerning the legal status of Ottoman lands, or in more recent ones, such as Christos Loukos 2018.

aspects of the issue.[9] It seems that 2021 –the bicentennial of the War of Independence– sparked some interest around the conversions.[10] In view of this renewed interest, the initial finding of my own research, which has been ongoing for many years, appears to be not only pertinent to the current discussion on conversions, but also adds to or modifies the findings of the two major studies of Nikolaou (1997), Katsikas and Dimitriadis (2021), and the one of Doxiadis (2021).

The War of Independence and the Greek nation

The Greek War of Independence, which commenced in Spring 1821, despite the insurgents' initial ambitions to expand it into the wider Balkan area, was quickly limited to parts of Central Greece and the Peloponnese, and a few islands in the Aegean Sea. These were the main regions that would later comprise the Greek state. In two short years after the beginning of the revolution, the insurgents managed to assume control of large areas in the aforementioned regions and to conquer many towns and cities. This situation was reversed after 1825 with the gradual advance of the army of Ibrahim Pasha of Egypt and other Ottoman forces across the Peloponnese and Central Greece. The victory of the three Great Powers' fleet (the British, the French, and the Russian Empires) against the Egyptian-Turkish fleet in the Battle of Navarino, off the southeastern coast of the Peloponnese in October 1827, inaugurated a new round of diplomatic pressure by the three Great Powers to the Sublime Porte which eventually resulted in the gradual withdrawal of the Ottoman forces from their former positions and the granting of independence to the Greek state.

John [Iōannēs] Capodistrias, former deputy Foreign Minister of the Russian Empire, was appointed the first Governor of Greece. In January 1828 he arrived in Nauplion. His power initially extended over the limited areas controlled by the insurgents. However, the final borders and the

[9] Katsikas and Dimitriadis 2021; Doxiadis 2021.

[10] We know of three relevant conference addresses: one by Giorgos Nikolaou, one by the author of this paper—both of which have touched on the general issue—and a more specialized one by Dimitris Dimitropoulos (forthcoming 2022).

question of the new state's full independence were determined gradually through a series of treaties and protocols, the last of which was signed in 1832.[11] Capodistrias was assassinated in 1831, a development which further deteriorated the government's hold over many of its territories. In January 1833, the son of King Ludwig I of Bavaria, prince Otto, still underaged and the future monarch of Greece, arrived in the country. An absolute monarchy was established, which was in turn overthrown in 1844, when the first constitution of Greece was adopted.

The Greek nation-building process, one of the first in the Balkans, became inextricably linked with religious affiliation. As in every other Balkan national movement, the new Greek nation was defined according to religious, denominational and ecclesiastical dividing lines, not according to the mother tongue[12] or any other identifying notion such as birthplace in a certain territory or citizenship. The Greek language eventually became of major importance to the Greek national narrative because it was the sole "visible" link of the new nation with Ancient Greece. Besides, the romantics of the West, who saw in the insurgency a revival of Ancient Greece, were instrumental in drumming up support for the Greek War of Independence. However, even though the theories of Ancient Greek racial origin of Modern Greeks and the continuity of the Greek language from antiquity to the present were the direct result of the romantic and racial perceptions which were dominant in the West at the time, they were quickly appropriated and fully incorporated in the ideology of the fledgling state. Despite this, and despite the dominant discourse concerning the language, for the next two centuries, the criterion of membership in the Greek nation was institutionally associated exclusively with religious and denominational attachment, while linguistic diversity was a non-issue in principle, provided that language was not connected to an actual or potential distinct religious or ecclesiastical affiliation. Conversely, having a different religion or belonging to a different denomination or ecclesiastical body was

[11] By 1830, full independence had been granted, but the northern borders were still contested.

[12] Excluding the Albanian nation which was defined by language.

believed to reflect a different *racial* origin according to the terminology used—and resulted in exclusion from the Greek nation.

The Muslims of Roumeli and Morias (Central Greece and the Peloponnese)

The Muslim populations residing in the Peloponnese and Central Greece before the outbreak of the War of Independence had not been counted in any reliable way.[13] The first Greek population counts, under Capodistrias, tended to significantly underestimate the Muslim populations, while the various population accounts cannot always be considered credible. In 1859, a somewhat accurate tally appeared. Despite it, underestimation of the real figures, which reported that in 1821 there were 63,813 Muslims in the Peloponnese, 19,852 in Central Greece, and 7,163 in Euboea,[14] continued. A clear example of the underestimation can be found in the inhabitants of Eğriboz, the Ottoman *sancak* which included, among others, Euboea, Attica, Thiva, Livadeia, and Zitouni (present-day Lamia). In the case of Euboea, the reported figure of 7,163 Muslims in the island probably constitutes less than half of the actual population.[15] The estimates concerning the percentage of Muslims in the general population are even more suspect. It should also be noted that during the hostilities, as well as later, there were significant population movement since the Christian population exhibited increased mobility. Furthermore, Greece was inundated with refugees from other rebelling provinces –and, after 1830, even immigrants from the Ottoman Empire– while at the same time a significant emigrant flow began from Greece towards the Ottoman Empire. Many of the refugees and immigrants who came to Greece ended up settling in urban centers.

[13] The Aegean islands that were included in the new state were virtually devoid of Muslim populations.

[14] Spēliotakēs 1859, 29–31. The data was taken from an undated document (tentatively dated to 1856) bearing the title *Renseignements statistiques sur la Grèce* and can be found in the *Greek State Archives (GSA),* Historical Archives of Giannēs Vlachogiannēs, catalogue Δ΄, 26.

[15] For an estimate of the Muslim populations in Euboea, see Baltsiotis 2017, 22–24.

Nonetheless, there is a clear picture of the urban Muslim populations, despite the fact that specific figures for each town and city are lacking.[16] In regard to the Peloponnese, there is abundant information for even smaller settlements, such as the cases of Langadia or Karytaina. Information on rural settlements, though, is fragmentary. Thus, we have an accurate estimate of certain groups, such as that of Bardounia in Laconia or Fanari in Ēleia, mostly because of the religious and ethnolinguistic peculiarities of these groups. In general, we lack concrete figures for many areas, such as the significant settlements in Vatika, Laconia.[17] For some of them there is not a single mention, at least in the Greek archives, which leads to the common perception that there were no farming Muslim settlements in many areas–which is not the case. Apart from the plains of Ēleia, Fanari in Western Peloponnese, and certain areas of Laconia, reports concerning the rest of the Peloponnese and the entire Central Greece, with few exceptions, are non-existent. Additionally, there is another type of settlement which seems to have evaded our attention: these are the "representatives" of large Muslim landowners in the villages that were dependent on them. These "representatives" were usually a couple of Muslim families. In some cases one or two other Muslim families resided in the same settlement or another settlement nearby. In terms of occupation, these families usually evolved around a specific professional function (for example they owned the mill or were operating it). These small communities can be found solely in the oral tradition or through indirect references. In general, these observations relating to the existence of such Muslim settlements equally apply to areas of Central Greece, for which archival sources are decidedly scarcer.

[16] The careful reading of the travellers of early 19th century and a number of other archival sources help the researcher to represent the population and its socioeconomic profile in Ottoman cities in the regions which later on will be included in the newly formed Greek state.

[17] It is illuminating that a large part of the information we have on Muslim populations in Vatika can be found in *Neofotistoi* catalogues (see also below).

Information regarding the languages spoken by the Muslim communities is likewise relatively scarce.[18] A significant number of urban and rural Muslim communities spoke Greek, others spoke Turkish –especially the urban ones– and some rural groups spoke Albanian. What we do know is that in the Albanian-speaking communities, and in most of the Turkish-speaking ones, a language shift towards Greek had already commenced or there was at least a sufficient knowledge of Greek,[19] with probable few exceptions in Central Greece. Finally, there is proof of presence of various *tarikat* in the entire area, but we must note that references related to Bektaşi/Kızılbaş groups are limited.

The existence of this rather numerous Muslim population within the territories of Roumeli and Morias, well above the one sixth of the total population, was an issue the insurgents had to address.

Aspects of the *Neofotistoi* issue

The Greek War of Independence was marked by the mass extermination of Muslims and Jews in many cities, towns, and villages that were captured by the insurgents[20] during the first two years of the war. This constituted a coherent policy: "The extermination of the Mussulmans in the rural districts was the result of a premeditated design. It proceeded more from the vindictive suggestions of the Hetairists[21] and men of letters, than from the revengeful feelings of the people, or the innate

[18] The travellers of early 19th century are less talkative and far less reliable. Some governmental reports of the new state, like the one published by Gritsopoulos (1971) and other references, for example in memoirs, help the researcher to reconstruct the linguistic landscape of some Muslim communities.

[19] The Albanian-speaking community of Lala in Ēleia, and the surrounding area in general, provides an example of the former, while Tripolis provides an example of the latter. I should note that the urban population consisted of various ethnolinguistic groups.

[20] In those cases where the population had not managed to flee to an Ottoman-held stronghold or had not been evacuated from insurgent-held areas.

[21] He means the members of *Filiki Etaireia* ("Society of Friends"), a secret society modeled after the Freemasons. The Society played a decisive role in the organization of the War of Independence.

barbarity of the klephts[22]".[23] Often, the 19th century historians reported the complete extermination of Muslim communities and –where present– the Jewish, but this was far from the truth. For example, in the case of Talanti (present-day Atalantē), in Eastern Central Greece, there is an explicit account stating that only a Muslim "doctor" was spared,[24] while now we know that many more were spared and either fled to Chalkida or converted to Christianity.[25]

Until now, the various conclusions on Neofotistoi were based on two comprehensive *Neofotistoi* catalogues compiled in 1834, one of Nauplion and another of some areas of the district of Laconia,[26] both of which were analyzed in an exemplary fashion by Georgios Nikolaou.[27] The two catalogues do indeed shed some light on certain aspects of the issue, while at the same time obscure other aspects of it. The Nauplion catalogue, especially, mainly concerns individuals who had fled to the city, many of whom were in dire financial straits. To a certain extent, this impoverishment has been confirmed by my own research, but applies mostly to individuals who had moved away from their place of origin for reasons other than marriage, land ownership or skilled employment. In fact, one of the characteristics of the *Neofotistoi* is that they often moved away from their place of origin for a variety of reasons.[28] This does not apply only to those individuals who fell into poverty, but even those who preferred or were obliged to acquire property in other regions. Thus, there seems to be an incomplete evaluation of archival sources on

---

[22] These were small armed groups—here it meant Christian ones—who lived as outlaws for long periods of time. They earned their living through robberies, kidnappings, and extortion.

[23] Finlay 1877, vol. VI, 152.

[24] Sourmelēs 1853, 152.

[25] For the first instance, see Baltsiotis 2017, 205–206. So far, I have managed to confirm that at least 12 persons from Atalantē converted to Christianity.

[26] *GSA,* Archive of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs [1833–1862], series 5, file 66 and Historical Archives of Giannēs Vlachogiannēs, B΄ Manuscripts Catalogue, file 193.

[27] Nikolaou 1997, 346–374, 468–529.

[28] According to the Laconia catalogue, 63% of *Neofotistoi* did not reside in the settlement from which they originated, but rather several of them had settled in nearby villages (Nikolaou 1997, 360).

this issue which can lead to confusion around the place of origin, the social profile, or the actual figures of *Neofotistoi*.[29] Moreover, even the Laconia catalogue, as detailed below, should be partly reexamined. At this point, no comprehensive catalogue has surfaced pertaining to the *Neofotistoi* of Central Greece.

Below certain aspects of the issue of *Neofotistoi* will be examined, especially those that have been contradicted by my own findings.

The extent of the practice of conversion and its geographical distribution

The areas that were inhabited by Muslims who converted to Orthodox Christianity were designated first and foremost by the following factors: a) whether their inhabitants had been captured by the insurgents, b) whether their communities had managed to flee, c) at which stage of the war they were captured and in what way, and d) what was the stance of the armed units concerning the Muslim community, both during the initial period of occupation and afterwards. The complete absence or the low numbers of *Neofotistoi* in some areas can be attributed to these factors. The issue is further complicated by the fact that some towns and cities, such as Livadeia in Central Greece, changed hands more than once. It should also be noted that certain cities, not only in the Peloponnese but in Central Greece as well, especially in the eastern part, were never captured by the insurgents or were captured only briefly–and hence the few *Neofotistoi* that have been identified there were usually later converts or had moved there from elsewhere.[30] These findings somewhat weaken certain conclusions by Nikolaou (1997), i.e., that there is a strong correlation between the distribution of *Neofotistoi*

[29] For example, Doxiadis 2021, paragraph 16, identified 3 men and 3 women in certain documents related to Leonidio, in Arcadia, and came to the conclusion –since that area had a very small or non-existent Muslim community– that the *Neofotistoi* were numerous, an assumption that he proceeds to generalize. As Doxiadis's text shows, these were clearly Muslims from elsewhere who had some connection with the area, either because their parents or their Christian spouses held property there, or because they had simply moved there.

[30] Mostly in Central Greece.

and areas of widespread conversions to Islam, after the recapture of the Peloponnese by the Ottomans in 1715.[31] The significant presence of *Neofotistoi* in cities and towns such as Salona (present-day Amfissa), Livadeia, Kalavryta, Argos, and Arkadia (present-day Kyparissia) undermines this assumption. Even though a connection could possibly be established between a number of settlements or groups of families, who were converted to Islam after 1715 and subsequently reconverted to Christianity, and seen as a factor signifying the number of *Neofotistoi* in an area, this connection could not be treated as a determining factor for the process of conversions and the actual number of *Neofotistoi* throughout the Peloponnese. There is no evidence to support the particular significance ascribed to this connection in areas outside Laconia and specific parts of Ēleia.[32] Even more, in the rural settlements of Laconia[33] and parts of Ēleia this connection is not generally applicable. Correspondingly, in the *kaza* of Gastounē, which saw many conversions to Islam after 1715, in the many converted villages of the wider plain area, there are virtually no *Neofotistoi* to be found. They can be found only in some hill villages and a few villages in the south of the *kaza*.[34] In regards to more recent conversions to Islam, mainly those occurred after 1770 in some parts of Peloponnese, a connection with the aforementioned reconversion to Christianity can be detected. However, post-1770 conversions to Islam were rather numerically insignificant and did not necessarily result in reconversions after 1821.[35]

---

[31] Similar conclusions can also be found in Katsikas and Dimitriadis 2021, 307.

[32] There are insufficient data to support that in these areas or in other areas of Ottoman Empire, the converted communities to Islam after a lapse of period of three generations, they still considered themselves as having some association to Christianity.

[33] It should be noted that is insufficient evidence about the origin of the inhabitants of many Muslim settlements in Laconia. Some of the inhabitants are locals (re)converted to Islam after 1715, while others might be Muslims fled from the area between 1685 and 1690 who resettled after 1715 and some others are new Muslim settlers of unknown origin.

[34] This conclusion could be reached even by a close reading of Nikolaou 1997.

[35] According to a report of the Acting Commissioner of Monemvasia, dated 26 August 1828, a part of those unconverted Muslims still residing in Monemvasia, did so as "descendants of recently converted to Islam" ("καταγόμενοι προσφάτως από Χριστιανούς») (Moschona 1980, 59).

Initial finding concerning Central Greece show a possible connection of resent conversions to Islam and reconversions after 1821 in a few settlements of Western Roumeli (Karlı İli). It should be stressed that these conversions concerned also the rural populations, a non-urban Islam, who had many relations with their Christian neighbors.

Moreover, contrary to previous studies, through my research so far, I have not been able to identify any correlation between particular linguistic-cultural groups and the issue of *Neofotistoi*. Apart from the singular example of the Albanian-speaking town of Lala, in which practically no conversions occurred, the town of Kalavryta stands as an indicative example of such a lack of correlation, since the Turkish language was still spoken there to some extent during the period in question.[36] To the above mentioned, should also be added two more elements: the adoption of certain older accounts concerning the occurrence of conversions due to "insufficient religious sentiment" among certain Muslim groups, and invented explanatory narratives referring to "an indifference to religion" by Albanian-speaking groups.

All these "justifications" are thought to have contributed to the conversions of Muslim inhabitants to Christianity. The rationale behind these older accounts–for example the fact that they highlighted the absence in many settlements of mescit or mosque,[37] and the invented narratives about lack of religious sentiment is not supported by archival sources. The absence of mescit or mosque is not indeed a fact for most of the rural settlements, even the minor ones. Additionally, there was a mosque or a mescit[38] in settlements which are considered as lacking one. In Laconia a mescit or a mosque have been traced in villages like Liantina, Xērokampi, Mousga, Kaminia, Agios Iōannis, Parori, Molaoi,

[36] Gritsopoulos 1971, 448, citing an 1828 report prepared in order to be sent to Capodistrias. In Kalavryta, many individuals converted while belonging to completely different social and possibly ethnolinguistic groups.

[37] In the beginning of the 19th century there were numerous small settlements that had no mosque or even mescit all over the Ottoman Empire. It is worth noting though that many small Christian settlements were lacking a church respectively.

[38] The term used for both buildings in Greek documents is *tzami* (cami). In some cases it is clear that a minaret exists but not in every case.

Perivolia and Vatika.[39] In Western Peloponnese in settlements like Zourtsa, Romanou and Phanari.[40] Even in the mixed village of Hrisso in Fokida, where no other Muslim settlement can be found nearby, a rather emblematic mosque was serving the small Muslim community.[41]

Similarly, the suggested correlation between Bektashism and conversions to Christianity, an argument that is advanced by Nikolaou (1997) and supported by Katsikas and Dimitriadis (2001, 307–308) has not been substantiated by own research. In any case, there is no proof to support the presence of *Bektaşi/Kızılbaş* communities in the rural areas of the Peloponnese and Central Greece and little is known about the influence of Halveti *tarikat* on Muslim populations of the above regions.[42] The *tarikats* were very much involved in the spread of Islam in the Balkans. The narration formed suggests that this was a Balkan peculiarity and is related with the alleged "relaxed" religious practices adopted by Bektashism and other *tarikats* like the Halveti. In fact, *tarikats* were equally influential in the spread of Islam in many regions of the word, from South-East Asia to sub-Saharian Africa and Northern Caucasus. Additionally, misconceptions on the notion(s) of religious syncretism and a "relaxed" Islam are mostly older western perceptions sometimes mixed with political intentions.[43] There are no references that in the Balkans, let alone other areas of the word, adherents of *tarikats* presented a tendency to convert to Christianity or other religions.

Finally, the existence of Crypto-Christians in the regions under discussion is also not supported by the sources, at least as far as the term

[39] See respectively Nikolakakou 2011, 29, Tartarē 1966, 1, Laskaris 2002, 166–167, Mezinēs 2021, 3, Leake 1830 vol. I, 133 and *GSA*, Archive of the Court of Auditors 1831–1948 [CA], series 1, Roll books of land concession to Neofotistoi 1839–1904 [RN] 232, Leake 1830 vol. I, 129 and GSA, CA, RN 232, Petrakakos 1933, 23, Leake 1830 vol. III, 17, Belia 1980, 105.

[40] See respectively Tagarēs 1970, 114, *GSA,* CA, RN 232, *GSA,* CA, RN 232 and Leake 1830 vol. I, 69; Leake writes: "There are five or six mosques in Fanári", quite probably referring to a group of villages in the area.

[41] Liaskou 1982, 25–26, 40, 60 and *GSA,* CA, RN 232.

[42] Nikolaou 1997, passim, also mentions those who were related to the *tarikat* of Halveti, an assumption repeated by Katsikas and Dimitriadis 2021, 307.

[43] As in the cases of Albanian nationalism and the Alevis in Turkey.

is used to categorize as such communities who consciously observed the fundamental practices and rituals of a different religion, other than the one they declared and were registered under.[44] Our approach to the issue of Crypto-Christians is somewhat different: Crypto-Christianity as has been described and practiced by certain communities in the course of 19th century is quite dissimilar to practices described in the 18th century in rural areas. The appearance of persons declaring simultaneously a Muslim and a Christian name in certain villages in a part of Ēleia and in some villages in Vardounia in early 19th century,[45] might be considered as a form of rural "religious fluidity". Nevertheless, the attitude of the entire population of the town of Lala, again, during the War, suggests that no general pattern can be applied to these communities, a fact already known from the *Laraman communities* in the Balkans.

Furthermore, it must be taken to account that conversions in certain rural settlements left behind almost no traces, even if the process of conversion concerned whole villages. One characteristic example is provided by the villages of Ēleia: In 1950, Chrysathakopoulos named three extended families in Koulogli,[46] one family in Giarmena, one extended family in Lagatoura, while for the village of Basta he reported that the population was "entirely Turkish", meaning Muslim.[47] Also, the case of Basta is indicative, since there is no indication of population movement to the settlement after 1821, and indeed it is one of the few villages in Ēleia where the Albanian language was spoken well up

[44] Nikolaou 1997, 273–284 proceeds to cast a doubt about the existence of Crypto-Christians through an incisive analysis of sources. However, his findings are not adopted by Katsikas and Dimitriadis 2021, 307–308. Katsikas and Dimitriadis (2021) perceive as singularly significant –and as a peculiarity of the Peloponnese– the existence of mixed marriages between Christians and Muslims, probably because they fail to realize that these were exclusively marriages between Muslim men and Christian women. This practice, which in many cases occurred without demanding the conversion of the wife, is in accordance with the teachings of some main Sunni schools (madhhab) which consider it as sanctioned by the Quran itself. These unions were not that rare in the Ottoman Empire, both in urban and rural regions.

[45] Nikolaou 1997, 242–243, 281.

[46] Most of the settlements that are mentioned have since been renamed. For a complete list of name changes see https://settlement-renames.eie.gr/.

[47] Chrysanthakopoulos 1950, passim.

until the 1940s.[48] However, there were large Muslim settlements which correspond to a disproportionately low number of *Neofotistoi* in the archives, despite the fact that we know from indirect references that their numbers were surely higher, such as in Athens and Lidoriki in Central Greece, and in parts of Gortynia and Ēraia in the Peloponnese.

In total, if the low numbers of *Neofotistoi* in Patras, Methonē, and Koronē, as well as in Thebes and perhaps Zapanti in Central Greece are excluded, there is reason to believe that in all other cases their numbers were relatively high.[49] The calculations by Nikolaou (1997, 349), that the numbers of *Neofotistoi* in the Peloponnese did not exceed 600 to 700 individuals, are incorrect. Nonetheless, any generalized conclusion would be arbitrary because of the peculiarities of each settlement. In this context, the hypothesis by Katsikas and Dimitriadis (2021, 310), who projected the figures of the two aforementioned catalogues to the entire country and estimated that the *Neofotistoi* made up about 1% of the total population of Greece, must be considered unfounded. It is still too early to make an estimate about the whole number of the *Neofotistoi*, since there is no sufficient information for many settlements, including cities and towns. After considering a part of the source material gathered, my research has yielded close to 2,000 individuals, while a total calculation of their number cannot be formulated presently, not even as a working hypothesis. In regard to the figures, one of the foremost examples is that of the village of Vatika in Laconia. The 1834 catalogue contains 27 to 31 individuals who cite Vatika as their place of origin and residence, and 9 citing a different place of origin and Vatika as their place of residence. However, by reviewing two more catalogues which contain 33 names from Vatika,[50] it was discovered that only around 20, at most, can be correlated with the contents of the 1834 catalogue. Interestingly, of the remaining 13 individuals 10 are male, which could conceal an unknown number of women and children too. For the rest of Laconia, the individuals not found in the 1834 catalogue

[48] Baltsiotis 2002, 265.

[49] These are the results of my research thus far.

[50] *GSA,* Secretariat/Ministry of Finance Archive: National Lands 1833–1869 (NL), series 3, subseries 1, file 1396.

but already identified and cross-referenced in my research are more than 200. This number, resulted from the analysis of only a fraction of the extant archival material. Another characteristic example is the province of Gytheio, which was virtually devoid of Muslim inhabitants before the War of Independence. By examining only the electoral registers and based exclusively on the surname and patronymic of voters in the province, more than 60 male *Neofotistoi*[51] may be identified. Besides, the authorities themselves repeatedly admitted that, in Laconia where the conversions were numerous, there were hundreds of individuals that were not included in the catalogue(s).[52]

In any case, the presence of *Neofotistoi* is fairly visible, and extensive, on a local level, and spreads beyond a few specific rural areas. If we exclude Tripolis, from where most of the indigenous *Neofotistoi* moved away, the figures are not negligible in other cities and towns, even in those which still remain mostly unexamined, such as Vostitsa (present-day Aigio) in Northern Peloponnese.

A case of young women and children?

The dominant perception about *Neofotistoi* is that they were mostly young women and minors. This is not entirely inaccurate, however my research places these assumptions into context. Indeed, in many cases the *Neofotistoi* appear to be women and individuals who were minors during 1821–1822.[53]

In the comprehensive catalogue of Laconia, out of 361 individuals, around 63 women and 37 men appear to have been older than 15 or 16 years of age in 1821.[54] However, this estimate changes radically if one takes into account a group of settlements in Eastern Laconia that is mentioned in the catalogue, prominent among them the Monemvasia,

[51] *GSA,* Collections of: a. Georgios Ladas b. Giannēs Vlachogiannēs Election material,,Province of Gytheio (elections 1848–1874). For the peculiarity of the Neofotistoi in this region see below the sub-chapter "Social integration and mobility".

[52] See various documents in *GSA,* NL, series 3, subseries 8, files 1493–1516.

[53] The term "minor" is used somewhat improperly, since reference is made to persons younger than 15 or 16 years of age.

[54] It is clear that the ages recorded are, at best, of doubtful accuracy.

Sykia, Molaoi, Agios Nikolaos, and Vatika villages, which record around 117 individuals. Nearly half of them, about 23 women and 26 men, are shown to have been older than 15 or 16 years of age in 1821. Conversely, in the Nauplion catalogue, out of 140 individuals, many of whom were natives of Tripolis, there are no more than 6 men who were over 16–17 in 1821. It is worth mentioning that only 10 individuals are recorded as natives of Nauplion (plus 2 Jews). Thus, different patterns may be discerned: *Neofotistoi* households, on the one hand, and *Neofotistoi* who fled to the cities alone. From archival sources, other "in-between" categories may be identified, such as concentrations in relatively large settlements close to their place of origin, and poorer individuals who kept moving from town to town throughout the 1830s. So, there are many different "categories," whose diversity is obscured by generalization. Also, as can be inferred from archival sources –and it is quite evident– some of them had passed away in the meantime, thus lowering even further the numbers of the *Neofotistoi*. Since most of the documents available to us date from 1833–1834 onwards, and particularly after 1838, the tendency is to "overlook", apart from certain references, those who passed away 10 to 15 years after their conversion, who were mostly adults over 40 and children under 5. For example, as aforementioned, if the focus was on a different area of Laconia, i.e., in the province of Gytheio, an initial processing of the available material yields a significant number of adult men. On the contrary, concerning other areas, such as Livadeia in Central Greece, sources depict a probable pattern of family conversions, a fact which could apply to other towns as well, such as Vrachōri (present-day Agrinio) and Salona.

Later conversions and the non-converted

It is believed that during the Greek War of Independence, the Muslim captives who were not sold as virtual slaves could only be spared or/and remain in their place of origin if they converted to Christianity.[55] In most cases, this is an erroneous assumption. In the case of Muslim captives, religious conversion did not constitute a prerequisite for salvation. In

[55] See relevant reference in Doxiadis 2021, paragraph 8.

most instances, executions and forced conversions were separate and distinct practices, and the population had no choice in the matter. Many of the captives, especially in urban centers, who were not attached to Christian families spent their lives working in inhumane conditions, or were sold off to wealthy Christians, particularly the women, irrespective of whether they converted.[56]

Besides, in many cases the baptisms took place many months or even years after captivity or the capture of a settlement. In at least 8 such cases out of 21 where the year of baptism is provided, this has been traced. In two of these cases, the baptisms took place between 1828 and 1830. Some individuals even remained Muslims until the end of the conflict.[57] Unfortunately, the catalogues of "Ottomans" that we know for certain that they were compiled before the mid-1830s, have not yet been located. However, through a series of documents related to the remaining Muslim inhabitants of Monemvasia in mid-1828, it is learned that 76 non-converted individuals were still residing in Monemvasia and, additionally, 34 poor females[58] lived in the neighbouring villages.[59] The explicit list of the 76 individuals demonstrate a variety of social stratification and, in most cases, family patterns. This particular case of non-conversion was not an exception as in another list, that of the "captives who resided temporarily in Nauplion ", dated 20 September 1828, 75 non converted *captives* are mentioned, some of them male.[60] It is indicative that out of the two aforementioned comprehensive *Neofotistoi* catalogues compiled in 1834 –one concerning the residents of Nauplion and the other those of Laconia– the former contains about 10 unbaptized individuals out of 140, while the latter contains

---

[56] This has already been described by Vakalopoulos 1941, but I should also mention two accounts, one by James Hamilton Browne and one by Edward John Trelawny in September 1823 from Tripolis: "[A] harem … might be formed on reasonable terms", writes the former, while the latter reports "maidenhead as plentiful as blackberries" (Minta 2007, paragraph 31).

[57] Most of them were baptized later, while others moved to the Ottoman Empire.

[58] "Insignificant women" ("γυναίκες ασήμαντοι") in the text.

[59] Moschona 1980.

[60] *GSA,* Archive of the General Secretariat (Governor I. Capodistrias' term) [1828–1833], file 128.

9 unbaptized out of 361 individuals. Baptisms took place up until well into the 1850s.[61] The unbaptized usually –though not always– shared certain social characteristics: they were widows, unmarried women, and individuals of low socioeconomic status. Men constituted a minority.[62] It seems that women who were not visible in society or did not participate in family functions could remain unbaptized within the new state.[63]

Socioeconomic origins

One more erroneous assumption stems from the belief that mainly the descendants of wealthy families were spared, for the reason that they might have been useful in the hands of the rebels and, subsequently, they converted to Christianity. Available data allows us to claim with certainty that the converted belonged to every socioeconomic group.[64] It is not that rare in the documents to find persons classified as *Arabs* and *Ethiopians,* terms which were used to denote slaves, servants, or

[61] From 1851 until 1860, 6 women and 1 man were baptized in Tripolis (Beloka 2017, 344).

[62] Here are a few indicative cases of males: Dēmētrios Mimikos or Galanopoulos from Kalavryta, who fought on the side of the insurgents, remained unbaptized until 1830. In 1833 he escorted the Greek Committee which went to Munich to prepare the coronation of the new king. In 1839 he was a lieutenant of the gendarmerie (see various documents in *GSA,* NL, series 3, subseries 5, file 1486). Bekirēs Mallousēs from Kalavryta, living in Kerpinē, was still unbaptized in 1838 (see documents in *GSA,* NL, series 3, subseries 5, file 1467). Achmetēs from Tripolis, living in Marathonēsi (present-day Gytheio), 19 years old in 1838, had been baptized 4 or 5 years earlier (Diplomatic and Historical Archives of the Hellenic Ministry of Foreign Affairs (*DHAMFA*), Central Office, 1838, 76.1). In the sizeable *Neofotistoi* community of Salona, a certain Mehmetēs, scion of a wealthy family, was still a Muslim in the year 1831 (*GSA,* Historical Archives of Giannēs Vlachogiannēs, B΄ Manuscripts Catalogue, file 135)**.**

[63] Hereby, the difference concerning those who arrived in Greece after the end of the conflict must be underlined. These individuals were largely exempted from these restrictions. Thus, out of two Muslim men (not converted) who are included in the electoral register of the city of Athens in 1847, one is mentioned as Athenian and the other as Macedonian (*GSA,* Collection of Georgios Ladas, Election material, Municipality of Athens elections).

[64] See relevant mention in Katsikas and Dimitriadis, 2021, 311.

manumitted slaves,[65] and also Gypsies.[66] The high percentage of affluent individuals in the archives, especially wealthy women, who were claiming back their considerable estates, further obscures the larger picture. However, apart from references to individuals with middle scale status, or with little or no family property, in the two aforementioned catalogues, individuals of similar status appear rather frequently in the rest of the material. Furthermore, the aforementioned hypothesis that many *Neofotistoi* who came from rural settlements were not recorded must be taken into account. This is a fact which could also modify the bigger picture of who the *Neofotistoi* actually were.

Integration into the new state

The relevant arrangements and the question of applicable law

Although the issue of the *Neofotistoi* had come under the attention of ecclesiastical authorities and the insurgents' executive and legislative bodies as early as the first years of the War, it would later stop being a priority. In June 1829 Capodistrias issued the first circular stipulating that some of the prior holdings of the *Neofotistoi* be returned to them.[67] He revisited the matter in January 1830 and once more in July 1830 with a letter to the Senate[68] which raised the subject of the restitution of the property of *Neofotistoi* "Turk children". In September 1830, he issued another circular stipulating the extent and characteristics of the real property to be allocated.[69] There were references of such restitutions as

---

[65] The term *Arab* (Άραψ or Αράπης (masc.) and Αραβίς or Αράπισ*(σ)*α (fem.) in Greek) might denote individuals and families of different social strata depending on the text.

[66] See below sub-chapter "Citizenship in the new state and the discourse concerning fellow-citizens".

[67] *General Gazette of Greece,* 79, 1 October 1830, 369–370 (see also Katsikas and Dimitriadis 2021, 314–315)

[68] Capodistrias 1987, 73.

[69] See for example Nakos 1970, 467–564ι, 499–500, where the relevant references can be found. For the process in the Senate, see *Αρχείο Ελληνικής Παλιγγενεσίας…* 2008, vol. 23, 20.

early as 1831.[70] Capodistrias' rationale was provisionally upheld by an unpublished Royal Decree in November 1833, and was then confirmed in 1836 with the Royal Decree of 21 April/10 May[71] which provided for restitutions of a part of the previously held assets or other holdings, up to an equitable amount. The beneficiaries, in order to claim these assets, had to be residents of Greece in September 1830.

As to the rest of the citizens' relationships with the new authorities, the official legal framework was hardly implemented during the fledgling state's first few years. In the case of the *Neofotistoi*, there are hundreds of long-winded legal reports discussing the law they fell under, especially family and succession law, along with many decisions issued by the higher courts. The prevailing rationale in the new state was that, for events that had taken place prior to 1821, Ottoman law applied, or else, the law which pertained to legal relationships between Christians. However, after 1821 the "new law" went into effect, which was largely unformed even well into the 1840s.[72] In practice, though, issues of property and relationships between natural persons, especially when they involved Muslims, were impossible to resolve without invoking or even applying Ottoman law.[73] Many times, the government's and the

[70] See for example a document dated 11/29 February 1849 (*GSA,* Secretariat/Ministry of Finance Archive (1833–1862), sub fond 1, sub fond 1 (Palace Archive), series 8, file 226). There are indications that properties were restituted even before the end of the war (see the decision by the Legislative Body [Βουλευτικόν] in July 1824, concerning the restitution of property to Panagiōtēs Tsakirēs who "even though a Turk, believes in Christianity" Αρχεία της Ελληνικής Παλιγγενεσίας… 1862, vol. 2, 341).

[71] *Government's Gazette* 20, 15 April 1836, 81–83. There followed one more Decree, in November 1838, concerning the monitoring of relevant procedures along with a relevant *Proclamation* by the Finance Minister, which redefined the restitution procedure.

[72] Baltsiotis 2017, 46–47.

[73] Doxiadis 2021, paragraph 19 erroneously reports "In 1836 a permanent committee was established to deal with the properties of such women [sic] who, under Ottoman (Islamic) law, recognized by the Greek state since 1830 as the customary law for Muslims, were stripped of their inheritances". The committee he mentions is a Joint Committee with judicial powers (that is the reason why it is occasionally mentioned as a Judicial Committee) (see *Government's Gazette,* 35, 17 July 1836, 163–164). This committee ruled on the disputes that arose from property transactions in Eastern Central Greece (and Euboea) and only incidentally, and rarely, did it deal with matters

administration's intentions were defeated by the harsh facts of reality.[74] Ottoman family and succession law was the first to be used in order to resolve the controversial issues which emerged.[75] The decisions by the Court of Cassation would in turn make their own interpretation, usually defending the state's right in properties that constituted *Neofotistoi* inheritance,[76] but these decisions were inconsistent. As has been correctly pointed out, there was no judicial interest in drafting a uniform body of case law and so the various issues that turned up were decided in an ad hoc and completely inconsistent manner.[77] The tremendous delays in resolving the *Neofotistoi* cases, sometimes running to dozens of years, should not be seen as the authorities' negative stance on the issue of restitutions. Rather it was an endemic problem within the fledgling state, especially in matters pertaining to property. On the other hand, the process of the restitution of property exhibits signs of a high degree of organization,[78] which was not carried over to most aspects of everyday life, a fact that was common occurrence during that period.

There was also another factor at play, concerning the relations between the government and the local authorities as far as the *Neofotistoi* are concerned. The latter served the aspirations and expectations of

---

pertaining to the *Neofotistoi* who came from these regions (Baltsiotis 2017, 65–91). There was no committee tasked with the *Neofotistoi* issue.

[74] For a few examples of the solutions given, see *GSA,* Secretariat/Ministry of Finance Archive (1833–1862), sub fond 1, sub fond 1 (Palace Archive), series 8, file 226. Some of the notable cases are those of Angelikē, spouse of Chasanēs; Vasilikē, formerly Emine, daughter of Machmout Aga Elioglou and spouse of Chavouzēs Lasti[otēs]; Konstantinos Laliotēs, son of Chousein, and his *Neofotistē* mother, Maria.

[75] For example, see the cases of Magdalēnē, daughter of Machmout Loumēs from Lakedaimon, Panagiōtēs Fasakoutas from Mantineia, and Maria, daughter of Moustafa Moutzos from Korinthos. The legal framework and procedure for resolving disputes between *Neofotistoi* and their Muslim relatives in Euboea and cities such as Athens, that is, where Muslims retained their property, is erroneously generalized by Katsikas and Dimitriadis 2021, 316.

[76] Ioannidēs 1874, 3787. However, see contrary decision concerning Serifēs/Serifopoulos from Kalavryta, who was baptized along with his children "because of need or fear" (ibid. 3228).

[77] Karipsiadis 1992, 229, 239.

[78] See for example the relevant tables and expert reports in *GSA,* NL, series 3, subseries 2, file 1410.

the local population.[79] The pattern of opposition between central and regional authorities in minorities' policy would bedevil the Greek state for the next two centuries. However, it should be acknowledged, that the tolerance of the policies implemented by local authorities which were non-aligned politically to the government ultimately constituted a central political choice for the government.

Social integration and mobility

The restitutions to the *Neofotistoi* were never met with significant resistance from the population. In instances, however, where the *Neofotistoi's* previous property was considered as a non-transferable public property, and where subsequently they were offered alternatively property elsewhere, the local communities reacted negatively. The *Neofotistoi* newcomers were granted land that the locals were expecting to cultivate themselves. The most indicative example here is the case of the Bertzova village in Arcadia: the settlement's fertile lands were preferred by *Falangites*[80] and *Neofotistoi*, to the great dissatisfaction of the local population, since close to half of all available land had been given to "outsiders".[81] This example pertaining to the reaction of the locals demonstrates the significance of *Neofotistoi* issue, as a problem which should not have been underestimated.

Furthermore, the fact that behind some wealthy *Neofotistes* women were husbands wielding a certain influence does not explain the great number of restitutions. An illuminating incident is the case of a *Neofotistos* who denied the existence of his two brothers in Izmir, so that his claim on family lands would not be reduced.[82] The extent of the issue is clearly demonstrated by another example: Fōtios Chrysanthopoulos or Fōtakos, a figure of the Greek War of Independence, was accused of fraud by the residents of Kalavryta. He spotted a certain *Neofotistē*

[79] Baltsiotis 2017.

[80] Officers of irregular units who were organized into a special force after the end of the War of Independence, in 1835.

[81] *Πρακτικά των Συνεδριάσεων της Βουλής* […], vol. 1, 1846, 346.

[82] See the document dated 1st October 1838 in *DHAMFA,* Central Office, 1839, 68.1 A–B.

woman without relatives, living in the mountainous region of Ēleia, and presented her as heiress of a huge fortune. In reality, Maria Davla, 60 years old, was the daughter of "an Ottoman, who had arrived in the area as a laborer. Her mother, an Ethiopian, was named Eli and was the sister of manumitted Ethiopians … both her father and mother had no property and did not own enough land for their own grave".[83]

The social diversity of *Neofotistoi* is also reflected to some degree in the ways that they were integrated into the new state. Beyond that, though, the interminable delays in returning to them even a fraction of their property, along with reactions in the local level, contributed to some of them falling to poverty and others moving to the towns and cities.[84] It seems, in general, that the majority of rural *Neofotistoi* populations, along with those who remained in their place of residence, usually shared the fate of their Christian neighbours. For example, in an electoral register, the *Neofotistoi* of Langadia are mentioned as masons, the profession that is practiced by nearly the entire male population of the settlement.[85] However, it was not that uncommon for some individuals, or even whole families, to live their lives as pariahs, or at the level of an extremely low socioeconomic status, especially those who had left their place of origin to move elsewhere.[86] It must be emphasized that women who had married men with a certain social standing in Greek society are over-represented in the archival material, and this somewhat obscures the issue. It is true, nonetheless, that a large number of military men, especially officers and former captains of the irregulars, but also many powerful figures of the economic and social life of the country, married *Neofotistes* women in order to take advantage of their property.[87]

---

[83] This document from 1850 and a number of documents relevant to this case are to be found in *GSA,* NL, series 3, subseries 5, files 1479 and 1482.

[84] See for example certain instances in *GSA,* NL, series 3, subseries 2, file 1389.

[85] We cannot rule out that they had already been practicing this profession, which means that there was not a disparity between the two religious groups as regards their profession.

[86] See for example Kōnstantinidēs-Trifylios 1961, 154–155. For the course of certain families see Trilikēs 2008, 17, 20–21, 207, 254–255, 260–261.

[87] This was a practice which was followed even by individuals coming from territories where there were no *Neofotistoi*. One example is the case of shipowner Ēlias

There are two more factors, at first glance paradoxical, which must be considered: these factors concern the participation of *Neofotistoi* and non-converted individuals in insurgent units, but also their professional career after the end of the war. First, after reviewing close to 1,000 individuals, especially from regions of the Peloponnese, of whom adult males in 1821 were no more than 200, 22 to 27 individuals, who had joined the insurgent forces, were identified. This practise is more prevalent in Laconia, but it is by no means absent in other regions[88] as well. It seems that the chieftains conscripted many *Neofotistoi* and non-converted in the armed units. Indeed, one of them is mentioned after 1828 as lieutenant in active service, and one more as a captain. Further research is required to ascertain whether these were individuals exclusively from the Peloponnese, or whether some of them had been captives who had arrived in the Peloponnese from abroad.[89] The second paradox is that a significant number of *Neofotistoi,* after 1828, was employed in the gendarmerie. At least 4 to 5 such constables have been identified (all of whom of non-Laconian origin) along with one lieutenant of the gendarmerie.

On the other hand, Katsikas and Dimitriadis (2021, 319–320) correctly report instances of hostility toward the *Neofotistoi* or them having a reduced capacity for social mobility, although these references concern mostly specific segments of the public sector. Nevertheless, we should not generalize on the notion of discrimination or non-discrimination against the *Neofotistoi* based on certain instances, since they usually reflect ex-post perceptions about social exclusion of specific groups in Greece. For example, the Greek army continued to include in

---

Kammenos, son of Panagiōtēs, from Galaxeidi, who married Maria Omeraga Aliaga Levaditou "from a fine family" (*GSA,* NL, series 3, subseries 1, files 1389. See also file 1394).

[88] The case of Serifēs, later known as Christodoulos, from Nauplion, is indicative (see various documents in *GSA,* NL, series 3, subseries 1, file 1389).

[89] Katsikas and Dimitriadis (2021, 321) erroneously consider those who are described as "Muslim philhellenes" to be indigenous Muslims. These are individuals of diverse origin (from Anatolia to Albania) which joined the insurgent forces for various reasons. This misconception arose from a study which included in the "Muslim philhellenes" half a dozen indigenous Muslims (see Loucatos 1980).

its ranks Muslim officers who had come from abroad until the end of the 19th century, a practice which was later abandoned. The occupational profile of many of the *Neofotistoi*, as inferred by the electoral registers and other documents, does not support a hypothesis of discrimination, for example in the area of practicing a variety of professions. In any case, any alleged discrimination does not affect the restitutions that took place later,[90] neither the descendants of the *Neofotistoi*. Furthermore, something which might be of more significance is that no administrative document contains even a passing mention of the *Neofotistoi* as a distinct category of second-class citizens or raises doubts about their inclusion in the nation.

The conversions that took place in Euboea after 1833, when a central authority had already been established in the region, along with the terms of the social integration of the converted, constitute a separate and distinct issue.[91] In the large Muslim population of Chalkida, the conversions began after 1840, in stark contrast to with the relatively remote Kızıl Hisar (present-day Karystos), where they began as soon as the Greek authorities were installed there.[92] However, in the case of Euboea we should not focus so much on the local authorities' arbitrary behavior and potential economic benefits, but rather on the conversions' considerable symbolic significance.[93]

The rationale of charity

Frequently, when property was restituted, the decision stated that this practice was against the law, and that it was being allowed for reasons of

---

[90] For example, in the restitutions of 1881 and 1882 in the village of Belesi, in Gortynia. In this settlement 4 male *Neofotistoi* can be identified, of whom one was not indigenous (see Papastamatiou 2012, 213–225).

[91] Further confusion often arises, since, as early as the beginning of the 1840s, there were conversions of immigrants, usually of Gypsies. See also the confusion between place of origin and place of baptism (Athens instead of Chalkida) in Doxiadis 2021, paragraph 23. We will not comment on the findings by Doxiadis 2021 concerning the Muslim and Jewish communities of Euboea, since he is unaware of the relevant literature.

[92] For example, see *DHAMFA,* Central Office, 1833, 76.1.

[93] Baltsiotis 2017.

clemency or charity.[94] This was the dominant rationale. Some individuals were granted property when previously they had none, and there have been a handful of cases where individuals who were not residents of the country were given back part of their property. The same rationale applied to certain regions, such as Attica and Euboea, where Muslims kept their property, since those territories were not considered as having been captured by insurgents. This practice went against the clear instructions by Governor Capodistrias stipulating that the *Neofotistoi* had no inheritance rights, according to the Ottoman law concerning "those converting [from Islam] to another religion".[95] It is also indicative that, from the end of the 1830s, many Muslims who resided or arrived in Athens, the capital of the new state, to resolve the disputes that had arisen with regard to the sale of their property, received a "welfare benefit" by the state.[96] These policies are undoubtedly significant in their own right and reveal the position of the fledgling state, which will be examined below, but it should not be underestimated that "unlawful" restitutions of any kind were far from the exception during the period in question. Furthermore, as we shall see, these policies concealed underlying political motives.

Citizenship in the new state and the discourse concerning fellow-citizens

Contrary to various suggestions,[97] citizenship policies during the first years of the Greek state have long been discussed in academia.[98] The initial approaches which applied at least up to 1826 were severe to the point of being against all presence of Muslims in the new state: the National Assembly, in its instructions to the Assembly Committee which had

[94] For many such documents see for example *GSA,* Secretariat/Ministry of Finance Archive (1833–1862), sub fond 1, sub fond 1 (Palace Archive), series 8, file 226.

[95] See the document sent by the Governor dated 24 February 1831, addressed to *The Committee for Attica and Euboea* (*GSA,* NL, series 4, subseries 12, file 1871).

[96] For similar cases, see *DHAMFA,* 1839, 7.1 A–Γ and 1841, 7.1 A–B.

[97] Including the one in Doxiadis 2021, paragraph 1.

[98] See mainly Vogli 2008, 191–204 and Baltsiotis 2017, 177–207, Baltsiotis 2022 (forthcoming); read also critically Karipsiadis 1992, 288–315.

been formed by its own members, based on the *Secret Resolution*, placed limits to negotiations with the admonishment "to press unfailingly, so that no Turk can have property or permanent residence in Greece".[99] The reservations of the enlighteners such as Adamance Coray and Jeremy Bentham were eventually assuaged,[100] and contrary to the provisions of what is now known as the three Revolutionary Constitutions, drafted between 1822 and 1827 about granting citizenship only to Christians, in 1833 citizenship was eventually granted to the members of the sole organized Jewish community that existed in the 1830s in Greece,[101] but also to the few Muslims, indigenous or not, who had supported the insurgency.[102] The regime which was established in 1833 employed a more liberal approach to the issue. It must be underlined here that the 1830 Protocols and the relevant "notes" of the three Great Powers to Capodistrias limited the legal obligations of the Greek state with regard to "the equality of civil and political rights" to Christians only.[103]

According to the aforementioned inclusive approach, all *Neofotistoi*, men and women, were granted Greek citizenship.[104] Perhaps what is more compelling is that even sedentary Muslim Gypsies who converted were granted citizenship.[105] The suggestion is that at the time, the

---

[99] Mamoukas 1839, 95–96.

[100] Despite their vacillations over the years, they were mostly unwilling or cautious in granting citizenship, permanent residence, or property to Muslims. Especially for Bentham, see for example Penna 2005. Katsikas and Dimitriadis (2021, 314) express the opposite opinion; Doxiadis (2021, paragraph 13) correctly points out the views of the two intellectuals.

[101] Vogli 2008, 195–199; Baltsiotis 2022 (forthcoming).

[102] As regards the indigenous Muslims, it has been confirmed so far with absolute certainty the case of Metos Brachopoulos, who appears in the 1844 electoral register, as well as one more individual who resided in Nauplion and was hired as a civil servant. For those who had originated outside the kingdom, see Baltsiotis 2017, *passim*. Greek citizenship was granted to other Muslims, tentatively at first, from 1850s onwards (Baltsiotis 2017, 177–189, 288–305).

[103] Ibid., 179–180.

[104] It is worth noting an 1848 decision by the Court of Cassation which confirms the rights of *Neofotistoi* to Greek citizenship (Karipsiadis 1992, 307).

[105] Cases like this can be found in the province of Olympia (especially in the municipality of Skillous). For example, see the case of the village of Makrysia in the electoral registers of 1871 (*GSA,* Election Material from Vlachogiannēs Collection, series 1,

Greek state, by granting citizenship to the aforementioned categories, and also to the "visible" Greek-Orthodox Gypsies, and furthermore, by introducing the 1835 Nationality Act based on principles of *jus soli*, introduced fundamentally liberal policies, contrary to legal approaches and practices of Serbian revolutioners, for example, during that same period.

As discussed earlier, the restitutions to the *Neofotistoi* were undoubtedly connected with the fact that converting to Orthodox Christianity resulted in inclusion in the nation. However, we should not overlook much baser motivations for this inclusion, such as that which is revealed in a letter by Capodistrias, dated August 1830, reminding the Senate to authorize restitutions to the *Neofotistoi*: "The Ottomans who converted to the Christian religion, at some point had fortunes and substantial property, and have now been reduced to poverty, so that many of them are planning to go to Turkey, since they lack any means of making a living in Greece. We think it is our duty to make haste and prevent such a scandalous development, and to this end we know of no other way than the one we previously announced".[106] It is quite revealing that these measures caused a backlash in the Senate.[107]

After the death of Capodistrias, the *Neofotistoi* restitution remained a divisive matter. Despite the fact that the National Assembly generally judged restitutions as "justified and charitable," because of "*strong reactions*" by its members, and despite the favorable opinion by the Explanatory Committee, a decision dated March 1832 attempted to reduce the amount of property to be restituted to every *Neofotistos* and annulled prior restitutions.[108]

But it was the outlook of the new Bavarian authorities which inaugurated a clear shift: this was evident in the Declaration by the

---

file 40). It is worth noting that a part of sedentary and most of itinerant Gypsies granted Greek citizenship according to legislation entered into force in 1968 and 1978–1979.

[106] *Αρχεία της Ελληνικής Παλιγγενεσίας*... , vol. 21, 2008, 59–60.

[107] See ibid. 95, where the answer of Capodistrias to the Senate (dated 22 January 1831) is included.

[108] For all of the above see *Αρχεία της Ελληνικής Παλιγγενεσίας*..., vol. 5, 1974, 58–63, 147, 157–163.

Viceregency, dated 10/22 February 1833, which imposed certain safeguards and effectively welcomed those "adherents of the Ottoman religion" who wanted to remain in the new state,[109] but also the exemplary conduct of the Bavarian army towards the Muslim population during the capture of Euboea. The approach advanced by the Bavarians, along with a not insignificant portion of Greek politicians –who at any rate were occupying the leading administrative positions at the same time– proved decisive in the treatment of diverse religious groups which were included in the Greek state.[110]

The policies implemented in the *Neofotistoi* issue were part of a wider rationale, where citizenship and inclusion in the nation went beyond the Greek-Orthodox religion. In a state founded after a revolution, the provisions related to citizenship included in the body politic those who "took up arms" and joined the insurgents. Those who had participated in the *struggle* had earned the right to remain non-converted, contrary to the provisions of the articles concerning citizenship in the 1827 Constitution as well as the Nationality Act of 1835, which referred to the Constitution. According to them, only *indigenous* Christians and Christians who had come *to* "join the fight" were granted citizenship. However, a much more open interpretation prevailed, and citizenship was granted both to Muslims who moved to insurgent territories and to indigenous ones.

To this extend, let us first consider the notorious cases of "doctors" such as Brachopoulos and Dritsakos –whose wife, Fatme Balaka, also remained unbaptized– as well as Chasan Kourtalēs. The latter married again and raised a Muslim family in Chalkida and along with Ibraïm Arnaoutoglou, a well-known landowner from Kalavryta, they kept a significant part of their property and lived, along with their descendants, as members of the Muslim community of Chalkida –and most of them as Greek citizens– at least until the end of the 19th century.[111] On the

[109] *Government's Gazette,* 2, 22 February 1833, 8–9. For a similar unpublished "Declaration" dated 10 August 1830, signed by Capodistrias and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, see Baltsiotis 2017, 107–108.

[110] Baltsiotis 2017. Doxiadis 2021, paragraph 30, argues in favor of the contrary.

[111] See in detail Baltsiotis 2017, 167–172, 184–189, 234–235, 288–289, 298–301.

contrary, the application of a Muslim from Karystos to be granted citizenship in 1852, was rejected because "not only did he not join the struggle, but also fought against it", and also because his father had emigrated, thereby "confirming he was an alien".[112]

However, the discourse concerning these *fellow citizens* had been formulated still earlier. As early as 1828, Bayramēs Liapēs, an armed insurgent who had come from abroad, wrote to Capodistrias: "I am a Turk by religion, Albanian by race, but a Greek citizen, because I fought for the Greek struggle for freedom right from the start; and I fought of my own free will".[113] Many years later, a *Neofotistos* from Tripolis who was living in Kalamata, stated in his application that he had joined the insurgency "fighting as a Greek". It goes without saying that these views were not written by the hand of illiterate soldiers, but by literate men who undertook to submit their complaints to the administrative authorities, however they do reveal that these and similar ideas were already prevalent.

After being baptized, an individual's shift to a different *quality* was particularly pronounced during the first years after the establishment of the Greek state and would continue to be so. In 1840, a document by the Authorities of Chalkida to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs related to a *Neofotistē* woman mentions the following: "She used to be an Ottoman, but now she is a baptized Christian, she is Greek, and she is subject to the religious and political Laws of Greece, that she will remain in Greece, her Homeland".[114] This shift of *quality* also results in corresponding favorable legal decisions in the courts—in the majority of cases. In 1849, the Court of Cassation decided that "he took the Greek-Orthodox religion and thus became Greek".[115] This way of thinking resulted in a shift of the authorities' rhetoric. In October 1852, the Finance Minister,

[112] For all of the above see Baltsiotis 2017, 177–189. In any event, it was suggested to the applicant from Karystos to reapply for citizenship following the procedure for naturalisation.

[113] The document was brought to our attention by Stathis 2010.

[114] Baltsiotis 2017, 191.

[115] Karipsiadis 1992, 240.

introducing a bill to restitute the property of Metos Brachopoulos[116] from Arkadia, who had joined the insurgents as a surgeon, said in Parliament: "This moderate and rightful application [to restitute his property] by this Ottoman in religion, surely, but a Greek in spirit and homeland, Brachopoulos … Gentlemen! There were Ottomans who chose to remain in this country and to join the fight of Greeks as surgeons, as in this case, or soldiers". Furthermore, the rapporteur of the draft law said: "The Ottoman Metos Osta Brachopoulos and his wife … earned their right to this country's gratitude … and, fighting as a genuine Greek … against his coreligionists … he is an Ottoman in religion only, and Greek in heart and soul".[117] In order to complete the picture, we should note that the "loss" of a *Neofotistos* was considered a symbolic failure of the national community.[118] Conversions to Orthodox Christianity after 1833, meaning those which took place mainly in Euboea, were a matter of "national pride"[119] of such importance that they endangered Greek-Ottoman relations.[120]

Conclusions

The previous studies stress the significance of religious fluidity in the *Neofotistoi* issue. The logic of total segregation, as well as irreversible conversions, stem from stereotypes and misconceptions rather than from actual reality. However, there was no religious fluidity in the sense that is raised by the studies, as common rituals, religious and everyday practices and beliefs do not alter the fact that strong boundaries between religious communities were of vital importance in Ottoman society. In the Ottoman Empire, conversions to Christianity were a state of exception

[116] He was married and had four children.

[117] *Πρακτικά των Συνεδριάσεων της Βουλής*..., vol. 2, 1852, 660–661, 758–759. A similar rhetoric ("Greek in spirit") would be repeated a few years later in the case of Gioupēs Dritsakos from Laconia (see also Katsikas and Dimitriadis 2021, 313).

[118] Particularly indicative is a case from 1860, when a recently baptized woman, hailing from Crete, was handed over to the Ottoman authorities, causing a backlash in the Senate (*Πρακτικά των Συνεδριάσεων της Γερουσίας*... 1860, 851–858).

[119] Baltsiotis 2017, 189–207; Vogli 2008, 200–204.

[120] Baltsiotis 2017, 189–207.

in the beginning of the 19th century. However, it became more and more prevalent during the Greek War of Independence. Thus, apart from the well-known mass conversions to Christianity in Livadeia and the subsequent "return" to Islam by many of the converted afterwards, there were many other similar cases which point to a "violation of the rules." This "violation" continued after the end of the conflict, when certain individuals –even some who had fought on the side of the insurgents– chose to leave Greece, and others sought their relatives to take them to the Ottoman Empire and thus convert them back to Islam.[121]

Undoubtedly, conversions, both in rural and urban communities, were of great importance for both the Greeks and the Ottomans. Conversions were not strongly facilitated by common or similar practices in everyday life, by common ideas, ceremonies, or religious rituals of the groups concerned. Similarities between the various religious and ethnolinguistic groups in any given territory were rather the rule in the Ottoman Empire, but simultaneously, it should not taken for granted that the boundaries of religious belonging were permeable.

The social integration of *Neofotistoi* in the first place, was undoubtedly connected with the religious definition of the Greek nation. However, this is an issue that stands as separate and distinct from religious conversions in general, or from shifts between Christian denominations or competing Orthodox Churches, i.e., processes which have afflicted the Balkans from the third quarter of the 19th century, that is, since Balkan nationalisms were dominant and national ideas had sufficiently disseminated in the communities.

Through this particular case study and the issues that were touched upon in this paper -i.e., the partial acceptance of the tiny number of Muslims and Jews, and the inclusive practices of granting citizenship- emerge certain liberal political choices during the period in question which subvert, to some degree, our perception of the Greek state during

[121] For example, a woman arrived in 1835 from the Ottoman Empire in Aegina to collect her daughter, while that same year two unbaptized children were sought in order to be returned to their relatives, a boy of 14 and a girl of 9 from Tripolis (*DHAMFA,* Central Office, 1835, 68.1 A).

the 19th century. As has been shown by other studies[122] and as it has also been suggested by the author,[123] until the demise of Greek irredentism –known as *Megali Idea*– the policies of integration and inclusion followed were more flexible. In other words, the civic nation was not absent in Greece during the 19th century. It appears, however, that many of our perceptions of Greek nationalism are based on a very narrow notion of the Greek nation, which became prevalent much later, after the collapse of the *Megali Idea* and the population exchanges that followed, and especially after the Greek Civil War.

[122] Such as Christopoulos 2012.

[123] Baltsiotis 2017, Baltsiotis 2022 (forthcoming).

Bibliography

Archives (unpublished)

GAK, abbreviation for *General Archives of the State.*

DHAMFA, abbreviation for *Diplomatic and Historical Archives of the Hellenic Ministry of Foreign Affairs.*

Primary sources

Αρχεία της Ελληνικής Παλιγγενεσίας μέχρι της εγκαταστάσεως της Βασιλείας, vol. 2. Athens 1862.

Αρχεία της Ελληνικής Παλιγγενεσίας 1821–1832. Αι Εθνικαί Συνελεύσεις τόμος τρίτος, vol. 5, Athens 1974.

Αρχεία της Ελληνικής Παλιγγενεσίας, Έγγραφα Καποδιστριακής Περιόδου τόμος πρώτος, vol. 21, Athens 2008.

Αρχεία Ελληνικής Παλιγγενεσίας, Έγγραφα Καποδιστριακής Περιόδου τόμος τρίτος, vol. 23. Athens 2008.

[General Gazette of Greece] *Γενική Εφημερίς της Ελλάδος*. Nauplion 1830.

Capodistrias. *Αρχείον Ιωάννου Καποδίστρια.* Ed. K. Dafnēs. Vol. 8. Corfu 1987.

[Government's Gazette] *Εφημερίς της Κυβερνήσεως του Βασιλείου της Ελλάδος*. Nauplion 1833, Athens 1836, 1838.

Finlay, George, *A History of Greece from its conquest by the Romans to the present time B.C. 146 to A.D. 1864,* vol. VI. Oxford 1877.

Ioannidēs, Iōannēs, *Πείρα ήγουν μικρόν κατά στοιχείον ευρετήριον της του Αρείου Πάγου νομολογίας* […]*, Μέρος Πρώτον περιέχον τας πολιτικάς και εμπορικάς αποφάσεις,* vol. 5. Athens 1874.

Leake, William Martin, *Travels in the Morea. With a map and plans,* vol. I, II, III. London 1830.

Mamoukas, Andreas, *Τα κατά την Αναγέννησιν της Ελλάδος ήτοι συλλογή των κατά την αναγεννώμενην Ελλάδα συνταχθέντων πολιτευμάτων, νόμων* […], vol. 4. Piraeus 1839.

Πρακτικά των Συνεδριάσεων της Βουλής κατά την δευτέραν Σύνοδον της Πρώτης Βουλευτικής Περιόδου, vol. 1, Athens 1846.

Πρακτικά των Συνεδριάσεων της Βουλής κατά την δευτέραν Σύνοδον της Τρίτης Βουλευτικής Περιόδου, vol. 2, Athens 1852.

Πρακτικά των Συνεδριάσεων της Γερουσίας κατά την πρώτην Σύνοδον της Έκτης Βουλευτικής Περιόδου, Athens 1860.

Sourmelēs, Dionysios. *Ιστορία των Αθηνών κατά τον υπέρ Ελευθερίας Αγώνα* […], vol. 2. Athens 1853.

Spēliotakēs, S[pyridon]. *Στατιστικαί πληροφορίαι περί Ελλάδος, Μέρος Α΄ περί πληθυσμού.* Athens 1859.

Secondary works

Baltsiotis, L., 2002. *L'albanophonie dans l'État grec. Expansion et déclin des parlers albanais.* Mémoire de Diplôme de l'EHESS. Paris.

— 2017. *Ο εχθρός εντός των τειχών. Η μουσουλμανική κοινότητα της Χαλκίδας (1833–1881).* Athens.

— 2022 (forthcoming). "Ιουδαίοι συμπολίτες στη Χαλκίδα: στοιχεία για το πολιτικό έθνος το 19ο αιώνα", in G. Ananiadis, D. Papadimitriou & S. Papageprgiou (eds), *Εθνικισμός και ετερότητα. Τιμητικός τόμος για τον Στέφανο Πεσμαζόγλου.* Athens.

Belia E., 1980. "Στατιστικά στοιχεία της επαρχίας Επιδαύρου-Λιμηράς κατά το 1828", *Λακωνικαί Σπουδαί* vol. 5 (Β΄), 60–117.

Beloka, S., 2017. *Η πόλη της Τρίπολης 1828–1862: Διοικητική, δημογραφική, πολιτική, κοινωνική και οικονομική εξέλιξη.* PhD dissertation, Panteion University. Athens.

Christopoulos, D., 2012. *Ποιος είναι έλληνας πολίτης; Το καθεστώς ιθαγένειας από την ίδρυση του ελληνικού κράτους ως τις αρχές του 21ου αιώνα.* Athens.

Chrysanthakopoulos, G., 1950. *Η Ηλεία επί Τουρκοκρατίας. Επί τη βάσει: Σπουδαιοτάτων πρωτοτύπων ανεκδότων ιστορικών εγγράφων* […]. Athens.

Dimitropoulos, D., 2022 (forthcoming). "Μεταξύ πολιτικής και θρησκείας. Η Πελοποννησιακή Γερουσία και οι βαπτίσεις μουσουλμάνων (1822)", in *Πρακτικά του συνεδρίου Πελοποννησιακή Γερουσία. Ένας πολιτικός θεσμός της Ελληνικής Επανάστασης,* Ινστιτούτο Ιστορικών Ερευνών – ΕΙΕ. Athens.

Doxiadis, Ev., 2021. “Neophotistoi and Apostates: Greece and Conversion in the Nineteenth Century” *Historein* 20.1.

Gritsopoulos, T., 1971. “Στατιστικαί ειδήσεις περί Πελοποννήσου” *Πελοποννησιακά* 8, 411–459.

Kapsalēs, G., 1957. “Η Βαρδούνια και οι Τουρκοβαρδουνιώτες” *Πελοποννησιακά* 2, 91–140.

Karipsiadis, G., 1992. *Η Ελλάδα ως διάδοχο κράτος. Η ίδρυση του ελληνικού κράτους και η Ένωση των Επτανήσων.* PhD dissertation, National and Capodistrian University of Athens.

Katsikas, S. & S. Dimitriadis. 2021. “Muslim Converts to Orthodox Christianity during the Greek War of Independence, 1821–1832” *European History Quarterly* 51.3, 299–323.

Kōnstantinidēs-Trifylios, P., 1961. *Το Σιδερόκαστρο στην Ιστορία (1210–1960).* Athens.

Laskarēs, D. G., 2002. *Το Ξηροκάμπι της Λακεδαίμονος[,] δέκατος ένατος και εικοστός αιώνας.* Athens.

Liaskou, R., 1982. *Χρισσό. Θρύλοι και αλήθειες.* Athens.

Loucatos S. 1980. “Les Arabes et le Turcs Philhellènes pendant l’insurrection pour l’indépendabce de la Grèce” *Balkan Studies* 21, 233–273.

Loukos, Ch., 2018. “Ερωτικές σχέσεις και σεξουαλικές πρακτικές κατά την Επανάσταση του 1821”, in *Όψεις της Επανάστασης του 1821. Πρακτικά συνεδρίου,* Αθήνα 12 και 13 Ιουνίου 2015, ΕΜΝΕ-Μνήμων. Athens, 357–383.

Mezinēs, S., 2021. “Στα Καμίνια πριν από την Επανάσταση” *Η Φάρις* 74, 3.

Minta, S., 2007. “Letters to Lord Byron”, *Romanticism on the Net 45.* https://doi.org/10.7202/015821ar.

Moschona, P., 1980. “Προβλήματα Τούρκων Μονεμβασιάς κατά το 1828” *Λακωνικαί Σπουδαί* vol. 5.2, 49–59.

Nakos, G., 1970. “Αι ‘Μεγάλαι Δυνάμεις’ και τα ‘Εθνικά Κτήματα’ της Ελλάδος (1831–1832)” *Επιστημονική Επετηρίς Σχολής Νομικών και Οικονομικών Επιστημών ΑΠΘ* 9, 467–564ι.

Nikolakakou, P., 2011. “Οι βρύσες της Λιαντίνας” *Η Φάρις* 54, 29.

Nikolaou, G., 1997. *Islamisations et christianisations dans le Péloponnèse (1715– ca. 1832).* Thèse de doctorat, Université des sciences humaines de Strasbourg.

Nikolaou, G., 2006. *Εξισλαμισμοί στην Πελοπόννησο από τα μέσα του 17ου αιώνα έως το 1821.* Athens.

Papastamatiou, G., 2012. *Η Γορτυνία του Λάδωνα και η Τριποταμιά της (Μπέλεσι). Συλλογή στοιχείων για την περιοχή των παλαιών δήμων Θελπούσης, Ηραίας, Ελευσίνος, Τροπαίων.* Athens.

Penna, D., 2005. "Some notes on Jeremy Bentham's involvement in Greek legal affairs in the early years of the formation of the Greek State (1821–1824)" *Groninger Opmerkingen en Mededelingen* 22, 1–19.

Petrakakos, D., 1933. *Μονεμβασία και Επίδαυρος Λιμηρά μετά την Επανάστασιν του 1821.* Athens.

Stathēs, P., 2010. "Μουσουλμάνοι και ιδιότητα του πολίτη στην ελληνική επανάσταση" *Η Αυγή, Αναγνώσεις,* 28.03.2010.

Tagarēs, A., 1970. "Φιγαλία (τ. Δήμος Φιγαλίας)" *Ολυμπιακά Χρονικά* vol. I, 111–115.

Tartarē, G., 1966. "Η Αγία Τριάδα" *Το Ξηροκάμπι* 2, 1 & 5.

Trilikēs, T., 2008. *Βουτιάνοι. Η Ιστορία τους και το Γενεαλογικό Δέντρο των οικογενειών τους.* Voutianoi.

Vakalopoulos, A., 1941. *Αιχμάλωτοι Ελλήνων κατά την Επανάσταση του 1821.* Thessaloniki.

Vogli, E., 2008. *'Έλληνες το γένος'. Η ιθαγένεια και η ταυτότητα στο εθνικό κράτος των Ελλήνων (1821–1844).* Heraklion.

Mundane but precious: Greek liberation from Ottoman rule

Mark Mazower, *The Greek Revolution. 1821 and the Making of Modern Europe,* London: Allen Lane 2021, 608 pp., ISBN 9780241004104

Historiographic treatments of the Greek Revolution have traditionally offered binary depictions of this protracted, remarkably complex war of liberation. Yet a wealth of archival material, coupled with an increasingly nuanced awareness of its protagonists' diplomatic, social and economic motives, are beginning to yield a picture quite remote from the one-dimensional narratives of a clear-cut Greco-Turkish confrontation. Indeed, in 1821 a cross-class swathe of groups of wide linguistic diversity – which included the militant Albanian element in Epirus – were drawn into a clash that was not a "two-way Greco-Turkish struggle after all," as Mark Mazower aptly indicates.

While a generation earlier the protomartyr of the Revolution Rhigas Velestinlis had not hesitated to include the Turkish Moslems among those whom he believed should also take up arms alongside the oppressed Balkan peoples in their battle against Ottoman absolutism, the prospect of pursuing what the author characterizes as "the magnificently ecumenical horizons of Enlightenment republicanism" was short-lived, drawing its last breath not long after the first clashes broke out and religious faith reared its head over the revolutionary battlefield as the decisive dividing line between combatants and non-combatants alike. Earlier plans, quintessential products of the pre-national world, such as those devised by the astute Corfiot diplomat and first Governor Ioannis Kapodistrias, who had envisaged the Albanian Moslems joining forces with the native Greeks, were also thwarted by the momentum of what swiftly developed into an Orthodox uprising.

Although Mazower tips his hat to a number of key readings, from the "masterly" early histories of Thomas Gordon (1832) and George Finlay (1860) to the recent *Critical Dictionary* of the Revolution edited by Paschalis Kitromilides and Constantinos Tsoukalas (2021), his study is clearly suffused with a deep sense of sympathy with the Greek

fighters. Despite the widespread illiteracy of the times, he notes, and unlike their counterparts in the Iberian peninsula and in eastern Europe, the protagonists of the Greek revolution "were never very far from the written word… thanks to the Church and a network of village schools and enterprising merchants." Indeed, in the three decades leading up to the outbreak of the Revolution the Greek-speaking schools under Ottoman rule saw a tenfold increase and the publications a fivefold increase. Alongside works by prominent philhellenes such as Maxine Raybaud (*Mémoires sur la Grèce*) and Samuel Gridley Howe (*Letters and Journals*) as well as the modest but growing harvest of Ottoman memoirs translated into English, such as those by Yusuf el-Moravi and Kabudli Efendi, Mazower draws invaluable insights from the words set down by the insurgents who found themselves on the front line of an all-out battle with the Ottomans.

The work is divided into two parts, of which the first concentrates on the conditions that gave rise to the Greek Revolution. It details the collective resilience and valorous feats – but also, not infrequently, the disconcerting capitulations and fratricidal clashes – of an incipient nation on the long path to its liberation. A decisive source of social cohesion emanated from the grassroots imperative to fight, built on enhanced cross-class bonds as well as by default, a direct result of the monolithically religious character imposed on the conflict by the Porte from the outset. But it was also forged from the outside, through timely international interventions which secured the Revolution's success – the topic on which the second part of the study is focused. Even though the ostensibly humanitarian character of these interventions far from guaranteed their success, the philhellenic component provided an intellectually as well as aesthetically alluring framework for outsiders to empathize with the cause and thereby negotiate a revamped Hellenic identity capable of acting as a double-edged sword against both European reaction and Ottoman absolutism.

By 1823 time seemed to be on the side of the Greeks, as the Holy Alliance was beginning to lose ground, the Russian military was growing increasingly restless over the dark fate that had befallen their Orthodox brethren and the Ottomans were risking further alienating the European

powers for the brutal treatment they accorded to their subjugated peoples. A key point which the author emphasizes is that the remarkable endurance of the insurgents and the absence of a regular army or a standing navy under the command of the Sublime Porte indicated that both sides would need to form external alliances, which they sought in Europe and the Eyalet of Egypt respectively. This virtually guaranteed that, even if they were victorious, both sides would need to make some not insignificant concessions to the third parties whose aid they had solicited.

Thus it came to be after the destruction of the Ottoman fleet at Navarino in 1827, when the Great Powers made it clear to the Greek leadership that theirs had been an intervention which had sought to restore peace to the neighborhood – but little more. Independence would not be guaranteed before another three years of diplomatic horse-trading and a humiliating Ottoman defeat by Russia in 1829.

Even after the London protocol of 1830, however, a score of issues would remain unsettled, from citizenship rights, property and compensation to borders and the title of its ruler. The guarantor powers would not agree to disburse the first tranche of a much-anticipated 60-million-franc loan vital to sustain the nascent state's threadbare fiscal system until eight months after the first Governor had fallen to an assassin's bullet. By then the country had descended into such chaos that renewed credence was given to the enemies of the revolution's claim that the Greeks lacked the political maturity to stand outside the Ottoman edifice. The civil clashes after the death of Kapodistrias legitimized the imposition of a Regency Council composed of three Bavarians, who would govern Greece with ill-concealed disdain for the institutional legacy of the National Assemblies until finally transferring power to the absolutist monarch King Otto in 1835.

Indeed, Mazower reminds us that the ending of the Revolution was never a clear-cut affair: independence was a gradual process that would last "for years if not decades." During the insurgency, "all the weaker side could really do was to hold out and hope," while the road to establishing its national sovereignty was an upward struggle that "in some ways… continues to this day." This gave rise to a "litany of all-

round dissatisfaction" – not least with the fact that the Revolution did not culminate in a divine redemption of the Irredenta of Strabo – which would develop into a "trope that endures to this day." And yet, the author concludes, while the Greeks may not have succeeded in liberating Constantinople or in creating the conditions for an idyllic community dedicated to social justice, their independence must not be dismissed as illusory. For they had compelled the Powers to break "the old taboo against intervention" and finally achieved something "mundane but no less precious: the freedom to shape their future in a state of their own within an international system of states."

Drawing a parallel with Greece's present-day struggles, Mazower extolls the Greek society for being "remarkably resilient" and enduring many hardships, from the European debt crisis to the refugee crisis and the ongoing global pandemic. To him this indicates a mode of coping which was also a key to the success of the Revolution, a story that was less about individual heroics and self-sacrifice than "social endurance in the face of systemic upheaval." His is an intertemporal outlook which seeks to unveil the dimly acknowledged affinities between the past and the present, through the evolution of communities which act as nodes of a collective civic morality. This discrete but discernible hallmark of his works does not spring from ideological motives, nor from a wish to impose coherent structures on his account, but from a disinclination to be drawn into the realm of evolutionary historiography – and also, not inconceivably, from a desire to pay homage to the Bundist spirit of his ancestors which he has declared to draw inspiration from.

On an epistemological level, however, this proclivity likely originates not just in his unwillingness to sacrifice analytical rigor for the finesse of a seamless narrative but, principally, in his earlier imbuement in a mutely subversive paradigm which has treated social anthropology as an essentially historical discipline. In navigating the ebbs and tides of Enlightenment-inspired tinkering, his gaze has been transfixed on the perennial disjuncture between ideologically motivated proclamations and political practice – in this case, between the pronouncements of the revolutionary assemblies and the realities of

the networked socioeconomic substrata of the private interest-clusters which underpinned them.

The author does not limit himself to the formidable commercial or philhellenic networks that nourished the revolutionary efforts from without, stressing that, in the absence of a central command in the first days of the uprising, it was the preexisting bonds of "patronage and authority" which managed to remain operative and thereby to "structure the apparent chaos." As for the collapse of the endeavor from within – a prospect which, amid devastating defeats and perfidious factionalism, was never remote – it was only averted by the "'inexhaustible patience' of village society."

Employing the cartographic representations expeditiously prepared by 19th century military officers from the Continent, Mazower nevertheless opts to go deeper by adopting an approach borne of the empathetic anthropographies of J. K. Campbell and Michael Herzfeld. These sketch out the ecumenical micromechanics of power systems, perhaps more accentuated in the resource-starved peripheries but no less a fixture of their polities than in the fabric of the more affluent class-ordered societies of the West. He thus steers clear of both the linear-minded doxologies of traditionalist historiography and the fragmentary luster of presentist studies, offering an incisive account of the pursuit of Greek independence in post-Napoleonic Europe from the vantage point of the sheer resilience that was required to establish it. It is the voices from down below that he regularly strains his ears to listen to, from the lowly klepht's to those of the women of the revolution. By so doing he constructs a captivating narrative of the "mundane but precious" banality of heroism, in what would turn out to be the first successful revolutionary uprising among the incipient national movements of the Balkan peninsula.

Dr George Kalpadakis
Modern Greek History Research Center (KEINE), Academy of Athens

The Metapolitefsi and its cultural mutations in Greece (1974-?...):
Dimitris Tziovas, *Greece from Junta to Crisis: Modernization, Transition and Diversity*, London: Bloomsbury 2021, 320 pp., ISBN 978-0755617449.

It was supposed to last for a few months-yet it is still with us, one way or another, almost five decades after its emergence. Not many Greeks even know that the 1974 *Metapolitefsi* which they have in mind as a landmark in their country's history is actually the second such phenomenon, preceded by that of 1843 (the first transition to a proper constitutional parliamentary democracy), the first time the definition was used to denote the transition to democratic rule. Nevertheless, if the 'original' use of the term '*Metapolitefsi'* has now fallen into oblivion, the modern one is still widely used and considered, covering such a wide spectrum of activities, mentalities and behaviours that one would think that Greece still lives in the 1970s. But this is not the case. Far from being a one-dimensional political phenomenon, *Metapolitefsi* has come to be a catch-all phrase for a series of political, economic and cultural transformations that characterize post-1974 Greece. How and why has this occurred, and what are its implications for the study of contemporary Greece?

The book of Dimitris Tziovas, Professor of Modern Greek Studies at the University of Birmingham, tries to shed some light to the above question(s). As Professor Tziovas notes, after the radical political change of 1974, Greece shifted gradually from the field of politics to that of culture, moving in parallel from cultural homogeneity to heterogeneity and pluralism. For the author, *Metapolitefsi* means, above all, identities: it is about the way in which contemporary identities (ideological, political, racial, ethnic, national, religious, sexual and linguistic) are born and shaped, and begins by noting that Greece has repeatedly found itself trapped between divisive dichotomies since 1974, in binary oppositions which have left their marks on the country. Therefore the period that starts in 1974 (and extends up to the Greek crisis after 2008) is one characterised by a strong 'cultural hybridity': different cultural groups and minorities are increasingly recognized, diversity is accepted,

there is a clear transition that favours popular culture, as well as an 'anti-systemic element' in society. One of the core arguments of the author is that in Greece of the *Metapolitefsi* there has emerged a cultural diversity of many modernizations, and at the same time it is slowly moving from a centralized and homogenizing state towards the acceptance of the 'other' both on an ideological and legislative level.

These cultural transitions are also marked by an increased emphasis on identity elements and various identity politics. Such cultural diversity and coexistence essentially means that the cultural history of Greece in the post-1974 period is a history of transitions, which are never linear (i.e. there is no unidirectional proceeding from one cultural ideal to the next), but there exist numerous 'reflections' and different trajectories. The author rejects the narrative that wants the modernizing, pro-European and pro-Western culture to be superior and to displace a more obsolete, popular culture based on traditional, non-European models; emphasizing each time that there has not been and does not exist a single public in Greece that treats things, identities, and historical memory itself in a single, unified way. Rather, different publics emerge with different sensibilities and different ways of negotiating and perceiving cultural material (of any texture) and the historical memory/past of Greece and the Greeks. The author manages to offer the reader a vivid picture of a Greece that, in terms of culture, in every field, is in a liminal space/conversation between different discourses. It is, for example, a Greece that often combines the positions of the pro-European/modernist with the traditional or anti-Western/ethnocentric, the liberal/secular with orthodoxy, the aesthetically 'high' with the 'popular', the traditional politicization and interest in the public sphere with the non-partisan, the emphasis on the private sphere and the private way of life. There are various factors, such as anti-Americanism and pro/anti-European views, orthodoxy and religious scepticism, the connection with antiquity and the weaning from it, the strong presence in the modern Greek imaginary of the Civil War, Greek identity and the crisis brought about in it by immigration and globalisation, the relationship with the Other, the Turk or the Jew, the battles for the Greek language.

As for language, also a crucial issue of the post-independence period, the introduction of '*dimotiki'* (the commonly spoken idiom) put an end to a long and highly contentious dispute, nevertheless the *katharevousa* (the idiom of cultural, administrative and intellectual elites) left its scholarly mark on the standard Modern Greek, without, however, allaying fears of decadence, linguistic poverty and secularism, combined with the prolonged conflicts over the teaching of ancient Greek in schools. Furthermore, in the field of television, there was a transition from state monopoly to private plurality, but with multiple political, economic and vested interests' entanglements.

In terms of youth, gender and sexual culture in the post-independence period, students and youth movements abandoned, as the author claims, party dependence after 1974 in favour of self-organization, while the same was true for women's issues, with rights proliferating but the autonomy of women's organizations remaining in arrears, while the visibility of homosexual demands seems to have increased. Tziovas also stresses the fact that there has not been and does not exist a single public in Greece that treats historical memory itself in a single, unified way. Rather, different publics emerge with different sensibilities and different ways of negotiating and perceiving cultural material (of any texture) and the historical memory/past of the Greeks.

The author's project is theoretically combined with analyses of the characteristics of late globalizing capitalism, with post- structuralism and postmodernism, with postcolonial studies, with analyses of social rights movements or the condensation of private and public space, with the thesis of the changing nature of politicization. Tziovas concludes that this is an age of identities, as everything is converging in the search for personal and collective identifications and integrations, more fluid identifications and less absolute, binding allegiances. The old divisions and bipolarizations have not ceased to exist, but on the one hand their boundaries are constantly shifting, and on the other hand new fields are being rearranged. He sees a polycentrism, where diverse trends and cultural models coexist in a kind of hybridization, such that shows a Greece that is contradictory as well as multifaceted, heterogeneous as well as multidimensional.

From the point of view of a political scientist the author's analysis poses more questions than can be answered in the context of a book alone. Bypassing the (mostly unfruitful) debate on the end of the *Metapolitefsi* the main issue(s) have to do with the *political* culture of the Greeks during that time and how it was (re)shaped and transformed- and which factors contributed to that unique phenomenon.

While one can agree with the author that the *Metapolitefsi* has been a time of (multiple) identities, from a political viewpoint there are some factors challenging this image. To start, the political culture of the Greeks from 1974 onwards was largely shaped by anti- Americanism and anti-westernism, both products of a blame on the 'West' for the imposition of the dictatorship of the Colonels and for the tragedy of Cyprus. This has been amply and agilely supported by the rising PASOK and has, after its victory in 1981, become the dominant political discourse in Greece. The rise of PASOK (and of the left in more general terms) has been associated with populism, which has, in turn, largely contributed to the prevalence of an 'underdog' political culture in the country. Furthermore, the emergence of those various identities needs to be linked to the transformation of Greece to a typical society where post-material values and behaviors rise, as has been the case with other Western societies studied by political scientists in the 1960s and 1970s (typical of these works is the book of Ronald Ingleheart *The Silent Revolution*: *Changing Values and Political Styles Among Western Publics*).

The political and democratic modernization that came with the *Metapolitefsi* has also seen a paradox in the fact that, whereas stable and lasting democratic institutions have been taking root for the first time for such a long period in Greek politics, certain old-fashioned practices have survived that to a great extent cancel the benevolent effects of institutional modernization: political clientelism and nepotism never ceased to play a major role in the country. This, along with the persisting populist tendencies in both left and right, have contributed to what a famous Greek political scientist called 'the extra-institutional consensus to the Greek political system' (see Dimitris Haralambis, Πελατειακές Σχέσεις Και Λαϊκισμός. *Η* εξωθεσμική συναίνεση στο ελληνικό πολιτικό σύστημα).

The persistence of nepotism and clientelism would not be made possible without the distribution of resources, however. Thus, the funding of various professional and social groups has been a practice transcending the political system and has also been vital for the electoral victories of political parties-mainly of PASOK and New Democracy, the protagonists of the *Metapolitefsi.* This funding, in turn, has been achieved mainly by securing loans and European funds rather than by building a robust economy. At the same time, the country was being transformed into a consumerist society, a phenomenon also linked with the decline of 'traditional' politics and the rise of new political and social identities and attitudes.

It is along these lines than the collapse of the Greek political system in the early 2010s has occurred, with the striking of the bail-out agreements at the time and the new political cleavage of 'pro- and anti- memorandum' parties that took shape in the aftermath. This can be taken as marking the end (?) of *Metapolitefsi* as it was known until then (interestingly, the author considers the crisis as the end of that conjuncture too). This collapse has led to the emergence of a whole series of behaviours and mentalities that were latently spreading in Greek society in the years before the crisis erupted: an outburst of xenophobia, a questioning of the achievements of Greece in the European integration process, and even a challenge to democratic rules and practices, along with political extremism and violence from both the extreme right and the extreme left side of the political spectrum. At the same time the electoral decline of PASOK-the *par excellence* representative political force of the Metapolitefsi- as well as the rise of SYRIZA –originally a radical and alternative left party, as well as that of the Golden Dawn and the Greek version of alt- right- the 'Independent Greeks' a populist right wing formation, radically transformed the political scenery.

A series of other issues touched in the book of Dimitris Tziovas can also form the basis of a political research and discussion-for instance, the issue of media has been in the core of debates on plurality of information and its discontents, as most of the owners of private television channels are also public contractors, something which has been spotted as an problem of transparency and actual freedom of

information in Greece from the 1990s onwards. Also, the relation with Greece's Balkan neighbors has been a politically sensitive issue, as since the breakup of Yugoslavia a wave of sympathy to the Serbs (viewed by many Greeks as fellow Orthodox Christians-victims of an 'anti-Orthodox Western conspiracy and aggression') and, in juxtaposition, a revival of old nationalist feelings (and insecurities) on the issue of Greek Macedonia (suffice to think of the massive rallies organized in Athens and Thessaloniki in 2018 against the agreement recognizing Foreign Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia as North Macedonia).

To sum up, *Greece from Junta to Crisis* has what it takes to be considered a seminal work for the period it examines: not only does it offer a comprehensive and multi-faceted account of the transformations of the Greek culture(s) during the *Metapolitefsi* years, but it also calls for a productive dialogue with other disciplines (political science, history, sociology etc) on the complexities of a country which underwent, in less than a generation, a series of transformations that irreversibly changed the physiognomy of its people.

Yannis Tzortzis
Teaching fellow, Political Science and International Studies Department
University of Birmingham

Αναζητώντας την Άνδρο. Κείμενα και εικόνες 15ου-19ου αιώνα από τη Συλλογή Ευστάθιου Ι. Φινόπουλου, Επιστημονική επιμέλεια και συντονισμός έκδοσης Μαρία Γιουρούκου, (In search of Andros: Texts and Images (15th-19th cent.) from the Efstathios J. Finopoulos Collection), Αθήνα 2021, 472 pp., ISBN 978-960-476-291-0.

There are several motives which compel travelers to journey to cities and lands in the Eastern Mediterranean: during the Renaissance, and later in the times of the European Enlightenment, because of a deeper desire to see Greek and Roman antiquities *in situ*; out of a genuine sense of curiosity to become acquainted with other cultures; in order to study fauna and flora in different areas; to seek out religious and non-religious manuscripts; so as to conduct linguistic research on the languages spoken in the Mediterranean region; to meet financial goals; for the enrichment of the disciplines of cartography and geography; in order to collect coins or paintings; finally, in order to purchase antiquities. The catalogue of motives can be longer.

The majority of travelers were wealthy but there were also those who traveled on behalf of commissions which financed them to record various subjects. There were also scientists driven by specific projects as well as those on educational missions, two categories of travelers who have invariably produced travel journals of high quality. The contribution of these travelers is especially important, owing to both their writings and the images they may have left behind, which are very often the main sources we possess in order to construct our knowledge of how various regions developed over time, as well as the state of the antiquities and libraries that were devastated as a result of military conflict, or by forces of nature themselves.

The transition to antiquity in the 15th century, during the Renaissance, signals a growing interest of travelers to discover the lands which had flourished in antiquity. Ancient Greek and Roman authors were translated into various European languages and these texts were resurrected from the obscurity of many centuries. At the same time as the pilgrimages that flourished, there were travelers who journeyed to the Mediterranean and visited Greece, Asia Minor, the Aegean isles, Cyprus and oftentimes

Map of Andros. Fr. Ferretti, *Diporti notturni*, Ancona 1580. © Benaki Museum - Finopoulos Collection.

the Middle East, principally for religious reasons. Moreover, the fact that Erasmus was those who laid the groundwork of classical philology within the framework of Christian Humanism also became a driving force behind these travels.

The routes varied depending on the travelers' interests. It was easier to access the most visited lands in Europe but not as easy to travel to other destinations in the Eastern Mediterranean. At that time, travel books concerning the Ottoman Empire written in European languages were published. From the 18th century onwards many of these were translated into other languages and thus their various editions helped travelers on their journeys.

The volume *In Search of Andros* includes 471 pages of travel descriptions, images and maps focusing on the island of Andros, produced by more than 70 travelers. The texts are translated into

Greek with accompanying commentaries by researchers. The one who initially conceived this work and from whose vast collection the books and engravings have been mainly drawn was the collector Efstathios J. Finopoulos, who did not live long enough to see his vision realized. This Finopoulos Collection includes 20.000 volumes of books and 5.000 maps and prints, and it is located in Benaki Museum in Athens. It was he who selected the books in this volume, in his quest to contribute to our knowledge of the history of Andros. In addition to the texts, there are also engravings and maps that make the collection very interesting. All are arranged in chronological order. Each entry provides their author's name, some basic information about their life and *oeuvre*, as well as information about the book from which the quote, picture, drawing, or map originates, followed by brief excerpts of translated text.

The comprehensive introduction to the volume and the laborious work of its scientific editing is owed to the philologist and paleographer Dr. Maria Yiouroukou. The authors and translators are many and have produced a very extensive volume which amounts to a small treasure for researchers and connoisseurs of travel literature alike; especially so for those who are interested in delving into various aspects of the Mediterranean in these centuries: indeed, without these travelers we would have limited knowledge on many subjects.

Several authors are featured in this book, beginning with Cristoforo Buondelmonti who was educated in classical studies and became interested in geography and cartography. He traveled to the Aegean islands in 1414 and resided in Rhodos until 1420. He traveled to Andros in 1419 and compiled the first known map of the island. He was the first cartographer who visited the isles and produced maps of them. At the same time, he made some notes on the geography and history of the isles.

The final contribution to the volume is by the Romanian archaeologist and historian Teofil Sauciuc-Săveanu, who visited the island in the years 1910-1912 and wrote a dissertation which focused on Andros' ancient history and the archaeological findings that had been unearthed from the excavations until that time.

Women of the island of Andros. A. L. Castellan, *Turkey, being a description of the manners,* London 1821. © Benaki Museum - Finopoulos Collection.

Among the well-known travelers who wrote books that others read and used as travel guides on their journeys, we will mention some of them in order to exemplify the intellectual breadth of those who traveled. They left behind them important pieces of knowledge about the island across many different fields and time periods, often contained within the same book, thus providing us with a holistic viewpoint of the island.

J. Pitton de Tournefort (1656-1708) was a French botanist who remained in Andros for ten days in November 1700. His three-volume edition entitled *Relation d' un voyage du Levant* (1717), a work containing numerous fine engravings, including a copper engraving with women of Andros as well as a map of the island, would become a travelogue for many travelers in the Mediterranean who used it as a reference book. He analyzed the history of the island since ancient times, describes its productive capacities, its administrative features and its religious organization. He also visited a monastery and described the service as well as the people who attended it. Much like the Swede Carl von Linné, who has been influenced by Tournefort in his botanical pursuits, he produces long systematic descriptions in the same spirit as other traveling botanists.

There are other travelers who became famous in their time for different reasons, such as Pasch van Krienen. He claimed to have unearthed Homer's tomb on the isle of Ios, something which is also referenced in Rigas Velestinlis' famous *Carta of Greece* (1797). In May 1772 he transported the tombstone to Livorno in Italy, where he met the Swedish orientalist and traveler Jacob Jonas Björnståhl. The latter provides us with an extensive description of van Krienen, who had shown him copies of inscriptions that were on the tombstones. Björnståhl informed him that the letters on the tombstones in fact belonged to an alphabet which was in usage long after Homer.

Another traveler was Benjamin Mary, a diplomatic representative of the Kingdom of Belgium in Athens between 1830 and 1844. During this period, he traveled to various regions in Greece but also to Smyrna, Constantinople, Cyprus and Egypt, where he drew the portraits of people he met, both famous and not. During his stay in Andros, Mary produced the portrait of the abbot of the Panachrantou monastery. In 2020 (English ed. 2021) an excellent publication was produced by the Sylvia Ioannou Foundation and the Historical and Ethnological Society of Greece, under the title *History Has a Face - Figures of 1821 in Othonian Greece by the Belgian Diplomat Benjamin Mary* – an edition containing the portraits of people he had met during the years he was in Greece.

Jean Baptiste-Gaspar de Viloisson was a Hellenist and a philologist. He was also a member of the French Academy in Paris which, among other things, published the Homeric Lexicon of the Iliad and the Odyssey by Apollonius the Sophist. He traveled to Greece and Asia Minor between 1784 and 1786. He described various customs from Andros associated with wedding feasts and collected material about the dialect spoken on the island. He also provided insights into its various products, how its people lived, how they dressed and how they congregated to conduct business.

Two women presented among these travelers originate from England and Denmark respectively. Lady Elisabeth Graven, an English writer and noble, traveled to Europe in 1783-1786 and remained for two days in Andros. Her notes about the isle were published in her book *A journey through the Crimea to Constantinople* (1789), which also contains a

copper plate depicting a bay as well as a monastery. The Dane Christiane Luth (1806-1859) was the wife of the Queen of Greece's personal pastor who resided in Greece between 1839 and 1852. Throughout her stay she kept a diary with her everyday life in Athens and also compiled notes about her travels that she had made in Greece. She came to Andros on two different occasions in 1845 and 1846. She described her walks on the island and how she experienced the islanders. She meets the priest Theofilos Kairis (1784-1852), a distinguished Greek enlightener who founded a school for orphans, and was later accused by the Church of having taught philosophy instead of theology. Luth describes both him, the children and the school.

Among the geographers who traveled to Greece and wrote about their journeys is Albert Philippson (1864 – 1953), a professor in Bonn who stayed at various regions of Greece, beginning in 1887. He cross-fertilized geography with field studies, diligently analyzing the manner by which the people, the areas they resided in and their customs and practices were all interconnected. With respect to Andros he provided detailed information on the geography of the island, its people and the means they employed to exploit its land through agriculture. The volume includes excerpts from Philippson's account that have been translated into Greek, which provide us with vivid descriptions of the island during the time he was there.

The completion of this book required many researchers, translators, language editors and image curators to collaborate in order to achieve the excellent result we see before us. The copious references to publications, archives and databases make this volume not merely a work on the history of Andros over four centuries, but also an exceptional example that should be emulated by all those who seek to produce similar publications on other places in Greece.

Vassilios Sabatakakis
Associate Professor in Modern Greek Studies, Lund University

Contributors

Lambros Baltsiotis is an Assistant Professor of History of Minorities in the Balkans at Panteion University (Athens). His main scientific interests are linguistic and religious diversity and citizenship in Greece and the Balkans, migration, Roma, minorities and ethnicity issues in the nation-state. A number of his publications focus on institutional and legal changes related to minorities, population movements and citizenship in the 19th and 20th centuries Balkans. His current research projects include the History of Gypsies in the Greek state.

Maria Kalinowska is professor at the Faculty of "Artes Liberales" of the University of Warsaw. She is the historian of Polish literature and the author of many books on the Romanticism, Philhellenism and Romantic reception of Greek culture and classical antiquity, among them *Mowa i milczenie – romantyczne antynomie samotności* [Speech and Silence: Romantic Antinomies of Solitude] (1989); *Grecja romantyków. Studia nad obrazem Grecji w literaturze romantycznej* [Greece of the Romantics: Studies on the Image of Greece in Romantic Literature] (1994), and a new edition of Juliusz Słowacki's *Journey to the Holy Land from Naples* (2011). She heads the editorial team of a series devoted to Philhellenism in Poland and one to Sparta in Polish culture. She is the co-editor of many joint publications, for example: *Filhellenizm w Polsce. Rekonesans* [Philhellenism in Poland. Reconnaissance], Warszawa 2007; *Filhellenizm w Polsce. Wybrane tematy* [Philhellenism in Poland. Selected Themes], Warszawa 2012; *Sparta w kulturze polskiej. Część 1: Model recepcji, spojrzenie europejskie, konteksty greckie* [Sparta in Polish Culture. Part 1: Reception Model, European View, Greek Contexts], Warszawa 2014; *Sparta w kulturze polskiej. Część 2: Przekroje, syntezy, konteksty* [Sparta in Polish Culture. Part 2: Sections, Synthesis, Contexts], Warszawa 2015; *Wolność albo śmierć. Polscy filhelleni i powstanie greckie 1821 / Freedom or Death: Polish Philhellenes and the Greek Uprising of 1821*. Published on the Bicentenary of the Greek Revolution**,** Warszawa 2021. In 2020 she obtained a Lord Byron Medal from the Society of Hellenism and Philhellenism in Athens.

George Kalpadakis is a Researcher at the Modern Greek History Research Center of the Academy of Athens (KEINE), specializing in foreign policy and institution-building in Southeast Europe. In 2021-22 he was a Fulbright Scholar at the Center for European Studies at Harvard University and in 2015-17 he was a Visiting Scholar at the Centre of Development Studies at the University of Cambridge. His books include *The Macedonian Dispute, 1962-1995* (2012; Academy of Athens Award 2013) and *The Cyprus conflict, 1954-1974* (2021). He holds degrees from University College London (BSc Honours), the London School of Economics and Political Science (MSc) and the University of Athens (PhD).

Charis Messis holds a PhD in Byzantine Studies from Écoles des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales in Paris and an habilitation from the Sorbonne University. He now teaches Byzantine literature at the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens and is a researcher within the research programme Retracing Connections (https://retracingconnections.org/). His research interests concern Byzantine history and literature, especially the history of gender, along with other social and anthropological aspects of the Byzantine world.

Sandro Nikolaishvili is a post-doctoral researcher at the Centre for Medieval Literature (University of Southern Denmark) and a member of research programme *Retracing Connections: Byzantine Storyworlds in Greek, Arabic, Georgian, and Old Slavonic (c. 950 – c. 1100)*. He has obtained Ph.D. (2019) and MA (2011) degrees in Medieval Studies from *Central European University (CEU)*. His primary interest is Byzantine and Georgian cultural and political relations and the Eastern Mediterranean and Caucasian history.

Ingela Nilsson is Professor of Greek and Byzantine Studies at Uppsala University and PI of the research programme Retracing Connections (https://retracingconnections.org/). She has a particular interest in storytelling and narratological approaches to Byzantine literature. Recent publications include *Writer and Occasion in Twelfth-Century Byzantium:*

The Authorial Voice of Constantine Manasses (2021) and *Spoliation as Translation: Medieval Worlds of the Eastern Mediterranean* (ed. with Ivana Jevtić, 2021).

Vassilios Sabatakakis is an Associate Professor in Modern Greek Studies at Lund University and his research concerns the language and literature of Byzantine heroic poetry, Renaissance poetry and travel literature. He has been the co-recipient of a grant from the Swedish Research Council for the interdisciplinary project, "J. J. Björnståhls travels in Europe and Constantinople, 1767-1779," which focuses on the work of the Swedish traveler, Orientalist and Hellenist J. J. Björnståhl, 1731-1779 (Makadam förlag 2021). He is currently working on the publication of the unpublished travel journal of the Swedish pastor A. F. Sturtzenbecker, who travelled to the Greek-speaking lands in 1784.

Ioannis Tzortzis holds a PhD in Political Science from the University of Birmingham, UK, where he is a Teaching Fellow. He has also taught at the Universities of Leicester and, recently, Reading. His research interests include Modern Greek and European History and Politics, Cold War studies, and Comparative Democratization, subjects on which he has published in numerous journals such as Democratization, European Security, Turkish Studies, Southern European and Black Sea Studies, and Comparative Southern and Eastern European Studies. He is the author of 'Greek Democracy and the Junta' (I.B. Tauris, 2020) and his most recent book 'Elites and Democratic Transition by Regime Transformation in Southern Europe' has just been published by Palgrave/MacMillan.