Papers from the First and Second Postgraduate Forums in Byzantine Studies: *Sailing to Byzantium*

Papers from the First and Second Postgraduate Forums in Byzantine Studies: *Sailing to Byzantium*

Edited by

Savvas Neocleous

CAMBRIDGE SCHOLARS PUBLISHING

Papers from the First and Second Postgraduate Forums in Byzantine Studies: *Sailing to Byzantium*,
Edited by Savvas Neocleous

This book first published 2009

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-4438-1102-5, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-1102-6

To my parents, Constantinos and Despo,
as a very small token of my gratitude
for their love and support over the years

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures.....ix

List of Tables.....xi

Acknowledgments.....xiii

Introduction.....1
Savvas Neocleous

Part I: History and Historiography

Byzantium and Jerusalem, 813-975: From Indifference to Intervention.....7
Konstantinos Ikonomopoulos

Is the Contemporary Latin Historiography of the First Crusade and Its Aftermath "Anti-Byzantine"?.....27
Savvas Neocleous

Anti-Byzantine Polemic in the *Dei Gesta per Francos* of Guibert, Abbot of Nogent-Sous-Coucy.....53
Léan Ní Chléirigh

Part II: Theology

Anianus Celedensis Translator of John Chrysostom's *Homilies on Matthew*: A Pelagian Interpretation?.....77
Emilio Bonfiglio

Eriugena's Use of Byzantine Biblical Exegesis in His Commentary on the Fourth Gospel.....105
Dan Batovici

Part III: Philology and Literature

The *Florilegium Coislinianum* and Byzantine Encyclopaedism.....127
Tomás Fernández

The Circulation of Poetry in Eleventh-Century Byzantium.....145
Floris Bernard

Part IV: Politics and Rhetoric

Advice and Praise for the Ruler: Making Political Strategies in Manuel II Palaiologos's *Dialogue on Marriage*.....163
Florin Leonte

Part V: History of Art and Cult

Christ and the Angelic Tetramorphs: The Meaning of the Eighth-Century Apsidal Conch at Santa Maria Antiqua in Rome.....183
Eileen Rubery

"Frankish" or "Byzantine" Saint? The Origins of the Cult of Saint Martin in Dalmatia.....221
Trpimir Vedriš

Contributors.....251

Index.....253

LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. 7-1: Vat. Gr. 676, fol. iv. Reproduced by permission of the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana.....151

Fig. 7-2: Vat. Gr. 676, fol. 26v. Reproduced by permission of the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana.....157

Fig. 9-1: The apse fresco at Santa Maria Antiqua (757-67). Christ stands in the centre; to his right the square halo of Pope Paul I (757-67) is still visible (see arrow); between him and Christ the edge of a further halo is just visible, even though most of the body is missing; either side, are two tetramorphs, each with four nimbed heads and six wings. Drawing by E. Rubery.....185

Fig. 9-2: Detail of tetramorph angel on the right side of the apse fresco at Santa Maria Antiqua showing the four heads, six wings, hands, feet and trolley/chariot. Drawing by E. Rubery.....187

Fig. 9-3: Detail of the head of the tetramorph from the apse fresco at Santa Maria Antiqua. The fine lines around the edge of the haloes and wings and radiating out from the halo of the angel are drawn in black, but are in fact white lines in the fresco. Drawing by E. Rubery.....187

Fig. 9-4: The sixth-century apse mosaic at Santi Cosma e Damiano. The rectangular dotted line encloses the compositional arrangement that can be considered as contributing to the central section of the Santa Maria Antiqua conch. Drawing by E. Rubery.....189

Fig. 9-5: The sixth-century apse mosaic at San Michele in Africisco, Ravenna (now at the Bode Museum, Berlin). Christ in the centre is flanked by the archangels Gabriel and Michael. The sides of the arch originally included images of Santi Cosma e Damiano. Drawing by E. Rubery.....192

Fig. 9-6: The sixth-century apse at San Vitale, Ravenna, with Christ, seated on a globe and holding a scroll, offering a martyr's wreath to San Vitale, and flanked by two unnamed angels. The bishop of Ravenna on the right holds a model of the church, which he offers to Christ. Drawing by E. Rubery.....193

Fig. 9-7: The apse at San Dodo in Georgia, possibly seventh century, with an enthroned Christ in a mandorla, the tetramorph and archangel on the right are hidden by the curve of the apse. Either side of the head of Christ are clipei containing images of the Sun (on the left) and Moon (on the right). There is a small apical "palanquin of heaven" from which rays may emerge but probably no hand of God or laurel wreath. Drawing by E. Rubery….....194

Fig. 9-8: Detail of the right tetramorph in the apse at San Dodo, Georgia, showing the wheels, trolley/chariot, hands, feet and fire. Drawing by E. Rubery.....195

Fig. 9-9: Christ in a mandorla supported by a tetramorph and two angels from the Ascension page of the Rabbula Gospels (sixth century). Christ is nimbed but not with a cruciform nimbus, and contained within the mandorla except where his right foot touches the wing of the tetramorph. Medicaean-Laurentian Library, Florence. Plut 1, 56. Drawing by E. Rubery.....196

Fig. 9-10: Tetramorph from the centre of a ripidium or liturgical fan from the time of Justin II (565-78), which is now in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection, 16.23. Washington D. C. (sixth century). Drawing by E. Rubery.....197

Fig. 9-11: Manuscript illumination of the Vision of Isaiah, from the *Christian Topography of Cosmas Indicopleustes*, Vat. Grec. 699 in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Christ is flanked by two seraphim, each with six wings. To the right an angel places a coal in the mouth of Isaiah. Drawing by E. Rubery.....200

Fig. 10-1: Late Antique Dalmatia and Early Medieval Croatia.....225

Fig. 10-2: Late Antique sites connected to the cult of St Martin in the surroundings of Zadar.....231

Fig. 10-3: The church of St Martin in Pridraga (Photo: T. Vedriš).....233

Fig. 10-4: Late Antique-Early Byzantine churches of St Martin along the *limes marritimus* in Dalmatia.....238

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4-1: Manuscripts preserving Anianus's translation of John Chrysostom's *Commentary on Matthew*.....82-3

Table 4-2: Manuscripts used by R. Skalitzky in her critical edition of Anianus.....83-4

Table 9-1: The relationship between the Evangelists and the four living creatures according to Irenaeus, Jerome and Gregory the Great.....203

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to the following referees who reviewed papers submitted for publication in this volume:

Professor Leslie Brubaker
Professor Alexander Beihammer
Professor Niels Gaul
Professor Wolfram Hörandner
Dr Jonathan Harris
Dr Ruth Macrides
Dr Tom Asbridge
Dr Maria G. Parani
Dr Stavroula Constantinou
Dr Barbara Crostini

INTRODUCTION

In October 2006 I conceived the idea of an international forum for postgraduate students and early-career researchers working in the field of Byzantine Studies. A conference to that effect, *Sailing to Byzantium,* was hosted by the Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, Trinity College Dublin, on 17-18 April 2007. The title, of course, was drawn from the poem of William Butler Yeats but it reflected not just a fortuitous link with Irish literature but the aim of the symposium, which was to present a challenging and fruitful journey to Byzantium through the eyes of a new generation of scholars who have chosen its history and culture as their research focus. Furthermore, in an era when the usefulness of interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary studies has been fully appreciated, this symposium was designed to bring together postgraduate researchers from various areas of Byzantine Studies, providing them an all-too-rare occasion to present their research, exchange new ideas, and meet, in an interdisciplinary context, people with whom they share the same research interests.

The First Postgraduate Forum in Byzantine Studies: *Sailing to Byzantium* was opened on 17 April 2007 by the Head of the Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, Dr Sarah Alyn Stacey. Dr Jonathan Harris of Royal Holloway, University of London, provided the opening lecture: "Playing the Endgame: New Approaches to Byzantium's Last Century." The following day, twelve papers on many diverse facets of Byzantine Studies were delivered by researchers from various universities across Europe: the University of Oxford (Exeter College, Pembroke College, Keble College, Linacre College); Trinity College Dublin; Ghent University; Queen's University Belfast; Courtauld Institute of Art; Royal Holloway University of London; and University of Bucharest.

Motivated by the success of the 2007 conference, the following year saw the Second Postgraduate Forum in Byzantine Studies: *Sailing to Byzantium* again hosted by the Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, Trinity College Dublin, on 15-16 May 2008. Dr Ruth Macrides of the University of Birmingham delivered the plenary lecture, entitled "Ceremonies and the City: Constantinople and the Court in the Fourteenth Century." Thirteen papers were presented by researchers from the University of Paris 1 Pantheon-Sorbonne; the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven; Trinity College Dublin; Queen's University Belfast; Royal Holloway University of London; University of Silesia, Katowice; Central European University, Budapest; and Anadolu University, Eskişehir.

Recognising that the two conferences had brought together much that was fresh in Byzantine Studies, but also the relatively large number of contributions, the decision was made to publish in this volume a selected number of essays based on

the conference papers. All the essays submitted for publication were reviewed by appropriately selected academic referees and those agreed to meet the required academic standards are published in this volume.

We begin with Konstantinos Ikonomopoulos's study on the relations between the Byzantine Empire and the city of Jerusalem in the period 813-975. As Ikonomopoulos argues, in this period the relations between the Byzantine Empire and Jerusalem went through a distinct evolution, traceable in distinct timeframes and taking on specific aspects. They began with an attitude of indifference and hostility during iconoclasm, shown in the exchanges between the city and the Amorian emperors, especially Theophilos (829-42), to one of looking at Jerusalem as a prestige objective, useful for legitimising various aspects of the emperors' rule, as seen during the reigns of Basil I (867-86) and Leo VI (886-912). Finally, the city became a target for military conquest in the middle of the tenth century after the reign of Constantine VII (913-59), with Jerusalem being seen as one of the main targets of the Byzantine campaigns against the Muslims in Syria.

My essay revisits a view prevailing in modern scholarship, namely that the Latin historiography of the First Crusade and its aftermath is "anti-Byzantine" or "anti-Greek". Making full use of a wide range of primary sources written during the first four decades of the twelfth century, I attempt to demonstrate the falsity of this thesis, which has long been perpetuated in an uncritical way by modern scholars. At the same time, I argue that the Greeks, who lived within or outside the confines of the Byzantine Empire, were generally regarded by the Latins as Christian brethren.

Léan Ní Chléirigh traces the attitudes of Guibert, Abbot of Nogent-sous-Coucy, towards the Byzantines and their emperor Alexios I Komnenos as can be seen in his chronicle of the First Crusade, *Dei Gesta per Francos*. Guibert, along with his contemporaries, Robert the Monk and Baldric of Dol, has been largely overlooked as a source for the First Crusade as his chronicle was largely derivative of its source, the anonymous *Gesta Francorum*. As a source for Western attitudes towards the Byzantines in the immediate aftermath of the First Crusade and its tributary Crusade of 1101, the *Dei Gesta* is extremely important however. Léan Ní Chléirigh argues that in the *Dei Gesta* Guibert criticised the Eastern Christians and their emperor on a religious, political and ethnic basis.

Emilio Bonfiglio's article presents an outline of the translation procedure followed by Anianus Celedensis in rendering the Greek text of John Chrysostom into Latin. As past scholarship has demonstrated that Anianus considers himself to be a Pelagian, Bonfiglio questions whether Anianus manipulated the original Greek text to make Chrysostom a champion of Pelagianism. An analysis of selected passages of Anianus's Latin translation of the ninth homily of Chrysostom's *Commentary on Matthew* shows that, although small changes in the Latin version often affect the syntax and the imagery of the Greek original,

Anianus's version for the present can be explained more as stylistically rather than ideologically conditioned.

Dan Batovici investigates the way Eriugena presents and uses his Greek sources, the analysis being centered on three authors: Pseudo-Dionysus, Gregory of Nazianzus and Maximus the Confessor. Batovici's essay also contains a brief account of the perspectives on both Eriugenian biblical exegesis and Eriugena's use of the Greek Fathers in past scholarship, before moving to the investigation on the *Commentary on the Gospel of John*. As such, the paper concludes that Eriugena is far from being a sheer presenter of the Byzantine biblical exegesis: he is as present in citing as he is present in interpreting a given source.

In his paper, Tomás Fernández presents the concept of Byzantine Encyclopaedism, focusing on one work that should be numbered among "Byzantine encyclopaedias", the *Florilegium Coislinianum*. Fernández briefly discusses its sources and structure, and then proceeds to a detailed comparison between this florilegium and one that almost certainly was its formal model, the well-known *Sacra Parallela*, attributed to John Damascene. As Fernández concludes, this latter work has very likely been not only a structural influence but also, in its original, non-preserved recension, a source for large portions of the text of the *Florilegium Coislinianum*.

Floris Bernard investigates the various conditions of circulation and reception of poems in eleventh-century Byzantium. Bernard discusses the aesthetic principles by which the poetry books of Mauropous and Christophoros Mitylenaios were constructed, and traces some other, earlier, collections of poems. The initial circulation of separate poems in a limited circle of readers is illustrated by some examples in Mauropous and Mitylenaios, with attention for the social consequences of being included in the readership of poems. Bernard further gives a preliminary sketch of a poetic event by Mauropous, in which the offering of a poem in material form went hand in hand with oral delivery.

Florin Leonte explores the political implications of the *Dialogue with the Empress-Mother on Marriage*, authored by Manuel II Palaiologos (1391-1425). Leonte argues that, despite its domestic topic, the *Dialogue* was not just a piece of rhetoric intended exclusively for the entertainment of a gathering of connoisseurs from the imperial court. Instead, it focuses on the discussion between the emperor and his mother which pertains to practical and theoretical aspects of state administration. By bridging orality and highbrow rhetoric, Manuel II Palaiologos seemingly tries to convey a message of legitimising his own authority against internal threats of usurpation coming especially from his nephew John VII Palaiologos (1390), an internal ally of the Ottomans.

A surviving fresco in Rome commissioned by Pope Paul I (757-67) depicts him being presented to an imposing Christ flanked by two tetramorph angels. This fresco occupies the apsidal conch of the church of Santa Maria Antiqua in the

Roman Forum. Notwithstanding its unusual iconography, this fresco has not previously been critically analysed. Eileen Rubery places the fresco, for a first time, in its artistic context in both Rome and the East, and then considers it within the frame of contemporary political concerns in Rome during the papacy's debate with the Eastern Empire over iconoclasm. The developing writings of the Church Fathers on images, and the role of the Eastern monks in Rome at the time are also taken into account.

Departing from the traditional historical narrative that the areas along the eastern Adriatic coast were under Byzantine rule from at least the age of Justinian (527-65) until the late eleventh century, Trpimir Vedriš focuses on the local hagiotopography in order to address the problem of the chronological layers of the cult of St Martin of Tours and the directions of its dissemination in the region. Critically assessing the "Carolingian thesis" according to which the cult of St Martin was introduced in Dalmatia only by the Franks in the ninth century, Vedriš constructs a more complex picture in which substantial importance is given to the lasting results of Justinian's *reconquista*. As a result, Frankish promotion of the cult is seen as yet another aspect of a Carolingian *renovatio* which actually preserved many features of cultural and religious continuity.

The ten essays contained in this volume, as well as the fifteen more that were presented at Dublin in 2007 and 2008, demonstrate that a new generation of scholars are carrying out a laborious task of painstakingly reinvigorating the field of Byzantine Studies with fresh perspectives.

Savvas Neocleous
Trinity College Dublin

Part I: History and Historiography

BYZANTIUM AND JERUSALEM, 813-975: FROM INDIFFERENCE TO INTERVENTION

KONSTANTINOS IKONOMOPOULOS

The policy of the Byzantine Empire concerning the city of Jerusalem during the years 813 to 975 went through a process of evolution, ranging from almost total indifference in the beginning, seeing the city as a distant objective, to active intervention aiming at its capture during the end of the tenth century. This evolution had distinct phases, with interest in Jerusalem steadily increasing, until direct action was taken against its Muslim masters. The year 813 was chosen as the start since it was the year during which Michael the Synkellos of Jerusalem visited Constantinople on his way to Rome, while the year 975 as the end because it was the year that the purported campaign of John I Tzimiskes (969-76) against Fatimid-held Jerusalem took place. The various episodes in the years in-between these show how imperial policy changed; there are no sources setting out exactly what it was, so we have to rely on secondary information, which is available in differing quality and quantity, however it all points to increasing Byzantine power attempting to reclaim the Holy City of Christendom. An important fact that should be noted in the beginning is that Byzantine diplomacy towards both the Abbasid (and by extension the Tulunids) and the Fatimid caliphates during this period never involved Jerusalem, especially since it could be considered "essentially 'reactive' and 'prophylactic'",[1] meaning that concessions in the city were not pursued during the timeframe covered, although the situation changed a lot in the eleventh century.

Michael, the synkellos of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, was sent to Constantinople in 813 with

> a letter to the patriarch in Constantinople, Theodotos by name, who was leader of the heresy of the image-burners, and to the Emperor Leo [Leo V (813-20)] of Armenian descent that they might perhaps be able to turn them away from the

[1] Hugh Kennedy, "Byzantine-Arab Diplomacy in the Near East from the Islamic Conquests to the Mid-Eleventh Century," in *Byzantine Diplomacy*, eds Jonathan Shepard and Simon Franklin (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1992), 133.

> heresy of the icon-fighters and lead them to the catholic, apostolic, and orthodox Church.[2]

The imperial capital, however, was only a stop before his final destination, the Holy See in Rome, where his mission was to consult with Pope Leo III (795-816) on the *Filioque* clause, as well as to raise funds to pay for a new tax that the "godless Hagarenes"[3] had levied on the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and others in Jerusalem. The reasons for his embassy to Rome are important in establishing the initial indifference of Constantinople towards Jerusalem. The fact that he had to travel all the way to Rome in order to get financial help clearly suggests that he was unable to secure it in Byzantium, as the empire was unwilling to get help, so funds to pay for fines and repair damaged churches would have to be sought from the West, either from the papacy or the Carolingian Empire.[4] The empire was not unable, as it had done so two years earlier, when Christian refugees from Palestine were fleeing the fighting and persecution there. The Emperor Michael I (811-13) had given them money and shelter within the empire.[5] This time though, the monks sent by Jerusalem were apparently met with complete indifference as to their plight, and the most probable reason is the only reason for their stop in Constantinople: iconoclasm.

Christian churches outside of the empire never accepted the doctrine of not venerating and destroying icons. Indeed, with the exception of the capital, the veneration of icons carried on more or less as usual. The monks who came from Jerusalem, carrying letters of rebuke were clearly an annoyance to the emperor. This is evident from the reaction to Michael the Synkellos's mission: after gaining an audience with the Emperor Leo V, his castigation of iconoclasm enraged the emperor so badly that he had him and his companions "beaten severely and confined within the prison of the Phiale."[6] The exasperation felt towards them was also expressed by the Emperor Theophilos (829-42) in the following conversation with the companions of Michael, Theophanes and Theodore:

---

[2] *The Life of Michael the Synkellos*, trans. Mary Cunningham (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 1991), 58-9.
[3] Ibid., 56-7.
[4] Klaus Bieberstein, "Der Gesandtenaustausch zwischen Karl dem Grossen und Hārūn ar-Rašid und seine Bedeutung für die Kirchen Jerusalems," *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 109 (1993); Michael Borgolte, *Der Gesandtenaustausch der Karolinger mit den Abbasiden und mit den Patriarchen von Jerusalem* (Munich: Arbeo-Gesellschaft, 1976).
[5] Theophanes the Confessor, *Χρονογραφία*, ed. Carl de Boor, vol. 1 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1883-5), 499.
[6] *The Life of Michael the Synkellos*, 68-9.

> He asked "where do you come from?" and they replied "from Palestine." And the criminal then said "why then do you obey the rulers of your land but when you come here you do not follow our kingship?"[7]

This dialogue shows two important facts: that while the Byzantine emperor recognised Jerusalem, as a physical location, was under the rule of the caliphate, he still considered its Christian inhabitants to be subjects of the Byzantine Empire. This notion is reinforced if Byzantine court ritual is seen in context. It is evident that Michael's party were not treated as ambassadors sent from a foreign power, (be it the caliphate or the Patriarchate of Jerusalem) and were treated as any imperial citizen would, especially when their fate and the diplomatic protocol are contrasted. The Palestinian priests were subjected to lengthy imprisonment, as mentioned above, exile, while the two brothers Theophanes and Theodore were further humiliated and tortured by having their faces tattooed with iambic verses for not communicating with the iconoclasts.[8]

Behaviour such as this towards foreign dignitaries was quite unusual in the Byzantine court. Other discrepancies with the protocol are also apparent in the priests' audience with the emperor. The whole audience ritual was scripted and controlled to the last detail as we know from two particular sources, the Kletorologion of Philotheos,[9] written in the ninth century, and the later work of the Emperor Constantine VII (913-59) on court ritual,[10] to which the entirety of the Kletorologion is appended. Obviously the former work is more relevant to the time period of Michael's visit as they were both of the ninth century (albeit with a difference of seventy years), however the inclusion of Philotheos's work in *De Cerimoniis* means that court ritual did not significantly change, if at all. Once the foreign dignitary was admitted to the presence of the emperor he had to prostrate himself,[11] and then enter into specific dialogue with a court official, the

---

[7] George the Monk Continuatus, *Βίοι τῶν νέων βασιλέων*, ed. Emmanuel Bekker (Bonn: Weber, 1838), 806-7.

[8] Ibid., 807; *The Life of Michael the Synkellos*, 84-7; Joseph Genesios, *Regum Libri Quattuor*, eds Anni Lesmüller-Werner and Hans Thurn (Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 1978), 52. For further information on the lives of the two brothers and Michael the Synkellos, see Claudia Sode, *Jerusalem-Konstantinopel-Rom Die Viten des Michael Synkellos und der Brüder Graptoi* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2001).

[9] Nicolas Oikonomides, *Les listes de préséance Byzantines des IXe et Xe siècles* (Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1972).

[10] Constantine Porphyrogennitos, *De Cerimoniis Aulae Byzantinae*, ed. Johann Jacob Reiske (Bonn: Weber, 1829-30).

[11] Jonathan Shepard, "Byzantine Diplomacy, A.D. 800-1204: Means and Ends," in *Byzantine Diplomacy*, eds Jonathan Shepard and Simon Franklin (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1992), 71.

logothete.[12] The Palestinian priests did no such thing. They stood, *ἔστησαν ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βασιλέως*,[13] instead of prostrating themselves, and they also entered into direct conversation with Leo V instead of addressing the *logothete* as any foreign envoy would. The same exact pattern occurred in their audience with Theophilos.[14] This discrepancy between official protocol and the actions of the Palestinian emissaries suggests that the Byzantine emperors considered these priests not as envoys of a foreign power,[15] but rather as imperial citizens living under foreign rule. Of course we have to be clear that an hagiographical source might not be wholly truthful in its account, especially since in 813 iconoclasm had not been re-introduced, and that the author of the *vita* of Michael might not have wanted his protagonist debase himself in front of a heretical emperor, but the breaches in protocol are quite clear, as is the fact that these people (and in extension those whom they were representing) were thought of as rebellious imperial subjects. The fate of Lazaros, a Byzantine icon maker who was tortured using similar methods further reinforces the opinion that these men were thought of as imperial subjects. It should be noted that all of these men were foreigners: the Graptoi brothers were from Palestine and Lazaros was a Chazar.[16]

Another piece of evidence showing the interaction between Constantinople and Jerusalem in the mid-ninth century is a letter by the three Eastern patriarchs to the Emperor Theophilos concerning iconoclasm, written after a purported synod held in Jerusalem during 836.[17] The letter's authenticity is in doubt, and it is thought that it was a Byzantine forgery. Griffith argues that the letter was a literary product of Byzantium and that there is no evidence of traffic between Jerusalem and Constantinople in the ninth century.[18] While the issue of its authenticity is far from resolved and outside this paper's scope, a Byzantine forgery in the name of the patriarch of Jerusalem illustrates the views held by Byzantium concerning the city

[12] Constantine Porphyrogennitos, *De Cerimoniis*, vol. 1, 680.
[13] *The Life of Michael the Synkellos*, 62-3.
[14] Ibid., 82-3.
[15] For example, Papal emissaries had their own paragraph detailing their reception, while the representatives of the Eastern Patriarchates did not, nor were they listed amongst other powers.
[16] Cyril Mango, "The Liquidation of Iconoclasm and the Patriarch Photios," in *Iconoclasm. Papers Given at the Ninth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies. University of Birmingham, March 1975*, eds Anthony Bryer and Judith Herrin (Birmingham: Centre for Byzantine Studies University of Birmingham, 1977), 134.
[17] *The Letter of the Three Patriarchs to Emperor Theophilos and Related Texts*, eds Joseph Munitiz et al. (Camberley: Porphyrogenitus, 1997).
[18] Stanley Griffith, "What has Constantinople to do with Jerusalem? Palestine in the Ninth Century: Byzantine Orthodoxy in the World of Islam," in *Byzantium in the Ninth Century: Dead or Alive?*, ed. Leslie Brubaker (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), 183.

even better, as it shows the ideal way that Jerusalem would interact with and think of the empire in general, and the person of the emperor in particular. The Emperor Theophilos is addressed as

> the most powerful emperor, advanced by God, supported by God, crowned by God, *solemnly crowned in glory and honour* by the divine ... powerful and almighty ... victorious, triumphant, eternal Augustus and God-honoured despot.[19]

This is the same emperor who had tortured and imprisoned the envoys of the patriarch of Jerusalem before, and who was still considered an iconoclast heretic. While Theophilos and his predecessors were given the title of *basileus* by Michael's biographer, thus showing that the Melkites still considered themselves to be, at least nominally, under the emperor's power, they were also referred to as heretics and criminals, and the letter entrusted to Michael by the patriarch of Jerusalem was much harsher in its tone than the one of the three patriarchs. Also, it is quite hard to reconcile the fact that an emperor considered a heretic would be referred to as supported and crowned by God, especially in a letter trying to advise him in the error of his religious ways, thus showing that it probably originated in Constantinople and followed official form of address.

By calling upon divine favour for Theophilos's rule, the letter contradicts the impression given by the earlier mission of Michael the Synkellos, which had the exact same goal. It serves to legitimise the emperor's position as the ruler of all Eastern Christians, as mention is made of the "entire great catholic and apostolic Church,"[20] and that the three patriarchs were his "humble and true servants [and] proclaim the praises of [his] imperial grandeur."[21] The most important passage in the letter though, at least as far as this paper is concerned, is the one where Theophilos is called upon to liberate the Eastern Christians from the Muslims. It is clearly written that he "shall hold sway in the midst of [his] enemies."[22] There is also mention of his victories over the Arabs and the expectation that even though Jerusalem belonged to a barbarian enemy there was "hope for the former state of our imperial happiness and most tranquil life to be restored once more."[23] With the established hostility existing between the empire and the Christians in the east over iconoclasm, it is difficult to believe that they would have wanted to be governed by a heretical emperor, especially given the treatment of iconophiles inside the empire. The notion that the letter was a forgery is further strengthened by the fact that Theophilos was waging an offensive against the Arabs at the time the letter

[19] *The Letter of the Three Patriarchs*, 2-3. Emphasis added.
[20] Ibid., 10-11.
[21] Ibid., 12-13.
[22] Ibid.
[23] Ibid., 14-15.

was written (836), and it would serve as a great propaganda tool for him to appear as the saviour and ruler of all Christians, who were impatiently waiting for him to be liberated. A letter by them lauding the emperor and submitting to him would have been a great coup for him. The letter, forgery or not, shows that despite the indifference shown towards Jerusalem, a theoretical movement to liberate it had started to appear, even if at this stage it was still in its infancy and primarily used for internal consumption. It also shows that there was a need to be approved by Jerusalem, a trend that would carry on for the remainder of the ninth century and into the tenth.

The need for Byzantine emperors to have the approval of Jerusalem can be seen from the reinstatement into the patriarchal throne of Constantinople of Ignatios (847-58, 867-77) in 867. The Emperor Basil I (867-86) wished to ally with the papacy, so he had to remove Patriarch Photios (858-67, 877-86) who had fallen into schism with the pope. He replaced him with his predecessor Ignatios in 867. From Ignatios's *vita* we learn that the emperor sent "gifts and letters to the ruler of Syria"[24] in order for him to allow the Eastern patriarchs to send legates to witness the crowning of Ignatios. This need for ecclesiastical sanction for his deposition of Photios and installing of Ignatios shows the prestige attached to Jerusalem and also ties in with the letter to Theophilos, who wanted to legitimise his iconoclastic doctrine in the face of opposition from the Churches outside the empire. In this case, Jerusalem sent Elias the Synkellos who sat next to the emperor during the ceremony.[25] In the proceedings of the eighth Ecumenical Council we see further evidence of the patriarch of Jerusalem considering himself to be bound towards the emperor, whom he refers to as "our God appointed despot,"[26] asking him to intercede with the local emir by freeing Saracen prisoners in order to reduce his anger. Theodosios of Jerusalem (862-78) was also able to report that his Church had been given permission to build its churches,[27] however there is no indication that Byzantium had played any role in this, continuing the trend of indifference towards the city and using it only to further its own ecclesiastical policies. The need for Jerusalem's approval was mandatory, as representatives of all the patriarchs and the pope needed to be present in a church Council, however Byzantium showed its indifference even in this respect. For example, when Photios was installed as patriarch for the first time the legates who appeared in the council which appointed him were not the actual representatives of

[24] Niketas of Paphlagonia, *Βίος τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρός ἡμῶν Ἰγνατίου, ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, Patrologia Graeca* 105:545.
[25] Ibid.
[26] *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, ed. Johannes Domenicus Mansi, vol. 16 (Paris: Hubert Welter, 1903-27), 313.
[27] Ibid., 313. Griffith writes that it was a report on the good fortune of Jerusalem's Christians. See Griffith, "What has Constantinople to do with Jerusalem?," 183.

the patriarchs, but men literally picked up from the street, *πονηρούς τινας ἄνδρας ἀπὸ τῶν λεωφόρων ἀγυιῶν*.[28] This shows that the actual worth of Jerusalem's opinion was minimal. While its sanction was needed, if it was not forthcoming, its legates were simply brushed aside and replaced by people who would agree in their name.

Patriarch Ignatios did not last for very long on the throne of Constantinople, as he died in 877 and Photios was installed once again. A representative of the patriarch of Jerusalem, Elias III (878-907) (not to be confused with the previous legate also bearing his name), played a large role in the Synod called by Photios to ratify his accession. Another letter by Theodosios, still the patriarch of Jerusalem, painted a much different picture than the one of guarded optimism sent ten years before. He beseeches Photios to intervene with the emperor, whom he still recognises as his sovereign, and send help to Jerusalem and the Holy Sepulchre.[29] Theodosios goes as far as to submit his Patriarchate to Constantinople if the emperor delivered it from the dire situation it had found itself in. Another letter by the patriarch of Jerusalem was addressed to Basil I. It asks the emperor to pity and resurrect the Holy City and hopes that Byzantium would defeat its enemies and deliver the Christians worldwide.[30] In that respect, the second letter has much in common with the letter of the three patriarchs, showing some continuity. The fact remains though, that Basil sent no help to Jerusalem, showing that the empire was still quite indifferent to its plight, only seeing the Holy City's utility in providing ecclesiastical sanction, something that it readily did. While the emperors might have been ignoring Jerusalem's plight, the same cannot be said of the clergy; Photios apparently took some action in response to Theodosios's letter, as we can see from yet more correspondence sent to Constantinople by the patriarch of Jerusalem. He thanks Photios for his aid, writes that all they have left is God and hope, and asks again for the emperor's intervention, but this time for a more modest affair: the release of some Saracen prisoners, which would alleviate some of the suffering of Jerusalem's Christians.[31] Again, it is unclear whether Basil acted on the appeals of the patriarch or ignored them once again.

Continued lack of concern with the fate of Jerusalem, prompted its patriarch to seek help elsewhere. Indeed,

> letters of appeal and emissaries from the patriarch seeking help in the west are just about all one reliably hears of the church of Jerusalem in the historical sources from

[28] Ibid., 401.
[29] Ibid., vol. 17, 441-3.
[30] Ibid., 460-4.
[31] Ibid., 477-81.

> the first decades of the ninth century until the military incursions of the Byzantines into the territories of the oriental patriarchs in the second half of the tenth century.[32]

This trend carried on further into the ninth century than just its opening decades. In the life of Alfred the Great (871-99), king of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Wessex, we are told of letters, whose contents are unknown, "sent with gifts, from the Patriarch of Jerusalem El."[33] Even though the name is incomprehensible, it could only be Patriarch Elias, who had asked for help from Byzantium and received very little. A hint on the content of the letter might be given from a contemporary mission of Western monks to Charles the Fat (881-7), requesting help "for the rebuilding of churches in Jerusalem."[34] We also know of another visit in the beginning of the tenth century, when a mission from Jerusalem went to the West requesting help in obtaining the ransom of a bishop and other Christians.[35] All this diplomatic activity between Jerusalem and Western powers suggests one thing: that Byzantium was either incapable or unwilling to give help and Jerusalem had to look for it elsewhere. The only place it could turn to was Western Christendom. What were the reasons for this indifference though? With the defeat of iconoclasm in the middle of the ninth century, there was no animosity between the empire and Jerusalem. Its patriarch had sent numerous letters begging for help, yet they went mostly unanswered. The inability of the Byzantines to offer help, at least on a tangible basis, can be attributed to the increasing threat that the Bulgarians posed, but also to the diversification of Arab attacks; from the end of the ninth century they used their fleets to attack Byzantine targets in Europe such as Syracuse, Cyprus, Thessalonica, and Demetrias. There is no evidence that financial help was not provided, as appeals to the west for funds are not mutually exclusive with that type of help sent from Byzantium, as it had before, although clearly it was not enough. The fact that Jerusalem was willing to accept any ecclesiastical decisions made in Constantinople after the iconoclastic movement ended, even quite unorthodox ones, can only point to the hope of some sort of reward. For example, when Leo VI (886-912) wanted to marry for the fourth time, being widowed three times before, the Patriarch of Constantinople Nikolaos Mystikos (901-7) refused to give him permission, as a fourth marriage was

---

[32] Griffith, "What has Constantinople to do with Jerusalem?," 183.
[33] Asser, *Life of King Alfred*, ed. William Stevenson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959), 76.
[34] Jonathan Harris, "Wars and Rumours of Wars: England and the Byzantine World in the Eighth and Ninth Centuries," *Mediterranean Historical Review* 14 (1999): 38. Lucas d' Achèry, *Spicilegium sive Collectio Veterum aliquot Scriptorum qui in Galiae Bibliothecis Delituerant* (Paris: Apud Montalant, 1723), 363-4.
[35] *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, eds Philipp Jaffé and Wilhelm Wattenbach, vol. 1 (Leipzig: Veit and Co., 1885-8), 444; *Vetera Analecta*, ed. Jean Mabillon (Paris: Apud Montalant, 1723), 428; Harris, "Wars," 38.

disallowed by the Orthodox Church. For this he was replaced by Euthymios (907-12), so Leo could marry his mistress Zoe Carbonopsina. From the *vita* of Euthymios, in the passage where Leo was attempting to persuade Euthymios to take the patriarchal throne, we see that serious diplomatic activity was undertaken towards the Eastern patriarchs so as to legitimise Euthymios's accession and Leo's fourth marriage. In a conversation between the emperor and Nikolaos before his dismissal, the former states that he "sent ambassadors and written to the patriarchs [and he] learnt that they had been moved to pity and compassion and understanding, and now they are both on their way, with representatives with writs of concession for [his] affairs."[36] Again, Jerusalem was needed to sanction an emperor's ecclesiastical meddling.

In the reigns of Constantine VII and Romanos I (920-44) we see a qualitative and quantitative increase in the sources mentioning or alluding to policy employed towards Jerusalem, with the city becoming a clearer target for the empire instead of just a tool to legitimise various decisions of the emperors as in the ninth century, or a theoretical objective, especially since the imperial border successively got closer to the city. The first thing that was changed by Constantine VII was the up to then accepted account of the fall of Jerusalem to the Caliph Omar (634-44). While the emperor based his account on Theophanes and most of the earlier Byzantine sources agree on the course of the siege and surrender of the city by the Patriarch Sophronios (634-8), Constantine's account brings in another feature of the fall: that the city was taken through trickery.[37] This is an obvious attempt to belittle the achievement of Omar and to show the prowess of Byzantine arms. As Constantine wrote, the city was captured by artifice, *δόλῳ* in order to save the churches inside, and implied that if there was a battle for Jerusalem then history might be different. This attitude, combined with the fact that one of the titles given to the emperor by appointed applauders in Constantinople during his official visits was "the destroyer of Hagar,"[38] shows that a martial solution to the occupation of Jerusalem by the Arabs was starting to take form in the minds of the Byzantine emperors, even though not explicitly stated yet, something that would happen in the final years of Constantine's reign. A fragment of text of praise towards Constantine VII recounts the various punishments he inflicted on the "barbarians" in the name of God.[39] These rather unpleasant actions (including

[36] *Vita Euthymii Patriarchae CP*, trans. Patricia Karlin-Hayter (Brussels: Éditions de Byzantion, 1970), 78-9.
[37] Constantine Porphyrogennitos, *De Administrando Imperio*, ed. Gyula Moravcsik, trans. Romily Jenkins, vol. 1 (Budapest: Pázmány Péter Tudományegyetemi Görög Filológiai Intézet, 1949-62), 82.
[38] Ibid., 51.
[39] *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας*, ed. Athanasios Papadopoulos-Kerameus, vol.1 (St. Petersburg: Kirschbaum, 1891-8), 114-15.

impalements) were carried out under the auspices of God by the emperor. The fragment itself originated in Jerusalem, not from within the empire, showing that the Christians of the city were still waiting for the emperor to liberate them, but this time the emperor was willing to listen and act.

A letter by the Venetian Doge Peter II (932-9) to the German emperor Henry I (919-36), dating from 934, deals extensively with the situation in Jerusalem at the time. It draws a grim picture of the condition of the Christians in the city. He writes that with the approval of the Saracens, the Jews took the Church of the Holy Sepulchre from the Christians and turned it into a synagogue.[40] Attacks on the Jews notwithstanding, it also mentions that the patriarch of Jerusalem sent an envoy to Constantinople and the Byzantine emperor, informing him of what was happening in the city[41] and presumably asking for help yet again. All this became known in Venice during a diplomatic exchange with Byzantium in the year 934[42] and was then transmitted to Germany. The letter makes it very clear that the patriarch of Jerusalem was still in direct contact with the Byzantine emperor concerning the problems of the city and that the latter cared enough about them to circulate their hardships to a wider audience. This visit by the patriarchal envoy also shows that Jerusalem was looking at Byzantium for help with their troubles and that now the empire was presumably ready to act, as there is no mention of an embassy asking for help in the West. Byzantine successes against the Arabs started bringing repercussions to the Christians under Muslim control, the year 934 being the one when Samosata was razed by John Kourkouas. These would go on to become worse as the tenth century progressed, especially in Jerusalem, showing that the empire was indeed taking active interest in the matters concerning the city, making it the onus of Arab reprisals.

A very interesting and important source dealing with Jerusalem is an account of the Easter feast and the miracle of the Holy Light in Jerusalem, sent to Constantine VII in 947 by a priest named Niketas Basilikos.[43] He went on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem so he could visit the holy city. This journey was financed by the emperor who sent him to the patriarch there with a gift of gold,[44] meaning that this letter was the report of Niketas to Constantine after his return. It is also reported that despite damages done by the Arabs, morale in the city remained

---

[40] *Gesta Berengarii Imperatoris*, ed. Ernst Dümmler (Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1871), 157.
[41] Ibid., 158.
[42] Heinrich Kretschmayr, *Geschichte von Venedig*, vol. 1 (Gotha: F.A. Perthes, 1905-34), 107.
[43] "Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς τὸν αὐτοκράτορα Κωνσταντῖνον ζ′ τὸν Πορφυρογέννητον περὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Φωτός," ed. Athanasios Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Православное Палестинское Общество* [Orthodox Palestinian Society] 13 (1894).
[44] Ibid., 1.