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ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the portrayal of outsiders - by gender, religion, race and tāξις - in Michael Psellos's Chronographia, Anna Komnene's Alexiad, and Niketas Choniates's Narrative - using sociological theories of deviancy. The twofold aim is to "treat texts seriously", localized in Jakobson's speech-event nexus of addresser, context, content, contact, code and addressee; and secondly to understand the texts as statements of the ideology of the dominant élite.

Outsiders are defined (using the labelling orientation) as people successfully defined as deviants; deviant behaviour is whatever they do. The dominant élite creates cultural boundaries, and places individuals in outsider roles on the other side of those boundaries. Outsiders can be understood only in terms of who defines them as deviant; there is no material reality to deviancy. Stereotypes, which identify social categories of people by evaluative trait-characteristics, are necessary elements of human cognition; they become prejudice only when they are overgeneralized, based on too limited data, applied too widely and maintained in the face of contrary empirical evidence.

The analysis of the three texts in depth allows the identification of those groups labelled as outsiders by these expositors of the dominant ideology. My conclusion is that these authors portray a picture of the Byzantine outsider, which is coherent between this limited sample group, allowing for individual variation. These authors used stereotypes to conceptualize and encode in the linguistic and lexicographical complexities of their texts the outsiders they identified in their societies. Their presentation uses stereotypes, but does not descend to prejudice.
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MOTHER
And after reading a little, don't start counting pages, or pick out what you think is the best and read them; you won't gain anything from this. Rather you should start to read from the cover which has the beginning of the letters until not a letter remains in it, and you'll gain a lot. It is the act of a dilettante not to read the whole book through two or three times, but to pick out a few [stories] for gossip.

Kekaumenos, Strategicon §142.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION.

The point of this thesis is to examine attitudes to Byzantine outsiders. Was prejudice the usual response? Prejudice is a modern concern, identified by modern industrialized, urbanized society as a problem. Prejudice is not a modern phenomenon that did not occur in the past, but it requires the modern perspective to be identified. Racism - categorizing people on the colour of their skin alone rather than treating them as individual persons with distinctive attributes - is a form of prejudice, as is sexism - categorizing people on the basis of their possession of certain sexual characteristics alone rather than on their distinctive abilities and potential. These prejudices are the most obvious, as the criteria used are visible to all. Other forms of prejudice - by ethnic group, religion, class - are more covert, but are as damaging to the functioning of society.

Racial and ethnic prejudice is exacerbated by post-imperial migrations of people from one region to another. The concern that these migrations cause, whether based on factual evidence or itself the product of prejudice, is too well-known to require documentation. However, Powell's "rivers of blood" (the war of all against all) and the distinction between black Britons (assimilation) and British Blacks
(segregation) encourage a questioning of accepted patterns of interaction between different social groups.

Paul Magdalino's article on the phenomenon of Manuel I Komnenos, suggests that his career may prove instructive to humanity at large, dealing with the westernization of a non-western society as Byzantium interacted with western Christendom on a more intense level.\(^1\) In a similar way, the history of Byzantium provides us with an example of how a non-western, city-dominated if not urbanized, bureaucratic society came to terms with its outsiders. There are, of course differences between Byzantium and the modern situation. The "empire" centred on Constantinople in the mediaeval period is very different from the maritime empires of the modern European nation-states, where temperate colonies provided Lebensraum and the tropical colonies suffered economic exploitation for the benefit of the metropolitan territory. In the empire of late antiquity, many ethnic groups were ruled from New Rome, and many languages were spoken in the City\(^2\), but racial differentiation between rulers and ruled was not as pronounced as for the colonial empires of nineteenth-century Europe. In part this may be ascribed to the lack of a clear "Byzantine" ethnic group. Christian religion, Greek education (and post Justinian, increasingly Greek language), and Roman habits combined to make "the Byzantines", but to the physical anthropologist they could be Slav,

---


Semite, or Greek.

The secondary literature dealing with the idea of the outsider falls into three categories: i) articles that relate to the concept of the outsider; ii) studies dealing with the use of Byzantine literature as a historical source; and iii) articles on specific outsider groups. As a way into the problem, I shall examine some of the articles in the first category.

Introduction to the Problem.

Three seminal articles point the differing, though not mutually exclusive, ways in which the notion of the outsider in Byzantine society may be approached: Robert S. Lopez's "Foreigners in Byzantium",

---


Evelyne Patlagean's "Byzance, le barbare, l'hérétique et la loi universelle"\(^6\), and Hans-Georg Beck's "Formes de non-conformisme à Byzance."\(^7\) Not one claims to be a complete study [Lopez describes his article as "merely the sketch of a possible book"]\(^8\), yet each provides important suggestions as to how further research should proceed.

Lopez takes the view that outsiders are foreigners. He proposes two questions: who were the foreigners? and how could they become citizens?\(^9\) This use of "citizen" suggests perhaps too strong a reliance on nation-state nationality, and raises an expectation that the Byzantine bureaucracy had a department of immigration and naturalization. Lopez notes that Zachariae von Lingenthal is silent on the matter, and suggests that liability for state service - either personal or commuted to taxes - might serve as a better indicator of nationality. This suggested principle of "no taxation without nationality" may have worked both ways: citizens paid taxes, so people who paid taxes were citizens.\(^10\) This regularizes a description of what was probably a very confused situation on the ground, and Lopez appears to abandon it in

---


favour of Roman ideas of citizenship.

Lopez finds some value in the Roman ideas of citizenship from the time of the late empire. If one lived within the territory of the empire, and lived as a Roman, then one was a Roman.\(^{11}\) This was the ideal; people within the empire were Romans, those living beyond its boundaries, barbarians. Lopez lists some of the comments of literate Byzantines (emperors and chroniclers) on barbarians. In general they are negative, and Lopez remarks "we know that the Byzantines came close to the Chinese in looking at foreigners with utter contempt."\(^{12}\) However, the argument for such a model is weakened when Lopez suggests an assimilation model for foreigners entering the empire, with government support for the assimilation process. The Armenians are presented as an example, with the assimilation process taking two to three generations.\(^{13}\)

Identifying the foreigners who came to Byzantium, Lopez divides them into merchants and soldiers. Different groups provided the empire with mercenaries at different times: Germans and Huns under Theodosios and Justinian; Scandinavians and Anglo-Saxons in the middle Byzantine hetaireia, and the Catalan company in the late period.

All of these foreign legions, however, fulfilled their special tasks in virtual isolation, and could in no way be counted as

\(^{11}\) Made law by the Constitutio Antoniniana of Caracalla [Marcus Aurelius Antoninus] in 212, though for fiscal reasons. In a sense this is in contrast with the classical Greek tradition, where despite lengthy residence in a polis one remained a resident alien, a Φίλος, and nothing more.

\(^{12}\) Lopez, "Foreigners", 342.

\(^{13}\) Lopez, "Foreigners", 342-3.
part of the Byzantine society.\textsuperscript{14}

The distance that was maintained between Byzantines and these foreign troops was signalled by their classification as \textit{βάρβαροι}. This term, with its long pedigree brought with it many shades of meaning, but frequently it meant no more than "not one of us", not a \textit{Ῥωμαῖος}. In this sense, its work was often shared by the term \textit{ἐξώνος}, a stranger, though this could cause confusion as the stranger could be a Byzantine from elsewhere, rather than a foreigner as such.

When religious considerations were to the fore, the term \textit{ἐθνικός} was used, the equivalent of the Hebrew gentile, supplemented by \textit{ὁ ἐξωτικός} or \textit{ὁ ἐξω} which again suggest an outsider quality, not necessarily foreign. This terminology shows there were different degrees and kinds of outsidersness, though the terms used rarely permit exactitude in marking the boundary between Byzantines and foreigners.

In dealing with what foreigners could do, Lopez not surprisingly turns to the second group of foreigners, the merchants. He outlines briefly the history of Byzantine external trade, and it is here that the comparison with China is most appropriate: "medieval Byzantium, like mandarin China, gradually dulled the edge of its keen merchant and maritime class through a combination of conservatism, \textit{hybris}, and neglect."\textsuperscript{15} However, as with China, foreign merchants came in increasing number to Byzantium, and in an effort to control this influx of foreigners, \textit{mitata} were created in the capital, where foreign

\textsuperscript{14} Lopez, "Foreigners", 343.

\textsuperscript{15} Lopez, "Foreigners", 345.
merchants were required to reside and trade under the eyes of imperial officials. The mitata seem to have developed from the ninth century, and were used at first by peoples whose level of civilization was lower than that of the Byzantines, and who could be termed allied (if not tributary) barbarians. With time, the mitata came to be used by Venetian and other Italian merchants as well. In the ninth and tenth centuries, Venice still passed as a tributary power, but this situation changed in the course of the eleventh century. Developments in Italy and Outremer as well as within Byzantium changed the perspective of the Italian merchants, who saw the mitata not as a place of control for the convenience of the Byzantine government, but as the nucleus of a colony with extra-territorial rights. In this sense, Byzantium was one of the first victims of western imperialism.

Lopez ends with 1204 which he feels marks a significant milestone in the history of relations between Latin and Greek:

The Fourth Crusade overthrew the Byzantine Empire temporarily but destroyed its restraint of foreigners forever. Even after Michael Palaeologus brought the double-headed Byzantine eagle back to Constantinople, he had to let aliens reside indefinitely on Greek soil without becoming imperial subjects, or immigrants awaiting naturalization, or members of a foreign legion. ... Henceforth Italians and Greeks lived side by side without fraternizing, like oil and water in the same cup.16

Lopez's article suggests several lines of research. He treats foreigners as a group rather than splitting them up into their various ethnic components, as some earlier writers have done.17 The stress on


17. For example, Peter Charanis, whom he cites; Peter Charanis, "The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire", BS 22 (1961), 196-240, reprinted as The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire (Lisbon, 1963).
fiscal status and the legal contrast between citizen and foreigner
would be productive, if the sources were available. Of more utility is
his recognition that:

> It would be equally easy to collect a similar series of unfair
statements about one's neighbors from the sources of any other
literate nation.18

This talk of "nation" is anachronistic, but the idea that negative
feelings towards neighbours, ie. those who are close, but who are at
the same time "not us", is provoking, especially when coupled with
Lopez's suggestion that ξένοι may be Byzantine strangers as well as
foreigners.

Patlagean's article turns the focus of attention from foreigners who
may be strangers to Byzantium, to strange Byzantines. Her outsiders
are not foreigners at all. Indeed in her conclusion, she presents the
notion that they may be the most inside of all insiders:

> Si nous pouvions apprécier de façon critique les transgressions
qui leur sont imputées, si nous les connaissions autrement que
par leurs ennemis, nous découvririons peut-être que nul n'a été
plus pleinement byzantin que les hérétiques "dualistes" de
Byzance.19

In this change of focus onto the Other in Byzantine society, Patlagean
draws on sociology20 to explain the structure of Byzantine society. The
sources she uses for the article are concentrated in the eleventh and
twelfth centuries, with two exceptions, even though she takes as her

20. Patlagean cites (81 & n.5) Mary Douglas, Purity and Danger: An
Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo (London & Henley,
1966). However see Peter Brown, "Learning and Imagination", in
Society and the Holy in Late Antiquity (London, 1982), 13 for the
view that Douglas's work is now in the general realm.
remit the period from the Council in Trullo (692) to the eleventh century. In her reading of these sources, she detects a grid or scale upon which the Other and the One appear, and which is the expression of the norms of Byzantine society, elegantly termed la romanité chrétienne de Byzance. In considering these norms of Byzantine society, Roman yet Christian, Christian but Roman, Patlagean does not consider governmental texts of law courts and the fisc; nor does she deal with the Jews, who appear on a different grid network. She does not intend to engage in a critique of the sources, but rather sees them as indicative of the conceptual space within which it was possible to portray both the Other and the Byzantine. In effect, she intends to examine the history of a mentality. Patlagean concentrates on consommation, both in the sexual realm and with regard to food, as a highly significant indicator of compliance with social norms.


24. This concern with food has received recent [Byzantine] attention in Caroline Walker Bynum, Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1987), as well as being influenced by the thinking of Douglas, Purity
Patlagean identifies four categories of "other humanity" used by Byzantine writers: wild savages, near to beasts; non-Christian barbarians; Christian barbarians; and finally the dualist heretics. The heretics, closest to the Byzantine observers, are considered the most subversive and the most dangerous. These categories form a sliding scale on which people or actions can be located. Taking the matter of food, eating meat places one on the scale. Firstly there is the question of whether the meat is raw or cooked. Then comes the Noahine prohibition of flesh cut from a living animal. Torah restrictions - meat that has been strangled, meat offered before an idol, blood, or certain animals all regarded as unfit - are forbidden to the People of God. The Byzantine Orthodox church had to reconcile the enforcement of the old law with the enunciation of the new law. The situation was further complicated by the dualist heretics, who ate no meat as it represented the entombment of the spirit in matter.

Sexual activity occurs on the same scale between the savage's liberty of will, and the heretics' deliberate inversion of the proper order. Barbarians were slaves to Venus, whilst Christian barbarians failed to maintain the proper distinctions between the sexes. The heretics practised all manner of unmentionable vices, with no regard to sex or relationship of the participants. Sexual intercourse is civilized, Christianized by placing it in the context of the family, and restrictions on marriage are comparable to those concerning the

and Danger (London & Henley, 1966).


prohibited animals.

Byzantine social organization and Byzantine ways of thought provide many other criteria to classify "otherness": life in society in general; everything that involves regular transactions; male and female; clerical and lay; sworn oaths between persons and between states; war and peace; and at a higher level, the system of authority that is at once political and religious. All these can be considered on the same sliding scale. At one extreme are the savages, who are outside the norms; at the other are the heretics, who overthrow or subvert the norms.27

Patlagean concludes that the Byzantine thought-world was self-sufficient: "la pensée byzantine n'est certes pas sortie d'elle-même pour tracer les cercles concentriques que l'on vient de voir."28 The Byzantine system of defining "otherness" in relation to the "deux consommations parallèles" of sex and food29 in relation to the three axes of social organization (kin, temporal power and the sacred) is universal in its application. She suggests two lines of investigation. First is to determine how relations between the Byzantines and the Others actually worked. Christian barbarians were an exception that complicated the smooth transfer of the thought-word into action. The second question concerns the otherness of the heretics, "la plus redoutée parce que la plus proche."30 Patlagean states that she has not

27. Patlagean, "Le barbare et la loi", 85.
29. Patlagean, "Le barbare et la loi", 86.
exhausted all the similarities between the heretics and the Orthodox, and that all that seems to separate them is the refusal to accept the ecclesiastical form. The Other in all these texts is defined, more or less, as the complete inversion of the One.

To sum up therefore, what are the main lines of approach that Patlagean's article presents for the study of the Byzantine outsider? In contrast with Lopez's article, Patlagean suggests that the outsider may be an insider - indeed her final conclusion suggests that paradoxically the furthest outsider is the most insider. Patlagean shows that one must look at the heretic as well as at the foreign barbarian when looking at the Byzantine outsider. She names the mentalité: la romanité chrétienne de Byzance, and indicates that social norms may permit the analysis of that mentalité. She establishes that the transgressors of norms are not to be seen in isolation; they form part of the whole society within which they operate. A sliding scale exists, with One and Other as mutually exclusive fixed points; neither can exist without the other. Patlagean focuses on the heretics and the people, and what the texts reveal about what the people thought. This

31. Patlagean, "Le barbare et la loi", 87. The accompanying footnote provides a cross reference to a work dealing with "frankisme polonais" in the eighteenth century, which Patlagean holds to be an exemplary analysis of the overturn of social norms by heretics even though separated by differences in motivation, and by the different historical context.

32. Patlagean, "Le barbare et la loi", 87.

33. Patlagean, "Le barbare et la loi", 87. In terms of the dominant mentalité this could be viewed as the way in which the holy man, as the outsider with regard to human society, is in actual fact the ultimate insider, having gained by his rejection of the norms of normal human society, membership of Heaven's elect and citizenship in the heavenly Jerusalem.
concentration on historical realities - people and the sources - is a good corrective to overdose of theory.

Beck opens by considering the terms dissenter, non-conformist and non-conformity. He notes their origin in the Elizabethan Church Settlement, and then goes on to discuss how these terms have been adopted by sociology, to describe nonconformity to the rules of conduct expected by society. By their sociological adoption, however, the terms have lost their precise meaning. Conformity or nonconformity is no longer determined by observance of an Act of Parliament or an Order in Council; it cannot be decided by a court of law. Sociological nonconformity is rather two attitudes opposing each other, and each attitude is as difficult to define as the other. Beck sees two causes for this difficulty. Firstly, the norms of conduct of a society represent the consensus of a group, taken to be the majority and known to Antiquity as the pars sanior. But this consensus is either unspoken, or is expressed obliquely. The second problem is that nonconformity to social norms, whether implicit or explicit, calls into question the entire edifice of social structure. This remains true, whether the nonconformity is a revolutionary struggle, criticism with reform as its goal, or a purely passive response, a withdrawal from society: "un «départ», une sorte d'anachorèse."

If nonconformity is to be used in analysis of Byzantine society, then one is immediately confronted with a problem. Beck states it bluntly: "Tout d'abord il faut poser la question suivante: quelles sont les

---

34. Beck, "Formes de non-conformisme", 313.
normes de conduite déterminantes de la société byzantine?  

Were the norms dictated by Orthodoxy; or by the ideological, political and cultural spiral round the autocratic centre; or by a system of patronage which created particular power structures; or even by Greek πατριαρχία and Greek ἀστειώτης; or were the norms created by all these influences at the same time?  

Even if norms are identified, the problem remains as to how they were worked out in daily life, and the extent to which they were observed. Seventeenth-century religious dissent in England called into question social orthodoxies as well. Beck proposes a broad definition of Orthodoxy:

A Byzance aussi l'orthodoxie est un mélange de conceptions dogmatiques, culturelles et politiques, difficile à pénétrer et pour cette raison même difficile à définir; on ne peut pas seulement considérer l'orthodoxie comme une simple profession de foi correcte. Il faut se demander quelle nuance de l'orthodoxie, quelle réfraction politique, culturelle ou dogmatique du prisme se trouvent en ligne de mire.

A second problem rests in the heterogeneity of Byzantine society, or more properly speaking:

dans le fait que nous ne possédons des connaissances détaillées pratiquement que sur l'idéologie, les normes et les règles de la classe dirigeante et sur celles qui calquent les modèles des dirigeants, parce qu'ils désirent eux-mêmes être de leur nombre un jour ou l'autre.

What Beck has identified here is the dominant ideology of sociology - the articulated unified attitude of the governing class, though each

---

individual member of the governing class may not express all the attitudes of the dominant ideology. Beck then states, without supporting evidence, that one may suppose that the lower orders [les couches sociales inférieures\textsuperscript{41}] are less conformist than their betters. Beck suggests that many parts of the dominant ideology, such as the imperial ideology or the political theories of the men of letters, had little, if any, relevance to these lower orders. What this seems to discount completely is the possibility of a form of politics of deference. An essential quality of a dominant ideology is that it extends throughout its society, being rejected only by a minority, defined as outsiders. This is not to say that, if we take the imperial ideology as our example, that the crowd or mob understood it in the same way as the governing class. If a negative view of human nature is assumed for a moment, the ruling élite accepted the imperial ideology because it explained the reality that surrounded them, and also because it perpetuated their group in power. For the lower orders, there is no way in which the imperial ideology as expressed by the ruling élite could be said to be in their material interest; in actual fact it worked counter to it as part of its function was to keep the élite in power, and other groupings down. However, within the imperial ideology there must have been articulations of the reality of the lower orders or they would not have accepted it. I am unaware of any work on this area in Byzantine studies, but the model should be the politics of deference.\textsuperscript{42}

\textsuperscript{41} Beck, "Formes de non-conformisme", 314.

\textsuperscript{42} This idea derives from work on British twentieth-century politics, where on average at least one third of the working class must vote
Beck suggests that a third problem is the changes that occurred in the ideology of the "establishment". As conformity and nonconformity are mirrored opposites, it is natural that a change in the dominant ideology will be reflected by a change in nonconformity.

Beck turns from social norms to ask if it is possible to identify Byzantine dissenters. Drawing on historical examples, he presents the view that dissenters usually make their presence clear by visible signs. The mention of hippies suggests hair length as a means of determining social non-conformity:

Beck states that he is struck in his perusal of the sources by the frequency with which long hair on men is deemed to be worthy of Conservative for that party to have any chance of gaining power. Problems of analysis of such politics of deference exist of course because of aspirational voting. See A. H. Hanson & Malcolm Walles, Governing Britain (Glasgow, 1975) 31-68; M. Benney et al., How People Vote (London, 1956); S. H. Beer, Modern British Politics (London, 1965); J. Bonham, The Middle Class Vote (London, 1954); E. A. Nordlinger, The Working Class Tories (London, 1967). How to account for aspirational acceptance of the dominant ideology by the Byzantine many is a problem, but Beck himself does allow for an aspirational acceptance of the dominant ideology by some writers: "celles qui calquent les modèles des dirigeants, parce qu’ils désirent eux-mêmes être de leur nombre un jour ou l’autre." Beck, "Formes de non-conformisme", 314.


comment. The issue is clouded, of course, by the question as to whether this is due to snobbery. Beck begins his examination of the sources with "Byzance après Byzance", dealing with long-haired dissenters from the established conservative intelligentsia of late nineteenth-century Greece. In attempting to work backwards to Byzantium, Beck remarks that a problem in dealing with hair length is the point at which long hair became fashionable in Byzantium. Skinheads were rare. Whilst one chronicler records that the bald emperor Theophilus (829-42) ordered all Byzantines to get crew-cuts, the general rule seems to have been that hair was worn relatively long. Suspicion was aroused only when the hair reached below the shoulders and the man presented a feminine appearance. Was this nonconformity or extravagant display?


47. Beck, "Formes de non-conformisme", 315-317. Beck shows the tortuous nature of the necessary analysis: the long-haired advocates of δημοσία were accused by the proponents of κοθαρεύουσα of being in the pay of the Russians, intent on the implementation of Catherine the Great's expansionist ideas; after 1917 they were accused of being communists [see Richard Clogg, Parties and Elections in Greece: the Search for Legitimacy (London, 1987) 1-7]; Beck concludes with the rather delphic utterance: "Mais au fond il s'agissait du grand problème de l'identité nationale des Grecs."


49. Beck, "Formes de non-conformisme", 317. Beck also remarks that the presence or absence of a beard could be significant, though frequently it was the gestures of the philosophers or pseudo-philosophers, stroking their beards as they put forward their arguments which were the focus for comment. In this context, one thinks of Anna Komnene's description of John Italos: Alexiad V viii 7-8, Leib 2:36-7 19 & 28.
Beck relates the mid thirteenth-century story of Phrangopoulos to be found in a letter of the Patriarch Gregory of Cyprus to the Grand Logothete. Phrangopoulos was a mere caricature of a man, an ἄνδρόφων according to the patriarch. He was a regular brawler, and was completely mad about his hair. He strutted round the town on horseback, with his hair falling below his shoulders down his back. Obviously nothing good was going to come of it. One night, while the Grand Sakellarios was officiating at the Great Church, Phrangopoulos entered the deacon's house and molested one of his daughters. The miscreant was arrested, given a #1 hair cut πρόμαχος, and imprisoned. In jail Phrangopoulos repented and was released, but once at liberty, his hair grew once more and he returned to depraved habits. It was almost as if his long hair caused his bad behaviour.

The final fate of Phrangopoulos is not known, but he seems to have had many imitators, as the Patriarch Athanasios I, one of Gregory's successors, fulminated regularly in encyclicals against the fashions of his time, men going about without belts like barbarians, and with their hair dressed like women. Long hair may have been an extravagant fashion rather than a sign of nonconformity, and it is possible that Phrangopoulos was not an actual person, but a generic "voyou de Franc" - a Frankish bounder. Here we find the meeting of nonconformists and foreigners, a meeting with a classical model in Procopios's description of the circus factions.

The middle centuries of Byzantium also had their share of trichomanes. A funeral oration by Michael Choniates for Niketas of Chonai stresses the efforts Niketas made to save the υλομανωϋτες. They wore their hair like women, falling in ringlets to their shoulders and their faces were closely shaven, smooth like women or young boys. The concern voiced is again that men and women are being confused. The fashion for long hair is also mentioned, and deplored as counter to the canons in Trullo by Zonaras. These trichomanes did not fall foul of the church. It seems that the church was content to tolerate a little nonconformity, when the important matters were met with obedience. The church's attitude seems to have been "better a long haired layabout, who comes to church, confesses, receives the sacraments and leaves his money to the church, than a skinhead who does not".

Hairlength is also important for holy men. In the desert, without scissors, their hair and beards grow long. In the twelfth century when the holy man underwent something of a crisis, such outward and visible signs could not be taken as evidence of sanctity.

Beck concludes by saying that long hair may be a sign of worldly extravagance, which given the heavenly orientation of Byzantine


society may be termed nonconformity. It may also be the sign of an assumed asceticism. However, in addition to all this, it may be the sign of real dissent, which in turn may be revolutionary, reformist, or passive (the groups of monks who form an anti-society, trying to regain Eden).57

What these three articles indicate is that an investigation of Byzantine attitudes to outsiders is both necessary and possible. The definition of the outsider is wide; it includes the foreigner, but also the dissenter and the social nonconformist. Lopez suggested taxes and legal status as a means of identifying the outsiders. However, with the case of the Venetians, he discovered that even for foreigners it is not simple: some foreigners are more foreign than others. Beck largely abandoned the attempt to identify the norms that governed Byzantine society before it had started. He preferred to concentrate on outward signs - hair and clothes - which mark out the deviant, seeing conformity and nonconformity as mirror images of each other. Patlagean, too, made no attempt to define nonconformity. Drawing on sociological concepts, she placed nonconformity in the context of the encounter with the Other, which shows that nonconformity is largely a relative phenomenon. The attitudes of the ruling élite dominated Byzantine society, and given that it was members of the élite who had the opportunity and inclination to write, the attitudes of the élites determine our perceptions of Byzantine society. I am unconvinced by Beck's belief in an automatic lack of sympathy between the rulers and the ruled: dominant ideologies percolate down through social strata.

though not without alteration. To measure the extent to which the
dominant ideology was accepted by the masses would be impossible,
but to talk of the dominant ideology as representative of the society as
a whole, though not in a quantitative way, is possible.

An attempt to discover and explain Byzantine attitudes to
outsiders, therefore will rely on evidence from the literate upper
echelons of society. There are no rules to identify the outsiders, and so
one method is to treat as outsiders in the analysis those who are
described as outsiders in the source-texts.

In addition to these necessary limits of methodological definition,
limits in time are required. One thousand years of changing attitudes
would be unmanageable at this stage. As with most things Byzantine,
attitudes to outsiders seems to accept a three-part division - a time of
formulation, a middle period of transformation and the final demise
of the sociocultural system in the two centuries after 1261.

I rejected the final period as I felt the events of 1261 did not see
the restoration of a fully autonomous culture. The thirteenth century
saw the creation of a new society, strongly influenced by its Byzantine
past, but dramatically altered by the encounter with the West.

The choice between the two remaining periods was more difficult.
Beginning at the start has much to recommend it, but an intractable
problem is to decide exactly when late Antiquity gave way to
Byzantium. To the extent that there is an answer, the centuries of
Justinian and Heraklios, the Persian defeat and the rise of Islam are
significant markers for the shift from classical antiquity to mediaeval
Byzantium. From the outsider perspective, this is the same period
which attempted to regulate in detail the behaviour of the Orthodox, and their interaction with the not so Orthodox by the canons of the Council in Trullo (690-1). However, what I found more interesting was not the establishment of the system, but how it responded to the stresses and strains imposed upon it by the events of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. These two centuries witnessed increasingly close interaction - both at a personal and at an institutional level. This interaction was between Byzantium and Western Europe, culminating in 1204; between Anatolian Turks and Byzantium after 1071; and with the northern peoples - usually labelled Skyths in the sources - the Russians, Patzinaks and Cumans. Frequently overlooked, the increased levels of interaction were a constituent part of what made Byzantine society in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

With the choice of period made, the matter of sources arises. Lopez has indicated that legal texts are not enlightening on outsiders, and attitudes would be more difficult to discern in documents rather than in more personalized writings. The works of the eleventh- and twelfth-century Byzantine historians provide the best source for plotting the changes - if any - in Byzantine attitudes to outsiders, as the extended nature of the narratives allows for a deeper treatment of displayed attitudes which does not rely on single utterances. It would be more difficult to build up such a body of material from shorter literary texts such as letters or orations. Numbering a full dozen, if Manasses's verse chronicle and Eustathios of Thessaloniki's account of the Norman capture of his city are included, there is wide coverage in time of the two centuries and individual variation. I chose
Psellos's Chronographia\cite{59}, Komnene's Alexiad\cite{60} and Choniates's Narrative\cite{61}. It is, of course, an idiosyncratic choice: why not Attaleiates, Skylitzes, Kedrenos, Bryennios, Kinnamos, Zonaras or Glykas? There can be no "right" answer. The reservation that these sources are too well-known deserves to be turned on its head: given that every undergraduate can read them in published translation, it is time the attempt was made to analyze how they portray outsiders, and why they use outmoded terminology (much noted but never explained). To provide coverage up to 1204 and beyond Niketas Choniates was the only choice. The beginning of the period could be served by several of the authors, but to attempt to treat the eleventh century without Psellos would make for dull reading, whilst middle Byzantine historiography without him is incomprehensible. Even were it possible to ignore The Alexiad for the period 1081-1118, Anna Komnene as the example of a Byzantine woman writer, an exception if not an outsider, could not be omitted.

\textbf{Introduction to the Period.}

\cite{59} Herbert Hunger, \textit{Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner}, vol. 1, Philosophie, Rhetorik, Epistolographie, Geschichtsschreibung, Geographie (Munich, 1978), 372-441.


The events of the eleventh and twelfth centuries in Byzantium have been the subject of divergent interpretations. The older view has been that ineffectual eleventh-century emperors frittered away the inheritance of Basil II, so that the defeat at Manzikert in 1071 showed the empire to be an empty sham which disappeared rapidly from Asia Minor. The loss of Asia Minor, the military heartland of the empire, is in turn held to be the cause of the failure of the Komnenoi to restore the empire, and for the final defeat in 1204. Added to the saga of military ineptitude, this analysis blames the Komnenoi - most especially Alexios I Komnenos (1081-1118) for inaugurating the trend - for granting the Venetians (and later the Genoese and Pisans) trading privileges and tax concessions which bled Byzantium white.62

More recent scholarship still sees the eleventh century as a pivotal epoch in Byzantine history, with the twelfth century working out the implications of the transformation. The problem rests in the exact nature of the transformation. The Byzantine social structure in the end was unable to meet the political challenges of the changed environment.63

The social transformation is seen as resting on changes in the economic


base, and it is here that the analysis diverges. The basic problem is the question argued by supply-side and Keynesian economists: does deficit spending end economic dysfunction, or does bad money drive out good, leading to economic stagnation and collapse?  

Four broad approaches are apparent: a continuous decline through the two centuries; a decline in the eleventh century, followed by a revival in the twelfth under the Komnenoi; an eleventh-century boom followed by a late eleventh-century and twelfth-century decline; or eleventh-century growth with continued economic expansion in the twelfth century.


66. I am grateful to Margaret Mullett for suggesting this schema.


The focus on attitudes to outsiders makes the eleventh and twelfth centuries particularly interesting for another reason. As Bryer pointed out, and Beaton has more recently drawn to our attention, the territories of the Byzantine Empire between Manzikert and 1204 (sub-Danubian Balkans, Aegean islands, the Anatolian littoral) were largely those areas colonized by the classical Greeks in Antiquity, which were at the same time the areas where modern Greek was spoken until the twentieth-century exchange of populations. The result of Manzikert was to create "a largely Greek state out of what had been a multilingual Empire." There is a leap from the reality of the coterminous linguistic and political frontiers to prescriptive identity between the two, and it is a leap not made by twelfth-century Byzantines. For Psellos as for the Komnenoi, Byzantium was the oecumenical empire and the Byzantines were the 'Ῥωμαῖοι; only gradually were the intellectuals beginning to see themselves in some ways as Greeks.

**Introduction to Persons.**

Michael Psellos

Constantine Psellos was born in about 1018, in a western suburb

---


73. Bryer, "First Encounter with the West", 97.

74. Michael was his name in religion by which he was known after
of Constantinople. His family originally came from Nikomedia, and though previously it had numbered hypatoi and patrikioi among its members, by the time of Psellos's father the family had fallen on hard times. However, there was still sufficient money to ensure Psellos had a sound grounding in the ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία, taught by John Mauropos as well as others. Encouraged by his mother Psellos was a model student and proceeded to study law under Xiphilinos.

When he was about sixteen, Psellos gained preferment and became a thematic judge in Thrace-Macedonia, but the death of his sister in 1034 forced him to resign and to return to the capital. However, a new appointment as theme judge at Philadelphia in Thrakesion soon followed, with a transfer the next year to the post of theme judge for the Bukellarion and Armeniakion themes.

At the end of 1041, with the aid of Leichoudes, minister of Michael V, Psellos was appointed secretary ὑπογραμματεύς in the imperial government. This promotion seems to have made marriage feasible, and Psellos married sometime in 1042. Nothing is known about Psellos's wife, but the couple did have one child, a daughter, Styliane, who died young.

In 1043, at the age of 25, Psellos became private secretary to Constantine IX, though it appears that his legal training was still used c.1054.

---

75. The family name, from the adjective ψελλός to falter in speech like a child, may have been a nickname given to an ancestor or it may ironically have been given to Michael Psellos himself.

76. See the funeral eulogy Psellos wrote for his mother in C-N. Sathas, Bibl. graeca medii aevi, V 3-61.

on occasion in judgment. He also took some private pupils and
gathered a group of "disciples" round him. It was at this time that
Constantine IX attempted to regularize the teaching of law in the
capital. Psellos used his good offices at court to secure the position of
nomophylax for his old friend Xiphilinos, at the same time introducing
his other teacher, Mauropous, to court. In 1045, Psellos was given the
title of Consul of the Philosophers. Earlier scholars have seen
Constantine IX's renovatio as a restoration of systematic,
institutionalized higher education in Constantinople. However,
given its severely practical orientation, and the fact that the title of
Consul of the Philosophers was only used subsequently of John Italos,
Theodore of Smyrna and one other in between, to describe the events
of 1043-5 as the refounding of the university is to go too far.

Under Constantine IX, Psellos reached the height of his fame as
rhetor, savant and philosopher. He was promoted to βέστις and then
to βεστώρχης. However, it was not all successes; charged with heresy,
Psellos had to submit a confession of faith to the church to get himself
cleared of the charges.

Shortly before the death of Constantine IX (11 December 1055),

---

78 Robert Browning, "Byzantine Scholarship", P& P 28 (1964), 3-22;
"Courante intellectuels et organisation scolaire à Byzance au XIe
siècle", TM 6 (1976), 219-22; "The Patriarchal School at
Constantinople in the Twelfth Century", B 32 (1962), 167-201 and 33
(1963), 11-40; M. J. Kyriakis, "Of professors and disciples in twelfth-
century Byzantium", B 43 (1973), 108-19; "Student life in eleventh-
century Constantinople", Buçautvcx 7 (1975), 375-88; "The
University: origins and early phases in Constantinople", B 41 (1971),
161-82; Paul Lemerle, "Le gouvernement des philosophes: Notes et
remarques sur l'enseignement, les écoles, la culture", in Cinq Études
sur le XIe siècle byzantin (Paris, 1977); Wanda Wolska-Conus,
"L'école de droit et l'enseignement du droit à Byzance au XIe siècle:
Xiphilin et Psellos", TM 7 (1979), 1-108.
Psellos had taken vows as a monk. Hunger sums up Psellos’s reaction to the life of contemplation succinctly:

_Allein, das Leben unter den meist ungebildeten Mönchen, fern der Hauptstadt mit ihrem Luxus und ihrem politischen Betätigungsfeld, konnte Psellos nicht lange befriedigen._

Within the year, Psellos had returned to the capital.

In 1057 Psellos acted with Leichoudes on the embassy from Michael VI to Isaak Komnenos. Under Isaak, Psellos became proedros and later protoproedros, while Leichoudes became protovestiarios, rising to patriarch in 1059. In that same year, Psellos abandoned Isaak and secured Constantine X on the throne. In 1069, Romanos IV Diogenes, on his second campaign against the Seljuks, forced Psellos to accompany him. The emperor was unwilling to leave the court schemer Psellos in the capital. The emperor’s suspicions were well founded. Psellos used the first possible pretext to return to the capital, and when Romanos IV was defeated at Manzikert, Psellos was to the fore in effecting his deposition, securing Psellos’s pupil Michael VII Doukas on the throne. Michael Psellos died shortly after Nikephoros III Botaniates seized power in 1078.

Anna Komnene

Anna Komnene was born on 2nd December 1083, the eldest child and first daughter of Alexios I Komnenos and Irene Doukaina. Most significantly, and a fact the reader of _The Alexiad_ is never allowed to forget, Anna was born in the porphyra chamber of the imperial

---

79. Hunger, _Hochsprachliche Literatur_, 375.

80. Kenneth Snipes, "A Letter of Michael Psellos to Constantine the Nephew of Michael Cerularios", _GRBS_ 22 (1981), 89-107, especially 107 for the suggestion that Psellos’s account of the hardships he endured may be humorous in intent.
palace, and her birth was associated with a miraculous happening.\textsuperscript{81} This self-conception as the eldest born of the Komnenoi-Doukai porphyrogennetoi was an expression of her goal in life: "Lebenziel Annas, nämlich dereinst als Kaiserin den Thron zu besteigen."\textsuperscript{82}

At an early age, Anna Komnene was betrothed to Constantine Doukas, the son of Michael VII and Maria the Alan, and she was brought up in the household of her future mother-in-law. Her future became less bright with the birth of her brother John in 1087, and in 1092 she lost her priority in the succession to John. It seems that Constantine Doukas died about two years later.

By 1097 at the latest, she was married to Nikephoros Bryennios, the grandson of the Bryennios captured by the youthful Alexios, and blinded by Botaniates.\textsuperscript{83} The marriage may have been prompted by a desire to tie the Bryennios family more closely to the ruling Komnenoi. The marriage produced two sons and a daughter though they receive no mention in The Alexiad, and it seems to have lasted happily until Nikephoros Bryennios's death in 1136-7. "Anna's Caesar" was liked by his mother-in-law, and with her daughter, Irene Doukaina attempted to replace John Komnenos with Bryennios and Anna in the succession. All the machinations came to nothing and after her husband's death\textsuperscript{84} Anna retired to the monastery of

\textsuperscript{81} The Alexiad VI viii 2, Leib 2:61 4-17.

\textsuperscript{82} Hunger, Hochsprachliche Literatur, 401.


Kecharitomene, founded by her mother. There she began work on completing the life of her father begun by her husband at the request of her mother. Anna died in about 1153-4.

As a highly educated porphyrogennete, Anna Komnene was part of the Byzantine élite. However, as Hunger has remarked "die Hälfte ihres Lebens (seit 1118) hatte sie fern von Macht und Einfluß verbracht" and to this extent *The Alexiad* may be described as an outsider production.

Niketas Choniates.

Niketas Choniates was born in about 1155 in Chonai, a younger son of a reasonably well-off family. When he was about nine years old, Niketas was sent by his father to Constantinople where, under the supervision of his elder brother Michael, Niketas was to receive his higher education. Michael Choniates was the first born son and destined for the Church; he eventually became Metropolitan of Athens. Niketas was destined to make his career in the state service.

It was not until 1182 that Niketas began his career as a tax official in Paphlagonia. He was recalled to Constantinople and promoted to imperial secretary (βασιλικός ὑπογραμματεύς) under Alexios II, though he may have been appointed during the reign of Manuel I Komnenos. Niketas Choniates withdrew from public office when Andronikos I seized power. It was at about this time that Niketas married, though only the family name of the bride - Belissariotes - is known, not her Christian name.

In 1187, Niketas accompanied Isaak II Angelos on campaign.

---

against the Vlachs and the Bulgarians as a secretary. In about 1188-9, Niketas Choniates was once more employed in the financial service, though at a higher grade, as comptroller of Philippopolis. During the Third Crusade, Niketas had the difficult task of reconciling the contradictory orders of the emperor - that the city be defended, and that the city walls be torn down.

However, by the next year (1190), Niketas Choniates was logothetikos grammateikos in the office of the Logothete of the Drome. Enjoying the trust of Isaak II Angelos, Niketas Choniates became kritis tou bhlou (1190-1) and ephor, ep tow krisewwv and finally logotheti tou geuikov, gaining eventually general oversight of all exchequer activities. Even though Niketas spent about a decade (1195-1204) as logotheti twv sekrwv or as megas logotheti, and therefore belonged to the Senate, he seems to have exercised little political influence. Niketas lost his place as Grand Logothete when Alexios Murtzuphlos seized power in February 1204. A few weeks later, he lost his second house in the city when the Latins took the city. Niketas fled to Selybria with his family where he remained until sometime in 1206. In the latter part of that year he spent six months in Constantinople before moving on to Nicaea in 1207, where the Byzantine government in exile had established itself.

Niketas Choniates attempted to gain preferment at the court of Theodore I Laskaris by use of his skills as a rhetor, but he appears not to have had any great political influence on the Nicaean government. Niketas had fallen on hard times and complained about the reduced circumstances in Nicaea. We do not know anything about Niketas's
final years. He died in about 1215-6, survived by his wife and several small children.

**Introduction to Texts.**

Michael Psellos's *Chronographia* exists in only one manuscript, Paris BN 1712. It is a twelfth-century production also containing the histories of Leo the Deacon, Michael Attaleiates and John Skylitzes. Whilst Mango's comment cannot be denied, it is perhaps *The Chronographia*’s novelty which reduced its popularity. Psellos's work was named *The Chronographia* by the scribe who copied out the surviving manuscript. Psellos himself uses the term only once whereas he uses term ‘iōtopía’ twice. Psellos’s usage of these terms is so rare that no attempt to analyze it would be meaningful. Any case made would be further weakened by the location of the two terms on either side of the 1059 divide.

The way Psellos attempts to explain why things happened means that his work is more like history than chronicle, even though its basic structure is the succession of reigns. *The Chronographia* is a strange kind of history. It is very personal in that Psellos himself is frequently a centre-stage participant, and is therefore more like a politician’s memoirs, a setting straight of the record. The possibility that the work was composed in two sections, and joined together at a later

---


date, further complicates the Chronographia's generic classification.91

However, it would seem that Psellos intended to write history. He begins in 976 at the death of John I Tzimiskes. The omission of a formal prooimion indicates that Psellos meant his work to serve as a continuation of the history of Leo the Deacon. Psellos's coverage of the events of 976-1077 is patchy in the extreme. Praise has been lavish:

Cet ouvrage a largement contribué à éclairer une période de l'histoire byzantine qui nous était très imparfaitement connue. La chronologie de Psellos constitue une source d'autant plus précieuse que l'auteur a occupé de hautes fonctions publiques et vécu dans l'intimité des princes.92

However, relying on Psellos alone, we would have no knowledge of the Bulgarian conquests under Basil II. The amount said about each reign varies considerably. For the reigns of Basil II, Constantine VIII and Romanos III (976-1034) Psellos contents himself with a summary, justified on the grounds that he was not an eyewitness to these events. The account is more developed for the reigns of Michael IV (1034-41) and Michael V (1041-2), but it achieves its full character as a personal memoir in the account of the reign of Constantine IX Monomachos.

90 1) Basil II to the end of Isaak Komnenos written between 1059 and 1063 at the request of a colleague, perhaps Leichoudes; and 2) Constantine X to Michael VII written in the mid-to-late 1070's either at the request of the Doukai or to curry favour with them. It has also been suggested that the section on Constantine IX was written separately see R. Anastasi, Studi sulla Chronographia di Michele Psello (Catania, 1969), 66.

91 Hunger, Hochsprachliche Literatur, 377; Renauld 1:xli-x; Christian Zervos, Un philosophe néoplatonicien du XIe siècle: Michel Psellos, Sa vie, son œuvre, ses luttes philosophiques, son influence (New York, 1974), 133.

92 Zervos, Un philosophe, 132.
(1042-55), whose thirteen-year reign takes up one hundred pages of Renauld's 339 page edition of the text. The reign of Isaak Komnenos is treated in 28 pages, the six-year reign of Constantine X in 14 pages, the four years of Romanos IV receives 15 pages, and the reign of Michael VII in 13 pages.

It has been suggested that The Chronographia was actually written as two works - the narrative up to the end of the reign of Isaak Komnenos and the appeal to the Doukai - which were joined together only after Psello's death. This may explain The Chronographia's liminality on the border between history and enkomiion. However, despite the weaknesses of Psello's narrative, what does engage the reader is the courtier's interests in the personality of the emperors, the internal politics of the court, with the comings and goings of the various power groups. In comparison with the physical descriptions by other historians, the "psychological" analysis of Psello, who attempts to account for changes in the psyches of his characters, is a great advance. We perceive the characters as living people: in Hunger's words: "stellt er [Psello] uns seine Figuren klar und lebendig vor Augen und läßt sie als echte Menschen Irrtümern und Inkonsequenzen erliegen."

The continual presence of Psello causes annoyance if one is

94. Hunger, Hochsprachliche Literatur, 378, n.249.
95. B. Rubin, "Zur Kaiserkritik Ostroms", in Studi Byzantini e neoellenici (_atti dell’VIII Congresso Internazionale di Studi Byzantini Palermo 1951), 8 (1953), 460.
96. Hunger, Hochsprachliche Literatur, 379.
attempting to reconstruct the events of the eleventh century. However, if one wishes to make the acquaintance of a Byzantine bureaucrat, and how he viewed the world\textsuperscript{97}, then little improvement could be made on The Chronographia as source material.

Like Psellos's Chronographia, Anna Komnene's Alexiad is a rather strange kind of history. Charles Diehl's view - that The Alexiad is less the title of a history book than the title of an epic poem, written to celebrate a legendary hero\textsuperscript{98} - is supported by reading of the text. While Anna Komnene claims that she loves truth more than she loves her father, this is more a rhetorical flourish to encourage her readers to take her views as the complete truth.

Even though Anna raises Alexios above Constantine the Great, and regards her father as worthy of a place among the apostles, nevertheless "grâce à elle nous connaissons bien l'homme et pouvons voir ce qu'il fut."\textsuperscript{99} Providing we take note of Anna's focus on Alexios, how she contrives to show him in the best light, and how all the major characteristics are portrayed in relation to Alexios\textsuperscript{100}, then The Alexiad provides a useful source, not least to balance the western chronicles of the First Crusade.

\textsuperscript{97} Günter Weiβ, Oströmische Beamte im Spiegel der Schriften des Michael Psellos (Munich, 1973); also - for a more idiosyncratic view, see A. R. Gadolin, A Theory of History and Society (Amsterdam, 1987).


\textsuperscript{99} Diehl, Société, 8.

\textsuperscript{100} For example, Alexios as hero and Bohemond as antihero.
As sources for her work, Anna used Psellos, Attaleiates, Skylitzes and of course Bryennios. By quoting the text of the chrysobull appointing Anna Dalassena regent and the terms of the treaty of Devol, Anna Komnene shows that she had some access to the official archives. She also used information gathered from her relations and the "old soldiers" of Alexios's reign.

The text of *The Alexiad* is made up of Vaticanus graecus 981 (prooimion); Florentinus 70,2 (books I-XIV) and par. Coislinianus (books II-XV). Leib suggests that the variety of readings in these early manuscripts may be due to an eager public demanding copies of the work, because of the fame of the subject matter and the author. This wide audience would explain two divergent near-contemporary manuscripts, together with an epitome, written perhaps with Anna Komnene's approval.101

The complex manuscript history of Niketas Choniates's *Narrative* is dealt with comprehensively in van Dieten's introduction to his edition.102 The work covers the period from 1118 to about 1207, if the account "What befell the Romans after the fall of Constantinople" is included. In common with Psellos's *Chronographia* and Komnene's *Alexiad*, Choniates's *Narrative* does not cover all events equally. The reign of John II Komnenos and the first two decades of Manual I Komnenos's reign are treated in summary fashion compared with other sections. He used the account of Archbishop Eustathios when dealing with the Norman conquest of Thessaloniki. Grecu has

101. Leib, 1:clxxiv.
suggested that not only did Choniates know and use the history by Kinnamos, but that the existence of Kinnamos's work shaped Choniates's *Narrative*; what Kinnamos dealt with extensively, Choniates abbreviated whereas Choniates developed and added new material to what Kinnamos merely mentioned.\(^\text{103}\) Choniates's accounts of official happenings frequently are his own personal eye-witness accounts. Niketas Choniates describes his intention to continue the histories of those who ended their accounts in 1118.\(^\text{104}\)

The purpose of history is to preserve the deeds of both good and bad to serve as lessons for the living. The organization by reigns suggests a strict chronological approach, but Niketas Choniates uses his history to attempt an explanation of why the events of 1204 befell God's chosen people.

**Introduction to a Solution?**

Having introduced the three sources on which this study concentrates, I now indicate how the study proceeds. Drawing upon the three articles that started my thinking about Byzantine outsiders, the way forward for this study is as follows. After this introduction, I review some of the sociological studies of deviancy and outcasts to develop a working definition of what is meant by "the outsider". The crucial point about definitions of outsiders is that they are not rigid. Obvious examples of this abound: Michael Psellos was cast aside and ignored by his pupil; Anna Komnene was part of the Byzantine élite, and yet she spent the second half of her life far from the centres of

\(^{103}\) V. Grecu, "Nicetas Choniatès a-t-il connu l’histoire de Jean Cinnamos?" *RÉB* 7-8 (1949-50), 201.

\(^{104}\) Je. Glykas, Komnene and Zonaras; *Historia*, van Dieten 4:68-71.
power; Niketas Choniates was ousted from his positions of power by the conquest of 1204 and the associated turmoil.

The second matter requiring some consideration is the way in which literary sources should be used as historical sources. Literary studies and history frequently have different objectives in view. However, given that in this study I am using sources written by their authors in a consciously literary manner, it seems useful to examine the differing ways of obtaining full meaning from the texts.

I have identified four categories of outsiders - by gender, by religion, by race and by τάξις. This fourfold categorization of outsiders is not envisaged as Douglas grid-group axes, though this has proved a fruitful line of sociological investigation into Byzantine society. The choice of these four categories is strictly utilitarian as they seem to cover most possibilities without becoming too complex. As this is merely the exposition of a method, and given the large volume of evidence available in the three texts, I examine perceptions of outsiders by each category for one text only (by gender in The Chronographia, by religion in The Alexiad, and by race in The Narrative) with the exception of the perception of outsiders by τάξις which is examined in relation to all three texts by way of a control.107

105 Mary Douglas, In the Active Voice (London, 1982), 191-2; and 205-8.


107 To allow close detailed reference to the texts, I have not attempted to give references to the corpus of secondary sources,
Having laid out the basic plan, it is now time to turn attention to nuts if not bolts, and to attempt a definition of exactly what an outsider is.
CHAPTER TWO

WHAT IS AN OUTSIDER?

But really, it is something that does not go beyond our nature, for someone to have practised one science [out] of them all, as if [it were] an intimate acquaintance, and then to go out, as if in the course of investigation and to have understood the other [sciences]; and moved from it to turn back again once more.¹

The three articles by Lopez, Patlagean and Beck provide the less than helpful definition that an outsider is someone who is not an insider; the outsider is the Other. Such a definition has a certain elegance about it, but it also poses the question of who or what defined the insider. Both Patlagean and Beck shied away from the large task of defining who the Byzantines were, or what made certain individuals Byzantines. In a similar attempt to side-step the issue of what imponderable mélange made the Byzantines, I have had recourse to theoretical analyses developed in the social sciences.

In historical disciplines, mention of theory frequently provokes dismissive comments about the "naive empiricism" of positivist research programmes on the one hand; or the irritated dismissal

¹ Τὸ γὰρ δὴ ἀκριβεῖας ταῦτα εἰδέναι, οὕτως ἂν αὐτὸς περὶ ἑαυτοῦ σεμινολογίσασι, οὕτως ἄλλω πιστεύοντα λέγοντι, τὸ δὲ μίαν τῶν παιδῶν ἐπιστήμην ὡσπερ ἔστιν ἰδεῖν ἑαυτῷ ἡποικοκτόνα τινὰ ἐνεπελευθερών εἰς τὰ ἱστορία ἔζιοντα καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐν περιοχή γένοις, καὶ αὕτης ἐπιστολογίσασιν ἢ ἡς κεκινηται τοῦτο δὴ οὐ παῦν τι τὴν φύσιν ἡμῶν ὑπερῆλθε. Chron. VI 11, Renaudel 1:136-7 5-11.
of theoretical work as full of incomprehensible jargon and abstractions of no practical value whatever.\footnote{John Haldon, ""Jargon" vs. ""the Facts"? Byzantine History-Writing and Contemporary Debates", BMGS 9 (1984-5), 95-132.}

The main point developed by Haldon in this article is that all historical endeavour has recourse to some theory, and that it is fairer to one's readership to make one's theoretical approach explicit, even if to do so is to reveal its eclectic nature. Many social scientists seem to believe that history is atheoretical.\footnote{"Sociology is history with the hard work left out; history is sociology with the brains left out." Donald G. MacRae, "Some Sociological Prospects", Transactions of the Third World Congress of Sociology (London, 1956), 8:302; Piotr Sztompka, System and Function: Toward a Theory of Society (London, 1974), 13-4; William Smart Frederick Pickering, Anglo-Catholicism: A Study in Religious Ambiguity (London, 1989), 3.}

This view has been encouraged by the adherents of empirical historiography, who regard it as bad form to talk of how one "does" history: one merely reads the sources and writes history.\footnote{Compare "Social facts do not exist as things in their own right." Frank Parkin, Max Weber: Key Sociologists Series (London, 1982), 30, with E. H. Carr's view of historical fact [E. H. Carr, What is History? (Harmondsworth, 1964), 7-24].}

History based in explicit theory gives words used in analysis clear definitions. For example, a heretic is an outsider, but does "heretic" describe someone who holds a wrong religious belief, or a person who is labelled as holding wrong religious beliefs by representatives of the dominant religion? The latter case is usually assumed by both author and reader of modern histories, but it is best to be clear about possible ambiguities.

There are a number of words which are needed to explain what I understand by the term "outsider". These include society, community,
culture, élites, masses, dominant ideology, alienation, marginalization and deviancy. These terms have a currency in the social sciences, and it is from those disciplines that definitions should be derived, so that meaning is imported with the words themselves.

These technical terms derive in the main from sociology. Traditionally, sociology has been seen as a discipline which relies on quantitative methods, allowing the formulation of general theories of human social behaviour, and as such has been overshadowed as a source of theoretical insight for historians by social anthropology, which shares with history a concern for the particular. The methods of social anthropology - direct participant observation with comparative analysis,

the use of insight, close attention to detail, validity through internal consistency and capacity to deal at the same time with all levels of behaviour from material artifacts to psychic life have been more familiar to historians (especially mediaevalists perhaps) than sociology's complex research design, statistical manipulation, data validation and replication. However, are the analytical concepts derived from social anthropology the only ones of use in studying Byzantine society? In Das byzantinische Jahrtausend, Beck has indicated that we are still a long way from a history of Byzantine society. While the nature of Byzantine society is still open

to question, it is a needless limitation to rely only on social anthropology, which developed its method in the study of primitive, or preliterate peoples, most frequently defined as those that did not have writing at the time of first contact with the west.8

This orientation has favoured the study of villages and small communities.9 With the growth of historical anthropology10, the connection between history and social anthropology has been very fruitful. Social anthropology's particular, non-statistical method has been successfully applied to complex, urban, literate societies.11 It is at this point, as an outsider to both social anthropology and sociology, that the distinction between the two disciplines escapes me. A facile

8. Greenberg, IEES, 305b.


division may once have been possible; now it seems prudent to
avoid ascription to discipline and say merely that I have derived my
approach from the model which seems to describe best the
phenomena I am attempting to explain.

Society and Community.

Whether Gesellschaft or Gemeinschaft, Byzantium in the eleventh
and twelfth centuries was a distinctive human grouping. Most
analytical definitions of discrete human groupings postulate a
relatively independent or self-sufficient population, characterized by
internal organization, territoriality, cultural distinctiveness (material
or symbolic) and sexual recruitment. Human interaction in groups is
political, that is at its basic level it is concerned with power, the
control over access to resources.\textsuperscript{15} That treatments of Byzantium address access to power should come as no surprise. Kazhdan has reminded us that Byzantine sources of the period favoured a two-fold division of society into the haves and the have-nots, whilst Rosemary Morris has used this division as a title.\textsuperscript{16} As a distinctive social entity, and not a mere aggregate of individuals, the irreducible unit is not the individual, but something social, that is interdependencies and interrelationships (\textit{Wechselwirkungen}).\textsuperscript{17}

Functionalism sees the human group as an organic entity, and examines social phenomena in terms of their consequences.\textsuperscript{18} Comte's writings prompted two emphases in functional analysis. Firstly, some notional "good" or "normal" state of the group is postulated; secondly, functionalism stresses the idea of social equilibrium, whether in the form of integration or cohesion.\textsuperscript{19} A weakness of functional analysis - if one is attempting Weber's \textit{erklärendes Verstehen} - is that the discovery of the need that a structure functions to meet does not explain its origins, its cause, the ultimate "why?":

\begin{flushright}
To show how a fact is useful is not to explain how it originated or why it is what it is...The need we have of things cannot give
\end{flushright}


\textsuperscript{17} McKee, \textit{Introduction to Sociology}, 25-6.


\textsuperscript{19} Turner and Maryanski, \textit{Functionalism}, 4-5.
them existence nor can it confer their specific nature upon them. It is to causes of another sort that they owe their existence...[for] no force can be engendered except by an antecedent force.20

Parsons's refinement requisite functionalism sees four requisites that all action systems - biological, psychological, social and symbolic - must meet if they are to survive. All action systems must seek resources from the environment, convert them into usable facilities, and then distribute them to the rest of the system. This is the requisite of adaption. All action systems must maintain coherent interrelationships among their constituent structures, and inhibit abnormalities between structures. This is the requisite of integration. All systems must set goals, establish priorities and allocate resources in order to achieve them. This is the requisite of goal attainment. All action systems must a) generate structures that can fit into the system (the problem of pattern maintenance); and b) reduce tensions between structures within the system. This is the requisite of latency.21

Rather than functionalism's positive, top-down interpretation, conflict theory views human groups as battlegrounds where human beings, as organisms in interaction, compete for access to status, power and scarce resources. Social organization is seen as a mechanism for regulating the struggle for existence, and is itself the product of antagonistic co-operation between competing organisms and groups. The aims of the conflicting parties are not only to gain

---

20. Émile Durkheim, quoted in Turner and Maryanski, Functionalism, 17.

21. Turner and Maryanski, Functionalism, 74-78. Note the similarities between the diagrams for these ideas and Douglas's grid-group.
their desiderata for themselves, but also to neutralize or eliminate their rivals. Sumner's dictum that the distinction between the ingroup (ourselves) and the outgroup (everybody else) is established in and through conflict has found general acceptance. This formulation is naturalistic in insisting that normative complexes develop gradually and naturally as a response to environmental stimulus.

For structuralists, the discrete human group is:

the largest and most encompassing of social structures, whose diverse groups and institutions are organized with a reasonable coherence into a single entity.

"A system is an entity made up of parts", but it is more than merely the sum of its parts; "it is the sum of its parts plus the relations among them." The useful corrective provided by the structuralist perspective - needed as we shall see when dealing with deviancy - is that "one must not be so intrigued with the components as to lose sight of the system." The system includes mechanisms in its organization for maintaining an equilibrium in interaction between the various units. These mechanisms also maintain boundaries, as the units in interaction must be kept distinct both from each other and from the environment. These structurally generated notions of unit

26. Lenski and Lenski, Human Societies, 52.
and boundary permit consideration of outsiders, i.e. those beyond the boundaries.

As well as socialization and controls internalized by the social actors, reliance is also placed on social pressure, custom\textsuperscript{27}, mores\textsuperscript{28}, norms\textsuperscript{29} and laws\textsuperscript{30} to ensure that the social system’s interaction is maintained.\textsuperscript{31} Correct behaviour is achieved by use of rewards and sanctions to ensure the social system’s continued existence.

The purpose of a sanction is to bring about behaviour considered to be in conformity with the goals and standards of a group, and to prevent behaviour which is inconsistent with those goals and standards. Notions of deterrence prompt sociologists to define sanction as the promise of reward for normative behaviour, with such rewards being withheld if the norms are breached, rather than as the threat of punishment. Thus sanctions are seen as latent, which means that they cannot be arbitrary; their existence must be generally known, and they must be regularly implemented. Informal sanctions imposed

\textsuperscript{27} Also known as folkways, customs are the right, or customary way of doing anything in social interaction. Violation of a custom brings ridicule rather than punishment, but the desire for acceptance on the part of individuals ensures widespread conformity McKee, \textit{Introduction to Sociology}, 85.

\textsuperscript{28} Mores are those standards of behaviour which are regarded as being crucial for the welfare of the group. Violation of the mores of a group usually involves a group enforced punishment McKee, \textit{Introduction to Sociology}, 85.


\textsuperscript{30} Law may be viewed as a body of institutionalized norms, with the norms, the method of identifying the norm-transgressors, and the sanction all institutionalized McKee, \textit{Introduction to Sociology}, 86.

\textsuperscript{31} McKee, \textit{Introduction to Sociology}, 103.
by the social group are frequently more drastic than penalties contained in the law code.32

A. P. Cohen33 advocated the definition of group by use. Two related suggestions emerge. A community exists where the members of a group of people a) have something in common with each other; and b) those things they have in common distinguishes them in a significant way from the members of other putative groups.

Community then, is a relational term.34 In many ways the term community is invoked only when there is the desire to mark out "the other".35 This stress on differentiating the other indicates that the nature of community is to be found in the notion of boundary. Boundaries encapsulate the community and are called into being by contact.

Boundaries are marked because communities interact in some way or other with entities from which they are, or wish to be distinguished.36

In the modern world, the obvious boundaries are those enshrined in law - counties, provinces, nation-states. Boundaries may be physical - seas, mountains or deserts, or they may be grounded in anthropology - race/ethnic group, language, religion. This suggests an objective reality to boundary markers. Unfortunately they are more likely to

32. A. L. Epstein, s.v. "Sanction", *JEHE.*


exist only in the minds of the beholders. Thus boundaries are symbolic because their importance lies in what they signify, what meaning they are capable of encompassing, what meaning they are capable of being perceived as encompassing, not what they actually are. The symbolic nature of intercommunal boundaries becomes increasingly apparent as the communities become smaller. With decreasing size, objective points of reference become fewer and less clear, until they become invisible to the external observer. For members of the community, however, the importance of the boundary is in inverse proportion to the existence of objective boundary markers and the size of the community.

...[P]eople become aware of their culture when they stand at its boundaries: when they encounter other cultures or when they become aware of other ways of doing things or merely of contradictions to their own culture. The norm is the boundary; its reversal, a symbolic means of recognizing and stating it.

Members of a community defend their borders when faced with an external threat which they fear will overwhelm them if they do not respond. It is also impelled by the collective mind-set, which they hold to be the product of their shared experience. Their identity comes from the occupation of social space. If outsiders trespass in that space, then its occupants’ own sense of self is threatened. If structural and spatial distance is lost then the sense of self derived from communal

---


38. A. P. Cohen, Symbolic Construction, 69. See also Frederik Barth, Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference (Boston, 1969), 10; and Barth, Scale and Social Organization (Oslo-Bergen-Tromso, nd).
space is already in a weakened state. However, in return for abiding by the norms of the group the individual is accepted. In turn, this acceptance of norms, reciprocated by acceptance of group members by the group, serves to delineate boundaries for the group - who is a member and who is not.

Culture.

The non-human element of a discrete human group is usually termed culture. The classic definition of culture is provided by Sir Edward Tylor:

Culture...taken in its wide ethnographic sense is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society.

Merrill defines culture as:

an abstraction. The basic reality is human behaviour and the product of that behaviour. We cannot see culture as such, we can only see human behaviour. This behaviour occurs in regular, patterned fashion and from this regularity we infer the existence of something that we call culture.

It is the means whereby humanity adjusts to its environment, providing socially acceptable patterns for meeting biological and social needs. In this guise, culture has a material element - the tools

produced to manipulate the physical world. Culture is humanity's social heritage, the sum total received from previous generations; it is shared (never a personal phenomenon) and learned by individuals in the course of their personal development, shaping personality. The stress is not on material culture but on its symbolic quality:

Culture then has two divergent though related meanings. A still useful conception conceives of culture as encompassing the vast range of non-biological phenomena that men themselves create and then transmit from one generation to another. It constitutes a social heritage, albeit an ever-changing one.

Abner Cohen is scathing:

The term "culture" is extensively used in many different senses and is too wide in its different connotations to be useful in operational microsociological studies. He runs the gamut of custom, norms, values, myths and ritual before settling on symbol as referring to phenomena that are objective and collective and are thus observable and verifiable, and it covers a wide range of cultural phenomena, though it is precise enough to indicate normative patterns of action, in contrast with utilitarian and technical patterns.

The difficulty with symbol is that it tends to conceal, rather than illuminate; it is part of the jargon to be explained. Another conception of culture places emphasis upon the fact that man organizes his life and gives meaning and significance to it by means of symbols. It clearly implies that human beings

---

44. McKee, Introduction to Sociology, 77; Merrill, Society and Culture, 131.
45. McKee, Introduction to Sociology, 77 & 82; Merrill, Society and Culture, 131.
46. McKee, Introduction to Sociology, 84-85.
47. Abner Cohen, Two-Dimensional Man, x.
desire to do more than organically survive. Through symbols people confer meaning upon their lives and construct styles of life. The values that they create are then used to interpret and organize their lives within the limits of objective contingencies and human power. Human beings in essence do not merely biologically exist, they live by values and meanings expressed in symbols. This more recent conception of culture then, views it as a symbolic pattern of values and ideas, a relatively coherent set of meanings and understandings.49

A symbol is "a stimulus that has a learned meaning and value for people."50 In these terms, culture is "an information conveyor whose form is arbitrary, and whose meaning is determined by those who use it."51 The use of symbols by persons in interaction enables the participants to give meaning to transactions and to understand - at a socially defined level - what is going on, though the sharing of a symbol is not the same as sharing the meaning. Symbolic interaction occurs when persons communicate their meanings and intentions by words or gestures.52 Both words and gestures are symbolic; very few words have any real connection between phoneme and phenomenological object. The role of language as a conveyor of symbolic meaning will be treated in the next chapter. For the present however, it is sufficient to note that:

49. McKee, Introduction to Sociology, 84-85.
50. Merrill, Society and Culture, 24.
51. Lenski and Lenski, Human Societies, 18.
52. A. P. Cohen, Symbolic Construction, 15-16 & 19; Edmund Leach, Culture and Communication: The Logic by which Symbols are Connected. An Introduction to the Use of Structuralist Analysis in Social Anthropology (Cambridge, 1976), 49; McKee, Introduction to Sociology, 63; Merrill, Society and Culture, 20.
language is more than a passive instrument of communication; it is part of our experience and therefore it helps determine what we feel, what we perceive and what we do.\textsuperscript{53}

This use of language as creator of symbols brings into existence things without prior existence.\textsuperscript{54} By use of language, humanity constitutes a symbolic environment in which it lives. Reality is not an observable, phenomenologically distinct object or range of objects:

rather [it is] all those sense impressions and perceptions that have been sifted through a symbolic screen and then given a recognizable form and set of relations by man-made symbols. It is a human construct, a product of the mind.\textsuperscript{55}

A. P. Cohen formulates community not as social structure, nor as a "doing", but rather as the "thinking". Community is a symbolic not a structural construct.\textsuperscript{56}

This notion of symbol is crucial to modern sociological analysis. Berger has used notions of symbol to give a clear statement of the ambiguous position of the discrete human group:

Society is a dialectic phenomenon in that it is a human product and nothing but a human product, that yet continuously acts


\textsuperscript{54} "Symbolization constitutes objects not constituted before, objects which would not exist except for the context of social relationships wherein symbolization occurs. Language does not simply symbolize a situation or object which is already there in advance; it makes possible the existence or the appearance of that situation or object, for it is part of the mechanism whereby that situation or object is created." McKee, \textit{Introduction to Sociology}, 61, quoting G. H. Mead.

\textsuperscript{55} McKee, \textit{Introduction to Sociology}, 62; Mary Douglas, \textit{In the Active Voice} (London, 1982), 3, suggests that this speech determinism - only a step away from cultural determinism - is not the best corrective to mechanistic determinism.

\textsuperscript{56} A. P. Cohen, \textit{Symbolic Construction}, 98.
back upon its producer. Society is a product of man. ... There can be no social reality apart from man. Yet it may also be stated that man is the product of society. ... it is within society, as a result of social processes, that the individual becomes a person, that he attains and holds onto an identity, and that he carries out the various projects that constitute his life. Man cannot exist apart from society. The two statements, that society is the product of man and that man is the product of society, are not contradictory.57

The human group, or world as Berger terms it here, is socially constructed and socially maintained. On-going social processes confirm the existence of the world; if the processes are interrupted, then the thoughtworld is threatened. To be maintained, a world requires a social base, i.e. continuing social interaction. Berger terms this the "plausibility structure", i.e. the structure maintaining the plausibility of the world as an on-going concern; it is in effect the worldview, mentalité, Weltanschauung, or to use a term from a different construct, ideology.58

An ideology is an explanation of how and why a sociopolitical system works as it does, as well as a justification for that system. Most simply, it is a set of beliefs and values which rationalizes a society's structure of power and privilege.59


Politics may be the art of the possible, but it is more concretely the art of resource allocation. A subordinate status may be ascribed to a social group which simply excludes that group from all political decisions. A second method has been termed the politics of deference. In United Kingdom general elections since 1945, it is clear that Conservative governments are returned only when at least one third of the working class vote Tory. The problem for Marxist analysis, then is why do these voters go against their own class interest? There is no clear answer, but in part it involves ideology.

That ideology which explains and justifies the status quo - that is, the prevailing power and reward structures - is called the dominant ideology. Since power and wealth are never distributed equally in any society, some justification and explanation must be provided for those at the top who gain the most from the way the system works as well as for those at the bottom who gain the least.60

Abercrombie outlines the main components of the dominant ideology thesis as follows:

The thesis argues that in all societies based on class divisions there is a dominant class which enjoys control of both the means of material production and the means of mental production. Through its control of ideological production, the dominant class is able to supervise the construction of a set of coherent beliefs. These dominant beliefs of the dominant class are more powerful, dense and coherent that those of subordinate classes. The dominant ideology penetrates and infects the consciousness of the working class, because the working class comes to see and experience reality through the conceptual categories of the dominant class. The dominant ideology functions to incorporate the working class within a system which is in fact operating against the material interests of labour. This incorporation in turn explains the coherence and integration of capitalist society.61

60 Marger, Elites and Masses, 307.

There are certain drawbacks to this notion of dominant ideology, not least the heavy emphasis on the economic origin of all social structures and institutions. Marger presents his definition of elites and masses, which can be applied to Byzantium's powerful and poor:

Elites are those who occupy the society's top positions of power and wealth. They are the people who exercise authority, influence, and control of resources within the society's important organizations. They formulate policies, guide the activities, and decide the significant issues of government, the corporation, education, and other major societal institutions. They own the bulk of the society's wealth. And perhaps most importantly, they are able to impose on the society as a whole their explanation and justification for the dominant political and economic systems.

Masses or nonelites are those who comprise the vast majority of the society's populace, whose power, wealth, and prestige are limited. Obviously there are great differences in power, wealth and prestige among nonelites. However, in deciding the fundamental issues of the political and economic systems - in political scientist Harold Lasswell's oft-quoted phrase, "who gets what, when, how?" - these differences decline in significance. The important distinction is basically between the few at the very top and the remaining populace.

In addition to organization, personal attributes and social forces, the elite is able to employ a ruling class ideology to ensure their continued place at the top of the political hierarchy.

Stereotypes.

Beliefs and attitudes derive from experience, but they are also learned in socialization as part of culture. A belief is a perceived relationship between two things or between something and a characteristic of it. Collectively, beliefs compose individuals'

63. Daryl J. Bern, Beliefs, Attitudes and Human Affairs (Belmont, CA., 1970), 2; Leach, Culture and Communication, 9.
64. Bern, Beliefs, Attitudes and Human Affairs, 4.
understanding of themselves and their environment. Beliefs ultimately rest on the credence one gives to one's own senses or on a basic belief in the credibility of some external authority. Zero-order beliefs are the nonconscious axioms upon which other beliefs are built. They are nonconscious because they are repressed as too painful to be admitted to the intellect. First-order beliefs derive from zero-order beliefs but without any formal inference. Zero- and first-order beliefs demand no independent formal or empirical confirmation, and require no justification beyond a citation of direct experience. They are usually based on generalizations abstracted from several experiences over time.

Generalizing from a limited set of experiences and treating individuals as members of a group are not only common cognitive acts but necessary ones. They are "thinking devices" which enable us to avoid conceptual chaos by "packaging" our world into a manageable number of categories. It is simply not possible to deal with every situation or person as if it or he were unique and the formation of "working stereotype" [generalizations treated as universally true] is inevitable until further experiences either refine or discredit them.65

The problem with stereotypes, therefore, is that they are overgeneralized beliefs, based on too limited a set of experiences, which are then applied too widely.66

However, Bem's definition of stereotype contains a major flaw: it identifies stereotype with error. This equation first appeared in Lipmann's Public Opinion, though that scholar did not present it as an

---

65. Bem, Beliefs, Attitudes and Human Affairs, 8.
66. Bem, Beliefs, Attitudes and Human Affairs, 5-10.
Over time, various reasons have been adduced to account for the invariable error in social stereotypes: they are based on no or insufficient personal experience of the target group; they are grounded in prejudice; stereotype is an inferior mode of thought [compared with the empirical-scientific]; stereotypes are self-fulfilling prophecies. Stereotypes share certain characteristics. They are grounded in folk wisdom. They are categories of groups of people, most frequently racial or ethnic categories, but sex, age, occupation or religion or any other social category may form the basis of a stereotype. The stereotype consists of trait characteristics of the group of people. The traits tend to have evaluative connotations: i.e. living within one's means is being either frugal or stingy. Stereotypes are undifferentiated. If the Jew-as-Shylock stereotype exists, then all Jews are classified as Shylocks. There is no sliding Shylock scale. This is a crucial problem in the study of stereotype, and it is one I examine in this thesis.

Agreement over the category (boundary) and associated traits is said to exist amongst the cultural group that uses the stereotype. However, empirical testing has shown stereotype consensus to be

---


68. This latter view is influential in the structuralist orientation; see Perkins, "Rethinking Deviance", 137. On these assumptions concerning stereotypes see Perkins, "Rethinking Deviance", 138. Mackie counters each of these reasons in turn: Mackie, "Stereotype Inaccuracy", 435-442.

69. See also Perkins, "Rethinking Stereotypes", 144.

70. Perkins, "Rethinking Stereotypes", 142.
illusory. Some researchers have attempted to account for this by redefining stereotype as a belief with a strong emotional commitment on the part of the holder. However, this restricts the application of stereotype unnecessarily, whilst not solving the problem. Finally, stereotypes are said to be inaccurate.\(^{71}\)

Mackie rejects this final element most strongly, pointing to a singular lack of empirical evidence to support it. The validity of a stereotype is a variable which must be tested.\(^{72}\) Mackie suggests the rejection of "stereotype as false", until proven, and offers a revised definition:

> A stereotype refers to those folk beliefs about the attributes characterizing a social category on which there is substantial agreement.\(^{73}\)

**Roles and Statuses.**

Social interaction is "a continuous and reciprocal series of contacts between two or more socialized human beings".\(^{74}\) It may be physical or symbolic; it is always social in that it requires more than one person; and it is dynamic, as each participant is simultaneously actor and reactor.\(^{75}\) Merrill identifies the principal forms of social interaction as competition, co-operation, conflict, accommodation or assimilation. The object of this interaction is access to resources.

\(^{71}\) Mackie, "Stereotype Inaccuracy", 432-435.

\(^{72}\) Mackie suggests a "metasociological" origin for the rejection of "stereotype as truth", based in modern sociologists' liberal orientation: Mackie, "Stereotype Inaccuracy", 442-444.

\(^{73}\) Mackie, "Stereotype Inaccuracy", 435.

\(^{74}\) Merrill, *Society and Culture*, 20.

\(^{75}\) Merrill, *Society and Culture*, 23.
For sociology, there is no human actor. Personality is analyzed as "the sum and organization of those traits which determine the role of the individual in the group." It is a symbolic construct, termed a role. The notion of role allows sociological analysis, as the move is made from total and unique persons to types of actors - mother, teacher, judge, friend, leader. The role is a social position in interaction, filled by an actor, that has certain behavioural requirements and expectations associated with it. Roles are validated each time they are used to give expression to shared symbolic expectations, but they are not automatically limiting or binding. Roles are not precisely defined and so each use gives expression to a slightly different symbolic meaning. In this way, role playing is also role making. This freedom in consistency of orientation rather than conformity to prescribed behaviour is significant when considering the outsider role, as it may be entirely passive i.e. the outsider may not actually do or think anything consistent with the role, but may have the role imposed. A final point to be noted about role is that it is usual for any

---


77. McKee, Introduction to Sociology, 66.

78. Lenski and Lenski, Human Societies, 44. It is "an expectation of behaviour shared among actors in social relations." Lenski & Lenski, 64.

79. McKee, Introduction to Sociology, 65-6, citing Ralph Turner's formulations. "The expectation of role does not prescribe actual behaviour, but instead, suggests an orientation to a particular other. A role only exists when there are relevant other-roles to which it is orientated. The sociologist Ralph Turner has argued cogently against a view of role that sees it as conformity to prescribed behaviour and for a view of role as consistency in orientation to others."
human actor to play differing roles depending on the other with whom interaction is taking place - an obvious range is the actor as child, sex-partner, or parent. For this reason it is more exact to speak of a role-bundle or role-set than of role in the singular. With a plurality of possible roles, it should be remembered that ones which are used most frequently or the ones which are most significant - either in positive or negative terms - are the ones which will be internalized most completely by the actors concerned.

Roles are differentiated. Frequently the social interaction in which two roles are engaged imposes a power differential - one is superior, the other inferior. With actors changing roles depending on the transaction to be undertaken, it is natural that the actors would find themselves superior one moment, inferior the next. This is largely what happens, and would always happen in ideal circumstances. However, certain roles tend to be internalized. These may be pleasant - or at least relatively neutral - even if inferior in power terms; an example of such a role would be child. Almost without exception, the child-role is internalized to all human actors, though its use in later life is limited to two significant others. However, some inferior roles are internalized as a strategy for survival. Failure to internalize the Uncle Tom-role in the American south of Jim Crow, for example, and indeed to present it as a sub-role at all times when dealing with whites, could lead to lynching as an "uppity nigger" - again an assigned

role, laden with symbolic meaning. When the symbolic order conceives of the various roles ranked in hierarchy, then they are stratified. When some roles are perceived of as being more permanent than merely enduring for the duration of the transaction, then there is a tendency for differentiated status to develop. Status is the vertical ranking associated with roles in accordance with the relative importance of those roles conceived in symbolic terms. It reflects the differential allocation by society of power, privilege and prestige. Statuses are of two kinds, ascribed or achieved.

Ascribed statuses are those which are assigned to individuals without reference to their innate differences or abilities. They can be predicted and trained for from the moment of birth. The achieved statuses ... are those requiring special qualities although they are not necessarily limited to these. They are not assigned to individuals from birth but are left open to be filled through competition and individual effort.

The status woman or black is obviously ascribed; the status thief or murderer is achieved. However, is the status heretic ascribed or

---


82. A status is the position an individual occupies in society, whereas a role is the ordered behaviour expected by virtue of the position. One tendency sees differentiation in economic terms: "with differentiation go special forms of social coercion, special monetary incentives to conform, special types of punitive sanctions, specialized police and overseers and progress men scanning our performance and so on, a whole paraphernalia of social control which would never be conceivable in small scale undifferentiated economic conditions." Mary Douglas, Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo (London, 1966), 91-2.

83. Lenski and Lenski, Human Societies, 51.

84. Merrill, Society and Culture, 183.
achieved? It probably depends on individual cases. The infant born to a heretic sub-group of a wider society will have the status heretic ascribed to it by the wider society; by contrast the bishop who strays into error will have earned his status heretic, and so it is achieved. It is not always so clear-cut. The infant with the ascribed status heretic will be socialized in a manner and by a group regarded by society at large as heretic. All the infant’s socialized roles will therefore be heretic, and thus in later life conduct will merit the achieved status of heretic.

The clear and present danger in the use of role, status and class is the difficulty of keeping them distinct in analysis. Is there a Bogomil role? Probably there is a multiplicity, though to the Orthodox they are just varieties of the role heretic. Is there a Bogomil status? Again probably yes, but the problem lies in reference to whom. Is there a Bogomil class? Probably not, in any meaningful sense. This scope for confusion seems to affect sociologists as well, in defining social mobility as:

movement, either upward or downward, between higher or lower social classes, or more precisely, movement between one relatively full time, functionally significant social role and another that is evaluated as either higher or lower. This movement is to be conceived as a process occurring over time, with individuals and their family units moving from one role and social class position to another because of what has happened to them in various kinds of social interaction.

Alienation and the Deviant.

85 A class is "a segment of a society whose members share the same general status." Merrill, Society and Culture, 301.

86 Merrill, Society and Culture, 332-3.
Émile Durkheim, in his study on suicide, conceptualized a state of utter normlessness, which he termed anomie. Anomie is brought on by repeated failure to raise one’s status, by continuous denial of access to the means of gaining one’s life-goals. It is characterized by hopelessness, discouragement, demoralization and despair. For the individual in anomie, disintegration has progressed to a stage when action is no longer governed by socially accepted rules and norms. The individual in anomie is the logically-impossible asocial human being.

Durkheim’s anomie is utter alienation; so extreme it demands urgent resolution, and that resolution often takes the form of suicide. The concept of alienation has a wider currency in sociology. What does it mean? As a word, alienation has three main meanings, 1) the transfer of rights or property; 2) the act or result of turning away from friends; 3) insanity. However, for sociologists the term has expanded in scope:

Loss of self, anxiety-states, anomie, despair, depersonalization, rootlessness, apathy, social disorganization, loneliness,

---

88. Merrill, Society and Culture, 348.
89. McKee, Introduction to Sociology, 25.
The term has widened out to include opposite meanings. It may mean alienation of self from society, or alienation from self through society; it may mean apathy or rebellion; conformity or deviance or isolation; social isolation or the hippie commune.93

In everyday usage the term now sometimes denotes helpless and hopeless misery, sometimes lack of fulfillment, sometimes social protest, and sometimes nothing at all.94

Various suggestions have been made to restore some specific significance to the term alienation.95 Baum suggests that notice should be taken that alienation is meant to be alienation from something. This serves as a corrective even if the term is used without specific referent.96 Robert Schacht suggests three restrictions on the use of the term "alienation":

One should use the term only when first, what it is supposed to denote was preceded by union; second, there is a feeling of alienation; and third, it is not a "critical and polemic term" implying the undesirability of alienation.97

94. Feuerlicht, Alienation, 36; also 4-5.
95. This in spite of Lee's "An Obituary for "Alienation"", 126.
96. Baum, Religion and Alienation, 15.
That alienation is not necessarily negative in import is worth stressing - alienation can serve as a reservoir of potential to meet the demands of new situations. In this sense it is associated with positive aspects of change; this is the alienation of the artist, the author, or even the sociologist. Alienation from society and its power structures may be a revolt against reification, prompted by a desire to preserve and cultivate the self, though in this usage some reservations are required. Alienation-from-self is far removed from this artistic alienation, and is dangerous to the individual, because of its part in developing anomic. "Strangers" in society may possess a degree of alienation-from-self in the roles they maintain for use in interaction with the members of the mainstream community.

Some writers, such as Adorno, have argued against identifying alienation in pre-industrial societies. Feuerlicht expands on this to suggest that:

it took the idea of the value of individuality, its potentialities, its creativity and uniqueness to see the harm done by the demands of life in a mass civilization, with its specialization,


100. "Good sociology should begin with the application of radical skepticism and criticism to one's own society, to one's place in it and, by extension to all social behavior. Sociology should, in short, be alienating." Pierre L. van den Berghe, quoted by Marger, Elites and Masses, 1, emphasis in original.


Social alienation is not identical with normlessness. The dominant authority is often rejected to be replaced by another authority.104

Extreme alienation from society is embodied by the outsiders, a motley group of people who are unwilling or unable to live up to socially accepted or prescribed rules and roles.105

Rather than alienation, with its confused terminology and extreme position, marginality is perhaps a more useful concept. Marginality implies that through spatial and social mobility, we - and indeed the Byzantines of the eleventh and twelfth centuries - have separated from the cultural community of primary socialization. Marginality is a liminal, transitional state between two cultures of socialization or reference.

The problem with deviance is definition: what is deviancy106, and what is meant by it? How is deviance related to the deviant? Is a deviant the same as an outsider, a non-conformist, a member of a minority, a society member on the margins?

As the sociology of deviance developed in the interwar years, it had a strong prescriptive drive. In many studies, the object was to discover

104. Feuerlicht, Alienation, 83.
105. Feuerlicht, Alienation, 85.
the aetiology of deviance, perceived as dysfunctional to society\textsuperscript{107}, and to find a cure. From 1945 until the late sixties, deviance as an object of study was characterized by a drive to the formulation of theory; an amoral approach (ie. it had abandoned the moral imperative to "cure" deviancy); a basis in empirical research; and it attempted to integrate its findings with mainstream sociology. What had been achieved by the late sixties was a "humanizing" of deviants by the removal of overt moralizing and prescription on the part of the observers, though such impulses remain covertly. The emphasis was still on the deviants and the problems they embodied for society, not the problems of society which were expressed in deviancy and the deviants.\textsuperscript{108} In the early sixties, the trend was to labelling theory as the explanation of deviance; in the early seventies, the rage was anti-labellist.\textsuperscript{109} The "me-decade" of eighties seems to have taken its toll:

the revulsion against theoretics and theoretical wrangling, the return of empirical research, the new popularity of historical work and the general air of hard-nosed realism in the late 1970's and early 1980's have all contributed to the demise of theoretical dynamics in this field. Deviance is certainly no longer at the forefront of debates in sociology.\textsuperscript{110}


\textsuperscript{108} Alexander Liazos, "The Poverty of the Sociology of Deviance: Nuts, Sluts and Preverts [sic]", \textit{Social Problems} 20 (1972-73), 103b-104a. Whilst cognates to "prevert" exist in the OED, with the sense of someone who goes beyond the bounds, I am grateful to Nan Astone for the suggestion that the word reflects a variant pronunciation of "pervert" by some socio-economic groups of the middle Atlantic states of the USA.


\textsuperscript{110} Colin Sumner, "Rethinking Deviance", \textit{Research in Law, Deviance and Social Control} 5 (1983), 187.
However, the problem of deviancy is not solved. What happened was merely that the proponents of the various orientations stopped talking to - or at - each other. Properly speaking, there is as yet no theory of deviance, rather there are orientations, sensitizing concepts, which help in developing a theory of deviance. Such a theory must clarify the relationship between deviance, social structure and social change; it must see deviance in terms of social control. Deviancy sociology must ask questions about those who have power, the expositors of the dominant ideology, rather than remaining a sociology of deviant behaviour.

As a result of the fascination with nuts, sluts and preverts and their identities and subcultures, little attention has been paid to the unethical, illegal and destructive actions of powerful individuals, groups and institutions in our society.

Given my purpose in understanding a past society, it is perhaps just as well that these orientations are sensitizing concepts and not full-blown theories, which, for sociologists, are also calls to action:

It should be our task to explore and describe this hierarchy [of differentiated power], its bases of strength, its uses of the "deviant" label to discredit its opponents in order to silence them, and to find ways to eliminate this hierarchy.

Lists of deviants used in empirical studies of modern society make interesting reading: criminals, cheque forgers, embezzlers, murderers, robbers, convicts, drug dealers and addicts, motorcycle gangs, gamblers, alcoholics, prostitutes, homosexuals, adulterers, divorcés and divorcées, widows and orphans, paupers, suicides, mystics, atheists, hippies, beatniks, racially mixed couples, healthfood users, the mentally ill, ex-mental patients, intellectuals, the old, stutterers, village eccentrics, bohemian artists. It would seem we are all deviants, we are all outcasts. If all these persons can be defined as deviant, what does it mean? Goode has pointed out that basically it does not mean anything. Deviance in isolation is meaningless.

Every society has its outcasts; this is a dynamic of each society. What varies is who the outcasts are, what - if anything - they have done and the consequences they face for being outcasts. The materialist view is that there is an objective reality to deviance that can be measured in some way. In this orientation, the stress is on norms, or their institutionalized variant, laws. In this view, the identification of the norm, coupled with the action that contravenes it, provides an objective definition of deviancy. Whilst this materialist-realist view has the appeal of simplicity, it fails to answer three questions: who does the defining? how is behaviour defined as

deviant? and what about behaviour similar to others' actions - which are defined as deviant - but which remains concealed?118

These two orientations seem to imply that deviants are the detritus of society or the waste product of civilization. Secondly they imply that deviancy is somehow intrinsic to the deviant. Such views are countered by labelling theory, which sees deviancy as an ascribed social construction.119

Labelling theory has much of the Holy Roman Empire about it: it is not a theory and it does not label. Goode finds no unified school espousing the research method - indeed he is hard pushed even to find one exponent. Goode prefers "interactionist perspective" as a description.120 However, even if the name is a problem, what is it? For the interactionist/labellist perspective, "deviance is simply defined as those persons or acts that get caught and labelled as deviant".121

The famous definition is Becker's:

The deviant is one to whom that label has successfully been applied; deviant behavior is behavior that people so label.122


120. Goode, "On Behalf of Labeling Theory", 570a-571b.


Under this schema, the group defines certain behaviour as deviant; it defines persons who engage in such behaviour as deviants; it treats the deviant in the appropriate fashion - applying sanctions of increasing severity, placing the individual in an outsider status. Deviancy is so relative that it is:

...not a quality inherent in any behaviour or person but rests on society's reaction to certain types of rule-breaking. The same act is not defined in the same way by all societies, nor are all persons breaking the rules officially defined and classified as deviants. One must understand deviance as the product of some sort of transaction that takes place between the rule breaker and the rest of society.

It is necessary to distinguish between what a person has done, and how they are publicly defined and categorized by the élite of their society. It is the publicly defined status that dictates how other members of society will interact with them, and what roles will be expected of them. Behaviour defined as deviant may not become publicly visible, and even if visible, it may or may not attract a deviant status:

The escalation from deviant acts to deviant character type is sufficiently problematic that the only way of dealing with the problem is to reserve judgment until learning whether a given individual has already been regarded as deviant by relevant audiences - including himself or herself.

123. Merrill, Society and Culture, 56.


Furthermore, Erikson has argued in *Wayward Puritans*¹²⁶ that the elite of a society does not have to wait for someone or thing to violate its rules. The dominant elite of a community will respond to a threat to its boundaries or identity, by ritually persecuting people - treating them as deviants though they have committed no deviant actions - redrawing the threatened boundaries, reaffirming the identity.¹²⁷ For Sumner:

...deviance is not best defined as a set of distinguishable behaviors offending collective norms but as a series of flexible ideological terms of abuse or disapproval which are used with varying regularity and openness in the practical networks of domination.¹²⁸

The imposition of a deviancy label may encourage an intensification of the deviant status and behaviour.¹²⁹

On to Byzantium.

These theoretical orientations help explain the Byzantine outsider by turning attention away from some supposed "real" cause of deviancy, to locate its origins in the social interaction between the dominant elites and the masses.¹³⁰ The opinion that historians should stop looking for the one great cause - be it economic determinism, thoughts of individuality and freedom, or the Great Man - is salutary.


¹²⁸ Sumner, "Rethinking Deviance", 188.

¹²⁹ Hagan, "Labelling and Deviance", 448b.

The complexity of causes to be dealt with do not lend themselves to linear analysis. Perhaps good history will never be neat and tidy history.\(^{131}\) The single sword blow severs the knot, but one will then never know how the knot was tied in the first place.

The litany of gender, religion, race and τάξις, suggests a theoretical parity for all four terms, implying that they are superordinate statuses, defining the permitted cluster of statuses which an individual may assume\(^ {132}\), but they are more merely labels to assist analysis.

One of the ways in which access to power is articulated is on grounds of biological sex. It still must be stressed that biological sex and the social roles associated with a particular sex are not the same, and the latter are indeed symbolic constructs.\(^ {133}\) Action deemed appropriate for men and women has little basis in their respective sexual characteristics, but has much to do with the social expectations that are ascribed to the statuses "woman" and "man".

---

\(^{131}\) Joan W. Scott, "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis", AHR 91 (1986), 1054-5.


In Wach’s memorable phrase, religion is the experience of the holy.\textsuperscript{134} The problem with the axiom is that it encapsulates, but does not really inform. Durkheim’s notions are perhaps more helpful.\textsuperscript{135} Religion is presented as the encounter with the supremely “other”, resulting in a dramatic tension between the transcendent and the here and now; the sacred and the profane. For Durkheim, religion is the means whereby humanity attempts to make sense of the encounter with the divine, to limit the destructive effects of the encounter, and indeed to a certain extent to attempt to control it. Religion is alienating and yet it attempts true reconciliation with the ultimate reality. The trend of alienation is particularly strong in Christianity, whose founder stressed that His kingdom was not of this world, and who enjoined His followers to abandon all social links. The Christian ideal is one of separation from the world, and by association the flesh and the devil.\textsuperscript{136} The basic Gospel message alienates. The way Christianity has developed as a credal, hierarchical religion also emphasizes that it is the dialectic product of interaction with the “other”: Jew and Greek, Jew and Christian, orthodox and heretic.

Ethnicity’s usefulness in the historian’s analytical tool-box is limited. Because its empirical data derive from modern societies, sociologists find it hard to distinguish between nationalism and

\textsuperscript{134} Joachim Wach, \textit{Sociology of Religion} (Chicago, 1944), 3.
\textsuperscript{136} This is true of mediaeval Christianity at least. Trends of liberation theology place more stress on building up the new Jerusalem here and now, without waiting for the parousia.
ethnicity, both of which have been described as organized ethnocultural solidarity. The difference, it is suggested, is that nationality must be self-defined, whereas ethnicity may be self-defined or other defined. A problem with this, as Royce has pointed out, is that dominant groups never define themselves as ethnics. Is the problem one of semantics? Are the same phenomena "nationality" if displayed by a dominant group, but "ethnicity" if displayed by a subordinate group? Basically, the answer seems to be "yes". Much ethnicity has been symbolic, in that it is identification in an overt way with a particular reference group. Edwards maintains that such symbolic attachments "must relate, at however distant a remove, to an observably real past." The remove may be very distant indeed. Ethnic identity is a phenomenon of borders, and these borders may be maintained from both sides. These borders persist even with a flow of personnel across them. People may cross the borders, but the borders must be maintained by rites of passage, exclusion and integration. Ethnic solidarity is much stronger when there is a reviled outgroup, or at least a group to describe what the group is


139. Barth, Ethnic Groups, 14; Edwards, Language, Society and Identity, 10.


141. Royce, Ethnic Identity, 29.

not.\textsuperscript{143} Studies in ethnicity have also identified possible responses to
ethnic interaction: acculturation, assimilation, multivariate
assimilation, amalgamation, pluralism, integration, segregation, ethnic
conflict.\textsuperscript{144}

\textit{Tōξιγ}, as a way of explaining the articulation of society, stresses the
power differentials in any society. Society is divided into the have
and the have-nots. The causes of why someone is numbered among
the have-nots are complex and imponderable, though facile economic
arguments can be presented. However, part of the resources of the
élite is expended in ensuring that they remain numbered among the
haves, and one way of achieving this is by using dominant ideology to
explain social differentiation. The dominant élite rarely has to spend
much energy on keeping the lower orders down in a stable situation.
The main danger comes from the representatives of other social
élites, who are not numbered among the dominant élite, but who want
to be. Excluded from the dominant élite, they are treated as outsiders
by the expressions of the dominant ideology. Of course, all outsiders
are equal, but some are more equal than others; the outsider status is
not a single entity. The aristocratic rebel - Alexios I Komnenos, when
he revolts - is still an outsider, from the point of the dominant élite.
His success means that he enters the dominant élite, but the ideology
and stability of the political system requires that the role of rebel
carries with it the status of outsider. The many will always be outsiders

\textsuperscript{143} Barth, \textit{Ethnic Groups}, 9-10, 15-6; Edwards, \textit{Language, Society}

\textsuperscript{144} Edwards, \textit{Language, Society and Identity}, 104-9.
to the Byzantine élite, and so do not pose much of a threat to the establishment. Rebels aiming to replace the dominant élite are such a threat, and so are dealt with as outsiders.

One way of organizing how the Byzantines perceived the outsider, the Other, therefore is on the four scales of gender, religion, race and ῥᾶξις. However, before turning directly to the evidence, I wish to consider how these narrative texts should be approached as historical sources.
CHAPTER THREE

Using Literature as Source.

Had he not seized many times the sense of the written [words] to his own interpretation

It is a commonplace that historical sources are divided into two classes: documentary and literary. The question addressed in this chapter is not whether literary sources can be used as historical sources - the answer is obviously affirmative - but the method of using literary sources. Definitions are useful at this point. Elton defines literary sources as having been written by someone who wished them to survive; they are attempts to influence posterity as opposed to documents whose author "had a purpose to play in which the prospect of the historian's interest played no part." Social researchers working with historical data have largely accepted this expression of the traditional view of historical sources. Sidney and Beatrice Webb define a document as

1. οὐδὲ τὸν νοῦν τῶν γραφομένων πρὸς τὴν οἰκείαν μεθέλκεν ἐν πολλοῖς πρόθεσιν Narrative, van Dieten 210:80-1.


3. Elton, Practice, 101. Of course, this is an expression of historical imperialism, where all literature is defined as grist to the historical mill.
an instrument in language which has, as its origin, and for its deliberate and express purpose, to become the basis of, or to assist, the activities of an individual, an organization, or a community.4

Documents are therefore "exclusively for the purpose of action" and are not written to inform historians, sociologists or the general reader. The "contemporary literature", ie. contemporary with the documents under discussion, includes all other written sources: treatises, sermons, newspapers, poems and biographies.5 To this list one can add the wide range of Byzantine sources.6

Many historians and social researchers "working in the past" prefer documents to literary sources. Those trained in social sciences seem to have a rather naïve belief in the accuracy and unbiased recording of past events in documents compared with "literature", and thus prefer the former, with merely the afterthought "literary sources however do provide information on the background, on the social tension which produced the documents."7 Those trained in history, who prefer documents, do so because of there supposed lack of desire to influence posterity. With documents, their authenticity is established and then the attempt is made to understand and explain their meaning.8 In this interpretation, literary sources are at a remove from

4. Scott, Matter of Record, 12.
5. Scott, Matter of Record, 12.
7. Scott, Matter of Record, 12.
8. Elton, Practice, 97.
the events they record, recording rather than being part of the events. However, if such literary sources are to be used, Elton provides a bluff, no nonsense way of doing so:

Material...designed to affect the writing of history can be judged with relative ease. The purpose which produced it was rational and therefore identifiable; the interests of the producer can usually be ascertained without trouble. Whether actor or himself historian, he is likely to have a case to make: his case once determined, one can judge both his own production and the material which he provides accordingly.9

I have not found it so simple. Is it possible to get a better definition of literary sources than "those residual sources which are not documents"? The attempt to define them in terms of literature in general is not helpful:

What, we may begin by asking, is literature, and how can we best define it? The answer is not at all self-evident, for the term can be used in several different senses. It can mean anything written in verse or prose. It can mean only those works which have a certain distinction. Or it can refer to mere verbiage: "all the rest is literature." For our purposes, it may be best to start by defining it in as broad and neutral a way as possible, simply as verbal art; that is literature belongs traditionally to the arts as opposed to the sciences or to practical knowledge, and its medium is the word, as opposed to the visual signs of painting and sculpture, or the tones of music.10

Todorov clarifies what is meant by "verbal art" when he says that literature designates

an utterance that must provoke the pleasure or interest of its hearers and readers, that is intended to last, and that is thereby


more highly elaborated than everyday speech.\textsuperscript{11}

Literature is the opposite of everyday speech. This statement of the obvious and "making strange"\textsuperscript{12} focuses attention on what is going on. And what is going on?

Literature, in other words, is a transaction between a human author and his human reader. By his command of linguistic and literary possibilities, the author actualizes and records in words what he undertakes to signify of human beings and actions and about matters of human concern, addressing himself to those readers who are competent to understand what he has written. The reader sets himself to make out what the author has designed and signifies through putting into play a linguistic and literary expertise that he shares with the author. By approximating what the author undertook to signify, the reader understands what the language of the work means.\textsuperscript{13}

This description of literature as a form of communication helps locate what Suleiman has characterized as "the most problematic concepts of contemporary literary theory: validity, meaning, authority, intention, text."\textsuperscript{14} The text\textsuperscript{15} is the actualization and record in words of what the

\textsuperscript{11} Todorov, Introduction to Poetics, "Introduction" by Peter Brooks, xxii. Compare "more highly elaborated" with the structuralist notion of "literariness, which distinguishes literary discourse from all other uses of language," John Rutherford, "Structuralism" in The Sociology of Literature: Theoretical Approaches, edited by Jane Routh and Janet Wolff, Social Review Monograph 25 (Keele, 1977), 45.

\textsuperscript{12} Ostranenie in Viktor Borisovich Shklovskii's formalist term; see Teorii Prozy (Moscow, 1929; 2nd reprint Ann Arbor, 1985.). By making the commonplace [or not so commonplace] strange, literature allows the reader to see it in a new light.

\textsuperscript{13} M. H. Abrams, "How to do things with texts", Partisan Review 46 (1979), 566.


\textsuperscript{15} A text is a) an ordered sequence of phonemes which displays resistance to change either in the course of retelling or when shared with another human memory; or b) perhaps more commonly for historians, a physical artifact which has as its central feature inscribed, graphic representations of language.
author undertook to signify. The intention is the intellectual process that the author did in fact undertake to signify something to readers. The meaning is both what the author undertakes to signify and what the author actualizes and records (not necessarily identical), at the same time as it is what the reader makes the text out to mean.

Hirsch distinguishes between the whole verbal meaning of a text, and its "significance" - i.e. its meaning in relation to some context beyond the text. Meaning is the object of hermeneutic interpretation, significance the object of criticism. Validity of interpretation encompasses the relationship between the text and the various meanings; it is the extent to which these words may signify these


17. Various critics (eg. Richards), but most notably Wimsatt and Beardsley have argued that "the design or intention of the author is neither available nor desirable as a standard for judging the success of a work of literary art." [W. K. Wimsatt Jr. and Monroe C. Beardsley, The Verbal Icon: Studies in the Meaning of Poetry (University of Kentucky, 1954), 3-4; John Peck and Martin Coyle, Literary Terms and Criticism: How to Study Literature (Basingstoke and London, 1984), 134]. Lowenthal states "creative literature conveys many levels of meaning, some intended by the author, some quite unintentional." [Leo Lowenthal, Literature and the Image of Man (Freeport, New York, 1970), 1]. These unintended meanings - Shakespeare's Merchant of Venice or Lessing's Nathan der Weise seen by a post-Holocaust audience, for example - are what make great literature significant for succeeding generations. However, as Hirsch has pointed out, at the level of interpreting (understanding the meaning of the words), the intention of the author - to the extent to which it is available - can serve as a yard stick to evaluate an interpretation of a text. [Hirsch, Validity, 3 & S; E. D. Hirsch Jr., The Aims of Interpretation (Chicago and London, 1976), 2-3 & 8].

18. Segre, Introduction to Analysis, 6-7. Or indeed to hearers, in the case of oral literature, or written works read aloud.


meanings. The shared linguistic codes - "the command of linguistic and literary possibilities" of the author coupled with the "linguistic and literary expertise" of the reader - constitute the authority. The crucial point of all this is that literature is a form of communication, as is language itself.

Viewing literature basically as communication "allows us to take stock of literary communication's potentialities and limits, while keeping a firm hold on the reality of both addresser and addressee." In the case of literature, much of the meaning of the communication is contained within the graphemes of the text. However, the complete communication also involves significant meaning assigned to the context, the nature of the contact between the author and the audience, and the code chosen: "Meaning in short resides in the total act of communication." This is perhaps clearer if literature is seen in terms of Roman Jakobson's analysis of the speech event.


24. Hawkes, *Structuralism and Semiotics*, 83. An example of this is provided by the fact that languages contain grammatical elements, "shifters", whose meaning is entirely dependent on the context in which they occur eg. personal pronouns.


```
context
message
adresser.............................addressee
contact
code
```
analysis identifies the various elements of the literary communication-act as follows: the addresser is the author, the addressee the reader. The context is the social system and physical environment in which the communication act is located. The contact is the physical meeting of the addresser and the addressee. The code is expertise, both linguistic - high style, atticizing Byzantine Greek in the present study - and literary - here, knowledge of the rhetorical forms and classical models. The message is the meaning that the author wished to convey to the reader.

Why should historical literary sources be viewed as communication acts? It is not to permit a display of the "technical lexicon (some will say "jargon") and coded rhetoric of the embattled theoretical "schools".

26. For historians of an empirical tendency, this is objective reality, "out there". For some literary theorists, it is merely a dominant genre, which prevails over all others. Todorov, Introduction to Poetics, 18-19.

27. The contact element is part of what makes literary communication distinctive, as usually there is no cybernetic interaction between addresser and addressee. The addresser originates the text, which then is encountered by the reader, the addressee, with a hiatus when the meaning of the text exists only in potential between the moments of origination and encounter (Segre, Introduction to Analysis, 28). This special relationship would be removed by a public reading by the author, as Psellos's Chronographia, Komnene's Alexiad, and Choniates's Narrative, may have received [Mango, Byzantium, Empire of New Rome, 237 in accord with Lucianic expectation Lucian, "How to Write History", Lucian 6 Loeb Classical Library, tr. K. Kilburn, (London, 1959), §§5, 16§10, 20§14, 32§23, 34§23, 65§51 §53]. The literary quality - Todorov's intention to last - [Chron. VI xxii, Renauld 1:127-8; Alexiad "Prooimion" i-ii, Leib 1:3-4; Narrative "Prooimion" van Dieten 1-2.] remains undamaged.

28. "The addresser is convinced that he will be understood, and he wishes to be understood." Segre, Introduction to Analysis, 3; see also 7 for a justification of a retreat from the indeterminacy of post-structural deconstruction and intertextuality.
of literary theory] of the mid-twentieth century." The aim in viewing literary sources in terms of Jakobson's speech-event structuralist model is to develop a methodology for what Margaret Alexiou has termed "approaches to Byzantine literary sources which take texts seriously, if not always literally." Examples of studies which take the texts seriously, if not always literally are becoming more common.

There is no easy way to characterize these approaches. Alexiou's use of terms such as écriture and intertextuality show her literary theory overtly. Beaton's use of Jauss's reception theory is intentionally restrained in its use of jargon. Kazhdan's interpretation has given added layers of meaning to Byzantine literary sources, undermining


30 Margaret Alexiou, "Literary Subversion and the Aristocracy in Twelfth-Century Byzantium: A Stylistic Analysis of the Timarion (ch. 6-10)", BMGS 8 (1982-83), 45.

31 Margaret Alexiou, "Literary Subversion", see previous note; Margaret Alexiou, "Poverty of écriture and the Craft of Writing: Towards a Reappraisal of the Prodromic Poems", BMGS 10 (1986) 1-40; Beaton, Medieval Greek Romance; Kazhdan, Studies on Byzantine Literature, especially "The Social Views of Michael Attaleiates", 23-86, together with the "aesthetic pendant" [Magdalino] of "Nicetas Choniates and others: aspects of the art of literature", 256-286; Ruth Macrides and Paul Magdalino, "The architecture of ekphrasis: construction and context of Paul the Silentiary's poem on Hagia Sophia", BMGS 12 (1988), 47-82. There is also the programme of research suggested in Bernard Stolte, "(No) pictures for lawyers. Some considerations on image and word in Byzantine legal literature", BMGS 12 (1988), 297-303, especially 302. For the wider ramifications of this tendency, see M. E. Mullett, "Dancing With Deconstructionists in the Gardens of the Muses: New Literary History vs ?" BMGS 14 (1990), 258-275.
the notion of "empty rhetoric". The stress he places on the individual has resulted in a forceful if perhaps one sided presentation. The article by Macrides and Magdalino focuses on the code and context, emphasizing its function as a literary celebration, rather than merely an accompaniment to a visual art work. The emphasis is given to the work as a whole, as an entity.

What these serious approaches share is a desire to understand the meaning of the texts, both for the Byzantine readership and for later interpreters, having due regard for the various elements of the communication act. Treating texts seriously means attempting to understand them at three levels. Firstly, literary texts should be

---

32. For example, the titles of papers II-VII in Studies on Byzantine Literature, and viii; see also Alexander Kazhdan, "Der Mensch in der Byzantinischen Literaturgeschichte", JOB 28 (1979), 1-21. This stress on the Einheit of the author, distancing himself from genre as a basic analytical tool, is balanced in turn by an emphasis on the individuals "die, sie machten, d.h. der Autoren, die benützten, d.h. der Leser, und in ihr beschrieben wurden, d.h. der Helden." 11.


36. "Far more relevant are attempts to relate the text to its cultural context. The text belongs to the culture at the moment of its sending, and will go on belonging to it during successive receptions. In its conformation, it is homogeneous with the other phenomena of the culture to which it belongs, and it is homologous with them. ... The influence, often indeed the impact, of historical forces (prevalently economic forces) is much more compellingly determinant for the cultural system as a whole than it is for single texts. Thus analysis of culture is able to mediate between study of history and study of texts." Segre, Introduction to Analysis, 117.

37. In Macrides and Magdalino, "Architecture of ekphrasis", 81, the elements are envisaged in a tetrahedron model, with the work enclosed by planes of 1) objective description; 2) literary form; 3) historical context; 4) occasional context.
understood in their own right and on their own terms.\textsuperscript{38} Empathy as a term has been overworked in historical discussions of late, but one would hope that prolonged exposure to Byzantine literature would lead to appreciation, if not pleasure.\textsuperscript{39} Secondly, the literary texts should be understood as expressions of a worldview or ideology of a social class. Thirdly, that worldview should be understood as originating in social processes, and a social system.\textsuperscript{40}

The attempt to understand a text in its own terms means decoding the various meaningful levels of style in which significant meaning

\textsuperscript{38} "The sociological study of literature presupposes an understanding of the literature studied. If its objective is to propose a theory of literature and society or to perceive a relationship between them, it must start from a comprehension, explicit or implicit of the works of literature themselves." Janet Wolff, "The interpretation of literature in society: the hermeneutic approach", in Sociology of Literature, ed. Routh and Wolff, 18. Though phrased to appeal to sociologists, this applies equally to historians whose objective is to perceive and explain a relationship between literary texts and society.

\textsuperscript{39} See Mango, Byzantium: Empire of New Rome, 234; and "Byzantine Literature as a Distorting Mirror", in Byzantium and its Image: History and Culture of the Byzantine Empire and its Heritage (London, 1984), 3-4.

\textsuperscript{40} Wolff, "The interpretation of literature in society: the hermeneutic approach", in Sociology of Literature, ed. Routh and Wolff, 19. Mention should be made here of the vexed question of "realism". Mango, both in the title "Byzantine Literature as a Distorting Mirror" and in his lecture (4, 17-18), suggests that there is a reality which is reflected in literature. However, literature is also creative, and makes its own reality [Joan Rockwell, "A theory of literature and society", Sociology of Literature, ed. Routh and Wolff, 35]. For example "...the novel was not always a passive reflection or mirror of eighteenth-century society. Rather, the novel presented authors with the opportunity to make, not just shape, reality. A strong case...can be made that the eighteenth-century novel was formative or constitutive, not just representative of reality." [Robert W. Uphaus (ed.), Idea of the Novel in the Eighteenth Century, (East Lansing, MI., 1988), vii.] The idea of literature as a mirror is classical in origin, eg. Lucian, "How to write History", 62 §30.
resides. A useful addition to Jakobson's analysis (in attempting to interpret meanings) is provided by M.H. Abrams.41

At the centre is the work or artifact itself. In orbit round it, at equidistant points, are the other three basic elements that constitute the object of critical investigation. These are the work's producer, the state of affairs ("nature" or the universe of existing things) which the work reflects or signifies, and the audience to which it is addressed.42

The serious treatment of texts should address all six elements of the communication act (addresser, addressee, work, code, context, contact).43 Jakobson's six-fold analysis, combined with Abrams' schema, helps clarify the significance of the various schools of literary criticism.

If the artist is the centre of critical attention, then an expressive approach to literature results. The expressive approach drew on the phenomenology of Husserl, and the psychoanalysis of Freud and Jung. It was particularly suited to the literature of Romanticism.44

Priority given to the text yields what Abrams termed an objective approach. The "objective" approach is often presented as "criticism itself".45 Practical criticism's emphasis on the text "as an autonomous

43. Explicitly enunciating this method of approach, see Uphaus, The Idea of the Novel, x.
44. Peck and Coyle, Literary Terms, 158-60.
45. Hawkes, Structuralism and Semiotics, 152.
object to be examined in and on its own terms”
uninfluenced by preconceptions, led to the method of "close reading". The close reading method was developed by the New Criticism school, and used to great effect in the metaphysical poets. However, in theoretical terms, New Criticism is outmoded; the words of the text isolated from the other five elements of the communication act are meaningless.

Richards' own experiments with practical criticism, texts and students, and work on genre has shown that expectation plays a crucial role in drawing meaning from a text. Nevertheless, the stress on the text itself and the meanings of the words as used in the text (seen in their wider context), serve as a point of departure and return. Richards refined his own approach by linking the text to the reader. Further developed as reader-response criticism, which treats the individual reader or the wider, multiple readership, this approach emphasizes the reader's response to the text. In what can be seen as an extrapolation of reader-response criticism to its logical conclusion, deconstruction sees the meaning in a text is the meaning got from the text by its readers - either Byzantines or Byzantinists - not meanings

46. Freund, Return of the Reader, 40. The emphasis on the text was in part a reaction to the use of psychoanalysis, the attempt to discover "what happened in an author's mind at a given moment" [Richards, How to Read a Page, 14] as the major determinant of a text’s meaning.

47. Peck and Coyle, Literary Terms, 157-158.

48. "...an interpreter's preliminary generic conception of a text is constitutive of everything that he subsequently understands, and that remains the case unless and until that generic conception is altered.” Hirsch, Validity, 74, 70 & 75-6; Heather Dubrow, Genre. The Critical Idiom 42, (London, 1982), 1-3; Todorov, Introduction to Poetics, "Introduction" by Peter Brooks, xv-xvi, and 61-2.
put into the text by the author. The thesis to which deconstruction was a spirited response is the view that the meaning of a text can be interpreted correctly only in terms of the author's biographical or psychological life.

The emphasis on the wider universe, beyond author, text and readership, which subsumes issues of rhetorical code, contact and meaning, is the area of interpretation which traditionally has been most of interest to historians. It results in a mimetic approach to literature. Russian formalism took the connection between literature and the universe in a different way from "mimicry". To the formalists, literature is a structure, a self-sufficient entity capable of self-regulation and transformation, whose central function is that of Shklovskii's "making strange" [ostranenie]. By comparison with "ordinary" language, literary language not only "makes" strange, it is strange. It is foreign, alien.

This notion of "making strange" has been influential in Marxist criticism, which like Russian formalism is mimetic in the sense that it

49. Hawkes, Structuralism and Semiotics, 15-7; 66-7; 72-3. Compare de Saussure's langue, or Chomsky's competence, or even Peter Brooks' langue is to parole as poetics is to literary criticism. Todorov, Introduction to Poetics, "Introduction" x.

50. Hawkes, Structuralism and Semiotics, 62.

51. Hawkes, Structuralism and Semiotics, 63; Elizabeth Abel, Marianne Hirsch and Elizabeth Langland, The Voyage In: Fictions of Female Development (Hanover and London, 1983), 90. For classical formulations consider "our language must therefore have a "foreign" air, for men admire what is remote" Aristotle, Rhet. 2.2, 1404b5-12, quoted in George L. Kustas, Studies in Byzantine Rhetoric, Analecta Viatadon 17, (Thessaloniki, 1973), 64 n.1; cf. "a stranger in [writing his] books and a man without a city, ruling himself, subject to no sovereign" Lucian, "How to Write History", 56 §41.
concentrates on the total situation that produced the work of art. By making strange the artist shows the audience the nature of the class struggle and of their alienation, the alienation serving as a call to action.52

Feminist criticism is the third critical orientation which tends to stress the environment that produced the artwork. Feminist criticism centres round two concepts. The first is that human beings are divided in two ways: biologically into male and female, the two sexes; and socially into feminine [like a woman] and masculine [like a man], the two genders.53 Feminists make the point that gender is a social construct, not bound in any natural or necessary way to sex. To this double polarity feminist critics have added the idea of patriarchy, the theory that human society has been and is organized by men to ensure the suppression of women.54 The way in which the dominant élite defines gender difference subjugates women. Feminist criticism

52. This mirrors Brechtian Verfremdungseffekt, Hawkes, Structuralism and Semiotics, 63. On Marxist criticism in general see Peck and Coyle, Literary Terms, 155-157.

53. s.v. "Gender", A Feminist Dictionary, ed. Cheris Kramarae and Paula A. Treichler, (London, 1985). The possibility of the "third sex" [as opposed to the grammarians' "third gender"], has a classical history see s.v. "Third sex", Everything You Ever Wanted to Know About Sex But Never Dared Ask, ed. Robert Goldenson and Kenneth Anderson, (London, 1986). In the Byzantine context, this could cover either the eunuchs of the imperial service, or perhaps more widely the ideal of the ascetic, removed from all physical desire, in addition to the modern usage referring to homosexuals of both sexes.

provides a different way of looking at texts, a way of making strange familiar texts which may highlight meaning not previously noticed.55

The final orientation under Abrams' formulation is the one which focuses on the audience, which he terms the pragmatic. The concentration on the reader may be specific (one reader, one text) or more general, where the text is seen as an example of all texts produced by a society, and how those texts are received by the readership of the society, developing over time (Jauss's reception theory).56

55. For example, feminist critics have drawn forward Jane Austen's treatment of the relationship between women and men, rather than the previous emphasis on the universals of pride and prejudice. There are limitations to feminist criticism, however. In common with the New Critics, feminist criticism has concentrated where its approach yields the best results, in writings by women in Modern English. As Modern English is largely uninflected, this has meant discussion of language difference has been limited to vocabulary and stylistics. Furthermore, the notion of patriarchy has tended to be accepted as a given, rather than as a theoretical tool, requiring to proof. On feminist criticism in general, see Peck and Coyle, Literary Terms, 151-3. For examples of a byzantinist making use of the feminist approach see Catia Galatariotou, "Holy Women and Witches: Aspects of Byzantine Conceptions of Gender", BMGS 9 (1984/5), 55-94; and "Eros and Thanatos: a Byzantine Hermit's Conception of Sexuality", BMGS 13 (1989), 95-137.

56. Reader-response criticism moves away from the assumptions of formalism and New Criticism that the text is a discrete, self-sufficient object. "In one mode or another, the swerve to the reader assumes that our relationship to reality is not a positive knowledge, but a hermeneutic construct, that all perception is already an act of interpretation, that the notion of a "text-in-itself" is empty, that a poem cannot be understood in isolation from its results, and that subject and object are indivisibly bound." [Freund, Return of the Reader, 5]. In reader-response criticism the challenge to the autonomy and objectivity may go so far as to remove the text from the centre of Abrams's satellite formation, subsisting the reader in its place. At an extreme, the "work" may vanish altogether, reading and writing seen as different names for the same activity. [Freud, Return of the Reader, 2 & 10]. This trend connects with post-structural "textuality", Derrida and deconstruction. Many historians are ill at ease with these directions of critical theory.
Two points are worth making in relation to the utility of literary theory. The first is that a comparison of the various orientations shows their weaknesses and limitations, frequently exacerbated by destructive criticism and polemic among the "embattled schools".\textsuperscript{57} However, the call for a return to plain speaking and reality by the opponents of theory presupposes a) that these exist and b) that they have been abandoned.\textsuperscript{58} The second point is the more important. The various critical orientations help explain the meaning of the text by suggesting ways of approach. No single approach, by virtue of its emphasis on one element of the communication act provides the whole answer\textsuperscript{59}, but taken together they do provide serious ways of dealing with texts.

The way to treat texts seriously is to locate them in Jakobson's scheme of the communication event. To treat sources merely as a quarry for historical facts or as a mirror of reality is to ignore much of the information sources communicate to historians about a functioning society in the past. The place to start is with the written text, because it is there physically before us. The close reading of the text, what each word means and how is functions in the organic unity of the text, advocated by the New Critics, has much to recommend it, at least as a way to start. Our understanding is influenced by

\textsuperscript{57} Beaton, \textit{Medieval Greek Romance}, 5; Freud, \textit{Return of the Reader}, 11.


\textsuperscript{59} This is largely the message of Wimsatt and Beardsley's listing of the various fallacies in \textit{The Verbal Icon}. 
considerations of genre, but such prejudgments may not convey the fullest meaning of the text, as increased awareness of ironic possibilities has shown.\(^60\) As well as considerations of genre (and what, after all, is the exact genre to which Psello's Chronographia belongs?), the actual verbal meaning of a text is deciphered by reference to elements beyond the text. The meaning of any word in any language is actually determined by how it is used, in relation to other words. In addition to the meaning of the words, the register, or level of style chosen also conveys meaning. The language of the three texts is in the highest register of the atticizing tendency of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. By using this register, the three authors were displaying, in Sevcenko's phrase\(^61\), their distinctive badge as members of the élite. As a historian by training and inclination, I leave to others detailed descriptions of the characteristic morphology of high style, atticizing Byzantine Greek.\(^62\) The extreme theoretical position which maintains that the possession of a particular Muttersprache imposes

\(^{60}\) There is an interesting by-play here in that literary theorists working with genre assume prejudgement will be valid, whilst sociologists working with outsider stereotypes assume prejudgement will be wrong.


an inescapable Weltanschauung is overstated. But ways of thinking are influenced by the ways in which those thoughts can be communicated. Any text has a plethora of meanings, which exist at differing levels and are decoded by different audiences. In understanding a text, the important thing is to make sure that the levels are respected.

This variety of registers, understood by different elements in the audience to varying degrees, is important when considering the vexed question of rhetoric. As is true of "Byzantine" itself, the word "rhetoric" in common English speech is overshadowed with negative connotations. "Rhetoric" is affected speech: vain, puffed-up, empty bombast, or worse yet the use of decorated language to lie convincingly. The crucial fact to recognize about rhetoric is that it is never empty. Rhetoric is part of the code, the elevated register of literary language, and its presence tells us about the author's skill in manipulating that coded register, and about the audience which the author intended should encounter the work, and their skill in deciphering its meaning. Byzantine rhetoric has begun to come in


64. Making sure that the meaning and the level are interpreted together means that the "danger of over-interpretation or overloading a simple aside with a vast but fragile hermeneutical construct" [E. M. Jeffreys, "Arabs in Byzantine Literature", 17th. International Byzantine Congress: Major Papers (New Rochelle, New York, 1986), 312] is avoided. This identification of level in the text is of course the literary problem, as identified by Hirsch [Steven W. Hirsch, *The Friendship of the Barbarians: Xenophon and the Persian Empire* (Hanover & London, 1985), 5]. However, as the review by Amélie Kuhrt and Susan Sherwin-White [*JHS* 107 (1987), 200-1] shows, recognizing the problem does not always solve it.
from the cold, and is recognized as a helpful tool in decoding Byzantine texts.65

Translators of Byzantine histories of the eleventh and twelfth centuries66 have remarked on the classical names given to the various foreign peoples encountered. This feature of hochsprachlich writing is mentioned, but largely it is then ignored. No attempt is made to explain why it is so. Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos recognized that high style could obscure meaning67, and the classical genre of history advocated calling "a fig a fig, and a trough a trough".68 There are two possible reasons for the change from plain speech in history, whose purpose was to instruct, with artistry as a pleasurable side

---


66. Sewter on Anna Komnene, 9; Magoulias on Choniates, xxix, Brand on Kinnamos, 7 & 226.


68. Lucian, "How to Write History", 57 §41. Of course this raises the question of exactly what Lucian meant.
effect if it did not detract from the truth. The first is that the Byzantines' sense of their own classical heritage was so debased, and their use of the Hochsprache was so artificial that they did not realize what they were doing. Such strange ideas need not detain us. The second is that the writers of the eleventh and twelfth century used the elevated style to show that they were members of the dominant elite [or perhaps that they had not yet been excluded from it] and that in this display any rhetorical flourishes they could muster played a part. The use of older names produces a timeless quality, it is said; it also transports one back no matter how briefly to the time when the terms really were current. When the future is dark and the present uncertain, the past has an appeal, and an appeal to the past may serve to bolster the worldview being expressed.

If rhetoric has indeed come in from the cold, the jury is still out on the nature and size of the readership of the hochsprachlich texts in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Indeed, there is a subsidiary question whether the destined recipients of the texts should be thought of as an


audience or as a readership. These matters are raised, not because they are going to be answered here, but because they form part of the location of the texts with which I am engaged.

Similarly, the authors of the three texts have been discussed previously. I add only that an identity between the author as narrator and author as actor should not be automatically assumed. By this, I do not wish to introduce an attribution debate. But these are works of contemporary history in which the authors were active participants for part of the time at least, and their own appearances in their literary creations may involve a distance between themselves as narrator and as actor which may permit an element of creative disinformation.

The widest element of Jakobson's theory is the context, the whole ramification of interlocked physical, intellectual and emotional ties that is the background for human life, both now and in eleventh and twelfth century Byzantium. This thesis is a contribution to understanding that society, by concentrating on a particular class of what Bakhtin has termed "ideologems", the actual words used to describe outsiders. Having spoken of "texts" and "actual words", it is


72. See "Introduction to Persons", 27-34.


74. "Ideologems" are words which convey ideological marks." Segre, Introduction to Analysis, 119.
now high time to turn to the texts themselves.
CHAPTER FOUR

OUTSIDERS BY GENDER IN
MICHAEL PSELLOS’S CHRONOGRAPHIA.

I myself have never been able to find out precisely what feminism is: I only know that people call me a feminist whenever I express sentiments that differentiate me from a doormat.¹

This personal - and political - definition is striking in its imagery, but applies more to the individual in social interaction than groups of people in history. It is much more difficult to define feminism² showing the theoretical issues and how it may inform historical analysis.³ The most accessible aspect of feminism is the thesis that gender and sex are not the same. By this theory, sex - being female or male - is defined as biologically determined, whilst gender - being feminine or masculine - is seen as a social construction made


². Feminism may be defined in one of four ways:- i) a doctrine advocating equal social and political rights for women on a par with the rights enjoyed by men; ii) an organized movement to gain those rights; iii) an assertion of the claims of woman as a group; iv) a belief in the necessity of large scale social change to the system to which women require access to increase the power of women. Gerda Lerner in Judith R. Walkowitz, et al., "Politics and Culture in Women's History: A Symposium", Feminist Studies 6 (1980), 49.

to rest by the dominant ideology of a society, on the biological givens.\(^4\)

From the recognition of gender as a social construct, feminism moves on to see gender stereotypes as the product of the dominant elite of a society, who (normally men) shape the stereotype roles available to women to fit their notions about the defective, other or second, sex.\(^5\)

This division of experience, by which gender stereotypes are formed by men but forced on women and men, is frequently termed patriarchy.\(^6\) The notion of patriarchy leads on to a second definition of feminism: it is "a conscious stand in opposition to male defamation and maltreatment of women; it is a dialectical opposition to misogyny."\(^7\) Gerda Lerner has made the definition in stronger terms: feminism is a doctrine advocating equal social and political rights for women; that there is, and ought to be, an organized movement to gain those rights; that the claims of women should be asserted as a group or class; and finally a belief in the necessity of a large scale social change (i.e. to the system to which women require access) to increase

---


\(^7\) Kramarae and Treichler (ed.), *Dictionary*, sv "feminism" 158.
the power of women. This mode of feminism stresses the male domination of women, and calls for its overthrow. Historically, this reading has received some criticism. Mary Beard criticized women's history as misconstruing the experience of women in the past when it presents it as the unchanging oppression of women; by stressing the oppression, women's active participation in historical events is underestimated. DuBois suggests that a feminist perspective is necessary to make women's history intellectually credible by increasing the scope of the comprehensive and analytical history of women's oppression to beyond questions of political and economic inequality to include the totality of sexual social relations. Feminist understanding in this mode is that the oppression of women and their efforts to understand and overcome it are central themes of women's experience, which must be analyzed in any account of women's history. According to Stuard, it is the espousal of a non-ideological stance on women by the Annales school which may have resulted in a wholesale, if unrecognized and perhaps unintended, rendering of all social relationships in terms of self (male) and other (female). Such a definition places men within society and women, the other, outside it or related to society only functionally as a means of exchange. In histories written in this second feminist mode, there is a strong

tendency to inevitability: feminist classics have identified patriarchal oppression; the feminist historian's job is to determine when it started (frequently it is located in some pre-historical age) and to delineate how that oppression differs through time.\footnote{Rosaldo, "The Use and Abuse of Anthropology", 391.} There is a danger in second mode feminist history of forgetting that the eventual goal (from a feminist perspective) is the elimination of women as a class oppressed by gender, both in society and in historical analysis. Instead such historians concentrate on the varieties of patriarchal oppression to be found throughout history.

The feminist anthropologist Rosaldo offers a bleak prognostication for anthropology (and by extrapolation, history) in the second feminist mode:

\begin{quote}
my reading of the anthropological record leads me to conclude that human cultural and social forms have always been male dominated. By this I mean not that men rule by right or even that men rule at all and certainly not that women everywhere are passive victims of a world that men define. Rather I would point to a collection of related facts which seem to argue that in all known human groups - and no matter the prerogatives that women may in fact enjoy - the vast majority of opportunities for public influence and prestige, the ability to forge relationships, determine enmities, speak up in public, use or forswear the use of force are all recognized as men's privilege and right.\footnote{Rosaldo, "The Use and Abuse of Anthropology", 393.}
\end{quote}

The manner and forms in which this male dominance is expressed or experienced are highly varied from society to society. Any example of female subjugation in any aspect can easily be countered by another society, where the women are in the ascent in that particular aspect. What is to be noted, however, is that in aggregate women in each
society are placed in a subordinate status, with low or subordinate role-bundles.14

Rosaldo's gloomy analysis is that certain facts of human physiology - women's role in reproduction and, perhaps, male strength - have operated in a universal way to shape and reproduce male dominance, though each reproduction is subject to infinite variation in combination. From this, Rosaldo believes that male dominance is a universal feature of human societies, with as many problems as the anthropologists' concepts of "family", "marriage" or "kinship", but which is just as unavoidable.15

Feminists working in the second mode see this attitude as giving in to patriarchy, seeing the evidence in male terms. These feminists say that what must be identified are those places where women are empowered - the domestic sphere and so on. However, from Rosaldo's viewpoint, this is again to accept definition by men. Women are excluded from the exercise of power in the public domain, therefore one searches for their experience in those areas allowed to them, discounting the negative experiences they endure in the public sphere. This is to allow men too strong a role in the definition of women's experience.16 Though previously Rosaldo used the notion of

the two spheres to good effect, she now feels that to accept the division into public and private spheres is to accept an outmoded nineteenth-century dichotomy of necessary sexual differentiation, whereby women are seen to be dominated - if not strictly speaking by their biology - then by the maternal nurturing instinct held to exist between mother and child, rather than by the criteria of legal process and coercive force which are held to direct the male sphere of public life.

The most serious deficiency of a model based upon two opposed spheres appears, in short, in its alliance with the dualisms of the past, dichotomies that teach that women must be understood not in terms of relationship - with other women and with men - but of difference and apartness. "Tied down" by functions we believe to belong to mothers and the home, our sisters are conceptualized as beings who presently are, and have at all times been, the same, not actors but mere subjects of male action and female biology. And feminists reveal themselves the victims of this past when their accounts attempt to focus our attention on the important things that women do, by adding variables that concern domestic roles, maternity, and reproductive life.

Rosaldo proposes that gender in all human societies must be understood in political and social terms at all levels of social relations both heterosexual and homosexual, i.e. in terms of social inequality, not of biological constraints. If one accepts Rosaldo's thesis, then the emphasis on social processes between human beings - both men and women - will show that men are normally dominant in those

relations, such dominance being neither the result of biological
determinism, nor of some functionally distinct masculine and feminine
spheres where women abdicate (or are forced from) any significant
role in the public sphere, but the result of differential access to
power. Rosaldo concludes:

What traditional social scientists have failed to grasp is not that
sexual asymmetries exist but that they are as fully social as the
hunter's or the capitalist's role, and that they figure in the very
facts, like racism and social class, that social science claims to
understand. A crucial task for feminist scholars emerges, then,
not as the relatively limited one of documenting pervasive
sexism as a social fact - or showing how we can now hope to
change or have in the past been able to survive it. Instead it
seems that we are challenged to provide new ways of linking
the particulars of women's lives, activities and goals to
inequalities wherever they exist.22

Feminist history in this third mode is a desire for a truly general
conception of humanity.23 To insist always on the centrality of the
male-female oppressive dyad is to maintain men as the central actors,
the definers of women's past, whilst the women themselves are at best
reactors, at worst objects. Women's history, therefore, is to explore
the complexity of women's experiences, making sure that events and
processes which are central to those experiences assume historical
centrality, and that women are recognized as active agents of social
change. This is the true counterpoint to men's history, which, properly
speaking, is not the traditional history of government, war and
diplomacy, but a history which has as its central object men's actions
and concerns. True feminist history is not the study of male

oppression and women’s organized resistance, but rather the localization of women’s historical experience at the centre. Such a feminist history, coupled with a men’s history that treats as central men’s experience in the past, will come together to form a complete analysis and account of all human experience in the past, a true New History.24

This ideal of the third mode of feminist history (as characterized by Smith-Rosenberg) is the goal. However, the nature of the sources means that we see women as their definers (usually men) saw them, not as they saw themselves. Little can be done to ameliorate this situation, except to recognize that our sources do not document the entire story. Bynum, discussing Turner’s liminal theory remarks:

In many places he suggests that women are liminal, or that women, as marginals, generate communitas. What I am suggesting is exactly that Turner looks at women; he stands with the dominant group (males) and sees women (both as symbol and as fact) as liminal to men. In this he is quite correct of course, and the insight is a powerful one. But it is not the whole story. The historian or anthropologist needs to stand with women as well.25

For anthropologists, a male-female pairing of fieldworkers is a possibility; for historians, evidence is dictated by the sources, and even the rare occurrence of a woman-authored source such as Anna Komnene’s Alexiad cannot be assumed to be the authentic voice of all Byzantine women. Indeed, given Anna Komnene’s particular circumstances, it would be most unlikely if it were.

Treating women as a minority group assumes discrimination, which may be objective or subjective. As labelling theory informs us, the more important aspect is the subjective awareness or self-consciousness as members of a minority or disadvantaged group. Awareness, without actual objective discrimination will create a minority, but discrimination without awareness (either self-imposed or externally imposed) will not. Even though historically a crude numerical majority of the human population women manifest many of the psychological characteristics, such as group self-hatred, which have been imputed to self-conscious minority groups. This self-hatred is not countered by socialization within the minority group, because other ranks conferred by other roles - frequently a direct function of the ranks held or achieved by the women's fathers, brothers, husbands, lovers and sons - take precedence over their membership of the minority group "women". Similarly, frequent and symbolically meaningful social interaction with men curtails the development of increased self-awareness as women, as equal members of a disadvantaged minority group.

The presence of formal discrimination is usually clearly seen. It includes being barred from certain activities, or if admitted, being treated differently, being disadvantaged. In the economic sphere, women are confined to occupations with low status (or conversely,

women's occupations are accorded low status), where they are frequently under male supervision; they are paid less, promoted less often, to more junior grades, and are given (or are allowed to assume) less responsibility. In the social sphere, women have less freedom of movement, and are permitted fewer deviations from the norms in dress, speech and manners, and are confined to a narrow range of personal expression in social interaction - at least in mixed gender groups.

On one level, the social distance between men and women is much smaller than that between many dominant élites and their other-defined minorities. The evidence usually cited for this intimacy is the heterosexual pairing, codified by many societies into marriage or at least cohabitation. However, this takes no account of the physical intimacy between house slaves and owners in the Ante-Bellum South, which did nothing to reduce the social distance between black and white.27 The sexual intimacy of marriage does not necessarily mean that a man treats his partner as an equal, just as many married men would not consult a woman doctor or other professional28.

The proper way in which to treat gender in Byzantium is unclear. From Rosaldo, it is to look at all aspects of gender relations, not to state categorically that Byzantium was dominated by patriarchal


28. The one "professional" that men might engage a) confirms their tendency to see women as sexual commodities; and b) shows the extent to which English is a man-made language.
structures, but to locate the power differentials in the interactions between the sexes. Women in Byzantium should not be marginalized because to do so merely emphasizes the powerlessness of women.

Psellos's Chronographia.

But just as beautiful women manifest more elegance from "artless" ornament, so much more do they shine far and away the most visible through shielding cloud, and to them the careless ornament is the ornament of the greatest skills.

Was Psellos a patriarchal misogynist? This quotation seems to indicate that he was. As an articulator of the dominant ideology, Psellos would be patriarchal in attitudes, if Byzantine society was patriarchal. However, the charge as presented is still unproven. What is needed is not the quarrying out of nuggets to prove the case one way or the other, but an awareness of the nuggets in their contexts, and how they fit together to articulate the work as a whole. It may be argued linguistically that the terms ἡ γυναῖκις (womanish behaviour) and ὅ γυναίκιςμος (womanish weakness) are not balanced by the meanings of ἓ ἀνδρεία (manliness or manly spirit, with the negative meaning of insolence or hardihood). The adjectival form ἓ ἀνδρείας means manly, brave, courageous or masculine (though it may also be used of women).

29. For example, Galatariotou, "Holy Women and Witches", 58; similarly, "Misogyny was a fundamental tenet of Byzantine thinking" (ibid. 66) implies either that Byzantine women did not think, or that they were so excluded as to be of no account, or that they were overwhelmed by the dominant values. See also the opening of the article in Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium (Oxford, 1991), sv women.


Women do not figure in Book I of The Chronographia. Such gendered topics as do appear serve more to establish what is normative for the male. In the second paragraph, the imperial princes are described:

Basil, the elder in age, seemed always to be awake, deep in thought and careful, while Constantine appeared careless of everything neglecting to have an eternal life, and being very concerned with a life of luxury.32

Both these descriptions are seen by Psellos as normal male reactions. The function served here is to point out how much more suited the serious-minded Basil was for the throne. In the second half of the paragraph, Psellos suggest that Constantine deserves praise for his modesty in allowing his brother to assume total power, firstly on the grounds that he was "a youth, when zeal for love of power is kindled strongly"33; and secondly because his brother was himself only two years older than Constantine.34

Having praised Basil for his serious nature suited to government, and having dismissed Constantine from the narrative for the moment as being too young and naive to realize his own loss of power, at the beginning of paragraph three Psellos turns to criticism of the way in which Basil II ruled. The new emperor, still growing his first beard35, had to turn to the advice of others.36 Basil II turned to the

36. Chron. I 3, Renauld 1:3 1-5.
parakoimomenos Basil. Psellos describes the parakoimomenos as follows:

This man happened to be the most outstanding in the Empire of the Romans, elevated according to his understanding, bodily stature and with the appearance fit for a tyrant.\(^{37}\)

That the bearing is \(\muορφὴν\ τυράννου\) is because he was not an emperor, and Psellos has no wish to suggest that he might become one. It may also bear some relation to the fact that as a eunuch he was barred from the throne. A third possibility is that as Psellos was not happy with the idea of eunuchs, and so draws attention to the fact that all this praise is qualified. This latter possibility, however, is rendered less likely by the non-emotive way in which Psellos describes the fact of Basil the Parakoimomenos's castration:

He suffered castration in his early infancy, so that he [born] of a concubine would not displace the first born of legitimate heirs from the government.\(^{38}\)

No indication is given that this was unusual treatment to be handed out to the offspring of concubines.\(^{39}\) The parakoimomenos was reconciled to his fate, and was fond of his half-nephews. The emperor Basil learnt from the parakoimomenos, not just as a spectator, but as an athlete being coached.\(^{40}\) Basil the parakoimomenos is shown to be in complete control of the imperial administration, both civil and military, with the emperor's aid. This indicates that Psellos felt there

\(^{37}\) Chron. I 3, Renauld 1:3 6-9.

\(^{38}\) Chron. I 3, Renauld 1:3 11-3.

\(^{39}\) See Keith Hopkins, "The Political Power of Eunuchs", in his Conquerors and Slaves (Cambridge, 1978), 172 n4 for the regulation of castration on Roman soil as a crime.

\(^{40}\) Chron. I 3, Renauld 1:3 19-22.
was no reason why the eunuch Basil should not command the military forces.

Paragraph four describes the rapid transformation which overtook Basil II. To people of Psellus's vintage, Basil II seemed severe and abrupt. However, before this, Psellus states that the historians of Basil's life saw him as a voluptuary. Psellus roots this dramatic change in the rebellions of Skleros and Phokas. There are suggestions that the cause may lie in the Russian agreement of 988, which may also explain Basil II's failure to marry and produce an heir. The change in attitude does more to delineate who is fit to govern the empire, than to set out gender differences.

The same is true of the comparison between Bardas Phokas and Skleros, where the former is said to be "more active and braver." This emphasizes the gravity of the threat posed by Bardas Phokas. The purpose was not to weaken the threat of Skleros, the main focus at this point, confirmed by the description of Skleros and his men as "brave and martial men."

In response to these revolts by Bardas Phokas and Skleros, Basil II had recourse to Russian mercenaries, received from Vladimir of Kiev in 988 in exchange for Basil II's sister Anna in marriage. At this point, these "Tauroscythians" are merely mentioned but they form a foil to

---

42. δραστικώτερος και γενομένωτερος Chron. I 7, Renaud 1:6 6-7.
43. γενομένων ἀνδρέως καὶ μάχημος Chron. I 11, Renaud 1:8 10.
44. Chron. I 13, Renaud 1:9 3-6.
the "Iberians" recruited by Bardas Phokas. These Iberians are "men reaching ten feet tall in stature, and have brows stretched out in ferocity."\textsuperscript{45} It was against these "Iberians", commanded by Phokas, who could kill with a single blow\textsuperscript{46}, that Basil II, who was "just growing a beard and being thrown into the practice of battles"\textsuperscript{47}, fought alongside his younger brother Constantine. Hearing that both Basil II and Constantine were on the field to oppose him, Phokas determined upon battle even though astrological portents were bad. Phokas gathered his picked "Iberian" troops round him, and charged at Basil, intent on killing him. Psellos describes this pseudo-imperial bodyguard:

\begin{quote}
[They were] I would say, the most warlike of the Iberians, all just bearded, putting forth the flowers of their youth, tall in stature and of an equal height as if [chosen] by a ruler, being armed like warriors with a sword in their right hands, and irresistible in headlong charge.\textsuperscript{48}
\end{quote}

From this description we gain some notion of positive male attributes as seen by Psellos.

Once the rebellions of Sideros and Bardas Phokas are dealt with, Psellos returns to the idea that it was these events, rather than his actual accession to the throne which transformed Basil. According to Psellos's account, it was after these rebellions had been quashed that Basil II dismissed the parakoimomenos, because

\begin{quote}
he was indignant, being emperor and having come to the age of reason, [that] he was judged worthy to reign with another [i.e.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{45} Chron. I 10, Renauld 1:7 16-7.
\textsuperscript{46} Chron. I 7, Renauld 1:6 7-8.
\textsuperscript{47} Chron. I 14, Renauld 1:9 2-3.
\textsuperscript{48} Chron. I 15, Renauld 1:10 19-23.
Basil the parakoimomenos] over the affairs of the empire as if he were not someone swaddled in the empire [i.e. a porphyro-gennetos], but as someone who had power alongside someone else, and who attended to the secondary things of government.  

This indignation on Basil II's part was because he was being denied full access to power, not because Basil the parakoimomenos was a eunuch. In response to his sudden downfall, this man, who had been "so great" became unable to control himself and sickened and died. In the account of the parakoimomenos's illness, there is no hint that his "weakness" in the face of adversity was because he was a eunuch; rather Basil the parakoimomenos behaved much as Psellos would have expected anyone to have done in the face of such complete and utter destruction.

Psellos returns to the sombre man, who now controlled the empire. Having realized the seriousness of the task of governing the empire,

   he despised all softness, going so far as to think little of ornaments for the body. He did not wear braided torques at his throat, nor tiaras on his head, nor even a brilliant purple robe.

However, this puritanical desire to be "plain" was not due to Basil II's sex, but rather to his character in its fixity of purpose. Basil II dealt in the same way with his brother, reducing his estate to a mere handful of guards.

50. ἐπερεμεγέθης Chron. I 21, Renauld 1:13 5.
Women appear tangentially when Skleros gives his advice to Basil II on how to preserve the empire from rebellion: "Never allow a woman to enter the imperial palace." This may have been added in an attempt to explain why Basil II never married, but what it cannot be taken as is evidence of misogyny. The other advices given are not standard Byzantine practices:

strike down overproud governors, and never let those in the army have too much, but burden them with unjust exactions so that they concern themselves with their own affairs; never allow a woman to enter the imperial palace; and be open with no-one and never have many of the advisers in your own mind.

Psellus describes this less as the advice of a general than the counsels of Machiavelli.

When so much of what was to be a man in Byzantium in the eleventh and twelfth century was tied up in concepts of ἀνδρεία and γενναιότης it is interesting that what Basil II stressed for his soldiers was obedience, not daring deeds of individual valour.

Psellus's description of Basil II's physical attributes is a useful enumeration of Byzantine ideals of an emperor. The first thing to note is that whatever his size, shape or colour, his appearance shows forth the nobility of his nature. His eyes - frequently an object of Byzantine attention - were χαρόποδαν [i) bluish-grey; ii) flashing or

bright, typical of a brave man] and λαμπρόν [brilliant].

His eyebrows are described as being neither overhanging nor sullen, nor as befitting a woman stretched out in a straight line, but being arched and indicating manly nobility.

Psellos returns to the eyes themselves. They were neither deep-set nor prominent, "but shone bright, with brilliance as befits a man." His face was round and his chest was moderately developed. The theme of moderation in harmony is expanded in the next paragraph dealing with his height, as his less than normal stature was not noticeable when he was on horseback, where he was incomparable to all in appearance.

The paragraph concludes with some further details of how his beard became sparse in his old age, and how he used to twist it between his fingers as he was in audience, angry or thinking. Psellos criticizes his way of speaking, describing it as more like a peasant than one of the leisured classes.

The book ends with a brief account of Basil II's death in 1025.

There are more mixed accounts of gender in the second book of Psellos's Chronographia. Constantine VIII is described, when he acceded to the throne at the age of seventy, as having "a way of life

58. **Chron. I 35, Renauld 1:22 2-3.**

59. **Chron. I 35, Renauld 1:22 4-6.**

60. ἀλλ' ἀόγυλης ἀρρενωπὸ ἀποστῆλθον **Chron. I 35, Renauld 1:22 9.**

61. το κατὰ πάντων ἔδιδον ἀνύγκητον **Chron. I 36, Renauld 1:23 4-5.**

62. καὶ ἀγροικικῆς μᾶλλον ἡ ἑλευθερίας **Chron. I 36, Renauld 1:23 24.**
most lacking in self-control, and a spirit [inclined] towards all transient pleasure." The treasure amassed by Basil II provided Constantine VIII with the means to give himself over to those pleasures.63

Describing Constantine VIII, Psellos states that he was more generous than any of the other emperors64, but that this generosity had its down-side as it was concentrated on the habitués of the palace, while those further from the palace received imperial largesse in greater moderation. The prime recipients of his generosity were "those, of whom in the first age the generative members were drawn off, whom he used as chamberlains and eunuchs of the bedchamber."65 These eunuchs are described as not being well-born nor having the fortune of the leisure class, but rather being ethnics and barbarians:

\[
\text{ἳσνοι δὲ οὗτοι οὐτὲ τῆς εὐγενοῦς οὐτὲ τῆς ἐλευθέρας τύχης, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἑθνικῆς καὶ βαρβάρου.}
\]

Their condition as eunuchs does not strictly speaking seem to have been the cause of Psellos's criticism of them, though he does say that the eunuchs distributed the wealth they received from the emperor to hide the shame of their condition by their perceptiveness:

63. Chron. II 1, Renauld 1:25 7-10.
64. Chron. II 3, Renauld 1:26 1.
Psellos's purpose was not to demean the eunuchs because of their condition but to criticize Constantine VIII for elevating these people, not drawn from the true élite of Byzantium (which in Psellos's eyes at least included himself), merely because they acted as flatterers of imperial conduct.

The appearance of Constantine VIII's wife Helen appears to confirm Psellos's patriarchal credentials. Helen is introduced as Constantine's wife, then as the daughter of Alypios, and finally as the mother of three daughters. She is described merely as coming from one of the noble and most revered families, being beautiful in elegance and good in spirit. Conveniently - in the patriarchal view - having given birth she died. Helen's three daughters were deemed worthy of being raised and educated in the imperial palace, but though the Emperor Basil loved and had strong affection for the girls, he did not take very genuine care of them; guarding the empire for his brother, he put their care onto him.

Thus in common with the treatment of the Lady Helene the daughters of Constantine VIII are treated at this point as a commodity, not as people.

70. ἔφ' αὐς μεταλλάττει τοῦ βίου Chron. II 4, Renauld 1:27 7.
The next paragraph deals briefly with the three daughters in turn. Each of the descriptions owes much to the dominant (which is to say male orientated) social value system. The eldest, Eudokia, is described as not resembling her family: "Her disposition was more equable, her understanding weaker and she possessed moderate beauty." At first glance, the overt sexism of the description of her "moderate beauty" may appear moderated by the explanation that it was caused by a childhood illness; however, it actually makes it worse. The middle sister, Zoë, is one whom Psellos saw in her extreme old age. As he intends to deal with Zoë more fully at the proper point in his history, Psellos tells us that he will describe her only briefly - but what a description! Zoë is most regal in bearing, most brilliant in appearance and [having] magnificent understanding which commanded respect. The third sister, Theodora, was tall in stature and her tongue was both concise and glib, but the beauty of her sister beat [her]. Their uncle Basil died without having had any thoughts worthy of an emperor concerning them i.e. without

73. Chron. II 4, Renaud 1:27 4-5.
75. Chron. II 5, Renaud 1:28 6-8.
77. οὐδὲν περὶ τούτων φρονήσας βασιλικότερον ἀπελήλυθεν Chron. II 5, Renaud 1:28 13.
securing the succession by marrying them off to suitable candidates for the throne. The same was true of Constantine VIII, though when he was dying he made a decision regarding Zoë (who is described as most royal\textsuperscript{78}). Zoë and Theodora were content to follow the advice of their uncle and father. In this, they were in accord with patriarchal notions of the submissive woman. The exception to this paradigm was the eldest daughter, Eudokia. She asked her father that she be dedicated to God, i.e. to be allowed to become a nun. Psellos offers two alternatives: either Eudokia was renouncing power [a role in government] or that she was yearning after the higher things.\textsuperscript{79} This turning from the world to heaven was laudable in Byzantine perspective, and this may have permitted unfeminine independent action. The action however was not that independent as Eudokia asked her father's permission to enter a nunnery, rather than entering the religious life on her own behalf.\textsuperscript{80} Constantine VIII accepted his daughter's suggestion immediately, and dedicated her to the Most High; his intentions for his remaining daughters he kept hidden.\textsuperscript{81}

Psellos in his description of Constantine VIII says that his account is truthful, with nothing added or omitted.\textsuperscript{82} The addition of the cares of state did not transform Constantine VIII as it had done Basil; he

\textsuperscript{78} Βασιλικώτερος Chron. II 5, Renaud 1:28 16.

\textsuperscript{79} Chron. II 5, Renaud 1:28 20-4.

\textsuperscript{80} An obvious western gender contrast is Francis of Assisi; see Bynum, "Women's Stories, Women's Symbols", 109-15.

\textsuperscript{81} Chron. II 5, Renaud 1:28 24-5.

\textsuperscript{82} Chron. II 6, Renaud 1:28 1-2.
was not someone to let himself be consumed by cares; he handed over
everything [to do with the state] to men more intelligent than he
was.\textsuperscript{83} He acted out the easier (τῶν ῥᾴστων) parts of the imperial
duties, but looked the part.\textsuperscript{84} He had not studied letters deeply, but
shallowly so that he reached a point in classical education such as
children normally had.\textsuperscript{85} However, natural intelligence and ease of
speech made up for these deficiencies. Physically, Constantine VIII is
described in standard imperial terms, being large in stature, almost
reaching nine feet tall [the usual Byzantine exaggeration].\textsuperscript{86} Coupled
with this large size was a hearty appetite to which he pandered,
creating novel piquant sauces. A slave to hunger and love,
Constantine VIII soon became afflicted by arthritis, and by the time of
his accession he moved on horseback rather than risk walking. The
reason given for his excellence on horseback - the arthritis caused by
overindulgence in food and love - weakens the impact of his
horsemanship in paragraph eight. His equestrian skill is further
demoted by its close association with the theatre\textsuperscript{87} and makebelieve,
even though Constantine liked his opponents in the gymnopodia to
fight back with conviction.\textsuperscript{88} Constantine VIII had all the imperial

\textsuperscript{83} οὐχ οίδος τε ἢ ἐν φροντίσου εὐαυτόν καταδιαμίαν, ἄνδρῶν τοῖς
λογωτέροις ἐγχειρίσας τὰ πράγματα \textit{Chron.} II 6, Renauld 1:28 3-5.

\textsuperscript{84} προὐκόθητο μάλα βασιλικῶς \textit{Chron.} II 6, Renauld 1:28 6-7.

\textsuperscript{85} \textit{Chron.} II 6, Renauld 1:28-29 9-11.

\textsuperscript{86} εὐμεγέθης δὲ ὡς τὸ σώμα, ὡς εἰς ἔννοιον πόδα ἀνεστηκέναι
\textit{Chron.} II 6, Renauld 1:29 1-2.

\textsuperscript{87} \textit{Chron.} II 8, Renauld 1:29 1.

\textsuperscript{88} \textit{Chron.} II 8, Renauld 1:29 6-8.
virtues\textsuperscript{89}, but they were directed towards hunting rather than the defeat of the empire's enemies. The same was true of his skill with weapons.\textsuperscript{90}

When Constantine VIII was surprised by Death and Old Age, he looked for someone to receive the empire, to whom he would betroth his middle daughter.\textsuperscript{91} At this point the narrative appears patriarchal, with the empire being passed from man to man, with the marriage of Zoë in a mild legitimizing function, but not serving as the conduit of empire as it would for Michael IV and Michael V.

The first choice for the new emperor was the city eparch.\textsuperscript{92} However, as he had taken a wife in adolescence, he did not seem very suited to government.\textsuperscript{93} It was not the fact of the eparch's marriage which barred him; after all Romanos Argyropoulos was also married when Constantine VIII chose him as his heir and husband for Zoë. In birth and rank the eparch was more appropriate a ruler than others, but the man had some unphilosophical attitude towards his wife, and this made the many hostile to him having a connection to the

\textsuperscript{89}. καύματος κρείττων ἡ, καὶ ψύχους ἐκράτει, καὶ πρὸς δῆμος ἀντέτεινεν Chron. II 8, Renaud 1:30 11-2.

\textsuperscript{90}. Chron. II 8, Renaud 1:30 12-5.

\textsuperscript{91}. Chron. II 9, Renaud 1:30 11-13.

\textsuperscript{92}. Probably Constantine Dalassenos - Cedrenos 722, p.484.

\textsuperscript{93}. γυναῖκα δὲ γῆμας ἐξ ἕτερ παιδὸς καὶ διὰ ταύτα οὐ πάνω πρόσφορας τῷ κράτει δοκῶν Chron. II 10, Renaud 1:30 3-5.
The love - or at least the lack of philosophical detachment - which the eparch had for his wife cost him the empire.

Lack of time for further deliberations concentrated Constantine VIII's mind on Romanos Argyropoulos, though at this point Psellos still keeps his name a mystery. Romanos Argyropoulos, like the eparch, was married, and Constantine VIII knew that Romanos's wife would be opposed to what the emperor proposed. Constantine VIII pretended to be in a rage against Romanos, and dispatched people to inflict terrible punishments on him and to drag her away from life in the world. She did not see the subterfuge and gave herself over to the undertaking. Her hair was shorn, she was dressed in black and taken to a nunnery, while her erstwhile husband Romanos was taken up to the imperial palace to be related by marriage to the emperor. Zoë is described as the most beautiful of Constantine's daughters, and no sooner had Romanos seen Zoë than he was brought into the imperial marriage. Having survived to see the marriage, Constantine VIII then died.

94. τὸ μὲν γὰρ ὅσον ἐς γένος καὶ τὸ ἄξιωμα τῶν ἄλλων ὑπήρχε καταληλότερος, τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ τῇ γυναικὶ ἀθλόσοφοὶ τί ὁ ἀνὴρ εἶχε, καὶ πρὸς βασιλέως κῆθος ἔχων τι ἀπὸ τούτου τοῖς πολλοῖς πρόσαντες Chron. II 10, Renauld 1:30-1 5-8.

95. That is that she should become a nun, thus freeing her former husband to marry Zoë. Chron. II 10, Renauld 1:31 14-5.


98. Chron. II 10, Renauld 1:31 22-6; the unseemly haste may have been to avoid problems with Romanos's first wife if she had discovered that it was all a trick.
The emphasis on the male line is clear at the start of Book III, when Psellos remarks that with Romanos III the Macedonian dynasty had died out. At first, Romanos III is described in standard terms for an emperor: nurtured in Greek literature, he also knew something of Italian literature; he spoke gracefully and his voice was impressive; he had a hero's stature and he had simply the face of an emperor. He thought he knew more than he did, but he tried to emulate the reigns of Marcus Aurelius and Augustus by concentrating "on the study of literature and by attention to arms." Though Romanos's execution of this programme was doubtful, Psellos has no quibble with learning and arms as the proper objects for a Byzantine emperor's study.

When Romanos III Argyropoulos came to the throne, he believed that he would found a new dynasty. It did not occur to him that Zoë, with whom he lived since coming to power, "had passed the time of conception and she had already a dry womb for the bearing of

That Psellos gives her age as 50, when in actual fact she was 48, suggests that Psellos regarded 50 as the age of the menopause. Even in the face of physical impossibility, he held to his belief in the possibility of siring a son.

He turned completely to those who claim [to be able] to quench and straightaway rouse nature. He gave himself over to topical ungents and to massages, and ordered [the same] for his wife.

Zoë went further:

she was initiated into most of the mysteries, and had certain little stones attached to her body, and attached to herself pendants and cords knotted in the process of magic, and suspended [other foolery] from her body.

However, as nothing came of these endeavours, the emperor abandoned them, and paid less court to Zoë. Psellos states that this was because "the resolve was duller and the condition of the body was exhausted." This was because - according to Psellos - Romanos was ten years older than Zoë. In their attempts to cure their sterility, there is no real difference between Romanos and Zoë. Both had recourse to avenues Psellos obviously holds to be dubious; it is interesting that neither is reported as making any resort to the saints or the Theotokos, especially as Zoë will be praised for her piety later. Given

105. Chron. III 5, Renauld 1:34 4-8.
the recent stress on Zoë's beauty and her regal appearance, the point here is to stress Romanos's stupidity in the face of nature, rather than to criticize Zoë separately for her recourse to magic and other foolishness.

That Romanos is the main object of criticism at this point is confirmed in paragraph six. The great liberality with which he began the reign - again an imperial virtue - suddenly vanished. Zoë was annoyed on two counts: firstly the emperor no longer loved her; and secondly because she did not have enough money to spend. Zoë's concern over the withdrawal of Romanos's affections show her to be bound by patriarchal values - or rather Psellus's interpretation of what she thought, to be hidebound by chauvinistic values. The second annoyance, the restricted access to cash on the orders of the emperor, was stronger. In response, Zoë opposed the counsellors who had advised Romanos on the matter. The counsellors in turn were aware of this and took care, especially Pulcheria, the emperor's sister. Pulcheria is described as a woman of excellent intellect, who helped her brother. The "excellent intellect" provides praise, which is then removed by the "τι", but nevertheless Pulcheria is presented as a counterpart to Zoë, a woman serving in the imperial councils without

---

111. ὀλλ. ἀθρό δον ἐς ψηφιοτάτης καταβεβήκει περιστάς Chron. III 6, Renauld 1:35 8-9.

112. τὸ τε μὴ ἐπὶ ἀυτής τῶν κρατείναι καὶ τὸ μὴ ἔχαιν ἀφθονικας χρήσθαι τοῖς χρήσκοις Chron. III 6, Renauld 1:35 10-11.


114. γυνὴ δὲ φρόνημα αἱροῦσα καὶ τι λυστελοῦσα τῷ ἀδελφῷ Chron. III 6, Renauld 1:35 17-8.
comment. The paragraph then returns to Romanos, ignorant of the currents of suspicion flowing round his court, placing his trust "in some ruling nature"\textsuperscript{115}, which is not synonymous with God. This placing of trust in false ruling geniuses could be construed as a criticism of Romanos placing trust in the counsels of his sister, but this is probably overinterpretation.

In his denunciation of the construction of the church of the Theotokos Peribleptos\textsuperscript{116} by Romanos III, Psellos reveals some attitudes to women. Psellos is determined to show how dreadful this desire to outdo Justinian and Solomon\textsuperscript{117} was: "And the object of his piety was the starting point of evil doing and of these numerous premeditated wrongs,"\textsuperscript{118} as all the wealth of the empire was diverted to the new building.\textsuperscript{119} Romanos seemed piously turned towards the divine, but at the same time he was the originator of many crimes.\textsuperscript{120} Psellos criticized Romanos III's embellishment of the Lord's House, as it was the cause of injustice: "Public affairs should not be confounded, nor should the body politic be broken in pieces."\textsuperscript{121} Psellos then makes the general statement:

For He who rejects the sacrificial gift of the prostitute and who loathes the burnt offering of someone without Law, as of a dog,

\textsuperscript{115} πρός τινα κρείττονα φώς ουν Chron. III 6, Renauld 1:35 18.
\textsuperscript{117} Chron. III 14, Renauld 1:41 2-6.
\textsuperscript{118} Chron. III 14, Renauld 1:41 7-9.
\textsuperscript{119} Chron. III 14, Renauld 1:41 20-1.
\textsuperscript{120} Chron. III 15, Renauld 1:42 1-3.
\textsuperscript{121} Chron. III 15, Renauld 1:42 10-1.
would not draw near a building, no matter how completely costly and wrought in varied colours, on account of which many evils have occurred.\textsuperscript{122}

The reference to prostitutes and lawless ones cannot be taken at face value. Thus ἀνομος, rendered "criminal" by Renauld and "ungodly" by Sewter, literally means "without law". By extension, "being without law" subsumes the notion of "impious".\textsuperscript{123} The second meaning in the same entry suggests that the Law referred to is Divine Law. I take the meaning here to be "impious" or "godless", rather than criminal. The same kind of problem exists with the use of the word πόρνη. LSJ gives "harlot" or "prostitute". However, there are problems with drawing from this a Byzantine - perhaps specifically an ecclesiastical - attitude to prostitutes. Within the Christian tradition, given indeed by Christ himself, the reformed prostitute was welcomed. The meaning of the πόρνη here is perhaps more closely related to the meaning given for πορνεύω, s.v. LSJ II.2 in the meaning "practise idolatry", citing the Septuagint at I Chronicles 5:25. This suggests that the prostitute's offering, rejected by God, was rejected not because she offered sex for sale, but rather because she "went awhoring after the gods of the people of the land." This mention of πόρνη cannot be used easily as an indicator of how eleventh-century Byzantines, or even Psellos, viewed prostitutes, showing the difficulties in using literary texts to determine underlying social reality.

Paragraph fifteen concludes with Psellos's comment that even the name of the foundation in honour of the Theotokos was in poor taste:

\textsuperscript{122} \textit{Chron.} III 15, Renauld 1:42 11-5.

\textsuperscript{123} LSJ s.v.
But wishing to embellish the Theometor with a name beautiful above all others, he (unaware) called her by a most human name, if Peribleptos really means admired by all observers.124 No strong conclusion may be drawn from this, but it does suggest that there was a class of "celebrated" women in Constantinople, not usually associated with the ever-virgin Mother of God.

Having dealt at length with Romanos III's building programme, Psellos then turns to other matters worthy of censure.125 Psellos offers two interpretations for Romanos III living with a woman. The first is that at the beginning (of his reign or of his marriage to Zoë) Romanos wished to exercise self-control. This implies a patriarchal attitude, whereby it is better to satisfy "baser passions" through alternative sexual outlets than to demand conjugal rights from one's wife, who (as one's social equal) is expected under the dictates of virgin/whore dichotomy to accede to her husband's demands for sexual intercourse only for the purpose of procreation. However, the reasoning that found most favour with the many was that Romanos turned aside from his legitimate wife to many loves. In either case, the result was that Romanos despised Zoë:

he both held from sexual intercourse with her and also turned away completely from having anything to do with her.126

The empress's response was heated:

Zoë was stirred up to anger, partly because Romanos III had thought so lightly of the imperial blood in her person, but even more because of her lust for intercourse, which was not due to

125. ἠνεπιτηδείως εἶχεν οὗτος ὁ βασιλεὺς τὰ τὲ ἄλλα καὶ πρὸς συμβίωσιν γυναικός Chron. III 17, Renauld 1:44 2-4.
126. Chron. III 17, Renauld 1:44 4-8.
her age, but on account of the luxury [wantonness] of the palace.127

Ideas of the physical needs of women have shaped the conclusions of this paragraph. Zoë’s desire for intercourse was not due to her age: Psellos has already stated that she was beyond the age of childbearing, with a dry womb. This should have meant that she no longer desired intercourse.128 However, the τρυφή of the palace fostered lust either because of the wanton habits, or because the life of luxury and inactivity prevented the effect of her drying womb from being felt in the rest of her body.

Romanos III’s rejection of Zoë, coupled with her desire for intercourse, set the scene for the unfolding drama. A certain castrated man129 had been in imperial service, from before Romanos’s accession to power.

He was of poor and most dreadful fortune, but he was most awesome in his active understanding; he was the familiar of Basil II, and was privy to his secrets. Basil II had not advanced him to high command, but had treated him most honestly.130

The eunuch’s lack of high command appears to have been due to his lowly origins, not to his emasculation.

The eunuch had a brother, Michael, still merely a stripling when Romanos III came to the throne, but who soon afterwards had come

---


129. τις ἄντρος έκτομίας Chron. III 18, Renauld 1:44 5.

130. Chron. III 18, Renauld 1:44-5 6-10.
into man’s estate and had reached the age of maturity.\textsuperscript{131} Michael is described as a vision of beauty:

While the rest of his body was put together very beautifully, in truth his face was the most beautiful, for it was blooming [εὐκυθής], and his eyes were bright, and veritably he was red-cheeked [μελατόπαρης].\textsuperscript{132}

During the audience with the imperial couple, Romanos III asked Michael a few questions and then asked him to retire but to remain at court; the effect on Zoë was very different:

It was as if some kind of light of equal measure to his beauty burned in her eyes, and straight away she succumbed. From an unspoken union, she developed a desire for him.\textsuperscript{133}

Psellos adds circumspectly that it still remained secret from the multitude.\textsuperscript{134} Zoë’s presence at the audience undermines Psellos’s comments elsewhere that women belonged in their own quarters, and that they should have nothing to do with affairs of state. It is possible to describe this meeting of Romanos with the brother of one of his eunuch chamberlains as a private, domestic occasion. However, given the lack of material evidence, it is better to ascribe it to a lack of coherence in Psellos’s viewpoint.

Zoë was unable to regulate [φιλοσοφεῖν] nor to manage [οἰκονομεῖν] her desire, and so she turned to the eunuch, whom previously she had avoided.\textsuperscript{135} The eunuch was to encourage his

\textsuperscript{131} \textit{Chron. III} 18, Renaud 1:45 10-2.

\textsuperscript{132} \textit{Chron. III} 18, Renaud 1:45 12-5.

\textsuperscript{133} \textit{Chron. III} 18, Renaud 1:45 20-2.

\textsuperscript{134} καὶ τὸ τοῦτο τέως ἀπόρρητον τοῖς πολλοῖς \textit{Chron. III} 18, Renaud 1:45 22-3.

\textsuperscript{135} \textit{Chron. III} 19, Renaud 1:45 1.
brother to visit the empress whenever he wished. Michael knew nothing of the empress’s intentions - or at least so Psellus would have us believe - and so he accepted the command at face value. In obeying the order to wait upon her, Michael acted in a subdued and timorous fashion. This respect made him dazzle even more, and he appeared completely dark-red [i.e. he blushed] and he was glorified with brilliant colours. Zoë eased his fear, and encouraged him in love, providing him with opportunities which he took without confidence at first, but then more shamelessly he acted as lovers do. These are enumerated: Michael suddenly embraced Zoë, and touched her hand and neck. These are not the natural actions of a lover, however, as Michael had to be schooled in the techniques by his brother the eunuch. Michael’s "ardour" provoked Zoë to great public displays of affection.

Zoë truly loved Michael, but he did not really desire her, because she was past the age for love; however the majesty of the empire was thrown into his mind and through her he could do everything, no matter what, boldly and stoutly.

137. υφεμένα δὲ καὶ πεφοβημένα τῷ σχῆματι Chron. III 19, Renauld 1:45 8.
142. ἢ μὲν καὶ ως ἀληθῶς ἦσσο, ὁ δὲ οὐ πάνω μὲν τι ταύτης παρηκμακώς ἐπιθυμῶν, τὸν δὲ τῆς βασιλείας ὄγκον ἔλει νοῦν βολάλομενον, καὶ διὰ ταύτην παῦν ὀτιοῦν ποιεῖν τολμᾶν τε καὶ ἀνεχούμενος Chron. III 19, Renauld 1:46 20-3.
This is a clear statement of misogynistic, if not patriarchal, attitudes. Because of her age, Zoë is assumed to be "past it". When their affair eventually became common knowledge amongst the courtiers,

he [Michael] was ashamed, and was both blushing and very timid about the matter. She was not in the slightest abashed, and clung fast kissing [him] in front of everyone's eyes, and exaggerated [saying that] she had enjoyed him many times.143

Zoë's overt avowal of her lover is perhaps surprising, given the retiring nature with which Pselllos has endowed women. The problem with attempting to draw too much from this is that Zoë's conduct may be shaped more by her imperial status than by her gender. Having described how Zoë decorated Michael as if he were a statue - ἀγαλμα, covering him in gold, rings and cloth-of-gold, Pselllos says that it was not surprising, "for what would an empress in love not provide for her beloved?"144 What she did provide was to seat him on the throne turnabout with herself, to give him a sceptre, and once even a coronet.145 These goings-on did not escape one of the courtiers, "one of those who see everything"146. Whilst this introduction might herald a negative characterization, he is described in positive terms, for all his watchfulness:

He was a eunuch, one of those charged with controlling the imperial palace, venerable both on account of his demeanour...
and on account of his reputation, [who] had served her father.147

At the sight of Zoë consorting with Michael, the eunuch almost expired. However, Zoë called him over and reassured him, ordering him to attach himself to Michael as the man soon to be emperor.148

Though everyone else knew of the situation, the emperor did not "so great was the cloud laid upon his eyes".149 Romanos made Michael his personal servant of the bedchamber, and thus abandoned his wife to him.150 Romanos is shown to be content to let things go on. Even when his sister Pulcheria and some of the chamberlains discovered "a plotted death against him"151 and warned him, the emperor chose to do nothing. "Once he ordered the lover, or the beloved, to him to enquire about this love", but when Michael denied all knowledge of it and swore oaths on relics, Romanos believed him, and regarded further rumours as lies against Michael, calling him his most faithful attendant.152

147. Chron. III 20, Renaud 1:46-7 10-1.


149. τοσοῦτον ωτῷ νέφος ὀφθαλμίας ἐπέκειτο Chron. III 21, Renaud 1:47 2-3.

150. τὴν γυναῖκα τούτῳ κατεμνηστεύετο Chron. III 21, Renaud 1:47 12.


Michael suffered from a terrible illness. Romanos III knew this epilepsy and madness well, but did not recognize the loves and pleasures. "To many people, his [i.e. Michael's] suffering seemed a screen and a veil [hiding] the plot." This might have seemed the truth, had not Michael continued in his affliction after he came to power. That love could force such dissimulation is not surprising; what is noteworthy is Psellos's recognition of the fact in his history. Psellos concludes by saying that even though the illness was real, rather than a pretence, it still provided Michael with a cover for his plans.

Psellos begins the next paragraph by saying that to persuade Romanos III that Zoë and Michael were not lovers was no great task, as the emperor was easily persuaded. He then introduces a personal informant, a courtier. He indicated that the emperor wanted to be persuaded that the empress had not had sex with Michael, but Romanos III, knowing her to be full of lust and

159. ἄνδρος ἄπασαν τῆς βασιλίδας τὴν ἐρωτικὴν εἰδότος ὑπόθεσιν Chron. III 23, Renauld 1:48 4-5.
swollen with passion\textsuperscript{162},

so that she would not give herself to many, he was not very
disgusted at his wife's sexual congress with one - i.e. Michael -
but pretended to over-look the consummation of the empress's
passion.\textsuperscript{163}

Psellos then proceeds to offer another interpretation of the events,
related to him by another, unnamed, informant.\textsuperscript{164} In this version,
Romanos III was content with the empress's thoughts of love and their
consummation\textsuperscript{165}, but his sister Pulcheria was angered by it, as were
those of her associates who shared in her secrets.\textsuperscript{166} Psellos then
resorts to military imagery to describe the conflict (ἡ μάχη) between
Pulcheria and her advisers on one side, and Michael and Zoë on the
other; the battle formation (ἡ παράταξις) was not unseen, but the
trophies existed [only] in conjectures.\textsuperscript{167} The conceit of the military
allusion - interesting because of Pulcheria's gender - is not developed
further, as the opponents of Michael and Zoë were decimated.
Pulcheria died shortly later, and of those who surrounded her, one
died subsequently and one was dismissed from the palace on the

\textsuperscript{162} καὶ σφυγνόσει περὶ τὸ πάθος Χρον. III 23, Renauld 1:48 8;
"σφυγνόσει" s.v. σφυγνός LSJ means "vigorous" or "in full health"
with the suggestion of swollen with desire, to be on heat, or to be full-
blooded, engorged. This connection with engorgement may indicate
that Zoë may possess too much of the firey, male element.

\textsuperscript{163} ἀπετλήρου τὸ πάθος τῇ βασιλίδι. Χρον. III 23, Renauld 1:49 11.

\textsuperscript{164} Χρον. III 23, Renauld 1:49 11-2.

\textsuperscript{165} πρὸς τὴν ἐρωτικὴν υπόληψιν ἡ κατάληψις Χρον. III 23,
Renauld 1:49 12-3.

\textsuperscript{166} Χρον. III 23, Renauld 1:49 13-5; whilst these associates are
grammatically male, their "sharing in her secrets" indicates that they
may be eunuchs.

\textsuperscript{167} Χρον. III 23, Renauld 1:49 15-7.
orders of the emperor. Psellos does not make it explicit, but it would seem that there were suspicions of foul play at the convenient deaths and exile of Zoë and Michael’s opponents. For the rest of the courtiers, either they accepted the affaire or held their tongues. The end result was that the love was not consummated unseen, but as if it were in accordance with the laws.

In dealing with the death of Romanos III, Psellos suggests that the loving couple and those who were parties to the affaire may have encompassed the emperor’s death. It is only a suggestion, and Psellos distances himself from full and complete knowledge - a rare occurrence for Psellos - as understandably it is not wise for a courtier to admit to intimate knowledge of poisonings. For the unnamed others however, there was common agreement that they first bewitched the man with drugs, after which they mixed in hellebore. Psellos refuses to be drawn on these accusations of poisonings, but he does maintain that Zoë and Michael were the cause of Romanos III’s


170. ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ ἦν εἶπομι: οὐ γὰρ ἐδίως οἶδα κοπαγιώσκειν δὲν οὕτω κοτάλησαι εἴλαξα Chron. III 26, Renauld 1:50-1 4-5.

171. τοῖς ἀλλοις Chron. III 26, Renauld 1:51 5

172. Culpepper’s Colour Herbal, edited by David Potterton (London, 1983), s.v. hellebore (black) Helleboris niger, 93. It is perhaps no coincidence that as well as a poison, Culpepper describes its use against convulsions, and that modern homeopathy uses hellebore to treat epilepsy.
death, even if they were not his poisoners. When, after his bath, Romanos III had been half-drowned in the swimming pool, Zoë came to see him on the couch where he had been laid. The empress was without a bodyguard (ὁδορωφόρητος) either to indicate the speed and haste with which she had come or because her recent actions precluded witnesses, and seemed in dreadful distress. However, she left the scene as soon as she was sure that Romanos III was going to die. The end of Romanos III's life descends into pathos: unable to speak, he tried to indicate by nods and signs the desire of his spirit to be shriven or to become a monk, but no-one understood him, and he died alone.

On learning that Romanos III had died, Zoë "immediately was the head of the government of everything, as if appointed from on high". However, Psellos says that Zoë was not interested in command for herself and wanted power merely to give it to Michael. Courtiers, who occupied the upper ranks of the hierarchy and who were drawn for the most part from the group of old family retainers of Zoë's family and of her husband's family, tried to prevent

---

174. ὡς ἐπὶ πένθει δεινωσφρα Chron. III 26, Renaud 1:52 37.
175. καὶ ἴδοισα αὖθις ἐπιθάλης, τὸ πιστὸν τῆς τελευτῆς εἰληφών διὰ τῆς ὂψεως Chron. III 26, Renaud 1:52 37-8.
176. τὸ βουλήμα τῆς ψυχῆς Chron. III 26, Renaud 1:52 41.
177. Chron. IV 1, Renaud 1:53 5-6; I have used meaning B.II.1 of προστημων c.gen. LSJ; the word also has the meaning "to prostitute" A.I.3, and "to be a prostitute" B.I.4. LSJ s.v.
her marrying in haste. They suggested that it would be better for Zoë to marry one of their number, raising him to the empire, as he would then treat her not as a consort, but as an absolute ruler.¹⁷⁹ That this is offered as an option indicates that married empresses were not usually regarded as holding power in their own right. The courtiers pressed their case in all ways, and believed that they would quickly convince her. Zoë remained true to Michael, however.¹⁸⁰ Michael's brother¹⁸¹ prompted Zoë to action. Michael was dressed in cloth-of-gold, with an imperial crown on his head and seated on a costly throne. Zoë, in the same garb, was seated beside him¹⁸², to show their equality - at least in Zoë's eyes. The courtiers were then brought forward to acknowledge their new emperor, soon followed by all the city, discredited somewhat by Psellus's description of the flattery as dissimulation.¹⁸³

The order for the recognition of the new emperor was effected the next day. The eparch and the other officials entered the palace at dawn to perform the ceremonial for the emperor Michael, and to

¹⁷⁹. οὐχ ὡς συμβίω ἄλλ᾽ ὡς δισπότιδι Chron. IV 1, Renauld 1:53 16-7.

¹⁸⁰. οὐ λογισμῷ ἄλλα πάθει τοῦ ἰδρα κρίνουσα Chron. IV 2, Renauld 1:53 4.

¹⁸¹. Ἦκαννης ὁ ἐκτομίας, ἀνὴρ δεμότατος περὶ τὰς ἐνθυμήσεις καὶ περὶ τὰς πράξεις δραστήριος Chron. IV 2, Renauld 1:54 7-9.

¹⁸². αὐτῇ παρακαθισταμένη πλησίον ἐν ὁμοίῳ τῷ σχήματι Chron. IV 2, Renauld 1:54 15.

attend the funeral rites of Romanos III. In the ceremonial of recognition, they entered the imperial presence one by one, and prostrated themselves. This was the only ritual directed at the empress; to the new emperor, however, they also performed the ritual of kissing the right hand. It is possible that the difference in homage rendered to Michael compared with that given to Zoë, was because as a woman she was less intimately connected with the imperial power. However, it is difficult to accept this evidence of misogyny, when an alternative explanation exists, namely that Michael, as the newly promoted emperor had to receive the allegiance of the senatorial order, allegiance that Zoë as empress would already have received. The conclusion of the ceremony marked Michael’s accession to power, and he became occupied with concerns of state.

To begin with, Michael acted out a pretence, in which he appeared well-disposed to Zoë in her eyes, but a short time afterwards he changed, and gave back in turn evil for the graces and favours she had given him. Psellos says that he can neither blame nor praise Michael IV for this. On the one hand, such base ingratitude ought not to be praised; but Michael's fear of Zoë - the means by which he

184 On burial ritual, see De Ceremonis ed. A. Vogt, 2:84-5; Patricia Karlin-Hayter, "Εξελθεινία. Les funérailles de l'empereur à Byzance aux VIII-Xe ss", in Actes du colloque international "Le souverain à Byzance et en Occident du VIIIe au Xe siècle Byzantion (1991); for earlier material see Simon Price, "From noble funerals to divine cult: the consecration of Roman Emperors", in Cannadine and Price, Rituals of Royalty (Cambridge, 1987).

185 Chron. IV 3, Renauld 1:54 7-10. On rituals of ceremonial see De Cerimoniis ed. A. Vogt, 2:12:7-8 and 2:16:17, which refer to the kissing of the imperial knees rather than the right hand of power.

186 Chron. IV 6, Renauld 1:56 1-4.
might preserve himself from her - that Psellos finds laudable. This notion of Zoë as a danger places Psellos in the misogynist canon: women, unless controlled are a threat, and will destroy whatever they touch. Psellos portrays Zoë in the guise of Eve the temptress, an evil power of seduction, who destroys those she tempts.

In the course of the next paragraph, however, Psellos retreats somewhat from this position of Zoë as evil temptress, seducing the innocent Michael. It is admittedly done in a rhetorical style, but it is unlikely that the hyperbole used in the description of Michael is to be taken seriously:

Above all Michael's way of life makes me have a doubt in my judgments, for if one left out this single injustice done to Romanos III - and the accusation of adultery, and equally being convicted of exiling [people] on suspicion - he [Michael IV] would be numbered among the chosen rulers. 187

These major failings - murder, adultery, lack of judgment, coupled with Michael's lack of classical learning188, mean that Michael IV is reduced in our estimation. This in turn reduces the force of the conceit of the sinful Zoë leading the naïf Michael astray. However, it is impossible to dismiss Michael as one of the "bad guys" in Psellos's *Chronographia*: in his description of the emperor, Psellos shows the good side of his character. Michael IV was more the master of his passions than the philosophers:

he controlled the vigour of his body and his youthful bloom; the passions did not control his reason, rather it mastered them. Not only had he fierce eyes, but also a fierce spirit, ready for well-matched disputes. His tongue was also well-formed,

not putting [words] together in a uniform way, but speaking fluently and sounding brilliant.\textsuperscript{189} Psellos points out that his account has shown how Michael IV's advent to power was not an auspicious beginning.\textsuperscript{190} When he first became emperor, he treated it as something of a joke, spending his time pleasing his wife and organizing pastimes and amusements for her.\textsuperscript{191} However, when he realized the magnitude of power, the multitude of things requiring foresight and how many matters requiring consideration gathered round the true emperor's presence, Michael IV changed suddenly. Just as a stripling suddenly becomes a man, so Michael became more manly and more noble [and] grasped the empire.\textsuperscript{192} This transformation of Michael IV in response to the problems that beset the ruler of the empire mark him out as being able to learn from experience, and able to take on the responsibilities of the purple at least, if not also of being a man.

The next extended description of a person in which we might expect gender to play a significant role, is that of the eunuch John, Michael IV's brother. The description opens in paragraph eleven, where Psellos describes John's attempts to mediate between his other brothers and the new emperor. He kept Michael IV's ire in check, and

\textsuperscript{189} Chron. IV 7, Renauld 1:56 10-4.
\textsuperscript{190} Chron. IV 9, Renauld 1:57 1-2.
\textsuperscript{191} Chron. IV 9, Renauld 1:57 5-7.
\textsuperscript{192} ἡλώς ἄθροος μετῆλλακτο, καὶ ὠσπερ ἄνηρ ἐκ μειρακίου γενόμενος ἀνδρίκωτερον ἡμι καὶ γενναώτερον τῆς βασιλείας ἀντείχετο. Chron. IV 9, Renauld 1:57 10-2.
won freedom of action for his brothers. This was not because he approved of their actions, but because he was mindful of family. Having laid claim to direct knowledge of John the eunuch, Psellos goes on to describe him:

He had a ready intellect, and shrewd, if ever anyone else was. These qualities were shown in him by the fierce glance of his eyes. He undertook matters diligently and was disposed to be most industrious about it.

He was experienced in all things, but it was in public finance that he excelled. Wishing neither to be a curse of misfortune to anyone, nor to be mistaken as to who he was, he adopted a fierce appearance to many. This fierce gaze itself was sufficient to stop people from carrying out evil intentions. In this way the eunuch John was both a bulwark and a brother to the emperor. Neither day nor night did he relax his vigilance, not even when devoted to pleasure and at parties. Nothing at all escaped him, and no one tried to escape his notice because everyone feared and was frightened by his knowledge. The eunuch John is described as knowing everything that went on in the city, not least because of his almost magical nightly visitations.


194. τοῦ δὲ γένους ὁμοίου κτρόμουνος *Chron. IV* 11, Renauld 1:58 21-2; also *Chron. IV* 20, Renauld 1:65 2; 14-20; *Chron. IV* 21, Renauld 1:66 12-4; *Chron. IV* 23, Renauld 1:68 14-6. This concern with family was an attribute also ascribed to Basil the Parakoimomenos *Chron. I* 3, Renauld 1:3 13-5.


196. ὤρμείαν δὲ τοίς πολλοῖς τῷ ὁμοίῳ πλατύλομονος *Chron. IV* 12, Renauld 1:59 15-6.

The sense of fear that resulted meant that everyone lived by themselves and that meetings with others were avoided.\textsuperscript{198}

Paragraph thirteen presents the negative side to the eunuch John. "His spirit was many-sided, and it was changed for every individual with whom he conversed."\textsuperscript{199} He criticized people when they were far off, but was nice to them when they came near.

And if someone announced to him some news which had the possibility of saving the empire, so that [John] would not have to reward [the informer], he pretended to have known it for a long time, and blamed [the informer] for his tardy utterance.\textsuperscript{200}

He wished to live life very magnificently, and to conduct government in a very imperial fashion\textsuperscript{201}, but his nature prevented him as he was an inveterate drinker. Even in his cups, however, he never forgot his care for the empire, and his beastly glare.\textsuperscript{202} When he was drunk, he would take note of what his drinking buddies did and said; when sober, he would then interrogate them to find out what they had meant. On account of this, he was feared more when drunk than when sober.\textsuperscript{203} For a long time he had worn the monastic habit, but not even in his dreams had he conducted himself in a way suited to his dress. He had no time for those who led a dissolute life, but he

\textsuperscript{198} Kαὶ καθ’ ἑαυτὸν ἐκαστὸς διεβίου, τῶν πρὸς ὀλλὴλους συλλόγων ἀνηρμένων \textit{Chron.} IV 12, Renauld 1:59 29-30.

\textsuperscript{199} \textit{Chron.} IV 13, Renauld 1:60 2-3.

\textsuperscript{200} \textit{Chron.} IV 13, Renauld 1:60 7-10.

\textsuperscript{201} \textit{Chron.} IV 13, Renauld 1:60 12-3.

\textsuperscript{202} τῶν ἑρι τῆν βασιλείαν φροντίδων...τὸ βλοσυρὸν τῷ ἔρι \textit{Chron.} IV 13, Renauld 1:60 18-9.

\textsuperscript{203} \textit{Chron.} IV 14, Renauld 1:60 7-8.
opposed equally whoever preferred a dignified life (ἐυσχημονα ζωή) or who lived very freely in righteous deeds, or who decorated his spirit with classical learning (ἐξωθεν λόγις). To all others he was paradoxical (ιτόπως), but to his brother the emperor he showed one single disposition, neither deviating nor changing, but showing to him the same unchanging attitude. The eunuch John was second in virtue, when compared with the emperor, but was far superior to the other [brothers] and was a law unto himself. Compared with the emperor, John was greatly his inferior, but there were similarities. Like Michael, John could not tolerate the evil of his brothers, but in his case, his brotherly love meant that he did not make them account for their deeds, and won greater freedom for them in the belief that the emperor would never notice. In Psellos's description of the eunuch John it is clear that we are not to approve of the man. At the same time, however, there is no one characteristic that can be pointed to as being typical of a eunuch. The description of John indicates that in Psellos's thought-world eunuchs cannot be considered as a third gender.

With paragraph sixteen, Psellos returns to Michael IV's treatment of Zoë. After a time of treating her with respect, Michael swiftly changed. He was suspicious of her - Psellos remarks that his very
nature gave him pretext for suspicion⁹⁷ - and he took from her the appearance of liberty. He forbade her usual excursions and confined her to the women's quarters.⁹⁸ No-one could gain access to her without interrogation as to their person, where they came from, and why they wished to visit Zoë by her guard.⁹⁹ Zoë seethed with indignation to have her kindnesses to Michael repaid in such coin, but contented herself, as deprived of imperial guards and all power, there was little else she could do. The careless nature of woman (ἐὶς γυναικὸς φύσιν ὀλίγωρον) was not heard, neither holding forth by tongue nor perplexity of thought.¹⁰ She appeared gentle to all, and like the best of rhetors changed according to persons and occasion. Zoë's behaviour seems unusual - not the usual careless habits of women - and so in a sense, the way in which Zoë governed her passions may be due to her purple breeding ameliorating her gendered condition.

Zoë acted in this pleasant manner to all; on their part, they [Michael IV, his brothers and the guards] changed nothing in their judgment of the woman, but feared her greatly, as if she were a
lioness, who for a period of time had laid aside her pride.\textsuperscript{211} The brothers and the guards all watched with their eyes, but the emperor gradually withdrew his gaze from her.\textsuperscript{212} Psellos records several reasons for this withdrawal of affection by Michael IV. Firstly he was unable to have congress with her\textsuperscript{213} because his illness was already well advanced. Secondly, he hid his face from her because he knew how he had disowned his friendship for her, denied his good faith and broken the agreements. Thirdly he confessed to holy men\textsuperscript{214} the means by which he achieved power, and then received the ordinances of salvation.\textsuperscript{215} This made him forgo all indulgence, even lawful intercourse with her [i.e. Zoë, his wife].\textsuperscript{216} To these restraints something else was added so that he never went to see the empress. The attacks of his illness were happening more frequently whatever the cause, and though he was not ashamed of his illness in front of others, before the empress he blushed deeply. This tendency to blush exhibited by Michael IV might be seen as a liability, but Psellos

\textsuperscript{211} Chron. IV 17, Renauld 1:62 1-4; \textit{βλασωρόν} LSJ s.v. usually of lions, means shaggy or bristling; it is also used to describe women, in which case it means "masculine" from its second meaning of "virile" or "burly". Later meanings include "grim" and "fearsome".

\textsuperscript{212} Chron. IV 17, Renauld 1:62 5-7.

\textsuperscript{213} εἶχεν ἐτι τοῦτη κροᾶθαι Chron. IV 17, Renauld 1:62 8.

\textsuperscript{214} Θειοὶς ἀνδράσι Chron. IV 17, Renauld 1:63 13.

\textsuperscript{215} σωτηριώδεις ἐντολάς penances; Chron. IV 17, Renauld 1:63 14-5.

\textsuperscript{216} ἢν δὲ καὶ τῆς ἐννόμου αὐτῆς ὀπέσχετο μίξεως. Chron. IV 17, Renauld 1:63 15-6.
presents it positively, as a kind of modesty.217

Raising the matter of Michael Kalaphates's adoption by Zoë to ensure the continued succession in their family line, the eunuch John offers a curious definition of Byzantine polity, curious at least if that polity is seen as intrinsically patriarchal:

You know, O emperor, that the empire belongs to the empress by inheritance, and all the populace is more well-disposed towards her, in as much as she is both a woman and heir to the government218 and by the liberality of her gifts she has won over the spirits of everyone.219

This might seem a clear statement of Zoë's right to rule, but it forms part of a rhetorical speech, constructed with hesitations and gaps to make Michael IV ask for further information.220 The eunuch John is forcing Michael IV to adopt his approved plan of action - the adoption of Michael Kalaphates by Zoë - by the selective revelation of information. The stress John places on Zoë's legitimacy and popularity is part of that complex, just as is Kalaphates's envisaged


218. οὔτε γυναίκα καὶ κληρονόμον τοῦ κράτους Chron. IV 22, Renauld 1:67 16-7. The people may have been more well-disposed to Zoë the heir as a woman because to rebel against a woman (and perhaps to fail, but even if not) would not be the same as rebelling against an emperor, and so would damage the delicate construction of masculinity. The more basic reason may be that a woman ruler is "softer" than an emperor, and with a lack of wars and foreign campaigns, the tax burden might have been lower. This account by Psellos shows the strength of the notion that the empire descends by inheritance: this idea in the eleventh century has not received sufficient credence from historians.


status.\textsuperscript{221} A more realistic view is given of Zoë’s position when John describes her likely response to the proposed adoption:

She will never disobey us being content in her mind and having nothing whatsoever [with which] to oppose [us].\textsuperscript{222}

This was what happened when Michael IV agreed to the plan and Zoë was approached.\textsuperscript{223} In describing Zoë’s straightened circumstances under Michael IV, Psellus indicates that her mildness to all was an affectation, and one which many of the people near her were right to suspect. That Michael IV elevated Kalaphates to the rank of Caesar at the Blachernai ceremony suggests that the eunuch John’s portrayal of the loci of power was for Michael IV’s consumption only. However, the text at this point does suggest a bipolarity of power (note especially the location of the empress).\textsuperscript{224}

As part of a longer discourse on Michael IV’s charitable foundations, Psellus recounts his foundation of a hostel for prostitutes. The reason for the charitable foundation is given as his worsening illness.\textsuperscript{225} He reconstructed the church of the Anargyroi\textsuperscript{226} providing it with interior decoration and with lawns and pools. “Everything he

\textsuperscript{221} καὶ μέχρις δύναμιν τὴν τύχην ἐπιμετρούμενος, τὰ δ’ ἄλλα σοι ἐν ἀφριωφήτῳ προσωπί μέρει καὶ τὴν ἐσχάτην τάξιν ταττόμενος. Chron. IV 22, Renauld 1:67 9-11.

\textsuperscript{222} Chron. IV 22, Renauld 1:67 22-3.

\textsuperscript{223} Chron. IV 23, Renauld 1:67 1-4.

\textsuperscript{224} η μέν γὰρ ὑπὸ τῶν τοῦ θείου προθυρίων βῆματος εἰς υἱὸν τάξιν ἀναλαμβάνει, ὁ δὲ αὐτοκράτωρ ὡς υἱὸν βασιλίδος τιμῶν τε καὶ σεβαζόμενος εἰς τὴν τοῦ καίσαρος ἄξιαν ἀναβιβάζει. Chron. IV 23, Renauld 1:67 8-11.

\textsuperscript{225} Chron. IV 32, Renauld 1:72 5-8.

knew that gladdened the eye and lead all the senses to [their] proper perception, he united and mixed together in the church. The purpose of this offering was to obtain a cure, but it was unsuccessful. Psellos makes reference to the rumours that circulated as to how Michael IV came to power, and then goes on to say that when he came to power, he displayed great piety - not only attending church, but also heeding the words of religious men. Psellos states that he does not wish to write an enkomion, but to narrate things done, but paragraph 35 deals with the commonplace of the emperor caring for the sick. To propitiate God, Michael IV set out to do all those things pleasing to Him. Imperial monies were set aside to found monasteries and nunneries, and the ptochotropheion was founded and endowed. He also conceived of a plan for the salvation of lost souls.

[For] whereas a great number of courtesan women were abroad across the city, he did not try to dissuade them by word (for this race [γενος] seems deaf to any saving exhortation), neither did he undertake to restrain [them] by deed, so as not to be expected to commit violence. But he built a house of training (ἀκοπτήριον) in the Queen of Cities, of great size and beautiful appearance, and by an edict through the greatest-voiced herald he announced to those who offered their beauty for sale that if anyone of them wished to give up the practice

228. Chron. IV 33, Renauld 1:72-3.
for life in luxury, she could go there, change into the habit of God, and never be in need of the necessities of life.

In response to this proclamation:

Straightaway, a great swarm of those under the roof flowed there together, changing their way of life as much as their habit, and being enrolled in the army of God as recruits on the roster of virtues.233

The story tells us more about Michael IV’s attempts to secure his salvation, than about the crowd of prostitutes in Constantinople. It seems that under the eaves was their usual habitation, but that may be merely because it was cheap to rent. The offer of a life without need, coupled with proverbial cheap housing suggests that entry into prostitution may have had economic motives, but that is not surprising.

The activities of Alousianos, son of Aaron of Bulgaria gives some insight into gender relations. Psellos describes Alousianos as "pleasant in habit and brilliant in intellect and of fortune."234 A hostage in Constantinople when he heard of Dolianos’s revolt, Alousianos conceived of a plan of very childish daring.235 This idea made him neglect his children completely, and to set aside his affection for his wife.236 He told no-one of his plans, apart from a few of his most daring retainers.237 The daring quality of the enterprise was not

---

236. στοργὴν δὲ ὀποτίθεται γυναικῶς Chron. IV 46, Renault 1:80 10.
237. ἄτόπων ἔργων καὶ τολμητίς Chron. IV 46, Renault 1:80 12.
laudible; its description as very youthful mitigates against that. Therefore from this it would seem that the proper attitude for a married man was to have affection for his wife and to show concern for his children. However, this does not indicate a liberated view of women, as of course the proper attitude towards the weaker vessels was one of supervision. Considerations of beloved [family], however forced Alousianos to reconsider when his attack on Michael IV proved unsuccessful, and he sued for peace.

Michael IV's condition continued to deteriorate. He decided to become a monk. He was carried to the monastery of the Anargyroi, where he received the tonsure. Michael IV, confident that he had passed on to a better life, was extremely happy; but a cloud of despondency covered everyone in his household, but especially his elder brother. Even the empress was unable to control her suffering:

As soon as she heard what had happened, she ran the gauntlet of all the gaze of men, threw over nature and went to see him.

---

238. τῶν φιλίτερων Chron. IV 49, Renauld 1:82 8-9.
240. In passing, it should be noted that as well as giving him the monk's habit, replacing the diadem with the helmet of salvation and signing his chest and back with a cross, they also girded him about ἄνθρωπος (Chron. IV 52, Renauld 1:84 21) against evil spirits.
This very retiring nature ascribed to Zoë - who had after all boasted in public that she had had him many times - must be for literary effect, emphasizing the way in which the natural order was overturned by the loss of such a great and good emperor. 244

The transfer of power from Michael IV to Michael V Kalaphates was seen as perilous. The brothers of Michael IV, under the leadership of the eunuch John, hearing of Michael IV's death, ordered their nephew, Zoë's adopted son, to the palace from his place of normal residence in internal exile. 245 The brothers fawned on Kalaphates, while John attended to the obsequies for his brother. 246 The two brothers did not have John's understanding, and perforce had to wait for the Orphanotrophos to return to the palace, which he did according to Psellos:

when had had enough of lamentation, or rather when he was troubled by the many days when the announcement [of Michael V's accession] had not been made. 247

Psellos claims to have seen John's return to the palace. 248 After a profuse greeting by his brothers and nephew, John set forth the basic principle of his plan - described as "most intelligent" 249 - which was:

---

244. Chron. IV 54, Renauld 1:85 12-8.

245. Chron. V 1, Renauld 1:86 4-10; for the exile see Chron. IV 25, Renauld 1:69 13-20.

246. Chron. V 2, Renauld 1:86 4-8; see also Simon Price, "From noble funerals to divine cult", 59-60.


to begin to do nothing without the empress, but to lay the foundations of their power and life on her and to do everything which they saw would make her easily managed.250

Once decided, the course of action was at once implemented:

Straightaway, in common accord, they arranged themselves in battle lines and besieged her easily-taken soul with the contrivances of their arguments.251

Zoë was reminded of her adoption of Kalaphates, how they had placed him under the protection of his mother and sovereign lady, and then in a coup de théâtre, which was also the coup de grâce, they threw Michael, prostrate at her feet.252 They convinced Zoë that Michael V would have only the name of royalty (τοῦ τῆς βασιλείας καὶ μόνου ὄνοματος), whereas Zoë would have

as well as this [name] her possession, inherited from her father. If she wished, she could hold everything; on the other hand, she could call him in and command him, as if the emperor were to be used as a slave.253

This presentation of Zoë's position is part of the contrivances of their arguments with which the brothers are ensnaring Zoë. However, this view does not seem totally removed from Psellos's perception of Zoë's situation. Zoë had no alternative but to accept their proposal:

For what else could she do, destitute of the substance of help and taken in by their sorcery?254

This could be taken as indicative of Zoë's status as a weaker vessel, easily bewitched, but the expansion which fills out the rest of the

paragraph shows the inevitability of Zoë's seduction by the machinations ranged against her.

The opening of paragraph 5 shows that Psellos feels Zoë to be the rightful heir to the empire to some extent - though this may be merely because the alternative to Zoë is Michael Kalaphates. The snobbery of Michael Psellos may well prefer purple-born women to the son of a pitch-worker on the throne. "So she handed power over to them"255 - thus implying that τὸ κράτος was hers to give, and "in the meantime, she quieted the city, in suspense about her decision, by an exhortation."256 which shows Zoë to have been in command of the capital, without any negative comment from Psellos. The normal procedure for the coronation of the Caesar as Michael V then went ahead.

When outlining the general characteristics of Michael V's reign - which are largely negative for Psellos257 - he presents Michael Kalaphates's use of eunuchs in the imperial bodyguard as part of this negative image.

Concerning his bodily safety, he undertook to transfer it to Skythian striplings whom he had bought a long time ago. All had been cut off [ἀποτελομένα i.e. were eunuchs] and knew his thinking, and were fit for the purpose he intended. This was because he could rely on their loyalty, as he had raised them up to higher ranks. Some he used as τὰ πεπέρα το ὅφυσα, others he used to cover whatever he wanted [done].258

These eunuchs are not described by the same word as the parakoimomenos nor the orphanotrophos. However, the differentiation is due more to their functions than to the nature of their emasculation. They have been promoted by the emperor, which is why he trusts them; they are cast out, not because they are eunuchs, but because they are emblems of Michael V's tyrannical overthrow of the established order. An element in this perversion of the natural order was for Michael V to appeal directly to the mob to support him against the privileged order. The strategy was largely successful: the crowd was attached to him, and showed signs of affection. With his position now secured by the loyalty of the crowd, Michael V felt confident enough to move against Zoë. Psellus describes the object of Michael V's hatred as "the empress, and she had become his mother contrary to good reason," and says that it dated from when he became emperor on her account. Psellus's description of Zoë's adoption of Michael V as being against good reason indicates that he saw the root cause in this ill-advised adoption, not in any gender-specific hatred.

Michael V was outraged when he heard Zoë's name in front of his in public announcements:

To begin with he elbowed her out of the way, and restricted [her], making her a party to none of the councils and giving her no place in the imperial treasuries, but neglecting [her] in

everything, that is to say mocking [her], guarding her walled up, as if she were an enemy, and threw her into the most ignoble surveillance; he took as his own her handmaidens, and searched the women’s quarters, and kept no faith in the agreements he had sworn with her.263

The final ignominy was her expulsion from the palace.264

The most wretched child made up some accusations against his mother, who had plotted nothing, unjustly accusing her of being a poisoner. The person from elsewhere, the most basely-born, plucked her, the best-born, who until then had known nothing of the daring plans, from the room where she was born, and fabricated charges against her and interrogated her about things of which she knew nothing. He forced her to render account and sought vengeance on her as perpetrator of the most dreadful deeds.265

Zoë was placed on a ship and sent into exile on Prinkipo.

When the general feeling of unease in the city at Michael V’s treatment of Zoë developed into rebellion266, the women also took part. The participation was extraordinary;267 Psellus emphasizes the unnaturalness of the occurrence, though he is at pains to describe it as an eye-witness account.268 These are women who never previously had appeared outside the women’s quarters, but here they were appearing in public, shouting and both beating their breasts and terribly bewailing the empress’s suffering. The remainder were like

Maenads, and formed no small force to oppose the sinner.\textsuperscript{269} This mob of women - frenzied perhaps but in a divine frenzy - cried out for Zoë, describing her as

the only one noble in spirit, beautiful of form, the only one of all women who is free, the sovereign of the entire race\textsuperscript{270}, who most lawfully has the inheritance of the empire.\textsuperscript{271}

Having shouted this, they then ran off intending to burn the palace.\textsuperscript{272} There was nothing to restrain them, as everyone was in revolt against the tyrant.\textsuperscript{273} They drew themselves up into ranks in place and in warlike order.\textsuperscript{274} They marched against Michael V with all the army of the city.\textsuperscript{275}

The emphasis on altered nature continues. Psellos describes the mob raised against Michael V as:

For it was as if some altogether mightier spirit transformed [them], no longer were they seen in their former condition of spirit, but both they were more frenzied in purpose, and their

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{269} \textsuperscript{270} Or "family"; see John Haldon, \textit{Three Treatises on Imperial Military Expeditions}, 242.

\textsuperscript{271} \textsuperscript{272} \textsuperscript{273} \textsuperscript{274} \textsuperscript{275} Chron. V 26, Renauld 1:102 4-9.

\textsuperscript{271} \textsuperscript{272} \textsuperscript{273} \textsuperscript{274} \textsuperscript{275} Chron. V 26, Renauld 1:102 9-12.

\textsuperscript{271} \textsuperscript{272} \textsuperscript{273} \textsuperscript{274} \textsuperscript{275} Chron. V 26, Renauld 1:103 16-7.

\textsuperscript{271} \textsuperscript{272} \textsuperscript{273} \textsuperscript{274} \textsuperscript{275} Chron. V 26, Renauld 1:103 17-8.

\textsuperscript{271} \textsuperscript{272} \textsuperscript{273} \textsuperscript{274} \textsuperscript{275} Chron. V 26, Renauld 1:103 18-20.

\textsuperscript{271} \textsuperscript{272} \textsuperscript{273} \textsuperscript{274} \textsuperscript{275} Chron. V 26, Renauld 1:103 20-1.
\end{flushleft}
hands were more powerful, and the flashes of their eyes both burned and were inspired, and their bodies were stronger.\textsuperscript{276} No-one wanted to attempt to deflect them from their purpose, nor to give them advice. The mob decided to attack the homes of the emperor's relations.\textsuperscript{277} Most of the destruction was wrought not at the hands of young men or men in their prime, but both by young girls and some individuals of both kinds out of both \textit{[sexes]}, who were not yet defined in their time of life \textit{[i.e. male and female children who had not yet reached puberty]}\textsuperscript{278}

Michael V at first thought to defuse the situation without bloodshed, but when the people formed companies\textsuperscript{279}, he could not ignore it. He could not rely on his previously much vaunted mercenaries, and so was hemmed in.\textsuperscript{280} Help came in the form of the emperor's uncle, the nobelissimos\textsuperscript{281}. Michael V and the nobelissimos decided to recall Zoë from her exile, as she was the cause of the mob rising, and the cause of the war.\textsuperscript{282} The empress Zoë was brought back into the palace, but rather than being joyful that the Most High was working

\textsuperscript{276} Chron. V 28, Renault 1:103-4 1-6.
\textsuperscript{277} Chron. V 29, Renault 1:104 1-3.
\textsuperscript{278} οὐ̃ χείρες ἡπώντων ἡ ἀκμαVtblσηντων ἀνδρῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ μείρακες καὶ εἰ τὶς ἐτέρα ἀτελῆς ηλικία ἐξ ἐκατέρου γένους, Chron. V 29, Renault 1:104 9-11.
\textsuperscript{279} κατὰ λόχους Chron. V 30, Renault 1:104 6.
\textsuperscript{281} Chron. V 31, Renault 1:105 2.
\textsuperscript{282} βουλεύονται γοῦν τὴν μὲν βασιλίδα εὐθὺς τῆς ὑπεροπίας ἀνακαλέσονται, δι ἣν ἀνεφρώγη τὸ πλῆθος καὶ συνεστήκει ὁ πόλεμος Chron. V 31, Renault 1:105 14-6.
out His purpose for her, she feared that she might have to suffer more
dreadful punishments due to the emperor's baseness. Zoë
did not seize the opportunity to reproach the tyrant [for her]misfortune, nor did she change her demeanour, but shared in
his suffering and shed tears on his behalf.283

In this Zoë was more noble than Michael V, who, even before he
reclothed Zoë in the purple, forced her to swear that when the crisis
was over she would return to the monastic life.284 Zoë agreed to
everything and they made an alliance in view of the dangers.285

Michael V and his uncle showed Zoë from the kathisma to the crowd
in revolt286 in the hope that the return of Zoë from exile would calm
their anger.287 The crowd were in no rush to recognize Zoë, and even
those who did were loath to give advantage to Michael V, who even in
dreadful times did not lay aside his fierceness and maliciousness.288

For all that Zoë was recognized as the cause célèbre of the
rebellion, the leadership feared that Michael V with Zoë289, would
not be put to flight by them, but that the crowd290 would be won

285. ἡ δὲ πῶς ὅτι οὖν ἐπαγγέλλετο, καὶ τὴν συμμαχίαν ἐπὶ τοῖς
290. οἱ πλείστοι Chron. V 33, Renaud 1:106 3.
round by her arguments. Another scheme was developed to counter Michael's tyrannical machinations. Note that in this short paragraph, Michael is always described as τυραννεύων, and his activities are tyrannical, whilst Zoë is ἡ βασιλίς.

Before outlining the rebels' new scheme, Psellos is forced to recap his narrative, reminding his readers that Constantine VIII had three daughters. The eldest - Eudokia, the nun - was already dead.

The youngest sister [Theodora] shared for a short time her sister's imperial life, and in a certain way, ruled with her, [in a certain way] because she did not share in the acclamations, and she was honoured differently, and in the palace she shared in the splendour, after her sister.

Neither their relationship nor being from the same origins was sufficient to raise them apart from jealousy; "she who was ruling" [Zoë] was jealous of the inferior honour given to Theodora.

Prompted by liars speaking against Theodora, Zoë persuaded the emperor [Romanos III] to exile Theodora from the palace, to cut her hair, and to give her as the most acceptable prison [some] of the more

---

293. Chron. V 34, Renauld 1:106 3-4; Chron. II 4, Renauld 1:27.
294. ἡ δὲ γε νεωτέρα βραχὺν τινα μὲν χρόνον συνήν βασιλευσάσθῃ τῇ ἁδελφῇ καὶ τρόπον τινα συμβεβαστολέυκει τῆς μὲν γὰρ εὐφημίας ἐκείνη ὡς ἐκοίμωνε, διαφεροῦτως δ’ ἐτετύμητο, καὶ τῆς ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις μετὰ γε τὴν ἁδελφὴν μετείχε λαμπρότητος Chron. V 34, Renauld 1:107 5-10.
This was done immediately, jealousy keeping Zoë in her superior position, but Theodora maintained at least the aspect of majesty. Theodora seems to have taken the majesty with her when she was exiled from the palace, a word-play explained more clearly in paragraph 35. Theodora resigned herself to the givens; she was annoyed neither at the vesting [in a nun’s habit], nor the separation from her sister. Romanos III permitted her some imperial favours; Michael IV when he took the sceptres [i.e. began to rule] soon forgot the empress, and utterly neglected in everything her sister; Michael V, when he came to power, did not know who Theodora was, whether she was born of the imperial stem, did not even know if she was alive or if she had arrived there.

297. Chron. V 34, Renauld 1:106 13-7; Theodora was lodged in the Petron monastery: Janin, Les églises et les monastères, 397.


303. i.e. if she had died, understanding death as the final destination of life; or more simply, where she was: οὔδ’ ἐστὶν ἡ Θεοδώρα ἐγνωκέται σοὶ δ’ θεοτέλειον ὁ ἄθλος ἐβλάστητον, ἀλλὰ τὸ γε καθ’ ἐκατόν οὖδ’ ἐλ ἐγεγονεὶ αὐτῷ οὗδ’ ἐλ ἐντούθα πωρεληλύθει. Chron. V 35, Renauld 1:107 10-3.
Theodora acceded to all the demands of the emperors, not forced to do so, but rather readily.\textsuperscript{304}

Psellos then describes the execution of the people’s second plan against the tyrant.\textsuperscript{305} They feared that Michael V would be still successful, as he held Zoë under his control.\textsuperscript{306} The mob directed their attentions to Theodora.\textsuperscript{307} One would have expected a crowd in revolt against an emperor to act as a mob, but the perversion of the natural order by Michael V is complete: the crowd moved off in units without confusion or tumult, with the commander, Kabasilas, a family retainer of Constantine VIII, at their head. Though Kabasilas “was not a Greek by race, [he was] a person of the noblest character”.\textsuperscript{308} The crowd went in search of Theodora. Confronted with the mob, Theodora shut herself away in a church, deaf to all entreaties.\textsuperscript{309} Theodora’s rejection of the crowd’s intention may have been due to feminine modesty, but it is easily explained as self-preservation, for Theodora’s participation in a failed revolt would have signed her own

\textsuperscript{304} οὐ τυραννουμένη μᾶλλον ἢ ἐκοῦσα Chron. V 35, Renaud 1:108 15.

\textsuperscript{305} Chron. V 36, Renaud 1:108 3-10.

\textsuperscript{306} ἐπειδὴ τὴν πρώτην βασιλίδα ἐλεύν οὐχ οἶος τε ἢν, τοῦ τυράννου ταύτην προκατασχόντος καὶ οἷον ἐλλημενίσαντος Chron. V 36, Renaud 1:108 6-8.

\textsuperscript{307} ἐπὶ τὴν ἀδελφὴν...ὡς δεύτερον αἷμα βασίλειον Chron. V 36, Renaud 1:108 8-9.

\textsuperscript{308} ἡδορα τὸ μὲν γένος οὐχ Ἐλληνα, τὸ δὲ ἦθος τοῦ καλλίστου γένους Chron. V 36, Renaud 1:108 12-3.

\textsuperscript{309} Chron. V 37, Renaud 1:108 1-4.
death warrant. The citizen army\textsuperscript{310} abandoned persuasion and threatened force. Some of their number, drawing their daggers, rushed in as if to kill her. Boldly they dragged her from sanctuary, brought her out into the open, and clothed her in a magnificent robe. Then they made her sit on a horse, and forming a circle all about her, they led her to the Great Church.\textsuperscript{311} In the Great Church, not merely a part of the people acclaimed Theodora, but the entire élite, ignoring the tyrant Michael V completely, proclaimed Theodora as empress.\textsuperscript{312}

Psellos reveals some of his attitude towards eunuchs, when the nobelissimos and Michael V had taken refuge in St. John Studios. Attempting to gain compassion for himself and to distance himself from Michael V's excesses, the nobelissimos explained:

\begin{quote}
For if I had been able to cut his zeal from [its source], my entire family would not have been cut off, and would not have undergone the deed of fire and iron.\textsuperscript{313}
\end{quote}

Psellos interrupts his narrative to explain the nature of this "cutting off".\textsuperscript{314} At the same time as he exiled the orphanotrophos, Michael V decided to destroy all his family.\textsuperscript{315}

\begin{quote}
Everyone who had come into the fullness of their age, and had grown a beard, had become fathers and had been entrusted
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{310} τὸ πολιτικὸν στρατευμα Chron. V 37, Renauld 1:108 4.
\textsuperscript{311} Chron. V 37, Renauld 1:108 4-10.
\textsuperscript{312} Chron. V 37, Renauld 1:109 11-14.
\textsuperscript{314} Chron. V 42, Renauld 1:111 1-2; note the punning use of variants of κόπτω 41, Renauld 1:111 18&19; 42 Renauld 1:111 1.
\textsuperscript{315} τὸ συγγενεὸς ἀπαύ Chron. V 42, Renauld 1:111 4-5.
with the rank of very majestic commands, had their generative members cut off, and their life was made a half-death.\textsuperscript{316}

The half-death is presented as though even Michael V preferred to use it, it would be better to be dead.

In dealing with the fate of the nobelissimos and Michael V, Theodora's adherents\textsuperscript{317} knew of her sister's jealousy, and knew that she would as gladly see one of the stable lads on the imperial throne as share power with her sister.\textsuperscript{318} They suspected that Zoë might ignore Theodora, and recall Michael V to the empire. To prevent such an occurrence, the fugitives were to have their eyes removed by iron, the deed being done by reckless and overbold men as soon as they appeared outside the sacred precinct.\textsuperscript{319}

With the dispatch of Michael V, the senators had no preference.\textsuperscript{320} Zoë held the palace and they respected her because she was the elder; the younger one was preferred because she was the cause of the end of Michael V's tyranny, and because she was the author of their salvation.\textsuperscript{321}


\textsuperscript{317} οἱ περὶ τὴν Θεοδώραν Chron. V 46, Renauld 1:113 1.

\textsuperscript{318} Chron. V 46, Renauld 1:113 1-4.


The [division of] power between them [the sisters] became [a matter of] dispute, but the elder sister in age released them [the senators] from the doubt of their understanding.\textsuperscript{322}

Here, a decision taken by a woman, Zoë, removes the doubt and indecision from a group of men. The end result is presented positively:

And thus having come to agreement about the matters of government she made her way in a splendid procession and took her share in the government.\textsuperscript{323}

On her part Theodora is shown to accept this sharing of the imperial power with dignity.

She did not lose all respect for her sister; neither did she deprive her of the privilege of honour, but gave way to her in majestic vestiture, so that she both governed with, and was ruled over by her sister.\textsuperscript{324}

This description of Theodora presents her in a favourable light; however, this is not because she is a woman - consider Zoë's portrayal as the seat of jealousy - rather it is because Psellos regards Theodora with more favour than Zoë. A comparison of the treatments of Zoë and Theodora shows that we obtain good portraits of both women, but that it is impossible to isolate from either Psellos's attitude to women in general.

At the beginning of Book Six, Psellos continues to describe the joint role of Zoë and Theodora. In the first four paragraphs, Psellos is

\textsuperscript{322} 'Αμφότεροι τοι γένος ουν αὐτοῖς ἤγεγόνει τὸ κράτος· ἀλλ᾽ ἡ τὴν ἡλικίαν πρεσβεύοσα σύλληψη λυεῖ τούτοις τὸ τῆς γυνώμης ἀμφίβολον \textit{Chron.} V 51, Renauld 1:116 5-7.

\textsuperscript{323} καὶ οὖτως αὐτῇ συμμολογήσας τὰ πρὸς τὴν ἁρχήν, σὺν λαμπρότατῃ ποιμῇ ἐφ᾽ ἑαυτὴν προσκαλεῖται καὶ κοινωνίαν τοῦ κράτους ποιεῖται. \textit{Chron.} V 51, Renauld 1:116 9-12.

\textsuperscript{324} \textit{Chron.} V 51, Renauld 1:116 12-6.
favourable towards the two empresses. Having said that the two sisters had assumed power, and that for the first time in their time - Psellos alludes to Irene, perhaps - the women’s quarters had become the imperial council chamber325, Psellos says that the two elements of the administration - the civil and the military - pulled together much better under the sovereign ladies than they would have done under an overlord issuing arrogant commands.326 This paragraph then becomes rather distracted - Psellos himself describes it as another speech interpolated into his narrative327 - in praise of the Macedonian dynasty.328 Even though rooted in blood and murder, the stem put forth "shoots, each with imperial fruit, each with nothing to compare it to, neither beauty nor grandeur."329 The κάλλος and μέγεθος are masculine, but what we are asked to compare are not the masculine imperial fruit (βασιλείας καρπός) but the feminine offshoots (βλάσται). The introduction of ideas of beauty and outward show may serve to reduce the impact of Zoë and Theodora’s tranquil government. However, at the same time, the description of the sisters as βλάσται, which produce imperial fruit, suggests that it is possible to

325. Περισσότερον γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία ταῖς δυσιν ἀδελφαῖς, καὶ τότε πρώτον ὁ καθ’ ἡμᾶς χρόνος τεθέατε γυναίκων ἐν τοῖς βασιλείαις καὶ μετακινησισθεὶσαι εἰς βασιλείαν βουλευτήριον. Chron. VI 1, Renauld 1:117 2-3.

326. καὶ τὸ τε πολιτικὸν πλήθος τὸ τε στρατιωτικὸν συμφωνοῦντας ὑπὸ δεσπότιον καὶ μᾶλλον αὐταῖς πειθομένους, ἢ εἰ τε ἀλοσυρός αὐτοῖς προεκάθητο καὶ ἐπέτατε σοβαρώτερον. Chron. VI 1, Renauld 1:117 3-6.


328. Chron. VI 1, Renauld 1:117 6-8.

329. Chron. VI 1, Renauld 1:117 11-3.
interpret this as a positive affirmation of women's capabilities and powers. This is evidence of Psellos's ambivalent attitude to women in power.

If Psellos had been violently opposed to the idea of women rulers, he would have been more vocal in his opposition to the sisters' decision to govern alone. The sisters did not introduce many new procedures, nor did they appoint many new ministers, but removed only those who were of the tyrant's family, and retained the other ministers in their posts. For their part, these ministers were held in check by the fear that at some later date they would be held to account for their actions. Psellos's exact attitude is difficult to unravel. On the one hand, these ministers were "most faithful, guarding an inherited goodwill towards them [the sisters]," but that they were concerned that they might be called to account suggests that they recognized the situation as unstable. Psellos says the ministers feared accusations under three headings: that they would be accused of making innovations in the constitution; of making foolish decisions, or of acting illegally. The most important considerations therefore, are the rule of tradition and the avoidance of innovation [continuity rather than change], the rule of law [the tradition of Roman law] and

333. ἡ τῆς τῶν καθηκόντων καινοτομίας, ἡ βουλευμάτων ἀλογίστων, ἡ πράξεων ἀθεμίτων Chron. VI 2, Renauld 1:117-8 7-9.
the need not to appear stupid [shades of Kekaumenos]. The result was that the government officials were very attentive to their duties, whether military or civilian, and furthermore, showed due respect to the empresses, as far as possible. Even though the two sisters are empresses, they are not the female equivalents of the βασιλεύς. As expected, Psellus is unsure how to present these women governors: on the one hand, they were the legal heirs to the empire, yet as women for them to be empresses-regnant is a perversion of the natural order. However, attempts to replace them or to associate male rulers with these women had been less than successful. With good officials, the system under the sisters brings good government, but it is unnatural - the officials defer to the women only "as far as possible", because the women cannot command the same respect from officials (who are male) as could a βασιλεύς.

Psellus emphasizes that in the exercise of power and in their appearances before the people the sisters continued in the customs of previous emperors.

In the outward form of government the sisters did as previous emperors had done, for both sat before the imperial tribune in one line, slightly indented to Theodora's side. And near them were the Rods and Sword-bearers, and the race who brandish an axe at the right shoulder. Next stood the special favourites and those who organize things. Round [the women] on the outside came a guard, like a surrounding crown; this second rank was most faithful; out of respect, everyone of them fixed their eyes on the ground. After them came the first senate and the order with privilege and then those of the second class and

those of the third class, one after another, all in rows, separated by equal intervals.\textsuperscript{335} The implication is that it was surprising that the women governed as previous emperors had done, but this support is qualified, for it was only in the σχήμα that the empresses conducted themselves as their ancestors. It was against this backdrop that business was carried on: lawsuits judged, questions of public interest or taxation levied, audiences with ambassadors [leading to] divergence of views or to accords, and all other duties that occupy those who exercise power.\textsuperscript{336} Psellos attempts to reinforce the Pauline notion that women should keep silence, as most of the talking was done by the officials\textsuperscript{337}, but this is moderated by the Judeo-Christian tradition of silence as a sign of wisdom, and that the sages consider before voicing their opinions. Emperors, as vicars of Christ - and thus of the Sophia of God - were also expected to be sparing in speech, rather than continually giving vent to idle chatter. This thought also struck Psellos. The sisters, now recognized as the empresses\textsuperscript{338}, gave orders if necessary in a soft voice, or replied taking instruction from their advisers’ experience or relying on their own judgement.\textsuperscript{339}

\textsuperscript{335} \textit{Chron.} VI 3, Renaud 1:118 1-13.
\textsuperscript{336} \textit{Chron.} VI 3, Renaud 1:118 14-6.
\textsuperscript{337} Καὶ ὁ μὲν πλεῖων λόγος πορὰ τῶν τὴν ἀρχὴν διατιθεμένων ἐγινετο. \textit{Chron.} VI 3, Renaud 1:118 16-7.
\textsuperscript{338} οἱ βασιλίδες \textit{Chron.} VI 3, Renaud 1:118 18.
\textsuperscript{339} τοῖς οἰκείοις λογισμοῖς \textit{Chron.} VI 3, Renaud 1:118 19-21.
Psellos now describes the two sisters, again referred to as empresses. Zoë is presented as being quicker in understanding, but being slow to voice her conclusions [normally a sign of wisdom]. Theodora was less quick to reveal her understanding, but quicker to speak. The subtext of this comparison is that Theodora was the weaker vessel of the two, a conclusion supported by her tendency to chatter. However, this is not to be construed too negatively, as her tongue is expert [discerning] and lively. Continuing the comparison, Zoë is described as the most impatient, interested in everything, whilst Theodora is the more level-headed, not to say boring. Similarly in monetary matters, Zoë is generous whilst Theodora is more inclined to count the cost of her generosity. No clear attitude on gender stereotypes comes from this description of the two sisters by Psellos.

Up to this point, Psellos's presentation of Zoë and Theodora has been largely positive. Whilst the situation was somewhat unusual, the complementary natures of the two sisters were working together in the best interests of the state in the imperial tradition. However, Psellos
states that writing a true history, not an enkomion makes him write without deceit. "Neither one had sufficient intelligence to rule." They knew neither how to administer nor were they able to reason solidly on matters of state; furthermore they confused the playthings of the women's quarters with serious imperial concerns. Here, Psellus views women as belonging in the women's quarters, and Zoë and Theodora are at fault because they have left the women's private sphere to invade the public sphere of government. This sudden change in attitude could be ascribed to dual authorship. Such theories are rightly difficult to prove, the more so when there is no clear discontinuity in style or diction. It is better - and simpler - to suggest that Psellus realized how he was presenting these women in government and retreated from it. The generosity - a theme in the previous paragraph - is picked up once more, but is used this time to criticize Zoë. To be a benefactor is a most characteristic virtue of those who rule, but only if it is tempered by judgment of occasion,

346. οὐ...ἐγκωμίζει...ἀλλ' ἱστορίαν ἀρχιβη Χρον. VI 5, Renauld 1:119 1-2.
347. οὐδέμιᾶ τὸ φῶς ἑαυτήν αὐταρκεῖς Χρον. VI 5, Renauld 1:119 3.
348. Note the domestic connotations of oikouμενω at Χρον. VI 5, Renauld 1:119 4.
349. Χρον. VI 5, Renauld 1:119 3-6.
350. Χρον. VI 5, Renauld 1:119 6-12.
351. χαρακτηριστικάτη μὲν γὰρ τὸ εὐεργετεῖν τοῖς βασιλείουσιν ἀρετὴ Χρον. VI 5, Renauld 1:119 13.
fortune and the variation of person.\textsuperscript{352} If this is the case, then it is
worthy of praise, but if it is not, then the money spent is worthless.\textsuperscript{353}

The physical descriptions of Zoë and Theodora which follow on
from the descriptions of their characteristics are written in male
terms. Zoë was plumper by nature than her sister, but was not very
tall. Her eyes were large and separated, under impressive
eyebrows.\textsuperscript{354} Her nose was aquiline, without being exaggerated; she
had golden hair\textsuperscript{355} and her body shone with a brilliant whiteness.\textsuperscript{356}
There were no indications of her age:

No place on her body was wrinkled, rather it was completely
smooth and stretched out, with nowhere a loose wrinkle.\textsuperscript{357}

Theodora was taller and thinner than her sister. Her face was pinched
and out of proportion with the rest of her body\textsuperscript{358}, but she was more
ready with her voice and movement than Zoë. She did not have a
gorgon's glance, but was pleasant and smiled with [people] and
engaged everyone in conversation.\textsuperscript{359} Theodora receives a less
detailed description, but this is because of Zoë's central role as

\textsuperscript{352} Καυρός το και τύχη και η των προσώπων διαφορά. \textit{Chron.} VI 5,
Renauld 1:120 15.

\textsuperscript{353} \textit{Chron.} VI 5, Renauld 1:120 15-7.

\textsuperscript{354} \textit{Chron.} VI 6, Renauld 1:120 4-5. \textit{βλοσυρχ} means shaggy, bristling,
fierce or impressive; when used of a woman it can also mean
masculine. \textit{LSJ} s.v.

\textsuperscript{355} A Homeric tag \textit{Iliad} 1.197.

\textsuperscript{356} \textit{Chron.} VI 6, Renauld 1:120 5-7.

\textsuperscript{357} \textit{Chron.} VI 6, Renauld 1:120 11-2.

\textsuperscript{358} \textit{Chron.} VI 6, Renauld 1:120 12-5.

\textsuperscript{359} \textit{Chron.} VI 6, Renauld 1:120 15-8.
"honey-trap", and because Theodora is dealt with at greater length in her own section.

Psellos returns to the conduct of government. Though the reputation of the government seemed more magnificent and dignified, it was boast.\(^{360}\) Most people, as if in the theatre\(^{361}\), changed their appearance for a more brilliant one; largesse poured out as never before.\(^{362}\) Zoë opened the imperial coffers, and treasure poured out; even the slightest drop discovered in its hiding place was given away.\(^{363}\) The source of this largesse was pillages and robberies, not voluntary contributions.\(^{364}\) Psellos identifies this high deficit spending as the main cause of the empire's decline; in so doing, he presents himself as one of the seers and sages who had recognized the cause of the state's downfall.\(^{365}\) The revenues which should have paid for the troops to defend the empire were diverted without due cause to others, the crowds of flatterers and guards who surrounded the empresses.\(^{366}\) The bitter conclusion is "as if it were for this purpose alone that the emperor Basil had filled the imperial treasury with

---

\(^{360}\) *Chron.* VI 7, Renauld 1:120 2-3.

\(^{361}\) ὅσπερ ἐν σκηνικοῖς *Chron.* VI 7, Renauld 1:120 4.

\(^{362}\) *Chron.* VI 7, Renauld 1:120 3-6.

\(^{363}\) *Chron.* VI 7, Renauld 1:120 6-9.

\(^{364}\) τὰ δὲ οὐδὲ παρείχετο, ἀλλ’ ἐσυλάτο ἦ διψηπάζετο *Chron.* VI 7, Renauld 1:121 9.

\(^{365}\) *Chron.* VI 7, Renauld 1:121 11-2.

\(^{366}\) πλῆθος οὗτοι κολάκων καὶ ἡ τυπικατα τῶν βασιλίδων δορυφορία *Chron.* VI 8, Renauld 1:121 3-4.
The added insult was that not only did Zoë and Theodora squander the ordinary resources of the empire, renewable from taxation, but also wasted the wealth built up by Basil II, which confirms its source in robberies and pillage.368

Psellos portrays the situation deteriorating:

For the imperial affairs immediately required a high-minded and intelligent management and a man’s dominion. [They needed a man] of strong hands and most trustworthy in government, who sees not only present incursions, but who [sees also] if something unforeseen has been set loose, and who [can see] what will grow from it, who can take on the future as well, and who checks from far away, all forays and attacks.369

This is what the empire needed; what happened was that the imperial men’s quarters became women’s quarters.370 This transformation was effected in a confused environment, where some [of the courtiers] loved power, some were without power, where some were in a state of false freedom, and some were not controlled by reason, and some desired more [power].371 This lack of closure extended to the people (τοίς πολλοῖς).372 Some favoured Zoë, others opposed her, holding that Theodora should have sole rights to the throne as she had upheld

---

367. Chron. VI 8, Renauld 1:121 4-6.
369. Chron. VI 10, Renauld 1:121-2 4-10.
370. τού βασιλικοῦ ἀνδρών γυναικωνίτιν πεποίηκεν Chron. VI 10, Renauld 1:122 12-3.
the people’s safety and because she had no experience of a man; others favoured Zoë because she had held the imperial power before. Zoë realized that the people were split, and that many favoured her sister, so she staged a coup, abrogating supreme power to herself.

Zoë’s personal rule was only an interlude; straightaway she began to inspect and decide who was both the most illustrious by birth, and the most magnificent by fortune, whether he was from the senatorial benches or from the military registers with a view to raising him to the imperial throne. Zoë’s eagerness to obtain a replacement for Michael V may be due less to an unliberated feeling that she cannot rule alone, than to the desire to have a counterbalance to the displaced Theodora.

The three descriptions of Zoë’s prospective consorts provide a comparison of Psellus’s descriptions of men. The first, Constantine Dalassenos, is identified by his place of birth, described as a most distinguished spot. It was as if he had been prepared by nature for the weight of command. Even when he was only ten years old, the rumour was that he was destined for great things. Previous emperors had barred him from the palace because of these rumours.

373. Chron. VI 11, Renauld 1:122 4-5.
374. οὕτω εἰς πείραν ἐλθούση ὁ αὐτός Chron. VI 11, Renauld 1:122 5.
375. Chron. VI 11, Renauld 1:122 8-11.
377. χωρίον ἐπισημαντοῦ Chron. VI 12, Renauld 1:122 3.
378. ὃσπερ εἰς ἀρχικὸν ὕγκον παρεσκευασμένος παρά τῆς φύσεως οὕτω γὰρ δεκαετῆς ἐγέγονε καὶ ἡ φήμη τοῦτοῦ εἰς τὴν κρείττων ἤρεν υποληψιν Chron. VI 11, Renauld 1:122 3-6.
Michael IV imprisoned him because of the great stir he caused among the people rather than from fear of the man himself, and Michael V forced him to enter the church, not as a friend would to bring him closer to God, but as an enemy to foil his presumed objective.\textsuperscript{379} His changed habit should have precluded him from any notion of gaining the throne, but he accepted his fate stoically, knowing that circumstances were drawing him to the throne, and in any case the example of Zoe provided him with hope.\textsuperscript{380} He was summoned to the empress on some other matter, but he was brusque in his speeches and he attached very intense (γενναωτέρων) arguments [to his talk] about the empire, and gave up nothing at all of his resolution (τοῦ γενναξίου..λήματος). He seemed very offensive, with a very overbearing attitude. As he was mistrusted, his expectations were dashed.\textsuperscript{381}

Constantine Artokline the Katepano was the next candidate. "This man was of not very eminent fortune, but he had a dignified and illustrious appearance."\textsuperscript{382} He had been secretary to Romanos III, who thought him fit for affairs\textsuperscript{383}, and he seemed most desirable to the empress. Zoe was accused of consorting with the man secretly.\textsuperscript{384}

\textsuperscript{379} Chron. VI 12, Renauld 1:122-3 8-17.  
\textsuperscript{380} Chron. VI 12, Renauld 1:123 17-21.  
\textsuperscript{381} Chron. VI 12, Renauld 1:123 22-6; cf. LSJ s.v. γενναωός II.1.  
\textsuperscript{382} ἀνὴρ οὕτως τὴν μὲν τύχην οὐ πάνω διάσημος, τὸ δὲ εἴδος ἀξιωματικὸς καὶ λαμπρός: Chron. VI 13, Renauld 1:123 1-3.  
\textsuperscript{383} προσήκων...τοίς πράγμασιν Chron. VI 13, Renauld 1:123 4.  
\textsuperscript{384} λεληθῶς τῷ ἀνδρὶ πλησιάζω Chron. VI 13, Renauld 1:123 6; or "having sexual intercourse with"; cf. LSJ s.v. πλησιάζω II.2 or II.3.
Romanos, not a jealous man, remained deaf to this, but Michael IV sent him from the palace, and on the pretext of promoting him, exiled him from the capital.\textsuperscript{385} The empress sided with him, and when he was recalled [from exile] he associated with\textsuperscript{386} the empress, and changed his attitude to please her.\textsuperscript{387} Everyone was rooting for him, when a sudden illness carried him off, and all their hopes were dashed.\textsuperscript{388}

The choice finally fell on Constantine Monomachos, the last shoot of a noble house.\textsuperscript{389}

This man, on account of his descent, was brought to [ie. numbered among] the first people of the empire. He had gathered in a good fortune and was of beautiful appearance. He seemed sought after in marriage by the exalted families.\textsuperscript{390}

Such a marriage was contracted, but his wife died of an illness, and so he was at once snatched up in a second marriage.\textsuperscript{391} Romanos Argyropoulos, not yet emperor\textsuperscript{392} though already marked out for

\textsuperscript{385} Chron. VI 13, Renauld 1:123 6-9.

\textsuperscript{386} Or again "had sex with" cf. \textsuperscript{LSJ} s.v. ôμιλέω I or IV.

\textsuperscript{387} Chron. VI 13, Renauld 1:123 10-2.

\textsuperscript{388} Chron. VI 13, Renauld 1:123-4 12-4.

\textsuperscript{389} δίκης ἀρχαίων τῶν Μονομάχων τελευταίως κατὰ τὴν οἰκείαν τάξιν βλαστῶν Chron. VI 14, Renauld 1:124 2-3.

\textsuperscript{390} Οὗτος γὰρ γένους ἔνεκεν τὰ πρῶτα τῆς βασιλείας φερόμενος, πολλῷ τε πλοῦτῳ κομίῳ, καὶ κάλλει διαπρεπῆς ὄν, ἀμφίπροσος εἰς κηδείαν ταῖς υπερτίμους ἔδοξε γενεάς. Chron. VI 15, Renauld 1:124 6-8. The parallel with Jane Austen's opening of \textit{Pride and Prejudice} springs to mind.

\textsuperscript{391} Chron. VI 15, Renauld 1:124 9-11.

\textsuperscript{392} Still leading a private life ἰδιωτικῶς βίου Chron. VI 15, Renauld 1:125 12.
greatness and the focus of hopes of high destiny, took an interest in Monomachos because of the bloom of his youth and the great preëminence of his family. Romanos decided to marry the daughter of his sister Pulcheria to Constantine Monomachos. This niece had previously been married to Basil Skleros. Constantine Monomachos was therefore out of favour with the advisors of the emperor Basil. Constantine Monomachos’s connection with Skleros meant he received no preferment from either Basil II or Constantine VIII.

Romanos III, when he came to the throne, did not see Monomachos’s future greatness, but he did keep him at court, and if for no other [reason] than his kinship to Romanos, Constantine was most distinguished. He was, of course, distinguished for other reasons:

Because he had a blooming face and he was considered in our days as someone in the spring-time of their life’s maturity, full of grace he acquired grace to the limit in conversation and in speaking, above everyone else.

---

393. ἤγασικεὶ τον ἀνδρα του τε ἀνθωνις της ἡλικιας και της του γένους μεγαλοπρεπειας Chron. VI 15, Renauld 1:125 13-5.

394. οι περι τὸν αὐτοκράτορα Βασιλείου Chron. VI 15, Renauld 1:125 22.


396. Chron. VI 16, Renauld 1:125 1-5.

397. Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀνθώνει ἔχει το πρόσωπον καὶ οἶνον ἑαυτή τις ὑπόρα τῷ καθ’ ἡμῶς βίω ἔχρηματις χάριτος τε ἐμπλεω τὴν ὄμιλον ἑκέκτητο, ἑστημεύλατο το υπερ τους άλλους Chron. VI 16, Renauld 1:125 5-8.
The empress liked him and wished to converse\textsuperscript{398} with him many times. Constantine paid court to her and made himself agreeable to her, and he enjoyed imperial favours from her.\textsuperscript{399} The many\textsuperscript{400} launched darts of abuse against them; Zoë and Constantine's meetings did not please them.\textsuperscript{401} Constantine Monomachos's birth and abilities - together with his link to Zoë - made Michael IV exile him to Mitylene, and his position did not improve under Michael V.

These three descriptions stress the nobility of birth of the candidates (even though one, Constantine Artoline, is not in possession of a fortune), and their place of birth. They are handsome in appearance and their characters are majestic. They suffer slights and setbacks, but are brought forward by Zoë, confounding the stereotype of man the actor. However, the idea of the autonomous active woman is marred somewhat by Zoë's subsequent actions.

When power inclined once more to the well-born empress, first of all as I have indicated she took care of the pressures of the time by seeking in marriage [someone] not from afar, but from nearby, [thus keeping] power for herself.\textsuperscript{402}

After many had been rejected for one reason or another, she returned to Constantine Monomachos. She discussed it with her guards and

\textsuperscript{398} Derived from \textit{\deltamu\lambda\epsilon\omega}, \textit{LSJ} s.v. I in the light of the use of \textit{\deltamu\lambda\eta\nu} above 1:125 7.

\textsuperscript{399} \textit{Chron.} VI 16, Renauld 1:125 8-12.

\textsuperscript{400} τοίς πολλοίς \textit{Chron.} VI 16, Renauld 1:125 12; the courtiers rather than the urban mob \textit{per se}.

\textsuperscript{401} \textit{Chron.} VI 16, Renauld 1:126 13-4.

\textsuperscript{402} \textit{Chron.} VI 18, Renauld 1:126 1-4.
household\textsuperscript{403}, and it seemed as if from a single preconcerted signal, that they all voted for this man to be put into power.\textsuperscript{404} The senate was summoned and the decision announced to them. In this it seems that Zoë's choice was not free, but engineered by those around her. Constantine Monomachos entered Constantinople in state, and the marriage was celebrated with the Patriarch Alexios exercising economy.\textsuperscript{405} The coronation was for the empresses the end of [their ability] to act by themselves and to rule the empire; for Constantine Monomachos it was the beginning and the start of his appointment to the empire.\textsuperscript{406}

\textsuperscript{403} πρὸς τὸ περὶ ἐαυτὴν δορυφορικὸν καὶ οἰκίδιον Chron. VI 18, Renaud 1:126 8-9.

\textsuperscript{404} Chron. VI 18, Renaud 1:126 9-11.

\textsuperscript{405} τούτῳ δὲ οὖν οἶδα ἐὰν ἱερατικὸν, εἶτε κολακικὸν καὶ πρὸς τὸν καρδόν Chron. VI 20, Renaud 1:127 6-7.

\textsuperscript{406} Καὶ γίνεται ταῦτα ταῖς μὲν βασιλίσσαις τέλος τοῦ δὲ ἐαυτῶν τι ποιεῖ καὶ αὐτοκράτει ἐν τοῖς πράγμασιν, ἀρχὴ δὲ τῷ Μυθόμαχῳ Κωνσταντίνῳ καὶ πρώτῃ τῆς βασιλείας κατάστασις. Αἰ μὲν ὅσον τρίτον μήνα συνάρξασαι παύονται τῆς ἀρχῆς Chron. VI 21, Renaud 1:127 1-5; LSJ s.v. παύω I.1.a "generally Med. denotes willing, Pass. forced cessation; cf. I.2 παύεσθαι ἀρχῆς "to be deposed from, or reach the term of office." The form παύονται may be either middle, implying the sisters gave up power freely, or passive suggesting it was forced. As in Theodora's case the transfer involved a coup d'état, the passive usage would be more apt. For Zoe, it appears we observe a tightening down of male values after an aberration of female independence. The men surrounding Zoe engineered (ὡσπερ ὀπὸ συνθήματι) Chron. VI 18, Renaud 1:126 9-10) her return to tutelage.
In the description, Psellos faults Constantine IX Monomachos for over-generosity - admittedly a deed of youth (νεανίευμα) - when he came to the throne. Psellos identifies as ἐν κολοκῦ that Monomachos was not seen boasting, nor grim-visaged, not talking verbosely, nor talking in pretentious phrases. He was generous to all, even those who gave him no help during his rise to power. Constantine Monomachos was most well favoured (ἐυψεστατος) if anyone was, and knew how to captivate and win friends without pretending, without being insincere towards the one who is to be won over. His speech was full of grace; he was easily moved to a smile, and had a cheerful face, not only when at play, when there was need of such a thing for him, but also [when] he showed himself to be engrossed in things.

409. Chron. VI 31, Renauld 1:133 3.
410. Chron. VI 31, Renauld 1:133 3-5.
412. οὔτε κατασφιξόμενος, οὔτε μὴν εἰρωνευόμενος πρὸς τὸν ἀλιστόμενον Chron. VI 32, Renauld 1:133 3-4.
413. Εἴπε δὲ καὶ τὴν γλώτταν χαρίτων μεστὴν, εὐκίνητος τε ἡμι πρὸς μεῖδαια, καὶ ὃταν εἴπε τὸ πρόσωπον, οὐκ ἐν παιδίας μόνον ὁπότε αὐτῷ καὶ τοῦτον ἐδέσθεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ὧν σπουδάζων ἐδείκνυτο. Chron. VI 33, Renauld 1:133-4 1-4.
The criticism begins again: this emperor had not grasped the nature of the empire at all. He gave over to others the oversight of public care, the honour of judgment and the care of the registers, cutting off from himself any small part of their weight, but he assigned to himself a life, fond and devoted to pleasure, as if it were his own inheritance. This description serves to introduce the illness suffered by the empire under Constantine Monomachos, which Psellos ascribes to the frivolous characters of the empresses, and the wish - following them - to give himself over to luxuries and laughter.

Constantine appeared to want not to stop the empresses, but to facilitate their desires. However, when a "certain matter" [ie. Skleraina] came up, he would have been angry with them, had not his partner [Zoe] seemed [to be] in the same way [of the same mind]. Thus Constantine Monomachos was not utterly hen-pecked, but then Zoe's acquiescence may have been because she hid her jealousy, or because her age meant she no longer felt it.


415. τοῦ δημοσίου is public taxation, the fisc.

416. τῶν καταλόγων could be tax records or military registers; as taxation has already been dealt with, it likely refers to the military registers.


418. τὰ ρήθημα τῶν βασιλίων ἦθη, καὶ τὸ κατ’ ἐκείνας ἔθελεν εἰς τρυφάς οἰκειόθεν καὶ γέλαστας *Chron.* VI 49, Renauld 1:141 2-3.

Attention then turns to Skleraina, the niece of Constantine's dead second wife. Described as both beautiful in nature and moreover chaste, she surrendered to him in a most illegal relationship, "won over by presents, charmed by words of love or by some other means." The final suggestion indicates that in Skleraina, we do not have the woman-temptress; she was the injured party. Skleraina accompanied Monomachos into exile on Mitylene, and this is presented as love:

the woman was beside [him], and cherished [him] with other things and set her things before him, and she encouraged him in all fashions and she got rid of the majority of the misfortune.

But this was not the whole story: Skleraina, like Constantine, lived for the day she would reign with her husband, confident that once Constantine reigned things would happen as she desired, and they would be married, laws being perverted by imperial objective [of sight or intention]. However, Constantine's elevation did not lead to the subversion of the imperial laws, and their marriage; Zoë retained all power and Skleraina feared not only for her dearest hopes, but also for her salvation, for she feared the empress and the wrath she

420, ὕπαίει τε οὖσαν καὶ τῇλα σώφρονα Chron. VI 50, Renauld 1:142 9.
422. Chron. VI 51, Renauld 1:142 4-7.
nurtured towards her.\textsuperscript{425} Constantine raised the matter of Skleraina with Zoë. He did this without a thought for the occasion, nor for the jealousy of the empress\textsuperscript{426}, "but valuing all advice as secondary to his desire."\textsuperscript{427} Even Euprepia, the emperor’s sister, described as most intelligent of women in our day\textsuperscript{428}, opposed him and gave him similar advice but he ignored it completely.\textsuperscript{429} However, rather than raising Euprepia’s status as the "most intelligent of women in our days", this episode shows how badly Constantine’s judgment was clouded: he could ignore all good advice, advice so obvious that even women saw the correct course to take.

Zoë gave her consent to Skleraina’s recall from exile, Psellos accounting for her lack of jealousy because she had been worn out by the evils she had suffered and because her age made her no longer subject to such feelings.\textsuperscript{430} Skleraina was recalled to Constantinople with an imperial guard, by letters from Zoë and Constantine.

\textsuperscript{425} ἠρέτας ἡ βασιλεία Ζωή τὴν ἐξουσίαν πᾶσαν συνείληθεν, ἢ μὲν παντάπασιν ἀπεγείωκεν ὑπὸ τὰς χρηστοτέρας μόνον ἐλπίδας, ἀλλὰ ὅτι καὶ τὴν σωτηρίαν, ἑδείμαυε γὰρ τὴν βασιλίδα καὶ βαφυμήνῃ ἐπὶ αὐτῇ ὑπὲρ Chron. VI 51, Renaud 1:142 14-7.

\textsuperscript{426} τὸ τῆς βασιλίδος ζηλότυπον Chron. VI 52, Renaud 1:142 6.

\textsuperscript{427} ἤλλα πᾶσαν συμβούλην ἐν δευτέρῳ τιθέμενος τοῦ βουλεύματος Chron. VI 52, Renaud 1:143 7-8.

\textsuperscript{428} συνετωτάτης τῶν καθ’ ἡμᾶς γυναικῶν Chron. VI 52, Renaud 1:143 9.

\textsuperscript{429} Chron. VI 52, Renaud 1:143 11.

\textsuperscript{430} Chron. VI 53, Renaud 1:143 1-4.
At first Skleraina was deemed worthy only of a most economical lodging, with a not very distinguished guard, but Monomachos then began to augment the building. The supervision of these extensions provided him with an excuse to visit Skleraina, an excuse accepted and bolstered by the adherents of Zoë, won over by Constantine's gifts.

Constantine Monomachos concealed his love for this woman at first, but soon "he visited her and spent time with her in public, as often as he wanted." The affaire seemed unbelievable (τῶν ἰπίστων ἐδόκει τὸ πράγμα) for he visited her not as a concubine (ὡς πολλακτί) but as a true consort (ὡς καθαρὸς ὁμενενετίδι). Continually emphasized in all this is Constantine's weakness, and how the natural order is subverted - as when the imperial treasury is diverted to provide whatever Skleraina wanted.

The unnatural order continued with the senate ratifying the concordat for the ménage à trois, and Zoë accepted Skleraina...

---

431. Chron. VI 54, Renauld 1:143 1-3.

432. καὶ οὕτοι τοῖς σκοπῶν τῶν τελομένων ἐπιστάμενοι, οὐ μᾶλλον τι περὶ τῆς δεσποτίδος ἐνυχέραινον ἢ περὶ ἐαυτοῖς ἐγγονίων ἐπιτυγχάνοντο ὃν ἐπούδαζον Chron. VI 55, Renauld 1:144 8-10.


434. εἰς ὑποίδρων αὐτῆς ὀσάκες βούλοιτο, παρεγίγνυτο τε καὶ συνεγίγνυτο Chron. VI 56, Renauld 1:144 4-6.


436. Ἐξῆντελε πὲ αὐτῆς τῶν βασιλικῶν ἡμοῦργῶν ὑπόσα καὶ βούλοιτο Chron. VI 57, Renauld 1:144 1-2.

"affecting to smile at everyone, and being content with events".438

Both women attended the emperor and talked over affairs of state.

The emperor paid attention to both [women], and weighed their arguments and often (τὸ πλέον) favoured the second empress (Skleraina439).440

In appearance, Skleraina is described as:

not particularly amazing, but at the same time, not a ready target for evil-speaking tongues and abuse. Her nature and understanding were such as to be able to charm stones, and she was most notable [on account of] her advice on affairs to everyone. No-one else had a voice like hers.441

Psellos goes on to describe the expression, the rhythm and the sweetness and grace of diction, which singled out Skleraina’s voice, before mentioning how she found favour in his eyes by listening to his erudition, becoming the student to his teacher.442 Her hearing was more acute than any other woman’s443, but this was learnt, not by nature (οὐ παρὰ τῆς φύσεως), because she knew that all tongues bore

438. μειδιώσα πᾶσι καθωράτο καὶ ἐπαγαλλομένη τῷ πράγματι: Chron. VI 59, Renaud 1:145 7-8.
441. Τὸ μὲν οὖν εἶδος αὐτῆς οὐ πᾶν νοθομόσιον, ἀλλὰ οὔδὲ πρόχειρον εἰς κακῆγορον γλῶτταν καὶ λοιπον, τὸ δὲ γε ἡθος καὶ τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς φρύτημα, τὸ μὲν καὶ θέλεια λίθους δυνάμενον, τὸ δὲ πρὸς πᾶσαν εἰπωλην προγμάτων ἀξιολογητάτων, τὸ δὲ φθέγμα οἷου οὐκ ἀλλο: Chron. VI 60, Renaud 1:146 1-5.
442. Chron. VI 60, Renaud 1:146 5-11.
443. εὐήκοος δὲ εἰ καὶ τὰς ἄλλα γυναικῶν ἐγεγόνει Chron. VI 60, Renaud 1:146 11.
[gossip] about her.\footnote{444. Chron. VI 60, Renauld 1:146 12-3.} Her hearing found a use in the οὐ νέμεσις episode, and she rewarded the courtier.\footnote{445. τῶν τις περὶ τὴν κολακείαν Chron. VI 61, Renauld 1:146 8.} She rewarded him not with some few or paltry things, but with such things as she was accustomed to receive and to give.\footnote{446. οὐκ ὁλίγοις τισιν, οὔδὲ φαύλοις, ἀλλ᾿ οἷς ἐκείνη κεχρῆσθαι καὶ ἀμείβεσθαι εἴσεθαν Chron. VI 61, Renauld 1:147 17-8.} To enable Skleraina to win over the people and the empresses [Zoë and Theodora]\footnote{447. οὖ τε ἄλλοι καὶ αἱ βασιλίδες Chron. VI 61, Renauld 1:147 18-9.} Monomachos gave her her own income to distribute to men and women.\footnote{448. τὸ ἐκάστῳ ἡ ἐκάστη οἰκεῖον ἐδίδου παρέχειν ὣ αὐτοκράτωρ. Chron. VI 61, Renauld 1:147 19-20.}

Skleraina was able to win over Zoë and Theodora by providing Zoë with aromatic herbs, and Theodora with gold coins. The strategy was not strictly necessary, as Zoë was released from jealousy because she was past her prime, and no longer bore her enmity, whilst her sister, allowed to do as she wanted, cared even less than her sister.\footnote{449. Ἡ μὲν γὰρ πρώτη βασιλίς τὸ ζηλότυπον ἤδη διὰ τὴν τῆς ἡλίκιας παρακμήν καταλύσασα, οὐκ ἔτι πρὸς αὐτὴν ἐμηνία,... ...καὶ ἡ ἀδελφὴ δὲ, ὀπολαύσουσα ἐν ἑβουλέτω, τῆς ἀδελφῆς ἐφρονίζειν ἐλαττον. Chron. VI 62, Renauld 1:147 9-13.} The riches accumulated by Basil II became a joyous plaything for the women, which they dispensed freely.\footnote{450. Chron. VI 63, Renauld 1:147 1-5.}

Psellos then tells us about the domestic arrangements of this ménage à trois: Constantine took the middle apartments, with Zoë and Skleraina on either side. As Skleraina, ἡ σεβαστή, had the...
ǒόυτον or inner sanctum, and therefore Zoë did not, this
counterbalances notions derived from Psellos that the women’s
quarters formed a harem, in some kind of turcocratie avant la
turcocratie. Zoë avoided meeting Monomachos in Skleraina’s
company and busied herself with her own business.

Psellos begins his treatment of Zoë’s customary habits with an
abrupt question: what was it [her business]? Zoë’s concerns are not
women’s work. One may ask in passing how often empresses busied
their hands with a spindle, or threw themselves into work at the loom
or gave themselves over to something else, but this delineates the
expected stereotype with which Zoë’s life-experience does not mesh
well, and indeed, to which Zoë makes no concessions whatsoever.
Psellos then makes use of another stereotype - the association
of women with vanity: Zoë completely rejected the imperial
adornments, but doing this made her like her uncle. Whether it
had always been so, Psellos does not know, but by raising the question

452. Chron. VI 59, Renaud 1:145 notwithstanding.
453. τὸ ἑαυτῆς ἔπραττε Chron. VI 63, Renaud 1:147 12.
454. τί ποτε τοῦτο; Chron. VI 63, Renauld 1:147 12.
455. Ἐκείνη γυνοκεῖων μὲν παντάπασιν ἔργων ὀπείχετο Chron. VI 64, Renauld 1:148 1-2.
456. οὔτε γὰρ ἀπακτῷ ποτὲ τὰς χεῖρας ἡσχόλησεν, οὔτε ἱστοργεῖν ἐπέβαλλε το; Chron. VI 64, Renauld 1:148 2-3.
457. κατωλιγύρει δὲ καὶ βασιλεῖων καλλωπισμῶν Chron. VI 64, Renauld 1:148 3-4.
it suggests that it was not. What Zoë did concern herself with was the manufacture of perfumes. Her room, set aside from common usage to be a bedroom, was no more august than the workshops of the marketplace, where there were artisans of mechanical arts and those who brought to consummation things wrought with fire. Psellos identifies a winter utility for the numerous braziers, but in summer it was different, though not for Zoë, who was surrounded by many fires as if she were insensitive to the burning heat. Generally, the sisters were weird: "For both her sister's and her nature seemed Other." Normal pleasures - pleasant air to breathe, a very splendid house and meadows and gardens - did not please them; but each closed up in their own apartments, one able to spend money, the other to hoard it, this to them was in the place of every pleasure. Psellos says that Zoë’s other qualities did not have much to commend them, but what he does single out is her piety, in which she surpassed the nature

459. καὶ ὁ ἀποτελεμένος αὐτῇ οἶκος εἰς εὔμην οὐδὲν τὶ σεμνότερος ἦν τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγορᾶς ἐργαστηρίων, ἐφ’ ὅν τι βάσανοι τῶν τεχνῶν καὶ ἐμπύρων τὴν εὐνεῖλεν ἔχουσι. Chron. VI 64, Renauld 1:148 9-12. Given Zoë’s colourful past, there may be more to the association of her bedroom with the market-place than the break in natural order.

460. ἡ δὲ ὑσπερ ἀναισθήτως τοῦ καύματος ἔχουσα ὑπὸ πολλοῖς ἐδορυφόρειτο πυρσοῖς Chron. VI 64, Renauld 1:148 19-20.

461. ἀλλόκοτος γὰρ αὐτῇ τε καὶ τῇ ἀδελφῇ ἡ φύσις ἑδόκει. Chron. VI 64, Renauld 1:148 20-1.

462. τούτῳ αὐταῖς ἀντὶ πάσης ἀπολαύσεως ἦν Chron. VI 64, Renauld 1:148 21-6.

463. οὐ λίαν ἐπαίων ἔχων Chron. VI 65, Renauld 1:148 1-3.
of all women and all men.\textsuperscript{464} The emphasis on Zoë’s piety and the way in which she continually had God’s name on her tongue\textsuperscript{465} serves to reintegrate her into the Byzantine mainstream after she had been shown to be so odd, but even her piety takes a bizarre tinge, in her adoration of the icon of Christ Antiphonetaes.\textsuperscript{466}

Psellos deals abruptly with the death of Skleraina.\textsuperscript{467} The main conclusion drawn from it is the way Monomachos dealt with his grief: "conquered by suffering, he cried like a child."\textsuperscript{468}

Psellos opens his description of Maniakes with a digression on pervasive jealousy:

\begin{quote}
A productive nature has only to sprout up, an accurate comprehension, a nobleness of nature, a resolute and manly spirit, or some other quality, and straightaway the pruner arrives and cuts off that part of the plant.\textsuperscript{469}
\end{quote}

This introduces "one who blossomed in our time", who showed the value of strategy, and who by his military daring and experience - στρατιωτικὰς τόλμας καὶ ἐμπειρίας - stopped the barbarians’ incursions and gave freedom to the Romans.\textsuperscript{470} This paragon receives

\textsuperscript{464} οἱ δὲ φιλοθεία πάσας μὲν γυναῖκας, πάσαν δὲ φύσιν ὑπερβάλλετο ἄρρητο: Chron. VI 65, Renauld 1:149 4-5.

\textsuperscript{465} οὐδὲν γὰρ ὃτι μὴ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ δύναμις διὰ ποιτὸς ἐπὶ γλώττης ἐκεῖνη Chron. VI 65, Renauld 1:149 11-2.

\textsuperscript{466} Chron. VI 66-71, Renauld 1:149-50.

\textsuperscript{467} Chron. VI 69, Renauld 1:150.

\textsuperscript{468} δὲ, τῇ πάθει νικῶμενος, μετακινοῦμενός ἀνωλοφύρατο. Chron. VI 70, Renauld 1:150-1 3-4.

\textsuperscript{469} ἡ γυνῖμον ἀναβλαστήσεις φύσεως, ἡ φροινήσεως ἀκριβοῦς, ἡ μεγαλοφύρας, ἡ ψυχής καρτερᾶς καὶ ἀνδρείας, ἡ ἀγαθοῦ τιμαρίου ἠλλού, εὐθὺς ἐφέστηκεν ὁ τομεὺς, καὶ τοῦτο μὲν τὸ μέρος τῆς βλάστης ἐκκέντραλ. Chron. VI 74, Renauld 1:153 9-12.

\textsuperscript{470} Chron. VI 75, Renauld 1:154 2-6.
a suitable description. Nature had united in him all that was needed for a commander:

For his height reached ten feet, and those who looked at him, looked up as if to a hill or the summit of a mountain. His appearance was neither soft nor devoted to pleasure, but rather he seemed like a whirlwind; thunder was in his voice, and his hands were such as to shake city walls and to smash gates of bronze, and his impetuosity was that of a lion and his brows were bristling. And everything else [to do] with the man was in agreement and went along with these.471

Following the murder of Monomachos’s envoy, men flocked to Maniakes. It was not surprising that they sought to follow such a brave man at the pinnacle of military science.472 Maniakes retained his judgment, knowing that skill and experience were what caused trophies to be set up, not large numbers. He grouped round himself the most experienced in war and those who had laid waste many cities with him.473

Constantine Monomachos’s younger sister concerned him more than the elder Helen. Euprepia

was full of intelligence, being most steadfast [more] than all the women I have seen, and hard to mislead.474

---

471 ἦν γὰρ τὴν ἡλικίαν εἰς δέκατον ἀνεστηκὼς πόδα, καὶ οἱ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὀρέωντες ὄπερ εἰς κολοβῷ ἡ κορυφὴν ὅρος ἀνέβλετον. τὸ δὲ εἶδος αὐτῷ οὐ τρυφερόν καὶ ἐπιτερπέν. ἀλλὰ ὅλον ἑορτὸν προστρέψαι ἔβροντα δὲ καὶ τῷ θέαματι αἱ τε χεῖρες ὅλαι διαστέται τείχη καὶ πύλαι συντρίψαι χαλκᾶς, τὸ δὲ ὁρμήμα τούτῳ ὅποιον λέοντος, καὶ τὸ ἐπισκύνσιον βλασφέρον· καὶ τὰ λαλὰ δὲ τῷ ἄνδρι συνωθᾶ τούτους καὶ σύνδρομα. Chron. VI 77, Renauld 2:1-2'3-10.

472 οἶα δὲ ἄνδρι γενναῖοὶ καὶ κορυφαῖς τὴν στρατηγικὴν τέχνην Chron. VI 82, Renauld 2:4 1-2.

473. Chron. VI 82, Renauld 2:4 4-7.

474. φιλοτητῶς τε πλήρη τυγχάνουσαν, καὶ γυναικῶν ὀπασῶν δὲν ἐγὼ τεθέαμαι στραθηροτάτην τε οὕσαν καὶ δυσπαράγγειν Chron. VI 100, Renauld 2:15 5-7.
In his dealings with Euprepia, Constantine Monomachos feared her rather than treating her with respect. This rupture meant that Euprepia did not visit her brother often, and when she did it was not fraternally. When she did talk with him, it was arrogantly, and she reproached him for many things, with magisterial pride. Brother and sister were therefore separated, and Euprepia used Leo Tornikios as a focus for her hatred of her brother, forcing Constantine's hand against Leo when it seemed he would do nothing.

When Leo Tornikios's attack on Constantinople was at its height, his sister Helen urged flight to a holy church for sanctuary. He glared at her like a bull. "Someone lead her away," he said, "if anyone is left to us, so that she can make her lamentations, and yet might not enervate my spirit." John Vatatzes was the only rebel who remained loyal to Leo Tornikios after the rout before the walls of Constantinople. He was a man whose strength of body and might of hands matched the

---

475. ἀλλὰ ἐδείξει μᾶλλον ἡ περιέπευν Chron. VI 100, Renaud 2:15 9.
476. οὖδέ ἐδάφρει ἀδελφοίς Chron. VI 100, Renaud 2:15 13.
477. ὑπερηφάνως τε διελέγετο καὶ μετὰ τὴς ἀρχαίας ὀφρύος ἀπελευχὲ τε τὰ πολλὰ τούτων καὶ προσωπείδει. Chron. VI 100, Renaud 2:15 14-6. The pride of the ἀρχή.
479. Euprepia, who would have favoured Tornikios, is said to be in exile Chron. VI 106, Renaud 2:25 2.
480. ταυρηδόν πρὸς αὐτὴν ἐποβλέψας: «Απεγέτω τις αὐτὴν, ἔφησεν, εἶ τις ἡμῖν καταλέλειπται, ἵνα καὶ ἐὰν τήν τούν θρήνου ποιῶ, καὶ μη τὴν ἐμὴν καταμαθοδικέοι ψυχὴν» Chron. VI 106, Renaud 2:25 4-7.
proverbial heroes.\textsuperscript{481} Even when faced with dire calamity, Vatatzes did not forget his spirit (φρόνημα); he kept hereafter his fearless pride and was brave and undaunted to everyone.\textsuperscript{482} This very positive portrayal of Vatatzes is to serve as a foil to Leo Tornikios’s behaviour. Vatatzes submitted γενναίως to his fate; contrast this with Leo’s base ἀγενναίαι lamentation.\textsuperscript{483}

Psellos’s physical description of Monomachos follows the established pattern. Nature endowed him with harmonious proportion and no-one was comparable to him in our time.\textsuperscript{484} “To this harmony was added a tension of strength, just as a beautiful dwelling is based on firm foundations.”\textsuperscript{485} This strength was not obvious, but hidden in his heart.\textsuperscript{486} His hands and fingers were in proportion, but their strength was not in proportion, for there was no object which he could not crush with these hands.\textsuperscript{487} He rode well, was the fastest of men [being] both loose-jointed and nimble, and completely unrivalled in

\textsuperscript{481} οὐ̊τ̊ρ̊ κατά τε σώματος φύσιν καὶ χειρῶν ἀκιμῆν τοῖς θριλλουμένοις ἐκέινοις ἐφαμίλλος ἦρωι Chōr. VI 122, Renauld 2:28 3-4.

\textsuperscript{482} ο̊ δὲ γε Βατάτζης σώ̊ο̊δε ἐν τοῖς δευνοῖς γεγονόις ἑπιλέληπτο τοῦ φρονήματος, ἀλλὰ σοβαρὰν τε αὐθίνα εἶλκεν όφρων καὶ γεγονοῦς ἑπιτο πάση καὶ ἀκατάσπηκτος Chōr. VI 122, Renauld 2:29 17-9.

\textsuperscript{483} Chōr. VI 123, Renauld 2:29 9-13.

\textsuperscript{484} καθ ἡμῶνςχρόνως [sic.] Chōr. VI 125, Renauld 2:30 1-3.

\textsuperscript{485} τῇ δὲ εὐσφρομοστὶ καὶ εὐτονίων ἵσχυος ἐπέθηκεν, ὡσπερ οἶκω καλῷ θεμελίως ὑποθετοσ στερροῦσ Chōr. VI 125, Renauld 2:30 4-5.

\textsuperscript{486} Chōr. VI 125, Renauld 2:30 7.

\textsuperscript{487} Chōr. VI 125, Renauld 2:30 10-3.
the pentathlon.\textsuperscript{488} His head was like the sun, a fiery red, and his chest and down to his feet and his back was the purest white.\textsuperscript{489} His character was in keeping with this harmony, with his tongue having a polished speech, and a charm attached itself to [his] conversation, and when he smiled, one saw one of the best graces.\textsuperscript{490}

Romanos Boilas, Constantine Monomachos's stuttering fool, seized not only the men's apartments, but also the imperial women's quarters, winning over both the empresses.\textsuperscript{491} The stupidity of these women\textsuperscript{492} gave the clown's stories credence, and allowed him access to the secret passages of the palace, and to presents. However, not merely the women were to blame, for Boilas carried a lot from the men's quarters as well as from the women's quarters.\textsuperscript{493} As an appendix to the stutterer's access to the men's and women's quarter, it should be noted what he intended to attempt for love - or at least passion - for the princess of Alania. She is described as having no great nobility, but as she was of royal blood, she was treated with

\textsuperscript{488} \textit{Φασί γονή αὐτῶν καὶ ἱππάσσοντες κάλλιστα, καὶ δρομικώτατον ἀνδρώπων γενέσθαι, εὐστρόφον τε καὶ κοῦφον καὶ ὅλως πρὸς τὸ πένταθλον ἀπαφάμιλλον.} \textit{Chron. VI 125, Renauld 2:31 15-7.}

\textsuperscript{489} \textit{Chron. VI 126, Renauld 2:31 11-4.}

\textsuperscript{490} \textit{Chron. VI 126, Renauld 2:31 18-21.}

\textsuperscript{491} \textit{Ὅ τοι ὑμῖν τῶν ἀνδρῶν μόνον ὁ ἀνήρ οὗτος κατέλαβεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐς τὴν βασιλείαν γυναικώντων παρεισφθαρῶς ἀμφό τὰς βασιλικὰς ὑποποιεῖται.} \textit{Chron. VI 144, Renauld 2:40-1 1-3.}

\textsuperscript{492} \textit{τὸ τῶν γυναικῶν ἐκείνων ὀβέλτερον.} \textit{Chron. VI 144, Renauld 2:41 11.}

\textsuperscript{493} \textit{ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρῶν ὧν ἀπὸ τῆς γυναικών ἱδώς.} \textit{Chron. VI 144, Renauld 2:41 14.}
respect by Monomachos and had honours of the first rank.\footnote{494} Constantine Monomachos's gullibility in the matter of the stutterer's plot forced the empress Theodora\footnote{495} and his sister Euprepia to act out the roles of the outraged goddesses Athena and Hera after the judgment of Paris.

They murmured dreadfully against these final outcomes; they displayed no grace at all, but blamed the many [occasions] of the emperor's simplicity.\footnote{496}

In response to this onslaught by these female harpies, Monomachos exiled the clown to the Princes' Islands, recalling him ten days later.\footnote{497} The presentation of this female intervention is complex. On the one hand, it was needed, as Constantine was being foolish; however, their graceless intervention - although Athena and Hera are cited as role models - is seen as being too unnatural, too far from the stereotypical woman of Psellos's imagination. This is confirmed by the rapid failure of their intervention.

In paragraphs 151-4, Psellos returns to the princess of Alania and her relationship with Constantine Monomachos. Psellos stresses again that Zoë's age had removed her desire for sex, but that Monomachos,
now deprived of Skleraina as a sexual release, was being burnt up by passion.\textsuperscript{498} The Alanian princess became the object of his desire.

She was not particularly beautiful, nor well-served in her court. She was adorned with only two graces: her skin was white and the flashing fire was how her eyes were most beautiful.\textsuperscript{499}

Beauty, however, is in the eye of the beholder, for Constantine Monomachos abandoned all his other loves for her and lived with her alone, nurturing a vehement desire for her.\textsuperscript{500}

While Zoë still lived, Monomachos concealed his love, but when she died, he wished to make the Alanian princess his wife.\textsuperscript{501} He was prevented from this course by the laws against fourth marriages, and because Theodora would not tolerate the burden of being taken both as ruling and ruled,\textsuperscript{502} Even though denied the imperial rank, the princess underwent a sudden transformation, as unaccustomed ornaments encircled her head, her neck shone with gold, gold bracelets in the form of serpents went round her arms and heavy pearls hung from her ears.\textsuperscript{503} Monomachos could not make her share in the empire, but he could give her the name, calling her Augusta,
and he constituted an imperial guard for her, and opened all the doors on her demands.504

In later life, Psellos describes Zoë as "completely ignorant of public affairs, and utterly destroyed by an imperial lack of taste."505

Whatever abilities she had were squandered:

For the rest, her life was both soft and unbridled, and also very hard and strained tight, and both [aspects] would change with no reason, quickly in time, being both things to one person.506

Zoë adopted her father's habit of blinding people, but used it indiscriminately. Monomachos restrained her excesses.507

Zoë was the most generous of women, but goodness had no measure for her.508

And if someone described carefully to her the good [deeds] of her family, and especially of the late blessed Basil, then straightaway she rejoiced a lot and her spirits were raised.509

504. διὰ ταύτα τούτων τοῦ μὲν σχήματος αὐτῆς τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔκωνωνησε, μεταδίωσε δὲ τοῦ ὀνόματος, σεβαστὴν αὐτῆς, δορυφορίαν ταύτης βασιλείας διατίθεται, καὶ πᾶσα ἡ ἄνθρωπος αὐτῆς θύρας αἰτήσεως ὑπανοιγόνυσιν Chron. VI 153, Renauld 2:46 5-9.

505. ὡς καὶ πριγμάτων μὲν παντάπασιν ἀδοςύς, ὑπὸ βασιλείας δὲ ἀνειροκαλικαὶ διηθαρμενής παντάπασιν. Chron. VI 157, Renauld 2:48 3-5.

506. ὃ δὲ γε λοιπὸς αὐτῆς βίος ή μὲν ἄπαλος τε καὶ ἕκλωτος, ή δὲ σκληρὸς οὐκ ἄνω καὶ σὺντόνος, οὐκ ἀκούσει λόγου καὶ παρὰ βραχὺ τινὰ χρόνου ἐπὶ ταύτῳ τὰ ἱδώματα διηθλαττετοὶ Chron. VI 157, Renauld 2:48 13-6.


508. φιλοτημοτάτη δὲ γενομένη πασῶν γυναικῶν Chron. VI 158, Renauld 2:49 1.

509. μὴ μέτρου ἐξε ταύτη τὸ καλὸν Chron. VI 158, Renauld 2:49 2-3.

510. εἰ δὲ τις αὐτῆς κατὰ σπουδὴν τὰ τοῦ γένους διεξῆς καλὰ, καὶ μᾶλιστα ὅπως ὁ θείος Βασιλείας, ἡγολετό τε καὶ αὐτίκα μετέφρασεν ἤν τὴν ψυχήν Chron. VI 158, Renauld 2:49 4-7.
Physically:

Even though already older than seventy years, she had no wrinkles on her face but she bloomed as [if she had come] newly into beauty. Her hands were not steady, but were agitated and her back was humped over. She neglected bodily ornaments completely, neither wearing a garment of cloth of gold, nor coronets nor decorative \[LSG\] "esp. of women" - perhaps to distinguish them from imperial] collars. She never dressed heavily, but wrapped her body in a light gown.511

Zoë did not join with the emperor in imperial concerns, but wished to be completely unschooled in labours for these things.512 Zoë was not interested in the normal womanly things, the loom, distaff, wool and weaving. She was devoted to making sacrifices to God, but even in this she was unnatural, as she offered not good deeds, nor prayers and penitence, but incense from Egypt and India.514

In her final illness, Zoë’s appearance changed slightly. With signs announcing death515, Zoë's thoughts turned to the prisons. Debts were released and pardons given to the condemned, all funded by the imperial treasury. Psellus characterizes Zoë even near death, as

511. Ἐβδομηκοστῶν δὲ ἦν ὑπερβασά ἐτος τῆς ἡλικίας ῥυμίδα μὲν οὐκ εἶχεν ἐπὶ τοῦ προσώπου, ἀλλ’ ἔμθει ὡς ἐπὶ νεῶ τῷ καλλεί τῶν ἐγε ἑχερῶν οὐκ ἁτρόμως εἶχεν, ἀλλ’ ἐκκλώνητο, συνεκεκύφει δὲ καὶ τὰ νῦν. τῶν δὲ γε περὶ τὸ σώμα καλλωπισμῶν ἡμέλει παυτάπασι, καὶ οὕτω χρυσώπαστῳ ἐχρῆτο στόλῳ, οὕτω ταινίας, ἡ κόσμως περιβεραίος, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ φορτικῶς ἡμφίεστο, ἀλλ’ ἐλαφρὰ τῇ στολῇ τὸ σώμα περικάλυπτε Chron. VI 158, Renauld 2:49 7-14.

512. Τῶν μέντοιχε βασιλικῶν φρουτίδων οὖδ’ ἐκθενόνει τῷ αὐτοκρατόρι, ἀλλ’ ἐβούλετο παῦτῃ ἁσχολοῦ εἰναι τῶν περὶ ταῦτα πόνων Chron. VI 159, Renauld 2:49 1-3.

513. τῶν ὅσα γυ νακάς Chron. VI 159, Renauld 2:49 3.


lacking moderation.\textsuperscript{516} The contrast between Zoë's lack of moderation and Constantine Monomachos's control is set out most clearly in paragraphs 164-6.\textsuperscript{517} However, at this point, Psellos is not attempting a straightforward male-female comparison. Monomachos is being compared to the great heroes. His control is stressed because he is their inferior in bravery.\textsuperscript{518} Elsewhere, Monomachos is described as utterly immoderate\textsuperscript{519} and having a spirit which was fickle and not completely at peace with itself.\textsuperscript{520} It was of course Monomachos's changeable character which forced the friends into the monastic life.\textsuperscript{521}

When Constantine Monomachos caught the chill that was to cause his death\textsuperscript{522}, he took to his bed.

He did not make over to the empress Theodora the consideration [of the succession] of the empire, but hid his intentions from her and searched for the [future, masculine] ruler in secret.\textsuperscript{523}

\textsuperscript{516} \textit{Chron.} VI 160, Renauld 2:50 7-13.

\textsuperscript{517} \textit{Chron.} VI 164-6, Renauld 2:52-3.

\textsuperscript{518} πρὸς ἀνδρὶν \textit{Chron.} VI 164, Renauld 2:52 2.

\textsuperscript{519} οὐδὲν τι μέτρου \textit{Chron.} VI 182, Renauld 2:60 3, referring to his loves and anger.

\textsuperscript{520} Ἐτερογνώμων δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν ὅν καὶ μὴ πάντη ἔστιν ὁμοίως \textit{Chron.} VI 189, Renauld 2:64 1-2, referring to his desire to extend the Byzantine dominions.

\textsuperscript{521} \textit{Chron.} VI 200, Renauld 2:70 4-5.

\textsuperscript{522} \textit{Chron.} VI 201, Renauld 2:70 11-18.

\textsuperscript{523} οὐ πρὸς τὴν βασιλίδα Θεοδώραν τὴν περὶ τοῦ κράτους σκέψιν ἀνέττα, ἀλλὰ κρύψας ἐκείνη τὸ βουλεύμα ἐν ἀπορρήτῳ ἐξήτη τὸν βασιλεύσουσαν: \textit{Chron.} VI 202, Renauld 2:70 2-5.
The plan was not kept secret, however, and Theodora got to hear of it.\textsuperscript{524} Theodora, for all that she has been compared unfavourably with Zoë, acted straightaway; she embarked on an imperial barge with the best of her retinue, as if to swim to safety in the courts of the palace, where she won over all the guardsmen.\textsuperscript{525} What influenced them all was that she had been swaddled in the purple, her gentle nature and the suffering of her previous life.\textsuperscript{526}

The emperor was strongly affected (δεσμοποιεῖ) when he heard the news, but was no longer capable of action. He became delirious (καὶ τὴν γυνώμην καὶ τὴν γλώτταν ἐπεπλάνητο), but then came to himself, realized the seriousness of his condition and gave up his spirit in a temper (ἀφῆκε βαρυθυμῶν τὴν ψυχήν).\textsuperscript{527} The anger is at being outwitted by a woman, and leaving the empire to Theodora. In this transfer of power, Theodora is shown as an active participant, who even if exiled to a nunnery beyond the city, was still capable of gathering information and using it to her best advantage. This further suggests that even if women were confined to the women’s quarters (an unlikely hypothesis, at best) then their interests and intrigues were not restricted to the private sphere.

\textsuperscript{524} Chron. VI 202, Renauld 2:70 5-6.

\textsuperscript{525} ἡ δὲ αὐτικὰ σὺν τοῖς περὶ αὐτῆς κρείττοσιν εἰς ὀλκάδα ἐμβάσα βασιλείων, ὠσπερ ἐκ κυμάτων εἰς τὰς τῶν ἀνακτόρων σύλλας ἀνανήσεται, ἐκείσε τε γενομένη πάσαν ἔφ’ ἐκείπ’ ἄρωφαριαν ἐφέλκεται Chron. VI 202, Renauld 2:70-1 6-9.

\textsuperscript{526} ἢ τε γὰρ πορφυρῖ, ὧ γ’ ἡς ἐσπαργάνωτο, τὸ τε ἱμερον τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ ἢ παθή τῆς προτέρας ζωῆς πάντα τοῖς πάσιν ἡνύνατο, Chron. VI 202, Renauld 2:71 9-11.

\textsuperscript{527} Chron. VI 202, Renauld 2:71 12-8.
On the death of Constantine Monomachos, contrary to all expectation - for the general view was that she would promote a noble man to power - Theodora took upon her shoulders the power of emperor of the Romans. From her own experience, from Zoë’s experience and from Constantine Monomachos, Theodora knew that there was "no-one more apt to forget benefits [received] than the person brought to reign by another." At this point, when Psellos - with regard to the sense of context - could have used the gender specific ἀνήρ, he used ἄνθρωπος instead. This may suggest that ἄνθρωπος had already begun its journey to the Modern Greek equivalence of ἀνήρ and ἄνθρωπος, but given the final result, that she [i.e. Theodora] wanted not one of all [of them] to sit on the imperial throne, this indicates that Theodora intended to share power with no-one, not that she had particular objections to sharing the throne with a man. This is confirmed by the description of her presiding over everything.

528. Ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸν βίον οὗτος ἀπέλιπεν, ἢς τὴν τοῦ Κωνσταντίνου παύσα Θεοδώραν τὸ κράτος ἐπένευσεν· ἐπίδοξος δὲ πᾶσιν οὗτος ὡς ἐγκαταστήσῃ τὸ κράτος ἤγειρεν ἄνδρι καὶ γυναικί, ὡς παρὰ τὰς πάντως γυναῖκας τε καὶ προσδοκίας τὴν αὐτοκράτορα Ρωμαίων ἀρχὴν ἐαυτῇ ἀνατίθησιν. Chron. VI Theodora 1, Renauld 2:72 1-6.

529. οὐδὲν οὕτως ἐπιληπταστάτων χρῆμα ὡς ἄνθρωπος ὑφ’ ἑτέρου βασιλείου λαχῶν Chron. VI Theodora 1, Renauld 2:72 6-7.


531. οὐδένα (masculine singular, but the masculine subsumes the feminine) τῶν πάντων ἔδωκεν τοῖς βασιλείοις ἐγκαθίσατε θρόνοις Chron. VI Theodora 1, Renauld 2:72 10-1.
and possessing the strength of power undivided.532 This statement of
independence from gender stereotype is weakened by the last lines of
this paragraph, which show Theodora strengthened in her resolution
by her train and household (το περί ἐκείνην θεραπευτικὸν καὶ
οἰκίδιον), all identified as men (αὐδρες), for a long time familiar with
imperial practice and versed in all the financial administration.533

In her conduct of the government, Theodora acted as a man
openly, with no need of a screen.534 The ways in which she acted like
a man - which is actually acting like an emperor - are enumerated:

She was seen promoting magistrates and from the sceptres
dispensing justice in a rousing voice, both determining and
processing, and she declared [her orders] sometimes without tension, and
sometimes severely.535

Psellos's response to government by Theodora is ambivalent. Within
the same paragraph, he starts by saying that to everyone it appeared
unseemly for the empire of the Romans to be made effeminate from
its more manly spirit.536 The validity of this statement of the

532 οὖν αὐτῇ τῶν πάντων κατάρχουσα τὴν τοῦ κράτους ἀμέριστον
ἰσχύν ἐκληρώστο τον VI Theodora 1, Renauld 2:72 11-3.

533. Chron. VI Theodora 1, Renauld 2:72 13-6.

534. ἐαυτὴν παρηγομαστικῶτερον ἅρρενωσασα καὶ μὴ δεηθεῖσα
παραπετάσματος Chron. VI Theodora 2, Renauld 2:72 2-3.

535. ἐράτου γοῦν ἀρχαιοτάτου σοβαρὰ
τὴ σφυλή ἡμιστεύσουσα, ὡσποδροῦσα τε καὶ διατίσσα, καὶ τὰ μὲν
ἐν ἐπιτολάξ, τὰ δὲ ἐς ἐπιπτέον θεσπίζουσα, καὶ τὰ μὲν ὑψίστα, τὰ δὲ ἐπιτομώτερον προαγγέλλουσα Chron. VI Theodora 2,
Renauld 2:72 3-7.

536. "Οτι μὲν οὖν ἀπρεπὲς ἔσοδε ἐξημαίνων ἐκ ἅρρενωποτέρον
φρουριατός ἐκβιώνθημα μὲν τὴν Ἰωμαίων ἀρχὴν ἐκ πολλῶν τὰς
βασιλείας πρᾶξεις έισότες καὶ τὴν τῶν ὅλων διοίκησιν
ἐπισταμένοι Chron. VI Theodora 4, Renauld 2:73 1-2.
universality of patriarchal values in Byzantium is weakened by the addition: "And even if they did not see this, this is what was the obvious fact."\footnote{537}{Chon. VI Theodora 4, Renault 2:72 3.} However, if Michael Psellos constructs a patriarchal reality, his description of the empire under Theodora’s rule belies it. A utopia is presented:

The empire both remained straight and became magnificent, and no-one of the multitude plotted against the empire nor treated with contempt speeches or decisions from there. And in accordance with the seasons, it turned out well for everybody, and the harvest of the crops thrived; no nation of the many [i.e. who surround Byzantium] either secretly seized and robbed the [possessions] of the Romans nor declared war. Nor was any portion of the polity stirred up, [because] fair dealing was being maintained in everything.\footnote{538}{Chon. VI Theodora 4, Renault 2:73 4-12.}

A description of this utopia’s presiding genius follows. Theodora was expected to enjoy a long life, as she looked younger than her years.\footnote{539}{Chon. VI Theodora 5, Renault 2:73 1-2.}

Her body was not very bent, and indeed she was tall in stature. Nor did it happen [that] she was lacking in understanding if it were necessary to do [something] or to converse for a long time. Sometimes she took [advice] beforehand, othertimes she reasoned it out by herself; she had sufficient accoutrements of...
In spite of this praise, matters required a noble man, versed in civil practice and instructed in imperial letters. No matter how accomplished a woman is, she still fails Psellos’s imperial identification test.

Even before the death of Monomachos, Theodora had been in the habit of consulting Psellos "if she wished to write something secretly or to do something else secretly." When she came to power, he was ordered to attend her (even though he was a monk) and if he knew something of the many (i.e. if he learnt of a plot by courtiers), [he was] not to conceal it from her. However this reliance on Psellos was not because she recognized his superior intellect and political skills (a sure way to win a place in Psellos’s affections), rather it was because she was not very confident in her own judgments, and therefore feared that on account of this, the [affairs] of the empire would go badly, she believed in others rather than herself.

540. ἡ δὲ ἡρά ὀὔτε τὸ σῶμα πάνυ ἐκάμπτετο, καίτοι προμῆχης τὴς ἠλικίας τυγχάνουσα, ὀὔτε δὲν προῆσα ἢ μακρότερον διωλέσασθαι ἐνδείξει τῆς γνώμης ἐτύχον πῶς ἀλα τὰ μὲν προλαμβάνουσα, τὰ δὲ αὐτομάτως ἐνθυμομένη ἀφείρεσαν εἰς πρᾶξιν τὴν διάφθειραν τούτων καὶ τὴν τῆς γράμματος περιβολήν Chron. VI Theodora 5, Renauld 2:73 2-8.

541. τῶν δὲ γε πραγμάτων δεομένων ἀνδρὸς γενναίου καὶ τὰς τις πολιτικὰς πράξεις εἰδότος, τὰς τε βασιλείους ἐπιστολὰς ἀκριβοῦντος Chron. VI Theodora 6, Renauld 2:74 1-3.

542. εἰ τι γράψειν ἀπὸρρητον βουλοῦτο ὁ ἄλλο τι ποιήσειν τῶν κεκρυμμένων Chron. VI Theodora 13, Renauld 2:78 10-1.


544. οὖ γὰρ πάνυ τι θαρροῦσα τῶς οἰκείας γνώμαις, εἶτα δὴ δεδομένα μὴ παρὰ ταύτα τὰ τῆς βασιλείας ἔχει κακῶς, ἑτέρως ἢ ἑαυτῇ μάλλον ἐπιστευεῖν Chron. VI Theodora 15, Renauld 2:79 2-5.
Though she greatly admired Monomachos even after his death, and wished to neglect nothing which he had done, "yet she failed in her aim entirely, and through this, the many things which he had done were destroyed." The greatest folly, however, was her failure - led by the courtiers - to provide for the succession:

They wished to entrust no-one with power [i.e. the empire], neither to preside over the best change-over in things [i.e. the empire], nor someone who would remove them from the deepest and most shameful stupidity.

Pselllos, the chosen counsellor, engages in damage limitation. He could not support such undertakings, and whispered privately, criticizing the government, to those people in whom he had confidence.

I was amazed, knowing this one [Theodora] was pious towards holy things, but love of sovereign power had seduced her to break the law.

Pselllos does not know whether this change in attitude to the Most High was a return to a normal state, her previous conduct having been

---

545. διημάρτησε δὲ τοῦ σκοποῦ· διὰ ταύτα πλείστα δὲν ἐκείνος ἐπεπράξει διέφθαρτο· Chron. VI Theodora 15, Renauld 2:79 8-9.

546. καὶ μηδένα βούλεσθαι ἐπιστήσαι τῷ κράτει, μηδὲ τὴν ἀριστημεταβολὴν προτανείσαι τοῖς πράγμασι, τὰς δὲ αὐτοὺς τὴν ἑσχάτης καὶ αἰσχρότης ἐξαιρεῖται εὐθέως; Chron. VI Theodora 15, Renauld 2:79 21-4.

547. τὰς τοιούτας προχειρίσεις Chron. VI Theodora 16, Renauld 2:79 2.

548. καθηπτόμην τοῦ πράγματος Chron. VI Theodora 16, Renauld 2:79 4-5.

deceit, or if this was the deceit to protect herself from the many. In part it may have been a response to the patriarchal attitude suitably displayed by the Patriarch Kerularios. Before Theodora came into the supreme power, she acted devotedly and reverently towards him, but then when she was ruling, she cut herself off from him and turned away from him completely. This was because he made no secret of his opposition to the empire of the Romans being ruled by a woman. Theodora would have deposed Michael Kerularios had not her own life been cut short.

During his description of the embassy composed of Michael Psellos, Theodore Alopos and Constantine Leichoudes, dispatched by Michael VI to the rebel Isaak Komnenos, Psellos provides two further examples of the male ideal. The Curopalates John, Isaak's brother, is described as

an adaptable and active man with courage, who spoke well, was better keeping silence and even better when thinking deeply; this was the Duke John, who inherited bravery and steadiness [under fire] from ancestors of the past.

550 Ch. VI Theodora 16, Renauld 2:80 8-12.

551 Kai to ton pro tis autokratorias chronon oikeiota protokemevna kai sebomevna, epeioi kathorwerten ebaptopolevei apthavento te kai apostrefeto. Ch. VI Theodora 17, Renauld 2:80 4-6.

552 Atinon de tis toimias metabolhs to dusanassatein kakeinon upo gynaiaki ta. Romaios agesthein pragmata. Ch. VI Theodora 17, Renauld 2:80 6-8.

553 Ch. VI Theodora 17, Renauld 2:80 10-2.

554 Athi oin to genaio avghistorofos kai drastrhros, eipein te kresttan kai woperai ajmeinw kai eustymhnae beltw, o doux Iwasteis, dei parrothan kai eke progonw to genaio kai stathron ekeklhrio. Ch. VII Michael VI 22, Renauld 2:95 16-9.
The second example comes from the full diplomatic reception of the embassy by Isaak Komnenos. Isaak is described as the emperor (ὁ βασιλεὺς), seated on a double finialed throne, with a footstool beneath his feet and a magnificent robe wrapped round his body. He "braced" his head up high, and puffed out his chest. The strain of doing so made his cheeks darken. His eyes were fixed in meditation and showed a heart full of thought.555 The description of Isaak Komnenos as emperor-proper, rather than as rebel, begins by stressing the two-fold nature of his character. In his official capacity, he was severe and hard (ἁπτόμω τε καὶ σκληρῷ), but at home or when advancing officials it was different. "He believed in two paradoxical things [at the same time]."556 Moving from the soft aspect to the severe,

his face changed and his eyes flashed and his brow beetled, as if there was a cloud in front of the splendour of his spirit, if I can say it like that.557

The description combines the lack of idle chatter with emphasis on Isaak's silence, signifying intelligent thoughts within.558 He was more economical in speech than anyone else, never letting loose his tongue

all at once, nor showing deficiently the meaning of his spirit. When dealing with foreign ambassadors, the extravagant wealth of Byzantium was displayed in Isaak's dress and words.

Isaak's wife and eldest daughter are introduced in the account of his death. The empress Catherine, daughter of John Vladislav of Bulgaria, is described:

She was marvellous of womenkind; and of the nobility, in the first rank; she yielded to no-one of greater excellence.

The empress was attended by her daughter. This daughter was beautiful, [more beautiful] of the two [Catherine and her daughter], but cut off as regards beauty, but even after the cutting [of her hair], the same was amber-like and flame-coloured, and she was more majestic than her mother, physically.

These two women, together with two male relations - the Curopalates John and a nephew - form a chorus. They urge Isaak to leave the Blachernai and to return to the Great Palace to safeguard their

---


position. Once in the Great Palace, all the family sat round Isaak lamenting, but the empress and her daughter are singled out. Catherine Komnene makes an extended appearance at this point because of her opposition to Psellos. When Isaak Komnenos indicated that he wished to die as a monk not as an emperor, Catherine suspected Psellos. Isaak protested that Catherine, showing affection like a woman, stopped him when he wished for higher things, and accused everyone rather than he himself [of having] the idea. She, however, would have none of it, and proceeded to paint a grim picture of the life in store for herself and her daughter:

Have you no pity on my destitution? What sort of spirit do you have that you will go out from the imperial palace? You will leave me in the hardest widowhood to bear, and your daughter in the most dreadful state of being an orphan. And these things will not suffice for us, and more dreadful things will come to pass, and hands - not obviously friendly ones - will take us away into distant banishment, or they may decide something worse, and a man, not knowing [how] to be merciful, will see your nearest and dearest of your blood. And you will live through your transformation, or equally you will die better, but for us there remains a life more bitter than death.
In blunt fashion, the empress enunciates the fate that awaits the wife of an ex-emperor, when there is no male heir of the body. The patriarchal value-set of Byzantine succession is clear here. Catherine’s powers of persuasion were insufficient, but she did persuade Isaak to choose as a successor someone who would act as a child to her.\textsuperscript{570} The successor chosen was Constantine Doukas, "a conspicuous man, having as family those of the first rank."\textsuperscript{571} His origins merited honour\textsuperscript{572}, but more to the point "brilliant were his family ancestors, but he was even more brilliant by his own nature and principles."\textsuperscript{573} "So that he would not be judged on his own appearance, he drew a cloud in front of himself, as if he were some kind of sun", before he became emperor.\textsuperscript{574} One of the reasons for Constantine Doukas’s favourable description from Psellos was that he favoured Psellos above all other advisers.\textsuperscript{575} Psellos in turn portrays Constantine as

\textsuperscript{570}\textsuperscript{575} Chron. VII Isaak Komnenos 82, Renauld 2:133 12-22.

\textsuperscript{571} Chron. VII Isaak Komnenos 83, Renauld 2:133 1-5.

\textsuperscript{572} Chron. VII Isaak Komnenos 83, Renauld 2:134 7-8.

\textsuperscript{573} Chron. VII Isaak Komnenos 84, Renauld 2:134 1-2.

\textsuperscript{574} Chron. VII Isaak Komnenos 84, Renauld 2:134 12-4.

\textsuperscript{575} Chron. VII Isaak Komnenos 85, Renauld 2:135 8-9.

\textsuperscript{576} Chron. VII Isaak Komnenos 86, Renauld 2:135 5-11.
being carried up to the vantage point of the empire, not through the lobby of rebellion, but from the lawful sanctuary.576

Constantine X Doukas’s family is described as graceful and well-favoured. Psellus uses again the conceit of Achilles and describes Constantine X as surpassing his ancestors becoming eminent in all manner of virtue.578 He married a notable woman, of beautiful appearance, who ornamented her life with wisdom.579 When his first wife died, he then married Eudokia Makrembolitissa:

She is well-born and has a noble understanding, and is very beautiful in appearance.580

As well as this description of the empress Eudokia, the emperor’s brother is described when Constantine X promoted him to Caesar. His promotion did not reduce his brother’s affection for him and the new caesar was made a partner in the governing councils.581 The

576. ἦνα μὴ ἐκ τυραννικῶν προθύρων, ἀλλ’ ἐξ ἐνυόμων ἀδύτων εἰς τὴν τῆς βασιλείας ἀναχθεῖν περιωμῆν. Chron. VII Isaak Komnenos 88, Renaud 2:136 21-3; see also Chron. VII Constantine X 8, Renaud 2:142 5-6.
579. γυναῖκα δὲ γάμως καὶ γένει περιφυτῇ...καὶ κάλλει διαστρεβῇ, σωφροσύνῃ τὸν βίον ἐκόσμησεν. Chron. VII Constantine X 6, Renaud 2:141 16-20.
description continues, with the reason why he was admitted to the
imperial councils:

For this man was adorned with quick comprehension, elevated
thought and dexterity towards government.582

It was under the authority of this man, as if under a father, that
Constantine X Doukas placed his own children, when threatened with
illness.583

Constantine survived the illness when he entrusted his children to
the Caesar John584, but when his final illness struck, he entrusted his
sons - "exactly like their father, carrying his character in both their
spirits and bodies"585 - to Eudokia, his wife.

She was thought by her husband to be the most intelligent of
all her time, and an exact fit for the education of their
children.586

The way Eudokia is described as being thought by her husband to be
the most intelligent, serves as an indicator that her intelligence and
suitability as educator of their children was a sham, which in turn
serves to introduce Psellus’s account of Eudokia’s reign.

582. ἔκεκόσιμητο γὰρ καὶ ὁ ὑπὲρ οὗτος συνέσει καὶ μεγαλοφροσύνη
καὶ τῇ περὶ τὰ πράγματα δεξιότητι Chron. VII Constantine X 26,
Renauld 2:150-1 4-5.

583. ὠσπερ ὑπὸ πατρὶ τοὺς ἰδίους παῖδας πεποίηται, Chron. VII
Constantine X 26, Renauld 2:151 7.


585. πατρῴζομενος ἀκριβῶς καὶ τὸν ἐκείνου χαρακτῆρα ἐν τῇ φυσὶ

586. συφρονεστάτη τε τῶν καθ’ ἑαυτὴν νοοικομένη τἀνδρὶ καὶ
παιδοτρόφησαί ἀκριβεστάτη Chron. VII Constantine X 27, Renauld
2:151 4-5.
Eudokia's coming to power was not as autonomous as Zoë's or Theodora's:

the empress Eudokia became mistress of everything in accordance with the dispositions of her husband and emperor.\footnote{587}

However, like Theodora,

she did not make the empire over to others. She did not intend to keep busy at home, nor in the end to entrust the administration to others, but she was girded about, and became the mistress of all government.\footnote{588}

"At first" - which of course suggests that it was different later on - "she affected a frugal state, displaying nothing excessive either in ornamentation or in processions."\footnote{589} She carried out all aspects of the government\footnote{590}, "for so great was the superiority of her intelligence".\footnote{591}

Her sons were associated with her, but they were full of fear and veneration.\footnote{592}

\footnote{587} Ἡ βασιλίς Εὐδοκία, κατὰ τὰς τοῦ ὀνόμας καὶ βασιλέως διατάξεις τῶν ἄλον ἐγκρατής γενομένη Chron. VII Eudokia 1, Renauld 2:152 1-2.

\footnote{588} οὐκ ἔχε ἐτέροις τὴν βασιλείαν πεποίηται, οὐδ' αὕτη μὲν οἰκουρεῖν τὰ πολλὰ ἡξίου, τῶν δὲ ἐν τέλει τισι πιστεῦειν τὰ πράγματα, ἀλλ' αὕτη περιζωσμένη τὴν δυναστείαν τῆς ἄλον ηγεμονίας γίνεται. Chron. VII Eudokia 1, Renauld 2:152 2-6.

\footnote{589} λίτως τε τὰ πρωτα διακειμένη καὶ μηδὲν τι περιττόν ἐπὶ τε κόσμους καὶ προοδοὶς ἐμφαίνουσα Chron. VII Eudokia 1, Renauld 2:152 6-7.

\footnote{590} Chron. VII Eudokia 1, Renauld 2:152 7-10.

\footnote{591} τοσοῦτον γὰρ αὕτη τὸ περὶ τοῦ φρουρίου. Chron. VII Eudokia 1, Renauld 2:152 11.

\footnote{592} Chron. VII Eudokia 1, Renauld 2:153 12-3.
Psellos maintains that it was not surprising that Constantine should defer to his mother, for after all he was "a child and not able to comprehend government". For Michael, however, it was different:

Some time previously, he had come to man’s estate, and had a grown intellect.

Psellos finds it impossible to praise Michael sufficiently for this reticence.

I saw him many times, able to speak in his mother’s presence, but keeping silence as if not able to speak and able to do everything no matter what, but holding himself aloof from the transactions of government.

Eudokia did not ignore Michael, but trained him. He was to appoint officials and to sit in judgment. "And quietly, she led him on in all those activities befitting an emperor." Part of this training was to hand Michael over to Psellos. This was the arcadian idyll which would have continued "had not some demon opposed the way things were being done."


596. ἅλλ’ εἰδον τοῦτον ἐγὼ πολλάκις λέγειν μὲν δυνάμενον ἐπὶ τῆς μητρὸς, συμπέπτεται δὲ ὡσπερ οὐ δυνάμενον λέγειν, καὶ πράττει μὲν πᾶν ὁτιοῦν ἔχοντο συνεχοῦς, πράξεως δὲ βασιλικῶν ἄπειρόμενον Chron. VII Eudokia 2, Renauld 2:153 10-3.


Psellos describes Eudokia in positive terms to begin with:

I do not know if ever there was another example of wisdom among women.600

He does not say that after this point her intelligence changes, but that it loses its exactitude, and she does not retain the same manner of thinking as before, though at least she was not consumed by passion (σοφίας ἐπιθυμίας).601 Protesting too much, Psellos says "For the life of the palace was not even a pleasure to her"602; but what did motivate her was fear for her sons.

This empress was of steady habits and a noble spirit, but the flowing rivers pounded her tower of sensible arguments, and she inclined to the second bed of a man [i.e. to marry for a second time].603

The most dreadful part of this inclination was that it was done without consulting Psellos.604

Once Romanos IV Diogenes - described as of an ancient and well-favoured family605 - came to the throne, "he quickly returned to his own character."606


The more she [Eudokia] wished to control him [Romanos IV], and to keep [him] as a [caged] lion, the one who prevails, the more he could not abide the bit and glared dreadfully at [Eudokia's] hands which restrained him.607

What Romanos wanted was to rule by himself and to have control of everything completely by himself.608 This was the goal of any man worthy of the empire - contrast this with Michael's deference to his mother even though he met Romanos IV with true imperial stoicism "changing neither spirit nor colour"609 - but Romanos lacked the deed of a man610 to bring his desire to fruition.

In his conduct at Manzikert, Psellos praises Romanos for his personal bravery611, but criticizes the way, as a general, he did not distance himself from the heat of battle.612

With the capture of Romanos IV on the field of Manzikert, the capital was in confusion as to who was to govern. At first the decision


609. μηδὲν διαλλάξας μήτε τῆς ψυχῆς μήτε τοῦ χρώματος Chron. VII Eudokia 8, Renauld 2:156 10-1.


was that Eudokia and her sons should rule together, but pressure soon developed that Eudokia should rule alone, exerted by those who wished to make the empire their own, and concerned themselves with a view to profit to the organization of the government.

With a view to gaining the upper hand, they fermented trouble between Michael and Eudokia.

Romanos IV's release by Alp Arslan threw the government once more into turmoil. Eudokia "was in two minds as to what she ought to do." Psellus advised the rejection of Romanos IV, and Michael finally adopted a wise policy - he separated from his mother and became his own man. The empress, meanwhile, was not really herself, but covered her head with a veil and followed the road down to some underground sanctuary. Eudokia was exiled and forced to become a nun.

The caesar John Doukas's sons sent as generals against Diogenes are idealized men. The younger son had a ready hand and a keen and marvellous wit, most distinguished in knowing what to do and in

---

614. οἱ τὴν βασιλείαν ἑαυτῶν ποιεῖν βουλόμενοι, καὶ κέρδους τοῦ σφετέρου ἑνεκα τὰ περὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν πραγματεύεσθαι Chron. VII Romanos IV 24, Renaud 2:163 8-10.
615. ἀμφίβολος ἢν ὃ τι καὶ δράσειεν Chron. VII Romanos IV 27, Renaud 2:164 4.
616. ἀποτρέχει τῆς μητρὸς καὶ ἑαυτοῦ γίνεται Chron. VII Romanos IV 28, Renaud 2:165 4-5.
617. Ἡ μὲντοι γε βασιλικὲς οὐδὲ καθετὴ ἤν, ἀλλὰ τῆς κεφαλῆς περιελμένη τὸ κολίμμα, κατατείχει δρόμου ἐπὶ τί σπήλαιον ἄσυτον Chron. VII Romanos IV 29, Renaud 2:165 4-6.
618. Chron. VII Romanos IV 30-1, Renaud 2:166.
explaining it. He was a winged horseman. The eldest son, Andronikos was "an admirable man, with a free understanding, a kindly and suitable spirit."

Psellos's description of Michael VII continues the themes already established.

His appearance was somewhat old, similar to what befits a moral tutor or teacher. For his eyes were steady and his brow neither haughty nor suspicious and pressing down on his eyes, but free and with a fitting appearance. His gait was neither hurried and agitated, nor lazy and sluggish. Any musical man, who has made his study of rising [fourths etc.] and scales would praise it [his walk]. The pitch of his voice is harmonious and rhythmical. The flow of his tongue does not spurt forth nor is it obscure nor unpleasant to the ear.

Similarly, Maria of Alania, married to Michael VII, is praised on account of her family, fortunate and ancient, her character and her beauty, neither of which is equalled by anyone else. Finally if silence is the ornament of women, then she is more ornamented than all others.

---


621. ἄνηρ καὶ ἕλκιαν ἀξιοθέατος καὶ τὴν γνώμην ἑλεύθερος, τὴν τε ψυχὴν εὐμενῆς καὶ ἐπιεικεστάτος Chron. VII Romanos IV 36, Renaud 2:168 3-5.

622. Τὸ δὲ ἐδός αὐτῷ πρεσβυτικὸν οἶον καὶ σωφρονιστὴ προσήκου ἢ παϊδαγχωμός ὅμοιον· πεπήγε τε γὰρ αὐτῷ τὰ δόματα καὶ ἡ ὀφθαλμὸς οὔτε σοφαρά οὔτε οἶον ὑποπτος καὶ ἐπικατημένη τοῖς ὀφθαλμῶις, ἀλλ' ἐλευθέρα καὶ ἐν τῷ προσήκοντι σχῆματι τὸ δὲ βαδίσμα οὔτε σεζομένου καὶ οἶον ταραχώδεστατον οὔτε ἀργὸν τε καὶ ἅθυμου, ἀλλ' οἶον μοισίκος τε ἄνηρ ἐπανέσειε περὶ ἄρσεις καὶ θέσεις τὴν προφανείαν ποιομένου, ὅ τε τῆς φοινίκος τόνος ἐμμελής τε καὶ εὐφύςμον, μῆτε κακλαίων τῷ τῆς γλώττης ῥημάτι, μῆτε ἀμαρτίας καὶ δυσήκους. Chron. VII Michael VII 5, Renaud 2:175 1-10.
for no-one other than her husband hears her voice. She happens to be beautiful of herself, rather than needing to make herself beautiful.623

Pséllos and Outsiders by Gender.

What conclusions may be drawn from Pséllos’s portrayal of gendered subjects? Firstly, and most importantly given the stress placed on the role of rhetorical custom in Byzantine literary composition, is that conceits are used to give expression to the experience of the women and men who people The Chronographia. What may seem to be merely a repeated empty phrase - s/he came of a good and ancient family - serves to locate the actors as "one of us", but furthermore the stress on the longevity of good fortune in Byzantium shows a particular concern of Pséllos.

Secondly, the subject matter of The Chronographia affects the presentation of gender ideals. The male attributes are envisaged in an imperial context and so are not universally applicable. The way in which the scales are weighted towards imperial values also causes problems when dealing with women. Pséllos does not share Michael Kerularios’s absolute abhorrence of women in charge of the empire. The individual reigns of Theodora and Eudokia receive censure, but then these empresses chose to take advice from others. A woman on the throne was recognized as a courtier’s opportunity, just as was a

623 Ἐθέρας ἢ ἐμφανίζει τὴν μονημονία καὶ ἠρχαίαττι πᾶσαν ὑπεραίρου ἀρχήν, ἀρκεῖ αὐτῇ ἀπ’ πάντων τὸ ἣδος ὅπως ὧμεν ἐτέρας ἐξευξεῖ τοῦ ἐνδωρθέον ὧμεν ἐτέρας ὄψεως· εἰ δὲ γυναιξὶ κόσμου ἡ σιγὴ φέρει, κατὰ τὸν πραγματικὸν, κόσμου πιστὸς αὐτῇ τιμωτέρα καθέστηκεν, ὅτι μηδεὶς τῷ [sic] ἔλλω ἢ τῷ ἀνδρὶ τὴν γλώτταν ἐγνώρισεν, αὐτοματικά καλλιών τυχανόον ἢ ὅπως ἀναγκαῖως ἔχοι κοιμήσασθαι. Chron. VII Michael VII 9, Renaud 2:177 4-11.
weak man. Theodora and Eudokia failed Psellos by looking elsewhere for advice, and suffered accordingly in his book. Were women always equated with weak men? Yes, at least in terms of the throne; this is best seen in the joint rule of Zoë and Theodora. Their reign is presented as ideal, yet beneath the surface is the problem that they were women, and what they really needed was a man.

The portrayal of Zoë is complex. She does not busy herself with distaff, looms and weaving, but then none of the women in The Chronographia do. With the stereotype fallen, the next possibility would be to portray her as the antithesis of the stereotype. Largely, however, this does not happen. Psellos is obviously ill at ease with the sexual voracity of one who is of riper years; in common with mediaeval medical practitioners, he has regard for his authorities, which tell him that with the fiftieth year, the menopause should cause a reduction in desire, and yet he records the evidence before him.

The women of Psellos’s Chronographia live in a society of patriarchal attitudes; they are likely to be identified as men’s daughters, wives - or indeed mistresses - widows and mothers, rather than as individuals. That said, however, it would be wrong to read backwards to Byzantium late-Victorian patriarchy. Byzantine patriarchy must be understood in its Byzantine context.

Women occupied the throne in The Chronographia, three times in fifty years. The reigns were of short duration only, and ended when the empresses married, but women were accepted on the throne and legitimized their consorts. It was unusual, but it did happen; eleventh-
century Byzantium was not so patriarchal as to discount the possibility completely.

Both women and men in The Chronographia were well-born, beautiful and well-proportioned, had ready wits which directed their fair expression through melodious voices. Both genders should meet trials with reserved stoicism, and rise above them. Men, to Psellos, have an additional quality, physical bravery on the battlefield. No mention is given to any female equivalent. Childbirth is the example of physical endurance in the female experience. Unsurprisingly, it is not mentioned by Psellos; Anna Komnene gives it an oblique reference when talking of the miraculous events associated with her own birth.624

624. Alexiad VI 8 ii, Leib 2:61 4-15.
CHAPTER FIVE
OUTSIDERS BY RELIGION IN
KOMNENE’S ALEXIAD.

Treatments of mediaeval heresy are usually expositions of what the heretics believed\(^1\), or attempts to explain the origins of the heresy.\(^2\) However, heresy has no reality; it is a social construct.\(^3\) Being poor does not predispose an individual to heresy, but being poor - part of the non-élite, the "non-U" masses - may dispose an individual to opposing the articulated dominant power structure by any available means, which may include rejection of the dominant religious ideology. Similarly, being poor increases the likelihood that the people who articulate the dominant ideology may cast such a person in an outsider role as a heretic. So far, I have mentioned only socio-economic origins for heresy; but heresy may also be an intellectual choice in the religious sphere. Within this intellectual realm, heresy


\(^2\) Gordon Leff, Heresy in the Later Middle Ages: The Relation of Heterodoxy to Dissent, c.1250-1450 (New York, 1967); R. I. Moore, The Birth of Popular Heresy (London, 1975); also his The Origin of European Dissent (London, 1977); Jeffrey Burton Russell, Dissent and Reform in the Early Middle Ages (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1965).

\(^3\) Ladurie, Montaillou (Harmondsworth, 1980); Leon Neal McCrillis, The Demonization of Minority Groups in Christian Society during the Central Middle Ages (Ann Arbor, 1974).
can be subdivided into attempts at reforming the dominant religious structures; basic misunderstandings of complex theological ideas (rustic heretics); and dualist heresies - either absolute or mitigated. Adopting the labellist perspective to deviation, I do not deal with what Byzantine heretics believed, nor with the origins of those beliefs. Rather I examine how Anna Komnene defined and portrayed certain individuals and groups as outsiders by religion.

The portrayal of religious outsiders in The Alexiad is twofold. First there is the detailed description of those individuals whom Anna Komnene portrays as heretics. Secondly, there are those more generalized references to heretical groups, including other religions


(Islam, Judaism), or other Churches (Latin Christianity), as well as heresy (Paulicianism or Bogomilism) per se.

Individuals.

The place to begin is Anna’s description of her father’s confrontation with Basil the Bogomil. To start at the end rather than at the beginning is perhaps unusual in history, but then The Alexiad is unusual history. Book XV is the climax of the work, where Anna Komnene draws together all the themes she has been developing. Alexios is shown to be a great hero and the saviour of the empire; his áνδρεία on the battlefield is shown by his defeat of the Turks, which also places him in the context of defending the Christian oecumene; his φλάνθρωπία is shown by the foundation of the Orphanotropheion; his defeat of heretics shows Alexios to be πίστος ἐν Χριστῷ, and by extension to be guarded by God. Having reiterated his credentials established in earlier books of The Alexiad, Anna Komnene is able to allow the final catastrophe to play itself out, whereby Alexios dies and the succession passes to John II Komnenos.

An ellipsis hides the date of the Basil the Bogomil episode. Anna leads her reader to conclude that the confrontation with Basil the Bogomil took place just before Alexios’s death in 1118, rather than sometime in the period 1097-1100, its most likely date.


7. Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τοῦ ἑτοὺς...δισπερώντος τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ Alexiad XV viii 1, Leib 3:218 28-29.
Basil the Bogomil's heresy is introduced as a major set piece. Rather than a growing awareness, it springs full grown upon an unsuspecting world:

a great cloud of heretics arose; and the appearance of this heresy was new, never previously known to the church.\(^8\)

Whilst it was new and unknown - and presumably more to be feared on that account - the heresy was also the union of Manichaeanism (which Anna confusingly identifies with "the Paulician heresy") with the notorious notions of the Massalians. To prevent any suggestion that her intention was not clear, and that her text was being misinterpreted, Anna states again that the Bogomil dogmas developed from Massalian and Manichaean ideas.\(^9\)

Having established Bogomilism's credentials as a heresy in the usual mediaeval fashion,\(^10\) Anna turns to the description of Bogomilism as her father found it. This was not a theological error pronounced from the pulpit or to students, by a teacher led astray by demons. It was a race, a well established sect, which was only now emerging from secrecy.\(^11\) The emphasis on a great cloud suddenly emerging makes Alexios's victory all the more amazing. Anna

---

\(^8\) "mégistou épegeíreítai néfoς aíreítikwv, kai tò tìs aírēsewv eídov kai nòv, mēpam próteron égnwsménov tì̂ ekklē̂sià. Alexiad XV viii 1, Leib 3:218 29-31.

\(^9\) Alexiad XV viii 1, Leib 3:218-9 31-5.

\(^10\) i.e. uniting them with previously condemned beliefs.

\(^11\) "Kαὶ ὡς ἔσοικεν, ἦν μὲν καὶ τοῖς πρὸ τούμου ποτὲ ἡμῶν, ἑλαῦες ἐκ δὲ δεινὸτατοῦ γὰρ τὸ Βογομιλῶν γένος φρετήν ὑποκρίνασθαι, Alexiad XV viii 1, Leib 3:219 5-7. Note it is to Βογομιλῶν γένος; the link between Christian heresy and different race is not made explicit."
describes this dwelling in secrecy as one of the major Bogomil characteristics.\textsuperscript{12} Interestingly, given Beck's \textit{dicta} concerning hairlength,\textsuperscript{13} she begins with the fact that no worldly hairstyles are to be found among the Bogomils.\textsuperscript{14} The Bogomils concealed the evil under cloak and cowl. With sombre demeanour and hidden faces, they walk with their heads down, muttering, but inside they are like a ravening wolf.\textsuperscript{15} In her introduction to the Bogomilism episode, Anna has established the clear link between Bogomils and Manichaeans and Massalians, or rather she has done so on Byzantine terms. The Bogomils are thus heretical without a shadow of a doubt. They are to be feared because they are well established and because their skill in dissimulation makes them hard to track down. As with all other enemies of Alexios, Anna is careful to portray the Bogomils as opponents worthy of Alexios's skill. It was a race of the shadows\textsuperscript{16} hiding like snakes in a hole, which Alexios brought out into the light, by incantations\textsuperscript{17} which is an interesting positive use of "magical" practices in \textit{The Alexiad}. With the Bogomils now established as

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{12} \textit{Alexiad XV viii 1}, Leib 3:219 6-7.
\item \textsuperscript{13} Beck, "Formes de non-conformisme," 315-328.
\item \textsuperscript{14} \textit{Ka̱i τρίχα μὲν κασμικὴν οὐκ ἂν ἰδοὺς βογομιλίκουσαν Alexiad XV viii 1}, Leib 3:219 7-8.
\item \textsuperscript{15} \textit{κέκρυπται δὲ τὸ κακὸν ὑπὸ τὸν μαυρὸν καὶ τὸ κουκούλιον. Καὶ ἐσκυθρώπακεν ὁ Βογομιλὸς καὶ μέχρι ρυμός σκέπτεται καὶ κεκυφώς βαδίζει καὶ ὑποψισθορίζει τὸ στόμα, τάνυσθι δὲ λύκος ἐστὶν ἀκάθεκτος. Alexiad XV viii 1}, Leib 3:219 8-11.
\item \textsuperscript{16} \textit{τὸ ἔθνος τοιοῦτον ὃν δυσφορώτατον Alexiad XV viii 2}, Leib 3:219 12.
\item \textsuperscript{17} \textit{ἐπωρδὼν ἵππειν ἀπορρήτους Alexiad XV viii 2}, Leib 3:219 13.
\end{itemize}
worthy opponents, Anna places the events into Alexios’s career as she has presented it: having dealt with enemies east and west, he turns to spiritual opponents. Alexios excelled everyone at everything: he was better at teaching than teachers, just as he surpassed the generals most noted for their conduct of arms.

The Bogomils were endemic. Basil the Bogomil, who is described as a monk, not as a former monk, was the cause. In parody of Christ, Basil had twelve disciples, whom he called apostles. As a monk, the imputation that he consorted with women may just have been the standard slur. However, it may be that there is a secondary meaning in that just as Basil is compared to Christ in his apostles, so he is compared with Alexios by the women in his life. Basil is being shown to be moving in the same direction, cooperating with women to further his own ends. The difference is that Basil has been corrupted by heresy, and so the women he consorts with are "of bad character, utterly depraved."

---


souls who were lost to it forced Alexios's hand. The significant feature of Basil the Bogomil's efforts seems to have been that they took place within the capital itself. To be a heretic in the sticks was one thing, but to have heretics in Constantinople was something entirely different. It would seem that for all their concealment, their wearing of cowls and cloaks, the Bogomils were easily identified, as Alexios initiated his investigation by having some of the Bogomils brought to the palace. The ease with which a group of Bogomils could be rounded up in the capital must raise the question as to what extent the accused were actually Bogomils themselves. That dualism was not rare is not surprising, but given Anna's description of how they concealed themselves, it is perhaps to be doubted that all the suspects were actually Bogomils. The second problem arises from the nature of Byzantine treatment of heretics in general. As we shall see, the heretics were held in prison, but it was rare for them to suffer a worse fate. Indeed, if they recanted, there was the possibility that they would receive benefits at the emperor's hands. The terror that an accusation by the Dominican inquisition could instill in late mediaeval western Europe does not seem to have developed, at least not yet. Given the absence of the notion that it was better to burn an innocent


25. Paul Magdalino, "Constantinople and the έξω χώρα in the time of Balsamon", in Byzantium in the Twelfth Century, ed. N. Oikonomides (forthcoming). I am grateful to Dr. Magdalino giving me access to a typescript of this article.

than to permit a heretic to live, then it is possible that for some
elements in society, the role of reformed heretic may have been a
method of career advancement, even though fraught with difficulties.
In any case, when questioned in the imperial palace, the suspects were
only too willing to denounce Basil the Bogomil as the leader.\textsuperscript{27}
Having given the general outline of what happened, Anna Komnene
then provides a more detailed picture of what happened in these
interrogations. Diblatios was one of the accused, and he was
imprisoned. As he refused to answer the questions, he was put to
torture. In the end he denounced Basil the Bogomil, and named the
twelve apostles who made up the leadership of the sect. Men were
dispatched to find Basil the Bogomil.\textsuperscript{28} Basil, named as the
archisatrap\textsuperscript{29} of Satanel\textsuperscript{30}, is brought to the light. Basil is described as
being dressed in a monk’s habit, with a pinched face, a sparse beard,

\textsuperscript{27} \textit{Alexiad} XV viii 3, Leib 3:219 28-30.

\textsuperscript{28} \textit{Alexiad} XV viii 3, Leib 3:219-20 30-4.

\textsuperscript{29} \textit{άρχισατράπης} \textit{Alexiad} XV viii 3, Leib 3:220 4. The term is used
more normally (nine out of ten) by Anna Komnene to refer to a
12-13.

\textsuperscript{30} \textit{Σατάναλ} “\textit{Σατάνας}, name of \textit{Σαταναν} \textit{πρωτον} \textit{ελεγμόμενο}, \textit{o}
\textit{φρουρέωντα} \textit{αγγελος} \textit{θεου} \textit{Ev.Barth.} 4:25” in G.W.H. Lampe, \textit{A
and said: If you wilt know my name, at the first I was called Satanel,
which is interpreted a messenger of God, but when I rejected the
image of God my name was called Satanas, that is, an angel that
keepeth hell (Tartarus)." Montague R. James, \textit{The Apocryphal New
Testament Corrected Ed.} (Oxford, 1953), 175 for Gospel of
Bartholomew 4:25; 166 for introduction to Gospel of Bartholomew.
Anna Komnene’s use of the name Satanel is interesting, given the
importance of the name in the myths of the Balkan dualists.
and being quite tall. The habit shows the ease with which the Bogomil hides his true nature, whilst the mention of the beard brings us back once more to Beck’s considerations of non-conformity. His height is mentioned to raise his stature with regard to Alexios as an opponent. The Byzantines regarded height as an advantage, and so the presentation of Basil the Bogomil as a tall man, means that Alexios will not suffer loss of face in dealing with him directly.

The first interaction between Alexios and Basil the Bogomil was not as violent as might have been expected. The emperor, hoping to gain more information from Basil by subterfuge than by torture, invited the heresiarch to the palace, on the pretext that he wished to learn more about Basil’s teachings. Part of this pretense was that the emperor rose from his throne when Basil entered the imperial presence, and Basil was urged to sit in the imperial presence. Basil the Bogomil is still described as a monk, even though one whose evil had many shapes. Given the presentation of Basil the Bogomil [ie. as heresy incarnate] it is curious that he is identified as a monk. This may indicate one of two things. Either in Byzantine society the notion


32. See the descriptions by Psellos of the various troop contingents; the descriptions of the Norman protagonists by Anna herself, and the transmission in the Icelandic sagas, by which Alexios becomes Kyr Alex the tall.

33. Alexiad XV viii 4, Leib 3:220 9-11. Note the outrage this caused when the western knight tried to do the same thing in Alexios’s presence Alexiad X x 6, Leib 2:229 8-17.

34. τῷ μοναχῷ τούτῳ καὶ πολλῷ τὴν κακίαν φέρον ἐνέχει διὰ παντοῦν Alexiad XV viii 4, Leib 3:220 14-5.
of monk is so loose that if one is dressed as a monk, then one is a monk; or the monastic discipline is so loose that roles of monk and heretic are frequently combined. The trap is laid out for our inspection. Alexios pretended that he wished to become Basil’s disciple, in order to save his immortal soul. Alexios treated Basil’s words as if they were a divinely inspired oracle. Anna Komnene relates that Alexios’s brother the Sebastokrator Isaak was also party to the deception, and indeed the oblique phraseology suggests that the idea of deception may originally have been Isaak’s. Though cautious at first, Basil eventually gave way to the temptation of having the emperor as a convert, and revealed the Bogomil doctrine. A stenographer concealed behind a curtain in the women’s quarters took down verbatim Basil’s teachings. In her precis of the Bogomil doctrine as recorded from Basil’s words, Anna Komnene says that he misconstrued orthodox theology, denounced the ecclesiastical


38. Alexiad XV viii 5, Leib 3:221 3-7. It is of note that the secretary is placed behind a curtain in the women’s quarters γυναικών. If the women’s quarters are to be conceived of as a kind of harem or purdah, then the explanation is that the γυναικών was a eunuch. The dénouement of the play, when Alexios throws back the curtain [XV viii 6, Leib 3:221 17-8], indicates that the division between the male and female quarters of the palace at this point seems to have been more a corridor, with a draught-excluder curtain, than a grille as one would see a synagogue for example.
organization, and held the churches to be the abodes of devils. The final indignity was that he held the sacrifice of the Liturgy to be meaningless.\textsuperscript{39}

With hard evidence in his hand, Alexios then summoned a council, composed of the senate, the army, and the synod under the presidency of the Patriarch Nicholas Grammatikos.\textsuperscript{40} Basil's teachings were read out to this gathering. With such direct proof, no other evidence was required, and indeed Basil the Bogomil made no attempt to recant or to distance himself from the beliefs described as heretical, but said that he was ready to face fire and scourging, to die a thousand deaths for his faith.\textsuperscript{41} Whilst Basil the Bogomil may be presented in such a way so as to emphasize the stiff-necked quality of the heretic, the possibility must be remembered that Anna Komnene is recording the true attitude of Basil. The prime motivation of heresy is belief in another, better world; for heretics as well as for Christians, suffering in the vale of shadows is often the means whereby the elect gain the kingdom of God.\textsuperscript{42} This apparent taking upon himself of the mantle

\textsuperscript{39} Alexiad XV viii 5, Leib 3:221 10-16.

\textsuperscript{40} καὶ τὸ συγκλητικὸν ἄπαν συνήθροιστο καὶ τὸ στρατιωτικὸν συνέδεκτο σύνταγμα καὶ ἡ γερουσία τῆς ἐκκλησίας συνή. Προκάθινο δ’ ἄρα τὸ τηροῦντα τὸν τῆς βασιλίδος πόλεως θρόνον ὁ ἐν πατριάρχιας μακαρώτατος ὁ γραμματικὸς ὁ κύριος Νικόλαος. Alexiad XV viii 6, Leib 3:221 18-22.

\textsuperscript{41} Καὶ οὖν ὁ τῆς ἐναντίας μοίρας ἐξαρνος ἦν, ἀλλ’ αὐτικά καὶ γυμνῆ τῇ κεφαλῇ πρὸς ἐναντιολογίας ἔχωρει καὶ πρὸς πύρ καὶ μάστιγας καὶ μυρίους θανάτους ἀντιπαρατάξασθαι ὑπισχυότατο. Alexiad XV viii 6, Leib 3:221 24-27.

\textsuperscript{42} For another interpretation of Basil the Bogomil's steadfastness in the face of torture, see Damien Leeson, "Imperial Orthodoxy: Heresy and Politics during the Reign of Alexios I Komnenos (1081-1118)," (Unpublished M.A. thesis, Queen's University of Belfast, 1987), 127-8.
of martyrdom, however, was not the end of the story. The assembled notables, even those who had been the cause of his downfall, namely the Emperor Alexios and the Sebastokrator Isaak⁴³, reproached him for his impiety.⁴⁴ This inflexibility in the face of reasoned argument showed him to be a true heretic, a high-minded Bogomil.⁴⁵ In spite of all the threats made against him, of fire and torture, he clung to his demon and embraced his Satanel.⁴⁶ Basil was therefore imprisoned, but Alexios sent for him many times, trying to shake his obdurate error, but to no avail.⁴⁷ Anna Komnene shows us the teacher of truth⁴⁸, Alexios, trying to make Basil the Bogomil, who had thought he was being called upon to be the teacher of the emperor⁴⁹, see the error of his ways.

Anna then relates a miracle that is intended to confirm Basil the Bogomil's status as a heretic. It is located in time at a point when Basil had confessed his impiety, but was still being treated leniently by Alexios in the hope of convincing him of abandoning his error. This lenient treatment included the provision of a small, newly-built house

⁴³ καὶ δοκῇ τῆς αὐτοῦ ἁπαλείας αὐτῷ κεκοινωνήκασιν Αλεξιάδ ΧV πις 6, Λείβ 3:222 1-2.
⁴⁴ τὴν ἀσέβειαν Αλεξιάδ ΧV πις 6, Λείβ 3:222 1.
⁴⁵ ὁ αὐτὸς ἦν Βασίλειος ἁμαρτακλίνης, Βογόμιλος γενναίότατος: Αλεξιάδ ΧV πις 6, Λείβ 3:222 2-3.
⁴⁶ Αλεξιάδ ΧV πις 6, Λείβ 3:222 3-5. Note the use of the term Satanel again; see note 26 above.
⁴⁷ Αλεξιάδ ΧV πις 6, Λείβ 3:222 6-9.
⁴⁸ Αλεξιάδ ΧV πις 2, Λείβ 3:219 16-19.
⁴⁹ Αλεξιάδ ΧV πις 5, Λείβ 3:221 7-10.
for Basil near the imperial palace. After the synod, Basil was lodged in the new house, but apparently no decision had been made as to his future. Anna is careful to provide a description of the weather that night, so that it cannot be said that it was merely a freak of nature. Stones fell from the sky and there was an earthquake. The guard entrusted with the task of ensuring that no one spoke to Basil, at first thought nothing of it. However, when he saw that the stones came from the air, and had no human agents, then he decided that it was the work of the devil. The relationship between cause and effect is distorted in Anna’s narrative, as she offers a reason for the attack by demons, before she describes the attack itself. Satanel’s demons were angry with Basil because he had betrayed them to the emperor, and because, in a fit of prescience, they knew the persecution that would follow on from Basil’s revelations.

Anna then deals more directly with the actions taken against the Bogomils. She announces that she had intended to give a complete account of the Bogomil heresy, but that as a woman and the first born in the purple [and therefore most honoured] child of Alexios, she could not. What is intriguing is whether her status as a woman, or her role as a porphyrogenite was more important in precluding a

---


complete discussion of the Bogomil heresy. Anna refers her readership who require further information about the Bogomils to Euthymios Zygabenos's Πανωτλία, composed on the orders of Alexios I Komenos. Zygabenos was said to be known to the clergy as having an unrivalled knowledge of dogma, but his way to the court was probably cleared by the connection with Anna's grandmother Maria of Bulgaria. With the leader under close house arrest, Alexios then moved against the second echelon of the sect's leadership. The emperor had a search made everywhere for the disciples and co-mystics of Basil. The prime object was to capture the twelve disciples. When they were gathered together, they were examined as to their beliefs. They were found to be true disciples of Basil. Anna states that the evil was deep-seated, and that many of the great houses and much of the crowd were influenced by the terrible thing. It would seem that the reason for this most serious
response to the Bogomils by Alexios I Komnenos was because they were active in the capital, and were affecting the ruling élite, rather than being confined to peasants in the mountains of the Balkans. It was this threat to the City itself that prompted drastic measures according to Anna; all tainted with the stain of heresy were to be disposed of. When those accused of being Bogomils were gathered together, there was the usual problem associated with witch-hunts. Some of the accused admitted that they were Bogomils, what the authorities chose to term heretics. However, many others denounced the accusation, rejecting the Bogomil heresy, and claiming to be good Christians. Anna Komnene tells us that Alexios was not inclined to believe these protestations of innocence. To prevent the eventuality that a Christian would be confused with the Bogomils as a Bogomil, or indeed that a Bogomil be thought to be a Christian and so escape punishment, Alexios evolved a novel plan by which real Christians would be easily recognized. It is interesting that Anna gives a clear indication that Bogomils and Christians are hard to tell apart, an indicator that should be borne in mind when dealing with the subject of Byzantine heresy.

The next day, Alexios put his plan into effect. He presided over a specially constituted synod, composed of invited members of the Holy

60. ἐπεὶ ἐτοίμως ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ τούτῳς πιστεύειν οὐκ εἴχεν, ἵνα μὴ τις πολλάκις Χριστιανὸς τοῖς Βογομίλοις ὡς Βογομίλος ἀναμιγνύσηται ἢ Βογομίλος ὡς Χριστιανὸς διαδραμῇ καὶνὸν τινα τρόπον ἐπινυστίζῃ, διὸ οὐ οἱ ὄντως Χριστιανοὶ ἀποφανθήσουσι. XV ix 2, Leib 3:224 13-18.
Synod, the senate and certain monks,62 persons known for their learning.63 Those arraigned for heresy were to stand trial before this body. The accusations were made against them once more, and the emperor instructed that each case be examined individually. Again some confessed their Bogomil belief, and refused to deny it; others denied that they were heretics and claimed to be Christians.64 Alexios then revealed his plan to separate the sheep from the goats: all the accused were to be burnt, the heretics on a bare pyre, the Christians on a pyre surmounted by a cross. As "consolation" Alexios says:

Better these Christians should die than live hunted as Bogomils and an injury to public conscience.65

With this declaration to the Bogomils66, Alexios appeared to have closed the matter. The accused were led away, and the pyres were lit in the Tzykansterion, the palace polo ground.67


66. πρὸς τοὺς Βογομίλους Alexiad XV ix 4, Leib 3:225 8; the Christians innocently accused seem to have been forgotten.

67. This area is liminal. It is part of the Great Palace complex, and so it is part of the "imperial" as opposed to "ecclesiastical" space (though this is a rather artificial distinction for Byzantium); however, it was also part of the Nea Ekklesia complex built by Basil I. Significantly, access to it could be controlled. See Paul Magdalino, "Observations on the Nea Ekklesia of Basil I", JOB 37 (1987), 51-64, esp. 61-3 with n70.
The choice was given to each of the condemned to go to whichever pyre they wanted, as all were going to be burnt. Seeing that the deed was inescapable, the Christians chose the pyre with the cross, whilst the Bogomils chose the one without. As all the accused were to be thrown onto the fires, the bystanders mourned for the innocent Christians about to be martyred and denounced the emperor. At the last moment, a command came from the emperor, showing it was all a ruse to provide hard evidence against the Bogomils. The Christians, or rather those who had chosen to die on a pyre with cross, were released with much good advice from Alexios on how to avoid such accusations in future, the emperor’s role as teacher being once more brought to the fore. The Bogomils were incarcerated, receiving food and clothes with daily visits from clergy charged with instructing them in the errors of their ways. Basil’s twelve apostles were kept apart, no doubt to remove the great mass from their influence. If the Bogomils recanted, they were released, but others died in their heretical chains, though Anna makes us aware that their deaths were not due to mistreatment by Alexios. Leib refers to Buckler’s account of the punishment meted out to the

68. αἱρεσὶς τοῖς ἐνόχοις ἐδίδοτο, ὅπῃ ποτέ ὁ Βουλιατὸν ἐκάστῳ, χωρεῖν, ὡς καυχησομένων ἀπαντῶν. Alexiad XV ix 4, Leib 3:225 14-16.


Problems exist, however, in using the testimony of Zygabenos to prove that the burning of Basil the Bogomil was not a cruel and unusual punishment. The major difficulty is the extent to which Anna Komnene and Euthymios Zygabenos are independent witnesses. The second consideration must be the way in Zygabenos says that the civil and ecclesiastical authorities joined together in determining that these heretics should be burnt. This seems to be closely related to the description of what happened to Basil, given by Anna Komnene:

> all [the members] of the Holy Synod, and the leaders of the monks and the Patriarch Nicholas judged him worthy of the fire.75

Anna Komnene makes it clear that only after Alexios had had many conversations with Basil, and was convinced that there is no chance of him repenting, that he decided on the dire punishment, and agreed with the decision of the church authorities. The location chosen for the execution was the hippodrome of the city, and it seems to have

---

74. Leib 3:226 n.1, reference to Georgina Buckler, Anna Comnena (London, 1929), 94 nn.2-3, which in turn refers to Euthymios Zygabenos’s Δογματική Πανοπλία in PG 130 col.1360 [not very relevant in this particular case] and col.1332[C]: Παραστηρόμενος γάρ αὐτὸν ὀσφύσιτας καὶ μεγαλόψυχος ἡμῶν βασιλεὺς, καὶ τὴν ἀπόκρισιν τοῦ γραμματος ἀποκαλύφας, καὶ διακωδώνιας τοῦ τούτου, ἐπείπερ εὑρε πανταχόθεν ὑπόχαλκου ἡχοῦτα, καὶ κιβώτου, λαῖνυ μὲν ἐπαγγελλόμενον μεταβολήν, ἀρτί δὲ καθάπερ κύνα πρὸς τὸν ἵππον ἐπανερχόμενον ἐμετον, σκέψις περὶ τοῦτον προθείς καὶ συμφήσους τῶν ἐν τελεί πάντας λαβών ἐκκλησιαστικοὺς ἁμα καὶ πολιτικοὺς, κατεδίκασε τὴν διὰ πυρὸς ὑποστήμαι τιμωρίαν τὸν πολλοὺς εἰς τὸ τῆς γεέννης παραπέμπεμαι πῦρ.

75. ἐπαινετες τῆς ἱερᾶς συνόδου καὶ τῶν Ναζαριων λογάδες καὶ αὐτῶς δὴ ὁ τότε πατριάρχης Νικόλαος πυρὸς δέιον ἐκρίναιν. Alexiad XV 1, Leib 3:226 10-12.
been stage-managed to be as visible as possible. In response to this public display, a huge crowd gathered to see what would transpire. Basil the Bogomil was given a final chance to recant. It would seem that in this public event, an obvious rejection of the heresy would be as good as a burning. That this entire episode was conducted with at least one eye on the audience is confirmed by Anna's opening sentence:

There was a crowd of heretics [there] to see their leader Basil.

Basil also played to the audience, though his confidence gave way when he confronted the fire. Anna ends this paragraph with a description of what Basil was doing, actions which seemed to show that he was now frightened of the fire, and had lost the driving force of his faith. What Basil actually did was to glance round him, to rub his hands together and to hit his thigh. Anna says that this indicated that he was greatly troubled. This, with the use of ἐδόκει, all adds to the uncertainty that surrounds the whole episode.

76. Alexiad XV x 1, Leib 3:226 16-18.
78. Alexiad XV x 2, Leib 3:226 24-25.
79. Alexiad XV x 2, Leib 3:226 25-30; the quotation from David is from Ps. 91:7-8, which continues: "And see the reward of the wicked".
81. Ἐστρεφε γὰρ τὸς ὅψεις πολλάκις καὶ ἐκρότει τὸς χεῖρας καὶ ἐπάτησε τῶν μυρῶν Alexiad XV x 2, Leib 3:227 8-9.
82. οἷον τοῖς ὅλοις ἐξαιροῦμενος. Alexiad XV x 2, Leib 3:227 9-10.
This curious uncertainty continues in the next paragraph. Basil is resolute, his iron will not softened by the fire, nor moved by the messages from the emperor. However, at this point Anna introduces the suggestion that Basil may be possessed by a demon, and that is why he is so resolute. It is an outstanding problem for any social group, having proscribed a particular set of beliefs or actions, to account for the persistence of those actions or beliefs in society, usually in the face of increasing penalties. In the case of Byzantium, it was possible to attempt an explanation in terms of their religious world view. To the modern reader this seems either quaint or incomprehensible, that people could believe in demons; there must be after all, a more deeply seated real reason for this religious belief. The proscribing ethos cannot admit that the "heretic" would be driven by a strength of feeling that could be equated with divine religious thought, and so demons are presented as the obvious cause of such abnormal religious feelings. The Byzantine thought world, however, still recognized other causes, and Anna offers madness as a cause of Basil’s inability to see what was best for him. A moment of tranquility followed, as Basil seemed rooted to the spot, moving neither forward nor back. This was the crucial moment in the unfolding drama. The spectators gathered round expected some great event to release the tension. Either the heretic would be burnt and the Orthodox would be vindicated, or the prophecies made by Basil would

84. ὡς ἀδομάντινος ἦν. Οὔτε γὰρ τὸ πῦρ κατεμάλαξε τὴν σίνηραν αὐτοῦ ψυχῆν οὔτε αἱ τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος πρὸς αὐτὸν διαπόμπων διαμιμόεις κατέθελεν, Alexiad XV x 3, Leib 3:227 11-13.

be fulfilled, and the Bogomils would be shown triumphant. The executioners feared that the demons associated with Basil might achieve some great coup, though only with the permission of God Anna is careful to point out, and so they decided to put Basil to the test, so that the second fault [being saved from the fire by a demon, who may or may not be the real God] might not be even greater than the first fault [the introduction of heresy into the capital in the first place].

This was the decisive moment. The executioners took Basil’s cloak and hurled it onto the pyre. With the resolution of the drama now in progress, Anna says that Basil spoke, inspired by his demon: "Do you see the cloak flying up into the air?" Basil was seized and thrown onto the fire at the same moment. Anna records that there was no change in the fire, there was no revulsion on the part of the element at being called upon to act as executioner. Rather, just as the fire of the furnace in Babylon had protected the three righteous young men, and so had done God's will, so here, by taking the abomination [Basil], the fire was also doing the will of God. Anna reiterates the notion of Alexios as protector as well as righteous avenger, as she makes it clear that it was the actions of the emperor that prevented the crowd from lynching the rest of the Bogomils there and then, and making them

---
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join Basil on the pyre. The Bogomils were imprisoned in the stoai and
galleries of the Imperial Palace, but were then transferred to some
other prison, where after many years, they eventually died in their
impiety.

The final paragraph in chapter ten of book fifteen has little to do
with heresy, and less to do with Basil the Bogomil. It does reinforce
the view that heresy is just as important to Anna’s conception, and
presentation, of her father’s greatness as his feats of άνδρεία on the
battlefield.

The portrayal of Basil the Bogomil in The Alexiad is a major set
piece to conclude the work. With the description of the restoration of
the Orphanotropheion it serves to round out Anna Komnene’s
portrayal of her father as the great emperor, rather than as merely a
lucky general. However, does this relate to the presentation of other
religious outsiders in the work?

Italos.

If the case of Basil the Bogomil is famous because of the
punishment meted out to him - if not because of the vivid descriptions
of him by Anna Komnene - then the trial of John Italos is well-known

90. See Paul Magdalino, "Manuel Komnenos and the Great Palace",
92. τὴν ἀναθείαν Alexiad XV x 4, Leib 3:228 29.
93. Τούτο μὲν οὐν ὑστατον ἔργον καὶ ξύλον τῶν μακρῶν ἑκατοντακοσ τῶν τῶν
πόλων καὶ κατοικημάτων τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος, καὶ καινοπραγία τις
καὶ τὸλμη παράδοξος. Alexiad XV x 5, Leib 3:228-9 29-1.
because of the extent to which it has exercised the minds of many, who attempted to discover exactly what was going on.

Anna's detailed account of the Italos affair occupies a two chapter section at the end of Book V. Its position here means that it follows on from an extensive treatment of Alexios's campaigns against the Normans. Anna establishes her father as a defender of Orthodoxy to balance his prowess in battle, and this was done in the midst of preparations to move against Bryennios94 who was occupying Kastoria.95 Returning from campaign, Alexios was not allowed a minute's peace, for ecclesiastical matters were in uproar.96 The function of this portrayal of John Italos then becomes clear: being an apostle97, Alexios lost no time in coming to the aid of the church, disturbed by the teachings of Italos.98 These dogmas of Italos were very popular, and were profoundly disturbing the Church.99 Whilst the matters which have provoked the concern of the emperor were Italos's dogmas, yet Anna chooses to concentrate on the man himself. Anna

94. Λατίνος δὲ οὗτος τῶν ἐπιφανῶν, δὲ καὶ κοσμοταύλου ὁμόμυχος. Alexiad V vi 1, Leib 2:28 6-7.
95. Alexiad V viii 1, Leib 2:32 24-29.
97. ἀποστολικὸς ὃν Alexiad V viii 1, Leib 2:32 26.
98. τοῖς τοῦ 'Ἰταλὸς δόγμασι Alexiad V viii 1, Leib 2:32 27.
presents Italos as a totally unsympathetic character. In her treatment of Italos, Anna Komnene adopts a very classical plan of psogos, starting with his origins and moving through the various categories. The use of such classical models by Anna Komnene is not surprising. What is of note perhaps is that it is in her treatment of Italos that Anna Komnene follows the scheme closely. In the physical description of Italos in section V viii 8, Anna Komnene is more inventive, but to begin with we are told that Italos came originally from Italy, and then had spent some time on Sicily. The move to Sicily had been occasioned by a revolt by the Sicilians against the Byzantine government, as Italos's father had been one of the Italian allies the Sicilians had imported to help them in the war. Even at this early stage in her description, Anna Komnene is giving clear indications of the way the narrative is to proceed. Whilst the very fact

100. See Timarion for a more sympathetic portrayal of Italos - or is the author being ironic here? Barry Baldwin, Timarion translation with introduction and commentary, (Detroit, 1984), 72-74, 131-137; also Margaret Mullett, "Theophylact Through his Letters: The Two Worlds of an Exile Bishop", (Ph.D. thesis: University of Birmingham, 1981), 2:756, dealing with Meurs XLV: "To Philosopher Kyr(ios) John". Mullett records the suggestion that that the Philosopher John might be John Italos. No indication is given as to the probability of this identification in the thesis. [In a personal communication, Dr. Mullett has indicated that she believes the suggestion to fail due to lack of substantive proof.] In the analysis of the structure of the letter, Mullett records: "5) urges his gentle correspondent to become belligerent and strike back at his enemies, relying on God and the emperor." No date is given, but Gautier apparently believes it to be contemporary with letters 96 (1096-1105), 97 (unknown), 98 (1096-1105), 99 (unknown, ?1097-1104?) [Gautier notation]. Such datings make it unlikely that Theophylact would be urging John Italos to rely on the support of the emperor.

101. ὁ Ἰταλὸς...οὕμνῳ μὲν ἔξ Ἰταλίας καὶ ἐν τῇ Σικελίᾳ ἔφ᾽ Ίκανον διέτριψε: Alexiad V viii 1, Leib 2:33 3-5.

102. Alexiad V viii 1, Leib 2:33 6-10.
that Italos is a foreigner should not be taken as an indicator that he is be to cast in an outsider role [for there are many examples of the foreigner-insider in The Alexiad], nevertheless such indicators are given by his early association with attempts to overthrow the Byzantine state, even if it is only in a far flung corner of the empire; and by the way in which his early education was concerned with military matters, even if they were in the debased Italian idiom. Such concerns were not the proper origins for one destined for philosophy.

When George Maniakes regained Sicily for the Byzantines in the reign of Constantine IX Monomachos (1042-55), Italos and his father went as refugees to Longibardia, an area still under Byzantine control. From Longibardia Italos eventually found his way to Constantinople, though Anna Komnene maintains that she does not know the means whereby this was achieved. By her description of Constantinople as a city not deficient in all kinds of learning and literary techniques Anna implies that John Italos came to the capital to further his education. Italos’s arrival in Constantinople was
probably sometime between 1040 and 1050.\textsuperscript{108} At that time, education and learning in the capital were undergoing a revival, most notably under the leadership of Michael Psellos, appointed consul of the Philosophers in 1045, by Constantine IX Monomachos. However, Anna leads us to believe that from Basil II until Constantine IX learning received little attention: it was with Alexios that a new period of interest in learning in all its forms began. The paragraph ends not on a high note, but with an denunciation of the pastimes of the majority of people before Alexios's reign.\textsuperscript{109}

Italos began his schooling in such an environment. His teachers were "rough schoolmen, of rustic habits (for there were some of that sort in the ruling [City] then)."\textsuperscript{110} After his basic literary education at the hands of such men, Italos then encountered Michael Psellos.\textsuperscript{111} The contrast between Italos and Psellos is drawn pointedly. Psellos\textsuperscript{112}

\textsuperscript{108} Gouillard, "Le Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie" \textit{TM} 2 (1967), 188.

\textsuperscript{109} \textit{Alexiad} V viii 2, Leib 2:33 21-30. Though beyond proof, the use of the word παιδευτός (33 29) may introduce the idea that the inhabitants of the city at this time were not as urbane as Anna Komnene might have hoped. It may merely be elegant variation, as the words παιδευτός, παγγυόνιος and παίδευσιν are used in rapid succession, though with the latter in the sense of education/what happens to children rather than in any derogatory sense of what children do.

\textsuperscript{110} σχολαστικοίς καὶ ἀμελήκτοις καὶ τὸ ἰθὸς ἀγρυῖος (φοιον γὰρ τότε καὶ τως ἐν τὴν βασιλείαν τοιουτου). \textit{Alexiad} V viii 3, Leib 2:34 2-4. The implication is that though Italos learnt from rude schoolmen in the capital, in the reign of Alexios such rustics were not the teachers.

\textsuperscript{111} \textit{Alexiad} V viii 3, Leib 2:34 4-5.

\textsuperscript{112} \textit{Alexiad} V viii 3, Leib 2:34 6-7.
had had little recourse to school teachers. However, added to his natural ability, Psellos had the advantage of divine Grace, obtained through the intercessions of his mother to the icon of the Mother of God in the Church of the Saviour. It seems that Anna Komnene here gives us an example of a boy making good, by doing what his mother tells him. The easy manner in which Psellos’s expertise in Chaldean science - generally speaking magic by any other name - is identified, and indeed praised, shows that the religious view of Byzantium had yet to be formulated in rigidly exclusive terms, if it ever was. Psellos’s acquaintance with Chaldean science merely improved his claim to be supreme in matters of learning. Any negative feedback from his association with Chaldean science has of course been neatly defused by Anna’s representation of him gaining his knowledge by Divine favour after his mother’s intercessions. The differences that separated Psellos and Italos were wide, even though Italos was in theory pupil to Psellos’s guiding hand. Italos’s barbaric and unschooled nature, coupled with his inability to accept a master, even to further his education, meant for Anna that he was unable to penetrate very far into the mysterious depths of

116. The introduction of Psellos’s mastery of Greek (pagan) and Chaldean (magical) science could be negative in import. See CMH IV 1:217 for Psellos’s profession of faith.
philosophy. Italos was driven by a boldness and barbaric folly, which meant he believed himself the equal or better of everyone.

Straight away, even before his studies were completed, he set himself up in opposition to Psellos. Italos was devoted to dialectic, setting forth all his proofs as sophistic arguments, where each proposition rested upon the reasoning of its predecessors. His passion for dialectic caused daily disturbances in public gatherings.

It is important to remember that Anna is not intent on showing Italos as he was. Rather, his story is adapted to the needs of The Alexiad. The Italos affair has two phases: an imperial trial in 1076-77 when certain theories, some of which had been identified with Italos’s teaching were condemned, but Italos’s name was not mentioned; and then in 1082, Italos and his teaching was solemnly condemned, and he was banished to a monastery. Goullard states that the first

118. Alexiad V viii 3, Leib 2:34 14-16.
119. θρασος δα μεστος και απονοιας βαρβαρικης Alexiad V viii 3, Leib 2:34 16-17.
120. Alexiad V viii 3, Leib 2:34 16-19.
121. Ἐμπαθύνως δὲ τῇ διαλεκτικῇ καθημερινώς θαρύβους ἐν παυδήμοις συνελέύσεις Alexiad V viii 3, Leib 2:34 19-23.
122. From the semeioma of March 1082, the synod of 1076-77 condemned the teachings of Italos as contrary to church dogma in nine chapters, without naming him. [see Gouillard, "Synodikon", TM 2 (1967) 56-61, 189; Joannou, Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche (1960) col.1043; Paraskevopoulou, Some Aspects of the Phenomenon of Heresy 63 n.9; Grumel, Regestes, no.907; Salavie, "Philosophie et theologie à Byzance de 1059 à 1117", ÉO 33 (1930) 142; Stephanou, "Jean Italos" Orientalia Christiana 134 (1949) 46-49.
trial is not mentioned by Anna Komnene. However, Anna does record that Italos held the favour of the emperor Michael VII Doukas and his brothers. The Doukai are characterized as being lovers of literature. One may wonder at the Doukai favouring Italos, from Anna’s description not known for his felicitous turn of phrase. It may be to form a contrast with the Komnenoi, headed by an apostle, with their orthodox devotion to scripture, favouring Psellos - who had the further advantage of being safely dead or in his dotage, and thus unable to cause further embarrassment. Such a neat dichotomy is disturbed by the reading matter of Irene Doukaina - heavy theology. Indeed the empress is said not to concern herself with discussions of nature, but rather with dogma, as she wished to gain for herself true wisdom. This is a facet of the way in which the Doukai may be criticized only within clearly defined parameters. On the one hand, the Doukai formed an alternate powerbase which the Komnenoi have replaced; at the same time, however, the Doukai and Komnenoi are united by marriage, and form a binary power nexus. Even with imperial favour, Italos still regarded Psellos with fury and frenzy, but the latter soared above him like an

124. Gouillard, Synodikon, 189 n.35.
126. "Ησαυ γὰρ φιλολογῶτατοι οἱ Δοῦκα Alexiad V viii 4, Leib 2:34 27.
eagle.\textsuperscript{129}

At this point, Anna Komnene permits herself to backtrack slightly in Italos's career. Shown favour by the Doukai, as we have seen, Italos was selected by Michael VII Doukas to be the eyes of the emperor in Dyrrakhion, because the emperor thought Italos a truthful man devoted to him.\textsuperscript{130} An on-the-spot observer was needed because of the continuing opposition to Roman [ie. Byzantine] rule in Longibardia and the rest of peninsular Italy by the Latins [ie. Normans] and the Italians [ie. chthonic inhabitants speaking either Greek or Italian].\textsuperscript{131} Italos betrayed the emperor's trust. However, he realized that he had been found out, and fled to Rome, before the emissary charged with relieving him of his duties reached him.\textsuperscript{132} The essential point of this digression is then reached, as Anna describes how true to character, he repented of his actions, asked and obtained the emperor's forgiveness and then returned to Constantinople, where he lodged in the monastery of the Source, and at the Church of the Forty

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{129} Ὅ δὲ Ἰταλὸς θερμὸν ἄει καὶ μαυρικὸν πρὸς τὸν Ψελλὸν ἐβλεπε, καὶ ἐκεῖνος ὡς ἀετὸς τῶν τοῦ Ἰταλοῦ ἐρεχθελίων ὑπερίπτατο. \textit{Alexiad} V viii 4, Leib 2:34-35 29-2.

\textsuperscript{130} \textit{Alexiad} V viii 5, Leib 2:35 5-6.

\textsuperscript{131} Ἐσφάδαζε τὰ τῶν Λατίων τε καὶ Ἰταλῶν κατὰ Ῥωμαίων καὶ ἧ τῆς Λογγιβαρδίας ὅλης ὅμοι ὧ καὶ Ἰταλίας ἐμελετᾶτο κατὰ σχεσιως. \textit{Alexiad} V viii 5, Leib 2:35 2-4. This activity antedates 1071, when Barī the last Byzantine holding in Southern Italy fell to the Normans.

\textsuperscript{132} \textit{Alexiad} V viii 5, Leib 2:35 7-10.
\end{flushright}
That education was the reason for his association with the Church of the XL Martyrs seems to be confirmed by the manner in which Anna's text moves on to state that when Psellos left the capital and retreated to a monastery in Bithynia it was Italos who was elevated to the rank of Consul of the Philosophers, as his successor.

Anna now turns to a description of the man. It starts well:

He was very well studied, able more than any other person to expound the peripatetic teachings, especially dialectic.

However that was the high point from which one descended to reality.

In other literary skills he was not so gifted, stumbling in grammar and he had not tasted the nectar of rhetoric. This was why his speech was not harmonious or well formed. His style was coarse and completely undecorated. His speech appeared with a frown, and exhaled bitterness. His arguments were

---

133. The placement of Italos in the Monastery of the Source is understandable as a place with strong imperial connections, at a remove from the centre of the capital. It was in effect a place of secure confinement, of quasi-house arrest. The location in the Church of the XL martyrs is less easy to account for. However, it may be the case that Italos had been associated with the teaching at the school there, and that he was being allowed to continue to teach. Paul Lemerle, "Le Gouvernement des Philosophes," Cinq études, 229, 240; G. Schiro, "La schedografia a Bizanzio nei secoli XI-XII e la scuola dei SS. XL Martiri," Bollettino della Badia greca di Grottaferrata, NS 3 (1949), 11-29; Robert Browning, "Il codice Marciano Gr.XI.31 e la schedografia bizantina," Miscellanea Marciana di Studi Bessarionei (Medioevo e Umanesimo), 24 Padua (1976) 21-34, reprinted in R. Browning, Studies on Byzantine History Literature and Education (London, 1977).

134. Psellos's retreat to Bithynia was in the reign of Constantine IX, though it was of a short duration. Sewter [176 n.34] is of the opinion that Anna has in mind Psellos's final disgrace at the hands of Michael VII [ie. c.1078].


Evidence is insufficient to evaluate whether Anna Komnene’s appraisal is accurate or not. With his origin in Southern Italy, it is probable that Italos was always identifiable by accent at least, as an outsider in the hot-house environment of Constantinople. The way in which Anna deplores his crude manner of speech seems to indicate more that he is to be regarded as an outsider, than that his speech was so unacceptable. In any case, for all that the Byzantines appreciated a well turned phrase, they did recognize other considerations. For Italos the other considerations were obvious enough. Through his dialectic Italos created ditches round his argument, which soon

---

137. Ἐνθὲν ταύτα τούτα ἐπεξεργασμένα ὁλόκληρον έργον έγειρον τοῦ διάλεκτου τοῦ ἐπίσκοπου Κωνστάντιου: ἐλάθοι γὰρ αὐτοὺς ἡμῖν ἐστιν ὁμοφωνίας ὑποκείμενας ὑπό τοῦ πρώτου, τῆς ἐπικράτειας τοῦ πολεμικοῦ ἄνδρα ἤκριβες ἔχωμεν. 

138. Such an occasion was when Psellos, acting as ambassador to the soon to be emperor Isaak Komnenos in 1057, claimed to have used plain speech in the style of Lysias to sway his audience without them being aware of the influence exerted upon them: ἐλάθοι γὰρ αὐτοὺς ἡμῖν ἐστιν ὁμοφωνίας ὑποκείμενας ὑπό τοῦ πρώτου, τῆς ἐπικράτειας τοῦ πολεμικοῦ ἄνδρα ἤκριβες ἔχωμεν. 

139. Alexiad V viii 6, Leib 2:35-6 21-3.
swallowed up any opponent. Italos’s opponents had to face the socratic method, and no-one escaped the traps he set.\textsuperscript{140}

If his skill as a debater, if not as a rhetor, was unparalleled, in other ways he was rather vulgar, and governed completely by his temper.\textsuperscript{141} This temper nullified whatever virtue he gained from his studies, for he argued not only with words as befitted a philosopher, but also with his hands, frequently physically attacking his opponents.\textsuperscript{142} Even more than his propensity to violence, however, his rapidly changing nature showed how unsuited he was to the philosophical life.\textsuperscript{143}

Having dealt with Italos’s strictly physical appearance\textsuperscript{144}, Anna then turns to his manner of speaking, a suitable area of comment for a rhetor and teacher. It is at this point, that the notion that Italos was so named because he was of Italian extraction from the areas of Byzantine control receives a blow. The assumption has always been that as a closed society, Byzantium would not have permitted a

\textsuperscript{140} Οὕτως ἐμπείρως εἶχε τῆς διαλεκτικῆς ὁ ἀνήρ καὶ ταῖς ἐπαλλήλαις ἐπερωτήσεσι κατέπνυε τοὺς διαλεγομένους συγχέων αὐτῶν καὶ συνταράττων τῶν νοών. Καὶ σὺν ἣν τὸν ἐπίπας αὐτῷ συντυχόντα τοὺς λαβρύνθους τοὺτον διελθεῖν. \textit{Alexiad} V viii 6, Leib 2:36 8-12.

\textsuperscript{141} \textit{Alexiad} V viii 7, Leib 2:36 12-13.

\textsuperscript{142} \textit{Alexiad} V viii 7, Leib 2:36 13-21.

\textsuperscript{143} Τούτω δὲ μόνου ἀνυπόστολον εἶχεν, ὅτι μετὰ τὴν πληγήν κατελίπαν ποιήσας καὶ τὸ δάκρυν κατελάβας καὶ εἰς λαμπρὸν μετάμελον ἦρχετο. \textit{Alexiad} V viii 7, Leib 2:36 22-4.

\textsuperscript{144} Generally speaking favourable, with its concentration on his broad chest and sound wind, coupled with good proportion, even if he was a little below average size.
"foreigner" to assume such an important role in society; by extension, therefore, though perhaps an odd, strange Byzantine, Italos still was one, with his name and criticism of his provincial origins pointing to an origin in the former Byzantine possessions of Italy. Anna damages such neat formulations by the way in which she describes his speech. The defence may be offered that she says merely that he spoke as if he were a Latin who had come to Byzantium as a child, and had never lost his accent. However, that is to rely on too fine definitions. It is better to accept that Anna's usage of ethno-significant terms is looser than we would like. The fault in his pronunciation did not escape the notice of the public (τούς πολλούς), whilst those more accustomed to rhetoric accused him of being a country yokel. In reply to these criticisms, Italos emphasized more the content of his writings rather than their oral presentation. However, even in this Anna criticizes, as there were faults in composition and articulation.

Having dealt with the man, Anna Komnene then turns to the studies he presented. In the list of philosophers she presents there are no great surprises. The greatest novelty was perhaps that Italos prided himself on the novelty of his philosophical works. He had written a book on logic and a book on rhetoric, and he had also written a book on the philosophy of language. He had also written a book on the philosophy of science, and he had also written a book on the philosophy of religion. He had also written a book on the philosophy of nature, and he had also written a book on the philosophy of society. He had also written a book on the philosophy of history, and he had also written a book on the philosophy of art. He had also written a book on the philosophy of politics, and he had also written a book on the philosophy of ethics. He had also written a book on the philosophy of morality, and he had also written a book on the philosophy of religion. He had also written a book on the philosophy of society, and he had also written a book on the philosophy of history.

---

145. τὴν δὲ φωνὴν τοιοῦτος οἶος δὲν ἀπὸ τῶν Λατίνων ἑλληνικᾶς νεωτικας ἐλεφαντήγυς την ἡμεραῖν ἀγιν τὰ Ἑλληνικὰ μὲν ἑκμάθηκε, οὐ πάνυ δὲ καθαρεύοι τὴν φωνὴν, ἀλλ’ ἔστων οὐ καὶ κολεῖωτερὰς ἑκθέροι τὰς συλλαβὰς. Alexiad V viii 7, Leib 2:37 1-5.


147. τοὺς ῥητορικώτερος Alexiad V viii 7, Leib 2:37 6.

148. ἄγροικιζων rude, boorish, rustic; Alexiad V viii 7, Leib 2:37 7.

149. Alexiad V viii 7, Leib 2:37 7-10.
himself on the utility of his work.\textsuperscript{150} The value of this utility was greatly reduced however, by Italos's inability to deal with his students. His temperament made him unsuited as a teacher.\textsuperscript{151}

Italos's students are then identified. First mentioned was John Solomon, a member of the senate, whom Anna later records as being involved in the Anemas revolt.\textsuperscript{152} Also implicated were Iasites\textsuperscript{153} and Serblias\textsuperscript{154}, as well as many others. Many of Italos's disciples were visitors to the imperial palace, and Anna grew to realize that they had only the outward form of learning, but not the inner systematic understanding. They even went so far as to propound their theories on metempsychosis.\textsuperscript{155} The easy access to the palace enjoyed by these "philosophers" suggests that a marriage between Eudokia and Iasites was not impossible on grounds of social difference, perhaps.

\textsuperscript{150} Alexiad \textit{V} ix 1, Leib 2:37 ll.14-17.

\textsuperscript{151} Alexiad \textit{V} ix 1, Leib 2:37 16-19.

\textsuperscript{152} Alexiad \textit{V} ix 2, Leib 2:37 20; Skoulatos, \textit{Les personnages} (Paris, 1980), 154-5.

\textsuperscript{153} Skoulatos, \textit{Les personnages}, 119, dismisses the notion that this Iasites could be either Constantine Iasitas, the father-in-law of Eudokia, Anna's sister, or indeed Eudokia's husband. He records that Gautier in "Le Synode des Blachernes" \textit{REB} 29 (1971), 251 identifies these two people as one without providing due cause in Skoulatos's view. Constantine Varzos, \textit{Γενεαλογία των Κομνηνών} (Thessaloniki, 1984) 254-259, has more to say on this.


\textsuperscript{155} Alexiad \textit{V} ix 2, Leib 2:37 22-29.
It would seem that the unlikelihood of these philosophers visiting the imperial palace on a regular basis also struck Anna, for she digresses to emphasize the learned activities of her parents. Returning to the events surrounding Italos, Anna makes a veiled reference to the events of the first trial. He was at the height of his popularity, but he treated all with contempt. The focus then is shifted drastically from Italos to Alexios Komnenos. Finding learning an abandoned, if not lost art, the new emperor encouraged scholarship, though he did express the preference that the students should be well equipped in the knowledge of Scripture before they embarked upon an investigation of classical philosophy. Were it not for the strong echo of Psellos in this section, it would be tempting to say that what appears here is a rare difference between Anna Komnene and her father. To an extent, Anna gloried in learning for its own sake; Alexios, in the extent to which he was concerned with learning - and it is too much to characterize him as a ramboesque dullard - found that reasons of state frequently required a fence round untrammeled speculation to preserve the tranquillity of the faithful. It should be recalled however, that just because a formula of words has

156. τοῦ λεγομένου ἡγούμενα τοσοῦτον περὶ τὴν τῶν θείων λόγων ἐξερεύνησιν διὰ πᾶσιν νυκτῶς καὶ ημέρας διαποιουμένων; Alexiad V ix 3, Leib 2:37 29-31.


been used before, it does not mean that they cannot convey real meaning.

Anna records that Italos came to the emperor's attention because he was leading many astray and causing trouble everywhere. He was given over to the Sebastokrator Isaak for preliminary investigation. Isaak found that there was indeed a case to answer, and after he had publicly refuted Italos, sent him for trial before an ecclesiastical tribunal, on the emperor's orders. Before the tribunal, Anna says that he was unable to conceal his ignorance displayed doctrines foreign to the church, and in the middle of the assembled clerics acted in an uneducated and barbaric way. Eusathios Garidas, patriarch at the time, took Italos into a form of protective custody, but Anna remarks scathingly that the patriarch was as likely to be corrupted by Italos as Italos was to see the errors of his ways. With this stalemate, all the people of Constantinople moved against the church [probably Aghia Sophia] apparently with the intent of seizing Italos bodily. Anna implies that the reason for Alexios's great concern was that it was a topic of conversation among many of the courtiers and not a few

162. τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀπαθεευσίαν Alexiad V ix 5, Leib 2:39 12-3.
163. τωὰ ποιῶν ἡθους ἀπαίδευτον καὶ βαρβαρικοῦ Alexiad V ix 5, Leib 2:39 15-16.
165. 'Ὁ δῆμος ἀπὸς τῆς Κωνσταντίνου Alexiad V ix 5, Leib 2:39 23.
166. Καὶ τάχα ἐν ὧν ὑψὸς εἰς μὲν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἔρριπτο, εἰ μὴ λαθών ἐκείνος εἰς τὸν ὁρὸν τοῦ θείου τεμένους ἀνελθὼν ἐν τῷ θαλεφ ἑαυτὸν συνεκάλυψεν. Alexiad V ix 6, Leib 2:39 24-27.
of the better sort had become infected with his evil doctrines.\textsuperscript{167} The doctrines which Italos was purported to have taught were summarized under eleven headings, and sent to the emperor.\textsuperscript{168} Italos was to denounce them from the ambo of the Great Church (with his head bare) with the crowd listening and adding their voices to the anathemas.\textsuperscript{169} Whilst the prominence Anna gives to the actions of Alexios as the driver of the entire episode could be due merely to her desire to establish Alexios as a guardian of Orthodoxy against heresy, it does seem that the Italos affair was motivated more by imperial than ecclesiastical considerations.

Italos soon returned to the teaching of the doctrines and was personally anathematised after he rejected the emperor’s advice, with barbaric disorder.\textsuperscript{170} Anna Komnene does admit that the anathema against Italos was moderated when he retreated somewhat from the extreme position to which his understanding of philosophy had led him.\textsuperscript{171} Anna leaves us with the picture of a man who was trying to

\textsuperscript{167} Ὡς δὲ τὰ παρ᾽ ἑκείνου κακῶς δογματισθέντα πολλοῖς τῶν περὶ τὰ ἀνάκτορα ἐθρυμμένα καὶ μεγιστάνες οὐκ οἷον διεθάρρησαν ὑπὸ τῶν φοροποιῶν τούτων δογμάτων καὶ μεγάλως ἥ τού βασιλέως ψυχῆ διὰ τοῦτο ἐδάκνετο, \textit{Alexiad} V ix 6, Leib 2:39-40 27-1.

\textsuperscript{168} \textit{Alexiad} V ix 6, Leib 2:40 1-3.

\textsuperscript{169} \textit{Alexiad} V ix 6, Leib 2:40 3-7.

\textsuperscript{170} καὶ παραμυθεμένος παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐκτακτον τι καὶ βαργοκυκόν ἀπεπιβά, \textit{Alexiad} V ix 7, Leib 2:40 9-10.

\textsuperscript{171} \textit{Alexiad} V ix 7, Leib 2:40 11-17.
reach accommodation with the church authorities. Italos did not set out to be heretical; as a philosopher, he carried to their logical conclusions his propositions. In doing so, he came under attack, not so much from the ecclesiastical hierarchy, most of whom, if they could understand what he was saying at all, were inculcated with similar desires for understanding. Rather the motivation for the clamp down came from the emperor.

**Nilos**

The episode of Nilos is presented at the beginning of Book X, which deals mainly with the Cuman war of 1095 and the arrival of the first crusaders 1094-7. In this it falls into the pattern Anna maintains, of placing Alexios's strivings on the battlefield always in the company of his actions against heretics. Anna opens her account of Nilos, by stating that it occurred slightly after the condemnation of the heretical dogmas of Italos. Skoulatos places the action in 1082-83, whilst Gouillard places it later in 1087. Nilos invaded the church, causing trouble for the spirits of all. Again the seriousness of the case is

---

172 Ἡρεύτο δὲ καὶ τὰς μετεμψυχώσεις καὶ τὸ ύβρις εἰς τὰς σεπτὰς εἰκόνας τῶν ἁγίων καὶ τὸν περὶ τῶν ἱερῶν λόγων μεθερμηνεύων πως πρὸς τῷ ὑπόκοιτον ἐσπευδῆ καὶ δῆλος ἡ ἐκ τούτων καταγωγώσκων εαυτοῦ ἐφ᾽ ὅις πρῶτον τοῦ εὐθέος μετετέρατο. *Alexiad* V ix 7, Leib 2:40 18-22.

173 ἐν τῇ πολύ τῆς τῶν ἑταλαίραν καθαρίσεις ἁναθαναθείς *Alexiad* X i 1, Leib 2:187 3-4.


175 Ἐπεὶ δὲ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ὡσπερ τῇ βέμα κακίας ὁ Νεῖλος ἐκείνος ἐπικλητῷ πολὺν τῶν σάλων ταῖς τῶν ἀπάντων ἐνεποιεὶ ψυχαίς *Alexiad* X i 1, Leib 2:187 1-3.
emphasized.\textsuperscript{176} She adds credence to Gouillard's contention that the Synodikon of Orthodoxy was concerned primarily with Christological heresies, and that that is why many of the other heretics condemned under the Komnenoi are notable by their absence.\textsuperscript{177} Part of his appeal was because he was well used to simulating virtue.\textsuperscript{178} This habit of dissimulation is a feature already noted with regard to Basil the Bogomil. It is a feature of all twelfth-century descriptions of heretics. Anna then goes on to state that she does not know where he came from (οὐκ ὁδὼ μὲν ὑδεν), though we learn from his abjuration that Nilos described himself, or was instructed to describe himself by the ecclesiastical authorities as coming from Calabria.\textsuperscript{179} Given that Nilos was a heretic, or rather is to be condemned as one, it is interesting that Anna does not emphasize that he was not a true Byzantine, but yet another foreigner like Italos from Southern Italy. This surely raises the point that perhaps she was not aware of his origins, for she does mention that he was not from the capital, describing him as staying in the Great City, but not his more exotic origin.\textsuperscript{180} The primary description of Nilos seems to be without

\textsuperscript{176} καὶ πολλοὺς ταῖς δίναις τῆς αυτοῦ κακοδοξίας ἐβύθισεν. \textit{Alexiad X i 1}, Leib 2:187 4-5.

\textsuperscript{177} Gouillard, "Le Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie", \textit{TM} 2 (1967), 184-5.

\textsuperscript{178} Ἀνὴρ δὲ οὖτος δεξιῶς μὲν τὴν ἄρετην ὑποκρίνωσθαι. \textit{Alexiad X i 1}, Leib 2:187 5-6.

\textsuperscript{179} Νεῖλος ἐγὼ μοναχὸς ὁ Καλαυρός. Gouillard, "Le Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie" \textit{TM} 2 (1967), 303:53. Gouillard suggests that Anna's ignorance about his origins may have been feigned to emphasize his insignificance. Gouillard, "Synodikon", 202 n.149.

\textsuperscript{180} \textit{Alexiad X i 1}, Leib 2:187 6-7.
reproach: he seemed to pay attention to God and himself alone, busying himself with the study of the Scriptures. Some note of caution is perhaps indicated by the use of δῆλον (appear) and ἔγγυων (keeping in corners) but it is only in the next sentence that the negative appraisal of the man is made explicit. The claim that he was not familiar with Hellenic culture is not necessarily negative in import when located with specific reference to Christianity. Then the agony is piled on, as the lack of a teacher to instruct him in the true depth of Scripture, forced him to turn to the writings of the saints directly. His total lack of logical training led him to wander from the meaning of writings into heresy. Nilos found favour in several of the great houses of Constantinople, partly

---

181. καὶ ἔγγυων θεῷ μόνῳ δήθεν καὶ ἑαυτῷ πρὸςαυτῖκε διὰ παντὸς ταῖς ἱεραῖς βιβλίοις ἐνασχολούμενος. Alexiad X i 1, Leib 2:187 7-9.

182. On the meaning of the word ἔγγυων [X i 1, Leib 2:187 7.] see Δ. Δημήτριακο: Μέγα Λεξικόν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Γλώσσης, ed. Ι. Σ. Ζερβός, (Athens, 1950), 3:2202a, where the definition ἀποσύρωμαι ἐκ τῆς τύρφης τοῦ βίου suggests that it might not be negative.

183. Ἀμύντος δὲ πάσης Ἑλληνικῆς παιδείας ὁν Alexiad X i 1, Leib 2:187 9-10.

184. καὶ μὴ δὲ καθηγητήν τινα ἐσχηκώς ἀρχίθεν τοῦ ὑπασφολυτα τούτῳ τῷ τῆς θείας γραφῆς βάθος ἐνεκεκυρεί μὲν τοῖς τῶν ἄγων συγγράμμασιν, ἄγευστος δὲ πάσης λογικῆς παιδείας ὄν ἑπετυλαύστω περὶ τοῦ νοου τῶν γραφῶν. Alexiad X i 1, Leib 2:187 10-14. It seems more likely that the writings with the misunderstood meaning are the writings of the Saints [i.e. the Church Fathers] rather than Holy Writ, the translations of Leib and Sewter notwithstanding. Without a basis in Hellenic culture and logical argument, the writings of the Cappadocian Fathers, for example, soon becomes unintelligible. To end on a more stylistic note, I wonder if it was with intent that Anna Komnene united Nilos's perambulations ἐφοίτησε round the capital with his wandering ἑπετυλαύστη from the truth.

because of his apparent virtue and ascetic life, but also because of his supposed possession of secret knowledge (γνώσις). The mention of such gnosis in such a theological context, would suggest to the audience the gnostic heresies that had dogged the early history of Christianity. It is a multilayered meaning because the gnostic heresies arose for the most part from an attempt to form a synthesis between the new religion of Christianity and the older traditions of Hellenic philosophy. Thus one who is berated as lacking Hellenic knowledge is associated with those who in former times had been accused of attempting to forge too close links between philosophy and the New Revelation. The crux of Nilos’s failure was in correct comprehension of the hypostatic union in the person of Christ of the human and divine natures. It is easy to understand how, without a training in the philosophy that underpinned it, the theory of hypostatic union would be a source of error. Anna reiterates that it was his failure to understand what was taught by the Saints that caused him to fall into error.

With the character of Nilos and his heresy well established, Anna then introduces her father. Nilos was summoned to the imperial presence, his boldness and ignorance upbraided, his errors

187. See Buckler, Anna Comnena, 324-9, and Gouillard, "Le Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie" TM 2 (1967), 61ff. The actual heresy of Nilos, with its intricate theological argument does not require elaboration here.
188. παρὰ τῶν ἀγίων διδασκόμενος Alexiad X i 2, Leib 2:188 1-2.
189. Alexiad X i 3, Leib 2:188 3-4.
confounded, and he was instructed in the true hypostatic union of the
God-Man Logos. Alexios set forth the manner of reciprocal relations
[between the two natures] and also taught with Divine Grace\textsuperscript{190} how
the πρόσλημμα became divine.\textsuperscript{191} In spite of all the efforts of the
emperor, Nilos remained convinced of his false doctrine.\textsuperscript{192} No threat
of physical punishment could cause him to stop teaching that the
"addition" became divine by nature.\textsuperscript{193}

It is at this point, that it becomes obvious that the clear distinction
between various of my outsider group classifications is less than
perfect. As Anna recounts the story one of the major reasons why
Alexios was so concerned with the activities of Nilos was his influence
on the large number of Armenians in the capital.\textsuperscript{194}

Two points need to be made about the introduction of the
Armenians at this point. The first is that the presence of Armenians in
a section where Anna is dealing with heresy means that it has been

\textsuperscript{190} μετὰ τῆς ἀνωθεν ἐδιδάσκει χάριτος. \textit{Alexiad X i 3, Leib 2:188}
10. This mention of Divine Grace is to protect Alexios from the
charge that he was claiming to understand by reason the things of
God.

\textsuperscript{191} \textit{Alexiad X i 3, Leib 2:188} 7-10. The vocabulary in this paragraph
and in \textit{X i 2} is parallel to the so-called Speech against the Armenians,
Cod. Sabb. 366, fol.246a-249a, ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus,
\textit{'Ανάλεκτα Τεροσολυμιτικής Έτοιμολογίας I} (St. Petersburg,
1891), 116-23 (text only).

\textsuperscript{192} τῆς ἴδιας ψευδοδοξίας \textit{Alexiad X i 3, Leib 2:188} 10-1.

\textsuperscript{193} \textit{Alexiad X i 3, Leib 2:188} 11-13.

\textsuperscript{194} Εἴπε δὲ τότε καὶ πολλούς τῶν Ἀρμενίων ἡ μεγαλόπολις, οἱς
τῆς ἀσθενείας ὑπέκαμαν ὁ Νεῖλος ἐκείνος ἐγίνετο· ἐντεῦθεν
διώλεξε τις συμπάθητος τοῦ Τιγράνην ἐκείνου καὶ τῶν Ἀρσάκην,
οὓς ἐπὶ πλείου ταῦτα τὸν Νεῖλον δόγματα πρὸς ἀσθενείαν ἤρεθιζε.
\textit{Alexiad X i 4, Leib 2:188} 14-18. On Tigranes, see Skoulatos, \textit{Les
personnages}, 298; Arsaces is not mentioned by Skoulatos.
used to bolster many assertions that Anna Komnene had a deep seated hatred of Armenians, that in effect she was ethnically or racially prejudiced.\footnote{See Sewter, 294 n.3 or Andrew Sharf, "Armenians and Byzantines in the Time of Alexius Komnenus", 121, with note 102 where he cites Buckler, \textit{Anna Comnena} 429, n.1, which brings the prejudice up to date in 1929 at least. See also Buckler, 328, n.2.} However, this fails to take into account, and surely begs the question of whether the hatred of individuals as Armenians comes first, or whether they are described as Armenians because they are hated. The second matter relating to this introduction of the Armenians is the way in which they were influenced by Nilos. Were Nilos and the Armenians arguing in the same way, or were the Armenian monophysites goaded to further extremes of their own doctrine by what they saw as unbearable heresy by Nilos? Buckler identifies Nilos and the Armenians as sharing in the same heresy,\footnote{Buckler, \textit{Anna Comnena} 324-329, esp. 324 "...Nilos, who with his Armenian followers...".} but Jean Gouillard presents the view that Nilos should be seen as a Nestorian rather than a Monophysite, and that the actions taken against Nilos by Alexios were to ensure that the Orthodox Chalcedonians were not seen as Nestorians by the Armenians.\footnote{Gouillard, "Le Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie", \textit{TM} 2 (1967), 202-206.}

Anna presents Alexios as being forced into action by several reasons. The way in which the Greek is arranged seems to stress the number of souls led astray by the heresy\footnote{\textit{Tην ἀρέβειαν πολλῶν ἐπινεμομένην ψυχὰς \textit{Alexiad X i 4}, Leib 2:188 18-19.}}; this is in keeping with
Anna's intention throughout the work to praise her father. Added to the concern for the wellbeing of the ordinary believers, Alexios was also aware of the mixing of the teachings of the Armenians and Nilos; of the public proclamation of the notion that the human nature of Christ had been deified; of the rejection of the words of the Fathers on these subjects and that the hypostatic union was being poorly understood. Alexios decided to combat the great evil, and summoned the dignitaries of the Church to appear before him. When they had done so, he decided that the proper way forward was for a synod to be held to determine what should be done. It would seem that Anna was concerned that the treatment of Nilos would be rejected as not being done in the proper fashion. She stresses, as in the Italos case, that the synod was composed of the whole body of the clergy and the patriarch Nicholas. Nilos stood in the midst of the council, with the Armenians, and defended his teachings in a loud voice. The synod (yet again the justification is given that it was so

201. Kai parh en tμhμ va ëπoν to των ǻξhμeréwv πhμrov ca ǻτhç ǻ πaτhμåρhçç Níkålalç Alexiad X i 5, Leib 2:188 26-28. The mention of the patriarch Nicholas provides a date post quem, as Nicholas was appointed to the patriarchal throne in 1084; see Gouillard, "Le Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie" TM 2 (1967), 203.
203. Alexiad X i 5, Leib 2:189 1-3.
that many souls would be saved from the doctrine\textsuperscript{204}) placed Nilos under an anathema.\textsuperscript{205} It seems that the denunciation of Nilos was the occasion for the composition of Alexios's "Speech against the Armenians".\textsuperscript{206}

As a postscript to the teachings of Nilos, Anna then recounts the episode concerning Theodore Blachernites. An ordained priest\textsuperscript{207}, he was mixed up with the "enthusiasts", whom Zygabenos identifies with the Massalians\textsuperscript{208}. Rather than attempting to construct an ancestry for them, it is perhaps better to merely identify them as a group who claimed direct inspiration from heaven, and who therefore felt able to dispense with the guides of spiritual authority. Anna does not explicitly outline his errors, but his story resembles that of Nilos. Blachernites wormed his way into the great houses and taught many false dogmas.\textsuperscript{209} In the normal fashion - at least as it is presented in The Alexiad - Blachernites was summoned many times\textsuperscript{210} before the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{204} \textit{Alexiad} X i 5, Leib 2:189 4-5.
\item \textsuperscript{205} \textit{Alexiad} X i 5, Leib 2:189 5-7.
\item \textsuperscript{206} Text: ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, 'Ανάλεκτα Ιεροσολυμιτικής Εταοχυλογίως I (St. Petersburg, 1891), 116-23; introduction 113-6. Cited in Buckler \textit{Anna Comnena}, 328 and Sharf, "Armenians and Byzantines" 103; translation with commentary in \textit{Alexios I Komnenos. 2:Texts} (Belfast, forthcoming).
\item \textsuperscript{207} κἀν λεγομένος ἥν. \textit{Alexiad} X i 6, Leib 2:189 9; Leib describes him as "dans les saints ordres."; Sewter (295) describes him as being "an ordained priest."; whilst Skoulatos (294) refers to him as a "moine," without comment.
\item \textsuperscript{208} Zygabenos, \textit{Panoplia Dogmatike}, c.1273.
\item \textsuperscript{209} \textit{Alexiad} X i 6, Leib 2:189 11-12.
\item \textsuperscript{210} πολλάκις \textit{Alexiad} X i 6, Leib 2:189 13.
\end{itemize}
emperor, who attempted to show him the error of his ways, and to instruct him in orthodoxy. As Blachernites persisted in his error, Alexios sent him before the church authorities. After a lengthy examination, they recognized that he was incorrigible, and placed him under anathema, together with his teaching.

The treatment of Leo, Metropolitan of Chalcedon, presents something of an unusual case. It occurs in Book V of The Alexiad, and it might be assumed that Leo of Chalcedon was being cast in the same heretic role as John Italos was later, in the same book. Such reasoning would be false. Book V opens with the Norman under Guiscard advancing in triumph through the Balkans. In the opening sentence Anna remarks that Guiscard "took away for himself, completely unhindered, all the booty." This concern with money dominates the first chapter of Book V, and also serves to introduce the episode with Leo of Chalcedon.

Alexios was in dire need of cash to raise new troops, but there was no cash, and the imperial treasury was empty; weakness and poverty

---

211. Alexiad X i 6, Leib 2:189 13-16; see also Grumel, Regestes, III, 45, #946.


213. ὁ μέντοι Ῥωμηρὸς ἀμερημιήςος παυτάπασι τὴν λείαν πάσαν καὶ τὴν βασιλικὴν σκηνὴν ἀφελόμενος Alexiad V i 1, Leib 2:7 1-2. The literal meaning given for λεία: the people's property is significant. s.v. LSI.
was the fate of the Roman empire.\textsuperscript{214} In the final paragraph of this first chapter of Book V, Anna Komnene presents Alexios as having two choices: he could abdicate to avoid any suggestion that he was inexperienced in war and ignorant of command,\textsuperscript{215} or out of necessity\textsuperscript{216} he could call on allies, gathering whatever money he could to satisfy them, whilst using bribes to encourage the native troops to return to him, hopefully bolstered in morale by the strengthening presence of the allies. Anna states that Alexios's decision was grounded in his desire not to do anything dishonourable, nor out of keeping with his understanding of warfare, nor his own daring.\textsuperscript{217} Alexios summoned allies, giving them the expectation of many gifts; at the same time, he instructed his mother and brother to raise cash to send to him from no matter where.\textsuperscript{218}
The destitute nature of the imperial treasury forced Anna Dalassena and the Sebastokrator Isaak to send their own personal treasure to be minted. At this point, filial piety comes to the fore, as Anna stresses that Irene Doukaina sent some of her own plate to the imperial mint.\textsuperscript{219} Anna attempts to reinforce her mother’s position as a loyal member of the family connection, even though her connection is only one of marriage. The sense that Alexios’s power base is relatively restricted is reinforced by the description of those who were well disposed to the imperial couple\textsuperscript{220} as sending their gold and silver to the allies or to the emperor.\textsuperscript{221} Coupled with the distinction drawn between those who had fought on Alexios’s side previously and the mercenaries \textit{per se},\textsuperscript{222} this indicates that Alexios’s position was at the head of an interest, rather than at the command of a family or clan-based articulation of power, where the blood relation came first and power was secondary.

\textsuperscript{219} ὅπωσα ἐκ τε μητρὸς καὶ πατρὸς κλήρου ἐνυπηρχον αὐτῆ κατεβάλετο \textit{Alexiad} V ii 1, Leib 2:10 12-13.

\textsuperscript{220} πρὸς τοὺς βασιλεῖς \textit{Alexiad} V ii 1, Leib 2:10 16. Sewter (157) identifies these “emperors” as Isaak and the empress, without specifying whether he means Anna Dalassena or Irene Doukaina. As mention has just been made of Irene and her concern for the emperor, I think that it is more logical to identify as the antecedents of τοὺς βασιλεῖς as Alexios I Komnenos and Irene Doukaina.

\textsuperscript{221} ἔξεπεμψαν τὸ μὲν τι τοὺς συμμάχους, τὸ δὲ τι πρὸς τὸν αὐτοκράτορα \textit{Alexiad} V ii 1, Leib 2:10 19-20.

\textsuperscript{222} \textit{Alexiad} V ii 2, Leib 2:10 21-22.
Having carefully done the ground work, Anna stresses yet again the desperation of Alexios’s situation.\textsuperscript{223} Anna Dalassena and Isaak the Sebastokrator were without means\textsuperscript{224}; they discussed many options, both individually and in common.\textsuperscript{225} The crux of the matter is finally broached.\textsuperscript{226} The search of canon law revealed that it was permissible to use church treasure to redeem captives. Anna establishes that due to their intercourse with the infidels, the Christians of Asia were obviously little better than captives, in need of redemption.\textsuperscript{227} Anna adds to her justification by emphasizing that the number of items concerned was very small, that they had not been used in the ritual for quite some time, and that the fact of their being left to one side had given rise to sacrilegious robbery and impiety.\textsuperscript{228}

\textsuperscript{223} διὰ τὸ ἀπεγνωσκέναι τὴν Ἱρωμάιον εὖνοιαν. Alexiad V ii 2, Leib 2:10 24-25.

\textsuperscript{224} εἰν ἀμηχανία Alexiad V ii 2, Leib 2:10 25.

\textsuperscript{225} καὶ πολλοὶ λογισμοῦς ἀνελίξατες ἱδία τε καὶ κοινῇ, V ii 2, Leib 2:10 26-27.

\textsuperscript{226} Alexiad V ii 2, Leib 2:10 28-30.

\textsuperscript{227} ἐξάρων δὲ ὅτι καὶ τῶν Χριστιανῶν ὡσαν περὶ τὴν Ἱ Ἁσίαν ὑπὸ τὴν βαρβαρίαν ἐτέλους χεῖρα καὶ ὑπὸ τὴν σφαγήν ἔξεφυγον ἔμμισθον δίὰ τὴν μετὰ τῶν ἀπίστων συναναστροφὴν. Alexiad V ii 2, Leib 2:11 2-5.

\textsuperscript{228} ὡλιγ' ἢττα τῶν πόλαι ἠργικώτατοι ιερῶ καὶ καταλελυμένων ως εἰς μυθεμίαν χρείαν συντελουσά, ἀλλ' ἁφόρμην μόνον ιεροσυλίας καὶ ἀσβεσίας ὡς τοῖς πολλοῖς παρεχόμενα ὡς ὑπὸ χράγματος εἰς μικρον τοῖς στρατιώταις καὶ συμμάχοις τὰ τουτά ἡρματίσα ἐσκέψαστο. Alexiad V ii 2, Leib 2:11 5-10. Given what she is actually describing, it is interesting that Anna Komnene attempts to seize the high moral ground by describing the misuse of the sacred objects as iεροσυλίας. Anna does not specify exactly what the sacred objects were. On the number of objects seized, see Grummel, “L’affaire de Léon de Chalcédoine: Le chrysobulle d’Alexis Ier sur les objects sacrés”, REB 2 (1944), 127.
When Anna Dalassena and Isaak Komnenos made the decision, the Sebastokrator went to the resident synod, where he explained the reason for his visit. Isaak presented the plan as offering the means of dealing with the “violent irruption in public affairs and the salvation of the army.” Isaak cited the various items from the canons concerning cultic objects no longer in use. He then concluded with a not very veiled threat. Rather than force majeur, however, his high-minded arguments quickly convinced the majority.

Isaak was opposed by one Metaxas. Metaxas made fun of Isaak himself, but also brought forward some good replies. "But for all that, the decisions [of the majority] held." However, this was, Anna assures us, the origin of serious accusations against Alexios and Isaak. Anna then introduces Leo, metropolitan of Chalcedon. The way in which he is described is very important.

229. [Greek text]
230. [Greek text]
231. [Greek text]
232. [Greek text]
233. [Greek text]
234. [Greek text]
235. [Greek text]
He was not very wise, nor learned, yet he cultivated goodness, but his manner was austere and hard.236

He is criticized for lack of learning, but his virtue is not shown as a pretense. The removal of the gold and silver from the doors of the Chalcoprateia church provoked the first response from Leo of Chalcedon. He went into the middle [of the action], and held forth, without any consideration for οἰκονομία or the canons and laws relating to holy things.237 Each time he returned to the capital, Leo was most insolent and totally undisciplined in his attitude towards the ruler [Alexios], trying his forbearance and charity.238

At first, Anna separates Leo of Chaledon's opposition to secularization from his opposition to Alexios:

On the occasion when the emperor left the imperial city to go out against Robert for the first time, Isaak the Sebastokrator, [the emperor's] own brother, who helped at that time procure gold from whatever source by common consent in accordance with the laws just as with justice, Leo aroused to anger the said brother of the emperor, acting towards him most shamelessly.239

However, when in the interlude between the Norman campaign and the attack of the Patzinaks, Alexios is in the capital and calls for more

236 ὅτι τῶν πάνω σοφῶν καὶ λόγιων, ὑπερήφανος ἡ ἐπιμελημένος, τὸ τὸ ἔθος αὐτῶν σκληρὸν καὶ ἀπόκρητον. Alexiad V ii 4, Leib 2:11 29-31. Leo's future history notwithstanding, the presence of the paired adjectives σκληρὸν and ἀπόκρητον leads me to interpret the first as "austere" rather than as "stubborn".

237 εἰς τὸ μέσον εἰσῆδως ἐπαρρησιάζετο μηδ' ὅλως ἡ οἰκονομίας ἡ τῶν περὶ τῶν λεφών κεμένων νόμων ἐποιεθανόμενος. Alexiad V ii 4, Leib 2:12 2-4.

238 'Ὑβριστικῶτερον δὲ καὶ οἷον εἰπεῖν ἀτακτότερον τῷ τημικοῦτα κρατοῦντι προσεφέρετο, οὕτως εἰς τὴν βασιλεύουσαν ἐπανήγει τῇ ἀνεξικακῇ εἰς κατὰ τῇ φιλοθετείᾳ καταφερμένους. Alexiad V ii 4, Leib 2:12 4-7.

239 Alexiad V ii 4, Leib 2:12 8-14.
money to be raised by the alienation of ecclesiastical objects, Leo of Chalcedon attacked the emperor. As would be expected, this opposition provoked long discussion, wherein Leo expressed ideas in keeping with his status as a bishop, but also ideas that were not in keeping with orthodoxy. Anna suggests that this may have been caused by the rivalry or hatred he affected towards the emperor, or because of ignorance. Anna believed Leo's opposition stemmed from misguided ignorance rather than from direct opposition. She has a very low opinion of his intellectual abilities.

The aspect by which Anna Komnene seems to be attempting a revision of the actions of Leo of Chalcedon continue in the last paragraph in which she concludes his story. His attitude towards the emperors became more extreme, encouraged by evilwishers, of whom there were many in the civil government. Vestiges of the complex chronology outlined by Grumel can be discerned in the account

---


244. Ἐξακριβοῦν γὰρ ἀσφαλῶς τὸν λόγον σύκ εἶχεν, ὅτι λογικὴς μαθήσεως ἀμέτοχος ὑπήρχε παυτάπασσιν. Alexiad V ii 5, Leib 2:12-13 27-2.

245. χαρεκάκους ἀνδρᾶς...ὁποῖοι πολλοὶ τὸτε ὑπήρχον τοῦ πολιτεύματος Alexiad V ii 6, Leib 2:13 3-4.

246. Grumel, REB 2 (1944), 333-341.
rendered by Anna. Leo of Chalcedon was encouraged to more vociferous opposition to Alexios by the office holders. This was in spite of the fact that a reconciliation had been achieved between Alexios and the leading members of the synod, and that Alexios had promised restitution of the treasures taken from the church. Leo was called upon to retract his false understanding of the doctrine of images. This would have been in 1082. He was removed from his see. However, this did not silence him. The constancy he displayed attracted more followers to his cause. Eventually, in 1086, Leo of Chalcedon was exiled to Sozopolis in Pontos. In common with other dissidents, Leo was accorded every comfort, but it seemed that he harboured some manner of grudge against Alexios.247

The most curious part of Anna Komnene’s treatment of Leo of Chalcedon occurs during her account of the battle of Dristra (1087).248 The Byzantine forces have been routed by the Patzinaks and are in flight; Alexios himself, after suitable displays of bravery, was persuaded by the protostrator Michael Doukas that it was better for the emperor to "withdraw to a position of strength and regroup" rather than to fall on the battlefield, largely to no purpose.249 Anna


249. Alexiad VII iii 10-11, Leib 2:99-100. For Michael Doukas the Protostrator see Skoulatos, Les personnages, 202-205. It is interesting to note that Michael Doukas was one of the principal signatories of the process against Leo of Chalcedon in 1094 at the synod of the Blachernae. Paul Gautier, "Le Synode des Blachernes (fin 1094) Étude Prosopographique," REB, 29 (1971) 213-284.
continues with an account of what befell George Palaiologos on the battlefield. While searching for his horse, George Palaiologos saw Leo, Bishop of Chalcedon. Whereas Anna Komnene is usually content to make second mention of people without referring to their first appearance in *The Alexiad*, here she specifically draws our attention to what she has already said about Leo of Chalcedon. This apparition of Leo of Chalcedon is given the tone of a holy visitation, and one feels that rehabilitation is being effected here. Gautier, in his prosopographical study of the Blachernae synod of 1094, notes the way in which Leo of Chalcedon’s appearance is described almost in terms of a vision or apparition, but then moves on to the matter concerning him at that point, namely the dating of the Blachernae synod, and how that Leo’s appearance in the dress of a bishop in the course of the battle of Dristra indicates that by that time he had not been stripped of his rank.

In the vision, Leo is described as being dressed in clerical vestments. The bishop offers his horse to George Palaiologos, who


takes it and flees, never seeing the venerable man again. Anna describes Leo of Chalcedon as being forthright in spirit and displaying the true characteristic of a bishop; however, his mind was simple and he displayed enthusiasm not moderated by discernment, and he did not have accurate understanding of the divine canons. This weakness in his understanding was the reason for his loss of his see, which again Anna describes as having been outlined previously. Anna states that George Palaiologos remained loyal to Leo, holding him worthy of honour because of his exceeding excellence. Anna concludes her treatment of Leo of Chalcedon with the rather enigmatic statement describing the visitation as either being due to George Palaiologos’s devotion, or due to some unknown divine purpose.

On the whole, Leo of Chalcedon is presented as a straightforward character, if rather simple. It is a poetic arrangement, in that the bishop saves George Palaiologos, who is presented as a straightforward hero, who at times has found himself on the opposing

---


256. Ἡν δ’ ἄρα οὕτος παρρησιαστικός τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ ἀληθῆ χαρακτήρα ἐμφαίνων αρχιερέως, φρονηματικὸς μέντοι ἀπλουστέρου καὶ τὸν θηλού ἔστιν οὐ οὐ κατ’ ἐπίγνωσιν ἐνδεεκνυμένος καὶ οὐδὲ τῶν ἱερῶν κανόνων ἀκριβῆς γνώσιν εἶχε. Alexiad VII iv 1, Leib 2:102 3-7.

257. Διὸ καὶ ἀπερ ἄνωθεν ἐξηται συνεπεπτώκει αὐτῷ λυπηρὰ καὶ τοῦ θρόνου ἐξέπεσεν. Alexiad VII iv 1, Leib 2:102 7-8.

258. Alexiad VII iv 1, Leib 2:102 8-10.

side to the Komnenoi, as he tried to defend the rights of the empress Irene Doukaina.

Groups of Outsiders by Religion

Manichaean Heretics

Dealing with Anna Komnene’s references to Manichaeans as a group, it is difficult to decide to what extent they were heretics, or merely a separated outgroup. One of the groups left to Alexios after Dyrrakhion was the 2,800 Manichaeans under the command of Xanthas and Kouleon, described as "of the same heresy".260

All these men were most warlike, most ready to taste the blood of the enemies if the occasion presented itself, and also reckless and impudent.261

Part of the reason for the Manichaeans' portrayal here is to underscore the heterogeneous nature of the paltry forces with which Alexios had to face Robert Guiscard after Dyrrakhion. Nothing in the narrative hinges on their status as heretics.

A long episode dealing with the Manichaeans of Philippopolis occurs immediately after Alexios had dispatched the barbarians of the West. Anna has Alexios himself introduce the idea that to allow the heretics to remain in Thrace would be to permit a blot to stain the brilliant trophies he won over the Normans. Anna describes them as

---

260. ης αὐτῆς καὶ οὕτωι ἀφέσεως Alexiad IV iv 3, Leib 1:151 29; Skoulatos accepts them as Manichaeans without comment Les personnages, 167-9; 300-1.

261. "Ἄνδρες ἄπωπτοι οὕτωι μαχαίραται καὶ ἁματος ἀπογεύοσθαι τῶν ἐχθρῶν, καρποῦ καλούματος ἐτοιμάτατοι καὶ πρὸς γε ἐτι καὶ ἅταμοι καὶ αυνάοχυτοι Alexiad IV iv 3, Leib 1:151-2 29-1."
Paulicians and as Manichaeans. No mention is made of their specific beliefs, but their warlike character is stressed. It was for this reason that Alexios wished to punish the leaders, but to incorporate the bulk of them into his army. Their warlike nature caused Alexios to resort to trickery as he feared that if he moved directly against them, he would provoke them, even though they were dwelling quietly in their own country. Alexios sent them letters, summoning them to appear before him. The recipients believed that the letters did not have their best interests at heart, but they responded nevertheless. Alexios pretended to want to see each one individually, to enroll the name of each. There is a certain formality to the proceedings: Alexios is seated, and the leaders of the Manichaeans pass before him, ten at a time. After being presented to Alexios, the groups of ten entered Mosynopolis where they were arrested by officials posted there for the purpose and carted off to jail. Having arrested these heretics, Alexios then expropriated their property, and distributed it to the troops who had followed him on campaign. Alexios had made extravagant promises to those who

262. Alexiad VI ii 1, Leib 2:44 1 & 8.
263. Alexiad VI ii 1, Leib 2:44 5.
264. Alexiad VI ii 1, Leib 2:44 10-1.
265. Alexiad VI ii 1, Leib 2:44 12-4.
268. τοὺς λογάδας τῶν Μανιχαίων Alexiad VI ii 2, Leib 2:45 1.
remained loyal. The imperial coffers were empty, and recourse had been had to church plate. This accusation of heresy and expropriation provides a neat solution for the ready means to pay his troops, with no possibility of vested interests in the capital leaping to their defence. Alexios gave their private possessions to the brave soldiers who had shared in the privations and dangers of the battlefield with him. A short time afterwards, Alexios treated the prisoners with clemency and those who accepted baptism were allowed to go free. Those whom Alexios discovered to be the leaders of such a loss of sense were banished to islands where they remained in captivity. The remainder of the dispossessed were allowed to go wherever they wished. They returned to the land that brought them forth, shifting for themselves as best they could. This is a strange fate to befall newly converted heretics: not displayed in the capital as a triumph of the most Orthodox emperor, nor given new lands or a city to inhabit. All this seems to indicate that these "heretics" suffered more at the hands of economic expediency than a pious emperor, especially as the narrative turns immediately to the resolution of the expropriation of the church plate.

269. τὰς αὐτῶν περιουσίας Alexiad VI ii 3, Leib 2:45 9; the expulsion of the women recorded at lines 13-4 indicates that the expropriation was total rather than merely of surpluses.

270. γενναίοις στρατιώταις Alexiad VI ii 3, Leib 2:45 12.

271. τὰς τοιαύτας ἀπονοίας Alexiad VI ii 4, Leib 1:45 19; ἀπόνοια may mean heresy or rebellion [LSJ sv].

272. Compare for example the treatment of the heretics from Philippopolis in Alexiad XIV ix 4, Leib 3:184-5.
The story of the Manichaeans of Philippopolis is concluded by the story of Traulos, some Manichaean. Traulos had become a trusted servant of Alexios when Alexios was appointed Grand Domestic by Nikephoros Botaneiates. Traulos was worthy of baptism and was married to one of the empress’s maids. He had four sisters who had been imprisoned at Philippopolis, and so he decided to leave the emperor’s service. His plans were discovered by his wife who revealed all to the one entrusted with the administration of the Manichaeans. Traulos fled with accomplices to Beliatoba, north of Philippopolis. The Manichaeans under Traulos at Beliatoba are described as a warlike race by nature, always ready to gorge themselves like dogs on human blood. They raided as far as the city of Philippopolis. Traulos opened negotiations with the Skyths and married the daughter of one of the chiefs. By every means at his disposal, he attempted to injure Alexios. Alexios attempted to win him back with a chrysobull setting out immunities, but to no avail.

276. Γένος γὰρ οἱ Μανιχαίοι φύσει μαχημάτατον καὶ αἵματι ἀνθρώπων λαφύσειν καθαπερεὶ κυνεὶς ἤδει ίμειρόμενον Alexiad VI xiv 2, Leib 2:82 13-5.
277. μέχρι τῆς σφατέρας φθάνοντες πόλεως φιλίππου Alexiad VI iv 3, Leib 2:49 17-8. σφατέρας may be interpreted as their Philippopolis if Manichaean merely means someone from there; as our Philippopolis if it is cleared of heresy and restored to Orthodoxy.
278. Alexiad VI iv 4, Leib 2:49 23-5.
Traulos continued to walk like a crab, dealing with the Skythians.\textsuperscript{279} Anna sews the matter up in a suspiciously facile manner and turns to Bohemond.\textsuperscript{280}

When the Byzantine camp near Dristra was attacked by Skyths, they killed some of the lightly armed troops, and took captive some of the fiercely fighting Manichaeans.\textsuperscript{281} It is noteworthy that there are still Manichaeans fighting with Alexios after his treatment of them at Philippopolis and after Traulos set himself up as their champion.

The reference to Romanos the Manichaean\textsuperscript{282} as one of the intimate attendants of Alexios and Irene during the famosa incident, makes it difficult to accept "Manichaean" as literally a heretic, at least on every occurrence. It may merely mean people from Thrace or Philippopolis (or even Adrianople as the closest rival to the reigning City). Anna's denunciation of Philippopolis relies on it as a dwelling place of heretics, and yet it serves as the scene of his triumph as the equal of the apostles - or at least Constantine the Great. To Anna practically all the inhabitants of Philippopolis were Manichaeans, who tyrannized the Christians, took their goods and thought little or nothing of the imperial envoys.\textsuperscript{283} Anna avoids giving an account of

\textsuperscript{279} \textit{Alexiad} VI iv 4, Leib 2:49-30 30-2.
\textsuperscript{280} Είτα ό μὲν αὐτοκράτωρ ὅδον πάρεργον καὶ τὰ κατὰ τοὺς Μανιχαίους ποιησάμενος ὑποσπόνδους αὐθίς εἶχεν \textit{Alexiad} VI v 1, Leib 2:50 3-4.
\textsuperscript{281} τινὰς τῶν ἐκθύμοτερον ἀγωνισμένων Μανιχαίων \textit{Alexiad} VII iii 2, Leib 2:94 20-1.
\textsuperscript{282} τε Ἡρωμανοῦ τοῦ ἐκ Μανιχαίων \textit{Alexiad} XIII i 7, Leib 3:89 20.
\textsuperscript{283} \textit{Alexiad} XIV viii 7, Leib 3:108 27-30.
Manichaean beliefs\textsuperscript{284}, but states that even if the new comers did not share in the Manichaean heresy, they did share in the rebellious spirit. Anna Komnene adopts this centre of opposition to Alexios, labels it as Manichaean and then uses it as a peg on which to hang her account of Alexios as the most Orthodox emperor.

**Western Christians**

Anna Komnene's portrayal of Western Christians shows the transient nature of outsider roles. When Alexios was dealing with Robert Guiscard, he wrote to the princes and all the leaders of the Keltic lands\textsuperscript{285} and asked for help in return for subventions and dignities. Henry IV, the Western Emperor (in accordance with Byzantine custom, Anna Komnene describes him as the king of Germany\textsuperscript{286}) is addressed as "very noble and most Christian brother".\textsuperscript{287} This is in a letter which forms part of the full panoply of Byzantine diplomacy: money and silk cloths were sent\textsuperscript{288}, with the promise of more money and the roga associated with twenty conferred honours to follow.\textsuperscript{289} In return, Henry IV was to swear the agreed oaths before the Byzantine envoys.\textsuperscript{290} The possibility of a marriage

\textsuperscript{284} *Alexiad* XIV viii 4, Leib 3:179 8-13.

\textsuperscript{285} πρὸς τοὺς πρίγκιπας, ἔτι γε μὴν καὶ πρὸς ἑπαυτὰς τοὺς ἀρχηγοὺς τῶν Κελτικῶν χωρῶν *Alexiad* III x 1, Leib 1:133 1-2.

\textsuperscript{286} τὸν ῥῆγα Ἄλαμανίας *Alexiad* III x 2, Leib 1:133 7-8.

\textsuperscript{287} πανευγενεστάτης καὶ τῷ ὄντι Χριστιανικῶτας ἀδελφὸν *Alexiad* III x 3, Leib 1:133 16-7.

\textsuperscript{288} *Alexiad* III x 4, Leib 1:134 6-7.

\textsuperscript{289} *Alexiad* III x 4 Leib 1:134 14-5.

\textsuperscript{290} *Alexiad* III x 5, Leib 1:134-5.
alliance was suggested\textsuperscript{291} and various precious items and a multiple reliquary (with each saint clearly labelled) were sent.\textsuperscript{292} By these means, others (as Christians) were to be considered as friends, and others were to be united into one house as relations.\textsuperscript{293}

When Henry IV came to Lombardy to take the promised oaths, Robert Guiscard made common cause with Gregory VII.\textsuperscript{294} The papal-Norman front did not deter Henry IV, but the news that Alexios had suffered many misfortunes did. Henry IV returned north of the Alps. Robert returned to Rome, where he established Gregory on his throne and was in turn acclaimed.\textsuperscript{295}

This reasonably favourable attitude continues when Anna Komnene refers to the mercenaries Alexios was expecting from Rome, and the papacy appears as a coordinator of Western efforts.\textsuperscript{296} Anna Komnene's relative silence on the letters of negotiation may be due to her desire to show her father succeeding without help from others. That Western knights were viewed with favour can be seen from Alexios's response to the Count of Flanders\textsuperscript{297} on his way home.

\textsuperscript{291} Alexiad III x 6, Leib 1:135.
\textsuperscript{292} Alexiad III x 7, Leib 1:135.
\textsuperscript{293} καὶ φίλα μὲν ὀλλήλοις φονείων ὡς Χριστιανοῖς, οἰκειότεροι δὲ καὶ τὰ ὀλλήλων ὡς συγγενεῖς Alexiad III x 6, Leib 1:135 17-9.
\textsuperscript{294} Alexiad V iii 6, Leib 2:16 19.
\textsuperscript{295} Alexiad V iii 7, Leib 2:17 5-7.
\textsuperscript{297} ὁ φλάντρας κόμης Alexiad VII vi 1, Leib 2:105 19.
from Jerusalem. The count gave the usual oath of the Latins, and promised to send Alexios five hundred knights as allies. These knights arrived with extra horses; Alexios greeted them warmly and used them against the Turks.

The attitude to the Western Christians is ambivalent. Anna recognized that some of the Latins, like Bohemond and his men, were trying to seize the empire, and used the preaching of the Crusade as an excuse: "pretending to go on campaign against the Turks to free the Holy Tomb, they sold their own lands." Their arrival at Constantinople involves their portrayal in a different light. They came armed with the evil crossbow. Marianos was charged with preventing men of the same faith from fighting, but he was hit on the head with a crossbow-bolt. Marianos was unharmed; Providence prevented it. A Latin priest attacked Marianos, but the latter remained constant, and encouraged others to fight.

298 τὸν συνήθη τοῖς Λατίνοις...ὁρκον Alexiad VII vi 1, Leib 2:105 21.
299 Alexiad VII vi 1, Leib 2:105 22.
301 Οἱ...τῶν Λατίνων Alexiad X vi 7, Leib 2:212 25.
302 καὶ σχηματιζόμενοι κατὰ τῶν Τούρκων ἀπέρχεσθαι εἰς ἐκδίκησιν τοῦ ἀγίου τόφου τὰς ἰδίας ἐπίπρασκοι κῶρας Alexiad X vi 7, Leib 2:212 30-2.
303 δαμόνιον Alexiad X viii 6, Leib 2:218 1.
304 μηδὲ μάχεσθαι πρὸς ὁμοπίστους Alexiad X viii 5, Leib 2:217 5.
305 πρόνοια γὰρ ἀπείρετον Alexiad X viii 7, Leib 2:218 6.
And this priest, though he had received many blows and was covered in his own blood, but for all that, he was fearless.\textsuperscript{307} Anna Komnene distinguishes between the customs of the Latins and the Byzantines.\textsuperscript{308} "This barbarian race is no less priestly than belligerent."\textsuperscript{309} When a parley was arranged, this most warlike priest\textsuperscript{310} did not stop fighting. When this polemarch rather than priest\textsuperscript{311} ran out of stones to throw, he became enraged like a wild beast (\textit{Θηρίον}) which turns upon itself. He threw barley cakes, and warfare became a parody of eucharistic distribution.\textsuperscript{312} These barley cakes were true rock cakes, as Marianos was injured on the cheek when hit by one.\textsuperscript{313} When the Westerners landed, the priest found Marianos and told him he would have perished many times beneath his hands had they met on dry land. The priest gave Marianos a silver drinking cup\textsuperscript{314}, and then expired.

\textsuperscript{307} Kαὶ οὗτος δὲ ὁ ἱερέως, κἀν πολλὰς τὰς πληγὰς δεδεχμένος ἦν καὶ τῷ ἰδίῳ αἷμα τί περιρρέομενος, ἀλλ' ὦμως ἀτρεστὸς ἦν \textit{Alexiad} X viii 7, Leib 2:218 16-8.

\textsuperscript{308} \textit{Alexiad} X viii 8, Leib 2:218-9.

\textsuperscript{309} Οὗτος ἐστὶ τὸ βάρβαρον τὸ πόλεμον γένος σώκη ἤττον ἱερατικὸν ἢ φιλοπόλεμον. \textit{Alexiad} X viii 8, Leib 2:218 27-8.

\textsuperscript{310} 'Ο δὲ γε μαχαμάτατος ἱερεῦς ἐκείνος \textit{Alexiad} X viii 9, Leib 2:219 8.

\textsuperscript{311} 'Ο δὲ πολέμαρχος ἐκείνος μᾶλλον ἢ ἱερεύς \textit{Alexiad} X viii 9, Leib 2:219 19.

\textsuperscript{312} \textit{Alexiad} X viii 9, Leib 2:219 25-9.

\textsuperscript{313} \textit{Alexiad} X viii 9, Leib 2:219-20 29-1.

\textsuperscript{314} Called a \textit{Θηρίκειον} i.e. a cup made by Thericles of Corinth [LSJ sv] \textit{Alexiad} X viii 10, Leib 2:220 12. This may be a pun, as it is also the drinking cup from the wild beast.
In describing the crowd (τηλήθους) that followed Count Raoul, Anna Komnene includes bishops with kings, dukes and counts\(^{315}\) in those who joined together from almost all the Keltic lands.\(^{316}\) However, rather than direct criticism of the Latin clergy, it is more to emphasize the diversity of the groups with which Alexios had to deal. A more direct criticism is levied against the Bishop of Pisa\(^ {317}\), who is made the organizer, with two others who live by the sea\(^ {318}\), of the fleet which attacked the Ionian islands.

If the actions of Latin priests are treated variously, the Normans' deeds at Dyrrakhion in 1081 are portrayed negatively. The Varangian guard had advanced far beyond their front line. Robert Guiscard was aware of their rapid advance, and concentrated his attack on them: "All the barbarians perished."\(^ {319}\) Those who escaped took refuge in the Church of St Michael, and when there was no more room in the church they climbed onto the roof, believing themselves to be safe.\(^ {320}\) "But the Latins set them on fire, and everyone was burnt up along with

\(^ {315}\) ῥήγων τε καὶ δουκῶν καὶ κομήτων καὶ αὐτῶν ἐπισκόπων \textit{Alexiad} X \textit{x} 3, Leib 2:228 2-3.

\(^ {316}\) ἕξ ἐπισκόπων μικροῦ τῶν Κέλτικῶν χωρῶν \textit{Alexiad} X \textit{x} 3, Leib 2:227-8 31-1.

\(^ {317}\) τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ Πίσιτος \textit{Alexiad} XI \textit{x} 1, Leib 3:41-2 31-1.

\(^ {318}\) \textit{Alexiad} XI \textit{x} 1, Leib 3:42 3.

\(^ {319}\) Πίσιτος γοῦν τηρουσάτα τὸ βάρβαρον ἐπισκόπου \textit{Alexiad} IV vi 6, Leib 1:160 23. These "barbarians" are the Nordic Rhos and Anglo-Saxons in service with Alexios.

\(^ {320}\) \textit{Alexiad} IV vi 6, Leib 1:160 23-8.
the church. There are further instances of the Westerners lack of respect for the sacred. When the Crusader leaders were long in their negotiations with Alexios, the army thought that their leaders had been imprisoned, and they marched on Constantinople. This was Maundy Thursday, 1097. This put the fear of God into Alexios's adherents, because it had been on Maundy Thursday 1081 that Alexios had seized the City and the throne. Even as he took advice, Alexios ordered that no-one should go beyond the walls to engage the Latins because of the sacred nature of the day, and because he wished to avoid civil (ἐμφύλιον) slaughter. The Latins reinforced their troops. Anna's Caesar, Nikephoros Bryennios was ordered merely to terrorize the Latins with his archers, but not to kill them. "For he respected - as was said above - the sanctity of the day and did not want civil slaughter." A sortie was organized and the archers were to shoot at the horses not the men. The guiding theory was "so that


322. Alexiad IX ix 4, Leib 2:222 3-7 cf. Alexiad II x 4, Leib 1:94-5 26-13. Anna says that the seizure of the City by the Komnenoi was achieved without killing (τοῦ μὲντοι ἀποκτεῖνε τῶν μόνον αἱρέταμεν 95:8). The fear expressed by Alexios's followers, and the continued stress on the need to avoid killing Christians, suggest (even within The Alexiad) that it was not, as Zonaras records.


Christians would not be killed." Recorded practice was at variance with the theory: "they killed many, but only a few of them were wounded on that day." Nikephoros Bryennios respected the sanctity of the day and Alexios's orders when he saw the Latins daring to approach the walls. Alexios finally committed his own guards, and the Latins were put to flight. Anna tries hard to show Alexios refraining from attacking the Western Christians on the holy day, but it seems the desire to show Alexios as a victorious general outweighs any desire to portray him as an observant Christian. The use of the term "Christian" shows some of the flexibility. Alexios supported the Crusaders because of his concern for them as Christians. However, when opposed to the usual (Turkish) enemy, "Christians" means the Orthodox of Anatolia. With required differentiation, terminology is more exact. A band of Normans was en route to Jerusalem. Alexios urged them to follow the same route as

328. ἵνα μὴ χριστιανοὶ κτείνωνται Alexiad X ix 7, Leib 2:224 4.

329. κτείνουσι μὲν πολλοὺς ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν κατὰ ταυτηνὶ τὴν ἡμέραν ἐτρώθησαν. Alexiad X ix 7, Leib 2:224 7-8. It is perhaps possible that the "many" refers to the horses, but this is contrived.


332. ἐκήθετο γὰρ αὐτῶν ὡς Χριστιανῶν Alexiad XIV iv 1, Leib 3:146 15-6.

333. καὶ τοῦ καροῦ στοχασάμενος, καθ’ ὅν σύνηθες τοῖς βασιλείς τὰς κατὰ τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἐκδρομὰς ποιεῖσθαι Alexiad XIV iv 1, Leib 3:159 23-5.

334. τὸ τῶν Νομάνων φοσσάτον Alexiad XI viii 1, Leib 3:36 22.
the rest of the Latin army, but they would not as they did not wish to join with the Franks. The Normans - not identified in the text - went on to Ankara, which they captured. They reached the Halys river and a small settlement held by the Orthodox. The priests, dressed in sacred vestments and carrying the Gospel and crosses, went out to them, having confidence in them as Christians. But inhumanely and without pity, they killed not only the priests, but also the rest of the Christians, and then continued on their way without a thought.

Their fate for this atrocity was to be set upon by Turks well-experienced in war. Opposed to the Turks, the Normans became generic "Kelts", but when they are put to flight by the Turks, they revert to being Normans. Their ruin was complete because they failed to listen to Alexios.

The stipulation in the treaty of Devol that the patriarch of Antioch was to be appointed from the clergy of Aghia Sophia, and was not to

---

335. τῷ λοιπῷ στρατεύματι τῶν Λατίων Ἀλεξιάδ ΧΙ εἶθες 2, Λέιβ 3:36 26.
337. Ἦρωμαίδι Ἀλεξιάδ ΧΙ εἶθες 2, Λέιβ 3:37 11.
338. θαρρήσαντες καὶ τὰς ἱερὰς ἐπενευδημέντες οἱ ἱερεῖς στολὰς εὐαγγελίζον τε καὶ σταυροὺς κομιδώμενοι ὡς Χριστιανοί τοῦτοις προσήχον. Ἀλεξιάδ ΧΙ εἶθες 2, Λέιβ 3:37 11-3.
339. καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς τῶν Χριστιανῶν Ἀλεξιάδ ΧΙ εἶθες 2, Λέιβ 3:37 15.
340. Οἱ δὲ Τούρκοι, ἐμπεσονόμουν ὅντες Ἀλεξιάδ ΧΙ εἶθες 3, Λέιβ 3:37 17-8. It was the Normans inexperience which had made them reject Alexios's advice.
341. οἱ Κέλτοι Ἀλεξιάδ ΧΙ εἶθες 3, Λέιβ 3:37 27.
342. τοὺς Νορμάνους Ἀλεξιάδ ΧΙ εἶθες 3, Λέιβ 3:38 3.
be "out of our own [Norman] race"343, shows that race and religion in the Byzantine world of the eleventh and twelfth centuries were not synonymous, but neither were they truly distinct. It is easy to over-emphasize the differences between the two Christian communities. Alexios advised Manuel Boutoumites (on his mission to Bertrand) to lodge the money with the Bishop of Tripoli, which was done.344 The Bishop of Tripoli was enough of a Latin, however, that it proved more difficult to remove the money from the episcopal safe deposit.345

**Muslims**

Anna Komnene’s portrayal of Muslims is complicated because they are most usually the enemy against whom Alexios strives. Anna uses the plague of locusts which proceeded the Crusaders, consuming the vines but not the wheat as a hook on which to hang her descriptions of the Muslims. The vines represent the barbarian Ishmaelites.346 The Muslims are slaves to drunkenness, wine and Dionysos. They are a race347 subject to Dionysos and Eros. Circumscribed in flesh, their passions are uncontrolled and they are slaves - triple slaves - to the evils of Aphrodite.348 Mangled references to Aphrodite, Astaroth and Chobar follow.349 This is the portrayal of the Muslims as the Other,

---

343. ἐκ τοῦ ἡμετέρου γένους *Alexiad* XIII xii 20, Leib 3:134 19.
346. τῶν βορβάρων Ἰσμαήλιτῶν *Alexiad* X v 6, Leib 2:208 12.
347. τὸ γένος *Alexios* X v 6, Leib 2:208 13.
slaves rather than free, and lacking in civilized self-control. It is in terms of the Byzantine stereotype, but it is not the only way Anna Komnene has of describing the Muslims.

Differences in religion were recognized, and Turks were allowed to swear oaths "after their own fashion." Anna Komnene uses three terms (Agarene, Ishmaelite and Saracen) which might be considered more religious in connotation than the more ethnically orientated "Turk". This is a problem caused by my schema of outsiders by gender, religion, race and τάξις. No clear causation exists for the choice of one word above another. In the context of the battle at Dyrrakhion in 1087, Alexios's Muslim forces used to attack the Normans over the salt marsh are simply referred to as "the ethnic army".

The use of "Saracen" implies some distance from the Byzantine heartland. Thus, many Saracens died when Jerusalem was taken by the First Crusaders. A distance in time - if not in space - is implied in the description of Tatikios. Most brave and undaunted in battle, even though not of free birth, Tatikios was placed in command of the Turks who lived in Achrido in Thrace.

350. κατὰ τὸ εἰδισμένου αὐτοῖς Alexiad II vi 6, Leib 1:83 30.
351. τὸ ἑθνικὸν στράτευμα Alexiad IV vi 1, Leib 1:158 3.
354. τῶν περὶ τὴν Ἀχριδῶ οἰκούντων Τούρκων Alexiad IV iv 3, Leib 1:151 22-3.
Saracen\textsuperscript{355}, captured by John Komnenos. This distinction between Turks and Saracens implies that Turks are from the Balkans, but that Saracens come from further afield. This interpretation is supported by the mention of the Saracens and Ishmaelites who went over to the empire and surrendered their cities, according to Bohemond’s words in the Treaty of Devol.\textsuperscript{356} Those who turned to Alexios because they feared the Frankish sword\textsuperscript{357} were to become Bohemond’s prisoners if captured, but those who “had gone freely into your service”\textsuperscript{358} were in a different category.

Anna explains the origin of the Crusade in the maltreatment Peter the Hermit received from the Turks and Saracens, who were plundering all Asia.\textsuperscript{359} In his preaching, Anna records that his goal was to free Jerusalem from the hands of the Hagarenes.\textsuperscript{360} However, too strong a differentiation in the meaning of words used to describe Muslims cannot be maintained. In dealing with Alexios’s attempts to defend Bithynia, the Turks who had been attacking\textsuperscript{361} suddenly

\textsuperscript{355} Σαρακηνός Alexiad IV iv 3, Leib 1:151 25.

\textsuperscript{356} Τῶν τε Σαρακηνῶν καὶ τῶν ἐκ τοῦ Ἰσμαήλ ὑπόσοι συνρέουσιν ἐκ τῆς βασιλείας σου γυπομολυκότες καὶ τὰς πόλεις αὐτῶν παραδίδοντες Alexiad XIII xii 16, Leib 3:132 25-7.

\textsuperscript{357} τὸ Φραγγικὸν ξίφος Alexiad XIII xii 16, Leib 3:133 3.

\textsuperscript{358} ἔθελονσις εἰς τὴν ὑπερήφανον δοῦλωσιν ἐρχομένων. Alexiad XIII xii 16, Leib 3:133 7-8.

\textsuperscript{359} παρὰ τῶν τῆς Ἀσίας πάσαν ληξουμένων Τουρκῶν τε καὶ Σαρακηνῶν Alexiad X v 5, Leib 2:207 14-5.

\textsuperscript{360} τῆς τῶν Ἀγαρηνῶν τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα λυτρώσασθαι χειρὸς Alexiad X v 5, Leib 2:207 24-5.

\textsuperscript{361} Alexiad X v 1, Leib 2:205 2.
become sons of Ishmael.\footnote{362} This may have been prompted by the historical digression which follows, and because the Turks have been bad neighbours from the beginning.\footnote{363} Simple elegant variation may be the cause.

Stylistic variation is the reason for the "Ishmaelite scimitar"\footnote{364}, when dealing with the account of the Turkish defeat of the Crusaders. The use of Ishmaelites\footnote{365} is to make the boundaries clearer: Alexios helps the Crusaders because they are Christians\footnote{366}; in turn they should have supported the Romans\footnote{367} against the Ishmaelites.

In common with Ishmaelite, Hagarene is a generic term with biblical connotations, which also places the Muslim on the slave/free scale. It was Hagarenes who attacked Kyzikos and gave Alexios the chance to call all his forces together in 1081.\footnote{368} The one criticism of the Sebastokrator Isaak's conduct in war was his lack of circumspection, which had resulted in his capture when on campaign in Asia against the Hagarenes.\footnote{369} This more general aspect continues in the three examples of "Hagarene" in book eleven. When the

\footnote{362} oi τοῦ 'Ισμαήλ \textit{Alexiad} X v 2, Leib 2:205 14.
\footnote{363} ἀνέκαθεν \textit{Alexiad} X v 2, Leib 2:205 14.
\footnote{364} μαχαίρας 'Ισμαήλιτικής \textit{Alexiad} X vi 4, Leib 2:211 24-5.
\footnote{365} at \textit{Alexiad XIV ii} 1, Leib 3:146 17.
\footnote{366} \textit{Alexiad XIV ii} 1, Leib 3:146 16.
\footnote{367} \textit{Alexiad XIV ii} 1, Leib 3:146 18, 19, 21.
\footnote{368} 'Αγορηνῶν \textit{Alexiad II} iv 2, Leib 1:71 22.
\footnote{369} Κάκ τούτου ἔσω καὶ ὅπως καὶ διὰ κατὰ τὴν 'Ασίαν συμμίμησας 'Αγορηνοῖς \textit{Alexiad III} iii 5, Leib 1:113 8-9.
Crusaders were besieging Antioch, the news that a force of Hagarenes\textsuperscript{370} were coming to its relief, forced Bohemond’s hand against Tatikios. It was in the face of the advent of the Hagarenes\textsuperscript{371} that Alexios organized the general retreat from Philomelion. Detached units were sent out against the Hagarenes\textsuperscript{372} to delay their advance. The use of Hagarenes (along with Armenians, Arabs and Saracens)\textsuperscript{373} in the list of the Sultan of Egypt’s army sent to Ramleh is to show its extent, and gives the Sultan added status so that Alexios’s concern for the captured Frankish counts can be matched by the Sultan’s generosity, without any loss of status for Alexios.\textsuperscript{374} This generality of use also applies to the term Muslim. Malik Shah had long wished for peace between Muslims and Romans\textsuperscript{375}, whilst the emir Mahomet joined in attacking Alexios, when he heard of the defeat of the Muslims from Karme.\textsuperscript{376}

The Armenian Muslim encountered guarding Antioch’s walls against Bohemond\textsuperscript{377} should be contrasted with the text of the Treaty

\textsuperscript{370} \(\piλ\hat{\iota}\nu\hat{\iota}\)ς ‘Αγαρηνών Alexiad XI iv 3, Leib 3:20 9.  
\textsuperscript{371} την των ‘Αγαρηνών έφοδον Alexiad XI vi 4, Leib 3:29 9.  
\textsuperscript{372} κατά των ‘Αγαρηνών Alexiad XI vi 5, Leib 3:29 17.  
\textsuperscript{373} ἐκ τε ‘Αρμενίων καὶ ‘Αράβων Σαρακηνών τε καὶ ‘Αγαρηνών Alexiad XI vii 1, Leib 3:32 18-9.  
\textsuperscript{374} Alexiad XI vii 3, Leib 3:33 14-29.  
\textsuperscript{375} την ἀναμεταξύ των Μουσουλμάνων καὶ ‘Ρωμαίων Alexiad XIV iii 7, Leib 3:157 27-8.  
\textsuperscript{376} τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ Καρμῆ Μουσουλμάνους Alexiad XIV vi 1, Leib 3:169 23.  
\textsuperscript{377} ‘Αρμένιος Alexiad XI iv 2, Leib 3:19 25.
of Devol, supposedly the words of Bohemond, which parallels Turk and Armenian with pagan and Christian, east of the empire at least. Armenian links with Islam occur again in the story of Philaretos, a man from Armenia renowned for his bravery and intelligence. Raised to the rank of Domestic by Romanos Diogenes, Philaretos revolted when Michael VII came to power. He seized Antioch and - to prevent the daily Turkish incursions - sided with them and offered himself for circumcision, according to their custom. His son tried to dissuade him, but when he was ignored, the son went to the Sultan of Nicea, and persuaded him to attack his father in Antioch. The motivations behind this conversion and alliances are more political then religious. The same is also true for Elkanes's acceptance of baptism, with his closest relations, after the siege of Apollonias. Anna uses these conversions to stress Alexios as the most observant and pious chief priest, who wanted to convert not only the nomad Skyths, but also everyone in Persia and also those...

379. Ἀνέρ τις εἶ Ἀρμενίας ὀρμώμενος Φιλάρετος τὴν ἐπισταμένην, περιβλεπτός ἐπ' ἀνδρείᾳ καὶ φρουησε Ἀlexiad VI ix 2, Leib 2:64 5-7.
380. ἐσκέψατο προσελθεῖν τοῖς Τούρκοις καὶ περιπεθήσαναι, ὡς ἔθος αὐτοῖς. Alexiad VI ix 2, Leib 2:64 14-5.
381. Alexiad VI ix 2, Leib 2:64 15-29.
382. Alexiad VI xiii 4, Leib 2:81 1-5. Siavos is another example of conversion by bribery Alexiad VI ix 4, Leib 2:65-6 31-5 and Alexiad VI ix 6, Leib 2:66 30-2.
383. ἔσεθε ἀπόκτητος...εὐσεβείας ἀπαστής ἀρχιερεῦς. Alexiad VI xiii 4, Leib 2:81 11-2.
barbarians in Egypt and Libya who practiced the teachings of Mohammed.

Jews

Anna Komnene's treatment of Judaism in The Alexiad is sparse in the extreme. There is only one reference to the "Hebrews", referring to the fall of Jerusalem to the First Crusade, which resulted in the death of many Saracens and Hebrews. Nearer home, Anna Komnene records that in payment for the Venetian aid, the Doge, Patriarch of Venice and the Church of St. Mark's received annual payments from Alexios I Komnenos. As well as freedom from all Roman exactions and the rents of the Almalfitians who had shops in Constantinople, the Venetians also received the warehouses from the ancient quay of the Hebrews to the Vigla. The Hebrews are now distant in time rather than in space. The final mention of a cognate is the city named Hebraike, which has been identified as Heraclea. Anna Komnene does not comment on this name. The

---


385. 'Εβραίων Alexiad XI vi 9, Leib 3:32 11.

386. ἀλλ' ἔξω πάσης εἶναι Ῥωμαϊκῆς ἔξοισίας Alexiad VI v 10, Leib 2:55 6.


388. ἀπὸ τῆς πολιάς 'Εβραϊκῆς σκόλας Alexiad VI v 10, Leib 2:54 23.


390. Sewter, 342n10; Grousset, Histoire des Croisades (Paris, 1936), 1:37 n3.
single reference to Jew (Ἰουδαῖος) is again historical and foreign as Anna Komnene likens Samuel, last of the Bulgarian dynasty to Zedekiah last of the Jews in a digression on the origin of the name Great Peristhava. Anna Komnene marginalizes the Jews of the Byzantine Empire by omitting them from her account. Given that other sources indicate that the eleventh and twelfth centuries were a period of Jewish immigration into the Empire from the Islamic Levant, her reticence may be due to a feeling that Judaism as a Byzantine heresy should not be seen to be flourishing under Alexios I Komnenos, Anna's suppressor of heresies.

Conclusion

Outsiders by religion in Anna Komnene's Alexiad are individuals and groups cast into an outsider role, more frequently because of political expediency or the desire to improve Alexios's image than because of some religious disagreement. This is not to say that heresy is without a spiritual dimension, but merely that the spiritual dimension is not dominant in The Alexiad. In many ways, Anna Komnene uses religious tags as spatial identifiers, and this links her description of outsiders by religion to Choniates's outsiders by race.

391. Σαμουήλ, ὁ τελευταῖος τῆς Βουλγαρίκης δυναστείας, καθόπερ ὁ Σεδεκίας τῶν Ἰουδαίων Alexiad VII iii 4, Leib 2:96 9-10.
CHAPTER SIX
OUTSIDERS BY RACE IN
NIKETAS CHONIATES'S NARRATIVE.

Thus habit strengthened by time is stronger than race and creed.¹

Though torn from context and isolated, this quotation from Niketas Choniates's Narrative serves better to introduce a discussion of the presentation of racial and ethnic outsiders than the more expected:

Thus between us and them [the most abominable Latins] a greatest chasm of disagreement has been made to stand. We are without known contact and we separate ourselves diametrically, even if we have united [our] bodies and often share the same house. From this, they are mostly haughty and exaggerate the straightness of their shape [i.e. with their heads held exaggeratedly high] out of arrogance and they love to watch us as heels, paying close attention to the smoothness of our manners and how we are close to the ground because of [our] moderation of mind. But to us, they look down because of their superciliousness, their boastfulness, and hauteur and for some of them, their heads are stretched up because of the snot in them.²

Only that they were committed to a course of action and the aid of Christ enabled the Byzantines to contain themselves. These words by Niketas Choniates have been used to sum up his attitude to the westerners (and by extension all foreigners) with whom increasingly the Byzantine empire was coming into contact.³ However Bryer's quotation is selective: no reference is made to εἰ καὶ σώμασι

¹. οὕτω χρόνω κρατημένε ἕθος γένους καὶ θρησκείας ἐστὶν λοχυρότερον Historia, van Dieten 37:92-3.
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the bed and board that prevents a legal separation. Rather than "a touch hysterical," Anthony Cutler has characterized Niketas Choniates's attitude as "not a mindless rage against the Latins."

How is this to be resolved? Byzantine Studies has adopted as a commonplace Sumner's ethnocentrism, the emotional attitude that "one's own group is the centre of everything, and all others are scaled with reference to it..." regarding oneself as superior and looking with contempt on outsiders. Magdalino's study of Byzantine snobbery provides further evidence of this. Looking at the outsider rather than the snobbery, however, note that the deep-seated exclusiveness and paranoia were directed at the outsider as invader, immigrant or slave, ie. external outsiders [foreigners] and internal outsiders [social outcasts].

What of the outsider as loyal servant (John Axouch), as wife (Bertha of Sulzbach, Maria of Antioch), as putative son-in-law (Béla-Alexios) or as ally? These outsiders were not treated with contempt.

Much work has been done on various racial or ethnic groups in the Byzantine Empire. These range from the obvious Byzantium and the

7. William Graham Sumner, Folkways (Boston, 1940), 13.
Arabs\(^9\), the Turks\(^10\), and the West\(^11\); through the more specialized
Byzantium and Armenia\(^12\), Genoa\(^13\), Georgia\(^14\), Jews\(^15\), Magyars\(^16\),

\(^9\) Elizabeth M. Jeffreys, "Arabs in Byzantine Literature", 17th
International Byzantine Congress: Major Papers (New Rochelle, New
York, 1986); Irfan Shahid, Byzantium and the Arabs in the Fourth
Century (Washington, D.C., 1984); Ahmad M. H. Shboul, "Byzantium
and the Arabs: The Image of Byzantines as Mirrored in Arabic
Literature", Byzantine Papers: Byzantina Australiensia 1 (1981), 43-

\(^10\) Charles M. Brand, "The Turkish Element in Byzantium, Eleventh-
Twelfth Centuries", DOP 43 (1989), 1-25; Claude Cahen, Pre-
Ottoman Turkey (London, 1968); Nicholas Zbiden, Abenländische

\(^11\) Hans-Georg Beck, "Byzanz und der Westen im 12 Jahrhundert",
Vorträge und Forschungen 12 (1969), 227-241; C M. Brand,
Byzantium Confronts the West, 1180-1204 (Cambridge MA, 1968);
Anthony A. M. Bryer, "Cultural Relations between East and West in
the Twelfth Century", in Relations Between East and West, edited by
Derek Baker (Edinburgh, 1973) 77-94; Bryer, "First Encounter", 83-

\(^12\) M. Chahin, The Kingdom of Armenia (London, 1987); Peter
Charanis, "The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire", BS 22 (1961),
196-240; also published as The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire
(Lisbon, 1963); Gérard Déderian, "L'immigration arménienne en
Cappadoce au XI\textsuperscript{e} siècle", B 45 (1975), 41-117; S. Der Nersessian,
Armenia and the Byzantine Empire (Cambridge MA, 1945); Andrew
Sharp, "Armenians and Byzantines in the time of Alexius I Comnenus",
Confrontation and Coexistence being Bar-Ilân Studies in History 2
(1984), 101-22; Spero Vryonis, "Byzantine Images of the Armenians",
in The Armenian Image in History and Literature, edited by Richard

\(^13\) Gerald W. Day, "Genoese involvement with Byzantium, 1155-
1204: a diplomatic and prosopographical study", Dissertation
Abstracts International A 39:12 (1979), 7465; and his "Byzantino-
Genoese Diplomacy and the Collapse of Emperor Manuel's Western
Policy, 1168-1171", B 48 (1978), 395-405; and "Manuel and the
Genoese: a reappraisal of Byzantine commercial policy in the late
twelfth century", JEconH 37 (1977) 287-301.


\(^15\) P. Argenti, "The Jewish Community in Chios during the eleventh
century", in Polychronion: Festschrift Franz Dölger zum 75
Geburtstag, ed. Peter Wirth, (Heidelberg, 1966), 39-68; Steven B.
Bowman, The Jews of Byzantium, 1204-1453 (Birmingham, AL,
1985); Vincent Déroche, "La Polémique anti-Judaïque", TM 11
Normans\textsuperscript{17}, Patzinaks\textsuperscript{18}, Rus\textsuperscript{19}, Serbs\textsuperscript{20}, Varangians\textsuperscript{21}, Venice\textsuperscript{22}, and


20. J. Kalic, "Idéologie impérale et histoire des Serbes au XII\textsuperscript{e} siècle", \textit{Actes du V\textsuperscript{e} Congrès International d'Études Byzantines}, 4 Athens (1980), 144-152.


the Vlachs\textsuperscript{23}; to the more esoteric Byzantium and the English\textsuperscript{24}, or Africans\textsuperscript{25}. For all the information these studies provide about their respective racial or ethnic group, they all share one flaw - they do not define who the ethnics were, nor how they were distinguished from the Byzantines. This has resulted in a form of antiquarianism by which we learn much about the Armenians, the Jews or the Vlachs, but very little about how they interrelated with other ethnic groups - including of course the Byzantines - in the social unity of the empire. This is also true of those studies which have concentrated on barbarians as the outgroup.\textsuperscript{26}


\textsuperscript{25} V. Christides, "The Image of the Sudanese in Byzantine Sources", BS 43 (1983), 8-17; Benjamin Hendrickx, "Un roi africain à Constantinople en 1203", Buçești\textsuperscript{m} 13 (1985), 895-8.

\textsuperscript{26} Walter Goffart, Barbarians and Romans, A.D. 418-584: The Techniques of Accommodation (Princeton, 1980); Edith Hall, Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy (Oxford, 1989); Kazhdan, Alexander P. Kahzdan and Ann Wharton Epstein, Change in Byzantine Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries (Berkeley and London, 1985), 167-96; Reinsch, "Ausländer und Byzantiner", Rechtshistorische Journal 8 (1989), 257-74. An exception may be Gadolin, who seems to discount race, writing: 'Provided one is ready to recognise the overlordship of the 'emperor of the Romans' as does the Bulgarian prince Alousianos, race may even appear to be decisively a question of secondary importance.' A. R. Gadolin, A Theory of History and Society (Amsterdam, 1987), 120.
Race and ethnicity are both analytical and folk concepts.\textsuperscript{27} Fittingly enough in a thesis submitted to St. Andrews, the earliest use of the word race in the "English" language was by William Dunbar in circa 1508. By race, Dunbar intended a sort or kind, differentiated from other human beings, but sharing something in common.\textsuperscript{28} In the early stages, race meant descent or blood, some form of family relationship.\textsuperscript{29} Given Niketas Choniates’s use of γένος - race, stock, kin, or family - this simple definition has a certain appeal and indeed validity. The writers on Byzantine race and ethnic relations mentioned above rely on similar folk concepts to define their groups, working on the assumption that everyone knows who is an Armenian, who is a Vlach. However, as the State of Israel found during the Brother Daniel case, it can be difficult to determine who is and who is not a Jew\textsuperscript{30}, and the same is true for all racial or ethnic groups.

What then is the analytical concept of race or ethnicity? Race or ethnicity is an attempt to categorize individual human variation. There have been three phases in the sociological approach to race. The first was biological classification; the second saw cultural


\textsuperscript{28} Michael Banton and Jonathan Harwood, The Race Concept (Newton Abbot and London, 1975), 13; OED 2nd. ed. sv race, 8a; Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue 7 sv race 3a.

\textsuperscript{29} Brewton Berry and Henry L. Tischler, Race and Ethnic Relations, 4th. ed. (Boston, 1978), 32.

\textsuperscript{30} Berry and Tischler, Race and Ethnic Relations, 30.
difference as the root of conflict; the third interprets race as part of
group contact and interaction.31

Biological

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, drawing heavily on the
Linnaean systems of classification, human variations were seen
primarily as biological. Various phenotype32 differences - most
noticeably skin colour, but head shape, hair form, lip and nose width
all served - were identified as the markers which distinguished
between the races. In 1775, Blumenbach first identified five divisions
of humanity: Caucasian, Mongolian, Ethiopian, American and
Malayan.33 Since then, physical anthropologists have not agreed on
which criteria to use, and races have varied in number therefore from
three to over twenty. At best,

a race is a subgroup of peoples possessing a definite
combination of physical characteristics of genetic origin; this
combination serves in varying degree, to distinguish the
subgroup from other subgroups of mankind and the
combination is transmitted in descent providing all conditions
which originally gave rise to the definite combination remain
relatively unaltered; as a rule the subgroup inhabits or did
inhabit a more or less restricted geographical region.34


32. The phenotype is an organism's actual visible or measurable
appearance in respect of a trait or traits. This is contrasted with the
genotype which is the underlying genetic constitution of the organism
in respect of a particular trait or traits. Banton and Harwood, The
Race Concept, 48-9.


34. W. M. Kroghman, "The Concept of Race", in The Science of Man in
the World Crisis, ed. R. Linton (New York, 1945), 49.
Furthermore, the various racial criteria vary discordantly\(^{35}\), and are plastic not immutable.\(^{36}\) Since the middle of the twentieth century, the idea of the cline has been gaining ground.

Clines may be defined as biological gradients in space. The distribution of a trait having been plotted, lines are drawn connecting the same frequencies, and what emerges is a pattern of curves rather like those on a weather map.\(^{37}\)

As human clinal variation is also discordant\(^{38}\), the classification of human variation by cline is in effect a denial that races as distinct discrete groups exist: "there are no races, there are only clines".\(^{39}\)

In this confusion, many physical anthropologists favour abandoning race as an analytic concept altogether.\(^{40}\) Blumenbach was in advance of his times when he added to his classification that each division was:

- connected with others by such an imperceptible transition that it is very clear that they are all related or only differ from one another by degrees.\(^{41}\)

He saw racial characteristics merely as a way of tracing Mendelian populations, not as discrete separate entities.

---

\(^{35}\) Banton and Harwood, *The Race Concept*, 57.


\(^{38}\) Banton and Harwood, *The Race Concept*, 58.


\(^{41}\) Banton and Harwood, *The Race Concept*, 24-5.
As no firm biological basis for the division of a human population - people living in the United Kingdom, the inhabitants of Constantinople in 1200 - can be established, attention then turned to cultural variation as a marker of human difference. This had the added advantage of dealing with ethnic as well as racial variation. If two human groups in interaction were to be analyzed genetically, it is almost certain that there would be a significant difference in the frequency of one or more of the genes. However, whether that difference would be statistically significant given the total number of genes shared between the groups is moot. Furthermore, it is unlikely that the genetic difference between the groups would be the cause, or substructure of the cultural differences between the two groups.

**Interaction**

42. A race may be defined as a group socially defined on the basis of physical criteria; an ethnic group is a group socially defined on the basis of cultural criteria [van den Berghe, *Race and Racism*, 9-10]. Van den Berghe maintains that the distinction between race and ethnicity is analytically useful - for example that membership in a racial minority is often involuntary, membership in an ethnic minority often voluntary [Banton, "Analytical and folk concepts", 136]. This draws too strong a distinction. Race may be a more rigid form of social cleavage, persisting after the cultural markers of ethnicity have been lost or shed, but see Berry and Tischler, *Race and Ethnic Relations*, 4 and 41 for the view that race and ethnicity are of the same conceptual order. A similar distinction has been drawn between nationalism (self-aware organized ethnocultural solidarity) and ethnicity which may be "other"-defined ethnocultural solidarity [Edwards, *Language, Society and Identity*, 5]. See Magdalino's discussion "Hellenism and Nationalism in Byzantium", *Tradition and Transformation in Medieval Byzantium* (Aldershot, 1991), paper XIV, for the application of ideas of nationalism to Byzantium.

The final view of race emphasizes its reality in social interaction between people. Race or ethnicity therefore is a subjective and social reality, with no objective reality independent of its social definition.\textsuperscript{44} This is not to say that biological and social race or ethnicity are utterly separate. Social ethnicity or race rests on biological phenotypes or genotypes, but only within the folk concept is there identity. Just as with sex and gender, phenotypes are a biological given, but social race or ethnicity is a cultural construct.\textsuperscript{45} As an example of this, consider the ability of money to lighten skin colour in Brazil. In Brazilian culture, blacks are poor; if one is not poor, then one is not black; one’s actual skin colour has no relevance. The phenotypical differences of skin colour, hair shape and somatype which people see around them are the signs they use to identify various ascribed social roles.\textsuperscript{46}

Frederik Barth’s work on ethnic boundaries as symbolic constructs utilized and manipulated to their own ends by those who use them\textsuperscript{47}, has freed ethnic groups from the need for a distinctive culture:\textsuperscript{48}

The group boundary can be maintained by shared objective characteristics such as language or religion; by more subjective

\textsuperscript{44} van den Berghe, \textit{Race and Racism}, 148; Anya Peterson Royce, \textit{Ethnic Identity: Strategies of Diversity} (Bloomington, 1982), 4-5.

\textsuperscript{45} Banton, "Analytical and folk concepts", 128; Berry and Tischler, \textit{Race and Ethnic Relations}, 23-5; Charles A. Weitz, \textit{An Introduction to Physical Anthropology and Archaeology} (Englewood Cliffs, 1979), 196.

\textsuperscript{46} Banton, "Analytical and folk concepts", 129-30.


\textsuperscript{48} Banton, "Analytical and folk concepts", 135.
contributions to a sense of "groupness"; or by some combination of the two.\textsuperscript{49}

However, what this emphasis on boundaries does require is something to be across the boundary. For twelfth-century Byzantium, there is Diehl's observation:

\textit{C'est que ce XII\textsuperscript{e} siècle est le moment où l'Orient byzantin se trouve amené par les circonstances à un contact plus direct et plus intime avec l'Occident et de ce rapprochement résulte une pénétration de l'Orient par l'Occident.}\textsuperscript{50}

The exact form of a group's response to the "other" varies. It may become fixed at any moment in time - and this is the model usually imposed on Byzantium, with the unchanging division between Byzantine and Barbarian - or it may remain in a state of flux, responding to changes in the group interaction. The responses may be firmly fixed in reality or they may operate on the basis of myth. In most cases, however, it occupies the "seductive middle ground" which hints at reality but also uses the fantasy of myth.\textsuperscript{51}

Michael H. Lyon has suggested that an ethnic group may be defined by an inclusive boundary, whilst a racial group is defined by an exclusive boundary.\textsuperscript{52} This overstresses the rigid nature of social racial ascription, and does not take into account the possibility of "passing", i.e. when the member of one social race passes as the


\textsuperscript{50} Charles Diehl, \textit{La Société Byzantine à l'Époque des Comnènes} (Paris, 1929), 6.

\textsuperscript{51} Royce, \textit{Ethnic Identity}, 5.

\textsuperscript{52} Michael H. Lyon, "Race and Ethnicity in Pluralistic Societies: a comparison of minorities in the UK and USA", \textit{New Community} 1 (1972), 256-62.
member of another. However, what should be drawn from this is that
groups' relations involve a double boundary round each group, one
drawn on the inside, the other on the outside.53

These group boundaries achieve a heightened significance when
groups in contact compete for scarce resources, or believe themselves
to be in competition. Intergroup contact in the presence of scarce
resources generates belief in a zero-sum game.54 For Byzantium:

[the Turks] were conscious that Byzantium represented an
alien people, religion and culture and, though always
quarreling among themselves, would unite in the face of
Byzantine aggression. The same is equally true of the Latins.55

The perception of a threat is as effective in generating group solidarity
as an actual threat.56

Human groups which see themselves as different, or have this
difference imposed upon them, [i.e. have feelings of ethnic identity]
and then interact after contact have five options leading to resolution:
anihilation; segregation; stratification; pluralism; assimilation.57

Originating in American sociology, quite how these five options relate
to one another is debated heatedly. The American social archetype -
increasingly under fire - is the "melting pot" which assumes a straight-
line model of group interaction moving by increasingly frequent and

53. Banton, "Analytical and folk concepts", 136; Donald G. Baker,
Race, Ethnicity and Power: A Comparative Study (London, 1983) 4-5;
Royce, Ethnic Identity, 29.

54. Baker, Race, Ethnicity and Power, 29.

55. Michael Angold, The Byzantine Empire, 1025-1204: A Political

56. Baker, Race, Ethnicity and Power, 10-3.

57. Berry and Tischler, Race and Ethnic Relations, 91.
meshed transactions from annihilation through segregation and stratification, to pluralism and then to the assimilation of all ethnic groups into the dominant "non-ethnic" group, white Anglo-Saxon Protestants. Commentators on American society in the past thirty years have moved to the "Irish stew" model, which stops short of total assimilation, with ethnic groups remaining identifiable as potatoes, carrots or onions. The symbolic ethnicity of the fifth generation Americans provides ethnic group border maintenance that looks set to continue, never quite reaching zero. Other theorists see annihilation and assimilation as the two alternatives, with segregation, stratification and pluralism as short-term accommodations, adopted because neither group is strong enough to impose its preferred solution - expulsion or amalgamation. Finally some see the five options as equally viable responses to group contact.

Given the sheer volume of references to ethnoracial outsiders in Choniates's Narrative, I have been forced by reason of space to abandon the inclusive methodology used for Psellos on Outsiders by Gender and Komnene on Outsiders by Religion. Therefore I use Berry and Tischler's five categories (annihilation, segregation, stratification, pluralism and assimilation) as a way of ordering Choniates's portrayal of ethnoracial outsiders. For the first four categories I present examples of Choniates's portrayal which falls into those categories. The selection is arbitrary. They are not the most obvious, the longest, the shortest or necessarily the most telling; but I

think they are the most interesting. The fifth category is presented in its entirety because the assimilationist trend best counters the dominant view that Byzantines hated all foreigners. In using Berry and Tischler's categories, I present them as a way of "managing" Choniates's portrayals of ethnoracial outsiders, not as the means of explaining them. Allocation of some of the examples is arbitrary, but the categories are to help understand, not to render neat and tidy.

**Annihilation**

This category encompasses the hatred and xenophobia that is held to characterize Byzantines' relations with foreigners, the barbarians, as well as extermination or expulsion is the final solution in this resolution of group interaction. I am not attempting a revisionist reading of Byzantine sources suggesting that the teaching of contempt did not exist. The portrayal of the foreigner as near-animal exists in Choniates's *Narrative*:

[The Skyths crossed the Danube quickly] because their equipment is a quiver slung round the waist to one side and a curved bow and arrows. And when in battle they use these things and brandish spears and also wheel about. And this same horse bears the Skyth, carries [him] through the furious battles, and it furnishes food when it has a vein opened, and also (they say) being covered it releases the insensate sexual desire of the barbarian.59

This emphasis on the barbaric nature of the Skyths (bestiality, eating blood, "tearing" bits from live animals for food - broadly the levitical

---

prohibitions) is not used directly in the narrative when Choniates recounts how the Skyths crossed the Danube using inflated animal skins.

The teaching of contempt, however, has a range of tones that too often is ignored. The role imposed on the Muslims by Choniates’s value system is not the same as that given to the Skyths. Telling the story of the lands of Mas’ud and their descent to his son Kilij Arslan, and sons-in-law Yaghi-Basan and Dhu’l Nun, Choniates begins a jeremiad prompted in part because until recently the lands had been subject to the Romans. Choniates describes the Turks in biblical terms as "a foolish people, without understanding separated at a distance from pious practice about You and faith." They are the descendants of the bondwoman Hagar, who lord it over those who are free [the Byzantines], destroying and killing Thy holy nation; they are the accursed ones, born of other races; they are the
worthless neighbours\textsuperscript{67} and the other tribes\textsuperscript{68}.

The Byzantines prayed for Divine intervention, and it was effective, as the sons of Mas'ud concerned themselves with differences (\textit{διαφοράς}) and disagreements (\textit{διαστάσεως}).\textsuperscript{69} Kilij Arslan of Ikonion and Yaghi-Basan of Cappadocia began plotting against each other, both attempting to enlist Manuel's aid. Manuel "taking [his] ease, rejoiced in their adversities as they were foreigners and impious."\textsuperscript{70} Manuel supported Yaghi-Basan against Kilij Arslan. In his turn the sultan went to Constantinople and appealed to the emperor for help.\textsuperscript{71} Manuel hoped that pandering to the "money-loving barbarian"\textsuperscript{72} would bring glory to the empire. The prospect of a triumph in the city with the sultan provoked an earthquake.\textsuperscript{73} The clergy said that it was due to God's anger that an impious man\textsuperscript{74} was to have taken part in a triumph decorated with Christian appurtenances.

\textsuperscript{67} \textit{τοῖς πονηροῖς γείτονοι Historia, van Dielen 117:95.}
\textsuperscript{68} \textit{οἱ ἄλλοφυλοι Historia, van Dielen 117:2.}
\textsuperscript{69} \textit{Historia, van Dielen 117:11.}
\textsuperscript{70} \textit{ν' ἤγην ἤρεμων αὐτὸς τοῖς ἔκεισθαι ἑπιχαίρη κακοῖς ὡς ἄλλοφυλοι καὶ ἀςεβῶν Historia, van Dielen 118:18-9.}
\textsuperscript{71} \textit{Historia, van Dielen 118:30-4.}
\textsuperscript{72} \textit{φιλοχρήματον βάρβαρον Historia, van Dielen 118:36-7.}
\textsuperscript{73} \textit{Historia, van Dielen 118-9:40-7.}
\textsuperscript{74} \textit{μὴ θεοσεβεῖας ἄνδρα Historia, van Dielen 119:50.}
Eventually, the sultan returned home laden with munificent gifts, the emperor knowing that "every barbarian was enslaved by gain." The treasures arrayed in the public halls of the imperial palace included "things rare among the barbarians and many [things] never seen by them." Who could withstand Roman might, if Manuel were to pour out wealth on "foreign and native troops"? The sultan promised to hand over Sebasteia, and Manuel promised more gifts if Kilij Arsian converted his words into deeds. Manuel anticipated the barbarian's decision and dispatched Gabras with further gifts. However, when he returned home, the sultan who was a cheat and never knew what was the whole truth, broke the treaties, laid siege to Sebastia and captured it, taking the city and the surrounding land. 

Physically, Kilij Arsian was maimed with distorted hands, walked with a limp and usually travelled in a litter. The sultan did not lead "a quiet life, but by nature was given to causing trouble and as ungovernable as a gulf of the sea." He waged war on the Romans...
without cause and without declaration. He also attacked the emir of Metilene, "neither [the fact that] he seemed to be of the same religion as him" or that he had nothing against him, stopped Kilij Arslan from expelling the emir. He also plotted against his brother, and both took refuge in Constantinople.

Changes in Kilij Arslan's fortunes brought on changes in attitude. "He changed according to the season like a barbarian." If he needed to, he was subordinate, but he readily accommodated being made as light as a feather if Fortune weighted the pans of the scales, deciding for him in undertakings once again. Kilij Arslan used flattery to win over Manuel, treating him like a father, whilst Manuel treated him, not as if he were keeping a wild beast - θηροκομούμενος - but as a son. In the letters that were exchanged, the emperor and sultan called each other father and son. This friendship - φιλίαν - they both affected was false on both sides. Kilij Arslan acted as a poisonous serpent, whilst the emperor held back Kilij Arslan's inroads with soldiers, or lulled the serpent to sleep with gold. Dealing with the

---

84. βασιλεικός μεταλλούμενος τῷ καιρῷ Historia, van Dieten 123:71.
87. καὶ ἰδόν τὰ παρ᾽ ἀλλήλων χαραττόμενα γράμματα πατέρα βασιλέα καὶ σουλτάνου ὑδύν κατασχέσατο Historia, van Dieten 123:77-8.
88. φόρμακα δράκουντα Historia, van Dieten 123:81.
forays of the Turks\textsuperscript{90} into Byzantine lands, Manuel repulsed their attacks, as the Turks\textsuperscript{91} dared not raise their hands against him. The sultan's ambassador Suleiman maintained that the Turks\textsuperscript{92} were acting against the sultan's wishes. Suleiman, discovered to be lying abroad for his nation, resorted to "paying court in excess of the genuine, as is the custom of the barbarians"\textsuperscript{93} giving some of his own swift horses to Manuel. The emperor, "not ignorant of these things"\textsuperscript{94} sent Suleiman to taunt Kilij Arslan with his untrustworthiness, his unfaithfulness and his evilness of behaviour\textsuperscript{95}, and to threaten him with Roman retribution. Given the continued incursions of the Turks\textsuperscript{96}, Manuel sent Basil Tzikandeles and then Michael Angelos to attack them. The commanders used σίδηρος as a shibboleth to distinguish those who were of the same origin, because they sounded the same, whereas silence would indicate someone of a foreign tongue\textsuperscript{97}. The password differentiated the races\textsuperscript{98} and iron entered.

\textsuperscript{90} Τούρκους Historia, van Dieten 124:89.
\textsuperscript{91} Περσῶν Historia, van Dieten 124:91.
\textsuperscript{92} Τούρκων Historia, van Dieten 124:94.
\textsuperscript{93} θεραπεύων δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ τὸ ἀληθές, ώς ἔθος τοῖς βαρβάροις Historia, van Dieten 124:2-3.
\textsuperscript{94} ὁ οὖκ ἦν ἄγυιον Historia, van Dieten 124:8.
\textsuperscript{95} καὶ ἐς αὐτὸ τοῦ τρόπου ἀποσκώπουτα τὸ παλίμβολον τὸ ἀπιστῶν τε καὶ τὸ κακόθες Historia, van Dieten 124:8-9.
\textsuperscript{96} τοῖς Τούρκων Historia, van Dieten 125:27.
\textsuperscript{97} ὡς εἰς αὐτός ὀὕτως ἀντιπαρέρχεσθαι μὲν τὸ ὁμόφυλον ὡς ὁμόφωνον, τὸ δὲ σιγὴ ἐπίον καίνοιεν ὡς ἀλλόγιωττον Historia, van Dieten 125:33-5.
\textsuperscript{98} διέστελλε τὰ γένη Historia, van Dieten 125:36.
the souls of the Turks. Many of the Turks were killed; eventually they recognized the significance of the word.

The extended episcope of the battle of Myriokephalon shows at length how Choniates portrays the Turks. The account opens as if Manuel will be praised and Kilij Arslan criticized because the latter found more use in having his Turks always pouring over the Roman borders. Manuel went out against him, and would not allow the ruler of the Persians a savage sleeping wild beast to remain at peace, but roused him to battle. However, Choniates does not present a difference of civilized Byzantine against barbarian beast, for both were inclined to hasty action. If anything, the contrast between the two rulers was the subversion of the norm, for it was the sultan who exercised caution and planned carefully, commanding through his generals: "no-one saw him standing in the frontline of a phalanx or bearing along with them the burden of his soldiers." By contrast, "the emperor having a brave nature, displayed [himself] quickly roused in wars and he was audacious in the

100. οἱ Τουρκοὶ Historia, van Dieten 125:37.
102. θῇρα ὁμοστόν ἐφυπνώστησεν Historia, van Dieten 175:30-3.
103. ἀλλ’ ἐμφυθο πρὸς θερμούριαν ὄντες ἐπιρρεπεῖς Historia, van Dieten 175:35-6.
104. οὐ γὰρ πιὰ τὰς αὐτὸν ἐθεάσατο ἐπὶ μετώπου ἰστάμενου φάλαινας ἢ τῶν καμάτων τὸς στρατιώτας συνδιαφέροντα Historia, van Dieten 175:42-4.
deeds of his hands.\textsuperscript{105} Manuel led from the front, a virtue in Choniates's eyes.

Manuel provoked the barbarian\textsuperscript{106}, Kilij Arslan, so that he could rebuild Dorylaion. Both sides used diplomacy to further their own ends. Threatened by the rapid refortification of Dorylaion led by Manuel\textsuperscript{107}, the Turks\textsuperscript{108} feared for their grazing lands and attacked the Romans\textsuperscript{109}, preventing them from foraging and killed those beneath their hands.\textsuperscript{110} "The emperor overcame this difficulty easily."\textsuperscript{111} Manuel wished to bring war to the Turks\textsuperscript{112} and they were pressured into destroying their crops and tents to prevent the Romans gaining supplies.\textsuperscript{113} With increased hostility, Manuel recruited more troops. "He enrolled not a few mercenaries, and these rather more from the race of the Latins and from among the nearby Skyths [i.e.

\textsuperscript{105} ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς γενναίαν έχων τὴν φύσιν ὀξύρροπος ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις ἐθέλησεν καὶ τὰς διὰ χειρὸς πράξεις ὅρατον ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῆς τὴν \textsuperscript{Historia}, van Dieten 175:44-6.

\textsuperscript{106} τὸν βάρβαρον \textsuperscript{Historia}, van Dieten 176:50.

\textsuperscript{107} \textsuperscript{Historia}, van Dieten 176:55-9.

\textsuperscript{108} οἱ Πέρσαι \textsuperscript{Historia}, van Dieten 176:60.

\textsuperscript{109} κατὰ \textsuperscript{Ῥωμαίων \textsuperscript{Historia}, van Dieten 176:63.

\textsuperscript{110} καὶ ἀνήρφοι τοὺς ἐν χερσὶ \textsuperscript{Historia}, van Dieten 176:64-5.

\textsuperscript{111} ὁ βασιλεὺς δὲ τὸ δεινὸν τοῦτο ἐρώσθη \textsuperscript{Historia}, van Dieten 176:65.

\textsuperscript{112} Πέρσαις \textsuperscript{Historia}, van Dieten 176:70.

\textsuperscript{113} \textsuperscript{Historia}, van Dieten 176:70-2.
just across the Danube]. He marched out with the army numbered in thousands to exterminate the Turks. Even though Manuel invoked God's aid in Aghia Sophia, the Judgment of God went in favour of the enemy.

Choniates describes Manuel as acting carefully, in accord with books of tactics, but constrained by the large number of pack animals to move slowly. In contrast, the Turks engaged in light skirmishes, harrying the Romans. For his part Kilij Arslan also recruited allies from Mesopotamia and also northern barbarians of the same tribe. The sultan sued for peace and "those not unpractised in warfare, especially Turkish warfare, and advanced in years" urged Manuel to accept the embassy of the Turk, advising him not to overlook the excellence of the Turkish horsemanship,

114. έστρατολόγει δὲ καὶ ξενικόν οὐκ ὀλίγον, καὶ τούτῳ ἐκ τοῦ γένους μάλιστα τῶν Λατίνων καὶ ἀπ’ αὐτῶν δὴ τῶν Ποριστρίων Σκυθῶν Historia, van Dieten 178:6-8.
118. οἱ Πέρσαι Historia, van Dieten 179:34.
119. ξυμμαχικὸν Historia, van Dieten 179:40-1.
120. ὁποὶ τοῖς Μέσης τῶν ποταμῶν καὶ τῶν ἄνω συμφύλων βαρβάρων Historia, van Dieten 179:41-2.
121. ὅσοι πολέμων οὐκ ἀμελετητοὶ καὶ μάλιστα δὴ τῶν Περσικῶν καὶ χρόνων προῆκουτες Historia, van Dieten 179:44-5.
122. τοῦ Πέρσου Historia, van Dieten 179:46.
123. τῶν Πούρκων Historia, van Dieten 179:50.
nor the illness of the army. However, Manuel listened to the advice of his near blood relations instead.

With Kilij Arslan sure that the negotiation would come to naught, he occupied the high positions on the route. Manuel made no attempt to reduce the Turks with his light units before the passage of the main army. The barbarians attacked and the Roman advance was put into disorder. Some barbarians were dislodged by the infantry of the van.

Baldwin, brother of Manuel's wife Maria, was in command of the right wing, which followed the van. They were attacked by the Turks. When Baldwin saw that his command was unable to break through, he gathered some knights and launched himself at the Turkish line. However, surrounded by the [opposing] warriors he was killed and everyone with him died, having displayed bold deeds and

---

125. τοῖς ἐς αἵματος αὐτῶν προσήκουσι Historia, van Dieten 179:53.
127. Πέρσας Historia, van Dieten 180:73.
128. Οἱ βάρβαροι Historia, van Dieten 180:77-8.
129. τοὺς βαρβάρους Historia, van Dieten 180:93.
130. μετὰ δὲ τοῦ τούς τὸ μὲν δεξιὸν ἐπείχε κέρας ὁ τοῦ βασιλέως γυναικάδελφος Βαλδουίνος Historia, van Dieten 180:84-6. Thus even in a section largely devoted to antagonism between Byzantine and foreigner, there are indication of assimilation.
131. Περσῶν Historia, van Dieten 181:1;3;11; Οἱ Πέρσαι 181:4.
brave undertakings. The barbarians closed in on the Romans. "They [the Byzantines] were easily killed there by the attackers." Death was dealt out to man and animal alike by the Turkish arrow.

Continuing the account of the battle, the Turks are named as Πέρσαι and τούς πολεμίους and τοίς Ἀμασεῳ Τούρκοις. When Manuel tried to dislodge them, they are Οἱ Πέρσαι and τοὺς βαρβάρους. The Turks were ever pervasive, and Manuel launched an attack against the warriors opposing him with a few of his troops, and left the rest to save themselves. Manuel suffered many injuries at the hands of the Turks standing round him, but he

---

132. ἀναλαμβῶν ἑπτάς τως εἰς τὰς φάλαγγας διελθὼν τῶν Περσῶν, κυκλῳδεῖς δὲ ύπὸ τῶν πολεμίων αὐτῶς τε κατακαίνεται καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ πίστωσιν ἀπομνημένοι πάλαι ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἔχεις ἔργα καὶ χειρός γενναῖος παράστημα ἐνδειξάμενοι Historia, van Dieten 181:10-3.
138. The Turks of Amaseia Historia, van Dieten 182:41. These are the opponents against whom Andronikos Vatatzes, Manuel's nephew, son of Eudokia, Manuel's sister, had been sent.
141. τῶν Περσῶν Historia, van Dieten 183:61.
142. πρὸς τοὺς ἐνώπιον αὐτῶς πολεμίους Historia, van Dieten 183:63.
143. ύπὸ τῶν περιστάτων αὐτῶν Περσῶν Historia, van Dieten 183:68.
escaped (by God’s protection) capture by the barbarians. The rest of the army beat off some Turks but were cut down by the enemy. The defiles were occupied by the Turks the rest of the country occupied by the enemy. The battle continued in a storm and the enemies killed their friends. The foreigner could not be distinguished from the fellow-countryman. Turks and Byzantines fought each other, and with drawn sword they killed their own race as enemies. Both Byzantines and barbarians ended up in a common grave with horses, oxen and asses. Manuel was attacked unhindered by some Turk; other Turks attacked him, but he

144. τῶν βαρβάρων Historia, van Dieten 183:72.
145. Πέρσας Historia, van Dieten 183:78.
146. ὑπὸ τῶν...πολεμίων Historia, van Dieten 183:79-80.
147. παρὰ τῶν Τούρκων Historia, van Dieten 183:83.
149. τοῖς ἑχθροῖς τοὺς φίλους ἐπικατέσφετον Historia, van Dieten 183:88.
150. οὕτω ἦν ἐξ ὁμοφύλου διακρίνετον ὀλλόφυλον Historia, van Dieten 184:89.
151. Πέρσας καὶ Ὁρμαῖοι Historia, van Dieten 184:89.
152. καθ’ ὁμογενῶς Historia, van Dieten 184:90.
153. ὡς πολέμιον Historia, van Dieten 184:91.
156. τις Πέρσης Historia, van Dieten 184:17.
repulsed them easily.158 In his escape, Manuel’s way was blocked by the Turks.159 Another group having killed John Kantakouzenos160 followed the emperor. They are described as οἱ Πέρσαι.161 All were mounted on Arab horses and in appearance they were distinguished from the many.162 Their weapons were distinguished163 and their horses’ trappings were most splendid.164 The emperor roused his men and repelled the charge of the warriors.165 Gradually, he outdistanced the Turks.166

When Manuel saw the Turks167 plundering the imperial tent, he attempted to rouse his men to attack the barbarians168 to stop the theft of the gold and silver. Manuel said they had more right to it than the Turks.169 The emperor was denounced by a Byzantine, who said it

162. ἦσαν δ’ οὕτωι πάντες Ἀραβίως ἔποιοι ὑποῖς καὶ κατὰ θέαιν τῶν πολλῶν ὑπερφέρουσις Historia, van Dieten 185:40-1.
163. ἐκρεπέσως Historia, van Dieten 185:41.
164. λαμπροτάτοις Historia, van Dieten 185:42.
165. τῶν πολεμίων Historia, van Dieten 185:45.
166. τοὺς Πέρσας Historia, van Dieten 185:48.
would suit the emperor better to meet the gold-looting Turks\textsuperscript{170} in battle and return the plunder to the Romans, rather than telling them to fight for what was previously theirs.

Manuel and his remnant made camp for the night, but the barbarians\textsuperscript{171} surrounded the bivouac, and urged their fellow ethnics, who had gone over to the Romans either from necessity or because they had changed faith\textsuperscript{172} to leave the camp as on the morrow all would be dead.

God then intervened to save the holy nation.\textsuperscript{173}

He moved the sultan’s spirit to unaccustomed most novel mercy, and formerly having feared the emperor’s martial quality [the sultan] then pitied [Manuel’s] misfortunes.\textsuperscript{174} God then deflected the Turkish ruler from fitting activity.\textsuperscript{175} The sultan began negotiations with the emperor, impelled by the Almighty.\textsuperscript{176} Some Turks\textsuperscript{177} were unaware of the sultan’s plans and continued their attacks, encircling the Romans\textsuperscript{178}, being wild beasts,
gobbling up or carrying off deserted eggs and [the contents] of an abandoned nest. Continuing the encircling beasts/encircling barbarians image, the Turks encircled the camp and shouted out in barbarian fashion.

Manuel ordered John, Constantine Angelos's son to attack the Turks, but he was repulsed. Kilij Arslan dispatched Gabras "first of those honoured by him and the best of [his] household" to the emperor. The Turks stopped their attacks. Gabras bowed deep before Manuel, in the barbarian way and gave him a horse. Gabras extracted his surcoat from Manuel in exchange, and then the treaties were drawn up and signed. Manuel learnt that the barbarian truly wanted peace, and asked to return by another route. However, the guides brought him past all the dead. The skin of their heads [scalps] and penises of the slain had been removed. It was said that the

---

179. οία θήρες, λαφύζοντες, ἡ ὑς ἐγκαταλελειμμένα ὡς καὶ νοσσίων ἐρήμην ἀπαξοῦντες Historia, van Dieten 188:37-8.
181. τοῖς Πέρσας Historia, van Dieten 189:41.
182. τὰ πρῶτα τῶν παρ’ αὐτῶ τετμημένων καὶ ψευδωμένων μάλιστα Historia, van Dieten 189:47-8.
184. βαρβαρικὴν Historia, van Dieten 189:51.
Turks did this, so that the circumcised could not be distinguished from the uncircumcised, and thus the victory could be disputed as many had fallen from both armies. Manuel’s dream before setting out against the Turks was echoed in its evil portent by the dream of Mauropoulos, a Roman by race.

The Turks harried the Romans on their retreat. It seemed the sultan regretted his clemency. Choniates narrates that Manuel compared his own fate to Romanos Diogenes’s experience κατὰ τῶν Τούρκων, but he came off best as he was not captured and he made treaties with the sultan.

Segregation

In the Narrative of Choniates, segregation is not a frequent way of resolving intergroup conflict. In his account of the punishment meted out to Andronikos Doukas by Andronikos Komnenos, Choniates says that after he was stoned on Ascension Day, Doukas was taken...
"to the other side of the straits [the Golden Horn], to the [place] separated off for the burial place of the Jews." The actual fate of Doukas (impaled, but with no suggestion that it was carried out by Jews) and Constantine Makrodoukas (impaled on a hill opposite the Mangana monastery) is not the issue. What is, is that the segregation of the Jews of Constantinople, mentioned by Benjamin of Tudela, is so complete - at least reading Choniates - that Jews both Rabbaniotes and Kara'ites disappear, apart from this mention and one other to the Jewish legion which opposed Titus from the Second Temple.

Segregation, however, was used as a means of maintaining discipline. When Manuel was attacking Corfu, the fleet's ships were divided into Venetian (allies) and Roman squadrons "so that in this way the ships at anchor of both the races would be unmixed and inexperienced in the disagreements that [come] of promiscuous mixing."

The daring attack on the citadel led by Poupakes and the Petraliphai brothers had just ended in disaster, when the need for segregation was shown as the Romans and Venetians separated into

---

196. τὸν μὲν ἐς τὴν περαίαν, ἢ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις εἰς ταφὴν ἀποτέθηκεν Ἰστορία, van Dieten 294:25-6.

197. Ἰουδαϊκοῦ τάγματος Ἰστορία, van Dieten 241:80.

198. ἣν καὶ διαμερίσθησαν πρὸς ἐνόρμισιν ἄ𝑡ε τῶν Οὐεντανῶν συμμαχίδες ὑπὲς καὶ αἷς Ἰουδαῖοι λατσοὶ, ἵνα ἔτεκεν τῶν μαχητῶν τῶν κατὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἀναστροφῆς ἀγαθοτοί διαφορῶν Ἰστορία, van Dieten 77-8:36-9.
factions in the open. The conflict was not one of words but their hands had weapons and battle with doubtful [outcome] reared up. "And many - even those who were unarmed - intervened, exalted in the emperor's family, and illustrious in rank. The most senior of the Venetians also came to extinguish the evil and to act as mediators. The crowd was not swayed by these "great men." The Grand Domestic attempted to check them, but this only enraged the Venetians even more. When he saw that the races were going to clash, his own bodyguard were summoned, who had been useful to him in time of battle and these good armed [warriors] were deployed. He sent them against the Venetians. He also used the

203. καὶ τῶν Βενετίων δὲ ἀφίκοντο οἱ γεφαιτοί τὸς σβέσοντες τὸ κακὸν καὶ διαλακτήτης ἐσόμενοι Historia, van Dietén 85:52-3.
204. μεγίστων ἀνδρῶν Historia, van Dietén 85:54-5.
205. Οὔεντανοὶ Historia, van Dietén 85:59.
207. τοὺς ἴδιους μετασχηματεῖσα δορυφόρους Historia, van Dietén 85:62.
209. Βενετίκων Historia, van Dietén 86:64.
army and forced them back on board their ships.

The Venetians were possessed of a barbaric understanding. Like wild animals in their death throes, they were unable to accept their defeat by the Romans. They acted as enemies to the Romans on Euboia. The ships manned by the Euboians seem to have drawn their special attention. The Venetians compounded their crimes by stealing the imperial ship, and after decorating it with hangings, used a little man a certain black-skinned Ethiopian to impersonate Manuel in the parody of the imperial coronation they carried out. Manuel wished to punish the barbarians, but force of circumstance required leniency, and some of his own family were sent to offer amnesty to the Venetians.

Stratification

211. κατά τὰ δυσθάνατα τῶν θηρίων Historia, van Dieten 86:68.
212. ώς πολέμοι Historia, van Dieten 86:73.
216. κελεχρώτα των Ἁλθίσων Historia, van Dieten 86:81. Compare this with the description of Manuel at 51:77-81 which seems to stress Manuel as an outdoor type who wins battles [ἀναχωρεῖν LSI sv 2 cf. Iliad "not withdraw from battle"], rather than a stay-at-home-in-the-palace pale-face.
218. πέμψας τῶν ἐξ οἰκείων γένεως τινὰς ἀμηνσίαν δίδωσι τοῖς Βενετίκοις Historia, van Dieten 86:89-90.
The assignment of inferior social roles because of foreign origin does occur in Choniates's *Narrative*. The Antiochenes were not pleased with Manuel's arrival at first, "but gave a lot of trouble and thought how they might send [him] away". As what could not be opposed had to be endured,

not only did they come out to meet [him], streaming through the gates with a servile appearance and attitude, but also prepared the most triumphal entrance for him. 

The listing of the inhabitants of Antioch who participated does not necessarily tell us anything about the composition of the Syrian metropolis's population. It serves merely to emphasize that everyone took part.

not just one from here, one from there, but the whole generality of the population, that is the Syrian gourmet, the Isaurian robber, the Cilician pirate and the Italian lance-carrying knight were [all] there.

The rather negative occupation descriptions of the inhabitants of Antioch, coupled with the presence of the high-vaunting and overproud spirited horse at the end of the list (a procession's point of honour) suggests criticism, but this is due more to the Antiochenes' treatment of Manuel, than to their reality as foreigners.

---

The imperial retinue described as "out of every nation and race", suggest a lack of stratification. However as this is the Ascension Day crowd which is about to execute Constantine Makro Doukas and Andronikos Doukas at the instigation of Hagiochristophorites, the plural composition of the crowd gives advance warning that they are not as true courtiers should be. There are further examples of this negative connotation to mixed groups.

When making good his escape, Andronikos Komnenos was captured by the Boukoleon guard. He said that he was an escaping slave and pleaded that he be let go free. He named Chrysochoôpolos [his accomplice] as his owner, "altering at the same time the dialect of Greece to barbarian sound" and pretended not to understand it very well. Chrysochoôpolos bribed the guards for the return of his "slave", and so Andronikos escaped. It seems that a barbarian accent supported the play-acting that Andronikos was a slave, i.e. that a barbarian would be expected to hold a subordinate position. Andronikos made his intention to go to foreign parts to his nearest family, and received help from Poupakes at Anchialos. No reference is made to Poupakes's foreign origin. When Andronikos thought he had escaped he was captured by Vlachs and was led back to the

---

223. ἐκ παντὸς ἑθνοῦς καὶ γένους Historia, van Dieten 293:92-3.
224. Historia, van Dieten 93; 234; 269-70.
225. μεταρρυθμίζων ὧμα πρὸς τὴν βάρβαρον φωνήν τὴν Ἑλληνικὴ διάλεκτον Historia, van Dieten 130:70-1.
226. τὰ ἀπόδημα Historia, van Dieten 130:77.
227. παρὰ βλάχων Historia, van Dieten 131:86.
emperor. Manuel arrested Poupakes, and had him scourged for harbouring the enemies of the emperor. Poupakes, however, felt no shame, for he had not wronged his benefactor τὸν εὐεργέτην. By doing so, Poupakes showed that he was as much a Byzantine as anyone, and did not occupy a subordinate position because of his origin; he was in effect assimilated.

Pluralism

Given the secondary literature, perhaps surprisingly pluralism exists in Choniates’s portrayal of ethnoracial outsiders. En route to Shaizar, John II encamped at Nistrion, a city of Mesopotamia. He destroyed it and gave it to the soldiers to loot, especially to the enrolled Skyths [Patzinaks] among them, by whom it had been taken. He then moved on to Shaizar. The officials of Shaizar gathered troops from the neighbouring satraps, uniting them in one force. These troops fought the imperial phalanx, but John II was victorious. The defenders are τῶν πολεμίων. Having achieved this, the emperor arranged the phalanxes according to race and clan, as tribe helps

tribe.\textsuperscript{235} John put Macedonians in one division, Kelts and Skyths who defected from the Persians in an earlier campaign in another.\textsuperscript{236} Faced with these divisions, armed with their own sorts of weapons, the enemy was seized by fear\textsuperscript{237} and they ceased resisting.

Niketas describing John II’s defeat of the Patzinaks, stresses John’s piety. When the Roman phalanxes were hard pressed by the enemy\textsuperscript{238} John turned to the Mother of God. Her aid was successful, as he put the Skyths to flight as Moses did Amalek.\textsuperscript{239} The plan relied on the guards, whom he had taken with him. They were protected by very long shields and single-headed axes.\textsuperscript{240} These guards advanced on the Skyths\textsuperscript{241} as a solid wall. When it came to hand-to-hand combat\textsuperscript{242} the enemy began to turn and the flight of ignominy, whilst the Romans [sic] began the pursuit of good courage.\textsuperscript{243} The wagon-dwellers\textsuperscript{244} fell in their thousands, and those to be seen [in captivity] were beyond

\textsuperscript{235} ὠς φύλα φύλως ἀρήγωσιν Historia, van Dieten 29:69.

\textsuperscript{236} εἰς μίαν μοίραν τὸν Μακεδόνα καθίστησιν, ἔτέραν τὸ ἐκ Κελτῶν, ἀλλὰ τὸ Σκυθικόν, ἐπὶ δὲ τὸ ἐκ Περσίδος ὁρμώμενον καὶ προσχωρήσαν 'Ῥωμαίοις κατὰ πολέμους τοὺς πρότερον. Historia, van Dieten 29-30:69-72.

\textsuperscript{237} φόβῳ πλείονι ληφθέν τὸ πολέμιον Historia, van Dieten 30:73-4.

\textsuperscript{238} τῶν πολεμίων Historia, van Dieten 15:87-8.

\textsuperscript{239} τὰς Σκύθας Historia, van Dieten 15:92-3.

\textsuperscript{240} Ἀναλαβὼν δὲ καὶ τοὺς ὑπασπιστὰς, οἱ περιμήκεσιν ἀσπίσι καὶ πέλεξιν ἑτεροστόμιοι φράγνυνται Historia, van Dieten 15:94-5.

\textsuperscript{241} τοὺς Σκύθας Historia, van Dieten 15:95.

\textsuperscript{242} εἰς χεῖρας... τοῦ πολέμου Historia, van Dieten 16:2.

\textsuperscript{243} γίνεται τῶν ἐναυτῶν τροπὴ καὶ φυγὴ ἀκλεής καὶ Ῥωμαίων εὐθαρσοὶς ἐπιδιώκεις Historia, van Dieten 16:2-3.

\textsuperscript{244} τὸ ἀμαξόβιον Historia, van Dieten 16:4; i.e. the Patzinaks.
number. The extent to which the barrier between Patzinak and Byzantine was permeable can be gauged by the final part of this paragraph: some of the Patzinaks were settled on the western borders of the Byzantine empire, not a few were enrolled as allied units and many more closely-bound divisions were given to the army. It seems that the barrier was not impossible to cross. The account concludes with the record of the great victory against the Patzinaks and established the rite known as the Patzinak rite, which lasted down to Niketas’s time as a memorial. This is the first time they are Patzinaks not Skyths in the story.

Immediately following on from the Patzinak campaign, Choniates refers to John II’s campaign “against the race of the Triballoi, also called the Serbs.” The stated reason for the campaign was that the Serbs had broken their treaties and were behaving badly. The Serbs were defeated, and are described

Overwhelmed in strength, this barbarian was brought under treaty. Never otherwise did he show himself worthy in battle,

---

245. εἰς σπέιρας...συμμαχικάς Historia, van Dieten 16:8-9.
246. συνελήμμενας Historia, van Dieten 16:9-10; in the sense of bound with ropes ie. captured (after Magoulias) or bound to each other as a fighting unit.
247. κατὰ Σκυθῶν Historia, van Dieten 16:11.
248. τὴν τῶν Πετζινάκων λεγομένην ἐς ἠμῶς τελετήν Historia, van Dieten 16:12-3.
but was always bowing down before the powers of neighbouring [lands].

In common with the defeated Patzinaks, the defeated Serbs were settled in the empire near Nikomedia. Some were enrolled in the army; the rest were made tributaries, which suggests a subordinate status.

The story of "a certain man, a descendant of Hagar" further indicates an aspect of pluralism in Constantinople at least, as there is no suggestion that he was part of Kilij Arslan's retinue then present in the city. At first, the man seemed to be a conjurer, but later he was seen as the most wretched of men and a suicide. He said he was going to fly the length of the hippodrome from the starting gates. It was the intention of this Hagarene to catch the wind in the folds of his upper tunic as a kind of parachute. When the hippodrome crowd encouraged him to jump, they addressed him as a Saracen: Σαρακηνὲ. This nomenclature coupled with the suggestion that he was a conjurer may imply an Egyptian rather than a Turkish origin.

Manuel attempted to dissuade the man from the impulse (τοῦ


255. ἔν δὲ σκοπὸς τῷ Ἀγαρηνῷ Historia, van Dieten 119:66.


257. See for example the way in which the defenders of Damietta are always Saracens, never Turks: Historia, van Dieten 160-8.
Whilst Kilij Arslan was in two minds, eager to see what happened, yet fearful for his compatriot. The man kept the crowd in suspense, waiting for a favourable wind, but when he finally jumped, he fell to his death. The abortive flight became a matter of jest against the Turks in the Sultan’s following by the citizens, even in the agora in front of the silversmiths. The sultan gradually became aware of this, and his barbarian spirit became vexed. Manuel made a show of restricting the freedom of the people.

As well as larger set pieces, many asides hint at pluralism in the multi-ethnic Byzantine Empire. When Andronikos Komnenos received the surrender of Nicea under the leadership of Nicholas the archbishop, he soon openly displayed [his anger] to the Niceans, especially to those who excelled in rank and were notable by birth. Many became fugitives from their homeland and others were thrown from the city walls to their deaths. Then comes the one-liner: "And as for the Turks, he impaled them in a circle round the city" which implies that there was nothing unusual in finding Turks in the city.

---

258. καὶ δεδώχκα περὶ τὸ ὀμογενεῖ. Historia, van Dieten 120:70-3. Perhaps a Turk after all? - or perhaps religion is sufficient to make "same descent".

259. τῶν μετὰ τοῦ σουλτάν Τούρκων Historia, van Dieten 120:82-3.


262. Τότε δὲ τοὺς Πέρσας ἀνασκολοπίσας κύκλῳ τῆς πόλεως Historia, van Dieten 286:5.
This seems to be further confirmed by the two mentions of mosques in the City.

**Assimilation/Amalgamation**

**Axouch**

The supreme example of assimilation in Choniates's *Narrative* is provided by the history of John Axouch.

He was Persian by race, of the city of Nicea which lies in Bithynia, taken by the western armies during their march to Palestine. He was captured and given as a gift to the emperor Alexios.

"Being the same age as the emperor John, [John Axouch] became his playfellow and was judged the most beloved of all the household and the chamberlains." When John became sole emperor, Axouch was promoted Grand Domestic and many of those related to the imperial family dismounted and bowed to him when they met him.

Not only were the man's hands rehearsed in war, but they were also sharp and agile in doing good deeds that were needed. Nevertheless, the nobility of his understanding and its freedom overshadowed his lack of the same qualities by race, and earned Axouch the desire of everyone.

---

263. *Historia*, van Dieten 525:20 (Saracens) & 553:3 (Hagarenes).
266. κατὰ γένος βασιλείου *Historia*, van Dieten 9:30.
When after the attempted revolt, John II Komnenos removed all the
Kaisarissa Anna Komnene's gold and silver and gave it to Axouch
saying "How order has been overturned for me: kinsmen found out to
be the enemy, the Other found to be a friend;" Axouch asked for
permission to speak his mind. Axouch's generosity to Anna
Komnene prompted John to change his mind, "or rather most
truthfully, he was shamed." John says:

I should be unworthy of ruling, if you would be judged more
full of loving-kindness towards my family, and above excessive
and readily-accessible gain.

The captured Muslim slave who out-byzantines the emperor has
surely assimilated the dominant values of the society.

It was John [Axouch] the grand domestic who suggested that
John II hold an audience on Easter Monday 1143, when he was near
to death. And it was John Axouch who was both instigator and the
terminator of those things which have been done, all with the

269. ἡ τάξις ἐπ' ἐμοὶ πώς αὐτέστραται: τὸ μὲν γὰρ συγγενὲς
πολέμιον εὑρήται, τὸ δ' ἀλλὸτρίου φιλίου. Historia, van Dieten

270. Οἱ τὰ εἰκότα διαλεξῆναι Historia, van Dieten 11:70.


272. εἶπεν τοῦ ἄρχεων ἄνδρος, εἰ σὺ περὶ τὸ γένος τούτου κριθείς
φιλοθρυπότερος καὶ κέρδους περιττοῦ καὶ προχείρου ἀνώτερος.
Historia, van Dieten 11:82-4.

273. τοῦ μεγάλου δομεστικοῦ Ἰωάννου Historia, van Dieten 41:4-5.


275. ὁ τῶν δρωμέων τούτων εἰσπυγήτης τε ἡμα καὶ τελετάρχης
intention of preventing other members of the family from raising the spectre of primogeniture.

As his first act, Manuel sent "the grand domestic, whose name was John and [whose] surname [was] Axouch to the Queen of Cities, with Basil Tzintziloukes the chartoularios".\textsuperscript{276} Their mission was to prepare the capital for Manuel's arrival, but also to secure it, and to confine Manuel's brother the sebastokrator Isaak, to prevent an attempt on the throne, as Isaak was living in the Great Palace. Axouch entered the city, seized Isaak and imprisoned him in the Monastery of the Pantokrator, which the emperor John had built.\textsuperscript{277} Isaak was still unaware of what had happened. "He beheld the sceptres of the Romans within himself, and he himself as sovereign of the empire by right."\textsuperscript{278} But it was too late; John Axouch had secured the succession for Manuel I Komnenos.

John Axouch took charge of the palace guard\textsuperscript{279} and the acclamation of Manuel as emperor by the citizens.\textsuperscript{280} He also handed over the imperial letter, which described with all its imperial
attributes is more of a diploma, which promised the clergy of the Great Church two hundred pounds of silver per annum.281 Axouch carried a second letter, which promised two hundred pounds of gold for Aghia Sophia's clergy, to be used if Isaak incited the city to rebellion.282 Axouch was enough of an insider for this decision to be left up to him. Axouch had achieved his objectives; he withheld the letter awarding the gold, but handed out the subvention of silver.283

With the death of Kontostephanos, the Grand Domestic John [Axouch] was given the command of the navy, but was not promoted Megadux at that time.284 However, he became leader of the fleet and presided over developments as a man conspicuous in strategy, and valiant in deed and richly most worthy in the presiding spirit of leadership.285 This aspect of action is then favourably contrasted with Manuel who was wasting time generally. John Axouch did not wish to spend his time with nothing good achieved.286

283 Historia, van Dieten 49:49.
284 ὁ μέγας δομέστικος Ἰωάννης τῆς τριπλοχίας ἐπιλεξαμένης οὐχ ὡστε καὶ μέγας δοῦξ ὀνομάζεσθαι, Historia, van Dieten 82:53-5.
In the attack on Corfu under leadership of John Axouch, the "preeminent above all others and the brave in war"\textsuperscript{287} were chosen to go up the ladder, the self-selection based on φιλότιμος ἐν δεινοῖς\textsuperscript{288}. No-one made the ascent until the four Petraliphai brothers, "who came from the nation of the Franks"\textsuperscript{289}. Although the four brothers were brave (ἀποτεθαρρηκότων)\textsuperscript{290}, it was actually Poupakes, a bodyguard of the Grand Domestic\textsuperscript{291} who actually went up the ladder first. Manuel then harangued the remnant to encourage them.

Poupakes made the sign of the cross\textsuperscript{292} before making his ascent, to confirm his Christian credentials. Those stretching up in attack (ἀνατείνωντες)\textsuperscript{293} are contrasted with those "of the fortress"\textsuperscript{294}. The outcome would have been best for the Romans\textsuperscript{296} had not the ladder collapsed as soon as Poupakes gained a foothold on the wall (the defenders are still an

\textsuperscript{287} ol ἀπόντων ἔξοχοι ἀλλών καὶ ἀλκιμοὶ κοτὰ πόλεμου, Historia, van Dieten 83:76-7.

\textsuperscript{288} Historia, van Dieten 83:78.

\textsuperscript{289} ἐκ τοῦ τῶν Ἑράγγων γένους ὤρμώμενοι, Historia, van Dieten 83:81-2.

\textsuperscript{290} Historia, van Dieten 83:84.

\textsuperscript{291} Historia, van Dieten 83:85.

\textsuperscript{292} ἐκ τοῦ σταυροῦ Historia, van Dieten 84:9.

\textsuperscript{293} Historia, van Dieten 84:16.

\textsuperscript{294} τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ φρουρίου Historia, van Dieten 84:16-7.

\textsuperscript{295} Historia, van Dieten 84:17.

\textsuperscript{296} Historia, van Dieten 84:21-2.
indeterminate τοῖς ἐκ τῶν τείχων. Single-handed, Poupakes frightened away the defenders and he found a gate through which he entered the fortress. The enemies (τοῖς ὑπεναυτίοις), as well as the Romans, marvelled at this feat, and "they stood in awe of men of such bravery".

When Manuel’s attempts to restrict Sicilian activity in Italy lay in ruins, he accepted papal peace negotiators. He sent the Prostrator Alexios Axouch, eldest son of the Grand Domestic to Ancona to achieve both his aims, if they were needed and [to win] the friendship of the king if he saw that they were advancing to an agreement.

Alexios is described as being efficient and experienced in all warlike activity, having both a mind and tongue which attempted much and hands which strove to [aid] the practice of ruling and boasted a revered aspect.

---

303. δραστήριος ὃν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξησυχίας αὐτοπροϊόν πολεμικὴν νοῦ τε τὴν γλώτταν ἔχων ἀνθράκιον καὶ χεῖρας ἀντεριζούσας ταῖς φρεματίσας μεθοδεύσεσί καὶ τὸ εἶδος αὐχών σεμνόν Historia, van Dieten 97:69-72.
On his arrival, Alexios Axouch gathered cavalrymen to-gether and engaged Maios, commander of the Sicilian fleet.304

Receiving an embassy from Sicily305 Alexios Axouch sent them on to Constantinople, with the recommendation that the terms be accepted, as he had learnt they contained nothing outlandish or excessive.306 Alexios also requested that he be informed quickly if an agreement was reached to prevent an attack after the cease-fire. This concern was because

He was surrounded by men from the regions friendly to the king of the Germans, whom he [Alexios Axouch] had won over in beneficial expectation. And from being most inflamed in spirit against the Romans, as he had [been], he was changed [to be] against the king of Sicily.307

The treaty agreed was not a good peace as it helped "not only those of brilliant birth and those honoured with imperial blood, but also those enrolled in the military registers."308 Excluded, however, were the weavers of Corinth and Thebes and those of poorer fortune309, who went to Sicily, both men and women to ply their trade.310 This must
have included the Jewish weavers, but Choniates makes no reference to them as Jews.

The prostrator Alexios was stripped of his offices, power and influence.\(^{311}\) He was accused of sorcery.\(^{312}\) The chief accuser was Isaakios Aaron of Corinth, who had learnt the Latin tongue when carried off captive to Sicily with his fellow-countrymen, and who served as interpreter, when Italians had an audience with the emperor.\(^{313}\) Alexios, a second generation immigrant took to the monastic life whole-heartedly.\(^{314}\) The final note in the rise of the Axouch family in Choniates is the career of John the Fat Komnenos.\(^{315}\) A claimant to the throne, he was John Axouch’s grandson.

Isaakios Aaron was himself accused of magic, discovered with a bound, pin-stuck “man-shape”\(^{316}\) and a Book of Solomon used to summon demons.\(^{317}\) Choniates states that this was not the only reason why he was arrested.\(^{318}\) While serving the emperor as interpreter for

---

\(^{311}\) Historia, van Dieten 143:65ff.  
\(^{312}\) γοττένα Historia, van Dieten 144:79.  
\(^{313}\) ὁ Ἀρών Ἰσαάκιος, Ἀρχιερεύς μὲν ὀρθόμενος, τὴν δὲ Λατινὴν γλῶτταν ἀκρως ἐξηγητικῶς ἑνικα συναπτήκη τοὺς πατριώτας ἐκ Σικελίαν αἰχμαλώτος καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ διαλεκτοῦ ταύτῃ τῶν βασιλέων ἐνυγχάνουσιν ὑποβολεῖς τηρικάτα γινόμενος Historia, van Dieten 144:85-9.  
\(^{314}\) Historia, van Dieten 145:14-6.  
\(^{315}\) Historia, van Dieten 526-8:34-78.  
\(^{316}\) ἀνθρωπόμορφον Historia, van Dieten 146:45-6.  
\(^{317}\) Historia, van Dieten 146:47-51.  
\(^{318}\) Historia, van Dieten 146:52.
envoys who had come from the Western nations, Aaron acted as a double agent, providing disinformation to both sides, advising the emissaries that they would be better regarded if they did not agree too quickly with the emperor by those who spoke the same language. These illegalities were concealed in difference of language. The deception came to light only because the empress "being a Latin by birth and understanding exactly what was being said", related all to the emperor. Manuel punished Aaron by blinding him and confiscating his property.

Dositheos, described as a Venetian by birth, managed to attain the rank of Patriarch of Constantinople after his path had been smoothed by Balsamon, though the aid was required because he was already Patriarch of Jerusalem, not because of qualms about appointing a Venetian to the position.

Assimilation did take place at the lower levels of society as well. Recounting Andronikos Komnenos's escape to Galitza "one of the district commands of the Russians who also are called the far-

---

319. ἀπὸ τῶν δυσμόθεν ἑθνῶν ἀφικόμενοι πρέσβεις Historia, van Dieten 146:53.
320. κακὰ τῶν ὁμογλώττων πλείω τιμῆν, Historia, van Dieten 147:59.
321. τῷ τῆς διαφύλακτης διαφόρω τὰ ἐκθέσεις συσκεύασα Historia, van Dieten 147:60-1.
324. ἐκ Βενετίκων δ’ ἔλκειν τὸ γένος Historia, van Dieten 405:15.
325. See Historia, van Dieten 253:2-3 for the suggestion of an Armenian patriarch.
northern Skyths" mention is made of a foreign child provided as a body-servant for Andronikos, because of his feigned illness. The child "always misplaced letters in our dialect". The slave did as he was told, and took the wax impression of the prison keys to Andronikos. The little boy was then to take it to the house of Andronikos's son, Manuel, with instructions to make copies and to provide the means of escape in the lunch-time amphorae of wine. The child carried out his instructions. Apart from the boy's atrocious accent, there is no hint that he was in anyway inferior because he was a foreigner; he was an obedient and capable servant, especially given his youth.

The penultimate example of assimilation is the Venetian, who shared Choniates's home and hearth, and who after the fall in 1204, proved himself a helpmeet. He had come out of the Venetian race, and when the troubles began he took shelter with his wife and family in Choniates's house. Dressed in armour and speaking the barbaric

---

331. ὁ παῖς Historia, van Dieten 129:45.
tongue, he kept them all at bay until the French arrived.\textsuperscript{333} He advised a strategic withdrawal. Going first to another Venetian household and then walking through the streets, they were led by the Venetian as if his prisoners. The household servant was now the coworker.\textsuperscript{334}

The final mention of assimilation is Aldebrandinus, an Italian by origin, raised exactly in Roman habits\textsuperscript{335}, who became the ruler of Attaleia after the collapse. However, nothing more is said about him.

Group assimilation also took place. The clearest example is the Venetians. Choniates introduces them as the 'Ευτετολ, who call themselves Venetians in their own dialect, men nourished by the sea they move around like Phoenicians and are very cunning.\textsuperscript{336} They had first come when there was need for sea power.\textsuperscript{337}

They came to live in Constantinople in swarms and bands. They spread out all through the Roman empire. They had retained for themselves only their family name, in all other things they were natives and completely Romans, growing in numbers and becoming common. Indeed they gathered together great wealth and displayed both stubbornness and shamelessness, which they had not only implacably for the

\textsuperscript{333} \textit{Historia}, van Diemen 588:18-23.

\textsuperscript{334} \textit{Historia}, van Diemen 588:27-8.

\textsuperscript{335} ἐξ Ἰταλῶν μὲν τὴν γένεσιν ἔλκων, ἀκριβῶς δὲ ἐντεθραμμένος τοῖς Ἄρματοις ἔθεσε. \textit{Historia}, van Diemen 639:74-5.

\textsuperscript{336} οὖς καὶ Βενετίκους ἐπὶ τις ἐν κατὰ γλώττης ἰδιότητα, ἀνδρεὺς θαλάττης τρόφιμοι κατὰ Φοινικας ἀγύρται, παυσάργοι τὸ φρούτημα. \textit{Historia}, van Diemen 171:45-7.

\textsuperscript{337} ναυμαχικὴν \textit{Historia}, van Diemen 171:48.
Romans but also they were inattentive to imperial threats and commands.\textsuperscript{338}

Manuel recalled their deeds on Corfu, where segregation had not prevented conflict, and their other well-known evil deeds. He ordered their arrest and confiscation of their property.\textsuperscript{339} On the appointed day, some of their goods went to the imperial treasury\textsuperscript{340}, but most was taken by the toparchs.\textsuperscript{341} The Venetians living in the city, especially the unmarried ones\textsuperscript{342} planned to escape on a three-master lying in the harbour. They were pursued by fire ships and by imperial triremes filled with men carrying one-edged axes at their shoulders.\textsuperscript{343} They sailed to their homeland Venice.\textsuperscript{344} The next year they returned and attacked Euripos and Chios.

Manuel responded by dispatching the Megadux Kontostephanos with a fleet of one hundred and fifty ships, together with not a few

\textsuperscript{338} κατὰ σμήνην καὶ φατρίας τὴν Κωνσταντίνου τῆς οἰκείας ἡλισσαμενο, οὖν ἀπανταχὶ τῆς τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἐπικρατείας διασπαρέντες καὶ μόνον τὸ ἀπὸ γένους δύομα παραμεμενήκος αὐτοῖς ἔχοντες, τὸ δ' ἀλλὰ σύμφυλοι δύτες καὶ πάνυ Ῥωμαῖοι παραυάνουτο τε καὶ ἐχυδαίζουν, οὐκοῦν καὶ περιβαλόμενοι πλούτου πολλοῦ συθαδείαν τε καὶ ἀναίδειαν μετεδιώκον, ὡς μή μόνον ἀναργής ἔχειν Ῥωμαῖος, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν βασιλικῶν ἀνεπιστρόφως ἀπεσαν τε καὶ ἐντολῶν. \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 171:48-55.

\textsuperscript{339} \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 171-2:56-64.

\textsuperscript{340} τὸ βασιλικὸν θησαυροφυλάκιον \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 172:66.

\textsuperscript{341} \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 172:67.

\textsuperscript{342} οἱ δὲ ἐν τῇ πόλει τὰς οἰκήσεις ἔχουσις Βενετίκοι καὶ τούτων μάλιστα οἱ μὴ γάμος \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 172:67-8.

\textsuperscript{343} ύπες πυρφόροι καὶ τρίφερεις βασιλικαὶ πλήρεις ἄνδρῶν οἱ τοὺς ἐτερωστόμους πελέκεις ἐπὶ τῶν ὠμῶν ἀνέχουσι \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 172:73-4.

\textsuperscript{344} ἡ πατρίς Βενετίω \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 172:79.
allied ships supplied by a province of the Slavs. The Venetians made a treaty with the king of Sicily. Manuel then was forced to buy Venetian neutrality as the Venetian-Sicilian combination was too strong. Manuel was forced to recognize their political equality and to return the treasure from the imperial store. The Venetians accepted commercial privilege instead of the return of individual property.

Group assimilation also took place for the Anconitans, for their resistance to the German emperor. In return Manuel judged them equal citizens with the Roman race and promised them whatever they needed with in reason. The Anconians are described as being loyal, which separates them from the normal run of barbarian, but by the end of the paragraph they are slaves to gain, following the leader likely to give them most.

The great conflict over the denunciation of God of the Muslims at the end of Manuel’s reign was done it seems to make the conversion
of Muslims (and thus their assimilation) easier\textsuperscript{351}, whilst it seems that provision was made for people to take oaths according to their own faith.\textsuperscript{352}

**Assimilation by Marriage**

At the individual level, assimilation worked best by intermarriage. Manuel’s first wife, Bertha of Sulzbach is described as "from the Germans, of a family among them who were distinguished and very illustrious".\textsuperscript{353} She was not very beautiful and scorned make-up, but was adorned with virtues to which she was devoted.\textsuperscript{354} "However, she had the ethnic [habit] of not bending, and she possessed [fixed] opinions on knowledge."\textsuperscript{355} It was these qualities which lost her Manuel’s affections, rather than her plainness, rejection of cosmetics or love of virtue - for these last two were usual grounds for praise in a Byzantine empress. In any case, she shared in the honours, the guards and the rest of the imperial splendour, but in bed she suffered\textsuperscript{356}, as Manuel lusted after other women.

\textsuperscript{351} *Historia*, van Dieten 213:51-8.

\textsuperscript{352} *Historia*, van Dieten 414:76-7.


\textsuperscript{354} *Historia*, van Dieten 53:59-65.

\textsuperscript{355} εἶχε δὲ τὸ μὴ ἐπικλωσὶς ἔθνους καὶ τὸ τῆς γυνώμης ἐκεκτητο δυσμετάθετο. *Historia*, van Dieten 54:64-5.

When Manuel's German wife died, he regarded her demise as the dismemberment of his body. However, after the mourning period spent "half-dead and half-left", he looked to a second bride, because he longed to hear [himself described as] the father of a male child. Manuel chose one of the daughters of Raymond, Satrap of Antioch, described

on the one hand this Petevinos was an Italian by birth, but on the other being a horseman with a good seat and being better than Priam with an ash spear. Raymond's daughter (Maria of Antioch) is described as "beautiful, and very beautiful, and exceedingly beautiful and of incommensurate beauty". She was compared favourably with the mythic beauties Aphrodite, Hera and Helen of Troy.

Manuel saw no objection to marrying his daughter to foreigners. Styppeiotes was promoted to and presided over the oath-taking in the Blachernae to ensure the succession of Alexios

357. τὴν ἐξ Ἀλαμάνων ξύνευνον Historia, van Dieten 115:47.
of Hungary and Maria, Manuel's daughter. This Alexios is Béla-Alexios [Béla III (1172-96)], son of Géza II (1141-61). In the intrigue against Stypeiotes mentioned here, Sicily as a likely foreign collaborator is mentioned frequently.

Manuel's settlement of the empire on his daughter Maria by his wife Bertha "from the Germans" and her fiancé Alexios, "who came from Hungary as has been said" met with opposition. Others swore the required oaths, but Andronikos Komnenos held back, saying that Maria was still only heir presumptive, and that oaths taken now might have to be broken. Then the main objection comes:

What madness has the emperor, that he judges all Romans to be kept away from the marriage bed of his daughter, and has preferred some foreign-born illegal alien to Romans, to rule over Romans in disgrace, and has placed him above all as master?

Manuel ignored these useful things "treating them lightly as the twitterings spoken by a contrary and obstinate man". Others,

---


367. ὡς, ὡς εἰρήκειμεν, ἐς Ὑπαγρίας ὄρμητο Historia, van Dieten 137:70.

368. τὶς ἡ τῷ βασιλεῖ θεοβλάβεια, ὡς πάντα μὲν ἮΡωμαίου τοῦ θυγατρίου κρίνειν ἀπόλεκτρον, τὸν δ ἀλλογενῆ καὶ παρέγγραπτον τούτῳ εἰς οὐνείδος ἮΡωμαιος ἮΡωμαίων βασιλεὺς προκεκρίθαι καὶ ύπερκαθίσθαι ὅλων ὡς κύριοι; Historia, van Dieten 137:78-80.


however, found sense in Andronikos’s words. The extent to which similar views may be ascribed to Choniates himself is limited. Andronikos Komnenos is not a positive role model in Choniates’s Narrative. However, Andronikos’s response to the betrothal of Maria to Béla-Alexios was governed more by political considerations than by pure xenophobia. Andronikos opposed the marriage to Béla-Alexios because it placed a man in close proximity to the throne. Andronikos, described as "great in family and a sight to be seen among men" did not follow his own advice against foreign marriages. Following on from his encounter with Thoros, Andronikos soon gave himself over to love, in the form of Philippa, daughter of Raymond of Poitiers, the sister of Maria of Antioch recently married to the emperor Manuel. Andronikos’s dislike of foreign alliances was dependent on surrounding circumstances, rather than on ideological grounds. Andronikos also seduced Theodora, daughter of Isaak the Sebastokrator, Manuel’s brother, the recently widowed wife of Baldwin, born of the Italian race.

Alexios Axouch, son of Axouch, Grand Domestic the Muslim-born slave companion of John II Komnenos, married the daughter of Manuel’s brother Alexios. Such intimate connection with the

374. τὸ γένος ἔλκυν ἐξ Ἰταλῶν Historia, van Dieten 141:93.
imperial family is a clear indication of the assimilation of a second
generation immigrant.

Similarly, the first generation Stephen [IV], bother of Géza II ruler
of Hungary\textsuperscript{376}, fleeing from the murderous hands of his brothers\textsuperscript{377},
reached Constantinople, was welcomed by Manuel with gifts and was
married to Maria, his niece, descended from Isaak the
Sebastokrator.\textsuperscript{378} László [II] followed in Stephen’s footsteps,

and had he wished he too could have taken a wife of the
imperial blood, but he held himself apart from marriage, so
that he would not be corrupted into forgetting to return to his
homeland, being transfixed by the lotus of his wife.\textsuperscript{379}

Géza [II], king of the Hungarians\textsuperscript{380}, died. With the accession of
Stephen III, Manuel had ideas for the Hungarian Satrapy\textsuperscript{381}, and most
especially Frangochorion and Zeugminon. An embassy was
dispatched to the land of the Hungarians\textsuperscript{382}, to assist at Stephen’s

\textsuperscript{376} τῷ τότε ἐξεχομεν τῶν Οὐννων \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 126:49.
Choniates announced a return to Hungarian matters in the previous
line επὶ τὰ Ποιονικά \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 126:48.

\textsuperscript{377} τῶν ἀδελφῶν τούτων ὁ Στέφανος τὰς ὁμογενίους ἐκφυγὼν
χεῖρας κατ᾽ αὐτὸν φονώσας \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 126:51-2.

\textsuperscript{378} ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ Μαρίαν ἔγυμε τὴν τούτου ἀνεψίϊαν, ἢν ὁ
σεβαστοκράτωρ ἐφύτευσεν Ἰσαάκιος. \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 126:54-5.

\textsuperscript{379} καὶ γυναῖκα δὲ ἢν ἡ βουλεύτῃ ἀγαγέσθαι, καὶ τοῦτην ἐκ
βασιλείαν ἐγγυτεν ἄν αἰματος, ἀλλὰ γάμου μὲν ἄπέσχετο, ἵνα μὴ
τῆς ἐς πατρίδα λαθόμενος ἐπαυνόδου τὰ οὐκὶ διαφθερῇ, τῷ λυτῷ

\textsuperscript{380} ὁ τῶν Οὐννων ρῆς \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 126:65.

\textsuperscript{381} ἢ τῶν Οὐννων...σατράπευσις \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 127:71.

\textsuperscript{382} τῶν Οὐγγρων χώρα \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 127:76.
coronation. When the Hungarians first heard of this embassy, they renounced Stephen [IV] "especially because of his marriage to the Romans" for they were suspicious that they would not be ruled as Hungarians by him, while he was controlled by the ruler of the Romans." Stephen and the envoys from the emperor were rejected. Manuel attempted to win over the most powerful of the Hungarians with gifts, but they achieved nothing, except that the Hungarians accepted László into the leadership. When László did not long survive, the Hungarians favoured Stephen [III], son of Géza [II].

Many wars followed on account of the conflict between Stephen III and Stephen IV. Manuel decided on Béla, son of Géza II as the husband for his own daughter Maria. The opponents of Stephen [IV] among the Hungarians decided to rid themselves of him completely. With Stephen [IV] dead, Zeugminon was surrendered to

---

383. Οὖν νοι Historia, van Dieten 127:78.
386. ύποποιοῦμενοι τε δύρους τούς μέγα παρὰ Ποιοσι δυναμένους Historia, van Dieten 127:92.
the Hungarians. When he heard of these events, Manuel declared war on the Hungarians.

Manuel's Hungarian policy had a long life. With the birth of his own son Alexios, Manuel transferred to him the oaths previously made to his daughter Maria and her betrothed Béla-Alexios of Hungary. Manuel then broke off the engagement and married Alexios-Béla to the sister of his own wife. Shortly thereafter, the ruler of Hungary died. Manuel dispatched Alexios-Béla [III] to succeed him in the dominion of Hungary and to rule over his fellow nationals. He was crowned with the royal crown of Hungary and ruled over the whole race with no dissent.

Manuel looked for a new husband for his daughter Maria among the dynasts of the nations either those who were not married or those with sons who would succeed to the throne. First choice was

---

392. κατὰ τῶν Οὐσίων Historia, van Dieten 128:27.
393. καὶ...τῷ μνήστορι τούτῃ Ἄλεξιῷ τῷ Παιοῦ Historia, van Dieten 169:6-8.
396. καὶ τῷ γένους ὅλου ἀνευδοιώτως δεπόζοντα Historia, van Dieten 170:20-1.
William, ruler of Sicily. Negotiations were protracted, and eventually Manuel decided an alliance with Sicily was not in the Roman interest. Maria was eventually married to a son of the Marquis of Montferrat, described as "graceful in appearance and delightful to look at and his well-groomed hair shone like the sun, and he was not yet growing a beard; she was past her thirtieth year and possessed the strength of a man." 

Maria's Italian husband was assimilated sufficiently to participate in the revolt against the Protosebastos Alexios and Maria of Antioch. Maria enrolled foreign mercenaries and placed troops in the sacred precinct of Aghia Sophia. Heavily armoured Italians and stouthearted Iberians who came from the East for trade were enlisted and a Roman phalanx. This muster of ecumenical forces is balanced by the imperial forces commanded by a certain Sabbatios, an Armenian. In his speech to his Latin bodyguard, the Kaisar


identifies the imperial troops as ὁμοφύλων καὶ ὁμοπίστων, and as ταυτόπιστοι καὶ ὁμογενεῖς, but because of their actions they are to be seen first as the enemy of God. This seems to indicate clear identification of this Latin with his wife's society and world-view.

Andronikos Komnenos, attempting to secure the throne married Agnes-Anna. However, rather than an assimilation of a foreign bride, this marriage was Andronikos's attempt to secure his position. It was more than just a political marriage, as Andronikos took Agnes-Anna into exile in Russia with him, and with his mistress Marapite Agnes-Anna "topped" his dirges on his present estate.

Isaak Angelos, decided on a foreign wife, the daughter of Béla of Hungary, while he married his sister Theodora to Conrad, "an Italian by race". During the revolt of Branas, Conrad was thought to be a blessing sent by God to the emperor. However, when he saved the day, he was dissatisfied with merely the dignity of kaisar,

---

405. Historia, van Dielen 238:3.
and went to Outremer, to his native people. In this case assimilation was not successful. A further case of failed marital assimilation is provided by Ivanko, who was to marry Theodora. The actual marriage ceremony itself could be fraught with difficulties, as the bride of Chrysos discovered when she attempted to behave in accord with her society's mores.

Attempts at Assimilation

However, attempts at assimilation, or rather at incorporation, were not always so easy. John II Komnenos marched against Cilicia to oppose Leon, ruler of Armenia, who wanted to take Roman fortresses, but most especially Seleukeia. John in turn campaigned to be master of all Armenia, which he accomplished. The situation at Baka was somewhat different. Those inside neither stretched out their hands to him, nor would they join in a peace treaty. Faced with this intransigence, John II laid down a determined siege and informed the besieged of the benefits they

414. ὃμογενῶν Historia, van Dielen 395:49-50; they are also identified as ὄμοφυλοις 395:52.
422. τοῖς πολιορκουμένοις Historia, van Dielen 22:70.
would gain if they surrendered, and the penalties they would suffer if they did not. 'However, he was singing these things to asps, who were willingly deaf to the blandishments made by the wise remedy, and he was obviously proven to be "washing the Ethiopian".'

During war with the Hungarians, there were people in Zeugminon, who favoured the Byzantines and formed a pro-Byzantine clique. They sent messages attached to arrows to reveal the plans of what the barbarians [i.e. their fellow Hungarians] intended. When Zeugminon fell, one of the Hungarians was being led away captive. A certain Roman killed him for his hat, which the Byzantine put on before continuing on his way. However, Justice came quickly, as yet another Roman, believing the now hatted Byzantine to be a captive Hungarian killed him. This shows clearly that without the external signifiers of costume, there is no somatype differentiation between the Byzantines and the Hungarians. In intent the retribution is as bad as the original crime, but Choniates feels that Justice has been done.

Assimilation to the Other

Assimilation can, of course, act in a contrary direction. The sebastokrator Isaak sided with his brother John II when Anna

427. δικῆς Historia, van Dieten 135:32.
428. ὡς ζωγρίαν Πιούνο Historia, van Dieten 135:35.
Komnene tried to seize the throne.\textsuperscript{429} However, vexed at some trifle, Isaak fled the lands of the Romans.\textsuperscript{430} Isaak took with him his eldest son John, described as a "heavily-armed warrior who when raising the din of war, was worth in form and showed an appearance that was worth looking at."\textsuperscript{431} This favourable description indicates that Choniates does not regard Isaak and John’s defection in too serious a light. Isaak came into contact with many different nations among whom was the satrap of metropolitan Ikonion.\textsuperscript{432} Isaak was always eager to attack Roman lands and to become John II’s satan.\textsuperscript{433} Isaak was motivated by jealousy of John, but everyone dissuaded him from rebellion.\textsuperscript{434} He was received by the toparchs with respect because he was most likely to prove imperial in appearance and because his family was most distinguished.\textsuperscript{435} Realizing that his self-imposed exile was achieving nothing, Isaak returned to John and was warmly received.

\textsuperscript{429} Historia, van Dieten 32:32-3.
\textsuperscript{430} καὶ φυγὼς ἀπόρας ἐκ τῆς Ῥωμαίων Historia, van Dieten 32:34.
\textsuperscript{431} αὕτη δ’ οὗτος ὁπλιτοπάλας καὶ πολεμόκλουσ, φημὴ τ´ ἄριστην καὶ εἶδος προφαίων ἀξίοθεταν Historia, van Dieten 32:35-7.
\textsuperscript{432} τελείτως μὲν καὶ ἄλλοις προσέμενεν ἔθνεσιν, σὺν αὐτοῖς δὲ καὶ τῷ τῆς Ἰκονιέων σατραπεύοντι μητρόπολεως Historia, van Dieten 32:37-8.
\textsuperscript{433} καὶ ἢν μὲν ὁ Ἰσπάκιος οὗτος ὄρμαινων ἢτι χώρας ἐπιθέσθαι Ῥωμαίακως καὶ Σατὰν γενέσθαι τῷ Ἰωάννῃ Historia, van Dieten 32:38-40.
\textsuperscript{434} Historia, van Dieten 32:40-5.
\textsuperscript{435} καὶ παρ´ οἷς κατέλυε δι´ αἰδοῦς ἁγόμενος ως τ´ εἰδος τυραγνικῶτατος καὶ τ´ γένος ἐπιστημοτάτος Historia, van Dieten 32:45-7.
However, the Sebastokrator Isaak’s son John still caused problems. During a battle with the Turks, the emperor John II saw a distinguished knight from Italy without a horse. The emperor ordered his nephew to dismount from the Arab horse his was riding and to give it to the Italian, as the emperor knew John had no lack of horses. The nephew John resisted his uncle’s command, and challenged the Latin to a duel, with the horse going justly to whoever prevailed. John could not long withstand the emperor’s command however, and handed the horse over under duress. He mounted another steed and fled to the enemy’s ranks. He became a deserter to the Turks. The enemy now switch from being the Persians to being the barbarians. They were happy to see John, and welcomed him as an intimate known from old with his father.

436. μετὰ Πέρσων Historia, van Dieten 35:42.
438. τοῦ Ἀραβίου ὑπὲρ Historia, van Dieten 35:44.
439. δοῦνα τούτου τῷ Ἰταλῷ Historia, van Dieten 35:45.
441. ἄρων Historia, van Dieten 36:49-51.
442. κατὰ τῆς τῶν πολεμίων παρατάξεως φέρεται Historia, van Dieten 36:52-3.
443. πρὸς Πέρσας αὐτόμολος γίνεται Historia, van Dieten 36:54.
444. τοῖς βορβάροις Historia, van Dieten 36:56.
Shortly afterwards, abjuring the rites of the Christians, he 
made the daughter of the Turk of Ikonion.446

With conversion and intermarriage his assimilation is well on its way 
to amalgamation. Faced with this breach in security, John II 
Komnenos retreated. He did not escape the attentions of the 
enemy447 entirely. The attacks of the barbarians448 ceased only when 
they reached the coast.

Manuel besieged Ikonion in the absence of Mas'ud. One of the 
sultan's daughters - the one said449 to be married to John Komnenos, 
Manuel's cousin - appeared above the walls450 and gave a persuasive 
defence of her father the sultan.451 Manuel did not invest the city - 
perhaps because a woman was conducting the defence? - and 
withdrew. As he retreated the enemy452 attacked in ambushes and the 
heavily wooded terrain. Manuel extricated himself with some 
difficulty and returned to the reigning city.

Continuing the story of Andronikos's escape to Galitza, he was 
welcomed by the governor.

And in this way, Andronikos attached [himself] to him 
completely because of his affection, and hunted with him, and

446 ὁ δ' οὗτος μικρῷ ύποτερον καὶ τὰ Χριστιανῶν ἐξομοσάμενος ὄργια τὴν τού Ικωνίους Πέρσου θυγατέρα ἔγιματο Historia, van Dieten 36:59-60.
448 τὸ βάρβαρον Historia, van Dieten 36:70-1.
449 ἔλεγετο Historia, van Dieten 53:47.
450 Historia, van Dieten 53:47.
452 τῶν πολεμίων Historia, van Dieten 53:55.
joined in his councils as well as sharing his hearth and being his mess-mate.\textsuperscript{453}

Manuel held this abandonment of hearth and home to be a personal affront, worsened when it was rumoured that Andronikos was gathering a myriad of Cuman horsemen\textsuperscript{454} with which to ravage the Roman borders. A reconciliation was effected; at the same time the Hungarians\textsuperscript{455} were quietened. The aim was to stop a war on two fronts. Though apparently partially assimilated to the far-northern Skyths, Andronikos was still more of a Byzantine than the Hungarians - or at least it serves Choniates’s purpose to portray him as such, lacking the strong alternative power base that makes the Hungarians worthy opponents. It is conflict with the Hungarians that breaks out, with Gabras striving heroically in the battle.\textsuperscript{456}

**Conclusion**

From the material presented here, and from the bulk to be found in the text of the Narrative, it is clear that ethnoracial outsiders loomed large in Choniates’s perceptual landscape. There was frequent contact and interaction, either as conflict at Myriokephalon in 1176, at Thessaloniki in 1185, or at Constantinople in 1204; or on a more constructive level as intermarriage, coexistence or service.


\textsuperscript{454} μυρίαν Σκυθίδα ᾑπὼν Historia, van Dieten 132:26.

\textsuperscript{455} τὸ Ποίονες Historia, van Dieten 132:29.

\textsuperscript{456} καὶ ἐρρωμένως αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ κατὰ τῶν Ούγγρων μάχη...μετὰ τῶν Ούγγρων Historia, van Dieten 132-3:37-46.
In dealing with the many outsiders, Choniates uses the stereotypes of Barbarians and Romans to construct his social reality. Any foreigner can be a barbarian, and indeed some Byzantines - such as the Komnenoi who spend time among the barbarian nations hostile to the Romans - can cross too far. However, Choniates also knows who is who, and the foreigners are not an undifferentiated mass of barbarians. All are seen in relation to the theme of the Narrative, the visitation of Divine punishment on the Byzantines for sins of omission and commission. From this it is important to stress that the social role of ethnoracial outsider was variable in Byzantium. It was not a range of rigid categories, but rather a spectrum of choices in which individuals could be located in a way to make sense of what the observer saw to be going on round them. It is a mistake to make the distinction between stranger and foreigner too strong: there were no state identity cards in Byzantium.

The five categories of group interaction was suggested as a means of managing Choniates's presentation of outsiders. It would be pointless to attempt to identify a dominant category, to say that twelfth-century Byzantium was a plural, a segregated, a stratified or an assimilationist society. It was all of these and none. Similarly from the evidence presented here about the Venetians, Turks or Western Christians no one category encompasses all interaction between the

\[457. \textit{Historia}, \text{van Dieten} 529:28-9.\]
Byzantines and another ethnic group. However, the five categories help analysis of group interaction.

Late twelfth-century Byzantium was a society in interaction, whose personnel adopted a multiplicity of strategies to resolve conflict between groups. The events of 1204 show that ultimately they failed.

---

458. The exception may be Jewish segregation, but one piece of indirect evidence is insufficient to build a theory. Jewish segregation may have been the ideal, but the reality probably fell far short.
CHAPTER SEVEN
OUTSIDERS BY ΤΑΞΙΣ.
"So great honour was without honour, and love of honour, joyless."¹

Introduction

Outsider categories dealt with in previous chapters - gender, religion and ethnic race - have had a certain autonomy; this chapter's category is more diffuse. What are outsiders by τάξις? I do not mean outsiders by class in the economic sense, which is why I use the more awkward term τάξις. Τάξις means order, arrangement or class of men. In the specifically Byzantine context, τάξις denotes the sequence of imperial offices and rankings which developed from the Late Antique cursus honorum. I stress the difference between outsider by class and the outsider by τάξις because although the notional difference between the powerful and poor as elucidated by Rosemary Morris² is important, differences by τάξις are not merely ones of economic function and achievement. The contrast is between the powerful and the poor, not between the rich and the poor - nor indeed between the powerful and the weak. Whilst notions of power and its articulation within a social structure suggests a too determined
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approach, it is clear that power differentials do exist. Rather than using the term "class" for divisions of society on the basis of distance from the ability to wield power, I have used a Byzantine term τάξις, even though I use it in a specific way.

Outsiders by τάξις are those individuals who for various reasons are alienated from the élite who exercise power, either by lack of material resources or for some other reason. Such reasons within Byzantium include lack of education, provincial origin or the rebel role.

Education served as a measure of alienation because the Byzantine élite was either well-educated in the classics, or made the pretense of being well-educated. As access to education in Byzantium was dependent on the ability to pay, one's level of educational attainment was superordinate to one's economic status, and was not decided by one's capacity to benefit from that education.

The category of outsider by provincial origin is more difficult to explain as a superordinate of economic status. It has been suggested with good reason that the Byzantine Empire should be viewed not as a proto nation-state of the modern period, but as the last city-state of antiquity. Elements of both interpretations are true, but this idea of Byzantium as a city-state helps explain the attitude of Constantinople to their fellow subjects in the provinces, whom they did not regard as their fellow citizens. Residence in the City - and

---

access to the capital's education and court - could erase lowly, provincial origins, but it simplifies a very complex issue.

The attempt to construct a purely economic argument of the outsider is further weakened by the existence of certain roles in Byzantine society, whose status clearly lies beyond the pale of the insiders. Most noticeable in this category is the role of the imperial rebel. The means of power transmission in Byzantium from one emperor to another was not fixed. The preferred peaceful transmission involved the association of the successor as co-emperor with the previous incumbent before his death or retirement. However, even with the successor previously associated on the throne, the succession was not always trouble-free - as for example the transition from Alexios I Komnenos to John II Komnenos in 1118. Similarly the succession after John II was not as straightforward as might have been expected, as John left the sceptre to his younger son Manuel, not Isaak. These difficulties in succession are even more interesting in that they occurred in a period of relative stability, with available male heirs of the body, when male primogeniture might have developed. In part this was due to the lively Byzantine tradition that the emperor owed his position to election by the army, senate and the people. This notion that the imperial office - for all the mystique of porphyrogennesis - was not tied in the blood, meant that the man with Divine support could make an attempt on, and win the throne, his success indicating that he held Divine favour. The imperial rebel is a liminal role of outsider status. If the rebellion is successful, then the rebel ceases to be rebel, and becomes the God-guarded emperor of
the Romans; but in between is that liminal stage, when subject
becomes rebel and therefore moves outside the norms of society, but
before he is reincorporated as the insider par excellence, the emperor.
The example of Anna Komnene's account of her father's rebellion
shows that outsider status is not a rigid social category, but the
dynamic product of social interaction.

If the first group of outsiders in the three texts are the rebels, the
second is the city crowd, the common rabble or the lower orders. The
three authors have little in common with this group. However, though
it is clear that the lower orders are regarded by these authors as
outsiders, uneducated and stupid, nevertheless, they are not always
portrayed in negative terms: the good and faithful servant has a
function to play in all three works. The function of the outraged urban
mob can vary considerably, and shows the necessity of a consideration
of context when attempting to analyze a mob appearance. Their status
as social outcasts must be understood on a symbolic level in a work of
literature as well as on the narrative-factual level.

The final group of outsiders by tάξις I highlight is the most
difficult to name. For Psello and Choniates, they are the upwardly-
mobile officials these two career bureaucrats have identified as
threats, or the new favourites. For Komnene the term parvenu does
not strictly fit, as her antagonists are normally nobles - even if
foreigners - who are opposed to Alexios Komnenos. A partial
exception to this rule, though still no aid in resolving the "upwardly-
mobile" idea, is the way she casts her brother John into a swarthy
outsider role. This group of outsiders by tάξις, however, shows the
non-material nature of the outsider social role, dependent to a large extent on the perception of the authors. These three texts are created perceptual universes of discourse. The writers have created certain individuals as outsiders, and in the literary discourse, their status as such has nothing to do with their objective statuses, roles or actions, were these recoverable from the sources.

In one sense, as indicated in the introduction, the authors themselves are outsiders by τάξις. Psellos wrote as a bureaucrat out of favour; Komnene wrote sequestered far from power and influence; and Choniates wrote having lost possessions, power and influence. To describe a porphyrogenite princess and two high governmental bureaucrats as outsiders may appear bizarre, but if the transitory nature of the outsider social status is not recognized, then its utility as a tool of socio-historical analysis is lost.

I. Outsiders by τάξις in Psellos's Chronographia.

Psellos's Chronographia follows most plainly the threefold division of outsiders by τάξις in rebels, great unwashed and the upwardly mobile. These follow in turn with a short conclusion.

I.1 Rebels as Outsiders.

The rebels Skleros and Phokas are the first outsiders by τάξις to appear in The Chronographia. The first description of Skleros is positive:

a man both capable of deliberation and expert at execution, both well-known for his wealth - great enough for a tyrant - and having the vigour of political domination, both successful in
great battles and having the agreement of all the army for this plan of his. The overtly positive aspect is tempered by the use of τυράννως; the end to which Skleros intends to use his advantages casts him in an outsider role. Psellos credits Skleros with many followers in his undertaking. At first, the revolt seemed destined for success as the heavily armoured infantry of the army went over to him en masse. This led Skleros to believe that he had merely to move against the emperor with cavalry and footsoldiers and the throne would be his. Basil II's advisers thought they had found a safe haven in Bardas Phokas. This "certain Bardas" was a


5. Οὕτως τοιγορθὺν [having the agreement of all the army] πολλοὺς συναρμόμενος ἐχων τῇ τυραννίδι Chron. I 5, Renaud 1:5 8-9. Again the use of tyranny to describe his rebellion confirms his status.


7. καὶ πᾶσαν ἐτ' αὑτῷ ἵππῳ τε καὶ πεζῷ παρῆλθαις δύμαις, καὶ ὡς ἐτ' προκειμένω πράγματι τῇ βασιλείᾳ πρὸς τῇ λαοῖς. Chron. I 5, Renaud 1:5 10-2. It is interesting that the desertion of the heavily-armed infantry, not the mounted soldiers, is held to be decisive. This contrasts with the continual stress on the mounted "knights" in the western style in the Alexiad and the Narrative. See M. E. Martin, "An Adriatic Hastings, 1081", History Today 27 (1977), 219-25 for a discussion of this change in military tactics and armaments.

man of noble birth and of greatest bravery, being the nephew of the emperor Nikephoros, [and] judged worthy of battling against the revolting Skleros.

The imperial advisers were only too aware of the dangers of entrusting Phokas with the supreme command. He came from an imperial family and would never think of himself in a lowly position. To prevent the possibility of rebellion, Bardas Phokas was stripped of his civilian [i.e. secular] status and all insignia by which tyranny is known, and he was enrolled among the clerics of the church. "As word has it," Bardas Phokas's understanding was like his uncle the emperor's, always clouded with gloom and vigilant, capable of foreseeing everything and viewing it together, not ignorant of warlike stratagems but familiar with all battle-techniques, ambushes and conflicts in pitched battles, and in deed more active and braver than him [Skleros].

Credited with quick comprehension, a thorough knowledge of the necessities of warfare, great physical strength and his resemblance to Nikephoros Phokas shows that Basil II's advisers were right to hedge Bardas Phokas round with restrictions to keep him loyal to the

---


10. ἀτε βασιλείου τυγχάνοντι γένους, καὶ οὐδὲν συμπροπερωὸς ἐννοηομένως περὶ αὐτοῦ Chron. I 6, Renaud 1:5 2-3.

11. περιθύνοσι μὲν τὸ πολιτικὸν τῆς περιβολῆς σχῆμα καὶ ὅσον οὐδὲν ἡ τυραννίς τῷ ὁ τῆς ἐκκλησίας κλῆρῳ ἐγκαταλέγουσιν Chron. I 6, Renaud 1:5 3-5.

12. ὡς ὁ λόγος ἔχει, τὴν μὲν γνώμην ἐς τὸν θείου ἀναφέρων καὶ βασιλέα, συννεφώς ἀεὶ καὶ ἐγχητόρως, καὶ πάντα προδείην καὶ συνιδεὶν ικανός, πολεμικῶς τε τεχνοματῶν σύνεσις ὁδοὶς π' οὐς, μὲν τειχομαχίας, πάσας δὲ λοχίσει καὶ ταῖς ἐκ παροτάξεως ἰσχύως ἐδαχ, τὰς δὲ διὰ κεράς πράξεις δραστικῶτερος ἑκείνου καὶ γενναίότερος Chron. I 7, Renaud 1:5-6 1-7.
reigning emperor. With such advantages, Bardas Phokas would have found the transition from rebel to legitimate emperor very easy.

The rebel and the emperor's champion met on the field at Pankalia in 979. The commanders elected to decide the issue by single combat. The rebel Skleros, unable to restrain his impetuosity, broke the rules of this form of engagement and struck Bardas Phokas at the charge. Phokas soon recovered, and returned the blow, causing Skleros to turn and flee. Skleros's status as an outsider is confirmed by Psellos's account of Pankalia: Skleros is introduced as the rebel and is unable to restrain himself; he breaks the rules of engagement and when struck, turns and flees rather than standing and being a man. These are all opposites of the qualities expected of a true emperor. In contrast, Bardas Phokas retains his high social standing as a man of constancy, well-able to withstand misfortune on the battlefield. Unable to face Bardas Phokas in battle and too embarrassed to submit to Basil II, Skleros adopted a plan Psellos describes as neither the best advised nor the safest. He crossed out of the Roman borders, and went into the lands of the Assyrians, with all his forces. Skleros has moved from being merely an ideological outsider, to being a physical outsider.

15. οὔτε συνετωτάτην οὔτε ἀσφαλεστάτην Chron. I 9, Renaud 1:6 4-5.
Returning to Constantinople after his victory over Skleros, Phokas was honoured with a triumph and numbered among the intimates of the emperor. Phokas saw his opportunities slipping away from him and therefore with the better part of his army, he raised up a revolt against Basil that was both most grave and most dangerous. All Bardas Phokas's laudable qualities now disappear beneath his insurrection. The revolt was further strengthened by the addition of the leading and most powerful families. Phokas's status as "emperor in waiting" is then bolstered by the recruitment of Iberian soldiers. Skleros chose to deal with the rebel Phokas rather than with Basil II, which Psellos describes as a further insult. Phokas and Skleros agree a division of the spoils and then divide their joint forces, rendering the rebellion more effective. Basil II, aware of the arrogance of the Romans, sent the six hundred warriors from the Skyths in Tauros.

25. Chron. I 13, Renauld 1:9 3; they are Russians.
against the rebels. They came upon them in their cups and killed some, scattering the rest.

When Phokas learnt that the two emperors - Basil II and Constantine VIII - were both on the field at Abydos in 989, he decided that day would see a resolution. He committed his cause to fortune, against the advice of the astrologers in his entourage, according to whom the omens were not good. Psellus’s ambivalence to the occult is shown here, as this rejected advice was correct. However, this inversion of the true order of things may be due to Phokas’s status as a rebel. The continued presence of true omens - two horses slipping beneath him and his skin changing colour - indicates some positive value to omens. Phokas was not to be dissuaded however, and advanced with his Iberian footsoldiers. In contrast to Phokas’s soothsayers, Basil II faced his enemy’s irresistible charge holding the icon of the Mother of the Word, confirming his orthodoxy and legitimacy. Phokas fell suddenly from his saddle and was dispatched. Phokas, lying defenseless on the ground, was soon dispatched and the rebellion collapsed.

26 ἀλλὰ τὴν ἡμέραν ἔκεισεν κρίσιν τοῦ πολέμου δημοτελῆ ἔθετο, καὶ τῷ τῆς τύχης ἐαυτοῦ ἐπέτρεψε πνεύματι· οὐ μὴν κατὰ σκοπὸν τοῦς περὶ αὐτόν ἐποιεῖτο μάστεσιν· οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἀπείροι τοῦ μάχεσθαι, τῶν θυμάτων αὐτοῖς τοῦτο διασαφούτων Chron. I 15, Renaud 1:9-10 6-10.

27 Chron. I 15, Renaud 1:10 11-4.

28 Chron. I 15, Renaud 1:10 14-5.

29 τὴν εἰκόνα τῆς τοῦ Λόγου μυτρὸς Chron. I 16, Renaud 1:10 4.
Skleros is then compared with Phokas by Psellus. If he did not seem Phokas's equal in strength of arms, Skleros did excel Phokas in skill of strategy and tactics and was reputedly more resourceful. In his second revolt, Skleros was careful not to confront the emperor directly. The imperial forces were continually harassed; convoys of necessary shipments were intercepted, imperial forces were denied free use of the roads and goods transported from elsewhere to the capital were intercepted and put to good use by Skleros's army. Skleros also intercepted instructions coming from the palace. Psellus emphasizes the length of time the rebellion lasted - a whole year by his reckoning - and adds that this evil troubled the state for many years to come. "This evil" is ἡ τυραννίς. Psellus notes that once troops enrolled with Skleros, they remained loyal. That he finds it

---


33. ἐκεῖθεν εἰς τὰ βασίλεια ἤγετο Chron. I 24, Renauld 1:15 11.


worthy of mention implies that this was not usually the case. Psellos attempts to explain this devotion:

Sideros bound them together in immutable resolution in this way: led by goodwill and enslaved by kindness, he joined one to another. From this [he went on by] breaking bread with them and sharing the same cup, calling each by name and [each] was made over by fair words of mouth.

Basil II tried by various stratagems to trap Skleros, but Skleros proved the more experienced general. Recognizing that Skleros would never be defeated, Basil sent an embassy offering terms if Skleros would cease his actions and accept first place after himself in the empire. Skleros eventually accepted the terms after due consideration of his age. Those who had revolted with Skleros were to retain their ranks and any privileges they had received. The rebels were to be deprived of neither things formerly in their possession, nor what had fallen to them since the revolt.


38. Οὕτως αὐτοῖς εἰς ὅμοιότετον γνώμην συμφημὸσεν ὁ Σκληρός, εὐνοεῖς τε ὑπαγόμενος καὶ εὐφρενεῖς ὁμολογομένος, καὶ συμβαζόντων ἀλλήλων, ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς τε τούτως συνομμένος καὶ κοινοῦ μετέχων κρατήρος, ἐξ ὑματίας τε καλῶν ἐκαστοῦ καὶ δι’ εὐφήμου γλώττης ποιομένος. Chron. I 25, Renauld 1:15 7-12.


At the meeting between Basil II and Skleros at Didymoteichon, Skleros had forgotten to remove the purple imperial slippers. Basil closed his eyes, not wishing to see him otherwise, if not dressed completely as a private person. Basil questioned "this man accustomed to command" about the state and how it might best be preserved free from factional disturbance. The result was the advice which Psellos describes more as a diabolical plot than the advice of a general.

Psellos's account of his embassy in 1057, on behalf of the emperor Michael VI to Isaak Komnenos, who was in revolt, is well known. Upon the embassy's arrival at Nicomedia, they were greeted warmly and were escorted directly to Isaak; Psellos takes care to call Isaak merely "the commander" not "the emperor". The embassy and their escort dismounted before Isaak's headquarters, and waited a moment. The delay was due to Isaak's unwillingness to have too many people in...
the imperial tent, now that the sun had set.  
Note that Isaak Komnenos's tent is now "imperial". The embassy was finally admitted. Isaak, though seated on a raised throne, was surrounded by only a few of his own bodyguards, and was dressed more as a soldier than as an emperor. His treatment of them was equally unlike an emperor. The audience the next day was a more elaborate affair. It was ol τῆς βουλῆς πρῶτοι who came to escort the ambassadors to Isaak, the commander, seated in a much larger tent, capable of holding an army and its foreign troops. This was the full imperial dignity of the Byzantine βασιλεύς καὶ αὐτοκράτωρ. Psellos had not fully accepted the propriety of Isaak's position: the sight within the tent is worthy of a tyrant (not a duly established emperor), and it causes shaking fear rather than proper respect. The scene within the tent is described: Isaak is ὁ βασιλεύς, seated on a golden throne, with a footstool, and

50. ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείου...σκηνῆς. Chron. VII 20 2:94 16.
51. ἐκάθετο δὲ ἐπὶ θώκου τινὸς υψηλοῦ, βραχείας τινὸς περὶ αὐτοῦ αὐτῆς δορυφορίας· ἐσκέπαστο δὲ ὁ τοσοῦτων βασιλικότερον, διὸν στρογγυλότερον Chron. I 21 Renault 2:94 2-4.
53. The senior councillors or the leaders of the Senate: the ambiguity may be intentional. Chron. VII 22 Renault 2:95 4.
54. πρὸς τὸν κρατοῦντα Chron. VII 22 Renault 2:95 5.
57. Ἡν γὰρ δὴ πάντα τυραννικὰ τῷ ὑπὲρ καὶ φύκης μεστά Chron. VII 23 Renault 2:96 5-6.
dressed magnificently. He is lost in thought and contemplation as befits a Byzantine emperor. Round his person were circles of warriors: closest were the important commanders, drawn from the nobility; then the front-line soldiers; next the light-armed troops. The final circle was composed of

all the allied forces who had come to them from the nations, Italians and Tauroskythians, terrible both in their form and in their appearance, both alike glaring fiercely.

Psellos presents Isaak surrounded by an outer ring of foreigners to accentuate the fact that Isaak, even though strictly speaking only a rebel at this point was about to become emperor.

If Isaak Komenos is the rebel who becomes emperor, Leo Tornikios, in his rebellion against Constantine IX, is the rebel who failed to make the grade. When he first appears, named as Leo, he is described as coming from the Tornikian family and living in Adrianople. This description is then ruined by the description of Leo's bellowed Macedonian boasting. This early introduction of this "outsider" quality shows that Leo Tornikios is not a rebel like

59. kai to' omoi esothic lambda kathoi ek Chron. VII 24 2:96 7-8. See also Chron. VII 2:113-4 1-2 for Isaak Komnenos and dress, when dealing with ambassadors: Prodoseiav de xromatikov ou pasas mev lsoxeonoiro, apo de tov krettonov pasas o milei sxmatos.

60. mev' ovi ai symmochikoi dynimeis opoai para twn ethinw autois paragevnoito, 'Iatoloi te kai Tauroskubit, boberoi kai tois eidei kai tois sxmatos, omyw mev gloukwnites, Chron. VII 24 Renauld 2:97 22-25.


62. to' mev dynma Leo, to' de genos Tornikios, to' 'Adrianoupolin oikow, Chron. VI 99, Renauld 2:14 3-4.

63. kai Makedonikin epuygaywv megaloikhv Chron. VI 99, Renauld 2:14 4-5.
Isaak Komnenos to be admired. Leo was not bad to look at, but his habits were shady and his mind was always turned to revolution. Even before he was fully grown, this man was destined for a most brilliant career, according to the illogical statements of the many about him. When Leo became a man and showed some strength of character, the Macedonian party attached themselves to him. The result was many attempted rebellions that always ended in failure.

Euprepia, Constantine IX's younger sister, befriended Leo Tornikios, apparently to spite her brother. To forestall this union of oppositions, Constantine IX exiled Leo as governor of Iberia. Constantine IX found his hand forced by courtiers - opposed to Leo Tornikios - who said he was planning a coup d'état. Constantine IX had Leo Tornikios forced to accept the tonsure, and it was in the poor robes of a monk that he returned to Constantinople. This was the opportunity seized by a group of Macedonians living in a suburb of the City:

Best among these people were ones who had lived in Adrianople at an earlier time. They were devious men, with tongues that spoke at variance with their thoughts. They were

64. ἀνὴρ τὸ μὲν εἰδός οὐ φαύλος, τὸ ἕθος ὑποκαθῆμενος, καὶ πρὸς ἐνθυμητέος ἰδι καὶ καυσόφρας ἀνελίπτων τὰς γυνὰς. Chron. VI 99, Renauld 2:14 5-7.


67. Chron. VI 100, Renauld 2:14-5.

very ready to consider unusual things and most active in putting them into practice. They were most adept in concealing their thoughts, and were most loyal to those agreements they made between themselves.\textsuperscript{69} Tornikios was persuaded to join them, and with the help of some confederates, described by Psellos as "few and completely obscure"\textsuperscript{70}, Tornikios left the City for Adrianople, the rebels’ capital. In the announcement of the new emperor, Leo is described as prudent and a man of action, descended from illustrious ancestors.\textsuperscript{71} This description is traditional for rebels, who would be emperor. The troops were soon won over, though Psellos admits that as well as the story\textsuperscript{72}, Constantine IX’s suspicion of the military cadre contributed to the ease with which Leo Tornikios built up his forces; this was a military coup. Leo was chosen as emperor, and proclaimed as far as circumstances allowed.\textsuperscript{73} Tornikios acted as if he really were emperor

\textsuperscript{69} "Εσυχε δὲ τὸ τηνικάτα καὶ Μακεδονικὴ τις περὶ τὴν Πόλιν φιλοξενοῦσα πλήθους καὶ μάλιστα δοσὶ τὴν Ἀδριανούπολιν ἔκπεπται ἐξ ἀρχῆς, ἄνδρες δεινοὶ τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ τὴν γυναῖκαν ἀντιστρόφων ταῖς ἐνθυμῆσαι ἔχουσιν, βουλεύσασθαι τι τῶν ἀτόπων ἐτοιμώτατοι καὶ καταπράξασθαι δραστικῶτατοι, κρύψας τε λογισμῶς ἀκριβέστατοι καὶ τὰς πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὀμολογίας πιστότατοι. \textit{Chron. VI 102, Renauld 2:16 1-7.}

\textsuperscript{70} ὀλίγων δὴ τιμῶν καὶ τούτων παυτάσωσιν ὀφανῶν \textit{Chron. VI 102, Renauld 2:17 15-6.}

\textsuperscript{71} συνετῶτάτων τε ὁμοῦ καὶ δραστήριον καὶ λαμπρός ἔχοντα τοῦ ἄνω γένους τὰς ὀφρυμῶς: \textit{Chron. VI 103, Renauld 2:17 9-11.}

\textsuperscript{72} τὸ πλάσμα \textit{Chron. VI 103, Renauld 2:17 14.}

\textsuperscript{73} \textit{Chron. VI 104, Renauld 2:18 2-5.}
as soon as he put on the garments. The crowd was won over to his side when he remitted taxes and allowed them to plunder as they willed. The rebels moved quickly against Constantinople, convinced that the people wanted a soldier-emperor who risked his life for his people. The Macedonian threat seemed severe, as they recruited warriors from the uplands on their way from Adrianople to the City. The emperor's position appeared weak, as the only troops available to him were the mercenary lifeguards, used in imperial processions, as the eastern army was billeted in Armenia. His defence was the city walls, which he had repaired where they had fallen into disrepair. Leo, as the rebel, established his camp in front of the city. Never before, according to the soldiers and old men, had one of the rebels gone so far as to attack the city directly. Leo remains the rebel, and he

74. ο δὲ ἡπαξ ἐν τῷ σχῆματι καταστὰς, ὡς ἣδο τοῦ πράγματος αὐτοῦ τετυχηκώς, καὶ οὐχ ὡς ἐπὶ σκηνῆς οἰον δραματουργῶν ἡ πλαττόμενος, ἀρχικάς καὶ τῷ οὐτι βασιλικάς τῶν βασιλευσάντων κατ' ἀρχές, βουλομένων κακεῖνων ἀκριβέστερον αὐτῷ τὴν αρχὴν διευθύνεσθαι. Chron. VI 104, Renaud 2:18 5-10.


77. πληθύς τε στρατωτικὴ ἀπὸ τῶν ψηλοτέρων μερών προσεγίνεται Chron. VI 105, Renaud 2:19 3-4.

78. εἰ μὴ τις ὀλγήν μερίς ζευκῆ, ὡς ὁσία τις εἶλθεν ἐφέπευσθαι ταῖς βασιλείαις ποιμαί Chron. VI 105, Renaud 2:19 8-9.


80. ὁ τύραννος Chron. VI 108, Renaud 2:20 1.


82. Chron. VI 107, Renaud 2:20 11-2; 108, 2:20 1; 110, 2:21 3; 115 2:25 3; 116 2:25 7; 117 2:25 1, 8; 118 2:26 6; 120 2:27 14; 121 2:28 1, 9, 12; 122 2:28 5 and 123 2:29 9.
disposes his men round the city as a disciplined force, not as a rabble.\textsuperscript{83} However, Tornikios's later dispersal of his forces to present the least target to the defenders had the effect of making the rebels look like a disorderly mob rather than infantry or cavalry at the charge\textsuperscript{84}, which weakens his validation as emperor-in-waiting. When none of the defenders would listen to the blandishments of the attackers, they then attacked Constantine IX personally, describing him as an adulterer, the ruin of the city and corrupter of the people.\textsuperscript{85}

Psellos goes on to give the famous denunciation of the Macedonians:

\begin{quote}
The majority of the Macedonians, being a people who delight in arrogance and insolent bearing, being more accustomed to the buffoonery of townsfolk than military simplicity, the majority I say dismounted from their horses and began dance improvisations.\textsuperscript{86}
\end{quote}

Constantine IX decided that some effort should be made to oppose those attacking the City. He released any soldiers in the City's jails and then he enrolled "a crowd of citizens [that was] not small...in the remains of the army."\textsuperscript{87} They gave themselves willingly to the

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{83} ἀλλὰ στρατιωτικῶς διεσκευασμένοι καὶ πολέμου σχήμα διατυπώσαντες \textit{Chron.} VI 107, Renauld 2:20 18-9.

\textsuperscript{84} οὐ μελλόν τι ισχὺν παρατάξεως ἢ φαντασίαν πλήθους παρείχων \textit{Chron.} VI 108, Renauld 2:21 11-2.

\textsuperscript{85} νῦν δὲ Πόλεως ὁλεθροῦ καὶ δήμου ψιρέα \textit{Chron.} VI 110, Renauld 2:22 10-2.

\textsuperscript{86} οἱ δὲ πλείως τῶν Μακεδόνων, δήμος δύντες αὐθαδεία χαίροντες καὶ θραυστητείς, καὶ οὐ στρατηγικῆς ἀφελείας ὀλλὰ πολιτικῆς βιομολοχίας δύντες θάδες, τῶν Ἰππῶν τέ οἱ πλείους ἀπέβαινον, καὶ χορείας εἰς τουμάσανες συνιστῶντες \textit{Chron.} VI 110, Renauld 2:22 10-4.

\textsuperscript{87} πλήθος πολιτικῶν οὐκ ἄλγον...τῷ λοιπῷ στίψει συναρθμεῖ \textit{Chron.} VI 112, Renauld 2:23 11-4.
\end{flushright}
platoons, as if war was another one of their games.88 The rebel forces are referred to as the enemy89 signalling that they are outsiders. Constantine IX drew up his scratch forces to oppose them. The apparent arrival of reinforcements from the East caused the rebels to check their assault, but when they saw what was opposing them, they pressed home their advantage. The defenders failed to withstand the onslaught, and were massacred. The situation was so grave that the courtiers round Constantine IX also fled, believing that Leo Tornikios was about to enter the City.90 Though the City was Tornikios’s for the taking, he did not make the final assault, perhaps convinced that the citizens would dispose of Constantine IX, allowing Leo to enter the City as legitimate sovereign, not as conqueror. Leo ordered the killing to stop, obviously convinced that he had won.91 Deserted by all (though Psellus lets us know that he remained with the emperor92) and expected to die within the hour, it was this display of philanthropy that caused Constantine IX concern. The emperor thought that this


89. τοὺς πολέμιους Chron. VI 112, Renaud 2:23 16; οἱ πολέμιοι Chron. VI 113, Renaud 2:23 1.

90. Chron. VI 113, Renaud 2:24 11-20, esp. 19-20 ὁ则是 γὰρ αὐτίκα τὸν τύραννον εἰσίειναι καὶ πάντας διαφθορῆσεθαι.

91. παρελαύνων δὲ τὸν ἱπποὺ ἐφ’ ἐκείνα τὰ μέρη τῶν οἰκείων δυνάμεις, μηδὲνα παῖειν ἐβίω, μηδὲ πληροῦσθαι φόνου συγγενοῦς, καὶ ἐὰν τινὰ ἴδοι τὸ πόλεμον ἐπισείοντα ἢ τῷ δόρατι βαλεῖν ἐθέλοντα τὸν ἁγιοῦ, ἔπειξε τὴν χείρα καὶ ἑλευθέρος τὸν ἰεύγοντα. Chron. VI 114, Renaud 2:24-5 12-5.

92. πρὸς ἐμὲ στραφεῖς Chron. VI 115, Renaud 2:25 4-5.
display by "the dreadful man intent on insurrection"\(^93\) would win him Divine favour.

Leo's fortunes took a dramatic turn from this point on. The people in the City remain loyal to the emperor, even though it did not appear in their best interests to do so. The near-miss experienced by Tornikios\(^94\) broke the rebels' will, and they withdrew from before the City. Leo's attempts to reduce some of the fortresses in West ended in failure and his troops and leaders began to desert him. In the end, only John Vatatzes\(^95\) remained loyal. The two men took sanctuary, and whilst John retained his pride, Leo was reduced to begging for his life.\(^96\) When they were brought to Constantinople, Constantine IX decided they should be blinded. Leo responded basely (άγενώς), but Vatatzes acted courageously (γεννάως).\(^97\)

The revolt against Constantine IX by Maniakes was a failure in man-management. Psellos opens his account of Maniakes in a very positive way, crediting his skill and boldness with stopping the barbarians onslaught and preserving Byzantine freedom.\(^98\) Maniakes had risen through the ranks, which Psellos seems to regard favourably,

\(^93\) Τυραννείων ὁ δεύτερος ἀνήρ ἐπιβαλλόμενος Chron. VI 115, Renauld 2:25 5.

\(^94\) Chron. VI 118, Renauld 2:26 6-10.

\(^95\) "a man whose bodily nature and strength of hands rivalled the ancient famous heros" ἀνήρ κατὰ τε σώματος φύσιν καὶ χειρῶν ἀκμὴν τοῖς θρυλλομένοις ἐκεῖνοι εἴσαμιλλος ἤρως Chron. VI 122, Renauld 2:28 3-4.

\(^96\) Chron. VI 122, Renauld 2:28-9 9-19.

\(^97\) Chron. VI 123, Renauld 2:29 10 & 12-3.

\(^98\) Chron. VI 75, Renauld 1:154 2-6.
especially as his rise to general was gradual not meteoric. Nature had endowed him with everything necessary to be a general. He was very tall and everyone had to look up at him as if to the top of a mountain.

His appearance was not effeminate and devoted to pleasure but seemed to be like a storm; his voice was deep and his hands were able to throw down walls and gates of bronze; his attacks were those of a lion and his frown was fearsome. Everything else about the man was in accord with these traits.

Michael V sent Maniakes to reconquer Apulia and Calabria in full force. All the strategies were attempted and it was clear Maniakes would succeed, even if he had to do it with his own hands. Rather than conciliating Maniakes with honours as was really his due, when he came to power Constantine IX treated him as if he was already in rebellion. Constantine IX sent envoys to Maniakes, not to appease him but to threaten him. The man leading the embassy from Constantine IX had not been tested on such missions before, nor was he one of those who had held the direction of civil or military matters

100. to de eidos au'tw ou trophorh kai epitrephe, all' oion eoukos proosthri: ebrounta de kai t' otheumat, ai te kefes oioi diasoivtai teixh kai pulas suntrhioi haks, to de orhima toutw oioin leountos kai to epitkuphion blosourh kai tallla de t' au'dri sunvoda toutois kai sunvodoia Chron. VI 77, Renaud 2:2 5-9.
for some time. Rather he was one of those who had just come into the
castle from the street-corner.  

Maniakes had already embarked on revolt when the envoy from
Constantine IX appeared, accusing Maniakes of lèse-majesté. Maniakes's troops killed the envoy. As Maniakes was brave and the
master of strategy many flocked to his side, boys and men, as well
as men of military age, but he chose the most experienced men.
Maniakes crossed to the Balkans, eventually to be opposed by
Stephanos with a huge army drawn from a wide area. The news that
the whole Roman army was marching against him did not alarm
Maniakes. He continued to plan to take the imperial forces by
surprise.

At Ostrovo, Maniakes is shown firmly in control, striking terror
wherever he appeared and giving heart to his own troops. Maniakes
fell due to a decision by God, the reason for which is unknown.
Psellos seems ambivalent about Maniakes: though previously
described as the rebel, he describes Maniakes's sliding from his

---

103. καὶ ὁ κορυφαῖος τῶν πρέσβεων οὗ τῶν ἐν τοιούτοις
ἐχθρασμένων, οὐδὲ τῶν προλαβόντων τῷ Χρόνῳ πολιτικῶν ἢ
στρατηγικῶν πραγμάτων ἐπιμέλειας, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἐκ τριδών ἀθρόων
ἐπιστεφόντων εἰς τὰ βασιλεία. Chron. VI 80, Renauld 2:3 6-9.

104. καταπλήσως γοῦν πρὸς τὸν τέως τιραννεῖν ἐπευλαμένου
Chron. VI 81, Renauld 2:3 1-2.

105. τούτου ἐντεῦθεν ἐλὼν τύραννον Chron. VI 81, Renauld 2:3 13-

4.

106. ἀνδρὶ γενναίῳ καὶ κορυφαίῳ τὴν στρατηγικὴν τέχνην Chron.
VI 82, Renauld 2:4 1-2.


horse as a θέαμα ἐλευθόν. Even though defeated and killed as a rebel in a civil war, Manakes remains an insider.

I.2 The Great Unwashed as Outsiders

The next aspect of Psellos's treatment of outsiders by τὰξις is how he represents members of the lower orders, who in The Chronographia are usually the city populace. He describes them as weak in understanding. When the matter of Michael IV's succession became known

to those residing outside the palace, the whole city wanted to receive the cheerfulness of the signal most [of them] pretending acquiescence and flattering the new ruler.

The ruler who was dead was thrown off as if some kind of burden. In this description, it is clear that Psellos regards the actions of the "most" as being driven by baser impulses.

The weak understanding of the people is underlined in a position statement by Psellos concerning the origins of Michael IV's illness:

Because I know that it is usual for people to make up stories, I do not accept quickly the slanders of the many, but I put the things spoken to the test, and from that I decide matters for myself.


111. τοῖς ἐκτὸς καὶ τῶν ἀνακτόρων καθίστατο καὶ πᾶσα ἡ Πόλις παραλαβεῖν τὸν συνόδημας τὴν εὐθυμίαν ἐβουλέτα, τούτο μὲν καὶ ψευδομένων τῶν πλείουν τὴν εὐθυμίαν καὶ κολακεύων τὸν βασιλεύσαυτα Chron. IV 2, Renaud 1:54 19-22.

112. ὡσπερ τι ἄχθος ἀποθεμένων τοῦ τελευτήσαυτα Chron. IV 2, Renaud 1:54 22-23.

113. Ἔγω γὰρ εἰδὼς ὅτι τὸ λογοποιεῖν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις σύνθεσι, οὐ τοῦτο τοῖς διαφοράς συμφέρομαι τῶν πολλῶν, ἀλλὰ βασάνοις δίδοις τὰ λεγόμενα ἐκεῖθεν εὐμαυτῷ πιστούμαι τὰ πράγματα Chron. IV 33, Renaud 1:73 11-4.
"The many" are not so rigorous in the acceptance of stories they hear.

Psellos describes Michael V's personal government as "having nothing measured [i.e. moderate] in mind." He wanted to change everything straightaway to what he wanted. Officials received neither favourable looks nor intentions, but were all terrified by the same tyrannical words and commands.

This theme of unnatural tyranny is one that follows through Psellos's account of Michael V's reign. Having changed the imperial attitude to the officials, Michael V came to rule with only one ambition:

He wished to display that in truth the citizenry was ruled by him. Most of the officials were deprived of their usual honours and the people were espoused to freedom, so that he would be guarded by the many rather than by the few.

The next element to be conciliated were "the choice people of the City and those who live by the disorder of the agora or by vulgar crafts". He won them over, having their compliance should it be required.


117. ἐβουλέτο δὲ αὐτὸ τοῦτο ὑπῆκοον ὡς ἄληθῶς ἐξεδείχθη ἄπρος τὸ ἀρχόμενον, καὶ τοὺς μὲν πολλοὺς τῶν ἐν τέλει παῦσαι τῶν συνήθων ἔξουσιῶν, ἐλευθερίαν δὲ τῷ δῆμῳ μνηστεύσθαι, ὡς τοῖς πολλοῖς μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς ἀληθοῖς δορυφοροῖ τὸ Chron. V 15, Renauld 1:95 7-11.

118. τῶν δ' ἀπὸλεκτὸν δήμου τῆς Πόλεως καὶ ὅσοι τῆς ἀγορᾶς τύβρης ἢ τῶν βαναύσων τεχνῶν ψευδοῦ Chron. V 16, Renauld 1:96 2-3.
They were attached to him and displayed their feelings openly.¹¹⁹ This winning over of the people was put to good use when Michael V attempted to depose the empress Zoe. The senate was easily convinced by Michael V's fabrications against Zoe¹²⁰, and then Michael V turned to the majority of the people.¹²¹ Some of them were well-disposed to that contrived undertaking he wanted; he spoke and they listened. As they were in favour of his activity, he dissolved that assembly as well.¹²²

This unnatural tyranny provoked a divinely-inspired response, as gradually throughout the City a general feeling of unease came to dominate.¹²³ Psellus states this affected all races, fortunes and ages¹²⁴ as if their natural order had been overturned.

There was no-one of all of them who did not let their tongue murmur and brooded more strongly about the affair in their heart, and gave their tongue license to speak.¹²⁵

By the second day, no-one restrained their tongues, not the people in office, not the clergy, not even the emperor's own relations and

---

household; and because of that the people from the workshops prepared themselves for great deeds.\textsuperscript{126} The natural order is so overturned that even the foreign and allied troops brought in by the emperors - by which circumlocution Psellos tells us he means the Skyths from Tauros - were not able to contain their anger, "but all wanted to lay down their lives for the empress."\textsuperscript{127}

As the common people became agitated at the idea of rising in rebellion against the tyrant\textsuperscript{128}, Psellos emphasizes the unnaturalness of the occurrence, though it is an eye-witness account.\textsuperscript{129} Having described how the crowd was armed, Psellos then describes them as running in greatest disorder.\textsuperscript{130} Even with the news that the whole people were moving against the emperor, and, as if under a single standard, were engaged in the same plan\textsuperscript{131} to many it seemed that

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{126} καὶ εἰς δεύτεραν ἡμέραν οὐδεὶς τέως ἐπείχε τὴν γλώτταν, οὐ τῶν ἐν τέλει, οὐ τῶν τῷ Βήματος, ἀλλὰ οὗ ὄσον ἐκείνου συγγενικὸν καὶ οἰκίδιον· οἱ δ᾽ οὐν ἐπὶ τῶν ἐργαστηρίων καὶ πρὸς μεγάλοις τόλμασι παρεσκευάζοντο. \textit{Chron.} V 25, Renauld 1:102 15-8.
  \item \textsuperscript{127} ἀλλὰ πάντες καταθύειν ὑπὲρ τῆς βασιλίδος ἐβούλουντο τὰς ψυχὰς. \textit{Chron.} V 25, Renauld 1:102 19-22.
  \item \textsuperscript{128} Τὸ δ᾽ ἀγοραῖον γένος καὶ ἄφετον ἵδη ποι καὶ παρεκκλίητο ὡς ἀντιτυραννησόμενο τῷ τυραννεύσαντι. \textit{Chron.} V 26, Renauld 1:102 1-2.
  \item \textsuperscript{129} ἐγὼ γοῦν πολλὰς ἐφράκειν \textit{Chron.} V 26, Renauld 1:102 4.
  \item \textsuperscript{130} ἀτακτότερον \textit{Chron.} V 27, Renauld 1:103 5.
  \item \textsuperscript{131} ἐπειτὰ τίς ἤκειν ἀγγέλλων, ὡς ὁ δῆμος ἀπὸ τοῦ βασιλέα κεκινήσατο καὶ ὠστρέψετο ὡς ἐν συνόηματι πρὸς τὴν αὐτὴν γνώμην συνελεκταί. \textit{Chron.} V 27, Renauld 1:103 11-3.
\end{itemize}
what was unfolding was unreasoned but our hero Psellos knew that it was the start of something big.

Michael V thought at first to defuse the situation without bloodshed, but when the people formed companies and became a battle-formation of note, he could not ignore it. Michael V and his uncle showed Zoë from the kathisma to the crowd in revolt - in the hope that the return of Zoë from exile would calm their anger. However, they were not ready to recognize her and continued to press their advantage against Michael V, always described as tyrannical, with his tyrannical activities. In contrast, Zoë is described as a queen.

Psellos then describes the people’s second plan against the tyrant, as they turned their attention to Theodora. When she rejected their blandishments, the citizen army abandoned persuasion and threatened her life. In the Great Church, Theodora

139. ἐπὶ τὴν ἀδελφὴν...ὡς δεύτερον αἶμα βασιλέων Chron. V 36, Renauld 1:108 8-9.
140. τὸ πολιτικὸν στράτευμα Chron. V 37, Renauld 1:108 4-5.
was acclaimed "not by only a part of the people but by all the élite." Thus the obvious outsider mob, who had violently violated sanctuary to remove Theodora from her refuge, had now moved in to be numbered with the élite in an insider grouping.

Michael V fled with his uncle to take refuge in the Studios monastery.

As this news became known in the City, straightaway the hearts of everyone - until then timorous and quaking, recovered [their spirits].

The division of the text implies that it was the better sort who offered thanks to God, and acclaimed the empress, while the people and the common herd of the market place joined in dances and composed songs about what had happened, which they themselves had caused. The largest part, however, was the group that headed off to the tyrant.

Theodora sent a guard. The commander was one of the nobles and a friend of Psellos's. When Psellos and the guard commander arrived at the gates of the church they saw another self-selected guard,

---

144. ὡς δὲ δῆλον ἐγεγόνει τούτο τῇ Πόλει, εὐθὺς αἱρέται πᾶσα ψυχὴ μέχρι τούτου πεφοβημένη καὶ φριττουσα Χρον. V 38, Renauld 1:109 8-10.
146. i.e. Michael V. Chron. V 38, Renauld 1:109 13-5.
a phalanx who surrounded the building and wished to destroy it
almost.\footnote{148} As the guard captain and Psellos entered the church, so too
did a great crowd.\footnote{149} Psellos had been mildly opposed to Michael V,
but the refugees' changed circumstances made him mourn the
fickleness of fortune.\footnote{150} Psellos's attitude is then contrasted with that
of the general population who had formed a circle round the two men,
and who wished to devour them like wild beasts.\footnote{151} Psellos's more
moderate attitude encouraged the two men to appeal to him. They
indicated their desire to become monks. He who had been clothed
with power\footnote{152} received the mystery of the changing habit.\footnote{153} The
ultimate insider was now the outsider, to political society at least.

The newly appointed official then arrived with orders from
Theodora. The official was followed by a horde of citizens and
soldiers.\footnote{154} With talk of public execution, the fugitives refused to
leave the sanctuary. The official then abandoned words and ordered

\footnote{148} έπει δὲ πρὸς ταῖς πῦλαις τοῦ μείω ἐγεγονείμεν, ἔτέραυν
οὐτοκέλευστον ὅρμμεν φουράν, δημοδὴ φαγεύς κ' ἱλαρε τὸν
ἱερὸν περιπεπότας οἰκον καὶ μονονοῦ διορίζει τούτον

\footnote{149} καὶ πολὺ τι πληθος \textit{Chron.} V 39, Renauld 1:110 9.

\footnote{150} \textit{Chron.} V 40, Renauld 1:110 11-6.

\footnote{151} Τὸ μὲν οὖν εἰσελθουθός πλῆθος κύκλωσε περιστάντες τῷ
ἀνδρὲ ὡσπερ ἐπὶ τινὲς θηρες καταδαισοσθαι τούτως ἐβοῦλυντο:
\textit{Chron.} V 41, Renauld 1:110 1-3.

\footnote{152} αὐτὸν δὲ τοῦ εὐληψία τὸ κράτος \textit{Chron.} V 41, Renauld 1:111
10.

\footnote{153} \textit{Chron.} V 43, Renauld 1:112 8.

\footnote{154} εἶπετο δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ πληθὺς πολιτικὴ τε καὶ στρατιωτικὴ: \textit{Chron.}
V 44, Renauld 1:112 4-5.
the mob to lay hands on them. They were dragged from the sanctuary ὠς θηρεις155 When the fugitives left the church they became the objects of the mob’s ridicule, which was reasonable given the circumstances Psellos tells us.156 They were then blinded by ἄνδρας ἱταμοὺς καὶ θροσεῖς sent by Theodora’s advisers.157 With the men blinded, the fury of the mob, so marked before, died away.158

For all his protestations that he was not writing an enkomion159 the last mentions of the common people come when Psellos describes Constantine IX’s good points as he came to the throne. The new emperor prayed for divine guidance, and sent the senators from his first audience away with many rewards. Even the manual workers did not go away empty-handed as they were raised in status to match the senators.160 Part of the same episode was the fact that:

the people of the fields, who before never knew who was ruling, honoured him highly, both on account of his benevolent

155. *Chron.* V 45, Renaud 1:112-3 1-5.
156. εἰκὸς τῷ καυρῷ *Chron.* V 47, Renaud 1:114 3.
158. ἐπεὶ δὲ τούτῳ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἐξερρυόκες, λήγει τοῖς πολλοῖς τὸ πολὺ θράσος ἐκεῖνο καὶ ἡ ἐπ’ ἐκεῖνοις ὁμή *Chron.* V 50, Renaud 1:115 8-9.
words, but also because of the more benevolent deeds he displayed.\textsuperscript{161}

I.3 The Upwardly-Mobile as Outsiders

Psellos’s treatment of the upwardly-mobile begins in the reign of Basil II. Basil II developed a policy of ruling utterly by himself; circumspect in his dealings with people, he was feared rather than loved.\textsuperscript{162} As he grew older and more experienced, he relied less and less on those more able than himself.\textsuperscript{163} He alone decided what measures to take and he alone decided the allocation of troops.\textsuperscript{164} With regard to the civil government, he governed not in accordance with the written laws, but by the dictates of his conscience.\textsuperscript{165} As he was naturally equipped for this, this seems not so much a criticism of Basil II, as the introduction of the section on scholarship. Not requiring their expertise, Basil paid no attention to men of learning, but treated them with scorn.\textsuperscript{166} People were drawn to scholarship with pure motives, with no ulterior goal. Psellos contrasts this with his own

\textsuperscript{161} Οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν ἁγίων, οἱ τὸ πρὶν μὴ δὲ τὸν βασιλέαντα ἱδεῖσαι, καθαρῶς αὐτῷ ἑυτηρεῖν, καὶ φιλανθρώπως μὲν λόγους, φιλανθρωποτέρως δὲ πράξεως μετελάμβανον. \textit{Chron. VII Constantine IX} 16, Renauld 2:146 14-7.

\textsuperscript{162} \textit{Chron.} I 29, Renauld 1:18 3-6.

\textsuperscript{163} τοὺς δὲ ἔτεις προστιθεὶς καὶ πεῖρας ἀπαίτως συνειδηθῶς, ἄπροσδείγματος ὑστερὶ τῶν σοφῶτέρων ἐτυγχάνειν ὧν \textit{Chron.} I 29, Renauld 1:18 6-8.

\textsuperscript{164} \textit{Chron.} I 29, Renauld 1:18 8-10.

\textsuperscript{165} τὸ δὲ πολιτικὸν οὐ πρὸς τὸς γεγραμμένος νόμους, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τοὺς γράφοντας τῆς αὐτοῦ εὐφυεστάτης ἐκμετάλλης ψυχῆς. \textit{Chron.} I 29, Renauld 1:18 10-2.

\textsuperscript{166} ὁθὲν οὖν προσεῖχε λογίας ἀνθράστων, ἀλλὰ τούτου δὴ τοῦ μέρους, φημὶ δὲ τῶν λογίων, καὶ παντάπασι καταπεφρούτηκε \textit{Chron.} I 29, Renauld 1:18 12-4.
day, when people were drawn to learning in the expectation that it would lead to preferment. If they did not achieve their goal immediately, they gave up their studies right away. Basil, however, surrounded himself with men, not known for brilliance of learning, nor for eminence of birth, nor for depths of knowledge in literature. To them were entrusted the imperial rescripts and he was accustomed to discuss the most secret matters of state with them. Thus Basil II replaced the leaders of the great families and brought them down to equal the others, relative outsiders, forcing out those who regarded the circles of power as their rightful place. Basil II reflected the officials he used. His replies were simple, without adornment, dictated directly to the secretaries. Psellos describes his speech as not fluid, not rounded in phrases and periods, but broken and stopping every little while. It was more like the speech of a peasant than of a free man.

Psellos's opening description of Constantine VIII shows clearly that he was not to be admired. Foreign barbarians were held in check by


grants of dignities and bribes\textsuperscript{172}, while any of the Byzantines who
dared revolt were punished severely.\textsuperscript{173} His subjects were not made
his slaves by favours gained at his hand, but by all manner of dreadful
punishments.\textsuperscript{174} He turned free Byzantines into slaves by fear.
Constantine VIII blinded people indiscriminately for the slightest
fault as well as for the most severe crime; to those merely suspected
by rumour of having contemplated an act, as well as those who
committed it.\textsuperscript{175} Unable to distinguish between levels of crime, he
acted in the same way, even against the greatest and the least.\textsuperscript{176} The
major element of this criticism of Constantine VIII is that he did not
recognize the differentials of place between the various elements in
society.

His generosity, like his punishments, was not tempered by good
judgment. Members of his court received a lot of gold, but those at a

\textsuperscript{172} καὶ τὸ μὲν πέριε βασιλείων ἵππων, ἰσιώματος ἰσιώματος, 
τὸ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐνεγκρεῖν καὶ ἀποδιδεῖν Chron. II 2, Renauld 1:25 5-11.

\textsuperscript{173} τοὺς δὲ τῶν ὑπηκόων στασιάζωντας σειμῶν ἐτυμωρεῖσθαι Chron. 
II 2, Renauld 1:25 7-8.

\textsuperscript{174} οὐκ εὐνοούσας τοὺς ὑπὸ χείρα δουλωθέντας, ἀλλὰ παντοδαπαῖς 
βασιλείαν κακώσεσθαι Chron. II 2, Renauld 1:25 9-11.

\textsuperscript{175} ταύτην δὲ τὴν κολασίν πᾶσιν ἀπέμετρησε, κἀν δὲ μὲν μείζονα, 
δὲ εἰλατόνον ἐμακτάνειν ἐδοξεῖ, καὶ δὲ μὲν ἔργον ἡπτεῖτο, δὲ μὲν 
χριστίς προεβαίνειν Chron. II 2, Renauld 1:26 16-8.

\textsuperscript{176} προέβη δὲ οὕτω ποιῶν ἀπὸ τῶν πρῶτων καὶ ἄρχα τῶν 
τελευταίων ἐξέτασε δὲ τὸ κακὸν καὶ ἐνίοις τῶν ἐν κλήρῳ 
kατευλημένων, οὐδὲ ἀρχιερωσύνης ἐφείσατο Chron. II 2, Renauld 
1:26 23-6.
remove from the palace saw less evidence of this quality.\textsuperscript{177} The recipients of this bounty at court\textsuperscript{178} are described as:

neither of good birth, nor having the luck of the leisured class, but rather being ethnics and barbarians; favoured with education by him and shaped in his own way of doing things, they were judged worthy of more respect and honour than any others.\textsuperscript{179}

The purpose is to criticize Constantine VIII for favouring them above the "better sort" of imperial subject.

Constantine VIII is described as having merely the learning deemed suitable for children. Natural intelligence and more than ordinary grace - perhaps an addition because of his imperial occupation - added to a melodious and refined tongue concealed his lack of formal education.\textsuperscript{180} He found pleasure in spectacles and at the hippodrome. He was enthusiastic about horses, harnesses and starting points. He also revived the gymnopodia, taking part himself,
spoke easily about these contests and mixed with the common citizenry.  

In the description of Romanos III after his abortive campaign against Aleppo of Coele-Syria, the emperor is more of a tax-gatherer than an emperor.  

This perversion is extended by the emperor's division of the entire people into two groups, one composed of those who lived simply and held themselves aloof from public affairs and for whom Romanos III cared not a straw; and the other composed of those who participated in public life to gain wealth at the expense of the rest.  

This faulty division bought everything to trouble and confusion, and what was worse was that these unjust exactions did not benefit the imperial treasury.

The first three books of The Chronographia criticize the reigning emperors for being less "imperial" than they might be. Book Four deals with Michael IV, and there are some references to his lowly origin. When Michael IV is introduced as emperor, Psellos says that had it not been for the small matters of adultery and the complicity in the murder of Romanos III, Michael IV would be numbered among

---

181. 'Εστι οὖν πάντα ἑαυτῷ, οὐ μόνον τὸν λαόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς πόλεις ἐτέλεσεν οὔτε οὗτος οὐδέποτε Κρόνιον. Πεσσάλιον, Πεσσάσι Ρεναουλ τ. ΙΙ 8, 1:30 9-10.

182. Πράξαις μετὰ τὴν Βοσίλικας ἐγέρθη, Κρόνιον. Πεσσάλιον, Πεσσάσι Ρεναουλ τ. ΙΙ 12, 1:40 5-6.

183. Κρόνιον. Πεσσάλιον, Πεσσάσι Ρεναουλ τ. ΙΙ 12, 1:40 10-6.

184. καὶ πάντα ἣν τὰ ταξίδια μεστὰ καὶ συγχύσεως Κρόνιον. Πεσσάλιον, Πεσσάσι Ρεναουλ τ. ΙΙ 12, 1:40 16-7.
the choice rulers.\textsuperscript{185} This is despite his lack of Hellenic learning\textsuperscript{186}, though this lack was countered by the moderation of his habits. Psellos says that the first marvel of this emperor was that despite his great elevation from obscurity to the throne, Michael IV did not lose his balanced judgment, nor was he overwhelmed by power.\textsuperscript{187} However, Michael IV’s judgment was overcome by the protestations of his brother John the Orphanotrophos, and he agreed to the adoption of his nephew Michael Kalaphates by Zoë. In doing so, the Orphanotrophos assured Michael IV that Kalaphates being invested in the outward form, will serve [you] better than before, and he will receive the honour measured out as far as the name [only], having towards you the place of a slave, holding the lowest rank.\textsuperscript{188}

Here, therefore, we have a future emperor of the Romans, likened to a slave bought for silver.

Psellos’s description of Kalaphates’s family origins places him at the bottom of the heap. His father’s family was completely unknown and most inconspicuous.\textsuperscript{189} His father came from utterly deserted

\textsuperscript{185} εν τοίς ἐξευλεγμένοις βασιλεύσιων οὗτος τετἀξεταί Chron. IV 7, Renauld 1:56 5.

\textsuperscript{186} Παισείας μὲν γὰρ ἐλληνικής ἀμοιρος παυτάπασιν ἦν Chron. IV 7, Renauld 1:56 6.

\textsuperscript{187} ἐξ ἐλάπτουνος τούχης τῆς μεγίστης ταύτης εὐδαιμονίας τυχών, οὔτε ἐξεπλάγη τὸ φρούμημα, οὕτε ἤττων εὐρέθη τοῦ κράτους, Chron. IV 10, Renauld 1:57 2-4.

\textsuperscript{188} ἀξιοῦσθω τοῦ σχ’ ματος, λατρεύων ἐτὶ μᾶλλον ἦ πρότερον, καὶ μέρισονόματος τὴν τύχην ἐπιμετροῦμενος, τα δ’ ἄλλα σοι ἐν ἀρχηγωμὴν προσωπῶν μέρει καὶ τὴν ἐσχάτην τάξιν ταπτόμενοι. Chron. IV 22, Renauld 1:67 8-11.

\textsuperscript{189} τὸ μὲν πατρὶδο γένος ἀδοξότατος πάντῃ καὶ ἀφανέστατος καθεστήκεν; Chron. IV 26, Renauld 1:69 2-3.
countryside or from some place at the farthest edge. We are then provided with a hierarchy of occupations - landowner with crops or vines, stockman or shepherd, farm bailiff, and then occupations to do with the sea: merchant-shipper, navigator, pilot, carpenter, joiner and finally the man who smears pitch onto new ships - which suggests livelihoods gained from the land were ranked above those to do with the sea, whilst occupations orientated to the sea ranked in terms of the skill involved and the capital needed to start them.

Michael Kalaphates's father later became the plaything of fortune, but everything about him remained out of kilter. Like a pygmy attempting to play Hercules, everything about him was wrong. Michael Kalaphates's mother's line was equally unsuitable:

If one wished to speak of his maternal line, it was not very different from his paternal family, apart from his uncle, but such as these were his origins.

190. ἤν γὰρ οἱ ὁ πατήρ ἐκ πανερήμου τινὸς ἄγρου ἢ τινὸς ἔλλης ἔσχατας ἀρμημένος Chron. IV 26, Renauld 1:69 3-4.

191. γὰρ μὲν οὖν σπείρων οὔτε φυτεύων, ἔπει μυθὲ τῆς βραχυτάτης εὔπορει, ἄλλ' οὔδε βουκολῶν ἐπόμενος ἢ ποιμνέως ἐπιστατῶν ἢ ἀγελασικοῦμα, οὐδ' ἄλλον τινὰ βιῶν ἔχων ἢ ἐπιδεικνύειν: επὶ δὲ τὴν θάλασσαν τρέφειν τὸν νουν οὐχ ὡστε ἐμπορεύονται ἢ ναυτίλλεον, ἢ ἐπὶ μισθῷ άγειν τοὺς αναγομένους ἢ καταπλεύοντας ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ τῆς γῆς ἀπεγνώκαι καὶ πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν ἑνενεύκει, χρήμα τι μέγα τῇ ναυπηγίᾳ ἢ ἀνθρωπος ἢν, οὐ δρομομένων οὐδ' ἀποξείων ἐκεῖθεν τὰ ναυπηγήσιμα ἔυλα οὐδ' ἀρμοττών ταῦτα καὶ συμπηγμένον, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ συμπηγμένειν ἑτεροι, αὐτὸς εὐ μᾶλα τὰ συμπηγμένα τῇ πίσος διέχριε, καὶ οὐκ ἕν᾽ ἄλλος ἀρτι συμπηγμεύσαν ναοῦς κατήκθη πρὸς θάλασσαν, εἰ μὴ ἐκείνος διὰ τῆς τεχνῆς ἑχειροῦσαν αὐτῷ τὸ ἐνύδσιον Chron. IV 26, Renauld 1:69 4-17.

192. τῆς τύχης γινόμενον παιγνιον Chron. IV 27, Renauld 1:69 2.

193. εἰ δὲ τὰς ἀρτοὺς καὶ μητρόθεν γενεαλογεῖν βούλοιτο, εἶτα ὑπερβαίνει τοῦ θείουν, οὐ πάνω τι τοῦ πατρικοῦ διαστήσει γένους ἀλλὰ τοιοῦτοι μὲν ἀφ'. ἄν γεγένη Chron. IV 28, Renauld 1:70 1-4.
As for Michael Kalaphates himself, in elevation of station and rank - or at least the outward appearance of the same - he was far removed from his begetter and she from whom he derived his substance.\textsuperscript{194}

The implicit distance between his rootstock and the role he played in society as Caesar was echoed by his duplicity.\textsuperscript{195} Psellos genuflects to orthodoxy when he ascribes Michael Kalaphates's accession to God, who knew that it would be through him that the entire family would be destroyed.\textsuperscript{196}

The problem in attempting to maintain distinct categories of outsiders is plain in the case of Dolianos. Dolianos led the Bulgarians in revolt in 1040. He is described as

\begin{quote}
\textit{deriving from the same race as them, a man from a family of no particular esteem, with a complex mind and most adept at tricking his compatriots.}\textsuperscript{197}
\end{quote}

Knowing the whole nation\textsuperscript{198} to be intent on rebellion against the Romans, Dolianos provided the leadership to bring about its realization by tracing his descent from Samuel and Aaron, "for it is the custom of the Bulgarians to give dominion over the nation to [people]...

\textsuperscript{194} \textit{Aύτός δὲ οὐσα μὲν ἐς φρόνημα φέρει, κατάστασιν τε τὴν ἄριστην καὶ τάχιν, ἢ τὴν γε ἐν σχήματι πόρῳ ποιεῖ τῆς πρὸς τοὺς γενεάτοράς ἀπὸν ὀμοιότητος. Chron. IV 28, Renauld 1:70 4-7.}

\textsuperscript{195} \textit{Chron. IV 28, Renauld 1:70 7-13.}

\textsuperscript{196} \textit{Chron. IV 30, Renauld 1:71.}

\textsuperscript{197} \textit{τὸ γένος αὐτῶν ἀποφύεται: ἀνὴρ τὸ μὲν γένος ὡδ' ὀσοῦν ἄξιοσθαί μηνῆς, ποικίλος δὲ τὴν γυνίμην καὶ καταπανουργεύσασθαι τοὺς ὀμοφύλους δεινότατος. Chron. IV 40, Renauld 1:76 3-5.}

\textsuperscript{198} \textit{τὸ σύμπαυ ἔθνος Chron. IV 40, Renauld 1:76 17.}
of royal descent". The Bulgarians were convinced, raised him on a shield, threw off the yoke of Roman dominion and began incursions into Roman territory.

Attention then switches to Michael IV's preparations to oppose the Bulgarians (who become Skyths as the imperial forces move up to confront them), and to the actions of Alousianos the second son of Aaron. Alousianos is described as the most agreeable of Aaron's sons, with a pleasant nature, a brilliant intellect and noble/remarkable fortune. He is portrayed in positive terms, and it is no surprise that Alousianos is the agent of Michael IV's success. Alousianos did not intend to achieve this; he aimed at the opposite. Psellos concludes that it was God who engineered Alousianos's actions to have such effect. When Alousianos heard that for want of a member of the royal family, his compatriots had chosen a

199. ἐν ἔθει γὰρ βουλγάρως τούς ἐκ βασιλείου γένους εἰς ἐπιτασσιαν τοῦ ἑθνοὺς παραλαμβάνει Chron. IV 40, Renauld 1:77 14-5.


201. ἐπὶ τοὺς Σκύθας Chron. IV 43, Renauld 1:79 18.

202. ὁ...χαριέστερος Chron. IV 45, Renauld 1:79 5.

203. τὸ τῆς ἡθος ἡθὸς καὶ τὴν γυνῶμην λαμπρὸς, καὶ τὴν τύχην ἐπίστημος Chron. IV 45, Renauld 1:79 7-8.

204. αἰτιώτατος τῆς νίκης τῷ βασιλεί γίνεται Chron. IV 45, Renauld 1:79 8.

205. οὐ τοῦτο βουλόμενος, άλλα πρὸς τούτων ὁρμησάς Chron. IV 45, Renauld 1:80 9.

206. ἀλλ' ὁ κυνήσας τούτον Θεὸς ἐκ τῶν ἐναυτῶν περιποιεῖται τὴν νίκην τῷ βασιλεί Chron. IV 45, Renauld 1:80 9-11.

207. τοῦ βασιλείου γένους Chron. IV 46, Renauld 1:80 8.
bastard to reign over them, he attempted a rather juvenile plan. Alousianos made his way to Bulgaria, and the rebellion was changed from a monarchy into polyarchy.

The two leaders were suspicious of each other, but Alousianos was the first to strike, blinding Dolianos and cutting off his nose - all with a kitchen knife. This detail reminds us of Alousianos’s impetuosity, but perhaps more importantly of Dolianos’s lowly origin - even in the means of mutilation the differentials had to be maintained.

Alousianos finally betrayed his people, abandoning them to subjugation by the Romans. Psellus’s class preconceptions are perhaps clearest at this point, as there is no denunciation of Alousianos because he valued his own safety above that of his people. His actions make it easier for the Byzantines, and so Psellus approves. This shows yet again that attitudes to outsiders are not constructed on a single scale.

The sense of class which figured large when Michael Kalaphates was first introduced, is continued when he became emperor. John the Orphanotrophos said Zoë could rule directly if she wished, or by giving orders to Kalaphates as if to a slave. This ambivalent position of the slave-emperor Michael V was confirmed for the first day at least, as he was not forgetful of the agreed words and deeds, indeed frequently from him [came the words].

208. τολμᾷ τι νεανικώτερον Chron. IV 46, Renaud 1:80 9.
209. μεγερικῇ σφαγῇ ἀμφοτερῶν Chron. IV 49, Renaud 1:81 3.
"the empress", "my mistress", "as I have been bought by her" and "the decision is as she decides".211

This subservience extended to John the Orphanotrophos, whom Michael V Kalaphates called "my master", and allowed to sit on a throne in the imperial presence.212

The orphanotrophos was suspicious, but there was nothing he could do. This differential in access to power is stressed again when Michael V’s antipathy towards his uncle became overt. The orphanotrophos’s withdrawal into seclusion with so many of the courtiers had prompted Michael V to fear it was the start of a revolution.213 However, Michael V was able to act as emperor, whilst John the Orphanotrophos’s scope of action was that of a private citizen.214

With the orphanotrophos removed, Michael V then turned to Zoë, whom he exiled to Prinkipo. Zoë the well-born was turned out from her birthplace by the Other, the most base.215 Michael V is the Other as emperor.

I.4 Psellos as Outsider.

211 Καὶ τὴν γε πρώτην ἡμέραν οὐκ ἐπιλήσθησαν ὁ βασιλεὺς οὔτε τῶν οἰκεῖων λόγων οὔτε τῶν ἔργων ἐγένετο· πολὺ γοῦν παρ’ αὐτῷ τῷ ὁ βασιλεὺς, καὶ ὁ ἐμὴ δεσπότης, καὶ ὁ ἐγὼ ἐρωμαι ταύτην, καὶ ἡν ἐν τείτο ψήφου. Chron. V 5, Renauld 1:88 7-10.


It was under Constantine IX that Psellos, who served under him from the beginning of his reign, was promoted to the senate. It is at this point that Psellos's own sense of social insecurity becomes most apparent. Psellos describes Constantine IX's early conduct as emperor as neither temperate nor prudent. For Psellos, the success of the Byzantine polity rests in its honours and resources and in their careful administration. This was exactly what Constantine IX lacked. He emptied the treasuries and honours were thrown without reason to the mob, especially to those who importuned the man vulgarly, and those who spoke nonsense on cue to provoke a smile from him.

Psellos accuses Constantine IX of overturning the due and established order.

He opened the senate to the market crowd and all the common people, and this favour was not given to one or two but suddenly by a single edict all were raised to the highest commands.

References:

216, γυνώ τε ευθύς ἐκείνῳ βεβασυλευκότι ὑπηρετηκώς διὰ πάντων καὶ εἰς τὴν κρείττα τάς ἡγαθείς πιστεύεις τε τὰ τιμώτατα Chron. VI 14, Renauld 1:124 9-11.


218, δεξιομάτων...καὶ χρημάτων Chron. VI 29, Renauld 1:132 8.

219, Chron. VI 29, Renauld 1:132 10-5.

220, οὕτως τούς μὲν τῶν χρημάτων θησαυροὺς αὐτόθεν ἔχειν ἐπιβεβλητα, ὡς μηδὲ τοὺς πυθμέσι καταλιπεύν τι: τιμῶν δὲ καὶ πλείστον μὲν ἀλόγως ευθὺς παραπλήσασιν, μάλιστα δὲ οἱ τε φορτικώτεροι καταδυσπούσσες τὸν ἀνδρὰ, καὶ οἱ πρὸς τὸν καιρὸν τι παραφθεγξάμενοι ὑπὲρ ἐκεῖνον κινῆσαι πρὸς γέλωτα Chron. VI 29, Renauld 1:132 10-5.

221, μικροῦ δεῖν τοῦ ἄγωραίου καὶ ἀγύρτην δῆμον ἐξεπαύεται κομμωνύσας τῆς γερουσίας πεποίηκα, καὶ τούτῳ οὐ τίς ἡ πλείον χαρίσαιμος, ὀλ' εὐθὺς ἀπὸ μίας φωνῆς ἀπαντᾶς εἰς τὰς ὑπερηφάνους μετευγκώς ἀρχάς Chron. VI 29, Renauld 1:132 18-21.
This apparent generosity was greeted with joy, because the
discernment of the crowd living in the City, where their desires are
fulfilled is weak. It was only later that the honours widely
distributed were seen to bring no distinction: "dignity was removed
from those who possessed [the honours]."

Psellos begins a historical digression. In Athens, the better sort and
the well-born were enrolled as citizens in antiquity, though others of
more obscure origin also found their way onto the lists. The system
worked well but then Romulus introduced the idea that anyone could
become a citizen. The Byzantines now found themselves governed by
worthless spartakoi rather than by Perikles or Themostokles.

One such man was the barbarian outcast, who outdid all
Romans in arrogance. He frequently made public his claim to have hit
men who later became emperors. This effrontery drove Psellos to
such heights that he wished to strangle the man himself. What
prompted Psellos's enmity was the man's rapid promotion, "mingling
with the nobility of our senate". He was of unknown family,


223. ἦ σεμνότης ἀφηρέθη τοῖς κτησωμένοις: Chron. VI 30, Renauld
1:133 2-3.

224. Chron. VI 134, Renauld 2:35 4-17.

225. κάθαρμα τι βαρβαρικοῦ Chron. VI 134, Renauld 2:35 1-2.


227. παρ᾽ ἡμῖν συγκλήτου κατέχανεν εὐγενὲς Chron. VI 136, Renauld 2:36 2.
ignorant and most foul\textsuperscript{228}, and yet he was promoted rapidly to a rank
Psellos felt he himself had achieved through merit alone. The man
then betrayed the trust placed in him as he decided to assassinate
Constantine IX and replace him as emperor. Captured and tortured,
he named as accomplices men well known for their loyalty.\textsuperscript{229}
Constantine IX according to Psellos took these accusations seriously
as the grandees were reduced in status for a time:

\begin{quote}
after some time though [the barbarian-rebel] remained
numbered among the most worthless, the others were restored
to their previous rank.\textsuperscript{230}
\end{quote}

Psellos never names this barbarian outcast who sought to replace
Constantine IX on the throne. We can be sure of very little, though he
was probably higher on the social scale than Psellos allows. In his
story we see united the various outsider categories - barbarian, rebel
and rapidly promoted worthless other.

The dispatch of one worthless fellow merely cleared the way for
the next. The emperor had a merry nature towards all amusements
and wished to be entertained all the time.\textsuperscript{231} Constantine IX was
amused by people who misused words, or who had speech
impediments, rather than by music, dance nor mimes. Psellos

\textsuperscript{228} άνηρ καὶ τὸ γένος, ὡς μοι δεδήλωται, ἀσημικός, καὶ εἰ τι ἄλλο τις
εἶπεῖν βούλοιτο, ἀγενέστατος καὶ φαύλοτατος \textit{Chron. VI} 136,
Renauld 2:36 5-6.

\textsuperscript{229} \textit{Chron. VI} 137, Renauld 2:37 17-20.

\textsuperscript{230} ἄλλ' ὅ γε μετὰ τούτα χρόνος ἐκέινον μὲν τοὺς ἀταμοτάτους ἐτὶ
συμπαράδειξεν, τούτους δὲ ἐς τὴν ἀρχαίαν τάξιν ἐπαινεσώσατο \textit{Chron.
VI} 137, Renauld 2:37 20-2.

\textsuperscript{231} ἤλθαν εἶχεν ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ πρὸς πᾶσαν παιδίαν τὴν ψυχήν
καὶ ἐβούλετο ψυχαγωγεῖσθαι ἀπὶ \textit{Chron. VI} 138, Renauld 2:37 6-8.
introduces a half-dumb outcast\textsuperscript{232}, who emphasized his defect to such an extent that when he spoke, no-one could understand his nonsense syllables. Gradually he insinuated himself into the emperor's affections so that Constantine IX could not bear to be parted from him. The main criticism was that the emperor brought him into the administration and gave him rapid promotion.\textsuperscript{233} The clown got himself into trouble over the love he conceived for Constantine IX's Alanian mistress.\textsuperscript{234} Unable to bridle his passion, the fool decided to murder Constantine IX, seize the throne and win his love. In his ridiculous undertaking, he was encouraged by his flatterers, who told him that his seizure of power would be greeted with joy by the people.\textsuperscript{235} One of his confidants betrayed him. He took refuge in a church, and confessed his intention to kill the emperor. A show trial followed, where the accused avoided all questions. Theodora and Euprepia forced him into exile to the Princes' Islands, but he was recalled in ten days.\textsuperscript{236} However, even this narrow escape did not cure the fellow of his infatuation.\textsuperscript{237} His natural disabilities and actions, as presented by Psellos should have made an outsider of this fellow. Continued imperial patronage meant that he remained part of the inner circle, a situation the courtiers came to recognize.

\textsuperscript{232} τοιούτου τι ἁμάρτων κάθερμα \textit{Chron.} VI 139, Renauld 2:38 2.
\textsuperscript{233} \textit{Chron.} VI 140, Renauld 2:38 8-13.
\textsuperscript{234} \textit{Chron.} VI 145, Renauld 2:41 5-9.
\textsuperscript{235} \textit{Chron.} VI 145, Renauld 2:42 25.
\textsuperscript{236} \textit{Chron.} VI 147-150, Renauld 2:43-5.
\textsuperscript{237} \textit{Chron.} VI 155, Renauld 2:47 16-7.
The final encounter with the rapidly promoted outsider occurs in the complex section that deals with the end of Constanine IX’s reign. Psellos opens this section with a statement of intent: "I do not wish to write a history, nor to be known as a friend of truth, but rather to write an enkomion of this emperor." Psellos distinguishes between history, where deeds are recorded purely and simply and eulogy, where the orator, influenced to a positive or negative aspect, can use one incident alone to construct a speech. Psellos concludes that a history which admits its subject’s faults, but which allows the nobility to shine through, is superior to an enkomion, where the perfection rings false and all becomes suspect. Psellos then discusses various points of Constantine IX’s character. Having dealt with his piety, generosity and sense of justice, Psellos then says he will relate some anecdotes about the emperor, which a historian would omit, but an orator would use to good effect.

The stress here on distinguishing between history and oratory is to trigger memories of the earlier discussion. The description of Constantine IX is veiled criticism, underlined when Psellos says he is using minimalist rhetoric. An example of a minor quirk in

---

238. ἐβουλόμενον μὴ ἱστορεῖν, μηδὲ φιλαλήθης ἑντούθα κατονομάζεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἐγκώμια τῷ αὐτοκράτορι τούτῳ ποιεῖν Chron. VI 161, Renauld 2:50'3-4.

239. ἀλλ᾽ ἐπειδή τε καὶ καθαρῶς τὰ πεπραγμένα διέξεως Chron. VI 161, Renauld 2:50-1 16-7.

240. ὡς ἐγκωμιαζομένων ὑποποτοὺς ὑπῆρχε καὶ ἐυφημία καὶ τοῦ πιθανοῦ μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦ ἀληθοῦς ἐχομένη Chron. VI 162, Renauld 2:51 10-1.


Constantine IX's predominantly good character was his childish response to a certain most brazen and most mindless youth, who until the year previous had never touched pen and ink. What outrages Psello so much is not that the youth came from the depths and the street corners to the centre of the Roman government but that this outcast was promoted rapidly without the hard-earned education that was Psello's passport to power and influence. Constantine IX called the youth his "sweetest boy" and promoted him leader of the senate. Constantine IX promoted the youth in preference to Constantine Leichoudes, who had run the administration since the emperor's accession. Leichoudes is described as of noble birth, a first-class scholar, a practised and witty speaker in all departments of oratory and an experienced politician, everything the sweetest boy was not. More telling however, was that Constantine IX promoted his "sweetest boy" in preference to Michael Psello.

1.5 Conclusion to Psellan Outsiders.

The rebels are prominent in The Chronographia. They look like tyrants and are strong threats - so strong that one, Isaak Komnenos,
succeeds. The people do not play such an individual role. Like
Shakespearian mechanicals, they appear briefly to accomplish some
task and then disappear. The case for Psellos the outsider has to be
constructed from his attitude to those promoted over him. The tone of
the work suggests that he still hoped to find his return to favour.
However, in dealing with the upwardly-mobile, themes of education
and the slave-free dichotomy are developed.

II Outsiders by τόξις in Komnene’s Alexiad.

Outsiders in The Alexiad fall into a more complicated pattern
those in Psellos’s Chronographia. It is easiest to deal with them in
separate categories, within the broader classes of rebels, mob and
rising officials. It is also much easier to deal separately with Anna
Komnene as an outsider.

II.1 Rebels as Outsiders.

The first section of Book 1 of The Alexiad (Chapters 1 to 9) deals
with the rebels on whom the young Alexios cut his teeth. Anna
enumerates these three labours of this latter-day Hercules when he
defeated Roussel de Bailleul, Nikephoros Bryennios and Basilakios.
Though only Roussel de Bailleul was an outsider in the sense of
foreigner, all three to varying degrees are presented as outsiders by
τόξις because they rebel against the emperor. Three main qualities
are emphasized in this section: manliness (ἀνδρεία), nobility
(γενναίότης) and glory in battle (κῦδος).

Prevented from displaying his manliness fighting the Turks with Romanos IV Diogenes, Alexios's first opportunity came when he was sent against Roussel de Bailleul. This former ally, driven in part by his pride and in part by the opportunity presented by Byzantine weakness, revolted after the battle of Manzikert. With an army of men from his own and other lands, he posed a formidable threat. Many generals known for their bravery and experienced in war were sent against him. So irresistible were his attacks that he captured some of the greatest of those sent against him and routed their armies. Alexios, deemed to have attained the summit of the general's art by devotion to hard work and constant vigilance, and judged the match of Roussel, is given supreme command by Michael VII Doukas. Determining and executing the best plans, Alexios quickly captured Roussel. To defeat Roussel, the possessor of such manliness even though he was a Norman and a barbarian was no
shame. However, it is not so clear cut. Though Dokeianos, himself a worthy man by rank and birth\textsuperscript{257} as Alexios's cousin, describes Roussel as "so brave a man, and a true hero"\textsuperscript{258}, yet Komnene has made plain Roussel's overweening pride.\textsuperscript{259} He possesses laudable bravery, but is an outsider because of his origin, his pride and his rebellion. This episode emphasizes Alexios's philanthropia and quick comprehension.

The next rebel is Nikephoros Bryennios. Anna Komnene's future grandfather-in-law is treated carefully. As a rebel against imperial authority and opponent of Alexios, he is an outsider, but only just. Because Bryennios is portrayed as a marginal outsider, a direct comparison between Alexios and Bryennios is possible. Both have their military skills established.\textsuperscript{260} Each is the other's equal in manliness, and neither surpasses the other in experience. Bryennios placed his trust in his troops; Alexios placed his in his skills and stratagems.\textsuperscript{261}

For the man is most excellent in warfare, and at the same time of a family of the nobility. Being adorned with bodily height and beauty of countenance, he was worthy of the throne

\textsuperscript{257} άνηρ δέ σύτος των ἐπιδόξων καὶ γένει καὶ άξιώματι \textit{Alexiad} I iii 4 Leib 1:16 9-10.

\textsuperscript{258} τοιούτου ἀνδρα γεννάδαν τε καὶ ἀντικρυς ἦρων \textit{Alexiad} I iii 4 Leib 1:16 14.

\textsuperscript{259} \textit{Alexiad} I i 2 Leib 1:10 5.

\textsuperscript{260} \textit{Alexiad} I iii 3 Leib 1:15; cf. \textit{Alexiad} I iv 1-2 Leib 1:17.

\textsuperscript{261} οὐδὲν γὰρ ἑτερὸς τοῦ ἑτέρου πρὸς ἀνδρείαν ἀπελιμπάνετο οὐδὲ τὰ τῆς ἐμπεφίας ἑτερὸς ἑτέρου παρ᾽ ἑλαττον εἶχεν \textit{Alexiad} I v 1 Leib 1:19 16-8.
[because] of his dignity of thought and the might of his arms, when compared with other men.262

Alexios used all his ruses against this Goliath.263 Eventually worn down, unable to flee, Bryennios made his last stand, like some noble athlete, trained in bravery, at the last challenging two noble Turks.264

Bryennios is the possessor of κύδος in defeat, which increases Alexios's own stock.265 Alexios's generosity to the prisoner is emphasized, as was the case in the pretence of blinding Roussel.266 However, only Divine Providence saved Alexios from Bryennios's hand when the opportunity presented itself under the tree.267 The guilt for the blinding of Bryennios is laid by Komnene on the barbarian Borilas, whose malignant presence is felt to the full in Book 2.268

Having dealt with Bryennios, Alexios is sent to deal with Basilakios. Much admired for his bravery, spirit, daring and

262. Κράτιστος γὰρ ὁ ἄνδρα τὰ πολέμια καὶ ἐνακριβῶς ὅν τῶν ἐπιστημοτάτων καὶ ἀναδρομὴ σώματος καὶ κάλλει προσώπου κοσμούμενος καὶ ἐμβρίθεια φυσικοῦ καὶ ἄρρητον ὅν τῶν κατ’ αὐτὸν διαφέρον ἀνθρώπων ἐπάξιον ἦν βασιλείας τὸ χρῆμα
Alexiad I vi 3 Leib 1:17 22-7.

263. Alexiad I v 5-7 Leib 1:22-3.

264. ἀνασκειράσας τούτου ὁ Βρυέννιος καθό πρὸς τὰς ἀθλητής γενναιότητας εἰστήκει πρὸς τὰς λαβᾶς καὶ πρὸς ἐαυτὸν δύο τῶν Τούρκων γενναιότητας ἐξεκάλεσσατο
Alexiad I vi 6 Leib 1:26 14-6.

265. Alexiad I vi 7 Leib 1:27 6-7.

266. Alexiad I vi 7 Leib 1:27 11-5.


strength, he became Bryennios's heir when he was defeated. He was a impressive man, because of his physique, the power of his arms and the nobility of his face. Nothing about him was base, and he also had a manly spirit and was indomitable. The description echoes that of Bryennios; Basilakios looked the part. However, in case we get carried away with the fulsome praise, he looked like a tyrant not an emperor. He shared with Roussel a τυραννικὴ ψυχὴ. Bryennios impressed both the serving soldiers and private citizens; Basilakios by contrast impressed this rustic militaristic tribe, who did not look beyond outward appearances to inner spirit. Thus Komnene casts doubt on those who deem Basilakios worthy of the empire, and points out his pride. His role as an outsider is stressed by his connection to the lower sort in society, with their weak understanding. Even at the end when he was handed over at

269. Ὡ γὰρ τοι Βασιλάκιος οὗτος ἄνδρη ἄν ἐν τοῖς πάνω θαυμαζόμενων ἐπὶ ἀνδρείᾳ τε καὶ θυμῷ καὶ τόλμῃ καὶ βρώμῃ Ἀλεξιάδ I vii 1 Leib 1:28 25-7.
270. Ἀλεξιάδ I vii 1 Leib 1:28 30-1.
271. θαυμαζόμενος ὁ ἄνδρη ἐπὶ τε μεγεθεὶς σώματος καὶ κράτει βραχιόνων καὶ προσώπου σεμνότητι Ἀλεξιάδ I vii 2 Leib 1:29 6-8.
272. Ὁ δὲ καὶ ταῦτα ἐξων οὐκ ἄγεννη, καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν εἰχεν ἀνδρείαν καὶ ἀκαταστάληκτον. Ἀλεξιάδ I vii 2 Leib 1:29 13-4.
273. καὶ ὅλως οὗτος ὁ βασιλάκιος τυραννικὸν τι καὶ ἔπνευ καὶ ἔβλεπε Ἀλεξιάδ I vii 2 Leib 1:29 14-5.
275. στρατιώται καὶ ἰδιώται Ἀλεξιάδ I iv 3 Leib 1:17-8.
276. ἀγροικικὸν τοῦτο καὶ στρατιωτικὸν ἔθνος Ἀλεξιάδ I vii 2 Leib 1:29.
Thessaloniki after all the battles, Basilakios was very much a man278 and wished to lose none of his might and bravery.279

II.1.2 Rebels against Alexios as Outsiders.

When Nikephoros Diogenes appears before Alexios, he was full of anger and arrogance.280 However, to the emperor he maintained an affable visage. His real disposition was given away when he placed his tent very near the imperial tent. Philokales became suspicious, "for he was not unaware of Diogenes’s schemes".281 Alexios allowed Philokales to take no action. Diogenes’s first attempt on the lives of the emperor and empress was prevented by some Divine force.282 However he continued in his actions against the emperor.283 Alexios was informed of the attempt by a maid284, but Diogenes was not confronted. The real nature of Diogenes was πάλαι τοραννίων.285 He attempted to murder Alexios in the bath, but was discovered by

278. λίων ἀνήρ Alexiad I ix 4 Leib 1:35 28.
279. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ὑπέσαν τι τοῦ ἀνδρώδους καὶ τοῦ γενναίου ἴδουλετο Alexiad I ix 4 Leib 1:35 28-9.
284. ἡ παιδίσκη Alexiad IX v 4 Leib 2:170-1 29-1.
Tatikios. Diogenes fled to the empress Maria. When Alexios came to the throne, he restored Leo and Nikephoros to their proper place in the court hierarchy. This was in part out of consideration for their sufferings and partially because of their personal qualities, both physical and moral. Leo accepted his lot. In contrast, Nikephoros was churlish and nurtured secret plans against the emperor. Nikephoros's plans soon became common knowledge. Nikephoros did not concern himself with the common soldiers, as they already supported him. Rather he concentrated on the grandees among the commanders and the choice of the senate. With the exception of his duplicity, Nikephoros receives a positive description: brave as a lion and strong enough to confront giants, his hair was golden-yellow, his chest broad and he stood head above others of his

---

286. What must be remembered at this point are the complex family relationships at court: Nikephoros was the half-brother of Maria's dead husband, Michael VII Doukas. The empress Maria was the adoptive mother of Alexios, cousin by marriage of Isaak Komnenos, and a prospective mother-in-law of Anna Komnene. Diogenes was brother-in-law of Alexios by the marriage of his brother Constantine Diogenes to Theodora Komnene, Alexios's sister. Nikephoros's half-sister, Zoë Doukaina, was married to Adrian Komnenos, Alexios's brother, which again related them by marriage. C. Barsos, The Genealogy of the Komnenoi, (Thessaloniki, 1984), plate 1.


289. Alexiad IX vi 4 Leib 2:173 26-9; NB τυραννίσεω.


generation. However, his natural favour won over the many, though Alexios’s brother-in-law Michael Taronites was also won over. Eventually, Alexios moved against Nikephoros Diogenes. He was questioned and finally cracked when threatened with torture. In his confession, the empress Maria was implicated and Alexios dealt with the matter privately. Komnene again stresses that Nikephoros had not concerned himself overmuch with the lower orders, but had taken care to win over the leaders of the military and civilian bureaucracy. In this way Nikephoros is shown to be a serious threat to the rule of Alexios Komnenos, who needed all his skills to extricate himself from the situation.

The idea that Alexios Komnenos himself could be portrayed as an outsider within The Alexiad may seem unlikely, but the evidence is there. Alexios and Isaak are as they rebel against Botaniates. In Book 2 we see Alexios’s separation from society, his metamorphosis into the rebel’s shadow world, and socialization into his new role, though it is not until Book 3 that the rites of purification

293. ἡ πόλεμος ἔξωθεν
296. Alexiad II vi 1 Leib 1:79 31.
and incorporation are completed. Alexios’s liminal position appears most clearly in the conflict over who should be the βασιλεύς-elect. The Doukai spared no effort to ensure that Alexios was the soldiers’ choice, the man’s man for emperor. Alexios, either out of brotherly love, or because he knew the throne was his in any case, pretended to hold Isaak in great respect and to give him precedence in all things. Isaak Komnenos bowed to the inevitable and placed the imperial slippers on his brother’s feet, reminding him of the vision Alexios had had. With this addition of a theophany whilst in a liminal state, Alexios serves almost as an anthropological paradigm.

At one stage, Komnene presents Alexios’s position as so weak that he contemplated abdication. In the end, however, wishing to do nothing either unworthy [ἄναξιον] or inconsistent [ἄσωμαφον] with his knowledge of military science and his daring [τὸλμη] he decided to call together all the allies, providing them with the expectation of great rewards, whilst at the same time ordering his mother and brother to raise money from wherever they could. This call for cash led eventually to the conflict with Leo of Chalcedon.

This led eventually to Alexios appearing before the patriarch and members of the Holy Synod as a man on trial, a convict, a worthless


298 Alexiad II vii 1-7 Leib 1:84-7 17-26.

299 Alexiad V i 5 Leib 2:9-10 29-2.

300 Alexiad V ii 5-6 Leib 2:12-3.
person, one of "those set under authority". However, there are limits to Alexios's outsiderness. He may have been a rebel against Botaniates, but his mother's description of him notwithstanding he was not a slave in his own - or his daughter's estimation:

It is not necessary to suffer as a slave, but to die doing something brave should it come to that, for he said a man of spirit would do that.

The second emperor portrayed as an outsider by Anna Komnene is her dark-visaged brother John. Her own birth had been accompanied by a miraculous event; her brother's birth was greeted with joy. All the subjects were glad to see their rulers so happy. There then follows a curious comment on the attitudes of the lower orders, as it seems they cannot be trusted. This is because Anna Komnene feels she was cheated by the crowds of the imperial city when her father died. Thus while the palace was *en fête* over the birth of the heir, those who were fondly attached to the royal pair were jubilant. Others however, merely affected joy. Anna draws from this the bitter conclusion:

301. Πρόσεξει τούτοις ὁ βασιλεύς ως ύπόδικος, ως κατάκριτος, ως εὐτελής ἢ καὶ τις ἄλλος τῶν ὑπ’ εξουσίαν τεταγμένων *Alexiad* III v 5 Leib 1:118 16-8.

302. οἱ παῖδες οἱ ἐμοὶ δοῦλοί εἰσι πιστοὶ τῆς σῆς βασιλείας *Alexiad* II v 5 Leib 1:77 17-8.

303. οὐ χρὴ ώς ἀνδράποδα παθεῖν, ὀλλὰ δράσαντάς τι γενναίον ἀπολέσθαι, εἰ καὶ τούτου δεῖσθε: καὶ τούτῳ γὰρ ἢδιον μεγαλοπρεπίας ἔλεγεν *Alexiad* II iv 6 Leib 1:73 18-20.


305. τὸ ὑπόκουον ὀπαῦ *Alexiad* VI viii 4 Leib 2:62 27.

For citizens are generally ill-disposed to their rulers, but most pretend, and through flattery win their betters' favour.  

II.2 The Great Unwashed as Outsiders

When Roussel was captured by Tutush, money was required to ensure the handover in accordance with the agreement made by Alexios with the Turks. Alexios addressed the citizens of Amaseia, directed his appeal to the richer and more influential. The suggestion of extraordinary taxation provoked insurrection, made worse by the presence in the crowd of criminals and agitators, well used to fomenting trouble in a crowd. Komnene characterizes the convulsions of the crowd as normal for a mass of people. The crowd is then persuaded by Alexios's oratory. However, this stresses Alexios's skill as a speaker not that the crowd was swayed by reasonable argument. This is why the crowd is likened to a potsherd, falling one time this way, the next the other. Knowing the fickle nature of the crowd, Alexios settled on the play of blinding Roussel. This convinced the whole throng, both inhabitants and


308. καὶ μᾶλλον τοὺς τὰ πρῶτα φέροντας καὶ χρημάτων Alexiad I ii 5 Leib 1:13 5.

309. τῶν Ἀμασειανῶν εἰς ἀποστασίαν κεκυπημένων Alexiad I ii 6 Leib 1:13 23-4.

310. ἄνδρες κακουργότατοι τινὲς καὶ δέκται πραγμάτων εἰδότες ὀπτύουν δῆμον εἰς ταραχὴν Alexiad I ii 6 Leib 1:13 25-6.

311. τοιοῦτον γὰρ τὸ συρφετάδες πλῆθος Alexiad I ii 6 Leib 1:13 29-30.

312. Alexiad I ii-iii 6-1 Leib 1:13-5 31-5.
foreigners alike. The addition of foreigners to the citizens of Amaseia further shows their "otherness".

A similar phenomenon occurred when Alexios besieged Constantinople. Alexios's troops are described as ἐκ παντοτῶν. He could not trust them completely, and so settled on a plan of trickery rather than frontal assault to win the city. The city was taken on Maundy Thursday, 1 April 1081. The whole army, drawn from foreign troops and natives, from both frontier regions and those near the city poured into Constantinople and began looting, though Komnene maintains that they committed no murder. The worst part for Komnene was that the native-born troops did not abstain from looting, but so forgot their own natures as to join in with the barbarians.

The troops that aided Alexios to power have no redeeming features. Drawn ἐκ διαφόρων it is only to be expected that they would riot. The looting of the City for which Alexios felt himself morally responsible, was accomplished by individual soldiers and the

313. ὅσος ἑγχώριος καὶ ὅσος ἐξωθεν Alexiad I iii 2 Leib 1:15 16.
314. Alexiad II ix 1 Leib 1:90 22.
315. αἱ δὲ δυνάμεις ἐκ διαφόρων ξενικῶν τε καὶ ἑγχωρίων συμελέγοντο· ὅπου δὲ πλῆθυς διαφόρος ἐκεῖ καὶ τὸ τῆς γνώμης διάφορον καταφαίνεται Alexiad II ix 2 Leib 1:91 5-7.
316. Alexiad II ix 2 Leib 1:91 7-12.
318. Alexiad II x 4 Leib 1:95 10-3.
dregs of society. In addition Alexios feared that precipitate action on his part could provoke them into rebellion. The low status of the Byzantine troops is emphasized again by Komnene when she discusses Alexios's preparations for the battle against the Cumans at Levounion in April 1091. Alexios invoked God's aid at sunset by prayers and hymns. However, he also forced the rest of the camp to participate as well. He advised the more intelligent to join in, and ordered the more boorish.

The mob can appear in a favourable light, however. When to πλήθος make up a song in honour of Alexios, it is because they admire his ὁρµή [dash] and ἀγγυωλα [shrewdness]. The rebel armies passing through the towns en route to the capital are treated to Alexios being acclaimed - with the exception of Adrianople, home of Bryennios. This is to foreshadow the acclamation of Alexios by the army under the guidance of the Doukas-Palaiologos faction. Because the common herd is in favour of Alexios, Komnene is in favour of them; for her the superordinate status is not social, but the attitude to Alexios Komnenos.

In Book 5, the entire population of Constantinople moved against John Italos, who had been given sanctuary by the patriarch. The

320. συμφετός Alexiad III v 2 Leib 1:117 12.
322. Οὐ μὴν οὖδὲ τὸ ὁπαυ θοσάτου ἤρεμειν συνεχώρει, ἀλλὰ τὰ αὐτὰ ἐκαστὰ μὲν τῶν συνετωτέρων πρᾶττεν συμβουλεύει, τοῖς δὲ ἄγροικοτέροις ἐπέσκηπτε Alexiad VIII v 3 Leib 2:140 17-9.
323. ὁ δῆμος ὁπα ὁς τῆς Κωνσταντινοῦ πρὸς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν συγκεκίνητο τὸν Ἰταλὸν ἀναζητούντες Alexiad V ix 6 Leib 2:39 23-4.
emperor was forced to act because Italos's false doctrines found followers among many of the courtiers and not a few of the grandees.\textsuperscript{324} This could be taken as evidence that the lower orders were closer to true orthodoxy than the ruling élite, but his would be at variance with the general tenor of the whole work. Italos's doctrines were denounced from the ambo of the Great Church, in effect in the midst of the people.\textsuperscript{325}

Anna indicates that there were rumours circulating as to the real reason for the empress Maria of Alania's reluctance to leave the palace.\textsuperscript{326} Anna herself chose to ignore these calumnies of the crowd\textsuperscript{327}, and she advises us to do the same. If we wish to be numbered among the better sort who care for truth, we should not listen to rumours.\textsuperscript{328} The Doukai are numbered among the όρίστοι because they are not accustomed to giving credence to rumours.\textsuperscript{329} However, common report also has its positive side. When dealing with the troubles that beset Alexios, Komnene remarks that both old soldiers and old men reported that never in man's memory had a

\textsuperscript{324} πολλοίς τῶν περὶ τὰ ἀνάκτορα...καὶ μεγιστάνες οὐκ ὀλίγοι. \textit{Alexiad V} ix 6 Leib 2:39 28-9.
\textsuperscript{325} \textit{Alexiad V} ix 6 Leib 2:40 3-7.
\textsuperscript{326} \textit{Alexiad III} i 2 Leib 1:104 6-7.
\textsuperscript{327} \textit{Alexiad III} i 4 Leib 1:104-5 30-3.
\textsuperscript{328} όρίστοι \textit{Alexiad III} i 4 Leib 1:105 6-8.
\textsuperscript{329} \textit{Alexiad III} ii 1 Leib 1:106 7-9.
nation fallen on such hard times, as had the empire before Alexios came to power.330

Komnene’s treatment of the inhabitants of Dyrrakhion, when besieged by Guiscard in 1082, shows that she was aware of the situation in which the citizens found themselves. Komnene describes most of the inhabitants of Dyrrakhion as incomers from Amalfi and Venice, i.e. not true Byzantines.331 When faced with the news of Alexios’s defeat, and the dispersal of the armies and fleets, the people of Dyrrakhion began to consider how best to serve their own interests. They met in assembly and discussed what they should do. Each gave his own opinion, and they discussed the options open to them. Finally a way out of the impasse was found in submission to Robert. At the instigation of an inhabitant of Amalfi, they opened the gates and let Robert enter the city in February 1082.332 Interestingly Komnene does not berate the inhabitants of Dyrrakhion for surrendering to Guiscard. This could be an example of Byzantine Realpolitik, recognizing the position as untenable, or it could be because she did not expect any better of non-Byzantines. A third option is that Komnene, realizing that the situation was untenable yet unwilling to see Byzantines surrendering without a fight, stressed that the inhabitants of Dyrrakhion could not be counted as true Byzantines.

330. Alexiad III ix 1 Leib 1:130 1-3.
331. Οἱ δὲ ἔντος Δυρραχίου, καθάπερ ὁ λόγος ἐδήλωσεν, ἐπει τὰ πλείους ἄποικως Μέλλης καὶ Βενετίας ἦσαν ἀποικοὶ Alexiad V i 1 Leib 2:7 10-12.
332. Ἐρεθισεντες δὲ καὶ παρὰ τοῦ τῶν ἄποικων Μέλλης καὶ τοῖς θὸν τούτον πεισθέντες ὑποθυμοσύνοις τὰς εἰσόδους ἀναπετάσαντες πάροδον τῷ Ρομπέρτῳ διδὼκασιν Alexiad V i 2 Leib 2:7-8 22-1.
More important than one's original status, however, was what one did - at least from the perspective of The Alexiad. The man who claimed to be the son of Romanos IV Diogenes is described as some man, not one of the distinguished, but of base fortune who came from the [military] camps.\footnote{Kal y&p &.uepwrtóç ti,ç oi èituavG3v, &XX} What really damned him, however, was that he rose in revolt against Alexios, not that he was a garrison-whelp.\footnote{ô xapaKrpiàç Alexiad X ii 3 Leib 2:191 7.}

II.2.2 Servants as Outsiders.

Borilas and Germanos, the "bad guys" of Book 2, are portrayed by Komnene as outsiders by τάξις even though as favourites of the emperor they are in fact political insiders. The case of Borilas and Germanos is further complicated by their foreign origin. However, Komnene stresses their lowly social position, as "slaves" of the emperor rather than their origin as Skyths or barbarians. Their open opposition to the Komnenoi mean that Borilas and Germanos are referred to almost without exception in negative terms; they attempted everything to oppose the Komnenoi.\footnote{Alexiad II i 3 Leib 1:64 2-19.} When Komnene speaks of Botaniates as κακώς βουλεύμενος\footnote{Alexiad II ii 1 Leib 1:66 19-20.} in his decision to leave the empire to Synadenos rather than to the porphyrogennitos Constantine, she is referring to Borilas and Germanos. Komnene presents these two as the evil influence at the palace for the Komnenoi. The Komnenoi saw the hand of the two Skyths in the

\footnote{Kai γὰρ ἄνθρωπος τις οὗ τῶν ἐπίφανῶν, ὀλλὰ τῆς κάτω τύχης ἐκ τοῦ χαρακτος ὁμομουσίως Alexiad X ii 2 Leib 2:190 10-2.}
summons to the palace after the fall of Kyzikos. The course of the narrative indicates that this was mere coincidence. The imperial servants decided on a second plan whereby the two Komnenoi were to be summoned at night to the palace without the emperor's knowledge, falsely accused and blinded. The Komnenoi learnt of this plan and decided on a pre-emptive strike. Alexios wrote to all the commanders loyal to him, under the pretext of his mission to regain Kyzikos, ordering them with their men to the capital. At the instigation of Borilas, someone informed the emperor that all the armies of the empire were converging on Constantinople - normally the first signal of a rebellion. Alexios was required to explain himself, which he did by explaining that what appeared to be the entire imperial army was in fact only those units responding to his commands to retake Kyzikos. Borilas argued against this, but Botaniates believed Alexios. These machinations failed to remove the Komnenoi, so the two slaves decided to attack the Komnenoi yet again.337

Komnene begins with the axiomatic statement: "For the servant is by nature opposed to his masters." When the slave cannot attack his masters, then he directs his attentions to his fellow slaves.338 This at least is the only explanation that Alexios is able to arrive at to explain the actions of Borilas and Germanos. Two aspects may be drawn from this. Firstly, Komnene sees all the servants of the emperor as slaves -


438

δοῦλοι - undifferentiated one to another with respect to the great
distance between them and the person of the emperor. Secondly,
Komnene appears to hold that all servants are opposed to their
masters. What Komnene is attempting to do at this point is to stress
that Borilas and Germanos are utterly opposed to the Komnenoi,
which shows that they are slaves to the Komnenoi masters, even
though at this point both are servants of Botaniates. This effort to
denigrate Borilas and Germanos should not be taken as indicative of
Komnene’s attitude to the servant problem as a whole. There are
many instances of the good and faithful servant in the text.

Borilas and Germanos disappear from the narrative at this point,
but it is worth mentioning that when Borilas reappears his actions
receive a revisionist interpretation. When Borilas realizes that most of
the Komnenoi troops have given themselves over to looting leaving

339. There are differences among Komnene’s δοῦλοι. When
Bryennios agrees to Alexios’s proposal of a rest beneath the oak tree,
she accounts for it because if a slave readily accepts any order, it is
even more the case for a captive. [Τοιούτου γὰρ τὸ δοῦλον πρὸς
ἀπὸ τὸ ἔπτωτομένου προκεῖται, καὶ μᾶλλον εἰ δορυφόρων
ἀγορὰς Αλεξιαριανί βι 8 Leib 1:27 23-5.] This implies that a captured
slave has less status than a bought slave. However this is confounded
by other evidence which shows that slaves-bought-for-silver could be
regarded as the lowest of the low. Anna Komnene displays an
unprejudiced view, paying more attention to the people’s attitude to
Alexios Komnenos, rather than what their social status was; see her
description of Robert Guiscard: Ὁτιὰς ἐκαὶ τυχίς καὶ φύσεις
καὶ ψυχῆς, δοῦλωτος ἂν, ὡς εἰκός, μηδὲν τῶν ἀπότατων
ὑποττόμενος: τοιοῦτον γὰρ αἱ μεγάλαι φύσεις, ὡς φασὶ, καὶ
τυχίς ὅσις ἄφοβοτέρες Αλεξιαριανί βι 4 Leib 1:38 15-8. However,
social status could be important. Raiktor was to be accepted by
Robert’s emissaries only if his not very base-born origin was exhibited
by his exterior appearance [ἐξ αὐτῆς δῆσες μὴ παῦν τὸ δυσγενές
ἐμφαίνουτα].

340. Αλεξιαριανί βι 7 Leib 1:45 19-20).

341. Αλεξιαριανί βι 7 Leib 1:100 2-5.
the Komnenoi surrounded only by their near relations and some of their "strangers"\textsuperscript{342}, he gathered together the Varangian guard and the men from Choma, intent on capturing the rebel Komnenoi.\textsuperscript{343} In doing so, he seems to echo the sentiments of Alexios in his speech to Pakourianos, as a possessor of τὸ γενναῖον, and being a man τῆς μεγαλοφυχίας.\textsuperscript{344} Borilas arranged his troops in perfect military formation.\textsuperscript{345} Up until now, the suspicion may have been that Borilas was a schemer and a politician, but now he is shown willing to fight for what he believes in. He is "betrayed" by Botaniates's abdication, which leads to his mockery of the former emperor on his way to Aghia Sophia.\textsuperscript{346} Thus in a sense the slave is redeemed.

II.2.3 Servants as Insiders.

When hell-bent on a foolhardy death or glory last stand against Bryennios\textsuperscript{347}, which would definitely have brought death if the glory element was more debatable, Alexios was dissuaded by Theodotos, a certain soldier who had served Alexios since his childhood.\textsuperscript{348} Goules, Alexios's faithful attendant, had a brave hand and an indomitable

\textsuperscript{342. Alexiad II xii 4 Leib 1:100 6-7.}
\textsuperscript{343. Alexiad II xii 4 Leib 1:100 9-12.}
\textsuperscript{344. Alexiad II iv 6 Leib 1:73 18-20.}
\textsuperscript{345. Alexiad II xii 4 Leib 1:100 12-5.}
\textsuperscript{346. Alexiad II xii 6 Leib 1:101 2-6.}
\textsuperscript{347. This is a forward echo of Bryennios's own last stand of course Alexiad I vi 4 Leib 1:26 14-6.}
\textsuperscript{348. Θεόδωτος τις στρατώτης, ἀνὴρ τῶν ἀμέλου πατρὶ παραδόθεν ὑπηρετήσας Alexiad I v 5 Leib 1:22 10-1.}
spirit in war. In the battle against Basilakios, Goules aimed a blow at his head, which connected but which shattered his sword into three or four pieces. It was at this point that Alexios saw Goules and mocked him for being without a sword; he was quietened when Goules showed him the hilt of the sword which he still held. Goules reappears as one of Alexios's personal bodyguards during the battle against Bohemond. He may be among the "twenty brave horse men" who remained with Alexios, numbered among the "family retainers". The case of Tatikios shows that servile origin did not prevent the possession of bravery. Tatikios was most brave and undaunted in battle, even though his family was not of free condition for his father was a Saracen, who had been captured by John Komnenos. Kalliparios is another example of a servant who rose above his origins, being appointed judge and assessor of taxes in Cyprus. This man was not one of the notables, but brought along with him, a lot of evidence of both his just-dealing and incorruptibility

349. τις ἀνήρ Κοππιαδόκης Γούλης τὸ ἐπώνυμον, εύνοος θεράτων τοῦμοι πατρός, τὴν χεῖρα γενναίος, τὸν θυμὸν ἐς πολέμους ἀκαθεκτός Alexiad I viii 4 Leib 1:33 9-10.
351. καὶ Γούλην τυνα καλούμενον πατρίδοιο θεράπουντα Alexiad VII iii 6 Leib 2:97 21-2.
352. Ἰππεῶν γενναίων ἀνδρῶν εὐκοστος... συμπαρόντων καὶ πατρίδων θεραποῦντα Alexiad VII iii 9 Leib 2:98 26-9.
353. γενναϊότατος ὤν καὶ ἀκατάστητος ἐν μάχαις, οὐκ ἠλευθέρας δὲ ὦν τύχης ἐκ προγόνων. Καὶ γὰρ ὅ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ Σαρακενὸς ὦν ἐκ προγόνως περιῆλθε τῷ πρὸς πατρὸς ἐμὸν πιστὼ ἑαυτή τῷ Κομνηνῷ Alexiad IV iv 3 Leib 1:151 23-7.
and his humility.\textsuperscript{355}

The protostrator Michael Doukas played a similar role to Theodotos in the "last stand" against Bohemond. With the Byzantines in retreat, he asked Alexios why he remained in such a dangerous spot. Alexios's \textit{ἀνδρεία}-filled reply, that it was better to die fighting valiantly than to be saved by doing something ignoble\textsuperscript{356} got short shrift from the protostrator, who said that the reply suited a common soldier, but not the emperor on whom the safety of the empire depended.\textsuperscript{357}

The Alan magistros, counted among the intimates of Botanlates\textsuperscript{358}, who revealed the plan of Borilas and Germanos to the Komnenoi, shows that not all servants were untrustworthy. Rather than betraying his master Botanlates or turning to the Komnenoi, the Alan was loyally serving his mistress, Maria of Alania.

The palace chef was one of the emperor's servants won over by the Komnenoi's kind words, courtesies and all kinds of polite attentions. He helped allay their fears by passing on a message from one of their own servants when they were unexpectedly summoned to the palace after the capture of Kyzikos.\textsuperscript{359} Similarly, the very plain-dealing

\textsuperscript{355} οὐδὲς οὗτος ὁ τῶν ἐπισήμων, μαρτυρίαν δὲ πολλὴν δικαιωματικὰς τε καὶ ἀκρωτηριαστικὰς καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνης συμπεριγμένος \textit{Alexiad IX} ii 4 Leib 2:164 13-5.

\textsuperscript{356} ὁ δὲ βέλτιον γενναίως μαχομένους ὁποθαυμεῖν ἐφ' ἀγεννῆς τι πεποιηκότας σωθῆναι \textit{Alexiad VII} iii 10 Leib 2:99 23-5.

\textsuperscript{357} \textit{Alexiad VII} iii 10 Leib 2:99 25-9.

\textsuperscript{358} ἐκ πολλοῦ προσωπικωμένος τῷ βασιλεί καὶ τοῖς οἰκείοις διατελῶν \textit{Alexiad II} iv 5 Leib 1:72 29-30.

\textsuperscript{359} \textit{Alexiad II} iii 2 Leib 1:69 20-5.
guards provided Anna Dalassena and Maria the Protovestiaria with information when they are incarcerated in the convent of the Petrion.360 Both these examples follow on from bribery of a sort - kind words to the cook and freedom to take what they wanted from the ladies' stores for the guards, so there is an element of self-interest but the dominant attitude is positive.

The tutor of Botaniates's grandson is a further example of the loyal servant. When Anna Dalassena and her entourage leave the house as the rebellion starts, he was suspicious, and runs after them torch in hand. However, he accepts Dalassena's explanation and sets off to do her bidding. He raises the alarm only when the porters open the doors to the palace. Rather than an accomplice of some sort, the tutor was one used to obeying orders given to him by his betters.361

The case of Byzantinos the taxcollector provokes sympathy. A minor official attempting to do his job in difficult times, he was bested by Caesar John Doukas, the high-class mugger. He was placed in lodgings and treated with every appearance of friendship, but the price was that the taxes went to the Caesar, not to the City. Byzantinos was presented with the unenviable choice of returning home with the country in turmoil, going to the city without the taxes or going with the Caesar. He took the latter course.362

361. Alexiad II v 1 Leib 1:75 17-20, 27-9; Alexiad II v 3 Leib 1:76 13-25.
362. Alexiad II vi 6-7 Leib 1:82-3 15-22.
In Book 3, the persona of the good and faithful servant is provided by the eunuch Leo Kydoniates, who by his timely warning to Eudokia Makrembolitissa prevented her from taking precipitate action either for herself or on behalf of her daughter, with regard to Botaniates. Given Alexios’s previous attitude to sorcery, it is not surprising that when Nicholas, one of the undersecretaries came to him saying that a solar eclipse was immanent, that Alexios was sceptical about it. Rather than magic, this prophecy was based on calculation but Nicholas had to swear he was not lying to get Alexios to believe him. When he did so, however, Alexios believed him and used the eclipse to good effect in dealing with the Skyths.

The episode of the Aaron brothers’ attempt to kill Alexios through the agency of their Skythian slave, using famosa to encourage Irene’s rapid departure gives further insights into the interlocking servant world. Aaron, the prime mover in the plot, is given an additional outsider status because of his illegitimacy. Demetrios the Skythian is a bought-for-silver slave. Though Anna Komnene maintains that Alexios knew who was writing the famosa, it was Constantine, "some eunuch, a servant in charge of the table of the emperor’s father

365. ἀπὸ μέρους ἀνέλκων τὸ γένος Alexiad XIII i 5 Leib 3:88 22.
367. Alexiad XIII i 7 Leib 3:89 27.
and now serving the empress, who overheard talk of the famosa. Constantine sent his own servant to fetch the man who was talking. Strategios, Aaron’s servant was recognized and brought to Constantine. Strategios confessed to Constantine who then took him to Basil Psyllos, who was of sufficient rank to be able to waken Alexios. Strategios tells his story again, describing Demetrios as his fellow-slave. Alexios did not believe these accusations at the first telling, warning Strategios that he should not be motivated merely by hatred for his masters and fellow slave. Strategios was able to provide Basil Psyllos with hard evidence, however, and the Aaron family were exiled.

II.3 Courtiers as Outsiders.

A strong element in the latter portion of The Alexiad is the distrust of courtiers. Book 9 ends with Alexios in less than complete control. Anna Komnene introduced this by saying that the one worthy of honours is treated well, but if his fortune changes, then attitude

\[368\] τῆς εκτομίας ἐπὶ τραπέζης πατρῶς τοῦ βασιλέως θεράπων, τῇ δὲ βασιλίδι τημικαύτα ὑπηρετῶν Alexiad XIII i 8 Leib 3:90 1-2.

\[369\] τοῦ ἰδίου οἰκέτην Alexiad XIII i 8 Leib 3:90 8.

\[370\] τοῦ 'Αρων οἰκέτην Alexiad XIII i 8 Leib 3:90 9.

\[371\] τοῦ ἐμαυτοῦ σύνδουλον Alexiad XIII i 9 Leib 3:90 24.

\[372\] πρὸς τοὺς σοὺς δεσπότας καὶ πρὸς τὸν σεαυτοῦ ὑμὸδουλον Alexiad XIII i 10 Leib 3:91 1.

\[373\] Alexiad XIII i 10 Leib 3:91 4-17.
changes as well without a blush. The collapse of the statue in Constantine’s forum provided an occasion of those ill-disposed to Alexios to talk of his death. He assumed an orthodox position and refused to ascribe any significance to the destruction of a statue. If the fall of the statue did not foretell Alexios’s death, it did serve as the harbinger of further troubles, this time a revolt of the better sort, for they were men very proud of their bravery and their good birth, who breathing murder plotted against the emperor’s life. And this was all against - according to Komnene - Alexios’s record of good government. Similarly, forced to mobilize because of Bohemond’s arrival, Alexios did what he could to settle the palace and city, even though he knew that once again nothing was going well among his own retainers. When Bohemond proposed peace, Komnene gives us to think that Alexios would have defeated him, had it not been for those in his entourage who were always plotting against him, who


377. μηδὲ τὰ κατ’ οἴκου αὐτοῦ καλῶς πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔχουτα πάλιν διεγεύως, ὡμοὶς τὰ κατὰ τὰ ἀνάκτορα καὶ τὴν βασιλίδα τῶν πόλεων εὖ διαθέμενος Ἀλεξιάδ XIII i 1 Leib 3:87 6-8.
were more of a threat that the foreign attackers.378

II.3.2 Soothsayers as Outsiders.

The soothsayers within the empire who appear in Book 6 receive a most peculiar treatment. It is impossible for Komnene to be supportive of practices that are frowned upon by the church, yet they do receive an equitable treatment at her hand which suggests that they were in favour at the Komnenian court. The close relationship between the courtiers and the exponents of astrology is first indicated by Seth entrusting the predictions to a member of the imperial household.379 When his prediction was fulfilled, everyone marvelled at the knowledge of this man who had achieved the summit of this wisdom.380 The use of the term σοφία for his science has no negative connotations, even if it has no positive ones either.

Anna Komnene states that the study of oracles and divination was a new science, unknown in former times.381 All these new things were transmitted by their inventor to those who joined in such foolishness.382 Komnene states that she had studied a little astrology,
not because she believed in it, but so that she would be better able to refute the practitioners. Anna stresses that study was encouraged under Alexios, but that he honoured philosophers and philosophy itself, rather than astrology. This was because that study could mislead the majority of the guileless innocents. The power of prophecy seems to have been abroad in the land, for Seth made predictions relying on the fall of pebbles rather than the predicted motion of the heavens. Komnene states that there was nothing magical in this but merely some skill in Alexandrian calculation. Seth is not accused of a connection with the devil or demons, but is presented as a trickster who makes predictions by application of common sense. Alexios asked him two questions and received correct answers. Fearing that great harm would come of it, and that everyone would engage in the foolishness of astrology, Alexios exiled Seth from the City to Raidestos. In exile, however, he was to be cared for and his wants provided from the imperial treasury.

Two other soothsayers are recorded: Eleutherios an Egyptian and Katanankes from Athens. The dialectician Eleutherios was skilled in

383. τιμώτες τούς φιλοσόφους καὶ φιλοσοφίαν αὐτὴν Alexiad VI vii 2 Leib 2:58 10-1.
384. τοὺς πολλοὺς τῶν ἀκεραιοτέρων Alexiad VI vii 3 Leib 2:58 13.
385. Ἡν δ᾽ ἡρὰ καὶ τοῦτο μαγικὸν μὲν οὐδαμῶς, ἀλλὰ τέχνη τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέως λογαρικῆ Alexiad VI vii 4 Leib 2:58 22-3.
this art.\textsuperscript{387} The Athenian by contrast was contentious and had come to the City to surpass his predecessors.\textsuperscript{388} He, like Seth, was asked two questions by Alexios, but his answers were both wrong. Unlike Seth, however, Katanankes was not exiled from the City. It would seem that his failings as a soothsayer would be sufficient to prevent him from being a danger to the people at large. Komnene returns to the main theme of her work, saying that she does not wish to darken the body of her history with the names of astrologers.\textsuperscript{389}

\textbf{II.3.3 Portmanteau Outsiders.}

In chapter 7 of Book 15, Komnene provides details of Alexios's philanthropia. On the return from Philomelion, many prisoners released from the hands of the barbarians\textsuperscript{390} travelled at the centre of the military formation for safety. During the march, Alexios's humanity was displayed by his treatment of pregnant women and the dying as he ordered the column to stop. Further, the unfortunates were invited to share his table.\textsuperscript{391} The day of his arrival in Constantinople, Alexios devoted to the care of prisoners and the strangers.\textsuperscript{392} The foundation of the Orphanotropheion, a home for the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{387} Alexiad VI vii 5 Leib 2:59 4-7.
\item \textsuperscript{388} Alexiad VI vii 5 Leib 2:59 7-9.
\item \textsuperscript{389} Alexiad VI vii 6 Leib 2:59 24-6.
\item \textsuperscript{390} Alexiad XV vii 1 Leib 3:213 19-20.
\item \textsuperscript{391} Alexiad XV vii 2 Leib 3:213-4 29-11.
\item \textsuperscript{392} Alexiad XV vii 3 Leib 3:214 20-1.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
poor and the halt[^393], Komnene likens to a miracle of Christ[^394] - though she does have the grace to describe the comparison as "daring"[^395]. Food and clothes were provided for nuns[^396] and education for those with no learning[^397]. What should be noted about these descriptions however, is that they tell us little about the attitude of the Byzantines to these classes of people. Their purpose in *The Alexiad* is to establish Alexios's credentials as a benevolent ruler, nothing more.

The curious story of Gregory, Doux of Trebizond may contain an indication of how the Byzantines responded to madness. It is difficult to explain the lenient treatment given to this rebel[^398], who jailed people for no reason[^399]. Gregory was in complete senselessness[^400]. He was incarcerated, not blinded, and he received visits from Nikephoros Bryennios, an old friend, which seemed to lift his great despondency[^401]. Eventually, Gregory was released. There is insufficient information to say if this is a Byzantine treatment of

[^393]: *Alexiad* XV vii 4 Leib 3:215 7-8.
[^394]: *Alexiad* XV vii 1 Leib 3:216 2-4.
[^395]: τολμᾶ* *Alexiad* XV vii 4 Leib 3:216 1.
[^396]: *Alexiad* XV vii 8 Leib 3:217 16-21.
[^397]: *Alexiad* XV vii 9 Leib 3:218 4-8.
[^398]: τοῦ ἀποστάτου *Alexiad* XII vi 1 Leib 3:75 25.
[^399]: However, see Margaret Mullett, "The Madness of Genre", DOP 46 (1992), forthcoming for a different evaluation.
[^400]: εἰς παντελῆ ἀπόνοιαν *Alexiad* XII vii 2 Leib 3:76 6.
[^401]: τῆς πολλῆς ἀθυμίας *Alexiad* XII vii 4 Leib 3:77 12.
madness, but it is an interesting possibility.  

II.4 Anna Komnene as an Outsider.  

The final matter to be addressed is Komnene’s self-portrayal as an outsider. She describes her life as one of storms and insurrections in spite of her fortunate birth. In Book 1, when discussing Robert Guiscard’s folly in believing that he could seize the throne in Constantinople, Anna Komnene says that the very idea made her smile as her pen scratched in the lamplight. At this point there is no explicit statement that Anna Komnene views herself as an outsider, but the suggestion is that she is alone. When she describes her birth, in the family section of Book 6, she goes on to describe her life as composed of:

many contests, troubles and dangers which I myself endured because of my love for them [Alexios and Irene], having no care for honour, money nor life itself. And this is just before her acclamation with Constantine.  

In Book 14, Komnene returns to the theme of all the troubles that befell her at the hands of aliens, the evil that people did to her. Even now, as she writes, a sea of misfortunes comes in to her, one

403. Ταύτα ἐνθυμομένη μοι μειδίων ἐπέρχεται καὶ γέλως ἐπιτρέχει τοῖς χείλεσι πρὸς λύχνον ἐπισυροῦσθα τὸν κάλαμον Alexiad I vi 6 Leib 1:56 13-5.  
404. καὶ τῶν πολλῶν μου ὑπὲρ τῶν γονέων ἔθλων καὶ κομάτων καὶ τῶν κυδώνων ἐκείνων, εἰς οὓς ἐμαυτὴν διὰ τὸ πρὸς ἐκείνους φίλτρου ἐνέβαλον, ἀφεώδησα μὲν καὶ τιμῆς καὶ χρημάτων καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς ζωῆς Alexiad VI viii 2 Leib 2:61 22-5.  
wave after another.\textsuperscript{406} As well as her own misfortunes, Anna Konmene mourns the deaths of her parents and husband. She spends her time devoted to her books and God.\textsuperscript{407} No-one, even out of the more insignificant of men, is allowed to visit her, never mind those from whom she might have learnt how things were turning out or her father’s retainers.\textsuperscript{408} For thirty years, Anna Komnene tells us she has been an outsider, prevented from seeing her father’s friends, some because they were dead, but many because they feared the flood of events.\textsuperscript{409} The masters of these [events] decreed the absurdities that [Komnene] was [not only] not to be seen but to be abhorred by the many.\textsuperscript{410} It was these feelings of isolation that gave Anna Komnene her status as an alienated outsider.\textsuperscript{411}

\textbf{IL.5 Conclusion on Komnene’s Outsiders.}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{406} ἐκβολεῖ ταῦτα καὶ μέχρι τοῦ ὑποτεθείσιν παρ' ἦματιν γράφω ἡ ἡμερομόρα τοῖς ἁλλοίς καταλαμβάνει τά κύματα \textit{Alexiad} XIV vii 4 Leib 3:174 27-9.
\item \textsuperscript{407} \textit{Alexiad} XIV vii 6 Leib 3:175 14-9.
\item \textsuperscript{408} Καὶ οὐδὲ τοῖς ἀφανεστέροις ἔξεσται τῶν ἀνθρώπων παρ’ ἦματιν φοιτῶν, μὴ ὑπετεθείσιν εἶχομεν, ἀπερ παρ’ ἄλλων διακηκοῦσες ἐτύγχανον, καὶ τοίς τοῦ πατρὸς ὀλυμματάντως \textit{Alexiad} XIV vii 6 Leib 3:175 19-22.
\item \textsuperscript{409} Εἰς τριακαστάδον γὰρ τούτῳ ἔτος, μὰ τὰς τῶν μακραστάτων αὐτοκράτορῶν ψυχὰς, οὐκ ἐθεασάμην, οὐκ ἐίδον, οὐκ ἀμυνόμεν ἀνθρώπων πατρίκων, τούτῳ μὲν τῶν πολλῶν ἀπερρυπατών, τοῦτῳ δὲ τῶν πολλῶν ἀπεργουμένων τῷ φόβῳ διὰ τὴν τῶν πραγμάτων πολλοφορίαν \textit{Alexiad} XIV vii 6 Leib 3:175 22-7.
\item \textsuperscript{410} Καὶ τούτῳ γὰρ ἦματι κατεδίκασαν οἱ κρατοῦντες τοῖς ἀποτιθέμαι μὴ δὲ θεασάσθε, εἰς ἀλλ’ ἐστυγμένους τοῖς πλείοσιν \textit{Alexiad} XIV vii 6 Leib 3:175 27-9.
\item \textsuperscript{411} \textit{Alexiad} XV xi 22 Leib 3:242 21-9.
\end{itemize}
Though analysis was facilitated by the division of the Psellan classes into smaller groups, the broad areas of rebels, the crowd and the upwardly mobile (though to Anna Komnene's perception "upstarts" might be a better term) are visible. Rebels are warlike and tyrannical, worthy opponents for Alexios Komnenos. From Anna Komnene's elevated position the distinction between the crowd and the officials is not so large as for Psellos or Choniates. However, she does present a strong difference between good servants (who help Alexios) and bad servants (who hinder him).

III Outsiders by τόξυς in Choniates's Narrative.

Given the numerous types of outsiders that exist in Choniates's Narrative, the three broad Psellan categories again have to make way for a more detailed breakdown.

III.1.1 Imperial Family Members as Outsiders.

I ended my account of outsiders in The Alexiad with Anna Komnene cast in an outsider role. Choniates's account of the reign of John II Komnenos opens at the same point. The empress Irene is described as showing favour to her daughter Anna in opposition.412 She attempted to dissuade Alexios from favouring John by stressing the latter's outsider qualities as uncontrolled, inclined to turn to an easy life with nothing at all sound in his way of life.413 Choniates's

---

413. προσετῇ τούτου ἀποκαλούσα καὶ υγρὸν τὸν βίον πολίντατροφὸν τε τὸ ἴθος καὶ μηδαμὴ μηδὲν ύγιες Historia, van Dieten 5:92-4.
conclusion about Alexios's handling of his wife suggests that Alexios himself might be an outsider of sorts to Choniates.414

John, when he saw that his father was dying, his mother was against him and his sister after the empire, made his move.415 Making his way to the Great Palace, he passed a crowd of his adherents and the commoners acclaimed him emperor.416 This is a positive role for the inhabitants of Constantinople, in their guise as ol ós-τος417 rather than their frequent appearances as the promiscuous rabble. Irene accused John of rebellion418; Alexios said nothing, but Irene took his raised hands as a further example of his deceit.419 Choniates maintains that John's failure to heed his mother's summons to his father's funeral was because he was not secure on the throne.420 He is likened to an octopus as he clung to the palace.421 John soon achieved total control

414. "For this man above any other concealed his thoughts, and always held deviousness to be wisdom, never giving away much information about what he was going to do." ἦν γὰρ, εὶ καὶ τις ἀλλος, κρυφότερος ὁ ἄληθινος καὶ σοφὸν ἤγοιμενὸς οἰκούμενος ἡ ποιήσεως ἐξαιτητικός τοῦ ποιητέου δεικτικός Ηistoria, van Dieten 6:26-8.


417. Note that LSJ gives this as the opposite of ξένος.

418. "of doing acts of political innovation" εἰς ἑργα βλέψας νεώτερα Historia, van Dieten 7:52-3.


421. ὁθεν οὔτος μὲν ὡς ὁλοπλοδες τῶν πετρῶν ἐξεῖχετο τῶν ἀρχεῖων Historia, van Dieten 8:90-1.
of the government. His brother Isaak was conciliated with the rank of sebastokrator, and John appointed relations as was fitting.

Within a year of his advancement (i.e. before August 1119), John Komnenos faced a rebellion by his own relations. The evildoers rallied round Nikephoros Bryennios, husband of Anna Komnene, because he had been educated in due season by reason, looked like a ruler and was connected in marriage to the imperial line. The description of Anna Komnene which follows, that she was devoted to philosophy above all other sciences and was well versed in all studies, suggests that she should be viewed as an insider, as befits the sister of the emperor. However, Nikephoros’s dull and slack habit stopped any attempt on the throne, which roused Anna Komnene to anger. With the plot discovered, the conspirators merely had their property seized, which for the most part was returned to them.

Anna Komnene is identified here as the leading perpetrator of the plot for the first time. This was to be an occasion on which to

423. παρὰ τῶν ἐκ γένους *Historia*, van Dieten 10:38.
424. ὡς λογικῶν ἐν μεθέξει δυτὶ παιδεύσεως καὶ εἴδος τυραννικῶν προφαίνοντι καὶ κατὰ κήδος προφέρεστέρῳ βασιλικῷ *Historia*, van Dieten 10:42-3.
425. ἦτος δὴ τῆς τῶν ἐπιστημῶν παρῶν ἐπόχου φιλοσοφίας ἔδεικνυτο μέλημα καὶ πρὸς πᾶσαν ἔρρυθμοτο μάθησιν *Historia*, van Dieten 10:45-6.
427. σαντις τῆς πρωτεργάτιδος τῆς ἐπιστολῆς Ἀνυψ *Historia*, van Dieten 11:60.
display the emperor's philanthropia - his "insiderness". When all the kaisarissa's movable wealth had been gathered together, John II (according to Choniates) said:

How is due order turned upside down for me, for relations make war, while the Other is my friend. Because of this it is necessary to give wealth to friends.428

John's desire to give the treasure to John Axouch, the Turkish-born Grand Domestic was thwarted by Axouch's own sense of what was seemly, and he returned everything to the kaisarissa and peace was made.429

If John was something of an outsider at the start of his reign as he clung tenaciously to the palace, he at least was the eldest son of the emperor who lay dying in the Mangana Palace. Manuel I Komnenos was the younger son of an emperor who died unexpectedly (and perhaps in dubious circumstances) far from the imperial palace. That Manuel's accession was problematic is not surprising. John, in his death-bed speech, did all he could to promote Manuel and denigrate Isaak. Manuel was proclaimed by the assembled troops. Each of the magnates with their houses in order then acclaimed him.430 Then all swore allegiance to the new monarch.431 This was orchestrated by


430. ἐκάστου τῶν μεγιστάνων μετὰ τῆς οἰκείας τάξεως Historia, van Dieten 46:47.

Axouch to reduce the support going to various members of the imperial family.432

The easiest way for Choniates to stress how much of an insider Manuel was, was to emphasize Isaak’s outsider qualities. The process had begun with John II Komnenos’s denunciation, but Manuel continued it though Axouch, who was sent in advance to Constantinople. Manuel feared - rightly - that Isaak, as eldest son in line to succeed and present in the Great Palace, would attempt to seize the throne.433 Axouch confined Isaak in the Pantokrator monastery, where his fulminations were of no consequence. Isaak had become a little bird caught in a net.434 Although Axouch’s activity had removed the main rival, and had quieted the church and people, Manuel was not well enough established to go to the aid of Andronikos Komnenos and Theodore Dasiotes who had been captured by the Turks while hunting. Choniates notes that to have gone to the aid of these men would have been both the proper and the imperial thing to do.435 After his coronation, Manuel and Isaak were reconciled.436 However, the negative portrayal of Isaak continues:

He was easily turned to anger and frequently for the smallest fault he would expose them to excessive chastisements [in a way] hard to understand by the many. In addition to this, he

434, κατὰ σαφήνευσθεν πτυχάριον Historia, van Dieten 49:32.
had base timidity, which at his age made him the opposite of brave.\textsuperscript{437}

Isaak’s qualities made Manuel seem the best choice, and John was blessed by all\textsuperscript{438} for having chosen Manuel, now the insider in comparison with someone cast out.

\textbf{III.1.2 Rebels as Outsiders.}

Manuel’s death, leaving an eleven-year old heir, resulted in a plethora of would-be protectors and rebels. Choniates characterizes them as one of three types: some concentrated on the empress, and in their attempts to appear beautiful in her eyes made themselves like infants and women\textsuperscript{439}; others - dealers and devourers of the people\textsuperscript{440} - concentrated on the money readily available with weak imperial control\textsuperscript{441}; others directed their attention to the throne directly.\textsuperscript{442} Equality in honour was no longer esteemed by the mighty in their greatness, and those related by family to the emperor no longer thought about the common good. Councils and meetings

\textsuperscript{437} ήν δὲ ὁ Ἰσαάκιος διὰ τὸ εἰς χόλον εὐέμπτωτον καὶ τὸ ἐκ μικρὸς πολλάκις αἰτίας ἐς κολάσεως ὑπερώγκους διαφροτίζεσθαι δυσεξυμβλητὸς τοῖς πολλοῖς. ἔτρεφε δὲ καὶ τὸ ψοφοδεῖς ἀγεννές, καὶ ταῦτα τηλίκος ὃν, καὶ ἀνδράσιν ἄνδροιον \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 52:11-4.

\textsuperscript{438} παρὰ πάσι μακαριστὸς \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 52:15.

\textsuperscript{439} ὑπηρωδῶς...γυναικωδῶς \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 224:17-20.

\textsuperscript{440} χρηματιστικοὶ δύτες καὶ δημοβόροι \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 224:20-1.

\textsuperscript{441} \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 224:21-3.

\textsuperscript{442} \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 224:25-9.
disappeared. It was into this highly atomized environment that Alexios Komnenos appeared. Alexios Komnenos set his sights on the dowager empress, and conquered. Seeing the advent of this tyranny the blood relations made equal in power by the emperor Manuel distrusted Alexios, though this was because of self-interest, not because they were concerned about Alexios II. Thus in his attempt on the throne, Alexios Komnenos is likened to an infant or woman, and gained the throne through a woman.

The account of the rebellion by Alexios Branas is in keeping with the standard rebel account seen in The Chronographia and The Alexiad. He is introduced as a general. Short in stature, the comprehension of his understanding and the deviousness of his intelligence was colossal, and he was more the general than anyone else. He carried out his command guardedly, not rashly, harassing the enemy, but guarding his own army.

Temperate in command, Branas was intemperate in his opposition to Isaak Angelos. Knowing the Roman forces under his command would not aid him in his rebellion, he turned to the German allies.

---


446. "οὐ θερμῶς, ἀλλὰ φυλακτικῶς" Historia, van Dieten 376:30-1.

447. ἀποστασιαὶ...τὸ ἦ Αλαμανῶν συμμαχικὸν Historia, van Dieten 377:40-2.
Such reliance on foreigners does not bode well for a rebel, even if he cared for his men. To gain more support, Branas did as Isaak Angelos had done and went to the Great Church at night, to win over those from outside. As they came in he explained his opposition to the emperor. Branas stressed his military achievements. Branas moved with the advice of his family and fellow-countrymen and was proclaimed by everyone in the army in his homeland. Branas made a good showing before the walls of Constantinople and urged surrender. At the first engagement, Branas’s troops bested the emperor’s troops, as they were seasoned warriors, the best squads were the combatants of the "Latin Foot". Branas gave the City five days thinking time and then the tyrant attacked again. He made himself terrifying to the citizens, and attempted a flanking attack using sea-power. Even though the imperial fleet was guarding against a sea assault by the tyrant, they were overwhelmed by the small boats manned by

448. τοὺς ἔξωθεν Historia, van Dieten 377:46.
449. τῶν εἰσόντων Historia, van Dieten 377:47.
452. ἀρχι τυμὸς ἐκράτουν τῶν τοῦ βασιλέως οἱ τοῦ Βρασδά ὡς πολέμων ἐμπείροι, καὶ τούτων μάλιστα οἱ ἐκ τοῦ Λατινικοῦ πεζικοῦ συγκροτούμενοι στίφος Historia, van Dieten 379:90-1.
454. ποιῶν δ’ ἐπίφοβον τοῖς ἀστικοῖς ἐστήτῳ Historia, van Dieten 380:4-5.
455. ὁ τύραννος Historia, van Dieten 380:27.
warlike men\textsuperscript{456}, who a little time before had been those who were not versed at all in battles.\textsuperscript{457} As persuasion and assault both failed, Branas - now the rebel\textsuperscript{458} - decided to use famine to subjugate Constantinople. Only divine intervention\textsuperscript{459} saved the City. Isaak Angelos saw that the population of Constantinople was still behind him, and he used the icon of the Theotokos Hodegetria to show the way to the rebel’s defeat. Branas made his stand surrounded by his relations and friends, with many persons of nobility and courage.\textsuperscript{460} That his wing was commanded by the Skyth Elpoumes\textsuperscript{461} could have been a criticism, had not Isaak Angelos been relying on the Latin Conrad in command of the centre.\textsuperscript{462} Branas’s troops fled under the press of the Latin charge.\textsuperscript{463} Branas urged his troops to turn and fight placing their hope in numbers, but he was unable to make them change their minds. Branas fought and attacked Conrad, but when he was unseated he pleaded for his life. As comfort, Conrad offered Branas only the gallows’ humour.

\textsuperscript{456} ἀρείκος ἄνδρας \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 380:23.
\textsuperscript{457} οἱ μάχης μὲν οὐ πάντες ἱστορεῖ \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 380:19.
\textsuperscript{458} ὁ ἀποστάτης \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 381:46.
\textsuperscript{459} \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 382:53.
\textsuperscript{460} \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 386:87-9.
\textsuperscript{461} \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 386:91.
\textsuperscript{462} \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 386:85-6.
\textsuperscript{463} \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 387:12-6.
The rebellion 464 of Theodore Mangaphas shows how a rebel can be put placed in the outsider role. The first people he won over were the common herd of Philadelphia, who were numerous, bold and shameless. 465 He made himself emperor. 466 As the rebellion 467 gained ground, Isaak Angelos moved against it. Mangaphas was besieged in Philadelphia, and Angelos prevailed upon the city’s inhabitants to hand him over. Though all Mangaphas’s supporters were from the common herd, Choniates states that the rebellion killed not a few brave and noble men. 468 Mangaphas was expelled finally from Philadelphia by Basil Vatatzes - shoot of an insignificant family 469 - and took refuge with the Turks. Recruiting freebooters from among them he acted as an enemy. 470 This unholy man 471 even allowed the destruction of the church of St. Michael at Chonai. Mangaphas was eventually handed over to the emperor by the sultan of Ikonion to be blinded.

464. τυραννίδι Historia, van Dieten 399:54.
466. Historia, van Dieten 399:58; the implication is that there was no army or senate to do it for him.
467. τῆς ἀποστολίας Historia, van Dieten 399:61.
468. οὐκ ὄλγοι δὲ κἂν τῇ ἐπαναστάσει ταύτη ἀγαθοὶ καὶ γενναῖοι ἄνδρες ἀπώλουντο Historia, van Dieten 400:72-3. This single sentence does not indicate on which side these noble losses occurred; this may imply that it was on the side of the central government alone, or that the noble citizens of Philadelphia suffered as well.
469. γένους μὲν ἀσύμπων βλαστῶν Historia, van Dieten 400:74-5.
470. ως πολέμιος Historia, van Dieten 400:89.
As well as Alexios Branas and Theodore Mangaphas, a certain Alexios rebelled against Isaak Angelos, claiming to be Manuel I's son. He dyed his hair and stammered, and convinced some Latin of his story. He too found his way to Ikonion, where the old sultan treated him as the true son of the emperor Manuel, and not as an impostor. In common with Mangaphas, Alexios was permitted to recruit freebooters. Known as "Grainburner", Alexios was already not adored by the many and the farm labourers, but was lovable by speech, account and sight. The members of the court, who knew that the real Alexios was dead, used the impostor as a means of furthering their own ends. When he was killed by one of the priests, the sebastokrator Alexios, looking at the pretender's face, said that it was not completely ignorantly that the cities had followed the man. Choniates holds that the pretender's fate was just punishment for attacking his countrymen and defiling the sanctuary at Chonai.

476. ού γάρ τοῖς πολλοῖς ἡμῖν καὶ ἀγροτέροις ἠπιάζετο καὶ ἦν διὰ στόματος καὶ ὄνοματος καὶ θεωμένος ἐδοκεὶ ἐπέραστος Historia, van Dieten 421:60-1.
477. τις τῶν λεπέων Historia, van Dieten 422:76.
479. καὶ ἤμοφυλον Historia, van Dieten 422:83.
Choniates then gives a brief account of five rebellions, the point of which was to criticize Isaak Angelos, but also to introduce a digression on how God directs human affairs.

When Alexios Angelos replaced his brother Isaak as emperor in the palace [lit. tent] coup d'état of 1195, Choniates has this to say. When Alexios made his move, it was to bring into the open what he had long concealed in his heart. With the named rebels who entered the imperial tent were many other hostile and fickle men, combined against the emperor's family and another swarm of the common herd.

With the first whiff of revolution, the army, his personal attendants and those he had raised to the senate all abandoned Isaak Angelos and switched to Alexios Angelos.

The accession of the new ruler was not auspicious. Choniates describes it as the new tyranny, recognized by one of the sacristans bought for a few coins. When the patriarch failed to organize resistance, all deserted to the empress as captured slaves. The

---

486. τῇ νέᾳ τυραννίδι Historia, van Dieten 456:76.
488. ὡς ἀνδράποδα Historia, van Dieten 456:85.
stupid men\textsuperscript{489} were outmanoeuvred by the empress, who soon won over the foolish Constantinopolitans.\textsuperscript{490} The way was opened for the new emperor to enter the city without bloodshed and without anyone suffering injustice in substance.\textsuperscript{491}

A final example of the rebel described in outsider terms will suffice. The second rebel against Alexios Angelos was John Spyridonakis. He was a Cypriot,

poor in appearance and squat, with squinting eyes. By craft he was a handyman and a son of the soil by fortune.\textsuperscript{492}

This emperor’s servant had been promoted to keeper of the private fisc and then governor of Smolena. He revolted and became a Satan for the emperor.\textsuperscript{493} Spyridonakis was worthless among men.\textsuperscript{494} When Alexios Angelos sent his son-in-law Alexios Palaiologos against him, the Cypriot is the little fellow\textsuperscript{495}, and in defeat he is the pygmy-like little man.\textsuperscript{496}

\textbf{III.1.3 Andronikos Komnenos as an Outsider.}

\textsuperscript{489} \textit{oι ἀβέλτεροι} \textit{Historia, van Dieten 456:90.}

\textsuperscript{490} \textit{τοὺς εὐήθεις διέχεε Βυζαντίων} \textit{Historia, van Dieten 456:92.}

\textsuperscript{491} \textit{Historia, van Dieten 457:95-1.}

\textsuperscript{492} \textit{'Ἰωάννης γάρ τις τὸ γένος Κύπριος. Σπυρίδωνάκης τούπωνυμιών, τὸ εἰδος φαιλός, τὴν ἡλικίαν φυλότερος, στράβων τὰς διεις, χειρώνας τὴν τέχνην, τὴν τύχην χθόνιος} \textit{Historia, van Dieten 534:64-6.}

\textsuperscript{493} \textit{Historia, van Dieten 534:66-72.}

\textsuperscript{494} \textit{τὸν οὐτιδανὸν ἐν ἀνθρώποις} \textit{Historia, van Dieten 534:76-7.}

\textsuperscript{495} \textit{τὸν ἀνθρωπίσκου} \textit{Historia, van Dieten 534:80.}

\textsuperscript{496} \textit{τὸ πυγμακίδον ἀνδρίου} \textit{Historia, van Dieten 535:84.}
In Choniates’s *Narrative*, Andronikos Komnenos is the outsider. At his second appearance in the *Narrative*, Andronikos Komnenos is identified as he who would later tyrannize the Romans. Manuel stripped him of his military command for secretly conspiring with the Hungarians against the Byzantines. Summoned before Manuel at Pelagonia, Andronikos was sent bound to Constantinople, and was confined in one of the gaols of the Great Palace. The reason for his imprisonment was his consorting with the enemy, but no less was his continual free speech, his bodily strength which surpassed many, and having the good bodily form and uncowed intellect which made [him] a substance worthy of rebellion. He was likely, in effect, to have proved most royally. In his own version of uneasy lies the head, Choniates says that these qualities, coupled with his ability in battle and distinction by birth led him to be regarded askance and completely suspect. A further cause of his imprisonment was his sexual deviancy, as he bedded Eudokia, his cousin once removed. Andronikos excused himself by saying that

497. ὃ καὶ ὑστερον τυραννήσας Ἡρωμάων *Historia*, van Dieten 101:68.


499. ἡ πόλις ἀναπεμπόμενον δέσμιον καὶ ἐν μιὰ τῶν τοῦ μεγάλου παλατίου φρονήματι καθεξιγύμενον *Historia*, van Dieten 101:72-3.

500. οὐδὲν δὲ ἦταν τὸ ἐξερευνομένων ἀεὶ καὶ τὸ τῆς ῥώμης τῶν πολλῶν διαφέρειων καὶ ἡ εἰ ἐξουσία πλάσις τοῦ σώματος ἀεὶ οὕσα τοῦ τυραννεῖν καὶ τὸ τοῦ φρουρήματος ἀπαίσιωτον *Historia*, van Dieten 103:9-11.

501. τὸ ἐν ταῖς μάχαις ἐνδέξιον καὶ τὸ τοῦ γένους ἐπίσημον *Historia*, van Dieten 103:14-5.

he followed Manuel's lead. Attacked, Andronikos survived by being reliant on his own manliness and surpassing his enemies in quick comprehension by a great deal.

In Antioch, Andronikos found his nemesis in Philippa, daughter of Raymond of Poitiers and sister of Manuel's second wife. He reckoned war secondary, and gave himself over to Aphrodite. He won Philippa over, but his virility was lost and he was always anxious; he gave away his dignity of carriage and intellect, and the reserve of the wild beast was thrown away. Philippa preferred Andronikos to her hearth and homeland and followed him. Manuel dispatched Constantine Kalamanos to woo Philippa away from Andronikos. She, however, called him short, and called the emperor Manuel stupid for thinking that she would forsake a hero of great renown

504. ἀνδρεία τῇ σφετέρᾳ πίσυνος ὤν καὶ κατὰ σύνεσιν τῶν ἐναυτῶν ὑπερφέρων ἐπὶ πολὺ Historia, van Dieten 104:45-6.
506. παρωσάμενος τὰ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης μέτεισιν ὀργία Historia, van Dieten 139:31-2.
507. οὐκὸς τὸ μὲν βλασφημόν ἐκεχώραστο καὶ τὸ ἐπὶ συννοίας εἶναι ἀεὶ καὶ τὸ τοῦ θόου έμμερθές καὶ φροντιστικόν ἐνδεδώκει καὶ τὸ ἐπισκύπτον ὁ θηρ ἀπεβόλετο Historia, van Dieten 139:53-5.
509. τὸ τῆς ἰλυκίας βραχὺ Historia, van Dieten 140:70-1.
510. ἀμαθῶς Historia, van Dieten 140:72.
and of a great family\textsuperscript{511} for a man of an obscure family which sprang into prominence only yesterday.\textsuperscript{512}

Andronikos then made his way to Jerusalem where he seduced Theodora, widow of Baldwin III. Manuel ordered Andronikos seized as one intending rebellion\textsuperscript{513} but the letter was intercepted by Theodora. It seems he was protected by God to wreak havoc on his Roman subjects in his tyranny, and to endure his later merciless punishments, says Choniates.\textsuperscript{514}

As Andronikos began to edge out Alexios II, Choniates continually refers to his tyranny.\textsuperscript{515} Andronikos displaced Alexios in the order of acclamation in the Great Church\textsuperscript{516}, it was said because of Andronikos's greater understanding and wisdom.\textsuperscript{517} Andronikos is the wild beast\textsuperscript{518}, and though he concealed his wild appearance\textsuperscript{519} and promised many better government, it was all a sham.\textsuperscript{520} The wild beast

\textsuperscript{511} τοῦ ἰδρωμοῦ, οὗ τὸ κλέος εὔρυ καὶ οὗ τὸ γένος πολύ \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 140:73.

\textsuperscript{512} προσκολληθῆσαι δὲ ἀνδρὶ, ὡς τὸ γένος ἀπεσβεσμένος καὶ χθὲς καὶ πρώην, εἰ ἐστιν ἄλως, ἐγνώρισται \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 140:73-5.

\textsuperscript{513} ὡς ἄντιφρον \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 141:3.

\textsuperscript{514} \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 141:8-11.

\textsuperscript{515} \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 270:31, 33; 271:43.

\textsuperscript{516} \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 271:57-9.

\textsuperscript{517} \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 272:61-3.

\textsuperscript{518} ὁ θήρ \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 272:65.

\textsuperscript{519} τὸ τοῦ βλέμματος...βλασφημον \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 272:65.

\textsuperscript{520} \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 272:67-9.
beast's disregard for the laws of God and man is shown by the perjury he committed on the sacrament in the chancel in the hearing of most people, when he said that he became emperor only because he wished to help Alexios, whom he sent to the depth of the sea several days later.521

Leaving the church to return to the Great Palace, Andronikos gave free rein to his horse, not moving slowly as was the custom with celebrating emperors.522 Some argued he moved rapidly because he feared assassination, others because he was incontinent.523 After several days celebration at the Great Palace, he turned - not to the government of the empire - but to other illegal acts.524

When the city of Prusa was conquered, Andronikos did not behave as a mild emperor and saviour525 to the Prusaeans, who had been subjects and who would have been again even though they had rebelled for a time526, but rather as a hungry kingly beast527, scattering and destroying his inheritance.528

525. οὐθ’ ὡς βασιλεὺς πραύς καὶ σώζων Historia, van Dieten 288:52.
526. ὑπηκόους οὕσι πάλαι καὶ οὕθις ἐσωμένους, καὶ πρὸς καιρόν ἀπέστησαν Historia, van Dieten 288:52-3.
527. ἀλλ’ ὡς ἀρχικὸς θηρ ἀπόσιτος Historia, van Dieten 288:55.
Returning to Constantinople, the weakness he felt in his position was shown when Andronikos was ready to flee when a box collapsed in the Hippodrome. Such a public display of lost nerve would have cost him the throne but his attendants persuaded him to stay.\(^{529}\)

Andronikos's lack of stability is stressed in the execution of Constantine Makrodoukas and Andronikos Doukas. Although they were the most outstanding of everyone in Andronikos's party and the commanders of his faction\(^{530}\) they were cut down, accused of plotting against Andronikos in favour of Isaak Komnenos, ruler of Cyprus. Andronikos feared that this Isaak might sail from Cyprus and end his rule.\(^{531}\) However, as Isaak was far off, Andronikos is likened to a dog which attacks what is near at hand, whether it is the true enemy or not.\(^{532}\) The emperor, who was a wild beast - and perhaps a lion the king of the beasts, is now reduced to a cur snapping at thrown stones.

Andronikos was distrusting to an extent\(^{533}\) in that he did not value Constantine Makrodoukas and Andronikos Doukas, who had been noted as his close friends.\(^{534}\) He displayed his fickleness of mind...

---

\(^{529}\) Historia, van Dieten 290:94-6.

\(^{530}\) κατέπερ τῶν τῆς μερίδος ὄντως Ἀυδρονίκου οἱ μέγιστοι ἔχοντο τις ἑταρείας οἱ κράτιστοι Historia, van Dieten 292:75-7.

\(^{531}\) τούτων τῆς τυραννίδος Historia, van Dieten 292:63-4.


\(^{533}\) ὁπως δὲ ἡπίστατο Historia, van Dieten 313:35.

\(^{534}\) τοῖς πάνυ φιλομένοις Historia, van Dieten 314:40.
clearly and his inability to remain well disposed to his adherents such as when he blinded Constantine Tripsychos, a man very useful in doing things for Andronikos’s tyranny.

Andronikos’s sexual licence made him an outsider. He was a man who struggled against the natural order. Rather than defeating the barbarians and defending the borders, he engaged in all inhumanity and went beyond all previous tyrants. He left Constantinople with courtesans and searched out pastoral idylls in the manner of wild beasts. He was a cock followed by hens, a goat followed by nanny goats, a Dionysos followed by his revelers. To replenish his sexual powers he ate an animal of the Nile, like a crocodile. To this sexual lawlessness, he added his bodyguard, barbarians who took pleasure in their lack of education, and most of whom were unable to speak Greek. To complete the picture on a more contemporary note,

535. ὅσοι δὲ τὸ τῆς γυναικὸς ἀστατον καθυπεδείξε καὶ τὸ μη βεβηκός εἰς εἴνοιον ἐν οἷς προσέβησε Ἡστορία, van Dieten 314:40-1.

536. Ἡστορία, van Dieten 314:43.

537. ἀνδρὸς τῇ φύσει τῶν πραγμάτων ἀντιμοχαμένου Ἡστορία, van Dieten 321:10-1.


539. καὶ θηρῶν δίκην συναγκέας ὁρῶν Ἡστορία, van Dieten 321:22.

540. Ἡστορία, van Dieten 322:39.

541. καὶ τούτο ἐκ βαρβάρων ἱλῶν καὶ ἄνδρῶν λοιμῶν χαράντων ἀπαίδευσι καὶ τὰ πλεῖότα μηδ’ ἐποίητων Ἐλληνίδος φωνῆς Ἡστορία, van Dieten 322:43-5.
finally he obtained the Byzantine equivalent of a Rhodesian Ridgeback.\textsuperscript{542}

Andronikos had no respect for the Constantinopolitans, and mocked their simplicity. The antlers placed in the agora to show his hunting prowess also served to mock the cuckolded citizens and the digressions of their wives.\textsuperscript{543}

However, not all of Andronikos's actions were negative. He did not a few good acts.\textsuperscript{544} The very fact that the proximity to Andronikos was injurious to health led paradoxically to an improvement in government as officials refrained from attempts to gain more from the emperor. To draw attention to oneself could be to sign a death warrant.\textsuperscript{545} Andronikos judged matters between the sons of toil and the rich and well born equitably.\textsuperscript{546} The wealthy man accused by the poor man of injustice, extortion or physical assault was punished accordingly. Choniates provides a concrete example.\textsuperscript{547}

In his refusal to allow theological speculation, Andronikos forbade philosophical discussions. This was not to say that Andronikos had

\textsuperscript{542} \textit{teleutwv de kai kyna kárhoarou, óiou kai léousin antiplékxesba kai tinna éfipou óplítin katevnekeiv ërapie, sú nóikou éautw peptitç Historia, van Dieten 322:46-8.} \textsuperscript{543} \textit{Historia, van Dieten 322-3:53-9.} \textsuperscript{544} \textit{kai ágathwv metêxchew sou olígyon práxeiv Historia, van Dieten 324:5-6.} \textsuperscript{545} \textit{Historia, van Dieten 325-6:14-50.} \textsuperscript{546} \textit{apó toû dikaiou to dikaiou ep’ ‘iophs te tû tûn tûchyn xósmalo toû kai génei kai ploutw sémvnon Historia, van Dieten 330:76-7.} \textsuperscript{547} \textit{Historia, van Dieten 330-1:82-91.}
taken on the appearance of something completely savage.\textsuperscript{548} He did honour the best composer of enkomia and the men expert in law\textsuperscript{549}, but refused to allow newfangled speculation.\textsuperscript{550} The picture of himself at the Church of the Forty Martyrs, dressed as a labourer\textsuperscript{551} was a propaganda appeal to appear as one of the people - or at least as one not of the oppressors - and not an advertisement of the deed he unlawfully had done\textsuperscript{552} to win the throne. Choniates concludes by saying that Andronikos was not inhuman in all things, but displayed two natures: one human and one the wild beast.\textsuperscript{553}

III.2 The Great Unwashed as Outsiders.

In the broadest of outlines, the great unwashed do not emerge from Choniates's Narrative with credit. John II Komnenos is praised for the way in which he held himself aloof from the crowd.\textsuperscript{554} A large number of people - especially in Constantinople - are seen as a danger on Manuel's accession to be quieted with cash.\textsuperscript{555} They - as the

\textsuperscript{548} καὶ μὴν κόκεινο γε σημείον τοῦ μὴ παμπαν ἐκτεθρώσθαι 'Ἀνδρόνικου Historia, van Dieten 331:5-6.

\textsuperscript{549} Historia, van Dieten 331:9-11.

\textsuperscript{550} Historia, van Dieten 331:92-5.

\textsuperscript{551} Historia, van Dieten 332:25.

\textsuperscript{552} ἀπερ εἶχεν ἐπὶ τῶν ἠργῶν ἠμομηκῶς Historia, van Dieten 332:32-3.

\textsuperscript{553} οὐ γὰρ πάντῃ ἀπηθρώπιστο, ὡλλὰ κατὰ τὰ διαφῆ ἄνωτετοκομομαυροφόμενα μορφώματα θηριώδιος μετέχων καὶ βροτείῳ εἶδεν ἐκέκαστο Historia, van Dieten 353:31-3.

\textsuperscript{554} Historia, van Dieten 47:76-8. Perhaps a criticism of his son who did not.

\textsuperscript{555} Historia, van Dieten 49:42-5.
promiscuous crowd\textsuperscript{556} - can be won over with copper coins to rebellion.\textsuperscript{557} Once aroused, they become unstoppable, not least because of their mixed nature, by race and trades.\textsuperscript{558} The Constantinopolitans are to be called stupid.\textsuperscript{559} They are again denounced as being mixed by race, trade and age.\textsuperscript{560}

During the revolt of Branas, Isaak Angelos allowed citizens and foreigners\textsuperscript{561} to leave Constantinople to attack the countrymen near the City and those allocated to live in the Propontis region.\textsuperscript{562} The common beggarly crowd of the city and its environs\textsuperscript{563} went with the Latin troops under Conrad, and looted what they could find in the monasteries. Their depredations were stopped by the intervention of

\textsuperscript{556} τούς πλείστους τῶν ἐκ τοῦ ξύγκλους δήμου \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 232:36.

\textsuperscript{557} \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 232:39.

\textsuperscript{558} τὸ δὲ τῆς Κωνσταντίνου φιλοταραχώτατον μάλιστα, προπετεῖα χάραν καὶ σκολιάζου ταῖς ὀδοῖς, δοσὶ καὶ ἐκ διαφόρων πολίτευται τῶν γενῶν καὶ τῇ τῶν τεχνῶν ποικιλίᾳ συμμετάποιονται, ὡς εὑρετέρας τις, τὸ φρονεῖν \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 233-4:71-4; see also \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 343:27-31, 34-7.

\textsuperscript{559} τοῖς ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ ἀβελτέροις (οὕτω γὰρ χρεῶν τῶν Κωνσταντινουπολιτῶν δήμου καλεῖ) \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 270:24-5; see also \textit{Historia}, 349:14-9 and \textit{Historia}, 344:27-31.

\textsuperscript{560} ἐκ παντὸς γένους καὶ τεχνῆς ἀπάσης καὶ ἡλικίας \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 270:26-7.

\textsuperscript{561} ἀστυκοῖς τε καὶ ἀλλοχώροις \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 391:28.

\textsuperscript{562} τῶν τε ἄγχου τῆς πόλεως ἄγρωτῶν καὶ τῶν τῆς Προποντίδα λαχώτων εἰς σικτσίν \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 391:29-30.

\textsuperscript{563} τὸ ἀγελάζον καὶ πτωχεύον πλῆθος τῆς πόλεως καὶ τὰ πέρις \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 391:42-3.
certain men. In a separate category from the poor who looted and the nobles who restrained them were the artisans of the City, who opposed the Latin attacks on the Byzantines. The artisans attacked the houses of the Latins within the City. Nobles restrained some and the Latins tricked the simple. Choniates lays much of the blame on drunkenness. Love of wine was also held to be the cause of the destruction of the statue of Athena, which stood in the Forum of Constantine.

III.2.2 Social Differentiation of Lower Order Outsiders.

Slightly more detailed is the description of the silk-weavers' capture by the Sicilian fleet. When they captures Thebes, the Norman captain dealt with the artisans, and then still eager for the filth of money, he treated badly the powerful and the illustrious by

566. See also Historia, van Dieten 390:92-11 for another social stratification.
568. τοῖς τῶν Λατινικῶν γενῶν οἰκίαις Historia, van Dieten 392:64-5.
birth, distinguished on account of their age and notable by rank.572

He sailed off with the better sort, but also chose the women, beautiful in appearance with deep cleavage, who were also master weavers.573

The Normans moved on to Corinth where he enslaved the illustrious by birth of Corinth and took captive those women who are most beautiful, with deep cleavage.574 It is at the resolution of this kidnap raid that social differentiations are made clear. Manuel secured the return of the well born and those with imperial connections. Also included were those on the military registers. Excluded however were the people of Corinth and Thebes and those of lowly station, and those who wove the linen clothes and the beautiful, deep-cleavage women who practised this skill and their husbands.575

Almost a subcategory of the promiscuous rabble are the mobs keen on loot. Those who accompanied Conrad's Latins to the Propontis have been described. Those who entered the Great Palace with John are merely those gathered together from the promiscuous rabble.576

When they enter with Isaak Angelos to depose Andronikos Komnenos

572. τῶν τε χείρώνακτας ἐχεπίεσε καὶ περὶ τοῦ ρύπου τῶν ὀβολῶν πολυπράγμων γνώμενος τοὺς δυνατούς καὶ λαμπροὺς τὸ γένος καὶ σεμίνους τὴν ἡλικίαν καὶ περιφανεῖς κατ' ἀξίωσιν διαφόρους κακώσει καθυπέβαλε Historia, van Dieten 74:35-7.


they are just a lot of people. However, they did manage to empty the mint, break open the armouries, strip icons in the palatine churches and remove the wrapping of the Letter of Edessa.

The final element of the City crowd in The Narrative is in the conquest and its aftermath. The people of Constantinople acted like men and urged Alexios Angelos to defend the City, as they were patriots. With the conquest, the freedom known by the many was removed, without them having enjoyed it while they had it. With their expulsion, rustics and the common sort called the Constantinopolitans' poverty and nakedness equal citizenship, having not at that time experienced their own chastisement.

III.3 Upwardly-Mobile as Outsiders.

Like Psellus, Choniates is sensitive to movements in the scale of honours. The rapid elevation of persons for no reason served as a devaluation of the entire system. Not only were the dregs of Byzantine society, the members of street-corner society and the markets, the money-changers and the flax-weavers ennobled as sebastoi, but Skyths and Syrians,
held in contempt by those who formerly served emperors, found they could pay to become sebastoi.\textsuperscript{584} What this showed was Alexios Angelos’s weak understanding and failure to govern properly.\textsuperscript{585}

The careers of John Komnenos\textsuperscript{586}, Gregory Taronites\textsuperscript{587} and Gregory Kamateros\textsuperscript{588} show that family connection did not save one accused of poor administration, whilst the lack of family connection, if ability was present, was no hindrance to advancement. Constantine Angelos was not of a very eminent or well born family, but he did have a good physique and was graced with a fair face.\textsuperscript{589} Nature’s favour enabled him to marry Theodora Manuel’s aunt.\textsuperscript{590} His failure to drive back the Normans, and indeed his own eventual capture was due more to the reliance Manuel placed in astrology than in Constantine’s less elevated origins.

Constantine Angelos was part of the network of aristocratic families that surrounded the throne. So also was Kastamonites.

\textsuperscript{584} ού μόνον τοῖνοι ἐν τριώδοις καὶ ἁγοραῖς καὶ καλλυνθηται καὶ πρῶτοι τῶν οθωνίων σεβαστοί ἐτιμήθησαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ Σκύθαι καὶ Σύραι ὄνυν ἄργυρων εὑρετοῦ τὸ σεβασταί οἱ πρὶν ὑπηρετεῖσθαι δεσπόταις ἱδοξηκότες \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 484:62-65.

\textsuperscript{585} \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 484:66-8.

\textsuperscript{586} \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 9:10, 11-4.

\textsuperscript{587} \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 9:9, 14-6.

\textsuperscript{588} \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 9:16-22.

\textsuperscript{589} γένους ἵνα οὐκ ἐὐπαραύνου πάνυ καὶ εὐγενεύς, εὖ δ᾽ ἔχων τῆς σωματικῆς φύσει καὶ τοῦ προσώπου λεμώνα κάλλους \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 95:26-8.

\textsuperscript{590} \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 95:26-8.
Nothing was done without his knowledge, and not one of the officials was allowed to sit with him, but had to stand in a slavish attitude.\footnote{άλλα παρισταντο πάντες δουλοπρεπεί σχήματι \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 438:36-8, i.e. as if they were standing in front of the emperor.}

Kastamonites was eventually carried off by the illness in his joints\footnote{The episode when he collapsed and the judge of the velum attempted to render first aid (\textit{Historia}, van Dieten 439:61-3) suggests that Byzantium was not the place for samaritans.} and he was replaced by Constantine Mesopotamites, described by Choniates as a small child.\footnote{οὐδίον μικρὸν \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 439:70.} He was a youngster with slate in hand, who should have been at school.\footnote{νεανισκάριον τι γραμματιστοῦ καὶ πυκνιδίου δεόμενον \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 439:68-9.} He became more powerful than Kastamonites and deemed legal whatever Isaak Angelos willed.\footnote{\textit{Historia}, van Dieten 439:78-80.}

\section*{III.3.2 Servants as Outsiders.}

The emperor Manuel at Myriokephalon received the two faces of his people. Defeated and alone, gathering his breath under a wild pear tree after the battle, some one from the mounted regiments saw him [Manuel] and took pity on him. This [soldier] was of the undistinguished mass of Byzantines.\footnote{ιδὼν δὲ τις αὐτῶν καὶ οἰκτείρος ἐκ τοῦ τῶν ἱππέων τάγματος, καὶ οὕτως τῶν ἀφενῶν καὶ πολλῶν \textit{Ῥωμαίων} \textit{Historia}, van Dieten 184:12-3.} He offered to serve Manuel as well as he was able, and set the emperor's helm back straight on his head. The less palatable face of the Byzantine lower orders
confronted Manuel in the form of a certain rash and bold man, who set the emperor straight on how much blood of Christians the emperor had drunk (in taxation). When Manuel proposed flight it was some one of the unknown soldiers standing outside the tent who kept him on the straight and narrow.

Though Manuel Komnenos began with excellent intentions, it did not last. He governed imperiously, and treated those under his hand not as free men, but as allotted servants. This treatment of imperial ministers as slaves by Manuel serves more as a criticism of the emperor than a true indicator of how slaves were treated or distinguished in twelfth-century Byzantium. To see just how hopeless such an attempt would be, note the positive description of Manuel’s treatment of the Sicilians, whether they wanted to stay to take service or wished to leave.

It was this lack of prejudice that encouraged the Sicilians to take service with Manuel. The impression might be gained that to serve Manuel as a chamberlain, a eunuch of the private chambers or as one of the other-speaking barbarian mumblers of the attendants from the

597. ὁ τάγος καὶ ὁ θραύσης Πιστίς van Dieten 186:59.

598. Ἀλίκ καὶ τὰς ἐξωθεν ἐστὶ καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς ἐκ τῶν ἀγνώστων στρατιωτῶν Historia, van Dieten 187:4-5.

599. τοῖς ὑπὸ χείρα ὑμᾶς ἐλευθεροῖς, ἀλλ᾽ ὡς κληρωτοῖς θεράπουσι προσφέρομενος Historia, van Dieten 60:37-8. θεράπων implies the free service of an attendant rather than a δοῦλος as such, but here it is being contrasted with free men.

nations was a good thing. However, these groups had the ear of the emperor, and easily gained what they wanted. Choniates disapproves; servants of the emperor should be just that. Choniates says that Manuel gave money to his relations; that was right and proper.

However, this was part of a larger picture where he wasted money. His niece, with whom he had sexual relations, together with their son, had whole seas of money at their disposal.

Manuel’s scheme of using the expertise of some noble Roman man in connection with the loyalty of his barbarian money gatherers, backfired badly. The Romans who were efficient and faithful by nature and training were alienated and sided with the barbarians, because they saw they were being treated as slaves, rather than as trusted imperial officials. Choniates’s ideal emperor was one who did not treat public estates as private demesnes, nor free men as slaves.

601. τοὺς κατευναστήριοι καὶ θαλαμητόλους ἐκτομίας, ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ τοὺς ὑπὸ γενέων ἑτερογλώττων ὑποβαρβιστικούσιν ὑπηρέταις Historia, van Dieten 204:3-5.


The tone of Choniates's *Narrative* is religious, a jeremiad, and Niketas accepts for himself some of the blame for what has befallen his society. When Isaak and Alexios Angelos took gold from the churches to give to the Latins, Niketas and his ilk stayed silent. With the fall of the City the Byzantines became the ultimate outsiders.

With one house lost, Choniates rested in his other house, his Venetian helpmeet serving as a deterrent. With the arrival of the French imminent, they were forced to flee, managing as best they could as their own servants had inhumanly abandoned them. Though all was lost, and Choniates was on his way to exile, all was not anomie. Called upon by an old and sick father, Choniates acted to save the judge's daughter. Though the environment lay in ruins, the pattern of Byzantine social order remained.

The basic structure of outsiders as rebels, the crowd and the parvenu works in Choniates's *Narrative*. With the capture of the city we are given a strong vision of the author as outsider. However, a sense exists that though the loss of the City is a divine punishment, as

---

609. *Historia*, van Dieten 552:71-6; see also 569:7-10.

610. τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἡμῶν *Historia*, van Dieten 575:68-9; see also 579:77-8 η ἀγγελία ἡμῶν μετεστράφη εἰς ἀλλοτρίους, οί συνε ἡμῶν εἰς ἔπλους.


with the Babylonian captivity, it is to give the Byzantines to
opportunity to repent and rediscover their own values, not to convert
to their conquerors’ ways.

IV General Conclusion.

In these accounts of the numerous rebels similar attributes are
given to the rebels as in The Chronographia and The Alexiad and The
Narrative: rebels who are to succeed are treated carefully; those of
high station are treated circumspectly; those drawn from the lower
orders are given short shift. A complicating element in the treatment
of the rebels in the three works is that the apparent aims of the works
are so very different. Psellos writes to inform us of the centrality of
Psellos’s role in shaping Byzantine destiny, of which rebels are one
part; Komnene describes rebels in glowing terms to increase her
father’s kudos when he defeats them; Choniates uses rebels to stress
the “vale of tears” quality of his history.

In all three works, the crowd is portrayed as stupid, with a tendency
to be swayed by flattery or financial gain. This is related to their lack
of education, and thus by association to their condition as “not free” at
least when compared with the emperor. The crowd of the reigning
City is however, free when compared with the Byzantine provincials
and definitely so when compared with foreigners in the West or
Muslim East. They may descend to the level of beasts, but this is for a
special reason.

Education also plays a role in the descriptions of the upwardly
mobile. The uneducated ousting those who have worked their way up
through the ranks of the imperial bureaucracy exercises Psellos
considerably in the Chronographia. It is only less apparent in Choniates's Narrative, where the upward mobility is often part of God's larger outworking of punishment. It may also be due to their different career histories: Psellos was eventually ousted by the parvenus he feared and spent his final years attempting to gain imperial favour; Choniates too was ousted from his office as Logothete of the Sekreta, by Philokales, father-in-law of Alexios Doukas\textsuperscript{614}, but in the surrounding maelstrom it had less impact than the loss of his world signalled by the loss of Constantinople.

All three works also make mention of the occult as an indicator of "outsiderness". The many persons treated as outsiders means that one cannot generate a picture of how Byzantines viewed social outsiders. The description of the Macedonians during the rebellion of Tornikios shows the complicated nature of the descriptions of outsiders. The Macedonians could be considered outsiders by ethnic origin; secondly as rebels they stand outside the duly established order; finally as the account by Psellos shows, they are outsiders by τῶς as well, as their comic turn was more suited to the riff-raff of the city rather than the disciplined members of an army camp. Similar complexities occur when imperial charity to the poor, sick and destitute is mentioned. Such occasions tell us far more about the emperor than they do about the poor.

The works must be examined as literature, to see how they function, and what roles the outsider characters might play. These

\textsuperscript{614} Historia, van Dieten 565:13-5.
considerations are really the matter of the concluding chapter, to which I now turn.
CHAPTER EIGHT

CONCLUSION.

The purpose of this research was to examine attitudes to the Byzantine outsider. A long-term goal remains to examine how Byzantine society was articulated in the relationships between insider and outsider.\(^1\) Before that research can be undertaken, it is necessary to refine the definitions of insider and outsider in Byzantine society in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. To that end, I have developed a methodology, presented in this thesis in two strands. Firstly, given the literary nature of many surviving Byzantine written sources, the way in which these sources should be used to gain most understanding of the people who produced them was made explicit. The second strand in my methodology was to use sociological definitions - specifically the labellist perspective - of outsiders and the wider society in which they were located.

The evidence presented in this thesis provides indicators of the portrayal of outsiders in the three texts in terms of the four by three matrix. The four categories are not how the Byzantines divided their outsiders; they are how I controlled my analysis of the Byzantine portrayals of eleventh- and twelfth-century outsiders. The categories are fluid. They are ranges of amplitude on which certain role-bundles of social action appear. An individual may be placed as an outsider on one of the four ranges, but relative positions on the other ranges may ensure an insider status. By contrast, an outsider role on all four lines

\(^1\) Patlagean, "Le barbare et la loi", 86.
reinforces the outsider status. Insider or outsider status is not an absolute: some outsiders are cast out further than others.

In my examination of gendered outsiders in Psellos's Chronographia, I attempted to implement Rosaldo's third category of feminist analysis, using gender to isolate relations between people differentiated by social manifestations of biological sex. Many elements Psellos holds to be common to individuals regardless of gender, though his presentation is less certain where women in power are concerned. Psellos does not portray eunuchs as some form of third gender; they are simply men who cannot have children. Psellos saw a clear separation of socially constructed gender and the biological imperative.

Outsiders by religion are more noticeable by their absence than their presence in The Chronographia. Divination and soothsaying are mentioned, and given a negative connotation, but this is normally to reinforce a criticism grounded elsewhere, for example the rebel Bardas Phokas's reliance on omens in contrast to Basil II's reliance on the Theotokos, or Romanos III and Zoë's recourse to topical medicines, pebbles and other amulets. His description of Constantine Monomachos's response to the events at Zoë's tomb suggests a critical attitude to the faith - which of course got Psellos into trouble - but largely there is no cloud of noxious heretics ready to embrace and pervert the faithful at the first opportunity.

In the range of the outsider by ethnic origin, the Tauroskythian (Rhos) attack on Constantinople is the great example of the foreign intervention. Otherwise, ethnic outsiders are people attempting to
move in too close to the centres of power, to which Psellos himself had only just gained admittance. The empire to Psellos is surrounded by barbarian foreigners, and it is the job of the emperor to fight them off; he should not buy them off with money and Byzantine honours. Psellos frequently uses the slur of ethnic origin, though there are occasions when an ethnic origin is cause for comment, with no negative connotation. The cause for this prominence may be Psellos’s concentration (in comparison with the other two texts) on the City and the palace. However, even for Psellos, where the non-Roman ally on the battlefield is not such an important role, he does use names that imply an actual contemporary referent group, rather than a generic "barbarian" tag. The definition of Psellos’s outsiders must be seen in relation to their function in the work, as their function - whether they are good guys or bad guys - strongly colours how they are presented.

The same is true of the presentation of outsiders by religion in The Alexiad. The heretics who appear make little sense in isolation. The episode of Basil the Bogomil must be seen in its context at the climax of the literary work: not only did Alexios triumph on the battlefield, but he was better at teaching the faith to heretics than a crowd of clerics. Many of the traditional stereotypes of heresy and the heretic are to be found, such as their deceit and dissimulation. However, notions of heresy are used to reinforce themes in the work. Leo of Chalcedon's weak understanding led him to oppose Alexios, and Italos was denounced as a heretic as well as for his foreign origin and barbaric nature which remained unbridled by Greek education. Nilos
was similarly connected with Armenians, both foreign and heterodox. Anna Komnene used heretic as a label for outsiders.

In the matter of outsider by gender, any attempt to equate gendered outsiders with women comes unstuck by Book II of *The Alexiad*. Anna Komnene’s women are strong, forceful characters, whether they are playing the Byzantine succession game in the Great Palace, defending Italian cities until the arrival of their sons, or encouraging their husbands’ troops - both Irene and Gaita. Men who fail to live up to Anna Komnene’s expectation of their gender, however, are outsiders by gender - their crime further compounded because their failure is usually on the battlefield which adds further difficulties to the labours of Alexios.

Outsiders by ethnic origin are well in evidence in *The Alexiad*. However, what is overlooked is that there are insiders in spite of ethnic origin. The danger is in using Anna Komnene’s portrayal of Guiscard and Bohemond and applying it universally as her attitude to foreigners; in effect using it as a stereotype. What determined outsider status to Anna Komnene was one’s attitude to Alexios. If one supported Alexios, then foreign or ethnic origin could be overlooked; if one opposed him, if any ethnic aspersion could be cast it was.

Berry and Tischler’s classification of interaction is the best way of organizing Choniates’s *Narrative’s* many outsiders by race. Choniates attempts to explain the failure to meet the challenge of the more frequent and more varied interactions, and this results in a more complex (than in *The Chronographia* or *The Alexiad*) picture of interaction between Byzantine and Other by race.
In the matter of outsiders by gender, Choniates is particularly weak. The well-developed women weavers of Thebes seem to be insiders, whose loss Choniates is denouncing, rather than outsiders. Anna Komnene, at the start of the work is an outsider, but this is not because she is a woman, but because she is a rebel. Women may help their husbands or they may be the source of temptation, such as Philippa of Antioch. Men may forget their martial ways in the face of this temptation (though this is usually only short-term) or they may lack manly vigour entirely. The structure of the work, which attempts to explain a military defeat, may in part explain the emphasis on warfare, and a concomitant lack of detail on gender difference.

Outsiders by religion are also subordinated to the needs of the work. The religious difference between Venetians and Byzantines are not stressed; what is stressed is that they were two groups with different goals. The final religious madness of Manuel Komnenos, when he attempted to ameliorate the oaths of abjuration required of Muslim converts to Christianity, places Niketas Choniates with the religious establishment, unwilling to adapt their perceptions to changing circumstances.

I began my study of Byzantine outsiders with three articles drawn from the secondary literature. It seems fitting as well as symmetrical to draw strands together with an examination of how two scholars have recently approached the same problem.² The article by Reinsch

does not provide a model, though some aspects of his approach are good. The article treats the foreigners in The Alexiad as a single group, and not as disparate ethnic groups. It raises the question of the foreigner as "outsider" or "other". It introduces various concepts from sociology, such as the viewpoint of the educated leadership\(^3\), the speech-community\(^4\), and the power and cultural élite\(^5\), all of which are useful in increasing our understanding of how the Byzantine society of Anna Komnene was articulated. In the latter part of the article, in his examination of the treatment of Robert Guiscard and Bohemond as the Norman examples of the βάρβαροι, Reinsch provides a useful schema of the way in which The Alexiad is organized, pointing out that Robert and Bohemond are to be seen as the antithesis of Alexios in everything they do. Raymond de St. Gilles is then presented as a foil to these supreme opponents of Alexios.

Given The Alexiad's status as a work of literature, recognized by Reinsch, who describes it as "kein plattes Propaganda-Pamphlet, das sich mit einem einfachen Schwarz-Weiß-Schema begnügte,"\(^6\) it is unfortunate that he does not deal with the problems of using a source written in rhetorical style, by an author well aware of what she was doing. He makes reference to the fact that the use of a rhetorical

\(^3\) "die Anschauungen der gebildeten Führungsschicht" Reinsch, "Ausländer und Byzantiner", 259.

\(^4\) "die Sprachgemeinschaft" Reinsch, "Ausländer und Byzantiner", 262.

\(^5\) "die Macht- und Bildungselite" Reinsch, "Ausländer und Byzantiner", 257.

figure (variatio, elegant variation) does not preclude an ideological function, but does not address the wider questions of how to approach such a source text. It is regrettable that Reinsch does not tackle the problem of intention more directly than references to "welch gezeilter Stoßrichtung" and "direktes Autoren-urteil" and "die Kompositionelle Absicht Annas". The overwhelming impetus to deconstruction as a tool of historical source analysis is perhaps (fortunately) on the wane, but given that our sources have the conscious artificiality of literature, all methods of literary criticism must be investigated to find the most illuminating.

Similarly, Reinsch’s dismissal of Anna’s gender as a significant consideration in interpreting the work will not do. His criticism of much of the scholarly literature’s use of terms such as "the princess", the "Princess-Royal" and the "[female] chronicler" as concealing implicit and ill-considered opinions is well-founded. Having mentioned the problem, however, Reinsch cannot dismiss it without meeting it foursquare. It is significant that "der Autor eine Frau ist" most obviously when she is describing the wild appeal of Bohemond,

or in her treatment of women in the narrative. For Reinsch gender differentiation does not constitute "foreignness", but this position must be justified, not assumed.

Reinsch concentrates on the term βάρβαρος as signifying "foreigner". A serious lack of clarity in terminology is present by the beginning of the second paragraph.\textsuperscript{14} The title of the article lays clear ground rules: foreigners and Byzantines. When\textsuperscript{15} the concept of the "other" is introduced, it would illuminate our understanding of Byzantine attitudes to foreigners, but only if made clear that "other" is not identical with "foreigner". Later in the article\textsuperscript{16}, Reinsch establishes that βάρβαρος may be equated with foreigner, when he describes how Alans and Paulicians are never described as foreigners, being merely ἐξ ἀλλοδοιπῆς or ἄλλοτριον, but not βάρβαρος as were the Patzinaks, Cumans, Germans, or Varangians. But this comes at a point when he has already dealt with major elements of the treatment of the βάρβαρος in The Alexiad.

What does the term βάρβαρος mean? Reinsch's definition is broad:

\begin{quote}
Das Wort βάρβαρος hat ja den Vorteil, daß es auch als reines Appellativum synonym für den jeweiligen Völker- oder Personennamen in einfacher stilistischer variatio verwendet werden kann, jederzeit aber bereit, die virtuell in ihm vorhandenen Negativ-Konnotationen bei passender Gelegenheit aus sich zu entlassen.\textsuperscript{17}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{14} As an aside, I think that some justification of the concentration on the "Anderen" in the Komnenian period is required.

\textsuperscript{15} Reinsch, "Ausländer und Byzantiner", 257:3 & 4 (2nd. paragraph).


\textsuperscript{17} Reinsch, "Ausländer und Byzantiner", 265.
Yet at almost the same point, he develops the idea that speech could be used as an identifier to place people beyond significant boundaries, taking further ideas about Byzantine society of the eleventh and twelfth centuries as a speech community highly aware of the differences implied by accent and deviation from standard usage. Viewing Byzantine society as a speech-community is useful, both in terms of non-Greek speaking inhabitants of the empire [or at least non-standard speakers of the language] as is the case for Italos, and in gender studies. The problem, which Reinsch does not address, is whether Alexios I Komnenos, because of his problems with the letter "r", could or should be considered as a βαρβαρος. The notion of the βαρβαρος is not a monolithic whole, it depends on one's perspective, but Reinsch does not explain where the differences lie, nor how they function.

Returning to more obvious βαρβαροι, Robert Guiscard and Bohemond are used as examples of the barbarian Normans - which indeed they were - but then Reinsch makes no attempt to account for how Raymond de St. Gilles, also a westerner, if a Kelt to Anna rather than a Norman, could serve as the weiße Raben. Even more difficult is Anna's description of the prowess of her brother-in-law Nikephoros

20. Alexiad I viii 1, Leib 1:31 22-3.
Euphorbenos as being more like a Norman than a Roman²².

Granted, the identification of Norman with βάρβαρος is not explicit here, but surely this underlines the need for erklärendes Verstehen.

The root cause of this lack of clarity in definition is a singular disregard for the context in which these terms appear. Reinsch limits himself mainly to a discussion of the term βάρβαρος, but the same consideration applies to all descriptions within The Alexiad. With notions of continuity and tradition, Reinsch introduces rhetoric; indeed, rhetoric is used as the example of continuity. This early introduction of rhetoric, coupled with an identification of Anna Komnene’s wide education in grammar and the proper use of letters,²³ sadly does not lead on to a proper discussion of how rhetoric, an integral part of the cultural baggage of the dominant ideology of Byzantine society, constrained the perceptions of the élite, and at the same time enabled them to reflect the reality they encountered, in so far as they were able to do so. Instead, we are given the notion of the βάρβαρος as an element of Byzantine culture derived from classical antiquity, as indeed it is, but only that.

Explicitly: whilst indeed Anna draws a distinction between βάρβαρος and Ἰωμαῖος, between "us" and "the rest of the world", there are other meanings to the term βάρβαρος, which Reinsch does not integrate fully in his treatment. The classical dichotomy would be between barbarians and Greeks; for Anna it is between βάρβαροι and


'Ρωμαιός, the romanité chrétienne de Byzance as she constructed it, and those she excludes from that construction. Judgments of outsiders must be taken in context.

When Reinsch moves on to deal with those named as barbarians regularly and routinely, he seems to develop a neutral-value view of the term at variance with his earlier view of it as the name given to depersonalized deviations from Normalmensch. The evidence within The Alexiad supports these multiple views of the barbarian, but Reinsch fails to come to terms with it. Similarly the simplistic identification of "Türken (Muslime)" will not do, just as the differences of Kelt, Norman, Latin and Christian must be explained.

At a low point indicating something between man and the animals, and then rising to serve as a value-free term of elegant variation, ὄρομος is now given positive characteristics. Only his tendency towards drunkenness, which permitted Kilij-Arslan to make fun of Alexios's gout, kept the Turk a barbarian; the Sultan of Cairo acted as a courtly knight - almost but not quite the equal of Alexios - in the matter of the captured Frankish knights. That Anna's account shows "barbarian" Turks in positive light must raise the question of how firmly she saw them as ὄρομοι in the classical sense, or rather how she integrated her perception of them as ὄρομοι in the classical sense with her understanding of their role in the society in which she lived. The actions of Nemitzes are standard fare for Reinsch's view of

the barbarian. Are more interesting questions not why was the account placed here, and why Alexios refrained from giving him his just deserts after such actions?

In some ways the article by Laiou marks an improvement over Reinsch in that the connection between the foreigner and stranger is emphasized, rather than concealed. Picking up on ideas developed in Lopez's article - though it is not cited - Laiou links the idea of the foreigner to legal and political definitions to do with jurisdictions. This is then contrasted with the notion of the ξένος, the stranger and its synonym ὁ ἀλλότριος the Other. Laiou draws too strong a distinction between these two concepts of foreigner and stranger/Other. My experience of the sources indicates that the separation of the Byzantine terms is not as clear-cut as Laiou states. In the example she supplies as evidence, the Other who is a friend contrasted with the relative who is an enemy, is surely stronger than merely "someone outside the small grouping, often meaning outside the family". This is especially relevant as the social order has been overturned by this event, and the Other is John Axouch, the Nicaean Turk captured in war and given to his son John as a companion by Alexios I Komnenos.

Laiou focuses on the foreigner and locates her evidence as derived from the educated élite of the capital. She stresses the importance of

27. Perhaps to reduce Alexios's dependence on "barbarians" now that the contingent of Maniakes's Λεβιάνων Alexiad VII xi 2, Leib 2:1173 had arrived.
the twelfth century as a period of increased contact which required improved strategies of interaction.\textsuperscript{30} The traditional idea of Constantinople as the centre surrounded by barbarians continues, with its classical terminology and stereotypes. However, names contemporary to the twelfth century are also used.\textsuperscript{31} Laiou proposes that religion is no longer used as a boundary marker: she distinguishes strongly between the religious identifications in \textit{The Alexiad} and Choniates's \textit{Narrative}. The evidence of these texts does not support her conclusion. Anna Komnene's presentation of her father does make her show him as having Christian charity to all Christians, even if they were attacking the empire. The Normans' nature makes barbarians of them just like the Turks and Patzinaks.\textsuperscript{32} Similarly, Choniates's description of the Turks in biblical terms as the descendants of the bondwoman Hagar, allowed by God to destroy His holy people requires more than "But this signifies very little."\textsuperscript{33} Sense is made of \textit{The Alexiad} by seeing the importance of the criticism of the twelfth-century present in comparison with the good old days of the emperor Alexios. Similarly, Choniates's \textit{Narrative} makes sense when seen as a jeremiad for the loss of the City.

In terms more strictly related to the subject of the article, religion cannot be so easily marginalized to the Byzantines' self-conception, nor to their construction of the Other. Laiou suggests "a secular

\textsuperscript{30} Laiou, "The Foreigner and the Stranger", 72.

\textsuperscript{31} Laiou, "The Foreigner and the Stranger", 73.

\textsuperscript{32} Laiou, "The Foreigner and the Stranger", 74.

\textsuperscript{33} Laiou, "The Foreigner and the Stranger", 75.
definition of ethnicity" of Romanness, while admitting that "the term Roman, however, as used in the twelfth century lacks a specific and consistent content. It certainly lacks any ethnic content."34 She then gives this secular, political meaning a religious definition: "a "Roman" was a Christian subject of the Byzantine emperor."35 These attempts at rigorous definition show that Byzantine foreigners and strangers are not so distinct.

Other symbolic markers - free/slave, Greek-speaker/other-tongued - are pointed to, but without close attention to the texts in their entirety, the divisions are made too definite and Byzantine complexities are ignored. Laiou's classification of the modes of interaction with the outsider as accommodation is less helpful than the five categories of annihilation, segregation, stratification, pluralism and assimilation, which allow a more comprehensive analysis of all the various ways in which interaction with the outsider could be accommodated in the Byzantine thought-world.

Laiou makes the good point that further work should be done to try and clarify the attitude of the non-elite to strangers and foreigners: did they differentiate between foreigners and Byzantines from the City? Though under special circumstances, Niketas Choniates's experience with the people of Nicaea after 1204 suggests that they did, but that it was not necessarily a pleasurable experience.

Taken as a whole, Laiou's article has sounder theoretical underpinnings, but it is severely weakened by the piece-meal

---

34. Laiou, "The Foreigner and the Stranger", 76.
approach to literary sources. Byzantine attitudes to outsiders will never be understood if they are divorced from the work in which they are expressed, the author who wrote them, the audience who first understood them and the wider context in which the communication took place.

The social category of the outsider makes more sense when it is analyzed in opposition to the insider, its definer; and when it works through the whole text. The method I have adopted is laborious and the evidence it generates is cumbersome. This however is a problem of presentation, which is easier to redress than the more serious methodological problems raised when episodes are used as evidence of the presentation of a particular ideology, without reference to contra-indicators in the same text. The goal is balance between stimulating presentation with sufficient evidence to remove reasonable doubt opposed to exhaustive (and exhausting) attention to detail in the search for the final exception.

The single most important conclusion, supported by my research evidence, is that the eleventh- and twelfth-century Byzantine presentation of the outsider is not a simple opposition of barbarian and Roman (Byzantine). A barbarian could and did mean lots of things. It could be a hairy wild-man nomad from up north. It could be a Kievan Rhos: once a wild man, but now civilized Christian and in the Byzantine orbit, described as a barbarian only when he has the temerity to attack the Queen of Cities. The same is true of other outsider categories. Muslim religion is a strong "push-factor" towards barbarian status, but when contrasted with the actions of some
westerners who were attacking the Byzantine empire, then the barbarian quality of the Muslim Turks could be ignored or concealed in the names they were given. Persians are not Romans, but they are not merely barbarians either; Persians - whoever they actually are - are almost (but not quite) on the "us" side of the boundary. They are therefore worthy opponents. Finally, people we would term as Byzantines - most notably Macedonians from Adrianople, but also the urban crowd or illiterate peasants - could be termed barbarians if to do so served the needs of the author.

My reading of the secondary literature led me to expect a slipshod use of terms to describe groups of people. However in the texts they are called barbarians, but they are also given other names, such as Rhos, Patzinak and German, as well as ones derived from the Byzantine past such as Persian and Skyth, and those names reflect contemporary usage, and convey contemporary meaning. The problem is to understand that meaning.

The method of detailed examination of the texts makes possible an analysis of Byzantine attitudes to outsiders which is firmly rooted in the evidence. It needs to be extended in several ways to substantiate the preliminary conclusions. The simplest extension is a widening out to cover all thirteen histories of the period. The next stage is more complex, as it requires that the narrative histories used in the method be placed in the wider context of Byzantine literature of the period. This will force an answer to the debate between adherents of a generic approach to literature and those who feel such an approach does irreparable, unnecessary damage to authorial Einheit. When
coherence is brought to the presentation of the outsider in Byzantine literature in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, then the surviving documentary evidence should be examined to see if presentations in documents confirm, refine or contradict the evidence from the literary sources.

This examination of all Byzantine written sources in the period for the presentation of the outsider will also provide evidence for the presentation of the insider, the romanité chrétienne de Byzance. The identification of these two opposing poles, together with the variations imputed to them by differing authors in different sources will allow an examination of how Byzantine insiders saw themselves, and how they saw their interaction with those they defined as outsiders. Changes to this perception - caused by different author or changed circumstances - can then be identified and possible explanations advanced.

The outsider cannot be understood without understanding the insider who defines the Other. Given the nature of the evidence, the definer will be a Byzantine author, and the method will succeed only if the author is recognized as insider and outsider. Shklovskii holds that artists are always outsiders, making strange the familiar, just as van den Berghe preserves that role for the sociologist. In this thesis, I have used the latter to examine the former. Encapsulating the method, the final word must go to Kekaumenos, who tells us to treat literature seriously, not as "the text" or "nothing but the text", but as "the whole text":

36. Hawkes, Structuralism and Semiotics, 63.
37. van den Berghe, quoted by Marger in Elites and Masses, 1.
You should start to read from the cover which has the beginning of the letters until not a letter remains in it, and you'll gain a lot. It is the act of a dilettante not to read the whole book through two or three times, but to pick out a few [stories] for gossip.38
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