

ICONOCLASM

Papers given at the Ninth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies

University of Birmingham

March 1975

Edited by

ANTHONY BRYER and JUDITH HERRIN

Centre for Byzantine Studies
University of Birmingham



This material is presented solely for non-commercial educational/research purposes.

Centre for Byzantine Studies,
University of Birmingham
Printed by John Goodman & Sons (Printers) Ltd.
Birmingham 4
England
Published by Centre for Byzantine Studies
© Copyright The Editors
ISBN 0 7044 0226 2
1st Publication 1977

CONTENTS

			<i>Page</i>
		Foreword	v
		Illustrations	viii
		Abbreviations	x
I	CYRIL MANGO	Historical Introduction	1
II	LESLIE BARNARD	The Theology of Images	7
III	JUDITH HERRIN	The Context of Iconoclast Reform	15
IV	HÉLÈNE AHRWEILER	The Geography of the Iconoclast World	21
V	PETER LLEWELLYN	The Roman Church on the Outbreak of Iconoclasm	29
VI	ROBIN CORMACK	The Arts during the Age of Iconoclasm	35
VII	OLEG GRABAR	Islam and Iconoclasm	45
VIII	SEBASTIAN BROCK	Iconoclasm and the Monophysites	53
IX	MARLIA MUNDELL	Monophysite Church Decoration	59
X	LESLIE BARNARD	The Paulicians and Iconoclasm	75
	ANTHONY BRYER	Excursus on Mananalis, Samosata of Armenia and Paulician Geography	83
XI	ANN MOFFATT	Schooling in the Iconoclast Centuries	85
XII	ANTHONY CUTLER	The Byzantine Psalter: Before and after Iconoclasm	93
XIII	ANN WHARTON EPSTEIN	The 'Iconoclast' Churches of Cappadocia	103
XIV	IHOR ŠEVČENKO	Hagiography of the Iconoclast Period	113
XV	CYRIL MANGO	The Liquidation of Iconoclasm and the Patriarch Photios	133
XVI	PATRICIA KARLIN-HAYTER	Gregory of Syracuse, Ignatios and Photios	141
XVII	ROBIN CORMACK	Painting after Iconoclasm	147
XVIII	DAVID FREEDBERG	The Structure of Byzantine and European Iconoclasm	165
		Chronology	178
		Anthology of Texts	180
		Index	187

ABBREVIATIONS

Byzantinists traditionally disclaim consistency in transliteration. Although its principles may not be immediately apparent, a single transliteration system has been imposed consistently on all contributions. The "Style Guide for the Dumbarton Oaks Papers," *DOP*, 26 (1972), 363–5, has been adopted.

In addition to the "Dumbarton Oaks List of Abbreviations," *DOP*, 27 (1973), 329–339, the following are used in this volume:

TEXTS

Cedrenus

Georgius Cedrenus Ioannis Scylitzae ope, Bonn ed. (ed. I. Bekker, 2 vols., *CSHB* [Bonn, 1838–9]).

Genesisius

[Joseph] Genesisius [*Regna*], Bonn ed. (ed. C. Lachmann, *CSHB* [Bonn, 1834]).

Georgius Monachus

Georgius Monachus (Harmatolus), *Chronicon*, ed. C. de Boor, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1904) = Bonn ed. (*Georgii Monachi Vitae Imperatorum Recentiorum*, ed. I. Bekker, *CSHB* [Bonn, 1838], 761–924; see under Pseudo-Symeon).

Nicephorus

Nicephori Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani Opuscula Historica, ed. C. de Boor (Leipzig, 1880); *Historia syntomos* (Brevarium), 1–77.

Scriptor incertus de Leone

Scriptor incertus de Leone Armenio, Bonn ed. (ed. I. Bekker, *CSHB* [Bonn, 1842] in *Leonis Grammatici Chronographia*, 335–362) = PG, 108 (1863), cols. 1009–1037.

Pseudo-Symeon

Symeon Magistri Annales, Bonn ed. (ed. I. Bekker, *CSHB* [Bonn, 1838] in *Theophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus*, 601–760).

Synaxarium CP

Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae. Propylaeum ad ActaSS Novembris, ed. H. Delehaye (Brussels, 1902; reprinted Louvain, 1954).

Theophanes

Theophanis Chronographia, ed. C. de Boor, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1883–5; reprinted Hildesheim, 1963).

Theophanes Continuatus

Theophanes Continuatus, [*Chronographia*], Bonn ed. (ed. I. Bekker, *CSHB* [Bonn, 1838], 3–481; see under Pseudo-Symeon).

OTHER WORKS

Alexander, *Nicephorus*

P. J. Alexander, *The Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople. Ecclesiastical Policy and Image Worship in the Byzantine Empire* (Oxford, 1958).

Alexander, "Sect"

P. J. Alexander, "An ascetic sect of Iconoclasts in seventh-century Armenia," in *Late Classical and Medieval Studies in Honor of A. M. Friend, Jr.* (Princeton, 1954), 155–160.

Alexander, *DOP*, 7 (1953)

P. J. Alexander, "The Iconoclastic Council of St. Sophia (815) and its Definition (*Horos*)," *DOP*, 7 (1953), 35–66.

Anastos, "Leo III's Edict"

M. V. Anastos, "Leo III's Edict against the images in the year 726–7 and Italo-Byzantine Relations between 726 and 730," in *Polychordia. Festschrift F. Dölger*, III (= *ByzFor*, [1968]), 5–41.

Anastos, "Ethical Theory"

M. V. Anastos, "The Ethical Theory of Images formulated by the Iconoclasts in 754 and 815," *DOP*, 8 (1954), 151–160.

Anastos, "754"

M. V. Anastos, "The Argument for Iconoclasm as presented to the Iconoclastic Council of 754," in *Late Classical and Medieval Studies in Honor of A. M. Friend, Jr.* (Princeton, 1954), 177–188.

Barnard, *Background*

L. W. Barnard, *The Graeco-Roman and Oriental Background of the Iconoclastic Controversy* (= *Byzantina Neerlandica*, 5) (Leiden, 1974).

Beck, *Kirche und Theologische Literatur*

H.-G. Beck, *Kirche und Theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich* (Munich, 1959).

ABBREVIATIONS *Continued*

- Brown, *EHR*, 346 (1973)
 P. Brown, "A Dark-Age Crisis: aspects of the Iconoclastic Controversy," *EHR*, 346 (1973), 1–34.
- Dölger, *Regesten*
 F. Dölger, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des Oströmischen Reiches* (Corpus der Griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der Neueren Zeit), I (Munich-Berlin, 1924).
- George, *Saint-Eirene*
 W. S. George, *The Church of Saint Eirene at Constantinople* (Oxford, 1912).
- Gero, *Byzantion*, 44 (1974)
 S. Gero, "Notes on Byzantine Iconoclasm in the eighth century," *Byzantion*, 44 (1974), 23–42.
- Gero, *BZ*, 68 (1975)
 S. Gero, "The eucharistic doctrine of the Byzantine Iconoclasts and its sources," *BZ*, 68 (1975), 4–22.
- Gero, *Leo III*
 S. Gero, *Byzantine Iconoclasm during the reign of Leo III. With particular attention to the Oriental Sources* (= Corpus Scriptorum Christ. Orient., 346, Subsidia, 41) (Louvain, 1973).
- Gouillard, "Deux figures"
 J. Gouillard, "Deux figures mal connues du second iconoclasme du IXe siècle," *Byzantion*, 31 (1961), 371–401.
- Gouillard, "Synodikon"
 J. Gouillard, "Le Synodikon d'Orthodoxie: édition et commentaire," *TM*, 2 (1967), 1–316.
- Grabar, *Iconoclasme*
 A. Grabar, *L'iconoclasme byzantin. Dossier archéologique* (Paris, 1957).
- Grumel, *Regestes*
 V. Grumel, *Les Regestes des Actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople, I: Les Actes des Patriarches, II: 715–1043* (Socii Assumptionistae Chalcedonenses, 1936).
- Hennepf, *Textus*
 H. Hennepf, *Textus byzantini ad Iconomachiam pertinentes in usum academicum* (Leipzig, 1969).
- Kitzinger, *DOP*, 8 (1954)
 E. Kitzinger, "The Cult of Images in the age before Iconoclasm," *DOP*, 8 (1954), 83–150.
- Ladner, "Concept"
 G. Ladner, "The Concept of Image in the Greek Fathers and the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy," *DOP*, 7 (1953), 1–34.
- Ladner, "Origin"
 G. Ladner, "Origin and Significance of the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy," *MedSt*, 2 (1940), 127–149.
- Lemerle, "Paulicians"
 P. Lemerle, "L'histoire des Pauliciens d'Asie Mineure d'après les sources grecques," *TM*, 5 (1973), 1–144.
- Mango, *Art*
 C. Mango, *The Art of the Byzantine Empire, 312–1453. Sources and Documents* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1972).
- Mango, *Brazen House*
 C. Mango, *The Brazen House. A Study of the Vestibule of the Imperial Palace of Constantinople* (= *Arkaeol. Kunsthist. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk. IV*, 4 [1959]) (Copenhagen, 1959).
- Mango, *Photius*
 C. Mango, *The Homilies of Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople* (Cambridge, Mass., 1958).
- Mansi
 J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* (Florence and Venice, 1759–98; reprinted J. B. Martin and L. Petit, Paris, 1901–).
- Martin, *History*
 E. J. Martin, *A History of the Iconoclast Controversy* (London, 1930).
- Millet, *BCH*, 34 (1910)
 G. Millet, "Les iconoclastes et la croix, à propos d'une inscription de Cappadoce," *BCH*, 34 (1910), 96–109.
- Ostrogorsky, "Débuts"
 G. Ostrogorsky, "Les débuts de la Quêrelle des Images," *Mélanges C. Diehl*, I (Paris, 1930), 235–253.
- Ostrogorsky, *Studien*
 G. Ostrogorsky, *Studien zur Geschichte des Byzantinischen Bilderstreites* (Breslau, 1929; reprinted Amsterdam, 1964).
- Schlumberger, *Sigillographie*
 G. Schlumberger, *Sigillographie de l'empire byzantin* (Paris, 1884; reprinted Turin, 1963).
- Stein, *Bas Empire*
 E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas Empire*, 2 vols (Paris, Brussels, Amsterdam, 1959, 1949).

IN the year 869 the Emperor Basil I sent a certain Peter of Sicily as his agent to Tephrike, which was then a renegade Byzantine strong point on a branch of the Upper Euphrates (later Leontokome, now Divriği on the Bati Firat). His instructions were to negotiate peace with Chrysocheir, a Paulician military leader, and to arrange an exchange of prisoners with the Paulicians. During a nine-month stay Peter had occasion to study the beliefs and customs of the Paulicians and he decided to write a systematic work to refute the heresy. As Peter learnt that the Paulicians were planning to send missionaries to Bulgaria, he wrote his treatise for the use of the Bulgarian Church, and not solely for his imperial masters in Constantinople. Peter's work, entitled *Historia Manichaeorum*, was completed ca. 872 and is the fundamental source for our knowledge of the Paulicians of Tephrike. Moreover chapters 21 to 43 of the *Historia Manichaeorum* cover the history of the Paulician movement from 668 to 868 and are of value for our purposes.¹

The text of the *Historia* evokes the atmosphere of the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, for it concentrates on the tradition of the sect and personalities of the Paulician 'masters' who were revered as apostles. Yet Peter of Sicily relates the internal history of the sect to Byzantine history, by naming those emperors in whose reigns certain events took place and by identifying Byzantine commanders or church dignitaries who persecuted the sect and its masters. The topographical references given by this source refer to the siting of churches and of places associated with significant events and developments in the early history of the sect. These are of great value. However, the chronology of the *Historia* must be treated with caution, for up to the beginning of the ninth century the length of activity of the sect's masters is given in a stereotyped form often in multiples of three; only for the Paulician leader Sergios do we have exact dates.

M. Loos, in an important study, has critically sifted the material in the *Historia Manichaeorum* and has isolated certain fundamental features in the earliest period of the sect's history.² He shows that at the time of its origins the sect was concentrated in country communities in the former provinces of Armenia IV and Pontos.³ Peter of Sicily's view was that "In the days of the Emperor Constantine [i.e. Constans II (641–68), or Constantine IV (668–85)], grandson of Heraclius, a certain Armenian named Constantine was born in the district of Samosata of Armenia, in a village (kōmē) called Mananalis, which still [i.e. in 869] belongs to the Manicheans."⁴

The geographical contradictions in this statement (for Mananalis is a district, not a village, and nowhere near Samosata of Armenia) are discussed in an Excursus appended to this paper.

*Note: geographical observations and some notes have been added or revised by the Editors.

1. The *Historia Manichaeorum* (PG, 104, cols. 1240–1349) was rehabilitated by H. Grégoire. "Les sources de l'histoire des Pauliciens: Pierre de Sicile est authentique et 'Photius' un faux." *BACBela*, 22 (1936), 95–114. Cf. also his "Pour l'histoire des églises Pauliciennes." *OCP*, 13 (1947). = *Mélanges Jerphanion*, 509–14. On previous eds. see Lemerle. "Pauliciens," 2–15. A new edition and translation is presented in the study by Astruc *et al.*. "Les sources grecques pour l'histoire des Pauliciens d'Asie Mineure". *TM*, 4 (1970) 3–67. hereinafter cited as *Histoire*. For earlier doubts as to the reliability of the source, D. Obolensky, *The Bogomils* (Cambridge, 1948), 30, note 7. N.G. Garsoïan, *The Paulician Heresy* (The Hague, 1967) has sought to show that the Greek sources consist of a triple pattern of texts. The earliest group (A and the *Letters of Sergios*) preserve the 'authentic' adoptionist character of the Armenian tradition. The second group (S and P), particularly the supposed lost source, P, reflect a docetic-dualism characteristic of Manichaeism. The third group (the *Histories* of Peter of Sicily, Ps-Photios and the Manichaean Formula) are late compilations designed to combat the revival of Paulicianism in the Balkans. Their purpose is a tendentious presentation of Paulician doctrine as a form of Manichaeism and they are therefore not primary evidence for the origin of Paulicianism (*ibid.*, 27–29). Against Garsoïan's somewhat subjective treatment of the Greek sources is that in the disputation between Gegnesios-Timothy and Patriarch Germanos in the reign of Leo III (Garsoïan's source S; Petrus Siculus, *Histoire*, 45–49 = PG, 104, cols. 1283/4B–1285/6A) we find so-called 'later' ninth century Paulician beliefs appearing. There is no good reason however for rejecting the historicity of this disputation. I adhere to the view that *Historia Manichaeorum*, chaps. 21–43 contains matter of high historical value for the understanding of early Paulicianism, although its chronological statements are admittedly not always accurate. For a recent study of all the Greek sources and a general review of Paulicianism, see Lemerle, "Pauliciens," 1–135, especially 12–15 for comments on Garsoïan's theory. Cf. The review of Lemerle's work by M. Loos, "Deux publications fondamentales sur le paulicianisme d'Asie Mineure," *Byzantinoslavica*, 35 (1974), 194–209.

2. "Le mouvement Paulicien à Byzance," *Byzantinoslavica*, 24 (1963), 258–86; 25 (1964), 52–68, hereafter cited as "Le mouvement." See further his book, *Dualist Heresy in the Middle Ages* (Prague, 1974), 32–40. I am much indebted to these studies in this chapter.

3. On Armenia IV, see J. Laurent, *L'Arménie entre Byzance et l'Islam* (Paris, 1919), Appendix I, 303–6; A.H.M. Jones, *The Cities of the East Roman provinces* (Oxford, 1937), 444–5, 530; E. Honigsmann, *Die Ostgrenze des byzantinischen Reiches* (Brussels, 1935; reprinted Brussels, 1961), 16, 34–7, 40. The connection with Armenia in the earliest sources is striking – even in the Pontos pockets of Paulicians existed in areas where the Armenian element in the population predominated. This close association with Armenia proper (i.e. the country which lay to the east of the Byzantine frontier) was to continue throughout the history of the Paulicians. On the difficulty of identifying this border accurately, see Lemerle, "Pauliciens," 53, note 10.

4. *Histoire*, 41 = PG, 104, col. 1276.

THE PAULICIANS AND ICONOCLASM

From her study of Armenian sources, Garsoïan⁵ has shown that the first traces of the Paulicians are found further east, in mid-sixth century Armenia; for then the Council of Dvin (554–5) associated Paulicianism with Nestorianism and condemned it.⁶ We have seen that in the following century, Constantine was born in Mananalis. His humble beginnings suggest that earlier Paulicians had virtually disappeared by this time. Originally a follower of Mani, he wished to support his teaching by an appeal to the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles. Constantine's reforms, according to Peter of Sicily, were a re-clothing of Manichaean ideas in a form more acceptable to Christians by rejecting the cosmological myths – indeed so subtle was this process that, according to Peter, the Paulicians from this time readily anathematised Mani and other Manichaean teachers.⁷ One of the most remarkable features of primitive Paulicianism is its great veneration for St. Paul, a fact underestimated by N. Garsoïan. This again apparently originated with Constantine for he assumed the name of St. Paul's companion, Silvanos, and having fled from Mananalis before an Arab attack, took up residence in the fortress of Kibossa, near Koloneia (now Şebinkarahisar), on the frontiers of the future Koloneian and Chaldian themes. (In a forthcoming study Anthony Bryer will propose Sisorta Kale as the site of Kibossa). The Paulician community at Kibossa called itself the 'church of Macedonia' – a name perhaps chosen because Kibossa was near to Koloneia, and in the Acts of the Apostles the term *Kolonia* (in the Roman sense of 'colony') is coupled with Macedonia.⁸ Constantine-Silvanos originated the tradition of giving Paulician churches names associated with the travels of St. Paul and of bestowing on the leaders of these churches the names of St. Paul's disciples associated with these particular churches.

Constantine remained the leader of the Paulician community at Kibossa for twenty-seven years until he was arrested and stoned to death by a certain Justus, on the orders of Symeon, an imperial officer sent to Kibossa by Constans II or Constantine IV to stamp out the Paulician heresy. This period saw the first general persecution of Paulicians during the reigns of Constans II (641–68), or Constantine IV (668–85), and Justinian II (685–95). Many Paulicians were martyred. Symeon, however, was apparently so impressed by what he had seen that three years later he renounced his position and returned to Kibossa. After assuming the name Titus, he became leader of the Armenian Paulicians. His apostasy from Byzantine Orthodoxy was short lived, for within three years he had quarrelled with Justus over the interpretation of the Pauline text *Colossians* i, 16. Justus secretly appealed to the bishop of Koloneia who notified the imperial authorities in Constantinople. The result was that Justinian II ordered the arrest of all Paulicians in ca. 690. Those who persisted in their faith, such as Symeon, were burnt alive.⁹

The events of the first century A.D., as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles and Pauline Epistles, determined the development of the sect in a remarkable way. Not only were the Paulician communities modelled on the early Christian communities, not only did their leaders take Pauline names, but events in Paulician history were shaped by those recorded in these writings. So in the incident concerning Justus we have a close parallel to the stoning of the first Christian martyr Stephen and the conversion of Saul-Paul which followed it.¹⁰ It would seem probable that the historical details concerning Justus cannot be pressed and that the events of the first Christian century may have influenced the account of Paulician history recorded by Peter of Sicily at this point.

The *Historia Manichaeorum* then tells of another Armenian, named Paul, who had escaped the persecution of Justinian II. With his two sons, Gegnesios and Theodore, he revived Paulician fortunes in the village of Episparis.¹¹ Paul made Gegnesios the master of the sect but quarrelled with Theodore, provoking a discord which continued to the end of their lives. Gegnesios had to defend his faith at Constantinople at the beginning of the reign of Leo III, the inaugurator of Byzantine Iconoclasm.¹² Accused by the patriarch of denying the Orthodox faith, the Cross, the Mother of God, the Body and Blood of Christ, the Catholic and Apostolic Church and baptism, Gegnesios stated that he firmly believed in these doctrines – meaning, according to Peter of Sicily, his own

5. Garsoïan, *op.cit.*, 88–91, 149; cf. an earlier examination by R.M. Bartikian, *Istochniki dlya izyechenia istorii navlikiânskovo dvejenia* (Yerevan, 1961), reviewed by Loos, *Byzantinoslavica*, 24 (1963), 135–41, and by Lemerle, "Paulicians," 10–11.

6. This identification is doubted by Lemerle, "Paulicians," 54.

7. *Histoire*, 41–3 = PG, 104, cols. 1276–7.

8. *Acts* xvi, 11–12; *Histoire*, 43, 61 = PG, 104, cols. 1277–80, 1297; cf. Lemerle, "Paulicians," 58, note 21.

9. *Histoire*, 43–5 = PG, 104, col. 1281.

10. Analogy already drawn by E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. J.B. Bury (Cambridge, 1898), VI, 117; Loos, "Le mouvement," 263.

11. On the problem of locating Episparis, see most recently Lemerle, "Paulicians," 51–2, 77–8.

12. *Histoire* 47–9 = PG, 104, cols. 1284.S; Leo III may have been accused of favouring the Paulicians, see Stephanus Diaconus, PG, 100, cols. 1083–4; cf. Georgius Monachus, 798.

Paulician heresy.¹³ As reported in the Paulician source, Gegnesios succeeded in deluding the patriarch and clearing himself of heresy, and returned home to Armenia with a safe-conduct from the emperor. The source at this point illustrates the difficulties which the Church faced in combatting heretics who professed conformity with Orthodox teaching. Gegnesios, however, apparently feared that he might not escape in future, so on returning to Episparis, he migrated with his followers to Mananalis, the sect's original homeland, which was now under Arab domination and so beyond the limits of Byzantine power.¹⁴ Some years later, after the death of Gegnesios and further internal strife, the sect left Mananalis and returned to Byzantium. M. Loos supports Bartikian's opinion that the intolerable burden of the Muslim tax system was the main cause of this further emigration,¹⁵ which eventually brought the Paulicians back to Episparis, where their leader, Joseph, was received with lighted lamps as if a disciple of Christ had arrived.

From the mid-eighth century the Paulicians became increasingly noticeable on the stage of Byzantine history as a political, as well as a religious, problem. They were no longer rooted in a rural milieu but spread into towns, such as Antioch of Pisida, where a new Paulician community emerged. They even appeared in Constantinople itself. This raises the question of their connection with Iconoclasm. How far did specifically Paulician tenets influence those of the Iconoclasts? How far were Paulician fortunes bound up with this controversy? What was the reason for the increasing interest in the Paulicians taken by Byzantine chroniclers from the eighth century onwards and for the production of polemical literature directed against their beliefs? In my view, the increasing strength of Paulicianism is directly related to the historical situation which developed in Byzantium in the eighth century, and in particular during the reign of the Iconoclast Emperor Constantine V (741–775). This emperor moved drastically against religious images, and in particular attacked monasteries, which formed the heart of the Iconodule opposition to this policy, which was directed to the secularization of their property. Monastic resistance was regarded as a revolt against imperial power and one to be suppressed by every possible means. The appearance of Paulicians on Byzantine soil coincided with the height of this crisis. They too were relentlessly opposed to the monks and indeed described the monastic habit as one of the disguises of Satan. They apparently repudiated the use of images and denied any special place to the Virgin Mary; while these views were largely consonant with Iconoclasm, it is not certain how far Paulicianism was officially tolerated by Constantine V.¹⁷

There are in fact considerable differences between Byzantine Iconoclasm and Paulicianism. The former was not dualistic and did not reject the Old Testament or savour of Marcionite or Manichaean beliefs. The Paulicians forbade the material cross, substituting the outstretched arms of Christ; for the Body and Blood of Christ they substituted His words. The Iconoclasts, on the other hand, retained the Cross and the eucharist as true symbols.¹⁸ Other differences will emerge later. Not too much weight should be accorded to Theophanes' statement that in 754 Constantine V transplanted to Thrace Syrians and Armenians from Melitene (Malatya) and Theodosiupolis (Erzurum), thus extending the Paulician sect. This seems to refer to a colonization of Thrace, an area which had been depopulated by epidemics and wars. Theophanes is the only writer who mentions the Paulicians in this context. Other sources such as George the Monk, describe these people simply as heretics.¹⁹ Michael the Syrian also speaks of Monophysites from Claudia and from the regions of Melitene.²⁰

The Paulicians greatly revered the figure of Constantine V, but their movement differed fundamentally from Iconoclasm in one respect: its attitude towards the ecclesiastical hierarchy. It is true that Constantine V replaced unco-operative bishops by docile men and persecuted monastic opposition – but he did not intend to ride roughshod over the church hierarchy which was inseparably linked to the Byzantine State. The Paulicians, on the other hand, relentlessly attacked

13. Garsoïan, *op. cit.*, 175–6, seeks to prove that Peter of Sicily's account is seriously interpolated at this point and distorts the original form of the story which had Gegnesios favourably treated by the patriarch and sent home. The ninth century narrator, unwilling to accept this, adapted Gegnesios' words to the Paulician teaching prevalent in his own time. This interpretation of the account is special pleading, but it is essential to Garsoïan's theory that Byzantine Paulicianism was in origin non-dualistic and adoptionist in character. I do not believe this to be the case.

14. According to Theophanes, 372, Armenia IV fell to the Arabs in 702. On the Arab occupation and resulting movement of refugees into Byzantine territory, see Laurent, *op. cit.*, (note 3 above) 175–82, 190–3.

15. Loos, "Le mouvement," 265.

16. Cf. *Matt.* XXV. 1–13. cf. Lemerle, "Paulicians," 66–7.

17. Cedrenus, II, 10, states that Paulicians settled in Constantinople during the reign of Constantine V (after the plague), and Georgius Monachus, 750–1, accuses the emperor himself of being a Paulician.

18. Brown, *EHR*, 346 (1973), 5; cf. Gero, *BZ*, 68 (1975), 4–22.

19. Theophanes, 429; Georgius Monachus, 752, refers to them as "Theopaschitai"; the same movement of population is mentioned by Nicephorus, 65–66.

20. *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, Patriarche Jacobite d'Antioche* (1116–99), ed. and trans. J.-B. Chabot (Paris, 1904) II, 523.

THE PAULICIANS AND ICONOCLASM

the foundations of ecclesiastical organization. They called members of the Byzantine church 'Romans' (Rhōmaioi); opposed and indeed hated, Orthodox clergy (*Presbyteroi*),²¹ and considered only themselves as 'Christians' and the true 'Catholic Church.' For this reason any alliance with Iconoclast state power was impossible, although individual Paulicians might, from time to time, adopt Iconoclasm.

An interesting example of the Paulician attitude towards the church hierarchy is provided by Peter of Sicily's account of the conversion of a young educated boy named Sergios by a Paulician woman.²² Sergios was the son of an affluent family of Tavia. In the conversion the proselytizing Paulician adopts an 'indirect' method of evangelisation; she points out the trail of 'truth' in the Gospels, so as to arouse the boy's curiosity. She rids him of the prejudice that it was wrong for laymen to read the Gospels alone – such a principle has no foundation in the Scriptures. On the contrary, God willed all men to be saved and to come to know the truth. It was the clergy, rapacious in their desire for gain, who intended to conceal the truth from the faithful. The woman read through the entire text of the Gospels with Sergios to show that the true sense of Christian doctrine was open to all. This account shows how the Paulician argument against the ecclesiastical hierarchy was developed in practice, no doubt concurring with other matters, such as the wealth and privileges of the Church, which provoked strong discontent.²³

These factors, however, do not explain why the Paulicians developed so rapidly from ca. 750 onwards. It is the merit of the work of Loos and Garsoïan to have shown that the conditions for this development were provided by Iconoclasm. The relaxation of persecution helped, but more important was the atmosphere engendered by the Iconoclast controversy.²⁴ A small treatise written in the ninth century illustrates the way in which Paulicianism adapted itself and flourished in this atmosphere. It contains a Paulician legend in which the sect's hatred of baptism and of the apostle Peter is linked to a sarcastic attack on monks – indeed, it claims that monasticism originated in the devil dressing himself up in a monk's habit. Such stories would have fitted into Constantine V's condemnation of the monastic habit as "a form of darkness";²⁵ similarly the Paulician belief that Mary was an ordinary woman could easily be incorporated with Iconoclast condemnation of the term *Theotokos*. Moreover, as Iconoclasm became widespread among different strata of the population, a more radical movement, such as Paulicianism, could gain converts from those already affected by Iconoclast propaganda.

We have clear evidence that this was the case. The Seventh Ecumenical Council called by the Iconodule Empress Eirene met at Constantinople on 17 August 786 in the church of the Holy Apostles, the empress and emperor watching from the gallery seats of the Catechumens.²⁶ The Iconoclast party was still active and soldiers of the imperial guard (*scholarioi* and *excubitores*), supporters of Iconoclasm, burst into the church, violence only being prevented by the Iconoclast bishops present shouting out, "we have won." The Council was forced to close.²⁷ However, during the winter Eirene had the Iconoclast units of the army sent on field service in Asia Minor on the pretext of a Saracen attack. This event is described in detail by Theophanes²⁸ and is also mentioned by Patriarch Nikephoros, who states that the dismissed soldiers "wandered about like planets" in search of a sect where there was no veneration of icons.²⁹ Many of them fell into the 'Manichaean' heresy, i.e. Paulicianism. Knowing the adroitness of Paulician propaganda, it is easy to see how it managed to gain ground among those disaffected with the restoration of icon worship by Eirene. In this way, Iconoclasm contributed to the development of Paulicianism even when it was not in the ascendant in Byzantium.

A favourable change occurred only after the deposition of Eirene and her replacement by Nikephoros (802–11). The new emperor exploited the available resources, public and private, in the interests of the State. He also restricted the gifts and privileges which Eirene had granted to the Church in profusion. Because of this Nikephoros became the object of the Iconodule party's criticism; Theophanes gives a detailed account of his alleged crimes. He states, among other faults, that the emperor was a friend and protector of heretics. In addition to the Iconoclasts, two sects in

21. *Histoire*, 23 = PG, 104, col. 1257A. Peter of Sicily regarded this as a striking feature of their heresy.

22. *Histoire*, 51ff = PG, 104 cols. 1288ff.

23. P. Charanis, "The Monastic Properties and the State in the Byzantine Empire," *DOP* 4 (1948), 51–118; M.V. Levcenko, "Tserkovnie imushchestva 5–8 vv v vostochnorumskoï imperii," *VizVrem*, 2 (1949), 11–59.

24. Loos, *op.cit.*, (note 2 above), 8–9.

25. PG, 95, col. 361B.

26. Theophanes, 461.

27. Theophanes, 461; Mansi, XIII, cols. 990E–999B.

28. Theophanes, 461; Mansi, XIII, col. 991C.

29. PG, 100, col. 501B–C, cf. Alexander, *Nicephorus*, 18–19.

Asia Minor are cited: the Paulicians and their near neighbours, the *Athinganoi*.³⁰ The precise motive for Nikephoros' tolerant attitude towards these sects is not known. However, it seems clear that Iconoclasm, temporarily repressed during the reign of Eirene, was still strong at the beginning of the ninth century and that even the Paulician movement still constituted a danger.

Theophanes' account of the benefits enjoyed by the Paulicians after Nikephoros' accession, is in agreement with Peter of Sicily's survey of these years. He states that at the end of Eirene's reign Sergios, already mentioned in connection with the Paulician missionary, succeeded in putting himself at the head of the sect. The young educated convert from Tavia undermined the authority of the master of the sect, a simple Armenian named Baanes, in public debate. The *Historia Manichaeorum* glorifies Sergios as the greatest leader of the Paulicians, although his rival, Baanes, complained: "You [Sergios] have only recently appeared, and have not known any of our masters, nor have you been associated with them. But, on the contrary, I am a disciple of master Epaphroditos, and teach his doctrine as he instilled it in me from the start."³¹ But Sergios, a strong personality, dominated the sect as a teacher, reformer, missionary and organiser. He adopted the name of Tychikos, a disciple of St. Paul, and from 801–35 he ruled the Paulicians. He reinvigorated the life of the sect, correcting those who had fallen into lax ways. Sergios inspired his followers with zeal for spreading the Paulician faith: "from the East to the West, in the North and in the South I have journeyed, proclaiming the Gospel of Christ, walking with (?) my own knees."³² In his remarkable missionary journeys Sergios founded three new Paulician churches. Such was his prestige that, like Mani before him, he was regarded as the Paraclete by his followers. His power of propaganda was so great that, according to Peter of Sicily, in order to follow him married people broke their vows, monks and nuns their monastic vows, even children and clergy became his disciples. Under Sergios' leadership Paulicianism reached its highest peak and influence.

This advantageous period, however, soon passed. The Emperor Nikephoros was killed by the Bulgars after having ventured with his army deep into the interior of their country. The reign of his successor, the weak Michael I (811–13), brought a great change. The Iconodule party succeeded in getting the death penalty proclaimed against Paulicians and Athinganoi, although this drastic measure was moderated somewhat through the influence of the celebrated Theodore the Studite and his monastic circle.³³ Theophanes nevertheless records that the emperor had a number of heretics beheaded. In spite of persecution, the Paulicians seem to have persisted in their beliefs secretly. In this they were encouraged by the political situation. The aversion of the populace to war, the burden of equipping Byzantine armies against the Bulgars and the Bulgarian penetration into Macedonia and Thrace, provided an opportunity for the renewal of Iconoclasm. Propaganda spread amongst the disaffected populace, suggesting that failure in the war was due to the eclipse of Iconoclasm. Had not Iconoclast leaders always led the Byzantine army from victory to victory? Theophanes, in this context, again speaks of Paulicians alongside the Iconoclasts.³⁴ For a time Michael succeeded in preventing a revolt in Constantinople. But the city lived through a further period of suspense when the Bulgarian leader Krum encamped near Versinikeia, not far from the Byzantine army, and prepared to annihilate it. People gathered at the Church of the Holy Apostles where the liturgy was celebrated. In the confusion no one noticed that the bolts of the door leading to the imperial tomb had been removed. With a great creaking noise the door suddenly opened and Iconoclast soldiers, who had pre-arranged their tactics, rushed to the tomb of Constantine V, invoking his aid. They called on the great Iconoclast Emperor to rise and save the state in its hour of doom. Stories spread of Constantine leaving the grave and riding on his horse against the Bulgars. The old cry went up again that Orthodoxy and the monks were bringing God's curse upon the country. According to Theophanes, the Paulicians took part in the activities of the Iconoclasts because they were unable to spread their ideas openly – hence they joined with those who called upon Constantine V's aid.³⁵ According to Martin, the term 'Paulician' used by Theophanes in this context, is a nickname for the Iconoclasts.³⁶ However, as Loos points out, in this source Paulicians are clearly distinguished from Iconoclasts;³⁷ and it seems quite likely that the Paulicians in the capital supported the restoration of Iconoclasm, no doubt believing that it would provide more favourable circumstances for their own activities.

30. Theophanes, 488; Loos, "Le mouvement," 273.

31. *Histoire*, 63–5 = PG, 104, col. 1300C–D. Garsoïan, *op. cit.*, 183–4, argues that Sergios introduced new doctrines into the sect while Baanes represented the older Armenian tradition, cf. Lemerle, "Paulicians," 69–70.

32. *Histoire*, 57, and especially note 77; = PG, 104, col. 1293.

33. Theodore the Studite, *epistola* 23 (Mai, *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca*, VIII, pt I, 21), and *epistola* 155 (PG, 99, cols. 1481–5).

34. Theophanes, 496.

35. *Ibid.*, 501; cf. Alexander, *Nicephorus*, 111–3.

36. Martin, *History*, 277.

37. Loos, "Le mouvement," 276.

THE PAULICIANS AND ICONOCLASM

With the accession of Leo V the Armenian (813–20), Iconoclasm was indeed restored. To their surprise, however, this did not alter the official Byzantine attitude towards the Paulicians. Peter of Sicily, who wrote within living memory of this period, claims that the two Emperors, Michael I and Leo V, instigated a persecution which wrought overwhelming harm to the Paulicians throughout the Empire.³⁸ The principal strength of the Paulician movement at this time was concentrated in the Armeniakon theme, where the population was heavily Armenian. It was in this region that imperial orders calling for the extermination of the Paulicians, provoked a bloody retaliation. Peter of Sicily records how Sergios' disciples, the "Astatoi", and people of Kynochorion (?Kainon Chorion = ? a site near Akkuş/Karakuş between Niksar and Ünye), the "Kynochoritai," seized the archbishop of Neocaesarea (Niksar), a certain Thomas, who had to carry out the imperial edict against heretics, and killed him.³⁹ At the same time the "Astatoi" killed the Exarch Parakondakes, and then fled to the territory of the emir of Melitene.⁴⁰ Whatever the precise details, this was an event of great significance and not simply the flight of a small group of rebels. Peter of Sicily states that hordes of Paulician refugees went over into the territory of Melitene at this time. They became a source of great assistance to the Arabs – no doubt because they had a warlike Armenian strain, coupled with a fierce desire to avenge the massacre of their co-religionists.⁴¹ In Melitene the Paulicians were exposed to foreign influences and the purity of their faith was sorely threatened.⁴² Sergios tried to prevent the dissipation of his movement but without much success: "I am not guilty of these evils. I have pleaded with them many times not to take the Rhōmaioi captive, but they have not listened to me."⁴³ Sergios, however, kept his Paulician faith. In the frontier area under Arab rule he developed a remarkable and widespread missionary project, recalling the great missionary efforts of the Monophysites some three centuries before. He was able to found two Paulician churches at Argaoun and Mopsuestia (named Kolossae and Ephesus), which formed a unit with the church of Laodicea also founded by him. While many Paulicians lived off the booty gained in their military raids, Sergios–Tychikos continued to live by his own labour, like the Apostle Paul himself. In 835 he was murdered on a mountain near Argaoun while cutting timber.⁴⁴ Nothing is known about his assassin Tzanion although this act was possibly bound up with the older quarrel between the disciples of Sergios and those of Baanes. The result of the murder was a massacre of the followers of Baanes, which was ended only by the intervention of Theodotos, one of Sergios' companions.

We do not possess concrete evidence about the fate of the Paulicians during the reign of Michael II (820–29). Certainly there is no evidence that they took part in the revolt led by Thomas the Slav which challenged that emperor. However, in the reign of the last Iconoclast Emperor, Theophilos (829–32), the *Life of Makarios* records that the Paulician heresy was condemned and Paulicians thrown into prison and put to death; Makarios knew them personally.⁴⁵ Another biographical source, written shortly after Theophilos' reign, casts light on the struggle of the Paulician movement at this time. In the *Acts of the Martyrs of Amorion* the story is related of the martyrdom of a certain *spartharios* Kallistos.⁴⁶ Because of his Iconodule convictions, he had been exiled by the Emperor Theophilos to Koloneia. Many of his subordinate officers in this place were Paulicians and Kallistos tried in vain to convert them to image veneration. After this failure, he was handed over to the Paulicians who were allied with the Arabs. Some years later, during the conquest of the Amorion fortress, Kallistos was captured and martyred. On the unsettled eastern frontier, Paulicianism was still a force which united rebellious elements of the population including Armenians.⁴⁷ At this time it had adherents among wealthy and influential people, as well as among the commanders of the Armeniakon theme – a threatening situation for Byzantium.

Such was the state of affairs in the eastern themes when Empress Theodora became Regent in 842. As is well known she put an end to Iconoclasm – but she also decided to destroy Paulicianism. Although not all the Iconoclast opposition disappeared overnight, the Restoration of Orthodoxy in 843 was a relatively straightforward operation.⁴⁸ This was, however, not the case with the Paulicians, who had to be put down by force. The *Continuator* of Theophanes gives a frightful

38. *Histoire*, 65 = PG, 104, cols. 1300D–1301A; cf. Lemerle, "Paulicians," 81–2.

39. Astruc *et. al.*, *op.cit.*, (note 1 above), 167 = PG, 102, col. 77B; *Histoire*, 65 = PG, 104, col. 1301.

40. On the Astatoi, see J.K.L. Gieseler, "Untersuchungen Über die Geschichte der Paulikianer," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 2 (1829), 93; cf. Lemerle, "Paulicians," 71–2.

41. Cf. Laurent, *op.cit.* (note 3 above), 50, 54–5.

42. Loos, "Le mouvement," 278.

43. *Histoire*, 59 = PG, 104, cols. 1293D–1296A.

44. *Histoire*, 65 = PG, 104, col. 1301; cf. Lemerle, "Paulicians," 74–5.

45. Ed. H. Delehayé, *AnalBoll*, 16 (1897), 140ff.

46. Acta 42 Martyrorum Amorion, ed. V. Vasilievskii and P. Nikitin, *Zapiski Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk*, series VIII, vol. 7, no. 2, (1905), 22–36 (version 3).

47. Loos, "Le mouvement," 280.

48. See the contribution by C. Mango, "The liquidation of Iconoclasm and the Patriarch Photios," *infra*, 133–40.

account of their suffering⁴⁹ – tens of thousands of heretics hanged, beheaded or drowned and their goods confiscated. The result of this persecution was another movement of Paulician refugees into Arab territory, and from this time a new Paulician urban centre emerged named Tephrike. An alliance was struck with the emirs of Melitene and Tarsos, to whom Paulician leadership was somewhat subordinated. Paulician support was in fact highly valued by the Arabs. An Arabic source tells us that in a certain Byzantine church there were portraits not only of the most dreaded Arab leaders but also of the Paulician general, Karbeas.⁵⁰ The heyday of Paulician power on the frontier of the Byzantine Empire came when Paulician armies commanded by Chrysocheir, dominated the mountainous region extending from Tephrike towards the south.⁵¹ Even the most western areas of Asia Minor were not immune from their raids – in Ephesus the heretics stabled their horses in the Church of St. John the Theologian near the temple of Artemis. However this spectacular period was short lived. After the failure of Peter of Sicily's attempt to secure peace with the Paulicians, Byzantine forces finally succeeded in crushing their military power in the year 872. The future of Paulicianism was to lie in the Balkans where, with Messalianism, it became an antecedent of Bogomilism.

There has been considerable discussion among scholars as to whether Paulicianism in its first stage propagated an adoptionist, non dualistic form of teaching; whether it had affinities with the teaching of Marcion, the second century Gnostic teacher,⁵² or whether it was a recrudescence of Manichaeism. Professor Garsoïan has sought to show that Paulicianism originated in Armenia in the sixth century in an adoptionist, non-dualistic form, which had close affinities with early Syriac Christianity, rather than with St. Paul's version of Christianity. From Armenia it spread into the Byzantine Empire where at first it appeared in a non-dualistic form. According to Garsoïan,⁵³ it was only in the ninth century that the Paulicians adopted a docetic Christology and a type of dualism akin to that of the Manichees. This shift of emphasis occurred through the influence of extreme Iconoclast groups in Constantinople, which were developing a Manichaean tendency even during the Iconoclast period. This theory of a straight-line evolution of Paulicianism from primitive adoptionism to dualism seems to me too stereotyped. It is unlikely that the Paulicians were branded 'Manichaean' in the ninth century simply because their Iconoclast tendencies connected them with the Byzantine Iconoclasts. Although they were condemned by the Iconoclasts as Manichaean despisers of matter and the material world, 'Manichaean' was simply a term of abuse which could be used of many groups and individuals, as Gero⁵⁴ points out. In the last resort Professor Garsoïan's theory depends upon her highly questionable analysis of the Greek sources – in particular that of Peter of Sicily's *Historia Manichaeorum*. Moreover, there are too many references which do not fit easily into this theory such as the Genesis – Germanos conflict in the time of Leo III, which has already been mentioned. I cannot believe that the Paulicians are correctly described as the extreme left-wing of the Iconoclast movement as Conybeare, has done,⁵⁵ followed by Garsoïan.⁵⁶ Of course it all depends how one defines 'Iconoclast,' but restricting the term to its Byzantine connotation, Paulicianism and Iconoclasm seem to me distinct separate movements which developed in different ways.

The importance of Iconoclasm is that it provided favourable conditions for the widespread extension of Paulicianism from ca. 750 and, paradoxically, contributed to its growth when the Iconoclasts were in power. Like Iconoclasts, the Paulicians drew their followers from all strata of society – and developed in a complex environmental situation. However unlike the Iconoclasts, the Paulicians totally rejected Orthodox ecclesiastical organization, particularly the ministry, and sought to recreate the simplicity of the Christianity of the apostolic age by appeal to the cult of St. Paul. The Paulicians had no hope of gaining the adherence of the Byzantine State and populace at large, important though some of their colonies were in the great urban cities of the empire. Paulicianism lacked the appeal to tradition (an appeal not neglected by the Iconoclasts), and they severed the close connection between the emperor and the Christian *schema* – a connection which Iconoclasm was to re-emphasize. The real strength of Paulicianism always lay in Armenia and on the eastern borders of the empire.⁵⁷ Here their power, far removed from Constantinople, was

49. Theophanes Continuatus, 165ff.

50. Mas'udi, *Les Prairies d'Or*, ed. and trans. Barbier de Maynard, (Paris, 1874), VIII, 74; cf. G. Le Strange, "Al-Abrik, Tephrike the capital of the Paulicians: A correction corrected," *JRAS*, (1896), 733–41. cf. Lemerle, "Paulicians," 93, esp. note 19.

51. S. Runciman, *The Medieval Manichee* (Cambridge, 1946), 41–3.

52. A full discussion in Obolensky, *op. cit.*, 25–58; cf. Loos, "Le mouvement," 55–64; Lemerle, "Paulicians," 126–32.

53. Garsoïan, *op. cit.*, 151–85, 235. See further Garsoïan, *DOP*, 25 (1971), 87–113.

54. Gero, *Byzantion*, 44 (1974), 35.

55. *The Key of Truth*, (Oxford 1898), cvi.

56. Garsoïan, *The Paulician Heresy*, 210, 226.

57. There seems to be no direct connection between the Armenian Paulicians and the ascetic iconoclastic sect which existed in Armenia in the seventh century. The latter was not originally heretical in doctrine but emphasized that sanctity belonged to persons not images, see Alexander, "Sect," 151–60.

THE PAULICIANS AND ICONOCLASM

often formidable, particularly when allied to that of the Arabs. Their fate in this situation was however to be largely the same as the Monophysites before them. A learned historian of the Monophysite movement has written recently: "No people or religion can accept the domination of another without risk of absorption and decline. By accepting the 'Ishmaelites' as instruments of God wherewith to punish the Chalcedonians, the Monophysites purchased not their liberty but their grave."⁵⁸ That could equally well have been written of the proud people called Paulicians, who flourished on the eastern borders of the Empire. But during their heyday from the mid-eighth to the mid-ninth centuries they were a considerable power in Byzantium. That was in no small measure due to the complex movement we call Iconoclasm, the conditions it created, and the issues it raised.

58. W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement* (Cambridge, 1972), 359.

EXCURSUS ON MANANALIS, SAMOSATA OF ARMENIA AND PAULICIAN GEOGRAPHY

(See page 75, above)

Peter of Sicily stated that "In the days of the Emperor Constantine [i.e. Constans II (641–68), or Constantine IV (668–85)], grandson of Heraclius, a certain Armenian named Constantine was born in the district of Samosata of Armenia, in a village (kōmē) called Mananalis, which still [i.e. in 869] belongs to the Manichaeans." (*Histoire*, 41 = PG, 104, col. 1276).

Garsoïan has already pointed out the obvious contradictions in this statement: Mananalis was not a village but a district which lay a good 110 km. north-north-east of Armenia. The two are divided by a formidable gorge and 3,000 m. range now known appropriately as The 'Mountains of the Devil' (Şeytandağları) – perhaps Aristakes' "the mountain which is called the fortress of Smbat," (Sembataberd, which Gelzer and Laurent make the see of Mananalis). Peter of Sicily's geography is clearly at fault in detail (Garsoïan suggests a misreading of Peter the *hegumene* and points out that the pseudo-Photios placed this Samosata in Syria), but his general directions are curiously significant. He is pointing to a stretch of longitude 40°E, east of Tephrike: harsh borderland, inaccessible but relatively well populated pastures, more successfully claimed by Arabs than Byzantines in the ninth century. Arnold Toynbee noted that "This district is walled-off from the rest of the World by ranges of huge mountains (I have seen Manalali [as he insisted on calling it] from the air)." Soon after Peter of Sicily's account much of these mountains became a new theme of 'Mesopotamia'. But by the late tenth century the *Taktika* (especially Oikonomides-Escorial) and the *Notitiae* (especially of Tzimiskes) reveal elaborate episcopal and thematic reorganisation and the same stretch emerges, defying all physical geography, as a deceptively realistic-looking frontier on Honigmann's map II. It is in fact the shortest overland line (but not route) between two great branches of the Euphrates: the Karasu and Murat, in other words the divide between Byzantine 'Mesopotamia' and Armenian Taron. But it may not have been a fresh border that a chain of new *stratègoi* and far-flung suffragan bishops of Trebizond were primarily appointed to patrol, so much as to regularise imperial control and Orthodoxy in an area identified by Peter of Sicily as an early Paulician one, which hence became a vulnerable section of the new Byzantine defence system. The remarkably obscure sites chosen for the short-lived Byzantine missionary cathedrals and army posts reflect the Paulician penchant for remoteness more than any obvious demands of strategy or centres of Orthodox population.

Unfortunately, an exact identification of this vital Paulician stretch can only be attempted when field work confirms armchair comparisons of the *taktika* with modern maps. There is, typically for a Paulician area, no direct road between Mananalis and Samosata of Armenia today, any more than there had been in the *Itineraria* or in the ninth century: communications run east-west. One of the few travellers' reports is by Kinneir who skirted Mananalis in 1813 (encountering lions). The laborious armchair geographer, Ritter, was misled by Kinneir; Lynch's comment on the matter is salutary: "A few months' personal travel would have stood him in good stead after all his minute analysis of the works of travellers." But, for almost all the stretch, there are simply no works of travellers.

With these caveats a preliminary guide to the ninth-century Paulician stronghold and tenth-century imperial 'frontier' along the 40°E longitude may be ventured, working north to south: *Dexene* (Derzene, Xerxene in Strabo) district lay along a bend of a branch of the Upper Euphrates (here Karasu), about 70 km. east of Arzinga (Erzincan) and 90 km. west of Theodosiupolis (Erzurum). The naphtha noted by Constantine Porphyrogenetos there still congeals along the east-west road to its north – a route which may explain why the empire was able to tackle *Dexene* earlier than other stations on the longitude. Its see of Bizana (?Vican), suffragan of Trebizond, may have been established as early as 856. *Dexene* district became a theme by 951/2 and was, like its bishopric, sometimes administered from Chaldia. In this century, a small town on a minor tributary of the Upper Euphrates (Tuzlasuyu), long known after its thirteenth-century mausoleum of Mamahatun (40° 23'E, 39° 50'N), has adopted the earlier district name of Tercan. Another ironic example of a Byzantine district name replacing a long-established Turkish place name in recent years comes from the Pontos, where Cevizlik (Karydia, Dikaisimon) has been renamed Maçka (i.e. Matzouka), which it was never called in the Middle Ages. In fact *Mananalis* (Armenian Mananaghi) seems to have been the southern Tuzlasuyu plain and it is even possible that the site of modern Tercan lay in it. The area was heretic in 869 but a short-lived suffragan bishopric of Trebizond was set up there after 969. Its Orthodox prelate must have found stony ground in the old heretic stronghold, for unlike nearby Bizana or even remote Chantierz, his see drops out of episcopal lists within eleven years. It may, however, have lasted a little longer, if only *in partibus*,

ANTHONY BRYER

for Laurent dates the only known seal of a bishop (Michael) of Mananalis to the tenth/eleventh century. But it was hardly effective for by *ca.* 1000 Mananalis is again reported as a hotbed of heresy and home of a local Armenian Paulician prince, Vrvver. The combination of Armenian popular tradition, and aristocratic protection for it, could well have been more than a Trapezuntine Greek bishop could face.

On the south side of the 'Mountains of the Devil', a tributary of the Tuzlasuyu reaches a broad plain, site perhaps of *Kama* (? Paulician Kameia – Katabatala), a new theme in 971/5 and (a long shot) maybe modern Kaman (40° 13'E, 39°N). To the south-east lay *Chortzine* (?? now Çorşan), a theme in 971/5. To the south-west lay *Chantiarte* (bishopric of Chantierz, Arabic Hisn al-H.n.d.r.s.), the most distant suffragan of Trebizond after 969 and a pocket theme before 971/5.

Finally *Samosata of Armenia* (Arsamasata, Asmosaton, now Şimşat Kale at 39° 47'E, 38° 37'N), lay on the south side of the Arsanias, yet another branch of the Upper Euphrates (here Murat), between Balouos (Palu) and Charpete (Harput, near Elaziğ). This major site brings us on to a common east-west route again. Not surprisingly it became a theme capital, (and independent metropolis) even earlier than Derxene, in 938/52. It is also the only site of the group of which we have any useful reports and has been excavated since 1969. It must be distinguished from the great mound of Samosata (Samsat) which lies by a crossing of the Euphrates proper (Firat) more than 200 km. downstream and is even better known to archaeologists.

Peter of Sicily's geographical error in fact brackets a group of sites which were Paulician hideouts in the ninth century and God-forsaken Byzantine administrative and ecclesiastical postings subsequently, reflecting imperial worries about the area. Until serious field research is conducted there, little more can usefully be said.*

ANTHONY BRYER

*For this geographical discussion, see the Turkish Harita General Müdürlüğü 1:200,000 series of maps (Ankara, 1953), and Strabo, *Geography*, XI, xiv, 5; Polybius, *Historiae*, ed. T. Büthner-Wobst (Leipzig, 1889), VIII, 23; N. Oikonomides, "L'Organisation de la frontière orientale de Byzance aux X^e-XI^e siècles et la Taktikon de l'Escorial," *XIV^e Congrès International des Etudes Byzantines, Rapports II* (Bucarest, 1971), 73-90, and *idem*, *Les Listes de Préséance Byzantines des IX^e et X^e siècles* (Paris, 1972), 241, 267-9, 358-363; to Oikonomides' seals of Derxene, add G. Schlumberger, "Sceaux Byzantins inédits (3e série)," *REG*, 7 (1894), 321-2, no. 105 (George Dros[er]ijos, dysanthypatos, krites epi tou hippodromou, of Chaldia and Derxene, 10th-11th centuries); and unpublished ones in Dumbarton Oaks: D.O. 55.1.2933 (Leo Areob[a]n[denos], krites, spatharocandidate, asekrete of Chaldia and Derxene); and D.O. 55.1.2066 (Michael, spatharios epi tou chrysotriklinou, logethete, grand curator, anagrapheus of Chaldia, Derxene and Taron); V. Laurent, *Le Corpus des Sceaux de l'Empire Byzantin*, V, 1 (Paris, 1962), 502-3, no. 668; Constantine Porphyrogenetos, *De Administrando Imperio*, ed. Gy. Moravcsik and trans. R.J.H. Jenkins, I (Budapest, 1949), 238, 284; H. Gelzer, *Ungedruckte und ungenügend veröffentlichte Texte der Notitiae episcopatumum* (Munich, 1901), 576, 578; Chrysanthos (Philippides), "He ekklesia Trapezountos," *ArchPont*, 4-5 (1933), 154-164, who is to be preferred to N. Bees, "Sur quelques évêchés suffragants de la métropole de Trébizonde," *Byzantion*, 1 (1924), 117-137; MS *Soumela* 27, f.1, a retrospective episcopal list copied on Sunday 6 March 1737, now in the Archaeological Museum, Ankara, identifies Bizana with Tercan but (misleadingly) Chantierz with Erzincan; J.M. Kinneir, *Journey through Asia Minor, Armenia, and Koordistan, in the years 1813 and 1814* (London, 1818), 358-9; H.F.B. Lynch, *Armenia, Travels and Studies* (Beirut, 1965), II, 231 and n.1; Arnold Toynbee, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus and his World* (London, 1973), 683; H.A. Manandian, trans. N.G. Garsoian, *The Trade and Cities of Armenia in relation to Ancient World Trade* (Lisbon, 1965), 33-5, 44, 52, 91-2; David Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the end of the third century after Christ* (Princeton, 1950), II, 1464-5; Honigmann, *op.cit.*, 64, 78, 191-205 and *idem*, *RE*, 27, 971-2; J. Markwart, *Südarmenien und die Tigrisquellen* (Vienna, 1930), 51-3, 244-64, 436-7, 468; Obolensky, *op.cit.*, 32; M. Loos, *Dualist Heresy in the Middle Ages* (Prague, 1974), 32 and n.2; Garsoian, *op.cit.*, 71-2, esp. notes 164 and 165; 143-6, who is to be preferred topographically to Lemerle, "Paulicians," 50, note 3; 57-8, esp. note 17; B. Ogun, "Haraba, 1970," *AnatSt*, 21 (1971), 456, *idem*, "Haraba, 1973", *AnatSt*, 24 (1974), 33; and observations by Anthony Bryer in Tercan and near Samosata of Armenia.