

PÉTER BARA

Texts and Contexts

*Closing the Gap between Leo of Chalcedon and Anna Komnene*¹



Anna Komnene (1081–ca. 1155), the daughter of the Byzantine emperor, Alexios I (r. 1081–1118), composed her work, the *Alexiad* in the 1140s and early 1150s.² The *Alexiad* is a historical work which records the deeds of Alexios I in an epic and apologetic manner through the eyes of a daughter who made painstaking efforts to preserve the proper memory of his father. When doing so, the princess left a highly valuable source material concerning events of the late-eleventh century. Between 1082 and 1094 a long-lasting religious controversy took place in Constantinople which was led by Leo, the metropolitan bishop of Chalcedon, and commonly called as the Komnenian Iconoclasm, or Komnenian Iconoclast Debate. In addition to late-eleventh-century sources, Anna left the most coherent account of the controversy. In *Book 5* of the *Alexiad*, the historian gave an overview of the entire debate in her own reading, while in *Book 7*, she portrayed Leo of Chalcedon as a holy saviour and benefactor of the imperial family, more closely of George Palaiologos. Modern research, however, in most of the cases, handled Anna's statements regarding the Komnenian Iconoclasm at face value and did not take into consideration seriously that Anna Komnene wrote her exposition in the mid-twelfth century and that the controversy had a legacy already before Anna Komnene put to parchment her narrative.

Therefore, this study aims at enlisting and analysing the surviving testimonies and

¹ I would like to express my gratitude towards Terézia Olajos, Tibor Almási, Niels Gaul, Christian Gastgeber, Johannes Preiser-Kapeller and Michael Grünbart for their professional support. Without the financial aid of the *Österreichischer Austauschdienst*, the *Aktion Österreich-Ungarn Stiftung* and the *Osteuropapogramm* of the *Katholischer Akademischer Ausländer-Dienst* my research could not be carried out. I am grateful to the organizers of the *10. Szegedi Medievalisztikai Konferencia* for their efforts and work in the course of the conference and during the publication procedure, as well. The paper presented in June 2017 focused only one aspect of the problem now treated, namely the analysis of the apparition of Leo of Chalcedon to George Palaiologos. Since then, however, I have made substantial progress in my research and published Leo of Chalcedon's *Apology* based on the ms. *Cod. Escorialensis Y. 2.7. (262)*. This unpublished oration opened a new ground regarding the evaluation of Leo of Chalcedon's intellectual achievements which required a novel approach to the Komnenian Iconoclast Debate. The present study represents this new approach concerning the afterlife of the Komnenian Iconoclasm.

² Based on her own statement: AL 14. 7. 5–6, see also: MAGDALINO 2000, 15. In this study I abbreviate some primary sources and inventories in a particular way which the reader can find in the bibliography, otherwise I use abbreviations common in the field of Byzantine studies (Please visit: <https://www.doaks.org/research/publications/resources-for-authors-and-editors/byzantine/list-of-abbreviations-used-in-byzantine-publications>, accessed 15 Sept 2017). Transliteration of Greek names and terms follow the system of the *ODB*.

their contexts which can be regarded as reflections on the Komnenian Iconoclast Debate lasting until the 1140s. After a short overview of the controversy, the study focuses on two sources from the early 1090s, the critique of John IV Oxeites and the so-called Reform Edict of Alexios I. After this, the mid-twelfth-century is examined, in which Anna Komnene's statements about the Debate can be assessed. The present paper lays the ground for the detailed examination of Anna's account about Leo of Chalcedon and the Iconoclast Controversy which, nonetheless, goes over the limits of this study.

The Komnenian Iconoclast Debate

The following chart displays essential details of the Komnenian Iconoclast Debate.³

1081 October	Normans of Southern Italy launch their invasion against Byzantium	
1081 December	a synod approves the alienation of sacred objects	
early 1082	Leo's protest	
1082 Spring	Leo, member of the synod which condemns John Italos	
1082 August	Alexios promises in a <i>chrysobull</i> never to confiscate church treasures again	
1082-83	Leo's letter to Alexios in which he asks for Patriarch Eustratios' deposition	
1083	a committee, after the examination of the confiscation, acquits Alexios I	
1084	Eustratios Garidas' official examination and acquittance, the patriarch nevertheless abdicates	
1084	Leo refuses to concelebrate with Nikolaos III, the new patriarch	
1085 November	Alexios launches an examination against Leo	

³ The overview here mirrors my view of Leo's controversy which I will present in detail in my prospective PhD Dissertation. For the Komnenian iconoclast debate, see: ANGOLD 2000, 45–73; ARMSTRONG 1996, 219–231; BARBER 2007, 131–158; CARR 1995, 579–601; Frankopan 2007, 1–34; FRANKOPAN 2008, 71–88; GAUTIER 1971, 213–284; GERHOLD 2012, 87–104; GLAVINAS 1972; GRUMEL 1944, 126–133; GRUMEL 1941–42, 333–341; LAURIOTES 1900, 403–407, 411–416; STEPHANOU 1946, 177–199; STEPHANOU 1943, 5–64; THOMAS 1987, 186–214.

end of 1085	Leo delivers his <i>Apology</i> in attendance upon Alexios I	
1086 January	Leo is deposed from his office	
1086	Leo accuses his adversaries with iconoclasm	
1086	Petcheneg invasion	
1086–early 1091	second confiscation of church treasures	
1087 August	Battle of Distra	1087 plot of high ranking officials (CHEYNET 1990, No. 122.)
between 1087 and 1089	Leo is banished to Sozopolis	
before 1094	Leo's theory on icons based on his correspondence is examined	1091 Konstantinos Humbertopoulos' conspiracy (CHEYNET 1990, No. 124.) 1092 John Komnenos' plot (CHEYNET 1990, No. 125.)
end of 1094	synod in the Blachernai-palace, the controversy ends	early 1094 Nikephoros Diogenes' scheme (CHEYNET 1990, No. 128.)

Leo of Chalcedon was the leading figure of the so-called Komnenian Iconoclasm, opposing the religious politics of Alexios I Komnenos.⁴ The prelate was member of the episcopal bench appointed before Alexios' accession. When Alexios I alienated sacred objects of churches and monasteries in order to be able to pay his mercenaries against the Normans in 1081, Leo entered into an open conflict with the new imperial policy. He publicly criticized the reigning family and its policy, and demanded Patriarch Eustratios Garidas' abdication (r. 1081–1084) who was the appointee of the Komnenoi. Finally Garidas renounced his throne, but this did not satisfy Leo who subsequently turned against those members of the permanent episcopal synod of Constantinople who had not sided with him previously. Since members of the synod aimed at deposing

⁴ The notion has been introduced by Annemarie Carr (CARR 1995, 579). Victoria Gerhold (GERHOLD 2012, 87) also applied the term 'Chalcedonian controversy', but I prefer the former in order to avoid the confusion with the fifth-century synod and the debates following it.

the prelate and the emperor also summoned him for a hearing, Leo delivered an apologetic oration (his *Apology*) at the end of 1085. In the oration the metropolitan elaborated the idea on the basis of canon law that Alexios I and his companions were sacrilegious and the alienation of church property was impiety. As a consequence, the permanent synod censured him with the charge of insubordination in 1086 and the prelate lost his see. After the second confiscation of church property, following the Pecheneg invasion in 1087, Leo renewed his opposition. The bishop was sent into exile to Sozopolis at the Black Sea at the end of 1087. From the period of Leo's exile a couple of letters survived.⁵ In his letter to his nephew, Nikolaos, Leo explained in detail his theory of icons.⁶ The letter's content came to light which initiated the synod held in the Blachernai-palace in 1094. Leo admitted his doctrinal error and was restored to his bishopric.

John IV Oxeites and his Critique

The first reflections on the Komnenian Iconoclasm, not coming from parties involved in debate, were worded already during Leo's exile. Early 1091, the emperor faced enemies in two fronts: on the one hand, the Pechenegs approached the capital arriving to the small fortress called Chirobakchoi, situated only a distance of one walking day from the capital.⁷ On the other hand, Tzachas, a Turkish commander constructed a naval fleet at Smyrna and occupied a number of islands at the Aegean coastline from Rhodes to Mytilene. In 1090–91, Konstantinos Dalassenos recovered Chios, nevertheless, Tzachas recovered his losses, proclaimed himself emperor and sought alliance with the Pechenegs.⁸ Alexios I prevailed over the nomads at Chirobakchoi in February 1091, however, the success was only partial. In the escalating situation, the emperor returned to the capital and assembled a meeting in late February, or early March to council the expertise of civilian and ecclesiastical leaders. John IV Oxeites, patriarch of Antioch (r. ca. 1089–1100) addressed the emperor in an oration, and also made a written summary of his claims.⁹

John Oxeites' address is an outstanding example for *parrhesia*, the unrestricted expression of opinion in attendance upon a potentate. Not much is known about John Oxeites' career. He was a monk who was appointed to the sensible position of the patriarch of Antioch ca. 1088–1089. The prelate, though, occupied his see only after the oration under discussion was delivered and returned from Antioch, banished by the Latin authorities in 1100. John also wrote a treatise on the *charistikion*, rejecting the institution.¹⁰ John's present address mixes harsh critique with the praise of the ruler

⁵ Four letters were written by the metropolitan, his nephew's, Nikolaos' letter to Leo, and Basil, metropolitan of Euchaita's letter to Isaac Komnenos the *sebastokrator*, see: LAURIOTES 1900, 403–407, 411–416.

⁶ *Letter to Nikolaos of Hadrianople*, LAURIOTES 1900, 414–416.

⁷ AL 8.1.1–5.

⁸ ODB 3, 2134, s. v. 'Tzachas'; FRANKOPAN 1998, 346–350; FRANKOPAN 2012, 58–64;

⁹ We are aware of the assembly from these documents. For John IV, Oxeites, see ODB 2 1049 s. v. 'John IV (V) Oxeites'. The oration and the written summary was reedited and published by Paul Gautier: GAUTIER 1970, 5–55. A comparative analysis is provided by Peter Frankopan: FRANKOPAN 2008, 71–88.

¹⁰ On the term, see ODB 1 412 s. v. 'charistikion'; BARTUSSIS 2012, 153–155.

which explains the further success of his career and the emperor's benevolence towards him.

John Oxeites claimed in his talk that God stopped protecting Byzantium. The reason for this was the impiety of the people and the personal vices of Alexios I and his family.¹¹ In John's view, the main failure of the people was that they thought that all the evil befalling Byzantium had been the result of some kind of automatism and they did not see God's hand in the events:

The majority of the people believed that maybe some kind of automatic working of natural forces, or a fortuitous cause had merged the empire into the waves of difficulties. Thus, I heard some people saying that it was destined to be so, therefore it happened. Others think that God only cares for the salvation of our souls, allowing that way the issues of the world just to happen by chance. I think that these are lies and perverse opinion of some people which the the Lord of all¹² with thousands of testimonies from the Scripture refute. οἱ πολλοὶ κατὰ τινα ἴσως αὐτοματισμὸν ἢ ἀποκλήρωσιν ᾤοντο τὴν οἰκομένην τοῖς τῶν συμφορῶν νῦν περιιλύζεσθαι ρεύμασιν. Ἦκουσα οὖν ἐγὼ τινων λεγόντων ὡς ἔμελλεν ἄρα ταῦτα οὕτως ἔσεσθαι καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ γίνεται, ἐτέρων δὲ καὶ δοξαζόντων μόνης τὸν Θεὸν τῆς σωτηρίας κήδεσθαι τῶν ἡμετέρων ψυχῶν, τὰ δ' ἐν κόσμῳ πράγματα οὕτως ὡς ἂν τύχη φέρεσθαι καταλείπειν. τὰς οὖν τοιαύτας ψευδεῖς ἡγοῦμαι τε καὶ κακοδόξους ἐνίων δόξας τὸν τῶν ὄλων πρῶτανιν ἐξελέγχοντα μετὰ μυριῶν τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς γραφῆς μαρτυριῶν.¹³

With regard to Alexios' role in the events, John Oxeites contended that the situation of the empire had deteriorated since Alexios' accession to the throne.

O what distinction, what good repute and honour, what benevolence you had from everybody's side [...] But you were such and this kind only before your rule [...] Since then you, who had accessed the highest power, all the contrary befell: war, disarray and misery. ὦ πόσης λαμπρότητος, πόσης εὐκλείας καὶ τιμῆς, πόσης καὶ τῆς παρὰ πάντων ἀπέλαυσας εὐνοίας [...] ἀλλὰ τοιοῦτος μὲν καὶ τηλικούτος σὺ πρὸ τῆς βασιλείας [...] λοιπὸν δὲ καὶ αὐτῆς ἐπιβάντι τῆς πρώτης ἀρχῆς τάναντία σοι πάντα συμβαίνει ἐκάστοτε, πόλεμοι, καὶ ταρχαὶ καὶ συμφοραὶ.¹⁴

In John's view, God demonstrated his tutelage for Alexios I Komnenos before his accession to the throne also by means of miracles:

There are a number of trustworthy tokens of God's pity upon you. Incredible miracles which occurred, and those especially in the most difficult moments. Miracles which took place earlier on many occasions particularly for your sake. εἴσι σοι πολλὰ τῶν οἰκιτριμῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰ ἐχέγγυα· αἱ ἐκ τοῦ παντός χρόνου

¹¹ GAUTIER 1970, 21.

¹² That is Jesus Christ's crucifixion.

¹³ GAUTIER 1970, 21.16–20.

¹⁴ GAUTIER 1970, 25.26–31; 27.1–3.

παράδοξοι θεοσημιαὶ καὶ μάλιστα ἐν τοῖς περιστάτικοῖς τῶν καιρῶν· τὰ εἰς αὐτὸν σε πολλάκις πρότερον θαυματουργηθέντα.¹⁵

However, after the new dynasty started to wield power, a number of shortcomings can be attributed to Alexios and the imperial family. First, Alexios came to power as a usurper and his troops pillaged Constantinople upon their entry.¹⁶ The way in which the extended Komnenian family wields power, was a disaster for the polity: members of the imperial family cared only about their own wealth.¹⁷ The *basileus* should not have chosen his relatives, but more honest men.¹⁸ In addition to this, when the *basileus* faced the Norman threat and suffered losses from Bohemond, he neither did see it as a token of God's warning, nor did he do penance.¹⁹ Instead, Alexios rather put his confidence in troops, armies and humans means.²⁰ Third, the Komnenoi imposed a heavy taxation system on their subjects and the comportment of local *archontes* and tax collectors was unbearable.²¹ Hence, the peasants suffer, they do not know where to flee.²² Fourth, due to the accession of the new dynasty, the affairs of the church also worsened. Alexios confiscated church valuables and gave ecclesiastical institutions into *epidosis*.²³ What is more, during the confiscation, bishops and clergy were maltreated and assaulted.²⁴ As the result of all this, the Pechenegs and Tzacha's navy arrived to punish Byzantium as 'the Iliads of evil'.²⁵

The prelate advised Alexios, his family and the people to repent seriously.²⁶ John also emphasised the importance of philanthropy on the side of the emperor.²⁷ Furthermore, the Patriarch suggested to turn to the Theotokos in the Blachernai. John reminded Alexios that with the help of the miraculous *maphorion* of the Blachernai church in 860, the invading Rus' army had been turned away from the city walls.²⁸ The written summary of the oration put particular emphasis on the words of the Psalmist:

If we are forced to do battle, let Christ be himself the commander and chief of the *tagmata* and none of our enemies could humble us saying with the Psalmist: 'these with their chariots, others with their horses, but we will be made powerful with the name of our Lord'. εἰ δέ ποτε καὶ στρατεύειν ἡναγκαζόμεθα, στρατάρχης ἐν ἡμῖν αὐτὸς ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ συνταγματάρχης καὶ ἐν τῷ μηδενὶ ἂν τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἡμῶν ἐταπεινὸν ὥστε καὶ λέγειν ἡμᾶς μετὰ τοῦ ψάλλοντος δύνασθαι· οὗτοι ἐν

¹⁵ GAUTIER 1970, 37.13–16.

¹⁶ GAUTIER 1970, 29.1–5.

¹⁷ GAUTIER 1970, 21; 23; 41.18–20.

¹⁸ GAUTIER 1970, 43.16–20.

¹⁹ GAUTIER 1970, 29.1–5.

²⁰ John alludes here to *Pf* 143, 6–8 (LXX).

²¹ GAUTIER 1970, 31.9–15.

²² GAUTIER 1970, 35. 24.

²³ On the term, see BARTUSSIS 2012, 153 fn. 77.

²⁴ GAUTIER 1970, 31.15–33.13.

²⁵ GAUTIER 1970, 31.5: αἱ τῶν κακῶν Ἰλιάδαί.

²⁶ GAUTIER 1970, 37 sqq. *passim*.

²⁷ GAUTIER 1970, 43.26–27.

²⁸ GAUTIER 1970, 39.23–27.

ἄρμασιν καὶ οὗτοι ἐν ἵπποις, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου Θεοῦ μεγαλυνθησόμεθα (Ps 19.8 LXX).²⁹

Therefore, John Oxeytes gave a complex interpretation of Alexios I's difficulties, approaching the question from all aspects he deemed important. One of the core problem was the Komnenian Iconoclasm: the alienation of church property for secular purposes. John Oxeytes expressed a theory that 'God punished Byzantium' taking into consideration a religious deed thus reward, sin therefore punishment scheme. It can be assumed that his advice was considered seriously, as the next source under examination, namely Alexios' Reform Edict suggests.

The Reform Edict of Alexios I

The Novel or Edict which Alexios issued with the intention to reform the preaching, or teaching standards of the clergy is one of his most important acts.³⁰ The Edict has been studied especially from the aspect of its influence on higher education of Constantinople and its impact on the intellectual milieu of the twelfth-century. However, other related questions, such as to what degree was the Novel the initiative of Patriarch Nikolaos III Grammatikos (r. 1084–1111), or the Edict's dating and circumstances of its release, are still far from being resolved.

Alexios Reform Edict is mostly known to Byzantinists as the 1107 Edict. Nevertheless, the late Andreas Schminck in 'a somewhat surprising footnote'³¹ dated the Novel to June 1092. Schminck's opinion was included in Dölger's renewed inventory of imperial documents,³² without further scholarly reflections on the topic since then. Andreas Schminck argued:

Die Novelle is aus inhaltlichen Gründen eher in das Jahr 1092 zu verweisen (wobei sich die Jahresangabe im *Cod. Marc. Gr.* 49, f. 346v, leicht als ein paläographisches Versehen, nämlich als ein durch die Indiktionsangabe verursachte Dittographie, [τῆς ιε' ἰνδικτιῶνος τοῦ ,ςχιε' ἔτους statt ιε' ἰνδ. τοῦ ,ςχ' ἔτους], erklären ließe).³³

Schminck contended that due to a dittographic failure of the scribe an inaccurate dating has been transmitted.³⁴ The reader of the manuscript finds the dating at the bottom of f. 346v which, however, does not help in elucidating the problem. I can only confirm, on the one hand, that Gautier's edition of the manuscript is accurate; on the other

²⁹ GAUTIER 1970, 51.13–17.

³⁰ The Novel was edited by Paul Gautier: GAUTIER 1973, for further discussions consult DW 1995, § 1168b, and MAGDALINO 1996, 199 fn.1.

³¹ As it is called by Ludwig Burgmann: BURGMANN 1996, 189; For the footnote itself, see SCHMINCK 1991, 563–565, fn. 40.

³² DW 1995, § 1168b

³³ SCHMINCK, 'Entwicklung', 564, fn. 40.

³⁴ I have the impression that Schminck based his claim on a parallel place. In the same long footnote (under the letter 'g') the scholar mentioned Zachariä von Lingenthal's idea to date a verdict concerning an ecclesiastical dispute (§ 1168c) from 1082 to 1092. The redating is based on a similar failure which Schminck supposed regarding the 1107 Edict: ἰνδ. ε' instead ἰνδ. ιε'. Nonetheless, this is only an assumption, since Schminck did not explain his idea which died with him.

hand, I am willing to accept Schminck's idea, because those passages of the edict which I analyse here, fit to the historical context of the late 1080s and early 1090s.³⁵

Alexios' Edict, in brief, aims at rising the clergy's standard of preaching and teaching for the moral and religious emolument of the Christian flock.³⁶ The orders of the Novel must have been a law (*νόμος κοινός καὶ θέσπισμα*), binding throughout the empire.³⁷ In spite of the fact that the Edict focused on the staff of the Great Church of Constantinople (the Hagia Sophia) whom Alexios chose as his primary allies in his dealing with the church, the edict was also meant to influence the clergy in the provinces. Alexios ordered the patriarch to survey the moral and intellectual standards of the members of the Great Church and expected the same from the metropolitans in their dioceses with respect to their priests.³⁸ In order to improve the intellectual standards of the clergy, Alexios I provided imperial funds to establish professional chairs to preach (the so-called *didaskaloi*, 'teachers'). These four positions³⁹ were recruited from members of the Great Church and were highly encouraged (even with additional salary) to enter priesthood, moreover, to become metropolitans in the provinces. In addition to this, Alexios ordered the revision of stipulations of canon law, namely Patriarch Photios' (r. 858–867 and 877–886) *Nomokanon of Fourteen Titles*.⁴⁰ Furthermore, the emperor urged to controll vagrant monks more strictly.⁴¹

Alexios I argued for issuing the Novel in two grounds (1) the faithful, particularly the more simple, were in danger and (2) the clergy did not perform his duties properly, especially preaching and teaching.⁴² The Edict was written in the first person singular, the emperor addressed the Patriarch and the episcopal synod. Paul Magdalino emphasised that the wording of the Novel suggests unprofessional drafting: the lack of a proper *prooimion*, the repetitive argumentation excludes the possibility that Alexios issued the Novel only to demonstrate imperial authority over the church.⁴³ The Edict did not mean simply to emulate Alexios' great predecessors, such as Justinian I (r. 527–565) and Herakleios (r. 610–641) in its form. Alexios had had the means to do so, since he had John Taronites,⁴⁴ an expert of Roman law, or Johannes Solomon⁴⁵ to draw up his official documents. In addition to the more simple execution of the document, which could be the token of Alexios' personal involvement in its issuing, the Edict's content also testified about an emperor burning with religious zeal. The emperor insisted recur-

³⁵ I plan to treat the Novel elsewhere, considering comparative legislative material and discussing its content in its entirety.

³⁶ GAUTIER 1973, 183; 186.

³⁷ GAUTIER 1973, 193.

³⁸ GAUTIER 1973, 199.

³⁹ Teacher of the Psalms, Apostles, Gospels and the Master of Rhetoricians.

⁴⁰ GAUTIER 1973, 197.

⁴¹ GAUTIER 1973, 197.

⁴² GAUTIER 1973, 183.

⁴³ MAGDALINO 1996, 204–205.

⁴⁴ See Anna Komnene's testimony: AL 13.1.3.

⁴⁵ The *protopredros* Johannes Solomon assisted in issuing a number of Novels, such as DW 1995, § 1004, 1047, 1082, 1083, 1113, 1122, and 1133, see SCHMINCK 1991, 564, fn. 40.

rently⁴⁶ that the situation was urgent:

We will not have any kind of excuse, unless we rise [spiritually] from the dead and we correct what is bad, renovating the good which is despised. What kind of good? The one which is incomparably better than any good thing: the one which makes us undoubtedly fitting to God, which hardly could be seen already since long due to negligence. Οὐχ ἔχομεν πάντως ἀπολογίαν τινά, εἰ μὴ διεγερωθῶμεν ἅπαντες καὶ διόρθωσιν τοῦ κακοῦ ποιήσομεν, ἀνακαινίζοντες τὸ καταφρονηθὲν καλόν. Ποῖον καλόν; Τὸ ἀσυγκρίτως μείζον ἁπάντων τῶν καλῶν, τὸ οἰκιοῦν ἡμᾶς δηλονότι τῷ Θεῷ τὸ διὰ χρόνιας ἤδη ἀμαυρούμενον ἀμελείας.⁴⁷

If Schminck's new dating of the Novel to 1092 holds, what were those circumstances in which the emperor was urged to apologise for the state of religious life? I believe that two contemporary events were influential on Alexios' issuing of the Novel. On the one hand, the empire's escalating military situation and John Oxiteas' address, delivered a year before the Edict's assumed release. On the other hand, the opposition of members of the Byzantine church against Alexios' measures and their professional qualities also has to be taken into consideration. First, I look at the former topic.

As I have already canvassed when examining John Oxiteas' address, the empire was in a precarious situation in the early 1090s threatened by the Pecheneg and Seljukian invasion. The Pechenegs were ultimately defeated at the battle of Lebonion on 29 April 1091, so the threat from the North ceased to exist.⁴⁸ This, probably, diminished the pressure on the people and on Alexios. However, the threat from the Aegean Coastline was still impending. Earlier research assumed that the Seljukid Tzacha was defeated during the year 1092, or at the latest in early 1093. However, Peter Frankopan contended that this happened only at the turn of 1097/1098.⁴⁹ After the ultimate fall of Asia Minor in the early 1090s to the Turks, only the arrival of Western knights of the First Crusade provided impetus for recovery.⁵⁰ As it were, when Alexios' Edict could have been issued during the summer of 1092, the situation was still not favourable.

I am of the opinion that John Oxiteas' alarmist approach and his claim that God punishes Byzantium influenced Alexios when issuing the Novel. The disorganised form of the Edict may be explained by the fact that Alexios I felt himself personally responsible to act for the improvement of the faith.⁵¹ John Oxiteas urged repentance and renovation by turning to God which are key points in the Edict. The emperor's claim that the faith is in neglect matches John Oxiteas' contention.⁵² With the help of John's oration, it is possible to define the nature of this negligence (ἀμελεία). In the section already quoted, John directed the attention of Alexios I towards different kinds of intel-

⁴⁶ GAUTIER 1973, 181 and 183: general neglect of faith, 186: low intellectual standards of the clergy, 195: the neglect of stipulations of canon law.

⁴⁷ GAUTIER 1973, 181, l. 25–28.

⁴⁸ Anna Komnene is the only source narrating the events, AL 8.4–6. On details of the battle, see KOVÁCS 2014, 174–189.

⁴⁹ FRANKOPAN 1998, 346–350; FRANKOPAN 2012, 63.

⁵⁰ FRANKOPAN 2012, 101–155.

⁵¹ To behave as the guardian of orthodox faith, was central in Alexios' self-representation throughout his reign, see: MAGDALINO 1996, 203; MALAMUT 2007, 191–267.

⁵² See above fn. 26–29 for John's view, fn. 45 and 46 for Alexios' Edict.

lectual deviation from orthodoxy.⁵³ The prelate mentioned two approaches to the events, (1) the world is governed by αὐτοματισμὸς or ἀποκλήρωσις and, (2) God cares only for the salvation of the soul (ψυχή). The identification of the first tenet referring to αὐτοματισμὸς or ἀποκλήρωσις is rather puzzling, so the solution of the problem requires further research.⁵⁴ However, I suppose that the latter idea can be in connection with the bogomil heresy.⁵⁵

This dualist heresy appeared in Bulgaria in the tenth century.⁵⁶ At the time of Alexios, bogomil beliefs seemed to be present in the empire, a physician called Basil ‘the Bogomil’ exercised influence among courtiers,⁵⁷ and also among the more simple people.⁵⁸ In 1111 Alexios summoned Basil for a private discussion, about which notes were taken in secret and after which Basil was publicly burnt in the Hippodrome of Constantinople. Alexios commissioned a monk, Euthymios Zigabenos to make an inventory about the known heresies, in which a chapter *Against the Bogomils* was also included.⁵⁹ According to the bogomil world view, the matter and the created world, including men, themselves are despicable and bad.⁶⁰ The soul is the most precious part of man, the Father’s creation and main concern. The Bogomil reading of divine salvation focused on the human soul, as Zigabenos singled out: the Father sent Archangel Michael, his ‘word/Logos’ and ‘had mercy upon the soul, which is his own inflation. κατελήσας τὴν ψυχὴν, τὸ ἴδιον ἐμφύσημα’.⁶¹ Therefore, it is plausible that in Alexios’ view, the Christian faithful were in danger, because they were threatened by Bogomil beliefs and also by tenets which denied the role of divine providence in governing the empire. In the escalating situation, Alexios seems (1) to create a group of intellectual

⁵³ GAUTIER 1970, 21.16–20.

⁵⁴ The ‘automatic working of natural forces’, and the ‘fortuitous cause’ show some parallels with the the eleventh-century polymath, Michael Psellos’ thoughts about the forces governing human history, see: KALDELLIS 1999, 101–108. Psellos was not alive when John Oxiteis delivered his talk (KALDELLIS 2011, 651–664), nonetheless his views might have been widespread via his writings and among his students.

⁵⁵ A similar assumption was made by MAGDALINO 1996, 215.

⁵⁶ Most recently: KUSABU 2013; overarching works: BOBOLENSKY 2004, esp. 59–214; RUNCIMAN, 1982, 63–82; ANGELOV 1978, 34–156; LOOS 1974, 47–112.

⁵⁷ AL 15.9.2 ; ODB 1 268 s. v. ‘Basil the Bogomil’; GRESS-WRIGHT 1977, 163–185.

⁵⁸ Euthymios Zigabenos, *Against the Bogomils*, PG 1292 B. It is difficult to define to what degree Bogomil tenets were widespread in monastic circles. The Edict’s hint to vagrant monks can be associated with the itinerant preaching profile thought to be characteristic of dualist heresies, such as the Late Antique Manichee, or the Kathars of Southern France in the thirteenth century. However the evidence concerning Bogomilism during the reign of Alexios I leaves one clueless in this respect. MAGDALINO 1996, 216 pinpoints that Alexios did not commission monks to restore the orthodox faith and there is evidence from the 1140s about monks persecuted for dualist beliefs.

⁵⁹ ODB 3 2227, s. v. ‘Zigabenos, Euthymios’; JUGIE 1912, 215–225; Zigabenos’ inventory is called *Panoplia dogmatike*. Its most accessible edition is PG 130. 1289D–1331D.

⁶⁰ Euthymios Zigabenos, *Against the Bogomils*, PG 1300 C: ‘For they not only classify the creation of men as one of the bad things, but [they think likewise] about the creation of the first heaven, the earth, and to put it simply, about all things that pertain to the earth. ἐκεῖνοι γὰρ τῷ πονηρῷ οὐ μόνον τὴν τούτων [τ. ε. ἀνθρώπων] δημιουργίαν ἀπονέμουσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν τοῦ πρώτου οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἀπλῶς εἰπεῖν, ἀπάντων τῶν ἐγκοσμίων’.

⁶¹ Euthymios Zigabenos, *Against the Bogomils*, PG 1302 B.

clergymen in the capital to reply to these beliefs, and (2) to raise the intellectual standards of the provincial clergy to take care of the faithful in the provinces.⁶²

The other factor which could have influenced Alexios' Novel, was the opposition of clergymen against the initiative of the novel Komnenian government. With the accession of the Komnenoi, the status of the Byzantine church changed notably. Alexios I's religious policy was labelled as 'interventionist' and 'oppressive' by modern interpreters.⁶³ Undoubtedly, the new *basileus* aimed at controlling the church and, in order to fulfill this purpose, Alexios had to tame the episcopal bench which he inherited and also to find allies among churchmen. During this procedure, Alexios chose the clergy of the Patriarch, the deacons and priests of Hagia Sophia in particular.⁶⁴ This explains why the emperor's measures were directed towards the clergy of the Great Church, despite the fact that the order equally bounded ecclesiastics residing in the provinces. The metropolitans step by step gave way to Alexios' ascendancy, in line with events of the Komnenian Iconoclast Debate. The Blachernai-synod marked not only the end of the controversy with Leo, but also with the members of the old episcopal bench. However, this procedure did not go smoothly and the opposition posed by the metropolitans was significant. It manifested in the Komnenian Iconoclasm, on the one hand, and Niketas of Ankyra's opposition, on the other.

Niketas, the metropolitan bishop of Ankyra, was the ringleader in a debate between the metropolitans and the patriarchal clergy between 1084 and 1088.⁶⁵ The controversy arose regarding the status of two episcopal sees, Madytos and Basileion, which were suffragans of Ankyra. Emperor Konstantinos Doukas (r. 1059–1067) raised both sees to metropolitan status, however, one of them died and Niketas of Ankyra aimed at having the see returned under the jurisdiction of Ankyra. The case brought about a fierce antagonism between the metropolitan party and the patriarchal clergy who were the new allies of Alexios I. The debate ended without changing the status of the two metropolitan sees with the intervention of Alexios I who demonstrated that *Canon 12* of the Council of Chalcedon (451) does not apply for the emperor who has the right to intervene in affairs of the church.⁶⁶ As a result of the controversy Niketas of Ankyra resigned his see in protest. During the dispute, Niketas of Ankyra composed four orations to buttress his position from different aspects.⁶⁷ These are *On Ordinations*, *On Synods*, *On the Elections*, and *On the Right of Resignation*. The works *On Ordination* and *On the Elections* show Niketas' reaction to imperial intervention in episcopal appointments. The oration *On Synods* argued for the metropolitans' right to have their local synods in the capital. The last work was produced when Niketas handed in an entreaty to the permanent episcopal synod upon his resignation at the end of the controversy. Niketas' works

⁶² There is no evidence to estimate to what degree Bogomilism was widespread in the provinces. The focus of the edict on the more simple men (see: GAUTIER 1973, 179. l. 5 'ἀπλουστέροι') suggest broader social influence.

⁶³ ANGOLD 2000, 45–72; MAGDALINO 2009, 267–268.

⁶⁴ TIFTIXOGLU 1959, 25–59; ANGOLD 2000, 54–63.

⁶⁵ For Niketas of Ankyra, see ODB 3 1481, s. v. 'Niketas of Ankyra'; ANGOLD 2000, 54–57; DARROUZÈS 1966, 37–53. Despite the fact that Alexander Kazhdan disputed Jean Darrouzès' identification of the anonymous author of the five treatises with Niketas of Ankyra (see: *ViçVrem* 30 (1969) 283), I find Darrouzès' arguments convincing.

⁶⁶ On the question, see SARADI 1991, 149–165.

⁶⁷ DARROUZÈS 1963, 160–266.

are rhetoricised in the middle style, use legal language, scholarly prose and a canonical argumentation, involving church canons and patristic sources to a greater, stipulations of secular law on a lesser degree.

The other way in which the opposition of the metropolitan party against Alexios' policy took form, was the Komnenian Iconoclasm. Niketas' works can be compared to an important document of this controversy: Leo of Chalcedon's *Apology*.⁶⁸ At the end of the year 1085, Leo of Chalcedon was called by Alexios for an official hearing. This happened after Leo replied in an entreaty to the synod the members of which contemplated to depose him due to his long and stubborn resistance. Leo held a defence speech which he turned into an accusation against the *basileus*. The prelate charged the emperor with idolatry and iconoclasm. Leo composed a legal treatise (ἀπόδειξις) on the alienation of sacred objects and their use for minting coins. The *Apology's* use of rhetorical tools, its scholarly language, the application of canonical and patristic source material can be compared to Niketas of Ankyra's orations. Both metropolitans fought against Alexios' measures using means provided by canon law.

Both Leo and Niketas protested that way, because Alexios I launched a discourse, finding legal explanations for his acts. His expropriation of church property was based on a stipulation of secular law, namely Iustinianos' *Seventh Novel*,⁶⁹ while in Niketas' instance, the emperor did not take into consideration *Canon 12* of Chalcedon. Alexios I not only presented himself as acting on a legal basis, but had in mind to control the escalating debate also on the theoretical ground. The aim was undoubtedly to grant himself the greatest possible flexibility (*oikonomia*)⁷⁰ to use secular (*nomoi*) and ecclesiastical (*kanones*) sources of law simultaneously, according to his purpose.⁷¹ This gives reason why the Reform Edict orders the revision of Photios' *Nomokanon of Fourteen Titles*, a collection which encompassed stipulations of both secular and ecclesiastical law:

The *Book of the Nomokanons* has to be read out in its entirety in front of the holy and sacred synod. From the canons which are in present subjects to comparative examination,⁷² those which concern piety and confirm the right teaching that we accepted as a tradition, in every way reworked, must be observed. The other canons must be given to our imperial majesty in an annotated form,⁷³ in order to apply it *flexibly* [italicised by the author] after examining it thoroughly together with your holiness [i.e. Patriarch Nikolaos III Grammatikos]. ἀναγνωσθήτω καὶ τὸ τοῦ νομοκάνονος βιβλίον ἅπαν ἐνώπιον τῆς ἱερᾶς καὶ ἀγίας συνόδου, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν

⁶⁸ Leo of Chalcedon's *Apology* will be published critically in my prospective dissertation, together with an ample discussion of its contents.

⁶⁹ CIC 3. 60.1–8; CIC 1.10.6–8.: Sacra. etiam per nostram constitutionem alienari et obligari prohibuimus, excepta causa redemptionis captivorum. On the use of Justinianic legislation during the eleventh century, see: CHITWOOD 2017, 174–182.

⁷⁰ On the term, see ODB 3 1515 s. v. 'oikonomia'.

⁷¹ For the imperial use of secular and canon law during the Komnenian period, see MACRIDES 1990, 61–87; PERENTIDIS 1991, 141–149; STOLTE 1991, 543–555.

⁷² That is the actual meaning for Alexios' contemporaries is considered.

⁷³ Both Paul Gautier (GAUTIER 1973, 196: tous les autres qu'on aura écartés) and Paul Magdalino (MAGDALINO 1996, 202: while the others should be removed and referred to the emperor) interpret it as 'put aside', however the verb also has this meaning, cf. LSJ sv. 1334: 'extract and compile the remarks of others', and παρεμβολή: compilation of a set of critical remarks, *ibidem*.

παραθεωρουμένων νῦν θείων κανόνων οἱ μὲν πρὸς εὐσέβειαν ὄρωντες καὶ τι συστατικὸν τοῦ ὀρθοῦ δόγματος παραδιδόντες ἡμῖν παντὶ τρόπῳ ἀνανεωθέντες τηρεῖσθωσαν, οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ παρεκβληθέντες δοθήτωσαν καὶ τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου, ἵνα κοινῇ τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ ἀγιότητι περὶ τούτων συνδιασκεψαμένη τὸ δέον *οἰκονομήσῃ*.⁷⁴

The Komnenian Iconoclasm and Niketas of Ankyra's case entailed discussions of legal nature and the imperial need for legal inventories which might have eased the administrative running of the church under the supervision of the emperor. The analysis of Alexios' Reform Edict is noteworthy from the aspect of the Komnenian Iconoclasm, because it indicates a change with respect to clergymen. During the early Komnenian period, the new rulers faced the opposition of ecclesiastics with legal expertise and the courage to defy the emperor. The new Komnenian lords immediately tried to control the legal discourse and found for themselves fresh allies among clergymen for whom new standards were established: instead of involvement in political debates, the importance of pastoral duties, especially preaching and teaching were emphasised.

Anna Komnene and the context of her presentation of the Komnenian iconoclasm

It is a well-known fact that Anna Komnene wrote the bulk of the *Alexiad* after 1143, the accession of Manuel I Komnenos.⁷⁵ Nevertheless, the way in which the context of the mid-twelfth century composition influenced Anna's narrative needs further clarification. It has been emphasised that the blossoming encomiastic literature during Alexios' successors meant a great stimulus for Anna to preserve a decent and fitting memory of his father.⁷⁶ The eulogists of the new emperors compared John II and Manuel I to Alexios I and, as a result of a dynastic development, the son and the grandson surpassed the grandfather in the eyes of the encomiasts. Anna aimed at saving the image of an Alexios which was the image cultivated by Eirene, Alexios' wife, and by Anna and her husband Nikephoros Bryennios. In other words, an image was to be perpetuated by the group, which fell from power with the succession of John II, Anna's brother. Paul Magdalino called attention to certain topics which particularly merited Anna's attention. According to all likelihood, Anna elaborated particular topics to react to opinions which assessed Alexios I negatively in the light of the achievements of his successors. These are Alexios' role in the First Crusade; the high moral standards in Alexios' court; the rejection of astrology; and the importance of learning. These critiques ought to be read in the context of Manuel I's successes in Antioch, the frivolity of his court, Manuel's passionate interest in astrology, and the image of a 'philosopher king' which developed as a result of the internal power struggles within the Komnenian family between John II and Isaakios, Anna's brother. However, other points are also worth mentioning which are singularly important for our argumentation.

Regarding Leo's controversy, Anna stated that it had had repercussions until the time when the chronicler composed the *Alexiad*.⁷⁷ From Anna's narrative it seems that Leo's *parrhesia*, or his claim that the emperors were iconoclasts, were not the reason for

⁷⁴ GAUTIER 1973, p.197, l. 282–287.

⁷⁵ AL 14. 7. 5–6.

⁷⁶ MAGDALINO 2000, 15–45.

⁷⁷ AL 5.2.4.

this. Alexios and his family were compared to iconoclast emperors implicitly by other critiques, such as John Oxeites and Niketas of Ankyra. Though Niketas of Ankyra abdicated from his see, John was an insider in the Komnenian system occupying the sensible position of the patriarch of Antioch.⁷⁸ I assume that Alexios' alienation of church property and his ecclesiastical policy brought about the accusations of him during the reign of Manuel I. Anna Komnene's account supports this view. The description of the events in the *Alexiad* starts with the scenario in the Hagia Sophia where Isaakios the *sebastokrator* entered and forced the episcopal synod of Constantinople and the clergy of the Great Church to let the rulers confiscate church property not in use any more.⁷⁹ Anna concluded the events with the following authorial comment: 'The original proposal was passed. This became the subject of a very serious accusation against the emperors [...], not only on that occasion, but even later, right down to our own time. τὰ δεδομένα ἐκράτει. τοῦτο ὕλη μεγίστης κατηγορίας τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν ἐγένετο...οὐ τότε μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ μέχρι καιροῦ διαρκέσασα'.⁸⁰ The scanty evidence that might be culled from different sources, tell about alienation of a greater dimension. Leo of Chalcedon in his letter to Alexios I made the following outburst:

If you wish to listen to the testimonies one by one: the monasteries: what number of holy objects those were deprived of! The hermitages: to what degree their decorations were taken away! The sanctuaries: to what extent those lost their decent outlook!..The poor boxes in churches shout more clearly than thousand testimonies! εἰ δὲ βούλει καὶ κατὰ μέρος ἀκοῦσαι τοὺς μάρτυρας, τὰ μοναστήρια, ὅσα ἱερὰ ἐσλήθησαν· τὰ ἀσκητήρια, ὅσα τὰ οἰκεῖον περιῆρηται κόσμον· τὰ θυσιαστήρια, ὅσα γυμνωθέντα τῆς εὐπρεπείας αὐτῶν...αὐτὰ τὰ κιβώτια..μυρίων μαρτύρων τρανότερον βοᾶσιν.⁸¹

With regard to the alienation, even Alexios I himself confirmed in one of his imperial documents from July 1082 that 'this trespass was committed in a number of holy churches. τοῦτι μὲν τὸ ἔργον ἐν πολλαῖς τῶν ἁγίων ἐκκλησιῶν διέπραξάτο'.⁸²

In the *Alexiad*, Anna Komnene used every occasion to express that his father had expropriated only a small number of objects. Moreover, she listed with care what institutions suffered from the confiscation and how they were compensated for their losses.⁸³ Alexios, later during his reign, tried to strengthen the financial basis of the episcopate.⁸⁴ The emperor sanctioned that prelates can collect the *kanonikon*, the tax for their pastoral duties, not only from the clergy, but also from laymen.⁸⁵ Additionally, Alexios was eager to retrieve episcopal lands and properties that had been given to lay and ecclesiastical owners as *kharistike*.⁸⁶ However, compared to Alexios I's harsh treatment of the church in the first decade of his rule, and also taking into account his more lenient

⁷⁸ MAGDALINO 2009, 268–274.

⁷⁹ AL 5.2.

⁸⁰ AL 5.2.4.

⁸¹ *Letter to Alexios I*, LAURIOTES 1900, 403.

⁸² RHP 5 282.

⁸³ AL 5.2; 6.3.5.

⁸⁴ ANGOLD 2000, 61–63.

⁸⁵ DW 943–944, 1127; GD 942.

⁸⁶ GD 952 for the metropolitan of Kyzikos.

approach afterwards, Manuel I made extraordinary concessions to the church during the first half of his reign. The concessions might have provided grounds to criticise Alexios I's church policy. This might be the *κατηγορία* to which Anna referred to in the section quoted above.

It has been noted there is a turning point in Manuel's dealing with the church starting from 1147 and taking full shape eventually in 1166.⁸⁷ The Byzantine church was divided by factionalism and the young emperor realised that his involvement in affairs of the church is necessary. From 1147 onwards, Manuel adopted the title *epistemonarches*, 'chief scientific expert' in the government of the church. His interventions were occasioned by internal conflicts within the church that took shape under the guise of theological debates and were palpable by the frequent changes of patriarchs.⁸⁸ One way how the *basileus* attempted to win the favour of the church, especially until 1158, was his generosity.⁸⁹ Upon his accession to the throne in 1143, Manuel bribed the patriarchal clergy for their support.⁹⁰ In 1144, the emperor exempted provincial priests from special taxes, to which he added further exemptions a year later.⁹¹ In the years 1148–1149, the bishopric of Korfu was granted 80 peasants and 40 houses, and further additions in a year's time.⁹² About the same time, the bishopric of Kroia received imperial donations, likewise the see of Thessalonike before 1155.⁹³ Furthermore, imperial chrysobulls testify to Manuel's largess. In 1146, the emperor confirmed the landholdings, possessions and privileges of monasteries around the capital.⁹⁴ In 1158, Manuel confirmed the same legislation for monasteries with some extensions, even if the respective owners could not verify their claim of possession by written evidence. The imperial fisc should have donated those items to monastic institutions which the monasteries claimed to be their own.⁹⁵ Imperial measures did not exclude the episcopate and the patriarchal clergy from such benefactions. The same allowances were provided to episcopal and metropolitan sees in 1148 and to the clergy of the Hagia Sophia in 1153.⁹⁶ Such excessive concessions did evoke reactions from Manuel I's encomiasts.

In an oration, which was delivered by Michael ὁ τοῦ Ἀγγιᾶλου, the later patriarch of Constantinople,⁹⁷ and dated recently to 1150, the orator made the following statement:⁹⁸

⁸⁷ MAGDALINO 2009, 286; ANGOLD 2000, 86–89. For an overview of Manuel's church policy, see ANGOLD 2000, 73–115; MAGDALINO 2009, 276–315.

⁸⁸ For Jean Darrouzès' view on the frequent alteration of patriarchs, see DARROUZÈS 1970, 7–20. The period between 1143 and 1170 witnessed seven incumbents of the patriarchal office.

⁸⁹ SVORONOS 1973, 373: 'En somme, de 1143 à 1158, Manuel, tout en essayant de sauvegarder dans une certaine mesure les droits de l'État, cède continuellement aux exigences de l'Église'.

⁹⁰ DW 1330.

⁹¹ DW 1334, 1341a.

⁹² DW 1371a, 1371b.

⁹³ DW 1387, 1395c.

⁹⁴ DW 1347.

⁹⁵ DW 1347, 1419.

⁹⁶ DW 1372, 1390.

⁹⁷ 1170–1179.

⁹⁸ The inaugural oration of Michael of Anchialos was published by Robert Browning who dated it to 1165–1167: BROWNING 1961, 173–214. However, Ioannis Polemis dated the speech as pertaining to Manuel's 1150-campaign against Hungary: POLEMIS 2011, 162–172.

O, of what happiness, or rather to say of what largesse! [Manuel] filled all that pertains to the holy lords and he worked for them so eagerly. Come here, o height of the saintly hierarchy, who are in charge of the mystical services, all-hallowed stewards of grace, raise your voice and as with a trumpet spread the news of the imperial magnificence, of the divine zeal, of his deeds which are visible everywhere. ὦ πόσης εὐδαιμονίας, ἢ μᾶλλον εἰπεῖν ἀγαθουργίας, τὰ τῶν ἱερῶν ἀνακτόρων ἐνέπλησε καὶ περὶ ταῦτα δειπνήθη φιλοτιμότερον· καὶ δεῦρο ἢ τῆς θείας ἱεραρχίας ἀκρότης, οἱ τελετάρχαι τῆς μυστικῆς ἀγιστείας, οἱ παναγεῖς οἰκονόμοι τῆς χάριτος, ὑψώσατε φωνήν, ὡς ἐν σάλπιγγι τὰς αὐκρατορικὰς μεγαλοπρεπείας ἀνακηρύξατε, τὸν θεῖον ζῆλον, τῶν ἔργων τὴν περιφάνειαν.⁹⁹

Michael the Rhetor, one of the mid-twelfth century teachers of the Patriarchal School, extolled Manuel I's achievement concerning the same campaign in the autumn of 1150 in an oration delivered in 1152.¹⁰⁰ The rhetorician labelled Manuel I's eagerness in support of the church as 'great accomplishments which had not been achieved by any of the emperors. ὑπ' οὐδενὸς βεσιλέων κατορθωθέντα μεγαλοργήματα'.¹⁰¹ Michael the Rhetor was the protégé of the archbishop of Thessalonike, probably Basil of Ohrid, and made a career in the Patriarchate as a teacher and *protekdikos*.¹⁰² Michael of Anchialos was connected to the episcopal bench through his protector, the metropolitan of Anchialos. He acted as the head of the patriarchal chancellery and, as Michael the Rhetor, occupied the position of the *protekdikos*. Michael was appointed by Manuel as *consul of the philosophers*.¹⁰³ It is plausible to argue that both orations voiced the opinion of that group of the church, which increasingly found and expressed its self-confident and distinct intellectual character from the early Komnenian period. Manuel's support of the church implied a mutual collaboration between him and the churchmen. The emperor needed the church to acknowledge his position and provide a stable backing for his military operations.¹⁰⁴ And indeed, in Michael of Anchialos' oration the emperor is praised as the patron of learning and philosophy,¹⁰⁵ an invincible commander at the battle of Tara during his recent campaign against the Hungarians,¹⁰⁶ and also against all his enemies, both Eastern and Western.¹⁰⁷ In addition to this, Manuel is eulogised as a law-giver,¹⁰⁸ and the benefactor of the church. Michael the Rhetor's oratory pieces are sources of primary importance descanting Manuel I's campaigns of 1149–1153.¹⁰⁹ Thus, an inflated image of Manuel I as benefactor of the church and as an unrivalled military leader were present side by side in some, especially ecclesiastical, oratory pieces of the early 1150s.¹¹⁰

⁹⁹ BROWNING 1961, 196.

¹⁰⁰ On Michael the Rhetor, see ODB 2 1369 s. v. 'Michael Rhetor', on the oration under discussion see REGEL 1982, XVIII.

¹⁰¹ REGEL 1982, 138, l. 16.

¹⁰² An ecclesiastical judge, see ODB 3 1742 s. v. 'protekdikos'.

¹⁰³ Dated traditionally ca. 1165, based on his inaugural oration. However, according to Polemis (see fn. 98 above), the speech must be dated to early 1151, thus Michael's appointment is also worth reconsidering.

¹⁰⁴ MAGDALINO 2009, 284. This mutual support stayed the same which resulted in that Manuel's praise and public propaganda is connected to a substantial degree to churchmen as public orators and churches as channels of communication. This means that the two surviving instances of

Conclusions

In sum, between the early 1090s and Anna Komnene's presentation of the Komnenian Iconoclast Debate in the 1140s, events of Leo's controversy were assessed in different ways. John IV Oxeites presented Alexios I's church policy and his alienation of church property as a trigger bringing about divine punishment and the military situation at the turn of 1090/1091 which seemed disastrous to the prelate and presumably to other contemporaries, as well. Alexios I's Reform Edict suggests that Leo of Chalcedon, together with other clergymen, were seen as people stirring up trouble by using their canonical expertise. They argued against the imperial policy and promoted the idea of a church which was more independent than Alexios I would have liked to see. Alexios had in mind bishops and priests who concentrated rather on their pastoral duties instead of governing the church. This was the prerogative of Alexios I, the patriarch, and of those people to whom the emperor conceded such a function, especially due to their loyalty.

In the 1140s Alexios I's expropriation of church property was in the critics' cross-fire, similarly to his heavy taxation and questionable economic policy. Manuel I's munificent measures concerning the church set Alexios' grandson in such a favourable light that Anna Komnene had to confess that because of minting coins from church valuables during the Komnenian Iconoclast Debate, Alexios' church policy came under serious critique.

eulogy just exposed, which are related to the context of the court, might have had many counterparts among people attending church services.

¹⁰⁵ BROWNING 1961, 188–190.

¹⁰⁶ BROWNING 1961, 197–201.

¹⁰⁷ BROWNING 1961, 195, 196, 197.

¹⁰⁸ BROWNING 1961, 196.

¹⁰⁹ REGEL 1982, XVIII.

¹¹⁰ It is noteworthy that posterity is aware of Manuel's donations to the church from the orations mentioned above and from references in Theodore Balsamon's commentaries on canon law (for the details, see fn. 89–96.) who was also an ecclesiastic. Other encomiasts, such as Theodoros Prodromos, or his younger colleague Manganeios Prodromos, did extoll Manuel's virtues, but not in the field of church policy.

Bibliography

PRIMARY SOURCES

- AL *Anna Comnenae Alexias*. Eds. Athanasios Kambylis, Dieter R. Reinsch. CFHB XL. Berlin-New York 2001.
- DARROUZÈS 1970 *Georges et Démétrios Tornikès: Lettres et discours*, ed. Jean Darrouzès. Paris 1970), 7–20
- LAURIOTES 1900 Alexander Lauriotès: Ἱστορικὸν ζήτημα ἐκκλησιαστικὸν ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας Ἀλεξίου Κομνηνοῦ. *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια* 10 No. 36 (1900) 403–407; 10, No. 37 (1900) 411–416
- REGEL 1982 *Fontes rerum Byzantinarum, Rhetorum saeculi XII orationes politicae*, Vol. 1. Ed. Vasilij E. Regel. Leipzig 1982.
- RHP *Σύνταγμα τῶν θείων καὶ ἱερῶν κανόνων*, 6 vols. Eds. Georgios Rhalles, Michael Potles. Athens 1852–59, repr. 1962.

SECONDARY LITERATURE

- ANGELOV 1978 Dimitar Angelov: *Les Balkans au Moyen Age: la Bulgarie des Bogomils aux Turcs*. London 1978.
- ANGOLD 2000 Michael Angold: *Church and Society under the Comneni 1081–1261*. Cambridge 2000.
- ARMSTRONG 1996 Pamela Armstrong: Alexios Komnenos, Holy Men and Monasteries. In: *Alexios I Komnenos*. Eds. Margaret Mullett, Dion Smythe. Belfast 1996.
- BARBER 2007 Charles E. Barber: Leo of Chalcedon, Euthymios Zigabenos and the Return to the Past. In: *Contesting the logic of painting*. Leiden 2007.
- BARTUSSIS 2012 Marc Bartussis: *Land and Privilege in Byzantium. The Institution of Pronoia*. Cambridge 2012.
- BROWNING 1961 Robert Browning: A New Source on Byzantine-Hungarian Relations in the Twelfth Century. *Balkan Studies* 2 (1961) 173–214.
- BURGMANN 1996 Ludwig Burgmann: Lawyers and Legislators. Aspects of Law-Making in the Time of Alexios I. In: *Alexios I Komnenos*. Eds. Margaret Mullett, Dion Smythe. Belfast 1996.
- CARR 1995 Annemarie W. Carr: Leo of Chalcedon and the Icons. In: *Byzantine East, Latin West: Art historical Studies in Honor of Kurt Weitzmann*. Ed. Doula Mouriki. Princeton 1995.
- CHEYNET 1990 Jean-C. Cheynet: *Pouvoir et contestations à Byzance 963–1250*. Paris 1990.
- DARROUZÈS 1966 Jean Darrouzès: *Documents inédits d'ecclésiologie byzantine*. Paris 1966.

- DW *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches*, Teil 2. Regesten von 1025–1204. Eds. Peter Wirth, Franz Dölger. Munich 1995.
- FRANKOPAN 1998 Peter Frankopan: *The Foreign Policy of the Emperor Alexios I Komnenos (1081–c. 1100)*. PhD Dissertation. Oxford 1998.
- FRANKOPAN 2007 Peter Frankopan: Kinship and the Distribution of Power. *EHR* 495 (2007) 1–34.
- FRANKOPAN 2008 Peter Frankopan: Where Advice Meets Criticism in 11th century Byzantium: Theophylact of Ochrid, John the Oxite and Their (Re)presentations to the Emperor’, *Al-Masaq* 20 (2008) 71–88.
- FRANKOPAN 2012 Peter Frankopan: *The First Crusade. The Call from the East*. Berlin 2012.
- GAUTIER 1970 Paul Gautier: Diatribes de Jean l’Oxite contre Alexis 1^{er} Comnène. *REB* 28 (1970) 5–55.
- GAUTIER 1971 Paul Gautier: Le synode des Blachernes (fin 1094). Étude prosopographique. *REB* 29 (1971) 213–284.
- GAUTIER 1973 Paul Gautier : L’ édit d’ Alexis I^{er} Comnène sur la réforme du clergé. *REB* 31 (1973) 165–201.
- GD *Les registres des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople, I: Les actes des patriarches, fasc. ii et iii: Les registres de 715 à 1206*. Eds. Venance Grumel, Jean Darrouzès. Paris 1947, revised ed. 1989.
- GERHOLD 2012 Victoria E. Gerhold: Le “mouvement” chalcédoine: opposition ecclésiastique et aristocratique sous le règne d’Alexis Comnène (1081–1094). *Erytheia* 33 (2012) 87–104.
- GLAVINAS 1972 Alexander Glavinas: *Ἡ ἐπὶ Ἀλεξίου Κομνηνοῦ (1081-1118) περὶ ἱερῶν σκευῶν, κειμηλίων καὶ ἀγίων εἰκόνων ἔρις (1081–1095)*. Thessalonike 1972.
- GRESS-WRIGHT 1977 Gress-Wright, D: Bogomilism in Constantinople. *Byz* 47 (1977) 163–185.
- GRUMEL 1941-42 Venance Grumel: L’affaire de Léon de Chalcédoine: le décret ou ‘semeioma’ d’Alexis I^{er} Comnène (1086). *EO* 39 (1941–42) 333–341.
- GRUMEL 1944 Venance Grumel: L’ affaire de Léon de Chalcédoine. Le chrysobulle d’ Alexis I^{er} sur les objets sacrés. *EB* 2 (1944) 126–133.
- JUGIE 1912 Martin Jugie: La vie et les oeuvres d’ Euthyme Zigabène. *EO* 15 (1912) 215–225.
- KALDELLIS 1999 Anthony Kaldellis: *The Argument in Psellos’ Chronographia*. Leiden 1999.
- KALDELLIS 2011 Anthony Kaldellis: The Date of Psellos’ Death, Once Again... *BZ* 104.2 (2011) 651–664.

- KOVÁCS 2014 Szilvia Kovács: The Cuman Campaigns in 1091. *Golden Horde Review* 1 (2014) 174–189.
- KUSABU 2013 Hisatsugu Kusabu: Orthodox Identity for Byzantine Theologians, Heresiologists, and “inquisitors”: a Byzantine View of Popular Faith in the Twelfth Century. In: *Medieval Identities: Political, Social and Religious Aspects. The Eighth Japanese-Korean Symposium on Medieval History of Europe, August 21, 2013 - August 22, 2013, Tokyo, Japan*. Ed. Atsushi Kawahara. Tokyo 2013.
- LOOS 1974 Milan Loos: *Dualist Heresy in the Middle Ages*. Prague 1974.
- MACRIDES 1990 Ruth Macrides: Nomos and Kanon on Paper and Court. In: *Church and People in Byzantium*. Ed. Rosemary Morris. Birmingham 1990.
- MAGDALINO 1996 Paul Magdalino: The reform edict of 1107. In: *Alexios I Komnenos*. Eds. Margareth Mullett, Dion Smythe. Belfast 1996.
- MAGDALINO 2000 Paul Magdalino: The Pen of the Aunt: Echoes of the Mid-Twelfth Century in the *Alexiad*. In: *Anna Komnene and her Times*. Ed. Th. Gouma-Peterson. New York 2000.
- MALAMUT 2007 Élisabeth Malamut: *Alexis Ier Comnène*. Paris 2007.
- OBOLENSKY 2004 Dimitrij Obolensky: *The Bogomils*. Cambridge 2004.
- PERENTIDIS 1991 Stavros Perentidis: Un canon peut-il être périmé? Mentalités et autorité du text canonique au XIIe siècle. In: *Byzantium in the 12th Century*. Ed. Nicholas Oikonomides. Athens 1991.
- POLEMIS 2011 Ioannis Polemis: Notes on the Inaugural Oration of the Patriarch Michael of Anchialos. *Byzantinoslavica* 1–2 (2011) 162–172.
- RUNCIMAN 1982 Steven Runciman: *The Medieval Manichee*. Cambridge 1982.
- SARADI 1991 Helen Saradi: Imperial Jurisdiction over Ecclesiastical Provinces. The Ranking of New Cities as Seats of Bishops or Metropolitans. In: *Byzantium in the 12th Century*, ed. Nicholas Oikonomides. Athens 1991.
- SCHMINCK 1991 Andreas Schminck: Zur Entwicklung des Eherechts in der Komnenen-epoche. In: *Byzantium in the 12th Century*, ed. Nicholas Oikonomides. Athens 1991.
- STEPHANOU 1946 Pelopidas Stephanou: Le procès de Léon de Chalcédoine. *OCP* 9 (1943) 5–64.
- STEPHANOU 1946 Pelopidas Stephanou: La doctrine de Léon de Chalcédoine et de ses adversaires sur les images. *OCP* 12 (1946) 177–199.
- STOLTE 1991 Bernard Stolte: Civil Law in Canon Law: a Note on the Method of Interpreting the Canons in the Twelfth Century. In: *Byzantium in the 12th Century*. Ed. Nicholas Oikonomides. Athens 1991.

◆ TEXTS AND CONTEXTS ◆

- SVORONOS 1973 Nicholas Svoronos: Un rescrit inédit de Manuel Ier Comnène. In : *Études sur l'organisation intérieure, la société et l'économie de l'Empire Byzantin*. London 1973.
- THOMAS 1987 John P. Thomas: *Private Religious Foundations in the Byzantine Empire*. Washington 1987.

Absztrakt

Szövegek és összefüggések

A szakadék csökkentése Leó, Chalkédón püspöke és Anna Komnéné között

I. Alexios Komnénos bizánci császár (u. 1081–1118) uralkodásának egyik leghevesebb egyházi polémiája volt a Komnénos-kori képromboló vita. Leó, Chalkédón püspöke állt a császárral szembeni egyházi ellenállás élére, mely 1082–1094 között zajlott. Kortárs források mellett a vita legrészletesebb leírását Anna Komnéné, I. Alexios leánya hagyta ránk *Alexias*ának 5. és 7. könyvében.

Anna atyjának halála után, 1134 körül fogott történeti munkájának, az *Alexias*nak írásához, melyen haláláig, tehát feltehetően 1156-ig dolgozott. Az *Alexias* megírásával a történetíró legfontosabb célja az volt, hogy méltó emléket állítson apjának. I. Alexios II. Ióánnés (1118–1143) és I. Manuél Komnénos (1143–1180) követték a császári trónon. Egyfajta dinasztikus fejlődés értelmében II. Ióánnés és I. Manuél reprezentációjának több eleme a Komnénos-dinasztiát a 11. század végén újraindító I. Alexios uralkodásának fényében került bemutatásra. A 12. századi udvari szónokok szemében a fiú és az unoka felülmúlták I. Alexios II. Ióánnésnek és Manuélnek elődjükkel való összevetése során I. Alexios eredményeivel kapcsolatban kritikus megjegyzések is elhangzottak, melyeket Anna Komnéné nem tudott szó nélkül hagyni az *Alexias* megírásakor.

Az újabb szakirodalomban (R. J. Lilie, R. D. Thomas és P. Magdalino) az *Alexias*nak mint 12. századi közepi alkotásnak az olvasata egyre nagyobb hangsúlyt kap. Jelen tanulmány ennek az irányvonalnak a meglátásait viszi tovább a Komnénosi képromboló vita elemzése kapcsán. A vita eddigi vizsgálói szóltak arról a tényről, hogy az *Alexias* vonatkozó információi nem mindig pontosak, illetve, hogy bizonyos részletek elsikkadnak a történetíró tálalásában. A probléma megoldásához elengedhetetlen a Komnénos-kori képromboló vita utóéletének beható vizsgálata, valamint a 12. század közepi kontextus Annának a vitáról adott beszámolója szempontjából releváns elemeinek kiemelése. Jelen tanulmányban ezeket vizsgálom. Először IV. Ióánnés Oxeítés antióchiai pátriárkának I. Alexioshoz intézett 1091-es *Szónoklatát* mutatom be, amit I. Alexios ún. Reformrendelete követ. A tanulmány második felében az *Alexias* megírásának 12. század közepi kontextusának releváns aspektusaira derül fény.