

The Use of the Donation of Constantine in Late-Eleventh-Century Byzantium: the Case of Leo Metropolitan bishop of Chalcedon¹

PÉTER BARA



This paper invites the reader to take part in an *oneirokrisia*, that is, dream-interpretation. This study aims at analysing and contextualising a dream which survived amongst the documents of a religious controversy, the so-called “Komnenian iconoclast debate” whose protagonist was Leo, metropolitan bishop of Chalcedon († after 1094), and which took place between 1081 and 1094. Furthermore, this investigation also contributes to the understanding of the changing nature of episcopal office during the early Komnenian epoch. After introductory remarks on the church history of the early Komnenian period and on the Komnenian iconoclast controversy, I examine the textual tradition, dating, the genre, and the message of the dream. After this I attempt to find the context in which the dream fulfilled its function. In the dream Leo of Chalcedon is portrayed as a powerful prelate wearing imperial clothes. This representation was presumably influenced by the model of the late antique *Constitutum Constantini* which constituted an element in the armoury of both the pope of Rome and the patriarch of Constantinople during the eleventh century. As a result of the analysis I claim that the career of Leo of Chalcedon presented an episcopal paradigm which was rejected during the Komnenian

¹ I am grateful to Terézia Olajos, Niels Gaul, Christian Gastgeber, Johannes Preiser-Kapeller, and Tibor Almási for their advice and help. I am also indebted to the Campus Hungary Programme of the Balassi Institute (Hungary), to the Aktion Österreich-Ungarn Stiftung, and to the Österreichischer Austauschdienst for their financial support. Throughout the study, with respect to periodicals I follow the abbreviations of the *L'Année Philologique* (http://www.annee-philologique.com/fil/es/sigles_ft.pdf [accessed 16 03 2017]) and the *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* (<https://www.doaks.org/resources/publications/resources-for-authors-and-editors/list-of-abbreviations-used-in-byzantine-publications> [accessed 16 03 2017]).

era.

The reign of Alexios I Komnenos (r. 1081–1118) was a period of transition and transformation with respect to the Byzantine church.² The church policy of Alexios I can be assessed as interventionist. The emperor's measures were triggered by his personal religious zeal and by the practical reason to reassert his rights over the church. Alexios' accession to the throne entailed the repression of philosophy. Michael Psellos and his circle was pushed aside with the trial of John Italos in 1082 and the new Komnenian regime favoured the clergy, which was entrusted with teaching and became the dominant force in the intellectual life of the empire by the first half of the twelfth century. The "Komnenian orthodoxy" was characterised by an outstanding number of heresy trials, a centrally-favoured interest in patristic theology, the promotion of monasticism, a centralizing administrative reform, the support of the patriarchal clergy of the Hagia Sophia, and the decreasing importance of the episcopal synod. As a result of these governmental attitudes new patterns arose with regard to the episcopal office. As Michael Angold argued,

"The old guard appointed before Alexius came to power was dying off. The emperor was able to influence appointments so that they were more to his liking. There was opposition from the metropolitan bishops. [...] It was the emperor's intention to get members of the patriarchal clergy on to the episcopal bench, the better to control synod. The emperor presented service in the patriarchal church as a stepping stone to the episcopate. In the long term this aim was realised. Increasingly the most prestigious sees went to members of the patriarchal clergy."³

The "new bishops" were characterised by "high degree of metropolitan refinement and wordly sophistication with a conscientious devotion to duty."⁴ The careers of Michael Italikos, George Tornikes, Eustathios of Thessalonike, and Michael Choniates might be seen as result of early Komnenian church

² On Alexios I's religious politics, see most recently: É. Malamut, *Alexis I^{er} Comnène*, Paris 2007, 191–354; M. Angold, *Church and Society under the Comneni 1081–1261*, Cambridge 1995, 45–72. Overviews on the intellectual milieu during Alexios' reign, see: M. Mullett, *Theophylact of Ochrid: Reading the Letters of a Byzantine Archbishop*, London 1997, 69–78; P. Frankopan, "The Literary, Cultural, and Political Context for the Twelfth-Century Commentary on the *Nicomachean Ethics*," in B. Charles – D. Jenkins, eds., *Medieval Greek Commentaries on the Nicomachean Ethics*, Leiden 2007, 45–63; A. Kaldellis, "Classical Scholarship in Twelfth-Century Byzantium," in B. Charles – D. Jenkins, eds., *Medieval Greek Commentaries on the Nicomachean Ethics*, Leiden 2007, 1–45; R. Morris, *Monks and Laymen in Byzantium, 843–1118*, Cambridge 2009, 267–295.

³ M. Angold, *Church and Society*, 58.

⁴ P. Magdalino, "The Byzantine Holy Man in the Twelfth Century," in S. Hackel, ed., *The Byzantine Saint*, London 1981, 65.

policy.⁵ If one labels these clergymen as the “new” bishops of the Komnenian epoch, there must be also the “old guard” which was replaced by the new. The analysis of the dream-description under consideration sheds light on some characteristics of the “old guard” to illustrate the nature of the change and transition taking place during the reign of Alexios I and John II Komnenos (r. 1118–1140).

Leo of Chalcedon was a leading figure of the so-called “Komnenian iconoclasm” opposing the religious politics of Alexios I Komnenos.⁶ 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 who was an appointee of the Komnenoi. Finally, Garidas renounced his throne, but this did not satisfy Leo who subsequently turned against those members of

⁵ On the question of continuity from the early to the later Komnenian period with respect to scriptural *didaskaloi*, see: P. Magdalino, “The Reform Edict of 1107,” in M. Mullett – D. Smythe, eds., *Alexios I Komnenos*, Belfast 1996, 213–215.

⁶ The notion has been introduced by A. W. Carr, “Leo of Chalcedon and the Icons,” in D. Mouriki, ed., *Byzantine East, Latin West: Art Historical Studies in Honor of Kurt Weitzmann*, Princeton 1995, 579. Victoria Gerhold (V. Gerhold, “Le ‘mouvement’ chalcédonien: opposition ecclésiastique et aristocratique sous le règne d’Alexis Comnène (1081-1094),” *Erytheia* 33 (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.

On the Komnenian iconoclasm, see: I. Sakkélion, “Décret d’Alexis Comnène portant deposition de Léon, Métropolitain de Chalcédoine,” *BCH* 2 (1878), 102–128; A. Lauriotès, “Ἱστορικὸν ζήτημα ἐκκλησιαστικὸν ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας Ἀλεξίου Κομνηνοῦ,” *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια* 10, No. 36, (1900), 403–407; 10, No. 37 (1900), 411–416; V. Grumel, “L’affaire de Léon de Chalcédoine. Le décret ou ‘semeioma’ d’Alexis Ier Comnène (1086),” *EO* 39 (1940), 333–341; P. Stephanou, “Le procès de Léon de Chalcédoine,” *OCP* 9 (1943), 5–64; V. Grumel, “L’affaire de Léon de Chalcédoine. Le chrysobulle d’Alexis I^{er} sur les objets sacrés,” *EB* 2 (1944), 126–133; V. Grumel, “Les documents athonites concernant l’affaire de Léon de Chalcédoine,” *Studi e Testi* 123 (1946), 116–135; P. Stephanou, “La doctrine de Léon de Chalcédoine et de ses adversaires sur les images,” *OCP* 12 (1946), 177–199; V. Grumel, “Léon de Chalcédoine et le canon de la fête du saint Mandilion,” *AB* 68= *Mélanges Paul Peeters*, II., Bruxelles 1950, 135–152; P. Gautier, “Le synode des Blachernes (fin 1094). Étude prosopographique,” *REB* 29 (1971), 213–284. A. Glavinas, *Ἡ ἐπὶ Ἀλεξίου Κομνηνοῦ (1081-1118) περὶ ἱερῶν σκευῶν, κειμηλίων καὶ ἁγίων εἰκόνων ἔρις (1081-1095)*, Thessalonike 1972; J. P. Thomas, *Private religious foundations in the Byzantine Empire*, Washington D. C. 1987, 192–207; M. Angold, *Church and Society under the Comneni 1081-1261*, Cambridge 1995, 46–50; A. W. Carr, “Leo of Chalcedon and the icons,” in D. Mouriki, ed., *Byzantine East, Latin West: Art historical studies in honor of Kurt Weitzmann*, Princeton 1995, 579–601; V. Gerhold, “Le ‘mouvement’ chalcédonien: opposition ecclésiastique et aristocratique sous le règne d’Alexis Comnène (1081-1094),” *Erytheia* 33, 2012, 87–104.

the permanent synod who had not sided with him previously. As a consequence, the permanent synod censured him with the charge of insubordination in 1086. During the same year, Leo labelled his secular and ecclesiastical opponents as iconoclasts. After the second confiscation of church property, following the Pecheneg invasion in 1087, Leo renewed his opposition. The bishop lost his see and 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.⁷ In his letter to his nephew, Nikolaos, Leo explained in detail his theory of icons.⁸ 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.

Together with the metropolitan's correspondence a short dream-description also survived.⁹ One of the priests of the Hagia Sophia, called Thomas, had a dream in which he saw Leo of Chalcedon in the church of Saint Euphemia wearing an imperial outfit. Thomas' dream was preserved to posterity in the manuscript No. 139 of the Great Lavra in Mount Athos. The codex, which was truncated at the beginning and the end, includes homilies and letters of prelates from Late Antiquity to the Komnenian period such as Gregory of Nyssa, Michael Keroullarios, Eustratios of Nikaia, Leo of Chalcedon, and others.¹⁰ The manuscript is dated to the thirteenth century, and it consists of 149 folios from which f. 33-f. 84 contain documents concerning Leo's case.¹¹ The texts were published in 1900 by the Athonite monk Alexander E. Lauriotes, who also described the manuscript.¹² The text of the scenario is as follows:

⁷ 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: A. Lauriotes, "Ἱστορικὸν ζήτημα," 403-407, 411-416.

⁸ *Letter to Nikolaos of Hadrianople*, A. Lauriotes, "Ἱστορικὸν ζήτημα," 414-416.

⁹ A. Lauriotes, "Ἱστορικὸν ζήτημα," 404. With regard to the order of the manuscript, see: V. Grumel, "Les documents athonites," 118.

¹⁰ I cannot identify any additional pattern according to which the authors in the manuscript were selected.

¹¹ V. Grumel, "Les documents athonites," 116.

¹² A. Lauriotes, "Ἀναγραφὴ χειρογράφου τεύχους τῆς ἐν Ἄθῳ ἱερᾶς μονῆς Μεγίστης Λαύρας," *Εκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια* 2, No. 16 (1886), 168-172.

t	<p>διήγησις ἐνὸς θαύματος τις τῶν ἱερέων τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας Θωμᾶς καλούμενος εἶδε τὴν παρουσίαν ὄρασιν^a ἐκ τρίτου^b καθ' ὑπνόν. ἐθεάσατο γάρ τὸν θεοφιλέστατον μητροπολίτην Χαλκηδόνος ἔσωθεν τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς πανευφήμου μάρτυρος τῆς Εὐφημίας βασιλικῆν στολὴν περιβαλλόμενον καὶ περὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ ἐπιτιθέντα μέγιστον χρυσοῦν φακίολιον,^c καὶ οἶα 5 περ εἰκὸς ἐκπλαγεῖς μετ' αἰδοῦς πολλῆς καὶ συστολῆς ἐφθέγγατο πρὸς αὐτόν· τί τοῦτο δέσποτά μου ὅπερ θεωρῶ σε διαπραττόμενον; οὐ δέδοικας μὴ τινες ἐξερχόμενον σε ἰδόντες κατείπωσί σου πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα; ὁ δὲ ἰλαρῶ τῷ προσώπῳ χαριέντως οὕτως πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀντεφθέγγατο ὅτι ὥσπερ ὁ πρώταθλος καὶ πρωταγωνιστῆς^d τιμὴν ἔχει πλείονα τῶν συνδούλων,^e οὕτως ὁ νήφων εἰς τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔργον.^f καὶ πᾶς παρρησιασμένως ἐλέγχων τοὺς 10 ἀνομοῦντας, οἶα τις μάχαῖρα δίστομος^g τοιαύτην παρὰ Θεοῦ στολὴν τιμῆς ἀμφιέννυται. ταῦτ' οὖν ἀκούσας ὁ εὐλαβῆς ἱερεὺς οὐδὲν ἕτερον τοῖς εἰρημένοις τροστίθησιν ἢ τοῦτο μετὰ θαύματος ἐξεπτῶν· ὃ βασιλεῖον ἱεράτευμα.^h</p>		
a JI 2, 28 (LXX); Act 2,17	b Mt 26, 44	c Acta Pilati A. 1,2.; Bas. Caes. hist. myst. 19. Pall. hist. laus. (PG 34 1009B); Acta Petri et Pauli 80b; J. Malalas Chronica 18 (PG 669 B); Phot. lex. κ, p. 1677	
d Sokrates hist. eccl. 5, 25, 13	e 1 Col 7, 2: καθὼς ἐμάθε ἀπὸ Ἐπαφρᾶ τοῦ [...] συνδούλου ἡμῶν ὃς ἐστὶν [...] διάκονος; Ef 2, 1; ἀδελφοὶ καὶ σύνδουλοι Clement of Alexandria Letter 17 (PG 2 53 A)		
f Apophthegmata Patrum (PG 65 101 A): νήφων εἰς τὰ ἔργα	g Heb 4, 12	h 1 Pet 2	
<p>Account of a miracle</p> <p>One of the priests of God's Great Church called Thomas saw a vision appearing three times in his dream. He saw the much-God-beloved metropolitan of Chalcedon in the nave of the [church] of the all-adored martyr Euphemia.¹³ The metropolitan wore an imperial robe and a great golden headband on his head. Thomas struck by the respect he felt, 5 asked him abasing, "How is it possible, my lord, that I see you, who was brought to ruin? Do not you fear lest some will report you to the emperor, if they see that you came here?" But the metropolitan joyfully replied to him with a happy</p>			

¹³ The central church of Chalcedon was dedicated to martyr Euphemia which housed the Council of Chalcedon in 451. The shrine was the place of the annual blood-exuding miracle of Euphemia. During the Persian invasion the city was occupied and the body was translated to Constantinople. The remnants were positioned in the palace of Antiochos near the Hippodrome which was turned into a church. The relics survived the iconoclastic period in Lemnos, afterwards were returned to the refurbished church which survived until the end of the empire. This church was under the supervision of the metropolitan of Chalcedon serving as a basis for Leo's Constantinopolitan activities who regularly visited the capital. See: C. Mango, s. v. Euphemia, Church of Saint, A. P. Kazhdan et al., eds., *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* 2, Oxford–New York 1991, 747; M. Angold, *Church and Society*, 58.

face that as the winner and the protagonist is more honoured than his fellow servants,¹⁴ so the one who is sober in the work for God. And if one accuses those breaking the law¹⁵ speaking against them openly in any way, as a two-edged sword, he will be vested by God with such an honourable outfit. **10** After hearing such words the pious priest did not put forward anything, but this with great reverence, "O royal priesthood."

Thomas addressed Leo as a prelate who "was brought to ruin" (διαπραττόμενον). In the next sentence Thomas stated that Leo had been banned from Constantinople, thus it is plausible to contextualize the dream to the period of Leo's exile, that is after 1087. While the controversy was settled by the Blachernai-synod, held in 1094, it seems reasonable to suggest that the dream-description circulated during the banishment of the prelate.

Thomas' dream is not a typical everyday dream contained in dreambooks, but rather a hagiographical account with political agenda.¹⁶ The *lemma* of Thomas' dream says that it is an account of a miracle (διήγησις ἐνὸς θαύματος). The text rather describes a vision in a dream (ὄρασις καθ' ὕπνόν). Similar hagiographical dreams and visions from the early Komnenian period were documented in the *Alexiad* and in the *Life of Cyril Phileotes*.¹⁷ Both sources favoured the Komnenian regime and were put to parchment in the twelfth cen-

¹⁴ The word fellow servant (σύνδουλος) is a synonym for Christian, and also signifies servants of the church (as deacons etc), see: σύνδουλος, G. Lampe, ed., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford 2009, 1313. In the context of the Komnenian iconoclasm in which Leo acted as porte-parole of the church, the word "fellow servant" may refer to other church officials, among whom Leo stood out.

¹⁵ People "breaking the law" here refers to Alexios I, and the governing elite who devised the alienation of church property. Leo labeled the expropriation as "injustice" (ἀδικία) in his *Letter to Alexios I* written in 1083, A. Lauriot, "Ἱστορικὸν ζήτημα," 403.

¹⁶ Some samples from the literature on dream-interpretation in Byzantium as starting points: M. Oberhelman, *The Oneirocritic Literature of the Late Roman and Byzantine Eras of Greece: Manuscript Studies, Translations and Commentaries to the Dream-Books of Greece During the First Millennium A. D., with Greek and English Catalogues of the Dream-Symbols and with a Discussion of Greek Oneiromancy from Homer to Manuel the Palaiologian*, PhD diss., Michigan 1981; G. Calofonos, "Dream Interpretation: A Byzantinist Superstition?" *BMGS* 9 (1984-85), 215-220; M. Mavroudi, *A Byzantine Book on Dream Interpretation: The Oneirocriticon of Achmet and its Arabic Sources*, Leiden 2002; M. Oberhelman, *Dreambooks in Byzantium: Six Oneirocritica in Translation, with Commentary and Introduction*, Farnham 2008; M. Oberhelman, *Dreams, Healing, and Medicine in Greece: from Antiquity to the Present*, Farnham 2013; Ch. Angelidi - G. Calofonos, eds., *Dreaming in Byzantium and Beyond*, Farnham 2014.

¹⁷ A. Komnene, *Alexias*, A. Kambylis - D. R. Reinsch, eds., CFHB XL /1., Berlin-New York, 2001 (thereafter *Al.* with the number of the book, and chapter); Nikolaos Kataskepenos, *Life of Cyril Phileotes*, É. Sargologos, ed., *La vie de Saint Cyrille le Phileote moine byzantin* (†1110), Brussels 1964.

ture.¹⁸ A comparison with Cyril's *vita* is enlightening with respect to Thomas' dream. Leo of Chalcedon was one of the holy men venerated by members of the extended Komnenian family, favoured rather by the Doukas-branch.¹⁹ The most famous holy man of Alexios' reign who got regular visits from imperial personages was probably Cyril Phileotes († 1110).²⁰ Cyril was a sailor who left his earthly vocation to become a monk at Philea, near Constantinople. His *Life* was recorded by Nikolaos Kataskepenos († after 1143) and contains fifteen dream-descriptions of different kind.²¹ Some of these dreams are similar in structure to that of Thomas: an identifier concerning the type of the dream at the beginning, the description of the clothes, a dialogue, and a conclusion.²² It is remarkable that the dream-description emphasizes that Thomas was wonderstruck and that he turned towards Leo with reverence. Compared to Cyril's *Life*, Cyril impressed people to stand in awe of him only after his death.²³ Thus, on the one hand the author of Thomas' dream portrayed Leo as it was the case with other holy men of the period. On the other hand, he undoubtedly sought to bring attention to Leo's supernatural, divine nature despite the fact that the bishop was still alive.

Anna Komnene used dreams and vision in the narrative to prove the providential destiny and the orthodoxy of her heroes.²⁴ What is more, she included a miraculous event about Leo of Chalcedon.²⁵ In August 1087 during the battle of Distra against the Pechenegs, George Palaiologos, the brother-in-law of the emperor, lost his horse. As Anna recorded, Leo of Chalcedon appeared to the commander and gave him a new horse on which he could escape. Leo is portrayed as a positive figure, as the saviour of Alexios' faithful general in a diffi-

¹⁸ With respect to the composition of the *Alexiad*, see: P. Magdalino, "The Pen of the Aunt: Echoes of the Mid-Twelfth Century in the *Alexiad*," in Th. Gouma-Peterson, ed., *Anna Komnene and her Times*, New York 2000, 15. The date when Nikolaos Kataskepenos composed Cyril's *Life* is not known, Kataskepenos died after 1143, see: Nikolaos Kataskepenos, *Life of Cyril Phileotes*, 13–15.

¹⁹ See the testimony of Leo's *Letter to Maria of Bulgaria*, A. Lauriotès, "Ἰστορικὸν ζήτημα," 404.

²⁰ Nikolaos Kataskepenos, *Life of Cyril Phileotes*, 18–23.

²¹ M. Mullett, "Dreaming in the *Life of Cyril Phileotes*," in *Dreaming in Byzantium and Beyond*, Farnham 2014, 1–21.

²² See the apparition of Theocharia, the embodied divine grace, to Cyril, Nikolaos Kataskepenos, *Life of Cyril Phileotes*, ch.10,3, p. 76; the episode with the traveller who came to Cyril: Nikolaos Kataskepenos, *Life of Cyril Phileotes*, ch.12,1., p. 78; a monk's disturbing dream without a dialogue: Nikolaos Kataskepenos, *Life of Cyril Phileotes*, ch. 27, 2., p. 122.

²³ Nikolaos Kataskepenos, *Life of Cyril Phileotes*, ch. 55, 3., p. 261.

²⁴ P. Magdalino, "The Historiography of Dreaming in Medieval Byzantium," in C. Angelidi – T. Calofonos, eds., *Dreaming in Byzantium and Beyond*, Farnham 2014, 133.

²⁵ *Al.* 7, 4, 2.

cult situation.²⁶ Contemporary evidence therefore testifies that Thomas' dream was not a unique phenomenon in the early Komnenian epoch, but dreams and visions were characteristic of the religious and political discourse of the period.

Modern research did not examine Thomas's dream exhaustively. The first who commented on Thomas' dream was Venance Grumel.²⁷ The scholar considered the dream to be the token of Leo's high popularity after his deposition, during the time of his exile. The passage was also interpreted by Michael Angold.²⁸ He compared Leo to mighty patriarchs of earlier Byzantine history and emphasized that the metropolitan acted in the place of the patriarch as the defender of the Byzantine church. Angold thought that Leo's imperial clothing expressed the metropolitan's disapproval of Alexios' church policy. In addition to this, Victoria Gerhold suggested an alliance between Leo, his ecclesiastical supporters, and the Doukas-branch of the Komnenian extended family.²⁹

²⁶ For the interpretation of the passage, see my forthcoming article: P. Bara, "Miraculum Leontis: the History and Context of a Family Account. Observations on Alexias 7.4.1," in M. Ivanova et al., eds., *Transmitting and Circulating the Late Antique and Byzantine Worlds. Selected Papers from the Oxford University Byzantine Society's 19th International Graduate Conference, 24–25th February 2017*, Leiden 2018, forthcoming. An investigation on the use of dream-, and vision-narratives for political purposes is a *desideratum*. See recently: A. Timotin, *Visions, prophéties et pouvoir à Byzance: étude sur l'hagiographie méso-byzantine, IX-XI siècles*, Paris 2010. The Münster-project entitled "The role of supernatural in procedures of imperial decision-making in the Byzantine empire from the 6th to the 12th centuries" under the auspices of Michael Grünbart will provide further details, see: <http://gepris.dfg.de/gepris/projekt/276253524> (accessed 03 02 2017).

²⁷ V. Grumel, "Les documents athonites," 127: "Ce récit est manifestement contemporain de la déposition de Léon, car, après son rétablissement, il ne conviendrait plus. Il indique que sa condamnation n'a pas détruit la vénération qui l'entourait, elle l'a peut-être accrue."

²⁸ M. Angold, *Church and Society*, 49: "It was a story that probably originated amongst Leo's supporters. It portrayed him as a man in the tradition of those patriarchs who used their spiritual and moral authority to advance the power of the church. In changed circumstances, Leo was left to defend these interests against imperial power. It left him open to ridicule for dressing up like an emperor and challenging the proper order of a Christian society."

²⁹ V. Gerhold, "Mouvement," 98, 100.: "La 'vision' du diacre Thomas [...] remet en question une fois de plus de loyauté du clan du Doukai, et souligne comment l'opposition au pouvoir impérial était fondée sur une association étroite entre laïc et ecclésiastiques [...] prélates contestataires, fiers défenseurs de l'héritage du patriarche Cérulaire, aussi bien que les dignitaires civils écartés par l'ascension des Comnènes, et le clan des Doukai."

Gerhold's claim is debatable, because Leo was in connection with the side of the Doukas-family descending from Andronikos Doukas and Maria of Bulgaria. The involvement of their sons and brother-in-laws (such as John, Michael, and George Palaiologos) in any of the plots against Alexios is difficult to substantiate. Peter Frankopan recently pointed to the fact that a gradual change took place from the mid-1090s and in the second half of his reign Alexios applied a distance between

My aim is to support these statements and to expand them with the help of the *Donation of Constantine*, a spurious document, which was forged in Italy probably during the eighth century and could be brought to Constantinople in 1053 by the envoys of Pope Leo IX (r. 1049–1054).³⁰ The pro-papal pamphlet surviving under the name of Leo IX and commonly called as *Libellus* preserved a Latin text of the *Constitutum Constantini*.³¹ Leo's "imperial outfit" in the dream-description and Thomas' address to the exiled metropolitan as "royal priesthood" show parallels to Leo IX's *Libellus*. After some remarks on the *Constitutum Constantini* and its assumable use in eleventh-century Byzantium, I examine details of Leo's clothing and attempt to contextualize the expressions of the dream which I regard important.

The *Donation of Constantine*, as it appeared in the *Libellus*, was a result of a longer textual development of different phases.³² The legend of Pope Sylvester (the *Actus Silvestri*) baptizing Constantine the Great and the story about the emperor's gifts (recorded in the *Donation of Constantine*, or *Constitutum Constantini*) to the papacy on this occasion were originally two separate narratives. According to the second chapter of the fifth-century *Actus Silvestri*, after defeating Licinius and becoming the sole emperor, Constantine the Great fell into leprosy. Being still pagan, he consulted pagan *sacerdotes* who counselled to have a bath in the blood of three thousand infants. Peter and Paul, as the story continues, appeared in a dream to the emperor and suggested that he be baptised. Constantine decided to do so and turned to Sylvester, bishop of Rome. Sylvester performed the ritual in the Lateran Palace and Constantine recovered from his illness.

The probably eighth-century *Constitutum Constantini* is the continuation of

himself and his kinship group, see: P. 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, 88. The source material, as far as I can see, does not provide more detail to go beyond that. I suggest to seek the involvement of the Doukas family not in the background of Thomas' dream, but in another miraculous event linked to Leo of Chalcedon: his alleged apparition to George Palaiologos during the battle of Distras. See my forthcoming study that I referred to above.

³⁰ Concerning details of Leo IX's rule and those of the Schism in 1054: A. Louth, *Greek East and Latin West: The Church, AD 681-1071*, Crestwood 2007; also: B. Whalen, "Rethinking the Schism of 1054: Authority, Heresy, and the Latin Rite," *Traditio* 62 (2007), 1–24; A. Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit: Das sogenannte Morgenländische Schisma von 1054*, Cologne 2002; P. Gemeinhardt, *Die Filioque-Kontroverse zwischen Ost- und Westkirche im Frühmittelalter*, Berlin-New York 2002.

³¹ The title "Libellus" comes from the *lemmata* of the manuscripts, see H. G. Krause, "Das Constitutum Constantini im Schisma von 1054," in H. Mordek, Hrsg., *Aus Kirche und Reich: Festschrift für Friedrich Kempf*, Sigmaringen 1983, 131, n. 3.

³² CPG 244; B. Studer, s. v. Silvestro I Papa, in A. di Berardino, ed., *Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiana* 3, Milan 2010, c. 4938; R. J. Loenertz, "Actus Sylvestri. Genèse d'une légende," *RHE* 70 (1975), 426–439; T. Canella, *Gli Actus Silvestri. Genesi di una leggenda su Costantino imperatore*, Spoleto 2006.

the *Actus*, revealing Constantine's largess towards Sylvester after the emperor's recovery.³³ Constantine donated the Lateran Palace to the bishop. In addition to this, the emperor made a concession for Sylvester and his clergy to use imperial *insignia*, together with all imperial clothes, the sceptre, and the trappings. Constantine declared that Sylvester had the right to appoint members of the clergy and at the end of the *Donation* the emperor revealed his plan to locate the new capital in Constantinople.

Around the year 1000, the Normans appeared in Southern Italy. Their steady advance northwards in the 1040s entailed an alliance between emperor Constantine IX Monomachos (r. 1042–1055) and Pope Leo IX (r. 1049–1054).³⁴ In order to strengthen the political initiatives Constantine IX also sought to reconcile the religious disagreement between the Greek and the Latin clergy in Southern Italy over issues of liturgy (azymes: the use of unleavened bread) and church discipline (clerical celibacy). The alliance was not successful from the military point of view, because the Byzantine army failed to appear at the right time and the papal army suffered a defeat from the Normans in 1053 at Civitate. The Pope was imprisoned in Benevento, nevertheless he sought further alliance with Byzantium. Constantine IX was also open for cooperation, because the pope's disposition was crucial for his Italian policy. At the same time, the religious conflict took serious dimensions when Michael Keroullarios, Patriarch of Constantinople (r. 1043–1058), closed the Latin churches of the capital (end of 1052–early 1053). Concurrently, Leo, archbishop of Ohrid, encouraged by Patriarch Keroullarios, addressed a letter to John, archbishop of Trani, in Southern Italy. Leo accused the "Latins" for observing Jewish rites through the celebration of the Eucharist with unleavened bread. The letter was passed to the papal confidant Humbert of Silva Candida who translated the letter and presented it to Pope Leo IX. The Pope was a prisoner of the Normans in Benevento, nevertheless he addressed Leo of Ohrid and Patriarch Keroullarios in a letter as a reply in September 1053.

Leo IX's letter entitled *In terra pax*, contained the *Donation of Constantine*.³⁵

³³ On the *Donation of Constantine* see most recently J. Fried, *Donation of Constantine and Constitutum Constantini. The Misinterpretation of a Fiction and its Original Meaning*, Berlin 2007; and G. W. Bowersock's introduction, Lorenzo Valla, *On the Donation of Constantine*, transl. G. W. Bowersock, Cambridge-London 2008, vii–xvii. For a detailed bibliography on the *Constitutum*, see: D. Angelov, "The Donation of Constantine and the Church in Late Byzantium," in D. Angelov, ed., *Church and Society in Late Byzantium*, Kalamazoo 2009, 94–95 and 240–241. For the historiography of the date and place of the *Donation's* production, see: *ibidem*, 138, n. 3.

³⁴ G. A. Loud, *The Latin Church in Norman Italy*, Cambridge 2007, 61–70; A. Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, 52–63.

³⁵ W. Wattenbach – S. Löwenfeld et al., eds., *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, I., Graz 1956, No. 4302; see also: R. L. Loenertz, "Constitutum Constantini. Destination, destinataires, auteur, date," *Aevum* 48 (1974), 200; The critical edition of the *Libellus'* text has not been published. Two studies delineate the relationship between the different textual versions: H. G. Krause, "Das Constitutum Constantini," for

Based on the text of the *Donation*, Leo IX neither raised claim on the highest secular authority in the West (only in the city of Rome and the *patrimonium Petri*), nor he discussed the relationship of temporal and ecclesiastical power, *regnum* and *sacerdotium*. This was a later development in the West during the pontificate of Gregory VII (r. 1073–1085), and Urban II (r. 1088–1099). Leo IX's aim was to demonstrate the papacy's superiority over the patriarchate of Constantinople. Leo IX based his claim on a plethora of scriptural arguments. These had already been utilised in the context of pro-papal treatises: Saint Peter is the rock upon which the church is built (*Mt* 16, 18–19), and people had to yield to God's power (*Rom* 13, 1–5). The new argument of the Pope's letter was a quotation from the *First Letter* of Peter (1–2; 2, 9–10): "scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bythinia [...] you are the elected stock, the royal priesthood, the holy people of God."³⁶ Peter's *First Letter* applies the expression of "royal priesthood" [Gr. βασιλειον ιεράτευμα, Lat. regale sacerdotium] expression from the Old Testament³⁷ to the baptized Christians as a whole. Pope Leo IX used the idea to denote the papacy which was, according to his view, held in contempt by Eastern Christians: "You restrain neither the love towards God and the brethren, nor the reverence of the divine canons to publicly rebuke and execrate 'the elected stock, the royal priesthood, the holy people.'"³⁸ When addressing Patriarch Keroullarios Leo IX claimed that, "these and a number of other attestations have to satisfy you concerning the secular and heavenly power, moreover the royal priesthood of the holy and apostolic see of Rome."³⁹ As the strongest argument after these words the Pope quoted in full the *Constitutum Constantini* in order to demonstrate the royal origins of the papal office. With this argument, Leo IX intended to state that "Constantine had not left Rome as a spiritual power distinct from the temporal power which had emigrated to another capital. As a result [the Roman church] was not sub-

his observations on the manuscript tradition: *HZ* 217 (1974), 671–77; and A. Michel, "Lateinische Aktenstücke und -sammlungen zum griechischen Schisma (1053/54)," *HJ* 60 (1940), 46–64. The different *lectiones*, in my view, neither concern this paper's particular problem on imperial insignia and papal vestments, nor does the *Libellus* deviate from earlier versions of the *Constitutum Constantini* in those passages which are relevant to this study. Therefore, I hereby used the version which is in use today and edited in *Acta et scripta quae de controversiis ecclesiae Graecae et Latinae saeculo undecimo composita extant*, ed. Cornelius Will, Leipzig 1861; repr. Frankfurt am Main 1963, 72–74 (*Libellus* hereafter). Theodore Balsamon's Greek translation derives from a "Southern-Italian collection" of the manuscript tradition, for which see: A. Michel, "Lateinische Aktenstücke," esp. 62–64.

³⁶ *New English Bible*, New York 1961.

³⁷ *Ex* 19, 6.

³⁸ *Libellus*, p. 71.: *Vos vero nec amor Dei et proximi nec reverentia divinatorum canonum [...] revocat, quin publice maledicatis et detestemini genus electum, regale sacerdotium, gentemque sanctam* (1 Pet 2).

³⁹ *Libellus*, p. 72.: *His et aliis quamplurimis testimoniis jam vobis satisfactum esse debuit de terreno et coelesti imperio, immo de regali sacerdotio Sanctae Romanae et apostolicae sedis.*

ject to the *judicium* of other churches or of the emperor himself."⁴⁰

It is debated, however, in the literature whether the *Libellus*, and thus the *Donation*, indeed reached Michael Keroullarios and when it was translated from Latin to Greek.⁴¹ Most recently Dimiter Angelov has claimed that Keroullarios was aware of the content of the *Constitutum* and the *Libellus* was translated into Greek after the confrontation between the Byzantine prelate and the Pope took place, that is after 1054.⁴² Angelov based his reasoning on two arguments. First, contemporary textual and artistic evidence suggests a familiarity with the *Constitutum Constantini* in the public discourse on the relationship of temporal and ecclesiastical power. According to *Scylitzes Continuatus'* testimony, Patriarch Michael Keroullarios used imperial insignia to express his authority as opposed to that of the emperor:

"[The Patriarch] went as far as to wear sandals dyed purple claiming that this was a custom of the ancient priesthood and that the hierarch ought to preserve the usage in the new, too, because between the priesthood and the empire there was no difference, or only a negligible difference."⁴³

The *Vatican Psalter gr. 752* preserved precious miniatures about Pope Sylvester acting with the Old Testament King David.⁴⁴ Ioli Kalavrezou argued for the identification of Sylvester with Michael Keroullarios and David with Constantine IX Monomachos (r. 1042-1055) and Isaac Komnenos (r. 1057-1059).

⁴⁰ G. Dagron, *Emperor and Priest. The Imperial Office in Byzantium*, Cambridge-New York 2003, 240.

⁴¹ F. Tinnefeld, "Michael Keroullarios, Patriarch von Konstantinopel (1043-1058): Kritische Überlegungen zu einer Biographie," *JÖB* 39 (1989), 95-127, esp. 105-109, leaves the question open. The "Southern-Italian collection" which was the basis of Theodore Balsamon's Greek translation was gathered in the 1070s after which the first Greek translation could have been produced, see D. Angelov, "Donation," 95.

⁴² D. Angelov, "Donation," 95. The most meticulous analysis in this respect is that of Hans-Georg Krause see: H. Krause, "Das *Constitutum Constantini*," 153-156. In Krause's view Patriarch Keroullarios did not know the content of the *Donation* which was labeled as the overinterpretation of the evidence by Dimiter Angelov. G. Dagron, *Emperor and Priest*, 240-241 also argued for Keroullarios' familiarity with the content of the *Constitutum Constantini*.

⁴³ *Scylitzes Continuatus*, ed. E. Tsolakes, Thessalonike 1968, 105: Ἐπεβάλετο δὲ καὶ κοκκοβαφῆ περιβάλεσθαι πέδιλα τῆς παλαιᾶς ἱερωσύνης φάσκων εἶναι τὸ τοιοῦτον ἔθος καὶ δεῖν τούτοις κἀν τῇ νέᾳ κεχρῆσθαι τὸν ἀρχιερέα. Ἱερωσύνης γὰρ καὶ βασιλείας τὸ διαφέρον οὐδὲν ἢ καὶ ὀλίγον ἔλεγεν εἶναι. See also M. Attaleiates, *Historia*, ed. I. Pérez-Martin, *Historia*, Madrid 2002, 60.; and M. Psellos, *Letter to Keroullarios*, ed. U. Crisculo, *Epistola a Michele Cerulario*, Naples 1990, ch. 6a, p. 26. Michael Keroullarios did not use the insignia mentioned in the *Donatio*, but all sources refer only to the purple sandals. The *Constitutum*, however, mentioned that Constantine conceded all the imperial clothes for the use of the pope (Ch. 14) which could be the basis of the use of the purple sandals by the Patriarch.

⁴⁴ Fol. 142 v., Psalm 42; Fol. 148 r., Psalm 44., see: E. T. De Wald, *The Illustrations in the Manuscripts of the Septuagint, III, Psalms and Odes, Part 2: Vaticanus Graecus 752*, Princeton 1942.

Second, the earliest surviving Greek translation of the *Donation of Constantine* is that of Theodore Balsamon (1130–1195).⁴⁵ In the later redaction of his *Commentary on the Nomokanon of Fourteen Titles*, he wrote,

“For the Second Council [that is the First Council of Constantinople in 381] gave all the privileges of the pope of Rome to the Constantinopolitan patriarch, some of the patriarchs, such as lord Michael Keroullarios tried to pride themselves on the pope’s rights.”⁴⁶

Angelov’s arguments are important from our point of view, because they testify that the *Donation* influenced the eleventh-century political discourse and was used explicitly in the twelfth century.

Patriarch Keroullarios wore imperial insignia and with his self-representation, he gave an interpretation to the relationship of temporal and ecclesiastical power, *regnum* and *sacerdotium*, βασιλεία and ιερωσύνη. With respect to the ecclesiastical power, Patriarch Keroullarios interpreted his priesthood as the “new one”, opposed to the “old.” The old priesthood, as it can be argued on the basis of stipulations of canon law and as it was understood also by Theodore Balsamon in the twelfth century, might refer to the bishop of the old Rome, the pope. The see of the new Rome, that of Constantinople, is presided by the patriarch.⁴⁷ Michael Keroullarios went a step further: he not only compared his patriarchate to the priesthood of the pope, but gave an imperial, or royal dimension to it. In that point the influence of the *Constitutum Constantini* may be assumed which gave imperial prerogatives to the pope which apply also to the bishop of the new Rome. This may explain Keroul-

⁴⁵ Published in G. A. Rhalles – M. Potles, eds., *Σύνταγμα τῶν θείων καὶ ἱερῶν κανόνων*, 6 vols, Athens 1852–59, repr. 1962, I, 145–48 (reprinted in W. Ohnsorge, “Das Constitutum Constantini und seine Entstehung,” *Konstantinopel und der Okzident*, Darmstadt 1966, 108–22). It has to be noted that Balsamon’s commentary on the *Donation of Constantine* dates to a later redaction of his work, which could be produced after 1179. Balsamon’s first glosses on the *Donation* are fragmentary and remain unpublished under the binding of codex *Vaticanus Palatinus* gr. 384, see D. Angelov, “Donation,” 127–129. The image, which one might draw about imperial priesthood, is different in the two redactions: see G. Dagron, “Le caractère sacerdotal de la royauté d’après les commentaires canoniques de XIIe siècle,” in N. Oikonomides, ed., *Byzantium in the 12th Century*, Athens 1991, 165–78.

⁴⁶ G. A. Rhalles – M. Potles, *Σύνταγμα* I, 147: ὅτι δὲ ἡ δευτέρα σύνοδος δέδωκε τῷ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τὰ προνόμια πάντα τοῦ πάπα Ῥώμης, ἐπεχείρησαν τινὲς τῶν πατριαρχῶν ὡς ὁ Κηρουλλάριος ἐκεῖνος κύρ Μιχαήλ [...] τῆς αὐτῆς ἀποσεμνόμεσθαι προνομίῳ. During the twelfth century the *Donation* was used in anti-Latin polemics, and also appeared in the historical work of John Kinnamos: see P. Alexander, “The Donation of Constantine at Byzantium and its Earliest Use Against the Western Empire,” in *Mélanges G. Ostrogorsky*, Vol. 1., Belgrade 1963, 19–22.

⁴⁷ Which can be argued on a canonical basis, such as *Canon* 3 of Constantinople (381), *Canon* 28 of Chalcedon (451), or *Canon* 36 of the synod of Trullo (692); see also: G. Dagron, *Emperor and Priest*, 242.

larios' use of imperial insignia.

When analysing the case of Patriarch Keroullarios his personal ambition also has to be taken into consideration. Before his election to the patriarchal throne in 1040, Keroullarios devised a plot against Michael IV (r. 1034–1041) which failed. The plan was to arrest the emperor and replace him with Michael Keroullarios himself.⁴⁸ The Patriarch played a central role in the fall of Michael VI Stratiotikos (r. 1056–1057) and in the enthronization of Isaac I Komnenos (r. 1057–1059).⁴⁹ Michael VI failed to promote a group of generals from Asia Minor who subsequently plotted against him.⁵⁰ Their ringleader was Isaac Komnenos who had to gain the support of the army, the people of Constantinople, the church, and the Senate. Albeit the military aristocracy was divided, important families, such as the Argyroi and the Dalassenoi, favoured Isaac. The most powerful person in the capital was Patriarch Keroullarios enjoying the support of the populace and the guilds in addition to that of the church due to his office. The Patriarch convinced Michael VI to abdicate, afterwards he roused the anger of the populace against intimates and dignitaries of the ex-emperor. The bloodshed convinced the Senate to buttress Isaac's position. On 1 September 1057 Isaac made his entry into Constantinople and Patriarch Keroullarios crowned him. The coronation confirmed Isaac's position as an *usurpator* after his plot.⁵¹ Patriarch Michael Keroullarios was aware of the fact that he played an important role in establishing Isaac's reign as it is attested by *Scylitzes Continuatus*.⁵² Therefore, despite the fact that the expression "royal priesthood" is not mentioned literally in the sources concerning Michael Keroullarios, the Patriarch definitely considered his *ιερωσύνη* close to *βασιλεία*. In practice this significantly influenced imperial politics.

After some observations on the *Donation of Constantine*, the paper focuses on the interpretation of Thomas' dream in the following pages. A comparison of Leo's imperial clothing in Thomas' dream with corresponding elements in the *Libellus*' text may facilitate a better understanding of the dream's message. Thomas saw Leo wearing clothes which gave the cleric an imperial appearance (*βασιλικὴν στολὴν περιβαλλόμενον*). Chapter 14 of the *Libellus* described Pope Sylvester as a prelate possessing imperial clothes:

"We donate to our father, the blessed Sylvester, *summus pontifex* and universal pope of Rome, and all his successors [...] our imperial palace in the Lateran, [...] In addition to this, the diadem, or crown of our head, together with the *phrygium* and the *superhumerales*, that is *lorus*, which is usually put on the emperor's shoulder; the purple mantle, the *tunica coccinea*, all the imperial clothes, the dignity of the imperial mounted guards, also giving the

⁴⁸ M. Psellos, *Letter to Keroullarios*, ed. U. Criscuolo, p. 414–15.

⁴⁹ F. Tinnefeld, "Michael I. Keroullarios," 120–122.

⁵⁰ W. T. Treadgold, *A History of the Byzantine State and Society*, Stanford 1997, 597–598.

⁵¹ É. Malamut, *Alexis I^{er} Comnène*, 36.

⁵² The chronicler recorded his rude words, *Scylitzes Continuatus*, ed. E. Tsolakes, Thessalonike 1968, 105.: I established you, oven, in order to destroy you. (Εγὼ σὲ ἔκτισα, φοῦρνε, καὶ ἐγὼ νὰ σὲ χαλάσω).

imperial sceptre with all the ensigns, banners, and different imperial equipments, the entire procession of the imperial head, and the glory of our *potestas*.”⁵³

This was the passage which may have influenced Leo’s imperial vestments. Compared to Michael Keroullarios, the Patriarch did not wear any of the items enlisted, but only the imperial baskins, as it is attested by contemporary sources. But in the case of Leo the evidence is more straightforward. Thomas described Leo as having a great golden headband around his head (καὶ περὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ ἐπιτιθέντα μέγιστον χρυσοῦν φακιόλιον). The φακιόλιον (Lat. *faciale*) means a cloth for the head which Christ wore during his Passion. On the other hand, it denoted a headband used by desert fathers and women.⁵⁴ The ninth-century *Lexicon* of Patriarch Photios (r. 858–867 and 877–886) testified a special meaning under the headword κίδαρις. The κίδαρις was “a diadem, forming part of Jewish high priest’s headdress.”⁵⁵ According to Photios’ *Lexicon*, the “*Kidaris*: a headband, or a cover (pending) from the hair; or a type of *kalamaukion* which you know as *tiara*, but some people call as *kidaris*, or crown, or *phakiolion*.”⁵⁶ The καλαμαυκίον (Lat. *camelaucum*) designated the headdress of the pope in the eighth century.⁵⁷ Photios used rather the word *tiara* for this, as the *lemma* says. Thus, among others, the φακιόλιον is the synonym of the papal headwear. Chapter 16 of the *Libellus* reads as follows:

“We decreed therefore that our venerable father, the same Sylvester, the *summus pontifex*, and all his successors have to use a diadem, that is a crown made from pure gold and precious stones, which we gave him from our head, and they have to wear it for God’s glory to demonstrate the honour of Saint Peter. But the same most holy pope cannot use an

⁵³ *Concedimus beato Silvestro patri nostro, summo pontifici et universali urbis Romae papae, et omnibus eius successoribus pontificibus, [...] palatium imperii nostri Lateranense[...] deinde etiam diadema videlicet coronam capitis nostri simulque phrygium necnon et superhumeralia, videlicet lorium, quod imperiale circumdare assolet collum; verum etiam et chlamydem purpuream atque tunicam coccineam et omnia imperialia indumenta, sed et dignitatem imperialium praesidentium equitum, conferentes etiam imperialia sceptrum simulque cuncta signa atque banda etiam et diversa ornamenta imperialia et omnem processionem imperialis culminis et gloriam potestatis nostrae.*

⁵⁴ φακιάλιον, *LSJ*, 1996, 1913; and φακιόλιον, *Lampe*, 2009, 1469.

⁵⁵ κίδαρις, *Lampe*, 2009, 753.

⁵⁶ Photios, *Lexicon*, ed. Th. Christos, *Photii patriarchae Lexicon*, Berlin 1998, Vol. 2, letter κ, p. 217.: Κίδαρις: περίθεμα κεφαλῆς ἢ ἐκ τῆς τριχὸς ὕφασμα· ἦτοι εἶδος καλαμαυκίου, ὃ καὶ τιάρα νοεῖτε τινὲς δὲ κίδαριν λέγουσι [...] ἢ στέφανον ἢ φακιόλιον.

⁵⁷ H. Norris, *Church Vestments. Their Origin and Development*, Mineola N. Y. 2002³, 97–98; M. de Waha, “Entre Byzance et l’Occident,” in L. H. Misguich *et al.*, ed., *Rayonnement Grec: Hommages à Charles Delvoeye*, Brussels 1982, 405–419; A. Maloof, “The Eastern Origin of the Papal Tiara,” *Eastern Churches Review* 1, 1966–1967, 146–149.

entirely golden crown upon the clerical crown which he bears for the sake of Saint Peter's glory."⁵⁸

The great golden crown in Thomas' dream might be a parallel to the "crown made from pure gold and precious stones," the "clerical crown" of the pope.

The third item which needs assessment in Thomas' dream and is also present in the *Libellus*, is the expression "βασιλειον ιεράτευμα". The Latin equivalent of this expression: "regale sacerdotium" was a central notion in Pope Leo IX's *Libellus*, as it has been demonstrated above.⁵⁹ As I have already noticed, for Patriarch Keroullarios, the priesthood was close to imperial power and he made claims for "imperial priesthood". In the late eleventh century to address the clergymen as "βασιλειον ιεράτευμα" was part of the practice. Alexios I, according to the testimony of a tribunal report (*semeioma*), addressed the *synodos endemousa* as "God's holy people, the divine priestly body. ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἅγιος κλῆρος, τὸ βασιλειον ιεράτευμα."⁶⁰ The *synodos endemousa* was the advisory and arbitral body of the patriarch of Constantinople, consisting of those metropolitans who happened to be (ἐνδημοῦντες) in the capital.⁶¹ The ιεράτευμα here refers to a decision-making body⁶² and the βασιλειον can be rendered as divine,⁶³ a synonym of ἅγιος, the preceding word in the address. Nevertheless, it can be surmised that in Thomas' dream Leo's priesthood was not qualified as "holy", or "divine", mirroring the collective sense of the expression.

The use of the phrase "royal priesthood" in the representation of Alexios I's and the imperial family may have given the background for Thomas' dream. Theophylaktos, the court rhetorician and later archbishop of Ohrid (1050–after 1126), delivered an *enkomion* early 1088.⁶⁴ The oration preserved the only passage which associates the Komnenian family with "royal priesthood" during

⁵⁸ *Decrevimus itaque et hoc, ut idem venerabilis pater noster, Silvester summus pontifex, vel omnes ei succedentes pontifices, diademate, videlicet corona, quam ex capite nostro illi concessimus, ex auro purissimo et gemmis pretiosis uti debeant et in capite ad laudem Dei pro honore beati Petro gestare. [...] Ipse vero beatissimus papa super coronam clericatus, quam gerit ad gloriam beati Petri, omnino ipsa ex auro non est passus uti corona.*

⁵⁹ G. Dagron, *Emperor and Priest*, 239–247.

⁶⁰ V. Grumel, "L'affaire de Léon de Chalcédoine. Le décret ou 'semeioma' d'Alexis Ier Comnène (1086)," 320.

⁶¹ A. Papadakis, s. v. *endemousa synodos*, in A. P. Kazhdan et al., eds., *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* 1, Oxford–New York 1991, 697.

⁶² See: G. Lampe, ed., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford 2009, 669.

⁶³ See: *LSJ* 308.

⁶⁴ Presumably 6 Jan 1088. For the passage, see: P. Gautier, *Theophylacte d'Achrida. Discours, Traités, Poésies*, Thessalonique 1980, 237, l. 17. For the dating of the *enkomion*: *ibidem*, 68–96. Smart assessments of the oration: M. Mullett, "The Imperial Vocabulary of Alexios I Komnenos," in M. Mullett – D. Smythe, eds., *Alexios I Komnenos*, Belfast, 1996, 359–397; P. 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, esp. 73–78.

the reign of Alexios I.⁶⁵ The addressee of the talk is the emperor, Alexios and, almost equally, her mother Anna Dalassene. This stemmed from the fact that Alexios during the first decade of his reign relied heavily on her mother, even appointing her regent when himself was absent from the capital.⁶⁶ Anna Dalassene conducted herself in a monastic manner and also tried to impose monastic habits in the imperial palace. Theophylaktos expressed admiration for this behaviour, praised the decency (εὐκοσμία) of the imperial palace and put the question: "Is not it imperial priesthood itself?"⁶⁷

As events in the history of the Byzantine church during the first decade of Alexios' reign demonstrate, some members of the patriarchal clergy and part of the episcopal bench were not in accord with Theophylaktos' view and they considered Alexios rather as a harsh ruler than as an "imperial" or "royal" priest. The phrase "βασιλείον ιεράτευμα" in Thomas' dream with the meaning "imperial priesthood" stands in contrast to the representation of the Komnenian family expressed by Theophylaktos.

Preceding Leo of Chalcedon's banishment in the year 1087, which is a *terminus post quem* for the creation of the dream-description, the highly interventionist ecclesiastical policy of Alexios I met dissatisfaction on the part of the church. The power of the patriarch and the *synodos endemousa* was at its heyday during the eleventh century. Alexios inherited a church in which metropolitans thought of themselves as a counselling body for the emperor which influenced imperial decisions.⁶⁸ Three groups interacted with each other within the clergy in early Komnenian Constantinople: the clergy of Hagia Sophia, the bishops leaving their sees in Asia Minor due to the Seljukian invasion, and the metropolitans visiting the resident synod of the capital who had their bishoprics in unoccupied territory.⁶⁹ Alexios I aimed at diminishing the role of the metropolitans and the patriarchal synod and intended to promote the clergy of Hagia Sophia as his new source of power in the church. Alexios clearly prevented members of the old episcopal guard from intervening in the issues of the patriarchal clergy and restricted the metropolitans' role in central decision-making. The crushing of the metropolitan party went in parallel with Leo's increasing opposition.

Leo of Chalcedon had his own faction (μέρος) in the *synodos endemousa* and

⁶⁵ Unfortunately, the presumably rich rhetorical production of the early Komnenian period did not survive, see: P. Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180*, Cambridge 2009, 414.

⁶⁶ PBW Anna 61 (consulted 20 06 2017), <http://db.pbw.kcl.ac.uk/pbw2011/entity/person/106273>; P. Wirth, *Regesten*, No. 1073; B. Hill, "Alexios I Komnenos and the Imperial Women," in M. Mullett – D. Smythe, eds., *Alexios I Komnenos*, Belfast 1996, 37–54.

⁶⁷ μήποτε τοῦτ' ἔστιν τὸ βασιλείον ιεράτευμα;

⁶⁸ Together with lay *archontes*, see Niketas of Ankyra, *On ordination*, ed. J. Darrouzès, *Documents inédits d' ecclésiologie Byzantine*, Paris 1966, 202–204.

⁶⁹ V. Tiftixoglu, "Gruppenbildungen innerhalb des konstantinopolitanischen Klerus während der Komnenenzeit," *BZ* 72 (1969), 36.

his metropolitan supporters promoted an image about him as a martyr and victim.⁷⁰ In a letter to an anonymous bishop, probably a member of his faction, Leo compared himself to John the Baptist and his cause to that of the blameless Jesus whom Pilate fustigated.⁷¹ In his letter to Leo Nicholas of Hadrianople, Leo's nephew, characterized his uncle as guardian of the church, comparing him to Balaam, the Mesopotamian prophet of the Old Testament.⁷² Both prophets came in an open conflict with secular rulers arguing for God's sake. In the dream, Thomas admired Leo as a banished prelate defying the emperor which might mirror Leo's representation by the "Chalcedonian faction".

During a canonical debate between 1084 and 1087 on the status of two suffragan bishoprics of the metropolis of Ankyra, the situation escalated among the emperor, the metropolitan party, and the patriarchal clergy.⁷³ Constantine X Doukas (r. 1059–1067) had promoted the bishops of Basileion and Madytos to metropolitan status contravening regulations of canon law. Niketas, the metropolitan bishop of Ankyra, wanted the imperial decision to be reversed to have the two bishoprics under the supervision of the see of Ankyra. The patriarchal clergy opposed this plan and Alexios I, siding with them, issued a decree telling that the decision would not be reversed.⁷⁴ It meant that the *basileus* had the right to manipulate episcopal appointments and promotions. Niketas of Ankyra resigned his see in protest. During the controversy Niketas produced five works to buttress his position.⁷⁵ In one of these the metropolitan bitterly noticed the reversal of roles between the emperor and the metropolitans: "laypeople behaved like priests and the priests like laypeople."⁷⁶ In Niketas' argumentation the example of the papacy played a role. Based on *Canon 28* of the Council of Chalcedon, the metropolitan compared the prerogatives of the patriarch of Constantinople to that of the pope.⁷⁷ Niketas of Ankyra did not use the

⁷⁰ On Leo's faction, see: *Al.* 5.2.6.: οἱ τῷ Χαλκηδόνοιο μέρει προσκείμενοι.

⁷¹ A. Lauriotès, "Ἱστορικὸν ζήτημα," 405–407.

⁷² A. Lauriotès, "Ἱστορικὸν ζήτημα," cited n. 6., p. 413. Concerning Balaam: see *Num* 22–24.

⁷³ P. Wirth, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches, Teil 2. Regesten von 1025–1204*, Munich 1995, No. 964.

⁷⁴ P. Wirth, *ibidem*, No. 1117; V. Grumel, *Les registres des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople, I: Les actes des patriarches, fasc. ii et iii: Les registres de 715 à 1206*, Paris 1947, revised ed. 1989, No. 938, No. 944.

⁷⁵ *On Ordination, On Councils, On Elections, On the Right of Resignation, On Prohibited Marriages*, see: J. Darrouzès, *Documents inédits d' ecclésiologie Byzantine*, Paris 1966, 176–275.

⁷⁶ *On synods*, ed. J. Darrouzès, *ibidem*, p. 214, l. 10: ὁ λαὸς γέγονεν ὡς ἱερεῖς καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς ὡς ὁ λαός.

⁷⁷ And not based on the *Constitutum Constantini* as Michael Angold claimed, see M. Angold, *Church and Society*, 56–57, cf. Darrouzès' edition, p. 218, l. 22–25: "The see of Constantinople received the same honour and the prerogatives of the pope of Rome from the fathers [my italics], because it became the emperors' residence. ὁ δὲ τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως θρόνος τὴν τοσαύτην τιμὴν εἴληφε καὶ τὰ προνόμια τοῦ πάπα Ῥώμης παρὰ τῶν πατέρων διὰ τὸ γενέσθαι ταύτην οἰκητήριον βασιλέων."

Donation of Constantine, but the passage is important, because it proves that the example of Rome was in use in the political discourse in the debate between Alexios and the metropolitan party. The resistance of the metropolitans had been quenched at the time of Leo's banishment (that is after 1087), and the clergy of the Great Church emerged as the dominant force in the church.

Despite Alexios' concessions to the patriarchal clergy, there were members officiating in the Hagia Sophia who did not accord with the new regime's initiatives. John Metaxas argued against Isaac, the *sebastokrator's* announcement about the alienation of church valuables at the beginning of the Komnenian iconoclast debate. Metaxas was also invited to the Blachernai-synod, the closing event of the controversy. It is likely that some discontented members of the patriarchal clergy also supported Leo's party. The fact that Thomas, the dreamer was a priest (ιερέυς) conducting his service in the Hagia Sophia church, could be explained by this hypothesis.⁷⁸

I assume that the person creating Thomas' dream may have had in mind the example of the *Constitutum Constantini* and the debate around Michael Keroullarios on the relationship of emperor and patriarch which reminded him of the antagonism between Leo of Chalcedon and Alexios I Komnenos. Leo's imperial appearance, his headgear and the description of Leo's priesthood as imperial may confirm this assertion. The author could have used the *Libellus*, a Greek translation which is unknown today, or the *Libellus'* content spread by word of mouth.⁷⁹ The wording of Thomas' dream reflects an author who wrote in a simple language and preferred scriptural and patristic quotations which might represent an ecclesiastical milieu.⁸⁰ Therefore, it is plausible to conclude that Thomas' dream originated among the ecclesiastical supporters of Leo, metropolitan of Chalcedon. Denoting Leo of Chalcedon's priesthood as imperial could have been the expression of the will of discontented clergymen to counteract the highly interventionist church policy of Alexios I. Moreover, with respect to the changing nature of the episcopal office during the early Komnenian period, Thomas the priest's dream preserved an episcopal model which was at its twilight: Leo of Chalcedon, member of the slowly disappearing "old guard" during the reign of Alexios I Komnenos, was the last prelate in the Komnenian epoch who was portrayed as one boasting of imperial prerogatives. Compared to Leo of Chalcedon, Pope Leo IX asserted the superiority of

⁷⁸ Using Thomas as a fictional character by the metropolitan party as its porte-parole cannot be substantiated. Furthermore, we do not have evidence about a Thomas among the clergy of the Great Church at the time of the controversy.

⁷⁹ See Franz Tinnefeld's claim that Michael Keroullarios knew the content of the *Donation of Constantine* by word of mouth, F. Tinnefeld, "Michael I. Keroullarios," 105–7.

⁸⁰ See my small *apparatus* to Thomas's dream above.

the papacy to the patriarchate in ecclesiastical matters stemming from Constantine I's alleged concessions. Patriarch Keroullarios, probably based on the same round, contended that his office was close to that of the *basileus*, but the surviving sources did not describe Keroullarios' priesthood as imperial. The case of Leo of Chalcedon is a step further: he was portrayed in Thomas' dream as an "imperial" prelate.