ALMA MATER STUDIORUM
UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA

ARCHIVIO ISTITUZIONALE
DELLA RICERCA

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna
Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Working in the Imperial and Patriarchal Chanceries

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:
Giuseppe De Gregorio (2023). Working in the Imperial and Patriarchal Chanceries. Leiden / Boston : Brill [10.1163/9789004527089_013].

Availability:
This version is available at: https://hdl.handle.net/11585/905844 since: 2023-03-06

Published:

DOI: http://doi.org/10.1163/9789004527089_013

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (https://cris.unibo.it/).
When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

09 September 2026

CHAPTER 11

Working in the Imperial and Patriarchal Chanceries

Giuseppe De Gregorio

1 Introductory Background

As is well known, among the many unique features of Byzantine society was an elevated idea of central authority, based on a principle directly derived from Roman imperial tradition. It is not surprising, therefore, that public documentation assumed a prominent role. The forms and characters with which it was produced almost always carried strong symbolic significance and represented concrete and tangible instruments through which that same central authority, both political-institutional and religious, exercised and manifested its power. Although the papyri of late antique Egypt have furnished us with very few original documents relevant to the acts issued by public bureaux of Constantinople other than the imperial office,[1] it is likely that the primary chancery of the Byzantine state, structurally organized with more or less stable personnel, was that of the emperor, at least by some point and certainly during the Palaeologan era. Similarly, in the ecclesiastical world, it is possible to reconstruct as a permanent entity the inner office of the Great Church,[2] which was in charge of preparing documents and equipped with well-established structures, based on entrenched and enduring tradition and customs — that is to say, the chancery of the primate of Orthodoxy.[3]

Certainly, we possess numerous acts issued by officials of various ranks in the state administration and the ecclesiastical hierarchy, which concern documents of officials or of bishops, archbishops, or metropolitans,[4] as well as a similarly conspicuous mass of private documents (still much less studied for Byzantium compared to Western mediaeval studies), that should be traced back to notarial boards organized in various ways. Regarding the documents of officials, we know, for example, that a good part of the letters and acts that make up the work of Demetrios Chomatenos (between the late 12th century and ca. 1236, first as *apokrisiarios* from the archbishopric of Ohrid to the patriarch of Constantinople, then *chartophylax* in Ohrid and finally archbishop of the same autocephalous see at Ohrid), were not only released but also written by that same prelate, based on forms and legal customs learned in the patriarchal chancery of Constantinople. Meanwhile, the remaining pieces must have been composed and transcribed by clerics in

1 Cf. e.g. Salomon, "A Papyrus from Constantinople (Hamburg Inv. No. 410)".

2 In Greek, ἡ Μεγάλη τοῦ Θεοῦ Ἐκκλησία, which refers first to the church of *Hagia Sophia* in Constantinople and, more universally, to the Ecumenical Patriarchate housed there.

3 Certainly, documentary production is also confirmed for the other eastern patriarchates (Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch), though mostly indirectly; but a systematic organization of the office is conceivable only for the prior period, up until a few centuries after the Arab conquest.

4 Cf. Dölger/Karayannopulos, *Byzantinische Urkundenlehre*, pp. 23-24.

his service in a chancery office of the archbishop in Ohrid, under the guidance of a *chartophylax*.[5] Similarly, regarding private documents, it is necessary to mention briefly the traditional role of the citizen notaryship, which, beyond the well-known example of Ravenna in the early Byzantine period, can be well illustrated, in terms of that office's corporate organization, by the regulations attested in the "Book of the Eparch" (early 10th century).[6] Moreover, regarding just the late Byzantine era, we cannot ignore the testimony of the numerous private documents conserved in cartularies, where tabellions with ecclesiastical rank — sometimes elevated — were active in a characteristic mix of functions. For example, in the cartulary of Makrinitissa and Nea Petra (13th century),[7] the bishop of Demetrias (Thessaly) operated as a "notary" in private acts (in the place of lay professionals, who must have not been available in that area), which moreover indicate an uncommon knowledge in the field of law as the result of formal study.

Nevertheless, a simple survey of, for example, the acts published in the series of the "Archives de l'Athos" reveals the presence of a somewhat extemporaneous production for the so-called minor authorities and for the notarial tradition in the realm of private documentation, where on the one hand the physical compilers seem to have been recruited just from the scribes operating in a specific region or place, mainly on the basis of their comparatively superior writing skills, and, on the other, the documentary forms appear to be modelled more or less coherently on the practices of the two central chanceries. A rapid skimming of the section "Erwähnte Urkunden und Gesetze" in the three volumes currently published in the edition of the Register of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, however, sheds some light on a not irrelevant series of private documents from the 14th century behind which likely hides an intense activity that has not yet been sufficiently investigated in terms of its organization and structure.

In general, it is useful to observe, for example, that in the 13th century the imperial chancery, though it had long dropped the tradition of the "Reservatschrift" (the script that was learned and spread exclusively within that office, especially for the privileges),[8] did not relinquish its role of controlling and selecting the types of handwriting internally employed there, depending on the various categories of documents produced (categories that can be valued correctly only with adequate knowledge of diplomatics). The same is also true, for example, of the production of imperial documents in the age of Andronikos II Palaiologos (between the 13th and 14th century) and beyond, at least until the middle of the 14th century, where, even in the presence of scripts used both for books and for documents (and thus not employed exclusively by the imperial chancery) more formalized outcomes were preferred for chrysobulls.[9] Moreover, the testimony of the Register of the

5 Prinzing,"Konvergenz und Divergenz zwischen dem Patriarchatsregister und den *Ponemata Diaphora*".

6 Leo VI the Wise, *Book of the Eparch*, ed. Koder, pp. 74-84 (Chapt. 1: Περὶ ταβουλλαρίων).

7 Cf. infra, n. 40 and context.

8 Cf. Dölger, "Die Kaiserurkunde der Byzantiner als Ausdruck ihrer politischen Anschauungen", pp. 236-39 (repr., pp. 17-20); Dölger/Karayannopulos, *Byzantinische Urkundenlehre*, pp. 31-34; Hunger, "Schriftästhetik in den drei originalen kaiserlichen Auslandsschreiben der Komnenenzeit".

9 "Großprivilegienurkunden": cf. Dölger/Karayannopulos, *Byzantinische Urkundenlehre*, pp. 119-27; Burgmann, "Chrysobull gleich Privileg?".

Patriarchate of Constantinople will, throughout most of the 14th century, offer a similar point of departure in the present overview.

2 Chanceries in the Service of Rhetoric and Ideology

Without doubt, the primary feature of the ideological programme of Michael VIII Palaiologos (1259-1282) — at least in this respect followed faithfully by his son Andronikos II Palaiologos (1282-1328) — was restoration. Reaffirming imperial dignity, thus legitimizing the dynastic power of the Palaiologoi, promoting the restoration and reconstruction of buildings in the capital, thus returning them to ancient splendour, and, last but not least, reconstructing the monastic communities dispersed during the Latin occupation (1204-1261), were some of the objectives of the policies of the dynasty's first two emperors, as is highlighted, with justifiable pride, in certain prefaces to documents issued by the same Michael VIII in favour of ecclesiastic institutions that were re-established and renewed — one example is the chrysobull for the restoration of the church of *Hagia Sophia* in Constantinople (1267-1271).[10] But it is the rhetorical construction of the acts — that is, the high tenor, the forms and the conventions of the chancery's *dictamen* — that reinforces these instruments for apology and propaganda. For example, it is telling that in some of these documentary sources (unfortunately only seldom transmitted in the original for this first period after Latin rule), the western yoke is described with intentionally vague and generic expressions, since, as is well-known, the Byzantines did not like to talk of contingent situations, especially unfavourable ones. Thus (confining ourselves to the customs of the patriarchal chancery), the disruption and the dispersion of monastic communities in the first half of the 13th century, which the Palaeologan dynasty now attempted to remedy, are revealed in an unedited documentary fragment, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Vat. gr. 100 B, with an ambiguous and reticent circumlocution in genitive absolute: "the die of fate of the events having rolled over differently" (or "the course of events having changed").[11] Moreover, regarding the institutional crises — economic and social — that from the end of the 13th century and throughout the entire 14th century shook the empire (as a consequence, additionally, of a progressive loss of territory, especially in Asia Minor), the documentation alludes simply to the "confusion and the irregularity of the state of things",[12] although the progressive decline of the administrative and civil structures left the Church to assume an ever increasing role, as much moral as political, in late Byzantine society.

10 Dölger/Wirth, *Regesten*, vol. 3, no. 1941a (transmitted in copy). An interesting contribution is now offered by Smyrlis, "Priesterhood and Empire". Cf. more generally Talbot, "The Restoration of Constantinople under Michael VIII".

11 Vat. gr. 100 B, line 4: ... τοῦ πε⟨σ⟩σου τῶν πραγμάτων ἄλλως μεταπεσόντος (I attribute this fragment to the first term of Patriarch Ioseph I Galesiotes, late 1266 – early 1275).

12 *Patriarchal Register*, vol. 1, no. 51 (1315, July), lines 14-15: ... ἡ τῶν πραγμάτων σύγχυσις καὶ ἀνωμαλία... .

2.1 Prefaces to Documents as Expressions of Intellectual Production

Beyond relaying historical information of fundamental importance, chancery documents can often be evaluated in the same way as literary works, at times attaining a high level of form and style. The highest expression — rhetorically and content-based — of imperial ideology, as well as of patriarchal intervention in theological matters or in the realm of monastic and ecclesiastical discipline, is normally found in prefaces (or arengas), that is, the introductory sections of the documentary text — which have already been analysed in terms of structure and tradition in a few esteemed contributions in the corpus of Byzantine studies[13] — where the ideological motivations (universally valid from the ethical point of view) behind the legal action are made explicit. To write these arengas, in part due to the necessity of adhering in the *dictamen* to established habits and conventional formularies that would reinforce and confirm the validity of the act, the chancery servants, and those called on from time to time to collaborate with the office, were able to use pre-existing models. One interesting collection of 20 *clichés* for prefaces to chrysobulls is conserved in MS Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek, Palat. gr. 356, copied towards the end of the 13th century, most likely in Constantinople.[14] Furthermore, one example of a document composed following the highest rhetorical rules, though it was never actually delivered to its recipient (perhaps because it was rendered obsolete by the hectic succession of events), is the letter (1265, ca. June) from the Emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos to the newly elected Pope Clement IV aimed at re-proposing agreement with Rome on the dogmatic level.[15] The text is passed down to us for its literary value in a *dossier* (contained in MS Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vindob. Phil. gr. 321, from the second half of the 13th century) of works by Manuel Holobolos, the well-known court rhetor and teacher in the patriarchal school who also had noteworthy experience in documentary *dictamen*, with particular reference to the dictation of prefaces.[16] Here we find numerous constructions, common in this kind of document, which derive from a pre-existing chancery formulary that was from time to time combed through for letters to be sent to the Roman pope.

---

13 Hunger, *Prooimion* (with the addition of Browning, *Notes on Byzantine Prooimia*); Mazal, *Die Prooimien der byzantinischen Patriarchenurkunden*. Observations on the compositional style of the documents transmitted in the Register of the Patriarchate of Constantinople can be found in Hunger, "Zum Stil und zur Sprache des Patriarchatsregisters von Konstantinopel"; id., "Zur scheinbaren Nonchalance der Kanzleisprache des Patriarchatsregisters"; Gastgeber, "Rhetorik in der Patriarchatskanzlei von Konstantinopel"; on the formulary of the patriarchal chancery see now Gastgeber, "Das Formular der Patriarchatskanzlei". On the prefaces and chancery formulas of the "letters of union" (the foreign letters and documents connected to the negotiations with the Church of Rome before and after the Council of Lyon of 1274) cf. Pieralli, *La corrispondenza diplomatica dell'imperatore bizantino*, pp. 61-69.

14 Cf. Hunger, *Prooimion*, pp. 217-45 (with 1 pl.); Heid. Palat. gr. 356, fols. 65v-69v, tit.: "Various chrysobull's proems excerpted from older chrysobulls" (Προοίμια χρυσοβούλλων διάφορα παρεκβληθέντα ἀπὸ παλαιοτέρων χρυσοβούλλων).

15 Pieralli, *La corrispondenza diplomatica dell'imperatore bizantino*, pp. 167-83 (no. 8).

16 On Manuel Holobolos cf. *PLP* 21047; De Gregorio, "Una lista di commemorazioni di defunti", 142-44, 180-81; Fisher, "Manuel Holobolos and the Role of Bilinguals".

It is not surprising that even intellectuals of a high level engaged in the composition of prefaces for documents, as this is a custom that was well established in Byzantium. For older periods, as prime examples one can quote Michael Psellos (11th century) and the brothers George and Demetrios Tornikes (12th century, second half/end).[17] For the age of the Palaeologan dynasty we also possess numerous testimonies of this type of text composed by the most eminent scholars of the time, who were in service as *mesazontes* (trusted advisors of the emperor and intermediaries of his will with the people). These scholars could inspire and sometimes formulate the text of the acts produced in the imperial chancery and submitted to the highest authority for signature. Thus, we are able to identify at least four highly elegant prefaces composed by Nikephoros Choumnos (1250/55-1327), which were inserted into four chrysobulls also drafted by the scholar and transmitted in several manuscripts with his works. Among these, MS Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Ambros. C 71 sup. (gr. 185) stands out, a collection of writings by Choumnos datable between 1320 and 1327 and copied in his own entourage by, among others, the primary scribe of the imperial chancery in this period, George Boullotes.[18] The latter was also the scribe of the only surviving original of these four chrysobulls, which are also preserved in the manuscript tradition,[19] as well as the scribe of another original, whose formal composition and style connect it, too, with certainty, to Choumnos, indisputably the head of the imperial chancery at the time. This last testimony also carries on its *verso* a typical entry of this office in Choumnos' own hand.[20]

For Choumnos' great rival, too, the scholar and politician Theodore Metochites (1270-1332) who managed and interpreted the policies of Andronikos II during the second half of his long reign, we have the testimony of at least one arenga, also intended for an imperial chrysobull and attested as a rhetorical exercise and compositional model in the well-known witness of the *mesazon*'s Discourses (*Logoi*), MS Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vindob. Phil. gr. 95 (fol. 329r-v), copied by his scribe, the imperial notary Michael Klostomalles. From certain stereotypical expressions characteristic of rhetorical composition in documentary practice, we can recognize the style adopted in other chrysobulls from the first decades of the 14th century for which Metochites was in all likelihood responsible.[21]

---

17 Cf. Michael Psellos, *Orations*, ed. Dennis, pp. 143-81; George/Demetrios Tornikes, *Letters and Orations*, ed. Darrouzès, pp. 189-201, 324-53 (nos. 30, 32-34) (also in the case of George Tornikes MS Vindob. Phil. gr. 321 counts as *codex unicus*; see also Pieralli, *La corrispondenza diplomatica dell'imperatore bizantino*, pp. 9-10, 63).

18 Cf. Papatriantaphyllou-Theodoridi, *Choumnos*, pp. 28-31 (nos 23, 24, 25, 29 [= Dölger, *Regesten*, vol. 4, nos. 2158, 2348, 2323, 2085]), 128-146 (for the codex Ambrosianus). I shall return to Boullotes below.

19 Papatriantaphyllou-Theodoridi, *Choumnos*, p. 29, no. 24 (1313, October: *Documents Chilandar*, eds. Živojinović/Kravari/Giros, no. 29; Dölger, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 2348); Lamberz, "Georgios Bullotes", p. 37 with n. 15, pl. 8.

20 *Documents Lavra*, eds. Lemerle/Guillou/Svoronos/Papachryssanthou, vol. 2, no. 89 A (1298, June; Dölger, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 2208); it is the oldest known document in Boullotes' hand: Lamberz, "Georgios Bullotes", p. 36, pl. 3. The document of Chilandar cited here (cf. previous footnote) also carries on its *verso* the chancery note inserted by Choumnos; to these originals, I shall return below.

21 Cf. Hunger, *Prooimion*, pp. 39 (with n. 99), 196 (no. 303) (= Dölger, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 2600 [without date]).

Finally, remaining with the office in charge of preparing and copying acts for the emperor, we may mention three formularies of prefaces composed by Demetrios Kydones (ca. 1324-1397/98). Kydones was the most noted anti-Palamite theologian and scholar of the second half of the 14th century, as well as an advocate for union with the Roman Church. He was in service as *mesazon* both from 1347-1354 under John VI Kantakouzenos and during the reign of John V Palaiologos from around 1356 to 1386 — precisely the period from which the three prefaces date (one being attributable to the end of 1371, and the other two probably simple drafts still without date).[22] Demetrios Kydones also played a decisive role in composing and transcribing the Greek text of the profession of Roman Faith (as well as partially in drawing up the related Latin version), that John V Palaiologos presented on 18 October 1369 in the Roman church of Santo Spirito in Sassia.[23]

Nikephoros Gregoras (1293-1361) is an equally significant case.[24] We know that the author of the *Historia Rhomaike* must have attempted, especially in his youth, the composition of some arengas, extremely refined rhetorically, that are now collected along with other literary works of his in MS Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 1086.[25] Examples of his activity in the realm of *dictamen* come from the documentation relating to the years of Patriarch John XIII Glykys (1315-1319).[26] Gregoras must have established a close relationship with the chancery of this primate of the Orthodox Church thanks, above all, to the good offices of his uncle John, metropolitan of Herakleia Pontike (1295-1328).[27] John took care of his nephew's education, introducing him to the circle of John Glykys. Thus, his young and promising relative composed, with great stylistic effect, the preface for an act issued by this patriarch in favour of the city of Herakleia Pontike (A.D. 1317-1318), which is transmitted in a dual tradition, both in the collection of Gregoras' works in Vat. gr. 1086 (fol. 213r) and in the series of documents included in the Register of the Patriarchate of Constantinople (MS Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vindob. Hist. gr. 47, fols. 33v-34v).[28] Some images foreshadow the complex rhetorical architecture of the writer's major works: for example, the construction of the preface's conclusion, modelled chiastically and alluding to the ties of spiritual

22 Hunger, *Prooimion*, pp. 39 (with n. 98); 113 and 129 (no. 162); 55, 141 and 157 n. 2 (no. 52) (he assigns these three rhetorical exercises to the beginning of the reign of Manuel II Palaiologos [1391-1425]); cf. Dölger, *Regesten*, vol. 5, nos. 3130 (A.D. 1371), 3217 e 3222 (both without date); cf. also above chapter 10.

23 See now Pieralli, "Un imperatore di Bisanzio a Roma".

24 *PLP* 4443; Beyer, "Eine Chronologie der Lebensgeschichte des Nikephoros Gregoras"; De Gregorio, "Un'aggiunta su copisti greci del secolo XIV", 261-68.

25 Cf. Kresten, in *Patriarchal Register*, vol. 1, pp. 43-45 (*Einleitung*, II: *Überlieferungsgeschichte*). In Vat. gr. 1086 the hand of Gregoras is attested on several folios: cf. especially Ševčenko, "Some Autographs of Nicephorus Gregoras", pp. 444-46 (with figs. 4-5); further bibliography is provided in Bianconi, "La biblioteca di Cora tra Massimo Planude e Niceforo Gregora", 417 (no. 39) (more recently Bianconi, "I libri di Niceforo Gregora", p. 35 [no. 27] limits himself to mentioning Ševčenko); see also Pérez Martín, *El patriarca Gregorio de Chipre*, pp. 49-50, 326 with n. 7, pl. 11; ead., "El «estilo Hodegos»", pp. 113-14, 118-21, pl. 7.

26 *PLP* 4271.

27 *PLP* 8609. Gregoras was also a native of Herakleia Pontike.

28 *Patriarchal Register*, vol. 1, no. 51 (from the Vat. gr. 1086, Nikephoros Gregoras, *Opuscules*, ed. Leone, pp. 769-70 [no VII]); Darrouzès, *Les regestes*, vol. 5, no. 2081.

brotherhood (such as those between the patriarch and his metropolitan) that are stronger than ties of blood:

> there, in fact, one is perhaps accused only for the harshness of the heart and one distances oneself after adequate pain has been established; here, instead, in addition one is blamed before the person from whom one has received the entrustment of the office of administration, in cases in which, though being able to offer a helping hand, one permits, through indolence, one's brother [in Christ] to be oppressed with violence.[29]

Moreover, we know of texts of this literary genre composed by Gregoras and conserved exclusively in the partial autograph of his works.[30] It is worth noting first another arenga, also for a patriarchal *sigillion*, likewise attributable to the period of John Glykys and addressed to an (unspecified) monastic community, which is otherwise unknown in the documentary tradition.[31] There are also two more prefaces for imperial chrysobulls,[32] demonstrating that barriers between the two central Byzantine institutions were practically non-existent in terms of the activity of the intellectual class and often also for those who, thanks to their acknowledged skills, performed there the function of scribe and physical compiler of acts. Finally, the arengas the scholar composed for the wills of several ecclesiastics appear in the same Vatican manuscript relating to Gregoras,[33] among which the literarily and historically most important is without doubt the *diatheke* of the same John Glykys (1319), a composition that would later be included in his major work.[34]

It is plausible that other prefaces to patriarchal documents might be attributed to Gregoras and that his contribution to the drawing up of texts issued by his mentor John Glykys is not limited to the examples contained in Vat. gr. 1086.[35] In this respect, one can understand why in 1321, right after he had personally met Gregoras and thus shortly after the death of the patriarch who marked the rise of this emerging figure in intellectual

---

29 *Patriarchal Register*, vol. 1, no. 51, lines 11-16: ... παρ' ὅσον καὶ κρείττων ἡ τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ἐξ αἵματος συναφείας. ἐκεῖ μὲν γὰρ ἴσως σκληρότητα γνώμης καταγνωσθεὶς τὶς εἶτα ἀπῆλθεν ἐς τοσοῦτον αὐτῷ τῆς καταδίκης ὁρισθείσης, ἐνταῦθα δὲ πρὸς τούτοις καὶ δίκας ὀφλήσει παρὰ τῷ τὰ τῆς οἰκονομίας πιστεύσαντι, εἰ δυνάμενος χεῖρα βοηθείας παρέχεσθαι, ἔπειτα ῥᾳστώνῃ δεδωκὼς τὸ πρᾶγμα τῇ βίᾳ συνωθεῖσθαι τὸν ἀδελφὸν συγκεχώρηκεν.

30 For an overview and exhaustive bibliographic references cf. Kresten, in *Patriarchal Register*, vol. 1, p. 44 n. 29.

31 Vat. gr. 1086, fols. 211v-212r; Nikephoros Gregoras, *Opuscules*, ed. Leone, pp. 766-67 (no. IV); cf. also Darrouzès, *Les regestes*, vol. 5, no. 2081 ("Critique").

32 Vat. gr. 1086, fols. 216v-217v, 235r-v; Nikephoros Gregoras, *Opuscules*, ed. Leone, pp. 778-81 (nos. XIII-XIV); also see the introduction to Nikephoros Gregoras, *History*, trans. van Dieten, vol. 1, p. 47 (nos. 19-20).

33 It is probable that some of these pieces collected in Vat. gr. 1086 represent rhetorical exercises or variations on a theme and compositional sketches.

34 Vat. gr. 1086, fols. 210r-211v; ed. in Kourouses, "Ὁ λόγιος οἰκουμενικὸς πατριάρχης Ἰωάννης ΙΓ' ὁ Γλυκύς", 403-05; Nikephoros Gregoras, *History* 8, 2, ed. Schopen, vol. 1, pp. 289, line 23-292, line 11; cf. Nikephoros Gregoras, *History*, trans. van Dieten, vol. 1, p. 48 (no. 22); Beyer, "Eine Chronologie der Lebensgeschichte des Nikephoros Gregoras", 131 (no. 6).

35 Cf. Darrouzès, *Les regestes*, vol. 5, no. 2081 ("Critique"); Kresten, in *Patriarchal Register*, vol. 1, p. 44 n. 29.

circles, Emperor Andronikos II Palaiologos intended to offer him the title of *chartophylax* of the Great Church (corresponding, in practice, to the head of the chancery), a position of great significance, from which, however, the scholar shielded himself.[36]

All this, however, does more than reflect the intersection, characteristic of Byzantium, between the caste of officials and the most elevated intellectual circles. It also demonstrates that the latter most definitely did not disdain the idea of concerning themselves with the production of documents, which, beyond the stereotypical formulary, served as a training ground for rhetorical education (a true pillar in the literary conception of the Byzantines). Moreover, it is clear that these exercises — certainly not secondary in value but always more limited in length — often merged (directly or indirectly) into the major works. The testimonies connected to documentary practices also often help bring to the fore figures otherwise less known, or entirely unknown, whose work and influence were primarily confined to the chancery. In this regard, we have some other invaluable attestations of preface authors in the documents of the Register of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the 14th century.[37] Among these, of particular importance are the arengas composed (and physically transcribed in the Register) by the scribe and patriarchal notary John Holobolos, who rose up through the ecclesiastical hierarchy to the level of (*megas*) *chartophylax* and later metropolitan (of whom, more later). In these last documents, it is evident that the notary/*dictator* drafted a text not only for the recipient directly involved ("addressed audience") but also for an "unaddressed audience". To study the rhetorical education of the patriarchal notaries, one need only glance at the private collections of John Chortasmenos (ca. 1370 - ca. 1436/37).[38]

3 Officials and Intellectuals in the Imperial and Patriarchal Chanceries

As we have just seen, the osmosis between the offices of the two central chanceries and the scholarly circles was continuous: not only were those who held positions in these centres of documentary production themselves protagonists in the intellectual life of the time, but also well-known writers occasionally could lend their services to the preparation of acts. Similarly, alongside the most notable scholar-officials, from time to time "minor" figures linked to documentary production also emerge from oblivion, shedding light on an equally important cultural substratum. In this respect, useful information is furnished by, for example, *typika* (i.e. documents of foundation that contain the rules of community discipline) and cartularies (i.e. collections of documentary copies) relating to "imperial" monasteries. In fact, these are texts that illustrate how the activity of the chancery of the Byzantine ruler could extend beyond the tight organization of that office to include the more or less occasional work of officials not formally employed for practices directly linked to documentary production, although they were members of the court's entourage,

36 Nikephoros Gregoras, *History* 8, 8-9, ed. Schopen, vol. 1, pp. 339, line 22 - 340, line 10; cf. Beyer, "Eine Chronologie der Lebensgeschichte des Nikephoros Gregoras", 131 (no. 10); Kresten, in *Patriarchal Register,* vol. 1, pp. 44-45.

37 Cf. Gastgeber, "Rhetorik in der Patriarchatskanzlei von Konstantinopel", pp. 191-97.

38 Cf. Hunger, *Chortasmenos*, pp. 29-31; see chapter 12 in this volume.

such as those who held generic secretarial offices.[39] A significant example is provided by the cartulary of the Thessalian monasteries of Makrinitissa and Nea Petra (A.D. 1280-82, validated by the emperor in 1285/1286), aristocratic foundations under the patronage of the Malias(s)enos family and under the aegis of the first members of the Palaeologan dynasty. The collection's compiler, holder of the imperial office of "*logothetes* of the herds", skilfully interspersed the transcription of documents with a series of paratexts, in prose and in verse, composed for the occasion as introduction to and commentary on the acts, thus creating rhetorical and literary linking devices that also enhance enjoyment of the documentary codex.[40] The same technique of combining brief metric prologues with the transcription of acts appears in other volumes of a documentary character, also compiled in the imperial chancery: for example, in the *typikon* of the well-known male monastery dedicated to the archangel Michael and re-founded by Emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos on Mount Auxentios in the vicinity of Chalcedon, each chapter opens with a dodecasyllabic couplet referring to the content of the precept expounded below.[41]

Nevertheless, both the imperial and the patriarchal chanceries required qualified staff to fix in documentary form the wishes and deliberations of the emperor or of the Orthodox primate and the permanent Synod (σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα). We must therefore now examine more closely the structure of these two offices.

3.1 The Imperial Chancery

The Byzantine imperial chancery changed over the centuries in terms of its organization and, consequently, of the denomination and tasks of the officials working there. A coherent reconstruction of the diverse roles is at times complicated by the fact that the sources do not always provide us with an entirely homogenous picture. For the Palaeologan age, we can distinguish between functionaries connected to the chancery who assumed a high-level political role there and personnel who primarily looked after the concrete mechanisms of setting up the acts. Naturally, there was continuous interaction between the two levels, so that the leading figures of the first category could (and often did) also hold the highest offices of the second.

Among those closest to the emperor, with whom he shared foreign policy and who assumed the responsibility of preparing acts addressed to foreign powers and institutions, we find the grand *logothetes*,[42] a title that at the end of the 12th century is used to indicate the functions of the *logothetes* of the *sekreta*[43] and in the 13th century replaces the *logothetes*

39 Cf. e.g. Dölger/Karayannopulos, *Byzantinische Urkundenlehre*, p. 64; Oikonomidès, "La chancellerie impériale", 170.

40 Cf. De Gregorio, "Epigrammi e documenti", pp. 58-96. Ibid., pp. 93-96, it has been proposed to identify the compiler of the *codex diplomaticus* of Makrinitissa and Nea Petra with the *logothetes* of the herds Pepagomenos (*PLP* 22350) mentioned in Gregory of Cyprus, *Letters*, no. 52, ed. Eustratiades, pp. 36-37.

41 Cf. De Gregorio, "Epigrammi e documenti", pp. 79-84; engl. trans. of the *typikon* by G. Dennis in Thomas/Constantinides Hero/Constable, *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents*, vol. 3, pp. 1215-34 (no. 37).

42 Μέγας λογοθέτης.

43 Λογοθέτης τῶν σεκρέτων, coordinator of various departments.

of the Course.[44] It is not possible to speak *stricto sensu* of the head of the imperial chancery, but rather of an even higher rung — an official who looked after the entire foreign correspondence, a sort of head of the Byzantine "Foreign Office".[45] However, the role of the grand *logothetes* seems to have diminished over the course of the 14th century as that of the *mesazon* rose in importance.

The latter represented the veritable éminence grise in the Byzantine court, with direct influence over the production of acts.[46] In fact, the *mesazon* (which literally means "intermediary")[47] was the trusted man closest to the emperor, who received the petitions of those, individuals or institutions, who intended to appeal to the highest authority in order to obtain privileges or confirmations of previous concessions, to resolve lawsuits or to receive justice or satisfaction in various disputes and so forth — and this through the last sanction that was submitted to a written draft in documentary form. It was not, therefore, a position in the true sense[48], but rather a title to which an extraordinary power was linked. Precisely because of his proximity to the throne, the *mesazon* collected petitions and interceded with the *basileus*, personally submitting to him the request (or even the document already compiled) with a recommendation in favour of its acceptance by the emperor or interposing his good offices for a positive result. The involvement of this high court dignitary could also translate into the conceptual formulation of the act itself, or at least into control over its writing: his intervention (as well as that of any other official, for example the grand *logothetes* himself, who might have brought about the legal action which was then translated into a document) could be registered in a specific autograph note on the *recto* of the document (the so-called *notitia interventionis* or *intercessionis*).[49] Over the course of the 14th century, the importance of the *mesazon* increased at the expense of the grand *logothetes*, so that from around the middle of the century there were two *mesazontes*, one of whom might concern himself with foreign affairs (as is the case, for example, with Demetrios Kydones). Thus, they increasingly assumed the functions of official counsellors to the emperor, appearing less associated with the daily work of the chancery.

Regarding this last aspect, it is necessary to draw a distinction. While for the reporting of single issues necessitating imperial intervention — and later the dictation of the relevant document — we have seen the grand *logothetes* and the *mesazon* at work, for all the formal aspects relating both to the physical copying of the acts and to their validation, since the

---

44 Λογοθέτης τοῦ δρόμου. Cf. Guilland, "Les logothètes".

45 Cf. Pseudo-Kodinos, *On the offices*, ed. Verpeaux, p. 174, lines 1-9.

46 The most suggestive portrait of this figure is provided by Beck, "Der byzantinische Ministerpräsident".

47 Μεσάζων τοῖς πράγμασι is the definition, referred to Nikephoros Choumnos, that we find in Nikephoros Gregoras, *History*, 7, 5, ed. Schopen, vol. 1, p. 241, lines 1-2; on the other hand, George Pachymeres, *History*, 6, 26, ed. Failler, vol. 2, p. 627, line 6, speaks of μεσιτεία τῶν κοινῶν, discussing one of the posts held by Theodore Mouzalon, the first, at least to judge from the testimonies dating back to the Palaeologan period, to combine simultaneously, from a certain moment on, the fuctions of grand *logothetes* and those of *mesazon*.

48 Actually, e.g. in Pseudo-Kodinos, *On the offices*, the *mesazon* is only present in connection with the grand *logothetes* (cf. above, n. 45).

49 "Intervenientenvermerk" in German diplomatics: cf. Karayannopulos, "Zu den «διά-Vermerken»". It might be translated in English as "note of intevention" or "intercession".

9th century there had been another figure in Byzantium with whom the direction of the proper chancery work lay: that is, the *epi tou kanikleiou* — literally, the official in charge of the custody and the use of the imperial inkstand (*kanikleion*) containing the red ink reserved to the *basileus*. The role of the *epi tou kanikleiou* is effectively described in a document predating the period discussed here, which attests to his extreme proximity to the emperor, a status which was also retained in subsequent periods.[50] This official was entrusted with the task of *recognitio*, i.e. the insertion, within the text, of the words in red ink (that is, the *kanikloma*), such as the substantives *logos*, *sigillion*, *graphe*, which, accompanying the first part of the act's denomination (*chrysoboullos*), officially connoted the documentary typology and fulfilled a corroborative function, that is, confirming the act's validity. In a previous period, the *epi tou kanikleiou* was also in charge of applying the annotation *Legi* or *Legimus* (a statement of careful inspection and imperial approval), which remains in force, still in Latin, in documents of the highest tenor throughout the 12th century. Meanwhile, for cases requiring the actual signature of the sovereign (certainly during the Palaeologan era), the emperor himself would append the autograph formula of validation at the end of the text in the guise of a signature. It cannot be totally excluded that at times the *epi tou kanikleiou* (as well as other authorities or officials temporarily assigned to this task) may have taken the place of the *basileus* not so much in the insertion of the name signature (usually reserved for the highest authority), but rather in cases that required final sanction in the form of a notation of the month and the indiction, the so-called *menologema* — a type of subscription used for imperial documents such as the *prostagmata* and the *horismoi*.[51] Certainly, the *epi tou kanikleiou* was appointed both to correct the text and to supervise the physical work of the chancery's team of scribes, and in the case of Choumnos at least was also responsible for safeguarding the document from forgery and surreptitious insertions via the addition, on the *verso*, of chancery notes at the junctures (*kolleseis*) between the single folios (*kollemata*), on parchment or paper, making up the documentary scroll.[52] It was perhaps not by chance (precisely in virtue of this key role that the *epi tou kanikleiou* played in the daily activities of the imperial chancery) that the trusted scribe of Nikephoros Choumnos — that same George Boullotes who collected the works of the celebrated official in the manuscript edition shortly before his death (Ambros. C 71 sup.) — carried out, even independently of his mentor's fortunes, the task of primary compiler of imperial documents. Indeed, Boullotes played a much more significant role in their physical writing than the scribe at

50 Cf. *Documents Lavra*, eds. Lemerle/Guillou/Svoronos/Papachryssanthou, vol. 1, no. 32 (A.D. 1057), lines 12-17. The best fine-tuning about this official (resumed then in Dölger/Karayannopulos, *Byzantinische Urkundenlehre*, pp. 29-30, 34-40, 56, 62-67, 118-20) remains that of Dölger, "Der Kodikellos des Christodulos in Palermo", pp. 44-57 (= repr., pp. 50-65); but the list of people who held the office of *epi tou kanikleiou* in the Palaeologan period, which is found ibid., p. 50 [= repr., p. 57], is incomplete and sometimes inaccurate. Moreover, not even the devaluation of this role, theorized in Oikonomidès, "La chancellerie impériale", 181, in the wake of a previous tradition of studies, seems justified.

51 Cf. Kresten, "Μηνολόγημα. Anmerkungen zu einem byzantinischen Unterfertigungstyp", pp. 32-42; De Gregorio, "Epigrammi e documenti", p. 93 with n. 409.

52 These annotations are the "Klebevermerke", so-called in German diplomatics: Dölger/Karayannopulos, *Byzantinische Urkundenlehre*, pp. 35-37; Karayannopulos, "Zu den «διά-Vermerken»", pp. 203-04, 213-17, 230-32.

the service of Theodore Metochites, that is Michael Klostomalles, even though the latter was given the title of imperial *notarios* — and this despite the rivalry with Metochites, who in his irresistible rise, as *mesazon* and grand *logothetes*, progressively marginalized Choumnos within the higher sphere of court officials under Andronikos II.

Precisely with regard to figures working in this eminent bureaucratic realm, who exemplify the activity and the role of chancery officials within the court and, more generally, in Byzantine society (from the intellectual perspective as well), I shall now present an overview of two notable pairs of rivals. The first is George Akropolites[53] and Theodore Mouzalon,[54] between whom the baton of grand *logothetes* metaphorically passed at the end of the reign of Michael VIII. The second is Nikephoros Choumnos[55] and Theodore Metochites,[56] who both served at the highest levels in the imperial chancery (Choumnos as *epi tou kanikleiou* and *mesazon*, a post subsequently ceded to Metochites, the grand *logothetes* responsible for the exaltation of this last office), as well as being the protagonists of a well-known polemic during the second half of the reign of Andronikos II.

George Akropolites is the author of the *Chronike Syngraphe*, a primary source for the period of the Fourth Crusade and the Empire of Nicaea.[57] During this epoch, he began his education (under Nikephoros Blemmydes, among others) and started to exercise his influence at court under the Laskaridai. Other than as an important historian of the Nicaean era, Akropolites is also known as a teacher of philosophy and mathematics in Constantinople immediately after the city's re-conquest in 1261.[58] Indeed, Gregory of Cyprus — the future patriarch whose name is linked with the anti-unionist reaction — studied under his tutelage. Akropolites, by contrast, was a staunch defender of the deliberations of the *Lugdunense* II (the council in which he participated as ambassador of Michael VIII),[59] as his activity as panegyrist also shows. We find him also among the legates charged with delivering to Rome the Latin letters the Byzantine emperor addressed to Pope Gregory X in the same year, 1274.[60] His total acceptance of the unionist policies of Michael VIII Palaiologos, to whom Akropolites remained a faithful servant throughout his reign, is striking. Akropolites held the post of grand *logothetes* from the time of Theodore II Laskaris (in 1255) until his own death, at an advanced age, in the same year as Michael VIII (1282), and more specifically just after the conclusion of a diplomatic mission to John II Komnenos of Trebizond to arrange a marriage between the latter and

53 *PLP* 518.

54 *PLP* 19439; on Mouzalon see more recently Samara, *Θεόδωρος Μουζάλων*.

55 *PLP* 30961.

56 *PLP* 17981.

57 Cf. George Akropolites, *History*, trans. Macrides.

58 George Pachymeres, *History*, 4, 14, ed. Failler, vol. 2, p. 369, lines 14-18.

59 Cf. Pieralli, *La corrispondenza diplomatica dell'imperatore bizantino*, p. 259 (no. 17 [Lyon, 1274, July 6]: abjuration of the schism and profession of Roman Faith; a text repeated within the renewed profession of faith of Michael VIII in 1277: ibid., p. 312 [no. 20]). A deep analysis of the Byzantine emperors' correspondence with the West is now provided by Gastgeber, "Changes in Documents of the Byzantine Chancery in contact with the West".

60 For all the texts sent to Rome on this occasion, cf. Pieralli, *La corrispondenza diplomatica dell'imperatore bizantino*, pp. 219-57 (nos. 12-16). On this diplomatic mission, shortly before the beginning of the Council of Lyon, cf. George Pachymeres, *History*, 4, 17 and 21, ed. Failler, vol. 2, pp. 490-95, 506-09.

the emperor's daughter, Eudokia Palaiologina Komnene.[61] Akropolites' two most prominent characteristics — his great knowledge and his lack of scruples — are noted by the great sketcher of characters and personalities, the historian George Pachymeres, reporting the repression of the Arsenites in 1267:

> the questions regarding these [scil. the Arsenites] are entrusted to George Akropolites, grand *logothetes* and eminent wise man, though unconcerned about matters of the conscience.[62]

We have at least one concrete trace of this unionist intellectual's activity in the imperial chancery: a document (*chrysoboullon sigillion*) issued by Michael VIII in 1277 with which the *basileus* sanctioned, among other things, the independence of the Chilandar monastery on Mount Athos from the authority of the *protos*.[63] An autograph note (*notitia interventionis*, with the formula introduced by διά) written by the grand *logothetes* George Akropolites is conserved on the *recto* of this original:[64] in this way Akropolites — that is to say, the person to whose intercession we owe the issue of the document itself — immortalized this pious action with his own hand, under the imperial signature (here obviously in the form of a *menologema*).

Similarly significant, even if reversed on the theological and doctrinal level, is the example furnished by the figure of Theodore Mouzalon. In the letter (no. 52, ed. Eustratiades) addressed by Gregory of Cyprus to the *logothetes* of the herds Pepagomenos (the probable compiler of the cartulary of Makrinitissa and Nea Petra),[65] the future patriarch reminds the addressee to send him the "wonderful discourse of the very wise *logothetes*".[66] The editor of this epistolary collection, Sophronios Eustratiades, has interpreted here the author's indication as a clear reference to a work by the grand *logothetes* Theodore Mouzalon, who played a major role in the correspondence of Gregory of Cyprus.[67] This hypothesis is confirmed, in the letters that immediately follow (nos 53-56 Eustratiades), by the flattering stylistic judgements on Mouzalon's oratory expressed by Gregory himself, who repaid the gift of the *logos* with one of his own rhetorical compositions.[68] Letter 52 can be linked to a particular turning point in the history of

---

61 George Pachymeres, *History*, 6, 34, ed. Failler, vol. 2, pp. 653-59 (ibid., p. 655, lines 18-19, the historian refers to Akropolites as "still living" [ἔτι ζῶν]); on the function of Akropolites see also Guilland, "Les logothètes", pp. 104-06 (no. 2, within the wider discussion about the figure of the grand *logothetes*, ibid., pp. 100-15).

62 George Pachymeres, *History*, 4, 28, ed. Failler, vol. 2, p. 409, lines 23-25: Ἀνατίθεται τοίνυν τὰ περὶ τούτων τῷ Ἀκροπολίτῃ Γεωργίῳ καὶ εἰς λογοθέτας μεγάλῳ καὶ σοφῷ τὰ μάλιστα, πλὴν κατημεληµένως τῶν εἰς συνείδησιν ἔχοντι. The Arsenites were supporters of the former Patriarch Arsenios Autoreianos (*PLP* 1694), who opposed Michael VIII Palaiologos' usurpation of the imperial throne at the expense of John IV Laskaris in 1261.

63 *Documents Chilandar*, eds. Živojinović/Kravari/Giros, no. 10 (Dölger/Wirth, *Regesten*, vol. 3, no. 2031).

64 Cf. Karayannopulos, "Zu den «διά-Vermerken»", p. 229 (no. 35).

65 Cf. supra, n. 40.

66 Gregory of Cyprus, *Letters*, no. 52, ed. Eustratiades, p. 37, lines 5-6: ὡς εὐφράναι με καλλίστῳ λόγῳ τοῦ πάντα σοφοῦ λογοθέτου ὑπέστης.

67 Ibid., pp. ιγ΄-ιδ΄.

68 See the rich analysis of Laiou, "The Correspondence of Gregorios Kyprios", pp. 92-95, 98-100, 102-06.

Byzantium, on the watershed between the reigns of Michael VIII and Andronikos II, that is to say shortly before the nomination of the Cypriot to patriarch of Constantinople (early spring, 1283) and in a moment in which Theodore Mouzalon had already been promoted to grand *logothetes*. And the latter obtained this recognition — after not a few hardships caused by his opposition to the decree of Lyon on the union with Rome — in 1282 in person from Michael VIII, the emperor who, at the death of George Akropolites and a few months before his own unexpected demise, wanted to reward Mouzalon for his submission.

This emblematic affair involving Mouzalon — who, thanks to his rhetorical education, was certainly becoming an expert, even in the *dictamen* of documents — illustrates well the conditions under which the activity of the great officials in charge of supervising the imperial chancery took place. Again Pachymeres' description faithfully reflects the times.[69] A protégé of Michael VIII Palaiologos, who, after having guided his studies and his military career, raised him (in 1277) to the rank of *logothetes* of the public treasury[70] and even found him a wife from the Kantakouzenos family, Mouzalon simultaneously became the intermediary for public affairs.[71] As *logothetes* of the public treasury, we see him at work in 1277 (the same year in which Akropolites records his intervention for the release of a document in favour of Chilandar)[72] on a treaty with Venice, in the related chancery note on the *verso*, at the level of the junctures, intended to safeguard the document's integrity.[73] In the text, the grand *logothetes* George Akropolites and the *logothetes* of the public treasury Theodore Mouzalon are mentioned, among others, as witnesses to the pact. Between the summer of 1280 and the first months of 1281 (due to George Akropolites' hostility) Mouzalon was temporarily distanced from the court: the emperor, persuaded to test Mouzalon's fidelity to the unionist policy, provocatively attempted to include him in a diplomatic mission to Rome and received a refusal without explicit motivation (the emperor then responded in anger and ordered Mouzalon's own brother Leon to beat him until he bled). Theodore thus fell into disgrace and was removed from his offices, especially that of *mesites* (= *mesazon*) which had placed him among the closest to the emperor. Prostrated by the harsh punishment inflicted upon him, he finally accepted the peace with the Church of Rome and was reinstated to all his functions. Newly appointed to the post of grand *logothetes*, Mouzalon was then the most influential of the counsellors used by Andronikos II Palaiologos, immediately after he was proclaimed emperor in December 1282, for the fulfilment of the most urgent affairs and likely for the first steps towards revoking the union with Rome.[74] On the strength of his friendship with

69 George Pachymeres, *History*, 6, 26, ed. Failler, vol. 2, pp. 625, line 15-627, line 11.

70 Λογοθέτης τοῦ γενικοῦ; cf. Guilland, "Les logothètes", 11-24 (ibid., p. 22, no. 16).

71 It is the μεσιτεία τῶν κοινῶν, on which cf. supra, n. 47.

72 Cf. supra, nn. 63-64 and context.

73 Dölger/Wirth, *Regesten*, vol. 3, no. 2026; cf. Karayannopulos, "Zu den «διά-Vermerken»", p. 230 (no. 2); new ed. by Pieralli, *La corrispondenza diplomatica dell'imperatore bizantino*, pp. 267-301.

74 George Pachymeres, *History* 7, 1, ed. Failler, vol. 3, p. 19, lines 16-19; from this passage it is possible to deduce that Mouzalon was awarded the high office of grand *logothetes* — at the death of his archrival George Akropolites in 1282 — by the same Michael VIII. Cf. also Guilland, "Les logothètes", pp. 106-08 (no. 3).

Gregory of Cyprus — in a changed political-religious climate (which is also evident in some of his anti-unionist dogmatic writings), and freed from the hostility of the court — and although he was ill, Mouzalon became the *longa manus* of Andronikos II in the imperial chancery during the first years of his reign, combining for the first time, at least in the Palaeologan era, the functions of *mesazon* and grand *logothetes* and serving until his death in 1294. This is reflected in practice, too, for five further dorsal notes survive, inserted at the *kolleseis* by Mouzalon on five original chrysobulls dating from 1283 to 1292,[75] which bear witness to the characteristic effort of the first Palaiologan emperors to favour the monasteries through the issue of privileges. Thus, here too we find traces of intervention — albeit of a merely technical nature — by the highest chancery official of the day.

But, as I have already noted, the rivalry that was most significant and weighty in terms of its impact on the organization of the imperial chancery itself was that between Nikephoros Choumnos and Theodore Metochites — two figures, both leaders in the intellectual and political life of Byzantium from the end of the 13th century through the first three decades of the 14th century, whose relationship is highlighted in a masterful study published by Ihor Ševčenko by now sixty years ago.[76] This is not the place to discuss the role of these two officials from a literary point of view, even though the breadth of their interests and their production are well known.[77] Here I shall focus on one specific aspect, which also reflects a bending of the court's hierarchical order that impacted the very office entrusted with the charge of writing acts issued by the emperor. Their two careers developed following inverse paths of ascent and descent.[78] Choumnos reached the apex of his influence right at the end of the 13th century: in 1294, he was appointed *mesazon* by Andronikos II (replacing Mouzalon), and in the following year he added the function of head of the chancery (*epi tou kanikleiou*), a post that he held probably until his death (1327), although, as we will soon see, it had by then lost the prestige that Choumnos himself had helped to confer upon it. Metochites began the first stages of his dizzying ascent in the years during which his friend/rival was consolidating his position. Younger than Choumnos by 15 to 20 years, Metochites charged through the various levels of

---

75 *Documents Iviron*, eds. Lefort/Oikonomidès/Papachryssanthou/Kravari, vol. 3, no. 62 (A.D. 1283; Dölger, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 2095); *Documents Philotheou*, eds. Regel/Kurtz/Korablev, no. 3 (A.D. 1287; Dölger, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 2121); Dölger, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 2131 (A.D. 1289, Lykousada monastery); *Documents Zographou*, eds. Regel/Kurtz/Korablev, no. 11 (A.D. 1289; Dölger, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 2136); *Documents Patmos*, ed. Vranussi, no. 15 (A.D. 1292; Dölger, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 2149). Cf. Karayannopulos, "Zu den «διά-Vermerken»", pp. 230 (nos. 3-5), 232 (nos. 17-18). In these acts, the title Mouzalon used in the corresponding dorsal note (in most of the cases introduced by διά) is mainly that of μέγας λογοθέτης. For a last note (A.D. 1293), this time on the *recto* and attested in a *prostagma* which is transmitted in copy, cf. Karayannopulos, "Zu den «διά-Vermerken»", p. 230 (no. 37).

76 Ševčenko, *La vie intellectuelle et politique à Byzance*.

77 On Choumnos' oeuvre and the range of its transmission, see Papatriantaphyllou-Theodoridi, *Ἡ χειρόγραφη παράδοση τῶν ἔργων τοῦ Νικηφόρου Χούμνου*; on Metochites, see Ševčenko's still fundamental study "Theodore Metochites, the Chora, and the Intellectual Trends of His Time".

78 Essential bibliography on the stages of their two careers: for Choumnos, Verpeaux, *Nicéphore Choumnos, homme d'état et humaniste*; for Metochites, id., "Le cursus honorum de Théodore Métochite", as well as Guilland, "Les logothètes", 18, 22, 74, 100, 110-13.

logothetes until finally he reached the rank of grand *logothetes* (μέγας λογοθέτης), starting in 1321. It was in this last year that he finally surpassed Choumnos, whose star had begun to wane a few years before, when in 1315/1316 Metochites was appointed *mesazon* in his place. In 1321, then, Metochites combined the two most important roles in political leadership directly connected to the documentary production, as had been the case a few years earlier with Mouzalon. Their fates thus played out within the chancery: Choumnos technically remained the head of the office, but lost his political and diplomatic prestige as principal counsellor to the *basileus*.

One source of primary importance — the treatise *De officiis* by Pseudo-Kodinos — describes with embarrassment the impossibility of placing the office of *epi tou kanikleiou* within the ranks of the court's hierarchy, as reflected by the position the officials occupied during public visits at the Palace, specifically because of the awkward case of Choumnos:

> *Epi tou kanikleiou* was the emperor's co-father-in-law, Choumnos, and he never attended the ceremony of the reception nor was he present at that of the kiss; therefore, his position was unknown.[79]

After having replaced Mouzalon, during the first part of the reign of Andronikos II, and serving as a state official at the highest rank, Choumnos no longer took part in court ceremonies after 1321 (the year in which Metochites was appointed grand *logothetes*), remaining out of sight as a bureaucrat in the chancery. In that year, we observe a reversal of hierarchical order, with the grand *logothetes* moving from twelfth to ninth position[80] while the *epi tou kanikleiou* dropped to thirteenth.[81] Certainly, Choumnos did not want to be subjected to the humiliation of publicly confronting his rival,[82] even though the situation reflected in the *De officiis* should be applied to this clamorous but circumscribed case: the lack of ranking for the *epi tou kanikleiou* does not imply a vacancy in this office until 1354 (with Manuel Angelos), for we can now point to John Gabras Meliteniotes as Choumnos' probable immediate successor.[83]

---

79 Pseudo-Kodinos, *On the offices*, ed. Verpeaux, p. 140, lines 1-7: Ἐπὶ τοῦ κανικλείου ἦν ὁ συμπένθερος τοῦ βασιλέως ὁ Χοῦμνος καὶ οὔτε εἰς παράστασιν ἐστάθη ποτέ, οὔτε εἰς ἀσπασμὸν παρεγένετο· διὸ καὶ ἦν ὁ τόπος αὐτοῦ ἀνεπίγνωστος. It should be recalled that Choumnos' daughter, Irene, married the despot John Palaiologos, son of Andronikos II (however, Metochites also married into the reigning dynasty, as his daughter, also named Irene, wed John *panhypersebastos*, the emperor's nephew). The first of the two ceremonies mentioned was when the emperor received all of the dignitaries and the *archontes* in a general audience (ibid., pp. 190-94). The second regards the circumstance by which courtiers kissed the emperor's right foot, left hand and right cheek (ibid., pp. 234-35). A re-edition of Pseudo-Kodinos, *On the offices*, with English translation and commentary has been more recently provided by Macrides/Munitiz/Angelov.

80 Pseudo-Kodinos, *On the offices*, ed. Verpeaux, pp. 136, 137, line 8.

81 Ibid., pp. 300, lines 9-10, 320, lines 29-30.

82 Cf. Ševčenko, *La vie intellectuelle et politique à Byzance*, pp. 157-61; Pseudo-Kodinos, *On the offices*, ed. Verpeaux, pp. 28-29.

83 The current interpretation derives from the analysis exhibited in Pseudo-Kodinos, *On the offices*, ed. Verpeaux, pp. 27-30 (introduction): cf. e.g. Oikonomidès, "La chancellerie impériale", 181 n. 71. On Manuel Angelos (*epi tou kanikleiou* from 1354 to 1370, to be identified with Agathangelos, an anti-Palamite companion of Nikephoros Gregoras) cf. *PLP* 91040; for John Gabras Meliteniotes (who is also

The traumatic turnover between Choumnos and Metochites is described — in a cryptic manner (as is often the case in Byzantine sources) and with apparent nonchalance — in some verses of the anepigraphic list of *officia* published by Jean Verpeaux in an appendix:

> We have met the illustrious Choumnos *epi tou kanikleiou*, who occupied a more important position than previously [i.e. with respect to others who held the same office], and after him [i.e. in a temporal sense] the dear Metochites, grand *logothetes*, to whom fate granted wisdom, wearing a gilded red headdress, which the emperor, the illustrious Andronikos, confered as a gift upon him, for his support in governing.[84]

Here dwells the essence of this replacement: the anonymous source recalls with pride having experienced the times in which Choumnos was *epi tou kanikleiou*, a function which he raised to the highest level, and having lived through Metochites' ascent. The latter was rewarded for his action at the side of the *basileus* with the insignia (here most especially the hat) that we see reproduced, for example, in the celebrated mosaic of the Chora monastery, which the grand *logothetes* himself had re-founded. But it is especially in the production of acts that these two figures — on the one hand Choumnos, above all in his older role as head of the chancery office, on the other hand Metochites, as the closest and most faithful servant and supporter of the *basileus*, in terms of both internal and external policy — influenced the concrete work of the imperial bureaucracy.

With regard to the material preparation of documents, within the chancery's personnel we can distinguish the copyists in charge of transcribing texts from the notaries public in the emperor's service.[85]

The first, the simple scribes of the imperial chancery, were recruited — at least in the late Byzantine period — based on their professional skills and often following contingent criteria (more or less illustrious acquaintances and relatives, collaboration with officials of a higher level at the forefront within the Palace at a specific moment, and so forth), without any real selection through formal training. Although the notion of a script learned and used exclusively within the imperial chancery as a "reserved" element of validation was long lost, we can argue that in the age of Michael VIII Palaiologos and the first years of the reign of his son, Andronikos II, the privileges surviving in original form display a script based on the *Fettaugen* ("fat-blob") style, of a high formal level and a more balanced and solemn structure compared to common examples, as well as a disciplined and airy layout.[86]

---

documented in the first half of the 14th century and is mentioned as *mesazon* in 1341) cf. *PLP* 17853-17854 (to be identified probably also with *PLP* 17847).

84 Pseudo-Kodinos, *On the offices*, ed. Verpeaux, p. 338, lines 127-135: Ἔγνωμεν λαμπρὸν τὸν Χοῦμνον κανικλείου / στάσιν ἔχοντα μείζονα τῆς προτέρας, / καὶ δὴ μετ' αὐτὸν τὸν καλὸν Μετοχίτην / λογοθετῶν μέγιστον, σοφίας λῆξιν, / φοροῦντα χρυσῆν ἐρυθρᾶν τὴν καλύπτραν, / ἣν δῶρον αὐτῷ συνανέχοντι κράτος / ἄναξ ὁ λαμπρὸς παρέσχεν Ἀνδρόνικος.

85 On the chancery's personnel, cf. Oikonomidès, "La chancellerie impériale", 170-73.

86 Cf. Pieralli, "Le scritture dei documenti imperiali del XIII secolo", vol. 1, pp. 273-93; De Gregorio, "La scrittura greca di età paleologa", pp. 83-86.

Right at the height of Choumnos' success at court, the scribe George Boullotes emerged in the imperial chancery. It is to Boullotes that we owe the first decisive step towards a "graphic reform", which unfolded simultaneously (though case by case in different ways) in the scribal habits of the Byzantine world.[87] We can characterize his handwriting as one of the most distinctive and successful examples of that tendency to control and modulate — in a masterfully balanced and calligraphic manner — the baroque elements of the *Fettaugenmode*, still recognizable as an allusion to a vogue that was not yet entirely passé. Boullotes must have had a brilliant career as scribe of documents in the imperial chancery, becoming its "spearhead" and remaining in service for more than thirty years, from 1298 to 1329, to judge from the surviving documentation. Erich Lamberz has reconstructed a picture of Boullotes' activity in that office thanks to a series of new attributions: overall, Boullotes copied 33 "grand privileges", to which we can also add some imperial documents of a lower tenor — that is, at least six *prostagmata* from the period between 1299 and 1321. Much less consistent, on the contrary, is his activity in copying books: up to now, only three manuscripts in his hand have been identified.[88]

Among the chrysobulls copied by Boullotes, two contain the characteristic chancery note at the junctures on the *verso*, introduced by the preposition διά and appended by Choumnos (διὰ τοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ κανικλείου Νικηφόρου τοῦ Χούμνου). Chronologically the first surviving documents in Boullotes' hand, they are a chrysobull issued by Andronikos II in 1298 for the Great Lavra of Mount Athos and an analogous act addressed to the Serbian monastery of Chilandar, also on the Holy Mountain, by the same emperor in 1313. Both contain prefaces composed by the same *epi tou kanikleiou*, a tangible sign of an also otherwise fruitful closeness.[89] There are also four documents by Boullotes, still in the form of privileges, that carry the *notitia interventionis* on the *recto* inserted by Metochites (διὰ τοῦ μεγάλου λογοθέτου Θεοδώρου τοῦ Μετοχίτου).[90]

Contrary to the conventions of the Latin mediaeval world, no Byzantine chancery scribe normally mentioned his own name explicitly in his documentary transcriptions (but see the cases of Klostomalles and Babiskomites mentioned immediately afterwards). The anonymity is obviously a reflection of the Byzantine mentality, which erased any manifestation of individuality before the supreme authority and the act that pertains to it as a unique prerogative. In his only surviving subscription, inserted, moreover, in a

87 Cf. Lamberz, "Georgios Bullotes", as well as more recently De Gregorio, "Filone Alessandrino tra Massimo Planude e Giorgio Bullotes", pp. 206-11.

88 Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, MS Guelf. 42 Gud. graec. (A.D. 1314/1315), Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, MS Ambros. C 71 sup. (gr. 185, from the years 1320-1327), to which I have added more recently Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, MS Laur. Plut. 10.23 (not dated). Cf. bibliography in the previous footnote (for the *Ambrosianus* supra, n. 18).

89 Cf. supra, nn. 19-20 and context; Karayannopulos, "Zu den «διά-Vermerken»", p. 230 (nos. 6-7); Lamberz, "Georgios Bullotes", pp. 36-37, pls. 3, 8.

90 *Documents Vatopedi*, eds. Lefort/Kravari/Giros/Smyrlis, vol. 2, no. 62 (1324, June; Dölger, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 2512); *Documents Chilandar*, eds. Petit/Korablev, no. 100 (1324, December; Dölger, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 2519); ibid., no. 101 (1324, December; Dölger, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 2520); *Documents Zographou*, eds. Regel/Kurtz/Korablev, no. 23 (1325, September; Dölger, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 2538). Cf. Karayannopulos, "Zu den «διά-Vermerken»", pp. 226-27 (nos. 1-2, 4); Lamberz, "Georgios Bullotes", pp. 37-38; De Gregorio, "Epigrammi e documenti", pp. 110-11 with n. 500.

manuscript with literary content, Boullotes simply declares his ecclesiastical title of deacon[91], without any reference to his activity in the office of the emperor. It is therefore evident that although Boullotes was one of the most expert "technical operators" within the imperial chancery, his position must not have had an entirely organic status among the office's personnel. More generally, the scribe, i.e. the person in charge of the material effort of putting the act in written form, did not seem to fulfil an official role in the hierarchy, although he possessed a specific graphic education that was appreciated as an essential element in the preparation and validation of the document. His task was rather that of a mere physical executor, called upon (and obviously compensated) for his acknowledged technical skills — in short, a manual labourer who remained anchored to the more general status of scribe in Byzantium. In a fairly literate society, as the Byzantine world was, the acquisition of a technical skill, such as that of an amanuensis, and the capacity to manage at a certain level copying literary texts and/or documents, allowed such persons to practice a recognized profession, even if it was considered to be of a purely technical nature.

Different is the case of Michael Klostomalles, identified for several years now with the "scribe of Theodore Metochites", to whom we owe, for example, the *mundum* — the fair copy — with the Discourses of the great statesman in a codex that also conserves the stratification in the various phases of its own creation and writing.[92] We know his name thanks to an explicit reference in a foreign letter missive, a deed of covenant in Greek and in Latin from the year 1324, addressed by Emperor Andronikos II Palaiologos to the Republic of Venice: "…written in Romaic [i.e. Greek] letters by the hand of the notary of my majesty, Michael Klostomalles".[93] Such an indication occurs here exceptionally, for the scribe of the Greek section intended to comply with the Latin text, where customarily the name of the notary appears. It has been rightly highlighted that Klostomalles was primarily active as a scribe of manuscripts rather than documents.[94] Certainly, the eight documents in his hand that have been identified up to now, which cover the period from 1311 to 1342, demonstrate that he was employed as simple scribe in the imperial chancery

---

91 MS Guelf. 42 Gud. graec.: cf. Harlfinger/Sicherl et al., *Griechische Handschriften und Aldinen*, pp. 40-42 (no. 11); Papatriantaphyllou-Theodoridi, *Ἡ χειρόγραφη παράδοση τῶν ἔργων τοῦ Νικηφόρου Χούμνου*, pp. 137-38; Lamberz, "Georgios Bullotes", pp. 35-44, pl. 7.

92 MS Vindob. Phil. gr. 95. For the identification with Klostomalles cf. Lamberz, "Das Geschenk des Kaisers Manuel II. an das Kloster Saint-Denis". For an overview on this scribe of books and documents, who represents an important chapter in the history of studies, cf. especially Prato, "I manoscritti greci dei secoli XIII e XIV: note paleografiche", pp. 140-48; Lamberz, "Georgios Bullotes", pp. 44-48, pl. 15; id., "Johannes Kantakuzenos und die Produktion von Luxushandschriften", pp. 140-45, 149, 151-53, 155-56; Hutter, "Schreiber und Maler der Palaiologenzeit in Konstantinopel", pp. 172-76; Bianconi, "Il Laur. Plut. 28.26 ovvero la storia di Bisanzio nella storia di un codice", pp. 39-40, 46-52.

93 Venice, Archivio di Stato, Miscell. Atti Diplomat. e Priv., busta 12, doc. no. 432 (Ὁρκωμοτικὸν χρυσόβουλλον, 1324, October; Dölger, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 2515 [on this documentary type cf. Dölger/Karayannopulos, *Byzantinische Urkundenlehre*, pp. 99-100]): ... γραφὲν Ῥωμαϊκοῖς γράμμασι διὰ χειρὸς τοῦ νοταρίου τῆς βασιλείας μου Μιχαὴλ τοῦ Κλωστομάλλου ... [the first-person pronoun is obviously a reference to the author of the act, that is to say the *basileus*]. See the analogue case (with identical wording) of Nicholas Babiskomites, also in a treatise with Venice of November 1332 (Dölger, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 2787): cf. Kresten, "Zur Datierung, zum Schreiber und zum politischen Hintergrund dreier Urkunden des Kaisers Andronikos III. Palaologos", 87.

94 Lamberz, "Georgios Bullotes", p. 46; id., "Beobachtungen zu den patristischen Corpora".

only sporadically, and extending into the reign of John V Palaiologos (therefore rather beyond the apogee of the Andronikos II/Metochites duo). Klostomalles' activity in the realm of book production, however, was much more consistent: the hitherto known codices in his hand (around 20) display the art of an "all-round calligrapher and decorator"[95] and leading figures of the aristocratic elite availed themselves of his work, among them — apart from his mentor Metochites — the future Emperor John VI Kantakouzenos (when he still held the post of *megas domestikos*), as well as, in all probability, members of the Palaiologos family.

Nevertheless, it is possible to add a few considerations that are helpful in terms of understanding certain mechanisms in the production of acts. Undoubtedly at the beginning, between the first and second decades of the 14th century, Klostomalles, who was younger than and perhaps a pupil of Boullotes, participated in the intellectual climate that gave rise to the new graphic trend (attested as much in the realm of books as in documentary production) that associates him with Boullotes as well as with further chancery scribes and also with other figures — mostly unknown up till now and often circulating within the court milieu — who were active only in manuscripts.[96] Moreover, Klostomalles, trained in this ambience, developed the new writing style to the highest perfection, freeing himself definitively from the imbalance of the *Fettaugen* fashion and creating a truly admirable formal equilibrium in the tissue of his flowing script and in page construction. But, despite his success in the preparation of books of the highest craftsmanship, it is in the imperial chancery that he must have built up his fame as a calligrapher, so that he carved himself a privileged space among Byzantium's elite patrons of the arts. In fact, it is not contradictory for an imperial notary to have left many fewer acts in his hand compared to a colleague who did not boast such a title (for example Boullotes). It is plausible that, just after starting as a simple scribe of the imperial chancery — the first three surviving documents are encompassed within a time span of a little less than three years (September 1311 – February 1314) —[97] Klostomalles moved on, probably

95 Hutter, " Schreiber und Maler der Palaiologenzeit in Konstantinopel", p. 176.

96 Lamberz, "Georgios Bullotes", p. 47. On the imperial chancery, also see the problem of scribal attribution (helpful in defining the boundaries of a veritable style) which is examined in Müller, "Weder Klostomalles noch Babiskomites".

97 *Documents Panteleemon*, eds. Lemerle/Dagron/Ćircović, no. 10 (1311, September; Dölger, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no 2333); *Documents Protaton*, ed. D. Papachryssanthou, no. 12 (1312, November; Dölger, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no 2342); *Documents Lavra*, eds. Lemerle/Guillou/Svoronos/Papachryssanthou, vol. 2, no. 103 (1314, February; Dölger, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 2353); from this same period, we have only one document copied by Boullotes (1313, October: cf. supra, n. 19), who, however, whether before or whether mostly thereafter must have nevertheless earned the role of the office's principle scribe. There are also three originals attributed to Klostomalles for the years 1317-1321: *Documents Chilandar*, eds. Živojinović/Kravari/Giros, nos. 34 (1317, July; Dölger, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 2390) and 35 (1317, July; Dölger, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 2649); *Documents Koutloumousiou*, ed. Lemerle, no. 10 (1321, September; Dölger, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 2469); for this same epoch, in contrast, we have at least 14 acts transcribed by Boullotes. That Klostomalles' activity in copying imperial chrysobulls drastically thinned out later is demonstrated by the fact that the last two surviving documents in his hand were transcribed at a considerable interval from each other, i.e. the Ὁρκωμοτικὸν χρυσόβουλλον of 1324 (supra, n. 93) and the chrysobull for the Lavra on Mount Athos of 1342 (*Documents Lavra*, eds.

as a result of Metochites' rise through the ranks of the bureaucracy all the way to the top (grand *logothetes*, 1321), to occupy the post of imperial notary. This figure (under the control of a *protonotarios*) assumed the role of notary public during the Palaeologan era, and was no longer a simple scribe. Besides holding the imperial *potestas* ("notary by imperial authority")[98] that rendered the signed acts valid for the whole empire, in the realm of foreign policy (and, therefore, in close connection with the grand *logothetes* himself) the *basilikos notarios* was employed in sending letters missive from the *basileus* and on missions outside the borders of the empire, as well as drafting treatises with foreign powers. Naturally, there were other *notarii* who were concerned with preparing the Latin text in these foreign letters missive, as the career of the Genoese Ogerio Boccanegra, *protonotarius imperatoris Graecorum* in the service of Michael VIII Palaiologos, illustrates.[99] It is therefore not by chance that Klostomalles was responsible for the material preparation — for example, among the extant documents — of precisely the aforementioned deed of covenant with the Republic of Venice in 1324: his participation in scribal activity must no longer have been part of his duties except in relatively infrequent circumstances connected to the higher function he was entrusted with.

3.2 The Patriarchal Chancery

The organization of the patriarchal chancery's personnel is described in detail in Jean Darrouzès' foundational work on the *officia* of the Byzantine Church.[100] The leading role for this department (*sekreton*) was assigned to the *chartophylax*, usually a deacon.[101] Through his insignia, the *chartophylax* conferred authenticity upon the acts of the patriarch, participated in the work of the Synod as secretary of the primate, oversaw the material aspects of transcribing, signing, and sealing patriarchal documents, and held judiciary power in the investigation of disciplinary and canonical procedures. In the *notitiae* listing the *officia* of the Great Church, the *chartophylax* normally occupies the fourth position, after the *megas oikonomos*, the *sakellarios*, and the *skeuophylax* and before the *sakelliou* — thus in the first pentad, namely the band of excellence of the *exokatakoiloi*, to whom a sixth was added at the end of the 12th century (the *protekdikos*). One of these *notitiae* specifies that the tasks of the *chartophylax* were focused on playing the role of intermediary (*mesazon*) and

---

Lemerle/Guillou/Svoronos/Papachryssanthou, vol. 3, no. 123; Dölger, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 2885). Meanwhile, between 1323 and 1329, Boullotes copied 10 documents still extant today.

98 Βασιλικὴ ἐξουσία: cf. Oikonomidès, "La chancellerie impériale", 172-73 (with n. 30).

99 Cf. Pieralli, *La corrispondenza diplomatica dell'imperatore bizantino*, pp. 88-95; see now Gastgeber, "Changes in Documents of the Byzantine Chancery in contact with the West", pp. 195-200, 213, 231-32, 234, 238, 248-49, 253-55; ibid., pp. 205-06, 232, 234-35, 260-62 we have also some considerations on George Kaballaropoulos (ἑρμηνεύς) and Stephen Syropoulos (*interpres*), one as scribe of the Latin text and the other as imperial envoy preparing the deed of covenant with the Republic of Venice (1324) mentioned above (see n. 93 and context).

100 Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les ὀφφίκια*, pp. 333-87. On the patriarchal documents themselves I newly had the opportunity to see very quickly the most recent contribution by Gastgeber, "Diplomatics of the Patriarchate of Constantinople".

101 Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les ὀφφίκια*, pp. 334-53: 338-44.

writing reports,[102] while elsewhere it is pointed out that "the (*megas*) *chartophylax* is not, as some say, a custodian and janitor of the *sekreton*…but rather the curator of the episcopal rights, namely as legal representative of the patriarch in affairs pertaining to the latter".[103]

Then there are officials who were subordinate to the *chartophylax*, or who supported him, such as the *protonotarios* (the coordinator of the notaries) — the seventh official in the hierarchy to whom the patriarch was able to directly entrust the writing of acts and other tasks, while the *primicerius* was in practice only a specialized notary.[104] And from there trickle down all the other *archontes*: *logothetes*, *hypomnematographos* (for the drafting of solemn acts and for the composition of the final records of synodal sessions), *hieromnemon*, *epi ton deeseon* and so on.[105] Here, among the simple employees, I will focus briefly on the *notarioi*, the primary labour force in any chancery, and on their prerogatives, which are generally distinct from the classic traits of the tabellion.[106] Normally numbering twelve, the notaries waited in the vicinity of the patriarchal throne during synodal assemblies and concisely registered their content. It was then their task to write the corresponding act for issue as well as to supply additional paperwork. Here too the difference between simple chancery scribe and patriarchal notary is not always clear. As professional writers, the first could be called upon (at times in occasional forms) even autonomously from the second (as we shall soon see in the case of George Galesiotes, who was for a long period the head scribe in the patriarchal chancery but was never officially designated in the sources as *notarios*), although it is likely that the *dictator* of the text and the one who materially wrote it were very often one and the same. As simple executors, notaries almost always remained anonymous, as we have already seen with the corresponding imperial office. Exceptional skills in the *dictamen* and "rhetorization" of the documents issued by the patriarchal chancery very often served to foster appreciation and favour among the "audience" and the addressees of the acts,[107] in so far as the activity of copying within the office helped scribes to procure profitable, high-rank book commissions from outside.

From this chancery office we can also identify numerous figures who stand out in the fervid intellectual climate of this era through their participation, in various ways, in the theological disputes that cut through the almost two hundred years of the Palaeologan dynasty's reign from beginning to end. Here we will examine in particular the struggles connected to union with the Church of Rome, sanctioned by Michael VIII in Lyon in 1274 and revoked by his son Andronikos II in 1282, as well as the Palamite controversy that swept through the Byzantine world for a large part of the 14th century.

---

102 Ibid., pp. 345, 546 (*notitia* F): 4. Ὁ χαρτοφύλαξ, εἰς τὸ μεσάζειν καὶ εἰς τὰς σημειώσεις.

103 Ibid., p. 565: Ὁ δὲ μέγας χαρτοφύλαξ οὐκ ἔστιν, ὥς τινές φασι, φύλαξ τοῦ σεκρέτου καὶ θυρωρός [...], ἀλλ' ἔστιν ἐπισκοπικῶν δικαίων φροντιστὴς καὶ οἱονεὶ δικαίῳ τῶν ἀνηκότων τῷ πατριάρχῃ. Cf. also Schminck, "Wörtliche Zitate des weltlichen und kirchlichen Rechts", p. 240. On the introduction of the adjective *megas* to the title of *chartophylax* (also added in the Palaeologan era to nearly all the posts in the first pentad) cf. infra, n. 140 and context.

104 Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les ὀφφίκια*, pp. 353-59.

105 Ibid., pp. 359-79.

106 Ibid., pp. 379-87.

107 Cf. Gastgeber, "Rhetorik in der Patriarchatskanzlei von Konstantinopel", pp. 189-97; an accurate analysis is now provided by Gastgeber, "Das Formular der Patriarchatskanzlei".

Regarding the relationship with the Latins, let us compare and contrast two exceptional documents, which carry the signatures of many officials of the Great Church, including the representatives of the patriarchal chancery. The first is the "guarantee document" of 1277, with which the patriarchal *archontes* (numbering 40) officially recognized the deliberations of Lyon, under the pressure of Michael VIII and the guidance of Patriarch John XI Bekkos.[108] Among the first signatories we find Constantine Meliteniotes,[109] the archdeacon of the Palace clergy[110] who precisely during this crucial period — from the deposition of the anti-unionist Patriarch Joseph I Galesiotes through the rise and fall of Bekkos (1275-1282) — also filled the top post in the patriarchal chancery (that of *chartophylax*), succeding Bekkos himself: Meliteniotes thus provided the concrete impetus to the writing of this act, to which the leading exponents of the Constantinopolitan clergy were committed, in support of imperial policy.[111] Moreover, within his chancery Bekkos had also appointed one of his relatives — George Bekkos, correspondent first of Maximos Planoudes and later of Nikephoros Gregoras — to the strategic post of *primicerius* of the notaries. The young George appears in the tenth position of the patriarchal *archontes* on the list of 1277 (in the absence of the *protonotarios*).[112]

The guarantee document of 1277 bears the signature of other figures who were also protagonists in this phase. For example, appearing immediately after Meliteniotes is the well-known historian Theodore Skoutariotes (with the dual role of *dikaiophylax*, a judicial officer nominated by the emperor for ecclesiastical matters,[113] and *sakelliou*, with jurisdiction over places of worship and their ministers),[114] who in this same year was also appointed metropolitan of Kyzikos.[115] Skoutariotes must have been followed as signatory by George Metochites, father of Theodore Metochites as well as polemicist and writer of a history of the dogmatic controversies ignited after 1274, who was also an archdeacon of

108 Ἔγγραφος ἀσφάλεια τῶν κληρικῶν τῆς Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας ἐπὶ τῇ εἰρήνῃ δῆθεν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν. Cf. *Dossier Lyon*, eds. Laurent/Darrouzès, pp. 468-73 (no. 17); Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les ὀφφίκια*, pp. 112, 532.

109 *PLP* 17856.

110 Ἀρχιδιάκονος τοῦ βασιλικοῦ κλήρου.

111 It should be pointed out that Meliteniotes, still as archdeacon of the Palace clergy, and Bekkos himself, who at that time was the *chartophylax* of the Great Church, were present, during a diplomatic mission, at the death of Louis IX, King of France, in Tunis (1270): George Pachymeres, *History* 5, 9, ed. Failler, vol. 2, pp. 463-467. Meliteniotes was therefore the immediate successor of Bekkos as head of the patriarchal chancery, when the latter became primate of Orthodoxy.

112 *PLP* 2547, probably identical with 2546 (George Bekkos must have risen through the patriarchal hierarchy to the rank of *megas oikonomos*); on this matter, cf. Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les ὀφφίκια*, pp. 115-16, 356, 532.

113 Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les ὀφφίκια*, pp. 109-10.

114 Ibid., pp. 318-22.

115 *PLP* 26204; Theodore Skoutariotes, *Chronicle* ed. Tocci; on manuscripts which belonged to him and most likely were also written in the patriarchal milieu, cf. e.g. D'Aiuto, "Note ai manoscritti del Menologio Imperiale", pp. 215-22 ("Appendice I. Per la biblioteca di Teodoro Scutariota"); Zorzi, "Lettori bizantini della «Bibliotheca» di Fozio", pp. 836-844; Bianconi, "Sui copisti del Platone Laur. Plut. 59.1 e su altri scribi d'età paleologa", pp. 265-71.

the Palace clergy and official "assigned to supplications" in the patriarchal chancery.[116] Indeed, a George is listed as *epi ton deeseon* in the 16th place of the presences, an entry which, considering his biographical dates, can refer only to the well-known author of the *Historia dogmatica.* Again in 1277, a highly eventful year in the negotiations with the Latins, all three officials (Skoutariotes, already in the post of metropolitan of Kyzikos, Meliteniotes and George Metochites, one as *chartophylax* and the other as *epi ton deeseon*) participated in the diplomatic mission Michael VIII sent to Pope John XXI to strengthen the agreement with Rome.[117] In addition to the imperial foreign letters missive, on this occasion the embassy also presented a document weighty in its consequences — the letter addressed by the Patriarch John XI Bekkos to Pope John XXI himself, which, in adherence with the sanctions of 1274 in Lyon, issued a profession of Roman Faith (including the *Filioque*) and affirmed the primacy of the Church of Rome and the complete doctrinal identity between the two Churches, with a renunciation of the schism.[118] This exceptional document, whose Greek text is conserved in original at the Vatican Secret Archives, also bears the dorsal chancery note inserted by Meliteniotes at the juncture between the two segments of parchment.[119]

Skoutariotes, Meliteniotes and George Metochites were among Bekkos' closest collaborators, with whom they shared the tenet of the reunion with the Roman Church both during the years of Michael VIII and after his successor Andronikos II had repudiated the Lyon decree.[120] Although he lost the metropolitan see, Skoutariotes was somehow spared from the anti-unionist reaction following Bekkos' sudden deposition, whereas a different fate befell the two chancery officials. Immediately after the condemnation enacted at the second Council of Blachernae in 1285, both George Metochites (along with his son Theodore, who was still quite young) and the (former) *chartophylax* Meliteniotes were imprisoned in the fortress of St. Gregory in the Gulf of

---

116 *PLP* 17979. On the figure of the ἐπὶ τῶν δεήσεων — the intermediary who, like the corresponding offical in the Palace for the emperor, presented the patriarch with the supplications and oversaw their writing in the chancery office — see Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les ὀφφίκια*, pp. 378-79; Skoutariotes also held this post before George Metochites.

117 Cf. Pieralli, *La corrispondenza diplomatica dell'imperatore bizantino*, pp. 349-57 (no. 22: the emperor entrusted his legates, mentioned by name, with the documents requested by Rome [in Latin only]); the dossier displayed on that occasion by the Byzantine embassy also provided for the renewed professions of faith by Michael VIII (in Latin) and by his son Andronikos II (in Greek and Latin) as imperial documents to be delivered to Rome: ibid., pp. 303-48 (nos. 20-21).

118 Cf. ibid., pp. 415-31 (App. No. 3), pl. 16 (1277, April; Laurent, *Les regestes*, vol. 4, no. 1433); a brief palaeographic discussion of the text's script can be found in De Gregorio, "La scrittura greca di età paleologa", pp. 86-87, pl. 6.

119 Vatican City, Archivio Apostolico Vaticano, A. A. Arm. I-XVIII, doc. no. 1740; on the *verso* διὰ τοῦ χαρτοφύλακος Κωνσταντίνου [scil. τοῦ Μελιτηνιώτου]. The name signature of the patriarch was inserted by Bekkos in the form of a monocondyle (i.e. executed in a single motion, without lifting the writing instrument from the support surface), an absolutely uncommon method in patriarchal documents. I shall return to this point shortly.

120 In the works of the two major scholars — i.e. Skoutariotes and George Metochites — there are numerous pro-unionist references. Moreover, before 1282 Meliteniotes wrote two discourses on the Procession of the Holy Spirit and, after Andronikos II's anti-unionist turn, a polemical treatise against the Patriarch Gregory of Cyprus.

Nicomedia, along with Bekkos himself, due to the annoyance caused by the steadfastness and obstinacy they demonstrated during the theological dispute. They were transferred back to Constantinople in 1290 and interned in the Great Palace.[121]

Aside from bearing witness to the involvement of Byzantine intellectuals with chancery work, these documents — and in particular the guarantee document of 1277 — also reflect their inner turmoil in the face of the regime's directives. The acceptance of such diktats, obviously a good rule for survival in the Byzantine world, reveals a not irrelevant intimidation and conditioning during the age of such a strong figure as Michael VIII Palaiologos, who demanded an explicit declaration of adherence to his unionist policies, even though opposition remained tenacious within the Church.[122] A case that exemplifies this dichotomy is that of the historian George Pachymeres. As a teacher in the patriarchal school[123] he signed the guarantee document of 1277, while as *hieromnenon* of the Great Church (a high official in the patriarchal chancery in charge of the procedures of sacerdotal ordination)[124] he appears in the list of signatories to the final deliberation (*tomos*) of the Council of Blachernae in 1285, which sanctioned the condemnation of Bekkos and the officials loyal to him.[125]

The *Tomos* of Blachernae from 1285 — antithetical in respect to that of 1277 — is the second document on which I shall focus here. Two patriarchal notaries also followed the same path as Pachymeres: Theodore Hypatios and Andrew Holobolos, who appear in the

---

121 Cf. George Pachymeres, *History*, 7, 35; 9, 29; ed. Failler, vol. 3, pp. 117, line 20 - 119, line 2; 299, lines 1-5. On the location of the fortress of St. Gregory (in which Bekkos remained until his death in 1297) cf. Failler, "Chronologie et composition dans l'Histoire de Georges Pachymère [III]", pp. 21-22.

122 Cf. Constantinides, "Byzantine Scholars and the Union of Lyons (1274)".

123 Διδάσκαλος τοῦ Ἀποστόλου: Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les ὀφφίκια*, p. 532.

124 Ibid., pp. 368-73.

125 On this synodal assembly see more generally Papadakis, *Crisis in Byzantium*. The relevant τόμος συνοδικός has been most recently discussed and edited by Stavrou, "Une réévaluation du *Tomos* du Deuxième Concile des Blachernes"; the same author has also printed the text of 1285 (without the list of signatories) for the editorial enterprise of the Fondazione per le scienze religiose (Bologna): Stavrou, M. (ed.), "Concilium Constantinopolitanum – 1285. Synod of Constantinople – 1285. Second Council of Blachernae", in *Ecumenical Councils*, eds. Alberigo/Melloni et al., vol. 4/1, pp. 103-30; the sole subscriptions had already been published in Laurent, "Les signataires du second concile des Blakhernes". For the signatures of the ἐκκλησιαστικοί see Stavrou, "Une réévaluation du *Tomos* du Deuxième Concile des Blachernes", pp. 90-93 (= Laurent, "Les signataires du second concile des Blakhernes", pp. 148-49: Εἶχε καὶ ὑπογραφὰς τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ταύτας κτλ.); in the fourth place we read: Ὁ ἱερομνήμων τῆς ἁγιωτάτης τοῦ Θεοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας Γεώργιος διάκονος ὁ Παχυμέρης, ὑπέγραψα (Stavrou, "Une réévaluation du *Tomos* du Deuxième Concile des Blachernes", pp. 90 [lines 62-63], 91 [with nn. 134-35]; Laurent, "Les signataires du second concile des Blakhernes", p. 148 [no 4]); cf. Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les ὀφφίκια*, pp. 117, 533. The synodal document against Bekkos was initially subscribed by Emperor Andronikos II Palaiologos (Dölger, *Regesten*, vol. 4, no. 2108), by Patriarch Gregory of Cyprus (Laurent, *Les regestes*, vol. 4, no. 1490) and then by the bishops and metropolitans; the other ecclesiastical dignitaries (i.e. for the most part the *archontes* of the Great Church, including Pachymeres himself) signed only after having received assurance from higher-up in the synodal hierarchy: George Pachymeres, *History*, 8, 1-2, ed. Failler, vol. 3, pp. 127, line 28 - 131, line 9; 131, lines 27-30. Shortly after 1285, Pachymeres reached the rank of *protekdikos* of the Great Church, which fell into the *exokatakoiloi*.

lists of witnesses in both documents.[126] Naturally, the evaluation of presences and absences in the two contrasting documents (of 1277 and 1285) also gives us an idea of the ecclesiastical officials who were purged for not bending to authority, or for being too involved in the losing side's policy. On the other hand, Pachymeres' silence on the facts of 1277 in his historical work[127] reveals the discretion (or better, embarrassment) of the official and man of letters, though he must have borne the unionist impositions with considerable difficulty.

The guarantee document of 1277 is preserved, *inter alia*, in MS Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Chigi R.VI.a[2] (gr. 54, fols. 139r-140v). This codex, which can be dated to the first quarter of the 14th century and is certainly of Constantinopolitan origin, also contains works of the theologian and anti-Latin pamphleteer George Moschampar.[128] The latter, "Teacher of the Gospels" at the patriarchal school,[129] appears as the first signatory — among the ecclesiastical *archontes* — of the *Tomos* against Bekkos and the other unionists issued at the conclusion of the second Council of Blachernae in 1285. Here, we see him at work as *chartophylax*, in the place of Meliteniotes.[130] Moschampar — one of the instigators and certainly the person in charge of the preparation of this document containing the definitive condemnation of the union as well as the reconciliation among the parties that were opposed to Michael VIII — indissolubly fused his lead role in directing the patriarchal chancery with his activity as a polemicist. This latter is expressed in ferocious anti-Latin pamphleteering (published anonymously before 1282, to avoid suppression) and afterwards in a diatribe against Patriarch Gregory II of Cyprus himself, who, after he removed Moschampar from the post of *chartophylax*, endured not only his invectives but also an attempt (orchestrated by, among others, his old chancery official) to depose him from the highest seat in the Orthodox Church.

We have seen how the highest scholar-officials of the patriarchal chancery customarily inserted their name signatures in documents that marked the religious policy of the time. These subscriptions were often affixed with a single motion, without lifting the writing instrument from the support surface (the technical term used by modern scholars for this practice is "monocondyle", from ancient and mediaeval Greek μονοκόνδυλος); and the

126 *PLP* 29492; *PLP* 21043. Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les ὀφφίκια*, pp. 532-33. For the *Tomos* of 1285 see Stavrou, "Une réévaluation du *Tomos* du Deuxième Concile des Blachernes", pp. 92 (lines 79, 82), 93 (with nn. 157, 161) (Laurent, "Les signataires du second concile des Blakhernes", p. 149 [nos. 17, 20]).

127 Cf. *Dossier Lyon*, eds. Laurent/Darrouzès, pp. 464, 468.

128 The Chigi manuscript, which has been severely damaged by humidity and is nearly indecipherable in many places, may have originated in the milieu of the Patriarchate of Constantinople; the chronology is confirmed by the presence of a type of Italian paper with a watermark datable to around 1320 (*Cercle*, cf. Mošin/Traljić, no. 2015). On George Moschampar cf. *Dossier Lyon*, eds. Laurent/Darrouzès, pp. 19-24; *PLP* 19344; Silvano, "L'origine dello scisma in un dialogo di Giorgio Moschampar"; id., "Per l'edizione della «Disputa tra un ortodosso e un latinofrone seguace di Becco sulla processione dello Spirito Santo» di Giorgio Moschampar"; Moniou, *Γεώργιος Μοσχάμπαρ, ἕνας ἀνθενωτικὸς θεολόγος*.

129 Διδάσκαλος τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου; on his tasks cf. *Dossier Lyon*, eds. Laurent/Darrouzès, p. 21.

130 Stavrou, "Une réévaluation du *Tomos* du Deuxième Concile des Blachernes", pp. 90 (lines 57-58), 91 (with nn. 128-129) (= Laurent, "Les signataires du second concile des Blakhernes", p. 148 [no. 1]: Ὁ χαρτοφύλαξ τῆς ἁγιωτάτης τοῦ Θεοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας Γεώργιος ὁ Μοσχάμπαρ συναινῶν ὑπέγραψα).

occurrences are naturally numerous.[131] However, there are also patriarchal documents showing, exceptionally, only the signature and the seal of the official who served as head of the patriarchal chancery — that is, the *chartophylax* — instead of the analogous instruments of validation that were usually the prerogative of the primate. It is those acts that bear the formula indicating their extraction, or better redaction, from the draft minutes of the proceedings for which the *chartophylax* was responsible.[132] But the rule required that it should be the patriarch in person who appended his signature at the bottom of the acts copied by his chancery. These subscriptions could be presented in name form or with the sole mention of the month and the indiction (*menologema*), depending on the type of document and its legal value, which is not always identifiable through internal evidence (i.e. distinguishing between acts of the patriarch alone, of the patriarch as archbishop of Constantinople and of the patriarch as head of the synodal assembly).[133] They were usually of indifferent quality, reflecting an often sloppy scribal education: the monocondyle signature of Patriarch John XI Bekkos[134] stands as an exception, precisely because he came from the ranks of the bureaucracy — his last post being just that of *chartophylax* of the Great Church — rather than from the long-established ecclesiastical apparatus or the monastic class, from which patriarchs were generally elected. From the late Byzantine era on, and more frequently after the fall of Byzantium, one may observe an increasing interaction between the customs of the ecclesiastical hierarchy and the scribal habits that were once the exclusive prerogative of patriarchal officials, as the diffusion of the monocondyle in the signatures of metropolitans testifies.

As outlined above, one of the functions of the *chartophylax* was that of coordinating all the operations of the office that was appointed to the production of acts, "for the writing of the reports",[135] a procedure that was solemnly emphasized in the ceremonial of the Great Church. A concrete trace of this can be found in the Register of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. It should be pointed out here that, unlike any other public institution (including the imperial chancery), the patriarchal chancery provided, as a key step, for the transcription of the issued documents in a common register, which the Byzantines called

131 Especially concerning the Register of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, suffice it to refer both to the officials' signatures, which are to be found appended at the bottom of some documents recorded there, and to the lists of the *exarchoi* (which I shall address shortly). For μονοκόνδυλος, attested in classical Greek as an adjective and in Byzantine sources also as a substantive (up to the modern Greek terms μονοκονδύλιον and μονοκονδυλιά/μονοκοντιλιά), cf. Trapp (ed.), *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität*, fasc. 5: *λ-παλιάνθρωπος*, p. 1040 (s.v. μονοκόνδυλος, ὁ).

132 It is the so-called formula ταῦτα παρεκβληθέντα: cf. Darrouzès, *Le registre synodal*, pp. 281, 304, 324; Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les ὀφφίκια*, pp. 517-21; Pieralli, "I «protocolli» delle riunioni sinodali". The originals which are still conserved for this typology (occurring already in the Comnenian era) are, for our time period, Laurent, *Les regestes*, vol. 4, nos. 1549 (1290-1293, under the Patriarch Athanasios I) and 1567 (1295, 5 October, Patriarch John XII). A fragment in a third analogous document, datable to 1354, 28 March (under the Patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos, first term), was discovered by Otto Kresten; moreover, it should be noted that the (*megas*) *chartophylax* who signed the document is John Ampar, while the scribe of the text has been identified as George Galesiotes: two protagonists in the patriarchal chancery during the 14th century who will be discussed in more detail below.

133 Cf. Darrouzès, *Le registre synodal*, pp. 140-43; Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les ὀφφίκια*, pp. 395-426.

134 Cf. supra, p. ### with nn. 118-19.

135 Εἰς τὰς σημειώσεις (cf. above, n. 102 and context).

the "Register of the sacred *chartophylakeion*" or, more simply, the "Holy Register" or "Register of the Church".[136] An exceptional record of this activity has been preserved thanks to the erudite interest in the relics of Byzantine culture that animated the Flemish bibliophile Ogier Ghislain de Busbecq, well-known Habsburg ambassador to the Sublime Porte in Ottoman Constantinople (1555-1562). In fact, two original volumes of the Register (for the years 1315-1376 and 1379-1404) are preserved in Vienna in, respectively, the MSS Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vindob. Hist. gr. 47 and 48.[137] MS Vindob. Hist. gr. 47, for example, transmits at fol. 48r the annotation at the start of the records referring to the *chartophylax* Gregory Koutales,[138] who began to serve under Patriarch Hesaias at the end of the reign of Andronikos II Palaiologos:

> Register of the proceedings of the synodal sessions kept in the days of our mostly holy Lord and Ecumenical Patriarch, *kyr* Hesaias, starting from the moment in which the most honourable *chartophylax* of the most holy Great Church of God, the *panhyperentimotatos kyr* Gregory Koutales, was awarded the office of *chartophylax*.[139]

With this reference to the act of entering upon his duties by the *chartophylax*, we are thrown directly into the work of the office of the patriarchal chancery. Koutales belonged to an influential Byzantine family which was very active in the milieu of the intellectual elite during the Palaeologan age. He was, for example, a correspondent of Matthew of Ephesos and a contributor to the political climate during the years of high tension between Andronikos II and Andronikos III, which escalated into the civil war between the grandfather and his grandson. Imprisoned when Patriarch Hesaias sent him to Andronikos II right after being appointed *chartophylax*, Gregory was liberated by Andronikos III when the latter succeeded his grandfather in 1328. In recompense, the young emperor promptly elevated the designation of Koutales' title, which from then on was *megas chartophylax*.[140] Koutales' ecclesiastical *cursus honorum* then culminated with his rise to the metropolitan throne of Thessaloniki (1334), a further demonstration that in

---

136 Κωδίκιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ χαρτοφυλακείου (where χαρτοφυλακεῖον obviously means the office of the *chartophylax*, namely the patriarchal chancery itself) or ἱερὸν κωδίκιον or also ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κωδίκιον.

137 See, above all, the introductions to the three volumes of *Patriarchal Register* that have so far appeared, as well as the monograph by Darrouzès, *Le registre synodal* (which, though outdated in some palaeographical and codicological aspects, is still relevant). Cf. also the overview in Hunger, "Das Patriarchatsregister von Konstantinopel", and more recently the contributions which appeared in the proceedings edited by Gastgeber/Mitsiou/Preiser-Kapeller, *Register*.

138 *PLP* 13617.

139 *Patriarchal Register*, vol. 1, no. 65 (1327, March-September; Darrouzès, *Les regestes*, vol. 5, no. 2134): † Κωδίκιον τῶν συνοδικῶν παρασημειώσεων γεγονὸς ἐπὶ τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ παναγιωτάτου ἡμῶν δεσπότου καὶ οἰκουμενικοῦ πατριάρχου, κῦρ Ἡσαΐου, ἐξότου ὁ τιμιώτατος χαρτοφύλαξ τῆς ἁγιωτάτης Μεγάλης τοῦ Θεοῦ Ἐκκλησίας, πανυπερεντιμότατος κῦρ Γρηγόριος ὁ Κουτάλης, τῷ τοῦ χαρτοφύλακος ὀφφικίῳ ἐτιμήθη. The scribe of this record is George Galesiotes, whom I shall discuss at length below.

140 Cf. John VI Kantakouzenos, *History*, ed. Schopen, vol. 1, p. 313, lines 9-16. See also Gastgeber, "Das Patriarchatsregister als Spiegel der Religionspolitik", pp. 100-01.

many cases working in the chancery served as a springboard that could launch officials towards the highest rungs of the Orthodox Church hierarchy.

Thanks to a codicological examination of MS Vindob. Hist. gr. 47 conducted by Otto Kresten, we have been able to uncover manipulations in the structure of the patriarchal Register.[141] Of particular interest are the actions connected with the Palamite controversy and the dynastic struggles following the death of Andronikos III Palaiologos, as well as those relating to the alternating succession on the patriarchal throne, where the chancery of the Orthodox primate played a primary role in intrigues that resulted in censure and in the skilful disguise of the sequence of the acts.

The *Tomos* of 1341 — the document with which Patriarch John XIV Kalekas and the Synod condemned the writings of the monk Barlaam of Calabria against Gregory Palamas — is a noteworthy case. The various phases of the assembly's progress (which was convened before the death of Emperor Andronikos III Palaiologos [15 June 1341] and led to the first affirmation of the Palamitic doctrine) can be reconstructed fairly easily thanks to the intersection of diverse sources.[142] The focal point for these events falls in the eighteenth and nineteenth quires of the patriarchal Register (now fols. 103-107 and 108-109 of the *Vindobonensis* manuscript).[143] These seven folia constitute the remains of an extensive intervention, which included the removal of at least seven other folia from the original quires. The resulting lacuna appears after fol. 107, right at the conclusion of the *Tomos* of 1341, in the version released in July of that year, which lacks the participants' signatures (the death of Andronikos III Palaiologos and the dynastic difficulties in the succession must have caused initial disorientation).[144]

Otto Kresten's reconstruction of this puzzle reads like a true crime novel within the walls of the patriarchal chancery. First and foremost, we can say for certain that the missing portion of the Register did not contain the August version of the same *Tomos*, which, today transmitted in copy, was nearly identical to the preceding version, with the signatures added. What was originally on these folia is difficult to say. Probably, the documents removed had something to do with the Palamite controversy (and they may have bothered the winning Hesychastic side) or with the regency of the empire in support of the underage John V Palaiologos (for example, Patriarch John XIV Kalekas' excommunication of John Kantakouzenos at the end of 1341).[145] Who may have been responsible for this action and why, however, is easily understood, for it is a diversion

141 Kresten, in *Patriarchal Register*, vol. 2, pp. 17-74 (*Einleitung*, II: *Zur Kodikologie des Patriarchatsregisters von Konstantinopel unter Ioannes XIV. Kalekas und Isidoros I.*). See also Gastgeber, "Das Patriarchatsregister als Spiegel der Religionspolitik", pp. 122-30

142 Cf. Darrouzès, *Les regestes*, vol. 5, nos. 2210-2214.

143 Kresten, in *Patriarchal Register*, vol. 2, pp. 32-45; on the issue that is dealt with here, see the two contributions, also by Kresten, "Der sogenannte „Absetzungsvermerk" des Patriarchen Ioannes XIV. Kalekas" and id., "Fünf nachgezeichnete Metropolitenunterschriften".

144 The text of the *Tomos* of July (*Patriarchal Register*, vol. 2, no. 132; Darrouzès, *Les regestes*, vol. 5, no 2213) begins already on fol. 102v, the final page of the seventeenth quire of MS Vindob. Hist. gr. 47. Andronikos III Palaiologos must have participated in the discussion during this first phase (cf. e.g. the emperor's intervention recorded in *Patriarchal Register*, vol. 2, no. 132, lines 424-463), but was already deceased by the time of the final act.

145 Darrouzès, *Les regestes*, vol. 5, no. 2218.

intended to conceal an extreme tampering with the Register through the defamation of the *chartophylax* John Ampar,[146] who was active in the patriarchal chancery a few years after the *Tomos* of 1341 was issued — at the time of the first affirmation of Palamism, Ampar was in the service of the empress Anna Palaiologina (Giovanna of Savoy), the regent for her son John V and protagonist in the struggle with John Kantakouzenos.

To fully understand the events, for which the patriarchal chancery was just the fulcrum, we must leap forward a few years, from 1341 to 1355 — a chronological span full of upheaval for Byzantium: from the discussions connected to the *Tomos* of 1341, with the attempts to reinterpret and distort its outcomes carried out by John XIV Kalekas and Gregory Akindynos,[147] to the resulting deposition of the patriarch (the *Tomos* of February 1347);[148] from the enthronement of the new Orthodox primate (Isidore I Boucheiras)[149] to the conclusion of the civil war with Kantakouzenos' appointment as co-emperor (both of which occurred in May 1347); from the *Tomos* of the Council held at the Blachernae in 1351 under the patriarch Kallistos I (elected in 1350[150]), with the definitive condemnation of Barlaam and Akyndinos, to the renewal of the dynastic conflict, with John VI Kantakouzenos' claim to nominate his son Matthew as co-emperor, the subsequent removal of Kallistos I from the patriarchal see and the election, in his place, of Philotheos Kokkinos (August 1353), who was willing to accept a line of imperial succession that, in practice, ousted John V Palaiologos, relegating him to a subordinate position; and finally, from the conclusion of the second dynastic conflict, with the abdication of John VI Kantakouzenos and the subsequent abandonment of Philotheos Kokkinos (at the end of 1354), to the return of Kallistos I on the throne of the Apostle Andrew (at the beginning of 1355).

Indeed, the note announcing the resumption of the entries in the *kodikion* with the second term of Patriarch Kallistos in the first half of 1355 helps us to understand this event, which exemplifies the "working methods" in the chancery of the Orthodox primate in one of Byzantium's most dramatic moments.[151] This detailed declaration — which also

---

146 *PLP* 800.

147 Cf. e.g. *Patriarchal Register*, vol. 2, no. 145 (1344, November; Darrouzès, *Les regestes*, vol. 5, no. 2251), with the annotation *Patriarchal Register*, vol. 2, no. 146, inserted in the Register by an adversary of Kalekas after his deposition and erased by a supporter of the ex-patriarch (Kresten, "Der sogenannte „Absetzungsvermerk" des Patriarchen Ioannes XIV. Kalekas"; id., in *Patriarchal Register*, vol. 2, pp. 51-52).

148 *Patriarchal Register*, vol. 2, no. 147 (1347, February; Darrouzès, *Les regestes*, vol. 5, no. 2270); it should be noted that the text of the *Tomos* of 1347, as it appears in the *Patriarchal Register*, is particularly damaged by scrapping and mutilations: Kresten, in *Patriarchal Register*, vol. 2, pp. 52-69. See also most recently Lauritzen, F. (ed.), "Concilium Constantinopolitanum – 1347. Synod of Constantinople – 1 February 1347", in *Ecumenical Councils*, eds. Alberigo/Melloni et al., vol. 4/1, pp. 153-70.

149 Cf. the annotation at the start of the entries under Isidoros I in the *hieron kodikion*, *Patriarchal Register*, vol. 2, no. 153 (1347, May 17; Darrouzès, *Les regestes*, vol. 5, no. 2273); George Galesiotes' hand appears here again. For these events see now Rigo, *1347: Isidoro patriarca di Costantinopoli*.

150 *Patriarchal Register*, vol. 3, no. 176 (1350, June 10: beginning of the entries; cf. Darrouzès, *Les regestes*, vol. 5, no 2311), where we see George Galesiotes again at work.

151 *Patriarchal Register*, vol. 3, no. 211 (1355, February/August; cf. Darrouzès, *Les regestes*, vol. 5, no. 2376); see the reconstruction by Kresten, in *Patriarchal Register*, vol. 2, pp. 41-44, as well as id., "Der sogenannte „Absetzungsvermerk" des Patriarchen Ioannes XIV. Kalekas", pp. 214-17, and id., "Fünf

recalls the reasons for which Kallistos was compelled to leave the patriarchal throne in the first place, given his refusal to contravene the rules of dynastic succession — without doubt conceals a chancery official, who, in concert with Kallistos himself, distorted the composition of the patriarchal Register, eliminating not only the folia following the *Tomos* of July 1341 but also, and above all, the "undesired" documents transcribed during the brief period of the first patriarchal term of Philotheos Kokkinos. And in the executor of this wild manipulation we can easily recognize the primary scribe of the patriarchal chancery, who remained afloat in that office, despite the dramatic upheavals, from the 1320s to the 1370s: that is to say, George Galesiotes, who in this circumstance must have represented the *longa manus* of the reinstated patriarch (Kallistos I). In fact, the plan required throwing dust in the eyes, thus distracting attention from the real manoeuvres of censorship and identifying a plausible scapegoat. In the Register's annotation, transcribed and perhaps also composed by Galesiotes himself, the blame for these grave alterations in the *Vindobonensis* manuscript is shifted onto the *megas chartophylax* John Ampar (who was no longer able to defend himself, as he had been recently removed from his position on account of a turbid affair of simony).[152] Ampar, therefore, served as a sacrificial victim, ready to be delivered to the outside world as the designated culprit. We need only look at the words used here, which must be conceived as a true denigration of a person already discredited by the investigations launched against him (the end of the following passage stands as a magnificent example of "smoke and mirrors"!):

> In the meantime,[153] however, one or a few evil men, fellows of the former *megas chartophylax* Ampar and then belonging to the ranks of the [Great] Church, arrived at such temerity and insolence that they not only severed and removed the synodal *tomos* issued in devout respect of the sacred dogmas, for which the much celebrated and most pious emperor, father of our powerful and holy lord and emperor, had supremely striven, exerting no small effort, as everyone knows, for the reward bestowed by God […],[154] that is to say that holy synodal *tomos* transcribed in the

---

nachgezeichnete Metropolitenunterschriften", 170-71. Gastgeber, "Das Patriarchatsregister als Spiegel der Religionspolitik", pp. 102-03.

152 On the fate of Ampar, who was accused of malfeasance in office and, indeed, of φιλαργυρία (the cases of corruption concerned conduct and practices that were against the ecclesiastical canons regarding both sacerdotal consecrations and celebrations of marriage), cf. Hunger, "Amtsmißbrauch im Patriarchat von Konstantinopel". Ampar's trial and dismissal must likely have taken place during Philotheos Kokkinos' first term as patriarch. The text of the pertinent synodal deliberation was replaced (probably in Galesiotes' hand) by a generic list of accusations, now *Patriarchal Register*, vol. 3, no. 202 (between February and the end of 1354) (cf. also Darrouzès, *Les regestes*, vol. 5, no. 2375), which appears at a point where the manipulations conducted at the beginning of Kallistos' second patriarchate are particularly extensive; cf. also Kresten, "Fünf nachgezeichnete Metropolitenunterschriften", 168-72.

153 The first part of the document retraces the events of the civil war, with the dynastic rights of John V Palaiologos infringed by Kantakouzenos and the banishment of Kallistos I, who would not bend to the usurper's will.

154 The passage omitted here, for the sake of brevity, recalls that the Synod of 1341 had been convened at the church of *Hagia Sophia* in an extreme longing by Andronikos III Palaiologos, who was then dying.

> Register of the Church, but they also destroyed the synodal acts once occurring in the same Register, as one by now can see.[155]

Alongside his office activities, Ampar had played an important role in the intellectual life of the Byzantine capital in the middle of the 14th century, among other things filling the imperial post of "consul of the philosophers" (*hypatos ton philosophon*). The passage quoted above portrays the *megas chartophylax* as the leader of a circle of ecclesiastical scholars — the "evil men" who in the stratagem are said to have assisted him in the destruction of the *Tomos* from 1341 and of the other documents — who in all likelihood actively participated in the theological disputes of the time. The episode narrated in this extract is particularly instructive since it occurs entirely within the patriarchal chancery, with fidelity and a sense of belonging giving way to intrigue and slander, above all when the senior official had already fallen into disgrace. Ampar and Galesiotes operated side by side during the period in which the former served as *chartophylax*. We see them active together, for example, in the *Tomos* of the Council held at Blachernae in 1351 (with the solemn recognition of the hesychastic doctrine and the definitive condemnation of the anti-Palamites, from the already-deceased Barlaam and Gregory Akindynos to the polemicists active at that moment, such as Nikephoros Gregoras): Ampar as the first signatory among the *exokatakoiloi*,[156] Galesiotes as one of the official readers of the text and, above all, as the scribe of the original.[157] This did not prevent the skilled and devious

---

155 *Patriarchal Register*, vol. 3, no. 211, lines 19-32: Ἐντῳμεταξὺ δὲ τὶς καί τινες χαιρέκακοι μετὰ τοῦ ποτὲ μεγάλου χαρτοφύλακος, τοῦ Ἄμπαρι, κατειλεγμένοι τηνικαῦτα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, εἰς τοῦτο τόλμης καὶ αὐθαδείας ἦλθον, ὥστε οὐ μόνον τὸν ἐπ' εὐσεβείᾳ τῶν ἱερῶν δογμάτων ἐκτεθειμένον συνοδικὸν τόμον, ὑπὲρ οὗ ὁ ἀοίδιμος καὶ εὐσεβέστατος βασιλεύς, ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ κραταιοῦ καὶ ἁγίου ἡμῶν αὐθέντου καὶ βασιλέως [...], πλεῖστα ἐμόγησε καί, ὡς ἅπαντες ἴσασιν, οὐ μικρὸν πόνον ὑπέστη διὰ τὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ μισθαποδοσίας [...], τοῦτον τὸν ἱερὸν συνοδικὸν τόμον ἐν τῷ ἐκκλησιαστικῷ κωδικίῳ καταγεγραμμένον διέρρηξαν καὶ κατέλυσαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ κωδικίῳ κειμένας συνοδικὰς πράξεις ἠφάνισαν, καθάπερ ἤδη ὁρᾶται. See also more recently Gastgeber, "Das Patriarchatsregister als Spiegel der Religionspolitik", p. 103.

156 *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. 151, col. 763B, lines 5-7 (text of the *Tomos* of 1351 [Darrouzès, *Les regestes*, vol. 5, nos 2324, 2326], signatures): Ὁ μέγας χαρτοφύλαξ τῆς ἁγιωτάτης τοῦ Θεοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας καὶ ὕπατος τῶν φιλοσόφων, ὁ Ἔμπαρις [= Ἄμπαρις] ("The megas chartophylax of the most holy Great Church of God and consul of the philosophers Ampar"); cf. Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les ὀφφίκια*, pp. 133, 319 n. 1. In the edition of the *Tomos* of 1351 printed by Karmires (*Dogmatic Monuments of the Orthodox Church*, vol. 1, pp. 374-407: 406), we find only the first six signatories (the two emperors, John VI Kantakouzenos and John V Palaiologos, Patriarch Kallistos I, the metropolitan of Herakleia in Thrace [Philotheos Kokkinos: see the next footnote], the metropolitan of Thessaloniki [Gregory Palamas] and the metropolitan Arsenios of Kyzikos), while in Lauritzen, F. (ed.), "Concilium Constantinopolitanum – 1351. Synod of Constantinople – 1351", in *Ecumenical Councils*, eds. Alberigo/Melloni et al., vol. 4/1, pp. 171-218, who based his text on that established by Karmires, there are no signatures published, as is normally the case in the Bologna series.

157 Philotheos Kokkinos, *First Antirrhetic against Nikephoros Gregoras*, ed. Kaimakes, p. 33, lines 304-306: Τρεῖς δ' ἦμεν οἱ κατὰ διαδοχὴν ἀνεγνωκότες ἐκεῖνον [scil. τὸν Τόμον], Γαλησιώτης, φημί, καὶ Μάξιμος ὁ σοφὸς καὶ τρίτος ἐπ' ἐκείνοις καὶ τελευταῖος ὁ Ἡρακλείας ("We were three, those who in turn read the *tomos*, I mean to say Galesiotes, the wise Maximos [probably Maximos Laskaris Kalopheros, *PLP* 10733] and third among them and last the metropolitan of Herakleia [in Thrace, namely Philotheos Kokkinos himself, who in 1351, shortly before his election to the patriarchal throne, held precisely that post: *PLP* 11917]"). Two original fragments, perfectly overlapping, of this *Tomos* —

calligrapher from demolishing his old boss, contriving for the Patriarch Kallistos I — who meanwhile had been restored to the throne — the stratagem that drew a veil over the unscrupulous action of censure (induced by the primate), by cancelling from the Register the most troublesome traces left by Philotheos Kokkinos.

The transcription of the acts in the Register being a "work in progress", the patriarchal chancery also constituted a sort of training ground for the scribal education of those who worked therein. And in this sense, it stood as a true crossroads for the trends and innovations introduced in Greek script during that period, which are inevitably reflected in the realm of book production, since, as I have already emphasized, professional copyists of manuscripts and scribes-notaries were very often the same persons. Indeed, as a "gathering place" for writing practices, the patriarchal chancery can be seen as a laboratory in which many great transformations were heralded and produced. Moreover, the Register bears witness to different levels of literacy in the late Byzantine period, for instance, among those who signed the lists of the *exarchoi* (ecclesiastic officials assigned to internal discipline and control), a concrete example of the action of moral renewal and recovery of the Constantinopolitan clergy undertaken by Patriarch Kallistos I in 1357.[158]

I shall now briefly examine the organization of the physical work of copying within this office, based just on the two volumes of the Register of the Patriarchate of Constantinople (MSS Vindob. Hist. gr. 47 and 48). Supported by a study, still in progress, of the scribes in the patriarchal chancery starting from the mid-14th century,[159] I have been able to reconstruct a precise "line of descent" consisting of three figures who passed on to one another the baton as the primary physical compilers of the Register entries. Two of these three also served as patriarchal notaries and pursued brilliant careers in the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Moreover, all three are known as scribes of manuscripts and participated to various degrees in the intellectual climate during the second Palaeologan age, over a chronological span of more than one hundred years, from the third decade of the 14th century through the 1430s.

The first of this triad is George Galesiotes, who was particularly appreciated for his scribal skills, being able to move from an extremely calligraphic style to a much more rapid, informal and at times "dishevelled" ductus.[160] Well known in the patriarchal milieu

---

without doubt redacted by Philotheos Kokkinos among others (cf. e.g. ed. Kaimakes, p. 33, line 274) — survive today: they contain the final part of the text and a portion of the signatures (MS Basel, Öffentliche Bibliothek der Universität, N I 6 no. 16: Darrouzès, *Les regestes*, vol. 5, no. 2326; Hieronymus, *Griechischer Geist aus Basler Pressen*, pp. 727-36 [no 446]): from the available facsimiles it is easy to identify George Galesiotes as the text's scribe (cf. Dölger, "Ein byzantinisches Staatsdokument in der Universitätsbibliothek Basel"; Dold, *Das Geheimnis einer byzantinischen Staatsurkunde aus dem Jahre 1351* [with 6 pls.]); see more recently Harlfinger, "Autographa aus der Palaiologenzeit", pp. 49-50 (with pl. 22). It should also be noted that Ampar and Galesiotes are attested together, the first as signatory, the second as scribe, in the documentary fragment of 1354 (Patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos, first term) mentioned above (supra, n. 132).

158 Cf. Hunger, "Die Exarchenlisten des Patriarchen Kallistos I.; De Gregorio, "La scrittura greca di età paleologa", pp. 98-99.

159 Cf. De Gregorio, "La scrittura greca di età paleologa", pp. 97-101, 115, and now id., "Un'aggiunta su copisti greci del secolo XIV".

160 Cf. De Gregorio, "Καλλιγραφεῖν/ταχυγραφεῖν", pp. 441-45.

— where he was customarily referred to simply as "Galesiotes" and never designated by an official title or role — and the relative of a homonymous literary author who was also a high ecclesiastical dignitary,[161] he entered the patriarchal chancery at a very young age in 1323 under the Patriarch Hesaias (1323-1332). There he became, from the start, the principal scribe both for the Register entries (32 out of the 35 acts inserted there in this first period are in his hand)[162] and for the few surviving original documents. The situation is somewhat different for the documents recorded in MS Vindob. Hist. gr. 47 during the age of the Patriarchs John XIV Kalekas (1334-1347) and Isidore I (1347-1350), when Galesiotes — perhaps choosing to keep his head down in the turbid general situation prevailing during this phase of the Palamite controversy — transcribed about half of the acts attested in the *kodikion* (33 out of 69, approximately 22 folia out of the 55 corresponding to that period in the *Vindobonensis* manuscript). Nevertheless, even while essentially serving as the coordinator of a team of around ten scribes, he did not dominate the scene: among the documents he was not entrusted with transcribing into the Register were, for example, the two *Tomoi* of 1341 and 1347 and the will of Isidore I.[163] Nonetheless, Galesiotes continued to gravitate towards the more restricted patriarchal orbit under John XIV Kalekas as well, as may be inferred from his part in the copying of the "house book" of Matthew, metropolitan of Ephesos, and from his high-level book production in MS Sinait. gr. 152 (commissioned by the powerful Isaac Palaiologos Asanes but probably initiated by the

161 We can distinguish George Galesiotes the Elder, probably the scribe's uncle, thanks to a cross-reference between biographical data (cf. the single lemma *PLP* 3528) and the activity of our chancery servant. Born around 1278/80, Galesiotes the Elder initially filled the post of πρωτέκδικος (approximately from 1310 to 1334, as the successor of George Pachymeres) and then that of σακελλίου (*post* 1334 – *ante* 1344) of the Great Church (i.e. an ἐξωκατάκοιλος). He was also the author of, among other works, a well known *Metaphrasis* of Nikephoros Blemmydes' Βασιλικὸς Ἀνδριάς (cf. Hunger/Ševčenko, *Des Nikephoros Blemmydes Βασιλικὸς Ἀνδριάς*). A confirmation of the hypothesis (already put forth ibid., pp. 33-34, upon suggestion of O. Kresten) that an ἐξωκατάκοιλος could not serve as a simple chancery scribe — furthermore at the venerable age of seventy-plus years old — can be found in the *Tomos* of 1351. In fact, thanks to the testimonies mentioned above (supra, n. 157 and context), we know that this document was written and, in part, read aloud publicly by George Galesiotes (therefore, as a servant operating in the patriarchal chancery, without any title or epithet corresponding to the rank), whereas the offices of σακελλίου, and, higher up in the first πεντάς, of the μέγας χαρτοφύλαξ and of the μέγας σκευοφύλαξ of the Μεγάλη Ἐκκλησία, were held at that time by other well-known figures, respectively Michael Kabasilas (*PLP* 10101, σακελλίου at least from 1344!), John Ampar (cf. supra, pp. 359-362) and Euthymios Apokaukos (*PLP* 1185, μέγας σκευοφύλαξ precisely in 1351), who all signed the *Tomos*. In 1351, therefore, Galesiotes the Elder, i.e. the Church official of high rank and learned rhetor known in Constantinople, was, in all likelihood, already dead. The scribe Galesiotes, on the other hand, appears in the patriarchal Register at least until 1371. His date of birth can therefore be placed around 1300. A different reconstruction (following the older interpretation) is offered by Gastgeber, "Das Patriarchatsregister als Spiegel der Religionspolitik", pp. 115-17.

162 Cf. Hunger, in *Patriarchal Register*, vol. 1, pp. 65-71; Gastgeber, "Das Patriarchatsregister als Spiegel der Religionspolitik", p. 118 (pl. 2).

163 See the distinction of hands proposed by Hunger, in *Patriarchal Register*, vol. 2, pp. 75-80; for the two *Tomoi* cf. supra, pp. 358-361, while the διαθήκη of Isidoros I is *Patriarchal Register*, vol. 2, no. 156 (1350, February; Darrouzès, *Les regestes*, vol. 5, no. 2309); see also Gastgeber, "Das Patriarchatsregister als Spiegel der Religionspolitik", pp. 118-19 (pls. 3-4), 130-31.

patriarch himself).[164] Galesiotes then returns as undisputed protagonist in the patriarchal chancery in the two terms of Kallistos I (1350-1353 [August], 1355-1363) and in the brief interval of the first patriarchate of Philotheos Kokkinos (August 1353 through the end of 1354): according to the data collected in my ongoing study, I can argue that during these years Galesiotes remained practically the only scribe attested in the *kodikion*, as well as in the few surviving originals. For the *Vindobonensis* manuscript, we are dealing with, in total, around sixty folia between fol. 137r and fol. 230r, excluding the folia with the lists of the *exarchoi* that originally circulated loose among the signatories.[165]

By contrast, the physiognomy of the patriarchal chancery must have changed radically at the beginning at least of the second term of Philotheos Kokkinos (1364-1376). In fact, from October 1364 to December 1365[166] there is no trace of George Galesiotes' hand in the Register, since he had temporarily fallen into disgrace and had been removed by Philotheos on account of his compromising ties with the policies of the previous patriarch (Kallistos I). In the Register entries from this era we see five fairly occasional and inexpert copyists alternating in the transcription, who highlight the trend towards an increasing personalization of the writing outcomes in Byzantine chanceries and, more generally, towards an impoverishment of the professional figure of the scribe in Byzantium, which foreshadows the following period's extreme variety. It is therefore not surprising that already in March 1366[167] the irreplaceable (though elderly) Galesiotes was reinstated in his role of coordinator of the patriarchal scribes. Starting from that date, and extending at least until May 1371,[168] his handwriting appears with a certain continuity in the *kodikion*, although it is found alongside another hand, more accurate and rounded compared to the later work of the elderly scribe. Thanks to an insight in Jean Darrouzès' pioneering work[169] we are able to attach a name to Galesiotes' collaborator, who seems to have been trained exactly as his successor: John Holobolos.

A reference to this latter scribe has been handed down to us thanks both to a note of redaction that appears as marginal insert in a few prefaces of documents comprised in the Register and to the subscription in MS Mount Athos, Lavra K 112 (A.D. 1369), which contains Constantine Harmenopoulos' *Hexabiblos* (with Philotheos Kokkinos' refutation of some synodal *tomoi* quoted by the same canonist) and other texts, such as one *Notitia episcopatuum* and some lists of ecclesiastical as well as imperial offices. Holobolos is indeed one of the chancery scribes for whom we can assume a specific activity as *dictator* (i.e.

164 On the two manuscripts, cf. infra, nn. 179, 183 and context.

165 Cf. supra, n. 158. For these lists, I have identified Galesiotes' handwriting in the decree that describes the patriarchal action, as well as the script of two primary hands (Michael Balsamon, *PLP* 2121, and Michael Skoutariotes, *PLP* 26211, both known by the professional title of ταβουλλάριος), which appear in the introductory texts.

166 *Acta et diplomata*, eds. Miklosich/Müller, pp. 448-79 (nos. 194-222 [incomplete numbering] = *Patriarchal Register*, vol. 4 [forthcoming], nos. 272-302).

167 *Acta et diplomata*, eds. Miklosich/Müller, pp. 479-83 (no. 223 = *Patriarchal Register*, vol. 4 [forthcoming], no 303; Darrouzès, *Les regestes*, vol. 5, no. 2510).

168 *Acta et diplomata*, eds. Miklosich/Müller, pp. 578-80 (no. 319 = *Patriarchal Register*, vol. 4 [forthcoming], no 402; Darrouzès, *Les regestes*, vol. 5, no. 2622).

169 Darrouzès, *Le registre synodal*, pp. 54, 56, 75, 77, 89, 114-15, 200, 261, 283, 330, pl. 37; id., *Recherches sur les ὀφφίκια*, pp. 246 n. 3, 364-65, 384.

drafter of documents, as shown by the *prooimia* explicitly attributed to himself in the patriarchal Register) in the role of patriarchal notary (as indicated, for example, in the Athonite Codex).[170] I have been able to assign 34 entries in the *kodikion*, between 1366 and 1372, to Holobolos with certainty, to which we can add at least four original documents also dating from the second term of Philotheos Kokkinos.[171] His *cursus honorum* was brilliant: from *notarios patriarchikos* and scribe of the chancery (as well as, later, *kanstrisios*, the servant in charge of ceremony belonging to the middle class of patriarchal officials), John Holobolos was even placed at the head of the patriarchal chancery as *megas chartophylax* from 1389 to 1399, the year in which he was promoted to the metropolitan throne of Gotthia in Crimea. In 1402-1403, he was a protagonist in the deposition of his mentor, the Patriarch Matthew I, who, however, was immediately reinstated by Emperor Manuel II Palaiologos. Holobolos' path, which through the redaction of prefaces and the material preparation of documents and entries in the Register brought him to the intrigues of "high" politics, concludes with his retirement to a monastery and his death in 1406.

John Chortasmenos follows directly on the heels of Holobolos in the notarial tradition.[172] Starting from the monograph by Herbert Hunger,[173] we know quite a bit about this intellectual, well-read and educated although from low social rank, who with his salary as a patriarchal notary (from 1391 to around 1415) managed to buy a few manuscripts on which to study texts, epitomize and fill them with annotations. Traces of his activity in the patriarchal chancery remain primarily in the second volume of the Register (MS Vindob. Hist. gr. 48), still for the patriarchate of Matthew I (more specifically covering the years 1399-1401),[174] and on fols. 200r-215v of MS Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Urb. gr. 80, a personal copy, probably from his youth, with older

170 After Darrouzès, it is now possible to consult Gastgeber, "Rhetorik in der Patriarchatskanzlei von Konstantinopel", pp. 192-94, and Schminck, "Wörtliche Zitate des weltlichen und kirchlichen Rechts", pp. 239-40, 243; cf. also the record in *PLP* 21044. For this paper, I could not consider the very recent articles by Estangüi Gómez, "Pour une étude prosopographique des fonctionnaires", and by Pieralli, "Gli originali copiati da due notai"; besides the comprehensive investigation I am conducting on the scribes of the patriarchal chancery (1350-1376), I shall return to the figure of Holobolos in a contribution, to be published soon, entitled "Un manoscritto agiografico dal Patriarcato di Costantinopoli nel XIV secolo: il Vat. gr. 809, Filoteo Kokkinos e gli scribi della sua cancelleria". – For MS Athon. Lavra K 112 see e.g. Burgmann/Fögen/Schminck/Simon, *Repertorium der Handschriften des byzantinischen Rechts*, pp. 42-43 (no. 33); its subscription is worded as follows: τὸ παρὸν πρόχειρον τῶν νόμων ἐγράφη χειρὶ τοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν πατριαρχικῶν νοταρίων Ἰωάννου τοῦ Ὁλοβώνου ἐν τῷ πατριαρχείῳ καὶ ἐτελειώθη κατὰ μῆνα μάρτιον τῆς ζ΄ ἰνδικτιῶνος τοῦ ϛωοζ΄ ἔτους (fol. 311r: "the present Handbook of the Laws was written by the hand of the patriarchal notary John Holobolos at the Patriarchate and it was completed in the month of March of the seventh indiction of the year 6877 [= A.D. 1369]").

171 A further twenty acts, inserted in the patriarchal Register and also belonging to the same period, are most likely attributable to this scribe-notary.

172 Cf. the reference already occurring in Darrouzès, *Le registre synodal*, p. 77.

173 Hunger, *Johannes Chortasmenos* (particularly interesting is his picture of late Byzantine society, ibid., pp. 44-48). For the manuscripts that contain notes of possession or acquisition by Chortasmenos indicating his profession as *notarios* cf. ibid., pp. 14, 52-53 (for the years from 1391 to 1402). On Chortasmenos see more recently Acerbi/Bianconi, "L'*Organon* a fisarmonica di Giovanni Cortasmeno".

174 Hunger, *Johannes Chortasmenos*, p. 51; Darrouzès, *Le registre synodal*, pp. 76-77, pls. 58-60, 64; cf. also Canart/Prato, "Les recueils organisés par Jean Chortasménos", pp. 165-66, pls. 4-5.

documents from the Register today partially missing in MS Vindob. Hist. gr. 47.[175] Simultaneously with his work as notary, and also after he assumed the monastic habit (as *hieromonachos* Ignatios, 1415-1430), Chortasmenos secured other sources of income both as a teacher (his students included protagonists of the following era, such as the tenacious anti-unionist Mark Eugenikos, the future cardinal of the Roman Church Bessarion and the future patriarch of Constantinople George Gennadios II Scholarios) and as a restorer of the older manuscripts discovered in the Byzantine capital (it is worth mentioning at least the Dioskourides manuscript of Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vindob. Med. gr. 1, from the beginning of the 6th century).[176] He also continued to cultivate his interests as a scholar, focusing on mathematics and astronomy, rhetoric, and Aristotelian philosophy. Moreover, he managed to build relationships with his numerous and influential correspondents, a network that allowed him to ascend to the metropolitan throne of Selymbria in 1431. His fame, laboriously gained starting from his apprenticeship in the patriarchal chancery, earned him a leading place in the intellectual life of this era. Here is a brief portrait of him by his pupil Bessarion:

> I was also acquainted with the metropolitan of Sely(m)bria, Chortasmenos, who was one of the scholars and of the great teachers, to wit, as I well know, to a particularly high degree.[177]

Galesiotes, Holobolos, Chortasmenos: with these figures we have entered the last Byzantine age, between tradition and the transformation, or, to some degree, the dissolution, of formal and socio-cultural models. From a strictly palaeographical point of view, we can propose the following considerations. The first half of the 14th century had already seen the flourishing of the "scribe of Metochites", Michael Klostomalles, who inaugurated a trend with the evident intention of rendering the script normally used for chancery practices (and now suitable even for modern high-level manuscripts) more calligraphic and ordered. Starting from around the middle of the same century, this multi-functional feature was heightened, breaking down more decisively the already thin barriers between the documentary and manuscript realms. On the one hand, a copyist like Galesiotes, who certainly entered the profession in connection with Klostomalles, made his own script increasingly more personal and informal. Cases in which the use of the

175 On the miscellany transmitted by the Codex Urbinas, which contains numerous sections in the hand of Chortasmenos, in addition to Hunger, *Johannes Chortasmenos*, pp. 24, 51, see, above all, the considerations in Canart/Prato, "Les recueils organisés par Jean Chortasménos", passim, especially pp. 173-75 and pls. 15-17 for the folia in question ("U 5"), as well as Kresten, "Zu Darrouzès, Regest *N. 2041".

176 For the legends and other annotations inserted by Chortasmenos (AD 1405/6) in the Dioskourides manuscript of Vienna cf. e.g. Hunger, *Johannes Chortasmenos*, pp. 15, 26, 51; Canart/Prato, "Les recueils organisés par Jean Chortasménos", p. 163, pl. 3; the significance of the whole restoration work on this cimelium by our notary has been more recently pointed out by Gamillscheg, "Johannes Chortasmenos als Restaurator des Wiener Dioskurides".

177 Cf. Hunger, *Johannes Chortasmenos*, pp. 14 n. 7, 19: εἶδον δὲ καὶ τὸν Σηλυβρίας τὸν Χορτασμένον, ὃς ἦν τῶν λογίων καὶ τῶν μεγάλων διδασκάλων εἷς, καὶ οἶδα καλῶς ὅτι λίαν.

calligraphic variant, directly connected with the chancery styles employed during the immediately preceding period (e.g. the *Metochitesstil*), was required — for the particular function of the act or for the high patronage in manuscripts — stand as exceptions. Thus, the script of Galesiotes' pupil Holobolos is equally characterized by a high aesthetic level, in the wake of a chancery tradition that had evolved and modernized. And the early attempts of Chortasmenos are also indebted to this tendency derived from the *Metochitesstil*. On the other hand, a graphic variant similar to the so-called *ton Hodegon* style, usually reserved for liturgical codices and scrolls of "pomp and circumstance" — the same style referenced in Chortasmenos' "liturgical script" — is employed, for example, in the lists of the *exarchoi* within the Register of the Patriarchate of Constantinople.[178] And it is precisely Chortasmenos, with his chameleon-like "multigraphism", who represents the point of arrival, between the 14th and 15th centuries, of these phenomena, as well as reflecting the changes that occurred in the hotbed of experimentation that was the patriarchal chancery during the long period examined here.

These three patriarchal scribes also copied manuscripts, and the number of exemplars attributable to them grows with the refinement of palaeographical techniques. Here, I shall limit myself to noting, first of all, their activity in the preparation of so-called "house books" — for Galesiotes the volumes of well-known leading exponents (e.g. Matthew of Ephesos in MS Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vindob. Theol. gr. 174)[179] as well as in private copies (e.g. MS Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 112),[180] for Chortasmenos above all in this latter category (the case of MS Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vindob. Suppl. gr. 75 is particularly instructive);[181] and then their manuscript production under patronage — Galesiotes was asked to create precious and refined exemplars for personalities of the highest rank such as John Kantakouzenos (in the Gregory of Nazianzos MS Mount Athos, Vatopedi Monastery, Vatop. 105, from 1326, in the Basil of Caesarea MS Vatop. 65 and in the Four Gospels MS Vatop. Skeuoph. 17)[182] and the *panhypersebastos* Isaac Palaiologos Asanes, great-uncle of the Emperor John V Palaiologos and perhaps also his *mesazon* (in the Four Gospels MS Mount Sinai, Saint Catherine's Monastery, Sinait. gr. 152, from 1346, commissioned by the influential politician most likely through the good offices of the Patriarch John XIV

178 Canart/Prato, "Les recueils organisés par Jean Chortasménos ", pp. 166-67, pl. 7. On this stylization, which started from the scribes active in the Constantinopolitan monastery *ton Hodegon*, cf. for the cases of the *exarchoi* De Gregorio, "La scrittura greca di età paleologa", pp. 99-100, 116; the contribution of Pérez Martín, "El «estilo Hodegos»" is, by contrast, controversed and problematic.

179 Cf. e.g. De Gregorio, "Καλλιγραφεῖν/ταχυγραφεῖν", pp. 442-44, pl. 9a.

180 Ibid., pp. 444-45, pl. 9b.

181 Cf. Hunger, *Johannes Chortasmenos*, pp. 54-63 et alibi (with 8 pls.); Canart/Prato, "Les recueils organisés par Jean Chortasménos", pp. 120-25 et alibi, pl. 1.

182 Cf. Lamberz, "Johannes Kantakuzenos und die Produktion von Luxushandschriften", pp. 135-38, 140, 142, 146, 148-49, 153, 155-56, figs. 15-17 (and now id., "Beobachtungen zu den patristischen Corpora", where, moreover, the hand of Galesiotes is identified in the Gregory of Nyssa MS Mytilene, Mone Ioannou tou Theologou tou Hypselou 6, which displays the same characteristics of the de luxe manuscripts produced on the initiative of Kantakouzenos; cf. especially ibid., p. 95 with nn. 25-26); Hutter, "Schreiber und Maler der Palaiologenzeit in Konstantinopel", pp. 160 nn. 6 and 9-10, 162 nn. 15-16, 172 n. 55, 179, 182 n. 96, 188 n. 117, figs. 44-45.

Kalekas).[183] Holobolos, by contrast, was employed primarily in volumes prepared in the Patriarchate of Constantinople itself (probably commissioned by Philotheos Kokkinos) and in connection with the Palamite controversy. From my still ongoing census, I shall confine myself to mentioning here only the following two exemplars: MS Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 809, the first part of which was copied by Galesiotes (in the 1350s-1360s) and the second and third parts (1370s), containing hagiographic texts composed by Philotheos Kokkinos and two orations by Palamas himself, by Holobolos;[184] and MS Mount Athos, Vatopedi Monastery, Vatop. 262, which dates from 1369-70 and transmits, among other texts and documents, the complete series of synodal *tomoi* on Palamism (from 1341, 1347 and 1351) and lastly that from 1368 with the condemnation of Prochoros Kydones, also signed by John Holobolos as patriarchal notary.[185]

But in the intellectual life of the Palaeologan age, the fortunes and the influence of these three brilliant bureaucrats — who were in contact with the highest political and religious spheres — are inextricably linked to their professional training in the chancery of the Great Church, the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, which even today in the few relics of the South Gallery of Ayasofya Müzesi (such as the "Marble Door") reveals traces of its charm and vestiges of its ancient splendour.[186]

183 Cf. now De Gregorio, "Un'aggiunta su copisti greci del secolo XIV", esp. pp. 169-84, 192-201, pls. 1, 3.

184 Cf. the contribution announced supra, n. 170.

185 Rigo, "Il Monte Athos e la controversia palamitica", pp. 55-60, 69, 76-77, 134, pls. I, IV. [*Addendum*: Estangüi Gómez, "Pour une étude prosopographique des fonctionnaires", p. 149 seems not to agree with the identification of the scribe with Holobolos. As already stated before (supra, n. 170), I shall return to Holobolos in a study currently under preparation. I just would like to point out here that the two plates provided by Rigo, *pace* Estangüi Gómez, do really show the same hand: the only difference, which a palaeographer would easily recognize, lies in the circumstance that the script displayed in pl. IV (Vatop. 262, fol. 151v) is simply airier and more spacious because this page contains (beginning from line 3, after the chronology) the copy of the subscriptions under the *Tomos* of 1347; *de hoc satis*, at least in the present contribution.]

186 The role of the Great Church on the eve of the Fall of Constantinople has been more recently outlined by Harris, "The Patriarch of Constantinople and the last Days of Byzantium".

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Acta et diplomata, eds. F. Miklosich/I. Müller, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi sacra et profana*, vol. 1, Vienna 1860.

Documents Chilandar, eds. L. Petit/B. Korablev, *Actes de Chilandar. Actes grecs* (Actes de l'Athos, 5/1), Saint Petersburg 1911.

Documents Chilandar, eds. M. Živojinović/V. Kravari/Ch. Giros, *Actes de Chilandar*, vol. 1: *Des origines à 1319* (Archives de l'Athos, 20), Paris 1998.

Documents Iviron, eds. J. Lefort/N. Oikonomidès/D. Papachryssanthou/V. Kravari (avec la collaboration d'H. Métrévéli), *Actes d'Iviron*, vol. 3: *De 1204 à 1328* (Archives de l'Athos, 18), Paris 1994.

Documents Koutloumousiou, ed. P. Lemerle, *Actes de Kutlumus* (Archives de l'Athos, 2), Paris ²1988.

Documents Lavra, eds. P. Lemerle/A. Guillou/N. Svoronos/D. Papachryssanthou, *Actes de Lavra*, vol. 1: *Des origines à 1204* (Archives de l'Athos, 5), Paris 1970; vol. 2: *De 1204 à 1328* (Archives de l'Athos, 8), Paris 1977; vol. 3: *De 1329 à 1500* (Archives de l'Athos, 10), Paris 1979.

Documents Panteleemon, eds. P. Lemerle/G. Dagron/S. Ćircović, *Actes de Saint-Pantéléèmôn* (Archives de l'Athos, 12), Paris 1982.

Documents Patmos, ed. E. Vranussi, *Βυζαντινὰ ἔγγραφα τῆς Μονῆς Πάτμου*, vol. 1: *Αὐτοκρατορικά*, Athens 1980.

Documents Philotheou, eds. W. Regel/E. Kurtz/B. Korablev, *Actes de Philothée* (Actes de l'Athos, 6), Saint Petersburg 1913.

Documents Protaton, ed. D. Papachryssanthou, *Actes du Prôtaton* (Archives de l'Athos, 7), Paris 1975.

Documents Vatopedi, eds. J. Lefort/V. Kravari/Ch. Giros/K. Smyrlis, *Actes de Vatopédi*, vol. 2: *Des 1330 à 1376* (Archives de l'Athos, 22). Paris 2006.

Documents Zographou, eds. W. Regel/E. Kurtz/B. Korablev, *Actes de Zographou* (Actes de l'Athos, 4), Saint Petersburg 1907.

Dogmatic Monuments of the Orthodox Church, ed. I. Karmires, *Τὰ δογματικὰ καὶ συμβολικὰ μνημεῖα τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, 2 vols, Athens ²1960 [repr. Graz 1968].

Dossier Lyon, eds. V. Laurent/J. Darrouzès, *Dossier grec de l'union de Lyon (1273-1277)* (Archives de l'Orient chrétien, 16), Paris 1976.

Ecumenical Councils, eds. G. Alberigo/A. Melloni et al., *Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque decreta. Editio critica*, vol. 4/1: *The Great Councils of the Orthodox Churches. Decisions and Synodika. From Constantinople 861 to Constantinople 1872* (Corpus Christianorum), Turnhout 2016.

George Akropolites, *History*, trans. R. Macrides, *George Akropolites, the History. Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, Oxford 2007.

George/Demetrios Tornikes, *Letters and Orations*, ed. J. Darrouzès, *Georges et Dèmètrios Tornikès. Lettres et discours*, Paris 1970.

George Pachymeres, *History*, ed. A. Failler, *Georges Pachymérès, Relations historiques* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 24), 5 vols., Paris 1984/2000.

Gregory of Cyprus, *Letters*, ed. S. Eustratiades, *Γρηγορίου Κυπρίου οἰκουμενικοῦ Πατριάρχου ἐπιστολαὶ καὶ μῦθοι*, Alexandria 1910.

John VI Kantakouzenos, *History*, ed. L. Schopen, *Ioannis Cantacuzeni ex Imperatoris Historiarum libri IV graece et latine*, 3 vols., (Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae, 41), Bonn 1828/32.

Leo VI the Wise, *Book of the Eparch*, ed. J. Koder, *Das Eparchenbuch Leons des Weisen* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 33), Vienna 1991.

Michael Psellos, *Orations*, ed. G.T. Dennis, *Michaelis Pselli Orationes forenses et acta*, Stuttgart/Leipzig 1994.

Nikephoros Gregoras, *History*, eds. L. Schopen/I. Bekker, *Nicephori Gregorae Byzantina Historia* (Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae, 19), 3 vols., Bonn 1829/55.

Nikephoros Gregoras, *History*, German trans. J.L. van Dieten, *Rhomäische Geschichte. Historia Rhomaike*, 6 vols. (Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur, 4), Stuttgart 1973/2003.

Nikephoros Gregoras, *Opuscules*, ed. P.L.M. Leone, "Nicephori Gregorae Opuscula nunc primum edita", *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Macerata* 3-4 (1970/71), 729-82.

Patriarchal Register, eds. H. Hunger/O. Kresten [vol. 2: H. Hunger/O. Kresten/E. Kislinger/C. Cupane; vol. 3: J. Koder/M. Hinterberger/O. Kresten; Indices: C. Cupane/E. Schiffer], *Das Register des Patriarchats von Konstantinopel*, vol. 1: *Edition und Übersetzung der Urkunden aus den Jahren 1315-1331*; vol. 2: *Edition und Übersetzung der Urkunden aus den Jahren 1337-1350* [+ *Indices zu den Urkunden aus den Jahren 1315-1350*]; vol. 3: *Edition und Übersetzung der Urkunden aus den Jahren 1350-1363* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 19/1-3), Vienna 1981, 1995, 2001; vols. 4 (*Edition und Übersetzung der Urkunden aus den Jahren 1364-1376*) and 5 (*Edition und Übersetzung der Urkunden aus den Jahren 1379-1390*) are announced as forthcoming.

Philotheos Kokkinos, *First Antirrhetic against Nikephoros Gregoras*, ed. D.B. Kaimakes, *Φιλοθέου Κοκκίνου δογματικὰ ἔργα*, vol. 1 (Θεσσαλονικεῖς Βυζαντινοὶ Συγγραφεῖς, 3), Thessaloniki 1983, pp. 25-43.

Pseudo-Kodinos, *On the offices*, ed. & French trans. J. Verpeaux, *Pseudo-Kodinos, Traité des offices* (Le monde byzantin, 1), Paris 1966; ed. & English trans. R. Macrides/J.A. Munitiz/D. Angelov, *Pseudo-Kodinos and the Constantinopolitan Court: Offices and Ceremonies* (Birmingham Byzantine and Ottoman Studies, 15), Farnham 2013.

Theodore Skoutariotes, *Chronicle*, ed. R. Tocci, *Theodori Scutariotae Chronica* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 46), Berlin/Boston 2015.

Secondary Literature

Acerbi, F./D. Bianconi, "L'*Organon* a fisarmonica di Giovanni Cortasmeno", *Segno e testo* 18 (2020), 223-82.

Atsalos B./N. Tsironi (eds.), *Πρακτικά του ΣΤ΄ Διεθνούς Συμποσίου Ελληνικής Παλαιογραφίας (Δράμα, 21-27 Σεπτεμβρίου 2003)* [= *Βιβλιοαμφιάστης – Παράρτημα*, 1], Athens 2008 [2009].

Beck, H.-G., "Der byzantinische Ministerpräsident", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 48 (1955), 309-38.

Berger, A./S. Mariev/G. Prinzing/A. Riehle (eds.), *Koinotaton Doron. Das späte Byzanz zwischen Machtlosigkeit und kultureller Blüte (1204-1461)* (Byzantinisches Archiv, 31), Berlin/Boston 2016.

Beyer, H.-V., "Eine Chronologie der Lebensgeschichte des Nikephoros Gregoras", *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 27 (1978), 127-55.

Bianconi, D., "I libri di Niceforo Gregora. Un aggiornamento", in D'Agostino/Pieralli (eds.), *Φιλόδωρος εὐμενείας*, pp. 29-61.

Id., "Il Laur. Plut. 28.26 ovvero la storia di Bisanzio nella storia di un codice," in M. D'Agostino/P. Degni (eds.), *Alethes philia. Studi in onore di Giancarlo Prato*, 2 vols. (Collectanea, 23), Spoleto 2010, vol. 1, pp. 39-63.

Id., "La biblioteca di Cora tra Massimo Planude e Niceforo Gregora. Una questione di mani", *Segno e testo* 3 (2005), 391-438.

Id., "Sui copisti del Platone Laur. Plut. 59.1 e su altri scribi d'età paleologa. Tra paleografia e prosopografia", in Id./L. Del Corso (eds.), *Oltre la scrittura. Variazioni sul tema per Guglielmo Cavallo* (Dossiers byzantins, 8), Paris 2008, pp. 253-88.

Blanchet, M.-H./M.-H. Congourdeau/D.I. Mureşan (eds.), *Le patriarcat œcuménique de Constantinople et Byzance hors frontières (1204-1586). Actes de la table ronde organisée dans le cadre du 22e Congrès International des Études Byzantines, Sofia, 22-27 août 2011* (Dossiers byzantins, 15), Paris 2014.

Browning, R., *Notes on Byzantine Prooimia* (Wiener Byzantinistische Studien, 1/Suppl.), Vienna 1966.

Burgmann, L., "Chrysobull gleich Privileg? Beobachtungen zur Funktion einer byzantinischen Urkundenform", in B. Dölemeyer/H. Mohnhaupt (eds.), *Das Privileg im europäischen Vergleich*, vol. 1 (Ius commune. Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Europäische Rechtsgeschichte. Sonderhefte. Studien zur Europäische Rechtsgeschichte, 93), Frankfurt am Main 1997, pp. 69-92.

Id./ M.T. Fögen/A. Schminck/D. Simon, *Repertorium der Handschriften des byzantinischen Rechts*, part 1: *Die Handschriften des weltlichen Rechts (Nr. 1–327)* (Forschungen zur byzantinischen Rechtsgeschichte, 20), Frankfurt am Main 1995.

Canart, P./G. Prato, "Les recueils organisés par Jean Chortasménos et le problème de ses autographes", in Hunger (ed.), *Studien zum Patriarchatsregister von Konstantinopel*, vol. 1, pp. 115-78.

Constantinides, C.N., "Byzantine Scholars and the Union of Lyons (1274)", in R. Beaton/C. Roueché (eds.), *The Making of Byzantine History. Studies dedicated to Donald M. Nicol* (Centre for Hellenic Studies, King's College London, Publications, 1), Aldershot 1993, pp. 86-93.

D'Agostino, M./L. Pieralli (eds.), *Φιλόδωρος εὐμενείας. Miscellanea di studi in ricordo di Mons. Paul Canart* (Littera Antiqua 21), Città del Vaticano 2021.

D'Aiuto, F., "Note ai manoscritti del Menologio Imperiale. I. Un monogramma nel Menologio di Mosca", *Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici* N. S. 39 (2002), 189-228.

Darrouzès, J., *Le registre synodal du patriarcat byzantin au XIVe siècle. Étude paléographique et diplomatique* (Archives de l'Orient chrétien, 12), Paris 1971.

Id., *Les regestes des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople I. Les actes des patriarches*, vol. 5: *Les regestes de 1310 à 1376*, Paris 1977.

Id., *Recherches sur les ὀφφίκια de l'Église byzantine* (Archives de l'Orient chretien, 11), Paris 1970.

De Gregorio, G., "Epigrammi e documenti. Poesia come fonte per la storia di chiese e monasteri bizantini", in C. Gastgeber/O. Kresten (eds.), *Sylloge Diplomatico-Palaeographica. Studien zur byzantinischen Diplomatik und Paläographie I* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften, 392 = Veröffentlichungen zur Byzanzforschung, 19), Vienna 2010, pp. 9-134.

Id., "Filone Alessandrino tra Massimo Planude e Giorgio Bullotes. A proposito dei codici Vindob. Suppl. gr. 50, Vat. Urb. gr. 125 e Laur. Plut. 10, 23", in C. Brockmann/D. Deckers/L. Koch/S. Valente (eds.), *Handschriften- und Textforschung heute. Festschrift zu Ehren von Dieter Harlfinger* (Serta Graeca, 30), Wiesbaden 2014, pp. 177-230.

Id., "Καλλιγραφεῖν/ταχυγραφεῖν. Qualche riflessione sull'educazione grafica di scribi bizantini", in E. Condello/Id. (eds.), *Scribi e colofoni. Le sottoscrizioni di copisti dalle origini all'avvento della stampa. Atti del seminario di Erice - X Colloquio del Comité international de paléographie latine (23-28 ottobre 1993)* (Biblioteca del "Centro per il collegamento degli studi medievali e umanistici in Umbria", 14), Spoleto 1995, pp. 423-48.

Id., "La scrittura greca di età paleologa (secoli XIII-XIV). Un panorama", in F. Magistrale (ed.), *Scrittura memoria degli uomini. In ricordo di Giuliana Cannataro (Lezioni tenute presso la Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università degli Studi, Bari, 3 maggio 2004)*, Bari 2006, pp. 81-138.

Id., "Un'aggiunta su copisti greci del secolo XIV: a proposito di Giovanni Duca Malace, collaboratore di Giorgio Galesiota nell'*Athen. EBE* 2", *Nea Rhome* 16 (2019), 161-276.

Id. "Una lista di commemorazioni di defunti dalla Costantinopoli della prima età paleologa. Note storiche e prosopografiche sul *Vat. Ross.* 169", *Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici* N. S. 38 (2001), 103-94.

Dold, A., *Das Geheimnis einer byzantinischen Staatsurkunde aus dem Jahre 1351*, Beuron in Hohenzollern 1958.

Dölger, F., *Byzantinische Diplomatik. 20 Aufsätze zum Urkundenwesen der Byzantiner*, Ettal 1956.

Id., "Der Kodikellos des Christodulos in Palermo. Ein bisher unerkannter Typus der byzantinischen Kaiserurkunden", in *Archiv für Urkundenforschung* 11 (1929), 1-65 (repr. id., *Byzantinische Diplomatik*, pp. 1-74).

Id., "Die Kaiserurkunde der Byzantiner als Ausdruck ihrer politischen Anschauungen", *Historische Zeitschrift* 159 (1938/1939), 229-250 (repr. id., *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt. Ausgewählte Vorträge und Aufsätze*, Ettal 1953 [Darmstadt ²1964], pp. 9-33).

Id., "Ein byzantinisches Staatsdokument in der Universitätsbibliothek Basel: Ein Fragment des Tomos des Jahres 1351", *Historisches Jahrbuch* 72 (1953), 205-21 (repr. id., *Byzantinische Diplomatik*, pp. 245-61, pls. XXIV-XXV).

Id., *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches von 565-1453*, vol. 4: *Regesten von 1282-1341*, Munich/Berlin 1960.

Id./J. Karayannopulos, *Byzantinische Urkundenlehre 1. Die Kaiserurkunden*. (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, XII.3.1.1.), Munich 1968.

Id./P. Wirth, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches von 565-1453*, vol. 3: *Regesten von 1204-1282*, Munich ²1977.

Id./P. Wirth, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches von 565-1453*, vol. 5: *Regesten von 1341-1453*, Munich/Berlin 1965.

Estangüi Gómez, R., "Pour une étude prosopographique des fonctionnaires de la chancellerie patriarcale: la carrière du secrétaire Iôannes Chrysoképhalos Holobôlos", in O. Delouis/K. Smyrlis (eds.), *Lire les Archives de l'Athos. Actes du colloque réuni à Athènes du 18 au 20 novembre 2015 à l'occasion des 70 ans de la collection refondée par Paul Lemerle* (Travaux et mémoires, 23/2), Paris 2019, pp. 111-84.

Failler, A., "Chronologie et composition dans l'Histoire de Georges Pachymère [III] (livres VII-XIII)", *Revue des Études Byzantines* 48 (1990), 5-87.

Fisher, E.A., "Manuel Holobolos and the Role of Bilinguals in Relations between the West and Byzantium", in A. Speer/P. Steinkrüger (eds.), *Knotenpunkt Byzanz. Wissensformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen* (Miscellanea Mediaevalia, 36), Berlin/Boston 2012, pp. 210-22.

Gamillscheg, E., "Johannes Chortasmenos als Restaurator des Wiener Dioskurides", *Biblos* 55/2 (2006), 35-40.

Gastgeber, C., "Changes in Documents of the Byzantine Chancery in contact with the West (Michael VIII and Andronikos II Palaiologos). Language, Material, and Address", in N. Drocourt/É. Malamut (eds.), *La diplomatie byzantine, de l'Empire romain aux confins de l'Europe (Ve-XVe s.). Actes de la Table-Ronde « Les relations diplomatiques byzantines (Ve-XVe siècle): Permanences et/ou changements », XXIIIe Congrès International des Études byzantines – Belgrade, Août 2016* (The Medieval Mediterranean. Peoples, Economies and Cultures, 400-1500, 123), Leiden/Boston 2020, pp. 175-272 (Chapt. 7).

Id., "Das Formular der Patriarchatskanzlei", in Gastgeber/Mitsiou/Preiser-Kapeller/Zervan, *Patriarchate*, pp. 197-302.

Id., "Das Patriarchatsregister als Spiegel der Religionspolitik: Registerführung unter dem Palamiten Isidoros I. (1347-1350), in Blanchet/Congourdeau/Mureşan (eds.), *Le patriarcat œcuménique de Constantinople et Byzance hors frontières (1204-1586)*, pp. 99-131.

Id., "Diplomatics of the Patriarchate of Constantinople: The State of Research on Byzantine Documents of the Patriarchs of Constantinople", in Id./E. Mitsiou/J. Preiser-

Kapeller/V. Zervan (eds.), *A Companion to the Patriarchate of Constantinople* (Brill's Companions to the Byzantine World, 9), Leiden/Boston 2021, pp. 246-85 (Chapt. 13).

Id., "Rhetorik in der Patriarchatskanzlei von Konstantinopel", in Gastgeber/Mitsiou/Preiser-Kapeller, *Register*, pp. 175-97.

Id./E. Mitsiou/J. Preiser-Kapeller (eds.), *The Register of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. An Essential Source for the History and Church of Late Byzantium. Proceedings of the International Symposium, Vienna, 5th - 9th May 2009* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften, 457 = Veröffentlichungen zur Byzanzforschung, 32), Vienna 2013.

Id./E. Mitsiou/J. Preiser-Kapeller/V. Zervan (eds.), *The Patriarchate of Constantinople in Context and Comparison. Proceedings of the International Conference Vienna, September 12th–15th 2012. In memoriam Kontsantinos Pitsakis (1944–2012) and Andreas Schminck (1947–2015)* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften, 502 = Veröffentlichungen zur Byzanzforschung, 41), Vienna 2017.

Guilland, R., "Les logothètes. Études sur l'histoire administrative de l'Empire byzantin", *Revue des Études Byzantines* 29 (1971), 5-115.

Harlfinger, D., "Autographa aus der Palaiologenzeit", in Seibt (ed.), *Geschichte und Kultur der Palaiologenzeit*, pp. 43-50.

Id./M. Sicherl et al., *Griechische Handschriften und Aldinen. Eine Ausstellung anläßlich der XV. Tagung der Mommsen-Gesellschaft in der Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel* (Ausstellungskataloge der Herzog August Bibliothek, 24), Wolfenbüttel-Braunschweig 1978.

Harris, J., "The Patriarch of Constantinople and the last Days of Byzantium", in Gastgeber/Mitsiou/Preiser-Kapeller/Zervan, *Patriarchate*, pp. 9-16.

Hieronymus, F., *Griechischer Geist aus Basler Pressen* (Publikationen der Universitätsbibliothek Basel, 15), Basel 1992.

Hunger, H., "Amtsmißbrauch im Patriarchat von Konstantinopel um die Mitte des 14. Jahrhunderts: Der Megas Chartophylax Ioannes Amparis", *Illinois Classical Studies* 18 (1993), 335-44.

Id., "Das Patriarchatsregister von Konstantinopel als Spiegel byzantinischer Verhältnisse im 14. Jahrhundert", *Anzeiger der philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 115 (1978), 117-36.

Id., "Die Exarchenlisten des Patriarchen Kallistos I. im Patriarchatsregister von Konstantinopel", in J. Chrysostomides (ed.), *Καθηγήτρια. Essays presented to Joan Hussey for her 80th Birthday*, Camberley/Surrey 1988, pp. 431-80.

Id., *Johannes Chortasmenos (ca. 1370-ca. 1436/37). Briefe, Gedichte und kleine Schriften. Einleitung, Regesten, Prosopographie, Text* (Wiener Byzantinistische Studien, 7), Vienna 1969.

Id., *Prooimion. Elemente der byzantinischen Kaiseridee in den Arengen der Urkunden* (Wiener Byzantinistische Studien, 1), Vienna 1964.

Id., "Schriftästhetik in den drei originalen kaiserlichen Auslandsschreiben der Komnenenzeit", *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 40 (1998), 187-96.

Id. (ed.), *Studien zum Patriarchatsregister von Konstantinopel*, 2 vols. Vienna 1981/1997.

Id., "Zum Stil und zur Sprache des Patriarchatsregisters von Konstantinopel. Rhetorik im Dienste der orthodoxen Hierarchie", in id. (ed.), *Studien zum Patriarchatsregister von Konstantinopel*, vol. 1, pp. 11-60.

Id., "Zur scheinbaren Nonchalance der Kanzleisprache des Patriarchatsregisters. Verschleierung, Absicherung und Ironie in Urkunden des Patriarchats von Konstantinopel", in id. (ed.), *Studien zum Patriarchatsregisters von Konstantinopel*, vol. 2, pp. 11-43.

Id./I. Ševčenko, *Des Nikephoros Blemmydes Βασιλικὸς Ἀνδριάς und dessen Metaphrase von Georgios Galesiotes und Georgios Oinaiotes. Ein weiterer Beitrag zum Verständnis der byzantinischen Schrift-Koine (*Wiener Byzantinistische Studien, 18), Vienna 1986.

Hutter, I., "Schreiber und Maler der Palaiologenzeit in Konstantinopel", in Atsalos/Tsironi, *Πρακτικά*, pp. 159-90.

Karayannopulos, J., "Zu den «διά-Vermerken» der byzantinischen Kaiserurkunden", in G. De Gregorio/O. Kresten (eds.), *Documenti medievali greci e latini. Studi comparativi, Atti del seminario di Erice (23-29 ottobre 1995)* (Incontri di studio, 1), Spoleto 1998, pp. 203-32.

Kourouses, S.I., "Ὁ λόγιος οἰκουμενικὸς πατριάρχης Ἰωάννης ΙΓ' ὁ Γλυκύς (Συναγωγὴ εἰδήσεων καὶ ἀνέκδοτα αὐτοῦ ἔργα)", *Ἐπετηρὶς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν* 41 (1974), 297-405.

Kresten, O., "Der sogenannte „Absetzungsvermerk" des Patriarchen Ioannes XIV. Kalekas im Patriarchatsregister von Konstantinopel (Cod. Vind. hist. gr. 47, f. 116v)", in W. Hörandner/J. Koder/Id./E. Trapp (eds.), *Βυζάντιος. Festschrift für Herbert Hunger zum 70. Geburtstag*, Vienna 1984, pp. 213-19.

Id., "Fünf nachgezeichnete Metropolitenunterschriften aus der ersten Amtsperiode des Patriarchen Philotheos Kokkinos im Patriarchatsregister von Konstantinopel", *Österreichische Osthefte* 33 (1991), 167-200.

Id., "Μηνολόγημα. Anmerkungen zu einem byzantinischen Unterfertigungstyp", *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 102 (1994), 1-52.

Id., "Zu Darrouzès, Regest *N. 2041. Beobachtungen zum Beginn des ersten Bandes des Patriarchatsregisters von Konstantinopel (Cod. Vind. hist. gr. 47) und zu dessen Abschrift im Cod. Vat. Urb. gr. 80", in Hunger (ed.), *Studien zum Patriarchatsregister von Konstantinopel*, vol. 1, pp. 85-113.

Id., "Zur Datierung, zum Schreiber und zum politischen Hintergrund dreier Urkunden des Kaisers Andronikos III. Palaologos für das Serbenkloster Chilandariu", *Anzeiger der philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 130 (1993), 67-99.

Laiou, A.E., "The Correspondence of Gregorios Kyprios as a Source for the History of Social and Political Behaviour in Byzantium or, on Government by Rhetoric", in Seibt (ed.), *Geschichte und Kultur der Palaiologenzeit*, pp. 91-108.

Lamberz, E., "Beobachtungen zu den patristischen Corpora in der Schenkung des Johannes Kantakuzenos an das Kloster Vatopedi und ihren Vorlagen", in Berger/Mariev/Prinzing/Riehle (eds.), *Koinotaton Doron*, pp. 87-99.

Id., "Das Geschenk des Kaisers Manuel II. an das Kloster Saint-Denis und der ‚Metochitesschreiber' Michael Klostomalles", in B. Borkopp/T. Steppan (eds.), *Λιθόστρωτον. Studien zur byzantinischen Kunst und Geschichte. Festschrift für Marcell Restle*, Stuttgart 2000, pp. 155-65.

Id., "Georgios Bullotes, Michael Klostomalles und die byzantinische Kaiserkanzlei unter Andronikos II. und Andronikos III. in den Jahren 1298-1329", in B. Mondrain (ed.), *Lire et écrire à Byzance. XX^e Congrès International des Études Byzantines, 19-25 août 2001.* [*Actes de la*] *Table ronde*, (Collège de France – CNRS. Centre de recherche d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance. Monographies, 19), Paris 2006, pp. 33-64.

Id., "Johannes Kantakuzenos und die Produktion von Luxushandschriften in Konstantinopel in der frühen Palaiologenzeit", in Atsalos/Tsironi, *Πρακτικά*, pp. 133-57.

Laurent, V., *Les regestes des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople, I. Les actes des patriarches*, vol. 4: *Les regestes de 1208 à 1309*, Paris 1971.

Id., "Les signataires du second concile des Blakhernes (Été 1285)", *Échos d'Orient* 26 (1927), 129-49.

Mazal, O., *Die Prooimien der byzantinischen Patriarchenurkunden* (Byzantina Vindobonensia, 7), Vienna 1974.

Moniou, D.I., *Γεώργιος Μοσχάμπαρ, ένας ἀνθενωτικὸς θεολόγος τῆς πρώιμης Παλαιολόγειας περιόδου. Βίος καὶ ἔργο*, Athens 2011.

Mošin, V.A./S.M. Traljić, *Vodeni znakovi XIII. i XIV. vijeka* [= *Filigranes des XIII^e et XIV^e ss.*], I-II, Zagreb 1957.

Müller, A., "Weder Klostomalles noch Babiskomites: Beobachtungen zur Schreiberhand von DR 2684 und DR 2775", in Berger/Mariev/Prinzing/Riehle (eds.), *Koinotaton Doron*, pp. 115-23.

Oikonomidès, N., "La chancellerie impériale de Byzance du 13^e au 15^e siècle", *Revue des Études Byzantines* 43 (1985), 167-95.

Papadakis, A., *Crisis in Byzantium. The* Filioque *Controversy in the Patriarchate of Gregory II of Cyprus (1283-1289)*, Crestwood/N.Y. ²1997.

Papatriantaphyllou-Theodoridi, N., *Ἡ χειρόγραφη παράδοση τῶν ἔργων τοῦ Νικηφόρου Χούμνου (1250/55-1327)* (Ἀριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης. Ἐπιστημονικὴ Ἐπετηρίδα τῆς Φιλοσοφικῆς Σχολῆς, Παρ. 32), Thessaloniki 1984.

Pérez Martín, I., "El «estilo Hodegos» y su proyección en las escrituras constantinopolitanas", in Atsalos/Tsironi (eds.), *Πρακτικά*, pp. 71-130.

Ead., *El patriarca Gregorio de Chipre (*ca. *1240-1290) y la transmisión de los textos clásicos en Bizancio* (Nueva Roma, 1), Madrid 1996.

Pieralli, L.,"Gli originali copiati da due notai attivi presso la cancelleria patriarcale costantinopolitana del XIV sec.: Giovanni Holobolos ed il copista C del patriarca Matteo", in D'Agostino/Id. (eds.), *Φιλόδωρος εὐμενείας*, pp. 591-614.

Id., "I «protocolli» delle riunioni sinodali (*Regestes*, no 1549, 1567, 3424 [= 2352a])", in Blanchet/Congourdeau/Mureşan (eds.), *Le patriarcat œcuménique de Constantinople et Byzance hors frontières (1204-1586)*, pp. 133-57.

Id., *La corrispondenza diplomatica dell'imperatore bizantino con le potenze estere nel XIII secolo (1204-1282). Studio storico-diplomatistico ed edizione critica* (Collectanea Archivi Vaticani, 54), Vatican City 2006.

Id., "Le scritture dei documenti imperiali del XIII secolo", in G. Prato (ed.), *I manoscritti greci tra riflessione e dibattito. Atti del V Colloquio internazionale di Paleografia greca (Cremona, 4-10 ottobre 1998)* (Papyrologica Florentina, 31), Florence 2000.

Id., "Un imperatore di Bisanzio a Roma: la professione di fede di Giovanni V Paleologo", in M.-H. Blanchet/F. Gabriel (eds.), *L'Union à l'épreuve du formulaire. Professions de foi entre Églises d'Orient et d'Occident (XIIIe-XVIIIe s.)* (Collège de France – CNRS. Centre de recherche d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance. Monographies, 51), Leuven/Paris/Bristol 2016, pp. 97-144.

Prato, G., "I manoscritti greci dei secoli XIII e XIV: note paleografiche", in D. Harlfinger/Id. (eds.), *Paleografia e codicologia greca. Atti del II Colloquio internazionale (Berlino - Wolfenbüttel, 17-21 ottobre 1983)* (Biblioteca di Scrittura e Civiltà, 3), Alessandria 1991, pp. 131-49.

Prinzing, G., "Konvergenz und Divergenz zwischen dem Patriarchatsregister und den *Ponemata Diaphora* des Demetrios Chomatenos von Achrida/Ohrid", in Gastgeber/Mitsiou/Preiser-Kapeller, *Register*, pp. 9-32.

Rigo, A., "Il Monte Athos e la controversia palamitica dal Concilio del 1351 al *Tomo* sinodale del 1368. Giacomo Trikanas, Procoro Cidone e Filoteo Kokkinos", in id. (ed.), *Gregorio Palamas e oltre. Studi e documenti sulle controversie teologiche del XIV secolo bizantino* (Orientalia Venetiana, 16), Florence 2004, pp. 1-177.

Id., *1347: Isidoro patriarca di Costantinopoli e il breve sogno dell'inizio di una nuova epoca* (Wiener Byzantinistische Studien, 31), Vienna 2020.

Salomon, R.G., "A Papyrus from Constantinople (Hamburg Inv. No. 410)", *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 34 (1948), 98-108 (with pl. XVIII).

Samara, D., *Θεόδωρος Μουζάλων. Ἡ ζωὴ καὶ τὸ συγγραφικὸ ἔργο ἑνὸς λογίου τοῦ 13ου αἰώνα* (Βυζαντινά Κείμενα και Μελέτες, 64), Thessaloniki 2018.

Schminck, A., "Wörtliche Zitate des weltlichen und kirchlichen Rechts im Register des Patriarchats von Konstantinopel", in Gastgeber/Mitsiou/Preiser-Kapeller, *Register*, pp. 235-43.

Seibt, W. (ed.), *Geschichte und Kultur der Palaiologenzeit. Referate des Internationalen Symposions zu Ehren von Herbert Hunger (Wien, 30. November bis 3. Dezember 1994)* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften, 241 = Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Byzantinistik, 8), Vienna 1996.

Ševčenko, I., *La vie intellectuelle et politique à Byzance sous les premiers Paléologues: Études sur la polémique entre Théodore Métochite et Nicéphore Choumnos* (Corpus Bruxellense Historiae Byzantinae. Subsidia, 3), Brussels 1962.

Id., "Some Autographs of Nicephorus Gregoras", *Zbornik Radova Vizantološkog Instituta* 8/2 (1964), 435-50 (repr. id., *Society and Intellectual Life in Late Byzantium* [Variorum Collected Studies Series, 137], London 1981, no XII).

Id., "Theodore Metochites, the Chora and the Intellectual Trends of His Time", in P.A. Underwood (ed.), *The Kariye Djami, vol. 4: Studies in the Art of the Kariye Djami and Its Intellectual Background* (Bollingen Series, 70), Princeton 1975, pp. 17-91.

Silvano, L., "L'origine dello scisma in un dialogo di Giorgio Moschampar", *Porphyra* 6, 13/2 (2009), 13-23.

Id., "Per l'edizione della «Disputa tra un ortodosso e un latinofrone seguace di Becco sulla processione dello Spirito Santo» di Giorgio Moschampar. Con un inedito di Bonaventura Vulcanius", *Medioevo greco* 14 (2014), 229-65.

Smyrlis, K., "Priesterhood and Empire: Ecclesiastical Wealth and Privilege under the early Palaiologoi", in Gastgeber/Mitsiou/Preiser-Kapeller/Zervan, *Patriarchate*, pp. 95-103.

Stavrou, M., "Une réévaluation du *Tomos* du Deuxième Concile des Blachernes (1285): commentaire, tradition textuelle, édition critique et traduction", in Gastgeber/Mitsiou/Preiser-Kapeller/Zervan, *Patriarchate*, pp. 47-93.

Talbot, A.-M., "The Restoration of Constantinople under Michael VIII", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 47 (1993), 243-61.

Thomas, J./A. Constantinides Hero/G. Constable (eds.), *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents. A Complete Translation of the Surviving Founders'* Typika *and Testaments*, 5 vols. (Dumbarton Oaks Studies, 35/1-5), Washington D.C. 2000.

Trapp, E. (ed.), *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität besonders des 9.-12. Jahrhunderts* (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Byzantinistik VI/1–8), 8 vols., Vienna 1994/2017.

Verpeaux, J., "Le cursus honorum de Théodore Métochite", *Revue des Études Byzantines* 18 (1960), 195-98.

Id., *Nicéphore Choumnos, homme d'état et humaniste (ca 1250/1255-1327)*, Paris 1959.

Zorzi, N., "Lettori bizantini della «Bibliotheca» di Fozio: marginalia del Marc. gr. 450", *Syculorum Gymnasium* N. S. 57 (2004) (= *Atti del VI Congresso Nazionale dell'Associazione Italiana di Studi Bizantini*), 829-44.