

# Andrzej Kompa, Mirosław J. Leszka

---

"Сенат и сенаторская аристократия Константинополя. IV - первая половина VII века", А. А. Чекалова, Москва 2010 : [recenzja]

---

Studia Ceranea : journal of the Waldemar Ceran Research Centre for the History and Culture of the Mediterranean Area and South-East Europe 2, 249-254

---

2012

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej [bazhum.muzhp.pl](http://bazhum.muzhp.pl), gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

Cela est manifestement une caractéristique positive de son discours, mais il faut tenir compte du choix relativement restreint de la littérature. Quand il en vient à l'historiographie, il faut noter qu'Iliev en connaissance de cause et à juste titre, ignore autant que possible de l'ainsi nommée historiographie «Macédonienne», qui dans sa majeure partie est purement spéculative, idéologisée et politisée, et qui en pratique n'a que peu en commun avec la recherche.

À la fin du livre, est placée de nouveau la nouvelle traduction en bulgare contemporain de la *Vie de Clément d'Ohrid* par Théophylacte,

réalisée par I. Iliev, qui, ici en fait une réimpression en se basant sur des sources Grecques concernant l'histoire de la Bulgarie. Est également présente une traduction de la courte biographie de Clément par Démétrius Chomatenus, qui a été faite au temps d'Alexandre Milev, dans son communiqué de 1966, qui est depuis longtemps déjà une rareté bibliographique. Le livre s'achève avec une bibliographie, un résumé ainsi qu'une traduction en anglais de ce dernier.

*Dimo Češmedžiev (Plovdiv–Sofia)*

### **А.А. ЧЕКАЛОВА, *Сенат и сенаторская аристократия Константинополя IV первая половина VII века*, Наука, Москва 2010, pp. 338.**

Aleksandra Alekseevna Čekalova, a Russian byzantinist, is a scholar of distinctive achievements and extensive bibliography. Among her scientific interests, the functions and the role of the Constantinopolitan senate have been a major focus for decades, resulting in a stream of articles<sup>1</sup>, a unique reference book for students<sup>2</sup>, and last but not least the book presented here, the coping stone of the many-years research. Some of the findings presented in the book have been perforce known to the admirers of the late Antiquity and Byzantium for some time, now they are placed in a new, broader context, coherently showing the matter and enriched in many contents previously omitted. The whole concept is obviously commendable, albeit in some places prone to the polemics; it will give a tone to the discussion on the senate,

the early Byzantine society and the institutional framework of its elite.

In the first, introductory chapter *От Восточной Римской империи к Византии* (*From the East Roman Empire to Byzantium*, p. 15–62) the Author outlines a historical panorama of the eastern part of Imperium Romanum from Constantine the Great up to Heraclius, centered on the processes in the constitutional, religious, social and economical spheres that lead together to the birth of the Byzantine empire. Data assembled in this fragment form a solid and convenient background to the further disquisitions.

Chapter II, *Возникновение сената и сенаторского сословия Константинополя* (*Origins of the Senate and Senatorial Order of Constantinople*, p. 63–80) is devoted to the forming processes and genesis of the senatorial group of the Byzantine empire. Čekalova is yet another author who refutes the claims that it evolved from the milieu of the senatorial hereditary aristocracy of Rome. She expresses a view – and elaborates it on in the further parts of the book – that the members of the Constantinopolitan *curia* originated mainly from the eastern Roman administrative and official circles, with a special place for the personages from the closest entourage of the emperors. Such a policy of recruitment was implemented by Constantine the Great, and

<sup>1</sup> Е.г. *Константинопольский сенат и словесие куриалов в IV в.*, ВВ 53, 1992, p. 20–35; *Патрикиат в ранней Византии*, ВВ 57, 1997, p. 32–44; *Сенаторская знать ранней Византии: стиль жизни, стиль мышления*, АДСВ 33, 2002, p. 12–20.

<sup>2</sup> *У истоков византийской государственности: сенат и сенаторская Аристократия Константинополя IV первой половины VII в. Учебное пособие*, Москва 2007, pp. 257.

then by his son and heir, Constantius II, who greatly contributed to the further development of the Constantinopolitan senate in its quantity and prestige.

In the chapter *Титулы и должности (Official Status and Titles*, p. 81–119) the Author explores a topic inseparably bound up with the very concept of the early Byzantine senatorship – the offices held by the members of the *sygkletos*, and the honorific titles they were entitled to use. Her deliberations revolve around the preture, consulship, patriciate and the ranks of *clarissimus*, *spectabilis*, *illustris* etc., with the differences in the East and in the West legitimately underlined, and the conclusion that in the Eastern part the titles of the senators were predominantly connected with their status in the military and bureaucratic central apparatus of the state, and in the imperial court.

The next, fourth chapter of the book, *Курiales и интеллектуалы в сенате Константинополя (Curiales and Intellectuals In the Senate of Constantinople*, p. 120–143), seems to be of special importance to the overall conclusions of the Author. It is a comprehensive attempt at applying the prosopographical methods to verify the social composition of the senate. Among 688 individuals potentially entering the *sygkletos* in the period of its creation, Čekalova identifies only some 40 *curiales*, with 13 examples she claims such provenience dubious, what entitles her to question an opinion on the significant role of this stratum among all the senators. Meticulously enlisted doubts of many sorts, multifaceted categorising, and the analyses of the model personal cases, let the Author to perform a disintegration of the group: 35 from the whole forty were adlected into the senate due to their service for the emperor or in the provincial administration, and from the latter part, 27 provincial officials must have spent a majority of their service outside the capital and, necessarily, exercised a minimal influence on the Constantinopolitan *curia* while in office (still the more later, as there are barely 18 individuals of similar social origins). With these reservations, Čekalova discerns a certain indirect impact of the *curiales* on the senate, being actually an influence on the new nobility due to a reason-

able matrimonial policy, and above all in close relations with the intellectuals, who similarly as *curiales* shared and transplanted their traditions and the ancient system of values.

In the institution socially, geographically and ethnically variegated, as the Author perceives the Constantinopolitan senate (p. 130), she distinguishes a notable intellectual substratum, composed in major part from the rhetors, the professions, etc. (she adds the 172 professional men of letters up to the 40 *curiales* against a background of total number of 688 senators identified in sources; taking into account an incomplete historical data, she treats the members of the both amalgamated groups as the vast majority of the senators). This overall group is than analysed and characterised, with a special focus on interpersonal and structural relations with the military and bureaucratic elite of the empire. The rationale for the trend to elevate the intellectuals to the senatorial dignities Čekalova perceives in the high esteem, in which intellectual qualities and education were traditionally held in the East from the classical era, as well as in the intentional policy of the emperors, from Constantine the Great and Constantius II onwards. She describes in detail the bureaucratic careers of the *literati*, from the humble beginnings to the peak in the highest functions in the imperial administration (*quaestor sacri palatii*, *magister officiorum*, *praefectus praetorium*, *praefectus urbis*) – both through the representative examples (e.g. Flavius Eutolmius Tatianus, Aurelianus PPO 399, 414–415, Cyrus of Panopolis), and through generalisation. A separate place in the chapter is reserved for the remarks about the influence of the intellectuals on the elite's attitudes towards education as a value, about the patronage of the higher officials over the poets, rhetors, philosophers, and about the impact of the most renown rhetors on the creation of the elite and the composition of the senate via protection and recommendation (here esp. the example of Libanius). As the Author claims with emphasis and, perhaps, exaggeration, the professional men of letters entangled the bureaucratic machine of the early Byzantium with the invisible threads of their friendships, and they virtually took control of it (p. 142). Interestingly

enough, she notices also the reverse tendency: the influence of the military and political elite of the empire on the intellectual circles, what was expressed by the etatisation of the cultural elite's views, with the centre of gravity transferred from a polis and the maternal city to the imperial service.

Fifth text in the order, *Родственные и дружеские связи как фактор стабильности сенаторского сословия Константинополя* (*Blood and Friendly Ties as Factors for Stability In the Senatorial Order*, p. 144–151), although relatively concise, supplements the previous disquisitions and forms an important gloss, that stresses the role of the interpersonal relations and the microstructures in creating the stable mechanisms and frameworks of existence of the social elites. It suggests additional arguments for the thesis on the social mobility through the groups of the eastern Roman society. Although the senatorial dynasties *sui generis* existed indeed, the senatorial dignity was not inherited, but acquired simultaneously with the function in the imperial administration. Thus, equally important for the wealthy families to maintain their status and position were horizontal relations of kin, in-laws and friendships, also exploited to exalt the descendants' position. This observation is documented by the Author in every case with the examples found in the sources; a cluster of some twenty families of nobility, closely related and connected with each other and, differently from the Western pattern, also with the imperial families, is shown as a crucial example. Senatorial dynasticism, perhaps a little overestimated by the Author (as it concerned a very small bunch of houses in fact), the existent social instinct of self-preservation, and on the other hand the above-mentioned mobility and facile social advances of individuals, activity of the emperors – all these factors altogether contributed to the senatorial medley of the members of the influential bureaucratic families and the Byzantine *homines novi*.

Chapter VI, *Характер сенаторской собственности в IV – первой половине VII века* (*The Wealth of the Senators in 4<sup>th</sup> – First Half of 7<sup>th</sup> Century*, p. 152–168) discusses the problem of the economic assets of the Constantinopolitan senators. Although prosopographical research

allowed to identify 2742 senators between 5<sup>th</sup> and the first half of the 7<sup>th</sup> century, only 262 members of the group can be, less rather than more precisely, analysed with regard to their wealth and possessions. Data reviewed by Čekalova allows her to stress that in comparison with the Roman senators, their Constantinopolitan counterparts possessed the premises in the vicinity of towns, houses inside the towns and monetary supply. Senatorial aristocracy of Constantinople could not equate in wealth with those of Rome, although men of fortune were not rare (e.g. Belisarius); Eastern senators are called here 'the urban aristocracy'.

Fragment *Роль сената в государстве и обществе* (*Political Role of the Senate in the State and Society*, p. 169–211), relying on the earlier texts, depicts the role of the senate in the political life of the Byzantine empire. The Author fixes her attention on the share of the senate in the election (designation) of the new monarch, and of the legitimising of the imperial decisions. She develops her views on the decisive part of the senatorial group in the Byzantine society, pointing at, among others, philanthropy and financing of the public edifices. Discussion on the activities of Anicia Juliana, member of the highly esteemed senatorial *gens Anicii*, is of particular interest.

While the above-described parts of the book were designed, altogether, to point out the characteristic features and differences of the *higher social class of the early Byzantium – the senatorial aristocracy of Constantinople* (p. 212), the last eighth chapter *Представление о знатности у современников* (*Concept of Nobility in Early Byzantium*, p. 212–246) touches upon the more general matters, connected not so much with institutional and administrative development, as with history of historiography and social mentality of the early Byzantines – these are, first and foremost, the concepts of nobility and main reasons and circumstances for gaining and maintaining the privileged social positions in late Antiquity – according to the historical sources rather than the present literature. The text, based on the previous findings and publications of A.A. Čekalova, acquires now a new, wider context. The Author explored the oeuvres

of the early Byzantine intellectuals (especially Ammianus Marcellinus, Libanius, Eunapius, Themistius, John Chrysostom, Synesius, Theodore, the hagiography, Zosimus, John of Lydia, John Malalas, Procopius) and raised here many threads, but the problem of competition and interaction between the three elements: birth, education and actual power (state functions) as possible decisive factors returns as leitmotiv over and over again. A review of the views helps in identifying a changeability of the attitudes towards Constantinople and careers in the city (critical in Eunapius or Libanius, affirmative in Themistius or John the Lydian). Valuable are also the Author's opinions on the semantic shifts in terms, titles and honorific styles denoting the social rank (*eugeneís, eupatrides, hoi ek sygklétou boulés, epifanéstatoi, sou megaloprepéia, hoi en télei* etc.). Here again, thanks to this book, a reader is able not only to follow through the views and ideas in their evolution owing much to the rhythm of social transformations and gradual growth of the centralised empire's administrative apparatus, but he can also experience the individual differences, relying not only on the social conditions, but also on the *Weltanschauung* of the respective thinkers.

The chapters are supplemented by the introduction (*Введение*, p. 5–14), the final remarks (*Заключение*, p. 247–250) and the bibliography (p. 288–308), list of abbreviations (p. 309–311), the English summary (p. 312–323; only part of the chapters included), the index of names (p. 324–339). The importance of the much extended annexes (p. 251–287: *List of the Senators of Constantinople; Intellectuals in the Senate of Constantinople; Curiales in the Senate of Constantinople; Roman Aristocrats in the Senate of Constantinople*) should not escape the readers' attention, as they document the prosopographical findings, on which much of the original opinions of the Author is based; alas, the annexes cover only the 4<sup>th</sup> century.

The book discussed forms an *ergon* mature and original; the Russian byzantinist by means of multi-faceted analysis of source material and careful usage of modern scholarship gives the readers a thorough image of the Constantinopolitan senate and the senators between 4<sup>th</sup>

and 7<sup>th</sup> century. Aleksandra Čekalova perfectly, almost intuitively understands Byzantine reality, her vision of the period is complemented with prosopography, adequately applied with consciousness of its limitations. She treats the title topic with much breadth and a polyphony of perspectives. A lively narrative intertwines the scientific and literary aspect of the reading, the Author is not afraid of showing her own statements and general historiographical judgements. As the side effect the reader sees generalization here and there, per se not always justified, but charming and rendering a climate of the late Antiquity (like when the Author writes about the Antiochenes, that the citizens born and bred in the city, no matter if Christians or pagans, just could not express the lack of respect towards the ancient culture and those who personified it, i.e. the rhetors, philosophers and poets – p. 131).

Some important questions still remain unsolved or without precise answer, and first of all: what is actually, in the Author's view, the senatorial aristocracy? how clear can be a delimitation between this group and the other highest strata, if even between the central and the provincial bureaucratic aristocracy it is sometimes too difficult to distinguish (cf. the Appions). If John the Lydian, as the Author sees it (p. 239), was a member of the municipal aristocracy in Philadelphia, than the early Byzantine empire had the highest amount of aristocracy of all the empires ever. The borderline between description and analysis of the senatorial class and the remarks on the elite *sensu largo* fades away here and there in the book – although on the one hand Čekalova clearly sets apart the senatorial and Constantinopolitan, military and administrative apparatus, the curial class and the local aristocracies, etc., she does not prove irrefutably their identities on the other. It goes without saying that with some of the findings presented above she supposes a complex character of the institutions.

Albeit aware of the limitations in prosopographical method in application to the early Byzantine times (cf. p. 122), Čekalova uses it with minute exactitude, and such a precision in numbers seems sometimes exaggerated; all

the more so because some ascriptions to the groups are dubious, even with fundamental problem of the senatorship itself (source information about the official function seems enough to the Author in some cases). Presence of a few peasants in the senate is for Čekalova a proof of social complexity of the *curia*, but if so, the eunuch Eutropius should not serve as the main example (p. 130, the note with his biography gives only the counterarguments). With the remarks on the role of friendship between the intellectuals and dignitaries, aptly and legitimately underlined by the Author, one may be puzzled by a certain two-dimensionality: it is a pity that the possible and actual differences between the individual friendships, from the conventional acquaintance based on interests and businesses up to the real, emotional intimacy is not stressed and discussed; the role of animosities and rivalry is almost absent from the argumentation (p. 141 sqq). We draw also a different conclusion as far as an estimation of number of the multigenerational noble families is concerned, although we draw it from the same source and prosopographical material. Where Aleksandra Čekalova sees a dozen of representative examples from a larger group with unidentified filiations (esp. p. 145sq), we tend to perceive rather a dozen of peculiar cases that lacked any broader analogies – these were the notable exceptions that were successful in maintaining their material, social, noble position through more than three generations. There may be also a problem in the analysis of some pieces of epistolography, where the panegyric thoughts and expressions are understood literally (vide the attitude of John Chrysostom towards the ranks and honours – expressed *explicité* in the letters and his broader homiletic legacy, but different in his practical actions in Constantinople, cf. p. 222).

Chronology of the book begs some clarification: the title declares the customary boundaries of the 4<sup>th</sup> and the first half 7<sup>th</sup> centuries, in the major part of the book the actual focus is on the 4<sup>th</sup>–5<sup>th</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup>–6<sup>th</sup> centuries (not further than to the death of Justinian I).

Such a multi-facteted research, being the main current of the Historian's thought through more than forty years (the first important text on the senatorial aristocracy was published in „Византийский временник” in 1972) begs an update and a fresh review of literature before such a résumé comes off the press. Unfortunately, some of the chapters have not been touched with it, and the notes direct only to the older literature (a threshold may be the eighties of the 20<sup>th</sup> c., cf. p. 235, an. 163), and some outdated or refuted views sneaked into the book, to the detriment of the details, e.g. identification of John Malalas with John the Scholasticus, the patriarch of Constantinople in 565–577 (p. 241 and an. 217); one may ask, why the Author does not cite here e.g. *Studies in John Malalas*, ed. E. Jeffreys, B. Croke, R. Scott, Sydney 1990 – yet it is just an example of the selectiveness in the literature, especially from the last twenty years. It is alike when it comes to the literature on the social views of Procopius (p. 242) and in some other places.

We would like to suggest the next issue of the book to be carefully proofread, as the present one is not free from the errors, esp. in the terms and names in the Latin alphabet (mainly in notes and bibliography, e.g. p. 131 an. 52 – Gaudemer; p. 133, l. 9 from the bottom – 338–392 [instead of 388–392]; p. 136, l. 18 from the bottom – 388–352 [inst. 388–392]; p. 142 l. 7 Priskina; p. 216 an. 33, Fesftugière; p. 217 l'hellinisme; p. 295, l. 15: *Gesellschaft*; p. 296 l. 7: *Icinoclasm*; p. 296: Blockey R.C.; p. 296: Boffartique J.; p. 296 l. 13 from the bottom: *Cristianization*; p. 297, l. 1 from the bottom: *Monastiticism*; p. 298, l. 16: *Diocétien*; p. 298, l. 25 from the bottom: *magiser officiorum*; p. 299, l. 2 from the bottom: *Bedeutungimim*; p. 300: Fesftugière, Gaudemer; p. 300, l. 2: Padeborn; p. 301: Hendy M.H.; p. 301: Holum K., Vilkan G.; p. 301 l. 23 od góry: *Prodiction*; p. 302: Kanngiesser; p. 302, l. 14 from the bottom: *Byzace*; p. 303, l. 23 from the bottom: *sp`tantiken*; p. 303, l. 8 from the bottom: *Churcn*; p. 305, l. 3: *économique*; p. 306: Ševcenko N.P.; p. 306: Sinnigan W.G.; p. 306, l. 12: *arhcontke*; p. 307, l. 24 from the bottom: *Foundations*; p. 307, l. 15 from the

bottom: *Srannungen*; p. 308, l. 17 from the bottom: *Studes*; p. 308, l. 11 from the bottom: *Changein*; p. 341 l. 1 from the bottom – indes).

Our remarks here does not change the overall, more than positive estimation of the Author's efforts and of the book, as it sums up conveniently and accurately the decades of individual research and in holistic way depicts

a fundamental matter of the early Byzantine history. The oeuvre of Aleksandra Čekalova, as we believe, blazes a trail for the next generations of scholars in discussing the role and the institutional shape of the Roman / Byzantine senate.

*Andrzej Kompa, Mirosław J. Leszka*  
(Łódź)

**FRANTIŠEK ČAJKA, *Církevněslovanská legenda o svaté Anastázii* [*The Church-Slavonic Legend of St. Anastasia*], Slovansky ustav AV ČR, Praha 2011, pp. 239 [= *Prace Slovanskeho ustavu. Nova řada, svazek 34*].**

The presented study is the sixth title within the Palaeoslavistic ones edited in the series of the Institute of the Slavic Studies to the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic. Its author recalls one of these Old-Church-Slavonic literary monuments, which – although known from copies delivered to the scientific circulation, already published and discussed – seem to have their origins undiscovered or, at least, not clear. The life – or legend, as Čajka suggests to state the genre in the title – of St. Anastasia, Early Christian martyr, is preserved in its Latin origin and Greek translation/elaboration, as well as the Slavic version in Russian and Serbian copies from the 14<sup>th</sup>–18<sup>th</sup> cent. Referring to the statements of the past and contemporary scholars occupied in this monument (since the first edition of the Slavic text by A.I. Sobolevskij, also G. Kappel, F. Thomson, E. Bláhová, P.F. Moretti, V. Tkadlčík, D.M. Atanasova, to mention only some of them), Čajka emphasizes the validity of its textological aspect, as the main instrument of the reconstruction of its origins (p. 8). That is why *The Church-Slavonic Legend of St Anastasia* is not a history of the saint's cult, but a very reliable, philological treatise on the literary monument.

The construction of the study clearly reflects the author's idea of placing *The Legend...* in a wide context of the Old-Czech literature. The first chapter, *Českokírkevněslovanské písemnictví a jeho památky/Czech-Church-Slavonic literary output and its monuments* (p. 11–47), is a particu-

lar description of a literary production of the Old-Slavonic literature, not only connected to the Czech lands and cultural centres, but also copied in the Slavic East and South. This part of the book presents and discusses literary monuments important not only for the Czech literature, but for the Medieval Middle European literature and culture, as the so-called legends of saints (St. Venceslas, St. Ludmila, St. Vit, St. Apolinarius, St. George and Stephan legends), the *Life of St. Benedict*, as well as with other well known monuments, like the *Evangelium Nicodemi* or sermons on Gospel by the pope Gregory the Great and numerous prayers. The author discusses texts arouse and copied in Bohemia, and even copied in Russian or South Slavic territories, written down in Cyrillic and Latin letters; on the grounds of the pope Stephen V's letters, makes inquiries for traces of the Slavonic liturgy in Bohemia. It is worth noting, that Čajka suggests to present not the only one approach to the collected material, but investigates favorable features of both chronological and genealogical attitudes.

The second part of the study, *Legenda o svaté Anastázii/The St Anastasia legend* (p. 49–195), is divided, in total, into almost 20 subsections. The first ones are a kind of introduction to the history of the text itself, as Čajka presents the history of the St. Anastasia's cult (part 2.1 *Legendární tradice a rozvoj kultu/Legendary tradition and development of the cult*, p. 52–58) and both Latin legends originating in the same