


Byzantina Symmeikta

Vol 11 (1997)

SYMMEIKTA 11



Some Questions Concerning the Terminology used in Narrative Sources to Designate the Byzantine State

T. C. LOUNGHIS

doi: [10.12681/byzsym.820](https://doi.org/10.12681/byzsym.820)

Copyright © 2014, T. C. LOUNGHIS



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

To cite this article:

LOUNGHIS, T. C. (1997). Some Questions Concerning the Terminology used in Narrative Sources to Designate the Byzantine State. *Byzantina Symmeikta*, 11, 11-22. <https://doi.org/10.12681/byzsym.820>

T. C. LOUNGHIS

SOME QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE TERMINOLOGY USED IN
NARRATIVE SOURCES TO DESIGNATE THE BYZANTINE STATE

There are a considerable number of terms used by Byzantine writers to designate their empire, the nature of their state, its territorial extent and boundaries, the political regime of the empire and its name¹. In the study that follows, the terms in question are gathered mainly from narrative sources, and an attempt is made to follow and understand the evolution of each term's connotations through the centuries.

As one might expect, the most proper and accurate term to designate the territorial extent of the Byzantine Empire throughout its thousand year existence is the term Ῥωμαίων ἐπικράτεια, which bears the clearest and most constant meaning among the terms included in this investigation. The term ἐπικράτεια presupposes concrete boundaries, which though they may be respected or disputed by enemies, nevertheless exist².

1. Very useful general theoretical works: O. TREITINGER, *Die oströmische Kaiser- und Reichsidee nach ihrer Gestaltung im höfischen Zeremoniell. Von oströmischen Staats- und Reichsgedanken*, Darmstadt² 1956; H. HUNGER, *Prooimion. Elemente der byzantinischen Kaiseridee in den Arengen der Urkunden*, Wiener Byzantinistische Studien 1, Vienna 1964; G. RÖSCH, *Ὄνομα βασιλείας. Studien zum offiziellen Gebrauch der Kaisertitel in spätantiker und frühbyzantinischer Zeit*, Wiener Byzantinistische Studien 10, Vienna 1978. Cf. Hélène AHRWEILER, *L'idéologie politique de l'empire byzantin*, Paris 1974, which contains general formulations rather than data.

2. E. g. PRISCUS, 585 and 586-7 (ed. DE BOOR); AGATHIAS, Proem., 24 and V. 11, 6 (ed. KEYDELL, p. 28 and 177); EVAGRIUS, III. 36, III. 37, IV. 9, V. 9 (ed. BIDEZ-PARMENTIER, p. 135, 136, 160, 204,); GENESIUS, II. 5, III. 2, III. 3, IV. 15 (ed. LESMUELLER-WERNER and THURN, p. 26, 37, 38, 68); THEOPHANES CONTINUATUS, 112, 277, 288, 292, 293, 298, 299, 301, 302 (CSHB); SKYLITZES, 67, 145, 154 (ed. THURN);

The term Ῥωμαίων (or ῥωμαϊκή) ἀρχή may be considered identical in meaning (though with some qualifications) with the term Ῥωμαίων ἐπικράτεια. Further, the term Ῥωμαίων ἀρχή frequently denotes boundaries³ and is employed in this sense by Nicephorus and Theophanes—the sources of the so-called ‘Dark Ages’—to whom the term Ῥωμαίων ἐπικράτεια is unknown. Procopius of Caesarea, two centuries earlier, appears also to have been unfamiliar with this latter usage.

In the vast majority of cases⁴, the term Ῥωμαίων ἀρχή conveys also the old meaning of *imperium romanum*, to which people, territories and power belong. Gradually, the term acquires the sense of a state limited in space, as can be observed from Procopius to Theophanes. The phenomenon becomes more than obvious, of course, in the last centuries of Byzantium⁵, while the term

CONSTANTINUS PORPHYROGENITUS, *De Administrando Imperio* (=DAI), 4.3-5, 43.4-6 (ed. MORAVSČIK-JENKINS, p. 50, 188); LEON DIACONUS, I.2, III.11, X.3, 6, 7, 8 (CSHB, p. 6, 53, 165, 169, 170, 171); ATTALEIATES, 77 and 229 (CSHB); ACROPOLITES, 167 (ed. HEISENBERG); PACHYMERES, IV. 24 (ed. FAILLER, 397). Cf. ATTALEIATES, 120, 233 (CSHB); and CANTACUZENUS, I, 179, 188, 189, 204, 205, 323, 328 (CSHB): *εἰς τὴν Ῥωμαίων*.

3. PROCOPIUS, *Aed.*, I 3.2, 8.5, II 8.11, III 1.1, 7. 10, V 8.2-3, VI 1.5, 7. 7, 7. 17, (ed. HAURY-WIRTH p. 20, 34, 70, 82, 100-101, 168, 172, 184, 185-186); AGATHIAS, *Proem.* 26, II, 18.7, 31. 2, (p. 8, 65, 81): ῥωμαϊκά ὄρια; EVAGRIUS, IV. 20, V. 7 (p. 170, 203); NICEPHORUS, p. 3.8-11, 34.20-22, 37.8-10, 58.11-13 (DE BOOR); THEOPHANES CONTINUATUS, 54; CONSTANTINUS PORPHYROGENITUS, *De them.*, 62 and 97 (ed. PERTUSI); SKYLITZES, 31; LEON DIACONUS, II.1, II.11 and X.8 (p. 18, 33, 173): Ῥωμαϊκά ὄρια; ATTALEIATES, 181 (Ῥωμαϊκά ὄρια), 117 (τὰ τῆς Ἀύσοντιδος ὄρια); CINNAMUS, 79, 11-14 (CSHB); ACROPOLITES, 113, 187; GREGORAS, I.3, III.5, III.5 (CSHB, p. 18, 19, 72); PACHYMERES, II.30 (p. 209).

4. E. g. DAI, 13.135-137, 21.46-47, 22.29-30, 22.41-43 and 61-62, 30.11-13 (p. 72, 88, 94, 94-96, 96, 140); *De them.*, 60, 62; PROCOPIUS, *Aed.*, I 1.11, 9.17-18, II 6.6, III 2.2, IV 2.2, 5.8 (p. 7, 38, 64., 86, 108, 125); SIMOCATTES, III 18.3, IV 13.6 (ed. DE BOOR, p. 147, 174); THEOPHANES, 196.23-26, 215.26, 222.4, 300.23-25 (ed. DE BOOR); EVAGRIUS, I.22, III.3, IV.3, 19 and 21, V.14 (p. 33, 100, 154, 169, 170, 210); ATTALEIATES, 51, 99, 180, 182, 207, 310; CINNAMUS, 174.2-6, 278.6-11; NICEPHORUS, 76.1-3; GENESIUS, II.4 (p. 25-26); THEOPH. CONT., 112, 305; SKYLITZES, 13-14, 66-67, 197, 240-241; *Life of Peter of Atroa*, 85 (ed. LAURENT, 223); *Fontes historiae imperii Trapezuntini*, 53 and 79 (ed. PAPADOPOULOS-KERAMEUS).

5. E. g. ACROPOLITES, 34, where the notorious expression: *ἐν στενῷ τεθεαμένος οὐσαν τὴν ῥωμαίων ἀρχήν*. Cf. ACROPOLITES, 35, 73, 74, 76, 89, 154, 156, 158, 163;

Ῥωμαίων ἀρχή is regularly used during the Comnenian period, mainly by Anna Comnena⁶ (from whose text the term Ῥωμαίων πολιτεία is totally absent, as will be discussed below). The same remark is valid for the *History* of John Cantacuzenus, where all kinds of misfortune are foreseen to engulf the Ῥωμαίων ἀρχή⁷.

The constitutional aspect of the term Ῥωμαίων ἀρχή needs to be seen as closely associated with the well-known term Ῥωμαίων πολιτεία, as used, in fact, by Constantine Porphyrogenitus himself in his treatise *De administrando imperio*: ‘and thereafter, whatever reforms have been introduced from time to time in our state (τῆ καθ’ ἡμᾶς πολιτεία), and also throughout the Roman empire (ἐν πάσῃ τῆ Ῥωμαίων ἀρχῇ)⁸. The order of terms is repeated in another chapter of the same work⁹, as if to confirm the affinity of both meanings.

Generally speaking, the term Ῥωμαίων ἀρχή has a much broader meaning than the term πολιτεία, as this is found in Procopius, when dealing with territorial expansion of the empire under Justinian I: ‘the emperor,’ says Procopius, ‘has considerable experience in annexing other states (πολιτείας ἐτέρας) to the Roman empire (τῆ Ῥωμαίων ἀρχῇ)’¹⁰. In a famous passage of the *Gothic War*¹¹, the same author reveals the close connexion that exists between the preservation of a just political order in the empire (πολιτεία

MICHAEL PALAEOLOGUS, *De vita sua opusculum*, 455 (ed. GRÉGOIRE); PACHYMERES, I.27, II.25, 30 (p. 109, 187, 209); GREGORAS, VII.5, XII.12 (p. 233, 612).

6. ANNA COMNENA, I. 9, 123, 130, 137, 146, 156; II. 69, 73, 81 passim; CINNAMUS, 13.9-14, 118-119, 174.15-19, 201.8-13, 202.3-6, 208.9-16, 212.18-23, 231.15-19, 243 (two mentions). CHONIATES, 246, 315, 347, 437, 475, 498, 529, 541 (ed. VAN DIETEN), where the term obviously declines in use and meaning as well.

7. CANTACUZENUS, vol. I, 78, 98, 114, 311, 399; vol. II, 114, 115, 117, 147, 148, 231, 270, 274-275, 306, 307, 321, 329, 350, 371, 372, 442, 466, 475, 490, 527, 551, 568; vol. III, 31, 108, 149, 262, 293.

8. *DAI*, Proem., 23-24 (p. 46).

9. *Ibid.*, 48 22-27 (p. 226).

10. PROCOPIUS, *Aed.*, I 1. 8 (p. 6): ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἀμελέτητός ἐστιν ἐμπορίζεσθαι πολιτείας ἐτέρας. πολλὰς ἀμέλει προσηποίησεν ἤδη τῆ Ῥωμαίων ἀρχῇ.

11. PROCOPIUS, *De Bello Gothico*, I. 12, 20 (ed. HAURY-WIRTH II, 65-66): Ἔως μὲν οὖν πολιτεία Ῥωμαίους ἢ αὐτὴ ἔμενε, Γαλλίας τὰ ἐντὸς Ῥοδανοῦ ποταμοῦ βασιλεῖς εἶχεν. ἐπεὶ δὲ Ὀδοάκρος ἐς τυραννίδα μετέβαλε, τότε δὴ, τοῦ τυράννου σφίσι ἐνδι-

Ῥωμαίοις) and the maintaining of its territorial integrity. In another equally unequivocal passage of the *Buildings*¹², Procopius makes a remarkable distinction between the component parts of the πολιτεία: under Justinian I, the empire (πολιτεία) has more than doubled its territories and other trappings of power (τῇ τε χώρᾳ καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ δυνάμει). If the term Ῥωμαίων ἀρχή signifies the Roman empire in general, in Procopius the term πολιτεία conveys the meaning of the old *res publica* headed by the emperor, that is, a political system, which, according to Priscus of Panium¹³, had been invented by wise and good men in Antiquity, who took care to maintain the laws, the army, and other institutions. As early as the first half of the fifth century, Priscus found the laws and the Roman political system to be good (ὡς οἱ μὲν νόμοι καλοὶ καὶ ἡ πολιτεία Ῥωμαίων ἀγαθή), excepting a number of critical remarks prompted by the conduct of some of its leaders¹⁴.

There are some exceptions to the rule. Less literary sources of the second half of the sixth century, such as the *Chronography* of John Malalas and the *Ecclesiastical History* of Evagrius, use the term Ῥωμαίων πολιτεία in a strictly territorial sense, almost equivalent to the term ἐπικράτεια¹⁵. This tendency seems to become general towards the end of the sixth and the beginning of the seventh century, when a literary source such as the *History* of Theophylactus Simocattes uses the term Ῥωμαίων πολιτεία in the same sense as Malalas and Evagrius¹⁶. This evolution of the meaning of the Ῥωμαίων πολιτεία is of crucial interest, not only because the tyrant Phocas destroyed the τάξις in 602,

δόντος, ξύμπασαν Γαλλίαν Οὐσίγοτθοι ἔσχον μέχρι Ἑλληων, αἱ τὰ Γάλλων τε θρία καὶ Λιγούρων διορίζουσι.

12. PROCOPIUS, I 1, 15-16 (p. 7-8); AGATHIAS, I 2. 2 and 20. 3 (p. 11, 35) prefers the term πολιτεία ῥωμαϊκή, while the term ῥωμαϊκή κατάσταση (IV 26, p. 156) conveys the meaning of the whole Roman political establishment.

13. PRISCUS, 136; CANDIDUS OF ISAURIA, Frg. 1: FHG IV, 136, designates by the same term the byzantine state under Zenon (474-491).

14. PRISCUS, 138.

15. MALALAS, 361, 412, 422, 449, 460 (CSHB); EVAGRIUS, II. 9 (p. 59).

16. SIMOCATTES, II 10.4 and IV 11. 8 (p. 89, 170). It must be noted, however, that the old, 'constitutional' use of Ῥωμαίων πολιτεία is also to be found in SIMOCATTES, III 5.4 (p. 117). Cf. also the use of the expression τὸ Ῥωμαίων πολίτευμα, SIMOCATTES, III 9.6 (p. 128). All mentions in Simocattes concern the earliest part of his *History*, thus they do not extend beyond Book IV, with the single exception in VIII 11.11 (p. 306).

γενόμενος ἐπίβουλος τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς πολιτείας, according to the *Chronicon Paschale*¹⁷, but mainly because, starting from that time, the *Chronography* of Theophanes the Confessor uses the term Ῥωμαίων πολιτεία in the sense of ‘the Byzantine State’¹⁸. In Theophanes, all uses of the Ῥωμαίων ἀρχή concern the early Byzantine period, till the beginning of the seventh century. From then on, it is replaced by another, more current, term.

Theophanes, Constantine Porphyrogenitus (who follows his great-uncle¹⁹) and, at times, Nicephorus the Patriarch, make use of the term Ῥωμαίων πολιτεία in this sense very frequently throughout the seventh century²⁰, up to the year 724²¹, while very few echoes of its old meaning are to be detected in the *Short History*. Such is the case for the year 641 (under the empress Martina), when the author uses highly expressive language to point out his exasperation: ‘God forbid that the Roman state sink into such bad order’²². From the year 724 on, there are no references to the term Ῥωμαίων πολιτεία and it is totally absent from the *Chronography* of Theophanes²³ which covers the entire eighth century up to the year 813, that is, shortly after Charlemagne’s diplomatic recognition.

The beginning of the ninth century witnesses the appearance of the term Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονία. Its first mentions are attributed to Genesisius²⁴ and Skylitzes²⁵ almost simultaneously with the revival of the term Ῥωμαίων πολιτεία, used alternatively by the same authors²⁶. Here, the term Ῥωμαίων πολι-

17. CHRONICON PASCHALE, 707 (CSHB). According to the same source (p. 708), Heraclius liberated the Ῥωμαίων πολιτεία in 610.

18. THEOPHANES, 245.18-22 (a. D. 571). Cf. THEOPHANES, 299.33-34 (a. D. 610).

19. Cf. T. C. LOUNGHIS, *Κωνσταντίνου Ζ΄ Πορφυρογεννήτου, De administrando imperio (Πρός τόν ἴδιον υἱόν Ρωμανόν). Μια μέθοδος ἀνάγνωσης*, Thessalonica 1990, 45-49.

20. DAI, 21. 52-54 (p. 88); THEOPHANES, 355.21-25, 359.17-19, 395.5-7; NICEPHORUS, 15.11-15, 23.17-21, 50.4-6, 52.7-9.

21. THEOPHANES, 402.9-15.

22. NICEPHORUS, 28.5-8: *μηδέ δοίη Θεός ἐν τούτῳ τάξεως τήν Ῥωμαϊκὴν ἐλθεῖν πολιτείαν...*

23. Cf. *supra*, note 6, on the absence of the term in Anna’s *Alexiad*.

24. GENESIUS, I.9 (p. 9).

25. SKYLITZES, 12.

26. GENESIUS, I.16 (p. 14); SKYLITZES, 47.

τεία seems to have lost something of its earlier meaning and to return to its original sense²⁷, adapting to new realities: Ῥωμαίων πολιτεία in the ninth century means ‘the organisation of the state’²⁸, not only in Genesis and Skylitzes but also in other sources up to the twelfth century²⁹, whereas Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονία fulfills the functions of the old term Ῥωμαίων ἀρχή, the *imperium romanum*, and is used in this sense by Anna Comnena³⁰. Only once is the term πολιτεία (unaccompanied by Ῥωμαίων) to be found in Anna’s text³¹ in clear juxtaposition with the term Ῥωμαίων ἀρχή: Anna Dalassena was able to govern the state apparatus (πολιτεία), not only in the Roman empire, but also in any realm under the sun.

It could be argued, that the reappearance of the term Ῥωμαίων πολιτεία in its original, constitutional sense, is attributable to the decline of the rather confusing style of the Chronography in general and to the revival of the sounder historiographical style, something that is very apparent in Leo Diaconus: in the text of his *History* (a literary genre that reappears at the end of the tenth century³²), we have four clear mentions of the term with the meaning ‘state organisation’³³ as well as six mentions of the term Ῥωμαίων (or ῥωμαϊκή) ἡγεμονία with the meaning of Roman empire, inclusive of its territories and power³⁴.

The *History* of Leon Diaconus is permeated by a belief in long-term stability and power, which underlines the longevity of the Empire. Hence, all terms concerning Byzantine self-determination are used very clearly³⁵. However, just

27. Cf. *supra*, notes 10-13.

28. Which may be interpreted: the singularity of Byzantine state organisation.

29. *DAI* 13. 173-175 (p. 74): τὴν εὐγενῆ πολιτείαν Ῥωμαίων; *THEOPH. CONT.*, 442, 446; *Fontes historiae imperii Trapezuntini*, 79.3-9; *CINNAMUS*, 281.10-12.

30. *ANNA COMNENA*, I 10, 57, 72, 106, 127, II 72, 73 *passim*. Cf. also *supra*, note 6.

31. *ANNA COMNENA*, I 123.

32. T. C. LOUNGHIS, *Η ιδεολογία της βυζαντινής Ιστοριογραφίας*, Athens 1993, 172.

33. *LEON DIACONUS*, III. 3, 5, VI. 2, VII. 7 (p. 40, 42-43, 95, 124).

34. *LEON DIACONUS*, III. 6, IV. 1, V. 1, 7 and 8 VII. 7 (p. 44, 56, 77, 88, 90, 124). Similar use of the term in *ATTALEIATES*, 131 and 194.

35. Cf. the combined use of three terms in order to describe the empire’s growth in *LEON DIACONUS*, III.6 (p. 45): *καὶ προσέτι τὰ μέγιστα τὴν πολιτείαν ὀνήσοντα, καὶ τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς ἀρχῆς τὴν ἐπικράτειαν ἀυξήσοντα*. The double use in *LEO DIACONUS*, IX.4 (p. 146): *τὴν τῆς ἡγεμονίας ἀρχὴν*, presents no difficulty. It must be noted, however, that

the opposite occurs in Michael Attaleiates, Anna Comnena and Nicetas Choniates, whose historiographical texts constitute the beginning and end of a particular period of 'Roman' history: the term Ῥωμαίων πολιτεία is totally absent from their texts, literary though they may be. The term exists, however, in the *History* of John Cinnamus, in whose time the empire was not on the brink of destruction, as it was in the case of Anna and Nicetas. In the *History* of John Cinnamus the term Ῥωμαίων πολιτεία acquires, as a rule³⁶, a meaning which includes state organisation and society³⁷ and which will later also be found in George Pachymeres³⁸ and Nicephorus Gregoras³⁹. Last, but not least, we have to take into account the fact that the term Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονία means indisputably the Byzantine empire in Gregoras⁴⁰, but not in Pachymeres, who uses the rather ambiguous expression τὰ πράγματα τῆς τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίας⁴¹. The term τὰ Ῥωμαίων (sc. πράγματα) is known by its broad use in the *History* of Nicetas Choniates⁴², to whom the term Ῥωμαίων πολιτεία is totally unknown (as already pointed out). A similar example is to be found in John Cantacuzenus in the fourteenth century⁴³.

The term, which almost imperceptibly replaced Ῥωμαίων πολιτεία in Byzantine narrative sources, is not τὰ Ῥωμαίων πράγματα, but the very commonly encountered expression Ῥωμαίων βασιλεία, also very frequent in Nicetas Choniates⁴⁴ and designating the *nature* of the Byzantine political

in LEON DIACONUS, V.3 (p. 81): *δυναστεία Ῥωμαϊκή* denotes the successive emperors, the line of sovereigns, and not the dynasty.

36. Not in the case of note 29, *supra*.

37. E. g. CINNAMUS, 276-277, 275, 285.

38. PACHYMERES, I.27 and III.21 (p. 109-111, 289).

39. GREGORAS, II.6 (p. 42). Cf. also *supra*, notes 3 and 5, for the meaning of the term Ῥωμαίων ἀρχή in Gregoras.

40. GREGORAS, I.2, 4, 17, II.1, V.5, VI.6, 11, VII.1, 5, XII.2 (p. 13, 13-14, 20, 77, 24-25, 144-145, 187, 208, 208-209, 214 [two mentions], 215, 234, 579); GREGORAS, *Epp.* 90.41-49 and 130, 11-19 (ed. LEONE, p. 242 and 331).

41. PACHYMERES, I.17 (p. 77).

42. CHONIATES, 46, 96, 194, 223, 436, 438, 472, 507, 510, 522, 551, 572. ATTALEIATES also uses this expression, though not so often (199, 223).

43. CANTACUZENUS, vol. I. 17, 219, 391, 425, 450; vol. II. 34, 35, 44, 110, 119, 202, 203, 230, 381; vol. III. 11, 258.

44. CHONIATES, 120, 127, 238, 327, 433, 477, 557, 571.

system, starting from the second half of the sixth century, that is at the same time that Malalas, Evagrius and Simocattes begin to alter the original, constitutional meaning of the old term Ῥωμαίων πολιτεία⁴⁵. The first mention of the term Ῥωμαίων βασιλεία in the sense of the Byzantine political system, and not *the reign of a given sovereign*, which is current much earlier⁴⁶, is to be seen in Evagrius of Epiphaneia⁴⁷, followed by the *Chronography* of Theophanes⁴⁸ and its Continuator⁴⁹, just once by Nicephorus the Patriarch⁵⁰, by the emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus⁵¹, John Skylitzes⁵², Michael Attaleiates⁵³, Anna Comnena⁵⁴, John Cinnamus (who, using the term Ῥωμαίων πολιτεία⁵⁵, seldom uses βασιλεία⁵⁶), Nicetas Choniates⁵⁷ and, afterwards, George Acropolites⁵⁸, George Pachymeres⁵⁹, Nicephorus Gregoras⁶⁰ and the emperor John Cantacuzenus⁶¹, who prefers both the term Ῥωμαίων ἀρχή⁶², and, more importantly, Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονία, which is mentioned some seventy times in his work⁶³ in the sense of the Roman empire, in most cases coinciding

45. Cf. *supra*, notes 15 and 16.

46. Cf. e. g. PRISCUS, 584; PROCOPIUS, *Aed.*, III 1. 11 (p. 83-84).

47. EVAGRIUS, III.44, p. 146-147 (if not EVAGRIUS, II.8, p. 55). Cf. also IV.25, p. 171-172.

48. THEOPHANES, 68.2-3, 115.22-25, 220. 2-9, 290.12-16, 291.4-6, 294.1-7 (*passim*), 326.16-20, 386-387, 456-457, 482.16-17.

49. THEOPH. CONT., 51, 84, 96, 162, 172, 184, 429, 458.

50. NICEPHORUS, 35-36; cf. also *Life of Peter of Atroa*, 63. 1-3 (p. 187).

51. *De them.*, 62; *DAI*, 22.81-82, 29.58-61, 63-66, 72-73 (p. 98, 124, 126).

52. SKYLITZES, 29, 56, 97, 115, 130, 145, 197, 204, *passim*.

53. ATTALEIATES, 45, 139.

54. ANNA COMNENA, I. 9, 10 (alternately with Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονία), 18 (two mentions) 92, 130, 132, 144; II, 43. II. 63, 73, *passim*.

55. Cf. *supra*, note 37.

56. CINNAMUS, 229-230.

57. Cf. *supra*, note 44.

58. ACROPOLITES, 84 (as in the case of Cinnamus).

59. PACHYMERES, I.3, II.30 (p. 115, 209).

60. GREGORAS, II.3, III.2, VII.5, XIII.3 (p. 28, 59, 242, 644, *passim*).

61. CANTACUZENUS, vol. I 13, 15, 18, 486, 487, 543; vol. II. 12, 21, 54, 76, 364; vol. III. 16, 17, 60, 79, 151, 173.

62. Cf. *supra*, note 7.

63. CANTACUZENUS, vol. I 114, 115, 117, 184, 220, 223, 280, 335, 392, 430, 502, 505, 523; vol. II 15, 24, 43, 59, 67-68, 80, 131, 151, 201, 203, 209, 210, 257, 264, 269,

with the term Ῥωμαίων ἀρχή, which only in relatively few examples draws nearer to the official term Ῥωμαίων βασιλεία. It is also worth pointing out that in the *History* of John Cantacuzenus, the term Ῥωμαίων βασιλεία is used to designate the old, Roman age⁶⁴. The historical work of Cantacuzenus, replete with a steady devaluation of the old, traditional terms, consists of an epilogue worthy of the best Byzantine administrative traditions. The author seems so conscious of the decline of all ‘Roman’ realities that, instead of a substantive, he ventures to use an adjective, τὸ Ῥωμαϊκόν⁶⁵, earlier used only by Attaleiates⁶⁶. The adjective, τὸ Ῥωμαϊκόν, which tends to be an equivalent of τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ῥωμαίων, also used by Cantacuzenus⁶⁷, has the meaning of what today we—in a non-Roman world—would call ‘the Roman element’ or ‘the Roman community’, an element which clearly has weak dimensions, as the empire dies away.

The term Ῥωμαίων ἐξουσία in the sense of ‘the Roman power’ or ‘the Roman domination’ appears in the Byzantine narrative sources from Nicephorus the Patriarch⁶⁸ to Anna Comnena⁶⁹, that is from the mid-eighth to the end of the eleventh century, in other words during the period of the so-called ‘limited oikoumene’, which starts with the papal political secession from the Empire and the forgery of the *Constitutum Constantini*, and ends around the time of the first Crusade. The term Ῥωμαίων ἐξουσία is used mostly by Byzantine sources close to the ideology of the Macedonian dynasty, that is the Continuator of Theophanes⁷⁰, Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus⁷¹ and John

273, 274, 276, 292, 310, 365, 366, 388, 396, 398, 403, 411, 449, 472, 481, 507, 508, 535; vol. III 12, 20, 28, 29, 32, 33, 34, 40, 41, 48, 63, 110, 138, 140, 143, 148, 149, 257, 263, 264, 280, 350-351.

64. Cf. the cases in the examples cited in note 61.

65. CANTACUZENUS, I 422.

66. ATTALEIATES, 76, 141, 163, 233.

67. CANTACUZENUS, I 228, 283, 393, 505; III 253.

68. NICEPHORUS, 64, 10-12.

69. ANNA COMNENA, II 55.

70. THEOPHANES CONTINUATUS, 277, 291, 346.

71. *DAI*, 27.3-6, 29.213-216, 31.26-27, 32.21-23, 29-30, 44.122-124, 50.130-132 (p. 112, 134, 148, 152, 154, 204, 238).

Skylitzes⁷², and underlines very clearly the fact that the Byzantine Empire rules territories and peoples beyond certain limits, that is, it points to Byzantine expansion. This, however, is not the subject of our discussion here: it is enough merely to compare the term with the Ῥωμαϊκόν in the world of the fourteenth century, when the ἔξουσία belonged to others.

In the second half of the sixth century, the Oriental chronicler John Malalas used the term Ῥωμανία in order to depict the eastern provinces of the Empire, that is the Eastern Roman Empire itself, since his use of the term does not embrace the reign of Justinian⁷³. At the beginning of the seventh century, in the *Chronography* of Theophanes, the term Ῥωμανία replaces the term Ῥωμαίων ἀρχή, which is henceforth totally abandoned. The term Ῥωμανία in the territorial meaning of the Empire is more than frequent throughout Theophanes's text⁷⁴. In a single mention, the Continuators of Theophanes inform us that the glorious general of the tenth century, John Courcouas, has doubled the size of 'Romania'⁷⁵. The term seems to have been preferred by Skylitzes⁷⁶ and especially by Constantine Porphyrogenitus⁷⁷, for whom Ῥωμανία has precise boundaries, such as with Armenia⁷⁸. It seems natural to conclude, therefore, that, for those same authors who also employ the term Ῥωμανία, the Ῥωμαίων ἔξουσία represents a notion of Byzantium that goes far beyond the boundaries of Ῥωμανία, a term that had restricted the Ῥωμαίων

72. SKYLITZES, 146-147, 156, 167. An echo of the achievements of the Macedonian dynasty *en bloc* in *Fontes historiae imperii Trapezuntini*, 79, where ἀρχή, πολιτεία and ἔξουσία are ὁμώνυμοι (i.e. Roman).

73. MALALAS, 398, 400, 407, 408, 409.

74. THEOPHANES, 304.24, 332.15, 345.25, 348.10, 17, 23, 26, 349.1, 363.19, 364.4, 367.1, 10, 11, 370.2, 18, 372.2, 377.16, 383.2, 27, 31, 384.4, 389.5, 392.8, 393.24, 25, 403.27, 404.16, 409.24, 410.3, 30, 411.10, 15, 415.23, 416.16, 430.9, 431.3, 444.28, 445.16, 446.19, 24, 447.6, 449.9, 451.4, 452.22, 463.15, 473.24, 482.2.

75. THEOPH. CONT., 426-427: *καὶ τὴν Ῥωμανίαν διπλὴν κατεστήσατο*.

76. SKYLITZES, 135, 154.

77. *DAI*, 9.111-113, 22.21-22, 46.128-135, 46.135-142, 47.23-25, 53.530-532 (p. 62, 94, 220, 220-222, 224, 286).

78. Cf. *DAI*, 44.125-128 (p. 204): *μέσον Ῥωμανίας καὶ Ἀρμενίας*; cf. also *DAI*, 46.15 (p. 214).

αρχή at the beginning of the seventh century and which resulted in debasing the value of the term Ῥωμαίων πολιτεία, predicted once by Procopius of Caesarea.

The last Byzantine author to employ the term Ῥωμανία⁷⁹ is George Pachymeres⁸⁰, in whose times the decline was not yet so marked. Later, however, with Cantacuzenus, a humbler polity seems to be implied by τὸ Ῥωμαϊκόν.

79. Cf. A. CARILE, *Impero Romano e Romania, Da Roma alla Terza Roma. Documenti e studi*, Studi II: *La nozione di «Romano» tra cittadinanza e universalità*, Naples 1984, 247-261.

80. PACHYMERES, I.31, V.3 (p. 123 and 125, 443).

Τ. Κ. ΛΟΥΓΓΗΣ, Σχετικά με την ορολογία των αφηγηματικών πηγών για το χαρακτηρισμό του βυζαντινού κράτους

1. Ο όρος *Ῥωμαίων επικράτεια* προϋποθέτει συγκεκριμένα σύνορα και χρησιμοποιείται σε ολόκληρη την υπερχιλιετή ζωή του βυζαντινού κράτους.
2. Ο όρος *Ῥωμαίων αρχή* προϋποθέτει σύνορα μόνο στη διάρκεια των «σκοτεινών αιώνων» και αντικαθιστά στο Νικηφόρο και στο Θεοφάνη τον όρο *Ῥωμαίων ἐπικράτεια*. Βαθμιαία, ο όρος υπονοεί το ρωμαϊκό κράτος περιορισμένο στο χώρο, από την Άννα Κομνηνή ως τον Ιωάννη Καντακουζηνό.
3. Ο όρος *Ῥωμαίων αρχή* είναι ευρύτερος σε περιεχόμενο από τον όρο *Ῥωμαίων πολιτεία* (Προκόπιος ή, ακόμα, Πρίσκος Πανίτης). Αντίθετα, στον Ιωάννη Μαλάλα, στον Ευάγριο και στον Θεοφύλακτο Σιμοκάττη, ο όρος *Ῥωμαίων πολιτεία* έχει εδαφική σημασία. Η συνήθεια αυτή θα υιοθετηθεί και από τους Νικηφόρο πατριάρχη, Θεοφάνη και Κωνσταντίνο Πορφυρογέννητο για να αποδώσει καταστάσεις ως το 724.
4. Από τις αρχές του 9ου αιώνα εμφανίζεται ο όρος *Ῥωμαίων ηγεμονία* (Γενέσιος, Σκυλίτζης), ταυτόχρονα με την επανεμφάνιση του όρου *Ῥωμαίων πολιτεία* με ελαφρά διαφορετική έννοια τώρα (κρατική οργάνωση). Στην Άννα Κομνηνή και στο Νικήτα Χωνιάτη, ο όρος *Ῥωμαίων πολιτεία* απουσιάζει, ενώ απαντάται σε κείμενα που αποπνέουν βυζαντινή κρατική συνέχεια και σταθερότητα (Λέων Διάκονος, Ιωάννης Κίνναμος).
5. Η μελέτη προσπαθεί να παρακολουθεί την εναλλαγή των αποχρώσεων της έννοιας των πιο πάνω όρων σε αντιστοιχία με την εξέλιξη της βυζαντινής πολιτικής ιδεολογίας στην εξωτερική πολιτική. Πρόκειται για προσωρινά συμπεράσματα, ιδιαίτερα σε ό, τι αφορά την εξέταση των όρων *Ῥωμαίων βασιλεία*, *τὸ Ῥωμαϊκόν*, *Ῥωμανία* κλπ.