The Partridge's Purple Stockings: Observations on the Historical, Literary and Manuscript Context of Pseudo-Kodinos' Handbook on Court Ceremonial*

NIELS GAUL

When the younger Andronikos Palaiologos ruled as emperor of the Rhomaioi, a certain carelessness came to prevail at the imperial court of Constantinople.¹

* First presented at a British Academy workshop splendidly hosted by Dr Ruth Macrides and Dr Dimitar Angelov at the University of Birmingham in May 2005. An earlier version of parts IIb and III of this paper was also discussed in the Byzantine Studies Seminar at Oxford University in May 2005. I am grateful to participants for their valuable comments and criticisms on both occasions; additionally, both Dr Joseph Munitiz and Dr Macrides kindly commented on the final version of this article. – Once again I am much indebted to Professor Erich Trapp for generously allowing me to consult and quote the as of yet unpublished files of the *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität*. – Translations from Greek into English are my own with the exception of those from Mazaris' *Journey into Hades*, which follow the translation provided by Barry, Share, Smithies, and Westerink (see n. 121).

Sources repeatedly referred to:

Achilleid L = D. C. Hesseling (ed.), *L'Achilléide byzantine*, Amsterdam 1919.

Achilleid N = O. L. Smith † (ed.), *The Byzantine Achilleid. The Naples Version* (WBS XXI), Vienna 1999. (Cited as Smith, *Achilleid*, wherever the commentary is concerned).

(Nikephoros) Gregoras, *hist.* = L. Schopen/I. Bekker (eds.), *Nicephori Gregorae Ῥωμαϊκῆ ἱστορίας* (CSHB), 3 vols., Bonn 1829–1855.

[Pseudo-Kodinos], *de off.* = J. Verpeaux (ed.), *Pseudo-Kodinos. Traité des offices*, Paris 1976. (Quoted as Verpeaux, *Traité*, whenever the commentary is concerned).

(John) Kantakouzenos, *hist.* = L. Schopen (ed.), *Ioannis Cantacuzeni eximperatoris historiarum libri IV* (CSHB), 3 vols., Bonn 1828–1832.

(George) Sphrantzes, *chron.* = R. Maisano (ed.), *Giorgio Sfranze. Cronaca* (CFHB XXIX – *Series Italica*), Rome 1990.

- 1 According to Gregoras, *hist.* 1.566.19–568.5. Gregoras commented primarily on Andronikos III's habit of sharing the emperor's dais in the triklinos with members of his court, even commoners. Interestingly enough, he then singled out the courtiers' headgear for criticism (*hist.* 567.16–568.5): περί γε μὴν τῆς ἐπὶ κεφαλῆς καλύπτρας ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν πρότερον βασιλέων ἔθος τοὺς μὲν χρόνῳ προβεβηκότας ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις χρησθαι καλύπτραις πυραμίδος μὲν ἐχούσας σχῆμα, Σηρικοῖς ἐνδύμασι κατὰ τὸ ἀνάλογον ἐκάστω ἀξίωμα καλυπτομέναις· ὅσοι δὲ ἐν ἡλικίᾳ, τούτους δὲ πάντας καθάπαξ ἀκάλυπτον ἔχειν τὴν κεφαλὴν. ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλείας ἐς τοσοῦτον ἔρρει τὸ ἔθος τοῦτι ὥς καλύπτραις μὲν κεχρησθαι πάντας ὁμοῦ καὶ νέους καὶ ἀφῆλικας, ὁμοίως ὥστερ ἐν ἀγροῖς, οὕτω καὶ

However, shortly after Andronikos had died (15 June 1341) and John Kantakouzenos had been proclaimed (rival) emperor of the Rhomaioi (26 October 1341), the latter noted in his *History*, or ‘Memoirs’,² with an almost painstaking accuracy:

The following day, after having taken off the garments shot with gold, they donned white garments, as is the custom of emperors in grief. The emperor [Kantakouzenos] explained the reason of this change to those present, that he had worn those shining garments the previous day because of the festivities (acclamation), now, however, that these had passed, it was once more necessary to mourn the death of his brother³ the emperor [Andronikos III Palaiologos].⁴

This episode seems to fit quite neatly with the corresponding chapter in Pseudo-Kodinos’ handbook. Indeed it does, but for one telling difference: that only when his father, mother or wife, son or grandson died, was an emperor of the Rhomaioi expected to wear white garments (and later yellow ones; first without, then with embroidery). If any other close member of his family passed away – and this seems to have included a brother – the requirement was for yellow garments

βασιλείων ἐντός, πολυειδέσι δ’ οὖν καὶ ταύταις καὶ ἀλλοκότοις καὶ οἷαις ἐκάστω πρὸς βουλήσεως ἦν. οἱ μὲν γὰρ Λατινικαῖς ἐκέχρηντο ταύταις, οἱ δὲ ταῖς ἐκ Μυσῶν καὶ Τριβαλλῶν ὁμοίαις, οἱ δὲ ταῖς ἐκ Συρίας καὶ Φοινίκης ἰούσαις, καὶ ἄλλοι ἄλλαις, ὡς ἐκάστω δεδογμένον ἦν. – For all these reasons and from other factors, specifically the decline of the imperial and patriarchal palaces and, not least, the Hagia Sophia, Gregoras concluded that the future turmoil of the empire was being foreshadowed (568.16–17): πάντων γὰρ ἐπ’ ἰσης φθορὰ καὶ κατὰλυσις κατωρχήσατο.

2 Kantakouzenos’ Memoirs still await thorough analysis. For the time being cf. H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner* (HdAW XII, Byzantinisches Handbuch 5, 1–2), Munich 1978, I 465–476 and A. Kazhdan, *L’Histoire de Cantacuzène en tant qu’œuvre littéraire*, in: *Byz 50* (1980) 279–335 (an attempt to uncover Kantakouzenos’ true intentions by means of semantic analyses). On Kantakouzenos in general, cf. D. M. Nicol, *The Reluctant Emperor. A Biography of John Cantacuzene, Byzantine Emperor and Monk*, c.1295–1383, Cambridge 1996 – somewhat flawed by the author’s excessively positivistic approach to his subject – and G. Weiß, *Johannes Kantakouzenos. Aristokrat, Staatsmann, Kaiser und Mönch – in der Gesellschaftsentwicklung von Byzanz im 14. Jahrhundert*, Wiesbaden 1969, and n. 3.

3 This passage is aptly discussed by F. Dölger, *Johannes VI. Kantakouzenos als dynastischer Legitimist*, in: *Seminarium Kondakovianum* 10 (1938) 19–30, especially 20–24 (reprinted in id., *Paraspora*, Ettal 1961, 194–207) and, most recently, by C. Rapp, *Ritual Brotherhood in Byzantium*, in: *Traditio* 52 (1997) 285–326, especially 317–318. Even if there was no formal spiritual brotherhood (ἀδελφοποιᾶ) ever conducted between those two, Kantakouzenos certainly stressed, among other things, his prerogative to sleep in the emperor’s bed (e.g., hist. 1.369.17–370.9), thus surpassing the rights even of a son and co-emperor.

4 Kantakouzenos, hist. 2.167.6–12: εἰς τὴν ὑστεραίαν δὲ τὰ χρυσόπαστα ἀποδυσάμενοι, λευκὰς περιεβάλλοντο ἐσθητάς, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τεκμήριον πενθούντων βασιλέων. ἐδήλου δὲ καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς μεταβολῆς ὁ βασιλεὺς πρὸς τοὺς παρόντας, ὡς τῇ μὲν προτεραίᾳ τῆς ἑορτῆς ἔνεκα τὰ λαμπρὰ ἐκεῖνα περιβάλλοιτο, νυνὶ δὲ ἐκεῖνης παρελθούσης ἀναγκαῖον πάλιν τὴν ἀδελφοῦ καὶ βασιλέως τελευτῇ πενθεῖν.

only.⁵ How do these two texts, John Kantakouzenos' Memoirs and Pseudo-Kodinos' handbook, relate in this instance? Both certainly seem close in the information they convey, one bearing on the other, and yet there is a slight, but crucial distortion discernible: Was Kantakouzenos aware of the prescriptions and did he choose to bend them, so as to emphasise the immense grief he experienced (or claimed to experience)? Did he happen to be unaware of the details? Or was Pseudo-Kodinos' chapter only codified at a later stage?⁶

Five years later, during the civil war that ensued after Andronikos' death, in the summer of 1346, Kantakouzenos' daughter Theodora was married to her father's ally, the Osmanlı Emir Urhan.⁷ Upon this occasion, the imperial ceremony of *prokypsis* was performed near the city of Selymbria. Again Kantakouzenos himself described the occasion as follows:

And the emperor, with the entire army of the Rhomaioi, came to Selymbria, with his wife, the empress, and his daughters, and he gave order to erect a wooden *prokypsis* in the plain before the city, so that on this (*prokypsis*) the emperor's daughter, who had just been married (to Urhan), would appear clearly visible to all. *For this was the custom emperors whose daughters were married would observe.* [...] Theodora, the bride, mounted the *prokypsis*. The emperor was the only one on horseback, everyone else on foot. In such manner, when the curtains were drawn (for the *prokypsis* was covered all round with silk and cloth-of-gold curtains), the bride appeared. *And torches were fastened around her, which were invisibly held by eunuchs who would bend down on their knees.* [...] *Since everything that befitted the occasion of an imperial princess being married was performed* the emperor entertained the army as well as those holding offices, among the Rhomaioi as well as among the barbarians (Turks), for many days.⁸

5 De off. 284.3–16.

6 Cf. Verpeaux, *Traité* (see n. *), 35–40. Some of the material certainly dates back to the rules of Michael VIII and Andronikos II (the latter together with his son, Michael IX). A seemingly secure *terminus post quem* is provided by the promotion of the Asan brothers to the rank of *sebastokratores* in 1347, discussed de off. 147.17–148.3. However, Verpeaux's *terminus ante quem* of 1368 (29–30. 35) rests on an *argumentum e silentio*, and should be treated as such.

7 A. A. M. Bryer, Greek historians on the Turks: the case of the first Byzantine-Ottoman marriage, in: R. H. C. Davis/J. M. Wallace-Hadrill (eds.), *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages*. Essays presented to Richard William Southern, Oxford 1981, 471–493.

8 Kantakouzenos, hist. 2.587.16–588.16: βασιλεὺς τε μετὰ τῆς στρατίας Ῥωμαίων ὅση ἦν, ἤκεν εἰς Σελυμβρίαν μετὰ γυναῖκός τῆς βασιλίδος καὶ τῶν θυγατέρων καὶ ἐκέλευσε πρὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ πρόκυψιν ποιεῖν ἐκ ξύλων, ἣν ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἡ βασιλέως νενυμφευομένη θυγάτηρ στᾶσα πᾶσι γένοιτο καταφανής· οὕτω γὰρ ἔθος εἶναι τοῖς βασιλεῦσι ποιεῖν ἐπὶ ταῖς θυγατράσι πρὸς γάμον ἀγομέναις. [...] Θεοδώρα δὲ ἡ νενυμφευομένη ἐπὶ τὴν πρόκυψιν ἀνῆλθε, βασιλεὺς δὲ εἰστέκει ἐφιππος μόνος· οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι ἅπαντες πεζοί. οὕτω δὲ τῶν παραπετασμάτων περιαιρεθέντων (περικεκάλυπτο γὰρ ἡ πρόκυψις πανταχόθεν ὑφάσμασι σιρικοῖς καὶ διαχρύσοις) ἀνεφαίνετο ἡ νύμφη. καὶ λαμπάδες ἦσαν περὶ αὐτὴν ἡμμέναι ἐκατέρωθεν, ἃς εὐνοῦχοι κατέχοντες ἐπὶ γόνυ κεκλιμένοι οὐκ ἐφαίνοντο. [...] ἐπεὶ δὲ

This essay does not focus on this intriguing occurrence as such, in spite of the *prokypsis* being such a prominent aspect of late Byzantine spectacle and in spite of the significance this particular instance may certainly lay claim to: not least because of the obvious absence of the Osmanlı husband.⁹ It is rather the tiny detail of the appearance of eunuchs that is of interest in this context, and by means of introduction only: the presence of seemingly substantial number of eunuchs who would bend down on their knees (so as to become invisible), holding torches (so as to produce the flaming light against which the now imperial princess would appear). To the best of our knowledge, aristocratic ladies in the mid-fourteenth century did not necessarily have an ample entourage of eunuchs readily at hand – while we know, on the other hand, that they were still, in all likelihood, present at the imperial court.¹⁰ However, again one must not forget that the whole story is related by the bride's own father (Kantakouzenos), who had only recently been crowned emperor at Adrianople; one may wonder, in fact, whether John Kantakouzenos might have hurried to acquire these eunuchs to emphasise his daughter's newly gained imperial status.¹¹ Both features together (an imperial lady on the *prokypsis*, the presence of eunuchs) certainly suggest one conclusion of interest to this study, and this is best summarised in Kantakouzenos' own words: 'This was the custom emperors would observe whose daughters were married', and later on: 'Everything that befitted the occasion of an imperial princess being married was performed'. In short, John Kantakouzenos, the not-so-undisputed emperor of the Rhomaioi, cared deeply about imperial ceremony. It is by no means surprising that he should have done so.

Whoever is interested in the literary context of Pseudo-Kodinos' handbook will have to bear these, and similar, passages from Kantakouzenos' *History* in mind; not so much, of course, because eunuchs (or white garments, for that matter) would feature prominently in the handbook – in fact, at least the former do not – but because it seems obvious, for the reasons presently outlined, that any attempt to investigate the question of the literary context of Pseudo-Kodinos' hand-

πάντα ἐτελεῖτο τὰ βασιλέως προσήκοντα θυγατράσιν νυμφευομέναις, τὴν τε στρατιὰν καὶ τοὺς ἐν τέλει πάντας καὶ Ῥωμαίων καὶ βαρβάρων ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰστία ἐφ' ἡμέρας οὐκ ὀλίγας.

9 Cf. R. Macrides' paper read at the 2005 Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies at The Queen's University, Belfast (unfortunately not to be included in the Symposium's proceedings). – It seems by no means sure that women of the imperial family frequently mounted the *prokypsis* in the Palaiologan period. The ceremony itself seems to go back to the twelfth century, cf. M. Jeffreys, *The Comnenian Prokypsis*, in: *Parergon* NS 5 (1987) 38–53 and P. Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180*, Cambridge 1993, 240–246.

10 For a brief discussion of the rôle of eunuchs at this occasion, cf. N. Gaul, *Eunuchs in the late Byzantine Empire, c.1250–1400*, in: S. Tougher (ed.), *Eunuchs in Antiquity and Beyond*, London 2002, 199–219, esp. 205.

11 Islamic influences (either way) notwithstanding.

book will have to start with an attempt to define what the historical relationship between John Kantakouzenos and 'Pseudo-Kodinos' was, if any. Such a relationship, if it can be demonstrated or at least shown to be probable, would help to tie other contemporary texts to the handbook;¹² it is with John Kantakouzenos' imperial ideology that we then must begin.

This short study falls into three parts: the following first part continues to explore the relationship between Pseudo-Kodinos' handbook and John Kantakouzenos' imperial ideology, deliberately widening the focus beyond the often-quoted coronation chapters (I); the second part scrutinises possibly related texts produced in mid-fourteenth and early-fifteenth century Byzantium beyond Kantakouzenos' Memoirs (II); the third part, finally, very briefly comments on the manuscript tradition of Pseudo-Kodinos' handbook (III).

I. Pseudo-Kodinos and John Kantakouzenos' Imperial Ideology

It will be argued that either John Kantakouzenos himself or certain members of his entourage – what the Byzantines would have called οἱ ἀνθρῳποι αὐτοῦ – had a hand in drafting certain chapters which either from the beginning or at a later stage became part of the handbook on court ceremonial nowadays known as 'Pseudo-Kodinos'.¹³ This is simply and primarily because, on the one hand, the *megas domestikos* features so very prominently in the handbook that there is sufficient reason to assume that Kantakouzenos was the one *megas domestikos* at the fourteenth-century Byzantine court who had the means of, and an interest in, wielding such influence and inserting his – Kantakouzenos' individual, specific – privileges into some of the chapters which the handbook transmits.¹⁴ On the other hand, as just shown, the *megas domestikos*' prominent rôle in the handbook is mirrored by this same *megas domestikos*' evident concern about issues of protocol and ceremony in the *History* he compiled.

The conclusion that John Kantakouzenos is likely to have been the 'model' *megas domestikos* for the anonymous *megas domestikos* in the handbook also

12 For some general deliberations concerning the date, cf. Verpeaux's unsurpassed account: *Traité* (see n. *), 31–35.

13 The Birmingham workshop proved unable to suggest a definite dating of Pseudo-Kodinos' handbook.

14 That Kantakouzenos was involved in some chapters, however, does not necessarily imply much about the time when the handbook as a whole was put together. Some chapters may well have been drafted early on in the fourteenth century and others in the 1340s or 1350s. It is also possible, but less likely, that it was not Kantakouzenos himself, but his imperial friend, the younger Andronikos, who wanted to secure his trusted ally's prerogatives at court, possibly beyond his (early) death. Cf. also 84–85 and n. 62.

derives from the fact that I firmly believe – as Verpeaux has well argued¹⁵ – that the promotion of the *megas domestikos* to the fourth rank of the court hierarchy was not to survive the special position Kantakouzenos held first under the two Andronikoi, the elder and the younger, when they ruled jointly (i.e., from his promotion in c.1325 to spring 1328), and especially, later under Andronikos III alone.¹⁶ All other lists of precedence preserved, i.e., those edited in Verpeaux's appendices (while certainly dating to the middle of the fourteenth century),¹⁷ still reflect the changes introduced by Andronikos II alone, i.e. the promotion of the *panhypersebastos* from rank seven to rank four (following the rather 'immobile' imperial titles of *despotēs*, *sebastokrator*, and *kaisar*),¹⁸ but not the – obviously only momentary – promotion of the *megas domestikos* to the fourth position, temporarily even superceding the *panhypersebastos*. Thus it may be noted that the first chapters of Pseudo-Kodinos' handbook, entitled 'On the order of the dignities and offices' and on their respective dresses and services,¹⁹ are the only ones surviving among *all* late Byzantine lists of precedence that preserve what one might call an explicitly 'Kantakouzenian' hierarchy.

Interestingly, Pseudo-Kodinos' first chapter starts off with the traditional hierarchy which even pre-dates, as shall be presently argued,²⁰ John Palaiologos' promotion to the dignity of *panhypersebastos*.

Below the imperial title of *kaisar* – the third in the hierarchy, if we count the title of *despotēs* as number one – it initially runs: *prōtobestiarios* [4], *megas doux* [5], *megas domestikos* [6], *panhypersebastos* [7]. It then goes on, by means of an explanatory interpolation, to discuss the changes introduced under Andronikos II

15 Verpeaux, *Traité* (see n. *), 293–294; according to Verpeaux, the *megas domestikos* eventually assumed the position immediately following the *prōtobestiarios*, preceding the *megas doux*. I do not see any convincing proof of this. Cf. also R. Guiland, *Recherches sur les institutions byzantines* (BBA 35), Berlin 1967, I, 405–425 (previously published as: 'Le grand domestique', in: EO 37 [1938] 53–64), specifically 416, who does not, however, comment on the post-Andronikos III period.

16 Cf. the APPENDIX for a survey of the changes introduced to the court hierarchy in the early fourteenth century.

17 Cf. Verpeaux, *Traité* (see n. *), appendices I (291–302), II (303–310), III (311–325), IV (327–340), V (341–349; Marc. gr. 608 reflects the order at the court of Trebizond).

18 Cf. n. 26 below.

19 De off. 133–140 (περὶ τῆς τάξεως τῶν τε ἀξιωματῶν καὶ ὀφφικίων). 141–166 (περὶ τῶν φορεμάτων ἐκάστου τῶν τε ἀξιωματῶν καὶ ὀφφικίων). 167–188 (περὶ τῆς ὑπηρεσίας ἐκάστου τῶν ὀφφικίων).

20 The point was actually made by Verpeaux, *Traité* (see n. *), 26 and 36, who correctly qualified the 'promotion de panhypersébaste dans la hiérarchie lorsqu'Andronic II Paléologue conféra, vers 1305, ce titre à son neveu' as an 'transformation intervenue à l'initiative des premiers Paléologues'. Verpeaux's observation seems to have passed widely unnoticed, and needs to be re-emphasised. Cf. also n. 26.

and his grandson, Andronikos III (ordinal numbers have been inserted to emphasize the position in the hierarchy, and changes thereof):

despotēs [1], / *sebastokrator* [2], / *kaisar* [3], / *prōtobestiarios* [4] [...], / *megas doux* [5], / *megas domestikos* [6], / *panhypersebastos* [7]].

The emperor Andronikos Palaiologos the Elder, taking away the yellow garments that of old belonged to the *eparchos* [i.e. the prefect of the city of Constantinople], invested his nephew John Palaiologos²¹ with them, the son of the Porphyrogennetos²², upon appointing him *panhypersebastos*, letting him take precedence over all his (other) nephews, and even over the *prōtobestiarios* [5], the *megas doux* [6], the *megas domestikos* [7], and all the others.

The younger emperor Andronikos as well as this²³ emperor, his grandfather, created John Kantakouzenos *megas domestikos*, [the one] who later became emperor, of the same rank with the *panhypersebastos*. Still later, the (younger) Andronikos, after his grandfather's death, honoured Kantakouzenos the *megas domestikos* by placing him above everybody else: above all the imperial nephews, his own, i.e., the emperor's, uncles, and all the others, even the *panhypersebastos* and the *prōtobestiarios*. Thus the *megas domestikos* [4] ranked immediately after the *kaisar* [3], with the others following suit: *panhypersebastos* [5], / *prōtobestiarios* [6], / *megas doux* [7], / *prōtostrator* [8] ...²⁴

After this insertion, the list of precedence starts afresh, this time in the order established under Andronikos III: *megas domestikos* [4], *panhypersebastos* [5], *prōtobestiarios* [6], *megas doux* [7], and so on (the two competing lists are underlined in the translation above).

21 PLP no. 21479.

22 Constantine Palaiologos (PLP no. 21492), youngest son of Michael VIII, born after the reconquest of Constantinople in 1261 and thus 'in the purple'.

23 Almost in the demonstrative sense of ἐκεῖνος.

24 De off. 133.7–137.4: *δεσπότης* [1], / *σεβαστοκράτωρ* [2], / *καίσαρ* [3], / *πρωτοβεστιάριος* [4]. [...] / *μέγας δούξ* [5], / *μέγας δομέστικος* [6].

ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς Ἀνδρόνικος τῶν Παλαιολόγων ὁ πρῶτος, ἐπάρας ἅπερ ἀρχήθεν ἐφόρει ὁ ἐπαρχος κίτρινα, ἐφόρεσε ταῦτα Ἰωάννην τὸν Παλαιολόγον τὸν ἀνεψιὸν αὐτοῦ, τὸν τοῦ Πορφυρογεννήτου υἱόν, ποιήσας πανυπερσεβάστον, τῶν ἀνεψιῶν αὐτοῦ ὑπερέχοντα πάντων, ἐτι γε μὴν καὶ τοῦ πρωτοβεστιαρίου [5], τοῦ μεγάλου δουκός [6], τοῦ μεγάλου δομεστίκου [7] καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν.

ὁ δὲ γε βασιλεὺς Ἀνδρόνικος ὁ δεῦτερος καὶ οὗτος δὴ ὁ βασιλεὺς ὁ πάππος αὐτοῦ ἐποίησαν τὸν μέγαν δομέστικον τὸν Καντακουζηνὸν Ἰωάννην, ὃς ἐγγόνει καὶ βασιλεὺς, ἰσοστάσιον τῷ πανυπερσεβάστῳ. ἔπειτα οὗτος δὴ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀνδρόνικος, μετὰ τὸν τοῦ βασιλέως θάνατον τοῦ πάππου αὐτοῦ, τιμήσας τούτον δὴ τὸν μέγαν δομέστικον τὸν Καντακουζηνὸν ὑπερέχοντα πάντων ἐποίησε, τῶν μὲν τοῦ πάππου καὶ βασιλέως ἀνεψιῶν, ἑαυτοῦ δὲ θείων, τῶν ἐτέρων τε πάντων, καὶ αὐτοῦ δὴ τοῦ πανυπερσεβάστου καὶ τοῦ πρωτοβεστιαρίου· ἦν οὖν οὗτος ἐντεῦθεν ὁ μέγας δηλαδὴ δομέστικος, μετὰ τὸν καίσαρα [3], ἀρχή, καὶ καθεξῆς οἱ λοιποί.

πανυπερσεβάστος [5], / *πρωτοβεστιάριος* [6], / *μέγας δούξ* [7], / *πρωτοστράτωρ* [8].

Inevitably, this ‘double beginning’ must strike the reader, now as then, as a rather strange occurrence, given that the chapter is otherwise apparently meticulously researched.²⁵ And indeed, the text does not explicitly say that the rank of *panhypersebastos* was promoted from the seventh to the fourth position – it rather focuses on the new colour assigned to that dignity –, thus rendering the *megas domestikos* (temporarily) seventh. However, it may be suggested that it is exactly this what must have happened in 1305.²⁶ From 1305 to the mid-1320s, the *panhypersebastos* led the post-*kaisar* hierarchy uncontested; then, for a presumably rather brief span of time, this fourth rank was shared between *panhypersebastos* (John Palaiologos) and *megas domestikos* (John Kantakouzenos); finally, from February 1332²⁷ or sometime (soon) thereafter onwards, the *megas domestikos* outranked even the *panhypersebastos*. However, John Palaiologos would not have lived long enough to see this: he died in 1326 over his attempted revolt, after having promptly been promoted to the rank of *kaisar* to quell his aspirations.²⁸ No successor to the position of *panhypersebastos* is known before Nikephoros Angelos Doukas and Isaac Asan in the 1340s.²⁹

This explanation, which would render this first chapter as something between a practical list of precedence and a historical commentary on a version of such a list originally pre-dating 1305, seems very much in accordance with its overall style.³⁰ If John Kantakouzenos was indeed not created *megas domestikos* before

25 The omission of the office of *epi tou kanikleiou* notwithstanding, cf. Verpeaux, *Traité* (see n. *), 28–29.

26 It needs to be reported that my – and Verpeaux’s (see n. 20) – reading of this passage did not go uncontested at the Birmingham workshop; there the assumption was that the *panhypersebastos* had in fact *always* occupied the fourth position of the court hierarchy. However, this is hardly borne out by the beginning of Pseudo-Kodinos if one is not prepared to admit that the triad *prōtobestiarios*, *megas doux*, *megas domestikos* represents a rather mindless interpolation. In my opinion, the solution here suggested remains the only plausible explanation of this otherwise rather curious repetition of offices/dignities in the beginning the first chapter and the insertion of the *panhypersebastos*’ promotion after the first mention of the *megas domestikos*. Otherwise one does not see why the text should not have read *kaisar* [3], *panhypersebastos* [4], *prōtobestiarios* [5] etc. from the beginning. – It should also be noted that the list of precedence transmitted under the name of Matthew Blastaris (PLP 2808) uniquely gives the order *prōtobestiarios*, *panhypersebastos*, cf. Verpeaux, *Traité* (see n. *), 320.12–13.

27 Interestingly, Andronikos III apparently hesitated to introduce this change while his grandfather was still alive in the Chora monastery in Constantinople.

28 Did John Palaiologos, son of a *porphyrogennētos*, feel slighted in his honour having to share the first rank of the post-*kaisar* hierarchy with Kantakouzenos? Gregoras, hist. 1.373.20–374.12, does not imply this, nor, naturally, would Kantakouzenos (hist. 1.209.2ff.).

29 PLP nos. 222 and 1494 respectively.

30 And indeed Pseudo-Kodinos’ rather historical attitude in general, cf. e.g., R. Macrides, ‘The reason is not known’. Remembering and recording the past. Pseudo-Kodinos as an historian, in: P. Odorico (ed.), *L’écriture de l’historiographie* (Paris, forthcoming), e.g., on the anecdote about Emperor Theophilos’ horse. Another noteworthy episode is the excursus on *πυλατῖκια* (de off. 204.24–207.10), essentially designed to prove Byzantium’s superiority to Seldjuk or Turkish

1325, as some suggest,³¹ this period of *megas domestikos* and *panhypersebastos* sharing the fourth rank of the court hierarchy, would conceivably have been a rather short one.

A cross-reading of this very section with the description of the ceremonial to be observed on Christmas Eve (ἡ τῶν Χριστουγέννων παραμονή), might help to place the Christmas ceremony described more precisely in time: throughout, the chapter on feastday-ceremonial shows an evident concern about where the *megas domestikos* ought to be positioned and what his duties were (e.g., carrying the imperial sword)³². He gets into action quite early on: 'Thereafter the *prōtobestiariētēs* calls the *megas domestikos* forward to the emperor's table. While the emperor is seated, the *megas domestikos* serves him in the following manner.'³³ This detailed description of the *megas domestikos*' duties in the palace goes on for a considerable amount of text, until it is formally concluded in a way rendering the *megas domestikos* the by far most important courtier to participate in the Christmas celebrations, singled out above all others: 'And such are the services of the *megas domestikos* within the palace, as we have (just) described; those outside (the palace) shall be discussed shortly.'³⁴

Throughout the ceremony, the *megas domestikos* was – apart from the *megas hetaireiarchēs* and the *primmikērios* – the only one who interacted with the court society as representative of the emperor (and clearly more so than the other two). His major, and certainly very significant, duty consisted of distributing symbolic gifts (golden and silver plates from the *bestiarion*, called *minsoi*) to all courtiers: 'and the *megas domestikos* hands the plates, as was said, to everybody'; significantly, 'it is only to him that the emperor gives one *with his own hands*'.³⁵ That it fell to the *megas domestikos* to call forward the emperor's nephews, the *panhypersebastos* and the *prōtobestiarios*, to receive their *minsoi* seems to suggest that he was ranking above them, or was at least of the same rank (ἰσοστάσιον) with the *panhypersebastos*, at the time when the chapter was drafted.

Even more importantly, the *megas domestikos* did not only receive a silver or golden plate from the emperor's own hands which he was allowed to keep as an

(Osmanlı) dynasties on the grounds of 'tradition' and the emperors ultimate descent from the great Alexander.

31 Nicol, *Reluctant Emperor* (see n. 2), 23, PLP no. 10973, and Guiland, *Recherches* (see n. 15), 1, 412.

32 Cf. *de off.* 190.19–21.

33 *De off.* 213.5–9: ἐπειτα δὲ προσκαλεῖται ὁ πρωτοβεστιαρίτης τὸν μέγαν δομέστικον εἰς τὴν τράπεζαν. τοῦ οὖν βασιλέως καθίσαντος ὑπηρετεῖ ὁ μέγας δομέστικος οὕτω.

34 *De off.* 219.22–26: καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ ὑπηρετήματα τοῦ μεγάλου δομεστίκου ταῦτά εἰσι, καθὼς εἵπομεν, τὰ δ' ἐκτὸς μετ' ὀλίγον ῥηθήσεται καὶ αὐτά.

35 See n. 37.

imperial gift (δῶρον)³⁶ while everybody else was expected to return his plate at the end of the ceremony; also, while the *megas domestikos* distributed the silver and golden plates, the *archontes* down from the emperor's nephews to the lowest ranks were not allowed to leave their posts. The reason for this is stated explicitly: 'And not one of those who have received their plate leaves, but all remain in their assigned places to show the *megas domestikos* honour.'³⁷ – 'To show the *megas domestikos* honour': it may be worth recalling that this occurred while the emperor himself was presiding.

Apart from very close relatives of the emperor, i.e., the *despotai*, *sebastokratores*, and *kaisares*,³⁸ the *megas domestikos* also was the only courtier of considerable standing who was addressed by the emperor himself during the ceremony, in this instance probably representing the assembly of courtiers, thus virtually being the personified link between emperor and court. The emperor's speech-act provides climax and solution to the ceremony at the same time: 'After everybody has shown his reverence, the emperor addresses the *megas domestikos* in a loud voice [i.e., audible to everybody assembled]: "Many years, *megas domestikos*." And then he says to him, "Retreat", and immediately everyone withdraws together with the *megas domestikos*.'³⁹

In short, the *megas domestikos* became the crucial intermediary who interacted with the court society by representing the emperor (even while the latter

36 See n. 37.

37 De off. 216.5–217.20: ἔπειτα κράζει τοὺς ἄρχοντας ὀνομασί, μέχρι καὶ αὐτῶν πάντων τῶν σκαράνικα φορούντων κόκκινα. καὶ πάντων μίνσους λαμβανόντων ἐξέρχεται οὐδὲ εἷς, ἀλλὰ πάντες ἴστανται εἰς τοὺς τόπους αὐτῶν διὰ τὴν τοῦ μεγάλου δομεστίκου τιμὴν. [...] μετὰ δὲ τὸ τὸν μέγαν δομέστικον πρὸς πάντας διανεῖμαι τοὺς μίνσους, τοῦ δομεστίκου καὶ τοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης ὑποχωρησάντων, ὑπηρετεῖ αὐθις τῷ βασιλεῖ ὁ μέγας δομέστικος· καὶ πᾶσι μὲν οὗτος διαδίδωσι τοὺς μίνσους, ὡς εἴρηται, τούτῳ δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς αὐτοχειρῶς. ὅσα μὲν οὖν ἄλλοις δίδονται εἴτε χρυσάφια εἴτε ἀσήμια διὰ μίνσων, εἰσκομίζονται αὐθις εἰς τὸ βεστιάριον, ὃ δὲ σκεὺς ὁ μέγας δομέστικος διὰ τῆς τοῦ βασιλέως λαμβάνει χειρὸς, εἴτε χρυσὸν εἴτε ἀργυρὸν εἴη, εἰσκομίζεται οὐδαμῶς, ἀλλ' ἔχει τοῦτο δῶρον αὐτός.

38 De off. 212.6–14.

39 De off. 218.21–28: τῶν δὲ μετὰ τοῦτο προσκυνησάντων, λέγει ὁ βασιλεὺς τῷ μεγάλῳ δομεστίκῳ μεγάλη φωνῇ· 'εἰς πολλὰ ἔτη, μέγα δομέστικε'. ἔπειτ' αὖ φησι πρὸς αὐτὸν 'ἄπελθε', καὶ παρευθὺς συνέρχονται πάντες τῷ μεγάλῳ δομεστίκῳ. The only other instances of the emperor addressing courtiers directly – and much more briefly – occur de off. 207.20–21, limited to those who wear hats (σκιᾶδια) of red and golden silk (from the *sebastokrator* down to the *megas stratopedarchēs*), and 209.17–18, to the *podestà* of the Genoese. – For the emphasis and prestige a direct address by the emperor carried cf., e.g., Thomas Magistros' depiction of his audience with Andronikos II Palaiologos, cf. M. Treu, *Die Gesandtschaftsreise des Rhetors Theodulos Magistros*, in: *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, Supplementband 27 (1902) 5–30, esp. 11.35–37.

was present), and vice-versa. He had taken over the rôle of the *mesazōn* in the true sense of the word.⁴⁰

Pseudo-Kodinos' *megas domestikos* was the emperor's second man – a constellation that is strongly reminiscent of John Kantakouzenos' *ad hominem* position at the court of Andronikos III and perhaps already under the joint rule of the elder and younger Andronikoi⁴¹, rather than mirroring any institutionalized function of the *megas domestikos*. The *megas domestikos* present in the Christmas Eve ceremonial may thus be identified with John Kantakouzenos.

If this is the case, can a more precise date be attached to the Christmas ceremonial as described in Pseudo-Kodinos' handbook? A closer look at the following passage might at least provide a clue (if one chooses to believe that the text reflects indeed a given, not an entirely hypothetical situation; and if one does not assume that the prosopographical data at our disposal, even at the highest ranks of the court society, are too sparse to pursue the matter):

Next the *megas domestikos* approaches the emperor and, before long, calls forward the emperor's nephew in this manner, '*Panhypersébastes*', and he hands a plate to him when he has come forward, which a page takes immediately from the latter's hands; retreating, this page then hands the plate over to one of the *panhypersébastos*' men. The *panhypersébastos* himself withdraws and resumes his former position. In the very same manner the *megas domestikos* calls forward the emperor's [other] nephew, the *prōtobestiarios*; he is dealt with in the same manner. The remaining nephews, those who do not hold office, are called forward in the following manner: 'Nephew of our lord emperor', or 'brother-in-law', or 'uncle'. [...] ⁴²

(1) One span of time in which we certainly encounter two imperial nephews holding the offices of *panhypersébastos* and *prōtobestiarios* respectively was the early 1320s, when John Palaiologos, the son of the *despotēs* Constantine, Michael

40 Cf. H.-G. Beck, *Der byzantinische Ministerpräsident*, in: BZ 48 (1955) 309–338 (reprinted in id., *Ideen und Realitäten in Byzanz* [Variorum Collected Studies Series 13], London 1972, no. XIII), esp. 313–316. 319.

41 Cf. Dölger, Johannes VI. Kantakouzenos (see n. 3) and Rapp, *Ritual Brotherhood* (see n. 3). Kantakouzenos resigned from the office of *mesazōn* after the end of the civil war (*hist.* 1.337.21–339.16), but it was the emperor's wish that he retained ultimate control of most affairs of state, cf. Beck, *Ministerpräsident* (see n. 40), 319. Note, however, that the term *mesazōn* (or similar) is not used by Kantakouzenos in this passage.

42 De off. 215.11–215.29: εἶτα ἔρχεται ὁ μέγας δομέστικος πλησίον τοῦ βασιλέως, καὶ μετ' ὀλίγον λέγει πρὸς τὸν ἀνεψιὸν τοῦ βασιλέως τὸν πανυπερσέβαστον τοῦτο· 'πανυπερσέβαστε', καὶ ἐλθόντι δίδωσι μίνσον, ὃν παρευθὺς παιδόπουλον ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτοῦ λαμβάνον χειρῶν, ἀπελθὼν δίδωσιν ἀνθρώπῳ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πανυπερσεβάστου· ὁ δὲ ἀπέρχεται, καὶ ἴσταται πάλιν εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ. ὁμοίως λέγει καὶ τῷ ἀνεψίῳ τοῦ βασιλέως τῷ πρωτοβεστιαρίῳ, καὶ γίνεται καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν οὕτω. τοὺς δὲ ἐτέρους ἀνεψιοὺς τοὺς μὴ ὀφφίκια ἔχοντας κρᾶζει οὕτως· 'ἀνεψιὲ τοῦ αὐθέντη μας τοῦ βασιλέως', ἢ 'ἐξάδελφε', ἢ 'θειέ'. [...].

VIII's only son who was born in the purple, held the dignity (ἀξιωμα) of *panhypersebastos* and Andronikos Angelos Doukas Komnenos Palaiologos,⁴³ son of Andronikos II's sister Anna Palaiologina (his grandfather was Michael II [Doukas Komnenos] Angelos, lord of Epeiros), the dignity of *prōtobestiarios*.⁴⁴ It is puzzling, however, that there is only one, not two emperors present in the text, as one might – theoretically at least – expect if it was drafted while Andronikos II and Andronikos III were ruling jointly; they may well have avoided holding court together though. On the other hand, it is not quite clear whether John Kantakouzenos was promoted to the office of *megas domestikos* before Andronikos III's (second) coronation in February 1325; given John Palaiologos' premature death in 1326, the time-span is rather short.

Even if one concedes that the assumption the two nephews mentioned may be equated with the two referred to above is a far too positivistic reading of the text, the phrasing might nevertheless suggest that this passage was drafted under Andronikos II's rather than Andronikos III's rule. For as the passage concerning the *panhypersebastos* (quoted above) explicitly states, Andronikos II's *nephews* were, unsurprisingly, Andronikos III's *uncles*: 'he', that is the young emperor, 'made Kantakouzenos superior even to the nephews of his grandfather, his own uncles, and to all the others, even to the *panhypersebastos* and the *prōtobestiarios*'⁴⁵.

(2) However, it should be noted that there might be an alternative reading, although perhaps somewhat less probable: this scenario would be placed in the early 1340s, at approximately the same time when Maria Kantakouzenina was betrothed to Nikephoros Doukas (Angelos),⁴⁶ the son of John II Orsini (John Doukas Komnenos Angelos) and Anna Palaiologina, daughter of the *prōtobestiarios* Andronikos Angelos Palaiologos mentioned above.⁴⁷ The lad, barely fourteen years old,⁴⁸ was honoured with the title of *panhypersebastos* shortly before November 1340.⁴⁹ He was finally married to Kantakouzenos' daughter Maria in the summer of 1342. Given that Nikephoros' grandfather, the *prōtobestiarios*, was perceived as an uncle of Andronikos III, young Nikephoros the *panhypersebastos* could certainly have been counted among the nephews of that emperor. While we do not know who (if anybody) occupied the rank of *prōtobestiarios* in those years, this may well have been another young gentleman belonging to the generation following Andronikos III.

43 PLP no. 21435.

44 Already suggested by Verpeaux, *Traité* (see n. *), 36.

45 De off. 136.7–12; cf. above, 75.

46 PLP no. 222.

47 PLP nos. 207 and 21345.

48 Kantakouzenos and Gregoras differ in the assessment of his age; Gregoras, *hist.* 1.545.23 says he was 14 years of age when Andronikos III's campaign in 1339 began.

49 Kantakouzenos, *hist.* 1.534.13–19.

In this rather short span of time between November 1340 and Andronikos III's premature and unexpected death on 15 June 1341, young Nikephoros could perceivably have joined the imperial court for the Christmas holidays. In 1340, Christmas celebrations would have taken place in Thessalonike.⁵⁰ If Pseudo-Kodinos should indeed reflect this particular situation – it cannot be excluded –, the hypothesis that the chapters involving the *megas domestikos* were crafted with regard to proving that it was not at all out of place for the latter to replace an emperor would gain in probability.

A brief glance at the chapter outlining the *megas domestikos*' prerogatives outside the imperial palace, i.e., on campaign leading the imperial army – he is, again, the only official who is granted a whole chapter concerned about his privileges (and duties) outside the palace – will suffice to emphasize the *megas domestikos*' outstanding position within the court hierarchy.⁵¹ The *megas domestikos* assumes yet again more or less the function of a vice-emperor: 'Therefore, whenever the emperor is absent, the *megas domestikos* is found in the emperor's exact place.'⁵² He ranked above the emperor's sons, the *despotai*, when those served as captains in the army; he was granted the right to unfold his banner when- and wherever he desired, ὅτε βούλοιτο, καὶ πρὸ τῶν βασιλικῶν ('even earlier than the imperial ones'). Finally, there were additional financial benefits: he was entitled to a share of one-fifth of the booty (the same share the emperor received) and

50 Cf. Kantakouzenos, hist. 1.534. 18–20. 541.13–15; the emperor's decision to spend the winter in Thessalonike is reported immediately after Nikephoros Doukas' promotion to the rank of *panhypersebastos*. Gregoras, on the other hand, stated explicitly that young Nikephoros accompanied the emperor to Thessalonike (hist. 1.553.19–554.2). Apokaukos joined the court that winter coming from Constantinople; others may have done the same.

51 The chapter also deals with the duties of a number of other officials, notably the *megas droungarios tēs biglēs*, the *epi tou stratou* and the *megas adnoumiastēs*; in fact it describes their duties in the *megas domestikos*' service. This comes across nicely from the word order preserved in the handbook's obviously original index (it is present in, e.g., Parisinus graecus 2991A, dating to 1419): περὶ τῆς ἐν τῷ φορσάτῳ τοῦ μεγάλου δομεστίκου ὑπηρεσίας τοῦ τε μεγάλου δρουγγρίου τῆς βίγλης, τοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ στρατοῦ καὶ τοῦ μεγάλου ἀδνουμιαστοῦ.

52 De off. 250.21–251.24: πάντες μὲν οὖν, καὶ αὐτοὶ οἱ τοῦ βασιλέως υἱοί, βιγλίζουσι μετὰ τῶν ὑπ' αὐτούς, ὁ δὲ μέγας δομέστικος οὐδαμῶς. ἡ δὲ αἰτία ἐστὶν αὕτη, ὅτι ἐκάστου μὲν τῶν ἀρχόντων μέρους φωσσάτου ὄντος, ἄρχοντος τοῦ μεγάλου δομεστίκου δὲ καθόλου, καθὰ εἴρηται, δεῖ παρεῖναι διὰ τοῦτο τοῦτον αἰὲν ἐν παντὶ τῷ φορσάτῳ διατάττοντα πάντας, ἵνα μὴ ἐφόδου πολεμίων γενομένης, εἰ τύχοι, χωρὶς ἡγεμόνος τὸ καθόλου στράτευμα εὐρεθῇ διὰ τοι τοῦτο καὶ τοῦ βασιλέως ἀποδημούντος ὁ μέγας δομέστικος ἐν ᾧ τόπῳ ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰς τὸ φωσσάτον εὐρίσκεται. [...] ἐάν τινα ἀπὸ τῶν ῥογατόρων στρατιῶν ἄπαιδα συμβῇ τελευτῆσαι, τὸ τοῦ πολέμου ἄλογον ἐκείνου καὶ τὰ ἄρματα πρὸς τὸν μέγαν δομέστικον εἰκομίζονται. εἰ δεήσει διελθεῖν τὸν μέγαν δομέστικον εἰς ἡγεμονίαν τινὸς τῶν ἀρχόντων, τὸ ἐκείσε φωσσάτον τοῦτον ἐρωτῶσι, καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἑαυτῶν κεφαλῆς, τὸ τί δεῖ γενέσθαι. – When the emperor (Andronikos III) was present, the *megas domestikos* (John Kantakouzenos) would share his tent and bed, cf. above, n. 3.

permitted to keep those war-horses whose (foreign) owners had died without heir, presumably not too unlikely a case.⁵³

At this point, it may be worthwhile briefly tackling the issue of the coronation chapters. Verpeaux convincingly argued that the two accounts are, in fact, quite different, merely deriving from the same source: there can be no doubt that the two narratives describe the same ceremony and share some peculiar details. However, Kantakouzenos' account cannot have been the direct source of Pseudo-Kodinos' or vice-versa;⁵⁴ whatever Kantakouzenos copied into his *History* may have been either a source of the chapter in Pseudo-Kodinos that was later rewritten and extended, or vice-versa. (It does not necessarily matter for our present purposes.) More important, however, is the observation that while we know that Kantakouzenos occasionally included archival material in his *History*, the account of Andronikos III's coronation does *not* fit this pattern: In all other cases Kantakouzenos cited a specific document befitting specific circumstances (like Andronikos II's letters to his nephew, Andronikos Angelos Palaiologos⁵⁵). Andronikos III's coronation is an example of the opposite, and the first question should be why this is the case.

The obvious aim of inserting this treatise into his *History* must have been to depersonalise the ceremony it described: 'An imperial ceremony of such kind took place in the following manner'⁵⁶. The concluding sentence is very similar: 'Such is the ceremony that is performed when emperors are crowned: it was performed likewise in the case of Andronikos, the young emperor, in the month of February of the eighth indiction.'⁵⁷ And indeed it is only this framing of the account that reveals that the emperor in question was Andronikos III.

It may be suggested that there are two answers to this, one relating to the younger Andronikos, one to Kantakouzenos himself. The first answer is that Andronikos III's coronation, although ultimately legitimate, was, as is well known, not uncontested: to objectify the narration would have helped to assert Andronikos' own imperial authority and to conceal the preceding civil war that had forced the elder Andronikos to consent. The second answer is that the theoretical treatise inserted at so early a stage in his *History* was designed to meet Kantakouzenos' own needs. A glance at Kantakouzenos' accounts of his own corona-

53 This chapter occurs right before the instructions of how an emperor ought to be crowned, thus, accidentally or not, mirroring Kantakouzenos' own *cursus honorum*.

54 Cf. Verpeaux, *Traité* (see n. *), 35–40.

55 Kantakouzenos, *hist.* 1.232.23–235.10.

56 Kantakouzenos, *hist.* 1.196.11–12: ἡ τοιαύτη δὲ βασιλικὴ τελετὴ τοῦτον γίνεται τὸν τρόπον.

57 Kantakouzenos, *hist.* 1.203.25–204.3: τοιαύτη μὲν ἡ ἐπὶ τοῖς βασιλεῦσι στεφομένοις γινομένη τελετὴ ἥ δὴ γέγονεν ὁμοία καὶ ἐπ' Ἀνδρονίκῳ τῷ νέῳ βασιλεῖ, Φεβρουαρίου ἱσταμένου τῆς ὀγδόης ἰνδικτιῶνος.

tions immediately reveals that they show the same pattern we encountered in his narration of his daughter's *prokypsis*: everything had to happen, and – if we are to believe him (Gregoras got other stories to tell⁵⁸) – indeed happened, in accordance with established imperial custom.

It seemed appropriate to him to be crowned in the manner of emperors, since the patriarch of Jerusalem was with him and quite a number of archbishops. And he turned to the goldsmiths to prepare crowns, and whatever else was necessary for the ceremony. When everything had already been prepared (for the ceremony), he was crowned by Lazaros, the patriarch of Jerusalem, in the month of May, when the feast of the great Constantine and Helena, his mother, the apostle-like emperors, was celebrated. He himself crowned according to custom the empress Eirene, his wife, *and everything was performed according to custom as much as it was possible*. For bags full of gold and silver were distributed, and drinks and gifts were spent for many days.⁵⁹

And on his second coronation in the Blachernai-church in Constantinople, 13 May 1347:

On the thirteenth day of May, when spring began, the Emperor Kantakouzenos was once more crowned in the Church of the Mother of God at Blachernai by Isidore, the patriarch. The Empress Anne [Palaiologina] was present, as was John [V Palaiologos], his son-in-law. *And on this festive occasion (ceremony) everything was performed in accordance with the established custom, and nothing was left out*. Later on, he (Kantakouzenos) crowned Eirene empress according to custom. And while they returned to the palace, they distributed drinks and gifts and everything else which he

58 Nikephoros Gregoras, hist. 1.373.14–20, on the coronation of Andronikos III, February 1325, was much more absorbed with an issue that is not even mentioned in Kantakouzenos than with custom and ceremony: μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἐλθὼν ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰς Βυζάντιον ἐστέφθη Φεβρουαρίου ἡμέρᾳ δευτέρᾳ τῆς ὀγδόης ἰνδικτιῶνος. συνέβη δ' ἀπερχομένοις τοῖν δυοῖν βασιλέουσιν εἰς τὸ μέγα τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ Σοφίας τέμενος τῆς στεφηφορίας ἕνεκα πεσεῖν τὸν γηραιὸν βασιλέα ξὺν γε τῷ ἵππῳ ὀλισθήσαντι εἰς τελματώδη λίμνην τινὰ κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἐξ ὀμβρίων ὑδάτων συστάσαν· καὶ ἔδοξε τὸ τοιοῦτον σύμπτωμα τοῖς συνεωτέρους οὐκ ἀγαθὸς ὄρνις εἶναι τῷ πεπτωκότι. ('When thereafter the [young] emperor arrived in Constantinople, he was crowned on the second day of February in the eighth indiction. It happened that when both emperors approached the Great Church of the Holy Wisdom so as to perform the coronation, the old emperor fell together with his horse that slipped on the muddy ground, which persisted along the road from rainfall. Perceptive men did not consider such an incident a good sign for the one who had fallen.')

59 Kantakouzenos, hist. 2.564.10–22: ἐδόκει δὲ ἤδη καὶ τὸν τῶν βασιλέων τρόπον στέφεσθαι, ἐπεὶ καὶ πατριάρχης ὁ τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων παρῆν αὐτῷ καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων ἄλλοι οὐκ ὀλίγοι. καὶ χρυσοῦσις ἐπιτρέψας στέμματα κατασκευάζειν καὶ τάλλα ὅσα ἐπιτήδεια πρὸς τὴν τελευτήν, ἐπεὶ πάντα ἦσαν ἤδη παρεσκευασμένα, ἐστέφετο ὑπὸ Λαζάρου τοῦ τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων πατριάρχου κατὰ μῆνα Μάϊον, ἡνίκα καὶ Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ Ἑλένης τῆς μητρὸς τῶν ἰσαποστόλων βασιλέων ἡ μνήμη γίνεται. ἔστεφε δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς κατὰ τὸ ἔθος Εἰρήνην βασιλῖδα τὴν γαμετήν, καὶ πάντα ὅσα εἴωθεν ἐτελεῖτο ὅσον μάλιστα ἐξῆν. ἀποδεσμοί τε γὰρ ἐρρίπτοντο ἀργύρου καὶ χρυσοῦ, καὶ πότοι καὶ φιλοτησίαι ἐπὶ πλείστας ἡμέρας ἐτελοῦντο.

knew would make the feast (ceremony) cheerful. Of course, he had been crowned before in Adrianople by Lazaros, the patriarch of Jerusalem, and that anointing with holy oil would have sufficed for those who were well intended (towards him): *So as not to give any pretext to the unruly because he had not been crowned in Constantinople according to the ancient custom of emperors, also the second rite was performed.*⁶⁰

However, these passages give away very little about the ceremonies themselves. Again, it is well known that Kantakouzenos' succession to, or rather usurpation of, the throne was even more disputed than Andronikos III's. Thus one may wonder whether he adopted the following literary strategy: did he hope to conceal the fact that he had usurped the throne by inserting a full account of the ceremony already at the occasion of Andronikos III's coronation and by limiting himself to allusions to the imperial ἔθος when his own coronation(s) was/were concerned? By linking the last legitimate emperor, the younger Andronikos, explicitly with an ἔθος, a custom, older and greater than any man, Kantakouzenos could at least hope to place himself silently in that tradition, very much in the same manner as he styled himself a member of the Palaiologan family clan: by giving a detailed, yet 'open' ('blank') account of the ceremony the listeners/readers of his *History* would naturally have to assume that his coronation was performed in the same manner, which, in turn, would reassert his imperial authority. At the same time, there was no need to dwell on those ceremonies any longer then necessary and thus to remind anyone (least of all the ὑβρισταί to whom Kantakouzenos himself refers) that, in fact, things were not quite as much in accordance with ἔθος as they could have been.

While this is not to say that Kantakouzenos was responsible for Pseudo-Kodinos' handbook as we know it today, it may be suggested that he was very likely to be one, maybe *the*, driving force behind a number of the earlier chapters, or at least behind some telling details in those chapters, i.e., all those pertaining to the *megas domestikos*' influential rôle. To conclude, three scenarios seem to offer themselves: these Kantakouzenian 'core chapters' of the handbook were compiled

60 Kantakouzenos, hist. 3.29.1–22: τρίτη δὲ ἐπὶ δέκα Μαΐου ἱσταμένου ἡρος τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ τῆς θεωμήτορος τεμένει τῶν Βλαχερνῶν βασιλεὺς ὁ Καντακουζηνὸς ὑπὸ Ἰσιδώρου τοῦ πατριάρχου ἐστέφθη αὐθις, Ἀννης τε τῆς βασιλίδος παρούσης καὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ γαμβροῦ καὶ πάντα ἐτελεῖτο τὰ νενομισμένα ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, οὐδενὸς παραλειφθέντος· ἔπειτα καὶ αὐτὸς Εἰρήνην ἔστεφε τὴν βασιλῖδα κατὰ τὸ ἔθος. καὶ εἰς τὰ βασίλεια ἐπανελθόντες πότους καὶ φιλοτησίας καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα ἐξεπλήρουν, ὅσα φαιδρύνειν οἶδε τὴν ἑορτήν. καίτοιγε αὐτὸς ἐν Ἀδριανουπόλει ὑπὸ Λαζάρου τοῦ τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων πατριάρχου πρότερον ἐστέφθη καὶ ἐπέχρησεν ἂν ἢ τοῦ ἁγίου μύρου χρῆσις ἐκείνη παρ' εὐφρονοῦσιν ἵνα δὲ μηδεμία εἴη πρόφασις τοῖς ὑβρισταῖς, ὥς ἄρα μὴ ἐν Βυζαντίῳ κατὰ τὸ ἀρχαῖον τῶν βασιλέων ἔθος ἔστεπτο, καὶ τὸ δεύτερον αὐθις ἐτελοῦντο.

(1) either while Andronikos III was still alive, trying to define, and preserve, John Kantakouzenos' distinguished position at court – and perhaps in an effort to counter the (alleged) loss of manners at court under said emperor. This possibility seems the least likely given that Andronikos died rather unexpectedly in 1341; however, his grave illness in 1330, when he already urged Kantakouzenos to accept the title of co-emperor, might have prompted Andronikos or Kantakouzenos into action. Allegedly, the emperor's last words were, 'I leave you with the *megas domestikos* as leader and protector in my stead,' and to Kantakouzenos: 'I entrust this (woman) [i.e., the Empress Anna, then with child] and all Rhomaioi to you; from this moment on, you shall be concerned about them;'⁶¹

(2) or right after Andronikos III's death (1341) in an attempt to educate the young John V Palaiologos, his mother, Anna of Savoy, the patriarch John XIV Kalekas and their circle about the prerogatives of the *megas domestikos*, and thus in an attempt to secure Kantakouzenos' uniquely influential position *without* usurpation of imperial rights;

(3) or, and this seems most likely, while John Kantakouzenos already was emperor of the Rhomaioi, perhaps still fighting to gain entry to Constantinople, hoping to demonstrate that it was quite natural for a *megas domestikos* to have assumed supreme power in the way he had done, emphasising that the *megas domestikos* had been the late emperor's port-parole and *mesazōn* anyway. This would fit best with the 1347 *terminus post quem*; even though arguably the information about the Asan brothers could have come into the text as a later interpolation.

Whether these Kantakouzenian 'core chapters' and the remainder of the material nowadays known as Pseudo-Kodinos' handbook were assembled, or whether they were conceived as a coherent whole, is, to my mind, yet another question – and one almost impossible to answer at present.⁶²

61 Kantakouzenos, hist. 1.393.22–24: ἔπειτα δὲ ἡγεμόνα καὶ προστάτην ἀντ' ἐμοῦ τὸν μέγαν δομέστικον ἀφίημι ὑμῖν. Ibid. 394.5–7: 'σοὶ ταύτην', ἔφη, 'παραδίδωμι καὶ πάντας Ῥωμαίους· καὶ τοαποτοῦδέ σοι μελήσει περὶ αὐτῶν.'

62 One must not forget that the only manuscript apparently dating to the fourteenth century, Vaticanus graecus 778, preserves 'chapter 10', περὶ προβλήσεως πατριαρχῶν καὶ ἀρχιεπισκόπων, only: this treatise could perceivably have circulated on its own before becoming part of the handbook as such. The date of Dionysiou 367 rests on Lampros' authority alone; again the manuscript contains excerpts only (this time from the 'first chapter').

II. Words and Genres

Building on this conclusion that a core of chapters in Pseudo-Kodinos' handbook mirrors Kantakouzenos' influence in one way or other, which other (roughly) contemporary texts can be linked to the treatise?

a) The fourteenth century:

the historiographical metaphrases, the Byzantine *Achilleid*, and the *Book of Birds*

First it should be observed that, in spite of a certain abundance of idiosyncratic terms, Pseudo-Kodinos' handbook cannot – grammatically or stylistically speaking, apart from a very few insertions of contemporary spoken Greek, e.g., when one hears the *meḡas domestikos* proclaim, ἐλᾶτε καὶ ἐσεῖς⁶³ – be considered a 'vernacular'⁶⁴ text or as written in a particularly low register. It is the copious amount of technical terms drawn from numerous languages – Latin and Persian most prominent among them – that gives a somewhat misleading impression. In fact most of these terms, interesting as they are in themselves, present a methodological pitfall if one attempts to contextualise Pseudo-Kodinos' handbook: either they are well-established examples of the Byzantine *koinē*, quite often going back to, e.g., the tenth-century *Book of Ceremonies* or the long tradition of military treatises, and tell us very little about the contemporary context⁶⁵ or – and this is the true pitfall – they are very specific and *hapax legomena*.⁶⁶ In fact, the handbook operates on a rather high level of written *koinē*. This one will easily realise if one compares the treatise to, e.g., the fourteenth-century metaphrasis of Anna Komnene's *Alexiad*, which, in turn, is still by no means a 'vernacular' text, but

63 De off. 215.4–5.

64 Here denoting the register of language close to the late Byzantine 'Dichtersänger-*koinē*'. This is not to say that texts written in the 'Dichtersänger-*koinē*' and Pseudo-Kodinos' handbook do not share a fair amount of vocabulary; a short glance at, e.g., the Byzantine *Achilleid* will prove that they do.

65 E.g., ἀδνουμιάζω (de off. 250.14), βίγλα (249.16 etc.); βιγλίζω (249.16 etc.); δεφενδεύω (173.22); μινσάλιον (217.22 etc. – LBG s. v. μεσ-); μίνσος (210.23 etc. – LBG s. v. μίσ-); πολυχρόνιον (191.1 etc.), πυρέκβολον (167.21), ρογάτωρ (175.13 etc.), ρογεύω (187.3), σάγιωμα (169.22 etc.), σαλίβα (161.20 etc.). Occasionally, Pseudo-Kodinos shares terms with chancery and less formal texts of the twelfth century, e.g., βουτίον in the specific meaning of 'pommel' (164.4 – LBG s. v. βουτ(τ)-; TypKechar [s. XII]); μαργέλλιον (132.12 etc.); μελλονύμφη (132.1 – cf., however, LSSup); μονοκάβαλλος (139.10 etc. – also APhil [a. 1344]). – For abbreviations, exact and further references, cf. LBG s. v.

66 E.g., ἀγγουρωτόν (de off. 181.27); ἀνακαριστής (172.9 etc.); βερικοκκόχροος (155.4); γρανάτζα (219.1 etc.); είσδουλεύω (187.3); λαπάτζας (219.12 etc.); μεγαλοαλλαγίτης (187.8); οκτάγλωσσος (-ον φλάμουλον) (196.3); πιλατίκιον (198.10 etc.); πολυχρόνισμα (235.11 – cf. n. 65, πολυχρόνιον); πτερνιστηρόλωρον (144.8); ρομφαιοκράτωρ (273.17). Cf. in all cases the LBG.

certainly closer to that register of language.⁶⁷ The frequency of these technical terms may thus tell us something about the presumably rather open-minded attitude concerning language at the mid- and later-fourteenth century imperial court, as opposed to the strict 'Attic' literary sociolect preferred in the learned circles of the period.⁶⁸

Only a few words/terms actually help to contextualise Pseudo-Kodinos' handbook in the late Byzantine period.⁶⁹ That the text is firmly tied to the *koinē* tradition becomes evident by some overall markers that it shares with other *koinē* texts of the mid-fourteenth century, such as the well-known metaphrases of Anna Komnene's *Alexiad*, Niketas Choniates' *History*, George Pachymeres' *History*, or Nikephoros Blemmydes' *Imperial Statue*.⁷⁰ Such markers are, for example, the frequent use of the verbs ποιέω, ἔρχομαι, κρατέω, and their respective composita instead of more learned alternatives. Also remarkable is the shift of meaning with regard to the verb ὀρίζω, which clearly became an imperial prerogative in

67 E.g., ἵνα-constructions are abundant, unlike in the case of Pseudo-Kodinos.

68 Cf. most recently N. Gaul, *The Twitching Shroud. Collective construction of late Byzantine paideia in the circle of Thomas Magistros*, in: *Segno e testo* 5 (2007) (forthcoming).

69 E.g., ἀετόπουλα (de off. 145.10 – cf. Kr [Achilleid]); ἀπελατίκιον (180.14 – NChonPar, cf. Kr [Achilleid, Chronicle of the Tocco]); ἀσπροκόκκινος (164.16 – cf. Kr [Erotokritos]); αὐθεντόπουλος (150.11 etc. – AXen [a. 1322/23], Achil [a. 1323]); ἀχρύσωτος (160.17 etc. – Achmet; MM [a. 1077], PetitNotre [a. 1449], cf., however, LSSup); ἔγκοπτος (154.3 etc. – PetitNotre [a. 1449], cf. Kr [Imperios & Margarona]); μαργαριταεῖνός (144.3 etc. – MM [a. 1397], cf. Kr -ρένιος [Digenis Akritas E]); ματζούκα (163.33 – PsHerod); μουρτάτος (180.16 etc. – ALavra [a. 1259], BoissAn [Nikephoros Choumnos]); νεονύμφη (286.22 – cf. Kr νεονυφάδες [Digenis Akritas E]); οἶνοχείον (218.12 etc. – APApp; Achiland [a. 1314]; ABator [a. 1325]; ADoch [a. 1384]); ὀλομάργαρος (141.3 – DelTyp [c.1300]; MM [a. 1397]); παράστασις in the specific meaning of 'imperial audience' (130.21 etc. – Syrop). – For abbreviations, exact and further references, cf. LBG s. v.

70 Komnene: H. Hunger (ed.), *Anonyme Metaphrase zu Anna Komnene, Alexias XI–XIII. Ein Beitrag zur Erschließung der byzantinischen Umgangssprache* (WBS XV), Vienna 1981. – Choniates: J.-L. van Dieten, *Bemerkungen zur Sprache der sog. vulgärgriechischen Niketasparaphrase*, in: *BF* 6 (1979) 37–77. – Pachymeres: A. Failler (ed.), *La version brève des relations historiques de Georges Pachymères* (Archives de l'Orient chrétien 17–19), 3 vols. (Paris 2001–2004); id., *Un incendie à Constantinople en 1305*, in: *REB* 36 (1978) 153–175; id., *La tradition manuscrite de l'Histoire de George Pachymère* (Livres I–VI), in: *REB* 37 (1979) 123–220. – Blemmydes: H. Hunger/I. Ševčenko (eds.), *Des Nikephoros Blemmydes Βασιλικὸς Ἀνδρίας und dessen Metaphrase von Georgios Galesiotes und Georgios Oinaïotes* (WBS XVIII), Vienna 1986. – On the metaphrases in general, J. Davis suggests that these 'probably need to be linked to the troubled period of the regency of Anne of Savoy, widow of Andronikos III, and Patriarch Kalekas, overseeing the minority of her son, John V Palaiologos, in the 1340s. The "declassicizing" translations of the histories of Anna Komnene and Niketas Choniates and of the speculum principis of Nikephoros Blemmydes do not represent a spontaneous expression of the desire of ordinary Byzantines to attain a clearer understanding of their historical and cultural background [...]; rather, they constitute a curious by-product of the desperate attempts of a small, threatened social group to hold on to political and economic power and privilege.' Cf. <http://maillists.uci.edu/mailman/public/mgsa-l/2004-November/004538.html> (8 Oct 2006).

the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, denoting a wide variety of even the most basic, imperial speech-acts.

It may suffice to give a couple of examples for ποιέω and ὀρίζω. One encounters two instances of ποιέω in the meaning of προβάλλομαι ('to promote') right in the beginning of Pseudo-Kodinos': (1) ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς Ἀνδρόνικος τῶν Παλαιολόγων ὁ πρῶτος [...] ἐφόρσε ταῦτα Ἰωάννην τὸν Παλαιολόγον τὸν ἀνεψιὸν αὐτοῦ [...] ποιήσας πανυπερσέβαστον ('the elder emperor Andronikos Palaiologos entitled his nephew John Palaiologos to wear those (colours) when *styling* him *panhypersebastos*'); (2) [...] ἐποίησαν τὸν μέγαν δομέστικον τὸν Καντακουζηνὸν Ἰωάννην [...] ('they *promoted* John Kantakouzenos [to the office of] *megas domestikos*').⁷¹ From the metaphrasis of the *Alexiad* we learn that the verb ποιέω came to replace, inter alia, the more aspiring termini technici προβάλλομαι and προχειρίζομαι; there are three occurrences of this in the metaphrasis.⁷² It is noteworthy that the more learned variant has been preserved in the more formulaic speech of ceremony: according to Pseudo-Kodinos' handbook, the emperor creating a *despotēs* proclaims, ἡ βασιλεία μου προβάλλεται σε δεσπότην ('my majesty creates you *despotēs*'). In the case of a patriarch this is even more elaborate, ἡ ἀγία τριάς ἡ τὴν βασιλείαν δωρησαμένη ἡμῖν προβάλλεται σε ἀρχιεπίσκοπον Κωνσταντινουπόλεως νέας Ῥώμης καὶ οἰκουμενικὸν πατριάρχη ('the Holy Trinity that has bestowed imperial majesty onto us creates you archbishop of Constantinople, New Rome, and ecumenical patriarch').⁷³

Secondly, Pseudo-Kodinos classified, and distinguished, all imperial speech-acts by means of the verb ὀρίζω, regardless of their significance and occasion; about this time, the verb seems to have become an imperial prerogative, be it even to express Christmas greetings.⁷⁴ Again from the metaphrasis of Anna Komnene's *Alexiad* we can infer that ὀρίζω came to replace the following, more learned, expressions that Alexios' daughter herself had employed in the *Alexiad*:

71 De off. 134.9 and 135.8 respectively.

72 Cf. Hunger's excellent index, Metaphrase (see n. 70), 156. 224–225. For the occurrences, cf. § 61 (μέγαν δοῦκαν τοῦτον ἐποίησεν) and again § 257 (μέγαν δοῦκαν ποιήσας αὐτόν); § 83 (ἀπέστειλε τὸν εὐνοῦχον Εὐστάθιον ἀπὸ κανικλείου μέγαν δρουγγάριον τοῦτον ποιήσας).

73 De off. 274.24–25 and 280.2–7 respectively.

74 De off. 207.20. 209.4 (ὀρίζει ὁ βασιλεὺς ...). 212.8 (πρὸς οὓς καὶ ὀρίζει ὁ βασιλεὺς δι' ἑαυτοῦ). Also, and perhaps more significantly, in indirect speech-acts, e.g., de off. 207.29 (ὁ μέγας ἐταιριάρχης ἡ ὁ πριμμικήριος τῆς αὐλῆς λέγει πρὸς αὐτοὺς 'εἰς πολλὰ ἔτη ὀρίζει ὁ αὐθέντης μας ὁ βασιλεὺς'). 208.14–17. 209.14 (ὀρίζει καὶ τούτους δι' ἔρμηνέως ὁ βασιλεὺς ...). In Kantakouzenos' Memoirs, the usage of ὀρίζω is less confined (cf., e.g., hist. 1.16.13); however, it occurs several times in the letter of Mamluk Sultan an-Nāsir Hasan to Kantakouzenos (hist. 3.96.1. 6. 97.4. 16. 98.2, cf. F. Dölger, Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches, 5: Regesten von 1341–1453, Munich 1965, no. 2950).

βούλομαι, ἐντέλλω, ἐπισκίπτω, ἐπιτάττω, κελεύομαι, οἰκονομέω, παραθήγω, παρακελεύομαι, προστάττω.⁷⁵

Having observed this, the texts which breathe the very same spirit⁷⁶ shining forth from Pseudo-Kodinos' handbook are, nevertheless, so-called 'vernacular' ones. After all, the *Kallimachos & Chrysorrhoe* romance may have been composed by a nephew of Emperor Michael VIII, Andronikos Palaiologos,⁷⁷ and the poetic language of the chivalric romance was never far from court culture. This study will limit its observations to four texts, (1) the Byzantine *Achilleid*, (2) the *Poulologos* or *Book of Birds*,⁷⁸ and (3) the *Porikologos* with its sibling, the *Opsarologos*.

(1) When Achilles dons his best garments to introduce the lady of his heart to his twelve squires, the text treats us to a detailed description of this costume as well as of his white mount's saddle and harness, which mirrors the respective passage in Pseudo-Kodinos' handbook.⁷⁹ Some differences remain – unsurprisingly, the chivalric *despotēs* emerges as even more spectacular than his 'real' counterpart yet there are also many instances where the two texts meet. The basic colour of the *despotēs*' tunic is white (white with golden eagles in the *Achilleid*, white and purple in Pseudo-Kodinos' handbook);⁸⁰ of his garment red (with embroidery in real life, with pearls in the romance);⁸¹ his stockings and boots are embellished with eagles.⁸² In both instances, some attention is devoted to the spurs (mere iron

⁷⁵ Hunger, *Metaphrase* (see n. 70), 156.

⁷⁶ Independent of stylistic register.

⁷⁷ PLP 21439. On his (disputed) authorship cf. H.-G. Beck, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Volksliteratur* (HdAW XII, *Byzantinisches Handbuch* 2.3), Munich 1971, 124–125 and R. Beaton *The Medieval Greek Romance*, London ²1996, 104 and 108–9. However, P. A. Agapitos/O. L. Smith, *The Study of Medieval Greek Romance*, Copenhagen 1992, 131 and P. A. Agapitos, *Narrative Structure in the Byzantine Vernacular Romances. A Textual and Literary Study of Kallimachos, Belthandros and Libistros* (MBM 34), Munich 1991, 15–16 suggest some caution. Even if Andronikos Komnenos may not be the author of *Kallimachos & Chrysorrhoe*, it is beyond question in general that he composed a chivalric romance. – On historical allusions in the chivalric romances cf. P. E. Pieler, *Recht, Staat und Gesellschaft im byzantinischen Roman der Palaiologenzeit*, in: *JÖB* 20 (1971) 189–221.

⁷⁸ With occasional reference to the *Entertaining Tale of Quadrupeds*.

⁷⁹ Compare *Achilleid* N, vv. 1186–1205 with de off. 143.2–145.11. *Achilleid* L, vv. 797–814, offers a slightly different version. – Achilles is promoted to the rank of *despotēs* very early on (right after his birth, v. 88); on some instances of court protocol from the beginning of the text cf. *Achilleid* N, esp. vv. 88, 116, 175–177, 366–378 and Smith's *Achilleid* (see n. *) on those verses.

⁸⁰ *Achilleid* N, v. 1187 (ἄσπρον βλαττὶν ἐφόρεσεν μὲ τὰ χρυσὰ πουλία); L, v. 798.

⁸¹ *Achilleid* N, v. 1188 (καὶ ἀπανωφόριν κόκκινον μετὰ λιθομαργάρων); L, v. 799. Cf. de off. 143.2–6 (ροῦχον and ταμπάριον). 146.2–5 (καββάδιον).

⁸² *Achilleid* N, v. 1189 (τουβίτσια χρυσοπράσινα μετὰ ἀετούς μεγάλους); L, v. 800. Cf. de off. 143.7–144.5. – Achilles' squires are equally clad in golden and green garments (*Achilleid* N, v. 1183).

in ‘real life’, with straps of white and purple; an ‘alloy’ of precious stones and pearls in the romance).⁸³ Achilles’ golden and green stockings (τουβίτσια χρυσοπράσινα), however, would have been a considerable social faux-pas: in Pseudo-Kodinos’ handbook, these colours are reserved for the *prōtobestiarios*’ mace (δικανίκιον) and the *prōtosebastos*’ hat (σκιάδιον) respectively.⁸⁴

Particularly striking is the amount of detail devoted to the description of Achilles’ saddle, which is exactly mirrored by the generous information Pseudo-Kodinos provides on the saddle and harness assigned to a *despotēs*.⁸⁵ Both saddles, the literary as well as the ‘real’ one, are embellished with eagles and pearls (in the romance, also lions).⁸⁶ Both horses’ harnesses are adorned with tassel and palm-leaves on the crownpiece: twelve golden ones in the case of the romance.⁸⁷ Collar and breaching are of two colours, white and purple in ‘real life’, golden and purple in the romance.⁸⁸

(2) The setting of the *Poulologos*⁸⁹ is the wedding of Emperor Eagle’s son (*archontopoulos*); on this occasion, the noble guests – each represented by a different species of birds – consequently question and dispute each other’s right to occupy a place at the imperial table. There are twenty-eight birds, including the bat (in terms of Byzantine ornithology) – half of them representing Kantakouzenos and his party, half of them Apokaukos and his cronies (?) – that line up in fourteen quarreling/disputing pairs. Günter Prinzing has recently suggested re-classifying this text, any contemporary political connotation notwithstanding, as belonging to the dialogic/dramatic sub-genre of Byzantine discourse combat (‘Rangstreitdichtung’)⁹⁰, i.e., a rhetorical, playful, yet ultimately serious discus-

83 Achilleid N, v. 1190 (καὶ περνευστήρια χυμευτὰ διὰ λίθων καὶ μαργάρων); L, v. 801. Cf. de off. 144.6–8.

84 Achilleid N, v. 1189; L, v. 800. Cf. de off. 153.3–6. 155.19–20. Smith, Achilleid (see n. *), 132 adduces an interesting parallel from a tenth-century military treatise; cf. id., ‘Towards a new approach to the Byzantine vernacular romances’, in: J. M. Egea/J. Alonso (eds.), *Prosa y verso griego medieval. Rapports of the Third International Conference ‘Neograeca Medii Aevi’* (Vitoria 1994), Amsterdam 1996, 331–339 and C. Cupane (ed.), *Romanzi cavallereschi bizantini*, Turin 1995, 401–403 and nn. 106–108.

85 Cf. Smith, Achilleid (see n. *), 132–133.

86 Achilleid N, vv. 1194–1195. 1198 (μὲ τὰ χρυσὰ ἀετόπουλα, μὲ τὰ χρυσὰ λεοντάρια); L, vv. 803 (here the saddle is golden). 806. Cf. de off. 144.8–145.1. 145.9–13 (ἀετόπουλα embellish also the *despotēs*’ tent).

87 Achilleid N, vv. 1204–1205 (φούντα μεγάλη, ἔμορφη εἰς τὸ μέτωπον τοῦ ἀλόγου / μὲ δώδεκα φοινίκια χρυσὰ σκουταρωμένη); L, vv. 813–814. Cf. de off. 145.4–9.

88 Achilleid N, vv. 1196–197; L, vv. 804–895 (red with embroideries). Cf. de off. 145.1–6.

89 I. Tsavare (ed.), *Ὁ Πουολόγος* (Βυζαντινὴ καὶ νεοελληνικὴ βιβλιοθήκη 5), Athens 1987. An earlier edition with German translation is provided by S. Krawczynski, *Ὁ Πουολόγος*. Kritische Textausgabe mit Übersetzung sowie sprachlichen und sachlichen Erläuterungen (BBA 22), Berlin 1960.

90 G. Prinzing, *Zur byzantinischen Rangstreitliteratur in Prosa und Dichtung*, in: RHM 45 (2003) 241–286, with regard to the Book of Birds esp. 260–271.

sion of one's rank in (court) society by means of dialogic *synkriseis* ('comparisons').⁹¹ From this perspective (much less so with regard to the amount of political satire), the *Poulologos* emerges as a relative of the (presumably) slightly later *Entertaining Tale of Quadrupeds*.⁹²

The *Tale of Birds* can be related to Pseudo-Kodinos' handbook in two ways. First, it can be linked to the circles surrounding Kantakouzenos to such a degree that it can be considered as a piece of pro-Kantakouzenian propaganda. The eagle, the mighty emperor (*basileus*) of all birds, may be tentatively identified with Kantakouzenos himself.⁹³ The text mocks the ambition of various birds, i.e., courtiers, half of them (presumably) representing Kantakouzenos' followers (the domesticated and tame ones), half of them his opponents (the wild birds). These latter ones, whose purpose is to heap insults on the opposing, Kantakouzenian, party who, defending themselves, are thus given the opportunity of blowing their own trumpets,⁹⁴ are portrayed in very unfavourable colours: two among them seem to represent Kantakouzenos' fierce adversary, Alexios Apokaukos (the ?flamingo),⁹⁵ and the latter's trusted man, an individual called Tzephre (the sea-gull).⁹⁶ Perceivably, this text could have been performed at Kantakouzenos' court – in a

91 It goes without saying that this was at the heart of Pseudo-Kodinos' handbook too, as I. Ševčenko, *Études sur la polémique entre Théodore Métochite et Nicéphore Choumnos*, Brussels 1962, 157–168, and Verpeaux, *Traité* (see n. *), 28–29 have suggested that the mere fact that the ἐπὶ τοῦ κανικλείου is missing from Pseudo-Kodinos' list of precedence may be owed to the fact that Choumnos kept away from imperial audiences (παραστάσεις) after Metochites' promotion (what must have felt like his own humiliation).

92 Cf. the exhaustive treatment of this latter text provided by N. Nicholas/G. Baloglou, *An Entertaining Tale of Quadrupeds*, New York 2003 and N. Nicholas, *How the Entertaining Tale of Quadrupeds became a Tale: Grafting Narrative*, in: J. Burke (ed.), *Byzantine Narrative. Papers in Honour of Roger Scott* (Byzantina Australiensia 16), Melbourne 2006, 182–192 (I owe this reference to G. Prinzing). Altogether the *Tale* is much less exposed to everyday politics than the *Book*, or so it seems; cf. Nicholas/Baloglou (431–447) on the difficulty to tie the *Tale* to any specific historical context in spite of the exact date evoked in *Tale's* proemium, 15 September 1364 (vv. 11–13). If anything happened that day prompting the composition of this text, which works, apart from the ongoing dispute about rank, along completely different lines than the *Book*, with much less obvious suggestions for identification of contemporary individuals (if at all), we do not know.

93 Cf. G. Makris, *Zum literarischen Genus des Pulologos*, in: N. M. Panayotakis (ed.), *Origini della letteratura neogreca. Atti del secondo congresso internazionale 'Neograeca Medii Aevi'* (Venezia, 7–10 novembre 1991), Venice 1993, 1, 392–412, esp. 410. Cf. Prinzing, *Rangstreitliteratur* (see n. 90), 270–271 and nn. 76 and 77 on the 'reconciliation' of political allusion with discourse combat in the *Book*. Makris himself assumes that the *Book*, once the civil war had passed, was primarily transmitted and enjoyed as an animal epic (410).

94 Prinzing, *Rangstreitliteratur* (see n. 90), 267 and H. Eideneier, *Zum Stil der byzantinischen Tierdichtung*, in: JÖB 32/3 (1981) 301–306, esp. 303 observed that only the tame birds are given the chance of emphasising their virtues while defending themselves.

95 PLP no. 1180. Apokaukos was murdered in June 1345 while inspecting a prison in Constantinople. Cf. Makris, *Genus* (see n. 93), 402–406.

96 PLP no. 27901. Cf. Makris, *Genus* (see n. 93), 408–409.

θέατρον? – to the entertainment of his entourage, and perhaps even circulated – or performed publicly in the heated atmosphere of the 1340s Constantinople? – as a pamphlet mocking Apokaukos.⁹⁷ With such a purpose in mind, a ‘vernacular’ sociolect would certainly make perfect sense in order to reach as wide an audience as possible as easily as possible (i.e., including the *mesoi* rather than the *dēmos*).⁹⁸

Secondly, satirising and parodying court society, the text does not fail to reflect the competitive and ambitious attitude among the courtiers quite seriously and to highlight especially the outward indicators/markers of this combat. Thus, perhaps unsurprisingly, just as the *Achilleid*, the *Book* does not fail to pay a fair amount of attention to matters of dress codes, interpreting the colours of some fowls’ and birds’ feathers very much in the spirit that permeates Pseudo-Kodinos’ elaborate chapter on court dress.⁹⁹ The following examples may exemplify the elements of the text that can be related to this prominent aspect of the handbook:¹⁰⁰

(a) The partridge defends herself against the bat, emphasizing her purple stockings, as well as her garment:

The stockings that I wear are of purple,
And my stockings befit me, like the partridge that I am:
And the garment that I wear, wherever I am,
befits me as a great lady, for I am of noble origin.¹⁰¹

(b) The ?flamingo/παραγιαλίτης (?Alexios Apokaukos) scorns the pheasant; this is presumably a passage at the very heart of the strife between Kantakouzenos and Apokaukos:

If one catches a glimpse of you, in that garment that you wear,

97 Cf. Makris, *Genus* (see n. 93), 402–410.

98 Well observed by Prinzing, *Rangstreitliteratur* (see n. 90), 268.

99 De off. 141.1–166.32 (περὶ τῶν φορεμάτων ἐκάστου τῶν τε ἀξιωματῶν καὶ ὀφθαλμίων). This chapter describes the colour and shape of the hats and garments worn by courtiers on official occasion in considerable detail and at considerable length. – For insights from outside on this matter cf., e.g., S. Crane, *The Performance of Self. Ritual, Clothing, and Identity During the Hundred Years War*, Philadelphia 2002.

100 It hardly needs additional proof that colours mattered in Pseudo-Kodinos’ world; a reference to the *prōtobestiaros*’ new green, the *panhypersebastos*’ new yellow garments and to the Asan brothers’ *despotēs*-like stockings and boots upon their promotion to the rank of *sebastokratores* may suffice (de off. 134.3–9. 12–135.5. 147.17–148.3).

101 Vv. 188–193: ἐγὼ τὰς κάλτσας τὰς φορῶ ἔναι ἀπὸ σκαρλάτο [...], / καὶ πρέπουν με οἱ κάλτζες μου, ὡς πέρδικα ὅπου εἶμαι / καὶ τὸ μανδί μου τὸ φορῶ, ὅπόθεν ἂν εἶμαι, / πρέπει με ὡς ἀρχόντισσα μου ὡς εἶμαι εὐγενίδα. – The term κάλτσα (κάλτζα) is prominent in Pseudo-Kodinos’ handbook, cf. de off. 143.7. 147.16. 148.2. 149.5 and 181.19.

that they call *atypin* – sprinkled with colourful dots and blots,
 red and a little yellow on the outside,
 and dark blue, green, purple, and light blue ones –,
 [if one catches a glimpse of you,] would one say that you are the noble son of a Kin-
 namos,
 or that you are from Anatolia, a scion of the Phouskomates family,
 or that you are from Berat, a scion of *sebastoi* [family name?].
 In fact, you are from Mesothynia, the son of a madwoman.
 Your mother died and left you some money,
 and you bought your *atypin*, that you boast about,
 and you claim to be the son of a *sebastos* from Nikaia.¹⁰²

Quite interesting is the occurrence of the term ἀτυπίν (ἀτουπίν) in this passage, denoting an originally Persian/Turkish court costume:¹⁰³ one is perhaps entitled to imagine this splendid garment as resembling Pseudo-Kodinos' γροανάτζα and λαπάτζας, terms which obviously denote Persian garments to be worn by the emperor and his lords respectively during the Christmas celebrations.¹⁰⁴

(c) Equally illuminating is the pheasant's subsequent defense against the flamingo: this passage is preceded by verses in which the pheasant blames the flamingo, who is scolded as a cobbler's son and accused of having borrowed money to get involved in the business of salt-works. The business failed and the flamingo, unwilling, or unable, to pay his debts, escaped from one stronghold on the sea-coast to the next – this story seems to fit the background and tactics of the Alexios Apokaukos, who was of 'obscure' origins and oversaw the Byzantine salt-works.¹⁰⁵ Later on he became commander of the fleet (*megas doux*) and indeed fortified a number of strongholds along the coastlines.

Everybody came to know (the truth about) you, and they came to know me as well:
 The shoes that you've worn from the beginning are still the same,
 and the garment that you put on, as if you were a lord (governor),

102 Vv. 271–281: ὅπου σὲ βλέπει, ἀφασιανέ, ὅτι φορεῖς τὸ ῥοῦχον, / αὐτὸ τὸ λέγουν ἀτυπίν, / νὰ 'χη τὰς χρὰς κομμάτια, / παρέξω νὰ 'χη κόκκινον καὶ κίτρινον κομμάτιν / καὶ γερανέον καὶ πράσινον, ὅξυν καὶ τὸ γαλάζιον, / νὰ εἰπῇ ὅτι εἶσαι ἀρχοντόπουλον ἀπὸ τοὺς Κινναμάδας / ἢ ὅτι εἶσαι ἐκ τὴν Ανατολήν, ἐκ τοὺς Φουσκωματάδας, / ἢ ὅτι εἶσαι ἐκ τὰ Βελάγραδα, ἀπὸ τοὺς Σεβαστάδας, / καὶ ἐσὺ εἶσαι ἐκ τὴν Μεσοθυνίαν, κάποιος Λωλῆς κοπέλιν, / καὶ ἀπέθανεν ἡ μάνα σου καὶ ἀφῆκε σε λογάριν / καὶ ἠγόρασες τὸ ἀτυπίν, αὐτὸν τὸ καμαρώνεις, / καὶ λέγεις, σεβαστοῦ παιδὶν ὑπάρχεις ἐκ τὴν Νίκαιαν.

103 Cf. Krawczynski, Πουολόγος (see n. 89), 81–82 n. 272 and E. Kriaras, Λεξικὸ τῆς μεσαιωνικῆς ἑλληνικῆς δημώδους γραμματείας 1100–1669, Thessalonike 1969–, s. v. ἀτιπίν.

104 De off. 219.63–66: καὶ ὁ μὲν ὁ βασιλεὺς φορεῖ, καλεῖται γροανάτζα, ὡς εἴρηται, τὸ δὲ τῶν ἀρχόντων λαπάτζας.

105 Brilliantly reconstructed by Makris, Genus (see n. 93), 403–404; seconded by Nicholas/Baloglou, Entertaining Tale (see n. 92), 416.

otherwise I wouldn't know that you ever put another one on your back,
 and you ridicule my *atypin*, the *skiadion* (hat) that
 the emperor himself gave me, my lord and the lord of all birds?
 For indeed he (the emperor) is a second cousin of my father,
 and (pray) that I don't tell it (the truth about you), you mean subject, so that they may
 trim your tail,
 and I shall make your (bad) reputation, and (show) your lack of education.¹⁰⁶

The striking term in this passage is σκιάδιον ('hat') that plays such an important rôle in Pseudo-Kodinos' handbook and corroborates the impression that these birds do represent courtiers, and use 'court-speak' to ridicule each other: these lines are Pseudo-Kodinos' rules and prescriptions fleshed out in a highly satirical and entertaining way. Equally interesting is the fact that the σκιάδιον is actually described as an imperial gift, as it may have occurred in connection with promotion to a position higher up in the hierarchy and/or as a reward for specifically important services.¹⁰⁷

(3) In this context of animal epics, a brief reference to two seemingly more straightforward attempts to ridicule Pseudo-Kodinos' strict system of precedence is in order, the *Porikologos* ('Fruit Book') and the *Opsarologos* ('Fish Book'). These short vernacular prose pieces presumably belonging to the fourteenth century clearly satirise late Byzantine legal procedures.¹⁰⁸ In both cases, the imperial law court consists of various dignitaries and officials:¹⁰⁹ the 'Fruit Book' features

106 Vv. 309–317: [...] πάντες καὶ ἐσένα ἡξεύρουν σε καὶ ἐμέναν ἐγνωρίζουν / αὐτὰ τὰ ὑποδήματα τὰ ἐφόρεις ἀπὸ πρώτον / καὶ τὸ φουστάνιν τὸ ἐβαλες, ὡς ἦσουν τοπικάρης / ἄλλον ποτὲ τὴν ῥάχην σου οὐκ οἶδά το νὰ ἀλλάξης, / καὶ ἐσὺ γελᾷς τὸ ἀτυπίν, τὸ σκιάδιον τὸ μὲ ἐδῶκεν / ὁ βασιλεὺς, ὁ αὐθέντης μου καὶ πάντων τῶν ὀρνέων; / πάντως γὰρ ἐν' καὶ ξάδελφος δευτέρως τοῦ πατρός μου, / κι ἂν οὐκ εἶπῶ το, ταπεινέ, καὶ κόψουν τὴν οὐράν σου, / νὰ ποίσω τὴν ὑπόληψιν, καὶ τὴν ἀπαιδευσιάν σου.

107 For imperial gift-giving to members of the court, including a robe of dark colour lined with fur (τὸ καβάδιν, τὸ μολυβὸν χαμουχάν τὸ μετὰ βαρεοκοιλίας ἐνδεδυμένον), cf., e.g., Sphrantzes, chron. 28.9–23 (§ 13.4).

108 Cf. H. Winterwerb (ed.), *Porikologos*. Einleitung, kritische Ausgabe aller Versionen, Übersetzung, Textvergleiche, Glossar, kurze Betrachtungen zu den fremdsprachlichen Versionen des Werks sowie zum *Opsarologos* (Neograeca Medii Aevi 7), Cologne 1992. All following examples are taken from 'version A' of the text (138–145). For the 'Fruit Book' Winterwerb suggests a fourteenth-century origin, although the observation that the text should predate the introduction of the *katholikoi kritai* is not convincing (51–55). Codex Constantinopolitanus Serail 35, dating to 1461, provides a secure *terminus ante quem*. The much shorter 'Fish Book' is clearly modelled on the 'Fruit Book'.

109 *Porikologos* A, phrases 1–11: βασιλεύοντος τοῦ πανενδοξοτάτου Κυδωνίου καὶ ἡγεμονεύοντος τοῦ περιβλέπτου Κίτρου συνεδριάζοντος τοῦ ἐπικέρνη, Μήλου τοῦ λογοθέτου, Νερατζίου τοῦ πρωτοβεστιαρίου, Ροδακίνου τοῦ πρωτοστράτορος, Δαμασκίνου τοῦ πρωτονοβελισμίου, Πιστακίου τοῦ καίσαρος, Λεμονίου τοῦ μεγάλου δρογγαρίου, Κουκουναρίου τοῦ ἐπικέρνη, Μοσκοκαρυδίου τοῦ μεγάλου ἄρχοντος [...]. – *Opsarologos*, phrases 1–10: βασιλεύοντος τοῦ πανενδοξοτάτου Κήτου καὶ ἀνθυπατεύοντος τοῦ

Emperor Quince (Κυδώνιος)¹¹⁰ sitting in judgment over Grape; the emperor's entourage includes an *epikernēs*, a *logothetēs*, a *prōtobestiaris*, a *prōtostratōr*, a *prōtonōbelissimos*,¹¹¹ a *kaisar*, a *megas droungarios*, yet another *epikernēs*, a *megas archōn*,¹¹² and several *grammatikoi*¹¹³ (in this order). The 'Fish Book', in turn, stages Emperor Whale (Κῆτος) sitting in court over 'Mr Mackerel' (ὁ τζῆρος); his court includes the *anthypatos* Dolphin,¹¹⁴ a *megas domestikos*, a *prōtostratōr*, a *logaras*,¹¹⁵ a *kaisar*, a *logothetēs*, a *parakoimōmenos*, and, finally, a *kastrophylax*.¹¹⁶ Both stories, apart from providing a detailed list of the emperors' respective entourages, present a dialogic re-staging of legal court procedures. The emperor is consistently addressed as ὦ δέσποτα βασιλεῦ Κυδώνιε and ὦ δέσποτα respectively.¹¹⁷ Each concludes with a ceremonial acclamation very much in accordance with Pseudo-Kodinos' handbook.¹¹⁸

Again, ὀρίζω is occasionally, although not consistently, employed in all the mentioned texts to denote imperial speech acts.¹¹⁹ Interesting about the *Tale*,

περιβλέπτου Δελφίνου, συνεδριάζοντος δὲ Ὁρκύνου τοῦ μεγάλου δομεστίκου, Ξιφίου τοῦ πρωτοστράτορος, Κεφάλου τοῦ ἐπικέρνη, Ψησίου τοῦ λογαρά, Λαβρακίου τοῦ καίσαρος, Γλανέου τοῦ λογοθέτου, Συακίου τοῦ παρακοιμωμένου καὶ Ὀστρείδου τοῦ καστροφύλακος). – Other dignitaries appear later in the texts. In both lists, the *kaisar* is remarkably misplaced. For some general observations, cf. Winterwerb, Porikologos (see n. 108), 64–84.

110 Greek κυδώνιος is inevitably reminiscent of Kydones, e.g., Demetrios Kydones (PLP no. 13876) who served as *mesazōn* under both John VI Kantakouzenos and John V Palaiologos.

111 A list of precedence transmitted in Vaticanus graecus 952 uniquely preserves the rank of *prōtonōbelissimos* at the very bottom end of the hierarchy, followed by the *nōbelissimos*, cf. Verpeaux, *Traité* (see n. *), 308.18–19 and 306 and n. 2.

112 Cf., e.g., de off. 138.16 – the function the office had once carried was by then defunct (ibid. 182.15–16).

113 These are the *notarioi* who are represented by the *prōtonotarios* in de off. 139.2. 185.23–24. Occasionally, they are referred to as *notarioi*, cf., e.g., Verpeaux, *Traité* (see n. *), 306.12.

114 A title that fell out of use by the early twelfth century at the latest, cf. ODB I 111.

115 *Logaras* is otherwise unattested as a title, but *megas logariastēs* and *logariastēs tēs aulēs* occur in de off. 138.21 and 139.9 respectively (and various other lists). However, *Logaras* is well attested as a proper name (cf. PLP nos. 14984–14990); most notably, a Philipp Logaras (PLP no. 14990) held the office (dignity) of *epi tōn anamnēseōn* (de off. 139.3) under Andronikos III. Winterwerb, Porikologos (see n. 108), 255, translates 'Schatzmeister', but does not discuss the title *logaras* on 64–84. Note that no less than nine *epi tōn anamnēseōn* appear Porikologos A, phrases 27–31.

116 De off. 188.20–21 mentions *kastrophylakes*; otherwise, the office *prokathēmenos (tou) kastrophylax* is reasonably well accounted for in various fourteenth-century lists, cf. Verpeaux, *Traité* (see n. *), 302.4–5.

117 E.g., Porikologos A, phrases 20. 44. 58 etc. Opsarologos, phrase 41.

118 Porikologos A, phrases 177–181: εὐθὺς οὖν εἶπον οἱ ἀρχοντες· 'εἰς πολλὰ ἔτη, δέσποτα βασιλεῦ Κυδώνιε, εἰς πολλὰ ἔτη, ὅτι ἐσὲν πρόπει τὸ βασιλεῖον ὡς εὐγενικός ὄντος ὅλων.' / Opsarologos, phrases 85–86: καὶ εὐθὺς κράξαντες οἱ ἰχθύες ἀπαξάπαντες εἶπαν· 'εἰς πολλὰ ἔτη, δέσποτα.'

119 Book: e.g., v. 660. Interestingly, the usage is autoreferential; the narrator is content to introduce the eagle's final address by means of λαλέω (ἐλάλησεν, v. 653). – *Tale*: e.g., vv. 902–3: τότε

however, is the fact that the whole situation is much more reminiscent of a huge θέατρον than in the *Book*: animals delivering their jibes against each other are constantly stepping ‘into the middle’, εἰς μέσον τοῦ συνεδρίου, closely resounding phrases like εἰς μέσον τοῦ θεάτρον.¹²⁰

But were such texts as the *Book* and the *Tale*, or the ‘Fruit Book’ and ‘Fish Book’, ever performed in a θέατρον?

b) The fifteenth century:

Mazaris’ *Journey into Hades* and George Sphrantzes’ *Chronicle*

There is ever so slight evidence that, in fact, they might have been. To uncover this slender piece of evidence leads us right into the early fifteenth century: in a dedicatory letter accompanying Mazaris’ famous *Journey into Hades*,¹²¹ preserved in one manuscript only, Berolinensis Phillipps 1577, and presumably addressed to lord Theodore (II) Palaiologos,¹²² *despotēs* at Mystras, we read the following words:

However, since I have completed the assignment of your highness most readily and without delay, keep also you, most distinguished lord, your promise, which was that this is not to be performed in the θέατρον nor here, in this very spot, to those who are nourished by Pelops’ land, but only at a safe distance from the Peloponnese, as you cross the Aegean off the coast of Euboea and Thessalia: so that you will delight me because you keep the terms, as promised; you will also provide entertainment for your fellow-passengers by reading this text to them.¹²³

να εἶπω καὶ ἐγώ, να ὀρίσω εἴ τι θέλω / καὶ ὅ,τι προῶγμα βούλομαι ὡς βασιλεὺς καὶ λέων. Cf. also vv. 59. 115. 984. 1014. But λαλέω (ἐλάλησε μεγάλως, v. 112) or λέγω (ὁ λέων καὶ πᾶσα ἡ βουλή του ... εἶπασιν, v. 556) are also employed. – Porikologos A, phrases 86. 114. – Opsarologos, phrase 68, but more frequently λέγω or φημί (εἶπε[ν], phrases 61. 78, and ἔφη, phrase 27).

120 E.g., ἐστάθη εἰς τὸ μέσον (v. 122), ἃς ἔλθῃ εἰς τὸ μέσον (v. 124), ἐστάθη εἰς τὸ μέσον (v. 183), φεύγει ἀπὸ τὴν μέσην (v. 194), ἐκ τὴν μέσην (v. 265), μέσον τοῦ συνεδρίου (v. 276), etc.

121 J. N. Barry/M. J. Share/A. Smithies/L. G. Westerink (eds.), Mazaris’ *Journey into Hades* (Arethousa Monographs), Buffalo, NY 1975 (Quoted as ‘Mazaris, in inf. peregr.’ in subsequent notes.) Cf. also R. Walther, Zur Hadesfahrt des Mazaris, in: JÖB 25 (1976) 195–206 (review article). On Mazaris cf. PLP no. 16117.

122 PLP no. 21459.

123 Mazaris, in inf. peregr. (see n. 121), 98.7–15: πλὴν ἐπειδήπερ τὸ παρὰ τοῦ σοῦ κράτους προσταχθὲν προθύμως καὶ ἀναβολῆς ἀνευ πεποιήκα, τήρησον καὶ αὐτός, εὐκλεέστατε, τὸ ἐπηγγελημένον· τὸ δέ ἐστιν, ἵνα μὴ ταῦτ’ ἐν θεάτρῳ ἀνεγνώσθῃ μηδ’ ἐνταυθὶ πρὸς οὓς ἢ τοῦ Πέλοπος τρέφει, ἀλλ’ ἔξω καὶ πόρρῳ Πελοποννήσου, τὸ τῆς Εὐβοίας τε καὶ Θετταλίας περαιούμενος πέλαγος, ὡς ἂν εὐφρανεῖς μὲν ἐμὲ, ὅτι γε τὸ ὀρισθὲν, ὡς ὑπέσχου, τετήρηκας, τέρψῃς δὲ τοὺς συμπλέοντας ταῦτα διεξερχόμενος [...].

This letter still does not provide any direct evidence that vernacular texts were ever performed in the θέατρα of the late Byzantine world; however, it opens the rather exciting perspective that a highly satirical, and openly critical, text could, at least potentially, have been performed in that social practice permeating virtually all of early- and mid-fourteenth century Byzantine society and later on the circles surrounding emperor Manuel II Palaiologos: Mazaris' *Journey* operates on an altogether different level of polemics than, e.g., the controversy between Theodore Metochites and Nikephoros Choumnos in the 1320s. Perhaps a better parallel could be found in the jibe directed by John Katrarios against Neophytos Momitzilas Prodomenos.¹²⁴ Written in a rather classicising style imitating Lucian of Samosata, Mazaris' *Journey* shares few features with the *Book* and the *Tale* in terms of language; however, all three texts meet on the level of bitter satire, and thus the chances of *Book* and *Tale* having performed in the θέατρα usually reserved for rhetorical productions may have increased.

Otherwise, resemblances between Pseudo-Kodinos' handbook and Mazaris' *Journey* are rather faint, in spite of the latter's whole purpose being to satirise and ridicule Mazaris' fellow courtiers, the living as well as the dead, those in Constantinople as well as those at the court of Mystras on the Peloponnese. Of course, to a certain extent questions of court hierarchy also lie at the centre of the *Journey*: after all, it features the rivalry among Holobolos and Philommates concerning a nondescript position of secretary at the imperial court; and Holobolos was obviously hoping at some point to gain the title of *megas logothetēs*.¹²⁵ A queue of recently deceased courtiers approached Mazaris to learn how their offspring fare at court.¹²⁶ But this is as far as Pseudo-Kodinos' influence on Mazaris seems to have extended; there is very little combat discourse in Mazaris in the sense that we encountered in the *Book* or the *Tale* and there is virtually nothing relating to dress codes.

Mazaris' *Journey into Hades* and the two anonymous vernacular texts discussed, the *Porikologos* and the *Opsarologos*, can easily give the misleading impression that court society had unanimously become a target of satire and parody; there is, however, equally amply evidence of the opposite: it comes in the form of

124 On the Metochites-Choumnos controversy see Ševčenko, *Études* (see n. 91), on Katrarios and Prodomenos, e.g., E. Trapp, *Learned and Vernacular Literature in Byzantium: Dichotomy or Symbiosis?*, in: *DOP* 47 (1993) 115–129, esp. 121–122.

125 Mazaris, in inf. peregr. (see n. 121), 10.12–16, Holobolos is described as ὁ τοῦ μεγάλου μὲν καὶ γεννασιότατου αὐτοκράτορος ἀριστος γραμματεὺς, [...] ὁ τῆς Κωνσταντίνου μὲν ᾧ τωρ δεινός, τῶν δ' ἱατρῶν ὁ βέλτιστος, ὃν ὁ μυρταΐτης ἐκεῖνος Ἀνδρόνικος φοιβάζων ἔλεγε· ἥ μέλλεις γενεῖν λογοθέτας; ('the most excellent secretary of our great and august Emperor, [...], the Capital's clever orator and the ablest of physicians, of whom the late *myrtaitēs* Andronikos once spoke the prophetic words: "You sure gonna be *logothetēs*?"')

126 In inf. peregr. 40.27–56.10.

the *Chronicle* of George Sphrantzes.¹²⁷ Sphrantzes testifies to the enormous popularity of Pseudo-Kodinos' handbook, or perhaps better: the system behind it, in the early and mid-fifteenth century.

Of primary interest is a passage showing Luke Notaras¹²⁸ and George Sphrantzes quibbling about the offices of *megas logothetēs* and *megas konostablos* (ch. 34). (The background to the story being that emperor Constantine XI Palaiologos sought to reward Sphrantzes with an office higher up the hierarchy before sending him as an envoy to the Morea and Cyprus.)

The elements that link Sphrantzes' account to the handbook are:

(1) While everybody else in the texts 'speaks' (λέγει αὐτῶ ὁ μέγας δούξ),¹²⁹ or 'answers' (ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπελογησάμην),¹³⁰ the emperor – just as was to be witnessed in the metaphrases – exclusively 'decrees', ὁρίζει.¹³¹

(2) The emperor himself obeys the rules of proper address as defined by Pseudo-Kodinos¹³² when he refers to his father in the following manner, παρὰ τοῦ αὐθέντου μου τοῦ βασιλέως τοῦ πατρός,¹³³ which is a construction that clearly parallels phrases like ὁ αὐθεντόπουλός μου ὁ υἱός σου ὁ δεσπότης, familiar from Pseudo-Kodinos' section on proper addresses.¹³⁴

(3) Moreover, this passage shows the most explicit reference to the court hierarchy being succinctly numbered that I am aware of in any Byzantine text: The emperor himself explicitly refers to positions by their ordinal numbers: 'I shall create him *megas logothetēs*, which is the fourth office [by rank], and that of the *megas konostablos* is seventh.'¹³⁵ Similarly detailed in these matters is the *megas doux*'s response: 'And what shall happen to Palaiologos Metochites (the *megas stratopedarchēs*), since you have created the son of [the *mesazōn*] Kantakouzenos *prōtostratōr*, following a request of your brother the *despotēs*¹³⁶ in consideration of the marriage ties and of his father. He will give his soul to the devil if you now appoint Sphrantzes *megas logothetēs*, because the latter position is the first before the rank of *megas stratopedarchēs*. What will happen then? Give him, then, the

127 PLP no. 27278.

128 PLP no. 20730.

129 Sphrantzes, chron. 124.22, cf. also 126.4.

130 Sphrantzes, chron. 128.17.

131 Altogether five times in § 34 alone, cf. Sphrantzes, chron. 124.16, 126.1. 5. 27, 128.21; beyond that the verb ὁρίζειν is reserved for the emperor, e.g., in the scene discussed above (see n. 107), chron. 28.15. 19 [§ 13.4], and once the empress (ἡ δὲ ἀγία δέσποινα ὁρίζει, 28.21).

132 De off. 149.15–151.10.

133 Sphrantzes, chron. 124.18 (§ 34.3).

134 De off. 150.7–151.10, especially 150.10–12.

135 Sphrantzes, chron. 124.20–21 (§ 34.3): νὰ τὸν ποιήσω μέγαν λογοθέτην, ὅπερ ἐνὶ ὀφθίκιον τέταρτον καὶ τὸ τοῦ μεγάλου κονοστάβλου ἐνὶ ἑβδομον.

136 At this point the codex Neapolitanus graecus XVI. A. 10 writes τοῦ δεσπότη τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τῆς βασιλείας σου, verging even closer on official terminology.

post of *megas primikērios*, which is right after the one of *megas stratopedarchēs*.¹³⁷

What seems to be behind this almost incomprehensible bit of 'court-speak' is Notaras' (almost certainly feigned) concern for the *megas stratopedarchēs* Demetrios Palaiologos Metochites,¹³⁸ who, it appears, had already been slighted when the son of the *mesazōn* Demetrios Palaiologos Kantakouzenos¹³⁹ was promoted to the position of *prōtostratōr*, which superseded the position of *megas stratopedarchēs* by two positions. Thus if the emperor had appointed Sphrantzes to the position of *megas logothetēs*, occupying the position right between *megas prōtostratōr* and *megas stratopedarchēs*, Palaiologos Metochites' expectations would have been thwarted yet again. (In fact, it later on emerges that Notaras coveted these two offices, *megas logothetēs* and *megas konostablos*, for his own sons, and simply attempted to outmanoeuvre emperor and rival, i.e., Sphrantzes, alike.¹⁴⁰)

(4) Finally, Sphrantzes – (allegedly) secretly appointed to the post of *megas logothetēs*, against Notaras' intervention – thanks the emperor speaking the very words: *πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη τῆς ἀγίας βασιλείας σου*,¹⁴¹ which is suspiciously reminiscent of Pseudo-Kodinos' recurrent formulaic *εἰς πολλὰ ἔτη*.

Altogether, the same ample amount of jealousy, rivalry, etc., that qualified the *Poulologos* as 'Rangstreitdichtung' can be detected in this chapter and in other passages of Sphrantzes' *Chronicle*. In any case, this passage certainly sheds some light on the question of why the handbook was so extremely popular in the first half of the fifteenth century and later on: even with only a couple of years to go before the final fall of the Byzantine empire, the intricacies of court hierarchy had not lost any of their 'appeal' to the Byzantines. Rather, the reverse is the case. It is as if Pseudo-Kodinos' handbook had become a legacy to which even the 'holy emperor' himself as an increasingly feeble *primus inter pares* was compelled to submit, if he hoped to maintain the equilibrium of power and his pole position in the game. Whereas Andronikos II or Andronikos III, as becomes visible already

137 Sphrantzes, *chron.* 124.22–29 (§ 34.4): 'καὶ τί νὰ γένηται μὲ τὸν Παλαιολόγον τὸν Μετοχίτην, ὅπου ἐποίησας τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Καντακουζενοῦ ζητήσῃ τοῦ δεσπότη τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου [see n. 136], διὰ τὴν συγγένειαν τῆς συγγαμβρίας καὶ διὰ τὸν αὐτοῦ πατέρα, πρωτοστράτορα; καὶ ἐκεῖνος ὑπάγει νὰ δώσει τὴν ψυχὴν του τὸν διάβολον, ἂν καὶ νῦν ποιήσῃ καὶ τὸν Σφραντζῆν μέγαν λογοθέτην, ὅπου ἔνι καὶ αὐτὸ πρῶτον ἀπὸ τοῦ μεγάλου στρατοπεδάρχου. τί θέλει γενεῖν; ἀμὴ δὸς αὐτῷ τὸ τοῦ μεγάλου πριμικηρίου, ὅπου ἔνι μετὰ τὸν μέγαν στρατοπεδάρχην.' – The translation given by M. Philippides, George Sphrantzes. The Fall of the Byzantine Empire, Amherst 1980, 67 is potentially misleading at this point.

138 PLP no. 17981.

139 PLP no. 10962.

140 Sphrantzes, *chron.* 126.21–128.6 (§ 34.8).

141 Sphrantzes, *chron.* 128.17 (§ 34.10).

from the first few lines of the handbook, might just have raised a certain office to higher rank to accommodate a particularly deserving, or appease a particularly unruly member of their extended family, Constantine XI does not seem to consider this as an option for even a moment. In the mid-fifteenth century, the 'system' had become static, subjecting the emperor as much as everyone else to its rigidity. Rather than to promote, or demote, an office, it had become custom by this time to share one office among several holders in order to accommodate everyone who laid claim to such a position; a practice Sphrantzes for one proudly and sternly denounced. – It is people like Sphrantzes and Notaras who the anonymous authors of 'Fruit Book' and 'Fish Book' may well have had in mind.

III. Conclusion: 'Pseudo-Kodinos' as a *lieu de mémoire*

The oldest securely dated manuscript transmitting Pseudo-Kodinos' handbook is Parisinus graecus 2991A, copied for Matthew Laskaris Palaiologos,¹⁴² a senator and *oikeios* of Emperor Manuel II Palaiologos. This miscellaneous manuscript, that carries the date of 11 September 1419, contains a very typical, already slightly 'nostalgic' collection of texts pertaining to the recent and not so recent past that would have been of interest to a late Byzantine aristocratic patron;¹⁴³ strikingly, it is also the earliest dated witness to Mazaris' *Journey to Hades*. Paris. gr. 2991A was presumably produced in Constantinople in the workshop located at the Prodromou-Petra monastery, but seems to have travelled to the Peloponnesus fairly quickly.¹⁴⁴ It is the result of the joint effort of the prolific scribe George Baiophoros, who copied about 40 manuscripts between 1402 and 1433/34, including a large number of schoolbooks on palimpsest parchment,¹⁴⁵ and Stephen,

142 PLP no. 14552. Cf. Walther, Hadesfahrt (see n. 121), 202.

143 E.g., Attaleiates' Diataxis, Isocrates, Aesopus, St Gregory, St Basil, Nikephoros Gregoras' monodies on Andronikos II Palaiologos and Theodore Metochites and letters, Xanthopoulos' lists of patriarchs and emperors, Planoudes' translation of the *Disticha Catonis*, Philes' praise of Kantakouzenos, proverbs, riddles, etc. For a full list, cf. H. Omont, *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris 1888, III 82–83. Cf. also Verpeaux, *Traité* (see n. *), 44–48.

144 There it was owned by Matthew Palaiologos Sgouromalles (PLP no. 24995) in 1426 (fol. 491v). E. Gamillscheg, *Zur handschriftlichen Überlieferung byzantinischer Schulbücher*, in: JÖB 26 (1977) 211–230, esp. 227–228 and n. 105. On Mystras as a political and cultural centre of late Byzantine life, cf. P. Schreiner, *Neue höfische Zentren im Byzantinischen Reich*, in: R. Lauer/H. G. Majer (eds.), *Höfische Kultur in Südosteuropa* (Bericht der Kolloquien der Südosteuropa-Kommission, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, phil.-hist. Klasse III/203), Göttingen 1994, 42–55, esp. 48–52.

145 PLP no. 2043 and E. Gamillscheg/D. Harlfinger/H. Hunger, *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten*, 1A–C, Vienna 1981, no. 55; idem, *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten*, 2A–C, Vienna 1989, no. 74; idem, *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten* 3A–C, Vienna 1997, no. 90.

skeuophylax of the said Prodromou-Petra monastery in Constantinople, who was later to become metropolitan bishop of Medeia and copied about twenty-two manuscripts between 1411/12 and 1442.¹⁴⁶ The handbook on foll. 65r–134v is written in the hand of Stephen.

In addition to Paris. gr. 2991A, there is another important manuscript, Vaticanus graecus 1002, which allows us to tie the (relatively) early reception of the handbook to the world of Mystras.¹⁴⁷ the manuscript was owned by the famous Isidore of Kiev,¹⁴⁸ and thus it is not surprising that it contains George Gemistos Plethon's Neoplatonic treatises next to the handbook.¹⁴⁹ Another important link to the Byzantine periphery – or 'second centre' – is provided by a group of three manuscripts including Marcianus graecus 608, which preserve a distinctly Trapezuntine version of the list of precedence.¹⁵⁰

From the early fifteenth century onwards, and certainly even more so after the fall of Constantinople, Pseudo-Kodinos' handbook slowly developed into a *lieu de mémoire*, into a cherished as well as desired memory that exuded the nostalgic scent of something that had been irretrievably lost. As with other texts – Sphrantzes' *Chronicle* is a case in point¹⁵¹ – Pseudo-Kodinos' handbook was expanded long after the fall of the City: not before the early/mid-sixteenth century additional information drawn from Anna Komnene's *Alexiad* was compiled (especially concerning Alexios I's reform of the court hierarchy) and inserted into

Cf. Gamillscheg, *Schulbücher* (see n. 144), 214–228; id., *Zur Geschichte einer Gregor-von-Nazianz-Handschrift* (Basil. A. VII. 1 = gr. 34), in: *Codices manuscripti* 5 (1979) 104–114. Baiophoros was clearly well connected in the upper échelons of Byzantine society; at various points of his career he collaborated with George Chrysokokkes, George Scholarios and Theodore Gazes. He is also the scribe of the second major refined copy of Mazaris' *Journey* which survives in Berolinensis Phillipps 1577. On the division of hands in Paris. gr. 2991A see Walther, *Hadesfahrt* (see n. 121), 202–203.

146 PLP no. 26779 and Gamillscheg/Harlfinger/Hunger, *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten* (see n. 145), I no. 366. II no. 503. III no. 584. Cf. Gamillscheg, *Schulbücher* (see n. 144), 225–227.

147 It may be worth briefly recalling that John Kantakouzenos, as monk Joasaph, visited Mystras thrice, in 1361/62, about 1370, and again in 1381, where he remained until his death on 15 June 1383, cf. Nicol, *Reluctant Emperor* (see n. 2), 137–138. 155. 158–159. One should also not forget that Kantakouzenos' son Manuel (PLP no. 10981, † 10 April 1380) had been governor at Mystras ever since 1349.

148 PLP no. 8300.

149 Verpeaux, *Traité* (see n. *), 51.

150 Verpeaux, *Traité* (see n. *), 341–349. For a description of the Venetian codex, cf. E. Mioni, *Codices graeci manuscripti bibliothecae divi Marci Venetiarum*, 2: *Codices* 300–625, Rome 1985, 534–535. The list follows Michael Panaretos' Trapezuntine chronicle. – Professor Bryer contributed a paper on this manuscript to the Birmingham workshop.

151 Cf., in short, ODB III 1335–1336 on Makarios Melissenos' activities; between 1573 and 1575, he compiled the so-called *Chronicon maius*, based on Sphrantzes' *Chronicle*.

the first chapters of Pseudo-Kodinos. The codices Vaticanani graeci 162¹⁵² and 975¹⁵³ are primary witnesses to this particular tradition. At this point, the exact history of the dignities and offices at court cannot have mattered but for sentimental reasons. In almost all these manuscripts, the handbook is transmitted next to chronicles on the fall of Constantinople, the so-called *Patria Konstantinoupoleos*, lists of emperors and patriarchs, and the legendary account of the construction of St Sophia under Emperor Justinian in the early sixth century: this was clearly a manual for 'Byzantine' gentlemen in exile who desired to revive the glory of Byzantium.¹⁵⁴ The workshop of the well-known scribe and scholar Andreas Darmarios in late-sixteenth century Venice played a crucial rôle in meeting the demands for this selection of texts;¹⁵⁵ it was Darmarios' own conspicuous τοῦ αὐτοῦ in Vaticanus Barberinus graecus 64 on fol. 104r, linking the handbook to the preceding *Patria*, that proved responsible for the text's lasting attribution to 'Kodinos the *kouropalatēs*'.¹⁵⁶ But this is Palaiologan Byzantium as represented in Pseudo-Kodinos' handbook *après Byzance*, and altogether an entirely different story.

It seems that the roots of some, probably most, chapters in Pseudo-Kodinos' treatise go back to the early- to mid-fourteenth century, mostly reflecting the state of art under Andronikos II Palaiologos. It seems equally likely that John Kantakouzenos, otherwise Andronikos III Palaiologos, had an interest in inscribing the privileges of the *mezas domestikos*, who seems not to have ever played such an important rôle again after Kantakouzenos had held the office.

An apparently more or less contemporary literary reflection of the court hierarchy and the issues as outlined by the handbook can be detected in a work of a very different genre and purpose, the vernacular *Poulologos*. This highly entertaining parody gives an example of disputing one's exact position in court society and pays in a satiric, yet ultimately serious manner questions of attention to dress code. A remarkable later reflection of the influence that Pseudo-Kodinos' treatise – or comparable lists of precedence – exerted comes in the form of George

152 Verpeaux, *Traité* (see n. *), prints their text in synopsis 130–136. Vat. gr. 162 includes various short chronicles and lists of Osmanlı sultans up to 1522, cf. P. Schreiner, *Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken* (CFHB XII/1 – Series Vindobonensis), Vienna 1975, I 123–124. 178. 263 and, generally, G. Mercati/P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Codices Vaticanani graeci*, Rome, 1923, I 183–185.

153 Written by Φρανγίσκος Γραυκός (Gamillscheg/Harlfinger/Hunger, *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten* [see n. 145], 3A no. 607), presumably in Rome, where he dedicated Vat. gr. 1898 to Cardinal Niccolò Ridolfi.

154 Verpeaux, *Traité* (see n. *), 92–107, esp. 101–102, where he speaks of a selection '*de rebus Constantinopolitanis*'.

155 Verpeaux, *Traité* (see n. *), 56–72. For a short biographical account cf. O. Kresten, *Der Schreiber und Handschriftenhändler Andreas Darmarios*, in: D. Harlfinger, *Griechische Kodikologie und Textüberlieferung*, Darmstadt 1980, 406–419.

156 Verpeaux, *Traité* (see n. *), 25. 114–115.

Sphrantzes’ *Chronicle*, which alerts us to the huge importance the Constantinopolitan court aristocracy assigned to matters of precedence even on the very Eve of Byzantium. If they were to perish, it was not to happen without τάξις.

Appendix: The Changing Order of Precedence at the Palaiologan Court, praie 1305-c.1354

	Andronikos II (before 1305)	Andronikos II & Andronikos III, joint rule (c.1325–1328)	Andronikos III (1328–1341)	some time later
1		δεσπότης		
2		σεβαστοκράτωρ		
3		καίσαρ		
4	πρωτοβεστιάριος	μέγας δομέστικος / πανυπερσεβαστος	μέγας δομέστικος	πανυπερσεβαστος
5	μέγας δούξ	πρωτοβεστιάριος	πρωτοβεστιάριος	πρωτοβεστιάριος
6	μέγας δομέστικος	μέγας δούξ	πρωτοβεστιάριος	μέγας δούξ
7	πανυπερσεβαστος	μέγας δομέστικος	μέγας δούξ	μέγας δομέστικος
8	πρωτοστράτωρ	πρωτοστράτωρ	πρωτοστράτωρ	πρωτοστράτωρ
9	μέγας στρατοπεδάρχης	μέγας λογοθέτης	μέγας λογοθέτης	μέγας λογοθέτης
10	μέγας πριμικήριος	μέγας στρατοπεδάρχης	μέγας στρατοπεδάρχης	μέγας στρατοπεδάρχης
11	μέγας κονοστάβλος	μέγας πριμικήριος	μέγας πριμικήριος	μέγας πριμικήριος
12	μέγας λογοθέτης	μέγας κονοστάβλος	μέγας κονοστάβλος	μέγας κονοστάβλος
13	ἐπί του κανικλείου	ἐπί του κανικλείου	ἐπί του κανικλείου	ἐπί του κανικλείου

[Reflected by other contemporary lists of precedence?]

Reflected by Pseudo-Kodinos' *handbooks*

Reflected by other contemporary lists of precedence