FEMALE FOUNDERS – IN CONCLUSION:
THE GYMANICS OF FOUNDATION
Margaret Mullett

Juliana Anicia, Theodosian princess turned Viennese female founder, addresses her world as she sits at the centre of an intricate geometrical intertwining (above, Theis, Figs. 1, 2), both practical and ideological,¹ which inspired the logo of conference and volume, connecting the famous faces of female founding through network and theme. Many more have been connected in the course of our work, even if the interconnections have taken second place to other issues. Indeed by this stage of the volume it is salutary to reflect on what had been the aims of the exercise in the planning stage.

I may be forgiven a little autobiography. I first came to Vienna for the Congress in 1981 (at which Juliana Anicia ruled from the congress poster, and at which Angeliki Laiou gave her iconic plenary address²) and was of course hugely impressed. The chance to come back and work with my friends and collaborators Lioba Theis and Michael Grünbart was a wonderful one. I was already teaching gender modules in Belfast as well as working one day a week for the women in the university so it seemed quite natural to launch into Vorlesungen on Gender in Byzantium, and Sex and The City, and Proseminars on Women and Power, and Women and Sanctity. At the time I was struggling to get to the printer a volume on “Founders and Refounders”³ and the questions I was asking in that book came to take on a distinctly gendered nature as I wrote its conclusion. Wolfram Hörandner noticed that the cover image (from the Lincoln College Typikon) could serve just as well for this conference and volume as it did for “Founders and Refounders” itself. For me the image (above, Brooks, Fig. 11) of Theodora Synadene and her daughter Euphrosyne offering the typikon and church of the convent of True Hope in Constantinople⁴ is a symbol not just of female founding but also of a resident genius of Vienna and the Institute of Art History, Dr Irmgard Hutter, whose work on the Lincoln College Typikon⁵ is a model of what can be learned about processes of foundation from scrupulous and minute understanding of an artefact.

³ M. Mullett (ed.), Founders and Refounders of Byzantine Monasteries (Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.3), Belfast 2007.
⁴ Lincoln College Typikon, fol. 11r.
In “Founders” I was interested in the rhythm of monastic renewal, when work was called re-foundation and when not, what a second founder was, the status attached to various roles, the nature of a ktor. This colloquium was to address various issues associated with patronage in Byzantium and neighbouring states, but through the perspective of gender. Like the spectrum of Founding (founding, second founding, refounding, patronage), we intended to look at processes of Stiftung (as I learned to call it) from the founding of a monastery through the building of a church to the production of a monumental programme or church furniture or icons or manuscripts or ivories or items of jewellery. Donation was a subset of Stiftung rather than the other way round as we learned with Linda Safran in her paper. And in Vienna we were determined not to ignore in particular “kleine Stiftungen”, the gifts without which society and the church could not function – like bread and light.

As in “Founders” we wanted to look at the relationship of different processes: at patronage and exchange, as suggested by Rico Franses nearly twenty years ago, at philanthropy and euergetism, a line which has been taken by three Byzantinists in King’s College London: Charlotte Roueché as well as Judith Herrin and Dionysios Stathakopoulos who appear with us in this volume. We wanted to return to debates opened up but not concluded in the 1980s, when at the Washington Congress Ihor Ševčenko longed for the day when literary scholars would return to editing texts, art historians to studying style and nobody would be working on patronage. In those days I believe we never really concluded discussion on the differences between the patronage of art, of literature, and individuals, or the differences between patronage in monasteries, the secular church and the world.

Nor did we consider very seriously the clues for patronage and how far they can lead us: literary accounts of acts of patronage are very few. One of the very few is the description in Anna’s Alexiad of the act of patronage, by her father Alexios I Komnenos, of the Panoplia dogmatike of Euthymios Zygabenos.

He sent for a monk named Zygabenos, known to my grandmother on the maternal side and to all the clergy, who had a great reputation as a grammarian, was not unversed in rhetoric and had an unrivalled knowledge of dogma. Zygabenos was commanded to publish a list of all heresies, to deal with each separately and append in each case the

---

6 Above, L. Safran, Deconstructing “Donors” in Medieval Southern Italy.
7 See the forthcoming PhD dissertation of Irene San Pietro at Columbia on the way sub-elite groups and individuals gave donations to religious institutions in the early years of legalized Christianity (313–565), and the Vienna Master’s thesis of Marietta Klenner on donations of light.
refutation of it in the texts of the holy fathers. The Bogomilian heresy was included, just as the impious Basil had interpreted it.12

When we have them they are often read in order to explain visual depictions of the act of donation. Without the Anna passage would we be able to read the images in Vat. 666 or Moscow syn. gr. 387, in which we see the fathers of the church offering their writings to Alexios across the opening, and then Alexios offering the open codex to a seated Christ (Fig. 1)?13 Or would we read them better? We should notice of course that there are several acts of patronage going on at once: first, the anonymous commission and donation of the smart manuscript (one of two) and its complex opening sequence involving a prose encomium, a verse encomium and the little poems as well as the three images (in which the author is invisible), second, the commission of the work itself by the emperor, and third, the evidence of personal patronage of the author by the protovestiaria, both evidenced in the passage from Anna. The text alerts us to the cases of literary and personal patronage but cannot explicate the case of artistic patronage. But without it we would not have known of the agency of the protovestiaria.

Another case is the image of the patroness sebastokratorissa Irene and the author Constantine Manasses (Fig. 2).14 Elizabeth Jeffreys told us to read this image with caution.15 We cannot safely deduce the form of a presentation copy from this and the other later manuscript which we saw during the conference in the National Library.16 They, and a third witness,17 have different headpiece layouts and so cannot be used to deduce an original. Both dedications and dedication images have problems all of their own and I had hoped that we would engage with both sets of problems. We saw at the beginning of this volume18 how the most famous image of all (above, Theis, Fig. 2), what Hans Gerstinger called “die früheste erhaltene Darstellung einer Buchwidmung (Dedikation) in der Buchmalerei”,19 the portrait of Juliana Anicia in the Vienna Dioskorides20 is a gift to a patroness in exchange for her work of building, not proof that she was the do-

14 Vindob. phil. gr. 149, fol. 10r (fourteenth–fifteenth century).
15 Above, E. Jeffreys, The sebastokratorissa Irene as Patron.
16 Vindob. hist. gr. 91, fl. 10r (fourteenth–sixteenth century).
17 Jerusalem, Patr. bibl. 65 (fifteenth–sixteenth century).
18 Above, Theis, Female Founders.
1: Vatican Library, Vat. gr. 666, fols. 1v, 2r, 2v. The fathers of the church offering their writings to Alexios across the opening, and then Alexios offering the open codex to a seated Christ.
nor of the manuscript. Literary dedications are by no means prima facie evidence of commis-

mission or patronage either.

Portraiture is another issue: if we can be sure that the enamel portrait of Michael VII and Ma-

ria of Alania (Fig. 3), now part of the Khakhuli triptych, and seen in the 1981 exhibition of Geo-

gian enamels in Vienna,21 is indeed a contemporary portrait, and not, like so many enamels, a Fabergé confection,22 can we be as sure that it is there to record some process of exchange or com-

mission? Is the fact that the actors are identified at all significant?23 Of course, even if we know the name of donor, scribe and illuminator, even if text helps us, and he holds an object, we still may not know who he actually was (Fig. 4),24 or indeed in a similar case she. The male figure is labelled as Theophanes the monk, but it is his worldly identification, perhaps as a Komnenos, we would wish to know.25 But would she be so represented in a similar case? Is he there as pa-

tron? Or scribe? Or illuminator? Or perhaps as all three? How many Byzantine women played those multiple roles?26 But how can we be sure who the portrayed person actually is? Does it

---


---


lery, 46, 1988, pp. 11–24.
23. Lynda Garland suggests in: L. Garland / S. Rapp, Mary “of Alania”: Woman and Empress between Two Worlds, in: L. Garland (ed.), Byzantine Women: Varieties of Experience, AD 800–1200, Aldershot 2006, pp. 91–124, at p. 102, that “this may have been sent as a gift to Bagrat on the occasion of their coronation”.
matter? Why are early Byzantine empresses so very difficult to identify?27 Are the Ariadne ivories really of Ariadne?28 Inscriptions, epigrams and monograms present their own difficulties, as the epigram project in Vienna knows really well, not least of visibility.29

Above all we wanted to look at the role of women and the nature of female patronage, the exercise of female economic power, the chalice in the hand of Theodora at San Vitale, the charter in the hand of Irene Piroska in Hagia Sophia. This was one of the three avenues of approach advocated by Judith Herrin twenty-five years ago,30 and called “matronage” by Leslie Brubaker.31 We also wanted to focus on objects in Vienna and it has been a pleasure to read papers which did just that.

29 A. Rhoby, Byzantinische Epigramme auf Fresken und Mosaiken (Byzantinische Epigramme in inschriftlicher Überlieferung, 1), Vienna 2009; idem, Byzantinische Epigramme auf Ikonen und Objekten der Kleinkunst (Byzantinische Epigramme in inschriftlicher Überlieferung, 2), Vienna 2010.
WHAT WE LEARNED

We can now see that the papers have admirably answered our questions, and have encouraged us to ask others.

Processes

We said that we wanted to focus on process rather than on collecting longer lists of women patrons. Well, we certainly have met a lot of new women, not all the usual suspects of our logo. Of the expected elite women, besides our poster-girl Juliana Anicia, only Theodora and Sophia have made it to the volume, both in student papers; many more, including Helena, the empress Irene, Zoe, Irene Doukaina, and Irene Piroska featured in block-seminar papers and in the student posters. The logo itself shows these imperial women mingling with provincial founders from Cyprus and Kastoria, and we met many new founders: queen Keran and her stunning manuscripts as introduced by Joanna Rapti at the conference, Jelena Balšić and her enviable three letters, women on walls in Italy and Cappadocia and Prespa, women founders in Russia and Albania, Sharon Gerstel’s village woman, buried with husband and son. We have learned more about women we thought we knew: notably the empress Sophia and the Sebastokratorissa Irene, but also Helena Kantakouzene Palaiologina and Theodora Raoulaina; but we’ve met a lot more Theodoras also, including a postfeminist sixth-century Theodora who should be credited for founding with her husband as well as independently, and a rather patronised eleventh-century Theodora, with Zoe and Eudokia, surrounded by competing counsellors. Were our female founders in charge of their clients, we wondered, or vice versa? Who was running the relationship? We have also interestingly considered women founding not just alone or with husband and sons but as a village community group, and as groups of elite women in a single assemblage as at Chora or Kastoria.

32 Above, A. Vukovich, The Epistles of Princess Jelena Balšić: An Example of Female Cultural Patronage in the Late Medieval Balkans.
33 Above, Safran, Deconstructing “Donors”.
35 Above, S. Bogevska, Notes on Female Piety in Hermitages of the Ohrid and Prespa Region: The Case of Mali Grad.
36 Above, A. Michalowska, Klostergründungen russischer Fürstinnen im dreizehnten Jahrhundert.
38 Above, E. J. Gerstel / S. Kalopissi-Verti, Female Church Founders: The Agency of the Village Widow in Late Byzantium.
39 Above, J. Radlagger, Die Stifterinnen-tätigkeit der Kaiserin Sophia: Impuls für die Gleichberechtigung mit dem Kaiser?
40 Above, Jeffrey, The Sebastokratorissa Irene.
43 Above, E. Limousin, La rhétorique au secours du patrimoine: Psellus, les impératrices et les monastères.
44 Above, T. Kambourova, Le don de l’église – une affaire de couple?
45 Above, Gerstel / Kalopissi-Verti, Female Church Founders.
46 Above, S. Brooks, Women’s Authority in Death: The Patronage of Aristocratic Laywomen in Late Byzantium.
But we have not just added to the rollcall of famous female founders. We started very well with Liz James’s insistence on looking at patronage over time, on the quest for reputation. And we wondered if that was so important why did women not put their names on these statues and ivories we wonder so much about? Marion Meyer suggested that perhaps men are more concerned to have their foundational acts remembered and recorded, but there is a bigger issue here about naming, which lay behind Rico Franses’s crucial work: he, and the Cormack school with him, started from the fact that the narthex mosaic in Hagia Sophia is not named. Memory became a process and issue that we were concerned with. Were dead women represented in wall paintings? Sophia Kalopissi showed us one in Paradise. Should we be thinking of women represented in wall paintings, even as outrageously, perhaps especially as outrageously as Maria at the Metamorphosis Meteora, as commemoration by grateful relatives rather than as personal claim to equality with the apostles? We also thought about how you might do this (either ensure your own name survived, or that of a beloved relative): why might you choose an epitaph over a figure incorporated in icon or wall-painting, or simply an additional inscription? We have seen both models in the same church. What does this tell us?

We have thought about other processes as well, notably mimesis and performance, but also the complex origins in guestfriendship and elite asceticism and the structural importance of hospitality as patronage in pilgrimage. Mimesis comes into play where iconic acts of patronage are reinvented and emulated over centuries, most notably of course the new Helens, but also Macrina as a model female founder. And performance was everywhere: at Iviron: how was the Synodikon biblion used? at the Bebaia Elpis lifting the veils, on Skyros. Performance does not of course, even in the Clanchy model, erode the importance of text, of the care of the text that Alice-Mary Talbot reminded us of. But it does focus on memory, on the need for sustenance

47 Above, L. James, Making a Name. Reputation and Imperial Founding and Refounding in Constantinople.
48 Above, M. Meyer, Visibility of Female Founders: The Case of Ancient Greece.
50 Above, Gerstel/Kalopissi-Verti, Female Church Founders.
51 Above, F. Gargova, The Meteora Icon of the Incredulity of Thomas Reconsidered.
52 Above, Bogievskia, Notes on Female Piety.
54 As in M. Mullett (ed.), Performing Byzantium: Papers from the Thirty-Eighth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Queen’s University, Belfast, March 2005, forthcoming.
55 Above, K. Klein, Do good in thy good pleasure unto Zion: The Patronage of Aelia Eudocia in Jerusalem; M. Whitting, Asceticism and Hospitality as Patronage in the Late Antique Holy Land: The Examples of Paula and Melania the Elder.
56 In the paper on Helena at the conference by Adriana Kapsreiter; S. Constantiou, Male Constructions of Female Identities. Authority and Power in the Byzantine Greek Lives of Monastic Foundresses.
57 In a paper given by Eka Tchkoidze at the conference.
58 The paper given by Niels Gaul at the conference made a case for the veils in the Lincoln College Typikon being contemporary with the manuscript, and being raised performatively for the viewer.
61 Above, A.-M. Talbot, Female Patronage in the Palaiologan Era: Icons, Minor Arts and Manuscripts.
which came through at Iviron, of a succession of
women sustaining a male foundation, manned
by men.\(^{62}\) Again the idea of foundation over time
was important. I loved the idea of getting a lot
of foundation-acts out of the same patrimony,\(^{63}\)
rather as in my adopted province voting early
and voting often is commended. (If once is good,
many times is better.) The other side of this coin
though was the issue of consent: consent to dona-
tion was not something considered in Laiou’s clas-
sic study of rape,\(^{64}\) but we saw it as just as much
a feminist issue. But we saw temporary donation
also, a way to gain prestige while not losing old-
age care in exchange for long-term support for the
institution. And that with a commodity that is so
easy not to see, the gift of labour.\(^{65}\)

\textit{Clues for patronage}

This leads me to my next head, clues for patron-
age, because there is something about Egypt that
focuses the mind, and makes us wish that we all
had evidence like that. But it does allow us to see
what Marianne Klemun asked us to remember
at the very beginning of the conference, that it
is all interpretation. We were careful about what
can be known and how to read sources. We ques-
tioned the learnedness of the learned patroness-
es, but we should also be careful not to patron-
ise them from a distance of centuries.\(^{66}\) We heard
tries to find patrons, at Hosios David, at
Prophetes Elias both in Thessalonike, the mysteri-
ous lady of the Sien relics.\(^{67}\) And these attempts
took us into wider territory than the immediate
detective story puzzle, into high politics or female
spirituality. We had some hard figures thanks to
the Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologen-
zeit, at least as a start, and we were relieved
to find that the acts of foundation we are con-
cerned with are at least in double figures.\(^{68}\) We
(in passing) saw artists as anonymous and writers
as named, both as clients, but of different social
status.\(^{69}\) This we need to revisit. The major con-
cern here was one of the two great provocative
papers of the colloquium, on “donor images”,
the clarion call by Linda Safran for caution, to
judge each case on its merits.\(^{70}\) It is the counter-
part to the conviction that in literary works dedi-
cation does not without further evidence mean
commission.\(^{71}\) Clues to reading the images were
suggested by most of our art historians: the do-
nor is the one whom Christ blesses,\(^{72}\) or the one
whose forehead and crown are touched,\(^{73}\) or the
one with the church.\(^{74}\) Galina Fingarová’s scrupu-
ulous and exemplary analysis of a single donation
composition leads to the surprising conclusion
that the holy can also be donors.\(^{75}\) So we will be
more careful in future, but we may still find after
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\(^{62}\) In Eka Tchkoidze’s paper.

\(^{63}\) Above, Neville, The Adventures of a Provincial Female Founder.

\(^{64}\) A. E. Laiou (ed.), Consent and Coercion to Sex and Marriage in Ancient and Medieval Societies, Washington, DC
1993.

\(^{65}\) Above, C. Römer, Female “Donors” in Eighth-Century Egypt.

\(^{66}\) Above, Jeffrey, The sebastokratōrisa Irene.

\(^{67}\) In papers by Christine Stephan-Kaissis, and by Stefania Gerevini.

\(^{68}\) Above, S. Herl., Auf der Suche nach weiblichem Stiftertum im „Prosopographischen Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit“ –
eine erste Auswertung.

\(^{69}\) Above, Jeffrey, The sebastokratōrisa Irene.

\(^{70}\) Above, Safran, Deconstructing “Donors”.


\(^{72}\) Above, Brooks, Women’s Authority.

\(^{73}\) Above, Gargova, The Meteora Icon.

\(^{74}\) Above, Kambourova, Le don de l’église.

\(^{75}\) Above, Fingarová, Die Stifterin par excellence.
further investigation that in some cases these red frocks are worn by patrons, not the dead, or those needing to be protected. What we shall also be careful about is the underlying set of values that we do not automatically question: is foundation pious or is it vainglorious — or is it meritorious for men, but not for women? And so to matronage.

**Matronage**

Stavroula Constantinou started with the salutary reminder that “the lady vanishes”, recalling that Clark had spotted the fact that once we pay attention to the way our information is presented and we realise its male origins, sex begins not to be about sex, women are good to think with and hard-discovered women, even founders, are only strategies or arguments.

Eirene Panou offered us a classic case of the stories about churches, imperial childbirth and St Anna, who clearly needs more work.

Judith Herrin’s magisterial survey of literature on Byzantine women since 1983, given in the year of her retirement, may not have been equally interested in the linguistic turn, and it failed utterly to underline her own achievement over twenty-five years, but it did single out areas of achievement (canon law, eunuchs, matronage, icons) and areas for further work (mothering, food, prostitution, work). These of course bear on matronage: food and work we did think about, and the role of the mother as patron and founder was coming through very clearly. We were glad to see that recent certainties were being challenged: for example that women’s devotion to the Virgin was less than to other saints, though we heard both that enkolpia may have been made to assist particularly female devotion to the Virgin, and that it might be possible to diagnose a patron on the basis of a particular devotion to the Theotokos. But we asked more basic questions. Was founding in itself a male act? Stavroula Constantinou suggests it was, on the basis of hagiography, and Leonora Neville supports her on the basis of charters. But Liz James suggests that foundation was the area of opportunity for women, that patronage and power are closely connected and that women took advantage.

Was there a special female form of patronage? We might think so in the middle Byzantine theatron, but perhaps that was only a function of male absence on campaign, a “parlement of women” kind of solution.

---

76 Above, Safran, Deconstructing “Donors”, at n. 32; above, Brooks, Women’s Authority, at n. 14.
77 Petra Melichar beautifully explodes the idea that virtue and foundation always go hand-in-hand, above, P. Melichar, Sins of Female Founders in Late Byzantium and Trebizond.
78 Above, Constantinou, Male Constructions.
80 Above, E. Panou, Patronage in the Patria, Matronage and Maternity.
81 Her handout is published here as an annotated bibliography, below.
83 In a paper by Andrea Olson on encolpia, and above, Jeffreys, The sebastokratorissa Irene (she rejects this view).
84 Above, Constantinou, Male Constructions; Neville, The Adventures of a Provincial Female Founder.
85 Above, James, Making a Name.
86 Variably convincing cases have been made for Komnenian theatra held by Maria of Alania, Anna Dalassene, Irene Doukaina, Anna Komnene and the sebastokratorissa Irene, see Mullett, Aristocracy and Patronage (cit. n. 11), at
Stathakopoulos asked this in the second provocative paper of the colloquium: was there any difference in male and female activity at the level of philanthropy, in the "kindness of strangers"? And we struggled to find answers. Were women more prone to support Arsenites (as we once and perhaps still believe they did the icons in Iconoclasm)? Did they favour particular kinds of buildings, and endow galleries, or chapels for the mediation of women saints? This really deserves further discussion.

A last remark is simply to highlight the importance in paper after paper of the contribution of widows. This is an area where we look forward to very fruitful results and we thank Sharon Gerstel and Sophia Kalopissi-Verti in particular for making us aware of the Widow's Tale. The contributions were various but often helpful for prosopography or dating, or with wider significance for the nature of women's patronage: for example Elizabeth Jeffreys considers whether the sebastokratorissa was most active in patronage as a widow, and Alice-Mary Talbot suggests that her elite Constantinopolitan women donated objects (icons, metalwork, textiles) as wives but built as widows.

FOR THE FUTURE

I think we need more work from prosopography, more detailing of acts of foundation, however small, a positivist phase as we collect evidence. I thought I saw at the beginning the next conference: after “Founding and Refounding”, and “Female Founders”, perhaps “Founding and Naming”, the connexion between identity and the act of patronage, the issue of recognition. Marion Meyer, Liz James, Ulrike Unterweger and Judith Radlagger have shown the way here. Dionysios Stathakopoulos’s modern figures from the Center for Women’s Business Research are interesting, suggesting that forty percent of women do not want recognition for their patronage, that women donate late in life, and that they prefer to make direct donation to individuals rather than to institutions. If this were true of Byzantine women (and the last two assertions certainly seem to be supported by evidence in this volume), it might also suggest that the six percent of women in Sophia’s figures, and the five percent at Vazelon who were women but neither widows nor nuns grossly underestimate the amount of female founding in Byzantium. After all, neither the Pantokrator model (in which a woman does the work of founding, a man claims the credit, but some sources give her credit nonetheless) nor the Kecharitomene-Philanthropos Soter model (a woman does the work but tries to give a man the credit) may be the norm. It may be more like this: a woman does the work, a man gets the credit and we never know otherwise. So collecting women donors may after all be what we need to do at this point.

pp. 177–179; for Helena Kantakouzene Palaiologina (Hypomone) running a theatron for John V Palaiologos see above, Leonte, A Late Byzantine Patroness.
87 Above, D. STATHAKOPOULOS, I seek not my own: Is There a Female Mode of Charity and Patronage?
88 In a paper by Panagiotis Fragkiadakis at the conference; see also above, Melichar, Sins of Female Founders.
90 In a paper given by Anastasios Tantsis and above, Karamouna/Peker/Uyar, Female Donors.
91 See above, Gerstel/Kalopissi-Verti, Female Church Founders.
We clearly need to do more work on “kleine Stiftungen”; they figured large in posters and block-seminar papers during the year, and Marlena Whiting has made us see that hospitality is just as much patronage as it is guestfriendship. And we need to focus more (though Cornelia Römer, Leonora Neville, Sharon Gerstel, Sophia Kalopissi-Verti are shining examples) on what non-elite women we have access to, using literary texts, including hagiography, with the same subtlety and skill that classicists and scholars in early Christian Studies have recently shown. We need to follow up the papers given on Armenia and Georgia and stretch to looking at Umayyad, Abbasid, Seljuk and Ottoman female founding, making the “beyond” of “Byzantium and beyond” more of a reality.

Here we are in tune with a recent call from Amy Richlin, who sees Byzantium as key in her desire for a pedagogy in all colleges—not just those that can afford a Byzantinist—that will allow each academic generation “to explain who we are” over a long span of time and space. The exercise of economic and social power seems as worthy a focus as the veil, one of her examples, and more significant for Byzantium than the disappearance of pederasty or divorce. But we need a firm basis of research before we can offer the theoretically sophisticated readings she calls for, or before we can put the finishing touches to the source-books, the pedagogy, the praxis, the surveys that she desires and which the Gastprofessur in 2007–08 allowed professors and assistants and students in Vienna most happily to achieve.

**Illustration credits:** Figs. 1, 2, 4: after I. Spatharakis, The Portrait in Byzantine Illuminated Manuscripts, Leiden 1976, Figs. 78–80, 100, 43. – Fig. 3: D. I. Ermakov, provided by DiFaB, Vienna.
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93 G. Herman, Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City, Cambridge 1987.
96 On divorce see commentary for example by P. Karlin-Hayter, Indissolubility and the “Greater Evil”: Three 13th-Century Divorce Cases, in: R. Morris (ed.), Church and People in Byzantium, Birmingham 1990, pp. 87–105, on cases in Demetrios Chomatemos and in the acts of Athos which suggest that women sometimes had the better of the late Byzantine legal system.