

PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF BYZANTINE ANATOLIA*

SPEROS VRYONIS, JR.
University of California, Los Angeles.

It is a pleasure and an honor to have been asked to address a few informal remarks to you today on some of the problems which the history of Byzantine Anatolia presents to the scholar. Inasmuch as the disciplines of Byzantinology and Turkology overlap chronologically, geographically, and topically, the scholars of Turkish history and language are in an excellent position to offer suggestions and methodologies towards solutions to many of the problems which the difficult history of Byzantine Anatolia presents. It is in this spirit that I would like to address my remarks to you.

As you are well aware the chronological period of Byzantine Asia Minor is quite an extensive one, beginning with the reforms of Diocletian and Constantine and continuing until the period of the Seljuk invasions... in other words Byzantine Asia Minor existed for at least eight hundred years¹. But in spite of this longevity and in spite of its great geographical extent, Byzantine Asia Minor remains terra incognita. In sharp contrast, research on the history of the Byzantine Balkans is more advanced and it is unlikely that there will be many major changes or revisions in the account of its history which Byzantinists have put together for the period up to the eleventh century. The history of Byzantine Asia Minor is not only less well investigated than the history of the Balkan regions during this period, but in comparison with practically any other period of Anatolian history the history of Byzantine Anatolia is still shrouded by comparative darkness. The progress and activity in the field of Hittite studies at the hands of K. Bittel and T. Özgüç, the monumental survey by Magie of Roman Anatolia, the numerous monographs by K. Erdmann, Uzunçarşılı, O. Turan, Ö. Barkan, Wittek,

* Bu yazı, California Üniversitesi, Los Angeles, Profesörlerinden Dr. S. Vryonis'in 17 Mayıs 1963 de Enstitümüzde vermiş olduğu konferansın metnidir. Kendisi notlar ilâve ederek Dergimizde yayınlanmasına müsaade etmek lûtfunda bulunmuştur.

¹ The phrase, 'Byzantine Asia Minor' in this paper is restricted to the area west of a line running through Trebizond-Caesarea-Tarsus, but excluding Cilicia.

Cahen, Köprülü and others on Seljuk and Ottoman Anatolia further indicate the neglected state of research on Byzantine Anatolia.

This neglect of Byzantine Asia Minor is strange when one considers the important and great role which the peninsula played in Byzantine history. After the great territorial losses to the Germans and Slavs in Europe and to the Arabs in the east and south, Asia Minor became the empire's principal reservoir of spiritual and physical strength. It contained the greatest portion of the empire's population and was the principal source of its agricultural, pastoral, mineral, and other products. It furnished the most important and most numerous levies from its free peasantry for the armies. The bulk of the great landed aristocracy was located there. The number of capable generals, administrators, patriarchs, holy men, and emperors who came from Anatolia is striking. In addition its urban centers remained comparatively sheltered from the periodic migrations of new peoples which so disrupted Byzantine urban society in great areas to the Balkans. In spite of this obviously great importance, its history is only poorly known. There have been, of course, some very important contributions, such as the work of William Ramsay and his school on the geography and epigraphy of Asia Minor. Equally monumental is the work of Jerphanion for the art history of this area. Though there have been significant contributions in some of the broad sectors of ethnography, demography, religious, urban, rural, economic, and administrative history, they have not been completely and thoroughly investigated.

Let us turn first to the field of ethnography. In antiquity Asia Minor was, ethnographically speaking, comparable to the Caucasus regions². It possessed a great variety of linguistic - cultural or ethnic groups... Lydians, Lycians, Mysians, Lycaonians, Phrygians, Cappadocians, Isaurians, Armenians, Greeks, and others³. From the point of view of Byzantine history, the critical phenomenon was the process of Hellenization amongst these groups, this process having occurred in three phases... that of classical Greek antiquity, that of the Hellenistic and Roman era and finally that of the Byzantine

² A. H. Sayce, "Languages of Asia Minor," *Anatolian Studies Presented to Sir William Ramsay*, ed. W. H. Buckler and W. M. Calder (London, 1923), 396.

³ On this vast, confusing subject one may consult the following: A. Goetze, *Kulturgeschichte des alten Orients. Kleinasien*. 2nd ed. (Munich, 1957), 180-3, 193-4, 201-9. D. C. Swanson, "A Select Bibliography of the Anatolian Languages," *Bulletin of the New York Public Library* (May-June, 1948), 3-26. O. Masson, "Epigraphie asianique", *Orientalia*, nov. ser., 23 (1954), 439-42. J. Friederich, *Kleinasiatische Sprachdenkmäler* (Berlin, 1932). M. B. Sakellariou, *La migration grecque en Ionie* (Athens, 1958), 414-37.

period. This process of Hellenization has as yet not received a definitive treatment, though the works of A. Jones and L. Robert have furnished us with exemplary works of synthesis and systematic collection of materials respectively⁴. The collection of all the factual material has not yet reached a point whereby a clear outline of the whole process emerges.

In the study of the *fortleben* of the pre-Greek Anatolian languages one of the basic problems is to trace the evolution in meaning of such older ethnic designations as Phrygian, Lycian, Cappadocian, Mysian, Paphlagonian, etc. When in 1870 Rambaud wrote his pioneering work on the history of the Byzantine Empire in the tenth century, he interpreted these terms as representing linguistic groups surviving in Anatolia during the tenth century⁵. Since then the German philologist Holl, in 1908, showed that some of these languages survived as late as the sixth century, but he suggested that they may have become moribund by that time⁶. However even Holl, it would seem, did not interpret all of his texts correctly, and over half century has lapsed since his work appeared. What is needed is a series of studies such as those of Neumann and then Cate who have studied the *fortleben* of Hittite and Luwian respectively⁷. In addition a semantological study should be made of the process by which older ethnic designations such as Lydian, Lycian, Cappadocian, etc. were transformed into purely geographical epithets, epithets which merely distinguished a particular portion of Asia Minor. One example of error arising from the misinterpretation of these ethnic-geographical terms will be sufficient to illustrate the necessity of such a study. Holl, and a whole host of authors following him, concluded as a result of a passage from the fifth century ecclesiastical historian Socrates that Phrygian was spoken and understood in the fifth century of the Christian era⁸. Soc-

⁴ A. H. M. Jones, *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian* (Oxford, 1940). L. Robert, *La Carie. Histoire et géographie historique avec le recueil des inscriptions antiques*. Vol. II, *Le plateau de Tabai et ses environs* (Paris, 1954); also, *Villes d'Asie Mineure; études de géographie ancienne*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1962).

⁵ A. Rambaud, *L'Empire grec au dixième siècle* (Paris, 1870), 241-2, 252.

⁶ K. Holl, "Das Fortleben der Volkssprachen in Kleinasien in nachchristlicher Zeit", *Hermes*, 43 (1908), 240-54.

⁷ C. Neumann, *Untersuchungen zum Weiterleben hethitischer und luwischer Sprachgutes in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit* (1962). Ph. H. J. Howink ten Cate, *The Luwian Population Groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspera during the Hellenistic Period* (1961).

⁸ Holl, loc. cit., 247-8. W. M. Calder, *Monuments from Eastern Phrygia, in Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiquae*, 7 (Manchester, 1956), xv, xxxii. Friederich, "Phrygia", *Pauly-Wissowa*, 868-9.

rates relates that the bishop of the Goths in fifth century Asia Minor, a certain Selinas, was the son of a mixed marriage.

"He was a Goth on his father's side and a Phrygian through his mother. And because of this he taught readily in both languages in the church."⁹ This passage has been interpreted as meaning that Selinas addressed his congregation in both Gothic and Phrygian. But the real question is the meaning of the phrase "ἀμφοτέραις ταῖς διαλέκτοις" in both languages. Does this mean that he really spoke both Gothic and Phrygian, or is the word Phrygian here simply a reference to the fact that his mother was from the district of Phrygia? Byzantine authors generally refer to individuals by placing geographical epithets next to their names, intending thus to show their place of origin (as is still the case in modern Greece). Thus the sources will refer to an individual as Thettalos, Helladikos, Makedon, Tharx, Cappadox, etc. That the epithet Phryx in the text of Socrates is geographical rather than linguistic is implied in a parallel passage of another ecclesiastical historian, Sozomenus. Sozomenus relates that Silenus was able to deliver sermons

"...not only in their national language (Gothic) but also in that of the Greeks."¹⁰

This example from the texts of Socrates and Sozomenus shows that a study of the semantological transformation of these ethnic-geographical epithets is very much needed.

We are better informed on the later ethnic groups introduced by the Byzantines into their Anatolian possessions...the Armenians, Syrians, Slavs, and others. The investigations of P. Charanis have been particularly important on these ethnic groups and on the Byzantine policy of transplanting of populations¹¹. But there is still need for a detailed study of the effect of Byzantine culture on these transplanted groups.

⁹ Socrates, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, *Patrologia Graeca*, 67 (1864), 648: "...Σελιναῖος ὁ τῶν Γοιθῶν ἐπίσκοπος, ἀνὴρ ἐπίμικτον ἔχων τὸ γένος. Γόθος μὲν ἦν ἐκ πατρός. Φρύξ δὲ κατὰ μητέρα. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀμφοτέραις ταῖς διαλέκτοις ἐτοίμως κατὰ κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐδίδασκε."

¹⁰ Sozomenus, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. J. Bidez and G. Hansen (Berlin, 1960) 236: "... καὶ ἐπὶ ἐκκλησίαις ἱκανῶς διδάσκειν, οὐ μόνον κατὰ τὴν πατριὸν αὐτῶν Φωνήν, ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ τὴν Ἑλλήνων."

¹¹ P. Charanis, "Ethnic Changes in the Byzantine Empire during the Seventh Century" *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 13 (1959), 25-44; "Slavic Settlements in Byzantine Asia Minor" *Byzantion*, 18 (1948), 69-83; "The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire," *Byzantinoslavica*, 22 (1961), 196-240.

The field of Anatolian demography has hardly been touched in regards to the Byzantine period. There have been important studies of Anatolian demography for the late classical period by Broughton and Beloch¹² and for Ottoman times by Barkan¹³. But aside from the study of Russell¹⁴ (which though useful, has not really marshalled all the evidence) there is very little which one can consult on this important subject¹⁵. Secondary works have tended to depict Asia Minor as depopulated to the point of semi-desolation. These works fall into two categories: 1. The studies of Islamicists, 2. the studies of Marxist historians.

Islamicists have often tended to state that the population of Asia Minor became very sparse as a result of the Arab razias and that the largest proportion of the Anatolian population simply disappeared¹⁶. This conclusion would, however, seem to be exaggerated and we must reserve judgement on this matter until the history of Byzantine-Arab warfare has been thoroughly investigated in the exemplary manner which M. Canard has done it for

¹² J. Beloch, *Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt* (Leipzig, 1886), 227 ff. T. R. S. Broughton, *Roman Asia Minor*, vol. VII in *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* (Baltimore, 1938), 812-16. For more recent remarks on the ancient period, H. Bengtson, *Griechische Geschichte von den Anfängen bis in die römische Kaiserzeit*, 2nd. ed. (Munich, 1960), 421. C. Roebuck, *Ionian Trade and Colonization* (New York, 1959), 21-3.

¹³ Ö. Barkan, "Türkiyede İmparatorluk devirlerinin büyük nüfus ve arazi tahrirleri ve hakana mahsus istatistik defterleri," *İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, II. I. (1949), 1-10; "Essai sur les données statistiques des registres de recensement dans l'empire ottoman aux XV. et XVIIe siècles," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, 1. (1957), 9-35.

¹⁴ J. C. Russel, *Late Ancient and Medieval Population, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, 43, no. 3 (Philadelphia, 1958), 81-100; "Late Medieval Balkan and Asia Minor Population," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, 3 (1960). The works of A. Andreaes may still be consulted with some profit, "La population de l'empire byzantin," *Actes du IV^e Congrès International des Études byzantines* (Sofia, 1935), 117-26; "περὶ τοῦ πληθυσμοῦ καὶ τοῦ πλούτου τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως κατὰ τοὺς ἑξέσους Χρόνους," in "Ἔργα, I (Athens, 1938), 417-21.

¹⁵ For the later period there is the work of P. Charanis, "A Note on Population and Cities of the Byzantine Empire in the Thirteenth Century," *Joshua Starr Memorial Volume; Studies in History and Philosophy* (New York, 1953), 135-48.

¹⁶ C. Cahen, "Le problème ethnique en Anatolie" *Journal of World History*, II, 2 (1954), 352-3. M. H. Yinanç, *Anadolunun Fethi* (İstanbul, 1944), 21. F. Köprülü, *Les origines de l'empire ottoman* (Paris, 1935), 60.

the tenth century¹⁷. The Arab razzias were generally small booty operations, not nearly extensive enough to extirpate the population of the whole peninsula.

Marxist historians have also posited a general decline of the Anatolian population, the conclusion not being based on any substantial source material but rather upon the dictates of Marxist dogma. But I shall reserve further discussion on the Marxist interpretation of this period of Anatolian history for a later point in the lecture.

The real difficulty in the investigation of Anatolian demography is the lack of adequate source material for the seventh-eleventh centuries. The Byzantine historical sources are all Constantinople-centered and so they do not reflect conditions and events in the provinces. We have nothing in the way of local chronicles. Thus most historians have tended to argue *ex silentio* when speaking of the history of the provinces. What sources might be consulted for information on Anatolian demography during the Byzantine period? There is the collection of documents usually referred to as the *notitiae episcopatum*. These documents are indications of the metropolitanates, archbishoprics and bishoprics which were composed for the purposes of protocol and were used for this purpose in synods, at the imperial court, and at other official places¹⁸. For this purpose the *notitiae* define clearly the position and rank of each participant. The position of each metropolitanate depended upon a number of things... the ancient tradition of a particular city as a seat of Christianity, the size of that particular city, and its importance in the provincial administration. A detailed study of these *notitiae* will reveal something as to the flux of population, as Jérphanion has already demonstrated in the case of the Cappadocian bishoprics¹⁹. These episcopal lists are supplemented by the *acta* emanating from the various synods of the church in Constantinople. These *acta* deal with specific questions of ecclesiastical

¹⁷ M. Canard, *Histoire de la dynastie des Hamdanides de Jazîra et de Syrie I* (Paris, 1953). The recent study of H. Ahrweiler, "L'Asie Mineure et les invasions arabes VIIIe-IXe siècles," *Revue Historique*, 227 (1962), 1-32, is unsatisfactory.

¹⁸ H. G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Litteratur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich 1959), 148-56. H. Gelzer, *Ungedruckte und ungenügend veröffentlichte Texte der Notitiae Episcopatum, ein Beitrag zur byzantinischen Kirchen- und Vergaltungsgeschichte. Abhandlungen der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaft*, 21 (1901), 529-641. W. Ramsay, "Phrygian Orthodox and Heretics 400-800 A. D.," *Byzantion*, 6 (1931), 1-35.

¹⁹ G. de Jérphanion, *Une nouvelle province de l'art byzantin: Les églises rupestres de Cappadoce*, I, 1 (Paris, 1925), li-lxii; I, 2 (Paris, 1932), 397-400. It is also explicitly stated in a synodal document of the fourteenth century, Miklosich et Müller, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi*, II (1862) 103-6.

administration and discipline and often reveal information which has a direct bearing on demography. Though these two groups of documents give us no definite population figures they seem to indicate a general increase in the Anatolian population during the tenth-eleventh centuries²⁰.

There also occur isolated references in the historical narratives as to the numbers of inhabitants in various towns and villages...these have not been collected systematically²¹. Further, these chronicles and histories often refer to areas and towns as heavily populated... these references must be collected and evaluated. The Byzantine policy of transplanting populations to and from Asia Minor must be re-examined in correlation with demography²². The numbers of soldiers in the provincial levies fluctuated from time to time, but any effort at a demographic estimate must take this factor into account. Archaeology is as yet of little value for it has not progressed sufficiently in regards to Byzantine material²³. But even so one must always keep in mind the admonition of Thucydides in regards to the lack of archaeological remains. He remarked that should people in later generations judge Sparta by its physical remains, they would deem it to have been a city of no importance²⁴. So here too, care must be exercised in accepting the negative evidence of archaeology.

It would seem that the demographic importance of Byzantine Anatolia has been seriously underestimated. Without its peasant armies, farmers,

²⁰ This conclusion is supported by the research of G. Ostrogorsky, "Das Steuersystem im byzantinischen Altertum und Mittelalter," *Byzantium*, 6 (1931), 233.

²¹ Such a case is the city of Edessa. According to Sawiras ibn al - Mukaffa^c, *History of the Patriarchs of the Egyptian Church*, tr. and ed. A. S. Atiya and Y. Abd al-Masih, II, iii (Cairo, 1959), 305, the city had, in 1071-2, 20,000 Syrians, 8,000 Armenians, 6,000 Greeks, and 1,000 Latins, for a total of 35, 000. Some three-quarters of a century later when the city was captured by the Muslims, Bar Hebraeus, *Chronography of Gregory Abu'l Faraj*, tr. E. W. Budge (London, 1932), 273, reports that 30,000 were killed, 16,000 enslaved, and 1,000 escaped. According to these figures the population had risen to 47, 000, the increase having been caused by the influx of rural elements to the safety of the city walls.

²² P. Charanis, "The Transfer of Populations as a Policy in the Byzantine Empire," *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, III, 2 (1961).

²³ The general survey of H. Rott, *Kleinasiatische Denkmaeler aus Pisidien, Pamphylien, Kappadokien und Lykien, Studien über christliche Denkmaeler*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1908), though useful, is badly out of date. There have been, of course, excavation reports on various sites, but there is no comprehensive survey. An exemplary study restricted to a small area is the recent one of W. Müller-Wiener, "Mittelalterliche Befestigungen im südlichen Jonien," *Istanbul Mitteilungen*, 11 (1961), 5-122.

²⁴ Thucydides, I, x.

and townsmen, Byzantium would have collapsed in Anatolia long before the appearance of the Seljuks.

.....

The domain of religious history, and more specifically the history of heresy, have been somewhat better investigated. But here also we are far from satisfactory solutions to many of the difficulties involved. Considerable material has been amassed in the studies of Harnack, Ramsay, Anderson and others on the spread of Christianity in Anatolia so that a considerable amount is known about the early spread of Christianity here²⁵. Also, considerable is our knowledge of the early Christian heresies which were so numerous in Asia Minor²⁶. But as yet the cultural significance of this appearance of heresy in Anatolia is not completely clear. Holl laid down the principle that where the pre-Greek Anatolian languages survived longest heresy was hardest to eradicate²⁷. Though this principle has been accepted unreservedly, does it stand before a more detailed investigation? Let us take the case of Montanism, the most sensational of the early indigenous heresies of Anatolia. As it arose in Phrygia it came to be called the Phrygian heresy. According to Holl's reasoning Montanism was so hard to eradicate in Phrygia because of the survival of tenacious local culture and especially of the Phrygian language. The implication is that as the Montanists were Phrygian speaking, they resisted Orthodoxy and Hellenization.

However, though a number of pagan inscriptions in the area have survived from the third century in Phrygian, the Montanist and other heretical inscriptions (and these are considerable) are inscribed in Greek²⁸. If Holl's

²⁵ A. Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Bishoprics of Phrygia, Being an Essay on the Local History of Phrygia from the Earliest Times to the Turkish Conquest* (Oxford, 1895-7). J. H. Anderson, „Paganism and Christianity in the Upper Tembris Valley, *Studies in the History and Art of the Eastern Provinces of the Roman Empire* (Aberdeen, 1906), 183-227.

²⁶ Bardy, „Montanisme,” *Dictionnaire de la théologie catholique*. W. M. Calder, „The Epigraphy of the Anatolian Heresies,” *Anatolian Studies Presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay* (London, 1923), 59-91. J. Starr, „An Eastern Christian Sect, the Athinganoi,” *Harvard Theological Review*, 29 (1936), 93-106. S. Runciman, *The Medieval Manichee* (Cambridge, 1955). G. Ficker, *Die Phundagiagaten* (Leipzig, 1908).

²⁷ Holl, *loc. cit.*, 253.

²⁸ W. M. Calder, „The Epigraphy of the Anatolian Heresies,” 59-91, publishes inscriptions, in Greek, of the heretic Sakkophoroi, Apostatitae, and Novatians. See also W. M. Calder, *Monuments from Eastern Phrygia, Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiquae*, VII (Manchester, 1956), xxvii-xxxii

principle were inviolably true, we would have expected the Montanist and other heretical inscriptions to be inscribed in Phrygian and other Anatolian languages rather than in Greek. Holl's pronouncement then is not inviolable and one must be careful in accepting it in an unqualified manner. Religious orthodoxy and heresy did not coincide completely and exactly with the linguistic boundaries between Greek and the pre-Greek Anatolian languages. In the regions of Cappadocia, where Cappadocian survived for some time, Orthodoxy took a firm root comparatively early. In contrast, Constantine Porphyrogenitus relates that in the ninth century the Greeks of the southernmost Peloponnesus were still pagans²⁹.

One of the important tasks then in the religious history of Byzantine Anatolia is to attempt an analysis of the cultural significance of heresy or of religious non-conformity. We must also re-study the spread of Christianity itself in Asia Minor. Of the first order of importance here are the writings of the churchmen of the fourth-sixth centuries (the Cappadocian fathers, Amphilochius of Iconium, John of Ephesus) and the inscriptions. Of equal importance are the decisions of the synods and councils, and above all the rich hagiographical literature. The hagiographical literature is of particular importance as much of it is concerned with the provinces rather than with Constantinople. The spread of monasticism and monastic colonization are phenomena which also deserve more detailed attention.³⁰ It is quite symbolic that in the tenth century it was a monk from Asia Minor who went to Crete after its reconquest by Nicephorus Phocas to convert the Muslims, and who then proceeded to Sparta to convert to Christianity the Slavs living nearby³¹.

.....

Of critical importance and badly needed is an intensive survey of Byzantine urban society during the period of seventh-eleventh centuries³². Asia

²⁹ Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio*, ed. and tr. G. Moravcsik and R. J. H. Jenkins (Budapest, 1949), 236-7. "The inhabitants of the city of Maina are not of the race of the aforesaid Slavs, but of the ancient Romans (Greeks), and even to this day they are called 'Hellenes' by the local inhabitants, because in the very ancient times they were idolaters and worshippers of images after the fashion of the ancient Hellenes; and they were baptized and became Christians in the reign of the glorious Basil." (867-886 A. D.)

³⁰ Ö. Barkan has done exactly such a study for the Muslim dervish brotherhoods, „Les fondations pieuses comme méthode de peuplement et de colonisation. Les derviches colonisateurs de l'époque des invasions et les couvents (Zaviyes).” *Vakıflar Dergisi*, 2 (1942), 59-65.

³¹ S. Lambros, “Ο βίος Νικωνος του Μετανοειτε,” *Νέος Έλληνομνημων*, 3 (1906), 150-2, 194, 200-02.

Minor was, in classical antiquity, covered with towns and cities... a condition which prevailed it would seem especially in Hellenistic and Roman times. The physical remains of these urban agglomerates still testify to the comparative intensity and importance of this urban life. This ancient life was characterized by a certain autonomy, the division of its inhabitants into tribes, certain types of education for the youth, etc. Physically it was characterized by a theatre, an agora, temples, palaestra, baths, city walls, etc. Two questions arise: 1. Did this polis of Graeco-Roman antiquity, which had spread through so much of Anatolia, survive and continue in Byzantine times? 2. And, secondly, can we speak of any type of urban society in Byzantine Asia Minor?

Did the polis of antiquity survive? This question has been framed in terms of the classical polis, i. e. an agglomerate consisting of a quantity of population but organized according to the classical pattern...with annually elected magistrates, independent coinage, internal and external independence, and with its cultural life centering about the pagan theatre, temples and cults. Such a polis, as an institution, had of course begun to disappear when the Hellenistic monarch instituted his epistates within the city to preside over its foreign affairs. By Byzantine times such a polis, institutionally speaking, had virtually disappeared...everything came to be rigidly centralized in Constantinople.

But does this mean that the polis as an important center of population with a relatively vital economic life and organization and as an administrative center had disappeared? There have been two answers to this question: a. that which is based on the disappearance of the institutions of the ancient polis, b. and that of the Marxist historians. Let us turn first to the argument based on the disappearance of the institutions of the classical polis. It is obvious that the classical municipal forms and institutions had disappeared or declined. However it is quite within the realm of possibility that though the classical forms might have disappeared, urban life continued.

³² See E. Kirsten, "Die byzantinische Stadt," *Bericht zum XI. Internationalen Byzantinisten Kongresses* (Munich 1958). F. Dölger, "Die frühbyzantinische und byzantinisch beeinflusste Stadt", *Atti de 3 congresso internazionale de studi sull' alto medioevo* (Spoleto, 1958). G. Ostrogorsky, "Byzantine Cities in the Early Middle Ages", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, XIII (1959), 47-66. Important for references to the sources on Byzantine urban history is A. Rudikov, *Ocherki vizantiiskoi kul'tury po dannym grecheskoi agiografii* (Moscow, 1917).

As we shall see, the Byzantine polis or castron was an important center of population, with an organized economic life and a cash economy which employed gold and bronze coinage. The magistrates annually elected by lot had of course disappeared, as did possibly much of the classical nomenclature of municipal officialdom. But even here the process was not complete for we hear of the existence of agoranomoi in the towns. But as an urban center the Byzantine town was characterized by different military, fiscal, and religious institutions.

The archaeological evidence has not been sufficiently well studied so as to supply us with detailed information on the Byzantine town. In any comparative evaluation of the archaeological evidence from the period of late antiquity and of Byzantium a number of items should be kept in mind. The life of towns in classical antiquity revolved about the temple palaestra, gymnasium, theatre, city walls, etc. The advance of Christianity however did away with the necessity for the palaestra, gymnasium, theatre, temples, etc. The Christian church henceforth fulfilled the functions of many of these institutions. It became the religious center, and what there was of drama was religious and took place in the church. All the rest was discarded as it was of pagan origin...only the hippodrome survived but even here the church fought it as it was pagan in origin. Thus the Byzantine town did not need the physical apparatus which the classical city needed. The basic nucleus of the Byzantine town consisted of its walls, agora, and church which served as the bishop's residence. In addition there were grain siloes, storehouses, and public baths. The use of brick, a material far more perishable than stone, meant of course that the buildings would be less able to survive the ravages of time and man. The use of brick, rather than of stone, does imply that this period in Anatolia might not have been as prosperous as the first and second centuries of the Christian era, but it does not imply the disappearance of urban life from the peninsula.

Let us turn to the Marxist argument on the disappearance of urban centers in Anatolia during the period under discussion. A very great concentration on the urban history, as well as on the whole socio-economic history of Byzantium, has taken place in the hands of the Soviet Byzantinists. This concentration on socio-economic history by Soviet scholarship has had a very salutary effect, for it has caused Byzantinists to re-examine the basic questions and problems of Byzantine socio-economic history. The conclusion of the Soviet school in regards to Byzantine urban history is that Byzantine

urban society disappeared virtually completely during the period from the late seventh to the mid-ninth century. This conclusion has been set forth in the most detailed fashion by the decanus of Russian Byzantinists Kajdan, first in his article, "Byzantine Cities in the 7-11 th Centuries," and in a much more detailed fashion in his monograph *Country and Town in Byzantium in the 9-10th Centuries*.³³ Subsequently there has been a tendency for scholars to accept this conclusion. Kajdan's theory on the disappearance of urban centers revolves very closely about Marxist dialectic. According to the well-known Marxist theory, human societies evolve through four stages: a. Slave-based society, such as that of Graeco-Roman antiquity, b. feudal society, in which slavery disappears, c. capitalist society, d. and socialist society. Kajdan thus argues that the ancient polis was based on slavery, but that during the feudal period slavery disappeared. Therefore, as the ancient city was based on slavery, the ancient city disappeared in feudal times because slavery disappeared. The transition between ancient and feudal society, he continues, occurred during the 7-9th centuries. Therefore Kajdan concludes it was during this period of transition, when slavery disappeared, that the urban centers also disappeared. He attempts to buttress his theory with evidence from the chronicles and through the use of numismatic evidence.

Kajdan maintains that the chronicles do not describe an urban society for this period of two centuries. But in effect he is arguing *ex silentio*, for we have no contemporary chronicles for the greater part of the period under discussion. But even the little that does exist in the way of literary source material reveals that between the late seventh and ninth century Asia Minor continued to be the scene of a lively urban society with an active economic life, a society which paid a portion of its taxes in gold and in which even a lowly shepherd received a daily wage in bronze coin which amounted to about two gold solidi per month. In short Kajdan has attempted to argue from the comparative silence of the sources that urban society had disappeared from Anatolia in the 7-9th centuries. But the few existing references do not support him.

More ingenious and interesting is Kajdan's use of the numismatic evidence. He has studied the coins unearthed in excavations and hoards and tabulated the totals for each emperor. By so doing he has provided a tabulation

³³ A. P. Kajdan, "Vizantiiskie gorod v VII-XI vv," *Sovetskaia Arkheologia*, 21 (1954), 164-88; *Derevnia i gorod v Vizantii IX-X vv* (Moscow, 1960). Adherence to this theory has not been complete. See M. T. Sjuzumov in *Voprosy Istorii*, 3 (1959), 98-117, who maintains that the prosperity of the towns was not interrupted in the 7-9th centuries.

which shows that the total number of coins for the period between 668 and 842 is smaller than that for the preceding period. And, he continues, as an abundance of money indicates prosperity and its paucity economic hard times, one must conclude that the period between 668 and 842 was one in which active commercial and economic life, and so urban life, disappeared.

This use of the numismatic evidence is interesting, but it raises more problems than it solves. To begin with, how reliable is the numismatic evidence as an indication of the extent of the economic life of the times? Is the number of coins found in a particular period proportionately related to the amount struck at the mints? Or, to phrase the question in a slightly different manner, is the number of coins found for a particular emperor directly related to the number struck, the latter number being determined by the comparative prosperity or poverty of his reign? In this connection one should also recall that periods of economic chaos often bear witness to a feverish activity on the part of the mints... one need only note the Roman Empire in the third century.

Secondly, as has already been mentioned, rural and urban society paid much of its taxes in gold during the 7-9th centuries. This means that there was some kind of cash economy, without which cash economy urban society could hardly have existed. Thirdly, we know that in spite of the relatively few finds of coins from the 7-9th centuries, there were comparatively large sums of gold in circulation in the provinces during this time. Two chance references in Theophanes record that the government spent perhaps as much 1,000,000 gold solidi in a year on annual salaries for the indigenous soldiery in Asia Minor about 800 A.D.³⁴ Yet none of this gold money has survived. What has become of it? According to Kajdan's tabulations only 138 coins have survived from the whole of the empire for the two centuries under discussion. Because of this, then, we must conclude that the numismatic evidence used by Kajdan as an indication of the lack of urban centers in 7-9th century Asia Minor is worthless, for it represents a very infinitesimal segment of all that was minted³⁵.

³⁴ Theophanes, *Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor, I (Leipzig, 1883), 484, 489.

³⁵ For a detailed criticism of Kajdan's numismatic theory, see G. Ostrogorsky, "Byzantine Cities in the Early Middle Ages," 48 ff. P. Grierson, "Coinage and Money in the Byzantine Empire 498-c. 1090," *Settimane di studio del centro di studi sull' Alto Evo VIII. Moneta e scambi nell'Alto Medioevo* (Spoleto, 1961), 445-6. S. Vryonis, "An Attic Hoard of Byzantine Gold Coins (668-741) from the Thomas Whittemore Collection and the Numismatic Evidence for the Urban History of Byzantium," *Sbornik Radova Srpski Akademije Naukai Umetnostin* 68. *Vizantolojki Institut*, 8 (1963), 291-300.

Since the numismatic evidence has been considered so extensively, it would be of considerable interest to have a general tabulation of Byzantine coins lying in the various collections and museums of Anatolia at the present.

.....

We are better informed on the history of rural Anatolia, largely as a result of the studies on the agrarian legislation of the 10-11th centuries. But there is still no comprehensive survey of the rural history of Asia Minor which attempts to answer the many difficult questions which arise³⁶. First of all there is the complicated question as to the various legal categories into which the members of rural society fell. The archontes or nobility are the most easily distinguished. But as yet there has been no complete list drawn up of the Anatolian aristocracy, the location and extent of its landed estates and the system of marriage alliances bound the aristocratic families together³⁷. We are far less advanced in the study of the peasantry. There is not as yet any firm agreement as to what constituted a free peasant farmer or a serf, or as to the extent to which slavery continued to exist. There is also need of a study which would elucidate the comparative fluidity and mobility of this peasant class in the social structure. One hears of numerous examples of people of insignificant peasant origin who became wealthy landowners, merchants, shipping magnates, powerful bureaucrats, generals, and even emperors.

In scholarly discussion one of the central themes has centered about the question as to the degree and extent to which a 'free' peasantry existed. One of the restraining factors in the geographical movement of society was the tax structure and administration, for each unit of land carried a tax ob-

³⁶ G. Ostrogorsky, "La commune rurale byzantine," *Byzantion*, 32 (1962), 139-66; *Quelques problèmes d'histoire de la paysannerie byzantine* (Brussels, 1956); *Pour l'histoire de la féodalité byzantine* (Brussels, 1954); "Agrarian Conditions in the Byzantine Empire in the Middle Ages," *Cambridge Economic History*, I (Cambridge, 1941), 194-223. A vigorous review of the literature is to be found in Lemerle, "Esquisse pour une histoire agraire de Byzance: Les sources et les problèmes," *Revue Historique*, 219 (Jan.Mar. 1958), 32-74; (Avr.Juin. 1958), 254-84; (Juillet-Sept. 1958), 43-94. Lemerle has opposed many of the views of Ostrogorsky here, but he has in some cases distorted the philological evidence, as for instance on p. 274 he translates τóπια as 'lands', whereas on p. 72 he defines τóπovς as places or positions in the army. The terms probably refer to land in both cases. Also his definition of στρατιώτης is hypothetical and unconvincing.

³⁷ An unpublished study does exist on this subject in Widener Library, Harvard University, S. Vryonis, *The Internal History of the Byzantine Empire during the Time of Troubles 1057-1081* (1956).

ligation. The vacation of the land threatened the administration with loss of tax revenues. Thus a peasant could not in theory abandon his land unless someone else assumed the tax burden on that piece of land. But peasants could and did often sell their land and the buyer simply assumed the tax burden. Inasmuch as this class of peasants was free to sell its landholdings this class of peasants was to that extent free. To what degree the tax structure and administrative system were onerous to the Byzantine peasantry it is difficult to say. Taxes have never been considered a blessing by those who have to pay them. It is quite possible that the supposed harshness of the Byzantine tax structure in the period under discussion has been somewhat exaggerated. For had it been as harsh as is often stated, the effect would have been to destroy the comparative prosperity of Anatolia. What is needed here is an evaluation of the services which the administration performed in Anatolia as opposed to the burdens which it imposed³⁸.

Aside from the administration there were other channels by which rural classes were integrated into Byzantine society, channels of a primarily economic and religious nature. The relationship of the country-side to the towns is the critical aspect which needs investigation³⁹. The towns, as the centers of the provincial administration, were the foci through which the central government reached the rural areas. But this in of itself would not be sufficient to produce any kind of integrated society. Other factors came into play. In the realm of economic activity, the peasantry of Anatolia produced a variety of agricultural and pastoral products, the principal markets for which were the towns. The towns, in possession of small local industry and commercial emporia, became the scene of a considerable provincial business life. The peasantry came to the towns to sell their produce and to buy the goods of the local craftsmen and merchants. The most important manifestation of this strong economic bond between town and country were the panegyria or feast-market days held in conjunction with the celebration of the feast days of various saints... such as the panegyria of St. Eugenius at Trebizond, the Archangel Michael at Chonae, St. John at Ephesus, etc⁴⁰.

³⁸ The monograph of J. Karayannopoulos, *Das Finanzwesen des frühbyzantinischen Staates* (Munich, 1958), 259 ff, has undertaken such an effort.

³⁹ On the comparatively closer bonds between town and country in Byzantium, as compared to the situation in the West, see S. Runciman, "Byzantine Trade and Industry," *Cambridge Economic History* (Cambridge, 1952), 86-7

⁴⁰ Ph. Koukoules, *Βυζαντινῶν βίος καὶ πολιτισμός*, III (Athens, 1949), 270-83.

Equally in need of further investigation is the role of the church in the integration of rural society. As has been established, the rural areas were converted to Christianity by the bishops who operated from the towns. Each Anatolian town had its special patron saint, and there arose early throughout Anatolia a whole host of cults centering about these saints⁴¹. These cults were essentially local in origin and character and came to have great meaning and influence on not only the urban populace but also on the rural populace as well. The sick and needy, as well as the rich and powerful, all appealed to the local saint in times of necessity, and of course all contributed economically for the services which they believed the saint rendered. Thus the local saints entered into every aspect of life of the rural as well as of the urban inhabitants of Anatolia. The central church structure simply absorbed all these local cults and by so doing further integrated rural and urban classes of Byzantine Anatolia into Byzantine society.

An attempt has been made to indicate that there is a whole host of important problems in the history of Byzantine rural society which awaits study and clarification: a. First there is the problem of differentiating the various social and legal groups in the countryside. b. Secondly, an evaluation of the Byzantine administration in the rural areas could be made. c. Finally, the relationship of the countryside to the town in the economic and religious spheres should be described.

.....

The economic history of Byzantine Anatolia has been almost entirely neglected, though there exists an excellent economic survey of Anatolia in Roman times, and there are also a number of important studies on Seljuk and Ottoman Anatolia by Cahen, İnalcık, Barkan, and others⁴². Again the main difficulty is the lack of source material. For Roman times there is the

⁴¹ H. Delehaye, *Les légendes grecques des saints militaires* (Paris, 1909); *Les origines du culte des martyres* (Brussels, 1933). That the time is ripe for a series of new studies on the cults of individual saints in Anatolia is indicated by the voluminous contents of F. Halkin, *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca*, 3rd. ed. (Brussels, 1959). Such a study is the work of A. Hadjini-colaou-Morava, *Ὁ ἅγιος Μάμας* (Athens, 1953).

⁴² Broughton, *op. cit.* C. Cahen, "Le commerce anatolien au début du XIIIe siècle," *Mélanges d'histoire du moyen âge dédiés à la mémoire de Louis Halphen* (Paris, 1951), 91-101. H. İnalcık "Bursa; XV. asır sanayi ve ticaret tarihine dair vesikalar," *Belleten*, 24 (1960), 45-102. Ö. Barkan, "Türkiyede İmparatorluk devirlerinin büyük nüfus ve arazi tahrirleri ve hakana mahsus istatistik defterleri," *İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, II, 1. (1949), 1-19; *XV. ve XVI. asırlarda Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda zirâi ekonominin hukûki ve malî esasları* (İstanbul, 1945).

great quantity of inscriptions as well as the important geographical description of Strabo, himself a native of Amaseia. In Seljuk and Ottoman times we have the geographical works of Ibn Batuta and al-'Umari, the commercial handbooks of Pegolotti and Badoer as well as the important collections of Turkish documents. Unfortunately the corresponding Byzantine documents (which were as detailed as those of the Ottoman period) have disappeared, and the historical narratives are centered on Constantinople⁴³.

Nevertheless this difficulty need not completely block research into the economic history of Byzantine Asia Minor. One may have recourse to other procedures. A method which has recently been employed in investigation on the Byzantine mining industry may be applied to the whole of the economic history of Anatolia during Byzantine times. By examining the economic history of Anatolia in Roman times and in the Ottoman period, where the documentation is more plentiful, one can shed a certain light on the economic history of Byzantine Anatolia, especially since the Byzantines were extremely conservative and tended to preserve rather than to innovate and discard. This method of proceeding is illustrated by its application to the question of whether or not a Byzantine mining industry existed⁴⁴. It has been customary in the standard treatments of Byzantine economic history to assume that after the loss of much of the Balkans to the Slavs and of the Near East to the Arabs, the Byzantines lost the metal producing regions and so produced no metals⁴⁵. But an examination of the mining industry in Roman times shows that gold, silver, copper, iron, and lead were mined in Asia Minor⁴⁶. The sources of the Seljuk and early Ottoman period indicate that many of these metals were mined in the same areas of Anatolia⁴⁷. Therefore one would not be surprised if the mines continued to function in Byzantine times. But the difficulty is that there are few sources. Nevertheless the Armenian and Arab sources mention the existence of mines in Anatolia

⁴³ The detailed nature of this lost Byzantine material is easily ascertained from some of the surviving fragments. N. Svoronos, *Recherches sur le cadastre byzantin et la fiscalité aux XIe et XIIe siècles: Le cadastre de Thebes* (Paris, 1959). Miklosich et Müller, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi*, VI (1890), 4-15.

⁴⁴ S. Vryonis, "The Question of the Byzantine Mines," *Speculum*, 37 (1962), 1-17.

⁴⁵ M. Lombard, "Les bases monétaires d'une suprématie économique: L'Or musulman du VIIe siècle au XIe siècle," *Annales*, 2 (1947), 146-60.

⁴⁶ Broughton, *op. cit.*

⁴⁷ V. Gordlevski, "Eksplotatsia nedr zemli v Turtsii," *Sovetskoie Vostokovedenie*, 3 (1945), 109-145

during the Byzantine period, as do also Procopius, Theophanes and some hagiographical sources.

This methodology then, of comparing the economic life of Roman with Seljuk-Ottoman Anatolia has some value for the history of Byzantine Anatolia, and especially if there can be found a few Byzantine sources which corroborate the results of this approach. But the type of results will be of a general nature and they will tend to be qualitative rather than quantitative. Thus it has been possible to ascertain by this method that certain types of economic endeavor existed in Byzantine Anatolia, viz. mining, textile making, dyeing, pottery and glass making, ship building, fishing, lumber, production of mastic, sponges, sheep's wool, etc⁴⁸. But we need not be entirely dependant on such a methodology, for the hagiographical texts are particularly rich on the economic life of Asia Minor. Unfortunately the number of inscriptions from the Byzantine period is not nearly so extensive as that from the Roman period, but what little has survived is of value⁴⁹. The Byzantine historical narratives will also yield a certain amount of information if they are combed thoroughly.

The single most important source, the Arab geographers, has remained unexploited. This body of material will increase our knowledge of the economic history of Byzantine Anatolia considerably. However, the difficulty of language and the lack of satisfactory texts in some cases have prevented their systematic utilization. The Arabs were much more the successors to the traditions of ancient Greek geography than were the Byzantines, and their works contain considerable information on the cities of Asia Minor, the road systems, and the products of the crafts and of agriculture. But there are two basic problems in the use of these texts. No one has yet worked out in detail the relation which exists amongst the various accounts of Anatolia in these authors. The Arab practice of copying and lifting information from older authors thus presents a substantial obstacle to any evaluation of the material which they furnish on the economic history of Anatolia. Secondly, one of the most important of these texts, that of al-Idrīsī, has not yet been critically edited, so that we are forced to rely upon the very poor French translation. Once this Arabic material has been presented to us completely edited, and once

⁴⁸ J. Teall has made a study of grain, "The Grain Supply of the Byzantine Empire, 330-1025," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 13 (1959), 87-139.

⁴⁹ H. Grégoire, *Recueil des inscriptions grecques chrétiennes d'Asie Mineure*, I (Paris), 1922, 91, 127, *passim*.

the interdependence and relations of the various accounts have been studied, we shall gather new information on the economic life of Byzantine Anatolia.

The Armenian and Syriac sources have been effectively martialled and utilized by Manandian⁵⁰, but the western travellers have been utilized only for the Seljuk and Ottoman periods.

Enough has been said about the sources and their problems. Perhaps a few words on the general lines of research would be in order here.

a. A general tabulation is needed of the industries, crafts, agricultural and pastoral products characterized the economic life of the peninsula. Such a list should follow the lines set out by Waltzing for the Roman Empire and which Goitein is preparing for the medieval Islamic world on the basis of the Genizeh materials.⁵¹

b. Secondly there is needed a description of the internal economic life of Anatolia, a localization of the various crafts and agricultural specialities, and a quantitative and qualitative sketch of the local commerce which took place between towns and between urban and rural areas.

c. Thirdly, there is need of a similar description of the commercial relations of Byzantine Anatolia with the Crimea, Constantinople, the Aegean world and Greece, with Crete, Egypt and Cyprus in the south, and with the Islamic and Caucasian world in the east. My own researches have indicated that trade was considerable⁵².

.....

The phase of administrative history of Byzantine Anatolia has received considerable scholarly treatment in regards to the administrative reforms of Diocletian and Constantine and the introduction and fate of the thematic system. Thus the general outline of the administrative history of Byzantine Anatolia is more or less clear⁵³. But a more detailed description and analy-

⁵⁰ Y. Manandian, *O torgovle i gorodakh Armenii v sviazi s mirovoi torgovle i drevnikh vremen* (Erevan, 1954).

⁵¹ J. Waltzing, *Etude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains*, 4 vols. (Louvain, 1895-1900). Goitein, "The Main Industries of the Mediterranean Area as Reflected in the Records of the Cairo Genizeh," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, 4 (1961).

⁵² In chapter one of a study in preparation on "The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization, 11-15th Centuries."

⁵³ For bibliography see G. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State* (New Brunswick, 1956).

sis of the actual mechanics is desirable. What services did the provincial administration perform, what obligations did it exact, and what was the total effect on the inhabitants? Of special importance would be careful study of the Byzantine administrative system of the 11-15th centuries so as to ascertain the effect of the Turkish conquest on the administrative system and also to ascertain to what degree the Byzantine administrative structure was inducive or not inducive to the conquest⁵⁴. Of equal importance would be an investigation of the relation between the Byzantine administrative patterns and those which arose in Turkish Anatolia. The studies of Professors Köprülü and İnalcık constitute valuable beginnings in this respect⁵⁵.

.....

Ladies and gentlemen, in the above remarks I have attempted to sketch for you in the briefest and broadest manner the vast gaps in our knowledge of Anatolia during the Byzantine period and also some of the difficulties which must be solved before this history becomes better known. I thank you for your kind attention and patience.

⁵⁴ H. Glycatzi-Ahrweiler, "Les fortresses construits en Asie Mineure face à l'invasion seldjucide," *Akten des XI internationalen Byzantinistenkongresses*, München 1958 (Munich, 1960), 182-9; "Recherches sur l'administration de l'empire byzantin aux IXe-XIe siècles." *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique*, 84 (1960), 1-111. G. Arnakis, *Oi prōtoi Θωμανοί*, (Athens, 1947), is a masterful study of the interaction between Byzantine administrative decline and the Turkish advance.

⁵⁵ M. Köprülü, "Bizans müesseselerinin Osmanlı müesseselerine te'siri hakkında bazı mülâhazalar," *Türk hukuk ve iktisat tarihi mecmuası*, 1 (İstanbul, 1932), 165-313. H. İnalcık, "The Problem of the Relationship between Byzantine and Ottoman Taxation," *Akten des XI internationalen Byzantinistenkongresses*, München 1958 (Munich, 1960), 237-42.