

GÜNTER PRINZING

A QUASI PATRIARCH IN THE STATE OF EPIROS:
THE AUTOCEPHALOUS ARCHBISHOP OF “BOULGARIA”
(OHRID) DEMETRIOS CHOMATENOS

The paper sketches the life and work of the archbishop of the autocephalous Byzantine archbishopric of *Boulgaria*/Ohrid, Demetrios Chomatenos (*fungit* 1216–1236). His main work, the corpus of records *Ponemata diaphora* (=PD), appeared in 2002 in a critical edition in Vol. 38 of the *CFHB*. The PD prove to be a first quality historical source, also for the history of Serbia. This present paper is thus based on numerous new findings from the analysis of the PD and other relevant sources. In particular, it deals with the quasi-patriarchal self-understanding and work of Chomatenos, who was an excellent canonist and *nomotriboumenos* (legal expert): The increased rivalry between Nicaea and Epiros in the years 1215–1230 enabled him to act like a patriarch in the area controlled by the rulers of Epiros. In so far as he reached beyond the boundaries of his archbishopric in this connection, as a rule he acted with the consent of further metropolitans and bishops in the state of Epiros who — unlike him — were formally subject to the patriarch. This also applies for the coronation of Emperor Theodoros Doukas which he carried out in 1227.

The archbishop, who is the subject of my paper, is quite certainly not an unknown Byzantine to a Belgrade audience.¹ Particularly for Belgrade Byzantinists and historians of medieval Serbia (among them Sima Ćirković), his writings, above all his great collection of nearly 150 records from his 20 years period of office, 1216–1236, the so-called *Ponemata diaphora* (= PD), recently published in an edition by the present author, have long been the subject of research.² The research in-

¹ This is the slightly revised version of a paper, given at the *Vizantološki Institut SANU* at Belgrade in October 2003. I would once again like to express my warmest thanks to its director, Professor Ljubomir Maksimović, for his kind invitation to give this lecture. Among those attending was also Professor Sima Ćirković and it is a great pleasure for me to now take the opportunity of dedicating this paper to him as a token of my appreciation of him as a most venerated historian, with my best wishes *ad multos annos*. — I would like to thank John M. Deasy, Mainz, for his translation of this article.

² Demetrios Chomatenos *Ponemata diaphora*, ed. G. Prinzing, Berlin, New York 2002. — Research on the works of Demetrios Chomatenos (Chomatianos) had indeed already begun long before the year 1891, when the first complete edition of them appeared in Rome and Paris, prepared by Cardinal Pitra,

terest, which was shown for Chomatenos' works right from the outset, has by no means diminished down to the present. On the contrary. It has greatly increased, because the corpus of records has a particularly high value as a source for us for several reasons:

Firstly, his texts provide information on a quite exceptional level and fullness of detail about everyday life in the Byzantine provinces of the western and central Balkan regions.

Secondly, his records prove to be extremely informative sources for the political and ecclesiastical history of that time, for legal history (more precisely: for the administration of justice that is only rarely documented) and finally for the social history of further areas of the Byzantine world at the end of the 12th and in the first half of the 13th century. (The same applies in part also with respect to the neighbouring countries Bulgaria, Serbia and the Latin Empire).

And thirdly, the records prove to be a rich treasure house for the study of prosopography and historical geography.

The high historical value of the corpus of records will also ensure the attention of research on it in future, so long as there will continue to be interest in research into the Byzantine dimension of the European Middle Ages.

No less a scholar than George Ostrogorsky published a critical new edition in 1938 of the famous protest letter from 1220 by Chomatenos to Sava Nemanjić, Serbia's first autocephalous archbishop and later national saint, a reprint of which is to be found in volume IV of his *Sabrana dela* (published in 1970). It is, of course, no coincidence that precisely this document from the corpus of Chomatenos' records attracted the interest primarily of Yugoslav and Serbian research. Because the letter to Sava (*PD* no. 86) is a document of central importance for our knowledge about the prevailing historical conditions for the founding of the autocephalous, independent archbishopric of Serbia. No other source illuminates so authentically, directly and clearly the ecclesiastical policy effects and dimensions of this event as this letter does.³ But also other records from this collection are very important for Serbian history: such as, for example, a letter from 1216/17 to Stefan Nemanjić, the brother of Sava and Serbian grand župan, who had still not yet been crowned king. This letter (*PD* no. 10) was concerned with a politically motivated, Byzantine-Serbian marriage project.⁴ And finally I should mention only here (without further discussion) the

but published posthumously by A. Battandier (*J. B. Pitra* [ed.], *Analecta sacra et classica Spicilegio Solesmensi parata, juris ecclesiastici Graecorum selecta paralipomena*, vol. 6, Paris, Rome 1891 [repr. Farnborough 1967]), cf. *J. Zhishman*, *Das Eherecht der orientalischen Kirche*, Vienna 1864, 352 passim.

³ Cf. now Ponemata (as in n. 2), 18*sq., especially 179*-182* (summary; 182*: add here to the bibliography *A. V. Popović*, *Književna vrednost pisma Dimitrija Homatijana svetom Savi* [Summary: The literary value of Demetrios Chomatianos' letter to Sava], *Manastir Žiča, Zbornik radova*, Kraljevo 2000, 35-46), and 296-302 (text).

⁴ Cf. Ponemata (as in n. 2), 72*sq. (summary) and 55 sq. (text). Another letter to the same, *PD* no. 13, addressed to the "King of Serbia", therefore dates after 1217, cf. Ponemata, 74*sq. (summary) and 61-63 (text).

Erotapokriseis (answers to [14] questions) from Chomatenos to king Stefan Radoslav. They were critically edited by F. Granić also in 1938.⁵

That may do for the moment as an introduction, in order to convey even to non-specialists and the non-Byzantine scholars among the auditory a first idea of my “title hero” and the great historical value of the collection of his records with respect to Serbian history. Coming now to the topic of my paper, I would like to deal with it in four sections:

1. The preconditions: a) Location and extent of the archbishopric of Ohrid within the framework of the imperial church around 1200/1220 and the archbishops’ self-assessment. — b) The fragmentation of the Empire as a result of the Fourth Crusade and its effects on the ecclesiastical situation.

2. The rise of Demetrios Chomatenos to his final office. a) Education and vocational position before 1216. — b) His appointment in 1216 by Theodoros Doukas of Epiros.

3. Chomatenos as archbishop and “quasi patriarch” between 1216 and 1236: a) His official activity as reflected in the *PD* (Ecclesiastical policy and “pastoral care”) and other writings. — b) Friends and enemies. Personal reports.

4. Outlook: From Chomatenos to Constantine Kabasilas.

1. The Preconditions

Before I come to deal with the location and extent of the archbishopric of Ohrid within the Byzantine Church around 1200 and the archbishops’ self-assessment, I would like to say in brief a few words about the history of this city. Situated on the north-eastern shore of Lake Ohrid, it is a place steeped in history. In our days ruins and mosaics from the late Classical period, the fortress of Tsar Samuel (around 1000), several churches, including some extremely important ones from the Byzantine and Serbian periods, such as the St Sophia Cathedral or the church of the Virgin Peribleptos/St. Kliment, but also smaller ones (such as the church of Constantine and Helena), in addition mosques and dwelling houses from the Ottoman period bear witness to this. Older than many cities in Central Europe, Ohrid is the medieval successor settlement to the Classical Roman city Lychnis (or Lychnidos), which was an important centre (and bishopric from 343 on) on the main west-east highway, the Via Egnatia. But in 842, at the latest, after the end of the invasion of Slavs and Bulgarians into the Balkan Peninsula, instead of Lychnis the city of Ohrid had come into being which now lay within the Bulgarian Empire. With its

⁵ F. Granić, *Odgovori ohridskog arhiepiskopa Dimitrija Homatijana na pitanja srpskog kralja Stefana Radoslava*, Svetosavski zbornik, knj. 2, izvori, Belgrade 1938, 147–189, with commentary. Cf. also B. Ferjančić — Lj. Maksimović, *Sveti Sava i Srbija između Epira i Nikeje*, Sveti Sava u srpskoj istoriji i tradiciji (Saint Sava in Serbian History and Tradition), ed. S. Ćirković, Beograd 1998, 13–25, here 20; G. Podskalsky, *Theologische Literatur des Mittelalters in Bulgarien und Serbien 865–1459*, Munich 2000, 496sq. — For a complete overview about the works of Chomatenos (including ‘*Dubia*’) cf. Ponemata (as in n. 2), 46*–54* and 344*sq. (list of manuscripts).

Christianisation, from 864 on, Ohrid became an important missionary and cultural centre, towards the end of the 10th century even the strongly fortified residence of Tsar Samuel and his archbishop and patriarch Philip. After the subjugation of Bulgaria in 1018 by Emperor Basileios II, Ohrid/Achrida came much more to the fore as an ecclesiastical centre than as a centre of the military and civil administration. Because around 1020, with his three famous *sigillia*, Basileios created the autocephalous Byzantine archbishopric of “Bulgaria”, with its traditional see in Achrida/Ohrid, out of the previous Bulgarian archbishopric and patriarchate.⁶ This great ecclesiastical province continued to be in existence until well into the period of Turkish rule. It was only abolished in 1767, when it passed into the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople. Admittedly, it had no longer belonged politically to Byzantium since 1334, but to the Serbian empire, and around 1400, Ohrid and its archbishopric, like all the other regions of the West Balkans and Macedonia, came under Ottoman rule which persisted here until 1913.⁷

1.a What position did the archbishopric of Ohrid now take around 1200, what extent did it have at that time and what do we know about the self-assessment of the archbishops? From 1020 on, just like the island of Cyprus, the autocephalous archbishopric of Bulgaria was theoretically independent of the Byzantine patriarchate, but was in effect associated with the latter as a completely independent ecclesiastical province within the framework of the Empire (therefore, as a rule the archbishops did in fact attend the imperial church-councils convened by the emperor and patriarch, but only sporadically the patriarchate’s so-called permanent synod [*Synodos endemousa*]). Only the emperor, not the patriarch, possessed the right to appoint the archbishop — as a rule a member of the clergy of St Sophia in Constantinople — just as he designated the ecumenical patriarch of Constantinople for his office from a list of three names proposed by the synod.⁸ The position of the prelates of the two great autocephalous archbishoprics (“Bulgaria” and Cyprus) was potentially like that of a quasi patriarch, above all on account of their independence from the ecumenical patriarch. Nevertheless, before 1204, there was hardly anything to be felt of a separation of the archbishops of Ohrid from the patriarchate on account of the ultimately in effect quite close and internal link with the emperor and patriarch.

Let us now turn to the territory of the archbishopric around 1200/1220: how many suffragan bishoprics did it include at that time? Theoretically it still formed a wide territory stretching from the Danube by Belgrade to Central Greece and West Bulgaria. In actual fact, however, on account of the achievement of independence by Bulgaria (since 1185) and Serbia (since c. 1195), only the following 13 bishoprics did still belong to it: Achrida/Ohrid, Debrai/Debar, Diabolis/Devol, Glabenitza/Glavinica, Grebenon, Kanina, Kastoria/Kostur, Moglaina, Pelagonia/Bitola, Prisdriana/Prizren,

⁶ For the *sigillia* cf. now: Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches von 565–1453, bearbeitet von F. Dölger, 1. Teil 2. Halbband, Regesten von 867–1025, zweite Auflage, neu bearbeitet von A. E. Müller, unter verantwortlicher Mitarbeit von A. Beihammer, Munich 2003, no. 806–808.

⁷ Cf. G. Prinzing, s.v. Ohrid, Lexikon des Mittelalters 6 (1993), col. 1376–1380 and *idem.*, s.v. Achrida, Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche (3rd edition) 1 (1993), col. 115 (both with further references).

Skopia/Skopje, Strumitza and Sthlanitza.⁹ These episcopal sees, with the exception of Prizren that fell to Serbia c. 1214,¹⁰ then also determined the extent of the archbishopric of Ohrid under Chomatenos from 1216 on.

In order to discuss the self-assessment of the archbishops of Ohrid, we should look to their own title (*intitulatio*). Until 1157 it read: “ἀρχιεπίσκοπος (πάσης) Βουλγαρίας.”¹¹ However, in 1157, a new title appears for the first time: “ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Πρώτης Ἰουστινιανῆς καὶ πάσης Βουλγαρίας”, i.e. “archbishop of Justiniana Prima and all Bulgaria”.¹² This title shows that its first bearer, archbishop Ioannes (Adrianos) Komnenos,¹³ an uncle of Emperor Manuel I Komnenos, had availed himself of a fictional theory most probably already developed under archbishop Theophylact of Ohrid. The theory stated that Ohrid was identical with the metropolis of Justiniana Prima established by Justinian I in 535. Thus Ohrid derived its claim to be also endowed with the same canon law privileges as Justiniana Prima from this theory. However, this late antique foundation, the ruins of which can be visited today in Caričin Grad near Niš, had already come to an end around 605, and Lychnis/Ohrid was never located within the diocese of Justiniana Prima: therefore there is no doubt, that the whole theory was fictional. (But we should not forget, that the territories of Justiniana Prima and the medieval archbishopric “Bulgaria” partly overlapped, a fact, that certainly facilitated the development as well as the acceptance of such a theory). In so far as the archbishops of Ohrid adopted the Justiniana Prima-theory, emphasising it by their own form of title (*intitulatio*), it was clearly intended to enhance Ohrid’s importance from an ecclesiastical-political and protocol aspect. However, after John Komnenos first began to use the ambitious title, initially there were no concrete signs of increased rivalry by Ohrid with the patriarchate, perhaps because a stop was immediately put to such ambitions by Constantinople. Given the lack of any explicit hint from the sources, my opinion would seem to be supported by the fact that after the death of Ioannes-Adrian (c.1163), the archbishops of Ohrid, until Chomatenos’ predecessor, Ioannes Kamateros, no longer used the title in question, so far as can be seen.¹⁴

⁸ Cf. H.-G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*. Munich 1959, 68.

⁹ Cf. Ponemata (as in n. 2), 29*sq.

¹⁰ Cf. *ibid.*, 206* (concerning no. 103 and no. 86).

¹¹ Cf. G. Prinzing, *Die Antigraphie des Patriarchen Germanos II. an Erzbischof Demetrios Chomatenos und die Korrespondenz zum nikäisch-epirotischen Konflikt 1212–1233*, *Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Slavi* 3 (1983) 21–64, here 39, n. 48.

¹² H. Gelzer, *Der Patriarchat von Achrida*, (Leipzig 1902), repr. Aalen 1980, 9. Cf. Ponemata (as in n. 2), 16*.

¹³ He held his office at least until summer 1163, see G. Prinzing, *Wer war der “bulgarische Bischof Adrian” der Laurentius-Chronik sub anno 1164?*, *Jahrbücher f. Geschichte Osteuropas* 36 (1988) 552–557 and *idem*, *Zu Odessos/Varna (im 6. Jh.), Belgrad (1096) und Braničevo (um 1163). Klärung dreier Fragen aus Epigraphik, Prosopographie und Sphragistik*, *BSI* 56 (1995) 219–225, here 224 sq.

¹⁴ Cf. G. Prinzing, *Entstehung und Rezeption der Justiniana-Prima-Theorie im Mittelalter*, *Byzantinobulgarica* 5 (1978) 269–287 and Ponemata (as in n. 2), 16* and 24*–26* (with further references).

It was Chomatenos who first used it again, doing so, in fact, relatively often (cf. *PD* no.10, 28, 86, 111, 112, 118). That was certainly no coincidence: Because only once within the whole Byzantine epoch of the archbishopric of Ohrid, precisely in Chomatenos' term of office, can we observe the *de facto* formation of a quasi-patriarchal authority of the archbishop, because the prerequisites were so favourable then as they were never to be again in the Byzantine period.

1.b With the Latin conquest of Constantinople in 1204, the empire was robbed of its capital for the first time and its unity was thus shattered. Constantinople became the centre of the alien 'Latin Empire'. On the Byzantine side, it was the chaos of that time, the age of the *σύγχυσις/synchyis*, that led to the emergence of the two Greek-Byzantine successor-states of 'Epiros' in the western Greek Balkans (with its centre initially in Arta, later in Thessalonike) and 'Nicaea' in north-western Asia Minor, if the special case of Trebizond is left aside. Both successor states fought for the recovery of Constantinople and the Latin, Bulgarian or Seljuk occupied territories. In both cases, the authorities quickly set about getting the administration to function again, linking up the remains of the former administrative network. Thus the state's political order was restored relatively quickly, and in part also newly installed from the periphery, using military means.

On the one hand, the parallel network of ecclesiastical administration allowed the stabilising function of the church to appear, clearly because it was less seriously impaired as a whole. But the exiling of the patriarchate to Nicaea and its link with the Empire of the Lascarids of course weakened the authority of the patriarchate in the Epirotic sphere of influence. Large areas there were under the jurisdiction partly of the archbishop of Ohrid and partly of metropolitans, who were subject to the patriarchate of Constantinople–Nicaea: Between 1216 and 1224, the patriarchal metropolies included Dyrrhachion, Kerkyra/Corfu, Larisa, Naupaktos and Neai Patrai, and they were joined from the end of 1224 by Thessalonike and Philippoi. But initially the latter had experienced great problems in communicating with their patriarch. Thus in questions of the possible filling of metropolitan sees, that had become free, they were exposed to the pressure of their rulers, Michael Doukas (died 1215) and Theodoros Doukas. Under these circumstances, it is thus to be assumed that the position of archbishop Chomatenos of Ohrid was probably greatly strengthened.¹⁵

2. The rise of Demetrios Chomatenos to his final office

Who was this man, who knew how to take advantage of the propitious situation? What prerequisites did Chomatenos bring with him for his activity as archbishop? What positions had he held before and under what conditions did he assume his office in Ohrid?

2.a We know neither Chomatenos' parents nor the date of his birth. However, he probably came from a family with connections with the senior clergy in Constan-

¹⁵ Ponemata (as in n. 2), 16*sq.

tinople; this is indicated, among other things, by two seals. He was probably born in the third quarter of the 12th century and died around 1236. He had at least one brother by the name of Stephan to whom he addressed a letter (*PD* no. 18), and a cousin named Constantine, the addressee of *PD* no. 115.¹⁶ All we know about his early life-time before 1200, is one single fact from a letter of Ioannes Apokaukos who was metropolitan of Naupaktos in c. 1200–1232 and had previously held a post in the patriarchate’s chancellery. He addressed the said letter to Patriarch Manuel I in 1222. It dealt with ecclesiastical disputes between Epiros and Nicaea. In it, Apokaukos defended his fellow bishop Chomatenos against the patriarch’s disparaging comments with the words: “I got to know him already a long time ago as *apokrisiarios* (“person who transmitted the *responsa*”) of the archbishops of Bulgaria at the patriarchs’ ...”¹⁷

The quotation does not for instance mean that Chomatenos dealt with the patriarch’s correspondence with the archbishops of Ohrid, but describes his activity as *apokrisiarios* = *nuntius* of the ‘Bulgarian’ archbishops (of Ohrid) at the patriarchate.¹⁸ Chomatenos held this post, for which he had to be at least a deacon — aged 25 years or more — for a lengthier period. From this it probably follows that he assumed this post already before or around 1191. In the course of this, he will not only have obtained a sound insight into the work of the patriarchate’s chancellery (or of some of the central offices of state as well), but also exchanged ideas with leading lawyers. However, we cannot answer the question whether he was ever a pupil of the great canonist Theodoros Balsamon (died after 1195) with certainty. There is a sentence, that is often quoted from an *erotapókrisis* to Constantine Kabasilas of Dyrrhachion, which used to be ascribed to Chomatenos, that its sender had heard many legal experts (*nomotriboumenoi*) in Constantinople during Balsamon’s lifetime who had disputed critically with him.¹⁹ In the meantime, however, it has been shown by J. Darrouzès years ago that this text is not from Chomatenos, but from bishop Ioannes of Kitros. But Chomatenos was perhaps among the ‘many legal experts’, because he was (later) undoubtedly such a *nomotriboumenos*, also according to his own statement.²⁰

His early education certainly also included the obligatory *enkyklios paidéia*. In addition, certain passages from a letter from Chomatenos (*PD* no. 8) to his fellow bishop, the metropolitan of Corfu, Basileios Padiadites (died 1217/18) may be re-

¹⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, 3*–5* (with further references).

¹⁷ V. G. Vasilevckuj, *Epirotica saeculi XIII, Viz. Vrem.* 3 (1896) 223–299, here 272. Cf. *Ponemata* (as in n. 2), 5*sq. (with further references).

¹⁸ By the way: the cited passage contains the only supporting evidence up to now for the existence of an *apokrisiarios* of the archbishopric of Ohrid in Constantinople.

¹⁹ Cf. *Pitra*, *Analecta* (as in n. 2), no. 181, col. 677.

²⁰ Cf. *Ponemata* (as in n. 2), 9*sq. and 37*sq. (with further references). For his own self-assessment as *nomotriboumenos* cf. there for instance no. 117, p. 382, 35–39. For the rendering of the term *nomotriboumenos* as “(private) legal expert” cf. D. Simon, *NOMOTRIBOYMENOI*, in: Satura (FS Robert Feenstra), ed. J. A. Ankum, J.E. Spruit and F. B. J. Wubbe, Fribourg 1985, 274–283, especially with the view to Chomatenos 276–281. Note, that in the *PD* the term *nomotriboumenos* is often paraphrased, cf. in the indices of the *Ponemata*, 505 s.v. νομοτριβούμενος II.

garded as circumstantial evidence for the fact that he had once been his pupil, as Pediaaites had taught rhetoric at the school attached to the church of St. Paul in Constantinople (1166–1189).²¹

It is, however, vouched for by *PD* no. 1 that Chomatenos, before assuming the office of archbishop, had held the post of *chartophylax* of the church of Ohrid under Archbishop Ioannes Kamateros. But it is difficult to determine exactly when he assumed the position: The chaotic conditions around 1204 forced Kamateros to flee to Nicaea,²² from where he probably returned to his residence in Ohrid directly after the reconquest that took place in 1214/15. It is therefore highly improbable that Chomatenos became *chartophylax* there already before 1215. As we do not have any positive evidence of a stay by Chomatenos in Epiros or in Ohrid **before** 1215, I assume that he also first travelled from Nicaea to Ohrid with Ioannes Kamateros.²³

As *chartophylax* Chomatenos was the most important member of the archbishop's staff; he was responsible for the supervision of the archiepiscopal chancery, together with the archive, and he was able to deputise for the archbishop. He was also allowed to support the archbishop's work as an expert, pass judgment in his name in certain canonistically relevant cases, thus for example when it was a question of the permissibility of dubious marriages, cases of divorce or the imposition of penalties. In the *PD*, there are, however, only a few works that could be attributed to Chomatenos' period as *chartophylax*: only the very first record belongs beyond doubt to this category — hardly surprisingly, because Archbishop Kamateros died already shortly after the return to his official residence. His successor was Chomatenos, namely already in 1216.²⁴

2.b The ruler Theodoros Dukas appointed him on the recommendation of Apokaukos, then came his consecration in the presence of the synod of the archdiocese. With the appointment, the ruler was acting like an emperor which he had not yet formally become at that time. Patriarch Manuel I therefore also criticised the appointment procedure in a later letter to Apokaukos from February 1222, pointing out that Chomatenos had attained hierarchical status contrary to previous custom. This was aimed at the lack of participation by the emperor of Nicaea in the appointment of the archbishop. Apokaukos therefore sharply repudiated this argument. In this connection, he mentioned above all the emperor-like position of the still uncrowned ruler Theodoros Doukas. Chomatenos never commented on this in writing as far as can be seen.²⁵

To sum up this section: What was decisive for the later assumption of a quasi-patriarchal position by Chomatenos was certainly the circumstance that, from

²¹ Cf. Ponomata (as in n. 2), 8*sq. (with further references; add to the literature about Pediaaites the article *K. A. Manaphes, I. D. Polemes, Βασιλείου Πεδιαδίτου ανέκδοτα έργα*, ΕΕΒΣ 49 (1994–1998) 1–62).

²² Cf. *V. Laurent, Les régestes des actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople, vol I : Les Actes des patriarches, fasc. 4 : Les régestes de 1208 à 1309*, Paris 1971, no. 1214.

²³ Cf. Ponomata (as in n. 2), 10*–12* (with further references).

²⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, 12*sq. (with further references).

²⁵ Cf. *ibid.*, 14*sq. (with further references).

his earlier position as *apokrisiários*, he — an excellent lawyer — knew the central ecclesiastical (and state) institutions and the administrative apparatus from his own experience. Another point of importance was, that he enjoyed the friendship of both the leading metropolitan in Epiros, Apokaukos of Naupactos, and the ruler Theodoros Doukas too.

3. Chomatenos as archbishop and 'quasi-patriarch'

3.a Immediately after assuming office, Chomatenos put relations with the “Bulgaro-bishops” into order, who had been installed in various dioceses in his archbishopric (but also in dioceses of patriarchal bishoprics, such as Berroia) by the Bulgarian occupying power. At the request of Theodoros Doukas, and quite certainly not without some effort by Chomatenos, who had previously obtained the advice of Metropolitan Basileios Padiadites of Corfu, in 1217/18, the Synod of Ohrid adopted the following shrewd compromise: The Bulgarian bishops had to leave their sees (in order to be replaced by Byzantines/Greeks), but the lower clergy consecrated by them could remain (*PD* no. 8 and no. 146). The ethnic homogeneity of the Byzantine higher clergy in the archbishopric of Ohrid was thus ensured.²⁶

Although the patriarchate was not recognisably concerned with this matter (despite the *Bulgaroepiskopos* in 'patriarchal' Beroia: cf. *PD* no. 81),²⁷ the opposite is true for the founding of the autocephalous archbishopric of Serbia, that was sanctioned by the synod in the autumn of 1219 under Patriarch Manuel I and Emperor Theodoros I Laskaris, the first hierarch of which was the Serbian aristocrat and Athos monk Sava. As mentioned, Chomatenos, to whose diocese the territory of the newly founded Serbian church belonged for the most part, protested energetically, but in vain, against this act in his synodal letter of 8 May 1220 (*PD* no. 86). However, the letter could not make a convincing impression, because, apart from canonist and historical arguments, Chomatenos put forward purely political ones in particular: He disputed the existence of a (genuine) empire that alone would have been entitled to undertake and sanction such an act. Chomatenos thus knew very well the Byzantine emperor's right to carry out the founding of an autocephalous church, but — out of consideration for “his” ruler in Epiros (Theodoros Doukas) — apparently considered the emperor in Nicaea to be illegitimate. (What he probably did not bear in mind [?] was that Theodoros had also not been a legitimate emperor at the time of his own appointment as archbishop).²⁸

Sava did not need to share this viewpoint, so long as the emperor in Nicaea was the only Byzantine emperor (Theodoros Doukas was thus still uncrowned). The counter-offer, probably only made with reluctance by Chomatenos, to help Sava *per*

²⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, 11* and 17*sq. (with further references; in 18* read instead of “ca. 1218/19” 1217/18).

²⁷ Cf. *ibid.*, 17*sq. and 31* n. 141 (with further references; 18* n. 74: instead of no. 81 “§ 19” read § 5 and 15).

²⁸ Cf. *ibid.*, 18*sq. and 26* (with further references).

oeconomiam, i.e. by dispensation (with regard to the special circumstances) to achieve the *same* status of a Serbian (arch-) bishop, if he were to confess his errors, could at all events not compete with the patriarchal consecration and the imperial privilege. Even if Chomatenos did deal with the matter once again in his later correspondence with Germanos II (see *PD* no.114), the fact that he did not intervene directly with the patriarch against Nicaea's procedure does indicate that he was probably quite aware of the weakness of his position.²⁹

On the other hand, Chomatenos could now also feel encouraged, without regard to the patriarch's rights, to also encroach on the latter's own sphere of jurisdiction. Therefore, on 12 May 1223, the synod of the archbishopric of Ohrid, at the orders of the ruler, carried out the election and consecration of a new bishop for the Thessalian city of Servia that had just been taken back from the Latins again. Chomatenos justified his action in *PD* no. 78, with reference to "*oikonomia*" through the impending under-supply of the bishopric. As Servia belonged to the not yet liberated metropolitan see of Thessalonike, but not to Ohrid, something that was not concealed, the patriarchate should have been consulted here. But that did not take place. The patriarch did not react at all for a long time, but the matter had not been forgotten, as we shall still see.³⁰

The central ecclesiastical-political event in the archbishop's term of office was, however, the anointing in connection with coronation as emperor of Theodoros Doukas in Thessalonike in mid-1227. This act represents the logical consequence of the ruler's acclamation as emperor and the assumption of the purple which had taken place following the reconquest of the city at the end of 1224. Chomatenos carried out the coronation, not acting single-handedly, but covered by a resolution of a synod made up of all bishops in the state of Epiros. The body had convened in Arta in February 1227 and, at the same time as the resolution on the coronation, had authorised a letter from Apokaukos to the patriarch. In this, imperial dignity for Theodoros and the granting of far-reaching autonomy for the Epirotic metropolitans were demanded in the form of an ultimatum.³¹

The conflict between Epiros and Nicaea³² now reached its hot phase: Nicaea would not even consider recognising the new ruler. It came to an ecclesiastical schism as Patriarch Germanos II was now less than ever prepared to give way on Epirotic demands for autonomy. The patriarchate had already protested against the assumption of the purple by Theodoros pointing out that there could not be two emperors for the empire any more than there could be *two patriarchs*. The statement indicates, at least indirectly, that the Nicaean emperor and patriarch saw Chomatenos as a kind of second patriarch.³³

²⁹ Cf. *ibid.*, 19* and 26* (with further references).

³⁰ Cf. *ibid.*, 20* (with further references).

³¹ Cf. *ibid.*, 20*sq. (with further references).

³² Cf. in general *A. Stauridu-Zaphraka*, Νίκαια και Ήπειρος τον 13ο αιώνα. Ιδεολογική αντιπαράθεση στην προσπάθεια τους να ανακτήσουν την αυτοκρατορία, Thessaloniki 1990.

³³ Cf. Nicephori Blemmydae Autobiographia sive Curriculum Vitae, ed. *J. A. Munitiz*, Turnholt, Leuven 1984, 14, 4–10; Engl. translation: Nikephoros Blemmydes, A partial account. Introduction,

A written confrontation between Patriarch Germanos II and Chomatenos came about. In his first letter after the coronation (*PD* no. 112), the latter held forth only in general turns of phrase on the co-operation of both parts of the empire and their respective churches. However, in his response (inserted in the *PD* as no. 113, but edited separately³⁴), the patriarch asked, where the archbishop of Bulgaria took the right to crown and anoint an emperor from, and where did he have the *myron* from that he was now using to divide the unity of the patriarchate. At the same time, he also announced the sending of an exarch to Epiros. Forced to defend his action, Chomatenos responded in detail in 1228/29 in *PD* no. 114: He pointed first to the particular political circumstances as well as the resolutions adopted by the political and ecclesiastical bodies in Epiros. Above all, however — and this underlines what I have already said about the self-assessment of the archbishops of Ohrid — he referred to certain prerogatives (allegedly) granted to the archbishopric of Bulgaria by Justinian I according to his Novel 131: These prerogatives, as Chomatenos alleged in his letter, put the archbishop of Bulgaria, who was mentioned in third place by Justinian, after the Pope and Patriarch of Constantinople, on an equal footing with the Pope of Rome and the archbishop of Carthage, namely with the approval of Pope Vigilius. The privileges were thus the shiny pillar that substantiated the majesty of the Bulgarian bishop's throne visible for all. His argumentation culminated in the question: "If we now, however, possess the pope's privileges in our diocese, why is it then an innovation if we too, like the pope, have anointed an emperor?" In other words, in his reply Chomatenos argued with the Justiniana Prima theory. From it he deduced that he had papal rights at his disposal, consequently he could also conduct the coronation and anointing of an emperor. In contrast, additional canonistic arguments to justify the anointing appear just as secondary — even if not unimportant — as his references to the patriarch's offences against the rights of the archbishopric of Ohrid (such as in the case of the consecration of Sava).³⁵

The outbreak of the schism was notified to the patriarch in detail at the beginning of 1228 by Corfu's metropolitan Georgios Bardanes (at the same time as Chomatenos' letter). Beforehand, the negotiations with the Epirotic metropolitans and bishops, probably also including Chomatenos, by the exarch, Georgios of Amastris, who had been sent by Germanos II, had failed. However, Bardanes' letter does not refer directly to him or his church at any point. From this, just as from the parallelism of Bardanes' letter with Chomatenos' one, the division of the Epirotic church into the autocephalous Ohrid part and the patriarchal part is clearly to be recognised. By no means had any new rights accrued to Chomatenos in a formal re-

translation and notes by *J. A. Munitiz*, Leuven 1988; cf. *Laurent* (as in n. 21), no. 1239, whose date should be corrected: cf. *G. Prinzing*, *Das byzantinische Kaisertum im Umbruch. Zwischen regionaler Aufspaltung und erneuter Zentrierung in den Jahren 1204–1282, Legitimation und Funktion des Herrschers*, ed. by *R. Gundlach* and *H. Weber*, Stuttgart 1992, 129–183, here 153.

³⁴ Cf. *Ponemata* (as in n.2), 225* and 270*; critical edition, with German translation and commentary: *Prinzing*, *Die Antigraphie* (as in n. 11), 34–36 (text).

³⁵ Cf. *Ponemata* (as in n. 2), 22*–*26* (with further references) and (for the quote from no. 114) 377, 223–225.

spect through the coronation which would have permitted him to appear as the sole spokesman for the Epirotic episcopate, so to speak as the patriarch of the Greek west.³⁶

After the overthrow of Theodoros following the defeat at Klokotnica in 1230, the return of the Epirotic patriarchal episcopate to the jurisdiction of the patriarchate of Constantinople/Nicaea was instituted with the support of the new ruler, Manuel Doukas. That was a process that also affected Chomatenos. The documentary evidence for this is the address which he drafted as it had been a speech given by the the bishop of Servia as a defence for his extra-canonical appointment in 1223 mentioned before (*PD* no. 150). The address was probably intended to be given at the synod convened by the new exarch, Christophoros of Ankyra, for the restoration of ecclesiastical unity in Thessaloniki in 1233. Whether Chomatenos was present there in person is, however, not known, we also do not know of any response to the address. But in the address mentioned he indicated that he had by no means resigned. His argumentation: If I accept that the metropolis of Bithynia (Nicaea) now boasts of the leading positions in the Empire and hierarchy (the erstwhile embellishment of Constantinople), because the overthrow of things is ascribed to chance, then no charge and no accusation can be preferred against the bishop of Servia, consequently, one could add, also not against him, Chomatenos, and his synod.³⁷

3.b As mentioned at the beginning, the outcome of Chomatenos' broadly based judicial, administrative and pastoral activity is to be found in his works and records, especially in the *PD*. In them it is a matter, in most cases, of resolving the legal problems of the population — lay people and clergy of the most varied stations, including also rulers — but also about questions of ritual, ecclesiastical discipline and administration in the narrower sense. In the records, the bishop's activity when dealing thoroughly with the cares and problems presented to him is reflected in an exemplary manner. The high proportion of legal problems from the field of matrimonial law, the law of inheritance and property law in Chomatenos' records may be surprising, but is to be explained, on the one hand, by the church's special jurisdiction in matters of marriage and divorce, on the other hand, by the tradition of the *audientia episcopalis*, as well as the fact that often the state courts or the ruler would pass on a dispute that was insoluble for them to the archbishop for an expert opinion, or even for a decision.³⁸

In our special case, however, it should be borne in mind that, on account of the special political development after 1204, the patriarchate had practically lost its central function as the highest moral and ecclesiastical-judicial appeal instance with regard to the Epirotic rulers' sphere of influence. His place was taken there now by the metropolitans with the highest spiritual and legal authority, Ioannes Apokaukos, but above all precisely Demetrios Chomatenos. The effect of this state of affairs was that both, but especially Chomatenos, also dealt with occurrences and concerns in their

³⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, 26* (with further references).

³⁷ Cf. *ibid.*, 26*sq. (with further references).

³⁸ Cf. *ibid.*, 28* (with further references).

writings which referred beyond the boundaries of their own dioceses to the territories of other metropolises in the Epirotic state, and in normal circumstances, i.e. in the case of the unity of the Empire, would have fallen under the jurisdiction of the patriarchate of Constantinople.³⁹

If we illustrate this for Chomatenos with a statistic, the following picture results from the 148 records contained in the *PD* written by him or in his name: All in all, 47 works concern his suffragans' dioceses. Of these 14 deal with the bishopric of Achrida/Ohrid proper, 3 with Deabolis/Devol, 1 with Debrai/Debar, 1 with Glabenitza / Glavinica, 1 with Kastoria, 3 with Moglena, 11 with Pelagonia/Bitola, 1 with Prisdriana/Prizren, 9 with Skopia/Skopje and 3 with Strumitza. (These are already almost all bishoprics which did actually belong to Ohrid during Chomatenos' period of office). Three further letters concern the entire territory of the archbishopric of Ohrid.⁴⁰

The number of records concerning events in other metropolises comes to a total of 60. Of these, 6 refer to Dyrrhachion, 10 to Corfu, 12 to Naupaktos (with the dioceses Bela, Bothrotos/Butrint, Ioannina, Acheloos and Arta), 2 to Philippoi and 30 to Thessalonike (with Beroia and Servia). By the way, *PD* no. 80 is very illustrative for the jurisdictional situation in Epeiros. It is concerned with an inquiry by the bishop of Bothrotos which was submitted to both Chomatenos and at the same time Apokaukos, namely with the express statement that questions of this kind had previously been addressed to the synod in Constantinople, something that was now impossible through the Latins' fault!⁴¹

However, in 23 works of the *PD* the regional reference remains unclear for lack of suitable details, thus also in the case of five works concerning the coastal province of Bagenitia which belonged to several metropolises ecclesiastically. The aforementioned figures are thus not absolute quantities. In addition, some works can only be attributed "locally" with difficulty, such as 6 letters to the ruler of Epiros, 2 letters to the ruler of Serbia, further 2 letters to the patriarch, etc., all in all 15 records or letters.⁴²

This statistical survey has shown that the ratio attributable to other metropolises accounts for some 40% of the *PD* (= 60 records). That is no small amount even if one assumes that of the 23 aforementioned works, which cannot be attributed regionally exactly, the majority were perhaps to be ascribed to the Ohrid archbishopric. Thus in the case of Chomatenos, his claim to a quasi-patriarchal position was fulfilled in an obvious manner in his actual episcopal activity, precisely in the patriarchal supraregional nature of his work. Once again, of course, the parallelism to Apokaukos may not be forgotten. Chomatenos was not a real patriarch.⁴³

³⁹ Cf. *ibid.*, 28*sq. (with further references).

⁴⁰ Cf. *ibid.*, 29*-31* (with further references).

⁴¹ Cf. *ibid.*, 31* (with further references).

⁴² Cf. *ibid.*, 32*sq. (with further references).

⁴³ Cf. *ibid.*, 33*.

However, there is a further aspect in Chomatenos' case that emphasises his quasi patriarchal nature. He issued many of his canon law responses and judgments with the assistance of the archiepiscopal synod assembled in Ohrid. This is specifically mentioned in 61 records in the *PD*. If it is borne in mind that both the metropolitan synods within the jurisdiction of the Byzantine patriarchate as well as probably the synod of the archbishopric of Ohrid before 1204 hardly played any role, apart from filling vacant episcopal sees, this activity is very unusual, but is again to be explained from the special situation of the considerable separation of the Epirotic church from the patriarchate after 1204.⁴⁴

Chomatenos apparently very deliberately utilised the possibility of reviving his archiepiscopal synod and of transforming it in name and function into a so-called *Sýnodos endemoúsa*, a so to speak 'Permanent Synod', i.e. in this way he created a substitute in Epiros for this type of synod as otherwise had existed only at the patriarchate seat from about the 10th/11th century. We can thus amplify the prevailing opinion that only Constantinople or the other great patriarchates had had such a *Synodos endemousa* to the effect that Ohrid also has this institution under Chomatenos.⁴⁵

We have hardly any information about the composition of the *endemousa* in Ohrid from the *PD*, because the records of attendance have practically never come down in this corpus. It is, however, to be assumed that, apart from the suffragan bishops, some of the high ecclesiastical officials, but at least the *chartophylax*, who was responsible for the synodal records, or his deputy, the *hypomnematográphos*, were also present at the sessions. We know two of them by name. In connection with the chancellery clerks, we may also note what the analysis of the complete corpus of the *PD* has shown. The presentation of the collections that have come down to us was prepared on the basis of one or more registers from the Ohrid chancellery by an unknown editor, but processed in such a manner that in most cases he omitted important parts of the record. The proof of this is provided by chance: one of the records (*PD* no. 50) has also come down separately as the copy of a complete excerpt from the register in Apokaukos' correspondence. However, as far as can be determined, the types of records, thus the formal structure of the acts registered (including letters, judgements and all other kinds of records), and their formal language conform very closely with the known specimens from the patriarchate chancellery in Constantinople. In other words: Chomatenos, who had also made use of the formula of humility otherwise always reserved to the patriarch, ἡ μετριότης ἡμῶν ("our mediocrity"), in his acts, had kept a counterpart to the patriarchal register of Constantinople in Ohrid, thus here too acting clearly like a patriarch! Regrettably, only the substance of the contents, but hardly any of the diplomatically relevant substance have survived.⁴⁶

Chomatenos' acts which he elaborated alone or with the participation of the synod, i.e. his personal letters, rulings, expert opinions, judgments and treatises, are

⁴⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, 33*sq. (with further references).

⁴⁵ Cf. *ibid.*, 34* (with further references).

⁴⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, 34*-36* (with further references).

outstanding for an extraordinary breadth of knowledge of the legal matter as well as great clarity and originality in the argumentation.⁴⁷ Many records begin with the *expositio* of the case, in more important cases also with a *prooimion*. This *expositio* for its part often contains the submissions by suppliants, orders by the rulers — e.g. the order to the synodal court to take on the case — statements made before court or other evidence (e.g. wills and testaments) in a complete or abridged verbatim rendering: This wealth of quotations contributes considerably to the enrichment of the contents of the records, precisely from a historical point of view. Then follows the *dispositio*, the decision by the archbishop or his official, and a detailed statement of reasons, in most cases supported by excerpts from the laws. These excerpts are an important special feature of the Ohrid records,⁴⁸ compared with the known records from the patriarchal register, especially those original ones to be found in the *Codices Vindob. hist. gr.* 47 and 48 in the Austrian National Library in Vienna!⁴⁹

The qualified nature of his dispensation of justice and his legal-moral advice seem to have gained favourable approval in the populations. There is, at all events, no cause to dismiss the words as a mere phrase with which a petitioner from Corfu preceded his submission to Chomatenos: "...everywhere one hears of the just dispensation of justice of the Court of Thy great Holiness as well as the Holy Synod presided over by Thee, therefore I am also turning to this justice-loving court and request a ruling in my matter in accordance with divine and pious laws."⁵⁰ Such marks of confidence, which were also shown towards him from "outside", for instance by monks from the Holy Mountain Athos (cf. *PD* no. 54) and by the enquiries from neighbouring metropolises,⁵¹ quite certainly strengthened Chomatenos' self-assurance and self-assessment as a lawyer. Chomatenos gives clear references to this in polemic passages against an unnamed bishop of Berroia (in *PD* no. 26) or, for example, in partially scornful parts of a letter to the Despot (Emperor) Manuel (*PD* no.117) and in an expert opinion (*PD* no. 151) in which he energetically defended himself against criticism of one of his earlier decisions!⁵²

3.b As far as Chomatenos' personal relationship with his colleagues and the rulers of Epiros/Thessalonike is concerned, our knowledge of this is very limited (as indeed the individuality of his person is difficult to understand). His official letters and *responsa* are marked throughout by courteousness and objectivity. Only one letter to a cleric of the church of Beroia (*PD* no.108) shows us that on one occasion there must have been considerable friction between Chomatenos and the bishop of

⁴⁷ Cf. especially *D. Simon*, *Byzantinische Provinzialjustiz*, *Byz. Zeitschr.* 79 (1986) 310–343.

⁴⁸ Cf. Ponemata (as in n. 2), 37* (with further references) and *Simon*, *NOMOTPIBOYMENOI* (as in n. 20), 281.

⁴⁹ About formal similarities between the *PD* and the patriarchal register of Constantinople cf. Ponemata (as in n. 2), cf. 269* *passim*, and 306*. The new edition of the patriarchal register, initiated by *H. Hunger* and *O. Kresten* (*Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*, vol. 19, parts 1–3, Vienna 1981, 1995, 2001) is still not complete.

⁵⁰ Cf. Ponemata (as in n. 2), 38* and for the quote see 227, no. 65, 15–19.

⁵¹ Cf. above, text referring to n. 41!

⁵² Cf. Ponemata (as in n. 2), 38* (with further references)..

Berroia. Chomatenos, who had been not inconsiderably enraged by the bishop's attacks, that were apparently linked with insults, threatened for the case of their continuance with massive (admittedly not more closely defined) resistance.⁵³ Chomatenos always showed the ruler, Theodoros Dukas, great respect, whereas his relationship with the latter's successor Manuel, whom he had also not crowned, appears to have been more reserved.⁵⁴

However, Chomatenos was linked by a deeper friendship with the aforementioned Metropolitan of Corfu, Basileios Padiadites, and his successor Georgios Bardanes.⁵⁵ But the most important friend of him and his patron was certainly the metropolitan Apokaukos who apparently knew Chomatenos best, always supported him and followed his work longest. It is all the more a great pity that none of Chomatenos's letters to him have come down to us, whereas we do know the text of six letters from Apokaukos to Chomatenos. Thus it is no coincidence that precisely they contain the few statements which can be taken, apart from the biography (see above), also for characterising the archbishop. Thus he praised him for his common sense (*logiotes*) and characterized him, among other things, as "one who does not only listen to the holy canons, but also instructs other people in all these things." He defended Chomatenos against the criticism of Patriarch Manuel I mentioned elsewhere among other things with the observation: "And he was a man admired by many, honourable on account of his moderate character, his discreet rhetoric and his tactful instructions."⁵⁶

4. Outlook: From Chomatenos to Constantine Kabasilas

Chomatenos was at all events suspect for the Palaiologoi from an ecclesiastical policy respect as a more or less "separatist-Epirotic" minded hierarch *kat' exochen* in Epiros. Most probably for that reason there is also not a single portrait of him still extant any more in the churches of Ohrid itself or in other places of the former archbishopric from the 13th century on: From the point of view of the Palaiologoi emperors of Constantinople and their loyal archbishops of Ohrid, the successors of Chomatenos, it was by no means the latter who was worthy of recollection, but Constantine Kabasilas⁵⁷ (the former metropolitan of Dyrrhachion), a victim of the Laskarids and a partisan of Emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos. The portrait of Constantine Kabasilas, painted with a nimbus, is not only still to be seen today in the St. Kliment (Peribleptos) church in Ohrid, but, for example, also on Mt. Athos (in the Protaton).⁵⁸ However, Chomatenos can cope with his *damnatio memoriae* in the field

⁵³ Cf. *ibid.*, 39* and 219*.

⁵⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, 39*.

⁵⁵ No wonder, that his letters to them are rhetorically highly polished.

⁵⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, 39*sq.* (with further references). Concerning the quotes cf.: A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Συμβολή εις την ιστορίαν της αρχιεπισκοπής Ἀχρίδος, Sbornik statej posvajaščennych...prof. V. I. Lamanskomu ..., St. Petersburg 1907, 227–250, here 233, 13–14, and 235, 4–6, and Vasil'evskij, Epirotica (as in note 17), no. 17, 272, 20–21.

⁵⁷ Cf. about him Ponemata (as in n. 2), 4*, note 11.

of art. Until 1918, there was still a literary and real reminiscence of him in the St. Kliment church in Ohrid in the form of a metric epigram on the silver frame of an icon of Christ donated by him.⁵⁹ Although the icon has since disappeared, Chomatenos, its donor, justifiably acquires far greater renown from us than Kabasilas enjoys, namely above all on account of the high quality of his writings.⁶⁰

Гинџер Принцинг

КВАЗИПАТРИЈАРХ У ЕПИРСКОЈ ДРЖАВИ: АУТОКЕФАЛНИ АРХИЕПИСКОП „БУГАРСКЕ“ (ОХРИДА) ДИМИТРИЈЕ ХОМАТИН

Стекавши приватно образовање у Цариграду за *новошривуменоса* (правни експерт), Хоматин је од око 1191. служио при Патријаршији као *ајокрисијарије* (=нунције) охридских архиепископа. Хартофилакс „Бугарске“ архиепископије постао је 1215 (или нешто раније), под архиепископом Јованом Каматиром. После Каматиrove смрти, свакако већ 1216, епирски владар Теодор Дука именовao је Хоматина, на предлог митрополита Навпакта Јована Апокавка, за Каматиrowог наследника. Тако је он постао водећа личност цркве у Епирској држави. Његово разумевање сопственог положаја као упоредивог са положајем патријарха, засновано на (псеудо) теорији о некадашњој митрополији *Iustiniana Prima* као корену идентитета Охридске архиепископије, јасно се одсликава у његовом главном делу — корпусу аката *Ponemata diaphora* (=PD). Неки редактор је то дело затим прикључио регистру Охридске архиепископије из Хоматиновог времена. Из новог критичког издања PD у оквиру CFHB произлази да је овај регистар у формалном погледу био приређен слично цариградском патријаршијском регистру. Али насупрот овом последњем, пресуде и препоруке изврсног канонисте Хоматина по правилу су подупрте обимним изводима из закона, и то је основна специфичност PD. PD су такође и прворазредан историјски извор, из-

⁵⁸ Cf. *Ponemata* (as in n. 2), 22*, note 90, and concerning the portraits of Constantine Kabasilas C. *Grozdanov*, *Portreti na svetitelite od Makedonija od XI–XVIII vek*, Skopje 1983, 180–190.

⁵⁹ See S. K. *Kissas*, *Natpis Dimitrija Homatijana na okovu ikone Hrista Velikog Arhijereja iz Ohrida* (Summary: S. Kissas [sic], The inscription of Demetrius Chomatianos on the silver cope of the icon of “Christ the Archpriest” of Ohrid, in : *Zbornik za likovne umetnosti* 23 (1987) 165–173 (with 2 illustrations), with further references.

⁶⁰ After completion of this present paper, I learned of the new article by *Ilija G. Iliev*, (Dimităr, po Božija milost arhiepiskop na Părva Justiniana i na cjala Bălgarija, *Istoričeski Pregled* 60, 1–2 [2004] 3–39 [summary: Dimitar, by the grace of God archbishop of the First Justiniana and of the whole of Bulgaria]), which is of similar approach and based on my new edition.

међу осталог и за српску историју, јер у њима је напр. пренето познато Хоматиново протестно писмо поводом Савиног посвећења у Никеји за првог аутокефалног архиепископа Србије (1219).

Иако се Хоматин владао као патријарх, он никада није оспорио легитимитет патријараха у Никејском царству у егзилу. Али је он истовремено, заједно са Патријаршији потчињеним митрополијама у Епирској држави, црквенополитичким средствима јачао независност епирских владара у односу на Никеју. То је чинио, с једне стране, својим утицајем на попуњавање вакантних митрополитских и епископских столица, чак и изван своје дијецезе, а с друге стране, крунисањем Теодора Дуке за цара у Солуну 1227. године. Овај чин био је предузет позивањем на наводна права по угледу на папске ингеренције (изведена из традиције везане за Прву Јустинијану), као и позивањем на једну ранију синодску одлуку свих епископа у Епирској држави, и одвео је петогодишњој унутарцрквеној шизми између Никеје и Епира. Као њен главни покретач, Хоматин (умро између 1236. и 1240) је био подвргнут *damnatio memoriae*, док је успомена на његовог каснијег наследника Константина Кавасилу (око 1254 — око 1262) била из политичких разлога нарочито подржавана. Међутим, његово целокупно дело показује да га је Хоматин далеко надмашивао.