MARK C. BARTUSIS (Aberdeen, South Dakota)

THE CHADENOS AFFAIR
(PACHYMERES, BOOK I, CHAPTERS 5–6)

The author offers an interpretation of a passage from the history of George Pachymeres involving the fate of the highlanders of Asia Minor under Michael VIII Palaiologos during the 1260s. Contrary to the opinion of numerous scholars, these men were not transformed into pronoia soldiers but into mercenaries.

Shortly after and as a result of the blinding of John IV Laskaris by Michael VIII Palaiologos in December 1261, a popular revolt erupted in the mountainous area called Trikokkia, the frontier region to the east of Nicaea. After quite some time, the episode ended through negotiations which divided the rebels. Through various threats and promises most were eventually persuaded to lay down their arms, while others fled to the Turks.1 According to the historian George Pachymeres, at some point after or in the midst of the Trikokkia revolt, Michael VIII sent an official named Chadenos to Asia Minor to implement a new agrarian program. “And as quickly as possible,” Pachymeres writes (and I translate this quite literally),

...stopping at the places and finding exceedingly rich men, heavy with property and animals, he [Chadenos] recruits them from their property by which the livelihood of each of them was composed. And reckoning out forty nomismata per one [man], and of these [nomismata] the most [coming] from his [each man’s] own property, he [Chadenos] ordered the rest of the tax established, being not a little, to be sent to the imperial treasury (Και δὴ ἐπιστάσας ταχέως τοὺς τόπους . . . ἄνδρας βασιλείαν τοὺς εὐρὺν καὶ κτήματι καὶ θρήματι βρίθοντας, στρατεύει τούτους ἐκ τῶν σφετέρων ἐκείνων καὶ ὅς ὁ ἐκάστου βίος συνεκερότητο καὶ, εἰς τεσσαράκοντα νομίσματα τῷ ἐνὶ συμποσίῳ, καὶ τούτων τὸ πλείστον ἐκ τῶν αὐτοῦ, τὸ λοιπὸν τοῦ τεθέντος τέλους, οὐκ ὀλίγον ὁν, τῷ βασιλικῷ ταμιεῖῳ εἰσκομίζεσθαι ἔταξεν).2

1 M. Bartusis, The Late Byzantine Army, Philadelphia 1992, 54.
He adds,

What was done for the first time, the men suffered what they had never expected, and it broke the courage in those who [fought] willingly and weakened [their] strength (Pachymeres, I, 33.9–11: Ὅ καὶ πραξάριν πρώτος, παθόντων τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἅ ὡκ ἠλπίσαν πώποτε, ἐπέκλασέ τε τὴν προθυμίαν βουλομένους καὶ καθυφείκεσαν τῆς δυνάμεως).

Despite this, their pay kept them in place, opposing the Turks:

And perhaps withdrawing day by day they would have abandoned the barriers to the enemies, if by the assigned rogai—for they did not have their own things to possess—those dwelling nearby had not been persuaded with great difficulty to resist (I, 33.19–21: Καὶ τάχα ἄν ἑσχοροῦντες ὁσημέρα τοῖς ἐναντίοις τῶν θρηγκῶν παρεκχώρησαν, εἰ μή γε ταχείσεσις ῥόγαις — τά γάρ σφέτερα ὠκ έίχον κατέχειν — μόνης ὑπείκον προσοικοῦντες ἀντέχειν).

And so the borders held as long as their pay was forthcoming: “And so were things, as long as the rogai were given at the times ordered according to custom” (I, 33.25: Καὶ ταῦτ’ ἔσαν, ἐως ἐδίδοντο ῥόγαι καιροὶ ὀρισμένοι κατὰ τὸ σύνηθες).

But, Pachymeres writes, matters changed: “Since concerning these things [the pay] the archons were stingy, and that which was given with difficulty and overdue and, compared with times of old, was too little, while the leaders of the armies took their own share by theft. While most fell into ruin, some became sword’s work,” others joined the Turks, or moved elsewhere (I, 35.3–9: Ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ περὶ ταῦτας οἱ ἐρχοντες ἐγλισχρεύνοντο, καὶ μόλις καὶ ὑπερήμερον καὶ παρὰ τὸ ἄρχαίον μείον ἦν τὸ διδόμενον, ἐφ’ ὁπερ καὶ οἱ κατὰ καυροὺς τῶν στρατευμάτων ἥμισυς μερίτας ἐκ κλεμμάτων ἐκεύσαν. ἀπάλευτο μὲν ἡ πλῆθος ἐκείνων, τῶν μὲν ἐργον μαχαίρας γεγονόταν, τῶν δὲ καὶ προσχωρησάντων τοῖς ἐναντίοις . . . ). In the face of enemy attacks, some fled to mountain lairs where they turned to brigandage, forming bands that terrorized the remaining Byzantine population.3 Nikephoros Gregoras, writing about events from around 1275, echoes these sentiments: “A short time earlier the guards inhabiting the highlands migrated from there [Asia] through lack of yearly incomes which they received from the imperial government” (τόυς τάς ἂκρας οἰκοῦντες φύλακας μετανάστας ἐκεύθεν γενέσθαι δι’ ἐνδειαν τῶν ἔτησίων λημμάτων).4 While the frontiers shrank, the chronic unreliability of pay for these men continued. Discussing the crises of the early 1290s Pachymeres writes,

the assigned pay granted to those in the highlands was deficient, all the more by the wickedness of leaders, who wished to loiter with the things given henceforth completely overdue in order to profit (III, 235.16–19: καὶ τὸ

3 Pachymeres, ed. Faillier, I, 293.
What exactly had happened to these men? Numerous interpretations have been offered to explain Michael’s actions toward the highlanders, but there is considerable disagreement among them. The reason for this is that Pachymeres, our only source for the Chadenos affair, provides too little precise information and that which he does provide is thoroughly ambiguous. Here I would like to re-examine the relevant passages. But first, some background.

Early in his history Pachymeres writes of the measures taken by Nicaean emperors to minimize the depredations of marauding Turkoman and splinter Seljuk bands over which the Seljuk sultans had little control. Foremost among them was the attempt to keep the civilian population inhabiting the mountainous frontiers at the fringes of the Nicaean state from abandoning their homes. These highlanders performed a vital and quite hazardous function for the Nicaean state by acting as a buffer between the Turkish marauders and the valleys of the Nicaean Empire. Pachymeres writes that the emperors, in order to maintain the eastern frontier, “turned to the mountains, securing them with many strong settlers from all over.” Somewhat later, faced with increasing Turkish pressure, the emperors did not leave those living on the mountains uncared for, who, not having an incentive to remain, were prepared to emigrate if anywhere enemies should attack somehow. . . . But they granted tax exemptions to all, pronoiai to the more illustrious among them, and imperial letters to those with a resolute spirit (ἀλλ' ἀτελείαις μὲν τοὺς πάντας, προνοίαις δ' ἐκ τούτων τοὺς ἐπιδοξότερους καὶ οἷς τολμήν τὸ φρόνημα γράμμασιν ἐδωροῦντο βασιλικοῖς).

Later in this same chapter, he adds, “those inhabiting the highs held their heads high not only by the aforementioned tax exemptions and pronoiai, but even by daily imperial kindnesses” (μὴ μόνον αἷς ἐρρῆθη ἀτελείαις τε καὶ προνοίαις, ἀλλὰ γε καθημεριναῖς φιλοτησίαις βασιλικαῖς τῶν τὰς ἀκρας οἴκοιτων βρενθομένων).

The policy of granting these men various benefits was designed to foster continued occupation of the border areas because the Nicaean emperors knew that continued occupation would include localized defense of their own lands and occasional sorties into Turkish territory for booty. In the sense that these duties were performed by the highlanders as a matter of personal survival even before they re-

---

ceived special privileges, they did not technically become “soldiers,” which is why the historian Pachymeres, our only source for these developments, does not in fact call them such. He simply writes that Nicaean policy affected “all” of those inhabiting the border areas, not a certain subset of the population who became “soldiers.” After receiving their tax exemption and other benefits they performed no additional service and their only obligation to the state was to remain on their lands. The Nicaean highlanders were essentially a localized militia composed of the able inhabitants of the frontier zones who, without much organization or discipline, defended their lands and harassed their opposite numbers in Turkish territory as best they saw fit. In this they performed a function well worth the imperial attention lavished on them. As a result their economic condition improved and they were persuaded to remain, and their activities allowed Nicaean commanders to direct their military resources elsewhere.

Pachymeres creates four categories of benefaction granted to the highlanders: tax exemption, pronoiai, “imperial letters,” and “daily imperial kindnesses.” Tax exemption affected property they already held, and, he claims, everyone benefitted from it. More limited in number were grants of pronoiai and “imperial letters” (γράμματα βασιλικά). The former went to “the more illustrious among them,” which means those of higher social status, and the latter, which appears to refer to imperial privileges granted through orismos or chrysobull, to “those with a resolute spirit,” a poetic way to refer to those who especially distinguished themselves.

Καθημερινά φιλοτησίαι βασιλικαί (“daily imperial kindnesses”) is an unusual phrase. If “daily” is taken literally, one might think of rations or a rations allowance. But that is unlikely. In the passage Pachymeres places these “daily kindnesses” on the same plane as the pronoiai and tax exemptions. It is difficult to imagine how either rations or a rations allowance would cause the men to “strut like peacocks” (an equally appropriate translation for the verb in the passage, βρενθύομαι). Rather, Pachymeres must be referring to either frequent rewards or gifts, or a salary, depending on whether we render kathemerinai as “daily” in the sense of “frequent” or “regular.”

With the Trikokkia revolt, the policy toward the highlanders changed. Let us consider Chadenos’ program. Pachymeres writes that Chadenos went eastward and found “exceedingly rich men.” Though it is not absolutely certain, scholarly opinion agrees that Pachymeres is referring to at least some of the highlanders here. These were the men who had prospered from the tax exemptions and

---

pronoiai conferred by the Laskarides. Pachymeres himself points out that he is deviating from his usual chronological presentation. First he writes of the treatment of those inhabiting the highlands under the Laskarides, then he writes of Chadenos, and then he describes the effects of Chadenos’ program, before returning to the Laskarides.

Did Chadenos’ program extend throughout all of Asia, only the border areas, or only some of the border areas? Since Pachymeres speaks of Chadenos visiting places (τοῖς τόποις), this suggests, though obviously weakly, that he went to more than one village, a fact which is evident anyway from Pachymeres’ implication that the later history of the Byzantine frontiers in the east were connected to Chadenos’ activities.

Chadenos’ first move was to impose military service on them (strateuei toutous), and then he “counted out” forty hyperpyra per man. G. Arnakis proposed that this was a one-time compensation for the confiscation of their lands. On the other hand P. Charanis and A. Faillier held that it represented a yearly money payment designed to replace the income from their confiscated lands. P. Mutafčiev, though he did not use the word pronoia, spoke of a reduction in the holdings of the wealthy highlanders to forty-hyperpyra parcels. N. Oikonomides, H. Ahrweiler, and others, maintained that Chadenos was really conducting an exisosis and that the forty hyperpyra was the posotes of the standard pronoia assigned to each man. The most detailed interpretation of Chadenos’ program was supplied by Oikonomides. He hypothesized that after conducting a cadastral survey of the tax-exempt holdings of the highlanders, Chadenos distributed to each land in pronoia with a posotes of forty hyperpyra (which gives a technical meaning to Pachymeres’ use of the verb σωμισσοκοvous), which was drawn from the existing holdings of the men. Their tax-exempt status was withdrawn, and further, their military duties were enlarged. In compensation they received a yearly salary to supplement their pronoiai. Further, by requiring them to pay taxes, the highlanders once again became part of the monetary economy of the empire. Oikonomides did not directly address the question of whether the property of the men in excess of forty hyperpyra was confiscated but he seems to imply this by speaking of a “social leveling” of these men and the disappearance of the economic disparities among these men. In effect the intention of Chadenos’ program was to reestablish

---


8 See Pachymeres, ed. Faillier, I, 30 note 2.


state control over the frontier regions, particularly important in light of the usurper Michael’s lack of popularity in Anatolia. The transformation of the highlanders from tax-exempt patrimonial landowners with some pronoiai to pronoiarioi with an annual salary, weakened their economic and psychological bond to their local soil, and allowed them a greater mobility, enabling Michael VIII to use them in his European campaigns.\footnote{Oikonomidès, A propos des armées, 359–60 and notes.}

In broad outline, one of two things happened: either the property of these men was confiscated, or they were each granted, from their property and as a pronoia, a posotes of forty hyperpyra. And whether or not pronoiai were involved, the men henceforth received a salary as well, because Pachymeres emphasizes that the borders held as long as this pay was forthcoming. Thus, we can present these possibilities, and their variants, as follows:

1. all of their property was confiscated, and either
   1a. they were given a one-time compensation of 40 hyperpyra, plus an unspecified annual salary, or
   1b. they were given an annual salary of 40 hyperpyra; or
2. they were each granted a holding, pulled from their own property, with a fiscal value of 40 hyperpyra (i.e., a pronoia), which was either taxed or tax exempt, plus they were granted an unspecified annual salary, and either
   2a. the rest of their property was confiscated, or
   2b. they kept the rest of their property but lost the tax exemption on it.

The possibilities involving pronoiai are not very tidy, and this is because more options come into play if the men were allowed to remain landholders. Nevertheless, each of these possibilities would have yielded an economic profit to the state. How do we choose from these possibilities? Usually our task is to pick the interpretation that best fits the text and historical circumstances. Here, however, our task is to find any interpretation that fits the passage without creating internal contradictions.

The section of the passage that creates a problem is “And reckoning out forty nomismata per one [man], and of these [nomismata] the most [came] from his [each man’s] own property, he [Chadenos] ordered the rest of the tax established, being not a little, to be sent to the imperial treasury,” and in particular the phrase “of these [nomismata] the most [came] from his [each man’s] own property” (τούτων τὸ πλεῖστον ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν). If τούτων refers to “nomismata,” which it seems it must, then Pachymeres is saying that some of the forty nomismata reckoned out per man did not come from the property of at least some of the men. Why not? Pachymeres calls them “exceedingly rich,” so it cannot be because some of the men did not have property with a liquidation value of forty hyperpyra (scenarios 1a and 1b): around 1300, for example, when the wealthy
measured their land in the thousands of modioi, forty hyperpyra could not have purchased even a hundred modioi (25 acres) of average land. If some of the forty hyperpyra had to come from a source other than the men’s property, scenarios 1a and 1b become, at least on the face of things, illogical.

On the other hand, we do not fare much better if we view the forty hyperpyra as a posotes. Again, for comparison, around 1300 the tax on 1,000 modioi of land (about 250 acres) was 20 hyperpyra. Add a half dozen paroikos families with the various taxes they normally owed, and the total tax assessment, or posotes, would approach 40 hyperpyra. Such a property holding hardly made one “rich.” But even if we simply ignore the magnitude of the forty hyperpyra, no matter how we view the forty nomismata—as a single payment (1a), as a yearly salary (1b), or as a fiscal assessment connected to each man’s property (2a and b)—the point of the passage is that the men suffered some kind of economic loss and the state made some gain through Chadenos’ program. If Chadenos could not find the 40 hyperpyra from the men’s own property, the state would be losing money on the procedure. So they had to have more to begin with, and so why did only “most” of these nomismata come from their property?

There is a way to reconcile scenarios 2a and 2b with this. Perhaps only “most” of a posotes of forty hyperpyra came from the men’s own property (e.g., 30 hyperpyra), and that the rest of their posotes was not composed of fiscal revenues, but of a simple salary (e.g., 10 hyperpyra yearly). Since we know that the men received a salary, this interpretation, while somewhat convoluted is at least possible.

Nevertheless, both scenarios involving pronoiai (2a and 2b) are doubtful or even excludable for other reasons. First, if Chadenos’ program involved pronoiai, a fiscal assessment, and the loss of tax exemption, it is fair to ask why Pachymeres does not use the words pronoia, or oikonomia or anagraphe or exisosis or ateleia in the passage. He is not bashful about using such words. There are eight passages in his history in which Pachymeres uses the word pronoia in its technical sense, three where he uses ateleia (“tax exemption,” usually in regard to Italian merchants), and one in which he uses oikonomia.12 In four other passages he employs combinations of these words: ateleia and pronoia; pronoia and oikonomia; exisosis and anagraphe; pronoia, oikonomia, and exisosis.13 In fact, one of these passages is found in the chapter of his history (ch. 4) immediately preceding the Chadenos affair (ch. 5–6). As quoted above, he writes that these men of the highlands had been holding pronoiai: the emperors of Nicaea “granted tax exemptions to all, pronoiai to the more illustrious among them, and imperial letters to those with a resolute spirit,” and “those inhabiting the highlands held their heads high not only by the aforementioned tax exemptions and pronoiai, but even by daily


imperial kindnesses.” The only terminology in the Chadenos passage even slightly related to pronoia grants is the verb *symposoo*, which might allude to the fiscal term *posotes*. But in the nine other passages in which Pachymeres uses this verb, it simply denotes the counting out or parceling out of something (usually soldiers or money), and in one instance it is used in connection with the mercenary pay of the Catalan Company.¹⁴

Even more damaging to the interpretation that pronoiai were involved in the Chadenos affair is what Pachymeres writes just a few lines afterward. The frontiers would have fallen “if by the assigned rogai—for they did not have their own things to possess—those dwelling nearby had not been persuaded with great difficulty to resist” (εἰ μὴ γε ταχθεῖσις ρώγαις — τὰ γὰρ σφέτερα οὐκ εἶχον κατέχειν — μὸλις ὑπείκουν προσοικούντες ἀντέχειν). Despite the tortuous syntax of this passage, he is juxtaposing, on the one hand, the salaries (rogai) that the men received, with, on the other, “their own things” which they did not have. Further, we compare ἐκ τῶν σφέτερον ἐκείνων, “from their own things,” in the Chadenos passage, to τὸ σφέτερα οὐκ εἶχον κατέχειν, “they did not have possession of their own things,” in this passage a few lines later.

I think we have to conclude that Chadenos confiscated the property of these men, and that the Chadenos affair had nothing to do with pronoiai or, more accurately, that the only connection between the Chadenos affair and pronoia is that some of the property confiscated from the men were the pronoia grants conferred upon them earlier, under the Laskarides.¹⁵

We are left with the confiscation interpretations (1a and 1b). The first of these, that the forty hyperpyra were a one-time compensation for confiscating the property of “exceedingly rich men,” might be considered an illustration of the figure of speech “adding insult to injury.” Because it was not reckoned proportionately and connected to the magnitude of their confiscated property holdings, it must have been more of a starting sum to help them establish themselves in their new vocation, as soldiers receiving a salary. In this sense, there is little difference between scenario 1a and 1b. Whether or not the forty hyperpyra were or were not their official yearly wage as soldiers (a reasonable if somewhat low figure), they could certainly be viewed as the first installment of such wages.

But we are not out of the woods yet. I noted above that any interpretation of the Chadenos passage must deal with the phrase “of these [40 nomismata] the most [came] from his [each man’s] own property” (τούτων τὸ πλείστον ἐκ τῶν αὐτοῦ). To find an explanation that fits this phrase, we have to envision what Chadenos actually did upon arriving at the properties under discussion. Accompanied by an armed escort, he went to the home of each man, announced the bad news, and, no doubt amid much wailing and lamentation, he might well have

¹⁴ Pachymeres, ed. Failler, IV, 549.30–31: Συνεποσώντω . . εἰς χιλίας χιλιοστῶν νομισμάτων ἐγγύς. See Pachymeres, ed. Failler, V, s.v. συμποσσό. ¹⁵ And thus, the interpretation I presented in Bartusis, Late Byzantine Army, 55–56, is, I now believe, incorrect.
looked for any ready hoard of cash. If he found a substantial one, he appropriated it and doled out the forty hyperpyra. But the odds are that these men, like most people who derive their livelihoods from the land, were cash-poor. And so, if he could not find a stash, or if it contained less than forty hyperpyra, he needed to seek other sources of specie.

At this point he determined what property, land and livestock, each man held, and began the process of confiscation. What happened to these properties after they were confiscated? There are a number of possibilities and they were probably used in combination. (a) If local buyers were found, Chadenos would have arranged for the sale of the properties. (b) Livestock could have been moved elsewhere, to state domains (episkepseis). Otherwise, since we must assume that the men’s lands and herds were large enough that they had needed help to exploit them, via lessors, tenants, or hired man, (c) once the men had been driven from their properties, the state could simply have taken their place as landowner, creating episkepseis. Only the first possibility had the potential to produce significant amounts of cash immediately, assuming that some of the men’s neighbors, who were not being dispossessed, had some cash. Overall, the initial disposition of most of the properties was probably more in accord with the third possibility.

Thus, while, in the long run, there was potential for the state to profit greatly from the confiscation, the actual initial confiscation may have produced relatively little ready cash. Therefore, Chadenos needed to supplement whatever specie he could raise locally with other moneys. And this can explain Pachymeres’ phrase “most of these 40 nomismata (came) from each man’s own property.”

Finally, we need to explain the last clause of the passage: Chadenos “ordered the rest of the tax established, being not a little, to be sent to the imperial treasury.” “The rest” (τὸ λοιπὸν) parallels “the most (of the 40 nomismata)” (τὸ πλεῖστον) in the previous phrase. “The rest” was therefore whatever profit the state made from the confiscation, after extracting as much of the forty hyperpyra per man it could find. Pachymeres refers to it as a “tax” (telos), and certainly some of it was. If buyers were found, they would have paid taxes, and the charges paid by lessors and tenants could be viewed, loosely, as a kind of tax.

We can now offer a translation of the key passage that, more concretely, fits the confiscation scenario. Indeed, the verb στρατεύον, which Pachymeres employs, now acquires a double sense, both of which are encountered in late Byzantine narrative sources: “to enlist as a soldier” and “to march.”

(Chadenos) marches them away (as soldiers) from their properties from which they derived their livelihood. And reckoning out (as pay) forty nomismata to each, and most of these (nomismata) (coming) from each man’s own property, (Chadenos) ordered that the rest of the tax established (i.e., the state’s profit through the program), being not a little, to be sent to the imperial treasury.

16 V. Laurent (Pachymeres, ed. Failler, I, 32) tried to include both senses in his translation of the passage: “Il les enrôle loin de ces biens qu’ils possédaient . . . .”
So, evidently with the triple purpose of reestablishing control over the frontier regions in the east, of forcing some well-off malingerers to give their share of military service, and of raising more imperial revenues, Michael VIII sent Chadenos to one or more regions in Asia Minor, found men who were benefitting from tax exemption, pronoiai, and other imperial favors, but were, perhaps, not contributing sufficiently to the defense of the area. So Chadenos, in what can be characterized only as a draconian measure, confiscated their property and enrolled them as soldiers serving for pay. After some time, as the pay became increasingly infrequent, the frontiers became increasingly porous.

Mark Bartusis

АФЕРА ХАДЕНОС (ПАХИМЕР, КЊ. I, ГЛ. 5–6)

На почетку своје историје Георгије Пахимер пише о мерама које су предузимали никејски цареви да би умањили штете од пљачкашких Туркомана и разбили селџуџске банде. Најважнија међу тим мерама био је покушај да се цивилно становништво, које је насељавало планинске границе на ободима никејске државе, спречи да напушта своје домове. Цареви су „даривали свима ослобођење од пореза, проније највиђенијима међу њима, а царска писма онима који су се одликовали одлучношћу“. Послије је била поправљање економског стања становништва, његово остајање у сопственим стаништима, што је дозвољавало никејским командантима да упућују на друге стране своје војне ресурсе. Никејски брђани чинили су тако локалну милицију, састављену од способног становништва пограничних зона, која је бранила сопствене поседе и успешно се одупирала Турцима.

Убрзо после ослепљивања Јована IV Ласкариса (декембар 1261) избила је народна побуна у брдским крајевима званим Триконија, пограничном региону источно од Никеје. После краћег времена, ова епизода била је завршена преговорима. Према Пахимеру, у једном тренутку, после или у сред револта, цар Михаило је послав чиновника по имену Хаденос да у Малој Азији спроведе нов аграрни програм. „Што је могућно брже било“, пише Пахимер, „заустављајући се повремено и проналазећи изразито богате људе са велиkim иметком и стоком, он [Хаденос] их је регрутовао према њиховим имањима од којих се сваки међу њима издржавао. Одбијајући четрдесет номизми по једном [човеку], при чему је већи део сума долазио са његовог поседа, он [Хаденос] је одредио да се остатак установљеног пореза, што није било мало, шаље у царску благајну“(G. Pachyméres, Relations historiques, ed. A. Failler. Paris 1984–2000, I, 33.3–8). Границе су се држале све док је плаћање пристизало
овим људима. Али када је постalo нередово, људи су запали у невољу: неки су се придржили Турцима, други су се некуда преселили или постали банди-ти. Границе су биле уздрмане.

Многобројне супротстављене интерпретације су биле ниђене да објасне Михаилове акције према брђанима. Када је Хаденос обвезао људе на војну службу и „одбио“ четрдесет хиперпера по човеку, да ли је то била једнократна компензација за конфискацију њихових поседа или годишња исплата у новцу, намењена за надокнаду прихода са конфискованих поседа, или годишња posotis са стандардне ироније (pronoia), која је припадала сваком човеку са правом на уживање exisis? Према досадашњим мишљењима, десила се једна од две ствари: или је имовина ових људи била конфискована, или је сваки од њих, од сопствене имовине, добио као пронију posotis од четрдесет хи- перпера. Било да су проније овим биле обухваћене или не, људи су примали надаље и плату, јер Пахимер тврди да су се границе држале све док су они добијали своју исплату.

Свако решење које укључује проније је сумњиво или, чак, неодрживо, и то из два разлога. Прво, ако је Хаденов програм укључивао проније, разрезивање пореза и губитак пореских изузећа, зашто онда Пахимер не употребљава термине, који се иначе у разним приликама налазе у његовој историји, да опише поклањање пронија (pronoia, oikonomia, anagraphe, exisis, ateleia)? Друго, само неколико редова после кључног одломка Пахимер раздваја плате (rogai) које су људи примали од „њихових сопствених ствари“ које више ни- су поседовали.

Морамо да закључимо да је Хаденос конфисковао имовину ових људи и да читава „афера“ нема ништа са пронијама или, тачније, да се једина веза између Хаденовог поступка и проније састоји у томе што су нека имања била одузета од људи којима су раније, под Ласкарисима, била дата у пронију.

Што се тиче четрдесет хиперпера, није вероватно да је ова сумма пред- стављала једнократну компензацију за конфискације имовине „изразито бо- гатих људи“, јер не би могла бити сразмерна величини те имовине. То је била или њихова плата или почетна сума која је служила као испомоћ за њихово стабилизовање у новом позиву плаћених војника. Кад је реч о фрази „четрдесет номизми по једном [човеку], при чему је већи део суме долазио са њего-вог поседа“, очевидно је да та сума, дигнута по човеку, није долазила са имања бар неких међу таквим људима. Зашто, ако су они били „изразито богати“? Да би се ово објаснило, морамо да замислимо шта је Хаденос у ствари урадио када је дошао на имања о којима је реч. Посећујући свако породично добро, он је по свој прилици тражио готовину. Ако би нашао довољну сумму, издавао је речених четрдесет хиперпера. Ако не, требало је да тражи друге изворе новца. Од вероватних акција које је Хаденос могао да предузме за вре- ме конфискације — продавање земље и стоке локалним купцима, премештање стоке на државне поседе, постављање државних чиновника да управљају по- седима оснивањем episkepseis — само је прва од њих имала довољно потенци
јала за брзо обезбеђивање значајних суме новца. Стога је Хаденос морао да тражи допunu у било каквом новцу који је на том простору могао да прикупи. Овим се објашњава Пахимерова фраза „при чему је већи део суме од 40 но- мизми долазио са сопственог имања сваког од тих људи“.

Најзад, кад Пахимер пише да је Хаденос „одредио да се остатак установљеног пореза, што није било мало, шаље у царску благајну“, то се мора односити на било какав профит који је држава обезбедила од конфискације по- сле издвајања онолико суме од по четрдесет хиперпера колико се могло наћи. Пахимер то назива порезом (telos), и тако је бар делимично било. Ако су купци били нађени, они би плаћали порезе, а давања зависних људи могла су бити третирани као врста пореза.

Очевидно је да је Михаило VIII послао Хаденоса у један или више регио- на Мале Азије са троstrukim задатком: да успостави контролу над погра- ничним крајевима, да присили неке од имућних људи да учествују у војној служби и да обезбеди више прихода за државу. Изасланик је нашао људе који су уживали изузете од пореза, проније и друге царске дарове, а који нису довољно допрinosили одбрани крајева у којима су живели. Хаденос је конфи- сковао њихову имовину и регрутовао их као војнике који служе за новац. После извесног времена, њихове исплате су се проредиле, што је границе учинио слабије брањеним.