

PREDRAG KOMATINA  
(Institute for Byzantine Studies of the SASA, Belgrade)

DATE OF THE COMPOSITION OF THE *NOTITIAE*  
*EPISCOPATUUM ECCLESIAE CONSTANTINOPOLITANAE*  
NOS. 4, 5 AND 6\*

The *Notitiae episcopatum Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* nos. 4, 5 and 6 are important sources for the reconstruction of the territorial organization of the Patriarchate of Constantinople in the 9<sup>th</sup> century. There are different opinions in the existing scholarly works about precise dating of those *notitiae*, ranging from the beginning of the 9<sup>th</sup> century, through the middle of it, up to its end. In this work, we analyse the content of each of the mentioned *notitiae* and point to certain elements which allow us to date more precisely each of them to the period between 806 and 838.

*Keywords:* *notitiae episcopatum*, Patriarchate of Constantinople, Amorium, Crete, Trebizonde, Isaurian Seleucia

**The date of the composition of the *notitia 4***

The so-called *Notitia of Basil of Ialimbana*, now commonly known as *notitia 4*, according to the critical edition of J. Darrouzès,<sup>1</sup> has been long known in Byzantine studies. However, different scholars tended to date it differently. Current view is the one established by Darrouzès, according to which this *notitia* is, *based on its content, close to the conditions at the Council of Constantinople of 869.*<sup>2</sup>

This *notitia* is in its content very close to the *notitia 2*, which was composed between 805/806 and 814.<sup>3</sup> In comparison to the *notitia 2*, *notitia 4* has two

---

\* The paper contains the results of the work on the Project no. 177032 – *Tradition, innovation and identity in the Byzantine world* – supported by the Ministry of education, science and technological development of the Republic of Serbia.

<sup>1</sup> *Notitiae episcopatum ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, ed. J. Darrouzès, Paris 1981, 4.1–493.

<sup>2</sup> *Notitiae*, 44–45.

<sup>3</sup> On the date of the composition of the *notitia 2*, cf. P. Komatina, *Osnivanje Patraske i Atinske mitropolije i Sloveni na Peloponezu*, ZRVI 46 (2009) 29.

major differences. First, in the *notitia 4* the metropolitans of the *Western provinces* are grouped together in a separate entity,<sup>4</sup> while according to the *notitia 2* an effort was made to find a suitable place for them within the existing hierarchy of the Patriarchate of Constantinople.<sup>5</sup> Second, in the *notitia 4* the metropolitan of Amorium (του Ἀμορίου) was mentioned for the first time in the list of metropolitans and bishops by their respective metropolitan sees, with suffragan bishops of Philomelium, Docimium, Claneum, Polybotum and Pissia,<sup>6</sup> while in the *notitia 2* the ecclesiastical head of that city had still been just autocephalous archbishop and ordinary bishop.<sup>7</sup>

**Amorium.** The status of the hierarch of Amorium, the city that was the seat of the *Theme of Anatolica* since the 7<sup>th</sup> century, was the characteristic of the *notitia 4* which was noticed long ago and which has most often been used as a base for dating the composition of the *notitia*. So, when did the hierarch of Amorium receive the rank of metropolitan? There were two major events in the history of the city in the 9<sup>th</sup> century. The first one was the accession of Michael II, the native of the city, to the Imperial throne in 820.<sup>8</sup> The second was the Arab sack and destruction of the city, on August the 12<sup>th</sup>, 838.<sup>9</sup> H. Gelzer had an opinion that between those two events, under the rule of the emperors that stemmed from the city, it was at the height of its progress and importance, which brought to it even the status of a metropolitan see.<sup>10</sup> However, that opinion was later abandoned by subsequent scholars.<sup>11</sup>

Gelzer's view was abandoned by later scholars primarily because of the fact that after 838 Amorium appeared in the sources again as an ordinary bishopric.<sup>12</sup> It seems, however, that they underestimated the importance of the destruction and the depopulation of the city in 838 for the subsequent fate of the city and its church and that they neglected the possibility of *discontinuity* in the development of the city church organization as a consequence of the catastrophe of 838. Another reason for rejecting the Gelzer's thesis was the fact that the sources which describe the Arab sack

<sup>4</sup> Notitiae, 4.483–492.

<sup>5</sup> Notitiae, 2.10–13, 38–41, 207–243. On the place and the manner in which the *Western provinces* were represented in the *notitia 2*, cf. Komatina, Osnivanje, 29–32.

<sup>6</sup> Notitiae, 4.39, 477–482; Georgii Cyprii Descriptio orbis Romani, ed. H. Gelzer, Lipsiae 1890, 40a, ll. 513–519.

<sup>7</sup> Notitiae, 2.77, 301.

<sup>8</sup> J. Bury, A History of the Eastern Roman Empire 802–867, London 1912, 77–79; G. Ostrogorski, Istorija Vizantije, Beograd 1959, 206–207.

<sup>9</sup> A. Vasiliev, Byzance et les Arabes I–1, Bruxelles 1935, 161–173.

<sup>10</sup> Georgii Descriptio, Intro, XV.

<sup>11</sup> E. Honigmann, Die Notitia des Basileios von Ialimbana, Byz 9 (1934) 205–222, tried to prove the absolute reliability of the note in one of the Mss. of the *notitia*, according to which the *notitia* was composed in 886, during the rule of lord emperor Leo the Wise and of patriarch Photius. At the same time, V. Laurent, La «Notitia» de Basile l'Arménien. Tradition manuscrite et date de composition, EO 34 (1935) 439–472, basing it on some other arguments, came to the conclusion that the *notitia* was composed between 845/846 and 863–869. V. Grumel, La «Notitia» de Basile de Ialimbana. Essai sur la date de composition, REB 19 (1961) 198–207, narrowed that interval to the 848–858. J. Darrouzès, Notitiae, 44–45, questions such a precise dating, claiming only that the *notitia* resembles the conditions close to those of the Council of 869/870.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. further below.

of the city mention no metropolitan of Amorium.<sup>13</sup> Those sources, however, mention also no bishop, nor speak of any kind of the church organization of the city, for they were concentrated primarily on the matters of war.<sup>14</sup>

The rank of the hierarchy of Amorium before 838 is evident from the *notitiae episcopatum*. Originally, the bishop of Amorium was just a suffragan of the metropolitan of Pissinous in the eparchy of Galatia II, according to the *notitia 1*.<sup>15</sup> However, already in the *notitia 2*, composed in the time of the patriarch Nicephorus (806–815), we can find him as an autocephalous archbishop, in the eparchy of Galatia II,<sup>16</sup> but he is also recorded at his old place among the suffragans of the metropolitan of Pissinous.<sup>17</sup> The next information on the hierarchy of Amorium is from the end of the year 814, and it testifies that he had already got the rank of metropolitan. Namely, according to the short *Life of St. Theophylactus of Nicomedia the Confessor*, found in the *Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, the patriarch Nicephorus, after the emperor Leo V the Armenian, an iconoclast, had taken the throne, *immediately summoned to him the chosen among the hierarchs – Emilianus of Cyzicus, Ephthymius of Sard, Joseph of Thessalonica, Eudoxius of Amorium, Michael of Synnada, Theophylactus of Nicomedia*, to approach the emperor and try to change his religious views.<sup>18</sup> This information has been usually dated to December 814.<sup>19</sup> As all the other mentioned hierarchs, with no exception, were metropolitans, it is quite clear that the hierarchy of Amorium, Eudoxius by name, was also a metropolitan at that time. If his rank was then in any way lower than theirs, there would be no chance for him to be listed in the fourth place among them, just after the metropolitan of Thessalonica and before the metropolitans of Synnada and Nicomedia, the two ancient and influential church centers with long tradition as metropolitan sees.<sup>20</sup> That is clear evidence that Amorium was the seat of a metropolitan already at the end of 814. So, as it is evident, the rise in significance of the hierarchy of Amorium at the end of the 8<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 9<sup>th</sup> century followed a natural path – according to the *notitia 1* he was just ordinary bishop, suffragan of the metropolitan of Pissinous, according to the

<sup>13</sup> On the sources on the fall of Amorium in 838, cf. n. 28.

About Amorium on the eve of the fall in 838, cf. *Vasiliev*, Arabes I–1, 160–161, n. 1, who accepted the opinion of *Honigmann*, *Notitia*, 210, that Amorium became metropolitan see only between 879 and 886, in honor of the Forty-two martyrs of Amorium.

<sup>14</sup> Even hagiographical sources, such as different Skazanija o 42 amorijskih mučenikah“ i cerkovnaja služba im“, izd. *V. Vasil'evskij – P. Nikitin*“, *Zapiski Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk*“ VIII, 7/2, St-Peterburg“ 1905, 1–90, give substantial data relevant for the military and administrative organization of Byzantine Asia Minor, for they mention the strategoi of the *Seven themes*, cf. *ibidem*, 1.15, 65.8, while their description of the very city of Amorium ends with constations that it was a glorius, great and densely populated city, *ibidem*, 11, 42, 65, 71, which is located in the East of the empire, *ibidem*, 1, 11.

<sup>15</sup> *Notitiae*, 1.239.

<sup>16</sup> *Notitiae*, 2.77.

<sup>17</sup> *Notitiae*, 2.301.

<sup>18</sup> *Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, ed. *H. Delehaye*, Bruxelles 1902, 519.12–520.7.

<sup>19</sup> *Les registes des actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople I. Les actes des patriarches 2: Les registes de 715 a 1043*, ed. *V. Grumel*, Paris 1936, n. 391, date the patriarch's epistle to the hierarchs on this subject to December 814, some time before Christmas.

<sup>20</sup> The information has not been unknown to the authors, but it has not been taken as seriously as it deserves. *Honigmann*, *Notitia*, 209, mentioned it only by the way and in the same manner tried to explain it in the way that the mentioned Eudoxius might have been also an autocephalous archbishop.

*notitia 2* he became autocephalous archbishop, which was one step below the rank of metropolitan,<sup>21</sup> and then, before the end of 814, he got the highest, metropolitan rank. Thus, the rise of the head of the church of Amorium from the rank of autocephalous archbishop to the rank of metropolitan occurred sometime between the composition of the *notitia 2* and the end of 814, and it indeed had nothing to do with the accession of the Amorian dynasty to the imperial throne of Constantinople in 820.

Most probably it was the individual qualities of the hierarchs of Amorium that contributed to the promotion of their ecclesiastical rank. They had a significant role even at the Seventh ecumenical council in Nicaea in 787.<sup>22</sup> Perhaps that was the reason why they got autocephaly from their metropolitans and instead of ordinary suffragan bishops became autocephalous archbishops, the direct suffragans of the patriarch. However, it seems that the further promotion of the see of Amorium is to be credited to the mentioned Eudoxius. He was one of the *chosen of the hierarchs*,<sup>23</sup> entrusted by the patriarch Nicephorus to try to cure the emperor Leo of his iconoclastic misbeliefs. Being one among the top five out of more than thirty highest dignitaries of the Patriarchate is no little thing. Eudoxius must have earned such an estimation somehow, and when he earned it, he got as a reward the metropolitan rank with five suffragan bishops. So, he would have been first metropolitan of Amorium, ordained by the patriarch Nicephorus, sometime before the end of 814. In any case, the exposed arguments turn the thesis that Amorium was a metropolitan see before 838 into a fact.

However, the fact is also that in the sources after 838 Amorium reappears as an ordinary bishopric, which we will expose further on. Because of that we have to examine the above-mentioned hypothesis about the possibility of discontinuity in the development of the church organization of Amorium after the destruction of the city in 838.

Concerning that, there is one interesting fact. According to the *notitia 1*, the bishop of Amorium is suffragan of the metropolitan of Pissinous, in the eparchy of Galatia II.<sup>24</sup> According to the *notitia 2*, the autocephalous archbishop of Amorium was also in the eparchy of Galatia II.<sup>25</sup> According to the very *notitia 4*, metropolitan of Amorium was a metropolitan of the same eparchy of Galatia II.<sup>26</sup> But, according to the later *notitiae*, composed in the 10<sup>th</sup> century, the metropolitan of Amorium was a metropolitan of the eparchy of Phrygia!<sup>27</sup> Thus, concerning the hierarch of Amorium,

<sup>21</sup> Within the hierarchy of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, the title of *autocephalous archbishops* belonged to those hierarchs that were not subordinated to any metropolitan, but directly to the patriarch of Constantinople. They had no bishops under their jurisdiction and their rank within the hierarchy of the Patriarchate was below the rank of the metropolitans, but above the rank of ordinary bishops suffragans of metropolitans, *E. Chryssos*, *Zur Entstehung der Institution der autokephalen Erzbistümer*, BZ 62 (1969) 263; *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. *A. Kazhdan*, Oxford 1991, I, 155–156 (*A. Papadakis*).

<sup>22</sup> Although only a bishop, suffragan of the metropolitan of Pissinous, bishop Theodosius of Amorium participated actively in the discussions of the Council, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, ed. *J. D. Mansi*, I–XXXI, Florentiae – Venetiis 1758–1798: XIII, 17 D – 20 A, 20 C. For his signatures at the acts of the Council, cf. *Mansi*, XII, 1098 A; XIII, 141 B, 368 B.

<sup>23</sup> *Synaxarium*, 519.17–520.1.

<sup>24</sup> *Notitiae*, 1.239.

<sup>25</sup> *Notitiae*, 2.77.

<sup>26</sup> *Notitiae*, 4.39, 477; *Georgii Descriptio*, 40a, 513–514.

<sup>27</sup> *Notitiae*, 7.654; 9.528; 10.634; *Georgii Descriptio*, 82, l. 1742. However, some of the Mss. of the *notitia 8*, *Notitiae*, 8.48, held again that Amorium was metropolitan see of the eparchy of Galatia, but, as J. Darrouzès had explained, it was due only to the tendency of imitation of the old eparchial organization

the content of the *notitia* 4 is far closer to the content of the *notitia* 2, from the beginning of the 9<sup>th</sup> century, then to the content of the *notitia* 7, from the beginning of the 10<sup>th</sup> century. On the other side, the fact that the hierarch of Amorium appears in the *notitiae* first as a metropolitan of one eparchy, and then as a metropolitan of another eparchy, could be taken as a direct testimony supporting the thesis about the discontinuity of the metropolitan rank of the see of Amorium.

There can be no doubt that the reason for the discontinuity was the catastrophe that befell Amorium on August 12<sup>th</sup>, 838, when, after the thirteen-days siege, the forces of caliph Al-Mutasim (833–842), sacked the city. What followed was the complete destruction and devastation of the city, slaughter and enslavement of its citizens.<sup>28</sup> Quite naturally, a city with no people could have no bishop or metropolitan. Amorium remained deserted for the ensuing seven years. Only on September 16<sup>th</sup>, 845, after a treaty had been signed, the Arabs released the captured inhabitants of Amorium and they were allowed to return to their city and people it again.<sup>29</sup>

In any case, after the destruction of the city in 838, the metropolitan see of Amorium existed no more. First information on the church of Amorium after 838 come from the end of 859 or the beginning of 860, when emperor Michael III (842–867) and patriarch Photius (858–867, 877–886) sent a delegation to Rome, to pope Nicholas I (858–867), with letters and gifts. The delegation consisted of protospatharius Arsaber, as emperor's representative, and four church dignitaries, as representatives of the patriarch – Methodius, metropolitan of Gangra, Samuel, archbishop of Chonae, Zachariah, bishop of Taormina and Theophilus, bishop of Amorium.<sup>30</sup> At the council held in Constantinople in 869/870, the last two claimed that they had

---

and of ignoring of the new names and eparchies, as in all other cases in the same *notitia*, *Notitiae*, 8, p. 290, comm. The Ms. used by H. Gelzer for his edition of the *Nova Tactica*, that was later split by Darrouzès into the *notitia* 8 and *notitia* 9, has no notes about the eparchies within the list of the metropolitan sees, *Georgii Descriptio*, 58, l. 1157, while in the list of the suffragans of metropolitans there is clear reference that Amorium was a metropolitan see of the eparchy of Phrygia, *Georgii Descriptio*, 82, l. 1742.

<sup>28</sup> On the fall of Amorium in 838 and the fate of its inhabitants, cf. *Iosephi Genesii Regum libri quattuor*, edd. A. Lesmueller-Werner – I. Thurn, Berolini – Novi Eboraci 1978, (III, 14) 49.66–73; *Symeonis magistri et logothetae Chronicon*, ed. S. Wahlgren, Berolini – Novi Eboraci 2006, 130.32–33; *Theophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus*, ed. I. Bekker, Bonnae 1838, (III, 33–36) 129.8–134.21; *Pseudo-Symeon, Theophanes Continuatus et al.*, 638.12–640.2; *Georgius Monachus Continuatus, Theophanes Continuatus et al.*, 804.19–805.22; *Skazanija o 42 amorijskih mučenikah*“, 1–90; *Vasiliev, Arabes I–I*, 161–173; *W. Treadgold, The Byzantine Revival 780–842*, Stanford 1988, 297–305; *A. Kazhdan, Hagiographical notes, Byz 56* (1986) 159.

<sup>29</sup> *Vasiliev, Arabes I–I*, 201–203; *Kazhdan, Hagiographical Notes*, 159.

<sup>30</sup> Nicetas David, *The Life of Patriarch Ignatius*, edd. A. Smithies, J. M. Duffy, Washington 2013 (CFHB 51), 42.15–31; *Liber pontificalis II*, ed. L. Duchesne, Paris 1955, 154.21–155.10, 158.15–27; *Mansi*, XVI, 4 B–C; *Photii patriarchae Constantinopolitani epistolae et amphiloquia*, I–IV, edd. B. Laourdas – L. G. Westerink, Lipsiae 1983–1986, no. 288; *Nicolai I papae epistolae*, ed. E. Perels, MGH, Epp. VI, Epp. Karolini aevi IV, Berolini 1925, 458.36–459.4, 505.31–34, 513.13–19; *F. Dvornik, Le schisme de Photius. Histoire et légende*, Paris 1950, 116–124. The last two were bishops, overthrown by patriarch Ignatius (847–858, 867–877) because of their cooperation with Gregory Asbestos, the metropolitan of Syracuse, the act allegedly recognized by pope Benedict III (855–858), so that new pope Nicholas I would not have them received as bishops and cocolebrants, *Mansi*, XVI, 58 C–D. However, as supporters of his friend Gregory Asbestos, they were rewarded by patriarch Photius and even more promoted, so Zachariah was moved from the position of the bishop of a small Sicilian town of Taormina to the important position of metropolitan of Chalcedon, *Dvornik, Schisme*, 108; *P. Komatina, Crkvena politika Vizantije od kraja ikonoborstva do smrti cara Vasilija I*, Beograd 2014, 133.

been ordained bishops already during the pontificate of patriarch Methodius (843–847).<sup>31</sup> In the case of Zachariah of Taormina, it was quite true. Namely, patriarch Methodius sent the then priest Zachariah as his envoy to Rome, but, while he, on his way to Rome, stayed in Sicily, the then metropolitan of Syracuse, Gregory Asbestos, ordained him bishop of Taormina. The action was contrary to the canons, and Gregory was called to Constantinople to defend himself before the patriarch.<sup>32</sup> Thus, there is no reason to doubt that Theophilus was ordained bishop of Amorium also during the pontificate of patriarch Methodius. Because Amorium was destroyed and devastated in 838 and its inhabitants released from the Arab captivity only in September 845, it seems that Theophilus was most probably the first bishop of the restored and repopulated Amorium, ordained at the end of 845.

What is of interest for the issue we discuss here is the question of the rank the said Theophilus held in 859/860. The author of the *Life of pope Nicholas I in the Liber Pontificalis* makes a clear distinction between the ranks of the ecclesiastical members of the Constantinopolitan delegation. According to him, Methodius was a metropolitan, Samuel was a bishop, and Zachariah and Theophilus were *deprived of the honor of episcopate (...depositi ab honore episcopatus...)*.<sup>33</sup> According to the *Vita Ignatii*, too, Theophilus of Amorium was an ordinary bishop.<sup>34</sup> But, what is important to underline is that the author of that work, Nicetas David Paphlagon, makes clear distinction between the rank of Theophilus and the rank of Samuel of Chonae. According to him, Samuel of Chonae had been up to the very same time just an ordinary bishop, suffragan of the metropolitan of Laodiceia, but by the decision of patriarch Photius he was freed from the subordination to the said metropolitan and raised to the rank of autocephalous archbishop, subordinated directly to the patriarch of Constantinople.<sup>35</sup> Theophilus of Amorium was, however, for Nicetas David obviously an ordinary bishop, at the bottom of the hierarchy of the Patriarchate.<sup>36</sup> That confirms the thesis that a serious degradation in the rank of the hierarch of Amorium occurred in the meantime, which could have only been a consequence of the events of 838.

The *Life of Blasius of Amorium*, a Saint who originated from Amorium and died in 912, also gives some information on the church conditions in Amorium and its surroundings in the mid-9<sup>th</sup> century. According to it, the Saint, whose baptismal name was Basil, *originated from the city of Amorium, the village of Aplatianae*, which was, however, *subordinated to the enory of pious and glorious metropolitan see of*

<sup>31</sup> *Mansi*, XVI, 328 E sq.

<sup>32</sup> Pseudo-Symeon, 671.1–5.

<sup>33</sup> *Liber pontificalis* II, 154.22–23.

<sup>34</sup> *Life of Ignatius*, 42.21.

<sup>35</sup> *Life of Ignatius*, 42.22–23. That rank was not known in the hierarchy of the Roman Church, cf. *Komatina*, Osnivanje, 39–40; *Isti*, Moravski episkop Agaton na Fotijeveom saboru 879/880. g., Srpska teologija danas 2009, prir. B. Šijaković, Beograd 2010, 362, so that was probable reason why the author of the pope's biography in the *Liber pontificalis* doesn't use it while referring to Samuel, calling him bishop instead.

<sup>36</sup> At the Council of 869/870, Metrophanes, the pro-Ignatian metropolitan of Smyrna, stated that Photius had sent *four metropolitans to the most holy pope to Old Rome*, *Mansi*, XVI, 416 E. That information contradicts those give by the *Liber pontificalis* and Nicetas David, although provide by a contemporary, it is for many reason incorrect, as shown by *Laurent*, *Notitia*, 465, n. 6. Nevertheless, he was also wrong when supposing that both, Theophilus of Amorium and Samuel of Chonae were autocephalous archbishops.

*Pissinous*.<sup>37</sup> Later, when he reached the zenith of the first age, his parents decided that he should be consecrated a subdeacon. The consecration was performed by the great hierarch of the said holy metropolitan see, metropolitan Eustratius.<sup>38</sup> We read further that the same Eustratius was a disciple of the great Ignatius, who was at that very time the lighthouse of justice to Constantinople and who was leading its people divinely and piously towards the teachings of righteousness,<sup>39</sup> which means that Blasius was consecrated a subdeacon between 847 and 858, when Ignatius held the patriarchal throne of Constantinople for the first time. I would not examine here the question why, according to the author of the *Life*, the village of the Saint's origine was in the *enory* of the metropolitan of Pissinous, even though it belonged to the city of Amorium,<sup>40</sup> and why the consecration of the young Basil/Blasius to the rank of subdeacon was performed by the metropolitan of Pissinous and not by the bishop of Amorium.<sup>41</sup> I would only underline that all of that clearly testifies that between 847 and 858 Amorium with its surroundings belonged to the metropolitan see of Pissinous, which confirms the thesis that at that time Amorium was just an ordinary bishopric subordinated to the metropolitan of Pissinous, and not the metropolitan see of its own, as it had been before 838, nor the autocephalous archbishopric, as it had been even earlier.

Amorium became a metropolitan see once again certainly before the end of 879. At the Council of Constantinople, known as the *Photian Council*, which began at that time, a certain Bessarion of Amorium was present, and his name was recorded near to the top of the list of the participants, among the names of the metropolitans.<sup>42</sup> I would not examine here the possible reasons that could have led to the restoration of the metropolitan see of Amorium,<sup>43</sup> but only wish to assert that the restored metropolitan see got the jurisdiction over the same bishoprics it had before 838, as is evident from the *notitiae episcopatum* of the 10<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>44</sup>

<sup>37</sup> Vita S. Blasii Amoriensis, AASS Novembris IV, edd. H. Delehaye – P. Peeters, Bruxellis 1925, 659. For a short overview of the text and its data, cf. H. Grégoire, La vie de Saint Blaise d'Amorium, Byz 5 (1929–1930) 391–414.

<sup>38</sup> Vita Blasii Amoriensis, 660.

<sup>39</sup> Vita Blasii Amoriensis, 660.

<sup>40</sup> In the Roman and Byzantine Empire, the area of the jurisdiction of a bishop was conterminous with the administrative area of the city (πόλις, civitas) the church of which he led, J. F. Niermeyer, Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus, Leiden 1976, 183. A number of cities formed a province, that is, an *eparchy*, so that the bishop of the capital city (*metropolis*) of that province was a metropolitan of the bishops of all of its cities.

<sup>41</sup> Laurent, Notitia, 466–467.

<sup>42</sup> Mansi, XVII, 373 C.

<sup>43</sup> The first possible reason for the restoration of the metropolitan see of Amorium is that it could have been a reward patriarch Photius gave the bishop Theophilus, his loyal supporter, who after Photius' enthronement on December 25<sup>th</sup>, 858, regained all the pastoral rights in his bishopric which he had been deprived of by the decision of the former patriarch Ignatius. But, in the acts of the Council of Constantinople of 869/870, held during the second pontificate of Ignatius (867–877), at which Theophilus was again persecuted for being the follower of Photius, there are no implications that Theophilus was granted the metropolitan rank by Photius, Mansi, XVI, 328 E sq. Another, and in my opinion more probable reason was the high estimation and reverence the Forty-two martyrs of Amorium had in the Empire at that time, which was especially emphasized by the construction and consecration of the church in honor of them in Constantinople by emperor Basil I (867–886), Skazanija o 42 amorijskih mučenikah<sup>4</sup>, 278–279; Honigmann, Notitia, 210; Kazhdan, Hagiographical notes, 152. It could have been the very opportunity that made the emperor decide to restore the metropolitan rank to the church of the city of Amorium.

<sup>44</sup> Notitiae, 7.654–659, 9.528–533, 10.634–639; Georgii descriptio, 82, l. 1742. For the case of the *notitia* 8, cf. n. 27.

**Maximianae.** In the *notitia 4* there was also recorded the bishopric of the city of Maximianae, as a suffragan of the metropolitan of Nicaea.<sup>45</sup> In one of the mss., the *Vaticanus graecus 1167*, there is a note that the bishopric of Maximianae was established by metropolitan Nicephorus of Nicaea, who held that position in the mid-9<sup>th</sup> century. It is not known when he assumed the office, but it is known that he remained in it until 877/878.<sup>46</sup> This led V. Laurent and V. Grumel to the conclusion that the *notitia 4* was composed after the establishment of the said bishopric, that is, most probably between 845/846 and 863–869, according to Laurent, or between 848 and 858, according to Grumel.<sup>47</sup> However, J. Darrouzès warned that the bishopric of Maximianae was not recorded in the archetype of the *notitia 4*, so that its inclusion in later mss. of the *notitia* could not be taken as a base for the dating its composition.<sup>48</sup>

**Notes on the West and Isauria. Crete.** *Notitia 4* contains a separate passage for the church provinces that traditionally had been part of the jurisdiction of the Church of Rome, but after 732, due to the emperors' will, were subordinated to the Patriarchate of Constantinople. That passage is accompanied by the note on the church province of Isauria and its metropolis Seleucia, which originally had formed part of the Patriarchate of Antioch, but it too became part of the Patriarchate of Constantinople by the time of the composition of the *notitia 4*. The passage is found at the very end of the *notitia*, after the list of the metropolitan suffragans according to their metropolitan sees, which ends with the list of the suffragans of the metropolitan see of Amorium, the newest of all the metropolitan sees.<sup>49</sup> Data provided by that passage are useful primarily for the reconstruction of the process of incorporation of the eparchies once under the Church of Rome and the Patriarchate of Antioch within the area of the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople during the 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> century. Nevertheless, there is one piece of information in that passage which is of utmost importance for the dating of the composition of the *notitia 4*.

That passage of the *notitia 4* contains the following list of the metropolitan sees of the *Western provinces*: Thessalonica, Syracuse, Crete, Corinth, Rhegium, Nicopolis, Athens and Patras.<sup>50</sup> We should pay attention on the mention of Crete.<sup>51</sup>

As it is well known, Crete fell under the dominion of the Arabs in 827/828.<sup>52</sup> The population of the island was enslaved, and the Christians were allowed to keep

<sup>45</sup> *Notitia*, 4.159; *Georgii descriptio*, 12, l. 207.

<sup>46</sup> *Laurent*, *Notitia*, 467–469; *Grumel*, *Notitia*, 198–207.

<sup>47</sup> *Laurent*, *Notitia*, 467–472; *Grumel*, *Notitia*, 207.

<sup>48</sup> *Notitia*, 44–45. The same should be said about the bishopric of **Taion**, *Notitia*, 4.198, which was also used by *Laurent*, *Notitia*, 469, as an argument for dating the *notitia*.

<sup>49</sup> *Georgii descriptio*, 27, ll. 520–529; *Notitia*, 4.483–493. The editor of the last edition, J. Darrouzès, thought the end of the list of metropolitan sees a more appropriate place for the passage but the end of the list of the suffragans of the metropolitans, *Notitia*, 249, n. 39, 260, n. 483.

<sup>50</sup> *Georgii descriptio*, 27, ll. 521–527; *Notitia*, 4.484–491.

<sup>51</sup> About Crete, cf. *Notitia*, 2.10, 207–227 (with suffragans); 4.486; 5.37.

<sup>52</sup> *Genesius*, (II, 10–11) 32.81–34.35; *Theophanes Continuatus*, (II, 20–23) 73.5–78.3; *Symeonis Chronicon*, 129.5; *Pseudo-Symeon*, 622.8–624.8; *Georgius Monachus Continuatus*, 789.1–7; *Vasiliev*, *Arabes I*, 49–61; *Treadgold*, *Revival*, 251–254.

The Arabs conquered and destroyed twenty-nine cities in Crete, *Vasiliev*, *Arabes I*, 56. *Notitia*, 2.207–227, list the names of twenty bishoprics in the island at the beginning of the 9<sup>th</sup> century, amongst them Gortyna was a metropolitan see. On the church organization of Crete before the fall to the Muslim rule,

their cult in one city only.<sup>53</sup> Those who escaped death and capture, amongst them some monks and bishops, fled to the mainland, mainly to Thessalonica and Constantinople.<sup>54</sup> Muslim rule in Crete lasted almost a century and a half, until 961.<sup>55</sup> After the liberation of the island it was necessary to reevangelize it, because the Christian faith had almost vanished in it until then, either because of the forcible conversion of the population to Islam, or because of its alienation from the recognized Christian dogmas and rites.<sup>56</sup> After *notitia 4*, Crete was mentioned in no *notitia episcopatum* until the *notitia 10*,<sup>57</sup> which was composed in the second half of the 10<sup>th</sup> century, that is, after the liberation of Crete from the Arab rule in 961. Thus, we may conclude that during the Arab rule in the island of Crete between 828 and 961, while the remains of the Christian faith were being uprooted, there was no church organization in the island, because of which the island was not mentioned in the *notitiae episcopatum* from that period. That's why we may assume that the *notitia 4* had been composed before the Arabs took Crete in 827/828.

cf. *I. Papadopoulos*, «Κρηθ υπο. τουj Sarakhnouj, Athēnai 1948, 46–50; *D. Tsougarakis*, *Byzantine Crete 5<sup>th</sup> – 12<sup>th</sup> centuries*, Athens 1988, 197–208, 216 sq.

<sup>53</sup> Genesis, (II, 10) 33.17–20; Theophanes Continuatus, (II, 23) 77.13–16; Symeonis Chronicon, 129.5; Pseudo-Symeon, 623.4–7; Georgius Monachus Continuatus, 789.1–8; *Vasiliev*, *Arabes I*, 56–57.

The same Byzantine authors tell that the last metropolitan of Gortyna, head of the church of the island, Cyril, died at that occasion as a martyr by the Sarazin sword, Genesis, (II, 11) 33.28–34.35; Theophanes Continuatus, (II, 23) 77.16–78.3; Pseudo-Symeon, 624.5–8; *Vasiliev*, *Arabes I*, 57, n. 2. However, *I. Papadopoulos*, «Uparceikai. deuterioj {Agioj Kurillioj Gortunhj}\*, *ΕΕΒΣ* 16 (1940) 247–251, tried to reject that information and to prove that the said authors at that place transmitted the report of the martyr death of an earlier Cyril of Gortyna, during the Decius' persecutions of Christians, in the mid-3<sup>rd</sup> century. That opinion prevails in literature, *N. Tōmadakēs*, «H Apostolikh. Ekklesia thj Kρηthj kata touj aij H , – IG , *ΕΕΒΣ* 24 (1954) 72–73; *Tsougarakis*, *Byzantine Crete*, <sup>209, n. 58</sup>.

<sup>54</sup> The fate of the Cretans is reported by the *Life of Nicholas the Studite*, who was a Cretan by origin himself, *Vita S. Nicolai Studitae*, PG 105, 865 B–C, 876 B – 877 A. Life of Ignatius, 66.4–7, mentions certain Basil, who had earlier been a bishop in Crete, but who then, due to the invasion of the Agarenes, had to flee to Thessalonica, where he became a metropolitan, and in 862/863, as a supporter of patriarch Ignatius, he openly confronted the emperor Michael III, cf. *Tōmadakēs*, «H Apostolikh. Ekklesia thj Kρηthj, 73–75; *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit*. 1. Abt. (641–867), ed. R.–J. *Lilie et al.*, Berlin – New York 1999–2002, no. 941. At the Council in Constantinople in 869/870 there was present another Basil, *archbishop of Crete, Mansi*, XVII, 496 D, but his status is not certain at all, as well as the use of the title *archbishop of Crete*, instead of that of *metropolitan of Gortyna*, *Tōmadakēs*, «H Apostolikh. Ekklesia thj Kρηthj, 76. In any case, his mention at that one place in the sources is not enough to support the claim that the church organization of the island persisted after the Arabs conquered Crete, as supposed by *Tsougarakis*, *Byzantine Crete*, 209–213.

<sup>55</sup> On Muslim rule in Crete in 828–961, cf. *Papadopoulos*, *Kρηth*, 61–89; *Tsougarakis*, *Byzantine Crete*, 30–58.

<sup>56</sup> In the process of reevangelization of Crete a prominent role was played by a famous Saint of the 10<sup>th</sup> century, St. Nikon „Metanoite“, who came to the island immediately after its liberation in 961 and stayed in it for seven years, restoring the Christian faith and the church organization, cf. *The Life of Saint Nikon*, ed. *D. Sullivan*, Brookline/Mass. 1987, § 20–21.

*Tsougarakis*, *Byzantine Crete*, 209–213, thought that the Arabs permitted the population of Crete to practice the Christian faith undisturbedly, while the metropolitans and bishops continued to be ordained regularly, but used to live outside the island, which is, in my opinion, wrong. The unexistence of the church organization in Crete during the period 828–961 is attested by the so-called *Synodicon of Sybrita*, which enumerates only the names of the Cretan metropolitans who held that position after 961, *V. Laurent*, *Le synodicon de Sybrita et les métropolités de Crète aux X<sup>e</sup>-XIII<sup>e</sup> siècles*, *EO* 32 (1933) 385–412.

<sup>57</sup> *Notitiae*, 10.466–476. Crete is mentioned only in the *notitia 3*, *Notitiae*, 3.14, 239–250, but it is in its entirety a special problem, on which, cf. *Komatina*, *Crkvena politika*, 244–246, 303–312, 314–315.

All of the so far examined gives a firmer ground for more precise dating of the composition of the *notitia 4*. Because it lists Amorium as the newest of the metropolitan sees of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, it has to be posterior to the *notitia 2*, according to which Amorium had still been autocapalous archbishopric. The *notitia 2* was composed between 805/806 and 814. Because Amorium was mentioned as the metropolitan see at the end of 814, it could have got that rank before that moment and after the composition of the *notitia 2*, and that event makes the *terminus post quem* for the composition of the *notitia 4*. The sack of Amorium by the Arabs and the loss of the metropolitan rank for its church in 838 make a clear *terminus ante quem*. However, because it lists the church of the island of Crete among the metropolitan sees of the *Western provinces*, it is quite certain that the *notitia 4* was composed before the Arabs conquered the island and destroyed the church organization in it, in 827/828. Thus, the *notitia 4* should have been composed between 805/806–814 and 827/828.

### Composition of the *notitia 6*

*Notitia 6* contains only the list of metropolitan sees and a separate passage on *Western provinces*, just as the *notitia 4*, without lists of autocephalous archbishops and suffragan bishops of the metropolitan sees.

In its content, the list of metropolitan sees of the *notitia 6*<sup>58</sup> resembles that of the *notitia 4*<sup>59</sup> in everything except that there are two more metropolitan sees, which are not present in the list of the *notitia 4*. Those are Trebizonde<sup>60</sup> and Seleucia.<sup>61</sup> The two metropolitan sees are listed at the very end of the list, after the metropolitan see of Hieropolis in Phrygia Capatiana,<sup>62</sup> the last one in the „original“ order of metropolitan sees of the Patriarchate,<sup>63</sup> and near to, that is one of them immediately before, another immediately after, the metropolitan see of Amorium,<sup>64</sup> which was mentioned for the first time in the *notitia 4*.<sup>65</sup> Thus, it is clear that all of the three were new metropolitan sees, recently included in the part of the hierarchy of the Patriarchate which encompassed metropolitan sees, with the fact that Amorium got that rank prior to the other two.<sup>66</sup> There is one more thing that the three metropolitan sees had in common in the text of the *notitia 6* – none of them was assigned a name of the eparchy of which each of them was a metropolitan see.<sup>67</sup> All of the three metropolitan sees were new ones in the hierarchical order of the Patriarchate, but because Amorium appears with that rank already in the *notitia 4*, while Trebizonde and Seleucia are mentioned in the list of the metropolitan sees for the first time in the

<sup>58</sup> Notitiae, 6.1–36.

<sup>59</sup> Notitiae, 4.6–39.

<sup>60</sup> Notitiae, 6.34.

<sup>61</sup> Notitiae, 6.36.

<sup>62</sup> Notitiae, 6.33.

<sup>63</sup> Notitiae, 1.38, 450–455.

<sup>64</sup> Notitiae, 6.35.

<sup>65</sup> Notitiae, 4.39.

<sup>66</sup> The fact that Trebizonde was listed before Amorium is of no importance, because it is thought that those sees that got the metropolitan rank after Hieropolis in Phrygia Capatiana were not by default listed according to the chronological order of their promotion, cf. Notitiae, 7.673–690, p. 287, comm.

<sup>67</sup> It was unlike Amorium in the *notitia 4*, where it was mentioned as a metropolitan see of the eparchy of Galatia, Notitiae, 4.39.

*notitia 6*, it is clear that the *notitia 6* is posterior to the *notitia 4*, composed between 805/806–814 and 827/828. At the same time, the fact that it lists the metropolitan see of Amorium testifies that it was composed certainly before the fall of Amorium on August 12<sup>th</sup> 838.

The passage about the *Western provinces* in the *notitia 6* contains another important distinction comparing to the same passage of the *notitia 4*. There is no Crete in it.<sup>68</sup> That fact clearly testifies that the *notitia* was composed after the Arabs took the island in 827/828. Thus, the *notitia 6* was composed certainly between 827/828 and 838. However, the composition of it could be dated more precisely. It depends on the reconstruction of the circumstances under which Trebizonde and Seleucia became metropolitan sees of the Patriarchate of Constantinople.

**Trebizonde.** In the *notitia 1* Trebizonde is just an ordinary bishopric, suffragan see of the metropolitan of Neocaesaria in the eparchy of Pontus Polemoniacus.<sup>69</sup> However, already in the *notitiae 2* and *4* it appears as both, the suffragan see of the metropolitan of Neocaesaria and as an autocephalous archbishopric,<sup>70</sup> the last rank holding also according to the *notitia 5*,<sup>71</sup> which contains no list of the suffragans of the metropolitans, only to be mentioned in the *notitia 6* as one of the newest metropolitan sees.<sup>72</sup> All of that testifies about an evident, but gradual, rise of this episcopal see. That rise began certainly with the Seventh ecumenical council in Nicaea in 787, because the name of the bishop of Trebizonde is found in the acts of the council near to the top of the lists of participants, among the metropolitans, thanks to the fact that a certain metropolitan Christophorus signed the acts once as the *bishop of Phasis, that is, Trebizonde*,<sup>73</sup> and another time as the *bishop of Trebizonde* only.<sup>74</sup>

J. Darrouzès thought that the rise of Trebizonde was inseparably connected with the disappearance of the metropolitan see of Phasis in the eparchy of Lazica,<sup>75</sup> and that Trebizonde took its place since the mentioned council of 787. The fact that Phasis as the metropolitan see of the eparchy of Lazica continued to appear in the *notitiae 2, 4* and *5*,<sup>76</sup> he tried to explain by posing a hypothesis that it was only the title of the metropolitan of Phasis that was preserved, while the see itself disappeared and its place in the hierarchy was taken over by Trebizonde.<sup>77</sup> Concerning the *notitia 6*, in which both, the metropolitan see of Phasis and that of Trebizonde were mentioned,<sup>78</sup> his explanation was that *it represents exactly the conditions at the Council of 787*.<sup>79</sup>

<sup>68</sup> *Notitiae*, 6.37–46.

<sup>69</sup> *Notitiae*, 1.234.

<sup>70</sup> *Notitiae*, 2.78, 296; 4.75, 251.

<sup>71</sup> *Notitiae*, 5.78.

<sup>72</sup> *Notitiae*, 6.34.

<sup>73</sup> Cristoforoj anaxioj episkopoj toul Fasidoj htoi Trapezouhtoj, *Mansi*, XIII, 137 C; J. Darrouzès, Listes épiscopales du concile de Nicée (787), *REB* 33 (1975) 17.

<sup>74</sup> Cristoforoj anaxioj episkopoj Trapezouhtoj, *Mansi*, XIII, 384 A; Darrouzès, Listes, 17.

<sup>75</sup> J. Darrouzès, Remarques sur de créations d'évêches byzantins, *REB* 47 (1989) 210–213.

<sup>76</sup> *Notitiae*, 2.31, 482–486; 4.32, 434–438; 5.27.

<sup>77</sup> Darrouzès, Remarques, 212–213.

<sup>78</sup> *Notitiae*, 6.27, 34.

<sup>79</sup> Darrouzès, Remarques, 212.

So, J. Darrouzès had an opinion that Trebizonde became a metropolitan see in 787, in the place of Phasis. However, there are several facts that speak against the identification of the two sees. The text of the *notitia 6* lists two metropolitan sees – Phasis at the 27<sup>th</sup> place in the hierarchy of the metropolitan sees, and Trebizonde at the 34<sup>th</sup> place.<sup>80</sup> The *notitiae 2, 4* and *5*, all of which are posterior to the Council of 787 and prior to the *notitia 6*,<sup>81</sup> list Phasis at the 27<sup>th</sup> place in the list of the metropolitan sees, and Trebizonde at the 35<sup>th</sup>, 36<sup>th</sup> and 37<sup>th</sup> place in the list of the autocephalous archbishops respectively, and at its old place in lists of the suffragan bishops of the metropolitan of Neocaesaria. In all those lists Trebizonde is only described as belonging to the eparchy of Pontus Polemoniachus,<sup>82</sup> with no indication of any kind of its relation with the eparchy of Lazica. Those facts testify that the episcopal sees in question were at that time two different and unrelated sees. The rise of the see of Trebizonde was completely independent from the fate of the see of Phasis and it was not its replacement at the head of the eparchy of Lazica.<sup>83</sup>

The rise of Trebizonde could have had any connection to the fate of the see of Phasis only at its very beginning, at the time of the Council of 787. Namely, in the acts of the Council there are signatures of a certain Christophorus who signed the acts firstly as the *bishop of Phasis*,<sup>84</sup> then as the *bishop of Phasis, that is, Trebizonde*, and then as the *bishop of Trebizonde*.<sup>85</sup> He was indeed, as it seems, representing both cities. However, his original title was that of the *bishop (that is, metropolitan) of Phasis*. How, then, he came in connection with Trebizonde? As the majority of scholars assume, exactly at that time, in 786/787, there occurred a revolt of the Abkhazians against the imperial rule, during which they conquered the province of Lazica.<sup>86</sup> The metropolitan of Phasis could have in those circumstances taken refuge in Trebizonde, the imperial stronghold nearest to his province. If the episcopal see of Trebizonde was at that time vacant, he could have easily taken the place of its head,<sup>87</sup> while simultaneously keeping his original position as the metropolitan of Phasis, and in that way he could have represented both cities at the Council, although he could have simply become the administrator of the vacant see of Trebizonde, as similar cases occurred many times in the church history. In any case, after his death different bishops were to be elected for the two sees. However, soon after Trebizonde was detached from the jurisdiction of the metropolitan of Neocaesaria and promoted to the rank of the autocephalous archbishopric, which was attested in the *notitiae 2, 4* and *5*,<sup>88</sup> but it still was not deleted from the list of the suffragans of the metropolitan of Neocaesaria.<sup>89</sup>

<sup>80</sup> *Notitiae*, 6.27, 34.

<sup>81</sup> We will discuss the time of the composition of the *notitia 5* later on.

<sup>82</sup> *Notitiae*, 2.78, 4. 75, 5.78.

<sup>83</sup> C. Zuckerman, Byzantium's Pontic Policy in the *Notitiae episcopatumum*, ed. C. Zuckerman, La Crimée entre Byzance et le Khaganat Khazar, ed. C. Zuckerman, Monographies 25, Paris 2006, 227.

<sup>84</sup> *Mansi*, XII, 994 C, among the metropolitans.

<sup>85</sup> *Mansi*, XIII, 137 D, 384 A.

<sup>86</sup> B. Martin-Hisard, Constantinople et les archontes du monde Caucasiens dans le Livre des cérémonies, II, 48, éd. G. Dagron, Byzance et ses voisins, TM 13 (2000) 459, n. 679.

<sup>87</sup> Zuckerman, Pontic Policy, 227.

<sup>88</sup> *Notitiae*, 2.78, 4. 75, 5.78.

<sup>89</sup> It was like the case of Amorium in the *notitia 2*, *Notitiae*, 2.77, 301. Cf. above.

Thus, we should look closely at which could have contributed to such a promotion of the see of Trebizonde, which resulted in it becoming a metropolitan see, attested in the *notitia* 6. There was an event in the history of the city of Trebizonde in the first half of the 9<sup>th</sup> century which exceeded all the other, and which, as scholars believe, could have had decisive impact on the church status of the see of Trebizonde.<sup>90</sup> After the victorious campaign against the Arabs in the Upper Euphrates region in 837, emperor Theophilus, in order to strengthen the Eastern borders of the Empire towards the Caucasus region, created a new military-administrative unit – the *theme of Chaldia*, the center of which became Trebizonde.<sup>91</sup> With that, this tiny litoral provincial city became one of the major administrative centers of the Empire. In that new capacity, it could have become also a major center of the ecclesiastical organization, becoming a metropolitan see, also by the will of the emperor.<sup>92</sup>

Already V. Laurent noticed that it was understandable that the appearance of a military commander bearing the title of *patricius strategus of Chaldia*,<sup>93</sup> could have resulted in the intention of the ecclesiastical hierarch of the city to reach the similar rank,<sup>94</sup> so that there would have been an *metropolitan of Chaldia* beside the *strategus of Chaldia*. However, in the *notitia* 6, where the metropolitan of Trebizonde was mentioned for the first time, the name of his eparchy was not noticed.<sup>95</sup> J. Darrouzès considered it certain that it was Lazica, because Trebizonde is mentioned as the metropolitan see of the eparchy of Lazica in the later *notitiae* (*notitiae* 7, 8–9, 10).<sup>96</sup> However, as it has been already shown, the rise of the see of Trebizonde was not related to the fate of the eparchy of Lazica and its metropolitan see of Phasis, and in all the *notitiae* that testified about the rise of Trebizonde before the *notitia* 6 – the *notitiae* 2, 4 and 5 – it had been always mentioned as belonging to its original eparchy, that of Pontus Polemoniacus.<sup>97</sup> As a newly established metropolitan see within the same eparchy, Trebizonde too could have got the name of the *metropolitan see of the eparchy of Pontus Polemoniacus*, the same held by Neocaesaria, to which it had been once subordinated. However, if the promotion of the church of the city of Trebizonde to the metropolitan rank was closely linked to the establishment of the theme of Chaldia with its center in the city, the new metropolitan see could have indeed taken the name of the *metropolitan see of Chaldia*. Documentary sources of the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> century confirm that the metropolitan of Trebizonde pretended to the title of the head of the church in Chaldia – there exist a seal of *bishop John of Chaldia* from the first half of

<sup>90</sup> Darrouzès, Remarques, 214–215; V. Laurent, *Le Corpus des Sceaux de L'empire byzantine*, tome V: L'Eglise, Paris 1963, no. 659.

<sup>91</sup> Treadgold, *Revival*, 295, 337–340. Chaldia held the rank of a *doukaton* before it was promoted to the rank of a *theme*.

<sup>92</sup> The case that the thematic reorganization of a region affected its ecclesiastical reorganization is well attested by the exemple of the creation of the *theme of Peloponessus* and the establishment of the metropolitan sees of Athens and of Patras, cf. Komatina, *Osnivanje*, 32–50.

<sup>93</sup> Les listes de préséance byzantines des IX<sup>e</sup> et X<sup>e</sup> siècles, éd. N. Oikonomidès, Paris 1972, 49.10.

<sup>94</sup> Laurent, *Sceaux*, no. 659.

<sup>95</sup> *Notitiae*, 6.34.

<sup>96</sup> Darrouzès, Remarques, 212–213; *Notitiae*, 7.33, 556; 8.35; 9.416; 10.498.

<sup>97</sup> *Notitiae*, 1.234; 2.78, 296; 4.75, 251; 5.78.

the 9<sup>th</sup> century,<sup>98</sup> and letters of patriarch Nicholas Mysticus (901–907, 912–925) to the metropolitan Basil of Chaldia.<sup>99</sup>

We may conclude that the church of Trebizonde got the rank of the autocephalous archbishopric of the eparchy of Pontus Polemoniacus soon after the Seventh ecumenical council of 787, and that it then, in 837, after the emperor Theophilus created the *theme of Chaldia*, centered in the city of Trebizonde, was promoted, again by the will of the emperor, to the status of the metropolitan see of the new eparchy of Chaldia. Its new rank was soon afterwards noticed in the *notitia* 6.<sup>100</sup> Even though in the *notitiae* of the 10<sup>th</sup> century (*notitiae* 7, 8–9, 10) it is mentioned as the metropolitan see of the eparchy of Lazica,<sup>101</sup> the fact that patriarch Nicholas Mysticus in official correspondence addressed the metropolitan of Trebizonde as metropolitan of Chaldia,<sup>102</sup> testifies about a vivid memory of such a titlature in Trebizonde and Constantinople alike.

**Seleucia.** According to the *notitia* 4, Seleucia, the metropolitan see of the eparchy of Isauria, which once had been a part of Patriarchate of Antioch, was included into the hierarchy of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and was listed along with the metropolitan sees of the *Western provinces*, once under the jurisdiction of Rome, in a separate passage of the *notitia*. However, in the *notitia* 6, unlike churches of those *Western provinces*, which are still listed separately,<sup>103</sup> Seleucia of Isauria appears within the basic list of metropolitan sees under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople, at the last place of it, just after the metropolitan sees of Trebizonde and Amorium, the two newest in that hierarchy.<sup>104</sup> It thus seems that it lost its special status as a former part of the Patriarchate of Antioch and was fully integrated within the hierarchy of the Patriarchate of Constantinople during the time between the composition of the *notitia* 4 and 6, unlike the metropolitan sees of the *Western provinces*, which were fully integrated within the Constantinopolitan hierarchy only at the beginning of the 10<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>105</sup>

Why the metropolitan see of Seleucia of Isauria so easily became full part of the Patriarchate of Constantinople and why it happened during the third or fourth decade of the 9<sup>th</sup> century? The explication, most probably, lies, as in the case of Trebizonde, in the changes of the military-administrative organization that took place in the border area of the Empire towards the Arabs in the region of the Taurus Mountains. Namely, during

<sup>98</sup> Laurent, Sceaux, no. 659.

<sup>99</sup> Nicholas I Patriarch of Constantinople, Letters, ed. R. H. J. Jenkins, L. G. Westerink, Washington 1973, nos. 114.1, 128.1, and also no. 74.18–19. Cf. also Zuckerman, Pontic Policy, 226–228.

<sup>100</sup> Old view about the establishment of the metropolitan see of Trebizonde during the pontificate of the patriarch Methodius (843–847), based of the Trebizondine sources of the 14<sup>th</sup> century, A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Sumbolai. eij thn istorian Trapezouhtoj, VV 12 (1905) 138–141, is inaccurate and legendary, cf. also Darrouzes, Remarques, 210.

<sup>101</sup> Notitiae, 7.33, 556; 8.35; 9.416; 10.498.

<sup>102</sup> Nicholas I, Letters, nos. 74.18–19, 114.1, 128.1; Zuckerman, Pontic Policy, 226–228.

<sup>103</sup> Notitiae, 6.37–46.

<sup>104</sup> Notitiae, 6.36.

<sup>105</sup> Metropolitan sees of the *Western provinces* were fully integrated within the hierarchy of the Patriarchate of Constantinople only thanks to the efforts of patriarch Nicholas Mysticus at the beginning of the 10<sup>th</sup> century, and the testimony about that is preserved in his prelude to the text of *notitia* 7, Notitiae, p. 270.

the fourth decade of the 9<sup>th</sup> century, emperor Theophilus created a number of *clissuras*, the military-administrative units of lower rank, along the Byzantine-Arab border. There was a *clissura of Seleucia* among them, created in the territory which previously formed *turma* within the *theme of Anatolics*. By turning Seleucia into a separate *clissura*, it became fully independent military-administrative unit, although of a lower rank, with its separate and independent command and administration, subjected directly to the imperial capital.<sup>106</sup> Firmer binding of that region to Constantinople in military-administrative sense might have had as its consequence also its firmer binding to the capital in the field of the church organization.

In the *notitia 6* the metropolitan see of Seleucia is mentioned without a notice on the eparchy it belonged, just as Trebizonde and Amorium.<sup>107</sup> However, in the *notitia 4* it is mentioned as the metropolitan see of the eparchy of Isauria.<sup>108</sup> It was only later, in the *notitiae* of the 10<sup>th</sup> century (*notitiae 7, 8–9, 10*) that it was listed as the metropolitan see of the eparchy of Pamphylia.<sup>109</sup> Thus, there is no reason to doubt that in the *notitia 6* it still represented the eparchy of Isauria.

If we accept that the promotion of the church of Trebizonde to the rank of a metropolitan see was linked to the establishment of the *theme of Chaldia* in 837 and that the full integration of the metropolitan see of Seleucia of Isauria within the regular hierarchical order of the Patriarchate of Constantinople was due to the creation of the *clissura of Seleucia* at that same time, we come to the quite precise date of the composition of the *notitia 6* – during 837 or the first half of 838.

### The problem of the *notitia 5*

*Notitia 5* contains only the list of the metropolitan sees, the passage on the sees of the *Western provinces* attached at the end of the list, and the list of the autocapalous archbishoprics. The data it provides are quite conflicting and pose many obstacles to its precise placing within the context of the *notitiae 2, 4* and *6*. However, after a close look, we can establish some elements for its dating.

Those elements are the following:

a) The list of the metropolitan sees ends with the see of Hierapolis in the eparchy of Phrygia Capatiana,<sup>110</sup> there is no Amorium, as in the *notitia 4*, neither Trebizonde and Seleucia, as in the *notitia 6*.

<sup>106</sup> *Treadgold*, Revival, 315. *Clissurae* were mentioned for the first time in the Arab sources for the period 838–848, *J. Ferluga*, Le Clisure byzantine in Asia Minore, ZRVI 16 (1975) 13. Although the *clissura Seleucia* was not mentioned in the *Tacticon Uspenskij*, the explication of that fact by the editor, N. Oikonomidès, that it was due to a scribal error, and that we should read κλεισουράρχης Σελευκίας instead of κλεισουράρχης Σοζοπόλεως, unattested in any other source, looks quite convincing, *Oikonomides*, *Listes*, 55.6, 54, n. 35.

<sup>107</sup> *Notitiae*, 6.34–36.

<sup>108</sup> *Notitiae*, 4.493. As a metropolitan see of the eparchy of Isauria Seleucia was mentioned also in the *notitia 3*, on which, cf. *Komatina*, *Crkvena politika*, 244–246, 303–312, 314–315.

<sup>109</sup> *Notitiae*, 7.512–535; 9.396; 10.679, 732–757.

<sup>110</sup> *Notitiae*, 5.33.

**Place of the ecclesiastical sees of Amorium, Crete, Trebizonde and Seleucia in the hierarchy of the Patriarchate of Constantinople in the 8<sup>th</sup> and the first decades of the 9<sup>th</sup> century according to the *Notitiae episcopatum* 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6:**

	<i>Notitia 1</i> (before 732)	<i>Notitia 2</i> (805/806–814)	<i>Notitia 5</i> (805/806–814, after <i>Notitia 2</i> )	Independent source (end of 814)	<i>Notitia 4</i> (before the end of 814– 827/828)	<i>Notitia 6</i> (837/838)
<b>Amorium</b>	bishopric	autocephalous archbishopric	autocephalous archbishopric	metropolitan see	metropolitan see	metropolitan see
<b>Crete</b>		metropolitan see	metropolitan see (in a separate list)		metropolitan see (in a separate list)	
<b>Trebizonde</b>	bishopric	autocephalous archbishopric	autocephalous archbishopric		autocephalous archbishopric	metropolitan see
<b>Seleucia</b>					metropolitan see (in a separate list)	metropolitan see

b) There is a separate passage about the sees of the *Western provinces*,<sup>111</sup> as in the *notitiae 4* and *6*.

c) In that passage, there is Crete,<sup>112</sup> as in the *notitia 4*.

d) In that passage, there is no note on Seleucia of Isauria, unlike the *notitia 4*.

e) In its archetype, most probably, there was no mention of the metropolitan see of Larisa,<sup>113</sup> which is not mentioned in the *notitia 4*, but is in the *notitia 2*.

f) In the list of the autocephalous archbishoprics, there is mention of Trebizonde,<sup>114</sup> just as in the *notitia 2* and *notitia 4*.

What do these facts tell? The presence of Crete within the passage about the *Western provinces* testifies that *notitia 5* was composed before 827/828. The absence of Amorium from the list of the metropolitan sees points that the *notitia* was composed before the end of 814 and that it is older than the *notitia 4*. The presence of Trebizonde within the list of the autocephalous archbishoprics testifies that it belongs to the time of the composition of the *notitiae 2* and *4*. The absence of the note on Seleucia from the passage about the *Western provinces*, however, confirms that it is older than the *notitia 4*, but the very existence of that passage testifies that it is younger than the *notitia 2*, in which there is no such a passage, and that it is close to the *notitia 4*. That is further confirmed by the absence of Larissa from the passage about the *Western provinces*.

Considering all of that, we may assume that the *notitia 5* was composed before the end of 814, but that it is younger than the *notitia 2*, composed between 805/806 and 814, and older than the *notitia 4*, composed between before the end of 814 and 827/828.

## ЛИСТА РЕФЕРЕНЦИ – LIST OF REFERENCES

### Извори – Primary Sources

Georgii Cyprii Descriptio orbis Romani, ed. *H. Gelzer*, Lipsiae 1890.

Ignatii archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani Vita sive Certamen, Auctore Niceta servo Jesu Christi, cognomento Davide Paphlagone, Patrologia Graeca 105, 487–574.

Josephi Genesii Regum libri quattuor, edd. *A. Lesmueller-Werner – I. Thurn*, Berolini – Novi Eboraci 1978 (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 14).

*Laurent V.*, Le Corpus des Sceaux de L'empire byzantine, tome V: L'Eglise, Paris 1963.

Les listes de préséance byzantines des IX<sup>e</sup> et X<sup>e</sup> siècles, éd. *N. Oikonomidès*, Paris 1972.

Les registes des actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople I. Les actes des patriarches 2: Les registes de 715 a 1043, ed. *V. Grumel*, Paris 1936.

Liber pontificalis II, ed. *L. Duchesne*, Paris 1955.

<sup>111</sup> Notitiae, 5.34–43.

<sup>112</sup> Notitiae, 5.37.

<sup>113</sup> Notitiae, 5.43, n. 35–43.

<sup>114</sup> Notitiae, 5.78.

- Nicholas I Patriarch of Constantinople, Letters, ed. *R. H. J. Jenkins, L. G. Westerink*, Washington 1973 (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 6).
- Nicolai I papae epistolae, ed. *E. Perels*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Epistolae VI, Epistolae Karolini aevi IV, Berolini 1925, 257–690.
- Notitiae episcopatum ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae, ed. *J. Darrouzès*, Paris 1981.
- Photii patriarchae Constantinopolitani epistulae et amphilochia, I–IV, edd. *B. Laourdas – L. G. Westerink*, Lipsiae 1983–1986.
- Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima colectio, ed. *J. D. Mansi*, I–XXXI, Florentiae – Venetiis 1758–1798.
- Skazanja o 42 amorijskih mučenikah“ i cerkovnaja služba im“, izd. *V. Vasil'evskij – P. Nikitin*“, Zapiski Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk“ VIII, 7/2, St-Peterburg“ 1905.
- Symeonis magistri et logothetae Chronicon, ed. *S. Wahlgren*, Berolini – Novi Eboraci 2006 (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 44/1).
- Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae, ed. *H. Delehaye*, Bruxelles 1902.
- The Life of Saint Nikon, ed. *D. Sullivan*, Brookline/Mass. 1987.
- Theophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus, ed. *I. Bekker*, Bonnae 1838 (Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae 45).
- Vita S. Blasii Amoriensis, Acta Sanctorum Novembris IV, edd. *H. Delehaye – P. Peeters*, Bruxelles 1925, 656–669.
- Vita S. Nicolai Studitae, Patrologia Graeca 105, 863–925.

### Литература – Secondary Works

- Bury J.*, A History of the Eastern Roman Empire 802–867, London 1912.
- Chryssos E.*, Zur Entstehung der Institution der autokephalen Erzbistümer, Byzantinische Zeitschrift 62 (1969) 263–286.
- Darrouzès J.*, Listes épiscopales du concile de Nicée (787), Revue des études Byzantines 33 (1975) 5–76.
- Darrouzès J.*, Remarques sur de creations d'evêches byzantins, Revue des études Byzantines 47 (1989) 209–237.
- Dvornik F.*, Le schisme de Photius. Histoire et légende, Paris 1950.
- Ferluga J.*, Le Clisure bizantine in Asia Minore, Zbornik radova Vizantološkog instituta 16 (1975) 9–23.
- Grégoire H.*, La vie de Saint Blaise d'Amorium, Byzantion 5 (1929–1930) 391–414.
- Grumel V.*, La«Notitia» de Basile de Ialimbana. Essai sur la date de composition, Revue des études Byzantines 19 (1961) 198–207.
- Honigmann E.*, Die Notitia des Basileios von Ialimbana, Byzantion 9 (1934) 205–222.
- Kazhdan A.*, Hagiographical notes, Byzantion 56 (1986) 148–170.
- Komatina P.*, Crkvena politika Vizantije od kraja ikonoborstva do smrti cara Vasilija I, Beograd 2013.
- Komatina P.*, Moravski episkop Agaton na Fotijeovom saboru 879/880. g., Srpska teologija danas 2009, prir. *B. Šijaković*, Beograd 2010, 359–368.
- Komatina P.*, Osnivanje Patraske i Atinske mitropolije i Sloveni na Peloponezu, Zbornik radova Vizantološkog instituta 46 (2009) 27–52.
- Laurent V.*, La «Notitia» de Basile l'Arménien. Tradition manuscrite et date de composition, Échos d'Orient 34 (1935) 439–472.
- Laurent V.*, Le synodicon de Sybrita et les métropolités de Crète aux X<sup>e</sup>–XIII<sup>e</sup> siècles, Échos d'Orient 32 (1933) 385–412.
- Martin-Hisard B.*, Constantinople et les archontes du monde Caucasic dans le Livre des cérémonies, II, 48, éd. *G. Dagron*, Byzance et ses voisins, Travaux et Mémoires 13 (2000) 359–530.
- Niermeyer J. F.*, Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus, Leiden 1976.
- Ostrogorski G.*, Istorija Vizantije, Beograd 1959.

- Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium I, ed. A. Kazhdan, Oxford 1991.
- Papadopoulos I.*, Η Κρήνη του Σαρακηνού, Athēnai 1948 [*Papadopoulos I.*, Η Κρήνη του Σαρακηνού, Athēnai 1948].
- Papadopoulos I.*, Ὑπαρχεὶ καὶ δευτέρῳ (Ἄγιοι Κυρίλλοι Γορτυνῆς, Ἐπεθρίη Ἐταίρειά Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν 16 (1940) 247–251 [*Papadopoulos I.*, Ὑπαρχεὶ καὶ δευτέρῳ Ἁγίοι Κυρίλλοι Γορτυνῆς?, Ἐπεθρίη Ἐταίρειας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν 16 (1940) 247–251].
- Papadopoulos-Kerameus A.*, Σymbolαὶ εἰς τὴν ἱστορίαν Τραπεζουήτου, Vizantijskij Vremennik 12 (1905) 130–147 [*Papadopoulos-Kerameus A.*, Symbolai eis ten historian Trapezountos, Vizantijskij Vremennik 12 (1905) 130–147].
- Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit. 1. Abt. (641–867), ed. R.–J. Lilie et al., Berlin – New York 1999–2002.
- Tōmadakēs N.*, Η Ἀποστολικὴ Ἐκκλησία τῆς Κρήτης κατὰ τοὺς αἰῶνες Η΄ – ΙΓ΄, Ἐπεθρίη Ἐταίρειά Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν 24 (1954) 67–107 [*Tōmadakēs N.*, Η Ἀποστολικὴ Ἐκκλησία τῆς Κρήτης κατὰ τοὺς αἰῶνες Η΄–ΙΧ΄, Ἐπεθρίη Ἐταίρειας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν 24 (1954) 67–107].
- Treadgold W.*, The Byzantine Revival 780–842, Stanford 1988.
- Tsougarakis D.*, Byzantine Crete 5<sup>th</sup> – 12<sup>th</sup> centuries, Athens 1988.
- Vasiliev A.*, Byzance et les Arabes I–1, Bruxelles 1935.
- Zuckerman C.*, Byzantium's Pontic Policy in the *Notitiae episcopatum*, ed. C. Zuckerman, La Crimée entre Byzance et le Khaganat Khazar, ed. C. Zuckerman, Monographies 25, Paris 2006, 201–230.

*Предраг Коматићина*

(Византолошки институт САНУ, Београд)

#### ВРЕМЕ НАСТАНКА ЕПИСКОПСКИХ НОТИЦИЈА ЦАРИГРАДСКЕ ЦРКВЕ БР. 4, 5 И 6

*Но̀тиција Василија из Јалимбане*, данас позната као *но̀тиција бр. 4*, блиска је по садржају и млађа од *но̀тиције 2*, која је настала између 805/806. и 814. године, али је и прва у којој се међу митрополитским столицама јавља Аморион. Пошто је епископска столица тог града добила митрополитски ранг пре краја 814. године, а изгубила га услед арабљанског освајања и разарања града 838, то је ово најшири временски оквир за настанак поменуте *но̀тиције 4*. Међутим, пошто се у њој јавља и митрополија Крита, која није постојала у време арабљанске власти над острвом, између 827/828. и 961. године, може се закључити да је *но̀тиција 4* настала у периоду између 805/806–814. и 827/828. године.

*Но̀тиција бр. 6* по садржају списка митрополитских столица слична је *но̀тицији 4*, и као и она садржи Аморион, али за разлику од ње садржи и две нове митрополије – Трапезунт и Селевкију, и не садржи Крит. Присуство Амориона и одсуство Крита сведочи да је настала између 827/828. и 838. године, док помињање митрополија Трапезунта и Селевкије, чији се настанак може повезати са војноадминистративном реорганизацијом у подручју источне

границе Царства, тј. настанком *ѿеме Халдије* са седиштем у Трапезунту и *клисуре Селевкије*, упућује да настанак ове notiције треба тражити у врло одређеном временском оквиру, 837/838. године.

Коначно, *ноѿиција 5*, која припада истом временском контексту као и *ноѿиције 2, 4 и 6*, може се на основу неких елемената из свог садржаја сместити у временски оквир 805/806–814, после настанка *ноѿиције 2*, али пре настанка *ноѿиције 4*.