THE HISTORICAL METHODOLOGY OF ANNA KOMNENE: A CASE STUDY OF BOOK XII CHAPTER 3 OF THE ALEXIAS*

In this paper we examine Anna Komnene’s editorial procedure in Book XII chapter 3 of the Alexias and reappraise her historical methodology. We investigate the two dates at the end of XII.3.1, which are incompatible: the indiction does not correspond to the regnal year. Our investigations come to the following conclusions: Anna composes XII.3 using reliable sources, Alexios I’s official letters and court logbook; both of the dates originate in the trustworthy imperial documents that she consulted; the discrepancy between the two, commonly regarded as a mistake made by Anna, was caused by editorial work on the text after her death. As far as we can tell from XII.3, her method of historical composition is entirely clear and this suggests that the Alexias is a reliable historical source.
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Introduction: the Alexias Book XII chapter 3

Opinions are divergent on the Alexias of Anna Komnene. On the one hand, it is called one of Byzantium’s best historical works or a masterpiece of Byzantine literature;¹ on the other, Anna has been repeatedly criticized for a lack of objectivity owing to the slavish admiration for her father, the emperor Alexios I Komnenos, and sometimes

* An earlier version of this paper was read at the 12th Annual Meeting of the Japan Association for Byzantine Studies held in Kyoto, 6. April 2014.

¹ Herrin, Byzantium, chap. 22 ‘Anna Komnene’; Ljubarskij, Why is the Alexiad a Masterpiece, 169-185.
reproached for sloppy editorial work. Taking into consideration the commonly accepted notion of Anna’s chronological inaccuracy or inconsistency, in this paper we would like to pay special attention to the dates in the Alexiad in order to reappraise her historiography. The object of our investigation is Book XII chapter 3.

The topics of XII.3 are the campaign of Alexios I to Thessaloniki against Bohemond, Prince of Antioch, and the empress Eirene’s obligation to accompany the emperor. Although XII.3 amounts to no less than 113 lines in the Greek text, the historical facts mentioned by Anna are rather simple. Its outline is as follows. (1) To the officers in the west Alexios I sent letters (graphas) ordering them to march to Sthlanitza. (2) Then he left Byzantium and arrived at Thessaloniki. This passage is a continuation of XII.1.6 which recorded the emperor’s departure for Thessaloniki, but in chapter 3 Anna adds his arrival and the date: ‘in the month of September of the fourteenth indiction, the twentieth year after his (Alexios I’s) taking up the reins of empire.’ (3) At his departure the emperor insisted that the empress go along with him. His insistence on her accompanying him is repeated in sections 3 and 8. (4) Arriving at Thessaloniki, Alexios made preparations for the forthcoming war.

The two dates mentioned in XII.3.1

The first point to notice is the dates at the end of XII.3.1. Byzantine historical works are customarily classified into two categories: chronikon/chronographia and historia. While chronikon usually enters a date on each event, the other category, historia, bears few dates. As a kind of literature it avoids using official terminology and entering dates. The Alexiad, included in the category of historia, also has few dates; even the indiction, the most popular dating system in the text, is used only sixteen times throughout the voluminous fifteen books.

---

2 See, for example, France, Anna Comnena, 20-32.
3 See, for example, Sewter and Frankopan, Anna Komnene the Alexiad, xxi: P. Frankopan says "The long-held assumption that the sequence of events in the text is broadly reliable is refuted by a catalogue of misplaced episodes, duplications and errors. Whether such errors were deliberate or the result of working with extensive and unfamiliar materials is a key question when considering how we should interpret the Alexiad."
4 B. Leib’s French translation gives the caption ‘La Basilissa Irène’ to XII.3: Anne Comnène Alexiade, III, 59.
5 Annae Comnenae Alexias, I, 364-368.
6 Anna uses the words graphē and gramma not merely in the sense of ‘letter’ but of ‘imperial decree’, whose official terms are prostagma or prostaxis. In this paper, we will also use the term ‘letter’ to refer to generic imperial mandatory documents. For Anna’s refraining from using technical terms, see infra n. 26.
7 Annae Comnenae Alexias I, 364, lines 76-78.
8 Hunger, Hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner, I, 252-254. The distinction between chronikon and historia is not very strict.
9 In the last three chapters, covering fifteen years (1042-57), of John Skylitzes’ Synopsis Historiarum, for example, the indiction is used no less than nineteen times and the annum mundi (year from the Creation) five times: Skylitzes, 422-500.
10 II.10.4; III.2.6; III.6.3; IV.1.1; IV.4.1; IV.6.1; VI.8.1; VI.8.4; X.2.5; X.5.4, lacuna; XII.3.1; XII.7.1; XII.7.2; XIII.1.1; XIII.12.26; XIV.8.1.
The account of XII.3.1 is one of the exceptions; Anna enters two dates at the end of the section: in the month of September of ‘the fourteenth indiction’ and ‘the twentieth year after his taking up the reins of empire’. The indiction year and the regnal one, however, are not in agreement: the fourteenth indiction corresponds to AD 1105/06; the twentieth year of Alexios I Komnenos, who ascended the throne in April 1081, is AD 1100/01.

Of the two years mentioned by Anna the indiction is correct. The history of Bohemond\(^\text{11}\) shows that it cannot be in Alexios I’s twentieth year, AD 1100/01, when the emperor marched toward Thessaloniki. Bohemond took Antioch in 1098 and assumed the title ‘Prince of Antioch’; from 1100 he had spent nearly three years as a prisoner of the Danishmendids; and after being ransomed, he set out for Italy at the end of 1104 and prepared an expedition against Byzantium.

The error of the regnal year has been known for a long time. The fourteenth-century manuscript V expurgates the dates entirely;\(^\text{12}\) its scribe might have been aware of the contradiction between the two years. A sixteenth-century marginal comment on the oldest manuscript F replaces the regnal year with ‘the twenty-fifth’ .\(^\text{13}\) Although the error is well known, no studies have ever tried to elucidate the reason why the regnal year is wrong.

We may simply suppose that the scribes accidentally dropped the word ‘fifth’; but all the manuscripts agree with ‘twentieth’, and moreover, the two most important ones, F (twelfth century) and C (fourteenth century), use different types of orthography to describe ‘twentieth’: the manuscript F uses εικοστος, while C gives the word with the numerical sign κ.\(^\text{14}\) Accordingly, it may safely be assumed that in Anna’s original text ‘twentieth’ was used. Is the error due to her careless mistake? She pays special attention, however, to personal names, toponyms and dates; if not sure of them, she leaves blank spaces in the text. Except for the last part of Book XV, where the manuscripts are lost or damaged, most of the lacunae in the Alexias are those of proper names and chronological data, which she would fill in vain after ascertaining the truth.\(^\text{15}\) It is, therefore, inconceivable that she made such a simple mistake. We have to find a sensible explanation for how the erroneous regnal year crept into the text.

‘The fourteenth indiction’ and entellomai

As mentioned above, the Alexias has few dates. It is noteworthy that many of them are found in quotations from or references to imperial documents. In III.6.3, to take an example, Anna Komnene enters a date before quoting Alexios I’s well-known

\(^{11}\) Savvides, Byzantino-Normannica, chap. III; McQueen, Relations between the Normans and Byzantium 1071-1112, 427-486, esp. 454-463.

\(^{12}\) Annae Comnenae Alexias I, 364, apparatus epitomae.

\(^{13}\) Annae Comnenae Alexias I, 364, apparatus criticus.

\(^{14}\) Annae Comnenae Alexias I, 364, apparatus criticus.

\(^{15}\) Buckler, Anna Comnena, 251. The blanks in X-5-4 and XV-8-1 are those of chronological data.
chrysobull to Anna Dalassene, his mother, entrusting the whole imperial power to her. The passage of IV.4.1, which deals with the imperial expedition to Dyrrachion in 1081, is another illustration of the same point. The emperor left the capital after sending a letter to the *megas domestikos* Gregorios Pakourianos instructing him to collect the army and join him. We can say with a fair degree of certainty that the date of ‘the month of August of the fourth indiction’\(^\text{16}\) is that of the imperial letter to Pakourianos. In the same way the first date in our XII.3.1, ‘September of the fourteenth indiction’, is probably borrowed from the imperial letters mentioned at the outset of the section.

There are two other reasons for considering that the date was borrowed from the imperial letters. For one thing, it is entered with the chronological system of the indiction. Since the dates used in imperial decrees (*prostagma*) or epistles are exclusively indictional,\(^\text{17}\) we may assume that ‘the fourteenth indiction’ comes from the imperial letters. For another, we have the particular word *enteilamenos* (enjoining) in XII.3.1.\(^\text{18}\) The verb *entellomai*, which is used in the New Testament in the context of divine commandments, is not very popular in Byzantine texts. In the *Alexias* it is often used in quotations from or references to imperial letters. The following are a few notable examples:

1. (1) III.10.5: ‘The *prōtoproedros* and *katepanō* Constantine has been enjoined (*entaltheis*) by Us (*tou kratous hēmōn*) …’\(^\text{19}\) *Entellomai* is used in Alexios’ epistle to ‘the king of Alamania’, Heinrich IV, quoted at length in III.10.3~8 along with such technical terms as *prōtoproedros, katepanō* and *to kratos hēmōn*.

2. (2) VIII.7.5: ‘When Alexios I handed these letters to Karatzas, he enjoined (*eneteilato*) him to deliver the one to John first…’\(^\text{20}\) Here Anna uses *entellomai* immediately after quoting from the imperial letter addressed to the leading citizens of Dyrrachion.

3. (3) XI.3.1: ‘The emperor enjoined (*eneteilato*) Boutoumites by letter to advise all the counts not to start on their way to Antioch…’\(^\text{21}\) Here, too, *entellomai* is employed in the context of instruction by letter.

From those examples it could be thought that Alexios I preferred using *entellomai* when he gave orders by letter and that Anna borrowed the word used in her father’s letters. To be sure, she might employ the word *entellomai* without looking at the actual letters, knowing that it is frequently used in imperial written orders. Taking her exceptional reference to the indiction in XII.3.1 into consideration, however, we could reasonably suppose that she was quoting from the imperial letters.

---

16 Annae Comnenae Alexias I, 126, line 92.
18 Annae Comnenae Alexias I, 364, line 71.
19 Annae Comnenae Alexias I, 113, lines 94-95.
20 Annae Comnenae Alexias I, 253, lines 48-50.
21 Annae Comnenae Alexias I, 329, lines 42-44.
Thus, ‘September of the fourteenth indiction’ would be the original date of the imperial letters which Anna consulted when she composed XII.3.

‘The twentieth year after his taking up the reins of empire’ and augousta

The other date, the regnal year, cannot have been borrowed from Alexios’ letters to the western officers, because imperial letters, as mentioned above, are usually dated only with an indiction year. What is the source of the erroneous regnal year? Was it fabricated by Anna?

First of all, we should not overlook the grammatical construction of the regnal year: it is expressed not merely in the genitive case but in the genitive absolute. If ‘the twentieth year’ was added by Anna calculating from the indiction year, she could not have described it in an absolute genitive but would have used an appositive phrase. We may, therefore, reasonably conclude that the regnal year is not Anna’s arbitrary addition. To say nothing of the unlikely miscalculation, she never supplemented an indiction year with a regnal one converted from the indiction in order to make the date clearer. The above mentioned IV.4.1 also has only one date, the indiction year which, in our opinion, was borrowed from the imperial letter to Pakourianos. From what, then, is ‘the twentieth year’ derived?

In considering the origin of the regnal year, we should draw attention to the first sentence of the following section 2: ‘He insisted that the empress (augoustan) accompany him.’ Here Anna uses the word augousta to mention her mother Eirene. Augousta is an official title of the Byzantine empresses and hence seldom appears in the Alexias; Anna usually uses basilis when she refers to the empresses. The opening sentence of XII.3.2 is just the third instance of her using the word augousta from the beginning of the Alexias, although after Book XII it appears frequently.

Having respect for Attic Greek and classical vocabulary, Byzantine historians avoided using technical terms and official titles. Anna Komnene is no exception. The above mentioned ἐποτοπροεδρος and κατεπανο appear only in the quotation from the imperial letter to Heinrich IV. It is likely, therefore, that the first sentence of XII.3.2

22 The last sentence of III.2.6 has two dates, regnal year and indiction, but they are independent of each other; that is to say, Anna does not convert one date to the other: Annae Comnenae Alexias I, a2, lines 60-64.

23 Annae Comnenae Alexias I, 364, lines 78-79.

24 Reinsch, Anna Komnene Alexias, 407, n. 26; Bensammer, Titulature de l’impératrice et sa signification, 243-291.

25 This can be explained by the fact that the empress Eirene’s influence and power at the Byzantine court increased in the later years of Alexios I Komnenos because the emperor was sickly; after Book XII Eirene is also called basilissa, despoina or autokratorissa. We may note in passing that the two instances of augousta before Book XII are both in the references to the Doukas, Anna’s maternal family: VII.3.9 and VIII.4.5.

26 The official jargon roga (pension), to take another example, never appears in Anna’s narrative part. It is used three times in the Alexias: III.6.7; III.10.4; VI.5.10. The first example is in the quotation of
has its original source in an official document: Anna transcribed the document or was influenced by its expression to introduce the word *augousta*, in the same way as in the case of *entellomai* mentioned above.

Of the Byzantine official documents, in our opinion, it is the logbooks recording imperial activities, succinct chronological compendia drawn up in the court, that use the dating system of the regnal year. Although we have no originals of court logbooks or imperial diaries, their existence is now widely accepted.\(^{27}\) Taking the character of the documents into account, it is fairly reasonable to suppose that they would have used the regnal year. We can suggest, therefore, that the second date, ‘the twentieth year’, comes originally from the imperial diary. Composing XII.3, Anna referred to the diary of Alexios I’s twentieth regnal year, in which the empress’s accompanying him was recorded, although we cannot know where they went.

Anna Komnene uses the word *augousta* cautiously: she calls no empresses other than Eirene *augousta*, and furthermore, it is mostly in the narratives of Eirene’s accompanying the emperor on his expeditions that she is called *augousta*. In addition to XII.3.2 the following are a few random examples:

(1) XIII.1.4: ‘When he (Alexios I) arrived at Mestos, the empress (*augousta*) wanted to return to the palace, but the emperor compelled her to go further.’\(^{28}\)

(2) XIV.5.2: ‘After three days’ march he arrived at the a place called Aigialoi, from which he intended to sail over to Kibotos. As the empress (*augousta*) saw that he was in a hurry to make the crossing, she took her leave of him and set out for the capital.’\(^{29}\)

(3) XV.3.1: ‘As he intended to stay there for a good many days, he sent for the empress (*augoustan*) for the reason I have given several times…. ’\(^{30}\)

From the examples above we can say that Eirene is called *augousta* in imperial diaries. It is undoubtedly possible to assume that Anna enters the regnal year from memory, but taking into account the fact that she uses the official title of *augousta* in XII.3.2, it seems reasonable to suppose that she consulted the imperial diary.\(^{31}\)

the chrysobull to Anna Dalassene; the second in that of the imperial epistle addressed to Heinrich IV; and the last in the reference to the chrysobull granted to Venice.

\(^{27}\) It has been established that John Skylitzes uses a war diary as his material for the reign of John I Tzimiskes: cf. Moravcsik, Byzantinoturcica, I, 398-399; Holmes, Basil II, 95. P. Speck shows in full detail that ‘protokollarische Notizen’, court logbooks recording imperial births, marriages, coronations and so on, provide the Chronicle of Theophanes with material for its description of the age of Herakleios (610-641): Speck, Geteilte Dossier, 25-50.

\(^{28}\) Annae Comnenae Alexias I, 385, lines 32-34.

\(^{29}\) Annae Comnenae Alexias I, 443, lines 95,1-3.

\(^{30}\) Annae Comnenae Alexias I, 466, lines 88-90.

\(^{31}\) It is only the obvious dates, e.g. those of Alexios Komnenos’ triumphal entry into Constantinople or the births of herself and her brother John, that Anna seems to enter relying on her own personal recollections: II.10.4; VI.8.1; VI.8.4; many of the dates are found in quotation from or references to imperial documents.
Several examinations in the last paragraphs have shown that the date of ‘the twentieth year’ is neither Anna’s arbitrary addition to nor an incorrect conversion from the indiction year, but originates from a trustworthy official document, or more specifically, the imperial diary.

Anna Komnene’s editorial process in Book XII chapter 3

In view of the analysis of the dates, we shall now look more carefully into XII.3 and throw light on Anna’s historical methodology: why and how did the error of date come about?

The description of XII.3 is rather irregular; Anna makes a great many digressions and repetitions. It is her justification or admiration for the parents, Alexios I and empress Eirene, that caused the irregular composition. The misdate is also, in our opinion, partly due to the insertion of explanations about her parents.

As discussed in earlier parts of this paper, the second sentence of XII.3.1, ‘To the officers engaged in the west he sent other letters enjoining (enteilamenos) them to march to Sthlanitza without delay,’32 and the first sentence of XII.3.2, ‘The emperor insisted that the empress (augoustan) accompany him’, are borrowed from the imperial letters and the court logbook respectively. The words entellomai and augousta point to the source of the sentences. Both of the documents were dated. Consulting the two dated imperial documents concerning her father’s actions, the imperial letters and diary, Anna made an outline of the chapter. Her method of historical composition is orthodox and proper.

Let us reproduce Anna’s draft for chapter 3; supposedly, it consisted of two topics or framework sentences based on the imperial documents. Our hypothetical reconstruction of her topic sentences is as follows:

1. Alexios sent letters to the officers in the west enjoining them to march to Sthlanitza without delay in the month of September of the fourteenth indiction.
2. In the twentieth year of the emperor Alexios Komnenos, he insisted that the empress accompany him on campaign.

As the result of making an outline of the chapter by quoting the imperial letters and diary, the two dates, the indiction at the end of the letters and the regnal year in the rubric of the imperial diary, were put side by side in Anna’s draft. That is what caused confusion and resulted in a mistake.

We shall examine minutely how Anna fleshes out the skeleton of the chapter. First, she adds the admiration for her father: he is not a weak emperor enjoying a life of ease in the palace.33 Then, after repeating the sentence of the emperor’s departure

---

32 Annae Comnenae Alexias I, 364, lines 69-71.
33 Annae Comnenae Alexias I, 364, lines 71-74.
for Thessaloniki in XII.1.6, she mentions his arrival. The sentence ‘he left Byzantium, as stated above, … and reached the polis of Thettalos’ is, to be sure, the outline of chapter 3, that is the description of the emperor’s actions, but it is not a quotation from the original sources, the imperial letters or logbooks, but rather Anna’s explanatory addition. The classical expression ‘the polis of Thettalos’ provides evidence for that.

The additions to the first framework sentence were put halfway between the body of the sentence ‘Alexios sent letters…Sthlanitza without delay’ and the date ‘in the month of September of the fourteenth indiction.’ The main reason for this improper interpolation may be that Anna was anxious to express her admiration for her father. Consequently, the passage gives us the impression that the emperor arrived at Thessaloniki in September.

On the other hand, the regnal year following the indiction is, as discussed above, the date in the imperial diary which records the empress’s accompanying the emperor in 1100/01. In other words, the end of section 1 and the beginning of section 2 were originally a single sentence, which is Anna’s second framework sentence based on the imperial diary. When the text of the Alexias was divided into chapters and sections, another mistake occurred. The sentence was separated into sections 1 and 2: section 1 closed with the date; the body of the text was put into section 2. That is not Anna’s mistake, for the division into chapters and sections was made after her death.

J. N. Ljubarskij’s Russian translation is worth a mention in passing. Seeing the problem in the Greek text, he transfers the first sentence of section 2 to section 1. His revision is reasonable, but it is more reasonable to put a full stop after ‘the fourteenth indiction’ and replace the full stop after the regnal year with a comma. Anna’s following narratives will support our assumption.

After the second framework sentence based on the imperial diary, Anna inserts a lengthy digression once more, this time her admiration for her mother, with references to classical writers such as Plutarch and Simonides of Ceos. She explains why the empress Eirene accompanied the emperor. Her explanations continue just before the last sentence of section 3, ‘she (the empress) is obliged to accompany the emperor on his frequent expeditions,’ which is a repetition of the first sentence of section 2.

We should, however, notice that there are several differences between those two sentences. First of all, the word augousta is not used in section 3; next, the verb in section 3 is passive and, in addition, not aoristic but present tense. Most importantly,

34 Annae Comnenae Alexias I, 364, lines 75-76.
35 Modern translations, except for the German one by D. R. Reinsch, do not distinguish ‘the polis of Thettalos’ from Thessalonikê. Although the revised English translation by P. Frankopan discriminates between those two expressions carefully, ‘the polis of Thettalos’ is translated as Thessaloniki in XII.3.1: Reinsch, Anna Kommene Alexias, 406; Sewter and Frankopan, Anna Kommene the Alexiad, 337.
36 Ljubarskij, Anna Komnina Alexis, 324.
37 Annae Comnenae Alexias, I, 365, lines 94-95.
Anna says that the empress is compelled to accompany the emperor on his ‘frequent expeditions’. If she simply repeats the second framework sentence, she cannot write ‘frequent expeditions’, although the voice of the sentence may be changed depending on the context. The reason why Anna uses the plural form is, in our opinion, that while she wrote about the emperor’s expedition to Thessaloniki in 1105 referring to the imperial letters, she also checked the imperial diary and knew that the empress had accompanied the emperor in his twentieth regnal year, AD 1100/01.

We must also pay attention to the fact that Anna uses the present tense in the repeated sentence at the last lines of section 3. All the translations, except for L. Schopen’s literal Latin one, change the verb into the past tense; the translators seem to have interpreted the present tense in section 3 as the historical present. We venture to say that it is the habitual present used to describe repeated actions. Reading the text further we can confirm the argument.

After explaining in verbose terms why the empress accompanied the emperor from section 4 through section 7, Anna returns to the main topic at the beginning of section 8 and tells for the third time of the empress’s duty to accompany the emperor. But her style is rather tedious in XII.3.8: ‘And thus on the expedition which took place at that time—the emperor had set off on campaign against Bohemond—she accompanied him to some extent against her will, and yet voluntarily’. What is immediately apparent in this extract is that Anna lays a special emphasis on Bohemond; she wants to tell us that she refers to the expedition against Bohemond in particular. To put it another way, the sentence expressed in the present tense at the end of section 3 is written with other expeditions, including that of 1100/01, in mind.

Returning to the main topics at the beginning of section 9, Anna records the preparations for war by Alexios I. In the rest of chapter 3, however, she repeats the explanations for the empress Eirene’s presence and continues to praise her.

**Conclusion: The value of the Alexias as a historical source**

We would like to propose a chronological correction in passing. *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches* dates the imperial letters mentioned in XII.3.1 to ‘1105 vor sept.’ Reading the passage straightforwardly, to be sure, we might conclude that the letters were written before September, because Alexios I left Constantinople after sending them and arrived at Thessaloniki in September. As stated above, however, Anna’s remarks on the imperial arrival at Thessaloniki are not based on a dated official document; they are her supplementary explanation continued from

---

38 Annae Comnenae Alexiadis, II, 142.
40 Annae Comnenae Alexias I, 367, lines 61-65.
41 Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches, 2, no. 1224.
the passage in XII.1.6. The first framework sentence of chapter 3 is ‘Alexios sent the letters .... in the month of September of the fourteenth indiction’ and the supplementary explanations are accidentally inserted before the date. Thus, the date is not originally that of the emperor’s arrival at Thessaloniki but of the imperial letters. The date of the letters, therefore, should be identified as ‘1105 sept.’.42

We must now return to our main point. From the discussions above we should conclude that Anna composes Book XII chapter 3 of the Alexias based on the reliable sources. Apart from the admiration for her parents under the pretext of history, the dates given in the text are trustworthy because they were copied from the imperial documents she had consulted. Later editorial work, which separated Anna’s sentence into sections 1 and 2, is responsible for the two apparently incompatible dates at the end of XII.3.1.

Granted that the Alexias has some errors in chronological sequence, they are not caused merely by Anna’s careless mistakes or later editorial works but by her historical methodology. Byzantine historians often write down a connected series of events together disregarding their chronological order; this kind of historical method is called ‘cast back’ or ‘cast forward’.43 Anna Komnene also uses it in XII.3: recording the empress’s participation in the imperial campaign to Thessaloniki in 1105, she ‘casts back’ her narratives to an event five years before.44 Thus, XII.3 has two different dates of the indiction and the regnal year, both of which are correct in themselves.

In this paper we analyzed only a small part of the voluminous Alexias and showed how detailed examination can elucidate apparent contradictions in her text. Further studies of Anna’s historical methodology will make clearer the value of the Alexias as a historical source.**

42 The date of the empress Eirene’s actions should also be corrected. The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium points out, ‘…from 1105 Alexios frequently insisted that Irene accompany him on campaign...’: Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium, II, 1009 ‘Irene Doukaina’. Our analysis of XII.3 shows that the empress has already accompanied him in 1100/01.

43 Jenkins, Chronological Accuracy of the ‘Logothete’, 91-112.

44 G. Buckler is wrong when she concludes that the great battle outside Dyrrachion took place in October 1082; taking Anna’s historiographical method into consideration, J. N. Ljubarskij corrects the date to 1081: Buckler, Anna Commena, 406-414; Ljubarskij, Aleksaïda, 495–496, n. 444, cf. also 493–494, n. 430. In XV.5, too, Anna employs the method of ‘cast forward’: she records the battle of Polyboton (AD 1116) and deplores the death of her brother Andrônìkos who distinguished himself by his performance at the battle, but he was not killed in the battle; cf. B. Skoulatos, Les personnages byzantins de l’Alexiade, 16-19.

**It remains an unsettled question how Anna Komnene, who lived in the private apartments of her mother’s monastic foundation after 1119, could have access to imperial documents. J. Howard-Johnston pointed out that it was Nikephoros Bryennios, Anna’s husband, who assembled the materials and made a draft of the Alexias: Howard-Johnston, Anna Komnene and the Alexiad, 260-302. Recent studies have argued against his thesis. I also do not share his opinion: Inoue, Alexias of Anna Komnene, 87-113 (in Japanese).
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ИСТОРИЈСКА МЕТОДОЛОГИЈА АНЕ КОМНИНЕ: СТУДИЈА СЛУЧАЈА ТРЕЋЕГ ПОГЛАВЉА XII КЊИГЕ АЛЕКСИЈАДЕ

У раду се разматра редакторски поступак Ане Комнине у трећем поглављу XII књиге Алексијаде, и поново процењује њена историјска методологија. Истражују се два датума с краја одељка XII.3.1, који су несагласни: индикт не одговара години владавине. Истраживање је довело до следећих закључака: Ана је саставила поглавље XII.3 користећи релевантне изvore, званична писма Алексија I и дворски дневник; оба датума потичу из веродостојних царских докумената које је она користила; нескладност између њих, која се обично посматра као грешка коју је начинила Ана, последица је редакторског рада на тексту после њене смрти. Онолико колико се може рећи на основу поглавља XII.3, њен метод историјске композиције је потпуно јасан, што сведочи о томе да је Алексијада веродостојан историјски извор.