

VLADA STANKOVIĆ / BELGRADE

## WHEN WAS THEOPHYLAKTOS LAKAPENOS BORN?

More than thirty years ago, Paul Lemerle emphasized that many of the mistakes modern Byzantology makes are due to the wrong information in the Byzantine sources themselves, which are not examined carefully enough.<sup>1</sup> One of the clearest cases of that pattern could be the example of John Scylitzes' remark concerning the age of the patriarch, Theophylaktos Lakapenos (933–956). It might seem difficult, or even absurd, to dispute the explicit data of a Byzantine historian, but the situation with Scylitzes' Σύνοψις ἱστοριῶν is somewhat specific. His text is full of *unique* information – regardless of whether it is correct or not – which cannot be compared with the data from other Byzantine writers. It is not only the issue of the additions to the main body of Scylitzes' text that presents a problem.<sup>2</sup> The question of Scylitzes' sources is a very complex one, and even though the research of his sources is not the main goal of the present study, that problem should be noted, as a need to examine almost every single item of information in his History with caution.<sup>3</sup> In this particular case, we will try to demonstrate not only that Scylitzes made a mistake concerning Theophylaktos' age, which could be ascribed to a simple error during the process of writing, but also that some of his information in the story about the Theophylaktos' χειροτονία are so utterly wrong that they must indicate some deeper confusion either in the sources which he had used, or in his compilation of them.

---

<sup>1</sup> P. LEMERLE, Cinq études sur le XI<sup>ème</sup> siècle byzantin. Paris 1977, 263; 313.

<sup>2</sup> Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis historiarum, ed. I. THURN [*CFHB* 5]. Berlin–New York 1973 (= Scylitzes) 17, 74 sq; 208, 40–43; 226, 29 sq; 244, 89 sq; 245, 21–26; 311, 74 sq; 340, 4 sq; 400, 29–31; 416, 58 sq., are just some examples of Scylitzes' unique data, for which an earlier source cannot be established. Cf. B. PROKIĆ, Die Zusätze in der Handschrift des Johannes Scylitzes codex Vindobonensis hist. gr. LXXXIV, Phil. Diss. München 1906, and Scylitzes, ed. THURN, XXIX–XXXIV.

<sup>3</sup> J. SHEPARD, A suspected source of Scylitzes' Synopsis Historion: the great Catacalon Cecaumenus. *BMGs* 16 (1992) 171–181. Cf. V. STANKOVIĆ, Novelisim Konstantin, Mihailo V i rod Paflagonaca. *ZRVI* 40 (2003) 31–33, and there note 23.

In his summarized commentary on Theophylaktos' death (February 27, 956), and in retrospective his consecration, and his rule and behavior in the church of Constantinople, Scylitzes gives the explicit information about the late patriarch's age. He says: "... in that way ended his life Theophylaktos the patriarch, (...), who was 16 years when he uncanonically took the helm of the church ...".<sup>4</sup> John Zonaras and Michael Glykas, who state the same about Theophylaktos' age, took their information from Scylitzes' History.<sup>5</sup> John Scylitzes' statement that Theophylaktos Lakapenos was 16 years old when consecrated as the patriarch of Constantinople on February 2, 933 is the only explicit information about his age in Byzantine *historical texts*. The complete concurrence of all the manuscripts of Scylitzes' History could easily lead to the conclusion that his information was correct, and although it is not possible to establish his particular source in this case – since not one *History* from the 10th century gives Theophylaktos' precise age – one may assume that Romanos I's son was 16 at the time of his χειροτονία. And actually, Scylitzes' story is almost unanimously accepted – from Runciman's *Romanus Lecapenus*, and Ostrogorsky's classical *History of Byzantium*, until the latest and highly valuable study about the Lakapenos family and relations within it, written by O. Kresten and A. Müller.<sup>6</sup> The only exemption, to my knowledge, is the footnote observation of J. Darrouzès and L. Westerink in their edition of the Letters of Theodore Daphnopates, in which they state that Scylitzes' information about Theophylaktos being 16 when consecrated as patriarch must be wrong, bearing in mind Daphnopates' remarks.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Scylitzes, 242, 47 sq.

<sup>5</sup> Ioannis Zonarae Epitome historiarum, tomus III, ed. Th. BÜTTNER-WOBST [*CSHB*]. Bonn 1897 (= Zonaras), 458, 13–14. Michaelis Glycae Annales, ed. I. BEKKER [*CSHB*]. Bonn 1836, 562.

<sup>6</sup> S. RUNCIMAN, *The Emperor Romanus Lecapenus and His Reign*. Cambridge 1929, 64; 67; 75–77. G. OSTROGORSKY, *Geschichte des byzantinischen Staates*. München <sup>3</sup>1963, 226. O. KRESTEN – A. MÜLLER, *Samtherrschaft, Legitimationsprinzip und kaiserlicher Urkundentitel in Byzanz in der ersten Hälfte des 10. Jahrhunderts*. Wien 1995, 17; 49 sq; 59, and note 200; 81. I am very grateful to Professor Otto Kresten, Vienna, for his help, and precious remarks he made on several points in this paper, and also for kindly sharing with me his personal scientific correspondence, concerning the subject of this article.

<sup>7</sup> Théodore Daphnopatès Lettres, edd. J. DARROUZÈS – L. G. WESTERINK. Paris 1978 (= Daphnopatès), 48–49. Cf. et ibidem 12, where the authors suggested that Theophylaktos was born between September 14, 913 and April 14, 914. Daphnopates' information served to me as proof that John Scylitzes made a mistake – in his case not so unusual – concerning Theophylaktos' age, unfortunately not being able at the

If we do accept John Scylitzes' information, it would mean that Theophylaktos was born in 917 (since he was 16 in 933) and that he was at least 15 years old in 932. In that case, however, the whole story about the forced resignation of his predecessor, Patriarch Tryphon,<sup>8</sup> in August 931 would lose its meaning and significance, if the earliest possible date when Theophylaktos could become the patriarch would have fallen in the year 932. And more than just that, Daphnopates' mention of the metropolitans' subsequent decisions that Romanos I's son could become patriarch at the age of 18 or 19, would also become meaningless – if Theophylaktos was born in 917 he would have reached the age of 18 as late as 935 – and at that time he had already been patriarch for two years!

Apart from Scylitzes' History, which was written more than a century after the actual events,<sup>9</sup> we have the official and contemporaneous correspondence of Theodore Daphnopates, or, more precisely, the correspondence of the emperor Romanos Lakapenos himself, written by Theodore Daphnopates. The emperor's letters to the metropolitans of the Byzantine church (Ep. 3, which is actually the emperor's προσφώνησις to the metropolitans),<sup>10</sup> and to the metropolitan of Herakleia, Anastasios, specifically (Ep. 2), contain the sole explicit mention of Theophylaktos' age. Anastasios was very important for the act of χειροτονία. As the metropolitan of Herakleia (under whose jurisdiction the Capital itself was long ago), he had to perform the consecration of the patriarch of Constantinople.<sup>11</sup> The accuracy of the letters written by Daphnopates when it comes to the question of Theophylaktos' consecration should not be doubted – they depict and witness the process of the negotiation between the emperor, Romanos Lakapenos, and the metropolitans of the church of Constantinople. The main facts about Theophylaktos' age that can be deduced from his father's letters are as follows:

The metropolitans had promised to the emperor Romanos I Lakapenos that they would consecrate his son, Theophylaktos,<sup>12</sup> but they kept moving

---

time to obtain and consult the already mentioned book by Kresten and Müller, cf. V. STANKOVIĆ, *Carigradski patrijarsi i carevi Makedonske dinastije*. Beograd 2003 (= Carigradski patrijarsi), 114 sq.

<sup>8</sup> See *infra*.

<sup>9</sup> W. SEIBT, Ioannes Skylitzes. Zur Person des Chronisten. *JÖB* 25 (1976) 81–85.

<sup>10</sup> Προσφώνησις ὀρθοῖσα πρὸς τοὺς μητροπολίτας ἐκ προστάξεως τοῦ βασιλέως, Daphnopatès, Ep. 3/ 49.

<sup>11</sup> Although he was not absolutely indispensable for the act of consecration: the emperor, Constantine VII, proceeded with χειροτονία of Polyuktos without the metropolitan of Herakleia, Nikephoros, since he was “angry with him”, Scylitzes 244; Zonaras, 486.

<sup>12</sup> Who is constantly referred to as θεοφύλεστατος σύγγελος, cf. De cerimoniis aulae byzantinae, ed. Io. REISKE [*CSHB*]. Bonn 1829, 635, 10–11.

up the potential age at which Romanos' son could be appointed. First, they had agreed that it would be at 15, then at 18, and finally, at 19 years – but even then they were reluctant to perform the ceremony, and kept changing their minds. It is very important that Daphnopates (i.e. Romanos Lakapenos) mentions *different decisions* concerning the suitable age for Theophylaktos' patriarchal consecration, reached at different times, during the rule of at least two patriarchs (Ep. 2/ 49, 90; Ep. 3/ 49, 10). The late patriarchs who were not explicitly named could only have been Nicholas I Mystikos (901–907; 912–15. May 925) and Stephanos II, who died on July 15 (or 18) 928, as Kresten and Müller have recently proved.<sup>13</sup> It is not clear whether some official *synod* was convened.<sup>14</sup> Daphnopates says simply that “the late patriarchs and metropolitans themselves” resolved (Ep. 2/ 49), or that “all metropolitans came together”, and made the decision about the consecration of Theophylaktos, “some having in mind the *canons* (sc. laws), others deciding by *οἰκονομία*” (Ep. 2/ lines 66–68), which means that they accepted the emperor's will, in the desire to avoid divisions within the church, or escape conflict with Romanos Lakapenos. Arethas, the metropolitan of Caesareia of Cappadocia, and the *πρωτόθρονος* of the Byzantine church, wrote about the decision that was not written, and which was in favor of the patriarch's right to select his own successor, although his narration is intentionally not exact enough.<sup>15</sup>

The emperor, Romanos Lakapenos, had determined the destiny of his eunuch son much earlier. During the last years of the patriarchate and life of Nicholas Mystikos, it was established that Theophylaktos would eventually become patriarch. On Christmas Day in 924, the patriarch, Nicholas Mystikos, made him *σύγκελλος*, in that way confirming that he was predestined for the highest spiritual office.<sup>16</sup> The death of the patriarch, Nicholas Mystikos, on May 15, 925, left Romanos Lakapenos without a reliable friend and associate. The rule of Stephanos II as patriarch lasted only three years, and although he too was on good terms with the emperor Romanos Lakapenos, it was only after his death that the question of Theophylaktos' *χειροτονία* gained its full significance.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>13</sup> KRESTEN – MÜLLER, op. cit. Exkurs IV, 57–65.

<sup>14</sup> As DARROUZÈS and WESTERINK thought, Daphnopatès, 12.

<sup>15</sup> Arethae Scripta Minora I, ed. L. G. WESTERINK. Leipzig 1968, No. 37, 290–293, here 292, 25.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. V. STANKOVIĆ, Carigradski patrijarsi, 113 sq.

<sup>17</sup> Stephanos II performed the wedding of Maria (Eirene) Lakapenos – granddaughter of the emperor Romanos I and daughter of his eldest son and favorite, Christophoros – and Peter, son of the Bulgarian ruler Symeon. The marriage brought with it a

One can only speculate what happened in the course of the five months that followed after Stephanos II's death. Although it is not unusual for the patriarchal throne to be vacant even for a longer period, the strange atmosphere that surrounded the consecration of his successor Tryphon – compared with information from Daphnopates' epistles – could provide a plausible answer to the question of Theophylaktos' age.

As we already saw, the metropolitans made various decisions, at different times, about the appropriate age for consecration. In both the Ep. 2. and Ep. 3, Daphnopates mentions that – obviously the first decision – allowed χειροτονία at the age of 15. In the Ep. 3, which is the emperor's address (προσφώνησις) to the metropolitans, Romanos Lakapenos repeats their earlier promises to consecrate Theophylaktos – first at the age of 15; then 18; after that 19, at which age they allowed his ordination to the priesthood, but also consecration as patriarch. And in spite of their solemn promises, *that (sc. Theophylaktos' consecration) did not happen* (τοῦτο οὐ γέγονεν). The conclusion is evident – Theophylaktos was not consecrated as the patriarch of Constantinople even in his 19th year.<sup>18</sup> In their translation of this particular segment, Darrouzès and Westerink omitted the crucial mention of the 19th year – after *la dix-huitième* should be added *puis la dix-neuvième*, and then *au cours de laquelle*, which is a reference to the 19th, and not the 18th year.<sup>19</sup> The only trouble is Daphnopates' use of cardinal and serial numbers: we cannot be sure whether he meant that Theophylaktos was in his 19th year (which actually means that he was 18 years old), or that he already was 19, and still expecting and waiting for χειροτονία. In any case, from the evidence of Ep. 3/ 49, 10- 51, 15, it is clear that Theophylaktos certainly was at least 18, maybe even 19 years old at the time it was written. In the Ep. 2/ lines 66–72, we find some more precise information: the metropolitans agreed that on the Day of the Exaltation of the Cross (September 14), Theophylaktos should be ordained a priest; and during the *Holy Days, or at Easter*, he should be installed as patriarch. And the reason is given: if some of the metropolitans hesitated to accept his consecration in the 19th year, in his 20th year they would most certainly consecrate him as patriarch. As Darrouzès and Westerink noted, the *Holy*

---

political alliance as well, and Romanos Lakapenos in that way also exalted and established the position of his own family, see A. STAVRIDOU-ZAFRAKA, 'Ο ἀνόνημος λόγος ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν Βουλγάρων συμβάσει. *BYZANTINA* 8 (1976) 343–407; I. DUJCEV, On the Treaty of 927 with the Bulgarians. *DOP* 32 (1978) 219–295.

<sup>18</sup> For Daphnopates' use of serial and cardinal numbers see *infra*.

<sup>19</sup> Daphnopatès, text 49,10–51,15; translation 48. This means that Ep. 3, but also the Ep. 2, were written after September 14, 932.

*Days* represent without doubt the period from Christmas until Epiphany, i.e. from December 25 until January 6, and in 933 Easter was on April 14. That indicates that Theophylaktos must have been born some time between 14 September and 14 April – or even more precisely, since his investiture was allowed already on Christmas<sup>20</sup> – **between September 14 and December 25**. Daphnopates' careless use of cardinal and serial numbers makes it impossible for us to conclude definitively only from his letters whether Theophylaktos was 20 years old when invested as the patriarch on February 2, 933, or in his 20th year. In the first case, he would have been born some time between September 14 and December 24, 912, in the second, which we hope to prove correct, between **September 14 and December 25, 913**.

In an attempt to deduce the real meaning of Daphnopates' numbers, and thus to establish with more certainty the year of Theophylaktos' birth, we must turn to the external evidence concerning the χειροτονία of Romanos I's son, and the problems surrounding it.

**15 years.** The first decision allowed the consecration of the emperor's son at the age of 15. The answer to the question of precisely when could that decision have been reached, must be sought in the circumstances inside the church, which allowed or even required that sort of deliberation. It seems highly unlikely that such a pronouncement was needed or even possible during the lifetime of the patriarch Stephanos II from Amaseia, who was in many ways the associate of the emperor Romanos I. Quite the opposite, all the elements indicate that only after his death, and that is to say, almost immediately after Stephanos II had died, Romanos Lakapenos negotiated with the metropolitans of the Byzantine church, the terms on which his son's consecration would be allowed. The very first indicator of that process inside the church was the vacancy of the patriarchal throne for five months: from July 15/ 18 until December 14, 928. It was the first significant period, after the iconoclasm, in which the Church of Constantinople was *widowed* (χηρεύουσα ἐκκλησία),<sup>21</sup> and that must suggest that it was the intentional choice of the emperor himself, who was awaiting the answer of the metropolitans.<sup>22</sup> The second ele-

<sup>20</sup> I do not see that it is possible to understand Daphnopates' text differently – but to conclude that Theophylaktos became a year older after September 14 and before the *Holy Days* – which must be understood as beginning with Christmas.

<sup>21</sup> Daphnopatēs, Ep. 2/ 49, 94–95: ἀνάξιον δὲ καὶ παρὰ κανόνα τὸ χηρεύειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν...

<sup>22</sup> V. STANKOVIĆ, Carigradski patrijarsi, the chapter: Udovištvo crkve i odnos cara prema patrijarhu, 263–267.

ment is the already mentioned letter of Arethas, in which the learned metropolitan of Caesareia tried to persuade Gregory of Ephesus, who held the second rank in the Byzantine church, using apostolic examples, that patriarchs had the right to nominate their successors during their lifetime. In other words, Arethas defended Theophylaktos' right to the patriarchal throne, since he was *prepared and trained* for that position by the late patriarch, Stephanos II. The question of Theophylaktos' (non) *canonical* age for the consecration was not even mentioned in Arethas' letter, which means that it must be dated in the first phase of the quarrel between the emperor and some of the Byzantine metropolitans.

**18 years.** But in the course of five months, between the death of Stephanos II and the consecration of the new patriarch Tryphon, agreement within the Byzantine church on the subject of Theophylaktos' χειροτονία could not be reached. It seems that the metropolitans (at least some of them) had changed their minds, and altered their previous decision according to which Theophylaktos could be appointed at 15 years. Now, they set a new boundary for his consecration at 18 years. Although this could only be inferred from indirect information, the emperor's acquiescence to appoint another patriarch, and the circumstances surrounding Tryphon's consecration indicate clearly enough that some kind of agreement was eventually reached between Romanos Lakapenos and the Byzantine metropolitans. John Scylitzes, followed by Zonaras, but also different variants of Pseudo-Symeon, convey the story about Tryphon's *temporary* consecration as the patriarch. According to their reports, the renowned monk, Tryphon, agreed (which means that the metropolitans, who opposed the intentions of Romanos I had also consented) to be the patriarch of Constantinople only until Theophylaktos Lakapenos reached the appropriate age for that office, which was evidently earlier fixed at 18 years.<sup>23</sup> That implies that the emperor, Romanos Lakapenos, succeeded in reaching an agreement with the metropolitans, a compromise that was at the time satisfactory for him, assuring Theophylaktos' ordination in three years time.

To summarize: after the death of Stephanos II on July 15/18, 928, the Byzantine metropolitans first decided that Theophylaktos could be installed as the patriarch at 15 years,<sup>24</sup> but shortly after that decision, they

---

<sup>23</sup> Symeonis Magistri Annales, ed. I. BEKKER [*CSHB*]. Bonn 1838, 742; Georgii Monachi Vitae imperatorum recentiorum, ed. I. BEKKER [*CSHB*]. Bonn 1838, 908; Leonis Grammatici Chronographia, ed. I. BEKKER [*CSHB*]. Bonn 1842, 318; Theodosii Meliteni qui fertur Chronographia, ed. T. L. F. TAFEL. München 1859, 227; Scylitzes, 225; Zonaras, 475.

<sup>24</sup> Which meant soon after the death of Stephanos II's since Theophylaktos turned 15 some time between September 14 and December 25, 928.

changed their minds and postponed his consecration for another three years, until Theophylaktos was 18 years old. In the meantime, Tryphon was appointed as the patriarch of Constantinople, himself aware of, and in accord with the predetermined temporary nature of his position.

Even before three years of Tryphon's patriarchate elapsed, the emperor, Romanos Lakapenos, forced him to step down, in August 931, eager to finally install his own son, Theophylaktos, as the patriarch of Constantinople. That clearly confirms that Theophylaktos was reaching the agreed age suitable for consecration, which had been fixed at 18 years. And if our conclusion that Theophylaktos was born some time between September 14 and December 25 is correct, the only year that conforms to all indications is **913**. Theophylaktos would thus have turned 15 between September 14 and December 25, 928 – in the period when Romanos I negotiated with the highest circles of the Byzantine church his *χειροτονία* at 15 years; and only thus would Romanos Lakapenos' decision to force Tryphon's resignation make sense – if he was preparing to proceed with Theophylaktos' planned consecration at 18 years, i.e. between September 14 and December 25, 931.

In August 931, Romanos Lakapenos forced the resignation of the patriarch, Tryphon, planning to carry on with Theophylaktos' *χειροτονία*, since he was turning eighteen between September 14 and December 25, that year, 931, probably closer to the first date than the second. In spite of the previous accord, some metropolitans refused to consent to the emperor's wishes. It seems that they again moved the age limit for *χειροτονία* at 19, having in mind the example of the patriarch, Stephanos I (the Macedonian), son of the emperor, Basil I, who was consecrated at that age.<sup>25</sup> It meant the prolongation of the whole process by yet another year. The opposed metropolitans, of whom Anastasios of Herakleia is best known, proposed the installation of yet another temporary patriarch, but the emperor refused. Theophylaktos' unsuitable age was allegedly Anastasios' only reason for opposition, and we cannot exactly discern all the elements of his rejection to accept Theophylaktos' consecration.<sup>26</sup> The political background of Anastasios' refusal, and the divisions within the church of Constantinople become much more evident in the

<sup>25</sup> Daphnopatès. Ep. 2/ 45–49. Cf. Ch. ANGELIDI, 'Ο Βίος τοῦ ὁσίου Βασιλείου τοῦ Νέου. Ioannina 1980, 112 sq.

<sup>26</sup> His only public reason, that is, since he was evidently connected with the expelled patriarch Tryphon, by whom he had been ordained. Cf. J. DARROUZÈS, Documents inédits d'ecclésiologie byzantine. Paris 1970, 174, and note 1, about Anastasios' possible later position as one of the *pedagogues* of Theophylaktos Lakapenos!



emperor Romanos' letter: Anastasios was the *partisan* of those metropolitans, who accepted the fourth marriage of the emperor, Leon VI. And since Anastasios insisted that his refusal was based *only* on strict adherence to the canonical rules, the emperor "reminded" him – with an evident, although subdued threat – that he was ordained by Tryphon, who himself became a monk many years before the prescribed canonical age for consecration, and that, consequently, Anastasios' own χειροτονία was not completely canonical.<sup>27</sup>

The emperor, Romanos Lakapenos, eventually lost patience, and, exhausted by the constant resistance within the Byzantine church, decided to proceed with Theophylaktos' consecration, with the help of the Roman church, Pope John XI and his legates. Unable to secure the acquiescence of the highest ranking Byzantine metropolitans – like Anastasios of Herakleia – who once again contradicted their previous decision that Theophylaktos would be ordained as a priest on the September 14, 932 and then, finally, consecrated as the patriarch between Christmas 932 and Easter 933, he ceased the negotiations and asked for, and received, Roman help, thus ending *the affair* of his son's χειροτονία.<sup>28</sup> The measure of the importance that papal intervention had become evident from the emphasis in Byzantine historical texts from the 10th century. Their common impression was that the Roman legates *decided* that Theophylaktos Lakapenos should become the patriarch.<sup>29</sup>

#### ADDITION

##### John Scylitzes' *Theophanes ho Kaisareias*

In the story about the overthrow of the patriarch, Tryphon, in August 931, John Scylitzes names one person, who helped the emperor, Romanos Lakapenos, the most, in securing, by a ruse, the resignation of the reluctant patriarch. Scylitzes says that it was ὁ Καισαρείας Θεοφάνης, ὃν δὴ καὶ Χοιρινὸν ἐκάλουν<sup>30</sup>, whose urge to help the emperor in the end cunningly led to Tryphon's resignation, thus opening the way for Theophylaktos'

<sup>27</sup> Daphnopatès, Ep. 2/ 43, 26–30.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Ibidem, Ep. 1.

<sup>29</sup> Theophanes Continuatus, ed. I. BEKKER [*CSHB*], Bonn 1838, 422, 3–9; Sym. Mag. 745, 15–19; Georg. Mon. Cont. 913, 1–5; Leon. Gr. 322, 8–12; Theod. Melit. 230–231 (all as in note 23).

<sup>30</sup> Scylitzes 226, 30 et sq.

consecration. And once again, like in the case of Scylitzes' information about Theophylaktos' age, the concordance of all the manuscripts of his work, and the historian's detailed and lively account, led scholars to accept his data. With Scylitzes' story accepted it was natural to conclude that some Theophanes, nicknamed Χοιρινός for his bad (piggish) morals and character, was the archbishop of Caesareia in the time around August 931.<sup>31</sup> All other writers from the 10th century, but even later ones do not name the archbishop of Caesareia, who helped Romanos Lakapenos in dealing with the patriarch, Tryphon – most of them just say ὁ Καισαρείας.<sup>32</sup> Fortunately enough, we have explicit proof that John Scylitzes made a mistake in this particular place in his Σύνοψις ἱστοριῶν, and in this specific nomination of the πρωτόθρονος of the Byzantine church. At the end of the manuscript (earlier known as Moscow – Dresden) now in Moscow (GIM VI 231 [394]) written for Arethas, the archbishop of Caesareia, there is the note by the hand of its writer, deacon Stylianos: Στυλιανὸς διάκονος ἔγραψα Ἀρέθα ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ Καισαρείας Καππαδοκίας ἔτει κόσμου ̅Ϛ̅ῠῢ ἰνδικτιῶνος πέμπτῃς μηνὶ ἀπριλίῳ συμπληρωθέντος τοῦ τεύχους.<sup>33</sup> That note is unequivocal confirmation that Arethas was still the archbishop of Caesareia in April 932, which means that he must have held that position during the overthrow of the patriarch, Tryphon, from office in August 931. And, indeed, that complies perfectly with everything we know about Arethas' attitude toward the consecration of Theophylaktos Lakapenos, which was evident enough at the very beginning of this *affair*, not long

<sup>31</sup> Cf. e.g. Byzanz – wieder ein Weltreich. Das Zeitalter der makedonischen Dynastie. Teil I. Nach dem Geschichtswerk des Johannes Skylitzes übersetzt, eingeleitet und erklärt von H. THURN [*Byzantinische Geschichtsschreiber* 15]. Graz–Wien–Köln 1983, p. 307. KRESTEN – MÜLLER, op. cit., 63, note 218. In the poems of Christophoros Mitylenaios occurs also some Basileios nicknamed Χοιρινός. Die Gedichte des Christophoros Mitylenaios, ed. E. KURTZ. Leipzig 1903, no. 84, 53–54.

<sup>32</sup> Sym. Mag. 742–745; Georg. Mon. Cont. 911–912; Leon. Gr. 321 (all as in note 23); Zonaras, 475–476 (475, 16). The explicit naming of Caesareia as the seat of a metropolitan involved in the overthrow of the patriarch, Tryphon, makes it more difficult to search for some Theophanes, (who would in that case, have held some other metropolitan's seat) as a person who managed to secure the patriarch's resignation.

<sup>33</sup> Clearly readable from the photograph in K. and S. LAKE, Dated Greek Minuscule Manuscripts to the Year 1200. VI. Manuscripts in Moscow and Leningrad, Boston, Massachusetts [*The American Academy of Arts and Sciences*] 1936, Pl. 384 (Cod. 231 (394)). Cf. P. LEMERLE, Le premier humanisme byzantin, Paris 1971, 229–230. L. PERRIA, *Arethae* II. Impaginazione e scrittura nei codici di Areta. *RBSN N. S.* 27 (1990) 55–89, here 58 and 66.

after Stephanos II's death in July 928. Arethas, for some reason, was the biggest supporter of the emperor's wish to consecrate Theophylaktos as soon as possible. He actively campaigned for the emperor's cause, and it seems quite possible that he even outsmarted the patriarch, Tryphon, and managed to secure his resignation. Arethas was the main defender of the emperor's will inside the church, and his strongest ally among the metropolitans. His conduct toward the whole problem of Theophylaktos' χειροτονία adds one small detail to the picturesque character of this scholar and metropolitan. It also poses a dilemma, whether it would be possible to see his personal ambition guiding his acts, since he would, as a πρωτόθρονος, take charge of the Byzantine church, once the patriarch's seat would become vacant.<sup>34</sup>

To provide an answer to the question of what John Scylitzes' source was seems to me impossible at present. Maybe, we shall be able to be more specific after the new critical editions of the Byzantine writers from the 10th century, and especially after the completion of the study of all the different manuscript traditions and variants of Pseudo-Symeon. The other possibility, that this is an early example of the later very common practice of naming someone as X ὁ τοῦ Y, which would suggest that Theophanes Χοιρινός was a nephew, cousin, οἰκεῖος, of Arethas, must be ruled out, since the manuscript tradition gives no indication that the article τοῦ was omitted from Scylitzes' text.

---

<sup>34</sup> I owe this suggestion to Professor Otto Kresten, Vienna, as well as thanks for his help in finding the photograph of Stylianos' note and its reading.

