

# East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages, 450–1450

*General Editor*

Florin Curta and Dušan Zupka

VOLUME 50

The titles published in this series are listed at [brill.com/ecee](http://brill.com/ecee)

# Migration, Integration and Connectivity on the Southeastern Frontier of the Carolingian Empire

*Edited by*

Danijel Dzino  
Ante Milošević  
Trpimir Vedriš



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Cover illustration: The Tetgis belt buckle from the *castrum* in Gornji Vrbljani, Zemaljski muzej Bosne i Hercegovine, Sarajevo. ©Photograph by Antun Z. Alajbeg.

#### Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Dzino, Danijel, editor. | Milošević, Ante, editor. |  
Vedriš, Trpimir, editor.

Title: Migration, Integration and Connectivity on the Southeastern Frontier  
of the Carolingian Empire / Edited by Danijel Dzino, Ante Milosevic,  
Trpimir Vedris.

Description: Leiden ; Boston : Brill, 2018. | Series: East central and  
eastern Europe in the middle ages, 450-1450, ISSN 1872-8103 ; Volume 50 |  
Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2018030758 (print) | LCCN 2018037515 (ebook) |  
ISBN 9789004380134 (Ebook) | ISBN 9789004349483 (hardback : alk. paper)

Subjects: LCSH: Croatia—History—To 1102. | Carolingians—History. |  
Dalmatians—History—To 1500.

Classification: LCC DR1548 (ebook) | LCC DR1548 .M54 2018 (print) |  
DDC 949.72/01—dc23

LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2018030758>

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: "Brill". See and download: [brill.com/brill-typeface](http://brill.com/brill-typeface).

ISSN 1872-8103

ISBN 978-90-04-34948-3 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-38013-4 (e-book)

Copyright 2018 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Hes & De Graaf, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Rodopi,  
Brill Sense, Hoter Publishing, mentis Verlag, Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh and Wilhelm Fink Verlag.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system,  
or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise,  
without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided  
that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910,  
Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

# Contents

Preface	IX
List of Figures and Tables	x
List of Abbreviations	XIII
Notes on Contributors	xv

- 1 A View from the Carolingian Frontier Zone 1  
*Danijel Dzino, Ante Milošević and Trpimir Vedriš*

## PART 1

### *Historiography*

- 2 From Byzantium to the West: “Croats and Carolingians” as a Paradigm-Change in the Research of Early Medieval Dalmatia 17  
*Danijel Dzino*
- 3 Carolingian Renaissance or Renaissance of the 9th Century on the Eastern Adriatic? 32  
*Neven Budak*

## PART 2

### *Migrations*

- 4 Migration or Transformation: The Roots of the Early Medieval Croatian Polity 43  
*Mladen Ančić*
- 5 The Products of the “Tetgis Style” from the Eastern Adriatic Hinterland 63  
*Ante Milošević*
- 6 Carolingian Weapons and the Problem of Croat Migration and Ethnogenesis 86  
*Goran Bilogrivić*

**PART 3*****Integration***

- 7 Integration on the Fringes of the Frankish Empire: The Case of the Carantanians and their Neighbours 103  
*Peter Štih*
- 8 Istria under the Carolingian Rule 123  
*Miljenko Jurković*
- 9 The Collapse and Integration into the Empire: Carolingian-Age Lower Pannonia in the Material Record 153  
*Krešimir Filipec*
- 10 *Imperium* and *Regnum* in Gottschalk's Description of Dalmatia 170  
*Ivan Basić*

**PART 4*****Networks***

- 11 *Liber Methodius* between the Byzantium and the West: Traces of the Oldest Slavonic Legal Collection in Medieval Croatia 213  
*Marko Petrak*
- 12 The Installation of the Patron Saints of Zadar as a Result of Carolingian Adriatic Politics 225  
*Nikola Jakšić*
- 13 Church, Churchyard, and Children in the Early Medieval Balkans: A Comparative Perspective 245  
*Florin Curta*
- 14 Trade and Culture Process at a 9th-Century Mediterranean Monastic Statelet: San Vincenzo al Volturno 268  
*Richard Hodges*

Afterword: “Croats and Carolingians”: Triumph of a New Historiographic  
Paradigm or Ideologically Charged Project? 287

*Trpimir Vedriš*

Bibliography 299

Index 359

## Preface

Most of the papers in this book were originally presented at the International conference “Croats and Carolingians – revisited: Fifteen years later”, as a part of the “Gunjača Days” conference series (*Gunjačini dani* 4). The conference was convened by Dr Ante Milošević, financially supported by the Croatian Ministry of Culture and organized by the Museum of Croatian Archaeological Monuments in Split on 17 and 18 September 2015. In addition to judiciously selected papers from this conference, additional articles were commissioned from Marko Petrak and Richard Hodges, in order to give the volume a more rounded approach to the field.

Preparation of this volume was long and arduous, and the editors would like to express gratitude to several people and institutions. First, our gratitude goes to all contributors to this volume, whose remarkably cooperative approach to the process of editorial revisions immensely eased the process. English editing of the text was carried out voluntarily by two Macquarie University Ancient History students: James Woodward and Caitlin Lawler. Both of them have done outstanding work, taking time from their busy study schedules to help bring the volume up to the highest standards of academic English. Our gratitude also goes to our institutions (Macquarie University, the Museum of Croatian Archaeological Monuments, and the University of Zagreb), and Danijel Dzino would like to acknowledge also the financial support of the Macquarie University Faculty of Arts, which facilitated his participation in the conference by awarding him a Faculty Travel Grant. Our gratitude goes to anonymous peer-referees and supporting people from Brill Academic Publishers – especially Marcella Mulder, Elisa Perotti, and Ester Lels whose help was an invaluable contribution to the preparation of this volume.

# Figures and Tables

## Figures

- 5.1 Gilded belt set from the round turret in Mogorjelo 75
- 5.2 Gilded belt strap discovered near the round turret in Mogorjelo 75
- 5.3 The strap-end with zoomorphic ornaments from Medvedička (Novo Virje – south of the river Drava in Pannonia) 76
- 5.4 Bronze gilded strap-end decorated with zoomorphic motives, and decorated belt-strap with quadrilateral rosette from Sipar near Novigrad/Cittanova 77
- 5.5 Circular shield-shaped bronze fibula, also from Sipar with partly preserved blue, green and red Champlevé enamel 77
- 5.6 The Tetgis belt buckle from the *castrum* in Gornji Vrbljani 78
- 5.7 Map of localities with finds of metal artefacts and stone sculptures with zoomorphic ornaments in ‘Tetgis style’ 79
- 5.8 The comparative drawings of the ornaments and letters from the Vrbljani belt-strap and Tassilo’s Chalice 80
- 5.9 The Censer from Cetina 80
- 5.10 Bronze shield boss from a round shield found in Breza near Sarajevo 81
- 5.11 Warriors with round shields and Carolingian weapons on fragments of altar screen from Pridraga, near Zadar 82
- 5.12 The building from Breza, so-called Breza II 83
- 5.13 Reliefs from Breza II 84
- 5.14 The drawings of graffiti from the column from Breza II building 85
- 5.15 Bilimišće-Zenica: column capital decorated with bird-headed snakes and the fragments of altar screen. Biskupija-Crkvina: fragment of small column 85
- 8.1 Istria around 800, with the Roman roads, the late antique diocesis, Carolingian churches and settlements 138
- 8.2a Novigrad, crypt, plan 139
- 8.2b Aquileia, crypt, plan 140
- 8.3a Novigrad, ciborium 141
- 8.3b Cividale, ciborium of patriarch Calixto 142
- 8.4 Sv. Lovreč, plan 143
- 8.5 Bale, cadastral plan, 1820 144
- 8.6 Gusan, excavated zone, aerial view 145
- 8.7 Dvigrad, plan 146
- 8.8 Stari Gočan, plan of the excavated area 147



- 8.9 Guran, schematic plan of excavated zones, situation 2012 148
- 8.10 Guran, plan of the northern walls, phases I and II 149
- 8.11 Bale, Santa Maria Alta, reconstruction 150
- 8.12 St Thomas near Rovinj 150
- 8.13 Bale, sarcophagus, 8th century 151
- 8.14 Single nave churches in Istria with three apses 151
- 8.15 Single nave churches in Istria with three apses on the transept 152
- 9.1 Sisak – Late Avar decorative horse brass (phalera) 164
- 9.2 Belišće Zagajci: cremation burials, Grave 5 164
- 9.3 Belišće Zagajci: cremation burials, Grave 22 165
- 9.4 The winged spear from the vicinity of Dugo Selo 166
- 9.5 Stari Perkovci – Debela Šuma – an early medieval elongated-oval structure 167
- 9.6 Stari Perkovci – Debela šuma: fragments sj 022 167
- 9.7 Lobar, ground plan 168
- 9.8 Timber church in Lobar – North side 169
- 13.1 Child burials of the earliest phase of the graveyard around the Church of the Holy Cross (Sv. Križ) in Nin 260
- 13.2 Child burials of the later phase of the graveyard around the Church of the Holy Cross (Sv. Križ) in Nin 261
- 13.3 Child burials within the graveyard around the chapel discovered in the Outer Town of Pliska 262
- 13.4 Child burials inside and outside the chapel discovered in the Outer Town of Pliska 263
- 13.5 Child burials inside the biritual cemetery excavated in Bdinci 264
- 13.6 Child burials inside the biritual cemetery excavated in Kiulevcha 265
- 13.7 Child burials inside the cemetery excavated in Ablanica 266
- 13.8 Child burials inside the cemetery excavated in Mishevsko 267
- 14.1 Map showing the location of San Vincenzo al Volturno, and the location of the Biferno and Volturno valley field surveys 277
- 14.2 A hypothetical plan of San Vincenzo al Volturno in the later 8th century (Phase 3c) 278
- 14.3 Plan of San Vincenzo al Volturno in Phase 4, ca. 800, showing the named buildings in the monastery 279
- 14.4 Plan of San Vincenzo al Volturno in Phase 4, showing the two principal thoroughfares 280
- 14.5 Plan of San Vincenzo al Volturno in Phase 5a1, ca. 830–840 281
- 14.6 Plan of San Vincenzo al Volturno and its borgo in Phase 5a2, ca. 840–850 282
- 14.7 Plan of San Vincenzo al Volturno in Phase 5a2, ca. 840–850 283

- 14.8 A map showing San Vincenzo al Volturno's 9th-century estates in southern Italy 284
- 14.9 The 9th-century stuccoed chapel B in the cave sanctuary of Olevano sul Tusciano 285
- 14.10 An escutcheon for an Irish hanging bowl found in the river Volturno 286

### Tables

- 10.1 Historiography on Gottschalk's account of Dalmatia, 1932–2012 172
- 10.2 Željko Rapanić's interpretation of Gottschalk's account of Dalmatia 174
- 10.3 Selection of documents containing tranpersonal phrases, issued by the Byzantine emperors from the Macedonian dynasty 179
- 10.4 The report of Theodore, bishop of Catania, on the embassy to Rome from 785 194
- 10.5 *Imperium* and *Regnum* in Gottschalk's account of Venetia and Dalmatia 197
- 10.6 The phrases τὸ κράτος and τὸ κράτος ἡμῶν in *De Cerimoniis* 200
- 10.7 The phrases ἡ βασιλεία and ἡ βασιλεία ἡμῶν in *De Cerimoniis* 208

## Abbreviations

<i>AAAd</i>	<i>Antichità Altoadriatiche</i> , Aquileia
<i>AAntHungActa</i>	<i>Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae</i> , Budapest
<i>AnnInstArch</i>	<i>Annales Instituti Archaeologici</i> , Zagreb
AASS	Acta Sanctorum
<i>AP</i>	<i>Arheološki pregled</i> , Belgrade and Ljubljana
<i>ARC</i>	<i>Archaeological Review from Cambridge</i> , Cambridge
<i>ArchAd</i>	<i>Archaeologia Adriatica</i> , Zadar
ARF	Annales regni Francorum
ByzAus	Byzantina Australiensia, Sydney, Canberra, Brisbane, Melbourne
<i>BZ</i>	<i>Byzantinische Zeitschrift</i> , Munich
<i>CroChrPer</i>	<i>Croatica Christiana Periodica</i> , Zagreb
Conc.	Concilia
Const.	Constitutiones
Denkschriften ÖAW	Denkschriften Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Vienna
<i>Diadora</i>	<i>Diadora: Journal of Archeological Museum in Zadar</i> , Zadar
<i>DOP</i>	<i>Dumbarton Oaks Papers</i> , Cambridge Mass
ECEE	East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages, 450–1450, Leiden and Boston
<i>EME</i>	<i>Early Medieval Europe</i> , Harlow UK
Ep.	Epistolae
<i>GGMS</i>	<i>Godišnjak Gradskog muzeja u Sisku</i> , Sisak
HAD	Publications of Croatian Archaeological Society, Zagreb
<i>HAG</i>	<i>Hrvatski arheološki godišnjak</i> , Zagreb
<i>HAM</i>	<i>Hortus Artium Medievalium</i> , Motovun and Zagreb
<i>HZ</i>	<i>Historijski zbornik</i> , Zagreb
JAZU/HAZU	Jugoslavenska/Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti
<i>JÖB</i>	<i>Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik</i> , Vienna
<i>MEFRA</i>	<i>Mélanges de l'École française de Rome</i> , Rome
<i>MemStorFor</i>	<i>Memorie Storiche Forogiuliesi</i> , Udine
MGH	Monumenta Germaniae Historica
MGH Diplomata	MGH Diplomata regum Germaniae ex stirpe Karolinorum
<i>Obavijesti HAD</i>	<i>Obavijesti Hrvatskog arheološkog društva</i> , Zagreb
<i>OpArch</i>	<i>Opuscula Archaeologica</i> , Zagreb
<i>PovPril</i>	<i>Povijesni prilozi</i> , Zagreb
<i>Prilozi</i>	<i>Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu</i> , Zagreb

<i>RÉB</i>	<i>Revue des études byzantines</i> , Leuven
<i>RFFZd</i>	<i>Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u Zadru. Razdio povijesnih znanosti</i> , Zadar
<i>RadoviZHP</i>	<i>Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest</i> , Zagreb
<i>Settimane</i>	<i>Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo</i> , Spoleto
<i>SHP</i>	<i>Starohrvatska prosvjeta</i> (series 3), Split – series 1 and 2 are individually marked in the references
<i>Slovo</i>	<i>Slovo. Časopis Staroslavenskog instituta u Zagrebu</i> , Zagreb
SS	Scriptores
SS rer. Germ.	Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi
<i>Starine</i>	<i>Starine Jugoslavenske/Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti</i> , Zagreb
<i>Travaux et Mémoires</i>	<i>Travaux et Mémoires de Centre de recherche d'histoire et de civilisation de Byzance</i> , Paris
<i>VAHD/VAPD</i>	<i>Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju/povijest dalmatinsku</i> , Split
<i>VAMZ</i>	<i>Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu</i> (series 3), Zagreb
<i>ZČ</i>	<i>Zgodovinski časopis</i> , Ljubljana
<i>ZRVI</i>	<i>Зборник радова Византолошког института</i> , Belgrade

## Notes on Contributors

### *Mladen Ančić*

is Professor of History at the Universities of Zadar and Zagreb. He studied history at Sarajevo and Belgrade, before completing his PhD at the University of Zagreb on the Hungarian-Croatian kingdom and Bosnia in the 14th century, the subject of his 1997 monograph *Putanja klatna: Ugarsko-hrvatsko kraljevstvo i Bosna u XIV. stoljeću* (The path of the pendulum. The Hungarian-Croatian kingdom and Bosnia in 14th century). His other books include a monograph on the medieval city of Jajce, as well as a book on historiography and nationalism *Što "svi znaju" i što je "svima jasno": Historiografija i nacionalizam* (What "everyone knows", and what is "clear to everyone": Historiography and Nationalism) (2008). He is also co-editor of *Imperial spheres and the Adriatic: Byzantium, the Carolingians and the Treaty of Aachen (812)* (2018) with Jonathan Shepard and Trpimir Vedriš.

### *Ivan Basić*

is Senior Lecturer in Medieval History at the University of Split and has taught at the University of Zagreb. He studied history and art history at the University of Zagreb, with a PhD in medieval studies on 'The Poleogenesis of Split at the Turn of Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages', on which he published extensively. His research interests include the late antique and medieval Adriatic, Church history, urban history, historical geography and Early Christian and medieval art. In addition to three co-authored monographs and an edited volume, his works in English include 'Diocletian's villa in Late Antique and Early Medieval Historiography: A Reconsideration' (2014), '*Spalatensia Porphyrogenitiana*. Some Issues Concerning the Textual Transmission of Porphyrogenitus' Sources for the Chapters on Dalmatia in the *De administrando imperio*' (2013), 'New evidence for the re-establishment of the Adriatic dioceses in the late eighth century' (2018), 'Pagan tomb to Christian church: The case of Diocletian's mausoleum in Spalatum' (2017), and '*Dalmatiae, Dalmatiarum*: a study in historical geography of the Adriatic' (2017). He is Head of Chair for Ancient and Medieval History at the Department of History of his faculty, and co-founder and vice president of the Croatian Society for Byzantine Studies.

### *Goran Bilogrivić*

is Senior Lecturer at the University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Studies, Department of History. He graduated archaeology at the University of Zagreb, where he then worked as a research assistant and completed his PhD

in Medieval Studies. He has published a number of papers on various early medieval topics, mostly concerned with weapons, material culture and ethnic identities.

*Neven Budak*

is Professor of Medieval Croatian history at the University of Zagreb, in the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, where he is head of the doctoral programme in medieval sciences. He taught also at the Central European University in Budapest, in the Department of Medieval Studies. His research interests include: early medieval identities, urban history, slavery, early medieval and early modern Croatian history, and the history of historiography. Among his books are: *Prva stoljeća Hrvatske* (The First Centuries of Croatia) (1994); edited collections *Kroatien. Landeskunde – Geschichte – Kultur – Politik – Wirtschaft – Recht* (1995), and *Towns and Communication, vol. I: Communication in Towns* (2010).

*Florin Curta*

is Professor of Medieval History and Archaeology, at the University of Florida, Gainesville. He is a specialist in the history and archaeology of the Middle Ages, with a particular interest in East Central and Eastern Europe between ca. 500 and ca. 1250. He received his PhD from Western Michigan University, and has taught at the University of Florida since 1999, where he is the founding member of the Medieval and Early Modern Studies program. His first book, *The Making of the Slavs* (2001) was named a 2002 Choice Outstanding Academic Title and won the Herbert Baxter Adams Award of the American Historical Association in 2003. He is also the author of *Southeastern Europe in the Middle Ages, 500–1250* (2006) and *The Edinburgh History of the Greeks, c. 500 to 1050. The Early Middle Ages* (2011), and editor of several volumes such as *Neglected Barbarians* (2011), *The Other Europe in the Middle Ages. Avars, Bulgars, Khazars, and Cumans* (2008), and *Borders, Barriers, and Ethnogenesis. Frontiers in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (2005).

*Danijel Dzino*

is a Lecturer at the Departments of Ancient History and International Studies (Croatian Studies) at Macquarie University, Sydney, having obtained his PhD in Classics at the University of Adelaide. His research interests focus on ancient and early medieval Illyricum, particularly the identity transformations undergone by the indigenous population of the region in Roman and post-Roman times. Author of *Becoming Slav, Becoming Croat: Identity Transformations in Post-Roman Dalmatia* (2010), *Illyricum and Roman Politics*

229 BC–AD 68 (2010), and co-author of *Rimski ratovi u Iliriku. Povijesni antinarativ* (Roman Wars in Illyricum. Historical antinarrative) (2013) with Alka Domić-Kunić. Dzino also co-edited, with Ken Parry, *Byzantium, its Neighbors and its Cultures* (2014).

*Krešimir Filipec*

is Professor of Early Medieval Archaeology at the University of Zagreb, with research interests in the archaeology of early medieval Pannonia. In 2004 and 2005 he was a Head of Department for Protection of Cultural Heritage in the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Croatia, from 2009 to 2011 Head of Archaeology at the University of Zagreb, and he is the current Head of the Discipline of Medieval and National Archaeology in the same department. He is the author of numerous scholarly works, including the monograph *Donja Panonija od 9. do 11. stoljeća* (Lower Pannonia from 9th to 11th centuries) (2015).

*Richard Hodges*

is President of the American University of Rome since 2012. In 1976 he was appointed lecturer at Sheffield University and launched excavations and cultural heritage projects at Roystone Grange (Derbyshire), Montarrenti (Tuscany) and San Vincenzo al Volturno (Molise). He was Director of the British School at Rome (1988–95), and became scientific director of the Butrint Foundation to undertake excavations and site management strategies at Butrint (Albania). He was subsequently Director of the Prince of Wales's Institute of Architecture (1996–98), Professor in the School of World Art Studies at the University of East Anglia, Norwich (1998–2017). He served in the Ministry of Culture in Albania (1999), as adviser to (and later, Board member of) the Packard Humanities Institute during the Zeugma (Turkey) excavations (2000–04), and oversaw the making of the Ottoman museum town of Gjirokastra, Albania into a World Heritage Site in 2005. He served as Williams Director of the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology (2007–12). He was also a visiting Professor at SUNY-Binghamton (1983), the University of Siena (1984–87), the University of Copenhagen (1987–88) and the University of Sheffield (2006–08). His most recent books are *The Archaeology of Mediterranean Placemaking* (2016) and *Travels with an Archaeologist* (2017).

*Nikola Jakšić*

is Professor Emeritus at the University of Zadar. He is a specialist in medieval art history and archaeology, with a particular interest in early medieval sculpture, European medieval goldsmithing and Croatian medieval topography. He is the author of over 100 publications including books such as his

most recent one *Klesarstvo u službi evangelizacije* (Sculpture in the Service of Evangelisation) (2016). He was also the editor of the multi-volumed edition “Umjetnička baština zadarske nadbiskupije” (Art Heritage of Zadar Archbishopry).

*Miljenko Jurković*

archaeologist and art historian, is Professor of Late Antique and Early medieval art history at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb. Currently he is Head of the Department of Art History, and Director of the International Research Centre for Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages (from 1993). He is the founder and editor of academic journal *Hortus Artium Medievalium* (1995) and the series *Dissertationes et Monographiae* (2001).

Jurković has organized 30 international conferences, and coordinated numerous international research projects, and published over 200 articles and books. He is the author or co-author of several exhibitions (French Renaissance, 2005; Croatian Renaissance, 2004; Europe in the Time of the Anjou Dynasty, 2001; Croats and Carolingians, 2000). He has been awarded the Strossmayer Award for Scholarly Work (2001) and twice the Medal of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences (2001, 2005). He has received the honors: Officier de l'ordre des palmes académiques (2004), Order of Lomonosov (2007) and Chevalier de l'ordre National du Mérite (2015).

*Ante Milošević*

is the Director of Museum of Croatian National Monuments in Split, and Editor-in-Chief of *Starohrvatska prosvjeta*, leading Croatian peer-refereed journal dealing with medieval archaeology and history. He is the author of numerous articles, book chapters, edited collections, and six monographs that deal with medieval history and archaeology of Dalmatia and Dalmatian hinterland. His most most recent monographs are: *Arheologija Sinjskoga polja* (2018), *Traces of Ancient Beliefs in Early Medieval Christianity* (2013), *Campanilli preromanici della Dalmazia e della Croazia altomedievale* (2011), *La chiesa preromanica di San Salvatore a Cettina* (with Ž. Peković) (2009), *Croci sulle lastre di rivestimento delle tombe altomedievali nell'area di Signa* (2008).

*Marko Petrak*

is Professor of Roman Law at the Law Faculty of the University of Zagreb, with research interests in: *Ius Commune*, Byzantine Law and Roman foundations of contemporary legal systems. He studied law, philosophy and classics at the University of Zagreb, and was a postdoctoral fellow at the Centro di studi e



ricerche sui Diritti Antichi (Pavia/Italy). He is a member of the editorial board of the series Studies in the History of Private Law (Brill/Netherlands), journals *Legal Roots*, *The International Journal of Roman Law*, *Legal History and Comparative Law* (Napoli/Italy) and *Ius Romanum* (Sofia/Bulgaria). Petrak is a peer-reviewer of the European Science Foundation and member of its College of Experts.

*Peter Štih*

is Professor of Medieval History and Auxiliary Historical Sciences at the University of Ljubljana, a Member of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts and a Corresponding Member of the Austrian Academy of Sciences. His research interests include early medieval Slav ethnogenesis and state formation in the eastern Alps. He has published many books and articles on the medieval history of the Alpine-Adriatic region, including *Studien zur Geschichte der Grafen von Görz* (1996) and *The Middle Ages between the Eastern Alps and the Northern Adriatic: Select Papers on Slovene Historiography and Medieval History* (2010).

*Trpimir Vedriš*

is Senior Lecturer at the University of Zagreb, in the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, where he studied history, ethnography and philosophy. He holds a doctorate in history from his home university and another one in medieval studies from the Central European University in Budapest. He has taught Croatian medieval history and the history of Christianity at the Universities of Zagreb, Split and Dubrovnik. His research interests focus on medieval hagiography and the cult of saints, and more recently, on the formation of medieval identities, cultural memory and the modern receptions of the early Middle Ages. He is co-editor of five volumes, including *Saintly Bishops and Bishops' Saints* (with John Ott, 2012) and *Imperial spheres and the Adriatic: Byzantium, the Carolingians and the Treaty of Aachen (812)* (with Mladen Ančić and Jonathan Shepard, 2018).

## *Imperium and Regnum* in Gottschalk's Description of Dalmatia

Ivan Basić

Over the last twenty years, scholarly literature, especially of the Anglo-Saxon sphere, as well as literature of German provenance, has radically changed the perception and knowledge of the Carolingian period. Many of the issues relevant for the Carolingian perception of *regnum* and *imperium* were meticulously analysed, with great success, a lot of this stemming from increased scholarly interest. A good example of this increased scholarly effort is the series *The Transformation of the Roman World* or *Forschungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters*. Also very important are the works by Mayke de Jong, particularly her book *In Samuel's Image: Child Oblation in the Early Medieval West* – a large portion of it dedicated to Gottschalk. In 2010 Francis Gumerlock and Victor Genke published the translated corpus of Gottschalk's texts: *Gottschalk and a Medieval Predestination Controversy*. One should also mention the progress made on the issue of kingship and emperors by experts such as Walter Pohl, Hans-Werner Goetz or again De Jong.<sup>1</sup> This paper, however, will examine the question of *regnum* from a different perspective. Although the term we are about to analyse comes from a Frankish source, it does not seem to have anything to do with the Carolingian idea of *regnum* and *imperium*.

### 1 Introduction: What did Gottschalk Hear?

Gottschalk of Orbais, a Benedictine monk, theologian, grammarian and poet, is best known as a staunch supporter of the doctrine of two-fold predestination.<sup>2</sup> His theological ideas met with negative reception among the ranks of the Frankish ecclesiastical hierarchy, forcing Gottschalk to travel and

- 
- 1 Goetz 1987; 2006; De Jong 2006: 121; 2015; Nelson 2007: 230–34 (historiographical overview of medievalists' perceptions and notions of Carolingian 'empire').
  - 2 Katić 1932: 2–8; Lambot 1951; Hödl 1989; Ivanišević 1992: 34–35, 45–46; Rapanić 1993: 28–32; 2013; De Jong 1996: 77–91; Katičić 1999: 299–303; Švab 2002; Boller 2004; Kottje 2006; Genke 2010: 11–54; Pezė 2017; Gillis 2017; Chambert-Protat *et al.* 2018.

move around Carolingian Europe. In ca. 846–848 he resided at the court of Croat *dux* Trpimir, afterwards leaving for Bulgaria. Several Church synods convicted him of heresy, ultimately resulting in his confinement in the monastery of Hautvillers, where he died.<sup>3</sup> Within the context of his theory of predestination, his works contain several valuable pieces of information about Dalmatia in the time of duke Trpimir, evidently picked up during his stay there. In *Responsa de diversis*, he attributed to this ruler the title of ‘king of the Slavs’ and described his military expedition against the ‘people of the Greeks and their patrician’.<sup>4</sup> In *De Praedestinatione*,<sup>5</sup> he also mentioned some linguistic peculiarities, apparently characteristic of the eastern Adriatic. Although its preeminent theme is predestination, the treatise also discusses many issues of logic and grammar, e.g. syllogisms and transferred meanings of words. Interpreting a sentence of the prophet Isaiah, Gottschalk highlights the frequent use of a general notion to denote a person who performs a function associated with that general notion, e.g. the word *venatio* (hunt) is used to convey the meaning of *venatores* (hunters). In this way the words *divinitas* and *deitas* could in fact mean *deus*. Gottschalk corroborates this by the following examples:

In that way then ‘deity’ and ‘divinity’ are used instead of ‘God’. Likewise, Dalmatian people, that is, likewise Latin people, but subject to the empire of the Greeks, call the king and emperor by an expression common throughout the whole of Dalmatia, which is a most spacious region, I mean, they call the king and emperor kingdom and empire. For they say: ‘We were at the kingdom’, and: ‘We stood before the empire’, and: ‘The kingdom has told us so’, and: ‘The empire spoke in that way’.<sup>6</sup>

3 Scholarship on Gottschalk: O’Donnell 2003; Genke 2010, esp. 7–11; relevant Croatian literature is summarised in Rapanić 2013: 27–28, 30–31.

4 “Likewise, also horses are cheerful in the battle array on that side which, when God gives it, must be victorious. This I myself have certainly proved by experience through Gottschalk, my little son, with respect to our horse. For when Trpimir, king of the Slavs, was going against the people of the Greeks and their governor, and our villa was in the very neighborhood of the future war, I told him to go and take care of everything that would be necessary for the king and his army, which he, by all means, had to do. However, I have terribly adjured him by the Lord God that he should neither take up arms nor go with the army, but, following their astride with full attention, consider which attitude this our horse would have or take. Indeed, I most certainly knew for a long time that victory would come and be on the side of the people, whose horses would tread cheerfully and show their cheerfulness with their triumphant attitude”, Genke 2010: 33, Latin text in Lambot 1945: 169.

5 Ms. *Bern.* 584, fol. 70v–71r; Lambot 1945: 208. According to Genke & Gumerlock (2010: 107) *On Predestination* is a collection of testimonies gathered under one title, of heterogenous origin and difficult to date, but most probably written in Hautvillers after 849.

6 Lambot 1945: 208; translated by Genke in Genke & Gumerlock 2010: 124.

Interpreted out of context, this passage was thought to witness the existence of two different entities in 9th-century Dalmatia: *Dalmatini* (Trpimir's subjects in continental Dalmatia) and *Latini* (Byzantine subjects in coastal cities and islands).<sup>7</sup> After 1932, when Lovre Katić introduced Gottschalk's text into the historiography,<sup>8</sup> Croatian historians tended to interpret it as shown in Table 10.1:

TABLE 10.1 Historiography on Gottschalk's account of Dalmatia, 1932–2012

	Dalmatini	Latini
Identity, ethnicity	People of Croatian Duchy, Croats	People of Byzantine Dalmatia, <i>Romani</i>
Ruler	Croatian duke	Byzantine emperor
Language	Latin	Latin
Expressions used	– <i>We were at the kingdom</i> – <i>The kingdom has told us so</i>	– <i>We stood before the empire</i> – <i>The empire spoke in that way</i>

However, the recent analysis of Željko Rapanić gave new insight into the way in which we might look at these two entities. The dominant interpretation of this passage was heavily influenced by the fact that Gottschalk mentioned Croatian ruler Trpimir as 'king of the Slavs'. Although this comes from a completely different passage, indeed, from a completely different treatise, most historians explicitly or implicitly associated the two, trying to explain

7 Expressed most succinctly by Katičić 1999: 300–01, see also: Katić 1932: 19, 25–26; Margetić 1983: 266; 2004: 9; Beuc 1985: 41; Rapanić 1992: 100; Katičić 1993: 46; Grmek 1994: 442–43; Budak 2008: 234; Živković & Radovanović 2009: 34, 37–38, Dzino 2010: 194. This in turn led some historians to conclude that Trpimir appropriated Byzantine courtly customs, identifying himself with *regnum*: Klaić 1971: 231; 1990: 60, Goldstein 1983: 145–46; 1992: 167. Consequently, Ančić 2005: 220, n.21 endeavored to find traces of this in current usage in the Old Church Slavonic text *S. Venceslai Vita Palaeoslovenica recentior, redactionis Nikol'skianae*. The full reference is as follows: ВРАТИСЛАВЪ, НА КЪНАЖЕНИЕ СТОЛА, ИЗЪБРАНЪ ВСЪМИ ЛЮДЬМИ, ПРИСТЪПИ (Katičić 1996: 9). However, the conclusions of this inquiry are circumscribed by the initial assumptions: a confident decision on this question is probably not justified, since there are no extant early medieval sources from Croatia containing such a manner of addressing the ruler. Koščak 1980/81: 306 attempted to trace the origin of this phrasing in the West, where the state was perceived as the personal patrimony of the ruler (although Koščak too assumes that Gottschalk's *Dalmatia* is in fact Croatia). Suić 1984: 22, n.27 assumes that both Croats (*Dalmatini*) as well as the Romani (*Latini*) designate the duke Trpimir's territory *regnum et imperium*. There is no ground whatsoever for such a conclusion.

8 Morin 1931; Katić 1932.

Gottschalk's description of Dalmatia as the kingdom/*regnum* of Trpimir. It was, however, necessary to examine things in context and if one takes into account the previous few lines of the text the whole hypothesis about the two entities then appears untenable:

All the Venetians, that is, Latin people living in the cities on this side of the sea, never call their lord, that is, the emperor of the Greeks, lord, but lordship. For they say: 'Your benign lordship, have mercy on us', and: 'We have been before his lordship', and: 'His lordship has told us so'.<sup>9</sup>

Gottschalk's description of Dalmatia directly follows the description of Venice and is associated with it in a very natural way. They are separated by only three short sentences, unambiguously connecting the two descriptions by a few explanatory notes. Another reason for this error is that the pages of the respective folios break exactly at that point, and the previous folio was for a long time not accessible to historians.<sup>10</sup> This is self-evident if one takes a look at the whole text (see also Table 10.5):

§ 6. Be ashamed, Sidon, the sea has said. For, as 'Sidon' means 'hunting' and 'hunting' is used in this passage for 'hunters'. Similarly 'divinity' and 'deity' are often used and said instead of 'God'. In order that you may see this clearly, pay careful attention to what I want to say. *All the Venetians, that is, Latin people living in the cities on this side of the sea, never call their lord, that is, the emperor of the Greeks, lord, but lordship. For they say: 'Your benign lordship, have mercy on us', and: 'We have been before his lordship', and: 'His lordship has told us so'.* But lest their manner of speaking should seem poor to you as rustic, see what is in heaven. For those blessed spirits who are located in sixth ranks among the others are called lordships instead of lords. [fol. 71r] In that way then 'deity' and 'divinity' are used

<sup>9</sup> Lambot 1945: 208; translated by Genke in Genke & Gumerlock 2010: 124.

<sup>10</sup> In 1931, after the discovery of the manuscript, only four pages were photographed and sent to Croatia: fol. 51r–v and 71r–v. These were the pages used by Katić, and herein lies the problem: they were taken out of context. Folio 51 contains the anecdote on the war with Greeks, whereas folio 71 (i.e. 40 pages below) contains the narrative on *regnum* and *imperium*. Both narratives belong to different treatises. The latter is part of § 6 in chap. 9 of *De Praedestinatione*. § 6 is a self-sufficient, closed textual unit, with a clearly marked beginning and end (both are quotes from Isaiah). Hence the narratives on Venice and Dalmatia belong to the same segment of the text. In terms of material space, § 6 covers three folios (70v, 71r, 71v); Katić had access only to the second and the third folio, thus passing over the first one (where Venice is mentioned); Ivanišević 1992: 34–35, 45–46; Grmek 1994: 436, 442–43; Rapanić 2013: 40–42.

instead of 'God'. Likewise, Dalmatian people, that is, likewise Latin people, but subject to the empire of the Greeks, call the king and emperor by an expression common throughout the whole of Dalmatia, which is a most spacious region, I mean, they call the king and emperor kingdom and empire. For they say: 'We were at the kingdom,' and: 'We stood before the empire,' and: 'The kingdom has told us so,' and: 'The empire spoke in that way'. But do not think that they say this with no authority, since the Holy Church in whole world truthfully and favorably as well as quite authoritatively sings joyfully about the Son of God: 'I have seen a man sit on a high throne, whom the multitude of the angels adore and sing in one voice: 'Behold him whose name for eternity is empire,' that is: This is the one whose name is for eternity emperor.

The *homines Latini* are not in any way contrasted with the *Dalmatini*: they are one and the same, and the phrase *perinde id est similiter homines Latini* means that they (*Dalmatini*) are also *Latini*, as are the Venetians. Rapanić has succeeded in emancipating himself from Katić's deeply rooted theory of two entities, where many – himself included – had followed with excessive trust.<sup>11</sup> Rapanić's conclusion is, namely, that Gottschalk identified *homines Dalmatini* with *homines Latini* – the Latin-speaking inhabitants of litoral Dalmatia – subject to Byzantine sovereignty (Table 10.2).

TABLE 10.2 Željko Rapanić's interpretation of Gottschalk's account of Dalmatia

Dalmatini = Latini	
Identity, ethnicity	People of Byzantine Dalmatia, <i>Romani</i>
Ruler	Byzantine emperor
Language	Latin
Expressions used	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <i>We were at the kingdom</i></li> <li>– <i>The kingdom has told us so</i></li> <li>– <i>We stood before the empire</i></li> <li>– <i>The empire spoke in that way</i></li> </ul>

11 Rapanić 2013: 61. *Contra* (Gottschalk's *Dalmatia* is Croatia): Katić 1932: 25–26; Koščak 1984: 218–19; Ančić 1997: 11.

Some of the more recent translations of Gottschalk's text make this abundantly clear.<sup>12</sup> In other words, in this passage the author mentions neither the Slavs, nor their ruler. The theory of two entities is a misconception. Gottschalk simply states that the people of Byzantine Dalmatia refer to their sovereign using the abstract nouns 'kingdom' and 'empire', and compares this to the similar case in Venice.<sup>13</sup> Their political allegiance is Byzantine, but their identity and language is Latin.

This manner of speech is by no means specific to Dalmatia, since the same is attested by Gottschalk for the inhabitants of Venice (also *homines Latini*, who call their sovereign, the Byzantine emperor, *dominatio*). The same phraseology is attested even earlier, in the *Placitum* of Rižana (*Placitum Rizianense*) of 804,<sup>14</sup> when it was used by Istrians protesting against the Frankish duke John, and describing the previous Byzantine rule over the peninsula (until ca. 788):

Since a long time ago, while we were subject to the Empire of the Greeks, our forefathers were accustomed to hold the honor of tribunate (...) And who wished to have a higher honor than the tribunate, went to the Empire, who appointed him consul.<sup>15</sup>

For the envoys of the Empire or for any other tax or tribute one half gave the Church, one half the people.

When the envoys of the Empire came, they stayed in the bishop's palace; and up until the time they had to return to their lordship, they resided there.<sup>16</sup>

12 Genke 2010: 124–25 (English); Borri 2008a: 156 n. 59 (English); 2010b: 23 (Italian); Schneider 1990: 245 (German). Only after this volume was ready for print, I become acquainted with the recently published book by Gillis, which contains very much the same translation; Gillis 2017: 101.

13 Another Frankish theologian, Amalarius of Metz, while passing through Zadar in June 813, described the inhabitants of Byzantine Dalmatia as *eos qui ad imperium Grecorum pertinent*, thus clearly affirming the difference between their political allegiance and Latin identity, much in the same way as Gottschalk, Vedriš 2005: 9–13; 2018; McCormick 2001: 138–43, 900, no. 316, 330, 902. Amalarius' text contains substantial echoes of the intermediary role of Dalmatia between the Franks, the Holy See and the Byzantines, especially in terms of liturgy and ecclesiastical structure – see Basić 2017/18. For more on the position of Dalmatia from the point of view of the imperial periphery: Dzino 2018.

14 First noticed by Borri 2008a: 15; 2010b: 23 and Rapanić 2013: 63.

15 *Placito*, 62.14–18. The most recent edition of the *Placitum* is Krahwinkler 2004: 61–92 (Latin text with Slovene and German translations). Cf. the English translation in Borri 2008a: 14, n.53: "In the Old Times, when we were under the lordship of the Greeks, our ancestors used to bear the dignities of tribune (...) And who wanted a better dignity than tribune traveled to the Empire, who ordained him consul."

16 *Placito*, 58.10, 58.12–60.13.



Once more, it is the empire that appoints the consuls, not the emperor in person (*ambulabat ad imperium, qui ordinabat illum ypato*). Moreover, the Byzantine envoys are not called the representatives of the emperor, but twice referred to as ‘envoys of the Empire’ (*missi imperii*). Finally, their return to Constantinople is curiously described: they return to ‘their lordship’ (*ad suam dominationem*).<sup>17</sup> The imperial sovereign of the Greeks is characterised here as *imperium, dominatio* instead of the anticipated *imperator, dominus*. McCormick was the first who, albeit in passing, hypothesised that these were not mere lexical features used in everyday vulgar Latin. He assumed that the phrases in question reflect the influence of diplomatic documents, issued by the Byzantine imperial chancery. Formulas used in these documents by which the emperor designated himself were written in plural form and using abstract nouns ἡ βασιλεία ἡμῶν (‘our majesty/empire/kingdom/sovereignty/reign/rule’). These exactly correspond to Latin titles *imperium* or *regnum*, that is to say, to abstract nouns attested by Gottschalk.<sup>18</sup> Additionally, the word *dominatio* that the Venetians used – according to Gottschalk – to designate their ruler, is in my opinion the exact translation of the Greek phrase τὸ κράτος ἡμῶν, used by the Byzantine emperor to designate himself as ‘Our Imperial Lordship/Imperial Power’.<sup>19</sup> It is against this background that the wording *imperium et regnum* of Gottschalk must be studied.

At this point, it is necessary to state the nature of my own inquiry.<sup>20</sup> I will try to tackle certain questions that seem interesting from a different point of view: namely, what generated the discourse I have been discussing thus far. My aim is to see what kind of ‘local knowledge’ (in Geertz’s sense)<sup>21</sup> lies behind these lexical peculiarities. Predictably, I welcome an approach which coincides with my own, such as the one by McCormick or Borri, but it might have

17 First noticed by Gračanin 2015: 503.

18 McCormick 1998: 23. Although he later noted the analogous use of *imperium* in the *Placitum* of Rižana (49, n.78), McCormick surprisingly fails to discuss its implications.

19 Blaise 1975: 322 lists five basic meanings: feudal lord’s authority over his vassal; bishop’s authority; authority, property; domain, lordship; ‘your lordship’ (as a title for kings and magnates); tribute paid to the lord. Cf. also Niermeyer 1976: 349.

20 First expounded in Basić 2015: 444–45. Although already Manojlović 1910/11: 139, 156, 158–59, and 162 correctly translated this as ‘our imperial majesty’, Croatian historiography does not seem to have noticed the correlation between Gottschalk’s *imperium* and Porphyrogenitus’ βασιλεία. Margetić 2000a: 5; 2004: 9 noticed in passing that Trpimir’s title *regnum* fits the Greek ἡ βασιλεία μου, but did not explore this further (nor did he observe that the same goes for *imperium*).

21 “... discourse that proceeds under a set of rules, assumptions, conventions, criteria, beliefs, which, in principle anyway, tell us how to go about settling issues and resolving disagreements on every point where statements seem to conflict”, Geertz 1983: 222.



been advisable to broaden the scope of research in more detail. None of the previous scholarship endeavoured to explain the Venetian *dominatio* (obviously not derived from βασιλεία). Finally, there is another, third source on the issue of *regnum* and *imperium* that has previously gone unnoticed (see below). The issue of the origin of 'majestic discourse' can be broken down into several subsidiary questions.

## 2 The Empire Speaks

In order to understand precisely what is meant by these words, we have to review the exact translation of both βασιλεία and κράτος. The term ἡ βασιλεία can mean: reign, sovereignty; kingship, emperorship, majesty, office of the king/emperor; domain, dominion, kingdom, empire, territory under a king/emperor, imperial office, royal office, imperial rulership, emperordom; majesty as a title (e.g. *Notre Majesté*, моя царственность). Τὸ κράτος – an even higher level of abstraction – may be interpreted as strength, might, power; political power, rule, sovereign power, sovereignty; authority, mastery; majesty.<sup>22</sup> Both can be used in the singular (ἡ βασιλεία μου, τὸ κράτος μου) as well as plural (ἡ βασιλεία ἡμῶν, ἡ ἡμετέρα βασιλεία, τὸ κράτος ἡμῶν, τὸ ἡμέτερον κράτος, τὸ ἡμέτερον βασίλειον κράτος).

Terms used in Byzantine sources to designate the (Eastern) Roman Empire, the nature of the Byzantine state and its political regime are numerous. As of the late 6th century the formerly ubiquitous term Ῥωμαίων πολιτεία in Byzantine narrative sources was substituted gradually for Ῥωμαίων βασιλεία. Already by the time of Euagrius Scholasticus (ca. 536–594) and especially Theophanes (ca. 760–818) Ῥωμαίων βασιλεία had come to denote not only the reign of a given sovereign, but the entire Byzantine political system.<sup>23</sup> Βασιλεία seems to have entered common usage as a ruler's title already in Biblical texts but gained further prominence in the Byzantine period, when it came to denote the Byzantine emperor in particular.<sup>24</sup> The myriad of notional

22 Sophocles 1900: 689 – majesty, as a title; Liddell *et al.* 1940: 992 – strength, might; power, especially political power, rule, sovereignty, sovereign power; power over somebody or something; possession of the land; power of persons, a power, an authority.

23 Lounghis 1997: 17–19. Sometimes even implied as legal statute – Karamboula 1996: 4. Cf. also Karamboula 1993; Chrysos 1978: 67–69 (βασιλεία in John Lydus).

24 Noted by Du Cange 1688: 179–80.

meanings inherited from the Graeco-Roman period were all reduced to make way for another, singular meaning denoting the office of Eastern emperor.<sup>25</sup>

The phrases βασιλεία ἡμῶν and κράτος ἡμῶν, as well as similar ones, were well studied some time ago by Dölger and Karayannopoulos, and in recent times most thoroughly by Gastgeber. This is, in Gastgeber's words: "the way the emperor speaks about his person, i.e. if he uses a verbal form in the first person plural – and a respective pronoun (*pluralis maiestatis*) – or impersonally with an abstract term like 'our majesty', in which case the Byzantine emperor tries to maintain the atmosphere of divinity and distance by using an abstract noun, especially when the addressee is privileged by a special grant or privilege; (generally speaking, an emperor represents the divine power as chosen by God, thus being in distance to common mortals. This distance is cultivated in numerous ceremonies and in the use of a language of distance, too)".<sup>26</sup> It is certainly unnecessary to present here a full survey of research done on Byzantine emperors' transpersonal terminology. The evidence is plentiful, and a selection of documents issued by several Byzantine emperors belonging to the Macedonian dynasty, containing the phrases we are dealing with will suffice here, beginning with the founder of the dynasty, Basil I (867–886) (Table 10.3).

Furthermore, Gastgeber meticulously analysed the charters issued until 992, amply demonstrating that the emperors used these phrases on a permanent basis: Leo VI (886–912: ἡ βασιλεία ἡμῶν, ἡ ἐκ Θεοῦ βασιλεία ἡμῶν, ἡ ἡμετέρα βασιλεία, ἡ θεοπρόβλητος ἡμῶν βασιλεία, τὸ ἡμέτερον κράτος, ἡ βασιλεία μου), Romanus I (920–944: ἡ βασιλεία ἡμῶν, ἡ ἐκ Θεοῦ βασιλεία ἡμῶν, ἡ ἡμετέρα βασιλεία, ἡ ἡμετέρα ἐπισκεψαμένη και ἀποδεξαμένη βασιλεία, τὸ ἡμέτερον κράτος, τὸ γαληνὸν και εἰρηνικὸν τῆς βασιλείας ἡμῶν κράτος), Constantine VII (944–959: ἡ ἐκ Θεοῦ βασιλεία ἡμῶν, ἡ βασιλεία ἡμῶν), Romanus II (959–963: ἡ βασιλεία ἡμῶν), and so on.<sup>27</sup> 'Majestic discourse' was a standardised form of imperial self-representation. The results of Gastgeber's work demonstrate that in the 9th century the phrase βασιλεία was ubiquitous in Byzantine imperial

25 Dölger 1938/39: 233–35, 241; Dölger & Karayannopoulos 1968: 34 and n.8, 47; Müller 2008: 132–33.

26 Gastgeber 2014: 80, 83. See Dölger 1938–39: 241; Berlinger 1935; Hunger 1964; Browning 1966. It seems that this majestic plural stems from the fact that all the formal pronouncements were made in the names of all members of the imperial college, a standard practice since the First Tetrarchy, which continued throughout Late Antiquity even in sole reigns, without reverting to the singular. The majestic plural became standard because of an almost continuous existence of co-rulers during the 4th and 5th centuries, Corcoran 2000: 318–23; 2015: 211–12, 214.

27 Gastgeber 2003: 118–27.

TABLE 10.3 Selection of documents containing tranpersonal phrases, issued by the Byzantine emperors from the Macedonian dynasty

Phrase used	Source and date	Ref.
– <i>amabile Christo imperium nostrum</i>	Letter to pope Nicholas I	Reg. 474
– <i>divinitus munitum imperium nostrum</i>	(11 December 867)	
– <i>imperium nostrum</i>	Edict to 8th ecumenical council	Reg. 484
– <i>tranquillitas nostra</i>	(28 February 870)	
– <i>divinitus muniendum imperium nostrum</i>	Edict to all the patriarchs	Reg. 485
– <i>imperium nostrum</i>	(28 February–31 August 870)	
– <i>imperium nostrum</i>	Letter to pope Hadrian II	Reg. 488
	(mid-871)	
– ἡ θεοσυνέργητος ἡμῶν βασιλεία	<i>Sigillion</i> for the monks of Athos	Reg. 492
	(June 883)	

documents issued to the West, and that its Latin equivalent was *imperium*, all in accordance with Gottschalk's narrative.

Imperial acts fall into five basic categories: legislative acts, intended for the interior of the Empire, imperial resolutions and rescripts on concrete matters, acts intended for the exterior, administrative acts, and privileges.<sup>28</sup> Of these, the majority obligatorily contained some version of the phrase ἡ βασιλεία or τὸ κράτος, designating the emperor. For instance, chrysobulls applied ἡ βασιλεία μου at least twice in the text, and typically ended with the formula which announced the emperor's signature: ἐν ᾧ καὶ τὸ ἡμέτερον εὐσεβὲς καὶ θεοπρόβλητον ὑπεσημῆνατο κράτος – “and upon it Our Respectful and Blessed Power has placed its signature”.<sup>29</sup> This so-called *kratos*-formula is an important feature for assessing the authenticity of Byzantine charters. Πρόσταγμα/όρισμός contained in its disposition the usual formula διὸ (ὅθεν) διορίζεται ἡ βασιλεία μου – “therefore My Emperorship appoints”. At the end of a σιγίλλιον a final clause was appended: ἐπὶ τούτῳ γὰρ καὶ τὸ τοιοῦτον τῆς βασιλείας μου σιγίλλιον ἐπεδόθη αὐτῷ/αὐτοῖς – “And to this end such sigillion of My Emperorship was handed unto him/them”. The phrases that interest us here also appear in codicils: ἡ ἐκ θεοῦ βασιλεία ἡμῶν – “our Emperorship from God”, as well as

28 Dölger & Karayannopoulos 1968: 24–25, 89–94, 99–107, 109–12, 117–28; Oikonomidès 1985: 174–89, 190–93.

29 Dölger & Karayannopoulos 1968: 122–23; Treitinger 1938: 60, 228ff.; Dölger 1962: 99; 1963; Müller 2008: 132–33.

*kratos-formulae*, otherwise unusual in administrative acts.<sup>30</sup> This last instance is of additional importance, because codicils were bestowed upon imperial officials and holders of honorary posts (ἀξίαι διὰ βραβείου) as a certificate of titles given by the emperor. These office-holders were very often persons of Western origin and local scope and functions, whether or not they received their nominations in person or via documents sent from Constantinople.

The formal greeting of the emperor to the addressee at the end of the document also contained the aforementioned phrase: since at least 681 until at least 871 the official farewell of the emperor was: *Bene valete sacratissimi auxiliores pietatis orantes pro nostro imperio* (=ἔρωσθε πανίεροι τῆς εὐσεβείας ὑπεριστάμενοι, καὶ τοῦ ἡμετέρου κράτους ὑπερευχόμενοι, where κράτος is translated as *imperium*).<sup>31</sup>

The transpersonalization of the emperor in the word *imperium* was not restricted to diplomatics only. For example, the phrases ἡ βασιλεία ἡμῶν and ἡ ἡμετέρα βασιλεία (“Our Imperial Majesty” and “Our Emperorship”) have been used 13 times in the *DAI*.<sup>32</sup> Several of these contain direct references to imperial chrysobulls, and all of them reflect the imperial self-designation in the official acts. The phrases τὸ κράτος and τὸ κράτος ἡμῶν (‘imperial power’) appear regularly (18 times) in the famous handbook on court ritual *De Cerimoniis* (*BOC*) (see Table 10.6), wherein they designate the emperor and his majesty. But in the same book ἡ βασιλεία and ἡ βασιλεία ἡμῶν are absolutely dominant (used as many as 85 times, see Table 10.7). These clearly designated either the emperor personally or his rule in an abstract way. Foreign ambassadors, when greeting the emperor via letter or in person, utilised formulas like these: “The highly esteemed so-and-so, prince of Old Rome, with the archons and all the people subject to him, send your imperial power (τὴν βασιλείαν σου) their most loyal homage (...) We find in your sublime and great imperial power (τὴν σὴν ὑψηλὴν καὶ μεγάλην βασιλείαν) noble protection and shelter and support. May your rule and imperial power (ἡ σὴ δεσποτεία καὶ βασιλεία) be vouchsafed us for

30 Dölger & Karayannopoulos 1968: 110–15.

31 E.g. Reg. 248 = *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 11: 723–24 (Constantine IV in 681). Brandt 1908: 40; Dölger & Karayannopoulos 1968: 93.

32 Cf. ἡ βασιλεία ἡμῶν: 45.68, 75, 109, 124, 132, 138, 142, 151–52, 161, 167, 172; ἡ ἡμετέρα βασιλεία: 45.102, 107, cf. Bury 1906: 543 and n.3. Of these 13 instances only 3 have been commented upon by the editors of the *Dumbarton Oaks* edition (S. Runciman in *Dvornik et al.* 1962: 175–76): 45.68, 124, 102 – who realised the link between the wording and imperial acts, some of them preserved (e.g. Reg. 649), pointing to chrysobulls issued by Leo VI as well as to authoritative works of reference like Dölger 1933: 445; 1956: 39–43; 1953: 16, 21–22, and Treitinger 1938: 212–13. However, all of the instances actually belong to the formulaic language used by the imperial court and chancery.

many years for we are your people and most loyal servants of your sovereign power." This also evidences that foreign courts and chanceries had at their disposal sets of fixed expressions ready to use when addressing the emperor in Constantinople.

When the emperor made appointments to a high office, he spoke of himself this way: "In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, my imperial power from God (*ἡ ἐκ Θεοῦ βασιλεία μου*) appoints you domestikos of the divinely-guarded scholai". The same formula – entailing *βασιλεία* instead of "*I, the emperor*" – was used at the appointment of several other officials (rector, *synkellos*), as well as at the ordination of the patriarch of Constantinople: "The grace of God and our imperial power derived from it (*ἡ ἐξ αὐτῆς βασιλεία ἡμῶν*) appoint this most pious man patriarch of Constantinople." All the aforementioned examples of 'majestic discourse' uttered before the candidates for office-holders made them acquainted first-hand with the official discourse of the Byzantine court, witnessed in the aura of awe-inspiring imperial power and the presence of the emperor himself. No wonder then that such discourse quickly and easily found its way into peripheral Byzantine provinces in the West, where many of the office-seekers actually came from.

Both *ἡ βασιλεία (ἡμῶν)* and *τὸ κράτος (ἡμῶν)* appear in the *BOC* in a solemn ritual context of liturgical and pseudo-liturgical acclamations and ruler-worship accorded to the Byzantine emperor. This was done both on religious occasions as well as on secular ones. One, of course, expects a handbook on the ceremonies of Byzantine court to abound in ritual courtly discourse, but notwithstanding this, it is quite amazing that the phrases discussed here were applied so many times (103 in total), and that they permeated all the spheres which concerned the emperor's person. The fact that this particular, peculiar wording was closely associated with the emperor – and constantly ritually repeated in regular cycles all through the year – made its penetration into public written and spoken communication, as a personification of the ruler, easier. Furthermore, it seems that some of these majestic expressions concerning *βασιλεία* as a synonym for the emperor's person are very old, because at least once a 5th-century text is explicitly mentioned as a source of such wording: "For your prayer for my holy and fortunate imperial power (*τῆς ἁγίας καὶ εὐτυχοῦς βασιλείας μου*) I will give you five nomismata each and a pound of silver to each soldier". This involves the proclamation of emperor Leo I in 457, citing Peter the Patrician (ca. 500–565) as the source. A few other very old formulas preserved in the *BOC* are especially interesting: these are the Latin acclamations of the emperor by the *kankellarioi* of the Quaestor, as well as in the Hall of the Nineteen Couches, transcribed into Greek:

Response: '*Cristus Deus noster cum servet imperium vestrum per multos annos et bonos!*' It is translated: 'May Christ our God guard your reign for many good years!'

When the emperor is reclining at the table and all the customary ceremonial is being performed, and when at a sign from the praipositos the guests who have been invited are about to sit, the five chanters recite: '*Conservet Deus imperium vestrum*', which is, translated: 'May God guard your reign!'

The importance of these chants is threefold: firstly, they were sung in Latin, and represent some of the latest survivals of that language in medieval Byzantium, albeit deformed and incomprehensible to contemporaries – hence the need for a Greek interpretation. Secondly, they also employ the term *imperium vestrum* (ἡμπερίουμ βέστρουμ) when referring to the emperor, and explicitly translate it as βασιλεία ὑμῶν. Thirdly, they point to the conclusion that the matching expression *imperium nostrum* (=βασιλεία ἡμῶν) dates back to early Byzantine period, when Latin was still a spoken language of the Empire and the court. As shown long ago by Charanis, and relatively recently by Oikonomidès, the Eastern Empire ceased to be functionally bilingual in the 7th century at the latest, notwithstanding some survivals of Latin-speaking subjects of the emperor (e.g. Thessalonica). These survivals of Latin gradually died out by the end of the 7th and early 8th century, so the only ones among Byzantine subjects still using it were those situated along the coasts of Adriatic: Venice, Istria and Dalmatia.<sup>33</sup>

In the late antique and early Byzantine era, documents issued for the West were sent exclusively in Latin. Following the Hellenization of the Empire in the 6th and 7th century, all official correspondence was issued in Greek. According to a very old tradition, all the Byzantine imperial documents intended for the exterior were written in the simplest Greek.<sup>34</sup> It looks as if this did not help those in the West to better understand Greek, since the language barrier produced texts that were either corrupt or extremely difficult to understand as early as the 7th century.<sup>35</sup> Diplomatic relations were no exception: although

33 Charanis 1959: 43; Oikonomidès 1999: 49–51; McCormick 1994: 23; Bianconi 2004: 548–49.

34 Oikonomidès 1985: 176–77.

35 Even in the capital of the Exarchate, Ravenna, the dominant mode of communication was Latin (albeit with a lot of Hellenisms). As early as the 7th century bilingual speakers were hard to find. Cf. Agnellus' anecdote on the notary of the Exarch Theodore (ca. 678–687), whose ability to translate imperial letters from Greek into Latin was considered rare and extraordinary – Guillou 1969: 112–13; T.S. Brown 1984: 154. On the poor knowledge

Greek governors of western provinces and their retinue for a long time came from Constantinople, a gradual loss of communication is evident when one considers for example the poor quality of translations of official Greek letters of appointment handed to *katepanos*.<sup>36</sup> The first known letter intended for Western consumption and written exclusively in Greek was sent in 765 by Constantine V. It contains a reference to translating the text at the recipient's court, as well as the emperor's complaint of poor interpretation of his sentences.<sup>37</sup> Documents written solely in Greek continued to be issued from Constantinople until the late 9th/early 10th century, when the first official translations began to be made.<sup>38</sup> Before that, in order to correctly understand the document, a Western addressee had to arrange for a translation of the Greek text into Latin. Seeing this problem, from the late 9th century the imperial chancery began to issue an official Latin translation (*charta transversa*), appending it to the original document. The Greek version was always thought of by the imperial bureaucracy as the official, primary document, whereas its Latin translation was deemed of secondary importance.<sup>39</sup> This is easily discernible by comparison of Greek and Latin versions of a given letter: a large number of errors or contradictions in the Latin version unmistakably points to the Constantinopolitan origin of both.<sup>40</sup> The creation of bilingual documents caused some additional problems, because the Latin translation made in Constantinople often did not exactly match the meaning of the Greek text. Furthermore, the quality of Latin was more often than not inferior to the one spoken in the West, and thus often completely incomprehensible.<sup>41</sup> This issue was resolved only in the 12th century, when the knowledge of Latin among the official court interpreters had conspicuously improved.

These exalted forms of address for the monarch in official documents or the most formal situations reached, it seems, also the Frankish court, as well as the papal curia. In 584 the Frankish queen Brunhilda wrote to the

---

of Greek cf. Falkenhausen 1989: 429; Bianconi 2004: 548–49; Dagron 1969: 24ff.; Đurić 1986: 110, 129; Chiesa 2004: 499–501; Drocourt 2012: 250–51.

36 *Syllabus*, no. 12, 23–25. On Greek origin of governors: Guillou 1969: 116; T.S. Brown 1984: 51, 64, 136, 169, Falkenhausen 1989: 414.

37 *Codex Carolinus* 36, 546.11–16; McCormick 2005: 137; Gastgeber 2010: 92.

38 A letter of Basil I to Louis II (871) mentions translating the letter into Latin at court in Constantinople; this is the first mention of such a practice, cf. Gastgeber 2005: 121; Dölger & Karayannopoulos 1968: 90.

39 Gastgeber 2005: 121; 2010: 91–92. On the structure of imperial chancery see Dölger 1961: 83–85; Dölger & Karayannopoulos 1968: 57–67; Oikonomidès 1985: 168–73.

40 Gastgeber 2010: 91.

41 Penna 2012: 13; Gastgeber 2005; 2010.



Byzantine dowager empress Anastasia: *Serenissime dominationi vestrae, quam, tribuente Domino, summo principe coniuge Romanam cognovimus rempublicam gubernare*.<sup>42</sup> In 603 Gregory the Great wrote to emperor Phocas: *Comprimentur iugo vestrae dominationis superbae mentes hostium*.<sup>43</sup> Gillett recently drew attention to the fact that in the two letters sent by the Exarch of Ravenna in 589/590 to the Frankish king Childebert II the noun *regnum* denotes the Kingdom of the Franks, but also the king himself, as a title.<sup>44</sup> Whether these letters indicate a possible earlier date for the origins of ‘majestic discourse’ remains an open question. Both letters, however, were undoubtedly composed in Byzantine territory (*ipso facto* following the custom of the imperial chancery), and from there they were sent to the Merovingian court. There are also some early-8th century Lombard sources indicating that this usage may have continued for several centuries at the royal court: king Liutprand in 715 used the phrase *regnum nostrum* (‘Our Majesty’) speaking of himself in official capacity.<sup>45</sup> Presumably, these customs reached the Lombard court from Byzantine Italy.

The oldest preserved Greek original of a Byzantine imperial letter, the famous *Kaiserbrief aus St. Denis*, dated to the first half of the 9th century, contains at least two instances: τῆς ἡμετέρας ἐ[κ θεοῦ βασιλείας], and τῆ]ς ἐκ θεο[ῦ βασι]λείας ἡ[μῶν – ‘of Our Emperorship from God’.<sup>46</sup> The letter of St Denis belongs to the early phase of Byzantine communication with the West, when letters were still emitted only in Greek. Apart from this, there are not many extant Greek documents available for comparison with their contemporary Latin translation, but those that did survive unequivocally confirm that the emperors constantly used the transpersonal term βασιλεία when referring to

42 *Epistulae Austr.* 3, 140, no. 29; Classen 1983: 193.

43 *Reg. Greg.* II, 1899, 397 =13, 34.

44 *Ep. Austr.* 40 (146–47): *sicut regni vestri christianitas habet cogitare (...) regni vestri gloria consequatur*; 41 (147): *Quantum christianitas regni vestri exquiret cottidiae*; Gillett 2011: 74.

45 Niermeyer 1976: 902–03 (*obtulistis in presentia regni nostri iudicatum*).

46 *Reg.* 413. Brandi 1908: 11–12; Dölger 1931: 8–9, no. 2; new edition: Dölger 1956: 207.5–7. Cf. Dölger & Karayannopoulos 1968: 91. The letter is variously dated: Brandi 1908 (813–817), Dölger 1951 (May 841), Ohnsorge 1955 (May 843), McCormick 2001: 899, no. 315 (812–850). Gastgeber 2010: 89, n.2 gives a review of earlier literature. Most recently, McCormick 2005: 147–48 dated the letter to 827, with plausible arguments. On the other hand, Shepard 2014a: 71–72 deems it more probable that this was in fact the letter delivered by Theodosios Baboutzikos to emperor Lothar in 842, concerning joint Frankish-Byzantine expedition against the Saracens in North Africa. For the context of this slightly later date (on the lines of Dölger) – Shepard 1995: 45–46.



themselves: *pium imperium nostrum*, *gaudium a Deo imperium nostrum*, or simply *imperium nostrum* are consistently used.<sup>47</sup>

Adapted in diplomatic discourse by the other side, this discourse in abstract and transpersonal terms permeated the documents sent to Constantinople by, for example, the Roman curia, such as two letters of pope Gregory II (715–731) to emperor Leo III, which respectfully observe the imperial protocol. The emperor is twice addressed as “your God-defended Sovereignty and Fraternity in Christ” (*vestrum a Deo conservatum imperium atque in Christo fraternitas – τὰ γράμματα τῆς ὑμετέρας θεοφρουρήτου βασιλείας καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ ἀδελφότητος*).<sup>48</sup> Pope John VIII still used the same manner of address in his instructions to the legates sent to Basil I in 879: “Kneel before Your Emperorship from God (...) Your Lordship from God (...) If Your Emperorship commands, the letters will be shown”.<sup>49</sup> The letter from, pope Hadrian II to Basil I and his sons in 871 points to the same conclusion. Although the original of Basil’s Greek letter is lost, the pope’s answer in Latin is a testament to the fact that the first letter contained the sort of ‘majestic discourse’ we are discussing here. Hadrian’s letter often addresses Basil as *imperium vestrum* (‘Your Emperorship’).<sup>50</sup> Considering this, the Greek original (or its Latin version) evidently contained the phrase ἡ βασιλεία ἡμῶν (*imperium nostrum*).

Considering all the above, we can form a few preliminary observations and hypotheses based on the following observations about Venice, Dalmatia and Istria:

- 
- 47 Reg. 346 (*divalis sacra* of Constantine VI and Irene preceding the Nicaean Council of 787), 408 (letter of Michael II to Louis the Pious in 824), 488 (letter of Basil I to Hadrian II in 871). Notably, these were translated by Hilduin of St Denis (letter 824) and Anastasius the Librarian – Brandi 1908: 40; Classen 1983: 197; Gastgeber 2010: 90–91.
- 48 *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 12: 959, Ep. 1 and 975, Ep. 2 = *Seventh Council*: i, xii. The authenticity of these letters is problematic; in their extant form they were composed probably in the 9th century, T.S. Brown 1984: 156 and n.24; Brubaker & Haldon 2001: 277.
- 49 MGH, Epp., 7, 1928, 188, n.211a: *Commonitorium Iohannis VIII. papae ad legatos suos*, 188.22–23: “Προσκυνεῖ τὴν ὑμετέραν ἐκ θεοῦ βασιλείαν (...) τὸ ὑμετερον ἐκ θεοῦ κράτος” = *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 18A: 467 – *Salutat vestrum ex Deo Imperium (...) vestram ex Deo potentiam*; 188.28: “Εἰ κελεύει ἡ βασιλεία ὑμῶν, ἰδέτω τὰς ἐπιστολάς” = *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 18A: 467 – *Si jubet imperium vestrum, videat epistolas*. Cf. McCormick 2005: 141. More on the instructions to Western envoys on how they were to comport themselves when in the imperial presence: Gillett 2012.
- 50 *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 16: 206.

*Venice, Dalmatia, Istria:*

- all are *homines Latini*
- all are subjects of the Byzantine emperor
- all share common linguistic traits
- all were under direct or indirect Byzantine rule around the same time
- all the relevant sources date from the early 9th century

*Questions:*

- is all of this a coincidence?
- what is the origin of this discourse?
- are there any equivalents in other Byzantine sources?

### 3 The Case of Dalmatia

Apart from a dozen Greek charters from Dubrovnik (12th–15th centuries) and a Latin one from Split (1180), most Byzantine imperial acts addressed to Dalmatia have regrettably been lost.<sup>51</sup> This comes as no surprise taking into account their general scarcity.<sup>52</sup> Even when speaking of Byzantine embassies, the dominant sources are the Latin, Western ones.<sup>53</sup> For example, there are only ten preserved Byzantine imperial acts addressed to Venice (992–1198),<sup>54</sup> three to Pisa (1111–1192),<sup>55</sup> and five to Genoa (1169–1193).<sup>56</sup> The ones directed towards Venice have been preserved only in a Latin translation, while the ones addressed to Pisa and Genoa have come to us both in the Greek original and in Latin translation. The long-term Byzantine cultural presence must be measured by a different set of criteria.

51 Jireček 1899: 31, 81–2, n.83; 1903: 502–04; Marc 1903: 100; Marković 1952. Although ἡ βασιλεία μου was used many times in charters from Dubrovnik and Split, this fact is in itself insufficient to prove the previous existence of the same syntax, since all the said charters date from the Late Byzantine period.

52 Müller 2008: 129; Dölger & Karayannopoulos 1968: 25–26, 129–34. Imperial letters to foreign rulers: Brubaker & Haldon 2001: 281–82; Lounghis 1980: 371–98. Cf. also the list of imperial letters (*jussiones, sacrae*) from 451 to 787 in Lounghis 1979, 73–80, no. 1–68. A more detailed list is in Karayannopoulos & Weiß 1982: 313–419. Until the 1900's, only 80 imperial acts prior to the 10th century were known – Brandt 1908: 21–31. According to T.S. Brown 1984: 148, in the period 565–775 as many as 76 of 337 known imperial acts concerned Italy. McCormick 2005: 143, according to Dölger concludes that from the period 565–1025 altogether 27 more-or-less wholly preserved imperial letters reached us: 8 are Greek originals, 8 are Latin translations; the remaining 11 letters were written in Oriental languages.

53 McCormick 2001: 276 ff; 2007: 56, n.31.

54 Reg. 781, 1081, 1304, 1365, 1373, 1576–78, 1590 and 1647. See the most recent edition in Pozza & Ravegnani 1993.

55 Reg. 1255, 1499 (1400) and 1607.

56 Reg. 1488, 1497–98, 1609 and 1616.

This holds true for the entire Adriatic basin. For example, the final Latin formula *Legimus* of Byzantine imperial charters was introduced into the chancery of archbishops of Ravenna as early as the 7th century.<sup>57</sup> The same *Legimus* entered Carolingian diplomatics during the reign of Charlemagne, as did the royal attribute *a Deo conservato* – a direct translation of one of the Byzantine imperial titles: θεοφύλακτος.<sup>58</sup> Lead seals of the doges of Venice were introduced (ca. 1141) on the model of Byzantine seals.<sup>59</sup> Charters of early medieval Neapolitan dukes were called *verbum sigillatum*, evidently a clumsy literal translation of the Greek χρυσόβουλλος λόγος.<sup>60</sup> It is a case of a semantic calque, just like the Dalmatian *imperium* or Venetian *dominatio*. Similarly, Byzantine letters to foreign recipients were sometimes called *imperiale* (verbatim translation of βασιλικόν), especially when addressed to Italian communes.<sup>61</sup> The title of a Croat court dignitary in the 11th century, *tepcija* (*tepciza*, *tepti*, *tepci*) is also of Byzantine origin, deriving from the Greek term *topotèrètès* (τοποτηρητής). Latin-speaking Byzantine southern Italy similarly deformed the same term (*tepoteriti*, *topoteritis*, *tepotati*).<sup>62</sup>

Gottschalk probably learned of Venetian terminology during his stay with Eberhard, margrave of Friuli, in Cividale del Friuli (ca. 836/840–846),<sup>63</sup>

57 Santoni 2011: 132; Dölger & Karayannopoulos 1968: 34–35, 55–56; Falkenhausen 2011: 307.

58 Metzger 1971: 54; Bonenfant 1951; Garipzanov 2005: 49.

59 Pozza 2011: 164; Falkenhausen 2011: 307.

60 Martin 2011: 63; Falkenhausen 2011: 307.

61 Dölger 1956: 37; Dölger & Karayannopoulos 1968: 89.

62 Margetić 1986: 259–60; Cheynet 1984.

63 McCormick 1994: 22–23. According to McCormick (2001: 923–24, no. 479) Gottschalk left Eberhard's court under Hrabanus' pressure in 846 and traveled to Venice, where he stayed for two years. Two basic sources for Gottschalk's stay in Italy are the letters of Hrabanus Maurus to Notting, bishop of Verona (May 840) and to Eberhard, margrave of Friuli (ca. 846), translated by Gumerlock in Genke & Gumerlock 2010: 165–67. They provide a precise chronological framework for the last five or six years of Gottschalk's Italian sojourn, which lasted a whole decade. The letters also enable us to shape the spatial radius of Gottschalk's activity during these five years: Friuli and northeastern Italy in general, as well as the hinterland of Venice (the bishop of Verona complained to Hrabanus that Gottschalk's predestination heresy had spread in his diocese). Genke 2010: 28. There is no doubt, therefore, that Gottschalk came into contact with Byzantine Venice between 836/840 and 846. Pezé (2013: 140–45) further discusses Hrabanus' letter to Notting, who occupied the episcopal throne in Verona ca. 834–43. He also points out that Gottschalk's activity in Verona left some trace among the local clergy. The codex BNF Lat. 3226 contains the correspondence between *scholaster* Vitalis, archdeacon Pacificus (both from Verona), and Frankish monk Hildemar of Corbie, then stationed in Milan, written in 844/45. They discuss a certain heresy that has taken root in the area of Verona, concerning the predestination of Adam (Pezé 2013: 148–50). The debate was most likely the result of Gottschalk's presence in northern Italy. Cf. also Gillis 2017: 94.

whereas his sojourn in Dalmatia and Croatia can be dated to 846–848 or 845–847.<sup>64</sup> Wherever Gottschalk collected his impressions on the spoken style in Dalmatia, his interlocutors must have been from the upper echelons of society.<sup>65</sup> Finally, that only social elites came into direct contact with Constantinople is best evidenced by the *Placitum* of Rižana: only the tribunes went ‘to the Empire’. In the latter case, this is further proof that the written documents lie behind the phrases in question. Gottschalk was chiefly in touch with the urban, social elite, most assuredly with members of the clergy and nobility, both of which had unlimited access to official correspondence with Constantinople. Addressees in the cities of Byzantine Dalmatia doubtlessly from time to time received letters and documents from the imperial chancery; the official summons to the Council of Nicaea in 787 is evidence enough. There are strong indications that these invitations were themselves formulated in a way that reflected the official and legally recognised imperial title: “*Sacra* to the most holy Bishops, who, by the grace of God and by the command of Our Pious Sovereignty (τῆς ἡμετέρας εὐσεβοῦς βασιλείας), have met together in the Council of Nicæa”.<sup>66</sup>

Imperial orders (κέλευσις, *iussio*) were sent in a well-known and strictly defined form, with a template recorded in *BOC*.<sup>67</sup> One such imperial order must have been the one sent by Basil I to Ragusa and other cities of Dalmatia, thereby ordering them to participate in the siege of Bari in 870; the respective text clearly shows that the Ragusans received an imperial mandate – βασιλική κέλευσις.<sup>68</sup> This again points to a political dependence of Dalmatian towns on Byzantine sovereignty, as well as to the reception of imperial documents as a relatively normal and usual occurrence.<sup>69</sup>

64 Rapanić 1992: 91–100. For more precise dating see Schneider 1990: 245. Ivanišević 1992: 46 (cf. Grmek 1994: 438) dates Gottschalk’s stay at Trpimir’s court to 846–848. According to De Jong 1996: 86, Gottschalk went to Italy and Dalmatia in 845–846. Genke (2010: 27) dates the Italian trip 835–836/840–845.

65 Rapanić 1992: 104; 2013: 62–63.

66 *Concilium Nicaenum* 42.2–3 = *Sacra sanctissimis episcopis qui uoluntate et gratia dei ac iussione pii imperii nostri conuenerunt in Nicena synodo* (43.2–3); *Seventh Council* 1850: 4–5.

67 Ferluga 1976: 261–90; Ostrogorski 1936: 49–50; Malamut 2000: 595.

68 *DAI*, 29.110–11. Cf. also McCormick 2001: 937, no. 565 on the Ragusan envoys in Constantinople as early as 867.

69 Dvornik *et al.* 1962: 105 (R.J.H. Jenkins); Ferluga 1978: 150. For κέλευσις see Katičić 1993: 107–18, 119. On the participation of these areas in different overlapping circles under Byzantine influence and the concept of ‘multiple peripheries’ cf. Shepard 2017: 87 and Shepard 2018. Regarding the Byzantine rule over eastern and northern Adriatic in particular, see recent text: Ančić 2018. A recent review of contacts between the imperial authorities and Dalmatia is Budak 2018b. Different aspects of Byzantine influence over Dalmatia are analysed in Basic 2010; 2013a; 2013b; 2016; 2017/18, and forthcoming.

The central government appointed all of the governors (*strategoi*), including the *strategos* of Dalmatia.<sup>70</sup> The establishment of the Theme of Dalmatia should be dated to the time of Leo V (813–820), the early reign of Michael III (842/843–846/848) or to the first decade of Basil I's reign (867–878).<sup>71</sup> Since the *strategoi* of Dalmatia were listed in the official lists of state offices (*taktika*), their Constantinopolitan origin is assured. This lasted until ca. 971/975, after which they were recruited locally, usually merging the office of *strategos* with the office of *prior* (mayor) of the city of Zadar.<sup>72</sup> Beginning with the establishment of the *theme* in the 9th century and ending in the last quarter of the 10th century, every *strategos* of Dalmatia invariably came from Constantinople, was probably Greek, and went through an elaborate investiture ceremony in front of the emperor in the Chrysotriklinos involving the inevitable formula "My Emperorship from God appoints you *strategos*". Since every new *strategos* after the expiration of his predecessor's term (according to Ferluga, this lasted ca. 3–4 years) had to be appointed personally by the emperor in Constantinople, this means that the investiture ceremony for the *strategos* of Dalmatia in Chrysotriklinos took place relatively often prior to 986.<sup>73</sup>

One neglected aspect is the routine administrative correspondance between Constantinople and the provinces, which included imperial legislature, laws, edicts, orders, etc. These documents do occasionally crop up in the sources, like the edict against icons of Leo III (ca. 726) or his *Ecloga* of the same year, which incidentally also used the phrase βασιλεία in reference to the emperor.<sup>74</sup> Although there is no direct contemporary evidence for Byzantine legislative acts in the eastern Adriatic, a marked reception of Byzantine law must have taken place (*Ecloga*, laws of Basil I, the *Basilika* of Leo VI of ca. 892), since traces of Byzantine legal norms have been detected in the later medieval law of Dalmatia and Istria.<sup>75</sup>

The fact that the same phraseology is present in Venice, Dalmatia and Istria, at the same time, in my opinion is not a mere coincidence. It results from the fact that these were provinces under long-term Byzantine rule, which of course received a number of official imperial documents. This argument is further supported by sigillographic evidence. Namely, at least nine seals of

70 *De Cer.*, 2, 788. Ferluga 1978: 184.

71 For an overview of sources and historiography see Basić 2015: 450; Gračanin 2015: 508.

72 Ferluga 1978: 160–70, 183–85, 235. Tacticons with details on Dalmatian dignitaries – Oikonomidès 1972: 57.12, 59.8, 101.31, 105.23, 139.19, 247.29, 267.8.

73 Ferluga 1978: 170–71.

74 *Ecloga*: 160.21, 166.90, 226.777 (17.3); Minale 2012a. On administrative contacts cf. T.S. Brown 1984: 154; McCormick 2001: 866, no. 118.

75 For a short synthesis see Karbić & Grbavac 2015: 239. The seminal works are Margetić 1978 and 1984.

Byzantine officials and one imperial seal are presently known in Dalmatia, and new ones keep surfacing. The earliest is one of Paul, the Exarch of Ravenna (723–726), seven can be dated to ca. 9th/10th century and the latest is one of Leo *spatharokandidatos* – [...] of Croatia (10th/11th c.). The names of the officials betray their Greek origin (Georgios, Theophylaktos, Euthymios, Eustathios).<sup>76</sup> To these should be added two very early seals recently associated with Dubrovnik (*Laousion*, *Rhaousion*, *Ragusium*) – the seal of Theodoulos, *spatharokandidatos* and *katepano tou Laou(...)* and the one of Eupraxios, also *spatharokandidatos* and *katepano tou La(...)*. Prigent dated the former to the period of the Amorion dynasty (ca. 820–867), dating the latter roughly to the early period of the Macedonian dynasty (ca. 860–880).<sup>77</sup> There is also a seal of Nicholas, *protospatharios*, *strategos* of Zadar and *katepano* of Dalmatia (ca. 1065), and a molybdobull of Constantine IX Monomachos (1042–1055).<sup>78</sup> This list, although sketchy, nonetheless indicates that Byzantine officials were present in Dalmatia as early as the 8th century and from then up until the 11th century, and as such were in a position to occasionally receive imperial documents, according to Bali most often in the form of a simple order (πρόσταγμα) sealed by the usual lead seal.<sup>79</sup>

A catalogue of these seals for the Balkan area during the *grand brèche* was compiled by Curta in 2004, followed by new studies. According to the studies of Byzantine sigillography – recently summarised in a seminal paper by Cheynet and Caseau – seals were not used for ordinary documents. They were used to authenticate a document or an object. Although all of them have been separated from the documents to which they were attached, the surviving seals nonetheless bear witness to the fact that Greek documents issued for the area of Byzantine Dalmatia must have existed. All of these governors and officials obviously arrived from Constantinople with a mandate from the emperor, sanctioned by an imperial document, a letter presumably containing the usual formulae of the imperial chancery, such as βασιλεία ἡμῶν. It is reasonable to assume that Gottschalk picked up these phrases either from the local aristocratic elites within the cities of Dalmatia, or in close contact with the Byzantine governor who resided in Zadar with his retinue, his gubernatorial *officium*.<sup>80</sup>

76 Nikolajević 1961; Nesbitt & Oikonomidès 1991: 47–48, no. 14.1–5; Ančić 2000: 282–84; Mirnik 2006: 481; Kislinger 2011: 342; Cheynet & Caseau 2012: 138; Bali 2014: 168–69.

77 Prigent 2008: 414–16; Bali 2014: 172.

78 Mošin 1972; Mirnik 1986. A complete gazetteer of Byzantine seals of Dalmatian provenance is lacking – for the time being see Ančić 2000; Curta 2004: 180–89; Bali 2014.

79 Bali 2014: 169.

80 The structure of the *officium* of the *strategos* of Dalmatia in Zadar was recreated by Ferluga 1978: 172–76.



#### 4 The Case of Venice

Apart from a suspicious letter purportedly sent by Leo III to the patriarch of Grado in 727 – containing terms such as *nostra imperialis maiestas* and *presente hoc nostrum preceptum more imperii nostri de bulla nostra infigi iussimus* – there are no extant Byzantine imperial acts relating to Venice earlier than the 10th century.<sup>81</sup> However, it is certainly indicative that the earliest surviving imperial act relating to Venice – a *chrysobullium sigillum* of Basil II for Venice (March 992) – contains the terms *nostrum imperium* (ἡ βασιλεία ἡμῶν) and *a Deo coronatum nostrum imperium* (ἡ θεοστεφῆς βασιλεία ἡμῶν).<sup>82</sup>

The Venetian sources of the 8th and 9th centuries contain an abundance of Byzantine titles and dignities, of which *hypatus* is one of the most esteemed, more often than not taking precedence over the title of doge (*dux*); the titles *spatharios* and *protospatharios* are also well attested.<sup>83</sup> Their connection with contemporary *hypatoi* of Istria (*Placitum* of Rižana) was noticed long ago. Francesco Borri highlighted the frequently overlooked fact that the Venetian tribuni also received the title of *consul-hypatos* at practically the same time as the Istrians.<sup>84</sup> This is further evidence of a massive influx of Byzantine documents bestowing such titles. A list of similar events assembled by McCormick attests formal bestowals of imperial titles (*spatharios*, *protospatharios*, *hypatos*) to Venetian officials from 806 to 897, whether by imperial representatives or by the emperor in person during their frequent stays at court; it also attests to several imperial *iussiones* to Venetian doges (822–829).<sup>85</sup> Visits and sojourns of the members of the Venetian ruling families in Constantinople were

81 The letter is published in Besta 1906 and Cessi 1940a: 31–32, no. 20. According to Cessi 1940b: 100, n.1 and 104–05, n.3 the letter is authentic. Stein 1921 (also T.S. Brown 1984: 156 n.24) argues convincingly that the letter is an early-11th century forgery. Even if this is so, the forgery must have been modeled upon an older original containing the said phrases.

82 Reg. 781 = Pozza & Ravegnani 1993: 22–24; Gastgeber 2003: 126–27.

83 E.g. Cessi 1940a: 49, 92–93, 99, 117–18 no. 30 (770–72), 52–53 (827–29, 829), 60 (853), Cessi 1942: no. 15 (880) and 25 (900). Cf. Martin 2000: 625–26, Marin 2005: 91–92. More on the Venetian *hypatoi*: Carile 2011: 648.

84 Ferluga 1978: 149; Martin 2000: 625; Borri 2008a: 14–15 pointed out a list of nobles of Cittanova and Equilo preserved in the *Chronicon Altinate*: “the Particiaci, called also Baduarii, who were tribunes, before obtaining the imperial dignity of consuls”. According to T.S. Brown (1984: 138–39) in the mid – and late-8th century all the governors in Byzantine Italy bore the title of *consul*.

85 McCormick 2001: 892–963, no. 270, 274, 283, 291, 296–97, 299, 300, 305–06, 358, 361, 371, 376–78, 383, 409, 421, 449, 455, 550, 635, 658, 700, 734. On the relations between Byzantium and Venice in the early Middle Ages the literature is boundless: Cessi 1940b: 39–40, 93–96, 115–18, 135–39, 154–66, 210–13, 245–49, 266–68, 297–98; Nicol 1988: 1–49; for an overview of earlier scholarship see Carile 2011: 629, n.1.

commonplace, as well as awarding Byzantine dignities to the doges and their sons or siblings.<sup>86</sup>

For the most part of the 9th century, then, Venice was as close to the Empire as one could possibly get. This proximity was especially manifest in the first part of the 9th century, exactly when Gottschalk stayed at Eberhard's court nearby, and most likely visited Venetian territory. The fact that Venice particularly abounded in Byzantine charters precisely at the moment when the Frankish theologian observed the 'majestic discourse' of its inhabitants is in all likelihood not accidental.

## 5 The Case of Istria

As opposed to both the Venetians and the Dalmatians, the Istrians evidently knew and used both *dominatio* (<κράτος) and *imperium* (<βασιλεία) to designate the sovereign. This reciprocity is, on another level, expressly stated in the *Placitum* of Rižana, when the Istrians call the Venetians and Dalmatians their "relatives and neighbours".<sup>87</sup> As far as one can tell, judging from the *Placitum* of Rižana, prior to Charlemagne's conquest of Istria (ca. 788) the governor of the province (*magister militum Graecorum*) was regularly a Greek sent from Constantinople. At first he was probably appointed by the Exarch of Ravenna, after 751 by the emperor himself.<sup>88</sup> The visits of imperial envoys were also fairly regular. This strengthened the ties with central government, along with the periodic visits of the provincial elite to Constantinople in order to obtain the dignity of *consul-hypatos*.<sup>89</sup>

86 Marin 2005: 75–76, 87–88. On their trips see Borri 2008a: 14–15. Later on, after 942 (up until 1008) the doges of Venice discarded the Byzantine titles; the last known κέλευσις to Venice was issued in 827, Martin 2000: 626.

87 *Placito*, 66.15–17: *vn̄de omnes d(e)uenimus i(n) paup(er)tate(m) et d(e)ridet nostros parentes et c(on)vicinj nostri Venetias et Dalmatias et(iam) Greci sub cuius antea fuimus potestate*. Cf. Borri 2008a: 3–4; 2010b: 2.

88 Ferluga 1978: 121–22; T.S. Brown 1984: 53–56; Levak 2007: 80; Bileta 2011: 112 and n.27, 113. The names of known *magistri militum Graecorum* in Istria are indicative of this, all of them Eastern: Basil, Mastalo, Constantine, another Basil, Stephanos.

89 Ferluga 1978: 149; McCormick 1998: 38; Levak 2007: 80. Some of them are actually mentioned in the *Placitum* – *Placito*, 60.41–42: *possess(io) Mauricij ypati seu Basillii magistri militu(m) instar et d(e) Theodoro ypato*. On the presence of the representatives of central government in the Byzantine provinces see Diehl 1888: 112–23; Guillou 1969: 306; T.S. Brown 1984: 144–63.



As recently emphasised by McCormick, imperial letters did not travel alone, nor did imperial envoys travel without some sort of document. For the period from 700 until 900 only five authentic imperial letters addressed to the non-Byzantine West are preserved. On the other hand, at least 45 Byzantine embassies are attested in the same period – this goes to show that only every ninth letter they carried has reached modern times.<sup>90</sup> According to McCormick's statistics, between ca. 700 and 900 a total of 83 Byzantine envoys reached the West, whereas 34 Western envoys reached Byzantium.<sup>91</sup> A more restrictive inquiry revealed that between 756 and 840 a total of 30 diplomatic missions were exchanged between the Carolingian and Constantinopolitan courts: 9 Frankish embassies and 21 Byzantine.<sup>92</sup> Even if we put aside the fact that only a small quantity of sources have reached us, this is a huge number. It helps us to understand how and why Byzantine courtly discourse became so deeply rooted in the Western provinces.<sup>93</sup>

## 6 The Case of Sicily

So far I have deliberately suppressed the identity of another source also referring to transpersonal forms of imperial office. To my knowledge, so far, its verbal similarities with the ones from Venice, Istria and Dalmatia have gone unnoticed. This source is evidence given by one Theodore, bishop of Catania in Sicily, who in 787 attended the Ecumenical Council of Nicaea. Before the council, in 785, he was a member of an imperial embassy sent by the strategos of Sicily to Rome, on the orders of Constantine VI. Theodore carried a letter intended to reassure the pope, Hadrian I, of the emperor's orthodoxy; after that the Sicilian bishop travelled to Constantinople with the pope's representatives late in 785. At the Council Theodore gave a report on his mission to Rome and confirmed the authenticity of pope Hadrian's letters to the emperor and

90 Reg. 341, 390, 408, 474, 488. McCormick 2001: 859–963, no. 65, 75, 85, 119, 125, 158, 161–62, 170, 197, 203, 211, 240, 251, 258, 262, 296, 311, 330, 344–45, 347, 383, 399, 425, 445, 449, 456, 465, 518, 535, 553, 568–69, 573, 613, 616, 624, 658, 660, 700, 708, 725, 732–73; 2005: 135, 142.

91 McCormick 2007: 55, 70–72 (Appendix: Check list of Byzantine and Carolingian ambassadors).

92 McCormick 1994: 25–27.

93 T.S. Brown 1984: 155–59; McCormick 1998: 49–50; Borri 2008a: 15–16; Bileta 2011: 117. For an analogous situation in Byzantine southern Italy cf. Peters-Custot 2012. Classical studies are still Guillou 1967; 1969: 231–26; 1989. Cf. Ferluga 1988 and Ravegnani 2004: esp. 81–143. On the issue of Hellenization of Byzantine Italy see in general Diehl 1888: 241–88; Simonini 1969: 50–54. On Byzantine *δουλεία* and *οικείωσις* in Dalmatia cf. Goldstein 1992: 119–20; 1996; 1998; 2003: 5–6; Gračanin 2015: 502–03.

the patriarch.<sup>94</sup> One passage of Theodore's report on the events of 785, cited in Table 10.4, resembles all of the aforementioned cases of 'majestic discourse' and appears to provide incontrovertible proof that the same had been in use in Sicily, too (Table 10.4).

TABLE 10.4 The report of Theodore, bishop of Catania, on the embassy to Rome from 785

Greek text	Latin translation	English translation
<p>Θεόδωρος ὁ θεοφιλέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Κατάνης εἶπε· Τῆς εὐσεβοῦς βασιλείας κελευσάσης διὰ τιμίας κελεύσεως αὐτῶν ἀποσταλῆναι τὸν σὺν ἐμοὶ δοῦλον τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀγιωσύνης Λέοντα τὸν θεοσεβέστατον πρεσβύτερον μετὰ καὶ τιμίου γράμματος τοῦ πανιέρου μου δεσπότη, ὁ σέβων τὴν ἀγιωσύνην ὑμῶν ὁ τῆς κατ' ἐμὲ Σικελῶν ἐπαρχίας στρατηγὸς ἀπέστειλέ με εἰς Ῥώμην μετὰ εὐσεβοῦς κελεύσεως τῶν ὀρθοδόξων βασιλέων ἡμῶν· καὶ ἀπελθόντων ἡμῶν τὴν πίστιν τῆς εὐσεβοῦς βασιλείας ἡμῶν καὶ ὀρθοδοξίαν ἀνηγγείλαμεν.</p>	<p><i>Theodorus deo amabilis episcopus Catanae dixit: Pio imperio iubente per honorabiles iussiones suas mittere Leonem dei cultorem presbyterum, qui una mecum seruius est uestrae sanctitatis, simul cum pretiosa epistola sacratissimi domini mei, ille qui colit sanctitatem uestram, Siculorum scilicet meae prouinciae magistratus, misit me Romam cum pia iussione horthodoxorum imperatorum nostrorum. Qui abeuntes fidem pii imperii nostri et horthodoxiam denuntiauimus.</i></p>	<p>Theodore, Bishop of Catana, said to the Patriarch: "Our religious Sovereigns having commanded, in their most honourable mandate, that Leo, a most religious Presbyter, should be sent with me, the servant of your Holiness, with the valued letter of our most sacred master the Governor of our province in Sicily, who ever holds your Holiness in highest estimation, forwarded us to Rome with the sacred letters of our orthodox Sovereigns; and when we arrived we declared the faith and</p>

94 *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 12: 1075–78. On Theodore (attested ca. 785–787), see <http://www.pbe.kcl.ac.uk/person/p7424> and Reg. 341. On this mission, see McCormick 2001: 881, no. 206. In total, I detected a further seven instances of βασιλεία in the same Acts, always either in reference to the emperor, or as a self-designation of the emperor, all regularly translated as *imperium* (*nostrum/pium/pacificum/a Deo concessum/tranquillissimum*) – *Concilium Nicaenum*: 42.2–3, 15–19; 46.1–3, 28–29; 120.25–26, 232.16, 244.9–12.

TABLE 10.4 The report of Theodore, bishop of Catania (*cont.*)

Greek text	Latin translation	English translation
καὶ ὁ μακαριώτατος πάπας ἀκούσας εἶπεν ὅτι “ἐπὶ τῶν ἡμερῶν τῆς βασιλείας αὐτῶν εἰ γένηται τοῦτο, μεγαλῶνα ἔχει ὁ θεὸς τὴν εὐσεβῆ βασιλείαν αὐτῶν ὑπὲρ τὰς ἔμπροσθεν βασιλείας.” <i>Concilium Nicaenum:</i> 172.12–20	<i>Et beatissimus papa audiens dixit quia “si in diebus imperii eorum factum fuerit hoc, magnificare habet deus pium imperium eorum super priora regna.” Concilium Nicaenum:</i> 173.14–21	<b>orthodoxy of our religious rulers;</b> and the most blessed Pope, having heard us, said in reply: ‘If, in the days of their sovereignty, this should be accomplished, God will magnify the reign of their piety above the reigns of any of their predecessors.’” <i>Seventh Council: 71</i>

Theodore’s oral statement is the final piece of the puzzle: here we have for the first time a first-hand account of a contemporary using Byzantine lexical features while referring to the ruling emperor – something we lacked in the case of Gottschalk and the *Placitum* of Rižana (both second-hand or anonymous accounts). Both times Theodore mentioned his sovereign (Constantine VI) he did so in a way directly reminiscent of our sources from Venice, Dalmatia and Istria. He received a mandate (*κελεύσις-iussio*) from the emperor – designated in transpersonal form (*βασιλεία-imperium*). When describing the emperor’s orthodoxy to the pope, Theodore again calls his sovereign *βασιλεία ἡμῶν-imperium nostrum*, instead of the expected *βασιλεύς-imperator*. The authenticity of Theodore’s report is beyond doubt. Moreover, he was an inhabitant of a Byzantine province, an imperial subject *par excellence*.

## 7 Concluding Remarks: Adriobyzantism, Latin Byzantinism, or Something Else?

The resemblances between Gottschalk’s writings relating to Dalmatia and Venice, the *Placitum* of Rižana, and Theodore’s narrative for 785 are of such a nature that a common source must be invoked. The mutual verbal similarities are frequent and striking and go beyond mere coincidence. These Byzantine borrowings are actually a semantic calque, adapted to the local circumstances of Dalmatia, Istria, Venice, and Sicily. In brief, Byzantine diplomatic

documents, resulting in standardised common expressions, should be defined as the common source of Gottschalk, Theodore, and the *Placitum* of Rižana, since its existence is deduced primarily from their resemblances.

In my opinion the phrases mentioned by Gottschalk were not simply examples of the everyday-speech of the local populace. They may in fact represent the influence of diplomatic formulas contained in the charters issued by the Byzantine imperial chancery. These documents were written in Greek, published and analysed in special corpora and form the basis of our knowledge of Byzantine diplomatics. If this is a valid assumption, then the penetration of Byzantine bureaucratic language suggests a regular reception of Byzantine administrative documents in Venice, Istria and Dalmatia, as well as regular communication between the people of these areas and Constantinople in relation to ceremonies involving imperial ideology.<sup>95</sup> Since a certain amount of time is needed for such discourse to take hold, this may hint at the reception of Byzantine documents beginning decades or centuries earlier than the documents in which it first appears. Three neighbouring regions were at the

95 Borri 2008a: 15. Some questions, however, still remain unanswered, such as: why should the people of Byzantine Dalmatia call their ruler *rex* or *regnum*? A possible explanation may lie in the fact that the term βασιλεύς was notoriously ambiguous, even in Classical Antiquity, because it could designate a king as well as an emperor. The title *rex* did not exist in Byzantine intitulation, and it was transferred into medieval Greek from Latin. The Byzantines knew and recognised only the title βασιλεύς, which was reserved for the Byzantine emperor (only later assumed by the emperors of the Franks, Bulgars etc.) – Maróti 1962: 175; Goldstein 1983: 148–49; McCormick & Kazhdan 1991; Sansterre 1991: 16; Zuckerman 2010: 883, 886. There was no adequate Latin translation of the word βασιλεύς, because it was sometimes translated as *imperator*, a term rather preferred for translating αὐτοκράτωρ, another preeminent imperial title. The fact that both βασιλεύς and αὐτοκράτωρ could at times be simultaneously rendered as *imperator* created ambiguities and contradictions in Latin imperial titles. On the other hand, Carolingian texts sometimes used the words *rex-regnum* and *imperator-imperium* interchangeably, especially during the reigns of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious – Goetz 1987: 124, 171, 174–75; Sansterre 1991: 37; Van Espelo 2013: 273; Bullough 2003: 383. At least once the terms *regnum* and *imperium* are explicitly equated, in the context of negotiations between Charlemagne and empress Irene about the imperial title in 800: “Around that time, envoys of the Greeks came to him, having been sent from Constantinople laden with lavish gifts, and entreated him to accept their office of kingship and emperorship”. *Annales Nordhumbrani*: 156; McCormick 2001: 889–90, no. 251; Van Espelo 2013: 279, n.102; Fried 2013: 314 and 453, n.109. Furthermore, the wording (*illorum* [sc. *Graecorum*] *regnum et imperium*) leaves no doubt that the office in question was actually Byzantine βασιλεία, imperial power faithfully rendered into Latin as *regnum et imperium*. Gottschalk’s contemporaries in Byzantine Dalmatia would, therefore, have called their sovereign *imperator/imperium* as well as *rex/regnum*, with some ambiguity as to whether they meant it in a technical sense of the word (βασιλεύς/αὐτοκράτωρ). This, however, remains speculative.

same time exposed to the same phenomenon (via Greek documents and periodical travels); moreover, they shared a common linguistic background (vulgar Latin and Proto-Romance). In that way these Latinised traces of Byzantine loanwords represent a sort of Adriabyzantism or Latin Byzantinism, an intellectual product of a marginally Byzantine cultural zone, which in the words of A. Beihammer: “did not produce Byzantine documents in the strict sense, but was, because of a strong Byzantine substrate, based on Greek chancery traditions and administrative practices and thus exhibited all kinds of cross-cultural influences and hybrid forms”.<sup>96</sup>

Therefore, what lay in the background of Gottschalk's observations on the syntax of Dalmatians were in fact complex mechanisms of Byzantine culture. These mechanisms were strong enough and durable enough to reach the Adriatic provinces and remain in local oral and written culture and as such were they witnessed by the Frankish theologian in mid-9th century.

TABLE 10.5 *Imperium and Regnum* in Gottschalk's account of Venetia and Dalmatia

<i>De praedestinatione</i> , chapter IX, § 6	
<p>[fol. 70 v] § 6. <i>Erubescere Sidon, ait enim mare. Nam quemadmodum Sidon interpretatur uenatio et ipsa uenatio pro uenatoribus ponitur in hoc loco, similiter crebro ponitur et dicitur diuinitas et deitas pro deo. Quod [ut] ualeas uidere liquido, diligenter attende quod dicere uolo. Omnes Venetici qui sunt uidelicet intra mare degentes in ciuitatibus homines Latini dominum suum id est imperatorem Graecorum nequaquam uocant dominum sed dominationem. Dicunt enim: Benigna dominatio miserere nostri, et: Fuimus</i></p>	<p>[fol. 70 v] § 6. <i>Be ashamed, Sidon, the sea has said.</i> For, as “Sidon” means “hunting” and “hunting” is used in this passage for “hunters”. Similarly “divinity” and “deity” are often used and said instead of “God”. In order that you may see this clearly, pay careful attention to what I want to say. All the Venetians, that is, Latin people living in the cities on this side of the sea, never call their lord, that is, the emperor of the Greeks, lord, but lordship. For they say: “Your benign lordship, have mercy on us,” and: “We have been before his lordship,” and: “His lordship has told</p>

96 Beihammer 2011: 7–8. On Latin Byzantinism see Ortalli 2005; Borri 2008a: 3–4. Cf. also Dzino & Parry 2014; Angelov 2003. Holmes (2010: esp. 145–46) discusses the interrelationship between peripheral elites and the imperial centre, and their side-effects (often unintended), noting the “ubiquity of written culture in Byzantine political contexts, above all the production of texts and inscribed objects by imperial government” (138), supplying an ever-growing demand for (authenticated) imperial documents in the provinces.

TABLE 10.5 *Imperium* and *Regnum* in Gottschalk's account of Venetia and Dalmatia (cont.)*De praedestinatione*, chapter IX, § 6

*ante dominationem, et: Ita nobis dixit dominatio. Sed ne tibi uilescat illorum quasi rustica loquutio, uide quid sit in caelo. Nam pro dominis dominationes uocantur illi spiritus beati qui sunt inter ceteros in ordine constituti* VI<sup>o</sup>. [fol. 71 r] *Sic ergo dicitur deitas et diuinitas pro deo. Item homines Dalmatini, perinde id est similiter homines Latini Graecorum nihilominus imperio subiecti, regem et imperatorem communi locutione per totam Dalmatiam longissimam reuera regionem regem inquam et imperatorem regnum et imperium uocant. Aiunt enim: Fuimus ad regnum, et: Stetimus ante imperium, et: Ita nobis dixit regnum, et: Ita nobis loquutum est imperium. Sed nec istud ab illis aestimes absque auctoritate dici, siquidem sancta ecclesia toto terrarum orbe cum ueraciter et fauorabiliter tum satis auctorabiliter laetissima canat de filio dei: In excelso throno uidi sedere uirum quem adorat multitudo angelorum psallentium in unum: ecce cuius imperium nomen est in aeternum id est: ecce cuius nomen imperator est in aeternum. Similiter quoque debes et illud nosse quod sub numero singulari generaliter omnes electi dicuntur et sunt regnum gratis effecti, sicut probat illud apostoli: Cum tradiderit regnum deo et patri id est ut ab beato dicitur Augustino: Eos quos redemit sanguine suo tradiderit contemplan-do patri suo. Porro huic regno*

us so". But lest their manner of speaking should seem poor to you as rustic, see what is in heaven. For those blessed spirits who are located in sixth ranks among the others are called lordships instead of lords. [fol. 71 r] In that way then "deity" and "divinity" are used instead of "God". Likewise, Dalmatian people, that is, likewise Latin people, but subject to the empire of the Greeks, call the king and emperor by an expression common throughout the whole of Dalmatia, which is a most spacious region, I mean, they call the king and emperor kingdom and empire. For they say: "We were at the kingdom," and: "We stood before the empire," and: "The kingdom has told us so," and: "The empire spoke in that way". But do not think that they say this with no authority, since the Holy Church in whole world truthfully and favorably as well as quite authoritatively sings joyfully about the Son of God: "I have seen a man sit on a high throne, whom the multitude of the angels adore and sing in one voice: 'Behold him whose name for eternity is empire,'" that is: This is the one whose name is for eternity emperor. Likewise you should also know that all the elect are generally spoken of under the singular number and have been gratuitously made a kingdom, as the words of the Apostle proves: *When he shall have handed over the kingdom to God the Father*, that is, as blessed

TABLE 10.5 *Imperium* and *Regnum* in Gottschalk's account of Venetia and Dalmatia (cont.)*De praedestinatione*, chapter IX, § 6

**daturus est dominus deus noster rex ubi perpetim regnent cum eo regnum, tunc uidelicet quando dicet illis ipse rex regum: Venite benedicti patris mei, percipite regnum tamquam dicat ut in sancti Augustini [fol. 71 v] exposuit sermone: Qui regnum eratis et non regnabatis, uenite regnate. Non mireris itaque si rex unus regnum uocetur iure, cum tot reges omnes electi – propterea reges deo donante sunt quia sub Christo uero rege semper animas eorum regente corpora sua regunt – regnum uocentur ut sunt rite.**

*Erubescere Sidon, ait enim mare. Sidon interpretatur uenatio ut supra dictum est. Porro uenatio seu uenator est quisque praedicator dicente domino per prophetam: Ecce ego mittam uenatores meos et uenabuntur eos et piscatores meos et piscabuntur eos. Per mare uero significatur uulgi et plebeia multitudo. Proinde quoniam palam peccat praedicator id est uenator et uulgi eius [est] reprehensor, tunc impletur istud: Erubescere Sion, ait enim mare.*  
Lambot (1945): 207–09

Augustine says: “When he shall have handed over those whom he redeemed by his blood to contemplate his Father.” But the Lord God, our king, will give to this kingdom the kingdom in order that they may reign there with him forever, that is, when the King of Kings himself says to them: “Come, blessed of my Father, receive the kingdom,” as if he would say as he explained it [fol. 71 v] in the sermon of Saint Augustine: “You who were a kingdom, but did not reign, come and reign.” Therefore, you should not be surprised if the one king is rightly said to be a kingdom, when so many kings, all the elect, are called a kingdom, which they rightly are. For they are kings by God’s gift because they always rule over their bodies under Christ the true king, who rules over their souls.

*Be ashamed, Sidon, the sea has said.* “Sidon” means “hunting,” as was said above. But hunting or a hunter is any preacher, as the Lord says through the prophet: *Behold, I will send my hunters and they will hunt them, and my fishermen and they will fish them.* But by the sea is signified the common folk and ordinary people. Hence, when the preacher, that is, the hunter, sins openly, and the common folk are the reprimander of him, then these words are fulfilled: *Be ashamed, Sidon, for the sea speaks.*  
Genke (2010): 124–25



TABLE 10.6 The phrases τὸ κράτος and τὸ κράτος ἡμῶν in *De Cerimoniis*

Chapter	Greek text	Translation (Moffatt & Tall 2012)
1.0.6–7 (4)	ἀκαλλώπιστον τῷ ὄντι καὶ δυσειδῆ τὴν βασιλείαν ἦν καθορᾶν	The imperial power was in fact unadorned and unattractive to look at
1.1.1–2 (22)	Εἰς πολλοὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς χρόνους ὁ Θεὸς ἀγάγοι τὴν βασιλείαν ὑμῶν.	May God guide your reign for many good years!
1.1.10 (25)	Εἰς πολλοὺς χρόνους καὶ ἀγαθοὺς ὁ Θεὸς ἀγάγοι τὴν δικαίαν ὑμῶν βασιλείαν.	May God guide your just reign for many good years!
1.2.1–2 (36)	Πολλοὶ ὑμῖν χρόνοι ἢ ἔνθεος βασιλεία	Many years to you, the divinely-inspired reign!
1.2.11–12 (36)	Πολυχρόνιον ποιήσει ὁ Θεὸς τὴν ἀγίαν βασιλείαν σας εἰς πολλὰ ἔτη.	May God make your holy reign long-lasting for many years!
1.2.6 (37)	Πολυχρόνιον ποιήσει ὁ Θεὸς τὴν ἀγίαν βασιλείαν σας εἰς πολλὰ ἔτη.	May God make your holy reign long-lasting for many years!
1.2.22–23 (38)	Πολυχρόνιον ποιήσει ὁ Θεὸς τὴν ἀγίαν βασιλείαν σας εἰς πολλὰ ἔτη.	May God make your holy reign long-lasting for many years!
1.2.19–20 (39)	ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ὁ τὴν ἡμετέραν προσλαβόμενος σάρκα ἐκ τῆς Παρθένου, τὴν ὑμῶν θεόστεπτον βασιλείαν φυλάξει ἐν τῇ πορφύρα.	May he who assumed our flesh from the Virgin guard your divinely-crowned reign in the purple.
1.2.15 (40)	ὁ ζωοδότης αὐτὸς τὸ κέρας ὑμῶν, δεσπότης, ἀνυψώσει ἐν πάσῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ, τὰ ἔθνη πάντα δουλώσει τοῦ προσφέρειν, ὡς οἱ μάγοι, τὰ δῶρα τῇ ὑμῶν βασιλείᾳ	May the giver of life himself, rulers, raise up your horn in all the empire and may he enslave all the nations to offer, like the Magi, gifts for your reign.
1.3.19 (41)	ἀλλ' ὁ τὸν κόσμον φωτίσας τῇ αὐτοῦ ἐπιφανείᾳ ὑψώσει καὶ μεγαλύνει τὸ κράτος τῆς ὑμῶν βασιλείας εἰς εὐτυχίαν καὶ δόξαν Ῥωμαίων.	May he who has illuminated the world by his epiphany raise up and increase the power of your reign for the good fortune and glory of the Romans!
1.3.8 (42)	Πολυχρόνιον ποιήσει ὁ Θεὸς τὴν ἀγίαν βασιλείαν σας εἰς πολλὰ ἔτη.	May God make your holy reign long-lasting for many years!
1.3.6–7 (43)	Τῷ λουτρῷ γὰρ ἀγιάσας, τῆς ἀφθαρσίας τῷ ἐλαίῳ βαπτίζει τὴν βασιλείαν, σωτηρίαν δωρούμενος τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις καὶ ἀντίληψιν μεγίστην καὶ δόξαν τῆς βασιλείας.	Having sanctified your reign with baptism, he is baptising it with the oil of incorruptibility, granting salvation to the Romans and the greatest support and glory for your reign.



TABLE 10.6 The phrases τὸ κράτος and τὸ κράτος ἡμῶν in *De Cerimoniis* (cont.)

Chapter	Greek text	Translation (Moffatt & Tall 2012)
1.3.18 (43)	Πολυχρόνιον ποιήσει ὁ Θεὸς τὴν ἁγίαν βασιλείαν.	May God make [your] holy reign long-lasting!
1.4.23 (44)	Πολυχρόνιον ποιήσει ὁ Θεὸς τὴν ἁγίαν βασιλείαν σας εἰς πολλὰ ἔτη.	May God make your holy reign long-lasting for many years!
1.4.5 (45)	ὁ γὰρ τῆς δόξης Κύριος τὸ σκυθρωπὸν ἀφανίσας τοῦ θανάτου καὶ τὰ τοῦ ᾄδου σκυλεύσας βασιλεία, συνανέστησε τοὺς πάλαι τεθνεώτας.	The Lord of glory, dispelling the gloom of death and plundering the kingdom of Hades, has raised up those who died long ago.
1.4.17–19 (46)	Ὁ γὰρ ἔχων τὸ κράτος τοῦ θανάτου, ὁ τοῦ Πατρὸς συνάναρχος καὶ συναῖδιος Λόγος, σκυλεύσας τὰ βασιλεία τοῦ ᾄδου, ἔλυσε τὸν δεσμὸν τῶν αἰχμαλώτων, πᾶσι δωρησάμενος ἐλευθερίαν, ὃς καὶ φυλάξει τὸ κράτος τῆς βασιλείας εἰς δόξαν, εἰς καύχημα, εἰς ἀνέγερσιν Ῥωμαίων.	He who has the power over death, the Word, co-eternal with the Father and everlasting, having plundered the kingdom of Hades, has loosed the bonds of the captives, granting freedom to all. May he guard the power of the reign to the glory, renown and exaltation of Romans.
1.5.11 (49)	Καλῶς ἦλθεν ἡ ἔνθεος βασιλεία	The divinely-inspired reign is welcome.
1.5.10 (50)	Καλῶς ἦλθεν ἡ ἔνθεος βασιλεία	The divinely-inspired reign is welcome.
1.5.14 (51)	Πολυχρόνιον ποιήσει ὁ Θεὸς τὴν ἁγίαν βασιλείαν σας εἰς πολλὰ ἔτη.	May God make your holy reign long-lasting for many years!
1.8.2–3 (58)	Διὸ αὐτὸς ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, εὐεργέται, εὐλογήσει ὑμᾶς ἐν πᾶσι καὶ χαρὰς ἐμπλήσει τὴν ὑμῶν βασιλείαν	So, benefactors, may our God himself bless you in all things and fill your reign with joy.
1.9.2 (61)	Πολυχρόνιον ποιήσει ὁ Θεὸς τὴν ἁγίαν βασιλείαν σας.	May God make your holy reign long-lasting!
1.9.8 (BOC, 62)	Εἰς πολλοὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς χρόνους ὁ Θεὸς ἀγάγοι τὴν βασιλείαν ὑμῶν.	May God guide your reign for many good years!
1.17.3–4 (108)	Εἰς πολλοὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς χρόνους ὁ Θεὸς ἀγάγοι τὴν βασιλείαν ὑμῶν.	May God guide your reign for many good years!
1.38.6 (195)	ἐν ἣ τὸ στέφος τῆς βασιλείας	On which the crown of the imperial power ...
1.40.3 (206)	ἐν ἣ τὸ στέφος τῆς βασιλείας τῆ κορυφῆ σου ἀξίως περιετέθη.	On which the crown of the imperial power has rightly been placed on your head.
1.42.3 (217)	Ὁ Θεὸς καλαῖς ἡμέραις πλεονάσει τὴν βασιλείαν.	May God provide the imperial power with abundant good days!

TABLE 10.6 The phrases τὸ κράτος and τὸ κράτος ἡμῶν in *De Cerimoniis* (cont.)

Chapter	Greek text	Translation (Moffatt & Tall 2012)
1.43.9–10 (222)	Ἀνάτειλον ἡ ἔνθεος βασιλεία.	Rise, the divinely-inspired imperial power!
1.62.17–18 (279)	Κατακοσμεῖς γὰρ τὸν θρόνον τῆς πατρῴας βασιλείας, σὺν τῇ Αὐγούστη	You adorn the throne of imperial power of your fathers with the augousta
1.63.6 (280)	Ἀνάτειλον ἡ ἔνθεος βασιλεία.	Rise up, the divinely-inspired imperial power!
1.63.22 (280)	Πολλοὶ ὑμῖν χρόνοι, ἡ ἔνθεος βασιλεία.	Many years to you, the divinely-inspired imperial power!
1.63.3–4 (281)	Ἀσύγκριτοι στρατιῶται, οἰκουμένης οἱ πρόμαχοι, στεφεφόροι, οἱ ἐκ Θεοῦ ὑψωθέντες ἐπὶ θρόνου τῆς βασιλείας	Incomparable soldiers, champions of the empire, who wear the crown, raised up by God to the throne of imperial power
1.63.7 (282)	Κατακοσμεῖς γὰρ τὸν θρόνον τῆς πατρῴας βασιλείας σὺν τῇ αὐγούστη	You adorn the throne of the imperial power of your fathers with the augousta
1.65.4 (294)	καὶ προελθὼν οὐρανόθεν ἀρχιστράτηγος ὁ μέγας, πρὸ προσώπου σου ἡνοιξεν τὰς πύλας τῆς βασιλείας·	The great Archangel Michael, having come from heaven, has opened the doors of imperial power before your eyes
1.69.13 (319)	Πολυχρόνιον ποιήσει ὁ Θεὸς τὴν ἁγίαν βασιλείαν.	May God make your holy reign long-lasting!
1.69.17–18 (320)	Πολλοὶ ὑμῖν χρόνοι, ἡ ἔνθεος βασιλεία.	Many years to you, the divinely-inspired imperial power!
1.69.17 (322)	τοῦτο γὰρ κέκτηται ἡ πολιτεία ἐς εὐτυχίαν καὶ δόξαν τῆς βασιλείας.	For the state has acquired this [flower] for the good fortune and glory of the imperial power
1.71.20 (349)	καὶ πολιτεύεται χάρις ἐν μέσῳ τῆς βασιλείας	Grace governs midst imperial power
1.71.2 (354)	Πολλοὶ ὑμῖν χρόνοι, ἡ ἔνθεος βασιλεία.	Many years to you, the divinely-inspired imperial power!
1.71.19 (355)	Πολλοὶ ὑμῖν χρόνοι, ἡ ἔνθεος βασιλεία.	Many years to you, the divinely-inspired imperial power!
1.71.8–9 (358)	νικήσουσιν χαροποιούντες τὴν βασιλείαν, τὴν πολιτείαν	May they be victorious, bringing joy to the imperial power, to the state;

TABLE 10.6 The phrases τὸ κράτος and τὸ κράτος ἡμῶν in *De Cerimoniis* (cont.)

Chapter	Greek text	Translation (Moffatt & Tall 2012)
1.73.9 (368)	Πολλοὶ ὑμῖν χρόνοι, ἡ ἔνθεος βασιλεία.	Many years to you, the divinely-inspired imperial power!
1.74.15 (369)	Ἀπόκριμα: “Κρίστους, Δέους Νόστερ, κοὐμσέρβετ ἡμπέριουμ βέστρουμ πέρ μουλτουσάννος ἐτ βόνος.” Ἐρμηνεύεται: “Χριστὸς ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, φυλάξει τὴν βασιλείαν ὑμῶν ἐπὶ πολλοῖς ἔτεσι καὶ καλοῖς.”	Response: “Cristus Deus noster cumservet imperium vestrum per multos annos et bonos!” It is translated: “May Christ our God guard your reign for many good years!”
1.75.20–21 (370)	Τοῦ βασιλέως ἀκουμβίζοντος ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης, καὶ τῆς συνήθους τάξεως πάσης τελουμένης, ἐπειδὴν διὰ νεύματος τοῦ πραιποσίτου ὀφείλωσιν καθεσθῆναι οἱ κεκλημένοι φίλοι, λέγουσιν οἱ πέντε βουκάλιοι: “Κωνσέρβετ Δέους ἡμπέριουμ βέστρουμ.” “Ὁ ἐστὶ μεθερμηνευόμενον: “Φυλάξει ὁ Θεὸς τὴν βασιλείαν ὑμῶν.”	When the emperor is reclining at the table and all the customary ceremonial is being performed, and when at a sign from the praipositos the guests who have been invited are about to sit, the five chanters recite: “Conservet Deus imperium vestrum,” which is, translated: “May God guard your reign!”
1.83.9–10 (384)	Καὶ μετὰ τὴν συμπλήρωσιν τοῦ ἀλφαβηταρίου, λέγουσιν: “Πολυχρόνιον ποιήσει ὁ Θεὸς τὴν ἀγίαν βασιλείαν σας.”	After the completion of the alphabetical acrostic they recite, “May God make your holy reign long-lasting!”
1.87.6–7 (393)	“Ὅσα δεῖ παραφυλάττειν, ἐὰν ὁ ἀναγορευθεὶς ἐν τοῖς ἄνω μέρεσιν βασιλεὺς ἀποστείλῃ πρέσβεις καὶ λαυρεάτα, μηδέπω δεχθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐνταῦθα βασιλέως εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν, καὶ πῶς βεβαιοῖ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς πρέσβεις ἀπολύει.	What is necessary to observe if one who has been proclaimed emperor in the western regions, but has not yet been accepted as with imperial power by the emperor here, should send ambassadors and laureate portraits, and how the emperor here confirms that emperor's imperial power and dismisses the ambassadors
1.87.5 (395)	ἐὰν δὲ βεβαιώσει τὴν βασιλείαν, καὶ ὁ ἔπαρχος τῶν πραιτωρίων καὶ ὁ ἔπαρχος τῆς πόλεως, λοιπὸν οὕτως δέχονται ὡς ἐνταῦθα ὄντες ἔπαρχοι, καὶ τὸ περσίκην αὐτοῖς ἀπαντᾷ,	If he confirms the imperial power, the praetorian eparch [of the West] and the eparch of the City [of Rome] are then received as eparchs here, and the sceptre meets them.

TABLE 10.6 The phrases τὸ κράτος and τὸ κράτος ἡμῶν in *De Cerimoniis* (cont.)

Chapter	Greek text	Translation (Moffatt & Tall 2012)
1.88.16 (396)	Ὅσα δεῖ παραφυλάττεσθαι, ὅτε μέλλει δέχεσθαι τοὺς αὐτοὺς πρέσβεις, καὶ βεβαιοὶ τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ ἀπολύειν αὐτούς.	What must be observed when the emperor is about to receive the said ambassadors and confirm the imperial power and dismiss them
1.91.12–13 (412)	ὑπὲρ ἐντεύξεως τῆς ἁγίας καὶ εὐτυχούς βασιλείας μου ἀνὰ εἴ νομισμάτων καὶ λίτραν ἀργύρου καταβουκόλον δώσω.	For your prayer for my holy and fortunate imperial power I will give you five nomismata each and a pound of silver to each soldier.
1.91.16 (412)	χρυσέους αἰῶνας βασιλεύουσα εὐτυχῆς εἴη ἡμῖν ἡ βασιλεία σου.	May your reign be a fortunate one for us, reigning over a golden age!
1.92.4 (419)	ἡ ὑμετέρα γενναιότης τὰ πρέποντα καὶ νῦν τῇ καθοσιώσει συνήθως ἐπεδείξατο καὶ τὴν εὐταξίαν ἐβεβαίωσεν, τὰ ὀφειλόμενα τῇ βασιλείᾳ φυλάξασα.	Your noble character has habitually exhibited appropriate behaviour, as now in your loyalty, and it has ensured good order, guarding what is essential to the reign.
1.92.13 (421)	προβαλούμεθα ἄνδρα εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ ὀρθόδοξον καὶ ἀγνόν.	We will appoint to the ruling power a man who is both orthodox and beyond reproach.
1.92.9 (424)	πρὸς τὸ ἀναδέξασθαι τῆς βασιλείας τῶν Ῥωμαίων τὴν φροντίδα.	To take upon myself the care of the imperial power of the Romans.
1.92.17 (424)	ἄξιε τῆς βασιλείας, ἄξιε τῆς τριάδος, ἄξιε τῆς πόλεως.	Worthy of the imperial power! Worthy of the Trinity! Worthy of the City!
1.92.6 (425)	ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐορτῆς τῆς εὐτυχούς ἡμῶν βασιλείας ἀνὰ εἴ νομισμάτων καὶ λίτραν ἀργύρου ὑμῖν καταβούκολον δώσω.	For the (inaugural) festival of our fortunate reign, I will give you five nomismata each and a pound of silver to each soldier.
1.93.19 (429)	τῇ τοῦ παντοδυνάμου Θεοῦ κρίσει, τῇ τε ὑμετέρᾳ κοινῇ ἐκλογῇ πρὸς τὴν βασιλείαν χωρήσαντες, τὴν οὐράνιον πρόνοιαν ἐπικαλούμεθα.	Since we accede to the imperial power by the judgement of almighty God and by your common choice, we invoke heavenly foresight.
1.93.12–13 (430)	ἄξιε τῆς βασιλείας, ἄξιε τῆς τριάδος, ἄξιε τῆς πόλεως.	Worthy of the imperial power! Worthy of the Trinity! Worthy of the City!

TABLE 10.6 The phrases τὸ κράτος and τὸ κράτος ἡμῶν in *De Cerimoniis* (cont.)

Chapter	Greek text	Translation (Moffatt & Tall 2012)
1.93.15–16 (430)	ὑπὲρ τῆς ἑορτῆς τῆς ἡμετέρας εὐτυχούς βασιλείας ἀνά ε' νομισμάτων καὶ λίτραν ἀργύρου ὑμῖν καταχάσμα δωρήσομαι.	For the (inaugural) festival of our fortunate reign, I will grant to each of you five nomismata each and a pound of silver a head.
1.96.17 (433)	κατέλειπεν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ βασιλείαν Βασιλείῳ καὶ Κωνσταντίνῳ	He left his imperial power to Basil (II) and Constantine (VIII).
App.1.1 (474–5)	προαποστέλλει δὲ τοὺς βασιλικοὺς καὶ πάντας, ἵνα ὑπαντήσωσι τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ εἰς Πύλας,	He sends in advance the emperor's men and all the others to meet his imperial highness at Pylai.
App.1.5–6 (482)	καὶ ὑπομιμνήσκειται περὶ τούτου ὁ βασιλεὺς, καὶ εἴ τι κελεύει ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ.	And the emperor is informed of this and asked what the imperial highness wishes.
App.1.7–8 (483)	ἐν τῇ ζωῇ τῆς βασιλείας σου καὶ ἡμεῖς οἱ δοῦλοι σου ὑγιαίνομεν.	While you live and reign, we, your servants, also enjoy health.
App.1.5–6 (484)	ἀγωνίσασθε, τοῦ Χριστοῦ στρατιῶται καὶ παιδί' ἐμὰ, ἵνα ἐν καιρῷ δέοντι ἐπιδείξησθε τὴν γενναιότητα καὶ τὴν ἀνδρείαν ὑμῶν καὶ τὴν πρὸς Θεὸν καὶ βασιλείαν ἡμῶν πίστιν ὀρθὴν καὶ ἀγάπην, ἵνα ἡ βασιλεία ἡμῶν ἀξίως τῆς ἀνδρείας καὶ γενναιότητος ὑμῶν καὶ ὀρθῆς πίστεως καὶ ἀγάπης εὐνοίαν ἀποδεξαμένη ἀνταμείψῃται καὶ εὐεργετήσῃ.	Strive, soldiers of Christ and my children, so that in time of need you will show your nobility of spirit and bravery and your orthodox faith and love for God and our imperial power, so that our imperial power, in acknowledgment, may worthily repay and reward the favour of your bravery
2, Index, 27 (512)	"Ὅπως Ἡράκλειος ὑπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου πατρὸς ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ καίσαρος ἀξίας ἀνήχθη εἰς τὸ σχῆμα τῆς βασιλείας, καὶ πῶς Δαβίδ, ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ, γέγονε καίσαρ.	How Herakleios (II, also called Heraklonas) was promoted by his father (Herakleios I) from the title of caesar to the position of imperial power, and how David, his brother, became Caesar.
2.0.13 (517)	διὰ ταῦτα δὴ καὶ πρὸς τὴν παρούσαν συλλογὴν ταύτην καὶ μὴ τισὶ πονηθεῖ- σαν ἄλλοις τῆς τακτικῆς διανέστημεν μεθόδου, τὴν μὲν βασιλείαν ταύτην βασιλικωτέραν καὶ φωβερωτέραν ἀποδεικνύντες.	For these reasons then, we embarked on an orderly plan also for this present collection, achieved by no others, thus showing the emperor's power as more imperial and awe-inspiring.

TABLE 10.6 The phrases τὸ κράτος and τὸ κράτος ἡμῶν in *De Cerimoniis* (cont.)

Chapter	Greek text	Translation (Moffatt & Tall 2012)
2.3.18 (526)	ἐπὶ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος προβάλλεται σε ἡ ἐκ Θεοῦ βασιλεία μου δομέστικον τῶν θεοφυλάκτων σχολῶν.	In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, my Imperial power from God appoints you domestikos of the divinely-guarded scholai.
2.4.13 (528)	ἐν ὀνόματι πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος προβάλλεται σε ἡ ἐκ Θεοῦ βασιλεία ἡμῶν ραίκτωρα.	In the name of the Father and Son and Holy Spirit, our imperial power from God appoints you rector.
2.5.14 (530)	ἐπὶ ὀνόματος πατρὸς, υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος προβάλλεται σε ἡ ἐκ Θεοῦ βασιλεία ἡμῶν σύγκελλον.	In the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, our imperial power from God appoints you synkellos.
2.5.18 (530)	ἡ βασιλεία ἡμῶν προεβάλετο τοῦτον σύγκελλον.	Our imperial power has appointed this person synkellos.
2.10.1 (547)	πολυχρόνιον ποιήσει ὁ θεὸς τὴν βασιλείαν ὑμῶν.	May God make your holy reign long-lasting!
2.14.2 (565)	ἡ θεία χάρις καὶ ἡ ἐξ αὐτῆς βασιλεία ἡμῶν προβάλλεται τὸν εὐλαβέστατον τοῦτον πατριάρχην Κωνσταντινουπόλεως.	The grace of God and our imperial power derived from it appoint this most pious man patriarch of Constantinople.
2.18.10 (606)	ἰστέον, ὅτι ἡ τῶν βρουμαλίων αὕτη τάξις ἠλλοιώθη καὶ εἰς τὸ μηκέτι εἶναι παρήχθη ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας Ῥωμανοῦ δεσπότη.	Note that this ceremonial for the Broumalia was changed, and it reached the point of ceasing to exist in the reign of the ruler Romanos.
2.19.7–8 (612)	αὔξει ἡ βασιλεία τῶν Ῥωμαίων.	May the imperial power of the Romans increase!
2.19.13 (612)	πολυχρόνιον ποιήσει ὁ Θεὸς τὴν ἁγίαν βασιλείαν ὑμῶν εἰς πολλὰ ἔτη»	May God make your holy reign long-lasting for many years!
2.21.15–16 (616)	εἶτα κληρονόμον γενέσθαι τῆς πατρικῆς ἐξουσίας καὶ βασιλείας, ὡς ἂν ἡ τῶν Ῥωμαίων καλῶς διευθύνοιτο καὶ διεξάγοιτο βασιλεία τε καὶ πολιτεία.	Then becoming heir to his father's power and empire, so that both the empire and the state of the Romans may be properly organised and conducted.

TABLE 10.6 The phrases τὸ κράτος and τὸ κράτος ἡμῶν in *De Cerimoniis* (cont.)

Chapter	Greek text	Translation (Moffatt & Tall 2012)
2.27.14 (627)	Ὅπως Ἡράκλειος ὑπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου πατρὸς ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ καίσαρος ἀξίας ἀνήχθη εἰς τὸ σχῆμα τῆς βασιλείας, καὶ πῶς Δαβὶδ, ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ, γέγονε καίσαρ.	How Herakleios (II) was promoted by his father (Herakleios I) from the rank of caesar to the position of imperial power, and how David, his brother, became caesar.
2.27.1 (627–8)	ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ καὶ μέγας βασιλεὺς θελήσας ἀναγορεύσαι Ἡράκλειον τὸν τούτου υἱὸν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀξίας τοῦ καίσαρος εἰς τὸ σχῆμα τῆς βασιλείας, ἐποίησεν οὕτως.	The sovereign and senior emperor, wishing to promote his son Herakleios from the rank of caesar to the position of imperial power, did the following.
2.37.14 (634)	Χρὴ εἰδέναι, ὅπως ἐδέξατο Μιχαὴλ ὁ βασιλεὺς Σκλάβους τοὺς ἀτακτήσαντας ἐν χώρᾳ τῆ Σουβδελιτίᾳ καὶ ἀνελθόντας εἰς τὰ ὄρη καὶ ἄλιν καταφυγόντας τῆ αὐτοκρατορικῆ καὶ ὑψηλῆ βασιλείᾳ.	It should be known how the emperor Michael (III) received the Slavs who had revolted in the town of Soubdelitia and gone up into the mountains and later sought refuge with the sovereign and mighty imperial power.
2.43.13 (650)	πολυχρόνιον ποιήσει ὁ Θεὸς τὴν ἁγίαν βασιλείαν σὰς εἰς πολλὰ ἔτη.	May God make your holy reign long-lasting for many years!
2.43.3–4 (651)	αὔξει ἡ βασιλεία τῶν Ῥωμαίων.	May the imperial power of the Romans increase!
2.43.11 (651)	πολυχρόνιον ποιήσει ὁ Θεὸς τὴν ἁγίαν βασιλείαν σὰς εἰς πολλὰ ἔτη.	May God make your holy reign long-lasting for many years!
2.47.15 (680)	ὁ ἐνδοξότατος ὁ δεῖνα ὁ πρίγκιψ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης σὺν τῶν ἀρχόντων καὶ παντὸς τοῦ ὑποκειμένου αὐτῷ λαοῦ ἐξαποστέλλουσιν τὴν βασιλείαν σου πιστωτάτην δούλωσιν.	The highly esteemed so-and-so, prince of Old Rome, with the archons and all the people subject to him, send your imperial power their most loyal homage.
2.47.8–9 (684)	Ὁ τῶν ἐρχομένων πρεσβέων ἀπὸ μεγιστάνου Ἀμηρᾶ ἢ Αἰγύπτου ἢ Περσίας ἢ τοῦ Χοροσάν, ὑποταγέντες δηλονότι τῆ βασιλείᾳ Ῥωμαίων καὶ πάκτα ἀποστέλλοντες, πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα χαιρετισμός.	The greeting to the emperor of the ambassadors coming from a chief emir, whether of Egypt or Persia or Chorosan, that is to say, [those] subject to the imperial power of the Romans and sending tribute.



TABLE 10.6 The phrases τὸ κράτος and τὸ κράτος ἡμῶν in *De Cerimoniis* (cont.)

Chapter	Greek text	Translation (Moffatt & Tall 2012)
2.47.12–14 (684)	καλὴν προστασίαν καὶ σκέπην καὶ ἀντίληψιν εὐρομεν τὴν σὴν ὑψηλὴν καὶ μεγάλην βασιλείαν. χαρισθεῖη ἡμῖν ἐν πολλοῖς ἔτεσιν ἡ σὴ δεσποτεία καὶ βασιλεία, ὅτι ἡμεῖς λαός σου καὶ δοῦλοι πιστότατοι τῆς αὐτοκρατορίας ὑμῶν.	We find in your sublime and great imperial power noble protection and shelter and support. May your rule and imperial power be vouchsafed us for many years for we are your people and most loyal servants of your sovereign power.
2.47.7–8 (685)	Ὁ τῶν ἐρχομένων πρεσβέων ἀπὸ μεγιστάνου Ἀμηρᾶ ἢ Αἰγύπτου ἢ Περσίας ἢ τοῦ Χοροσάν, δηλονότι μὴ ὄντος ὑποτεταγμένου τῇ βασιλείᾳ Ῥωμαίων	The greeting to the emperor of the ambassadors coming from a chief emir, whether of Egypt or Persia or Chorosan, that is to say, when he is not subject to the imperial power of the Romans.
2.52.9 (725) (Philotheos, Kletorologion)	ταῦτα δὲ πάντα φυλάττεσθαι, τηρεῖσθαι τε καὶ πράττεσθαι ἀπαρσάλευτα καὶ διαμένειν βέβαια, καθὼς ἡ εὐσεβὴς καὶ ἔνθεος βασιλεία ἡμῶν ἐξέθετο	All these things should be observed and heeded and done unerringly and remain in force just as our pious and divinely-inspired imperial power set it out.

TABLE 10.7 The phrases ἡ βασιλεία and ἡ βασιλεία ἡμῶν in *De Cerimoniis*

Chapter	Greek text	Translation (Moffatt & Tall 2012)
1.0.2 (5)	ἐν τάξει καὶ κόσμῳ αἱ τοῦ κράτους ἡνία διεξάγοντο	So that the reins of power will be managed with order and beauty.
1.0.6 (5)	ὑφ' ὧν τοῦ βασιλείου κράτους ῥυθμῶ καὶ τάξει φερομένον	Through this the imperial power will have measure and order
1.2.19 (37)	Αὐτὸς τὸ κράτος ὑμῶν, δεσπότης, εἰς μῆκος χρόνων φυλάξει εἰς ἀνέγερσιν Ῥωμαίων.	May he guard your power, rulers, for a long time, to the exaltation of the Romans!
1.3.19 (41)	ἀλλ' ὁ τὸν κόσμον φωτίσας τῇ αὐτοῦ ἐπιφανείᾳ ὑψώσει καὶ μεγαλύνει τὸ κράτος τῆς ὑμῶν βασιλείας εἰς εὐτυχίαν καὶ δόξαν Ῥωμαίων.	May he who has illuminated the world by his epiphany raise up and increase the power of your reign for the good fortune and glory of the Romans!



TABLE 10.7 The phrases ἡ βασιλεία and ἡ βασιλεία ἡμῶν in *De Cerimoniis* (cont.)

Chapter	Greek text	Translation (Moffatt & Tall 2012)
1.3.16 (42)	ἀλλ' ὁ ταῦτα τελέσας Χριστὸς φιλανθρωπία τὸ ὑμέτερον βασιλειον κράτος κατὰ σειρὰν ἀδιάδοχον κελεύει εὐτυχεῖν Ῥωμαίοις καὶ βασιλεύειν.	May Christ who has accomplished this in his love for mankind command that your imperial power prosper and rule over the Romans like an unbroken chain.
1.4.7–8 (45)	τελείται παραδόξως, μεγαλύνεται τὸ κράτος ὑμῶν, δεσπύται, εἰς δόξαν, εἰς καύχησιν, εἰς ἀνέγερσιν τῶν Ῥωμαίων.	May your power be increased, emperors, to the glory, renown, and exaltation of the Romans.
1.4.19 (46)	ὃς καὶ φυλάξει τὸ κράτος τῆς βασιλείας εἰς δόξαν, εἰς καύχημα, εἰς ἀνέγερσιν Ῥωμαίων.	May he guard the power of the reign to the glory, renown and exaltation of Romans.
1.6.14 (52)	καὶ εἰρήνην χαρίζεται πάσῃ τῇ οἰκουμένη, καὶ τὸ βασιλευόν κράτος ἀστέρως ἀνατολή τοῦ ἀδύτου νεουργεῖ καὶ μεγαλύνει, ὡς λαμπρὸς ἥλιος.	The rising of a star which never sets acts anew and increases the imperial power, like a resplendent sun.
1.7.2 (54)	καὶ γεραίρουσι τὸ κράτος ὑμῶν, δεσπύται, εἰς δόξαν, εἰς καύχημα, εἰς ἀνύψωσιν Ῥωμαίων.	And celebrate your power, rulers, to the glory, renown and exaltation of the Romans.
1.43.20 (223)	τὸ κράτος ὑμῶν φυλάξει εἰς πλήθη χρόνων ἐν τῇ πορφύρᾳ.	May he guard your power for a great number of years in the purple.
1.65.2 (294)	Ἐν ταῖς χερσὶ σου σήμερον παραθέ- μενος τὸ κράτος, Θεὸς σε ἐπεκύρωσεν αὐτοκράτορα δεσπότην	Having placed the power in your hands today, God has confirmed you as sovereign ruler.
1.69.12 (316)	Τὸ θεοπρόβλητον κράτος τῆς ὑμετέρας δυάδος, ὁ δεῖνα αὐτοκράτωρ καὶ ὁ δεῖνα ἡ δόξα τῆς πορφύρας, ἐκλάμπητε	Let the divinely appointed power of your joint rule, so-and-so sovereign and so-and-so the glory of the purple, shine forth.
1.69.15 (316)	Ἀνάτειλον τὸ ὀρθόδοξον κράτος	Rise up, the orthodox power!
1.69.18 (323)	Εἰς δικαίωμα πρῶτων τὸ φιλάγαθον, κράτος ὑμῶν, δεσπύται.	Your power that loves good puts righteousness first, rulers.
1.69.23 (325–6)	τοῦ κόσμου γὰρ εὐσεβείᾳ δεσπόζετε ὅλως, εἰς φιλάγαθον κράτος ὑμῶν, δεσπύται.	You rule the world entirely with piety, in your benevolent power.
1.69.9 (326)	Τὸ ὑμέτερον κράτος, φιλόχριστοι, θεοπρόβλητοι εὐεργέται, ἐκ Θεοῦ καταλάμπεται ἀληθῶς	Your power, Christ-loving, divinely appointed benefactors, in truth is illuminated by God.
1.71.16 (359)	Κύριε, σῶσον τὸ ὀρθόδοξον κράτος·	Lord, save the orthodox power!
1.73.20 (368)	Κύριε, σῶσον ὀρθόδοξον κράτος	Lord, save the orthodox power!