Notes and Documents

THE HELLADIKOI.

FINLAY¹ makes the following statement: 'At the beginning of the eighth century we find the native Greeks called Helladikoi by Byzantine writers in order to distinguish them from the ancient Hellenes and from the Romaioi or Greeks of the Roman empire. The word was a contemptuous name for them as mere provincials.'

The statement is repeated,² and subsequent writers have accepted it on Finlay's authority. Elsewhere I have casually touched on this point and shown that Finlay made a wrong inference; but the matter is so constantly turning up in books which deal with medieval Greece that it seems well to write about it expressly.

Finlay had got hold of an interesting fact, but he got hold of it by the wrong end. The name which was borne by the Greeks of old, and which is now borne by the Greeks of the modern kingdom—*Hellènes*—had ceased, in the days of which Finlay speaks, to mark any national distinction. It had come to mean *pagans*, as opposed to Christians; it was no longer opposed to *barbarians* or non-Greeks. This fact is familiar to everybody who has any acquaintance with the history of medieval Europe. But, it may be asked, by what name then were the Greeks, that is to say the posterity of the old Hellenes, or at least the people who lived between Tempe and Taenarum, called? Finlay says they were called *Helladikoi*, and, he adds, the name was contemptuous. He was mistaken. They were not called Helladikoi, and there is no reason to suppose that the name was contemptuous.

Helladikoi meant the inhabitants of the theme *Hellas*, which was only a small part of *Hellas*, either modern or ancient. It did not include the Peloponnesus, which constituted another theme; the Peloponnesians were not Helladikoi. Nor did it include the western parts of Greece north of the isthmus which formed the theme of Nicopolis. The passages in Theophanes³ do not give the slightest ground for supposing either that the word had a wider signification

¹ *History of Greece*, i. 405.

² P. 409.

³ *Chronographi*, 3, i. 405, and p. 474, ed. De Boor.

than the theme of Hellas, or that there was anything contemptuous about it. *Helladikoi*, formed on the analogy of *Armeniakoi* and *Anatolikoi*, had a purely administrative, and not a national meaning. The folk of the theme of Hellas could not be called *Hellènes*, because that famous name had acquired a theological meaning; so they were most fitly called *Helladikoi*, and thus brought into line with their fellow subjects of the Anatolic and Armeniac themes. There is no ground for fancying that *Ἑλλαδικοί*, as far as lay in the name, carried any notion of contempt.

But by what name, it may still be asked, were the 'Greeks' distinguished, if the *Helladikoi* were only a part of them? The answer is, they were not distinguished by any name; and that is the point which Finlay missed. The people of the three themes, Hellas, Peloponnesus, and Nicopolis, were all *Rômaioi*; but were not linked together by any narrower name, which could serve to mark them out as a sort of national unity, distinct from the other Greek-speaking subjects of the empire. This important historical fact has been in some measure obscured by the misinterpretation of '*Helladikoi*.'

J. B. BURY.

THE EXCOMMUNICATION OF QUEEN ELIZABETH.

SANDERS¹ says that the council of Trent deliberated about excommunicating Elizabeth, and were only prevented from doing so by the representations of the emperor Ferdinand. The first of the following documents will show that some one of the English exiles—probably Sanders himself—urged the council to take that step, and did his best to overcome any scruples that might be felt about the wisdom of such a course. The document is not dated, but it speaks of excommunication by a general council, not by the pope, and it refers to the repressive legislation of the English parliament of 1562, and to the improbability of the parliament being summoned again in consequence of any action taken by the council. Further, the reference to the refusal of Elizabeth to admit a papal nuncio is to the year 1561. We may, therefore, date the document as written early in 1563, before the release from the Tower of the imprisoned bishops in September 1563. It will be seen that the fanaticism of the writer cannot entirely blind his judgment, that he is unable to point out any advantages which might be expected from the sentence of excommunication, and that his attempts to prove that it would not do much harm to the English Romanists are singularly inconclusive.

What the council of Trent declined to do was done by Pope Pius V., and his bull *Regnans in excelsis* only succeeded in exposing

¹ *De Schismate Anglicano*, iii. 381.