

THE ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW

NO. LXXXVI.—APRIL 1907 *

The Ceremonial Book of Constantine Porphyrogennetos

THE treatise on the ceremonies of the Byzantine court, commonly known by the title *De Cerimoniis*, is ascribed to Constantine VII in the unique manuscript in which it is preserved.¹ It is clear that, if this attribution is true, it is not completely true of the text which has come down to us, since this text contains some passages relating to events subsequent to Constantine's death. These passages, which will be noticed below, led Reiske to throw out the conjecture that the original compiler was not Constantine VII, but his grandson, Constantine VIII.² As there is no evidence whatever to connect Constantine VIII with the work this suggestion, which Reiske only put forward tentatively, has met with no favour; and it is now generally admitted that the original compilation belongs to the reign of Constantine VII.³ A careful examination of the treatise leaves no room for doubt that this is the case; but there is considerable uncertainty as to the limits of the work in its first shape and the extent of the later additions. Thus Rambaud concluded that the greater part of book ii. dates from the end of the tenth century.⁴

Besides the problem of determining how the work came to

¹ In the University Library at Leipzig: a handsome parchment, saec. xi/xii. First edited by Leich and Reiske, 1751-4; reprinted in Bonn *Corpus*, 1829-30.

² Reiske's *Praefatio*, ed. Bonn, p. xxiii.

³ So Rambaud, Krumbacher, Bieliaev.

⁴ *L'Empire grec au dixième Siècle*, p. 136; but he also contemplates the reigns of Constantine VIII and Romanus III (p. 134).

assume its present form, the character of the original compilation, which consists largely of transcripts of older documents, presents a second problem to the critic. It is important to distinguish the compiler's work from his material, and to discover the periods to which the various incorporated documents belong. In his book dealing with the ceremonies described in book i. cc. 1-37, Bieliaev has made several useful observations bearing on this question, and Diehl has recently made a valuable contribution.⁵

I. GENERAL ANALYSIS OF THE TREATISE.

§ 1. A comparison of the preface to book ii. with the preface to book i. shows that book ii. was part of the design of the original author. The preface to book i. announces as the subject ἡ τῆς βασιλείου τάξεως ἔκθεσις τε καὶ ὑποτύπωσις, and promises to describe ὅσα παρὰ τῶν παλαιότερων ἐφευρέθη καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἑωρακότων διηγγέλθη καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν αὐτῶν θεάθη καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ἐνηγγίθη (p. 4). The preface to book ii. (p. 516) draws a distinction between two kinds of material—(1) written records, ὅσα συγγραφῆς παρὰ τισιν ἔτυχεν; and (2) what has been handed down orally, ταῖς μνήμαις διασωζόμενα καὶ παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀκολούθως τοῖς νεωτέροις παραπεμπόμενα. It is stated that the former, hitherto scattered and disconnected, have been arranged, 'by our care,' in logical order and included in book i. (ἐν τῇ πρὸ τῆσδε βίβλου); the latter are to form the content of book ii. (ὅσα ἡ παρούσα βίβλος ἐμπεριέχει). There can be no doubt that the two prefaces are from the same pen, as they profess to be; the style and tone are exactly the same. But the first preface does not announce, or seem to contemplate, a division of the work into two books, nor does it discriminate the two classes of material which determine that division. Hence we can conclude that the preface to book i. is a preface to the work as a whole, written before book i. was completed or perhaps begun, and that the second book was an afterthought.⁶

It is to be observed that, although in these prefaces the writer

⁵ The chief literature on the *De Cerimoniis* is as follows: the Prefaces of Leich and Reiske (in vol. i., ed. Bonn), and the Commentary of Reiske (in vol. ii., ed. Bonn); Rambaud, *op. cit.* (1870), pp. 128-36; H. Wäschke, *Studien zu den Ceremonien des K. Porphy.* (1884); Krumbacher, *Gesch. der byz. Litt.*² pp. 254-7 (where references to works on special points will be found); D. Th. Bieliaev, 'Ezhednevnye i voskresnye priemy vizantiiskikh tsarei i prazdnichnye vykhody ikh v kbram sv. Sophii,' v ix-x v. 1893 (being the 2nd book of his *Byzantina*); Bieliaev's preface deals with the origin and composition of the work, and is the fullest study of the question that has hitherto appeared. The first book of his *Byzantina* ('Obzor glavnykh chastei bolshago dvortsa,' 1891) is also indispensable. For the works of Markovich and Kanevski it is enough to refer to Bieliaev's preface, p. xvi sqq. I cite his two volumes as *Obzor* and *Priemy*. Diehl, *Études byzantines* (1905), p. 293 sqq.

⁶ This conclusion is supported by the fact that while in the MS. book ii. is headed τὸ δεύτερον βιβλίον (p. 509) book i. is not headed τὸ πρῶτον βιβλίον.

does not give any express indication of his identity, there is not only nothing to contradict, or cast suspicion on, the authorship of Constantine, but the general tone and some particular phrases seem to bear out its imperial origin. For instance, p. 3: *ἡμῖν δὲ καὶ λίαν φίλον καὶ περισπούδαστον καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων οἰκειότερον, ἅτε διὰ τῆς ἐπαινετῆς τάξεως τῆς βασιλείου ἀρχῆς δεικνυμένης κοσμιωτέρας κ.τ.λ.* And the distinction between *παρ' ἡμῶν αὐτῶν ἐθεάθη* and *ἐν ἡμῖν ἐνηργήθη* (p. 4, l. 15) seems a pretty clear discrimination of the reign of Romanus I, when Constantine was a subordinate *basileus*, from his own reign as *basileus autokrator*.

§ 2. Book i. cc. 1-83 displays the orderly arrangement which is claimed for it in the preface to book ii. The ceremonies follow each other *εἰρμῶ τινι καὶ τάξει λελογισμένη*, and there is nothing in these eighty-three chapters which points to a date subsequent to Constantine VII. It is to be noted that there is a considerable lacuna; a portion of the manuscript has been lost; and the chapters, which now number eighty-three, were originally ninety-two. This lacuna will claim our attention subsequently; for the present we may represent the arrangement of book i. as follows:—

BOOK I. cc. 1-83=1-92*.

- cc. 1-37 (=46*): processions and ceremonies on religious festivals.
cc. 38-83 (=92*): secular ceremonies.

The rest of book i. cc. 84-97 (or properly 93*-106*) consists of material different in character:

- | | |
|---|--|
| { | cc. 84, 85: ceremonies at the appointment of certain functionaries. |
| | c. 86: investitures of certain officers. |
| | cc. 87, 88: reception of ambassadors announcing proclamation of western emperor. |
| | cc. 89, 90: reception of Persian ambassadors. |
| | cc. 91-5: ἀναγορεύσεις of Leo I, Anastasius I, Justin I, Leo II, Justinian I. |
| | c. 96: ἀναγόρευσις of Nicephorus II. |
| | c. 97: ceremony of appointing proedros of senate. |

The two last chapters proclaim themselves as subsequent to the reign of Constantine. The office of *proedros* was first instituted by Nicephorus Phocas, and first filled by Basil the *parakoinomenos*.⁷ Hence c. 97 cannot be prior to the reign of Nicephorus Phocas. C. 96 was written during his reign, for the writer refers to him as *ὁ εὐσεβῆς καὶ φιλόχριστος βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν Νικηφόρος*

⁷ Cedrenus, ii. 379, *μήπω πρότερον ὄντος τοῦ ἀξιώματος* (cp. Leo Diaconus, p. 49). Reiske has drawn illegitimate conclusions (Comm. p. 465), and he is followed by Rambaud (*op. cit.* p. 132). They both mistranslate the passage of Cedrenus. Cp. Bieliaev, *Priemyl*, pp. 28-9 note.

(p. 434); and one might expect to find that c. 97 also was an addition of the same period. Internal evidence confirms this explanation. We find prominence given to the Caesar (τοῦ εὐτυχεστάτου Καίσαρος) along with the βασιλεὺς αὐτοκράτωρ (p. 443, 7, 10, 13). This proves that there was a Caesar when the ceremony was held from which this description is generalised. Nicephorus Phocas, on his accession, created his father, Bardas, Caesar.⁸ After this reign there was no Caesar at Constantinople until the end of the reign of Michael IV, when his nephew, Michael Kalaphates, was adopted by Zoe and raised to the rank of Caesar. We are justified in concluding that c. 97 was based on the ceremony which promoted Basil to the office of *proedros* at the beginning of the reign of Nicephorus; and we note as significant that no account is taken of the μικροὶ βασιλεῖς (Basil II and Constantine VIII). They are equally ignored in the acclamations of c. 96. The addition, then, of these two chapters points to a redaction of book i. in the reign of Nicephorus.⁹

§ 3. Cc. 84-95 are documents dating unquestionably from the sixth century. This is abundantly evident from both style and contents. In particular c. 86 can be dated between A.D. 548 and 565,¹⁰ c. 87 (with 88) in the reign of Justinian. The series of ἀναγορεύσεις was also compiled in Justinian's reign and formed one whole, as is shown by the fact that all the emperors are referred to as deceased, except Justinian (τὸν εὐσεβέστατον ἡμῶν Ἰουστινιανόν).¹¹ That the series is taken from the work of one writer, who looked back on the coronation of Leo I as ancient history, is proved by the last sentences of c. 91.

As the evident origin of all these chapters in the sixth century is generally admitted it is unnecessary to enumerate the marks (offices, institutions, technical nomenclature) which differentiate them from the rest of book i. The only question which admits of dispute is their authorship. The lemmata in the manuscript state that cc. 84, 85 are taken ἐκ τῶν τοῦ μαγίστρου Πέτρου. Hence we are

⁸ Leo Diaconus, p. 49. It is hardly necessary to observe that the passage in the preface to Nicephorus Phocas, *De velitatione bellica*, p. 185 (ed. Bonn), refers to this Bardas Caesar (Βάρδας ὁ μακαρίτης Καίσαρ), and not, as I have somewhere seen it explained, to the uncle of Michael III.

⁹ Rambaud (with Reiske) contemplates the possibility of c. 97 dating from the sixth century, the *proedros* being the old *princeps senatus*. But, apart from other objections, such a date is peremptorily excluded by the style (which is homogeneous with that of the ninth and tenth century ceremonies, in marked contrast with that of the sixth-century documents, cc. 84-95) and by later institutions which are implied.

¹⁰ Theodora dead, 390, 9; Justinian still alive, 391, 17.

¹¹ P. 433, 1. I may observe that in this chapter, 433, 5, κομέντον should be corrected to κοβέντον (*conuentum*). The mistake was due to the easy confusion of μ and β in tenth and eleventh century MSS. So in *De Adm. Imp.* 74, 20, Νεμογάρδας should be corrected to Νεβογάρδας (Novgorod).

justified in assigning them to the *περὶ πολιτικῆς καταστάσεως*¹² of Peter the Patrician, whose position as *magister officiorum* explains his special interest in these ceremonies. It was a natural conjecture of Reiske that not only cc. 84 and 85 but the following ten chapters also belong to Peter. This view was rejected by Wäschke,¹³ but probability, as Patzig has shown, is entirely in its favour.¹⁴ Otherwise we have to believe that these chapters, here juxtaposed, have been taken from two (or more) different works, dating from the reign of Justinian, similar in subject and uniform in style.

The authorship, however, is unimportant for the present purpose. For that purpose, and in relation to Constantine's work, all these chapters form a single group which stands apart from cc. 1-83. (1) Whereas 1-83 are a guide to the actual court ceremonial of the tenth century, 84-95 are of purely antiquarian interest. They not only describe ceremonies which had been changed in character, but concern obsolete institutions (e.g. the Augustalis of Egypt, the *κόμης σχολῆς*), and apply to circumstances which no longer existed (the Persian kingdom; the Ostrogothic kingdom, or western emperors, in Italy). (2) 91-5 describe ceremonies as performed on particular historical occasions. In 1-83 the descriptions are always generalised. (3) This group stands quite outside the arrangement of 1-83. If 84, 85 had been part of the design of book i. they should, in accordance with the principle of its arrangement, have followed 43-59. These considerations establish that 84-95 are an accretion, lying outside the homogeneous unity of the book. It does not follow, however, that they may not have been added by the author himself, just as in a similar case a modern writer might furnish in an appendix extracts of antiquarian interest.

§ 4. Book ii., in contrast to book i., is a miscellany showing little attempt at arrangement. We learn from its preface (as we have seen) that it was taken in hand after the completion of book i., and that its aim was to describe ceremonies (*τάξεις*) which had not been already committed to writing. Cc. 1-25 conform to this scheme, and are homogeneous with book i. 1-83, with the exception of c. 17. They all describe *ὅσα δεῖ παραφυλάττειν* on certain occasions, and so continue and supplement the ceremonial of book i. Fol. 203 of the manuscript is missing; it contained the end of c. 16, c. 17, and the beginning of c. 18. According to the index (p. 511) c. 17 described the *ἀναγόρευσις* of Romanus II. We find

¹² See Suidas *sub* Πέτρος ὁ ῥήτωρ.

¹³ *Ueber das von Reiske vermutete Fragment der Exzerpte Konstantins Περὶ ἀναγορεύσεως*. Dessau, 1878.

¹⁴ Patzig, *Byz. Zeitschr.* ii. 436-7. On Peter's use of colloquial Greek in a relation of his embassy to Persia see Menander, fr. 12, *F. H. G.* iv. 217. Cf. Krumbacher, *Gesch. der byz. Litt.* p. 339. Bieliaev also accepts Reiske's view as probable (*Primy*, p. xxxiii, note).

also, appended to c. 15, descriptions of the particular proceedings on the occasions of the receptions of Saracen ambassadors and of a Russian princess in the reign of Constantine. Although such accounts, relating to specific occasions, are not found in book i., 1-83, they can hardly be said, for this formal reason, to be interlopers or to imperil the unity of the group cc. 1-25. But it is only these first twenty-five chapters that can be said either to conform to the programme of the preface or to continue the subject of book i.

Cc. 26-39 are antiquarian and historical, and must have been, for the most part, transcribed from written records. C. 26 relates to Theodosius I (with reference to a life of St. Ambrose). Cc. 27-30 describe ceremonies in the reign of Heraclius, cc. 31-7 acts in the reign of Michael III; c. 38 recounts the enthronisation of Theophylactus as patriarch in A.D. 933; c. 39, on the obsolete office of the *praepositus* of the patriarch, refers to an *ἀσφάλεια* of Heraclius.

§ 5. Thus ii. 26-39 bear a relation to ii. 1-25 similar to the relation which i. 84-95 bear to i. 1-83. The rest of book ii. is of a more miscellaneous character. C. 40 contains an antiquarian explanation of the origin of the twelve *λῶροι* worn on Easter Sunday by the emperor, *magistri*, &c., and an enumeration of treasures preserved in certain chapels; and c. 41, which seems closely connected, an enumeration of *ἀλλάξιμα*. C. 42 describes the imperial tombs in the church of the Holy Apostles. C. 43 gives the acclamations of the army on the occasion of triumphs. Cc. 44, 45 are copies from official schedules of military armaments in the reigns of Leo VI (A.D. 902), Romanus I (A.D. 935), and Constantine VII (A.D. 949), and are quite alien to the subject of the work. Cc. 46-8 form a group concerning the official style of address to be observed in relations with foreign and client princes. Cc. 49 and 50 contain respectively tables of the taxes paid by officials on their appointment and of the stipends of *strategoï* and *kleisurarchai*, in the reign of Leo VI. In c. 51 we have the description of a ceremony. Cc. 52, 53 consist of the *Kletorologion* of Philotheos, composed in A.D. 900; and c. 54 is a *notitia episcopatum* by Epiphanius of Cyprus, which Philotheos added as an appendix to his work. C. 55 defines the distribution of the fees paid by patricians on their elevation to that rank. The manuscript breaks off in this chapter, but the index shows that the book contained two more chapters, 56 being a life of Alexander of Macedon and 57 containing *τοῦ φυσιολόγου ἢ τῶν ἐκάστου θηρίου θαυμαστικῆ ἕξις, πρὸς τε θεὸν ἀναγωγὴ καὶ τῶν ἐν βίῳ εὐαρεστούντων λόγοι ν'.*

The titles of these two lost 'chapters' prove that book ii. of our manuscript includes matter which cannot have formed part of book ii. of the treatise on ceremonies designed by Constantine VII,

or of any ceremonial book. The other chapters which have been enumerated fail to conform to the programme announced in the preface, but these two have not even the remotest connexion with the subject of the work. Hence we can conclude with certainty that book ii. assumed its present form and compass by a purely mechanical process of stringing together and numbering as chapters *documents which happened to be physically associated with the original book ii. of Constantine.*

§ 6. Setting aside 56 and 57, most of the other chapters of book ii. might be alleged to have some bearing, near or remote, on the theme of the book. The relevance of cc. 43 and 51 is obvious. Cc. 40, 41 might be considered as notes on certain costumes and churches mentioned in various ceremonies, while cc. 49, 50, and 55 may be regarded as excursus to the ceremonies which pertain to the appointment of officials. Cc. 46-8 are also distinctly appropriate as an appendix. The enumeration of the tombs in the church of the Apostles, c. 42, might be *à propos* of the reference to certain tombs in that church in c. 6 (p. 533). It is to be observed that between cc. 41 and 42 there was once another document, described in the index (p. 513) as a brief list of the emperors who reigned at Constantinople, beginning with Constantine the Great. A leaf seems to have been lost between ff. 216 and 217 of the manuscript (cp. Reiske, p. 754). The index numbers this list c. 42, and throws together as c. 43 the two chapters which are numbered c. 42 and c. 43 in the text. There was evidently a confusion in the capitular arrangement here; and when we note that the paragraph which appears as c. 41 really belongs to the latter part of c. 40 we may conclude that the division ought to have been: 41, list of emperors; 42, imperial tombs; 43, *εὐφημία ὑπὸ τῶν στρατοπέδων*. A list of emperors is an irrelevancy; its occurrence in this place may possibly have been determined by the adjacent list of the imperial tombs, to which it might have been intended to serve as a chronological guide.

It is difficult to see how the descriptions of the armaments sent on various occasions to Crete and Italy in cc. 44, 45 have any relation to the subject of the book, or how a writer treating of court ceremonies could have thought of introducing them in any shape into his work. The fact that they contain some information about some military officials and their bureaux is obviously no justification. They must be placed in the category of irrelevant matter.

On the other hand cc. 52, 53 are a document which is strictly pertinent and cognate, the *Kletorologion* of Philotheos. But can we suppose that the writer of the original book ii. intended to include in his work a complete treatise by an earlier writer? Such a supposition would be in manifest contradiction to his

intention as declared in the preface, and seems in itself unlikely. It is not even as if this treatise of Philotheos had not been independently published. Written as a practical manual in A.D. 900, we should *a priori* expect it to have been disseminated, and this expectation seems to be confirmed by the discovery of a part of the treatise in a miscellaneous manuscript in the Patriarchal Library of Jerusalem.¹⁵ The document was identified, and the variants published, by Uspenski.¹⁶ Though it is not possible to demonstrate that this copy was not transcribed from a copy of the *De Cerimoniis*, book ii., there is nothing to suggest that this was the case; and the fact that the same manuscript contains another document dealing with the ranks and dignities of the Byzantine court, which is not included in the *De Cerimoniis*, may be urged as a positive indication that the book of Philotheos came to the scribe of the Jerusalem codex in another form.

§ 7. The result of our analysis is that in the collection which the manuscript describes as book ii., and presents as a connected whole with capitular divisions, only cc. 1-25 can claim to be the original book designed by Constantine and announced in his preface. The rest is a miscellany of various documents, some perfectly irrelevant and extraneous, some more or less closely connected with the subject, others loosely hanging on to its outskirts.

§ 8. It might be thought that c. 51 should be connected with cc. 1-25, since it describes a ceremony in a similar way and is at first sight homogeneous. The lemma is of the same form:

ὅσα δεῖ παραφυλάττειν ὅταν ἐν ὀχλήματι βούλεται προελθεῖν ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ἰδεῖν τὰ ὀρῆα τοῦ στρατηγίου.

An examination of it, however, shows that it is a description not of a practice of the tenth century, but of an obsolete ceremony of the past. It belongs to an age when there was still a praetorian prefect of the east (700, 9; 701, 10, &c.) and the old organisation of the domestics and protectors still existed (700, 2-5). The decurion has prominent functions (709, 17), as in the extracts from the work of Peter the Patrician incorporated in book i.;¹⁷ in the ceremonial of the tenth century he has no place. The function performed by the silentarius (699, 17) is in keeping with sixth-century but not with tenth-century usage. The style of the chapter¹⁸ corresponds to these clear indications, and there can be no doubt that it is an extract from a sixth-century work, and is

¹⁵ Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Ἱεροσολυμιτικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη*, no. 39, p. 115 sqq.

¹⁶ Th. Uspenski, *Vizantiiskaia tabel o rangakh*, p. 101 sqq., in the 'Izviestiia russkago arkheologicheskago Instituta v Kplie,' iii. 1898.

¹⁷ See 390, 20; 397, 17; 403, 15; 407, 21. *οἱ τριβούνιοι τοῦ πραισέντου* (700, 1) is another indication. For the *προσκύνησις* by the domestics and protectors see 397, 7.

¹⁸ Compare also *paratus* and *transfer*, p. 699, loco p. 701. So *transfer*, p. 407, 20.

homogeneous in character with book i. cc. 84-95. We must therefore place it in the same category not as ii. 1-25, but as ii. 25-39.

§ 9. Some of the documents of this miscellany, as we have just seen, are extracts from works prior to the tenth century (viz. cc. 26-37, 39, 51). Cc. 49, 50, and part of 44 (651-60, 12) are official documents of the reign of Leo VI. C. 38 and the rest of c. 44 belong to the reign of Romanus I. C. 45 is an official document of Constantine's reign, describing the Cretan expedition of A.D. 949. That c. 40 (which involves 41) was written in Constantine's reign is shown by the form of the reference to him as living (640, 3); and a definite *terminus a quo* is supplied by the mention of the fourth indiction (641, 3), which can only have been A.D. 945-6. C. 48 was compiled in the reign of Constantine VII and Romanus II (686, 23 and *passim*); and there is no reason to dissociate cc. 46, 47.

§ 10. There are only two chapters containing indications which point to a later date than the reign of Constantine. In c. 42 among the tombs at the Holy Apostles', is mentioned that of Constantine himself, and in another place the same emperor is referred to as deceased. But these passages do not justify the conclusion, which is generally drawn, that the chapter, as a whole, dates from a period subsequent to Constantine.

643, 7. ἐν ᾧ ἀπόκειται Λέων ὁ αἰδίδιμος σὺν τῷ υἱῷ Κωνσταντίνῳ ὕστερον τελευτήσαντι τῷ Πορφυρογεννήτῳ.

649, 1. Ζωὴ ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ θεοστέπτου καὶ Πορφυρογεννήτου τοῦ μακαρίου βασιλέως τοῦ ἐγγόνου Βασιλείου.

In the first passage the addition *τελευτήσαντι* is without a parallel in the rest of the chapter, and obviously shows that the words were written not long after Constantine's death. But if the whole chapter had been written then—say, in the reign of Romanus II—the writer must have said *ἀρτίως*, not *ὑστερον*. *ὑστερον* has no point in the sentence as it stands. It is impossible to suppose that 'subsequently to the death of Leo VI' can be meant.¹⁹ The only supposition which explains *ὑστερον* is that the chapter was compiled by Constantine, and that the clause *σὺν τῷ υἱῷ—Πορφυρογεννήτῳ* was interpolated, or added in the margin, after his death. Thus *ὑστερον* becomes perfectly intelligible. The clause means, 'Constantine himself, who wrote all this, died *since*, and was buried with his fathers.'

In the second passage *τοῦ μακαρίου βασιλέως* similarly stamps itself as an addition. Anyone writing the *whole* sentence would not have used this form of words. He would have said, *τοῦ μακαρίου Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ πορφυρογεννήτου*, or something of the kind. The

¹⁹ Rambaud, *op. cit.* p. 133, translates erroneously 'enseveli, longtemps après son père, dans le même tombeau.'

epithet *θεοστέπτου* suggests a living sovereign. We may conclude that Constantine himself wrote *Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ θεοστέπτου καὶ πορφυρογεννήτου, τοῦ ἐγγόνου Βασιλείου*, and that *τοῦ μακαρίου βασιλέως* was inserted by the same hand which added the notice of his sepulture.

It is to be observed that throughout the enumeration of the tombs emperors are designated only by their names and the distinguishing epithets necessary to identify them (e.g. the two Justinians are distinguished as *μέγας* and *μικρός*; Theodora, wife of Theophilus, by her official epithet *μακαρία*). The sole exceptions to this rule are Basil I and Leo VI. Basil is described as *τοῦ φιλοχρίστου δεσπότης* (648, 12, 17, 24); Leo is *ὁ κύρις Λέων ὁ βασιλεύς* (643, 2), *τοῦ κυροῦ Λέοντος* (*ibid.* 15),²⁰ *τοῦ μακαρίου Λέοντος* (*ibid.* 11, 17). This exceptional treatment conforms to the regular practice, which marks the writings of Constantine VII, of speaking of his father and grandfather with formal respect—‘his majesty Basil,’ ‘his late majesty Leo.’

The form of the two interpolations can leave no doubt that they were added at no very long period after Constantine’s death. If they were added after the death of Romanus II one would suppose that the interpolator would have also inserted a notice of that emperor’s tomb.²¹ It is possible that such a notice was added, for there is a brief lacuna after 643, 22;²² but this question must be left open. In any case such a late date as the reign of Constantine VIII, suggested by Rambaud, is quite inconsistent with the character of the references to Constantine VII. Rambaud assumed, with Reiske, that the words *Βασίλειος ὁ ἀδελφὸς Κωνσταντίνου Πορφυρογεννήτου* (643, 19) could only refer to Basil II, brother of Constantine VIII.²³ Basil II (whom one might expect to find distinguished as *Βουλγαροκτόνος*, if the reference were to him) was buried, as Reiske pointed out, in the church of St. John the Evangelist at Hebdomon.²⁴ (There is undoubtedly some corruption in the words which immediately follow: *καὶ Βάρδας ὁ υἱὸς Βασιλείου τοῦ πάππου αὐτοῦ*—for Basil I had no son named Bardas: should it be Stephanos?—but *αὐτοῦ* evidently refers to Constantine VII.) I suggest that this *Βασίλειος*, ‘brother of Constantine Porphyrogenetos,’ was the son of Leo VI by Eudocia, who died in infancy.²⁵

²⁰ Constantine speaks of the recent emperors, Leo and Romanus I, as *κύρις*, gen. *κυροῦ*, in *De Adm. Imp.* 200, 4, 18, 201, 4, &c.

²¹ Recorded in the lists of tombs printed in Banduri, *Imperium Orientale*, i. 121. More will be said of this below, § 15. ²² Cf. Reiske, p. 766.

²³ Rambaud, *op. cit.* p. 133. This is the only ground for the view that the greater part of book ii. was compiled in the time of Constantine VIII (p. 136).

²⁴ *Theoph. Contin.* vi. c. 17, p. 364.

²⁵ Cedrenus, ii. 480; Reiske, p. 764. The objection to identifying this Basil with Basil II, furnished by the positive evidence of Cedrenus, is reinforced by the following

The conclusion is that c. 42 was compiled in the reign of Constantine VII, and that two interpolations were added, not many years after his death, in the reign of his son or of Nicephorus Phocas. It will be shown below (§ 15) that this conclusion is supported by certain marks of Constantinian compilation; and it may also be remarked that, as we otherwise know, Constantine took a particular interest in the church of the Holy Apostles, which his grandfather Basil I had restored.²⁶ It was in obedience to his wish that Constantine of Rhodes wrote a description of the church in iambic trimeters, which has been published from a manuscript preserved in the Laura of Mount Athos.²⁷ It was written between 931 and 944 A.D.,²⁸ and the emperor Constantine's interest in the church is emphasised in the lines (430-1)—

καὶ τὸν φαεινὸν καὶ σεβάσιμον δόμον
αὐτῶν γεραίρει καὶ ποθεῖ ξενοτρόπως.

§ 11. The other passage which contains marks of a later date than Constantine's reign is the last section of c. 55. This section is entitled *περὶ συνθηγιῶν τῶν πραιποσίτων ἐν τῇ τάξει τοῦ ἵπποδρομίου*, and in Reiske's text is numbered as a separate chapter (56). It is on the last folio of the manuscript, which is mutilated (as we saw) and terminates in the middle of a sentence. In this section the following words occur :

καὶ γὰρ ὡς ἀπὸ παλαιοῦ ἐκράτει ἡ συνθήθεια, ἐξηύρηται δὲ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπὶ τῷ Ἰωσήφ πραιποσίτου τοῦ γέροντος καὶ τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ οἷς καὶ ἐπέπρακτο.

Joseph, the *praepositus*, is manifestly Joseph Bringas, patrician and *praepositus*, who held successively the posts of *sakellarios* and *δρουγγάριος τῶν πλοῦμων* under Constantine VII,²⁹ who on his death-bed intrusted Romanus II to his care.³⁰ Under Romanus, who appointed him *parakoimomenos*, he was the most influential member of the administration (as *παραδυναστεύων*), and guided the counsels of the emperor.³¹ The accession of Nicephorus Phocas (A.D. 963) meant his fall,³² and he was banished to Paphlagonia.

consideration : It is highly improbable that Basil II would have been simply described as the 'brother of Constantine' in any other reign than that of Constantine VIII; but it is also highly improbable that a writer of that time, in the three years after Basil's death (1025-8), would have designated him baldly as *Βασίλειος*, without the addition of *δ μακάριος* or something of the kind.

²⁶ *Theoph. Contin.* ('Vita Basilii,' c. 80), p. 323.

²⁷ By Legrand, with commentary by Th. Reinach, in *Revue des études grecs*, ix. 32 sqq. 1896. An edition by Begleri was also published at Odessa in 1896.

²⁸ When four *βασιλεῖς* were reigning, vv. 22-6.

²⁹ *Theoph. Contin.* p. 445.

³⁰ *Ibid.* p. 466.

³¹ *Ibid.* pp. 469, 474, 479, 480. The contrast between the favourable treatment of Joseph in this work and the disfavour shown to him in the chronicle of Skylitzes (Cedrenus) is marked.

³² Leo Diaconus, p. 31 sqq.; Skylitzes-Cedrenus, ii. 350-1. We have a contemporary account in the relation of the *ἀναγόρευσις* of Nicephorus, added to book i. of the *De Cerimoniis* (c. 96).

The form of the reference to Joseph in the sentence above quoted gives the impression that it was written after his fall, but not at a very much later period. He is not designated as *ὁ γέρον* in any of our other sources, and it is natural to conjecture that this was the familiar way in which he was spoken of by his contemporaries in the reigns of Romanus II and Nicephorus.

Further on, however, in this document (807, 23) we read *χαυνότητι τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα πραιποσίτων*, and Reiske, referring *μετὰ ταῦτα* to the days of Joseph, draws the conclusion : ³³

debet codex hic ceremonialis multum aetate Constantini Porphyrogeneti senioris et Nicephori Phocae posterior esse.

Even if this explanation of *μετὰ ταῦτα* is correct Reiske's inference—*multum posterior*—is not necessitated, for the *πραιπόσιτοι* were a body, and the period of their 'negligence' might have lasted only a short time, within the reign of Nicephorus. But it is important to understand the character of our document, as a whole, which Reiske has not considered. It has the authoritative character of an order, written by the direction of an emperor, to reform an abuse which had crept in. It begins in the fashion of an imperial constitution :

*ἐπειδήπερ πᾶσιν πρόκεινται ἡ τῆς τερπνῆς ἵπποδρομίας χαρμόσυτος θέα καὶ ἀκριβὴς τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ διαφόρων τάξεων ἐνάρμωτος χωρία (leg. χορεία) καὶ σίμπνια, δεῖ πάντως καὶ ταύτην ἀνάγραφτον ταῖς εἰς τὸ ἐξῆς γενεαῖς καταλιπεῖν σημαίνουσαν κ.τ.λ.*³⁴

The special purpose of drawing up the register (*ἀναγραφὴ*), for the regulation of the *τάξις τοῦ ἵπποδρομίου*, was to put an end to an irregularity. The functions which properly belonged to the *praepositi* of administering and distributing the salaries (*ρόγαι*) of the *πολιτικαὶ τάξεις* of the Hippodrome had been partly taken out of their hands by a conspiracy between the *chartularii* of the factions and the military treasurer (*λογοθέτης τοῦ στρατιωτικοῦ*), who on their own authority (*χωρὶς γνώμης τῶν πραιποσίτων*) nominated recipients of salaries, and of course profited by this traffic. This practice is here forbidden :

καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν δεῖ πάλιν τοῖς πραιποσίτοις ταῦτα κατέχειν καὶ διορθοῦσθαι, καὶ μηκέτι μήτε τὸν στρατιωτικὸν ἢ τοὺς χαρτουλαρίους καὶ νοταρίους ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ εἶναι κ.τ.λ.

We have clearly to do with an imperial ordinance, and in such an official document the description of Joseph as *τοῦ γέροντος* would be distinctly strange. This sentence referring to Joseph appears to state that the fee to the *praepositi* was an ancient custom, but

³³ P. 903. So Rambaud, p. 133.

³⁴ For the beginning, *ἐπειδήπερ*, cp. the novel of Basil II, Zachariū, *Ius Graeco-Romanum* iii. 308, and that of Constantine VII, *ibid.* p. 257.

was intermitted and then reintroduced by the predecessors of Joseph. If, then, the ordinance dates from a period subsequent to Joseph we have four stages in the history of the *συνήθεια*: (1) the ancient custom (2) fell wholly or partly into abeyance, (3) was renewed by Joseph's predecessors, (4) was again endangered by the usurpations of the military treasury. There is nothing impossible in this; but I do not believe that it is the right interpretation. While τὸ γὰρ ἀκρόστιχον (l. 14) follows on naturally to ἀπαρλλάκτως τοῖς ἀρχαίοις τύποις ἐξακολουθοῦσιν (l. 11) the intervening sentence (καὶ γὰρ ὡς—ἐπέπρακτο) comes in awkwardly. Its baldness gives it a distinct character from the rest of the document; and its tone is incongruous. The ordinance is drawn up in the interests of the *praepositi*, to secure them the control of the *ρόγαι* and their due *συνήθεια*; but this sentence gives the impression that its writer was not particularly favourable to the claims of the *praepositi*. Besides the not very respectful designation of Joseph, the words ἐξηύρηται and οἷς καὶ ἐπέπρακτο combine to convey this impression. We seem to have to do with a marginal note, not belonging to the original text, and intended as a comment on τοῖς ἀρχαίοις τύποις (which is taken up by καὶ γὰρ ὡς ἀπὸ παλαιοῦ).³⁵ If so the note was evidently added after Joseph's disgrace, in the reign of Nicephorus; and the regulation itself was of older date, whether of the reign of Constantine VII or of an earlier emperor.

§ 12. We saw that the only parts of book i. which imply a date later than Constantine VII were an addition made in the reign of Nicephorus II (cc. 96, 97). An examination of book ii. has led to the result that it contains no document that need be posterior to Constantine VII, but that there are three interpolations, two in c. 42 and one in c. 55 (56), of which the last dates from the time of Nicephorus,³⁶ while the others might belong either to his reign or to that of Romanus II. These results mutually sustain each other, and point clearly to the conclusion that the redaction of the *De Cerimoniis*, in the form in which it has come down to us, dates from the reign of Nicephorus. There is no proof of any alterations or additions subsequent to that time.

Of what nature was this redaction? Constantine left his first book entire. Of his second book he succeeded at all events in completing a part (cc. 1-25). In the work of compilation he used a number of documents bearing on various parts of his subject, some of them describing ceremonies of a long past date. Bieliaev has well shown how such descriptions of actual ceremonies were

³⁵ There is no difficulty in τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα πραιποσίτων, 'subsequent "praepositi"' (l. 23); they are contrasted with the 'praepositi' of l. 15.

³⁶ If it is not admitted that this is an interpolation I contend that we must ascribe the whole document to the time of Nicephorus.

used as a basis for the prescribed ceremonies.³⁷ Thus the description of the réception of a deputation by Michael III in c. 37 seems to have supplied the hint for the procedure prescribed in c. 1 (522, 5 *sqq.*); and the directions in c. 14 (565) seem to be based on the ceremony described in c. 38. The reception in the Magnaura, c. 15, is based on the actual proceedings in the case of the Saracen ambassadors and the princess Olga, which are added as an appendix to this chapter. The practical use of these extracts from history, ancient as well as modern, is indicated in some of the lemmata, as in c. 31 (*πὼς δεῖ προσφέρειν τὸν βασιλέα ἐν μεγάλῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀναθήματα*), where the title suggests the general application of a particular ceremony performed by Michael III. To this class of documents, some of practical use, others of antiquarian interest, belong cc. 84-95 of book i. and cc. 26-39 of book ii. From the circumstance that cc. 84-95 are appended to book i. we can conclude that they were placed there by Constantine himself; for if all these documents had formed a separate *dossier* it is highly unlikely that the redactor would have inserted some of them in book i. and some of them in book ii. It seems clear that the *original compiler*, when he had completed book i., added the series of extracts from Peter as a sort of appendix. And it was because he found a series of *ἀναγορεύσεις* (91-95) at the end of book i. that the *redactor* added here (and not in book ii.) the *ἀναγόρευσις* of Nicephorus, with which he naturally associated further the ceremony of the proedros.

§ 13. It is further to be observed that cc. 26-39 of book ii. form a homogeneous series, whereas the rest of the book is a miscellany, showing no sign of ordered arrangement. This suggests that Constantine intended this series to follow book ii., exactly as the other series followed book i. It therefore seems possible that the true book ii. is complete, cc. 1-25 forming the body of the book and cc. 26-39 an appendix of illustrative material. The upper limit of date for its composition is the autumn of the year in which Olga visited Constantinople, A.D. 957, as recorded in c. 15; ³⁸ while the upper limit for the completion of book i. is 956, the year of the death of the patriarch Theophylactus, who is referred to as no longer alive in c. 28 (p. 160).³⁹

³⁷ *Priemy*, pp. xxxiii-iv.

³⁸ The date (falsely given in the Russian chronicle as 955) can be inferred from Constantine's account, though he does not mention the indiction. Olga's audience was on Wednesday, 9 September (p. 594), and there was a banquet to which the Russian retinue was invited on Sunday, 18 October. The only years in Constantine's reign fulfilling these data are 946 and 957, of which the former is otherwise excluded. It would be unnecessary to call attention to this were it not that Rambaud (*op. cit.* p. 380) strangely says 'pas de date à tirer de *Cérém.* ii. 15,' and leaves it open whether the year was 956 or 957. The true date is now currently accepted. There are good notes on Olga's visit in Ilovanski, *Istoriia Rossii*, i. 294-5.

³⁹ Book ii. c. 18 seems to have been compiled before the marriage of Romanus II

§ 14. On the other hand the incorporation of cc. 40-57 in the second book was the work of the redactor. These chapters are evidently the miscellaneous contents of a *dossier* or collection of pieces, which he found physically associated with the original manuscript of the *De Cerimoniis*. They are, in fact, literary papers of Constantine, partly excerpts, partly compositions of his own, some of which he may have intended to add to *De Cer.* book ii. (for instance, cc. 40, 43, 51⁴⁰). The want of intelligence on the part of the redactor is apparent. The inclusion of such irrelevant documents as the schedule of the military expeditions in cc. 44, 45 shows that he had no discretion; but the inclusion of a life of Alexander and the contents of c. 57 proves that his procedure was purely mechanical. In the capitular divisions he also displays his incapacity. Thus c. 50 includes (1) a schedule of salaries of *strategoî*, and (2) a schedule of persons of certain classes exempt from, or liable to, service in military expeditions—two totally distinct subjects. On the other hand the separation of c. 53 from c. 52 is indefensible.

That a number of these diverse pieces were not merely used for consultation, but were designed for publication, whether in the *De Cerimoniis* or not, can be proved; for some of them either were compiled by Constantine or reveal his editorial hand. The formula which reveals his hand is *ιστέον ὅτι* (sometimes *χρῆ εἰδέναι*). This formula is used uniformly throughout the treatise *De Administrando Imperio* (varied by the abbreviated *ὅτι*), as I have shown elsewhere.⁴¹ (See further below, § 30.)

§ 15. This test confirms our previous result, that the enumeration of the tombs in the Holy Apostles' (c. 42) was compiled by Constantine. *ιστέον ὅτι* occurs repeatedly (pp. 642, 646-9). I pointed out above that this list might be considered *à propos* of the reference to some tombs in book ii. c. 6; yet it does not seem probable that it was intended to form an addition to book ii. It followed, as we saw, a list of emperors (lost from our manuscript)⁴² which, whether compiled under Constantine or not,

with Theophano. Cp. 603, 3, where only *ἡ ἀυγούστα* (Helena) appears. In the reception of Olga Theophano appears (*ἡ νύμφη*).

⁴⁰ This chapter may have been already added to book ii. by Constantine himself; I have treated it as disconnected, because 26-39 are homogeneous.

⁴¹ See my article 'The Treatise *De Administrando imperio*,' § 6, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, vol. xv. 1906. The formula is also used frequently in ii. cc. 1-25; and the notices in cc. 26-37 are all introduced by *ιστέον ὅτι* or *χρῆ εἰδέναι*. It was not used in the case of a literal transcription, and we can infer that the account of the *χειροτονία* of Theophylactus in c. 39 is an exact copy of an account written at that time (A. P. 933).

⁴² It may be observed that the list of emperors, which forms part of the Codinus collection (ed. Bekker, p. 149 *sqq.*), seems to have been originally compiled under Constantine VII. This is shown by the notice of the legislation of Romanus I (pp. 154-5), in connexion with which Constantine is described as *ὁ βασιλεὺς κύριος Κ.* (*κύριος* does not occur earlier in the list).

was doubtless a separate *opusculum*. Now we possess another enumeration of the imperial tombs, published from different manuscripts by Ducange and Banduri.⁴³ It differs from c. 42 in several respects. It is briefer and less correct;⁴⁴ and there are some deviations in the order. It also records the tombs of Nicephorus Phocas, Theophano, and Constantine VIII,⁴⁵ so that it must have been compiled or edited after 1028. But a comparison of the two documents shows at once that they are not independent of each other. The order is generally the same; the form of the notices is exactly the same,⁴⁶ the variations mainly consisting in omissions on the part of the writer of the list. As an example of the correspondence take the notices of the first two tombs in the 'Heroon' of Justinian.

'DE CER.' ii. 42, p. 644.

Πρὸς αὐτὴν τὴν κόγχην κατὰ ἀνατολὰς πρῶτος λάρναξ ἐν ᾧ ἀπόκειται τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰουστινιανοῦ, ἀπὸ λίθου ξένου καὶ ἀλλοκότου μέσην χροιάν ἔχουσα τοῦ τε Βιθυνοῦ καὶ Χαλκηδωνί του παραπλησίως λίθῳ Ὀστρίτη.

ἕτερος λάρναξ ἀπὸ λίθου Ἱεραπολίτου ἐν ᾧ ἀπόκειται Θεοδώρα ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ μεγάλου Ἰουστινιανοῦ.

'ANONYMUS' (Bekker, p. 205).

λάρναξ κατὰ ἀνατολὰς ἀπὸ λίθου ξένου καὶ ἀλλοκότου μέσην χροιάν ἔχουσα τοῦ τε Βιθυνοῦ καὶ Χαλκηδονίτου παρὰ (?) λίθου ὀστρέτου ἐν ᾗ ἀπόκειται Ἰουστινιανός.

ἕτερα λάρναξ ἀπὸ λίθου Ἱεραπολίτου ἐν ᾗ ἀπόκειται Θεοδώρα ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ.

The question to be determined is whether the work of the 'Anonymus' was derived from the Constantinian document or was based on a common source. In the latter case c. 42 would represent not an original composition, but an edition of an older work. The former alternative must be accepted, because the characteristic *ἵστέον ὅτι* appears in the 'Anonymus' (p. 207, 9 and 16; also 20, where the text gives *εἰ δέ* corruptly). Moreover the homogeneity of the Constantinian document is notable; the stone of the sarcophagus is designated throughout, whereas in the late additions of the 'Anonymus' the stone is not described (simply *ἄτερα λάρναξ*).

⁴³ Ducange, *Constantinopolis Christiana*, bk. iv. pp. 109-10; Banduri, *Imperium Orientale*, i. 121, whence it was reprinted in Bekker's *Codinus* ('Exc. de ant. Const. '), p. 202, and (with Banduri's commentary) in Migne, *P. G.* 157, c. 725 sqq.

⁴⁴ Thus a tomb of Theodosius II is inserted after that of Theodosius I (Bekker, p. 203), and again rightly noticed in a different place along with that of Arcadius (p. 207). There is a similar duplication of Michael II (pp. 204, 206).

⁴⁵ Pp. 204-5. Also of Romanus II, which may have been in *De Cer.* c. 42. Observe that Constantine VIII is described as 'the brother of the emperor Basil Bulgarktonos,' as we should expect, and nothing is said of a tomb of Basil II, who was buried elsewhere; see *abōve*, § 10.

⁴⁶ Curiously *λάρναξ* is masculine throughout in c. 42, but feminine, according to the commoner usage, in the anonymous list.

The 'Anonymus' has indeed one additional piece of description. It is noted that the stoa containing the tombs of Arcadius, Eudoxia, and their son is τὰ νῦν ἀσκέπαστος (p. 206); this is not mentioned in the Constantinian document. There are, however, certain other variations which suggest that this addition may not have been due to the 'Anonymus.'

(1) The notice of the casting out of the body of Constantine V, ἀλλ' ἐξέωθη κ.τ.λ. (p. 645, 4) appears in the 'Anonymus' in an expanded form (contrary to wont), and is introduced by the Constantinian formula ἰστέον ὅτι (p. 206), which is absent here in the Constantinian document.

(2) The last part of the Constantinian document (647, 20-649, 6) is omitted in the 'Anonymus.' This does not prove that the anonymous list was left incomplete, for this omitted portion records the tombs of minor members of imperial houses, ἐν τῷ εὐωνύμῳ μέρει τῆς αὐτῆς ἐκκλησίας. No emperor was buried in this part of the church, and therefore a list of imperial tombs might have been composed without including it.

It seems, then, worth while to suggest that the work was issued in Constantine's lifetime without this latter portion, and differing in a few details from the generally fuller draft in c. 42; and that it was from this publication that the anonymous list was transcribed. The only objection to this hypothesis is that the tomb of the empress regent Zoe was in the omitted portion, and it may be asked whether Constantine would have allowed a description to appear which did not include his mother's tomb. In any case it seems highly probable that the document of c. 42 was intended to be an independent work by itself.

§ 16. It has already been observed (§ 6) that the list of ἀλλάξια in c. 41 belongs to, and should not have been separated from, the lists which form the latter part of c. 40. On the other hand c. 40 comprises two heterogeneous documents, (a) the account of the origin of the ceremony of the twelve λῶροι and (b) the lists of church treasures. The division between cc. 40 and 41 ought to have been at the end of a. We saw that b contains internal evidence of its compilation in the reign of Constantine (above, § 9); but it does not seem at all probable that he intended to append it to the *De Cerimoniis*. On the other hand a has no special marks of Constantinian origin, and the introductory sentence is unlike the general style of the *De Cerimoniis*.⁴⁷ It must be left open whether it was compiled by Constantine or is an extract from some older work. In any case it is closely connected with the subject of the *De Cerimoniis*, and would have formed a suitable adjunct to the treatise.

⁴⁷ ἐκ μὲν τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς νοημάτων τῆς εὐσεβείας, καθὼς ὁ ἐμὸς λόγος, ὑποτυπώσομαι. In the prefaces Constantine does not use the first singular.

That the *εὐφημία* on the occasion of a triumph (c. 43) was meant to be incorporated somewhere is shown by the emperor's *ιστέον ὅτι ἡ αὐτὴ εὐφημία ἄδεται κ.τ.λ.* (p. 649, 9). It would have been quite a relevant addition to book ii.

The two documents combined in c. 44, relating to the expeditions to Crete under Leo VI, and to Italy under Romanus I, bear the marks of Constantine's editing (*ιστέον ὅτι* pp. 656-7 repeatedly, 660, 662; also *ὅτι* 663). And in the similar document of his own reign we also find the characteristic mark (669, 12, 671, 18). These pieces have nothing to do with ceremonies; their proper place would be in a treatise on military and naval organisation. The documents in c. 50, on the salaries of the strategoi and liability for military service, would also be appropriate in such a treatise. They too were edited by Constantine (compare 697, 10; 698, 9, 22; 699, 1). It seems a not improbable inference that he had formed the idea of compiling a treatise on military administration.

§ 17. C. 47 is distinguished by a special title in majuscules, a distinction which it shares with c. 52 (the *Kletorologion*). This indicates that the *χαριεπισμοί* were, like the *Kletorologion*, an independent document, and internal evidence suggests that it may have been composed in the time of Leo VI.⁴⁸ C. 48 seems also to be an older document, in which the names of Constantine and Romanus have been substituted in the formulae for those of earlier emperors. I conclude this from the retention of an obsolete formula for addressing the prince of Bulgaria side by side with the new form of address.⁴⁹ Further traces of Constantine's editing appear at p. 688, 16, and in the scholia on pp. 690 and 686.

The schedule of fees, dating from Leo's reign, in c. 49 has no signs of Constantine's hand, but it is followed by notices relating to (1) subsidies and exemptions granted to Saracen captives who have become Christians and (2) the property of soldiers, which ought not to have been grouped either together or in the same chapter as the schedule. These notices are marked by the usual Constantinian formula.

The *Kletorologion* of Philotheos, cc. 52, 53, with its appendix, 54, is intact; there are no notes or additions of Constantine. The schedule of c. 55 is introduced by the Constantinian formula.

§ 18. Sorting these documents in accordance with our results,

⁴⁸ It looks as if the Bulgarian formulae on p. 681 were used in the first years of Leo, during Vladimir's reign (the emperor is *πάππος* because Vladimir was son of Boris), and as if those following on p. 682 (*μεταμειφθέντος τοῦ δνόματος*) were introduced after the accession of Symeon (A.D. 893). Cf. Reiske, p. 801.

⁴⁹ P. 690. The first formula represents evidently the later usage of Leo's reign (see last note), while the second, in which the Bulgarian ruler is entitled *κύριος* and *βασιλεύς*, must have been introduced when the tsar Peter married Maria, granddaughter of Romanus I.

we may draw up the following table of the contents of the collection known as *De Cerimoniis* :—

A. *Treatise ' De Cerimoniis :*

Book i.=i. cc. 1-83 (92*)+84-95 (93*-104*) [84-95 contain matter which a modern author might include in an appendix].

Book ii.=ii. cc. 1-25+26-40a [26-40a contain matter of the nature of an appendix. 51 seems also to belong to this series]. It is possible that 43, 48 (and 46) were intended to be incorporated.

Subsequent addition in the reign of Nicephorus Phocas=i. 96, 97 (105,* 106*).

B. *Various opuscula composed or edited by Constantine VII :*

(1) *περὶ τῶν τάφων τῶν βασιλέων*=ii. 42.

(2) Military documents, perhaps for a treatise on military administration=ii. 44, 45, 50, and latter part of 49 (694, 22-end).

(3) *χαιρετισμοί* of ambassadors=ii. 47, with which perhaps 46 and 48 are connected.

(4) Schedule of *συνήθειαι*=ii. 55 (with Reiske's 56).

? (5) List of emperors=ii. 42 in index. But, as this is lost, we cannot say whether it belongs here or under C.

C. *Additions, not written or edited by Constantine VII :*

(1) Kletorologion of Philotheos=ii. 52, 53 (with its appendix 54).

(2) Schedule of fees in reign of Leo VI=ii. 49 (beginning-694, 21).

(3) Life of Alexander of Macedon=ii. 56 (lost).

(4) Documents of ii. 57 (lost).

(As the most simple explanation of the appearance of the accretions B and C it is suggested that they were found in a *dossier* of Constantine along with material connected with the Ceremonies.)

J. B. BURY.

(*To be continued.*)