Maria G. Parani

"Rise like the sun, the God-inspired kingship": Light-symbolism and the Uses of Light in Middle and Late Byzantine Imperial Ceremonials

Texts, images, and extant artefacts leave no doubt regarding the permeating preoccupation of all social strata of Byzantine society, from the emperor to his humbler subject, with the illumination of their places of worship and the central role of lights in the rituals of the Church and in acts of private devotion. Modern scholarship, with its emphasis on ecclesiastical lighting and the symbolic uses of lights in liturgical contexts, reflects to a large extent the biases of the surviving evidence[1]. However, apart from the church, the monastery, and the tomb, there is yet one other "sacred space" to be considered from the point of view of lighting and its symbolic ramifications. This is the palace of the divinely-appointed ruler, whose authority and sacral character was articulated and repeatedly re-affirmed through the stately rhythm of imperial ceremonial.

The metaphor of the Byzantine emperor as the sun, bringing warmth and light to his subjects and destructive fire to the empire's enemies, was a constant in the rhetoric of the Byzantine imperial idea. Still, while the investigation of the origins of this ideological construct and the potential solar connotations of certain imperial ceremonies have been the object of scholarly investigation[2], the actual use of light in Middle and Late Byzantine imperial ceremonial and its symbolic function therein have received comparatively little attention. The present study is a step towards redressing this imbalance by exploring the use of artificial lighting in "profane" imperial ceremonies[3]. Given that in Byzantium in general and in imperial ceremonial in particular, the boundaries between the religious and the secular were not only permeable but often blurred, the term "profane" is used here, for lack of a better term, to describe imperial ceremonies outside an ecclesiastical, liturgical, or funerary context. Under no circumstances does it imply that the ceremonies in question were deprived of Christian religious symbolism.

In the absence of relevant archaeological evidence in the form of standing imperial palace structures and their lighting fixtures from the Byzantine capital, the following discussion is based on a survey, by no means exhaustive, of pertinent written sources. Principal among them are the two Byzantine ceremonial "handbooks", the tenth-century *Book*

of Ceremonies[4] and the fourteenth-century *Treatise on the Offices* of pseudo-Kodinos[5]. The information gleaned falls into two categories and concerns, on the one hand, the artificial lighting of non-ecclesiastical spaces that served as the setting of imperial ceremonies and, on the other, the ritual use of lights, especially candles, during specific ceremonial performances.

The artificial lighting of the imperial palace

Regarding the artificial lighting of various palace buildings during audiences, promotions, receptions, and formal dinners, there is nothing in extant Byzantine texts on court ceremonial to compare with the careful regulation of the lighting of monastic churches provided by Middle and Late Byzantine monastic foundation documents (*typika*)[6]. On the contrary, what evidence we do have is to a large extent incidental and concerns the lighting of the Great Palace in the tenth century. The focus of the ritual life of the Byzantine court at that time was the Chrysotriklinos, the throne room attributed to Justin II (567–578) and decorated with mosaics by Michael III between 856 and 866. On the basis of written descriptions, this was an octagonal domed hall, with a central space opening into an apse towards the east. On the remaining seven sides, there were vaulted spaces, through which one gained access to surrounding buildings and terraces. Sixteen arched windows around the basis of the dome provided ample natural lighting to the area beneath it, while smaller windows seem to have been located high up on the walls of the side vaults. It has been suggested that the light coming through these side windows may have also passed into the central area through openings above the curtains that separated these subsidiary spaces from the centre[7]. Three imperial thrones, each used on different ceremonial occasions by the emperor, stood on a raised platform in the apse[8]. In the conch above the imperial dais was located the famous image of Christ enthroned to which the emperor would address a prayer each morning before taking his seat beneath it[9]. The remaining interior surfaces of the building were adorned with images of angels, apostles, martyrs, and holy prelates, while above the western doors the Virgin was represented as the Divine Gate[10].

The main lighting fixture of the Chrysotriklinos was a *polykandelon*, a multi-light device, suspended in the middle of the great hall[11]. On the occasion of the reception of the Arab legates from Tarsus on 31 May 946, described in chapter II.15 of the *Book of Ceremonies*, eight items of imperial female jewellery and belts were suspended from this *polykandelon* as part of the adornment of the octagonal throne room[12]. This might be taken to imply that the device was itself octagonal, perhaps of a composite construction, like the later monastic *choros*[13]. Still, the possibility that it was a single large round disc cannot be excluded. Whatever the case, it must have been impressive, literally highlighting the spot where newly promoted officials and visitors to the palace would stand to offer obeisance to the emperor enthroned in the apse.

That there must have been other *polykandela* and oil-lamps in the

Chrysotriklinos may be inferred from the reference in the *Kletorologion* or *Book of Banquets* of Philotheos (899) to a group of lamplighters (*κανδηλάπται*) assigned to the service of the lamps of the throne room and in charge of the oil for its lights[14]. The number and the disposition of these lights remain for the most part unknown, with the exception of the lighting of the focal point of the throne room, its eastern apse. Apparently, three oil lamps (*κανδῆλαι*) were suspended there in a triangular arrangement, with one at the front and two further behind, to the right and left. We only hear of them, because, during the reception of the Arab ambassadors mentioned above, the three lamps were replaced by three votive crowns, complete with crosses and doves, especially brought in for the occasion from the palace chapels of the Holy Apostles, the Theotokos of the Pharos, and St. Demetrios and this departure from normal practice was recorded in the account of the reception for future reference[15]. The number of the lamps and their positioning in front of the image of Christ in the conch and above the imperial throne can hardly have been fortuitous. Indeed, I would argue that the three lamps in the apse of the Chrysotriklinos served as a symbolic allusion to the Holy Trinity, the "light of a triple sun" (*φῶς τρισήλιον*) as it is called elsewhere in the *Book of Ceremonies*[16]. Underneath these three lamps, the emperor, who was regularly acclaimed by the Factions as "the choice of the Trinity"[17], would proceed to the investiture of officials using, in the words of Gilbert Dagron, a quasi-sacramental formula: "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, my kingship derived from God promotes you..."[18]. Within this framework, then, the lamps may have been understood as alluding to the source of the emperor's legitimate authority and power to rule, the Holy Trinity, but also as a symbol of divine illumination guiding the ruler in his governance of the empire. Thus, in conjunction with the architectural plan, the mosaics, and the rituals enacted in it, the lighting of the Chrysotriklinos seems to have contributed to the creation of a sacred space in which the emperor's status as God's chosen ruler and His vicar on Earth was made manifest in no uncertain terms[19].

Apart from the Chrysotriklinos, regular provisions for lighting were also in place for the two other palace halls that were regularly used for imperial receptions and other ceremonies throughout the year, namely the Ioustinianos and the Lausiakos, both located in the immediate vicinity of the throne room. According to Philotheos, they too had a corps of lamplighters assigned to them for servicing their *polykandela*[20]. From chapter II.15 of the *Book of Ceremonies* we learn that on the occasion of the reception of the Tarsiote legates in 946, the *polykandela* of the Lausiakos and the Ioustinianos had all their lamps lit (*ὁλόφωτα, καὶ ἀνελλιπῆ*), though we know nothing of their numbers and arrangement[21]. Equally lacking is information on the everyday lighting of the remaining areas in the sprawling palace complex.

The *Book of Ceremonies*, however, does include a small number of references to the use of lighting devices, especially silver *polykandela*, on special occasions involving the celebration of a joyous event or a diplo-

matic reception. In these contexts, in addition to the traditional honorific connotations of lights, their lavish display bespoke of imperial power and munificence, while their brilliance must have enhanced the festive character of the proceedings. Thus, on the eighth day following the birth of a son to the emperor, the empress's chamber was adorned with the gold-woven curtains of the neighbouring Chrysotriklinos and *polykandela*, so that the imperial mother and child could receive the congratulations first of the female and then of the male members of the Byzantine court[22]. On an altogether different scale, on the occasion of the imperial triumphs of Theophilos and Basil I in 831 and 878 respectively, the prefect of Constantinople adorned the triumphal way from the Golden Gate in the city-walls to the Chalke Gate, the main entrance to the imperial palace, with laurel and myrtle branches, flowers, silk hangings, and silver *polykandela*. In the words of the compiler of the respective accounts, the whole city was thus transformed into a bridal chamber (*δίκην νυμφικῶν παστάδων*), awaiting, one may add, the glorious arrival of the victorious groom, the emperor[23].

Still, in none of these descriptions are we given any indication as to where all the lighting devices used in these decorations came from. For more information we are obliged, yet again, to turn to chapter II.15 and the description of the preparations for the reception of the Arab ambassadors in May 946. Thus we learn that the great silver *polykandelon* from the church of the Blachernai was suspended outside the Chalke Gate, where the envoys dismounted before they entered the palace. The passages and the halls of the upper palace that the ambassadors traversed and the magnificent audience hall of the Magnaura, where they were received by the emperor, were adorned with the silver *polykandela* of the Nea Ekklesia, no less than 73 in number, suspended from brass chains borrowed from the nearby church of Sts. Sergios and Bakchos. Lastly, for the banquet in the Chrysotriklinos, the lighting devices of the throne room's side vaults were either supplemented or replaced with silver chains and silver *polykandela* from the palace church of the Theotokos of the Pharos (Table A).

The fact that many of the areas in the upper palace do not appear to have been in regular use or in a good state of repair during the tenth century might go some way to explain the need to bring in lighting devices from elsewhere[24]. That the great numbers of *polykandela* and suspension chains required were provided for the most part by the palace churches testifies both to the ostentation of ecclesiastical lighting and to the great importance accorded to provisioning for it as a time-honoured and well-received act of piety on the part of the emperor. It is thus that churches and, especially, the palace chapels became depositories of large numbers of expensive lighting devices to which the emperor and his agents could have recourse as the need arose. Earlier in the tenth century, for instance, the emperor Alexander (912–913) borrowed ecclesiastical lighting devices to adorn the Hippodrome on the occasion of the special games he organised[25]. However, the churches were no ordinary treasuries. Their lighting

TABLE A
Lighting provisions for the reception of the Tarsiote legates in May 946, based on *De cerimoniis* II.15.

Outside the Chalke Gate	One chain and the great silver polykandelon of the Blachernai	De cer. / Ed. Reiske, p. 573; *Featherstone*, Δι' ἔνδειξιν, p. 87.
Inside the Chalke Gate	Two chains and two silver polykandela from the Nea Ekklesia	De cer. / Ed. Reiske, p. 573; *Featherstone*, Δι' ἔνδειξιν, p. 87.
Triklinos of the Scholae	Ten chains and ten silver polykandela from the Nea Ekklesia	De cer. / Ed. Reiske, p. 572–573; *Featherstone*, Δι' ἔνδειξιν, p. 87.
Tribounalion	Twelve chains and twelve silver polykandela from the Nea Ekklesia	De cer. / Ed. Reiske, p. 572; *Featherstone*, Δι' ἔνδειξιν, p. 87.
Triklinos of the Exkoubitoi	Six chains and silver polykandela from the Nea Ekklesia	De cer. / Ed. Reiske, p. 572; *Featherstone*, Δι' ἔνδειξιν, p. 86.
First Schola, middle of the dome	One chain (and polykandelon?)	De cer. / Ed. Reiske, p. 572; *Featherstone*, Δι' ἔνδειξιν, p. 86.
Outside the Stable of the Mules	Five chains (and polykandela?)	De cer. / Ed. Reiske, p. 572; *Featherstone*, Δι' ἔνδειξιν, p. 86.
Triklinos of the Kandidatoi	Five chains and five silver polykandela from the Nea Ekklesia	De cer. / Ed. Reiske, p. 572; *Featherstone*, Δι' ἔνδειξιν, p. 86.
In the vault leading to the Triklinos of the Kandidatoi	One chain and one polykandelon	De cer. / Ed. Reiske, p. 571–572; *Featherstone*, Δι' ἔνδειξιν, p. 86.
At the anadedradion (a passage covered with a trellis?)leading to the Magnaura	Thirteen brass chains from the church of Sts. Sergios and Bakchos and silver polykandela from the Nea Ekklesia	De cer. / Ed. Reiske, p. 571; *Featherstone*, Δι' ἔνδειξιν, p. 85–86.
At the great arch, outside the Magnaura	One brass chain from the church of Sts. Sergios and Bakchos and one large silver polykandelon from the Nea Ekklesia	De cer. / Ed. Reiske, p. 570–571; *Featherstone*, Δι' ἔνδειξιν, p. 85.
In the Magnaura	Seven brass chains from the church of Sts. Sergios and Bakchos and seven large silver polykandela from the Nea Ekklesia to the left, and seven brass chains and silver polykandela from the same churches to the right	De cer. / Ed. Reiske, p. 570–571; *Featherstone*, Δι' ἔνδειξιν, p. 85.
In the Magnaura, from the four great columns	Four brass chains from the church of Sts. Sergios and Bakchos and four large silver polykandela from the Nea Ekklesia	De cer. / Ed. Reiske, p. 570–571; *Featherstone*, Δι' ἔνδειξιν, p. 85.
Ioustinianos and Lausiakos	Their own polykandela with their lights fully lit	De cer. / Ed. Reiske, p. 580; *Featherstone*, Δι' ἔνδειξιν, p. 93.
In the seven side vaults of the Chrysotriklinos	Silver polykandela with silver chains from the church of the Theotokos of the Pharos	De cer. / Ed. Reiske, p. 581; *Featherstone*, Δι' ἔνδειξιν, p. 93.

devices, along with their other furnishings, were votive offerings dedicated to God and, consequently, the uses to which they were put needed to accord with and be respectful of their sacred character. Thus, Alexander's act, which, according to Byzantine chroniclers, was inspired by the counsels of magicians and was intended to satisfy his own superstitious beliefs, was condemned as a sacrilege, for which the emperor was soon after punished by God with the loss of the imperial dignity and his life. The *Book of Ceremonies*, of course, provides no inkling as to how the use of ecclesiastical lighting devices in the reception of the Arab ambassadors was received. One is perhaps safe to assume that it was not deemed inappropriate, since it was done for the glorification of the imperial dignity and, ultimately, of God from whom this dignity was derived. Besides, let us not forget, imperial ceremonial in its beauty, order, and stateliness, was considered as a reflection of the harmony of the Heavenly court and as such it may have been perceived as imparting a sacral aura to the spaces through which it unfolded, blurring the boundaries between the sacred and the profane. One could suggest that such concepts may have facilitated or even helped to justify the migration of the *polykandela* from the churches to the palace halls, if justification was needed, but as things stand such an interpretation must remain speculative.

Before concluding our discussion of the illumination of palace spaces in the tenth century, reference should be made to one particular structure located in the upper palace, in the area of the Scholae and the *triklinos* of the Exkoubitoi, called the *Λύχνοι*, i.e. the Lamps. Albert Vogt has suggested, plausibly, that this should be identified with the *Θόλος τῆς Ἑπταλύχνου*, that is the Dome of the Seven-branch lamp, mentioned in the late-tenth-century redaction of the *Patria* of Constantinople as being in that same area of the palace[26]. The Lychnoi apparently opened onto the open courtyard of the Tribounalion, to which they are sometimes equated in the *Book of Ceremonies*[27]. The name preserved in the *Patria* would suggest that this domed structure housed a menorah, perhaps yet another object with Old Testament allusions and messianic connotations in the possession of the Byzantine emperor, but, so far, I have been unable to find confirmation of such a claim in any other source[28]. The *Book of Ceremonies* mentions only a silver cross and an unspecified number of lamps as housed in the Lychnoi[29]. According to the same source, the emperor would pass through there during the procession from the palace to the church of Hagia Sophia organised on important religious feast-days. At the Lychnoi, he would light candles in front of the cross in thanks to God, while a comment added to the text suggests that the emperor would also light the lamps[30]. Though there is hardly enough evidence to allow us to reconstruct the ritual, let alone to gauge its meaning, it is particularly interesting that the visit to the Lychnoi marks the beginning of a series of receptions (*δοχαί*) of the emperor by the Factions, which punctuate the gradual passage of the ruler from the private sphere of the palace and court into the public sphere of the city and people. When he emerged from the Lychnoi into

the Tribounalion, the emperor would be greeted by the Blues, the members of the office of the prefect of the city, other city officials, members of the city guilds, as well as foreign visitors, if they happened to be in attendance at the time[31]. The Tribounalion was adorned for the occasion with silks and precious vessels provided by the textile merchants and the silversmiths, while our text seems to imply that this first imperial reception also took place in the presence of lit lamps, though it is unclear if these were the actual lamps of the Lychnoi[32]. *Mutatis mutandis,* this ritual welcome of the emperor by the representatives of the people and the city at the Lychnoi is reminiscent of another comparable ceremony, in which festive decorations and lights also featured prominently: the imperial *adventus.*

Of ultimate Hellenistic origins, the ceremonial arrival and welcome of a ruler into a city with flowers, burning incense, and lit candles continued to be staged in Byzantium, as it had been in Roman times, at least down to the Middle Byzantine period[33]. Thus, in 963, upon his arrival to Constantinople following his assumption of the throne, Nikephoros II Phokas was greeted at the Golden Gate with candles and incense by all the inhabitants of the city, young and old[34]. Almost one hundred years later, in 1057, another usurper, Isaak I Komnenos received a similar welcome to the capital. Indeed, according to Michael Psellos, the populace rejoiced as if Isaak's first entrance into the city was an epiphany of God[35]. Though sarcastic, Psellos's comment is nevertheless revelatory of the underlying meaning of this ceremony, during which the ruler was welcomed into the city as a protector and a saviour[36]. The ceremonial entrances of both emperors into the capital took place in daytime, a fact which intimates that the presence of candles did not serve the practical function of illumination. Rather, in the ritual context of the *adventus*, beyond any traditional honorific connotations, the lights can also be understood as expressive of the people's joy at the emperor's arrival and his presence among them[37]. Though it is not possible to claim that the first reception of the emperor at the Lychnoi was actually patterned after the *adventus* or was consciously meant to evoke it, the echoes of the grander, public ceremony in the scaled-down, more intimate *doche* within the palace seem to me beyond question. With the discussion of the Lychnoi and the ceremonial associated with them we have, however, moved on to the examination of the ritual use of lights in imperial ceremonial, to which the second part of this study is dedicated.

The ritual use of lights in imperial ceremonial

Considering the important role of lights in the *adventus*, it is not surprising to find them featuring in a ritual that resonates with its impact much more strongly than the ceremony at the Lychnoi ever did. The reference is to the commemoration of Christ's own "royal entry" into Jerusalem, which, in the tenth century, took the form of a procession through the lower palace. The procession culminated in the placement of a gospel-book — the symbol of Christ — on the empty imperial throne in the apse of the Chrysotriklinos by a deacon, in the presence of the emperor, the members

of the Imperial Chamber (*κουβούκλειον*), and the *patrikioi*, all holding crosses and processional candles (*λιτανίκια κηρία*)[38]. In this specific context, on could argue, the candles were held in honour of the arrival not of any ordinary ruler, but of Christ, who was after all the King of Kings[39].

The imperial *adventus* aside, the question now arises whether there were any other imperial "secular" ceremonies that can be profitably examined from the point of view of the ritual use of lights[40]. We shall begin with the information provided by our Middle Byzantine sources, before proceeding to examine the developments that are attested in the Late Byzantine period. The relevant references in the treatise of Philotheos and the *Book of Ceremonies*, though few in number, are enough to document two interesting practices: first, the giving of candles as parting gifts to the participants in imperial banquets and, second, holding lit candles or torches while dancing.

The custom of giving one candle to each of the guests at the conclusion of formal dinners before they departed is recorded for the dinner on the Ninth Day of Christmas (3 January), for those following the vespers of Holy Thursday and Holy Saturday, and lastly, for the dinner given in celebration of the emperor's *Broumalion*[41]. Neither Philotheos nor the *Book of Ceremonies* provide any explanation as to the meaning of this gesture and the reason why donatives of candles were associated with these particular occasions. The habit of offering gifts to the guests at imperial banquets is, of course, well-documented. However, these gifts usually took the form of food from the imperial table, precious vessels, and specie, not candles[42]. Conversely, according to the *Oneirokritikon* of Achmet, a tenth-century text on dream interpretation, lit candles were symbols of authority (*ἐξουσία*); if the emperor dreamt that he gave lit candles to his familiars, this meant that, in real life, he would grant them dignities and power[43]. Such ideas, however, could hardly explain the practice that we are discussing here. While the giving of candles on Holy Saturday is, more or less, understandable, given the well-known association of the feast of the Resurrection with light, it is far less so in the case of Holy Thursday, the day of the commemoration of the Last Supper. Interestingly, Holy Thursday was the day when the emperor would visit the hospices for the old, comforting the poor and distributing largess from the bounty that God had given him. Furthermore, on the evening of the same day, after the vespers, the emperor, would give the *patrikioi*, the *magistroi*, and other members of his court two apples and one stick of cinnamon, yet another intriguingly obscure ritual gesture[44]. With this in mind, one wonders whether the distribution of candles should be understood within this broader context of Christian charity, of sharing one's blessings, and, perhaps also, of remembrance which seemed to have defined the spirit of this sober feast. Alternatively, the candles may have had a different symbolic function altogether. Philotheos speaks of Holy Thursday as "the day on which divine wisdom prepared the supper of divine mystagogy"[45], also alluding to the establishment of the Eucharist by Christ. One could suggest, then, that the candles were emblematic of the illumination and, by

extension, of salvation which could be achieved by partaking in this mystical supper, but all this remains highly conjectural.

Equally mystifying is the giving of candles on the Ninth Day of Christmas, at the dinner which was named after the vintage (*τρυγητικόν*), even though the actual gathering of grapes took place in autumn. On that evening, along with the members of the court, the emperor entertained at dinner all the runners of the foot-race called the "βοτὸν πεζοδρόμιον", which took place on the day before (2 January), as part of the celebrations for the beginning of the New Year[46]. These revelries hark back to the New Year pagan festival of the Calends, extending over the first four days of January[47], while the name of the banquet itself, *trygetikon*, suggests a connection with Late Antique winter agricultural festivities of fertility and rebirth related to Dionysos. Indeed, according to a tradition recorded by the sixth-century author John Lydos, Dionysos was associated with fire, since he was identified with the heat-generating spirit that was the cause of growth and reproduction of all living things, while nocturnal dances with lit torches formed part of his cult[48]. With this in mind, one might surmise that the giving of candles was simply a festive note added to the celebrations of the evening. However, Philotheos, right before he mentions the distribution of candles, speaks of a "προέρτον φωταυγίαν", without further qualification[49]. In chapter I.92(83) of the *Book of Ceremonies* we are told that, on the night of the banquet of the *trygetikon*, the famous Gothic Dance (*Γοτθικόν*) was performed, with the dancers dressed up as Goths and wearing masks, reminiscent of the masquerades associated with the Calends. However, there is no mention of the presence of lights during this dance[50], and in truth it is highly unlikely that Philotheos is referring to this practice. In fact, the lack of any reference to the *Gothikon* in the *Kletorologion* has been adduced as evidence that the dance was no longer performed at the time of the composition of the treatise around the end of the ninth century[51]. What then could the "illumination of the forefeast" of which Philotheos speaks be? Apart from the festivities for the New Year, the first days of January and more specifically the 2nd to the 5th of that month were dedicated to the celebration of the forefeast of Epiphany (6 January), also known as the Feast of Lights[52]. Could it be that the *Gothikon* was replaced by a ritual involving the use of lights in honour of the upcoming feast of Epiphany for the purpose of overlaying the original pagan tenor of the celebrations of that night with a pious Christian veneer? The distribution of candles in such a context would certainly be quite appropriate.[53] In any case, that ancient imperial rituals with pagan roots could be suppressed on grounds of piety as late as the beginning of the tenth century is demonstrated by the case of the *Brumalia*, to which we now turn[54].

Derived from the Latin word "bruma", referring to the shortest day of the year, the *Brumalia* was a festival with pagan origins, associated with the cults of Saturn, Demeter, and Dionysos. Celebrated over a period of twenty-four days, from 24 November to 17 December, it had both agricultural and cosmological-solar associations since it marked the completion of the harvest and the onset of winter, with increasingly long nights leading up to the winter solstice. By the sixth century, each of those twen-

ty-four days had become associated with a letter of the Greek alphabet, and it was customary for people to entertain their friends with dinners and gifts on the day assigned to the first letter of their name. The Byzantine emperor followed this tradition, celebrating his *Brumalion* on his name day, a tradition which was revived by Constantine VII, after a short period of suppression of the practice "προσχήματι εὐλαβείας" by Romanos I Lekapenos (920–944)[55].

Candles, as already mentioned, were distributed to the members of the court following the dinner organized on the evening of the emperor's *Brumalion*[56]. Though it was the custom of the day for the host to present his guests with gifts, in the case of the emperor these took the form of donatives of specie, precious vessels, and silk garments. The candles, on the other hand, might be better associated with the solar aspects of this particular festival, which marked the onset of winter and the receding of daylight as nights became longer. Candles, in this context, may be perceived both as symbolic of the struggle to keep darkness at bay and as a promise for the eventual return of the light after the winter solstice. That they were distributed on behalf of the emperor, who in Byzantine political thought and rhetoric was allegorized as the light-giving sun and who was the earthly representative of Christ-the Light of the World (cf. John 8:12), may have helped to endow the practice, regardless of its possible pagan associations, with a particular contemporary imperial and Christian resonance.

Be this as it may, that light symbolism was central to the celebration of the imperial *Brumalion* is also made evident by the fact that, in mid-afternoon, before the banquet, the members of the senate, including the *magistroi*, the *anthypatoi*, and the *patrikioi*, would dance before the emperor holding lit candles and singing hymns in his honour[57]. It is important to point out that, though there are a number of descriptions of members of the court dancing before the emperor in *Kletorologion* and the *Book of Ceremonies*, this is the only instance where there is an explicit reference to them holding lit candles while doing so. According to the latter source, the dance took place on an open terrace in the upper palace known as the Mystic Fountain of the Triconch, while the emperor watched enthroned on what appears to have been a raised platform situated to the east[58]. In front of this platform was a balustrade on which a veil was spread, thus allowing only the upper part of the emperor's body to be visible from the terrace. It is on this same platform that the emperor would be seated when he was ceremoniously received at the Mystic Fountain of the Triconch by the Factions (*δέξιμον*) on the eve of the races organised to celebrate important anniversaries, like his accession or the foundation of Constantinople on 11 May. On these occasions, before the emperor manifested himself on the throne, the Factions would call him forth with the invocation "Rise like the sun the God-inspired kingship! Rise!"[59], and, indeed, as Dagron has already pointed out, with his lower body hidden behind the curtain and in his radiant bejewelled insignia, he would appear like the incarnate metaphor of the sun rising in the eastern horizon[60]. Though no such invocation is recorded on the occasion of the *Brumalion*

dance at the Mystic Fountain, the solar symbolism of the ceremony is made evident both by the appearance of the emperor on his high throne and by the "φωτοφανὲς σάξιμον", the dance of lights, as it is described by Philotheos[61]. In the tenth century, however, this solar symbolism was no longer that of the cosmic-religious nature that had been associated with the ancient Roman festival; rather, it was a solar symbolism harnessed by imperial ceremonial for the glorification of the Christian sun-like ruler.

As pointed out above, the dance of lights on the occasion of the imperial *Brumalion* was performed by the members of the senate in the presence of the emperor. As such, it needs to be distinguished from another type of dance with lit candles or torches that is recorded in the *Book of Ceremonies*. This is the so-called *φακλαρέα*, whose name is derived from the Latin word "faculus", meaning "small torch". This dance formed part of the elaborate ritual petition addressed to the emperor by the Factions for permission to organise chariot races in celebration of a major feast or an important anniversary. Once imperial permission was granted, the members of the Factions would gather in the evening to dance the *phaklarea*. Prior to the reign of Basil I (867–886), the dance would be performed separately by the Blues and the Greens at their respective fountains in the imperial palace. Following the dismantling of the two fountains by that emperor, the *phaklarea* was performed by the members of both Factions at the Mystic Fountain of the Triconch. The emperor, however, did not attend its performance[62]. In the case of the *phaklarea*, then, the dance and the lights must have served a different symbolic function than they had done in the case of the imperial *Brumalion*. Beyond providing the appropriate festive opening for the celebrations of the following days culminating in the races at the hippodrome, the *phaklarea* may be interpreted as a ritualised demonstration of joy by the people, represented here by the Factions, at the magnanimity and the liberality of the emperor in allowing and providing for the games. Not least, the presence of lights accorded well with the overall solar symbolism that underlay imperial ceremonial associated with the Hippodrome, a symbolism that Byzantium had inherited from Rome[63].

No text comparable to the *Kletorologion* of Philotheos and the *Book of Ceremonies* has come down to us from the period ranging from the eleventh century down to the mid-fourteenth, when the treatise of pseudo-Kodinos was composed. Thus, tracing the development of the use of lights in "profane" imperial ceremonies after the tenth century becomes even more challenging since one is forced to rely on mostly random references in a variety of written sources. As we have already seen, certain practices involving the honorific uses of lights, such as the presence of lit candles and torches during the ritual welcome of the ruler to a city, continued after the tenth century as well. The use of silver lamps as part of the decorations of the capital in celebration of a joyous event also appears to have continued, as suggested by the description of the festivities accompanying the birth of the much-awaited male heir to Manuel I in 1169[64]. On the other hand, evidence for the celebration of the imperial *Brumalion* after the tenth century is equivocal, though there is a passing reference to it in a

poem by the mid-twelfth-century poet known as Manganeios Prodromos[65]. As to the potential impact of the increasing use of the Blachernai Palace under the Komnenian emperors on ceremonies involving lights that were associated with specific spaces in the Great Palace, the state of our knowledge does not allow us to offer any observations beyond the realm of conjecture. All one can say is that, contrary to prevalent opinion, the old palace was not abandoned by the Komnenoi and some ritual practices associated with it may have survived down to 1204[66]. Still, despite the grievous gaps in our knowledge, there is some evidence to suggest that two major developments that appear in place in the fourteenth century, when they were documented by pseudo-Kodinos, may have had their roots in the Middle Byzantine period. The reference is to the practice of carrying a light before the emperor in processions other than those associated with an imperial triumph or an *adventus* and to the ceremony of the *πρόκυψις*, which involved the staged appearance of the emperor on a raised, brightly illuminated platform.

The custom of two torch-bearers walking in front of the Roman emperor when he left the palace, even on ordinary days, is attested in the second century A.D. and it has been suggested that it may have persisted into Late Antique times as well. The torches in this context appear to have been one of the honorific accoutrements of the imperial dignity[67]. According to Treitinger, their fire was also a symbol of the timelessness of the imperial authority[68]. Be this as it may, despite the numerous and detailed descriptions of imperial processions in the *Book of Ceremonies*, there is no reference to torch- or candle-bearing attendants or officials walking before the emperor. The next time we hear of the practice is in the late eleventh century, in a homily addressed by Theophylact of Ohrid to the *porphyrogennetos* Constantine, son of Michael VII Doukas (1085/86). Among other things, Theophylact instructs his imperial pupil on the importance of the virtue of charity (*φιλανθρωπία*), in the sense of loving mankind in imitation of God. The emperor's red garments and shoes are symbols of fire, the prelate states, fire that can illuminate but also burn, that can be beneficial but also an instrument of punishment. A good emperor should be a continuous source of illumination for his subjects, but slow to burn, that is to punish. The lit large candle carried before the emperor (*ἡ λαμπὰς ἡ προπορευομένη τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος*) symbolizes precisely this, Theophylact concludes, since it is used to illuminate, but not to destroy by fire[69]. In other words, it is a symbol of the emperor's benevolence, in whose light his people thrives.

The practice is next discussed by Theodore Balsamon in the late twelfth century, in his treatise *On the privileges of the patriarchs*. According to the Byzantine canonist, lights in the form of a lit large candle (*λαμπάς*) were carried not only in front of the emperor, but in front of the empress as well, while, amongst the ecclesiastical hierarchy, this distinction was enjoyed only by the patriarchs, autocephalous archbishops, and certain metropolitans, the latter by imperial dispensation[70]. Balsamon sets out to clarify the reasons behind this ancient, as he calls it, practice, without, however, going into detail about who carried the said lights and on what occasions.

Though in his time many regarded the lit large candle as emblematic of the right of the emperor and the patriarchs to preach by the power of the Holy Spirit, this alone, we are told, cannot explain why the empress would also be honoured thus, since women were not allowed to preach[71]. The emperor is honoured with the lit large candle, which is adorned with silver-gilt wreaths, because like the "giant of the sky", the sun, he illuminates with his rays the "heart of Orthodoxy" (*τὸ κέντρον τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας*). When he appears, he lights up the heavens from one end to the other, and no-one can hide from his warmth[72]. Because the sun-like emperor cares and nurtures both the body and the soul of his subjects, his large candle is adorned with two silver-gilt wreaths. On the other hand, the large candles of the patriarchs and of the empress are adorned with a single wreath each, because the first care only for the souls and the second only for the bodies[73]. Though Balsamon makes no mention of it, it seems to me more likely that the said wreaths would have been attached on portable candle-holders for carrying the candles, rather than on the candles themselves, and indeed, a silver holder (*ὑποδοχεύς*) for the patriarchal candle is actually mentioned by Nicholas Mesarites, a younger contemporary of Balsamon[74]. The Byzantine canonist concludes his discourse on the candles by stating that the faithful who saw the emperors and the patriarchs thus distinguished were moved to give thanks to God for glorifying His champions and for making the world bright with imperial trophies and by the prayers of the patriarchs[75].

While Theophylact views the large candle as a symbol of one particular imperial virtue that should characterize the Christian ruler, in Balsamon's interpretation it becomes emblematic of the conceptualisation of imperial authority that he espouses and wishes to promote. While certain elements of this ideological construct are easily recognisable as harking back to the traditional concept of the all-conquering sun-like emperor, the emphasis on the emperor's theological expertise in defence of Orthodoxy and on his superiority over Church leaders in both physical and spiritual concerns seems to me to have a strong contemporary resonance. One has only to bring to mind the ecclesiastical policies of Alexios I and, especially, of Manuel I Komnenos, whom Balsamon ardently supported. Manuel in particular had a high regard of himself as an arbiter on all matters ecclesiastical, whether pertaining to dogma or administration, and he wrote some of the sermons that he addressed to his subjects himself. Moreover, he was a master at the manipulation of ceremonial for enhancing the imperial image and for furthering his political goals[76]. That either he or someone in his environment came up with the idea of the two wreaths in order to state in visual and visible terms the emperor's precedence over the hierarchy of the Church seems to me quite plausible.

The custom of carrying a lit large candle in front of the emperor apparently survived into the Late Byzantine period, when it is attested at the Palaiologan court. At this later date, the large imperial candle (*λαμπάς*) is sometimes mentioned in association with a "διβάμπουλον", which, I would argue, was the portable candle-holder in which the candle was placed[77]. The *dibampoulon* is commonly interpreted as a double-branch

candle-holder, comparable to the liturgical *δικήριον*[78]. However, the fact that it was used in association with a single imperial large candle makes this rather unlikely. In the light of the preceding discussion, I would suggest that the imperial *dibampoulon* is better understood as a single candle-holder with its shaft adorned with two metal wreaths, as can be extrapolated by Balsamon's earlier account. As far as I know, the earliest mention of the *dibampoulon* is encountered in Pachymeres, in relation to the appointment of John XII Kosmas to the patriarchal throne in 1294. Upon his accession, Andronikos II Palaiologos granted the patriarch the right to the *dibampoulon*, a gesture extraordinary enough to be recorded by Pachymeres[79]. As we have seen above, the patriarch already had the right to a *lampas* and a candle-holder and, indeed, a "λαμπαδοῦχον" (a portable candle-holder) is mentioned by the same historian in relation to the resignation of Arsenios from the patriarchate in 1260[80]. With this in mind, I would argue that the gesture of Andronikos becomes truly meaningful only if we accept that the *dibampoulon* was a candle-holder adorned with two wreaths, the use of which had, up to that moment, been an exclusive prerogative of the emperor. Andronikos's attitudes towards the Church were markedly different from those of his Komnenian predecessors and the significance of this concession of this imperial privilege for the relations between Church and State at that time has been commented upon by Angelov and need not be reiterated here[81]. As to whether this honour was transferred to John's immediate successors to the patriarchal throne, this is unclear since it is only in the writings of Sylvester Syropoulos in the fifteenth century that we again encounter the use of the *dibampoulon* as a patriarchal privilege[82], a privilege that has survived to the present day (Figs. 1-2)[83].

1. Phanar, Oecumenical Patriarchate. Feast of the Pentecost (12 June 2011). The patriarchal dibampoulon

That the large candle with the *dibampoulon* continued to be one of the imperial insignia in the fourteenth century is securely attested by pseudo-Kodinos. The imperial *dibampoulon* is said to have been golden, while the large candle is described as having its two ends red and its middle adorned with golden foil on which were painted crosses enclosed in circles, also in red[84]. It was carried by the *lampadarios*, a member of the palace clergy[85]. The *lampadarios* with the *dibampoulon* and the lit *lampas* would walk before the emperor when he went in procession from his chamber to the church and back again on Palm Sunday[86]. When the emperor attended the Christmas Eve service in the *triklinos* of the imperial palace at Blachernai, the *lampadarios* would stand to the left of the emperor, on the same side though not at the same level with the *megas domestikos*, who carried the imperial sword[87]. The lit candle also featured in the ceremony of the *prokypsis*. During that ceremony, the large candle, like the imperial sword, would appear hovering at the side of the emperor since the persons carrying both items would be carefully hidden from view[88].

Luckily for us, pseudo-Kodinos includes the *lampas* in his discussion of the symbolism of the Palaiologan imperial insignia. According to him, the large candle was carried before the emperor as an allusion to the evangelical passage "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in Heaven" (Matthew 5:16)[89]. Evidently, the symbolic meaning of the imperial *lampas* had once more been transformed. It now alluded to the pious emperor's wisdom and beneficence expressed in his care for his subjects, all towards the greater glory of God, the ultimate source of his power. As such, I would suggest, it helped to balance and circumscribe imperial authority symbolised by the imperial sword in conjuction with which the imperial candle was now displayed. The emperor's power to rule and to administer justice, made manifest by the implied menace of the sword, was tempered by his Christian good-will and charity that shone forth for all to see like the light of the candle that appeared next to him. Interestingly, this development in the ritual construction and projection of the imperial image resonates more with the ideas of eleventh-century Church prelates like Theophylact of Ohrid, rather than with the grandiose Komnenian formulation of the imperial ideal, a formulation which the changing historical circumstances of an empire beset with difficulties could no longer support[90].

2. Phanar, Oecumenical Patriarchate. The modern patriarchal dibampoulon, detail (photo: author)

But what of the actual ceremony of the *prokypsis* itself? The *prokypsis* involved the quasi-theatrical appearance of the emperor — who could be accompanied by his son the co-emperor, the *despotes* (the highest ranking officials in the Byzantine court, often sons, brothers, or sons-in-law of the emperor), and, possibly, the empress — on a specially constructed raised platform, also known by the name of *prokypsis*. The ceremony took place on Christmas Eve and on Epiphany. Imperial brides could also appear on a *prokypsis*, apparently on their own, as part of the ceremonial celebrations of an imperial wedding. In the fourteenth century there was a permanent structure at the Blachernai Palace for the regular performance of the ceremony[91]. If the emperor happened to be away from the capital, a wooden platform would be constructed as the need arose, as in the case of the *prokypsis* of the imperial bride staged outside the city of Selymbria in Thrace on the occasion of the marriage of Theodora, daughter of John VI Kantakouzenos, to the emir Orhan in 1346[92]. Behind closed curtains, the imperial personages would ascend the stage-like platform lined with precious silks, while a page carrying the imperial sword and the *lampadarios* would also take their place at the sides. Theodora Kantakouzene, being a woman and standing alone on the platform of her *prokypsis* in 1346, was framed only by candles held by eunuchs, the sword being emblematic of imperial authority which she did not have[93]. Once everyone was in position, the signal would be given and the curtains would be suddenly drawn apart to reveal the emperor to his subjects gathered below the platform, who would acclaim him with fanfares and eulogies. The ruler would be visible from the knees upwards, enhancing thus the impression that he was indeed rising like the sun to which he was compared in a number of poems composed apropos such ritual performances[94]. On the other hand, as mentioned above, those carrying the sword and the *lampas* would be

completely hidden from view, thus creating the impression that the two insignia were hovering at the side of the emperor, adding to the wondrousness of the imperial vision[95]. References to the *prokypsis* in various sources imply that the ceremony took place in the late afternoon or early evening and that the platform was illuminated by artificial means, which, however, are never described[96]. The recurrence of the term "δίσκος" (disk) in a number of laudatory poems associated with the ceremony has led Michael Jeffreys to postulate the use of circular reflectors to direct light on the platform, possibly on the figure of the emperor himself, but this, though probable, is far from certain[97].

A number of significant studies have advanced our understanding of the origins, the context, and the meaning of this ceremony within the framework of imperial ceremonial and the construction of the imperial image[98]. Though the first secure evidence for the performance of the *prokypsis* dates to the thirteenth century and the Empire of Nicaea, prevalent scholarly opinion holds that it was a creation of the Komnenian era[99]. As already pointed out by others, its fundamental purpose — the epiphany of the sun-like ruler — places it in the same category with other imperial rituals imbued with the ideology of sun-rulership that are attested, in one form or another, throughout the history of the Byzantine State and which involved the emperor "rising". Such was the ceremony of the reception of the emperor by the Factions at the Mystic Fountain of the Triconch on the eve of the races in the tenth century mentioned above and his appearance in the *κάθισμα*, the imperial box, at the Hippodrome[100]. Still, there are a number of novel elements that distinguish the *prokypsis* from possible antecedents, not least among them being the actual presence of lights, both in the form of the artificial illumination of the platform and of the large candle held by the *lampadarios*. It would seem that, for reasons which at present are difficult to fathom, those in charge for the staging of the *prokypsis* took a more dramatic, not to say literal, approach to conveying the concept of the ritual "rise" of the ruler, not satisfied with the high platform, the radiance of the imperial dress, and the accompanying acclamations to convey the desired effect. Rather, by having the ceremony performed after dark, on a brilliantly illuminated stage, the image of the emperor as another sun driving back darkness and its forces, i.e. the enemies of the Empire, and bringing life and joy to his subjects by his presence and his good works, the latter alluded to by the *lampas*, could not have been more forcefully and spectacularly projected.

Another interesting development, which distinguishes the Late Byzantine *prokypsis* from tenth-century rituals in the imperial palace and the Hippodrome, was its association with the feasts of Christmas and Epiphany, an association that had an impact on the symbolic ramifications of the ceremony[101]. Based on what can be extrapolated from the relevant written sources, though the traditional rhetoric of the emperor as the all-conquering, invincible sun remained pervasive, another layer was added to the meaning of this ritual articulation of solar kingship. As discussed by Ernst Kantorowicz, the emperor on the *prokypsis* appeared also an imitator of Christ and more specifically as "a reflection of the Sun of

Righteousness, so prominently present in the liturgies of Christmas and Epiphany"[102]. Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos in the fourteenth century explains the nature of this *mimesis*: it is not simply that the emperor, standing high on the *prokypsis* platform, looks down on his subjects from above as if he were some transcendental being; the emperor imitates God, "who mingles with men through the compassion of his goodness"[103]. And, thus, we come back full-circle to the candle accompanying the emperor on his *prokypsis* and helping to define the nature of his rule in the language of symbols.

With the discussion of the *prokypsis* we have reached the end of our survey of the uses of lights in the imperial palace and in "profane" imperial ceremonies during the Middle and the Late Byzantine periods. Despite the fragmentary and often fortuitous nature of the surviving evidence, one is struck by the continuity into the medieval period of a number of practices that hail from Roman times. These practices included the honorific and celebratory uses of lights, uses that formed part of the ritual articulation of the concept of solar kingship, as well as certain uses that may be regarded as residual reminiscences of pagan fertility and mystic cults. The inherent conservatism of imperial ceremonial, in itself expressive of the constancy of certain cardinal concepts in the construction of the imperial idea, may go some way to explain this continuity. Still, it seems to me that it is the adoption of certain practices by the Church, as for example, the use of candles and torches for the ritual welcome of bishops and relics, and the endowment of old practices with new layers of meaning under the impact of Christianity and contemporary political thought that probably ensured their survival into a Christian Byzantine context. As we move away from the tenth century, rituals the pagan origins of which were only thinly veiled, such as those associated with the *Brumalia*, die out, despite imperial efforts to legitimize them. On the other hand, the symbolic use of lights imbued with a marked Christian significance becomes more pronounced. However, even in the case of a single item, such as the light carried before the emperor, this significance did not remain static, but mutated in response both to fluctuations in the relations between Church and State and to historical circumstances that affected the tenor of imperial ritual performances.

The equation in Christian thought of light with divine illumination, wisdom, and salvation and the association of light- and sun-related vocabulary and imagery to Christ appear to have informed a number of practices involving the uses of lamps and candles in imperial ceremonial. The presence of lights cultivated and promoted the image of the emperor not merely as a divinely appointed and divinely inspired ruler, but, above all, as the reflection and the imitator of Christ on Earth. Thus, their importance went beyond lending a solemn or festive character to the proceedings as the occasion arose, to imparting and projecting a sacral aura to the emperor and, through him, to the spaces through which he moved.

Мария Парани
(University of Cyprus)

«Взойди как солнце, Боговдохновенное царство». Световая символика и использование света в византийских императорских церемониях

Даже беглое ознакомление с Книгой Церемоний — компиляцией из архивных материалов (в том числе и более ранних , среди которых две главы относятся к правлению Никифора II Фоки) в эпоху правления Константина VII Багрянородного, — ставит в тупик исследователя, изучающего световые эффекты в торжественном византийском имперском церемониале. Несмотря на то, что существуют многочисленные ссылки, указывающие на использование свечей во время религиозных шествий, а также на обычай, согласно которому византийский император возжигал свечи во дворцовых молельнях и в столичных церквях в знак благодарения Богу, вряд ли имеются свидетельства об использовании огня в церемониях вне церковного и литургического ритуального контекста. Редкое исключение представляет пассаж в главе II.18 (ред. Reiske), где мы узнаем, что в дни празднования Брумалий ,— языческой по происхождению традиции, — члены Сената танцевали с зажженными свечами перед восседающим на троне императором. Второе упоминание о торжественном и праздничном использовании зажженных огней содержится в описании прибытия (adventus) императора Никифора II Фоки в Константинополь в 963 г. в главе I.96 (ред. Reiske). Источник сообщает, что все жители столицы, старики и молодежь, встречали Никифора у Золотых ворот с зажжёнными свечами и воскуряя ладан. Серебряные паникадила также фигурировали среди декораций, которыми был убран торжественный вход в Константинополь в ходе празднеств, совершаемых в честь триумфов Феофила и Василия I в 831 и 878 годах. Об этом упоминают соответствующие документы, добавленные в качестве приложений к первой части книги Церемоний.

Одинаково редки и описания фактического освещения в покоях дворца, особенно во время аудиенций, награждений, торжественных приемов и официальных обедов. Все же имеются отдельные случайные ссылки, упоминающие о паникадиле Хрисотриклиния — восьмигранного тронного зала с апсидой, который находился в эпицентре византийской политической жизни на протяжении десятого века. Иногда говорится о паникадилах и в двух других залах дворца,

примыкающих к Хрисотриклинию, которые также регулярно использовались в течение всего года, а именно — в Триклинии Юстиниана и в Лавсиаке. Помимо этих упоминаний большая часть интересующей нас информации сосредоточена в главе II.15 (ред. Reiske), в которой сообщается о приготовлениях к прибытию тарсийских послов в Константинополь в 946 г. Здесь мы читаем об осветительных устройствах, составляющих декоративное оформление покоев дворца, которые должны были вызвать у иностранных гостей благоговение своей роскошью и блеском. Примечательно и то, что светильники, украшавшие дворец, были заимствованы из дворцовых церквей, в первую очередь, из Nea Ekklesia , а также из других храмов Константинополя, как, например, из Влахернской церкви Богородицы. Вопрос, что же происходило в покоях дворца, когда иностранные гости отсутствовали, остается без ответа: мы оказываемся один на один с редкими нестыкующимися и почти отсутствующими в книге Церемоний ссылками, сообщающими о внелитургическом использовании света и о византийских представлениях о роли императора как лучезарного и животворящего солнца — идеях, несомненно, находящих свое отражение и в книге Церемоний.

Это кажущееся несоответствие становится еще более интригующими при сопоставлении со вторым источником, ключевым для нашего понимания византийского имперского ритуала, а именно — с трактатом Псевдо-Кодина середины 14 века. Начнем с того, что в поздневизантийские времена лампа, или огромная конусообразная свеча, была включена в число символов императорской власти. Лампадарии — придворное духовенство — торжественно несли ее перед императором в специальном подсвечнике, называемом dibaboullon. Как сообщает нам анонимный автор трактата, свеча во время церемонии иллюстрировала отрывок из евангелия от Матфея 5. 16: " Так да светит свет ваш пред людьми, чтобы они видели ваши добрые дела и прославляли Отца вашего Небесного ." В данном случае подчеркивался боговдохновенный характер императорского благочестия , равно как мудрость и попечение императора о божественной вере и о благодарных подданных. Данный светильник также фигурирует в церемонии Прокипсис – еще одном нововведении, появившемся после десятого века и служащем для прославления образа императора, в котором свет, по всей видимости, играл кардинальную роль.

Прокипсис включал в себя квази-театральное появление императора и его семьи на специально сооруженном помосте с одноименным названием. Церемония проходила в канун Рождества и Крещения, а также по другим важным поводам, таким как свадьба императора. Члены императорской семьи поднимались на подобную сцене платформу, закрытую занавесями, в то время как придворный, несший императорский меч и лампадарий с зажженной конусовидной свечой занимали свои места по обе стороны от помоста. После завершения всех приготовлений подавался специ-

альный сигнал и отдергивались занавеси, являя императора подданным, которые тут же начинали его бурно приветствовать фанфарами и славословиями. Фигура правителя была показана вплоть до колен, таким образом усиливая впечатление, что он поднимался ввысь, подобно солнцу, с которым его сравнивали в ряде поэм, специально сочиненных по поводу данной церемонии. В то же время придворный, несущий меч, и лампадарий были скрыты от взоров зрителей, и знаки императорской власти словно парили в воздухе по обе стороны от императора, сообщая зрелищу чудесный, сверхъестественный характер. Ссылки на прокипсис в других источниках, похоже, указывают на то, что церемония проходила вечером и помост освещался искусственными средствами, которые, однако, нигде не описаны. Если это действительно так, то образ императора как второго солнца, дарующего жизнь и радость своим подданным, а также изгоняющего тьму и приспешников темных сил (то есть, врагов Империи), представал во всей своей наглядности и величии.

Несмотря на то, что представления об императоре как о солнце, животворном для подданных и губительном для врагов, были более или менее постоянной составляющей византийской имперской идеологии и риторики, в определенные периоды византийской истории им придавали большее значение, чем в остальные. Несомненно, что суть ритуала кристаллизировалась в контексте развития имперских торжеств и под воздействием обстоятельств, что требует дальнейшего изучения . Что же касается фактического использования огня в имперских церемониях, то, похоже, мы наблюдаем постепенный переход от более традиционного чествования, унаследованного из античных времен, к более символичному и проникнутому религиозными / христианскими смыслами, а также литургическими влияниями. В настоящей публикации мы стремились обстоятельно рассмотреть данные вопросы, оценивая информацию, представленную руководствами по проведению церемоний, и учитывая сведения из других относящихся к делу источников, как письменных, так и, в меньшей степени, художественных. Исследование об использовании света в ходе торжественных византийских имперских церемоний будет, по мере необходимости, представлено в сложном контексте византийской имперской идеологии, унаследовавшей имперские римские и христианские традиции. Конечной целью нашего исследования мы ставим освещение символических аспектов церемониального использования света, их поэтапного развития, а также их роль в создании и популяризации священного образа императора.

* I am grateful to Dr. Alexei Lidov whose kind invitation to participate in the international conference *Light and Fire in the Sacred Space* organised in Moscow in September 2011 offered me inspiration and opportunity to engage this topic. My special thanks go to Dr. Ruth Macrides for her invaluable input on various aspects of the present study.

1 See, for example, the still classic studies of *Galavaris G.* Some Aspects of the Symbolic Use of Lights in the Eastern Church. Candles, Lamps and Ostrich Eggs // Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies 4 (1978), p. 69–78, and *Bouras L.* Byzantine Lighting Devices // **Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik** 32.3 (1981), p. 479-491. For a more recent survey, see *Theis L.* Lampen, Leuchten, Licht // Byzanz — das Licht aus dem Osten: Kult und Alltag im Byzantinischen Reich vom 4. bis zum 15. Jahrhundert. Katalog der Ausstellung im **Erzbischöflichen Diözesanmuseum** Paderborn / Ed. Ch. Stiegemann. Mainz 2001, p. 53–64.

2 See, for instance, *L'Orange H. P.* Studies on the Iconography of Cosmic Kingship in the Ancient World. Oslo, 1953, repr. New York, 1982. *Treitinger O.* **Die oströmische Kaiser- und Reichsidee nach ihrer Gestaltung im höfischen Zeremoniell vom oströmischen Staats- und Reichsgedanken. 2nd edition. Darmstadt,** 1956, p. 67–71. *Kantorowicz E. H.* Oriens Augusti. Lever du Roi // Dumbarton Oaks Papers 17 (1963), p. 117–177. *Hunger H.* Prooimion. Elemente der byzantinischen Kaiseridee in den Arengen der Urkunden / Wiener Byzantinische Studien 1. Vienna, 1964, p. 75–80.

3 The manipulation of natural light during imperial ceremonies for greater effect, whether through the use of curtains and strategically placed reflectors or by the timing of ceremonial performances, deserves a separate treatment beyond the scope of the present article.

4 Constantine Porphyrogennetos, De cerimoniis aulae byzantinae / Ed. J. J. Reiske. 2 vols. Bonn, 1829–1830 (hereafter, De cer. / Ed. Reiske). Constantin Porphyrogēnēte, Le Livre de **Cérémonies** / Ed. A. Vogt. 2 vols. Paris, 1935–1940 (hereafter, De cer. / Ed. Vogt). Chapters I.77–I.82 of the *Book of Ceremonies*, referring to the staging of games at the Hippodrome, have been edited separately by *Dagron G.* L'organisation et le dēroulement des courses **d'après le Livre des cérémonies** // Travaux et mēmoires 13 (2000), p. 10–101. For the edition of the three short treatises on imperial expeditions appended to the *Book of Ceremonies*, see *Haldon J.*, Constantine Porphyrogenitus. Three Treatises on Imperial Military Expeditions. Vienna, 1990 (hereafter, *Haldon*, Three Treatises). For a tabulated summary of the contents and date of the chapters of the *Book of Ceremonies*, see The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium / Ed. A. Kazhdan et al. 3 vols. New York, 1991, 1: p. 595–597 (s.v. De Ceremoniis).

5 Pseudo-Kodinos, Traitē des offices / Ed. J. Verpeaux. Paris, 1966 (hereafter, Pseudo-Kodinos). A new edition of this very important text, accompanied by an English translation and commentary, is expected to appear in 2013: Pseudo-Kodinos: The Constantinopolitan Court Offices and Ceremonies / Eds. and trans. R. Macrides, J. Munitiz, D. Angelov.

6 The most detailed provisions regarding monastic ecclesiastical lighting are found in the *typikon* of the Pantokrator Monastery in Constantinople (1136), see *Gautier P.* Le typikon du Christ Sauver Pantocrator // Revue des **Études Byzantines** 32 (1974), p. 5–145; English translation in Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents / Eds. J. Thomas and A. Constantinides Hero. 5 vols. Washington, D.C., 2000, 2: p. 725–781.

7 *Featherstone J. M.* The Chrysotriklinos Seen through the *De Cerimoniis* // Zwischen Polis, Provinz und Peripherie. **Beiträge zur byzantinischen Geschichte und Kultur** / Ed. L. M. Hoffmann. Wiesbaden, 2005, p. 845–852; *idem*, The Great Palace as Reflected in the *De Cerimoniis* // Visualisierungen von Herrschaft. **Frühmittelalterliche Residenzen** — Gestalt und Zeremoniell / Ed. F. A. Bauer / BYZAS 5. Istanbul, 2006, p. 50–53 and fig. 3; *idem*, Emperor and Court // The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Studies / Ed. E. Jeffreys, with J. Haldon and R. Cormack. Oxford, 2008, p. 509–511.

8 *Dagron G.* Trônes pour un empereur // Byzantium. State and Society. In Memory of Nikos Oikonomides / Eds. A. Avramea, A. Laiou, E. Chrysos. Athens 2003, p. 193-201.
9 *Ibidem*, p. 192-193.
10 *Mango C.* The Art of the Byzantine Empire, 312-1453. Sources and Documents. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1972, repr. Toronto, 1993, p. 184
11 Philotheos, Kletorologion / Ed. N. Oikonomidès, Les listes de préséance byzantines des IXe et Xe siècles. Paris, 1972, p. 131 (hereafter, Philotheos, Kletorologion); De cer. / Ed. Vogt, 1, p. 85; De cer. / Ed. Reiske, p. 624.
12 De cer. / Ed. Reiske, p. 582; English translation by *Featherstone, J. M. Δι' ἔνδειξιν*: Display in Court Ceremonial (*De Cerimoniis* II,15) // The Material and the Ideal. Essays in Medieval Art and Archaeology in Honour of Jean-Michel Spieser / Eds. A. Cutler and A. Papaconstantinou. Leiden and Boston, 2007, p. 95.
13 On the *choros*, see *Bouras*, Byzantine Lighting Devices, p. 480–81, and *Isar N.* Imperial Χορός: A Spatial Icon of Time as Eternity // Spatial Icons. Performativity in Byzantium and Medieval Russia / Ed. A. Lidov. Moscow, 2001, p. 143–166, esp. p. 145–148.
14 Philotheos, Kletorologion, p. 131.
15 De cer. / Ed. Reiske, p. 581; Featherstone, Δι' ἔνδειξιν, p. 94. It is difficult to say whether there was more to this substitution than the desire to impress with the wealth and luxuriousness of the room's adornment. In any case, the lamps appear to have been back in their place a few days later when the emperor received the envoys, this time to converse with them as the head of state. We assume this, because on this occasion the three crowns were displayed in an elaborate, composite display cabinet called the pentapyrgion, the extraordinary decoration of the Chrysotriklinos put together for the banquet having been dismantled, see De cer. / Ed. Reiske, p. 586–587; Featherstone, Δι' ἔνδειξιν, p. 98. On the votive crowns, which had been commissioned by Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos, see Dagron G. Couronnes impériales. Forme, usage et couleur des stemmata dans le cérémonial du Xe siècle // Byzantina Mediterranea: Festschrift fur Johannes Koder zum 65. Geburtstag / Ed. K. Belke et al. Vienna, 2007, p. 162. For the pentapyrgion, see idem, Architecture d'interieur: le pentapyrgion // Mélanges Jean-Pierre Sodini / Travaux et Mémoires 15 (2005), p. 109-117.
16 *Dagron,* L'organisation et le dēroulement des courses, p. 25. Cf. the three-light *polykandelon* suspended in the bema of the katholikon of the imperial Pantokrator Monastery in the twelfth century, *Gautier*, Le typikon du Christ Sauver Pantocrator, p. 37; Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents, 2: p. 740. Three-light *polykandela* certainly had Trinitarian connotations in ecclesiastical contexts, though the relevant evidence is admittedly later, see, for instance, Symeon of Thessalonike, De Sacro Templo // PG 155, col. 349.
17 See, for example, De cer. / Ed. Vogt, 1, p. 30; 2, p. 91; *Dagron,* L'organisation et le deroulement des courses, p. 29, 35, 49, 83.
18 *Dagron*, Trônes pour un empereur, p. 196–197. For the formula, see De Cer. / Ed. Reiske, p. 527: ἐπὶ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος προβάλλεταί σε ἡ ἐκ Θεοῦ βασιλεία μου [...].
19 *Dagron*, Trônes pour un empereur, p. 192–193.
20 Philotheos, Kletorologion, p. 131.
21 De cer. / Ed. Reiske, p. 580; *Featherstone*, Δι' ἔνδειξιν, p. 93.
22 De cer. / Ed. Reiske, p. 618.
23 *Haldon*, Three Treatises, p. 140, 147–148.
24 On the imperial palace in the tenth century, see *Bardill J.* Visualizing the Great Palace of the Byzantine Emperors at Constantinople. Archaeology, Text, and Topography // Visualisierungen von Herrschaft, p. 5–45.
25 Theophanes Continuatus, Chronographia / Ed. I. Bekker. Bonn, 1838, p. 379; George the Monk Continuatus, Chronicon / Ed. I. Bekker. Bonn, 1838,

p. 872–873; John Skylitzes, Synopsis historiarum / Ed. J. Thurn. Berlin, 1973, p. 194–195.

26 *Vogt A.* Constantin Porphyrogénète, Le Livre de Cérémonies. Commentaire: Livre I — Chapitre 1-46 (37). Paris, 1935, p. 51–52. Cf. *Preger T.* Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum, part 2. Leipzig, 1907, p. 144; *Berger, A.* Untersuchungen zu den Patria Konstantinupoleos. Bonn, 1988, p. 214.

27 De cer. / Ed. Vogt, 1: p. 8, 29, 33: εἰς τὸ Τριβουνάλιον, ἤγουν εἰς τοὺς Λύχνους. On the Tribounalion, which dates back to the Early Byzantine period, see *Berger*, Untersuchungen, p. 217, 237, 735–736.

28 Vogt (see above, n. 26) and G. Dagron (Empereur et prêtre. Étude sur le "césaropapisme" byzantine. Paris, 1996, p. 108) take it for granted that this was the case, without citing any supporting evidence. For the presence of Old Testament relics in the imperial palace, see, for example, *Klein H. A.* Sacred Relics and Imperial Ceremonies at the Great Palace of Constantinople // Visualisierungen von Herrschaft, p. 92–93

29 De cer. / Ed. Vogt, 1: p. 8, 9.

30 *Ibidem*.

31 *Ibidem*, p. 9, 21, 29. Cf. *Dagron*, Empereur et prêtre, p. 108. During the Early Byzantine period, the Tribounalion appears to have been the place where the Factions would perform a ritual dance, see *Berger*, Untersuchungen, p. 237, 735–736.

32 De cer. / Ed. Vogt, 1: p. 9.

33 *Kantorowicz, E. H.* The "King's Advent" and the Enigmatic Panels in the Doors of Santa Sabina // The Art Bulletin 26.4. (1944), p. 207–231; *Koukoules Ph. Βυζαντινῶν Βίος καὶ Πολιτισμός*, 6 vols. Athens, 1948–1957, 2.1: p. 52–53; *MacCormack S.* Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity. Berkeley, 1981; *Lehnen, J.* Adventus principis. Untersuchungen zu Sinngehalt und Zeremoniell der Kaiserankunft in den Stдdten des Imperium Romanum. Frankfurt am Main, 1997.

34 De cer. / Ed. Reiske, p. 438.

35 Michael Psellos, Chronographie ou histoire d'un siècle de Byzance (976-1077) / Ed. É. Renauld. 2 vols. Paris, 1926, 1928, 2: p. 108–109.

36 Cf. *Kantorowicz,* The "King's Advent".

37 Cf. *Dendy, D. R.* The Use of Lights in Christian Worship. London, 1959, p. 5–6, 73–91; *Bouras L.* and *Parani M. G.* Lighting in Early Byzantium. Washington D.C., 2008, p. 21.

38 De cer. / Ed. Vogt, 1: p. 162–163. Cf. *Dagron*, Trônes pour un empereur, p. 194–195. Much later, in the fourteenth century, Pseudo-Kodinos, p. 225, describing the imperial procession from the emperor's chamber to the church on Palm Sunday, makes the symbolism of the gospel carried by an archdeacon explicit: εἰς τύπον γὰρ Χριστοῦ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἔρχεται. Interestingly, during this procession, the emperor holds a lit candle — perhaps, a distant echo across time of the honorific use of lights in the *adventus*, see *ibidem*, p. 224–225.

39 On reciprocal influences between the staging of the royal *adventus* and the liturgical celebrations of Palm Sunday in western Europe but also in Russia, see *Kantorowicz,* The "King's Advent".

40 The numerous references in the *Book of Ceremonies* to the use of lit candles during religious processions and to the Byzantine emperor lighting candles in palace oratories and in his capital's churches as a means of offering thanks to God will not concern us here.

41 Philotheos, Kletorologion, p. 183 (3 January), 199 (Holy Thursday and Holy Saturday); De cer. / Ed. Reiske, p. 602 (imperial *Brumalion*).

42 For references, see *Koukoules*, Βυζαντινῶν Βίος, 5: p. 199–202.

43 Achmet, Oneirocriticon / Ed. F. Drexl. Leipzig, 1925, p. 129, 158, 159.

44 De cer. / Ed. Vogt, 1: p. 165–166. The relevant chapter in the *Book of Ceremonies*, I.42 / Ed. Vogt (I.33 / Ed. Reiske), is thought to date to the reign of Michael III (ca. 847–862), with later revisions ca. 900–903 (Leo VI) and

ca. 957-959 (Constantine VII), see Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium, 1: p. 595. As far as the apples and the cinnamon are concerned, it is tempting to see a connection with the Jewish *haroset*, a dish made of raisins, apples, and cinnamon, consumed on the first night of Passover in remembrance of the clay that the Hebrews used to make bricks with during their enslavement in Egypt, though this, of course, is far from certain. On the Jewish practice, see *Bar-David M. L.* haroset // Encyclopaedia Judaica / Ed. M. Berenbaum and F. Skolnik. 2nd edition. Vol. 8. Detroit, 2007, p. 361 [Gale Virtual Reference Library. Web. 30 May 2012].

45 Philotheos, Kletorologion, p. 197: ἐν ᾗ ὁ τῆς θείας μυσταγωγίας παρὰ τῆς ἄνω σοφίας ἐφήπλωται δεῖπνος.

46 Philotheos, Kletorologion, p. 178–183; *Dagron,* L'organisation et le déroulement des courses, p. 88–95. Cf. *Guilland R.* Études sur l' hippodrome de Byzance // Byzantinoslavica 26 (1965), p. 12–13.

47 On the Calends and their survival in Byzantine times, see Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium, 1: p. 367–368; *Bolognesi Recchi Franceschini E.* Winter in the Great Palace: The Persistence of Pagan Festivals in Christian Byzantium // Byzantinische Forschungen 21 (1995), p. 117–132; *Dagron,* L'organisation et le déroulement des courses, p. 130–131, 133.

48 John Lydos, De mensibus / Ed. R. Wünsch. Leipzig, 1898, p. 176–177. On the cult of Dionysos, see, for instance, *Otto W. F.* Dionysus, Myth and Cult. / trans. R. B. Palmer. Dallas, 1981.

49 Philotheos, Kletorologion, p. 183.

50 De cer. / Ed. Vogt, 2, p. 182–185.

51 *Bolognesi Recchi Franceschini*, Winter in the Great Palace, p. 118–127.

52 Cf. *Jordan R. H.* The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, September — February. Belfast, 2000, p. 388–411.

53 In the fourteenth century, there is a mention of the distribution of candles both on Epiphany and on Holy Thursday, but in these later instances the candles were distributed by the patriarch or the clergy to the emperor and the members of his court in conjunction to the liturgical celebrations of the two feasts, see Pseudo-Kodinos, p. 224–225, 230.

54 Cf. *Dagron G.* L'hippodrome de Constantinople. Jeux, people et politique. Paris, 2011, p. 258–259.

55 De cer. / Ed. Reiske, p. 600–607, esp. p. 606 for the quotation. For the *Brumalia*, see *Crawford J. R.* De Bruma et Brumalibus Festis // Byzantinische Zeitschrift 23 (1914/19), p. 365–396; *Koukoules*, Βυζαντινῶν Βίος, 2.1: p. 24–29; *Guilland,* Etudes sur l' hippodrome, p. 23–26; *Mazza R.* Dalla *Bruma* ai *Brumalia*. Modelli di cristianizzazione tra Roma e Constantinopoli // Diritto Romano e identita cristiana / Ed. A. Saggioro. Rome, 2005, p. 161–178.

56 De cer. / Ed. Reiske, p. 602–603.

57 *Ibidem*, p. 600–601.

58 On the Triconch and the Mystic Fountain, which were built by Theophilos (829–842), see Theophanes Continuatus, p. 140–143, translated into English by *Mango*, The Art of the Byzantine Empire, p. 161–162. See also, *Bardill,* Visualizing the Great Palace, p. 15–16.

59 De cer. / Ed. Vogt, 2: p. 90: Ἀνάτειλον ἡ ἔνθεος βασιλεία. Ἀνάτειλον.

60 *Dagron*, Trones pour un empereur, p. 181–185; cf. *idem*, L'hippodrome de Constantinople, p. 76.

61 Philotheos, Kletorologion, p. 223.

62 De cer. / Ed. Vogt, 2: p. 88–89, 93, 94; *Dagron,* L'organisation et le déroulement des courses, p. 72–77. Cf. *Guilland,* Etudes sur l' hippodrome, p. 16–18; *Dagron,* L'organisation et le déroulement des courses, p. 147–148.

63 Cf. *Dagron*, L'hippodrome de Constantinople, p. 53–78.

64 *Magdalino P.* The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180. Cambridge, 1993, p. 243.

65 Theodori Prodromi De Manganis / Ed. S. Bernardinello. Padua, 1972, p. 38

(poem III, verses 78–79): χαρᾶς ἡμέρα κοσμικῆς, ἡμέρα βρουμαλίου. / βασιλικὸν συμπόσιον ἐνταῦθα συγκροτεῖται.

66 On the continual use of the Great Palace under the Komnenoi, see *Magdalino P.* Manuel Komnenos and the Great Palace // Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies 4 (1978), p. 101–114.

67 See, for instance, *Stern H.* Le calendriel de 354. Paris, 1953, p. 134–139; *Treitinger*, Die oströmische Kaiser- und Reichsidee, p. 67–68

68 *Ibidem.*

69 *Gautier P.* Theophylacte d'Achrida. Discours, Traitŭs, Poŭsies. Thessalonica, 1980, p. 209.

70 Theodore Balsamon, Meditata sive responsa // PG 138, col. 1017. According to Euthymios Malakes, in the second half of the twelfth century, the archbishop of Thessalonike also enjoyed the same privilege, see *Mpones K. G. Εὐθυμίου τοῦ Μαλάκη μητροπολίτου Νέων Πατρῶν (Υπάτης) [δευτέρον ἥμισυ ιβ' έκατ.] τὰ σωζόμενα.* Athens, 1937, p. 82.

71 Theodore Balsamon, Meditata sive responsa, col. 1017.

72 *Ibidem.*

73 *Ibidem*, cols. 1017, 1020.

74 *Flusin,* B. Nicolas Mésaritès: Éthopée d'un astrologue qui ne put devenir patriarche // Mélanges Gilbert Dagron / Travaux et Mémoires 14 (2002), p. 241. I owe this reference to Dr. Ruth Macrides, whom I here thank.

75 Theodore Balsamon, Meditata sive responsa, col. 1020.

76 *Magdalino*, The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, esp. p. 237–248, 267–309.

77 Pseudo-Kodinos, p. 190, 191, 198. Cf. the reference to the *dibampoulon* in the anonymous description of the coronation of Manuel II Palaiologos in 1391 or 1392, edited by Verpeaux, Pseudo-Kodinos, Traité des offices, p. 356.

78 See, for instance, Pseudo-Kodinos, p. 190 n. 4; *Dagron*, Empereur et prêtre, p. 268, 400 n. 53; *Angelov D.* Imperial Ideology and Political Thought in Byzantium, 1204–1330. Cambridge, 2007, p. 399.

79 George Pachymeres, Relations historiques. III. Livres VII-IX / Ed. A. Failler. Paris, 1999, p. 207.

80 George Pachymeres, Relations historiques. I. Livres I-III / Ed. A. Failler. French transl. V. Laurent. Paris, 1984, p. 163.

81 *Angelov*, Imperial Ideology, p. 399–400.

82 *Laurent V.* Les "Mémoires" du Grand Ecclésiarque de l'Église de Constantinople Sylvestre Syropoulos sur le concile de Florence (1438-1439). Paris, 1971, p. 188, 238. A *monobamboulon*, which, if my interpretation of the *dibampoulon* is correct, should be identified as a candle-holder with a single wreath, is mentioned in a list of officials of the Great Church dated to the second half of the fourteenth century, as being held by an *ostiarios*; in a later list, probably dated to the fifteenth century, the *monobamboulon* was replaced by the *dibamboulon*, see *Darrouzus J.* Recherches sur les ὀφφίκια de l' Église byzantine. Paris, 1970, p. 269 n. 1, 284 n. 4. As for the other prelates who were entitled to a *lampas*, these apparently continued to use the *monobamboulon*, see *Dmitrievskii A.* Opisanie liturgicheskikh rukopiseĭ, khraniashchikhsia v bibliotekakh pravoslavnago Vostoka. I. Typika. Kiev, 1895, p. 164–165.

83 The form of the modern *dibampoulon* offers additional support for the identification of its Byzantine predecessor as a single candle-holder adorned with two wreaths.

84 Pseudo-Kodinos, p. 190, 191.

85 Cf. *ibidem*, p. 308.

86 *Ibidem*, p. 225–226.

87 *Ibidem*, p. 191.

88 *Ibidem*, p. 198, 203.

89 *Ibidem*, p. 202.

90 For the sword as a symbol of imperial authority and power, see *ibidem.* Interestingly, a rhetorical juxtaposition of the imperial sword, which the emperor should use only as a last resort to punish, and the imperial candle,

appears in the text by Theophylact discussed above, see n. 69. Whether this juxtaposition was inspired by a specific ritual during which the two objects were displayed side by side, as was the case in Palaiologan times, is impossible to say.

91 See *Magdalino P.* Pseudo-Kodinos' Constantinople // *Magdalino P.* Studies on the History and Topography of Byzantine Constantinople. Aldershot, 2007, no. XII, p. 5.

92 *Bryer A.* Greek Historians on the Turks: The Case of the First Byzantine-Ottoman Marriage // The Writing of History in the Middle Ages. Essays presented to Richard William Southern / Ed. R. H. C. Davis and J. M. Wallace-Hadrill. Oxford, 1981, p. 478–479; repr. in *Bryer A.* Peoples and Settlement in Anatolia and the Caucasus, 800-1900. London, 1988, no. IV.

93 John Kantakouzenos, Historiarum libri IV / Ed. L. Schopen, 2 vols. Bonn, 1828, 1831, 2: p. 588.

94 The *prokypsis* is described in detail by pseudo-Kodinos, p. 197–204. For the ceremony, see, among others, *Heisenberg A.* Aus der Geschichte und Literatur der Palaiologenzeit // Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse, Jahrhang 1920, 10, p. 82–132; repr. in *Heisenberg A.* Quellen und Studien zur sputbyzantinischen Geschichte. London, 1973, no. I; *Kantorowicz,* Oriens Augusti, p. 159–162; Bryer, Greek Historians, p. 482–484; *Jeffreys M.* The Comnenian Prokypsis // Parergon 5 (1987), p. 38–53; *Angelov*, Imperial Ideology, p. 41–45.

95 Cf. *Maguire H.* The Disembodied Hand, the *Prokypsis*, and the *Templon* Screen // Ἀναθήματα Ἑορτικά. Studies in Honor of Thomas F. Mathews / Ed. J. D. Alchermes, with H. C. Evans and Th. K. Thomas. Mainz am Rhein, 2009, p. 233–235.

96 See, for instance, *Boissonade J. Fr.* Anecdota graeca e codicibus regiis, V. Hildesheim, 1962, p. 169–170 (Manuel Holobolos, poem 9); Nikephoros Gregoras, Historia Byzantina / Ed. L. Schopen and I. Bekker, 3 vols. Bonn, 1829, 1830, 1855, 2: p. 616–617.

97 *Jeffreys*, The Comnenian Prokypsis, p. 42.

98 See above, n. 94.

99 See, however, *Magdalino P.* And *Nelson R.* The Emperor in Byzantine Art of the Twelfth Century // Byzantinische Forschungen 8 (1982), p. 165–166, and n. 113.

100 In addition to the studies cited in the previous notes, see also Grabar A. Pseudo-Codinos et les cérémonies de la cour byzantine au XIVe siècle // Art et société à Byzance sous les Paléologues. Actes du colloque organisé par l'Association internationale des études byzantines à Venise en septembre 1968. Venice, 1971, p. 201–203, 213–215, and, more recently, Dagron, L'hippodrome de Constantinople, p. 74–78.

101 Cf. *Grabar,* Pseudo-Codinos, p. 200.

102 *Kantorowicz*, Oriens Augusti, p. 160.

103 Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos, Allucutio encomiastica ad Andronicum Palaeologum // PG 145, col. 585. English translation by *Magdalino*, Pseudo-Kodinos' Constantinople, p. 13.