

THE COUNCIL IN TRULLO (691-692):



A STUDY OF THE CANONS RELATING TO PAGANISM, HERESY, AND THE INVASIONS

Frank R. Trombley

The surviving documents of the Council in Trullo (691-692) are an extremely useful source for the history of seventh century Byzantium. The Acta have unfortunately perished, but the historian does have at his disposal the 102 Canons published by the Council, in addition to the synodal list of metropolitans and bishops who adhered to its enactments.¹ Ecclesiastical legislation has great importance as a source for this period, because annalistic accounts like the chronicle of Theophanes the Confessor give no more than a fragmentary picture of Byzantine social structure. In spite of this, no detailed analysis of the Canons has been done.² The following discussion will concentrate on the Canons relating to paganism, heresy, and the consequences of the Arab and Bulgar invasions.

The use of legal documents to analyze the history of a given society requires caution, especially when concurrent historical sources are lacking. Only limited questions may be asked of such materials. As enactments of positive law, the Quinisextan Canons were a direct response to current abuses. They are evidence of problems deemed destructive to the religio-social order, which stood therefore in need of correction. The fundamental problem with such documents is that they describe the society only qualitatively, and furnish very little statistical (quantitative) information. Thus, it is often impossible to determine the extent of a proscribed practice. Certain activities have harsh penalties attached to them; but unless other evidence is forthcoming, it is at times impossible to determine whether the law in question was enacted to reverse the proliferation of a relatively innocuous activity throughout society, or to abolish an offense which, although practiced only by a small minority, was considered particularly heinous. For example, the Sixty-second Canon sets forth quite strict prohibitions against the worship of "the abominable" Dionysus; but the Canon fails to explain whether this cult was embraced by a large section of the society, or whether the ecclesiastical authorities had conceived a particular hatred for the cult of a pagan deity embraced only by a small group of viticulturists. Supporting evidence is needed, therefore, in order to gain an accurate picture of the society under analysis.

One must also bear in mind that the Quinisextan Canons, as ecclesiastical legislation, apply to orthodox Christians only. Thus, when the Canons command believers to abstain from certain heretical or pagan practices, it may be inferred that various degrees of errancy existed within the Christian population of the empire. Such canons shed no light, however, on the relative strength of the particular heretical or pagan group in question. The Council did not treat such matters, since legislation of that kind did not lie within the purview of the bishops, but rather in the domain of the emperor.

Finally, the qualitative character of the Canons makes it difficult to fix the geographical locus of certain forbidden practices, except where, for example, the African, Armenian, or Roman churches are singled out because of certain abuses. The Canons on paganism cannot be ascribed with certainty to any particular area of the empire. It is therefore impossible to determine which ecclesiastical provinces had the most serious problems with pagan survivals—those in Anatolia or elsewhere. It is also difficult to ascertain from the Canons whether these practices were confined to the mountainous

back-country, or whether they flourished in urban areas as well. Evidence from other sources gives only partial answers to these questions.

The Sixth Oecumenical Council (680-681) had resolved the Monothelite controversy, but failed to deal with the demoralization of Byzantine society in the wake of the Arab and Bulgar invasions. The Council in Trullo (Quinisextum) was a direct response to this condition.³ Although the Canons were formulated ostensibly to complement the work of the Fifth and Sixth Oecumenical Councils,⁴ their real purpose was to fortify the social order of the late seventh century, primarily in the Greek-speaking parts of the empire, like Anatolia. This administrative aim is quite clear from the practices treated by the Canons, which define standards of clerical discipline and social conduct that conform to the traditions of the see of Constantinople. The Canons proscribe many ecclesiastical practices of the Roman, African, and Armenian churches, all of which ministered to non-Greek congregations. The Canons were intended, therefore, to reinforce the Hellenic-Christian core of the Byzantine state.⁵

The proclamation of the bishops addressed to the emperor Justinian II, which stands ahead of the Canons, mentions the existence of "some remainder of pagan or Jewish perversity" (*ti leipsanon hellēnikes, ē iudaikēs skaiotētos*), and calls for its extirpation (*ek rhizēs*).⁶ There are also frequent references in the proclamation to the devil as "dragon," "the Assyrian," and "the man-slaying deceiver"; the pagan gods, and particularly Dionysus, were identified as demons. These texts reflect the preoccupation of the emperor and bishops with persistent remnants of pagan tradition and explain the legislation of the Council in this area. In the following discussion, the term *pagan* is used in a sense synonymous with the Greek *hellēnikos*. Any aspect of social life derived from non-Christian Graeco-Roman culture was referred to with this term. During late classical antiquity and the early medieval period, especially in Byzantium, it bore a broader significance than our word *pagan*. The folk culture, even among baptized Christians, had retained certain Graeco-Roman heathen practices, which the social demoralization of the mid-seventh century may have caused to proliferate. It was natural, therefore, that many of the Canons were enacted against different kinds of pagan cultism. Some of the practices mentioned constituted actual worship, but many others were simply calendar customs, which had a pagan origin, but by the time of the Quinisextum were

mere expressions of a holiday spirit. The prohibitions of the Council applied only to Christians, however. The Quinisextum produced no legislation *vis-à-vis* unbaptized pagans, nor did it deal with the cults of the quasi-pagan Slavs, who had probably syncretized Christianity with their national gods as a result of sporadic evangelization.⁷

The survival of pagan cult practices among Christians alarmed imperial and ecclesiastical authorities, it seems, partly because the empire still had a highly visible, but not very large pagan population. Apostasy was an ever-present danger. Very little information survives in the sources about the continuation of pagan cults in Anatolia and Greece after the mid-sixth century. It will be recalled that in 542 John of Ephesus, with the assistance of Deuterius, the metropolitan of Caria, undertook the catechization of the pagans of western Anatolia (the regions of Asia, Caria, Lydia, and Phrygia).⁸ John himself penetrated the mountainous country near Tralles, and convinced many idol-worshippers to embrace Christianity. He directed these activities from a monastery at D'RYR', and at one time entered the rough mountain area where a celebrated pagan temple, containing fifteen hundred idols, existed.⁹ The conversion of these populous regions was accomplished by the foundation of more than one hundred churches and monasteries. The maintenance of these institutions was necessary to prevent the apostasy of the vast new congregation. The population of the regions evangelized by John practiced the enthusiastic cult of Cybele, which featured orgiastic rituals including self-castration.¹⁰ The strength of paganism in these areas, even after John's missionary work, is attested by the persistence of this cult practice in Caria well into the eighth century, as Cosmas of Jerusalem states:

[Following a description of the cult of Cybele:] Until the present day certain irrational pagans in the mountains of Caria castrate themselves, it is related, ruled by this ancient custom.¹¹

The case of western Anatolia, at least, favors the argument that paganism continued to exist in the mountainous areas of the empire until the time of the Quinisextum.

Pagan groups persisted in Greece as well, although the exact character of their cult is not attested. Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus reports in *De Administrando Imperio* that the city of Maina in the Peloponnese was inhabited by a non-Slavic population. The people referred to themselves as "Hellenes," and gave out that

in ancient times they had been idolators in the fashion of the Greeks of old. They accepted conversion during the reign of Basil I (867-886).¹² This text buttresses the hypothesis that pagans continued to practice the ancient cults in isolated localities throughout the seventh century.

The Sixty-second Canon enumerates several Graeco-Roman cult festivals, and forbids their celebration: the Brumalia, the Bota, the Kalends, and the First of March.¹³ The Brumalia was the traditional festival of Dionysus, and the Bota, that of Pan. Celebrated at the winter solstice, the Brumalia can have been little more than a calendar custom by this time.¹⁴ As the final stage of the wine cycle, when the fermented liquid was poured into jars, this festival had an obvious pagan significance, and its juxtaposition with Christmas must have offended the austere Justinian II. The Brumalia had attained respectability as a holiday by the late seventh century, and persisted despite the injunction of this Canon.¹⁵ For example, it was celebrated at the imperial court during the reign of Constantine V Copronymus (742-775).¹⁶ The survival of such cults, including that of Pan, which was indigenous to the Peloponnese, suggests the continued existence of an ethnically Hellenic population in European Greece.¹⁷ The Canon in question does not, unfortunately, fix the location of such cult practices.

The Sixty-second Canon forbade the invocation of the name of the "abominable" Dionysus when the grapes were crushed in the wine vats. Viticulturists were also cautioned to avoid frivolous laughter while pouring the fermented wine into jars, because that meant cooperation with the god. The ecclesiastical authorities regarded such agrarian earth-gods as demons, and evidently feared the apostasy of the wine producers.

The Sixty-second Canon also forbade certain cult practices. Dances in honor of the pagan gods (*tōn hellēsi pseudōs onomasthentōn theōn*) were proscribed. These seem to have been performed on the First of March, which the canonist Balsamon refers to as a "great pagan festival" (*panēgyris hellēnikē megalē*). The donning of comic, satyric, and tragic masks was also prohibited. Balsamon explicitly links the wearing of satyric masks with the cult of Dionysus. But this was not the only reason for this law: it attacked as well the custom of mumming, because the clergy sometimes wore dramatic masks at festivals, and even brought them into the churches. Finally, men and women were enjoined not to masquerade as members of the opposite sex.¹⁸

The detailed attention given to these matters suggests that the cult of Dionysus lasted among Christians until the time of the Council. Although the urban population of the empire probably kept the Brumalia as a mere holiday, the agriculturists, particularly the wine-producers, inherited this pagan cult as a part of their trade. The population transfers and social demoralization of this period perhaps resulted in a proliferation of these activities.

The Sixty-first Canon describes a different type of paganism, one not unique to Graeco-Roman culture, yet referred to with the term *hellēnika*.¹⁹ In times of cataclysm, such as the invasions of the seventh century, fortune-tellers and seers do a windfall business. The Canon catalogues several types of diviners and charlatans. Diviners (*mantai*) of the usual sort, who read palms and dishes, are recorded, including the so-called *hecatantarchoi*, old men who claimed to be divine, and convinced the simple folk of this by displaying bears and other animals, and then making them do tricks. Soothsayers went about making pronouncements regarding fate (*tychē*), destiny (*heimarmenē*), and genealogy (*genealogia*) (the prediction of the future by analysis of the circumstances of birth, including the position of the heavenly bodies), which this Canon refers to as the "nonsense of error." Several other types of diviners are mentioned. These include cloud-diviners (*nephodiōktai*), who foretold events after gazing at the shapes of clouds at sunset, and "magicians" (*gēteutai*), who invited themselves into the houses of Christian women by singing psalms, muttering the names of the *theotokos* and martyrs, and wearing amulets and charms. It is recorded that the purveyors of amulets (*phylaktērioi*) were doing a good business.²⁰

The Sixtieth Canon reflects another aspect of the pagan subculture.²¹ Certain persons, it is reported, imitated the manners of the possessed. Like the soothsayers and diviners, they probably did this for private gain. Women practiced this, if Balsamon's conjecture is correct, in oracular fashion resembling that of the priestesses of Delphi.²² Since the pagan deities were regarded as demons, persons who feigned possession had, by the injunction of this Canon, to undergo the same discipline of exorcism as those actually possessed. This case furnishes another possible example of the continuation of pagan cult practices.²³

The Sixty-fifth Canon condemned the practice of erecting a pyre in front of one's home or workshop, and of leaping over it during the *nūmeniai*, or celebration of the new moon. According to the

Canon this custom, designed to ensure good luck, was an ancient practice (*kata ti ethos arkhaion*) among pagans and Jews. By the date of the Council it had become a mere calendar custom.²⁴

The Seventy-first Canon set forth regulations for law students (*hoi didaskomenoi tūs politikūs nomūs*),²⁵ who experienced great exposure both to pagan intellectual culture and to certain semi-pagan practices of civil life in Constantinople. It had become the fashion, says the Canon, for them to affect pagan customs (*hellēnika ethē*). For this reason, they were forbidden to attend the theater or to attire themselves in unusual or bizarre clothing. Although we have no descriptions of seventh-century modes of dress, we know that during the reign of Justinian I (527-565), Gothic and Hunnic styles were the rage. This Canon also prohibited the attendance of law students at the horse races, and the practice of drawing lots on the races from the *culistrae* urns. All these activities—the theater, unusual dress, the races—were a part of student life in the capital. They belonged to the same milieu as education in the Greek classics, which this Canon sought to restrict as well. Law students were no longer permitted to investigate “the sciences” (*ta mathēmata*), or to perfect their knowledge of them. They were even forbidden to “speak by means of such pagan education”—to embellish their formal address with classical allusions and rhetorical artifices. The Seventy-first Canon constituted, therefore, a direct attack on the traditional *paedeia*. This piece of legislation brands Justinian II as an obscurantist, who sought to crush classical literary studies and forestall their revival. This Canon attempted to do for the educated classes what the proscription of the Dionysiac cults and diviners did for the common folk.

The Fiftieth Canon forbade gaming with dice.²⁶ This practice apparently had a pagan terminology,²⁷ and may have been the occasion for curses and oaths in the names of pagan gods. The latter (*horkoi hellēnikoi*), the Ninety-fourth Canon prohibited.²⁸ Both of these regulations indicate that reminiscences of pagan deities existed in the social conversation of Christians. However, it seems that the terminology survived only in stereotyped vows and curses and in technical phraseology.

Certain practices recorded in the Quinisextan Canons originated in Graeco-Roman culture, but lacked a precise connection with religion. Many of these customs suffered proscription as well. For example, the Ninety-sixth Canon condemned women who wore seductive hair styles and the persons who arranged them.²⁹ The Hundredth Canon indicates the existence of pornography in seventh century Byzantium, forbidding:

...paintings that bewitch the sense of sight, whether communicated on tablets or in any other way, which are destructive to reason (*nous*), and move it toward the fueling of shameful passions.³⁰

Visiting the baths (*ta balaneia*) had been for many centuries an important institution of civic life. The Seventy-seventh Canon now restricted the clergy, monks, and laymen from bathing with women because it gave scandal.³¹ The Council undoubtedly reprobated these practices because they were deemed to reflect Graeco-Roman forms of immorality.

With a similar intent, the Fifty-first Canon ended the mime shows (*hoi legomenoi mimoi*) and closed the theaters where such entertainment was performed (*ta tūton theatra*). Wild beast hunts (*ta tōn kynēgiōn theōria*) and pantomimic dances (*hai epi skēnēs orkhēsai*) also became unlawful.³² The pagan mime had a long history of regulation under the Christian Roman emperors, beginning with Theodosius I (379-395), but it persisted throughout the history of the empire.³³ This Canon seems to have been a unique attempt to eradicate the practice. The mimes depicted Arabs, Armenians, monks, slaves, and other characters within a context of slapstick humor. The skits often dealt with adultery, featured obscene songs, and depicted pederasty as well as conventional sexual relations on the stage. The female mimists taunted men in the audience with suggestions, and male actors donned the raiment of the opposite sex.³⁴ The skits represented certain events of the New Testament, such as the virgin birth, with obvious impiety. The shows evidently also had themes derived from pagan mythology. The emperor and bishops seem to have desired the eradication of "pagan immorality," and also the flaunting of the gods on the stage. The "effervescent and immoderate laughter" which this entertainment aroused was also viewed as a vice.³⁵ The Fifty-first Canon forbade the pantomimic dances for similar reasons. Male dancers contorted their bodies and undressed during the performances, and the female performers made lewd proposals to the men in the audience. As institutions of Graeco-Roman origin all spectacles were condemned, although the material used in the stage shows appears to have been most often contemporary.

In summary, the evidence demonstrates the existence of pagan calendar customs and other practices, which Christian society freely retained without falling into apostasy. On the other hand, the condemnation of the cult of Dionysus, considered beside other

evidence, suggests that in certain rural regions of the empire the population possessed only a thin veneer of Christian belief over a substratum of paganism. The apostasy of this group was feared because the population of the mountainous regions in certain provinces had not been converted.³⁶

The Quinisextan Canons provide useful information about the persistence of heretical sects in the late seventh century. These sects fall into two distinct groups. On the one hand, there were the adherents of the traditional Christological heresies. By the time of the Council, the incidence of Monophysitism and Nestorianism had declined sharply within the empire, because the regions east of the Taurus Mountains had fallen to the Arabs. In consequence, the urban ecclesiastical hierarchy had become thoroughly orthodox. The reaffirmation of the creed of Chalcedon at the Sixth Oecumenical Council (680-681) symptomatized this social condition. The second group consisted of local heretical sects, many of which had arisen in Anatolia long before the Arian controversy, and whose practices were sharply differentiated from Greek, Latin, and Syro-Coptic Christianity. Timotheus of Constantinople (fl. early seventh century) catalogues these sects in *De Receptione Haereticorum*, a handbook on the procedure for admitting heretics to the church. As a document of pastoral care, it provides information about which sects were currently in existence.³⁷ These groups were viewed as a social problem of considerable magnitude during the seventh century, an era of invasions and the transfer of populations. A perusal of Timotheus' work will reveal that many of these sects, such as the Melchisedetae, imitated Jewish practice in certain ways.³⁸ As mentioned above, the Council felt itself bound to eradicate the last vestiges of what it called "Jewish perversity."³⁹

The Seventy-second Canon forbade the intermarriage of heretics with the Chalcedonian orthodox.⁴⁰ Such marriages, when contracted, were declared invalid. The obvious aim of this regulation was to retard the corruption of the orthodox by restricting social intercourse. Although no locality is stated, this Canon may have been a response to conditions in central Anatolia. Arab raids into Galatia and Phrygia, such as the one that destroyed Amorium in 669, may have displaced many of the indigenous heretics from their homogeneous communities,⁴¹ so that they mingled with orthodox Christians.

The Eighty-first and Eighty-second Canons are distinctly anti-Monophysite in character. The first of these anathematized anyone

who recited the Trisagion prayer with the Theopaschite addition: "He who was crucified for our sake."⁴² This anti-Chalcedonian formula had remained in use long after the Sixth Oecumenical Council (680-681), and proves that crypto-Monophysites existed within the empire, although the size of this group must have been quite small. The Eighty-second Canon stipulated that in religious art, Christ be depicted with human features (*kata ton anthrōpinon kharaktēra*), rather than as a lamb.⁴³ Although this article attacked western religious painting, its primary thrust was anti-Monophysite, since it emphasized the corporeal character of the Incarnation (*pros mnēmēn tēs en sarki politeias*). The heretical survivals described in these Canons seem to have been a minor obstacle to the Chalcedonian integration of Byzantine society.

The Ninety-fifth Canon sets forth the procedure for admitting heretics into the church.⁴⁴ These sects are divided into three groups. The first of these consisted of Eunomians, Marcionists, Montanists, Paulianists, Sabellians, and Valentinians. Converts from these sects were to be received as pagans (*hōs hellēnas dekhometha*), and had to undergo baptism. These heresies were of great antiquity, and some bore the accusation of judaizing Christianity. The second group of heretics, composed of Arians, Macedonians, Novatians, Tessaracaidecatitae, and Apollinarists, had to present *libelli* anathematizing every heresy, and be anointed with chrism. The third group, composed of Nestorians, Eutychians, and Severians, had to produce *libelli* similar to these, and anathematize the leaders of the Monophysite and Nestorian movements. Timotheus of Constantinople also divides the aforementioned heretical sects into this tripartite scheme.⁴⁵

The evidence transmitted by the Ninety-fifth Canon offers some clues concerning the social and cultural development of central Anatolia during this period. The Canon reports that numerous (*polloi*) Eunomians, Montanists, Sabellians, and other heretics were coming out from the region of Galatia and asking for baptism. This statement ties the heretical sects to a fixed locality, primarily the ecclesiastical provinces of Galatia Prote and Galatia Deutera, and proves that the sects accused of Judaeo-pagan practices were numerically strong in this region. Since "pagan and Jewish perversity" formed one of the basic themes of the conciliar decrees, it seems clear that these groups were regarded as a direct threat to the religio-social order. Yet none of the Canons deals with the adoption of their practices by orthodox Christians.

Some evidence exists for the persistence of non-Hellenic cultural forms and linguistic survivals in Galatia at this time.⁴⁶ However, the historical data does not fully support Karl Holl's hypothesis that local heretical sects in Anatolia had their greatest strength in areas where such conditions prevailed.⁴⁷ The Synodal List of the Quinisextum names bishops from Galatia Deutera who seem to have presided over rather backward communities, probably no larger than villages since they lacked the title of *politeia*; among these were Horchoseton and the Springs of Saint Agapius.⁴⁸ The Galatians had a traditionally pastoral society and seem to have resisted urbanization.⁴⁹ This has an interesting connection with the alleged persistence of Anatolian native languages. Timotheus of Constantinople, in describing the derivation of the name of a heretical sect called the Tascodrugoi, states that they are so termed in the Galatian tongue (*Taskodrūgoi legontai tēi glōssēi tōn Galatōn; Galatisti*).⁵⁰ This language may not have been spoken widely, but this notice, coming at the beginning of the seventh century, indicates the continued existence of that tongue. If Holl's thesis were valid, one would expect unhellenized cultural units like the pastoral Celto-Galatian society of central Anatolia to be largely heretical. Yet, this is not the case. The province of Galatia Deutera sent six orthodox bishops to the Quinisextum, besides the metropolitan of Pessinus. These had congregations in the Celto-Galatian village communities. One of the bishops, Segermas of Horchoseton (*Sēgermas elakh. episk. Horkhoseitū*), bore a non-Greek, undoubtedly Celtic name.⁵¹ This evidence, although quite fragmentary, suggests that the orthodox-heretical division of central Anatolian society cut across all cultural and linguistic lines, for partially hellenized Galatians like Segermas were on the orthodox side. More evidence is needed, however, to prove this hypothesis definitively.

The invasions of the seventh century were an important factor in the demoralization of Byzantine society. Since many of the Quinisextan Canons deal with problems that arose from enemy raids, it will be necessary to consider, in conclusion, how these affected the social life of the empire. The war in Anatolia had been characterized by desultory fighting with the Arabs, which lapped around the main centers of Byzantine resistance. Although, with the exception of Amorium in Phrygia, the fortified cities held out, the countryside suffered considerable destruction. Furthermore, large bands of captives were enslaved and led off by the Arabs. Widespread depopulation and a breakdown of the social structure must have

resulted from this.⁵² Sections of the population seem to have migrated from the threatened provinces to more secure localities.⁵³ This resulted in a great mixture of populations, and a breakdown of the mores typical of a settled, agricultural society. These stresses were complicated by the enforced resettlement of Slavic tribes within the themes of Asia.⁵⁴ Distinctly pagan and non-Hellenic, these groups further loosened the social cohesion of an empire already badly shaken by the invasions. By the time of the Council in Trullo, therefore, the secular and ecclesiastical hierarchies had some particularly difficult problems to solve *vis-à-vis* the social order. Let us consider, then, the Canons relating to the consequences of invasion, and what they reveal about problems of demoralization and the intermixture of populations.

The Eighth Canon sought to restore the practice, which had fallen into disuse, of calling a yearly synod with each ecclesiastical province (*eparkhia*).⁵⁵ This procedure had been generally discontinued because of barbarian inroads (*dia te tas tōn barbarōn epidromas*). Arab raids in Anatolia, for example, must have restricted travel severely, and as a result the bishops could neither meet with each other nor, it seems, exercise proper supervision over their secular congregations.

The Eighteenth Canon ordered all clergy who had become migrants (*metanastai*) to return to their churches.⁵⁶ The pretext of invasion, which this Canon mentions, would not have been abused except that it was often a valid reason for abandoning one's assigned locality. The civil population must have similarly yielded to fear. This Canon supports the hypothesis that the Arab attacks displaced segments of the rural population. It is impossible, however, to judge the quantitative extent of this phenomenon.

The Thirty-eighth and Thirty-ninth Canons supply useful information about officially sanctioned population transfers. The first of these provided that, if a city were founded or refounded under imperial authority, the arrangement of its ecclesiastical affairs should follow the secular pattern.⁵⁷ The foundation of a city requires a body of citizens. These were obtained (this evidence suggests) by enforced migration. The Thirty-ninth Canon supplies an example of one such transfer.⁵⁸ It reads in part:

Our brother and fellow minister John, the bishop (*proedros*) of the island of Cyprus, has migrated from the aforesaid island with his congregation (*laos*) to the Hellespontine province (*tēn Hellespontion eparkhian*) because of barbarian attacks, and as a result of being liberated from slavery to the heathen (*tēs ethnikēs...douleias*).

The Treaty of 685, contracted between Justinian II and Abimelech, stipulated that the revenues of Cyprus be shared by Byzantium and the Caliphate.⁵⁹ But the Greek population was nevertheless subject to frequent Arab plundering raids, as this Canon demonstrates. Justinian attempted to transfer a large number of Cypriots in 691, contravening the treaty by this act. But a storm appears to have struck the flotilla—the chronicle of Theophanes is unclear about this—and most of the migrants either suffered shipwreck or returned to Cyprus.⁶⁰ The imperial fleet carried away the remnant and used it to populate the newly-founded New Justinianopolis, which bore the name of the current emperor, in the Hellespontine ecclesiastical province. This incident demonstrates that population transfers were made over great distances, and that widely disparate social groups were intermixed.

The Canons here cited prove that the barbarian attacks of the seventh century caused both planned and involuntary population shifts. A certain amount of social disintegration was the natural result. This, coupled with the curtailment of the bishops' supervisory work by enemy raids, and with the consequent corruption of the clergy (treated in many other Canons), resulted in a decline of public moral standards. The bishops' letter of address to Justinian II agrees with this interpretation. The empire had been torn apart by many disorders, they remark, and this had resulted in a lapse of discipline.⁶¹ Under such conditions, the adherence of the population to certain pagan cult practices brings no surprise.⁶²

Notes

1. For editions of the Canons containing the glosses of Balsamon and Zonaras, see: G. A. Rhalles and M. Potles, eds., *Syntagma tōn theiōn kai hierōn kanonōn*, 2 (Athens, 1852): 295-554, hereafter cited as Rhalles and Potles; and Jacques P. Migne, ed., *Patrologia Graeco-Latina* 137 (Paris, 1865), cols. 501-874; this series is cited hereafter as *MPG*. For the Canons and Synodal List, see: Joannes D. Mansi, ed., *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, 11 (Florence, 1765; reprinted Paris, 1901), cols. 921A-1006B; this series is hereafter cited as Mansi. See also: Perikles Joannou, ed. and trans., *Discipline générale antique (IIe-IXe s.) (Pontificia commissione per la redazione del codice di diritto canonico orientale, Fonti*, 9 [Rome, 1962]), which includes a translation.
2. Summaries of the Council and its Canons may be found in: Charles J. Hefèle, *Histoire des conciles d'après les documents originaux*, trans. from 2nd German edition, H. LeClercq, ed. and trans., Vol. 3, pt. 1 (Paris: Letouzey, 1909), pp. 560-81; Franz Görres, "Justinian II und das römische Papsttum," *Byzantinische*

- Zeitschrift* 17 (1908): 432-54; and John B. Bury, *A History of the Later Roman Empire from Arcadius to Irene (395 A.D. to 800 A.D.)* 2 (London: Macmillan 1889), pp. 393-96, hereafter cited as Bury, *LRE*.
3. This is the view of E. W. Brooks, "The successors of Heraclius to 717," *Cambridge Medieval History* 2 (New York: Macmillan, 1913), pp. 407f. Bury does not draw this connection, *LRE* 2, pp. 393-96.
 4. Rhalles and Potles, 2: 298.
 5. Vitalien Laurent, "L'oeuvre canonique du Concile in Trullo (691-692), source primaire du droit de l'église orientale." *Revue des études byzantines* 23 (1965): 10f., hereafter cited as Laurent.
 6. Rhalles and Potles, 2: 299. For the social position of the Jews in this period, see: A. Sharf, "Byzantine Jewry in the Seventh Century," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 48 (1955): 103-115.
 7. See note 5. Justinian II resettled numerous Slavic families in the Opsikion theme in 689. Theophanes the Confessor, *Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor, 1 (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1883), p. 364, lines 14-15, hereafter cited as Theophanes. These had probably been Christianized beforehand, but retained their language and customs.
 8. John of Ephesus, *Historiae Ecclesiasticae Pars Tertia*, ed. E. W. Brooks (*Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, Scriptores Syri*, 54 [Louvain: L. Durbecq, 1952]), p. 111, lines 3-4. Deuterius is referred to in the Syriac text as "bishop of the orthodox in the region (= province) of Caria."
 9. *Ibid.*, pp. 169ff. John received the nicknames "Over the Pagans" ('*al hanepē*') and "the Idol Breaker" for these activities. *Ibid.*, p. 58, line 5.
 10. Franz Cumont, *Die orientalischen Religionen im römischen Heidentum*, 5th ed., ed. August Burckhardt-Brandenberg (Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1969), pp. 46f.
 11. Cosmas of Jerusalem, *Scholia in Gregorii Nazianzenii Carmina*, MPG 38 (Paris, 1862), col. 502. The text states: *Akhri de tū parontos tines peri ta orē iēs Karias Hellēnes alogistoi katatēmnūsin heautūs, hōs logos, iōi palaiōi tūtōi kratūmenoi ethei.*
 12. Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio*, ed. G. Moravcsik, trans. R. Jenkins (Budapest, 1949), p. 237.
 13. Rhalles and Potles, 2: 448. The canonist Balsamon, writing in the late twelfth century, appends a lengthy explanation of the cult practices proscribed by this Canon. Some sections are worth quoting: "The present Canon indicates and seeks the correction of actions performed among the clergy at Christmas and at the Festival of Lights (i.e. Epiphany), which are not in the spirit of those festivals.... The Kalends are the first ten days of the month, the Nones are the second [ten days], and the Ides the third [ten days]. They are called thus from three Roman nobles who fed the Roman people at a time of famine. It became the custom of the Romans to celebrate in a pagan manner (*hellēnistikōteron*) once a year in their memory, and to practice certain irreverent [rites], whence even until the present day it occurs in the first days of January.... [The participants] think that they will pass the whole year in tranquility if they celebrate this festival at its beginning.... The Bota and the Brumalia were pagan (*hellēnikai*) festivals, the former celebrated in honor of the false god Pan, the overseer (*ephoros*) of the affairs of beasts, cattle, and other animals, the latter in honor of Dionysus the Preserver (*sōtēr*) of wine.... For Brumos was an epithet of Dionysus. In the month of March a great pagan festival was celebrated because of the mildness of the season and air, wherefore improper dances took place among some men and women." *Ibid.*, 449f.

14. John Lydus reports the Brumalia as a calendar custom in the sixth century. *Liber de Mensibus*, ed. R. Wuensch (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1898), p. 174.
15. For a full but unanalytical description of Byzantine social customs, including pagan survivals, see the relevant sections of Phedon Koukoules, *Byzantinôn bios kai politismos*, 6 vols. in 9 (Athens, 1948-55).
16. Stephen of Constantinople, *Vita Sancti Stephani Iunioris*, MPG 100, cols. 1169B-C. Citharae were used for music.
17. Demetrios J. Constantelos, "Canon 62 of the Synod in Trullo and the Slavic Question," *Byzantina* 2 (1970):24f.
18. For dances in honor of pagan gods, see note 13. The canonist Balsamon indicates that masks were used during the performance of drama, and describes them thus: "It must be ascertained what comic, tragic, and satyric masks are. Comic masks are laughing and sneering, as are the plays of Aristophanes; tragic masks are emotional and plaintive, as are the *Iambeia* of Euripides; and the satyric are used to celebrate the rites of Dionysus, with a hymn by satyrs and Bacchae." Balsamon seems to have witnessed a festival at which mumming took place. He implies that it had a pagan origin: "They wear every kind of stage mask, and impiously mock the monks and clergy. But even some clergy, at certain festivals (*kata tinas heortas*), transform themselves with various masks. With sword in hand and wearing military garb, they enter the middle aisle of the church, and then [others] come forth, [dressed] as monks or as quadruped animals. Having asked how it was that these practices were permitted, I heard no other answer except that these things were celebrated out of ancient custom." Rhalles and Potles, 2: 450f.
19. Rhalles and Potles, 2: 442ff.
20. A heretical sect called the Athinganoi practiced certain forms of divination, as an eleventh-century abjuration oath attests. Joshua Starr, "An Eastern Christian Sect, the Athinganoi," *Harvard Theological Review* 29 (1936): 98f., hereafter cited as "The Athinganoi."
21. Rhalles and Potles, 2: 440f.
22. *Ibid.*, 441. Balsamon, writing in the late twelfth century, describes these as persons "who feign being possessed as a means of profit, and proclaim certain things with the evil (*phaulû*), satanic gaze of the prophetesses of the pagans (*tôn Hellôn*)...."
23. John of Ephesus describes a case of possession during the construction of the monastery at D'RYR'. See note 9. Possession or the imitation thereof seems to have been common in western Anatolia.
24. Rhalles and Potles, 2: 456f. Balsamon supplies a lengthy digression here on divination, including augury by the flight or cry of birds. He also describes the "ventriloquists" (*engastrimythoi*) and "knowers," whom he regards as having prophesied while satanically enthused. *Ibid.*, 457ff.
25. *Ibid.*, 469f.
26. *Ibid.*, 424.
27. When two aces came up, the throw was referred to as a "dog." When each die came up with a different number, it was called a "Venus." Suetonius, *Divus Augustus*, 71, 2. See the note of J. C. Rolfe in the Loeb edition: *Suetonius*, trans. J. G. Rolfe (London: W. Heinemann, 1920), p. 234, note b. This information may not be applicable to seventh-century Byzantium, but it helps to establish the character of dice play.

28. Rhalles and Potles, 2 :528.
29. *Ibid.*, 553.
30. *Ibid.*, 545.
31. *Ibid.*, 483f.
32. *Ibid.*, 424f.
33. Franz Tinnefeld, "Zum profanen Mimos in Byzanz nach dem Verdikt des Trullanums (691)," *Byzantina* 6 (1974): 325ff.; 329ff.
34. *Ibid.*, 327f.
35. Zonaras, Rhalles and Potles, 2: 425f.
36. Missionary work usually began in the cities, where Greek was the *lingua franca* of conversion. The back country of Anatolia was not fully hellenized even in the late seventh century. Linguistic barriers thereby slowed the progress of Christianization.
37. Timotheus of Constantinople, *De Receptione Haereticorum*, MPG 86, cols. 11-68.
38. *Ibid.*, col. 33B-C. These alleged imitations of Jewish practice included observance of the seventh day as the Sabbath, celebration of the new moon, and postponement of baptism (which the orthodox interpreted as a rejection of the sacrament): Starr, "The Athinganoi," pp. 101f.
39. For a discussion of the Anatolian heresies during the Byzantine period, see Jean Gouillard, "L'hérésie dans l'empire byzantin des origines au XIIe siècle," *Travaux et mémoires* 1 (1965):299-324. Gouillard's discussion of the heresies of the seventh century is confined mostly to questions of nomenclature. He rejects the idea that a large number of distinct sects existed, although he accepts the descriptions given in the *De Receptione Haereticorum* of Timotheus. This article suffers from a number of weaknesses. For criticism, see: Speros Vryonis, Jr., "Review Article of *Travaux et mémoires*, ed. by Paul Lemerle, vol. I (Paris, 1965)," *Byzantina* 1 (1969): 226-29. For the relationship between Holl's thesis and the Ninety-fifth Canon of the Quinisextum, see below.
40. Rhalles and Potles, 2: 471f.
41. See note 52 below.
42. Rhalles and Potles, 2: 490. Monophysite Christology argued that Christ had one divine nature (*physis*). Among the extreme Monophysites, the dogmatic corollary to this was that his divine nature was passible in the sense of human nature and suffered crucifixion. Hence the expression "theopaschite." On the other hand, Chalcedonian dyophysite theology argued that he was perfectly human and perfectly divine. It was soteriologically necessary that his human nature suffer crucifixion for mankind to triumph over death.
43. *Ibid.*, 492f.
44. *Ibid.*, 529ff.
45. Timotheus of Constantinople, MPG 86, col. 13A. The article by A. Sharf, "The Jews, the Montanists, and the Emperor Leo III," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 59 (1966): 37-46, disputes a passage in Theophanes which indicates the survival of the Montanists into the eighth century. Sharf argues that rebaptism of heretics was not sanctioned by canon law (pp.38-39). The work of Timotheus and the present Canon invalidate this viewpoint.
46. For a useful discussion of this question, see: Peter Charanis, "Ethnic Changes in the Byzantine Empire in the Seventh Century," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 13 (1959): 23ff. Charanis argues that the indigenous languages of Anatolia persisted

long after the chronological limits of our evidence. His argument is handicapped, however, by an uncritical acceptance of Holl's thesis. See next note.

47. The hypothesis that the local heretical sects of Anatolia were strongest where the population retained its pre-Hellenistic cultural and linguistic identity was first proposed by Karl Holl, "Das Fortleben der Volkssprachen in Kleinasien in nachchristlicher Zeit," *Hermes* 43 (1908): 240-54. The issue is more complex than Holl realized. For criticism, see: Seros Vryonis, Jr., *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Centuries* (Berkeley:University of California Press, 1971), pp. 45-47, 59-60.
48. Mansi, 11, col. 1000D-E.
49. Clemens Bosch, "Die Kelten in Ankara," *Jahrbuch für kleinasiatische Forschung* 2 (1951): 283. Bosch goes on to prove that Celtic names almost completely disappeared among the Roman citizens of Ankara between 34 and 166 A.D. The assumption of Roman names conferred obvious advantages, especially in a large, important city like Ankara. This proves nothing, however, about the rural Celtic population, where such matters of form had very little importance.
50. Timotheus of Constantinople, *MPG* 86, cols. 13B-16A. The word *Galatisti* is unattested elsewhere in ancient and patristic literature.
51. Mansi, 11, col. 1000D. It is possible that the Celto-Galatian "Segermas" is the same name as the "Sagramnos" which appears in a Welsh inscription. It may be kindred also to the Celtic "Segomarus," with a metathesis of the -m- and -r-. This connection can be made by allowing for local variation, shifts in vocalization, or the contraction of consonantal units since the Celtic settlement of central Anatolia in the third century B.C. Celtic names continue to appear in the seventh century, even in Spain, which was the most latinized of the Roman provinces. For example, there was a "Sagarellus" present at the Eighth Council of Toledo (653 A.D.) (*Sagarellus diaconus Saturnini episcopi ecclesiae Osonobensis*). Mansi, 10, col. 1223B. For analysis of western Celtic forms, see: Alfred Holder, *Alt-celtischer Sprachschatz*, 2 (Leipzig, 1904), cols. 1285, 1295f., 1447.
52. For a summary of these events, see: Andreas N. Stratos, *To Byzantion ston z' aiōna* 4 (Athens, 1972), pp. 227-57; 5 (Athens, 1974), pp. 20-58. Theophanes' account, although barren of details, demonstrates that the Arabs found the Anatolian countryside a useful source of captives for the slave markets of the East. The raid against Isauria in 651, it is said, produced 5,000 captives (Theophanes, p. 344, lines 19-21). During the years 663-667, four separate raids against certain undefined areas produced numerous captives and left much of the countryside desolate. No large cities fell, but the Arab armies twice wintered within Anatolia (*Ibid.*, p. 348, lines 10-11, 16-18, 23, 26-27). After the accession of Constantine IV (668-685), this state of affairs continued. During the revolt of Saborius (669), Arab units reached Chalcedon and took numerous captives; they also captured Amorium in Phrygia, which must have yielded many more prisoners (*Ibid.*, p. 351, lines 2-4). In 672 Busur led another captive hunt (*Ibid.*, p. 353, lines 9-10). The advance of the Arab fleet against Constantinople, which began in 673, touched the coasts of Cilicia and Lycia, and part of the squadron wintered at Smyrna (*Ibid.*, p. 353, lines 14-16). In 674, after the first year of the siege of Constantinople, the main body wintered at Cyzicus. The coastal regions thus experienced the Arab onslaught. The winter months were undoubtedly spent in

- foraging, and must have yielded captives and plundered wealth as a result of inland forays. The period from 651 until 678, when a peace treaty temporarily ended hostilities (*Ibid.*, p. 355, line 10-p. 356, line 2), was an era of systematic pillage in central, western, and southern Anatolia. Although the evidence is not conclusive, the argument of widespread depopulation and disorganization of the social order seems cogent. This does not apply, of course, to the cities, which with the exception of Amorium seem to have resisted the enemy. The Arabic and Syriac sources are in complete agreement with this picture. For analysis and translations, see: E. W. Brooks, "The Arabs in Asia Minor (641-750), from Arabic Sources," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 18 (1893): 182-208, and T. Nöldeke, "Zur Geschichte der Araber im 1. Jahrh. d. H. aus syrischen Quellen," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 29 (1875): 76-98 (see especially pp. 96ff.).
53. The Eighteenth Canon of the Quinisextum indicates that the clergy (and presumably the civil population as well) often fled their homes in times of invasion and hesitated to return, especially if residence was in a frontier zone. This Canon excommunicated clergy who failed to go home. There were undoubtedly analogous regulations in force to compel the secular population as well. Rhalles and Potles, 2: 344.
 54. Historians view Constans II's campaign against the Slavs in 658 as an attempt to collect settlers in order to repopulate the themes of Asia (Theophanes, p. 347, lines 6-7). Theophanes is not explicit, but this argument can be easily inferred. See: George Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, 2nd ed., trans. Joan Hussey (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1969), p. 117. Justinian II resettled numerous Slavic families in the Opsikion theme in 689 (Theophanes, p. 364, lines 6-7). The Arabs undoubtedly ravaged this area during the siege of Constantinople; Bithynia evidently still lacked a sufficient agricultural population.
 55. Rhalles and Potles, 2: 324f.
 56. *Ibid.*, 344.
 57. *Ibid.*, 392.
 58. *Ibid.*, 395f.
 59. Theophanes, p. 363, lines 10-11.
 60. *Ibid.*, p. 365, lines 8-13.
 61. Rhalles and Potles, 2: 298. The prologue, as an ecclesiastical document, uses imprecise language. The essence of the meaning is reproduced here. The bishops cite "ignorance" and "forgetfulness" as the reasons for moral decline. These were obviously the result of clerical laxity *vis-à-vis* secular society.
 62. This conclusion agrees with the argument proposed by Laurent.

Frank R. Trombley received his B.A. in history from the University of San Diego in 1969 and his M.A. in medieval history from the University of California at Los Angeles in 1976, where he is now working toward a Ph.D. in Byzantine history. His dissertation will be written under the direction of Professors Milton V. Anastos and Speros Vryonis, Jr., and will concern imperial ecclesiastical policy in seventh-century Byzantium.