
"AFTER THE FALL OF CONSTANTINOPLE"

The Dumbarton Oaks Symposium, 1968.

During the spring of each year the Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies in Washington, D.C., is the host for a Symposium on some topic related to Byzantium; it is also the opportunity for many friends with similar interests to gather and exchange ideas. The year 1968 was no exception, but it was an unusual year because the topic of the Symposium escapes the traditional chronological limits, and was concerned with the sequel: τὰ μετὰ τὴν Ἀλωσιν; it is for this reason that the proceedings will be especially interesting to the readers of *Balkan Studies*. As usual, friends appeared from both shores of the Atlantic, and from the area between both coasts of the United States; but many familiar faces were absent, probably because the topic was concerned with events after The Fall of Constantinople.

The symposium was under the direction of Professor Kenneth M. Setton (Vilas Research Professor, University of Wisconsin, and Professor Elect, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton) who opened the session on May 2nd, with a general introduction that set the pace for the activities that were to continue until the afternoon of May 4th: proceedings that would take the participants over the entire spectrum of post-Byzantine studies, and would include discussion of major factors that were to influence the future.¹ As was only proper, in a Symposium covering such scope, the first paper dealt with "The Greek Language, 1453-1821." In his paper, Professor Demetrius J. Georgacas (University of North Dakota) was primarily concerned with linguistic continuity in the Greek language, and made this intricate subject easily understood by means of a carefully prepared series of tables dealing with subjects which he elaborated in his paper. To illustrate the linguistic continuity in Greek, Professor Georgacas defined the various periods of the Greek language after the *Koine*, and indicated that the specific aspect of that development which he would consider could be identified as "intermediary modern Greek", both in language and in literature. His discussion led him to a consideration of : loanwords of Italian, Aromunian (Koutsovlach), Albanian, and Turkish origin; modern Greek dialects, both of the Western and Eastern groups, of which more than twelve were identified; changes in grammatical

1. I would like to take this opportunity to thank Professor Setton for his aid in the preparation of this summary, which is based in large part on his concluding remarks at the last session of the Symposium.

structure of common Greek; modern Greek isoglosses; the vocalic system of middle Greek (to c. 1000 A.D.) and modern Greek (from c. 1000 A.D.); and, characteristics of middle and modern Greek phonology, morphology, syntax, and vocabulary (the most interesting aspect for this listener). A subject as involved and complex as linguistic continuity and transmission is not easy to discuss or to understand, but Professor Georgacas succeeded admirably in his task in great part due to the lucidity of his presentation, carefully chosen examples, and humorous and lively manner, which also served to prepare the audience for the papers that followed.

The delineation of influence is always difficult, and in his paper "The Byzantine Legacy and Ottoman Forms after 1453," Professor Speros Vryonis (University of California at Los Angeles) employed great caution in describing the imprint which the Byzantines left on the Turks: he indicated that the question of Byzantine influence on Ottoman institutions remains nebulous and controversial, but that there was an influence. In Byzantine society church and state had been closely associated, and therefore there were limitations on what Seljuk and Ottoman society could borrow from Byzantium. Moreover, the Turks, in the fifteenth century, unlike the Arabs in the seventh and early eighth centuries, were the heirs of a mature Islamic civilization with well developed traditions in theology, law, and literature. But the conversion of Christians to Islam, intermarriage, and daily contact, brought various Christian beliefs and practices into Turkish Islam. Both the Seljuks and the Ottomans incorporated Christian military groups into their own armies, and the Ottoman *timar* appears to have been influenced by the Byzantine *pronoia*. The Byzantine navy as well as the chancery left its mark on what Professor Vryonis calls Ottoman forms; and it is significant that the Ottoman Turks collected many of the same taxes the Byzantines collected, and in some way or other the Byzantines also had an influence on Ottoman agriculture, mining, industry, crafts, cooking, entertainment, commerce, and architecture. Although it is difficult to escape the conclusion that there must have been a fair amount of influence, up to now the problem of the Byzantine impact on Ottoman ideas and institutions has usually been discussed with far more subjective rationalization than objective documentation, and it is for this reason that the paper of Professor Vryonis was well received by the participants.

In his paper "Byzantium and the Eastern Slavs after 1453," Professor Ihor Ševčenko (Dumbarton Oaks) was concerned with intellectual history; with states of mind of bookmen of Eastern Europe, who after the mid-fifteenth century had to accommodate their frame of reference to the fact that Byzantium was no more. However, this need for an accommodation preceded the

fall of Constantinople; the decisive event in the shaping of Muscovite attitude toward Byzantium and the post-Byzantine world was not the fall of the Empire in 1453, but the Council of Florence, where the purported betrayal of the true faith led Muscovite bookmen to ambiguous attitudes towards Byzantium, and later towards the Greeks. However, Muscovite bookmen at the end of the fifteenth century and for a century thereafter could point to no new frame of historical reference and to no new system of cultural values than those which their predecessors had taken over from Byzantium. Muscovite political ideology provided Professor Ševčenko with material to illustrate this development, and indicated that all of this ideology developed after Byzantium's fall, but Byzantium remained the central point of reference for it all. In spite of the Muscovite defiance of the Greeks, their approval was sought by Moscow after Ivan IV's imperial coronation, and after the creation of the independent patriarchate in Moscow. But, by the eighteenth century, in terms of Russian political schemes, Byzantium was no longer as a frame of reference, but purely as an item or propaganda. Professor Ševčenko concluded that the years between the middle of the fifteenth and the end of the seventeenth centuries were the years of Eastern Europe's de-Byzantinization and the story they tell the intellectual historian about Russia may be briefly summarized: after Florence and Constantinople's fall Russian bookmen attempted to build a cultural and ideological framework of their own by re-using the very elements which Byzantium had given them, often indirectly, in the preceding four centuries of their history. This did not give these bookmen enough self-confidence in the face of Russia's formerly glorious but, by then, debased Greek mentors. Hence the instances of defiance of the Greeks by the Muscovites throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In the meantime, neo-Byzantine castles continued to be built from their native imitations, and also from Western components. This was a contradictory situation and it did not last; when a new system based entirely on Western blueprints emerged about 1700, the Russian elite, without ever becoming oblivious to the Byzantine heritage, relegated it to the sidelines.

Linguistic continuity, Byzantine influence on Ottoman forms, and the religio-political inheritance for the Eastern Slavs led to another aspect of the Symposium. The paper presented by Sir Steven Runciman (Late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge) on "The Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Turkish Government," was especially significant, as it dealt with the changing role of this well-established part of the Byzantine order of things, and served to illustrate the two-way nature of influences, and the impact of the Conquest on the new role the patriarchate was to play in former Byzantine lands. Sir

Steven pointed out that with the fall of the Byzantine Empire, the patriarchate was the major Hellenic institution left in the Greek world, and as such helped to preserve Orthodoxy, and together with the Greek language helped to preserve a sense of Greek nationality. In his perceptive synthesis Sir Steven surveyed the depressing and often perilous history of the patriarchate under the Ottoman Sultans. In this context he indicated that much of the difficulty was due to their earlier history when the Patriarch lived in the shadow of the Emperor: the Byzantine Emperors had too often and for too long dictated to, and deposed, Patriarchs of Constantinople for them to achieve an independent authority or prestige. This contributed to the varying fortunes of the patriarchate under the Sultans, and was bound to lead to certain irregularities. As an example, he noted that there were some sixty-one changes on the patriarchal throne during a hundred year period, but because of frequent reinstatements there were only thirty-one individual Patriarchs; and, a few years after the Ottoman occupation of Constantinople, Symeon of Trebizond was able to purchase the patriarchal throne for a *peshkesh* of two thousand pieces of gold, which serves to indicate that the patriarchate was becoming increasingly susceptible to corruption; the days were not far away when the pashas and the Phanariots would come to speak much the same language, and Sir Steven illustrated this state of affairs with numerous examples, which together with the uncertainty and costliness of election to the patriarchal throne, the continuing poverty of the patriarchate, and the capricious exercise of power by the Ottoman government, tended to act as a restraining force on the continuity of the Greek spirit.

The significance and importance of Byzantine art has always been a consistent theme in previous Symposia at Dumbarton Oaks, and the artistic tradition after the fall was not ignored this year. Mr. Manolis Chatzidakis (Director of the Benaki Museum, Athens) supplied a paper on "Le Peintre crétois Théophane Bathas et son école"² in which he presented a well reasoned argument, with superb illustrations, to indicate that the Byzantine artistic tradition continued to have a powerful influence after the fall of Constantinople. Mr. Chatzidakis pointed out that this style transcended national boundaries, and it is to be found today in Serbia and Bulgaria, as well as in Greece and Crete: It was an artistic *koine*, just as Orthodoxy was the spiritual *koine*, and it received a pictorial embodiment in Byzantine art; the Church was the unifying spiritual force in the Orthodox world, and the

2. Mr. Chatzidakis was unable to be present for the Symposium, and his paper was read by Professor Ševčenko.

artist was as useful as the priest was necessary. Mr. Chatzidakis indicated that painters of both murals and icons adhered to aesthetic principles and techniques of the imperial past until the eve of the Greek Revolution; and in this connection pointed out that there seems to have been very little direct Italian influence in Cretan painting of the sixteenth century even though there was constant intercourse between Crete and Venice during this period. However, certain tendencies towards classicism and realism which Mr. Chatzidakis detects in the work of Theophanes Strelitzas (surnamed Bathas) — whom he considers as the chief representative of the Cretan school of the sixteenth century — may derive from Italian sources. The origins of the Cretan school are lost in the shadows of the past, but during the fifteenth century there was sufficient artistic exchange between Crete, Constantinople, and Greece to explain the high level of artistic achievement of Crete as well as the Cretan attachment to the Palaeologian tradition. The importance of Theophanes Bathas is largely that we now know something about him — from the new data concerning his life drawn in recent years from a manuscript in the Laura on Mt. Athos and from a notarial register from Candia — and much of his work has now been identified on Mt. Athos and elsewhere. We are therefore grateful to Mr. Chatzidakis for his detailed presentation concerning the nature and extent of Theophanes' contribution to church decoration after the fall of Constantinople, and for an insight into the development of the school of artists that developed in Crete.

A crucial aspect of *Byzance après Byzance* was the inheritance of the Ottomans by virtue of their conquest. Early in this paper "Mehmed the Conqueror's Policy on Byzantine Properties and the Greek Population of Istanbul," Professor Halil Inalcik (University of Ankara)³ states that "Mehmed II and his successors regarded themselves, through their possession of the throne of the Caesars, as emperors of Rome and legitimate heirs to all the territories which the emperors had formerly ruled." However, Professor Inalcik did not discuss the fortunes of the Empire, or the political inheritance of the Ottomans in connection with the Roman imperial idea or ambition, but limited his discussion to the immediate social and economic consequences of the fall of Constantinople with respect to both the former Greek and the new Turkish residents. In discussing the economic inheritance of Byzantium within the walls of the city, he dealt in detail with the policy of Sultan Mehmed II, of reconstruction and repopulation in Constantinople, whereby Muslims re-

3. Professor Inalcik was unable to be present for the Symposium, and his paper was read by Professor Romilly J. H. Jenkins (Dunbarton Oaks).

ceived outright gifts of homes and land, the possession of which was guaranteed by deeds of freehold (*müllkāme*), and of the Greeks that were brought into the city from Asia Minor, Greece and the islands in order to repopulate the capital of the Caesars. By this policy of repopulation of Constantinople, Mehmed II had to also guarantee an increased food supply for the capital, and for this purpose he instituted a program of settling, Greek, Serbian, and other peasants in the surrounding suburban villages of the city on servile tenures which they were required to maintain in order to provide the agricultural needs for the increased population of the capital. In the process of his discussion, Professor Inalcik illustrated numerous fascinating problems associated with land tenure and ground rents which were faced by Mehmed II in his policy of reconstruction and repopulation of Constantinople.

No Symposium dealing with events after the fall would be complete without a consideration of the Fanariots, and Professor Cyril A. Mango (Koraes Professor of Modern and Byzantine Greek, University of London, and Professor Elect of Byzantine Archaeology, Dumbarton Oaks) filled the need with his witty and provocative paper entitled "The Fanariotes and the Byzantine Tradition." The role of the Fanariots and their influence during the Ottoman period has always appealed to those interested in the bureaucratic and diplomatic history of the Porte. Rather than consider those privileged families, who held some of the most influential positions in the Ottoman administrative bureaucracy, from a traditional point of view, and assess their role as : members of the high clergy of the Orthodox Church, Governors of Moldavia and Wallachia, and dragomans of the Porte; or, to look behind the dilapidated facade of their sumptuous palaces to explore the reasons for their arrogance, which earned them the hatred of the Christian subjects whose affairs they administered for the Sublime Porte, Professor Mango considered the mentality of the Fanariots under Turkish domination by an examination of the literary remains they left, and especially the works written in the Byzantine tradition, which include the epistolary, historical, grammatical and other literary productions of the Fanariot families. It was not surprising to learn that their literary efforts were based on models from the distant past, but it was surprising to learn that few if any of the leading Fanariot families had a Constantinopolitan origin. In his presentation, Professor Mango discussed, among others, the writings of the dragoman Alexander Mavrocordato, whose historical efforts are reminiscent of the chronicles of Skylitzes-Cedrenus and Zonaras, and the writings of Athanasius Ypsilanti, whose history, with emphasis on the patriarchate of Constantinople, is in the tradition of Byzantine historiography which extends from Sozomen in the

fifth century to Nicephorus Callistus in the early fourteenth. In the process, Professor Mango pointed out that Phanariot literature was centered in Constantinople, but encompassed the whole Orthodox world, and that although many Fanariots shared the dream of recreating the Byzantine Empire, they were in an ambivalent position. Some of them were very well off under the existing state of affairs and hesitated to change it. Others secretly prayed for the defeat of the Turks, but feared to be compromised in the event of a Turkish victory. Yet, no people like to be conquered, and the appeals of Rhegas Ferraios, Alexander Ypsilanti, or Adamantios Koraes could not fall on deaf ears.

Professor Mango indicated that a prime characteristic of the Fanariots was their political and religious conservatism, and that this conservatism had a great influence on the patriarchate; but all Fanariots were not conservatives, and some were revolutionaries who were greatly influenced by the French Revolution and Russian propaganda. But the emotional response of the Fanariots to the slogans of the French Revolution proved to be merely the triumph of illusion over the facts of life, because their minds and their emotions were often not geared together.

In our summary of the events, we have not mentioned one area of the world which was intimately involved in eastern affairs. That lacuna was eliminated by Professor Setton who, in addition to his other responsibilities as director of the Symposium, also contributed a paper on "Pope Leo X and the Crusade," which served a dual purpose: it gave a glimpse of western attitudes toward the former areas controlled by the Byzantine Empire, and also served to round out the offerings of the Symposium. In his elaborately detailed investigation of Papal attitudes during the time of Pope Leo X, Professor Setton relied on a wealth of materials from the Vatican Archives to illustrate numerous facets of his topic, and from the unpublished correspondence of Alberto Pio, Count of Capri, whose first drafts of well over a hundred letters are in the University of Pennsylvania Library. These materials provided interesting and often amusing anecdotes and examples which conveyed a lively tone to the proceedings. Professor Setton elaborated on his subject during his general summary at the close of the Symposium to include a brief account of Père Joseph's crusading plans in the seventeenth century, which served the very useful purpose of bridging the hundred year period since the time of Leo X. In his general summary of the Symposium, Professor Setton offered a broad general overview of the proceedings of the three day Symposium and took this opportunity to elaborate on a number of specific points that had been raised by the contributors, and also served as a synthe-

sis of the many topics and ideas that had been presented by the participants.

To say more concerning the formal part of the Symposium would be presumptuous and fatuous. Any summary can only give a very general flavor, at best, of the material presented, and therefore we shall eagerly await the publication of the papers in a future volume of the *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, which is the usual practice for contributions presented at the annual Symposia. However, two of the papers presented this year will not appear in the *Papers* as Sir Steven Runciman's contribution is due to appear shortly as part of his forthcoming book, and Professor Setton's contribution will appear in the near future as part of a larger work.

As always, there was another aspect to the Symposium, apart from the formal presentation of papers. Amidst the splendor and ceremonial that is always associated with this yearly function, there is ample time set aside for the informal gathering of scholars and students to exchange ideas about their work and interests, and for the renewal of friendships. However, there was a recurring lament voiced by many that attended the Symposium this year. A friend of many persons that had come to Dumbarton Oaks was not among them this year; and the topic of this Symposium would have greatly interested him, as it was one in which he was especially well qualified. He was a devoted friend and product of Dumbarton Oaks, and a person familiar to the readers of *Balkan Studies*. We all missed George C. Soulis, but I am not at all convinced that he was unaware of what was going on in his absence.

University of Kansas

BYRON C. P. TSANGADAS

REUNION STATUTAIRE DE L'ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE DES ETUDES BYZANTINES,

9-13 septembre 1968.

A Venise et dans les locaux de l'Institut Hellénique des Études byzantines et post-byzantines a eu lieu du 9 au 13 septembre 1968 la réunion statutaire de l'Association Internationale des Études Byzantines.

L'Association Internationale des Études Byzantines, créée par les VI^e et VII^e Congrès Internationaux d'Études Byzantines de Paris - Bruxelles en juillet-août 1948, et le Comité International, réorganisé au XII^e Congrès d'Ochride en septembre 1961, ont pour but, selon le statut, "de promouvoir par tous les moyens en leur pouvoir les études byzantines et notamment