

Dimitris Krallis

Serving Byzantium's Emperors

The Courtly Life and Career
of Michael Attaleiates

palgrave
macmillan

Dimitris Krallis
Stavros Niarchos Foundation Centre
for Hellenic Studies
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, BC, Canada

New Approaches to Byzantine History and Culture

ISBN 978-3-030-04524-1

ISBN 978-3-030-04525-8 (eBook)

<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-04525-8>

Library of Congress Control Number: 2018962359

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer
Nature Switzerland AG, part of Springer Nature 2019

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use. The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Cover illustration: © Heritage Image Partnership Ltd/Alamy Stock Photo

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG

The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland



Byzantine “Republicanism”: Attaleiates’ Politics of Accommodation and Self-Interest

Back from the battlefields after Romanos’ disastrous campaign in Armenia, Attaleiates was hard at work trying to settle into a less than friendly court. Having orbited imperial power in the years of Romanos’ reign, he was likely suspect in the eyes of the new regime. It may in fact be that this consideration made him rush to Constantinople after the dust had settled on the battlefield of Mantzikert. Army regiments and courtiers, men like Attaleiates’ friend Maleses, flocked to Romanos’ standard after the latter was released from his eight-day captivity in the hands of the Sultan. Attaleiates who was in Trebizond when he received the joyous news of Romanos’ survival joined instead those members of the imperial *taxis* who sought the fastest possible means to reach the capital.

His choice was practical if not altogether principled. A few years later, a contemporary from the ranks of the army wrote a book of advice for his children, in which he argued that: “the emperor in control of Constantinople always wins.”¹ Much like this pragmatic commander, Attaleiates may have reckoned that the Constantinopolitan regime would prevail and that, despite his popularity, Romanos was a spent force, as the capital, its people, and the edifice of the state were all arrayed against him. Reflecting on all this in writings circulated among peers and friends during the ensuing decade, he presented the beaten emperor as Rome’s betrayed hero. In the autumn of 1071, however, he judged it prudent to rush back to Constantinople, offer his loyalty to the now dominant Doukas faction, and embrace his son Theodore whom he had not seen

for nearly six months. The boy along with Attaleiates' dependents and household was likely worried sick, given the swirling rumors of the emperor's defeat.

Once in the capital, the judge worked frantically to restore his position at court and by 1075, when he received from Michael VII Doukas a grant of extensive tax privileges for his newly founded monastery of Christ Panoiktirmon, he was evidently once again a regular member of the courtly scene. In order to come closer to the bookish young emperor and establish himself in the Doukas circles, Attaleiates took a page from Psellos' guidebook of sycophantic self-promotion. Michael Doukas was a naïve fellow, yet to Psellos' credit, the emperor, whom writers of the period treat as a plaything in his tutor's hands, valued education, and erudition. Psellos himself wrote a long legal poem in which he developed the central tenets of Roman law for Michael, while Symeon Seth dedicated to him a work on nutrition and on the dietary properties of a series of comestibles.² Thus, when Attaleiates sought to establish his own credentials as a loyal servant of the emperor and an intellectual to boot, he chose this well-tried method and offered Michael a book, an abridgment—more scholarly than Psellos' poem—of the essential points of Roman law.

This text, known to us as the *Ponema Nomikon*, opens with a historical overview of the Roman legal tradition going all the way back to the first Roman kings and the republic. It then structures its material in a manner that casts imperial rule as an enterprise bound by laws. This commitment to the rule of law is evident in Attaleiates' other legislative activity and also more broadly colors his view of politics. It is of course with trepidation that one ventures on ground as shaky and shifty as a medieval individual's political opinions. For much contemporary scholarship, a Byzantine's political universe was monolithic and simple enough to reconstruct. As the story goes, Byzantium was a monarchical state ruled by the representative of God on earth. It derived legitimacy from its long Roman past and from the connection of this Roman history with God's plan for humanity. The emperor stood at the center of this ideological construct, not quite divine in this new Christian era, but bathed in God's approbation. Every component of the state was linked directly to his almost superhuman will and submitted to his divinely conceived ordinances. From the emperor came justice and from him the wealth and goodwill that allowed the upper classes to establish their authority. The emperor was finally the guarantor of his subjects' safety and prosperity.

Byzantine authors are thought to have written history within the parameters set by this ideology in turn reinforcing it with their every reference to imperial omnipotence and divine will.

By privileging one type of document, the imperial panegyric and the Christian theology of power tied to it, over the more complex and demanding historical and legal texts, we have somewhat uncritically adopted the imperial view of politics. Would we privilege, however, White House press releases and Downing Street briefs in a study of American or British politics and political ideology? Or would we perhaps cast a wider net? What about society at large, what did people think of politics? During Michael VII's reign, both Psellos and Attaleiates started working on ideas about the body politic which, while remaining firmly within Roman traditions, radically departed from the schema described above. The two intellectuals mined a rich vein of Roman political thought and produced interpretations of contemporary politics that took heed of the altered face of Romanía's eleventh-century society. Psellos was the first to put pen on paper. Along with his legal poem, which itself harked back to the days of the Roman Republic, he offered Michael VII a second text, a peculiar little Chronicle recording Rome's history from the days of its first kings to the mid-tenth century.

We have more or less ignored this peculiar and relatively little-studied text, overwhelmed by the narrative brilliance and sheer fun of Psellos' masterpiece, the *Chronographia*. Yet Psellos was onto something very interesting as he wrote this less known text, which was addressed to an emperor and was intended to shape his worldview. In it, after narrating the gradual slide of the Roman monarchy to tyranny, Psellos speaks of Brutus' admirable expulsion of Rome's last king and of the institution of the republic. No doubt to the surprise of many a palace insider, the *Historia Syntomos* informed Michael that Rome had been best ruled in the days of the Republic, when two annually elected consuls managed the affairs of the Roman state.³ Is it likely that Psellos saw in the republic, or in a regime that borrowed from its panoply of practices and traditions, a means to institutionalize the position of educated men like Attaleiates and himself in the Byzantine political apparatus? What we find in the rest of his body of work suggests that the answer may have to be a cautious yes. Psellos left hints of his republican agenda even in the *Chronographia* where despite his negative use of the term democracy he cites republican Roman and democratic Greek leaders as models of virtue.

Attaleiates, already the author of a text on Roman law, was working on very similar ideas about a decade after Psellos published the *Historia Syntomos*. The world they both lived in was changing and people of their class were trying to find ways to make sense of these changes. Attaleiates had personal experience of such commotion in 1077 when he found himself in the midst of a civic moment that highlights the social flux of his times. From the safety of his office, he could look back to the events of 1077 and ponder on their significance. It had been another difficult year for the Romans whose forces were hard pressed on every front. The Seljuqs were pushing hard on the Asian frontiers and in the Balkans; the Patzinakoi were restless in the lands around the Danube. To make things worse, there was discontent in the ranks of the army and its aristocratic leadership. While the empire was in pitiable state and even as Michael VII was fast acquiring nicknames associated with his inability to efficiently and cheaply provision the capital with food, Attaleiates decided to visit his estates in and around the city of Raideustos. As a master of men and owner of substantial tracks of land, he regularly toured his estates in order to ensure their proper operation. The visit was also necessary as the town and its people at the time suffered from a state-imposed monopoly on the sale of grain, which had led to hoarding and to government repression of those farmers who resisted imperial intervention in the local economy. As a landowner and employer of tenants on his lands, Attaleiates had reasons to be in Raideustos in the summer around the time of the harvest.

When traveling to his estates the judge was always accompanied and rode on horseback, pretty much as if going on campaign. The number of people in his entourage is unknown, yet his entry in Raideustos would have been a much-anticipated moment on the part of the local community given his links to the court and his rank. As we have already seen, he had carefully marked his ties to the city and its people through a series of donations to local churches and monasteries, while his home was located within the walls of the town. Much like in Greek villages to this day, people would recognize his house as *ton Attaleiatou* (Attaleiates'), and the caretaker would have carefully prepared it for his master's arrival. Yet this routine summer visit was to put Attaleiates in a dangerous situation. Soon after his arrival, the *doux* Nikephoros Bryennios, governor of the city of Dyrrhachion on the Adriatic Sea, rebelled against Michael Doukas' authority. This development should not have troubled the judge, as in normal circumstances it would have taken weeks

for Bryennios to muster his troops and march toward Thrace from his power base in the Western Balkans. On this occasion, however, things proved more complex. Writing in the twelfth century, the princess Anna Komnene, married to Bryennios' grandson, noted that the population of the Balkans flocked in droves to the rebel's standards. It seems that the *doux* had agents bent on mobilizing the people to his side in all the important urban centers of the area.⁴ In Raideostos, that agent was a woman. Batatzina was a member of an important aristocratic family.

When rumors of Bryennios' unwelcome rebellion reached Thrace, the judge no doubt assumed that he had enough time to conclude his business in Raideostos before retreating in timely fashion to the safety of the capital. Not long afterward, however, a knock on the door in the middle of the night brought him news of a rapidly changing situation. A man he had previously benefited in some manner, conceivably a client of his or maybe a tenant, came to his home and informed him of meetings among the city's elite in the course of which Batatzina sought to bring local notables over to the side of the rebel. Attaleiates who had not been approached, an indication that he was probably seen as a loyalist, now faced the need to reassess his position among the citizens of Raideostos.⁵ Thinking fast, he decided to make a run for the capital. As in 1071, when he left behind him Trebizond, friends, and the newly freed Romanos on the first available boat to the capital, he placed his eggs in the imperial basket once more. The emperor in Constantinople was bound to be the winner on this occasion as well.

Batzina, however, had placed armed guards at the city gates and complicated his escape from Raideostos. Early in the summer morning, the silk-clad official met the determined lady and her citizen soldiers. A tense face-off ensued during which Attaleiates argued with a mix of threats and reason that it was in the aristocratic woman's interest to offer him a way out. Thinking to the future Batatzina understood that the judge could prove a useful ally should the rebellion fail. The city of Raideostos, her family, her sons, would all need a friend at court to make the case for clemency. He owed her one for being set free. Writing about those events a year or two later Attaleiates offered interesting details regarding the city's preparations for the rebellion. He noted that the people assembled and together decided to join the rebel. Once the decision was taken they proceeded to fortify the city with the help of newly arrived rebel troops and burn a number of structures by the city's harbor that would make it easier to defend the area from an attack coming

over the sea. Then, altogether citizens and soldiers moved toward the neighboring fortified town of Panion, which had not yet declared for the rebel, and besieged it. In his description of events in Raideustos, Attaleiates is in effect narrating what amounts to popular mobilization and action. The upper social strata led the city, yet decisions were taken collectively and, most importantly, the citizens acted as one properly constituted political and military unit; almost like a city-state.

Throughout 1078 and 79 Constantinople itself was a city in unrest. Rumors were rife of new rebellions stirring in the provinces. To make things worse, southern winds carried the sound from the Turkish war drums from the city of Chalkedon on the Asian coast. The people of the capital were tired and demoralized. The previous emperor, Michael VII Doukas had presided over the gradual decomposition of the empire, the secession of significant parts of Asian territories, and perhaps most significantly for the Constantinopolitans themselves, extensive grain shortages and famine. The crowd was clearly at the limits of its tolerance when it greeted with cheers as a savior the man who put an end to the Doukas regime, Nikephoros Botaneiates. Attaleiates cannot have felt comfortable in such fluid political environment. He had witnessed in his years as a resident of the capital a series of popular upheavals and knew that they were volatile, highly destructive affairs. The new emperor soon proved to be less of a savior and more of a poser. Botaneiates looks great on the pages of an expensive manuscript his predecessor commissioned with homilies of Saint John Chrysostom. He appears young and elegant. In reality, he was an older man well past his prime. His military exploits lay in his distant past. For the people writing after his reign, he was a buffoon

He sat high on throne wrought of silver
Honouring with offices those who came to him:
Blacksmiths, carpenters, diggers, merchants, farmers,
cobblers, rope-makers, fullers, workers in vineyards.
He debased and defiled what was valuable and illustrious,
by handing down glory to lowly labourers,
which former emperors had bestowed as a trophy
for great feats of valour and achievements
and [reserved] for those of illustrious lineage and blood.⁶

Aristocratic snobbery notwithstanding, this scurrilous text reveals a social dynamic, which Attaleiates had already witnessed in Raideustos. The rising elites of the empire, merchants, and tradespeople, who benefited from

increasing volumes of trade and commercial activity, were useful allies to any emperor looking to bolster his claim on the throne. They maintained direct links to the populace, as they were themselves products of the street and fed the expanding roster of the Roman Senate with a steady stream of cash-rich members. In the process, they frequently contested the authority of traditional stakeholders in empire-wide tests of will. We thus see them spring into action in 1074 at Antioch, where according to the twelfth-century historian Nikephoros Bryennios

Some of those who had recently risen in status, burning with envy for those in power and for the *doux*, armed the crowd against them and the former they blockaded in the citadel guarding the gates, while they attacked and killed some of the latter. As for the rest, they turned towards the citadel and stormed the houses of the ruling class pilfering their money.⁷

The *doux* Isaakios Komnenos, elder brother of future Emperor Alexios I, and member of the very same established class of notables under attack at the Syrian metropolis was able to quell the rebellion only with difficulty. In this context of social flux and loudly beating war drums, with Botaneiates looking to the empire’s new rich for support against external and internal enemies, Attaleiates picked his pen to write about a popular rebellion in the empire’s recent past.

The judge kindled vivid memories from his youth as he unspooled the thread of the story line. Even as tensions rose in the capital in 1078 with the prospects of riots and urban disturbances at an all-time high, he wrote about the popular uprising that toppled the Emperor Michael V some thirty-five years earlier. The rudiments of the story are simple. Michael V succeeded his uncle Michael IV to the throne. He owed his rise to power to Empress Zoe, his uncle’s wife, who adopted him after intense lobbying by influential members of Michael IV’s clan. Upon being adopted and offered, the title of *Kaisar* Michael swore oaths to faithfully submit to Zoe’s authority. Once, however, his uncle died and Michael was crowned emperor in his place he felt stifled by Zoe’s presence and by her legitimate, not to say venerable, dynastic claims to power. Michael, who wanted to rule as sole emperor, started looking for ways to sideline the empress. To test popular opinion, he staged a lavish imperial procession the likes of which emperors orchestrated on a regular basis to court their subjects’ favor and impress their majesty upon them.

The event itself was well received and Michael convinced himself that he was the people's darling. Emboldened he sent guards to arrest Zoe and lead her to a monastery outside the city's limits, where her influence and authority, far from the wellspring of popular support was expected to wane. At this point, however, the people got wind of the development and shortly their indignation burst out into furious rebellion. Days of violence in the capital led to the end of Michael's reign after less than six months on the throne. At least three thousand dead civilians as well as significant damage to the center of the city must be added to the historian's ledger.

If our interest lies in the details of the rebellion itself then we should not be using Attaleiates' account, relying instead on Skylitzes and Psellos' more detailed story lines. What makes his recollection of the event fascinating, however, is how he treats the participants and main heroes of the rebellion, the people of Constantinople. If Attaleiates had modeled his storytelling on the writings of other historians, who had in years past described similar occurrences, he would certainly have sketched a rather negative portrait of the rebelled population. Put simply, Byzantine authors did not like "the people." Like many new rich seeking to escape their social milieu, historians—more often than not men of middling background who scaled the social ladder by means of education and service to the state—developed a passionate dislike for the unwashed masses of Constantinople.

Writing more than a century after Attaleiates' death, Niketas Choniates described the Constantinopolitan plebs as disorderly, difficult to control, rash in behavior and crooked in their ways. For Choniates, the variety of peoples and the diverse trades that all together made up the populace constituted a collective whose will easily swayed one way or the other. The people therefore acted without reason and rarely if ever accepted good advice, nearly always hurting their own interests in the process. Having delivered this scathing rebuke of his fellow citizens, Choniates turns his attention on the impulsive nature of the populace and notes that often just one word was enough to dispose the crowd to rebellion. Our Constantinopolitan functionary tells us that this was to be expected, given that the people really had no concern for dynastic legitimacy and monarchy.⁸

In the late 1070s, writing in a city teetering on the verge of social explosion, Attaleiates put his own spin on the 1042 rebellion. In doing so, he staged his own rebellion against elite critiques of the populace

such as the one presented here. Attaleiates' crowd first appears in the pages of the *History* as a gossiping collection of individuals. After Michael's grand procession, the people in the streets and the city's markets discussed the events of the day and expressed their approbation for the grand imperial show. Soon, however, this happy, benign, and barely coherent body of people starts acquiring a collective consciousness. A reader expecting Attaleiates to follow established models of narration similar to Choniates' bilious description of the crowd is in for a surprise. From early on Attaleiates musters the vocabulary of democracy to set up the people as a formally constituted political body, a rational actor, reaching decisions through careful and reasoned deliberation and acting as agents of justice, guided by a force up above, pretty much as any Byzantine ruler was supposedly guided by God.

Attaleiates' use of the vocabulary of democracy could be attributed to the Byzantine tendency to use classical terms in order to color contemporary reality. On this occasion, however, we are dealing with something different. Attaleiates' Constantinopolitan populace is presented as a *demos* and a *boule* and proves adept in mobilizing allies and organizing resistance to the emperor. They are assembled in the forum of Constantine, which the author links to the ancient Athenian *agora*, through some deft messaging. Most importantly, the people's decisions can be judged from the actions that follow. They collectively attack the imperial agents sent by Michael V to address them, following in unison the example of one man and most essentially, they appear to be guided by God. Then they destroyed property belonging to the family of the emperor, which was built on the sweat and tears of the oppressed poor and later they looted monasteries richly endowed through similar processes of expropriation and extortion. If the judge felt sorry for the afflicted monks he certainly did not see it fit to report his disapproval. The people's final action is the blinding of Michael along with his closest and most loyal ally the *nobellissimos* Konstantinos. They were dragged out of the church, where they had taken refuge and taken to a public spot in the city where they were blinded in an act that was clearly against canon law, violating the church as a place of asylum. Attaleiates does not seem to mind. He in fact describes this action as divine justice that befell the oath-breaking emperor.⁹

Here we are then, with Attaleiates in his late fifties, a member of the senate, a holder of courtly titles that evoked Rome's republican past, in the midst of a city in turmoil and in a court brimming with

representatives of the empire's urban strata, writing an account of a popular rebellion in which the people appear as the true upholders of dynastic rights and of the monarchy. The judge had every reason to be bilious in his attitude toward the crowd. The citizens of Raidestos who had only recently rebelled against Michael Doukas had also destroyed his property in the city, treating him as a loyalist and therefore an enemy. Despite that he was open to something new. Attaleiates was carefully unveiling his "republican" side. In the *History*, the most patriotic Romans are the ancient heroes of the republic, the Scipiones and Aemilii, who offer his readers *exempla* of virtue to set up against the vices of his contemporaries. It is in republican Rome that Attaleiates finds proper devotion to Roman custom, religion, and the fatherland. Much like Psellos, who praised Lucius Junius Brutus' Roman regicide and the balanced system of governance of the republic, Attaleiates looked to the past for a model of governance, which would accommodate all the sometimes chaotic, yet creative and dynamic forces that constituted the polity of the Romans in the eleventh century.

The ultimate impact of Attaleiates' historically embedded political science is hard to gage. He did not live to experience the rise of the Komnenoi, who rather than share power with an urban senate, colonized the state with members of aristocratic families they grafted onto their own bloodline and promoted an exclusive aristocratic ideal inimical to republican musings, one based on antiquity of lineage and heroic, Homeric even, deeds. And yet, the language of the republic did survive, as writers in the twelfth century followed Attaleiates and Psellos' practice of using republican heroes as models of Roman virtue.¹⁰ Attaleiates appropriated the lineage of the ancient Scipiones and the Fabii for his contemporary Byzantine Emperors; Bryennios and his wife, Alexios' daughter Anna Komnene, did much the same. Republican heroes were there to stay even if the republic was once again consigned to the calends of history.

It is not too bold a statement to note that what emerges from the *History* as Attaleiates' political ideology was, at least to some extent, grounded on his own social experiences and sought to address his concerns about the position of his social peers in Romanía's changing social landscape. In many ways, Attaleiates articulated a political theory of self-interest that envisioned enhanced influence in the body politic for newly emerging groupings. Yet, this is also a somewhat unfair assessment of his thinking. Self-interest did not have to demonstrate itself in the

tortured form of elaborate re-conceptualizations of Romanía’s politics. There were plenty of men like Attaleiates, who had risen from a mid-dling economic background through education and skills, had integrated themselves in the upper echelons of the administration and remained attached to the theology of power produced at court by the emperor’s image-makers, never hinting at the possibility of political change. Unlike such men, Attaleiates and with him Psellos to be sure, weave in their work a bottom-up vision of politics predicated upon a two-way interaction between an active citizenry and its rule-bound rulers. Most importantly, living in a time of profound political and military crisis, Attaleiates is one of the few Byzantines we know of, who appears to have connected the political and military condition of the state with the social forces fueling the crisis. For Attaleiates then, politics—usually treated by medieval writers as a field of action for emperors, or, in more nuanced analysis, as an arena for the clash between courtiers and army leaders—was influenced, and ultimately defined, by changes in the societal level. Eleventh-century Emperors from Michael V to Nikephoros Botaneiates crudely attempted to harness what they saw as rising urban strata to prop up their faltering regimes and bolster their positions on the throne. It was left, however, to intellectuals like Attaleiates to provide the ideological framework for such transition.

That said the *History* is no manifesto against the monarchy. Attaleiates consistently sought a strong emperor, who would keep the polity in order and successfully lead the troops in battle. Ironically his answer to that call was Alexios Komnenos, the man who would in time put a conclusive end to any further discussion of “republicanism.” Nevertheless, the phenomenon, which Attaleiates was trying to address in his writing, namely the rise of new, wealthy, and influential urban strata was not to go away. In writing about her father’s campaigning in Asia Minor in the 1070s, Anna Komnene described his interaction with the citizens of Amaseia. In the year 1074, the Emperor Michael VII Doukas sent Alexios on a campaign against the Norman rebel Rouselios. Reaching the city of Amaseia the young *generalissimo* had to negotiate with its leaders and the local population in order to gain their support for his actions against the Norman mercenary. In presenting Alexios’ interaction with the Amaseians, his daughter Anna cast him in the guise of a Greek orator in the *agora* addressing the *demos* of a city-state.¹¹ Everything, from Alexios’ gestures, to his language and even the presence of demagogues in the crowd, worked to replicate a sense of democratic deliberations.

Sixty years after Attaleiates' death, the language of democracy and republicanism was still an apt tool for the description of certain social and political phenomena.

Sat before his desk, with cheap cotton-based chancery-grade paper before him, Attaleiates wrote about Botaneiates, noting that he took no heed of the state's need for money and resources that would be devoted to the dangers pressing the polity from every side. Instead the elderly emperor proved a most generous patron of the people of Constantinople, making even the beggars rich. The language used is ambiguous and one could read the text both as praise of generosity and as castigation of profligate spending in a time of crisis. What is, however, important is that in Attaleiates' writings and then in the venomous twelfth-century critique of this opening of the senate, we see discussions about a new consensus regarding the division of the pie. Attaleiates and his peers were political beings who enjoyed life in the public sphere. They debated the world around them, took opposing positions, organized into competing parties on account of those positions, and in doing so produced a peculiarly Roman conception and form of politics.

NOTES

1. Kekaumenos see Tsougarakis, *Κεκαυμένος, Στρατηγικόν*, p. 234; Charlotte Roueché's online translation under *IV. About Rebellions and Loyalty* in the sixth paragraph for the text.
2. Bernhard Langkavel (ed.), *Simeonis Sethi Syntagma de Alimentorum Facultatibus* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1868); Gunter Weiss, "Die 'Synopsis legum' des Michael Psellos," *Fontes Minores* 2 (Frankfurt, 1977), pp. 147–214.
3. Psellos, "Historia Syntomos," in *Michaelis Pselli Historia Syntomos*, ed. and trans. Jan Aerts (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1990), p. 8, lines 22–24.
4. Anna Komnene, *Alexiad*, pp. 18.28–19.32 on the general popular response to Bryennios.
5. Attaleiates, *History*, pp. 455–57, Bekker 249–51.
6. Konstantinos Manasses, in Odysseas Lampsides (ed.), *Constantini Manassis Breviarium Chronicum* (Athens: Academy of Athens, 1997), p. 357, lines 6594–602.
7. Nikephoros Bryennios, *Material for History*, II. 29 in Paul Gautier (ed. and trans.), *Nicéphore Bryennios, Histoire* (Bruxelles: Byzantion, 1975), p. 205, lines 19–25.

8. Niketas Choniates, “History,” in *Niketae Choniatae Historia*, ed. Jan L. van Dieten (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1975), pp. 233–34, Bekker 304–5; Speros Vryonis Jr., “Byzantine Δημοκρατία and the Guilds in the Eleventh Century,” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 17 (1963), pp. 291–92 offered a lively translation of this passage that echoes in the text above.
9. Attaleiates, *History*, pp. 26–29, Bekker 17.
10. Leonora Neville, *Heroes and Romans in Twelfth-Century Byzantium: The Material for History of Nikephoros Bryennios* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012) for a wonderful survey of that process.
11. Anna Komnene, *Alexiad*, p. 15, line 20; p. 16, line 48.