




Aleksei S. Shchavlev (Moscow)

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0997-8235>

## **TREATISE *DE ADMINISTRANDO IMPERIO* BY EMPEROR CONSTANTINE VII PORPHYROGENITUS: DATE OF THE PARIS. GR. 2009 COPY, YEARS OF COMPILING OF THE ORIGINAL CODEX, AND A HYPOTHESIS ABOUT THE NUMBER OF AUTHORS**

### **The date of the manuscript *Paris. gr. 2009*<sup>1</sup>**

The treatise *De Administrando Imperio* reached our days only in the form of a sole manuscript of the 11<sup>th</sup> century – all other copies are its later apographs of the 16<sup>th</sup> century<sup>2</sup>. This treatise was not replicated and was not reflected in the texts of the Byzantine court authors<sup>3</sup>. The only copy was in the possession of Caesar John Ducas who was the younger brother and a close associate of emperor Constantine X Ducas (*Prosopography of Byzantine World*: “Ioannes

<sup>1</sup> The first part of this article was presented as a report at the international conference “Palaeography, Codicology, Diplomatics: Contemporary Experience of Studies Greek, Latine and Slavic Manuscripts and Charters” in honor of the eightieth anniversary of doctor of History and correspondent member of the Athenian Academy B.L. Fonkič, on 27–28 February 2018 in the Institute of World History of Russian Academy of Sciences in Moscow. The handout of my report was published: A.C. ЩАВЕЛЕВ, *Трактат византийского императора Константина VII Багрянородного «Об управлении империей»: о датировках оригинала рукописи и его копии XI в. писца Михаила Роизаита (Paris. gr. 2009)*, [in:] *Палеография, кодикология, дипломатика: Современный опыт исследования греческих, латинских и славянских рукописей и документов. Материалы Международной научной конференции в честь 80-летия доктора исторических наук, члена-корреспондента Афинской Академии Б.Л. Фонкича. Москва, 27–28 февраля 2018 г.*, ed. И.Г. Копылова, М.А. Курешева, Москва 2018, p. 296–310.

<sup>2</sup> G. MORAVCSIK, *Critical Introduction*, [in:] CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS, *De Administrando Imperio*, vol. I, *Greek Text and English Translation*, ed. R.G.H. JENKINS, G. MORAVCSIK, Washington 1967 [= CFHB, 1], p. 15–23; CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS, *De Administrando Imperio*, vol. II, *Commentary*, ed. R.G.H. JENKINS, Washington 1962, p. 1–8; C. SODE, *Untersuchungen zu De administrando imperio Kaiser Konstantins VII. Porphyrogenetos*, [in:] *Varia V*, Bonn 1994 [= ПВ, 13], p. 253.

<sup>3</sup> R.J.H. JENKINS, *General Introduction*, [in:] CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS, *De Administrando Imperio*..., vol. I, p. 13–14; G. MORAVCSIK, *Critical Introduction*..., p. 32.

Doukas, kaisar” or “Ioannes-62”). Caesar John Ducas was a politician, a courtier, and an intellectual, whose interest in the books was appreciated by such a maven as Michael Psellos<sup>4</sup>. John Ducas had an opportunity to get this unique (maybe even secret) codex, could estimate its value, and ordered a copy for himself.

There is a colophon of a scribe on the folio 211<sup>verso</sup> of the manuscript *Paris. gr. 2009*: Βίβλος καίσαρος Ἰωάννου τοῦ Δούκα γραφῆ(σα) χερσὶν οἰκογενοῦς οἰκέτου Μιχα(ή)λ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ροῖζαῖτου / *The Book of Caesar John Ducas was written by hand of his household man Michael named Roizaite*<sup>5</sup>. The reading of the colophon comes from F. Dölger, V. Laurent, G. Moravcsik, and B. Mondrain.

According to John Ducas's political biography, G. Moravcsik defined the time when *Paris. gr. 2009* could have been ordered: from 1059 until 1081. On 24 November 1059 emperor Constantine X Ducas gained the throne and his younger brother John Ducas got the title of *Caesar*<sup>6</sup>. On 4 April 1081 Alexios I Komnenos became the emperor – John Ducas was the grandfather of his wife Irene and his key advisor during the coup<sup>7</sup>.

Nowadays there is an opportunity to clarify some more details of John Ducas's life. Between 1073 and 1075 John Ducas was tonsured under the name Ἰγνατίος<sup>8</sup>. By this name he was mentioned in the *Typikon* of the Monastery of Christ Philanthropos, compiled on behalf of his daughter Irene Ducaina: Τῇ αὐτ(ῇ) ἡμ(έ) ρ(α) μνήμ(η) Ἰγνατ(ίου) | (μον)αχ(οῦ) κ(αί)σαρο(ς) κ(αί) πάπ(ου) τ(ῆς) ἀγίας δεσποί(νης)<sup>9</sup>. Besides, there are seals with a legend: Κύριε βοήθει τῷ σῷ δούλῳ / Ἰγνατίῳ μοναχῷ τῷ Καίσαρι. This Ignatios, who was at the same time a *monk* and a *Caesar*, can be identified only with John Ducas<sup>10</sup>. Anna Komnene in her *Alexiad* described him in a monk's robe, and wrote a sketch about how soldiers ironically called him “Abba” (the events took place in 1081)<sup>11</sup>. John Ducas died on 12 May around the year 1088, possibly a year before, or some years later<sup>12</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> MICHEL PSELLOS, *Chronographie ou Histoire d'un siècle de Byzance* (976–1077), VII (Constantin X Doucas, 26; Michel VII, 16–17), ed. et trans. É. RENAULD, vol. II, Paris 1928, p. 150–151, 180–182; MICHEL PSELLOS, *Ep. V*, [in:] P. GAUTIER, *Quelques lettres de Psellos inédites ou déjà éditées*, REB 44, 1986, p. 132.

<sup>5</sup> G. MORAVCSIK, *Critical Introduction...*, p. 16; B. MONDRAIN, *La lecture du De administrando imperio à Byzance au cours des siècles*, TM 14, 2002 (= *Mélanges en l'honneur de G. Dagron*), p. 488–489.

<sup>6</sup> D.I. POLEMIS, *Notes on Eleventh-Century Chronology* (1059–1081), BZ 58, 1965, p. 61.

<sup>7</sup> ANNAE KOMNENAE, *Alexias*, II, 6–12, pars 1, *Prolegomena et Textus*, rec. D.R. REINSCH, A. KAMBYLIS, Berolini 2001 [= CFHB, 40.1] (cetera: *Alexias*), p. 70–86; G. MORAVCSIK, *Critical Introduction...*, p. 16.

<sup>8</sup> D.I. POLEMIS, *Notes on Eleventh-Century...*, p. 67–68, 76; IDEM, *The Doukai. A Contribution to Byzantine Prosopography*, London 1968, p. 39.

<sup>9</sup> M. KOUROPOU, J.-F. VANNIER, *Commémoraisons des Comnènes dans le typikon liturgique du monastère du Christ Philanthrope* (ms. Panaghia Kamariotissa 29), REB 63, 2005, p. 45, 63–64.

<sup>10</sup> W. SEIBT, *Die byzantinischen Bleisiegel in Österreich*, vol. I, *Kaiserhof*, Wien 1978, p. 132–133.

<sup>11</sup> *Alexias*, II, 9, p. 78–79.

<sup>12</sup> D.I. POLEMIS, *The Doukai...*, p. 40; M. KOUROPOU, J.-F. VANNIER, *Commémoraisons des Comnènes...*, p. 26, 63–64; B. MONDRAIN, *La lecture du De administrando imperio...*, p. 490.

So, using this information, it is possible to ascertain a more precise time when John Ducas could order the copy of *De Administrando imperio*. The first possible period lasted from 1059 (when he became a Caesar) to 1073 (when he lost his power and became a monk)<sup>13</sup>. It is not possible that he had a chance to order a copy of *De Administrando imperio* from the Palace Library in the period between 1073 and 1081. The second possible period when he could order to copy this unique text, began from the April of 1081, when the monk John-Ignatios Ducas returned to Constantinople as an advisor of the new emperor Alexios I Komnenos. *Terminus ante quem* of this period is the year of his death about 1088.

We should therefore choose between two possible variants: the period between 1059 and 1073 and the period between 1081 and 1088. But it is necessary to take into consideration that after his tonsure John Ducas got a new church name – ‘Ignatios’ – and this new name was stamped on his seals and was reflected in the record of his posthumous commemoration. No doubt that in his family he could continue to use his first secular name ‘John’. His great granddaughter Anna Komnene called him John in her *Alexiad*, but the colophon of the manuscript (as well as the legends of his seals) must rather contain the official name of the donor.

In the period between 1059 and 1073 Caesar John Ducas had a practical reason to order a copy of the manual of political affairs which had been made for the young emperor Romanus II Porphyrogenitus. After the death of emperor Constantine X Ducas in 1067, John Ducas, as his younger brother, became the tutor of Constantine X's children – the future emperors Michael VII and Constantine X. It is obvious that John Ducas needed this text to educate and foster his wards. His close friend and famous scholar Michael Psellos wrote a new special guide entitled *Short History* for the young emperor Michael VII<sup>14</sup>. In his *Short History* Michael Psellos did not dissemble the sins of emperor Constantine VII, but he showed Constantine VII's image as an example of an educated monarch for his pupil Michael VII<sup>15</sup>. Therefore, both teachers of young emperors made handbooks on history and on public administration for their pupils. Michael Psellos wrote a new book, *Short History*, and John Ducas ordered a copy of the old book, *De Administrando imperio*. John Ducas could also use his own copy of *De Administrando imperio* for the education of his own sons, Andronicus and Constantine.

That is why John Ducas should rather order to make the codex *Paris. gr. 2009* in the period of fourteen years between 1059 and 1073. The other variant, that of the period between 1081 and 1088, is possible, but not so plausible.

<sup>13</sup> D.I. POLEMIS, *Notes on Eleventh-Century...*, p. 73; IDEM, *The Doukai...*, p. 39.

<sup>14</sup> *Michaelis Pselli Historia Syntomos. Editio Princeps*, ed. et comm. W.J. AERTS, Berlin–New York 1990 [= CFHB, 30] (cetera: *Historia Syntomos*).

<sup>15</sup> *Historia Syntomos*, 105, p. 102.

### Did the intermediate copy betwixt the original codex of the treatise and the manuscript *Paris. gr. 2009* exist?

Except latest marginalia<sup>16</sup> and auxiliary litters for the orientation in the text, the manuscript *Paris. gr. 2009* contains three scholia of so called historical matter<sup>17</sup>. All three were written on the margins of the codex by Michael Roizaites's hand. It is obvious that they were copied by him from the protoghaphé.

The first scholium is on folio 129<sup>verso</sup>: Οὗτο(ς) (ἐστὶν) ὁ πατὴρ Νικολάου μαγίστρου τοῦ Τορνίκη / *This is the father of magistros Nicholas Tornikios*. This scholium was made to the text of chapter 43 *Of the Country of Taron* which contains a story about a patrician Tornikios, the son of Apoganem (resp. Arabic name 'Abu Ghanim')<sup>18</sup>. The magistros Nicholas Tornikios was the participant of the plot in the end of January 945 which brought the supreme autocratic power for Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus<sup>19</sup>. Nicholas Tornikios was also mentioned in the summer of 963 in the description of the dramatic events which preceded the coronation of emperor Nikephoros II Phokas on 16 August 963<sup>20</sup>.

The second scholium is on folio 140<sup>verso</sup>: Οὗτο(ς) (ἐστὶν) ὁ Τζιμισχ(ῆς) ἐπικληθεὶς / *Who was called Tzimiskes*. The scholium was made to the text of chapter 45 *Of the Iberians*. It is a story about magistros John Kourkouas who in the time of the Romanus I Lecapenus's reign led the expedition against the Arabs to the fortress named Tibi<sup>21</sup>. John Kourkouas was a famous warlord. He was born about 900 and disappeared from the sources in mid-940s or the second half of the 940s<sup>22</sup>. Some of the members of the noble family named Kourkouases had an alias (something like cognomen?) 'Tzimiskes'<sup>23</sup>. The most famous, but not only, example was emperor John Tzimiskes. In light of this scholium it is clear that John Kourkouas had such a double cognomen, too.

The third scholium is on folio 143: Οὗτο(ς) (ἐστὶν) Ζουρβανέλ(ης) ὁ π(α)τὴρ τοῦ Τορνίκη τ(οῦ) ἀβᾶ τοῦ ἀρτ(ίως) συνκέλλου / *This is Zourvanelis the father*

<sup>16</sup> The overview of all marginalia, see: B. MONDRAIN, *La lecture...*

<sup>17</sup> G. MORAVCSIK, *Critical Introduction...*, p. 19–20.

<sup>18</sup> CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS, *De Administrando Imperio*, 43, vol. I, *Greek Text and English Translation...* (cetera: *De Administrando Imperio*), p. 194.

<sup>19</sup> Ioannis Scylitzae *Synopsis historiarum*, XI, 2, rec. I. THURN, Berolini 1973 [= *CFHB*, 5], p. 235–287; JOHN SKYLITZES, *A Synopsis of Byzantine History, 811–1057*, trans. J. WORTLEY, praef. et ed. J.-C. CHEYNET, Cambridge 2010, p. 227–228.

<sup>20</sup> CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENNETOS, *The Book of Ceremonies*, I, 96, vol. I.1, trans. A. MOFFART, M. TALL, Canberra 2012 [= *BAus*, 18.1] (cetera: *De cerimoniis*), p. 435; D. SULLIVAN, *The Rise and Fall of Nikephoros II Phokas. Five Contemporary Texts in Annotated Translations*, Leiden–Boston 2018, p. 11.

<sup>21</sup> *De Administrando Imperio*, 45, p. 208.

<sup>22</sup> L. ANDRIOLLO, *Les Kourkouas (IX<sup>e</sup>–XI<sup>e</sup> siècle)*, SBS 11, 2012, p. 61–66.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 66–67, 71–76.

of the Tornikios, who is Abbot and since recent time Syncellos<sup>24</sup>. The scholium was made to the text of chapter 45 *Of the Iberians*. This is a story about the mission of the protospapharios Zourvanelis, concerning the negotiations about the rights of the Iberian kouropalates to possess the land Phasiane and the fortress Abnikon (Avnik). An Abbot and Syncellos Tornikios was the founder of the Monastery of Ivion on Mount Athos and he died on 15 December 984<sup>25</sup>. He got the church title of Syncellos after 24 March 979; therefore this scholium was written on the original codex of the treatise right after this date<sup>26</sup>.

All these three scholia show an interest of the noble men of Armenian or Iberian origin. Thus, this anonymous scholiast belongs somehow to the aristocratic families of this region that had family or marriage ties with the Macedonian Dynasty. It is not hard to find such connections among the relatives and courtiers of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus and his descendants<sup>27</sup>. These connections should not be overestimated<sup>28</sup>, but it is impossible to deny them.

G. Moravcsik posited that the scholium “after 979” is a sign of the existence of one more intermediate copy between the original codex and the manuscript *Paris. gr. 2009*. But it is not an obligatory explanation, as I myself<sup>29</sup> and A. Németh<sup>30</sup> independently noted. These three scholia are surely a weak argument to postulate a lost intermediate stage of the text’s history. It is notable that G. Moravcsik himself in his early article published in 1930, which was especially dedicated to the manuscript and replication of the treatise’s text, represented the *stemma codicum* without an intermediate copy<sup>31</sup>. This first variant of the stemma is more simplex and is evidently closer to the truth. The canonical stemma from the classical critical edition is not cogent and it should be changed to G. Moravcsik’s early simple variant: a direct connection of the original codex (πρωτότυπον in stemma) to its only existing copy which is *Paris. gr. 2009* (11 αἰῶνος in stemma). This actuality is an apparent basis of every further critical study of the text of the *De Administrando Imperio*.

<sup>24</sup> *De Administrando Imperio*, 45, p. 210.

<sup>25</sup> J. LEFORT, *Histoire du monastère d'Ivion des origines jusqu'au milieu du XI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, [in:] *Actes d'Ivion*, vol. I, Paris 1985, p. 8, 22–23.

<sup>26</sup> G. MORAVCSIK, *Critical Introduction...*, p. 19.

<sup>27</sup> P. CHARANIS, *Studies on the Demography of the Byzantine Empire*, London 1972.

<sup>28</sup> A. KALDELLIS, *Romanland. Ethnicity and Empire in Byzantium*, Cambridge Mass.–London 2019, p. 155–195.

<sup>29</sup> A. C. ШАВЕЛЕВ, *Трактат...*, p. 305–306.

<sup>30</sup> A. NÉMETH, *The ‘Excerpta Constantiniana’ and the Byzantine Appropriation of the Past*, Cambridge 2018, p. 130.

<sup>31</sup> G. MORAVCSIK, *Η χειρόγραφος παράδοσις τοῦ ‘De administrando imperio’*, ΕΕΒΣ 7, 1930, p. 150.

### The date of the original codex of the treatise *De Administrando Imperio*

The approximate time of compiling the treatise was established by J.B. Bury with the help of the annual dates and collateral reference points<sup>32</sup>. His conclusions were adopted in the contemporary critical edition<sup>33</sup> and are nowadays commonly shares among all scholars. *Terminus post quem* is obvious: it is 15 June 948, the date of emperor Romanus I Lecapenus' death. He is referred to as dead in chapter 13 of the treatise<sup>34</sup>. *Terminus ante quem* is the death of the author of the treatise, emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, on 9 (or 15) November 959. Constantine VII's direct appeals to his son Romanus II and Constantine's first-person commentaries are located both at the beginning of the treatise in the *Proem* and in chapter 13, as well as at the end of the text, in chapter 51. Certainly, the whole treatise was written when emperor Constantine VII was alive<sup>35</sup>. It is impossible to imagine vast interpolations or addition of any chapter into the only luxurious codex from the emperor's library<sup>36</sup>. It is even stranger to assume such interpolations in the only copy of the 11<sup>th</sup> century, written by Michael Roizaita.

The text of the treatise contains three annual dates and one more chronological marker. In chapter 26 the king of Italy Lothair II<sup>37</sup> is mentioned as an active person. He died a little before December 950<sup>38</sup>. In chapter 27 there is an indication that from the time of the division of the province of Lombardy "until now" (τῆς σήμερον) 200 years had passed and there are indications of the "7 indiction" and "6457 year". According to the standard conversion of the dates, it is 949 A.D.<sup>39</sup> The reference point of the "73 years" from the foundation of the New Capua is useless because it is difficult to understand the exact nature of this event<sup>40</sup>. In chapter 29 there is a passage stating that from the relocation of the fugitives to the fortress Ragusa "until now" (τῆς σήμερον) 500 years had passed, and there are indications

<sup>32</sup> J.B. BURY, *The Treatise De administrando imperio*, BZ 15, 1906, p. 522–524, 574.

<sup>33</sup> R.J.H. JENKINS, *General Introduction...*, p. 11–12; CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS, *De Administrando Imperio...*, vol. II, p. 5–6.

<sup>34</sup> *De Administrando Imperio*, 13, p. 72, 74, 76.

<sup>35</sup> J.B. BURY, *The Treatise...*, p. 519.

<sup>36</sup> About the Palace Library in Constantinople, see: *De cerimoniis*, I, App., p. 456–457; NICETAS DAVID, *The Life of Patriarch Ignatius*, 89, ed. et trans. A. SMITHES, ed. J.M. DUFFY, Washington 2013 [= DOS, 51], p. 118, 120; *Chronographiae quae Theophanis Continuati nomine fertur. Libri I–IV*, III, 43, rec. M. FEATHERSTONE, J.S. CODOÑER, Berlin 2015 [= CFHB.SBe, 43] (cetera: *Theophanes Continuatus*), p. 206, 208.

<sup>37</sup> *De Administrando Imperio*, 26, p. 112; CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS, *De Administrando Imperio...*, vol. II, p. 83.

<sup>38</sup> M. MARROCCHI, *Lotario II, re d'Italia*, [in:] *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. LXVI, (Lorenzetto–Macchetti), ed. M. CARVALE, Roma 2006, p. 177–179.

<sup>39</sup> *De Administrando Imperio*, 27, p. 116; CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS, *De Administrando Imperio...*, vol. II, p. 88; V. GRUMEL, *La Chronologie*, Paris 1958, p. 314.

<sup>40</sup> CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS, *De Administrando Imperio...*, vol. II, p. 88.



about the “7 indiction” and “6457 year”<sup>41</sup>. Again it is 949 A.D. In chapter 45 there is an indication that from the migration of Iberians from Jerusalem “until now” (τῆς σήμερον), i.e. until the reign of emperors Constantine VII and Romanus II, 400 or 500 years had passed. Afterwards there are indications of the “10 indiction” and “6460 year”<sup>42</sup>. It means 952 A.D.<sup>43</sup> The same formula of dates and the same phrase, τῆς σήμερον, may be the features which display the single type of sources of chapters 27, 29 and 45, with the same style of dating the events.

The date 952 A.D. with the indication “until now” gives a rigid *terminus post quem*, but it does not give *terminus ante quem*, because two other dates with the indication of 949 A.D. also marked “until now”. Consequently, there was no unification of the dates during the compiling of the treatise. The date 952 A.D. as well as the date 949 A.D. were obviously mechanically copied from protographic texts. It can therefore be argued that the text of the treatise was compiled at some point after 952 and before November 959 when Constantine VII died.

The popular idea that the original codex of *De Administrando Imperio* was the gift to Romanus II for his fourteenth birthday is a common guess, because the levels of age in Byzantium were fuzzy. The fourteenth birthday was not a special occasion or a significant stage of age<sup>44</sup>. Instead of the mythical fourteenth birthday, if one tries to guess the celebrated event when such a gift could be presented, it is necessary to remember the date of the wedding of Romanus II and Anastasia-Theophano. The exact date of the wedding day is unclear, but it took place reliably between 954 and 957<sup>45</sup>.

Another reason for Constantine VII's anxiety about the governmental skills of his eldest son could be the death of his younger son Leo. Constantine VII probably wrote about his two sons in his letter to Theodoros the archbishop of Cyzicus<sup>46</sup>. Besides, “Little Leo” and “Young Romanus” were mentioned in the poem dedicated to the Romanus II<sup>47</sup>. The younger son Leo lived about 940–950s<sup>48</sup>.

<sup>41</sup> *De Administrando Imperio*, 29, p. 134.

<sup>42</sup> *De Administrando Imperio*, 45, p. 206.

<sup>43</sup> V. GRUMEL, *La Chronologie...*, p. 314.

<sup>44</sup> G. PRINZING, *Observations on the Legal Status of Children and the Stages of Childhood in Byzantium*, [in:] *Becoming Byzantine. Children and Childhood in Byzantium*, ed. A. PAPACONSTANTINOU, A.-M. TALBOT, Harvard 2009, p. 15–34.

<sup>45</sup> A. KAZHDAN, *Theophano*, [in:] *ODB*, vol. III, ed. IDEM, p. 2064–2065; L. GARLAND, *Byzantine Empresses. Woman and Power in Byzantium, AD 527–1204*, London–New York 1999, p. 126.

<sup>46</sup> *Theodori Metropolitae Cyzici Epistulae. Accendunt Epistulae Mutuae Constantini Porphyrogeniti, Ep. XVIII*, rec. M. TZIATZI-PAPAGIANNI, Berlin–Boston 2012 [= *CFHB*, 48] (cetera: *Theodori Metropolitae Cyzici Epistulae*), p. 107–108.

<sup>47</sup> P. ODORICO, *Il Calamo d'argento. Un carme inedito in onore di Romano II. Con una tavola*, JÖB 37, 1987, p. 93.

<sup>48</sup> I. ŠEVČENKO, *Re-reading Constantine Porphyrogenitus*, [in:] *Byzantine Diplomacy*, ed. J. SHEPARD, S. FRANKLIN, London 1992, p. 167–170.

It is possible that during his live he was considered as an alternative candidate to gain the throne.

As a result, it can be asserted that the treatise *De Administrando Imperio* was compiled in its final version after 952 and before the 9<sup>th</sup> (or 15<sup>th</sup>) of November 959. Apparently, but not certainly, it was a gift on the wedding day of co-emperor Romanus II and his bride Anastasia-Theophano in the mid-950s.

### **The formal criterion for the detection of the number of authors of *De Administrando Imperio***

The treatise *De Administrando Imperio* is a compilation of various texts from different times. There are plenty of investigations in which the compound of these excerpts and the process of their elaboration were analyzed<sup>49</sup>. I do not review these hypotheses about the textual structure of the treatise and do not debate them<sup>50</sup>. It is a particular research mission. It is more efficient to establish the sum of the most reliable statements of the scholars to make the basis of my further analyses.

The treatise *De Administrando Imperio* was decidedly written during the lifetime of Constantine VII. In this text his son Romanus II is never designated as a self-sustained ruler. Emperor Constantine VII's personal remarks are traced in the whole text of the treatise from the beginning to the end<sup>51</sup>. No chapter contains any reference points of a time after Constantine VII's death in November 959. It is difficult to imagine a mechanical interpolation in the sole gift codex from the library in the emperor's palace. The treatise consists of 53 chapters. It is the finalized text with precise composition. This number of fifty-three chapters

<sup>49</sup> J.B. BURY, *The Treatise...*, p. 517–577; G. MORAVCSIK, *Byzantinoturcica*, vol. I, *Die Byzantinischen Quellen der Geschichte Türkvolker*, Berlin 1983, p. 356–379; R.J.H. JENKINS, *General Introduction...*, p. 7–14; CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS, *De Administrando Imperio...*, vol. II, p. 1–8, 12–13, 18–20, 143; I. ŠEVČENKO, *Re-reading...*, p. 167–195; C. SODE, *Untersuchungen...*, p. 147–260; J. HOWARD-JOHNSTON, *The De Administrando Imperio: A Re-examination of the Text and a Re-evaluation of its Evidence about the Rus*, [in:] *Les centres proto-urbains russes entre Scandinavie, Byzance et Orient*, ed. M. KAZANSKI, A. NERCESSIAN, C. ZUCKERMAN, Paris 2000 [= RByz, 7], p. 301–336; IDEM, *Byzantine Sources for Khazar History*, [in:] *The World of the Khazars: New Perspectives. Selected Papers from the Jerusalem 1999 International Khazar Colloquium*, ed. B. GOLDEN, H. BEN-SHAMMAI, A. RÓNA-TAS, Leiden–Boston 2007, p. 163–194; T. ŽIVKOVIĆ, 'De Conversione Croatorum et Serborum'. A Lost Source, Belgrade 2012, p. 19–89; A. NÉMETH, *The Excerpta Constantiana...*, p. 130–137.

<sup>50</sup> See the brief analytical surveys of common contemporary views: N. GAUL, *Zooming in on Constantinople. Introductory Notes on the Interplay of Center, Province and Periphery in the Tenth-Century Byzantine Empire*, [in:] *Center, Province and Periphery in the Age of Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos. From 'De ceremoniis' to 'De Administrando Imperio'*, ed. N. GAUL, V. MENZE, C. BÁLINT, Wiesbaden 2018, p. 7–10; A. MARKOPOULOS, *Voices from the Centre. Constantine VII and the Macedonian Dynasty in Contemporary Historiography*, [in:] *Center, Province...*, p. 22–33.

<sup>51</sup> J.B. BURY, *The Treatise De administrando imperio...*, p. 519.



had a special symbolic sense. As A. Németh discerningly noticed, the number of chapters in the *De Administrando Imperio* coincides with the number of volumes of *Excerpta Constantiniana*<sup>52</sup>. The number “53” was symbolic according to the church calendar (the fifty-two weeks and one day of the liturgical cycle), and in terms of ideology (ancient historian Polybius repeated several times that fifty-three years was the interval of the growth of Rome’s power from a city-state into a world-wide empire).

The treatise’s starting point is *Proem*. The following chapters are the description of the Northern nomadic peoples (chapters 1–13). After that, there is a description of the peoples neighboring the Roman Empire: the Islamic World from Arabia to Spain; the Balkans; the Black Sea coastal area from Thessaloniki to the Caucasus; and finally the Caucasus (chapters 14–46)<sup>53</sup>. After that, there is the description of the hotspots of the Roman Empire: Cyprus, Peloponnesus and Cherson (chapters 47–53). There are no interruptions or interpolations into this logical composition. Also P. Magdalino, tracking the notes in the treatise, finds the basic themes of the treatise: “useful” and “dangerous” to the empire nations; their insatiable demands; differences between various nations; the events involving Romans and other various nations; and, at last, the changes in the whole Roman Empire<sup>54</sup>. Hence, the treatise’s text is permeated by different logical connections and sequences. On these grounds I assume that the treatise’s text was completed by Constantine VII himself and not elaborated by his successors<sup>55</sup> or by the copyist Michael Roizaite.

In spite of the historiographical prejudice, it is impossible to imagine in Constantinople a highly organized archive office with plentiful thematic dossiers to be accessed. This word “dossier” creates an illusion of understanding the nature of the texts that were used by the authors of the *De Administrando Imperio*. Only I. Ševčenko emphasized this simple but essential idea. He was the only scholar who stressed the point that we must evaluate the degree of awareness and education of the Byzantine politicians according to the text of the *De Administrando Imperio*, but not compare this text with our illusions of their high education and developed state bureaucracy<sup>56</sup>. I. Ševčenko was absolutely right when he wrote that the

<sup>52</sup> A. NÉMETH, *The Excerpta Constantiniana*..., p. 58, 71–77, 130–137; N. GAUL, *Zooming in Constantinople*..., p. 7; A. MARKOPOULOS, *Voices*..., p. 26.

<sup>53</sup> Similar logic of sequence of geographical areas in chapters 1–46 of the treatise was approximately traced in a brief overview: Г.Г. ЛИТАВРИН, *Предисловие*, [in:] *Константин Багрянородный. Об управлении империей. Текст, перевод, комментарий*, ed. Г.Г. ЛИТАВРИН, А.П. НОВОСЕЛЬЦЕВ, Москва 1991, p. 26–27.

<sup>54</sup> P. MAGDALINO, *Constantine VII and the Historical Geography of Empire*, [in:] *Imperial Geographies in Byzantine and Ottoman Space*, ed. S. BAZZAR, Y. BATSAKI, D. ANGELOV, Cambridge Mass.–London 2013 [= *HelS*, 56], p. 29–39.

<sup>55</sup> G. MORAVCSIK, *Byzantinoturcica*..., p. 365.

<sup>56</sup> I. ŠEVČENKO, *Re-reading*..., p. 189–193.

treatise had not been divided into “antiquarian” and “actual” chapters, but it was a reflection of the scanty and random information that Constantine VII was able to find. Only this text itself can show what was known to him, and what was not, what was important to him, and what was not, or what was elegant in his eyes, and what was ugly. The opposite approach runs the risk of modernizing Constantine VII’s political, historical, and epistemological views.

It is strange to compare the process of compiling a vast historical encyclopedia like *Excerpta Constantiniana* that required a wide staff, who made global thematic compilations<sup>57</sup>, with the process of drafting a confidential and very personal treatise. Apparently, *De Administrando Imperio* was written only for Romanus II’s eyes. It is tenable to pay attention to the compilation process of another text which was the ideological manifest of the Macedonian dynasty, and fixed the family memory of emperor Constantine VII. It is *Vita Basilii Imperatoris*. Its short preface announces the process of its compilation: Ἱστορικὴ διήγησις τοῦ βίου καὶ τῶν πράξεων Βασιλείου τοῦ αἰοιδίμου βασιλέως, ἦν Κωνσταντίνος βασιλεὺς ἐν Θεῷ Ῥωμαίων, ὁ τούτου υἱὼνός, φιλοπόνως ἀπὸ διαφόρων ἀθροίσας διηγημάτων τῷ γράφοντι προσανέθετο / *Historical narrative of the life and deeds of emperor Basil of glorious memory which his grandson Constantine, by grace of God emperor of the Romans, assiduously gathered from various accounts and submitted to the <present> writer* (trans. I. Ševčenko)<sup>58</sup>. I. Ševčenko gave a convincing interpretation of how *Vita Basilii Imperatoris* had been written. At first, emperor Constantine VII himself gathered his own extracts and notes and gave all these materials to the second author (ὁ γράφων). Afterwards this anonymous second author (“ghost-writer”) wrote on this basis the final text. Therefore, *Vita Basilii Imperatoris* was written by *two authors*, by Constantine VII himself and his anonymous confidant. This mode of production through the work of a limited circle of authors can be naturally hypothesized when it comes to the preparation of the political treatise *De Administrando Imperio*. Constantine VII offered the same *modus operandi* in his private letter to his well-educated friend Theodoros the archbishop of Cyzicus. Constantine VII mentioned their “cooperation” in the compiling of Constantine VII’s public speech (ἡ δημηγορία)<sup>59</sup>. Hence, this emperor’s public speech had *two authors*, emperor Constantine VII himself and his friend archbishop Theodoros.

<sup>57</sup> G. MORAVCSIK, *Byzantinoturcica...*, p. 359–360; A. NÉMETH, *The Excerpta Constantiana...*, p. 102–109.

<sup>58</sup> *Chronographiae quae Theophanis Continuati nomine fertur. Liber V. Vita Basilii Imperatoris Amplectitur*, rec. I. ŠEVČENKO, Berlin 2001 [= CFHB.SBe, 42], p. 8–9; *Theophanes Continuatus*, Proem, p. 13\*, 9; I. ŠEVČENKO, *Re-reading...*, p. 184–185; W. TREADGOLD, *The Middle Byzantine Historians*, London–New York 2013, p. 165–167; I. ŠEVČENKO, *The Title of and Preface to ‘Theophanes Continuatus’*, BBGG n.s. 52, 1998 (= *Ὁπώρα. Studi in onore de mgr P. Canart per il LXX compleanno*, ed. S. LUCA, L. PERRIA), p. 77–93.

<sup>59</sup> *Theodori Metropolitae Cyzici Epistulae*, Ep. I, p. \*96, 84.

Using the assumption of the limited number of authors, I tried to find *formal markers* to trace the features of the different parts of the text *De Administrando Imperio* which could belong to different compilers. It sounds strange but most scholars did not try to determine such formal criteria to uncover the structure of this text, but used only speculative historical and unsteady logical arguments.

The most vivid marker in the text of the *De Administrando Imperio* is the use of *only two initial words* in the inceptions of the sections inside chapters. The first initial collocation is ἴστέον, ὅτι..., i.e. *Know that...* The second one is ὅτι..., i.e. *That...* These initial collocations were noted by J.B. Bury, who postulated that the sections without these initial words were the intercalations in the prepared text<sup>60</sup>. But it is wrong because the sections of the text without these initial words have no features of interpolations and are connected with the adjoining sections. And *vice versa*, some sections which begin with ἴστέον, ὅτι... or ὅτι... were considered to be interpolations by J.B. Bury. These two initial elements attracted G. Moravcsik's attention, but he did not think that it was a significant marker<sup>61</sup>. S.R. Tokhtas'ev also paid attention to these initial formulas, but he analyzed only stylistic aspects of their usage in the text<sup>62</sup>.

J. Signes-Codoñer was sure that the ἴστέον, ὅτι... and ὅτι... initial formulas were the traces of primordial structure of the text, disrupted by the later headings of the chapters<sup>63</sup>. I am not sure whether I find convincing his theory of the unfinished text of the treatise and its structural redo with the secondary separation of chapters during the coping. But he is apparently right when he argues that the headlines of the chapters with the initial Περί... contain the central topics (thirty-seven of fifty-three chapters), and headlines without this initial formula mark the additional archival materials (the other sixteen chapters). Besides, his idea that these two initial formulas, ἴστέον, ὅτι... and ὅτι..., are an important trace of the process of elaborating of this treatise, is very productive. Only T. Živković noticed that no other initial figures of speech were used in the text of *De Administrando Imperio*. There are no initial words like διὰ... or μετὰ δέ<sup>64</sup>. But T. Živković was sure that this is a tag of rough pieces of different texts in the treatise without literary refinement<sup>65</sup>. In fact, he proposes the reverse of J.B. Bury's explanation. And again there is no argument to prove the draft condition of these sections of text with this initial pair of collocations. T. Živković's explanation is obviously *ad hoc*.

<sup>60</sup> J.B. BURY, *The Treatise...*, p. 538–539.

<sup>61</sup> G. MORAVCSIK, *Byzantinoturcica...*, p. 363.

<sup>62</sup> С.Р. ТОХТАСЬЕВ, *Язык трактата Константина VII Багрянородного 'De administrando Imperio' и его иноязычная лексика*, Санкт-Петербург 2018, p. 85, 94.

<sup>63</sup> J. SIGNES-CODOÑER, *Los eslavos en las fuentes bizantinas de los siglos IX–X: el 'De administrando imperio' de Constantino Porfirogéneto*, *Ilu* 13, 2004, p. 126–127.

<sup>64</sup> T. ŽIVKOVIĆ, *'De Conversione Croatorum et Serborum'...*, p. 23. See for comparison: *De ceremoniis*, I, App., p. 459–460, 463, 465–466, 469, 473, 478.

<sup>65</sup> T. ŽIVKOVIĆ, *'De Conversione Croatorum et Serborum'...*, p. 22–30.

It is well known that the initial figure of speech ἰστέον, ὅτι... and its shortcut analogue ὅτι... are trivial for the Medieval Greek<sup>66</sup>. But the regular use of only two of a wide spectrum of possible initial figures of speech is a sign requiring special attention. It is not a trace of combining different texts and is not an individual author's attempt to achieve stylistic diversity. In both these cases the number of different initial words would be much higher. The only logical hypothesis lies in the assumption that this is a trace of *two different authors*. One of them began his excerpts with the words ἰστέον, ὅτι..., and the other one began to copy his excerpts with the vulgar short ὅτι... To verify this hypothesis, it is necessary to dissect the spreading of ἰστέον, ὅτι... and ὅτι... in the whole text of the treatise. The author who used ὅτι... will be conditionally marked as the 'First', and another one, who used ἰστέον, ὅτι..., will be marked as the 'Second'.

The initial ὅτι... (*That...*) begins the sections in chapters 1–13, 31, 33–36, and 38. It is the whole block of chapters about the 'Northern peoples', and a block about the Balkan Slavs. In addition, there are chapters 31 *Of the Croats...* and 38 *Of the genealogy of the nation of the Turks*. All these chapters are 'ethnographic' and relate to two topics – 'Northern Barbarians' and 'Balkan Slavs'. Excluding chapter 38, all these chapters constitute two compact areas in the text of the treatise.

The initial ἰστέον, ὅτι... (*Know that...*) is used in chapters 15, 21, 25–28, 37, 39–42, 48, 50, and 52.

Some chapters do not contain either of these initial collocations; these are chapters 14, 16–20, 22–24, 30, 43, 47, and 49.

Some chapters contain both the initial ὅτι... or ἰστέον, ὅτι...; these are chapters 29, 32, 44–46, 51, and 53. These chapters can vividly show the essence of the relation of these initial words in the sections. That is why these chapters should be analyzed first.

Chapter 29 *Of Dalmatia...* begins with ὅτι... (29/3). These words begin the stories about the times of Roman emperors Diocletian and Heraclius (29/54). The words ἰστέον, ὅτι... begin the short reference (29/113–115) which *breaks the sequential narrative* about the siege of the fortress of Ragusa and about a Saracen named Soldan. This reference is a short remark about the moving of Croats and the other chiefs of the Slavs into Lombardy. After an insert reference with the initial ἰστέον, ὅτι... the didactic story about Soldan continues. All the subsequent accounts about different fortresses of Dalmatia begin only with ὅτι... It is obvious that chapter 29 was entirely written by the 'First author', but the 'Second author' made a gloss that was mechanically inserted into the coherent text, maybe from the margins of the page.

Chapter 32 *Of the Serbs...* begins with the initial ἰστέον, ὅτι..., and at the end of the chapter the initial ὅτι... begins two short additional notes about

<sup>66</sup> F. BLASS, A. DEBRUNNER, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, trans. et ed. R.W. FUNK, Cambridge 1961, p. 246–247.

the submission of Serbia's princes to the emperors of Romans and about the cities of the baptized Serbia (32.146–151). The complete chapter 29 was written by the 'Second author' and the 'First author' made two remarks at the end of it.

Chapter 44 *Of the country of Apachunis...* consists of two parts. The first part of the chapter is devoted to the country Apachunis, and the second part focuses on the cities Manzikiert, Perki, Chliat and so on. The first part, about the country of Apachunis, begins with ἰστέον, ὅτι... (44.1–12). In the second part that talks about different cities, the account of each city begins with ὅτι... (44.13–128). The two-section chapter 44 was therefore written jointly by two authors. The 'Second author' wrote the first part, and the 'First author' wrote the second part.

Chapter 45 *Of the Iberians* begins with ἰστέον, ὅτι... (45.2). About a half of this chapter deals with a story about the wars of emperors Leo VI and Romanus I for the country of Phasiane (45.1–66). Afterwards there is a piece of text beginning with ὅτι... (45.67). This is an instance of direct speech of emperor Constantine VII. In this narration Constantine VII calls himself "our own imperial majesty" (ἡ βασιλεία ἡμῶν) and calls Romanus I "our father-in-law" (ὁ πενθερός ἡμῶν)<sup>67</sup>. Chapter 45 obviously consists of two parts. The first one was written by the 'Second author' and the second one was written by the 'First author', who called himself "our majesty". There is thus a good reason to suppose that the 'First author' was emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, who used the initial ὅτι... to begin the sections of the chapter.

Chapter 46 *Of the genealogy of the Iberians and of the city of Ardanoutzi* is constructed with the use of the same two-section structure as chapter 44. The first part, *Of the genealogy of the Iberians*, begins with ἰστέον, ὅτι... (45.3–41). The second part, *Of the city of Ardanoutzi*, begins with ὅτι... (45.42–169). The second part of the chapter is finished with a direct appeal of Constantine VII to his son Romanus II (φιλτατε υἱέ). This appeal is a quotation from Thucydides<sup>68</sup>. Once again Constantine VII's direct speech correlates with the initial ὅτι...

Chapter 51 *Why the imperial galley came to be made... and all about the protospatharius of the basin* consists of three parts. Two parts are basic and the third one is additional. The first part, *Why the imperial galley*, begins with ἰστέον, ὅτι... (51.5–45). The second one, *All about the protospatharius of the basin*, begins with ὅτι... (51.46–190). The second part has a recollection about the infancy of Constantine VII. The third grammatical person was used here by Constantine VII to show the typicality of the situation of vice and corruption seen when a ruling emperor is a child<sup>69</sup>. R.J.H. Jenkins was sure that in spite of the third grammatical person, this piece of text was written by Constantine VII himself<sup>70</sup>. The final

<sup>67</sup> *De Administrando Imperio*, 45, p. 208–214.

<sup>68</sup> *De Administrando Imperio*, 46, p. 222, 339.

<sup>69</sup> *De Administrando Imperio*, 51, p. 252, 254.

<sup>70</sup> CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS, *De Administrando Imperio...*, vol. II, p. 202.

additional part of the chapter consists of three notes beginning with ἰστέον, ὅτι... This part is devoted to the topic of taking money and horses away from those who refused to join military expeditions. This chapter was written by two authors, and the 'Second author' also included three notes on one topic. It is worthy to note that the following chapter 52 is a story on the same topic of mobilizing horses and raising money in the province of Peloponnesus. Chapter 52 contains the initial ἰστέον, ὅτι... and can be attributed to the 'Second author' who made notes similar to those in the previous chapter 51.

The last chapter, i.e. chapter 53 *Story of the city of Cherson*, is a long narrative about the history of the Crimean city of Cherson from the times of Roman emperor Diocletian (53/1–492). At the end of this chapter, after the main story, there are seven additional notes about where petroleum (naphtha) can be found. All these notes begin with ἰστέον, ὅτι... (53.493–529). At the very end of the chapter there are two notes about trade operations that were the most important ones for the Chersonites, beginning with ὅτι... (53.530–535). Chapter 53 is a vast excerpt about Cherson with additional notes from both authors. The 'Second author' wrote seven notes about petroleum production. The 'First author' wrote two notes about the Chersonites' trade affairs.

Now it is time to trace the work of the 'Second author', who used the initial ἰστέον, ὅτι... Chapter 15 *Of the tribe of the Fatemites* is the first one in the text with these initial words. The source of this chapter is not identified even now<sup>71</sup>. This chapter is included in the block of chapters devoted to the Islamic countries (14–22). All other chapters of this block are the excerpts from the *Chronicle of the Theophanes Confessor* with an additional text of the horoscope ("canon") of Stephen the astrologer ("mathematician") (chapter 16).

The next chapter which contains the initial ἰστέον, ὅτι... is chapter 21 *From the Chronicle of Theophanes: the year from the creation of the world 6171*. The initial ἰστέον, ὅτι... begins the first account (21/3–5) about the invasion of the Mardaïtes on the Lebanon. Actually, the excerpt from the *Chronicle of the Theophanes Confessor* begins with the words καὶ πολλοὶ δοῦλοι... (*and many slaves...*)<sup>72</sup>. The next initial ἰστέον, ὅτι... marked the second addition from an unknown source to the text of the *Chronicle of the Theophanes Confessor* (21/49–126)<sup>73</sup>. The third initial ἰστέον, ὅτι... begins the final (29/111–126) passage about the Mauias' genealogy and the expedition of the Saracens against Constantinople.

I propose that these were not only chapters 15 and 21 which were written by the 'Second author', but that the whole block of chapters 14–21 about the Muslims and their faith, Islam, was compiled by him. There is no feature indicating the participation of emperor Constantine VII in the preparation of these texts.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 72.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 75.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 76.



In chapter 22 Theophanes the Confessor is designated as ὁ μητρόθεις, i.e. Constantine VII's "uncle" or "forefather" "on the mother's side" (22/79). In this passage Constantine VII is presented in the third person and in a strictly official manner. This passage could hardly be written by Constantine VII himself, but was apparently written by his close collaborator who was aware of his family's memory about the emperor's famous ancestor.

Chapter 25 from the block about Spain (chapters 23–25) contains the initial ἰστέον, ὅτι... In this chapter, after the description of the ancient history of Spain, based on the *Chronicle of the Theophanes Confessor*, the initial ἰστέον, ὅτι... is used to begin an additional fragment about the Arabs (25/56–85). Chapter 25 has the same composition as chapters 15 and 21. The structure of the chapters about Spain is similar to the structure of the chapters about the Muslim World. It is not surprising because in fact Spain was a part of the Muslim lands at that time. Therefore, it can be assumed that chapters 14–25 create an entire block devoted to the Islamic civilization. I suppose that this block was entirely compiled by the 'Second author'. There is not a single case of Constantine VII's direct speech in these chapters.

The next block of chapters (26–28) deals with Italy and contains only the initial ἰστέον, ὅτι... It can be attributed to the 'Second author'. In this "Italian" block of chapters there are no instances of Constantine's direct speech or appeals to his son. Chapter 26 talks about the genealogy of Romanus II's wife Bertha-Eudocia who received a Greek name in honor of Constantine VII's grandmother and sister<sup>74</sup> (26.71–72). This passage is similar to the indication of Constantine VII's family relation with Theophanes the Confessor in chapter 22.

Chapters 37–42, excluding chapter 38, contain the initial ἰστέον, ὅτι... This is the block of chapters about northern nomads with an additional geographical mini-treatise Γεωγραφία ἀπὸ Θεσσαλονίκης... μέχρι τοῦ κάστρου Σωτηριοπόλεως (*Geographical description from Thessalonica... to the city of Sotirioupolis*). In chapter 42 there is an insert about the mission of a patrician Petronas Camaterus to the land of Chazars.

Chapters 47 and 48 are two excerpts about the history of Cyprus. The first one is historical, and the second one is canonical (the citation of the 39<sup>th</sup> canon of the Sixth Holy Synod in Trullo). At the end of chapter 48 there are two additional notes. The first one is a direct appeal of Constantine VII to his son Romanus II. Emperor Constantine VII states that he has finished the narrative about the foreign nations (περὶ ἐθνῶν) and begins the narrative about "our polity", i.e. the Roman Empire<sup>75</sup>. Here Constantine VII's direct appeal has no initial words ὅτι... because his appeal to his son is not an excerpt, but is his own commentary. Chapter 48 has one additional note about the invention of the Greek fire and the first victory with its help near the city of Cyzicus, which begins with ἰστέον,

<sup>74</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 98, 112.

<sup>75</sup> *De Administrando Imperio*, 46, p. 226.

ὅτι... This note is quite logical because chapters 47 and 48 talk about the city of Cyzicus and its inhabitants. That city was the place of the allocation of the archbishop of Cyprus John after the capture of the island by the Saracens. Only this final additional note about the Greek fire could be firmly attributed to the 'Second author', who made an expert appraisal of petroleum in the context of the Greek fire in chapter 53. In sum, it is impossible to attribute chapters 47 and 48 to any of the main authors based on formal criteria, but both of them inserted their comments in chapter 48.

All the sections of chapter 50 *Of the Slavs in the province of Peloponnesus...* begin with ἰστέον, ὅτι... In this chapter Constantine VII and his mother Zoë (50.159–163) are mentioned in the third grammatical person without any rhetorical purposes<sup>76</sup>. Chapter 50 is a mini-treatise on the administration of the Byzantine Empire. This text is written exclusively by the 'Second author'.

Chapter 52 continues the topic of the governmental collection of horses and money which begins in chapter 51. All the sections about the acquisition of horses and money begin with ἰστέον, ὅτι... Besides, it is a typically bureaucratic text like the text of chapter 50. There is no first-person direct speech of Constantine VII. These are vivid features of the work of the 'Second author'.

Some chapters do not contain either the initial ὅτι... or ἰστέον, ὅτι...; these are chapters 14, 16–20, 22–24, 30, 43 and 47–49. Some of them can be attributed to the 'Second author' based on thematic comparisons and by drawing connections to his other chapters. These are chapters 14, 16–20, 22–24.

Chapter 30 *Story of the province of Dalmatia* is rather specific in style and content<sup>77</sup>. The beginning of this text is about the benefit of 'Knowledge' (30.6–7). The source of this passage or its related texts are unknown. It resembles a separate lecture or a mini-treatise, but there are no reasons to consider it a later insert into the text of *De Administrando Imperio*.

The same can be said about chapter 49 *He who enquires how the Slavs were put in servitude and subjection to the church of Patras...* This is a peculiar law mini-treatise with etiological connotations. The titles of chapters 30 and 49 feature words derived from the verb ζητέω ("to seek", "to enquire"). Both these chapters tell the stories about the introduction of taxes and the imposition of obligations on Slavic communities. It is quite likely that chapters 30 and 49 are excerpts from the same source, but this needs further inquiry.

There are no initial ἰστέον, ὅτι... or ὅτι... in chapter 43 *Of the country of Taron*, but this chapter begins with a direct appeal of Constantine VII to his son<sup>78</sup>.

<sup>76</sup> *De Administrando Imperio*, 50, p. 240.

<sup>77</sup> CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS, *De Administrando Imperio...*, vol. II, p. 97–99, 112–113.

<sup>78</sup> *De Administrando Imperio*, 43, p. 188.

The long history of Taron that follows is evidently based on a particular earlier narrative.

With that in mind, the 'First author', who used the initial *ὅτι...*, wrote chapters 1–13, 31, 33–36, 38, and chapter 29 can probably be added to this list. The investigation of these chapters and chapters with both the initial figures of speech show that this 'First author' is Constantine VII himself. The complete first block of chapters 1–13 is marked only by the initial *ὅτι...* There are no instances of the initial *ιστέον, ὅτι...* in these thirteen chapters. The composition and the content of this block is closely connected with *Proem*. The *Proem* is authentically Constantine VII's personal copyright text. Chapter 1 begins with Constantine VII's appeal to his son Romanus II (1.4–24). Chapter 13 contains a similar appeal of Constantine to Romanus II (13.12) and a personal invective addressed at emperor Romanus I Lecapenus who is referred to as "a common, illiterate fellow" (*ὁ ιδιώτης καὶ ἀγράμματος ἄνθρωπος*)<sup>79</sup>. Hence, *Proem* and the initial thirteen chapters were written by Constantine VII himself. It is not necessary to imagine a "dossier" written by an anonymous "ghost-author", and to multiply the number of authors of *De Administrando Imperio*. These chapters seem like personal notes and excerpts coming from Constantine VII himself. The style of personal notes explains the uniform character of each chapter, but the texts are of different sizes, from one line up to one hundred and thirty lines (seen in terms of standard text of critical edition). The average size of a note (excerpt) is from five up to twenty lines.

Emperor Constantine VII could begin to note down such information early in his life. In the 'first' ("A") and the 'second' ("B") redaction of the *Chronicle of Symeon the Logothete and the Magistros* there is an account of how Constantine VII with his own hand wrote a letter to the future emperor Romanus I and personally signed it. This happened not much before March 919. Constantine VII was born in May 905. Hence, he was thirteen years old when he wrote this diplomatic letter<sup>80</sup>. That is the age when Constantine VII could have begun to note down information he deemed important to himself. The information in chapters 1–13 is dated 920–950s which is when Constantine VII had all the opportunities to store the most important political information.

Chapter 29 (except for a short inserted note) and chapters 31–35 contain the initial *ὅτι...* It can be assumed that most of the block of chapters about the Balkan Slavs (chapters 29, 31, 33–36) was compiled by Constantine VII himself, except for the additional chapter 30 about the history of Dalmatia and chapter 32 about the history of the Serbs. Besides, Constantine VII inserted two notes into chapter 32 with the initial *ὅτι...*

<sup>79</sup> *De Administrando Imperio*, 13, p. 66, 72, 74, 76.

<sup>80</sup> *Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae Chronicon*, 135, 24, rec. S. WAHLGREN, Berolini 2006, p. 306.

Chapter 38 *On the genealogy of the nation of Turks...* is the only chapter with the initial ὅτι... in the block of chapters about nomads (37–41). The whole block except for chapter 38 was compiled by the ‘Second author’ using the initial marker ἰστέον, ὅτι... This is a mirror image of the block about the Balkans (chapters 29–36). In both cases one author compiled the main text on a given topic, and the other author added his own chapter or two chapters into the block.

To test the hypothesis which identifies the ‘First author’ with Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, it is necessary to examine his direct speech in the whole text of *De Administrando Imperio*<sup>81</sup>. Such direct utterances of Constantine VII are found in chapters 1 (1.4–24), 13 (13.12–200), 43 (43.2–6), 45 (45.67–175), 46 (46.166–169), 48 (48.23–27), 51 (51.133–191)<sup>82</sup>. These parts of the texts are authentically of Constantine VII’s personal authorship. Only the author of the speech for the benefit of ‘Knowledge’ (ἡ γνώσις) in chapter 30 (30/2–5) is uncertain<sup>83</sup>. These remarks organize all the composition of the treatise and correlate only with the sections with the initial ὅτι... or the sections without special initial words. Not a single remark from Constantine can be found in the section with the initial ἰστέον, ὅτι... Such correlations leave no doubt that the ‘First author’, who used the initial ὅτι..., is emperor Constantine VII. The ‘Second author’, who used the initial ἰστέον, ὅτι..., can be conditionally called an “Anonymous Collaborator”.

My hypothesis is that emperor Constantine VII compiled *Proem* and chapters 1–13, 29, 31, 32.146–151, 33–36, 38, 43.2–6, 44.13–128, 45.67–175, 46.42–169, 48.23–27, 51.46–191; 53.530–535. He personally worked with the blocks of chapters about ‘Northern peoples’, Balkan peoples, the Caucasus, Cyprus and the chapter on Cherson. These regions were the most important ones for the Byzantine (“Roman”) Empire and hence demanded the emperor’s personal attention. There are no grounds to imagine one more proxy-author who could work instead of Constantine VII and write his personal remarks on his behalf.

The “Anonymous Collaborator” compiled chapters 14–28, 29.113–115, 32.1–145, 37, 39–42, 44.1–12, 45.1–66, 46.1–41, 50, 51.1–45, 52, 53.493–529. His task was to handle information about the world of Islam, Italy, Dalmatia, Serbia, nomads of the Eastern Europe, the Caucasus, Cyprus and Slav’s imposts in the Balkan region. He also surveyed the petroleum sources in the addition to the history of Cherson.

Significantly, chapters 30, 43, 47–48, and 53 which remain without any authorial attribution are separate “self-sufficient” mini-treatises or epitomes<sup>84</sup>.

<sup>81</sup> CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS, *De Administrando Imperio...*, vol. II, p. 7–8.

<sup>82</sup> *De Administrando Imperio*, 1, 13, 43, 45, 46, 48, 51, p. 48, 66, 68, 70, 72, 74, 76, 188, 208, 210, 212, 214, 222, 226, 252, 254, 256.

<sup>83</sup> *De Administrando Imperio*, 30, p. 138.

<sup>84</sup> About chapter 30, see: T. ŽIVKOVIĆ, ‘*De Conversione Croatorum et Serborum*’..., p. 30–38, 91–147.

The scheme of the teamwork of Constantine VII and his “Anonymous Collaborator” can be presented in the following table:

**Proem, I – XIII** || *XIV – XXVIII* || **XXIX/1–112** || *113–115* || **116–295** || ?XXX? || **XXXI** || *XXXII/1–145* || **146–151 – XXXVI** || *XXXVII* || **XXXVIII** || *XXXIX – XLII* || **XLIII/2–6** || ?7–188? || *XLIV/1–12* || **13–128** || *XLV/1–66* || **67–175** || *XLVI/1–41* || **42–169** || ?XLVII? || *– XLVIII/1–22?* || **23–27** || *28–32* || ?XLIX? || *L – LI/1–45* || **46–191** || *LII* || ?LIII/1–492? || *493–529* || **530–535**.

The **bold type** indicates Constantine VII's parts of the text; the *italic type* indicates the “Anonymous Collaborator's” parts of the text; the underline and the “??” mark the parts of the text without any convincingly attributable authorship. The numbers of chapters are in Roman numerals, and the numbers of lines are in Arabic numerals.

The “Anonymous Collaborator” (‘Second author’) was not inferior to Constantine VII when it comes to the knowledge of rare manuscripts and documents. They both quoted the *Taktika* by Leo VII Wise and a protographic text of the treatise *De cerimoniis aulae Byzantinae* (“the old book of ceremonies”<sup>85</sup><sup>86</sup>). Both compilers knew well the genealogies of the Macedonian dynasty and the families of their court elite.

It is notable that Constantine VII in his uses of direct speech quoted only the most popular classical texts of ancient authors. At one point he cited *Odysea* (13.28–30) and on another occasion Thucydides (46/168–169). It does not come as a surprise because in the *Proem*, personally compiled by Constantine VII, he used only phrases and paraphrases from the Bible<sup>87</sup>, and there are no quotations from any Classical text. Constantine VII's modest education was emphasized by I. Ševčenko<sup>88</sup>, so it is one more indirect argument supporting my identification.

All other thirteen quotations of ancient authors are found in the blocks of chapters compiled by the “Anonymous Collaborator”<sup>89</sup>. But it is difficult to determine whether he cited them all himself, or whether these quotations are the integral parts of his sources. In chapter 21 the inscription on the Rhodian colossus may be cited by the “Anonymous Collaborator” himself, or may be an integral part of the source of the chapter. Chapter 23 contains twenty quotations from different ancient authors. It is not surprising because it is an antiquarian geographical compilation about Spain with sophisticated grammatical commentaries. This section does not contain any ἱστέον, ὅτι... – probably the “Anonymous Collaborator”

<sup>85</sup> M.A. КУРЫШЕВА, *Рыконисъ Lipsiensis bibl. Urb. Rep. I 17 τριακτάμα «De cerimoniis aulae Byzantinae»*, CB 76, 1/2, 2015, p. 61–63, 65.

<sup>86</sup> *De Administrando Imperio*, I, 27, 30, p. 44, 116, 138, 340.

<sup>87</sup> *De Administrando Imperio*, Proem, p. 44, 46.

<sup>88</sup> I. ŠEVČENKO, *Re-reading...*, p. 168–179.

<sup>89</sup> *De Administrando Imperio*, 21, 23, 24, 41, 42, p. 88, 98, 100, 102, 180, 338–339.

took it as a whole prepared text and inserted it into the block of chapters about Spain. The same can be said about the quotations in chapter 24, also devoted to Spain. Chapters 41 and 42 begin with ἰστέον, ὅτι... Both these chapters are original texts without any exact prototype in Byzantine literature. Chapter 41 is an original narrative about the decline and fall of Great Moravia, based on ancient fables by Aesop, Babrius and Lucius Mestrius Plutarch. Chapter 42 is an itinerary titled Γεωγραφία..., with quotations from Herodotus and Claudius Ptolemy. It is combined with the narrative about the mission of a patrician Petronas Camaterus. Given the absence of precise sources of these chapters, it is natural to suggest that these two texts were compiled by the “Anonymous Collaborator” himself. He wrote the narrative about Moravia and at least connected two parts of the Γεωγραφία..., or even wrote it, too. With that in mind, the “Anonymous Collaborator” seems a well-educated person, and likely an experienced writer.

If we use the formal criterion proposed by J. Signes-Codoñer<sup>90</sup> and fix the scheme of the different headlines of chapters, it becomes evident that the initial formula with Περί... was used by both authors in the headlines of thirty-seven chapters. The initial Ἐκ... was used only by the “Anonymous Collaborator” (headlines of chapters 16, 17, 21, 22, and 25). He also used abnormal headlines, counting “chiefs of Arabs”, in chapters 18, 19, 20. He also used the headlines with the designation of the type of the text (source?) Ἡ γενεαλογία (chapter 26), Διήγησις... (chapter 28), Γεωγραφία... (chapter 42), and Ἡ γενομένη ἀπαίτησις... (chapter 52). It is to be expected because the “Anonymous Collaborator”, but not Constantine VII, had to collect additional archival materials for special topics to add them to the treatise. All other abnormal headlines begin the chapters which remain without confident identification of emperor Constantine VII or his “Anonymous Collaborator”. These are Διήγησις περὶ... (chapter 30), Κεφάλιον... (chapter 48), Ὁ ζητῶν... (chapter 49), and Ἱστορία περὶ... (chapter 53). These archival “documents” may have been inserted into the text by the “Anonymous Collaborator”, or they can be a faint trace of the “Third author”, who can be called an “Anonymous Archivist”.

Also, it is quite logical that the “Anonymous Collaborator” used the entire initial ἰστέον, ὅτι, and emperor Constantine VII could afford to use the shortened vulgar initial ὅτι...

No doubt that my hypothesis about two authors of the treatise *De Administrando Imperio*, Constantine VII himself and an “Anonymous Collaborator”, needs further verification by the examination of style and linguistic peculiarities of different chapters and sections. It is possible that an “Anonymous Collaborator” turns out to be several anonymous persons. At this stage, I see a weak sign of the third author, an “Anonymous Archivist”, who gathered additional documents. My goal is to establish the preliminary scheme of the collaboration of two

<sup>90</sup> J. SIGNES-CODONER, *Los eslavos...*, p. 126–130.



compilers, emperor Constantine VII and his close “Anonymous Collaborator”. Such a scheme of co-working was authentically proclaimed in the title of *Vita Basilii Imperatoris* and can be traced in the text of *De Administrando Imperio*, the two most intimate texts, concerning Constantine VII’s grandfather Basil I Macedonian and Constantine VII’s son Romanus II Porphyrogenitus.

### Conclusions: the basic stages of the text’s history

The text of *De Administrando Imperio* was written after 952 and before the November 959 by emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus himself for his elder son Romanus II Porphyrogenitus. Apparently, it was the father’s gift on the occasion of the marriage of Romanus II and Anastasia-Theophano in the mid of the 950s (about 955?). Constantine VII had an educated “Anonymous Collaborator”. The basis of the treatise’s text was Constantine’s private miscellanea of historical and geographical excerpts. In this way Constantine VII compiled his most significant texts: *De Administrando Imperio* and *Vita Basilii Imperatoris*.

The codex of *De Administrando Imperio* was kept in his library in the emperor’s palace. One of its readers made some notes on the margins. One marginalia can be dated to right after 979. Probably between 1059 and 1073 a scribe Michael Roizaite wrote a copy of this codex – manuscript *Paris. gr. 2009* for the Caesar John Ducas. Caesar John Ducas apparently used this copy as a handbook for the education of future emperors Michael VII and Constantine X, whom he taught together with Michael Psellos.

### Bibliography

#### Primary Sources

- ANNAE COMNENAE, *Alexias*, pars 1, *Prolegomena et Textus*, rec. D.R. REINSCH, A. KAMBYLIS, Berolini 2001 [= *Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae*, 40.1].
- Chronographiae quae Theophanis Continuati nomine fertur. Liber V. Vita Basilii Imperatoris Amplectitur*, rec. I. ŠEVČENKO, Berlin 2001 [= *Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae. Series Berolinensis*, 42].
- Chronographiae quae Theophanis Continuati nomine fertur. Libri I–IV*, rec. M. FEATHERSTONE, J.S. CODOÑER, Berlin 2015 [= *Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae. Series Berolinensis*, 43].
- CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS, *De Administrando Imperio*, vol. I, *Greek Text and English Translation*, ed. R.G.H. JENKINS, G. MORAVCSIK, Washington 1967 [= *Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae*, 1].
- CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS, *De Administrando Imperio*, vol. II, *Commentary*, ed. R.G.H. JENKINS, Washington 1962.
- CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENNETOS, *The Book of Ceremonies*, vol. I.1, trans. A. MOFFART, M. TALL, Canberra 2012 [= *Byzantina Australiensia*, 18.1].

- Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis historiarum*, rec. I. THURN, Berolini 1973 [= *Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae*, 5].
- JOHN SKYLITZES, *A Synopsis of Byzantine History, 811–1057*, trans. J. WORTLEY, praef. et ed. J.-C. CHEYNET, Cambridge 2010.
- KOUROPOU M., VANNIER J.-F., *Commémoraisons des Commènes dans le typikon liturgique du monastère du Christ Philanthrope (ms. Panaghia Kamariotissa 29)*, “Revue des études byzantines” 63, 2005, p. 41–69.
- LEFORT J., *Histoire du monastère d’Ivroux des origines jusqu’au milieu du XI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, [in:] *Actes d’Ivroux*, vol. I, Paris 1985, p. 3–97.
- Michaelis Pselli *Historia Syntomos*. Editio Princeps, ed. et comm. W.J. AERTS, Berlin–New York 1990 [= *Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae*, 30].
- MICHEL PSELLOS, *Chronographie ou Histoire d’un siècle de Byzance (976–1077)*, vol. II, ed. et trans. É. RENAULD, Paris 1928.
- NICETAS DAVID, *The Life of Patriarch Ignatius*, ed. et trans. A. SMITHES, ed. J.M. DUFFY, Washington 2013 [= *Dumbarton Oaks Studies*, 51].
- ODORICO P., *Il Calamo d’argento. Un carme inedito in onore di Romano II. Con una tavola*, “Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik” 37, 1987, p. 65–93.
- SULLIVAN D., *The Rise and Fall of Nikephoros II Phokas. Five Contemporary Texts in Annotated Translations*, Leiden–Boston 2018.
- Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae Chronicon*, rec. S. WAHLGREN, Berolini 2006.
- Theodori Metropolitae Cyzici Epistulae. Accendunt Epistulae Mutuae Constantini Porphyrogeniti*, rec. M. TZIATZI-PAPAGIANNI, Berlin–Boston 2012 [= *Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae*, 48].

## Secondary Literature

- ANDRIOLLO L., *Les Kourkouas (IX<sup>e</sup>–XI<sup>e</sup> siècle)*, “Studies in Byzantine Sigillography” 11, 2012, p. 57–88.
- BLASS F., DEBRUNNER A., *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, trans. et ed. R.W. FUNK, Cambridge 1961.
- BURY J.B., *The Treatise De administrando imperio*, “Byzantinische Zeitschrift” 15, 1906, p. 517–577.
- CHARANIS P., *Studies on the Demography of the Byzantine Empire*, London 1972.
- GARLAND L., *Byzantine Empresses. Woman and Power in Byzantium, AD 527–1204*, London–New York 1999.
- GAUL N., *Zooming in on Constantinople. Introductory Notes on the Interplay of Center, Province and Periphery in the Tenth-Century Byzantine Empire*, [in:] *Center, Province and Periphery in the Age of Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos. From ‘De ceremoniis’ to ‘De Administrando Imperio’*, ed. N. GAUL, V. MENZE, C. BÁLINT, Wiesbaden 2018, p. 1–21.
- GAUTIER P., *Quelques lettres de Psellos inédites ou déjà éditées*, “Revue des études byzantines” 44, 1986, p. 111–197.
- GRUMEL V., *La Chronologie*, Paris 1958.
- HOWARD-JOHNSTON J., *Byzantine Sources for Khazar History*, [in:] *The World of the Khazars: New Perspectives. Selected Papers from the Jerusalem 1999 International Khazar Colloquium*, ed. B. GOLDEN, H. BEN-SHAMMAI, A. RÓNA-TAS, Leiden–Boston 2007, p. 163–194.
- HOWARD-JOHNSTON J., *The De Administrando Imperio: A Re-examination of the Text and a Re-evaluation of its Evidence about the Rus*, [in:] *Les centres proto-urbains russes entre Scandinavie,*

- Byzance et Orient, ed. M. KAZANSKI, A. NERCESSIAN, C. ZUCKERMAN, Paris 2000 [= *Réalités Byzantines*, 7], p. 301–336.
- JENKINS R.J.H., *General Introduction*, [in:] CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS, *De Administrando Imperio*, vol. I, *Greek Text and English Translation*, ed. R.G.H. JENKINS, G. MORAVCSIK, Washington 1967 [= *Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae*, 1], p. 7–14.
- KALDELLIS A., *Romanland. Ethnicity and Empire in Byzantium*, Cambridge Mass.–London 2019.
- KAZHDAN A., *Theophano*, [in:] *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. III, ed. A.P. KAZHDAN, Oxford 1991, p. 2064–2065.
- KURYŠEVA M.A., *Rukopis' Lipsiensis bibl. Urb. Rep. I 17 traktata «De cerimoniis aulae Byzantinae»*, “Средние века” / “Srednie veka” 76, 1/2, 2015, p. 41–80.
- LITAVRIN G.G., *Predislovie*, [in:] *Konstantin Bagrjanorodnyj. Ob upravlenii imperiej. Tekst, perevod, kommentarij*, ed. G.G. LITAVRIN, A.P. NOVOSEL'CEV, Moskva 1991, p. 10–30.
- MAGDALINO P., *Constantine VII and the Historical Geography of Empire*, [in:] *Imperial Geographies in Byzantine and Ottoman Space*, ed. S. BAZZAR, Y. BATSAKI, D. ANGELOV, Cambridge Mass.–London 2013 [= *Hellenic Studies*, 56], p. 23–42.
- MARKOPOULOS A., *Voices from the Centre. Constantine VII and the Macedonian Dynasty in Contemporary Historiography*, [in:] *Center, Province and Periphery in the Age of Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos. From 'De ceremoniis' to 'De Adnistrando Imperio'*, ed. N. GAUL, V. MENZE, C. BÁLINT, Wiesbaden 2018, p. 22–33.
- MARROCCHI M., *Lotario II, re d'Italia*, [in:] *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. LXVI, (Lorenzetto–Macchetti), ed. M. CARVALE, Roma 2006, p. 177–179.
- MONDRAIN B., *La lecture du De administrando imperio à Byzance au cours des siècles*, “Travaux et mémoires du Centre de recherches d'histoire et civilisation byzantines” 14, 2002 (= *Mélanges en l'honneur de G. Dagron*), p. 485–498.
- MORAVCSIK G., *Byzantinoturcica*, vol. I, *Die Byzantinischen Quellen der Geschichte Türkvölker*, Berlin 1983.
- MORAVCSIK G., *Ē cheirografos paradosis tou 'De administrando imperio'*, “Ἐπετηρίς Ἐταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν” / “Epetêris Etaireias Buzantinôn Spoudōn” 7, 1930, p. 138–152.
- MORAVCSIK G., *Critical Introduction*, [in:] CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS, *De Administrando Imperio*, vol. I, *Greek Text and English Translation*, ed. R.G.H. JENKINS, G. MORAVCSIK, Washington 1967 [= *Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae*, 1], p. 15–39.
- NÉMETH A., *The 'Excerpta Constantiniana' and the Byzantine Appropriation of the Past*, Cambridge 2018.
- POLEMIS D.I., *The Doukai. A Contribution to Byzantine Prosopography*, London 1968.
- POLEMIS D.I., *Notes on Eleventh-Century Chronology (1059–1081)*, “Byzantinische Zeitschrift” 58, 1965, p. 60–76.
- PRINZING G., *Observations on the Legal Status of Children and the Stages of Childhood in Byzantium*, [in:] *Becoming Byzantine. Children and Childhood in Byzantium*, ed. A. PAPAConstantinou, A.-M. TALBOT, Harvard 2009, p. 15–34.
- ŠČAVELEV A.S., *Traktat vizantijskogo imperatora Konstantina VII Bagrjanorodnogo «Ob upravlenii imperiej»: o datirovkach originala rukopisi i ego kopii XI v. pisca Michaila Roizaita (Paris. gr. 2009)*, [in:] *Paleografija, kodikologija, diplomatika: Sovremennyyj opyt issledovanija grečeskich, latinskich i slavjanskich rukopisej i dokumentov. Materialy Meždunarodnoj naučnoj konferencii v čes' 80-letija doktora istoričeskich nauk, člena-korrespondenta Afinskoj Akademii B.L. Fonkiča*. Moskva, 27–28 fevralja 2018 g., ed. I.G. KONOVALOVA, M.A. KURYŠEVA, Moskva 2018, p. 296–310.

- SEIBT W., *Die byzantinischen Bleisiegel in Österreich*, vol. I, *Kaiserhof*, Wien 1978.
- ŠEVČENKO I., *Re-reading Constantine Porphyrogenitus*, [in:] *Byzantine Diplomacy*, ed. J. SHEPARD, S. FRANKLIN, London 1992, p. 167–195.
- ŠEVČENKO I., *The Title of and Preface to 'Theophanes Continuatus'*, “Bollettino della Badia greca di Grottaferrata” n.s. 52, 1998 (= Ὁπώρα. *Studi in onore de mgr P. Canart per il LXX compleanno*, ed. S. LUCA, L. PERRIA), p. 77–93.
- SIGNES-CODOÑER J., *Los esclavos en las fuentes bizantinas de los siglos IX–X: el 'De administrando imperio' de Constantino Porfirogéneto*, “Ilu. Revista de Ciencias de las Religiones” 13, 2004, p. 115–131.
- SODE C., *Untersuchungen zu De administrando imperio Kaiser Konstantins VII. Porphyrogenetos*, [in:] *Varia V*, Bonn 1994 [= Ποικίλα Βυζαντινά, 13], p. 149–260.
- TOCHTAS'EV S.R., *Język traktata Konstantina VII Bagrjanorodnogo 'De adminstrando Imperio' i ego inojazyčnaja leksika*, Sankt-Peterburg 2018.
- TREADGOLD W., *The Middle Byzantine Historians*, London–New York 2013.
- ŽIVKOVIĆ T., *'De Conversione Croatorum et Serborum'. A Lost Source*, Belgrade 2012.

**Abstract.** The article proposes a new version of the history of the famous Byzantine political treatise *De Administrando Imperio*. The text of this treatise was written after 952 and before November 959 personally by Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus for his eldest son Romanus II. The emperor worked in tandem with an “Anonymous Collaborator”. The text of the treatise was based on the private notes and excerpts of emperor Constantine VII and various other historical and geographical data. Such a scheme of cooperation of Constantine VII himself and a second “Anonymous Collaborator” was described in the title of *Vita Basilii Imperatoris*. The same mode of compiling was mentioned in Constantine VII's private letter to Theodoros the archbishop of Cyzicus. The original codex of the treatise was kept in the emperor's palatial library, where one of the readers made a few marginalia on its pages; one of them is dated to after 979. Between 1059 and 1073 a scribe Michael Roizaite made a copy of this text for Caesar John Ducas. Apparently, John Ducas needed it as a handbook for future emperors Michael VII and Constantine X, whom he taught together with Michael Psellos.

**Keywords:** *De Administrando Imperio*, Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, emperor's palatial library, manuscript Paris. gr. 2009, scribe Michael Roizaite, caesar John Ducas.

**Aleksei S. Shchavelev**

Russian Academy of Sciences

Institute of World History

Department of “History of Byzantium and Eastern Europe”

Moscow, Leninskij Prospekt, 32a, 1119415

Russian Federation

alexissorel@gmail.com