

1-2001

***Studies on the Internal Diaspora of the Byzantine Empire* (Review)**

Martin Arbagi

Wright State University - Main Campus, martin.arbagi@wright.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/history>



Part of the [History Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Arbagi, M. (2001). *Studies on the Internal Diaspora of the Byzantine Empire* (Review). *Speculum: A Journal of Medieval Studies*, 76 (1), 130-132.

<https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/history/11>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the History at CORE Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in History Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of CORE Scholar. For more information, please contact library-corescholar@wright.edu.

Secondly, Ælfric was a self-conscious author whose interventions in his own text, his restlessness with how he presented things, and his tendency to revise and supplement demonstrate his authorial imagination. For Ælfric composition was a process, not an event, and so interpreters of Ælfric's text ought always to look for changes, additions, and other readings in the manuscripts.

Clemons sets forth his editorial procedure in a succinct four pages. For the beginning student particularly, as classroom use has already made clear, and for the nonspecialist there is likely to be some difficulty in coming to terms with the system of punctuation. Clemons follows manuscript punctuation, not modern punctuation as the one-time reader or user might wish, and he assumes that the reader will know the scholarship on Old English punctuation, for he does not mention or describe his own contributions to the subject or those of Claude Barlow or Bruce Mitchell, among others. There will apparently be no explanatory treatment of punctuation in the third volume of the Ælfric project. This choice to follow manuscript punctuation is in line with one aspect of the noninterventionist theme prevalent in the discussions of Old English editing. The text then is closer to the author, here a most recognizable presence, but the present-day reader is farther away.

The many interventions in the text of A manifestly create all sorts of presentational problems for the apparatus, as Godden's note implies, and the reader-user had best read the section in the editorial procedure on variants with care. Appendix C with its list of variant readings in late manuscripts is helpful. Short of a direct reading of the manuscript, those interested in the many interventions in A should consult the EEMF facsimile. Spot checks suggest only a few minor problems. In appendix A, passage 1 (Homily 12), the reading should be *ydelnesse*, not *-nysse*, and the header for passage 2 (Homily 38) must want to say "see p. 519 l. 351 above"; on page 105 an unnecessary "on" has crept into the first line of the description of the gamma version.

At long last, then, Anglo-Saxon studies has an authoritative edition of *The First Series*, which, joining Godden's edition of *The Second Series* and the soon-to-appear volume of commentary, will assist the understanding of a major work by arguably the major vernacular prose writer of the period. Pope's *Supplementary Series* will at last welcome all its mates.

PAUL E. SZARMACH, Western Michigan University

HÉLÈNE AHRWEILER and ANGELIKI E. LAIOU, eds., *Studies on the Internal Diaspora of the Byzantine Empire*. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1998. Pp. ix, 205; maps and tables. \$30. Distributed by Harvard University Press, 79 Garden St., Cambridge, MA 02138.

For millennia empires have systematically practiced forced transfers of populations from one region to another within their borders. The most familiar examples are biblical: the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel, uprooted by the Assyrians, and the Babylonian Captivity of the Judaeans. At other times, members of a group in search of better opportunities have voluntarily left their homeland for different regions under the same government. Whether the resettlement is voluntary or involuntary, such movements are called "internal diasporas." The peoples affected may retain their cohesiveness (as did the Judaeans), or they may be assimilated into the surrounding culture and lose their identities (which is probably what happened to the Lost Tribes).

Studies on the Internal Diaspora of the Byzantine Empire is a collection of articles, some traditional, others using new methodologies, presented originally at a Dumbarton Oaks symposium in 1993, though not published until 1998. The collection begins with an introduction by Hélène Ahrweiler, "Byzantine Concepts of the Foreigner." Ahrweiler emphasizes attitudes toward nomads. Presumably this is on the theory that before we can study

the internal “other” we must know what Byzantines thought of the external alien, but I was left thinking that the connection of Ahrweiler’s prefatory essay with the book’s theme is tenuous.

The first main article is by Michael McCormick, “The Imperial Edge: Italo-Byzantine Identity, Movement, and Integration, A.D. 650–950.” McCormick makes use of two new and radically different methodologies. Noting that “Byzantine” identity can be socially constructed, he points out how Italo-Byzantines could readily be distinguished from other Italians by such things as personal names and the way they cut their hair. Changes both of name and of hair style often followed changes in political affiliation. But group identity is also frequently grounded in things beyond the reach of language, custom, or other social constructs. McCormick shows how the frequency of beta-thalassemia (a form of sickle-cell anemia) in modern Italy corresponds with regions occupied by Byzantium in the early Middle Ages. As the recent excitement over Thomas Jefferson’s descendants has shown, blood types, inherited diseases, and other genetic data can yield valuable clues to ancestry.

The second major article, by Nina Garsoïan, “The Problem of Armenian Integration into the Byzantine Empire,” is more traditional. She does not intend to break new ground, instead presenting a summary of what scholarship has established and the problems that remain to be resolved. In the former category Garsoïan concludes that the Armenians were the largest non-Greek minority throughout the history of the Byzantine Empire; they were present in most provinces, including Byzantine Italy; their presence in Constantinople, though reasonably certain, is not as well documented as for the provinces; Armenians were integrated into imperial society mostly through the military; and the major source of friction was religious differences between the Armenians and the Chalcedonian majority of the empire.

Beyond those five points, the consensus breaks down. Garsoïan observes that there could be at times divergences between the Armenian policies of church and state. In general, the state’s attitude toward the Armenians was “generally less uniform than that of the church, [and] oscillated between the tolerance required to accommodate the multicultural nature of the empire and attempts to impose dogmatic homogeneity” (p. 84). Like McCormick, Garsoïan traces how some Armenians attempted to assimilate, while others preserved their identity through such things as religion, nomenclature, language, and dress. She concludes that the Armenians became increasingly unassimilable after 1100, with a brief exception under Manuel I (1158–80).

McCormick’s and Garsoïan’s articles, which take up most of the book, are followed by three shorter essays.

Stephen Reinert’s article, “The Muslim Presence in Constantinople, 9th–15th Centuries: Some Preliminary Observations,” suffers from two problems. The article deals largely with Muslim merchants from outside the imperial borders—Arabs, Persians, Turks—and prisoners of war; this strains the definition of *internal* diaspora. The second problem is the lack of evidence. We know almost nothing of Muslims in most of the empire, though the Muslim community in Constantinople is slightly better documented.

A large number of these Muslims, especially in the ninth and tenth centuries, were prisoners of war. Such prisoners were usually well treated and permitted to observe their faith, including dietary restrictions. A mosque was provided for them in Constantinople. In a rare glimpse of Muslim life outside the capital, Reinert cites evidence for mosques in provincial internment camps as well.

The evidence for the other large group of Muslims—merchants—is equally scanty. *The Book of the Eparch* tells us that there were “Syrian” merchants in Constantinople in the tenth century, many of them long-term residents. Reinert concedes that some may have been Arab Christians, but “it is just as plausible that many were Muslims” (p. 133). Other than the business regulations that affected such merchants and that they had a mosque,

almost nothing is known about them. The mosque was closed by Basil II but reopened under Constantine VIII. Was it the same one provided for Muslim prisoners of war? Reinert does not—perhaps because of the lack of data cannot—tell us. A treaty with Saladin in the late 1180s provided for a second mosque in Constantinople. The mosque may (or may not) have been in a neighborhood of Muslim traders that was destroyed by Italians in 1203, just before Constantinople itself was sacked by the Fourth Crusade. There is no “secure evidence” of Muslim inhabitants in Constantinople during the Latin occupation. After his reconquest of the capital, Michael Palaeologus restored the Muslim quarter and at least one mosque. Patriarch Athanasius wrote a famous letter to Emperor Andronicus II between 1304 and 1309 demanding that all Muslims be expelled from Constantinople or at least that the muezzins in the mosque be silenced. Andronicus ignored the letter. Reinert concludes by reconstructing a vague incident during the reign of Manuel II, in which the Ottoman sultan Bayezid demanded the installation of a Turkish neighborhood, with a *kadi* (Muslim judge), and mosque. John VII, ruling in Manuel’s absence, complied, but Manuel leveled the new Turkish quarter on returning from his visit to western Europe in 1403. Again the episode concerns Turkish merchants rather than an internal diaspora.

Mark Bartusis, “The Settlement of Serbs in Macedonia in the Era of Dusan’s Conquests,” notes that the Serbs were probably the people most easily assimilated into the Byzantine Empire. “Unlike almost all other peoples the Byzantines encountered, they already had the ‘correct’ religion, and the correct form of that religion” (p. 159). Serbs looked up to Byzantine culture and readily adapted Byzantine clothing, names, and even the Greek language. As with Reinert’s article, Bartusis’s suffers from scanty documentation, but it at least deals with a truly internal diaspora.

Angeliki Laiou’s concluding article, “Institutional Mechanisms of Integration,” is the best of the three shorter ones. Laiou finds that in theory Byzantine (Roman) law applied to all imperial subjects. In practice, we have many examples of officials bending the law to accommodate ethnic groups whose customs differed from the imperial codes. Precisely because of this flexibility, law acted as a powerful integrating mechanism. Laiou’s evidence ranges from the fourth to the fourteenth centuries, though the emphasis is on the later period.

In an uneven collection, the articles by McCormick, Garsoïan, and Laiou are of enduring value.

MARTIN ARBAGI, Wright State University

JAUME AURELL I CARDONA, *Els mercaders catalans al quatre-cents: Mutació de valors i procés d'aristocratització a Barcelona (1370–1470)*. (Col·lecció Seminari, Sèrie Catalònia, 5.) Lleida: Pagès, 1996. Pp. 428; 15 tables, 14 graphs, and 4 plans.

One of the problems vexing historians of Catalunya has been how to account for the region’s decline during the fifteenth and subsequent centuries. After the civil war of 1462–72, which pitted Catalan nobles and the city of Barcelona against the king, the region’s influence was notably less than it had been in earlier centuries. There is little agreement, however, on whether the civil war caused the decline, was symptomatic of long-term weakness, or merely coincidental. Former generations of political historians attributed Catalunya’s troubles to the establishment of a branch of the Castilian Trastámara dynasty on the throne of Aragon in 1412. Most historians now follow Jaume Vicens Vives and Pierre Vilar, who argued in the 1950s for general, secular changes in the region’s economy following the recurrent outbreaks of plague after the Black Death of 1348. Less widely accepted is the revisionist thesis presented in the late 1960s by Claude Carrère and Mario del Treppo: admitting that there were bank failures, depopulation, and an economic down-