

ΣΥΝΕΔΡΙΑ ΤΗΣ 24ΗΣ ΟΚΤΩΒΡΙΟΥ 1974

ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ ΔΙΟΝ. Α. ΖΑΚΥΘΗΝΟΥ

---

ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑ.— **Byzantium and Greece**, ὑπὸ *Sir Steven Runciman* \*.

Ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς δημοσίας συνεδρίας, ὁ πρόεδρος \* Διον. Ζακυθηνὸς λαβὼν τὸν λόγον εἶπε τὰ ἑξῆς :

Κύριοι Συνάδελφοι,

Ἔχω τὴν τιμὴν καὶ τὴν εὐχαρίστησιν νὰ σᾶς παρουσιάσω ἀπόψε τὸν *Sir Steven Runciman*, ἀντεπιστέλλον μέλος τῆς Ἀκαδημίας, ὁ ὁποῖος θὰ προβῇ εἰς ἀνακοίνωσιν μὲ θέμα : «Βυζάντιον καὶ Ἑλλάς». Ἐπὶ τῇ εὐκαιρίᾳ ταύτῃ θὰ ἔχω τὴν χαρὰν νὰ ἐπιδώσω ἰδιωχείως εἰς τὸν διαπρεπῆ συνάδελφον τὸ δίπλωμα τοῦ μέλους, ἀφοῦ δι' ὀλίγων ἑξάρω τοὺς κυρίους σταθμοὺς τοῦ ἔργου καὶ τὰ ἐπισημονικὰ ἐπιτεύγματα αὐτοῦ.

Ὁ *James Cochran Stevenson Runciman*, υἱὸς τοῦ ὑποκόμητος *Runciman*, ἐγεννήθη τὴν 7ην Ἰουλίου 1903 ἐν *Northumberland*. Ἐσπούδασεν εἰς τὸ *Eton* καὶ τὸ *Trinity College* τοῦ *Cambridge*, τοῦ ὁποῖου ὑπῆρξεν ἐταῖρος ἀπὸ τοῦ 1927 μέχρι τοῦ 1938 καὶ ἐπίτιμος ἐταῖρος ἀπὸ τοῦ 1965. Κατέλαβε διαφόρους διπλωματικὰς καὶ ἀκαδημαϊκὰς θέσεις : Ὑφηγητὴς εἰς τὸ Πανεπιστήμιον τοῦ *Cambridge* (1931 - 1938), ἀκόλουθος Τύπου τῆς ἐν Σόφια Βρετανικῆς Πρεσβείας (1940 - 1941), Καθηγητὴς τῶν Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν εἰς τὸ Πανεπιστήμιον τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως (1942 - 1945), ἀντιπρόσωπος τοῦ Βρετανικοῦ Συμβουλίου ἐν Ἑλλάδι (1945-1947), Πρόεδρος τοῦ ἐν Ἀγκύρᾳ Βρετανικοῦ Ἀρχαιολογικοῦ Ἰνστιτούτου (ἀπὸ τοῦ 1962), μέλος τῆς Βρετανικῆς Ἀκαδημίας (ἀπὸ τοῦ 1957). Εἶναι ἐπίτιμος διδάκτωρ τῶν Πανεπιστημίων τοῦ

---

\* *SIR STEVEN RUNCIMAN*, Βυζάντιον καὶ Ἑλλάς.

Cambridge, τοῦ Σικάγου, τοῦ Durham, τοῦ Λονδίνου, τοῦ St. Andrews, τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης κλπ. Ἀπὸ τοῦ 1951 μέχρι τοῦ 1967 διετέλεσε Πρόεδρος τοῦ ἐν Ἀγγλίᾳ Ἀγγλοελληνικοῦ Συνδέσμου. Ἀντεπιστέλλον μέλος τῆς Ἀκαδημίας Ἀθηνῶν ἐξελέγη τὴν 26ην Ὀκτωβρίου 1972 καὶ διορίσθη τὴν 9ην τοῦ παρελθόντος Ἰανουαρίου.

Ὁ Steven Runciman εἶναι ὀλιγώτερον διδάσκαλος καὶ περισσότερον συγγραφεύς. Τὸ πρῶτον του βιβλίον *The Emperor Romanus Lecapenus and his Reign. A Study of Tenth-Century Byzantium* ἐξεδόθη ἐν Cambridge τῷ 1929 (ἀνατύπωσις, 1963), ἠκολούθησε δὲ τὸ ἔργον *A History of the First Bulgarian Empire*, ἐν Λονδίῳ, 1930. Τῷ 1933 ἐξέδωκε τὸ γενικωτέρου ἐνδιαφέροντος βιβλίον *Byzantine Civilization*, τὸ ὁποῖον μετεφράσθη καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν. Εἰς τὴν δυτίζουσαν αἵρεσιν τῶν Μανιχαίων, Παυλικιανῶν καὶ Βογομίλων ὁ Runciman ἀφιέρωσε τὴν μελέτην *The Medieval Manichee. A Study of the Christian Dualist Heresy* (ἐν Cambridge, 1947).

Προῖον μακρῶν ἐρευνῶν καὶ ὁρίμου ἱστορικοῦ στοχασμοῦ εἶναι ἡ τρίτομος *History of the Crusades* (ἐν Cambridge, 1951, 1952, 1954), θεμελιῶδες σύγγραμμα συντεταγμένον ἐπὶ τῇ βάσει τῶν πηγῶν. Εἰς τὸ δοκίμιον *The Sicilian Vespers. A History of the Mediterranean World in the Later Thirteenth Century* (ἐν Cambridge, 1958) ὁ Runciman ἀφηγεῖται μετ' ἐναργείας τὰς τραγικὰς περιστάσεις τοῦ Σικελικοῦ Ἑσπερινοῦ καὶ ἐπισκοπεῖ τὰ προβλήματα τοῦ Μεσογειακοῦ χώρου κατὰ τὸ τελευταῖον τέταρτον τοῦ δεκάτου τρίτου αἰῶνος. Τὸ βιβλίον *The Eastern Schism. A Study of the Papacy and the Eastern Church During the XI<sup>th</sup> and XII<sup>th</sup> Centuries* (ἐν Ὁξφόρδῃ, 1955) ἀποτελεῖ γνηθάλιον καὶ διαυγῆ ἀναθεώρησιν τοῦ Σχίσματος τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν καὶ τῆς ἀντιθέσεως τῆς Χριστιανικῆς Ἀνατολῆς καὶ τῆς Χριστιανικῆς Δύσεως.

Τὰ τελευταῖα τρία βιβλία τοῦ Runciman ἀναφέρονται εἰς θέματα, τὰ ὁποῖα ἰδιαίτερος συγκινοῦν τὸν Ἕλληνα ἀναγνώστην: *The Fall of Constantinople* (Cambridge, 1965 — Γαλλικὴ μετάφρασις, ἐν Παρισίοις, 1968), *The Great Church in Captivity. A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the Eve of the Turkish Conquest to the Greek War of Independence* (ἐν Cambridge, 1968) καὶ *The Last Byzantine Renaissance* (ἐν Cambridge, 1970). Εἰς τὸ περὶ τῆς Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας ἔργον του ὁ συγγραφεύς ἀναδεικνύεται οὐ μόνον ἄριστος γνώστης τῶν Βυζαντινῶν πραγμάτων, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐρευνητὴς ὀξὺς τῶν Μετὰ τὴν Ἄλωσιν, δυνάμενος νὰ συλλάβῃ τὸ βαθύτερον νόημα τῆς Ἱστορίας τῶν Ἑλλήνων κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους τῆς Τουρκοκρατίας. Σπανίως ξένοι

ιστορικοί, γράφοντες περί τῆς Νεωτέρας Ἑλλάδος, κατώρθωσαν νὰ μεταδώσουν εἰκόνα συνολικὴν τοιαύτης πληρότητος.

Κληρονόμος τῆς μεγάλης Βρετανικῆς Σχολῆς, ἡ ὁποία γεννᾶται ἀπὸ τοῦ Γίββωνος καὶ προάγεται διὰ τοῦ Finlay, τοῦ Bury καὶ τοῦ Baynes, ὁ Runciman ἐπετέλεσεν ἐπὶ τεσσαράκοντα καὶ πέντε ἔτη ἔργον ἐπιβλητικόν. Ἐκκινῶν πάντοτε ἀπὸ τὴν ἀμορφον ὕλην τῶν πηγῶν, ἔχων ὑπ' ὄψιν τὸν ὄγκον τῆς βιβλιογραφίας, κατώρθωσε νὰ συνδυάσῃ εἰς τὰ δημοσιεύματά του τὴν αὐστηρότητα τῆς ἱστορικῆς μεθόδου μετὰ τῆς λιτῆς χάριτος τοῦ λόγου, τῆς ἐναργείας τῶν ἀφηγήσεων καὶ τῆς λεπτότητος τοῦ στοχασμοῦ.

Mr. President, Fellow Academicians,

It is a very great honour that you have done to me today ; and I am touched and flattered by the kind words that you, Mr. President, have spoken. I would have liked to have been able to prepare an address more worthy of the great traditions of this Academy. But I have not had the time for that. So I hope that you will accept these rather impromptu remarks on a subject that is of concern to all of us who are engaged in Byzantine studies.

I have often been asked, even in Greece, how Greek I believe the Byzantines to have been ; and I have recently heard lectures and seen articles in which it has been maintained that the Byzantines had very little to do with Ancient Greece. They spoke a decadent Greek language, and they had a superficial knowledge of some parts of ancient Greek literature but racially, culturally and temperamentally they were entirely different from the Greeks of the Classical era.

Clear thinking is needed. First, what is race ? There is no such thing as complete purity of race. Every nation in the world is of mixed blood ; and, the longer that the nation has been civilized, the greater is the mixture, as immigrants have been coming in down the centuries to share in the civilization, individually or in hordes. The Ancient Greeks had Pelasgian, Ionian and Dorian strains, which were different from each other ; and certainly in Byzantine times the mixture was enormous, though this does not mean that any single element, Greek or other, was eliminated. Even modern dictators have never succeeded in achieving complete genocide. Language is a better criterion, but it is not entirely satisfactory. In Switzerland, for instance, some of the population speak German,

some French, some Italian, but they are all Swiss ; they are not Germans, Frenchmen and Italians settled in Switzerland. Even the Americans speak English of a sort, but they are not English. All in same, language is of importance. It is the fundamental means of self-expression. It dictates the process of thought and is at the same time affected by the process of thought. There is a tendency for people who speak the same language to regard themselves as being of the same community, especially if they share the same literary heritage, as well as the same folklore and traditions. But, in the final analysis, we are what we feel ourselves to be. If I may speak personally, I consider myself to be Scottish. I was born and educated in England, as were my parents. But my blood is purely Scottish, which means a mixture of Celtic, Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian ; and as a family we always thought of ourselves as Scots. So we are Scots.

The question therefore is: what did the Byzantines consider themselves to be? If you had asked a Byzantine his nationality, at least up till the thirteenth century, he would probably have answered, if he understood the question at all, that he was Roman, - Ῥωμαῖος, because he would have answered in Greek. This did not mean that he was a citizen of the old Latin city by the Tiber. He was a Roman in the sense that St. Paul used when he claimed to be a Roman citizen. The Empire was the Roman Empire, constitutionally and legally ; and Constantinople was New Rome. The Emperor who resided there saw himself as the lawful heir not only of Constantine but also of Augustus Caesar. Every Byzantine was all the more anxious to emphasise that he was Roman when upstart Emperors appeared in the West with no legal right to the title. Alternatively, he might have answered that he was a Christian : which to him meant the same thing. For the Empire was now the Christian Emperor, the Oecumene of all true Christians, and its Emperor was the viceroy of God on earth. The one thing that he would not have called himself was Greek, neither Ἕλλην nor Γραικός. The latter word seems to have had a derogatory implication. It was only used by Westerners, and usually with either hostility or contempt. For this we can chiefly blame Virgil, the one Classical poet to be consistently admired in the West throughout the Middle Ages, who had proclaimed the Greeks to be treacherous and hostile. When the Western ambassador

Liudprand of Cremona arrived at the Court of Nicephorus Phocas with letters addressed to the Emperor Graecorum, he was rightly not received. Indeed, I am always regretful that we in the West still use the word Greek instead of the more correct and harmonious word Hellenē.

Hellenē was, however, unacceptable to the Byzantines for many centuries to come, as it had acquired the meaning of pagan. By the fifth century after Christ the Hellenē was the citizen of the Empire in the East who had not accepted Christianity. One might therefore suppose that the Byzantine considered himself to be in no way Greek. But there was the matter of language. From the middle of the sixth century onwards the whole administration and life of the Empire was conducted in Greek. Every citizen of the Empire was conscious that he spoke the Hellenic tongue, and he was prepared to make use of the word Hellenē in this context. As Anna Comnena tells us, it was an essential part of a child's education that he should be taught to 'hellenise his tongue', that is to say, to learn to speak and write Greek correctly. Anyone who failed to speak good Greek was an object of ridicule, like the tenth-century Patrician Nicetas who never lost his Slav accent, or the thirteenth-century Constantine Margarites whose speech was so common that you would have thought him, Acropolita tells us, to have been brought up on barley and bran. Having studied his grammar and syntax a child had next to start reading the Greek Classics, Homer first and foremost, but a wide range of other works. It is sometimes maintained that the Byzantines did not really know the Classics but contented themselves with digests and compendia; and their quotations from the Classics are full of verbal inaccuracies. This contention is hardly borne out by the evidence. It is true that quotations are often inaccurate. But the idea that complete accuracy is needed is of a comparatively modern date. It was enough to give the sense of the passage. It is true that the Byzantines liked digests and encyclopaedias. But so do many people today. We are none of us ashamed of consulting, for example, a dictionary of quotations. And you cannot have digests made unless someone has thoroughly studied the original works. Moreover, the surviving number of manuscripts of Classical works made in Byzantine times shows that there must have been a demand for them then. There is abundant evidence

that Homer was intimately known. There were scholars, such as Psellus, who could recite the whole *Iliad* by heart. Anna Comnena introduced sixty-six quotations or allusions from Homer in her *Alexiad*, and seldom bothered to add 'as Homer says'. That was quite unnecessary.

The Byzantines were therefore well aware that their literary heritage came from Ancient Greece. So too did their scientific heritage. Not only did they study the Greek philosophers, though the Church considered that Plato was dangerous because his doctrines were so persuasive, but they were also well aware of the works of the great scientists such as Archimedes and Euclid, Ptolemy and Galen. Their whole intellectual and technical life was grounded in the Classical past. Indeed, as regards Byzantine literature, it might have been better if they had not been so conscious of their heritage; for, in their anxiety to write as elegantly as their forebears, they looked continually back to the past and never allowed their own literary language to develop healthily. Byzantine historiography maintained a remarkably high standard. But the works might have been easier to read had not every historian seen himself as Thucydides.

In the middle of the fourteenth century there was a change of attitude, at least amongst intellectuals. We now find Byzantine men of letters referring to themselves as 'Hellenes', and even addressing the Emperor as 'Basileus of the Hellenes'. There had been one or two isolated cases of this use of the word in the twelfth century; but now it became the fashion. It seems to have started in Thessaloniki, not in Constantinople where Roman Imperial traditions lingered on. It is noticeable that it occurred at a time when the Empire was reduced in size to the old Greek lands round the Aegean Sea, with Byzantium itself as an eastern outpost. It was no longer an Empire so much as a group of city-states. It occurred, too, at a moment when the Western world was beginning to look with admiration at the civilization of ancient Greece. The Byzantines were now politically powerless, but they knew that they were the heirs and guardians of this great heritage that was now at last receiving universal appreciation. They were proud to show to the world that they were Hellenes.

Not everyone accepted the new usage. In the years shortly before the fall of Constantinople in 1453 someone asked the learned George

Scholarius what was his rase. 'Though I am a Hellene by speech', he answered, 'yet I would never call myself a Hellene, as I do not believe as the Hellenes believed. I should like to take my name from my faith and answer that I am a Christian . . . Though my father was born in Thessaly I do not call myself a Thessalian, but a Byzantine; for I am of Byzantium'. Significantly, it was this Christian, this Byzantine, who, as Gennadius, the first Patriarch of the Church in captivity, by his statesmanship did more than anyone else to ensure that Hellenism should survive through the dark centuries of Ottoman dominion.

The words and the deeds of the Patriarch Gennadius perhaps provide the best answer to the question: How Greek were the Byzantines? But I think that the question is a little irrelevant. What is relevant is to remember that the Byzantine period is an essential part of Greek history; and, if I may say so, it is important that the Greeks themselves should realise this and to realise that they therefore are the people best qualified to interpret Byzantine history, as you, Mr. President, in your many great works so abundantly and so admirably have shown.

#### Π Ε Ρ Ι Λ Η Ψ Ι Σ

Ἐξετάζεται τὸ ζήτημα κατὰ πόσον οἱ Βυζαντινοὶ ἦσαν Ἑλληνας. Ἀπὸ ἀπόψεως φυλετικῆς, παρατηρεῖται ὅτι, ὅπως εἰς ὅλα τὰ ἔθνη, καὶ ἰδίως τὰ πολιτισμένα, ὑπάρχει ἐπιμειξία, τὸ αὐτὸ συμβαίνει καὶ προκειμένου περὶ τῶν Βυζαντινῶν, χωρὶς τοῦτο νὰ σημαίνει ὅτι ἐξηφανίσθη οἰονδήποτε φυλετικὸν στοιχεῖον, ἑλληνικὸν ἢ ἄλλο. Ἀπὸ ἀπόψεως γλώσσης, ἐπισημαίνεται ὅτι αὕτη ἀποτελεῖ καλύτερον, ἂν καὶ ὄχι ἀπολύτως ἀσφαλές, μέσον διαπιστώσεως τῆς ταυτότητος ἑνὸς ἔθνους. Καὶ ὑποστηρίζεται ὅτι ἕνας λαὸς εἶναι πράγματι ὅ,τι αἰσθάνεται ὅτι εἶναι.

Μέχρι τοῦ ΙΓ' αἰῶνος περίπου οἱ Βυζαντινοὶ ἐθεώρουν ἑαυτοὺς Ρωμαίους, ὑπὸ τὴν εὐρείαν σημασίαν τοῦ ὄρου, καὶ Χριστιανούς. Ἑλληνας ἐκάλουν μέχρι τοῦ Ε' μ. Χ. αἰῶνος τοὺς εἰδωλολάτρας ὑπηκόους τοῦ Ἀνατολικοῦ τμήματος τῆς Αὐτοκρατορίας. Ἀπὸ τῶν μέσων τοῦ Γ' αἰῶνος εἰς ὅλην τὴν ζωὴν καὶ τὴν διοίκησιν τῆς Αὐτοκρατορίας εἶχε κυριαρχήσει ἡ ἑλληνικὴ γλῶσσα, ἀπὸ τῆς

ἀπόψεως δὲ ταύτης ὁ Βυζαντινὸς ἠδύνατο νὰ ὀνομάσῃ ἑαυτὸν Ἑλληνα. Ἐπὶ πλεόν οἱ Βυζαντινοὶ ἐπίστευον ὅτι ἦσαν οἱ κληρονόμοι τῆς ἀρχαίας ἐλληνικῆς φιλολογίας, φιλοσοφίας καὶ ἐπιστήμης.

Κατὰ τὰ μέσα τοῦ ΙΔ' αἰῶνος παρατηρεῖται μία ἀλλαγὴ, τοῦλάχιστον μεταξὺ τῶν πεπαιδευμένων, μεταξὺ τῶν ὁποίων ἐπικρατεῖ ἡ συνήθεια νὰ ἀποκαλοῦν ἑαυτοὺς Ἑλληνας καὶ τὸν Αὐτοκράτορα «Βασιλέα τῶν Ἑλλήνων». Ἐν τούτοις ἡ συνήθεια αὕτη δὲν ἐγενικεύθη.

Ἐν κατακλειδί παρατηρεῖται ὅτι μεγαλυτέραν σημασίαν ἀπὸ τὸ ἐρώτημα κατὰ πόσον οἱ Βυζαντινοὶ ἦσαν Ἑλληνες ἔχει ἡ διαπίστωσις ὅτι ἡ Βυζαντινὴ περίοδος ἀποτελεῖ οὐσιῶδες τμῆμα τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Ἱστορίας.

