

Heresiological Labeling in Ecumenical Networking from the Ninth to Thirteenth Centuries : The Byzantine Oikoumene Reconsidered¹

Hisatsugu KUSABU

Osaka City University, Japan

kusabu@lit.osaka-cu.ac.jp

Abstract

Apart from its Greco-Roman and Christian connotations, considering its continuous influence in the Byzantine world, the oikoumene should be seen as a geo-political as well as socio-religious concept of networking and unity in popular thought and local narratives. This paper argues that “ecumenical” thought survived after Late Antiquity and through the Byzantine era in the Orthodox transportation infrastructure of people and information. It also provides a review of the circulation of heresiological “labels” in the middle to late Byzantine eras. In the Mediterranean, routes, transportation vehicles, and any media supported intelligent networking in the oikoumene. People in the oikoumene could access foreign teachings or stories from outsiders or “barbarians” of different faiths. Constantinopolitan intellectuals coined and issued labels for heretics, such as the Bogomils, Paulicians, and Massalians, and constructed a narrative of the heretical contamination from the center of the oikoumene. Heresiologists collected the information used in creating these heresy titles from far-flung places in all directions from Constantinople, and then exported the labels, which were spread using the transportation network of the Byzantine oikoumene.

Key words

¹ This is a revised and expanded version of a paper titled “Byzantine *Oikoumene* Reconsidered: Post-Roman, Byzantine, and the Early Ottoman Weltanschauung 700-1500 CE” presented at the 3rd AAWH at NTU, Singapore (30.5.2015). JSPS grants (numbers H25284144 and K24401030) supported the research project.

Byzantine Empire, Orthodoxy, Heresy, Heresiology, Bogomils

INTRODUCTION

The classical term *oikoumene*, meaning “the inhabited” in Greek, has long represented the Greco-Roman and Orthodox Christian worldview, characterized as “civilized cosmopolitanism.”² *Oikoumene* as a geographical term in the Ancient East Mediterranean covers a living area that is diverse in terms of culture, politics, and religion in the pre-modern era. The alternative Latin term *orbis Romanus* referred to the concept of Roman universalism. The Greek concepts of *Ge Oikoumene* and *Romaike Arche* gradually took on Christian and imperial overtones, coming to signify Orthodox Christendom under imperial administration in the Mediterranean world.³

One of the remarkable characteristics of the Byzantine *oikoumene*, equipped as it was with a transportation network, was the existence of popular “holies” who traveled from city to city, asking people for alms and preaching sermons in the common indigenous languages (namely Greek, Slavic, Arabic, etc.).⁴

² In modern usage, the English derivative “ecumenism” and German *die Ekumene* are usually employed as technical terms in a socio-religious context and in human geography. The definition of ecumenism is as follows: “the principle or aim of uniting different branches of the Christian Church” (*Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary*, Oxford University Press, 2010, electric version); *Ökumene*: von naturgegebenen Grenzen bestimmter Lebens- und Siedlungsraum des Menschen auf der Erde (*Duden Deutsches Universalwörterbuch 6 Auflage*, Mannheim, 2006, electric version). The historical use of the term *oikoumene* discussed in this paper is not related to such contemporary usage. McNeil presents the history of the concept (William H. McNeil, *The Ecumene. Story of Humanity*, New York, 1973).

³ Evangelos Chrysos, ed., *To Βυζαντίο ως οικουμένη* (*Byzantium as Oecumene*), Athens, 2005, 59-78; Johannes Koder, “Die räumlichen Vorstellungen der Byzantiner von der Ökumene (4. bis 12. Jahrhundert),” *Anzeiger der philosophisch-historische Klasse der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 137, no. 2 (2002), 15-34; Gudrun Schmalzbauer, “Überlegungen zur Idee der Oikoumene in Byzanz,” in *Wiener Byzantinistik und Neogräzistik: Beiträge zum Symposium Vierzig Jahre Institut Byzantinistik und Neogräzistik der Universität Wien im Gedenken an Herbert Hunger*, ed. Wolfram Hörandner, Vienna, 2004, 408-419.

⁴ In the discussion of holy men, Peter Brown’s groundbreaking achievement cannot be underestimated. See Peter Brown, “The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity,” *Journal of Roman Studies* vol. 61, 1971, 80-101. As for cases in the Middle Byzantine period, see Stephanos Efthymiadis, “The Function of the Holy Man in Asia Minor in the Middle Byzantine Period,” *Byzantine Asia Minor (6th-12th Cent.)*, Athens, 1998, 151-161; J. Signes Codoñer, “New Alphabets for the Christian Nations: Frontier Strategies in the Byzantine Commonwealth between the Fourth and Tenth Centuries,” *New Perspectives on*

These self-styled holy men attempted to attract ordinary people, drawing attention with their own interpretations of the Gospels, the liturgy, and the hierarchy of the Orthodox Church. Successful holies were welcomed into local monasteries or civilian residences. Others moved from minor to major cities, and eventually to Constantinople. From the ninth century onward, along with the network expansion of the Empire in all directions, people from the fringes of the Orthodox *oikoumene*, namely middle and eastern Anatolia and Bulgaria, fled to urban areas in large groups. Authorized monasteries and orthodox writers harshly criticized such vagrancy, as monks were expected to remain bound to their original tonsured institutes for life (*stabilitas loci*).⁵

Vagrant monks often gained popularity among the ordinary people, but some warned about such activities. Authorities prohibited ordinary people from wearing monastic clothing.⁶ However, according to contemporary literati John Tzetzes (ca. 1110-1180), there were many kinds of self-styled ascetic in Constantinople who coiled chains around themselves and wore fetters. For the literate Tzetzes, such men were "thrice-sinful persons."⁷ He hated even the ordinary citizens who adored them in Constantinople. Nicholas Kataskepenos, author of *The Life of Cyril Philotes* (d. 1110), wrote that Cyril severely criticized wandering monks, despite the fact that he himself had had the experience of wandering.⁸ According to Angold, the emperor and his family sought endorsement from these "holy men."⁹ Such people sowed the seeds of the ideas that characterized the *oikoumene* network.

the Late Roman Eastern Empire, eds. A. de Francisco Heredero, D. Hernández de la Fuente, and S. Torres Prieto, Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014, 116-163.

⁵ Donald M. Nicol, "Instabilitas Loci: The Wanderlust of Late Byzantine Monks," in *Monks Hermits and the Ascetic Tradition*, ed. William J. Sheils, London (1985), 193-202.

⁶ Petrus A. M. Leone, ed., *Ioannis Tzetzae Epistulae*, Leipzig, 1972, 151.

⁷ *Tzetzae Epistulae* no. 104, 151.

⁸ Étienne Sargologos, *La Vie De Saint Cyrille Le Philéote Moine Byzantin (+1110)*, Brussels, 1964, 114-115.

⁹ Michael Angold, *Church and Society in Byzantium under the Comneni, 1081-1261*, Cambridge University Press, 1995, 283-284; Pamela Armstrong, "Alexios Komnenos, Holy Men and Monasteries," in *Alexios I Komnenos. Papers on the Second Belfast Byzantine International Colloquium*, ed. Margaret E. Mullett and Dion C. Smythe, Belfast, 1997, 219-231.

This paper does not summarize and redefine the ideological concept and networking system of the *oikoumene* or *orbis terrarum* in the Byzantine era, but rather presents an investigation into “heresiological” networking—the labeling of popular piety.

So far, scholars have mainly emphasized either a geographical-physical or ideological-mental approach to the investigation of the Byzantine *oikoumene*. The Roman emperor was the *oikonomos* (“steward”) of the *oikoumene*, with divine *oikonomia* (“administration”), and Georg Ostrogorsky pointed to a theoretical world order in the Byzantine hierarchy, called the “commonwealth” by Dimitri Obolensky.¹⁰ The Roman emperors and patriarchs of Constantinople did not hesitate to entitle themselves “ecumenical,” emphasizing their status both visually by means of regalia such as orbs and verbally through panegyrics.¹¹ As Kai Brodersen and Johannes Preiser-Kapeller revealed, the natural and physical conditions of the *oikoumene* and its networking system have attracted much research attention, especially when it comes to the dynamism of the human flow within the network.¹² Reviewing the historical concept of *oikoumene* from the perspective of an intellectual or heresiological map, this paper aims to focus scholarly attention on the *oikoumene* as a pre-modern field of information infrastructure and networking.

¹⁰ George Ostrogorsky, “The Byzantine Emperor and the Hierarchical World Order,” *The Slavonic and East European Review* 35, no. 84 (1956), 1-14. On the “Byzantine Commonwealth,” see D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth: Eastern Europe, 500-1453*, New York, 1971; Jonathan Shepard, “Byzantium’s Overlapping Circles,” *Proceedings of the 21st International Congress of Byzantine Studies: London, 21-26 August, 2006*, Volume I, Ashgate, 2006, 15-55; Garth Fowden, *Empire to Commonwealth: Consequences of Monotheism in Late Antiquity*, Princeton, New Jersey, 1993, 6-7; Christian Raffensperger, “Revisiting the Idea of the Byzantine Commonwealth,” *Byzantinische Forschungen*, 28, 2003, 159-174.

¹¹ Titos Papamastorakis, “Orb of the Earth: Images of Imperial Universality,” in *Byzantium as Oecumene*, ed. Evangelos Chrysos, Athens, 2005, 79-105. As for the ecumenical title of the Constantinopolitan patriarch and the surrounding controversy, historians have revealed that the Byzantine side used the term “ecumenical” for their neutral description of the world, which caused an over-reaction from the Roman Papacy (André Tuilier, “Grégoire le grand et le titre de patriarche œcuménique,” in *Grégoire le grand*, Paris 1986, 69-82; André Tuilier, “Le sens de l’adjectif ‘œcuménique,’” *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 86 (1964), 260-271; Siméon Vailhé, “Saint Grégoire le Grand et le titre de patriarche œcuménique,” *Échos d’Orient* 11, no. 70 (1908), 161-171.

¹² Kai Brodersen, *Terra Cognita: Studien zur römischen Raumerfassung*, Spudasmata 59, Hildesheim-Zurich-New York, 1995; Johannes Preiser-Kapeller, “The Medieval Roman Empire of the East as Spatial Phenomenon: Selected Aspects (300-1200 CE),” *Workshop Draft*, June 2015, esp. 22-27.

THE BYZANTINE *OIKOUMENE* AS AN UNSTABLE CONCEPT

The Byzantine usage of the term *oikoumene* is characterized by a conceptual discrepancy between theory and practice. According to T. Lounghis, the *oikoumene* was described as "limited", and it was not considered a geographical and ideological space that covered all inhabited areas.¹³ In actual political and religious contexts, throughout the history of the empire the Byzantines had never experienced full ecumenical leadership outside of their palace courts. In their writings, Byzantine authors emphasized theoretical universalism and Constantinopolitan centrism, rather than the functioning and actual conditions of the *oikoumene*. They did not establish an office for diplomatic affairs,¹⁴ and did not wish to leave Constantinople or the "civilized" cities in which they lived.¹⁵ Traveling Byzantine authors did not leave travel diaries or local ethnographies. As Magdalino correctly points out, "There was no Byzantine equivalent of Strabo, Ptolemy, Pausanias, Ibn Hawqal, al-Idrisi, Gerald of Wales, William of Rubruck, Marco Polo, or Evliya Çelebi."¹⁶ The number of official documents outlining the physical *oikoumene* is relatively limited. The representative "ecumenical" ideologue was Emperor Konstantinos VII Porphyrogenetos (r. 913-959), who edited texts on various topics, including the administrative policy of his empire. In his collection of excerpts from earlier works on the legates (*Excerpta de Legationibus*), on the ceremonies (*De Ceremoniis*), and on the administration of the empire (*De Administrando Imperio*), the term *oikoumene* appeared occasionally. In *De*

¹³ Telemachos Lounghis, "Die byzantinischen Ideologie der 'begrenzten Ökumene' und die römische Frage im ausgehenden 10. Jahrhundert," *Byzantinoslavica*, 56 (1995), 117-128. As for the limited category of *Romanitas*, see Ioannis Stouraitis, "'Just War' and 'Holy War' in the Middle Ages: Rethinking Theory through the Byzantine Case-Study," *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik*, 62 (2012), 227-264; "Roman Identity in Byzantium: A Critical Approach," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 107(1) (2015), 175-220.

¹⁴ Louis Bréhier, *Le monde byzantine, Les institutions de l'empire byzantine*, Paris, 1970, 239-262.

¹⁵ Catia Galatariotou, "Travel and Perception in Byzantium," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 47 (1993), 221-241.

¹⁶ Paul Magdalino, "Constantine VII and the Historical Geography of Empire," in *Imperial Geographies in Byzantine and Ottoman Space*, ed. Sahar Bazzaz (Washington D.C.: Center for Hellenic Studies, 2011), 23.

Administrando Imperio, Konstantinos repeatedly emphasized the importance of the Roman hegemony and the difficulties of negotiating with the rival states surrounding the empire. Obolensky has argued that the Byzantine diplomatic policy emphasized the Christian world's equilibrium with the neighboring Balkans.¹⁷ However, according to the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* corpus, Konstantinos rarely used the term *oikoumene* and its derivative forms in his original “geopolitical” work, *De Administrando Imperio*. Rather, in the corpus of Byzantine texts, authors tended to use the term *oikoumene* exclusively in relation to the titles of emperors and patriarchs.¹⁸

The sixth-century author (pseudo-) Cosmas Indicopleustes visualized the biblical Genesis in *Christian Topography*.¹⁹ Illuminators of manuscripts around the tenth century or later (e.g., those of the manuscripts Plut. 9.28 and MS Vat. gr. 699) described the Earth with the caption *Ge Oikoumene*. Cosmas's statements were visualized in terms of a biblical view of the world in a chest with a water canopy. However, Maja Kominko correctly points out that Cosmas's *oikoumene* map emphasized “the notion of the surrounding ocean, common to many ancient cosmographies, (that) was generally accepted in Greek geography.”²⁰ His visualized *oikoumene* was surrounded by ethnic outsiders on all sides, such as the Celts, Ethiopians, Scythians, and Indians (according to Kominko's hypothetical interpretation of

¹⁷ Dimitri Obolensky, “The Principles and Methods of Byzantine Diplomacy,” *Byzantium and the Slavs*, New York, 1994, 10-11.

¹⁸ Corpus reference from *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (TLG, accessed January 30, 2016, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/>).

¹⁹ Wanda Wolska-Conus, *Cosmas Indicopleustes, Topographie chrétienne* trans. John Watson McCrindle, Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1968. With regard to Cosmas: Wanda Wolska-Conus, *Cosmas Indicopleustes vol. 1*, Paris: Éd. du Cerf, 1968, 542-545; Horst Schneider, *Kosmas Indikopleustes*, Brepols, 2010, 97.

²⁰ Illuminations of MS. Plut. 9.28, fol. 40v, 43r in Maja Kominko, *The World of Kosmas: Illustrated Byzantine Codices of the Christian Topography*, Cambridge University Press, 2013, 54; Kominko, “The Map of Cosmas, the Albi Map, and the Tradition of Ancient Geography,” *Mediterranean Historical Review* 20 (2005), 163-186. Also see Leslie Brubaker, “The Christian Topography (Vat.gr.699) Revisited: Image, Text, and Conflict in Ninth-Century Byzantium,” in *Byzantine Style*, ed. Elizabeth Jeffreys, Cambridge University Press, 2006, 3-24. For a visual image of the “γῆ οἰκουμένη” and a Mediterranean Map of Cosmas, see the MS illumination of Plut. 9.28, f. 90v, 92f and 92v., Plates XII, XVI, and XV in Jeffrey C. Anderson, eds., *The Christian Topography of Kosmas Indikopleustes*, Rome, 2013. For images of MS Vat. gr. 699 40v, 43r, see Wanda Wolska-Conus, *Cosmas Indicopleustes, vol. 1*, Paris, 1968, 545 and 557.

the map of Ephoros).²¹ Cosmas's notion of a surrounded *oikoumene* was supported by twelfth-century historian Anna Komnene:

Certain it is that in my father's reign great disorders and wave on wave of confusion united to afflict the empire. For the Scythians from the north, the Kelts from the west and the Ishmaelites from the east were simultaneously in turmoil; there were perils, too, from the sea, not to mention the barbarians who ruled the waves, or the countless pirate vessels launched by wrathful Saracens or by the ambitious Vetones, who regarded the Roman Empire with jealousy. ... All of them flock from all quarters to attack us by land or by sea. [Book XIV, Chapter 7, Sections 1-2]²²

As a Byzantine historian, Anna Komnene considered the *oikoumene* as covering the original territory of the *Rhomanike arche* ("Roman Rule").²³ In reality, however, by the time of Alexios I Komnenos, the territory of the medieval Roman Empire was actually limited. In this regard, it is important to note that Anna Komnene considered the *oikoumene* as a geographical framework, and not simply a representation of Roman domination:

But at the time we are speaking of, the boundary of Roman power on the east was our neighbor the Bosphorus, and on the west the town of Adrianoupolis. The Emperor Alexios, fighting two-fronted against barbarians who attacked him on either flank, manoeuvred round Byzantium, the centre of his circles as it were, and proceeded to broaden the empire: on the west the frontier became the Adriatic Sea, on the east the Euphrates and Tigris. [Book VI, Chapter 11, Section 3]²⁴

The actual management of the *oikoumene* assigned to the Patriarchate of Constantinople appears to have been intensively revised by Anna Komnene's time. Its theoretical and hierarchical rankings of dioceses, in the tradition of *Notitia Episcopatum*, represented the physical portion of the overall

²¹ Maja Kominko, *The World of Cosmas: Illustrated Byzantine Codices of the Christian Topography*, 2013, 37.

²² Anna Komnene, *The Alexiad*, trans., E. R. A. Sewter, revised with introduction and notes by Peter Frankopan, London, 2009, 419.

²³ Anna Komnene, *The Alexiad*, 2009, Book XV, Chapter 11, Section 3, 176.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 176-177.

picture of the imperial church. In the days of the Muslim advancement, despite the difficulty of maintaining individual dioceses in Anatolia, the Constantinople Patriarchate remained unchanged until around the ninth century.²⁵ However, minor but critical changes were seen in significant revisions from between *Notitia 4* (before 869) and *Notitia 7* (between 901-907). According to Darrouzès and Hild's ranking, the metropolitanates of Lykia, Phrygia, and Lykaonia were revised between the eras of *Notitias 4* and 7.²⁶ Aside from these, most other dioceses continued in the same traditional order, but the statuses of Tlos and other dioceses under the Myra Metropolitanate, for example, changed drastically.²⁷ Satoshi Urano, who investigated archeological sites around Xantos Valley and the Tlos Basilica ruins, has argued persuasively that the changes in rank were caused by the state of seacoast transportation.²⁸ As Johannes Koder and Urano suggested, from Late Antiquity onward, while the land route was becoming limited, the sea route remained active, and transportation led to the development of coastal cities in Lykia.²⁹ Both static physical and ideological frameworks of *oikoumene* were not supported by contemporary conditions; it should be examined for its dynamism as a working concept.

CIRCULATION OF HERESIOLOGICAL LABELS

The circulation of some heresy labels and the network infrastructure of the *oikoumene* need to be investigated at the same time. Since the time of Justin Martyr, the earliest days of church theology, church intellectuals developed a list of heresy titles that constructed the geography of dogmatical outsiders and the “periphery” of Orthodox *oikoumene*. This had an influence on

²⁵ Jean Darrouzès, *Notitiae Episcopatum Ecclesia Constantinopolitanae*, 42-45, 78.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 885-888.

²⁷ Hisatsugu Kusabu, “Ecumenical Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy in Post Late Antiquity,” in *New Approaches to the Later Roman Empire*, ed. Takashi Minamikawa, Kyoto University, 2015, 166-169. As for the Tlos ruins, see Taner Korkut, *Tlos: Akdağlar'ın Yamacında Bir Likya Kenti*, E Yayınları, 2015.

²⁸ Satoshi Urano, “Basilica Excavation Report, Tlos 2015,” *Shi'en*, 76, no. 2, 2016, 83-91.

²⁹ Johannes Koder, “Regional Networks in Asia Minor during the Middle Byzantine Period, Seventh-Eleventh Centuries: An Approach,” *Trade and Markets in Byzantium*, ed. Cécile Morrisson, 2012, 147-175.

legal documents (see *Codex Theodosianus* XVI-5 and *Codex Justinianus* I-5)³⁰ and "ethnographies" of peoples.³¹ From the ninth century onward, Constantinopolitan patriarchs confronted more types of heretic than in the earlier days of doctrinal controversy, such as the Paulicians, the Massalians, and the Bogomils. These heretics were not theologians or secular philosophers, but popular sect leaders who jeopardized the church's ecclesiastical control over the citizens. Unlike the earlier theological heretics, such as the Arians, Nestorians, and Iconoclasts, church authorities regarded these sects as a new type that had arrived from the fringes of the Orthodox *oikoumene*. Now, the questions are: what/who brought the labels into the *oikoumene* and how was this achieved?

1) The *Oikoumene* in a Network

Travelers would bring both items and thoughts into their "inhabited areas" in the *oikoumene*. A certain kind of news that also circulated in the Byzantine *oikoumene* that has received insufficient attention thus far is marginal discourses, such as those involving false rumors, popular tales and myths, and biased or false reports contributed by travelers. From the fringe of the Orthodox *oikoumene* to Constantinople, travelers walked and communicated with indigenous populations, thereby constructing their view of the *oikoumene*. Such marginal discourses reflect a different sort of contemporary view of the Byzantine *oikoumene* than does traditional theory.

Established Roman routes, such as the Via Egnatia and other eastern routes, especially those to Jerusalem, were used by frequent travelers. Additionally, the network infrastructure in-

³⁰ See Clyde Pharr, *The Theodosian Code*, New Jersey, 2001, 450-463.

³¹ For the genre and list-tradition of heresy titles, see Young Kim, "The Transformation of Heresiology in the Panarion of Epiphanius of Cyprus." *Shifting Genres in Late Antiquity*, eds. G. Greatrex and H. Elton, Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2015, 53-65; Richard Flower, "Genealogies of Unbelief: Epiphanius of Salamis and Heresiological Authority," *Unclassical Traditions*, vol. 2, 2011, 70-73. L. G. Müller, *The De Haeresibus of Saint Augustine. A Translation with an Introduction and Commentary*, Washington, 1956; *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, herausgegeben vom byzantinischen Institut der Abtei Scheyern; besorgt von P. Bonifatius Kotter, vol. 4 (Liber de haeresibus. Opera Polemica), Berlin, 1981.

cluded the sea routes from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean via the Sea of Marmara, the coastal routes connecting the Aegean archipelago and coastal ports, and the long-distance commercial routes dominated by a network of domestic merchants, foreign caravans, and even pirates.³² The army corps in expedition, the foreign and Byzantine merchants, the parties of legates, soldiers with hostages, and refugees from deserted areas all moved on these land and maritime routes.³³ In the Byzantine era, some emperors conducted the forced transfer of marginal peoples, a means of imperial control over a variety of ethnic groups.³⁴ The steppe people and nomads frequently accessed the border land zone via a given network. The Russians took advantage of boats in their swift advance to the South Black Sea. Warnings about the influx of Petchenegs and Cumans into the imperial border zones were brought by messengers on horseback.

By sea and land, the network infrastructure gave people access to other people far away, and to interesting news and stories, unfounded rumors, and questionable myths, even including “heretical” sermons. Byzantine emperors and ecclesiastical authorities dispatched messengers and ambassadors as often as possible for a range of purposes, such as securing peace treaties, exchanging captives, and addressing political or doctrinal controversies.³⁵ To disseminate the proclamations of the universal Roman authority in the center of the *oikoumene*, the Byzantines had to develop a diplomatic communication strategy over centuries, all while surrounded by rival nations. They arranged and maintained regional management systems,³⁶ including territorial military operations, land and sea transportation, internal and foreign postage systems, individual travel, and mass pilgrimages. The

³² John H. Pryor and E. M. Jeffreys, *The Age of the ΔΡΟΜΩΝ: The Byzantine Navy, ca 500-1204*, Brill, 2006; J. H. Pryor, *Geography, Technology and War: Studies in the Maritime History of the Mediterranean, 649-1571*, Cambridge, 1992, esp. 86-111.

³³ An Important network mapping project has been conducted by Johannes Preiser-Kapeller. See his *Harbours and Maritime Networks as Complex Adaptive Systems (Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum - Tagungen Book23)*, Schnell & Steiner, 2015.

³⁴ Peter Charanis, “The Transfer of Population as a Policy in the Byzantine Empire,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 3, no. 2 (1961), 140-54.

³⁵ Franz Dölger, “Gesandtschaft,” in *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches, 1. Teil, 2. Halbband*, ed. Franz Dölger, Munich, 2003.

³⁶ Wolfgang Brandes, “Finanzverwaltung” in *Krisenzeiten: Untersuchungen zur byzantinischen Administration im 6.-9. Jahrhundert*, Frankfurt am Main, 2002, 239-426.

Byzantine people traded information not only about human resources and goods, but also the monetary economy, the sources of laws, educational materials, and foreign craftworks. Scholars' recent achievements related to this topic are remarkable.³⁷ The *Tabula Imperii Byzantini* project in Vienna reconstructed a road map with a detailed topography.³⁸ Élisabeth Malamut's extensive investigation of traveling Byzantine saints in the ninth to eleventh centuries revealed how they took advantage of both sea and land routes and encountered political difficulties caused by the Muslim advancement into Asia Minor.³⁹ Similarly, in Margaret Mullett's quantitative study of the correspondence of Theophylact of Ochrid, the letters and their means of delivery have allowed historians to reconstruct Byzantine personal networking.⁴⁰ As for one intellectual's personal relationships during the days of religious conflict in the mid-fifth century in Syria, Adam Schor provided a detailed examination and analysis of the network related to Theodoret of Cyrhus.⁴¹ Also, regarding transportation and travel, a number of important individual works on diplomacy,⁴² ambassadorship,⁴³ travel⁴⁴ and transportation, markets,⁴⁵ and logistics⁴⁶ have made possible a fair reconstruction of the Byzantine socio-geographical sphere.

³⁷ See the works reviewed by Johannes Preiser-Kapeller, "Großkönig, Kaiser und Kalif- Byzanz im Geflecht der Staatenwelt des Nahen Ostens, 300-1204," *Historicum. Zeitschrift für Geschichte*, 2012, 26-47; Johannes Preiser-Kapeller, "The Medieval Roman Empire of the East as Spatial Phenomenon: Selected Aspects (300-1200 CE)," Workshop Draft June 2015, (Retrieved July 1, 2016).

³⁸ *Tabula Imperii Byzantini*, Vienna 1966-.

³⁹ Élisabeth Malamut, *Sur la route des saints byzantins*, Paris, 1993.

⁴⁰ Margaret Mullett, *Theophylact of Ochrid*, Birmingham, 1997: Chapter 4. For kinship-network calculation, see Johannes Preiser-Kapeller, "Calculating the Middle Ages? The Project 'Complexities and Networks in the Medieval Mediterranean and the Near East' (COMMED)," *Medieval Worlds*, No. 2 (2015), 100-27.

⁴¹ Adam M. Schor, *Theodoret's People: Social Networks and Religious Conflict in Late Roman Syria*, University of Carolina Press, 2011, esp. 9-13.

⁴² With regard to diplomacy, see Dean A. Miller, *Studies in Byzantine Diplomacy*, Rutgers State University, 1963; Jonathan Shepard and Simon Franklin, *Byzantine Diplomacy*, Ashgate, 1992. As for transportation, see Ioannis C. Dimitroukas, *Reisen und Verkehr im Byzantinischen Reich, vom Anfang des 6. Bis zur Mitte des 11. Jh.s*, Athens, 1997.

⁴³ T. C. Lounghis, *Les ambassades Byzantines en occident*, Athens, 1988, 458-487.

⁴⁴ Ruth Macrides, ed., *Travels in the Byzantine World*, Ashgate, 2001.

⁴⁵ Cécile Morrisson, ed., *Trade and Market in Byzantium*, Washington D.C., 2012.

⁴⁶ John F. Haldon, ed., *General Issues in the Study of Medieval Logistics: Sources, Problems and Methodologies*, Leiden, 2006, especially the introductory article by Haldon (pp. 1-35) and that on network analysis by Malcolm Wagstaff (pp. 69-91).

As for information networking, a variety of messengers were common in the East Mediterranean from the days of the Roman Republic.⁴⁷ A networking map, the Latin Peutinger Map, has enabled historians to draw a transportation web among the cities.⁴⁸ The Byzantine emperors and patriarchs inherited this infrastructure and dispatched and accepted correspondents. A limited number of ambassadors, such as Priskos and Menandros, left behind diaries.⁴⁹ Their successes and failures attracted much interest from readers. Konstantinos VII allowed the compilation of excerpts of works related to legates (*De Legationibus*).⁵⁰ Historians have attested not only the geographers' point of view, but also the ordinary mentality of these medieval travelers. As Nicolas Drocout noted, an ambassador was nothing but a medieval traveler with a dangerous task.⁵¹

2) Byzantine Labels for Heresies

The study of Byzantine heresiologies and the rhetoric of heresy condemnation⁵² are related to each other within the "holy men" context of information networking in the Orthodox *oikoumene*. Ever since Averil Cameron asserted the significance of heresiology and the study of the imperial court's rhetoric, scholars have set about investigating Byzantine views on so-called "heretics," rather than their historical reality.⁵³

⁴⁷ Anne Kolb, *Transport und Nachrichtentransfer im römischen Reich*, Berlin, 2000, 264-299.

⁴⁸ Emily Albu, *The Medieval Peutinger Map, Imperial Roman Revival in a German Empire*, Cambridge University Press, 2014, 19-29; Friedrich Hild, "Verkehrswege zu Lande: Die Wege der Kreuzfahrer des Ersten und Zweiten Kreuzzuges" *Handelsgüter und Verkehrswege*, Austrian Academy of Sciences, 2010, 268.

⁴⁹ Ernst Doblhofer, ed., *Byzantinische Diplomaten und östliche Barbaren*, Graz, Wien, Köln: Styria, 1955: on Priskos 11-82, on Menander 83-223.

⁵⁰ Terry C. Brennan, "Embassies Gone Wrong," in *Diplomats and Diplomacy in the Roman World*, ed. Claude Eilers, Brill, 2009, 71-192.

⁵¹ Nicolas Drocout, "La mort de l'ambassadeur faits, causes, enjeux (7^e-12^e siècles)" *Revue des Études Byzantines* 71 (2013), 67-104; "L'ambassadeur maltraité, autour de quelques cas de non-respect de l'immunité diplomatique entre Byzance et ses voisins (VII^e – XI^e siècles)" *Les relations diplomatiques au Moyen Âge* (2011), 87-98.

⁵² Averil Cameron, "Texts as Weapons: Polemic in the Byzantine Dark Ages," in *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World*, eds. Alan K. Bowman and Greg Woolf, Cambridge University Press, 1994, 198-215.

⁵³ Averil Cameron, "How to Read Heresiology," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 33, no. 3 (2003), 471-92.

It is important to note that these defendants of heresy never called themselves "heretics," nor the names given to them by orthodox authors. Rather, they believed themselves to be good Christians, and attributed their teachings to the Gospels and Pauline letters. Ordinary church members labeled them as heretics with individualized names, considering the defendants' somewhat "dualistic" and "ascetic" ways of life to be like those of the Manichaeans or Enthusiasts. In terms of this labeling in general at courts and synods, however, the Byzantine authorities could label them as "Manichaeans" in order to denounce their "sects" as having a tendency toward "dualism." This was because since Late Antiquity the Manichaeans were known as heretics, listed in the imperial codes in which they were strictly banned under the threat of death.⁵⁴

In terms of the medieval neo-Manichaeans, that is, the Massalians, the Paulicians, and the Bogomils, the actual diffusion of heretics in society was often reported by biased authors using these labels. Heresiological texts, such as the *Dogmatike Panoplia* and the *Hiera Hoplotheke*, have been closely investigated in the past decade.⁵⁵ The Komnenian heresiologist Euthymios Zigabenos, compiler of the encyclopedic *Dogmatike Panoplia* (ca. 1050), clearly identified the Manichaeans with those three groups, namely the Paulicians, Massalians, and Bogomils. Since the concept of heresy is an ideal constructed by an authority with certain powers, these authorities' views of heresy must be examined. Recently, Yuri Stoyanov examined the apocalyptic tradition attributed to the Bogomils.⁵⁶ However, we have no internal documents, only reports by opposing orthodox intellectuals. Scholars' overemphasis on "leaked" documents and former members' confessional reports prevent the evaluation of the social influence of

⁵⁴ Laurette Barnard, "The Criminalization of Heresy in the Later Roman Empire," *The Journal of Legal History* 16, no. 2 (1995), 121-146.

⁵⁵ Antonio Rigo, "La Panoplie dogmatique d'Euthyme Zigabène: les Pères de l'église, l'empereur et les hérésies du présent," in *Byzantine Theologians*, eds. Antonio Rigo and Pavel Ermilov, University of Rome, 2009, 19-32; Nadia Miladinova, *The Panoplia Dogmatike by Euthymios Zygadenos*, Brill, 2014, 1-29; Alessandra Bucossi, ed., *Andronicus Camaterus: Sacrum Armamentarium: Pars Prima*, Brepols, 2013; Hisatsugu Kusabu, *Comnenian Orthodoxy and Byzantine Heresiology in the Twelfth Century*, PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2013, 35-57.

⁵⁶ Yuri Stoyanov, "Medieval Christian Dualist Perceptions and Conceptions of Biblical Paradise," *Studia Ceranea* 3 (2013), 149-166.

the sect movement. In order to evaluate the historical activity of such “heretics,” a promising method is to investigate and trace the diffusion of narratives and rumors and the labeling activities of non-heretics. The diffusion process in the ecumenical networks reveals the Byzantine form of the intellectual *oikoumene*.

As representative examples of the circulation of heresy labels, the cases of the Massalians, Paulicians, and Bogomils are worthy of discussion.⁵⁷ Orthodox theologians referred to the Syrian origin of the Massalians in the days of Emperor Valentinus as typified by extreme asceticism and demonology. The Paulicians were from Phrygia and the Bogomils were of Bulgarian origin. Not only theologians, but modern historians, including Steven Runciman, called these groups “medieval Manichees,” related to each other as the descendants of the old Manichee founded by Mani. Mainly, it was believed that the Bogomilism movement appeared in multiple parts of the orthodox *oikoumene*, including the Western Balkans (Macedonia and Bosnia Herzegovina) and even Italy. In the history of medieval heresy, the Bogomils were often celebrated as the forebears of the Cathars.⁵⁸

1. The Massalians⁵⁹

The name or label “Massalians,” meaning “the prayers” in Syrian (*Euchitai* in Greek), had long been known among theologians, such as Epiphanius of Salamis (*Panarion* and its summary), Aurelius Augustinus (*De Haeresibus*), and John of Damascus (*Peri Haereseon*). This was because Epiphanius’ listed this label in his heresy catalogs.⁶⁰ Byzantine intellectuals tended to attribute the Massalians to Syrian asceticism, as they were absorbed by overly strict exercises featuring a strong longing for spiritual ecstasy. In fact, such radical asceticism or mysticism appeared in various

⁵⁷ For personal networks and labeling issues, see Adam Schor, *Theodoret’s People*, 2011, 148.

⁵⁸ Michael Frassetto, *Heretic Lives: Medieval Heresy from Bogomil and the Cathars to Wyclif and Hus*, London: Profile, 2007, 7-21.

⁵⁹ Rainhart Staats, “Messalianer,” *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* XII (1992), 607-613.

⁶⁰ Frank Williams, *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*, vol. 2, Leiden, 1987, 629-638. As for “Massalians” as a heresiological label, see Klaus Fichten, *Messalianismus und Antimesalianismus*, Göttingen, 1998.

Eastern Mediterranean areas. They had their own indigenous aliases, such as the Marchionistai, Euchitai, and the Enthousiastes.⁶¹ The orthodox heresiologists collected the aliases that came along the information routes from all directions in the *oikoumene* and established the heresiological entry. The label used for the Massalians represented the congregation of the readers of heresiologies around the title. In Pseudo-Psellos' *De Daemonibus*, the impious people were affiliated with the Euchitai and Enthousiastes,⁶² and some later condemnation mentioned the "heresy" of the Massalians. However, none of the defendants had anything to do with the regional Syriac background.⁶³

2. The Paulicians

The Paulicians were thought to be medieval Marcionists in terms of the heresiological categories, and emphasis was put on the Pauline Letters with their anti-Jewish sentiment (i.e., rejection of the Old Testament).⁶⁴ It is highly possible that the "church" or followers in *Phrygia Pacanatiana* had communications with a variety of Christian denominations, such as the Jacobites, the Nestorians, and the Armenians, who connected with the network in central Anatolia. The Paulicians formed a militia against the imperial campaign and later clashed with Basileios I in the second half of the ninth century at the fortified town of Tephrike (today's Divriği).

Peter of Sicily, an orthodox diplomat dispatched from Constantinople to the Paulician camp to negotiate the exchange of

⁶¹ Gerhard Ficker, *Die Phundagiagiten*, Leipzig 1908, 4; A. Rigo et P. Eleuteri, *Eretici, dissidenti, Musulmani ed Ebrei a Bizanzio*, Venezia, 1993, 136.

⁶² Paul Gautier, "Le *De Daemonibus* du Pseudo-Psellos," *Revue des études byzantines*, 38 (1980), 132-133.

⁶³ Jean Gouillard, "Quatre Procès de mystiques à Byzance (vers 960-1143) inspiration et autorité," *Revue des études byzantines* 36 (1978), 5-81; Antonio Rigo, *Messalianismo = Bogomilismo. Un'equazione dell'Eresiologia Medievale Bizantina*, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 56 (1990), 53-82.

⁶⁴ For the Paulicians, Lemerle, and others' monumental project, see Charles Astruc, Wanda Conus-Wanda, Jean Gouillard, Paul Lemerle, Denise Papachryssanthou, and Paul Lemerle, "Les sources grecques pour l'histoire des Pauliciens d'Asie Mineure: Texte critique et Traduction," *Travaux et Mémoires* 4 (1970), 1-227; Paul Lemerle, "L'histoire des Pauliciens d'Asie Mineure d'après les sources grecques," *Travaux et Mémoires* 5 (1973), 51-144.

captives, called them “Manichaeans” and reported their ways of life and thoughts as those of Christian heretics. As seen in his work titles and correspondences, it is highly probable that Peter of Sicily coined the label “Paulians” and its diminutive “Paulicians” and diffused the label in Bulgaria thereafter.⁶⁵ As usual with heresy titles, the name of the Paulicians was not a self-styled one, but a heresiological label. The origins of the name remain unknown. Although Garsoïan posited an Armenian origin, most scholars have assumed that the diminutive form of “Paulians” refers to the followers of the Apostle Paul.⁶⁶ Based on Peter of Sicily’s report, his contemporary Photius and the later Byzantine heresiologists argued that their heresy was that of the Manichaeans, and that the sect founder was Paul of Samosata, the earlier heresiarch of the old sect.⁶⁷ Either way, the Constantinopolitan Church detected the presence of such heretical parties on the fringes of the orthodox network, or *oikoumene*, through negotiation with them.

Thereafter, the Paulicians were transported from the eastern fringe of the Orthodox *oikoumene* to the frontier zone and the Petcheneg. After the sacking of Tephrike, the Paulicians were forcefully brought en masse to the area around Philippopolis (today’s Plovdiv), a city in the border zone with Bulgaria on the Via Militaria, in order to be a human buffer against the encroaching nomads, the Petchenegs and Cumans. There, the Paulicians seemed to be active against the Imperial Church, and were apparently so successful that Anna Komnene claimed that Philippopolis had been “taken” by them. For Alexios I Komnenos, Philippopolis on the Via Militaria was located at the strategic frontline of the nomads.⁶⁸

3. The Bogomils

⁶⁵ Charles Astruc, ed., “Les sources grecques pour l’histoire des Pauliciens d’Asie Mineure,” *Travaux et Mémoires* 4 (1979), 6-9.

⁶⁶ Nina Garsoïan, *The Paulician Heresy. A Study of the Origin and Development of Paulicianism in Armenia and the Eastern Provinces of the Byzantine Empire*. The Hague, 1967; Garsoïan, “Byzantine Heresy: A Reinterpretation,” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 25 (1971), 87-113.

⁶⁷ Charles Astruc, ed., “Les sources grecques pour l’histoire des Pauliciens d’Asie Mineure,” *Travaux et Mémoires* 4 (1979), 99-173.

⁶⁸ *Alexias*, Book XIV, Chapter 8, Section 3. (Sewter-Frankopan transl., 424.)

The Bogomils, or the “labeling of the Bogomils,” offer a remarkable case for the investigation of the role the intellectual network of the *oikoumene* played in heretical labeling. The Bogomils were known as a medieval Christian sect/heresy during the Byzantine Empire. Their Bulgarian origin, as hinted at by the etymology of their label (*Bog* and *milvi*⁶⁹), as well as their moderate dualism and popularity among a variety of social strata in various countries, have attracted much research attention. They represent one of the most influential popular religious movements discussed by scholars in area studies, church history, and medieval social history. The Byzantines seemed to emphasize the Bulgarian pronunciation of the name “Bogomils” as an established label. The Bulgarian tone was preserved and the spelling variant *Pogomeloi* can also be observed in manuscripts.⁷⁰ The name of the Bogomils was a representation of their ongoing silent influx into the Orthodox *oikoumene*. While the Paulicians were categorized as noisy, armed dissidents of Phrygia, the Bogomils were seen as “passively resistant against the *Mammon*.”⁷¹ According to Anna Komnene, the Bogomil sect was organized hierarchically, with a “teacher,” his 12 disciples or “apostles,” and ordinary followers among the citizens.⁷² Euthymios and other Byzantine intellectuals warned of their hidden infiltration, their disguise as legitimate monks, and their popularity among noble and ordinary citizens.⁷³

When actual indigenous preachers were present, the label “Bogomil” circulated at high speed through the Orthodox *oikoumene* network. Orthodox and Catholic sources outlined the

⁶⁹ The majority of MSS., e.g., Paris gr. 1232A, f. 193v. Cf. “Bogon and Milon,” *Patrologia Graeca* 130 (1864), col. 1289.

⁷⁰ See the Nippon’s case documents for the condemnation of Nippon: V. Grymel, *Les registes*, Vol. I, Fasc. 3, Paris 1947, 90-91 (No. 1013), 92-93 (No. 1015); Johannes. D. Mansi, ed., *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, XXI, 597-600, 601-604, and 701-708.

⁷¹ Hans-Georg Beck, *Vom Umgang mit Ketzern*, Munich, 1993, 83.

⁷² See *Alexias* Book XV, Chapters 8 and 9 on the Bogomils’ trial.

⁷³ “It had penetrated even the greatest households and had had an impact on an enormous number of people.” [Book XV, Chapter 9, Section 2], Anna Komnene, *The Alexiad*, trans. E. R. A. Sewter, revised with introduction and notes by Peter Frankopan, London, 2009, 459.

diffusion of the Bogomils as attested in Bulgaria for the first time. Gradually, they diffused into Thrace, Constantinople, Anatolia, Macedonia, Bosnia, and Italy. The Bulgarian orthodox priest Kosmas (Presbyter Kozma) first mentioned the founder Pop Bogumil and his followers in an Old Slavic treatise from around the 970s.⁷⁴ By 1050, the Bogomil heresy had diffused in Phrygia Pacatiana under the alias of Phundagiagitai,⁷⁵ and by ca. 1099 in Constantinople's lower and middle strata.⁷⁶ A later *synodikon* condemned the listed leaders. It seems reasonable to suppose that the Bogomil movement was activated in and diffused across the Byzantine *oikoumene* by heretical instructors. Historians have argued that Bogomilism diffused into Western Europe through the Cathars of Italy and Langdoc.⁷⁷

In 1167, there was a secret conference at Saint-Félix de Caraman, to which the “heretics” invited a certain Niketas (Niquinta), a teacher from the Balkans.⁷⁸ This guest was supposed to be a member of the Bogomils. Because of the critical lack of documentation, it is impossible to determine the prosopography of the eastern teacher. In terms of intelligence, however, there was a typical flow of knowledge via the *oikoumene* network. A conference report was compiled by former members after the general arrest and condemnation of many Cathars, and careful attention is required to determine the actual phases of the sectarian movements. Contemporary Catholic authors and later historians took advantage of the report as eloquent evi-

⁷⁴ Henri-Charles Puech and André Vaillant, *Le Traité Contre Les Bogomiles de Cosmas le Prêtre*, Paris, 1945.

⁷⁵ Gerhard Ficker, *Die Phundagiagiten*, Leipzig, 1908, 62.

⁷⁶ Antonio Rigo, “Il Processo del Bogomilo Basilio (1099 ca.): una riconsiderazione,” *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 58 (1992), 185-211.

⁷⁷ Bernard Hamilton, “Wisdom from the East: The Reception by the Cathars of Eastern Dualist Texts,” in *Heresy and Literacy*, eds. Peter Biller and Anne Hudson, Cambridge University Press, 1994, 38-60; important source translation: Janet Hamilton, Bernard Hamilton, and Yuri Stoyanov, eds., *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World, C. 650-C. 1450*, Manchester University Press, 1998, 45-59.

⁷⁸ Monique Zerner, ed., *L'histoire du Catharisme en discussion: Le ‘Concile’ de Saint-Félix (1167)*, Brepols, 2001; reviewed by Bernard Hamilton, *English Historical Review*, cxx. 486 (April 2005), 500-502; discussion followed up by Francesoco Zambon, “Où en est le problème des Actes du ‘concile’ de Saint-Félix? À propos de ‘L’histoire du Catharisme en discussion,’” *Les Cathares devant l'histoire* (2005), 135-144.

dence of the spread of heresy in the High Middle Ages.⁷⁹ Catholic reporters did not mention the detail about Niketas, although it was certain that the conference gathered the credentials of people within Catharism/Bogomilism from various parts of the Mediterranean. However, details of Niketas's party, routes, and transportation from the east remain under discussion, and his language, teaching, and social status are all unknown. More critically, the Cathars and Bogomils did not call themselves such, and no Cathars mentioned the name of the Bogomils. Even church intellectuals in Catholic Christendom tended to call these heretics simply Manichee, not Bogomils, Paulicians, etc.⁸⁰

On the one hand, in order to avoid categorical confusion, contemporary specialist theologians, or heresiologists, usually took good care to retain these labels. On the other, more ordinary, non-specialist authorities, and even modern historians, have tended to apply these labels arbitrarily to contemporary and pre-modern popular religious activities, naming them as heretical without specifying or considering the subcategory or individual heresy.⁸¹ The labels of heresy were invented by specialist intellectuals but diffused by ordinary readers, including clerics and laypeople.

The "dealers" and "seeders" of heresy titles were not just the people moving in the regional network, but also the intellectuals who remained in Constantinople. A map portraying the labeling of heresy needs to be developed to capture this special form of medieval networking. In the original phase of the issue of the Bogomils, the Bulgarian presbyter Kozma from the tenth century left a sermon on the newly appeared heretics and on the criticism of the corruption of the established Orthodox Church and monasteries. As usual for a heresiological work, in Kozma's sermon, after the condemnation of the earlier Trinitarian and

⁷⁹ As for the Cathars, Borst's and Duvernoy's works remain important: see Arno Borst, *Die Katharer*, Stuttgart, 1953; Jean Duvernoy, *L'Histoire des Cathares* (1979) and *La Religion des Cathares* (1976).

⁸⁰ Steven Runciman, *The Medieval Manichee. A Study of the Christian Dualist Heresy*, Cambridge University Press, 1982; Dimitri Obolensky, *The Bogomils. A Study in Balkan Neo-Manichaeism*, Cambridge University Press, 2004; Milan Loos, *Dualist Heresy in the Middle Ages*, New York, 1974.

⁸¹ One example review is Karen L. King, *What Is Gnosticism?* Harvard University Press, 2003.

Christological heresies (Arius, Sabellius, and Macedonius), he listed the Bogomils:

Heretics came to the land of Bulgarians as well under the good Christian Emperor Tsar Peter I (r. 927-969). There was a priest (*pop*) named Bogomil, but to tell the truth, *Bog-ne-mil* (not worthy of God's mercy), as totally contrary to the meaning of the name (worthy of God's mercy), preached heresy for the first time in the land of Bulgaria. (*Sermon against the heretics*)⁸²

These introductory lines on founder Pop Bogomil by Kozma appeared again in the later *Tsar Boril's Synodikon* of 1211⁸³. In early Christian and Byzantine heresiology, the founder's name represents the label of an individual sect, so the "Bogomils" could be the followers of certain of Bogomil's teachings. However, Kozma's work was composed of accusations against the Bogomils and against his contemporary church in the land of Bulgaria. Although his coined heresy title for the Bogomils survived thereafter, the second part of his criticism was almost ignored by later heresiologists.

In Kozma's sermon, we see the label "Bogomils" employed to refer to a variety of people in various places. However, it is important to note that later users of the labels were not faithful to Kozma. Rather, they took advantage of the name as a heresy title or label. Some defendants were ex-bishops or preachers of Paphlagonia (Eleutherios), Phrygia (a preacher who met Euthymios of Peribleptos), Kappadokia (Clement of Sasima and Leontios of Balbissa), Constantinople (including a doctor named Basileios), a renowned monk (Niphon), an abbot (Chrysomallos), and nobles, magnates, and ordinary citizens, including the "Manichaean" citizens of Philippopolis.⁸⁴ In the Paleologan era, the Bogomil accusation targeted even the Palamists.⁸⁵ However, it is overly hasty to regard the sectarian movement as successful-

⁸² Puech and Vaillant, *Le Traité Contre Les Bogomiles de Cosmas le Prêtre* (1945), 54.

⁸³ Jean Gouillard, "Une source grecque du Sinodik de Boril," *Travaux et Mémoires* 4 (1970), 361-374.

⁸⁴ Jean Gouillard, "Quatre procès de mystiques a Byzance (vers 960-1143): Inspiration et autorité," *Revue des Études Byzantines* 36 (1978), 5-81.

⁸⁵ Antonio Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci Bogomili*, Firenze, 1989.

ly gaining popularity among many followers in various areas, for there is a critical lack of quantitative evidence. Also, one has to be careful in considering the supposed Bogomil missionary in the *oikoumene* as responsible for the inconsistency in the heresy charges mentioned above. It is highly possible that a religious movement or local mores gained popularity among pious Christians, as the Byzantine *oikoumene* included much diversity, and popular unauthorized activities could be detected at any time or place. However, it was the church authorities that developed the label "Bogomils" as a concept of new heresy. They created a backstory for the label that appeared first in Bulgaria and diffused immediately across the *oikoumene*. Indeed, people without any relationship to the Bulgarian founder Bogomil could be anathematized of Bogomilish (*bogomilike*) heretics.

CONCLUSION

The unified Eastern Mediterranean and northwest Eurasian lands contained multiple people and cultures that were heavily dependent on universal networking. The concept of *oikoumene* in the pre-modern Eastern Mediterranean represents an active transportation and thought network. The *oikoumene*, as an example of Byzantine universalism within civilized Christianity, was always a vulnerable theoretical fiction. However, the physical concept of *oikoumene* did exist, and was related to human living phases. It not only consisted of theoretical statements and theological views of the world, but also individual local experiences, social and political rumors, and even biased views of others (as with the use of heresy titles), which were all brought about by the "inhabitants" moving along land and sea routes.

Via the network, people in the *oikoumene* could access foreign teachings and stories from outsiders or "barbarians" of different faiths. Through the production and circulation of manuscripts and books, the network acted as a transporter of ancient knowledge and valuable works by church fathers, but also of tales, rumors, and labels, which were diffused and brought to people's attention.

Both official and private travelers in the Byzantine *oikoumene* encountered dubious ascetics and local churches along the way. These travelers probably shared news that they later reported officially.⁸⁶ A chronicler of the First Crusade reported a camp of “heretics.” Euthymios of Peribleptos, a heresiographer in the mid-eleventh century, came to Constantinople in his youth from his home of Acmonia.⁸⁷ He happened to note that the “heretical” preacher and his followers were called the Phundagiagiten (“the people of scrip, or bag”). Thereafter, when he heard a rumor about the Bogomils of Bulgaria while living in Constantinople, he immediately linked the names of the Phundagiagiten and the Bogomils. There was no direct evidence that the Bulgarian sect accomplished the diffusion of their teaching in Constantinople as well as Phrygia. However, travelers like Euthymios of Acmonia introduced and spread the “label” in Constantinople.

In the “official” Byzantine viewpoint, heretics lived on the fringes of the Orthodox *oikoumene*. Constantinopolitan intellectuals coined and issued heresy labels and spread their heretical contamination story in the center of the *oikoumene*. The heresiologists collected information on the heresy titles from far-flung locales in all directions from Constantinople, and again exported the labels. Any accused ascetics from the twelfth century onward were arbitrarily labeled as “Bogomils” or “Massalians,” though there was no explicit evidence that those defendants were associated with the condemned Bogomil party of Basileios, the Phrygian Paulicians, or the Syrian Massalians. The heresy labels and the intellectuals’ labeling behavior spread via the transportation network of the imperial Orthodox *oikoumene*.

Further investigation into the textual and visual representations of *oikoumene* will shed light on the network characteristics of the living phases of multi-cultural areas, like the medieval Eastern Mediterranean in which information, migration, and inter-religious networking were strong among Byzantine Christians, Slavs (“ethnic” groups, including nomads), Latins, Arabs, and Turks. Through the investigation of Byzantine representa-

⁸⁶ Louis Bréhier, ed., *Histoire Anonyme de la première Croisade*, Paris, 1964, 21.

⁸⁷ “*Pseudopresbyteros de en... apo tou choriou Gozous* (There was a false preacher from Gozous)” Ficker, *Die Phundagiagiten*, 6.

tions of the *oikoumene* as a network of "ideas" or "concepts," such as that of heresy titles, it has become clear that this network concept will be significant in further reviews of the medieval term "*oikoumene*."