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The prefect of Illyricum and the prefect of Thessaloniki

1. Theories and problems concerning the prefect of Illyricum and the prefect of Thessaloniki

One of the thorniest issues in contemporary research is the organization and function of the provincial administrative structures of the Byzantine Empire, especially during the transitional period of the so-called Dark Ages (7th-9th c.), because of the scanty information provided by literary sources. Although our limited knowledge is supplemented by sigillary material, in some cases however different and conflicting theories have been formulated.

Such is the case of the prefect of Illyricum (ἔπαρχος Ἰλλυρικοῦ), who was at the head of the prefecture of Illyricum, which was established in 395 or early 396 and included the dioeceses of Dacia and Macedonia1. His seat was in Thessaloniki2. It has been argued that the Slavic invasions and the challenge to the Byzantine rule in the areas around Thessaloniki led to the restriction of the prefect’s jurisdiction to the city itself, a transition which is reflected in the seals (8th-9th c.), where a prefect of Thessaloniki and not of Illyricum is mentioned:


2. See B. Bavant, L’Illyricum (see n. 1) 308-309, who correctly argues that Thessaloniki was constantly the capital of the prefecture from the end of the 4th to the end of the 7th century. Concerning the problem of the capital of the prefecture of Illyricum and its transfer from Sirmium to Thessaloniki in 441, see G. Theocharides, Ιστορία της Μακεδονίας κατά τους μέσους χρόνους (285-1354), [Μακεδονική Βιβλιοθήκη 55] Thessaloniki 1980, p. 100-103, with the older bibliography. Cf. Elisavet Chatziantoniou, Η μητρόπολη Θεσσαλονίκης από τα μέσα του 8ου έως το 1430. Ιεραρχική τάξη - Εκκλησιαστική περιφέρεια - Διοικητική οργάνωση, [Βυζαντινά Κείμενα και Μελέτες 42], Thessaloniki 2007, p. 18-19, with bibliography. See also the study of P. Tóth, Sirmian Martyrs in Exile Pannonian Case-Studies and a Re-evaluation of the St Demetrius Problem, Byzantinische Zeitschrift 103.1 (2010) 145-170, p. 164-168, who rejects the view that the seat of the prefecture was transferred from Sirmium to Thessaloniki.
- Agallianos, spatharios and eparchos of Thessaloniki (9th c. or rather first third of the 9th c.)
- Andronikos, hypatos and eparchos of Thessaloniki (8th-9th)
- Basileios, basilikos spatharios and eparchos of Thessaloniki (9th c. or rather first half of the 9th c)
- Eustathios, basilikos spatharios and eparchos of Thessaloniki (8th c.)
- Ioannes (?), basilikos spatharios and eparchos of Thessaloniki (late 8th c.)
- Leon, hypatos, basilikos spatharios and eparchos of Thessaloniki (8th-9th c.)
- Niketas, hypatos, basilikos spatharios and eparchos of Thessaloniki (8th c. or rather second quarter of the 8th c., according to the more accurate dating by A.-K. Wassiliou-Seibt and W. Seibt)
- Persentios, hypatos, basilikos spatharios and eparchos of Thessaloniki (second half of the 8th c.)
- Staurakios, basilikos spatharios and eparchos of Thessaloniki (8th-9th c.)
- Theodoros, hypatos and eparchos of Thessaloniki (first half of the 8th c.)


4. G. Zacos - A. Veglery, Seals (see n. 3) no. 1717A (750-850). Cf. PmbZ (see n. 3) no. 434.
6. J. Nesbitt - N. Oikonomides, Catalogue (see n. 3) no. 18.19. Cf. PmbZ (see n. 3) no. 1758.
8. K. M. Konstantopoulos, Βυζαντινά μολυβδόβουλλα τού ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἐθνικοῦ Μουσείου, Athens 1917, no. 8γ, p. 282. Cf. PmbZ (see n. 3) no. 4391.
9. G. Zacos - A. Veglery, Seals (see n. 3) 957. – J. Nesbitt - N. Oikonomides, Catalogue (see n. 3) no. 18.20. – A-K. Wassiliou-Seibt - W. Seibt, Bleisiegel (see n. 7) no. 136. Cf. PmbZ (see n. 3) no. 5394.
10. Seven specimens from the same bouloterion: E. Stepanova, Eparchoi (see n. 5) no. 2.
11. Two specimens from different bouloteria: G. Zacos - A. Veglery, Seals (see n. 3) no. 2382a-b. – J. Nesbitt - N. Oikonomides, Catalogue (see n. 3) no. 18.21a-b. Cf. PmbZ (see n. 3) no. 6887.
12. J.-Cl. Cheynet - C. Morisson - W. Seibt, Les sceaux byzantins de la collection Henri Seyrig, Paris 1991, no. 196. Cf. PmbZ (see n. 3) no. 7533. See also another seal of Theodoros, hypatos and eparchos of Thessaloniki published by E. Stepanova, Eparchoi (see n. 5) no. 1. The seal is attributed by the editor to the same person, despite the differences between the two specimens.
The prefect of Illyricum and the prefect of Thessaloniki

-P. Lemerle formulated different and contradictory views regarding the prefect of Illyricum, which although disputed by J. Karayannopoulos have affected modern research. Initially, P. Lemerle claimed, in his book “Philippes et Macédoine orientale ...” (1945), that the prefect of Illyricum survived until the 8th century, but later, in his study of the invasions and the migrations in the Balkans during the 8th century (1954), he argued that the prefecture of Illyricum disappeared between 610 and 678-680 and that the prefect of Illyricum became an urban prefect. Finally, in his commentary on the edition of St Demetrius’ Miracles (1981), he revised his previous assumptions and argued that the last mentions of the prefect of Illyricum were those of the second collection of St Demetrius’ Miracles dated in the late 7th century and that later the praetorian prefect became an urban prefect.

Many scholars, including N. Oikonomides, followed P. Lemerle’s views and adopted the idea that the prefect of Illyricum had become an urban prefect as early as the second half of the 7th century, since the prefecture disintegrated and the power of the Byzantines in the region around Thessaloniki was strongly disputed by the Slavs. Other scholars, such as Aikaterini Christophilopoulou...
and Angeliki Konstantakopoulou, considered that the *prefect of Illyricum* was abolished and that the *prefect of Thessaloniki* was a completely new institution similar to the *prefect of Constantinople*.

Although in one of their studies W. Brandes and J. Haldon adopted the theory that the *prefect of Thessaloniki* was a new type of imperial officer, they consider the *prefect of Thessaloniki* as an evolution of the *prefect of Illyricum*. According to J. Haldon “the *praetorian prefect of Illyricum* existed until the second half of the 7th century, although his *prefecture* effectively disappears and he becomes, in practice, the *eparch* or the *prefect of Thessaloniki*, for whom seals from the later 7th century until the later 8th century survive.” It should be mentioned, however, that the seals of the *prefects of Thessaloniki* date from (see n. 2) 96, 102, 220. – J.-Cl. Cheynet - B. Flusin, Du monastère Ta Kathara à Thessalonique : Théodore Stoudite sur la route de l’exil, *REB* 48 (1990) 193-211, p. 201 note 29. – Maria Leontsini, *Κωνσταντίνος Δ΄ (668-685). Ο τελευταίος πρωτοβυζαντινός αυτοκράτορας*, [Εθνικό Ίδρυμα Ερευνών, Μονογραφίες 7] Athens 2006, p. 204. – J.-Cl. Cheynet, L’administration impériale, in: *Le monde byzantin*, vol. II: L’Empire byzantin 641-1204, ed. J.-Cl. Cheynet, Paris 2006, p. 125-147, 147.

22. Aikaterini Christophilopoulou, *Βυζαντινή Μακεδονία. Σχεδίασμα για την εποχή από τα τέλη του Στ’ μέχρι τον Θ’ αιώνα*, *Βυζαντινά* 12 (1983) 9-63, p. 46, 51-52, who considers that the *prefect of Illyricum* was abolished between 620-680 and that the *prefect of the second collection of St Demetrius’ Miracles* was a different and new institution, an urban *prefect* (of Thessaloniki) similar to that of Constantinople, following P. Lemerle (Invasions). – Angeliki Konstantakopoulou, *Ιστορική Γεωγραφία της Μακεδονίας (4ος-6ος αι.*)*, Giannena 1984, p. 93 and note 47 (p. 335), contrary to Aik. Christophilopoulou, remarks that the last mentions of the *praefectus Illyrici* are those of St Demetrius’ Miracles. – Eadem, *L’éparque de Thessalonique: Les origines d’une institution administrative* (VIII-IXe siècles), in: *Communications greques présentées au Ve Congrès International des Études du Sud Est-Européen (Belgrade, 11–17 Septembre 1984)*, Athens 1985, p. 157-162. – Eadem, *Βυζαντινή Θεσσαλονίκη. Χώρος και ιδεολογία* [Πανεπιστήμιο Ιωαννίνων. Επιστημονική Επετείου Φιλολογικής Σχολής. Δωδώνη, Παράρτημα 62], Giannena 1996, p. 64, 88.

23. W. Brandes - J. Towns, Tax and Transformation: State, Cities and their Hinterlands in the East Roman World, c. 500-800, in: *Towns and their Territories between Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. G. P. Brogiolo, N. Gauthier, N. Christie, Leiden - Boston - Köln 2000, p. 141-172, 170-171: “… It seems more likely that the central government now appointed *eparchs*, perhaps following the precedent of the appointment of the *eparch* of the city of Constantinople. It is in any case doubtful whether the *eparch*, whose presence at Thessaloniki is mentioned in the second part of the *Miracula S. Demetrii*, should be seen simply as the holder of the old office of *praefectus praetorio per Illyricum*. A seal of Niketas, *eparch of Nicaea* ... together with several seals of *eparchs of Thessaloniki*, supports the view that these *eparchs* represent a new type of imperial official”.

24. L. Brubaker - J. F. Haldon, *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era*, c. 680-850. *A History*, Cambridge 2011, p. 671. See also J. Haldon, *Byzantium in the seventh century. The transformation of a culture*, Cambridge 1990, p. 195, where it is mentioned : “the praetorian prefect of Illyricum continued to exist until the second half of the seventh century, although probably with only nominal authority over much of his former prefecture, which was now mostly outside Byzantine imperial control”.
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the early 8th century to the early 9th century and not from the 7th century. W. Brandes believes that the *prefect of Illyricum* did not disappear, but was transformed into a *prefect* of the city of Thessaloniki in the 7th century, because the lands of the *prefecture* were conquered by the Avars and the Slavs. He also remarks that, although it is not certain that the *prefect of Thessaloniki* had the same duties as the *prefect of Constantinople*, urban *prefects* are mentioned in relation to other cities of the empire during the 8th century, such as in Nikaia, Nikomedea, Amorion and Catania.\(^{25}\)

J. Karayannopoulos, on the other hand, has suggested that the *prefect of Thessaloniki* was in fact a continuation of the *prefect of Illyricum*, with his jurisdiction not confined to the narrow limits of the city but extended to the region of central and east Macedonia, from Pindos to the Nestos, and after the creation of the *theme of Thrace* to the Strymon, and from the Aliakmon to south of Stoboi, until the establishment of the *theme of Thessaloniki* and the replacement of the *prefect* by the *strategos of Thessaloniki*.\(^{26}\)

The recent publication, by Elena Stepanova, of new seals of *prefects of Thessaloniki* from the collection of the Hermitage Museum in St Petersburg\(^ {27}\) provides new prosopographical data and a good occasion for a re-examination of the relation between the *prefect of Illyricum* and the *prefect of Thessaloniki*.

The present paper brings into discussion the problem of the duration of the *prefecture* and the *prefect of Illyricum* and includes certain observations on the information of St Demetrius’ Miracles concerning the terminology used for the *prefect of Illyricum* and his duties. In addition, it examines whether the *prefect of Thessaloniki* mentioned on seals (8th-9th c.) was a survival of the *prefect of Illyricum* or a post created *ab initio*, whether it was an office similar to that of the *prefect of Constantinople* with a jurisdiction limited to the city of Thessaloniki and whether this administrative model was applied to other cities of the empire as well.


\(^{27}\) E. Stepanova, *Eparchoi* (see n. 5).
2. The testonies of St Demetrius’ Miracles

The main narrative sources about the prefect of Illyricum are the two well known collections of St Demetrius’ Miracles that praise the patron saint of the city and provide valuable information about Thessaloniki, unknown to other sources. The first collection is attributed to John, archbishop of Thessaloniki, and dates to the early 7th century, while the second collection was compiled by an anonymous clergyman seventy years later. Despite the reservations that have been expressed from time to time concerning the historical reliability of these hagiographical sources, St. Demetrius’ Miracles have been used by many scholars, who draw conclusions on the history, the social and administrative structure of Thessaloniki, and the relations between the Byzantines and the Slavic tribes.

The prefect of Illyricum is mentioned several times in the first collection of the Miracles, which refers to "τοὺς τῶν ὑπάρχων θρόνων τοὺς κατὰ τὸ Ἰλλυριῶν ἔθνος", "τὴν ἔπαρχον ἀρχὴν τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ", "τοὺς ὑπάρχους..." Apart from P. Lemerle’s edition and commentary see also P. Chrestou, Η γραμματεία των Δημητρείων Α΄. Διηγήσεις περί των θαυμάτων του Αγίου Δημητρίου, Thessaloniki 1993 and Ch. Bakirtzes, Αγίου Δημητρίου Θαύματα. Ο βίος, τα θαύματα και η Θεσσαλονίκη του Αγίου Δημητρίου, translation by Aloe Sideri, Thessaloniki 1997. Cf. also Sofia Kotzabassi, Αγιολογικά κείμενα, in: Η Θεσσαλονίκη στη βυζαντινή λογοτεχνία. Ρητορικά και αγιολογικά κείμενα, Thessaloniki 2002, p. 91-95.


30. P. Lemerle, Miracles I 10 (57.6-7).
31. P. Lemerle, Miracles I 25 (69.4), 77 (108.6), 128 (137.18).
"Ἰλλυρίου"32 and "τῶν όπάρχων τοῦ Ἰλλυρίων ἔθνους ἁρχήν"33. There are also references to "ἐπαρχος,"34 "ὑπάρχος" or "ὑπάρχος ἐξουσία"35 and to "ἐπάρχος"36 or "ὑπάρχος"37 as well as to the scrinia of the prefecture of Illyricum and their head.

Concerning the scrinia, the "ἀξιομνημόνευτος ἀνὴρ καὶ τὴν ἐντιμὸν στρατείαν τοῦ δακικοῦ καλομετέων σκρινίον τῶν ύπερλάμπρων ύπάρχων τοῦ Ἰλλυρίου στρατευόμενος"38 and those who were "ἐν τοῖς σκρινίοις τῶν ύπάρχων τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ πρῶτοι" are mentioned39. It is known that the praetorian prefects were assisted by a numerous staff of subordinates, in order to perform their administrative, financial and judicial duties40. The administrative organization of the prefectures was divided into two branches, financial and judicial; they consisted of scrinia that were situated in the capitals of the prefectures. The available information about the judicial structure of the prefecture of Illyrium is scanty: only a cornicularius, who was at the head of the judicial department, and a primiscrinius, who was responsible for the execution of the judicial decisions of the prefect, are known41. Nevertheless, we can posit that the judicial branch may have resembled that of the other prefectures, which included more senior officers, such as the commentariensis, dealing with criminal cases, the ab actis, concerned with civil cases and the keeping of judicial records, and perhaps the a libellis, responsible for petitions and for the correspondence of the Chrysostom of Illyricum42. The composition of the financial department, on the other hand, is well attested. According to the Notitia Dignitatum, the prefecture of Illyrium consisted of four scrinia: one for each

32. P. Lemerle, Miracles I 77 (108.3), 86 (114.18), 106 (126.3), 129 (137.21).
33. P. Lemerle, Miracles I 96 (119.15).
34. P. Lemerle, Miracles I 10 (57.4), 15 (61.25), 22 (66.26), 92 (116.6), 93 (116.17), 94 (118.2), 96 (119.31).
35. P. Lemerle, Miracles I 13 (59.18 και 21), 15 (61.16), 16 (62.8 και 63.1), 22 (66.9), 210 (188.22), 231 (209.5), 290 (229.16-17: “οἱ τὴν ύπάρχον ἐχοντες φροντίδα”).
36. P. Lemerle, Miracles I 77 (108.12).
37. P. Lemerle, Miracles I 22 (66.20), 23 (67.14), 79 (108.20).
38. P. Lemerle, Miracles I 106 (126.2-3).
39. P. Lemerle, Miracles I 129 (137.21).
42. For the judicial department of Africa see A. Gkoutzioukostas - X. Moniaros, Quaestura Exercitus (see n. 1) 68-69. For the senior officers of the judicial branch of the prefecture of the East see Chr. Kelly, Prefecture (see n. 41) 435-442.
dioecesis (Macedonia and Dacia), one for public works (scrinium operum), and one for the treasury (scrinium auri)⁴³. The officials of the scrinia were called scriniarii⁴⁴ and those at their head were called numerarii⁴⁵.

The term “ἐπαρχοὶ Θεσσαλονίκης” (“prefects of Thessaloniki”) occurs only once, as a synonym, it seems, for the prefect or prefects of Illyricum mentioned in one and the same paragraph of the Miracles of St Demetrius. The subordinate of the komes of Abydos, who had been sent to Chios because of the delay to the ships carrying the annona civica from Alexandria to Constantinople, sent a letter of protest to the prefect of Illyricum when he discovered that the ships were sailing to Thessaloniki and informed the komes of Abydos about the incident blaming the prefect of Thessaloniki – that is, the prefect of Illyricum: “Ὁ δὲ ἀνὴρ … ὑποτοπήσας τοὺς ὑπάρχους τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ … γράμμα ἐπεξεργάσθη πρὸς τὸν τηνικαῦτα τὴν ἔπαρχον ἐγκεχειρημένην ἁρχὴν τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ, καταβοῶν τὴν ἁδικίαν, προσθεὶς καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πεμφθέντος δήθεν παρ’ αὐτῶν Δημητρίου ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν πλοίων ἀναγκαστική προτροπῆ. Οὐκ ἡμέλησε δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ στείλαντι αὐτὸν ἐν Χίῳ καὶ τῆς Ἀβύδου προκαθημένῳ γεγράφηκε, διαβάλλων τοὺς ἔπαρχους Θεσσαλονίκης, γνωρίσας αὐτῷ τὰ κατὰ λεπτὸν καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πεμφθέντος Δημητρίου, ὡς ἐκείνον κινηθέντα θυμῷ βασιλεῖ ταῦτα προσανοίσαι, καὶ βασιλέα πάλιν τὸν φιλόχριστον ἐπιπληκτικικαὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἔπαρχους κελεύσας χρῆσαι την ἀναγκαῖον κεραυνίαν περὶ τοῦ ἔπαρχου Θεσσαλονίκης”⁴⁶.

W. Brandes wonders whether the prefects of Thessaloniki in the above passage referred to the prefect of Illyricum or the prefect of Thessaloniki. In addition, he does not exclude the possibility that the term ἐπαρχοὶ referred in general to the head officers (“führende Beamte”)⁴⁷. As we see it, there is no difference between the prefect of Illyricum and the prefect of Thessaloniki in the above text. The prefect of Illyricum resided – at least during this time – permanently in Thessaloniki, and perhaps this is why he is also mentioned as prefect of Thessaloniki. Besides, the prefecture still existed and no urban prefect is known in Thessaloniki during that period. The use of plural (“ἐπαρχοὶ”) is usual in the Miracles of St Demetrius, as it can be concluded from the testimonies

⁴⁴. For the scriniai, who were subalterns to various military and financial offices, see O. Seeck, Scrinium, RE II.A1 (1921) 894-903, p. 902-903. – W. Brandes, Finanzverwaltung (see n. 25) 64-72.
⁴⁵. See W. Ensslin, Numerarius, RE XVII.2 (1937) 1297-1323. – A. H. M. Jones, Empire (see n. 43) I 450, II. 589. – W. Brandes, Finanzverwaltung (see n. 25) 70-71. – Chr. Kelly, Prefecture (see n. 41) 443.
⁴⁶. P. Lemerle, Miracles I 77 (108.1-13).
⁴⁷. W. Brandes, Finanzverwaltung (see n. 25) 54, 612-613.
mentioned above, and does not indicate the existence of more than one prefect in Thessaloniki at the same time. The second collection of St Demetrius’ Miracles, compiled at the end of the 7th century, mentions a prefect, on three occasions. First, there is a reference to the “ὑπαρχος Χαρίας”, who was sent by the emperor to Thessaloniki in 619/620 during a siege of the city by the Avaroslavs, with no mention of his duties. The second reference is to an anonymous prefect in the Miracle concerning the well-known case of Perboundos (“Περὶ τής κατὰ τὸν Περβοῦνδον λιμοῦ καὶ ἀνενδότου πολιορκίας”)50, which has attracted the interest of many scholars, and the third one to those who “τὴν ὑπαρχον ἔχοντες φροντίδα” in the Miracle concerning Kouver’s and Mavros’ episode (“τοῦ μελετηθέντος κρυπτῶς ἐμφυλίου πολέμου κατὰ τῆς πόλεως παρὰ τοῦ Μαύρου καὶ Κουβερ τῶν Βουλγάρων”). The prefect organized the transportation of the Sermesianoi, who had arrived in Thessaloniki with their women and children, by ship to Constantinople.

In our view, the terminology used for the prefect in the case of Perboundos is clear. The prefect is designated as “ὁ τότε τῆς τῶν ἐνταῦθα ἑπαρχότητος κρατεῖν” and as “ὑπαρχος ἐξουσία”.53 The use of the term “ἐπαρχότης” (prefecture) indicates that the officer was the prefect of Illyricum in the regions which the Byzantines controlled and not a prefect of the city, since the praefectus urbis, whose duties were completely different than those of the praefectus praetorio, never administrated a prefecture and his position or office was not designated as prefecture. It should also be noted that the term πολιτάρχης (politarches) is used for the prefect of Constantinople in the same Miracle, as we have argued in another study.

There is also another evidence that in our opinion confirms the function of the prefecture of Illyricum during the 7th century, namely a lead seal of the trakteutes of Crete Theodosius, which dates from the 7th century in general or 48. See also A. Konstantakopoulou, Thessalonique (see n. 22) 158-159, 49. Cf. W. Brandes, Finanzverwaltung (see n. 25) 612, who remarks that it cannot be concluded what kind of prefect Charias was (prefect of Illyricum or prefect of the city). 50. P. Lemerle, Miracles I 230-282 (208-221) and II p. 112 ff. 51. P. Lemerle, Miracles I 289 (229.16-17). 52. For Perboundos see PmbZ (see n. 3) no. 5901. 53. P. Lemerle, Miracles I 231 (208.9-209.1 and 209.5) and II 176. 54. See also Th. Korres, Παρατηρήσεις σχετικά με την πέμπτη πολιορκία της Θεσσαλονίκης από τούς Σλάβους (676-678). Παλαιότερη έρευνα και νεότερες ερμηνείες, Βυζαντιακά 19 (1999) 139-165, p. 141. – PmbZ (see n. 3) no. 10719. 55. Cf. W. Brandes, Finanzverwaltung (see n. 25) 612. 56. A. Gkoutzioukostas, Πολιτάρχης και πολιταρχία στα Θαύματα του Αγίου Δημητρίου και σε άλλες πηγές, Βυζαντινά 27 (2007) 1-20. 57. J. Nesbitt - N. Oikonomides, Catalogue of Byzantine Seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg.
the late 7th century or the second to third third of the 7th century according to A.-K. Wassiliou-Seibt. It is known that the trakteutes belonged to the financial branch of the prefectures and was responsible for collecting the tax revenues from the provinces. We assume that the trakteutes of Crete worked in the financial department of the Illyrian prefecture, which was still functioning, and the prefect of Illyricum had jurisdiction in Crete even in the mid 7th century or even later.

In the Miracle concerning the case of Perboundos, the head of the Rynchinoi Slavs was suspected by the prefect and considered a threat to the safety of Thessaloniki. When the emperor was informed about the situation, he demanded that Perboundos be arrested and sent to Constantinople. The prefect's involvement in the arrest of Perboundos does not constitute sufficient supporting evidence for the view that he had police duties, similar to those of the prefect of Constantinople, as Aikaterini Christophilopoulou claimed. The


59. A. H. M. Jones, Empire (see n. 43) I 450-451, II 589. – W. Brandes, Finanzverwaltung (see n. 10) 78 and n. 104, the trakteutes of Crete, who bore no honorary title, probably belonged to the subordinates of the provincial governor of Crete, although nothing is known about the administration of Crete during the 7th century. It should be mentioned that this is a hypothesis based on the assumption that the prefecture of Illyricum did not exist in the second half of the 7th century. Besides, other trakteutes mentioned on seals of the same period also belonged to the mechanism of a prefecture. See for example the trakteutes of the islands (τρακτευτὴς νήσων) Leontius attested on seals of the 7th century, and the trakteutes Procopius, whose seal was found in Cyprus. These were probably members of the financial department of the prefecture of quaestura exercitus. See W. Brandes, Finanzverwaltung (see n. 25) 52-53, 78-79. – A. Gkoutzioukostas - X. Moniaros, Quaestura Exercitus (see n. 1) 172-173.

60. According to W. Brandes, Finanzverwaltung (see n. 10) 78 and n. 104, the trakteutes of Crete, who bore no honorary title, probably belonged to the subordinates of the provincial governor of Crete, although nothing is known about the administration of Crete during the 7th century. It should be mentioned that this is a hypothesis based on the assumption that the prefecture of Illyricum did not exist in the second half of the 7th century. Besides, other trakteutes mentioned on seals of the same period also belonged to the mechanism of a prefecture. See for example the

61. For the Rynchinoi Slavs see N. Dapergolas, Σλαβικές εγκαταστάσεις (see n. 29) 67-68, with the previous bibliography.

62. P. Lemerle, Miracles I 231 (209.4-9): “... Όστις θεοστεφής βασιλεύς θείαν αὐτοῦ κεραίαν πρὸς τὴν ἑπαρχον ἐξοσιαν κατέπεμψε, κελεύοντας τὸν αὐτὸν ῥήγα δὲ οὐ νομίσει τρόπον δεσμί-σιν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀποστείλαι. Καὶ τῶν τοιούτων εἰσεβέβην κεραίαν τοῖς ἐξόχοι τῶν πρῶτων ἱδία ἐμφανισθεισῶν, τοῖς αὐθόρου ἐν τῇ πόλει διάγοντα κρατήσαντες, ἔστειλαν σιδηροδέσμιον, καθὼς τὰ θεία περιείχον γράμματα, πρὸς τὸν λεχθέντα πανήμερον βασιλέα” and II 113.


64. See Aik. Christophilopoulou, Βυζαντινή Μακεδονία (see n. 22) 46, 51-52.
emperor ordered the \textit{prefect} to have Perboundos arrested, and the \textit{prefect} appealed to the “\textit{ἐξοχοι τῶν πρώτων}” (the local authorities), who were probably responsible for policing the city\textsuperscript{65}. Such duties performed by those who administered the city are also indicated in another passage of the same Miracle. During the blockade of Thessaloniki by the Slavic tribes the city was struck by famine, despite the transportation of food supplies from Constantinople. Armed men\textsuperscript{66} under the command of the rulers of the city (“\textit{katά κέλευσιν τῶν κρατούντων}”) entered the houses, in order to search for hidden grain, or entered the gardens of the city unhindered “as if they were theirs”\textsuperscript{67}.

The \textit{prefect} was not, as it seems, either in charge of policing the city of Thessaloniki or of conducting military operations\textsuperscript{68}, although in the first collection of St Demetrius’ Miracles it is stated that during the attack of the Avaroslavs against Thessaloniki in 597 or 586\textsuperscript{69} the \textit{prefect} was absent along with most of the elite young men of the military forces and those who served in the praetorium (“\textit{κατά κέλευσιν τῶν αὐτῶν τῶν ἐπιλέκτων νεανίων τοῦ τε στρατιωτικοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ μεγίστῳ στρατευομένων πραιτωρίῳ, ἀμὴ τῷ τηνικαῦτα τὴν ἑπάρχον μετὰ χεῖρας ἐπούλησαν τὴν ἀρχήν}”\textsuperscript{70}. Ch. Bakirtzes has argued that the

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{65} See also Ar. Mentzos, Πρώτες παρατηρήσεις για την εξέλιξη των πολιτικών θεσμών της Θεσσαλονίκης στην αυγή του Μεσαίωνα. Σχόλια στο τέταρτο θαύμα της ανώνυμης Συλλογής των θαυμάτων του αγίου Δημητρίου, Βυζαντινά 26 (2006) 33-61, p. 42.
\textsuperscript{66} These men were probably the armed sailors of the ships that had previously transported supplies to the harbour of Thessaloniki, as pointed out by P. Lemerle, Miracles II 121.
\textsuperscript{67} P. Lemerle, Miracles I 252 (213.31-34): “Ἀλλοι δὲ κατὰ κέλευσιν τῶν κρατούντων εἰς τοὺς τὸ δοκεῖν οἴκους ὅπου γε καθ’ ἐπόνυμον σίτου ὑπάρχεσθαι ἐκεῖ ἐκείνον ἐδόκουν ἐκελεύσθησαν ὑπεισέρχεσθαι...· ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐνδον τῆς πόλεως κήποις ἑκάστος ὡς ἐις ἱδία ἀνεμποδίστως εἰσέρχεσθαι”. Cf. Ar. Mentzos, Θεσμοί (see n. 65) 46.
\textsuperscript{68} But, see P. Chrestou, Διηγήσεις (see n. 28) 319 n. 15. – A. Stavridou-Zafraka, Θέματα (see n. 26) 162. Cf. A.-K. Wassiliou - W. Seibt, Bleisiegel (see n. 7) no. 136, who mention that the \textit{prefect} of Thessaloniki “dürfte neben den zivilen auch paramilitärische Agenden gegabt haben”.
\textsuperscript{69} See G. Kardaras, The episode of Bousas (586/7) and the use of siege engines by the Avars, BSI 63 (2005) 53-65, who argues that the siege took place in 586 and not in 597 (with the previous bibliography). See also more recently, S. Iatrou, Μία παρατήρηση σχετικά με τη χρονολόγηση της α’ αβαροσλαβικής πολιορκίας της Θεσσαλονίκης, Βυζαντιακά 28 (2008) 115-130, who concludes that a re-evaluation of the chronological data in question is necessary, since “the date ‘September 22nd’ forms part of a substantial number of examples of the Old-Testament contamination in John’s (archbishop and compiler of the first collection of the Miracles) account of the incidents”.
\textsuperscript{70} P. Lemerle, Miracles I 128 (137.16-19). Cf. the not so accurate translation of the first phrase by Aloe Sideri (Ch. Bakirtzes, Θαύματα [see n. 28] 189): “most of the elected young men who served in the greatest praetorium”. But, see the correct translation of P. Chrestou, Διηγήσεις (see n. 28) 319 “most of the young men of the military forces and of the great praetorium”.
\end{footnotesize}
“στρατιωτικόν” constituted part of the comitatenses palatini[71], the latter though were usually stationed around Constantinople. It should be noted that contingents of the imperial guard such as scholarii, protectores and domestici[72] resided during the 6th century in provinces of Asia Minor. Such units could have been at the disposal of the provincial governors since the reign of Justinian (527-565), in order to ensure public order, to collect taxes or to enforce their judgments[73]. But the military forces of Thessaloniki constitute a different case.

The “ἐπίλεκτοι νεανίαι” correspond, according to M. Pillon, to the collegia juvenum and the juvenitates of the Principatus, as well as to the (ellecti) juvenes of certain cities that formed military corps during the 3rd century[74]. In our view, the “ἐπίλεκτοι νεανίαι” of the Miracles is not a technical term. The adjective ἐπίλεκτος is used by the archbishop John in other passages as well, e.g. when he describes the attack against Thessaloniki by the elit forces of the Slavs[75]. It should be also remarked that the phrase “ἐπίλεκτοι νεανίσκοι” is also used in the Old Testament and other ecclesiastical sources[76]. It seems, therefore, that Ioannes, who was an ecclesiastical man, used phrases and passages from the Bible, as is obvious from the testimonia of P. Lemerle’s edition[77].

In the case of Thessaloniki the military units were probably part of the forces of the magisterium militum per Illyricum[78]. It has been observed that to-
wards the end of the reign of Justinian I a large part of comitatenses tended to reside permanently in cities and towns, where they functioned as local garrisons⁷⁹. Consequently, the soldiers in Thessaloniki were professional military forces who lived in the city⁸⁰ and were probably recruited from that region⁸¹. The prefect of Illyricum could use these forces, after imperial permission, to perform his duties outside of Thessaloniki as well, e.g. to collect taxes or enforce judgments. This does not necessarily mean that the prefect was a military governor or that he was in charge of defending the region around Thessaloniki, contrary to what has been argued. He was probably responsible for the payment and the supply of these forces.

The praetorium was the seat of the prefect of Illyricum, as it is stated in the first collection St Demetrius’ Miracles⁸². Apart from those who served in the scrinia and were among the most senior officials of the prefecture, there must had been other junior officers, that is, a staff assisting the prefect. For example in the prefecture of Africa 278 employees, organized into nine scholae (exceptores, chartularii, singularii, mittendarii, cursores, nomenclatores, praecones, draconarii, stratores), provided auxiliary support to the prefect⁸³. It is probable that the “ὑπατικιανός ταξεώτης” mentioned in the first collection of St Demetrius’ Miracles belonged to that sort of personnel under the Illyrian prefect⁸⁴. On the other hand, the term “στρατευόμενος” also designates the political

78. See also P. Lemerle, Miracles I 124 (136.19-21): “καὶ ἀγνώτες φήμαν οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ τῆς θέας αὐτῶν, πλὴν τῶν ἐν στρατιωτικοῖς τεταγμένων λόχων, καὶ τῶν ἄλλως πως ἔθεον μακρὰν πού τῆς πόλεως ὀπλιτικῶς αὐτοῖς παρατάτθηναι”. Cf. Ch. Bakirtzes, Ἀγωνία (see n. 28) 389, according to whom the soldiers who had fought against the Slavs far from Thessaloniki belonged to the magisterium militum (per Illyricum) and were settled in the city.


80. See P. Lemerle, Miracles I 49 (86.20-21), 137 (137.11-13), and 309 (238.16-17). Cf. P. Lemerle, Miracles II 77. – M. Pillon, Illyricum (see n. 74) 59-60.

81. M. Pillon, Illyricum (see n. 74) 35-36.

82. P. Lemerle, Miracles I 22 (66.19-20) and 23 (67.7).

83. See A. Gkoutzioukostas - X. Moniaros, Quaestura Exercitus (see n. 1) 69-70.

officials of the **prefecture**, as is shown by another reference in the first collection of Miracles (“εἰς, ἀξιομνημόνευτος ἀνήρ καὶ τὴν ἐντιμὸν στρατείαν τοῦ δακικοῦ καλουμένου σκρινίου τῶν ύπερλάμπρων ύπάρχον τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ στρατευόμενος”)85. But the “ἐπίλεκτοι νεανίαι”, who served in the praetorium (“ἐν τῷ μεγίστῳ πραιτωρίῳ στρατευόμενοι”) according to the narrative of St Demetrius’ Miracles, were probably soldiers. Consequently, they could be identified with the personal guard of the **prefect** of Illyricum (bucellarii)86, which was appointed by the **prefect** himself and payed out of his own expenses87.

In the case of the **prefect** Charias who was sent by the emperor, it is stated that he arrived in Thessaloniki during a siege. He went first to the church of St Demetrius where he prayed, and then he armed himself and manned the walls along with sailors and citizens. Consequently, it appears that the **prefect** took part in the defence of the city like everyone else, without playing a leading role.

Besides, apart from the military forces (“στρατιωτικῶν”) based in Thessaloniki, there was also the city’s militia (“παγανικῶν”)88. Such forces con-
sisted of the people of Thessaloniki ("ὁ δῆμος ἀπας")⁸⁹ plus slaves⁹⁰ and mercenaries Slavs⁹¹, under the command of the governors of Thessaloniki ("ἀρχοντες της πόλεως"), who appear to have conducted the defence of the city⁹². The city authorities were also engaged with the provisioning of Thessaloniki, along with the prefect of Illyricum⁹³, and were responsible for managing the city granaries. The narrative of the Miracles concerning the episode of Perboundos states that they had sold the wheat stored in the public granaries ("δημοσίους ἀρείους")⁹⁴ ("greniers municipaux")⁹⁵ despite the threat of a blockade of the city by the Slavs, who moved against Thessaloniki be-

89. P. Lemerle, Miracles I 107 (126.13-14): “Ὁ γαρ δῆμος ἄπας τῆς ἀπροδοκήτου ταύτης βοής κατακούσαντες ἐδραμον εἰς οἴκους, καὶ ὄπλωσθέντες ἐπὶ τὰ τείχη ἄνθησαν”.


91. See also P. Lemerle, Miracles I 250 (213.19-21): “ὅτε καὶ διὰ προσόντων τοιαῦτα ὑπάρχον τοῦ Ἱλλυρικοῦ πρωτο ὑπάρχον τοῖς σκρινίοις, τὸ ἄνθος τῶν ρωμαλεωτέρων εἰς τὰ ἀρκτῶν μέρη πρὸ τω θνί κατεσφάγησαν”. The Slavs, who were slaughtered, were fighting on behalf of the Thessalonians. See P. Lemerle, Miracles II 120. – P. Chrestou, Θαύματα (see n. 28) 432 n. 14.

92. P. Lemerle, Miracles I 136 (148.3-4): “Πολλοὶ γὰρ αὐτῶν περὶ τᾶς ὑπηρεσίας ἀπελπισάντες τὸ νικάν, προσφεύγοντες τοῖς ἀρχοντες τῆς πόλεως, ὁμολογοῦσι λέγοντες δε ἐρμηνεύως ότι της πόλεως ἐγνωσάν ὡς ἐβραγον ἀλλήνων τοῖς πολίταις”. Cf. Ar. Mentzos, Θεσμοι (see n. 65) 46 and n. 79.

93. J. Durlat, De la ville antique à la ville byzantine. Le problème des subsistance, [Collections de l’École Française de Rome] Rome 1990, p. 389-406, believes that the imperial authorities, the prefect of Illyricum or the prefect of Macedonia (although such an institution does not exist; he probably means the vicarius of the diocese of Macedonia) and not the local authorities, were in charge of provisioning Thessaloniki during the 7th century. But the testimonies of St Demetrius’ Miracles, mentioned below, reveal the involvement of the local authorities as well. In Constantinople the prefect of the city was responsible for the management of the annona civilis. See ibidem 245 ff.

94. For the adjective δημόσιος, which applies not only to the state but also to the city, see J. Durlat, Ville (see n. 93) 293.

95. P. Lemerle, Miracles II 117. By contrast, F. Malingoudis, Ο λιμός της Θεσσαλονικης το έτος 676, in: Η Θεσσαλονικη και ο κόσμος των Σλάβων. Επιστημονικά δόκιμα, Thessaloniki 1997, p. 69, considered that the granaries belonged to the state and not to the city and that those who sold the wheat were state officials. However, it should be remarked that if the grain that was sold belonged to the state and was a product of taxation, then the prefect of Illyricum would be accountable to the emperor, but according to the narrative of the Miracles the prefect was not involved in this case. See also Ar. Mentzos, Θεσμοι (see n. 65) 44, who pointed out that the letters of the emperor regarding the alimentation of the city were addressed to the municipal authorities and not to the prefect.
cause of the execution of Perboundos\textsuperscript{96}. It is evident that the granaries belonged to the city and differed from those of Constantinople and Rome, for which the \textit{prefect of the city} was responsible\textsuperscript{97}.

The fact that the local authorities of the city were engaged in the provisioning of Thessaloniki is illustrated by two more incidents mentioned in the same Miracle. According to the first, the local authorities and citizens decided to send their ships, plus another ten that had come from Constantinople, to Thessalic Thebes (Archialos) and Demetrias in order to buy dried fruits; they came back with wheat and pulses from the Belegezites Slavs\textsuperscript{98}. In the second incident, the city authorities had petitioned the emperor for a supply of grain\textsuperscript{99}. Such activity on the part of the local authorities is also cited in the eighth Miracle of the first collection composed by archbishop John, which says that in 586, shortly after the first failure of the Avaroslavs to take Thessaloniki, to Thessalic Thebes (Anchialos) and Demetrias in order to buy dried fruits; they came back with wheat and pulses from the Belegezites Slavs\textsuperscript{98}. In the second incident, the city authorities had petitioned the emperor for a supply of grain\textsuperscript{99}. Such activity on the part of the local authorities is also cited in the eighth Miracle of the first collection composed by archbishop John, which says that in 586, shortly after the first failure of the Avaroslavs to take Thessaloniki, the city sent an embassy to the emperor asking for food supplies because of the threat of famine\textsuperscript{100}.

\textsuperscript{96} P. Lemerle, \textit{Miracles I} 244 (211.27-212.4): “Ὡς λοιπὸν καὶ τὰς πόλεις ἀποκλείσει, διὰ τὸ καὶ τινὰς τῶν ἀσθενεστέρων τῶν λογισμῶν ἐκεῖσε προσφεύς διὰ τὴν ἀφάνιν ὑπὸν ἐν τῇ πόλει λιμᾶν. Κέρδους γὰρ ἔνεκα καὶ λήμματος, ὡς οίμαι, καὶ σὺν κατὰ τρόπον ἑτέρων, αὐτῷ ἡ ἀλήθεια ἀποδείκνυσιν, ἡ πλείστη ὑπεισῆλθε τῇ πόλει λιμᾶν. Τὸν γὰρ τὴν προνοιαν πάντων ἀναδεδεγμένων πιστῶν βασιλέως διὰ θείων αὐτοῦ κερασίν κελεύσαντος τοῦ ἐναπόθετον τῆς πόλεως φροντισά, καίτοι ὅντος ἐν τοῖς ἐνθάδε δημοσίων ἀφρείων σιτίων ὑπὸ δέσομος, καὶ τῆς διοικήσεως τῆς πόλεως τότε λαχόντες κατὰ ἑπτὰ μοδίων τὸν νομίσματος ἐπὶ τῶν ἐξίνων πλοίων κατέτροφασαν, καίτοι τῆς κινησεως τῶν βαρβάρων καταδήλου αὐτοῖς γεγενημένης. Τῇ πρὸ μᾶς γὰρ τοῦ τὰ κούφρα γεννήθη τῇ ἐστέρα δέξει τὰ τωστα πλοῖα σιτοφόρα ἀποστέλλει ἐκ τῶν ἐναπόθετα λιμῶν, μὴτερω ἐκφόριον ἐκ τῶν ἐναπόθετα γεγονένοιν”. According to J. Teall, \textit{The Grain Supply of the Byzantine Empire}, 330-1025, DOP 13 (1959) 89-139, n. 173, the tax imposed on the exports. See also P. Lemerle, \textit{Miracles I} 281 (221.6) or the tax imposed on the exports. See also P. Lemerle, \textit{Miracles II} 118-119; Cf. J. Durlait, Ville (see n. 93) 400 n. 247; F. Malingoudis, \textit{Λιμός} (see n. 95) 67-68, argues that ἐκφόριον is used instead of the term ἐκφόρημα, which simply means export.

97. Ar. Mentzos, Θεσμοί (see n. 65) 44.

98. P. Lemerle, \textit{Miracles I} 1254 (214.9-19). Cf. Ar. Mentzos, Θεσμοί (see n. 65) 39, who wonders if Thbes and Demetrias survived until this period as cities. See also Olga Karagiorgou, \textit{Urbanism and Economy in Late Antique Thessaly (3rd-7th c.)}, The Archaeological evidence (doctoral thesis), Oxford 2011, p. 28-33 and 52-82, who analyzes this mission of the Thessalonians to the Belegezides and the archaeological evidence for these cities and concludes that only “Demetrias managed to survive but in a completely new location and urban form”.

99. P. Lemerle, \textit{Miracles I} 281 (221.3-7): “Τὸν γὰρ στρατὸν ἐκεῖσε ἐκ τῶν δικαίως καὶ ἐνδεχόμενος βασιλεύειν ἦμιν λαχόντος σταλέντος ἐπὶ παρατάξει τῶν Σκλαβίνων, σιτοφόρα σκάφη καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἡμῶν αἵτισεως ἐνταῦθα ἀπεστείλε τῶν κρατοῦντων καὶ ἐν τούτῳ ἀργησάντων διὰ τὸν φοβὸν εὑπερ ἐποίησαν ἐκ τῶν ἐναπόθετα ἐκφόριον, μήπως γνωσθῆντες ἀγανακτῆrei καὶ ὑποβληθοῦν”. Cf. Ar. Mentzos, Θεσμοί (see n. 65) 45.

100. P. Lemerle, \textit{Miracles I} 72 (102.32-103.2). Cf. Ar. Mentzos, Θεσμοί (see n. 65) 45.
It seems, then, according to the testimonies of St Demetrius’ Miracles, that even up to the late 7th century certain urban structures of Thessaloniki were still functioning, as may be concluded from the existence of the “τῆς διοικήσεως τῆς πόλεως τότε λαχόντες”, the “κρατοῦντες (τῆς πόλεως)”, the “ἔξοχοι τῶν πρώτων”, and the “τὰ πρῶτα φέροντες τῆς πόλεως”101, although the decline of municipal administration did not proceed at the same rate in all cities of the empire102. These testimonies reveal the existence of a “ruling class” that participated actively both in the administration of the city and at the diplomatic level103.

This “ruling class” is seen by A. Konstantakopoulou as proof of the political importance of Thessaloniki in the late 7th century, which in conjunction with the demographical growth of the city, due to the destruction and abandonment of other big cities of Illyricum, led to the establishment of a prefect of Thessaloniki104. A. Konstantakopoulou further believes that the appointment of such a new prefect ended the rivalry between the prefect of Illyricum and the local authorities of Thessaloniki that is mentioned in the Miracles of St Demetrios105. The existense, though, of such municipal governors, contrary to the centralized model of an urban prefect in Thessaloniki, could cause ad-

101. P. Lemerle, Miracles I 121 (135.17), 193 (179.11), 231 (209.7), 244 (211.33), 252 (213.31), 254 (214.9), 281 (221.5), 293 (230.19).
103. See P. Lemerle, Miracles II 113, 135-136. – J. H. W. G. Liebeschutz, The Government of the Late Roman city with special reference to Thessaloniki, in: Byzantine Macedonia (see n. 26) 116-127, 122-126. – Idem, The Decline and Fall of the Roman City, Oxford 2001 (reprinted 2003), p. 117-119. – W. Brandes - J. Haldon, Towns (see n. 23) 169-170. – Ar. Mentzos, Θεσσαλονίκη (see n. 65) 39 ff., analyzes the role and the duties of the municipal authorities of Thessaloniki. For an opposing view see J. Durliat, Ville (see n. 93) 400-401, who argues that the κρατοῦντες were representatives of the emperor and not curiales; but it seems that they are identified with the municipal authorities of the city.
104. A. Konstantakopoulou, Thessalonique (see n. 22) 160-161.
105. A. Konstantakopoulou, Thessalonique (see n. 22) 160-161.
ditional problems, because of the similar and contradictory duties of the local municipal authorities and the representative of the central administration.

It seems that the “ruling class” continued to exist in the next century, as can be deduced from the testimony of a letter of Theodoros Studites written in 796: “προσεπεμφθεὶς τοῖνυν παρὰ τοῦ ὑπάρχου τῶν ἐξόχων εἰς μετὰ στρατιωτῶν προσέμενεν ἐν τῇ ἀνατολικῇ πόρτῃ”\textsuperscript{106}. The prefect of this passage is identified with the prefect of Thessaloniki mentioned on seals of the 8th and early 9th century, and this is the only reference to the prefect of Thessaloniki in the narrative sources in this period\textsuperscript{107}.

\textsuperscript{106} Theodori Studitae Epistulae, ed. G. Fatouros, vol. 1-2, [CFHB 31], Berlin 1992, no. 3.106-107. Cf. T. Pratsch, Theodoros Studites (759–826): zwischen Dogma und Pragma: der Abt des Studiosklosters in Konstantinopel im Spannungsfeld von Patriarch, Kaiser und eigenem Anspruch, [Berliner Byzantinistische Studien 4] Frankfurt am Main 1997, p. 113 n. 54, who excludes the possibility that the prefect was an urban prefect. See conversely W. Brandes, Finanzverwaltung (see n. 25) 54 and n. 217. – PmbZ (see n. 3) no. 11030. See also A. Konstantakopoulou, Thessalonique (see n. 22) 159, who wrongly considered that ἃρχων τῶν ἐξόχων of the above passage designated one of the municipal rulers of the city. Cf. A. Stavridou-Zafraka, Invasions (see n. 26) 172 n. 24. See also PmbZ (see n. 3) no. 11418, where it is mentioned that the man who flagellated the monk Theodoulos according to an Epistula (816/817) of Theodoros Studites (no. 190.4-5: “οἱ ἐνηθλί-σας ἐν Θεσσαλονίκῃ, ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνιέρου τυφθεὶς ἐν ἀποκλειστικῇ διακοσιαίᾳ”) was probably prefect in Thessaloniki, that is prefect of Illyricum, whose seat was in Thessaloniki, or strategos of Macedonia or some other high officer. In our view, it cannot be excluded that in this text it stands for the prefect of Thessaloniki or even for the strategos of Thessaloniki but certainly not for the strategos of Macedonia, since the latter was in charge of the theme of Macedonia in Thrace.

\textsuperscript{107} A prefect of Thessaloniki is also mentioned in the Vita of Hilarion the Iberian, who visited Thessaloniki during the reign of Basil I (867-886). See the Latin translation of the long version of the Vita by P. Peeters, S. Hilarion d’Ibérie, Analecta Bollandiana 32 (1913) 243-269, 257 (praefectus urbis), 262 (praefectus civilis), 266 (Thessalonicensis eparchus) [only one reference] or proconsul [ἀνθύπατος] according to the second version of the Vita (see p. 266 n. 39. Cf. St. Euthymiades, Η μεσαιωνική Θεσσαλονίκη και τα θαύματα των αγίων της, Μικρές και μεγάλες διεκδίκησες ενός αποκλειστικού προνόμιου (9\textsuperscript{th}-12\textsuperscript{th} αἰ.), Βυζαντία 28 (2008) 51-67, 57-58, with bibliography. See also the recent study by Eka Tchskoidze, Ένας Γεωργιανός προσκυνητής στον βυζαντινό κόσμο του 9\textsuperscript{ου} αιώνα: ο Άγιος Πλαριός ο Γεωργιανός, Athens 2011, 135ff., who translates the Vita into modern Greek. In her extended commentary she refers to Hilarion’s stay in Thessaloniki and considers that the “ἄρχων της πόλης”, the “ἄρχων Θεσσαλονίκης” and the “ἐπαρχῶς Θεσσαλονίκης” (only one reference, ibidem p. 172) or “ἀνθύπατος” (second version of the Vita, see ibidem p. 175-176, 200) was the governor of the city as well as the judge of the theme of Thessaloniki (ibidem p. 146-150 and 200-202), and that from 871/872 to 878/9 he performed the duties of a praefectus urbis like the prefect of Constantinople. But the reference of the Vita to an eparchos of Thessaloniki is obviously an anachronism, since in the last third of the 9th century there was not a prefect, but only a strategos of Thessaloniki, who was the highest officer in the city. Moreover, a praefectus urbis could not be an official of a theme. In our view, it cannot be concluded from the testimonies of the Vita that the prefect of Thessaloniki was an urban prefect similar to that of Constantinople.
Consequently, the administrative tradition of Thessaloniki as the seat of a praefectus praetorio for centuries, the participation of a local “ruling class” in the government of the city, and the lack of evidence in the sources that the prefect of Thessaloniki performed the same duties as the prefect of Constantinople, undermine the theory that the prefect of Thessaloniki was an urban prefect.

Another point that remains to be examined is whether the jurisdiction of the prefect of Illyricum was indeed confined solely to the city of Thessaloniki because of the Slav invasions and their presence in the neighbouring region.

3. Thessaloniki and its hinterland after the Slav invasions

The raids of the Avaroslavs did indeed create insecurity and problems, mainly in the northern part of Illyricum and Thrace, as described in the Miracles of St Demetrius. Because of the Slav invasions and certain cata-

108. P. Lemerle, Miracles I 197 (185.20-22): “καὶ αὐτὴν ὑπανεῖχεσθαι πάντας τοὺς ἀποφύγοντο τῶν ἐκ τοῦ Δανυβίου μέρων, Παννονίας τε καὶ Δακίας καὶ Δαρδανίας καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐπαρχιῶν τε καὶ πόλεων, καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ ἐπερείδεσθαι”. – Ibidem 179 (175.7-10): “καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν Θεσσαλίαν καὶ τὰς περὶ αὐτὴν νήσους καὶ τῆς Ἑλλάδος, ἔτι μὴν καὶ τὰς Κυκλάδας νήσους, καὶ τὴν Αχαίαν πᾶσαν, τὴν τε Ἡπείρον καὶ τὸ πλείον τοῦ Ἡλληνικοῦ καὶ μέρος τῆς Ασίας ἑκπορθήσατο, καὶ ὀκικητοὺς, ὡς εἴρηται, πλείστας πόλεις τε καὶ ἐπαρχίας ποιῆσαι”. See also Isidore of Seville, ed. Th. Mommsen, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi 11, Chronica Minora 2, Berlin 1894, p. 479. Cf. Ar. Mentzos, Θεσμοί (see n. 65) 57, who, unlike P. Lemerle, Miracles II 135, notes that the city was not isolated in a hostile surrounding area, as described in the Miracles.

– F. Curta, Greeks (see n. 79) 18-19, also points out the exaggerated narration of St Demetrius’ Miracles concerning the extended devastation of Illyricum, the Aegean islands and Asia. He believes that the writer of the second collection framed a local event against a broader historical and administrative background, in order to make it appear of greater importance. – For the evidence of Byzantine pottery in Peloponnes and the Aegean islands, which testifies to a continuity of trade within the boundaries of the empire during 7th-8th century, on an even larger scale than in the preceding centuries see Natalia Poulou-Papademetriou, Βυζαντινή κεραμική από τον ελληνικό νησιωτικό χώρο κατά την Πελοπόννησο (7<sup>σ</sup>–<sup>9</sup><sup>ο</sup> αι.): Μία πρότυπη προσέγγιση, in: Οι σκοτεινοί αιώνες του Βυζαντίου (7<sup>σ</sup>–<sup>9</sup><sup>ο</sup> αι.), [Εθνικό Ίδρυμα Ερευνών. Ινστιτούτο Βυζαντινών Ερευνών, Διεθνή Συμπόσια 9] Athens 2001, p. 231-266. See also P. Lemerle, Miracles I 284 (227.18-228.5): “τὸ Ἡλληνικὸν σχεδὸν ἄπαν, ἣναν τὰς αὐτὸν ἐπαρχίας, λέγω δὴ Παννονίας δύο, Δακίας ὀσοιάς τῶν δύο, Δαρδανίας, Μυσίας, Πραβάλωνος, Ροδόπης τῶν πασῶν ἐπαρχιῶν, ἔτι μὴν καὶ Θράκης καὶ τῶν πρὸς Βυζαντίων μακροὺς τείχους, καὶ λοιπὰς πόλεις τε καὶ πολιτείας ἑκπορθήσαντες, ἄπαντα τὸν αὐτὸν λαὸν εἰς τὸ ἐκείθεν πρὸς Παννονίαν μέρος τὸ πρὸς τὰ Δανυβίου ποταμῷ, ἤστινος ἐπαρχίας πάλαι μητροπόλεις ὅπριν τὸ λεγέν διερμύον”. According to H. Ditten, Zur Bedeutung der Einwanderung der Slaven, in: Byzanz im 7. Jahrhundert. Untersuchungen zur Herausbildung des feudalistischen, ed. F. Winkelmann - Helga Köpstein - H. Ditten - I. Rochow, Berlin 1978, p. 73-160, 112, the inclusion of Rhodope in Illyricum reflects the disintegration of the administrative system in Illyricum and Thrace. But see P. Papademetriou, Θεσμικὲς σχέσεις (see n. 26) 179. See also Kalliope Mpourdara, Ο Βίος καὶ τα Θαύματα του Αγίου Δημητρίου ως πηγή
strophic earthquakes, many cities and settlements were abandoned as people moved to safer areas, and the communications and regular financial activity were hindered, but there was neither comprehensive and devastating destruction nor a total loss of Byzantine rule in Macedonia and Thrace. Archaeological evidence shows that, in the region of modern Greek Macedonia, 51 from the 180 sites attested during the Early Christian period survived in the middle Byzantine period, while new settlements were established as well. It was not only Thessaloniki that survived during the 7th and 8th centuries, but also other cities, including – according to the archaeological data – Kassandreia, Amphipolis, Philippi, Veroia and Serres. Moreover, the bishops of Philippi, Amphipolis and Edessa participated in the Quinisext Council (or Council in Troullo) in 692, as did the bishop of Stoboi, who had also taken part in the Sixth Ecumenical Synod (680). Excavational evidence indicates that the city

νομικών πληροφοριών, in: Πρακτικα ΙΒ’ Διεθνούς Επιστημονικού Συμποσίου (see note 29), p. 123-133, 130-131 and F. Curta, Greeks (see n. 79) 19, who remark that the above two “lists of provinces” mentioned in the second collection of the Miracles betray the use of an administrative source. Cf. P. Lemerle, Miracles II 177.

109. See Flora Karagianni, Οι Βυζαντινοί ιεραρχοί στη Μακεδονία μέσα από τα αρχαιολογικά δεδομένα (4-15 α. Χ.), Thessaloniki 2010, p. 75-82 and 105 ff.

110. See for example with relevant bibliographical references Eutychia Kourkoutidou-Nikolaidou, Από την παλαίσχυσιανική στη βυζαντινή πόλη, in: Βυζαντινή Μακεδονία (see n. 15) 171-178. – Alkmene Stavridou-Zafraka, Τα θέματα του Μακεδονικού χώρου: Το θέμα Στρυμονός, in the same volume, 307-319. – J. Karayannopoulos, Διοικητικό σύστημα (see n. 17) 24-25. – Ch. Bakirtzes, The end of antiquity in Eastern Macedonia, in: Αρχαία Μακεδονία. Ανακαινισθέντες κατά το έκτο Διεθνώς Συμπόσιο, Thessaloniki 15-19 October 1996, Thessaloniki 1999, p. 123-127. – P. Papademetriou, Θεσμικές σχέσεις (see n. 26) 178. – Ar. Mentzos, Θεσμοί (see n. 65) 57, who supposes also that Veroia survived. Cf. also N. Dapergolas, Σλαβικές εγκαταστάσεις (see n. 29) 140 n. 294.

111. H. Ohme, Das Concilium Quinisextum und seine Bischofliste, [Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 56] Berlin - New York 1990, p. 152 (61), 152 (63), 152 (64), 153 (65). Cf. A. Stavridou-Zafraka, Θέμα Στρυμόνος (see n. 110) 308 and n. 11 with bibliography. For the ecclesiastical organization of the region of Strymon and the bishopric of Amphipolis see also D. Agoritsas, Η εκκλησιαστική οργάνωση της περιοχής του Στρυμώνα (7ο-12ο αι.), Βυζαντιακα 24 (2004) 29-54, 31-35, who adopts the view of Maria Nystazopoulou-Pelekidou, Σλαβικές εγκαταστάσεις στη μεσαιωνική Ελλάδα. Γενική επισκόπηση, in: Βυζάντιο και Σλάβοι – Ελλάδα και Βαλκάνια (6ο-20ο αι.), Thessaloniki 2001, p. 93, that the bishopric of Amphipolis was re-established by Justinian II between 680/1 and 692 as a mean of reinforcing the Byzantine presence against the Slavs of Strymon.

112. R. Kiedinger, Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum, Series secunda, volumen secundum: Concilium universale Constantinopolitanum tertium, parts 1-2. Berlin 1990-1992, part 1, p. 688,2, 738,8, 758,7, 784,17: “Των των ελληνικής θεού επίσκοπων της Στρυμόνα πόλεως ορίσες ὑπέγραψα”. Cf. M. Leontsini, Κωνσταντίνος Δ (see n. 21) 199-200, who remarks that numerous bishops from the Aegean islands participated in the Sixth Ecumenical Council, a fact that runs counter to the assertion in the second collection of St Demetrius’ Miracles that the Aegean islands had been laid waste by the Slavs. See also X. Moniaros, Σλαβικές επιδρομές στο Αιγαίο στις αρχές του 7ου αι.
of Stoboi had been destroyed and abandoned a century previously, in the late 6th century. For this reason, it has been suggested that the said bishop of Stoboi may have been a titular prelate, resident in Constantinople113, unless life had continued in the city or the bishopric had been re-established114 or even relocated115. If the bishop of Stoboi was a titular one, then the question that arises is why all or some of the other titular bishops did not participate in this Council.

In addition, it seems that the coastal zone from Thessaloniki to Thrace was almost continuously under the Byzantine control116, while the Slavic groups who settled around Thessaloniki were gradually brought under Byzantine control and integrated into the administrative mechanism of the Empire until

---

113. J. R. Wiseman, The City in Macedonia Secunda, in: Villes et peuplement dans l’Illyricum protobyzantin, Actes du colloque organisé par l’École française de Rome, [Collection de l’École française de Rome 77] Rome 1984, p. 289-313. Cf. H. Ohme, Das Concilium Quinisextum (see n. 111) 227-228. Cf. PmbZ (see n. 3) no. 4718. See also R.-J. Lilie, Thrakien und Thracesion. Zur byzantinischen Provinzorganisation am Ende des 7. Jahrhunderts, JÖB 26 (1977) 7-47 (for Stoboi see p. 37), who considers that the hinterland of Macedonia and Thrace was conquered by the Slavs, since the bishops who participated in the Synods of 680 and 692 resided mainly in coastal cities. The absence of bishops who resided in the mainland, for which could be several explanations, reflects the difficulty of travelling during that period [See also E. Chrysos, Η ἱδρυση των θεμάτων Κεφαλληνίας, Δυρραχίου καὶ Νικοπόλεως, in: Ηπειρος. 4000 Χρόνια Ελληνικής Ιστορίας και Πολιτισμού, ed. M. Β. Sakellariou, Athens 1997, p. 185-189, 186. Cf. also M. Leontsini, Κωνσταντίνος Δ (see n. 21) 182-184 and 198-200. – D. Agoritsas, Εκκλησιαστική οργάνωση (see n. 111) 35], but does not necessarily imply a loss of Byzantine control over these areas. See also H. Ohme, Das Concilium Quinisextum (see n. 111) 231, note 51: “Die These von Lilie, Thrakien 35, man könne bei einem ‘auf beiden Konzilien (sc. 680/1 und 692) fehlenden Bischof annehmen, daß das Bistum in dieser Zeit dann nicht existent war’, geht wohl einen Schritt zu weit!”.

114. Maria Nystazopoulou-Pelekidou, Σλαβικές εγκαταστάσεις (see n. 111) 93.

115. Vl. Popović, Aux origines de la slavisation des Balkans: la constitution des premières sklavinies macédoniennes vers la fin du Vle siècle, Comptes rendus de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres 124.1 (1980) 230-257, p. 249-252, according to whom the revival of the bishopric of Stoboi may be connected with the settlement of the Sermesianoi in Keramesios kampos. See also A. Konstantakopoulou, Ιστορική Γεωγραφία (see n. 22) 153. – P. Papademetriou, Θεσμικές σχέσεις (see n. 26) 178 σμι. 46.

their final subjunction, christianization and assimilation.\textsuperscript{117}

As a characteristic example of the recognition of imperial authority as early as the 7th century we refer to the case of Drougouvites mentioned in the Kouver episode in the second collection of St Demetrius’ Miracles.\textsuperscript{118} According to this narrative, the Sermesianoi\textsuperscript{119} crossed the Danube and reached the Keramesios kampos (plain). Then, their leader Kouver sent an embassy to the emperor and asked for permission to settle there with his people. He petitioned also for access to food supplies from the neighbouring Slavic tribe of Drougouvites, situated probably southeast of Giannitsa\textsuperscript{20}. This testimony clearly demonstrates the Byzantine control over the region of northwest Macedonia and over the Drougouvites\textsuperscript{121}. It seems that the Slavic tribes, like the Drougouvites and the Rynchinoi, were governed by their own rulers (ρῆγες), but recognized the imperial authority. This is also indicated by the case of Perboundos, who was arrested and sent to Constantinople because of information that he was planning an attack against Thessaloniki. A mixed delegation of local authorities from Thessaloniki and noble Slavs went to the capital to plead for his release. The emperor promised that he would set him free and allow him to stay in Constantinople under supervision, but Perboundos escaped from the capital. He was arrested again, tried to escape and was recaptured, and during his interrogation confessed his plans against Thessaloniki and its surrounding area. After that he was executed as a conspirator against the imperial authority. The story of Perboundos implies the existence of prescribed relations in the framework of an agreement between the Rynchinoi and Byzantium and the imposition of imperial power over them\textsuperscript{122}, like the Seven Tribes in Thrace, who

\textsuperscript{117} For the means and the stages of this procedure see for Maria Nystazopoulou-Pelekidou, Σλαβικές εγκαταστάσεις (see n. 111) 87-104. – Hélène Ahrweiler, Βυζαντινή Μακεδονία. Από τον ένατο αιώνα έως το 1204: Πολιτική ιστορία (Ο εκβυζαντινισμός των Σλάβων της Μακεδονίας και η νέα περίοδος ακρίμης της Θεσσαλονίκης), in: Μακεδονία. 4000 Χρόνια Ελληνικής Ιστορίας και Πολιτισμού, ed. M. B. Sakellariou, Athens 1992, p. 272-279. – P. Papademetriou, Θεσμικές σχέσεις (see n. 26) 167-218. – N. Dapergolas, Σλαβικές εγκαταστάσεις (see n. 29) 167-180.


\textsuperscript{119} P. Lemerle, Miracles II 141 ff.

\textsuperscript{120} See Elisavet Chatziantoniou, Συμβολή στον εντοπισμό της ολαβικής εγκατάστασης των Δρουγουβιτών, in: Φιλοτιμία. Τιμητικός Τόμος για την ομότιμη καθηγήτρια Αλκ. Σταυρίδου Ζαφράκα, ed. Th. Korres - Polymnia Katsoni - I. Leontiadis - A. Gkoutzioukostas, Thessaloniki 2011, p. 105-133, with the earlier views of modern research.

\textsuperscript{121} See also Maria Nystazopoulou-Pelekidou, Βαλκανικοί λαοί κατά τους μέσους χρόνους, Thessaloniki 1992, p. 87-88. – H. Ahrweiler, Βυζαντινή Μακεδονία (see n. 117) 274. – A. Stavridou-Zafraka, Θέμα Θεσσαλονίκης (see n. 26) 162. – P. Papademetriou, Θεσμικές σχέσεις (see n. 26) 199-200.

\textsuperscript{122} See the analysis of Chr. Zachopoulos, Η πολεμική ισχύς των «Σκλαβίνων» στην «5η
according to Theophanes were clients of the Byzantine emperor and, after the establishment of the first Bulgarian state, clients of the Bulgar quagan\textsuperscript{123}.

Such a policy of integration and control of the Slavic groups, which presupposes an agreement with the Byzantine state and the acceptance of the Byzantine authority, is also revealed by the seals of \textit{archons} of Slavic tribes\textsuperscript{124}. These \textit{archons} were clearly Byzantine officials. The first mention of an \textit{archon} of a Slavic group is that of Τιχωμίρος, βασιλικὸς σπαθάριος, ἄρχων τῶν Βελεγεζητῶν, mentioned on an unpublished seal (ex collection of V. Laurent which is now in Paris) dating from the beginning of the 8\textsuperscript{th} century\textsuperscript{125}. It seems that the leader of the Belegezites who had settled in Thessaly was also integrated into the Byzantine administration system in the framework of an

\textsuperscript{123} Theophanes Chronographia, ed. Ch. de Boor, I, Lipsiae 1883 (reprinted Hildesheim 1963), 359.12-17: “κυριευσάντων δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν παρακειμένων Σκλαυινῶν ἐθνῶν τὰς λεγομένας ἑπτὰ γενεὰς, τους μὲν Σέβερεις κατῴκισαν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐμπροσθεν κλεισούρας Βερεγάβων ἐπὶ τὰ πρὸς ἀνατολὴν μέρη, εἰς δὲ τὰ πρὸς μεσημβρίαν καὶ δύσιν μέχρις Ἀβαρίας τὰς ὑπολοίπους ἑπτὰ γενεὰς ὑπὸ πάκτον ὄντας”. Cf. P. Papademetriou, \textit{Θεσμικὲς σχέσεις} (see n. 26) 181. – F. Curta, \textit{The making of Slavs}. History and Archaeology of the Lower Danube Region, c. 500-700, Cambridge 2006, p. 331. – E. Chrysos, Settlements of Slavs and Byzantine sovereignty in the Balkans, in: Byzantina Mediterranea. Festschrift für Johannes Koder zum 65. Geburtstag, ed. K. Belke, E. Kislinger, A. Külzer and Maria Stassinopoulou, Vienna 2007, p. 123-135, 133-134, who argues that apart from Rynchinoi “who lived as a gens in a condition of peace with the imperial local authorities” in the framework of an agreement that prescribed “roles and activities of them”, similar agreements were probably also concluded between Byzantium and the other Slavic tribes, regulating the area of their settlement and their political relationship to the local imperial authorities.

\textsuperscript{124} H. Arhweiler, \textit{Βυζαντινή Μακεδονία} (see n. 117) 274. – A. Stavridou-Zafraka, \textit{Θέμα Θεσσαλονίκης} (see n. 26) 162, who also argues that the Rynchinoi, Strymonites, and Belegezites were under imperial control, since Perboundos was punished as a conspirator against the imperial authority, the Strymonites were warned by Constantine IV before his campaign against them (see n. 140) and the Belegezites provided wheat and pulses to the Thessalonians. – Eadem, Macedonia (see n. 26) 132. – Th. Korres, \textit{Παρατηρήσεις} (see n. 54) 151 and 162, who agrees that Perboundos was treated as a conspirator against the emperor and that the Rynchinoi were tributary to Byzantines. – F. Curta, \textit{The making of Slavs}, p. 331. – E. Chrysos, Settlements of Slavs and Byzantine sovereignty in the Balkans, in: Byzantina Mediterranea. Festschrift für Johannes Koder zum 65. Geburtstag, ed. K. Belke, E. Kislinger, A. Külzer and Maria Stassinopoulou, Vienna 2007, p. 123-135, 133-134, who argues that apart from Rynchinoi “who lived as a gens in a condition of peace with the imperial local authorities” in the framework of an agreement that prescribed “roles and activities of them”, similar agreements were probably also concluded between Byzantium and the other Slavic tribes, regulating the area of their settlement and their political relationship to the local imperial authorities.
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agreement with the imperial authority. This may be why the Belegezites provided the ships sent from Thessaloniki with wheat and pulses, as we mentioned above. A similar example of an archon during the same period is that of Mauros, the head of part of the multiethnic group of Sermesianoi, who was appointed πατρίκιος καὶ ἄρχων Σερμησιάνων καὶ Βουλγάρων by the emperor and settled with his people in Thrace. Other examples of archons of the Slavic tribes mentioned on seals are Πέτρος, βασιλικὸς σπαθάριος καὶ ἄρχων Δρουγουβιτῶν (first half of the 9th c.), Βοηδάργος βασιλικὸς σπαθάριος καὶ ἄρχων τῶν Βηχιτῶν (second half of the 8th c.) and Βοιυδάργος, βασιλικὸς σπαθάριος καὶ ἄρχων τῶν Βηχιτῶν (a little after the middle of the 8th c.), who are probably the same person, Ἰωάννης (?), βασιλικὸς σπαθάριος καὶ ἄρχων τῶν Βηχιτῶν (first half of the 9th c.), Κωνσταντῖνος, ἄρχων Βηχιτῶν (first third of the 9th c.), Ἐσάγης, βασιλικὸς σπαθαροκανδιδᾶτος, ἄρχων τῶν Βηχιτῶν (third quarter of the 9th c.) and Λέων βασιλικὸς στατάριος, ἐπὶ τῶν οἰκειακῶν καὶ ἄρχων Βιχητῶν or Θεότητων (?). The archontes of Thessaloniki who appear on seals in the context of the theme of Thessaloniki in the second half of the 9th century, are also considered

126. G. Zacos - A. Veglery, Seals (see n. 3) no. 934 (late 7th-early 8th c.) Cf. P. Lemerle, Miracles II 152-153. – Maria Nystazopoulou-Pelekidou, Sceaux byzantins improprement appelés proto-bulgares, Βυζαντιακά 11 (1991) 13-22, p. 16-17. See also N. Oikonomides, A Collection of Dated Byzantine Lead Seals, Washington, D.C. 1986, no. 25 (p. 38), who does not exclude that the seal could also belong to the son of Mauros, who had probably the same name.


130. W. Seibt, Slawenarchonten (see n. 124) 33. – Idem, Weitere Beobachtungen (see n. 124) 464 (Abb. 4-5).

131. W. Seibt, Slawenarchonten (see n. 124) 34.

132. W. Seibt, Slawenarchonten (see n. 124) 34.

133. W. Seibt, Slawenarchonten (see n. 124) 34.

as chieftains of neighbouring Slavic settlements, or according to others as military officers or naval commanders, an institution that needs further research.

Another factor contributing to the gradual subjugation of the Slavs, their acceptance of imperial authority and their integration into the Byzantine administration was, of course, the campaigns of the emperors against the Slavs during 7th-8th centuries. Firstly, Constans II (658) campaigned against the Skalveniae, that is the Slavs, although the exact region of his military operation is not specified. The emperor defeated the Slavs, imposed the imperial authority and took many prisoners. The second military operation was that of Constantine IV against the Slavs of Strymon after the failed Arab siege of Constantinople (674-678) and the end of the siege of Thessaloniki (677-678). The Strymonites and Rynchinoi were making naval raids close to Constantinople. The emperor, having warned them of his intentions, moved successfully against them and restored order and security in the region.

138. For the term Sklavenia, which had territorial meaning from the early 9th century see the analysis of E. Chrysos, Settlements of Slavs (see n. 108) 123-135. See also F. Curta, Sklaviniai and Ethnic Adjectives: A Clarification, Byzantion. Nea Hellas 30 (2011) 85-98, who accepts the conclusions of Chrysos, but he interprets in a different way a passage of Theophylaktos Simokattes, Κατά τὴν μεσοβυζαντινή περίοδον (see n. 29) 79. – A. Papademetriou, Θεσμικές σχέσεις (see n. 25) 54.
139. Theophanes (see n. 123) 347.6-7: “οἱ κατὰ τὸν χρυσόν ἐπανετεκτευνόμενοι Βασιλείς κατὰ Σκλαβινίας καὶ ἡμιμακρυτενεν πόλλοις καὶ ὑπέταξεν”. Cf. P. Lemerle, Miracles II 130. – Chr. Zachopoulos, Πολεμική ισχύς (see n. 122) 55-56. – H. Ahrweiler, Βυζαντινή Μακεδονία (see n. 117) 275. – A. Stavridou-Zafraka, Θεμα Θεσσαλονίκης (see n. 26) 163. – P. Papademetriou, Θεσμικές σχέσεις (see n. 26) 182-183. – N. Dapergolas, Σλαβικές εγκαταστάσεις (see n. 29) 79.
140. P. Lemerle, Miracles I 277-279 (220.5-24): “Τῶν γαρ ἀπαντῶν Σκλαβών τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ Στρημώνος καὶ Ρυγχῶνον ... διὰ ζευκτῶν πλοίων τῶν θαλαττίων πλωτήρως, τοὺς ἐπὶ παρακομιδὴ καρπον ἐν τῇ βασιλεύσασθεν ἀνάστασιν πόλει, παμπόλλοις ἐκπροσβάθηκε, ἀπὸ τῶν νησίων καὶ τῆς στενῆς θαλάσσης καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ τὸ Παρνάσον καὶ Προκόπινην τόπους ... Ὑπό δὲ ὁ τῶν πραγμάτων κύριος, ἡ χριστοστεφὴς ημῶν βασιλεὺς ... ἡμίσως τουρ στὸν θρόνον διὰ Θράκης καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν κατὰ τοῦ τοῦ Στρημώνος καταστροφευέναι, οὐ κρυφόθην ὡς λαθραίως, ἀλλὰ καὶ προμηνύσας αὐτοὺς τὴν πρὸς αὐτούς ἐπέλευσαν. Οὕτως προεγκακτεὶς, τὰς κλημοῦρας καὶ τους ἀχρωτερῶς τόπως καταλαβόντες, πρὸς ἀντίστασιν τῶν ρωμαίων ἐκκατομασμάθημα ἀνθρωπολύστω, πάσαν τὴν βαρβαρίαν ἐκ διαφόρων ῥήμα.
A decade later Justinian II (688) headed a campaign which probably took place in the area of the upper Strymon in Thrace and the region of Thessaloniki. Justinian defeated the Slavic tribes and transferred Slavic populations in Asia Minor, but during his return to Constantinople he fell into a Bulgarian ambush. The creation of the kleisoura of Strymon is probably connected with that expedition. According to the testimony of Constantine Porphyrogennitus in his De thematibus, Justinian II settled Scythes (that is, Slavs or – according to others – Bulgars), who had been subjugated in the mountains and narrow passages of the Strymon region, from Roupel to the valley of the upper Strymon, to control the roads from the North and repel Bulgarian attacks. With the establishment of the kleisoura of Strymon, which later developed into the theme of Strymon, the Byzantines controlled at least the region between the

βοήθειαν εἰς συμμαχίαν προτρέψαμεν … νικοὶ τῶν Σκλαβίων ἐνέδειξε στρατόπεδον, καὶ εἰς αὐτοὺς πεποίησα ταύτης ἔνδρας, τοὺς αὐτῶν σθεναροὺς καὶ ἑξόχους καὶ ὀπλίτας κατεισόμενοι. Καὶ ἐδραμεῖσα ἡ βαρβαρία …”. Cf. P. Lemerle, Miracles II 126-127. But see also Th. Korres, Παρατηρήσεις (see n. 54) 158-161. The settlements of Slavs in the region of Lete (Λητή) near Thessaloniki mentioned in the next paragraph of the Miracles (280) were not permanent but temporary, because of the Slav blockade of Thessaloniki in 677-678. See P. Chrestou, Διηγήσεις (see n. 28) 107-108. – Th. Korres, Παρατηρήσεις (see n. 54) 161. – N. Dapergolas, Σλαβικές εγκαταστάσεις (see n. 29) 133 n. 278 and 163 n. 321. 


143. A κλεισουριάρχης Στρυμόνος is mentioned on a seal published by G. Zacos, Byzantine Lead Seals, vol. II, Berne 1985, no. 318 (late 9th c. or even earlier). For the kleisouri and kleisourarchiai see also Martha Gregoriou-Ioannidou, Οι βυζαντινές κλεισούρες και κλεισουραρχίες, Βυζαντιακά 9 (1989) 181-202, 190 (for the kleisouriarches of Strymon).

144. Costantino Porfirogenito, De thematibus, ed. A. Pertusi, [Studi e Testi 160] Vatican 1952, 3.9 (p. 88-89): “Τοῦ δὲ θέμα τοῦ Στρυμόνος τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ αὐτή τὸν λόγος ἐστὶ περὶ θέματος, ἀλλ’ εἰς κλεισουράς ταύτης λελάμβανε· καὶ Ἐκκλησία ἀπό τοῦ Μακεδόνος διανεμοῦται, Ιουστινιανοῦ τῶν Ρωμαίων ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι τοῦ Στρυμόνος καὶ ταῖς διαβάθραι τῆς κλεισούρας τοῦτοις ἐγκατοικισάντων”.

145. F. Curta, Greeks (see n. 79) 109-110.

146. P. Lemerle, Philippes (see n. 18) 125.

147. J. Karayannopoulos, Διοικητικό σύστημα (see n. 17) 10. – A. Stavridou-Zafraka, Θέμα Στρυμόνος (see n. 110) 314-315.
The confluence of Stroumitza and Strymon river to the Aegean coast\textsuperscript{148}. The area between Thessaloniki and the Strymon was also under Byzantine control, at least during the late 7\textsuperscript{th} century. Later, Constantine V campaigned against the Slavs, not in the region of Thessaloniki but in the theme of Macedonia in Thrace\textsuperscript{149}.

There are also other indications that the area around Thessaloniki was under Byzantine control. Several offices were located in Thessaloniki during the 8\textsuperscript{th} century, a phenomenon that in our view is inconsistent with a total loss of the city’s hinterland to the Slavs. In 713, 723/724, 724/725, 727/728 and 734/735 the genikos kommerkiarios of the apotheke of Thessaloniki, and then in the years 737/738, 737/738, 740/741, 742/743, 746/747, 755/756 or 770/771, 773/774, 778/779, 783/784, 787/797, and 798/799 the basilika kommerkia of Thessaloniki are recorded on seals\textsuperscript{150}. Both the apothekai and the kommerkia were, according to most scholars, connected with the provisioning of the army, although not all the apothekai and the basilika kommerkia can be connected with military expeditions\textsuperscript{151}. But if this was indeed a function of the apothekai and kommerkia\textsuperscript{152}, then a logical question arises: where were the supplies in the warehouses of Thessaloniki gathered from through taxation, if at least the hinterland of the city was not under Byzantine control? In other words, on which areas were taxes in kind imposed in order to procure the annona militaris? Even if we assume that the kommerkiarioi of the apotheke and the basilika kommerkia were connected with trade\textsuperscript{153} and not only with military logistics, this pre-

\textsuperscript{148} J. Karayannopoulos, Επικοινωνία (see n. 116) 215. – A. Stavridou-Zafraka, Θέμα Στρυμόνος (see n. 110) 315.

\textsuperscript{149} Theophanes (see n. 123) 430.21-22: “Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει Κωνστάντιος τάς κατὰ τὴν Μακεδονίαν Σκλαυνίας ἤχιμαλωτεύει καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ὑποχειρίους ἐποίησεν”. Cf. H. Ahrweiler, Βυζαντινή Μακεδονία (see n. 117) 275. – A. Stavridou-Zafraka, Θέμα Θεσσαλονίκης (see n. 26) 163-164. – N. Dapergolas, Σλαβικές εγκαταστάσεις (see n. 29) 82-83.

\textsuperscript{150} W. Brandes, Finanzverwaltung (see n. 25) 609.

\textsuperscript{151} M. Hendy, Studies in the Byzantine Monetary Economy c. 300-1450, Cambridge 1985, p. 654 n. 438, who relates only one seal of the basilika kommerkia of Thessaloniki in 783 to the expedition of Staurakios against the Slavs in Peloponnese, but not the rest of the seals. – W. Brandes, Finanzverwaltung (see n. 25) 392-393.

\textsuperscript{152} For the role of kommerkiarioi of apotheke and of the basilika kommerkia in supplying the army see W. Brandes, Finanzverwaltung (see n. 25) 239 ff. with sources and bibliography. – L. Brubaker - J. F. Haldon, Byzantium (see n. 24) 682 ff. also with detailed analysis and certain differentiations compared to W. Brandes’ theory. But see also the reservations expressed by J.-Cl. Cheynet, L’administration impériale (see n. 21) 129.

supposes that there was a significant area of hinterland around Thessaloniki under Byzantine control. W. Brandes excludes the possibility that the above institutions were connected with trade, because he considers that the region around Thessaloniki was occupied by Slavic tribes and that their transactions with Thessaloniki were not of such a large scale as to justify the existence of apothekai and basilika kommerkia. E. Malamut believes, however, that the introduction of the basilika kommerkia of Thessaloniki reflects the restoration of Byzantine authority over and the taxation of the Slavs.

Another office, apart from that of the prefect of Thessaloniki, mentioned during the 8th century is that of the abydikos of Thessaloniki who, according to N. Oikonomides, was responsible for the control of trade and movement of individuals to and from the hinterland of the city. The parallel existence of such an institution reinforces the view that the hinterland of Thessaloniki was under Byzantine control despite the scattered Slavic presence.

In addition the paraphylax of Thessaloniki (9th c.), who is thought to have been the commander of the city’s fortress, and the kommerkiarios of Thessaloniki (798/799, 795/796, 810/811 and 825/826), who was in charge of collecting taxes imposed on trade transactions, are also known from sigil-lary material.

Consequently, the existence in the city of the above officers, together with the prefect of Thessaloniki, who was the highest and most important officer in the region, can be explained only if the Byzantines controlled a significant part of the region around Thessaloniki, since the financial growth and commercial activity of the city and its harbour could not have been achieved without control of a significant part of its hinterland, as has been correctly observed. Besides, it is not possible that the Byzantine state could allow the existence of a shadow government confined to Thessaloniki for a century, from the end of

154. W. Brandes, Finanzverwaltung (see n. 25) 392.
156. N. Oikonomidès, Abydos (see n. 21) 241-248.
157. J. Nesbitt - N. Oikonomides, Catalogue (see n. 3) no. 18.52 (9th c.). Cf. also the remarks of the editors in no. 18.36.
158. N. Oikonomidès, Abydos (see n. 21) 241. – J. Nesbitt - N. Oikonomides, Catalogue (see n. 57) no. 36.5, p. 96-97.
159. W. Brandes, Finanzverwaltung (see n. 25) 609-610.
160. For the basilikoi kommerkiarioi who appeared in late 8th century see W. Brandes, Finanzverwaltung (see n. 25) 416-418, with earlier bibliography.
161. A. Stavridou-Zafraka, Θέμα Θεσσαλονίκης (see n. 26) 165.
the 7th to the end of the 8th century, in the region of the empire’s second largest city\textsuperscript{162}.

The formation of the \emph{theme of Thessaloniki} before 824 or 826\textsuperscript{163} denotes Byzantine control of the area in the 9th century\textsuperscript{164}. The \emph{strategos of Thessaloniki} replaced the \emph{prefect of Thessaloniki} as the supreme officer in the region, although it is not clear whether the two offices co-existed for a short period, since certain seals of the \emph{prefect of Thessaloniki} are dated during the first half of the 9th century. The jurisdiction, however, of the \emph{strategos of Thessaloniki} was also not confined solely to the city itself, but covered a region extending from the Strymon to Pindos and from Olympus or the Tempe valley to, possibly, the average flow of Axios\textsuperscript{165}.

It may be concluded from the above analysis that Byzantine dominion and consequently the jurisdiction of the \emph{prefect of Illyricum} and the \emph{prefect of Thessaloniki} were not necessarily confined within the limits of the city, despite the disintegration of the \emph{prefecture of Illyricum} and the devastation caused by Slavic raids. On the contrary, at least from the late 7th century a significant

\textsuperscript{162} J. Karayannopoulos, \emph{Διοικητικό σύστημα} (see n. 17) 14.

\textsuperscript{163} J. Nesbitt - N. Oikonomides, \emph{Catalogue} (see n. 3) 50-51. – A. Stavridou-Zafraka, Macedonia (see n. 26) 132-133. – Eadem, \emph{Θέμα Θεσσαλονίκης} (see n. 26) 165. See also J. Karayannopoulos, \emph{Διοικητικό σύστημα} (see n. 17) 20. Cf. W. Brandes, \emph{Finanzverwaltung} (see n. 25) 54.

\textsuperscript{164} N. Dapergolas, \emph{Σλαβικές εγκαταστάσεις} (see n. 29) 169. In the other western areas of Greece which were under Byzantine control and had previously belonged to the \emph{prefecture of Illyricum}, apart from the \emph{theme of Hellas}, the \emph{theme of Kephallonia} that included the Ionian islands (8th c.) was established [J. Nesbitt - N. Oikonomides (see n. 57) 1-2. – Chr. Tsatsoulis, Some remarks on the date of creation and the role of the maritime theme of Cephalonia (End of the 7th-11th century), \emph{Studies in Byzantine Sigillography} 11 (2011) 153-172, who argues that the \emph{theme} was created sometime in the end of the 7th century], while a \emph{doux of Nikopolon}, whose seat was in the Ionian islands or rather in Nikopolis, is mentioned on a seal dated to the first third of the 8th century [see Alexandra-Kyriaki Wassiliou-Seibt, \emph{Νέα στοιχεία για τη βυζαντινή Νικόπολη βάσει σημαντικών δεδομένων}, in: \emph{Νικόπολις Β΄}, Πρακτικά του Δεύτερου Διεθνούς Συμποσίου για τη Νικόπολη (11-15 Σεπτεμβρίου 2002), ed. K. L. Zachos, Preveza 2007, p. 587-593, 587-589 (no. 1)], before the formation of the \emph{Nikopolis theme} in the 9th century [J. Nesbitt - N. Oikonomides, \emph{Catalogue} (see n. 57) 9-10]. The Byzantine presence in the region during the 8th century is also confirmed by the sigillary evidence for bishops of Nikopolon [see \emph{ibidem} 10, no. 2.11 and 2.13] and of Corfu (see \emph{ibidem}, no. 5.2). See also the recent study of E. Kislinger, Dyrrachion und die Küsten von Epirus und Dalmatien in frühen Mittelalter – Beobachtungen zur Entwicklung der byzantinischen Oberhoheit, \emph{Millenium} 8 (2011) 313-352 (with rich bibliography), who argues that, from the few outposts on the East Adriatic coast that remained under the imperial authority (Dyrrachion, Butrint, Nikopolis and several Dalmatian islands), the Byzantines managed gradually to expand their power on the coastal areas and the hinterland occupied by the Slavs. He recognizes the creation of \emph{themes} in Kephallonia, Dyrrachion and Dalmatia as an important step in the restoration of Byzantine dominion.

\textsuperscript{165} J. Karayannopoulos, \emph{Διοικητικό σύστημα} (see n. 17) 20. – A. Stavridou-Zafraka, \emph{Θέμα Θεσσαλονίκης} (see n. 26) 167.
area, extending to the east of the *theme* of Thrace, initially to the east of Nestos and then of Strymon \(^\text{166}\), to the north of the *theme* of Hellas, which included all or parts of Thessaly, central Greece, Euboea and Peloponnesse \(^\text{167}\), to the west of Pindos and to the south of Stoboi, was controlled by the Byzantines and probably governed by the *prefect of Thessaloniki* \(^\text{168}\).

4. Comparing the *prefect of Thessaloniki* with the *prefects* of other cities of the empire.

Another problem that should be examined is what kind of *prefects* were those who are mentioned in relation to other cities of the empire. G. Zacos and A. Veglery published a seal of Νικήτας, ὑπάτος, βασιλικὸς σπαθάριος καὶ ἔπαρχος Νικαίας (8th c.) \(^\text{169}\). The editors considered the owner of the seal to be the same person as the *prefect of Thessaloniki* Niketas mentioned on another seal (second quarter of the 8th c.) \(^\text{170}\) and claim that Niketas was not an urban *prefect of Nikaia*, since such an office is not attested in the sources, but was probably an *archon* of the harbour of the city of Nikaia located to the east of Lake Askania in Bithynia \(^\text{171}\), as in the case of Thessaloniki. Apart from the justified reservations expressed concerning the identification of the above individuals \(^\text{172}\), it

166. I. G. Leontiades, Παρατηρήσεις στις διοικητικές δομές της Θράκης (7ος-10ος αι.), in: Πρακτικά 1ου Πανελλήνιου Συνεδρίου. Ανατολική Ρωμυλία. Ιστορία και Πολιτισμός (Κομοτηνή, 4-6 Απριλίου 2008), Θεσσαλονίκη 2009, 123-139, with the previous bibliography.


168. Cf. J. Karayannopoulos, Διοικητικό σύστημα (see n. 17) 16-20 and map. 4-6.

169. G. Zacos - A. Veglery, Seals (see . 3) no. 3156.

170. G. Zacos - A. Veglery, Seals (see n. 3) no. 3957. – J. Nesbitt - N. Oikonomides, Catalogue (see n. 3) no. 18.20.


172. *PmbZ* (see n. 3) no. 5393.
should also be mentioned that the prefect of Thessaloniki had nothing to do with the city’s harbour, since there was another official in charge of the harbour during the 8th century, namely the abydikos of Thessaloniki. N. Oikonomides argued that Nikaia was administered by a prefect, like Constantinople or Thessaloniki\(^\text{173}\). But the historical conditions and the developments in that region cannot explain the introduction of an institution similar to that of the prefect of Constantinople or of the prefect of Thessaloniki.

The power of the prefect of Nikaia was probably not limited to the city of Nikaia, the capital of the Opsikion theme, but extended to the whole periphery of the theme. There is a similar case, that of a protokentarchos of Nikaia Gregorius who is mentioned on another lead seal (8th/9th c.) and was an official of the Opsikion theme attached to Nikaia, as noted by the editors\(^\text{174}\). In our opinion, the prefect of Nikaia could also have been an official of the Opsikion theme. The above offices bear the name of the capital of the theme, where the headquarters of the strategos were located, but their jurisdiction probably extended to the whole theme. In our view, the prefect of Nikaia could be identified with the prefects of the themes for which various and contradictory views have been expressed; but this is an issue that needs further investigation and is beyond the scope of this study\(^\text{175}\). In any case, the prefect of Nikaia was not necessarily an urban prefect.

As has been mentioned, prefects are also attested in Nikomedeia, Amorion and Catania. According to an anonymous Syriac Chronicon, the tomb of Nikomedes I, the founder of the city of Nikomedeia, was found in a cave near the city during the reign of Constantine V (741-775). The tomb was full of precious objects, and when the “praefectus civitatis” was notified of the discovery he informed the emperor\(^\text{176}\). Here a governor in Nikomedeia is mentioned,
but it is not certain that the prefect who acted in Nikomedeia, the capital of the Optimaton theme, was an urban prefect like that of Constantinople. Besides, the term praefectus in the translation is not necessarily a special technical term, but is also used in other passages to denote the governor in general.\footnote{177. See for example the same page of the Chronicon, where the military campaigns of Constantine V are described: “Et cum essent Romani in Armenia, venit Chaledus filius Achaei, praefectus Eddesae cum exercitu Arabum”. See also page 264: “praefectus Saluhum filium Ali universae Aegypto et Libyae … Et cum praefecturam exerceret Iachias in Mosulem ….” Cf. J. R. Martindale, The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, vol. IIIA-IIIB (527-641), Cambridge 1992, p. 376 (Cyrus 16), who had been appointed by Chosroes governor of Edessa (praefectus Edessae), and p. 1438 (Anonymous 62).}

A prefect in Amorion is also mentioned in the Chronicle of Michael the Syrian (12th c.), which states that, after the capture of Amorion (838), the Arabs took as prisoners the patricios Aetios, an unnamed eparchos and Bodinos and returned to their homeland.\footnote{178. The editor, B. Chabot, identifies the eparchos or hyparchos with Theodoros Krateros\footnote{179. mentioned by Theophanes Continuatus as one of the officers captured after the fall of Amorion. This identification, however, is risky and the exact office held by Krateros is not known; Bar Hebraeus considered the title eparchos as a name (Euparkà) and not as an office.\footnote{181. According to Theophanes Continuatus, Krateros was one of the officers (“ήγεμόνας καὶ ἄρχοντας”) sent to help the strategos of Anatolikon Aetios defend Amorion. In this case, too, it is not certain that the eparchos was an urban prefect like that of Constantinople. We have to take into consideration that Nikomedeia was the capital of the Optimaton theme and Amorion the capital of the Anatolikon theme. Thus, the existence of prefects in these cities, assuming that the testimonies of the Syrian patricians.} and Bodinos, who betrayed the city, and they destroyed heaps, heaps (of the people)”. Cf. PmbZ (see n. 3) no. 7679.} The editor, B. Chabot, identifies the eparchos or hyparchos with Theodoros Krateros\footnote{179. mentioned by Theophanes Continuatus as one of the officers captured after the fall of Amorion. This identification, however, is risky and the exact office held by Krateros is not known; Bar Hebraeus considered the title eparchos as a name (Euparkà) and not as an office.\footnote{181. According to Theophanes Continuatus, Krateros was one of the officers (“ήγεμόνας καὶ ἄρχοντας”) sent to help the strategos of Anatolikon Aetios defend Amorion. In this case, too, it is not certain that the eparchos was an urban prefect like that of Constantinople. We have to take into consideration that Nikomedeia was the capital of the Optimaton theme and Amorion the capital of the Anatolikon theme. Thus, the existence of prefects in these cities, assuming that the testimonies of the Syrian patricians.} and Bodinos, who betrayed the city, and they destroyed heaps, heaps (of the people)”. Cf. PmbZ (see n. 3) no. 7679.}

177. See for example the same page of the Chronicon, where the military campaigns of Constantine V are described: “Et cum essent Romani in Armenia, venit Chaledus filius Achaei, praefectus Eddesae cum exercitu Arabum”. See also page 264: “praefectus Saluhum filium Ali universae Aegypto et Libyae … Et cum praefecturam exerceret Iachias in Mosulem ….” Cf. J. R. Martindale, The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, vol. IIIA-IIIB (527-641), Cambridge 1992, p. 376 (Cyrus 16), who had been appointed by Chosroes governor of Edessa (praefectus Edessae), and p. 1438 (Anonymous 62).


179. Michel le Syrien (see n. 178) 101 n. 4. For Theodoros Krateros see PmbZ (see n. 3) no. 7679.

180. Theophanes Continuatus, ed. I. Bekker, [CSHB] Bonnæ 1838, p. 126-3-15: “πολλῶν οὖν συμβολευόντων μετακιμάτων τὸν ἐν ἀμορίῳ οἰκονόμα τοῦ καὶ τέως ἐπικραδεμείν τὴν ἄχρονον φόραν τῶν Σαρακηνῶν (πολὺς γὰρ ἡμέρα καὶ λαὸν ἐπήγετο ἄλφατον), ἄτοπον μὲν ἐφαινετο τοῦτο τῷ Θεοφίλῳ καὶ ἀνανδρῷ, καλὸν δὲ καὶ πρὸς ἀνθρῶν εὔοδον τὸ μᾶλλον ἐποχύρωσαι αὐτὸ καὶ στρατηγοῦ γενναίου διασώσαι βουλαίς. Λεῖτος ἦν οὗτος ὁ πατρίκιος καὶ τῶν Ἀνατολικῶν ἱπταμένος. ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ τίνος πολυχειρίας ἐδέετο, καὶ ταύτῃ ἀποσταλείν ὁ Θεοφίλος ὡς πανταχοθεὶν ἀντισταιρεόμενον καὶ τὸν ἐχθρὸν ἐκκενδομένος. ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐδίδον ὡς ἕγεμονας καὶ ἄρχοντας τοὺς μετὰ βραχὺ μαρτυρήσοντας, Θεοδορὸν τε τὸν Κρατερὸν καὶ Θεοφίλον καὶ τὸν Βαβούτζικον οὕτως ὡς τῶν ἐκείνων τοῦ λαοῦ ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς φάλαγγος τῶν τεσσαράκοντα δύο μαρτύρων γεγονόν τις ἀρχηγὸς".

181. See E. A. Budge, The Chronography of Gregory Abû Faraj 1225-1286, the Son of Aaron, the Hebrew physician commonly known as Bar Hebraeus being the first part of his political history of the world, London 1932 (reprinted in USA and Great Britain 2003), p. 137: “And they seized ἌΕΤΙΣ the Patrician, and EUPARKÅ, and BÖDIN who betrayed the city, and they destroyed heaps, heaps (of the people)”. Cf. PmbZ (see n. 3) no. 11607.
Chronicles are accurate and refer to the Byzantine technical term ἔπαρχος, could also be related to the themes.

Finally, a prefect named Lucius acting in Catania is mentioned in the Greek Vita of Leo of Catania (BHG 981b) compiled towards the end of the second phase of Iconoclasm, circa 838-843, and in a short prose version of the Vita (BHG 981), which should be dated later, perhaps in the 10th century. Augusta Acconcia Longo, the editor of the second version, held that Lucius was an anthypatos and eparchos of the theme of Sicily, an opinion rejected by W. Brandes, who thinks that the ἀνθύπατοι and ἔπαρχοι τῶν θεμάτων were honorific titles revived in the framework of an “administrative Protorenaissance” during the first half of the 9th century. A. G. Alexakis, the last editor of the Vita, believes that Lucius was an urban prefect, a prefect of Catania, like that of Constantinople. The office of the prefect is mentioned in the Vita as ἐπαρχότης (“τοῦ τῆς ἐπαρχότητος περιδόξου μεγέθους”) The term, according to A. Alexakis, designates the praefectus urbis and the above phrase is vaguely reminiscent of that of John Lydus, De Magistratibus (“Περί τῆς ἐπαρχότητος τῶν Πραιτωρίων. Τὸ μὲν περίβλεπτον τῆς ἀρχῆς …”) It is obvious, though, that Lydus refers to the prefectus praetorio and not to the praefectus urbis.

Finally, S. Cosentino considers Lucius as praetor of Sicily. It is related in the Vita that Lucius sent a letter to the emperor describing the events that took place in his province “κατὰ τὴνδε τὴν καθ’ ἡμᾶς ἐπαρχίαν”. This phrase implies, in our opinion, that Lucius acted indeed as a governor of the prov-

182. The Greek Life of St Leo bishop of Catania (BHG 981b). Text and Notes by Alexander G. Alexakis. Translation by Susan Wessel, [Société des Bollandistes] Bruxelles 2011, ch. 16 (p. 158.2 and 10.9), ch. 17 (p. 160.3), ch. 30 (p. 176.1, 9), where the prefect Lucius is also referred.
184. See A. G. Alexakis, Life (see n. 182) 9 ff., with an extended analysis concerning the versions, the content and the date of the Greek Life of St Leo.
185. See A. Acconcia Longo, La vita (see n. 183) 40-42.
186. W. Brandes, Finanzverwaltung (see n. 25) 121 n. 362.
188. A. G. Alexakis, Life (see n. 182) ch. 9 (152.13).
190. S. Cosentino, Prosopografia dell’Italia Bizantina (493-804), vol. II: G-O, [Collana Medievistica diretta da Antonio Carile 9] Bologna 2000, p. 301-302 (Lucius 3). It should also be noted that in the Latin Vita of Leo (BHL 4838) Lucius is termed proconsul, although the Latin Vita was compiled much later and has certain differences compared to the Greek one [see PmbZ (see n. 3) no. 4636 for the problems concerning the two Vitae].
191. A. G. Alexakis, Life (see n. 182) ch. 17 (160.5).
ince, or that he had jurisdiction over the whole province, but he was not an urban *prefect* (of Catania). It seems that the terms ἐπαρχός and ἐπαρχότης are used anachronistically and not accurately by the writer of the Vita. In any case, Lucius was certainly not an urban *prefect*.

**Conclusion**

The *prefecture of Illyricum* existed from the 4th century to, probably, the end of the 7th century. The *prefect of Illyricum* mentioned in the first collection of St Demetrius’ Miracles is identified with the *prefect* of the second collection. In Thessaloniki there was a “ruling class” that participated actively in the administration of the city, a fact that contradicts the theory that the *prefect of Illyricum* was transformed into an urban *prefect* similar to that of Constantinople or that a new urban *prefect* like the *praefectus urbis* was established in Thessaloniki.

The *prefect of Thessaloniki* (8th-9th c.) was, rather, a survival of the *praefectus Illyrici*. His jurisdiction was not confined only to the city of Thessaloniki, but probably covered a region extending to the east of Strymon to the north of Thessaly, to the west of Pindos and to the south of Stoboi, that was controlled by the Byzantines, as can be concluded from the gradual extension of Byzantine control over the Slavic tribes around Thessaloniki and their integration into the Byzantine administrative system, as well as from the existence of many offices situated in Thessaloniki (8th-9th c.), such as the *genikos kommerkiarios of the apotheke*, the *basilika kommerkia*, the *kommerkiarioi*, the *abydikos* and the *paraphylax*, the existence of which presupposes Byzantine control of the city’s hinterland.

It is true that a *prefect of Thessaloniki* and not of *Illyricum* is cited on seals of the 8th and 9th century, but it cannot be concluded from the name of the institution alone that the *prefect of Thessaloniki* was an urban *prefect* like that of Constantinople; it is also indicative that the jurisdiction of the *strategos of Thessaloniki*, who replaced the *prefect of Thessaloniki* as the supreme officer in the region, was not confined solely to the city itself.

In addition, the administrative model of a *praefectus urbis* was not applied to other cities of the empire, as it has been argued, since the *prefects* mentioned in Nikaia, Nikomedeia, Amorion and Catania in Sicily were not urban *prefects* according to our analysis.

The duties of the *prefect of Thessaloniki* would have been taxation and the administration of justice, although there is no reference to them in the sources.
Ανδρέας Ε. Γκουτζιουκώστας

Ο έπαρχος Ιλλυρικού και ο έπαρχος Θεσσαλονίκης.

Στην παρούσα μελέτη εξετάζονται το πρόβλημα της διάρκειας της επαρχότητας Ιλλυρικού και η σχέση του επάρχου Ιλλυρικού με τον έπαρχο Θεσσαλονίκης που μαρτυρείται σε σφραγίδες (8ος-9ος αι.).

Με βάση την κριτική προσέγγιση των αντικρουόμενων απόψεων της νεότερης έρευνας, την ανάλυση των πληροφοριών των Θαυμάτων του Αγίου Δημητρίου, των αφηγηματικών πηγών και του σφραγισμού υλικού καθώς και την αξιοποίηση των πορισμάτων της αρχαιολογικής έρευνας προέκυψαν τα ακόλουθα συμπεράσματα.

Η επαρχότητα Ιλλυρικού λειτουργούσε από τον 4ο μέχρι τα τέλη περίπου του 7ου αιώνα. Ο έπαρχος Ιλλυρικού που μνημονεύεται στην πρώτη συλλογή των Θαυμάτων του Αγίου Δημητρίου δεν διαφοροποιείται σε σχέση με τον έπαρχο που αναφέρεται στη δεύτερη συλλογή των Θαυμάτων.

Η ύπαρξη μίας ισχυρής τοπικής «άρχουσας τάξης» στη Θεσσαλονίκη, που λάμβανε ενεργά μέρος στη διοίκηση της πόλης και φροντίζε για τον επισιτισμό και την ασφάλεια της, έρχεται σε αντίθεση με τη θεωρία ότι ο έπαρχος Ιλλυρικού μετατράπηκε σε έναν έπαρχο πόλεως όμως με τον έπαρχο της Κωνσταντινούπολης ή ότι ένας νέος έπαρχος πόλεως κατά το πρότυπο της Κωνσταντινούπολης εισήχθη στη Θεσσαλονίκη.

Αντίθετα ο έπαρχος Θεσσαλονίκης (8ος-9ος αι.) ήταν μάλλον επιβίωση του επάρχου Ιλλυρικού και η δικαιοδοσία του δεν περιορίζοταν μόνο στην πόλη της Θεσσαλονίκης, αλλά εκτεινόταν πιθανότατα σε μια ευρύτερη περιοχή που ήλεγχαν οι Βυζαντινοί, ανατολικά του Στρυμόνα, δυτικά της Πίνδου, βορείως της Θεσσαλίας και νοτίως των Στόβων. Στην άποψη αυτή συνηγορούν η σταδιακή επέκταση του βυζαντινού ελέγχου επί των σλαβικών φύλων που είχαν εγκατασταθεί γύρω από τη Θεσσαλονίκη, η ενσωμάτωσή τους στο βυζαντινό διοικητικό σύστημα μέσω του θεσμού του άρχοντος των σλαβικών ομάδων και η παραδοσιακή ύπαρξη και λειτουργία πολλών υπαλλήλων και υπηρεσιών στη Θεσσαλονίκη (8ος-9ος αι.), όπως των γενικών κομμερκιαρίων, των κομμερκιαρίων, των αβυδικών και του παραφύλακα, οι υπηρεσίες τους προορίζονταν τον ελέγχο της ενδοχώρας της Θεσσαλονίκης από τους Βυζαντινούς.
Είναι γεγονός ότι στις σφραγίδες μνημονεύεται έπαρχος Θεσσαλονίκης και όχι έπαρχος Ιλλυρικού, αλλά δεν μπορεί να υποστηριχθεί μόνο με βάση το όνομα του αξιώματος ότι ο έπαρχος περιορίζοταν στη Θεσσαλονίκη. Αλλωστε και η δικαιοδοσία του στρατηγού Θεσσαλονίκης που έδρευε επίσης στην πόλη εκτεινόταν σε μία ευρύτερη περιοχή.

Επιπλέον το διοικητικό μοντέλο του επάρχου πόλεως δεν εφαρμόστηκε και σε άλλες πόλεις της αυτοκρατορίας, όπως έχει υποστηριχθεί, καθώς οι έπαρχοι που μαρτυρούνται στη Νίκαια, τη Νικομήδεια, το Αμόριον και την Κατάνη της Σικελίας δεν φαίνεται να ήταν έπαρχοι πόλεως, όπως προέκυψε από την ανάλυση των πληροφοριών των πηγών.

Τα κύρια καθήκοντά του επάρχου Θεσσαλονίκης πρέπει να ήταν η επιβολή και είσπραξη των φόρων και η απονομή δικαιοσύνης, μολονότι δεν υπάρχει κάποια σαφής αναφορά στις πηγές.