LEICHOUDES’ PRONOIA OF THE MANGANA

Leichoudes held the pronoia of the Mangana. In this case that means that he was a pronoetes of an imperial estate, in Latin a curator domus divinae. The pronoia thus implies that he held an emphyteutic lease. He held it twice between 1042 and 1050 and then again in 1057–1059, while he was mesazon. He gave back the pronoia to the emperor in 1059 because of an objection raised within the synod. Someone seems to have noticed that the pronoia would be unacceptable with his new role as patriarch. This may be due to canonical restrictions imposed on higher clergy in relation to revenue and sales of property, which would be contrary to the terms of an emphyteutic lease. Therefore, the pronoia of the Mangana was a kouratoreia, the administration of an imperial estate and Leichoudes was a curator domus divinae.
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In 1043 Romanos Skleros⁠¹ destroyed the residence of George Maniakes⁠² in Cappadocia. His sister⁴ was the mistress⁵ of the Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos, so he felt supported at court, since there was clearly some sort of antagonism between

¹ Romanos 104 PBW2016. All prosopographical references and seals are numbered according to the Prosopography of the Byzantine World 2016.
² Georgios 62.
³ οὗτος ὁ Μανιάκης κατὰ τὸ θέμα τῶν Ἀνατολικῶν τὰς οἰκήσεις ἔχων καὶ Ῥωμαίων γειτονῶν τῷ Σκληρῷ, διαφέρομενος πρὸς αὐτὸν πολλάκις ἐπεχείρησεν τούτον ἀνελεῖν, εἰ μὴ φυγῇ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἐπορίσατο σωτηρίαν. ἐπεὶ δὲ τὰ Ῥωμαίων σκῆπτρα ἐς Κωνσταντῖνον ἦλθε τὸν Μονομάχον καὶ ὁ Σκληρὸς ἐπὶ μέγα τύχη ἦρτο (ἐπαλλακεύετο γὰρ τῷ Μονομάχῳ ἡ τοῦ Σκληροῦ ἀδελφή) μάγιστρος τιμηθεὶς καὶ πρωτοστράτωρ, τῶν εἰς αὐτὸν μεμνημένος τοῦ Γεωργίου καταδρομῶν, καταχρώμενος τῇ ἐξονοίᾳ καὶ τὴν ἀπουσίαν κατατρέχων τοῦ Μανιάκη, τὰ τε ἀνήκοντα αὐτῷ ἐδήσε καὶ ἔκειρε χωρία καὶ εἰς τὴν τούτου κοίτην ἀνέδην ἐξέβρισεν. (Scylitzes Historiae Const. 9.3.55–64, ed. Thurn).
⁴ Maria 64.
⁵ The main account remains Psellus Chronographia 6.50–75, ed. Reinsch.
the Skleroi and Maniakes. This episode summarizes the question of land tenure in the middle of the eleventh century. Romanos Skleros owned estates in Cappadocia, while his sister was connected with the Imperial estate of the Mangana. These two types of property were the private property of an individual (res privata) or the private property of the emperor (domus divina). Different was a third category which was public property (res publica). The current article aims to clarify the middle eleventh century understanding of the term pronoia (πρόνοια) in relation to the ownership and use of the Mangana estate. The first volume of the newly founded Byzantine Institute of the Serbian Academy of Sciences was written by Ostrogorski on the topic of pronoia. Since Ostrogorski’s concerns were tracing the evolution of pronoia from Byzantium to Serbia, he only devotes a couple of pages to the question of Leichoudes and the Mangana. Bartusis has recently considered the case of St George of Mangana an exception to the system of pronoia allegedly established after 1081 by Alexios Comnenos. It would appear that Maria and Romanos Skleros had a lack of foresight. They were living an exception to the system of pronoia created after their lifetime. Ostrogorski in 1951 claimed that the pronoia of the Mangana in the eleventh was the first example of this system which lasted until the fall of Constantinople. Part of the problem is that a number of scholars are interested in the military pronoia, while the pronoia of Leichoudes clearly has no military aspect. However, it is worth exploring what pronoia could have meant for them and their generation especially in the 1040s and 1050s. Ostrogorski is correct to point out that the term pronoia does not have a

---

6 On land tenure still classic is Každan, Derevnja.
7 She first lived at the Kunegion palace (Zonaras 17.27.18) and then in a new residence at the Mangana (Σφραγὶς τοῦ σεκρέτου τοῦ ἁγίου μεγαλομάρτυρος Γεωργίου τοῦ Τροπαιοφόρου / καὶ οἴκου τῆς ὑπερπεριλάμπηραν καὶ εὐτυχεστάτης σεβαστῆς seal 53 PBW2016) then at the imperial palace in the adyton. (Psellos Chronographia 6.59.2, ed. Reinsch).
8 The fiscus dealt with the private property of the emperor in the early centuries see Millar, 198. It became equivalent to late Hellenistic basilikon, Millar, Emperor, 199. Syme argues it was present at the time of Augustus Syne, Roman revolution 410. Dölger, Finanzverwaltung, 12.
9 The aerarium in the early empire dealt with the res publica. See Millar, Emperor, 200. The three categories are also present in the tenth century. See Leo VI, Novel 51, εἰ δ’ ὁ τόπος ὃς τὸν θησαυρὸν εἰς φῶς ἠνεγκεν οὔτε βασίλειος οὔτε δημόσιος, ἀλλ’ ἐτέρου τινὸς προσώπου, ἀμφοτέροις ὁμοίως, τῷ τε περιτυχόντι καὶ τῷ τοῦ χωρίου δεσπότῃ, τοῦτο ἐπίσης διανέμεσθαι· (Leo VI, Novel 51.28–31, ed. Dain Noialles). See Každan, Epstein, Change, 16. Dölger, Finanzverwaltung, 12.
10 Ostrogorski, Pronija.
11 Ostrogorski, Pronija, 13–14. Dölger, Finanzverwaltung, 14, 40. He does not associate the curator with the pronoia.
12 Bartusis, Land and priviledge.
13 “The leichoudes-mangana affair may be safely omitted from any discussion of pronoia as an institution” Bartusis, Land and priviledge, 24.
14 Bartusis, Land and priviledge.
15 Ostrogorski, Pronija, 13. The argument had been presented also in Uspenski, Značenie. Každan, Economic, 90 says that Ostrogorski’s argument was of “more elegant and accurate form”.
16 Ostrogorski, Pronija, 14 note 37.
generic meaning of ‘concern’ but is a technical term.\textsuperscript{17} This paper will argue that Constantine Leichoudes was the \textit{προνοητής} of the Mangana, that the title was the Greek equivalent to the Latin curator of an imperial estate (\textit{domus divina}) which may be found in the early Roman Empire and in Egyptian papyri. The pronoia of Leichoudes is in fact a kouratoreia.\textsuperscript{18} Moreover, it will propose that the specific responsibility of Leichoudes in relation to this estate were similar to an emphyteutic lease\textsuperscript{19}, also well known since the earliest days of the Roman Empire (\textit{ager vectigalis}).

The evidence for the \textit{πρόνοια} of the Mangana in the eleventh century is limited but important. The seals give an overview of the situation. There are some persons who have the word Mangana on their seal listed in the PBW.

\begin{center}
Γύριε βοήθει τῷ σῷ δούλῳ / [...] βασιλικῷ πρωτοσπαθαρίῳ μεγάλῳ χαρτουλαρίῳ τοῦ γενικοῦ λογοθέτου και κουράτωρι τῶν Μαγγάνων (Anonymous 20327 seal 4572)

Ὁ ἄγιος Εὐστάθιος. / Εὐσταθίῳ πρωτοσπαθαρίῳ ἐπί τοῦ Χρυσοτρικλίνου μεγάλῳ χαρτουλαρίῳ και μεγάλῳ κουράτωρι τῶν Μαγγάνων (Eustathios 20127 seal 3555)

Μήτηρ Θεοῦ. | Θεοτόκε βοήθει τῷ σῷ δούλῳ / Εὐθυμίῳ πρωτοσπαθαρίῳ κουράτωρι τῶν Μαγγάνων (Euthymios 20119 seal 4567)

ἄγιος Γεώργιος. / Κύριε βοήθει Γεωργίῳ ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ κουράτωρος τῶν Μαγγάνων (George 20226O seal 4565)

Ὁ ἁγίος Ἰωάννης ο Πρόδρομος. / Κύριε βοήθει Ιωσηφίῳ πρωτοσπαθαρίῳ καὶ πρωτονοταρίῳ τῶν Μαγγάνων (Gregorios 20169 seal 4574)

Ὁ ἁγίος Νικόλαος. / Ἰωάννης βασιλικὸς πρωτοσπαθάριος ἐπὶ τοῦ κοιτῶνος καὶ μέγας κουράτωρ τῶν Μαγγάνων (Ioannes 20600 seal 4568)

Ὁ ἁγίος Ἰωάννης ο Πρόδρομος. / Ἰωάννης πρωτοσπαθαρίῳ κουράτωρι τῶν Μαγγάνων κριτὴ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἱπποδρόμου τῷ [...] (Ioannes 20411 seal 2517)

Μήτηρ Θεοῦ. / Σφραγὶς Ἰωσήφ Μαγγάνων βασιλικοῦ νοταρίου (Joseph 20122 seal 4573)

Μήτηρ Θεοῦ. / Θεοτόκε βοήθει Κυριακῷ ἀσηκρῆτι καὶ πρωτονοταρίῳ τῶν Μαγγάνων (Kyriakos 20102 seal 2240)

[...] / Κύριε βοήθει τῷ σῷ δούλῳ / Μιχαὴλ βασιλικῷ σπαθαροκανδιδάτῳ καὶ κουράτωρι τῶν Μαγγάνων (Michael 20400 seal 4125)

Νικολάῳ τηρητῇ / τοῦ βασιλικοῦ οἴκου τῶν Μαγγάνων (Nikolaos 20244 seal 4569)

Θεοτόκε βοήθει τῷ σῷ δούλῳ Ῥωμανῷ πρυμικηρίῳ / βασιλικῷ πρωτοσπαθαρίῳ κουράτωρι τῶν Μαγγάνων (Romanos 20114 seal 1082)
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{17} Стравиче Ostrogorski, Pronija, 13.
\textsuperscript{18} See ODB. Každan, Derevnja, 131–133. Dölger, Finanzverwaltung, 14, 40.
\textsuperscript{19} See Johnson, Emphyteusis.
It is not simple to date such seals, but what emerges is there are two main titles associated with Mangana: a μέγας κουράτωρ τῶν Μαγγάνων and a κουράτωρ τῶν Μαγγάνων. In any case it is clear that the term is

(μέγας) κουράτωρ τῶν Μαγγάνων
(great) curator of the Mangana

The term κουράτωρ seems to have two main meanings. One is connected with a region of the empire or to imperial properties in the city. In the empire, some examples are the following: Curator of Armenian Themes, Antioch, Cyprus, Mesopotamia, Strymon and Thessaloniki, Taron, Tarsos, West and Longibardia.

There are also curatores in the city of Constantinople: ta eleutheriou and old petrion. One of the seals of the old petrion indicates that the person was curator of imperial houses. Another seal has a curator of the imperial palace. One of the seals indicates that the Mangana was also a βασιλικὸς οἶκος, an imperial household. Therefore, these curatores in Constantinople are connected with areas where one could find imperial properties. This is an older system as Ševčenko pointed out. The standard designation of the administrator of such estates is Κουράτωρ τῶν [...]

---

20 Bury, Administrative, 100; Každan, Derevnja, 131, 132, 134.
21 For the term curator see Každan, Derevnja, 131–133.
22 Každan, Derevnja, 131.
23 Georgios 20133.
24 Ioannes 20597.
25 Anonymous 2399, Anonymous 2477.
26 Anonymous 20268.
27 Anonymous 20284.
28 Anonymous 20359.
29 Ioannes 20421.
30 Ioannes 20733.
31 Georgios 20187, Ioannes 20524, Nikolaos 20128, Philetos 20103, Theodoretos 20104, Theodoros 20253, Theodoros 20170. On the oikos Eleutheriou, see Každan, Derevnja, 134.
32 Ioannes 20601, Ioannes 20556, Theophylaktos 20132; Každan, Derevnja, 131.
33 Κύριε βοήθει τῷ σῷ δούλῳ Ἰωάννῃ βασιλικῷ ὀστιαρίῳ / [...] καὶ κουράτωρ τῶν βασιλικῶν οίκων τοῦ Πετρίου (Ioannes 20556 seal 4124).
34 Μήτηρ Θεοῦ. Θεοτόκε βοήθει τῷ σῷ δούλῳ / Κωνσταντίνῳ βασιλικῷ πρωτοσπαθαρίῳ καὶ μεγάλῳ κουράτωρ τῶν αὐγουστιακῶν οίκων (Konstantinos 20154 seal 886).
35 The seal of Michael 20400.
FREDERICK LAURITZEN: Leichoudes’ pronoia of the Mangana

(Curator of […]). Therefore κουράτωρ τῶν Μαγγάνων (the curator of the Mangana) is the administrator of the imperial properties within the area of the Mangana. The sixth century historian Agathias indicates what the term means in Greek since it is not a translation but a transliteration of the Latin term and says that the aim of the curator was to administer imperial houses and estates. Jones claims that the first occurrence of curator as imperial administrator is in the year 531 in Justinian’s codex. The three persons to which the emperor writes his opinion are defined as Curator dominicae domus. This text was maintained in byzantine law and translated into Greek which gives an insight of how the terms were rendered. The functions of the curator are thus defined both in Latin and in Greek:

\[
\text{sed curatores nostri, per quos solemus substantiam nostram gubernare (Codex Iustinianus 7.37.3.1a Krueger)}
\]

\[
\text{Ἀλλ’ οἱ κουράτορες οἱ ἡμέτεροι, δι’ ὅν εἰώθαμεν τὴν υπόστασιν ἡμῶν χειρίζειν, (Basilica 50.13.3.17–18 Scheltema van der Berg).}
\]

But our curatores, through which we are used to administer our properties.

\[
\text{nostros curatores, per quos res divinarum domuum aguntur, (Codex Iustinianus 7.37.3.1b Krueger)}
\]

\[
\text{τοὺς ἡμετέρους κουράτωρας, δι’ ὅν τὰ πράγματα τῶν θείων οίκων πράττονται, (Basilica 50.13.3.25 Scheltema van der Berg)}
\]

Our curatores, through which the property of the divine houses is dealt with.

These estates could be either in the city or in the provinces according to the Novel 1 of Tiberius II of 574. Thus the curator administered imperial properties (houses or estates) either in Constantinople or the provinces. The system was not new in the middle of the eleventh century. Therefore, the κουράτωρ τῶν Μαγγάνων is the administrator of the imperial estate of the Mangana comprising buildings and land.

The term curator dominicae domus is technical and designates the administrator of a part of the properties subject to the emperor. Another technical term

36 Ševčenko, Inscription. Κουράτωρ τῶν δεσποτικοῦ οίκου τῶν Πλακιδίας, Κουράτωρ τῶν Ορμίσδου, Κουράτωρ τῶν Άντιόχου, Jones, Later Roman Empire, 1173 p. 39
37 ἐπιμέλειαν τῶν βασιλείων οίκων τε καὶ κτημάτων ἀρχῆν εἰληχότα. κουράτωρας δὲ καλοῦσι Ρωμαίοι. (Agathias Historiae, 5–7, ed. Keydell).
38 Jones, Later Roman Empire, 1173 note to page 426.
39 iust. a. flor. com. rer. privat. et curat. dominic. domus et petro viro ill. curat. div. domus sereniss. augustae et macedonio viro ill. curat. et ipsi dominicae domus. <a 531 d. v. k. dec. constantinopoli post consulatum lampadii et orestis vv. c c.> Codex Iustinianus 7.37.3.5, ed. Krueger of the year 531.
40 Svoronos, institutions, 473–498 esp. 475.
41 Οἱ ἐνδοξότατοι κουράτωρες τῶν θείων οίκων, οἱ τὰς μεγίστας ἢ καὶ ἐλάττους ἀρχὰς ἰθύνειν ἐπιτετραμμένοι κατὰ τὰ τῆς εὐδαίμονα πόλιν ταύτην καὶ μὴν καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἑπαρχίαις (Novel Tiberius II 1, p. 19, ed. Zacharia Ligenthal).
employed was *curator domus divinae*..

In effect the ultimate ownership belonged to the emperor, but the different types of property implied different administrators and bureaucracies. At the end of the reign of Justinian imperial properties were divided into five administrations. In the novel constitutions of Justinian the res privata (*θεία πριβάτα*), the patrimonium (*θείον πατριμόνιον*) and domus dominicae (*θεῖοι οἶκοι*) are referred to as three different departments. Similar distinctions are also present in novel 51 of Leo VI (886–912)

and confirms that the term *κουράτωρ τῶν Μαγγάνων* is a specific term designating a specific bureaucracy (*domus divina / θεῖοι οἶκοι*). The private imperial nature of the estate of Mangana is clear from the foundation.

The first main description of the imperial property of Mangana at the time of Basil I (867–886) is in the Vita Basilii and confirms that the revenues of the imperial estate were not public but private:

> ἔργον δὲ τούτου τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ὁ λεγόμενος οἶκος τὰ Μάγγανα καὶ ὁ ἄτερος ὁ Νέος καλούμενος. οὗς ἀπὸ τοιαύτης κατεσκεύασε προαιρέσεως, μὴ βουλόμενος γὰρ τὰ δημόσια πράγματα εἰς οἰκείας καταναλίσκειν χρείας τοὺς τοιούτους ἀνωκόδομησεν οίκους, καὶ προσόδους ἐκ γεωργίας ἀπέταξεν αὐτοῖς ἰκανάς, ἀρ’ ὁν ἡ βασιλική πανδαισία αὐτοῦ τε καὶ τῶν ἁπάντων ἄφθονον καὶ δικαίαν τὴν χορηγίαν ἐμελλὲν ἄεί. (Theophanes Cont. Chronographia 91.23–10 Bekker p. 337 = Scylitzes Basil1.41.77–84 Thurn)

creation of this emperor was also the so-called Mangana house and the other called New house. He established them out of this intention: since he did not wish to spend public funds for his personal needs, he constructed such houses and ordered them to have enough revenues from agriculture from which the imperial full banquet would always have an endless and appropriate supply for him and those invited by him throughout the year.

Basil did not want to spend public money (*δημόσια*) on his private estate. He therefore endowed the estate with enough land to provide an income on its own (i.e. *domus divina / θεῖος οἶκος*). There was not mixture between public (*δημόσιον*) and private imperial revenue (*βασιλικόν*) in this case. This description indicates that the

---

42 Domus divina see *Jones*, Later Roman Empire, 1173 n. 39.

43 Res privata (comes); Patrimonium (comes); Domus divina per Cappadociam (praepositus sacri cubiculi); Domus dominicae (curatores); Patrimonium Italieae (comes) see *Jones*, Later Roman Empire, 426–427.

44 ἢ τις τῶν αὐτῆς τῆς βασιλείας οἰκών ἢ τοῦ θείου πατριμονίου ἢ τῶν θείων πριβάτων (Novel 69: 353.25–26, ed. Kroll Schöll; cfr. Basilica 6.21.4.13–14, ed. Scheltema van der Wal); ἢ της περιλαμβάνειν ἡς εἰρήται καὶ ἐκκλησίας καὶ εὐαγῆ μοναστήρια καὶ τοὺς θείους οἰκώς καὶ τὰ θεία πατριμόνια καὶ τὰ θεία οἴκως καὶ τὰ θεία πριβάτα καὶ τὸ θεία πατριμόνιον (Novel 69: 354.8–11, ed. Kroll Schöll; cfr. Basilica 6.21.4.27–29, ed. Scheltema Van der Wal); ἢ οἷς μηδὲ τὴς θείας πατριμονίας ἢ τοῖς θείοις ἡμῶς πριβάτοις ἢ αὐτῶ τῷ θείῳ ἡμῶν οἴκῳ τὴν οἰκείαν ἐπιστήσεις ἃ ἡμῶς ἀπολείπετον ἡμῶν οἴκῳ (Novel 102: 494.1–3, ed. Kroll Schöll; cfr. Basilica 6.15.1.8–10, ed. Scheltema van der Wal).

45 See note 8.
palace had an estate: it was not simply a palace. The estate paid for itself yearly.\textsuperscript{46} It is worth noting that the idea of imperial estates covering private costs of the emperor is well known from earlier times.\textsuperscript{47} Cappadocia was an imperial estate and its revenue paid for the private expenses of the emperor.\textsuperscript{48}

Imperial houses (\textit{dominicae domus, θεῖοι οἶκοι}) had their own bureaucracy which did not overlap with other city institutions. It was controlled personally by the emperor through his \textit{curator dominicae domus}. This explains the connection of the Mangana with the \textit{βασιλικὸς οἶκος} in the seals. It does not refer to a specific palace of the Mangana per se, but rather to the imperial household or estate of Mangana. Such a property could include also a palace or even a series of imperial buildings. From the point of view of Constantinople, the curator of the Mangana would administer the area without interference of other bureaucracies such as the city eparch (urban prefect). The Kletorologion of Philotheos indicates that the curator of the Mangana is part of a sekreton,, i.e. a bureau with specific bureaucrats.\textsuperscript{49} The seals of the Mangana and the chrysobulls of 1057\textsuperscript{50} and 1060\textsuperscript{51} reveal the following titles connected with this imperial property:

\begin{itemize}
  \item Curator\textsuperscript{52}
  \item Protonotarios\textsuperscript{53}
  \item Logariastai\textsuperscript{54}
  \item Chartoularioi\textsuperscript{55}
  \item Basilikoi notarioi\textsuperscript{56}
  \item Notarioi
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{46} See Oikonomides, Malyj sion, N. 23 on the properties.
\textsuperscript{47} 4. C. Caesar [Augustus], quem mihi uidetur rerum natura edidisse ut ostenderet quid summa uitia in summa fortuna possent, centiens sestertio cenauit uno die; et in hoc omnium adiutus ingenio uix tamen inuenit quomodo trium prouniciarum tributum una cena fieret. (Seneca ad Helviam matrem de consolatione 10,4) cfr. Millar, Roman Emperor, 197.
\textsuperscript{48} Jones, Later Roman Empire, 427 and note.
\textsuperscript{49} Bury, Administrative 100–102.
\textsuperscript{50} \textit{kουρατώρων τοῦ ὀί(κου) τῶν Ἑλευθερίου καὶ τῶν Μαγγάνων, ὁκιστι(κῶν) (καὶ) τῶν ὑπ’ άυτούς πρωτονοτ(α)ρί(ων), λογαριαστῶν, χαρτου(λαι)ρί(ων), βασιλι(κῶν) νοταρί(ων) (καὶ) νοταρίων} (Chrysobollum Michaelis VI (a. 1057) 30–32, edd. Guillou, Lemerle).
\textsuperscript{51} \textit{kουρατ(ώ)ρων τοῦ ὀί(κου) τῶν Ἑλευθερίου (καὶ) τῶν Μαγγάνων, ὁκιστι(κῶν) (καὶ) τῶν ὑπ’ αυτούς (πρωτο)νοτ(α)ρί(ων), λογαριαστῶν, βασιλι(κῶν) νοταρί(ων) (καὶ) νοταρίων} (Chrysobollum Constantini X Ducae (a. 1060), 61–62, edd. Guillou, Lemerle).
\textsuperscript{52} Curator Mangana seals, see above.
\textsuperscript{53} Gregorios 20169; Kyriakos 20102; Michael 20400.
\textsuperscript{54} Did not find a logariastes of the Mangana. However, there is a logariastes of the Ta Eleutheiou Konstantinos 20419; Seal 4562.
\textsuperscript{55} Did not find a chartoularios of the Mangana. However, there is a chartoularios of the Orphano-tropheion Konstantinos 20196; Theodoros 20352.
\textsuperscript{56} Joseph 20122.
Moreover, there are two figures in the seals which are representatives of the curator.57 Thus the Mangana estate had its own administration (σέκρετον) under the supervision of a curator, who reported directly to the emperor. One may notice that nine seals also have the dignity of protospatharios. Každan points out that in the tenth century the dignity protospatharios was found among the curatores of imperial estates. At the same time it was also awarded to governors of provinces.58 This the sekreton of the Mangana was organised as an imperial department (σέκρετον).

Within this department (σέκρετον) there is some information about one of the institutions, namely the law school. The novella constitutio of Constantine IX Monomachos which created the law school within the Mangana estate explains:

\[\text{ἔσται γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς παρούσης μετὰ τῆς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ βοηθείας καὶ συνεργίας ἀνειμένων μὲν τοῖς νόμοις εἰς παιδευτήριον τὸ κάλλιστον σχεδόν καὶ τερπνότατον οἴκημα τοῦ εὐαγγέλου ἡμῶν οἶκου, ὥστε τῷ πάντων ἡμῖν τὸν ἀγαθὸν δοτὴρ καθερώσαμεν, καὶ τὸν ἐν μάρτυσι περιώνυμον, τὸν καὶ κλήσει καὶ πράγματι τροπαιοφόρον Γεώργιον οἰονεῖ τινα μέγαν οἰκοδεσπότην αὐτῇ(?) καὶ οἰκιστὴν τε καὶ φύλακα λαμπρῶς ἐπεστήσαμεν, ὡς τὸν ἐκείσεθε θεῖον ναὸν—οὗ τῆς μαρτυρικῆς χωρίς (οἵμαι) συνευδοκίας ἅμα καὶ ἀντιλήψεως—ἐκ καινῆς ἀνηγείραμεν καὶ εἰς ἱερὸν φορτιστήριόν τοῦ οἴκου κατεσκεύασαμεν. (Mauropous, novella constitution 10 Salac)\]

From this moment on, with the help and cooperation of Heaven, practically the most beautiful and most pleasing building from our illustrious household is to be left as a school for the laws, which we have been preparing with the greatest of expectations, and which we have dedicated to our god, giver of all good things, and we have gloriously established the famous among martyrs, the triumphant in name and deed George, as its great patron of the house, founder and guardian, who also has a church there – we would not want a school without his martyrly succour and supplication, I think – thus we have rebuilt and prepared the building to be a holy monastery. (tr. Chitwood)

The law school is a building within the Mangana estate. The building is within the foundation (εὐαγής οἶκος) where is found the church of St. George the Tropaiophoros. The terms employed are rather technical. Indeed, Eustathios Rhomaios in the mid eleventh century explains how an εὐαγής οἶκος is not equivalent to a monastery.

καὶ ἡρμήνευσεν ὁ μάγιστρος, ὡς τοίς οἴκοις εὐαγεῖς οὐ πάν μοναστήριον εἴπεν ἡγηροκομεῖον ἀλλὰ μόνον τοὺς οἰκείους τοὺς ὑπὸ βασιλέως τὴν σύστασιν δεξαμένους ὡς τὰ πέτρια καὶ τὸ μυρέλαιον—(eustathius Rhomaeus Peira 15.12.10–13 Zepos)

57 τηρητὴ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ οἴκου τῶν Μαγγάνων (Nikolaos 2024; Seals 4569) ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ κουφάτωρος τῶν Μαγγάνων (Georgios 20226; Seals 4565).

58 Každan Epstein, Change, 17.
The magistros explained that the charitable foundations are not always a monastery or hospice but only those private ones which received a constitution from the emperor like the Petria and the Myrelaion.

This passage indicates that the Petria and Myrelaion were εὐαγεῖς οἶκοι with a special status received from the emperor. Indeed, both Petrian and Myrelaion had a curator, since they were imperial properties not monasteries, within which one could find εὐαγεῖς οἶκοι. This is the same case as the Mangana. Within the estate of the Mangana was the monastery of Saint George the Tropaiophoros and within this foundation was present the law school. Xiphilinos was appointed as head of the law school (νομοφύλαξ), one specific building within the estate. The novella of the law school describes buildings and their functions within the monastery within an estate administered by a curator.

The term curator is not directly associated with Constantine Leichoudes, in the sources. His name is connected with the term πρόνοια. Since he holds a πρόνοια, that makes him a προνοητής. The synopsis minor identifies the term κουράτωρ with προνοητής:

ξθ’. Κουράτωρ ἐρμηνεύεται μὲν φροντιστὴς ἢγουν ἐπιμελητὴς καὶ προνοητής, ἐστὶ δὲ μείζων τοῦ ἐπιτρόπου, καὶ αὐτῷ τουτέστι τῷ κουράτωρι ἀποδίδουσι τοὺς λόγους ὁ ἐπίτροπος, καὶ ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ ἀνακρίνεται καὶ εὐθύνεται. (liber alphabeticus sive synopsis minor Kappa69 Zepos)

Curator means a manager or a responsible and administrator, he is greater than an executor, and the executor gives his accounts to the curator and is judged and punished by him.

The προνοητής was also the administrator of an imperial estate (domus divina) in the Roman Empire. The Greek term is well studied in late antique papyri. The administrator of an imperial estate was called a curator in Latin and προνοητής in Greek. The connection between pronoia and curator is apparent already in the sixth century.

59 Každan, Derevnya 134; Každan Epstein, Change, 16
60 Petrian: Μήτηρ Θεοῦ. / Θεοτόκε βοήθει τῷ σῷ δούλῳ Ἰωάννῃ πριμικηρίῳ καὶ κουράτωρ τοῦ Παλαιοῦ Πετρίου (Ioannes 20601 seal 4577); Κύριε βοήθει τῷ σῷ δούλῳ Ἰωάννῃ βασιλικῷ ὀστιαρίῳ / [...] καὶ κουράτωρ τῶν βασιλικῶν οἴκων τοῦ Πετρίου (Ioannes 20556; Seal 4124).
61 Azzarello, Gonis, Pronoetes.
62 See also χωρίον διαφέρει | τῷ θεῷ | ω ὑπὸ τῶν κόμ(ητος) | καὶ τῶν θεομαστῶν | κοράτωρ. ☩ (Inscription 528, ed. Jalabert Mouterde). Dated to 573–578 from Bab al Hawa.
Village belonging to the divine household of Marina administered by the most glorious curator Magnes.

In this inscription the house is looked after (προνοούμενον) by the curator. The pronoia was the concern of the curator. Therefore, the term προνοητής has a technical meaning equivalent to curator. Both terms also signify an administrator of a region. The προνοητής of Bulgaria\(^{63}\) must have been instituted after Bulgaria was included into the empire. The reason for using the term προνοητής to mean administrator of a region or of an imperial estate, may be due to the fact that when land was conquered it became an imperial estate. When Melitene was seized by the byzantine army in 934, the administration was first given to a προνοητής/curator.\(^{64}\) The term προνοητής/curator of a region may refer to lands conquered. This would imply that newly acquired lands would automatically be imperial (ager publicus).\(^{65}\)

Leichoudes was thus προνοητής of the estate of the Mangana. The main question concerning the Mangana, are two texts of Skylitzes Continuatus\(^{66}\) and Zonaras\(^{67}\) which indicate that Constantine Leichoudes was given the pronoia of the Mangana and that Isaak I Comenos refused to appoint him patriarch until he had given up this pronoia. The problem described about the pronoia of the Mangana in Scylitzes Continuatus and Zonaras indicated the return of the privileges of the Mangana (δικαιώματα / ἐλευθερίας ἔγγαφα) to the emperor. The importance of the privileges does not seem connected with the monastery of St George the Tropaiophoros but rather with the estate of the Mangana itself. This would seem to imply that Leichoudes was the administrator of the Mangana, or more precisely the curator of the Mangana. The reason is that if he were of a lower rank within the estate administration of the Mangana he would not be entitled to keep these documents, unless he was the in charge of the whole estate.

Beside being προνοητής/curator he was also the main minister of the government (μεσάζων/παραδυναστεύων).\(^{68}\) Another curator of the time was the person in charge of

---

\(^{63}\) Pronoetes of Bulgaria. Ioannes 20221, Konstantinos 20114.

\(^{64}\) Theoph Cont., 416.23; Každan Epstein, Change, 17.

\(^{65}\) Ager publicus. See for example Frank, Dominum in solo proviciali and Jones, In eo solo dominum.

\(^{66}\) ἀνὴρ μέγιστον διαλάμψας τοῖς βασιλικοῖς καὶ πολιτικοῖς πράγμασιν ἀπὸ τε τῆς τοῦ Μονομάχου ἀναρρήσεως καὶ μέχρι τῶν Μαγγάνων προνοίας καὶ τῶν δικαιωμάτων φυλάξ παρὰ τοῦ εἰρημένου βασιλέως καταλεφθεῖ. (Scylitzes Continuatus, 106.5–10, ed. Tsolakes).

\(^{67}\) ὁπερ ὁ Μονομάχος καὶ τὴν τῶν Μαγγάνων ἀνέθετο πρόνοιαν καὶ τά περὶ τῆς ἐλευθερίας αὐτῶν ἐνεπίστευσεν ἐγγαφά. (Zonaras Epitome, 670.7–9, edd. Böttner, Wobst)

\(^{68}\) Verpaux, Contribution.
the Orphanotrophieion⁶⁹, the orphanotrophos John⁷⁰, who tried to become patriarch in 1037. Leichoudes became patriarch in 1059. Thus there is a political link between being a curator/προνοητής of an imperial foundation and seeking the patriarchate.

The accumulation of personal wealth may be connected with his pronoia. The administration on behalf of the emperor of his private property is well attested and regular practice in the Roman Empire.⁷¹ Millar quotes the following the letter of the Emperor Constantine (306–337) to the rationalis in Africa in 319:

We have granted certain properties and slaves withdrawn from the patrimonium and fiscus. We wish these to be held in full and perpetual ownership without any risk of question, laying down a penalty for rationales, magistri of the privata res or officiales who make any attempt to contravene it.⁷²

Moreover, Millar quotes an important passage from Eusebius where the emperor Constantine says money should be obtained from the administrator of an estate.⁷³ This would imply that the person in charge had full and free use of the imperial estate and its revenues. Millar identifies this type of possession as an emphyteutic lease.⁷⁴ That would mean that the administrator would have full usufructus of the estate in exchange for a rent. This was in roman law had been known as the ager victigalis.⁷⁵ The situation seems rather similar to that of the pronoia of Leichoudes. Given that Leichoudes was mesazon in 1042 but was then removed in 1050⁷⁶ he cannot have received an eternal or lifetime grant of pronoia to the Mangana under Constatine IX Monomachos. Leichoudes was recalled to power at the accession of Theodora/Michael VI. It is tempting to see Leichoudes obtaining a new pronoia when he was dealing with the succession from Michael VI to Isaak I. Indeed, he was on the embassy⁷⁷ to Isaak I to understand his intentions and which resulted in the new emperor. Could Isaak I have guaranteed a new pronoia with its revenue to Leichoudes in 1057 in exchange for his support at court? The

---

⁶⁹ Guilland, Administrative.
⁷⁰ Janin, Ministre.
⁷¹ Tacitus contrasts the situation of Tiberius in Italy with that of his time: rari per Italiam Caesaris agri, modesta servitia, intra paucos libertos domus; ac si quando cum privatis disceuptaret, forum et ius. Tacitus Annales, 4.6. For the topic see Millar, Roman Emperor, 178–180.
⁷² Millar, Roman Emperor, 175 note 3.
⁷³ Παρὰ Ηρακείδα τοῦ ἐπιτρόπου τῶν ἡμετέρων κτημάτων, Eusebius Historia Ecclesiastica, 10.6.3.3, ed. Bardy.
⁷⁴ Millar, Roman Emperor, 180–181. See also Comfort, Emphyteutic lease. This would imply that the term episkeptites was equivalent to conductores.
⁷⁵ Lanfranchi, Studi sull’ager vectigalis.
⁷⁶ Replaced Leo Paraspondylus δ ... τῶν ὀλὼν πεποιημένους διοίκησιν (Psellos, Chronographia, 6a.15.9–14). See De Vries-Van der Velden, Amitiés.
⁷⁷ Embassy described at: Psellos Chronographia 7.15–43, ed. Reinsch. Composition of embassy: Michael Psellos (Michael 61), Constantine Leichoudes (Konstantinos 13), Theodorus Alpos (Theodorus 106).
proof is indirect. Indeed, the reason why Leichoudes’ appointment to the patriarchate in 1059 was delayed was not due to Isaak I Comnenos. This appears to confirm that the pronoia was not something which the emperor could not revoke. His nomination was opposed by someone78 within the church. There had to be an investigation of the synod.79 There was apparently an impediment. Given that the obstacle was within the church, it would imply that canon law would be breached if he were appointed to a higher level of hierarchy. This could be a breach of a canon such as 2 of the Synod of Nicaea of 787.80 The question concerns dealing with property. This was in contradiction to an emphyteutic lease which would give unrestricted freedom of acquisition and sale. This may not have been a problem, unless the estate of the Mangana could be an automatic beneficiary of land or the ordinary spending of its revenue was incompatible with the position of a bishop. An imperial estate could benefit from lands which had been abandoned (bona vacantia), inherited (bona caduca), confiscated (bona damna-torum), conquered (ager publicus). In the last case it is worth remembering Constantin Leichoudes’ son Stephanos Leichoudes81 was in charge of Vaspurakan82 and Syria.83 Moreover Stephanos Leichoudes according to Scylitzes was in charge of Vaspurakan at the time when Costantine Leichoudes held the pronoia of the Mangana. Since imperial estates were augmented also by conquered lands there may have been a convergence/collusion of interests. In any case it may have been a point of potential reproach. It would be tempting to see a friend of the former minister Leo Paraspondylos raising the question during the synod.84 For this reason Isaak revoked the rights (δικαιώματα) and the freehold (ἐλευθερίας ἔγγραφα) of the Mangana. That the question seemed to be about money seems confirmed by the fact that Leichoudes immediately after being appointed patriarch was noticeably generous. The grant of the pronoia of Mangana to Leichoudes would be enough for Psellos change his opinion about Isaak I Comneos.85 That would mean that Leichoudes was pronoetes of the Mangana twice: 1042–1050 and 1057–1059. The pronoia was connected with his role as mesazon.

That emperors awarded the lease of estates to persons for political support is well known. In the Roman Empire there are some important cases. Augustus awarded the Chersonnese (Gallipoli) to Agrippa.86 It is worth remembering that this historic

78 For an example of such opposition see Psellos poema 21 Westerink which the editor thinks addressed to monk at the beginning of the patriarchate of Leichoudes.
79 On the procedure at this time see Lauritzen, Synod decrees.
80 A person may be elected archbishop if they respect all church canons.
81 Stephanos, 103.
82 Skylitzes Cont., 9.10.9; Bryennios, 99.1; Zonaras, 17.25.16–17.
83 Attaleiates, 44.9/33.24.
84 This would explain Psellos’ identification of Leo Paraspondylos character as strict. Lauritzen, mixed life.
85 Letter to Machetarios in Sathas, V.352.
86 τῶν τε γὰρ πλείστων αὐτοῦ ἐκληρονόμησεν, ἐν οἷς ἄλλα τε καὶ ἡ Χερρόνησος ἡ πρὸς τῷ Ἐλλησπόντῳ, σὺν οἴδ’ ὅπως ἐς τὸν Ἀγρίππαν ἐλθόντος (Dio Cassius Historiae Romanae, LIV.29.5, ed. Boissecain).
fact is transmitted by Dio Cassius. The person who wrote the epitome of Dio Cassius was the nephew of patriarch Xiphilinos, who had been head of the law school at the Mangana. Thus within the walls of the Mangana estate, people could easily know about Agrippa being in charge of the Chersonnese at the time of Augustus. Moreover, the area was an integral part of the Byzantine Empire at the time when Leichoudes was προνοητής.

It is worth remembering how properties could be acquired by the emperor. Augustus for example seized the villa of Hortensius and decided to live there, establishing the first imperial residence on the palatine hill (from which the term palace derives). Indeed, the confiscation of property was a way in which the private estates of the emperor could increase. Basil II confiscated the properties of Maleinos. Moreover he had him stay with him in Constantinople. In view of the present argument, it would appear that Basil II took over the properties of Maleinos in exchange for Maleinos’ use of an imperial residence for his lifetime. Confiscation of property occurred during the civil war at the beginning of Augustus’ reign. A memorial to these confiscations is the Eclogues of Virgil. It also occurred when all pagan religious properties entered the private possession of the emperor in 380ad. Another manner of acquiring property was inheritance. We are told that to guarantee the transmission of property within families, a part of a property would be left to the emperor. This would be the case also if a property owner did not have an heir. One may remember the case of the widow Danelis who left vast estates to Leo VI. Thus the private property of the emperor was being constantly replenished. Conquered lands as well would pass to the emperor’s private estate and then be organised (ager publicus). This may explain better the procedure by which the kingdom of Ani entered the Byzantine Empire at the death of king Smbat and it may also explain how Sennecherib Arcruni obtained estates in Cappadocia in exchange for his kingdom. Cappadocia seems to have had a large extent of imperial properties (since 17AD) to the extent it had a special department in late antiquity.

87 Suetonius Divus Augustus, 72.1 See Syme, Roman revolution, 388.
88 Bona damnatorum, bona caduca and bona vacantia would go to the fiscus, instead of the ager publicus. Millar, Roman Emperor, 198. See Locupletabant et fiscum et aerarium non tam Voconiae et Iuliae leges, quam maiestatis singulare et unicum crimen eorum, qui crimine vacarent. (Pliny the younger, Panegyricus, 42.1)
89 Scylitzes, Historiae, Bas2Const8.21, ed. Thurn.
90 On the confiscation of Vergils’ estates and the composition of the Eclogues see Syme, Roman revolution 252–253.
91 The temple properties entered the res privata of the emperor. Fundi iuris templorum see Jones, Later Roman Empire 416 n. 11.
92 ODB, Danelis.
93 Scylitzes, Historiae, Bas2Const8.39.7-12, ed. Thurn. See Každan, Armjane, 33.
94 domus divina per cappadociam see Bury, imperial administrative 100. Some of the most important evidence is in Cicero De Lege Agraria.
These elements appear to confirm Každan’s idea that the emperor had direct ownership of the land within the Byzantine empire (dominium directum). This would distance Byzantine land tenure from that usual in feudal society. The problem of feudalism remains central, especially since it is considered a necessary topic of study in order to render comparable the Latin middle ages with the Byzantine Empire. It has been important within some soviet scholarship in order that Byzantine lands have a feudal phase, essential for their evolution of history. A number of scholars have identified the pronoia of Leichoudes with a fief within a feudal economy. However, if the pronoia of Leichoudes represents a system well known in the East Roman Empire since the earliest days, that would mean that it antedates feudalism. Especially if feudalism is associated with legal innovations imported together with Germanic traditional law, then the role of curatores of estates was established long before the contact between early Germanic customs and Roman law. Moreover, it does not appear to be an ad hoc solution, but one which was known since a long time. Nor can be it considered a charistikion, a type of possession which was considered problematic in the eleventh century. Leichoudes was appointed curator to an imperial estate as had many before him over the previous one thousand years.

Ostrogorski is correct that Leichoudes was the first to hold a new pronoia, but this was simply a new title for an old institution. Nevertheless, the novelty was connected to his person and not to his office. Leichoudes was simply curator τῶν Μαγγάνων / προνοητής τῶν Μαγγάνων, he was administrator of an imperial estate, a domus divina, θεῖος οἶκος. He seems to have obtained not only the title προνοητής but also an emphyteutic lease of the estate which seems to have made him remarkably rich. This wealth and its legal nature raised concerns within the church when he was elected patriarch in 1059. The animosity concerning this pronoia was due to the specific circumstances of the end of the Macedonian dynasty and the probable promises given by the first of the Comneni at the accession in 1057. Regardless of the specific events connect to Leichoudes’ life, the terms of this pronoia and its emphyteutic lease fit within the legal structures of Roman property laws and practice since the time of Augustus.

---

95 Caesar omnia habet, fiscus eius privata tantum ac sua; et universa in imperio eius sunt, in patrimonio propria (Seneca, De Ben. 7.6.3). Každan, Epstein, Change, 17.
96 It is worth remembering that behind this concern for soviet scholarship was what Marx had said about the Asiatic Mode of Production.
97 Uspenski, Značenie, 1–32; Ostrogorski, Pronija, 13–4. See also Ostrogorski, Pronoia, 41–54, Carile, Sulla pronoia (1972), 327–335, Carile, Sulla pronoia (1975), 55–61.
98 Ganshof, Féodalité 23 indicates that feudalism originates in the Frankish monarchy in the 6th–7th centuries. See also the Germanic origin of the word feud in Bloch, Société féodale, 236–239. The term feud seems connected with gothic faihu, wealth.
99 Oikonomides, St. George Mangana.
100 Ahrweiler, Droits incorporels.
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ЛИХУДОВА МАНГАНСКА ПРОНИЈА

Лихуд је држао Манганску пронију, што је у том случају значило да је био прониој једног царског поседа, или на латинском curator domus divinae. Пронија према томе подразумева да је он држао емфитеутски закуп. Држао га је двапут, између 1042. и 1050. и поново између 1057. и 1059, док је био месазон. Вратио је пронију цару 1059. због једног приговора у синоду. Неко је, чини се, приметио да би пронија била неспојива са његовом новом улогом патријарха. То је могло бити у вези са канонским ограничењима вишем клиру у вези са приходима и продајом имовине, што би било у супротности са условима емфитеутског закупа. Према томе, Манганска пронија је била кураторија, управљање једним царским поседом, а Лихуд је био curator domus divinae.