



ΠΡΑΚΤΙΚΑ

Β' ΔΙΕΘΝΟΥΣ ΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΟΝΙΚΟΥ ΣΥΝΕΔΡΙΟΥ



ΟΙ ΣΕΡΡΕΣ

ΚΑΙ Η
ΠΕΡΙΟΧΗ
ΤΟΥΣ

ΑΠΟ ΤΗΝ
ΟΘΩΜΑΝΙΚΗ ΚΑΤΑΚΤΗΣΗ
ΜΕΧΡΙ ΤΗ
ΣΥΓΧΡΟΝΗ ΕΠΟΧΗ

Α' ΤΟΜΟΣ

ΣΕΡΡΕΣ 2013

DEAN SAKEL

MANUSCRIPTS OF THE CHRONICLE OF 1570 FROM THE REGION OF SERRES

The Chronicle of 1570 is a mostly anonymous Byzantine-style historical compilation dating from the year 1570, and covering world history over various periods, and to various degrees of detail, across its extensive manuscript and printed traditions¹. In what follows I shall make an overview of five manuscripts of this work that are to be associated with Eastern Macedonia (and with the region of Serres in particular), drawing some conclusions about the significance of their presence in this part of the world, as this relates both to the work itself and to the region in question in the particular period.

The first manuscript of the five to be dealt with on account of the strong ties with which it is to be associated to the region is Cod. Atheniensis Greek National Library 2501. This manuscript contains a chronicle from the beginnings of Rome till the time of Sultan Selim II (1566-1574), followed by a selection of Byzantine oracles, then the title (only) of a tract by Athanasius of Alexandria, as well as an anonymous erotapokrisis². The manuscript is to be identified definitely with what used to be manuscript number 131 of the Monastery of Timiou Prodromou just outside of the town of Serres, the identification having been made, amongst other places, in the recent unpublished Athens catalogue of the more recent acquisitions of the Greek National Library. A note on the manuscript states that it was written in the year 7127 (i.e. 1623 A.D.), by the Hieromonk Galatius, an otherwise unknown scribe³.

The form of the Chronicle of 1570 that is present in this manuscript

1. On the Chronicle of 1570 in general, see Th. Preger, «Die Chronik vom Jahre 1570 (‘Dorotheos’ von Monembasia und Manuel Malaxos)», *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 11 (1902) 4-15. Also, G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica 1. Die byzantinischen Quellen der Geschichte der Türkenvölker*, ed. 2, Berlin, 1958 (repr. Leiden, 1983), vol. 1, pp. 412-414. Both the *Vivlion Istorikon*, ascribed to Dorotheos of Monemvasia, and the «Patriarchal History of Constantinople», included in the *Turcograecia*, represent different variants of the chronicle in published form. Only the first of these has the margins of a world chronicle such as is represented by much of the manuscript tradition of the chronicle.

2. L. Politis, *Κατάλογος τῶν Χειρογράφων τῆς Ἐθνικῆς Βιβλιοθήκης τῆς Ἑλλάδος* - ἀφ. 2501-3121 (unpublished), p. 123.

3. L. Politis-M. Politi, «Βιβλιογράφοι 17ου-18ου αἰῶνος Συνοπτικὴ Καταγραφή», *Δελτίο τοῦ Ἱστορικοῦ καὶ Παλαιογραφικοῦ Ἀρχείου* 6 (1988-92), Athens 1994, pp. 313-645; at 380.

turns out to be identical with that preserved today in Cod. Athous 3290 [Kutlumusiu 217], which also contains the same selection of oracles found in Cod. Atheniensis 2501, other than for most of the text of the final oracle of these⁴. In Cod. Kutlumusiu 217 we find a note that states, among other things:

Τὸ παρὸν χρονογραφικὸν βιβλίον ἐγράφη ἐν σέρρες. παρ' ἐμοῦ δημη-
τρίου τοῦ εὐτελοῦς υἱοῦ τοῦ κυριάκη. τάχα καὶ λαμπαδαρίου σερρῶν.
καὶ ἐπροσήλωσα αὐτὸ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον ὄρος. εἰς τὴν σεβασμίαν μονὴν τοῦ
κουτλουμουσίου. καὶ οἱ ἀνὰ χειρᾶς λαβόντες καὶ ἀναγινώσκοντες, εὐχε-
σθαι διὰ τὸν κύριον καὶ μὴ καταράσθαι. Ὡπερ συγγνωμονητές, ὡς μὴ
τυχόντι ἀληθῶν προτοτύπων.

Ἐτελειώθη δὲ κατὰ τὸ ζῶλα ἔτος ὁ μὴν φεβρουαρίῳ ιη.

Accordingly, Cod. Atheniensis 2501 (previously Cod. Serres Timiou Prodromou 131), and Cod. Kutlumusiu 217, were written at Serres only four years apart from each other, presumably from a now lost common original. About Demetrius, the son of Kyriaki, the scribe of Cod. Kutlumusiu 217 mentioned in this note, he is also a scribe unknown other than for the information present on this particular manuscript⁵.

We continue with Cod. Sardicensis Dujçev 307, which has been identified according to the recent Dujçev Checklist as manuscript 138 of the Monastery of Timiou Prodromou⁶. This manuscript contains a version of the Chronicle of 1570 different from that present in the two manuscripts previously considered. In the case of Cod. Sardicensis Dujçev 307, narrative history begins with Creation, proceeds into the Roman period, whereupon it continues in highly similar, though not identical, form as the account present in the two previous manuscripts just described. It breaks off today at a point within the narrative on the second Ottoman siege of Nauplion (1537-1540), the remainder of the manuscript having being lost. The version of the Chronicle of 1570 present here appears to be the same as that also present in several other known manuscripts of the chronicle. These include Cod. Athous 4287 [Ivion 167] and Cod. Scopelos Βιβλιοθήκη Ἀστικοῦ Σχολείου⁷, the definite sister variants Cod. Atheniensis Greek National Library 1205 and Cod. Constantinopolitanus Μεγάλη τοῦ Γένους Σχολῆ 64, as well as Cod. Londiniensis Harleianus 5742 and Cod. Naxos Bibliotheca Emm. Drylli 2.7 These manuscripts, all dating

4. S. Lambros, *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos*, vol. 1, Cambridge, 1895 (repr. Amsterdam, 1966), p. 298.

5. L. Politis-M. Politi, *op. cit.*, p. 416.

6. A. Dzurova et al., *Checklist' de la collection de manuscrits grecs conservée au Centre de Recherches Slavo-Byzantines 'Ivan Dujçev' auprès de l'Université 'St. Clement d' Ohrid' de Sofia*, Thessalonica, 1994, pp. 38, 67.

7. On these manuscripts, see respectively: Lambros, *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos*, vol. 2, Cambridge, 1900 (repr. Amsterdam, 1966), p. 45; Politis, *op. cit.*, p.

from the very early seventeenth century, conclude their narrative history with events of the later part of the year 1571, being the fulfilment of the Ottoman conquest of Cyprus, which is the point at which Cod. Sardicensis Dujcev 307, at least at the time of its original transcription, must also have concluded.

Like the manuscripts with which it is related in terms of the variant it contains, Cod. Sardicensis 307 also dates from the early seventeenth century, indeed more specifically from the period between 1618-1622. This dating is to be determined from the list of emperors that is present more towards the more central parts of the chronicle, this being a list that is present in many variants of the Chronicle of 1570, though it is absent from the variant represented by the two manuscripts previously considered. In Cod. Sardicensis 307, this emperor list proceeds up to the accession of Sultan Osman II (1618-1622), though in the original form of this variant of the Chronicle of 1570 it would have extended only up to either Selim II or Murad III, these being the only sultans from the 1570s when much and perhaps all the manuscript tradition of the Chronicle of 1570 was produced. Of the related manuscript noted above, only Cod. Scopelos 7 includes an extension to the emperor list any further than the 1570s, and unlike Cod. Sardicensis 307, it proceeds only till the reign of Sultan Ahmed I (1603-1617)⁸. It is therefore possible that any of the related manuscripts, including Cod. Scopelos 7, or perhaps another now lost manuscript in some way related to one or more of these, served as the direct original for Cod. Sardicensis 307. The nature of the relationship between the various representatives of this extensive group can in fact only be established following a meticulous textual and palaeographic study of all its representatives. In its present state, Cod. Sardicensis 307 contains no colophon or scribal note, though one may well have been present in the concluding sections that have since been lost. A particular point of interest about Cod. Sardicensis 307 is that its script is particularly fine and attractive, for which reason, we may note, it is always one of the manuscripts taking pride of place at exhibitions of the Dujcev Centre. Further study therefore of Cod. Sardicensis 307 would be an interesting proposition, particularly, in terms of our immediate interests, as it would indicate whether or not such a fine manuscript had in fact been produced in the region of Serres.

106; I. Sakkelion, *Κατάλογος τῶν Χειρογράφων τῆς Ἐθνικῆς Βιβλιοθήκης τῆς Ἑλλάδος*, Athens, 1892, p. 219; D. M. Sarros, «Παλαιογραφικὸς Ἔρᾱνος - Αἱ Τρεῖς Ἄγνωστοι Κώδικες τῆς Μεγάλης τοῦ Γένους Σχολῆς», *Ὁ ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Ἑλληνικὸς Φιλολογικὸς Σύλλογος* 33 (1910-1911) 51-61; at 58-61. R. Nares, *A catalogue of the Harleian manuscripts in the British Museum*, vol. 3, London, 1808, p. 292. B. B. Sfyroeras, «Κώδικες ἐκ Νάξου», *Ἐπετηρὶς Ἐταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν* 33 (1964) 206-225; at 218.

8. The emperor list in Cod. Scopelos 7 is in fact extended twice, in the original hand of the transcribed variant till the reign of Sultan Ahmed I, and by a later hand till the reign of Murad IV (1623-1640).

A manuscript with evident though unclear connections to Serres, at least at the time in which it was written, is Cod. Atheniensis Greek National Library 1564. This is a manuscript that has till now been totally unconsidered either in terms of its own palaeographic or literary value or in terms of its significance as a representative of the Chronicle of 1570. Cod. Atheniensis 1564 comprises twenty folios from a clearly once grander manuscript dating, according to the Athens Library catalogue, from the seventeenth century⁹. The greater part of the manuscript, being sixteen of its folios, contains the concluding portions of one version of the Chronicle of 1570. The four remaining folios that precede these sixteen contain a portion of one of the redactions of the Oracle of Pseudo-Methodius of Patara. The form of the oracle present here (the so-called Fourth Redaction) happens to be the same form that is present in the first two manuscripts previously considered. The form of the chronicle present in Cod. Atheniensis 1564 is also that present in Cod. Atheniensis 2501 and Cod. Kutlumusiu 217, though whether Cod. Atheniensis 1564 is as closely related to these other two manuscripts as these two are related to each other is something that remains to be determined, something yet again only possible following a textual and palaeographic study of the group as a whole. It would appear nonetheless that the oracle section precedes the chronicle portion in Cod. Atheniensis 1564, in contrast to the arrangement in all related cases, in the two we have already seen and the final one left to consider, given the present-day fragmentary state of this manuscript.

It is a fortunate fact that the surviving portions of Cod. Atheniensis 1564 do not represent only the conventional portions of the Chronicle of 1570, meaning the portions making up the original variant dating from and proceeding only up to the 1570s. Rather the surviving portions, in addition to including the very end-point of the traditional account (concluding usually with the narrative on the Cyprus War), also contain an extension that proceeds from this point into the 1620s, namely to the reign of Sultan Murad IV (1623-1640), and in particular to the year 1627. The extension deals very briefly with the Ottoman succession from the time of Sultan Mehmed III to that of Sultan Mustafa I, but it becomes especially detailed for the reigns of Sultan Osman II and Sultan Murad IV. Given moreover that the extension breaks off less than a decade after the accession of Osman, it is almost certain that the scribe is here chronicling in relative detail the history of these two sultans from his own personal knowledge. In the case now of the reigns of these two sultans we find the usual matters of political, military and financial interest, all focused on Constantinople, which is, in general terms, the trend present in other such extensions of the Chronicle of 1570. Nonetheless, there is also in this extension of Cod. Atheniensis 1564 a single and curious item about affairs

9. Sakkalion, *op. cit.*, p. 275.

in Serres itself. This is present in the text for the fourth year of the reign of Sultan Osman, namely for the year 1622. I quote here the passage in point:

Ἐν δὲ τῷ, ζῶλα χρόνῳ νοεμβρίῳ καὶ ὥρα ζ τῆς νυκτὸς ἐν τῇ μακεδονίᾳ, δηλαδὴ ἐν ταῖς σέρραις καὶ τῶν πέριξ χωρίων, ἐγένοντο ἀστραπαὶ καὶ βρονταὶ μεγάλαι, εἶτα καὶ βροχὴ πολλή, καὶ ἐκατέβησαν ποτάμια, καὶ ἐχάλασαν ὀσπῆτια, καὶ κήπους, καὶ ἀμπέλια, καὶ ἄνθρωποι πολλοὶ ἐπνίγησαν ἀθρόως¹⁰.

Quite apart from the importance of this information on a natural disaster in the history of Serres, information which to my knowledge is otherwise unattested, the fact is that it also indicates a possible origin for the manuscript itself, or at least possibly for its scribe, from the region of Serres itself. This is especially interesting for the added reason that the extension in Cod. Atheniensis 1564 indicates that the scribe was fairly well informed about affairs in Constantinople, including on matters relating to patriarchal succession, which occurred very frequently at that time and would have been particularly confusing for anyone to chronicle outside the capital city itself. Also of interest is that the scribe's knowledge of Ottoman military matters is particularly detailed by comparison with other later extensions to the Chronicle of 1570, and it indeed extends even to relations with the far-away Safavids. All this raises interesting questions about the nature and extent of contacts in the early seventeenth century between the region of Serres and the Ottoman capital, as well as about contacts with the Ottoman East.

The narrative of the extension in Cod. Atheniensis 1564 breaks off abruptly with events of the year 1627, which is almost certainly the time of writing of the manuscript, as was evidently noticed by its cataloguer who dates it to the seventeenth century apparently on this basis. Accordingly, as with previous cases here considered, the focus with the present representative is yet again with the area of Serres in the 1620s. The National Library of Greece possesses no information on the date or circumstances of acquisition of Cod. Atheniensis 1564 into its collection. All we can say is that the manuscript was already part of the collection by the 1880s when the first cataloguing took place. That there is, however, some type of close relationship between Cod. Atheniensis 1564 and the first two manuscripts considered as far as content is concerned seems clear enough. It remains therefore to be determined, following a detailed palaeographic and textual study, whether it too definitely originated in Serres, and if so in what relationship it stands in relation to the other two.

The fifth and final manuscript left for us to consider is of definite and special interest in terms of manuscript production from the region of Serres in the said period. Cod. Manchester John Ryland's Library Greek 22, being today one of the best described manuscripts of the Chronicle of 1570, contains

10. Cod. Atheniensis 1564, ff. 16v-17r.

a version of this work that is closely related in some way, perhaps even to the extent of being identical, with Cod. Atheniensis 2501 and Cod. Kutlumusiou 217, as well as with Cod. Atheniensis 1564¹¹. It also includes a selection of oracular texts that follow the text of the chronicle and match in part, though not completely, those in Cod. Atheniensis 2501 and Cod. Kutlumusiou 217. A colophon on the manuscript states the following:

Κτῆμα μὲν ἔοικα τοῦ πανιερωτάτου μητροπολίτου τῆς ἀγιωτάτης μητροπόλεως Μελενίκου κυροῦ γαλακτίονος. Πόνος δὲ τοῦ ἐν ἐλαχίστοις καὶ ἀμαθοῦς Γαβριήλ τοῦ ὀλ...πιώτου ἐτελειώθη δὲ ἐν τῷ, ζϞλ ἔτος ἐν μηνὶ μαΐῳ κγ' ἡμέρα Πέμπτη ἐν τῇ πόλει Μελενίκου¹².

The Meleniko referred to here is present-day Melnik, an important town in Ottoman times just to the north of Serres. In addition, the time of writing of the manuscript is given as the year 1622. We have then here, yet again, a manuscript of the Chronicle of 1570 copied in the same general region of Serres, in the same overall period as the other cases previously considered.

The note also informs us about the manuscript's original owner, one Galaction, about whom we know otherwise that he was the well-known Metropolitan of Meleniko between 1602 and 1628. The scribe gives his name in the colophon as Gabriel, together with an epithet that is unfortunately not legible in the manuscript as it today survives. Of a scribe called Gabriel fitting the circumstances of Cod. Manchester Greek 22 no other manuscript has so far come to light¹³. About the fate of the manuscript, we know that it was bequeathed to John Ryland's Library in 1923 (indeed by the Hellenist scholar Rendel Harris). No recording of Greek manuscripts in Meleniko is ever known to have taken place. It has been suggested that it was looted by Bulgarian forces during the Balkan Wars, to be sold in Europe, and so to end up in the hands of Rendel Harris some time before 1923.

Four of the five manuscripts we have here considered have an oracular content, which is of special interest not only in terms of the history of the Chronicle of 1570, but also in terms of the history of the Byzantine oracular tradition in general, particularly as it circulated in the early Ottoman period. We have noted how Cod. Atheniensis 1564 contains the Oracle of Methodius of Patara, which is also present as the first item of the oracular selection in the pair Cod. Atheniensis 2501 and Cod. Kutlumusiou 217, while it is also present in Cod. Manchester Greek 22. As is by now well known about the Oracle of Pseudo-Methodius, it exists in four principal redactions, and the Fourth has been stated to exist in only two manuscripts, one of which is Cod. Kutlumusiou

11. A. Markopoulos, «Ἐνα χειρόγραφο ἀπὸ τὸ Μελένικο στὴ Βιβλιοθήκη John Rylands τοῦ Μάντισσετεο», *Μνήμων* 5 (1975) 35-48; for the information that here follows about this manuscript.

12. *Ibidem*, p. 46.

13. L. Politis-M. Politi, *op. cit.*, p. 375.

217 (the other being, yet again, another manuscript of the Chronicle of 1570, with a highly similar, though by no means identical, oracular collection as that of the Kutlumusiou manuscript)¹⁴. As we have here seen however, the Fourth Redaction is to be found in at least three further manuscripts. Of special interest in this respect is the case of Cod. Manchester Greek 22, whose oracular collection is not the same as in any other known manuscript, although the variant of the Chronicle of 1570 it contains is recognisably that of the three other cases connected to Serres with which it is related, although it remains to be demonstrated that it is in fact identical with them. This raises interesting questions about the origins of the manuscript tradition of the Chronicle, and in particular of the role of Serres in this circulation, but this is something that needs to be left for consideration elsewhere, in the context of a wider study of the Chronicle of 1570.

The five manuscripts we have here examined represent the five manuscripts of the Chronicle of 1570 that till now are able to be associated with the region of Serres, though none of these, rather sadly, reposes in the region itself. The manuscripts constitute a small, though not insignificant proportion of the representatives of the Chronicle of 1570, whose principal area of association is known to have been Constantinople itself. Outside the Ottoman capital, judging by manuscript numbers, no place can be found to have had such a strong association with this chronicle than the region of Serres. Of particular interest is the fact that all the manuscripts date from around the same period, namely from the 1620s. This naturally cannot be a feature restricted to the Chronicle, and must extend to other works of contemporary interest, though to what extent this is a case is something that remains to be demonstrated. A special point however about the transcription of the Chronicle of 1570 in general is that this basically stops during the 1630s, and this is something that has to be attributed to the publication of the full-length world chronicle at the beginning of this same decade. How scribal activity continues in the region of Serres after this point is also of interest, though it is a matter in which the manuscript tradition of the Chronicle of 1570 is of no help. For the 1620s however, as this study has indicated, literary activity in Serres appears to have been both notable and extensive.

14. *Die dritte und vierte Redaktion des Ps.-Methodius*, edited by A. Lolos, Meisenheim am Glan, 1978 (=Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie, vol. 94), pp. 15-16. The other known manuscript of the Fourth Redaction in point is the seventeenth-century Cod. Parisinus Bibliothèque Nationale Suppl. gr. 467, noted wrongly as number 462 and of the eighteenth century.

ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ

DEAN SAKEL

ΣΕΡΡΑΪΚΗΣ ΠΡΟΕΛΕΥΣΕΩΣ ΠΑΡΑΛΛΑΓΕΣ ΤΟΥ ΜΕΤΑΒΥΖΑΝΤΙΝΟΥ ΧΡΟΝΟΓΡΑΦΟΥ, 1570

Η εισήγηση θα εξετάσει τις σωζόμενες παραλλαγές του μεταβυζαντινού χρονογράφου, του λεγόμενου Χρονικού του 1570, που γράφτηκαν ή διατηρήθηκαν στην περιοχή των Σερρών. Τα εν λόγω χειρόγραφα, όλα της αρχής του 17ου αιώνα, είναι τα ακόλουθα:

- Κέντρου Dujcen 307 (πρώην Μονής Προδρόμου 138)
- Εθνικής Βιβλιοθήκης Ελλάδος 2501 (πρώην Μονής Προδρόμου 131)
- Μονής Κουτλουμουσίου 217
- και μάλλον το Εθνικής Βιβλιοθήκης Ελλάδος 1564.

Το τελευταίο χειρόγραφο, ανεξέταστο μέχρι στιγμής, έχει ανάγκη ιδιαίτερης αναλύσεως πριν αποδοθεί σε σερραϊκή προέλευση, όπως μάλλον θα πρέπει.

Στην εισήγηση, θα εξεταστούν οι σχέσεις των χειρογράφων μεταξύ τους καθώς και με άλλα γνωστά χειρόγραφα του Χρονικού του 1570. Οι διευκρινιζόμενες σχέσεις, συν τοις άλλοις, επιτρέπουν την εξαγωγή συμπερασμάτων, σχετικά με τις καλλιτεχνικές δοσοληψίες των διαφόρων περιοχών του βορειοελλαδικού χώρου, στην περίοδο παραγωγής των χειρογράφων. Εκτός από την Ανατολική Μακεδονία, εστίες επικοινωνίας εντοπίζονται και τον Άθω, την Πόλη και τις Σποράδες.

Θα καταβληθεί επίσης προσπάθεια, να διευκρινιστεί η συμβολή των οθωμανικών Σερρών στην παραγωγή και διαφύλαξη των χειρογράφων. Τέλος, θα διερευνηθεί η συμβολή των έργων αυτών στην καλύτερη εκτίμηση της κοινωνικής και πολιτιστικής ιστορίας των οθωμανικών Σερρών.



ΧΟΡΗΓΟΙ:



ISBN: 978-960-86390-8-9