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Preface

It is with great pleasure that we welcome the reader to this, the first volume ever put together on the subject of Byzantine gardens. Presented here are the revised versions of papers delivered by scholars expert on different facets of Byzantine history and/or garden history at the colloquium “Byzantine Garden Culture,” which was held in November 1996 at Dumbarton Oaks. Information on the genesis of this colloquium can be found in the first two papers of this volume written by Joachim Wolschke-Bulmahn and Antony Littlewood.

We should like to thank Angeliki Laiou, the director of Dumbarton Oaks at the time, who offered us the opportunity of holding the colloquium. Especial thanks are due also to the director of Byzantine Studies, Alice-Mary Talbot, and the then-acting director of Studies in Landscape Architecture, Terence Young, both of whom wholeheartedly supported the project and graciously hosted the colloquium.

Antony Littlewood
Henry Maguire
Joachim Wolschke-Bulmahn
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The Study of Byzantine Gardens:
Some Questions and Observations
from a Garden Historian

Joachim Wolschke-Bulmahn

The Study of Byzantine Gardens at Dumbarton Oaks

This book is the end result of initiatives of a group of scholars affiliated with Dumbarton Oaks that date back to the early 1980s, a time when the collaboration of scholars interested in Byzantine studies and their colleagues interested in the history of gardens was not in evidence. It was a time in the evolution of Dumbarton Oaks when its director, Giles Constable, pointed out with regret that there had never been a symposium combining the three disciplines of Byzantine, Pre-Columbian, and garden studies: “The diversity of the three fields of study at Dumbarton Oaks, which resist even the hardiest efforts to build bridges between them, creates tensions between both groups and individuals which will probably never entirely go away.” Yet it was also a time of transition. During the following years the situation changed slowly and the intellectual climate at Dumbarton Oaks became more and more conducive to building bridges and to starting discussion of topics of mutual interest among the departments. Of course, due to the specific character and interests of each of the three programs, there have been only limited possibilities for collaboration, but garden studies is one of them, and a fascinating one. In 1984 plans for a colloquium on Byzantine gardens were discussed by the Byzantine scholars Robert Browning, Antony Cutler, Alexander Kazhdan, and Henry Maguire, who were among the first to provide me with bibliographic guidance toward the scant resources that exist on the topic. Anthony Cutler’s encouragement to pursue my interest and numerous stimulating discussions with him helped me formulate questions on Byzantine garden culture, many of which are reflected in this essay. Linda Safran’s discussion of a paper that I presented at the 1991 Dumbarton Oaks roundtable on Byzantine gardens, jointly organized by the programs of Byzantine Studies and Studies in Landscape Architecture, as well as her editorial expertise on this work, were of great help to me as a “non-Byzantinist” exploring this fascinating topic. I also would like to thank the anonymous reader of an earlier version of my introductory remarks for his or her comments. I am grateful to Antony Littlewood for his careful reading of this essay and for his significant suggestions and corrections.

Joachim Wölschke-Bulmahn

and Henry Maguire, with Elisabeth Blair MacDougall, then director of Studies in Landscape Architecture. These efforts did not bear immediate fruit, but were taken up again some years later.

One outcome was a roundtable, “Gardens and Garden Culture in Byzantium,” held in the fall of 1991, the first scholarly event in the history of Dumbarton Oaks to join two of its fields of study. It was organized by Henry Maguire, then director of Byzantine Studies, and myself as acting director of Studies in Landscape Architecture. On the one hand, the papers presented at this roundtable and its subsequent discussion could only hope to raise some valuable questions and elucidate once again how little is known about Byzantine gardens. On the other hand, they helped stimulate interest in the topic among a broader group of scholars. In 1994 Antony Littlewood suggested a follow-up event on Byzantine gardens. His suggestion resulted in the colloquium held in November 1996 “Byzantine Garden Culture,” which brought together a group of garden historians and scholars who are experts in Byzantine studies, with varying interests and expertise, some of them focusing their research on Byzantine garden culture for the first time. The title of the colloquium, “Byzantine Garden Culture,” already indicated that the focus was not exclusively on gardens, but that the speakers approached the topic more broadly, investigating issues related to horticulture and gardening as well as the actual design of gardens in Byzantium and how they were reflected in the arts, literature, and other spheres of Byzantine life.

Garden History as a Scholarly Discipline

Dealing with Byzantium and the Byzantine period may be of interest for garden historians. Garden historical studies deal with a unique subject that distinguishes it from the study of more static art and architecture. Gardens as works of art are different from other art objects. They are in a permanent process of change, development, and perhaps even decay due to their most important component: the plants. The garden’s vulnerability, its transience, sets it apart from architecture. It also creates particular problems for research. Gardens are exposed to human use. The interests of humans in gardens change over time; accordingly the design and layout of gardens often vary with changes in taste. Garden historians and archaeologists often have to decipher the various layers of a garden that have been changed over the centuries. Gardens occupy a liminal space, a locus of tension between the practical and the pleasurable, between horticulture and the reality of food production, economy, art, and the ideology of cultural symbolism. Garden historical studies today try to address this broad range of issues. Traditionally there has been a focus on the study of gardens and parks of the elite as works of art in various cultures and societies. This scholarly tradition is also reflected in Byzantine studies. The Aretai Palace and its garden, or automata as art objects and features of palaces and gardens, are representative of this important aspect of Byzan-

2 For more detail, see A. R. Littlewood, “The Scholarship of Byzantine Gardens,” in this volume, 13–21.
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tine garden studies. Gardens and garden culture of the common people are a more recent interest in the field of garden history.

The range of issues related to historic gardens in general, and Byzantine garden culture in particular, cannot be investigated by a single scholarly discipline. Garden history requires, perhaps more than many other disciplines, a broad interdisciplinary approach. Scholars today look for evidence of gardens in literary sources, for example, in the Byzantine romances and in hagiographic, legal, and other texts. Each of these groups of texts has to be read and interpreted in slightly different ways, which requires expertise in Byzantine history as well as in the specialized subdiscipline. Archaeological expertise is as important as knowledge about art history. Botany, the social sciences, and philosophy also contribute to a better understanding of gardens and garden culture in historical societies.

The forming of a discipline of garden historical studies itself was a phenomenon of the nineteenth century, especially in its second half. It was connected to processes of professionalization from horticulture, landscape gardening, and garden art into landscape architecture. A milestone in the process of forming a profession of landscape architecture was the establishment of the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA) in 1899. Colleges for horticulture and landscape gardening were established, and the history of gardens gained new importance as part of the curriculum. In Germany the first horticultural college was established in 1823, the Königliche Gärtner-Lehranstalt zu Schöneberg und Potsdam. Over the course of the following 150 years the discipline of garden-historical studies slowly evolved. Today not only garden historians, art historians, and landscape architects are involved, but also social scientists, anthropologists, geographers, and scholars from other disciplines as well. Garden history is a rather new scholarly discipline, still in the process of defining itself and shaping its subject, goals, approaches, and methods. A recent example of the broadening of the subject of garden historical study is the renaming of the Journal of Garden History, founded and edited by John Dixon Hunt, as Studies in the History of Gardens and Designed Landscapes in 1998.

However, the interest in the history of gardens is not limited to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Already during the sixteenth and following centuries intellectuals were interested in the history of gardens. A major step in the evolution of related interests can be traced back to the Renaissance, when a systematic analysis of ancient history aided the development of such disciplines as architecture, medicine, natural science, and engineering. Intellectuals interested in horticulture and gardens also discussed antiquity in its relevance for present and future developments. David Coffin, in his Gardens and Gardening in Papal Rome, addresses a special problem with gardens as compared to, for example, Renaissance sculpture and painting, which were guided by ancient models:

In contrast [to Renaissance sculpture and painting], gardening because of its ephemerality had no physical remains from classical antiquity to aid in any desire to classicize the garden. Even the ancient painted depictions of Roman gardens uncovered later...
at Pompeii or the House of Livia at Prima Porta were unknown to the Renaissance. The only evidence regarding ancient gardens available to the period was the literary references to gardens in classical poetry, the agricultural writings of the *Res Rusticae Scriptores* [sic], or the letters of Pliny the Younger, and of these only Pliny preserved a detailed image of an ancient Roman garden. . . . The limited information regarding ancient gardening may partly explain the lateness of the appearance of what might be defined as a Renaissance garden based on classical thought, and the persistence of the medieval hortus conclusus as seen previously in the garden of Pope Paul III in the Vatican.  

Richard Bradley’s 1725 treatise, *A Survey of the Ancient Husbandry and Gardening, collected from Cato, Varro, Columella, Virgil and others the most eminent Writers among the Greeks and Romans*, may serve as an example for the interest of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century scholarship in ancient horticulture, botany, and gardening. The life and work of the English virtuoso and writer John Evelyn (1620–1706) also gives evidence of this interest. His unpublished manuscript “Elysium Britannicum” included a chapter titled “Of the most famous Gardens in the World, Ancient and Modern.”  

Since then there has been an increasing interest in the history of gardens. Over the course of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries one can find historical overviews in various publications, for instance, in Christian Cajus Laurentz Hirschfeld’s *Theorie der Gartenkunst*. A milestone in establishing garden historical studies was John Claudius Loudon’s *Encyclopaedia of Gardening*, first published in 1822. Loudon’s work includes a substantial “General history of gardening in all countries,” which became part of the subtitle of Loudon’s *Encyclopaedia. Book One*, entitled “History of gardening among ancient and modern nations,” includes a “Chronological history of gardening, from the time of the Roman kings, in the sixth century B.C., to the decline and fall of the Empire in the fifth century of our era,” and a “Chronological history of gardening in continental Europe, from the time of the Romans to the present day, or from A.D. 500 to A.D. 1850.” Loudon discusses ancient Greek and Roman garden culture and subsequent developments in Italy. The Middle Ages in general, and particularly Byzantium, are hardly mentioned. This reflects the focus on ancient history, originating in the Renaissance. Loudon’s historical treatise was followed by numerous late-nineteenth-century publications on garden design and garden art that in-

---

7 Cf. J. Ingram, “John Evelyn’s ‘Elysium Britannicum’: Provenance, Condition, Transcription,” in T. O’Malley and J. Wolschke-Bulmahn, eds., *John Evelyn’s ‘Elysium Britannicum’ and European Gardening*, Dumbarton Oaks Colloquium on the History of Landscape Architecture 17 (Washington, D.C., 1998), fig. 11, p. 47. This chapter on ancient gardens has apparently been lost. At least, it is not among the hundreds of pages of the manuscript that are housed today in the British Library in London. The significance of ancient writers for Evelyn and his contemporaries has been discussed, for example, by J. Levine, “John Evelyn: Between the Ancients and the Moderns,” ibid., 57–78.
8 Leipzig, 1779–85, 5 vols.
10 Ibid., 25–235.
cluded chapters on garden history. In Germany, Eduard Petzold contributed to this discussion with *Die Landschaftsgärtnerei* (1862), as did Gustav Meyer with *Lehrbuch der schönen Gartenkunst* (1862). Another history of gardens written by a German was Bernhard Oswin Hüttig’s *Geschichte des Gartenbaus*, which appeared in 1879.

In 1888 Hermann Jäger published his *Gartenkunst und Gärten sonst und jetzt: Handbuch für Gärtner, Architekten und Liebhaber*. Jäger’s work is noteworthy because it was one of the first German publications to address specifically issues of Byzantine gardens (Jäger used the term “oströmisches Reich” for the Byzantine Empire). Jäger elaborated on the lack of knowledge about the actual design of the gardens of, for example, Constantine VII and Justinian II and offered the following general description of the “Philopation”:

> At the time of the Crusades there existed in Byzantium a famous public garden called Thilopation [Philopation]. Almost each day the court and its attendants appeared there to be admired by the people. There were flowers and quiet bushes, alleys for driving and riding and walkways, pavilions for delight [Lustgebäude] and colorful tents, and pleasures and entertainment of all kinds. Even a game park existed with all sorts of animals, and in secure pits they kept wild animals. In this garden one also could find flowing water, fountains, and ponds with exotic aquatic birds. All this may be true, but one cannot learn from the given information what the garden really looked like. But we surely can assume that symmetry was predominating.

It is regrettable that we do not know on which sources Jäger’s remarks on Byzantine garden art were based.

In 1914 Marie Luise Gothein published her *Geschichte der Gartenkunst*, an impressive work and one of the first to include a substantial chapter in its own right on Byzantine gardens. Gothein stated, “Unfortunately the accounts in literature are not yet confirmed by excavations, and the information about gardens is very scanty. The picture which we have shows what is found in all Byzantine civilization—a combination of Graeco-Roman and Asiatic elements.” In the decades following Gothein’s *History of Garden Art* there was little work on Byzantine gardens, and, as far as I know, there were no specific contributions by garden historians to the topic. Several reasons might explain this absence of garden historical efforts in this field. One is that garden historians, at least in Germany, mainly focused their studies on western traditions beginning with the Renaissance. One exception, Dieter Hennebo in his 1987 work *Gärten des Mittelalters*, touched on Byzantine gardens in a general

---

way, without offering new information. In addition, there existed and still exist considerable difficulties for garden historians regarding language and accessibility of sources needed to study Byzantine garden culture. Moreover, scholars in the field of Byzantine studies approached this topic only occasionally (see Antony Littlewood, “The Scholarship of Byzantine Gardens,” in this volume). The entry “Garden” in the Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium may not be emblematic for the still enormous gaps in our knowledge about Byzantine gardens, but may indicate how little the publications on Byzantine gardens have made their way into mainstream Byzantine scholarship.17

Questions regarding the Study of Byzantine Gardens

Why is it of particular interest now for garden historians, and for scholars of Byzantine history as well, to approach a period where scholars have discovered only a few pieces of evidence about garden-related issues? What may garden historians contribute to our knowledge about this facet of Byzantine culture? Byzantium provides a connection among such different cultures and periods as ancient Greece and Rome, Persia, and the world of Islam. With regard to Rome, thanks to the work of Wilhelmina Jashemski and other scholars, we have considerable information about the layout and design of gardens of various groups within Roman society. Regarding ancient Greek gardens, the state of research is, as with Byzantine gardens, far more fragmentary in character. Studies by Massimo Venturi Ferriolo, Robin Osborne, and Maureen Carroll-Spillecke serve as good examples of scholarship on Greek gardens.19

Because the Byzantine Empire bridges late antiquity and the Renaissance, knowledge


about Byzantine culture is crucial for understanding western civilization. It is therefore to be expected that some explication of Byzantine horticulture, gardening, and garden design could lead to a better understanding of the evolution of gardens and horticulture in Europe. Perhaps the many entries in lexika about classical history on horticulture, botany, and gardens can broaden our knowledge of Byzantine gardens and how related ideas and expertise permeated from late antiquity to the Byzantine period. What can we learn about Byzantine horticulture and botany by studying scholarship on Greek medicine, botany, and horticulture, for example, in Wilhelm Capelle’s 1954 “Der Garten des Theophrast”?21

A systematic study of Byzantine traditions might aid the scholarly development of garden history precisely because of the lack of information about Byzantine gardens, the lack of archaeological evidence, of plans and realistic depictions of gardens, or of trustworthy literary descriptions. On the one hand this lack of information is a reason to lament, but it also offers an interesting opportunity for garden history. Too often garden historians have looked first, and sometimes only, at gardens, at the physical object itself, its archaeological remains, plans, maps, and depictions of gardens. Obviously this is important, but it might result in an overly narrow understanding of garden culture in a given society. Too often garden historians have tended to ignore and overlook other important evidence necessary to understand the role of gardens within a society. In the case of Byzantium, because of the nature of its surviving evidence, we have to look systematically into other spheres of Byzantine society and culture. For example, works of art and literary sources, including legal, religious, and literary texts, are critical to find hidden traces of garden culture, texts that otherwise would have been ignored by the garden historian. The scholars contributing to this volume have investigated this area of research. Thus for garden history, a hypothetical approach to questions that is based on developments in other, better investigated spheres of Byzantine life may provide a paradigm for developing better ideas about the theory of gardens and for strengthening the theoretical foundation of garden history as a scholarly discipline in general.

The Question of Continuity and Discontinuity in Byzantine Garden Culture

It might therefore be helpful to apply to gardens hypotheses that have been developed for other spheres of Byzantine life. For example, one issue that is not new to the field of Byzantine studies but has not yet been discussed with regard to gardens in Byzantium is that of “continuity and discontinuity.” Among other investigations of the topic, I refer to Alexander Kazhdan and Anthony Cutler’s “Continuity and Discontinuity in Byzantine History.”22 The

20 See, e.g., the entries for “Garten” in Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum, vol. 8 (Stuttgart, 1972), 1048–62; Lexikon der Alten Welt (Zurich-Stuttgart, 1965), 1025–27; Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie, vol. 1 (Rome-Freiburg-Basel-Vienna, 1968), 77–82. Evaluation of entries on such terms as botany, flora, gardener, and paradise could be interesting for the study of Byzantine gardens.


question of continuity and discontinuity in the design and use of Byzantine gardens should be considered regarding the transition from late antiquity to the early Byzantine period as well as within the epoch of the Byzantine Empire itself. We have evidence that discontinuity was a remarkable phenomenon between late antiquity and the Byzantine period, even if different opinions exist about its extent. Cyril Mango refers to a “dramatic break between the lifestyle of Late Antiquity and that of the Byzantine Middle Ages”; Charalampos Bouras mentions a “fundamental break in the evolution of the cities.” The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium states about Byzantine cities: “In the 7th c., cities underwent fundamental and permanent transformations as they reduced in size and population; their public works and services came to an end. They generally became ruralized.”

Did such changes and developments also have an impact on Byzantine gardens? If yes, how? If Byzantine cities during this time were exposed to such change, if whole cities in some parts of the Byzantine Empire shrank into small towns or were even totally abandoned, then it is to be expected that this development also had an impact on garden culture and the design and use of gardens. A decline of the cities, for example, had to be connected with the decline and decay of gardens owned by the wealthy aristocrats. Not only the clientele that demanded pleasure gardens may be supposed to have decreased, but also the number of people who could design and take care of these gardens, and who produced the wealth that enabled a minority to own and enjoy marvelous pleasure gardens.

Until the sixth century, gardens in all probability remained in the tradition of the Greco-Roman world. Characteristics of Byzantine gardens can perhaps best be found in those periods following the seventh and eighth centuries, for example, the so-called Age of Recovery and Consolidation, a period in which “the ‘classic’ form of the Byzantine centralized and ‘totalitarian’ state was established, and ideological and cultural uniformity was superimposed upon society.” After the decline of the cities an urban revival took place from about the ninth until the eleventh or twelfth centuries. This development no doubt led to a new demand for pleasure gardens, and it would be unlikely that with regard to the layout and design of these new gardens, the tradition of late antiquity was resumed without any changes. Of course, it is possible that the influence of late antiquity was still noticeable, and it is also probable that during the former period an aristocracy still existed that kept the tradition of pleasure gardens alive. Yet the subsequent urban revival probably allowed new influences to be more easily introduced.

The period between the tenth and twelfth centuries was marked by the transformation of the ruling elite and the rise of new noble families, who kept their wealth and political influence over several generations, surely a situation that could have promoted the rise of new and elaborate pleasure gardens. Would it therefore be worthwhile to study the literary sources of this period in the search for garden historical evidence?

25 C. Foss and A. Cutler, ODB, 1:465; see also Bouras, “City and Village,” 612.
26 A. Kazhdan, ODB, 1:346.
Regarding the layout and use of gardens, the shift from pagan to Christian patronage should be explored to determine what its impact was on garden culture. For example, statues of garden-related deities such as Priapus, Hermes, and Pan were a common feature of gardens in late antiquity and not only in the gardens of the nobility. The presence of such deities in gardens may suggest a religious dimension of gardens in late antiquity. An epigram on a statue of Hermes guarding a garden says, “Wayfarer, come not near the vines, nor yet the apples, nor where the medlars grow, but pass me by there along the rope, so as not to disturb or break off any of these things which the gardener Midon got with labour. He it was who set me up here, but if thou give not ear to me, thou shalt know how Hermes rewards wicked men.”

Mango describes how the statues of pagan divinities were in use over centuries after late antiquity and that a “new ‘folkloristic’ significance arose in their popular imagination.” Or is it to be supposed that statues of pagan deities disappeared gradually over the centuries from the Byzantine garden?

We might also wonder whether one can notice an increasing Islamic influence. From the ninth century until the twelfth century in particular, traces of contact with the Islamic world are perceptible in Byzantine culture. The reign of Emperor Theophilos, for example, is considered by Müller-Wiener as “the epoch of strongest influence on the Byzantine world by Arab culture.” In this context he refers to the gorgeous furnishings of the palace, such as the mechanical toys, as well as the extravagant gardens. But was the influence exercised by the Islamic world on the imperial palace in Constantinople also reflected in the gardens of the noble and wealthy people or in the gardens of the common people? Is the example of the palace sufficient to draw inferences about Byzantine gardens in general?

The question of continuity and discontinuity has other ramifications as well. What impact did the “striking differences” between the ancient and the Byzantine family, which have been summarized in their impact on urban life as the change “from ancient ‘open’ house” to “the medieval ‘closed’ habitat,” have on garden culture? Did the function of parks, squares, and other public open spaces in this period change in accordance with the change from the public role of the citizen to that of a more private retreat in Byzantine society?

With Christianization, a new type of garden arose, the gardens of the monasteries, which had an enormous impact on western European garden culture. The study of monastic garden culture continues to have considerable gaps, but we know that knowledge concerning horticulture, gardening, and about newly introduced plants was spread by Byzantine monks and nuns, influencing garden culture in Europe and elsewhere over many centuries.

29 Cf. O. Grabar, ODB, 2:1019.
31 Kazhdan and Cutler, “Continuity and Discontinuity,” 463.
For a systematic study of Byzantine garden culture the list of questions to be addressed can be enlarged. A few more of these questions illustrate the point. Did the Byzantine garden ever exist? Or is it to be expected that in an empire with more than a thousand years of history, with a multinational population living in “a variety of climatic and agricultural zones,” \(^{34}\) there existed at the same time a multitude of different forms of gardens? Did a particular Byzantine garden style evolve from the integration of characteristics of its historic predecessors? What, in the final analysis, was characteristic of Byzantine gardens? Was it the layout of gardens, the use of statuary, the cultivation of specific plants? What elements composed a Byzantine garden? Did the improvement of such horticultural techniques as breeding and pruning give new impulses to garden culture? Did specific garden features exist based on newly invented craftsmen’s techniques and newly developed building materials?

The profession of the gardener in Byzantine culture is also worth exploring. Probably this existed as independent and distinguishable from other professions. For this we have some evidence from the later period of Byzantine history. The *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit* makes reference to gardeners, even if only a few. Thus there are 11 references to gardeners, but more than 450 to bishops and archbishops, more than 2,500 to landed proprietors, and nearly 60 to prostitutes. Yet we cannot form absolute conclusions concerning reality in Byzantine life from these figures. First of all, they may tell us more about the interests of those who wrote the texts and documents on which the figures are based.

Therefore, what position did the gardener hold in Byzantine society? Would the answer to this question tell us something about the significance of gardens and horticulture? There is evidence that artisans and craftsmen held a respectable position in Byzantine society, particularly around the twelfth century—such writers as John Tzetzes, Michael Haploucheir, and Theodore Prodromos discuss the “theme of a poor intellectual’s envy of a well-to-do artisan.” \(^{35}\) Did this envy also include the profession of the gardener? Some sources offer information about the gardening profession and its social position. In late antiquity there are implications that a gardener sometimes could gain wealth and reputation, as indicated by an epigram: “To thee, Priapus the gardener, did Potamon, who gained wealth by his calling, dedicate the hoe that dug his thirsty garden.” \(^{36}\) Another epigram tells about a poor gardener who has become rich: “Stephanus was poor and a gardener, but now having got on well and become rich, he has suddenly turned into Philostephanus.” \(^{37}\) Do such references provide enough evidence to ascribe significance to the role of the gardener or more broadly to gardens and horticulture?

The difficulties posed by these questions are enormous for the field of Byzantine garden culture. It is easy to demonstrate how difficult it is for scholars of all disciplines to deal with this topic and to find unequivocal answers to these questions. I ended a 1992

\(^{34}\) Kazhdan, *ODB*, 1:345.

\(^{35}\) *ODB*, 2:901.


article with the following beautiful description by Nicholas Mesarites of the garden landscape around the church of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople:

One can also see deep and fertile soil, rich and soft, easy to dig, richly responding to the desires of husbandmen, equally good for sowing and growing, and well suited to the production of both classes of products, both tall trees with rich fruit, and fruits in abundance; the beauty of these even surpasses the quantity, and the crops are taller than trees themselves are elsewhere. One can see saffron growing in the land about this Church, balsam and lilies, fresh clover and hyacinth, the rose and the oleander and everything of sweet aroma. This is more lovely than the garden of Laertes, than the much-sung happy Arabia. For there is a variety of gardens in it and pleasant aqueducts and a multitude of springs, and houses hidden in trees, a scene of every pleasant view, choruses of musical birds, a moderate breeze, sweet scents of spices.38

I was given this description by a well-known Byzantine art historian, and I quoted it as an argument that in a culture where the aesthetics of beautiful landscapes played such a role, it would be promising and worthwhile to investigate its gardens in more detail. Some time later Antony Littlewood informed me that this was not truly a contemporary description: “The literary descriptions are largely artistic exercises which give very little precise contemporary information. You quote Mesarites’ description of the gardens around the Church of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople, which is our most detailed description; but it is taken word for word (with a few omissions) from Libanios’ description of a garden in Antioch. How much, therefore, can we take as factual?”39 The study of Byzantine garden culture is a fascinating and challenging enterprise. It requires the collaboration of scholars from a variety of disciplines interested in Byzantine history and in the history of gardens. The various contributions in this volume should help to stimulate further research and discussion on this topic.


The Scholarship of Byzantine Gardens

Antony Littlewood

In the slightly more than 100 years since the late nineteenth century, when Byzantine studies first began to attract the attention of other than the rarest of scholars, the study of the history of its gardens has been virtually ignored despite the establishment during that century of garden studies as a viable discipline in its own right.1 Even the three volumes of the Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium, published as recently as 1991, spare only one-third of a page out of their 2,232 for consideration of gardens. Moreover, nearly all this paltry amount is devoted to utilitarian gardens: despite the well-attested Byzantine enthusiasm for decorative gardens, these are vouchsafed but half a sentence, a mere fifteen words: “Pleasure gardens occupy an important place in Byzantine romance as a place for romantic encounters.”2 This present book is the first ever devoted to the subject. However, it is not completely creation ex nihilo, as I shall attempt to show.

For the sake of convenience and simplicity the following survey of scholarship on the Byzantine garden makes a distinction between pleasure gardens and productive gardens. It is always hazardous, and often misleading, to force modern concepts onto an historical period, but, although an absolute distinction between the types was not always discernible in the Byzantines’ literature or practice, their many words for gardens are not completely interchangeable and indicate a realization of the two differing functions.3

It is in Germany in the 1880s that there appears the first interest in the Byzantine pleasure garden. In his various tangential studies tracing changing attitudes toward nature over the centuries4 Alfred Biese, despite his emphasis on the western Middle Ages, briefly

2 ODB, 2:822. It is strange that the only two items that John Nesbitt and Alexander Kazhdan chose to put in their accompanying bibliography are on the romantic garden.
3 This is indicated by, among other things, the fact that some words, such as ἄμπελοκηπίων, were specifically coined to designate dual functions.
Antony Littlewood touches upon Byzantium in discussing the attitudes of the Cappadocian fathers (Basil, Gregory of Nazianzos, and Gregory of Nyssa) and John Chrysostom. In 1888 there appeared the first book specifically on gardens to include a section, albeit only half a page, on Byzantium in Hermann Jäger’s *Gartenkunst und Gärten sonst und jetzt: Handbuch für Gärtner, Architekten und Liebhaber,* in which the author remarkably demonstrates some familiarity with later Byzantine public gardens of the eleventh and twelfth centuries.⁶

Despite, however, this early awareness, the real pioneer in researching the Byzantine pleasure garden, once more in Germany, is Marie Luise Gothein, who in 1914 published the first edition of her two-volume *Geschichte der Gartenkunst,*⁷ which was loosely and rather unsatisfactorily translated into English in 1928 by Mrs. [Laura] Archer-Hind as *A History of Garden Art.*⁸ The Byzantine section is a scant five and a half pages long⁹ (and that includes illustrations), but is remarkably good for a general history written at a time when few studies of Byzantine topics were available. Gothein is familiar with the information in the Continuators of Theophanes on the various buildings and gardens in the Great Palace at Constantinople; and indeed we can even today add little if anything to this. She, like the Continuators of Theophanes, expatiates on the elaborate fountains and the automata, for which she draws also on descriptions in the romances of Achilleus Tatios and Eustathios Makrembolites and the Byzantine Achilleid. She concludes her remarks with a quotation from Louis VII’s chaplain Odo of Deuil concerning the suburban park known as the Philopation. However, she finds nothing on the gardens of nonpalatial houses¹⁰ and nothing on the gardens that so enhanced some urban churches; she completely ignores technical treatises such as the *Geoponika*; she makes no attempt to ascertain what types of plants could be found in a Byzantine garden; and she evinces no real interest in Byzantine attitudes toward gardens.

In 1942 Otmar Schissel published his substantial monograph *Der byzantinische Garten,*¹¹ which very thoroughly investigates and details the frequently lengthy and often lavishly detailed descriptions of gardens in the romances, for which in the Byzantine period they had become an indispensable feature. Interest in the pleasure garden continued, however, to be very slow, as is well illustrated by the sad fact that Phaidon Koukoules, in his colossal and

---

² Berlin, 1988, p. 74.
⁷ Jena, 1914. A second edition (Jena, 1926) is for the Byzantine section all but an exact reprint.
⁸ Edited by W. P. Wright and published simultaneously at London and Toronto and at New York. Archer-Hinds unfortunately omits the references furnished by the German edition (1:425) and presumes wrongly to correct Gothein’s “Kloster Daphni bei Athens” (146, caption) to “The Daphne cloister near Antioch” (140, an error inserted also on 139).
¹⁰ Gothein restricts herself to the surmise “Die eigentlichen Hof- und Ziergärten werden sich von denen der Stadtplätze wohl kaum unterschieden haben” (1:148).
omnivorous multivolume collection of facets of Byzantine life, saw fit to devote fewer than three pages to the subject in 1951.\textsuperscript{12}

However, in 1960 a fascinating and important insight into the way in which at least some Byzantines could regard a garden and its contents became available in the publication by Margaret Thomson, from a miscellaneous thirteenth- to fourteenth-century manuscript, of an anonymous treatise (\textit{Theoretikon Paradeission}) that contains a mass of vegetal symbolism not found in more conventional sources.\textsuperscript{13} The year 1968 saw a further consideration of the romantic garden in Elizabeth Jeffreys’ B.Litt. thesis at Oxford\textsuperscript{14} (although she never subsequently published it in any form), and 1972 an addition to the tiny number of known descriptions of real gardens in two letters devoted to a private garden of tenth-century Constantinople which are included in my \textit{Progymnasmata of Ioannes Geometres}.\textsuperscript{15} My interest having been thus drawn toward gardens, I too turned to the romances and attempted for the First International Conference on the Ancient Novel, held at Bangor in North Wales in 1976, to trace the growing elaboration of the works of art in their descriptions of gardens: however, things did not work out like that, and I found myself arguing, quite contrary to my beliefs at the time, that the ekphrasis of the garden was not, as everybody who had ever commented on it said it was, a decorative piece of pretty writing conventionally but irrelevantly inserted into the romance, but rather an integral part of the romance intimately connected with the heroine and to some extent reflecting the extent of her sexuality.\textsuperscript{16}

In the 1980s Henry Maguire started to give perceptive attention to gardens in two books, considering in \textit{Art and Eloquence in Byzantium}\textsuperscript{17} the relationship between gardenly settings for the Virgin (in the Annunciation and the Lamentation) in paintings and mosaics on the one hand and rhetorical ekphraseis on the other; and similarly treating the paradisia-
cal garden in *Earth and Ocean: The Terrestrial World in Early Byzantine Art*. He subsequently gave further attention to the latter subject in his paper “Adam and the Animals: Allegory and the Literal Sense in Early Christian Art.” Note may be taken here also of Hans-Veit Beyer’s study of the Byzantines’ attitude toward the *locus amoenus*, which has many connections with both their conception of Paradise and their aims in creating pleasure gardens.

It is in the 1990s, however, that we have seen the burst of activity that we may hope has finally established Byzantine gardens as a legitimate area for scholarly inquiry. First, in 1990, Henry Maguire identified, I believe successfully, a flowery description by John Geometrics of an imperial estate with palace, formal garden, and game park as the park at Aretai that was later mentioned by Anna Komnene. Shortly afterwards Maureen Carroll-Spillecke asked me if I would write about early Christian gardens for her projected collection of essays, *Der Garten von der Antike bis zum Mittelalter*. I persuaded her to let me change the theme slightly to Byzantine gardens, and then, taking fright at my ignorance of the subject, asked Leslie Brubaker to collaborate with me. What we tried to do was to write a general survey of what could be found out about Byzantine gardens as a basis for further work by other scholars. It is most gratifying to realize that if we were to rewrite it now, only a scant six years since its publication (in German) in 1992, we should be able to make all manner of additions and modifications instigated largely, but not entirely, by the papers of the colloquium which constitute this volume. Written just after that collaborative effort, but actually published a few months earlier, is a closely connected survey of Byzantine gardens which started off life as a lecture at the University of Western Ontario in 1990 for a colloquium on Greek, Roman, and Byzantine gardens. An attempt was made in both these papers not only to present what is known about Byzantine pleasure gardens (and, to a lesser extent, their productive counterparts), but also to investigate Byzantine attitudes toward them.

In the same year there appeared Joachim Wolschke-Bulmahn’s “Zwischen Kepos und Paradeisos: Fragen zur byzantinischen Gartenkultur,” which asks many searching and provocative questions. Some, I fear, we shall never be able to unearth sufficient data to answer, but in time I hope that others will become amenable to informed discussion. Still in 1992, to crown this (at least quantitatively) *annual sabalis*, Charles Barber’s “Reading the Garden

18 Monographs on the Fine Arts 43 (University Park, Pa.-London, 1987), passim (see index, s.v. Paradise).
in Byzantium: Nature and Sexuality” explored further the relationship between girl and
garden in the romances and concluded that here and elsewhere man “is the master artificer”
whose “look shapes the garden and the woman to his own image” and that “the obvious
artifice of the treatment of the garden and of the woman could . . . be read either as a
metaphor of complete control, or [and here we may appreciate the subtlety of his examina-
tion] as a metaphor of this control’s apparent frailty.”25

Two years later, in 1994, Henry Maguire contributed a chapter entitled “Imperial
Gardens and the Rhetoric of Renewal,”26 which both adds to our knowledge of palatial
gardens and discusses with considerable insight their imperial connotations. Still in 1994 I
attempted to gather together what we know about the gardens of Byzantine palaces for the
Dumbarton Oaks symposium on court culture,27 and for this I considered both the Roman
and Near Eastern tradition of regarding, and indeed even creating, gardens as symbols of
power; and I also drew what parallels I could between Byzantine and Islamic rulers’ gardens.
itself, Yosef Porath added to our scanty store of knowledge of surviving sites with a discus-
sion of the sunken garden of a wealthy sixth-century resident of Caesarea.28

Interest has continued since the colloquium, whose findings were summarized with
additional comments by Joachim Wolschke-Bulmahn in 1997.29 In the same year William
Tronzo considered the influence of Byzantine aesthetics on Siculo-Norman gardens in a
paper entitled “The Royal Gardens of Medieval Palermo: Landscape Experienced, Land-
scape as Metaphor” for the symposium “Byzantium through Italian Eyes” at Columbia
University. An examination of the anonymous Symbolic Garden edited by Margaret Thomson
led Peter Booth to emphasize its biological accuracy and “its affirmation, in the manner of
the allegorizing, of the validity within a redeemed creation of the pains and pleasures of the
flesh.”30 Most recently, at the Dumbarton Oaks symposium of 1998, Henry Maguire tack-
led the problem of the accuracy of Byzantine ekphraseis by comparing texts and topo-
graphical remains of gardens in the four instances in Constantinople where this is possible
(the suburban parks of the Philopation and the Aretai and the palatial gardens of the
Mesokepion and the Mangana), thereby providing highly useful information comple-
tary to my attempt of 1994. Maguire concluded his survey with a consideration of the
changed perceptions of gardens between late antiquity and the middle ages.31

25 BMGS 16 (1992): 18–19. He discusses also Geometres’ garden (pp. 8–10).
26 In P. Magdalino, ed., New Constantines: The Rhythm of Imperial Renewal in Byzantium, 4th–13th Centuries
(Aldershot), 181–97.
27 “Gardens of the Palaces,” in H. Maguire, ed., Byzantine Court Culture from 829 to 1204 (Washington,
D.C., 1997), 13–38.
28 “The Evolution of the Urban Plan of Caesarea’s Southwest Zone: New Evidence from the Current
Excavations,” in A. Raban and K. G. Holm, eds., Caesarea Maritima: A Retrospective after Two Millennia
(Leiden, 1996), 106–20 (esp. 118–20 with figs. 2 and 3).
30 “The Symbolic Garden, A Practical Guide for the Care of the Soul,” Cahiers des études anciennes 34
In turning now to productive gardens we find that no systematic overall survey has been attempted. The first really useful item dates to as early as 1866 when Bernhard Langkavel published his *Botanik der späteren Griechen vom dritten bis dreizehnten Jahrhundert*. In 1952 Phaidon Koukoules made an extensive collection of references to fruits and vegetables, which is in marked contrast with his skimpy treatment of the pleasure garden. Valuable primary sources of information supplementary to that found in herbals, the *Geoponika*, and medical texts were provided by Margaret Thomson in 1955 through her edition of twelve short anonymous texts from mainly fifteenth- and sixteenth-century manuscripts.

Books and articles on monastic holdings, agriculture, and rural society frequently have references to village gardens and their produce and the working conditions of the peasants. Prior to 1980 we may notice here Peter Charanis’ “Monastic Properties and the State in the Byzantine Empire,” two works on Byzantine society by Elena Lipshitz in addition to her translation of the *Geoponika*, Germaine Rouillard’s *La vie rurale dans l’empire byzantin*, Paul Lemerle’s investigations of the sources of information on the rural economy and organization, two agrarian studies of Alexander Kazhdan, Nikola Kondov’s examination of fruit cultivation in medieval Bulgaria, John Teall’s invaluable “Byzantine Agricultural Tra-
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Since then our knowledge has increased considerably. In 1981 Klaus-Peter Matschke examined the revealing lawsuit of 1421 in which the Athonite monastery of Iveron successfully appealed against the Argyropoulos family’s subleasing of gardens at Thessalonike which the monks had previously rented out to peasants. Apostolos Karpozilos collected in 1984 references in Byzantine letters to fruits and vegetables of the garden sent to correspondents as gifts. Anthony Bryer’s “Byzantine Agricultural Implements: The Evidence of Medieval Illustrations in Hesiod’s Works and Days” of 1986 has considerable application to our interest in horticulture. Two major works in 1992 confirm that this indeed was “The Year of the Byzantine Garden”: Michel Kaplan made a painstaking examination of peasants’ lives in *Les hommes et la terre à Byzance du VIe au Xle siècle: Propriété et exploitation du sol,* and Yizhar Hirschfeld put us all in his debt by thoroughly detailing all that had been learned through archaeology of monastic gardens in Judea, information that is helpfully supplemented by relevant material from literary sources. In 1993 Johannes Koder published his substantial monograph *Gemüse in Byzanz.* Although this deals also with subjects such as the provisioning of Constantinople and the preparation of vegetables, its heart is a catalogue of vegetables accurately identified and supplied with a substantial number of references to his sources that include not only the *Geoponika,* the *Porikologos,* and various Byzantine medical texts ranging from the fourth to the twelfth century, but also very usefully the early-sixth-century letter in Latin of the Byzantine doctor Anthimos to the Merovingian king Theodoric I.

---

45 *Princeton, 1977.*
49 Paris, 1992, esp. 68–73, but see the index for numerous entries s.v. *jardin.*
small addition to Hirschfeld’s information on monastic gardens in Judea appeared in 1995 in Joseph Patrich’s monumental study of Saint Sabas. Finally, in 1996, Andrew Dalby included some interesting material in a chapter entitled “Biscuits from Byzantium” of his book on Greek gastronomy.

The idea of a colloquium on the subject of Byzantine gardens was first conceived in May 1984 on the occasion of the symposium “Ancient Roman Villa Gardens” at Dumbarton Oaks. The project got as far as being announced at the subsequent Byzantine Studies Conference, but was then aborted because, rumor reported, some Byzantinists believed that nothing sufficiently substantial could ever be found out about Byzantine gardens, and especially the pleasure gardens that were intended to bear the main emphasis.

With this view I did not agree, but, I must admit, I was undoubtedly forced to sympathize with it when I made the brief Byzantine contribution to The Oxford Companion to Gardens in 1986. At that time the only available survey of the subject was the few pages by Gothein; Koukoules, as we have seen, had almost completely ignored the pleasure garden; archaeology had produced virtually no relevant information of any interest; there were no artistic depictions devoted to a garden pure and simple, but merely details (and those often tralatitious) in other scenes and in gardenly decorations to canon tables and section dividers in manuscripts (although there was once a painting of a garden on a ceiling of the imperial palace, since this is described in a surviving poem of 108 lines by Manuel Philes). What about literature? Allusions to gardens were indeed legion, but yet Barmecidal. Apart from comments on the gardens of the Great Palace scattered in the writings of the Continuators of Theophanes, there were only five descriptions more than just a few lines long of real gardens (as opposed to the imaginary ones both in the romances and of paradise); and these were frustratingly unhelpful (there was Geometres’ poem on a garden that Maguire had not yet identified as that at Aretai; there was Nicholas Mesarites’ description of the gardens around the church of the Holy Apostles, but this was taken almost word for word from Libanios’ description of the pagan sanctuary at Daphni; there was the poem of Theodore Metochites on his palace and garden pillaged after his exile by Andronikos III in 1328; and there were the two letters in which Geometres praises his own garden, but since he is at pains to prove it superior to Homer’s famous Phaiakian garden of Alkinoos, he is frustrat-

...
ingly sparse in concrete detail). In view of all this (or, rather, this scanty all) the skeptical Byzantinists of 1984 were probably right in avoiding the possible embarrassment of a series of papers with little substance.

Nonetheless, ten years later both Dumbarton Oaks’ willingness to hold a round-table discussion on the subject (jointly organized by the departments of Byzantine Studies and Studies in Landscape Architecture) and the little rush of recent publications seemed to suggest that the time was at last ripe for a colloquium on Byzantine gardens, and so I made bold to broach the possibility again, this time with Joachim Wolschke-Bulmahn and Henry Maguire. That readers may now taste the fruits of that gardenly feast is thus owing to the serendipitous synchrony at Dumbarton Oaks of a director of Landscape Architecture who had published an article on Byzantine gardens and a director of Byzantine Studies who had published articles on gardens; and also, of course, to their hard work and effective organization.

University of Western Ontario


I am grateful to Glenn Peers for sending me the abstract of the paper “Garden Design in Renaissance Crete” which was delivered by Minos Hesychakis at the Ninth International Congress of Cretan Studies held at Elounda from October 1st to 6th, 2001. Hesychakis claims that Crete “seems to have been the first place where a Renaissance garden was laid out (before 1410) for the purpose of philosophical retirement, making use of ancient statues and water fountains.”

61 Curiously, however, he does say enough for us to be able to place it on probably the south side of that branch of the Mese Odos that ran from the Forum Tauri to the gate of Charisios (Edirnekapı) on the fourth hill of the city near the church of the Holy Apostles or where the Fatih Mosque now stands. If we were magically translated to 10th-century Byzantium, we should actually be able to find it, for Geometres tells us that fruit-laden branches overhung the wall in a welcome to visitors who could recognize his home by the notable landmark of its magnificent triple-crowned bay tree (for a similar use by Manuel Chrysoloras of vegetation to identify a house, see Littlewood, “Possible Future Directions,” 220).

62 I must record my gratitude to the late Alexander Kazhdan for drawing to my attention some of the eastern European bibliography, and thank Henry Maguire and especially Joachim Wolschke-Bulmahn for their criticisms.
Paradise Withdrawn

Henry Maguire

In his responses to Count Antiochos, Pseudo-Athanasios remarked that no mortal had ever been allowed to return from the afterlife and to report back on the whereabouts and situation of the departed.1 Apart from visits in dreams and visions, the nearest that any living Byzantines got to paradise was twenty miles from its gates, a point that was reportedly reached by three Mesopotamian monks, Theophilos, Sergios, and Hygieinos, after a long and arduous journey to the east.2 Nevertheless, in spite of its inaccessibility to mortals, numerous Byzantine descriptions of paradise exist. The very fact that these descriptions were purely imaginary makes them the more interesting as mirrors of changing Byzantine attitudes toward gardens and landscape. In this essay I contrast Byzantine visualizations of the earthly paradise in the periods before and after iconoclasm and show how the changing perspectives of paradise mirrored the ways in which the Byzantines viewed other gardens, both real and imaginary.

Although there were some Early Christian writers, notably Origen, who denied the physical existence of the earthly paradise, seeing in the biblical account only a tissue of allegories,3 most early commentators were prepared to accept the earthly paradise as a real place, which, to be sure, had the potential for further allegorization, like all objects in the material world.4 Early Christian writers obtained their information about the topography of paradise from two main sources. Primarily, of course, they drew upon the biblical account, contained in the book of Genesis, with a little supplementary information from Revelation. They expanded upon the details given in scripture with the aid of the literary tradition of the Elysian fields, derived ultimately from Homer. These biblical and pagan sources provided certain landscape features which became constants in the early Byzantine views of the earthly paradise. First, the garden was furnished with a variety of fruit trees,

I wish to thank Antony Littlewood, Nancy Ševčenko, and Alice-Mary Talbot for their comments on earlier versions of this essay.
3 Selecta in Genesis, PG 12: 98–100.
which are evoked in the book of Genesis. These trees can be seen in the three later medieval copies of the map of the earth which originally illustrated the sixth-century Christian Topography by Kosmas Indikopleustes. Here the earthly paradise is portrayed as a rectangle framing fruit-bearing trees, situated to the east of the inhabited earth, beyond the encircling ocean, as may be seen in a ninth-century manuscript of the Christian Topography in the Vatican (Fig. 1). Another constant feature of paradise was its beautiful scents, which were described by several writers. It also had a special climate, without extremes of heat or cold, in which all fruits were ripe at all times of the year. Exceptionally, samples of such fruits reached mortals, as happened to the ascetic St. Apollo and his five disciples, who were mysteriously brought paradisal fruits of every kind out of season while they were sojourning in a cave in Egypt.

These notions about the atmospheric and meteorological conditions in paradise were derived from both the biblical and pagan traditions. The book of Revelation says that the Tree of Life, which Genesis placed in the earthly paradise, yielded its fruit each month of the year, while Homer said that the Elysian fields provided the easiest kind of living to humans, with no harsh winter and no storms of rain or snow. The equable climate of paradise became a favorite theme of Early Christian writers. According to a sermon attributed spuriously to St. Basil the Great: “in that place . . . there is no wintry ice, no dampness of spring, no heat and burning of summer, no dryness of autumn, but a temperate and peaceful mutual concord of the seasons of the year.” Likewise, in the Tenth Hymn on Paradise by Ephrem Syrus we read: “somber February laughs here like May . . . our miserable months become like Eden.” In later Byzantine paintings of paradise, this mixing of the weathers is represented by a white background, as shown in the maps of the earth contained in the medieval copies of Kosmas Indikopleustes (Fig. 1).

There is an amusing satire upon these paradisal descriptions in the Timarion, which was composed in the twelfth century. Here the protagonist visits the Elysian fields and finds a place without seasons, where spring never fades and fruit is ripe all through the year. As for the fragrances, these are provided by vegetables that had a sweet aroma before being eaten and produced sweet burps afterwards.

5 Gen. 2:9.
6 Vatican, ms. gr. 699, fol. 40v; C. Stornajolo, Le miniature della Topografia Cristiana di Cosma Indicopleuste, codice vaticano greco 699, Codices e Vaticanis selecti 10 (Milan, 1908), 26, pl. 7. The map is also preserved in the 11th-century Florence, Laurenziana ms. Plut. IX, 28, fol. 92v (E. O. Winstedt, The Christian Topography of Cosmas Indicopleustes [Cambridge, 1909], pl. 7), and Mount Sinai, St. Catherine’s monastery, ms. gr. 1186, fol. 66v (E. K. Redin, Khristianskaia topografiia Koz’my Indikoplova [Moscow, 1916], pl. 91).
8 Historia monachorum, 8.40. I owe this reference to the generosity of Alexander Kazhdan.
9 Gen. 2:9; Rev. 22:2.
10 Odyssey, 4.565–68.
11 De Paradiso, PG 30:64.
A final very important element in the Early Christian view of paradise was the presence of water in the form of the four rivers. According to some writers, who took their cue from the tenth verse of the second chapter of Genesis, the four rivers flowed from a single river, or *potamos*. But other authors, including Kosmas Indikopleustes and Ephrem Syrus, described the source of the four rivers as a spring or a fountain; they were following the sixth verse of the same biblical chapter, which speaks of a fountain (*pege*) that “went up . . . from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground.”

In the book of Genesis (2:10–14) the four rivers of paradise are identified as Phison, Gehon, Tigris, and Euphrates. The most important feature of these rivers, as they were visualized by Early Christian commentators, was that they brought the blessings of paradise to mortals by flowing out of paradise into the inhabited world as its four major rivers. This extension of the four rivers to our world was commented upon by several writers and illustrated clearly on the map by Kosmas Indikopleustes, where the four streams can be seen.

---

See, e.g., Severian of Gabala, *De mundi creatione*, Oratio 1/5; PG 56: 478.
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both flowing out of paradise and irrigating the central rectangle that represents the inhabited earth (Fig. 1). Thus Ephrem Syrus, in his Commentaries on Genesis, stated that “the four rivers that flow from the fountain of Paradise . . . have been absorbed in the periphery of Paradise, and they have descended in the middle of the sea as if by an aqueduct, and the earth makes each one spring forth in its place.” The poet Avitus, after telling us of the source of the four rivers at the fountain in Eden, gives a long description of their geography in our earth, including the annual floods of the Gehon, which he identifies, like other writers, with the Nile, and the rich gifts of the Phison, which he takes to be the Ganges in India. The Phison, he declares, steals the wealth of paradise and conveys it to our place of banishment.

The Early Christian authors agreed that once the four rivers of paradise reached the inhabited earth they acquired their familiar mundane characteristics. Ephrem Syrus specified that the rivers here do not taste the same as the waters of the fountain in paradise. Nevertheless, the Early Christian commentators were conscious of what lay upstream. Epiphanius of Salamis said that he knew the description of paradise in Genesis to be literally true, because: “I saw the waters of Gehon [i.e., the Nile], waters that I gazed at with these bodily eyes. . . . And I simply drank the waters from the great river Euphrates, which you can touch with your hands and sip with your lips.”

The Byzantine view of paradise in the post-iconoclastic era was more complex, because in the Middle Ages the concept of the earthly paradise became less distinct than it had been in the earlier period, and its identity became more strongly fused with notions concerning the spiritual paradise and the fate of souls in the afterlife. Some medieval writers maintained that one should understand paradise only in spiritual and allegorical terms. The eleventh-century theologian Niketas Stethatos argued that the earthly paradise had lost its utility for the faithful after the incarnation of Christ, and allegorized its plants and fruits. Other authors, however, were prepared to give the place a more tangible topography. Among the latter group, two main perceptions can be distinguished, which corresponded, in the main, to different literary genres. First, according to the Hexaemeron tradition, paradise was described as the historical place of Genesis, complete with the four rivers and their continuations in the inhabited world. Second, in the saints’ lives and the apocalyptic texts,

20 Commentarii in Genesim, 1.23n; Daniélou, “Terre et Paradis,” 451–52. On the other hand, in the epic of Digenes Akrites, the waters of the Euphrates that watered the hero’s garden retained their “very sweet bouquet” on account of their origins in paradise: Digenes Akrites, 7–11; ed. J. Mavrogordato (Oxford, 1956), 216.
21 Epistula ad Joannem Episcopum Jerosolymorum, PG 43: 386.
Paradise was seen as a vestibule, a kind of first class lounge, where the elect awaited the Last Judgment and their final flight into the Kingdom of God. In these sources the location of paradise is generally vague, but its landscape features are clear. The four rivers play little or no part, being replaced either by intervening lakes of torment or by rivers of fire, in which sinners are punished until the time comes for them to be eternally consigned to damnation in Gehenna. Typically, the fiery rivers are seen as flowing between the paradisal waiting room and our world, so that only the elect can cross over the narrow bridge to receive their reward.

A good example of the first construction of the earthly paradise, following the *Hexaemeron* tradition, is the ekphrasis that comes at the beginning of the twelfth-century chronicle by Constantine Manasses. Here, in a poetic account of the creation, Constantine describes the garden, with its beautifully orchestrated trees, its fragrant plants, its abundant fruits, its brilliantly colored flowers, its iridescent grass, its wafting breezes, and, finally, the spring, the mother whence flow the four great rivers, identified as the Ganges, the Nile, the Euphrates, and the Tigris. Constantine Manasses concludes his account by switching from the past to the present tense and describing the geography of these rivers on earth.

Later in the twelfth century, the Cypriot hermit Neophytos, writing at a much lower literary level, discussed paradise in a sermon on the *Hexaemeron*. Like Constantine Manasses, Neophytos explicated the biblical text by briefly locating the rivers of paradise in their geographical contexts in our world.

However, the *Hexaemeron* tradition was relatively weak in the post-iconoclastic period, compared to the wealth of such texts surviving from early Byzantine times. After iconoclasm, accounts of the landscape of paradise are encountered more frequently in hagiographic and apocalyptic sources. Here we find that paradise, wherever it may be located, is not associated with water and free-flowing abundance, but with the notions of judgment, retribution, and reward. We encounter this view already in the Life of St. Makarios, which may have been composed as early as the eighth century. This story, which I mentioned at the beginning of this essay, concerns three monks, Theophilos, Sergios, and Hygieinos, who set off from their monastery in Mesopotamia in order to find the holy hermit Makarios, who lived somewhere in the east, on the very edges of paradise. On the way they passed the Lake of Judgment, filled with snakes and wailing sinners, as well as various other places of torment, before they finally reached the cave of Makarios. In this retreat the saint lived peacefully with a pair of amiable lions. The holy man informed his three visitors about the location of the earthly paradise with rare precision: “Twenty miles from here,” he said, “is the wall of iron and another of bronze, and within these walls is paradise, where Adam and Eve once were. . . . Outside paradise God set the Cherubim and the flaming

---

Ed. V. Vassiliev, *Anecdota*, 152.


like snow,” the third bringing with it a glow like “the sky at sunset,” and the fourth causing “a delightful melody” to echo in the trees.  

In art, also, we can see the new mentality that is reflected by these post-iconoclastic texts. In early Byzantine art the four rivers of paradise were frequently shown, both on the floors, walls, and vaults of churches and on small-scale objects, such as pilgrims’ flasks.  

After the eighth century, however, they became much rarer in Byzantine iconography; henceforth the rivers appeared only in manuscript illustrations. For example, a common composition in early Byzantine art, which can be seen, among other places, on the late sixth-century pilgrims’ ampullae from the Holy Land, was the cross as the Tree of Life, with the four rivers of paradise flowing from its base (Fig. 2).  

In post-iconoclastic versions of this theme, however, the rivers are generally omitted. Thus on the back of the tenth-century Harbaville triptych, a carved ivory now in the Louvre, the cross flowers as the Tree of Life in a paradisal setting that includes fruiting vines and animals such as lions and rabbits at peace with one another (Fig. 3a, b). But, in spite of this detailed evocation of the landscape, the four rivers are absent.  

Likewise, in the decoration of post-iconoclastic churches, paradise

---

31 Ed. and trans. L. Rydén, \textit{The Life of St. Andrew the Fool}, vol. 2 (Uppsala, 1995), 50.560–52.602. The text describes a single river inside the garden, but not four rivers flowing out of it; ibid., 50.549–51. Nevertheless, this paradise apparently is located on earth rather than in heaven; see ibid., 1:61. The four rivers are also absent from the account of the celestial Jerusalem in the 10th-century Life of Basil the Younger, although the punishments of sinners are described; ed. A. N. Veselovskii, \textit{Sbornik Otdeleniiia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoi Akademii nauk} 46 (St. Petersburg, 1889–90), 39.


3a  Paris, Musée du Louvre, ivory triptych (“Harbaville Triptych”), reverse: Cross as the Tree of Life in Paradise (photo: Réunion des Musées Nationaux)

3b  Paris, Musée du Louvre, ivory triptych (“Harbaville Triptych”), reverse: detail (photo: Réunion des Musées Nationaux)
itself is often depicted in the context of the Last Judgment, but here, as in the post-iconoclastic
texts, the only river to be shown is the river of fire descending from the seat of judgment to
consume the sinners.\footnote{On the iconography of the Last Judgment in Byzantine art, see B. Brenk, “Weltgericht,” in Lexikon der

It may, then, be concluded that the dominant view of paradise in medieval Byzantium
was less generous than the perception current in the centuries before iconoclasm. No longer
do we find the four rivers bringing their blessings into our world, free for all to take, but
instead a river, or rivers, of fire, with associated ideas of judgment and intercession, that
 guarded the joys of paradise for a privileged few. Even though some people after iconoclasm
still believed that the four rivers of paradise flowed out from the garden into the inhabited
world, the Byzantines could no longer have recourse to them—neither spiritually nor, for
the most part, physically. For the Byzantines of the middle ages, paradise became a more
distant and at the same time a more fabulous place. It was a garden cut off and minimally
connected to the desolate landscapes that surrounded it.

The Byzantines’ conception of paradise changed in parallel with their attitudes toward
other garden spaces, both real and imagined, which also underwent a profound shift be-
tween the early and later periods. A common theme in Roman and late antique writing
about gardens was that the garden was a place embracing its surroundings, making its setting
a part of its identity. Later Byzantine writers, on the other hand, stressed another idea, that
the garden was a place preferably closed off and completely distinct from its surroundings, a
confined site where the most desirable features of nature were collected together and guarded
by a strong enclosure. Even though enclosed gardens certainly existed in the ancient world,
especially in urban settings, and gardens with views still existed in the Middle Ages, the texts
reveal that there was a distinct change in mentality. In the construction of medieval Byzan-
tine gardens the ideas of enclosure and confinement came to predominate. The medieval
garden wanted to look inward rather than outward.

The setting and the vistas were very important elements in the planning and percep-
tion of Roman gardens, especially those located in the countryside. In the words of A. R.
Littlewood, “from at least the first half of the first century B.C., house, garden, agricultural
land (the villa), and even sea and surrounding countryside were regarded not as discrete
units but as an aesthetically integral entity.” The letters of Pliny convey this aesthetic very
clearly. For example, in his description of his villa at Laurentinum, near Rome, he speaks of
his favorite spot, a mirador crowning the garden from which there were prospects of the sea,

\footnote{Letters, 2.17; trans. W. Melmoth, vol. 1 (London, 1915), 160. In another letter (5.6), Pliny refers to the
view of the countryside to be obtained from his villa in Tuscany; trans. Melmoth, 382.} For late antique writers, also,
the views from their villas were important. Thus, in the fifth century, we find Sidonius
Apollinaris describing the woods around his villa at Avitacum and also the lake that could be
seen from the dining room, complete with its fishermen at work; he says that whenever the
diners were not busy eating, they were engrossed by the pleasures of the view.38 Such views were so essential to the desirable country retreat that they appear as a *topos* in a saint’s life, the biography of the high-born Melania the Younger, who sold her estates in the early fifth century so that she could devote herself to Christ. Here we read how the devil tried to divert Melania from her chosen path by reminding her of the most splendid of her properties, which had a pool from which there were views of both the sea and groves of trees. Those who bathed here, says the biographer, could see both the movements of ships and animals being hunted in the woods. But the future ascetic responded to the devil by pointing out that all this was nothing in contrast to what was promised to the servants of God, for trees could rot, or be burned, and quickly come to nothing.39

Even in the imaginary and symbolic world of the classical romances, we find that landscape views are an important part of the construction of the garden. At the beginning of the fourth book of *Daphnis and Chloe* by Longos there is an extensive description of a garden of Dionysos with all kinds of trees, vines, and flowers. It is said to lie on high ground, from which “there was a pleasing prospect to the plain, where one could see the herdsman; there was a fine view also to the sea, where one could see all who sailed by, creating no small addition to the delight of this garden.”40

In the medieval Byzantine descriptions of gardens we find a shift of emphasis; the gaze is rarely from the garden to the outside, but it is directed inward, from the outside to the garden, or within the garden itself.41 For example, scenes of agriculture, pastoralism, and hunting feature in the description of a garden in the twelfth-century romance *Hysmine and Hysminias* by Eustathios Makrembolites, but they are no longer part of the surrounding vistas of landscape, as they were in the classical novel by Longos. In the medieval romance, the scenes are painted on the walls *inside* the garden as a frieze depicting the seasonal activities of the months.42

Another interesting contrast is provided by a passage in the biography of the abbot Theodore of Studious that was attributed to his disciple Michael. In the course of recounting how Theodore withdrew to one of his estates, named Boskytion, in order to practice the ascetic life, Michael, somewhat apologetically, provided a description of the place.43 His

---

39 *Vita Sanctae Melaniae Junioris*, 18; *AB* 8 (1889): 33. Compare Seneca, *Letters*, 86.8, criticizing the luxury of private baths provided with large windows so that the bathers could enjoy views of land and sea; Littlewood, “Ancient Literary Evidence,” 20.
41 For a view from the outside into an estate, see the description composed around the year 1200 by Nicholas Mesarites of the park of the Philopation outside the walls of Constantinople, as seen from an upper level of the Holy Apostles church inside the city; ed. and trans. G. Downey, “Nikolaos Mesarites: Description of the Church of the Holy Apostles at Constantinople,” *TAPS*, n.s., 47 (1957): 898, 5.1–6.
ekphrasis was not entirely original, for he based it on a letter written over five centuries earlier by St. Basil describing his retreat in the Pontos. According to Basil, his abode was on a high mountain, covered with a thick forest, and watered by streams. At the base of the mountain was a plain, also well watered. Basil’s estate was surrounded by variegated trees, which formed a hedge around it. There was only one entrance, since the property was enclosed on all sides either by ravines or by a crescent-shaped mountain. Basil dwelt upon the fine view of the plain below that could be obtained from the situation of the house, and also the view of a swift-flowing river that could be seen from a nearby ridge, a prospect “furnishing me and every spectator with a most pleasant sight.” However, Basil reserved his highest praise for the tranquility of the place, “not only because it is far removed from the disturbances of the city, but also because it attracts not even a wayfarer, except the guests who join me in hunting.”

Michael’s description of the retreat chosen by Theodore of Stoudios is clearly based on Basil’s fourth-century letter; indeed, much of the vocabulary is the same. However, there are some significant differences in the ninth-century account. Like Basil’s retreat, Boskytion supposedly had a mountain peak covered with variegated trees, and there was a well-watered plain at its base. Boskytion also was enclosed by a crescent, in this case formed not by a mountain, but by trees, some planted by art, others occurring naturally. Like Basil’s property, it had only one way in, and again we are told that its greatest feature was its tranquility. However, in the ninth-century description there is absolutely no mention of the pleasures of sight provided by the surrounding terrain; rather the place “provides tranquility to those living there, who hold converse alone with God, and who maintain a rest from the senses.”

A similar change in perspective, which cuts the estate off from its surroundings, characterizes two descriptions of elevated properties near Constantinople, written in the fourth and tenth centuries respectively. The earlier description is contained in a letter written by Emperor Julian describing a small garden and estate that had been given to him by his grandmother. It was located in Bithynia, near Constantinople, about two and a half miles from the sea. The property included springs of water, trees, and a garden, and it provided fine views. “If you walk up on to a sort of hill away from the house,” wrote Julian, “you will see the sea, the Propontis, and the islands, and the city that bears the name of the noble emperor. . . . Very peaceful it is to lie down there and glance into some book, and then, while resting one’s eyes, it is very agreeable to gaze at the ships and the sea.” The later description is an ekphrastic poem written by John Geometres describing the park and garden of the Aretai. This estate was probably situated on the Thracian side of

---

45 *Vita S. Theodori Studitae*, 6, PG 99:122bc. The 12th-century typikon of the Kosmosoteira praises the panoramic view of the Thracian plain to be obtained from the monastery, but undercuts the charms of the site by declaring that it was “formerly the dwelling of snakes and scorpions”; ed. L. Petit, “Typikon du monastère de la Kosmosotira,” *IRAIK* 13 (1908): 57.27–36.
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Constantinople, near the southern end of the land walls. According to the twelfth-century historian Anna Komnene, the Aretai was located on a ridge with one of its flanks facing the sea and the other facing the city. Therefore, like Julian’s estate, it commanded views of both Constantinople and the sea. However, these views outside the garden were not described in the ekphrasis by the tenth-century writer. Instead, he compared the Aretai to Eden, with its streams, fountains, plants, and creatures. It was a site where “the virtues not only of earth, but of all creations came together.” It was “one place” where the best of nature was either “transferred,” through the art of gardening, or else re-created, through the arts of sculpture, there to be admired within the enclosed space of the park and garden.

Byzantine views of paradise, therefore, changed along with their perceptions of other garden spaces. In the early period, paradise, even though closed to sinful humanity, was for most people still an integral part of the earth. Paradise was tangibly linked to the outside world through its four rivers, by means of which mortals could still share in its blessings. As in the case of other late antique gardens, the view of paradise was connected to its surroundings, with the difference that the flow of benefits was reversed; in the case of the landed estates, the owner or his guests received views and produce from the surrounding landscape; in the case of paradise, the inhabited earth received its irrigation from the source of the four rivers within the garden. After iconoclasm, however, another view of paradise grew in the popular imagination; it became increasingly remote, cut off, and disconnected from its surroundings. Situated in a forbidding and hostile terrain, it reserved its inner pleasures only for the elite group who were invited inside its walls. Similarly, in their accounts of other gardens, the Byzantines of the middle ages tended to cut them off from their settings, concentrating only on what had been gathered, or re-created, within the exclusive space of the garden itself.

These parallels between the changing perceptions of paradise and of other gardens raise the question whether the Byzantine views of paradise affected the ways in which they looked at gardens in general, or vice versa. There were, certainly, mutual influences. For example, we have seen that John Geometres in his ekphrasis compared the garden of the Aretai to a new Eden, even saying that it was watered by four springs like the old Eden. Conversely, in the description of paradise contained in the Life of St. Andrew the Fool, we find landscape features that echo the instructions for planting a garden given in a practical

---

49 Alexiad, 2.8.5; ed. B. Leib, vol. 1 (Paris, 1937), 90.4–11
50 Maguire, “Description of the Aretai,” esp. 209, lines 3–4, 210, lines 67–68. With the help of borrowings from Libanios, Mesarites described the views of the sea and of the gardens in the area of the Holy Apostles that he obtained from the upper levels of the church. However, in a passage that was not borrowed from the 4th-century writer, Mesarites stressed that these gardens were self-sufficient and self-contained, and not dependent upon the outside world: “for those who live near [the church], the wheat alone which grows in the land about their houses is sufficient for their nourishment, and they need have no care for invasions of barbarians, for the mighty waves of the sea, or for the dangers from pirates.” Description, 3.1–5.2 (ed. and trans. Downey; “Nikolaos Mesarites,” 897–98).
51 Maguire, “Description of the Aretai,” 209, lines 33–34.
horticultural manual, the *Geoponika*. However, at a deeper level, it is evident that both the descriptions of paradise and those of other gardens reflected a more general change in people’s attitudes toward landscape between late antiquity and the middle ages. This shift of perception expressed itself in a number of different ways. Spiritually, there was a shift from an open acceptance of nature’s bounty and her sensual pleasures to a view of unredeemed nature as corrupt and corrupting, and in need of confinement and control. Concomitantly, the old pagan beliefs in the autonomous powers of natural elements such as earth and water were gradually replaced by a system that placed the powers of nature more firmly under the supervision of Christ and his representatives, the saints and the church, to whom recourse now had to be made in case of need. Emotionally, the open landscapes that had once been seen as sources of sustenance and delight became the potential sites of new threats and dangers, both seen and unseen. Physically, the settlements of vulnerable plains and seacoasts increasingly gave way to the occupation of concealed or fortified hilltops. These and other profound changes affected the Byzantines’ relationship to landscape, changes to which writers gave poetic expression in their descriptions of gardens, both real and imagined.

*University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign*
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52 The saint’s life states that the trees in paradise “stood in rows like one line of battle behind the other. Blessed be the hand that planted them” (ed. and trans. Rydén, 48.545–46). The *Geoponika*, 10.1.2, advises, “The plants should be planted neither out of line nor intermingled, so to say, . . . but each of the plants should be put in separately by type”; ed. H. Beckh (Leipzig, 1895), 263.19–264.2. On the *Geoponika*, see R. Rodgers, “*Khpopoii?a*: Garden Making and Garden Culture in the *Geoponika*,” in this volume.


54 This idea is conveyed clearly in the description by Mesarites of the views to be seen from the Holy Apostles in Constantinople: the prospect of the sea might at times be tranquil and pleasant, but equally it might be stormy and peopled with drowning sailors (earlier, he has mentioned pirates), while the view beyond the land walls is of the army encamped at the Philopation, ready to face the enemy; *Description*, 4.2, 5.1–5 (ed. and trans. Downey, “Nikolaos Mesarites,” 898).

55 The literature on these changes in settlement patterns is now very extensive. For a summary, see Mango, *Byzantium*, 60–87, esp. 73.
Byzantine Monastic Horticulture:
The Textual Evidence

Alice-Mary Talbot

There is a paucity of evidence on Byzantine gardens, both textual and archaeological. When we turn to monastic horticulture, however, the situation is somewhat less bleak, for both foundation documents (typika) and saints’ lives shed occasional light on the gardens, vineyards, and orchards that provided food, drink, and eucharistic wine for the use of the resident monks or nuns. The surviving textual sources should ideally be supplemented by the findings of archaeological excavation of actual monastic gardens. Such excavation, which has been carried out to date primarily in the late Roman monasteries of Palestine, can only be touched upon in this essay, in which I focus on the literary evidence. For the most part I limit my observations to those gardens situated in the immediate vicinity of monasteries, rather than to agricultural properties owned by monasteries but located at some distance from the monastic complex.1

Monastery Site Selection

Most founders of Byzantine monasteries took care in choosing the site of their monastic complexes: they looked for fertile land, a good water supply, temperate climate, peaceful surroundings, security, and the natural beauty of the landscape. Good climate and pure water were essential for health and horticulture, while isolation and quiet would provide physical security and an environment conducive to contemplation and spiritual progress.2

I am grateful to my colleagues Angela Hero, Joseph Patrich, and Svetlana Popović, who provided useful bibliographical citations, and to René Gothóni, Thalia Gouma-Peterson, Yizhar Hirschfeld, and Antony Littlewood, who gave me illustrative materials. Thanks are due also to Yizhar Hirschfeld, Sharon Gerstel, Antony Littlewood, and the anonymous reviewers, who read earlier drafts of this article and made useful comments. Research for this article was greatly facilitated by use of the Dumbarton Oaks Hagiography Database.

1 There is much information, for instance, on such gardens and fields in Athonite documents; see, for example, J. Lefort, N. Oikonomidès, et al., Actes d’Iviron, vol. 4 (Paris, 1995), no. 97, which describes the gardens near Thessalonike leased by the monastery to the Argyropouloi in the early 15th century. C. Constantinides, “Byzantine Gardens and Horticulture in the Late Byzantine Period, 1204–1453: The Secular Sources,” in this volume, 88–90, summarizes much of the available data.

2 I have developed this topic further in a paper on monastery site selection delivered at the Belfast colloquium of September 1998, “Founders and Refounders of Byzantine Monasteries.”
Typical is the ideal monastery site described in the Life of St. Luke of Steiris: “See what sort of place this is where you are standing—how temperate in climate, how pleasant, free from all disturbance and isolated from men, and also how well supplied with very pure water, sufficient both for the demands of thirst and for the irrigation of vegetables and plants.” In the eleventh century, Christodoulos described as follows a site on the island of Kos that he considered for his new monastic foundation: “an extensive ridge with no habitation, in a well exposed site, well-watered besides and temperate.”

An even more striking example of a real appreciation of the landscape setting, for both the view it afforded and its agricultural bounty, is a passage in Isaac Komnenos’ twelfth-century typikon for the Kosmosoteira monastery at Pherrai, where he lauds its site, with the river Ainos, the sea, with its surf and its calms, the pasturage and grazing land of evergreen meadows to nourish horses and cattle. There is the site on the crest of the hill, with its easy access. There is the fine temperance of the currents of air and the power of strong breezes with the everlasting reeds rustling in tune with them about the mouth of the river. There is the immense plain, and the panoramic view, especially in summertime with wheat in flower and in ear, which impresses great gladness on viewers. There is the grove of lovely saplings growing so near the monastery upon which vines are entwined, while clear and cold water gushes forth, bringing delight to parched throats.

Other monastic founders, on the other hand, selected less well favored sites for their new foundations. Athanasios of Athos, for instance, was motivated by spiritual rather than practical concerns when he picked the location of the Lavra. He chose a spot near the southeastern tip of the holy mountain where he had first lived as a hermit, battled with the devil, and received enlightenment, even though it had an inadequate water supply. The future patriarch Nikephoros I, when he first retired from his civil service career, is said to have intentionally selected an unsuitable site for his monastic foundation on a ridge overlooking the Bosporos. Since he was renouncing the comforts of urban life, he reportedly deliberately sought out a place where it would be an arduous struggle even to grow a few vegetables. His biographer emphasizes that the location was “unlovely because of its harsh

---


5 Reading εὑερπητής for εὑερπητής, as suggested by Ph. Koukoules, Βυζαντινών βιος και πολιτισμός, vol. 6 (Athens, 1955), 77.

6 L. Petit, “Typikon du monastère de la Kosmosoteira près d’Aenos (1152),” IRAIK 13 (1908): chap. 74, p. 57; slightly modified version of the English translation by Nancy Ševčenko, Documents, 833.


and uneven ground and completely barren for cultivation because of the steepness of the ridge; it was a thirsty <land>, not softened by any water, and unless rain water was brought <to it>, deprived <even> of that by virtue of its precipitous slope.” This seems to be a case in which the beauty and fruitfulness of the landscape were considered a negative criterion for a monastic foundation, although Nikephoros soon built irrigation channels to facilitate horticulture. Thus the hagiographer may be seeking to justify Nikephoros’ choice of an apparently inappropriate site by stressing the virtuous element inherent in the strenuous effort required to provide well-watered gardens for his monastic complex.

The deliberate choice of monastery sites inappropriate for horticulture is also evident in the lengthy vita of Lazaros of Mount Galesion, which emphasizes the lack of water at all three complexes he founded on the holy mountain. The monks had to rely on rainwater from cisterns or water carried up from the river by pack animals, and there was an insufficient supply for irrigating vegetable gardens. Thus the monks were dependent on charitable donations and provisions from a nearby monastery at the foot of the mountain for their food. Lazaros, however, felt the mountain to be ideal for monastic settlement precisely because it was “impassable and craggy and very rugged . . . <and> waterless, and for these reasons was able to offer much tranquility to the person who went there.” In his words: “If you <really> want to be saved, <then> persevere on this barren mountain . . . the fathers <of old> always sought out the deserts and most uncomfortable places, not those which had springs and leafy trees and other physical comfort<. . > <as soon as> they began to transport <fertile> soil from elsewhere for growing vegetables and they set up trees and cisterns in front of their doors, <those monks> went into decline and were delivered to destruction.”

It may not be a coincidence that Lazaros received his early monastic training at Mar Saba in the Judean desert, where horticulture was also virtually impossible; the monastery

9 V. Niceph., 148.

The aridity of Mount Galesion is also emphasized in an undated chrysobull of Andronikos II (MM, 5:266): “For the place is a steep and rugged mountain, possessing scarcely anything <conducive> to refreshment and physical comfort; for neither is it shaded by trees, nor do any plants or grass grow there, nor does it bear anything else useful <that comes> from the earth, but is completely and totally unsuited for such fruits of the earth, although it is fertile in virtue, both producing it naturally and also receiving seeds and thus conceiving and bearing and nurturing virtue and making it increase manyfold.” Part of this passage is also found in the vita of St. Meletios the Confessor, ed. S. Lauriotes, “Βίος και πολιτεία και μεταφράσεις τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς Μελετίου τοῦ Ὀμολογητοῦ,” Τριημήνος ὁ Πολιμήτης 5 (1921): 613, which adds the detail that the monks had to relieve their thirst by drinking their own sweat!

11 Cf. chap. 34 of the V. Laz. Gal., which states that the monks got most of their food from donations, but that their beans were provided by a field at the monastery of St. Marina.
13 Chapter 26 of the Life of John the Hesychast states that “not even in fresh air and a garden do figs or any tree grow, because of the great heat and dryness of the air of the laura . . . and indeed, although many have tried to plant along the gorge, where there is depth of soil, and have watered throughout the winter, the plants


had to rely on vegetables grown in a garden in Jericho and on wheat transported from Transjordan, although the associated hermitages did have small garden plots. Likewise, the desert monastery of Choziba (Fig. 1), where “everything is so blasted by the burning sun

1 Monastery of Choziba, Judean desert (photo: Y. Hirschfeld)
that one can see the rock emitting tongues of flame” and pools of water were heated by the sun to the boiling point, was primarily supplied from gardens located in more salubrious terrain on the edge of the desert near the oasis of Jericho. These fertile lands are described by a twelfth-century Byzantine pilgrim, John Phokas: “the whole district is well watered and is used for a garden for the monasteries situated in the desert. The ground is parcelled out and shared among the Holy Monasteries. It is all planted with trees and vines and for this reason the monks have set up towers among the monks’ allotments, from which they harvest fruit in plenty.”

Clearing of the Land for Horticulture

The construction of rural monasteries wrought changes in the Byzantine landscape, whether in Palestine, Anatolia, Greece, or Italy, and whether the chosen site was idyllic or harsh. The impact on the land was relatively small compared to that of agricultural village communities and rural estates; nonetheless, monks often served as “pioneers” in undeveloped areas. With the exception of the most ascetic of hermits (the βοσκοί, or “grazers”), who, living in caves, eating wild plants, and drinking rainwater, made virtually no impact on their environment, almost all hermits and monks were involved to some extent in subduing and transforming their natural surroundings. One of the biographers of Athanasios of Athos seems conscious of this point when he describes the condition of the holy mountain when Athanasios first arrived there: the land was unplowed and unsown; the hermits did not cut furrows in the ground but collected wild fruits from trees for their food; their huts were made of twigs with straw roofs. But when Athanasios began to build the Great Lavra, his first action was to cut down trees in the thick forest and to make level areas in the rough ground. Clearing forest land and burning the slash figure in hagiographic descriptions of the foundation of a number of other monasteries in Italy and Anatolia.

In heavily forested areas, land had to be cleared not only for the construction of churches and cells, but also for planting the gardens, orchards, and vineyards that formed an integral part of most monastic complexes. The biographer of the tenth-century monk Neilos of
Rossano, for example, describes “the monks working on the mountain and rolling down the burned trees to make a clearing and transform wood-bearing land into grain-bearing land.” Rocks had to be removed from stony soil, garden plots leveled, or terraces constructed (Figs. 2, 3). In more barren areas, fertile soil might have to be transported to build up planting beds. Thus at the Enkleistra of Neophytos on Cyprus a ravine was filled in with earth to make level terrain for a garden.

Water Supply and Irrigation

A good water supply was an essential requirement for horticulture, and on this subject there is abundant archaeological material to supplement the information of saints’ lives and typika. Particularly in the area of Byzantine Palestine, systematic excavations and surveys at the lavras, monasteries, and hermitages in the Judean desert have uncovered detailed evidence about the systems of channels, cisterns, and rock pools (Figs. 4, 5) that provided water not only for horticulture but for other activities at the monastery, such as laundry, cooking, grinding grain, watering animals, and bathing. Such provisions for a water supply obviated

---

21 G. Giovanelli, Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἤμων Νείλου τοῦ Νέου (Grottaferrata, 1972), 87.31–33.
22 On terracing, see, e.g., Patrich, Sabas, 82 and 151.
the necessity to carry water by hand or on donkeyback from a spring, stream, or well. In an arid region such as the Judean desert, elaborate waterworks were necessary to make use of every drop of rainwater to supplement the occasional spring or stream. The monks took advantage of natural depressions in the rock or built numerous cisterns to catch and store  

the winter rains, which were often channeled from roofs and courtyards by gutters and downspouts. The water could then be channeled to different parts of the monastic complex. Alternatively water might be brought from some distance by aqueducts, often simple dug channels (Fig. 6). At Mar Saba, almost every hermitage had its own cistern, to provide for the hermit’s personal needs and for watering his individual garden plot. An additional advantage of the reservoir system was that the silt that accumulated at the bottom of settling tanks furnished fertile soil for the gardens. Saints’ lives also mention rain barrels (in this case, pithoi) standing next to gardens, presumably to supply water for irrigation.

As noted above, in the better-watered areas of Greece and Anatolia, monastic founders generally took a good water supply into consideration in the selection of a construction site. Luke the Younger chose a spot “abundant in the purest water” and had only to clear away the brush from the spring to make its flow increase. When, however, founders chose arid locations, it became necessary to transport water from some distance or to devise com-

26 Patrich, Sabas, 100, 106–7.
27 Hirschfeld, Desert Monasteries, 159.
29 V. Luc. Steir., chaps. 54–55.
plicated supply channels. The site chosen by the future patriarch Nikephoros, for example, was watered only by rain, which did not soak into the ground but ran off immediately because of the steepness of the slopes. Nikephoros transformed the landscape and "replaced <its> barrenness with a reputation for fruitfulness, <its> aridity with the abundant rains of heaven. <He accomplished this> by enriching <the land> with an abundance of interconnected cisterns branching through the hollow rocks . . . <as a result the spot> imitates faithfully the paradise of God."30

Athanasios of Athos, on the other hand, relied not on rainwater cisterns but on water channeled from distant springs, as his vita describes in some detail:

And since there was a lack of abundant water at the site of the Lavra, he devised a way out of his difficulties and showed his great genius and cleverness. For after traversing many parts of Athos to find an abundant source of water and exerting much effort, he found a lofty and inaccessible site, which had water but was more than 70 stades (ca. 8 miles) distant from the Lavra. And he began to dig from that point, and excavating trenches in the steep and high slopes, and placing pipes in the channels, he transported a stream of water to the monastery from different sources.31

This water was brought inside the monastery for various purposes, being channeled past the cells. It was also directed to two mills and used to water the fruit trees and irrigate the gardens (κηποτ). Aqueducts were used to supply cisterns at other Athonite monasteries as well, such as Stavroniketa (Fig. 7) and Simonopetra (Fig. 3).  

Monastery Horticulture

With some exceptions, planting a garden was an essential aspect of monastic foundation, whether it be a solitary hermitage or an enormous complex housing hundreds of monks. The twelfth-century archbishop of Thessalonike, Eustathios, criticized hermits who withdrew to mountains and, like the Cyclopes, did not plow or plant anything, in fact, however, this lifestyle was characteristic of only a relatively small number of ascetics who survived by foraging for wild herbs, fruits, or nuts or emulated the example of St. Paul the

---

32 On Simonopetra, see S. Nomikos, “Water Supply—Irrigation—Water Power,” in Simonopetra: Mount Athos (Athens, 1991), 88–112. The typikon of Neophytos, in describing the irrigation channels dug to water the garden of the Enkleistra on Cyprus, comments that sometimes a violent downpour would produce too much water, which would bury the garden with sand and stones, requiring much labor for the monks assigned to remove this debris; cf. Tsiknopoullos, Κυπριακά τυπικά, chap. 18, p. 88.

33 Eustathios of Thessalonike, Commentary on the Odyssey, 1618.31–34, as noted in A. Kazhdan, “Ô tevleio” monaco; “hō tevleio” polemisth`; o sugkeramboi tōn koinnikōn ιδανικῶν στὸ Βυζάντιο,” Dodone 15 (1986): 211.

34 Hirschfeld (Desert Monasteries, 215) provides a good description of the “grazer” hermits of the Judean desert, who subsisted on wild plants such as melagria (asphodel), reed hearts, saltbushes, and wild caper buds,
First Hermit, who supplemented his diet of spring water and dates from the ancient palm tree that grew near his cave dwelling with a daily bread ration brought by a crow. In reality, most hermits did tend small garden plots, even St. Antony the Great, that model of the ascetic life. His biographer, Athanasios, tells us that when Antony first withdrew to the desert, he depended upon charitable donations of bread for survival. Later, however, when he moved to the greater solitude of the Upper Thebaid he became more self-sufficient. He settled at the foot of a mountain, where “there was water, crystal-clear, sweet, and very cold. Spreading out from there was flat land and a few scrappy date-palms.” In the beginning he accepted bread from his traveling companions and nomadic Arabs, supplementing his diet with dates from the palm trees. Realizing, however, that he was imposing upon others for his bread supply, he decided to raise his own grain. So he asked some visitors
to bring him a two-pronged hoe, an axe, and some grain. When these were brought, he went over the ground about the mountain, and finding a small patch that was suitable, and with a generous supply of water available from the spring, he tilled and sowed it. This he did every year and it furnished him his bread. He was happy that he should not have to trouble anyone for this. But later, seeing that people were coming to him again, he began to raise a few vegetables too, that the visitor might have a little something to restore him after the weariness of that hard road.

St. Antony’s small-scale garden in the Egyptian desert may have resembled the gardens still tended today by Bedouin in the vicinity of St. Catherine’s monastery in the Sinai peninsula (Fig. 8).

Archaeological excavation and survey work in the Judean wilderness have uncovered the remains of gardens attached to both hermitages (Fig. 9) and monasteries, identified by terracing or by the waterworks that irrigated them. One of the best examples is the vegetable plot of the hermit Kyriakos, known to us from his vita written by Cyril of Skythopolis. Cyril tells us that since the hermitage had no cistern, Kyriakos had made indentations in the

supplemented by bread and kidney beans brought to them from the outside world. See also Patrich, Sabas 8, 42–43.

35 Life of St. Paul the First Hermit, trans. H. Waddell, The Desert Fathers (London, 1936) 31, 35. The hagiographer comments that the palm tree provided Paul with food and clothing, presumably some sort of tunic woven from palm leaves or fibers.


38 Vita of Antony, PG 26:916–17; trans. Meyer, Life of Antony, chap. 50; cf. S. P. Bratton, Christianity, Wilderness, and Wildlife: The Original Desert Solitaire (Scranton, Pa., 1993), chap. 10. For the impression made on a 19th-century visitor to the monastery, located in an oasis, and its gardens, see G. J. Chester, “Notes on the Coptic Days of the Wady Natrun and on Dayr Antonios in the Eastern Desert,” Archaeological Journal 30 (1873): 113: “<The monastery’s> lofty walls enclose . . . large and beautiful gardens, abounding in vegetables and date palms, olives, carobs and other trees. These are watered by rills conducted from a magnificent spring, which bursting out of a cleft in the rock behind, falls into a round artificial basin hewn in the natural stone, and afterwards into a large covered reservoir. It was of course the existence of this delicious and copious Ain which, in the first instance, determined the position of the Convent . . . The charm of these beautiful and well-watered gardens in that ‘barren and dry land’ will be readily imagined.”
rocks in which he collected sufficient rainwater during the winter to serve both drinking and irrigation purposes during the summer, specifically for watering his vegetables. In fact, archaeologists found below his cave at Sousakim, a plot measuring ca. 25 m², and at a distance of ca. 250 m a second plot covering an area of ca. 40–50 m². At the monastery of Chariton the remnants of terraced garden plots totaling more than 18,000 m² can still be seen (Fig. 10).

On the Greek mainland a garden played an important role in the daily routine of the hermit Luke the Younger of Steiris. We learn from his vita that he planted his vegetable plot (here called a paradeisos) not for his own sustenance, but rather to keep himself busy with manual labor and to provide food and “ample delight to the eyes” of his visitors. His garden, although small, “was planted with . . . every variety of vegetables” and provided such an abundance that he gave the produce away with a liberal hand. Some guests were invited to pick the vegetables themselves and to cook them at the hermitage for their meal.

Hirschfeld, Desert Monasteries, 220. Another garden plot was found at a hermitage near ‘Ein er-Rashash in the northern Judaean desert; it had a terrace wall, was watered by a spring, and measured 5.5 × 1.2 m; cf. ibid., 218.
Hirschfeld, Desert Monasteries, 200.
V. Luc. Steir., chap. 19. See also chaps. 54–55 for the garden he planted at another hermitage later in his career. Chapter 41 relates how Luke brought a gift of vegetables from his garden to the bishop of Corinth.
V. Luc. Steir., chap. 28.
8  A Bedouin garden near St. Catherine’s monastery, Mount Sinai

9  Cliffside hermitage with garden terrace near Choziba, Judean desert
(photo: Y. Hirschfeld)
The planting of gardens, orchards, and vineyards was one of the first steps in the foundation of a new monastery complex, undertaken simultaneously with the construction of a church and cells. The intertwining of the establishment of garden and church (Fig. 11), as the two essential elements of monastery foundation, is demonstrated by a passage in the typikon for the monastery of the Savior at Messina. Its founder Luke writes that he planted the monks, “like some sacred shoots in this spiritual paradise of Christ. Then we most frequently irrigated <them> with the sweet and most fresh springs of the sacred commands and teachings.” In a subsequent paragraph he describes how he established “olive groves and vineyards, vegetable gardens, and very large buildings in the fields to receive the fruits of the harvest time and to serve as quarters for those laboring out there. In some places, too, we built and planted holy churches.”

Typikon of Luke, ed. J. Cozza-Luzi, “De typico sacro messanensis monasterii archimandritalis,” Novae patrum bibliothecae 10.2 (1905), 126; the English translation is a slightly modified version of that by T. Miller, Documents, 645. See also chap. 24 of the vita of Germanos of Kosmitza, where the planting of vineyards and gardens is mentioned in the same sentence as the construction of cells (AASS, May 3:10).
11 A monk gardening at the Great Meteoron monastery, Thessaly
(photo: Great Meteoron monastery)

12 Gardens outside Koutloumousiou monastery, Mount Athos
(photo: after Koutoumanos, *Athos from the Heavens*)
Gardens, vineyards, and orchards were planted both within and without the cloister walls, depending no doubt on the size of the monastery and the nature of the terrain (Fig. 12). They were typically walled (Fig. 13) and had a gate to keep out animals, both domesticated and wild. They provided the bulk of the monastic diet, which consisted primarily of bread, leafy and leguminous vegetables, fruit, wine, and olive oil. Dairy products, eggs, and fish were consumed more sparingly. Hagiographic and documentary sources provide more details about the varieties of vegetables grown in monastery gardens: the generic greens or láχάνα (which probably included lettuce, cabbage, and other leafy greens), onions, beets, squash, leeks, carrots, garlic, cucumbers; among the legumes were broad beans and chickpeas. Fruits such as apples, peaches, pears, figs, mulberries, cherries, grapes, melons, pomegranates, and oranges are known to have been grown in Greece and Anatolia, with dates and carobs being a staple in the Near East. The hagiographic sources reveal an ambivalent monastic

46 Hirschfeld, “Importance of Bread.”
47 Information on the varieties of fruits and vegetables available in monasteries has been drawn from Hirschfeld, “Importance of Bread,” 149–50; Hirschfeld, Desert Monasteries, 86–88; the Dumbarton Oaks Hagiography Database; and J. Koder, Gemüse in Byzanz (Vienna, 1993). For the reference to a Seville or bitter orange tree (nerantzá) at the monastery of Argyroi, killed by frost, see Theodore Balsamon’s epigram of lamentation, ed. K. Horna, “Die Epigramme des Theodoros Balsamon,” Wiener Studien 25 (1903): no. xxxi, pp. 193–94; for the name of the monastery, see R. Janin, La géographie ecclésiastique de l’Empire byzantin, vol. 1, Le siège de
attitude toward the consumption of fruit: in many texts, fruit is considered a standard part of
the monastic diet, suitable for ascetics, while elsewhere it seems to be considered as a
special treat and is described as the favorite food of children. Aromatic plants such as mint
and cumin added flavor to food and were also used in the preparation of a hot drink called
eukration or kyminaton. Besides fruits and vegetables, groves of nut and olive trees provided
additional food sources, as well as oil, and vineyards offered grapes for fresh and dried fruit,
wine, and vinegar.

The written sources furnish virtually no information on the location of the garden
within the monastic complex, nor the layout of its beds. We can perhaps get an idea of how
such a garden may have looked from the idealized plan for a vegetable garden at the ninth-
century western medieval monastery of St. Gall (Fig. 14). The garden is depicted with
eighteen beds, probably raised above the ground, each holding a different kind of vegetable
or herb. Walter Horn has suggested that this was a kitchen garden, where flavorful supple-
ments to the primarily vegetarian monastic diet were cultivated. He argues that root veg-
tables, squashes that grow on vines, cabbages, and legumes that take up a lot of room were
grown in more spacious gardens outside the monastery walls. Nonetheless, cabbage and
lettuce are mentioned on the St. Gall plan, along with onions and parsnips. In addition, the
garden grew garlic, celery, radishes, and chard, as well as herbs such as parsley, chervil, dill,
and coriander. The St. Gall vegetable garden was located right next to the orchard, which
curiously enough also served as the cemetery (Fig. 15). Horn has pointed out the conven-
ient location of the vegetable garden near the poultry runs and the monks’ latrine, sug-
gesting that both animal and human waste was used as fertilizer. Such use of manure in
Byzantine monastery gardens is attested by a passage in the vita of Athanasios of Athos
which explicitly describes the use of animal manure as garden fertilizer.

\[\text{49 In his rules on monastic penances, Theodore of Stoudios stipulates that anyone who tastes fruit before
it is blessed by the priest is to be deprived of it for the ensuing year (PG 99:1749a). This is the only food so
singled out. For fruit being the favorite food of children, see V. Luc. Steir., chap. 3, and D. Sullivan, The Life of Saint
Nikon (Brookline, Mass., 1987), 258, chap. 75.19–20.}\\n
\[\text{50 For cumin, see V. Luc. Steir., chap. 30; on eukration, Hirschfeld, Desert Monasteries, 88–89; on kyminaton,
\[\text{51 For this we have not only textual evidence, but also the actual remains of wine and oil presses at
monasteries; cf. Hirschfeld, Desert Monasteries, 106–11, and R. Frankel, “Oil and Wine Presses in the Southern
Levant in Antiquity,” DOP 51 (1997): 73–84.}\\n
\[\text{53 V. Athan. Ath. (A), 81, chap. 173.4–7. This passage is linked with the cleaning of latrines, but there is no
explicit statement that night soil was used as fertilizer. In this connection A. R. Littlewood has pointed out to me
that Columella, in the 1st century a.d., recommended the use of human excrement as fertilizer, although he
preferred bird dung, especially that of pigeons; cf. his On Agriculture, 2.14.1–2, trans. H. B. Ash (Cambridge,
Herb Gardens

The textual sources on Byzantine monasteries contain only the scantiest of allusions (and those indirect) to medicinal herb gardens, such as are familiar to devotees of Brother Cadfael, the twelfth-century Welsh herbalist detective created by Ellis Peters. Even so, I would argue that most Byzantine monasteries must have grown herbs for medicinal and culinary purposes, despite the virtual lack of hard evidence. I draw this conclusion from the following facts: Byzantine monastic complexes often included infirmaries and hospitals, both for their own religious and for laypeople; the hospitals employed pharmacists, who prepared the herbal remedies that were staples of both traditional Greco–Roman and popular medical practice, the aromatic herbs used in cooking and the preparation of hot drinks.

---

14 Plan of the vegetable garden at St. Gall (photo: after W. W. Horn and E. Born, The Plan of St. Gall, vol. 2 [Berkeley, Calif., 1979], 204, plan 426)
may also have been used therapeutically; the Prodromos in Petra monastery in Constantinople, associated with a hospital, owned a manuscript of the famous herbal treatise of Dioskorides, now in Vienna. Finally, in the post-Byzantine and modern periods, herbalists and herb gardens are attested at the monasteries of Mount Athos (Fig. 16).
Stories from hagiographic texts provide further indications that monks had some familiarity with herbal medicine and that medicinal herbs were used in a monastic context in the Byzantine era. During the course of a long journey, Athanasios of Athos is said to have healed the sore foot of a fellow monk by picking some wild herbs and pounding them into a paste that he applied to the skin. He covered the medicinal paste with a bandage of plane tree leaves.58 A fourteenth-century account of the miracles of St. Eugenios of Trebizond relates that a man suffering from a serious ear infection sought aid from a monk, who was asked “if he knew any herbs with which to treat someone suffering from this disease.”59 Finally, in the fourteenth-century Miracula of the Pege monastery in Constantinople, we read about a leper who bathed himself in the outlet of the miraculous Pege spring located at some distance from the church, rubbing himself with mud, hyssop (a European mint, cultivated in gardens as a remedy for bruises), and some of the wild herbs growing next to the water.60

60 Logos of Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos, ed. A. Pamperis, Νικηφόρου Καλλιστού Ξανθοπούλου περί συστάσεως τού σεβασμίου οίκου τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινούπολεί Ζωοδόχου Πηγῆς καὶ τῶν εἰς αὐτῷ ὑπερφυῶς τελεσθέντων θεαμάτων (Leipzig, 1802), no. 52, p. 70.
Byzantine Monastic Horticulture: The Textual Evidence

Regrettably there is no Byzantine source to correspond to the information on the ninth-century medicinal herb garden found in the plan of the St. Gall monastery (Fig. 17), nor the contemporary poem of Walahfrid Strabo on the herb garden at the monastery of Reichenau. The St. Gall herb garden, which was walled, was conveniently located in the part of the monastery that contained the infirmary (see Fig. 15). Sixteen different species of herbs grew there, including rosemary, lovage, fennel, and mint, each planted in a separate bed.61

Flower Gardens, Shrubs, and Trees

I have also found very little information on flowering plants and trees grown for aesthetic rather than practical purposes, such as are a common feature of modern Greek monastery courtyards (Fig. 18). There are some archaeological indications at the monastery of Khirbet-ed-Deir in the Judean desert that vines were grown on a trellis to provide shade for the courtyard,62 and the Lausiac History of Palladios describes a grapevine that grew all over the church at the Douka monastery near Jericho.63

The cypresses that adorned many monastery courtyards are interpreted by Theodore Metochites as symbolizing the spiritual ascent of monks: “the cypress, . . . in rising even to the skies, . . . proclaims without artifice to those who meditate there the way in which they are to walk and strive upward, laying aside gradually as they go up the excess of their material part and growing thinner as they rise.”64

Wild Animals and Gardens

One of the commonplaces in hagiographical descriptions of gardens is the intervention of wild beasts, normally in a destructive capacity but sometimes in a protective role. St. Antony, one of the earliest monastic gardeners, had to contend with the ravages of wild animals who would trample his vegetables as they came to the spring to drink. The garden of the hermit Kyriakos was a favorite haunt of wild goats, and deer trampled the beloved vegetable plot of St. Luke the Younger.65 Bears and wild pigs are also described as invading gardens and eating vegetables under cultivation.66 Often these stories introduce an account of the holy man’s miraculous command over wild animals, as he paralyzes a marauding deer,67 keeps a bear from eating a squash, causes a boar to drop dead as soon as it touches the

61 Horn and Born, St. Gall, 2:181–84.
63 C. Butler, The Lausiac History of Palladios, vol. 2 (Cambridge, 1904), 143.3–7. A. R. Littlewood informs me that in 1971 such a grapevine was growing on a trellis outside the katholikon of Chilandar (letter of 14 May 1998).
Plan of the medicinal herb garden at St. Gall
(photo: after Horn and Born, The Plan of St. Gall, 182, figs. 414 [top] and 414Y [bottom])
garden fence,\textsuperscript{68} employs a lion to guard his garden against wild goats,\textsuperscript{69} or uses words alone to persuade wild animals to stay away from his vegetables.\textsuperscript{70} At the same time they symbolize the monk's control over nature: not only does he subdue the forest or desert with his hoe, but he alters the behavior of the wild fauna which inhabit this domain, and whose intrusion may represent nature’s attempt to reassert itself.

Monastic Gardeners

Gardening was part of the manual labor performed by monks (Fig. 19). Since it involved arduous physical exertion, garden chores were often assigned to novices or young monks. Matrona of Perge and Theodora of Alexandria, two young nuns who had disguised themselves as monks, were set to work in the garden,\textsuperscript{71} as was the young George upon his arrival at Choziba and Sabas at the monastery of Flavianae.\textsuperscript{72} At the Pantokrator monastery, gardeners were ranked as servitors (\textit{douleutaiv}) together with the bakers and cooks.\textsuperscript{73} Other evidence as to the relatively lowly status of the gardener (\textit{khπourov}) is found in the typikon of the St. Mamas monastery: the monastery's gardener, two vinedressers, and the baker used the sign of the cross for their signatures, an indication of their illiteracy.\textsuperscript{74} A more explicit indication of the illiteracy of vinedressers is provided by the twelfth-century typikon of Neophytoys the Recluse, who states that because he had never been taught his letters he was assigned by the abbot to work in the vineyards. Only after five years of manual labor tending vines, when he had mastered the rudiments of reading and writing, was he given the position of assistant sacristan (\textit{parekklesiarches}).\textsuperscript{75} On the other hand, an educated and advanced monk might show his humility through horticultural labors; St. Hilarion, for example, worked in the garden of the Dalmatos monastery for ten years even though he had attained the great habit, to demonstrate his obedience to the abbot.\textsuperscript{76} Likewise, Emperor Romanos I is known to have tended a plot of lentils after he retired to monastic life following his deposition from the throne.\textsuperscript{77}

\textsuperscript{68} V. Sym. Styl. Jun., chap. 176.
\textsuperscript{69} \textit{Vita} of Kyriakos, chap. 16, ed. Schwartz, \textit{Kyrillos}, 232.12–25.
\textsuperscript{71} \textit{Vita} of Matrona of Perge, \textit{AASS}, Nov. 3:792r, chap. 5; K. Wessely, “Die Vita s. Theodorae,” \textit{Jahresbericht des k. k. Staatsgymnasiums Hernals} (Vienna, 1889): 29.3–7; 32.3–4, 9; 41.9–12.
\textsuperscript{72} (C. Houze), “Sancti Georgii Chozibitae confessoris et monachi vita auctore Antonio eius discipulo,” \textit{AB} 7 (1888): chap. 4, p. 99.4; \textit{vita} of Sabas, ed. Schwartz, \textit{Kyrillos}, 88.18. Other monastic gardeners include Elias Spelaiotes, who dug in the fields and garden even though he had only one good hand (\textit{vita} of Elias Spelaiotes, \textit{AASS}, Sept. 3:853a, par. 13), and Euthymios the Younger, who was attacked by demons while he was irrigating his garden (L. Petit, “Vie et office de St. Euthyme le Jeune,” \textit{ROC} 8 [1903]: 194.23–24). See this page (and note 76) for Hilarion of Dalmatos, who worked as a gardener for ten years at an early stage of his monastic career.
\textsuperscript{73} Pantokrator typikon, ed. Gautier, “Pantocrator,” 61.543.
\textsuperscript{74} S. Eustratides, “Τυπικά της ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει μονής τοῦ ἁγίου μεγαλομάρτυρος Μάιαντος,” \textit{Hellenika} 1 (1928): 304.
\textsuperscript{75} Tsiknopoullos, \textit{Κυριακή κυπικά}, 75.
\textsuperscript{76} \textit{Synaxarion}, 731–32. 52–53.
18 Flower garden at the Pantanassa monastery, Mistra
(photo: T. Gouma-Peterson)

19 A monk gardening at the monastery of St. Paul, Egypt
(photo: H. von Aderkas)
Theodore of Stoudios describes the principal duties of the gardener as sowing the vegetable seeds and watering and cultivating the vegetables so as to provide sufficient food for the monastic community. Failure to carry out these duties was punished by performing fifty to a hundred penitential prostrations (metanoiai). The vinedresser was responsible for pruning, hoeing, and otherwise tending the grapevines. The only evidence that nuns worked in convent gardens is found in the typikon of the Cretan nunnery of Damilas, where the two portresses were excused from shooing away birds and watering the plants and vines in the garden and vineyard; one may infer that these tasks were normally included among the duties of the other nuns (Fig. 20). Depending upon the size and location of the monastery gardens, outside lay workers might also be hired for horticultural work: at the nunnery of Chrysobalanton in Constantinople, for example, a young lay vinedresser named Nicholas fell in love with one of the nuns of whom he caught sight while working in the vineyard right next to the convent wall.

Horticulture in Urban Monasteries

So far I have focused on monasteries located in the countryside and explored ways in which monks converted forest or desert into gardens. In turning briefly to urban monasteries, and the impact of monastic gardens on the cityscape, I limit myself to the case of Constantinople. Monasteries were an important aspect of the urban scene of the capital from the early period of its development. Little attention has been given so far to the siting of monasteries in the capital, but it would be interesting to study the locations of new foundations over the centuries to see if there was any preference for sites on a hill, or with a sea view, or in a quiet suburb. Some monasteries were established in semi-rural regions just outside or even within the city walls, in spacious calm surroundings with a beautiful natural setting. Others, founded in the very heart of the city, were built in a more constricted space and probably limited horticultural activity to the interior of the complex.

Prokopios notes, for example, that Justinian established the Pege monastery (Fig. 21) in a suburb where there “is a dense grove of cypresses and a meadow abounding in flowers . . ., a garden abundant in beautiful <plants>, and a spring bubbling silently forth with a gentle stream of sweet water.” There is abundant evidence that many urban monastic complexes incorporated gardens and vineyards within or immediately outside their enclosure walls.

The early fifteenth-century traveler Clavijo comments, for instance, on the gardens, or—
chards, and vineyards located within the precincts of the monasteries of the Prodromos of Petra, Peribleptos, and St. George. A chapter from Theodora Synadene’s typikon for the nunnery of Sure Hope, describing the perimeter wall of the convent, provides a vivid image of the abundance of gardens in the vicinity of the monastic complex: the wall goes along the boundary between her son’s garden and the convent garden; it then passes another garden and comes to Theodora’s own apartments, where it passes by her garden, having on its left the vineyard of Theodora’s sister; later the wall passes by the vineyard for which she herself had arranged the planting.

In addition to cultivated plots within or immediately adjoining the monastic complex, monasteries acquired by purchase or donation gardens, orchards, olive groves, and the like in other regions of the city or in outlying suburbs. These are frequently attested in inventories of monastic property or in synodal acts ruling on disputes over vineyards and gardens belonging to monasteries.

The concern of monastic founders and benefactors not only with the functional purpose but the aesthetic impact of gardens and other plantings is suggested by a passage in the Chronographia of Michael Psellos describing Emperor Michael IV’s restoration of the Kosmidion monastery; in addition to the refurbished buildings, he mentions “lovely baths,

84 Typikon for Bebaia Elpis, ed. Delehaye, Deux typica byzantins, chap. 145, p. 95.
numerous fountains, beautiful lawns, and whatever else can delight or attract the eye.” 86 Likewise Constantine IX Monomachos surrounded the monastery church of St. George of Mangana with “lawns full of flowers,” water channels, and basins. “People marvelled at . . . the streams of water, . . . the lawns covered with flowers, the dewy grass, always sprinkled with moisture, the shade under the trees.” 87 The eleventh-century patriarch Constantine Leichoudes is praised by Psellos for the construction of waterworks permitting the installa-

tion of a garden and lawns at the convent he founded. A twelfth-century dedicatory epigram for the Pantokrator monastery alludes to grass and flowers, fountains, cypress trees, and gentle breezes. The fifteenth-century typikon of Patriarch Matthew I for the Charsianites monastery stipulates that the abbot is to entertain guests at mealtime only in the refectory, not in the garden, thus implying that he enjoyed dining al fresco. The best evidence on the appearance of urban monastery courtyards is found in Clavijo’s account of 1402: he mentions cypress, walnut, and elm trees within various monastic enclosures (Fig. 22).

It is well known that, as the population of Constantinople declined over the centuries, the area within the walls became much less congested, so that at the end of the empire the capital was more like a group of villages separated by wheat fields and vineyards. What has not been sufficiently appreciated is the role played by monastic horticulture in the “greening” of Constantinople, a topic that warrants further investigation.

The Garden as Metaphor for Monastery

It should not be surprising that the Byzantine monastery, whose irrigated gardens stood out in the dry Mediterranean landscape or in the crowded cityscape like a verdant oasis, was often described metaphorically in typika and saints’ lives as a paradisios, or garden. What could be more appropriate than that monks and nuns, who led an angelic life and were attempting to recreate the divine paradise, should be alluded to as plants and trees and their monastery as a garden? Some authors, extending the metaphor, referred to the

89 Volk, Gesundheitswesen, 190.
91 Markham, Clavijo, 30–31, 39. Cf. also the vita of Irene of Chrysobalanton, which describes the “two lofty cypresses . . . standing on either side of the forecourt, reaching far up into the air” (V.Irene Chry. 76.17–19). One might also note that the nunneries of St. Matrona in Constantinople was founded on the site of a rose garden (AASS, Nov. 3:806a, chap. 36), but we do not know if any roses survived the construction of the monastic complex.
92 Cf. Markham, Clavijo, 46: “Though the city is so large, it is not at all well populated, for in the middle of it there are many enclosures, where there are cornfields, and fruit gardens.” There are similar descriptions by other travelers to Constantinople in the Palaiologan period; cf. J. P. A. van der Vin, Travellers to Greece and Constantinople (Leiden, 1980), 1:254; 2:564, 569, 684. It should be noted that even earlier in the history of the capital, during the transition from the late antique to the middle Byzantine period, significant depopulation and abandonment of certain regions of the city occurred; cf. C. Mango, Le développement urbain de Constantinople (IVe–VIIe siècles) (Paris, 1985), 51–62.
93 Cf. the Life of Mary of Egypt, chap. 5 (PG 87:3701c), where the monks of the Judean desert were admirably re-creating the divine paradise.” L. Rydén noted that the goal of the desert father was “to reconstruct the Garden of Eden and anticipate Paradise” (“New Forms of Hagiography: Heroes and Saints,” The 17th International Byzantine Congress: Major Papers [New Rochelle, N.Y., 1986], 537); cf. also M. Angold, “Were Byzantine Monastic Typika Literature?” in The Making of Byzantine History: Studies Dedicated to Donald M. Nicol (Aldershot, 1993), 61.
94 Out of numerous examples, I note the following: vita of Nicholas of Stoudios (PG 105:877A and
Constantinople, Pammakaristos monastery in 1578, woodcuts (photo: after H. Hallensleben, “Untersuchungen zur Baugeschichte der ehemaligen Pammakaristoskirche, der heutigen Fethiye camii in Istanbul,” *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 13/14 [1963–64]: 132, figs. 2 and 3)
abbot or abbess as a gardener who nurtured his or her charges with the waters of spiritual instruction. One could cite the case of St. Matrona of Perge, whose convent in Constantinople was built appropriately on the site of a former rose garden and had herself worked for a while as a gardener while a monk in disguise; she is described by her hagiographer as a “spiritual husbandman who, receiving neglected and barren souls, tended them with careful and experienced ascetical attention; and when they had become fruitful through good works she offered them to Christ.” The future patriarch Ignatios (847–858, 867–877) as a young monk “was planted in the house of the Lord like a sapling, and having flowered in the courts of monastic life,” he soon bore fruit. The twelfth-century bishop Leo of Argos used the metaphor of transplantation of plants to describe his transfer of the nuns of Areia to a safer location at Bouze: “Just as one can see gardeners and farmers acting in accordance with their skill, and now setting the seedling of a plant in the earth and tending it for a while, and then removing it from there and transplanting it somewhere else, so that thereby the plant may proceed to firmer rooting and greater growth and earlier bearing of fruit, it so happened that I did this at this monastery.” It should also be noted that, like the typical garden, the monastery was enclosed by a wall and had a gate.

Variations on this theme include comparisons of a nunnery with a vineyard, “having virgins and nuns within like flourishing and beautiful vine branches, teeming with numerous large and excellent bunches of grapes,” or monks described as a swarm of bees set in the midst of a garden blooming with evergreen plants and all sorts of flowers. The horticultural imagery was even extended to the monastic peninsula of Mount Athos, where numerous manmade gardens, vineyards, orchards, and olive groves complemented the naturally verdant landscape; the holy mountain was sometimes called “the garden of the Panagia [the Virgin Mary].”

---

95 Cf., for example, V. Laz. Gal., AASS, Nov. 3:580A: έμμετρών Θεοκόμων εἴναι λογίζομαι Θυτεύοντα διάφορα φυτά καὶ κατὰ δύναμιν ὁρθάως τε τὰ πολλά καὶ τὴν λοίπην περὶ αὐτὰ ἐνείκνυμαι ἐπιμέλειαν. See also P. Karlin-Hayter, Vita Euthymii patriarchae CP (Brussels, 1970), 25, where Euthymios refuses to take over the leadership of an existing monastery, saying, “God forbid that ever I should water another’s plantation,” and that he did not want to divert the work of others into “the channels of my laws and rules.”

96 Vita of Matrona of Perge, AASS, Nov. 3:811n, chap. 48.

97 Vita of Patriarch Ignatios, PG 105:493b.

98 G. A. Choras, Η Αγία Μονή Απείτες (Athens, 1975), 239; note a similar horticultural metaphor at pp. 243–44.


100 This image is found in a dream vision of St. Elias Spelaiotes; cf. AASS, Sept. 3:864d, chap. 40.

Conclusion

The establishment of gardens and vineyards was an essential element of the foundation of most monasteries, except for those establishments that gave absolute priority to matters of the spirit: the monks had to clear tracts of virgin forest, terrace and fence the earth, store and channel water, and plant fruits and vegetables, so as to obtain a regular food supply. In the urban environment, monastery courtyards and gardens added open green spaces to the cityscape and afforded pleasant vistas for monastic residents and visitors alike. In building monasteries embellished with gardens, a secondary purpose was served as well: the creation of miniature versions of paradise on earth, where the abbot as spiritual gardener could nurture his seedlings with the waters of instruction in the scriptures and the patristic tradition to encourage the monks’ spiritual growth.

Dumbarton Oaks
Wild Animals in the Byzantine Park

Nancy P. Ševčenko

In early autumn of 1996, before the true gravity of his heart condition had been publicly revealed, Boris Yeltsin entertained a visiting head of state at a country retreat sixty miles north of Moscow. According to the New York Times, on this occasion Yeltsin shot forty ducks and a wild boar weighing more than 440 pounds. Later, he and his guest, Prime Minister Helmut Kohl of Germany, along with their respective entourages, feasted on the spoils of their hunt in the halls of the rural estate. In another notice three years earlier, the New York Times reported on the death of Pablo Escobar, drug lord of the Medellín cartel. The article included a description of Escobar’s 7,000-acre ranch in the mountains of Colombia: “he landscaped it with artificial lakes and imported hundreds of exotic animals, including giraffes, camels, bison, llamas, a kangaroo and cockatoos.”

These two recent notices suggest that little has changed when it comes to the interests and pursuits of royal, or quasi-royal, personages. In this essay I investigate the types of preserve evoked in these modern accounts—the game park and the animal park or menagerie—in the Byzantine period. While our evidence for the former, Byzantine game parks, is scattered and that for the latter meager indeed, the popularity of animal preserves among Byzantium’s neighbors and contemporaries makes us wonder whether Byzantium was really as uninterested as the scarcity of Byzantine sources on the subject might suggest. A closer look at the evidence is therefore in order. The material assembled here is limited for convenience to the middle Byzantine period and divided into three sections: game parks, menageries, and animal parks. This is still a preliminary study, however, and it should be stressed that the distinctions made here, if not downright anachronistic, were surely less clear-cut in the Byzantine period under review.

Game Parks

In Byzantium the major imperial hunts often took place, as one would expect, in wild territory at some distance from the city of Constantinople. Romanos II is said to have

I wish to thank Anthony Cutler, John Dixon Hunt, Christine Kondoleon, Thomas Leisten, Joan Barclay Lloyd, Scott Redford, D. Fairchild Ruggles, Engelina Smirnova, and William Tronzo. All have been extremely helpful in directing me to sources within their diverse fields of expertise, and this essay could not have been written without their kind assistance.

2 Ibid., 3 December 1993, A12.
3 On ancient hunting, see J. Aymard, Essai sur les chasses romaines des origines à la fin du siècle des Antonins
hunted deer in remote mountains. Emperor John II Komnenos was fatally wounded, according to the chronicler Kinnamos, in an encounter with a boar in the Taurus mountains in Cilicia; his son Manuel I hunted wherever he could from Syria to the Danube. To be sure, fierce creatures might appear unexpectedly even close to home: once at Damatrys in Bithynia, Manuel encountered a monstrous unidentified feline after a severe winter snow-fall; this beast he is said to have killed single-handedly after all of his men had fled in fear. Before he was emperor, Basil I killed a great wolf that had leapt unexpectedly out of a thicket during an imperial chase in the Philopation, just northwest of the city of Constantinople. Basil’s success on this occasion was later viewed as a sure sign of his imperial qualifications and destiny.

But these challenging hunts in open territory were often reduced to courtly stage-hunts within game preserves. The latter provided a concentrated and more controlled version of the same experience: the distances were smaller, the game more predictable—consisting mostly of small hoofed animals, hare, and boar—and since the park was often located

---


4 Leo Diakonos, Historia (Bonn, 1828), 30.22–23.
6 Kinnamos, 266.9–267.13; Brand, Deeds, 200. See also S. Runciman (as in note 16 below), 222.
close to a pavilion or even residence, there was always the gratifying possibility of having an audience following the course of the hunt from a nearby tower. Furthermore, much of the actual felling of the prey in such parks was done not by the huntsmen themselves or their dogs, but by falcons released to capture the hare or by a cheetah bounding from the back of a rider’s horse to down a deer.

This kind of park had to be laid out, landscaped, managed, and harvested with care. The Roman author Columella, writing his On Agriculture in A.D. 60, provided guidelines for the estate owner that would have been useful even centuries later:

Ancient custom placed parks for young hares, wild goat and wild boars near the farm, generally within the view of the owner’s dwelling place, so that the sight of their being hunted within an inclosure might delight the eyes of the proprietor and that when the custom of giving feasts called for game, it might be produced as it were out of store. . . . Wild creatures, such as roebucks, chamois and also various kinds of antelopes, deer and wild boars sometimes serve to enhance the splendour and pleasure of their owners, and sometimes to bring profit and revenue. Those who keep game shut up for their own pleasure are content to construct a park (vivarium) on any suitable site in the neighborhood of the farm buildings, and always give them food and water by hand. Those on the other hand who look for profit and revenue, when there is a wood near the farm (for it is important that it should not be far out of sight of the owner), reserve it without hesitation for the above-mentioned animals, and if there is no natural supply of water, either running-water

---


9 Koukoules, Κωκούλης, 27; E. Maguire, in Evans and Wixom, Glory of Byzantium, 261–64, 269. There is evidence for the use of felines in Slavic lands as well: Oleg, son of Prince Sviatoslav, gave to (or received from) Prince Iuri Vladimirovich Dolgorukii a leopard (pardus) when he visited Moscow in 1147, according to the Hypatian Chronicle, Polnoe sobranie russkih letopisej 2, 2d ed. (St. Petersburg, 1908; repr. Moscow, 1962), cols. 339–40; Der Aufstieg Moskaus: Auszüge aus einer russischen Chronik, trans. P. Nitsche (Graz-Vienna-Cologne, 1966), 41 (Nitsche thinks this gift was only a pelt). The current assumption that the hunting “leopards” were really cheetahs has been challenged by Pamela Armstrong, who notes the Byzantines had no word for cheetah: Bulletin of the Detroit Institute of Arts 71 (1997): 15. Physically, however, the creatures depicted in manuscripts and on pottery often have the long-legged, swayback frame of a cheetah, not that of a leopard. See the Pantechnes text cited above, note 3; the word translated by Miller as “once” is παρδάλις.
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is introduced or else ponds are dug and lined with mortar to receive and hold the rainwater. (9, praef., 1–2, Loeb ed., vol. 2, pp. 421–23)

Columella recommends enclosing this wood with a stone or brick wall, or with a fence in the form of a lattice of oak wood. For large areas, he recommends a rail fence with posts every eight feet. The soil should have lots of springs, and the woodlands be rich with fruits and natural fodder—grass, acorns, and other wild fruits. In winter, the park keeper (custos vivarii) should come with barley or wheat meal or beans, or grape husks, and feed the mother animals by hand. Small animals like hare should be given grain and herbs, wild endive and lettuce, thrown upon small beds of earth at intervals. After four years, the antelope and wild boar are ready to be turned into cash, while deer can be allowed to live considerably longer.10

Columella then turns to a discussion of the raising of bees, a sure indication of the extent to which this sort of game park was seen as a form of animal husbandry. Though he uses the term vivarium for both, Columella suggests a distinction between the area near the house—where the animals are kept to “enhance the splendour and pleasure of their owners” and are fed entirely by hand—and the large enclosed wood where the animals run free but where a proper environment for them is created or maintained—plenty of water, trees that provide nuts, fruits, and roots, special herbs planted in clumps for the rabbits—and where extra fodder is supplied when necessary in the winter season. He advises introducing tame animals of each species into the larger park to encourage their hesitant wild cousins to eat the special diet provided by the custos vivarii.11

We lack any prescriptive text comparable to that of Columella for the Byzantine period, but Byzantine game preserves there surely were. Some of the evidence is well known: Liudprand’s visit to a park in Bithynia, and descriptions of the Philopation, the park located just beyond the Blachernai walls, outside the city of Constantinople.

Liudprand, an envoy of the German emperor Otto I, was entertained in 968 at a state dinner in Constantinople by Emperor Nikephoros Phokas. Phokas could not resist asking Liudprand: does your master have perivolia (“id est briolia,” says Liudprand, later using the spelling “brolia”), and in them does he have onagers, that is, wild asses? Liudprand’s answer,


11 Here we should recall the famous story told by the Roman author Varro of his friend Q. Hortensius, who had on his estate an enclosed wood of around 30 acres, called a theriotropheion. Hortensius liked to dine with his friends in the midst of the wood, and for their amusement on such occasions a slave, carrying a lyre and dressed as Orpheus, would blow a horn and the denizens of the wood, especially boar and deer, would show up to be fed. Marcus Terentius Varro, De re rustica, 3.13.2–3: Varron, Économie rurale, ed. and trans. C. Guiraud (Paris, 1997), 34. A theriotropheion is apparently the Greek equivalent for Columella’s word vivarium. For the term θηριοτρόφος or “beast-rearer,” in the context of animal games in the East, see C. Roueché, Performers and Partisans at Aphrodisias in the Roman and Late Roman Periods (London, 1993), 73. St. Basil the Younger confronted a theriotrophos who arrived with a lion to intimidate him (see note 45 below).
that naturally his master has a perivolium and in it he has every kind of animal except onagers, evidently gratified Phokas, for he then proposed that he take Liudprand to visit his park and see the asses. A few days later, Liudprand went riding in the park (its location is unspecified), but when he spotted the asses, who were in a herd along with wild goats (capreis), he was less than impressed and said to himself that they looked just like the donkeys he could see any day in the market in Cremona. When his escort suggested that the emperor might conceivably be persuaded to give him a few asses to take home to his master Otto, saying that the wild asses would “bring him (Otto) no small prestige, since he will own something which none of his noble predecessors has ever seen,” Liudprand’s disdain (along with his refusal to take off his hat while riding near the emperor’s line of sight) must have galled the Byzantines, for Phokas ultimately sent him back not with any of the precious asses but with a pair of goats instead.\(^\text{12}\)

Phokas evidently took pride in his wild asses and deemed them the sort of animal one prince might give another in the endless one-up-manship of royal diplomatic exchange.\(^\text{13}\) The asses presumably reproduced in the park, or Phokas might not have been quite so generous with his offer—but one wonders to what extent, given that they were not native to the area, they served as regular quarry for the hunt or were actually eaten. Despite the clear evidence provided by a ninth-century fresco at Qusayr ’Amra in Jordan that wild asses were royally slaughtered by the Umayyads—they are shown being driven by dogs and men with torches into a paddock, where they are speared by the caliph, then bled and skinned\(^\text{14}\)—there is no mention of hunting in Liudprand’s account. In fact, Phokas’ attitude bespeaks an emperor who was as much a collector as a huntsman.\(^\text{15}\)

The other game park about which we have any information is the Philopation, a rolling landscape enclosed by walls, located north of Constantinople just outside the Blachernai walls. The sources relating to this park reveal that it was not all that heavily forested, since Odo of Deuil, a Latin chaplain who passed through the Philopation with King Louis VII of France in 1147, says diverse game animals (“speciosus multimodam venationem includens”) find hollows and trenches to hide in, instead of woods; this “deliciarum locus,” as Odo calls it, had waterways in the form of canals and ponds of the type considered essential by Columella, and pavilions, including the residence in which Louis was invited to stay.\(^\text{16}\)

---


\(^{14}\) M. Almagro et al., Qusayr ’Amra: Residencia y baños omeyas en el desierto de Jordania (Madrid, 1975).

\(^{15}\) According to R. Guillaud, “Études sur l’Hippodrome de Byzance VI: Les spectacles de l’Hippodrome,” BSI 27 (1966): 290, in 963 Phokas had exhibited in the Hippodrome dogs dressed in costumes of people all over the world, wild beasts with their guardians, a chained crocodile, a mule with two heads, and a wise dog who could pick out the greediest man in a crowd. But the reference Guillaud cites, C. Diehl, Dans l’orient byzantin (Paris, 1917), 381, is faulty, and I have not so far been able to locate the Greek source.

\(^{16}\) The sources on Philopation have been analyzed by Maguire, “Description of the Aretai,” 212; idem, “Imperial Gardens,” 184–86, 191–92; Littlewood, “Gardens of Byzantium,” 148–49. Odo of Deuil, De profectione
We have also a text describing Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos’ (1042–55) attempt to rid this park of predators who were devouring his game animals. The text is a Georgian life of St. George Hagiorites, who came to Constantinople in the mid-eleventh century. According to this vita, the emperor, determined to protect his herds, resorted to calling upon gypsies, who, by imitating animal calls, managed to attract and then eliminate the predators. Curiously enough, these predators—wolves perhaps?—more savage animals, at any rate, than the peaceful creatures inhabiting the preserve, were not themselves hunted down by the royal entourage, but had to be seduced by the gypsies (presumably specialists in animal behavior) instead. In his concern for the maintenance of his herds, Constantine Monomachos was in some sense acting as the proper manager of his estate, the custos vivarii mentioned by Columella. Similarly, it was said of Emperor Isaac I Komnenos, who ruled shortly thereafter (1057–59), that he went off to pursue game in its natural habitat since he was fearful of depleting the animals in his preserve.

Parallels for Byzantine game preserves have been found in Islamic and Sicilian hunting parks, especially the haunts of the Norman kings of the twelfth century around Palermo. According to Romuald of Salerno, a section of the hilly terrain above the city was enclosed by Roger II with a stone wall to contain fallow deer, roe deer, and wild boar; special trees were planted inside it, water was channeled to it, and a palace erected there. This is the area

---

18 On the wolf killed at Philopation by the future emperor Basil I, see p. 70 above.
19 Michel Psellus, Chronographie, 7.72–73, ed. E. Renauld, vol. 1 (Paris, 1926), 128–29. According to Psellus, Isaac went off to stay in an imperial lodge in an unspecified area surrounded by the sea, where he could hunt bear and wild boar all day long and well into the evening.
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known as Parco or Altofonte, up in the mountains seven or so miles southwest of Palermo; here Roger II went during the summer heat. Later, a continuous landscaped area in the plain below was carved out of Roger’s other park nearer Palermo (the “Parco Nuovo”) by William I and William II; this formed a belt of green around the city and connected the various royal solatie erected west of Palermo just outside the city walls (palaces such as William’s Zisa and Cuba), and was known as the Genoard, or paradise of the Earth. The latter park was located right beneath the Palazzo reale of the Norman kings and contained elaborate constructions for channeling water to the various pavilions. When destroyed in 1194 by Emperor Henry VI, it was apparently full of exotic animals (“omniumque bestiarum genere delectabiliter refertum”), according to Otto of St. Blaise. In contrast to the Altofonte, I have found no evidence to indicate that the Genoard was used for hunting.

Menagers

In addition to their stocked game parks, the Romans and early Byzantines had animal farms where beasts were raised for eventual use in the hippodrome. Just how long animal combats continued to be staged in the Hippodrome in Constantinople is an open question. Certainly al-Marwazi, the Arab physician who visited Constantinople in the early twelfth century, saw some such events taking place there: following concerts, wrestling matches, and races, all in the presence of the emperor and empress, he says “they set dogs upon foxes, then cheetahs upon antelopes, then lions upon bulls, while (the onlookers) feast and drink and dance.” Later that century, the traveler Benjamin of Tudela saw in the Hippodrome


22 On the relation of these various parks, see P. Caselli, “La Conca d’Oro e il giardino dell Zisa a Palermo,” in Il giardino islamico: Architettura, natura, paesaggio, ed. A. Petruccioli (Milan, 1994), 185–200. It is not entirely sure that the Genoard included the Zisa palace, Caselli, p. 189; Meier, Königspaläste, 150. On the Zisa, see most recently G. Bellafore, La Zisa di Palermo (Palermo, 1994); on the Cuba, G. Caronia and V. Noto, La Cuba di Palermo (Palermo, 1988).

23 Ottonis de Sancto Blasio Chronicna, ed. A. Hofmeister (Hannover, 1912), 61.26–62.1.

24 The piece of evidence most often cited for the presence of wildlife in the Genoard is a miniature captioned “viridarium genoard” in a late 12th-century manuscript of Peter of Eboli’s De rebus siculis carmen (Bern, Bürgerbibliothek 120, fol. 98r). The miniature shows birds and an awkward sort of hare or feline (perhaps a lynx?). For a color reproduction, see, for example, Caselli, “Conca d’Oro,” 187. Fazello, writing in the 16th century, says of the Genoard: “Ex una huioi pomerij parte, nequid regij luxus deesset, animalia omnis fere tum ad voluptatem, tum ad Palatij delicias ferini generis abunde nutriebantur”; T. Fazello, De rebus siculis decades duae (Palermo, 1558), 174, cited in G. Bellafore, Architettura in Sicilia nell’età islamica e normanna (827–1194) (Palermo, 1990), 60.


27 V. Minorsky, “Marwazi on the Byzantines,” AIPHOS 10 (1950): 462, repr. in his Medieval Iran and Its
“men from all the races of the world come before the king and queen with jugglery and without jugglery, and they introduce lions, leopards, bears and wild asses, and they engage them in combat with each other; and the same thing is done with birds. No entertainment like this can be found in any other land.” Animal combats in the Hippodrome may well have continued into the late twelfth century, although they could conceivably have been no more than the staged wild animal encounters of our own circuses. The eleventh-century frescoes in the northwest and southwest towers of the church of St. Sophia in Kiev also suggest that some kind of animal hunts, if not animal combats, took place in the Hippodrome, although the relation between the hunting scenes and the various Hippodrome entertainments on the register below remains somewhat ambiguous.

Although some exotic species familiar to the Romans then disappeared from Europe for centuries, wild animals continued to be shipped across the Mediterranean throughout the Middle Ages and played an important role in the language of both diplomacy and royal ceremony. Charlemagne requested and received his beloved elephant Abul Abbas from the caliph Haroun al-Rashid and was given in the course of his reign monkeys, a lion from Marmarika, and a Numidian bear. The royal menagerie in Tulunid Cairo (late 9th century) included leopards, panthers, elephants, and giraffes, and Byzantine ambassadors to Baghdad in 917 bore witness to the grand ceremonial role played by the lines of elephants, giraffes, leopards, and lions at the caliph’s palace along the bank of the Tigris River. Caliph

Neighbors (London, 1982), no.IX.

28 The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela, 21.2, trans. M. N. Adler (New York, 1907), 12–13. Benjamin says that the Hippodrome festivities he witnessed took place on Christmas day. Why Christmas? Public displays of this sort enlivened the Christmas day wedding of Manuel I to Maria in 1161, but this was not the year Benjamin was in Constantinople. Did a procession of exotic animals and birds with their keepers and trainers before the emperor in the Hippodrome evoke Magi bringing gifts? According to the De Ceremoniis, the emperor was acclaimed at the church of the Holy Apostles on Christmas day with the words: “May he who gives life, O ruler, exalt your horn in all the universe, may he enslave all the nations to offered, like the Magi, presents to your royal power,” 1.1, Constantin Porphyrogénète, Le Livre des Cérémonies, trans. A. Vogt (Paris, 1967), 33.21–24.

29 O. Powstenko, The Cathedral of St. Sophia in Kiev (New York, 1954), figs. 170–200. In the southwest tower are a so-called bear hunt, squirrel hunt, and wild horse hunt, along with a possible boar hunt and cheetahs? pursuing and devouring a deer, figs. 170–71. In the northwest tower is another potential bear hunt, figs. 183, 188. Most of these take place in a landscape setting, possibly an artificial one; cf. Kondoleon, Domestic and Divine (note 7 above).


32 G. Wiet, Cairo: City of Art and Commerce, English trans. S. Feiler (Norman, Okla., 1964), 5–6; see also 149–50 for later elephants and giraffes.

Abd al-Rahman III at Cordoba received large numbers of animals as gifts: lions, horses, twenty-three camels, two beautiful gazelles, and eight ostriches from one source in 930–931, and from another source another year ten dromedaries, twenty pregnant camels, a lion, fine horses, and other animals. Such animals often arrived accompanied by their handlers, which added to their exoticism. Otto I of Germany got two lions as an Easter present in 950 and owned camels, apes, and ostriches as well. King Henry I of England kept lions, lynxes, leopards, camels, and a porcupine within a stone-walled enclosure at Woodstock, outside Oxford, around 1130. Emperor Frederick II assembled a sizable menagerie in Lucera in Apulia in the first half of the thirteenth century; he traveled, even on campaign, with his elephant and giraffe, camels (which he bred), lions, leopards, and ostriches, and rode ahead of them in triumphal processions.

It would be surprising had the Byzantines been indifferent to what the rest of the medieval world was doing, from caliphs to petty French and English lords. And indeed special animals are occasionally mentioned in Byzantine sources. In 1053, Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos was sent a giraffe and an elephant from Egypt, presumably in response to a large shipment of wheat he had provided at a time of famine. Michael
Psellos noted that this type of diplomatic gift was now commonly being substituted for more traditional ones such as silks or jewels.40 Around 1261, Emperor Michael VIII received a giraffe from Baybars, the sultan of Egypt, who was negotiating for slave trade routes on the Black Sea. The historian Pachymeres tells us that the giraffe proved a delight for those who saw it walked daily (?) through the agora. Its appearance so impressed him—he describes it in detail “to remind those who have seen it and to enlighten those that have not”—that we can presume that no such animal had been seen in Constantinople for quite some time.41

In his encomia to Monomachos, Psellos relates how the giraffe and elephant were brought into the Hippodrome, and how when the elephant reached the spot where Monomachos was sitting, it knelt before him.42 The honor paid the emperor was magnified, since this gesture of respect was being made by what Psellos terms the very largest animal in the world. However, Psellos does not stress the emperor’s dominion, like an Adam or even an Orpheus, over the animals,43 but rather his influence in foreign territories of which the animals are a symbol and from which they are a precious gift. Psellos praises the idea of a wide-ranging peace: Constantine Monomachos has seen to it that his subjects can now walk freely and without fear in the remotest parts of the earth.44 Possession of exotic animals, for Psellos, then, does not bespeak triumph and dominion so much as the success of agreements and treaties with other powerful foreign powers, and prestige in a competitive hierarchy of potentates.

There is one wild animal held in captivity in Byzantium about which we can collect a certain amount of further information, namely, royal lions: in this respect, at least, Byzantium seems to have kept up with the Joneses. In 896, we are told, Emperor Leo VI used a real lion kept in the palace to threaten an insubordinate saint, St. Basil the Younger.45 In 1022, Em-
peror Basil II, according to Skylitzes, had a traitor in the service of Xiphias thrown to the lions, reviving a long defunct mode of execution, *condemnatio ad bestias*, though just where the event took place is not specified. Additional evidence that Byzantine imperial lions were not only made of silk or gold can be found in Crusader sources. One story concerns the English strongman Hardigt, who in 1072 burst uninvited into the court of the imperial palace, only to come face to face with at least three lions, which he managed, like Samson, to overcome bared-handed (our source, needless to say, is a Latin one). The feat apparently so impressed the Byzantine emperor Michael VII that Hardigt was hired as a palace guard on the spot.

This story might seem a bit fanciful did we not find the same thing taking place again around thirty years later, when in 1101 the Lombard Crusaders approached the area of the Blachernai palace and camped outside the city walls. The Norman historian Ordericus Vitalis reports that Emperor Alexios I Komnenos at first dismissed the problem of this rowdy and obstreperous group that was clamoring for provisions and refusing to move on. “But when he realized that they were persisting in their efforts, he commanded that three fierce lions and seven leopards (‘tres ferocissimos leones et septem leopardos’) should be driven between the middle and outer walls. He also posted guards on the third wall, against which the palaces of the nobility were built, and commanded that the gates be barred. So, derisively, he proposed to frighten away the westerners with wild beasts, and defend the imperial city without human force.” When the Franks broke through the outer gate, “instantly the fierce lions sprang on the first men to enter and injured some whom they savaged with teeth and claws, tearing men who were caught unawares and had no experience of fighting wild animals. But the attack of beasts could not defeat the wit of man for long. Armed champions sent spears and javelins whistling to strike down the wild animals and after killing the lions drove away the leopards, chasing them as they fled up to the middle wall. Then the leopards, creeping forward like cats, leapt over the wall, and the troops of westerners entered through the gate in the second wall and attempted to take the third by assault.”

Temporary lions at Cordoba were also used to terrorize criminals; Ibn Hayyan, *Crónica*, 41–42.

---

46 Skylitzes, 367.68–70. The incident is illustrated in the 12th-century Skylitzes manuscript in Madrid (B.N. vitr. 26–2, fol. 196r), S. Cirac Estopañan, *Skyllitzes Matritensis* (Barcelona-Madrid, 1965), fig. 486. On *condemnatio ad bestias*, see, e.g., Roueché, *Performers*, 78. Caliph Haroun al-Rashid had a lion pit into which he tossed his adversaries; Loisel, *Ménageries*, 185.


palace the Lombards also killed the emperor’s pet lion, which had been kept as a friend in the palace.\footnote{Albert of Aachen, \textit{Jerusalem History}, book 8.4, trans. H. Hefele, \textit{Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzugs} (Jena, 1923), 2:76. Pet felines were often found in royal palaces, down to the time of Haile Selassie of Ethiopia.}

We would like to know just where these lions, which seem to have been used as a sort of backup palace guard,\footnote{Ciggaar, “L’émigration anglaise,” 337. The 10th-century Samanid ruler Nasr b. Ahmad b. Nuh kept two lions by his very throne, resting their heads on his thighs. Visitors had to approach him along a route lined with lions and their trainers, and the lions turned to follow the visitors from behind as they made their way forward. The experience was so alarming to one set of envoys in 938 that they actually “fainted and soiled themselves”; they were to attempt and fail the approach six more times in the next months before the ruler took pity on them and called off the lion guard; al-Qaddumi, \textit{Book of Gifts}, 160–61; see also 164–65.} were ordinarily housed. The lion confronting St. Basil the Younger is said to have been brought from the “Oikonomeion.”\footnote{On the Oikonomeion in the Great Palace, see P. Magdalino, “The Bath of Leo the Wise and the ‘Macedonian Renaissance’ Revisited: Topography, Iconography, Ceremonial, Ideology,” \textit{DOP} 42 (1988): 99–100.} The Crusader sources suggest that the lions in those days were kept somewhere in or near the imperial palace at Blachernai.\footnote{In Moorish Spain, lions were kept in a ravine under a bridge in front of the Alcazar at Cordoba; in England, the royal lions were kept in the “Lion Tower” at the base of the Tower of London; in France, King Philip VI established them at the “hôtel des lions du Roi” at one corner of the Louvre palace garden in 1333. One of the lions at Cordoba escaped and wandered into a mosque, startling a holy man praying there, who ordered it out; Ibn Hayyan, \textit{Cónica}, 41–42. On the Tower Menagerie ca. 1245–1832, see Keeling, \textit{Where the Lion Trod}, 5–14. The menagerie was located near the entrance to the Tower, in front of the Middle Tower. Three leopards were given to King Henry III by Emperor Frederick II, and eventually lions were moved into the house 40 feet long and 20 feet deep that Henry had built originally for his elephant (see note 34 above). On the Louvre lions (later moved to the suburban palace of Saint-Pol), see Loisel, \textit{Ménageries}, 169–72.} In 1185 the despised Andronikos I was confined in the so-called prison of Anemas, a tower adjacent to the Blachernai palace; his chains are described as the iron collars used to fetter the lions in their cages.\footnote{Choniates, ed. van Dieten, 349, trans. Magoulias, 192.}\footnote{In Turkish times, what Pierre Belon in the sixteenth century called the “bestes cruelles”—including lions, lynx, leopards, bears, and wolves—were kept near the Hippodrome, at first perhaps in what had been the Byzantine church of St. John of the Diippion, later surely in the lower story of the nearby “Arslanhane,” once the church of Christ Chalkites erected by Emperor John Tzimiskes in the tenth century; Belon saw a lion chained to each pier of the ancient church.\footnote{J. Lassner, \textit{The Topography of Baghdad in the Early Middle Ages} (Detroit, 1970), 266 n. 2 = palace of al-Ma’mun (813–833); 85 = palace of al-Muqtadir (908–932).} The “zoo” at Madinat al-Zahra, the tenth-century palace of

[108x689]We would like to know just where these lions, which seem to have been used as a sort of backup palace guard,\footnote{Ciggaar, “L’émigration anglaise,” 337. The 10th-century Samanid ruler Nasr b. Ahmad b. Nuh kept two lions by his very throne, resting their heads on his thighs. Visitors had to approach him along a route lined with lions and their trainers, and the lions turned to follow the visitors from behind as they made their way forward. The experience was so alarming to one set of envoys in 938 that they actually “fainted and soiled themselves”; they were to attempt and fail the approach six more times in the next months before the ruler took pity on them and called off the lion guard; al-Qaddumi, \textit{Book of Gifts}, 160–61; see also 164–65.} were ordinarily housed. The lion confronting St. Basil the Younger is said to have been brought from the “Oikonomeion.”\footnote{On the Oikonomeion in the Great Palace, see P. Magdalino, “The Bath of Leo the Wise and the ‘Macedonian Renaissance’ Revisited: Topography, Iconography, Ceremonial, Ideology,” \textit{DOP} 42 (1988): 99–100.} The Crusader sources suggest that the lions in those days were kept somewhere in or near the imperial palace at Blachernai.\footnote{In Moorish Spain, lions were kept in a ravine under a bridge in front of the Alcazar at Cordoba; in England, the royal lions were kept in the “Lion Tower” at the base of the Tower of London; in France, King Philip VI established them at the “hôtel des lions du Roi” at one corner of the Louvre palace garden in 1333. One of the lions at Cordoba escaped and wandered into a mosque, startling a holy man praying there, who ordered it out; Ibn Hayyan, \textit{Cónica}, 41–42. On the Tower Menagerie ca. 1245–1832, see Keeling, \textit{Where the Lion Trod}, 5–14. The menagerie was located near the entrance to the Tower, in front of the Middle Tower. Three leopards were given to King Henry III by Emperor Frederick II, and eventually lions were moved into the house 40 feet long and 20 feet deep that Henry had built originally for his elephant (see note 34 above). On the Louvre lions (later moved to the suburban palace of Saint-Pol), see Loisel, \textit{Ménageries}, 169–72.} In 1185 the despised Andronikos I was confined in the so-called prison of Anemas, a tower adjacent to the Blachernai palace; his chains are described as the iron collars used to fetter the lions in their cages.\footnote{Choniates, ed. van Dieten, 349, trans. Magoulias, 192.} In Turkish times, what Pierre Belon in the sixteenth century called the “bestes cruelles”—including lions, lynx, leopards, bears, and wolves—were kept near the Hippodrome, at first perhaps in what had been the Byzantine church of St. John of the Diippion, later surely in the lower story of the nearby “Arslanhane,” once the church of Christ Chalkites erected by Emperor John Tzimiskes in the tenth century; Belon saw a lion chained to each pier of the ancient church.\footnote{J. Lassner, \textit{The Topography of Baghdad in the Early Middle Ages} (Detroit, 1970), 266 n. 2 = palace of al-Ma’mun (813–833); 85 = palace of al-Muqtadir (908–932).}
Abd al-Rahman III near Cordoba, has not yet been excavated; it appears on site plans as a rectangular area in the lowest terraced area of the palace complex, near gardens and the cavalry barracks, and is described as having been surrounded by a moat. 57

A poem by the tenth-century Byzantine author John Geometres offers an intriguing passage to the effect that in a park, which Henry Maguire has identified as the Aretai park west of Constantinople, the multitude of animals “having left every part of the world, has found this place here as its common home.” 58 This passage might suggest that species from distant lands inhabited the Aretai, although the only animals then mentioned by name are the usual hare and roe deer. 59 A canon table miniature in a small Byzantine Gospel manuscript of the late eleventh century (Paris, B.N. gr. 64 fol. 6r) shows an elephant, along with a camel and his handler, approaching a fountain, and this motif recurs in various other contemporary manuscripts. 60 The garden setting may be symbolic of Eden, but could conceivably reflect a real setting as well.

Animal Parks

The walled gardens of Byzantine literary romances are filled with songbirds, and with birds of signal beauty, such as peacocks, 61 but the only animals present in these poetic gardens seem to be painted or sculpted ones. This absence of animals in the Byzantine garden is by no means surprising: rabbits, goats, and deer, no matter how graceful or how tame, would scarcely be welcome in a cultivated space that they were quite capable of nibbling away.

Yet one wonders whether there did exist reserved areas that were neither gardens nor menageries nor game preserves, areas in which valued species could be raised without cause-

57 Ibn Khaldun, as in note 62 below; M. Barrucand and A. Bednorz, Moorish Architecture in Andalusia (Cologne, 1992), 65.
58 Ὑπὸ τὰ πλήθη, θηράς, ὄρνεις, ἑχθάς; Διὸ καὶ λυπόντα πάντα τοῦ κόσμου τῶν/ Ως οἶκον ἐφέν
61 Littlewood, “Gardens of the Palaces,” 34. In the garden of the palace of Digenes Akritas on the Euphrates, there were tame peacocks, parrots, and swans; “the swans browsed for food in the water, the parrots sang in the branches among the trees, the peacocks paraded their wings among the flowers and reflected the flowers’ colours in their wings”; Digenis Akritis: The Grottaferrata and Escorial Versions, ed. and trans. E. Jeffreys (Cambridge, 1998), Grottaferrata Book 7:31–41 (p. 205).
ing damage to the garden itself and without danger of being hunted. The gifts sent by Emperor Michael VI (1056–57) to the Fatimid caliph al-Mustansir bi-Allah, included, along with “huge bears which play musical instruments” and special dogs, rare species of birds: white partridges, white peacocks, white cranes, white ravens, and white starlings. Such birds strongly suggest the existence of an imperial aviary.\(^6\)

Even the practical Columella had spoken of the aesthetic value of certain animals to the owner of an estate, and had suggested setting aside an area near the house where the tamer animals could be enjoyed and fed by hand.\(^6\) Cultures neighboring Byzantium maintained animal parks of just this kind. The Byzantine ambassadors to Baghdad in 917 visited not only the awesome display of lions but also the so-called Park of the Wild Beasts. “Then the envoys were led . . . to the passageways and vestibules of the [wild] animal enclosure (hayr al-walsh). Here were herds of tamed animals of various kinds, which came up close to people, sniffing at them, and taking food from their hands.”\(^6\) Marco Polo encountered a comparable park toward the end of the thirteenth century much farther east, in the palace complex of Kubla Khan in Peking: “Between the inner and the outer walls . . . are stretches of park-land with stately trees. The grass grows here in abundance, because all the paths are paved and built up fully two cubits above the level of the ground, so that . . . the moisture trickles over the lawns. . . . In these parks there is a great variety of game, such as white harts, musk-deer, roebuck, stags, squirrels, and many other beautiful animals. All the area within the walls is full of these graceful creatures, except the paths that people walk on.”\(^6\)

And in the medieval West too, we occasionally hear of an intermediate area between the hunting park and the domestic garden, a park replete with favored animals and birds located just outside the garden wall. Frederick I Barbarossa had erected by 1158 a new palace for himself at Kaiserslautern, according to the chronicler Rahewin. “On one side he surrounded it by a strong wall; the other side was washed by a fish pond like a lake, supporting all kinds of fish and game birds, to feast the eye as well as the taste. It also has adjacent to it a park (hortus) that affords pasture to a large herd of deer and wild goats. The royal splendor of all these things and their abundance (which precludes enumeration) are well worth the spectator’s effort.”\(^6\) The use of the word hortus for the area suggests that it was more a “Tiergarten,” or


\(^{63}\) See above, p. 71.

\(^{64}\) Le Strange, “Greek Embassy,” 41; cf. al-Qaddumi, Book of Gifts, 164. This tour given to the Byzantine envoys had a particular logic to its sequence: it started mildly enough, with a visit to a stable where a thousand caparisoned mares were arranged in two rows, progressed to the wild animal park, then to a pavilion with elephants and giraffes, and ended up at the palace where a hundred lions were displayed in two rows, “each held by a lion-trainer and having an iron chain around its neck.”

\(^{65}\) The Travels of Marco Polo, trans. R. Latham (Harmondsworth, 1958), 126. At one corner of this park there was a fishpond, graced with swans and other waterfowl, from which the animals could drink.

animal park, than a hunting park. The French park of Hesdin in Burgundy, begun in the late thirteenth century, is another such example: though we don’t know just how large it was or how its various spaces were divided, it had forest and meadow areas, ponds, orchards, stables, an aviary, and a menagerie at one corner of the grounds. The nearer landscape was graced with flocks of peacocks, herons, and swans, and a large fountain was built close to the castle so that Duke Philip the Good could watch the deer from the windows of his palace as they drank.67

In the work of Piero de’ Crescenzi, a medieval author writing ca. 1305, we learn how this kind of park should be constructed. In his chapter “On the gardens of Kings and other illustrious and rich lords,” he says:

The spot should be of 12½ acres or more, and surrounded by convenient and lofty walls; in the north part a grove of diverse trees should be planted, into which wild creatures placed in the garden may fly and hide. On the south part, let a handsome palace be built . . . In some part of the garden a fish pond should be made in which diverse kinds of fish may be nourished; hares, stags, roebucks, rabbits, and the like harmless beasts may be put amongst the bushes, a shelter being made, the roof and walls of which are formed of closely woven boughs. In this too are to be put pheasants, partridges, nightingales, blackbirds, goldfinches, linnets and all other kinds of singing birds. If there are rows of trees close to the palace, they should run from the palace to the grove but not crosswise, so that one can see easily from the palace whatever the animals do in the garden.68

The prescribed area is relatively small (12½ acres), and there is no question here of hunting. Illustrations to de’ Crescenzi’s text, combined with images in other late western medieval manuscripts reveal a parklike world just beyond the garden wall inhabited by stags, peacocks, and other elegant or rare fauna.69 Terms such as “Little Park” (which in England is opposed to the “Great Park,” or hunting park) or the “Petit Paradis” (as at Hesdin) refer to a space lying somewhere between game park and garden enclosure reserved for a variety of semi-wild creatures valued particularly for the rarity and beauty of their appearance.70
Whether such parks existed in Byzantium, even as a concept, is hard for us to determine at present. Certain images suggest that members of the Byzantine aristocracy may indeed have developed a taste for parks of this sort. Both the canon tables and the headpieces in manuscripts of the Gospels have from earliest times included lifelike images of birds, and eventually animals, above the arches or square carpet designs. These birds may be little more than a general reference to the flourishing of nature attendant upon the Word of God, and the fountains above the headpieces the Fountain of Life, the Source made available to all of creation. But in certain Komnenian miniatures of the late eleventh and the twelfth century we find carefully observed fauna of the kind usually associated with courtly gardens in the West: deer and gazelles, pheasants, peacocks and guinea hens, cranes and herons, parrots and finches, swallows and doves, foxes and even a monkey or so, along with the usual hunting creatures of the aristocracy: dogs, cheetahs, falcons, and their prey, the partridge and hare. As the tightly controlled ornamental patterns of these headpieces evoke the garden, so one wonders whether these pairs of animals and birds might evoke the denizens of an aristocratic patron’s park. Animals inhabiting the ornamental borders of Renaissance manuscripts sometimes depict specific creatures that were owned by the patrons or that refer in a punning way to the family name. In Byzantium the recognizable species are admittedly routinely joined by mythical ones, but the vivid creatures do suggest

park”); Landsberg, Medieval Garden, esp. 21–24 (“The Pleasure Park, or Little Park”); Hennebo, Garten des Mittelalters, esp. 104–11.


that these types of fauna were not unfamiliar to the Byzantine aristocratic household.

The poem by Manuel Philes devoted to the painted ceiling of the imperial bedchamber might also echo this intermediate kind of aristocratic park. The poem passes from an evocation of the flowers of the trellislike ceiling to the animals present in the painted grove: carnivorous beasts, fowl, hares, deer, peacocks, and a lion. Antony Littlewood has quite rightly cautioned us against reading this poem too literally as a description of an actual garden. But Philes’ garden is not the usual metaphorical one either: it is neither replete with traditional allusions to Eden, nor is it presented as the Peaceable Kingdom of Isaiah, as is so often the case in garden poetry. Its components remind us strongly of Hesdin and of de’ Crescenzi (with whose writings this poem is virtually contemporary), even of a late medieval western tapestry, with its diversity of animals, its aviary, menagerie, and the roof of closely woven boughs. Here the theme is not so much the peaceful coexistence of beasts foretold by Isaiah, as it is that the isolation of the diverse species in the garden park and attention to what we would call a sort of balance of nature are clues to the harmony of the whole and the success of the garden. The meat-eating animals, says Philes, will eat only the herbivores, which in this way are kept from overgrazing the meadow; the fowl are kept in circular pens to keep them off the grass. The rabbits are confined for their own safety, and the lioness is kept in a woven pen to nurse her cubs and to keep her from chasing the deer. Philes attributes all this good sense to the painter, but of course the message is that the emperor himself should be as good a custodian, epimeletes, of the grove; he is implicitly encouraged to manage the empire and presumably its peoples in the same wise fashion.

The distinctions between the various kinds of parks described here can never have been entirely clear-cut. Many exquisite birds and beasts from the park, menagerie, or aviary doubtless ended up as food for the royal table, while herds maintained primarily for hunting gave aesthetic, as well as athletic, pleasure to their owners. Yet the material from the medieval cultures other than Byzantium surveyed here does show a certain widespread division between hunting park, menagerie, and garden, with the so-called Little Park or Petit Paradis sharing traits of all three and being everywhere the most difficult to define. If we can trace its existence at all in Byzantium, the implications of this kind of pleasure park for the study of the imperial and aristocratic self-image and taste, of patterns of international exchange, or of the state of zoological knowledge, could be of considerable interest. But first we need more sources.

---


77 Littlewood, “Gardens of the Palaces” 34.

In the meantime it is important to keep two things in mind: royal animal imagery was still being reinforced, even in Byzantium, by the presence of real animals at the court; and whatever their character, all these areas enclosing animals, whether extensive game preserve or more intimate animal park, were areas that needed to be carefully laid out and maintained. Effective boundaries had to be constructed, whether through the digging of trenches or the erection of walls or fences. Trees were specially planted within the enclosure to provide cover, fodder, and even sight lines to ensure views of the animals; waterways, in the form of running streams, canals, ponds, or fountains, were constructed both to water the animals and birds and to divide and protect the individual species. Whether intended for the hunt or simply for the visual enjoyment of their royal owners, these parks were important elements in the designed landscape of the medieval world.

Philadelphia
Byzantine Gardens and Horticulture in the
Late Byzantine Period, 1204–1453:
The Secular Sources

Costas N. Constantinides

Despite the attractiveness of the theme and the work of colleagues in recent years,¹ the Byzantine garden is still not well known, mainly because of the paucity of sources. I have chosen to examine, by use of the secular literature, the late Byzantine period, from ca. 1204 to the fall of Constantinople to the Ottoman Turks in 1453. This period seems to have been less thoroughly investigated than have most earlier periods, and a concentration on it should produce a more coherent picture than another attempt to cover the whole span of Byzantine history. It is, moreover, the only period from which there survives any sizable quantity of documentary evidence for productive gardens.

During these last 250 years of Greek rule, conditions drastically curtailed the tradition, which stretched back to Hellenistic times, of building luxurious villas, mostly outside the cities, with pleasing gardens, as appear in mosaics and frescoes or are recorded in texts. At a time when the safety of the countryside was shaken, especially after around 1300, this had become practically impossible. Nevertheless, it appears that the declining empire continued to uphold the ideals and culture it had preserved for centuries. Although the pleasure garden seems to have been gradually replaced by the profitable vegetable garden, or the flower garden of the household by the kitchen garden, there were individuals of considerable culture and wealth who could, always within the limits of Christian piety, appreciate pleasure gardens and ensure their continued existence, however precarious, in the big cities. Poets used the color and fragrance of flowers in their poetry; rhetoricians, following an old tradition, spoke appreciatively of the presence of gardens in cities or outside public buildings in their encomia, or ekphraseis; scholars continued to study and copy the relevant textbooks, like the Geoponika, while a few intellectuals went beyond the traditional limits and composed works like the Porikologos (“Fruit Book”), where many fruits are presented as

taking part in legal procedures satirizing court ceremonial. That flowers continued to exist in the minds of people, though not always in their kitchen gardens, is apparent from the many proverbs in both the high and the demotic style which were in everyday use in both the written and the oral language during the late Byzantine period.

Productive Gardens

During the period under investigation the Byzantines lost much of the countryside that had supplied the towns and cities with fruit and vegetables. Many peasants were forced to abandon their farmlands and take refuge in the walled towns or flee to Constantinopole and the other lands still in Christian hands as Turkish tribes advanced quickly through Byzantine territory in both Asia and Europe. This development turned the neglected areas into uncultivated regions of wild nature, while many deserted settlements soon fell into ruins. When Michael VIII Palaiologos took an army into Bithynia in the autumn of 1281 to combat the threat from a Turkish tribe later to be known as the Ottomans, he found the area of the Sangarios River abandoned and impassable. Having known this region well from his service there as a young general some thirty years earlier, he fell into despair on seeing what he described as a “Skythian desert.” There were, however, still abundant fruits on the trees, enough to feed his army. That the European lands of the empire suffered a similar abandonment is reported by Pero Tafur, a Spanish traveler, who upon visiting the area of Adrianople in the autumn of 1437 noted that the land, though fruitful, was depopulated by war.

Nevertheless, there were still market gardens and orchards. These were known by a variety of names indicating both size and purpose: kēpos, kēpion, kēpoperibolion, kēpotopion, kēporeion, which are all regularly found in Athonite praktika (inventories) from the thirteenth century on, refer mostly to vegetable gardens; ampelokēpion and ampeloperibolion refer respectively to a mixed vineyard and vegetable garden and to a vineyard (Fig. 1) and orchard. These texts employ also, but only very occasionally, the term paradéisos (which appears more in rhetorical texts and especially in late Byzantine romances): when used in a literal sense, this means a pleasure garden with flowers and trees mixed together. Unfortunately such
documentary texts, while presumably in large part factually accurate, do not describe the actual gardens. For descriptions (usually brief and often vague) we must rely primarily on rhetoricians who frequently, in writing models for their students, merely recycled material from their predecessors, who were writing of quite different locations and were too, of course, more concerned with expressing the beauties of the traditional *locus amoenus* than the specific features that the historian craves. Their general pictures are likely to be largely correct, but all details are suspect.

The historian George Akropolites speaks of a large garden nearly eight stadia (i.e., ca. 1,480 m) outside Thessalonike, called the garden of Provatas. This seems to have been a vegetable garden, and it was there that John III Vatatzes camped with his army in 1242 when trying to recover the city from the separatist rulers of Epiros. A century and a half later we learn from *praktika* that the Athonite monastery of Iveron owned two gardens within the walls of Thessalonike and a large cultivated garden outside the walls close to the Golden Gate (i.e., in the west-southwest of the city) and stretching along the coastline. These huge gardens were let in 1404 to the noble family of the Argyropouloi at an annual rent of 30

---

1 Parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, gr. 74, fol. 39v (photo: Bibliothèque Nationale de France)

---


gold coins. The Argyropouloi were also obliged to provide for the needs of the monastery adequate amounts of produce from the gardens; among the items mentioned in the document are cabbages, leeks, carrots, garlic, onions, courgettes, melons, and cucumbers as well as pomegranates. The Argyropouloi profitably exploited the property, expanded the cultivated land, improved the irrigation, and hired out the gardens to a number of gardeners, whose names are given in the document, and thus they earned much more than the annual rent they paid to the monastery. This caused disagreement with the monastery, whose monks took the case before the court in Thessalonike and even to Emperor Manuel II Palaiologos himself in 1421. The emperor ordered his son in Thessalonike, the despot Andronikos, after hearing the views of the Argyropouloi, to return the gardens to the monastery. The fate of these gardens, which seem to have supplied Thessalonike with fresh vegetables for many years, cannot be followed after 1430, when the Ottomans stormed into the city and carried away most of its citizens.8

The Athonite praktika mention not only many other kepoi in the area of eastern Macedonia and Chalkidike that the monasteries had acquired through donation or purchase, but also water mills used in irrigating the gardens. These registers of land also refer to the small gardens or kitchen gardens owned by most families living in villages whose land belonged to the Athonite monasteries. We know the types of trees grown in these gardens—and almost every household could boast at least one tree. The following are mentioned: fig, walnut, pear, cherry, quince, almond, apple, pomegranate, olive, chestnut, mulberry, and oak. The great number of vineyards mentioned in these documents indicates that the area was well cultivated and productive. The same trees are cultivated today in the area of Chalkidike, evidence that few changes have occurred in both the farming habits and the climate of this area, at least before the introduction of mechanized agriculture.9 One suspects, but cannot, of course, prove, that in these gardens the instructions given in the Geoponika (which was preserved mostly through late Byzantine manuscripts) for cultivating flowers beneath the trees were often followed.10

From the Peloponnese there survives a fifteenth-century description by the churchman John Eugenikos of the village of Petrina, east of Sparta. Eugenikos speaks of the

---

8 For a recent edition of these documents, see Actes d’Iviron, vol. 4 (Paris, 1995), 1: nos. 97–98, 151–64. Document no. 98 is a σεκρετικόν γράμμα of the καθολικοί κρίται of Thessalonike of April 1421 (text, 158–62, pls. xxxv–xxxiv), while no. 99 (text, 164, pl. xxxv) is a πρωτάγνωμα of Emperor Manuel II of June 1421. The first, acephalous, document was also published by Ioakeim Iberites in Gregorios Palamas 5 (1921): 846–51, and by F. Dölger, Aus den Schatzkammern des Heiligen Berges, Textband (Munich, 1948), no. 102, 263–72 (text, 266–69). The second document was also published by Ioakeim Iberites in Gregorios Palamas 1 (1917): 541–42, and by Dölger, Schatzkammern, no. 24, 69–71 (text, 70). For the gardens owned by this monastery in Thessalonike, see Actes d’Iviron, vol. 3, De 1204 à 1328, Archives de l’Athos 18 (Paris, 1994), no. 76, 240.60–62 and no. 84, 299.3–4 and 300.27. For literature on the disputes over these gardens, see Littlewood, “Scholarship.”


picturesque landscape, since the village was close to the sea but also to a lake, where forest
trees were mixed with fruit trees and the land was covered by vineyards and olive, fig, pear,
pomegranate, apple, and oak trees. All these together created a healthy climate. He adds that
as one went lower in the plain, there were natural springs, green bushes, meadows, and a
variety of flowers.¹¹

The capital itself had suffered much under the Latin occupation of 1204–61, but in a
public speech delivered before the emperor, perhaps in 1266, Manuel (monastic name
Maximos) Holobolos records what Michael VIII Palaiologos had done in the way of resto-
ration.¹² He mentions the fertile land and the rivers and refers to improvements in the
cultivated fields, the ports, the many beautiful parks, the fountains in public places, and the
watered meadows, where all kinds of plants and a great variety of flowers, which had been
neglected for many years, were now flowering to such a degree that they could be com-
pared with the Homeric gardens of Alkinoos.¹³ This is partly a rhetorician’s license, but we
do know of a number of specific vegetable gardens, vineyards, orchards,¹⁴ and other culti-
vated land toward the end of the fourteenth and the early fifteenth century, when the
city was blockaded by the Ottomans and there was a shortage of food. These gardens and vine-
yards were mostly owned by monastic communities, but were worked by laymen who did
not always fulfill their obligations to the monasteries. We thus obtain useful information on
them from the documentation of a number of cases that were brought before the patriar-
chal synod.¹⁵

Further east at Nicaea, where John III Vatatzes is known to have taken a great interest
in farming,¹⁶ his successor, Theodore II Laskaris, composed an encomium of the city ca.
1250 before his own accession. In it he describes the many vineyards and other plantations
and the bountiful supply of water and springs in the surrounding area.¹⁷ Some forty years

Potsdam, Ostern (Potsdam, 1907), 57, 29–59.5. On Michael’s work of restoration, see also Georgii Cyprii Laudatio
Michaelis Palaeologi, PG 142:376–377; Fauilli Laurent, Pachyméros, 3.2:233.8–11; Nikephoros Gregoras, Byzantina
¹³ For Alkinoos’ gardens, see Homer, Odyssey, 7.112–32.
¹⁴ For the fruit grown in Demetrios Kydones’ garden, see below, pp. 99–100.
¹⁵ See MM, 2:497–99 (garden and cultivated land in the area of Kynegos, a.d. 1400); 499–501 (vineyard
owned by Theotokos Pausolype in 1401); 501–2 (garden owned by the monastery of Magistros in 1401); 506–9
(vineyard and plot of land cultivated with wheat owned by the monastery of St. Andrew in Krisei in 1401);
543–46 (peribolion, a.d. 1401); 557–58 (wineyard in the area of St. Romanos, a.d. 1401).
¹⁷ Theodore II Lascaris imperatoris in laudem Nicaeae orbis onta, ed. L. Bachmann (Rostock, 1847), 8.2–
10.1; for a new edition of the text, see Sophia Georgiopoulou, “Theodore II Dukas Laskaris (1222–1258) as
an Author and an Intellectual of the XIIIth Century” (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1990), 140–72, esp.
156.169–163.238. The encomium also appears, together with an English translation by J. Tulchin and C. Foss
and a brief commentary by the latter, in C. Foss, Nicaea: A Byzantine Capital and Its Praises (Brookline, Mass.,
later the youthful Theodore Metochites delivered an encomium of the city before the visiting emperor Andronikos II, in which he speaks of the rivers watering the surrounding fertile plain where vineyards and other trees were planted.\footnote{Ed. K. Sathas, Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη, vol. 1 (Venice, 1872), 143 (hereafter MB). The text is reprinted with an English translation by Talchum and Foss in Foss, Nitsa, 172–75.}

Similar descriptions survive of the neighborhood of independent Trebizond in two mid-fifteenth-century encomiasic ekphraseis. Its native son Bessarion, probably shortly before becoming a cardinal in 1439, expatiates on the flowery suburbs, meadows (λειμώνες), and pleasure gardens (παράδεσσοι) full of all kinds of fruit trees, including a large number of olive trees that provided shade in many places.\footnote{“Βησσαρίωνος Εγκώμιον εἰς τὴν Τραπεζούντα,” ed. S. P. Lampros, Νέας Ἑλλάς. 13 (1916): 145–204, text 146–94; see esp. 154, 167, 185–87, 188–90.} John Eugenikos, paying a visit to his father’s birthplace, more briefly praises the view of the city from the sea: “the eyes discover a delightful and splendid view of plains and pleasant meadows, a variety of flowers, extensive woods, and gentle mountains, green bushes and grass, planted vineyards and many other shrubs and cypress trees, which sway as if they were dancing.”\footnote{“Ιωάννου Ευεγένιου, Ἐκφρασις Ἱπταμένου,” ed. O. Lampsides, Ἀρχ.Πόντ. 20 (1955): 3–39, text, 25–36; see esp. 32.126–33.130: This evidence is corroborated by Pero Tafur, who visited Trebizond at the end of 1437 and reported, “Trebizond has about 4,000 inhabitants. It is well walled, and they say that the ground is fruitful and that it produces a large revenue” (Tafur, Travels, 131).}

There is no evidence to suggest that the legislation concerning the everyday life of those working farms and gardens had changed in the late Byzantine period, and it seems that the “Farmer’s Law” (of possibly 7th-century origin) continued to provide the legal solutions to their problems. This collection contains specific references to gardens. The first (chap. 31) refers to the protection of the garden affected by the shadow of a tree, whose owner is ordered to prune its branches. The other two (chaps. 50, 51) refer to the accidental killing of an animal that tries to enter a garden.\footnote{See I. and P. Zepos, Jus Graecoromanum, vol. 2 (Athens, 1931), 67, 68, 69; cf. also G. E. Heimbach, ed., Constantini Harmenopuli, Manuale Legum sive Hexabiblos, cum Appendicibus et Legibus Agrariis (Leipzig, 1851), 840.3, 6 and 846.2.} The “Farmer’s Law” influenced later legal texts. These included the “Hexabiblos” of the lawyer Constantine Harmenopoulos, which was composed in Thessalonike ca. 1345 to serve as an epitome of the Byzantine legal system. The “Hexabiblos” contains a chapter referring to the gardens or orchards and other plantations in which it is stipulated that a distance of at least 50 feet must separate an existing garden from a new building.\footnote{Cf. Harmenopoulos, Προχειρον Νόμων ἢ Εξέβιβλος, ed. C. G. Pitsakes (Athens, 1971), 2:4.48, 128–29.}

Public Parks

For convenience, pleasure gardens may be subdivided into public parks, imperial gardens, and private gardens in urban houses of the aristocracy, although all three bear many similarities to each other. The fullest information on any public park comes from just before our period. It is contained in the description of the church of the Holy Apostles in
Constantinople that was composed between 1198 and 1203 by Nicholas Mesarites. However, it is perhaps reasonable to assume that Michael VIII Palaiologos, who spent many of the funds available in the imperial treasury to restore the prestige of his recovered capital, took special care of the church of the Holy Apostles and its surrounding gardens, for it was there that he erected a column with a bronze statue of himself offering a model of the city to his namesake the Archangel Michael to celebrate his restoration of the capital. The speech of Holobolos referred to above further corroborates this belief since the orator specifically mentions parks among Michael’s improvements. Mesarites’ description, therefore, despite his literary borrowings, may substantially give us an idea of the parkland as it was in the 1260s and 1270s. He tells us that there were water reservoirs here able to supply the whole city and also a great variety of fruit trees and splendid gardens where balsam, lilies, fresh clover and hyacinth, roses, oleander, and many other plants of sweet aroma were cultivated. Aqueducts and a variety of springs, tall trees, and musical birds added to the pleasure of the environment.

One cannot expect great concern for public parks and gardens or for the pleasure gardens of the capital during the last century of hardship. Manuel Chrysoloras, in a long letter from Rome, where he was residing as teacher of Greek and ambassador of the emperor, to the prince and future emperor John VIII Palaiologos early in the fifteenth century, does indeed find that New Rome resembles the Old Rome like a daughter resembles her mother, for the former is more beautiful with numerous monuments and statues, great buildings and churches, colonnades and cisterns, strong walls but also fruit trees and many suburbs on both the European and Asiatic shores. However, Chrysoloras was being rather nostalgic, presenting an ideal picture of his home city; the decline of Constantinople began in the fourteenth century, and many of its inhabitants had fled during the lengthy blockade of Bayezid I from 1394 to 1402. A few years after Chrysoloras’ letter, Pero Tafur reported...
more accurately on the condition of Constantinople when in 1437/38 he observed that the dilapidation of the city was indicative of “the evils which the people have suffered and still endure.”

There are hints that the inhabitants of Nicaea enjoyed parks while it was the capital and for some time thereafter. Theodore II Laskaris, in the encomium mentioned earlier, claims that it so abounded in trees that anyone approaching the city might have confused it with a grove and, coming closer, have thought it a “paradise,” while on entering might have said that it was a city of the Graces, since cypress trees projected above the towers of its fortifications (Fig. 2). Again, ca. 1290 Metochites praised the city’s many public baths, fountains, and churches, such as that of St. Tryphon, whose feast was celebrated at the time when flowers in the city were blooming. The two descriptions of Trebizond by Bessarion and Eugenikos quoted above also suggest the possibility of public parks (as well as privately owned pleasure gardens) in that city.

Imperial Gardens

During the Latin occupation of Constantinople, the Nicaean emperor John III Vatatzes created gardens at his summer palace outside Nymphaion. In fact it is in these gardens that he died in November 1254. Praise of the palace, the excellent climate, the meadows, and the flowing springs of the area is to be found in an encomium of Emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos by Manuel Holobolos, delivered after the recovery of Constantinople ca. 1265. The palatial gardens at Nymphaion may also figure in an epitaphaliam by the otherwise unknown poet Nicholas Eirenikos. This was composed for the wedding of John III and Constance (called Anna by the Byzantines), daughter of the German emperor Frederick II and Bianca Lancia, which took place in 1244. In part 4 of the poem the emperor is compared to a lotus and the bride to a beautiful rose, while the ceremony takes place in a meadow that may well have belonged to the summer palace.

Although Manuel Philes, court poet under Andronikos II and III in the first half of the fourteenth century, left among his compositions on flora and fauna no description of an actual palace garden, he did write a long poem of 108 verses referring to a garden painted...
on the ceiling of an imperial palace. The poem takes the form of introductory questions posed by a visitor admiring the painted ceiling, and the poet, while answering his queries, presents a nice picture of the garden to the reader. The poet admires the garden hanging from the ceiling, which, though not watered, has branches of fresh trees, full of leaves and flowers. Next to the lilies are the colors of a beautiful grove. So lifelike is it all that he wants the visitor to avoid touching or cutting the lilies. The painter has shown himself to be an excellent guardian of the grove and has depicted predatory animals pursuing other animals, such as hares, which feed on herbs; occasionally, too, a bird perches in the hollow of a lily, gathering the seed of the flower. He has painted a female lion feeding her cubs, and a pair of peacocks, but has banished the noisier birds, such as swallows, nightingales, and swans, to avoid disturbing the silence obligatory in an imperial chamber.38

A second ekphrasis by John Eugenikos describes a royal couple in an imperial garden whom he seems to have observed from the galleries of the palace above. He gives us valuable information about this garden in the fifteenth century. The newly married couple had walked out of the palace into the garden, and they were surrounded by trees, such as apple, pear, and citrus, and also by vineyards and flowers, such as red and white roses, hyacinths, narcissi, violets, and lilies. There was also a very pretty fountain with a golden dove and flowing water.39 Whether John Eugenikos refers to a real or an imagined garden we cannot tell, but his description is very vivid, and he may well refer to an event that he had observed in the palace after a royal wedding.40

Elements that appeared in descriptions of imperial (and other) gardens before the sack of 1204 may be found in Palaiologan romances and in a long ekphrasis by the early fourteenth-century teacher of rhetoric Theodore Hyrtakenos on the pleasure garden of St. Anne,41 as is well demonstrated by Mary-Lyon Dolezal and Maria Mavroudi.42

Imperial enthusiasm for hunting in the middle Byzantine period resulted in the creation of game parks outside the capital.43 There is no clear evidence that any of these


40 If the persons are real, he may well be referring to the second wedding of John VIII Palaiologos and Sophia of Montferrat, which took place in the capital on 19 January 1421 and was followed by the coronation of John as co-emperor. See D. M. Nicol, The Last Centuries of Byzantium, 1261–1453, 2d ed. (Cambridge, 1993), 330–31.


42 “Theodore Hyrtakenos’ Description of the Garden of St. Anna and the Ekphrasis of Gardens,” in this volume. Mention should also be made of a brief description by Emperor Manuel II Palaiologos of a handmade embroidery depicting spring scenery, which he had seen in the palace of King Charles VI in Paris (PG 156:577–80).

43 See Littlewood, “Gardens of the Palaces,” 35–38; H. Maguire, “Imperial Gardens and the Rhetoric of
survived the Latin conquest, although there seems to have been little abatement of imperial interest: the locations of the hunts mentioned may have been simply the countryside surrounding the city.44

Private Gardens in Urban Houses of the Aristocracy

Little is known about the private houses of the aristocracy in the cities, and archaeology can offer little help in the case of Constantinople and Thessalonike, the largest cities of the empire, since the modern cities are built above the medieval ones. Nonetheless, written sources sometimes give us limited information about the palaces of the wealthy, which in certain cases it is hard to imagine did not possess gardens;45 and even in the parlous conditions of the fifteenth century, aristocrats were still constructing for themselves luxurious three-storey houses in Constantinople that presumably often had attached gardens.46

One house, however, is well attested, the palace of Theodore Metochites, which was looted by the followers of Andronikos III Palaiologos when he took over the capital in May 1328. Nikephoros Gregoras, who mentions the event, says that even the soil from this famous Constantinopolitan palace was sent as a present to the ruler of the Skythians. From exile Metochites himself vividly refers in a poem to his house, which possessed a chapel with many-colored marbles and a bath. There were also gardens of delightful beauty and ever-flowing fountains and a courtyard surrounded by a portico sheltered from the rays of the sun, where Metochites delighted in taking walks (he had even reconstructed the road


44 Emperor Andronikos III Palaiologos (1328–41) became famous for his hunting expeditions, for which he kept a great number of hunting dogs and hunting birds, whose upkeep cost an annual sum of 15,000 gold coins (Gregoras [Bonn ed.], 1:11, 566.4–12). Pero Tafur, who arrived in Constantinople in the autumn of 1437, two weeks before John VIII Palaiologos departed for the West to attend the Council of Ferrara, accompanied the emperor on hunting expeditions outside Constantinople. Once when they were joined by the empress, he reports that they killed many hares, partridges, francolins, and pheasants, which were very plentiful (Tafur, Travels, 118, 124). The same emperor also invited Ciriaco di Ancona to take part in a hunting expedition outside Constantinople together with the Genoese podestà Boruelo Grimaldi and his son in July 1444 (see J. Colin, Cyriaque d’Anconè: Le voyageur, le marchand, l’humaniste [Paris, 1981], 355–56). John had indeed been promised by his father, Manuel II, a horse of noble origin, a hunting dog, and a hunting bird when he reached adolescence (PG 156:313b).

45 For instance, the late 13th-century house owned by the grand logothete Constantine Akropolites, which had an enclosed interior with a private chapel and a study (the evidence is to be found in a letter addressed to his brother, the monk Melchisedek, after the severe earthquake of 1 June 1296; ed. C. N. Constantinides, Higher Education in Byzantium in the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries, 1204–ca. 1310 [Nicosia, 1982], 163–64, no. 59, lines 31–39). Other examples are probably the wealthy two-storey house with a front courtyard of the future emperor John Kantakouzenos, which was confiscated by the state in 1341 (Kantakouzenos, Historianun, ed. L. Schopen, 3 vols. [Bonn, 1828–32], 2:137.8–11, 164.21–165.12), and the well-known tower-house, called Epivatai, built outside the walls of Constantinople on the European shore of the Bosporos by Alexios Apokaukos ca. 1340 when he was parakoimomenos to Andronikos III Palaiologos (Kantakouzenos, 270.24–71.2; Gregoras [Bonn ed.], 2:585.10–22; 602.14–603.3).

46 They were blamed by Joseph Bryennios in 1416 for doing this while paying no attention to the restoration of the city walls; see N. B. Tomadakes, Περί ἀλώσεως τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως (1453), 2d ed. (Athens, 1969), 249.180–84.
3  Istanbul, monastery of Chora, present-day Kariye Camii. Mosaic, the Annunciation to St. Anne, detail of well
leading to this house). In the narthex of the monastery of the Chora, which he had refounded and lavishly decorated, the garden with a fountain in the mosaic of the Annunciation to St. Anne may well be a reminiscence of his private garden (Fig. 3). The representation in a nearby mosaic of peacocks in Joachim’s garden, besides their symbolic role, may similarly have been intended to remind him of peacocks adorning his own paradise (Fig. 4).

It is unclear whether another property belonging to a slightly later statesman was a separate orchard or a garden adjoining his house. Demetrios Kydones mentions in one of

---


49 Kydones refers to it here and elsewhere in his letters as a γηρών (= “little piece of land”) and himself as a γεωργός (“worker of the land”), but, as elsewhere, his letter is gently ironic, while γεωργός can bear the meaning of “gardener” rather than “farmer.”
his letters (dated ca. 1374–75) to his patron, the empress Helena Kantakouzene Palaiologina, that he sent her medlar fruits from his own garden. Kydones claims that he himself cultivated his garden but, because his medlars were famous for their sweetness, the emperors had ordered him to send the fruit to them. Very charmingly Kydones adds that “although I swore to obey the emperors in all things by day, at night I exercise my rights, and, stealing my own fruit, I taste it and send some to those to whom it is right to send it, before sending it to the emperors.”

Conclusion

The love for trees and nature, for the garden and the flower, has always been part of human culture. The Byzantines inherited from antiquity this appreciation and made it part of their own Greco-Roman and Christian culture. Byzantine emperors took special care for the upkeep of Constantinople and other important cities by founding public buildings that were sometimes surrounded by gardens. Public parks also existed either within or in the vicinity of the capital. Likewise individuals took pride in having small pleasure or kitchen gardens. Those who could afford to do so created for their own delight a larger paradise, an enclosed garden in imitation of the garden of Eden. Finally, although we have inadequate information, it appears that those who continued until the fifteenth century to copy and study the Geoponika and Dioskourides and to prepare drawings of the various plants, and to write poems on flowers or rhetorical ekphraseis on gardens, represent the continuity of a garden culture that was preserved in the east until the end of the Byzantine Empire. In Constantinople in the spring of 1453, when the great city was destroyed by the heavy artillery of the Ottoman Turks and looted by the illiterate soldiers of Mehmet II, the flowers were blooming and the fruits were ripe for picking by the hands of another culture. But even this was not the end, for the Turks themselves began to replant the gardens, and admiration of the splendor of the city and the persistence of ideals in the Greco-Roman tradition had already traveled from the city to reach Italy.

University of Ioannina


51 An example that typifies the Byzantine delight in the natural world, whether wild or tended by human hands, is afforded by the historian Nikephoros Gregoras, who in an introduction to the disastrous expedition of Andronikos III against the Ottomans in 1329 cannot help remarking that “the time had already come when the hands of spring give birth to plants and paint the earth with the varied colors of grass, offering much pleasure to the eyes of human beings” (Bonn ed., 1:9.9, 433.9–11).

52 For the building of palaces and gardens in Constantinople after its capture by the Ottoman sultan Mehmet II and the eparch of Europe Machmout, see Critobuli Imbriotae Historiae, ed. D. R. Reinsch (Berlin–New York, 1983), 131.25–133.7, esp. 133.1–4.
Appendix

Information on Gardens and Their Produce in Proverbs

Unlike the other sources used for this survey of late Byzantine gardens, proverbs are notoriously difficult to date and usually impossible to link with any historical situations. They may generally be divided into two categories: those in the “high” language and those in the “low” or demotic. The former were collected by classicizing scholars or teachers of rhetoric and are frequently related to or extracted from ancient Greek and Hellenistic literature or refer to ancient Greek myths; most are to be found in Byzantine lexica and especially in the encyclopedic compilation of the tenth century known as the Souda. The latter represent the wisdom of the Greek-speaking population of Byzantium, and many of these proverbs have passed into Modern Greek and are in use even today. The justification for presenting such information in this Appendix is twofold. First, most of the proverbs adduced here come from compilations made during the late Byzantine period by Gregory II of Cyprus, patriarch of Constantinople (1283–89), Makarios Chrysokephalos, metropolitan of Philadelphia (1336–82), and the mid-fifteenth-century teacher, writer, and copyist Michael Apostoles. Therefore, the frequency with which trees and flowers especially figure in these proverbs may reflect the importance of gardens to the Byzantines at this time. Second, paroemiographers have hitherto been ignored by historians of Byzantine gardens. It must be noted, however, that what follows is far from an exhaustive survey of information pertaining to gardens, flowers, trees, and vegetables preserved in even the published collections of proverbs (some of the demotic have still not been printed).

Gardens in General

Illusory pleasure is indicated with reference to the gardens of Adonis or Tantalos, while a flowering garden is compared to the garden of Alkinoos or even to those of Zeus.


2 The following abbreviations are used in the notes to this Appendix: G. of C. = Gregory of Cyprus; Chrys. = Makarios Chrysokephalos; Apost. = Michael Apostoles; Corpus = E. L. Leutsch, Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum, vol. 2 (Göttingen, 1851; repr. Hildesheim, 1965).

3 For the gardens of Alkinoos, see above, note 13, and Treu, Manuelis Holoboli Orationes, 2:58.15.

4 Αδώνιδος κήπος. Επὶ τῶν άλγορονιαν καὶ ύδρον (G. of C., PG 142:445; similar version in Corpus, 132.5–6); cf. also Άκαρπότερος ‘Αδώνιδος κήπον ἐπὶ τῶν μηδὲν γεννάτον τεκεῖτ’ δυναμένον (Chrys., Corpus, 140.20–21) and the lengthier version in Apost. (Corpus, 247.19–24). It is worth observing that hanging gardens were called ‘Αδώνιδοι because they were temporary: ‘Αδώνιδοι καρποὶ λέγονται οἱ μετέφοροι κήποι (Souda, 1:53.15, no. 514 [ed. A. Adler, 5 vols. (Leipzig, 1928–38)]; cf. ibid., 53.21–24, no. 517; 76.27–28, no. 807 and Apost., loc. cit.).

5 Ταντάλου κήπους τρυγῆς ἐπὶ τῶν μᾶτασι ποιούντων (Apost., Corpus, 656.1–2; cf. idem, Corpus, 657.10–17; Souda, 4:501.14–20, no. 80; 507.12–19, no. 147).

6 For the gardens of Alkinoos, see above, note 13, and Treu, Manuelis Holoboli Orationes, 2:58.15.

7 Ἔν Δίως κήποις αροῦσθαι μόνον εὐδαιμόνας ὄλβοις (Apost., Corpus, 399.20–21).
Costas N. Constantinides

Flowers

The royal flower for the Byzantines was the rose, which came in many varieties of color, fragrance, and foliage (e.g., triakontaphylla, hexekontaphylla, hekatomphylla). Vanity and the temporal nature of beauty are compared with an old or dying rose; the inequality of things is shown by the comparison of a rose and an anemone; happy news is received like roses.

Trees

The strongest or the royal tree is the oak, and this tree is used in proverbs with various meanings: even an oak finally succumbs when continuously struck; the fall of a high personage that may benefit many is compared with the falling of a big oak tree.

The wood of the fig tree, which breaks easily, was used to refer to weak assistance or to the weakness of a person in general, but the fig fruit itself was always synonymous with integrity, honesty, and truth.

Silence and negligence abroad were linked with the lotus; infertility could be suggested by the fruit of the cypress tree, luxury gifts by the apples of the Hesperides, and ambition by a garland of myrtle.

Vegetables

Vegetables appear more rarely in proverbs, but cabbages, onions, and garlic had a very low value. Thus poor reinforcements were referred to as cabbage additions, or a person

---

8 On roses, see Beckh, Geoponika, 11.18, 336–38.
9 Ὄνοδον παρελθὸν μικρότερον ζήτει πάλιν: ἐπὶ τῶν κυδαίνωντας τινῶς (Souda 4:297.11–12, no. 203; cf. G. of C., PG 142:465 and Corpus, 86.8–9; Apost., Corpus, 635.5–7).
10 Ὄνοδον ἄνεμον συγκρίνεις ἐπὶ τῶν ἄνωμοι συμβαλλόντας (Souda, 4:297.8–9, no. 203; G. of C., Corpus, 86.10–11; Chrys., ibid., 207.1–2; Apost., ibid., 635.1–2).
11 Ὄνοδο μὴ εἰρήνης, ἀντὶ τοῦ, ἐμοί τὰ παρά σου εἰρήμενα ρόδα ἑστίν (Souda, 4:297.9–10, no. 203, G. of C., Corpus, 86.12–13; Apost., ibid., 635.3–4).
13 Δρύος πεσοῦσις πᾶς ἄνηρ ζηλεύεται: ἐπὶ τῶν ὁδόσιοι λαμβανόντων ἑκρότερον μόλις ἡδύναντο καὶ θυμός καὶ πέτρας λόγοι: ἐπὶ τῶν ἀδόλεσχοντων καὶ μυθολοογούντων παράδοξα (Chrys., Corpus, 158.1–4); cf. Δρύος πεσοῦσις πᾶς ἄνηρ ζηλεύεται: παρόσον ἄνηρ μέγας ὅταν σφαλῇ, πάντες κατ’ αὐτοῦ φέρονται καὶ τὰ αὐτοῦ ἀρπάζουσι (Apost., ibid., 372.2–4).
14 Συκίνη μέγαρα: ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀσθενῆς καὶ ἀνοφέλης (Apost., Corpus, 684.1–3); cf. Συκίνη μέγαρα: ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσθενεστάτων καὶ εὐτελῶν; Συκίνη βακτηρία: καὶ συκίνη μέγαρα: ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσθενεστάτων (Chrys., ibid., 210.3–5; Σύκινος νοῦς: ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνοητῶν: παρόσον τὸ σύκινον ζύλον ἀσθενεστάτου (Chrys., ibid., 212.5–6).
15 Τὰ σύκα σύκα λέγα, καὶ τὴν κάρδσπον: ἐπὶ τῶν τὰ ἁλῆθε λεγόντων ἀνεπιθυμόνως (Apost., Corpus, 658.1–2).
16 Λοστοῦ ἐφαγές: ἐπὶ τῶν σχυντῶν λήθην τῶν οἰκῶν καὶ βαρδοντὸν ἐπὶ ζένης (Apost., Corpus, 515.2–4).
17 Κυπαρίσσιον καιρός: ἐπὶ τῶν καλῶ καὶ ψυχής λεγόντων, ἀκάρπα δέ (Apost., Corpus, 491.5–6).
18 Μύλης Ἐσπερίδων μοι ἐδορήσου ἐπὶ τῶν πολυτελῆ χαριζόντων (Apost., Corpus, 528.14–15).
19 Μυρρίνων ἀρχῇς ἐπιθυμεῖς: μυρρίναις γὰρ στεφανούσαν οἱ ἀρχοντες (Apost., Corpus, 538.9–10).
20 Αἱ λαχέοις προσθηκάται: ἐπὶ τῶν μηδὲν ὀψελούστων (Apost., Corpus, 263.9); Ὁ ἔχων πολὺ πέπερι
with few debts could proudly say that he owed only onions and garlic.²¹ These last two vegetables could also express the difficulty in communication and understanding between two people.²² A need of celery meant that a person was elderly or seriously ill, since tombs were crowned with this in antiquity.²³ These examples could easily be multiplied. Most interestingly we may learn from a demotic proverb that those living close to a gardener could expect to have at least free cabbages.²⁴
Theodore Hyrtakenos’ Description of the Garden of St. Anna and the Ekphrasis of Gardens

Mary-Lyon Dolezal and Maria Mavroudi

It is with some trepidation that scholars enter the world of the Byzantine garden. On the one hand, the garden and garden motifs are ubiquitous in Byzantine literature and art; rhetorical descriptions and extant monuments and objects provide a rich array of textual and visual examples from which to work. On the other hand, the garden, by its very nature, is part of the ephemera of the past, particularly in a conquered culture such as the Byzantine Empire; no archaeological remains of gardens have yet been excavated that would allow us precisely to reconstruct or situate the allusive paradisiacal landscapes that once ornamented the city of Constantinople or its shores along the Bosporos or Sea of Marmara. Yet the romance of the Byzantine garden has tantalized twentieth-century scholars since the early-century publication of M. L. Gothein’s Geschichte der Gartenkunst, which first appeared in 1913 (published in English in 1928), with its short description of Byzantine garden culture.1 Recently, A. R. Littlewood and H. Maguire have lamented the limitations for scholarly reconstructions in their own attempts to broaden the scope of our knowledge.2 However,

We would like to extend our great appreciation to Henry Maguire and Joachim Wolschke-Bulmahn for their support and always helpful suggestions and for organizing, with Antony Littlewood, the colloquium on Byzantine garden culture (November 1996) that resulted in this volume. We also thank Kenneth Helphand, Charles Lachman, Amy Papalexandrou, Alice–Mary Talbot, and the two anonymous readers for their advice and contributions to our project. Our translation of the text of Theodore Hyrtakenos benefited from the useful remarks of the participants in the Dumbarton Oaks seminar on Byzantine ekphrasis (1994–95). Finally, we are indebted to Kate McGee, a landscape architect in Eugene, Oregon, for aiding in the visualization of Hyrtakenos’ garden ekphrasis through her fine drawings illustrating this article.

consultation of the secondary sources on Byzantine gardens indicates that Gothein, in fact, set forth much of the essential information that still forms the core upon which current interpretations and adumbrations are based. It is into this fray that our own contribution hastens, as we elucidate a previously neglected ekphrastic text by the early fourteenth-century literatus Theodore Hyrtakenos, the Description of the Garden of St. Anna (see Appendix 1).\(^3\)

Little biographical detail is known of Hyrtakenos except that he was born on the Kyzikos peninsula and that he was a writer and teacher in Constantinople. His writings include a panegyric on the Theotokos and an encomium on the anchorite Aninas, as well as ninety-three surviving letters to various members of the elite of Constantinople, including Emperor Andronikos II Palaiologos, Patriarch John XIII Glykys, and Theodore Metochites.\(^4\) His Description of the Garden of St. Anna has excited little interest, eliciting only a terse statement from Herbert Hunger, with no further elaboration or evidence, that this ekphrasis was based on a painting seen by Hyrtakenos.\(^5\) Our analysis suggests otherwise: this overwrought rhetorical description positively reeks of allusions, textual and visual, that relate to the literary, artistic, and religious concerns of the intellectual milieu in which Hyrtakenos labored.\(^6\) Ekphrastic connection to a specific or identifiable work of art is unnecessary to maintain in order to draw on its rich texture. The multiple allusions to divergent genres, in effect, contribute to more precise definitions of late Byzantine culture, not the least of which is its sustained attraction to gardens, real or imaginary.

The text itself begins and ends with Anna, first contemplating her childless fate and, finally, receiving news of her conception of the Virgin. These very brief narrations frame the lengthy description of the garden in which Anna muses and that forms the heart of Hyrtakenos’ narrative. The obvious starting point for discussion of Hyrtakenos’ ekphrasis on the garden of St. Anna is that which inspired the framing story around the garden portrayal: an apocryphal Gospel text such as the Protoevangelion of James (1–4:2).

Struct actual gardens from the written accounts. Either the texts are excessively brief in their descriptions, or else they are prolix, but at the same time opaque, rhetorical, and vague on specifics.\(^7\) Analysis of the focus of this study, Hyrtakenos, will only provide further proof of this characterization.


\(^4\) For a summation of Hyrtakenos’ life, see ODB, 2:966–67. For a discussion of his letters, see A. Karpozilos, “The Correspondence of Theodoros Hyrtakenos," JÖB 40 (1990): 275–94. It is evident from his letters that he often asked his influential patrons for financial help and for various gifts. Letters to individuals of high status pressing for financial concessions were usual among Hyrtakenos’ contemporaries; these demands do not necessarily indicate dire need. For an assessment of the social standing of 14th-century intellectuals, see I. Ševčenko, “Society and Intellectual Life in the Fourteenth Century”. Actes du XVe Congrès international des Études byzantines, Bucarest 1971, vol. 1 (Bucharest, 1974), 69–92; repr. in idem, Society and Intellectual Life in Late Byzantium (London, 1981).

\(^5\) H. Hunger, Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner (Munich, 1978), 1:184: “Von Theodoros Hyrtakenos (14. Jh.) lesen wir noch die Ecphrasis des Gartens der hl. Anna, der Mutter Mariens, nach einem Gemälde.” Hunger’s statement has been repeated as accepted fact with no further supporting evidence in the ODB entry.

\(^6\) Like many 14th-century authors, Hyrtakenos’ texts and letters are replete with erudite allusions to ancient literature; see ODB, 2:967, and Karpozilos, “Correspondence of Theodoros Hyrtakenos,” 286–90.
and expand the story of the Virgin, it begins with the sad state of affairs of her childless parents, Joachim and Anna. Key to Hyrtakenos’ text, and embedded in the narrative, is a bare outline of the garden to which Anna retires to lament her barren fate. Unadorned references to the disposition of the garden, the trees, animals, birds, and a source for water (possibly a fountain?) indicate a setting on which Hyrtakenos could base his much more florid description of the garden of her lamentation. The lushe ness of his writing conjures up the repetitions of the words fruit and fruitful found in the *Protoevangelion* and assigns them with more poignant meaning as they contrast with Anna’s condition. Hyrtakenos does not fail to underscore the issue of fertility, or the lack thereof, in all aspects of his text, as we shall see. It is useful to address the textual insinuations and sources in his ekphrastic text before turning to an analysis of the descriptive devices and their connection to the “real” or artistic world in which Hyrtakenos functioned.

The topic selected by our author, the Annunciation to Anna, is perhaps significant in light of the relatively few textual precedents on which he could draw. Aside from the original inspiration, the *Protoevangelion of James*, other sources include homilies and encomia that date from the eighth through twelfth centuries. The feast of the Annunciation to Anna was a minor one in the Byzantine liturgical calendar and was not celebrated until well after the fourth century. Thus the early church fathers did not address this event in their own rhetorical works. One of the first authors to discuss Anna’s annunciation is Andrew of Crete (late 7th–early 8th century) in his Kanons (although his homily has been considered spurious). Other authors who treat this event are John of Euboea (mid-8th century), George of Nikomedea (late 9th century), Patriarch Euthymios (early 10th century), Peter of Argos (late 9th–early 10th century), and James of Kokkinobaphos (12th century).7 It is interesting to note that the well-known homilies on the Virgin from James of Kokkinobaphos do not attempt to describe Anna’s garden; the images of her annunciation found in the two deluxe illustrated versions of his text from the second quarter of the twelfth century (Vatican Library, gr. 1162, and Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, gr. 1208) are far more evocative than his words.8 His homily on the conception of the Virgin (the first of six) contains the word παραθέσιος (garden) in three passages. He emphasizes the serenity of the garden over its appearance.9


9 For instance, ἀκολούθων τοις και ἀπειροτύπητον τὸν τοῦ παραθέσιον καταλημβάνον χώρον (“Anna came to the place of the garden, that was calm and away from the noise”) (PG 127:556c); τὸν
Yet the authors of these texts, like Hyrtakenos, depended on that early source for their own descriptions and interpretations of Anna’s annunciation. Unlike Hyrtakenos, however, they chose not to highlight the physical setting of Anna’s garden through any extended ekphrasis. In fact, the two most informative texts concerning her garden are contained in the Protovangelion and Hyrtakenos’ ekphrasis, and even the former is limited in its depiction compared to the latter. It mentions a laurel tree, birds in the branches, animals, and indicates the presence of water. The other homilies and encomia tersely situate Anna in a garden, but are silent on its characteristics or meaning. Thus Hyrtakenos relied mainly on the apocryphal account of Anna coming to a more solitary place because of the tranquility of the garden (“She came to the place that was more solitary, because of the tranquility of the garden”) (ibid., 557c); and “But what were the words of Anna’s prayer in the garden?” (ibid., 557d–560a).

One author, John of Euboea, does connect Anna’s garden to the garden of Eden, which he states was regained for mankind because the Virgin’s conception took place in a garden. See his Sermo in conceptionem sanctae Deiparœ, PG 96:1465a: Ἱοάχιμος καὶ Ἁννα, ὁ μὲν νηστευόν τοῦ ἑρμικότερυν δὲ, διά τὸ ἔρημον τοῦ παραδείσου, καταλαμβάνει χώρον (“Lo! Joachim and Anna, he fasting on the mountain, she in the garden, received a vessel from the One who erected the garden”).
Hyrtakenos’ description of Anna’s garden sets forth several topoi that conform to other types of textual descriptions as well as to visual material extant from the middle and late Byzantine periods (Figs. 1, 2). Alluding to the wealth of Joachim and Anna mentioned in the Protoevangelion, he begins with a vivid image of the enclosure surrounding the garden (located in an estate); it is a wall made of stone in the shape of a ring and perfectly round. Atop the wall rises a double frieze, making the whole enclosure a complicated (and fanciful) but, significantly, very secure barrier from the outside world. The two most well known

mountains and planted the garden of Eden; lo! good news of merriment [are given] in a garden, so that the ancient garden may be delivered to mankind.”

11 One of his biblical references is in error—that Fenanna was childless (Boissonade, AneGr, 3:69). Hyrtakenos’ allusions to classical literature give some sense of his training. The structure of the ekphrasis follows the instructions of Aphthonios by describing the garden from the outside toward the inside (from the outer walls to the fountain in the middle) and by mentioning what is inside the garden (trees, flowers, and birds); H. Rabe, ed., Aphthonii Progymnasmata (Leipzig, 1926), 37, lines 6–14. See also O. Schissel, Der byzantinische Garten: Seine Darstellung im gleichzeitigen Romane (Vienna-Leipzig, 1942), 8–9.
images of the Annunciation of Anna, the late-eleventh-century mosaic at the church of the Koimesis, Daphni (Fig. 1), and the early-fourteenth-century mosaic at the Kariye Camii, Istanbul (Fig. 2), do not indicate an enclosed garden, but a fifteenth-century fresco at the church of the Holy Cross at Pelendri in Cyprus (Fig. 3) does depict an awkward wall that encircles Anna and her house. A post-Byzantine manuscript (Προσκυνητάριον), Mount Athos, Grigoriou monastery, cod. 139 (fol. 12r; Fig. 4), has a little painting of a rectangular stone wall enclosure identified as ὁ κήπος, which evidences similar arrangements in Byzantine gardens. But Hyrtakenos ensures that his enclosure has its own impregnable integrity, and does not leave to chance his audience’s understanding that Anna’s haven is protected from carnal love, a topos so often found in Byzantine romances:\(^\text{12}\)

<The garden> had a surrounding wall in the shape of a ring; the shape of a ring is circular. A double frieze was raised upon the surrounding wall, soaring aloft high in the air. And each was a beautiful ornament for the other, encircling the garden in safety. One, <the frieze>, was put together with the stonemason’s craft, so that nei-

ther the clever thief could indulge in theft, nor the one who enslaves his eyes to love could burn into carnal fire because of curious looks <into the garden>. Rid of all disturbances, it gave its mistress freedom to converse with God, whom she desired, raising her mind <to him> without distraction.\footnote{\textit{Ekfrasi" eij" to;n paravdeison th'" aJgiva" "Annh"}, in Boissonade, \textit{AncGr}, 3:60.}

Accordingly, the heroine is often found in a garden, awaiting her love (and awakening to it in the highly charged confines of the luscious landscape). For example, in the twelfth-century romance of Eustathios Makrembolites, \textit{Hysmine and Hysminias}, the hero finds the eponymous and flirtatious heroine in a garden (book 4), where she welcomes and resists his sexual advances.\footnote{See M. Alexiou's synopsis and discussion, “A Critical Reappraisal of Eustathios Makrembolites' \textit{Hysmine and Hysminias},” \textit{BMGS} 3 (1977): 23–43.}

In contrast, the hero of the early-fourteenth-century romance \textit{Kallimachos and Chrysoroe} has far greater success with his conquest; Chrysoroe surrenders completely (in the “safety” of the garden) to his (and her) passion.\footnote{G. Betts, trans., \textit{Three Medieval Greek Romances} (New York-London, 1995), 37–90.}

And after the first or second hour of night the hired laborer ran up and crossed the garden. He approached the pavilion, went up to the curtain, and there spied the
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queen, who also saw him. She rose trembling with desire. He came to her as though
on wings. Words, no matter how fair, cannot tell of the passion, the joy, the love
with which they embraced. It can only be described by a tender heart. The ineffable
sweetness of their kiss watered their fair but dead hearts like a river. . . . And when
they had spent the greater part of the night kissing, he joyfully took Chrysorroe to
bed and their bodies were united. She in turn embraced Kallimachos and they then
experienced a delicious rapture beneath the trees, a rare and wondrous pleasure.
Their dead hearts began to beat again in unison. Then it was that they returned to
the living. Their souls, which had completely suffocated under so much passion,
revived and came back to life. Streams of a fountain of joyful tears poured down.
They derived much pleasure from this flood that rose from a spring of happy
weeping. . . . Amidst weeping, sighs and lamentation, and through fear of the crowd,
their bodies parted. The hired laborer, a laborer again, went out into the garden as if
to tend the plants and put in trees.16

16 Ibid., 75–76, verses 1950–90.
Anna, of course, is not about to confront human passion, but rather, is free to commune with the divine in an equally fertile garden, and that will lead to the “fruition” of her desires.

In addition to the wall and double frieze (as if that were not enough!), the garden was also wreathed with a “chorus of cypress trees.” Hyrtakenos informs us that these trees were configured through manmade artifice, indicating that they are topiaries. He describes the trunks of the trees as stripped bare and shaped in a conelike foliage.17 There is no lack of evidence in the visual material for this gardening manipulation, and it is also referred to in another fourteenth-century romance, *Belthandros and Chrysantza*:

Belthandros immediately entered on his own. He saw both banks of the river variously set with white vines and red flowers of narcissus and with a covering of trees. He threw a glance up at them and saw their beauty, their pleasing symmetry

17 The comparison of the cypresses to dancing maidens is inspired by the myth recorded in the *Geoponika* (11.4.2), the 10th-century compilation of different authors from late antiquity; the daughters of Eteocles stumbled and fell into a well while dancing in honor of the goddesses. Gaia (earth) had pity on them, sprouting trees in their place that were as comely as the maidens.
and the graceful rise of their trunks. You would certainly have said that a carpenter had turned them smooth on a lathe, set them upright and planted them.18

Examples of topiaries or what appear to be topiaries occur in middle Byzantine manuscripts such as the Gospel book, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, gr. 74 (second half of the 11th century), or the Homilies of James of Kokkinobaphos, Vatican Library, gr. 1162, and Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, gr. 1208, as well as in the contemporary mosaics in the Kariye Camii (Enrollment for Taxation and detail of a peacock in a garden; Figs. 5, 6). The visual evidence suggests the use of topiaries, an artificial manipulation of landscape, and an obvious attraction to the fantastical treatment of the landscape in Byzantium.19 That Hyrtakenos

18 Betts, Three Romances, 10, verses 282–90.
19 Littlewood also marshals visual evidence, from manuscripts in particular, as allusions to topiaries and their use in Byzantine gardens in the face of no surviving examples. He too acknowledges that the artistic renderings of trees are often imaginative and fantastically colored, which complicates the distinction between the real and the fanciful. See “Gardens of the Palaces,” 29 and figs. 1 and 2 (Paris, B.N., gr. 74, fols. 52r and 149v), and “Gardens of Byzantium,” 137 and fig. 18 (Paris, B.N. gr. 74, fol. 61r).
includes it in his ekphrasis is a critical textual allusion to this gardening practice reproduced in the visual material, but the modern audience cannot disentangle easily the real (that he describes from something he saw in life) from the literary/artistic allusion.

Hyrtakenos thus has already given, early in his description, ample details for us to attempt a visual reconstruction of Anna’s garden. In fact, with the help of a landscape architect, Kate McGee, we have done just that. Her drawings illustrate this essay and give a sense of the garden conception so nicely suggested by Hyrtakenos’ rhetoric. The drawings follow his text closely, and we have interpolated where necessary. In reconstructing the garden from this ekphrasis, perhaps we extend its puzzle as we take up the challenge of his description (Figs. 7, 8).

Hyrtakenos continues to speak of the science of gardening, the deliberate incorporation of human control of the landscape, in an otherwise romanticized narrative. The trees must be evenly spaced, and trees of different species must not intermingle, but be planted by kind, according to the rules of gardening. This configuration emulates the guidelines found in the Geoponika, as well as topoi established in earlier descriptions found in literary texts and in illustrated manuscripts such as the late-eleventh–early-twelfth-century menologion, Mount
Thus the chorus of cypresses (the only non–fruit-bearing tree in this garden) is joined by choruses of mostly unspecified fruit-bearing trees (later in the text, he mentions olives, laurels, and myrtles), underscoring the fertility theme that permeates Hyrtakenos’ ekphrasis.21 The disposition of the trees in the garden of Anna can be visualized in the oft-cited early sixth-century floor mosaic of the basilica at Heraklea Lynkestis in Macedonia (see Fig. 14). The trees are nicely lined up in a row and by species: pine, cherry, apple, olive, two cypresses, a dead tree, pear, fig, and pomegranate.22 However, Hyrtakenos eloquently compares his choruses of trees to a hippodrome, so that the reader comprehends that the fruit trees, like the cypresses, encircle the garden, and are obviously terraced to conform to the hippodrome seating analogy (Figs. 9, 10). His description depicts several concentric circles of trees, the outermost being the tallest, the cypress (and thereby also removing both the least fertile and the most protective and fencelike to the outer boundary of the garden),23 with each successive fruit tree moving in toward the center (Fig. 8):

20 The Geoponika’s popularity in Byzantium is reflected in its extensive manuscript tradition. Because of its established renown, it also represents gardening practices still followed in the 14th century. Parallelisms with Hyrtakenos’ text include the instructions that the garden be fenced (10.1.1) and that plants should be arranged according to species (10.1.2); see Littlewood, “Gardens of Byzantium,” 135, and idem, “Gardens of the Palaces,” 30; see also R. Rodgers, “Herbs in the Field of the Field and Herbs of the Garden in Byzantine Medicinal Pharmacy,” in this volume, 159–175.

21 These trees are listed in most descriptions of gardens wherein the author enumerates the species. They are also attested in the Geoponika (book 10).

22 Littlewood, “Gardens of Byzantium,” 136. Littlewood explains (n. 30) that the dead tree has been restored as a date palm in the reconstruction drawing of the mosaic, but that a dead tree would make more sense in the context of this mosaic. See also H. Maguire, Earth and Ocean: The Terrestrial World in Early Byzantine Art (University Park, Pa.–London, 1987), 36–40.

23 Likewise, the Geoponika (11.5.4) contains the advice that cypresses should be placed at the outer barrier to act in concert with it as a fence around the garden: Δημόκριτος δὲ ἐκεῖνον ὡς ἔνθεθα τοῦ θριγγοῦ τὴν κυπαρίσσιον δὲ ἐπιτευχθήσας, ἴσα μετὰ ἀμίφστητα εἰς τέρμην καὶ περιφέρειαν γένηται (“Demokritos says that cypresses should be planted within the enclosing wall, so that they become both something to enjoy and a fence.”). Theodore Metochites describes the contribution of the desirable, yet unfruitful, cypress to the garden next to a church in his encomium for Nicaea:

Ἀ δὲ εἴχετο τοῦ νεό παραχώματι ἀπαντά, ἣν πολλὴ χάρις, ὅραν ἔθεν μὲν λευμάνις κεχμένους, ἔθεν δὲ στεινήν εὐκαρπίαν τε ὄμοιο καὶ πολυκαρπίαν, ἀπὸ τὴν τινὰ ἀνέπιμπται ἐκεῖνον, καὶ γάρ ἄκαρπον μὲν ἀλλὰ θυσινές ἢ κυπάρισσας καὶ εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀναστροφών, ἐμιδίδειν ἀπεριοῦς ὑποδεικνύει τοὺς ἑκεῖ Φιλοσωφοῦσίν, ὅποι δὲ τρέχει καὶ ἀνατείνεται, μετὰ τῆς ἀνάλους καταβάσας καὶ περιττὰ τῆς ὑπερσπάνεον καὶ στενηκοῦνεον πρὸς τὴν ἀνάβασιν.

And what meets one on leaving the church, and a very pleasant thing it is, is to see on one side meadows spread out and on another an excellent and a rich growth of trees; and to see even the unproductiveness of some there make its contribution. For an unfruitful thing, yet a straight-standing one, is the cypress, which in rising even to the skies, as it seems to me, proclaims without artifice to those who meditate there the way in which they are to walk and strive upward, laying aside gradually as they go up the excess of their material part and growing thinner as they rise. (Trans. C. Foss, Nicaea: A Byzantine Capital and Its Praises [Brookline, Mass., 1996], 180–81.)

Immediately after the chorus of cypresses there were several other choruses of all kinds of trees, winding around the garden in turns, neither indiscriminately, nor in utter confusion, nor mingling the different species; and none whatsoever was barren or even declining with regard to its edible efficacy, or did not offer fruit surpassing all others of the same nature by being greatly superior. But each chorus was neatly arranged according to its kind and species, and knew how to differ from the others in only one thing: further behind was more elevated, while the one on the inner side would always be somewhat lower, so that it allowed for the beauty of the outer chorus to be visible, and so that all of them could see the life-giving sun. It is possible to see something similar happening in the theaters of the hippodrome, where the spectators sit together as on a ladder, beginning with the highest seats, always sitting lower in the inferior level, until they descend to the lowest level, so that it is possible for everybody to watch the competitors.

This disposition of trees is echoed in sources from the late antique period through the late fourteenth century. For example, both the late antique romance *Daphnis and Chloë* and the twelfth-century romance *Drosilla and Charikles* stipulate that the non–fruit-bearing trees were placed on the outside and the fruit trees in the center.

24 *Ekfrasis eis tVPN varadeiVnon tVz aVtias* *Azwv*, in Boissonade, *AnecGr*, 3:64.

25 The description in *Daphnis and Chloe* (4.2.4) states, ἐνδόν ἂν τὰ καρποφόρα φυτά, καθάπερ φρουρούμενα ἐξόθεν περιείστηκε τὰ ἄκαρπα, καθάπερ θρεπτικὸς χειροποίητος· καὶ ταῦτα μέντοι λεπτῆς αίμαστάς περεῖθει περίβολος. (“The fruit-bearing trees were inside, as if they were guarded. The non–fruit-bearing trees were toward the outside, like an artificial fence. These were surrounded by a thin wall.”). R. Hercher, ed., *Erotici Scriptores Graeci*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1858–59), 305, 17–19. The same arrangement is found in Niketas Eugenianos’ romance, *Drosilla and Charikles* (1.77–80): λειμῶν γὰρ ἂν ἡδίστος αὕτης ἐν
In addition, a fourteenth-century allegorical poem by Theodore Meliteniotes, *Sophrosyne* (see Appendix 2), dating later than our ekphrasis, describes a garden with trees planted in concentric circles again following this same arrangement of species. The garden is described twice, once by the heroine, Sophrosyne, and once by the narrator. The second description (verses 2334–2524) portrays a garden enclosed by a square wall, but the trees are planted in three concentric circles called “choruses.” The outside circle is formed by non–fruit-bearing trees, the next by evergreens, and the third, in the center, by those that bear fruit:

> Who could talk about the garden to an assembly? Or is it clear to all of them that <the garden> is unrivaled? For all around, near the <enclosing> wall, non–fruit-bearing trees were standing in rows, as if they were a first chorus. Then, a second

---

chorus, that of evergreen trees, was standing within the <chorus> of the non–fruit-bearing ones. The fruit-bearing trees were standing as a third chorus, having all the branches leaning toward the earth, and all of them nodding downward because of the weight of their fruits.27

The text also asserts that the trees are planted in pleasing symmetry and order (στοιχηδόν and κατ’ εὔθειαν, verses 2355–57). Other details of the garden correspond variously to those found in Achilles Tati̇os, Makrembolites, or Hyrtȧkonos: fruit hang heavy from the branches, a sweet Zephyr is blowing, a pool is situated in the middle of the garden with animals and birds adorning its rim, water spouting from their mouths, and the garden is mirrored in the water of the pool. The final verses of the poem, which interpret its allegorical symbols, state that the garden of Sophrosyne is comparable to the garden of Eden (verses 2909–3062, especially 3054–59).

27 Miller, Poème allégorique de Meliténio, verses 2335–45.
Yet all of these other cited garden ekphraseis refrain from Hyrtakenos’ degree of detail (Figs. 9, 10); his circular and stepped tree (hippodrome) arrangement (for once) does not have an obvious source in middle or late Byzantine texts. Michael Psellus, in his biography of Constantine IX (1042–55), describes the gardens of the church of St. George of Mangana in Constantinople:

All round were buildings bordered with porticoes on four or two sides and all [the grounds] as far as the eye could see (for their end was not in sight) were fit for horse-riding, and the next [buildings] were greater than the first; and in addition there were meadows full of flowers, some extending all round, others in the middle; there were water conduits that filled fountains; there were groves, some on high ground, others sloping down towards the plain; there were baths of indescribable charm.28

But is this his imaginary invention, or is he describing the plan of an aristocratic garden in Constantinople?

Hyrtakenos’ garden does not lack its requisite ornament, a fountain; he proffers an effusive illustration of this magnificent structure in the enclosure of the by-now-forgotten Anna. It is, not unexpectedly, in the very center of the circle of trees (Figs. 7, 11, 12). Made of three different colored marbles, it shone brilliantly in the light of day. Porphyry, which threatens to enflame all around it, and a green and a golden stone form a tricolored sculpture, which Hyrtakenos likens to creation (and the garden of Eden). The colors may allude to Phison, one of the four rivers of Paradise.29 The description of the fountain begins simply enough: it had a round basin (green stone) with a cylinder (golden gleaming stone) rising from the middle with a pinecone (porphyry) on top.30 Holes were drilled into the cone, seven in all, from which jets of water streamed (like the tears of Niobe). Again, it is not difficult to locate images of fountains with pinecone spouts in Byzantine art; they are omnipresent.31 Foremost are the two depictions of the Annunciation to Anna from Daphni (Fig. 1) and from the Vatican Kokkinobaphos manuscript (Fig. 15); in each, water spews forth, streaming into the basin below. The elaborate marble fountain at Daphni also reflects the multicolored appearance of its textual sister. Fountains proliferate in manuscripts of all types, such as Gospel books, lectionaries, and menologia. For example, the canon tables of


29 ὁνόμα τῷ ἔνι Φισών, οὗτος ὁ κυκλῶν πάσαν τὴν γῆν Εὐλατ, ἐκεῖ οὗ ἐστὶν τὸ χρυσὸν· τὸ δὲ χρυσὸν τῆς ἑκεῖνης καλῶν· καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐστὶν ὁ ἄνθραξ καὶ ὁ λίθος ὁ πρόσινος (Gen. 2:11–12). The word ἄνθραξ was understood to be a red stone in Byzantium. A reference to this stone is found in Theophrastus, ἄνθραξ καλοκάμινας... ἐφυσμένοι μὲν τῷ χρώματι; F. Wimmer, ed., *Theophrasti Eresii Opera Omni*, vol. 3 (Leipzig, 1862), 18.

30 Littlewood briefly discusses other kinds of connections made between marble colors and patterns and the natural world in other Byzantine texts; see “Gardens of Byzantium,” 131 (and his note 21 for more sources).

the Gospel books Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, gr. 64 (11th century; Fig. 16), Parma, Palatina Library, cod. 5 (late 11th–early 12th century), and Mount Athos, Dionysiou monastery, cod. 4 (13th century), or the headpiece of the lectionary Mount Athos, Chilandar monastery, cod. 105 (late 11th–early 12th century; Fig. 17) are surmounted by elegant and often flamboyant fountain constructions, with pinecone spouts and flanked by an array of fanciful birds and animals, again suggestive of Hyrtaikonos’ confection, as well as Byzantine fondness for landscape and animal motifs.

Historical sources corroborate the existence of similar fountains in imperial and aristocratic gardens in Constantinople and its surroundings. No examination of Byzantine gardens fails to mention those few references. Constantine VII, in the Vita Basilii (85–86), describes the Mesokepion in the Great Palace precinct near the Nea Ekklesia built during the reign of Basil I (867–886). The fountains of the atrium of the Nea are described as follows in the Vita Basilii:

On the western side, in the very atrium, stand two fountains, the one to the south, the other to the north. . . . The southern one is made of Egyptian stone which we are wont to call Roman [porphyry], and is encircled by serpents excellently carved. In the middle of it rises a perforated pine-cone supported by hollow white colonnettes disposed in circular dance formation, and these are crowned by an entablature that extends all round. From all of these elements water spouted forth and inundated the underlying surface of the trough. The fountain to the north is made of so-called Sagarian stone (which resembles the stone called Ostrites) and it, too, has a perforated pine-cone of white stone projecting from the center of its base, while all round the upper rim of the fountain the artist has fashioned cocks, goats and rams of bronze, and these, by means of pipes, vomit forth jets of water onto the underlying floor. Also to be seen there are cups, next to which wine used to spout up from below to quench the thirst of passers by.33

32 This manuscript has been erroneously dated to the late 13th–early 14th century in S. M. Pelekanides et al., Treasures of Mount Athos (Athens, 1975), 2:393, and more recently in the catalogue for the Mount Athos exhibition in Thessalonike, Treasures of Mount Athos (Thessalonike, 1997), 247. Instead, Chilandar cod. 105 fits easily into the early Komnenian period in both its script and ornament. Moreover, it is closely allied with other abridged middle Byzantine lectionaries such as Florence, Laurentian Library, Med. Palat. cod. 244.

Theodore Hyrtakenos’ Description of the Garden of St. Anna
Thus the two fountains were located in an enclosed space on the north and south sides, one porphyry and one marble; both sported a pinecone spout from which water spewed, similar to that of Hyrtakenos (and given visual reality in the second quarter of the 12th-century Homilies of Gregory of Nazianzos, Mount Sinai, St. Catherine’s monastery, cod. 339, fol. 4v; Fig. 18). Other fountains recounted with lesser detail include the Mystic Fountain of the Trikonchos palace, which is described as bronze crowned with a silver and gilded cone, and fountains in the Aretai palace.34


15 Annunciation to Anna. Vatican Library, gr. 1162, fol. 16r (photo: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana)
Theodore Hyrtakenos' Description of the Garden of St. Anna

The presence of fountains is attested, but they are not described. The Mystic Fountain is described in Theophanes Continuatus, *Vita Theophili*, 43, ed. I. Bekker, Bonn ed. (1838), 141–42 (lines 10–16), trans. Mango, *Art of Byz. Empire*, 162. A contemporary, and correspondent of Hyrtakenos, Theodore Metochites, wrote a poem concerning his palace and its gardens. It contains a slight reference to the presence of fountains spouting water and a beautiful decorated pool. A portion of the garden grounds was encircled with a path (similar in idea to Anna's garden?); R. Guilland, “Le Palais de Théodore Métochite,” *REG* 35 (1922): 82–95. For an abridged, but more accurate translation of Metochites' text, see Mango, *Art of the Byz. Empire*, 246–47. In addition to Metochites' poem describing his estate garden, in his encomium for Nicaea, he may also allude to fountains in his description of a church garden in that city. He mentions the water in the garden, that which comes from nature and that which comes through artifice. See his *Nikaeûς* in Sathas, MB, 1:147–48; and the recent edition and translation by Foss, *Nicaea*, 180–181. But he does not suggest that the fountains or water sources in either of his texts included automata.
Although Hyrtakenos’ fountain had an obviously decorative function, he still suggests that its water irrigated the surrounding plants (maintaining a link to the science of gardening), and it provided a pool in which the fish he describes could swim: “At one point there was as a landmark a fountain that could both reserve water and gush it forth, occupying the place of the center, as if setting up to view evenly all the lines flowing from the center toward the periphery and again rebounding toward the center.”

However, he reserves his greatest enthusiasm for the sculptural features of the marble basin at the heart of the fountain (Figs. 11, 12). No simple, smoothly curved bowl was this. Instead, according to Hyrtakenos, the artist has created an assemblage of bounding lions, leaping leopards, and swaying bears that are so lifelike they could frighten an onlooker. In addition, carved birds are perched on the basin and, he alleges, appear to drink from the water. As he rhapsodizes:

35 Ἐκφρασις εἰς τὸν παρόδεισου τῆς ἀγίας Ἀννης, in Boissonade, AnecGe, 3:61. In the reconstruction drawing inspired by Hyrtakenos’ description, the fountain has been positioned in the center with streams of water running from four sides. This divides the circular garden into four quadrants; the four streams could suggest the four rivers of paradise (and fit with Hyrtakenos’ paradisiacal allusions); one opening into the garden is indicated in the drawing according to his stress on the idea of protective enclosure (see Fig. 7).
The bounding of lions, the leaping of leopards, and the swaying of bears, as well as the images of other wild animals that the craftsman had excellently carved, were so close to moving that the beholder wished he could withdraw somewhere far away, lest the beasts suddenly leap on him and tear him to pieces.

These very things were on the fountain, around the outside surface. Around the rim <the craftsman> had shaped and positioned birds as admirable as a myth would describe the eagle on the scepter of Zeus, to the point that they seemed to dip their beaks and drink from the water, and would almost fly away, if anyone approached.36

36 Ἐκφρασὶς ἐις τὸν παράδεισον τῆς ἁγίας Ἀννῆς, in Boissonade, AnecGr, 3:62–63.
Birds of different species (and one assumes of many hues) fly about the cylinder as they spread their wings in flight (Figs. 11, 12). But Hyrtakenos does not permit his ekphrasis to stand on its own eloquence; he compares the artist’s handiwork to Apelles and deprecates his own poor attempts at description by invoking the eloquence of Demosthenes! (“It takes the eloquence of Demosthenes to describe how well they imitated nature.”) Nevertheless, unidentified, yet underlying his fountain ekphrasis, are any number of other textual and historical sources. Aside from his literary prowess, Hyrtakenos here suggests his knowledge of complex mechanical devices invented to entertain and flabbergast that have a long history, real and fantastical. Hyrtakenos’ fountain is more than a sculptural assemblage; his account implies that this fountain was an automaton. Although it is unclear from his description whether the bounding lions, leaping leopards, and swaying bears, which were so lifelike, were part of a mechanism that caused them to move about, yet the birds conform to similar descriptions of objects known to be automata. Hyrtakenos’ fountain certainly alludes to a connection with automata, even if implicit rather than explicit in his choice of descriptive words. The heroine’s garden in the fourteenth-century romance, Byzantine Achilleïs, includes a fountain with a pool adorned with statues of lions and leopards, with water spurting from their mouths, breasts, heads, and ears. Historical narratives reveal that there were automata in the Great Palace at least in the ninth and tenth centuries. Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (913–959), in his Book of Ceremonies, mentions three automata related to the “throne of Solomon” in the imperial court. They include trees with singing birds, roaring lions, and moving beasts. The western ambassador and chronicler Liudprand of Cremona also alludes to automata in the palace with lions and singing birds in his memoirs of his trip to Constantinople (949):

In front of the Emperor’s throne was set up a tree of gilded bronze, its branches filled with birds, likewise made of bronze gilded over, and these emitted cries appropriate to their different species. Now the Emperor’s throne was made in such a

37 Hyperbole of this sort is typically found in Byzantine literature as a technique to emphasize the nature of the beauty described (human, object, or landscape) and to bring some luster to the author through the backdoor association with literary luminaries of the past. See R. Beaton, The Medieval Greek Romance, 2d ed. (London–New York, 1996), 22–29 and 65–69; and Betts, Three Romances, xxviii. The invocation of the famous Apelles stresses the closeness to nature achieved in this manmade fountain. See also S. Bann, “Zeuxis and Parrhasius,” in The True Vine: On Visual Representation and the Western Tradition (Cambridge, 1989), 27–40. Bann repeats the famous passage from Pliny concerning the Greek painter Zeuxis and his “lifelike” painting of grapes (which could deceive birds) and discusses the tradition of ekphrasis.


Theodore Hyrtakenos' Description of the Garden of St. Anna

A cunning manner that at one moment it was down on the ground, while at another it rose higher and was seen to be up in the air. This throne was of immense size and was, as it were, guarded by lions, made either of bronze or wood covered with gold, which struck the ground with their tails and roared with open mouth and quivering tongue. Leaning on the shoulders of two eunuchs, I was brought into the Emperor's presence. As I came up, the lions began to roar and the birds to twitter, each according to its kind, but I was moved neither by fear nor astonishment. . . .

After I had done obeisance to the Emperor by prostrating myself three times, I lifted my head, and behold! the man whom I had just seen sitting at a moderate height from the ground had now changed his vestments and was sitting as high as the ceiling of the hall. I could not think how this was done, unless perhaps he was lifted up by some such machine as is used for raising the timbers of a wine-press.40

Several Byzantine chroniclers give evidence for automata at the court of Emperor Theophilos (829–842) and the destruction of them under his successor, Michael III (842–867), suggesting that by or during the time of Constantine VII more automata had been constructed for the palace confines.41 Unfortunately, historical sources contemporary with Hyrtakenos were apparently silent on this issue. There is more extant evidence of a fascination with fantastic devices in the Islamic world. For example, 'Abbásid palaces in the ninth-century capital of Samarra may have had automata, and there survives a Muslim account of the visit of two Byzantine ambassadors to the 'Abbásid court in Baghdad (917) that remarks on their amazement at the sight of a lavish artificial tree with singing birds placed in a pond.42 Yet it is important to bear in mind that in both cultures such contraptions were

---


41 Theophanes Continuatus, Vita Michaelis, 21, Bonn ed. (1838), 173 (lines 6–10). For further bibliography see Littlewood, “Gardens of the Palaces,” 32 n. 139.

42 R. Ettinghausen, “Introduction,” in The Islamic Garden, Dumbarton Oaks Colloquium on the History of Landscape Architecture 4, ed. R. Ettinghausen and E. B. MacDougal (Washington, D.C., 1976), 3–4. A succinct discussion of Islamic automata with useful references is found in Y. Tabbâ, “The Medieval Islamic Garden: Typology and Hydraulics,” in Garden History: Issues, Approaches, Methods, Dumbarton Oaks Colloquium on the History of Landscape Architecture 13, ed. J. Dixon Hunt (Washington, D.C., 1992), 322–29. Tabbâ suggests a development in Islamic garden design that moves from the use of more fantastical devices, in its early period, to the more tempered use of hydraulics both to enhance the aesthetics of the design and to produce virtuoso effects with water (329). See also Littlewood, “Gardens of the Palaces,” 32, with further references to the 10th-century visit of Byzantine ambassadors to the 'Abbásid capital at Baghdad described by the historian Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī. The issue of automata in the Byzantine and Islamic realms highlights the complex relationship that exists between these two cultures in terms of influences in each direction. It has been tempting to surmise that Byzantine garden design was dependent on Islamic schemes, mostly because more has survived and there are more extant text descriptions to muster for evidence from the Islamic world. Yet the Islamic court is known to have purposely imitated Byzantine palaces (why not gardens too?). Barber aptly confronts the problem of direction of influence between these two cultures in “Reading the Garden,” 2–5; Littlewood also alludes to it in “Gardens of the Palaces,” 25. For discussions and descriptions of Islamic gardens, see Tabbâ (cited above) and the essays in The Islamic Garden and Les Jardins de l'Islam/Islamic Gardens, Proceedings, 2nd International Symposium on Protection and Restoration of Historical Gardens, International Council of Monuments and Sites, 29 October–4 November 1973, Granada, Spain (Granada, 1976). Literary descriptions of Islamic gardens are collected in M. J. Rubiera, La arquitectura en la literatura árabe (Madrid, 1981).
based on the same principles devised by engineers of late antiquity such as the first-century A.D. inventor Heron of Alexandria, who wrote two works, *Pneumatika* and *Peri automatopoietikes*, describing wonderful mechanical devices. In 1206 the Artuqid sultan, Naṣīr ad-Dīn Ṣāmīḫ (1200–1222) ordered a book on automata from his engineer al-Jazār, *Book of Knowledge of Mechanical Devices (Kitāb ǧī Ma‘rifat al-Ḥiyal al-Handasiya)*. Fourteenth-century illustrated copies of this text provide delightful images of fanciful devices, which may approximate their appearance in Byzantium, such as an elephant clock, or a hand-washing device in the form of a servant pouring water from a pitcher, which is driven by a complicated hydraulic system.

Closer to home and more consequential is the insertion of automata into the garden descriptions of the twelfth- and fourteenth-century romances. For instance, in *Hysmine and Hysminias* (1.5–6), Makrembolites portrays a multicolored marble fountain with a gilded eagle, with wings spread, spurtng water from its beak at top, and beneath the eagle a goatherd milking a goat, a hare washing its chin, and various birds that also spurt water from their beaks and sing. Also from the second half of the twelfth century is the romance by Niketas Eugenianos, *Drosilla and Charikles* (1.91–104), containing an analogous albeit more cursory description of a garden fountain with automata. Contemporary with Hyrtakenos, the romance *Belthandros and Chrysantza* provides a protracted and lively enumeration of an


45 R. Ettinghausen, *Arab Painting* (New York, 1977), 93–95. The image of the elephant clock is from a manuscript in the Freer Gallery, the *Automata* of al-Jazār, acc. no. 30.75r; see E. Atil, *Art of the Arab World* (Washington, D.C., 1975), 110.

46 Schissel, *Der byzantinische Garten*, 25–28; Littlewood, “Gardens of Byzantium,” 147. The birds Makrembolites names are a swallow, a peacock, a dove, a turtledove, and a cock. For the description of the fountain, see R. Hercher, ed., *Erotpi Scriptoris Graeci*, vol. 2 (Leipzig, 1858–59), 163.3–164.9. Passages will be quoted according to Hercher’s text. Another edition of Makrembolites’ romance (with the same book and chapter divisions) is I. Hilberg, ed., *Eustathii Macrembolitae protonobilissimi de Hysmines et Hysminiae amoribus* (Vienna, 1876), 1.5.4–6.

47 Eugenianos states only: “in the middle of the beautiful spring stood a circle of well-hewn statues of white marble. The statues [άνθρωποι], implies statues of men rather than beasts; Eugenianos may have used the word άνθρωποι to avoid repeating the word άγάλματα in the previous verse] were the works of Pheidias and the opus of Zeuxis and Praxiteles, men excellent in sculpting statues.” (λευκών δὲ πετρῶν τὴς κυλῆς πηγῆς μέσων//άγαλματον έστηκεν εύξετοι κύκλος--οί δὲ άνθρωποι ἔστησαν έργα Φειδίου//καὶ Ζεύζοδος πόντιοι καὶ Πραξίτελος//άνθρωπον άριστον εις άγαλματοποιήσαν). Conca, *De Drosillae et Chariclis Amoribus*, 1.100–104; for the garden in general, 1.77–104 (pp. 35–37) and for the fountain and automata, 1.91–104. See also Schissel, *Der byzantinische Garten*, 30.
automaton fountain observed by Belthandros when he entered Eros’ castle, which featured a griffin with water spouting from its mouth:

He [Belthandros] then came upon a remarkable fountain whose water was as cold as snow. The beauty which the fount of the cupids possessed in boundless measure, I am wholly at a loss to describe. A carved griffin was standing there with extended wings and its back arched to a level with them. Its tail was bent round to its head. In its front paws it held a beautiful round basin carved from a precious stone. Water came from its mouth and flowed into the basin without the smallest drop falling down to the ground. For some time Belthandros stood contemplating the griffin’s construction and the strange property of the water. How was the water, which came from the griffin’s mouth, held in the small basin, which had no aperture at all? Or did the water change direction to escape? But how could the water flow back from the basin’s lips? He marveled at where the water went. Suddenly the griffin stamped away from where it was standing, crossed the river and stood there.48

The author narrates Belthandros’ wonderment at the sight, querying how the water worked its way from the griffin’s mouth to the basin and back again. Most remarkable was the sudden escape of the griffin, who crossed the river and stood opposite, a moment in the narration that may serve to stress the feat of mechanical engineering that enlivened the beast. The later romance by Meliteniotes, Sophrosyne, similarly portrays an automaton fountain:

In the very middle of this Garden there was a pool of generous width, having little depth toward the bottom. It was an indescribable structure made with rock crystal of the most pure whiteness. On the lips of this admirable pool stood a chorus of numerous birds and animals, also hewn in rock crystal. The mouths of these animals and birds were opened by some kind of mechanical device. Some were receiving the streams of water in their feet through some pipes, and were again spitting them forth through their mouths inside the pool, pouring like a spring.49

Thus the romances indicate that the inclusion of fountain automata was a critical topos in the ekphraseis of gardens, bolstering the possibility that Hyrtakenos’ construction may well allude to such fantastic devices. From the resemblances between Hyrtakenos’ description of the fountain in the garden of Anna and those of the literary texts, a context can be adduced for our author’s literary construction. It proffers mounting evidence that Hyrtakenos in part relied on romance literature as a means to construe an appropriate environment for Anna that could only intensify the significance of her lamentable situation. It is also the case for both Hyrtakenos and the romance authors that allusions to earlier writers further bolstered their own positions as they relentlessly demonstrated their erudition, as we have

48 Trans. Betts, Three Romances, 10–11 (verses 295–310). See also Schissel, Der byzantinische Garten, 40–41. He also analyzes the bath with mechanical devices recounted in Kallimachos and Chrysonoe (33–37) and translated in Betts, 42–43.
49 Miller, Poème allégorique de Melténiote, verses 2390–2405.
noted throughout. Heron of Alexandria provides useful narrations of automata and, in particular, has apt descriptions of garden fountains with similar features to our text and the various romances. Heron’s works give detailed information concerning the mechanical workings of these devices. One is a basin with a bird on its rim as if about to drink, and other more complex assemblages have birds in trees perhaps singing and with some drinking from the fountain basin. All of these automata bear some similarity to those described in the later Byzantine texts, particularly Hyrtakenos’ ekphrasis of Anna’s garden (Figs. 19, 20). Curiously, but without the mechanical paraphernalia, a headpiece in a fourteenth-century lectionary, Mount Athos, Dionysiou monastery, cod. 13, fol. 2r (Fig. 21), displays a large fountain basin with two oversized birds dipping their beaks into the water that may be a visual reflection of automata-like fountains.

Visualization of fountain automata does not occur in the most likely visual sources for Hyrtakenos’ garden of Anna: the images of this scene at Daphni (Fig. 1), the two Kokkinobaphos manuscripts (Fig. 15), and Kariye Camii (Fig. 2) present varying degrees of complexity in the structures of the garden fountains without mechanical additions. Moreover, the contemporary fountain image at Kariye Camii is the simplest one of them all: it has a square basin on a base with water flowing from a lion spout into a rectangular basin at a slightly lower level. Renditions such as these imply that sources from the visual arts did not play as much of a role in Hyrtakenos’ garden creation as did those from the literary (and possibly historical) realm.

Hyrtakenos does not end his ekphrasis with the stupendous fountain automaton/construction in Anna’s garden (Figs. 7, 11, 12). Continuing his narration laden with allusions in all directions, he describes an assortment of multihued birds flying or singing their sweet songs in the trees. He names four species: nightingale, parrot, peacock, and swan, but fails to mention the sparrows of the Protoevangelion. In fact, none of the sources that discuss this

---

19 Automaton (Heron of Alexandria), reconstruction drawing (after W. Schmidt, Herons von Alexandria: Druckwerke und Automatentheater [Leipzig, 1899], 1:89, fig. 16)

50 Schmidt, Herons von Alexandria, 1:88–175, 218–21.
event allude to the sparrows found in that text. The appearance of Anna’s garden is indirectly described in her lament wherein she compares her own barrenness with the fruitfulness of her surroundings. Once again, James of Kokkinobaphos does not supply a depiction of the specific features of her garden, omitting mention of the birds or water present in the *Protoevangelion.* All of these birds are mentioned in different combinations in earlier garden descriptions, and some of them, such as the nightingale and peacock, inhabited real Byzantine gardens. For example, Achilles Tatios mentions the parrot, peacock, and swan, and the

As noted previously (note 7), James’ text (which has the advantage of surviving in two illustrated versions) is copying from the earlier homily (III) of George of Nikomedea, *PG* 100:1393c–1396a.
Geoponika (book 14), which discusses the upkeep of domesticated birds, only mentions the peacock from Hyrtakenos’ group. Hyrtakenos displays some ignorance of parrots and swans, since he claims that they were singing; his description of them is most likely based on literary antecedents.\(^5^2\) In a finishing poetic flourish, Hyrtakenos signals the presence of elegantly arranged flowers: a rose, a lily, violets, narcissus, lotus, hyacinth, and silphium:

The rose emerged delightful, setting the bud ajar. The lily sprang forth sweet, breaking through the pregnant womb. The violet frisked splendidly, like an infant bounding without its swaddling clothes. The beautiful narcissus was twisting with desire. The “dewy lotus,” as a disciple of Homer might call it, as well as the crocus and the hyacinth were dancing around elegantly. Silphium was smiling charmingly, admired

\(^5^2\) Peacocks, swans, and parrots are mentioned in Achilles Tattos’ *Leukippe and Kleitophon* (1.15.7–8, 2d century A.D.):

> οἱ μὲν χειροθεὶς περὶ τὸ ἄλσος ἐνέμοντο, οὐς ἐκολύκησαν αἰών ἀνθρώπων τροφαῖ, οἱ δὲ ἐλεύθεροι ἔχοντες τὸ πετρόν, περὶ τὰς τῶν δενδρῶν κορυφὰς ἐπισειζόν οἱ μὲν ἄδοντες τὰ όρνιθιῶν σάματα, οἱ δὲ τὰ πετρὸν ἀγλαζόμενοι στολῆ, οἱ ὀφθαλμὸι τοὺς στείχες καὶ χελιδόνες, οἱ μὲν τὴν Ἑώς ἄδοντες εὐλόγην, οἱ δὲ τὴν Τηρέας τράπεζαν, οἱ δὲ χειροθεῖς ταῖς κύκνοις καὶ φιτακοῖς οἱ κύκνοι περὶ τὰς τοῖς ὕδατον πίθακας νευμένοις, οἱ φιτακοὶ εἰς οἴκοσκο περὶ δενδρῶν κρεμαμένοι, οἱ ταῖς τοῖς ἄνθισες περισύρον τὸ πετρόν, ἀντέλαμπτη λέγοντας ἢ τῶν ἄνθεων ἔθα τῶν όρνιθιῶν χρωτά καὶ ἢ ἀνθή πετρῶν. (“Birds there were too: some, tame, sought for food in the grove, pampered and domesticated by the rearing of men; others, wild and on the wing, sported around the summits of the trees; some chirping their birds’ songs, others brilliant in their gorgeous plumage. The songsters were grasshoppers and swallows: the former sang of Aurora’s marriage-bed, the latter of the banquet of Tereus. There were tame birds too, a peacock, a swan, and a parrot; the swan fed round about the sources of the spring, the parrot was hung in a cage from the branches of a tree, the peacock spread his tail among the flowers; some, shrill with the desire of Aurora’s marriage-bed, others garlanded their necks with the hues of the peacock, whose plumage seemed itself to consist of very flowers.”) S. Gaslee, trans., *Achilles Tattus*, Loeb (Cambridge, Mass., 1917; repr. 1961), 46–49.

The singing of parrots is described in *Digenes Akrites* (Escorial, verses 1657–59; see the recent edition and translation by E. Jeffreys, *Digenis Akritis: The Grottaferrata and Escorial Versions*, Cambridge Medieval Classics 7 [Cambridge, 1998], 360–61), and Meliteniotes’ *Sophrosyne* (verse 2517). Lyrical descriptions of preening peacocks, browsing swans, and singing parrots in a garden context are also found in the Grottaferrata version of *Digenes Akrites* (6:21–28 and 7:31–41; Jeffreys, 152–55 and 204–5). Schüssel, *Der byzantinische Garten*, discusses the dependence of *Digenes Akrites* on Achilles Tattos (10–21), for example: άρνεων γένηει παχάνεν ενέμετο τὸ ἄλσος, ταῖς χειροθεῖς τε φιτακοὶ καὶ τοὶς κύκνοις οἱ κύκνοι εἰς τοὺς κλάνοσ ἤδον, οἱ κύκνοι εἰς τοὺς ἄνθη τὴν νόμην ἐποιεύοντο, οἱ ταῖς τὰς πέρυμας κυκλούντες εἰς τὰς ἀνθῆς ἀντέλαμπον τῇ τῶν ἄνθων ἐν τὰς περίστης χρώματι. (“Several kinds of birds lived in the grove—tame peacocks, parrots and swans; the parrots hung on the branches and sang, the swans browsed for food in the water, the peacocks paraded their wings among the flowers’ colors in their wings.”) (6.21–26; Jeffreys, 152–53). *Sophrosyne* also echoes Achilles Tattos’ romance in imagery and vocabulary. In John Eugenikos’ encomium to a plane tree, he exaggerates that a parrot and fourteen other species inhabit its foliage (J. F. Boissonade, *Anecdota Nova* [Paris, 1844; repr. Hildesheim, 1962], 334). Hyrtakenos’ knowledge of swans was probably based on literary sources, and he may have been misled by passages such as the one in the romance *Daphnis and Chloe* (2.5.1, usually dated to the 2d century A.D.), which describes the voice of Eros in the garden of Philetas: ἐνταῦθα πάνω κατιφρον γελάσας ἀφίστη φωνή, οἷον ὡσε χελιδῶν οὗτο ἀπὸν ὡσε κύκνος, ὡμίους ἐμοί γέρον γενόμενος. (“At this point he laughed loudly and made an utterance which was neither like a swallow, nor like a nightingale, nor like a swan becoming as old as myself.”) Swans sing once, just before they die. Hercher, *Erotici Scriptores Graeci*, 1:263, 1–2.
The Beauties were laughing, the Delights were leaping, the Muses were chanting, the Nymphs were accompanying their song with the lyre; “nor did they lack aught of the beauteous lyre that Apollo held,” “while the player struck the chords in prelude to his sweet lay.”

Personified, symbolic, and studiously connected to classical predecessors, they intensify the luxuriant disposition of the garden and how the individual confined inside would experience it.

Struggling mightily, Hyrtakenos finally returns to the crucial focus of the narrative, Anna and her annunciation. He proclaims as he synopsizes:


54 A 12th-century anonymous work analyzes individual trees and plants according to their symbolic and virtuous nature; see M. H. Thomson, ed. and trans., The Symbolic Garden: Reflections Drawn from a Garden of Virtues, a Twelfth Century Manuscript (North York, Ont., 1989), 16–126. The rose is the most popular flower in garden descriptions, and the lily, violet, narcissus, and hyacinth are also frequently enumerated. The Geoponika (10.1.3) advises gardeners to plant roses, lilies, violets, and crocuses among the trees because of their appearance, smell, and usefulness, as well as because they are income producing and beneficial to bees.
Why should one enumerate the olive groves and the vineyards, the laurel and myrtle groves, the beds of the plants, the appearance of cultivated trees, the attributes and qualities of the fruits, as well as their beauty and magnitude, the bursting of transparent springs and the bubbling up of the sweetest waters, the clear songs of birds that are not inferior to the charms of music, and the other things, each one of which is worth talking about and narrating, why should one spend time describing them? Especially since they did not offer the slightest consolation to Anna, though they were so lovely and wonderful. For, once a soul has experienced sad ideas and is brought down by grief, it does not easily want to look up nor to change mood. Rather, like a ship dipped in a billow and sunk by an influx of waves one after the other, it cannot shake free and rise from the surface. In any case, she was not well disposed toward anything pleasant. But, whence she might derive some repose, therefrom she rather stored up burdens of misfortune, and anything sweet she deemed as “good for nothing.”

In other words, as Hyrtakenos elaborates further, the wonders, sights, and smells of this luscious paradise are all lost on Anna (as is Hyrtakenos’ rhetorical prowess), so absorbed was she in her lament with which the description began. Amidst this fertile environment, Anna’s barren state is all the more evident. But, all is not lost, in fact, because it is within the sensual potency of this setting that Anna symbolically re-loses her virginity. For the Archangel Gabriel (“who knows how to release the fetters of barrenness”) appears to Anna and triggers her conception of the Virgin; the hapless Joachim, brooding in the wilderness, contributes little to this desired event.

Within his ekphrasis on the garden of Anna, Hyrtakenos constructs multiple layers of meaning in his narrative. The story of Anna herself is simple enough; he leads the reader into her lamentation and exits through her annunciation and conception. The garden description, however, functions in a variety of ways for the audience by providing a highly charged context for an important religious moment. Hyrtakenos founds his ekphrasis on the modest narrative in the Protoevangelion of James, but he broadens its scope through the vivid presence of the garden and through the orchestrated erection of literary allusions, ancient and Byzantine. The idea of παραδείσου, of course, goes back to the original paradise, the garden of Eden (“Then the Lord God planted a garden in Eden away to the east, and there he put the man whom he formed. The Lord God made trees spring from the ground, all trees pleasant to look at and good for food; and in the middle of the garden he set the tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.” Genesis 2:8–9), which Hyrtakenos does not fail to mention in his text, “But whence had the transplanting of those unwithering plants come? Whence the water of the leaping springs? Clearly, indeed, from Eden and the Euphrates [one of the four rivers of Eden].”

Similarly, Eden and the Euphrates are invoked in the early romance Digenes Akrites in book seven:

55 Ἐκφρασες εἰς τὸν παράδεισον τῆς άγυιας Ἀννής, in Boissonade, AnecGr, 3:68.
56 Ibid., 3:67.
after he had bravely subdued all the frontiers, capturing very many cities and rebellious districts, chose to settle close to the Euphrates. This river was the loveliest of all, with its source in the great Paradise itself; because of this it has a most fragrant sweetness, and a coldness from recently melted snow. Channelling water from this river, he planted another delightful pleasure garden there, a remarkable grove, truly a good sight for the eyes. There was a wall around the grove, high enough, with four sides of smoothed marble.57

Hyrtakenos’ text, like many with romantic pretensions, also implies an association with the Song of Songs. The garden plays a familiar role in this biblical text, full of fervent fertility with its flowers, fruit trees, and singing birds. It is the paradigm for the enclosed garden of the romances, of Anna, and of the Virgin (“My sister, my bride, is a garden close-locked, a garden close-locked, a fountain sealed.” [Κήπος κεκλεισμένος ὁδελῆ μου νυμφή, κήπος κεκλεισμένος, πηγή ἐσφραγισμένη, 4:12]). In the West, late medieval (ca. 1400) Virgin iconography developed an image of the Annunciation to the Virgin that positioned her in an enclosed or walled garden with flowers (lilies, violets, and roses), often with a fountain, based on the words of the Song of Songs.58 The imagery clearly reflects the type of depictions, verbal or visual, that in Byzantium were associated with Anna (Figs. 1, 2, 15). In contrast, the Byzantine Annunciation to the Virgin does not evolve into a popular portrayal of her in an enclosed garden with a fountain. Instead, she is usually depicted in front of an architectural structure as the Archangel Gabriel approaches. Nevertheless, garden imagery does appear in the Virgin annunciation scenes to varying degrees, as for example, in the famous Annunciation icon at the monastery of St. Catherine’s, Mount Sinai (Fig. 22). Trees, flowers, and birds with their wings spread or perched in the trees enhance the event and underscore the relationship of her annunciation with the fecund period of spring. Even enclosures and fountains or wells are included in some instances, but as part of the background, not as a confining space for the Virgin.59 Aside from its obvious metaphorical

57 Jeffreys, Digenis Akritis, 7.5–16, 202–3.


59 For a useful summary of Byzantine Annunciation iconography and its relationship to ekphrasis, see H. Maguire, Art and Eloquence in Byzantium (Princeton, N.J., 1981), 42–52. Maguire analyzes different versions of the Annunciation in conjunction with textual sources that use metaphorical description to connect the Virgin to the idea of renewal and fertility. Near in time to Hyrtakenos, Isidore, archbishop of Thessalonike, uses an ekphrasis of spring in his Sermo in annuntiationem Beatae Virginis Mariae (Sermon III), PG 139:112d.
intent, all of this seasonal simulation is appropriate for the Annunciation to the Virgin, a feast day celebrated in spring (25 March).

It is useful to remember that the Annunciation to Anna was celebrated on 9 December, not a time of year associated with either fertility or renewal. It becomes imperative, then, to fabricate a most fruitful garden as a counterpoint to that seasonal dilemma, again to enhance the significance of this event. Accordingly, aside from its calculated proximity to *topoi* in the Virgin’s Annunciation, Hyrtaenkos’ overabundant garden representation contrives to situate Anna in an unmistakable equivalence to her daughter. From the *Protoevangelion of James* to the *Description of the Garden of Anna*, the texts expanding the narrative of the life of the Virgin strive to increase her purity and holiness. Her virginity at the conception of Christ is declared in the canonical Gospel texts, but her status is heightened through the escalation
of her mother’s status. Her un-virgin mother whose womb God has shut up dons her bridal garments and becomes like a virgin again; she too can partake of a divine intervention that insures a pristine conception of the Virgin. A further reference to virginity may be found in the pinecone spout with its seven orifices at the top of the fountain. Byzantine writers attached meaning to the number seven, referring to it as άμήτωρ (without a mother) and παρθένος (virgin) because it is the only single-digit number that can be neither divided by nor divide another single-digit number. Hyrtakenos’ descriptive detail may have been a subtle, but deliberate, attempt to enhance Anna’s status for her virginlike conception of her daughter.60

Therefore, another one of the multiple layers of meaning in Hyrtakenos’ ekphrasis is intertwined with romance literature. We come back to that very daunting circular barrier that encloses Anna’s garden (Figs. 7, 9). With the circles of trees, it seems a particularly potent protective construct, and its presence aligns itself with the many enclosures found in the Byzantine romances and ancient literature. As A. R. Littlewood and C. Barber have pointed out, in the romances the garden is a metaphor for woman; she is sequestered securely behind its walls.61 In Hysmine and Hysminias and Kallimachos and Chrysorroe, for example, the heroines await their lovers in an enclosed garden. The walls of the gardens, at least for Hysmine, stand for her virginity, yet the abundant plant life refers to the heroine’s fertility and ability to reproduce.62 Likewise, within his version of the apocryphal narrative,

---

60 For a discussion of the symbolism of the number seven, see Hunger, Die hochsprachliche Profane Literatur, 2:223, and below, Appendix 1, note 9, for further explication of this symbolism.
61 Littlewood, “Romantic Paradises,” 103–7, and Barber, “Reading the Garden,” 14–19. This metaphor was already established in ancient literature and was familiar to the Byzantines. For instance, in his commentary on the Odyssey, Bishop Eustathios of Thessalonike (12th century) remarked (in his annotation of the description of the archetypal literary garden of Alkinoos) that ὥς δέ κήπος μεταληθεῖς ὑπὸ κοιμικοῦ σκόμμα ἐποίησε, γυναικεία γάρ τις μακάσκορον εἶπε, τὴν μεμηχανὸν περὶ μίξεις, κήπον ἐκείνον ὑποθέμενον εἶναι, τὸ παρά Λυκόφρονι ἐπείσθαν. (“This garden, interpreted in another sense by a comic poet, was turned into a gibe. Because someone called a woman who is mad [with desire] to have sexual intercourse ‘a mad garden’. He suggested that a garden is what Lycophron calls επείσθαν [pudenda muliebria].”); Scholium on Odyssey, 7.129, in Eustathii Commentarii ad Homeri Illadem et Odysseam (Hildesheim–New York, 1970), 265, lines 37–40.
62 Romances in western medieval literature invoke analogous topoi in their utilization of the garden. In Chrétien de Troyes’ Erec and Enide (ca. 1180), one episode concerns a knight and his mistress who are imprisoned (through a rash lover’s promise) in a garden enclosed by walls of air (O. Gilbert, trans., Erec and Enide [Berkeley, Calif., 1992], 204–35, verses 5348–6384). The Roman de la Rose (Guillaume de Lorris, 1230) presents a dream vision garden that displays many similarities in its description to those of the Byzantine romances. The hero’s garden is enclosed with a high crenellated wall and contains so many fruit trees that they cannot be enumerated, as well as the requisite fountains. He effuses: “Then I entered into the garden, without saying another word, by the door that Idleness had opened for me, and, when I was inside, I was happy and gay and full of joy. Believe me, I thought that I was truly in an earthly paradise. So delightful was the place that it seemed to belong to the world of the spirit, for, as it seemed to me then, there was no paradise where existence was so good as it was in the garden which so pleased me. There were many singing birds, collected together, throughout the whole garden” (C. Dahlberg, trans., The Romance of the Rose, 3d ed. [Princeton, N.J., 1955], 39, verses 631–60). The hero then proceeds to fall in love with the rose contained within the lush garden. Many thanks to Barbara K. Altmann for her helpful discussion of French medieval literature and bibliographic citations. A 12th-century treatise on Love, De arte honesta amandi by Andreas Capellanus, recounts a garden with every variety of fruitful tree where a nobleman wishes to make love to a lady. This garden is very similar to Hyrtakenos’ in its scheme: it is circular and
Hyrtakenos has engineered an enclosure for Anna, in the same vein, that simultaneously suggests a heroine-as-virgin role and provides the agency for her pregnancy by divine intervention (or by the gardener/male). His use of the staunch barrier only augments her claim to an undefiled conception and is a necessary construct in her case, unlike that of her daughter (who really does not need to be in an enclosure for the conception of Christ). His dependency on topoi associated with the romance heroine indicates that the Description of the Garden of Anna was itself conceived as a mini-romance despite its religious underpinning.

Like Hyrtakenos, however, we too digress. It is necessary to return to the issue of the garden itself. Peeling back Hyrtakenos’ metaphorical approach to the narrative of Anna, his many allusions to classical and Byzantine texts, and patent delight in the pictorial aspects of the garden he describes, it remains to determine how aptly he has re-created a Byzantine garden for his audience (to return to the question, is it real or is it imaginary?). It will be remembered that he makes a point to invoke science as well as the art of gardening (“One could consider those the artifacts and gifts of diligence and agriculture”). This is a garden created by following understood, but not delineated, rules such as the manufacture and use of topiaries, the insistence that the trees and flowers be evenly spaced in their planting according to species, the needed hydraulics for watering (in this case through the automaton fountain), and the enclosing wall. Hyrtakenos gives us enough data to suggest a scheme for the garden (Figs. 7, 8, 10, 11), but not the specific measurements or even a sense of scale. The limited references to the science of gardening may be based on Hyrtakenos’ practical knowledge of the topic, which can be gleaned from treatises such as the Geoponika or even literary sources such as the anonymous twelfth-century text concerning a symbolic garden, which specifies many of the features found in Hyrtakenos’ description, including the need for a “safe fence.” The few extant historical sources also convey a picture of what Hyrtakenos may have been familiar with in terms of actual gardens in Constantinople or its surroundings; his social contacts indicate that he would have had access to the estates and gardens of the upper classes. In addition, evidence from his correspondence reveals that Hyrtakenos owned a grove with fig trees and he sent gifts of pomegranates to Emperor Andronikos III,

concentric in plan and organization and has at its center singing birds and a spring full of fish. See P. F. Watson, The Garden of Love in Tuscan Art of the Early Renaissance (Philadelphia, 1979), 28. The rise of popular romances in the West and the use of the enclosed garden as a major theme may have influenced the later development of a new iconography of the Virgin which depicts her in an enclosed garden similar to the situation in Byzantium with regard to Hyrtakenos’ Description of the Garden of Anna. Interesting analogies may also be made with the Renaissance text Hypnerotomachia Poliphili (Venice, 1499) and its garden descriptions. Thanks to Barbara Lynn-Davis for useful discussion on this text. See F. Colonna, Hypnerotomachia Poliphili, repr. of 1499 Venice edition published by Aldus Manutius (New York, 1976). In addition, the text by Meliteniotes, Sophrosyne, is also very rich in its garden descriptions and in its similarities to western romances such as the Roman de la Rose. We intend to pursue our analysis of Hyrtakenos and Meliteniotes in a future publication. See J. V. Fleming, The Roman of la Rose: A Study in Allegory and Iconography (Princeton, N.J., 1969), and K. Brownlee and S. Huot, eds., Rethinking the Romance of the Rose: Text, Image, Reception (Philadelphia, 1992).

63 ἄλλα ἔχειν μὲν ἵσις ἀν τις ἐπιμελείς καὶ γεωργός ἐπι τεχνάσματι καὶ δορήματι· Εὐχής, ἐχεῖς τὸν παράδεισον τοῦ ἀγίου Ἁννης, in Boissonade, AnecGr, 3:66.

Theodore Hyrtakenos’ Description of the Garden of St. Anna

which suggests that he had some pragmatic familiarity with gardens or at least with orchards. Yet, although his personal experience of real gardens may have influenced his description, the inclusion of obvious references to textual sources, whether scientific or not, thwarts our current efforts to extract a precise representation of gardens in this culture.

If Hyrtakenos’ garden does not reflect a fixed image of this medium, it leads us to the other part of the conundrum in this text: is it an ekphrasis of an actual painting of the Annunciation to Anna as Hunger claimed? It has been demonstrated here that comparison of Hyrtakenos’ description to extant images indicates that the textual visualization corresponds to them only in the most generalized manner. In fact, the text is more elaborate and allows the audience to imagine the specific scheme of Anna’s garden that transcends the lush but constrained renditions in material culture. True, there may have been more paintings in churches and manuscripts than have survived; seven churches dedicated to Anna are known to have existed in Constantinople at one time. Unfortunately, we have no indication of their decoration, and it is unlikely that our text reproduces the one (now lost) exquisitely detailed representation in the visual arts. Moreover, our analysis of Hyrtakenos’ text has underscored his practice of mimesis, his unabashed use of previous sources, religious or romantic, to produce his description. His use of identifiable rhetorical devices, as a testament to his status as a literatus, also distances his text from an actual work of art. Through his clever use of words, he pictorializes an event, its garden context, and its emotional impact in order to move his audience, of whom he is quite aware, as he makes clear at the end of his piece: “However we, oh you who are present, should now end the description” (ήμιν δ’, ὃ παρόντες, ἀναπαυστέον ἢδη τὴν ἐκφρασιν).

In conclusion, Hyrtakenos’ Description of the Garden of St. Anna offers a complex combination of affectations that encompass pointed references to other texts, reflections of gardens in literature and in Constantinople and its surroundings, and even allusions to visual images that may have been known to him. It is, most of all, an artifice, a work of art unto itself, transcending any specific connection to the real. Hyrtakenos achieves for his audience the entire panoply of emotions that his set piece evokes as he builds on every one of

65 A. Karpozilos, “Realia in Byzantine Epistolography XIII–XV c.,” BZ 88 (1995): 75. Hyrtakenos sent the pomegranates along with his expressions of hope for an heir. In a letter to the imperial protospaltes, he requested a gall-insect (δικλωθος), which inhabits wild fig trees, so that he could produce more fertile fig trees in his own garden.


67 Ἐκφρασις εἰς τὸν παράδεισον τῆς ἀγίας Ἀννᾶς in Boissonade, AnsGt, 370. For a recent discussion of ekphrasis and art in Byzantium, see L. James and R. Webb, “To Understand Ultimate Things and Enter Secret Places: Ekphrasis and Art in Byzantium,” Art History 14 (1991): 9–17. James and Webb separate ekphrasis as aesthetic description from its rhetorical and spiritual function in this society. They argue against it as a realistic re-creation of a work of art (“We have tried to show how they [ekphrasesis] are indeed largely irrelevant to a reconstruction of the material appearance of art,” 13).

68 See R. Beaton’s pertinent discussion on artifice in literature, Romance, 65–69.
the senses. Foremost is “the hook of delight” that his imaginary garden creates for his audience/reader:

Moreover, there were some things <in the garden> that enslaved the senses of the body. One captured vision. Another, by tickling hearing, made the listener hang upon his ears. Yet another weakened smell by remembrance alone. A fourth one hardly suggested itself to taste and the hook of delight seized the chest. As for the sense of touch, even before experiencing the smoothness <of the fruits and flowers of the garden>, one’s capacity to touch was weakened. Thus one was overcome from all sides, even if he struggled very hard to resist. He was overthrown not only with regard to <his senses>, but also with regard to the powers of the soul.69

Indeed, does the imagination need anything other than Hyrtaulos’ verbal images to re-create this vivid picture of a garden?

University of Oregon and Berkeley, California

69 Ἐκφρασίς εἰς τὸν παράδεισον τῆς ἐγίας Ἁννης, in Boissonade, AnecGr, 3:66. The appeal to the senses is a theme of the garden descriptions of the romances and is also included in the anonymous 12th-century treatise (Thomson, The Symbolic Garden, 18–19).
Nazareth is a town of Judea; Anna was dwelling in the town. The town was the homeland of the Mother of God, formerly undistinguished and unimportant, but later distinguished and extremely important. For there Gabriel brought to the Virgin the glad tidings of the conception without seed, because it was, indeed, it was necessary that the birth of Christ by his mother be devised anew without a father, as by his father was without a mother. However, Joachim (for he was the father of the maiden), due to the divine tribulation of childlessness that had been inflicted upon him, as was already mentioned, considered even mingling with men as a major point of shame. And indeed, he was living together with wild animals in the thickets of the mountains. As for Anna the mother (but why should I put in words how utterly distressed she also was, when I can describe it in deeds?), she paid no attention to any of her household affairs, but abandoned everything because she considered it treacherous and responsible for her barrenness. She only frequented one of the neighboring estates (this estate was a garden) and conversed with God in solitude. What kind of garden this was, blooming with how many and what kind of goods, my words will proceed to describe.

The garden had a surrounding wall in the shape of a ring; the shape of a ring is circular. A double frieze was raised upon the surrounding wall, soaring aloft high in the air. And each was a beautiful ornament for the other, encircling the garden in safety. One, the frieze, was put together with the stonecutter’s craft, so that neither the clever thief could indulge in theft, nor the one who enslaves his eyes to love could burn into carnal fire because of curious looks into the garden. Rid of all disturbances, it gave its mistress...
freedom to converse with God, whom she desired, raising her mind <to him> without
distraction. The other, <the wall>, was enwreathed with a chorus of cypresses. The trees
were sufficiently stripped of stems in their trunks, and from there grew straight [61], so that
they shot up in an upright foliage shaped like a cone, and were so well pushed up and were
held in check in such a way, that one would think he was looking at well-girded maidens
stretching their hands to one another reciprocally and setting up a noble and harmonious
dance. Both knowledge and craft had gathered together, and each vied emulously to bring
forward its own good offices to <these maidens>: <craft> by competently burying <their>
roots in a certain way according to the rules of gardening, and by requiring as much dili-
gence as craft needs caution; knowledge by measuring <the intervals> between each other
so that they could not meet, since they were parallel,⁶ and so that the intermediate space be
neither too much nor too little, avoiding both too long and too short a distance.

At one point there was as a landmark⁷ a fountain that could both reserve water and
gush it forth, occupying the place of the center,⁸ as if setting up to view evenly all the lines
flowing from the center toward the periphery and again rebounding toward the center. The
bowl <of the fountain> was hewn in light green stone. [62] In the middle of the bowl an
upright cylinder was soaring aloft. A cone was posted upon the cylinder like a head on a
neck, pierced with as many holes as there are on a head, three plus four.⁹ From the holes

⁵ This simile is obviously inspired by a myth recorded in the *Geoponika*, 11.4. 1–2. See above in article,
ote note 17. Cf. Makrembolites 1.4.4: ἐξαπλοῦσθι τοὺς κλάδους ὡς χείρας καὶ ὀπίσερ χορὸν συστημαμένος καταφοροῦσθι τὸν κήπον. For the branches of trees likened to stretched arms, see A. R. Littlewood, *The
Progymnasmata of Ioannes Geometres* (Amsterdam, 1972), 55 n. 11.29.
⁷ Ἐφ’ ἐνι ἐν μένοι σημεῖο, ὑδροδόκη καὶ ὕδροχυ ψαλὴ της ἴπ τὸ σημεῖον. Paronomasia with hom-
onyms. Hyrtakenos is playing with the multiple meaning of the word σημεῖον, “point” in geometry and “sign,”
“portent,” “token,” “landmark,” etc. in other contexts. The remainder of this period contains a number of other
geometrical terms as well.
⁸ ὑδροδόκη καὶ ὕδροχυ ψαλὴ της ἴπ τὸ σημεῖον, λόγὸν ἐξουσια κέντρου, πάσας ἐπίσης ὅρων
ἐπιστημησά ὀπίσερ ἀπὸ κέντρου πρὸς κύκλον ρυθμομένως γραμμάς καὶ πάλιν πρὸς τὸ κέντρον
ἀνακλομένας. Cf. Makrembolites 1.5.1 (quoted above in App. 1, note 4). In another text, Hyrtakenos describes
the rays of the sun in similar words: ἢ μὴ ἀκτίνες ἡλιακά ἐκέχει ἐκδηλοκώμενοι κάκεισα πάλιν
ἀνακλομέναι, ἢ καὶ πρὸς κύκλον ἀπὸ κέντρου γραμμαί ρυθμοκόμεναι καὶ πρὸς τὸ κέντρον σὺνθες
ἐπανακομίσασα (Boissonade, *AnecGr*, 1:252).
⁹ Seven all together, as there are two ears, two eyes, two nostrils, and a mouth. The idea that the number
seven corresponds to the openings of the human head is expressed in the work of Anatolius, *Περὶ δεκάδος καὶ
[Paris, 1900], 27–41; French translation by P. Tannery, *ibid.*, 42–57 = *Mémoires scienti-
fiqques* 3 [1915]: 12–28), p. 36. Hyrtakenos is aware of the mystical significance of this number, as is evident from a passage in his encomium for
the birthplace of the Virgin Mary (Boissonade, *AnecGr*, 3:43–44): μονοτικός γάρ ἄνθεθεν ὁ ἐπά τυσεται καὶ σετέται
προσμαρτυρεῖται καὶ τίμησε, ἐτ τῶν ἐντῶν παρακληθα γε χαρισμάτων τοῦ τοῦ πνεύματος, ἐτ τῶ τῶν
τριμᾶσα καὶ τετραδιά σών ἐνετὸς καὶ τῷ δημιουργῇ τὴν δημιουργίαν συνάπτησε, ἐτ τῶν τοῦ παρθένου
ἐλήμνε τὴν καθαρίαν, ἐτ τε καὶ διὰ λόγως ἄλλους σὺς αὐτὸ το το πνεύμα μόνον ἐπιστάττατ. (“For seven is a
mystical number from above and is confirmed as revered and worthy of honor, having received this <qual-
ity> either because of the seven endowments of the Holy Ghost [Is. 9:2], or because both three and four can be
observed in it joining the creation with the creator, or because it is a virgin and pure number, or even for other
reasons that the Spirit alone is aware of”). Anatolius (ibid., p. 35) cites the Pythagoreans for calling number seven
ἀμήτος (“motherless”) and παρθένος (“virgin”), because it is the only one-digit number that can neither
darted up as many jets of water as there are veins. Rather, they flowed as if streams of tears flowing from eyes, for craft had wrought the holes in such exact likeness to eyes. Compared to these, what were the tears of Niobe, which were not tokens of pleasure and gladness, but rather proof of suffering and mourning? And if Niobe changed into stone, one could suppose, or, rather say, seeing it, that the tears of joy and delight that were streaming down from all sides turned the stone into a human being, for the fountain received the showers with such fondness that, whatever it embraced in pleasure, it then with great enjoyment drew off to the plants for irrigation.

The bounding of lions, the leaping of leopards, and the swaying of bears, as well as the images of other wild animals that the craftsman had excellently carved, were so close to moving that the beholder wished he could withdraw somewhere far away, lest the beasts suddenly leap on him and tear him to pieces.

These very things were on the fountain, around the outside surface. Around the rim had shaped and positioned birds as admirable as a myth would describe the eagle on the scepter of Zeus, to the point that they seemed to dip their beaks and drink from the water, and would almost fly away, if anyone approached.

It was possible to perceive the cone as an ornament upon an ornament, and as being to the fountain what the fountain was to the garden. For it was hewn in porphyry, while the tube was constructed from a different, gleaming stone, so that the creation and position of everything appeared there in small scale, since purple was at the top, bright green at the bottom, and in between them both there was linen-color.

Moreover, various species of birds sculptured on the tube were as if swimming through the air, delightfully spreading their wings and flying around, here and there. In addition,
somewhere there the fish, unable to swim in the tube, were swimming steered by their tails, unpredictable in their restlessness, jumping about in the artificial sea. For where further could they go, since porphyry, being aether, was threatening to enflame anything that might touch it? [64] The craftsman had decked out <the birds15> with such precision, as if he were a second Apelles. It takes the eloquence of Demosthenes to describe how well they imitated <nature>.

Immediately after the chorus of cypresses there were several other choruses of all kinds of trees, winding around <the garden> in turns, neither indiscriminately, nor in utter confusion, nor mingling the different species; and none whatsoever was barren or even declining with regard to its edible efficacy, or did not offer fruit surpassing all others of the same nature by being greatly superior. But each <chorus> was neatly arranged according to its kind and species, and knew how to differ from the others in only one thing: <the chorus situated> further behind was more elevated, while the one on the inner side would always be somewhat lower, so that it allowed for the beauty of the outer chorus to be visible, and so that all of them could see the life-giving sun. It is possible to see something similar happening in the theaters of the hippodrome, where the spectators sit together as on a ladder, beginning with the highest seats, always sitting lower in the inferior level, until they descend to the lowest level, so that it is possible <for everybody> to watch the competitors.

As for the birds, and especially those that the craft of nature beautified with multifarious hues, some were flying in all directions, while others were sitting on the bottom of the trunks and the topmost leaves of the trees,16 and it was possible to think that those going in the middle <did> neither, so that the beholder would wonder which of the two is closest to the truth, that they sat <on the trees> or that they flew around. Moreover, each was striking up its own music, and they vied with each other in a worthy competition, who would sing a sweeter melody. [65] From one side a nightingale with variegated neck17 was singing more sweetly than the Sirens.18 From another spot the bright green parrot was singing. The peacock, the gilded bird, a most splendid sight, was delighting in its own hues.19 A swan spreading its wings to Zephyr20 was sounding a harmonious lyre. And if myth knows a monstrous all-seeing man, then, by all truth, the garden possessed all tongues.21

14 τὸ μὴ μένειν ἀπρόόπτω (literally, “unforeseen in not staying still”).
15 ἐκεῖνα = “those,” “the former.”
18 On the Sirens, see also Hyrtakenos in Notices et extraits 6:38 (letter 78); ibid., 42 (letter 86).
21 The mythological all-seeing man that Hyrtakenos refers to is Argos Panoptes, whose body was covered with eyes. When Zeus transformed his beloved Io into a heifer so as to hide her from the jealousy of Hera, Hera sent Argos to watch over Io and never leave her in peace. Argos is extensively referred to by Hyrtakenos in Boissonade, AnecGr, 1:292.
Throughout spring, how could words ever express what <beauty> was attained by the multifariousness and polychromy of the flowers, smelling better than the perfumes from Arabia and India?22

And whenever the season of fruits arrived, when the matchmaking full bloom happened to be appointed as the mother of fruits, what beauty, size, smoothness, shine, and sweetness of juices they obtained called for <one’s> ability to distinguish the pleasures rather than a descriptive narrative.

Moreover, there were some things <in the garden> that enslaved the senses of the body. One captured vision. Another, by tickling hearing, made the listener hang upon his ears. Yet another weakened smell by remembrance alone. A fourth one hardly suggested itself to taste and the hook of delight seized the chest. As for the sense of touch, even before experiencing the smoothness <of the fruits and flowers of the garden>, one’s capacity to touch was weakened. Thus one was overcome from all sides, even if he struggled very hard to resist. He was overthrown not only with regard to <his senses>, but also with regard to the powers of the soul.

One could possibly call those the artifacts and gifts of diligence and agriculture. But <the plants> that the earth brought forward by itself, how would he discuss them?23

For the face of that land was richly painted and variously ornamented, as nothing else, since all the seasonable <harvests> yielded24 everywhere had assembled there together, as if at a signal. One could justifiably call her Bride of Solomon,25 adorned with lilies better than a field. The rose emerged delightful, setting the bud ajar. The lily sprang forth sweet, breaking through the pregnant womb. The violet frisked splendidly, like an infant bounding without its swaddling clothes.26 The beautiful narcissus was twisting with desire. The “dewy lotus,” as a disciple of Homer might call it,27 as well as the crocus and the hyacinth [67] were dancing around elegantly. Silphium was smiling charmingly, admired more than the others. The Beauties were laughing, the Delights were leaping, the Muses were chanting, the Nymphs were accompanying their song with the lyre; “nor did they lack aught of the beauteous lyre, that Apollo held,”28 “while the player struck the chords in prelude to his sweet lay.”29

---

22 For other references to the perfumes of Arabia and India by Hyrtakenos, see Boissonade, AncGr, 3:23; Notices et extraits, 6:17 (letter 54).
23 Cf. Longos, Daphnis and Chloë, 4.2: ἔσαν καὶ ἄνθην προσηταί, ὅν τά μέν ἔφερεν ἡ γῆ, τά δὲ ἐποίει τέχνη. (“There were also beds of flowers, some of which the earth brought forth, and others that craft created.”).
25 Cant. 2:1.
26 Τερπόν τό ρόδον, παρανοιγόν τήν καλύκα, προϊόντες· ἦδο προεπίδα τό κρίνων, τήν κυψερόσες γατέρα διαρρίγγουν· ἀγλαύν εσκίρται τό ὄνω, ὡς βρέφος ἀπεπαργαγμένον ἀλλόμενον. Cf. Makrembolites, 1.4.1: τόν προπηδά· τόν φύλλον καί μετ’ ὀξύμη ὠφαίζει τήν ὀμίλη· τόν ρόδον τά μέν προκύπτει τής κάλυκας, τό δ’ ἔγκυμονεῖται, ἄλλο προκέκυκλον, ἐστὶ δ’ ὁ καί πεπανθέν κατά τήν ἐρρύμη.
Graces all over, charms everywhere. From one side Luxuries, from the other Delights were calling. All was beautiful, all lovely, and every single thing considered it a shameful defeat not to excel among all others. Such was their noble competition with each other.30

But whence had the transplanting of those unwithering plants come? Whence the water of the leaping springs? Clearly, indeed, from Eden and the Euphrates. For everything beautiful from everywhere had assembled there as if to one abode, and truly constituted “the most fertile of lands.”31 Why <did> that silly little garden of Alkinoos the Phaeacian <exist>, raised, as they say, above the earth, planted suspended up in the air?32 Why <were there> the Islands of the Blessed and the “asphodel meadows” and the Elysian Fields that are beyond decay,34 this nonsense of the poets35 [68] and the talk of inebriated old crones, the silly meadows that the Hellenes deemed worthy of silly heroes, because they were stranded away from Paradise as we know it? <They existed> so that those whom neither green pasture would feed, nor dew of grace would refresh, be seized by spiritual thirst and hunger, and <so that> they be condemned neither to Kokytos nor to Pyriphlegethon,37 but <have> a river of eternal fire and the flame of hell as a resting place.

Why should one enumerate the olive groves and the vineyards, the laurel and myrtle groves, the beds of the plants, the appearance of the cultivated trees, the attributes and qualities of the fruits, as well as their beauty and magnitude, the bursting of transparent springs and the bubbling up of the sweetest waters, the clear songs of birds that are not inferior to the charms of music, and the other things, each one of which is worth talking about and narrating, <why should one> spend time describing them? Especially since they did not offer the slightest consolation to Anna, though they were so lovely and wonderful. For, once a soul has experienced sad ideas and is brought down by grief, it does not easily want to look up nor to change mood. Rather, like a ship dipped in a billow and sunk by an

---

30 Cf. Makrembolites, 1.4.2: σῦ δ᾽ ἐνε ἀλκινοῦ τὰ ποταμοὶ, σῦ ὀλίβνοι δ᾽ ἔχεις ἀναψυχῆς ἀπαυγάσεως.
31 Iliad, 9.141 and 283.
32 Suspended were the gardens not of Alkinoos but of Semiramis. See Boissonade, AnecGr, 3:67 n. 4. It is a literary topos to judge the beauty of any garden by comparison to that of Alkinoos. For a list of examples, see Littlewood, Progymnasmata, 47. To these add Libanios’ description of a garden in R. Foerster, Libanii Opera, vol. 8 (Leipzig, 1915; repr. Hildesheim, 1963), 485–86.
33 Odyssey 11.539.
34 For the Elysian Fields and the Islands of the Blessed in ancient literature, see Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, new rev. ed. by G. Wissowa and W. Kroll (Stuttgart, 1893–), s.v. Elysion.
35 Cf. Makrembolites 1.4.3: Ταῦτα ἔχεις τῶν Ἀλκινοοῦ κήπων ἑδόκους ὁρῶν, καὶ μόνον σῦ εἶχες τὸ παρὰ τοῖς ποιηταῖς σεμινολογοῦμένοιν πεδίον Ἑλύσιον.
36 The pagan Greeks.
37 Hyrtakenos refers to Pyriphlegethon again in Notices et extraits, 5:732 (letter 9). For entries of Byzantine dictionaries on Kokytos and Pyriphlegethon, see Suidae Lexicon, s.v. Ηλύσιον πεδίον: ἐν ὃ οἱ παρ’ Ἐλλησπόντῳ δίκαιοι αὐλίζονται, μετὰ θάνατον ἐκεῖσε ἐλευθεροῦσαν. οἱ δὲ κολάδες αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ Κωκυτῶ καὶ τῷ Πυριφλεγέθον ἀπελεύθησαν. ποταμοὶ δὲ οὗτοι, ὃ μὲν Κωκυτῶς ψυχρώτατος, ὃ δὲ Πυριφλεγέθους θερμώτατος. (“Elysian Field: where the just ones dwell, according to the Hellenes, arriving there after death. Those who deserve punishment will depart to Kokytos and Pyriphlegethon. These are rivers, Kokytos a very cold one and Pyriphlegethon very hot.”).
influx of waves one after the other, it cannot shake free and rise to the surface. In any case, she was not well disposed toward anything pleasant. But, whence she might <derive> some repose, therefrom she rather stored up burdens of misfortune, and anything sweet she deemed as "good for nothing."³⁸

At any rate, from time to time she stretched not only her mental thoughts but also her physical eyes together with her arms toward heaven, [69] sometimes beating her breasts with both hands, other times fixing her brow and knees on the ground, and, in distress of both soul and heart, she uttered such pitiful cries to God as "I ought not to have been conceived in the first place, nor should my miserable mother have borne me in her womb. Rather, I should have been to it so that I be aborted as soon as I was conceived, or that I die"³⁹ as soon as I was born. Thus I would not have met with such an evil destiny. Otherwise, since I have reached such an age,⁴⁰ <I should> either become a mother or depart from among the living!!

Such were her words. And since she could not produce thunder, nor make torrential rains fall, she was doing what befitted her nature, uttering deep sighs and gushing forth fountains of tears. What then? Contemplating Sarah and Anna <the mother of Samuel> and Fenanna,⁴¹ and all <the women> who, like them, met up with that terrible demon of infertility, and how each one changed into bearing children, was that <reason> for better hope? By no means. For <Anna> considered their situation as curable, while her own as the only incurable one.

But I proclaim to you to have courage, Anna! Look at Sarah, who brought forth Isaac. Behold Anna, [70] the mother of Samuel. The archangel Gabriel, who knows how to release the fetters of barrenness, <is> near. He foretells to you that you will conceive, Anna. For, as <the Old Testament> Anna conceived Samuel, likewise you will conceive a virgin daughter. In her turn, she <will conceive> the one who is God over all, about whom John, the son of Elizabeth, will prophesy that he is the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world. And he will point him out not only by his words but also by his finger, saying "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."⁴² Praise to you for the glad tidings! More than praise for the graces! Now you have truly become what your name signifies, or, rather, you will become what you have been called. Know the interpretation of your name: "Anna" is Hellenized as “grace,” and, by becoming Hellenized, it is ennobled. For grace will

³⁸ 'Ουδὲν ιερόν (“nothing sacred”): ancient proverb that Hyrtakenos also uses elsewhere in his writings. Cf. Boissonade, AnecGr, 3:68 n. 1. Cf. also Suidae Lexicon, s.v. 'Ουδὲν ιερόν: Ἡρακλῆς εἶπεν Ἀδωνίδος ἰδίων ξύλων, ός τῶν εἰμενετιστῶν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους μόνους δεόντων τιμᾶσθαι ἢ ὅτι οἱ καταυφάντες εἰς αὐτὸ δούλου ἔ bubbαιν ὦν εἶχον. ("Nothing sacred": Heracles said that when he saw the cultic statue of Adonis, because, in his opinion, only those who were benefactors of humans ought to be honored. Or, because the slaves that fled there for protection were not granted indemnity.").


⁴⁰ εἰς τὸν θηλικόν παραγεγέλλασα. Παραγεγέλλω εἰς = “to enter the ranks of” (see Lampe, s.v. παραγεγέλλω).

⁴¹ See Boissonade, AnecGr, 3:69 n. 3.

⁴² John 1:29.
not give birth to grace, as they say, but to the mother of all graces and the one who filled our nature with grace, that is, the graceful Mother of God and mistress of both angels and humans. Therefore you, <Anna>, prepare yourself for the conception, and, after conceiving, give birth, and after giving birth rejoice and exult and dance. However we, oh you who are present, should now end the description.

43 Sophocles, Ajax, 520.
Theodore Meliteniotes, *Eis Sophrosynen*

Description of the Garden

[The poem *Eis Sophrosynen* is written in fifteen-syllable “political” verses. The narrative voice employed is the first person throughout. The poem begins with an introduction stating its didactic character: the authors of fiction are usually admired, though they disfigure the truth and compose false tales. On the contrary, the narrative that will follow is truthful. On the first of May, the best of all months, the narrator went for a walk in the midst of flourishing nature. While enjoying his surroundings, he saw a strange light emanating from a distant dome. A comely and dignified maiden appeared in front of him and explained that the dome was the roof of her home, and that she was the mistress of the land surrounding it. She had seen him approach her estate, unaware of the deadly dangers ahead of him, that neither human nor angel could avoid without her guidance. Worried for his safety, she had hastened to meet him. She explained that her home and its surrounding garden were protected by seven defensive obstacles: an impassable river, a bridge about to collapse, a closed iron gate, a plain with man-eating beasts, a steep trench, a dense woodland, and an immense enclosing wall. The narrator implored the maiden to let him visit her home and garden and then allow him to go back in safety. Moved by his tears, she agreed and guided him through the aforementioned dangerous obstacles, at this point described in detail, to the gates of her garden. Cerberus, who was prevented from devouring the narrator only by the maiden, watched outside these gates. An angel with a flaming sword, who was about to attack the narrator and was ordered not to by the maiden, guarded inside the gates. As soon as the gates closed behind him, the narrator started trembling with fear.]

[Verses 758–827] When the maiden saw me standing and trembling, she said: “Rejoice, oh human, do not be afraid, do not tremble, for you have now escaped the causes of fear. But see inside, admire everything as you have asked <to do>, even my own house, where I dwell. Do not overlook my bed, which is situated <therein>, oh stranger. Look at the

---

1 “To Sophrosyne,” that is, the maiden who led the narrator into her garden. Her name could be translated as “Moderation,” “Probity,” or “Chastity.” See Lampe, s.v. Σοφροσύνη.

2 The verses of the poem chosen for translation were strictly those pertinent to the landscaping of Sophrosyne’s garden. The summary of the verses omitted (including the description of the buildings contained in the garden) is given in italics. The subtitles preceding different sections of the translation were apparently placed there not by the author, but by a scribe, and were repeated by the editor. They are retained in the translation in order to aid the reader. References to other texts in the notes are not exhaustive, but only indicative of the number of rhetorical *topoi* employed by the author. For the connections between Meliteniotes’ poem and other texts, see F. Dölger, “Quellen und Vorbilder zu dem Gedicht des Meliteniotes ‘Εις τὴν Σοφροσύνην’: Mit einer Einleitung über die Person des Dichters” (diss., Munich, 1919). See also V. Tiftixoglu, “Digenes, das ‘Sophrosyne’-Gedicht des Meliteniotes und der byzantinische Fünfzehnsilber,” *BZ* 67 (1974): 1–63.

3 Many of the elements used in this part of the poem for the depiction of spring will reappear in the description of Sophrosyne’s garden.

4 The description of the woodland (verses 642–57), the last obstacle before the surrounding wall, reverses the *topoi* employed in the description of a pleasure garden: everything is covered with thick ivy, bramble, and an infinite number of holm oaks filled with thorns, while the bushes grow tangled and in total confusion. No wild or domesticated animal and no bird or other fauna lives there.
Mary-Lyon Dolezal and Maria Mavroudi

Garden⁵ and <the attributes> of the Garden, [765] the statues of the sculptors that are positioned in it, that are standing above, all around the walls, others looking like they were made of iron, others showing off a form made of copper, others of gold, others of some kind of silver. [770] Also look at the pleasant site of this Garden, its valley, the position of the place, the fragrance of the flowers that are in the Garden, the unusual beauty and colors of the herbs, the meadows [τὰς πόας], the likes of which no human eye has seen, [775] the ineffable and divine beauty of the shrubs. Behold the comeliness of the infinite plants, wonder at the delight that they bring here, see the assembly of the evergreen trees. Do not pass without awe, oh stranger, do not, by God. [780] But be surprised at the novel fruits <that grow> in it, and do not shun the vines <that are> thither, and see the form of the bunches of grapes, while you happen to be there.⁶ For they bring a lot of pleasure to their beholders and insatiable enjoyment to those who look at them. [785] Look at the grapevine, if you do not shrink from it. You will see many and multicolored grapes on it, some crystal-like, others blackish, while yet others have a purple appearance, offering a multiple and novel delight. [790] Do not overlook the tame⁷ and beautiful birds, those that sing sweetly and those that are used for hunting, those that love water and those that eat fish, for you will be delighted and will rejoice greatly. Behold the multitude of quadruped animals, and, [795] while looking at the springs and fountains of the garden, admire the extraordinary structure of the pool, gazing at the novel limpidity of the waters, and the multitude of fish that live in the pool. Admire the Sirens together with the Erotes,⁸ [800] and the decorous and great dance of the Graces,⁹ and the water-loving trees all around the pool, and the fowl that likes the nature of waters. Admire how my bath has been erected by a sensible builder near the pool,¹⁰ [805] and do not bypass my conspicuous throne, which, as is expected from its beauty and the ornamentation of its precious stones, has by far defeated the throne of Cyrus, which the scriptures vaunt as being a very brilliant one. Moreover, admire the two statues that are near it, [810] and you will by all means know the prudence of the most wise

⁵ In the translation that follows, “Garden” (with capital initial) renders the Greek Παράδεισος, which means both “garden” and “Paradise.” The importance of the double meaning of this word in the context of Meliteniotes’ heavily symbolic poem is obvious. For the garden of Sophrosyne, Meliteniotes also uses the word λειμών, which means both “garden” and “meadow.” Since “meadow” in English signifies a grassland, we rendered the Greek λειμών with “garden” (without initial capital).

⁶ [verse 782] We accept the editor’s emendation of οὔτω το οὖδ’. 


⁸ Cf. Achilles, p. 61, verse 720N, and p. 103, verse 488L.


¹⁰ The bath is described in detail later, but it is the only structure gracing Sophrosyne’s garden for which no allegorical interpretation is provided at the end of the poem. Baths are often described in the gardens and castles of the Byzantine romances (such as Kallimachos, 291–354, Belthandros, 457–59, Achilleis, p. 62, verses 776–94N, and p. 104, verses 514–29L), so it is possible that Meliteniotes’ mention of the bath is simply a repetition of a literary topos. However, baths in Byzantine culture had become associated with healing, a connotation that was also employed in Christian symbolism. See ODB, s.v. Bath. See also P. A. Agapetos, “The Erotic Bath in the Byzantine Vernacular Romance of Kallimachos and Chrysprhor,” Classica et Mediaevalia 41 (1990): 257–73.
craftsman. Look also at the divinely erected temple that I have, oh stranger, which is consecrated in the name of God, my redeemer and savior. See also my tomb near the temple, which is a gloomy memorial for me, the wretched one. Then look at the great gate that this Garden has, how it is locked. And after becoming a spectator of this all in there, you will feel pleasure, since you are human, and will admire even more the great and divine power of God. And if there are puzzles that are difficult to understand, let me manifestly explain their meaning to you, so that you can learn from facts about my nobility. For which human mind could be suitable enough for telling? Those who beheld the construction of the castle from far away, you could see them regard it as supernatural in their stupefaction. For they thought they were seeing snow, since the castle was twined by the whiteness and harmonious joining of its stones.

[Above the castle there was a cruciform apartment that is described in detail (vv. 828–1106). In it there was a bed decorated with precious stones, enumerated in alphabetical order (vv. 1115–97).] The posts of the bed ended in dragon heads that looked as if they were about to devour the sleeper. The legs of the bed were in the form of four men carrying it on their shoulders, as if in a funeral procession. The bed was covered with a purple veil (vv. 1198–1221). The narrator admired the house of the maiden, then climbed to the roof and gazed at the garden planted around it. The garden was surrounded by a wall made of rock crystal, above which there were labyrinthine galleries adorned with statues that faced the garden. The statues were sculpted by the famous sculptors of antiquity. Those that adorned the first wall of the garden represented ancient poets, orators, philosophers, grammarians, magicians, astronomers, and wise soothsayers, in one word those that were familiar with “Hellenic wisdom”: Adam, Seth, Cain, Solomon, Homer, Hezekiah, Orpheus, Epicurus, Deucalion, Cecrops, ancient doctors such as Hippocrates, Galen, Posidonius, Paul of Aegina, and Archigenes, etc. The southern wall of the garden was adorned with statues of the Greek gods: Saturn, Zeus, Poseidon, Apollo, Hades together with Tityus, Tantalus, Charon and Rhadamanthys, Phaethon, Hermes Trismegistos, Orion, Ares, Dionysus, Hephaestus, Gorgon, Aphrodite, Athena, Rhea, Demeter, Artemis, Hera, Selene, and the statues of wise men that the ancients honored as gods (vv. 1485–1858). The statues of the third wall represented Moses, Samson, David, Goliath, Jonathan, and other Old Testament figures known for their victories against the enemies of their people, as well as Herakles, Achilles, Nestor, Odysseus and other Homeric heroes, and Alexander (vv. 1859–2295). The fourth wall was adorned with statues of virtues: Gratitude, Vigil, Prudence, Humility, Charity, Continence, Truth, etc. Such was the position of the statues (vv. 2296–2334).

[Verses 2335–2524] Who could talk about the Garden to an assembly? Or is it clear to all of them that the Garden is unrivaled? For all around, near the wall, non–fruit-bearing trees were standing in rows, as if they were a first chorus. Then, a second chorus,

---

12 Cf. the beds in Makrembolites 1.6. Cf. also the bed in Achilles, p. 62, verses 768–73N and p. 104, verses 509–11L.
13 Cf. the statues on the wall of Rhodamne’s silver castle, verses 882–963N.
that of evergreen trees, [2340] was standing within the <chorus> of the non–fruit-bearing ones. The fruit-bearing trees were standing as a third chorus, having all the branches leaning toward the earth, and all of them nodding downward because of the weight of their fruits.  

Seeing the compactness of those trees, one would think [2345] that he was looking at a very dense mountain inside the Garden. At the very edge of this Garden innumerable kinds of shrubs were planted, that were in every way beautiful in form and appearance, rendering splendid the Garden of the Maiden. [2350] It was possible to see that the manner in which the trees were planted was unexpected: for the multitude of fruitless and fruit-bearing trees and the sounds of the birds that were in the shrubs represented the dance of female dancers that were singing a sweet song while dancing. [2355] The craftsman had pitched the trees in such rows, and had positioned the chamber in such a straight line, that he managed to please everybody by the view alone. This circular shape of all the trees created a magnificent plain, filled with trees [2360] and all kinds of herbs, as well as various flowers that adorned the place with their manifold colors and almost caused heavy torpor with their perfumes. In the very middle of this plain, on an elevation [ἀνα可靠性], there were fragrant, novel, and strange garden beds, [2365] bringing a sweet smell to the nostrils and delighting the soul with their unusual pleasantness. Who would not immediately be astounded, <thinking> it might be a sculpture, if he saw the thick shade of all the trees, the variation of the leaves, the kind of fruits, the close order of the shrubs and vines, [2370] the composition of the herbs, the fixing of the reeds, the beauty of the flowers, and the color of the pigments? Moreover, there were such big fruits hanging on the branches that all the shoots were bending downward because of their load. [2375] I therefore rejoiced looking at the fruits and pomes, some having their sweetest taste on the outside, and others guarding their delicious flavor inwardly. Amidst the continuous trees, violets and lilies, as well as balsam trees and basil [2380] together with roses, were sprouting in the garden, which offered a significant spectacle to the viewers. So unusual was the delight of this garden.

On the waters of the garden

<The Garden> also had several springs and fountains jetting forth from the ground and outpouring around in a circle, [2385] much cooler than melted snow, all uniting in one straight canal from which that whole garden was watered, receiving thus thoroughly sufficient irrigation.

On the pool of the garden

In the very middle of this Garden [2390] there was a pool of generous width, having little depth toward the bottom. It was an indescribable structure made with rock crystal of the most pure whiteness. On the lips of this admirable pool [2395] stood a chorus of numerous birds and animals, also hewn in rock crystal. The mouths of these animals and birds were opened by some kind of mechanical device. Some were receiving the streams of water [2400] in their feet through some pipes, and were again spitting them forth through

14 Cf. above, pp. 115–18 and note 25.
15 See above in App. 2, note 9.
16 The idea that the beauty of nature in a garden imitates the beauty of art can also be found in Longos, 4.3.5: ἔδωκει μέντοι καὶ ἡ τοιούτων φύσις εἶναι τέχνη.
their mouths inside the pool, pouring like a spring. These offered immeasurable delight with their abundance. The water was so limpid and diaphanous [2405] that the bottom of the pool was clearly visible, and it seemed as if the pool was a mirror for the Garden,17 as all the fruitless and fruit-bearing trees, the multitude of fruits, plants, and shrubs, as well as the herbs and the colors of the fragrant flowers, [2410] the grass and the species of birds and animals, and all that was growing in the Garden, appeared inside this admirable pool. This was an awe-inspiring sight for the onlookers. And whenever perchance the wind blew, [2415] it was possible to see the pool swelling with low waves, gently agitated because of the volume of the water, and the fish rising above it. For, one could see, swimming in the water, plenty of

On the fish inside the pool
[2420] urchins, red mullets, sargues, frogs and skates, huge octopuses, stingrays and mylluses, crabs, eels, parrot-wrasses, and the whole species of molluscs, cuttlefish, breams, carp, scorpion fish and sprats, gudgeons together with bass, prawns and shrimp, [2425] swordfish, turbots along with pipers,18 hyscae,19 braizes and flat-fish, sea-wolves and cod, sardines,20 a multitude of mormys, tunnies, and gobies and perch,21 and several other species of edible fish, that were meant, I believe, as food and sustenance for the admirable Maiden.

On the grapevine of the garden
[2430] I even saw a grapevine all around the pool, bearing many diverse and enormous grapes, others having a surface like that of a ruby, others with a black color, and yet others golden. Even as I looked at their size, my mind boggled.

On the vine in the garden
[2435] For an enormous vine, stretching high, roofed the roofless pool in an admirable way, and I believe that the single sight of it was something incredible for its beholders. The multitude of the bunches and the size of the grapes forced the vine twigs to bend toward the earth. [2440] What words can accurately depict their flavor? Who could inform with words the completely ignorant ones? The touch of the grapes was so enjoyable to the heart, their taste was so pleasant and so very sweet, and they were so delightful to the soul and so filled with honey, [2445] that I believe even the queen would rejoice and luxuriate in the beauty of their clusters and the multitude of their berries. The interweaving of the vine twigs and the vines, and the mass of the tendrils and the clusters of the grapes <created> something like another luminous ceiling above the garden.

17 Cf. Achilles Tatios, 1.15.6: τὸ δὲ ὕδωρ τῶν ἄνθον ἦν κάτωτρον, ὡς δοκεῖν τὸ ἀλογος εἶναι διπλοῦν, τὸ μὲν τῆς ἀληθείας, τὸ δὲ τῆς σκέψεως (“the water served as a mirror for the flowers, giving the impression of a double grove, one real and the other a reflection”). Trans. Loeb (London, 1917), 47.
18 φιλομήλα = “piper, trigla cuculus,” not “apple-loving,” as is implied by the editor’s punctuation.
19 See E. A. Sophocles, Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (Cambridge, Mass.-London, 1914), and D. Demetrakos, Mega Lexikon tês Hellenikês Glosês (Athens 1936–50), s.v. ἵςκα and ἵςκα (verse 2425).
20 The text here reads ἅτις. The editor (verse 2426 and n. 11) suggested its correction to κατὰ µύς (“and mussels”). The translation of the word given here follows the correction of Spyridon Lampros (Νέος ΕΛ. 12 [1915]: 19) τὸ ἄφων (“small fry of various fishes”) in Liddell et al., Lexicon; εἶδος µυκροῦ ἵθος, σαρδέλλα in Demetrakos, Mega Lexikon.
21 The emendation of παυθία to ἄνθια, as suggested by the editor (verse 2427 and n. 12), is acceptable.
On the beauty of the garden

[2450] It was possible to see an incredible sight in all this. That festive assembly of plants was growing a thick foliage.\(^{22}\) The branches of the fruitless trees \(<\text{formed}>\) a multitude beyond description, while the chorus of fruit-bearing trees was also growing there, as well as \(<\text{the chorus}>\) of evergreen and water-loving trees, [2455] while the swarm of leaves and the crowd of shoots, and of boughs and of all the saplings, and the composition of the fruits and the forest of the trees, were imitating the ceiling of a palatial home. Thus had the admirable craftsman covered it, [2460] thus had he roofed this admirable garden, that even the sun itself could not penetrate inside it, except only in times of windy weather in the garden, when most of the trees generally lose their leaves and drop all their adornment.\(^{23}\) [2465] Such were the plants and the vines.

On the fragrant garden beds

Could the garden beds of those fragrant flowers, which were filled with plants breathing sweet unguents, be easily described by anyone? I do not think so. For who could outline with words their composition, order, and beauty, [2470] as well as their ultimate symmetry? Their skillful gardener seemed to have used measuring cords of equal length. Some \(<\text{beds}>\) were growing roses, others were bringing myrtles to bloom, and yet others narcissus, violets and lilies together with balsam trees, [2475] different beds \(<\text{were bringing forth}>\) different \(<\text{flowers}>\), and holly\(^{24}\) and several other \(<\text{plants}>\), and \(<\text{it is possible}>\) to mention anything fragrant that the earth produces.

On the colors of the fragrant herbs

The color of the flowers was seen all-variegated. For the swarm of roses stood purple, the myrtles possessed an emeraldlike appearance, [2480] the narcissus seemed from afar as platinum, and the dark blue of the violets\(^{25}\) like the color of the sea.\(^{26}\) And if \(<\text{the garden}>\)

---

\(^{22}\) [verse 2451] ἐκόμα γὰρ ἡ τῶν φυτῶν πανήγυρις ἑκείνη. Cf. Achilles Tatos, 1.1.3: ἐκόμα πολλαῖς ἀνθεῖσιν ὁ λεύμων; also ibid., 1.15.1: ἔνδον ἢ ἡ τῶν φυτῶν πανήγυρις.

\(^{23}\) Cf. Achilles Tatos, 1.1.3: συνήστον οἱ πάρθοι τὰ φύλλα καὶ ἐγίνετο τοις ἀνθεῖσιν ὀρόφος ἢ τῶν φύλλων συμπλοκή (“and the branches, intertwining their leaves, thus made a kind of continuous roof over the flowers beneath”). Cf. also ibid., 1.15.4: τῶν δὲ φύλλων ἀνθεῖκεν ἀκρομυκέναι, ὥστε ἄλλο τῶν ἀνθεῖσιν συμμεταχωρήσαν ὀρόχνον ἐμεμφαράνεν ἢ γῆ σκιάν (“The leaves higher up were in gentle motion, and the rays of the sun penetrating them as the wind moved them gave the effect of a pale, mottled shadow on the ground”) as translated in Loeb (London, 1984), 5 and 47, respectively. Cf. also Makrembolites 1.4.3–4: δύσφη γὰρ καὶ μυρίνη καὶ κυτάρττος καὶ άμπελοι καὶ τάλλα τῶν φυτῶν, ὅσα τὸν κήπον ἀκούσμει ἢ μάλλον ὁ Σοσθένειος ἐβεβέβη κήπος, ἐφάπτουσα τοὺς κλάδους ὡς χέιρας καὶ ὥσπερ χορὸν συστησάμενα κατορφούσα τὸν κήπον, ἐξ ὀσοῦ δὲ τὸ ἄλλο παραχωρόσα προκυόν περὶ τὴν γῆν, ἐξ ὧν ὃν ἐξεύρος πνεύσας τὰ φύλλα διεσφείασεν (“Because the laurel, the myrtle, the cypress, the grapevines, and the other plants that ornamented the garden, or rather that the garden of Sosthenes brought forth, spread their branches like arms and, as if they had set up a dance, roof the garden, and allow the sun to peep out at the earth only as much as the zephyr blows and moves their leaves”).

\(^{24}\) [verse 2475] Possibly “holly” (κώκκος) should be emended to “crocus” (κρόκος).

\(^{25}\) [verse 2481] The text has τῶν ἰων δὲ κοκιανόν, which is signaled by the editor as a corrupt reading (p. 115 n. 6). The translation follows the emendation of κοκιανόν to τὸ κυανόν, suggested by Lampros (Νέος Ἑλλ. 12 [1915]: 19).

\(^{26}\) Cf. Achilles Tatos, 1.15.6: τῷ δὲ ἵππῳ κάλυξ μὲν οὐδαμοῦ, χρόνα δὲ οὐαν ἢ τῆς θαλάσσης ἀστράπτει γαλήνη.
enjoyed some chance breeze, it trembled slightly, like small waves, so that the many who were gazing at it from afar could see [2485] a calm ocean inside the Garden. The whiteness of those pure lilies and the splendid and green-colored sight of the balsam trees seemed to the beholders like a spraying river, and it was reckoned by the wayfarers as an emerald stone.

As for the voices of the birds that were in the orchard, and the honey-flowing songs of those that were singing, who will possibly tell their tale, what words could hand it down, even if one had ten thousand tongues and was immensely boastful <of his eloquence>? Some <birds> were sitting on the earth and were often singing, [2495] others were flying around uttering sweet songs, while yet others were seated together on the young shoots of the branches, delivering musical notes as if accompanied by a lyre.27

In addition, the garden possessed yet another delight: a gentle breeze was eternally blowing inside it, [2500] softly swaying the trees and all the herbs, and moving and throwing down the swarm of fruits. You could say this is the Zephyr of Paradise. It blew for the growth of everything in there and for the flourishing of the unconstrained <plants>, and in order to send out ineffable joy and incredible fragrance. [2505] Know that such was the comeliness of the garden, such was its adornment, and such its appearance, that it could even delight the angels, as I believe. For the blowing of Zephyrs in the Garden, the sound of both the <exceptionally> enjoyable and the <more> common little trees, [2510] the din of the fruits and the scented lotuses, the breathing of the waters, the rattling of the shrubs, the multicolored sight of the blooming herbs, and the fragrance of all the fragrant flowers, as well as that wonderful and awesome wind [2515] and the voices of the sweet-singing sparrows, the humming of the nightingales, the twittering of the swallows, the songs of the parrots, the melodies of the finches, and the odes of the cicadas that chirruped loudly brought a novel delight all over the Garden, [2520] wherefrom the heart of the Maiden was sweetened, and a wind filled with delight blew there. The sight of the garden was this splendid, full of many strong perfumes and unbelievable mirth, wondrous and graceful for everyone who laid eyes on it.

[The narrator goes on to describe in detail other structures in the garden, beginning with the splendid bath that was situated in its westernmost section (vv. 2525–67). He then describes the throne of Sophrosyne. Its legs represented the four virtues (Prudence, Valor, Truth, and Justice) and on its sides stood the statues of Life and Death (vv. 2568–2728). The garden also contained a church that was superior to the Temple of Solomon (vv. 2729–48). In the courtyard of the church there was an empty mausoleum, meant as a tomb for the maiden Sophrosyne (vv. 2749–2809). Finally, the narrator describes the appearance of the maiden herself (vv. 2810–67). After the narrator had thanked Sophrosyne for allowing him to enjoy such pleasant surroundings, she led him to the gates of the garden and provided the symbolic interpretation of all that he had seen, so that he might warn and admonish others. The path that he had taken while walking on his own, filled with trees and flowers that are transient

27 Cf. Achilles Tatios, 1.15.7. Cf. also Hyrtakenos in Boissonade, AnecGr, 3:64.
and subject to corruption, was the path of life led astray, filled with pleasures but leading to destruction. But, since humans are endowed with the ability to look up to a moral way of life, the narrator was able to perceive the light from afar, though he could not have reached the source of this light without the guidance of Sophrosyne (and her homonymous virtue). The seven obstacles represented the passions of flesh that one has to fight. The statues of the wise men and heroes that surrounded the garden were a reminder that the virtuous attain the eternal kingdom. The church with the tomb in its courtyard symbolized freedom from sin, which is impossible to obtain without remembering death. The gates to Sophrosyne’s estate should be understood as the Earth, on which man arrives and from which he departs naked. Those who live on it sinfully are condemned to the fire of Hell, while those who live virtuously will enjoy Paradise (vv. 2868–3016). The narrator then addresses a eulogy to God (vv. 3017–60), which ends with a final reminder that the Garden of Sophrosyne was, indeed, Paradise:

[Verses 3054–60] I now appeal to Your love toward humanity, oh King of all, so that I do not become alien to spiritual Paradise. But, as I have now seen this garden, which can be perceived with the senses, and have joyfully enjoyed its graces, may I likewise see that spiritual garden and enjoy all its delightful graces, as well. For glory beseems Thee, oh King, all into the ages, oh Trinity of three persons with one single substance; glory to Thee, thrice-illuminating, who bestows the end.
I have two main objectives in what follows. First, “the Geoponika” (as we call it) is a text that has been relatively ill served by editors, translators, and commentators, and thus its nature and purposes are rather too widely misunderstood. A brief introduction is in order. Second, I should like to look more closely at the content of those books that deal with gardens, orchards, and flowers. What variety and kinds of information are presented? Can one discern contemporary practice from literary lore? How does one fairly and appreciatively use this text as a document illustrative of its era?

The Geoponika is an agricultural and horticultural encyclopedia aiming to present in digest an accumulated practical lore of the ancients: those things that were collected for their usefulness. It is the sole survivor—in Greek—of a long and rich tradition of such agricultural literature (stretching back at least to Hesiod, flourishing in the Hellenistic era, 1

---


3 Prologue to book 1: Τά διαφόρατα τῶν πολλῶν περὶ τα γεωργίας καὶ ἐπιμελείας ψυχῶν καὶ σπορίσμων καὶ ἑτέρων πολλῶν χρήσεων εἰρημένα συλλέξας ἐκ ἔννοιας τοῦ βιβλίου συνεθέθηκα.
codified and “homogenized” by Roman writers in the first century of the common era). The text in its present form dates from the mid-tenth century. This we know because it opens with an elaborate prologue addressed to Emperor Constantine VII (913–959), “sweet scion of the purple.” The encomiast continues with reference to military victories; and he praises his monarch for the restoration (or renaissance: καντισμός) of philosophy, rhetoric, and the entire range of science and art. The state consists of three parts: army, clergy, and agriculture—a collocation, incidentally, that gives a characteristically Byzantine twist to a literary convention of the king as warrior-farmer in his own right. Xenophon’s Oeconomica (4.20–25) reports how Cyrus delighted to tell the visiting Lysander that his remarkable παράδεισος at Sardis was a personal labor: “I measured and arranged the whole, and some of the plantings I did myself” (ἐγὼ πάντα καὶ διεμέτρησα καὶ διέταξα, ἐστι δ’ αὐτόν, φάναι, ἀ καὶ ἐφύτευσα αὐτός), to which Lysander, astonished, asked, “Did you really plant part of these with your very own hands?” (Ἡ γὰρ σὺ ταῖς σαίς χερσὶ τούτον τι ἐφύτευσας). Nor was the convention by any means in desuetude on the eve of Constantinople’s founding. The anonymous Epitome de Caesaribus (39.6) tells how Diocletian cheerfully refused a suggestion to resume the imperial role: “If you only could view the vegetables at Salona planted by our hands, surely you would never urge even the contemplation of such a thing” (“utinam Salonae possetis visere olera nostris manibus instituta, profecto numquam istud temptandum iudicaretis”).

Agriculture was not alone in receiving special attention at the imperial court in the Macedonian renaissance. The Geoponika was one of a series of similar compendia, excerpted or compiled from ancient writings, that were put together under the auspices of Constantine VII. The intellectual atmosphere and its literary production were lucidly delineated by Paul Lemerle, and we honor him rightly by using his term—encyclopédisme—for this stage of Byzantine humanism. In many ways the closest parallel we have to the Geoponika is to be found in the collection known as the Hippiatrica, excerpts from late antique writers on veterinary medicine. Leaves of a sumptuous tenth-century manuscript (now Berlin, Staatsbibl.

---

5 Parts of the convention go back as far as Homer’s Odyssey: e.g., in Odyssey, book 24, Laertes is retired to his orchard.
6 According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the word derives from Old Persian pairidaeza, “enclosure, park,” from pairi, “around” [cf. Grk. παρά] + diz “form, mould.” Its first use in Greek was by Xenophon in reference to enclosed parks of Persian kings (see H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, Greek-English Lexicon, With a Supplement [Oxford, 1968]). More could be said on the “enclosure” in anthropological context, with the implication that crop growing superseded a hunter-gatherer society. Yet more could be said on the etymology of Latin hortus, leading to co-hort > court (both royal and architectural).
The elegance of format lavished upon imperial productions of what strike us as highly technical writings. No such luxurious codex survives of the Geoponika, although by the “jigsaw” decoration on its title page Kurt Weitzmann has dated to the period of Emperor Constantine a relatively ornate copy of this text and the oldest that survives, now in Florence (Laur. Plut. LXXIV, 7).9

Where the Geoponika has, for its part, outshone the other products of imperially sponsored encyclopédisme is in the number of its surviving manuscripts (some fifty, dating from the 10th to the 16th century). Scholars have noted an enthusiastic sequel to its editio princeps (Basel, 1539) and a practical value attached to its contents well into the nineteenth century.10 Less carefully studied is the intimate relationship between this Byzantine compendium (which came to scholarly notice in the Renaissance) and the parallel literary traditions that perpetuated Greco-Roman agricultural knowledge in the Latin West and in the world of Islam. The simplified stemma sketched in Table 1 shows some main lines of a complex tradition. The Geoponika (in its Constantinian form) appears in the lower right portion of the diagram.

How was the work compiled? The ancestry depicted on the chart is essentially the work of Eugen Oder and Eugen Fehrle at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth.11 Unequivocally central to the legacy of content and form in the Geoponika is the work of a fourth-century writer, Vindonius Anatolius of Beirut. Very probably, although not certainly, Anatolius can be identified with the prefect of Illyricum of that name mentioned by Ammianus Marcellinus; he was a distinguished jurist at Beirut and a friend of the orator Libanios.12 Why exactly Anatolius chose to compile a Collection (Synagoge) of Agricultural Practices (Συναγωγή γεωργικῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων) we do not know, although he fits the pattern of literary flurry at the end of antiquity and his work parallels or complements contemporary collections on other technical subjects: for example, medicine, both human and veterinary.13 We do know that Anatolius’ work was enormously successful. Despite the survival of a mere half page of his original Greek text, from those who followed and built upon Anatolius’ Synagoge (close to “plagiarized” in our use of that word) we can

9 K. Weitzmann, Studies in Classical and Byzantine Manuscript Illumination (Chicago-London, 1971), 192–95 (with fig. 175): “It is only the fact that the Florentine Geononica manuscript lacks the elegant script and the refined ornament which one would expect to find in the exemplar dedicated to the emperor that speaks against its being such a copy.” To this judgment I should also add that the text of the codex Florentinus is not of “imperial quality.”


largely reconstruct both the form and content of his work. Not only did Palladius use it in the West (and Palladius was the agricultural handbook for the western Middle Ages, thanks perhaps to the endorsement of Cassiodorus, *Institutes*, 1.28.6), but it was also translated into Syriac and thence to Arabic (eventually to Armenian). We are fortunate, too, that Patriarch Photios, writing in the ninth century, included a brief notice of Anatolius’ work. He called it “a useful book, as we have often found by direct experience, for agricultural activities and the tasks of the farmer, perhaps more useful than any of the others that treat of the same subjects. However, it too contains some irrational and incredible elements, reeking of pagan folly, which the pious farmer needs to avoid while he gathers good advice from the remainder.”

More important for our purposes, Anatolius’ *Synagoge* was incorporated as the primary source of *Selections on Agriculture* (*Περὶ γεωργίας ἐκλογάι*) compiled by one Cassianus Bassus “Scholasticus,” a very shadowy figure whose title probably fixes him in the sixth century, although we have no good clues as to the location of an area called “Maroton” to which his is apparently the personal reference (*ἐν τῷ Μαρωτονῷ χώρῳ, Geoponika, 5.6.6*). Like the work of Anatolius, Cassianus’ *Selections* circulated widely and early on. Besides the oriental versions, successive reworkings of his compilation took place in the Byzantine tradition, the most important of which was the wholesale incorporation of his work into the Constantinian corpus we call the *Geoponika*. (We can make this assertion because some 80 to 85 percent of the whole *Geoponika* is so close to the surviving Arabic works in both arrangement and content—and this despite the phenomena of “translations” and the “fluidity” of the Arabic tradition in its own right.)

Evidence so far available does not allow us to do much by way of illuminating the intervening stages between sixth-century Cassianus and the tenth-century encyclopedist(s). An early thirteenth-century manuscript in Venice (Marcianus gr. 524) differs in some interesting ways from the remaining witnesses to the text of the *Geoponika*. The incipit of the Marcianus reads (fol. 190r) ‘Ἀρχὴ σὺν θ[ε]ῷ τῶν περὶ γεωργίας ἐκλογῶν: Κασσιανοῦ Βάσσου σχολαστικοῦ. There is no prologue addressed to Constantine VII, and in the formulaic sentences at the beginning of books 7, 8, and 9 we can still read a parenthetical vocative, “my dear son Bassus.” Yet the suggestion that the Marcianus represents the text of Cassianus Bassus is too facile a conclusion, despite the evident vestiges of that work.
which this manuscript does preserve. Aside from the absence of the prologue, the overall text of the Marcianus, give or take trifles here and there, is the same as other Geoponika manuscripts: significantly it includes what are apparently “Constantinian” features, such as the chapter on the growing season for vegetables in the area of Constantinople (Geopon., 12.1), and mythologies associated with certain plants in chapters of book 11. Second, the Arabic versions derived from Cassianus (both “Kassianos” and “Qustus” in Table 1) reveal an
organization and book division agreeing far more closely with the Arabic “Yūniyūs” (i.e., Anatolius) than with that in the Constantinian Geoponika. Hence one can discern that the twenty-book collection as we have it in Greek is post-Cassianus: it is likely, but perhaps not subject to proof, that many of the repetitive elements in the Geoponika are introductions made as part of the tenth-century redaction.

Both tedious and inappropriate for extensive discussion here, but yet essential of note is that there remains much work to be done in determining the stage(s) at which names (in the genitive case) were attached to chapter headings in the Geoponika. That these names are not part of the transmitted literary tradition as such is generally accepted (in contrast to the situation with the Hippiatrika). To suggest that they were wholesale fabrication on the part of the Byzantine encyclopedists is neither charitable nor tenable (given the demonstrable validity of some of the ascriptions as confirmed by independent and pre-Constantinian evidence). And the manuscripts themselves behave in both inconsistent and idiosyncratic ways. As a preliminary conclusion I submit that the Constantinian editorial endeavor was no more than the starting point—if even that—for attempting a systematic pattern of chapter title + “name of authority.” Subsequent readers and copyists continued the process with widely differing standards and purposes. One point needs to be made emphatic: until each and every one of the authorities named in the chapter headings has been examined in light of the manuscript tradition of the Geoponika itself and in comparison to the more complicated tradition that underlies this compendium, these names ought not to be cited as if they were a reliable index of transmitted truth.\(^\text{18}\) To give but one example, the chapter heading for Geoponika, 10.1, to be discussed below, reads as follows: Περὶ παραδείσου, Φλωρεντίνου. A certain Florentinus is prominently named as one of Anatolius’ sources, but only in the Geoponika chapter heading is he credited as an authority for this chapter.\(^\text{19}\) As we shall see, the chapter that now stands as Geoponika, 10.1, has apparently undergone little change from the version compiled by Anatolius six centuries earlier. Nowhere do we have good evidence that this Geoponika chapter derives in any way from a work by Florentinus.

Let us turn to the larger questions of the overall contents of the Geoponika and the extent to which any of this material may be used to illustrate the actual culture of fields or gardens, either in theory or practice, in the tenth century or at any other point along its literary lineage. Views on this issue have been diametrically opposite. E. E. Lipshitz, who studied this work and translated it into Russian in 1960, focused on a few clearly Byzantine references and felt that it could be useful as a rich source for documenting contemporary tenth-century agricultural practice. But she overlooked the fact that the overwhelming mass of


\(^{19}\) Photios, Bibliotheca, cod. 163 (Florentios); Geopon. 1 prol. (Florentinos); Teheran ms. of Yūniyūs (Filurintinus), etc. Florentinos is cited several times within the text of the Geoponika chapters (for these there is no reason to question the reliability of ascription). For discussion of the man’s identity and his agricultural writings, see Oder, “Beiträge,” 83–87.
the content was part and parcel of a long literary tradition that had homogenized agricultural theory and practice from the entire Mediterranean region and had been circulating with only minor and mostly superficial changes from the first century of our era. Lemerle, whose judgment rested in part on comparison of the Geoponika with its sibling encyclopedias produced in the tenth century, went to the other extreme, suggesting that the only originality to be discerned was the purple prologue addressed to Emperor Constantine. The truth no doubt lies somewhere in the middle, but nearer (as I see it) to Lemerle’s end of the scale than to that of Lipshitz. The only way to come closer to understanding is by patient analysis of the text—the actual substance, not just the chapter titles—and careful study of the problems surrounding the literary sources on which it is almost entirely based.

Table 2 provides a general “table of contents” to the Geoponika as a whole (books 1–20), and Table 3 provides translations of the individual chapter headings for three of the books (10–12) that deal to some degree with orchards and gardening. From the two tables one gains not only a sense of the range of material covered, but, because the chapters are so specific, one has practically a comprehensive index of plants for which the Geoponika gives instructions on culture and usefulness.

There is much repetition from chapter to chapter, for each of the disjunctive units focuses upon an individual plant (many of which have a very similar or virtually identical culture). The discussion ranges widely: appropriate soil type, planting season, grafting techniques, methods of preservation, therapeutic applications, medicinal recipes. Further overlap occurs with other portions of the Geoponika. There are numerous references to sympathetic plantings and plant combinations to be avoided: in more than one place in other books we have specific chapters outlining the “Democritean” doctrine of sympathy and antipathy.

Another example of overlap is with the more extensive treatment set forth in book 1, concerning weather damage and pests. Book 1, chapter 14, “On hail,” provides a particularly interesting and instructive example. Chance has preserved for us this chapter alone of Anatolius’ Greek text (in Paris, B.N. gr. 2313, fol. 49v), and it can be compared sentence by sentence to each of the parallel versions deriving from Anatolius: Palladius, Syriac, Arabic, Geoponika. This single passage thus serves as a useful control to monitor how little free

20 Succinctly stated by A. Kazhdan in ODB, 2:834, s.v. “Geoponika.” For a similar assessment in the Latin West, see P. Meyvaert, “The Medieval Monastic Garden,” in Medieval Gardens, ed. E. B. MacDougall (Washington, D.C., 1986), 31: “but in all probability they were very seldom consulted by the monastic gardener. What these books contained was a literary tradition having little or nothing to do with the practical side of horticulture.”

21 I confess to some slight awkwardness in excluding entirely vineyards and olive groves (books 4–9). Almost certainly an owner or overseer of a small and self-sufficient estate would have thought of both as part of the “garden.”

22 Both the repetitive nature of literary treatments and the “Democritean” attitude toward plants and planting could copiously be illustrated in Columella and Pliny the Elder, the two most important synthetic works that survive from the 1st century of our era. As for the latter author, too often dismissed as tedious and contemptible, I cannot let pass the opportunity to mention the recent work by M. Beagon, Roman Nature: The Thought of Pliny the Elder (Oxford, 1992), esp. 79–91 on gardens.

23 Identified and published by H. Beckh, “De Geoponicorum codicibus manuscriptis,” Acta seminarii philologici...
adaptation and extensive rearrangement actually occurs compared to what one might have expected.

Surely Patriarch Photios would have had his readers forego many of the procedures outlined in the chapter on hail, and vestiges of editorial excision are apparent at this very point in the manuscript tradition of the Geoponika. On the other hand, the danger of hail to growing crops was familiar and omnipresent (a hail-filled sky is depicted above Gregory of Nazianzos preaching on hail in Paris, B.N. gr. 510, fol. 78r, a 9th-century manuscript of his homilies).24 Accretions to the list of possible remedies for hail are also to be found. To Cassianus’ version, apparently, we owe the suggestion of averting hail by stringing keys and

---

Table 2
The Geoponika: A Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book Number</th>
<th>Contents in General</th>
<th>No. Chapters</th>
<th>No. Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Astrological Weather Lore</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Siting, Soil, Water Management, Cereals and Legumes</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Farmer’s Calendar by Months [3 intrusive chapters]</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Vines, Viticulture, Wine</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Vines, Viticulture, Wine (includes Pests in Vineyard)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vines, Viticulture, Wine</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Vines, Viticulture, Wine</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Vines, Viticulture, Wine [recipes]</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Olive Trees, Olives, Oil</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Garden, Fruit Trees</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ornamental/Medicinal Plants (includes Mythological Snippets)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pests and Vermin</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Bees</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sheep, Goats</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Dogs, Swine, Game</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Fish (mainly recipes for bait)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Garden (παράδεισος)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Planting trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Trees from seed, buds, cuttings, and slips (ἀπὸ σπέρματος, παρασπέρματος, παραπόλων)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Date palms (φοίνιξ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Date palm fruits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Palm leaves for weaving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Citron trees (κίτρινον), red fruit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Good crop of citron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Shaped citron (bird, human face, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Preserving citrons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pistachio (φιτάκι)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pistachio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Peach (διόρκεστιν, περσικά)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>“Written” peaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Red peaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>“Pitless” peaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Grafting peaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Apples (μήλα)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Red apples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Grafting apples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Preserving apples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Pears (ἄππιδιον), not “stony”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Pears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Grafting pears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Preserving pears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Quinces (χυδόνια)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Shaped quinces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Preserving quinces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Pomegranates (ροϊα)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>“Unburst” pomegranates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>“Seedless” pomegranates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Pomegranate branch for insectifuge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Redder pomegranate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Sweeter pomegranate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Good crop of pomegranates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Reckoning number of seeds in a pomegranate fruit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Grafting pomegranate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Preserving pomegranates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Plum (δαμασκήνη)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Preserving plums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Cherries (κεράσια)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Preserving cherries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Jujube (ζιζωφόν)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Preserving jujube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Figs (σύκα)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Keep figs wormless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>“Inscribed” figs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Keep figs from dropping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Tame wild fig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Scab-infested fig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Figs as purgative, early ripening (Democritean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Grafting figs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Multicolored figs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Preserving dried figs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Winter figs, unripe figs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Preserving green figs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Almonds (ἄμμυριαλάτη)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Harvest almonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Sweeten bitter almonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>“Written” almonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Cure sterile almond tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Grafting almond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Chestnuts (κάστανον)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Nut tree (κάρυκι)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Grafting nut tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>“Naked” nuts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>“To dry up” nuts and other trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Hazel nuts (ποντικόν)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Mulberries (συκώμινα) and making them white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Preserving mulberries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Medlar (μέσπιλον)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Carob tree (κεράτιο)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Interpreting types of fruits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Difference between soft (ὀπωριά) and hard (ακρόνυτα) fruits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Season for grafting trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Twig grafts (ἐμπυκηλλισμός) and boring grafts (ἐγκεκτερισμός)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Ocular or bud grafts (ἐνοσθαλάμισμός)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Pruning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>For weather-damaged trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Warding off birds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Plantings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Recipes for fruitfulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Production from sterile tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Treatment for damaged trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Transplanting grown trees even in fruit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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86 Trees from seeds
87 To avoid dropping fruit
88 Treating drop of blossoms or leaves
89 Avoiding harm by livestock
90 Avoiding damage from worms and the like

Geoponika, book 11—embracing the “wreath” trees (στεφανωματικά) and the ever-leaved trees, also planting of roses, lilies, violets, and other aromatic plants.

1 Trees that are ever-growing or nondeciduous
   - Olives (ἐλάτια) [= Geopon., 9.1, repeated]
2 Laurel (δαμάσκινος) myth
3 Grafting laurel, from seed, suckers
4 Cypress (κυπάρισσοι) myth
5 Cypress
6 Myrtle (μυρσίνης) myth
7 Myrtle
8 Preserving myrtle berries
9 Boxwood (πύξις) myth
10 Pine (πῖτος) myth
11 Pine
12 Mastich tree (στῦλος)
13 Willow (τεῖχος)
14 Holm oak (πῦρνος)
15 Frankincense tree (δενδρολίβανον) myth
16 Frankincense tree
17 Rose (ῥόδας) myth
18 Roses, aromatic, everblooming
19 Lily (κρίνα) myth
20 Lily
21 Iris (ίρις)
22 Violet (lōv) myth
23 Violet
24 Narcissus (νάρκισσος) myth
25 Narcissus
26 Crocus (κρόκος)
27 Marjoram (σάμυσχον), saussurea (κόστος), costmary (βασιλεία)
28 Basil (μύστον
29 Ivy (κιττός) myth
30 Ivy

Geoponika, book 12—embracing the planting and culture of different vegetables, which one should plant in each month, and remarkable garden-construction, and useful properties of vegetables.

1 Calendar by month of sowing and planting in region of Constantinople
2 Garden making
3 Soil for vegetables
4 Fertilizer
5 Vegetables in arid region
6 For productive growth
7 To avoid insects and birds
8 To avoid worms
9 Get rid of leek-bugs (πρασοκουρίδες)
10 Companion plantings
11 Harm to the garden
12 Mallow (μαλάχη) and its uses
13 Lettuce (φυλίδας)
14 Lettuce with parsley (σέλινον), rocket (ἐντεξυμον), basil (ἐκίκυμον) from same root
15 Root vegetables (σελύτλα)
16 Remedies from miscellaneous vegetables
17 Cabbage (κράμβη)
18 Asparagus (ασπράγαγος)
19 Pumpkins (κόλοκυτῆτα) and cucumbers (σίκνοις), with early and seedless varieties
20 Melons (μηλόπεποινες)
21 Cress (γογγύλη)
22 Radishes (ραδανίδες)
23 Parsley (σέλινα)
24 Mint (ηδόσμον)
25 Rue (πίγανον) cultivated and wild
26 Rocket (εντεξυμον)
27 Pepperwort (κάρδαμον)
28 Endive (σέριτα)
29 Leeks (κράσιον)
30 Garlic (σκόρδο)
31 Onion (κρύμαν)
32 Hartwort (κανακαλίδες)
33 Pennyroyal (γλίχυλον)
34 Dill (ανήθον)
35 Peppercress (σκυμβρον)
36 Bulbs (βολβοί)
37 Squill (σκίλλη)
38 Sorrel (λάπαθον)
39 Artichokes (κινάρες)
40 Purslane (ανάραρη)
41 Mushrooms (μύκτης)
hanging them about the property (Geopon., 1.14.6). Nowhere but in the Constantinian Geoponika, however, do we read the curious prescription that then follows (1.14.7), to set up “wooden bulls” (ταύρους ξυλίνους), and more than slightly attractive is P. Hamblenne’s emendation to σταυροῦς.25 Geoponika, 1.14, then, with its evidence of addenda and editorial changes, illustrates an important point: Byzantine readers did take some note of what ancient texts had to say.

I mentioned earlier two instances of what are evidently tenth-century contributions to the Geoponika. The first of these is the series of ten mythological “nuggets” inserted at appropriate points prefatory to the discussion of individual plants in book 11 (chap. 2, laurel; chap. 4, cypress; chap. 6, myrtle; chap. 10, pine; chap. 15, frankincense tree; chap. 17, rose; chap. 19, lily; chap. 22, violet; chap. 24, narcissus; chap. 29, ivy). By way of illustration, Table 4 gives the text and translation of Geoponika, 11.29 (Περὶ κιττοῦ. Ἡστοια). Nothing parallels these short chapters in the oriental versions of agricultural literature. Both the language and the decorative pedantry betray the encyclopedist’s touch. While the source or sources of these brief mythologies is not specifically known, it may be supposed that they come from school-books or rhetorical models. That they are incorporated into a compendium that preserves “the advice of the ancients” is not without interest to show at least a mild tolerance of paganism that could be intellectually consistent with Byzantine classicism.

The other tenth-century addition is the longish opening chapter of book 12 (“By month what is sown and planted in the region of Constantinople”). Again, there is no evidence that such a listing of vegetables and greens was included in earlier versions, and details of its vocabulary studied recently support the view that this chapter is a properly Byzantine product, perhaps in origin a specialized calendar drawn up in a context of market supply for the capital.26

Ancient and perennial was the intellectual fascination that attached to the possibilities of improving upon nature. With their enclosed and irrigated orchard, vineyard, and orderly rows of greens, the storied gardens of Alkinoos (Odyssey, 7.112–32) outshone the flourishing grove, vine, and soft flowery meadows of Kalypso’s island (Odyssey, 5.63–74). The Geoponika gives full attention to marvels of τεχνη. Results (real or theoretical) ran the gamut from what moderns would call experimental improvement all the way to impractical—even impossible—exotic features. Grafting, for instance, is extensively treated,27 and procedures are repeated from long centuries of literature even though some combinations were quite impossible. Recipes for altering the quality and appearance of fruit had sometimes a straightforward cosmetic appeal (better coloring), but could aim more ambitiously at producing

27 The phenomenon of grafting was one important innovation at the end of the Dark Ages; see V. D. Hanson, The Other Greeks: The Family Farm and the Agrarian Roots of Western Civilization (New York, 1995), 41–45.
exotic shapes. Behind the instructions for shaped fruits and vegetables are traditions represented in Theophrastus, Columella, and Pliny.\textsuperscript{28} The first flurry of such literary works combining “science” with “magic” came in the Hellenistic era, but a second marked the Second Sophistic and its sequel in late antiquity—exactly the period during which the main forerunners of the \textit{Geoponika} were compiling their comprehensive works.

Too good to pass by for its curiosity is \textit{Geoponika}, 12.11, “Harm to the garden”: Dissolve goose dung in brine and sprinkle the plants with it (Χινών αὐδευμα ἄλημη λύσας ραίνε τὸ λάχανα). Is this a kind of weed killer? Ancient authors mention the harmful properties of salt water and tell us to keep an eye on the geese, but there is no parallel to this curiously negative recommendation. The “authority” named in the chapter heading is Afrikanos, and despite my own firm admonition above, I am very tempted to believe that this prescription may have come from Julius Africanus (a known source of Anatolius), from whose \textit{Kestoiv} Psellos cites a number of examples that closely resemble passages in the \textit{Geoponika}. This particular “harm to the garden” could readily have been mentioned in that portion of the work that Psellus describes: “A craftsmanlike, or rather sorcerous, fertility he produces in fields, and the opposite barrenness by antipathies.”\textsuperscript{29}

Among the ancient literary traditions encapsulated in the \textit{Geoponika} are occasionally to be found some Byzantine surprises, for example, the one in \textit{Geoponika}, 12.83, a chapter not known to be paralleled in any of the oriental versions. A glance at Table 5 shows that this chapter bears strong resemblance to the Gospel parable in Luke 13:6–9. I have not located a specific literary source from which the encyclopedists may have drawn it, nor do I think that a Byzantine reader needed one—any more than a literary source was prerequisite

\textsuperscript{28} \textit{Historia plantarum}, 7.3.5: “Some things come to resemble in their shapes even the position in which they grow: thus the gourd likens its shape to the container in which it has been placed” (ἔντα δὲ καὶ τοῖς σχῆμασιν ἐξομοίωσται καὶ τοῖς τόποις ἡ γάρ σκύλω ὀμοιοσχῆμα γίνεται ἐν ὧν τεθῇ ἄρρητο); Columella, 11.3.48–53; Pliny, \textit{Naturalis historia}, 19.70. The practical application is recommended by modern authors: see W. Robinson, \textit{The Vegetable Garden}, 3d ed. (New York, 1920), 270: “Should any young fruits exhibit a tendency to become crooked, they put them into cylindrical glasses open at both ends, . . . as one good and straight cucumber is worth nearly a dozen small and deformed ones.”

for the practice of trampling the vintage (Geopon., 6.11), otherwise totally unattested in ancient writings.

It might be noted in passing that we do not have in the Geoponika any noticeable evidence for enthusiastic botanical experimentation or introduction of new plants on the scale that one finds, by contrast, in the Islamic world. It would be interesting to know whether and to what extent the literary and intellectual traditions at the disposal of Byzantine aristocrats paralleled the botanical and agricultural innovations known to have emerged from the more widely attested “science” of garden culture in Islamic lands, the more so because we know that the identical literary works of Greco-Roman antiquity from which the Geoponika is derived also lay behind the voluminous medieval Arabic literature on farming and gardening. 30

I have saved till last a look at what the Geoponika has to say about garden design and its aesthetic impact. The prologue, addressed to Emperor Constantine VII, speaks of the collection as one where the reader will find matters of pleasure as well as usefulness (“not only necessities but even those exceptional things that contribute solely to the delight of sights and smells”), apparently referring to books 10–12 which deal with gardens, orchards, and flowers. Recognition of sight and smell (alongside usefulness and profit) recur in the somewhat skimpy instructions for garden design found in two specific chapters: 10.1 “The Garden” (παράδεισος) and 12.2 “Garden making” (κηποποιία). Table 6 presents the former of

Table 6

Geoponika, 10.1: Περὶ παραδείσου. [Philosophy]

1 Χρή τὸν βουλόμενον παράδεισον ἐχεῖν ἐπελεξάσθαι τότον ἐπιτήδευτον, εἰ μὲν ἐχορροεῖ, ἐνδοθέν τὸν ἐπιτύμβιον· εἰ δὲ μὴ, ἐκ τοῦ συνεχείας, ἢν μὴ μόνον τὰ απὸ τής θέσης τηρητικά τοϊκῶν ἐνδοθεῖν ἀποθεωρηθήσεται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ περὶς ἀρχὴ συναναχοριζόμενος τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν φυτῶν ἀναφοραῖς ὑπεικεῖν ποιῆν τὴν κτήσιν. περιβλητέοις δὲ αὐτῶν θρική, ἡ ἐπέρει τινὶ ἐπιμελεῖ. 2 τὰ δὲ φυτά μὴ ἀτάκτως μιμᾶ μικτὰ φυτεύεσθαι, οἷα δὴ φασί, τῆς τῶν φυτῶν διαφοράς εὐπρέπειαν ἐπεισαγωγῆς, ἀλλὰ κατὰ γένος κεχωρισμένοις ἕκαστα τῶν φυτῶν ἐμβάλλσθαι, ἵνα μὴ κατακρατηθῆται τὰ ἡττα ὑπὸ τῶν κρειττών, ή καὶ τῆς τροφῆς ἀποπετρηθῆται. 3 τὸ δὲ μεταξύ τῶν δενδρών πάν πληροῦσθαι ρόδινον καὶ κρίνον καὶ ιῶν καὶ κρόκου, ἡ καὶ τῇ ὑπερλαμβάνει καὶ τῇ ψηφίσθαι καὶ τῇ χρίσθαι ἐπίν ἡστα ἐπεισοδεύσαται, καὶ ταῖς μελισσεῖς φώλειμα. 4 τὰ δὲ φυτὰ λυπέτουν εἰς ἀκμαίον καὶ σατύρων δενδρῶν, εἰδέναι δὲ χρή, ὡς τὰ απὸ σπέρματος φυτὰ ὡς ἐπὶ πολύ πάντων τῶν φυτῶν ἐστὶν χεῖρον βελτίων πολυῖς φυτῶν μοσχεύεται κρέιττον δὲ τῦτον τὰ ἐγκεντριζόμενα, οὐ γὰρ καλλίκαρπίαν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς πολυκαρπίαν, καὶ παρεῖν φοράν τῶν καρπῶν.

1 One who wishes to have a garden ought to choose a suitable site; within the farmstead if possible, if not, from the nearby area, so that not only things pleasant to the sight may be observed by those within but also that the surrounding atmosphere may be imbued by contact with plants and thus make the property healthy. The garden should be surrounded by a wall (or fence) or some other structure, as a precaution. 2 The plantings ought to be planted neither irregularly nor intermingled, so to say, although the variety of plants introduces attractiveness. But each of the plants ought to be set out by type, so that the weaker ones not be overcome by the stronger or be deprived of nourishment. 3 The entire space between the trees ought to be filled with roses and lilies and violets and crocus, which are most pleasing to sight and smell and usefulness (medicinal?), as well as profitable (income-producing?) and beneficial to bees. 4 Cuttings are to be taken from thriving and undamaged trees. One ought to know that plants from seed for the most part are inferior to all others. Better in the case of every plant are natural shoots. Of these the stronger/superior are those produced by grafting, not only for beauty of fruit but also for its abundance and swift production of the fruits.

aArab. mentions “near waters if possible.”
bArab. mentions “two rows of cypress and other similar trees; put on side of it vines, because cypress trees make vines like cylindrical columns, and so vines will be on top and will grow together to 6 cubits, and then expand to walls and then the space in the middle will be filled and not clear to vision.”
cArab. mentions plants “with three heads if possible, otherwise with two heads.”

these chapters (10.1), one that corresponds precisely to what was the opening section on orchards and gardening in Anatolius’ Synagoge (as we can reconstruct it from the Arabic and Syriac versions). In Table 7 we have the latter chapter (12.2), which similarly serves to introduce the section on kitchen gardens (for vegetables and medicinal plants), again its position apparently that given by Anatolius.31

The following salient points emerge from these two passages: (1) site relative to the farmstead, enclosed; (2) implied combination of fruit trees, vegetables, and flowers; (3) health

31 My hesitant probes into the Arabic Yūnīyūs (for which I use a photocopy of Teheran Millī 796) have convinced me that this text deserves close and careful study. For access to the Arabic in this text, and for diverse helpful comments, I am grateful to Irfan Shahîd (Georgetown University) and Dmitri Mikulskii (Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow).
Table 7

Geoponika, 12.2: Περὶ κηποποιίας [Φλορεντίνου]

1 Making a garden is essential for life. Now a garden must be prepared—both for one's health and for attacks of illness—not far from dwellings, but in the vicinity, so that it may provide pleasure both from sight and especially from smell.

2 It should not lie downwind of the threshing floor, lest the plants suffer from the chaff. *Cf. Pallad., 1.34.1: Gardens and orchards ought to be close to the house, and located at a good distance from the threshing floor because they are harmed by the dust of the chaff. ( Horti et pomaria domui proxima esse debent . . . , ab area longe situs, nam pulverem palaenum patitur inimicum. )

3 The person who wants to excel in growing garden plants must take forethought for good seeds, suitable soil, water, and manure.

4 Good seeds will produce offspring like themselves. Suitable and fertile soil will guard what is entrusted to it. Water will make the vegetables grow larger through nurture. Manure makes the soil more friable, so that it receives water more readily, to make space for the roots and to allow the foliage to sprout.

Benefits and aesthetic impact; (4) stress on proper culture by plant type; (5) quality of stock. Most of these features are discussed, variously and generally in greater detail, elsewhere in the Geoponika. An example would be the specific recommendations for hedges and borders, the advantages of quick-growing ones and the distinction between living plants versus masonry structures ( Geopon., 5.44). Anatolius’ reason for the summaries here is partly, of course, as a device for starting the books, and that of Geoponika, 10.1, is prefatory to the general section of the whole work, which focuses on horticulture.

But there is more to be said. In contrast, for instance, to the hygienic emphasis recurrent in a number of chapters in book 2 (on water supply, unhealthy siting of dwellings), the aesthetic points noted in this chapter are not elaborated elsewhere in the Geoponika. It may be going too far to suggest that the writer of the Constantinian prologue in speaking of “things that contribute solely to the delight of sights and smells” has in mind the phrases in these specific chapters that call attention to pleasures of “sight and smell.” The reference to sight and smell in Geoponika, 10.1, occurs alongside a reference to bee-keeping, and perhaps the production of honey is one of the “profits” of the garden. (The role of bees in pollination was unknown to the Byzantines.)32 A practical book (such as Anatolius’ Synagoge had aimed to be) would not likely have dwelt in sentimental vein upon points of aesthetics any

---

32 Geoponika, book 15, is remarkably sterile compared to the emphasis on bees and apiaries in the Roman agricultural writers.
more than it rehearsed the mythological associations of certain plants. The encyclopedist(s) responsible for putting the Geoponika into the form we have it were not so energetic as to search out literary texts—if any existed as such—in which the aesthetics of the garden might have been discussed; nor would they, in the context of their project, have composed afresh on this topic. It is enough, perhaps, to conclude that they gave some continuing prominence to the conventional ideal of garden aesthetic as old as Homer.

These chapters (Geopon., 10.1 and 12.2) exemplify nothing so well as a literary tradition in Greco-Roman agricultural writings, reworked and refashioned over many centuries, and finally encapsulated as we have it in the Constantinian encyclopedia. With some exceptions (a few of which I have discussed above), this statement holds true for the Geoponika as a whole. To put it another way, the practical elements sketched in the Geoponika represent a “common denominator” of information thought by the tenth-century compilers to be useful to any garden, large or small, owned or worked by any person of any rank in any geographical location. By incorporating in new format certain literary materials inherited from antiquity, the imperial encyclopedists may have been doing little more than fulfilling an antiquarian or preservationist role. The relative unoriginality of their final product makes it easy to dismiss the Geoponika in this way and to argue that there is little here of value for those who seek knowledge of patterns and practices current in the tenth century.

Yet we ought again to beware of a facile solution. The Geoponika, of course, deserves no small respect as a document and product of its own age. But, more than this, in a sphere so generally conservative as Mediterranean agriculture has always tended to be, it is not unreasonable to suppose that lessons of antiquity were, by and large, held to be of continuing validity in the Byzantine era.33 The “collections of the ancients” of which the prologue speaks were not, in other words, intended to be perpetuated as mere antiquarian curiosities. We might wish for compilers in the tenth century to have criticized and annotated the late antique texts they were compiling and to have given us precise notions of continuity and change. On the other hand, if horticultural practices and traditions were largely a continuum, tenth-century librarians need not automatically be guilty of compiling a Geoponika that contemporaries would have found useless except on the bookshelf. Only a century earlier, Photios had written of an important forerunner in the genre of agricultural literature, “Useful is the book [of Anatolius], as I know through experience.”

Other scholars can better clarify both the audience that may have read and used the Geoponika and the contemporary reality it may reflect. Others, too, will better recognize, identify, and discuss effects that the Geoponika may have had in actual Byzantine practice. Fifty manuscripts is a remarkable progeny, so some indeed there must have been. Geoponika, 10.85, for instance, instructs on transplanting fully grown, fruit-bearing trees. This precept may in part have inspired the creative energy that Psellus ascribes to Constantine IX.34

My conclusion is perhaps disappointing for its lack of originality, but the interest that attaches to the Geoponika is not really diminished. An educated readership could appreciate

33 The conservative tendency of farmers is discussed by Hanson, The Other Greeks, esp. chap. 4.

a convenient and respectably literary book for more than antiquarian amusement. Gardens were made, cultivated, and appreciated by persons of all ranks and for a wide range of purposes. No gardener will rely on books alone, nor should the student of Byzantine gardens expect the Geoponika to answer more than its share of questions.

The University of Vermont
Herbs of the Field and Herbs of the Garden
in Byzantine Medicinal Pharmacy

John Scarborough

Among scholarly studies of Byzantine gardens are a number that provide details about what plants were grown and why they were cultivated as a common practice. Yet little attention has been paid to the botanical and pharmacal particulars of Byzantine garden lore. Moreover, even less well known are the all-season plant gatherers of the Byzantine Empire, plant collectors who continually augmented the herbal drugs of the monasteries. By focusing on some aspects of the gathering of wild specimens, which were, in many ways, “taken for granted,” one receives a rather different picture of Byzantine botanical lore than if research depends solely on evidence drawn from gardens.

An interested student or scholar wishing to inquire about the essentials of herbalism in the Byzantine Empire likely will be led into the Greek texts on gardens, well illustrated by the Christian “dream garden” as published in Greek, with a French and now English translation, by Margaret Thomson.1 Within are, indeed, the expected fruits and vegetables, sweet smelling and pleasantly verdant, along with some descriptions of “how to plant a garden.” Presumably technical names, however, are not intended as a guide for the reader, but rather suggest how an ideal garden would appear. For example, in Thomson’s text is the “knowledge of smilax,”2 and one reads an ethereal account of the possible shapes of such a tree, but nothing one could designate as “practical.” Thomson’s notes on jardín, 21, indicate biblical allusions, but nothing concerning botanical, agricultural, or medical utility. Smilax here is a tree (to dendron), so that one need not bother to consider other plants with the same name, for example, the cowpea or cherry bean as described by Dioskorides,3 or the European sarsaparilla first noted by Pliny the Elder and Dioskorides,4 probably drawing information

2 Le jardin symbolique, 68–77; The Symbolic Garden, 86–95.
from a common source; nor does one need to posit the infamous scammony (occasionally called *smilax*) with its well-known cathartic resin.\(^5\)

Two trees are possible: *Taxus baccata* L., the so-called English yew, renowned in medieval Asia Minor for its heavy and hard, yet elastic, wood (thus the English “yew-bow” of folklore\(^6\)), and, second, the ever-popular tree of an enchanted grove, the holm oak (*Quercus ilex* L.),\(^7\) with its prickly, hollylike sucker-shoot leaves. Centuries earlier, Theophrastus had remarked that the name is “Arcadian,” and since Thomson’s text leaves little doubt about the fairy-tale purpose of the anonymous writer, it seems clear enough that this famed “dream garden” manual is just that: an imaginary world of fragrances and wafting breezes, of pruned shapes and colorful flowers and equally colorful fruits edible only with the nose and eyes. Thomson attributes this “garden of the imagination” to the eleventh century,\(^8\) and there is an ancestry in similar tracts of pagan antiquity, such as those published by A. Delatte in the *Herbarius*.\(^9\) Delatte’s texts retail the plants of medical astrology, with seven major kinds of plants linked with planets also of extremely important ceremonial use and prominence in mythology.

Yet this genre of the “dream garden” manual represents only one facet of Byzantine garden lore and herbalism. Too often, moderns ignore other types besides this religio-mystical “symbolism” of specific plants: Thomson herself had called attention to other and varying traditions of more practical utility in her seldomly cited *Textes grecs inédits relatifs aux plantes*,\(^10\) texts in themselves supplementary to those on botany (and other topics) as edited and published earlier by Delatte.\(^11\) Important is Thomson’s section of Greek texts (with French translations) of botanical lexicography,\(^12\) paralleled by Delatte’s fifteen botanical glossaries,\(^13\) only slightly emended by J. Stannard.\(^14\) Delatte’s glossaries include one by a Pseudo-Galen,\(^15\) nine by anonymous authors, one by a Pseudo-Symeon Seth,\(^16\) and one each by Neophytos, Nikomedes, and Nicholas Hieropais, followed by Thomson’s Greek text of a “Lexicon of Arabic Plant Names,”\(^17\) leading into several more tracts of similar content and with the obviously intended purposes of pure lexicography. These are not the vaguely perceived or

---

\(^5\) *Convolvulus sepium* L. is the most common, cosmopolitan species of scammony, still used in Greece, Turkey, and Syria as a powerful cathartic. In some botanical guides, the plant bears the name *C. scammonia*. Why *Smilax*, in ancient Greek botanical nomenclature, should sometimes take the place of *skammonia* is a lexicographical mystery. The scammony’s main pharmaceutical action is its properties to cause large amounts of bodily fluids to be evacuated, which explains why many modern herbal manuals describe it as a “diuretic.”


\(^7\) Theophrastus, *Historia plantarum*, 3.16.2; Pliny the Elder, *Natural History*, 16.19.


\(^12\) Thomson, *Textes grecs*, 125–77.


\(^16\) Ibid., 339–60.

fancifully aromatic plants of the symbolic garden: rather these spare listings show repeated attempts at precision in nomenclature, attempts forecast quite early by the multilingual synonyms provided by Dioskorides and later scholiasts, augmented first by an obscure Pamphilus about a century after the original *Materia medica* appeared, and by the “Synonym Lists” of drugs circulating by the second century, illustrated by the Galenic tract under this title.

The Greek tracts published by Delatte and Thomson are ample evidence of an herbalism among the Byzantines, an herbalism rather far removed from the redolently imaginary gardens of pagan and Christian myth. Such treatises also tell us immediately that doctors, pharmacologists, herbalists, and farmers not only were very interested (and literate), but also required information about wild as well as cultivated plants: some were used as medicinals, others for the manufacture of ointments and perfumes (especially the numerous “oil plants”), others as food sources on a seasonal basis, still others as condiments, and, of course, as sources of the species transplanted and carefully tended in the well-known gardens of both the Byzantine East and medieval Latin West, with similar and carefully cultivated gardens also characteristic of the Islamic world.

Yet even a short survey of this kind of modern study, representing excellent scholarship and detailed command of the texts and multilingual sources, shows the predominance of an “ideal garden,” when a scholar considers medicinal plants or potherbs (e.g., J. Stannard, G. Keil, and C. Opsomer-Halleux in the 1986 *Medieval Gardens*). This tendency is widespread...
in the specialist literature, and particularly characteristic (perhaps appropriately) of the nu-
merous books on medieval English botanical lore, exemplified by the work of Teresa McLean. One can, to be sure, argue that humankind’s occupation and cultivation of Europe and the
Near East had consumed millennia, and thereby truly feral areas were unusual (unlike the
New World in 1492, which was almost all wild, with the exceptions of certain Amerindian
cultures that flourished and passed away long before the arrival of Europeans), so that “wild” herbs were presumably unimportant in the pharmacal lore of classical antiquity and the
Middle Ages.

Our texts, however, demonstrate vividly that physicians in ancient Greece, the Hellen-
istic world, the Roman Republic, and the successor empires of the Roman and Byzantine
centuries, knew and valued both wild and cultivated plants, employed as drugs; such are fully attested in the works of many Byzantine physicians and pharmacologists, ranging from
Alexander of Tralles to John Aktouarios. In fact, Byzantine concepts of what was herbal
medicine were fundamental in the teaching of herbal pharmacology in the medical schools
of Renaissance Europe; many of these teaching institutions boasted of their own “teaching
gardens” that incorporated traditionally cultivated potherbs along with “wild herbs” gath-
ered from local countrysides (with information on the curative powers of these plants also
derived from local folklore); soon added to these often beautiful and scrupulously planned
teaching gardens were the ever-increasing numbers of “new and wild” botanicals from the
New World, Africa, and Asia. And as one would expect, culinary arts overlapped pharmacy
in the discussions of plant properties (or “virtues” as they were often termed), so that foods
and foodstuffs became part of herbalism in almost all eras. The Byzantines valued such
expertise, and some recent scholarship has begun to explore how Portuguese, Spanish, and
English, alongside long-term Venetian, trading ventures came to improve the Byzantine
diet.

Medical botany is quite prominent in Byzantine medicine, and, as I have indicated
elsewhere, early Byzantine pharmacy occupies a central role in how the doctor treats
disease, in company with how the physician perceives the “properties” (here usually dynametis
in the Greek as one explicates how drugs “work”). Our written texts, from Oribasios to
Paul of Aegina, repeatedly show how the Byzantine philosopher–physicians (and those some-
times known as iatrosophists) reworked, streamlined, augmented, and clarified the medical
and pharmacological texts of the Greco–Roman era. Dioskorides’ great Materia medica (ca.

---

24 There is an enormous bibliography on the “introduction” of new species into the pharmacal lore of
Europe in the Renaissance. For a summary and collection of references, see J. Scarborough, “Botany, Pharmacy,
and the Culinary Arts,” in A. C. Crombie and N. Siraisi, eds., The Rational Arts of Living (Northampton, 1987),
161–204.
25 This interplay is well demonstrated in two monographs (among many): R. Howard, La bibliothèque et le
laboratoire de Guy de la Brosse au jardin des plantes à Paris (Geneva, 1983), and W. T. Stern, Botanical Gardens and
26 Most recently (among the welcome interest in “food history” by classicists and medievalists), one may
A.D. 70) had become the basic treatise on all aspects of pharmacology and pharmacognosy, and pure botany continued to be represented by Theophrastus’ rightly honored Inquiry into Plants and Causes of Plants (both ca. 300 B.C.). It is, however, Galen of Pergamon (A.D. 129–after 210) who became the absolute authority on all facets of medicine in the Eastern Roman Empire, especially after Oribasios of Pergamon (ca. A.D. 325–400) had performed probably the first known of many attempted truncations, summaries, and rearrangements of Galen’s often massive, self-contradictory, and presumably all-inclusive works on medicine (the often-cited edition by C. G. Kühn [Leipzig, 1821–33; repr. Hildesheim, 1963–64] occupies four linear feet on one of my bookshelves).

This overriding authority is further attested by the “Seven Physicians” folio of the A.D. 512 Vienna manuscript of Dioskorides (fol. 3v),28 which, accompanied by the previous “seven physicians” of folio 2v, provides a pictorial “history of medical authorities” in the early sixth century (notably absent is Hippocrates of Cos). Galen sits top and center on folio 3v, flanked by Dioskorides and Krateus, the former the major author of this beautiful, alphabetical version of Dioskorides’ Materia medica. And although one admires the occasionally magnificent (and one growsl at some of the paintings, which are dreadful) illuminations of Dioskorides’ plants, Nicander of Colophon’s poisonous creatures, and some other topics including a manual of ornithology by an otherwise unknown Dionysius, all are but

28 Regarding the famous Vienna codex (properly cited as Codex Vindobonensis med. gr. 1 der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek), two reproductions of what constitutes 485 folios (weighing 14 lbs.) have appeared in the 20th century: the first was published in Leiden in two volumes by A. W. Sijthoff (1906), with the first volume of descriptive commentary and the second of black and white reproductions of the folios; useful in its day, this De codicis Dioscuridei Aniciae Julianae, nunc Vindobonensis Med. Gr. 1 (with commentary by A. de Premerstein, C. Wessely, and J. Mantuani), has been completely superseded by the full-color, full-sized reproduction (five volumes, with a sixth containing commentary and listings by H. Gerstinger) published by the Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt (Graz, 1970). Unlike the 1906 Leiden edition, the 1970 reproduction has full commentary on the other works represented (other than a shortened, alphabetical version of Dioskorides): an anonymus Poem on the Properties of Herbs (fols. 388–392); two paraphrases of Nicander’s Theriaka and Alexipharmaka by an otherwise unknown Euteknios (fols. 393–459 [many illuminations scattered here and there in the margins, with many accurate renderings—especially of the blister beetles—and many purely imaginary images of the poisonous creatures retailed by Nicander of Colophon]); a paraphrase of Oppian’s Book on Fishing, again by Euteknios (fols. 460–473 [the illuminations, however, seem more intended to accompany pseudo-Oppian’s lengthy poem, On Hunting]); and, finally, a paraphrase of an Ornithology (Grk. Ixeutika) by an (again) otherwise unknown Dionysios (fols. 474–485 [fols. 483v shows twenty-four birds, quite vividly painted from life]). Most large libraries have copies of the Graz reproduction volumes; I apologize to my readers for my inability to gain permission to reproduce relevant folios from Vienna in time for publication. One can, however, peruse the selection of illuminations, reproduced in full color and size, in O. Mazal, Pflanzen, Wurzeln, Saft, Samen: Antike Heilkunst Miniaturen des Wiener Dioskurides (Graz, 1981), a volume held much more commonly in university libraries. It is interesting to speculate about the first illuminated folio, showing a peacock (male, with feathers spread in the “courting” position), presumably the family’s animal (a kind of 6th-century coat of arms), and reflect how this peacock precedes the famous two folios of famous physicians, not to mention the portrait folio 6v, showing the princess Anicia Juliana and her attendants. The tale of how this magnificent manuscript survived to be deposited in the Hapsburg collection in the 16th century is a tale worth telling in itself, perhaps best summarized by G. Sarton, “Brave Busbecq,” Isis 33 (1942): 557–75. Anicia Juliana was known as a generous benefactor in her day, as suggested by M. Harrison, A Temple for Byzantium: The Discovery and Excavation of Anicia Juliana’s Palace Church in Istanbul (London, 1989). On this manuscript, see also Leslie Brubaker, “The Vienna Dioskorides and Anicia Juliana,” in this volume, 189–214.
selections from the complete works; but those that do appear give us a reasonable guide to which plants were deemed useful in early sixth-century Byzantine pharmacology. It is important likewise that one have in hand the complete, nonalphabetical Greek text of Dioskorides (last and best edited by Max Wellmann in 3 vols. [Berlin, 1906–14; repr. 1958]), so that one can gain a clear impression of which plants were deemed useful in sixth-century Byzantine pharmacology including plants gathered in the wild and those emerging from one of the countless gardens, so appropriately recapitulated and condensed in several books in the tenth-century *Geoponika*. Sometimes what is omitted in the Vienna text of Dioskorides (admittedly our earliest medical manuscript in Greek) is surprising, but inclusion of a plant per se suggests a reader may be presumed to have “known” a more complete account: that the 14-pound codex was not intended as a “field manual” should be apparent, but even as a “royal gift” fit for a princess, the codex is a valuable guide to what plants were thought valuable for a household in the highest levels of the ruling class of the Byzantine Empire in the sixth century.

One example will serve to illustrate the question of “herbs in the field” and “herbs of the garden” as would be depicted in the Vienna manuscript: the opium poppy (*Papaver somniferum* L.). Folio 221v gives a reasonably accurate painting of the opium capsules in the various stages of growth (the leaves are not well depicted, but at least the pinnate edges receive emphasis; the *P. somniferum* does not have multilobed, pinnated leaves as here represented by the unknown artist), and the root stock is somewhat of the “generic” type.

Here is what Dioskorides, 4.64 (ed. Wellmann, 2:218–21; my trans.) has to say about this famous and presumptive analgesic:

1. [The opium] poppy. Some is cultivated and grown in gardens, from which the seed is made into bread, and becomes part of a healthy diet; and with honey, they use the poppy seed in place of the sesame seed, and thereby it is called the “common poppy,” which has a longish head and a seed that is white. Another kind that is wild has a capsule head that droops, a seed that is black, and is called the “corn poppy,” and some term this “rhoias” on account of the juice flowing from it. But there is a third kind of these poppies, much less cultivated, and it is smaller and more useful as a drug; this type has a longish capsule.

Then follow medical and pharmaceutical uses, and Dioskorides makes explicit the variations between the “cultivated” and “wild” poppies (4.64.5 [ed. Wellmann, 2:221; my trans.]):

Best is the latex (or “juice,” = *opos*) which is thick and heavy of the wild kind; it is soporific to the person who smells it, bitter to the taste, easily diluted in water, smooth, white, neither rough nor full of lumps, nor does it congeal as it is passed

---

through a sieve as would be characteristic of wax; and set down in the sun and allowed to spread out while melting [identifies it as genuine]; and set alight from an oil lamp, it does not have a darkly colored flame, retaining indeed the odor of its own particular property. Some, however, counterfeit it by mixing the juice of the horned poppy or acacia gum or the juice of the wild lettuce.

This is the text readers and viewers of the famous Vienna codex of the Materia medica would have known and consulted; Dioskorides has warned previously (4.3 [ed. Wellmann, 2:119]) that too much of the wild latex can kill, so that the physician-pharmacologist had to use great care in its employment. Several points are important, even in this short account of the opium poppy: some poppies are, indeed, part of garden plots, and would remain so from Roman times through the twentieth century (many botanical gardens today proudly display their specimens of this famous plant, sometimes with a guard closely observing the visitors); those poppies that are cultivated are raised for their oilseeds, and they remain a staple in the production of breads (the ancients were well aware that there are no narcotic properties in the seeds); and, as Dioskorides and the Vienna version make clear enough, it is the wild variety that is gathered for the ill-famed soporific and occasionally for its death-dealing properties. These uses were well known to Nicander of Colophon (fl. ca. 130 B.C.) and his sources, so that wild and cultivated poppies are part of the long history of classical and Byzantine gardening culture, as well as the lore of gathering the latex from the maturing plant in the field.

It is unlikely that the artist who rendered the opium poppy on folio 221v of the Vienna codex has painted from life, but he has captured the four basic stages of the life cycle of the capsules’ development (harvesting the best latex is detailed in Dioskorides, 4.64.7 [ed. Wellmann, 2:221]), and except for some slightly more sophisticated knives and collection pans, the methods of modern harvesting of the P. somniferum’s latex from the capsules just before they ripen (almost exactly what Dioskorides records) remain almost identical. Moreover, ancient pharmacologists and their Byzantine successors were well aware that there were several varieties of poppies, ranging from a truly “wild” kind (Vienna codex, fol. 222) through less potent varieties (fols. 223v, 224v, and 225v). The scholia on poppies in the text of Dioskorides are not particularly revealing of Byzantine gardeners’ or physicians’ experiences that might have varied from the textual tradition, so that it would seem that later doctors and pharmacologists found that Dioskorides was essentially correct. That same textual tradition, beginning in the second century, suggested that repeated employment of the opium poppy latex thus generally verified the account of Dioskorides, confirmed as one examines parallel passages, condensed by Oribasios, or elaborated by Alexander of Tralles, and a few others, conveniently listed in Wellmann’s apparatus criticus.

Yet the Byzantine scribes did not simply parrot their classical texts in medicine and related matters, and one can choose no better example than that selected by John Riddle, in

his fine essay of 1984,\textsuperscript{31} to illustrate two matters: (1) additional information by later and obviously experienced gardeners and physicians; and (2) parallel traditions accompanying the texts of the \textit{Materia medica}, in this instance an almost exact match with a series of passages in the \textit{Geoponika}. When Riddle submitted his essay for inclusion in the published collection of papers resulting from the 1983 Dumbarton Oaks Symposium on Byzantine Medicine, I was happy to augment his arguments on asparagus with the \textit{Geoponika}, and I think it quite appropriate here to call attention to these again.

Dioskorides, 2.125 (ed. Wellmann, 1:198; my trans.), had written that “some” (in his usual manner of giving a report that he has heard but did not necessarily believe) “have set down that if someone were to bury rams’ horns broken into small pieces, asparagus grows.” A scribe, sometime before the fourteenth century, flatly denied this, saying in his scholiastic comment, “this appears incredible to me,” and, as Riddle notes, this \textit{emoi de apithanon} appears in at least ten variant manuscripts of Dioskorides’ discussion of this common garden vegetable. And although Riddle did not make particular note of Dioskorides’ account of the utility of the asparagus, it is clear (again) that both wild and garden-grown varieties are included: the feral sort grows in rocky soils, the cultivar as one would expect in the soils prepared for other vegetables (medicinal uses are those well known in many folk traditions: bowel softener, diuretic, treatment for sciatica and jaundice, as a remedy for toothache, and as an antidote for the bites of poisonous spiders). Perhaps the gardener is attempting to duplicate the “rocky” soil for his asparagus plot (a tricky and long-term vegetable to grow as any modern gardener all too well knows), but of importance is the parallel passage in the tenth-century \textit{Geoponika} (last edited by H. Beckh as \textit{Geoponica sive Cassianti Bassi scholastici De re rustica eclogae} [Leipzig, 1895; repr. Stuttgart, 1994]),\textsuperscript{32} which reads: “If one wishes to produce an abundance of asparagus, chop up horns of the wild ram into small pieces, throw them into the asparagus beds, and water them. Some [others] say that it is better if the whole rams’ horns are bored with holes and then put down into the soil, they will produce asparagus” (\textit{Geoponika}, 12.18.2–3 [ed. Beckh, p. 365; my trans.]).

Quite puzzling in this passage is its description of technical details: is the would-be gardener being advised to put rootstocks (or crowns) of old asparagus into the holed rams’ horns? Growing edible asparagus from seeds gives poor yield, but crown-growth from permanent beds can yield annually (after the third year); the tender shoots of springtime (in temperate climes) can be harvested repeatedly for up to twenty years. One is, however, struck by the \textit{Geoponika} extract that both a “wild” and a “cultivated” sort are known and used. The extract (if we can rely on the copyists of the tenth century) is quoted from a Didymus, probably the Didymus of Alexandria known to have written a fifteen-book \textit{Georgika} in the fifth century, and if Wellmann is right,\textsuperscript{33} Didymus was a physician of some repute. The mix of agricultural and pharmacological data remains explicit, and the passage in Dioskorides neatly interlocks with that of Didymus as quoted in the tenth-century \textit{Geoponika}.

\textsuperscript{32} On this text, see also Robert Rodgers, “\textit{Khpopoii?a} Garden Making and Garden Culture in the \textit{Geoponika},” in this volume.
The Byzantine text is incorporated into the book “on” gardens (e.g., 12.2 [ed. Beckh, pp. 349–50]), quoted from an otherwise unknown Florentinus, and headed “How to make a garden,” with a preceding “gardening calendar” (12.1.1–2 [ed. Beckh, pp. 347–49]): January through December, with each month specified with plantings “as is suitable for the climate of Constantinople.” As one reads through the accounts of the particular vegetables and foodstuffs (asparagus, lettuce, beets, cabbages, and so on), one notes again and again that there are “wild kinds” also to be harvested, and one again can use the exemplar of the asparagus: Geoponika 12.18.4 and 5 (ed. Beckh, p. 365) tells us that in order to have asparagus year-round, one is to take the seeds [?: such are really more akin to “berries”] and weed around the surface roots, a description that can match only what one finds in the growth patterns of the still common “wild asparagus” of Turkey; its underground stem grows horizontally, which then produces the spring shoots that are very tender and tasty, the so-called turions. Gathering asparagus, for both medical and culinary purposes, thus includes garden lore as well as a common knowledge of how this vegetable favors sandy soils. Modern California’s January “asparagus spears,” so horribly expensive in a Wisconsin winter, are, in some respects, quite like those gained by herbalists in fifth-century Alexandria and tenth-century Constantinople. And these were gathered and marketed by professional “herbalists,” not gardeners of the town. These “herbalists” were indeed “farmers” addressed and assumed to be literate, an assumption by the compilers of the text we have as the Geoponika. This manner of mixing the cultivars with the gathering of “wild” species, for the sake of (one presumes) freshness, could be illustrated by several accounts in Geoponika 12 and in other books of the same compilation that address plants and their employment as drugs, foods, or condiments.

My last example of the continual intermeshing of farm and field with the geometrically pleasing “ideal gardens,” so common in medieval times from England to Bombay, had more to do with veterinary practices than with vegetables, but will illustrate the same point: knowledge flowing both ways, from city to countryside and back again, perhaps “corrected” or “refined” for the city slickers. We have to keep in mind that most people lived in the country in those days, with a few making a living knowing the plants to be gathered, while the great majority tilled the fields of one or another overlord, living out their years as had their forefathers before them. Life in the country, however, was not without its special realms of pure knowledge. Country dwellers (pagani in Latin) “knew” the plants; they did not “name” them, a habit that reaches back as far as Mycenaean times and Homeric Greece, if not to the beginnings of our species somewhere in northeastern Africa some many millennia ago.

Alongside the domestication of wheat, rice, barley, oats, and several other food plants came the domestication of animals. We do not know “when” these processes were firmly in place, but with the creation of urban centers in Mesopotamia, China, India, Egypt, and elsewhere after about 7000 B.C., we find animals side by side with the plants on the farms (by whatever name) most of the human population tilled. From the very beginnings, people and animals transferred illnesses to one another, but, except for the worst of the plagues, it would seem that most of what today we would call illnesses went unnoticed, as a part of
normal life. Even so, as we learn in the late texts we know as the *Geoponika* and the collection of excerpts from the same era which we call the *Corpus hippiatricorum Graecum*, farmers and horsemen had many problems with parasites on and in their animals, and I have chosen one very intriguing passage in the *Geoponika* that indicates Byzantine sheep herders did deal with ticks and other irritating pests. Indeed, the modern world is coming back to something like these natural insecticides or vermicides, since there would be, by definition, very few (if any) “side effects” or long-term damage to either the environment or to the productive capability of the sheep and their prized wool. *Geoponika* 17.16 is headed “Concerning lice. From Didymus,” and one reads (ed. Beckh, p. 495; my trans.):

1. If sheep have ticks or lice, pound thoroughly some maple tree roots and boil this mash in water; part the wool on the sheep from head to the end of the spinal column, and then pour this liquid on while still warm, so that it finds its way over the whole animal’s body. Some use cedar oil in the same way.
2. Some others likewise in a similar fashion prepare mandrake root for this use, but one must ensure that the animals do not ingest this mandrake root wash, since it is poisonous to them.
3. Others prepare likewise in a similar fashion a decoction of cyperus root and wash the sheep with it.

From the modern vantage, the phytochemistry and the “logic” of using a maple root wash and its tannin as an excellent flea- and tick-repellent, makes good sense, but the cyperus root’s chemical properties remain obscure. At this juncture, however, I wish to emphasize the curious appearance of mandrake as a “delouser” for sheep.

Mandrake (*Mandragora officinarum* L. or *M. autumnalis* Spr.), among the six species known in ancient and modern times, contains goodly amounts of hyoscynamine, a powerful narcotic, especially in the famous “manlike” roots. The narcotic properties of the mandrake were famous among laypersons and professional medical practitioners, and its fame reached even into a well-known scene in Apuleius’ *Golden Ass*, where the physician and those listening to his testimony both knew of the generally safe anesthetic properties of mandrake. Mandrake leads us immediately back to the Vienna codex of Dioskorides: widely known is folio 5v, depicting three figures doing three things with the mandrake root (and this painting of the root [twice] is not replicated elsewhere in the codex); on the right is Dioskorides reading the account of the plant and its properties (4.75 [ed. Wellmann, 2:233–37]); in the center Epinoia holds the root in her hands extended in front of her to ensure that the


35 I suspect that *kypeiros* is not galangale, but either the edible cyperus (*Cyperus esculentus* L.), or perhaps a turmeric (*Curcuma longa* L.), known as early as Dioskorides, whose *Materia medica*, 1.5, seems to be the first mention of this Indian rhizome, today used as a condiment in curries.

36 Apuleius, *Golden Ass* (or *Metamorphoses*), 10.11.
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viewer sees exactly its color and shape; and on the left of the full-page folio is the artist depicting the plant while he looks at Epinoia, not Dioskorides. Mandrake is, in effect, the first medicinal plant in the codex, and Dioskorides’ full description of the properties and uses of mandrake root parallels its employment today in many folk medical systems from Spain to India: it is an excellent purgative and emetic, with narcotic properties particularly valuable in treatment for asthma, hay fever, and coughs, since the alkaloidal phytochemistry in the “natural” drug acts as vasodilators. There are numerous references in the medical sources of classical antiquity, as well as those of the Byzantine era: mandrake was the narcotic of choice, or, as Dioskorides puts it, “The physicians use this whenever they are about to begin cutting [i.e., surgery], or when they are cauterizing [a wound] shut” (4.75.7 [ed. Wellmann, 2:237; my trans.]).

Garden plant or wild? Evidence shows (again) both. In the text “On the Mandrake,” printed by Thomson in her Textes grecs inédits (pp. 84–87; numbered texts 5, 3, and 4), it is clear that this is indeed an herb raised and used against leprosy and eye diseases and as a remedy for raging diarrhea, among other afflictions. Older traditions (e.g., Theophrastus, Historia plantarum, 9.9.1 and Dioskorides as above) indicate that mandrake was brought into market by ever-present and expert rhizotomoi (“root cutters”).

Throughout the centuries, there is little doubt that anyone could obtain mandrake in just about any season, as would be true of the opium poppy and its hardened latex, easily remelted as needed. Among the Byzantines, one gains the sure impression from Alexander of Tralles’ directions for the preparation of pastilles for specific treatment of quartan fevers characterized by yellow bile,37 that all ingredients are commonly obtained and that many are “garden cultivated”: one reads about the saffron crocus, licorice, anise, castor (a plant in this instance), henbane (if this, indeed, is what hyoskyamos leukos means), and likely enough the three grams of mandrake “bark” (the outer layers of the root) that end the preparation formula. Alexander of Tralles is recording what he considered “tried and true” pharmaceutical recipes sometime at the very end of the sixth century or, at the very latest, the beginning years of the seventh. A principle of his practice and its written summary is almost always a direct simplicity, a characteristic especially true of his botanical or medicinal pharmacy. The opium poppy is an “ordinary” drug, much as is mandrake (whether its “apples” or juice or rind or stem or roots). Alexander’s long career and extensive travels (he died in Rome in A.D. 605) enabled him to compose several medical masterpieces, including the Book on Fevers, the Twelve Books on Medicine, and the Letter on Intestinal Worms (this last tract is the first western treatise on parasitology and deserves careful translation and commentary). He has carefully selected drugs readily obtained from feral areas and then brought to the marketplace, or, as one would expect, from the common herb gardens; such cultivated plots included well-known poisons like aconite, the two hellebores, henbane, and the ever-infamous hemlock, not to mention the commonly employed female contraceptives, pennyroyal and rue. In both pharmacy and cooking, in the manufacture of perfumes or the flavorings of

wine, “fresh” was a mark of quality, so that “out of season” would engender the ordinary 
assumption of the continual activity of farmers and the rhizotomoi (who were in all likeli-
hood farmers too) who gathered herbs for the market stalls, so nicely recorded by Pollux in 
the second century.\(^{38}\)

In summary, even a short study reveals food and medicinal sources in the Byzantine 
Empire rather well balanced by city and countryside. Wheat, barley, and other long-cultivated 
staples continued to be planted and harvested by the traditional farmer, and his stock (whether 
pigs, chickens, and so on) contributed the major part of each Byzantine city’s food supply. 
Herb gardens existed almost in all cities in great numbers, but much of what we know of 
Byzantine drugs, condiments, perfume production, and several other “luxury” products (e.g., 
wine flavorings), and the frequently ignored production of the best grapes for the finest 
wines, remained (obviously) products of the country dwellers. In medicinal pharmacy, Byz-
antine root gatherers and farmers at large provided specific herbs, especially “out of season,” 
suggested by the examples of asparagus, the opium poppy, and mandrake.

University of Wisconsin, Madison

---

1967], 1:297).
The Vienna Dioskorides and Anicia Juliana

Leslie Brubaker

Dioskorides of Anazarbos, a physician and pharmacologist, wrote the *Materia medica* in the first century of our era, probably around A.D. 65. The text is essentially a herbal and lists hundreds of plants along with their medicinal uses. The *Materia medica* has many novel features, but pharmacological texts had existed for centuries before Dioskorides wrote his influential version: fragments of “drug lore” from the Mycenaean period and passages of Homer suggest early general knowledge, which was apparently first codified in a medical manual sometime in the fourth or fifth century B.C. The earliest herbal, book 9 of Theophrastus’ *Historia plantarum*, was written around 300 B.C. This work and later Hellenistic efforts, such as Nicander’s *Theriaka* and *Alexipharmaka* of ca. 130 B.C. (two poems on remedies for poison that remained familiar in the Byzantine period, as we shall see), were rather haphazard compilations. Dioskorides’ aim was to introduce order and accuracy to pharmacology; medieval appreciation of his efforts is evident in the scores of Greek, Latin, and Arabic copies of the *Materia medica*, which remained a fundamental handbook until the Italian Renaissance.¹

The Vienna Dioskorides and Its Illustration

The sixth-century copy of Dioskorides’ *Materia medica* in Vienna (Nationalbibliothek, cod. med. gr. 1) includes 383 botanical pictures, the earliest preserved illustrations to Dioskorides’ description of the pharmaceutical properties of plants.² The title page (Fig. 1), composed specifically for the Vienna manuscript,³ explains that the book contains Dioskorides’ writings “about plants and roots (rhizomes) and decoctions and seeds along with herbs and drugs” in alphabetical order. Whatever other values the Byzantines may have attributed to


the plants that grew in gardens and fields, their significance here is pragmatic and functional.

The Materia medica remained fundamental to Byzantine pharmacology; like other much-used medical (and legal) texts, it was rearranged for ease of use in later centuries. As the title page indicates, in the Vienna Dioskorides the plant descriptions have been alphabetized, and there is an alphabetical index at the beginning of the manuscript.4

While the Vienna manuscript is the earliest preserved copy of Dioskorides with pictures, there are earlier scrolls and books with descriptions and pictures of medicinal plants: examples include a second-century papyrus scroll and a papyrus codex from around A.D. 400.5 We are also told by Pliny the Elder (A.D. 23–79) that other pharmaceutical plant lists

---

4 The index appears on fols. 8r–10v.
Krateuas, Dionysios and Metrodoros adapted a most attractive method, though one which makes clear little else except the difficulty of employing it. For they painted likenesses of the plants and then wrote under them their properties. But not only is a picture misleading when the colors are so many, particularly as the aim is to copy nature, but besides this, much imperfection arises from the manifold hazards in the accuracy of copyists. In addition, it is not enough for each plant to be painted at one period only of its life, since it alters its appearance with the fourfold changes of the year.6

In the Vienna manuscript, Pliny’s cautions have been thrown to the wind. Whoever commissioned the book evidently requested a deluxe manuscript of great size—at 38 × 33 cm, it weighs 14 pounds7—with full-page images of each plant facing a page of description of its pharmaceutical properties (see Figs. 5–8, 19, 20). The balance between word and image is, however, tilted slightly in favor of words. Once, for example, a plant—the Daphne gnidium—is embedded in the text (Fig. 2). The illustration was not an afterthought: as is evident from the way the text flows smoothly around its contours, the image was painted before the words were written. Presumably, the amount of space needed in the quire had been underestimated; rather than condensing the text—a formula followed in certain illustrated biblical manuscripts of the period8—the image was reduced, though not abandoned. The solution indicates the relative importance of both. There are also several pages where two plants, usually variants of the same species, share a page: on folio 201v (Fig. 3), for example, two types of Mercurialis annua, identified by Dioskorides as Linozostis theleia and Linozostis aren, appear.9 The normal pattern, however, remains a single image facing a page of text.

The scribe did not always adhere exclusively to Dioskorides’ text. The Vienna manuscript was apparently originally intended to supplement Dioskorides’ formulae by adding relevant additions to pharmaceutical knowledge contributed by Galen (A.D. 129–210) and Krateuas, who wrote on root medicine in the second century B.C. On folio 25r (Fig. 4), for example, Krateuas’ comments on the medicinal properties of the root of the achillea were inserted below Dioskorides’ discussion; the scholia, introduced by Krateuas’ name in red ink, are written in the same hand as the text, but about half-sized. On two occasions, the added comments were themselves accompanied by plant pictures. Folio 25v (Fig. 5) carried the main illustration to the facing discussion of the anemone, and here both the text and the image were supplemented: Galen’s remarks, introduced by his name in red, accompany the

9 See also fols. 152v, 153v, 173v, 221v, 222r.
2 Vienna Dioskorides, *Daphne gnidium*. Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, cod. med. gr. 1, f. 134v (photo: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna)

3 Vienna Dioskorides, *Linozostis theleia* and *Linozostis aren*.
Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, cod. med. gr. 1, fol. 201v (photo: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna)
4 Vienna Dioskorides, text on *achillea*. Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, cod. med. gr. 1, fol. 25r (photo: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna)

5 Vienna Dioskorides, *anemone*. Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, cod. med. gr. 1, fol. 25v (photo: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna)
main image; Krateuas’ comments follow Dioskorides’ and are illustrated with a variant form of the plant (Fig. 6). 10 Similarly, Dioskorides’ discussion of the Juniperus phoenicea, with its facing image (Figs. 7, 8), has been extended to include Galen’s remarks on the Juniperus oxycedrus, also illustrated (albeit minutely). Though these are the only original supplementary images, quotations from Krateuas and Galen appear regularly at the beginning of the manuscript (to fol. 42r); after a brief resurgence several quires later (fols. 70–94), they then cease. 11

This suggests that the Vienna manuscript was not conceived as a simple copy of Oribasios’ alphabetized Dioskorides, but was rather planned as an augmented edition. The additions

10 On the complications of this sequence, see Gerstinger, Kommentarband, 10–11; on the Krateuas insertions in general, see J. Riddle, “Byzantine Commentaries on Dioscorides,” DOP 38 (1984): 95–102, esp. 98–100.
11 All are in the same uncial as the text, but half size; usually the author’s name is included, in red. Excerpts from Galen appear on fols. 16r, 20r, 22r, 23r, 24r, 25v, 28r–v, 30v, 32r, 34r, 35r, 38r, 39r, 42r, 70r, 71r, 72r, 73r, 74r, 75r, 76r, 82r, 94v; from Krateuas on fols. 25r, 26r, 29r, 31r; and from both on fols. 27r, 30r, 33r, 40r. There are also
7 Vienna Dioskorides, *Juniperus phoenicea*. Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, cod. med. gr. 1, fol. 33v (photo: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna)

8 Vienna Dioskorides, text on *Juniperus phoenicea*, with *J. oxycedrus*. Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, cod. med. gr. 1, fol. 34r (photo: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna)
are not in themselves unusual—many Dioskorides manuscripts interpolate other texts—but the scholastic approach to the insertions emphasized and isolated them beyond the ordinary. In terms of the pharmaceutical commentary, this encyclopedic project stopped about a fifth of the way through the manuscript. Five supplementary texts were, however, appended at the end. These need some comment.

The Supplementary Texts and Their Illustration

The Carmen de viribus herbarum (fols. 388–392), a first- or second-century text about herbs that sometimes attributes magical properties to various plants, is accompanied by a few plants, omitted by Dioskorides, that have been incorporated seamlessly into the body of the text in both the Vienna manuscript and in a 7th-century Dioskorides in Naples, on which see note 23 below; Riddle, “Byzantine Commentaries,” 101 n. 72.

12 Ed. E. Heitsch, Carminis de viribus herbarum fragmentum, in Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen
picture of coral (Fig. 9). In addition to confirming that the designer of the Vienna manuscript aspired to provide a more or less comprehensive encyclopedia of herbal/medicinal knowledge, the Carmen also reveals signs of the manuscript’s later use: marginal comments in a thin-inked and (originally) unaccented slanting uncial distinct from the upright uncial of the text have been added throughout (Fig. 10). The later script, technically known as inclined ogival majuscule, can be dated to the eighth century.13

Following the Carmen are Euteknios’ two prose paraphrases of Nicander’s texts on how to cope with poisonous bites, the Theriaka and the Alexipharmaka. The Theriaka para-

---

13 I am deeply grateful to Guglielmo Cavallo for discussion of this hand and for confirmation of the date. Inclined ogival majuscule appears in the 3d century and continues to be found in certain Constantinopolitan manuscripts until the 11th; see G. Cavallo, “Funzione e struttore della mauscola greca tra i secoli VIII–XI,” La paléographie grecque et byzantine, Colloques internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique 559 (Paris, 1977), 95–137, esp. 98–106. The accents were probably added in the early 15th century; see below, p. 199.
11 Vienna Dioskorides, asp. 
Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, cod. med. gr. 1, fol. 401r (photo: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna)

12 Vienna Dioskorides, 
*Oreganum, Anagyris foetida*, and *Asphodelus naemous*. 
Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, cod. med. gr. 1, fol. 397r (photo: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna)
phrase (fols. 393r–437v) continues the marginal commentary in slanting uncial script and is copiously illustrated with images of both remedial plants and the offending snakes, lizards, and insects. The full-page format has been abandoned: sometimes, as with the image of the asp on folio 401r, the portrait sits below the text (Fig. 11); sometimes the plants or creatures are interspersed in the text: on folio 397r, for example, images and descriptions of *Origanum, Anagyris foetida*, and *Asphodelus racemosus* all appear (Fig. 12), while on folio 423r (Fig. 13) a salamander in flames shares the page with an eel. Occasionally a space has been left unfilled (Fig. 14), and once six snakes and a lizard are collected together in a group portrait (Fig. 15). While no one would argue that these are scientific illustrations in the sense that we now understand the term, it is nonetheless worth noting just how repetitive they are: most of the

---

13 Vienna Dioskorides, salamander and eel. Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, cod. med. gr. 1, fol. 423r (photo: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna)

---

14 Fols. 396r (Fig. 14), 411v, 412r, 413r, 414r, 414v, 415v.
snakes look virtually identical; and the insects, especially, are on the whole interchangeable. Evidently, the Vienna Dioskorides was meant to be a manuscript with pictures, even if stock formulae were simply repeated page after page. Whatever the reason these creatures were pictured, it was not in order to help the reader identify them.

The Alexipharmaka paraphrase, which follows on folios 438r–459v, omits pictures entirely, though the scribe left nine spaces within the text that were presumably originally intended for images that were never supplied. Such blank spaces are not uncommon in Byzantine manuscripts; usually, however (as in the Theriaka paraphrase; Fig. 14), they are random and can plausibly be attributed to haste, oversight, or ignorance. Here, clustered tightly around one particular text, the lacunae suggest that while someone—the scribe? the designer? the commissioner?—thought that pictures ought to accompany the text, there were difficulties in supplying either the pictures or an artisan to paint them. Perhaps in response to this problem, the anonymous paraphrase of Oppian’s Halieutika which follows
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(fols. 460r–473r) carries no illustrations. Though the blank page (fol. 460v) that separates the title page from the Halieutika text may have been meant for an introductory image, the scribe left no space for any pictures in the body of the text.

The final text in the Vienna Dioskorides—another anonymous paraphrase, this time of Dionysios’ Ornithiaka (fols. 474r–485v + fol. 1v)—incorporates more than twenty pictures of individual birds plus a page of multiple birds.15 These have been called the earliest preserved “scientific” images of birds,16 and most of them are in fact still easily identifiable: the pelican and the European kingfisher (Fig. 16), for example, are immediately recognizable, as is the seagull eating fish (Fig. 17). Once (Fig. 18), we are even shown the same bird—probably a puffin—twice, with its wings open and also closed, as in a modern bird book.

15 Vienna Dioskorides, snakes and lizard. Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, cod. med. gr. 1, fol. 411r (photo: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna)

16 As in the Theriaka, space is occasionally left for a bird portrait that was never completed: fols. 475v, 477r, 480r.

16 Weitzmann, Ancient Book Illum., 16.
16 Vienna Dioscorides, pelican and kingfisher. Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, cod. med. gr. 1, fol. 479v (photo: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna)

17 Vienna Dioscorides, seagull. Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, cod. med. gr. 1, fol. 478v (photo: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna)
18 Vienna Dioskorides, great heron and seabird. Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, cod. med. gr. 1, fol. 480v (photo: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna)

19 Vienna Dioskorides, *Spartium junceum*. Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, cod. med. gr. 1, fol. 327v (photo: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna)
The Later Use of the Vienna Dioskorides

The Vienna Dioskorides is, then, a compendium of texts that deal with healing and, more generally and secondarily, natural history. The expense involved in its production is obvious, but, unlike many deluxe service books donated to the Byzantine church, it was not only a showpiece: the Vienna Dioskorides reveals signs of at least sporadic later use. In addition to the slanting uncial additions to the paraphrases at the end of the manuscript, virtually all of the plant pictures include later identifications in Hebrew and Arabic, probably of the sixteenth century; some incorporate Latin, apparently added during the Latin occupation of Constantinople between 1204 and 1261; and most of the texts were transcribed into a late Byzantine minuscule—probably in 1406, when the manuscript was rebound—at which time some corrections and additions to the drawings were also made. On folios 327v–328r (Figs. 19, 20), for example, the image of the *Spartium junceum* has been augmented in dark ink by a thirteenth- or fourteenth-century hand, the Latin name for the plant (*genestre*) has been inserted by a thirteenth-century hand, and the sixth-century text has been transcribed, with a line drawing, in the late Byzantine hand associated with the rebinding of 1406.

The Origins of Botanical Illustration

The healing texts collected in the Vienna Dioskorides preserve the earliest extant copies of these texts with pictures. It is nonetheless sometimes assumed that the majority of the plant pictures were not invented for this manuscript but instead follow earlier models. Certainly, as we have seen, there are a few earlier pictures of plants on rolls and in books; Pliny’s words, quoted earlier, suggest that others once existed. But it is worth noting that most Dioskorides manuscripts do not include pictures: though the text was the basic pharmaceutical guide until the Renaissance, only about a dozen of the Greek copies are illustrated. The fifteenth-century manuscripts in Cambridge and at the Vatican, both of which

19 Ibid., 25.
21 In addition to the Vienna manuscript, these include Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, gr. 1 (7th century); Paris, gr. 2179 (9th or 10th century); New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, ms. M652 (10th century); Vat. gr. 284 (10th century, though perhaps with later illustrations); Athos, Lavra Ω 75 (11th or 12th century); Venice, Marc. gr. 92 (13th century); Padua, Seminario Vescovile, gr. 194 (14th century); Vat. Chigi F.VII.159 (14th or 15th century); Vat. urb. gr. 66 (15th century); Escorial Σ. t. 17 (15th century); Paris, gr. 2091 (15th century); Cambridge, University Library E.e.5 (15th century). See M. Wellmann, s.v. “Dioskurides,” in *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, vol. 5.1 (Stuttgart, 1903), 1131–42; Singer, “Herbal,” 22–29; A. Touwaide, “Un recueil grec de pharmacologie du Xe siècle illustré au XIVe siècle: Le Vaticanus gr. 284,” *Scriptorium* 39 (1985): 13–56; A. Capecelatro, *Codices urbinates graeci Bibliothecae Vaticanae*, ed. C. Stornajolo (Vatican City, 1895), 77–80; H. Belting, *Das illuminierte Buch in der spätbyzantinischen Gesellschaft* (Heidelberg, 1970), 20; van Buren, “*Materia Medica*,” 66–69. Latin copies were rarely illustrated, though Pseudo-Dioskorides’ *Ex herbis femininis* normally was
apparently directly copied many of their illustrations from the Vienna Dioskorides, are picture books and omit all text; the others, however, embed the plant images within the text, much like the paraphrase pictures in the Vienna manuscript itself. In its format, the Vienna Dioskorides is isolated, and most of the later manuscripts also follow a different text tradi-


tion: of the illustrated manuscripts, only the seventh-century copy in Naples and a fifteenth-century manuscript in Paris that, again, seems to rely directly on the Vienna Dioskorides are textually related. Further, aside from the late copies, only the Naples Dioskorides and the tenth-century version in New York show any real pictorial affinities with the Vienna manuscript.

For both manuscripts, however, a strong case can be made for the impact of the Vienna Dioskorides itself. The New York Dioskorides was made in Constantinople, where the Vienna copy remained until at least the fifteenth century, and was possibly destined for imperial use. Though it includes pictures unrelated to the Vienna Dioskorides, those that are related are so similar that the miniaturist of the New York Dioskorides should be added to the ranks of those who consulted the Vienna manuscript directly. This is unlikely to be true of the Naples miniaturist: if Guglielmo Cavallo is correct in siting the production of the Naples Dioskorides in Rome, the close connections with the Vienna copy shown by many of its images cannot depend on direct observation of the earlier manuscript. Cavallo suggests that the Naples Dioskorides depends on a now-lost exemplar brought from Constantinople either for Cassiodorus or by a Byzantine functionary involved with Justinian’s reconquest of Italy. Whether that hypothesized exemplar copied the Vienna Dioskorides, or whether both independently adapted another fictive source, is of course impossible to say. What we can safely conclude is that although plant portraits in and of themselves were not an innovation in the sixth century, there is no clear evidence for the sources upon which the painters of the Vienna Dioskorides may have drawn for their portraits of plants. They may well not have drawn from any at all.

Whether or not some of the plants were painted from specimens collected from the garden or from the field—a process illustrated in two of the opening miniatures of the book (Fig. 21)—the 383 plant pictures in the Vienna manuscript fall into about a dozen groups of basic plant types. Many of them are plausible schematic renderings that are more specific

---


27 See note 23 above. The Naples manuscript is sometimes very close to Vienna, and sometimes diverges from it completely.
than the generic snakes, lizards, and insects that accompany the *Theriaka* paraphrase; still, few present what we would now consider scientific botanical drawings, and Pliny’s first-century remarks on the inaccuracies of plant portraits suggest that this perception is not just a product of modern expectations of botanical accuracy. While the most precise presentations are of plants that were apparently indigenous to Thrace and Anatolia in the sixth century, in many cases a secure identification of a plant could not be based on the pictures in the Vienna Dioskorides alone. That most Dioskorides manuscripts lack illustration sug-

21 Vienna Dioskorides, Dioskorides with Heuresis (‘Discovery’) holding a mandrake. Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, cod. med. gr. 1, fol. 4v (photo: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna)

23 On the 17th- and 18th-century botanists who compared local flora with the Vienna images, see Singer, “Herbal,” 21. The Royal Horticultural Society has been publishing its plant findings in Anatolia over the past several years in its publication, *The Gardener*. Since the areas on which most of the society’s explorations have concentrated have been largely unaffected by modern innovations, the plants that now exist often preserve forms no longer attested elsewhere, but whether or not we can use them to imagine 6th-century plants is uncertain.

27 This impression was confirmed by John Scarborough at the Dumbarton Oaks colloquium that gener-
gest in fact that the pictures were not deemed essential: they probably confirmed existing knowledge rather than providing crucial information for the beginner, who presumably got her or his basic visual pharmaceutical plant information in other ways. Armed with this basic plant knowledge, however, the Vienna Dioskorides could indeed be expected to expand one’s knowledge of plants and their medical properties.  

But that the plant images were embedded in an expensive book made the information that either the words or the images could impart exclusive: only people who could decode texts and had access to the manuscript in the first place could also use the images. The Vienna Dioskorides is not a handbook for casual use, even though it may later have been used as such: it is a self-consciously deluxe reference book presented as a learned text with
The Vienna Dioskorides and Anicia Juliana

The dedication miniature that follows the miniatures of the doctors and Dioskorides grounds the manuscript in a specific context (Fig. 24). The central figure, identified as a patrikia by her costume and named as Juliana (ΙΟΥΛΙΑΝΑ), is flanked by personifications of Magnanimity (Μεγαλοψυχία) carrying gold coins and of prudence (Φρόνιμος) holding a

23 Vienna Dioskorides, the doctors Kraterus, Galen, Dioskorides, Apollonios Mys, Nicander, Andreas, and Ruphos. Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, cod. med. gr. 1, fol. 3v (photo: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna)

encycopedic pretensions. Its role as an inclusive compendium of medical knowledge is signaled by two of the frontispiece miniatures, which present a pantheon of great doctors of the past, beginning with Cheiron, the centaur credited with introducing medicine to the world (Figs. 22, 23).31

31 Gerstinger, Kommentarband, 28. Two more images (fols. 4v [Fig. 21] and 5v) show Dioskorides: ibid., 30–33.
closed book; a third personification, gratitude of the arts (Ἐὐχαριστία τεχνῶν), kneels at Juliana’s feet, while a putto, identified as “the founder’s desire for wisdom” (πόθος τῆς σοφίας κτίστου), presents her with the book. In the outer spandrels of the frame, more putti, painted in grisaille, are shown engaged in construction work. Though the later Greek hand that transcribed the miniature’s inscriptions in the margins of the page reidentified Juliana as “wisdom” (σοφία), modern scholars are unanimous in naming the central woman as the patrikia Anicia Juliana, daughter of the emperor Olybrius and a member of the venerable Roman Anicius family who could trace her lineage back through Theodosios I to Constantine the Great; in her lifetime (ca. 462–ca. 528), she was probably both the most aristocratic and the wealthiest inhabitant of the Byzantine capital.\(^3\) She was also a prolific commissioner of

buildings, the best known of which is the huge and expensive church dedicated to Hagios Polyeuktos in the quarter of Constantianae (Theodosianae) near the Anicii family estates, probably constructed between 524 and 527. Juliana also completed the church of Hagia Euphemia in the Olybrios district of Constantinople, the precise date of which is unknown, and according to Theophanes funded a church in the Honoratae district (probably modern Pera) in 512/13.

It is clear from Juliana’s epithet of “wise founder” that the Vienna Dioskorides celebrates one of her commissions. The building was identified in 1903, when A. von Premerstein deciphered and reconstructed the partially preserved inscription written in minute white letters on the octagonal black inner border of the frame; here the people of Honoratae salute the “magnanimity of the Anicii” for building a church. The manuscript is thus usually dated to ca. 512/13, at which time Juliana was around fifty years old; the inscription also suggests that the book was a gift presented to Juliana by the grateful recipients of the church, the people of Honoratae.

Anicia Juliana’s personal status in early-sixth-century Constantinople was high. In 512 a crowd, dissatisfied with Emperor Anastasios, had converged on what the Chronicon Paschale and John Malalas designate as “the property of the nobilissima patrician Juliana” and had attempted to proclaim her husband Areobindus emperor (an attempt he resisted). That the household was identified with Juliana rather than with her husband may probably be taken to indicate her higher social rank and the estate’s location on Anicii family property; certainly it indicates that Juliana’s status was recognized.

Juliana’s identity as a patrikia in early-sixth-century Constantinople virtually guaranteed that she lived the life of a late Roman matron in charge of a huge household, with the resultant responsibilities of all late Roman urban aristocrats, male or female. One of these responsibilities was the medical care of her household. That aristocrats took this duty seriously is evident from a number of sources, and that women were frequently responsible


38 See S. Fischler, “Social Stereotypes and Historical Analysis: The Case of the Imperial Women at Rome,” in Women in Ancient Societies, an Illusion of the Night, ed. L. Archer, S. Fischler, and M. Wyke (Houndmills, 1994), 115–33, many of whose observations can be extended into late antiquity.

for medical care is equally clear. Women medics (doctors, nurses, and midwives) are well attested in the late antique and early Byzantine periods; for our purposes, however, it is more interesting that nonprofessional domestic medicine—the arena where most healing skills actually seem to have been practiced—is often ascribed to women: as Gillian Clark has already observed, “Medicine was part of the lives of ordinary women,” and written sources record some of their contributions. The Greek magical papyri include a cure for inflammation from “a Syrian woman of Gabara” and one for headaches from a certain Philinna of Thessaly. Galen, Scribonius, and Pliny also give various women credit for several of their pharmaceutical recipes, and while some were professionals, others—such as the Roman matron whom Scribonius credits with a potion against epilepsy or the African woman from whom he obtained his cure for colitis—were not; they were sharing home remedies.

The extent to which we can generalize about aristocratic women’s understanding of medicine from this evidence is limited, but certainly the early Byzantine centuries provide many examples of aristocratic women whose Christian good works, it is claimed, included caring for the sick. Whether or not this was sometimes a pious topos—and it often was not: the empress Flacilla attended patients in one Constantinopolitan hospital, the aristocrat Fabiola founded and worked in another—it was evidently considered appropriate for aristocratic women to be associated with healing. Status and gender together suggest that Anicia Juliana, credited with “good works” by Cyril of Skythopolis and a “desire for wisdom”

---

40 For a good general overview, see Clark, Women in Late Antiquity, 63–93; cf. with considerable caution K. C. Hurd-Mead, A History of Women in Medicine from the Earliest Times to the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century (Haddam, Conn., 1938), 84–96.


44 Greek Magical Papyri, 258–59.


in her dedicatory portrait, and as the materfamilias of an extended household, would have been expected to be interested in basic remedies.

The impetus behind the creation of the Vienna Dioskorides was, then, apparently a desire to provide an extremely high-status materfamilias with a luxurious but potentially practical medical compendium for domestic use. The selection of a herbal rather than a religious text may have had implications—the common metaphorical association of women and gardens springs to mind—but they were not based on Anicia Juliana's lack of Christian conviction: not only did she commission churches, she was a firm and noted Chalcedonian who, Theophanes tells us, resisted pressure from the patriarch and Emperor Anastasios to adopt a more monophysite position. Depending on when the Vienna Dioskorides was made, Juliana's religious convictions may in fact have prompted the people of Honoratae who commissioned the book to opt for a safe (nonreligious) text; alternatively, we might suspect that the gift hinted at a need for a hospice in Honoratae. But whatever the scenario was, the donors are not likely to have commissioned a text that they thought would be distasteful to or ignored by their benefactor, and we can assume that they believed Juliana would understand the significance of the text. We in fact have no evidence for Anicia Juliana's interest in medicine save, perhaps, for the Vienna Dioskorides itself; but Juliana's interest is not necessarily in question: what is significant is that the expectations of the givers of the gift were that a woman running a large and wealthy household should appreciate a deluxe medical text.

However we assess the commission, the decision to give Anicia Juliana the book we know as the Vienna Dioskorides is revealing. Although the manuscript is exclusive in its luxury, the information it provides grounds us in the essentially utilitarian understanding of plants in sixth-century Byzantium, and it reminds us just how important plants were: they saved lives, an attribute that was important not just to professional medics but to the entire population. Medicine and health were of course central issues in Byzantine daily life, and the tentacles of Byzantine medicine extended into areas that we would now consider non-medical; it is easy to forget the critical ideological and practical importance of plants in an age before penicillin.

Conclusions

In the context of this volume, it must be said that the Vienna Dioskorides tells us nothing about the structure of Byzantine gardens; and many of the plants in it would have been collected from the wild rather than cultivated in any case. But the manuscript is important all the same for our perception of how gardens themselves have to be understood, for it documents the extent to which people believed in the power of plants, and in the ability of men and women to harness that power. It suggests, too, that early-sixth-
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century Constantinopolitans expected those responsible for the public good—those with the means to have commissioned the great parks and gardens—to have a certain informed involvement in the everyday reality of plants and their medicinal uses. In texts, images, and garden design, the pomegranate may symbolize the bounty of the earth, but it was also one of the most common (and effective) ingredients in Byzantine contraceptive suppositories: to recognize the former but not the latter compromises and distorts our understanding of Byzantine garden culture.

University of Birmingham, U.K.


I begin with a plea—to archaeologists. We have no Byzantine Pompeii, and it is unlikely that we shall ever find a Byzantine Akrotiri: it is even unlikely (though not perhaps quite beyond legitimate yearnings) that we shall ever have the good fortune to excavate a Byzantine Stöng, the farmstead of the Viking saga hero Gaukur Trandilsson.¹

Nevertheless, the information about Byzantine gardens provided us by archaeologists is still disappointingly scant. In the capital itself garden soil was discovered in the middle of the large mosaic in the Great Palace, but unfortunately this was thrown away by the Turkish workmen before the Talbot Rices and their colleagues thought of having the soil analyzed.² Expectations aroused by the prospect of excavation of the supposed site at Küçükyalı of the Bryas Palace, which was rebuilt and furnished with expansive gardens by Theophilos, have been dashed by the recent discovery that the remains do not fit the characteristics of the palace as described in the literary sources.³ The situation is, however, fortunately not completely barren: there is evidence for canalization around the Pantokrator complex;⁴ recent investigation of the terracing amid modern houses helps, in conjunction with literary evidence, to locate more precisely and define the nature of the imperial garden known as the Mesokepion; and examination of the surviving topography including, again, the Byzantine terracing confirms the accuracy of Psellus’ description of the gardens around the monastery of St. George of the Mangana.⁵ Nonetheless, there surely must be further material evidence waiting to be discovered from the large number of gardens known to have existed in Constantinople.

Outside the capital the sum total of our present knowledge is similarly paltry. We know that in late antiquity increasing lawlessness and barbarian invasions, especially in the western

¹ It lies at the upper end of Thjórsárdalur and flourished until Mount Hekla’s eruption in 1104 covered both it and about twenty other neighboring farms. Trandilsson’s was the best preserved and has now been reconstructed further down the valley at Skeljastaðir and is commonly known as the Jölveldisbær (“Commonwealth Farm”).
² Tamara Talbot Rice, personal communication.
³ What used to be thought the palace proper appears to be a tri-apsed church above the domed chamber of the cistern; see A. Ricci, “The Road from Baghdad to Byzantium and the Case of the Bryas Palace in Istanbul,” in L. Brubaker, ed., Byzantium in the Ninth Century: Dead or Alive? (Aldershot, 1998), 131–49.
part of the empire, discouraged the making of extensive gardens around open villas, yet they did not entirely disappear. Nonetheless, there is only sporadic archaeological information on both pleasure gardens and productive gardens to supplement the scanty literary evidence,\(^6\) while for the later periods virtually nothing has been unearthed. The one honorable exception to the general picture should be made in regard to the excavation of monasteries and hermitages in the Near East in the Early Christian period, for which there is now substantial knowledge, so competently collected and organized by Yizhar Hirschfeld,\(^7\) of irrigational systems and terracing and sometimes even of the exact dimensions of productive gardens. Conditions there have undoubtedly often been conducive to the survival of such traces, but surely a similar survey is feasible for parts of Turkey and possibly North Africa.\(^8\)

Signs of a recent growing interest in gardens by archaeologists are encouraging, but, sadly, in the past most let slip any opportunities of looking for or studying them, and some were clearly insufficiently aware of what could still be read in the soil before they themselves often irreparably destroyed the evidence. I suspect, however, that even today archaeologists sometimes automatically interpret disturbance of the soil in suburban and rural settings as evidence for farming, when around palaces and even homesteads it may often indicate horticulture. Lack of time or money also frequently precludes thorough investigation of suspected gardens. A recent example is that of a site once thought to be the Samaritan Castra, but now shewn to be a Christian city (perhaps Porphyreon),\(^9\) where the architecture of possibly the bishop’s palace and the topography indicate a view to the sea not blocked by any buildings. The intervening land was thus likely to have been taken up by gardens and orchards: lines of stones too narrow to have served as the foundations of buildings could have served as boundaries for individual gardens, while circles of small stones suggest plantation. Despite the wishes of the archaeologists, however, the excavated area has now had to be filled in through the constraint of time, with the resultant loss of another possible opportunity to add to our knowledge of maritime gardens.\(^10\)

\(^6\) For instance, at Aphrodisias we know that there was a peristyle court with probably a garden at the early Byzantine residence of the governor or bishop near the odeon; and at a second complex, thought by Kenan Erim to have been originally a school of philosophy, which lay north of the temenos of Aphrodite (where later the Byzantine cathedral was built), there was a courtyard with a shallow pool still used into the Byzantine period. See K. T. Erim, *Aphrodisias: City of Venus Aphrodite* (New York, 1986), 71–73.

\(^7\) On this, see A. R. Littlewood, “The Scholarship of Byzantine Gardens,” in this volume, 19 and note 50, for supplementary information from Yosef Porath (on a pleasure garden) and Joseph Patrich, ibid., 17 and 20, respectively; and for further bibliography of relevant archaeology in the Near East, 19 n. 50. For a recent discovery by Patrich, see below, 219.

\(^8\) Scope for excavation in Greece is, of course, limited owing to continued use of most Byzantine monastic gardens, but non-intrusive investigation may still be worthwhile, especially on Mount Athos.

\(^9\) The site was occupied throughout the period of Byzantine control of the area from the 4th to the 7th century.

\(^10\) Gerald Finkielsztejn, personal communication. Finkielsztejn, of the Israel Antiquities Authority, is also co-director of the Castra excavations. The preliminary report of the excavations is due to appear in *Hadashot Arkheologiot* in early 1999 with a contemporaneous English translation in *Excavations and Surveys*, and the final report in perhaps 2001.
There are further formidable difficulties, especially in urban areas. Most Byzantine towns and cities lie today beneath their modern counterparts, whose central areas are frequently graced by important post-Byzantine buildings which are, and should be, repaired rather than torn down. More promising, perhaps, for our purposes may be the modern suburbs, where once there may have been farms or even imperial palaces and game parks, especially since in these areas there is frequent demolition, modern buildings being regularly erected in the expectation of speedy obsolescence. But even here, unfortunately, the internal combustion engine, in enabling massive amounts of rubble to be removed, has irremediably changed the older practice of building on top of ruins to one of building from the ground or even bedrock: thus it forever has removed, and continues to remove with inexorably increasing pace and thoroughness, whatever material evidence had survived from earlier centuries. In the countryside, on the other hand, centuries of horticulture and agriculture in the areas of richer earth have usually obliterated all traces of Byzantine operations. Moreover, even when the site of a garden may be proved or suspected, any information other than that on watercourses is hard to extract. Although Wilhelmina Jashemski has so triumphantly used soil analysis to re-create accurate pictures of Roman gardens in Campania, yet away from the realm of Mount Vesuvius’ preservatory destruction problems abound. Except for the rare occasions when a garden is burned in situ, any carbonized plants that may be found are likely to be debris from kitchen or table used in mulch as fertilizer, and will consequently give evidence of vegetables and other plants grown in productive gardens (but not necessarily those in the particular garden in which they were unearthed), and they will certainly not represent the plants of a pure pleasure garden. Plant phytoliths similarly are recoverable mainly, though certainly not exclusively, from fertilizer. Pollen, if found and identified, is of less help than may at first be thought likely, for most of it will have been windblown from the general area, especially since many flowers grown in a pleasure garden, in their reliance on the more efficient agency of insects, produce but little pollen.

Need, however, all hope of finding Byzantine gardens and their contents be lost? The situation is not entirely one of tenebricose and inspissated gloom, if archaeologists will be alert to the possibilities of discovering gardens. Even in Istanbul there is occasionally widespread demolition for road-widening schemes, and other operations, such as that at Saraçhan in 1964–69, which made possible the excavation of Anicia Juliana’s church of St. Polyeuktos. On sites like this, and especially when archaeologists suspect or discover a mansion or church (for urban churches were commonly surrounded by gardens), let at least the quality of the earth be closely examined. Whenever near, or on occasion in, a building complex there is found an area in which the earth is richer than elsewhere in the neighborhood, this almost certainly serves as evidence for a garden; and if analysis of the soil proves fruitless, at least the

---


12 I am indebted to Kathryn Gleason for pointing out to me technical problems in soil analysis.
size and shape of that garden may be ascertainable. On occasion we can raise our hopes
higher: Barry Cunliffe’s work at Fishbourne has most encouragingly shown that even when,
unlike at the Campanian sites, land has been used for almost two subsequent millennia,
ancient disturbance of the soil may still be sufficiently evident to trace bedding trenches,
and pollen analysis may still give positive results. Moreover, soil underneath enclosure
walls was immune to later disturbance, and thus samples may, when analyzed, give evidence
of ancient vegetation. All wells should also be examined not only, as is customary, for lost
artefacts but also for waterlogged vegetal material, which is far more likely than phytoliths
and carbonized remains to represent the contents of a neighboring garden.

Urban archaeologists should also be able to use the discovery of terracing to indicate
possible sites for gardens and the layouts of others whose existence is positively known from
literature. They may also be able to help with another uncertainty. Almost a deWning feature
of a garden was an enclosing wall, so often elaborately described in the romances and men-
tioned in legal sources. In the countryside it kept animals out, in game parks it kept animals
in, to urban houses it gave privacy; but were all the gardens around churches so enclosed?
Again, can archaeologists shed further light on the systems of the distribution of water for
the irrigation of urban gardens? For appurtenances may it be plausibly argued that any
decorative slabs now in museums, still lying on the ground (as in Istanbul) or even gracing
the walls of churches or other buildings, could once have adorned Byzantine gardens? Jo-
seph Alchermes does indeed suggest that the slabs carved with real and imaginary birds and
animals and a bare-breasted female musician which were found in 1904 between Stara
Zagora and Nova Zagora in Bulgaria “perhaps belonged . . . to a stone screen or canopy that
embellished an aristocratic house or garden.” Even ornamental elements of fountains may
possibly still survive—Henry Maguire tentatively attributes a sculpted goose, now incorporated
into the Ottoman fountain known as Kazlı Çeşme, to a Byzantine fountain of the Aretai
park outside the city’s land walls.

In rural areas excavators of not only late antique villas but also fortified palaces must
expect that they contained at least a courtyard garden, while the courtyards and circumjacent
lands of monasteries may also prove sites for profitable excavation (in Italy, for instance, at
the Benedictine monastery of San Vincenzo al Volturno some 20 miles or so east of
Montecassino, archaeologists discovered that a peristyle court had been used in the 9th
century as a garden). One major task outside built-up areas may already have been done
for us and merely awaits our attention: I know of no scholar who has studied available aerial
photographs with a view to locating Byzantine gardens.

14 In H. C. Evans and W. D. Wixom, eds., The Glory of Byzantium: Art and Culture of the Middle Byzantine
15 See his “Gardens and Parks,” 256–57. Another, bronze, goose whose beak has a tubular ori-
cine was found
long ago in the hippodrome, but its construction renders its association with a fountain unlikely; see D. Buckton,
Byzantium: Treasures of Byzantine Art and Culture (London, 1994), 44.
Archaeological work is indeed now in progress that may add to our knowledge of Byzantine gardens. This is perhaps most likely at the moment in Israel, where, for instance, Joseph Patrich has discovered a roof garden around the audience hall of the Roman financial procurator at Caesarea. This particular garden, which replaced an earlier reflecting pool, is most probably in origin pre-Byzantine, but it seems to have survived until at least the mid-fourth century when it was buried beneath a vast mosaic floor. Another opportunity is afforded by the work at Butrint in Albania (Vergil's Buthrotum), where in the late fifth or the early sixth century some late Roman buildings were destroyed for the erection of a triconch palace, perhaps intended as the residence of the city governor or bishop. Although construction was soon abandoned, there had yet been time for the making of a peristyle garden, which is at present under excavation. In a related culture, Scott Redford informs me that he is working on Seljuk pavilions and enclosures in and around Alanya: greater exchange of information with Arab, Persian, Seljuk, Ottoman, and even Mughal archaeologists may lead to profitable future irrigation of our respective plots. Let us, at all events, urge all archaeologists, however potent their architectural intoxication, to keep, at least at the back of their minds, the humble garden.

We may now turn to literature. This provides no great cornucopia of specific information, but the Byzantines' love of the natural world and their own manipulation of it was so great that their literature is permeated with the imagery of both. No genre seems to have been immune. We may thus be sure that some choice rarities remain to be discovered.


18 The site was first excavated in the 1930s by the Italian Archaeological Mission, but work is now under the directorship of Oliver Gilkes of the newly formed Institute of World Archaeology of the University of East Anglia and Kosta Lako of the Institute of Archaeology, Tirana. Publication is due in the Journal of Roman Archaeology. I am grateful to Lucy Watson of the Institute of World Archaeology for this information.

19 Publication is forthcoming in 15 Arasın Toplantıları Sonuçlar Töplüntüsü (Ankara).


21 Their discoveries would also encourage art historians to consider the garden as an integral part of a building complex, as the Byzantines most certainly did. It is revealing that “garden” does not occur in the lengthy indexes of most books on Byzantine architecture, including R. Krautheimer, Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture, 3d ed. rev. (Harmondsworth, 1981), C. Mango, Byzantine Architecture (New York, 1975), and a more recent volume in which one could reasonably expect such reference, K. M. Hattersley-Smith, Byzantine Public Architecture between the Fourth and Early Eleventh Centuries A.D. with Special Reference to the Towns of Byzantine Macedonia (Thessalonike, 1996).

22 Robin Osborne has splendidly shown what important information for the even more elusive ancient Greek gardens may be found lurking in seemingly unpromising texts: “Classical Greek Gardens: Between Farm and Paradise,” in Hunt, Garden History (as above, note 11), 373–91.
Why, for instance, in historiography, the most conscientiously investigated area, has no writer on gardens found in so obvious a source as Theophanes Continuatus the detail\(^{23}\) that when Constantine, the infant son of the emperor Theophilos, had drowned in a cistern by the new palace of “The Pearl,” his grief-stricken father filled it in to create a garden where he could enjoy the sun and indulge in fond memories of his lost child?

The Dumbarton Oaks colloquium has itself opened up new terrain for our literary explorations. There is, however, one vast but underexploited area, that of epistolography. Margaret Mullett has calculated that “somewhere around 15,000” letters in “upward of 150 major letter-collections”\(^{24}\) have survived, a few still unpublished. All writers on the subject have gleaned a little from a hesitant foray into this field, but nobody has yet set out to harvest its produce systematically. Chryssa Maltezou recently brought to my attention the touching admission of the homesick Manuel Chrysoloras, who would climb a hill in Rome from which he could not refrain from trying to locate below the “hanging garden” and cypresses of his faraway Byzantine house.\(^{25}\) As far as the collection of information on Byzantine gardens is concerned, a systematic reading of letters is, I believe, the prime desideratum. What of other genres?

All workers in the field, myself included, had hitherto been intimidated by the forbidding bulk of hagiographical texts, but now this area has been explored by Alice-Mary Talbot,\(^{26}\) whose finds constitute the most important contribution to our knowledge of productive gardens in Byzantium. Supplemented by the work of Hirschfeld,\(^{27}\) they give us probably almost as full a picture of monastic gardens as we are likely to get, although there may still be something to be learned from cartularies.\(^{28}\) Despite the fact that monks and hermits did not create pleasure gardens, they were not all unaffected by natural beauties, and it is worthy of note that in the letter in which he attempts to entice Gregory of Nazianzos to his Pontic hermitage in Ibora, St. Basil indicates that he regarded all the scenery around as a sort of grand and wild garden, which he compares with Homer’s Ogygia, one of the sources of the long literary tradition of garden descriptions.\(^{29}\) This attitude Talbot documents from saints’ lives, but its development could be traced more fully with the help of other genres. It is, I think, worth doing in the case of the monks of Byzantium, who have traditionally claimed that Mount Athos was the personal garden of the Panaghia, as can still be noticed today on an ill-painted warning to visitors to the holy mountain: “Do not pick the flowers: this is the Virgin’s garden.”

\(^{23}\) 3.4.9 (Bonn, 1838), 88.


\(^{27}\) See above, 216, and Littlewood, “Scholarship,” 19.

\(^{28}\) For some references, see Littlewood, “Scholarship,” 18 n. 36.

Proverbs, legal texts, and ekphraseis have been exploited by Costas Constantinides for the Palaiologan period.30 The first had hitherto been almost completely ignored by writers on gardens, but, despite the usually impossible problem of dating, they may be worth exploiting further for such delightful finds as the fact that neighbors could expect free cabbages from a market garden,31 and also for light on Byzantine attitudes to gardens and their contents and a symbolism different from both the biblical and those to be found in Niketas Stethatos and the anonymous author of Le jardin symbolique (Theoretikon paradeission).32

Legal texts clearly have yet more to provide us: there was, for instance, in Constantinople a guild of market gardeners whose unfair practice Justinian attempted to curb in one of his Novels33—both when members took out and when they surrendered leases for suburban market gardens, assessments were made of the value of these estates, but the guild itself provided the assessors, to the great advantage of their colleagues, who could find that the huge leap upwards in value bore little correspondence with any possible improvements made during their tenure. There is perhaps also useful statistical information waiting to be extracted from legal documents. For instance, in sales, leases, and other cases, how often are gardens included with the house and how often are they separate? Together with other clues this could help establish to what extent utilitarian gardens in the countryside were integral parts of the home and to what extent they were discrete entities, sometimes at a considerable distance from the home. Again, when documents specify occupations of manual workers, how often comparatively are these gardeners? Similarly, although not many tombstones survive of the lower classes, how many of these are for those once thus employed?34 Does the evidence allow us to see any variations over time and place, including between city and countryside? Konon, a popular Isaurian saint, was known as “the Gardener,” but is Clive Foss justified in proposing that his fellow countrymen were famed not only as builders but also as gardeners?35

Constantinides’ use of ekphraseis of Nicaea and Trebizond is a useful reminder that we should be alert for information about cities other than the capital. Foss’ recent book on Nicaea, for instance, though not listing the word in the index, has many references to gardens:36 one passage that had eluded garden historians is a description by Gregory Palamas of the church of the monastery of Hyakinthos (the church of the Dormition), where the exiled bishop, a captive of the Turks, took delight in the shade of the garden’s trees.

31 Ibid., 103.
33 Novel 64.538.
36 Foss, Nicaea 14, 32, 33, 34, 84, 85, 98, 118–19, 127, 128, 129, in addition to the texts that he edits and his own comments on them (142–46, 159, 160, 172–74, 180, 182, 199, 201).
There is clearly much work still to be done on the technical treatises that we have. The interrelationships of the \textit{Geoponika}, its sources, and parallel texts in various near-eastern languages are now becoming clearer despite the labyrinthine complexity apparent even in Robert Rodgers’ simplified diagram,\footnote{“\textit{\v{K}epronika}: Garden Making and Garden Culture in the \textit{Geoponika},” in this volume, 159–75.} but, as he indicates, there is hope of profit from a careful examination of all these texts and an attempt to ascertain any additions. This last may give a little guidance in the vexed and often insoluble problems of deciding whether a given fact is merely antiquarian or reflective of Byzantine practice (and, if so, of what period, for unfortunately in this context horticulture is not quite as conservative as agriculture). We must remember also that a section that does not occur in the Greek \textit{Geoponika} but only in a Syriac or Armenian text may nevertheless be evidence for practice in the Byzantine world as opposed to that in the ancient world, which, of course, is the basis for all the practical manuals (which began with the Carthaginians). With even greater caution, Arabic and Pahlavi texts could possibly be employed for the same purpose. Rodgers is fortunately tackling the formidable problems of the manuscript tradition and taking heed of more non-Greek texts than just the Syriac version of Vindonius Anatolius, which alone was noticed by H. Beckh in 1895 in the Teubner edition of the \textit{Geoponika}, still our standard edition: its replacement by Rodgers will at last place a reliable tool in our hands.

Further assistance for those who toil in Byzantine fields would perhaps be forthcoming if the \textit{Geoponika} were more readily available to experts in the agriculture and horticulture of both the Near East and the Latin West. There is at present only one modern translation of the work, Elena Lipshitz’ Russian version published in 1960.\footnote{See Littlewood, “Scholarship,” 18 n. 38. In the 16th century there had been one Latin version, by Janus Cornarius, and two in Italian, by Nicolo Vitelli and Pietro Lauro.} In English there exists only the two-volume work from 1805/6 by the rector of Upton Scudamore, the Rev. Thomas Owen; and this is extremely rare and often unknown to scholars working in the area\footnote{I know of copies in the Bodleian, the British Library, and the libraries of Cornell, Yale, the Missouri Botanical Garden in Saint Louis, and the United States Department of Agriculture.} (Rodgers’ promise of an eventual new translation is, therefore, much to be applauded). We must be careful, however, in our dependence upon the \textit{Geoponika}, which because of its nature will never be a sure guide; and in comparing material in Dioskorides’ herbal on the one hand and in the \textit{Geoponika} and other texts on the other, John Scarborough\footnote{“Herbs of the Field and Herbs of the Garden in Byzantine Medicinal Pharmacy,” in this volume, 177–88.} reveals the rich potential of such an approach, which clearly must be continued.

For information on pleasure gardens no literary genre has been more exploited than the romance and the romantic epic, for the obvious reason that they contain often very lengthy ekphraseis of gardens. In the dearth of comparable descriptions of real gardens,\footnote{See Littlewood, “Scholarship,” 20–21.} they have been taken as evidence for contemporary practice, and as long as this has been done with caution it has been a valid procedure. They still have, however, much to offer in the area of the Byzantine perceptions of gardens and their contents. In a paper at the colloquium unfortunately not available for publication, Margaret Alexiou surely destroyed...
any lingering belief in anybody’s mind that the ekphrasis of a garden is a mere rhetorical intrusion into a romance, as she showed how in terrestrial and even cosmic fashion it is central to the development of the story. I suggest that more attention should be paid particularly to Kallimachos and Chrysorrhoe, where the three gardens are a very elaborately designed scheme to show in symbolic vegetal imagery the stages in the development of a male-female relationship from loneliness to passion. Meliteniotes’ strange and inordinately long Sophrosyne offers further insights into Byzantine perceptions of both heavenly and terrestrial gardens, and it has, moreover, not been dug over sufficiently to extract all the evidence it contains on the actual appearance of real gardens. I was glad to see it used by Mary-Lyon Dolezal and Maria Mavroudi in their emphatic demolition of Herbert Hunger’s factoid that Hyrtakenos’ ekphrasis of the scene of the Annunciation to St. Anne was based upon a picture. As they emphasize, this ekphrasis is very closely connected with those in the romances; and belonging to this tradition are also rhetorical descriptions, in both prose and verse and in both religious and secular works, of the beauties of nature, which, like John Geometres’ poem on spring, would repay closer scrutiny.

Using both literary texts and artistic representations, Henry Maguire points out the changing Byzantine conceptions of paradise in the pre- and post-iconoclastic periods. But there is further work to be done here. For instance, what differences do we find in the Byzantine descriptions of Eden and the more ethereal paradise? The latter was not part of the early Byzantine vision, but later there was a growing belief that there was a paradise in heaven or at least between heaven and earth, Niketas Stethatos in the eleventh century even denying the Edenic garden’s relevance to humanity after the Incarnation in his treatise Contemplation on Paradise. Maguire does indeed touch on this, but further exploration may perhaps be instructive in tracing not only theological developments but also shifting Byzantine attitudes to their own real gardens. Again, how much and how did Byzantine conceptions of the paradisiacal change during the Palaiologan period when their terrestrial environment was becoming increasingly perilous?

The Persian quadripartite arrangement of the chahar-bagh reflects the four rivers of paradise, but there seems never to have been a similar arrangement in a description of a Byzantine garden. The Muslims went to extreme lengths to claim their gardens the equal of paradise, or its superior, even when it was only a garden on some moored barges on the river.
at Agra,\textsuperscript{48} and at Jahangir's Shalamar Bagh in Kashmir the pavilion in the zenana garden boasted, "If there is a paradise on the face of the earth, it is here, it is here, it is here."\textsuperscript{49} Have we been misled by the Byzantine claim for their capital city to be a reflection of the heavenly Jerusalem into thinking that they similarly regarded their gardens as reflecting paradise? Alternatively, does the absence of the quadripartite arrangement indeed indicate an overweening desire to emulate the celestial, rather than terrestrial, paradise, which, as Maguire points out,\textsuperscript{50} was customarily envisaged without the four rivers? It is, however, worth noting that there is no evidence for the quadripartite arrangement in the early period before the Byzantines began to envisage discrete paradisiacal locations.\textsuperscript{51}

Works in all the literary genres display briefly, or occasionally at some considerable length, Byzantine attitudes toward gardens and their individual component parts, the trees, plants, and fountains. Various speakers at the colloquium touched on these, but there is here still a wide field for exploration. Horticultural similes and metaphors are pervasive, ranging from the ubiquitous simple comparisons of a girl or a youth with a flower or tree to marriage as a form of grafting,\textsuperscript{52} to independence as a planting of roots in one's own soil,\textsuperscript{53} to librarianship as a form of paradisiacal gardening,\textsuperscript{54} to literary excisions as a cutting away of offshoots,\textsuperscript{55} to the comparison between the amputation of fingers and the pruning of vines,\textsuperscript{56} to the description of impaled captives as swaying in the wind like scarecrows in cucumber beds.\textsuperscript{57} Occasionally these passages may teach us something of Byzantine horticultural prac-

\textsuperscript{48} This is a boast of the second Mughal ruler, Humāyūn, in a poem by Muḥammad Khwāndamīr, quoted by J. L. Wescoat Jr., "Gardens of Invention and Exile: The Precarious Context of Mughal Garden Design during the Reign of Humayun (1530–1556)," Journal of Garden History 10 (1990): 108.

\textsuperscript{49} We should note, however, the legend recorded by Yaʿqūt that when King Shaddād had created his Garden of Iram in southern Arabia in imitation of Paradise, the Almighty, after his warning was disregarded, destroyed it (Muʃjan al-Buldān, vol. 1 [Leipzig, 1886], 212–26; cf. Qurʾān, surah 89). For some bibliography on the Islamic attitude, see A. R. Littlewood, "Gardens of the Palaces," in H. Maguire, ed., Byzantine Court Culture from 829 to 1204 (Washington, D.C., 1997), 21 n. 55. See also J. L. Wescoat Jr. and J. Wolschke-Bulmahn, eds., Gardens: Sources, Places, Representations, and Prospects, Dumbarton Oaks Colloquium on the History of Landscape Architecture 16 (Washington, D.C., 1992).

\textsuperscript{50} Above, 27.

\textsuperscript{51} I now have serious doubts about my former naïf assumption: “of one thing we can be certain: the Byzantine tended and loved his garden both for its present beauty and as a foretaste of the paradise for which he yearned”; "Gardens of Byzantium," Journal of Garden History 12 (1992): 149.

\textsuperscript{52} Psellus, Chronographia, 6.15, ed. S. Impellizzeri, vol. 1 (Venice, 1984), 262.

\textsuperscript{53} The whole passage is worth quoting: τὴν γεωργοῦντα ταύτην ρίζαν θέσασθαι ἐπεθύμησεν, καὶ ἐπιθυμήσας εὑρε, καὶ εὑρὼν τὸ ἱδίον παραδέσποτον μεταφέτεσαι ἤθελεν, καὶ θελώσας τοῦ ἐρωτοῦ ὡς ἰσότοχον, καὶ πάλιν τὴν ρίζη εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν μετακινήσει ἔγινεν ἑαυτὸν τοῦ μέγα φύτευμα ([Bishop Eustathios] “desired to behold this productive root [St. Demetrianos], and having desired it he found it, and having found it he wished to transplant it into his own garden, and having wished it he failed to gain his desire, for the great scion remained independent, setting instead his roots into his own soil”): H. Grégoire, “Saint Démétrianos, évêque de Chytri (île de Chypre),” BZ 16 (1907): 226, lines 316–20.

\textsuperscript{54} Manasses, Chron., ed. I. Bekker (Bonn, 1837), 4257–69, pp. 182–83.


\textsuperscript{57} Ibid., 84–89.
tice, but far more frequently they reveal rather how gardens and their contents impinge on the inner world of the Byzantines. Dimitrios Petropoulos wrote a fascinating book in 1954 on the imagery of the natural world in modern Greek folk songs, and in 1969 C.-H. de Fouchécour published an extensive examination of vegetal imagery in eleventh-century Persian poetry. Something similar should be done for Byzantine literature: it would certainly shed much light on our subject. Furthermore, there is sufficient material in the corpus of various church fathers to warrant a detailed examination of an individual author’s attitude toward gardens and nature in general, as has been shown by a series of theses inspired by the pioneering work of Alfred Biese and published in the Patristic Studies series at the Catholic University of America between 1931 and 1946. A similar investigation into the output of a secular author could also well bear fruit: the poet and prose writer John Geometres springs immediately to mind.

A few broader considerations of literature are also possible. For instance, Byzantine descriptions of paradisiacal, romantic, and even real gardens are lineal successors of a pagan tradition ultimately derived from Homer and a mainly Orphic and later Pythagorean eschatological vision secularized by the rhetoricians. What modifications did the Byzantines make and why? Were any modifications the result of changes in real Byzantine gardens? Again, Genesis and Canticles had their due effect, but is there discernible any influence from Islamic literature and art?

The Byzantines’ own art may, I fear, have little more information to offer on their gardens, largely because after the early period, when (as, for instance, in the floor mosaic of the narthex of the Large Basilica at Heraclea Lynkestis in Macedonia) each plant offers at least a chance of identification, in later Byzantium they are, with only a very few notable

---

58 La comparaison dans la chanson populaire grecque (Athens, 1954).
60 Perhaps I may be permitted to observe here that my own work on just one fruit, the apple, shows that it was the subject of very varied symbolism in Byzantium and even more so in meta-Byzantine demotic poetry, which probably in large measure reflects the lost literature of this type from Byzantium itself; “The Symbolism of the Apple in Byzantine Literature,” JOB 23 (1974): 33–59, and especially “The Erotic Symbolism of the Apple in Late Byzantine and Meta-Byzantine Demotic Literature,” BMGS 17 (1993): 83–103.
61 Details are given in Littlewood, “Scholarship,” 13 n. 4.
62 His poetry is full of natural descriptions or imagery, notably his encomia of spring (above, note 43) and a park almost certainly that at Aretai (Littlewood, “Scholarship,” 16). All six of his prose progymnasmata (ibid., 15) are vegetal: two (2–3) describe his own garden, three (4–6) were written to accompany gifts of apples, and one (1) is a wonderfully sensitive encomium of the oak which obeys all the rhetorical rules for such a composition but yet treats of the life cycle of the tree in human terms from birth to grandmotherhood. See Littlewood, “A Byzantine Oak and Its Classical Acorn: The Literary Artistry of Geometres, Progymnasmata 1,” JOB 29 (1980): 133–44.
63 Mainly Odyssey, 7.112–32.
64 One of the earliest passages is Pindar, O. 2.61–77.
66 Dated to the late 5th or early 6th century. See H. Maguire, Earth and Ocean: The Terrestrial World in Early Byzantine Art (University Park, Pa., 1987), pls. 42–49. A much better known, but far less varied, example is afforded by the mosaic of paradise in the conch of the apse at Sant’Apollinare in Classe at Ravenna.
67 Above, p. 123, fig. 14. A complete list of flowers, shrubs, and trees depicted in pre-iconoclastic art could be useful for comparison with literary sources.
exceptions, hopelessly generic except for the odd rose, vine, and other very common plants. Moreover, despite the artists’ love for vegetation, which may appear in the most unlikely places, their gardens are only incidental details of larger scenes and give few clues about the layout of actual gardens. There are, nonetheless, three areas possibly worth pursuing.

First, although none of the approximately fifty manuscripts of the Geoponika is illustrated, about a dozen Greek and various Arabic copies of Dioskorides’ herbal are. Since, as Leslie Brubaker has indicated, both the famous Vienna Dioskorides and later manuscripts of the work were intended in both text and illustrations for contemporary use, can we find further clues about horticultural and agricultural practice in the Byzantine world in their illustrations? I am thinking here of a few pictures in the twelfth-century copy at the Lavra on Mount Athos (Ω). Kurt Weitzmann argues that figures were introduced into manuscripts of Dioskorides in the tenth century to indicate methods of obtaining the desired pharmaceutical products. However, one folium shows a farmer attacking an arbutus with a two-handed axe brandished over his head, and other similar pictures involve leeks, earthnuts, and the epimedion (on whose identification Liddell and Scott give up). An axe would seem an odd implement for gathering the pharmaceutical products of all of these plants, and one may be tempted to assume that the artist, in high disregard for any practical utility in his illustrations, was translating a scene from one tree to other far less appropriate plants. But one of his illustrations shows the farmer on one knee, grasping an axe in his right hand while he stretches out in seeming supplication his left hand to a cedar tree. It seems far more likely to me, pace Weitzmann, that the artist is illustrating a technique for restoring the fertility of a barren plant. According to the Geoponika, a farmer may do this with the help of an accomplice: while he rushes at the unproductive tree with his axe and angrily threatens to chop it down, he is restrained by the tender-hearted third party who begs for the tree to be given a second chance. We may think that this technique would not work, we may think it merely a pious allusion to Luke 13.6–9, but did the Byzantines have sufficient biblical faith actually to practise it? Do any further suggestive illustrations lurk in these manuscripts?

68 E.g., the plants and especially the oak with acorns on the famous 10th- or 11th-century ivory casket now in the treasury of Troyes cathedral; see H. Maguire, “Imperial Gardens and the Rhetoric of Renewal,” in P. Magdalino, ed., New Constantines: The Rhythm of Imperial Renewal in Byzantium, 4th–13th Centuries (Aldershot, 1994), figs. 5 and 8.
69 Flowers and small trees can appear in profusion even in the desert: see Littlewood, “Gardens of Byzantium,” 132 and fig. 11.
70 Literature is of more use here, as it is for the broader field of landscape architecture, and further information is perhaps still to be found as Dolezal and Mavroudi have shown (“Hyrtakenos,” 109–21).
71 Unfortunately this seems to be true also of all the related non-Greek texts.
72 For details, see L. Brubaker, “The Vienna Dioskorides and Anicia Juliana,” in this volume, 204, n. 21.
73 Ibid., esp. 213.
Second, topiary work, invented according to Pliny the Elder by a certain C. Matius in the time of Augustus, was taken to extraordinary lengths in Rome, bushes being trimmed into fanciful tableaux of hunting and sailing or spelling out the name of gardener or owner. Such monstrous perversities of nature the Byzantines eschewed. Although the standard convention in their art shows two strata of outstretched branches, one at the crown and one beneath with a stretch of bare trunk between, there are a few variations that may not be entirely artistic fantasy. A survey of the material could produce something of interest.

Third, illuminated manuscripts of even late Byzantium are far more precise in their depiction of mammals than they are of plants. Nancy Ševčenko shows how this material can be used in association with literary sources for ascertaining what beasts were found in game parks, menageries, and animal parks, although she rightly points out that the latest exotic arrival in the capital was the main stimulus for the artist. I think that there is little further to be gained here, but there may be in the case of birds. These occur in art largely in headpieces and borders to canon tables and come somewhere between mammals and plants in specificity of depiction. Because they usually appear in association with vegetation, may they offer any clues to what birds were kept in gardens? Mary-Lyon Dolezal and Maria Mavroudi state that, of the four birds mentioned by Hyrтakenos, “nightingales and peacocks inhabited ‘real Byzantine gardens,’” thus implying that the parrot and swan did not. Did swans ever grace large bodies of water in a man-made setting? In Manuel Philes’ poem describing a garden painted on the ceiling of a room in a palace, he claims that swans were omitted because in that situation they would have disturbed the imperial peace. Does this suggest that swans were normally to be found on garden lakes, or does his ornithological ignorance (shared by Hyrтakenos) suggest that they could not have been, at least not commonly? Al-Qadi al-Rashid Ibn al-Zubayr’s (if he indeed be the author) accounts of collections of treasures record that Michael VI sent the Fatimid caliph al-Mustansir, among other gifts, possibly albino starlings, ravens, partridges, peacocks, cranes, and aquatic birds. The starlings and perhaps the ravens (unless the latter’s wings were clipped) were, we may presume, to be placed in cages, but were the others intended to grace the caliph’s gardens, and do they all reflect Byzantine practice? Can art give any guidance in such matters? Can it, again, help in the matter of ornamental fish and fishponds, where, however, a trawling of literature would probably result in a more profitable catch?

Information on Byzantine gardens, in contrast with that on Roman, is often elusive.

---

76 Pliny the Elder, Naturalis historia, 12.6.13, 16.60.140; Pliny the Younger, Ep. 5.6.
77 Note the listing of some relevant illustrated manuscripts by Dolezal and Mavroudi, “Hyrтakenos,” 114.
78 “Wild Animals in the Byzantine Park,” in this volume.
79 “Hyrтakenos,” 133 and 134, n. 52.
81 Account 84 of Kitab al-Dhakhár wa al-Tuhaf, ed. M. Hamidullah (Kuwait, 1959). See O. Grabar, “The Shared Culture of Objects,” in Maguire, Byz. Court Culture, 121. That the birds were albinos is not certain, for, although the adjective has the proper signification of “white, it is used also in the figurative sense of ‘pure,’ ‘pristine,’ ‘of superb quality’” (Oleg Grabar, personal communication).
82 It is perhaps significant that the recent article by L. Landgren, “The Roman Pleasure Garden—Founda-
However, there is far more information on them, and especially on contemporary attitudes toward them,83 than there is on Classical Greek gardens, for which Robin Osborne has manfully suggested that “the very scantiness and limitations of our knowledge . . . can be turned to advantage; for the limitations of our evidence about Greek gardens are not limitations to the Greek situation, but are limitations present, less obviously and therefore often more insidiously, in the study of all historic gardens.”84

We, with our far more extensive stores of information, must have the courage to pick up the gauntlet of Osborne’s implied challenge. Above I have in the main suggested areas I believe promising for the unearthing of new information, but while all that spadework is being done, Joachim Wolschke-Bulmahn’s challenging questions85 and also those posed recently by John Dixon Hunt,86 should be borne in mind: when it has been done we should be in a position to attempt answers to some. In particular, I think, we should look for changes over the centuries87 (especially when the late antique was giving way to the more distinctively “Byzantine” world), for the importance of productive gardens in the Byzantine economy, for any adoption of foreign, and especially Muslim, aesthetic ideas in their pleasure gardens. Above all we should consider the Byzantines’ emotional reactions to the beauties of nature, the significances that they attached to both earthly gardens and the divine and their attitudes to what is human manipulation of the handiwork of God.88

Byzantine gardens were usually walled. In recent years we have peeped over those walls. Now we have shyly tiptoed inside the gates and, though realizing that we shall never be able to stroll where’er we list in these Byzantine paradises, we have become more aware

83 And probably even more than on attitudes toward western medieval gardens, which have long been considered far more accessible to the modern world than their Byzantine counterparts.
84 “Classical Greek Gardens,” 373–74. With a similar lack of visual images of Greek gardens, he calls for a consideration of “the garden’s place in the conceptual framework of man as a social animal” (ibid., 374).
87 Scantiness of evidence is probably always going to make impossible a thorough study of geographical differences.
88 I mean this not only on the large scale of a whole garden setting, but also in attitudes toward grafting, enhancing sweetness, color, and tenderness, and growing plants out of season. (This last had been condemned by the Roman pagans, the Younger Seneca [Ep. 122.8], and Martial [8.14, 8.68].) See further A. R. Littlewood, “Ancient Literary Evidence for the Pleasure Gardens of Roman Country Villas,” in E. B. MacDougall, ed., Ancient Roman Villa Gardens, Dumbarton Oaks Colloquium on the History of Landscape Architecture 10 [Washington, D.C., 1987], 20.) What changes in attitude are there over the centuries and between different social groups? Our literature comes from the intellectual elite, but I believe that it nonetheless offers further clues for us to differentiate between attitudes of the urban rich and of the urban poor and between those of the more horticulturally minded city dwellers and those of the more agriculturally minded inhabitants of the countryside.
of the pleasures that await us therein. But their attainment is possible only through our continued toil, as we ever heed the injunction of an ancient tiller of the soil: ἔργον ἐπὶ ἔργῳ ἐργάζεσθαι. 89
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89 “Work with work upon work” (Hesiod, Works and Days, 382). I wish to thank Henry Maguire for many suggestions and Joachim Wolschke-Bulmahn for his provoking and, I hope, productive castigation of my pessimism.

In August 2001 Ken Dark assured me that he, the codirector E Özgüümüş, and their team of the Istanbul Rescue Archaeological Survey were aware of the possibility of finding traces of gardens and would be vigilant in their pursuit.
This bibliography, compiled by Antony Littlewood, is not intended to be a complete bibliography, but merely a guide to further study. Some additional references may be found on pp. 13–21 of this volume and in the chapters on specific topics.
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Theophanes Continuatus. Ed. I. Bekker (Bonn, 1838) (with Latin trans.: scattered references are main source of information on gardens of the Great Palace).
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Art

There is no surviving Byzantine work of art in any medium that gives us a view of a complete garden, but details of gardens and vegetation commonly associated with them are often shown. There has, however, been no attempt to collect a representative survey of these (although A. R. Littlewood is [2001] in the very early stages of planning one such), but, in addition to L. Brubaker and A. R. Littlewood, “Byzantinische Gärten,” in M. Carroll-Spillecke, ed., *Der Garten von der Antike bis zum Mittelalter* (Mainz am Rhein, 1992), 213–48, and A. R. Littlewood, “Gardens of Byzantium,” *Journal of Garden History* 12 (1992): 126–53, the following contain relevant artistic material.
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Karpozilos, A. “Realia in Byzantine Epistolography, X–XII c.,” *BZ* 77 (1984): 20–37 (21–23 on garden produce as gifts, etc.).


Kazhdan, A. P. *Agrarnye otushen’ia v Vizantii XIII–XIV vv.* (Moscow, 1952).

———. *Derewia i goro v Vizantii IX–X vv.* (Moscow, 1960).


———. *Ο κηπούρος και η καθημερινή κουζίνα στο Βυζάντιο* (Athens, 1994).


———. *Earth and Ocean: The Terrestrial World in Early Byzantine Art* (University Park, Pa., 1987) (with black-and-white illustrations; see also index, s.v. Paradise).


General Index

With the intention of facilitating use many entries have been grouped under generic lemmata, of which the largest are churches, fauna, flora, gardens, horticultural/agricultural operations/practices, manuscripts, monasteries, nunneries, palaces, parks, romances, saint’s lives, and water-supply and irrigation. The Bibliography has not been indexed, while from the notes simple references to further information have been omitted. Italicized page numbers (placed at end of entries) indicate illustrations. CP = Constantinople. (The index has been compiled by Joachim Wolschke-Bulmahn and Antony Littlewood, the latter of whom wishes gratefully to acknowledge the assistance of his student David Dobrowolski and, for aid with botanical classification, his colleague James Phipps.)

abbot: not to entertain guests in garden, 64; as spiritual gardener, 66–67
Abd-al-Rahman III, 77, 81
Abdul Abbas (Charlemagne’s elephant), 76
Abraham, 28n.29
Achilles: statue of, in garden, 153
Achilles Tatus. See romances (individual)
Actes d’Iviron (Athos), 37n.1, 90n.8
Acts of Saints David, Symeon, and George of Mitylene, 53n.48
Adam, 27–28, 78; statue of, 153
Adonis: garden of, 101; statue of, 149n.38
Adrianople, 88
aesthetic: value of animals, 82, 85; impact of gardens, 171–74; interest in vegetation, 57, 62
aesthetics: of automata, 129n.42; influence of Byzantine, 17; influence of Muslim, 228; of landscapes, 11. See also aroma; art; color; gardens, pleasure–; monasteries, selection of sites for; nature; taste; touch; view/vista/sight
Aëtios of Amida, 214n.52
Africanus, Julius (writer on agriculture), 163, 170
Agra, 224
agriculture/farming, 32, 37–38, 91, 147, 159–75, 216–17; Arabic literature on, 171; ancient Greek and Roman, 159–61, 174; Carthaginian, 222; conservatism of, 174, 222; Nabataean, 166n.23; writers on, 4, 159–64, 174. See also farm; farmer; Geoponika; horticultural/agricultural implements; horticultural/agricultural operations/practices; horticulture/gardening ailments. See diseases and ailments
Ainos, River, 38
Akropolites, Constantine, 97n.45
Akropolites, George, 88n.3, 89, 94n.34
Akrotiri, 215
Alanya, 219
Albert of Aachen, 79
Albertus Magnus, 83n.68
Alchemyes, Joseph, 218
Alexander III of Macedon (“the Great”): statue of, in garden, 153
Alexander of Tralles, 180, 183, 187
Alexios I Komnenos, 79
Alexiou, Margaret, 222–23
allegory. See symbolism/allegory/imagery/metaphor
ambassadors: Byzantine, 76, 82, 93, 129; western, 128–29
Ambrose, Saint, 13n.4
American Society of Landscape Architects, 3
Ammianus Marcellinus, 161
Analgesics, 182
Anastasios I, 77n.39, 211, 213
Anatolia, 41, 44, 52, 207
Anatolius, Vindonius, 144n.9, 161–65, 166n.23, 170, 172–73
anchorite. See hermit
Andreas Capellanus, De arte honesta amandi, 139n.62
Andrew of Crete, 107
Andronikos I Komnenos, 80
Andronikos II Palaiologos, 92, 94, 106: chrysobull of, 39n.10
Andronikos III Palaiologos, 20, 93n.28, 94, 97, 100n.51, 140
Andronikos (despot of Thessalonike), 90
Anemas (prison in CP), 80
anesthesia, 186–87
angel: delighted by garden, 157; helping with irrigation, 43n.24
Anicia Juliana, 181n.28, 209–13, 217, 210
Aninas (anchorite), 106
Anna (Constance of Hohenstaufen, wife of John III Vatatzes), 94
Anna, Saint (mother of Virgin): Annunciation to, 99, 107–10, 121, 135, 141n.66, 223, 98, 108–10, 124; churches dedicated to, 141. See also gardens (specific)
Anonymus Londinensis (10th-cent. schoolteacher in CP), 224n.55
Anthimos (Byzantine doctor), 19
Anthologia Palatina, 10nn.36–37, 211n.34
Anthologia Planudea, 9n.27
antiquarianism, 174–75
antiquity (Greek and Roman), 3, 100, 103, 153, 174, 178, 187. See also gardens, ancient
Antony the Great, Saint, 47
Apelles, 128, 146
Aphrodisias, 216n.6
Aphrodite: statue of, in garden, 153; temenos of, at Aphrodisias, 216n.6
Aphthonios, 109n.11
apiaries, 173n.32. See also bee under fauna:
v Invertebrates (specific)
Apocalypse of Anastasia, 28
apocalyptic texts, 26–28
Apokaukos, Alexios, 97n.45
Apollo, 135, 147: statue of, in garden 153
Apollo, Saint, 24
Apostoles, Michael, 101, 102n.9–20, 103n.21
Apuleius, 186
Arab culture: influence on Byzantium of, 9. See also Islam; Islamic
Arabia, 11, 147
Arabic: identifications of plants in Vienna Dioskorides, 204; lexicon/glossaries of plant-names, 178, 179n.20; texts on agriculture, 222; translations of Dioskorides, 189, 204, 205n.21, 226; translations of Greek agricultural texts, 162–65, 171–72
Arabs, 47
archaeologists/archaeology, 2–3, 19–20, 37, 42, 47–48, 57, 97, 105, 215–19
Archer-Hind, Laura, 14
Archigenes (doctor): statue of, in garden, 153
Areebindus, 211
Ares: statue of, in garden, 153
Arge Orthodoxos, 146n.21
Argyropouloi/Argyropoulos family, 19, 37n.1, 89–90
arithmetic, 144n.9
Armenian translations of Greek agricultural texts, 162, 222
Armstrong, Pamela, 71n.9
aroma/bouquet/fragrance/perfume/scent/smell: of balsam, 93; of breezes, 178; of clover, 93; of crocus, 135n.54, 172; of cumin, 53; of flowers, 11, 87, 135n.54, 147, 152, 154–57, 171; of fruit, 177; of garden or some component thereof, 142, 171, 173; of garden beds, 154, 156; of herbs, 54, 156; of hyacinth, 93; of lily, 93, 135n.54, 172; of mint, 53; of oleander, 93; of opium poppy, 183; of orchards, 171; of paradise, 24; of plants, 27, 93, 156, 179; of river (Euphrates) flowing from Paradise, 26n.20, 137; of roses, 93, 102, 135n.54, 168, 172; of spices, 11; of vegetables, 24, 177; of violets, 135n.54, 172; of wind in Paradise, 28; of zephyr in Paradise, 157. See also perfume, manufactured from plants
art: gardens as, 2; gardens in, 7, 20, 105, 225–26; paradise in, 24, 29–31. See also aesthetics; embroidery of spring scenery; frieze; icons; manuscripts, illuminated; mosaics; paintings/frescos; pottery; sculpture; tapestry; topiary (under horticultural/agricultural operations/practices)
Artemis: statue of, in garden, 153
ascetic/asceticism, 41, 46–47, 53. See also hermit
astrological weather lore, 166
Athanasios of Alexandria, Saint, 47
Athanasios of Alexandria, pseudo-, 23
Athanasios of Athos, Saint, 41, 45, 53, 56
Athena: statue of, in garden, 153
Athos, Mount (Holy Mountain), 38, 41, 216n.8, 45, 56: called “Garden of Panagia,” 66, 220; inventories from, 88, 90. See also manuscripts (specific); monasteries; monasteries (specific)
Attaleiates, Michael, 77n.39
Augustine, Saint, 14n.4
Aurora’s marriage-bed, 134n.52
automata/mechanical toys, 2, 9, 14, 79n.47, 83n.67, 120, 122–32, 140, 145–46, 154–55, 118–19, 132–33
aviary, 82–83, 84n.75, 85
Avitacum: villa at, 31
Avitus (poet), 26
Baghdad, 76, 80, 82, 129
bakers, 59
Balsamon, Theodore, 52n.47
Banu Musa, 130n.44
Barber, Charles, 16–17, 129n.42, 139
Barberini Ivory, 77n.35
Basil I, 70, 122
Basil II, 78–79
Basil the Great, Saint, 14, 24, 33, 220
Basil the Younger, Saint, 72n.11, 78, 80
bathing pool, 32
baths, 62, 94, 97, 121, 152, 157
Baybars (Egyptian sultan), 78
Bayezid I, 88n.3, 93
Beagon, M., 165n.22
Beaton, Roderick MacL., 141n.68
Beckh, H., 159n.1, 222
beauty. See aesthetics.
Belon, Pierre, 80, 81n.59
Benjamin of Tudela, 75, 76n.28
Bessarion, 92, 94, 162n.17
Beyer, Hans-Veit, 16
Bible: source of information on Paradise, 23;
symbolism of, 221; Old Testament, 149; Old
Testament figures, statues of, in garden, 153;
Genesis, 23–26, 78n.43, 136, 225; Canticles/
Song of Songs, 137, 147n.25, 225; Gospels,
138; Luke, 170, 226; John, 149n.42;
Revelation, 23–24
Biese, Alfred, 13, 225
Bihynia, 33, 70, 72, 88
Blagojević, Miloš, 19
Bombay, 185
Book of Knowledge of Mechanical Devices, 130
Book of Gifts and Rarities/Book of Treasures and Gifts,
76n.33, 80n.51, 82nn.62, 64, 227
Booth, Peter, 17
Boskytian, 32–33
Bosporos, 38, 97n.45, 105
botany, 7, 189–214: experimentation in 171;
glossaries of, 178–79; illustrations of, 189–214,
and origins thereof, 204–9; texts of 178, 181.
See also Dioskorides; gardens, botanical;
Geoponika; horticulture/gardening; medicine;
pharmacology/pharmacy; Pliny the Elder;
Theophrastus
Bouras, Charalampous, 8
Bradley, Richard, 4
bread, 47, 52: from seeds of opium poppy, 182–83
breeze, 11, 27, 38, 64, 157, 178. See also wind;
zephyr
Breton, Henri, 74n.20
Bride of Solomon, 147
bridge to Kingdom of God/Paradise, 27–28, 151
Browning, Robert, 1
Brubaker, Leslie, 16, 159n.2, 226
Bryennios, Joseph, 97n.46
Bryer, Anthony A. M., 19
Bulgaria, 18, 218
Buondelmonti, 93n.25
Cadfael, Brother, 54
Caesarea, 17, 219
Cain: statue of, in garden, 153
Cairo, Tulunid, 76
calendar for sowing and planting in region of
Constantinople, 168–69, 185
Campania, 217–18
canon tables, 20, 84
Capelle, Wilhelm, 7
Carmen de viribus herbarum, 196–97
Carroll-Spillecke, Maureen, 6, 16
Carthaginians, 222
cartularies, 220
Cassianus Bassus “Scholasticus,” 162–64, 166
Cassiodorus, 162, 206
castle: of Eros, 131; at Hesdin, 83; in Sophrosyne, 153
Casta, 216
cathartics, vegetal, 178
Cavallo, Guidelmo, 197n.13, 206
Cecrops: statue of, in garden, 153
cemetery in orchard at monastery of St. Gall, 53
Cerberus, 151
chahar-bagh, 223–24
Chalkidike, 90
chapel in garden, 97
Charanis, Peter, 18
Charities. See Graces
Charity: statue of, in garden, 153
Charles VI of France, 96n.42
Charles X of France, 77n.39
Charon: statue of, in garden, 153
Cheiron: as founder of medicine, 209, 208
Cherubim, 27
children, 53
China, 185
Choniates, Niketas, 70n.5, 80n.54, 224nn.56–57
Choziba, hermitage near, 49. See also under
monasteries (specific)
Chrétiens de Troyes. See romances (individual)
Christian patronage of gardens, 9
Christian Topography, 24. See also manuscripts
(specific)
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Christodoulos of Patmos, Saint, 38
Chronicon Paschale, 211
Chrysokephalos, Makarios, Metropolitan of Philadelphia, 101, 102n.10–14, 103n.23
Chrysoloras, Manuel, 21n.61, 93, 220
Chrysostom, John, Saint, 14
churches, 29, 41, 50, 57, 93, 117n.23, 213, 217; books donated to, 204; commissioned by women, 210–11, 213; in garden 157, (temple) 153; urban, 217
churches (specific): Christ Chalkites (CP), 80; Heraklea Lynkestis (Macedonia), Large Basilica at, 117, 225, 123; Holy Apostles (CP), 11, 20, 21n.61, 32n.41, 34n.50, 35n.54, 74n.16, 76n.28, 92–93; Holy Cross (Pelendri, Cyprus), 110, 110; Koimesis (Daphni, Greece), 110, 121, 132, 108; Koimesis (Monastery of Hyakinthos, Nicea), 221; Nea Ekklesia (CP), 122; Sant’Apollinare in Classe (Ravenna), 225n.66; St. Euphemia (CP), 211; St. John of the Diippion (CP), 80; St. Polyeuktos (CP), 211, 217; St. Romanos (CP), 91n.15; St Sophia (CP), 18n.41; St. Sophia (Kiev), 76, 77n.35; St. Tryphon (Nicea), 94; seven dedicated to St. Anna in Constantinople, 141. See also monasteries (specific); nunneries (specific)
Cilicia, 70
Ciriaco di Ancona, 97n.44
Cistercians, 74n.21
cities, 87–94, 97, 100, 185, 188, 217, 221: disturbances of, 33; evolution of, 8; monasteries in, 61–64, 67. See also Constantinople; urban
Clark, Gillian, 212
classicism, Byzantine, 15n.15, 169
Clavijo, Ruy González de, 61, 64
Clement of Alexandria, Saint, 14n.4
climate, 90–91, 94; of Constantinople, 185; for gardens, 37–38; of paradise, 24
clock, elephant-, 130
Coffin, David, 3
Colombia, 69
color: of balsam trees, 157; of birds, 82; of fruits, 178; of fruits, enhancing, 167, 169, 228n.88; of flowers, 27, 87, 154, 178; of grapes, 152, 155; of grass, 27, 100n.51; of herbs, 152; of lily, 157; of myrtle, 156; of narcissus, 156; of rose, 102, 156; of violet, 156
Columella, 53n.53, 71–74, 82, 163, 165n.22, 170 condimentatio ad bestias, 79
condiment, 179, 185, 186n.35, 188
Connor, Carolyn L., 189
Conrad III of Hohenstaufen, 74n.16
Constable, Giles, 1
Constance of Hohenstaufen, 94
Constantine (son of Emperor Theophilos), 220
Constantine II Leichoudes, Patriarch of CP, 63
Constantine IX Monomachos, 63, 74, 77–78, 121, 174
Constantinides, Costas, 221
Constantinople/the capital, 33, 64, 69, 72, 74, 77n.39, 78, 88, 91, 93–94, 96n.38, 97, 100, 105–06, 128, 160, 163, 206, 211: calendar for sowing and planting in region of, 168–69, 185; fall of, 87, 100; Latin occupation of, 91, 94, 204; provisioning of, 19. See also Anemas; churches (specific); gardens; hippodrome; monasteries (specific); nunneries (specific)
Continence: statue of, in garden, 153
Continuators of Theophanes. See Theophanes Continuatus
contraceptives, vegetal, 187, 214
cramp. See nunneries
cooking/culinary arts/gastronomy, 20, 180, 187
cooks, 59
Cordoba, 79n.45, 80–81
Cornarius, Janus, 222n.38
Corpus hippiatricorum Graecorum. See Hippiatrika.
country retreat, 32
countryside, 88, 185, 188
courtyard, 44, 57, 67, 97, 218: peristyle, 216n.6, 218
creation (of world), 27, 84, 121
Cremona, 73
Crescenzi, Piero de’, 83, 85, 163
Cronus: statue of, 152
Crusaders, 79–80
Cuncliffe, Barry, 218
custos vivarii. See parks, keeper
Cutler, Anthony, 8n.25
Cyprian, Saint, 14n.4
Cypriot proverbs, 103n.20
Cyprian, Saint, 14n.4
cyprus, 42
Cyril of Skythopolis, 47, 212
cyrus the great: throne of, 152
cyrus the younger, 160
Dalby, Andrew, 20, 180n.26
Damatrys, 70
Danube, 70
Daphni (near Antioch on the Orontes), 20
Dark, Kenneth R., 229n.
death: statue of, 157
delatte, Armand, 178–79
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Demeter: statue of, in garden, 153
Demetrianos, Saint (Bishop of Chytris, Cyprus), 224n.53
“Democritean” doctrine of sympathy and antipathy, 165
Demoen, Kristoffel, 15n.15, 21n.
demons attacking monk gardening, 59n.72.
See also devil
Demosthenes, 128, 146
desert/wilderness, 39, 59, 61, 88, 226.n.69, 49:
Egyptian, 43.n.24, 47; Judean, 39–43, 46n.34, 47, 48n.40, 57, 64n.93, 40, 44, 49, 50
Deucalion: statue of, in garden, 153
devil, 38. See also demons
Didymus “the Younger” of Alexandria, 163, 184, 186
Digenis Akrites. See romances
Diethart, Johannes, 19n.51
Dionysios (illustrator of plants), 191
Dionysios of Philadelphia or Periegetes (author of Ornithiaka), 181, 201
Dionysios, 32, 170: statue of, in garden, 153
Dioskorides, pseudo–, 204n.21
diseases and ailments: asthma, 187; bruise, 56; colitis, 212; constipation, 184; cough, 187; diarrhea, 187; ear infection, 56; epilepsy, 212; eye diseases, 187; hay fever, 187; headache, 212; inflammation, 212; jaundice, 184; leprosy, 56, 187; sciatica, 184; sore foot, 56; spiders’ bites, 184; toothache, 184
doctors/physicians, 179–81, 183–84, 189, 208–9: female, 212; statues of in garden, 153. See also Actios; Anthimos; Didymus; Dioskorides; Galen; Hippocrates; Krateus; Nathanael; Oribasio; Soranus
Doleyal, Mary–Lion, 96, 223, 226n.70, 227
Dolgér, Franz, 151n.2
Dolguruki, Prince Iuri Vladimirovich, 71n.9
domestication of plants and animals, 185
drugs. See pharmacology/pharmacy.
dung of goose as weedkiller(?), 170
Durling, Richard J., 179n.20
Earth, 170. See also Gaia
earth: map of, 24; as natural element, 35
Eden. See paradise/Eden
eggs, 52
Egypt, 24, 47 (Upper Thebaid), 77–78, 185, 221n.35. See also desert, Egyptian
Ein er-Rashash, 48n.40
Eirenikos, Nicholas, 94
ekphrases, 15, 17, 27, 32–34, 87, 92, 96, 100, 105–58, 221–23: relationship with art, 141
elect, the, 28n.29
elements, the four, 145n.13
Elias Spelaiotes, Saint, 59n.72, 66n.100
Elizabeth, Saint (mother of John the Baptist), 149
Elysian fields, 23–24, 148. See also paradise/Eden
embroidery of spring scenery, 96n.42
emperor as recipient of fruit, 100
encomia, 78, 87, 91–92, 94, 106–8, 125n.34, 143n.4, 144n.9, 225n.62
encyclopaédisme, 160–61, 174
engineers of late antiquity, 130
England, 77, 80n.53, 83, 185
English trading ventures, 180
Ephrem Syrus, Saint, 24–26
Epimetheus: statue of, in garden, 153
Epimene, 186–87
Epiphanius of Salamis, 26
epistolography, 220
epithalamion for wedding of John III Vatatzes and Constance of Hohenstaufen, 94
Epitome de Caesaribus, 160
Epivatai (house on Bosporos of Alexios Apokaukos), 97n.45
Erim, Kenan, 216n.6
Eros/Erotes, 131, 134n.52, 152
Escobar, Pablo, 69
Eteocles, daughters of, 113n.17
Eugenianos, Niketas. See romances (individual)
Eugenios of Trebizond, Saint, 56
Eugenikos, John, 90, 92, 94, 96, 134n.52
Euphrates: one of rivers of Paradise, 25–27, 136
Eustathios, Archbishop of Thessalonike, 46, 139n.61
Eutychion, Patriarch of Constantinople, Saint, 66n.95, 107
Euthymios the Younger, Saint, 59n.72
Eve, 27, 28
Evelyn, John, 4
experimentation, botanical, 171

Earth, 170. See also Gaia
earth: map of, 24; as natural element, 35
Eden. See paradise/Eden
eggs, 52
Egypt, 24, 47 (Upper Thebaid), 77–78, 185, 221n.35. See also desert, Egyptian
Ein er-Rashash, 48n.40
Eirenikos, Nicholas, 94
ekphrases, 15, 17, 27, 32–34, 87, 92, 96, 100, 105–58, 221–23: relationship with art, 141
elect, the, 28n.29
elements, the four, 145n.13
Elias Spelaiotes, Saint, 59n.72, 66n.100
Elizabeth, Saint (mother of John the Baptist), 149
Elysian fields, 23–24, 148. See also paradise/Eden
embroidery of spring scenery, 96n.42
emperor as recipient of fruit, 100
encomia, 78, 87, 91–92, 94, 106–8, 125n.34, 143n.4, 144n.9, 225n.62
encyclopaédisme, 160–61, 174
engineers of late antiquity, 130
England, 77, 80n.53, 83, 185
English trading ventures, 180
Ephrem Syrus, Saint, 24–26
Epimene, 186–87
Epiphanius of Salamis, 26
epistolography, 220
epithalamion for wedding of John III Vatatzes and Constance of Hohenstaufen, 94
Epitome de Caesaribus, 160
Epivatai (house on Bosporos of Alexios Apokaukos), 97n.45
Erim, Kenan, 216n.6
Eros/Erotes, 131, 134n.52, 152
Escobar, Pablo, 69
Eteocles, daughters of, 113n.17
Eugenianos, Niketas. See romances (individual)
Eugenios of Trebizond, Saint, 56
Eugenikos, John, 90, 92, 94, 96, 134n.52
Euphantes: one of rivers of Paradise, 25–27, 136
148; having source in Paradise, 137; garden of Digenes Akritas on, 81n.61, 137
Eustathios, Archbishop of Thessalonike, 46, 139n.61
Eutechnios (paraphraser of Nicander), 181n.28, 197
Euthymios, Patriarch of Constantinople, Saint, 66n.95, 107
Euthymios the Younger, Saint, 59n.72
Eve, 27, 28
Evelyn, John, 4
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Fabiola (sixth-century Roman aristocrat), 212
farmer, 66, 99n.49, 162, 179, 185–86, 188, 226; conservatism of, 174n.33; king as warrior-, 160
Farmer's Law, 92
farming. See agriculture/farming
fauna, 59, 83–85, 151n.4: compositions on, 94; creatures, 34, 199; creatures, poisonous, 181n.28; marginal illustrations of, used for punning on family names, 84; vermin, 166. See also pests
amphibians (specific): frog, 155; salamander, 199, 199
birds, 75n.24, 82, 84, 96, 107–8, 109n.11, 132–33, 136, 146, 148, 151n.4, 152, 154–55, 157, 167–68, 181n.28, 201, 227, 135; aquatic, 152, 227; beautiful/exquisite, 81, 85, 152; dung of, 53n.53; combats of, 76; exotic/rare, 76n.28, 82; fanciful/imaginary, 122, 218, 126, 135; game, 82; as gifts, 77, 82, 227; hunting, 97n.44, 152; lifelike images of, 84; musical/song-/singing, 11, 81, 83, 93, 137, 139n.62, 152, 157; tame, 152; rare, 82. See also aviary
birds (specific): blackbird, 83; chicken, 188; cockatoo, 69; crane; 84; crane, albino, 82, 227; crow, 47; scarecrow, 224; dove, 84; duck, 69; eagle, 127, falcon, 71, 84; finch, 84, 157; fowl, 85; francolin, 97n.44; goldfinch, 83; goose dung, 170; guinea hen, 84; heron, 83, 84; heron, great, 203; kingfisher, European, 201, 202; linnet, 83; nightingale, 83, 96, 132–33, 134n.52, 146, 157, 227; ostrich, 77; parrot, 81n.61, 84, 134n.52; partridge, 83–84, 97n.44, 99n.48; partridge, albino, 82, 227; peacock, 77n.38, 81, 83–85, 96, 99, 114, 132–34, 146, 181n.28, 99, 113; peacock, albino, 82, 227; peacock, tame, 81n.61, 134n.52; pelican, 201, 202; pheasant, 70n.3, 83–84, 97n.44; pigeon dung, 53n.53; poultry, 53, 166; puffin, 201; raven, albino, 82, 227; seabird, 203; seagull, 201, 202; sparrow, 132–33, 157, 98; starling, albino, 82, 227; swallow, 84, 96, 130n.46, 157, 227n.80; swan, 82n.65, 83, 96, 132–34, 146, 227; swan, tame, 81n.61, 134n.52; waterfowl, 82n.65
fish, 52, 82–83, 126, 140n.62, 146, 152, 155, 166, 201, 227. See also fisherman, fishpond
fish (specific): bass; braize; bream; carp; cod, all 155; eel, 199, 199; flat-fish; goby; gudgeon; hyssa; mullet; red; mormyr; myllus; parrot-wrasse; perch; piper; sardine; sargue (sea bream); scorpiun-fish; sea-wolf; skate; sprat; stingray; swordfish; tunny; turbot, all 155
invertebrates (specific): bee, 66, 72, 135n.54, 166, 172–73; blisterring, 181n.28; cicada, 157; coral, 197, 196; crab, 155; cuttlefish, 155; gall insect, 141n.65; grasshopper, 134n.52; insects, 168, 199–200, 207, 217; leek-bug, 168; louse, 186; mollusc, 155; mussel, 155n.20; octopus, 155; prawn, 155; sea-urchin, 155; shrimp, 155; scorpion, 33n.45; spider, 184; tick, 186; worm, 28, 168
mammals (animals/beasts/creatures), 96, 107–8, 155: carnivorous, 85; ceremonial role of, 76; combats of, 76; domesticated, 52, 151n.4; dominion over, 78; exotic, 69, 75–76, 78, 80; game/hunted, 32, 82, 166 (see also hunt/hunting); as gifts, 77–78, 80, 82; motifs of, 122; imaginary, 122; as symbol of foreign territories, 78; wild, 52, 57–59, 69–86, 143, 151n.4; herbivores, 85; livestock, 168; quadrupeds, 152. See also condemnatio ad bestias; menagerie: parks, animal-; parks, game-
mammals (specific): antelope, 71–72, 75; ape, 77; as, wild, 72–73, 76 (see also onager); bear, 57, 76, 77n.35,38, 80, 81n.60; bear, Numidian, 76; bear playing musical instrument, 82; bear, white, 77n.34; bear-trainer, 77n.35; bison, 69; boar, wild, 57, 69, 70–72, 74, 76n.29; bull, 75, 81n.60; camel, 69, 77, 81, 125; camel driver, 77n.35; cattle, 38, 72n.10, 166; chamois, 71; cheetah, 75, 79n.49; cheetah, hunting, 71, 76n.29; 84; deer, 57, 71–72, 74, 76n.29, 81–88; deer, fallow, 74; deer, musk, 82; deer, roe, 74, 81, 83n.66; dog, 75, 82, 166; dressed in human clothing, 73n.15; hunting, 70n.7, 71, 73, 84, 97n.44; donkey, 43, 73;
Index

Faziozzo, Tommaso, 75n.24
Fehrle, Eugen, 161, 166n.23
Fenanna (wife of Elkanah), 109n.11, 149
fence. See gardens, enclosed; parks, animal-, enclosed by fence
Ferriolo, Massimo Venturi, 6
fertilizer. See horticultural/agricultural operations/practices
field, 50, 164, 170, 183, 185, 190, 206

Finkielstein, Gerald, 216n.10
Fishbourne, 218
fisherman, 31
fishpond, 82–83, 126, 140n.62, 155, 227
Flacilla, Aelia Flavia (wife of Theodosius I), 212

fence. See gardens, enclosed; parks, animal-, enclosed by fence

flora:

plants/vegetation (unspecified), 7n.20, 14, 27, 34, 38, 91, 147, 152, 155–57, 217, 224–25; allegorization of, 26; aromatic, 53–54, 93, 168, 179; arrangement of in garden, 35n.52; beds of, 136, 148; carbonized, 217–18; combinations of, to be avoided, 165; creation of healthy atmosphere by, 172; cultivated, 179–80; damage to, from weather and pests, 165; evidence for ancient, 218; generic depiction of, in art, 226–27; descriptions of, 177–88, 190; evergreen, 66; gatherers of, 177; introduction of new, 9, 171, 180n.24; literary compositions on, 94; magical properties of, 196; of medical astrology, 178; medicinal uses of (see under herbs below); metaphors of, 64, 66, 224–25; mythology of, 163, 169–170, 174, 178–79; nomenclature of, 179, 185; origins of illustration of, 204–9; ornamental, 166; phytoliths of, 217–18; pollination of, 173; roots of, 72; seeds/seedlings of, 61, 66, 167, 173, 189; symbolic and virtuous nature of, 135n.54; wild, 41, 46n.34, 179–80, 182, 213. See also aroma

flowers, 32, 61, 63–64, 66, 85, 88, 91–92, 94, 96, 109n.11, 121, 134, 137, 140, 142, 147, 152, 154–57, 159, 168 (bulbs), 169, 171–72, 217, 220n.29, 224, 225n.67; not to be picked on Athos, 220; cultivated below trees, 90; depicted even in dessert, 226n.69; love for, 100; in paradise, 27; poems on, 100; in proverbs, 101–2; even spacing of, 140; symbolism of, 135n.54. See also gardens, flower-

flowers (specific): anemone, 102, 191, 193–94; asphodel, 46n.34, 199, 198; asphodel meadows, 148; crocus, 134, 135n.54, 147, 156n.24, 168, 172; crocus, saffron, 11, 90n.10, 187; hyacinth, 11, 93, 96, 134, 135n.54, 147; iris, 168; lily, 11, 90n.10, 93, 96, 134, 135n.54, 137, 147, 154, 156–57, 168–69, 172; lotus, 94, 102, 134, 147,
Index

157; narcissus, 96, 113, 134, 135n.54, 147, 156, 168–69; poppy, common, 182; poppy, corn, 182; poppy, horned, 183 (see also poppy; opium under medicinal and toxic plants [specific]); rose, 11, 90n.10, 93, 96, 102, 134, 135n.54, 137, 145, 154, 168–69, 172, 226; rose, variety of, 102; rose, white, 94n.37; rose as gift, 100n.50; rose, bride compared to, 94; rose garden, 64n.91, 66; violet, 90n.10, 96, 134, 135n.54, 137, 147, 154, 156, 168–69, 172

fruit, 18, 41, 50, 52–53, 64, 67, 88, 107, 118, 120, 136, 142, 146–48, 152, 154–57, 172: allegorization of, 26; blessed by priest, 53n.49; favorite food of children, 53n.49; as gift, 19, 100, 140, 225n.62; of paradise, 24, 27–28, 223n.47; artificial shaping of, 169–70; not to be tasted by monks before being blessed by priest, 53n.49; wild

46, 72. See also gardens, fruit-;
horticultural/agricultural /operations/practices; orchard and (under flora)

woody plants (specific)

grains, 42, 47, 72; cereals, 166; crops, 11; fodder, 72

grains and pulses (specific): barley, 72, 185, 188; clover, 11, 93; cowpea (cherry bean), 177; earthnuts, 226; oats, 185; rice, 185; sesame seeds, 182; stinking-bean trefoil (Anagyris foetida), 199, 198; wheat, 34n.50, 38, 40, 72, 77, 91n.15, 185, 188 (see also wheatfields)

herbs, 53–57, 72, 96, 152, 154–57, 177–89, 196: aromatic (see plants, aromatic); pot-, 179–80; produced out of season, 188; sold at marketplace/stalls, 187–88; wild, 46, 56, 180. See also gardens, herb-; herbal; herbalist

herbs and spices (specific): achillea, 191, 193; anise, 187; basil, 154, 168; cardamon, 200; chervil, 53; coriander, 53; costmary, 168; cress, 168; cumin, 53; cumin, black (Nigella sativa), 200; cyperus as insect repellent, 186; dill, 53, 168; endive, 72, 168; fennel, 57; galingale, 186n.35; hartwort, 168; hyssop, 56; lovage, 57; marjoram, 168; mercury, annual dog’s (Mercurialis annua), 191, 192; mint, 53, 56–57, 168; origanum (oregano), 199, 198; parsley, 53, 168; pepper-cress, 168; pepperwort, 168; purslane, 168; rosemary, 57; saussurea, 168; silphium, 134, 147; sorrel, 168; turmeric, 186n.35

medicinal and toxic plants, 54–57, 166, 172, 177–214, 226

medicinal and toxic plants (specific): aconite, 187; castor, 187; convolvulus, see scammony; epimedium 226; hellebore, 187; hemlock, 187; henbane, 187; ivy, 151n.4, 168–70; licorice, 187; mallow, 168; mandrake, 186–88, 207; mandrake as delouser, 186; mandrake, narcotic properties of, 186–87; pennyroyal, 168; pennyroyal, as contraceptive, 187; poppy, opium, 182–83, 187–88; poppy, opium, latex from, 182–83; poppy, opium, bread made from seeds of, 182–83; rue, 168; rue as contraceptive, 187; sarsaparilla (Smilax aspera), 177; scammony, 178; squill, 168

vegetables/legumes/greens, 18, 38–40, 47–48, 52–53, 57, 59, 67, 160, 166, 168, 172–73, 177, 217: aroma of, 24; as gifts, 19, 48n.42; growing of from seed, 61; growing season of in area of CP, 163, 169, 185; market supply of/provisioning for cities, 19, 88, 90, 169; preparation of, 19; in proverbs, 102–3; root-, 53, 168; seeds of, 61; artificial shaping of, 170; wild species of, 185. See also gardens, productive; gardens, vegetable–

vegetables (specific): artichoke, 168; asparagus, 168, 184–85; bean, 39n.11, 72; bean, fava, 52; bean, kidney, 47n.34; beet, 52, 185; cabbage, 52–53, 90, 102, 168, 185; cabbage free for neighbors, 103, 221; cabbage paid as rent, 18n.41; carrot, 52, 90; celery, 53, 103; chard, 53; chickpea, 52; courgette, 90; cucumber, 52, 90, 168, 170n.28; garlic, 52–53, 90, 102–3, 168; leek, 52, 90, 168, 226; lentil, 59; lettuce, 52–53, 72, 168; lettuce, juice of wild, 183; onion, 52–53, 90, 102–3, 168; parsnip, 53; pumpkin, 168; radish, 53, 168; rocket (arugula), 168; squash, 52–53, 57

woody plants: bushes, 92, 151n.4, 227; shrubs, 57, 152, 154–55, 157; trees, 32–33, 39, 41, 57, 74, 82–83, 86, 88,
92–94, 96, 99n.48, 107, 109n.11; 112, 132, 134n.52, 137, 157, 167; artificial, 128–29, 132; evergreen, 119–20, 152, 154, 156, 168; fruit–, 11, 23–24, 28, 46, 88, 90–93, 117–18, 120, 136–37, 139n.62, 146–48, 154, 166, 172, 174; non-fruit–, 118, 153–56; of Paradise/paradisal, 24, 35n.52; sterile, 167; water-loving, 152, 156; wreathe–, 168; arranged as chorus, 113, 117–20, 144, 153–54, 156; arranged in concentric circles, 119, 121, 139, 114–15; arranged in crescent, 33; arranged like a hippodrome (i.e. stepped), 117–18, 121, 146, 116; arranged in rows, 35n.52, 117; blossom of, 96n.38; compactness of, comparable with mountain, 154; depicted even in desert, 226n.69; different species not to be mixed, 115, 140; fruit-trees surrounded by non-fruit-trees, 118, 115; hiding houses, 11; as identifying feature of house, 21n.61, 220; list of in Geoponika, 167; love for, 100; monks and nuns alluded to as, 64; planting methods of, 167, in proverbs, 101–2; seeds of, 167; shade/shadow of, 63, 92, 154; symbolism of (see Theoretikon Paradeission). See also forest; grove; orchard; wood/woodland

woody plants (bushes, shrubs, trees, and their fruits) (specific): acacia, gum from, 183; acorn, 72, 226n.68; almond, 90, 167; apple, 9, 52, 90–91, 96, 117, 167; apple, symbolism of, 225n.60; apple as gift, 225n.62; apples of Hesperides, 102; apricot, 19n.51; arbutus, 226; balsam tree, 93, 154, 156–57; bay, 21n.61; boxwood, 168; bramble, 151n.4; broom, Spanish (Spartium junceum), 204, 203, 205; caper buds, wild, 46n.34; carob, 47n.38, 52, 167; cedar, 226; cedar oil as insect repellent, 186; cherry, 52, 90, 117, 167; chestnut, 90; citron, 167; citrus, 96; cypress, 57, 61, 64, 92, 94, 102, 113, 117–18, 119n.25, 144, 146, 156n.23, 168–69, 172, 220; daphne (Daphne gnidium), 191, 192; date, 47, 52, 117n.22; elm, 64; fig, 39n.14, 52, 90–91, 102, 117, 140–41, 167; frankincense, 168–69; grape/vine, 28–29, 32, 38, 41, 52–53, 57, 61, 66, 113, 128n.37, 152, 154–56, 166, 169, 172, 224, 226 (see also vinedresser; vineyard; viticulture; wine); grape hucks, 72; (grape) vine grown on trellis affording shade, 57; hazel, 167; holly, 156; jujube, 167; juniper, Phoenician (Juniperus phoenicea) and prickly (Juniperus oxycedrus), both 194, 195; laurel, 108, 117, 119n.25, 136, 148, 156n.23, 168–69; maple root as insect repellent, 186; mastich, 168; medlar, 9, 167, medlar as gift, 100; melon, 52, 90, 168; mulberry, 52, 90, 167; myrtle, 117, 136, 148, 156, 168–69; myrtle, garland of, 102; nut, 28, 46, 53, 72, 167; orange, 52; orange, bitter (Seville), 52n.47; peach, 52, 167; pear, 52, 90–91, 96, 117, 167; pine, 117, 168–69 (see also fountain, with pinecone spout); pistachio, 167; plane, 119n.25, 134n.52; plane leaves used as bandage, 56; plane, artificial golden, 128n.38; plum, 167; pome (any fruit of apple-kind), 154; pomegranate, 28, 52, 90–91, 117, 167, 214; pomegranate as gift, 140–41; quince, 90, 167; saltbush, 46n.34; smilax, 177; vine: see grape/vine; walnut, 64, 90; willow, 168; yew, English, 178

other plants: grass, 27, 39n.10, 63–4, 72, 82, 85, 92, 100m.31, 155 (see also lawn; meadow; pasturage); mushrooms, 168; reed, 38; reed heart, 46n.34

Florentinus (writer on agriculture), 164, 172–73, 185

forest, 33, 41, 59, 61, 67, 83. See also grove; orchard; wood/woodland

Foss, Clive, 8n.25, 221

Fouchécour, C.-H. de, 225

Fountain: in setting of Annunciation to Saint Anna, 99, 107, 121–28, 132, 137, 143n.4, 144–46, 98, 108–9; in iconography of Annunciation to Virgin, 137; with automata, 14, 79n.47, 127–32, 140, 144–46, 154–55, 118–19, 132–33; in imagery of Song of Songs, 137; in gardens, 14, 34, 63–64, 79n.47,
96–97, 107–9, 121–22, 124–32, 139n.62, 140, 143n.4, 144–46, 152, 154, 98; Kazlı Çeşme, 218; with leopard’s head spout, 128; with lion’s head spout, 128, 132, 98, 109, 133; illustrated in manuscripts, 84, 122, 125–27, 135; illustrated in mosaic, 99, 98, 108–9; of Life, 84; in Muslim Paradise, 223n.47; Mystic of Trikonchos Palace (Great Palace, CP), 124; in parks, 34, 81, 83, 86; with pinecone spout, 121–22, 124, 139, 144–45, 108, 118–19, 124–27; in public places, 91, 94; reconstruction of in description by Hyrtakenos, 118–19; in romances, 14, 130–31, 139n.62, 143n.4, 154–55; as source of rivers of Paradise, 25–26; surviving ornamental elements of, 218; allegorical of virginity, 139

Four Rivers of Paradise, 25–27, 29, 31, 121, 126n.35, 136–137, 145n.13, 148, 224; in art, 29; geographical contexts of, 27; literary descriptions of, 27–28; reflected in Persian chahar-bagh, 223; replaced by lakes of torment or rivers of fire, 27; replaced by other quaternities, 28; specified, 25

garbage. See aroma
France, 80n.53, 83
Franks, 79
Frederick I Barbarossa, 82
Frederick II of Hohenstaufen, 77, 80n.53, 94
fresco. See paintings/frescos
frieze: double upon garden wall, 110, 113, 143
Fruit Book. See Porikologos

Gabriel, Archangel, 136–37, 143, 149
Gagik I of Armenia, 71n.8
Gaia, 113n.17. See also Earth
Galesion, Mount, 39, 41n.17
Galen, 179, 181, 191, 194, 212, 209: statue of, in garden, 153
Galen, pseudo-, 178
game preserve/vivarium, 70–72, 86 (see also parks, game–)
Gand (Flanders), 80n.55
ganges: one of rivers of Paradise, 27; identified with Phison, 26
gardens: ancient, 3, 4, 20, 31; Athos as garden of Panagia, 66, 220; aristocratic, 97–100, 122; attitudes towards/perception of, 14, 16–17, 23, 34–5, 100, 221–25, 228; bath in, 152, 157; Bedouin, 47, 49; beds, 53, 154, 156; botanical, 183; chapel/church/temple in, 97, 153, 147; cistern, built over filled in, 220; Byzantine, study of, 6–21; continuity and discontinuity
gardens [specific]; monasteries, urban; monasteries [specific], nunneries [specific]; palaces [specific]; parks [specific]; vegetable-, 39, 48n.42, 50, 53, 57, 87–89, 91, 54–55 (see also gardens, productive); village-, 18, 90–91; walks in, 97; western medieval, 228n.83; as works of art, 2. See also Geoponika; horticulture/gardening; orchard; palaces; paradise/Eden; parks; vineyard gardens (specific): Adonis, of, 101; Alkinoos, of, 20, 91, 101, 139n.61, 148, 169; St. Anna, of, 96, 99, 105–50, 108–9, 114–16, 124, described by Theodore Hyrtaenos, 105–58; in Antioch described by Libanios, 11; Aphrodiasis, at, 216n.6; Cyrus the Younger, of, at Sardis, 160; Daphni (Antioch), of pagan sanctuary at, 11, 20, 148n.32; in Antioch described by Libanios, 11; Aphrodiasis, at, 216n.6; Cyrus the Younger, of, at Sardis, 160; Daphni (Antioch), of pagan sanctuary at, 11, 20, 148n.32; Dionysos, of, 32; Eden (see paradise); Humayun, of, on barge at Agra, 223–24; Iran, of, 224n.49; Jericho, at, 40; Joachim, of, 99; John Geometres, of, 15–16, 20–21, 225n.62; Julian, of, 33–34; Demetrios Kydones, of, 91n.14, 99–100; Laertes, of, 11, 160n.5; Mesokepion, 17, 122, 215; Theodore Metochites, of, 97, 99; al-Mustansir, of, 227; Pope Paul III, of, 4; Provatas, of (Thessalonike), 89; Semiramis, of, 148n.32; King Shaddad, of (see above Iran, of); Shalamar Bagh, 224; Simonopetra (Athos [herb-] at), 55n.57; Sophrosyne, of, 19–20, 151–58; Tantalus, of, 101; outside Thessalonike (productive let to Argyropouloi by Iveron monastery), 19, 37n.1, 89–90; Virgin Mary/Paragha, of, 66, 137, 220; Zeus, of, 101. See also churches; monasteries; nunneries; palaces; parks gardener, 10, 57, 59–61, 66, 90, 99n.49, 103, 140, 156, 165n.20, 175, 183–85: as appellation of St. Konon, 221; duties of, 61; market-, guild of, 221; statues of, 59; status of, 10, 59 gardening. See horticulture Gargilius Martialis, 163 gastronomy. See cooking/culinary arts/gastronomy Gehon: one of rivers of Paradise, 25; identified with Nile, 26 Geometres. See John Geometres Geoponika, 14, 18–19, 35, 87, 90, 100, 102n.8, 115, 117n.21, 23, 134, 135n.54, 140, 159–75, 182, 184–86, 222, 226: table of contents of, 165; horticultural chapter headings of, 167–68; manuscript tradition of, 117n.20, 161–64, 222, 226; mythological sections of, 113n.17, 144n.5; 163, 169–70; sources of, 159–64; translations of, 162, 222 George of Choziba, Saint, 41n.16, 59 George of Cyprus, 91n.12 George Hagiorites, Saint, 74 George of Nikomedea, 107, 133n.51 gifts: apples of the Hesperides as proverbial of luxurious, 102; birds and mammals as, 73, 77–78, 80, 82, 227; fruits as, 19, 100, 140, 225n.62; garden soil as, 97; vegetables as, 19, 48n.42 Glykas, Michael, 77n.39 Goliath: statue of, in garden, 153 Good Thief, 28 Goethe, Marie Luise, 5, 14, 20, 105–6 Graces, 148, 152 grammarians: statues of, in garden, 153 Gratitude: statue of, in garden, 153 Gratitude of the Arts: illustration of, 210 grazer, 41, 46n.34 (see also hermit) Greco-Roman: agricultural knowledge, 161; agricultural writings, 171, 174; culture, 100; medical practices/texts, 54, 179n.20, 180; world, gardens of, 8 (see also Greek, Roman) Greece, 6, 41, 44, 48, 52, 178n.5, 180, 216n.8 Greek: botanical nomenclature, 178n.5; high and low languages, 101; magical papyri, 212; myths (see mythology) Gregoros, Nikephoros, 91nn.12, 16, 93n.28, 97, 100n.51 Gregory of Nazianzos, Saint, 14, 16, 166, 206n.26, 220, 127 Gregory of Nyssa, Saint, 14, 19n.50 Gregory II of Cyprus, patriarch of CP, 101, 102nn.9–12 Grimalki, Boruelo (Genoese podestà), 97n.44 grove, 32, 38, 83, 85, 94, 96, 121, 134n.52, 137, 169: of figs, 140; of myrtle, 148; of nuts, 53; of olives, 50, 53, 62, 136, 148, 165n.21. See also forest, orchard, wood growing season for vegetables, 163 Guillard, Rodolphe, 73n.15 Gylius, Petrus, 81n.59 gypsies, 74 Hades: statue of, in garden, 153 Hagiology. See Saints' Lives hail, 165–66 Haile Selassie, 80n.50 Hamblenne, P., 169 Hanson, Victor David, 169n.27, 174n.33 Haploucheir, Michael, 10 Harbailli triptych, 29, 84n.72, 10 Hardig (English crusader), 79 Harmanopoulos, Constantine, 92
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Haroun-al-Rashid, 76, 79n.46
Hauck, Karl, 71n.8
health, promoted by plants, 172
Hebrew identifications of plants in Vienna Dioskorides, 204
Helena Kantakouzene Palaiologina, empress, 100
Hell: fire/flame of, 148, 158
Hellenistic: agricultural writers, 159, 163, 170; literature, 101; medical texts, 180; texts on mechanical devices, 130n.43; texts on poisons, 189; villas, 87
Hennebo, Dieter, 5, 6n.16
Henry I of England, 77
Henry III of England, 77n.34, 80n.53
Henry VI of Hohenstaufen, 75
Hephaestus: statue of, in garden, 153
Hera: statue of, in garden, 153
Herakles, 149n.38: statue of, in garden, 153
herbal, 18, 55, 189–214
herbalist, 54–55, 179, 185
herdsmen, 32
Hermes: epigram on, 9; statues of, in gardens of late antiquity, 9
Hermes Trismegistos: statue of, in garden, 153
hermit, 38, 41, 44, 46–48, 57, 220
hermitages, 40, 42, 44, 46–48, 216, 49
Heron of Alexandria, 130, 132: reconstructions of automata of, 132–33
Hesiod, 19, 146n.17, 159, 229n.89: statue of, in garden, 153
Hebeschakis, Minos, 21n.
Heuresis, 207
Hexabiblos, 92
Hexaemeron, 26–28
Hezekiah, statue of, in garden, 153
Hippocrates, 179n.20, 181; statue of, in garden, 153
Hippocrates, 179n.20, 181; statue of, in garden, 153
Hippodrome (CP), 73n.15, 75–76, 78, 80, 218n.15: arrangement of trees compared to, 117–18, 121, 146; entertainments in, 76
Hirschfeld, Christian Cajus Laurentz, 4
Hirschfeld, Yizhar, 19, 20, 216, 220
Historia Monachorum, 24n.8
historiography, 220
history of garden scholarship, 2–6, 13
Holobolos, Manuel, 91, 93–94, 101n.6
Holy Land: pilgrims’ ampullae from, 29
Homer, 15n.15, 20, 23–24, 91, 134, 147, 148n.31, 33, 160n.5, 174, 189, 220, 225: statue of, in garden, 153
Homer: Hercules: statues of, in garden, 153
homilies, 107–8, 114, 124
honey, 173. See also bee under fauna, invertebrates (specific)
Horn, Walter, 53
horsemen, 186
Hortensius, Quintus, 72n.11
horticultural/agricultural implements, 19: axe, 47, 171, 226; hatchet, 171; hoe, 10, 47, 59
horticultural/agricultural operations/practices, 162, 165, 217, 222, 226: clearing of land, 41–42; cultivation of fruit, 18; enhancing color/sweetness/tenderness of fruit, 167, 169, 228n.88; fertilizing/manuring, 53, 168, 173, 217; grafting, 165, 167–69, 172, 224, 228n.88; grinding grain, 42; growing plants out of season, 228n.88; growing trees from seeds, buds, cuttings, and slips, 167; hoeing, 61; planting, 50, 62, 160, 165, 167; preserving fruit, 165, 167–68; protection against pests, 165–68; pruning, 10, 61, 92, 167, 178, 224; remedies against weather damage, 165–67, 169; restoring fertility to barren tree, 167, 171, 226; shaping of fruit and vegetables, 167, 169–70; sowing, 47, 61; terracing, 67, 81, 215–16, 218 (see also gardens, terraced); tilling, 47; topiary, 113–15, 140, 144, 178, 227; trampling vintage, 171; transplanting, 66, 167, 174; transportation of soil, 39, 42; warding off birds, 61, 167–68, 224; warding off livestock, 168; warding off wild animals, 57, 59; weeding, 185. See also water supply and irrigation
horticultural imagery. See symbolism, horticultural horticulture/gardening, 2–3, 7–9, 18n.33, 37–67, 87–103, 126, 140, 144, 159–75, 216–17, 222, 51, 62. See also Geoponika hortus conclusus, 4
hospital/infirmary, 54–55, 57, 212
houses: gardens of, 97–100, 218. See also gardens, urban; gardens (specific)
humanism, Byzantine, 160
Humayūn (Mughal ruler), 224n.48
Humility: statue of, in garden, 153
Hunger, Herbert, 106, 141, 223
Hunt, John Dixon, 3, 228
hunt, hunting, 32–33, 69–86, 96–97: with cheetahs or leopards, 71, 76n.29, 84; with dogs, 70n.7, 71, 73, 84; by empress, 97n.44; with falcons, 71, 84; imagery of, 70n.7; late antique, 70n.7; poisoned arrows used in, 70n.5; spectators of, 71n.8; of wild asses by Umayyads, 73. See also parks, game-
Hüttig, Bernhard Oswin, 5
hydraulics, 130, 140. See also automata
Hygieinos (Mesopotamian monk), 23, 27
Hypatian Chronicle, 71n.9
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Hypnerotomachia Poliphili, 140n.62
Hyrakenos, Theodore, 96, 105–42, 157n.27, 223, 227; translation of his Description of the Garden of Saint Anna, 143–50; reconstructions of his Garden of Saint Anna, 114–16, 118–19

Ibn al-Ndaim, 130n.43
Ibn al-Zubayr, Qadi al Rashid, 227
Ibn Hayyan (i.e., Haiyân ibn Khalaf, al-Kurturbî), 77n.34–35, 79n.45, 80n.53
Ibn Khaldun, 81n.57, 82n.62
Ibora (Pontic retreat of St. Basil), 33, 220
icons: of Annunciation (at Sinai), 137, 138; of Zoodochos Pege, 63
Ignatios, Saint (Patriarch of CP), 66
imagery. See symbolism
India, 187. See also Bombay
insecticides, 186
Io, 146n.21
Isaac (son of Abraham and Sarah), 149
Isaac I Komnenos, 74
Isaac Komnenos (sebastokrator, son of Alexios I Komnenos), 38
Isaiah, Peaceable Kingdom of, 85
Isidore, Archbishop of Thessalonike, 137n.59
Islam: world of, 6, 9, 161, 171; influence of, 9, 225
Islamic: automata, 129–30; gardens: see gardens, Islamic/Muslim; palaces: see under palaces and palaces (specific); Park of the Wild Beasts (Baghdad), 82
Islands of the Blessed, 148
Israel, 219. See also Judea
Istanbul, 217–18. See also Constantinople
Istanbul Rescue Archaeological Survey, 229n.
Italy, 18n.36, 41, 100, 218. See also Renaissance

Jäger, Hermann, 5, 14
Jahangir (Mughal ruler), 224
James of Kokkinobaphos, 107, 114, 133
James, Liz, 141n.67
Jardin symbolique, Lc. See Theoretikon paradéision
Jaschinski, Wilhelmina Mary Feemster, 6, 217
Jazari, al-, 130
Jeffreys, Elizabeth M., 15
Jericho, 40, 41
Jerusalem, celestial, 29n.31, 224
Joachim, Saint (father of Virgin Mary), 99, 107, 109, 136, 143, 108
John I Chrysostomos, Saint (Patriarch of CP), 14
John I Tzmiskes, 80
John II Komnenos, 70
John III Vatatzes, 89, 91, 94
John V Palaiologos, 100n.50
John VI Kantakouzenos, 97n.45
John VIII Palaiologos, 96n.40, 97n.44
John XIII Glykys (Patriarch of CP), 106
John Aktouarios, 180
John Eugenikos. See Eugenikos, John.
John Geometres, 15–16, 17n.25, 20, 33–34, 81, 125n.34, 144n.5, 223, 225
John Malalas. See Malalas, John
John Phokas. See Phokas, John
John of Damascus, Saint, 43n.24
John of Euboea, 107, 108n.10
John the Baptist, 149
John the Hesychast, Saint, 39n.14
Jonathan (son of Saul), statue of, in garden, 153
Judea, 19–20, 143. See also desert, Judean; Israel; Sousakim
Julian (emperor), 33–34
Justice: leg of throne representing, 157
Justinian I, 61, 206: Novels of, 221
Justinian II, 5

Kalavrezou-Maxeiner, Ioli, 206n.26
Kalypos’s island, 169. See also Ogygia
Kaplan, Michel, 19
Karpizos, Apostolos, 19
Kashmir, 224
Katounakia, Athos, 45
Kazlı Çeşme (Ottoman fountain in Istanbul), 218
Kazhdan, Alexander, 7, 8n.26, 13n.2, 18, 19n.46, 165n.20
Keil, Gundolf, 179
Khatı¯b al-Baghda¯dı¯, 129n.42
Khwândamîr, Muḥammad, 224n.48
Kiev, 71n.8
Kievan Rus, 71n.8
Kokytos, 148
Komnene, Anna, 16, 34
Kondoleon, Christine, 70n.7
Kondov, Nikola, 18
Konigliche Gärtnerei-Lehranstalt zu Schöneberg und Potsdam, 3
Index

Konon of Isauria, Saint, 221
Koran. See Qur‘an
Kos, 38
Kosmas Indikopleustes, 24–25, 28
Kosmas, Vision of, 28n.29
Koukoules, Phaidon, 14, 18, 20
Krateuas, 181, 191, 194, 209
Kritoboulos, Michael, 100n.52
Kubla Khan, 82
Kydones, Demetrios, 88n.3, 91n.14, 99–100
Kyriakos, Saint, 47–48, 57
Laertes, 160n.5
Laferntes-Dosogne, Jacqueline, 141n.66
Laou-Thomadakis, Angeliki, 19
Lake: architecture, professionalization of, 3; attitudes towards, 23, 35, 122; beauty of, 37, 91; beauty of considered negative criterion, 39; changes in, 41; designed/manipulated, see landscaping; features of in Paradise, 27, 29, 34; relationship towards, 35; scenes of hunting set in, 76n.29; views afforded by, 32, 34, 38
Landgren, Lena, 227n.82
landscape/designed/manipulated landscape, 71, 75, 86, 114, 151n.2
Langkavel, Bernhard, 18
Last Judgment, 27, 28, 31
Late antiquity, 6–8, 64n.92, 113n.17, 118, 130, 161, 211n.38, 212, 215, 228; attitudes towards landscape in, 35; gardens of, 9, 34; hunting in, 76n.7; perceptions of gardens in, 17; villas of, 218; writers of, 131, 160, 170.
See also, antiquity; Greco-Roman
Latin: copies of Dioscorides, 189, 204n.21; glossaries, 179n.20; identifications in Vienna Dioscorides, 204; occupation of CP, 91, 204; West, 161, 179, 222
Latrine near vegetable garden, 53
Laurentinum, Pliny the Younger's villa at, 31
Lauro, Pietro, 222n.38
Lavras, 42
Lawn, 63–64, 82. See also grass under flora: other plants
Lazaros of Mount Galesion, Saint, 39, 41n.17
lectionaries, 121
legal texts, 89–90, 218, 221
Lemerle, Paul, 18, 160, 165
Leo VI, 78
Leo, Bishop of Argos, 66
Leo the Deacon, 70n.4
Libanius, 11, 20, 34n.50, 93n.27, 148n.32, 161
librarianship as paradisiacal gardening, 224
Life: statue of, 157
Lipshtis, Elena, 18, 159n.1, 164–65, 222
literary sources (for gardens and agriculture), 20, 105, 141, 219–25, 227: ancient/classical/pagan
23, 106n.6, 109, 139n.61, 140, 148n.34, 161–63, 170. See also, Bible; ekphrasis; encomia; historiography; lectionaries; legal texts; manuscripts; proverbs; rhetoric; romances; Saints' Lives and individual authors and works
Littlewood, Antony Robert, 1–2, 6, 11, 15–18, 20, 31, 53n.53, 57n.63, 71n.8, 82n.62, 85, 93n.27, 105, 114n.19, 117n.22, 121n.30, 139, 144n.5, 159n.2, 225n.60, 62
Ludprand of Cremona, 72–73, 128
Luoan amoenus, 16, 89
Lombard crusaders, 79–80
Loudon, John Claudius, 4
Louis VII of France, 14, 73
Louis IX of France, 77n.34
Lucera (Apulia), 77
Luke (founder of monastery of the Savior at Messina), 50
Luke of Steiris, Saint, 38
Luke the Younger of Steiris, Saint, 48, 57
Lycophron, 139n.61
Lysander, 160
MacDougall, Elizabeth Blair, 2
Macedonia, eastern, 90
Machmout (Ottoman eparch of Europe), 100n.52
Magi, 76n.28
magic, 170
magical papyri, 212
magical properties of plants, 196
magicians: statues of, in garden, 153
magnanimity: personification of, 209, 210
Mago (Carthaginian writer on agriculture), 163
Maguire, Henry, 2, 15–17, 20–21, 35n.53, 71n.8, 74n.21, 81, 105n.2, 137n.59, 218, 223–24
Makarios Chrysokephalos, Metropolitan of Philadelphia, 101
Makrembolites, Eustathios. See romances
Maltezou, Chryssa, 220
Manasses, Constantine, 27, 224n.54
Mango, Cyril, 8–9
Manuel I Komnenos, 70, 76n.28
Manuel II Palaiologos, 88n.3, 90, 96n.42, 97n.44: prostagma of, 90n.8
manure. See horticultural/agricultural operations
manuscripts, 90: of Dioskorides, Arabic, 205n.21, 226; of Dioskorides, Greek, 184, 189–214, 226; of Geoponika, 161–64, 226; of Dioskorides, Greek, 184, 189–214, 226; of Dioskorides, Arabic, 205n.21.

manuscripts (specific): Athos, Chilandariou 105, 122; Athos, Dionysiou 4, 122; Athos, Dionysiou 13, 132, 135; Athos, Diniysou 154, 56n.59; Athos, Espagyemone 14, 115–17, 120; Athos, Grigoriou 139, 110, 111; Athos, Lavra Ω, 75, 204n.21, 226; Athos, Vatopediou 425, 107n.7; Berlin, Staatsbibl. Phillipps 1538, 160–61; Bern, Bürgersbibliothek 120, 75n.24; Cambridge, Univ. Libr. E.e.5, 204n.21, 205n.22; El Escorial, S.t, 204n.21; El Escorial, C-IV-22, 134n.52; Florence, Laur. plut. IX, 28, 24n.6; Florence, Laur. Med. Palat., 122n.32; Grottaferrata, Z-a–44, 134n.52; Madrid, B.N. vitr. 26–2 (Madrid Skylitzes), 79n.46; Melbourne, Nat. Gallery of Victoria 710/5 (Melbourne Gospels), 84n.73; Mestia, Museum, 482 (Lapskaldi Gospels), 84n.73; Naples, Bibl. Naz. gr. 1, 204n.21, 206; New York, Pierpont Morgan Libr., M 652, 204n.21, 205n.22, 206; Oxford, Bodl. Auct. T. inf. 1.10 (Codex Ebnerianus), 84n.73; Padua, Seminario Vescovile gr. 194, 204n.21; Paris, gr. 64, 81, 84n.73, 122, 125; Paris, gr. 74, 114, 89; Paris, gr. 139 (Paris Psalter), 200n.26; Paris, gr. 510 (Paris Gregory), 166, 200n.26; Paris, gr. 1208 (Paris Kokkinobaphos), 107, 114, 132; Paris, gr. 2091, 204n.21, 206; Paris, gr. 2179, 204n.21; Paris, gr. 2313, 165; Parma, Bibl. Pal. 5, 84n.73, 122; Sinai, gr. 1186 (Sinai Christian Topography), 24n.6; Sinai, gr. 339, 124, 127; Tbilisi, Institute Kekelidze of the Georgian Academy of Sciences, A 1335 (Vani Gospels), 81n.60, 84n.73; Tehran, Milli 796 (Arabic Yu¯niyu¯s), 164n.19, 172n.31; Vatican, Chigi F.VII.159, 204n.21, 205n.22; Vatican, Reg. gr. 1 (Leo Bible), 78n.43; Vatican, Urb. gr. 66, 204n.21; Vatican, Vat. gr. 284, 204n.21; Vatican, Vat. gr. 699 (Vatican Christian Topography), 24, 25; Vatican, Vat. gr. 1162 (Vatican Kokkinobaphos), 107, 114, 121, 123, 124; Venice, Marc. gr. 92, 204n.21; Venice, Marc. gr. 294, 162n.17; Venice, Marc. gr. 479, 70n.7; Venice, Marc. gr. 524, 162–63; Venice, Vind. med. gr. 1 (Vienna Dioskorides), 55, 181–83, 186–87, 189–214, 226, 190, 192–203, 205, 207–10; Vienna, Vind. theol. gr. 31 (Vienna Genesis), 191n.8

manuscripts, illuminated, 24, 71n.9, 84, 141, 227; canon tables in, 81, 84, 121, 125; decorative title page of, 161; of Christian Topography, 24, 25; of Dioskorides, 189–96, 204–14, 226, 190, 192–95, 203, 205; of other treatises in Vienna Dioskorides, 196–201, 196–203; evidence for topiaries in, 114; headpieces in, 84, 126, 135; of Kokkinobaphos School, 84n.73; Komnenian miniatures, 84; late western medieval, 83. See also manuscripts (specific)

map of the earth, 24–25, 28, 25

Marco Polo, 82

Marmara, Sea of/Propontis, 34, 35n.54, 105

Marmarika, 76

Martial, 228n.88

Marwazi, al- (Arab physician), 75

Mary. See Virgin Mary.

Matius, Caius, 227

Matrona of Perge, Saint, 59, 66

Matschke, Klaus-Peter, 19

Matthew I (Patriarch of CP), 64

Mavroudi, Maria, 96, 223, 226n.70, 227

May, 96n.38. See also spring (season)

McGee, Kate, 115; reconstructions of Hyrtakenos’ description of a garden by, 114–16, 118–19

McLean, Teresa, 180

meadow, 38, 61, 83, 85, 91–92, 94, 117n.23, 121, 152, 169; of asphodel, 148. See also field and under flora: other plants, grass

medical astrology, 178; botany, 180; uses of mandrake, 186–87; practice, popular, 54; texts, 18–19, 183; schools, 180

medicinal herbs/plants: recipes using, 165. See also flora: medicinal and toxic plants

medicine, 7: root-, 191. See also analgesics; anesthesia; cathartics; contraceptives; diseases/ailments; doctors; hospital/infirmary; midwives; nurses; pharmacology/pharmacy

medieval period/Middle Ages, 76, 85–86, 180; Arabic literature of, 171; Bulgarian, 18; Byzantine, 8, 26, 31–32, 34–35, 97; “closed” habitat of, 9; English botanical lore of, 180; hortus conclusus of, 4; iconography of Virgin in, 137; maps in, 24; Serbian, 19; Western, 13, 53, 82–83, 162, 179, 228n.83

Megalopsychia, 209, 210

Mehmet II Fathih, 100

Meier, Hans-Rudolf, 75n.21

Meliteniotes, Theodore. See romances (individual).

menagerie/zoological garden, 69, 71n.8, 75–81, 83, 85, 227; enclosed by moat, 81. See also parks, animal-; parks, game-

menologion, 115

Mesarites, Nikolaos (Nicholas), 11, 20, 32n.41, 34n.50, 35n.54, 74n.16, 93
Index

Mesokepion. See gardens (specific)
Mesopotamia, 27, 185
metaphor. See symbolism
Metochites, Theodore, 20, 57, 92, 94, 97, 99n.47, 106, 117n.23, 125n.34
Meterodoros (illustrator of plants), 191
Meyer, Gustav, 5
Meyvaert, Paul, 165n.20
Michael (disciple of St. Theodore of Stoudios), 32–33
Michael, Archangel, 93
Michael III, 129
Michael IV Paphlagon, 62
Michael VI Stratitios, 82, 227
Michael VII Doukas, 79
Michael VIII Palaiologos, 78, 88, 91, 93, 94
Middle Ages. See medieval period/Middle Ages
midwives, 212
mirador, 31
Mohammed Ali (viceroy of Egypt), 77n.39
monasteries, 37–67, 177, 216: Athos, 55; alluded to as gardens, 64; holdings/lands of, 18, 218; in Mesopotamia, 27; late Roman, of Palestine, 37; selection of sites for, 37–41, 61–62; urban, 61–64, 67. See also gardens, monastic; hermitages; lavras
monasteries (specific): Argyroi (CP), 52n.47; Athanasios on Xerolophos (CP), 61n.82; Chariton (Judea), 48, 50; Charsianeites (Nea Peribleptos, CP), 64; Chilandar (Athos), 57n.63; Chora (Kariye Camii, CP), 61n.82, 110, 114, 132, 95, 98–99, 109, 112–13; Choziba, lavra at (Judea), 40–41, 59, 40; Christ Philanthropos (CP), 61n.82; Dalmatos (CP), 59; Douka (near Jericho), 57; Enkleistra of Neophytos (Cyprus), 42, 46n.32; Euthymios, lavra of (Judea), 66n.95; Flaviana (Cappadocia), 59; Galesion, three monasteries founded by St. Lazaros on Mount (near Ephesus), 39; Great Meteoron (Meteora, Thessaly), 51; Iveron (Athos), 19, 89–90; Khirbet-ed-Deir (Judea), 57; Kosmidion (CP), 62; Kosmoteira, Pherrai, 33n.45, 38; Koukoulioumossi (Athos), 51; Lavra (Athos), 38, 41, 45, 61n.78; Mount Nebo (Judea), 77n.35; Pammakaristos (CP), 65; Pantanassa (Mistra), 60; Pantokrator (CP), 54n.55, 59, 64, 215; Patriarch Nikephoros I (on Bosporos), 38–39; Pege (CP), 56, 61, 63; Peribleptos (CP), 62; Prodromos of Petra (CP), 55, 62; Reichenau (Switzerland), 57; St. Andrew in Krisei (CP), 91n.15; St. Catherine (Sinai), 47, 137, 46, 49, 138; St. Gall (Switzerland), 53, 57, 54, 55; St. George of the Mangana (CP), 17, 63, 215; St. Mamas (CP), 59; St. Paul (Athos), 42; St. Paul (South Galala Plateau, Egypt), 60; St. Sabas (Judea), 39–40, 44; San Vincenzo al Volturno (Italy), 218; Hyakinthos (Nicea), 221; Savior (Messina), 50; Simonopetra (Athos), 46, 55n.57, 43; Stavroniketa (Athos), 46, 48; Xenophon (Athos), 52. See also nunneries (specific); monastic typika (specific)
monastic typika, 37, 42, 64
monastic typika (specific): Athanasios, of (Lavra, Athos), 41n.19; Damias, of (Pantanassa, Baionaia, Crete), 61; Isaac Komnenos, of (Kosmoteira, Pherrai), 33n.45, 38; Lips (CP), of, 54n.55, 62n.85; Luke, of (Savior at Messina) 50; Mamas (CP), of, 59; Patriarch Matthew I, of (Charsianeites, CP), 64; Neophytoys, of (Enkleistra, Cyprus), 42, 46n.32, 59; Pantokrator (CP), of, 54n.55, 59n.73, 66n.94; Theodore Synadene, of (Sure Hope, CP), 62, 66n.99; Theotokos Kecharitomene (CP), of, 53n.50, 61n.82
monastic virtues equated with fruit of garden, 66n.94
monks, 23, 27, 37–67, 90, 220, 51, 56: described as swarm of bees, 66; compared to Cyclopes, 46; control over nature of, 59; having familiarity with herbal medicine; recreating divine paradise, 64; spreading horticultural knowledge, 9; symbolized as plants and trees, 50, 64, 66
mosaics, 15, 87: at Caesarea, 219; at Daphni, Church of Koimesis, 110, 108; in Great Palace, CP, 215; at Herakleia Lynkestis, 117, 225, 123; hunting, 70n.7; at Kariye Camii, 114, 132, 95, 98–99, 109, 112–13; at Memorial of Moses on Mount Nebo, 77n.35; at Piazza Armerina, 84n.75; at Sant’Apollinare in Classe, 225n.66
Moscow, 69
Müller-Wiener, Wolfgang, 9
Mullette, Margaret, 220
Muses, 135, 147
mushrooms, 168
Muslims, 223, 228
Mustansir bi-Allah, al- (Fatimid caliph), 82, 227
Mycenaean period, drug lore in, 189
mythology, 146, 178–79; animal, 84; vegetal, 113n.17, 144n.5, 163, 169–70, 174
Nâsîr ad-Dîn Maḥmûd (Artuqid sultan), 130
Nasr b. Ahmad b. Nuh (Samanid monarch), 80n.51
Nathanael (doctor at Xenon of the Kral), 55n.56
nature (natural world), 84, 151: attitudes towards/perceptions of, 13, 31, 35, 228; balance of, depicted in painting, 85; beauty of, imitating that of art, 154n.16; rhetorical descriptions of beauties of, 223; control over, 59; imagery of, 225; imitation/re-creation of, 34, 128, 146, 191; improving upon 169–70; love for, 100, 219
Nazareth, 143
Near East, 180, 216, 222. See also Arabia; Judea; Palestine; Syria; Transjordan
Neilos of Rossano, Saint, 41–42
Neophytos (writer of botanical glossary), 178
Neophytos the Recluse, Saint, 27, 46n.32, 59
Nesbitt, John, 13n.2
Nestor: statue of, in garden, 153
Nicaea, 91–92, 94, 117n.23, 125n.34, 221
Nicander, 181, 183, 189, 197–200, 207, 209
Nicholas I Mystikos, Patriarch of CP, 18n.41
Nicholas (lay vinedresser at nunnery of Chrysobalanton, CP), 61
Nicholas Hieropais, 178
Nikarchos, 10n.37
Nikephoros I, Saint, Patriarch of CP, 38–39, 45
Nikephoros II Phokas, 72–73
Niketas (grandson of Saint Philaretos the Merciful), 28
Nikomedes (writer of botanical glossary), 178
Nile: one of rivers of paradise, 27; identified with Gehon, 26
Niobe: tears of, 121, 145
Norman kings of Sicily, 74–75
North Africa, 216
Novgorod, 71n.8
Numidia: bear from, 76
nunnery compared with vineyard, 66
nun sisters, 28, 37; gardening, 62; gardening while disguised as monks, 59, 66; recreating divine paradise, 64; shooing away birds and watering plants, 61; spreading horticultural knowledge, 9; symbolized as plants and trees, 64, 66
Nymphs, 135, 147
Oases, 41, 47n.38, 64
ocean: encircling, 24
Oder, Eugen, 161
Odo of Deuil, 14, 73
Odysseus: statue of, in garden, 153
Ogygia, 220. See also Kalypso’s island
Oikonomos (probably office of steward of Nea Ekklesia in Great Palace, CP), 80
oil, olive, 52–53, 166
oil press, 53n.51
Oleg, son of Sviatoslav of Kiev, 71n.9
opium, 182n.29. See also poppy, opium—under flora: flowers (specific)
Oppian, 181n.28, 200–1
Oppian, pseudo-, 181n.28, 70n.7
Opsomer-Halleux, Carmélia, 179
Orators: statues of ancient, in garden, 153
Ordenerius Vitalis, 79
Oribasios, 180–81, 183, 194
Origen, 23
Orion: statue of, in garden, 153
Orpheus, 78: mosaic of, 84n.75; slave dressed as, 72n.11; statue of, in garden, 153
Orphic eschatalogical vision, 225
Osborne, Robin, 6, 219n.22, 228
Otto I, 72, 73, 77
Ottomans/Turks, 87–88, 90, 91, 100, 221; building of palaces and gardens in CP by, 100n.52; fountain in CP of, 218
Otto of St. Blaise, 75
Owen, Thomas, 222
Pachymeres, George, 78, 88nn.2–3, 93n.24–25
pagan: beliefs in autonomous powers of natural elements, 35; condemnation of growing plants out of season, 228n.88; divinities, statues of, 9; folly in Anatolios’ agricultural treatise, 162; literature, Hyrtakenos’ allusions to, 109; myth, 179; patronage of gardens, 9; sanctuary at Daphni, 20; sources for descriptions of paradise, 23–24, 225
paganism: Byzantine tolerance of, 169
Pahlavi translation of Cassianus Bassus, 163, 222
paintings/frescos, 15: on garden wall, 32, 81; at Kiev, 76, 77n.35; as origin of Hyrtakenos’ ekphrasis, 106, 141, 223; on palatial ceiling in poem byPhiles, 20, 85, 94, 96; 15; at Pelendri; 110, 110; pre-iconoclastic, 225n.67; at Qusayr’Amra, 73; Renaissance, 3; by Zeuxis, 128n.37. See also icons; manuscripts,
illuminated palaces: 'Abbasid in Samarra, 129; Byzantine, 17; caliphal in Baghdad, 80; connection with landscape, 75n.21; fortified of late antiquity, 218; summer-, 94

palaces (specific): Alcazar (Cordoba), 80n.53; al-Ma'mun, of (Baghdad), 80n.56; al-Muqtadir, of (Baghdad), 80n.56; Aretai (CP), see parks (specific); Blachernai (CP), 79–80; at Butrint (Albania), 219; Bryas (CP), 215; of Charles VI in Paris, 96n.42; Cuba (Palermo), 75; of Digenes Akritas, 81n.61; at Fishbourne (England), 218; of Frederick I Barbarossa at Kaiserslautern, 82; Great Palace (CP), 9, 14, 20, 79–80, 93n.28, 122, 128, 215, 217; at Hesdin (Burgundy), 83, 85; of John III Vatatzes (near Nymphaion), 94; of Kubla Khan (Beijing), 82; Louvre (Paris), 80n.53; Madinat al-Zahra (Cordoba), 80, 82n.62; of Theodore Metochites (CP), 20, 81n.59; on Tigris in Baghdad, 76; Tower of London, 80n.53; Trikonchos (in Great Palace, CP), 124, 125n.34; Zisa (Palermo), 75

Palaiologan period, 10, 87–103, 221, 223: palace of, 81n.59; travelers in, 64n.92

Palamas, Gregory, Saint, 221

Palestine, 37, 41–42. See also Judea

Palladius, Rutilius Taurus Aemilianus, 162–63, 173

Pamphilus (author of mutilingual botanical synonym list), 179

Pan: statues of, in gardens of late antiquity, 9

Panagia. See Virgin Mary

Pantechines, Constantine, 70n.3

Paphnutios (hermit on Mount Galesion), 41n.17

paradise/Eden, 7n.20, 23–35, 85, 136, 148, 158: allegorization of, 23, 26; artistic depictions of, 15–16, 24, 29, 25n.66, 25, 29–30; atmospheric and meteorological conditions of, 24; closest approach to by mortals, 23; denial of physical existence of earthly, 23; difficulty of access to, 28; earthly and spiritual fused, 26, 223; fountain of, 26; fragrance of, 24; fruit of, 24; imaginary nature of descriptions of, 23; literary descriptions of, 20, 23–35; perceptions of, 16, 23–35, 223; recreation of, attempted by monks and nuns, 64; relationship to surroundings, 32–35; satire on, 24; shape of, 24, 25; sources for descriptions of, 23; terrestrial gardens compared with/symbolic of, 34, 67, 75, 81, 99–100, 108n.10, 120, 224; topography of, 24, 26; tradition of in hagiographic and apocalyptic texts, 26–28; tradition of in Hexaemeron, 26–27; as a vestibule in which to await Last Judgment, 27. See also Elysian Fields; Four Rivers of Paradise; Isaiah, Peaceable Kingdom of; Islands of the Blessed; locus amoenus; paradeisos; rivers of fire

parasitology, 185–87

parks, animal-, 69, 81–86, 227 (see also menagerie); enclosed, 34, 160n.6; enclosed or divided by embankment, 72n.10; enclosed or divided by fence, 72, 86; enclosed or divided by trench, 72n.10; enclosed by wall, 72–74, 77, 82–83, 86; enclosed or divided by waterway, 72n.10; game-/hunting-, 5, 16, 69–75, 83, 85, 96, 217–18, 227 (see also game preserve/vivarium); game-, predators in, 74; Great, 83; keeper, 72, 74; landscaping of, 71, 86; Little/Petit Paradis, 83, 85; paths in, 82; pleasure-, 85; public, 91–94, 100, 214; sight lines in, to view animals, 86

parks (specific): Altofonte (near Palermo), 75; Aretai (CP), 2, 16–17, 20, 33–34, 74n.20, 81, 124, 218, 225n.62; Gagik I, of, 71n.8; Genoard (Palermo), 75, 83n.67; Hesdin (Burgundy), 83, 85; Kubla Khan, of (Beijing), 82; Parco, see Altofonte; Parco Nuovo (Palermo), 75; Philopation (CP), 5, 14, 17, 32n.41, 35n.54, 70, 72–74; of the Wild Beasts (Baghdad), 82

paroemiographers, 101. See also proverbs

paronomasia, 144n.7

pastoralism, 32

pasturage, 38

Patrick, Joseph, 20, 216n.7, 219

patronage of gardens, 9

Paul of Aegina, 180: statue of, in garden, 153

Paul the First Hermit, Saint, 46–47

pavilions, 71, 111: in Baghdad, 82n.64; in Genoard (Palermo), 75; in Philopation (CP), 73; Seljuk, 74n.20, 219; in Shalamar Bagh, 224

peasants, 18–19, 88

Peninnah (wife of Elkanah). See Fennana

Pereslavl, 71n.8
Index

perfume, manufactured from plants, 187–88 (see also aroma)

peristyle: court, 216n.6, 218; garden, 219

Persia, 6

Persian: chahar-bagh, 223; origin of word paradise, 160n.6; poetry, vegetable imagery in, 225

pests: of animals, 186; of crops, 165–66

Peter of Argos, 107

Peter of Eboli, 75n.24

Peters, Ellis, 54

Petropoulos, Dimitrios, 225

Petzold, Eduard, 5

Petrina (Peloponnese), 90–91

Phaethon: statue of, in garden, 153

pharmacology/pharmacy, 177–214: pharmaceutical uses of asparagus, 184–85; of mandrake, 186–87; of opium poppy, 182–83; of pennyroyal, 187; of rue, 187; of scammony, 178; pharmacists, 54; pharmacognosy, 181; pharmacologists, 179–80, 183, 189; “Synonym Lists” of drugs, 179

Pheidias, 130n.47

Philes, Manuel, 20, 85, 94, 96n.38, 227

Philimin of Thessaly, 212

Philip VI of France, 80n.53

Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy, 83

philosophers: statues of, in garden, 153

Phison: one of rivers of Paradise, 25, 121; identified with Ganges, 26

Phokas, John (12th-cent. pilgrim), 41

Photios, Patriarch of CP, 162, 164n.19, 166, 174

photography, aerial, 218

Phronesis/Prudence, 209, 210: statue of, in garden, 153

physicians. See doctors

phytoliths, 217–18

pilgrims’ flasks, 29

Pindar, 225n.64

Planoudes, Maximos, 103n.22

Plato, 15n.15, 145n.9

Pliny (Gaius Plinius Secundus, “the Elder”), 128n.37, 163, 165n.22, 170, 177, 178n.6–7, 190–91, 204, 207, 212, 227

Pliny (Gaius Plinius Caecelius Secundus, “the Younger”), 4, 31, 227n.76

poems. See gardens, poems on

poets: statues of, in garden, 153

poisons, 187, 189, 197; poisoned arrow, 70n.5. See also medicinal and toxic plants (under flora); toxicology

pollen analysis, 217–18

pollination, 173

Pollux, Iulius, 188

Pompeii, 215, 228n.82

pond/pool: bathing, 32; in courtyard, 216n.6; in desert, 41; in game park, 72–73, 83, 86; in garden, 120, 126, 128–29 131, 152, 154–55; reflecting, 219. See also water supply and irrigation

Pontos. See Ibora

Porath, Yosef, 17, 216n.7

Porikologos, 19, 87

Porphyry, 216

porphyry, 121–22, 124, 145–46

portico, 97, 121

Portuguese trading ventures, 180

Poseidon: statue of, in garden, 153

Posidonius: statue of, in garden, 153

post-iconoclastic period/after iconoclasm, 23, 26–29, 31, 34, 223

pottery, 71n.9

power: gardens as symbols of, 17

praktika, Athonite, 88–90

Praxiteles, 130n.47

pre-iconoclastic period/before iconoclasm, 23, 223, 225n.67

Premierstein, A. von, 211

Priapus: statues of, in gardens of late antiquity, 9–10

Prodromos, Theodore, 10, 96n.38

Prokopios, 61

“Promotus, Aelius”: compilation of toxicology by, 186n.34

Propontis. See Marmara, Sea of

Protoevangelion, 106–9, 132–33, 136, 138

proverbs, 88, 101–3, 149n.38, 221: Cypriot, 103n.20

Prudence. See Phronesis

Psellus, Michael, 28, 62–63, 74n.19, 77–78, 121, 170, 174, 215, 224n.52

putto identified as desire for wisdom, 210

Pythagorean: arithmology, 144n.9; eschatological vision, 225

quaternities, 28. See also chahar-bagh; Four Rivers of Paradise

Qu‘rān, 223n.47, 224n.49

Qustūs (Arabic translation of Cassianus Bassus), 163

Rahewin (chronicler), 82

rain. See water supply and irrigation

Redford, Scott, 74n.20, 219

Renaissance (European/Italian), 3–6, 84, 140n.62,
Index

161, 179n.20, 180, 189, 204
Rhadamanthys: statue of, in garden, 153
Rhea: statue of, in garden, 153
rhetoric, 17, 115, 160
rhetorical: descriptions, 105–6, 223; devices, 141 (see also paronomasia; punning; symbolism; topos); models, 169; texts, 88, 105, 107. See also ekphrasis; encomia
rhetoricians/teachers of rhetoric, 87, 89, 91, 96, 101, 225
Ricci, Alessandra, 215n.3
Rice, David and Tamara Talbot, 215
Riddle, John, 183–84
righteous, the, 28
rivers of fire, 27, 28, 31, 148
rivers of paradise. See Four Rivers of Paradise
Robinson, Gertrude, 18n.36
Robinson, William, 170n.28
rock crystal, 131, 153–54
Rodgers, Robert, 222
Roger II of Sicily, 74–75
Roman: agricultural writers, 4, 160, 173n.32; animal farms, 71–72, 75; financial procurator, 219; monasteries in Palestine, 37; Republic, 180; responsibilities of urban aristocrats, 211–12. See also gardens, Roman
romances (individual):
Achilleïs (Byzantine Achilleid, anon.), 14, 128, 152nn.8, 10, 153n.12
Belthandros and Chrysantza (anon.), 113–14, 130–31, 152n.10
Daphnis and Chlor (Longos), 32, 118, 134n.52, 147n.23, 154n.16
Digenes Akritas (anon.), 26n.20, 27n.25, 81n.61, 134n.52, 136–37, 152n.7
Drosilla and Charikles (Niketas Eugenianos), 118, 130, 145n.11
Erec and Enide (Chrétien de Troyes), 139n.62
Hysmine and Hysminias (Eustathios Makrembolites), 6n.16, 14, 32, 111, 120, 130, 139, 143n.4, 144n.5, 8, 145n.11, 147n.26, 148n.30, 35, 153n.12, 156n.23
Kallimachos and Chrysorhoe (anon.), 111–12, 131n.48, 139, 152n.10, 223
Leukippe and Kleistophon (Achilles Tatoos), 120, 133–34, 146n.19, 152n.7, 155n.17, 156nn.22–23, 26, 157n.27
Libistros and Rhodanne (anon.), 153n.13
Roman de la Rose (Guillaume de Lorris), 139n.52, 140n.62
Sophrosyne (Theodore Meliteniotis), 119–20, 131, 143n.52, 140n.62, 223: partial translation of, 151–58
Romanos I Lekapenos, 59
Romanos II, 69
Rome: comparison with New Rome/Constantinople, 93, 220; Greek manuscript of Dioskorides written in, 206; topiary invented in, 227. See also gardens, Roman
Romuald of Salerno, 74
root cutters (rhizotomoi), 187–88
Rouillard, Germaine, 18
Ruggles, D. Fairchild, 69n.
Sabas, Saint, 20, 59
Sagarian marble, 122
Saints’ Lives/hagiography, 3, 26–29, 37, 42, 44, 52, 56–57, 64, 220
Saints’ Lives (specific): Andrew the Fool, 28, 34; Antony the Great, 47n.36, 57n.65, 59n.70; Athanasios of Athos (A) 38n.7, 41n.18, 53, 56n.58; Athanasios of Athos (B), 38n.7, 41n.19, 45n.31; Basil the Younger, 29n.31, 78n.45; Christopher and Makarios, 41n.20, 57n.66, 59n.70; Demetrianos (Bishop of Chytri), 66n.94, 224n.53; Elias Speiatiotes, 59n.72, 66n.100; Euthymios (Patriarch of CP), 66n.95; Euthymios the Younger, 59n.72; George Hagiories, 74; George of Choziba, 59n.72; Germanos of Kosinitza, 50n.44; Ignatios (Patriarch of CP), 66n.97; Irene of Chrysobalon, 53n.48, 61nn.80, 82, 64n.91; John the Hesychast, 39n.14; Kosmas the Hymnographer and John of Damascus, 43n.24; Kyriakos, 47–48, 57n.65, 59n.69; Lazaros of Mount Galesion, 39, 41n.17, 66n.95; Luke the Younger of Steiris, 38, 44n.29, 48, 53n.49–50, 57n.63, 67; Makarios of Rome, 23n.2, 27; Mary of Egypt, 64n.93; Matrona of Perge, 59n.71, 64n.91, 66n.96; Melania the Younger, 32; Meletios the Confessor, 39n.10; Michael Maleinos, 53n.48; Michael Synkellos, 53n.48; Neilos of Rossano, 41–42; Nicolas of Stoudios, 64n.94; Nikephoros I (Patriarch of CP), 38–39, 45n.30, 52n.45; Nikephoros of Miletos, 41n.20; Nikephoros of Sebaste, 41n.20; Nikon, 53n.49; Paul the First Hermit, 47n.35; Philaretos the Merciful, 28; Sabas, 59n.72, 212n.48; Sabas the Younger, 41n.20; Symeon
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Tabbaa, Y., 129n.42
Tafur, Pero, 88, 92n.20, 93–94, 97n.44
Talbot, Alice–Mary, 220
Talbot Rice.  See Rice, David and Tamara Talbot

Tannin, 186
Tantalus: garden of, 101; statue of, in garden, 153
tapestry, 85
taste/sweetness of fruit, 100, 133n.51, 142, 147, 154–55; enhancement of, 167, 228n.88
Taurus Mountains, 70
Tchalenko, Georges, 19n.50

Teachers.  See rhetoricians

Teall, John, 18, 160n.4
temple (i.e., chapel), 153; of Solomon, 157
tents of the elect, 28n.29
Tereus, 134n.52
terracing.  See gardens, terraced; horticultural/ agricultural operations/practices

Thebaid, Upper, 47
Theodora of Alexandria, Saint, 59
Theodora of Thessalonike, Saint, 66n.94
Theodora Synadene.  See Synadene, Theodora Palaiologina
Theodore II Laskaris, 91, 94
Theodore Hyrtaenos.  See Hyrtaenos, Theodore
Theodore Metelioniotes.  See romances (individual)
Theodore of Stoudios, Saint, 32–33, 53n.49, 61
Theodoric I (Merovingian king), 19
Theophanes the Confessor, Saint (historian), 211, 213
Theophanes Continuatus, 14, 70n.7, 124n.33, 122 (Vita Basilii), 125n.34, 220
Theophilos (Emperor), 9, 129, 215, 220
Theophilos (Mesopotamian monk), 23, 27
Theophrastus, 121n.29, 170, 178n.7, 181, 187, 189
Theoretikon Paradeission/Christian Dream Garden/ Symbolic Garden, 15, 17, 135n.54, 140, 142n.69, 177–79
Theotokos.  See Virgin Mary

Thessalonike, 19, 37n.1, 89–90, 92, 97
Thomson, Margaret H.: miscellaneous botanical texts edited by, 18, 177–79, 187.  See also Theoretikon Paradeission

Thrace, 207
throne: of Cyrus, 152; imperial with mechanical lions, 79n.47, 128–29; of Solomon, 128; of Sophroyne, 152, 157
Thucydidies, 147n.24
Tigris, 76: one of rivers of Paradise, 25, 27
Timarion, 24
Timothy of Gaza, 77n.39
Tityus: statue of, in garden, 153
tomb/tombstone, 153, 157, 221

Topiary.  See pruning under horticultural/ agricultural operations/practices
touch: of fruit and flowers, 142, 147; of grapes, 155
toxicology, 186n.34.  See also poisons

Trading ventures, 180
Transilvania, 215

Turkish tribes, 88
Turks.  See Ottomans/Turks
typika.  See monastic typika

Tzetzes, John, 10

Unayyads hunting wild asses, 73
Urban: churches, 217; gardens, 92, 217–18; monasteries, 61–64; settings of ancient gardens, 31.  See also churches; cities; Constantinople; gardens; monasteries; Nicaea; nunneries; palaces; parks; Trebizond

Varro, Marcus Terentius, 72n.11
Venantius Honorius Clementianus Fortunatus, 24n.7
Venetian trading ventures, 180
Vergil, 219
vermicides, 186

Vesuvius, Mount, 217
Veterinary medicine/practices, 160–61, 185–87

View/vista/sight, in/of garden, 11, 67, 154, 171–73; of hunt, 71, 74n.16 (see also sight lines); of landscape, 31–33, 35, 38, 91–92; from sea, 92; of sea, 32–34, 61, 216.  See also mirador

Vigil: statue of, in garden, 153

Villa: Hellenistic, 87; late antique, 216, 218

Vindonious Anatolius.  See Anatolius, Vindonious

Vinedresser, 59, 61

Vineyard, 37, 41, 50, 52–53, 59, 61, 62, 64, 66–67, 88, 90–92, 96, 136, 148, 165n.21 166, 169, 120: compared with nunnery, 66; parable of laborers in, 89

Virgin Mary/Panagia/Theotokos: Annunciation to,
Index

15, 137–38, 143, 138; Athos as garden of, 66, 220; conception of, 106, 108n.10, 136; encomium of, 106, 144n.9; garden metaphor for, 137; gardenly settings for, 15, 140n.62; homily on, 107; iconography of, 141n.66; Lamentation of, 15; life/story of, 107, 138; as Mother of God and mistress of angels and humans, 150; virginity of, 138–39. See also

Protoevangelion

virtues: statues of, in garden, 153

vista. See view/vista/sight

Vitelli, Nicolo, 222n.38

viticulture, 166

visarium. See game preserve/vivarium

Walhfrid Strabo, 57, 85n.78

wall. See gardens; parks, game-

water: as element of autonomous power, 35;

mentioned in Garden of St. Anna in

Protoevangelion, 107–8

water mills, 46, 90

water supply and irrigation

storage: basin, 63; cistern, 39, 42–47, 93, 220, 44; rain barrel (pithos), 44; reservoir, 44, 47n.38, 93; rock cutting, 47n.38, 45; rock depression/indentation, 43–44; settling tank, 44. See also fishpond; fountain

supply, 37–38, 91, 172–73: rain 39, 41, 43–45, 48, 72; river, 26n.20, 39, 92; rock pool, 42; rock, trickling down from, 41n.17; spring, 11, 33–34, 39, 43–45, 47, 48n.40, 50, 56–57, 61, 72, 91, 93–94, 130n.47, 136, 140n.62, 148, 152, 154–55; stream, 33–34, 43, 86; well, 43; 137, 218. See also lake; pond/pool

transport: aqueduct, 11, 26, 44, 46, 93, 48; canal, 73, 86; canalization, 215; channel, 39, 42, 44–45, 63, 46; conduit, 121; course, 217; donkey/pack animal, 39, 43; gutter and downspout, 44; hand, 43; pipe in excavated trench, 45; waterway,

72n.10; waterwork, 43, 47, 63


Webb, R., 141n.67

weedkiller, 170

Weitzmann, Kurt, 161, 226

Wellmann, Max, 179n.19, 182, 184

Wescoat, J. L., Jr, 219n.20

wheatfields, 64

William I of Sicily, 75

William II of Sicily, 75

wind, 28, 155–57. See also breeze; zephyr

wine, 52–53, 166; eucharistic, 37; flavorings of, 187–88; press, 53n.51, 129. See also (under flora: woody plants [specific]), grape/vine; vineyard

Wolschke-Bulmahn, Joachim, 16–17, 21, 159n.2,

219n.20, 221n.35, 228

women, 212–13. See also doctors/physicians, female; midwives; nuns; nurses

wood/woodland, 31–32, 71–72, 92, 151

Woodstock (England), 77

Xanthopoulos, Nikephoros Kallistos, 56n.60

Xenon of the Kral (CP), 55n.56

Xenophon, 160

Xiphias (traitor thrown to lions), 79

Yaūqūt, 224n.49

Yeltsin, Boris Nikolaevich, 69

Yugoslavia, 18n.33. See also Serbia

Yūniyüṣ, 163–64

zephyr, 120, 146, 156n.23, 157. See also breeze; wind

Zeus, 127, 145, 146n.21: garden of, 101

zoological garden. See menagerie/zoological garden

Zoroaster, 171

zverinets, 71n.8
Index of Greek Words

ametor, 139, 144n.9
ampelokepion, 13n.3, 88
ampeloperibolion, 88
boskoi, 41
botanologia, 54n.55
byssinos, 145n.13
douleutai, 59
dynamis, 180
epimeles, 226
epimeletes, 85
eukration, 53
gedion, 99n.49
georgos, 99n.49
glaukos, 145n.13
hekatomphylla, 102
hexekontaphylla, 102
kainismos, 160
katholikoi kritai, 90n.8
ekellion, 45
kepion, 88
kepoperibolion, 88
kepopoporia, 159, 171
kepopreion, 88
kepos/ois, 46, 88, 90, 110, 111

kepotopion, 88
kepouros, 59
kypinos, 186n.35
lachana, 52
leimon, 92, 152n.5
ostrites, 122
paradeisos. See main index
pandalis, 71n.9
parekklesiarches, 59
panthenos, 139, 144n.9
pementarioi, 54n.55
peribolion (perivolium), 72–73, 91n.15
praktika. See main index
prostagma, 90n.8
rhizotomoi, 187–88
sekefrion, 90n.8
semeion, 144n.7
techna, 169
theriotropheion, 72n.11
theriotrophos, 72n.11
triakontaphylla, 102
typika. See monastic typika in main index
xerokepion, 43n.24