

Scott Kennedy

## Michael Panaretos in context

### A historiographical study of the chronicle *On the emperors of Trebizond*

**Abstract:** It has often been said it would be impossible to write the history of the empire of Trebizond (1204–1461) without the terse and often frustratingly laconic chronicle of the Grand Komnenoi by the protonotarios of Alexios III (1349–1390), Michael Panaretos. While recent scholarship has infinitely enhanced our knowledge of the world in which Panaretos lived, it has been approximately seventy years since a scholar dedicated a historiographical study to the text. This study examines the world that Panaretos wanted posterity to see, examining how his post as imperial secretary and his use of sources shaped his representation of reality, whether that reality was Trebizond’s experience of foreigners, the reign of Alexios III, or a narrative that showed the superiority of Trebizond on the international stage. Finally by scrutinizing Panaretos in this way, this paper also illuminates how modern historians of Trebizond have been led astray by the chronicler, unaware of Panaretos selected material for inclusion for the narratives of his chronicle.

---

**Adresse:** Dr. Scott Kennedy, Bilkent University, Main Camous, G Building, 24/g, 06800 Bilkent–Ankara, TURKEY; scott.kennedy@bilkent.edu.tr

Established just before the fall of Constantinople in 1204, the empire of Trebizond (1204–1461) emerged as a successor state to the Byzantine empire, ultimately outlasting its other Byzantine rivals until it fell to the Ottoman Turks in 1461. Our main source for the history of the empire is a short (roughly 6,000 word) chronicle entitled *On the emperors of Trebizond, the Grand Komnenoi, how, when, and how long each of them reigned* (Περὶ τῶν τῆς Τραπεζοῦντος βασιλέων, τῶν μεγάλων Κομνηνῶν, ὅπως καὶ πότε καὶ πόσον ἕκαστος ἐβασίλευσεν).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> When this article was written, the standard edition was O. LAMPSIDES, Μιχαὴλ τοῦ Παναρέτου περὶ τῶν Μεγάλων Κομνηνῶν. *Archeion Pontou* 22 (1958) 61–81. This has recently been super-

Running from 1204 to ca. 1429, the text was written by the *protonotarios* of the Trapezuntine emperor Alexios III (1349–1390), Michael Panaretos (ca. 1320–ca. 1390) and continued after 1390 by an anonymous continuator(s). Consisting of a series of short entries which recount when an event happened, sometimes down to the exact hour, but often omit much information about the circumstances or causes behind an event, the chronicle is frustratingly spare. In this regard, it has often been compared to the short chronicles published by Peter Schreiner and the chronicle of George Sphrantzes.<sup>2</sup>

Despite the chronicle's drawbacks from a modern perspective, it has often been said that it would be nearly impossible to write the history of the empire, were it not for the rediscovery of the chronicle by Jakob Fallmerayer in the 1820's.<sup>3</sup> As a fundamental source for the empire's history, it is surprising that the chronicle has elicited very little attention from a historiographical perspective. The last major studies of the chronicle date from the 1950's when Odysseas Lamprosidis was preparing his 1958 edition of the text.<sup>4</sup> In the meantime, the researches of Anthony Bryer, Sergei Karpov, Rustam Shukurov, Anthony Eastmond, Alexios Sabbides and many other scholars have vastly increased our knowledge of the empire's history in almost every respect.<sup>5</sup> But while these researches have

---

seded by R. SHUKUROV / S. КАРПОВ / A. M. КРЮКОВ, Михаил Панарет. О великих Комнинах (Трапезундская хроника). Saint Petersburg 2019. For the sake of convenience, I cite the new edition first followed by (L)amprosidis in parentheses.

2 P. SCHREINER, Studien zu den Βραχέα Χρονικά. *MBM*, 6. Munich 1967; Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken, ed. P. SCHREINER. *CFBH*, 12. Vienna 1975–79; ● **title added** ● Giorgio Sfranza, Cronaca, ed. R. MAISANO. *CFHB*, 29. Roma 1990, 23–51.

3 O. LAMP SIDES, Τινὰ περὶ τοῦ ἔργου καὶ τῶν ἰδεῶν Μιχαὴλ Παναρέτου. *Archeion Pontou* 37 (1954) 39–60; LAMP SIDES, Μιχαὴλ (as footnote 1 above) 9; S. P. КАРПОВ, История Трапезундской империи. Saint Petersburg 2007, 14; R. SHUKUROV, Великие Комнины и Восток (1204–1461). Saint Petersburg 2001, 23; A. SABBIDES, Ιστορία της Αυτοκρατορίας των Μεγάλων Κομνηνῶν της Τραπεζούντας (1204–1461). Thessalonike 2016, 198; A. ASP-TALWAR, The chronicle of Michael Panaretos, in A. Eastmond / G. Peers / B. Roggema (eds.), *Byzantium's other empire*. Trebizond. Istanbul 2016, 173.

4 I. ΡΑΜΠΟΥΚΕΣ, Ποντιακά. Athens 1947; O. LAMP SIDES, ὁ γάμος Δαβίδ τοῦ Μεγάλου Κομνηνοῦ κατὰ τὸ Χρονικὸν τοῦ Παναρέτου. *Athe* (1953) 365–368; LAMP SIDES, Τινὰ (as footnote 3 above); O. LAMP SIDES, La tradition malite de la chronique de Panarétos et l'édition de S. Lampros, in *Mélanges offerts à Octave et Melpo Merlier, à l'occasion du 25e anniversaire de leur arrivée en Grèce*. Athens 1956, 1–5; O. LAMP SIDES, Διορθωτικά εἰς τὸ Χρονικὸν Μιχαὴλ τοῦ Παναρέτου. *Archeion Pontou* 21 (1956) 3–25; O. LAMP SIDES, Κροτώ-κρατώ-κρατίζω εν τῷ Χρονικῷ Μιχαὴλ τοῦ Παναρέτου. *Archeion Pontou* 21 (1956) 226–230; O. LAMP SIDES, Συμμεκτα εἰς τὸ χρονικὸν τοῦ Παναρέτου. *Archeion Pontou* 23 (1959) 39–54. ASP-TALWAR, Chronicle (as footnote 3 above), is a promising start to further work.

5 This is only a survey of some important works: A. BRYER / D. WINFIELD, *The Byzantine monuments and topography of the Pontos*. 2 vols. Washington, D.C. 1985; A. BRYER, *The Empire of*

vastly helped us reconstruct the world in which Panaretos lived, less attention has been paid to what world Panaretos left for us to see and why he constructed this world. While it might seem odd to devote a historiographical study to a chronicle such as Panaretos's, which is seemingly devoid of rhetoric and literary merit in the tradition of other Byzantine short chronicles, such a pursuit is not without merit. As Hayden White has illustrated in an examination of the list-like *Annals of Saint Gall* from the early Middle Ages, even historical forms which seem to eschew storytelling techniques such as the annals and the chronicle tell a story in their selections of facts no matter how meagerly they present those facts.<sup>6</sup> This article, then, examines the image of reality that Panaretos constructed for posterity and illustrates some of the ways in which Panaretos's representation of his times has misled modern scholars. By scrutinizing Panaretos's chronicle in this fashion, I hope that this study will also cast light on the mind and concerns of a fourteenth century Trapezuntine official, such as Michael Panaretos. We have many voices from mainland Byzantium for this era, but few native voices from far flung outposts of the Roman world such as Trebizond, whose beliefs and ideas are often overshadowed by their Constantinopolitan counterparts.

## Michael Panaretos the chronicler

Our knowledge of Michael Panaretos as an individual comes solely from his chronicle. As the reader of his chronicle will notice, Panaretos's name does not actually appear in the chronicle's title in the apograph manuscript Marcianus gr. 608/coll. 306, dating from the 1440's.<sup>7</sup> From its beginning in 1204 until 1340, the chronicle is entirely written in the third person until first person plural entries begin to creep in. Our attribution of the text to Michael Panaretos is based

---

Trebizond and the Pontos. London 1980; A. BRYER, Peoples and settlement in Anatolia and the Caucasus, 800–1900. London 1988; S. KARPOV, L'impero di Trebisonda Venezia Genova e Roma 1204–1461: rapporti politici, diplomatici e commerciali. Rome 1986; KARPOV, История (as footnote 3 above); SHUKUROV, Великие Комнины (as footnote 3 above); A. EASTMOND, Art and identity in thirteenth-century Byzantium: Hagia Sophia and the empire of Trebizond. London 2016; SABBIDES, Ἰστορία (as footnote 3 above).

6 H. WHITE, The value of narrativity in the representation of reality. *Critical Inquiry* 7 (1980) 5–27.

7 On the manuscript, see now P. SCHREINER, Bemerkungen zur Handschrift der trapezuntinischen Chronik des Michael Panaretos in der Bibliotheca Marciana (Marc. gr. 608/coll. 306), in R. Shukurov (ed.), *Mare et litora: essays presented to Sergei Karpov for his 60th birthday*. Moscow 2009, 613–626.

off an entry, in which the chronicler describes the dispatch of an embassy to Constantinople led by George Scholaris and Michael Panaretos, “who is writing this” (ὁ ταῦτα γράφων).<sup>8</sup> From this, scholars have extrapolated that all the first person plural entries which range from 1340 and 1386 originate from Panaretos and thus have concluded that he is responsible for the chronicle from 1204 up to or around 1390 (the death of his master Alexios III).<sup>9</sup>

Based on these assumptions, Panaretos’s life went something like this. He was probably born sometime around 1320 in Trebizond or thereabouts. Panaretos’s origins were probably humble, as the Panaretos family name was not common in the Pontos before him, though it was popular enough in mainland Byzantium.<sup>10</sup> Whatever his origins, Panaretos probably began his career as a *notarios*, a secretary in the imperial service, in which capacity he served the regime of the young emperor Alexios III. In 1351, he would accompany the dowager empress Eirene of Trebizond on an expedition against the rebel Constantine Doranites.<sup>11</sup> He was frequently by the side of the young Alexios III as the emperor traveled throughout his realm and waged war on his enemies, and by 1363 Panaretos had obtained the titles *protosebastos* and *protonotarios*. While the first was purely honorific, Panaretos was now in charge of the imperial secretariate and responsible for drafting, polishing, and preserving imperial correspondence and documents.<sup>12</sup> In such a capacity, his knowledge of previous events or treaties could be quite valuable, and Alexios III sent him on a number of diplomatic missions to Constantinople in the 1360’s, including one during which he helped secure a marriage alliance with the Byzantine emperor John V (1341–1391) and reestablish positive relations with Venice.<sup>13</sup>

**8** SHUKUROV / KAPOV / KRYUKOV, Παναρετ (as footnote 1 above) 98 (74 L).

**9** Generally most recent scholars have argued that Panaretos died in or around 1390: SHUKUROV / KAPOV / KRYUKOV, Παναρετ (as footnote 1 above) 11; SABBIDES, Ιστορία (as footnote 3 above) 200; SHUKUROV, Великие Комнины (as footnote 3 above) 23; LAMPSIDES, Τινὰ (as footnote 3 above) 41; LAMPSIDES, Μιχαήλ (as footnote 1 above) 10–14. But older scholarship held that Panaretos stopped writing in 1382: S. LAMPROS, Τὸ Τραπεζουντιακὸν Χρονικὸν τοῦ Πρωτοσεβαστοῦ καὶ Πρωτονотариῦ Μιχαήλ Παναρέτου. *NE* 4 (1907) 226–294: 265. Pampoukes contended that Panaretos had continued up until 1426: PAMPOUKES, Ποντιακά (as footnote 4 above) 30.

**10** LAMPROS, Τὸ Τραπεζουντιακὸν (as footnote 9 above) 274–275; SHUKUROV / KAPOV / KRYUKOV, Παναρετ (as footnote 1 above) 11.

**11** SHUKUROV / KAPOV / KRYUKOV, Παναρετ (as footnote 1 above) 90 (70 L).

**12** On the office of protonotarios, see *ODB* 1746.

**13** SHUKUROV / KAPOV / KRYUKOV, Παναρετ (as footnote 1 above) 98 (74–75 L), 102 (76 L). For Venice receiving word of this embassy, see F. THIRIET, *Régestes des délibérations du Sénat de Venise concernant la Roumanie*. Paris 1958, I 413.

Aside from his political duties, Panaretos was the father of two sons, whose premature deaths in 1368 he includes in his chronicle of political events in a rare moment of self-interjection. A religious man, Panaretos saw their deaths as punishment for his sins or as he puts it, “wretched sinner that I am.”<sup>14</sup> In general, religion played an important role in shaping his world view.<sup>15</sup> When Panaretos describes multiple battles between Trapezuntines and their enemies, the chronicler does not usually focus much on battle tactics or the morale of the army, but often notes that a battle turned out positively or negatively “with God’s consent (Θεοῦ εὐδοκοῦντος).” Take for example his account of a Turkish attack on Trebizond in 1336, “the sheikh Hasan, the son of Timurtaş, came to Trebizond and there was a battle at the ravine of Saint Kerykos and at Minthrion. With God’s consent, he was turned back by a torrent of rain and fled.”<sup>16</sup>

## Panaretos as imperial secretary

As chief secretary and an occasional ambassador of Alexios III, Panaretos needed a precise knowledge of the past when communicating in an official capacity. His chronicle is no doubt a précis of the kind of information he found useful in his day-to-day business. For example, the chronicle’s report of the marriage of John II Komnenos with Eudokia Palaiologina, the daughter of Michael VIII Palaiologos in fall 1282 includes an aside, “Note that the emperor lord Michael was still alive when the marriage of John the Grand Komnenos and Palaiologina took place.”<sup>17</sup> As marriages were relatively common between the Grand Komnenoi and the ruling family in Constantinople, Panaretos no doubt valued having a precise knowledge of these marriage alliances and the conditions surrounding them, as the Byzantines prided themselves on their knowledge of history and frequently manipulated it for diplomatic advantage during

---

**14** SHUKUROV / KARPOV / KRYUKOV, Παναρετ (as footnote 1 above) 102 (76 L). All translations of Panaretos come from: S. KENNEDY, *Two works on Trebizond: Michael Panaretos*. Bessarion. *Dumbarton Oaks medieval library*, 52. Cambridge, MA 2019, here p. 43. All other translations are my own.

**15** For a fuller exposition, see LAMPSIDES, Τὴν (as footnote 3 above) 59–60; LAMPSIDES, Μιχαήλ (as footnote 1 above) 32–33.

**16** SHUKUROV / KARPOV / KRYUKOV, Παναρετ (as footnote 1 above) 80 (65 L); KENNEDY, *Two works* (as footnote 14 above) 11. For further examples of Panaretos’ typical battle, see SHUKUROV / KARPOV / KRYUKOV, Παναρετ (as footnote 1 above) 84, 86, 92 (66, 68, 71 L, respectively).

**17** SHUKUROV / KARPOV / KRYUKOV, Παναρετ (as footnote 1 above) 76 (62 L).

negotiations.<sup>18</sup> For example, one area where a precise knowledge of Trebizond's past would have aided Panaretos was when he had to defend his master's position in Byzantine ideology among his fellow Byzantines and Westerners. Palaiologan propaganda, first propagated by Michael VIII, had alleged that the founder of the empire of Trebizond, Alexios I the Grand Komnenos (1204–1222), was originally a governor appointed by the emperor in Constantinople who had then rebelled and illegitimately laid claim to the title and insignia of the Roman *basileus*.<sup>19</sup> The empire of Trebizond was thus born out of an act of treachery and rebellion against its rightful emperor. But the truth was somewhat more complicated. The grandson of Andronikos I, Alexios and his brother David had left Constantinople and sought Georgian aid to retake the imperial throne from the Angeloi, seizing Trebizond in April 1204 around the same time as the sack of Constantinople by the Fourth Crusade. The crusade's seizure of the city derailed their original plans, as Byzantines scrambled to establish imperial legitimacy.<sup>20</sup> Nevertheless, the Palaiologans' delegitimizing narrative of Trebizond's origins was widely disseminated among the empire's Western neighbors.<sup>21</sup> Given the story's popularity, Trapezuntine ambassadors must have encountered preconceptions during negotiations with foreign powers that their master's sovereignty was founded on treason and arrogance. Precisely knowing the early history of his empire's foundations could thus be valuable. Panaretos's description of the empire's foundation is uncomplicated:

Ἦλθεν ὁ μέγας Κομνηνός, ὁ κύρ Ἀλέξιος, ἐξελθὼν μὲν ἐκ τῆς εὐδαίμονος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, ἐκστρατεύσας δὲ ἐξ Ἰβηρίας, σπουδῆ καὶ μόχθῳ τῆς πρὸς πατρός θείας αὐτοῦ Θάμαρ, καὶ παρέλαβε τὴν Τραπεζοῦντα μηνὶ Ἀπριλίῳ, ἰνδικτιῶνος ζ', ἔτους ςψιβ', ἐτῶν ὦν κβ'.

**18** J. SHEPARD, The uses of 'history' in Byzantine diplomacy: observations and comparison, in C. Dendrinos (ed.), *Porphyrogenita: essays on the history and literature of Byzantium and the Latin East in honour of Julian Chrysostomides*. Aldershot 2003, 91–115.

**19** R.J. LOENERTZ, *Mémoire d'Ogier, protonotaire, pour Marco et Marchetto nonces de Michel VIII Paléologue auprès de pape Nicholas III*. 1278 (printemps-été). *OCP* 31 (1965) 374–408: 391.

**20** The clearest account of the empire's foundation remains A.A. VASILIEV, The foundation of the Empire of Trebizond (1204–1222). *Speculum* 11 (1936) 3–37. For further detail, see SAVVIDES, *Ιστορία* (as footnote 3 above) 53–8; ΚΑΡΟΒ, *Ιστορία* (as footnote 3 above) 88–111.

**21** The tale is taken up in the Western traveler Odorico: A. VAN WYNGAERT, *Relatio fratri Odorico*. *Sinica Franciscana*. Florence 1929, 413–495. It also appears in the Armenian Hethum's account: *Recueil des historiens des croisades: documents arméniens*. Paris 1906, 133.

Lord Alexios I the Grand Komnenos left the blessed city of Constantinople and set out on campaign from Georgia with an army provided by the zeal and efforts of his paternal aunt Tamar. He came to Trebizond and captured it in April, indiction 7, 6712 (1204), at the age of 22.<sup>22</sup>

However, his laconic account contained the information needed to refute the Constantinopolitan account, as it provided the itinerary of the Grand Komnenos (Constantinople, Georgia, Trebizond) and specified that his conquest of Trebizond was accomplished through Georgian aid. Knowing Alexios I's age at the foundation of the empire could not have hurt either. When confronting Palaiologan memories that Alexios had been a rogue governor, Panaretos could point to his empire's past and point out incongruous details in their account. For example, what responsible emperor would make a 22 year-old the governor of an important border province?

Occasionally he even included humorous moments, where we can hear the emperor's chief secretary complain about his job. For example, when Alexios III's chief minister, Niketas Scholaris, fled to Kerasous in 1355 in order to rally rebels around himself against Alexios, Panaretos remarks, "Who could possibly describe all the messages and dispatches that passed between Trebizond and Kerasous from that point on?"<sup>23</sup> No doubt, the memory of all the messages he wrote to Scholaris's group of rebels made Panaretos's hand ache.

As chief imperial secretary, Panaretos would also have had some responsibility for the preparation of the emperor's chrysobulls. Scholars have long assumed that the chronicle is Panaretos's only surviving work and proceeded to judge him from this composition. But we must remember that more texts survive to which Panaretos contributed than just his chronicle. From the period when he was demonstrably *protonotarios*, that is 1363–1379, we have a surprisingly large number of surviving imperial chrysobulls for foreign powers, monasteries, and even a private individual. These are summarized in chronological order below:

1364 Chrysobull in favor of Venice<sup>24</sup>

 4 Chrysobull in favor of the Soumela Monastery<sup>25</sup>

**22** SHUKUROV / KARPOV / KRYUKOV, Паһарет (as footnote 1 above) 74 (61 L); KENNEDY, Two works (as footnote 14 above) 3.

**23** SHUKUROV / KARPOV / KRYUKOV, Паһарет (as footnote 1 above) 90 (70 L); KENNEDY, Two works (as footnote 14 above) 27.

**24** D. ZAKYTHINOS, Le chrysobulle d'Alexis III Comnène, empereur de Trébizonde en faveur des Vénitiens. Paris 1932.

**25** F. MIKLOSICH / J. MÜLLER, Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi sacra et profana, V. Vienna 1887, 276–280.

1371 Chrysobull in favor of George Doranites<sup>26</sup>

1374 Chrysobull in favor of the Dionysiou Monastery on Mount Athos<sup>27</sup>

1376 Chrysobull in favor of Venice<sup>28</sup>

To this list, we can probably also add a lost chrysobull for the monastery of Saint Phokas in Kordyle, about 70 kilometers west of Trebizond. In his chronicle, Panaretos reports on Alexios III's foundation of the monastery in the 1360s, no doubt because he helped draft its foundational documents.<sup>29</sup> Panaretos also probably played an important role in drafting the Venetian chrysobull, as he was part of the embassy that requested the renewal of Venetian-Trapezuntine relations in 1363. There may even be traces of his compositional style in the document. For example, throughout his chronicle, Panaretos refers to Trebizond and Constantinople with the epithet "blessed" εὐδαίμων.<sup>30</sup> In the 1364 Venetian chrysobull, the epithet is also used for Trebizond and even extended to Venice.<sup>31</sup> It is worth noting that that a specimen of Panaretos's secretarial hand may even survive among these chrysobulls, as Dionysiou's and Soumela's original chrysobulls survive.<sup>32</sup> As Panaretos's chronicle survives only as an apograph, there is no way of knowing for sure. But it seems quite probable that Alexios III's chief secretary would have at least overseen and edited some of these documents. After all, we have a few chrysobulls and *prostagmata* composed by Nikephoros Choumnos, the head of the imperial chancery under Andronikos II Palaiologos (1282–1330), which survive in both Choumnos's collection of his works and the archives of the monasteries for which they were issued.<sup>33</sup>

Understanding Panaretos as a contributor and even composer of these documents broadens our perspective of him as an author. Scholars of Trebizond have

---

26 S. LAMPROS, Ἀνέκδοτον χρυσοβούλλον λόγον Ἀλεξίου Γ' τοῦ μεγάλου Κομνηνοῦ αὐτοκράτορος Τραπεζοῦντας, *NE* 2 (1905) 187–198; E. LOBEL, A Chrysobull of Alexios III Grand Komnenos, *BZ* 3 (1921) 140–143.

27 N. ANONIMIDÈS, Actes de Dionysiou. Paris 1968, 59–61.

28 R. PREDELLI, *Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum*, II. Venice 1899, 229–230 (136). On the date, see S.P. KARPOV, The Empire of Trebizond and Venice in 1374–75 (a chrysobull redated). Birmingham 1978.

29 SHUKUROV / KARPOV / KRYUKOV, Παναρετ (as footnote 1 above) 94 (74 L).

30 LAMPSIDES, Μιχαήλ (as footnote 1 above) 24.

31 ZAKYTHINOS, Chrysobulle (as footnote 24 above) 29 ll. 8, 31 l. 41.

32 The authenticity of Soumela's was recently proven by R. STEFEC, Die Textgeschichte des chrysobullos logos des Alexios III. Megas Komnenos für das Kloster der Muttergottes Sumela (1364). *BZ* 111 (2018) 747–776.

33 J. VERPEAUX, Nicéphore Choumnos, homme d'état et humaniste byzantin (ca. 1250/1255–1327). Paris 1959, 93–96.



labeled Panaretos as laconic and often colloquial, as he allows many Pontic expressions and grammatical phenomena to slip into his chronicle.<sup>34</sup> But the chronicler was capable of writing and understanding elevated, Byzantine bureaucratic prose. For example, the proem of Alexios III's chrysobull for Soumela eloquently argues that mankind's weapons, walls, and defenses pale in comparison with the power of the Virgin Mary. Alexios III cannot begin to describe the gifts of the Virgin or record them in a historical text (λόγω ξυγγράφειν ιστορικῶ).<sup>35</sup> The substitution of ξυγγράφειν for συγγράφειν is a nice touch testifying to the chrysobull-writer's knowledge of the Thucydidean tradition of history.<sup>36</sup> A man in Panaretos's position probably would have been well aware of the Athenian historian, as his predecessor as *protonotarios* Constantine Loukites (d. after 1336) had inherited a copy of Thucydides from the noted astronomer Gregory Chionades.<sup>37</sup> Similarly, his contemporary the metropolitan of Trebizond, Joseph Lazaropoulos (d. after 1368) shows some awareness of the historian in an oration for Saint Eugenios, writing that, "even followers of Thucydides and Demosthenes could hardly have been able to appropriately praise [the emperor Alexios II (1297–1330)]."<sup>38</sup> We also know that Thucydidean histories such as Prokopios circulated at Trebizond, as an anonymous poem in honor of perhaps Alexios I (1204–1222) or Alexios IV (1417–1429), celebrates the emperor's Roman ancestors who once humbled the proud Vandal king Geiseric (530–4).<sup>39</sup>

---

34 On the colloquial Pontic Greek used in the chronicle, see LAMPSIDES, Μιχαήλ (as footnote 1 above) 17–19.

35 MIKLOSICH / MÜLLER, Acta (as footnote 25 above) V 276.

36 E.g., Thuc. 1.1: Θουκυδίδης Ἀθηναῖος **ξυνέγραψε** τὸν πόλεμον τῶν Πελοποννησίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων ...

37 An imperfect transcription of Loukites's notice of ownership of Vat. Ottob.gr. 211 is published in E. FERON / G. COZZA-LUZI, Codices manuscripti graeci ottonboniani Bibliothecae Vaticanae. Rome 1893, 124. A correct transcription is published in R. STEFEC, Aspekte griechischer Buchproduktion in der Schwarzmeerregion. *Scripta* 7 (2014) 215.

38 J.O. ROSENQVIST, The hagiographic dossier of St. Eugenios of Trebizond in Codex Athous Dionysiou 154. Uppsala 1996, 220 l. 300.

39 A. PAPAΔOΠOYΛOΣ-KERAMEYΣ, Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας. St. Petersburg 1891, I 436 ll. 38–42. Cf. Prokopios, *Wars* 4.6–8.

## Panaretos' use of sources

Contextualizing Panaretos within his secretarial functions can thus help us better understand his chronicle. His function as imperial secretary dictated what kind of information he recorded, such as historical notes on Trebizond's relationships with its neighbors and reports on the comings and goings of ambassadors between them. It is now time to extend the scope of our investigation and discuss where he obtained his information and how he processed it as a chronicler.

The question of Panaretos's sources was first raised by Jakob Fallmerayer in the early nineteenth century,<sup>40</sup> who suggested that he derived his chronicle from murals painted on the walls of the imperial palace accompanied by brief accounts of events, as described by the cardinal Bessarion in the fifteenth century:

Ἐκ δέ γ' ἐπὶ θάτερα μήκει τε μήκιστος οἶκος καὶ κάλλει κάλλιστος παρατέταται, τοῦδαφος μὲν λευκῷ λίθῳ σύμπασις ὑπεστρωμένος, χρυσῷ δὲ τὴν ὄροφὴν καὶ ποικιλία χρωμάτων καὶ τοῖς τῆς γραφῆς καταστραπτόμενος ἄνθεσιν, ἄστρα τε προδεικνύσαν ἐν τῷ ξύμπασι εἰσὶν αὐτῆς κύτει καὶ αὐγὰς ἀποπέμπουσιν ὡς ἂν οὐρανοῦ μίμημα καὶ πολλὴν ἐπιδεικνυμένην τῆς γραφῆς περιττότητα καὶ τρυφήν· τὰ τε κύκλω καὶ πρὸς τοῖς τοίχοις αὐτοῖς γέγραπται μὲν ὁ τῶν βασιλέων χορὸς ὅσοι τε τῆς ἡμετέρας ἦρξαν ὅσοις τε προγόνοις ἐχρήσαντο, γέγραπται δὲ καὶ εἰ τινα κίνδυνον ἢ πόλις ἡμῖν περιστάντα διήνεγκε καὶ ὅσοι κατ'αὐτῆς ἐπιόντες καθ' αὐτῶν ἔγνωσαν ἐγχειρίσαντες.

On the other side as you enter there extends a building of very great length and very great beauty. Its floor is paved entirely with white marble, while its ceiling gleams with gold, a variety of colors, and masterpieces of painting. The entire vault shimmers with stars casting their light in imitation of the sky and displaying the extraordinary refinement and luxury of the painting. In a circle around the walls of the building they have had painted a procession of both the emperors who have ruled our city and of their ancestors, and there are also scenes depicting the dangers which the city has had to undergo as well as those who have attacked it, only to recognize that they were fighting a losing battle.<sup>41</sup>

While this thesis is appealing, scholars have been hesitant to accept it, preferring to imagine Panaretos like a modern researcher, who derived most of his information from Trapezuntine archival materials such as documents and regnal lists, to

<sup>40</sup> J. P. FALLMERYER, *Originalfragmente, Chroniken, Inschriften und anderes Material zur Geschichte des Kaisertums Trapezunt. Abhandlungen der Historischen Klasse der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 4 (1844/1) 9.

<sup>41</sup> O. LAMPSIDES, 'Ὁ Ἐἰς Τραπεζοῦντα' λόγος τοῦ Βησσαρίωνος. *Archeion Pontou* 39 (1984) 64. Translated in KENNEDY, *Two works* (as footnote 14 above) 197–199.

which he had access as *protonotarios*.<sup>42</sup> There is no doubt that Panaretos used archival records such as these when he wrote about near-contemporary and contemporary times (particularly after the 1330's). Below I will discuss an instance in which the chronicler may have incorporated another secretary's records. But for the period between the foundation of the empire in 1204 and the death of Alexios II in 1330, the chronicler's method of composition deserves further scrutiny. It is easy to assume that Panaretos derived most of his information in this section from imperial records, but one must wonder how useful they actually were and how much information about the empire's past they could provide. Or, to put it another way, how much information could they provide about the questions that interested Panaretos? Imperial correspondence might have aided a researcher to reconstruct the preoccupations and concerns of Trebizond's emperors. Chrysobulls and contracts could have provided dates and information on the emperors' official activity both at home and abroad. Certainly, Panaretos must have been personally familiar with these kinds of documents from his official duties. For example, he probably had a hand in drafting the emperor's chrysobull for the Soumela monastery, which had been similarly endowed by John II the Grand Komnenos (1280–1297), as the Soumela chrysobull informs us.<sup>43</sup> A copy of John's original chrysobull must have been kept in the imperial archives. But Panaretos does not mention any of John's activities such as this, even though the event must have been of some importance to him, as he visited the monastery with the emperor and would have needed to know its history while composing the emperor's chrysobull for the monastery. Events such as monastic endowments and foundations were of interest to Panaretos, as he elsewhere records Alexios III's foundation of the monastery of Saint Phokas at Kordyle.

For this early period, Panaretos does not appear to have profited from the detailed kinds of information which he could have found in the imperial archives. His record of events is sparse and often lacks much detail. For example, his entries on the reign of John II, who died only a generation before Panaretos was born, are generally non-specific after the Grand Komnenos and his wife returned to Trebizond from Constantinople:

Ἔϊτα ἐγένετο ἡ τοῦ Κομνηνοῦ κῆρ Γεωργίου ἐπιδρομὴ καὶ κατάσχεσις, ὃν καὶ Πλάνον ἔλεγον, καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἡ ἐπίθεσις καὶ τὸ βασίλειον καὶ ἡ ἐξαιφνης φυγὴ κυρᾶς Θεοδώρας τῆς Κομνηνῆς, θυγατρὸς πρώτης τοῦ μεγάλου Κομνηνοῦ κῆρ Μανουήλ ἐκ τῆς ἐξ Ἰβηρίας

<sup>42</sup> LAMPSIDES, Τινὰ (as footnote 3 above) 41–44; LAMPSIDES, Μιχαήλ (as footnote 1 above) 40–41; ASP-TALWAR, Chronicle (as footnote 3 above) 137.

<sup>43</sup> MIKLOSICH / MÜLLER, Acta (as footnote 25 above) V 278.

Ῥουσούντανας. Καὶ πάλιν ἀπεκατέστη εἰς τὸ σκαμνὶν ὁ Καλοϊωάννης ὁ Κομνηνὸς καὶ βασιλεύσας τὰ πάντα ἔτη ὀκτωκαίδεκα ἐκομήθη ἐν τοῖς Λιμνίοις μηνὶ Αὐγούστῳ εἰς τὰς ἰς', ἡμέρᾳ ς', ἰνδικτιῶνος ι'<sup>ϛ</sup>, ἔτους ςωε'.

Then the raid and capture of lord George Komnenos, whom they called the Vagabond, took place, and after him the coup, reign, and sudden flight of lady Theodora Komnene, the eldest daughter of lord Manuel the Grand Komnenos and Rusudani of Georgia. Kaloioannes Komnenos was again restored to the throne and, after reigning eighteen years in all, he passed away at Limnia on Friday, August 16, indiction 10, 6805 (1297).<sup>44</sup>

In just a matter of a few sentences, Panaretos has collapsed the reign of John II, recording a few principal events that impressed themselves on the memory of the Trapezuntines such as civil war between the Grand Komnenoi. But even though the chronicler could have obtained exact dates on when John II endowed Soumela from the emperor's chrysobull, he does not even mention the emperor's relationship with the monastery.

For the early history of Trebizond, Panaretos's most visible source of information seems to have been oral history. In a rare instance, he explicitly recognizes his oral sources by qualifying a report that the emperor John I (1235–1238) died on the polo grounds with λέγεται, 'it is said.'<sup>45</sup> But we know that he must have used oral sources for other early events such as the attack and rout of the army of Melik sultan in the second year of Andronikos Gidos's reign (1223). Panaretos's contemporary, John Lazaropoulos explicitly tells us that "we did not hear about the story from hearsay, nor was it transmitted through dreams and visions, nor was it reported by our distant ancestors: no, our kin who gave birth to us and brought us up saw with their own eyes and handed it down to us and our forefathers."<sup>46</sup> No doubt, Panaretos culled his report from similar oral traditions. But his report is brief:

Ἐν δὲ τῷ ςψλα' ἔτει, τῷ δευτέρῳ χρόνῳ τῆς τοῦ Γίδωνος βασιλείας, ἦλθεν ὁ Μελικ σουλτάν κατὰ τῆς Τραπεζοῦντος καὶ ἐχάωθησαν ὅσοι ἦσαν ἅπαντες.

In 6731 (1223), during the second year of Gidos's reign, Melik Sultan came to attack Trebizond, and nearly all his army was lost.<sup>47</sup>

**44** SHUKUROV / ΚΑΡΠΟΥ / ΚΡΥΚΟΥ, Παναρετ (as footnote 1 above) 76 (62 L); KENNEDY, Two works (as footnote 14 above) 7.

**45** SHUKUROV / ΚΑΡΠΟΥ / ΚΡΥΚΟΥ, Παναρετ (as footnote 1 above) 74 (61 L).

**46** ROSENQVIST, St. Eugenios (as footnote 38 above) 310 ll. 347–350.

**47** SHUKUROV / ΚΑΡΠΟΥ / ΚΡΥΚΟΥ, Παναρετ (as footnote 1 above) 74 (61 L); KENNEDY, Two works (as footnote 14 above) 3.

Panaretos's report no doubt contains things that could have been easily remembered in the oral tradition, such as the year in which the army was destroyed (the second of Gidos's reign) and the destruction of the army of Melik sultan.<sup>48</sup>

Nonetheless, as a user of oral traditions, it is worth noting that Panaretos exercised a level of judgement over how much and what he recorded. Take for example his report on the defeat of Melik sultan. At 4779 words, Lazaropoulos's narrative of the defeat of Melik sultan is five-sixths the length of Panaretos's entire chronicle (5999 words). Panaretos dispenses with the event in just twenty-three words. Panaretos seems to have been interested only in the meat of historical events which could potentially be useful. He has much lengthier entries on treaties and wars later in the chronicle, but even though the defeat of Melik sultan resulted in a treaty between the Seljuq sultan and the emperor of Trebizond, the Seljuq state was now defunct. Knowledge of this event and the resulting treaties probably would have done him little good in negotiations with the empire's immediate Turkish neighbors.<sup>49</sup>

One suspects that another factor in Panaretos's selection of events was a certain disdain for the mythical, which he may have acquired from reading historical texts such as Thucydides. For example, John Lazaropoulos reports a tale about the emperor Alexios II slaying a serpent that was harassing his subjects who lived around Mount Mithrion near the city. The tale was tied to a supposed serpent's skull kept at the imperial palace, and published more widely by Lazaropoulos in an oration in honor of Saint Eugenios.<sup>50</sup> In its essential outlines, the tale is conventional, as heroic figures from the god Apollo to Saint George had slain serpents.<sup>51</sup> In later Trapezuntine folklore, Alexios I (1204–1222) would become the slayer of the serpent.<sup>52</sup> But even though this tale was circulating at the imperial court, Panaretos omitted it from his brief account of the reign

---

**48** For a recent study of the event, see A. PEACOCK, The Saljuq campaign against the Crimea and the expansionist policy of the early reign of "Alā" al-Dīn Kayqubād. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 16 (2006) 133–149. The identity of Melik sultan is much debated. For a discussion of the various proposed candidates, see ΣΑΡΡΗΣ, Ιστορία (as footnote 3 above) 59 note 87.

**49** Other treaties: SHUKUROV / КАРОВ  YUKOV, Παναρετ (as footnote 1 above) 98 (74–75 L), 106 (78–9 L).

**50** ROSENQVIST, St. Eugenios (as footnote 38 above) 220 l. 302–228 l. 481. For the skull being kept in the imperial palace, see 254 l. 357–358.

**51** D. OGDEN, *Drakōn: dragon myth and serpent cult in the Greek and Roman worlds*. Oxford 2013.

**52** P. ΜΕΤΑΧΟΡΟΥΛΟΣ, Ἡ Θεία καὶ Ἱερά Ἀκολουθία τῶν ὁσίων καὶ θεοφόρων Πατέρων ἡμῶν Βαρνάβα καὶ Σωφρονίου τῶν ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν, καὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ Χριστοφόρου, τῶν ἐν Μελά Ὅρει ἀσκησάντων ... συντεθεισα καὶ ἡ ἐν συνόψει ἱστορία τοῦ βασιλείου τῆς. Leipzig 1775, 39; H. LYNCH, *Armenia, travels and studies*. London 1901, I 22.

of Alexios II, perhaps because it lacked credibility or belonged to a different genre.

When Panaretos confronted oral material, he thus exercised a measure of judgement in deciding what to include. But he occasionally came upon conflicting information. His entries on the death of John I Axouchos and the succession of his brother Manuel I the Grand Komnenos are one such example:

Ὅς καὶ βασιλεύσας ἕτη ἕξ ἑκομήθη ἔτους ἑξακισχίλια ἑπτακόσια τεσσαράκοντα ἕξ. Λέγεται δὲ ὅτι ἐν τῷ τζυκανιστηρίῳ παίζων ἐκρημνίσθη καὶ σπαραχθεὶς ἀπέθανε.

Ἀπεκάρη γοῦν κατὰ μοναχοῦς Ἰωαννίκιος καὶ διεδέξατο τὴν βασιλείαν ὁ δεύτερος ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ, κύρ Μανουὴλ ὁ μέγας Κομνηνός, ὁ στρατηγικώτατος ἅμα καὶ εὐτυχέστατος, τῷ αὐτῷ ᾠψιμς' ἔτει.

After reigning for six years, he [John I Axouchos] died in the year 1238. It is said that he was playing polo in the polo grounds when he fell and died after being severely injured.

Ioannikios was then tonsured as a monk and his younger brother, lord Manuel I the Grand Komnenos, who was the greatest and most successful general, succeeded to the imperial office in that same year, 6746 (1238).<sup>53</sup>

There are two major problems here. The first is chronological. After reporting that the emperor Andronikos Gidos (1222–1235) died in 1235 directly before these entries, it is problematic that his successor Axouchos ruled six years and died in 1238. As Panaretos's counting of regnal years does not include the years in which an emperor was co-ruler, the chronicler seems to have found conflicting information about the length of John's rule and left the matter unresolved. I assume that John's reign of six years is not a scribal error because ἕξ is written out in the manuscript, and thus unlikely to have been a corrupted numeral. Scholars have generally followed Panaretos's preferred solution that John died in 1238, although he could be wrong. But it is worth noting here what looks like confusion caused by a regnal list used in the first entry and a more precise accession notice in the second entry.

The second problem in the text is the confusing death of John Axouchos on the polo field and the monastic retirement of Ioannikios. Who is Ioannikios? A scholarly tradition dating back to the first modern historian of Trebizond, Jakob Fallmerayer, holds that that he was the son of John, who was forced into a monastery, so that his uncle could take the throne.<sup>54</sup> Since the chronicle

<sup>53</sup> SHUKUROV / КАРПОВ / КРЫКОВ, *Παναρετ* (as footnote 1 above) 74 (61 L).

<sup>54</sup> J.P. FALLMERAYER, *Geschichte des Kaiserthums von Trapezunt*. Munich 1827, 102; G. FINLAY, *The history of Greece from its conquest by the Crusaders to its conquest by the Turks, and of the Empire of Trebizond, 1204–1461*. Edinburgh 1851, 392. W. MILLER, *Trebizond:*

implies that Ioannikios was Manuel's brother, Rustam Shukurov has suggested that Ioannikios was actually a brother of Manuel and John Axouchos.<sup>55</sup> Finally, Nikolaos Oikonomides proposed that Ioannikios was the monastic name of John Axouchos. As Byzantines usually took monastic names beginning with the same letter as their baptismal name, John had retired to a monastery and died shortly after from his crippling injuries.<sup>56</sup> I favor Oikonomides's solution and would suggest that the problem derives from the conjunction of two separate sources. For his information on the gruesome death of John Axouchos, Panaretos clearly derived his information from oral memories (λέγεται) associated with the polo field in Trebizond. Oral tales exaggerate events in transmission. For example, the emperor George Komnenos (1266–1280) was betrayed by his officials and handed over to his Mongol overlord Abaqa in 1280.<sup>57</sup> Contemporary Armenian sources tell us that Abaqa had the emperor executed, but Panaretos reports that he survived and later attacked Trebizond hoping to retake his throne.<sup>58</sup> Imprisonment became execution in the retelling, and in Axouchos's case a crippling fall became immediate death. But Panaretos reported the oral tale anyway, even though he had information that the emperor John retired to a monastery. As with the dating issue, he made no effort to resolve the inconsistencies in his text.

Oral memories were important sources of information for Panaretos. Although scholars have generally disregarded Fallmerayer's suggestion that Panaretos derived some of his chronicle from the murals of imperial palace, one must admit that memories and stories associated with the depicted events were quite possibly among Panaretos' sources. There may also have existed palace chronicle(s) along the lines of the short chronicles or marginalia, recording the deaths of the emperors and an occasional event. But it is also possible that Panaretos did some research to reconstruct the early years of the empire. Given the brevity of some entries that record little more than the accession and death of an emperor (e.g., the death of John Axouchos), Panaretos possibly obtained his information from visiting the tombs of the emperors and reading their funerary epitaphs. The tombs of Trebizond's emperors were conveniently located near the imperial palace in the churches of the Virgin Chrysokephalos and the Theoske-

---

the last Greek empire of the Byzantine era, 1204–1461. New York 1926, 25; É. JANSSENS, *Trebizonde en Colchide*. Brussels 1969, 80.

55 SHUKUROV, *Великие Комнины* (as footnote 3 above) 102–104.

56 N. OIKONOMIDES, *Αἱ χρονολογίαι εἰς τὸ χρονικὸν Μιχαήλ τοῦ Παναρέτου*. *Neon Athenaiion* 2 (1957) 72–73.

57 On the event, see A. BRYER, *The Fate of George Komnenos, Ruler of Trebizond (1266–1280)*. *BZ* 66 (1973) 332–350.

58 A. GALSTYAN, *Армянские Источники о Монголах: Исвлечения из рукописей*. Moscow 1962, 29, 83. Cf. SHUKUROV / КАРОВ / КРЫУКОВ, *Панарет* (as footnote 1 above) 76 (62 L).

pastos Monastery as well as possibly a small chapel inside the imperial palace complex where Alexios I and Alexios II were buried.<sup>59</sup> No Byzantine imperial epitaphs survive *in situ*, but we know that some of the short chroniclers visited the tombs of the emperors for research purposes, as Phillip Grierson has shown.<sup>60</sup> If Panaretos was using the tombs of Trebizond's early emperors as a source, this may well explain a curious anecdote he includes about the body of John II after he died at Limnia, the empire's westernmost stronghold:

Ἐπεὶ καὶ ζῶν ἔτι, ἐκομίσθη τὸ λείψανον αὐτοῦ ἐν Τραπεζοῦντι καὶ ἐτάφη ἐν τῷ ναῷ τῆς Χρυσοκεφάλου.

While he was still warm, his remains were brought to Trebizond and buried in the church of the Virgin Chrysokephalos.<sup>61</sup>

How the emperor's body could have stayed warm for a journey of some 300 kilometers from Limnia to Trebizond is unknown. Scholars have noted this potential problem in the text and suggested reading ὄων 'uncorrupted, fresh' instead of ζῶν 'warm.'<sup>62</sup> But regardless of which reading scholars prefer, a miraculous tale of the emperor's body arriving uncorrupted or still warm after a long journey from Limnia is exactly the kind of lore Panaretos might have learned after inquiring about the emperor's tomb. Funerary epitaphs also could have provided Panaretos with some of the epithets that he bestows on Trebizond's emperors. For example, he calls Manuel I "the greatest general" and "the most fortunate" (ὁ

---

**59** On the tombs of the emperors of Trebizond, see BRYER / WINFIELD, *Byzantine monuments* (as footnote 5 above) I 201. F. USPENSKY, *Очерки из истории Трапезунтской империи*. Saint Petersburg 1929, 38–43, suggests that an inscription he found in a chapel in the imperial palace complex may suggest this was the burial place of Alexios I. BRYER / WINFIELD, *Byzantine monuments* (as footnote 5 above) vol. 1, 184, is cautious. But if true, we know Alexios II was laid in the same tomb as Alexios I from a contemporary funeral oration by Constantine Loukites: ΠΑΠΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ-ΚΕΡΑΜΕΥΣ, *Ἀνάλεκτα* (as footnote 39 above) I 425.

**60** P. GRIERSON, *The tombs and obits of the Byzantine Emperors (337–1042); With an Additional Note*. *DOP* 16 (1962) 1–63.

**61** SHUKUROV / ΚΑΡΠΟΥ / ΚΡΥΚΟΥΚ, *Παναρετ* (as footnote 1 above) 78 (63 L); KENNEDY, *Two works* (as footnote 14 above) 7. Shukurov and Karpov (p. 129) argue in favor of altering the text, so that the problematic phrase ἐπεὶ καὶ ζῶν ἔτι is appended to the previous sentence. However, the manuscript here is clearly punctuated: ἐπεὶ καὶ ζῶν ἔτι, ἐκομίσθη etc. For a facsimile, see SHUKUROV / ΚΑΡΠΟΥ / ΚΡΥΚΟΥΚ, *Παναρετ* (as footnote 1 above) 24.

**62** SHUKUROV / ΚΑΡΠΟΥ / ΚΡΥΚΟΥΚ, *Παναρετ* (as footnote 1 above) 74 (61 L); FALLMERAYER, *Originalfragmente* (as footnote 40 above) 14; LAMPROS, *Τὸ Τραπεζοῦντιακόν* (as footnote 9 above) 268; ASP-TALWAR, *Chronicle* (as footnote 3 above) 190 note 80. For an interpretation in favor of reading ζῶν in light of the medical phenomenon known as post-mortem caloricity, see KENNEDY, *Two works* (as footnote 14 above) 228–229.



στρατηγικώτατος ἄμα καὶ εὐτυχέστατος), noting that he ruled well and in a God-pleasing manner (καλῶς καὶ θεαρέστως).<sup>63</sup>

While Panaretos's researches into Trebizond's early years required him to collate multiple sources of information, as he drew closer to his own times the chronicler supplemented his account with information from more recent written sources, particularly for the period of the civil wars. One possible indication of this method of composition is the bewildering use of ethnonyms for the Genoese in the text. The chronicle is relatively consistent in its use of ethnonyms, employing the usual Byzantine range. The Trapezuntines are Romans or Christians.<sup>64</sup> The Turks are Turks, Hagarenes, or Muslims.<sup>65</sup> The Georgians are Georgians and Abasgians.<sup>66</sup> The Venetians are only Venetians.<sup>67</sup> However, the chronicler employs five different ethnonyms for the Genoese. They are called Λατῖνοι, Φράγκοι, Γενουῖται, Γενουβίσοι, and Ἴανουαίοι.<sup>68</sup> While the first three usages are normal and demand no explanation, the latter two are unusual. Γενουβίσοι, a calque on the Italian *genovese*, is relatively rare among Byzantine authors. During the late Byzantine period, it generally appears in texts only where the writer in question has been exposed to the West and to Italian. For example, it appears in several letters by Demetrios Kydones, who studied at Rome, and in the chronicle of the Morea.<sup>69</sup> More interesting is the highly unusual ethnonym Ἴανουαίοι, which derives from the Latin name for Genoa (Ianua). For all that they delighted in using archaicizing and erudite terms for foreigners, the Byzantines never used the city's Latin name, with two exceptions.<sup>70</sup> The first is Manuel Holobolos' panegyric of Michael VIII Palaiologos, who refers to the city as Ἴάνουα to show off his knowledge of Latin when he connects it with the Roman

**63** SHUKUROV / KAPPOV / KRYUKOV, Παναρετ (as footnote 1 above) 74 (61 L).

**64** Ibid. 82, 92, 104, 106 (66, 71, 77–78, 79 L, respectively).

**65** Ibid. 76, 78, 82, 84, 92, 96, 98, 102, 106 (63, 64, 66, 67, 71–72, 73, 75, 77, 78 L, respectively).

**66** Ibid. 102 (76 L).

**67** Ibid. 86 (68 L), 90 (70 L).

**68** Ibid. 78 (Λατῖνοι); 84, 86 (Φράγκοι); 84, 98 (Γενουῖται); 90 (Γενουβίσοι); 86 (Ἴανουαίοι); LAMPSIDES, Μιχαήλ (as footnote 1 above) 63 (Λατῖνοι); 67, 68 (Φράγκοι); 67, 74 (Γενουῖται); 70 (Γενουβίσοι); 68 (Ἴανουαίοι).

**69** R.J. LOENERTZ, Démétrius Cydonès, Correspondance. Città del Vaticano 1960, letter 167.20–2; 197.17; 418.10; J. SCHMITT, The Chronicle of Morea: A history in political verse, relating the establishment of feudalism in Greece by the Franks in the thirteenth century. London 1904, Recension P: l. 9107, 9133; Recension H: l. 8786, 9107, 9127, 9133, 9139, 9166, 9188, 9190, 9204; D. BALFOUR, Politico-historical works of Symeon, Archbishop of Thessalonica (1416/17 to 1429). WBS, 13. Vienna 1979, 58.

**70** H. DITTEN, Die Namen für Venedig und Genua bei den letzten byzantinische Geschichtsschreibern (15. Jahrhundert). *Helikon* 6 (1966) 51–70.

god Ianus.<sup>71</sup> The second is Laonikos Chalkokondyles, who transliterates the Latin name as Ἰανύη and transforms it into the ethnonym Ἰανύιοι throughout his *Histories*.<sup>72</sup> But what is noteworthy is that both of these authors knew Latin and chose to use it for literary purposes.<sup>73</sup> Their usage was not common among Byzantines. In Panaretos, then, the term seems heavily out of place in the text's créole of Greek, which often lapses into colloquial expressions.<sup>74</sup> Panaretos uses the term Γενουίται in the entry in which he introduces himself as the author of the chronicle and subsequently throughout the work.<sup>75</sup> This is only to be expected, given his position at the Byzantine court as *protonotarios*. Γενουίται was preferred term for the Genoese in the Byzantine chancery. For example, the surviving 1364 Greek chrysobull for Venice, which Panaretos no doubt helped draft, uses the term throughout.<sup>76</sup>

Thus, it is strange that the chronicle uses so many Western appellations for the Genoese. It is possible that Panaretos knew Latin. Perhaps that is why Alexios III sent him to Constantinople tasked with the mission of reestablishing connections between Venice and Trebizond in 1363. However, Γενουβίσοι and Ἰανουαίοι appear only in early, isolated entries, where the author does not disclose his involvement:

Τῷ αὐτῷ ἔσωνς', ἐν μηνὶ Ἰανουαρίῳ, ἐπιήσθη ἡ Κερασσοῦς καὶ αἰχμαλωτίσθη καὶ ἐπυρπολήθη παρὰ Ἰανουαίων.

Τῷ αὐτῷ μηνὶ καὶ ἔτει ἦλθαν τὰ Βενέτικα τὰ κάτεργα κατὰ τῶν Γενουβίσων καὶ ἔκαυσαν καράβια πολλὰ.

In January 6856 (1348), Kerasous was taken, enslaved, and burned by the Genoese.

In that same month and year (August 1351), Venetian galleys came here to attack the Genoese and burned many light boats.<sup>77</sup>

71 X. SIDERIDES, Μανουήλ Ὀλοβώλου Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν αὐτοκράτορα Μιχαήλ Η' τὸν Παλαιολόγον. *EEBS* 3 (1926) 186.

72 J. DARKÓ, *Laonici Chalcocondylae historiarum demonstrationes*. Budapest 1922, I 80, calls Genoa the gate of France, thus demonstrating Laonikos's knowledge of the city's Latin name.

73 For Laonikos's knowledge of Latin, see the testimony of Cyriaco d'Ancona: E. BODNAR / C. FOSS, *Cyriac of Ancona: later travels*. Cambridge, MA 2003, 298.

74 On the colloquial Pontic Greek used in the chronicle, see LAMPSIDES, Μιχαήλ (as footnote 1 above) 17–9.

75 SHUKUROV / KAPPOV / KRYUKOV, Παναρετ (as footnote 1 above) 98 (74 L).

76 ΖΑΚΥΘΙΝΟΣ, Chrysobulle (as footnote 24 above) 30, 32, 34.

77 SHUKUROV / KAPPOV / KRYUKOV, Παναρετ (as footnote 1 above) 86 (68 L), 90 (70 L); KENNEDY, Two works (as footnote 14 above) 21, 27.

Given the nature of these entries, it is possible that he took them over from a source, possibly from the emperor's Latin secretary.

With regard to contemporary events that Panaretos records, his record of events occurring throughout the empire is somewhat limited. Obviously, his view of the empire is mostly limited to Trebizond and the provinces immediately surrounding the city. He occasionally notes external events such as the deaths of the Byzantine emperors Michael VIII and Andronikos III,<sup>78</sup> but his information is usually somehow linked to either Alexios III or Trebizond. For example, the people of Matzouka, an administrative district encompassing the modern Maçka and the Soumela monastery, slaughtered the invading emir of Bayburt and his troops on their own initiative in 1363. They then marched throughout Trebizond displaying the heads of their foes. Panaretos learned of this event because he probably witnessed the Matzoukan parade, which was also commemorated in two poems by Andreas Libadenos.<sup>79</sup> But the chronicler's vision did extend south to Chaldia along the profitable caravan roads. For example, he records the fall and reconquest of towns along the caravan routes such as Golacha and Cheriana.<sup>80</sup>

Panaretos is somewhat nearsighted for events that transpired beyond the immediate hinterland of Trebizond and caravan routes. For example, Lazia and the Greek cities near the empire's border with Georgia are almost completely ignored unless Alexios III passed through them. But they were important enough to Trapezuntines. In Panaretos's lifetime, the region would produce a rebel movement that unseated the usurper Eirene Palaiologina and enthroned the empress Anna, the daughter of Alexios II.<sup>81</sup> A few decades after Panaretos, the Trapezuntine-

---

**78** SHUKUROV / ΚΑΡΡΟV / ΚΡΥΚΟV, Παναρετ (as footnote 1 above) 76 (62 L), 82 (66 L).

**79** Ibid. 96 (73 L); O. LAMPSIDES, *Ἀνδρέου Λιβαδηνοῦ βίος καὶ ἔργα*. Athens 1975, 105–112. On Libadenos, see M. HINTERBERGER, *Autobiographische Traditionen in Byzanz*. WBS, 22. Vienna 1999, 290–294; J. DIMITROUKAS, *Andreas Libadenos' travel to Egypt and Palestine and its description: 1325 or 1326*, in J.P. Monferrer Sala / V. Christides / T. Papadopoulos (eds.), *East and West. Essays on Byzantine and Arab worlds*. Piscataway, NJ 2009, 277–284; M. HINTERBERGER, *Ο Ανδρέας Λιβαδηνός, συγγραφέας/γραφέας λογίων κειμένων, αναγνώστης/γραφέας δημωδών κειμένων: ο ελληνικός κώδικας 525 του Μονάχου*, in D. Holton et al. (eds.), *Κωδικογράφοι, συλλέκτες, διασκευαστές και εκδότες. Χειρόγραφα και εκδόσεις της όψιμης βυζαντινής και πρώιμης νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας. Πρακτικά Συνεδρίου που πραγματοποιήθηκε στο Ινστιτούτο της Δανίας στην Αθήνα, 23–26 Μαΐου 2002, προς τιμήν των Hans Eideneier και Arnold van Gemert*. Herakleion 2005, 25–42; A. ASP-TALWAR, *Bad luck and divine protection – religion and biography in the Periegesis by Andrew Libadenos*, in M. Mitre (ed.), *Tradition and transformation. Dissent and consent in the Mediterranean*. Kiel 2016, 163–182.

**80** SHUKUROV / ΚΑΡΡΟV / ΚΡΥΚΟV, Παναρετ (as footnote 1 above) 92, 102 (Cheriana); 96, 102, 104 (Golacha); LAMPSIDES, *Μιχαήλ* (as footnote 1 above) 71, 77 (Cheriana); 74, 77, 78 (Golacha).

**81** Ibid. 82 (66 L).

born cardinal Bessarion would proclaim in his encomium of Trebizond that Lazia had been ruled by Trebizond ‘without blemish’ (καθαρῶς) since antiquity and would report the military accomplishments of the Laz kingdom under Justinian, as if they were in fact Trapezuntine exploits.<sup>82</sup> Nor was Lazia a cultural wasteland. Under the Grand Komnenoi, it was possible to buy from a Laz priest a copy of sophisticated literary works, including an invective against the monody genre.<sup>83</sup> Limnia at the extreme west of the empire is similarly problematic. The emperor Alexios III visited the town on numerous occasions, chasing off encroaching Turkman tribes.<sup>84</sup> But even though the town fell to the Turkmen sometime between 1369 and 1379, we hear nothing of this event even though Alexios III clearly valued the town’s strategic position highly enough that he was willing to trade his own daughter for the town in 1379 with the Turkish emir Tacedin.<sup>85</sup>

In sum, Panaretos was not just an imperial bureaucrat sifting through the imperial archives like a modern historian. There is certainly some truth to this picture, particularly with regard to events that transpired during Panaretos’s lifetime. But when handling the distant past, Panaretos seems to have faced a distinct lack of material and tried to fill the gaps through a combination of oral tradition and research. In carrying out this project, he exercised some level of judgment, concisely presenting events lengthily exposed elsewhere such as Melik sultan’s siege of Trebizond, or completely omitting more mythical material such as the story of Alexios II and the dragon. From this examination, we can see Panaretos as a researcher and a critic of the past who probably worked without very detailed sources for the distant past of Trebizond. We presume that the empire of Trebizond kept longstanding archives from which the historian could have reconstructed the past, but one must wonder how well-preserved the palace archives were. This is not to say that the empire kept bad records, but let us remember that fires destroyed Trebizond on multiple occasions (1243, 1302, 1341)

---

**82** KENNEDY, Two works (as footnote 14 above) 264–265. This same stance was independently adopted by ΜΕΤΑΧΟΡΟΥΛΟΣ, Ἀκολουθία (as footnote 52 above) 37.


**83** A. SIDERAS, Eine byzantinische Invective gegen die Verfasser von Grabreden. Ἀωνόμου μονωδία εἰς μονωδοῦντας. *WBS*, 23. Vienna 2002, 12, records a copy of a buyer’s note that he/she acquired our sole manuscript of this work (Paris, Suppl. gr. 1284) from a Laz priest in Lazia with the emperor Alexios. As the manuscript most likely dates from the fourteenth century (see the review of Sideras by Niels Gaul, *BZ* 100, 2007, 257–261), the emperor Alexios mentioned here is likely to be Alexios III (1349–90) or Alexios IV (1417–1426).

**84** SHUKUROV / ΚΑΡΠΟΒ / ΚΡΥΥΚΟΒ, Παναρετ (as footnote 1 above) 92, 96, 106 (72, 73, 79 L, respectively).

**85** *Ibid.* 106 (79 L).

and thus might have destroyed earlier archival records, leaving Panaretos without the raw material that he needed.<sup>86</sup>

## Panaretos and the regime of Alexios III

Whether consciously or not, every historian selects and creates stories by what he chooses to include and exclude. This process is perhaps most evident in Panaretos's portrayal of his master Alexios III. Through his selection of material, Panaretos generally crafts a positive picture of his lord, who is shown to exhibit many of the virtues of a successful Roman emperor.<sup>87</sup> For example, Panaretos repeatedly shows the diligence of his master. After a trip to the Georgian frontier to celebrate the marriage of his daughter Anna to the Georgian king Bagrat V (1360–93), Panaretos tell us that the emperor immediately (παρενθὺς) left to patrol the summer pastures of his empire.<sup>88</sup> Sometimes his reports showing the emperor's diligence can be rather mundane, such as the emperor's patrol of the summer pastures in the Pontic Alps during 1357, even though this action did not produce tangible results, such as the capture or slaughter of Turkish tribesmen.<sup>89</sup> Other patrols reported by Panaretos include this element and are no doubt included to demonstrate the emperor's courage and manliness in combat, such as the patrol of 1370, during which the emperor routed a Turkish army of 800 men despite being outnumbered 8:1. As Panaretos writes, "they suddenly encountered some five hundred Turkish cavalrymen and three hundred infantrymen. There were about a hundred cavalrymen surrounding the emperor. This was the situation when the emperor joined battle with them, decisively overpowered them, and chased them away. He sent back here the heads of the Hagarenes and their battle standard."<sup>90</sup> ●  **Should this passage be formatted as a quote with the Greek text added?** ●

Panaretos's portrayal of Alexios also demonstrates his master's magnanimity toward his political enemies. Consider his relationship with his minister Niketas Scholaris. Scholaris had served as a kingmaker during the civil war of 1340–1355, regularly replacing emperors with candidates whom he believed he could control. Alexios III was one such candidate, having been summoned

<sup>86</sup> Ibid. 74 (62 L), 78 (63 L), 82 (66 L), respectively.

<sup>87</sup> On Byzantine ideals of imperial rulership during this period, see D. ANGELOV, *Imperial ideology and political thought in Byzantium (1204–1330)*. Cambridge 2007, 78–115.

<sup>88</sup> SHUKUROV / KARPOV / KRYUKOV, *Παναρετ* (as footnote 1 above) 102 (76 L).

<sup>89</sup> Ibid. 94 (72).

<sup>90</sup> Ibid., 102 (77 L).

from exile and placed on the imperial throne at the age of eleven. When the teenage emperor and his supporters proved less malleable than the kingmaker had hoped, Scholaris fled Trebizond for the nearby city of Kerasous, where he and his supporters held out until Alexios III attacked them and drove them to the mountain fortress of Kechrina. After a short siege, the emperor and Scholaris reconciled, and Scholaris resumed his position. When Scholaris died six years later in 1361, Panaretos tells us that “the emperor greatly mourned his passing at that time and led his funeral procession, wearing white for mourning as is the custom for rulers.”<sup>91</sup>

Panaretos thus conveys the impression that Alexios could show magnanimity toward even one of his bitterest political enemies. His treatment of the rebels contrasts starkly with the brutality shown to other rebels during the Trapezuntine civil war, who were often executed, as Panaretos reports earlier in the text.<sup>92</sup> But it is worth pointing out that Alexios’s magnanimity may not have been all that genuine. Within two years of his father’s death, George Scholaris would launch a coup against the emperor with the powerful Kabazitai family and the metropolitan of Trebizond Nephon Pterygionites.<sup>93</sup> The coup failed, but Panaretos’s chronicle appears to obscure our view of Alexios’s relationship with his councilors. In the early years of his reign, this relationship was probably quite toxic. Explaining why his friend Niketas Scholaris departed for Kerasous and refused to return to Trebizond, Andreas Libadenos reports that “frequent messages and ambassadors passed between the rulers and our companions (ἑταρείαν), bidding us to hastily return to Trebizond. But they put off their return, alleging on legitimate grounds (ἐνδίκους λόγους) that they feared for their safety and lives, as the rulers had been filled by a fiery and not ill-suited rage. It had already been stoked by some of their opponents. But this just added more fuel to the flames and caused it to jump into the air.”<sup>94</sup> The emperor’s rage was apparently indomitable, and from this period we possess one of the boldest works ever addressed to a reigning Roman emperor, by the imperial *protonotarios* Stephanos Sgouropoulos.<sup>95</sup> Addressing Alexios in an admonitory

---

91 Ibid.

92 E.g. *ibid.* 82 (65–66 L).

93 *Ibid.* 98 (75 L).

94 LAMPSIDES, Ἀνδρέου Λιβαδηνοῦ (as footnote 79 above) 74.

95 There is some debate concerning when Sgouropoulos lived, as noted by SABBIDES, *Ιστορία* (as footnote 3 above) 201–202. ASP-TALWAR, *Chronicle* (as footnote 3 above) 176, prefers to see him as a courtier of Alexios III, while ШУКУРОВ, *Великие Комнины* 25, prefers to see him as the *protonotarios* of Alexios II (1298–1330). I favor identifying Sgouropoulos as a courtier of Alexios III, as Constantine Loukites seems to have occupied the position of *protonotarios* for al-

poem, Sgouropoulos gloats that when he himself dies, which he expects to be soon, he will stand by Christ when Alexios faces judgment and accuse the emperor “like a beast wildly jumping, a wolf gnashing its teeth” for all his misdeeds, which included anger, listening to bad councilors, and showing Sgouropoulos no generosity.<sup>96</sup>

While Sgouropoulos might howl at the wickedness and impieties of Alexios, Panaretos, who was perhaps Sgouropoulos’s (more amenable) replacement, details the emperor’s piety. Entries such as that concerning the emperor’s establishment of the monastery of Saint Phokas in Kordyle (mentioned above) show his benevolence toward the Church. Panaretos’s discussion of an eclipse in 1361 similarly shows the emperor’s piety in a moment of potential crisis. Eclipses induced panic in the people of Trebizond, who took to streets and threw rocks at Alexios’s father, the unpopular emperor Basil Komnenos (1332–1340), in 1337.<sup>97</sup> But as Panaretos notes, Alexios and his court “opportunistically found ourselves at the Soumela monastery of the Virgin Mary in Matzouka and we made many supplications and prayers at that time.”<sup>98</sup> While other emperors might disregard these celestial manifestations of divine will, Alexios showed a healthy respect for the will of God. But Panaretos does not fail to show that Alexios, like any good Roman emperor worth his salt, also received the obeisance of inferior peoples, whether those people were the Turks “who escorted us as if they were our slaves” or the Gurieli of Georgia.<sup>99</sup> Even though his master was the emperor of a small enclave of the Roman world, the chronicler generally paints the Trapezuntine emperor as a typically good Roman emperor for posterity.

But for all the admiration that Panaretos shows Alexios, he does not completely ignore the failures of the regime he served. A Turkish raid on the Matzou-

---

most the entirety of Alexios II’s reign. We know from a letter of Gregory Chionades that he held the title in 1301 when Alexios II attacked Kerasous: J.B. ΠΑΠΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, Γρηγορίου Χιονιάδου τοῦ ἀστρονόμου ἐπιστολαί. *Epistemonike Epeteris Philosophikes Scholes* 1 (1927) 141–204: 195–197. He held the same title when Alexios II died in 1330 per the manuscript in which Loukites’s funeral oration for the emperor survives: ΠΑΠΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ-ΚΕΡΑΜΕΥΣ, Ἀνάλεκτα (as footnote 39 above) I 421. Finally, he appears to have held the same title under Alexios II’s son Basil (1332–1340), as the anonymous writer of a horoscope for the year 1336 refers to him as *prototonarios* and *protovestarios*: R. MERCIER, An almanac for Trebizond for the year 1336. *Corpus des astronomes byzantins*, 7. Louvain-la-Neuve 1994, 23–24. If Loukites occupied the position for some 30–40 years, it seems improbable that Sgouropoulos could have held the same position under Alexios II.

<sup>96</sup> Τ. ΠΑΡΑΘΕΟΔΩΡΙΔΗΣ, Ἀνέκδοτοι στίχοι Στεφάνου τοῦ Σγουροπούλου. *Archeion Pontou* 19 (1954) 262–282: 273.

<sup>97</sup> ШУКУРОВ / KARPOV / KRYUKOV, Παναρετ (as footnote 1 above) 80 (65).

<sup>98</sup> Ibid. 94 (73 L).

<sup>99</sup> Ibid. 96 (73 L), 104 (77 L).

ka region south of Trebizond is blamed on “our neglect in guarding it.”<sup>100</sup> The chronicler thus lays full blame on his own regime for its defensive failures. Similarly, his admiration for his emperor was to some degree tempered by an appreciation of his master’s failures. When describing a campaign against the Çepni Turks who had occupied the Philabonites (Harşit) river valley in 1380, Panaretos reports that Alexios divided his army into two parts. He led one section north deep into the Pontic Alps before turning back and reaching the beach near Sthlabopiastes where he was supposed to wait and rendezvous with the other army. But the emperor did not wait, much to the dismay of the second contingent. According to Panaretos:

Οἱ δὲ χ', οἱ ἀπελθόντες ἀπὸ τὸ Πέτρωμαν, ἐκούρσευσαν εἰς τὸ Κοτζαυτᾶ καὶ ἐποίησαν σφαγὴν καὶ κοῦρσον καὶ πυρκαϊᾶν πολλήν· καταβαίνοντες δὲ μετὰ πολέμου, ὁσάκις ἐποίουν καὶ συμπλοκὴν μετὰ τῶν διωκόντων Τούρκων, πολλοὶ ἔπιπτον ἐκ τῶν Τούρκων. Οἱ δὲ Ῥωμαῖοι ἐλπίζοντες τὸν βασιλέα εἰς τὸν αἰγιαλόν, ἰσχυρὰ πολεμοῦντες καὶ κτείνοντες ἤρχοντο. Περὶ δὲ τὸν αἰγιαλὸν τοῦ Σθλαβοπιᾶστου γενόμενοι, ὡς οὐχ εὔρον τὸν βασιλέα, ὡς ἐσυνεφώνησαν, μικρὸν πρὸς τροπὴν βλέψαντες ἔπεσον ὡσεὶ μβ' Ῥωμαῖοι.

Meanwhile, the six hundred who had set out from Petroman plundered as far as Kotzauta. They engaged in much slaughter, plundering, and burning. Whenever they engaged in combat with the Turks who were pursuing them as they fought their way down, many Turks fell. The Romans, who were hoping to find the emperor at the shore, were fighting fiercely and killing as they went, but when they came close to the beach of Sthlabopiastes and did not find the emperor there as they had arranged, they were more inclined to flee, and as many as forty-two Romans fell.<sup>101</sup>

While the chronicler does not explicitly attack his master for his failure to follow the prearranged plan, he also does not omit the failure. Throughout his chronicle, Panaretos creates a favorable image of his master as a good Roman emperor, but when the regime’s or the emperor’s failures were egregious, the chronicler lets the facts speak for themselves and avoids infusing his chronicle with passionate interjections.

## Panaretos and the other

With regard to foreigners, Panaretos generally avoids explicit negative stereotyping. His image of Christian peoples is generally positive. The Georgians are the most highly regarded in the chronicle. Panaretos speaks admiringly of the mar-

<sup>100</sup> Ibid. 94 (72 L).

<sup>101</sup> Ibid. 106–108 (79 L).



vels of Tbilisi and calls the emperor's son-in-law Bagrat V the 'greatest general', an epithet elsewhere bestowed only upon Manuel I the Grand Komnenos (1238–1263), whom the chronicler like other Trapezuntines regarded as one of Trebizond's greatest emperors.<sup>102</sup> The Venetians hardly ever appear in the chronicle, except in reference to their galleys which were hired out by various claimants to the Trapezuntine throne during the civil war (1340–1355). The Genoese appear more frequently, as they engaged in more belligerent activities toward the empire. Panaretos reports on their raiding of coastal cities, destruction of Trapezuntine property, and even a humiliating Trapezuntine naval defeat at their hands. However, the chronicler refrains from casting any judgements on them, unlike Constantinopolitan intellectuals such as George Pachymeres, Theodore Metochites, and Constantine Akropolites who reviled the haughty, supercilious behavior of the Genoese.<sup>103</sup> For example, both Pachymeres and Panaretos report on a military confrontation between them and Alexios II in 1301. The Genoese had become dissatisfied with their tax arrangement in Trebizond and wanted to pay no tax on their merchandise. When the emperor refused, "they became puffed up with their usual, endemic pride" and tried to leave Trebizond without paying any tax, precipitating a battle in which they were defeated.<sup>104</sup> But despite the occasionally charged relationship that existed between the Genoese and Trebizond, the chronicler refrains from any disparaging comments. His account is matter of fact:

Ἐν δὲ τῷ ἐπιόντι ἔτει ἐπυρπολήθη ἡ ἐξάρτησις μηνὶ Ἰουνίῳ παρὰ τῶν Λατίνων, ὅτε καὶ ἐγένετο μέγας πόλεμος.

In June of the following year, the shipyard was burned by the Latins when a great battle took place.<sup>105</sup>

War is an important engine for the creation and diffusion of negative stereotypes and hatred for the perceived other, but Panaretos seems to have refrained from

**102** Ibid. 110 (L 80) for Bagrat; 74 (61–62 L) for Manuel. Manuel is similarly admired in Constantine Loukites' funeral oration for Alexios II, whom he says avenged Manuel's empire: PAPA-DOPOULOS-KERAMEUS, Ἀνάλεκτα (as footnote 39 above) I 425.

**103** On Byzantine attitudes toward the Genoese during this period, see S. ORIGONE, *Bisanzio e Genova*. Genova 1997, 243–254; S. ORIGONE, *Genova vista da Bisanzio*, in: *La storia dei genovesi*. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi sui Ceti Dirigenti nelle Istituzioni della Repubblica di Genova, Genova, 7–10 giugno, 1988. Genoa 1989, 485–505; A. E. LAIOU, *Italy and the Italians in the political geography of the Byzantines (14th Century)*. *DOP* 49 (1995) 73–98.

**104** A. FAILLER, *Georges Pachymerès*. *Relations historiques*. *CFHB*, 24. Paris 1999, 495.

**105** SHUKUROV / КАРПОВ / KRYUKOV, *Παναρετ* (as footnote 1 above) 78 (63 L); KENNEDY, *Two works* (as footnote 14 above) 9.

making these kinds of comments here. His attitude towards Christian peoples is generally more favorable than his attitude toward Muslims.<sup>106</sup> Trebizond was engaged in almost constant warfare with the Turks. The history of Trebizond from the late thirteenth century onward is characterized by conflict between the sedentary Trapezuntines and mobile Turkmen peoples who fought repeatedly for control of the Pontic Alps's idyllic pastureland.<sup>107</sup> But even then, despite the numerous battles which Panaretos and his master fought against the Turks, the chronicler adopted a fairly moderate attitude toward them. Throughout the chronicle, he avoids loaded terms such as 'barbarian' and generalized statements about how barbarians are wont to act, which other Byzantine authors favor. For example, compare Panaretos's report of the Matzoukans' victory over the Turks with that of his contemporary Andreas Libadenos:

#### Michael Panaretos

Μηνὶ Ἰουλίῳ κγ', ἡμέρᾳ ς', ἰνδικτιῶνος ιδ', τοῦ ,ςωξθ' ἔτους, ὁ ἀπὸ τοῦ Παῖπερτίου κεφαλή Χοτζιαλατίφης, λαβὼν ἐπιλέκτους στρατιώτας ὡσεὶ υ' καὶ πρὸς, εἰσῆλθεν κατὰ τὴν Ματζούκαν πρὸς τε τὴν Λαχαρανὴν καὶ Χασδένιχαν. Οἱ δὲ γε Ματζουκαῖται προκαταλαμβάνοντες τὰς διεξόδους ἔκτειναν ὡσεὶ σ' Τούρκους καὶ πλείους ἀρπάσαντες καὶ ἄλογα καὶ ἄρματα πολλὰ, καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν Χοτζιαλατίφην καρατομοῦσι καὶ τῇ ἐπαύριον θριαμβέουσιν τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν ἀνὰ τὴν Τραπεζοῦνταν ὄλην.

On Friday, July 23, indiction 14, 6869 (1361), the chieftain of Bayburt, *hoca* Latif, entered Matzouka near Lacharane and Chasdenicha with a select group of soldiers numbering around four hundred or more. But the people of Matzouka took control of the passes before his return, killed about two hundred Turks, and captured more of them, as well as many horses and arms. As for *hoca* Latif himself, they beheaded him and on the following day they carried their enemies' heads in triumph through all of Trebizond.<sup>108</sup>

#### Andreas Libadenos

τῶν γάρ τι τὸ πρὶν ὠμοτάτων βαρβάρων,  
σφόδρα σοβαρῶν, ἀγέρωχων θηρίων  
σθένους σατραπῶν καὶ κραταιῶν ἐς μάχας,  
εἰς γῆν πεσόντων σὺν πανοπλίᾳ πάσῃ,  
κέχρωστο βῶλαξ τοῖς λύθροις τῶν αἱμάτων,  
καὶ γῆ πεπορφύρωτο πρὸς χρόαν ὄλην  
αἵμασιν αὐτῶν πασσυδι τετμημένων.  
Πέρσαι συνετρίβησαν ἐν στίφει βέλους,

**106** ASP-TALWAR, Chronicle (as footnote 3 above) 183.

**107** A. BRYER, Greeks and Türkmens: The Pontic exception. *DOP* 29 (1975) 113–148.

**108** SHUKUROV / ΚΑΡΡΟΝ / ΚΡΥΥΚΟΝ, Παναρετ (as footnote 1 above) 96 (73).

ἅμα σατράπταις καὶ κακὸς Ὀλατούφης...

What remains of the previously most savage barbarians, who were so pompous, the proud beasts, the strength of the satraps and mighty has now fallen to the ground with all its panoply, and the earth has been drenched with their blood, the land's color has entirely turned red with the blood of those who were completely cut down. The Persians shattered under a barrage of missiles along with their satraps and the wicked Oulatouphes (*hoca Latif*)<sup>109</sup>

Admittedly, it is not entirely fair to compare the two, as Libadenos's choice of genre allowed greater rhetorical and poetic license. But throughout his chronicle, Panaretos avoids even religiously charged language such as ἀσεβής ('impious') and ἄθεος ('godless') commonly applied to the Turks in late Byzantine chronicles such as George Sphrantzes and the short chronicles.<sup>110</sup>

Panaretos was not unbothered by Turkish violence. Throughout his chronicle, he reports on what many Byzantines would have considered typical barbarian behavior. Raids, fire, and destruction abound. Panaretos mentions a Turkish raid at the end of the thirteenth century intended "to render all the lands inhospitable."<sup>111</sup> Barbarian treachery also has a place in the chronicle. In 1369, "Golacha was treacherously seized by the Turks. For this reason, Chaldia was obliterated, some of its people dying in battle, others in the treacherous cave there."<sup>112</sup> Vast barbarian hordes are defeated by a few good men. As an example, one might cite Panaretos's inclusion of the 1370 incident cited above during which Alexios defeated 800 men with only a handful of men.

Panaretos's view of the Turks was no doubt shaded by his face-to-face cordial interactions with them. Following previous Trapezuntine precedent, Alexios III frequently intermarried with the Turks. On a few occasions, his Turkish in-laws visited Trebizond and were even the recipients of state visits from Alexios III. Panaretos himself accompanied the emperor on state visits with Alexios's brother-in-laws, the hacı emir (whose titles but not personal name survive) and Kutlu beğ of the Turkmen Akkoyunlu federation.<sup>113</sup> At the end of one visit by Kutlu beğ in 1365, Panaretos even reports that the Turkmen emir "left peacefully, having received great honors."<sup>114</sup> Panaretos's verbiage here is rather

**109** LAMPSIDES, Ἀνδρέου Λιβαδηνοῦ βίος καὶ ἔργα (as footnote 79 above) 111 ll. 82–90.

**110** Ş. KILIÇ, Ottoman perception in the Byzantine short chronicles. *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Tarih Bölümü Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi* 32 (53) (2013) 111–135. For Sphrantzes, see MAISANO, Cronaca (as footnote 2 above) 226.

**111** SHUKUROV / КАРПОВ / KRYUKOV, Παναρετ (as footnote 1 above) 76–78 (63 L).

**112** Ibid. 102 (77 L); KENNEDY, Two Works (as footnote 14 above) 45.

**113** Ibid. 96 (73–74 L) for hacı emir; 98, 100 (75, 76 L) for Kutlu beğ.

**114** Ibid. 100 (76 L).

pointed, as he frequently closes his descriptions of Turkmen attacks on the city (including an Akkoyunlu attack some thirty years prior) with the Turkmen departing “ashamed and empty-handed.”<sup>115</sup> Now things are reversed; peace replaces war, honors take the place of dishonor and plunder. In contrast with other Turkish interactions with the city that ended in violence, the inclusion of this event demonstrated the feasibility of peaceful Byzantine-Turkish interactions. It seems that Panaretos preferred to handle the Turks as separate groups rather than as a collective stereotypical ‘other’, reporting the good and the bad of their interactions with the empire. In this respect, he seems to have been following the official line of Alexios’s government. For example, the emperor’s chrysobull for the Soumela monastery from 1364 instructs the abbot to establish a garrison in case the “inimically disposed Hagarenes” should attack. Of concern here were the emperor’s Turkish enemies, not his allies. The document (like Panaretos) abstains from labeling the Turks barbarians or dehumanizing them. The only wild beasts (θηρες ἄγριοι) that attack the monastery in this text are tax collectors.<sup>116</sup> Panaretos is somewhat unique among Byzantine commentators on the Turks in this regard. He is more likely to treat the Turks as human beings rather than reduce them to a negative stereotype.<sup>117</sup> His treatment of the Turks resembles that of Byzantines after the Turkish conquest of Constantinople in 1453 such as Laonikos Chalkokondyles or George Scholarios, who treated their conquerors not as impious infidels or animals, but human beings with good and bad qualities.<sup>118</sup>

Nonetheless, Panaretos’s feelings toward the Turks were shaded by an acute awareness of the limitations of Trapezuntine power. Trebizond was a modest power. In 1367, Alexios would field 2000 men for show when he met Kutlu beğ and patrolled the summer pastures of Trebizond, but his regular field

---

**115** Ibid. 78, 84, 96 (64, 66, 74, respectively).

**116** MIKLOSICH / MÜLLER, Acta V (as footnote 25 above) m280, 278, respectively.

**117** On Byzantine perceptions of the Turks, see N. OIKONOMIDÈS, The Turks in the Byzantine rhetoric of the twelfth century, in C. Farah (ed.), Decision making and change in the Ottoman Empire. Kirksville, MO 1993, 149–155; I. SMARNAKIS, Rethinking Roman identity after the Fall (1453): perceptions of ‘Romanitas’ by Doukas and Sphrantzes. *Byzantina Symmeikta* 25 (2016) 211–234.

**118** K. MOUSTAKAS, Byzantine “visions” of the Ottoman Empire. Theories of Ottoman legitimacy by Byzantine scholars after the Fall of Constantinople, in A. Lymperopoulou (ed.), Images of the Byzantine world: visions, messages, and meanings. Studies presented to Leslie Brubaker. Burlington, VT 2011, 215–229; A. KALDELLIS, A new Herodotos: Laonikos Chalkokondyles on the Ottoman Empire, the fall of Byzantium, and the emergence of the West. Washington, D.C. 2014, chap. 4; M.-H. BLANCHET, Georges-Gennadios Scholarios (vers 1400–vers 1472): un intellectuel orthodoxe face à la disparition de l’empire Byzantin. Paris 2008, 107–110.

army hardly ever numbered more than a few hundred.<sup>119</sup> The chancery of the Mamluk sultanate considered Trebizond a third rate power, which lacked resources and was frequently defeated by its Turkmen enemies.<sup>120</sup> Over time, it gained a reputation for the ferocity of its men, who, though few in number, fought like “lions who never let their prey escape.”<sup>121</sup> Perhaps, for this reason, Panaretos proudly notes whenever a few Trapezuntine soldiers defeat a large number of Turks.<sup>122</sup> But sometimes the chronicler’s pride got the better of him. Recalling a state visit to Chalybia during which the emperor’s brother-in-law hacı emir escorted Alexios III and his convoy back and forth between Kerasous and Chalybia, Panaretos comments that, “hacı emir and his Turks escorted us, almost as if they were our slaves (μικροῦ δεῖν δουλικῶς).”<sup>123</sup> No doubt, the Roman chronicler wistfully wished that the hacı emir’s Turkmen really were the emperor’s slaves. At the end of the thirteenth century, the Turkmen had seized Chalybia and raided much of the Trapezuntine coast. This moment, which Panaretos reports earlier in the chronicle, had imprinted itself on the collective conscience of Trapezuntines as a moment, when the empire had seemed in danger of imminent collapse until Alexios II had defeated the enemy and restored the empire.<sup>124</sup> Now only sixty years later, the illusion of these Turks’ descendants submitting and acting the part of the emperor’s personal bodyguard temporarily stirred the chronicler’s Roman pride, even if the feeling could only have been fleeting.

Another area where Panaretos’s Trapezuntine pride temporarily shines through is in his description of Trapezuntine-Constantinopolitan relations. In general, Panaretos is reverential toward Constantinople as the ideological center of Romanity. Throughout his chronicle, he refers to the city as “blessed Constantinople,” an epithet he reserves only for Trebizond.<sup>125</sup> When he visited the city in 1363 on state business, he tells us, “we went by imperial galley to the great city ...

---

**119** SHUKUROV / КАРПОВ / КРЫУКОВ, Панапет (as footnote 1 above) 100 (76 L). On the Trapezuntine army, see КАРПОВ, История (as footnote 3 above) 152–155.

**120** H. LAMMENS, Correspondances diplomatiques entre les sultans Mamlouks d’Égypte et les puissances chrétiennes. *Revue de l’Orient Chrétien* 9 (1904) 179–80; SHUKUROV, Великие Комнины (as footnote 3 above) 172–173.

**121** É. QUATREMÈRE, Notice de l’ouvrage qui a pour titre Mesalek alabsar fi memalek alamsar: voyages des yeux dans les royaumes des différentes contrées. *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale et autres bibliothèques* 13 (1838) 380.

**122** SHUKUROV / КАРПОВ / КРЫУКОВ, Панапет (as footnote 1 above) 102 (77 L), 108 (79 L).

**123** Ibid. 96 (73–74 L).

**124** Ibid. 76 (63 L); ROSENQVIST, St. Eugenios (as footnote 38 above) 218. Later popular tradition moved this moment to the reign of Alexios III: ΜΕΤΑΧΟΡΟΥΛΟΣ, Η Θεία (as footnote 52 above) 41.

**125** LAMPSIDES, Μιχαήλ (as footnote 1 above) 24.

and made fulsome obeisance. We saw the emperor lord John Palaiologos ...”, before listing all the individuals he saw there.<sup>126</sup> Just the act of seeing Constantinople was enough to inspire reverence and awe in the chronicler. But in Panaretos’s time, the relationship between the Palaiologoi and the Grand Komnenoi cannot have been easy. Constantinople had regarded the Trapezuntine state as a subordinate despotate since the late thirteenth century.<sup>127</sup> Its emperors frequently intervened during the Trapezuntine civil war (1340–1355), playing one candidate for the imperial throne off against the other. According to Alexios III’s metropolitan of Trebizond, John Lazaropoulos, the emperor’s own regime was one of these candidates, as the emperor John Kantakouzenos had given his blessing to the expedition that placed Alexios on the throne.<sup>128</sup> Once installed on the throne, Alexios III was eager to establish marriage alliances with first the Kantakouzenoi and, after 1354, the Palaiologoi, with whom Panaretos helped secure a marriage alliance between the children of Alexios III and John V Palaiologos (1354–1391).<sup>129</sup> However, from a Constantinopolitan perspective, Trebizond was not a friend, but a subordinate. Between 1364 and 1369, Demetrios Kydones would even remind his master John V Palaiologos (1354–1391) that “you have provided the rulers of Trebizond with their dominion as a reward for their friendship to you,” as if the throne of Trebizond was Constantinople’s to bestow.<sup>130</sup>

Ultimately, however, relations between the two soured in the 1370s and the proposed marriage alliance collapsed. In 1373, John V’s son, Michael Palaiologos, would even launch an assault on Trebizond:

Μηνὶ Νοεμβρίῳ ἰα΄, ἡμέρᾳ ς΄, τοῦ ςωπβ΄ ἔτους, ἰνδικτιῶνος ιβ<sup>ης</sup>, ἦλθεν ὁ τοῦ βασιλέως τῶν Ῥωμαίων κύρ Ἰωάννου Παλαιολόγου υἱός, ὁ κύρ Μιχαήλ, μετὰ δύο μεγάλων κατέργων καὶ ἑνὸς μικροτέρου κατὰ τοῦ βασιλέως ἡμῶν· καὶ σταθεῖς ἡμέρας ε΄ παλίνροσος γέγονε, μὴ ἀνύσας τι τῶν ἀδοκίμων, ὧν σὺν αὐτῷ ὁ πρωτοβεστιάριος κύρ Ἰωάννης ὁ Ἄνδρονικόπουλος· ὃς καὶ, ἀπελθὼν ὁ Παλαιολόγος, αὐτὸς ἐξῆλθε καὶ γέγονεν ὑπόσπονδος τῷ βασιλεῖ ἡμῶν.

126 SHUKUROV / KAPPOV / KRYUKOV, Παναρετ (as footnote 1 above) 98 (74 L): ἀπήλαμαμεν μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως κατέργου εἰς τὴν μεγάλην Πόλιν ... καὶ προσεκυνήσαμεν προσκυνήσεις φοβερὰς.



● **Shouldn’t the complete Greek text with translation be put into the main text as a quote?** ●

127 On Trapezuntine-Constantinopolitan relations, see KAPPOV, *История* (as footnote 3 above) 186–212.

128 ROSENQVIST, St. Eugenios (as footnote 38 above) 338–340.

129 SHUKUROV / KAPPOV / KRYUKOV, Παναρετ (as footnote 1 above) 98 (74–75).

130 PG 154, 963C.

On Saturday, November 11 of indiction 12, 6872 (1373), the son of the Roman emperor lord John V Palaiologos, lord Michael, came to attack our emperor with two large galleys and a smaller one. And after remaining here for five days, he beat a hasty retreat without accomplishing anything remarkable. The treasurer  the wardrobe, lord John Andronikopoulos, was with him and, when Palaiologos  he came over and became our emperor's vassal.<sup>131</sup>

The only direct confrontation between a Palaiologos and a Grand Komnenos, the affair brought out Panaretos's local pride. The details of this affair are mostly lost beyond what can be recovered from a terse marginal entry in a brief chronicle of the Palaiologoi that records, "And his (i.e., Manuel II Palaiologos, r. 1391–1425) brother Michael, who went to Trebizond and did not take it, but returned home, became the son-in-law of the despot Dobrotitsa."<sup>132</sup> From Venetian documents, it seems that the Bulgarian despot of Karvuna, Dobrotitsa, a close ally of the Palaiologoi who possessed a small but effective fleet in the Black Sea, had claimed the Trapezuntine throne for his son-in-law. In 1376, the Venetians would even seriously consider replacing Alexios III with Michael in order to improve their commercial position at Trebizond.<sup>133</sup> Panaretos's selection of facts nonetheless shows the pride he felt that a Palaiologos's *protovestarios* abandoned his master and pledged allegiance to the Grand Komnenos of Trebizond.<sup>134</sup> In this moment, the usual order of the world was reversed, and Trapezuntines could savor the fact that an official of one of their Constantinopolitan rivals had submitted before their emperor.

## Conclusion: On the limitations of Panaretos as a source

A new image emerges of Panaretos as a chronicler. An imperial bureaucrat, his chronicle often aided him in his bureaucratic functions as the emperor's secre-

---

**131** SHUKUROV / КАРПОВ / КРЮКОВ, Паһарет (as footnote 1 above) 104 (78 L); KENNEDY, Two works (as footnote 14 above) 47.

**132** P. SCHREINER, Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken. *CFHB*, 12. Vienna 1975, I 118 (Chron. 22.18).

**133** THIRIET, *Régestes* (as footnote 13 above) vol. 1, 576. N. JORGA, Veneția în Marea Neagră. *Analele Academiei Române. Memoriile Secțiunii Istorice. Seria 2*, 36 (1913) 1058–62.

**134** V. LAURENT, Deux chrysobulles inédits des empereurs de Trebizonde Alexis IV–Jean IV et David II. *Archeion Pontou* 18 (1953) 263, records the donation of property which formerly belonged to the protostrator Andronikopoulos. Presumably, it refers to this Andronikopoulos or his descendants.

tary, but Panaretos was also a discriminating researcher who sifted through oral, inscriptions, and written sources to reconstruct the history of his country. Panaretos proudly, but not uncritically supported his master Alexios III, but he was also aware of the limitations of Trebizond on the global stage. Like his master, Panaretos appreciated the importance of maintaining good relations with the Turks and is unique for his century in his willingness to abandon explicit negative stereotypes of them so common in other sources of the period.

However, taken as a whole, Panaretos's construction of his chronicle raises other more important questions about his value as a source. The chronicle's lack of literary adornment, matter-of-fact reporting, and use of precise dates have encouraged scholars to trust Panaretos as a reliable witness.<sup>135</sup> Nonetheless, Panaretos' style may create an illusion of trustworthiness and has perhaps prevented us from asking the important historiographical question: how or why did Panaretos select events for inclusion in his chronicle? Throughout this study, I have illuminated some of the variety of reasons why Panaretos included material: work, diplomacy, pride, shame, etc. But Panaretos's selection of material has implications besides simply illuminating his life and personality; it has also skewed our image of Trebizond, as modern historians have often treated him as our ultimate authority for this region. As an extended illustration of this point, consider how modern scholars have handled the 1380's, the last decade of Alexios III's reign. For the period 1380–1389, Panaretos includes four events. In general, his treatment of earlier decades starting from the 1340's is much fuller, becoming sparser from the 1370's onward, as illustrated in the table below:

Decade	Number of events reported	Percentage change
1340–49	16	NA
1350–59	24	+50%
1360–69	21	-14%
1370–79	7	-66%
1380–89	4	-42%

Noting the lack of entries in the 1380's, historians of Trebizond have assumed that the lack of entries is due to a lack of material to report. For example, Alexios Savvides, the author of the one of the most important recent histories of Trebizond, assumes that this decade was quieter for Alexios III because of the lack

<sup>135</sup> LAMPSIDES, Τὴνὰ (as footnote 3 above) 52–54; LAMPSIDES, Μιχαήλ (as footnote 1 above) 24–29; SABBIDES, Ἰστορία (as footnote 3 above) 199–200; ASP-TALWAR, Chronicle (as footnote 3 above) 173.



of entries.<sup>136</sup> Similarly, Rustam Shukurov has also suggested that Alexios III's marriage alliances with local Turkish emirs had finally yielded results during this decade, resulting in more peaceful frontiers and thus a lack of entries.<sup>137</sup>

But in truth, the 1380's offered their fair share of challenges and obstacles to Alexios' regime, which Panaretos should have documented, were he following the same patterns he exhibits earlier in the chronicle. For instance, the death of Alexios's son-in-law, the Turkish emir Taccedin, in October 1386 freed the emperor's daughter Eudokia.<sup>138</sup> She probably returned home to Trebizond relatively soon after his death. If Panaretos were following the same patterns as previously, he probably would have noted her return, as he elsewhere reports on the visits of Trebizond's imperial women married to Turkish princes to the city.<sup>139</sup> However, the princess was not single for long, as we learn from Laonikos Chalkokondyles that the emperor John V (1354–1391) originally meant to marry her to his son Manuel II Palaiologos (1391–1425), but was enamored with the princess and kept her for himself.<sup>140</sup> Scholars have disputed Chalkokondyles' gossipy story, arguing that she actually married Konstantin Dragaš, the grandfather of the emperors John VIII Palaiologos (1425–1449) and Constantine XI (1449–1453).<sup>141</sup> But nonetheless, this alliance would have required negotiations. Panaretos is very conscious about noting when ambassadors were sent to arrange marriages with the Byzantine emperor. He himself had served as Alexios III's ambassador to the court of John V in 1363 and 1368, arranging a marriage of John V's son and Alexios III's daughter that never took place.<sup>142</sup> It is therefore reasonable to suggest that Panaretos who knew John V personally could have been expected to serve his master once more and arrange a marriage alliance between Eudokia Komnene and the Palaiologoi, or, at least, he would have at least recorded the dispatch of the emperor's envoys or the princess to Constantinople.

Throughout earlier decades, Panaretos frequently records Alexios III's movements whether the emperor was touring his realm or marching against his enemies. But after 1382, there is not a single note about his movements until we hear

---

**136** SABBIDES, *Ιστορία* (as footnote 3 above) 130–131.

**137** R. SHUKUROV, *Between peace and hostility: Trebizond and the Pontic Turkish periphery in the fourteenth century*. *MHR* 9 (1994) 39; SHUKUROV, *Великие Комнины* (as footnote 3 above) 215–216.

**138** SHUKUROV / KAPOV / KRYUKOV, *Панапет* (as footnote 1 above) 108 (80 L).

**139** *Ibid.*, 94 (72 L), 100 (76 L).

**140** DARKÓ, *Laonici* (as footnote 72 above) vol. 1, 75–76.

**141** R. J. LOENERTZ, *Une erreur singulière de Laonic Chalcocandyle : le prétendu second mariage de Jean V Paléologue*. *REB* 15 (1957) 176–184.

**142** SHUKUROV / KAPOV / KRYUKOV, *Панапет* (as footnote 1 above) 88, 94, 96, 98, 102 (69, 72, 73, 74, 76, respectively).

of his death in 1390. It is hard to believe that the emperor stopped campaigning and traveling throughout his empire from 1382–1390 when he was only a middle-aged man of forty-three to fifty years old.<sup>143</sup> Nor is it believable that the Turks stopped menacing the empire. There is reason to believe that the 1380's were far more unsettled than the meager entries in Panaretos let on. For example, the Çepni, a Turkman tribe, whom Alexios III had attempted to expel from the Philabonites river valley in 1380, remained a thorn in the emperor's side.<sup>144</sup> When the Spanish ambassador to Timor, Ruy Gonzalez de Clavijo, passed through the empire of Trebizond in 1403, he records that they menaced the empire's southern frontier beyond the modern Torul, not too far from where they had been in 1380.<sup>145</sup> Alexios and his government never seem to have found a way to subdue the tribe with a marriage alliance.

Similarly, there were other developments afoot beyond the empire's limits. From 1381 onward, the emir of Erzincan, Mutaherten (1379–1403), began subduing the minor emirates surrounding the empire.<sup>146</sup> It is difficult to believe that the emir's activities did not drive some tribes to seek refuge in the Pontic Alps, causing trouble for the empire. Similarly, one must wonder whether Mutaherten himself did not attack the empire. Previous emirs of Erzincan had made attempts on Trebizond and by 1403, Ruy Gonzalez de Clavijo reports that the late Mutaherten was married to a daughter of Alexios III.<sup>147</sup> We know that Alexios' marriage alliances with his enemies generally were arranged when a tribe or emir had attacked the empire multiple times or seized key territory. For example, the emperor's son-in-law Tacedin obtained a Trapezuntine princess only after he had seized Limnia at the empire's western frontier, trading the region for his bride.<sup>148</sup> Therefore, it seems possible that Mutaherten may have attacked the empire during this decade and received a Trapezuntine princess to prevent further incursions. An attack on Trebizond seems even more likely, as multiple sources report that the emir exacted tribute (*kharaj*) from the emperor of Trebizond.<sup>149</sup> Besides Mutaherten, Alexios III's alliance with the Hacımaroğulları emirate

---

**143** The emperor was born in 1338: *Ibid.*, 80 (65 L).

**144** SHUKUROV / КАРПОВ / КРЫКОВ, Паһарет (as footnote 1 above) 106–108 (79 L).

**145** F. LÓPEZ ESTRADA, Ruy González de Clavijo, La embajada a Tamorlán. Madrid 1943, 79–84.

**146** E. A. ZACHARIADOU, Trebizond and the Turks (1352–1402), Romania and the Turks. London 1985, III.350–351; SHUKUROV, Between peace (as footnote 137 above) 36–37.

**147** LÓPEZ ESTRADA, Ruy González (as footnote 145 above) 92.

**148** SHUKUROV / КАРПОВ / КРЫКОВ, Паһарет (as footnote 1 above) 106 (79 L); LAMPSIDES, Μιχαήλ (as footnote 1 above) 79.

**149** SHUKUROV, Between peace (as footnote 137 above) 39; SHUKUROV, Великие Комнины (as footnote 3 above) 215.

also deteriorated after 1386. We know that the emperor's nephew Süleyman was attacking the empire's western provinces in the 1390's, seizing the key city of Kerasous (modern Giresun).<sup>150</sup>

Therefore, it seems unreasonable to suggest that the empire was at peace during this era, as evidenced by Panaretos' lack of entries. For some reason, Panaretos's inclusion of events during this decade diminished. This is speculation based on the silence of our source, but my general argument stands. Panaretos was a selective chronicler and chose to write about what he found useful or significant or what might redound to the glory of his master. When historians approach his chronicle, it is important to consider his selectivity and remember that he is not a representative sample of everything that happened in Trebizond during the mid to late fourteenth century. He omits important events, which he might otherwise have mentioned, had some unknown factor not altered his historiographical approach. Perhaps he retired from public life or lost his court position and lost access to the kind of information he had previously. But when scholars ignore Panaretos as a historiographer and treat him as the measuring stick for this era and region, we lose the opportunity to recover from his silences a more balanced picture of the era.

---

**150** SHUKUROV, *Between peace* (as footnote 137 above) 44; SHUKUROV, *Великие Комнины* (as footnote 3 above) 220–221.

