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INTRODUCTION

Angeliki Lymberopoulou

Ever since the work of the twentieth-century historian Fernand Braudel, the Mediterranean basin with its many interacting cultures has been recognised as a vital engine in the development of European civilisation. Byzantine/Orthodox East (Greek, Russian, Serbian, Bulgarian), European West (Roman Catholic and Protestant), Jewish, Arab, Seljuk, Mameluke, Ottoman and wider Islamic communities and cultures interacted, not always by choice and perhaps even more rarely in peace. Nevertheless, the end result of this interaction had many fruitful outcomes.

It would certainly be interesting to examine all the contributing cultural interactions and dialogues simultaneously from all its different perspectives and angles (e.g. Byzantium and the West; Byzantium and the East; wider East and West; etc.). The subject is beyond the scope and aim of the present volume. Nonetheless this volume aspires to provide an initial bridge and bring together scholars that work either in different geographical locations within the same discipline or in different traditions and have different approaches to research. This particular combination has certainly not featured as a theme in any of the previous Spring Symposia of Byzantine Studies, as is apparent from their timeline (Appendix 1).

The interaction between Byzantium and the West, however, was a focus in past Spring Byzantine Symposia. In 1969 the Symposium was dedicated to the Turkish (Ottoman) occupation (Tourkokratia) (fifteenth–nineteenth centuries), on which occasion Alfred Vincent from the University of Cambridge delivered a paper with an eye-catching title referring to the Cretan Renaissance (1453–1669). The pioneering approach suggested by the paper’s title should be noted here, since the post-Byzantine period was later openly branded as ‘Greek Renaissance’ in the twenty-first century with an exhibition that took place in the Byzantine and Christian Museum in Athens in 2002. In 1984, the 18th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies explored Byzantium and the West, c. 850–1200, while in 1988 the 22nd was entitled Latins and Greeks in the Aegean World after 1204. These Symposia probably partly reflect the rising profile of the subject that it was earmarked in the 1970s with major publications, such as one by Otto Demus, Byzantine Art and the West (London, 1970) and another comprising of selected

However, the importance of Venetian Crete’s role in the development of the wider Mediterranean culture cannot be either ignored or side-lined. For the past quarter of a century, scholarship has identified and highlighted the island’s leading role as one of the most significant cultural melting pots in the basin based on the following factors:

- the stability and the continuation of a government established between 1211 and 1669 – in fact the geographic division of Crete into prefectures and provinces introduced by the Venetians was in use until the early twenty-first century;4
- the agricultural production of the island that enhanced its financial affluence through trade;5
- the geographical importance of the island which is situated at the crossroads of trade and pilgrimage routes;6
- the abundance of archival testimonies, presently housed in the Archivio di Stato di Venezia (the State Archives of Venice). Their survival and transport from Candia to Venice after 1669 were specifically mentioned in the agreement to hand the island over to the Ottomans;7
- Crete’s importance to the art of the post-Byzantine era, since after 1453 the island became the cradle for preserving Greek Orthodox culture;8
- the rise of the ‘hybrid’ icon (such as the Fogg triptych, examined in the fourth chapter of this volume), which encapsulates perfectly the society that created it, produced it, and disseminated it in a wider European market, thus highlighting its contribution to a Renaissance that transcends Vasarian boundaries.9

However, the main purpose of this volume is not to ascertain Crete’s ‘supremacy’ within the realm of Latin Greece that developed after 1204. It rather aims at evaluating cross-cultural interaction by examining representative case studies of cultural contact between Orthodox and Catholic Christians from both perspectives in the Mediterranean basin in the aftermath of the Fourth Crusade. As such, the symposium’s theme also aimed at being among the initial attempts to eliminate a disadvantage that the subject faces. Traditionally, the interaction between Byzantium and the West in this period is studied either from the perspective of Byzantine experts with an interest in western European culture or by western experts with basic knowledge of Byzantium. A forum where the two sides can discuss issues and exchange ideas could only be to our benefit.10

The sacking of Constantinople in 1204 by the troops of the Fourth Crusade radically changed the dynamic of the relationship between Byzantine (Orthodox)
East and European (Catholic) West. The army consisted of Frankish knights and Venetians, commonly and collectively referred to as ‘Latins’, a language-based cultural signifier. Byzantium, officially an ally of the crusading quest(s) of western Europe in the Holy Land, was dismembered and devoured by its allies, and found itself in a situation from which it never fully recovered.11 Although certain territories had been lost to Byzantine rule some years prior to the sacking of the capital, such as Cyprus which was occupied by Richard the Lionheart in 1191, nevertheless 1204 constitutes a major landmark in the Christian eastern-western cross-cultural process centred in the Mediterranean and hence stands at the beginning of this volume’s time frame.

Latin Greece developed over the centuries and there is plenty a geographical place that offers rich material for scrutinising this process – Constantinople, the Peloponnese, the Ionian islands, Euboea, Naxos, Rhodes, Cyprus and, of course, Crete, to mention but a handful. The stories they present are all equally important in piecing together the cross-cultural dialogue and its various manifestations and translations that took place between the different groups of the territories’ inhabitants. Nevertheless, the cut-off point for the present volume is offered by the Venetians ceding their beloved colony on Crete, their ‘most precious possession in the Mediterranean’ to the Ottomans in 1669, ending the siege of the island’s capital, Candia (present-day Herakleion), which lasted from May 1648 until 27 September 1669. This is the longest siege recorded in European history, which left Venice on the verge of bankruptcy.12

The cultural interactions among the various ethnically and religiously distinct groups of peoples in the Mediterranean – and in particularly of opposing Christians, the focus of this present volume – are neither black-and-white nor one-dimensional. There is no single rule applicable to cross-cultural interaction in the Mediterranean and as such the various forms of symbiosis would have been neither a match made in heaven nor hell on earth. The co-existence between the separate groups was not based upon mutual initiative but rather upon colonisation of the territories of one group by another, involving invariably violence, atrocities and bloodshed. This would have formed an ominous starting point for any future cross-cultural interaction, further underlined by religious squabbles and what must have been perceived both at clerical and secular level as an unbridgeable gap. Nevertheless, the society, language and artistic production of territories that were exposed in such interaction, reflect nuanced, progressive and changeable exchanges, developing over the course of decades and centuries.

History offers opportunities to dwell on the negative aspects of this originally forced co-existence, such as the rebellion of the Greek villagers against the Lusignan rule in 1426 in the wake of the Mameluke invasion – an example already highlighted by the fifteenth-century Cypriot chronicler Leontios Machairas.13 At the same time we should not underestimate the plethora of opportunities that could and would have drawn them together such as inter-marriages, business transactions, everyday contact (reflected in fashion),14 even natural calamities (e.g. earthquakes, a common menace in the basin).15 For
example, in thirteenth-century Crete the native population was hostile to the newly-settled Venetian colonists and for over a century there were persistent rebellions against the new regime. In the second half of the fourteenth century, however – in 1363 – the native population joined forces with Venetian settlers on the island to challenge the Serenissima’s rule over it. By the seventeenth century Cretan and Venetians were fighting side-by-side to maintain Venice’s dominion and to prevent the Ottoman conquest of the island.

Another example of positive cross-cultural progression is attested by army recruitment in the Peloponnese: in 1341 the castellans (rulers) of Coron and Modon demanded that all Latin mercenary soldiers had to have clean-shaven faces in order to be distinguished from the Greeks, who invariably sported beards. However, this distinction (or discrimination?) had disappeared by the fifteenth century in the multi-national regiment of the Stratiote (soldiers). There is a long list of Greeks who served the Serenissima, which covers a period of over a century. Venice regarded these Greek soldiers and sailors as ‘the sort of people that merit to be clasped by the state in its arms and recognized [for their services], because at every occasion they wholeheartedly demonstrated their virtue and their loyalty’. It was because of the contribution of the Greek soldiers in the Serenissima’s war against the Ottomans between 1463–1479 and 1499–1503 that the Greek community in Venice was granted permission to build a Greek Orthodox church, dedicated appropriately to their patron Saint George known as San Giorgio dei Greci (Saint George of the Greeks).

As mentioned above, that interaction between different groups led, among other things, to shaping fashion and fashion choices. The male native Cretan donors of the church of the Archangel Michael at Kavalariana, in the southwest part of the Chania prefecture, dated 1327/28, present a well-known example of such development. One of the most interesting aspects of their church is the dedicatory inscription, which mentions the ‘great Venetians, our masters’ – a unique reference by native Cretans in praise of the Venetian rule on Crete. Equally rare is the naming of foreign rulers in Orthodox churches built by the native Greek-speaking population in former Byzantine provinces, such as in the church of Saint Nicholas Mavrika in Aegina, dated 1330, which records the Catalan ruler, Don Alfonso, the son of King Frederique. However, the fact that foreign rule and/or rulers are mentioned at all within an Orthodox church is indicative of the intensity of the interaction, especially if we take into consideration that these rulers were not of the Orthodox faith. This is not a minor detail to contemplate, as examples of the opposite behaviour highlight: the inscription in the church of the Holy Apostles at Prines, dated to the fourteenth century and situated in the south-west part of Crete (prefecture of Chania), declares that the donors of this particular church were Orthodox, a specification which suggests not only that this was not always the case in the churches around the area, but also that contributions from non-Orthodox (i.e. Catholics) in this particular neighbourhood had been deliberately excluded. The need to explicitly state this in the inscription of the church, suggests
that contributions by Catholics towards Orthodox edifices in rural Crete were taking place.

Because of the importance of Crete for Venice’s *Stato da Mar*, and hence a prolific provider of sources for cross-cultural interaction in the basin, the volume will open with four case studies from the island’s Venetian period. These case studies will hand over the baton to three chapters exploring Cyprus, an island that invites many a comparison with Crete, followed by a further two on the Peloponnese, another favourite stronghold of the Serenissima. The last part of the volume comprises seven papers piecing together interactions within the wider Mediterranean, starting with Leslie Brubaker’s discussion of processions and continuing in chronological order. This (necessarily) fragmented approach to the cross-cultural interaction between Byzantium and the West nevertheless succeeds in presenting the ‘bigger picture’ of a positively hybrid Mediterranean with permeable boundaries and identities that belongs to everybody.

In the first paper, Diana Newall presents a survey of the interaction between the Catholic Venetian colonists and the Greek Orthodox native to the capital of Crete, Candia. The survey is based on archival research and published material from the Venetian archives and bears testimony to the ever increasing engagement between the two culturally, linguistically and religiously different populations, following the progression of their relation from the thirteenth to the beginning of the sixteenth centuries. Similarly, Maria Constantoudaki’s paper continues with the presentation of archival material that reveals the existence of Venetian painters on the island of Crete. The research raises a number of important questions regarding the reasons why these artists moved from the mother city to the island; the tasks in which they were involved both as artists and outside their profession; and their patronage. The evidence testifies to the artistic two-way traffic between Venice and Candia and further suggests that Crete was recognised as a thriving, developing colony, with political stability. The volume then shifts from archival to object-based research. My contribution is based on the close examination of a visually bilingual devotional artefact, the Fogg triptych, and the information provided by the Cretan artistic production on the society that created and promoted these objects. Rembrandt Duits then embarks on an intriguing journey trying to ascertain if there could have been a western model used by artists in Venetian Crete that could account for certain characteristics of the representations of Hell we encounter in Byzantine Cretan churches. While such an examination needs to guard against releasing Weitzman’s favourite skeleton – the ‘lost prototype’ – from its well-closed closet, the examination of the visual evidence is rich with suggestions regarding artistic interaction in the cross-cultural environment of Venetian Crete.

Tassos Papacostas introduces issues relating to Cyprus by investigating the continuation of Byzantine traditions on the island once it ceased to be part of the Byzantine Empire in 1191, showing the development of a dialogue between Byzantine and western practices in the subsequent era. His examples are drawn
from surviving architecture, the vocabulary and decoration of which highlight visual exchanges in this different medium. The author indicates that there was a dichotomy in Cyprus between the overwhelmingly monolingual countryside and plurilingual cities, a division which has parallels also on Crete. Michele Bacci concentrates on the church of Saint George of the Greeks in Famagusta, whose architecture blends Byzantine and Gothic forms. He explores ‘un-Byzantine’–looking visual characteristics by tracing a motif through a maze of exchanges, in which Giotto’s art seems to be a crucial link. This paper verifies once more that ‘secondary’ and decorative motifs, in other words visual elements that did not affect the ‘primary’ religious iconography of scenes, had a more flexible licence for use. Ioanna Christoforaki concludes this section by questioning the notion of ‘East’ and ‘West’ in Lusignan Cyprus. The author presents a number of objects that testify to the influences the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem and Armenian Cilicia exercised on Cypriot art during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

The volume’s itinerary takes us from Cyprus to the Peloponnese, another area on which the Republic placed great importance, as attested by the fact that the Peloponnesian Coron and Modon were tellingly nicknamed ‘the two eyes of the Republic’. Sharon Gerstel and Michalis Kappas discuss regional monumental painting in the southern Peloponnese dated to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. As in many other former Byzantine territories in the wider Mediterranean that after 1204 passed to western rule, in Messinia and Lakonia the symbiosis between the native Greek Orthodox population and the western Roman Catholic colonists left its traces in the artistic production of the period in the area. The long-term co-habitation had a profound impact on painting styles in the region, visualising the cross-cultural interaction and dialogue between the two different sets of inhabitants, highlighting comparisons both with Venetian Crete and Latin-dominated Cyprus. Andrea Mattiello presents interaction in this region from a different perspective – that of western influences within Byzantine-held territories – by engaging with the rather small detail of a big elephant in a manuscript. Its analysis offers an insightful look into a milieu which is completely different to that examined by Gerstel and Kappas – that of the intellectual circle and its diverse interests at the cultural centre of Mystras during the Palaiologan era in yet another example of fertile cross-cultural interaction between (Byzantine) east and west.

The volume then expands to issues concerning the wider Mediterranean. Leslie Brubaker explores the ‘Mediterranean mentality’ reflected in public processions in four major cities at the time – Cairo, Constantinople, Rome, Thebes – described in the sources. The close comparative analysis highlights both similarities and differences, which is in accordance with sharing a wider geographical space and culture but at the same time conforming to specific local, political and religious needs. Following the glamour of processions, Dionysios Stathakopoulos looks into the lives of four aristocratic women who through marriage tie a Florentine to a Greek Orthodox family and whose lives span 100 years, between the 1330s
and 1430s. The choice of these women highlights an aspect of the interaction between Byzantium and the West which has so far attracted less attention but is nevertheless of great significance, since it sheds light on how the political and social aspects of the joining of cultures were experienced and handled by people who, while socially affluent, were not at the front line of making history. Liz James then shifts the focus more to the west, exploring a separation rather than mixing of tradition by challenging the predominant opinion that mosaic as a medium in thirteenth-century Italy was synonymous with Byzantine artistic production. She puts forward the opinion that mosaic in Italy was rather tied to notions of Early Christianity and Rome, and this is what lies at the heart of reproducing and emulating the rather expensive and time-consuming medium. Ágnes Kriza navigates through the correspondences between the iconography of the Coronation of the Virgin in Catholic West and the Royal Deesis in Orthodox East. She argues that the image of the Virgin in the Royal Deesis constitutes an Orthodox appropriation and adaptation of her image in the Coronation of the Virgin, a concept alien to Byzantine theological hierarchy. The essay further presents the constraints that religion imposes on cross-cultural dialogue, creating unbridgeable gaps, which nevertheless form a vital part of trans-cultural negotiations. Leonela Fundić analyses the relations forged by the Byzantine State of Epeiros with western allies in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in order to safeguard its borders against the Empire of Nicaea as well as the Latin states formed in Greece after the fall of Constantinople in 1204. The cross-cultural interaction between Epeiros, a state bound to Byzantine culture and traditions, and the West is manifested in ‘bilingual’ works of art from this period, as is the case in many other Byzantine areas in close contact with or under the rule of westerners. Alex Rodríguez Suarez presents the significance of bell ringing as a vital element within the Christian soundscape, pinpointing another ritualistic element shared by both sides of the Christian divide (Orthodox and Catholic). Its importance is clear from the fact that the Ottoman expansion put a stop to bell ringing and prohibited its use, thus silencing a sound identified with Christianity. Finally, Francesca Marchetti discusses the reproduction of Byzantine manuscripts with botanical and medical imagery during the Palaiologan era and how such manuscripts became a vehicle of inspiration in reshaping the sciences during the first half of the sixteenth century in both Greece and Italy.

* * *

Sailing from port to port in the Mediterranean basin at a time when borders were fluid and identities were changed and challenged, are we really in a position to answer the question of this volume – whose Mediterranean is it anyway? And does it matter? Back in 1988, the late Professor Anthony Bryer, while talking to Karen Gold about Byzantine studies, said: ‘The Greeks think it [Byzantium] belongs to them. The Bulgarians and Serbs and Turks to some extent think it
belongs to them. But as far as I am concerned, it doesn’t. Anyone can have a go.’33 While in the case of Byzantium an argument for the strength of its Greek ties can be made based on the official state language post Justinian, its capital Constantinople, the Greek Orthodox religion and the fact that during the Palaiologan era the ‘Greekness’ of the Empire was highlighted and promoted,34 Professor Bryer’s opinion is certainly applicable to the eastern Mediterranean at large.

Applying labels to artistic production that involves cultural dialogue and development is much more difficult than it may seem. For the purpose of this volume the most challenging label would be ‘Italo-Greek’ (or, indeed, ‘Greco-Italian’). Manolis Chatzidakis, when discussing Cretan icon painting, already drew attention to the former term and its meaning and significance.35 From this general term others could branch-out, with more geographic specificity; for example, regarding Venetian Crete do we opt for ‘Veneto-Cretan’ or ‘Creto-Venetian’? Which of the cultural components takes precedence? And on what basis? One could argue that a decision could be made based on phonetic reasons – for example ‘Veneto-Cretan’ may sound better than ‘Creto-Venetian’. Even if this were the sole argument for making a choice, inevitably over time this choice would come to signify prominence of the first-mentioned culture over the other and this would certainly be both misleading and a-historical. And this does not take into consideration that neither of these two labels allows for the incorporation of other cultures, e.g. from northern Europe and the Islamic East, that contributed to its development. In other words even the two ‘battling’ components effectively contribute only one perspective to our understanding of the period.

In that case, would it be more appropriate to label the art and the society it produced it by its geographical association – e.g. Cretan, Cypriot, Peloponnesian etc. (incorporating a dimension of hybridity)?36 If this would be considered as promoting fragmentation, what would be the alternative? The designation ‘Early Modern Mediterranean’ effectively mixes together geography, history and time in an amorphous mass that means very little without further explanation. In this case it is important that the need for and function of such nomenclature is appropriately questioned, assessing both positive and negative connotations.

The aforementioned fragmentation should not be regarded suspiciously but rather like pieces of a big Mediterranean mosaic, each adding its own vital characteristics and glitter to the bigger picture. To quote from David Sedley on Aristotle’s *Generation and Corruption*: ‘no amount of fragmentation of the compound’s spatial parts [...] will prevent the resultant fragments from still being bits of that very same compound.’37 The Early Modern Mediterranean compound and the various ‘parts’ it was made up of remain one of the best case studies to enhance not only our understanding of history but also of our own global society and its fluid fragmentation.
Appendix: Origins and timeline of the *Spring Symposia of Byzantine Studies*

Fiona Haarer and Angeliki Lymberopoulou

In 1963, the University of Birmingham decided to encourage and support Byzantine Studies. By 1965 a committee had been established to ensure the progress of the decision taken two years earlier. In 1967 the precursor of the current Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies made its first appearance on the academic stage of the United Kingdom. Originally, the Symposium took the form of annual courses in Byzantine Studies, which were held in collaboration with the Department of Extramural Studies. By 1971 these courses had become more than local meetings and became known as the ‘Spring Symposium’. From 1978 the Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies at the University of Birmingham ran the Symposia for the British National Committee of the International Byzantine Association, while in 1983 they were placed under the patronage of the British Academy. In 1982 the Spring Symposia moved outside Birmingham for the first time and to the present day their organisation alternates between their birth place and another U.K.-based university with strong ties to Byzantine studies.38

Timeline of the Spring Symposia of Byzantine Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td><em>Byzantium and Europe</em></td>
<td>University of Birmingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td><em>Byzantium 976–1261</em></td>
<td>University of Birmingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td><em>The Tourkokratia (15th–19th centuries)</em></td>
<td>University of Birmingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td><em>The Roman Empire in the East: Constantine to Justinian</em></td>
<td>University of Birmingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td><em>(5th?)</em>, <em>Asceticism in the Early Byzantine World</em> (non-residential school; University of Birmingham) – the numbering of the Spring Symposia probably starts with this one, since in the following year it is marked as 6th*</td>
<td>University of Birmingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>6th, <em>Byzantium and the East</em> (as a non-residential weekend school; University of Birmingham)</td>
<td>University of Birmingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>7th, <em>Byzantine Literature and Art</em></td>
<td>University of Birmingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>8th, <em>Byzantine Society and Economy</em></td>
<td>University of Birmingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>9th, <em>Iconoclasm</em> (22–24 March, University of Birmingham)</td>
<td>University of Birmingham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Its subsequent publication was the first full publication of a symposium: *Iconoclasm: Papers Given at the Ninth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Birmingham, March 1975*, edited by Anthony Bryer and Judith Herrin (Birmingham: University of Birmingham, Centre for Byzantine Studies, 1977)
This Symposium was praised as ‘one of the best attended’ in a 1977 review published in the *Eastern Churches Review* 9 (1977), 109–10 (with the initials G.E. at the end)


1979 13th, *Byzantium and the Classical Tradition* (University of Birmingham; in conjunction with the 75th Meeting of the Classical Association)
*Byzantium and the Classical Tradition: 13th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies: Papers*, edited by Margaret Mullett and Roger Scott (Birmingham: Centre for Byzantine Studies, University of Birmingham, 1981)

1980 14th, *The Byzantine Saint* (University of Birmingham)

1981 15th, *Byzantium and the Slavs* (University of Birmingham)

1982 16th, *The Byzantine Aristocracy* (University of Edinburgh)

1983 17th, *Life and Death in Byzantium* (University of Birmingham)

1984 18th, *Byzantium and the West* c. 850–c. 1200 (30 April–1 May, University of Oxford)


1986 20th, *Church and People in Byzantium* (University of Birmingham)
*Church and People in Byzantium: Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies: Twentieth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Manchester, 1986*, edited by Rosemary Morris (Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek studies, University of Birmingham, 1990)


1988 22nd, *Latin and Greeks in the Aegean World after 1204* (University of Nottingham)

1989 23rd, Salonica: The Second City (18–21 March, University of Birmingham)
From this point onwards the Spring Symposia of Byzantine Studies were published by Ashgate Variorum (with only a few exceptions):

1990 24th, Byzantine Diplomacy (March, University of Cambridge)


1992 26th, New Constantines: The Rhythm of Imperial Renewal in Byzantium, 4th–13th Centuries (University of St Andrews)

1993 27th, Constantinople and its Hinterland (April, University of Oxford)

1994 28th, Mount Athos and Byzantine Monasticism (26–29 March, University of Birmingham)

1995 29th, Through the Looking Glass: Byzantium through British Eyes (University of London)

1996 30th, Byzantium in the Ninth Century: Dead or Alive? (23–26 March, University of Birmingham)

1997 31st, Desire and Denial in Byzantium (University of Sussex)
Desire and Denial in Byzantium: Papers from the Thirty-first Spring

1998 32nd, Strangers to Themselves: The Byzantine Outsider (University of Sussex)

1999 33rd, Eastern Approaches to Byzantium (27–29 March, University of Warwick)

2000 34th, Travel in the Byzantine World (1–4 April, University of Birmingham)

2001 35th, Rhetoric in Byzantium (University of Oxford)

2002 36th, Was Byzantium Orthodox? (23–25 March, University of Durham)

2003 37th, Eat, Drink, and Be Merry (Luke 12:19) – Food and Wine in Byzantium (29–31 March, University of Birmingham)

2004 38th, Byzantine Trade, 4th–12th Centuries (March, University of Oxford)

2005 39th, Performance Indicators (2–4 April, Queen’s University, Belfast; sympsoiarch Prof. Margaret Mullett)

2006 There was no Spring Symposium for Byzantine Studies in 2006, because of the 21st International Congress of Byzantine Studies that took place in London, U.K., that year

2007 40th, History as Literature in Byzantium (13–16 April, University of Birmingham)

2008 41st, The Archaeologies of Byzantium (4–6 April, University of Edinburgh; symposiarch Prof. Jim Crow)

2009 42nd, Wonderful Things: Byzantium through its Art (20–22 March, Courtauld Institute of Art, London)


2010 43rd, Power and Subversion in Byzantium (27–29 March 2010, University of Birmingham)


2011 44th, Experiencing Byzantium (8–11 April, University of Newcastle)

Experiencing Byzantium: Papers from the Forty-fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Newcastle and Durham, April 2011, edited by Claire Nesbitt and Mark Jackson (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013)


2013 46th, Byzantine Greece: Microcosm of Empire? (23–25 March, University of Birmingham)


2014 47th, The Emperor in the Byzantine World (25–27 April, University of Cardiff)


2016 49th, Inscribing Texts in Byzantium: Continuities and Transformations (18–20 March, University of Oxford; symposiarchs Prof. Marc Lauxtermann and Dr Ida Toth, publication forthcoming)
Notes

2. See also Wolf, 2009.
3. *Post-Byzantium: The Greek Renaissance*, 2002. In the opening pages it is acknowledged that the post-Byzantine Renaissance had multiple manifestations (e.g. the ‘Cypriot Renaissance’, the ‘Cretan Renaissance’, the ‘Heptanesian Renaissance’); ibid., 4. However, is it not conditional for a ‘renaissance’ to have multi-faceted manifestations in order to both ensure and live up to its fundamental principle of non-static change?
4. Maltezou, 1988, 111; this system, with minor alterations and adjustments, remained in use until 31st December 2010. Since 1st January 2011 the Greek government implemented the so-called Kallikratis Plan on the geographical division of the municipalities of Greece; as a consequence, the four prefectures are no longer divided in provinces.
7. Maltezou, 1988, 158.
8. This is partly supported by the fact that post-Byzantine Cretan painters were invited from Crete to decorate churches within Orthodox monastic institutions located in Ottoman-occupied mainland Greece; for example the sixteenth-century artist Theophanis Striliztas (also surnamed Bathas), an older contemporary of El Greco from Candia, was invited to decorate the monastery of Stavronikita on Mount Athos, one of the places that still remains a major cradle of Orthodoxy: Lymberopoulou, 2015, 24–5. For the painter see: Chatzidakis, 1969–1970; Chatzidakis, 1986; Chatzidakis and Drakopoulou, 1997, 381–97.
9. Lymberopoulou and Duits, 2013. The term ‘hybrid’ is used here in its positive association with the production of something new and different, and not as diverting from cultural ‘purity’ and hence a relegation; see Burke, 2009, esp. 66–78 and Burke, 2012. However, it should be noted that the use of this term to describe outcomes of cultural exchange is regarded as problematic by some scholars; see paper by Michele Bacci in this volume, XXX–XXX, and note 4.
10. This was also the driving force behind the volume *Byzantine Art and Renaissance Europe* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), edited by this author and Rembrandt Duits; effectively, this volume carries the baton from the aforementioned publication and aspires to further pave the road in establishing such collaborations.
14. Lymberopoulou, 2006, 199–204 (with extensive notes and bibliography); Lymberopoulou, 2007.
15. Such as the earthquake of 1303 that had a devastating impact on Crete’s capital, Candia: Georgopoulou, 2001, 52, 53, 55, 91, 124.
This is the Saint Titus rebellion that lasted from 1363 to 1367 and was eventually crushed by Venice; the rebellion has attracted attention in scholarly literature since 1903 for its social dynamic: McKee, 1994; McKee, 2000, 133–67.

Maltezou, 1988, 158.
Chrysostomides, 2011, X, 164.
Ibid., 166.
The request was granted on 30 April 1514; the construction of the church started in 1536 and concluded in 1577: Elliniko Institouto Venetias, 2005.

See above, note 14.
Lymberopoulou, 2006, 366 (colour plates 28, 29), 369 (colour plates 50, 51), 370 (colour plates 52, 53).
Ibid., 194–217.
Kalopissi-Verti, 2015, 413.
Gerola, 1932, 466–7 (no. 47).
Fortini Brown, 2016, 43–5.
The islands of Cyprus and Crete in particular invite a number of comparisons that are very illuminating for Mediterranean cross-cultural interaction between the (Byzantine) East and the Latin West and deserve further attention. The International Kretologika Congresses take place every five years and examine all periods in Cretan cultural history from prehistory to the present day. The latest (12th) took place in September 2016 in Herakleion (Venetian Candia). Similarly, the International Kyprologika Congresses address all periods in Cyprus' equally long cultural history. The latest (4th) took place in April–May 2008 in Nicosia. Scholars of Cretan and Cypriot studies have pointed out that a combination of the two Congresses would be of immense benefit for research carried out on both islands; however, this project remains on a scholarly wish list, due to the immense expense and co-ordination its organisation would demand.

See Duits' essay in this volume, XXX and note XXX.
See Papacostas' essay in this volume, XXX.
See essay by this author in this volume, XXX, and the assumption that the Fogg triptych, based on its linguistic bilingualism, points to one of the more cosmopolitan centres on the north coast, probably Candia. For the language used on Venetian Crete: Gasparis, 1994.

Chambers, 1970, 92.
Archives of the Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies, University of Birmingham (research carried out by the author 6th March 2014).
Runciman, 1988, 15.
Chatzidakis, 1974a; Chatzidakis, 1974b; Chatzidakis, 1975, xlvi.
The idea of the hybrid icon is apparent in Chatzidakis' works on Cretan painting: Chatzidakis 1974a; Chatzidakis 1974b. On this issue, see also Drandaki, 2014. The Cretan ‘hybrid’ icon is a relatively common topos even in publications not directly connected with the artistic production of the island; see, for instance, Elliot, 2009, 235. As mentioned above (see note 9) some scholars, such as Michele Bacci, have signposted the term as problematic. Bacci has argued against the term on the basis of its original meaning in Latin (‘bastard’) and its use along those lines in biology: Bacci, 2014. However, is it not a mark of a progressive society to change perspectives and transform negative notions into positive ones? In other words it is up to us how we use and apply terms.

Information based on the Archives of the Spring Byzantine Symposia, Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies, University of Birmingham.
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