U

ÜÇAYAK, a Byz. church (original name unknown) in a desolate area of northwestern Cappadocia, 30 km north of Kırşehir. The structure, exceptionally for the region, is entirely of brick. Its unusual plan of two adjoining cruciform domed chapels with separate apses but a common narthex suggests a dedication to twin saints or perhaps by two emperors; possibly it was built to commemorate the victory of Basil II and Constantine VIII over Bardas SKLEROS in the vicinity in 979. In any case, its style and decoration—the interior decor is lost but the outer walls bear a system of blind arcades—indicate a date in the 10th–11th C.

LIT. S. Eyice, "La ruine byzantine dite 'Üçayak' près de Kırşehir en Anatolie centrale," *CahArch* 18 (1968) 137–55. –C.F.

UGLINESS. See BEAUTY.

UGLJEŠA. See JOHN UGLJEŠA.

ULFILAS (Οὐλφίλας), "bishop of the Goths"; born Cappadocia? ca.311, died Constantinople 382/3. Captured by the Goths in 337, Ulfilas was sent by them as a member of an embassy to Constantinople where EUSEBIOS OF NIKOMEDEIA ordained him as bishop. During his activity among the Goths, Ulfilas translated the Bible (or part of it) into Gothic. In 360 he became an adherent of ARIANISM and signed the creed of the HOMOIOUSIANS; his activity thus contributed to the entrenchment of this doctrine among 4th-C. Germanic people.

The role of Ulfilas has been reconsidered by modern scholars. Thompson stated plainly that Ulfilas did not convert the Goths to Christianity, Schäferdiek rejected the possibility of Ulfilas's definition as a "missionary bishop," and Stockmeier emphasized that the Goths had already accepted Christianity in the 3rd C.

LIT. E.A. Thompson, *The Visigoths in the Time of Ulfila* (Oxford 1966). K. Schäferdiek, "Wulfila," *ZKirch* 90 (1979) 252–92. P. Stockmeier, "Bemerkungen zur Christianisierung der Goten im 4. Jahrhundert," *ZKirch* 92 (1981) 315–24. –A.K.

ULPIOS. See OULPIOS.

ʿUMAR (Οὔμαρος), more fully ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb; caliph (634–44); born Mecca ca.592, assassinated Madīna 3 Nov. 644. Elected caliph, he succeeded Abū Bakr in 634. Muslim conquests of Byz. territory, including most of Palestine, Syria, Egypt, Cyrenaica, and Mesopotamia, took place under ʿUmar. He reportedly met Patr. Sophronios at the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem in 637 while visiting newly won territories in Palestine and Syria. It was probably at Jābiya in 637 that he made the precedent-setting decisions for the initial administrative organization of the newly conquered lands. Desiring peace with the Byz. while he consolidated these lands, he permitted the withdrawal or evacuation of Christians from Chalkis (Ar. Qinnasrīn) in northern Syria and restrained his expansion into new territory. He allegedly did not wish ʿAMR to conquer Egypt but acquiesced in its occupation. He disliked KHĀLID and removed him from command. His diplomatic contacts with Byz. include his successful negotiations to recover prominent Muslims from Byz. captivity and his successful demands for the return of Arabs who had fled to Byz. territory; allegedly he used threats to Christians within caliphal territory to secure his terms. Many Muslim institutions, including a number of treaties and regulations concerning non-Muslim subjects, are ascribed to his decisions.

LIT. Donner, *Conquests* 150–53, 193–200. Caetani, *Islam* 3:119–973, vols. 4–5. W. Kaegi, "The Frontier: Barrier or Bridge?," 17 *CEB Major Papers* (Washington, D.C., 1986) 288–93. A.S. Tritton, *The Caliphs and Their non-Muslim Subjects: A Critical Study of the Covenant of Umar* (Oxford 1930; rp. London 1970). –W.E.K.

ʿUMAR ("Αμερ), emir of Melitene (Malaṭya); died 3 Sept. 863. A lifelong opponent of the Byz. Empire, he was often allied with the ʿAbbāsid

caliphate and the Paulician leader KARBEAS. In 863 ʿUmar accompanied a Muslim army through the Cilician Gates but then advanced separately into Cappadocia, where he probably fought an inconclusive battle with Michael III before moving on to sack Amisos. He is reported to have imitated Xerxes by flogging the Black Sea for stopping his progress (Genes. 67.71–75; *TheophCont* 179.16–19). He then confronted the Byz. general PETRONAS, who destroyed his army at Po⟨r⟩son; ʿUmar died in the battle.

LIT. G. Huxley, "The Emperor Michael III and the Battle of Bishop's Meadow (A.D. 863)," *GRBS* 16 (1975) 443–50. Vasiliev, *Byz. Arabes* 1:249–56. Bury, *ERE* 283f. –P.A.H.

ʿUMAR II ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, caliph of the UMAYYADS (717–20); born Medina 682/3, died Radjab Feb. 720. After his accession ʿUmar ordered MASLAMA to lift the siege of Constantinople and thereafter maintained peaceful relations with Byz.; he may even have signed a seven-year treaty that granted Byz. pilgrims access to the Holy Land (Gero, *infra* 177, n.5). His military activities were almost all defensive in nature (M. Cheira, *La lutte entre Arabes et Byzantins* [Alexandria 1947] 207–13). Theophanes the Confessor (Theoph. 399.20–26) states that in 718 ʿUmar persecuted Christians, exempting from taxation converts to Islam and declaring Christian testimony against Muslims inadmissible, and that he sent Leo III "a dogmatic letter" in hopes of converting him. Thomas Arcruni (10th C.), however, reports that Leo's reply persuaded ʿUmar to reject many Islamic beliefs (Gero, *infra* 132f). Other evidence indicates that ʿUmar was relatively tolerant. Arabic sources say that he prohibited the destruction of old churches, permitted bequests to churches, forbade Christians to wear Arab clothing, and lowered taxes on non-Muslims. He ordered that the Church of St. John in Damascus, dismantled by Walīd I (705–15) and incorporated into the Umayyad Mosque, be returned to the Christians, although he accepted a compromise whereby they received only the suburban Church of St. Thomas.

LIT. K.V. Zetterstéen, *EI* 3:977–79. A. Jeffrey, "Ghevond's Text of the Correspondence between ʿUmar II and Leo III," *HThR* 37 (1944) 269–332. Gero, *Leo III* 44–47. –P.A.H.

UMAYYAD CALIPHATE (661–750), founded by MUʿĀWIYA with its capital at Damascus. After the haphazard formation of the vast Arab empire under the early successors of Muḥammad came a period of administrative consolidation. Even though the Umayyad caliphs tried to expand their possessions in Byz. Asia Minor and attacked Constantinople in 674–80 and 717–18, the view of their relations with Byz. cannot be limited to warfare; as H. Gibb (*DOP* 12 [1958] 219–33) stressed, both their military assaults and administrative adaptation reveal the ambition to establish their own imperial dynasty at Constantinople. To this end the Umayyads used both those Arab tribes traditionally allied with Byz. as well as the Syrian population of former Roman provinces. The Umayyads built substantial fleets that allowed them to exploit a new military tactic—attacking islands and blockading ports. Umayyad expansion was stopped at AKROINON—in part because of stiffening Byz. resistance, in part due to growing internal conflicts within the caliphate. Surviving Arabic traditions are hostile to the Umayyads: these caliphs are criticized for betraying the spirit of the theocratic state as Muḥammad had established it. (See table for a list of Umayyad caliphs.)

LIT. G.R. Hawting, *The First Dynasty of Islam* (Carbondale, Ill., 1987). P. Crone, M. Hinds, *God's Caliph* (Cambridge 1987). H. Lammens, *Études sur le siècle des Omayyades* (Beirut 1930). –W.E.K.

Umayyad Caliphs

Caliph	*Dates of Rule*
MUʿĀWIYA I	661–680
Yazīd I	680–683
Muʿāwiya II	683–684
Marwān I	684–685
ʿABD AL-MALIK	685–705
al-Walīd I	705–715
Sulaymān	715–717
ʿUMAR II	717–720
YAZĪD II	720–724
Hishām	724–743
al-Walīd II	743–744
Yazīd III	743
Ibrāhīm	744
Marwān II	744–750

UMM EL-JIMAL, in Jordan, ruined site probably to be identified as Thantia; a large walled and garrisoned settlement of the 4th–7th C. in the province of ARABIA. A watchtower was built there in 371 in the names of Valentinian I, Valens, and Gratian, and a *kastellos* (barracks?) was constructed by a *doux* in 412/13. Umm el-Jimal is noted for its approximately 15 churches of the 4th–6th C., including the earliest dated church of Syria (built in 344 by a local priest as a memorial church for his son), the cathedral of 556 (?), and at least four other churches paid for by families. The town continued to prosper until the end of the Umayyad period, when it was apparently destroyed by an earthquake and not rebuilt.

LIT. *Princeton Exped. to Syria* 2A:149–213, 3A:131–223. B. De Vries, "Research at Umm el-Jimal, Jordan, 1972–1977," *Biblical Archaeologist* 42 (1979) 49–55. –M.M.M.

UMUR BEG (Ἀμούρ), emir of the coastal beylik of AYDIN; born 1309, died Smyrna 1348. He was the second son of Mehmed and grandson of Aydın, the eponymous founder of the Aydınoğlu dynasty. The exploits of this ghazi warrior are recounted both by Byz. historians (Nikephoros GREGORAS, JOHN VI KANTAKOUZENOS) and the Turkish poet ENVERI, a section of whose *Destur-name* (composed in 1465) deals with Umur. In 1326 Mehmed assigned SMYRNA to Umur as his appanage, but not until 1329 did he gain control of the lower harbor fortress, which was held by the Genoese. Once in command of the port, he constructed a sizable fleet and raided Byz. territory (Chios and Kallipolis) and Latin possessions in Greece (Bodonitsza and Negroponte). Umur succeeded his father as emir in 1334. The next year he formed an anti-Latin alliance with ANDRONIKOS III PALAIOLOGOS and renewed his attacks on Frankish territory. After the death of Andronikos (1341), Umur became a staunch ally of Kantakouzenos and gave him crucial support in the CIVIL WAR OF 1341–47. Gregoras (Greg. 2:649.16) compares Kantakouzenos's relationship with Umur to that of Orestes and Pylades, while Kantakouzenos (Kantak. 2:393.2–3) stresses Umur's slavish devotion to him. The loss of the port of Smyrna in Oct. 1344 to Latin Crusaders, led by Henri d'Asti, Latin patriarch of Constantinople (1339–45), was a severe blow to Umur's naval power; thereafter he was restricted to overland raids. He was killed while trying to dislodge the Latins from lower Smyrna.

SOURCE. *Le Destan d'Umur Pacha,* ed. I. Mélikoff-Sayar (Paris 1954).

LIT. P. Lemerle, *L'Emirat d'Aydin, Byzance et l'Occident: Recherches sur "La Geste d'Umur Pacha"* (Paris 1957). –A.M.T.

UNCIAL, or majuscule—the latter term now being preferred by some scholars, esp. by G. Cavallo and H. Hunger—is the conventional designation for the kind of script used almost exclusively for writing books from the 2nd to 9th C., until the rise of the MINUSCULE as book script. Uncials are also used in INSCRIPTIONS. The characters are *grosso modo* the same as those used up to the present as Greek capital letters; they are unconnected, of equal height, and (with few exceptions) fit into the space between two lines. In early uncial MSS the words are not separated or accented. In its most pure and aesthetically attractive form this script is called "biblical uncial," after the famous Bible codices of the 4th C. (Alexandrinus, Sinaiticus, Vaticanus). Most of the characters can be inscribed into a square, very much as in the Latin *capitalis quadrata.* Besides this ideal type are three other main (and later) types of uncial: the so-called Coptic uncial (today usually called Alexandrian, after the center of its diffusion), the upright ogival uncial, and the inclined ogival uncial, the last two with regional variants: Italo-Greek, Palestinian, and Constantinopolitan.

With the development of the minuscule as book script from around 800 onward, the use of uncials declined and was reserved increasingly for special purposes. In secular texts it was now used exclusively for certain prominent parts of the text (hence Hunger's term "Auszeichnungsmajuskel" for what was commonly called half-uncial), for example, for titles (LEMMA), tables of contents (*pinakes*), marginal notes, etc. The Alexandrian uncial was often used for this purpose. Only in the religious sphere did the uncial continue to be used for writing entire books (in its upright form, until the 11th C.); uncial codices thus gained an additional symbolic value, being associated a priori with the religious world.

LIT. Hunger, "Buch- und Schriftwesen" 80–86. Idem, "Epigraphische Auszeichnungsmajuskel," *JÖB* 26 (1977)

193–210. G. Cavallo, *Ricerche sulla maiuscola biblica* (Florence 1967). Idem, "Funzione e strutture della maiuscola greca tra i secoli VIII–XI," in *PGEB* 95–137. E. Crisci, "La maiuscola ogivale diritta," *Scrittura e civiltà* 9 (1985) 103–45. –W.H.

UNCTION (*εὐχέλαιον, ἅγιον ἔλαιον*), SACRAMENT of the anointing of the sick for healing and for the forgiveness of sin, the administration of which was eventually restricted to presbyters and bishops. The Byz. also called this rite *heptapapadon akolouthia* because it was celebrated (ideally) by seven priests. Unction, foreshadowed in New Testament therapeutic and burial anointings, is seen in James 5:14, in the oldest extant church orders, which have blessings of oil for therapeutic and exorcistic use, and in the earliest Byz. *euchologion* (Goar, *Euchologion* 346–48). Symeon of Thessalonike comments at length on the rite, disputing the Latin view that it should be received only by the moribund (PG 155:515–36). In Byz. it was administered to both the dying (vita of Theodore of Stoudios—PG 99:325B) and the dead, and confusion between the two anointings in *euchologia* MSS was a source of complaint. Patr. Nikephoros II of Constantinople (1260–61) condemned the *euchelaion* of the dead (*RegPatr*, fasc. 4, no.1348).

Unction, which could be administered to several persons at once, was originally a series of prayers distributed throughout the offices, beginning at *pannychis* (see VIGIL) and concluding with the anointing itself at the end of the morning liturgy. It eventually became an independent *akolouthia* (Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie* 2:320–24, 369–71, 405–10), consisting of a KANON modeled on that of ORTHROS, followed by the sevenfold repetition of a specific liturgical unit concluding with a prayer of blessing over the oil (Goar, *op. cit.* 332–46). After each of the seven priests had blessed the oil in turn, the people came forward to be anointed on the forehead, ears, nostrils, hands, etc., the order and number of senses anointed varying according to the MS. The ANOINTING of persons and objects in other Byz. *akolouthiai* (baptism, imperial coronation, the consecration of a church) should not be confused with this sacrament.

SOURCE. *Sacrement de l'huile sainte et prières pour les malades*, tr. D. Guillaume (Rome 1985).

LIT. E. Melia, "The Sacrament of the Anointing of the Sick," in *Temple of the Holy Spirit* (New York 1983) 127–60. A.M. Triacca, "Per una rassegna sul sacramento dell'Unzione degli infermi," *EphLit* 89 (1975) 431f (bibl.). –R.F.T.

UNGUENTARIUM, a conventional term applied to a well-attested type of small (approximately 18–21 cm in height) pottery flask, fusiform in shape—with a short tubular mouth marked off from the body by a slight ridge—tapering at the bottom to a roughly truncated point. Nearly half the specimens bear a stamp impression, most often of a MONOGRAM, but occasionally of an image (e.g., lion) or a text (e.g., "of Bishop Severianos"). The vessel type is datable ca.500–650 by the monogram format ("box" and "cruciform") and by the discovery of a cache of 20 examples in the Athenian Agora in mid-6th-C. context. Findspot evidence indicates substantial production and wide distribution, probably from a single source in Palestine. The stamps were probably added to vouch for the vessels' contents (see STAMPS, COMMERCIAL); ecclesiastics' names among them, coupled with the likely Palestinian origin, suggests that they were pilgrimage AMPULLAE made as containers for Jordan water or holy oil from the LOCA SANCTA.

LIT. J.W. Hayes, "A New Type of Early Christian Ampulla," *BSA* 66 (1971) 243–48. –G.V.

UNION OF THE CHURCHES, term describing the effort to reunify the churches of Rome and Byz. following the breach of the 9th to early 13th C. Although theological, disciplinary, and liturgical polarization between Rome and Constantinople led to temporary schisms during the first millennium of Christian history, only gradually did this opposition, along with cultural and political differences, result in a permanent breach. The so-called SCHISM of 1054 did not mark a final separation of Eastern and Western Christendom. It was rather the Fourth Crusade (1204) that rendered the breach definitive. During the next two centuries there were innumerable attempts to restore communion, but developments such as the Latin domination of Byz. by the Crusaders, papal centralization, scholastic theology, and the dogmatization of the FILIOQUE at the Second Council of LYONS complicated the situation.

Political more than religious considerations motivated the negotiations for union during the Komnenian and Palaiologan periods. The Palaiologos dynasty particularly needed military aid to fight the Turks. The papacy, realizing this, demanded total ecclesiastical submission of the Byz. church in return for military assistance. Unconditional union—not a negotiated settlement—was to precede military aid.

The Western church was reluctant to acknowledge the traditional practice and habits of the East. On the other hand, Byz. hardliners and esp. monks clung to minor niceties of their tradition, refusing to give up even the slightest items and sometimes preferring Turkish conquest to submission to the "papists." In such conditions only a few politicians and intellectuals on both sides were sincere supporters of the union; political agreements remained short-lived and cynical, often resulting from Western indifference and Eastern zeal.

The Unionist attempts could not succeed, as the unions of Lyons and FERRARA-FLORENCE demonstrate. Lyons is an esp. dramatic case not only of the limitations of Byz. imperial influence over religious policy, but of the rigidity of papal diplomacy. Ultimately both councils only served to widen the separation.

LIT. S. Runciman, *The Eastern Schism* (Oxford 1955). F. Dvornik, *Byzantium and the Roman Primacy* (New York 1966). D.M. Nicol, "Byzantine Requests for an Oecumenical Council in the Fourteenth Century," *AnnHistCon* 1 (1969) 69–95. –A.P.

UNIVERSITY OF CONSTANTINOPLE, conventional term for an institution of higher education, the stage subsequent to the CURRICULUM of *enkyklios paideia*. Of the two formal features of most medieval universities—a royal charter or papal bull granting recognition and juridical personality—the University of Constantinople had only the former. Like Western universities, however, it developed the elements of professional education (e.g., a LAW SCHOOL), whereas MEDICINE was taught at hospitals by physicians. The earlier University of Constantinople was organized (or reorganized) by Theodosios II in 425. Located in the Kapetolion (Janin, *CP byz.* 174–76), it had 31 chairs, primarily for Greek and Latin grammar and also for rhetoric, philosophy, and law. The fate of the University of Constantinople after Justinian I is obscure. The schema presented by A. Schneider (*Byzanz* [Berlin 1936] 25)—that the university was closed by Phokas and replaced by a "Patriarchal Academy" under Herakleios—is simplistic and unfounded (Lemerle, *Humanism* 93f, n.39). The school in MAGNAURA created by Caesar BARDAS used to be described as a university, but its curriculum and structure did not differ substantially from those of regular secondary schools.

There is more justification for applying the name *university* to the schools of law and philosophy founded by Constantine IX; for the first of them there is a statute promulgated in 1046/7 (in Apr. 1047, according to J. Lefort, *TM* 6 [1976] 279f). The school, which was administered by the NOMOPHYLAX, was responsible for training high functionaries, lawyers, and notaries. The secular university reached its acme in the 11th C., but in the 12th C. it was overshadowed by a more conservative PATRIARCHAL SCHOOL, which was more concerned with the teaching of theology. Nevertheless, at least until ca.1300, Constantinople retained, together with Paris and Baghdad, the reputation of a center of higher education. Some kind of officially sponsored higher education was available in Constantinople up to 1453, though its institutional form varied (see XENON OF THE KRAL).

LIT. F. Fuchs, *Die höheren Schulen von Konstantinopel im Mittelalter* (Leipzig-Berlin 1926). P. Speck, *Die kaiserliche Universität von Konstantinopel* (Munich 1974). M.J. Kyriakis, "The University: Origin and Early Phases in Constantinople," *Byzantion* 41 (1971) 161–82. W. Wolska-Conus, "Les écoles de Psellos et de Xiphilin sous Constantin IX Monomaque," *TM* 6 (1976) 223–43. C.N. Constantinides, *Higher Education in Byzantium in the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries, 1204–ca.1310* (Nicosia 1982). –A.K.

URBAN II (Odo of Châtillon), elected pope at Terracina 12 Mar. 1088; born Châtillon-sur-Marne ca.1035, died Rome 29 July 1099. Urban inherited a difficult situation: northern Italy was under the control of Henry IV of Germany, who supported the antipope CLEMENT III; Urban's natural ally in this state of events was ROGER I, count of Sicily. After the death of ROBERT GUISCARD in 1085 the Normans did not continue their attack on Byz., and, according to GAUFREDUS MALATERRA, opened negotiations with Alexios I in 1089 after consultation with Roger. Patr. NICHOLAS III GRAMMATIKOS, in an epistle addressed to Urban, expressed expectations that UNION OF THE CHURCHES could soon be attained. No evidence of a formal union agreement is known, but Urban evidently achieved his aim and prevented Alexios from joining an alliance with Henry IV and Clement. When the situation improved in Italy in the early 1090s, Urban journeyed from Rome to France. On his way in March 1095, he convened

a synod in Piacenza, which was attended by Byz. envoys who appealed for Western military aid against the Seljuk Turks; a few months later at Clermont he made a full-fledged appeal for a crusade (Nov. 1095), thus initiating the First Crusade. J. Hill (*Speculum* 26 [1951] 265f) hypothesizes—on the basis of indirect evidence—that Urban prepared a plan of Greco-Latin union, the execution of which he entrusted to RAYMOND OF TOULOUSE.

LIT. S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, vol. 1 (Cambridge 1951) 100–10. A. Becker, *Papst Urban II. (1088–99)*, 2 vols. [= MGH *Schriften* 19.1–2] (Stuttgart 1964–88). W. Holtzmann, "Die Unionsverhandlungen zwischen Kaiser Alexios I. und Papst Urban II. im Jahre 1089," *BZ* 28 (1928) 38–67. H.E.J. Cowdrey, "Pope Urban II's Preaching of the First Crusade," *History* 55 (1970) 177–88. J. Richard, "Urbain II, la prédication de la croisade et la définition de l'indulgence," in *Deus qui mutat tempora*, ed. E.-D. Hehl et al. (Sigmaringen 1987) 129–35. –A.K.

URBAN V (Guillaume de Grimoard), pope (from 28 Sept. 1362); born Grisac Lozère, France, ca.1310, died Avignon 19 Dec. 1370. Urban spent the first five years of his pontificate in Avignon; after 1367 he resided in Rome. Urban supported the idea of a crusade, but the success of the king of Cyprus, Peter I Lusignan (1359–69), in capturing Alexandria in 1365 was short-lived. Urban also failed to achieve significant results in imposing UNION OF THE CHURCHES on Constantinople. Emp. John V came to Rome and on 18 Oct. 1369 abjured the Eastern creed and recognized papal supremacy, but the agreement remained on the level of a personal compact, with the vast majority of the Byz. clergy and people refusing to accept their emperor's decision. The cause for Byz. opposition was Roman arrogance rather than Byz. obstinacy: the pope rejected the idea of a universal council to discuss theological differences and was very reluctant to allow continuation of the Greek rite. J. Gill (*OrChrP* 39 [1973] 461–68) tried to reconsider the traditional interpretation of the pope's letter to the archbishop of Crete; Gill argues that Urban allowed Greek priests, after their conversion to Catholicism, to retain their wives. They could conduct processions and ceremonies that were part of the Greek rite; since they knew no Latin, they celebrated in Greek.

LIT. E. de Lanouvelle, *Urbain V* (Paris 1929). O. Halecki, *Un empereur de Byzance à Rome* (Warsaw 1930). W. de Vries, "Die Päpste von Avignon und der christliche Osten," *OrChrP* 30 (1964) 85–128. N. Housley, "The Mercenary Companies, the Papacy, and the Crusades, 1356–1378," *Traditio* 38 (1982) 253–80. –A.K.

URBAN LIFE. See CITIES.

URBAN PREFECT (*praefectus urbi*, ἔπαρχος Ῥώμης), high-ranking official of the early Roman Empire who was responsible for police and criminal prosecution in Rome and Italy. Reforms of Diocletian, Constantine I, and Constantius II limited the area of his activity to within 100 miles of Rome, while Italy was placed under the authority of the PRAETORIAN PREFECT. At the same time his functions within Rome were increased: besides criminal jurisdiction the urban prefect controlled trade, the bread supply, building activity, and the administration of spectacles. He held a military command and, as president of the SENATE, supervised the senators. As Chastagnol has shown, the post was in the hands of the great landowners, 60 percent of whom were local, demonstrating imperial leniency toward the Roman aristocracy. Until 323 all urban prefects were pagans and until 352 Christian urban prefects remained exceptional. The urban prefect of Rome continued to exist after the fall of the Western Empire, as attested by CASSIODORUS and CORIPPUS, and is mentioned as late as 879. The staff of the urban prefect included the *princeps officii*, who was the prefect's adviser in matters of administration and law.

By 359 the office of the Constantinopolitan urban prefect, or EPARCH OF THE CITY, was created to replace the former proconsul (see ANTHYPATOS); thus the administration of Constantinople was equated to that of Rome.

LIT. A. Chastagnol, *La préfecture urbaine à Rome sous le Bas-Empire* (Paris 1960). Idem, *Les Fastes de la préfecture de Rome au Bas-Empire* (Paris 1962). Dagron, *Naissance* 213–94. W.G. Sinnigen, *The Officium of the Urban Prefecture during the Later Roman Empire* (Rome 1957). *PLRE* 1:1052–56; 2:1252–56. –A.K.

URFA. See EDESSA.

UROŠ V. See STEFAN UROŠ V.

USĀMAH IBN MUNQIDH, noble Muslim knight, Arab poet, man of letters, and passionate hunter; born Shayzar, Syria, 4 July 1095, died Damascus 16 Nov. 1188. His life span corresponded with a dramatic period in Near Eastern history that saw incessant Muslim factional struggles, the capture of Jerusalem, the establishment of the Latin Kingdom by the First Crusade, the failure of the Second Crusade, and the recapture of Jerusalem by SALADIN. Serving or visiting different Muslim and Crusader princes, sultans, and caliphs, Usāmah participated in their court life, military campaigns (e.g., the siege of Shayzar by JOHN II KOMNENOS), and hunting expeditions.

Usāmah spent the last two decades of his life mostly in religious contemplation, teaching, and writing. He attained fame as a superb poet and prolific author. Most important among his surviving works, *The Book of Didactic Examples* is essentially his memoirs. A source of direct information about contemporary battle and siege methods, it also provides details on the treatment of prisoners (e.g., the ransoming of a Muslim slave from his Greek owner in Constantinople), on the intimacies of Muslim court and private home life as well as on horse races and falconry. Above all, it offers Usāmah's personal and equanimous observations on different habits and social customs, thoughts, medical treatments, religious attitudes and practices of the Muslims and Franks in Syria.

ED. *Ousama ibn Mounkidh*, ed. H. Derenbourg, 2 vols. (Paris 1886–89). *An Arab-Syrian Gentleman and Warrior in the Period of the Crusades*, tr. P.K. Hitti (New York 1929). *Des enseignements de la vie: Souvenirs d'un gentilhomme syrien du temps des Croisades*, tr. A. Miquel (Paris 1983). *Die Erlebnisse des syrischen Ritters*, tr. H. Preissler (Munich 1985). –A.S.E.

USPENSKIJ GOSPEL BOOK, the earliest known dated minuscule manuscript, written in 835 on parchment in the scriptorium of the STOUDIOS MONASTERY by the scribe Nicholas. The manuscript contains notes on the death of the Stoudite leaders Plato of Sakkoudion and Theodore, as well as Joseph of Thessalonike. The codex, from the former collection of the bishop Porfirij Uspenskij, a traveler to Mt. Athos, is now in the Leningrad Public Library (gr.219).

LIT. E.E. Granstrem, "Katalog grečeskich rukopisej Leningradskich chranilišč, 1," *VizVrem* 16 (1959) 233f. –A.K.

USUFRUCT (χρήσις καρπῶν, in scholia to the *Basilika* usually οὐσούφρυκτος), according to classical Roman law, "the right to use the things of another, their substance remaining unimpaired" (a definition accepted by *Basil.* 16.1.1). Unlike praedial servitudes, usufruct was personal, given for life or for a fixed term. Classical jurisprudence differentiated usufruct from OWNERSHIP; this distinction, strong under Diocletian, became obscured during the 4th and 5th C. when the tendency arose to consider usufruct as a form of POSSESSION, limited in time and content. Justinian I sought, with partial success, to reverse this process and return to the classical formulation. Later texts cease to distinguish between usufruct and plain use (CHRESIS).

LIT. M. Bretone, *La nozione romana di usufrutto*, vol. 2 (Naples 1967), rev. D. Medicus, *ZSavRom* 85 (1968) 525–28. Kaser, *Privatrecht* 2, par.247. –A.J.C.

USURPATION, a common phenomenon of late Roman and Byz. political life, was neither terminologically nor legally defined in Byz. The most usual term for usurpation of power by an illegal claimant was *tyrannis*, but the term *tyrannis* could designate other situations (rebellion, arbitrary rule) and other terms could be used for usurpation—*stasis* (insurrection), *epibouleuma* (conspiracy). Usurpation may be defined as an illegal arbitrary assumption of the emperor's power, but since, in theory, proclamation by the people in the Hippodrome or by the army was considered legal authorization, the concept of usurpation appears significantly ambiguous; furthermore, a co-emperor who cleared his way to the throne by murder (e.g., Basil I) was not considered a usurper but a legitimate heir.

Usurpation usually is recognized as symptomatic of broader trends in the distribution, bases, and exploitation of power in Byz. society. In the late Roman Empire usurpation had diverse causes and diverse characteristics: it originated in both military and civilian milieus, could have a religious tinge, and was often connected with crisis situations on an endangered frontier (e.g., PHOKAS) or in Constantinople (HYPATIOS during the Nika Revolt). It was a subject of intense political concern to the emperor; its repression was frequently and loudly celebrated in TRIUMPHS. From the second half of the 7th C. to the mid-9th C., usurpation occurred primarily in new provincial territorial units—first exarchates and then themes—that provided a material base for military seditions (GREGORY, exarch of Africa; OLYMPIOS, exarch of Ravenna, etc.). From the 10th C. onward, usur-

pation came first and foremost from the action of high-ranking families (Lekapenoi, Phokades, Skleroi, Komnenoi, Palaiologoi, etc.), whereas usurpers from the rank and file (e.g., Nicholas KANNABOS) were rare. At the same time, the sources distinguish between usurpation (*tyrannis*) and a less grave offense (*apostasia*), while punishments for participants became more lenient. The major symbol of usurpation was putting on the PURPLE; additional actions could be CORONATION, SHIELD-RAISING, and ACCLAMATIONS. Public opinion condemned usurpation; KEKAUMENOS is esp. vocal in criticizing it and in predicting that every revolt against the emperor would fail. In reality, however, many usurpations were successful.

LIT. S. Elbern, *Usurpationen im spätrömischen Reich* (Bonn 1984). W. Kaegi, *Byzantine Military Unrest, 471–843* (Amsterdam 1981). J. Szidat, "Usurpator und Zivilbevölkerung im 4. Jhd. n. Chr.," *Gesellschaft und Gesellschaften* (Bern 1982) 14–31. M. Koutlouka, "La tyrannie dans la philosophie byzantine du XIe siècle," *Actes du Colloque La Tyrannie* (Caen 1984) 51–60. McCormick, *Eternal Victory* 80–83, 186–88. P. Salama, "L'apport des inscriptions routières à l'histoire politique de l'Afrique Romaine," *L'Africa romana*, vol. 3 (Sassari 1986) 229–31. –A.K.

USURY (*τοκοληψία*, lit. "receipt of interest") in the ancient and medieval sense of the word encompasses a variety of modes of receiving INTEREST, whereas in the modern period it is applied only to excessive interest. Usury, defined as any form of lending money or things at interest, was a controversial topic from the 4th C. onward, when three different approaches were formulated: church fathers condemned all usury as contradicting the principles of Christian ethics; ecclesiastical councils forbade only the clergy to lend at interest; and civil legislation continued to permit usury, although Justinian I apparently lowered the maximum rate of interest. Attempts to abolish usury in the 8th (?) or 9th C. failed, and Leo VI, in novel 83, reinstated the practice despite its un-Christian character. The general attitude of society toward usury was negative. Hagiographers compared usurers to wild beasts. In the 14th C. Nicholas KABASILAS wrote at least two works against usurers. Time and again demands for action against usury were voiced (see DEBT).

LOANS played a double role in Byz. society. On the one hand, the use of credit could stimulate small enterprises; thus, the vita of BASIL THE YOUNGER mentions a wine merchant who borrowed money to purchase goods. On the other hand, usury contributed to the redistribution of (landed) property. Peasants contracted loans for a variety of reasons—in times of famine, to ransom prisoners of war, to pay taxes; in these cases their livestock or land served as a mortgage. A case described in *Peira* 40.10 presents the stages of expropriation: when a debtor was unable to pay, the judge ordered him to hand over his houses to the creditor "as possession" (*epi nome*); after six months the creditor acquired the *despoteia* of the immovables. Little is known about loans among the nobility, but in the late centuries the Byz. crown was deeply in debt to Venice and other Western powers.

LIT. E. Bianchi, "Il tema d'usura," *Athenaeum* 61 (1983) 321–42; 62 (1984) 136–53. Kazhdan, *Derevnja i gorod* 295–98. –A.K.

UTENSILS (*ἔπιπλα*). Household implements and furnishings encompassed FURNITURE, VESSELS, cutlery (knife, spoon, and fork), lighting appliances (LAMPS), writing tools (inkstands, etc.); the distinction between utensils and tools (see TOOLS AND HOUSEHOLD FITTINGS), on the one hand, and utensils and liturgical vessels, on the other, as described in texts is sometimes conventional and reveals itself more in function than in form. Utensils were made of wood, stone, metal, clay (CERAMIC), glass, bone, skin, osier, and cloth; there was a hierarchy of materials in which gold and silver stood above bronze and iron, ebony and cedar above other kinds of wood, ivory above ordinary bone, etc. A 14th-C. historian (Greg. 2:788.15–18) stresses the hierarchy of materials when he exclaims that the poverty of the imperial court required the replacement of gold and silver vessels by those made of tin and "ceramic and clay." Ornament was another means to express the hierarchy of utensils, and glaze and coloring usually distinguished table dishes from plain kitchen pottery. For expensive utensils, gold, silver, precious stones, enamel, and ivory were applied. A simple method of ornamentation was to carve lines on wooden and ceramic objects. The most precious utensils were adorned with inscriptions (dedications), while ordinary objects occasionally bore marks (of craftsmen or owners?).

LIT. Koukoules, *Bios* 2.2:60–116. E. Kislinger, "La cultura materiale di Bisanzio," *Schede medievali* 11 (1986) 299–313. –A.K.

ʿUTHMĀN (*Οὐθμάν*), caliph (early Nov. 644–17 June 656); born Mecca, ca.569 or 575, died Madīna 17 June 656. A merchant who converted to Islam, he was the chosen successor of ʿUMAR. Although the rate of Muslim territorial expansion slackened during ʿUthmān's caliphate, his forces overran Armenia. The Sasanian Empire ended with the death of YAZDGIRD III, and Muslim naval prowess increased. ʿUthmān approved the renewal of conquests to the west: in North Africa, Ibn Saʿd, his governor of Egypt, crushed GREGORY the exarch in 647 and, with the exception of Carthage, conquered much of Byz. Africa. This seriously threatened the remaining Byz. positions in the entire Mediterranean. Two critical maritime triumphs over Byz. in ʿUthmān's caliphate were the victory of the Battle of the Masts (655) and the first invasion of Cyprus (648). ʿUthmān was accused of indolence, corruption, and, in the later years of his caliphate, nepotism. Some allege that he modeled his administrative changes on Byz. and Sasanian models, but documentation for this is poor. Civil strife in ʿUthmān's caliphate disillusioned many Muslims. He was slain after his besieged house was stormed.

LIT. M. Hinds, "The Murder of the Caliph ʿUthmān," *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 3 (1972) 450–69. J. Wellhausen, "Prolegomena zur ältesten Geschichte des Islams," *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten* (Berlin 1899) 6:113–35. Caetani, *Islam* 7, 8:1–321. –W.E.K.

UTOPIA, a term coined in the 16th C. to designate a perfect commonwealth. The ancient mind created politico-geographical utopias, considering certain real (Sparta in Plato) or fictitious states as ideal systems. The ancient tradition of a world without labor and tyranny, spatially separated from the regular *oikoumene* and located at its edge, seems to have been preserved in chs. 4–21 of the EXPOSITIO TOTIUS MUNDI (C. Molè in *Le transformazioni della cultura nella tarda antichità* [Rome 1985] 2:730–36). Christianity shifted the emphasis from the spatial category to one pertaining to time: utopia, as elaborated particularly in APOCALYPSES, was placed in the future—as a perfect reign of an expected king, or an ESCHATOLOGICAL period of peace, or the Heavenly Kingdom. In LACTANTIUS this concept of the future happy era when everyone would praise the true God is combined with a Platonic social utopia and mythological imagery of the age of Saturn. The Byz. envisaged that the Kingdom of justice would be established after the second PAROUSIA; at the same time they thought that mankind had reached maturity following Christ's advent and therefore stressed that ideal life is attainable here and now. From antiquity they inherited the topos of the "happy barbarian" as opposed to the corrupted civilized man: this topos appears, for example, in Simokattes' account (Theoph.Simok. 6.2.10–16) of the Sklavenoi, who lived in a remote area on the Western Ocean and were distinguished for their height and beauty; they never used iron weapons and carried with them only lyres. The communities of the Brahmans were also represented as ideal societies as in PALLADIOS. Another type of ideal life was the image of the "angelic communities" of monks, esp. hermits dwelling in the DESERT, withdrawn from the world and to some extent resembling the Brahmans. The palace and Constantinople were viewed as representing the ideal "heavenly" order, although the Byz. understood the difference between the heavenly utopia of the palace or monastery and everyday reality.

The concept of political utopia was employed as a means of propaganda; thus CLAUDIAN predicted Stilicho's prosperous rule, and Andronikos I Komnenos claimed that he had brought the golden age of justice on earth: his portrait showed him as "the laborers' king," and Niketas Choniates (Nik.Chon. 325.17–36) preserved the traces of a contemporary pamphlet whose author, using biblical citations (e.g., Mic 4:4), depicted the perfect life of satisfied subjects under his reign. On the other hand, utopia might appear as a form of political program, for example, in the case of PLETHON, who used Platonic traditions as a model for his (unrealistic) project of reforms in the Peloponnesos.

LIT. J. Irmscher, "Die christliche und die byzantinische Utopie," *StItalFCl*[3] 3.2 (1985) 250–66. Mango, *Byzantium* 218, 223f. A. Kazhdan, "Certain Traits of Imperial Propaganda in the Byzantine Empire from the Eighth to the Fifteenth Centuries," in *Prédication et propagande au Moyen Age: Islam, Byzance, Occident* (Paris 1983) 23f. –A.K.

UTRIGURS. See COTRIGURS AND UTRIGURS.

UZES (*Οὔζοι*), Torki in Kievan sources, the confederation of Oghuz Turks that formed a part of the Old Turkic steppe empire; they were akin to the SELJUKS. Under CUMAN pressure the Uzes moved west, crossed the Volga, and in the 10th C., following the PECHENEGS, appeared in the area

north of the Black Sea and on the Middle Danube. Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (*De adm. imp.* 9.114) suggested the Uzes as potential allies against the Pechenegs.

Closely involved in skirmishes with Rus' princes, in 1064 the Uzes crossed the Danube and invaded Byz. territory as far as Thessalonike. Attaleiates (Attal. 83.19–20) reckons that they numbered 600,000. Disease and starvation, however, as well as Bulgarian and Pecheneg attacks forced the Uzes to retreat; many were crushed by their own animals and vehicles. Some Uzes became Byz. MERCENARIES, some merged with the Pechenegs, others settled near Kiev as military colonists in the service of the Rus' princes (*černye klobuci*). In Byz. the corps of mercenary Uzes was still active in the second half of the 11th C. (*SkylCont* 144.13), then disappeared as a distinct force, leaving some echoes in toponymy (Lake Ouzolimne) and personal names (a commander Ouzas "of Sauromatian origin" in the *Alexiad* of Anna Komnene). The Byz. identified the Uzes as Scythians (Skylitzes Continuatus) or Huns (Anna Komnene); TZETZES (*Hist.* 8.773), following an old tradition, placed the Uzes with the Huns in the vicinity of the Caspian Sea.

LIT. O. Pritsak, *Studies in Medieval Eurasian History* (London 1981), pts. VI, X, XIX. P. Golden, "The Migrations of the *Oğuz*," *ArchOtt* 4 (1972) 45–84. T. Nagrodzka-Majchrzyk, *Czarni kłobucy* (Warsaw 1985). –O.P.

V

VAHRAM, known as *rabun*, "master," or *vardapet*, "teacher"; Armenian scholar active in the late 13th C. He calls himself "chancellor" at the court of Leo II, king of Armenian Cilicia (1270–89); little else is known of his life. His *Rhymed Chronicle* traces the history of Armenian Cilicia from its occupation by Ruben (see RUBENIDS) in the late 11th C. until 1276. His *Commentary on Aristotle's Categories* follows the tradition made popular in Armenia by works of (or attributed to) DAVID THE PHILOSOPHER.

ED. E. Dulaurier, ed., "Chronique rimée des rois de la petite Arménie," RHC *Arm.* 1:491–535, with Fr. tr. Eng. tr. in C. Neumann, *Vahram's Chronicle* (London 1831). *Lucmunk' "storogut'eanc'n" Aristoteli*, ed. G. Grigoryan (Erevan 1967). –R.T.

VAŁARŠAPAT (Vagharshapat, now Ējmiacin in Armenia), capital city under TRDAT THE GREAT; site of the martyrdom of Sts. Hŕip'simē, Gayanē and their companions. Since the 4th C., churches at Vałaršapat have commemorated the martyrs and the spot where GREGORY THE ILLUMINATOR had a vision in which four lofty columns supporting vaults were called forth by a man descended from heaven. (The 12th-C. identification of the man as Christ explains the cathedral's dedication, Ējmiacin, "the Only-Begotten-One descended.")

The present cathedral is a 7th-C. cross-in-square church, with apses to the north, south, and west, as well as east. Seventeenth-century additions obscure the exterior. Beneath the apse and nave are remains of basilicas (and a Zoroastrian temple); A. Sahinyan's reconstruction of a 5th-C. cross-domed structure here (*REArm* n.s. 3 [1966] 39–71) is based on a misunderstanding of excavation notes (F. Gandolfo, *Le basiliche armene IV–VII secolo* [Rome 1982] 14–19).

St. Hŕip'simē (618) is the best-known example of a church plan type (including Džvari at Mc'xet'a) peculiar to the Transcaucasus: four apses open out of a domed central area. Between the apses, steep, three-quarter-round chambers lead to four square corner rooms. St. Gayanē (630) is a cross-domed basilica. Like St. Hŕip'simē, its apse and auxiliary chambers are inscribed within a flat wall. Later churches at Vałaršapat (e.g., the 17th-C. Šołokat) presumably mark the sites of other 4th-C. *martyria*.

LIT. O.Kh. Khalpakhchian, *Architectural Ensembles of Armenia* (Moscow 1980) 97–157. A.B. Eremjan, *Chram Ripsime* (Erevan 1955). –A.T.

VALENS (Οὐάλης), augustus (from 28 Mar. 364); born Cibalae, Pannonia, ca.328, died near Adrianople 9 Aug. 378. A low-ranking army officer during the reigns of Julian and Jovian, he rose swiftly after the ascent to the throne of his brother Valentinian I. Valentinian appointed him *tribunus* (or *comes*) *stabuli*, and less than a month later he became co-ruler. After a division of responsibilities Valens retained the eastern part of the empire including Thrace and Egypt. The brothers reversed Julian's policies, depriving the curiae of state support and removing Julian's appointees. The pro-Julian elements gathered around the rebel PROKOPIOS. His revolt in 365, however, was suppressed. Less clear are the reasons for the so-called plot of Theodoros in 371/2 in which many influential people were involved; denunciation led to a series of severe punishments.

The situation on the Persian frontier was troublesome during his reign, and Valens spent the winters of 373/4 and 377/8 in Antioch negotiating such matters as the division of Armenia between Constantinople and Persia. The first war against the Goths ended with a peace treaty in 369 that was not favorable to the empire. In 376 Valens gave permission for a large number of Visigoths, fleeing from the Huns, to settle in Thrace. This operation was poorly handled, supplies of food ran out, and Roman officials took advantage of the situation to gain personal profit. As a result, the Visigoths rose in revolt and ravaged the Thracian countryside. Valens, then at Antioch, rushed westward, hoping to defeat the barbarians without the help of his nephew Gratian; as a result, he