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INTRODUCTION

The commission of the Panoplia Dogmatike (Dogmatic Armoury, henceforth: PD) is connected with perhaps the most famous trial against heresy in Byzantium, which was held against the leader of the Bogomil heresy at the beginning of the twelfth century. In connection with this trial Emperor Alexios I Komnenos (1081-1118) commissioned his best Constantinopolitan theologian, Euthymios Zyga
denos,¹ to expose each important heresy in an anthology, beginning from early Christian times and concluding with the heretical movements of the twelfth century. In this way one of the authoritative dogmatic anthologies in Byzantium was created, which became the basis for the subsequent anthologies of Andronikos Kamateros² and Niketas Choniates.³

In modern scholarship the involvement of the Bogomils has overshadowed many aspects concerning the PD, but with the appearance of several studies witnessing the revival of interest in the great anthologies of Byzantium⁴ perhaps the hour of the PD has come

¹ The name of the theologian who compiled the PD is attested in several variations by the manuscript tradition – most commonly as Zygadenos or Zyga
denos. This study will use the form Zyga
denos, a variant which is not frequently used in Modern and Early Modern Times, but which was accepted by the editors of the first Greek edition in 1710. The only monograph to date dedicated to the life and works of this theologian also argues that Zygadenos is the correct version of the name. See Andreas Papavasileou, Εὐθύμιος Ἰωάννης Ζυγαδηνός - Βίος, Συγγραφαί (Leukosia: 1979), 16-21. (Henceforth: Papavasileou, Εὐθύμιος Ζυγαδηνός).
² At the moment of writing this thesis, the critical edition of Andronikos Kamateros’ Sacred Armoury is under preparation by Alessandra Bucossi for the Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca.
⁴ The Institute of Early Christian and Byzantine Studies at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, under the supervision of professors Peter Van Deun and Caroline Macé, hosts a research project which aims to produce a critical edition of Byzantine encyclopedias from different periods: Florilegium Coislinianum (Xth cent.); De oeconomia Dei of Nilus Doxapatres (XIIth cent.); Synopsis variarum disciplinarum of Joseph the Philosopher (XIVth cent.).

On the current state of the research questions concerning Byzantine dogmatic florilegia and systematization of doctrine see Antonio Rigo and Pavel Ermilov (eds.), Byzantine Theologians: The Systematization of Their Own Doctrine and Their Perception of Foreign Doctrines, Quaderni di "Nea Rhome" 3 (Roma: Università di Roma “Tor Vergata,” 2009).
again. Be that as it may, in the present study I will present snapshots of the reception history of this book against heresy which continued to be read long after the twelfth century and was used in ways that went beyond the expectations of Emperor Alexios I and his theologians.

Accounts of the compilation of the anthology in the twelfth century

The circumstances around the compilation of the PD in the twelfth century are well known. They come from two sources – the account in Alexias of the Byzantine Princess Anna Komnene and the prologue of the PD itself.

The events which Princess Anna describes in the Alexias must have occurred between 1099 and 1114. According to Anna Komnene, the trial against the Bogomils was exceptional in many respects – it was personally initiated and supervised by Emperor Alexios I Komnenos; the accused heretics were followers of a little known dualistic movement, the Bogomils, who were quickly gaining popularity; the result of the trial was the decision to burn the Bogomil heretics at the Hippodrome of Constantinople, which was an unusual punishment in Byzantium. The PD was commissioned by Alexios I in connection with this trial.

Internal evidence on the PD comes from the prologue of the book. In this, Zygadenos praises the military and political achievements of Emperor Alexios. In his ability to devise military constructions, Alexius is compared to Archimedes. The emperor was equally zealous in the preservation of Orthodoxy and, for this very reason, he wished to

---

5 Another doctoral study to Zygadenos’ Panoplia is prepared by Hisatsugu Kusabu at The University of Chicago. The article I could consult on his work is the following: Hisatsugu Kusabu, Panoplia Syndrome and Comnenian Orthodoxy – Photios in the Dogmatike Panoplia, Paper presented at the University of Chicago: Workshop on Late Antiquity and Byzantium, 2008, available on-line at http://cas.uchicago.edu/workshops/lantbyz/pdfs/LantByz_Wksp_KUSABU.pdf (web page last consulted in December, 2009).


8 PG 130, 20 D-35 C.
prepare a compilation of the teachings of the Orthodox faith (συλλογή τῶν δογμάτων τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως) in order to stop the dissemination of the pernicious heresies which flourished at the time. In order to achieve this, Alexios I commissioned a group of experienced theologians and defenders of Orthodoxy to prepare an anthology with texts from the Patristic fathers. The emperor himself invented the name of the book – Panoplia Dogmatike which is a reference to the Pauline description of the whole armory of God -- πανοπλία τοῦ Θεοῦ -- (Eph. 6, 10-19) with which the Christians – as soldiers fighting on the spiritual battlefield – should equip themselves in order to wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places. Further on, Zygadenos explains that the anthology is divided into two parts – a) presentation of the Orthodox teaching and b) refutation of the heresies. He states that the heresies are arranged chronologically – only the most important heresies are chosen from the past, which are compared to burning embers that might be kindled again; after them are presented the heresies of the present days, that is to say, the twelfth century. The last part of the prologue contains the first refutation — that of the Epicureans and their atomic theory. It is placed here, in the opening of the anthology, because it concerns a teaching before the beginning of Christianity. The two rhetorically ornamented accounts of the compilation of the PD situate

---

9 Καὶ δὴ τὰ δόγματα τῶν μακαρίων Πατέρων, καὶ προμάχων τῆς ὀρθής πίστεως διὰ τῶν τοῦ παρόντος καιροῦ οὐφόν καὶ πολυπείρον άνδρῶν ἐκλεξάμενος, καὶ συναγαγών ἐμοὶ τὴν συνθήκην τούτων ἐπέτρεψε. PG 130, 24 A12-15.

10 Eph. 6, 12. Translation Standard American version.
the anthology in the milieu characteristic of the first decades of the Komnenian dynasty.\textsuperscript{11} The project to compile the PD came about in relation to the enhanced role that Alexios I Komnenos chose to play in religious politics. During the reign of Alexios I, for the first time since the victory over iconoclasm, new heresies were added to the *Synodicon of Orthodoxy*.\textsuperscript{12} Apart from the trial against the Bogomils, several other trials with wider repercussions took place in Constantinople – the trial against John Italos, the Neoplatonist philosopher and disciple of Michael Psellos in 1082;\textsuperscript{13} the process against Neilos and his disciples on the problem of divinization (1094/95); the trial against Theodore the deacon of Blachernai, who was accused of a kind of “Messalianism” (1095); and the trial in connection with Eustratios of Nicaea (1117).\textsuperscript{14} Anna Komnene states that one of the last achievements of Alexios occurred in 1114. In that year the emperor organized a military expedition to Philippopolis against the remnants of the Paulician heretics who had been transferred to Thrace by Emperor John I Tzimiskes (969-876). The expedition being completed successfully, Alexios had a discussion with the Paulicians and attempted to convert them to Orthodoxy.\textsuperscript{15}

The creation of the PD was an event which also fitted into this religious policy. Two illuminated manuscripts of the PD, which were the official copies presented to Emperor Alexios I, are preserved until today are – Cod. Vat. Gr. 666 and Cod. Mosq. Syn. Gr. 387


\textsuperscript{15} Anna Komnene, *Alexias*, XIV, 8.
The initial three pages of these manuscripts are occupied with illuminations which depict the creation of the PD. Each illumination is accompanied by verses which are also available in vol. 130 of the *PG*.

The first illumination (Cod Vat. Gr. 666), presents a line of Church fathers. The inscriptions above the images indicate that these are: Dionysios the Areopagite, Athanasios, Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nazianzos, Cyril of Alexandria, John Chrysostom, Maximos the Confessor and John Damascene. Each of them holds a scroll with his own works and waits for his turn to present his work to the emperor. The next page depicts Emperor Alexios. He looks towards the Church Fathers and waits to receive their works. The third illumination (Cod. Vat. Gr. 666) depicts Christ enthroned. Emperor Alexios is standing beside Him. He offers a decorated copy of the PD to Christ, who accepts this present and blesses the emperor.

These solemn illustrations are directly related to the contents of the anthology – in each chapter the fragments of the Church Fathers are arranged chronologically and roughly correspond to the order depicted in the illustrations of the dedicatory copies.

It should be said, however, that in reality the contents of the anthology are more inconsistent than the clear arrangement presented in the illustrations. The organization of the chapters is not coherent. In each chapter there is a deviation from the chronological order of the fathers. For example, on many occasions the fragments of John Damascene precede the

---


17 A detailed description of the chapters is available in Papavasileou, Εὐθύμιος Ζυγαδηνός, 80-119.
fragments of Maximos the Confessor; the chapters contain fragments from unnamed authors, introduced by the expressions ἐκ διαφόρων Πατέρων, ἑτέρων Πατέρων and ἑτέρου.

The anthology was copied in two volumes because it was too lengthy. The first volume contained the titles from 1-11, the second the rest of the anthology. Thematically, the anthology has two parts. The initial seven chapters give a summary presentation of the Orthodox teaching – that there is one God, about the Trinity, on the three hypostasies, on the incomprehensibility of God, on the divine names, on the divine creation and the incarnation.

The rest of the chapters are refutations of heresies. Sixteen heresies were chosen from the past: the first in this series of chapters is the refutation of Judaism, presented here as a Christian heresy; the second is against Simon the Magician, the alleged predecessor of all heresies, and against Mani, the predecessor of all dualistic heresies, and his sect of the Manichees. Then follow the refutations of the Sabellians, Arians, Pneumatomachoi, Latins, Apollinarians, Nestorians, Monophysites, Aphtharthodocetes, Theopaschites, Agnoets, Origen, the Monothelites, and the Iconoclasts.

From these chapters the one Against the Latins has received most attention. Its text was transmitted under both the name of Patriarch Photios and that of Zygadenos; this problem of authorship was solved by Dvornik.\(^\text{18}\)

The compilers of the anthology have chosen the most suitable texts for the refutation of each heresy – for this reason in some chapters they have included more Patristic and later authors.\(^\text{19}\) This is particularly valid for the last part of the PD, which contains chapters against the heresies coeval to the twelfth century – these chapters contain more recent works, including some by Euthymios Zygadenos himself.

---

\(^{19}\) Leontios of Neapolis (*Against the Jews*); Athanasios Sinaites, Leontios of Byzantion (*Against the Monophysites*); Leontios of Byzantion (Against the Aphtharthodocetes); Athanasios Sinaites (*Against the Theopaschites*); Patriarch Photios (*Against the Latins*); the acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, Patriarchs Germanos of Constantinople and Nikephoros of Constantinople, Theodore Studites (*Against the Iconoclasts*).
The chapter *Against the Armenians* treats the faith of the Armenians as a separate heresy, which is not included in the chapter *Against the Monophysites*. The chapter *Against the Paulicians* contains a work entitled *History of the Manichees*, that is to say Paulicians, allegedly written by Patriarch Photios. Including it in the PD, Euthymios added some material which is not in Photios and altered the organization of the work. Because the interventions by Zygadenos are not considered entirely fortunate, his testimony was discarded as an independent source on the teachings of the Paulicians.\(^{20}\)

The second part of the chapter *Against the Paulicians* is an entry entitled *On the Cross, on the holy Baptism and on the Mystery of the Eucharist*. It is now published as a separate chapter in the PG 130 (cols. 1244-1274) and, as I will demonstrate in my study, it became crucial for the subsequent reception of the anthology in Early Modern times.

The next chapter is *Against the Messalians*, even if their heresy flourished in the fourth century. As Antonio Rigo has convincingly argued, the heresy was included among the coeval heresies because in Byzantium the Messalians were considered the predecessors of the Bogomils.\(^{21}\) The chapter *Against the Bogomils* has been the part of the PD which has received most attention, because it is the primary source for this medieval dualistic movement.\(^{22}\)

The chapter *Against the Saracenes* contains a prologue by Zygadenos and two works – the first is descriptive, authored by the eighth-century author Georgios Amartolos\(^{23}\); the

---


\(^{22}\) A synthesis on the research problems and abundant bibliography around the Bogomil heresy can be found in Yuri Stoyanov, *The Other God: Dualist Religions From Antiquity to the Cathar Heresy* (New Haven-London: Yale University Press, 2000).

\(^{23}\) PG 110, 864C-868A = PG 130, 1333 A-D; PG 110, 868B-869A = PG 130, 1353 B-D
second is a refutation of the Qur’an, authored by Bartholomew of Edessa (eighth century).24 This was the first part of the PD, which was printed in the Greek original by the sixteenth-century German scholar, Friedrich Sylburg.25 However, the same chapter was excluded from the first edition of the entire PD because the editors at that time, that is, in 1710 in Walachia, did not want to get into trouble with the Ottoman authorities.26

The difficulty in fully presenting the contents of the PD comes from the fact that the anthology represented a part of the theological synthesis, a *summa*, achieved during the Komnenian period. In addition to this, in the context of the twelfth century, the anthology was not a single book but rather a volume in a series. Euthymios Zygadenos composed three other major works – *Commentaries to the Psalms*, 27 *Commentaries to the Gospels*, 28 and *Commentaries on the Epistles of Saint Paul*.29 At the time of their compilation, all these

\[ \text{(References and notes omitted for brevity.)} \]
works were part of one construction. However, from the later reception of this theological series, it is apparent that the *Panoplia* was the most successful part of the project.

**Reception of the text**

The PD continued to be read for centuries in the confines of the *Oikoumene* as a key source of Orthodox theology. Notwithstanding the fact that it only refuted those movements known in the twelfth century, the anthology was flexible enough to be used in different historical contexts later. It became very popular in Southeast Europe during the Middle Ages and continued to be read long after the Fall of Constantinople. Approximately 150 Greek manuscripts are extant, the latest of them dating from the eighteenth century. A Slavonic translation was made in the fourteenth century.\(^30\) In early modern times in both East and West the PD was considered an authoritative book on heresiologies. A Latin translation was printed in Venice in 1555.\(^31\) One of the last episodes in the long history of this text is the Greek *editio princeps*, published in 1710 in Tîrgovişte, Walachia.

Volume 130 of the *PG* brought together and presented in a synchronic way these different episodes in the long history of this text. In addition, the *PG* is enriched with the notes of Christian Friedrich Matthäi, who visited Moscow in 1780 and noted the differences between the printed edition of Walachia and manuscripts available in Moscow.\(^32\) It also includes the notes of Friderich of Sylburg on the PD’s chapter *Against the Saracenes*.\(^33\)


\(^{32}\) See above, note 27.

\(^{33}\) Friedrich Sylburg (ed.), *Saracenica sive Moamethica*. 
Aims of the present study

Instead of going immediately to the twelfth century, my point of departure is this latest edition of the PD in the *PG*. It remains the most easily available version of the text, so that whenever the PD is dealt with in modern scholarship the *PG* edition is used.\(^{34}\)

The investigation unfolds backwards in time, starting from the vantage point of the eighteenth-century Greek *editio princeps* and looking back to the original anthology commissioned by Emperor Alexios. I consider this a proper way to demonstrate that some of the concepts held about the PD today are the result of later interpretations. The heuristic value of such an approach is to be supported by the fact that the anthology – in every version in which it has appeared -- was flexible enough to be adapted for different contexts and in aid of different theological and political agendas.

Thus, the aims of the present study are to demonstrate how this authoritative book continued to be used after the fall of the Byzantine Empire, demonstrating both continuity and change, as a part of the Orthodox legacy in early modern Europe; to present a case study on the question of how the function of an important text may change throughout the ages; to argue that we should in some cases dissociate the texts that we are studying from the editions that we are using. Or, to put it in a nutshell, my aim is to show how the text of the PD remained living in the tradition that was using it.

Structure of the study

My original intention was to dedicate separate chapters to each major episode of the text transmission, presenting the three versions in which the text was transmitted – the Greek, the Slavonic and the Latin. However, since its compilation the anthology had differing success in these different traditions. This can be seen from the remaining versions of the text.

---

34 Euthymius Zigabenus, *Panoplia dogmatica ad Alexium Comnenum*, PG 130.
The Greek version continued to circulate in manuscript form until the eighteenth century and the influence of the text was enhanced by the printed edition. To my knowledge, the Latin translation of the PD is known only from the printed editions and there are no attested manuscripts. On the contrary, the Slavonic PD was present only in a limited number of manuscripts, of which only three have survived.

In the process of the work it became clear that it would be superficial to put strict boundaries between the traditions in which the text has been preserved. In its final form the present study consists of two parts -- the first deals with the problems related to the Greek editio princeps; the second deals with a single manuscript that attests a version of the text which is most divergent from this editio princeps, because it contains scholia. My research on the circumstances behind the Greek editio princeps has shown that in the post-Byzantine era the Eastern and Western traditions of this text were inextricably linked. The only existing edition in Greek was created by a synthesis of the Orthodox and Catholic theological traditions.

This study also demonstrates that the publication of the PD in 1710 came as a part of what George Florovsky called the “pseudo-morphosis” of Orthodox theology in the Early Modern Period,35 when Orthodox thinking was heavily influenced and infiltrated by external concepts. The major reason for the publication was the Eucharistic disputes of the seventeenth and of the beginning eighteenth century. The connection of the PD to these disputes is not obvious and, to the present day, has remained unexplored.

I discovered this connection when I was conducting research into the circumstances behind the editio princeps printed in Wallachia in 1710. This was an edition printed by the Orthodox after twenty years of effort. Because of the time that had elapsed from the initial idea to publish the PD until the final realization of the project, the names of the men who

---

actually stood behind the publication are not mentioned – these were the successive Orthodox Patriarchs of Jerusalem, Dositheos Notaras, and Khrysanthos Notaras. After the Orthodox lost the Protection of the Holy Places, these patriarchs supported the edition of a series of polemic books in answer to the missionary activities of Catholics and Protestants. The reason why they chose to publish in the principalities of Walachia and Moldova was because these lands were autonomous from the Ottoman authorities.

What was more important for my investigation were the reasons for the choice of publishing the PD and the intermezzo of twenty years before the book went into print. The immediate reason for the publication was an internal conflict among the Orthodox on the question of whether the term μετουσίωσις should be used to describe the mystery of the Eucharist. Some years before the editio princeps two Orthodox theologians of the seventeenth century used a chapter of PD as an argument in this discussion. The chapter in question is entitled On the Cross, on the holy Baptism and on the Mystery of the Eucharist. However, this utilisation of the PD was not an original invention of theologians in the seventeenth century. Actually, it was an argument imported from the theologians of the Catholic Countereformation who had quoted the same chapter as a refutation of the Protestants.

Thus, the first section of this study traces the origins of this interpretation of the PD and shows that in fact the Latin translation of the PD published in Venice in 1555 indirectly inspired the Greek editio princeps. This is demonstrated by the references to the PD by Catholics and Protestants and the way these interpretations became incorporated in the Orthodox view on the anthology.

Further on, this part of the study attempts to establish which manuscripts were used for the Tîrgoviște edition and traces details on the people involved in the publication project from the point of view of a sociology of theological texts.
Part two of this dissertation deals with a single Athonite manuscript of the PD – Iviron 281. This manuscript proves to be a fourteenth-century recension of the PD which shows significant differences from the Tîrgovişte edition and the other PD manuscripts which I was able to consult. For this reason it deserves attention as a contribution to the transmission history of the anthology and to a future critical edition of the Panoplia.

MS Iviron 281 seems to be a kind of “edition” made by a man of letters from the Palaeologian period who created his version of the PD. Compared to the Tîrgovişte edition, the Iviron MS omits many of the Patristic texts, but adds scholia to the fragments of Pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite and the orations of Gregory the Theologian (Orationes 28, 29, 30, 31, 38). The present study gives a sample of these scholia: it treats the fragments of Gregory of Nazianzos’ De Theologia, Oratio 30 and In Theophania, Oratio 38 as well as to the Pseudo-Dionysian fragments from De divinis nominibus and the Fourth Letter. As far as I can judge, this is an editio princeps of these scholia most of which I have identified as fragments coming from the scholia of Niketas Herakleensis and Elias Cretensis, two among the most prominent commentators of Gregory of Nazianzus.

The two parts of the dissertation represent two case studies on the transmission history of the PD – one from the early modern period and the other from the time of the Palaeologian dynasty. What unifies them is that they deal with the history of the text and will be a contribution to a future critical edition of the PD.

A Review of the Secondary Literature

Inventories of the PD manuscripts

This study is greatly facilitated by a monograph on Euthymios Zygadenos which was authored by Andreas Papavasileou.36 Papavasileou provides a useful inventory list of the PD manuscripts.

36 Andreas Papavasileou, Εὐθύμιος Ζυγαδηνός.
manuscripts found in different catalogues and deals with the context of the PD during the twelfth century. Papavasileiou’s list is updated by information on many more manuscripts provided by the *Pinakes Project – Textes et Manuscrits Grecs*, managed by the *Institut de Recherche et d’Histoire des Textes*, Paris, and available online. Papavasileiou also collected the studies on the PD which appeared before 1978.

**Scholarly approaches**

The scholarly approaches to the PD can be divided in two major trends: a) the PD was used for preparation of critical editions because the fragments in the anthology are testimonia of the indirect tradition of Patristic texts; b) it was used as a heresiology, providing information on the heretical movements described in it.

The PD was used in the preparation of critical editions. The text was used for this purpose by the editors of Gregory of Nyssa’s *Oratio Catechetica*, which is quoted extensively in the PD. The anthology was consulted for the critical edition of Maximus Confessor. Also, it was used in the critical edition of the *Dissertatio adversus Iudaeos*, a treatise attributed to Gregory of Nyssa, now convincingly proven to have been authored by Metrophanes of Smyrna. An important variant reading of Pseudo-Dionysios Areopagite’s *Fourth Letter*, found in the PD but attested in just a few manuscripts of the direct tradition,

---

37 [http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/rech_oeuvre/resultOeuvre/filter_auteur/5534/filter_oeuvre/12212](http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/rech_oeuvre/resultOeuvre/filter_auteur/5534/filter_oeuvre/12212)


was used for the establishment of this Letter’s text together with the Syriac versions and other testimonies from the indirect tradition.\textsuperscript{43}

The PD quotes a large number of fragments from John Damascene’s \textit{Expositio de fide orthodoxa}. Before the twelfth century John Damascene was rarely quoted as an authority and copied. A recent study has demonstrated that it was through the PD that John Damascene officially entered the sphere of Orthodox dogmatic theology.\textsuperscript{44}

The PD was also used as testimony for the attribution of authorship of the Patristic authors – it was proven that the PD attests a case in which the work of Theodoret of Cyros’ \textit{De Sancta et Vivifica Trinitate} was transmitted under the name of Cyril of Alexandria as early as the twelfth century.\textsuperscript{45}

As was demonstrated above, the PD has been used as a primary source on heretical teachings. In this line the PD follows another ancient tradition – that of the polemical works against heresies in the tradition of Epiphanius’ \textit{Panarion}.\textsuperscript{46}

These scholarly approaches show two characteristics of the anthology itself – it is an anthology of Church Fathers and, at the same time, it remains a piece of polemics, a historical presentation of different heresies -- a heresiology. The existence of anthologies in Byzantium has stirred fruitful discussion over the usage of the term that best describes this Byzantine phenomenon, which lays emphasis not on creativity but on excerpting and copying. The most

\textsuperscript{43} István Perczel, “The Christology of Pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite: The Fourth Letter in its Indirect and Direct Text Traditions”, \textit{Le Muséon} 117/3-4 (2004): 409-446.


influential terms describing this specific phenomenon are *Byzantine encyclopedism* and *la cultura della sylloge* or *culture du recueil*. The attention which these terms have received is understandable -- what is at stake is to describe the way in which a culture, in this case Byzantine culture, created a systematization of knowledge and how it disseminated it.

Following this theoretical framework, the PD could be described as encyclopedic heresiology, or dogmatic anthology–heresiology. The present study will use the established term “anthology” and will not enter into a theoretical discussion since this remains peripheral to its main subject -- which presents a third approach to the PD -- from the point of view of reception history and text edition.

**A review of the literature on the subjects treated in the first part of this study**

The first part of the present study falls within the area of reception studies of the Greek Church Fathers. While the afterlife of the Patristic authors in the West has received considerable attention, this field remains incompletely explored for Eastern Europe and the countries which were part of the Byzantine Commonwealth. To my knowledge, there has been no previous attempt to examine the reception history of the PD in the post-Byzantine

---

47 The term “Byzantine encyclopedism” was used for the first time for tenth-century Byzantium but later was applied for a wider scope for Byzantine works with excerpting tendencies. It was coined out in two influential studies by Paul Lemerle, “L’encyclopédisme à Byzance à l’apogée de l’Empire, et particulièrement sous Constantin VII Porphyrogénète, “ Cahiers d’Histoire Mondiale 9 (1966); Idem, Le premier humanisme byzantin. Notes et remarques sur enseignement et culture à Byzance des origines au Xe siècle (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1971). However, it remains controversial because “encyclopaedias” in the strict sense of the term did not exist in Byzantium. The Institute of Early Christian and Byzantine Studies at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, under the direction of Prof. Dr. Peter Van Deun, is conducting a research project Byzantine encyclopedism, see note 4.


Period, with the exception of two articles which dealt with the edition of the PD in Walachia.\textsuperscript{51} Because my aim is to showcase the changing landscape in Orthodox history through the particular case of the PD, I have used several invaluable studies on Orthodox theology and the Church during the post-Byzantine period\textsuperscript{52} as well as studies on the political aspects of the Byzantine legacy.\textsuperscript{53}

For an investigation with such a narrow focus, many of the details come from articles of historiographical schools in the Southeast European countries that were once part of the Byzantine Commonwealth – mainly Romania, Greece, Russia and Bulgaria. The majority of these studies focus on details which make them particularly important for tracing the history of the PD. Eucharistic issues played an important role in the transmission history of the PD. For this reason, the comprehensive overview provided by a recent publication on Eucharistic problems was quite important for my study.\textsuperscript{54}

\textit{A review of the literature on the subjects treated in the second part of the present study}


\textsuperscript{54} István Perczel, Réka Forrai and György Geréby (eds.), \textit{The Eucharist in Theology and Philosophy: Issues of Doctrinal History in East and West from the Patristic Age to the Reformation} (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2006).
The second part of the present study examines a manuscript of the PD – Iviron 281 – a manuscript which was identified in the process of my work. It has remained unstudied until this time and there is no secondary literature on it, except the studies which deal with the scholiasts of Gregory of Nazianzus and which I have presented in this second part of the study.

***

The methodology which I have adopted aims at presenting a new approach for an anthology on which everything appeared to have been researched, especially in relation to the dualistic movements with the Bogomils who, for various reasons, have received a great deal of attention. In order to better present the book in its new setting, I have tried to use as many sources as possible – manuscripts, early printed books, private letters, and letters of the Orthodox patriarchs, original catalogues, and references to historical events. Naturally, the story will remain far from complete and every discovery of new material will be most welcome, as it was apparent from the beginning that some details would appear at later times. In order to provide more authenticity, I have allowed myself to quote extensively, especially when the actors of the story speak in first person singular, as is the case when the anthology itself introduces itself on the opening pages of the Tîrgoviște edition.
THE PANOPLIA DOGMATIKE IN DEFENSE OF ORTHODOXY IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

Panoply I am most rightly called,
Because I am providing weapons sharper than the sword,
Capable of obtaining glorious trophies and worthy victories
For those whose impetus is against all heresies.
My father is the monk Zygadenos,
Who in simplicity explained the precise meaning of the Scriptures.
Hitherto I remained unknown in the darkness
As gold hidden deeply in the ground.
Athanasiós, the Archbishop of Drystra, is printing me
At his own expense, for <spiritual> benefit.
Let, therefore, all of you pray for him that he may reach old age
And afterwards the heavenly abode.55

These verses from the beginning of the eighteenth century are written in a prosopopoeia as uttered by the voice of the Panoplia Dogmatike. They come from the Tîrgovişte edition of the year 1710. In this chapter I will investigate the history of this edition.

The Tîrgovişte edition was not only the fruit of antiquarian interest but was deeply related to current affairs of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century. With minor changes in the original content, the anthology of Alexios I Komnenos was once more employed in the fight against coeval religious opponents. This was possible only in a cultural milieu permeated by the language and the values of Byzantium.

The publication of the PD in Walachia as a genuine authority in the fight against heresy became possible because the Romanian Principalities shared the legacy of the Byzantine Commonwealth. The Commonwealth, as Obolensky has pointed out, consisted of

55 PG 130, col. 17. All translations in this study, unless otherwise indicated, were made by me.
a group of nations that were politically autonomous but had strong and enduring connections with each other. Undoubtedly, the Orthodox Church formed the strongest bond among these people and continued as a binding element long after the fall of the empire.\textsuperscript{56} Given this background, the PD offers the possibility of tracing the development of one of those flexible cultural nerves that made and sustained the Commonwealth.

However, to present the anthology in a new historical setting may well be more dangerous than it appears at first sight, because it is inevitably connected with the different context in which this Byzantine text appeared again. First and foremost, after the fall of Constantinople the Great Church was in a new, subordinate, position, without an emperor. In addition, the seventeenth century was a troubled time for the Orthodox Church\textsuperscript{57} -- the period was marked by the controversies over the tradition and legacy of the Constantinopolitan Patriarch Kyrillos Lukaris\textsuperscript{58} and his Calvinist \textit{Confession} from 1629; by the danger of uniatism in Transylvania, and by the troubled situation of the Russian Church after the reforms of Patriarch Nikon in Russia. The micro-focus on the PD edition shows how these major events necessitated, and were reflected in, the Tîrgovişte edition. As a point of departure, I intend to present the context in which the edition of the PD appeared and to find out how the Orthodox theologians of the seventeenth century interpreted the anthology.

\textsuperscript{56} Dimitri Obolensky, \textit{The Byzantine Commonwealth, Eastern Europe, 500-1453} (Crestwood, N.Y: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1982); Iorga, \textit{Byzantium after Byzantium}, Pippidi, \textit{Traditiia politică bizantină.}


\textsuperscript{58} Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople for the following periods: November 1620 – April 1623; September 1623 - October 1633; October 1633 -March 1635; March 1637-June 1638. Dates for the terms of office of Patriarch Lukaris, as well as other Eastern Patriarchs, are taken from Podskalsky, \textit{Griechische Theologie}, 495-509. For a comprehensive bibliograpy on Patriarch Lukaris see Podskalsky, \textit{Griechische Theologie}, 219-135. Among the studies on Lukaris are those of George Hadjiantoniou, \textit{Protestant Patriarch: the Life of Cyril Lucaris (1572-1638) Patriarch of Constantine} (Richmond VA: Knox, 1961), and of Zacharias N. Tsirpanlis, “ Ο Κύριλλος Λούκαρις και η καθολική προπαγάνδα της Ῥώμης (1622-1638),” \textit{Κρητολογία} 4 (1977): 49-56.
The PD attracted the attention of two leading Orthodox theologians of the time – the Patriarch of Jerusalem Dositheos II Notaras (1669-1707) and Meletios Syrigos (1586-1643). Both Meletios and Dositheos attest that the anthology was read in connection with three important Church synods of the seventeenth century -- Jassy 1642, Jerusalem 1672 and Constantinople 1692 – which were all concerned with the discussion over the legacy of Lukaris. The way Meletios and Dositheos used the anthology suggests that the chapters of the PD from the twelfth century this time were read as a defense against the Calvinists, the Uniate Church of the Greek Catholics in Transylvania, the Roman Catholics, and the Muslims of the Ottoman Empire. Above all, however, there was one direct reason for the publication. The Orthodox printing presses in Walachia and Moldova were competing with the printing activities of the Calvinists in Transylvania. Almost every Orthodox edition was an answer to the activities of their Calvinist opponents. Thus, the PD was used in a way perhaps far beyond the expectations of Alexios I and his theologians. The anthology gave the authentic voice of the Greek Church Fathers in an age when the Patristic legacy was already in use and under discussion both by Catholics and Protestants.

The abundant historical material on the people who stood behind the publication (the editor, the sponsor an other people involved) allows one to place the edition in its natural milieu. If the evidence provided by the testimonies of these witnesses also demonstrates that the edition came out of the rigorous religious fights at that time, a logical next move would be to search for traces of editorial alterations in the printed text. Such a task would be of critical importance, because the text from Târgoviște, reprinted in the *PG* with the notes of Christian Friedrich Matthäi, remains the only printed edition of the PD, used and quoted by scholars today. Finally, any study of the anthology in the Danubian Principalities would not be complete without the examination of the late MSS which co-existed with the printed text.
**Historical context**

**The lost protection of the Holy Places by the Orthodox**

The story of the first Greek edition of the PD should start much earlier than the actual publication with a landmark historical event – the last siege of Vienna -- which changed the balance of power between the Ottomans and Western Europe and also affected the Orthodox population of the Ottoman Empire. In 1689 the Orthodox lost the Protection of the Holy Places. On several occasions before this event King Louis XIV of France had supported missionary activities by the French Catholics in Jerusalem. He intended to use the Holy City as a basis for a further extension of influence and the French Catholics demanded from the Ottoman authorities the right to protect the Holy Places. By that time the Ottoman Empire was successful in foreign policy and it could allow itself to give no heed to such demands. The siege of 1683 changed everything. The Ottoman army was severely defeated in Vienna and the next year the empire was threatened by the creation of the “Holy League” between Austria, Venice and Poland, which Russia joined two years later. Fearing that France would also take part in the new alliance, the Ottoman Empire conceded the protection over the Holy Places in Jerusalem to the French Catholics. This loss for the Orthodox happened during the office of the Patriarch of Jerusalem Dositheos, who spent the rest of his life in efforts to oppose the influence of the Catholics. Left without many possibilities for action, he produced a series of anti-Catholic editions. As I will demonstrate in this chapter, Patriarch Dositheos was directly involved in and inspired the edition of the PD in Walachia, although his name is not mentioned.

---

Polemic editions in the Romanian Principalities

With the strong support of Patriarch Dositheos, Greek printing presses started to produce Orthodox editions of polemic character in Moldova (1682) and in Walachia (1690). This was possible because at the turn of the eighteenth century the Romanian Principalities had already taken on an important role in the preservation of Orthodoxy. This position of the Principalities was due to the fact that they preserved their autonomy from the Ottoman empire. The PD is described in BRV I, 160, 482-483. For this study I have consulted two copies of this edition – one in the Romanian Academy of Science in Bucharest, and another in the Gennadius Library, Athens. The first books published with the support of Patriarch Dositheos appeared in Moldavia in 1682 and in Walachia in 1690. Maximos Peloponnesios, Ἐγχειρίδιον κατὰ τοῦ σχίσματος τῶν παπιστῶν. Συντεθὲν μὲν παρὰ τοῦ σοφωτάτου Ἱερομονάχου Μαξίμου τοῦ Πελοποννησίου. Bucharest, 1690. BHellén. II 635; Nektarios Patriarch of Jerusalem, Τών μακαρωτάτων καὶ σοφωτάτων πατριάρχων τῆς μεγάλης καὶ ἁγίας πόλεως Ἱερουσαλήμ κυρίου Νεκταρίου...περὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ παπα ἀντιῤῥήσις. Iaşi, 1682. BHellén. II 568. An edition of John of Damascus appeared in 1715 in Iaşi, the Principality of Moldavia. For a bibliography on the book-printing in the Principalities at the time see note 63.
Empire and became important centers of Orthodox culture.61 The patriarchs of Jerusalem frequently visited the Romanian Principalities,62 including Patriarchs Theophanes III (1606-1644), Paisios (1645-1660), Nektarios (1661-1669) and later Khrysanthos (1707-1731). “But of all the hierarchs the Patriarch of Jerusalem Dositheos (1669-1707) loved Moldavia most,” as Oikonomides puts it.63 Dositheos, the undisputed leader of Orthodoxy at that time, made Walachia and Moldavia the headquarters for his activities and the printing presses, which the patriarch supported, produced a small panoply of books 64 directed against Catholic and

---

61 Details on the historical context could be found in Nicolae Iorga, Histoire des roumains et de la romanité orientale (Bucharest: 1937-1945; Peter Sugar, Southeastern Europe under Ottoman Rule, 1354-1804 (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1993); George Castellan, Histoire des Balkans (XIVe-XVe siècle) (Paris: Fayard, 1995).

62 In particular, for the relations between the Patriarchs of Jerusalem and the Romanian Principalities see Gregorescu, “Legăturile Țărilor Române cu Ierusalimul. Patriarhii Ierusalimului în Țările Române (veac XVII-XVIII),” Studii Teologice 8, 5-6 (1956): 349-362.


Calvinist propaganda in Southeastern Europe. These editions remain monuments to early printing in Romania and already anticipated the future edition of the PD.

**Internal conflict among the Orthodox over the terms used for the Eucharist and the utilization of the patristic tradition**

The publication of the PD was much more involved in current affairs than appears at the first sight. The Greek *editio princeps* was related to the major theological discussions among the Orthodox during the seventeenth century – a controversy over transubstantiation and over the words used to define the Eucharist. After 1457 Orthodox theologians became involved in a harsh discussion on the problem of transubstantiation and, in general, on that of the real presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist. An analogous debate started in the West in the mid-eleventh century with the teaching of Berengar of Tours (ca. 999-1088), who denied the identity of the Eucharist with the physical body of Christ. He also proposed that the bread and wine were efficient signs of Christ’s heavenly, spiritual body, which is what they signified, but were not substantially identical with it either. Finally, he made the efficacy of the presence of Christ’s heavenly body dependent on the personal faith.

---

of the recipients of the eucharistic elements. While Berengar’s theses were repeatedly condemned and the Catholic Church subsequently adopted the dogma of transubstantiation the problem of the real presence and of the more restrictive concept “transubstantiation” re-emerged once again during the Reformation. The decisions of the Council of Trent (1545-1563) confirmed the dogma of transubstantiation, but this was rather a beginning of a new series of controversies than the final word on the matter. During this controversy both Catholics and Protestants turned to the ancient tradition of the Orthodox Church in order to find arguments for their claims. This process began perhaps in 1576, when Patriarch Jeremiah II Tranos (May 1572- November 1579; August 1580- February 1584; April 1587-September 1595) had to answer the Protestants from Tübingen but left them disappointed in the prospect of union between the Orthodox and Protestants.

With the Calvinising Confession of Faith of Patriarch of Constantinople Kyrillos Lukaris the matter became an internal affair of the Orthodox Church. At the time when the idea to publish the PD crystallized, around 1690, there were two Orthodox parties. On theological grounds the two camps were divided over the problem of whether the term μετουσίωσις, a direct translation into Greek of the term transubstantiation, should be used for the mystery in the Eucharist.

Thus, the publication of the PD came amidst the controversy over the heritage of Kyrillos Lukaris during the seventeenth century. The two opponents in this conflict were

---


67 The correspondence is published in Martin Crusius and Jakob Heerbrand, Acta et scripta theologorum Wirtembergensium, et Patriarchae Constantinopolitani D. Hieremiae : quae utrique ab anno MDLXXVI. usque ad annum MDLXXX. de Augustana Confessione inter se miserant. Graece et Latine (Witeberga: Crato, 1584). I was not able to consult it.

expressing two different trends of the Orthodoxy of their time – on the one side was the zealous Patriarch Dositheos, who claimed to represent the conservative and pristine Orthodox tradition. On the other side was Ioannes Karyophylles69 (circa 1600 - 1692), who had been educated in the West and was a disciple of Theophilos Korydalleus (1570-1646), one of the most prominent Orthodox philosophers of the period.70 The conflict expanded over two generations of Orthodox theologians. It should be noted that Korydalleus was connected with the circle around Patriarch Lukaris and that Meletios Syrigos was an opponent of both of them. In the next generation the main protagonists were Karyophylles, a direct disciple of Korydalleus, and, on the other side, Patriarch Dositheos Notaras, an ardent admirer of Meletios Syrigos.

Patriarch Dositheos thought that the rejection of the term μετουσίωσις meant support for the Protestant view on the Eucharist. The opposing side, led by Ioannes Karyophylles, stated that the term μετουσίωσις was not used in the Patristic tradition and, thus, should be avoided as a term of foreign origin. Later I shall go into more detail concerning this discussion; the PD became a useful weapon in this internal battle because an entry in it (now part of chapter 25 in the PG) discussed the Eucharist. The evidence for this comes from the way the PD was interpreted by Orthodox theologians at that time.


References to the PD in Anti-Calvinist treatises published from the printing presses in the Principalities

In fact, the influence of the PD can be found in several editions, but direct references to the PD are found in a book printed in Bucharest, two decades before the edition of the PD itself. It would not be far-fetched to suggest that this book provides evidence on the question of who actually inspired the edition of the PD and why it was printed in Walachia with the support of the ruling dynasty of the Brâncoveanu. This volume also demonstrates that the PD was published because of the Eucharistic discussions among the Orthodox.

In 1690 Patriarch Dositheos Notaras published, in one volume, two anti-Calvinist treatises. The first treatise was written by Meletios Syrigos in connection with the Synod of Jassy (1641) and was entitled Κατὰ τῶν Καλβινικῶν κεφαλαίων. The second text was written by Dositheos himself and published under the title Ἕγχεριδιον κατὰ καλβινικῆς φρενοβλαβείας. This second text was nothing else but a third edition of the Confession of Faith adopted in 1672 by the Synod in Jerusalem, this time published with some significant additions. The edition of these treatises in 1690 was connected with an internal conflict among the Orthodox theologians over the Greek terms that should be used in the Eucharist.

In the second of two prologues to the Ἕγχεριδιον Patriarch Dositheos states that he published this book in order to support the Orthodox population in Transylvania. But in the background stood another, equally important, reason. This reason was the conflict between Dositheos and Karyophylles on the so-called Tetradion (Quire) which contained the views of

71 Τοῦ μακαρίου Μελετίου Συρίγου διδάσκαλου τε καὶ πρωτοσυγκέλλου τής ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας κατὰ τῶν καλβινικῶν κεφαλαίων, καὶ ἐρωτήσεων Κυρίλλου τοῦ Λουκάρεως, Ἀντίῤῥησις. Καὶ Δοσιθέου Πατριάρχου Ἰεροσολύμων κατὰ τής καλβινικῆς φρενοβλαβείας, BRV I, 90, 298-315; BH II, 632, 458-472.

Karyophylles and which was condemned by the Synod in Constantinople in 1690, as Karyophylles kept on insisting that the term μετουσίωσις should be avoided because it was a later translation of the Latin term transsubstantiatio. Karyophylles gave preference to the established and ancient Greek terms like μεταβολή or μετάληψις.

It seems that Patriarch Dositheos did not understand the arguments of Karyophylles, partially because he was not well versed in Latin and the Western tradition. This undermined any possibility for a further dialogue and the two sides were not listening to each other. Patriarch Dositheos accused Karyophylles of being a Calvinist and of rejecting the real presence of the Lord in the Eucharist by rejecting the term μετουσίωσις. Karyophylles accused Dositheos of being a Latiniser and of supporting a term of foreign origin.

Both sides turned to the authority of the Patristic tradition. The argument of Karyophylles was based on the writings of the Church Fathers who never used the term μετουσίωσις. Amid the conflict Karyophylles stated:

Ἐγὼ δείχνω τὰ δικά μου ἀπὸ τούς ἀγίους πατέρας: αὐτὸς ἂς ἓδωμεν ἀπὸ ποὺ δείχνει τὰ δικά του. Ἡμεῖς δὲν ἔχομεν πίστιν Κορέσση καὶ Γενναδίου καὶ Συμεῶν καὶ Συρίγου, ἀλλὰ πίστιν ὅποι μᾶς τὴν ἔξηγναν οἱ θεοφόροι πατέρες καὶ διδάσκαλοι. Καὶ ἔχομεν τὰς παραγγελίας τους, νὰ μὴ τολμώμεν νὰ μεταλάξωμεν οὐδὲ Ἑλξῃν, οὐδὲ νοήμα.73

I demonstrate my views from the Church Fathers. Let us see from where he [Dositheos] demonstrates his views. Our faith is not that of Koressios, Gennadios, Symeon and Syrigos, but the faith that the God-

73 This quotation, along with several others, is based on secondary publications, because the primary sources were not accessible to me. In this case the text taken from the private correspondence of Karyophylles is quoted after Ioan Dură, Ο Δοσίθεος Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ ἡ προσφορὰ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς Ῥουμανικὰς Χώρας (Athens: s.n., 1977) (Henceforth, Ioan Dură, Ο Δοσίθεος Ἱεροσολύμων).
bearing Fathers and doctors have explained us. And they have commended us not to dare to change either any word or any concept.

The theologians whom Karyophylles mentions are Georgios Koressios (d. after 1659), Gennadios Scholarios (1405-1472), Symeon of Thessaloniki (d. 1419) and Meletios Syrigos. The objection against them was that they were more recent authors and, thus, less reliable than the Church Fathers. Apparently, Patriarch Dositheos had quoted all these authors in the discussion. This confirms the identification of Symeon with the hesychast author Symeon of Thessaloniki, because Dositheos also supported the editio princeps of his works as he also supported the edition of Koressios. So here a situation is evident when contending groups among the Orthodox, who were referring to different authorities, also cared about publishing the works of these authorities.

It was at the time of this internal controversy over the terms used for the Eucharist that Patriarch Dositheos published the double volume of 1690. Here, one finds two important references to the PD — one by Meletios Syrigos and another written by Dositheos. Although published together, these references were written at different times. For this reason they are treated here separately.

---


75 More on Scholarios, including a detailed bibliography see Podskalsky, *Griechische Theologie*, 123-129; Θεόδωρος Ζήσης, Γεννάδιος Β’ ΢χολάριος. Βίος, Συγγράμματα, Διδασκαλία, Analeceta Vlatadon 30 (Thessaloniki: Πατρ. Ἵδρυμα Πατερ. Μελετῶν, 1980).


77 See above, note 71.
Meletios Syrigos refers to the PD: connection with transsubstantiation

In 1641, the Moldavian ruler Basile Lupu (1595-1661) convoked a Synod in Jassy. The aim of the Synod was to develop a unanimous position in the Orthodox Church against the advancing propaganda of Protestantism and to condemn the Calvinising tinges in the Confession of Lukaris. The first reference to the PD came in relation to this Synod and was authored by Meletios Syrigos, a religious adviser to Basile Lupu and perhaps the most educated opponent of Kyrillos Lukaris. Syrigos participated in the Synod of Jassy as a representative of the Constantinopolitan patriarch and translated the famous Confession of Moghila from Latin into Greek. Meletios refuted the Calvinist Confession of Lukaris article by article. Being among the most educated men of his time, it comes as no surprise that he knew and quoted the PD. However, he quoted a part of the anthology which has not received attention by modern scholars.

This reference is in connection to chapter 17 of Kyrillos, “in which is rejected the actual presence of the Lord and the transformation of the bread and the wine into the body and blood of the Lord.” Syrigos totally refuted Lukaris’ Confession using traditional argumentation divided in two sections – Scripturae, arguments from the Bible, and Patres -- arguments from the Patristic tradition. In this exposition, Syrigos showed his thorough knowledge of the authors of the Patristic heritage. However, he also used some sources from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, which will be analyzed in detail in a separate chapter. The testimonies from the Church Fathers are grouped into generations, with each generation


counted as lasting for one hundred years. Thus, the authors of the first generation included Ignatios of Antioch and Pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite. The account finished with the fifteenth generation, represented by Meletios, patriarch of Jerusalem, Maximos Margounios (circa 1549-1602), and Gabriel of Philadelphia (1541-1616).

In the twelfth generation, that is to say, the twelfth-century, Syrigos referred to Zygadenos and Salomon of Gaza. What follows is a quotation of the whole entry concerning the activities of the court theologian of Alexios Komnenos. Syrigos began his account with a quotation from the Commentaria in sacrosancta quattuor Christi Evangelia, another work by Zygadenos.

Γενεὰ δυοκαιδεκάτη ἀπὸ τοὺς αυτές ἐκ τὸς χρόνου τῆς σωτηρίας

Ανάμεσα εἰς τοὺς χρόνους τούτους ἠκμασέν ἕνας κάποιος Εὐθύμιος Ζυγαβηνὸς, ἀνθρώπος ἐλλογιμώτατος ὁ ὁποῖος λέγει τέτοιας λογίς εἰς τό κατά Μαθαίον εὐαγγέλιον, εἰς τό κατά κεφάλαιον. δεν εἰπέ ταῦτα εἶναι τά σημάδια τοῦ σώματός μου, καὶ τοῦ αἵματός μου, ἀλλά ταῦτα εἶναι τὸ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα μου, καὶ μετ' ἄλλων δὲν εἶπε ταῦτα εἶναι τά σημάδια τοῦ σώματός μου, καὶ μετ' ἄλλων δὲν εἶπε ταῦτα εἶναι τά σημάδια τοῦ σώματος μου, καὶ μετ' ἄλλων δὲν εἶπε ταῦτα εἶναι τά σημάδια τοῦ σώματος μου, καὶ μετ' ἄλλων δὲν εἶπε ταῦτα εἶναι τά σημάδια τοῦ σώματος μου, καὶ μετ' ἄλλων δὲν εἶπε ταῦτα εἶναι τά σημάδια τοῦ σώματος μου, καὶ μετ' ἄλλων δὲν εἶπε ταῦτα εἶναι τά σημάδια τοῦ σώματος μου, καὶ μετ' ἄλλων δὲν εἶπε ταῦτα εἶναι τά σημάδια τοῦ σώματος μου, καὶ μετ' ἄλλων δὲν εἶπε ταῦτα εἶναι τά σημάδια τοῦ σώματος μου, καὶ μετ' ἄλλων δὲν εἶπε ταῦτα εἶναι τά σημάδια τοῦ σώματος μου, καὶ μετ' ἄλλων δὲν εἶπε ταῦτα εἶναι τά σημάδια τοῦ σώματος μου, καὶ μετ' ἄλλων δὲν εἶπε ταῦτα εἶ


The twelfth generation, from the year 1200 to the year 1300.

During this time flourished a certain Zygabenos, a most educated man, who says the following in his commentary on chapter 26 of the Gospel according to Matthew. “He did not say, these are the signs of my body and my blood, but “these are my body and blood.” And a little further: ‘Just as He above nature deified the flesh, which He took on (if it is right to say “deified,” given that He did not make the flesh God according to nature), so also the other things pertaining to his life-giving body are also beyond words.
And also in the Armoury, in Chapter 21, he [Zygabenos] demonstrates extensively from the Holy Fathers, namely from Gregory of Nyssa and John Damascene, the transformation of the bread and the wine into the body and the blood of Christ, because it was at that time that the heresy of Berengar even started to be heard in the land of Greece and the Orient. By then, this heresy, which started in Italy beginning with the year 1050 of Christ, indeed grew its branches in the followers of Berengar and sent even to us its deadly smell. And his [that is, Berengar’s] opposing and all-defiled tongue sometimes said that the Body of Christ is not present in the Eucharist, unless so as the signified is in its sign and a depicted living man is in his inanimate image, and sometimes he said that the body of the Lord is in truth in the Eucharist, but so that, nevertheless, the bread and the wine remain in their own natures, so that it is [at the same time] bread and the Body of Christ. This latter opinion was that which was inherited by those named after Luther and they made this teaching their own, maintaining it until today. Because of this, the Fathers who were living at that time used clearer expressions when they wanted to explain the sacrament and so also the later Fathers, in order to refute the impious opinions and words of those heretics.82

Interestingly, what Syrigos presents here as Berengar’s view on the Eucharist, is closer to the Orthodox tradition of synousiosis, that is, the real presence of the body and blood of the Lord in the Eucharist without the destruction or disappearance of the substance of the bread and wine.83 In fact, it was Syrigos and Dositheos who supported the Western

82 The quotation follows the edition (BRV I, 90, p. 301) kept in the library of RAS. 134.
tradition of the transubstantiation. Be this as it may, at first sight this account adds one more heresy to those refuted by the PD, coeval in date to its compilation. The concept that a part of the PD may be related to the teachings of Berengar is a brilliant invention that matches the chronological frame and, thus, presents the PD as also refuting a heresy of the Western Church that was contemporary with the compilation, by Constantinopolitan theologians, of the anthology made for Emperor Alexios I. However, the early manuscripts of the PD which I was able to consult do not attest such a chapter, that is to say, the entry 25 in vol. 130 of PG entitled Περὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ, περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος, καὶ περὶ τῆς μεταληψεως τοῦ Δεσποτικοῦ σώματος, is not a separate entry in these manuscripts. This might be a later development in the contents of the anthology or even an addition by the editors of the Tîrgovişte edition. In a later section of the present study I will treat the manuscripts used for the Tîrgovişte edition. Editorial alterations, or accepting variants different from the early manuscripts, were splitting the chapter against the Paulicians (chapter 24 in the earlier manuscripts and chapter 25 in the Tîrgovişte edition) and rearranging part of the Patristic material so that it formed a separate chapter (chapter 25. On the Baptism, the Body and Blood of Christ and the Cross, col. 1244 in the PG).

The account of Berengar seems to fit the chronological framework, but the Byzantine counterpart to which Syrigos is alluding is much more problematic. In fact he seems to refer to a later dogmatic controversy, during the time of Manuel I Komnenos, in which Soterikhos Panteugenos Deacon of the Great Church in Constantinople and candidate for the patriarchal throne of Alexandria, presented a kind of sign theory, to a certain extent similar to

84 I have consulted the following codices Vat. Gr. 666; Vat. Gr. 668; Vat. Palatin. 200; Patmos 103; Parisinus Gr. 1232 A.
that of Berengar, to explain the Eucharistic mystery. Syrigos also relied on traditions coming from the Catholic theologians who presented the Protestants as successors of Berengar in order to show that they were offshoots of an old heresy. In fact, he followed, rearranged and interpreted the ideas of the prominent theologians of the Catholic Reformation. Indeed for us the important conclusion is that the idea of Byzantine offshoots of Berengar’s teachings being refuted by the PD already anticipates some characteristics of the future Tîrgovişte edition of the PD. These imaginary correlations established by Syrigos bring one closer to an understanding of the reasons why this anthology was published by Orthodox theologians of the seventeenth century. Apparently, one of their main aims was to fight, through a similar effort, the contemporary Eastern “offshoots” of Berengar’s and Panteugenos’ heresy, namely, the views of Patriarch Lukaris, Korydalleus, and Karyophylles, which they believed to be derived from the post-Berengarian Western heresies of Luther and Calvin. Berengar himself was also often mentioned in other writings of Syrigos and other contemporary theologians. This kind of “modernization” of the PD’s contents was not restricted to its chapter on the Eucharist. Other sections refuting the views of the iconoclasts and those of the twelfth-century dualist heresies were also considered as appropriate for fighting against Calvinism infiltrating the Orthodox tradition. From all the Patristic texts included in the PD, Meletios is referring only to Gregory of Nyssa and John Damascene, both of whom, and especially the Damascene, had already been referred to by the Catholics in their fight with the Protestants.

86 The teaching of Panteugenos was condemned at two Constantinopolitan synods held in 1156 and 1157. See John Meyendorff, Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes (New York: Fordham University Press, 1974), 40.


89 This theme on the usage of John Damascene and the Greek Church Fathers in the Catholic Reformation deserves attention on its own. See Mariarosa Cortesi (ed.), I Padri sotto il torchio.
An interpretation of the PD by Patriarch Dositheos

The second reference to the PD comes from the text of the Orthodox Confession of Patriarch Dositheos, prepared in 1672. This was the year when the restless patriarch organized a council in Jerusalem and ostentatiously commemorated the event with the renovation of the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem, which had recently been taken from the Catholics. The council is known as the “Council of Jerusalem”, but it started in Bethlehem, in the Church of the Nativity. This synod is considered a major event in the ecclesiastic history and theology of the seventeenth century. The seventy-one bishops and clerics who gathered in Bethlehem and Jerusalem condemned the Confession of Lukaris. The council fathers also accepted the Confession of Dositheos. The same Confession was published for a third time in the Tomos of 1690.

In the internal conflict among the Orthodox over the term μετουσίωσις Patriarch Dositheos had to prove his views on the basis of the Patristic tradition. In this third edition of his Confession he elaborated the article about the ancient Orthodox tradition on the basis of the text on the same subject written by Meletios Syrigos referred to earlier in this chapter, which divides the Orthodox tradition in twelve hundred-year generations. In this edition Dositheos altered the text of the original Confession, augmenting it with more evidence from the Church Fathers. In this new elaboration he also made reference to Berengar and the PD. Here I provide the exact reference with a translation.90

Κεφάλαιον β’

Επειδή ἐμνήσθημεν τοῦ Βερεγγαρίου, χρὴ εἰδέναι ὅτι ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας Ἰσαακίου τοῦ Κομνηνοῦ, περίπου τὰ ἄνη’ ἐτή τῆς

Because we have mentioned Berengar, it should be known that during the reign of Isaak Komnenos, around the year 1058, this Berengar was an archdeacon of a certain church in Italy, who, renewing the blasphemy against the <Eucharistic> mystery of the Iconoclast Synod held under the Kopronymos, said that the bread and the wine are a mere sign of the Body and Blood of the Lord.91 And when at the time of Pope Nicholas II of Rome a great Synod of the westerners was convoked, they condemned Berengar and his teaching and later he was condemned by different synods and, especially in the year 1215 in the old church of Rome called Lateran, they anathematised this teaching, so to say, <through the authority> of the entire western Synod following the Scriptures, the Fathers and the holy Seventh

---

91 Dositheos refers here to the Council of Hiereia under Constantine V, held in 754.
Ecumenical Council, even if, in some other matters, the same Synod declared unbefitting things.\textsuperscript{92}

Κεφάλαιον γ’

Ἐπὶ Ἀλεξίου τοῦ Κομνηνοῦ, ὃς ἐβασίλευσεν ἐν ᾳπα’, Βασίλειός τις, ἀρχηγὸς γενόμενος τῆς αἱρέσεως τῶν Βογομίλων, πρὸς ταῖς αὐτοῦ βλασφημημαίας, ἐπόμενος Ἐβιωναίοις καὶ Μανιχαίοις καὶ Μεσσαλιανοῖς, ἐβλασφήμει καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ ἁγίότητα καὶ μεταβολήν. Ἀλλ’ ὁ Ἀλέξιος, σύνοδον ποιήσας τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν καὶ τῶν συγκλητικῶν, τὸ μὲν δόγμα ἀνεθεμάτισε, τὸ δὲ Βασίλειον κατέκαυσεν εἰς τὸ ἱπποδρόμιον ζῶντα. Περὶ δὲ τοῦ μυστηρίου ἐπέτρεψεν Εὐθυμίῳ τῷ Ζυγαβινῷ, ἵνα εἴπῃ τὰ πρόσφορα, στις συνέγραψεν εἰς τὴν δογματικὴν πανοπλίαν ὅλόκληρα τὰ περὶ τοῦ μυστηρίου ῥητὰ Γρηγορίου Νύσσης καὶ τοῦ Δαμασκηνοῦ, ἅτινα παρίστησι τὴν ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ πραγματικὴν μεταβολὴν τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ οἴνου εἰς τὸ ἀληθὲς σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τοῦ Κυρίου.

Chapter three

In the time of Alexios Komnenos, who was reigning in the year 1081, a certain Basil who was the leader of the heresy of the Bogomils, besides other blasphemies of his in which he followed the Ebionites, the Manichees and the Messalians, also blasphemed against the sacrament and the transformation of the \textit{Eucharistic} mystery. However, Alexios, having convoked a Synod of the bishops and the senators,

\textsuperscript{92} Dositheos refers here to the Fourth Lateran Council, which, among others, adopted a resolution “against the Greeks,” so that, in this council some “unbefitting things” were declared. Though the Constitutions of the Council do not mention the name of Berengar and his heresy is not being condemned, indeed this was the first official council to adopt the dogma of the Transubstantiation. This move was not, as Dositheos holds, against Berengar’s followers, but against the Albigensians. See: Edward Yarnold, “Transubstantiation,” \textit{The Eucharist in Theology and Philosophy}. 
made this teaching condemned and also made Basil to be burnt alive in the Hippodrome. As for the sacrament, he commissioned Euthymios Zygabinos to say whatever <he would find> convenient, who compiled in his Dogmatic Armoury everything which Gregory of Nyssa and John Damascene had said about the Mystery, which show that in the sacrament there is a true transformation of the bread and wine into the true Body and Blood of the Lord.

Continuation of the internal conflict among the Orthodox.

Notwithstanding Dositheos’ criticisms, Karyophylles did not change his position and kept on insisting that his arguments were based on the Patristic tradition. In a letter to Khrysanthos Notaras, nephew of Dositheos and future patriarch of Jerusalem,93 Karyophylles firmly stands by his arguments.

Εσείς νεωτεροποιεῖτε, καὶ τὰ κεκριμένα πρὸ πολλῶν χρόνων ἀρίτος κινεῖτε, θέλοντες νὰ ματαιοπονήτε, νὰ συγγράφητε ὀµολογίας καὶ ἐκθέσεις πίστεως, ὡς ἀν νὰ ἐµεινὲν ἡ Ἀνατολικὴ Ἐκκλησία εἰς τὰς ἡμέρας σας ἑνδεής, ἀπορος, καὶ ἀφίκετε τὰς λέξεις ὑπὸ ἐµεταχειρίσθησαν οἱ ἁγιοι διδάσκαλοι εἰς ἀµυδρὰν κατανόησιν περὶ τοῦ μυστηρίου τῆς ἑγίας κοινωνίας, ἀφοῦ ἐστάθη ἡ εὐσέβεια μέχρι τοῦδε καὶ διδάσκετε μετουσίωσιν, καὶ κάµνετε ἀπορίας πῶς γίνεται καὶ πῶς κατασκευάζεται. Καὶ ἀφίνοντας τὰ ὑπὸ λέγουν οἱ ἁγιοι θεολόγοι, διὰ νὰ μὴ κάµνωμεν ἐρευν hendetai καὶ γράφητε. Ἔστως καὶ δὲν ἀναγινώσκετε, ἀµή καὶ δὲν ἀνεγνώσατε τὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ Δαµασκηνοῦ ἐν τῇ περὶ τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦτον, “ἐι δὲ τὸν τρόπον ἐπιζητεῖς πῶς

93 Later on Khrysanthos Notaras became a key figure in the publication of the PD. A monograph on him is written by Penelope Stathe, Χρύσανθος Νοταράς, Πατριάρχης Ἱεροσολύμων· πρόδρομος τοῦ Νεοελληνικοῦ διαφωτισµοῦ (Athens: Syndesmos ton en Athēnais Megaloscholiton, 1999) (Henceforth: Penelope Stathe, Χρύσανθος Νοταράς).
γίνεται, ἀρκεῖ σοι ἀκούσαι, ὅτι διὰ Πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ πλέον οὐδὲν γινώσκομεν”. Λοιπὸν ἐσεῖς κινεῖτε καὶ νεωτεροποιεῖτε ὅποιο ἐβαλθήκατε νὰ μάθετε πῶς γίνεται, καὶ δέχεσθε τὰς φλυαρίας ὅλας τῶν δυτικῶν εἰς τὸ ύπερφυὲς τοῦτο μυστήριον μετὰ τῆς ἀλλοκότου λέξεως μετουσιώσις, ὅποιο ὀνείδες τῶν ἁγίων διδασκάλων τὴν ἀνέφερεν ὡς ἀνοίκειον εἰς τὴν μεταβολὴν τοῦτο τοῦ ἁγίου μυστηρίου.94

You are introducing novelties, you reopen issues decided many years ago, wishing to do useless work, writing confessions and expositions of faith, as if the Eastern Church had remained in your days needy and helpless. You have abandoned the terms which the Holy Teachers used for a dim understanding concerning the mystery of the Holy Communion, from which the religion was established up the present day, you teach transubstantiation and are asking questions about how it happens and how it is made. Disregarding whatever the holy theologians had said about not to make inquiry into the hidden mysteries, you are inquiring and writing <about them>. Perhaps you are not reading, as indeed you have not read the words of the holy Damascene in <his chapter> about this Sacrament “but if you inquire in what way it happens, it is enough for you to hear that <it happens> through the Holy Spirit and we know nothing more.”95 However, now you are stirring up and innovating, because you have decided to learn how it happens, and you accept all the gossips of the Westerners on this supernatural mystery, together with the odd expression μετουσιώσις, which none of the Holy Teachers have mentioned,

94 Quotation after Ioan Dură, Ὁ Δοσίθεος Ἱεροσολύμων, 140-141.
because it is inappropriate for expressing the transformation of this holy mystery.

The *Tetradion* of Karyophylles was condemned by the Synod in 1691. On the Sunday of Orthodoxy of the same year Patriarch Dositheos tore apart an exemplar of the *Tetradion*. Karyophylles was violently expelled from the Church and beaten by Alexandros Mavrokorodatos (1641-1709), who was at that time *megas dragoumanos* (translator and foreign minister) of the Sublime Porte.96

Karyophylles took refuge in the court of Constantine Brîncoveanu. In Bucharest Karyophylles had friendly connections with a group opposing Dositheos. This group included Anthimos the Iberian (1650-1715)97 and Constantine Kantakouzenos (circa 1650-1716), uncle and initial supporter of Constantine Brîncoveanu who later competed with him. The former patriarch of Constantinople, Dionysios IV,98 also belonged to the same circle.

On 22 September 1692 Karyophylles passed away in Bucharest. This did not prevent Dositheos from publishing a treatise against Karyophylles in which he ascribed the typical features of every heretic to his enemy. This book, published in Jassy in 1694, came out just two years after the death of Karyophylles.99

Dositheos recalls the following episode of the trial:

---

97 Athimos the Iberian was a key figure for the book printing activities in the Principalities. A study on him together with a bibliography has been provided by Gabriel Ţrempel, *Antim Ivireanu* (Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române, 1997).
98 Because of the internal struggles among the Orthodox parties, Dionysios IV was five times Patriarch of Constantinople (1671 November 8-1673 August 14), (1676 July 29-1679 July 29, in place until Aug 2), (1682 July 30-1684 March 10), (1686 March-1687 October 12), (1693 August-1694 April).
Once more the faithful asked him [Karyophylles]: “why don’t you believe in the teaching and the dogma of the Catholic Church, which teaches the whole truth on this Sacrament?” Karyophylles answered “Anathema to whoever is not obedient to the teaching of the Catholic Church.” However, by Catholic Church he meant Simon, Basileides, the Gnostics, Markion, Ebion, Mani, the Messalians, the Bogomils, the Synod of the Iconoclasts in Blachernae during the time of the Kopronymos, Berengar, Calvin, Luther, Lukaris, Korydalleus, himself and his companions.

Here, Patriarch Dositheos is presenting an established genealogy of all heretical movements which, invariably, begins with the legendary predecessor of every heresy, Simon Magus. He is providing the same imaginary correlations between Eastern and Western heretics which already noted in Syrigos’ text and mentioned earlier in this chapter. In order to clear the name of their friend, the group around Anthimos the Iberian published the

---

100 BHellén. III 661, p. 35.
disputed *Tetradion* under the title Ἐγχειρίδιον περὶ τινων ἀποριῶν καὶ λύσεων in 1697.\(^{101}\)

The idea to publish the PD arose around 1692 and was initiated by Patriarch Dositheos. Paradoxically, he thought that this anthology supported his own views. In reality, the PD supports Karyophylles because the Church Fathers quoted in the PD nowhere refer the term μετουσίωσις. Moreover, the quotation from John Damascene which Karyophylles used as an argument is present in the PD itself!

Σῶμα ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ἐνωμένον θεότητι, τὸ ἐκ τῆς ἀγίας παρθένου σῶμα, οὐχ ὅτι αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἀναληφθὲν\(^{102}\) ἐξ οὐρανῶν κατέρχεται, ἀλλ’ ὅτι αὐτὸς ὁ ἁγιός καὶ οίνος μεταποιεῖται εἰς σῶμα καὶ σῶμα θεοῦ. Ἐὰν δὲ τὸν τρόπον ἐπιζητεῖς, πῶς γίνεται, ἀρκεῖ σοι ἀκούσαι, ὅτι διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν κατέρχεται, ἀλλ’ ὅτι αὐτὸς ὁ ἁγιός καὶ οίνος μετατίθεται εἰς σῶμα καὶ σῶμα θεοῦ. Ἐὰν δὲ τὸν τρόπον ἐπιζητεῖς, πῶς γίνεται, ἀρκεῖ σοι ἀκούσαι, ὅτι διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν κατέρχεται, ἀλλ’ ὅτι αὐτὸς ὁ ἁγιός καὶ οίνος μετατίθεται εἰς σῶμα καὶ σῶμα θεοῦ. Ἐὰν δὲ τὸν τρόπον ἐπιζητεῖς, πῶς γίνεται, ἀρκεῖ σοι ἀκούσαι, ὅτι διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν κατέρχεται, ἀλλ’ ὅτι αὐτὸς ὁ ἁγιός καὶ οίνος μετατίθεται εἰς σῶμα καὶ σῶμα θεοῦ. Ἐὰν δὲ τὸν τρόπον ἐπιζητεῖς, πῶς γίνεται, ἀρκεῖ σοι ἀκούσαι.

The Body is truly united to the divinity, the Body from the Holy Virgin, not that this assumed body is taken from heavens but the very bread and the wine are transformed into God’s Body and Blood. If you enquire how this happens, it is enough for you to know that it happens through the Holy Spirit, in the same way as the Lord has created flesh for Himself and in Himself from the holy Mother of God though the Holy Spirit. And we know nothing more, but that “the

\(^{101}\) BHellén. III 673.

\(^{102}\) ἐξ οὐρανῶν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἀναληφθὲν in PD

word of God is” true “and efficient” (Heb 4:1) and omnipotent, but the way it works is not possible to examine.

The conflict between Dositheos and Karyophylles over the patristic legacy attracted attention to the PD. For different reasons the edition itself came eighteen years later. In the year of the publication, that is, 1710, both opponents had already passed away and their enmity was soon forgotten. Thus, the edition of the PD became something different from the initial plans. When it was published it was much less a piece of polemics than a tribute by the next patriarch of Jerusalem, Chysanthos Notaras, to his predecessor, Dositheos. To understand this, one has to turn to Dositheos’ failed plans to publish the PD in Russia.
PLANS FOR PUBLICATION IN RUSSIA WHICH NEVER CAME TRUE

One episode in the history of the Greek *editio princeps* of the PD happened in Russia. This episode confirms that the edition of the PD was an endeavor of the patriarchs of Jerusalem, even though their names are not directly mentioned in any part of the printed text from the year 1710. Even if the edition of the PD in Russia never came true, it still remained an important stage in the prehistory of the publication. In this section I will focus on details of the failed project to print the PD and on the manuscripts that were to be used for the edition. In order to do so, the viewpoint of my investigation will move from the Romanian Principalities to the Russian Empire, especially in the context of Patriarch Nikon’s reforms and the changes under Peter the Great. On Russian soil one can see two recurring patterns concerning the PD. The interest in the anthology surfaced again at the juncture between manuscript culture and printing. Yet again the PD was involved in the problem of the Byzantine legacy and the way it was accepted or rejected during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

After the visit of the Jeremiah II Tranos, patriarch of Constantinople, (patriarch for intermittent periods 1557-1559; 1580-1584; 1587-1595) to Moscow, the political connections between Russia and the Eastern Patriarchs became stronger. The Eastern Orthodox patriarchs, clergy, and laymen often regarded the Russian tsars as the only powerful rulers that could take the place of the Byzantine emperor and restore the traditional balance in the Orthodox Church with both patriarch and emperor.

In the words of Kapterev “an especially great deal of advice on different occasions was given to the Russian government by a man who was among its most active and zealous agents – the Patriarch of Jerusalem Dositeeos, who unceasingly served the interests of Russia for more than thirty years.” Indeed, Patriarch Dositeeos kept intense contacts with Moscow; as his wide-ranging correspondence is partly preserved, one is able to form an image of these contacts. Among others, Dositeeos’ correspondence includes a letter from the patriarch requesting Tsar Peter the Great to support the printing of a collection of Greek polemical manuscripts. In 1692 Khrysanthos Notaras arrived in Moscow carrying eleven printed books as a present to the tsar together with eighteen Greek manuscripts to be printed in Russia. Among the selected MSS was also a fourteenth-century copy of the PD – currently held in Gosudarstvennyi Istoricheskij Muzej under the call number (GIM) 226.

Details concerning the whole plan of Dositeeos have been carefully studied by Boris Fonkič, who consulted the manuscripts and documents available in Russia. The plan for the publication of the whole anti-polemic corpus was established by Patriarch Dositeeos. It is preserved in an official document, prepared by the Russian foreign ministry, for the actual delivery of the manuscripts. The list of the manuscripts to be printed provides the authentic background against which the edition of the PD should be viewed. Dositeeos planned to publish an exhaustive collection of Byzantine and post-Byzantine authors committed to

---

106 Kapterev, Kharakter otnoshenii Rossii, 300. Kapterev has dedicated another study to the connections of Patriarch Dositeeos with Moscow. Nikolai Kapterev, Snoshenija ierusalimskago Patriarcha Dosifeja s Russkim Pravitelevom (1669-1707) (Moskow: 1891) (Henceforth: Kapterev, Snoshenija ierusalimskago Patriarcha Dosifeja ) I have not been able to consult this study.

107 The letter was published by Kapterev, Snoshenija ierusalimskago patriarchy Dosifeja, 104. The original of this letter had been quoted by Fonkič in the following way: Tsentralnyi Gosudarstvenyi Arhiv Drevnyih Actov, f. 52, op. 1, 7201 g., delo № 4, ll. 192-194.


theological polemics. The comprehensiveness of the list shows that Dositheos planned to create a modern *Panoply* based on similar principles to the polemic anthologies of the Byzantine tradition. The PD was one of these anthologies and its inclusion shows that it was appreciated as an example coming from ancient times.

Initially, the request of Patriarch Dositheos was favorably accepted in Russia. On the 3 April 1693 the Russian authorities issued an order (*ukaz*) to establish a Greek printing press. Khrysanthos Notaras started to prepare the first manuscript for publication. This was a huge anti-Latin corpus (GIM 250), compiled from texts available in the Metochion in Constantinople with the rich library of the patriarchs of Jerusalem. From the marginal notes left by Khrysanthos and Dositheos on this MS, it is apparent that the first polemic book was supposed to contain excerpts refuting the Catholics. The list also shows that a small fragment of the PD was to be published as part of this larger collection. Apart from this, Patriarch Dositheos also wanted to see the whole PD published, as is evident from the list he prepared.  

However, in 1694 Khrysanthos was summoned to Walachia. The Greek men of letters who were active in Russia, the Leikhoudes brothers – Ioannikios (1633-1717) and Sophronios (1652-1730) – were supposed to take care of the publications, but their relations with Patriarch Dositheos were getting worse. In 1697 the Russian Patriarch Adrian (1690-1700) informed Dositheos that the newly established printing presses in Moscow were ready. However, the printing of these books never started. In 1700 Patriarch Adrian passed away and Peter the Great did not nominate a successor to him, but designated Stefan Yavorskij (1658-1722) as the temporary head of the Russian Church.

---

109 Details on all these MSS are provided in Boris Fonkić, “Ierusalimskij patriarch Dosifej i ego rukopisi v Moskve,” *Vizantijskij Vremennik* 29 (1969): 290-294.


111 In fact, Demetrakopoulos has published some polemic works by Zacharias of Mytilene, Nikolaos of Methone, Eustratios of Nicea and Johannes Phurnes on the basis of some of the manuscripts which Patriarch Dositheos has sent to Russia. See Andronikos Demetrakopoulos, Εκκλησιαστική Βιβλιοθήκη, vol. 1. Leipzig, 1866 (repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1965).
Apparently, the project to gain the support of Moscow failed because Russia was going in a different direction. It was not the *Dogmatica* but the *Arithmetica* (1703) by Leontij Filippovich Magnitskij which became one of the most famous books of the early Petrine age. The PD was present in Russia, but did not receive much attention. This case highlights the fact that the mere presence of manuscripts does not necessarily involve their having any influence.

Dositheos and Khrysanthos now had to find a new place for their printing project. After a long eighteen-year preparatory period the edition of the PD was realized in the Principality of Walachia. Patriarch Dositheos never saw the anthology go to print because he passed away three years before the publication. The new patriarch of Jerusalem, Khrysanthos Notaras, undoubtedly stood behind the final publication. Patriarch Khrysanthos seems to have supported the editions of the PD and the famous *History of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem* as a tribute to his restless predecessor, Spiritual Father and close blood relative, Dositheos.

It can be seen from the list of manuscripts published by Fonkič that initially the PD was one of the last texts to be published in Moscow. Even so, it was finally chosen to be published in Romania. The movement of the PD upwards in the list has a logical explanation. The project of Russia was designed by Patriarch Dositheos, who made the first selection. The MS of the PD sent for publication to Russia – GIM 226 -- has the ownership mark of Khrysanthos Notaras. Becoming patriarch of Jerusalem himself, Khrysanthos made a further selection of the texts which he found most suitable and deserving to be published in the principalities. In this way the PD took priority. This adds a certain value to the anthology, being chosen to be published among the great number of Byzantine and post-Byzantine polemic works. It shows that it perfectly fitted the goals of the Orthodox to answer their

---

112 This important book will be treated later in detail.
opponents at the time. The inherent flexibility that the contents provided was appreciated and could be used on a variety of occasions.
THE TÎRGOVIȘTE EDITION OF 1710

Princely patronage for the PD -- the Voevods of the Romanian Principalities as new defenders of Orthodoxy

When the patriarch of Jerusalem saw that the printing of their books in Russia would never happen, he turned again to the Romanian Principalities. Equally talented as theologian and historian, Dositeos elaborated on the influences of Byzantium on the tradition of rulership in the Romanian principalities. Indeed, the Byzantine influence on this tradition was visible on many levels – the announcement of the ruler, the titles which he used and the symbols of his power – the extent and importance of this influence, however, is still disputed among scholars.113

Patriarch Dositeos fully accepted the connection between the Byzantine tradition in rulership and the the Principalities. He fashioned the rulers of Walachia in the traditional role of the Emperor as a defender of Orthodoxy. Already in the Tomos of 1690,114 cited above, Dositeos presented the rulers of Walachia and Moldova as direct heirs of the Byzantine tradition in the battle against heresy. This account is important for understanding that the princes of the Principalities took the role of Byzantine emperors as commissioners of anti-


114 Meletios Syrigos and Dositeos Notaras, Κατὰ τῶν καλβινικῶν κεφαλαίων... κατὰ τῆς καλβινικῆς φρενοβλαβείας, B hellén II 632.BRV I, 90, see note 71.
heretic books and the PD itself. What did the patriarch write in the solemn dedication of the
volume to Constantine Brîncoveanu, ruler of Walachia, about the responsibilities of the
Orthodox ruler?

Ἀλλ᾿ ἐπειδή οὐκ ἀπολέσθαι τὰ κακὰ δυνατὸν - ὑπενάντιον γὰρ τι
tῷ ἀγαθῷ ἀεὶ εἶναι ἀνάγκη 115- ἐγένοντο ἐν μὲν τῶ πάλαι λαῷ
ψευδοπροφήται, ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ δὲ εἰσέφηρον [εἰσφήρισαν]
ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, οἵτινες παρείσαξαν αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας, τὸν
ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἅρμουνοι (cf. 2 Pt 2:1), καὶ πολλοὶ
ἐξηκολούθησαν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀπωλείαις καὶ γε δι᾽ αὐτοὺς ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς
ἀληθείας παρὰ πολλῶν ἐβλασφημήθη (cf. Rm 2:24). Ο ἐκδικος
ὅμως τοῦ δικαίου καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας Θεός, διττὰ ὅπλα δικαιοσύνης
ἀνέτησεν εἰς κατάλυσιν τῆς αἱρετικῆς ὁφύος, τοὺς μὲν
didaskalous τῆς ἐκκλησίας δηλονότι νὰ ἀποκορακίζωσι τὸ ψεῦδος
μὲ ταῖς ἁγίαις συνόδοις καὶ μὲ τὰ συγγράμματά των, τοὺς δὲ
ὄρθωδοὸς ἀρχηγοὺς νὰ τὰ βεβαιώσουν. Ὅθεν οἱ ὑσεβεστατοι
αὐτοκράτορες διὰ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν ἦθροισαν τὰς ἁγίας συνόδους,
ἐν δὲ τοῖς καθ᾽ ἡμῶν καιροῖς, τὸ μίγμα τῶν αἱρέσεως, τὴν ἀσέβειαν λέγω τοῦ Καλύνου, ἐθεάτρισε
καὶ κατῄσχυνεν ὁ μακαρίτης Βασίλειος βοεβόδας, σύνοδον
ἀθροίσας εἰς Γιάσιον, καὶ ἐπιτρέψας τὸν μακαρίτην Μελέτιον
Συρίγον ἐναγγέλει τὸ παρὸν βιβλίον εἰς παντελῇ ἐξουδένωσιν
ἀυτῆς. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐχρειάθη εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν νῦν ἡ ἐκδοσίς του
diὰ ἀναγκαίας αἰτίας, ἐμείνεν ἐργον τῆς σῆς ἐκλαμπρότητος καὶ

115 Cf. Plato, Theaetetus 176A.
νὰ τὸ φέρῃς εἰς φῶς, βάνωντάς το εἰς τύπον, καὶ νὰ τὸ διαφεντεύσῃς, παρέχων αὐτὸ δωρεὰν τῇ καθόλου ἐκκλησίᾳ.  

But since it is not possible that the evil should disappear, for it is necessary that there be always something opposite to the good, so in the old people there were pseudo-prophets and also false teachers crept into the Church, who introduced pernicious heresies, disowning the very Master who bought them, reneguing the Lord who has redeemed them and many followed their perdition. In fact, because of them the way of truth was blasphemed by many. However, God, who is the avenger of the just and of the truth, has provided two weapons of justice to dissolve the heretical pride: on the one hand, the doctors of the church, in order that they may eradicate the lie by the holy councils and their own writings; on the other hand, the Orthodox rulers in order to confirm all these. Hence, for this very reason the pious Emperors convoked the Holy Councils, in order to decide on the arising controversies, and they confirmed these decisions with imperial rescripts, with edicts, with letters, with orders and other efforts. In our times, the blessed Voevod Basile exposed and put to shame the mixed heresy, I mean Calvin’s impiety, when he convoked a council in Jassy and commissioned the blessed Meletios Syrigos to write the present book for a final annihilation of this heresy. And given that now, for compelling reasons, the Church needed the publication of this work, it was incumbent upon your Illustriousness to bring it to light sending it to the press, and to sponsor it giving it as a present to the universal Church.  

116  BH I, p. 462.
117  BRV I, 90, p. 301.
The parallel with Alexios I Komnenos, who commissioned his theologian Zygadenos to compile the PD as a final refutation of the Bogomil heresy, might appear plausible and yet farfetched had Dositheos not continued his address. Further, he claimed that Constantine Brîncoveanu’s stand against heresy was a logical continuation of the deeds of his noble ancestors from the line of his mother -- the imperial families of the Komnenoi and the Kantakouzenoi. He mentions five rulers as predecessors of the ruler: Alexios I Komnenos (1081-1118), Johannes II Komnenos (1118-1143), Manuel I Komnenos (1143-1180), Johannes Kantakouzenos (1341-1376), Mathaios Kantakouzenos (1353-1355).

As founding father of the dynasty and forerunner of Constantine Brîncoveanu, Dositheos mentions none other than Emperor Alexios I, whom he says fought par excellence (διαφόρως) for the faith. He lists feats of his prowess in defense of the Orthodox faith. In this list, right after the well-known episode of Basil the Bogomil being burned in the hippodrome of Constantinople, Dositheos continues that Alexios I also:

Ἐπρόσταξεν Εὐθύμιον τὸν Ζυγαβηνὸν, καὶ συνέγραψεν κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων τὴν δογματικὴν πανοπλίαν, τὸ ὡραιότατον βιβλίον ὃποῦ νὰ εἶναι εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

Commissioned Euthymios Zygadenos to compile the Dogmatic Armoury against each heresy, which is the most beautiful book that is there in the Chuch.

Patriarch Dositheos did not stop here but continued listing the subsequent rulers through whom Brîncoveanu claimed blood-relationship, summarizing their religious policy.

---

118 The relation between Brîncoveanu and the Komnenoi was made through Kantakouzenos, using the maternal line of the prince.
119 The account of Anna Komnene see in Anna Comnena, Alexias, 15, VIII, 1 – 15, IX, 1. 485-489.
120 BRV I, 90, p. 302.
Clearly, the parallels between the Komnenoi and the voevods of the Danubian Principalities did not occur by chance. It was a general trend for these rulers to search for and emphasize their genealogical connections with the old aristocratic dynasties of Byzantium. The same quest was also reflected in the choice of Byzantine symbols in the coats of arms of the Walachian Principality at the time. Patriarch Dositheos adds another facet in the same direction when fashioning the ruler in the traditional role of Byzantine emperor as Champions of Orthodoxy. In two steps Patriarch Dositheos made a “brilliant invention” of a way to connect the family of the Kantakouzenoi, from whom the Walachian ruler was descended, with the dynasty of the Komnenoi. The first step was in the year 1688, when the patriarch connected the ancestry of the ruler to John Kanthakouzenos, duke of Thrace “around 1225”. Two years later, in the above quoted preface to the edition of Meletios Syrigos, Dositheos connects the family of the Kantakouzenoi to the Komnenoi in order to legitimize the usurpation of John VI, but confusing his father with a man bearing the same name, who, five generations earlier, was married to a niece of Manuel I Komnenos. Thus, we see that the Emperor Alexios I Komnenos, who commissioned the PD, came to be viewed as an ancestor of the family of the ruler Constantine Brincoveanu.


124 For a detailed study see the works of Andrei Pippidi indicated above in note 122.
Patriarch Dositheos deliberately repeated one statement twice in the text. All those imperial predecessors of Brîncoveanu were commemorated in the Synodicon of Orthodoxy because they acted not only with political but also with ecclesiastical power (αὐτοκράτορες, βασιλεῖς - ἀρχιερεῖς) in the footsteps of Constantine the Great.

Dositheos is also famous for his passionate, sometimes over-heated, defense of Orthodoxy. Thus, one might ask how far his testimony is valuable evidence for the PD or whether it was just an image created by the zealous patriarch who aimed to flatter the prince while pursuing his own agenda. Probably both answers are correct. Indeed, Dositheos would have uttered the same flattery to the rulers of Russia had they shown interest in publishing his Greek anti-heretic collection. On the other hand, Constantine Brîncoveanu did truly belong to the Kantakouzenoi family on his maternal side.

The previous rulers of the Principalities had already claimed Byzantine heritage. A telling case is the Moldavian ruler Basile Lupu, who was indeed presented as a defender of Orthodoxy at the Synod of Jassy and whose religious advisor was none other than Meletios Syrigos. Iorga concluded that Lupu “had reached and even superseded the Byzantine Emperors”. Among the most telling examples is the letter of the representatives of the Synod of Jassy to Basile Lupu, in which the ruler was called “defender of the Church and true destroyer of heresies”. In the quoted passage Patriarch Dositheos does not hesitate to

---


128 Επειδή γὰρ οοὶ τὸ σύνθημα δέδοκεν ὁ Κύριος τοῦ εἶναι τῆς ἐκκλησίας αὐτοῦ πρόμαχον καὶ τῶν αἱρέσεων γενναίον καταλύτην, σὲ μόνον ἐκ πάντων τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ἡγεμόνων ὡς εὐχρηστον αὐτῷ ἐκκλεξάμενος. BRV I, 90, 313.
interpret events exactly in this light. He placed the commission of anti-heretical books among the duties of an Orthodox ruler, be he the Byzantine emperor Alexios I, the Moldavian ruler Basile Lupu, or Constantine Brîncoveanu, prince of Walachia.

The failure to publish the PD in Russia and the success in the Principalities is proof of an observation made by Dimitri Obolensky in *The Byzantine Commonwealth*. According to Obolensky, the idea that Russia was an heir of Byzantium was not dominant at the beginning of the eighteenth century, but rather the ideal of the country was to become “Second Kyevan Rus”. The rulers of the Romanian principalities were those who claimed the Byzantine legacy. Thus, one “modernized” *Panoplia Dogmatike*, with its old chapters being read against new enemies, was prepared under the patronage of a “modern” ruler and defender of Orthodoxy.

**The Title of the Edition**

The Tîrgovişte edition of the PD is carried out in the established tradition of book printing in the Romanian Principalities at the time. The title page is framed by a beautiful floral engraving. Here I present the title as it is attested in the copy kept nowadays in the Romanian Academy of Science. This copy of the PD seems to have preserved the original binding of black leather with a cross of gold on the front and floral decorations on both sides of the cover.

---


130 The PD is described by Legrand in BH I, 69, pp. 95-96. I have consulted the copy at RAS, Bucharest, and the Gennadius Library, Athens. The description in the BH I has two minor omissions from the title page. The re-print in PG 130 renders the title correctly.

ΠΑΝΟΠΛΙΑ ΔΟΓΜΑΤΙΚΗ
ΑΛΕΞΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΤΟΥ ΚΟΜΝΙΝΟΥ

Περιέχουσα ἐν συνόψει
tά τοῖς μακαρίοις καὶ θεοφόροις πατράσι πατρασί ἑγγαραφέντα, εἰς τάξιν δὲ καὶ
dιεσκεμμένηn
ἀρμονίαν παρὰ Εὐθυμίου Μοναχοῦ τοῦ Ζιγαδινοῦ τεθέντα

Ἐπὶ ἀνατροπὴ καὶ καταφθορὰ τῶν δυσσεβεστάτων δογμάτων τε καὶ
dιδαγμάτων τῶν ἁθέων Αἵρεσιαρχῶν132, τῶν κακῶς133 κατὰ τῆς ἱερᾶς αὐτῶν
Θεολογίας λυτησάντων,

Ἀφιερωθείσα

Ἐπὶ τοῦ Εὐσεβεστάτου, Ὕψιλοτάτου, καὶ Θεοστέπτου Αὐθέντου καὶ
Ἡγεμόνος πάσης Ὁγγροβλαχίας Κυρίου Κυρίου
Ἰωάννου Κωνσταντίνου Μπασσαράμαπτα
Βοεβόδα τοῦ Μπραγκοβάνου.

Τῷ ἐκλαμπροτάτῳ καὶ σοφωτάτῳ νῦν αὐτοῦ
Κυρίῳ Κυρίῳ Στεφάνῳ Βοεβόδα
τῷ Μπραγκοβάνῳ.

Παρὰ τοῦ πανιερωτάτου καὶ λογιωτάτου μητροπολίτου Δρύστρας Κυρίου Κυρίου
Ἀθανασίου,
Οὐ καὶ τοῖς ἀναλώμασι νῦν πρῶτον τετύπωται.

Παρὰ τῷ Πανιερωτάτῳ, Λογιωτάτῳ καὶ θεοπροβλήτῳ Μητροπολίτῃ
Ὀγγροβλαχίας Κυρίῳ Κυρίῳ Ἀνθίμῳ
τῷ ἐξ Ἰβηρίας,

Ἐπιμελεία καὶ διορθώσει Μητροφάνους ἱερομονάχου Γρηγορίας τοῦ ἐκ Δωδώνης.

Ἐν τῇ Ἁγιωτάτῃ Μητροπόλει τῇ ἐν τῷ ἐξ Ὁγγροβλαχίας Θεογονίας,

Ἐν ἑτέρο τοῦ Θεογονίας Χυλοστῶ Ἑπτακοσιοστῶ Ἑπτακοσιοστῶ,
Κατὰ Μῆνα Μάιον.

132 τῶν δυσσεβεστάτων Αἵρεσιαρχῶν in BH I
133 κακῶς] κακῶν in BH I
PANOPLIA DOGMATIKE
OF EMPEROR ALEXIOS KOMNENOS

Containing in a resume the writings of the blessed and God-bearing Fathers,
Put in order and reasoned harmony
By the monk Euthymios Zigadinos

For the refutation and destruction of the most impious doctrines and
Teachings of the ungodly heresiarchs, who have fought, in an evil manner,
Against the sacred theology of the Fathers,

Dedicated

To the Most Pious, Highest and God-crowned Ruler and
Prince of all Ungrovlachia Kyr Kyr
John Constantine Basarab
Brincoveanu Voivod

To his illustrious and most wise Son,
Kyr Kyr Stephan Brincoveanu
Voivod,

By the Most Holy and Most Erudite Metropolitan of Drystra
Kyr Kyr Athanasios
By whose expenses it has now been printed for the first time,

By the Most Holy, Most Erudite and God-chosen Metropolitan
Of Ungrovlachia Kyr Kyr Anthimos
From Georgia,

Under the cares and editing of Hieromonk Metrophanes Gregoras
From Dodone.

In the Most Holy Metropolia that is in Tîrgoviște
of Ungrovlachia

In the year 1710 from the Birth of God
In the Month of May

---

Θεογονία was originally a pagan expression for the genealogy of the Greek gods from each other, it is also the title of the famous mythological work of Hesiod. It was Pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite who applied the term to the Son’s eternal birth from the Father (cf. Pseudo-Dionysios, DN I, 5, p. 128, 10 [Suchla]; Ep IX, 1, 18 [Ritter]. Before him, Christian authors used the expression only with contempt. However, even after the “avantgarde” innovation of Pseudo-Dionysios, it still needed a long period of dogmatic and stylistic developments until the term could be used, as it was done here, for the Incarnation. This term used here, together with the Theaetetus citation of the previously cited letter of Dositheos (see our note 115), shows well the classicizing tendencies of those times.
It was a custom at that time that all books printed in Walachia pay homage to the ruler, Prince Constantine Brîncoveanu (1689-1714), and the Metropolitan of Walachia – Anthimios the Iberian (1650-1715). The edition also mentions one of the sons of Brîncoveanu – Steven. Apparently, Athanasios, the metropolitan of Silistra, provided money for the publication. The man directly responsible for the quality of the published text is mentioned in the last place – Hieromonk Metrophanes Gregoras of Dodone.

The second page of the Tîrgoviște edition is occupied by the coat of arms of Constantine Brincoveanu and a dedicatory poem to him.

Πρὸς τὸν ἐκλαμπρότατον, εὐσεβέστατον καὶ γαληνότατον αὐθέντην,
kai ἡγεμόνα πάσης Ὀυγγροβλαχίας Κύριον Κύριον, Ιωάννην
Κωνσταντίνον Βασσαράβαν Βοεβόδαν τὸν Μπραγοβάνον.

Ἡγεμόνων κλέος, εὐσεβέων αὐχημά γε θείον
Κωνσταντίνε Μουσών κοίρανε, Φρουραί νόμων
Αντιπήσαι νῦν τίς ποτε αἱς ἀρεταῖς περ ἰκανοῖς,
Οδ ἐπὶ πᾶν ἀτρεκτῶς εἰς φάος ἠλθεῖ καλὸν.
Εἰς ἐτεῶν ἀμέλει σε θεοί φρουροί ἑλίξεις
θώκῳ εἰν *sic* σφετέρῳ ἱδρυμένον πολέας.

Ἀντώνιος ὁ διδάσκαλος τὰς ἐν Κωνσταντινούπολει σχολῖς,
καὶ λογοθέτης γενικοῦ τῆς Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας

The next pages are occupied by an address by Athanasios of Silistra to the ruler of Walachia, Constantine Brîncoveanu. Then follow other short contemporary verses of dedication written by people associated with the patriarchal school in Constantinople. As in a

135 Anthimos was already mentioned in note 97.
dyptich, after these came the opening pages of the PD from the twelfth century with the original dedicatory verses and the address to Emperor Alexios Komnenos.\textsuperscript{136}

An investigation of the Tîrgovişte edition of the PD should start with the man who worked on the text as editor -- Hieromonk Metrophanes Gregoras of Dodone.

**Metrophanes Gregoras – hieromonk, adventurer and editor**

Metrophanes Gregoras was born in Dodone, northern Greece, somewhere around 1630.\textsuperscript{137} He was a man of notable personality, mentioned in several accounts of his contemporaries. In analyzing these accounts, however, it should be noticed that there were at least two other Metrophanes living at this time in the Romanian Principalities. Metrophanes, the bishop of Buzau, was also a well-known editor, and Metrophanes of Nyssa, the confessor of Brîncoveanu who became Metropolitan of Ungrovlachia after the death of his predecessor, Anthimos the Iberian.\textsuperscript{138}

Demetrios Prokopios provided the following brief description which perfectly fits what one would expect from the editor of a monumental book like the PD.

Μητροφάνης Γρηγορᾶς Δοδωναῖος ἱερομόναχος, ἀνήρ ἐλλόγιμος, εἰδήμων τῆς ἑλληνικῆς διαλέκτου, πεπαιδευμένος τὴν τε θύραθεν, καὶ τὴν ἱερὰν παιδείαν, ποιητὴς καὶ ἱεροκήρυξ· ἀναγινώσκει καὶ μελετᾶ τὰς θείας γραφάς, καὶ τὰ τῶν πατέρων ἱερὰ συγγράμματα.

\textsuperscript{136} Short description on Athanasius and the edition in Athanasios Karathanassis, Οἱ Ἕλληνες Λόγιοι στῇ Βλαχία (1670-1714) (Thessaloniki: Ἰδρυμα Μελετῶν Χρεοσονήσου τοῦ Αἴμου, 1972) (Henceforth: Karathanassis, Οἱ Ἕλληνες Λόγιοι στῇ Βλαχία), 143-144.

\textsuperscript{137} Most of the bibliographical references to Metrophanes were collected by G. P. Kournoutos, Ἡ Δωδεκάβιβλος τοῦ Δοσιθέου εἰς τὴν Ἰστορίαν τοῦ Βουκουρεστίου, Θεολογία 24 (1953): 250-273 (Henceforth: Kournoutos, Ἡ Δωδεκάβιβλος τοῦ Δοσιθέου).

\textsuperscript{138} Karathanassis, Οἱ Ἕλληνες Λόγιοι στῇ Βλαχία.
Hieromnak Metrophanes Gregoras of Dodone, an erudite man, proficient in the Greek language, educated both in secular learning and in our sacred education, poet and preacher; he reads and studies the divine Scriptures and the holy writings of the Church Fathers.139

A first-hand testimony comes also from the contemporary Greek historian Constantine Daponte, who recalled a meeting with Metrophanes, who was already old and burdened with years.

Ὅταν δεκαεπτὰ ἢ δεκαοκτὼ χρονῶν ὄντας εἰς ἡλικίαν ἐγὼ, υπήγα εἰς Βουκουφρέστι εἰς τούς χιλίους ἐπτακοσίους τριάντα τὸν Ιούλιον, ἀνθεντεύωντας ὁ Μιχάλβοδας Ρακοβίτζας ὁ Μπόγδανος, δέκα μήνας ύστερα ἀπό τὸ μεγάλο ζωτικά τοῦ ζορμπάλασι Πατρώανα, ὅπου κατέβασε τὸν Σουλτάν Αημέτ, καὶ ἀνέβασε τὸν Σουλτάν Μαχμοῦτ τότε ἐγνώρισα τὸν Μητροφάνη, τὸν ἐσυναναστράφηκα, καὶ αὐτὸς του μὲ εἶπεν, ὅτι ἦτον ἑκατὸν τεσσάρων χρονῶν, καὶ ἔπερασε καιρὸς καὶ ἐτελειώθη.

When I was eighteen or nineteen years of age, I went to Bucharest in June 1730, when Mihail Racovitça Bogdan was a ruler, ten months after the great upheaval of Zorbabashi Patrona, who deposed Sultan Ahmed and imposed Sultan Mahmud; then I got to know Metrophanes, talked with him and he told me that he was hundred and four years; not a long time afterwards, he passed away.140


The upheaval in question is known as the uprising of Patrona Halil which deposed Ahmed III (1673-1736) and imposed Sultan Mahmud I (1696-1754).

Daponte also provided a list of the services to Saints, written by Metrophanes, several verses (including one on the dangerous charms of love), and a letter to Nikolaos Mavrokoridatos, in which Metrophanes explained that due to sickness he had not been able to write verses in a book by Nikolaos.

Our editor not only reached a patriarchal age but also lived an adventurous life. Among the events in his life was a miracle that took place on the eve of the Feast of St Demetrios in 1687. In a first hand narrative, Metrophanes described that the Patriarch of Constantinople Jakobos (in what must have been his third term as Patriarch between 1687-1688) sent him on a mission to Macedonia together with some younger companions, in a turbulent time of power struggles in Constantinople. Suddenly awakened at midnight, Metrophanes and his companions were dragged to a prison and accused of being Austrian spies, aiming to betray the region to the Austrians. When the local judge saw the patriarchal seal, he refused to pass any judgment saying that there was not enough evidence. The accusers rushed into the neighbouring villages and gathered around fourteen people who were ready to give false testimony. Thus, in less than twenty-four hours Metrophanes found himself condemned to die. The future editor of the PD recalled this last night of his life:

Καὶ θερμότερον προσηυχόμην, ταῖς τῶν δακρύων μου ῥοαῖς τὴν γῆν καταβρέχων. ἅλλ’ ὁ τῶν μεγίστων σου θαυμασίων, Χριστέ, καὶ τῆς ἀδόκητου σου δόξης καὶ παρουσίας σου, ἥς ἔλαχον παρὰ σοῦ ὁ ἄγιοι σου καὶ ἐξαιρέτως ὁ πανεύδοξός σου Δημήτριος· προσευχομένῳ οὖν καὶ ἀγωνιῶντι μοι, αὐτοῦ περὶ μέσας νύκτας

141 Kaisarios Daponte, Ἱστορικὸς κατάλογος, 113-119.
ἐφ' ἵππου κοκκίνου βαθυχρόου, ὁ θεῖος ἐφάνη Δημήτριος στεφηφορῶν, ὁ μετὰ τὸν κοινὸν δεσπότην ἐμὸς δεσπότης καὶ εἶπε μοι: "Μὴ φοβοῦ Μητρόφανες, ἰδοὺ σοί τε καὶ τοῖς μετὰ σοῦ νεανίσκοις ὁ θεὸς τὸ ζῆν ἐχαρίσατο, καὶ ἅμα τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ ἁγίου διέτεινα τὰς χεῖρας αὐτὸν ἐναγκαλίσασθαι, ὁ δὲ ἀφαντὸς ἐγένετο."

And I started praying more warmly, watering the ground with the floats of my tears. But o, your great miracles, Christ, and your ineffable glory and advent, which your Saints have obtained from you, and especially your most glorious martyr Demetrios! While I was praying in agony, there, around midnight, appeared to me on a purple horse, the crown-bearing divine Demetrios, my lord after our common Lord, and said to me: "Fear not, Metrophanes, for God has granted life to you and to your young companions." And as the Saint was talking, I stretched my hands to embrace him, but he disappeared.

Later, Metrophanes recalls that a happy end followed – a certain man came, unlocked the cell, and brought a horse; Metrophanes and his young companions were saved in the night before the Feast of St. Demetrios. As a token of gratitude Metrophanes later wrote a service to St. Demetrios.144

This story is composed of common motifs and shows another facet of the reality of contemporary life. Apparently, the editor was describing a vision of St. Demetrios as he had seen him on an icon, riding a purple horse.145 The allegations that he was a spy for Austria can be explained by the war between the Ottoman Empire and Austria (1682-1699), with the second siege of Vienna in 1683, and the final peace of Sremski Karlovci (Karlovitz, Karlóca)

143 Zaviras, Νέα Ελλάς, 441.
144 Kaisarios Daponte, Ἱστορικός κατάλογος, 113-119.
in 1699. In the year in question – 1687 – the Ottomans lost Eger and the second battle of 
Mohacs to Austria. The internal problems of the empire mentioned in the account fit well 
with the chronology because in this year Sultan Mehmed IV (1648-1687) was deposed and 
Süleyman II (1687-1691) came to power. The mission on which Patriarch Jakobos sent 
Metrophanes to Macedonia remains enigmatic, however. The list of the patriarchs of 
Constantinople shows that Jakobos and Dionysios IV the Muslim replaced each other on the 
patriarchal throne three times.\textsuperscript{146} Apparently there was a certain division and power struggle 
in Constantinople in which Metrophanes was involved, probably on the side of Jakobos.

As mentioned above in this chapter, when Karyophylles fled from Constantinople to 
Bucharest in 1692, his friend, the deposed Patriarch Dionysios IV, had already, in a similar 
way, escaped from his enemies in Constantinople. Being connected to Patriarch Jakobos, 
Metrophanes is not saying a word on who might have denounced him to the Ottoman 
authorities.\textsuperscript{147}

The important historical events of the time had repercussions on the life of 
Metrophanes and the abundant material, which also includes some interesting letters, contains 
material for a micro-history on the life in the Ottoman Empire as presented by this educated 
Greek monk. Such a task will not be attempted here, except for a few details.

A picture of Metrophanes is provided by Nikolaos Mavrokordatos (1670-1730), the 
Great Dragoman to the Sublime Porte (1697-1709) and the first Phanariot Hospodar of the

\textsuperscript{146} Podskalsky provides the following chronology on the Patriarchs of Constantinople based on the Julian 
calendar. Jakobos (10th of August, 1679-30th of July, 1682; Dionysios IV Mouselimes (30\textsuperscript{th} of July, 1682 – 10\textsuperscript{th} 
of March, 1684 ); Parthenios IV ( 10\textsuperscript{th} of March, 1684 – 20\textsuperscript{th} of March, 1685); Jakobos (20\textsuperscript{th} of March, 1685 – 
end of March, 1686); Dionysios IV Mouselimes (end of March, 1686 – 12\textsuperscript{th} of October, 1687); Jakobos (12\textsuperscript{th} of 
October, 1687- 3\textsuperscript{rd} of March 1688). If the chronology of the text of Metrophanes is correct, then he must have 
been sent to Macedonia in the first days of the third appointment of Jakobos as Patriarch. Dates after 

\textsuperscript{147} It is possible that records of the period might reveal more information on the events. For the moment, 
it was not possible for me to consult the letters to Patriarch Dositheos by Dionysios IV The Muslim which are 
published in: Ἐπιστολαὶ τοῦ Ἀδρανουπόλεως Νεοφύτου καὶ Διονυσίου ... πρὸς τὸν 
μακαριώτατον ἡμῶν αὐθέντην καὶ διεστότην [Dositheus, Patriarch of Jerusalem], In: Kleophas 
Romanian principalities (hospodar of Moldavia from 1711, of Walachia from 1715). Mavrokordatos knew Metrophanes personally and recalled meeting him in Istanbul. In the capital of the Ottoman Empire Metrophanes constantly drank wine, played table [the game] and gossiped amid a mist of tobacco smoke from his ever-lighted cigarette. Mavrokordatos even wrote a treatise “Against Tobacco”, which Metrophanes answered with a parallel work entitled “A Treatise in Defense of Tobacco”. Mavrokordatos replied with another treatise, “Against Tobacco.”

As a man of letters, Metrophanes had a library and MSS bear his name as their owner. A MS preserves his ex libris -- appended to a text by Korydalleus -- together with a brief historical note on his years of service to the Grand Vizier (the highest minister of the sultan) Köprülü Mustafa (son of Mehmed) (1689-1691).

Spending the last period of his life in Walachia, Metrophanes witnessed the tumultuous years which followed the execution of Constantine Brîncoveanu and his four sons by janissaries in Constantinople (1714). He wrote a short chronicle describing the downfall of Brîncoveanu and the rule of Stephanos Kantakouzenos (1714-1715) followed by the accession of Nikolaos Mavrokordatos (1715-1716). The chronicle was dedicated to the next ruler and son of Nikolaos, Joannes Mavrokordatos (1716-1719).

Above all, however, Metrophanes is mostly known as an editor. For the period 1705-1715 (or 1721) he edited seven books in Walachia -- all of them in Greek -- differing in content, but all of an ecclesiastical character and in most cases with his own verses of

---

148 Comprehensive information on the life of Metrophanes with all sources, including the accounts by Nikolaos Mavrokordatos, was collected by Demostene Russo, “Mitrofan Grigoraş Cronica Țării Românești (1714-1716),” Revista Istorică Română 4 (1934): 1-43; the same text was reprinted in Demostene Russo, Studii istorice greco-române, Opere postume, vol. 2, eds. Nestor Camariano, Ariadna Camariano, Constantin Giurescu (Bucharest: 1932), 409-462.

149 Reference to this MS is provided in the excellent article on Metrophanes by Kournoutos, Η Δωδεκαβιβλοσ του Δοσιθέου, 250-273. The MS with the ex-libris is described by Linos Politis, “Χειρογραφικα μοναστηριων Αιγιου και Καλαβρυτων,” Ελληνικά 11 (1939): 89. The second MS with Metrophanes’ ex libris is actually kept in Xeropotamou: Ευδοκίμου Ξηροποταμίου, Κατάλογος Χειρογραφών μονής Ξηροποτάμου (Thessaloniki, 1932), 81.

150 See note 148.
dedication. As an editor, Metrophanes was in the printing team of Anthimos the Iberian, the greatest hero of book printing at that time, who made contributions reaching far beyond the confines of the Romanian Principalities. Undoubtedly, Metrophanes knew Anthimos personally and even wrote a service to St. Anthimos at his request.\textsuperscript{151} Anthimos quickly advanced in the ecclesiastical hierarchy and, because he did not wish to abandon book printing, moved his printing activities to the locations of his new appointments. Following the displacements of Anthimos,\textsuperscript{152} Metrophanes worked as an editor in Bucharest, Rîmnic, and Tîrgovişte. A close examination of the books which Metrophanes edited reflects the changes which happened around 1710, after the appointment of Anthimos as metropolitan of Ungrovlachia. The new metropolitan fought with the patriarch of Jerusalem, Khrysanthos Notaras, over the possession of the monasteries in the Principalities which were under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{153} Metrophanes took Khrysanthos’ side and edited his last two books under the patronage of the patriarch of Jerusalem. A review of the books edited by Metrophanes can be of help in better understanding the edition of the PD and its context. These books will be presented here with short notes on the historical background and connection, if any, to the PD. Such a detailed approach, however, might yield a distorted view of Metrophanes and exaggerate his role in the Romanian Principalities. In order to be honest, it will be necessary to emphasize that as a man who was highly professional and precise in his work, he was one among the well educated experts who contributed to book printing at the time. His task was described as \textit{ἐπιμελεία καὶ διορθώσει} – “under the care and editing”, implying that he was responsible both for the technical side and the quality of the editions.

\textsuperscript{151} Kaisarios Daponte, \textit{Ἱστορικός κατάλογος}, 113-119.
\textsuperscript{152} Anthimos the Iberian came to Walachia in 1689 or 1690. He was appointed a superior of Snagov Monastery. In 1705 he became bishop of Rîmnic, from 1708 until his death in 1715 he was Metropolitan of Walachia. The metropolitan city of Walachia was Tîrgovişte.
\textsuperscript{153} The Romanian Principalities had close connections with Mount Athos as well. On the topic see Petre Năsturel, \textit{Le Mont Athos et les Roumains}. 
4.3.1 The Service to Saint Bessarion, Bucharest, 1705

The first book of Metrophanes Gregoras of Dodone was published on the 2 April 1705 in Bucharest. It contained the Service to Saint Bessarion. St. Bessarion, bishop of Larissa (circa 1490-1540), was a very important saint because of his miracles averting plague. Not accidentally, the book had several reprints. At first sight, a service to a saint cannot be connected in any way to the belligerent spirit of anti-heretic anthologies such as the PD. Nonetheless, the common editor of the volumes is not the only connection among these books. It is enough to read the epigram on page 26, dedicated by Metrophanes to St. Bessarion and probably referring to a case of furta sacra, theft of relics. The epigram for St. Bessarion reads as follows:

Μητροφάνους κατὰ τῶν ἱεροσύλων παπιστῶν.
Βησσαρίωνος δυσθέοις κλυτὸν δέμας
ληστὴς παπίσταις ἀμπεπώλει χρυσίου
μένει δ’ ἥ κρας εὐσεβείας τροφίμοις
τὸ στεφρὸν ἡμῖν δογμάτων ἐκκλησίας
τῆς καθολικῆς θαυμάτων δι’ ἀφθόνων
corpora πιστοῖς φιλεόρτοις τε σφόδρα.

Poem of Metrophanes against the sacrilegious Papists
A robber sold for gold to the godless Papists
the glorious body of Bessarion.
but his head remains here for those who are nourished on piety.

154 Ακολουθία τού ἐν ἁγίοις Πατρός ἡμῶν Βησσαρίωνος, Ἀχιμπεσσικύπου Ἀφρίσσης τοῦ Ἐκκλησιαστοῦ. BRV 148 p.463.
156 Émile Legrand is refering to reprints from the years 1744, 1759, 1797 and 1800. See BRV I, 148.
confirming the strength of the doctrines of the Universal Church through abundant miracles to us the faithful, who celebrate the feasts of the saints. 157

4.3.2 Tomos Kharas, Rîmnic, 1705

In the same year, some six months later, the next editorial work of Methrophanes appeared from the printing press of Rîmnic, where Anthimos was bishop at that time. This is the Tomos Kharas, which was intended to serve as an answer to the act of union with the Catholic Church by a portion of Romanian Orthodox clergy in Transylvania in 1700. 159

Tomos Kharas is one of the famous polemic editions of Patriarch Dositheos, coming in the same series and fulfilling the same polemic purpose as Tomos Katallages, Tomos Agapes, and the Orthodoxos Omologia. In the Tomos Kharas Patriarch Dositheos wrote

157 In fact, Metrophanes wrote two epigrams in the book – the one discussed here and the other addressed to Constantine Brîncoveanu. The both epigrams were reprinted in BH I, pp. 38-39.


159 The act was agreed upon by the Bishop of the Romanian Orthodox Church, on the one hand, and the representatives of the Hungarian Roman Catholic Church and the Habsburg Imperial Court in Vienna on the other hand. See also Imre Révéz, La réforme et les roumains de Transylvanie /Études sur l’Europe Centre-orientale; 10/ (Budapest: Sárkány, 1937); Roberto John Weston Evans, The Making of the Habsburg Monarchy 1550-1700: an Interpretation (Oxford: Clarendon, 1979), 423-424; Keith Hitchins, “The idea of nation among the Romanians of Transylvania,” Nation and National ideology. Past, Present and Prospects. Proceedings of the international symposium held at the New Europe College, Bucharest April 6-7, 2001, Bucharest, 2002. Soon after its publication Tomos Kharas was noticed by the Catholic theologians and in 1716 appeared a refutation of this volume authored by Aloysius Andruzzi and published in Rome. Aloysius Andruzzi, Consensus tum Graecorum, tum Latinorum Patrum de processione Spiritus Sancti ex Filio, contra Dositheum Patriarcham Hierosolymitanum (Rome: typis Sacrae Congregatioinis De Propaganda Fide,1716). On several occasions Andruzzi refers to Epiphanius of Salamis but, as far as I could see, does not mention the PD.

160 Dositheos Notaras, Τόμος καταλαγής ἐν ὑψώτατοι Πατριάρχου τοῦ Βαλατόρων μακρὸν, καὶ Ιωάννου τοῦ νομοφύλακος, καὶ Ἐβραίου τοῦ Ἀρχιερείου, καὶ μακαρίου ἱερομονάχου τοῦ Μακηρῷ, καὶ συνελέυσαι ἐν τῇ Αγίᾳ Σοφίᾳ, καὶ Θεοδώρου τοῦ Ἀγαλλιανοῦ, καὶ Ματθαίου τοῦ Βλαστάρως, καὶ σύνοδος ἐν τῇ Αγίᾳ Σοφίᾳ, Iaşi, 1694. BHellén. III 658.

161 Dositheos Notaras, Τόμος ἀγάπης κατὰ Λατίνων, Bucharest, 1698. BHellén. III 681.
a detailed prologue on the relations between East and West during the time of Photios and yet another commentary on the same topic, inserted in the main body of the book (103-134). This second commentary is a fragment of the most famous work authored by Dositheos, *History of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem* -- a history of the Church from the early days of Christianity to the personal experience of Dositheos as patriarch of Jerusalem. Metrophanes was the editor of this famous book, too. That a fragment of the *History* was published in the *Tomos Kharas* suggests that in 1705 Metrophanes had already received the manuscript of this important book, which he published around ten years later. *Tomos Kharas* testifies to a direct connection between Patriarch Dositheos and Metrophanes.

Being responsible for the publication of the *Tomos Kharas*, Metrophanes offered his humble contribution to the spiritual fight of the Orthodox with two short epigrams, addressed to Constantine Brîncoveanu and Patriarch Dositheos. Here, he ended his address to Constantine Brîncoveanu by drawing a comparison between the fight against heresy and the Lernean Hydra, the nine-headed monster which was killed by Heracles. Because it is not possible to treat in detail all the dedicatory verses written by Metrophanes, this epigram will be used as an illustration of this side of his editorial work. The epigram, placed under the coat-of-arms of Constantine Brîncoveanu, reads as follows:

Εἶπερ κοίρανον ἄνδρα πατὴρ μέλψαι μ' ἐποτρύνεις
Δός μοι δὴ αὐτῷ εἴκελον Ἡγεμόνα
Ἄλλον, καγώ σοι τόν δ᾿ ἡρανὸν ἄνδρα ἀείσω.

---

162 Dositheos Notaras, Ορθόδοξες ὁμολογία τῆς πιστεῖς τῆς Καθολικῆς καὶ Ἀποστολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς καὶ εἰσαγωγικὴ ἐκθέσεις περὶ τῶν τριῶν μεγίστων ἀρετῶν πίστεως, ἐλπίδος καὶ ἀγάπης, Snagov. 1699. BHellén. ΙΙΙ 684.

163 The title of this entry is Σημειώσεις Δοσιθέου πατριάρχου Ἰεροσολύμων, εἰς τὴν παρούσαν σύνοδον, αἵτινες κεῖται ἐν τῷ ἐβδῶμῳ βιβλίῳ τοῦ περὶ Ἰεροσολύμως πατριαρχευσάντων τεύχος.

164 Dositheos Notaras, Ἰστορία περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἰεροσολύμοις πατριαρχευσάντων. Bucharest, 1715. BH I 97, see pages 80-84 of the present study.

165 The *Dodekabiblos* will be treated in detail later in this chapter.
Εἰ δὲ ἀμηχανεῖς. ἀλλὰ με θυμός ἄγει
Στέψαι κράντορα τόνδε ἐπαίνοις ἔξοχον ὅδε,
Χαϊρ' ἀγάπη μ' ἀνδρῶν ἡγέτα τῶν ζαυέων,
Καύχημ' Ὀυγκροβλάχων πόλεων, μέγα φέρτατε πάντων,
"THONSTE KLEINHēs ἐκγονε σωφροσύνης,
ΚΩΝΣΤΑΝΤΙΝΈ, ΜΈΓΙΣΤΈ, ΑΠΑΛΗΝΌΤΑΤΈ, ΜΠΑΣΑΡΑΜΠΑ.
ΖΩΗς ὡς πλεῖστους ἩΕΛΙΟΒ ΚΥΚΛΟΥΣ.
Οὐ γὰρ δὴ ὑδράν ἩΡΑΚΛΕΙ ἐξεναρίζεις,
ἈΛΛΑ ὑΠΟΓΡΑΦΗ ΠΑΤΡΙΔΑ ΩΡΑΙΣΑΣ,
ἈΪΡΕΣΙΝ ΠΑΠΠΟΛΑΤΡῶΝ ΒΛΑΣΦΗΜΩΝ ἘΞΑΦΑΝΙΣΕΙΣ
ΒΡΑΓΚΟΒΑΝΕ ΜΠΑΣΑΡΑΜΠΑ, ΚΛΕΟΣ ΕΥΣΕΒΕΩΝ.166

If you, o Father, urge me to celebrate a ruler,
Give me another sovereign similar to him
And I will celebrate that king
However, if you are unable to do so, my passion leads me
To crown this very outstanding sovereign with praises.
Rejoice, my beloved, leader of the sacred people,
Great pride of the cities in Ungrovlachia, bravest of all,
You sweetest grandson of the famous virtue,
Constantine the Great, Serenissimus, Basarab!
May you live for many revolutions of the sun
For you are not killing a Hydra with Herakles
But having adorned your motherland with a press
You are destroying the heresy of the blasphemous pope-worshippers,
O Brîncoveanu, Basarab, glory of the pious.

166 The text of this epigram is rendered after the edition available in Romanian Academy of Science, Bucharest – the volume is described in BRV I, 149, pp. 463-466.
My English translation cannot render the Classisising style of Metrophanes, which is quite characteristic of writers of the period. The metaphor of the many heresies in the many heads of the mythical Hydra was a preferred *locus communis*. The Walachian prince, Radu Brîncoveanu (1704), also employed it in a eulogy to Dositheos.\(^{167}\) To the Classical imagery one might add the comparison of Meletios Syrigos in the aforementioned *Against Calvin*, where the man who could tackle all the heresies is compared with Lynkeos, the hero who helped the Argonauts in their search for the Golden Fleece.\(^{168}\) Leaving aside any parallels reaching back to Byzantium, here it will suffice to understand the odd comparison which was employed with regard to the PD in 1710. In the prologue, written in a heavy and artificial Greek, Athanasios of Silistra compared the dogmatic *Panoply* of Alexios with the shield of Akhilleus, described in the *Iliad*.\(^{169}\) This comparison was not successful because Athanasios was not precise when he said that Akhilleus received only a shield while Alexios was equipped with a whole armory. However, this parallel may also be revealing because it refers to the influence of the Homeric language in this period.

### 4.3.3 Biblos Eniavsios, 1709, Tîrgoviște

This was an essential edition to be read in the Church throughout the ecclesiastic year with the *Liturgies and Services*.\(^{170}\) Naturally, a publication of the Church services in Greek should also be viewed as an answer to the printing activities of the Calvinists and their editions. It was initiated by Anthimos the Iberian, who also wrote the prologue to the book.

\(^{167}\) Λογιδιον εις το Κοσμοσωτημον Παθος του Θεανθρωπου Λογου, BRV I, 145, 457-460.

\(^{168}\) The volume of Syrigos is available in the Romanian Academy of Science from where the text is quoted. The same text was preprinted in BRV 90. In Greek mythology, Lynkeus was a king of Argos, succeeding Danaos.

\(^{169}\) PG 130, 13-14.

\(^{170}\) BRV I, 157, pp. 480-481; Picot, Anthime, 550. With the commentary of Picot “Cet énorme volume, supérieurement imprimé fait honneur à la Typographie de Tîrgoviște.” The book is wonderful, indeed, printed in black and red ink, with binding of brown leather, decorated with a medallion representing the Old Testament Trinity in gold and small flowers. The copy in the Romanian Academy of Science has the original book-locking still preserved on it.
Metrophanes left a colophon in the main body of the edition, where some blank space was left at the end of the *Pentekostarion*. As far as I know, this colophon has not been studied in the scholarly literature. It is an example of the fluctuation in the shift from manuscripts to printed text, because the editor has left a printed note fashioned similarly to the way a scribe would write his name at the end of a manuscript:

Τέλος, θεῷ δὲ δόξα τῷ τρισηλίῳ,
Τῷ δόντι ἵσχὺν τῷ ταπεινῷ μου νοῦ,
Ὄρθως νοήσαι καὶ διορθώσαι ἁμα,
τῶν ὀρθοδόξων τάσσε τὰς θείας βιβλίους.
'Οσοὶ γε οὗν μοι ποιμένες κλήρος θ' ἀπας,
Οἵ ἐντερπώντες τῶν ἅμα τῶν βιβλίων ἰοίς,
σύγγνωτε πάντες, εἶ τι τῶν ἐν ταῖς βιβλίοις
'Οψις παρῄκεν ἥττον εὐθέος λόγου.
'Ο τῆς ύμετέρας ἀγάπης πρόθυμος
θεράπων τῶν πρεσβυτέρων
εὐτελής Μητροφάνης ὁ ἐκ Δωδώνης.

End and glory to the triple-sun God,
Who gave strength to my humble mind,
To understand correctly and to correct
These divine books of the Orthodox
All those shepherds and the entire clergy
Who would find delight in any one of these books
All of you, forgive me, if something in the books
My eyes have left in a form not conform to the right saying!
The prompt servant of your kindness,
the most humble among
the presbyters, Metrophanes of Dodone.
4.3.4 Service to Saint Catherine, Târgoviște, 1710

Published several months before the PD, this edition of the Service to St. Catherine\(^{171}\) again demonstrates that Metrophanes had a certain affiliation with the patriarchate of Jerusalem. The tradition of close contacts between the Romanian Principalities and the monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai began in the sixteenth century and was strictly respected, especially by the Walachian princes. On the other hand, Dositheos, as patriarch of Jerusalem, also kept in contact with the the monastery of Mount Sinai. Thus, there were a number of reasons why this small and very elegant book was published exactly at this time and place. Only the ruler, Constantine Brâncoveanu, and Metropolitan Anthimos are mentioned as supporters of the edition. Again, the book contained dedicatory verses by Metrophanes to the voevod, the metropolitan, and St. Catherine.

Σέλος, θεῷ δὲ δόξα τῷ τρισηλίῳ,
ἐργα φικώδη ἐν τε πυρὶ καὶ γνόφῳ
πάλαι δράσαντι ἐν Σιναίῳ τῷ ὑπαί, ἀ τῆς παλαιᾶς καὶ νέας ἕως δεσπότης
ὁ αὐτὸς ἐπλήρωσεν, ὡς πύρ ἐν βάτῳ
οἰκήσας ἀγνῆς Παρθένου ἐν νηδύϊ
καὶ εἰς προελθὼν Χριστὸς ἀρρήτω τρόπῳ,
ὁν προσκυνοῦντες τῇ ὑποστάσει ένα,
καθ’ ἡν ἔνωσις ή ὑπέρ φύσιν πέλει
τῶν φύσεων [ὡν ή μὲν] ἀκτιστος ή δ’ ύπο χρόνον,
θερμήν δείησιν σύν Σιναίου πατράσι
πάντες τελοῦμεν ὡς τύχουμεν τῆς ἀνω
τρυφῆς ἀλήκτου ταίς λιταῖς τῆς Παρθένου
καὶ μητρός αὐτοῦ εὐλογημένης
Αἰκατερίνης ἑστὶ σοφῆς τ’ ἀθληφόρου.

\(^{171}\) BRV I, 159, pp. 481–482; Picot, Anthime, 551. Available in the library of RAS.
ὁ τῶν ἱερομονάχων εὐτελὴς Μητροφάνης Γρηγορᾶς ὁ ἐκ Δωδώνης

End and glory to the triple-sun God,
who made terrifying signs in fire and darkness
once on the mountain of Sinai.
He, being the Lord of the Old and the New (Testaments)
Himself accomplished [these signs], dwelling,
as the fire in the bush, in the womb of the pure Virgin
and so the unique Christ was born in ineffable way,
whom we worship as one in His hypostasis,
in which consists the supernatural union
of the natures – one being uncreated and the other temporal
and - together with the fathers of Sinai – we all perform
a warm supplication that we may obtain the heavenly
and unceasing joy through the prayers of the Virgin
and His blessed Mother,
and of the wise Catherine, the champion of the faith.
The humble among hieromonks Metrophanes Gregoras from Dodone

4.3.5 Panoplia Dogmatike, Tîrgoviște, May, 1710

Seen in the context of the other books by Metrophanes, it becomes apparent that the
PD was the last edition carried out in close collaboration with Anthimos the Iberian. In the
summer of the same year there was a conflict between Anthimos and Khrysanthos Notaras,
who had already been patriarch of Jerusalem for three years (that is, 1707-1710).
Metrophanes, who was already affiliated to some degree with Jerusalem, seems to have taken
Khrysanthos’ side and from this moment onwards edited only books commissioned by the
patriarch of Jerusalem. Just several months after the publication of the PD, Anthimos
appealed to the patriarch of Constantinople, Athanasios V (1709-1711), describing the conflict with the Patriarchate of Jerusalem over the possession of the monasteries in the Principalities. This, however, was a not the right move, because Patriarch Athanasios stood on the side of Khrysanthos Notaras. In a letter dated December, 1710, Anthimos the Iberian wrote the following to Athanasios:

Γελοῖον μέντοι, ἅτε παράνομον καὶ παρὰ κανόνας, τὸ λέγειν τινὰ ἑθος ἑπικρατεῖν τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων μνημονεύσθαι εἰς τὸ “ἐν πρώτοις μνήσθητι Κύριε” ἐν ἀλλοτρίᾳ παροικίᾳ, πολὺ δὲ γελοώτερον αὖθις τὸ λέγειν εὑρίσκεσθαι ἐν τῇ Ὀγκροβλαχίᾳ μοναστηρία ὑποκείμενα τῷ Ἱεροσολύμων ἢ ἐτέρῳ Πατριάρχῃ, χωρὶς τῶν Σταυροπηγιακῶν μοναστηρίων τῆς ύμετέρας Παναγιότητος…. οὐ γὰρ ἑνὸς ἢ δύο ἢ τριῶν μόνον Μοναστηρίων ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν πλείω εἰκοσιν ἐν τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ ἔπαρχίᾳ τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἀφήρπασε, παρὰ ταῦτα δὲ, καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τῶν χωρίων τῶν δοθέντων αὐτῷ παρὰ τῶν ἡγεμόνων χάριν ἑλέους, ἐν αἷς εἰσὶν ἡμέτεροι ἱερεῖς κοσμικοί, τὸ ἡμέτερον μνημόσυνον τελείως ἐκβάλων, τὸ ἐαυτοῦ μόνον προσέταξε μνημονεύσθαι, καὶ ἐν συνόψει μόνοι ἡμεῖς ὑπερελήφθημεν μὴ μνημονεύοντες τοῦ ὅνόματος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ “ἐν πρώτοις μνήσθητι Κύριε”.

Indeed, it is ridiculous as well as unlawful and not according to the canons to say that a certain custom imposes the commemoration of Jerusalem in the prayer “Among the first remember, o Lord” in the

---

172 Published after Αρχιμ. Καλλινίκος Δελικάνης, Τὰ ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ Αρχιεφιλακτείου Σωζόμενα Επίσημα Εκκλησιαστικά Ἑγγραφά, Βλαχικα καὶ Μολδοβικά (s. n.: 1905). The letter is under the number 183, entitled – Ὀγκροβλαχίας Ἀνθίμου τῷ Ὀικουμενικῷ Πατριάρχῃ Ἀθανασίῳ Ε’. Περὶ τῶν αξιώσεων τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων τῶν μνημονεύσθαι τῷ ἐαυτοῦ ὅνομα ἐν τοῖς ὑπ’ αὐτῶν ἐν Ὀγκροβλαχίᾳ Μοναστηρίοις, 391-395.

173 This is the prayer that priest says immediately after the epiclesis, in which it commemorates his own patriarch and bishop.
diaspora in another country; and it is even more ridiculous to say that in Ungrovlachia are to be found monasteries under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Jerusalem or any other Patriarch, except for the Stavropegeic monasteries belonging to your most-holiness...for he [Khrysanthos Notaras] did not grab power over just one, or two or three, monasteries, but almost over twenty monasteries in our diocese. In addition to this, from the churches in the villages which were gracefully donated to him by our rulers, in which there are our secular priests, he completely banned our commemoration and ordered that only he may be commemorated and, to resume, only we are left as not commemorating his name in the prayer “Among the first remember, o Lord”.

4.3.6 Syntagmation, Bucharest, 1715

The supporter of the edition of this book at this time was the next patriarch of Jerusalem, Khrysanthos. Metrophanes had dedicated verses to him and the new ruler of Walachia, Stephan Kantakouzenos (1714-1715).174 The book is still used as a source for the organization of the Church.175 It matches perfectly the interests of Khrysanthos in ecclesiastic administration and ceremony as well as in geography. It is a book of the ecclesiastical offikia and other dignitaries in the Greek Church, of the hierarchical order of the various dignitaries, and of the geographical jurisdiction of the four patriarchates and their respective metropolitans. The book provides a description of the organization of the Church during Byzantine times, with a chapter referring to the actual state at the beginning of the eighteenth century. The Slavic names written in this book are rendered in the Cyrillic alphabet. Cyrillic

---

175 Theodore Papadopoulos, Studies and Documents Relating to the History of the Greek Church and People under Turkish Domination (London: Aldershot Variorum Reprints, 1990), 44.
is also present in the last book, the *Dodekabiblos*, which has its lengthy title also rendered in Slavic together with the Greek.

### 4.3.7 History of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem, or Dodekabiblos, 1715-1722

This history, known by its short title of *Dodekabiblos*, represents a monumental piece of work within the period as a whole.\(^{176}\) It was written by Patriarch Dositheos and presented not only the history of Jerusalem but also the history of the Christian Church from Early Christian times until the time of Patriarch Dositheos. In the last part of the book, Dositheos presented a first-hand account of the troubled times during his own term as patriarch of Jerusalem. The edition of this huge work comprises a story in itself. The story was thoroughly outlined by Kournoutos.\(^{177}\) Khrysanthos Notaras commissioned Metrophanes to carry out this posthumous edition of Patriarch Dositheos. At this time “poor Metrophanes”, as Kournoutos puts it, must have been around eighty-five years old. Both his poor health and the political changes in the Principalities prolonged the work on the edition for more than five years. Khrysanthos, excellently versed in the craft of book-printing, took an active part in the publication of this edition and kept up a correspondence with Metrophanes, part of which is still preserved, providing a moving insight into Metrophanes’ personality; partially paralyzed and bed-ridden, he continued his work under the aegis of the patriarch.

In this work Dositheos mentioned the PD again. Although heavily dependent on the account by Anna Komnene in the Alexiad, this reference still remains of interest for the reception of the PD.\(^{178}\) In fact, it shows the twelfth century of the Komennian Dynasty through the eyes of an Orthodox theologian working at the turn of the eighteenth century.

---


\(^{177}\) Kournoutos, Ἡ Δωδεκάβιβλος τοῦ Δοσιθέου, 250-273.

\(^{178}\) Because the passage is lengthy it cannot be quoted here. It can be found on pages 784-785 of the first edition.
Βίβλος Η’, Παράγραφον Β’

Περὶ τῶν τὸ δόγμα καὶ τὴν προσθήκην μετὰ Φώτιον ἐλεγξάντων, καὶ τῶν κατὰ τής προσθήκης καὶ τοῦ δόγματος ἐπὶ Αλεξίου καὶ Μανουὴλ συγγραφαίσαντων, καὶ τῶν Πανοπλίαν συνθεμένων.

Μετὰ τὸν Φώτιον ἠλεγξαν τὸ δόγμα καὶ τὴν προσθήκην Νικήτας ὁ Παφλαγών καὶ Σέργιος ὁ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Πατριάρχης, ἢ ἐπὶ τοῦ Κηρουλλαρίου Σύνοδος, Πέτρος ὁ Πατριάρχης Αντιοχείας, Νικήτας ὁ Στηθατός, Λέων, Θεοφύλακτος, Αδριανὸς καὶ Γεννάδιος Ἀρχιεπίσκοποι Βουλγαρίας, καὶ Μιχαὴλ ὁ Ψελλός. Ἐπὶ μέντοι τῶν Κομνηνῶν Αλεξίου καὶ τοῦ ἐγγόνου αὐτοῦ Μανουὴλ ἄνδρες γεγόνασι σοφώτατοι ἐν τῇ Ανατολικῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ οἵτινες γενναίως συνέγραψαν κατὰ τής προσθήκης καὶ τοῦ δόγματος, καὶ δὴ καὶ διαλέξεις πεποιήσατε μετά τινων ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἐθθοντῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ιταλίας. Καὶ συνέγραψε μὲν Εὐθύμιος ὁ Ζυγαβηνός, ὡς μαρτυρεῖ Ἄννα ἡ Ἀλεξιὰς καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ τοῦ Ζυγαβηνοῦ Πανοπλία, περὶ ἣς διείληπται ἀνωτέρω, ἀλλὰ πάλιν ὅτι ἂν Ἀλεξίας μετὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν τινὰ περὶ τῆς Αἱρέσεως τῶν Βογομίλων, τὴν τελεωτέραν ἱστορίαν τῆς Αἱρέσεως πέμπει τὸν ἄκροτινον μαθεῖν παρὰ τοῦ Ζυγαβηνοῦ, καὶ λέγει "Παραπέμπω δὲ τοὺς βουλομένους εἰς τὸ ὅτι καλούμενον βιβλίον Δογματικῆν Πανοπλίαν, ἡ ἐπιταγῇ τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος έπεταξεν ἑκάστην ἑκάστης ἡ ἱερατικῆς ἱστορίας ἐγγράψασθαι, καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν Βογομίλων πατέρων ἀνατροπὰς ἐκθέσθαι, ἑκάστην ἱδία, καὶ ἐφ’ ἑκάστη τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἀνατροπὰς ἐγγράψασθαι, καὶ αὐτῶν δὴ τῶν Βογομίλων.
τὴν αἵρεσιν, καθὼς ὁ ἀσεβὴς ἐκεῖνος Βασίλειος ὑφηγήσατο. Ταύτην τὴν βίβλου δογματικὴν Πανοπλίαν ὁ Αὐτοκράτωρ ἄνωμας, καὶ μέχρι τοῦ νῦν οὕτω προσαγορεύεται τὰ βιβλία". 179 - βιβλίω δεκάτῳ πέμπτῳ. Λέγεται δὲ κατὰ τῶν παπιστῶν ἐν τῇ Πανοπλίᾳ ταῦτα, Εὐθυμίου τοῦ Ζυγαβηνοῦ κατὰ τῶν τῆς παλαιᾶς Ρώμης, ἢτοι Ἰταλῶν κεφάλαια δώδεκα, δηλούντα ὡς ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς μόνον ἐκπορεύεται τὸ ἁγιον Πνεῦμα, ἀλλ' οὔχι καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Ὕιου. Χρόνος δὲ ὑστερον ἐλθὼν ὁ ἐν Βασιλεῦσιν ἀοίδιμος Αλέξιος ὁ Κομνηνός, καὶ τὰς πολλὰς τῶν αἱρέσεων πλοκὰς θεασάμενος, καὶ αὐτὰς δὴ τὰς προσθήκας καὶ ἐλλείψεις τῶν Ἰταλῶν, ὅσα ἀἱρεσιωτῶν ἄγχινος δὲ ἦν ὁ ἀνήρ, μάλιστα καὶ τῆς πίστεως ζηλωτῆς, δὲ τῷ τότε καρφῷ μηχάνημα τι σοφὸν ἐτεχνάσατο, καὶ ἐφεῦρε καὶ τὸν αἱρεσιάρχην τῆς Βογομλικῆς αἱρέσεως, συνεκαλέσατο ἄνδρας ἁγίους τε καὶ σοφοὺς, τὸν Ζυγαβηνόν φημι, καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν καλούμενον Φουρνήν, οἰτίνες ἐκ πάντων τῶν θείων βιβλίων λόγους ἑρανισάμενοι κατὰ τῶν αἱρέσεων, καὶ κατ’ αὐτῶν δὴ τῶν Ἰταλῶν διὰ τὴν προσθήκην τοῦ ἁγίου Συμβόλου καὶ τὰ Ἀζύμα, τὴν δογματικὴν Πανοπλίαν συνέταξαν. Τελευταίος δὲ πάντων ὁ θαυμαστὸς Ζωναρὰς μοναχὸς Ἰωάννης τούς θείους καὶ ἱεροὺς Κανόνας τῶν ἁγίων και πανευφήμων Ἀποστόλων, καὶ ἐπτὰ ἁγίων Οἰκουμενικῶν Συνόδων, καὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἡμῶν σαφέστατα καὶ εὐσεβέστατα ἑξηγησάμενος, οὐδαμοῦ τὸν Πάπαν ἄς ὀρθόδοξον ἄνωμας, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ τῷ ἀναθέματι καθυπέβαλε τοὺς τὰ ὄρια τῶν πατέρων σαλεύοντας, καὶ ἀδέτησιν ποιοῦντας τῶν θείων Κανόνων.

Book Eight, Paragraph Two

179 Anna Comnena, Alexias, XV, 9, 1.
About those who have refuted the dogma and the addition [of the *Filioque*] after Photios, and about those who have written against the addition and the dogma in the time of Alexios and Manuel, and about those who complied the *Panoplia*

After Photios, Niketas the Paphlagonian, Sergios the Patriarch of Constantinople, the Synod of the time of Kerullarios,¹⁸⁰ Petros the Patriarch of Antioch, Niketas Sthetatos, Leo, Theophylaktos, Adrianos and Gennadios, archbishops of Bulgaria and Michael Psellos refuted the dogma and the addition. At the time of Alexios and his grandson Manuel from among the Komnenians, there were most wise men in the Eastern Church, who wrote against the addition and the dogma and also held disputations with some people who have come from Italy to Constantinople. And Euthymios Zygabenos complied [the *Panoplia*] as testifies Anna, the author of the Alexiad, and the same *Panoplia* of Zygabenos, which I have discussed earlier. However, I should again say that Anna, having said some words about the heresy of the Bogomils directs the reader to learn a more elaborated history of the heresy from Zygabenos, saying: “And those who wish I will refer to the book entitled *Dogmatic Panoply*, which was compiled by my father’s order. For there was a monk called Zygabenos, known to my mistress, my maternal grandmother, and to all the members of the priestly roll, who had pursued his grammatical studies very far, was not unversed in rhetoric, and was the best authority on ecclesiastical dogma; the Emperor sent for him and commissioned him to expound all the heresies, each separately, and to append to each the holy Fathers’ refutations of it; and amongst them too the heresy of the Bogomils, exactly as that impious Basil had interpreted it. The

¹⁸⁰ Dositheos means the Permanent Synod of Michael Kerullarios.
Emperor named this book the *Dogmatic Panoply*, and that name the books have retained even to the present day,” 181 in the fifteenth book. In the *Panoplia* are said the following against the Papists: “Of Euthymios Zygabenos Against those of the Old Rome, or Italians, demonstrating that the Holy Spirit proceeds only from the Father alone and not also from the Son.” Some years later, when Alexios Komnenos, the glorious among the emperors, ascended the throne, seeing the many branches of heresies and, particularly, the additions and omissions of the Italians, who are heretics, he convoked holy and wise men, I mean Zygabenos and John nicknamed Phournes, who compiled the *Dogmatike Panoplia*, gathering texts against heresies from all divine books, and also against the Italians because of the addition to the holy Creed and the unleavened bread (for Alexios was a clever man, and especially zealous for the faith, and he, at that time, by inventing a wise trick, discovered the leader of the Bogomil heresy). Last among these, the admirable Johannes Zonaras the Monk who most clearly and religiously commented the divine and sacred canons of the holy and glorious Apostles, of the seven holy Ecumenical Councils and of all our holy Fathers, in no place has called the Pope Orthodox, but rather subjected to anathema those who had removed the milestones set by the Fathers and despised the divine canons.

****

These accounts add an inside pn how the anthology was viewed by the people who stood behind the publication, but dealing with the editorial activities of Metrophanes also permits to see traces of the distribution of his books. A useful illustration in this direction is

Cod BAR 1052.\textsuperscript{182} Dated to the eighteenth century (1725 on f. 2), this manuscript is a catalogue of the books designated for the personal use of Constantine Mavrokordatos (1711-1769).\textsuperscript{183} Even though this inventory is not complete, it contains three books edited by Metrophanes -- \emph{Tomos Kharas}, the \emph{Syntagmation}, and \emph{The History of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem}. By chance, the same editions show that Metrophanes was a clearly affiliated with Dositheos and Khrysanthos, who supported these books as patriarchs of Jerusalem. The presence of these volumes in the library of Mavrokordatos shows that although apparently they were not of primary interest, nevertheless, they had to be in any good library collection.

\textbf{Athanasios, Metropolitian of Drystra (Silistra) – sponsor of the edition and author of the Prologue}

Athanasios, metropolitan of Silistra, is remembered mainly for his contribution to the PD. Being a metropolitan of a town with a Turkish garrison, he preferred to avoid any possible tension and spent much of his time at the court of Constantine Brîncoveanu.\textsuperscript{184} The court of Brîncoveanu was an attractive centre for many other theologians and men of letters, coming to Walachia from various places.\textsuperscript{185} In the year of the edition, Athanasios was in Istanbul. However, his own account of the PD is well preserved because he wrote the prologue of the edition of 1710. This prologue is an address to Stefan -- one of the sons of the Walachian ruler Constantine Brîncoveanu. Athanasios was careful not to fall into the diction of the original prologue from the twelfth century, which was also published in the same volume. To read this prologue was so difficult that the editors of the BRV left it without a Romanian translation. From a linguistic point of view the text is interesting as an example of

\begin{quote}
\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{182} Nestor Camariano, \emph{Catalogul Manuscriptelor Greceşti din Biblioteca Academiei Române}, vol. 2 (Bucureşti: Academia Română, 1940).
\item \textsuperscript{183} The catalogue of the library of Mavrokordatos was published by Nicolae Iorga, “Pilda bunilor Domni din trecut,” \emph{Analele Acad. Rom.}, sc., ist. Serie II, vol. 37 (1914) 85-120.
\item \textsuperscript{184} Drystra, is nowadays called Silistra, a port city of northeastern Bulgaria, lying on the southern side of the lower Danube at the country’s border with Romania. It was founded by the Romans as a military center and in Antiquity had the name Durostorum.
\item \textsuperscript{185} For details see Athanasios Karathanassis, \emph{Des grecs à la cour du Constantin Brîncoveanu}.
\end{itemize}
\end{quote}
an attempt to write in high-level Greek – paradoxically, this prologue contains more archaic features than the prologue of the twelfth century. Here, however, it is important because it presents some of the reasons for the publication as they were seen by the people who stood behind the edition.

Behind the heavily ornamented rhetorics, Athanasios provides several points important for understanding the idea behind the edition.\(^{186}\)

A claim that the book was found as a hidden treasure.

Ἐλελήθει μέντοι γε τέως, καὶ ἐν ἀφανεῖ που κειμένη ἠγνοεῖτο παρ’ ἁξίαν ἡ οὕτω χρησίμη τε καὶ παγκάλη πραγματεία, οὐκ οἶδ’ ὡς ὁ θησαυρὸς τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἀμεληθείσα τε καὶ παρόρασε, καὶ τὴν ἑσχάτην ἀπειλούσα καταφθοράν, ἢ μή τις φθάς τῆς τοῦ Πανδαμάτορος ἐξαρπάσει εἴρημα, καὶ ἀνασώσηται τὴν ὀλίγου δεῖν ἐξίτηλον γεγονυῖαν ἀρίστην Χριστιανῶν πᾶσι Πανοπλίαιν.

Up to the present day this so useful and beautiful work, this treasure of the Church, being forgotten and laying in a hidden place, was unduly ignored I don’t know how, was neglected and overlooked, being threatened by complete annihilation, had not come somebody and snatched it from the way of the Destroyer of all things and saved again the almost extinct for all the Christians wonderfully useful Armoury.

A claim that it contains “the teaching of the saintly fathers of our Church.”

Τὴν δυνατὴν τέως κατεθέμην σπουδὴν ὡς τύποις ἐκδοθέν τουτί τὸ πολυωφελέστατον πόνημα, προϊκά τοῖς ὀρθοδοξίας τροφίμωις διαδοθῆ, εἰς ἀσφάλειαν μέν καὶ ἀποτροπὴν τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν αἱρέσεων λύμης, εἰς μνημόσυνον δὲ τῆς ἐμῆς ταπεινότητος, καὶ τῷ κοινῷ τῆς

\(^{186}\) The text of the prologue is taken from the edition of PG, vol 130.
Ἐκκλησίας πληρώματι ἡ παντευχία τῆς τῶν εὐαγῶν τῆς καθ’ ἡμᾶς Ἐκκλησίας Πατέρων διδασκαλίας χορηγηθῇ, ἵνα τοῖς αἱρουμένοις ἀντικαθίστασθαι πρὸς τοὺς ἐτεροδοξοῦντας ὡστόνῃ εἰπ πρὸς τὴν ἐκπλήρωσιν τοῦ βουλήματος, οἷον ἕξ ιεροῦ τινος ταμείου τά κατά πάσης αἰρετικῆς κακομυθίας ἀντίδοτα προφέρουσι, καὶ ἕξ ἑτοίμου ἀποχρωμένοις πρὸς ἄμμαν. Οὐ γάρ κατὰ τὴν μυθικὴν Ἡφαίστου Ἀχιλλεί πονηθεῖσαν ἄσπίδα, ἀλλ’ οὐρανοχάλκευτον πανοπλίαν κατὰ πάσης αἰρετικῆς κακονοίας ἡ προκειμένη βίβλος προτίθησι, καὶ ἀήττητον ἀποφαίνει τὸν μετ’ αὐτῆς κατὰ τῶν ἀντιθέων λήρων στρατευόμενον.

I have made all possible effort that this most useful work, after being printed, be distributed as a dowry to those nurtured on Orthodoxy; on the one hand, for a protection from and the repulsion of the outrage of heresies; on the other hand, in order that, for the remembrance of my humbleness, to the general public of our universal Church be transmitted the full armoury of the teaching of the saintly fathers of our Church, in order that those who have assumed to oppose the heterodox, may easily fulfill their will, drawing from it, as if taking from a holy reserve, the antidotes against all the heretical myths, and being able to use them ready-made for defending themselves. For the present book does not offer something alike to the fabulous shield made by Hephaistos for Akhilleus but an armoury hammered in heaven against all heretical evil thought and renders invincible those who fight with it against the God-opposing madmesses.

A claim that that this is an imperial work well befitting the voevods, who are direct descendents of the Kantakouzenoi

---

Διὰ ταῦτ’ ἄρα κἀγὼ σοὶ τῷ θερμῷ ζηλωτῆ καὶ προμάχῳ τῶν τῆς ἀληθείας δογμάτων ταυτηνὶ φέρων προσφωνώ τὴν δογματικὴν Πανοπλίαν, ὅπως τεθωρακισμένος τῇ τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριτι, ὡμαλεώτερον ἀντιπαρατάττῃ τὸ ἀπὸ τούτῳ αὐτῶν ἀντιλέγουσί τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, τὸ θείον όμη φέρων κατὰ τὴν σάλπιγγα τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν, Παῦλον φημὶ τὸν μακάριον, ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαι, καὶ ὀμφαίαν ἀμφήκη, καὶ δι’ αὐτοῦ τοὺς τοῦ ἐνθεομοίος λόγου διαχρόμενος πολεμίους, καὶ λαμπρὰ κατὰ αὐτῶν ἰστῶν τρόπαια, ὦντερ οὐ ότ̄ πάντα καὶ χαμαίζηλα κομίσῃ τὰ ἀθλα, οὐδὲ δόξαν οὐτ’ ἀπανθοῦσαν καὶ ἐκλείπουσαν, ἀλλ’ ἅπερ οὔτ’ ὀφθαλμοῖς εἰς θέαν ἐφικτὰ, οὔτ’ ἀκοῆ χωρητὰ, καὶ λόγου παντὸς ὑπερπαίει δύναμιν, βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν, καὶ μακαριότητα διαιωνίζουσαν, τὴν ἀποκειμένην τοῖς ἐκλελεγμένοις πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων. Οὐ μόνον δὲ διὰ ταῦτα προσήκειν ἄγνων σου τῇ ἐνδοξότητι τὸ δώρημα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τι δὴ παρὰ πάντας οὕτως καὶ κηρύττει τὴν πρὸς ἐκείνους συγγένειαν ἡ τῶν πράξεων ὁμοιότης.

Through all these I, offering this to you, an enthusiastic fighter for the teachings of the truth, am sounding the Dogmatike Panoplia, so that, from now onward, you, armored with the grace of the Spirit, would be strengthened to hold your ground against those who oppose the truth carrying, according to the trumpet of the Churches – I mean, according to the blessed Paul – the divine word as a weapon over all dagger or two-edged sword (Eph 6:14-17), and to destroy in it all the enemies of the pious teaching, thus erecting bright monuments of their defeat. In
this way you would gain not transient and earthly prizes, nor a glory that would vanish and fade away, but one that cannot be contemplated by the eyes, nor can be received by the ears, and that transcends the power of any speech (1Cor 2:9), namely the Kingdom of Heaven and eternal bliss, which are awaiting those who had been chosen before the ages.

The language which the authors at the time were using deserves further study for all the Classicising influences. However, for the investigation here it suffices to say that the prologue of the PD in 1710 clearly confirms the evidence from the previous testimonies concerning the anthology – that it was related to the Byzantine heritage and the fight against religious opponents.

The authors of the dedicatory epigrams – teachers of the Patriarchal School and a pilgrim to the Holy Places

Although most of the editorial work was carried out by Metrophanes Gregoras, the Greek edition of the PD was the result of the efforts of a group of people who each contributed according to their opportunities. All the Walachian editions of that time mention the ruler, Constantine Brîncoveanu, and Metropolitan Anthimos. Thus, based on the contents of the title page, it is not possible to conclude that they were directly involved. The mention of Constantine’s son, Stephen, deserves further investigation, because this prince had literary interests and was himself the author of several printed books.188

The edition’s connection to Constantinople is provided by the authors of the dedicatory verses, two of whom were well-known teachers at the Patriarchal Academy in Phanar – Antonios (1685-1711) and Khourmouzios Byzantios (d. 1717). The third author of a

188 The following books at least were authored by the Prince BRV I, 127, 419-421; BRV I, 128, 421-422; BRV I, 135, p. 441; BRV I, 142, 452-453.
A dedicatory verse was a certain Georgios Hadzithanou from Larissa who had made a pilgrimage to the Holy Places.\textsuperscript{189}

Demetrios Prokopios left an account of both Antonios and Khourmouzios. Behind this account lies a family tragedy. These two men, natives of Constantinople, were brothers and premature death ended the promising career of each of them. Procopios is concise in his account:

Ἀντώνιος Βυζάντιος, διδάσκαλος τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει σχολῆς, ἀνήρ ἐλλόγιμος, φιλόσοφος, φιλομαθής, δαήμων τῆς ἡλικίας γλώσσης, πεπαιδευμένος τήν τε θύραθεν φιλοσοφίαν καὶ τήν καθ’ ἡμᾶς ιερὰν θεολογίαν· υἱὸς ἄν εἰς ὀφελείας πρόξενος τοῖς φιλολόγοις τῶν νέων τῇ προόδῳ τοῦ χρόνου, εἰ μή γε κομιδή νέος ἔς ἀνθρώπων ἐγένετο.

Χούρμουζιος Βυζάντιος, αὐτάδελφος τοῦ Ἀντωνίου, καὶ κατ’ οὐδὲν ἐκείνου ἀρετῆ καὶ παιδεία ἀπολειπόμενος· ἀπέπλευσε δὲ οὗτος καὶ εἰς Ἰταλίαν, καὶ τῶν ἐν Παταβίῳ σοφῶν πρὸς καιρὸν ἕκροσατο, ἐχρημάτισε καὶ διδάσκαλος τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει σχολῆς· καὶ εἶ ὁ γὰρ ἔλλαττον ὀφελείας πρόξενος τοῖς ἀκροαταῖς εἰγε μὴ ἀῶρῳ θανάτῳ ἀπετμήθη τοῦ βίου.\textsuperscript{190}

**Antonios Byzantios** – teacher in the Constantinopolitan school, erudite, laborious and industrious, proficient in Greek language, educated in the secular learning as well as in our sacred theology, with the passing of the time he could have been useful for the youngsters pursuing philology, had he not passed away at a very young age.

\textsuperscript{189} The dedicatory verses are re-printed in vol. 130 of PG, 17-20.

\textsuperscript{190} Demetrios Procopios, “Ἐπιτετμημένη Ἐπαρθημέω τῶν κατὰ τὸν Παρελθόντα Αἰώνα Λογίων Γραϊκῶν καὶ περί τινων ἐν τῷ νῦν Αἰώνι Ανθρώπων,” In Konstantinos Sathas (ed.), Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη, vol. 8 (Venice: 1892), 491.
Khourmuzios Byzantios – genuine brother of Antonios, and in none virtue or education left behind him, he sailed to Italy and, for a certain period of time, studied with the wise men in Padova. He also served as a teacher in the Constantinopolitan School. He also would have been no less useful for his students, if untimely death had not cut off his life.

For a long time Antonios Byzantios was considered to be an author from the twelfth century and a contemporary of Emperor Alexios I Komnenos. This opinion was introduced by Nikephoros Kalogerias\(^{191}\) and was repeated many times until a detailed study appeared at the beginning of the twentieth century showing that Antonios lived at the turn of the seventeenth century, being known and mentioned by Dimitrie Cantemir, Zaviras, and Vendotis.\(^{192}\) In fact, the same Antonios Byzantios is a well-known author from the period. He translated from Latin *Chrestoetheia* – a manual of good manners which is subsequently attested in nineteen printed editions and around fifteen manuscripts.\(^{193}\)

The other three verses of dedication were written by two men of letters who are less known. Nonetheless, the data in the edition provide one more small detail concerning the milieu of the PD. These authors call themselves “the most humble among the Hierodeacons Ioannikios Hadzi” and “the most humble among the learned men Georgios Hadzithanou from


\(^{192}\) The study that has changed the identification of Anthonios Byzantios is the aforementioned article of Perikles Zerlentes, “Ἀντώνιος ο Βυζάντιος,” 241- 253. While a student in the Patriarchal School of Constantinople Antonios had as a teacher in Latin Nikolaos Mavrokorattatos. In the same article Zerlentes is giving this account written by Antonios:


Larissa”. The title *hadzi*, added to the names of Orthodox Christians, was always used to indicate an individual who had made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem and the Holy Sepulchre. The honor which this title brought has not been forgotten even today and the addition of “hadzi” to the family name of a pilgrim is sometimes, although rarely, still used in some parts of the region.

Khrysanthos Notaras kept a correspondence with a wide range of people both from East and West. It seems that three of the authors of the dedicatory verses to the PD also exchanged letters with Khrysanthos. For the year 1711 are attested three letters from Khourmouzios. From his brother, Antonios, is preserved one letter, somehow dated from 1726 – this means, fifteen years after the death of Antonios - probably because the letter was included in an epistolary collection. There is another single letter written by Georgios Hadzithanasiou. It is probable that this man can be identified with Georgios Hadzithanou, the variation in the second name being explained by a usage of diminutive form. To my knowledge, these letters are not published and their content is still not known. The connection of Khrysanthos to Metrophanes had already been shown in their exchange of letters some of which were published by Kournoutos.

---

194 PG 130, 17-18.
195 The information on the correspondence of Patriarch Khrysanthos Notaras is taken from the book Penelope Stathe, Χρυσάνθος Νοταράς, Πατριάρχης Ιεροσολύμων. The author of this study is mistaken when she claims that Mitrophanes Gregoras was a metropolitan of Ugrovlia. For letters of Nikolaos Papadopoulos Komnenos to Khrysanthos see Vasiliki Bobou-Stamati, Οι «Επιστολιμαίες πραγματείες” των Νικόλαου Παπαδοπούλου Κομνηνού προς τον Χρυσάνθο Νοταρά (Athens: EESMNED, 2000.)
196 Penelope Stathe, Χρυσάνθος Νοταράς, 260.
197 Ibid., 263-264.
198 Ibid., 292.
199 Kournoutos, Η Δωδεκάβιβλος τού Δοσιθέου, 250-273.
MANUSCRIPTS OF THE EDITION OF 1710

Because the *editio princeps* of the PD appeared in the Principality of Walachia, the first logical move is to search for MS or MSS of the PD which are still kept in Romania. During Communist times MSS from different parts of Romania were brought to Bucharest. Thus, the Romanian Academy possesses the largest Greek collection. MSS are also kept in the Synodal Library and the National Library of Romania. As far can be ascertained, the collections of the Romanian Academy of Science do not possess a complete MS which could have been used as a *textus receptus* for the edition. The question as to which MS or MSS was/were used as a basis for the edition of the PD becomes even more complicated after examining the period and seeing the mobility of the Orthodox theologians and, logically, the mobility of the texts. However, the evidence gathered suggests that manuscripts from three centers were involved in the process of the edition – Eastern manuscripts provided by the patriarchs of Jerusalem, manuscripts now kept in Russia, and manuscripts from Austria.

Manuscripts of the failed edition in Russia

Even if it is not clear which manuscripts were used for the edition in Walachia, the manuscript which was to be used for the publication in Russia is known and is still kept in the repositories there as GIM 226. Dating to the fourteenth century, this MS bears the ownership mark of Khrysanthos Notaras, who was sent to Moscow by Patriarch Dositheos in order to publish there a collection of Greek polemic manuscripts. In fact, GIM 226 was one of the manuscripts which Khrysanthos brought to Moscow.\(^\text{200}\)

Had Khrysanthos started preparatory work on the PD, he would have found that Moscow already had at least three manuscripts of the PD – GIM 224, 225, and 227. These

\(^{200}\) Boris Fonkić, *Grechesko-Russkie Kulturnye Sviazi.*
manuscripts were taken from Athos during Arsenij Sukhanov’s Russian expedition for ancient Greek manuscripts, organized and supported by Patriarch Nikon, who needed the old Greek texts as a basis for the new translations and editions, which formed an important branch of his ecclesiastical reform.\footnote{Nikolai Kapterev, Patriarkh Nikon i ego protivniki v dele ispravlenija tserkovnykh obriadov: vremia patriarshestva Iosifa Moscow (Universitetskoj tipografii (M. Katkov), 1887; repr. Moscow: Indrik, 2003.)} Had the PD been printed in Russia, these three manuscripts together with the MS sent by Dositheos would have been used as the basis of the edition. Thus, one is faced with the odd situation of having an edition without traces of the manuscripts used in Walachia, and manuscripts without an actual publication in Russia.

However, the manuscripts of the PD in Russia became involved in the printed text of the PD which is used today. At the end of the eighteenth century these manuscripts were described by the German scholar Friedrich Christian Matthäi, who wrote two catalogues of the Greek MSS in Moscow.\footnote{Christian Friedrich Matthäi, Index codicorum manuscriptorum graecorum Bibliothecarum Mosquensium Sanctissimae Synodi Ecclesie Orthodoxae Graeco-Rossicae (Sankt-Peterburg:1780). Christian Friedrich Matthäi, Accurata Codicum Graecorum Mss Bibliothecarum Mosquensium Sanctissimae Synodi Notitia et Recensio, vol. 1- 2 (Lipsiae: 1805).} Matthäi compared the manuscripts in Moscow with the Greek editio princeps of 1710 and included his notes in the edition of the 

Commentaries to the Four Gospels written by Zygadenos.\footnote{Euthymius Zigabenus, Commentarius in quattuor evangelia graecae et latinae/ Textum graecum...ad fidem duorum codicum...diligenter recensuit et repetita versione latina Jo. Hentenii suis adiectis animadversionis edidit Christ. Frid. Matthaei (Berlin and London: Asher, 1845).} His comments on the MSS of the PD are well known because they are included in the preface of vol 130 of PG. Coming at the end of eighteenth century, Matthäi must have seen at least four manuscripts – the aforementioned three Athonite MSS taken by Sukhanov and the MS brought to Moscow by Khrysanthos Notaras. What he did not know was that these manuscripts were supposed to be the basis for the edition of the PD in Russia. In fact, his notes on the differences between these manuscripts and the Tîrgovişte edition give a picture of probably what the edition would have looked like if it had been produced in Russia. This puts the reprinted text in PG in an interesting situation. The PG edition includes the notes of Matthäi on the MSS from Russia. Thus, the
text in vol. 130 of *PG* becomes a kind of reconstruction, a model, of the first project for the publication of the PD. This, to a certain extent, brings the text in *PG* closer to the original intentions behind the publication.

### 5.1.1 Athonite manuscripts of the PD taken to Moscow by Arsenij Sukhanov

Historical material permits tracing further the way in which manuscripts of the PD became part of Russian library collections. In order to make a bridge to what has already been said about the edition in the Principalities, one may start with a particular episode concerning Meletios Syrigos, the leading Greek theologian of the time, whose name was connected with the history of the publication of the PD in Walachia.

During the term of office of Patriarch Paisios of Constantinople (1654-1655), Patriarch Nikon, who was just beginning his reforms, sent a letter to the Constantinopolitan See. The letter contained questions concerning the diverging traditions among the Orthodox in terms of ritual and ecclesiastic books. Patriarch Nikon was interested in knowing which was the most correct among these variations and fluctuations in the Orthodox tradition. Patriarch Paisios passed the letter to his most educated theologian, Meletios Syrigos, who prepared the basis of an answer. Soon afterwards Patriarch Nikon began his controversial reforms in the church organization, ritual, and books.

In 1654 Patriarch Nikon organized a synod which took the decision to begin book reform. In 1653-1655 the patriarch sponsored an expedition to bring Greek manuscripts from Mount Athos. The mission to Greece was not official and the Ottoman authorities

---


were not informed. Arsenij Sukhanov, the leader of the expedition, left Moscow, stayed for several days in Jassy and afterwards entered the Ottoman Empire. Sukhanov spent six months at the Holy Mountain. He visited different monasteries and noted the books he wanted to buy. His choice was dictated by the books which were needed in connection with Patriarch Nikon’s reforms. Sukhanov also took an interest in books which once belonged to the libraries of reputed and learned men. He considered the books which had once belonged to the ecumenical Patriarch Jeremiah (1522-1546) worth taking from the Stavronikita Monastery. For the same reason he took from the Iviron monastery most of the manuscripts and early printed books which contained the *ex libris* of Maximos Margounios, the Greek theologian and bishop of the island of Kythera, who had bequeathed his books to Iviron. The number of manuscripts gathered was about 490. On the way back, Suhanov made a discrete visit to Constantinople, stayed three months in Jassy, and finally arrived in Moscow.\(^{207}\)

The books and manuscripts brought by Sukhanov fell on fertile ground in Russia. They were used as a basis for corrections and additions to books printed in Russia. Among those manuscripts were three copies of the the PD – GIM 224, GIM 225, and GIM 227, which were examined in the study of Boris Fonkič on the Greek manuscripts in Russia.\(^{208}\)

GIM 224 is a well-known twelfth-century copy which also contains illumination scenes with the Church Fathers and the emperor, who offers the PD to Christ.\(^{209}\) This MS is considered to be a copy close to the one presented to Emperor Alexios I -- Cod Vat Gr. 666. Understandably, when Sukhanov was examining the library of the Vatopedi Monastery, this richly illuminated manuscript attracted his attention and he took it, together with around sixty-four other MSS, from the same monastery.

\(^{207}\) Fonkič, *Grechesko-Russkie Sviazi*.


\(^{209}\) A study on the illuminations of these MS is authored by Iohannes Spatharakis, *The portrait in Byzantine illuminated manuscripts* (Leiden: 1976), 122-129.
GIM 225 was taken from the Dionysiou Monastery along with thirty-four manuscripts and early printed books. Boris Fonkić identified thirty manuscripts which were taken from Dionysiou and are now kept in Russia. Fonkić notes that GIM 225 contained an ownership mark from the sixteenth century saying κτήμα μονής τοῦ κυρὶ Διονυσίου. The third MS is now kept under the number GIM 227.

Thus, three copies of the PD already available in Russia in the middle of seventeenth century were taken from the Dionysiou, Vatopedi and Iviron monasteries. Sources even make it possible to establish who gave permission for the copies of the PD, along with the other manuscripts, to be taken to Russia. The information comes from a contract of the representatives of Mount Athos with the Russian tsar to sell the Athonite books. The preserved document comes from the archives of Dionysiou Monastery and presents the agreement of the elders of Mount Athos to sell their manuscripts to the “tsar in Moscow”. Further, they agreed to give a unanimous version of the bargain in case the Ottoman authorities were to start an inquiry on the connections between Mount Athos and Russia. All Athonite monks were supposed to justify the case by excusing it with the dire poverty of the monasteries and the need of the money which came from the book sale. The document ends with the signatures of the *hegoumenoi* and elders. Among them are the names of the representatives from Dionysiou and Vatopedi signed as follows:

προηγούμενος τοῦ Βατοπαιδίου Μάξιμος ιερομόναχος μὲ ὅλω μου τὸ μοναστύρι στέργομεν τὰ ἁνοθέν [sic!]

---

210 The text of the letter, nowadays kept in Moscow, is published by Fonkić, *Grechesko-Russkie Sviazi*, 73-77. The agreement of the monks is formulated as follows: καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ ἐδόκαμεν ὀπὸ παλήν μας ἐπτωχιάν. καὶ τὸ ἄλλον τὸ πῶς νὰ ἔχουν τὰ ἐπτωχα μοναστήρια νὰ πιγένουν νὰ τοὺς δίδη ἐλεημοσύνην νὰ πορεύονται οἱ πτωχολογία.
προηγούμενος Δημοσιιτής Κλήμης ιερομόναχος με ὅλου μου τὸ μοναστήριον στέργομεν τὰ ἄνοθεν [sic!]. 211

Once in Moscow, the MSS of the PD were not left unnoticed, especially the richly illuminated GIM 224. In 1658, Patriarch Nikon finally resigned from his position as patriarch. Upon leaving his post and retreating to the Voskresenskij Monastery, it was decided by imperial degree that some of the books would remain for use in the printing office. From around hundred and forty manuscripts they choose 47 and made an official inventory list, which is preserved in later copies. 212 The manuscripts in this list are mentioned in a vague manner, but the same books, described in more detail, are listed in several later catalogues – of 1677, 1718, 1725, 1727, and also in the catalogues prepared by Christian Friedrich Matthäi, who spent the period between 1772 and 1784 in Russia. Fonkić undertook the task of comparing the manuscripts listed in these catalogues with the actual manuscripts, which are still extant in the repositories of Russia.

It was a common practice that the *spravchiks* (editors) in the Printing Office were given the right of personal use of the MSS from the typographic library. Among the famous editors in the Printing Office was Evfimij Chudovskij. 213 According to Fonkić, Evfimij never wrote his name on any MSS which he had used, but he left numerous notes which testified to his close reading and re-reading of some manuscripts. GIM 224 was among the MSS on which Evfimij left a number of notes, as Fonkić has demonstrated based on a codicological analysis. 214 Without seeing the manuscript it is impossible to conclude anything about the way this MS of the PD was used for correcting the newly printed books.

---

211 Fonkić, *Grechesko-Russkie Sviazi*, 73.
212 Fonkić, *Grechesko-Russkie Sviazi*, 73.
213 Evfimij of Chudov Monastery (d. 1705) was a monk and man of letters, disciple of Epifanij Slavinetskij. He worked in the Printing Office between 1650-1690 and participated in the polemics against the Old Believers and with Solvester Medvedev.
214 Fonkić, *Grechesko-Russkie Sviazi*, 73.
The manuscript which was brought for the publication of the PD by Khrysanthos Notaras is described by Papadopoulos Kerameus, who indicates that this text has the notes of Patriarch Dositheos.\[215\] Apparently these were not notes for the spiritual instruction of the Russian brethren, as stated in the catalogue, but Dositheos had started preparing the manuscript for publication.

**Manuscripts from Vienna, used by Patriarch Khrysanthos for the editio princeps**

The data provided by Fabricius do not permit an identification of which MSS were used by Patriarch Khrysanthos. The list of the manuscripts of the PD available in Vienna includes both early and late manuscripts.\[216\]

- **Those dated between the twelfth and thirteenth century**
  - theol. gr. 076 (1-201)
  - theol. gr. 193 (186v-209)

- **Those dated to the thirteenth century**
  - theol. gr. 040 (203-251v)

- **Those dated to the fourteenth century**
  - Suppl. gr. 091 (97v-199v, excerpta)
  - theol. gr. 270 (2-226, tabula libri (f.1))

- **Those dated to the sixteenth century**
  - phil. gr. 303 (207-247)

---

\[215\] Athanasios Papadopoulos Kerameus, Ἱεροσολυμιτικὴ βιβλιοθήκη ἤτοι κατάλογος τῶν ἐν ταῖς βιβλιοθήκαις τοῦ πατριαρχικοῦ θρόνου τῶν Ἱεροσολυμῶν και πάσης Παλαιστίνης (St. Petersburg, 1881-1915).

\[216\] This list is based on the information provided by the Pinakes Project. For the whole list see [http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/rech_oeuvre/resultOeuvre/filter_auteur/5534/filter_oeuvre/12212](http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/rech_oeuvre/resultOeuvre/filter_auteur/5534/filter_oeuvre/12212) (Last consulted on 10.06.2009).

Following the catalogue description of Hunger and Kresten, it is possible to suggest three MSS of the PD: theol. gr. 76\textsuperscript{217} (12\textsuperscript{th} century); theol. gr. 34\textsuperscript{218} (16\textsuperscript{th} century); theol. gr. 270\textsuperscript{219} (14\textsuperscript{th} century).

**Editorial modifications in the Greek editio princeps of 1710**

The PD does not have a critical edition yet. Two studies assess the quality of the texts in the PD. Without reaching preliminary conclusions, both of them suggest that the editors have not used the most representative texts and urge the preparation of a critical edition.\textsuperscript{220}

Here, I will present general outline of the editorial alterations introduced in the Tîrgovişte edition. These alterations concerned two levels of the text – the division into chapters and the omission of some patristic fragments.

#### 5.3.1 Division into chapters

As Matthäi observed, the Tîrgovişte edition was based on MS or MSS containing an abridged version of the PD which omitted the chapters *Against Agnoetas* and *Against Origen*.\textsuperscript{221} According to Matthäi these small chapters were missing from a large number of the manuscripts he consulted. The chapter *Against the Saracens* was omitted *timore turcorum*.

Here, I can provide only preliminary notes on the main differences in the chapters of the PD manuscripts which I have consulted myself or information available in various

---

\textsuperscript{217} Hunger, *Katalog der Griechischen Handschriften*, vol. 3/1, 136-137.

\textsuperscript{218} Hunger, *Katalog der Griechischen Handschriften*, vol. 3/1, 64-65.

\textsuperscript{219} Hunger, *Katalog der Griechischen Handschriften*, vol. 3/3, 237-239.


\textsuperscript{221} Euthymius Zygadenos, *Commentarius in quatuor evangelia graece et latine/ Textum graecum...ad fidem duorum codicum...diligenter recensuit et repetita versione latina Jo. Hentenii suis adiectis animadversionis edidit Christ. Frid. Matthaei* (Berlin and London: Asher, 1845). This book is available in the Gennadius Library, the text concerning the PD is presented in the PG 130, 9-11.
catalogues. The edition of the PD has two chapters, which in the manuscript tradition sometimes appear as chapters and sometimes as subchapters – these are the entries against the Latins (chapter 13 in PG) and on the chapter About the Cross, the Holy Baptism and about the Tranformation of the Lord’s Body and Blood (chapter 25 in PG). Apparently these were the chapters which allowed the PD to be used as a real weapon in the fight against the Catholics and the Calvinists. It is also highly likely that the editors were aware of these fluctuations in the manuscript tradition and consciously chose to treat the entries in question as chapters. What follows is a brief presentation of the historical background behind these two chapters.

5.3.2 The chapter against the Latins

The edition of the PD has a separate chapter against the Latins, which apparently was intended to be used against the Catholics. In the background of the Tîrgovişte edition were: the disputes between the Catholics and Orthodox over the rights of protection of Holy Places, the Unia with the Catholic Church by a portion of the Orthodox in Transylvania, and the continuing missionary activities by Jesuits and Capuchins.

In the Tîrgovişte edition, reprinted in PG, this is a small chapter attributed to Patriarch Photios. In the early Cod. Ethn. Bibl. 297 the chapter against the Latins (ff. 116 v.- 118 r.) is denoted as a subchapter or, more precisely, as an appendix. This is the way it was described both in the table of contents (f.185 r.) and the main text (ff. 228 verso - 230 recto).

In Cod. Vat. Gr. 668 the same part is again denoted as a subchapter. It is preceded by the twelfth chapter Against the Pneumatomachoi (f. 149v). The subchapter (paratitlos) of

---

222 On the discussion whether this chapter is authored by Photios or by Zygadenos see Andreas Papavasileou, Εὐθύμιος Ζυγαδηνός, 131-147.
223 Cod. Ethn. Bibl. 297 described in Joannes Sakkelion, Κατάλογος τῶν χειρογράφων τῆς Ἑλλάδος (s.n.: Athens, 1892), 51. The term used is Παράτιτλος. The same term was used in the last section of the DA which contains the answers of Patriarch Photios to the Bulgarian King Boris-Michael.
Patriach Photius occupies ff 190r-191r. Without a thorough study of the manuscript tradition, it is impossible to reach any conclusions, but this important alteration must have appeared much earlier than the Tîrgovişte edition. The evidence of the “moving chapter” comes from the only known copy of the Slavonic translation of the PD, dated from the fourteenth century and kept in the Romanian Academy of Science as BAR MS Slav 296. The text against the Latins was marked there as a chapter (f. 116v). The translator of the text or another man of letters compared this Slavic translation with another Greek manuscript and noted some differences. For the item “Against the Latins” he left a marginal note stating that this chapter should be a subchapter.224

5.3.3 The entry On the cross, on the Holy Baptism and on the transformation of Lord’s flesh and blood (chapter 25 in PG)

As it was shown above, this part of the PD was the one quoted in the seventeenth century by the people who actually initiated the edition. In some manuscripts this entry is attested as a separate chapter. In most copies, however, the texts are indeed there, but as part of a larger chapter intended to refute the Paulician heresy. As noted above, this was exactly the entry quoted by Meletios Syrigos and Patrirach Dositheos. Undoubtedly this part was one of the major reasons for the publication. The same entry was much quoted by the theologians of the Catholic Reformation, as will be discussed below.

In the MSS which I was able to consult until this moment -- Vat. Gr. 668225, Cod. Patmiacus 103226, Parisinus Gr. 1232A227 and the above-mentioned Cod. Ethn. Bibl. 297 –


225 For description see Robert Devreese, Codices Vaticani Graeci, 111.

226 Joannes Sakkelion, Πατμιακὴ Βιβλιοθήκη (Athens: Ek tou turgofeioi Alexandrou Papa Geōrgiou, 1890) 62.

this entry is incorporated in the chapter Against the Paulicians. However, it is not possible to conclude that this chapter was introduced by the editors in Tîrgoviște without consulting every manuscript.

5.3.4 Omission of fragments with Patristic texts in order to avoid any association with the legacy of Patriarch Kyrillos Lukaris

This is a clear editorial alteration which is documented by Fabricius. According to him, Patriarch Khrysanthos omitted some Trinitarian texts in the initial fragments because these texts might have been interpreted as supporting the teachings of Kyrillos Lukaris, with whom Khrysanthos did not wish to be associated.228 As will be discussed later, Fabricius is in fact retelling the direct testimony of Patriarch Khrysanthos; thus, his account deserves serious attention because it attests the most conscious alterations in the text, which deserve a separate study in themselves. Fabricius also witnesses that Patriarch Khrysanthos used some unknown manuscripts of Eastern origin as well as manuscripts taken from Vienna.

6 LATE MSS THAT COEXISTED WITH THE PRINTED VERSION. POPULARITY OF THE TEXT. IMPACT OF THE EDITION

It was a common phenomenon that printed texts coexisted with the manuscript version of the text. As already stated above, there are just several MSS nowadays kept in Romania. Although fragmented and late, these MSS also deserve attention. The best example is perhaps the latest copied MS of the PD, now kept in Bucharest under number BAR 1300. This MS is an anthology of anti-Islamic texts written in 1765. It refers directly to the printed edition. This MS includes the chapter “Against the Saracens” (ff. 56r – 67v) with the explanation that it was missing from the edition in 1710:

Clear refutation of the Ismaelites and of the bubbling of those eminent among them, which [refutation] was incorporated in the Dogmatike Panoplia of Euthymios Zygadenos, but was not printed together with it, because of the fear of those who (for reasons God knows), o friendly reader, rule over us.

Moving beyond the confines of the Principalities, there is at least one more manuscript which was executed at the time when the Orthodox were already making moves

229 BAR 1300 is described in Mihail Carataşu, Catalogul Manuscriptelor Greceşti din Biblioteca Academiei Române, vol. 3. (Bucureşti: Ρουμανική Εταιρεία Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών, 2005), 313-315. The MS came into the collections of the Romanian Academy in 1952 and is of unknown provenance. The same MS BAR 1300 (f. 60 r ) contains one more reference to the PD:

However, this could be a much older note, copied from an earlier model and having nothing to do with the edition.
to publish the anthology. This is Codex Dionysiou 133, which, according to a note in the manuscript, was copied on 12 October 1696 by a certain Seraphim, hieromonk of Thasiou.\footnote{Lampros, Spiridon, Κατάλογος τῶν ἐν ταῖς Βιβλιοθήκαις τοῦ Ἁγίου Ὄρους Ἑλληνικῶν κωδικῶν, vol. 1 (Cambridge: 1895), 342.}

This was also the time when some early manuscripts of the PD underwent transformations to fit the new theological agenda. An example of this is Cod. Gr. 2972, National library of Greece, dated from the twelfth century.\footnote{Described in the unpublished catalogues of the National Library of Greece by Sakkelion.} This manuscript was restored at the end of the seventeenth century. Its restorer, called Zaphiri, added a new colophon (f. 367v), mentioning the Metropolitan of Larissa and all Greece (πάσης Ἑλλάδος) and giving a date of 1692. By chance or not, this was exactly the time when the plan to prepare an edition of the PD had already crystallized and Khrysanthos Notaras was heading towards Moscow with a manuscript for the future edition. At the same time, somewhere in Northern Greece, this certain Zaphiri\footnote{I could not find any other information on him.} considered it important to restore the old manuscript of the PD by adding an ornamented initial letter (f. 228v.) to the subchapter against the Latins, thus emphasizing the importance of this text. The corrections of Zaphiri show that the text was indeed still living and printing it was not just an artificial project of the patriarchs of Jerusalem. Probably other manuscripts of the PD also witnessed similar restorations.

Because it was not possible to consult all of these manuscripts, this aspect of the history remains open for further research. Nonetheless, one could suggest that in the latest manuscripts of the PD it became a matter of choice which part of the anthology should be copied and the chosen chapter easily became part of another (polemic) anthology. Thus, the Cod. Gr. 2972, from the National Library of Greece\textsuperscript{234} -- which belonged to the library of Constantine Mavrokorodatos Balitza -- only contains the chapter against the Armenians (f. 509v- f. 517v).

**Description of the PD fragment in BAR MS 587 (667)**

In addition, MS BAR 587 (667) in Bucharest contains a fragment of the PD with only the chapters against the Armenians, Paulicians, Bogomils, and Saracens. This manuscript was described by Litzica\textsuperscript{235} although the fragment coming from the PD remained unidentified. It is dated to the eighteenth century. This manuscript is written by different hands and the fragment of the PD starts on a new quire. The fragment occupies ff. 108 r. – 114 r. and has some omissions compared to the text in *PG vol. 130*.

\begin{itemize}
  \item ff. 108 r.-114 r. Τίτλος κατὰ Ἀρμενίων
  \item Inc: Μετὰ τὴν ἐν Χαλκηδόνῃ ἀπορρήξαντες ἑαυτοὺς τὰς καθολικὰς Ἐκκλησίας.
  \item ff. 110 r. – compared to *PG*, the MSS omits the subtitle Περὶ τῶν Ἀζύμων, otherwise the content is the same as that of the edition.
  \item f.114v. Τίτλος κατὰ τῶν λεγομένων Παυλικιανῶν ἐκ τῶν Φωτίου τοῦ μακαριωτάτου πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινοπόλεως.
  \item Inc: Σαμόσατα πόλις ἐστὶ τῆς Συρίας.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{234} See note 231.

\textsuperscript{235} Constantin Litzica, *Catalogul Manuscriptelor Greceşti* (Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române, 1909)266.
Coll. 1200-1212 of PG 130 are missing, that is the whole title Ότι οὐ δύο ἀρχαί, ἀλλ’ εἰς δημιουργός οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, καὶ τῶν ἐν μέσῳ
f.119 r. Ότι εἰς δημιουργός τοῦ σώματος καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς

Inc: Εἰ ὁ ἄγαθός μὲν τὴν ψυχὴν δημιουργεῖ κατὰ τοὺς ἀνοίτους, ὁ δὲ πονηρός….Desinit: Πώς δὲ τῷ θρόνῳ συνεδριάζει τῷ πατρικῷ [PG 130 colls. 1212-1216]

122r.-141v. the title of the chapter Against the Bogomils is the same and, collated with PG, all fragments of the chapter are present.

142r.-154r. Title Against the Saracenes. The chapter is mutilated, illegible at the beginning. Desinit: οὗτω σπέρματι ἐνευλογηθήναι πάντα.

6.3 First reference to the published PD given by Fabricius in an account about the chaplain of the Swedish Embassy in Constantinople

The first reference to the Greek editio princeps happened three years after the publication. It is narrated by Fabricius and this account can be accepted without reservations. He confirms that it was finally Khrysanthos who printed the PD and who was apparently delighted with the edition so much so that in 1714 he presented it as a gift to the chaplain of the Swedish Embassy in Constantinople, Michael Eneman (1676-1714). Towards the end of his life Eneman returned to Europe as a professor of oriental languages at Uppsala University. Eneman recollected the meeting with the Orthodox Patriarch Khrysanthos in a private conversation with Fabricius. Thus, the information which Fabricius provides on the edition comes indirectly from Patriarch Khrysanthos himself!\footnote{Already discussed in page 103 of this study.}
6.4 Some well known owners of Greek manuscripts at the time

Another snapshot of the history of the PD can be reconstructed based on the information on the owners of manuscripts of the PD. Inevitably, this side of the story will remain open for additions. The anthology of Emperor Alexios I is listed in the libraries of at least two important figures in Orthodox theology in the post-Byzantine Period. In 1572 two manuscripts of the PD were listed in the catalogue of Metrophanes III, patriarch of Constantinople (1565-1572). The great Greek theologian of the seventeenth century, Maximos Margounios, also had a copy of the PD in his personal library. This copy is nowadays kept on Mount Athos (Cod. Iviron 284) and contains Margounios’ *ex libris*.

Moving to the manuscripts of the PD in the West at that time, one notes the telling example of the copy kept in the College of St. Athanasios in Rome. This manuscript was in fact a donation of the Greek Karyophylles family, which wanted to ensure that their sons received an education in Rome. The Karyophyllides were a well-known family at the time, but should not be confused with the adversary of Patriarch Dositheos -- the philosopher Johannes Karyophylles.

The manuscript in question contains a note, in Latin, that it had been in the possession of a certain “Georgios Carofillis”. The data provided by Zacharias Tsirpanlis on the students of the Greek College in Rome permits suggesting that this Carofillis can be identified with the brother of John Matthew Karyophylles or with one of his relatives. Karyophylles entered the College of Saint Athanasios in 1583. His name in Latin was rendered as Giovanni Matteo Carofili or Careofil. Tsirpanlis quotes a letter addressed by his father, Georgios, to Cardinal Sirletto with the request that his son be admitted to the College (Vat. Gr 1902). Some years

---


238 See note 69.
later, in 1595, a younger brother of John Caryophilles was admitted in the college, too. The
name of the boy was rendered as Niccolo Carofiglio or Carefilo. He must have been around
sixteen years old.239

Naturally, the list of owners will remain open to further additions. For the moment,
one more detail on ownership can be added for one of the latest manuscripts of the PD which
was kept in the West and dates from about the time of the Târgovişte edition-- Cod.
Rminensis Bibl. Comunalis 119. It was part of the rich library of Giuseppe Garampi, a
reknowned bibliophile and prefect of the Vatican Secret Archives from 1751 to 1772.240 For
the printed edition of the PD, for the moment, the only clearly attested ownership I could
find is that of the aforementioned Michael Eneman.

6.5 Old chapters against new enemies

Apparently, the PD was much appreciated because it could easily be used by the
Orthodox in different contexts and the old chapters read against new enemies. Once the
edition was printed in Walachia it became part of the milieu in the Principalities. In this
milieu several parts of the anthology must have been particularly welcome. Although there is
no direct evidence, some of the opponents of the Orthodox in the Principalities should be
mentioned in order to provide the wider background against which the edition of the PD
appeared. This brief account, however, does not aim to give a comprehensive overview on all
the religious groups in the Principalities.

As noted above, in the seventeenth century the Manicheans, Paulicians, Messalians,
Bogomils, and Iconoclasts were perceived as forerunners of the Protestants. Thus, the

239 For details see Zacharias N. Tsirpanlis, Τὸ Ἑλληνικὸ Κολλέγιο τῆς Ρώμης καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ τῶν
1576-1700, Analecta Vlatadon (Thessaloniki: Πατριαρχικόν Ἰδρύμα Πατερικῶν Μελετῶν, 1980), 289-
292, 346.
240 Christa Samberger, Catalogi Codicum Graecorum qui in Minoribus Bibliothecis Italicis Asservantur
(Lipsiae: Zentral-Antiquariat, 1968), 373.
chapters which refute them could be used effectively against these heresies, creating a strong motive for deciding to publish the PD. The chapter against the Latins was also a welcome text in the seventeenth century because of the dangers facing Orthodoxy from the Unia in Transylvania. Potentially, some of the other chapters could have been used against the “enemies” of Orthodoxy. The entry “Against the Armenians” might well have been read against the Armenians of the time, at least MS 604 (262) from the Library of the Romanian Academy of Sciences leads in this direction. It is an anti-heretical miscellany against the Armenians and Latins, dated from the sixteenth century. The provenance of this MS may have been Moldova; in 1551 there was a persecution there against the Armenians which was never repeated. Over the next century, between the years 1683 and 1685, Armenians immigrated from Moldova to Transylvania because of war and not persecution. Approximately from the same period there are also data concerning a group of Paulicians living in the Romanian Principalities. During the Middle Ages the Byzantine Emperors settled these Paulicians in the region near the modern town of Plovdiv (Bulgaria). Over the course of time, some of them converted either to Catholicism or to Islam and took a part in a revolt against the Ottoman Empire in 1688. In the aftermath they emigrated to the Romanian Principalities. The chapter against the Jews also deserves attention, given that five years after the publication of the PD, what may be the first data concerning a pogrom against the Jews appeared, when in 1715 the prince of Wallachia, Stephen Kantakouzenos, ordered the Bucharest synagogue to be demolished. As stated earlier in this study, documented proof (MS BAR 1300) exists that the old chapters were read against new enemies.

241 MS BAR 604 (262).
Saracens were clearly identified with the Turks in a manuscript which was copied in the middle of the eighteenth century when the printed edition already existed.\footnote{This manuscript is discussed here in the section on the MSS which coexisted with the printed edition. This is BAR 1300. See note 229.}

6.6 The Orthodox divided – attempts to write modern Panopliae, the example of the Dogmatike Didaskalia

As was already pointed out, the seventeenth century witnessed a strong division among the Orthodox. At the turn of the seventeenth century Patriarch Dositheos experienced growing influence; he secured high ecclesiastic positions for his followers and attempted to marginalize his opponents.\footnote{See the notes on the political background by Ioan Dură, Ὄ Δοσίθεος Ἱεροσολύμων.} As already said, the main point of disagreement was whether the term μετούσιωσις should be used for the Eucharist and whether and which of the works of the more recent Orthodox theologians had value in discussions of dogma. Thus, Patriarch Dositheos supported the editions of later authors such as Georgios Koressios, Georgios of Chios, Meletios Syrigos, and others. From the information on the people involved in the edition of the PD, it becomes clear that it was supported by the party of Dositheos.

This age of polemics with Catholics and Protestants and inner contradictions among the Orthodox themselves leaves one with the possibility of observing the attempts to create modern synthesis imitating to a certain extent the Panoplia against the heresies of modern times. One of them is the already mentioned work of Meletios Syrigos. Instead of listing all the other polemical books published in the Principalities at the time I will give as an illustration of a modern Panoplia only one book, entitled Dogmatike Didaskalia, authored by Sebastos Kyminetes.
The *Dogmatike Didaskalia* (CRV 140) was published ten years before the PD -- in Walachia in the year 1700. Its author -- Sebastos Kyminetes\(^{246}\) -- was an alumnus of Padova, author of a tract in support of Palamite doctrines, director of the Patriarchal Academy in Constantinople; he died as professor in Bucharest. The volume itself is addressed to Patriarch Dositheos. The major questions in the book are again on the Eucharist and also on whether the Mother of God partook in original sin.\(^{247}\)

### 6.7 Impact of the Greek printed edition of the PD

Having examined various aspects of the Greek *editio princeps* of the PD, what remains is to assess the impact of the publication. Apparently it was intended to be used as a weapon against coeval opponents, but to what extent was it successful? The edition came from the Orthodox leaders and most educated theologians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. However, the whole story about the book in Walachia and Moldavia might leave the reader with the erroneous impression that the Romanian Principalities were inhabited by Greek Orthodox theologians who were supported by the pious local voevods, which was not the real situation in the Principalities. However it shows that the edition of the PD was carried out by the highest Orthodox elite and had limited impact. So far, I have not found a Romanian or coeval Slavonic translation of the PD. *Volens-nolens* the investigation comes to the question of the Greek presence in the Principalities. The edition was carried out in the period when the strong Greek influence in the Principalities was replaced by the actual rule of the Phanariots over Walachia and Moldavia, which started in 1711 and 1715, respectively. The micro-focus on just one edition helps one to see patterns of continuity and change in the Greek presence in the Principalities. With the change in the political situation books like the

\(^{246}\) Charitonas Karanasios, *Sebastos Trapezuntios Kyminetes: (1632 - 1702); Biographie, Werkheuristik und die editio princeps der Exegese zu De virtute des Pseudo-Aristoteles* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2001).

\(^{247}\) Sebastos Kymenites. *Δογματικὴ διδασκαλία τῆς ἁγιωτάτης ἀνατολικῆς καὶ καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας* (Bucharest, 1703) BH I 18.
PD lost their value, even among Greek-speaking people, while the Phanariots had varied interests which were more Western-oriented and were not focused exclusively on their Orthodox legacy. Nonetheless, it should be emphasized that the project went beyond the confines of the Principalities. The Patriarchs of Jerusalem had chosen to print an anthology that had universal appeal to the Orthodox, no matter where they lived. One could conclude that the whole project was very well thought out, but the situation for the Orthodox was changing too fast, so that soon afterwards the publication lost its relevance. A proof of this is the fact that the Greek edition of the PD has never been reprinted on Orthodox soil and the next time the text was published was the PG edition.

6.8  The Tîrgovişte edition - Intertwined with Western influence?

During the seventeenth century the PD re-emerged as an old, pure, and traditional Byzantine book. It was not only a weapon against heresy but also a scholarly book from which the heresies could be learnt. In an age when the leading Orthodox theologians were educated in the West, the anthology of Emperor Alexios had a special place. The edition came from the inspiration, and, as has been proved, the direct involvement of Patriarch Dositheos Notaras, who, accused by modern scholars of bigotry, defended his Orthodox see in the ways paved by the Byzantine tradition; one of these ways was Panoplia Dogmatike.

Even if at the time of the editio princeps the PD was regarded as a synthesis of the authentic Byzantine tradition, still it was a product of the time of the Great Church in Captivity. The most puzzling reference to the PD comes from the erudite Orthodox theologian Meletios Syrigos. He connected the compilation of the PD with Berengar’s heresy, which started to spread in Italy in the twelfth century. Meletios quotes a chapter which does not exist as a separate entry in all PD manuscripts but only in some of them. Apparently, the reading of the PD offered by Meletios and quoted above was one of the reasons why
Dositheos appreciated the anthology so much. However, Berengar was not a part of the Byzantine theological legacy. Thus, one could ask how he had become associated with such a traditional Orthodox book as the PD. The bibliography gives the answer – Meletios Syrigos had graduated from Padova and was equally versed in the traditions of East and West. He used the reference to Berengar to connect the traditions of the Eastern and Western Churches. The picture he paints in his account is that the Churches of East and West are divided on several points but are united against common enemies -- the heretics.

Meletios was a true erudite and scholar. The question that remains is where he took this reference to Berengar from. The sources tell that as a student in Padova he became an adherent of Cardinal Roberto Bellarmino, the most renowned Catholic theologian of his time and opponent of Calvin. Meletios was described by his contemporaries with the expression *omnino Bellarmino spirat.* In fact Syrigos, unwillingly, was also part of what Father Florovsky called the Babylonian captivity of the Orthodox Church, when the Orthodox theologians of the seventeenth century were so heavily influenced by the Western tradition that the Catholic traditions penetrated their writings at the expense of the Orthodox legacy.

Metetios was a man of such vast learning that it remains questionable whether he knew only the Greek manuscripts of the PD, or also the Latin edition, which must have been available to him in Italy. Probably he knew both versions and it is difficult to say to which one he is alluding to and whether the variations between the Latin and the Greek version really mattered to him or he accepted both equally.

The idea that the PD refuted Berengar and, consequently his descendents, the Protestants, apparently came from the West. As I will demonstrate, Catholic theologians became interested in the Latin translation of the PD exactly because it was read in the sixteenth century against the “new heretics,” that is, the Protestants. It seems that when the

---

educated Meletios connected Berengar with the PD he was relying on a Western rather than any Byzantine tradition. The translation into Latin even seems to have been more successful than the Greek *editio princeps* because this translation went through three editions. The Greek publication of the PD was in fact an act of bringing the anthology home. Naturally, those involved in the first printed edition of the Greek text could not and did not know about the Western tradition of the anthology. It is a severe irony for the restless Patriarch Dositheos, who feared and hated the Jesuits, that a book which the Orthodox managed to publish after eighteen years of effort, had already been published in translation and was associated with the Synod of Trent. In addition, the prologue of the Latin translation contains a respectful mention of Pope Paul III, the pope who established the order of the Jesuits in 1540. In the next section of the study I will treat all these questions in detail and search for the Western interpretation of the *Panoplia* in early modern times as far as it seems to have influenced the publication of the anthology in Greek.
THE PD INTERPRETED BY THE THEOLOGIANS OF THE WEST IN EARLY MODERN TIMES

In the verse quoted at the beginning of the previous section, the Greek *Panoplia* by itself is taking pride of the fact that it has remained buried “as gold” and is printed for the first time in Tîrgoviște. The sponsor of the edition – Metropolitan Athanasios of Silistra -- also emphasized that this was the first publication of a hidden and long-forgotten treasure. It is known that during the seventeenth century most of the Orthodox mistrusted the Greek books printed by “the Schismatics” in the West. Thus, the emphasis on the fact that the PD appeared on Orthodox soil certainly had value in the eyes of the people behind the Greek edition. It was a book not contaminated by the heterodox. The reality was different and, in fact, the Latin version of the PD might well have inspired the Greek edition. In this chapter I will attempt to demonstrate this by examining the usage of the PD in the writings of Catholic theologians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in connection with the Eucharistic controversies. Many of these theologians read the PD in the Latin translation which was published for the first time in Venice in 1555, while others refer to the Greek text as well.

For the moment the detailed study on the circumstances around the translation into Latin is not a feasible task both in terms of time and the accessibility of sources. However, it is not possible to avoid this translation without providing a brief overview because it became involved in the history of the Greek edition which is the main focus here.

---

249 See page 21 of the present study.
250 For a summary of the whole problem of the connections between the Reform movement and the Medieval Dualists see the epilogue of Yuri Stoyanov, *The Other God: Dualist Religions from Antiquity to the Cathar Heresy* (New Haven: Yale University, 2000). Stoyanov gives also references to Protestant and Catholic authors discussing these connections. At this stage, I could not go in further detail. But future research should start from these early constructions made both by Catholics and Protestants.
7.3 Editions of the translation of the PD into Latin: Venice 1555, London 1556, Paris 1575

It was not coincidental that a translation of the PD into Latin appeared for the first time in the period between the second and third periods of the Council of Trent, with the thirteenth session being held on 11 October 1551, and issuing a decree on the sacrament of the Eucharist. The translation into Latin seems to have been prepared in connection with the council. The translation was made by the distinguished patristic scholar Pietro Francesco Zini and was supported by Cardinal Reginald Pole (1500-1558), Aloisius Lippomano (1500-1559), and Cardinal Marcello Cervini (1501-1555), all of them prominent figures in the proceedings of and around the Council. A detailed investigation of the Latin translation should begin with the figure of the translator, Pietro Zini, on whom several important studies have been published. 251

For this investigation it suffices to say that the editors of the Migne edition of the PD omitted the original prologue of the Latin edition, written by Zini, and thus the connection to the Synod of Trent is less evident and remains largely unexplored. The possibility that Catholic theologians somehow employed the PD in arguments against some Protestant views becomes more evident with the two subsequent reprints of the text.– The first reprint appeared in London in 1556 coinciding with the short reign of Queen Mary I (1553-1558); the second was published in Paris in 1575.

In the prologue to the Latin edition Francesco Zini states that with the permission of the librarian of the Vatican library, he has used a vetustissimum exemplar of the Greek original. Comparing the surviving inventories of the Vatican library at the time, one can


252 A copy of this reprint is kept in the Gennadius Library in Athens. The binding is stamped with the coat of arms of Robert Reid, bishop of Orkney and abbot of Kinloss, who died in 1558. The reprint of the PD in London was made during his lifetime.
suggest that the manuscript in question should be identified with Cod. Vat. Gr. 666, which was already present among the library holdings in 1510 when, during the pontificate of Pope Julius II, Fabio Vigili de Spoleto prepared a catalogue of the manuscripts in the possession of the Holy See.\textsuperscript{253}

7.4 The PD and the theologians of the Counter-Reformation

Apart from the editions of the translation into Latin, one finds a number of references to the PD among the writings of Catholic theologians. In fact, there seem to be more references to the \textit{Panoplia} in the Western theological tradition of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries than on native Orthodox soil. Most of these references are connected with the question on the transubstantiation. The interpretation elaborated by the Catholic theologians penetrated and influenced the Orthodox interpretation of the anthology. This is one more example of the influence of Western theology on Orthodox theological thought during the seventeenth century.

However, one finds a variety of references to the PD which can be categorized in three main groups – (1) references to the PD by Catholics -- prominent Jesuit controversyists and also Baronius and Leo Allatius – (2) sparse references by Protestant authors and, finally, (3) a detailed account in connection with the Jansenist controversy. The latest period of the Jansenist controversy coincided with the initial phases of the preparation of the Tîrgovişte edition, although those interested in the \textit{Panoplia} in the West and the East do not seem have been interested in each other’s common enquiries. In what follows, I will

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{253} Robert Devreesse, \textit{Le Fonds Grec de la Bibliothèque Vaticane des Origines à Paul V, Studi e Testi}, vol. 244 (Vatican: Città del Vaticano, 1965), 171. Cod Vat. Gr 666 ia mentioned in the inventories afterwards like the list created by the librarian Zenobe Acciaioli in 1518 and that written by Jean Matal in 1545. For us most interesting from the inventories published by Devreesse is that prepped by Cardinals Cervini and Sirleto, prepared on 13\textsuperscript{th} of November because Cervini is mentioned in the preface of the Latin translation of the PD as the librarian of the Vatican who procured the manuscript which was used for the translation. In his inventory we see four manuscripts of the PD – Cod. Vat. Gr. 666, Cod. Vat. Gr. 667, Cod. Vat. Gr. 1099 and yet a another one which Devreesse was not able to identify but which is decribed as containing scholia on 8 chapters of the PD, authored by Teodore the Studite (Devreesse, \textit{Le Fonds grec}, 452).}
treat the references to the Eucharistic controversies among Catholic theologians and, in order to present a balanced view, will indicate the sparse references made to the PD by Protestant theologians.\textsuperscript{254}

7.5 References by Catholic theologians connected to transubstantiation

The publication of the PD in Tîrgovişte was related to the Eucharistic disputes among the Orthodox and the terms used for the mystery of the Eucharist. The evidence that the Tîrgovişte edition came as a synthesis of the Catholic and Orthodox theological traditions comes from how the theologians of the Catholic reformation interpreted the PD. The PD was quoted by a series of prominent Jesuits and Catholic theologians – all of them referring to one and the same part of the PD – the reference to the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist (part of chapter 25 in the PG edition) and also the chapter on the Bogomils. Meletios Syrigos connected the creation of the PD with Berengar and the Eucharistic controversies precisely on the basis of the tradition created by these theologians.\textsuperscript{255} In analyzing the Catholic testimonies one finds even the direct model, which Meletios had read and used for the PD, had been authored by the Catholic Jesuit theologian and saint Roberto Bellarmino (1542-1621), who wrote a highly influential, comprehensive and often quoted polemical work -- \textit{Disputationes De Controversiis Christianae Fidei}.\textsuperscript{256} After its compilation this book was

\textsuperscript{254} The texts which are quoted in this chapter were consulted at the Digital Library of the Catholic Reformation, available at KULeuven. The original spelling is preserved.

The references given by Allatius and Baronio are not related to the Eucharistic Controversy. Baronio provides a historical account of the reign of Alexios I and the compilation of the Panoplia: Cesare Baronio, \textit{Annales Ecclesiastici, Tomus XII} (1608), 163-164. Allatius is interested in the chapter against the Latins. Leo Allatius, Leonis Allatii, \textit{De Ecclesiæ Occidentalis atque Orientalis Perpetua Consensione Libri Tres}, lib. 2, cap. 10 (1684).

\textsuperscript{255} For the text of Meletios Syrigos and analysis see pages 33-38 of the present study.

\textsuperscript{256} Peter Godman, \textit{The Saint as Censor: Robert Bellarmine between Inquisition and Index}, Studies in medieval and reformation thought 80 (Leiden: Brill, 2000); Romeo de Maio, \textit{Bellarmino e la Contrariforma}, Fonti e studi Baroniani 3 (Sora: Centro di Studi Sorani Vincenzo Patriarca, 1990).
widely read among the Orthodox and Meletios was no exception from this general trend; Kyrillos Lukaris himself read and wrote marginal notes in a volume of *De Contorversiis*.257

However, the account of Bellarmino was not original either. It was a repetition of earlier sources and, in its turn, was later repeated by a series of prominent Jesuit theologians. This shows that the PD became a part, although a small one indeed, of the Patristic arsenal that the Catholics used in their argumentation against the Protestants. In relation to the Eucharist the Catholic authors refer mainly to one part of the PD, presented as chapter twenty-five in PG, where it bears the title “On the Cross, the Holy Baptism and the Transformation of the Lord’s Body and Blood.” In what follows I will present this part of the PD as it is attested in the PG and will then trace the occurrences and subsequent, reinterpretations of the same theme, starting from the account which Meletios used as a direct model for his words on the PD.

7.5.1 The patristic fragments in question

In the earlier Greek MSS of the PD this chapter was an integral part of the entry “Against Paulicians.” In the edition of PG it is a separate chapter but some Greek MSS attest this entry as a separate chapter, too. When this change actually happened can be established only after consulting all existing manuscripts. I do not know whether it was a separate chapter in the Latin translation by Zini (but in any case the chapters in his translation have subtitles). The texts which attracted the attention of Catholic theologians concern the last fragments -- from Gregory the Theologian, Gregory of Nyssa, and John Damascene. However, in order to acquire a clearer view of the theological context, I give a short description of the whole entry.

**Fragment 1**: PG 130, 1244 C – 1248 D Σνῦ Δαμασκηνοῦ περὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ


Fragment 2: PG 130, 1248 D Περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος, τοῦ μεγάλου Βασιλείου ἀπὸ τῶν πρὸς Ἀμφιλόχιον τὸν Ἰκονίου τριάκοντα κεφαλαίων.


Fragment 3: PG 130 1259 D – 1252 B Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου ἐκ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ προτρεπτικοῦ εἰς τὸ βάπτισμα

Inc. Διττῶν δὲ ὄντων ἡμῶν ….Desinit ἐπειδὴ καὶ αὐτὸς χρῄζω φιλανθρωπίας) [Gregory of Nazianzus, In Sanctum Baptisma, 8 1-25, PG 36, col. 368 A-C ]

Fragment 4: PG 130, 1252 B -1253 C
Τοῦ Νύσσης ἐκ τοῦ κατηχητικοῦ λόγου περὶ τοῦ Βαπτίσματος


Fragment 5: PG 130, 1253 C -1260 D
Τοῦ Δαμασκηνοῦ ἐτι περὶ βαπτίσματος
Inc. Ὅμολογοῦμεν δὲ ἐν βάπτισμα... Desinit καὶ θεοῦ λαὸς χρηματίζομεν


**Fragment 6:** PG 130, 1261 A – 1265 B

Περὶ τῆς μεταλήψεως τοῦ Δεσποτικοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος, τοῦ Νύσσης ἐκ τοῦ κατηχητικοῦ λόγου


**Fragment 7:** PG 130, 1265 B

Περὶ τῆς μεταλήψεως τοῦ Δεσποτικοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος, τοῦ Δαμασκηνοῦ


7.6 De controversiis of Roberto Bellarmino – the direct model for the text of Meletios Syrigos

The accounts of the Orthodox theologians contain the somewhat unexpected statement that the PD refutes the followers of Berengar, whose teaching had allegedly reached the confines of Byzantium in the twelfth century, when the anthology was compiled in Constantinople. This view is mentioned for the first time by Meletios Syrigos, who had read the works of Cardinal Roberto Bellarmino.
Roberto Bellarmino referred to the PD in the second volume of his *De controversiis*, which contained his lectures on the sacraments and appeared in 1588. In it Bellarmino cited two hundred and fifty-nine ecclesiastical authors and a large number of ecclesiastical historians. Against this background the reference to the PD might appear not that important. Nonetheless, it is of some importance because this was exactly the reference to the PD which Meletios Syrigos had read and worked upon. Even if he reworked the text entirely the main points remain the same and leave no doubt that Syrigos had a volume of *De controversiis* in his hands while writing his treatise against the Confession of Lukaris. What follows is a transcription, translation, and discussion of the account by Bellarmino and the way Meletios Syrigos transformed it.

**Roberto Bellarmino CAPUT XXXVII. Testimonia Patrum XII. aetatis Euthymii, & S. Bernardi.**


S. BERNARDUS in vita S. Malachiae: *Fuit*, inquit, *quidam clericus, probabilis, ut fertur, vitae, sed fidei non ita: is sciolus in oculis suis praesumpsit dicere, in Eucharistia esse tantummodò Sacramentum, & non rem Sacramenti, id est, solam sanctificationem, & non corporis veritatem*. Haec ille. ubi subnectit insigne miraculum quo ille à B. Malachia coactus est, vel invitus veritatem tandem amplecti, & confitere.

---


Haec illi proferunt, ex quibus nos multum omnino lucramur. Nam dubitari non potest de sententia S. Bernardi, tum ex testimonio à nobis paulò antè citato; & ex aliis plurimis, quae adferri possent; tum quia constat eum fuisse coniunctissimum Romanæ sedi, quae multis Conciliis damnaverat haeresim Berengarii; necnon amicissimum Hugoni de S. Victore, & Petro Cluniacensi, qui ex professo scripserant de Sacramento contra haeresim paulò antè exortam;

*Testimonies from the fathers of the twelfth century: Euthymios and St. Bernard*
Also in the twelfth century many authors wrote on this matter in a most clear and exhaustive way, such as, for example, Peter of Cluny (Peter the Venerable), Peter Lombard, Hugh and Richard of St Victor, Euthymios Zygadenos, saint Bernard and others. For us, however, it would be enough to provide two testimonies – one by St. Bernard for the Latins, and another by Euthymios for the Greeks.

ST. BERNARD, in the Vita of St. Malachy said the following "There was a certain cleric, as they say, acceptable in his way of living but not in his faith: this man – a connoisseur in his own eyes – dared to say that in the Eucharist there is only the sacrament but not the reality of the Sacrament, that is, only the sanctification [operated by Christ’s body] but not the true body. That is what the cleric said, and then he [Bernard] adds a great miracle, by which the cleric is forced by the blessed Malachy to embrace and confess the truth even against his own will.

EUTHYMIOS upon chapter 26 of Matthew says: “He did not say, these are the signs of my body and my blood, but “these are my body and blood.” And a little further: ‘Just as He deified the flesh, which He took on above nature, if it is right to say so, in the like manner He also indicibly transforms these [that is, the bread and wine] into his life-giving body. See also the Panoplia of the same author where in chapter 21 he demonstrates extensively from the fathers [Gregory of] Nyssa and Damascene the transformation of the bread into the body of the Lord.

Nonetheless, Peter Martyr dares to bring forward testimonies from Bernard in his book Against Gardinetus, under the entries 252, 253 and 254. For Bernard writes in Sermon 33 of his commentary on the
Song of Songs: I too have the Word, but the Word made flesh; and the Truth is set before me, but in the sacrament. An angel is nourished with the richness of the wheat, is satiated with the pure grain; but in this life I have to be content with the husk, as it were, of the sacrament, with the bran of the flesh, with the chaff of the letter, with the veil of the faith. And a little further: But no matter how great the effusion of the Spirit that enriches these, the husk of the sacrament is not received with the same pleasure as the fat of the wheat, nor is faith the equivalent of vision, nor memory of presence, nor time of eternity, nor a face of its reflection, nor the image of God of a slave’s condition. The same Bernard again, in the sermon on the Supper of the Lord, compares the Sacraments with the ring and baculo, on which in their quality of signs is being introduced a certain dignity or possession.

They have given us these teachings of which we draw no little benefit. No doubt could be voiced about the view of St Bernard, partly because of the testimony which we quoted a bit earlier; and many other testimonies which could be taken from many other authorities, and partly, because it is well known that Bernard was most closely connected with the see of Rome, which had condemned the heresy of Berengar in many Councils and also because he had most friendly connections with Hugh of Saint Victor and Peter of Cluny, who have written ex professo on the Sacrament and against the heresy which had begun a little earlier.

The clear textual parallels leave no doubt that it was indeed the De Controversiis that served as a model for Meletios. The two accounts are connected, yet they are not the same. The line of the argumentation is the same and in some parts Meletios made a direct

translation from Latin into Greek. Both texts present testimonies of Church fathers, mention Berengar, and, quote exactly the same part of the PD as the main evidence. However, the erudite Meletios entirely reworked the section on the twelfth century, consciously omitting any reference to Western authorities.

7.6.1 Similar references to the PD in the works of Roberto Bellarmino

The above-quoted lengthy paragraph is not the only place where Roberto Bellarmino quoted the PD. Sparse references glitter in the vast corpus of his writings. But most of these references, with some exceptions, treat the same passage and repeat the same idea. References to the PD appear pas sim in the first volume of De Controversiis. The first occurrence is related to the adoration of the cross, with its special position in worship being partim inter reliquias, partim inter imagines.

Fuit igitur haeresis inprimis Claudii Taurinensis, qui praeter ceteras imagines crucem Domini execrabatur, teste Iona lib. 1. vixit autem Claudius anno Domini DCCC. Idem eodem tempore in Oriente docebant Pauliciani, à quodam Paulo sic appellati, teste Euthymio in panoplia, part. 2. tit. 21. 260

It is interesting to notice that in the opening pages of the second volume of the De Controversiis, which is perhaps the most important because it treats the Eucharistic questions, the PD is mentioned on two occasions as a source for the antiqui errores de sacramentis. In these pages Bellarmino refers again to the PD in connection with the heresy of the Paulicians, categorizing them among the heretics who reject all the sacraments.

Huc denique pertinent Pauliciani, qui teste Euthymio in 2. parte Panopliae, tit. 21. tollebant de medio omnem Sacramentorum materiam; aquam, vinum, panem, oleum, & solūm verbis quibusdam

260 Roberto Bellarmino, De Controversiis, Tomus Primus, 1007-1008.
loco Sacramentorum utebantur: ut exempli gratia, Baptismum esse dicebant illa verba: *Ego sum aqua viva.*

To this [type of heretics] belonged the Paulicians who, according to the testimony of Euthymios in the second part of the Panoply, chapter 21, removed all the matters of the Sacraments - water, wine, bread, olive oil – and, instead of the sacraments, they only used some words: for example, they claimed that the Baptism consists in these words: *I am the living water.*

In the same passage Roberto Bellarmino also mentions the Bogomils and, on the basis of the testimony provided in the PD, categorises them among the heretics who do not follow the Eucharist but accept some of the other sacraments.


Others say that the Sacrament of the Eucharist is nothing. For, in his book against the Petrobrusians Peter of Cluny writes that one of the errors of the Petrobrusians was that they believed the body of Christ was only once made of bread, that is, in that night when the Lord was betrayed: this would not happen later nor could it happen. And also Euthymios wrote in the second part of the *Panoply*, title 23, that one of

---

262 Roberto Bellarmino, *De Controversiis, Tomus Secundus*, 3-4.
the errors of the Bogomils was that they believed that the Eucharist was nothing else but the *Our Father*.

Further on Bellarmino refers one more time to the passage of Gregory of Nyssa on the Eucharist as it is presented in the *Panoplia*. Bellarmino seems to quote the passage directly from the Latin translation.

Idem Gregorius in oratione Catechetica, cap. 36. & 37. multa habet expressè de veritate huius Sacramenti, & citatur hic locus ab Euthymio in *Panoplia*, parte 2. tit. 21. & à Bessorione <sic> in lib. de verbis consecrationis. Inter alia dicit, & saepius repetit, corpus Christi immortaleconiungi per Eucharistiam cum nostro mortali corpore, & illud sibi simile reddere, id est, efficere, ut gloriosum & immortale aliquando resurgat: *Quemadmodum*, inquit, *parum fermenti totam massam sibi similem reddit; sic & corpus illud, quod à Deo factum est immortale, in nostrum corpus ingrediens totum in se transfert, atque commutat. Nam, ut pestiferum cum salubri commistum, illud efficit perniciosum; sic & corpus immortale reddit totum illud, in quo susceptum est, naturae simile immortali. Et infrà: *Fidelium corporibus coniungitur, ut ea coniunctione cum immortali, homo etiam immortalitatis particeps fiat.* Haec ille.263

The same Gregory had said many things on the reality of this Sacrament in the Catechetical Oration, chapters 36 and 37. This part is also quoted by Euthymios in the *Panoply*, second part, title 21, and also by Bessarion in the book *On the words of the consecration*. Along with other things he said, and often repeated, that in Eucharist the immortal body of Christ is united to our mortal body and renders [our body] similar to itself, that is to say, it makes our body so that one day it

---

263 Roberto Bellarmino, *De Controversiis, Tomus Secundus*, 610-611.
would rise as glorious and immortal: For, in the manner that a little leaven assimilates to itself the whole lump (1 Cor. 6), so in like manner that body to which immortality has been given by God, when it is in ours, translates and transmutes the whole into itself. For as by the admixture of a poisonous liquid with a wholesome one the whole drought is deprived of its deadly effect, so too the immortal Body, by being within that which receives it, changes the whole to its own nature. And further, blending Himself with the bodies of believers, to secure that, by this union with the immortal, man, too, may be a sharer in incorruption.264 That is what he says.

There is one more somewhat similar reference.


Gregory of Nyssa said in the Catechetical Oration, included in the Panoply of Euthymios, title 21, that the bread immediately transforms into body with the Word, as it is said by the Word, This is my body. And further he said that the sanctified bread transforms into the body of Lord, but it is not the word of God, that Oration is from Greeks.

---

7.7 More Catholic References to the PD in connection with Eucharistic questions\textsuperscript{265}

This overview of \textit{De Controversiis} has shown that three parts of the PD received attention – the entries “On the Cross, Baptism and Transformation of the Lord’s Body and Blood,” “Against the Paulicians” and “Against the Bogomils.” The reference to the PD in relation to the Eucharistic controversies, however, does not exist solely in the writings of Roberto Bellarmino. The PD became part of the Jesuit theological argumentation. A series of Jesuit theologians quoted the same parts of the anthology. It is important to discover who introduced this interpretation because this might reveal the source of this reference, whether that was the Latin edition of the PD or a Greek manuscript. The shortest way to sift the references is to trace the references which certainly predate Bellarmino’s account – these are the accounts of Peter Canisius’ \textit{Catechism}, the testimony of John Martiall (1534-1597), and the mention by Nicholas Harpsfield (1519-1575). Later interpretations are numerous and include Thomas Harding (1516-1572), Thomas Stapleton (1535-1598), the Jesuit Antonio Possevino, and the Flemish Jesuit and scholar Leonard Lessius (1554-1623).

\textbf{John Martiall (1534-1597)}

Undoubtedly, the first references to PD situate the edition of the book clearly in the religious controversies of the Elizabethan age.\textsuperscript{266} John Martiall, an English Catholic involved in these controversies, exiled to the continent, where he was active in Leuven and involved in establishing the Catholic College in Douai, has left what seems to be the first very brief mention of the PD. It is in the form of a short note mentioning chapter 19 of the PD in his

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{265}] Please, note that footnotes 275, 280, 283, 286, 289, 291, 294, 299, 302 were written following the report comments of Prof. Dr. Peter Van Deun.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
work *A treatyse of the crosse*. This work was related to the controversy prompted by John Jewel, bishop of Salisbury, but was also a response to Queen Elizabeth I’s retention of a cross in her royal chapel. Martial dedicated the work to Elizabeth. This reference undoubtedly quotes the PD published in Latin translation. The fact that the first references to the PD appear among the writings of English Catholics suggests that they were referring to the translation published in London in 1555.

**Nicholas Harpsfield (1519–1575)**

Nicholas Harpsfield left another early reference. In his book, *Dialogi contra summi pontificatus oppugnatores* (1566), Harpsfield presents the Calvinists as holding views close to the Bogomils. He also gives the earliest reference which I have found so far to chapter 21 of the PD and already employs it in connection with the Reformation leader of Switzerland, Huldrych Zwingli (1484-1531) and the internal disputes among the reformers.

---


268 Let any man come that desirith to learne experience of these things, and of the very pomp of the devils, subtlety of divination, and strange sights by witchcraft: let him use the sign of the foolish cross (as they say) but only naming Christ, he shall see the devils to be put to flight by it, all divination cease, and all magic and witchcraft destroyed: Further S. Augustine sayeth. Quod faciebat in terris corporis Christi praeSENTiA, hoc factum cum fidelium invocatione nominis Christi, victoriosae crucis insignita memoria. Look what the presence of Christ did in earth, the same doth the memory of the victorious cross expressed in a sign, with the faithful invocation of the name of Christ. And as Euthymius writeth. Per virtutem Tit. 19, parte 2, panopli. crucis doemonum expellitur caterva, & agrotationes variae curantur, ea gratia & vir tute que semel in prototypo & primogenio fuit efficac, ad ipsis quoque crucis effigies, unae cum simili efficacia procedente. By the sign of the cross companies of devils are expelled, and diverse diseases healed. John Martial, *A Treatyse of the Crosse Gathered out of the Scriptures, Councelles, and Auncient Fathers of the Primitive Church* (Antwerp: John Latius, 1564)


132
over the real presence in the Eucharist. The direct reference to the PD is in a very short footnote.270

**Thomas Harding (1572-1516)**

The next reference on the PD was made by Thomas Harding (1572-1516), English controversialist who shared some Protestant views but returned to Catholicism. On Elisabeth’s accession Harding moved to Leuven, matriculating in the University there in 1563 and later becoming a professor in Douai. In exile he began to write the polemical works for which he is famous in relation with the so called “Jewel-Harding Controversy” and his works were published in Leuven and Antwerp.271 On in *A Rejoinder to M. Jewel's Reply Against the Sacrifice of the Mass* (1566). This reference came in the dispute of the English Catholic, Harding, and the Anglican, Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury and champion of Protestantism. Harding, however, does not make it clear to which of Zygabenos’ works he refers.272

**Peter Canisius (1521-1597)**

Peter Canisius referred to the PD in his *Antidotes Sacrae Scripturae* (1571). This reference is found among around twelve hundred quotations from the Church Fathers which

---


272 *Euthymius* also a Father of the Greke Churche, construed the same words of Christ in like sense, saying, *Sicut Vetus Testamentum hostias & sanguinem habebat, ita sanè & Novum, Corpus videlicet & sanguinem Domini. Non dixit autem, haec sunt signa corporis mei, & sanguinis mei, sed haec sunt corpus meum, & sanguis meus.* As the Old Testament had sacrifices and blood, even so truly hath the New Testament also to wit, the Body and Blood of our Lord. He said not, these be the signs of my body, and of my blood, but these be my Body, and my Blood. Thomas Harding, *A rejoindre to M. Jewels replie against the sacrifice of the Masse. In which the doctrine of the answere to the xvii. article of his challenge is defended, and further proved, and al that his replie conteineith against the sacrifice, is clearely confuted, and disproved.* (Louvain: Apud Ioannem Foulern, 1567), 68.
were included in Peter Canisius’ Catechism which were later collected in the original by Peter Busaeus and appeared in four volumes under the title *Authoritates Sacrae Scripturae et Sanctorum Patrum*. In the preface, Busaeus, giving a reference to chapter 21 of the PD, recommends the PD among other anthologies as a book of general reference.  

**Thomas Stapleton (1535-1598)**

Thomas Stapleton (1535-1598), English Catholic controversialist, referred to the PD in his work *Speculum Parvitatis Haereticae* (1580). It is known that he spent a long period of his life in exile in Leuven and read and used the *De Controversiis* of Bellarmino.

---


275 This note is introduced following the report comments by Prof. Dr. Peter Van Deun. The description “controversiste catholique anglais” for Thomas Stapleton is found in *Dictionnaire de Biographie crétienne et anti-crétienne* vol 3, eds. François Marie Pérennès, François Xavier de Feller (Paris, Petit-Montrouge Migne, 1851), p. 1200. With expired copy rights, available in public domain: http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:2G2267ftaw0J:www.archive.org/details/dictionnairedebi03pruoft+Dictionnaire+de+Biographie+cr%C3%A9tienne+et+anti-cr%C3%A9tienne&rct=j&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=be&source=www.google.be. (For the pages use the numbering of the book, not of the PDF program, last consulted January 2011).
Stapleton himself makes two references to the PD – again to chapter 21 and the Bogomils.\textsuperscript{277}

**Antonio Possevino (1534-1615)**

Antonio Possevino (1534-1615), an Italian Jesuit and papal legate to various places, including Moscow, refers to the Latin translation of the PD. He quotes the chapter on Apollinaris of Laodicaea, which is numbered 14 in the Tîrgoviște edition but 13 in the Latin


one.\textsuperscript{278} In addition, he makes a second reference, again quoting the PD in connection with the works of Gregory of Nyssa.\textsuperscript{279}

**St. Lorenzo da Brindisi (1559 – 1619)**

St. Lorenzo da Brindisi (1559 – 1619) was an Italian Capuchin, a doctor of the church, and one of the leading polemicists of the Counter-Reformation in Germany.\textsuperscript{280} He quotes the PD in his work *Lutheranismo hypotyposis: pars I: Hypotyposis Martini Lutheri*, again connecting the anthology with the Eucharistic controversies. This reference makes a

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{279} & \quad \text{Iam verò Fragmenta pleraque, & quidem de dogmatibus magni momenti, ex Nysseni Operibus, quae vel non extant, vel non habentur ad manu, collegit Euthymios in suae Panopliae prima parte, tit. 7. Quae Fragmenta, quoniam indicant varia Nysseni scripta, omnino hic praenotanda sunt, ut viri antiquae veritatis amantes, & eadem integra eruant, sicubi delitescunt; & certè utantur istis interdum ad Divinam gloriam. Extant igitur sequentia, sed fusius quidem, quàm hoc in loco interseri debeant. Antonio Possevino, }\textit{Apparatus sacer ad scriptores Veteris, & Novi Testamenti} (Venice: Apud Societatem Venetam, 1603), 589. \\
\text{280} & \quad \text{This note is introduced following the thesis report comments of Prof. Dr. Peter Van Deun. The short description of Lorenzo da Brindisi (in English St. Lawrence of Brindisi) is provided by The New Encyclopaedia Britannica (London : Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1974, 15th edition), p. 92. The same sentence “a doctor of the church, and one of the leading polemicists of the Counter-Reformation in Germany” is used without reference to Encyclopaedia Britannica in another recent encyclopaedia Schadé, Johannes P., }\textit{Encyclopedia of World Religions} (Foreign Media Group, 2006. Availible online at: http://books.google.be/books?id=XRkfKdho-5cC&pg=PT527&lpg=PT527&dq=%E2%80%9Ca+doctor+of+the+church,+and+one+of+the+leading+polemicists+of+the+Counter-Reformation+in+Germany%27%27&source=bl&ots=CvRwJHFl&sign=2VGUhsSU9fMnpzaRLLxZ-5iGaXY1&hl=en&ei=0zFQTdOXCOPJHaEo0vyUDw&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=3&ved=0CCU6AEwAg#v=onepage&q&f=false Last consulted by me in January 2011.}
\end{align*}
\]
clear connection between the heresy of Berengar and his followers, the Bogomils, and the
Protestants.281

Jakob Gretser (1562-1625)

The references to the PD continued in the seventeenth century with the Jesuit scholar
Gretser (1562-1625), who refers to the chapter on the Bogomils, apparently having read both
the Latin and Greek texts as well as the Panoplia of Niketas Choniates. His work is entitled:

_Hortus S. Crucis accessit liber De more lavandi pedes peregrinorum_ (1610).282

Leonard Lessius (1524-1623)

Leonard Lessius (1524-1623) was a Jesuit moral theologian and a pioneer in business
economics.283 In his work _De Antichristo et eius praecursoribus_ (1611) he does not mention the

281 Sic Lutherus multas alias putidissimas haereses antiquorum haereticorum in sui istius novi evangelismi
cloacam congressit; puta Berengari, qui negavit in Sacramento Altaris, dum conficitur, transubstantiationem,
asseruit quod remanere post consecrationem substantiam panis; ex Bogomilis, qui teste Euthymio in Panoplia,
part(e) 2, tit(ulo) 23, asserebant Baptismum christi
anum in aqua factum baptismum Ioannis esse; negat enim
Lutherus Baptismum conferre gratiam, in primo Articulo, asserit que minime necessarium esse. Lorenzo da
Brindisi, _Lutheranismi hypotyposis: pars I: Hypotyposis Martini Lutheri, San Laurentii a Brundusi
O Opera omnia_ (Patavii: Typis seminarii, 1930), 447.

282 Hic iterum nostros convenio Iconomachos. Num idem illis est in Crucem affectus? Num & ipsi
φαιδρῶς ὑψίασι τὸν σταυρὸν; Num haec sancsanctae Crucis ὑψωσίς, ipsorum sententiā, adscribi potest, tī
εὐσέβει κρίτες; Nullo modo, nam ipsis hoc in articulo magis lubet esse Bogomilianis, quàm Copronymianis.
Ita enim Nicetas Tom. 19. & Euthymius in _Panoplia de Bogomilis_. Ἀτιμάζουσι τῶν θείων σταυρῶν, ὡς
ἀναιμέτητοι τοῦ σωτῆρος. Ignominiae officiunt divinam Crucem, ut Salvatoris interfectricem
thé̂s diei. Subiungit Nicetas. Ὄν ἐδει μᾶλλον τιμάν, ὡς καθαιμέτητο τοῦ διαβόλου. μετὰ γὰρ τότε θανατηφόρον
ὀργάνον χρηματίζων, ἔκτοτε ζωήφόρον ὑπεράνεντες ὑπέρ τῶν σωτῆρος, ἐξορίσατο τοῖς εἰκονὶς ἐπὶ τῶν
despotikōs àματτίς, καὶ ὑπῆρτοι καταραντισθέν. _Quam magis venerari oportebat, tanquam peremptricem Diaboli: nam quae
eousque mortiferum instrumentum audiebat, illa ex eo tempore vitalis
armaturea evasit, quam maximè regalis & hostibus terrifica, quippe sanguine & aqua Domini irrigate. Jakob
Gretser, _Hortus S. crucis, accessit liber de more lavandi pedes peregrinorum et hospitum, cum paralipomenis
pro libris de sacris pereginationibus & processionibus, Omnia nunc primum in lucem edita_. Ingolstadt: Ex
typographia Adami Sarttorii, 1610, p. 40

283 This note is introduced following the thesis report comments by Prof. Dr. Peter Van Deun. I include that the
sentence “was a Jesuit moral theologian and a pioneer in business ethics” can be found in Wikipedia but not in the
economics” is a cliché, currently in use and applied for various fields of economics, including book titles, e.g.

In the case of Lessius, I have already given my description of him in the thesis draft as a “Flemish Jesuit and
scholar.” I included it from the very beginning because Lessius was an important figure in Leuven, where I have
worked on this part of the thesis. This description of mine has remained in the final version. Thus, in the case of
Lessius there are two descriptions – my old description on p. 131 and the present description which was
introduced on written recommendation by my supervisor of KULeuven who read and approved it. The thesis
draft is available with my supervisor’s notes.
PD directly, but lists Bogomils together with Berengar and other heresies in connection with calculations over the coming of the Antichrist.  

**Jacques Davy Du Perron (1556-1618)**

Jacques Davy Du Perron was a French cardinal and author of *Le traité du saint sacrement de l'Eucharistie divisé en trois livres* (1622), where the PD is mentioned in a brief footnote to the chapter against the Armenians. Du Perron mentions the PD for a second time in connection with the Eucharistic disputes.  

**Paul Laymann (1574-1635)**

Paul Laymann (1574-1635), an Austrian Jesuit and important moralist, was a copious writer on philosophical, moral, and juridical subjects. He refers to the PD in his work *Theologiae moralis liber quintus. De sacramentis, et sacrificio novae legis* (1625). He


286 This note is introduced following the report comments by Prof. Dr. Peter Van Deun. I include that the description of Paul Laymann as “Austrian Jesuit and important moralist” can be found in Wikipedia [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paul_Laymann](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paul_Laymann) but not in the Catholic Encyclopedia.

The definition “Austrian Jesuit and important moralist” does not pertain to the substance of my thesis because his nationality and importance do not have any relevance for the research. The Catholic Encyclopedia contains lengthier article on Laymann which includes, *inter alia*, the information that he was “a copious writer on philosophical, moral, and juridical subjects.” This encyclopedia is available on public domain [http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/09095a.htm](http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/09095a.htm). Last consulted in January 2011.
mentions Chapter 21 and the text of Gregory of Nyssa in the section the nature of the Eucharist.287

Denis Pétau, (1583-1652)

Being one among the most prominent French Jesuit theologians and erudite scholars of his time, Denis Petau mentions many parts of the PD in his famous Theologica Dogmata (1650); apparently he knew the anthology in detail.288

The references to PD in connection with the Eucharistic questions had a long tradition among Catholic theologians, beginning with the disputes between the English Catholics and the Anglicans and continuing the same interpretation, without many changes, in the following centuries. All the references presented here were intended against the Protestants. Thus, the next part of the study moves to the Protestant writings to search for how they responded.

7.8 The PD in the writings of the Protestant authors

Even if the Catholics used the PD as an argument for their Eucharistic views, the Protestants did not become interested in the PD. The sources show that the references to the Panoplia to a large extent remained unnoticed. Only the earliest reference to the PD emerged in a real discussion between the Catholics and the Anglicans – that is, the passage interpreted by both the Catholic Nicholas Harpsfield and the Anglican John Jewel. I could not find later traces of discussion. The Protestants showed little interest in the PD.

Johann Gerhard

Johann Gerhard (1582-1627) was a Lutheran church leader and theologian who wrote numerous works on exegetical, polemical, dogmatic, and practical theology.289 In

---

287 Paul Laymann, Theologiae moralis liber quintus. De sacramentis et sacrificio novae legis (Munich: Formis Nicolai HenRICI, 1625), p.87
Confessionis Catholicae Liber II he refers briefly to Zygabenus’ interpretation of Matthew, chapter 28, in connection with the Eucharist.\(^{290}\)

**Abraham Calov**

Abraham Calov (1612-1686) was one of the champions of Lutheran orthodoxy in the seventeenth century and professor of theology at Wittenberg. His chief dogmatic work, *Systema Locorum Theologicorum Tomus Primus* (1655), is considered the climax of Lutheran scholasticism.\(^{291}\) In this work Calov provides a brief mention of the comment on Matt. 26 as interpreted by Zygadenus.\(^{292}\)

**John Owen**

John Owen (1616-1683) was an English Church leader, theologian, and prolific author. In *a vindication of the animadversions of fiat lux* (1664) he mentions the burning of

---

\(^{289}\) This note is introduced following the thesis report comments of Prof. Dr. Peter Van Deun. The description “was a Lutheran church leader and theologian” and “exegetical, polemical, dogmatic, and practical theology” for Gerhard is quoted after *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1910, vol. 11, pp. 767-768, which is out of copyright and is available online. [http://www.archive.org/details/EncyclopaediaBritannica1911HQDJVU](http://www.archive.org/details/EncyclopaediaBritannica1911HQDJVU) No author is indicated for the article on Gerhard because it is from the so called “unsigned articles” in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Web page last consulted in January 2011.


\(^{291}\) This note is introduced following the thesis report comments of Prof. Dr. Peter Van Deun. The data on Abraham Calov “was one of the champions of Lutheran orthodoxy in the seventeenth century and professor of theology at Wittenberg. His chief dogmatic work” is taken from *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1910, vol. 5, p. 68, which is out of copyright and is available online. [http://www.archive.org/details/EncyclopaediaBritannica1911HQDJVU](http://www.archive.org/details/EncyclopaediaBritannica1911HQDJVU) The article on Calov is from the articles in Britannica which are unsigned by any author. Last consulted in January 2011.

Basil the Bogomil in connection with the repressive methods adopted by the Catholic Inquisition.293

Peter van Maastricht

Peter van Maastricht (1630-1706), a German-Dutch theologian, is best known for his *Theologia Theoretico-Practica* (first edition 1698), a comprehensive and influential work that was translated into Dutch.294 The reference he made to the PD coincided with the time when the Orthodox were already making efforts to publish the PD. Peter van Maastricht quotes the chapter against the Latins.295

The references to the PD among the Protestant authors which I have collected so far display limited interest in the *Panoplia*. These references appear sporadically. Each of them

293 It is the Principle of your Church, whereunto your Practise hath been suited, that those who dissent from you in things determined by your Church, being Heretics, if they continue so to do, after the application of the means for their reclaiming which you think meet to use, ought to be imprisoned, burned, or one way or other put to death. This you cannot deny to be your Principle, it being the very foundation of your Inquisition, the chief corner-stone in your present Ecclesiastical fabric, that couples and holds up the whole building together: And it hath been asserted in your practice for sundry Ages in most Nations of Europe: Your Councels, as that of Constance, have determined it, and practised accordingly, with John Huss, and Hierome: Your Doctors dispute for it, your Church lives upon it. That you are destitute of any colour from Antiquity in this your way, I have showed before: Bellarmine de Laic. cap. 22. could find no other Instances of it, but that of Priscillianus, which what entertainment it found in the Church of God, I have declared; with that of one Basilius out of Gregories Dialogues, Lib. 1. Cap. 4. whom he confesseth to have been a Magitian; and of Bogomitus in the dayes of Alexius Comnenus 1100 years after Christ, whose putting to death notwithstanding, was afterward censured and condemned in a Synod of more sober Persons than those who procured it. Instance of your avowing this Principle in your dealing with the Albigenses of old, the Inhabitants of Merindol and Chrabiers in France, with the Waldenses in the valleys of Piedmont, formerly and of late; of your judiciary proceedings against multitudes of Persons of all sorts, conditions, ages, and sexes in this and most other Nations of Europe, you are not pleased with the mention of, I shall therefore pass them by. John Owen, *A vindication of the animadversions of fiat lux* (London: Henry Cripps, 1662), 119.

294 This note is introduced following the report comments of Prof. Dr. Peter Van Deun. I include the following note concerning the phrases “a German-Dutch theologian,” “best known for his *Theologia Theoretico-Practica*”, “a comprehensive and influential work that was translated into Dutch.”

I could not find further reference on this author. It is possible that there are references on him in Dutch. The only information about Peter van Maastricht I could find is on the site of Theopaedia http://www.theopedia.com/Peter_Van_Mastricht (last consulted in January 2011). The article there does not provide further bibliography. “A comprehensive and influential work” is a cliché and the fact that it was translated in Dutch does not have any relevance for the thesis.

seems to be independent from the other accounts. Also, each reference is a result of erudition rather than an answer to the interpretations of the Eucharist which were elaborated by the Catholics. There is no direct answer to the accusations that the Protestants were heirs of the Bogomils; the PD was just a small part of all the Patristic authors and books discussed by Catholics and Protestants. Paradoxically, the Catholic interpretation of the Eucharistic question in the PD became interesting not for the Protestant but for the Orthodox. This is most evident in the latest references to the PD which were related to the Jansenist controversy.
8 THE JANSENIST CONTROVERSY AND THE PD

During the Jansenist Controversy, which shaped theological discussions in Western Europe in the second half of the seventeenth century to a great extent, the Jansenists and their Calvinist opponents turned to the legacy of the Orthodox Church in search of arguments to support their views. The first contact on behalf of the Jansenists was made through the French ambassador in Sweden, M. de Pomponne, who requested information on the Orthodox view on transubstantiation from Nicolae Milescu (1636-1708), a Moldavian nobleman, writer, traveler, geographer, and diplomat.\(^\text{296}\) The Milescu’s reply encouraged Jansenist theologians to enhance their contacts with the Greek Church. For this reason they approached Patriarch Dositheos, Patriarch Dionysios, and Panagiotis Nikousios, who initially took a favorable position. As a result of this short cooperation some Orthodox authors were quoted in the main work of the Jansenists, *La perpétuité de la foi de l'Église Catholique, touchant l'Eucharistie, défendue contre le livre du Sieur Claude, ministre de Charenton*.\(^\text{297}\) In addition, the acts of the Synod of Jerusalem, organized by Dositheos, and the *Refutation* of Meletios Syrigos were published in Paris. The cooperation between the patriarch of Jerusalem and the French Catholics quickly ended with the disputes over the protection of the Holy Places, which began in 1674.

Among the Greek fragments the Jansenists employed were some taken from the *Panoplia* of Emperor Alexios Komnenos.\(^\text{298}\) The most influential authors who quoted the PD were Antoine Arnauld and Eusèbe Renaudot. These authors were interested in the Eucharistic

---


Chapter of the anthology. Their references coincided with the moves by the Orthodox to publish the book.

**Antoine Arnauld**

Antoine Arnauld (1612-1694) was a leading intellectual of the Jansenist group of Port-Royal and one of the authors of the famous *La perpétuité de la foi de l'Église Catholique*<sup>299</sup> where he made the lengthiest reference to the PD.<sup>300</sup> It contains a summary of everything which was said by earlier authors in connection with Christ’s real presence in the Eucharist. Arnauld’s reference can be found in appendix 3 of the present study since this is the most authoritative work of the Jansenist movement.

**Eusèbe Renaudot**

<sup>299</sup> This note is introduced following the report comments of Prof. Dr. Peter Van Deun. It indicated that the phrase comes from Wikipedia, where the lengthy article on Arnauld is introduced by two sentences part of one of which contained the same wording (but in plural). Address quoted in this quote http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Johann_Gerhard <sic>

In fact, this is a cliché used for the Jansenist circle in Paris who are usually tagged as “the ideologists of the Jansenist group of Port-Royal.”

For example this wording can be found via googlebooks:


Second example

Peter Hobley Davison, Rolf Meyersohn, Edward Shils (eds.), *The Sociology of Literature*, (Somerset House, 1978). Available at: http://books.google.be/books?id=a5pkAAAAMAAJ&q=%22the+Jansenist+group+of+Port-Royal%22&dq=%22the+Jansenist+group+of+Port-Royal%22&hl=en&ei=V_NSTb3dFsqyhAePpaGqCQ&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=1&ved=0CCwQ6AEwAA

An article dedicated to Antoine Arnauld can be found in Britannica 1910 vol 2, p 626-627.


The fourth volume of *La perpétuité de la foi de l'Église Catholique* contains one more reference to the PD, this time by Eusèbe Renaudot (1646-1720), French theologian and Orientalist. Renaudot discusses the volume of Patriarch Dositheos, published in 1672 in Paris, and the differences introduced by the patriarch in the second edition of the same book published in Bucharest (1690). Renaudot emphasizes that this is an edition sponsored by an Orthodox ruler, carried out by Greeks, and accepted without reservation in its natural milieu. Renaudot retells the account of Patriarch Dositheos in the PD in connection with Berengar, quoted in an earlier section of this study. His full account is provided in the Appendix.

**Richard Simon (1638-1712)**

The last reference which will be given here on Eucharistic matters comes from the French biblical scholar Richard Simon. He shows scholarly interest in the works of Euthymius Zigabenus, quoting the Latin edition on the *Commentary on the Gospels* and expresses his disbelief that none of Zygabenos’ works has a printed edition in Greek!

### 8.6 Conclusions

The connection between the PD and the heresy of Berengar which is attested in the writings of the Orthodox theologians of the seventeenth century was apparently created under Western influence. The fact that the PD is the most serious source on the teaching of the Bogomils attracted the attention of the Catholic scholars to studying the anthology more closely and to tracing similarities between the teachings of the Bogomils and the Protestants.

---


302 The description “Eusèbe Renaudot French theologian and orientalist” is found in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, vol. 23, 1911, p. 96. There, the article on Renaudot does not have indication for its author because it is from the so called “unsigned articles” in *Britannica*. The edition of *Britannica*, 1910-1911 is out of copy rights and is available in several public domains, e.g., [http://www.archive.org/details/EncyclopaediaBritannica1911HQDJVU](http://www.archive.org/details/EncyclopaediaBritannica1911HQDJVU) Last consulted in January 2011.

Among the Catholic authors who connected the PD with Berengar was Roberto Bellarmino, whose account influenced the Orthodox theologians. The connection of the PD with the heresy of Berengar, however, was not an original invention of Cardinal Bellarmino. Until now I have not found with certainty who the first Western author was to begin quoting the PD in connection with the Eucharist and the Berengarian movement. However, at least it is possible to suggest which text of the PD served as a basis for this reference. It must have been the Latin edition of the PD. The earliest references to the Latin translation of the PD originate from the discussions among the English Catholic theologian Harpsfield and his Anglican opponent, John Jewel, and also the account of John Martiall. This means that they might have been referring to the edition of the Latin translation, London 1556. Soon afterwards, it was the recusant community of English Catholics in Leuven who used the Panoplia with the testimonies of Harding and Stapleton. As was demonstrated, later the PD was referred to by theologians of the Counter-Reformation and later still, in relation to the Jansenist controversies.

The references to the PD in the Catholic tradition were created as an argument against the teachings of the Protestants. However, the PD did not become involved in a discussion between both sides because the Protestants did not show any substantial interest. Apparently, when the Orthodox theologians became interested in the anthology during the seventeenth century they were not aware of the reception history of the anthology in the West. The editio princeps of the Greek text which they prepared was a synthesis of the Orthodox and Catholic traditions. Even if on the surface both sides were openly hostile to each other, in fact they were using the same texts and, in the case of the anthology of Emperor Alexios I, the same interpretations.
9 THE RECENSION OF PANOPLIA DOGMATIKE IN THE ATHONITE MS IVIRON 281

The dogmatic anthology of Euthymius Zigabenus remained most popular in the Greek tradition. It was shown in the previous section of this study that the text was continuously copied until the eighteenth century, so that over 160 Greek manuscripts are still extant.

Against this background, a mutilated manuscript of the PD from the fourteenth century would not be of the greatest interest. Nonetheless, a study of such a text can show that every manuscript, even late and fragmentary, is interesting. The manuscript in question, Iviron 281, attests a version of the Panoplia which differs both from the printed edition and all MSS that I was able to consult. While many of the patristic fragments in the MS are missing, this Athonite MS contains scholia.

The existence of scholia which became attached to the Corpus of the PD attracted the attention of Friedrich Christian Mattäi as early as the end of the eighteenth century. Having consulted the copies of the PD in Russia, he speaks of a PD manuscript with many omissions of Patristic fragments but also additions curiosius tractanda a futuro editore. In this section of the dissertation I will treat another curiosius tractandus manuscript which contains scholia.

Iviron 281 is described in the catalogue of Lampros, where it is identified as a copy of the PD; it has not been studied in further detail until now. It deserves attention as a small contribution to the transmission history of the anthology. What follows is a description of this MS, a discussion of the provenance of the scholia and a presentation of a sample of these scholia, which, as far as I can judge, will be their editio princeps.

304 PG 130, 13. Also in: Euthymius Zigabenus, Commentarius in quatuor evangelia graecae et latinae/Textum graecum...ad fidem duorum codicum...diligenter recensuit et repetita versione latina Jo. Hentenii suis adiectis animadversionis edidit Christ. Frid. Matthäi (Berlin and London: Asher, 1845).
305 Spiridon Lampros, Κατάλογος τῶν ἐν ταῖς τοῦ Ἁγίου Ὄρους Ἑλληνικῶν Κωδίκων, vol. 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1900), 70.
9.6 Description of Iviron 281

Lampros describes the manuscript as a mutilated “theological book of an unknown author which contains diverse views and excerpts from the Fathers.” After consulting the whole manuscript, I can provide the following description of the contents:


Ἐκ τοῦ περὶ θεολογίας λόγου. Θεόν νοῆσαι μὲν χαλεπόν, φάναι δὲ ἀδύνατον· ὡς τις παρ᾿ Ἑλλησὶ θεολόγων ἐφιλοσοφίσειν, σῶκ ἀτέχνως, ἕμοι δοκεῖν [Greg. Naz., De theologia (Orat. 28) 4, 1, f. 1r]

Chapter 5: Περὶ θεωνυμίας· τοῦ Ἀρεοπαγίτου, ἐκ τοῦ λόγου περὶ θείων ὀνομάτων [f. 10r]

Chapter 6: Περὶ τῆς θείας δημιουργίας, τοῦ μεγάλου Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου· ἐκ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ εἰς τὰ γενέθλια τοῦ Χριστοῦ [f. 14r]

Chapter 7: Τοῦ Ἀρεοπαγίτου· ἐκ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ περὶ θείων ὀνομάτων [f. 24v]

Chapter 8: Κατὰ Εβραίων· Ἐκ τῆς λεγομένης εἶναι τοῦ Νύσσης βίβλου τῆς προσαγορευμένης Θεογνωσίας τὰ ψυχοτομικῶν κεφάλαια μέχρι τῶν Χρυσοστομικῶν. Τὸ μέντοι πέμπτον τούτων τοῦ μεγάλου Βασιλείου ἐστίν [f. 51v]

Chapter 9: Κατὰ Σίμωνος τοῦ Σαμαρέας, καὶ Μαρκίωνος τοῦ Ποντικοῦ, καὶ τῶν Μανιχαίων [f. 67v]

Chapter 10: Κατὰ Σαβελλιανῶν τοῦ Ἁγίου Κυρίλλου [f. 76v]

Chapter 11: Κατὰ Αρειανῶν τοῦ μεγάλου Αθανασίου [f. 77v]
Chapter 12: Κατὰ Πνευματομάχων, τοῦ μεγάλου Βασιλείου έκ τοῦ πρός
Αμφιλόχιον τοῦ Ἰκονίου περὶ τοῦ ἀγίου Πνεύματος κεφαλαίων· κεφάλαια θ [f. 130r]

The end of the chapter is mutilated.

Desinit: αἱ μὲν πρῶται συζυγίαι τοιαῦται καὶ οὕτως ἔχουσι, τίνα δὲ, οὔτε ἐστίν, οὔτε λέγεται πονηρόν, τὸ θεῖον ἡ σφαῖρα τετράγονος· τὸ παρελθὸν ἐνέστηκεν, οὗ σύνθετον ὁ ἄνθρωπος (Greg. Naz., De spiritu sancto [Orat. 31], 23, 11-16)

The above data permit the identification of this anonymous fragment: it is from a version of the Panoplia Dogmatica of Euthymius Zigadenus. The Iviron fragment begins at PG 130, 157 A11 and ends at 837 B12. However, it does not contain the same text as the edited Panoplia. It contains both less and more. Many of the edited texts are missing in the fragment, while the text is different in many respects. The text edited by Metrophanes contains some variants compared to the Iviron fragment (or vice versa), but the main difference is that the edited text does not contain the scholia.

9.7 Codicological and palaeographic description

Lampros’ catalogue indicates that the manuscript dates from the fourteenth century. There is no sound reason to contest this proposed dating; however, it could be extended to between the thirteenth and fourteenth century. The manuscript does not have watermarks and is written on bombicine paper.

The quires, indicated in the upper right margin, show that five quires are missing from the beginning of the MS (that is, 40 pages). The numbering is the following: stigma om. f. 8v; ζ f. 15v; η f. 23v; ι f. 31v; τ f. 39v; ϊα f. 47v; there is no numbering iβ on page 55v, the
numbering of τγ is on f. 63v.; the numberings from 15-18 are on f. 79v, f. 87v, f. 95v, f. 103v, the numberings of quires 21-25 are on ff. 127v and 159v.

The pages are 310 x 235 mm; the written text occupies 225 x 76 mm. Each folio has 29 lines, except for the folia that have only 28 lines because of the decorative stripes between two chapters.

Despite archaising tendencies, the script has the characteristics of the style that Herbert Hunger called “die Fettaugenmode,” and which clearly points to the indicated dating. All the pages are probably written by one hand. The punctuation consists only of superior dots, commas, and signs for the end of each paragraph. The paragraphs themselves are not separated by any spacing. The main text and the scholia that follow them are marked by marginal signs. In the main text, the word to which each scholion refers is indicated by a different sign. Only the scholia in the last part of the MS are numbered.

Written in a Fettaugen style, the letters vary in size – some are enlarged, while others remain small. Among the Fettaugen elements are letters with elongated tails – the chis, kappas and the xis. Although not systematically, the betas, rhos, and omegas have rounded bows; the ypsilons are regularly elongated as well. Because of the archaising tendencies, ligatures are little used – among the few are those of epsilon-xi (ex) and epsilon-rho. Καὶ is in most cases written fully. Nomina sacra are presented in abbreviations. The text is written neatly and the scribe made corrections several times. Decoration of modest quality consists of decorative stripes between two chapters finishing with human hand (f. 10r, f. 51v, f. 67v, f. 77v, f. 130r), a bird-like creature (f. 77v), or a simply decorated initial letter (f. 7r, f. 13v, f. 23v, f. 67v). Page 123v is left blank and several notes are written on it. The scribe has left a note on the upper part of the page that he has forgotten and omitted the blank page --

---

ἐλαθόθημεν καὶ ἐπαρεδιάβημεν τὸ καταβατὸν τούτον. At the bottom of the folio the same note of the scribe was copied by another hand.

The remaining two notes are not written by the main scribe. In presenting them, I keep the orthographical peculiarities of the scribe:

1) Χριστῷ φέρουσιν αἱ μαθήτριαι μύρων.

Έγω δὲ ταύτες εἴμινων ὡς δόρων φέρω.

These are the στίχοι that precede the Synaxarium read in the morning service on the Sunday of the Myrophores (the second Sunday after Easter)

2) θεωρία γάρ φησιν ἀχαλίνωτος τάχα ἄν καὶ κατὰ κρημνῶν ὡσις:

This is a fragment from Gregory Nazianzen, *In Sancta Lumina*, PG 36, col. 334)

There are two other small notes which are not legible.

9.8 Omission of Patristic fragments

Compared to the text of Metrophanes, the major omissions of Patristic fragments in Iviron 281 are the following:

Chapter 6
f. 24 v. the last fragment in the chapter, authored by Maximus the Confessor is missing

Ὁ μὲν τοῦ ἁπλῶς εἶναι τρόπος (PG 130, 208 B)

Chapter 7
f. 27v. two fragments from Dionysios Areopagite missing

Η δὲ τῆς θεαρχικής ἀγαθότητος (PG 130, 209 C and D)
Ανανεύσω δὲ καὶ πρὸς τὰς υπερτάτας...

f. 41r. missing fragment from Maximus the Confessor

Οἱ ἕξ ἄρχης αὐτόπται καὶ υπηρέται γενόμενοι (PG 130, 229 A – 232 A)

f. 42r. missing text from Maximus the Confessor
Ὡς δίκαιος ὁ Χριστός (PG 130, D 232)

f. 48v. fragment missing in PG 130, 248 C
unidentified author – Εἴπερ ὁ ἥλιος σῶμα φθαρθέν ὃν

Chapter 8
The chapter in the Iviron MS is copied as far as the fragment of Leontios of Cypros Δεῖξόν μοι, φησί, τὰ σημεία τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παρουσίας
The MS omits fragments that follow – PG 130, 296 A – 305 C

Chapter 9
f. 73v. missing fragment – PG 130, 320 B - 321 A
Κἂν γὰρ Μανιχαῖος ὑπεισέλθῃ λέγων

f. 75v. several lines, which in PG 130, 325 are published as a scholion, here in Iviron 281 are presented as in corpore text.

It can be observed that most of the omissions are made at the end of each chapter. It is only chapters 11 and 12 that change the order of the number of texts and make more omissions compared to the Tîrgoviște edition. However, the most significant differences between the Iviron 281 and the printed edition are the scholia. These scholia will be treated in the next part of the study.

9.9 Fragments with scholia

The scholia are attached only to the fragments of Gregory Nazianzen’s Orations and Dionysios the Areopagite. Fragments with scholia occupy the following parts of the manuscript:

Scholia on fragments of Gregory Nazianzen

*In Theophania*, Orat. 38, : f. 14r- 22r; f. 26v.- 32v

*De filio*, Orat. 28: f. 1v – 6r

*De filio*, Orat. 29: f. 80r-91 r; f. 103v-118r

*De filio*, Orat. 30; f. 10v– 14 r; f. 100r -101 r; f. 120v-126r

*De Spiritu Sanctu*, Orat. 31: f. 154r– 165r
Scholia on fragments from Dionysios the Areopagite

*De divinis nominibus* f. 10r– 11v

*Epistula IV* f. 24v– 26v

*De divinis nominibus* f. 26v

I provide a sample which includes all the *scholia* to the fragments of the Areopagite (there are only seven) and a selection of the texts on Gregory Nazianzen -- the scholia to Oratio 38 *In Theophania* and Oratio 30 *De Filio*. The reason for my choice of these particular orations is that they represent the two types of Gregory’s orations -- Oratio 38 was from the so-called ἀναγινωσκόμενοι λόγοι which were read aloud in the Church for religious purposes, while Oratio 30 is from the theological orations which were read only as a text. In the complicated tradition of commentaries to Gregory’s Orations the two types of orations were often treated differently by different commentators. Thus, in order to provide a comprehensive overview of the type of scholia, I have chosen one from ἀναγινωσκόμενοι λόγοι and one theological oration.

---

9.10 Sources of the scholia

The scholia to Dionysios the Areopagite

The scholia in Iviron 281 attached to Pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite are not identical with the scholia traditionally appended to *Corpus Dionysiacaum*. These scholia do not seem to add any new interpretation and merely retell the text but still have a value of their own. One scholion contains a large fragment of St. Maximus’ *Ambigua ad Thomam*.

The scholia to the fragments of Gregory the Theologian

In Iviron 281, the scholia to Oratio 38 *In Theophania* are appended to this part of the oration, which is identical with another oration of Gregory – that is *In Sanctum Pascha* (Oratio 45). Part of the scholia in Iviron 281 have not yielded identification until this moment. However, a considerable number of them are based on (or share a common source with) the scholia to Oratio 45, *In Sanctum Pascha*, authored by Niketas Heracleensis, a twelfth-century scholar, teacher in the patriarchal school of Constantinople. The scholia of Niketas to the orations of Gregory the Theologian are partially edited (CPG 3027). In the printed version the scholia to Oratio 45 are available only in the Latin translation of Billius, which is re-printed in volume 127 of PG. As a basis for comparison I have used a fourteenth-century MS of Niketas – Cod. Pii Gr. 5. The comparison shows that Iviron 281 does not contain the whole commentary of Niketas but a selection of passages. Some of these passages are re-worked. In the cases when the scholia differ much from the text of Niketas, I

---

309 Bart Janssens (ed.), *Maximi Confessoris Ambigua ad Thomam una cum Epistula secunda ad eundem, Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca* 48 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002).
311 *Diui Gregorii Nazianzeni ... Opera omnia, quae quidem extant, nova translatione donata / una cum doctissimis Nicetae Serronij commentarisi in sedecim panegyricas orationes ... Adiunctum ... Nonni opusculum ... Quae omnia nunc primam latina facta sunt, Iacobi Billii Prunaei ... diligentia & labore* (Parisiis: apud Sebastianum Nivellium, 1569).
have provided both texts. Apparently, the scholia also incorporated parts of a Byzantine
dictionary to the works of Gregory of Nazianzus.\footnote{Dionysios Kalamaki, Λεξικὰ τῶν ἐπῶν Γρηγόριου τοῦ Θεολόγου μετὰ γενικῆς θεωρήσεως τῆς πατερικῆς λεξικογραφίας (Athens: Typografeion Emm. Papadaki, 1992).} The fragments of the Oratio 30, which are
being treated here, are not \textit{propria} either. The scholia contain several sentences which are
also found in the scholia of Elias Cretensis available in the very fragmented edition of this
author in PG. However, on the basis of further evidence it can be affirmed that for the major
part of this scholia the author is indeed Elias Cretensis.

Finally, a remark should be made on the combination of the manuscript of the PD and
the commentators of Gregory the Theologian. The main compiler of the PD, Euthymios
Zygadenos, was a specialist on Gregory the Theologian and compiled his own scholia on the
oration not read in the church using the scholia of the tenth century author Elias Cretensis
(CPG 3028). The manuscript which attests to this version is kept in Paris, where I intend to
go and examine the traces of this version.

\textit{Author and importance of the scholia}

The scholia which I present in this edition are not \textit{propria} in the strict sense. They
represent a re-working which was made by a (to this moment) anonymous person, who made
his own version. This anonymous man was far from being a great theologian, but was a man
with strong faith and zeal. His version has the immediacy of displaying personal interests. For
example, he liked different metaphors on the union of the two natures in Christ and for this
reason he copied several scholia on this question – the natures in Christ likened to a blazing
sword, to a soldier with full armour, to the mixture of wine and water. Furthermore, he was
interested in the mixture of different elements, also in the nature of the angels, and
Melchisedek.

This anonymous scholiast was not consistent in his paraphrasing technique. He copied
literally the passages which he liked most (several of the passages from Niketas Heracleensis
and Maximus Confessor) while in many other cases he retold his source or omitted parts. Many of the scholia to Oratio 30 include only Biblical quotations. There are two possibilities for these scholia – the quotations are taken from earlier scholia or these Biblical passages were included by the anonymous scholiast himself. This can be either proved or disproved when more studies appear on the scholia to Oratio 30.

Although not highly original, the scholia which he has composed have a certain value of their own and deserve attention. They demonstrate that it is worthwhile to do more research on the scholiasts of Gregory the Theologian.

In conclusion, the data suggests that Iviron 281 attests another recension of the Panoplia which was compiled on the basis of several manuscripts. In this case Iviron 281 is “an edition” by a copyist and man of letters who has prepared it on the basis of several sources during the Palaeologian Period. With the limited data coming from the manuscript itself and the fact that many of the scholiasts to Gregory Nazianzen remain unedited, any preliminary conclusions about the milieu and circumstances that necessitated this MS remain open for further research, which can be carried out if similar manuscripts of the PD come to light or one finds the missing parts of Iviron 281. At this stage the only thing which could be said about the author of this version is: quem sit ad auctorem referendus libellus non dixerim; divinabit alius.

9.11 On the principles of the edition.

The MS has been damaged by moisture and several portions of the text could not be read. The scholia are presented together with the text of Gregory the Theologian. The edition of the scholia follows the MS as close as possible but introduces modern punctuation as far as the scholia to Gregory are concern. Given that punctuation and sentence structure is an unsolved question to date in the case of the Dionysian Corpus, for the Dionysian texts and
scholia I have kept the punctuation (indicating pauses in reading, not punctuation in the modern sense) of the manuscript. The bold type indicates the passages of Nazianzen’s text which were repeated in the scholia. On several occasions I have provided the text of Niketas Heracleeensis as it is attested in MS Pii II 5 Gr. in order to show the paraphrasing technique of the anonymous scholiast.

The critical edition of the Areopagite\textsuperscript{313} made it possible to include in an earlier study\textsuperscript{314} an apparatus which gave insight into the relation between the Dionysian fragments in the PD, and Iviron 281 in particular, and the text as it is transmitted in the direct tradition.


κείμενον

Όντω μέν οὖν τὰ Ἀγια τῶν ἁγίων, ἢ καὶ τοῖς σεραφίμι συγκαλύπτεται, καὶ δοξάζεται τρισὶν ἁγιασμοῖς, εἰς μίαν συνιούσι κυριότητα καὶ θεότητα· ὁ καὶ ἄλλω τινὶ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν πεφιλοσόφηται κάλλιστα τε καὶ ψηλότατα.

σχόλιον

Όντω μοι θεολόγηται, καθὼς ἀποδέδωκα· ἁγία δὲ ἁγίων, ἢ ἁγία τριάς, ἢτις καὶ αὐτοὶ τοῖς παρεστῶς κύκλῳ σεραφίμ συγκαλύπτεται, τούτων ἀποκρύπτεται, μὴ δυναμένοις ἀτενίζειν διὰ τὸ ὑπερβάλλον τῆς ἐξαστραπτούσης

---


11 θεολόγηται] sic I

11–20 Όντω...θεότητα] Nik. Serr. P, f. 21v.: Όντω φησίν ἐκβεβλημένης τῆς ιουδαϊκῆς μοναρχίας καὶ τῆς ἐλληνικῆς πολυθείας εἰσάγεται ἡμῖν τὰ τῆς μιᾶς οὐσίας τρία πρόσωπα, τὰ καθ’ ύπερφυήν ἢ κατά περιοχὴν ἁγία ἁγίων ὄνομαξιμένα, μᾶλλον δὲ, ὡς αθέατα· ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν τῇ παλαίᾳ σκηνῇ, ἢ Ἰωσὴ ἐπηζέτατο, τὸ ἐνδοξότατον αὐτῆς μέρος, τὸ λεγόμενον ἁγία ἁγίων, καταπέτασμα ἐκαλύπτετο καὶ ἀπεκαλύπτετον οὖν (οὖν τοις ρέον) (ὁ) καὶ τῆς μιᾶς θεότητος τὰ τρία πρόσωπα τῇ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐκτίθεσθαι ἀστραπῆ τῆς λαμπρότητος, οίονει· τινὶ καταπέτασμα καλύπτοντα καὶ οὐδὲ αὐτοὶ θεωροῦνται τοῖς ἐξαπτερύγοις σεραφίμι ἀλλ’ ως φησίν ὁ μεγαλόφρον Ἡσιάς (sic) ταῖς μὲν δυσὶν πέραξε τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν συγκαλύπτοικν ταῖς δυσὶ δὲ τοῖς πόδας· ταῖς δὲ λοιπαῖς δυσὶν ἦπτανται καὶ κραύζουσιν ἁγίως, ἁγίος, ἁγίος Κύριος, δοξάζοντα τὴν ἁγίαν τριάδα τρισὶν ἁγιασμοῖς, συναγωμένοις· εἰς μίαν κυριότητα· ἐν γὰρ τῷ (correx, τὸ) cod. P) λέγειν ἐκ τρίτου τὸ ἁγιός τὰς τριες ὑποπτάσεις στημάνουσιν ἐν δὲ τῷ ἐπιλέγειν ἀπας τὸ Κύριος τὴν μιᾶν δηλοῦσιν θεότητα, καθά καὶ Ἀθανασίῳ τῷ μεγάλῳ πεφιλοσόφηται.

5–7 Όντω... ἁγιασμοῖς cf. Is. 6, 2–3
λαμπρότητος· δοξάζεται δέ, ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑμνεῖται·
κράζουσι τρισάκις μὲν, τὸ ἄγιον, ἀπαξ δέ, τὸ
Κύριος, ὡς δηλούσθαι διὰ τοῦ τριτοῦ μὲν
ἀγιασμοῦ τὴν πατρίδα τῶν ὑποστάσεων, διὰ τῆς
μιᾶς δὲ κυριότητος τὴν μιᾶν θεότητα.

κείμενον

Ἐπεὶ δὲ οὐκ ἦρκει τῇ ἁγαθότητι τούτῳ, τὸ
kineisθαι μόνον τῇ ἑαυτῆς θεωρία.

σχόλιον

Οἱ παλαιοὶ καὶ πρῶτοι φιλόσοφοι τρία μόνα τῇ
θείᾳ φύσει προσήησαν ὀνόματα - ἁγαθόν καὶ ἐν,
καὶ Θεός -, τάλλα πάντα κατάδεικτα κρίνοντες·
καὶ ἁγαθὸν μὲν, ὃτι ἁγαθὸν θέομεν ἐπ’ αὐτό, τῆς
ἁγαθότητος μεταλαβεῖν εἰφέμενου ἐν δὲ, ὡς
συναγωγὸν τῶν θεότητος Θεός δέ, ὡς πανταχοῦ
θέου, καὶ πάντα τῆς ἱκείας πληρῶν δυνάμεως.
Ὅταν μὲν οὖν οἱ θεολόγουντες τὸ πανταχοῦ
παρείναι τὸν δημιουργὸν δείξαι θέλωσι, τὸ Θεός
όνομα λαμβάνουσιν· ὅταν δὲ τὴν συναγωγὸν
αὐτοῦ δύναμιν παραιτάνει, τὸ ἐν εἰσφέρουσιν·
ὅταν δὲ τὴν ἐνεργεικὴν δύναμιν | ΕΤΑΙΚΑ
κριμένω τὸ ἁγαθὸν ἀποφαινόνται ..... 
αὐτοῦ ἁγαθύνειν καὶ εὐεργετεῖν πάντα ὡς πρῶτον
αἴτιον· οὐχ ἔξω οὖν ἡ ἁγαθότης τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα μὴ
συμβεβηκός εἰπόποιεθεί, ἀλλὰ Θεὼ μὲν ἐστι κατὰ
φύσιν ἀτρεπτος· τοῖς ἄλλοις δὲ, κατὰ προαίρεσιν
ἐκ φαστώνης πολλάκις ἀπολυμένη ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ
φύσιν οὖν αρετῆς τὸ θείον ὄνομας· κεινεσθαι δὲ
εἰστε, οὐχ ἀπλῶς, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἑαυτῇς θεωρίᾳ· κατὰ
γὰρ τὴν παρὰ φιλοσόφους ἐξ ἀρχῆς κίνησιν,
ἀκινητὸν τὸ θείον· ὡσὶ γὰρ γίνεται, αἰε ὠν· ὡσὶ

22–23 Ἐπεὶ ... θεωρία Greg.Nav, In Theophania, Orat. 38, 9, 1–2,
PΓ 36, 320 C (In Sanctum Pascha, Orat. 45, 5, PG 36, 628 D–629
Michael Psellus, Theologia, Opusculum 89, 35–75
30–31 θεός ... θεόν cf. Etymologicum Gudianum, p. 259, 14–15;
Athanasius, Quaestionis Aliae, PG, col. 773; Jo. Damascenus,
Expositio Fidei, 9, line 14 et alii auctores

45 ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐξ ἀρχῆς I
φθείρεται, ἀδιόν ὢν οὔτε μειούται, ἀτρεπτον ὢν· οὔτε ἀλλοιοῦται, ἀποιον ὢν· οὔτε μεταβάινει τοπικῶς, οὐδένον ὢντος κενοῦ τῆς αὐτοῦ πληρώσεως· λοιπὸν οὖν ἐνταῦθα κίνησιν ἐκάλεσε θείου τὴν πρὸς ἐαυτὸ ἐπιστροφὴν τε καὶ σύνευσιν, καὶ οίνον εἶπεν, ἐλλαμψίν τῆς τριάδος μόνης, ἐαυτὴν θεωροῦσης· τὸ δ’ οὐκ ἥρκει· καὶ τὸ ἐδεί θεοπρεπῶς ἐμμηνευτέον, οὐχ ὡς ἐνδείκτως ὢντος ἔτι τοῦ θείου, ἀλλὰ ὑπερβάλλον τῆς χρηστότητος παριστῶντος τοῦ τοιοῦτον τῶν λόγων σχήματος, καὶ δεικνύντος τὴν ἐνεργείαν, ὡς ἀναγκαίαν διὰ τὴν τοῦ ἐνεργετήσαντος ἀγαθότητα.

κείμενον

ἈΛΛ’ ἐδει χεθήναι τὸ ἁγάθον καὶ ὀδεύσαι, ὡς πλείονα εἶναι τὰ ἐνεργετούμενα.

σχόλιον

Χεθήναι διὰ τὸν ἀπειρὸν πλοῦτον τῆς ἁγαθότητος· οὐ τὴν ἁγαθότητα δὲ εἶπεν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἁγάθον· ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἁγαθότης κατὰ φύσιν ἀκίνητός ἐστι τῷ Θεῷ ἁγαθὸν δὲ νῦν ἡ ἐνεργεία ἤγουν τὸ γενέσθαι καὶ ἄλλους κοινωνοῦς τῆς τοιαύτης ἐλλάμψεως· εἰς ἐπίτασιν δὲ τῆς χύσεως ἐπίγαγε τὰ καὶ ὀδεύσαι, ὥσπερ μὴ ἀπακτὸν χύσιν οἰηθεὶν τις· ἐπεὶ δὲ λόγῳ τὸ ὀδεύειν ἔχεται πρῶτα γὰρ τάξεις καὶ δεύτεραι, καὶ καθεξῆς ἐδημιουργηθήσαν· ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ χεθήναι καὶ τὸ ὀδεῦσαι δαφύλεια ·…………… τ ἀλλήλως προσεθηκε, τὸ πλείονα ἐστὶ δὲ …… ἀλλ’ ἀπόλυτον· ἀντὶ τοῦ, πολλά.

κείμενον

---


56 παριστῶντος] παριστῶντι I  67 ἐνεργεία] εὐφρατ I
69 ἐλλάμψεως] ἐλάμψεως I
Τούτο γάρ της ἀκρας ἢν ἀγαθότητος, πρώτον μὲν ἐννοεῖ τὰς ἀγγελικὰς δυνάμεις καὶ σῴζανιν.

σχόλιον

Ὀ πατήρ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐποίησεν· οὐχ ἄγαθοτήτος, ἀλλ' ἡμών ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐν οὐρανοῦ ἡμῶν σουρανιῶν, καὶ γὰρ καὶ τὸ πάντα διὰ τοῦ ἐξ ἀυτοῦ προερχομένου φωτὸς φωτίζον, οὔτε ἢν τοῦ ἀγγέλου ὑπουργικοῦ τούτο δότα, ἀλλ' ἡμῶν ἡμῶν σουρανιῶν.

Τὰς αἰτίας πρότερον τῆς δημιουργίας εἰπὼν, οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτην ἠλθεν· ὅγα δὲ καὶ τὴν τάξιν αὐτῆς· τάξεως γὰρ τὸ πρώτον καὶ δεύτερον· ἀλλ' ἀπὸ μὲν τῶν ὑπερηφανίματον ἦσαν παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ, ὑπὸ τὰς πάντας γινώσκοντι. Τότε δ' ἐννοήσε τὰς ἀγγελικὰς δυνάμεις παραγαγείν αὐτάς, ὅτε ἔχει προέπον· τὸ δὲ καὶ σῷσανιν προσέθηκε, δηλῶν ἐνθά τὴν διατριβήν ἔχουσιν, ἢ ἐπὶ καὶ ὁ ἀνθρώπος ἀγγελος ἐστίν, ἀλλ' ἐπίγειος. Χρῆ δὲ γινώσκειν, ὅτι τῶν ἀγγέλων ὄνοματι, πολὺ μὲν καθολικῶς χρώμου καὶ τὰς τάς ἀσωμάτους δυνάμεις σημιάνθησαν, ὡς καὶ νῦν, ποτὲ δὲ μερικῶς, ἐν τάγμα, τὸ ἀγγελικών.

κείμενον

Καὶ τὸ ἐννοήμα ἔργων ἦν, λόγῳ συμπληρωμένων, καὶ Πνεύματι τελειώμενον. Καὶ οὕτως ὑπεστήσαν λαμπρότητοι δεύτεροι, λειτουργοὶ τῆς πρώτης λαμπρότητος.

σχόλιον

Μωσῆς μὲν τοῖς παχυτέροις Ἑβραίοις διαλεγόμενος, παχυτέρον εἰρήκε· καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς· γεννηθῶ τάδε καὶ τάδε, καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ δὲ Θεολόγος πρὸς τοὺς συνεπτέρους ἐκεῖνων χρυσιανοῦς τὸν λόγον ποιούμενος, οὐχ οὕτως, ἀλλὰ λεπτότερον, ὅτι ἐνενόησε, καὶ τὸ ἐννόημα, ἔργον ἦν· κα......... συνεπτήρωσε δὲ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ λόγος.... καὶ τὸ Πνεύμα τὸ ἁγίον· μία γὰρ ἐν τοῖς τρισὶ καὶ...βούλησις καὶ δύναμις καὶ ἐνέργεια· οἶμαι δὲ, τὸ δαινικὸν ἐνταῦθα μετέλαβε, τὸ τῶν λόγων νῦν οἱ οὕρανοι ἐστερεωθήσαν· καὶ τὸ πνεύματι τῶν στόματος αὐτῶν πᾶσα ἡ δύναμις αὐτῶν· τούτῳ γὰρ τὸ ὕψον ἔμφαίνει τὴν συμπληρωτικὴν τῶν τριῶν προσώπων δημιουργίαν· εἰ γὰρ καὶ τὸν υἱὸν δὲ ἔτερον λέγομεν δημιουργόν, ἀλλὰς λόγον, καὶ σοφίαν, καὶ δύναμιν. Οἱ δ' ἀγγελοὶ δευτεραὶ μὲν λαμπρότητις πρὸ....πρὸτην ἦτοι τὴν θεότητα· λαμπρότητες δὲ, τῶ ἐκεῖθεν αὐγάσεσθαι κατὰ μέθειν· πρῶτη δὲ λαμπρότης, ὅτι καὶ πρώτη φωτεινὴ φύσις, ὃς προλαβὼν εἰρήκε.

κείμενον

Εἴτε νοερὰ πνεύματα, εἴτε πῦρ οίνων άυλον καὶ ἀσωματον, εἴτε τινα φύσιν ἄλλην, ὅτι ἐγγυτᾶτω τῶν εἰρημένων, τάущας ύπολήπτεον. Βουλομαι μὲν εἰπείν, ὅτι αἰκινήτους πρὸς τὸ κακόν, καὶ μόνην ἐχώσας τὴν τού καλοῦ κίνησιν, ἄτε περὶ Θεοῦ οὕτως, καὶ τὰ πρῶτα ἐκ Θεοῦ λαμπαμένας· τὰ γὰρ ἐνταῦθα, δευτέρας ἔλλαμψεως. Πείθει δὲ με, μὴ αἰκινήτους, ἀλλὰ δυσκινήτους, καὶ ύπολαμβάνειν τάущας, καὶ λέγειν, ὁ δὲ τὴν λαμπρότητα Ἑωσφόρος, σκότος διὰ τὴν ἐπάρσιν καὶ γενόμενος, καὶ λεγόμενος, αἱ τε ύπ’ αὐτὸν ἀποστατικαί


115 ἐνταῦθα] ἐν ταύτα I 120 δημιουργο[ν] δημιο[ν] I

δυνάμεις, δημιουργοί τής κακίας τή τού καλού φυγή καὶ ἡμῖν προέστην.

σχόλιον

Απὸ τοῦ δαινίτικου ὕμτου κάνταθα ἡ ἐννοια· ὁ ποιῶν γάρ ἤθη τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ παῖ δέδογον. Καὶ νοεῖ μὲν πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν τῶν αἰσθητῶν, ἢτοι τῶν ἀνέμων· τὸ δὲ οἶνον, εἰκαστικὸν καὶ διερμηνευτικὸν, καθάπερ ἄρα καὶ τοῦ ἄνυλου ἐπεξηγητικὸν τὸ ἀόματον· τὰ πρῶτα ὃ ἐκ Θεοῦ λαμπρομένας, διὰ τὸ ἀμεσον· τὰ γὰρ ἐνταῦθα, δευτέρας ἐλλάμψεως, διὰ τὸ ἐμεσον· ἡς γὰρ μέσων τῶν ἀγγέλων ἐλλαμπρονταί οἱ ἀνθρώποι. Ἐσωφόρος δὲ ὁ σατανᾶς· εἰληφθαί δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς βίβλου Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφήτου, λέγοντος ὡς· ἐπεσα· ὡς τοῦ ὀμνου, ὁ ἐσωφόρος· οὕτως μὲν οὖν ἐκλήθη διὰ τὴν λαμπρότητα τῆς ἐλλάμψεως, διὰ τὴν ἑρασίν δὲ, στερηθείς αὐτῆς, σκότος· γέγονεν· ἐκ προαίρεσεως, κεναθεῖς τοῦ φωτίζοντος αὐτῶν φωτός· καὶ οὐ γέγονεν τούτο μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ λέγεται· σκοτίαν γὰρ αὐτὸν ὁ Ἐυαγγελιστής Ἰσαάκης προσηγόρεσε· καὶ ἢ σκοτια· γὰρ φησιν, αὐτὸ οὔ κατέλαβε. Δημιουργοί δὲ τῆς κακίας, οὕτη· ὑπόστασιν αὐτὴ δόντες κατὰ τὸν μανιχαῖκον λήχον, ἀλλὰ· ως πρώτοι ταύτα ἐνεργήσαντες· ἐπεὶ δὲ κατεχορισάντω τῷ τῆς δημιουργίας ὅνοματι, σκεψάμενος μή καὶ ἢ κακία νομισθεὶς· τεθεράπευκε τὴν ὑπόνοιαν, προσπελαγάων ὅτι τῇ τοῦ καλοῦ φυγῆ, μονονουχὶ λέγων, ὡς ἢ κακία στέρησις· ἐστίν αἵτης, καθάπερ καὶ σκότος· ἐστίν· ἢ τοῦ φωτός· ὑποχώρησις. Οὐ μόνον· το ταύτην ἐνεργήσαν· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμῖν αὐτὴν προεξήνησαν, ὡς· αντικείμενοι τῷ Ἰησοῦ· τῷ μέν γὰρ· οὔκ ἢρκει· καθάς· εἰσιταί. τὸ κινεῖσθαι· μόνον· τὴν κακίαν· ἀλλὰ· καὶ· ἐφ᾽ ἡμῖν· αὐτήν· ἐχύσαν· ἢτοι· ἐκεῖνο· μὲν· ἢ· ἄκαρας· ἀγαθότητος· τούτο· ἀκαρας· πονηρίας.


142–144· Ps. 103, 4· 152–153· Is. 14, 12· 159–160· Jo. 1, 5
έκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ λόγου

κείμενον

Οὔτω μὲν οὖν ὁ νοητός αὐτῷ, καὶ διὰ ταύτα ὑπέστη κόσμος.

σχόλιον

Οὔτω μὲν οὖν, ὅτι κατὰ τὴν πρώτην τάξιν καὶ ἐφ’ ἐνι ἐννοήματι διὰ ταύτα δὲ, ἀντὶ τοῦ “διὰ τούτο” κατὰ τοὺς ἀττικῆς, τῆς εὐκρίνειας δὲ τὸ σχῆμα, συμπληρωμάτων ὁμοῦ καὶ ἀνακεφαλαίωσιν τῶν εἰρημένων.

κείμενον

Ὡς ἐμὲ γοῦν περὶ τούτων φιλοσοφήσαι.

σχόλιον

| Ἐλλειπτικῶν τούτῳ εἰκός εἰ δυνατόν μετρίου δὲ ἡθοὺς καὶ πολιτικοῦ, καθάπερ καὶ τό, "εἶτε τὸδε, εἰτὲ τὸδε," καὶ ὅσα ἐνδοιαστικά.

κείμενον

Μικρὸς λόγῳ τὰ μεγάλα σταθμώμενον. Ἐπεῖ δὲ τὰ πρῶτα καλῶς εἰχέν αὐτῷ, δεύτερον ἐννοεῖ κόσμον ὑλικὸν καὶ ὀρθώμενον.

σχόλιον

Μετροῦντα: μετρεῖν γὰρ λέγομεν καὶ τὸ ἕξετάζειν καὶ διαγινώσκειν τῷ λόγῳ.

---

κείμενον

Καὶ οὕτως ἔστι τὸ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, καὶ τῶν ἐν μέσῳ σύστημα τε καὶ σύγκριμα.

σχόλιον

Αριστοτέλης ἐν τῷ περὶ κόσμου λόγῳ τὸν κόσμον ὑπογράφων, φησὶν κόσμος ἐστὶ σύστημα ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, καὶ τῶν ἐν τούτοις περιεχομένων φύσεων καὶ σύστημα μὲν, ὡς ἐκ τούτων συμπεπληρωμένος· ο Ἑθολόγος δὲ προσέθηκεν ὅτι καὶ σύγκριμα διὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα, ὡς μὴ μόνον ἰδίους ἔχοντα τόπους, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλας ἐπιμιγνύμεναι συγκρινόν γὰρ λέγεται καὶ τὸ μίγνυμι, καθάπερ καὶ διακρίνω τὸ διόστῳ.

κείμενον

Ἐπαινετῶν μὲν τῆς καθ’ ἐκαστὸν εὐφύειας, ἄξιοπαινετώτερον δὲ τῆς ἐξ ἀπάντων εὐαρμοστίας καὶ συμφωνίας.

σχόλιον

Φυσιολογίας τῶν αἰσθητῶν ἄφαμενος ἐπιπλέκει τοῦτοι κεφαλαίως ἐγκώμιαν, ὅτι καὶ κατὰ φύσιν ἔχει καλῶς καὶ κατὰ σχέσιν τὴν πρὸς ἐτερον. Καὶ διὰ μὲν τῆς εὐαρμοστίας ἐδειξεν ὡς οὐκ ἐναντίας ἀλλήλους ἔχουσιν, διὰ δὲ τῆς συμφωνίας, ὡς οὐ μόνον οὐκ ἐναντίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἰκείως μᾶλλον ὡς γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς λύρας ἀρμονία ἐστίν ἐκ διαφόρων μὲν χορδῶν, συμφωνοῦσα δὲ ὁμοιοί εἰς ἑνὸς θέλους ἀπαρτισμὸν, οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος κόσμου, διάφορα μὲν τὰ εἴδη, σύμφωνα δὲ πρὸς τὴν τούτου συμπλήρωσιν· πάντα γὰρ αὐτῷ κατάλληλον εὑσάγουσα χρείαν καὶ διακέκριται μὲν ταῖς τοπικαῖς θέσεις καὶ φύσειν ὡς τὰ | στοιχεῖα, συγκρίνονται δὲ ταῖς οἰκείωσει καὶ σχέσεισι.

κείμενον

Ἀλλού πρὸς ἀλλό τι καλῶς ἔχοντος, καὶ πάντων πρὸς ἀπαντα, εἰς ἑνὸς κόσμου συμπλήρωσιν, ἵνα

231–234 Ἀλλοῦ...όν Greg. Naz, In Theophania, Orat. 38, 10, 8-11, PG 36, 321 B (In Sanctum Pascha, Orat. 45, 6, PG 36, 629 C, Pppl., PG 130 , 197 D 3 – D 6)

222 συμφωνούσας] συμφωνοῦσαν I

δείξῃ, μὴ μόνον οἰκείαν ἑαυτῷ φύσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντη ἐξήνη ὑποστήσασθαι δυνατός ὁν.

σχόλιον

Τῆς μὲν γῆς πρὸς τὸ ὤδωρ καὶ τῆς ἐγγύτητος τοῦ τόπου, διὰ τὴν ἐγγύτητα τοῦ βάρους καὶ τῇ φυλίᾳ τῆς οἰκείωτητος, διὰ τὴν συγγένειαν τῆς ψυχρότητος. Τοῦ ὦδατος δὲ πρὸς τὸν αέρα καὶ τῇ ἐγγύτητῃ τοῦ τόπου, διὰ τὴν ἐγγύτητα τοῦ διαφανοῦς, καὶ τῇ φυλίᾳ τῆς οἰκείωτητος, διὰ τὴν συγγένειαν τῆς ψυχρότητος. Τοῦ δὲ αέρος πρὸς τὸ πῦρ, διὰ τῇ ἐγγύτητῃ τῆς κούφωτος καὶ τῆς οἰκείωτητῇ τῆς θερμότητος. Πῦρ δὲ νῦν λέγομεν τὸν αἰθέρα.

κείμενον

Οἰκείαι μὲν γὰρ θεότητος, αἰ νοεραὶ φύσεις, καὶ νῷ μόνῳ λητῇ· ἐξενο τῇ παντάπασιν, ὡσαὶ ὑπὸ τὴν αἰσθήσιν, καὶ τούτων αὐτῶν ἐτῖ πορφοτέρω, ὡσαὶ παντελῶς ἄψυχοι καὶ ἀκάνθητοι.

σχόλιον

Ναῦς μὲν γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς λέγεται νόες δὲ ἄγγελοι κατὰ μεθεξιν οἴ καὶ ἀυλοὶ εἰσὶ καὶ ἀσώματοι, καὶ

235

236—245 Τῆς...αἰθέρα Νικ. Σερρ. π. f. 23v. -24r.
247—250 Οἰκείαι...ἀκάνθητοι Γρ.Ναζ, In Theophania, Orat. 38, 10, 8-11, PG 36, 321 B (In Sanctum Pascha, Orat. 45, 6, PG 36, 629 C, Pnpł. PG 130, 197 D 6 – D 10)

249 αὐτῶν] αὐτῶ I

236—245 Τῆς...αἰθέρα] Νικ. Σερρ. π. f. 24r.: Τῆς μὲν γῆς πρὸς τὸ ὤδωρ - κοινὸν γὰρ ἀμφότερον τὸ βαρύ καὶ ψυχρόν -, τοῦ δὲ ὄδατος πρὸς τὸν αέρα, διαφανές γὰρ καὶ ὑγρὸν τὸ ὄδωρ, ὡσπέρ καὶ ὁ αἰρό-, τοῦ δὲ αέρος πρὸς τὸ πῦρ, εἶτον πρὸς τὸν αἰθέρα· θερμά γὰρ ἐστὶ τὰ στοιχεῖα ταύτα καὶ κούφα, καὶ πάντα δὲ τελοῦσιν ἄλληλοις εἰς τὴν τοῦ κόσμου σύστασιν, καὶ αὐτὰ δήτου δοκοῦντα ἐναντιώτατα. Τὸ γὰρ καὶ πάντων πρὸς ἀπάντα, οὕτως νοησεῖς, καθὼς ὡσπέρ ἐν γῇ οὐ μόνον τὸ ἔξων καὶ τὸ γεώδες, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ὑγρόν καὶ τὸ ἀερόδες, ἢ δὲ καὶ τὸ πῦρ, οὕτω καὶ τὸ ὑγρὸ πάντα καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ὀμοίως εὐρήσεις, καὶ καθ᾽ ἐν σῶν ἐκαστὸν καὶ ἄλλου πρὸς ἀλλοῦ καλῶς ἔχωντος.
ἀνείδειν ὑπὸ τὴν αἰσθησίαν δὲ καλεῖ πάντα τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα, ἀ καὶ ξένα πάντα Θεοῦ κατὰ τὸ μηδεμίαν ἔχειν Θεῶ ἐμφέρειν· κατὰ γὰρ τὸν λόγον τῆς κτίσεως καὶ προνοιάς οὐκ ἀπεξένωνται τοῦ Θεοῦ. Οἰκεία δὲ Θεοῦ ἡ λογικὴ φύσις καὶ νῦν μόνω ληπτῆ, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντῃ πορφωτάτῳ κειμένην τὴν ὑπὸ τὴν αἰσθησίαν δηλαδὴ πίπτουσαν καὶ μάλιστα ὅτι ἄψυχος· πάντα μὲν γὰρ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀγαθότητος μετέχει, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ἄψυχα κατὰ τὸ εἶναι μόνον, τὰ δὲ ζῶα κατὰ τὸ εἶναι καὶ κατὰ τὸ ζωῆς μετέχειν, οὔ δὲ ἄνθρωπος κατὰ ταύτα καὶ κατὰ τὸ λόγικὸν, οὔ δὲ ἄγγελος ἐτὶ μάλλον οἰκείοτέρος ἐστὶ τῷ Θεῷ, ὡς καὶ νοητός καὶ νῦν μόνω ληπτῆς.

κείμενον

Νοῦς μὲν οὐν ἢδη καὶ αἰσθησίας, οὕτως ἀπ’ ἀλλήλων διακριθέντα, τῶν ἰδίων ἡμῶν ἐντὸς εἰστήκεσαν, καὶ τὸ τοῦ δημιουργοῦ Λόγου μεγαλειόν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐφέρον, στιγμές ἐπαινεῖται τῆς μεγαλουχίας, καὶ διαφυγείοις κῆρυκες. Οὔτω δὲ ἢν κράμα εἰς ἀμφοτέρων, οὕτως τις μείζον ἐναντίων, σοφίας μείζονος γνώμῃ, καὶ τῆς περὶ τὰς φύσεις πολυτελείας οὔτε οἷς πᾶς πλούτος τῆς ἀγαθότητος | <γνώμῃς. Τοῦτο> δὴ βουληθεὶς ὁ τεχνίτης ἐπεδείκαθαί Λόγος, καὶ ἦσσον έν εἰς ἄμφοτέρων.

σχόλιον


273–274 στιγμένης...κῆρυκες cf. Ps. 18, 4-5
Νοῦν ἐνταῦθα τὸν νοητὸν κόσμον καλεῖ, καὶ αἰσθήσαντα τὸν αἰσθητὸν· καὶ φησὶν ὅτι ἀπὸ ἀλλήλων διακρίθησαν οἱ δύο οὕτω κόσμοι, τουτέστιν ἱδρυτόπως γεγονότες καὶ ἁμαρτών, τῶν ἵδων ὅρων ἐντὸς ἦσαν· ἐμείνε γὰρ ὁ νοητὸς κόσμος ἐπὶ τοῦ οἰκεῖου ὄρου, τουτέστιν ἐπὶ τοῦ εἶναι νοητὸν μόνον· καὶ αὖ πάλιν ὁ αἰσθητὸς ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκείας ἐμείνε φύσεως, μόνον ὁν ἀισθητός· ἐφέσον δὲ καὶ ἐδείκνυν ὑπὸ ἐαυτοῦ ἐκάστους τὸ μεγαλοπρεπὲς τῆς ἀγαθότητος καὶ τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ παραγαγόντος αὐτοῦ Δόξου καὶ Θεοῦ, καὶ δίᾳ τῆς κατασκευῆς ἑαυτῶν καὶ τῆς τάξεως ἀφθονίας φωναῖς τὸν δημιουργόν ἐμεγάλυνεν κατὰ τὸ ὁ ὀφθαλμοὶ διηγοῦνται ὁδὰν Ἰησοῦ, καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἐκ τῆς Σοφίας Σολομώντος· ὁ γὰρ μεγέθους καὶ καλλονῆς κτισμάτων, ἀνάλογως ὁ γενεσιουργός αὐτῶν θεωρεῖται. Οὕτως μὲν οὖν οἱ δύο κόσμοι καθ’ ἑαυτοὺς ἦσαν κεχωρισμένοι καὶ περιγεγραμμένοι, οὕτω δὲ ἦν κράμα ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων, οὔτε τις μιᾶς τῶν ἐναντίων· ἐναντία γὰρ νοῦ καὶ αἰσθήσεως, ὕλικόν καὶ αἰώλον. Εἰρήνης δὲ ἑνταῦθα τὸ μὲν κράμα διὰ τὸ παρ ’ όλον τὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου βίον ἀδιαφρέτως εἶναι τὴν


282–308 Νοῦν…οίτος] cf. Nik. Serr. P, f. 175r.: Νοῦν μὲν ἐνόμισαν ὁ Θεολόγος τὸν νοητὸν διάκοσμον, ἤγουν τοὺς ἀγάλλως αἰσθήτους δὲ τὸν αἰσθητόν τοῦτον κόσμον καὶ φησιν, ὅτι ὁ νοητὸς καὶ αἰσθητός ἐν μὲν τῷ δημιουργῷ νῦν ἦσαν· ὅτε δὲ παρεστάθησαν, τότε καὶ ἀπὸ ἀλλήλων διεκρίθησαν· τουτέστιν κεχωρισμένος ἐνδημιουργήθη καὶ ἁμαρτῶς ἀλλήλων· καὶ ἑσταντε ἐκάστους ἐπὶ τῶν ἵδων ὅρων τουτέστι τὰ νοητὰ, νοητὰ μόνον ἦσαν καὶ τὰ αἰσθητὰ αἰσθήτα, καὶ οὐκ ἐμίγνυντο ἀλλήλοις, καὶ συστηρῶς ἐκθρυστῶν διὰ τοῦ κάλλους ἑαυτῶν καὶ μεγέθους, τὴν δύναμιν καὶ τὴν σοφίαν τοῦ ποιητοῦ. Οὕτω δὲ ἦν κράμα, οὐδὲ μιᾶς τῶν ἐναντίων· ἤγουν τοῦ αἰσθητοῦ καὶ τοῦ νοητοῦ κόσμου, ἣς ἐν ἐνδημιουργῇ ὁ ἀνθρώπος ἐκ ψυχῆς νοερᾶς καὶ γηνοῦ σώματος. Λέγει δὲ κράμα ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος· ίνα μάθωμεν, ὅτι ἡ ἡμιέδεια ψυχῆ ἡνος ἰδεῖ τὸν ἀνακρινόντα τῷ σώματι μιᾶς ὑπὸ ὅτι διὰ τοῦ θανάτου χωρίζεται τοιαύτα γὰρ τὰ μιγνύμενα, ἢς κρῆθη καὶ σῖτος· δημιουργεῖ δὲ τὸν ἀνθρώπον ἑξ ἔλεος.

295 Ps. 18, 2 296–298 Sap. 13, 5
ψυχήν ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος· ἡ δὲ μίας, διὰ τὸν ἐν τῷ
θανάτῳ χωρισμὸν· τὰ γὰρ κινώμενα ἁλώηστα,
ὡς úωρ καὶ οἶνος, τὰ δὲ μιγνύμενα χωριστά, ὡς
κρύθη καὶ σῖτος. Αὐτὸ μέντοι τότε τὸ μιγῆναι τὰ
ἔναντία γνώρισμα ἐμελλεν ἔσεσθαι ἦ ἡμίονος
tοῦ Θεοῦ σοφίας, καὶ ἀπώδειζε τὸ ψ ϑ νασθαί
αὐτὸν καὶ πολυτελεῖς καὶ ποικίλας φύ·σεις
dημιουργεῖν, καὶ φανέρωσις τῆς πλουσίας αὐτοῦ
ἀγαθότητος.

κείμενον

Ἀοράτου τέ λέγω καὶ ὀρατῆς φύσεως, δημιουργεῖ
tὸν ἀνθρώπον· καὶ παρὰ μὲν τῆς ύλῆς λαβὼν τὸ
σῶμα ἤδη προὐποστάσης.

σχόλιον

Χρή γινώσκεις ὡς ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
κατασκευῆς κυρίως ἡ δημιουργία λέγεται
εἰργάσθη γὰρ οὕτως εἰς δήμον καὶ πλῆθος γένους·
αὐξάνεσθε γάρ φησὶ, καὶ πληθύνεσθε· δήμος δὲ
ἐστι πλῆθος ἀνθρώπων, ἐκ τοῦ δεδημάθησαν καὶ
ὑποτεάθαται τοῖς ἀρχούσιν, ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν ἄλλων
κτισμάτων τούτω κατάχρησις.

κείμενον

Παρ’ ἑαυτοῦ δὲ πνεύμα ἐνθείς.

σχόλιον

315–317 Ἀοράτου…προὐποστάσης Greg Naz, In Theophania,
Orat. 38, 11, 9-11, PG 36, 321 C (In Sanctum Pascha, Orat. 45, 7,
PG 36, 632 A, Pppl., PG 130, 200 A 11 – A 12) 327 Παρ…ἐνθείς
Greg Naz, In Theophania, Orat. 38, 11, 11-12, PG 36, 321 D (In
Sanctum Pascha, Orat. 45, 7, PG 36, 632 A, Pppl., PG 130, 200 A
14)

308 κρίθη] κρίθης I

322 Gen. 1, 28
Όψιν ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτοῦ ὕψος, ὡς τινὲς εἰπεῖν ἐτόλμησαν, ἀλλὰ ἐπι θώμα μὲν ἐξ ὑποκειμένης
ὑλῆς ἔλαβε - προὐπέτησε γὰρ αὐτή - τὴν δὲ ψυχήν ἐκ μὴ ὄντος ὑπέστησε θηναῦτα, διὰ τούτῳ
παρ’ έαυτοῦ εἰρήται, τουτέστι παρὰ τῆς ἐαυτοῦ 

dημιουργικῆς δυνάμεως ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος.

κείμενον

Ὡς νοερὰν ψυχήν.

σχόλιον

Δείκνυται ἐνταῦθα τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς πολυώνυμνον·
καλεῖ γὰρ αὐτὴν ὁ λόγος τῆς μοιάτης γραφῆς
καὶ πνεῦμα καὶ ψυχήν καὶ εἰκόνα Θεοῦ καὶ πνεῦμα
μὲν, ὡς τό καὶ ἐνεφώσαν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ
πνεῦμα ζωῆς· ψυχήν δὲ, ὡς τό καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ
ἀνθρώπως εἰς ψυχήν ζωᾶν εἰκόνα δὲ Θεοῦ, ὡς τό
cαὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον κατεἰκόνα Θεοῦ
ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν νοεράν δὲ προσέθηκε, διὰ τὴν
αισθητή τῆς ψυχῆς τῶν ἀλόγων ζωῶν.

336  Ως...ψυχήν Κατ.Ναζ.Πολ.Πενθ.Ορατ.38,10,12ΠΓ.36,
321 D (In Sanctum Pascha, Orat. 45, 7, PG 36, 632 A, Pnpl., PG
130, 200 A 14) 336–346 Δείκνυται...ζωῶν cf. Νικ. Σερρ. Ρ, f.
24v.-25r.

332 θηναῦτα] θηναύτα I 336 Ως] Ω

329–334  Όψιν...όντος] Νικ. Σερρ. Ρ, f. 24v.-25r. Το μὲν σῶμα ἐκ
γῆς διαπλάσας τῆς ἡδύ προὐπετάσεις παρὰ εαυτοῦ δὲ
πνεῦμα ἐνθέεις, σὺχι ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτοῦ σωφρών δηλοῖ, ὡς τινὲς
eἰπεῖν ἐτόλμησαν, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τῆς ἐαυτοῦ δημιουργικῆς
dυνάμεως· τὸ μὲν γὰρ σῶμα εἰς ὑποκειμένης ὑλῆς ἔλαβε· τὴν
dὲ ψυχήν ἀπ’ οὐδενός, ἀλλ’ ἐκ μὴ ὄντος ὑπέστησε.
338–346 Δείκνυται...ζωῶν] Νικ. Σερρ. Ρ, f. 25r. Πολυώνυμος δὲ
ἡ ψυχή λέγεται γὰρ πνεῦμα, ὡς τὸ ἐνεφώσαν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον
αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα ζωῆς, λέγεται δὲ καὶ ψυχή ἡς τὸ καὶ ἐγένετο εἰς
ψυχήν ζωᾶν καὶ εἰκόνα Θεοῦ, ὡς τὸ κατεἰκόνα Θεοῦ
ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν· δηλοὶ δὲ τὸ μὲν κατεἰκόνα, τὸ νοερὸν καὶ τὸ
αὐτεξουσιον, τὸ δὲ καθ’ ὁμοιώσιν τῆς τῆς ἁρετῆς κατὰ τὸ
dυνατὸν ὁμοιωμὸν νοεράν δὲ τὴν ψυχήν ἡ Ἡθολόγος εἶπε
πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν τῆς τῶν ἀλόγων ψυχῆς· ὡς

336 νοερὰν ψυχήν cf. Gen. 2, 7 341–342 Gen. 2, 7
342–343 Gen. 2, 7 344–345 Gen. 1, 27
κείμενον

Καὶ εἰκόνα Θεοῦ οἶδεν ὁ λόγος.

σχόλιον

Εἰκών καὶ ἐμφέρεια Θεοῦ ἦστι κατὰ τὸν Θεολόγον 350
Γρηγόριον Ἰ ὁ νοῦς τῆς ἀνθρώπου ψυχῆς, οἷος ἦν ὁ τοῦ Αδάμ, ὡσπον ὄνομασθέτει τοῖς ἀδόγας ἔως ὑπηκόοις, προφητικῶς, ὡς εἶχον φύσεως, καὶ πάντα καλῶν ὁμιλεῖ δὲ καὶ διὰ τὸ ἀόριστον πάσα γὰρ ὄφησιν ὁ νοῦς, καὶ περιγραφῶς καὶ ἀόριστος ἔν ἤμιν μένων καὶ πάντα ἐφοδεύων τάχεα φοράς καὶ ὑπεύθυν ἐπεί γὰρ ἦ εἰκὼν, πὴ μὲν έτοικε, πὴ δ᾿ ἀπεόικε τοῦ ἀρχετύπου, καὶ ὁ νοῦς, ἢ μὲν ἐστὶν ἀόριστος, έτοικε, ἢ δὲ ἐστὶν περιγραφῶς, ἀπεόικε. Κατὰ μέντοι τὸν Χρυσόστομον Ἰωάννην εἰκών Θεοῦ 360
καθ᾿ ἢν ὁ ἀνθρώπος ἐπλάσθη, τὸ ἀρχικὸν καὶ βασιλικὸν πρόσεκεται γὰρ εὐθὺς ὡς καὶ ἀρχετύπωσαν ἀρχεῖ μὲν γὰρ ὁ Θεός, ἀρχεῖ δὲ καὶ ὁ ἀνθρώπος, ἀλλ᾿ ὁ μὲν ὁμοῦ πάντων ἀρατῶν καὶ ἀρατῶν, ὁ δὲ μόνων τῶν ἐπί τῆς. Μόνος τοίνυν ὁ ἀνθρώπος εἰκών Θεοῦ κατὰ τὸ ἀρχικὸν ὡς δεδηλωται τὸ δὲ καθ᾿ ὁμοίωσιν, τινὲς μὲν τὸ αὐτὸ σημαίνειν εἰρηκασι - ταύτων γὰρ εἰκῶν καὶ ὁμοίωμα - τινὲς δὲ καὶ καθ᾿ ὁμοίωσιν ἀντὶ τοῦ, καὶ ὁμοίωσεως δύναμιν ἔχοντα πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, ἐν τῷ δύνασθαι ὁμοιοῦσθαι αὐτῷ κατὰ τὰς ἀρετὰς.

κείμενον

Οἶδον τινα κόσμον δεύτερον, ἐν μικρῷ μέγαν, ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἵστησιν.
σχόλιον

Τών ἐγκοσμίων τά μέν εἰσὶ παντελῶς ἄψυχα, ὡς τά στοιχεία, καὶ χρυσός, καὶ ἄργυρος, καὶ χαλκός, καὶ σιδήρος, καὶ λίθος, καὶ τά τουατα’ τά δὲ ἐγγὺς ἐμφυσᾶσες, ἀπερ εἰσί τά φυτά’ τά δὲ ἐμψυχα μέν, ἄλογα δέ’ τά δε καὶ ἐμψυχα καὶ λογικά. Καὶ γεγόνασι πρῶτον μέν τά ἄψυχα, εἴτα καθεξής τά ἀπαραθημηθέντα, προβαίνουσα τῆς δημιουργίας ἐπί το τελειότερον διὸ τελευταίος ὁ ἀνθρωπος γεγονὼς, κεκοιμώνθηκε τοῖς μὲν ἄψυχοις κατά τὸ σώμα, καὶ τήν ἀπὸ τῶν τεσσάρων στοιχείων κράσιν, τοῖς δὲ φυτοῖς, κατά | τά τε ταύτα, κατά τήν θρεπτικήν καὶ αὐξητικήν καὶ στερματικήν δύναμιν τοῖς δὲ ἀλόγοις, <κατα τα> ειρημένα πάντα, καὶ προσέτα κατά τήν οίνον φέγγος καὶ τήν καθ’ ὀρμήν κινήσεν καὶ τήν ὄρεξιν λέγεται κατά θυμόν καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν. Καθ’ ὀρμήν δὲ κίνησις, τό, ἀπὸ εἰς τόπον μεταβατικόν, καὶ τό κινητικόν ὅλου τοῦ σώματος, καὶ τό φανητικόν τε καὶ ἀναπνευστικόν. Διὰ τούτο τοῖνν καὶ κόσμος ὁ ἀνθρώπος, ὡς ὅλους τοῖς ἐγκοσμίοις κοινωνόν καὶ πάντων μετέχον μέγας δὲ διὰ τό ἀξίωμα τής λόγω τετυμημένης ψυχῆς, καθ’ ὁ κοινωνεὶ καὶ τῇ νοσοῖ τῶν ἀγγέλων φύσει.

Ἄλλο εἰς τό αὐτό.

σχόλιον

Κόσμος ὁ ἀνθρώπος, ὡς χαρακτήρας τινάς ἔχων τῶν δύο κόσμων. Τοῦ αἰσθητοῦ μέν, ὅτι καὶ οὕτως συνεστήκεν, ἐξ οὐρανοῦ μέν, οἴνον τῆς κεφαλῆς, ἓκ γῆς δέ, τῶν ποιῶν, ἓκ τῶν ἐν μέσῳ δέ, τῶν άλλων ποικίλων μερών καὶ μορίων καὶ ὁτι κεκόσμηται τοῖς εἰδέσι τούτων, καὶ ὁτι συγκεκριμένοι εκ τούτων τοιούτωσι γὰρ τρόποις ο εκόσμος ηπιολόγηται. Τοῦ νοητοῦ δέ, διὰ τάς νοσοῖς δυνάμεις τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τήν τούτων τάξην, καὶ τό

383–394 ὁ...ἀναπνευστικόν cf. Jo. Damascenus, Expositio Fidei, 26, 1. 71-77 et 79-80
ἀσώματον αὐτῶν καὶ ἀνείδεον. Τὸ δὲ οἶον
προσέθηκεν, ὡς ἀφ’ ἑαυτοῦ τὸν ἀνθρώπον εἰκαστικῶς οὕτω προσαγορεύσας: ἄλλον δὲ, ὡς
παρὰ τούς δύο ο μὲν γὰρ μόνον ἀόρατος, ὁ δὲ
μόνον ὀρατός, οὗτος δὲ μικτός ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἢ ἄλλον
παρὰ τὸν δεύτερον τούτον τὸν αἰσθητόν: Ἐν
μικρῷ δὲ μέγαν, ὡς ἐν μικρῷ τῷ σώματι, μέγαν
τὴν ψυχήν, διὰ τὸ ταύτης ἄξιωμα: ἢ ἐν μικρῷ τῷ
κόσμῳ διὰ τὴν ἀλογίαν, μέγαν διὰ τὸν λόγον-
νοερᾶς γὰρ ψυχῆς οὐδὲ ὁ σύμπας κόσμος
ἀντάξιος τούτον δὲ ἐν τῷ περὶ θεολογίας λόγῳ,
μικρὸν κόσμον ἐκάλεσε | ... τῆς ....... ἔχειν καὶ
ἀναλογίας πρὸς τὸν μέγαν ......... μένω. Ἰστῆσι δέ,
ἀντὶ τοῦ τίθησιν εἰς διάταν...ἀς τῶν ἀντιγράφων
ἔχουσιν, οἴον τίνα κόσμον τὸν ἁέριον ἁμείνον δὲ,
τὸ, ἄλλον εἰ δ’ ἄν καὶ δεύτερος πρὸς τὸν
αἰσθητὸν ἐν ώ διατρίβειν ἐτάχθη ἀνω γὰρ καὶ
ὑπὲρ τούτους ὁ νοητός.

κείμενον

Ἀγγελον ἄλλον, προσκυνητὴν μικτόν, ἐπόπτην
tῆς ὁράτης κτίσεως, μύστην τῆς νουμένης,
βασιλέα τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς, βασιλευόμενον ἄνωθεν,
ἐπιγειον καὶ οὐράνιον, πρόσκαιρον καὶ ἀθάνατον,
ὄρατον καὶ νουμένου, μέσον μεγέθους καὶ
ταπεινότητος τὸν αὐτόν, πνεῦμα καὶ σάρκα-
πνεύμα διὰ τὴν χάριν, σάρκα διὰ τὴν ἐπαρίσσιν,
tὸ μὲν, ἵνα μένη καὶ δοξάζῃ τὸν εὐεργέτην- τὸ δὲ, ἵνα
πάσχῃ, καὶ πάσχων ὑπομιμήσκηται καὶ
παιδεύηται τῷ μεγέθει φιλοτιμούμενος.

σχόλιον

Ὡς διὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ κατασκευῆς, ἀγγέλλοντα τὴν
tὸν Θεοῦ σοφίαν καὶ δύναμιν, ὡς λειτουργὸν καὶ
αὐτὸν - ἵνα γὰρ φησὶ μένη καὶ δοξάζῃ τὸν


434 καὶ σάρκα- in marg. τὴν τιμήν I

440–441 I Corr. 1, 24
ευεργέτην - προσκυνητήν δὲ μικτὸν ἦτο σώματος, ὡς καὶ πνεύματι προσκυνοῦντα καὶ σώματι ὁμοία δὲ τὸ προσκυνητήν εἴην τοῦ ἀγγέλου· ἀγγελικὴ γὰρ ὑπηρεσία τὸ προσκυνεῖν· διὸ καὶ μικτὸν αὐτὸν εἶπεν, ὡς οὐράνιον μὲν διὰ τὴν ψυχὴν, ἐπίγειον δὲ διὰ τὸ σῶμα· οἱ γὰρ ἀγγέλοι ἀπλοὶ καὶ ἀσύνθετοι.

κείμενον

Ζώων ἐνταῦθα οἰκονομοῦμενον, καὶ ἄλλαχον μεθιστάμενον.

σχόλιον

Πρὸς τὴν ἀθάνατον διαγωγήν, πρὸς τὸν αἰώνιον βιόν· εἰ δὲ τις εἶποι «πάς οὖν μήπω σφαλείς ὁ Αδάμ τοιοῦτος ἐπλάσθη, ζώον ἐνταῦθα οἰκονομοῦμενον, καὶ ἄλλαχον μεθιστάμενον· οὕτω γὰρ τὸν θάνατον κατεκρίθη» λέγομεν ὅτι προεγίνωσκεν ὁ Θεὸς τὴν αὐτοῦ παρακοήν, καὶ τὸν δὲ αὐτῆς ἡμετάρρυθῳ καὶ θυμιστότητος τούτῳ ἐνδημούργησε.

κείμενον

Καὶ πέρας τοῦ μυστηρίου τῇ πρὸς Θεόν νεῦσει θεοῦμενον. Εἰς τούτῳ γὰρ ἐμοὶ φέρει τὸ μέτριον φέγγος τῆς ἀληθείας.

σχόλιον

Μυστήριον ἐνταῦθα τὴν τε κατὰ τὸν παρόντα βιόν οἰκονομοῦν καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ τὸν μέλλοντα μετάστασιν ὑποληπτέον διὰ τὸ δυσεφημήνευτον·

---

τέλος γάρ τής ἐνταύθα πραγματείας καὶ τοῦ πολιτευματος ἔπαθλον, εἰγέ προς Θεόν ὁ πολιτευόμενος δι’ ἀρετῶν οἰκειώσεως ἀπονεύσειν, ἢ ἐκεὶ θέωσι: διατούτῳ γὰρ δοκιμάσσεται συνεχωρήη κατὰ τὸ αὐτεξούσιον, καὶ πολυπρόσωος πειράζεσθαι, ἵν’ εἰπ’ τούτω πόνον ἀμοιβὴ μάλλον ἢ θέωσιν· ἀλλ’ ἢ μὲν πρὸς Θεοῦ νεύσις τῆς ἐνταύθα φιλοπονίας ἔργον, ἢ δὲ θέωσι τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰώνος βραβείον.

κείμενον

Λαμπρότητα Θεοῦ καὶ ιδείν καὶ παθεῖν, ἀξίαν τοῦ καὶ συνδήσαντος, καὶ λύσαντος, καὶ αὐθίνς συνδήσωτος ψηλότερον.

σχόλιον

Ἰδεῖν μὲν διὰ μυσταγωγίας τῶν ἀπορρήτων λόγων τῆς θείας φύσεως, περὶ ἡς διδαχθήσονται πάντως οἱ κατὰ Θεόν ἐνταύθα ζήσαντες παρὰ τοῦ δεσπότου Χριστοῦ, ἀποκαλύπτοντος, ὡς ἐν ἄλλως ὁ Θεολόγος εἰρήκε, καὶ διδάσκοντος, ὥν μετοίκωσ παρεδείης: παθεῖν δὲ, διὰ τὸ λαμπρούνθηναι τὴν μὲν γὰρ ἀρετὴν ἐνεργεῖ τῆς φύσει συγκατασκαιείσαν ἐργαζόμενος, τὴν λαμπρότητα δὲ καὶ θέωσιν πάσχει μάλλον ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐνεργουντος Θεοῦ.

κείμενον

Τούτου ἔθετο μὲν ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ, ὡστὶς ποτὲ ἦν ὁ παραδείσων οὔτος, τῷ αὐτεξούσιῳ τιμήσας, ἵν’ ἦ

---

486–489 οἱ...παρεδείης cf. Greg. Naz., In Sanctum Pascha, Orat. 45, 24, PG 36, 656 A.
495–500 Τούτου...τελεωτήρον Greg. Naz., In Theophania, Orat. 38, 12, 1-5, PG 36, 324 B (In Sanctum Pascha, Orat. 45, 8, PG 36, 632 C, Pnpl., PG 130, 200 C 14 - D 4)

495 ἔθετο] ἔθεντο I
495 Τούτου...παραδείσω cf. Gen. 2, 8-15
τοῦ ἐλομένου τὸ ἀγαθὸν οὐχ ἦττον ἤ τοῦ παρασχόντος τὰ στέρματα, φυτῶν ἀθανάτων γεωργόν, θείων ἐννοιῶν ἱσως, τῶν τε ἀπλουστέρων καὶ τῶν τελεωτέρων.

σχόλιον

|………………ἀναγωγήν· εἰκὸς γάρ διπλοὺν ὑπάρχοντα τὸν ἀνθρωπον, τὸ μὲν τι αἰσθητόν, τὸ δὲ τι νοητόν, διπλοῦν ἔχειν καὶ τὸ ἐνδιαιτητήριον ἀλλὰ ὁ μὲν αἰσθητὸς παράδειγμας, δήλος ἀπὸ τῆς μοσαίκης γραφῆς· νοητός δὲ λέγοιτʼ ἂν ἡ τῆς ψυχῆς καθαρότης καὶ λαμπρότης, ἢς φυτὰ αἱ θείαι ἐννοιαι, περὶ ἄν ἰθηκησεῖται, ἃν αἱ μὲν ἀτελεότεραι, αἱ δὲ τελεώτεραι καὶ τῶν φυτῶν γάρ τὰ μὲν ἀσθενέστερα, τὰ δὲ ἰσχυρότερα· γεωργεῖν μὲν γάρ ἐκελεύσθη τῶν αἰσθητῶν παράδεισου, γεωργεῖν δὲ καὶ τῶν νοητῶν, διὰ τοῦ ἐννοεῖν περὶ ἑαυτοῦ πῶς ἐδημιουργήθη, καὶ διατὶ καὶ πῶς τὸ μὲν αἰσθητὸν αὐτῶν, τὸ δὲ νοητόν, καὶ τίνες αἱ δυνάμεις τῆς ψυχῆς, καὶ τίνες αἱ τῶν σώματος, καὶ οίκαι καὶ ὁσὶν διαφορὰν ἔχει πρὸς τὰ ἀλογα ζῶα, καὶ τὰ τοιάντα· ἀλλὰ αὐτὰ μὲν αἱ ἀπλουστέραι τῶν θείων ἐννοιῶν· αἱ τελεώτεραι δὲ, τὶς ἡ διαφορὰ τῶν ἀσωμάτων δυνάμεως, καὶ τὶς ἡ τάξις αὐτῶν, καὶ τὶς ἡ ἐνέργεια, καὶ τὶς ἡ προκοπή, καὶ τὶς ἡ τελεώσεις, καὶ ὅπως οἱ μὲν μᾶλλον, οἱ δὲ ἦττον φιλίζονται, καὶ τὰ παραπλήσια· φυτῶν δὲ ἀθανάτων εἰπε διὰ τὸ ξύλον τῆς ζωῆς, ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ παραδείσου περιπετεμένου, ὅπερ ὅσικ ἄν παρεῖχεν ἀθανασίαν, εἰ μὴ ἀθανάτον ἤν, ὡς ἐκ τῆς ἴστοριας μαθάνομεν· θείαις δὲ τὰς τοιαύτας ἐννοίας εἰπεν, ὡς εἰς Θεὸν φερούσας καὶ Θεοῦ ἐχομένας· τὸ δὲ ἱσως ἀντί τοῦ "ὡς ὑπολαμβάνω".

κείμενον

502–510 εἰκὸς…ἰσχυρότερα Νικ. Σερρ. Ρ. 26τ.

504 ἐνδιαιτήτηριον| ἐνδιαιτήτηριον I

Γυμνόν τῇ ἀπλότητι καὶ ζωῇ τῇ ἀτέχνῳ, καὶ δίχα παντὸς ἐπικαλύμματος καὶ προβλήματος. Τοιούτον γὰρ ἔπρεπεν εἶναι τὸν ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς.

σχόλιον

Τριχώς ἐξηγεῖται τὴν γυμνότητα κατὰ τὴν ἀπλότητα τῶν τρόπων· ὑστερον γὰρ ἡ διπλασία καὶ . . . . . [κατὰ] τὴν ἀτέχνον ζωὴν· ὑστερον γὰρ αἱ τέχναι, κατὰ τὸ . . . ἀναφιάστουν καὶ ἀστεγον· ὑστερον γὰρ καὶ ἀμφία καὶ στέγαι τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἐπικαλυπτοῦσι καὶ περιστέλλουσι τὸ σώμα, οἷ δὲ προβάλλονται κατὰ τῶν ἐξ ἀέρος ἐπιγινομένων, καὶ κατὰ θηρίων καὶ πολέμων.

κείμενον

Καὶ διδώσει νόμον, ὑλὴν τῷ αὐτεξουσίῳ. Ὅ δὲ νόμος ἦν ἐντολή, ὥν τὲ μεταλητεέον αὐτῷ φυτῶν, καὶ οὐ μὴ προσαπτέον.

σχόλιον

Ὑπόθεσιν τῇ αὐτεξουσιότητι, ἕνα ἑπί ταύτης ἡ ἀρετῆ φανεῖτη τῆς αὐτεξουσιότητος.


535–542 Τριχώς . . . πολέμων] Nik. Serr. P, f. 26v: Καὶ τὸ γυμνὸν εἶναι τὸν ἀνθρώπον τριχώς ἐξηγεῖται. Γυμνός γὰρ ἡ φησί κατὰ τὴν ἀπλότητα τοῦ τρόπου· οὕτως γὰρ ἡ διπλωμένη ἐπικαλύμμα καὶ πονηρία· γυμνός ἦν καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀτέχνον ζωῆν· μετὰ ταύτη γὰρ αἱ τέχναι εὑρέθησαν· γυμνὸς ἦν καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἀναφίαστον καὶ ἀστεγόν· ὑστερον γὰρ ἀμφία καὶ στέγαι ἐπενοηθῆσαν· διαφέρει δὲ ἐπικαλύμμα προβλήματος, ὅτι τὸ μὲν ἐπικαλύμμα χάριν σκέψεως ἐπινενθήτησα, ὡς τὰ ἰμάτια τὸ δὲ προβλήμα χάριν φιλακής, ὡς τὰ ὁπλα καὶ τὰ ἀμαντήρια ὀφýα.

κείμενον

Τὸ δὲ ἤν τὸ ἐξολοθρεία τῆς γνώσεως, οὔτε φυτευθὲν ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς κακῶς, οὔτε ἀπαγορευθὲν φθονοφόρως.

σχόλιον

Γνώσεως καλοῦ καὶ πονηροῦ φαγών γὰρ καὶ αἰσθήματος τῆς ἱδίας γυμνώσεως, ἐγνώ ὅτι καλὸν μὲν ἡ φυλακὴ τῆς ἐντολῆς, πονηρὸν δὲ ἡ παράβασις; δύο δὲ γνώσεως λέγομεν, τὴν τε πρὸ τῶν πραγμάτων, ἢ καὶ διακριτικὴν καλοῦμεν, καὶ τὴν ἐν τοῖς πράγμασιν, ἢ καὶ πρακτικὴν ὄνομάζομεν. Τὴν μὲν οὖν διακριτικὴν γνώσιν εἶχεν ὁ Ἀδὰμ καὶ πρὸ τῆς γεύσεως - αὐτὸς γὰρ καὶ τοῖς ἀλόγοις ζώοις καὶ τῇ γυναικὶ στοχαστικῶς ἐπέθηκε τὰ ὀνόματα; τὴν δὲ πρακτικὴν γευσάμενος προσεκτίζομεν.

κείμενον

Μὴ πεμπτῶσαν ἑκεῖ τὰς γλώσσας οἱ θεομάχοι, μὴ δὲ τὸν ὁφίν μιμεῖσθωσαν· ἀλλὰ καλὸν μὲν εὐκαίριος μεταλαμβανόμενον - θεωρία γὰρ ἦν τὸ φυτόν, ὡς ἡ ἐμὴ θεωρία, ἢς μόνος ἐπιμαίνειν ἀσφαλές τοῖς τὴν ἐξιν τελευτάτοις; οὐ καλὸν δὲ, τοῖς ἀπλουστέρους ἐτί καὶ τὴν ἐφεσιν λυχνοτέρος, ἀσπέρ οὔτε τροφὴ τελείᾳ λυπητελῆς τοῖς ἀπαλοίς ἐτί καὶ δεσμένοις γάλακτος.

σχόλιον

551–552 Τὸ...φθονοφόρως Κρ.Ναζ, In Theophania, Orat. 38, 12, 10-11, PG 36, 324 B (In Sanctum Pascha, Orat. 45, 8, PG 36, 632 C, Pppl., PG 130, 200 D 9-11) 554–564 Γνώσεως...προσεκτίζομεν Νικ. Σερ. Π, ἐν. 566–573 Μὴ...γάλακτος Κρ.Ναζ, In Theophania, Orat. 38, 12, 12-18, PG 36, 324 B-C (In Sanctum Pascha, Orat. 45, 8, PG 36, 632 C – 633 A, Pppl., PG 130, 200 D 11 - 201 A 4)

554 Γνώσεως...πονηροῦ cf. Gen 2, 9 554–555 φαγών... γυμνώσεως cf. Gen 3, 7 561–563 αὐτὸς...ὀνόματα cf. Gen. 2, 19-23 567 μὴ...μιμεῖσθωσαν cf. Gen. 3, 1-6 572–573 οὔτε... γάλακτος cf. 1 Cor. 3, 2, 1 Petr. 2, 2
...οἱ ἁμφὶ τὸν θεοστυγῆ λέγει Πορφύριον ἐλήρουν γάρ, ...κακῶς ἐφυτεύθη τὸ φυτὸν εκεῖνο, μέλλον προεξῆναι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις θάνατον· ἢ [ἐν] καλῶς πάντως φθόνορως ἀπίγορευθη, καλύσων τοῦ ἀπαγορευόντος τὴν γνώσιν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, καὶ μωρὸν εἶναι αὐτὸν βουλομένου· μὴ πεμπῆται μή ἀναδυόμενον τὸν ὄρθιν, ὅτι κακεῖνος φθόνον ἔτερον τότε τῷ Θεῷ προσήχειν, ἀπαγορεύσατε τοῦ τοιοῦτο ἔνδου τὴν βουλήν· οὐ τανάτῳ γάρ φησιν ἀποθανείσθαι· ἢδει γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ὅτι ἐν ἢ ἁ μέρα φαγίτη αὐτῶν, διανοιξθήσονται ὦνὶ ὁ φθοραλοί καὶ ἔσεσθε ὡς θεοί· γινώσκοντες καλὸν καὶ πονηρὸν λύει δὲ τὸ δυλήματον τῶν θεομάχων· 

575–580 οἱ ...βουλομένους cf. Porphyrius, Gegen die Christen, p. 67; Severianus Gabal., De Mundi Creatione, Orat VI, PG 56, 487.

575–607 οἱ ...θείας Νικ. Serr. P., f. 27v.-28r.

586 ἡμέρα] ἡμέραν I 587 ἐσεσθή] ἐσεσθαι I 589 -] πειρομένων I

575–606 οἱ ...λιθενομένους] Νικ. Serr. P., f. 27v.-28r.: ἀλλ᾽ ἐνταῦθα οἱ περὶ τὸν θεοστυγῆ Πορφύριον πειρώμενο ἐπὶ τούτῳ τῷ ἐνδού τῆς γνώσεως, ἐνι γούν ἀμαρτήματι τὸν Θεὸν ὑποβαλείν φασὶ γὰρ κατὰ τὸ δυλήματον σχῆμα, ὅτι τὸ φυτὸν ἐκεῖνο ἡ κακῶς ἐφυτεύθη, προεξῆνει μέλλον τοῖς ἀνθρώποις θάνατον, ἢ, ἐὰν καλῶς ἐφυτεύθη, πάντως φθόνορως ἀπίγορευθη, φθονούντοι τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τῆς γνώσεως καὶ μωροῖς αὐτοῖς εἶναι βουλομένους. Λοιπὸν οὖν ὁ Θεολόγος τὴν τοιαύτην αντίθεσιν, μη πεμπῆται φησίν οἱ θεομάχοι τὰς γλώσσας ἐπὶ τὸ φυτὸν, μὴδὲ τὸν ὄρθιν μιμείσθωσαν, ἐπειδὴ κακείνους φθονεῖν ἐρή τὸν Θεόν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τῆς γνώσεως καὶ τῆς θεόστερος· οὔτε γὰρ κακῶς ἐφυτεύθη τὸ φυτὸν, οὔτε διὰ φθόνον ἀπίγορευθη, ἀλλὰ καλὸν μὲν ἡ τῇ φύσει· εἰδε γὰρ φησίν οἱ Θεοὶ πάντα δοσα ἔποιησε καὶ ἱδο καλὰ λίαν -, τῇ χρῆσθε δὲ καὶ καλὸν ἢ καὶ οὐ καλὸν· καλὸν μὲν ἐν προσήκοντι καρφο μεταλαμβανόμενον, οὐ καλὸν δὲ πρὸ τοῦ οἰκείου καρφοῦ. Ως γὰρ ἐγὼ θεωρῶ καὶ κατανοῶ, ἐννοοῖ ἣν τελεοτέρα τὸ φυτὸν ἐκεῖνο καὶ γνώσει ψηφιλοτέρα, ἢς μόνος ἐπιβαίνειν ἀσφάλες τοῖς διὰ τὴν ξένην τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ὁ φησίν ὁ Ἀπόστολος, τὰ αἰσθητήρια γεγυμνασμένα ἔχουσι πρὸς διάκρισιν καλῶν καὶ κακῶν· οὐ καλὸν δὲ τοῖς ἐς νησίους καὶ ἀτελεῖαν, ἄστερον οὐδὲ στερεά τροφή τοῖς βρέφεσι θραύσει γὰρ τοὺς ἀριστεῖς ὀδόντας καὶ ἔμμοι.

584–588 Gen. 3, 4-5
άμαρτήματι τὸν θεόν ὑποβαλεῖν, λέγων ὅτι καλὸν μὲν ἦν τὸ φυτὸν τῇ φύσει, τῇ χρήσει δὲ καὶ καλὸν καὶ οὐ καλὸν· καὶ καλὸν μὲν ἐν καρφί τῷ προσήκοντι μεταλαμβανόμενον, οὐ καλὸν δὲ πρὸ τοῦ οἰκείου καρφί οἰκογοιεί δὲ καὶ τούτο, καθὼς καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων φυτῶν ἑποίησε, καὶ φησὶν ὅτι ὡς ἐγὼ τέως θεωρῶ, τουτεστὶν ἐννοεῖ, ἕννοια ἦν θεία κάκειν, αἰνιττεῖται δὲ τὴν περὶ τῆς ὑπερφυσάς φύσεως τοῦ θεοῦ, τίς ἂν εἴη καὶ πάθει ἡτὶς θεωρία τοις μὲν ἀγγυμνόστοις ἐπισφαλῆς ἐστι - θεωρία γὰρ φησίν ἀχαλίνωτος, τάχα ἄν καὶ κατὰ κρημνῶν ὁσεῖ - τοῖς δὲ διὰ πρακτικῆς καὶ θεωρητικῆς ἤδη γεγυμνασμένοις, καὶ εἰς ἐξίν ἐπιστήμης γνώσεως ἀναβεβηκόσι, μεταλητητὴ καὶ ἐσοδόμος· ἀπλοῦστεροι δὲ εἰσὶν οἱ πόροι μὲν ἐπὶ ὠντες τῆς θεωρητικῆς, εὖφιείμενοι δὲ ταύτης καὶ περὶ αὐτὴν λιχνευμένοι.

| Ἐτι περὶ τῆς θείας ἐνανθρωπήσεως, τοῦ μεγάλου Γοηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου, ἐκ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ εἰς τὰ γενέθλια τοῦ Χριστοῦ

κείμενον

Ἐπεὶ δὲ φθόνῳ διαβόλου.

σχόλιον

Φθόνῳ δὲ διαβόλου τῷ διὰ τὴν τοσαῦτην τιμήν ἄλλας τε καὶ ὅτι πληροῦν ἐμελλέν ἐν οὐρανῷ τὴν τοῦ ἀποστάτου τάξιν.

κείμενον


613–615 Φθόνῳ...τάξιν] Nik. Serr. P, f. 28r: Ἐπ' ἀφθορία μὲν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἀνθρωπόν ἑποίησε· φθόνῳ δὲ διαβόλου ἑμελέτει εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθέ· φησὶ γὰρ ὁ Σολομών ἑφθάνησε γὰρ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ διὰ τὴν τοσαῦτην τιμήν ἄλλας τε καὶ ὅτι πληροῦν ἐμελλέν ἐν οὐρανῷ τὴν τοῦ ἀποστάτου τάξιν.
Καὶ γυναικὸς ἐπηρεία, ἣν τε ἔπαθεν ὡς ἀπαλωτέρα, καὶ ἢν προσήγαγεν ὡς πιθανωτέρα· 
πεῦ τῆς ἐμῆς ἄσθενειας· ἐμὴ γὰρ ἢ τοῦ προπάτορος· τῆς μὲν ἐντολῆς ἐπελάθετο τῆς 
δοθείσης καὶ ἦττήθη τῆς πικρᾶς γεύσεως.

|σχόλιον |

Δι' ἔνος λόγου δύο παρέστησεν ἐννοίας· τὸ γὰρ 
καὶ γυναικὸς ἐπηρεία δύναται μὲν καὶ τὸ κατὰ 
γυναικὸς, δύναται δὲ καὶ τὸ παρὰ γυναικὸς· ὁ μὲν 
γὰρ ὄψις, δόξας ὀρθὰ συμβουλεύει, ἡπάτησε 
καὶ ἐναλακωτέραν τὴν γυναίκα· ἢ δὲ γυνὴ 
δόξασαι ἵνα πεῦεσθαι διὰ τὴν σχέσιν, ὅτι καὶ 
μονὴ βοήθουσα τὸν ἀνδρὶ παρὰ τὸν Θεοῦ δέδοσθο, ὅτον ἐπεί 
καὶ οὕτως ἀπατηθείσα μὲν ἐπηρεάσθη, πεῖσαι 
δὲ ἐπηρεάσετεν. Οὔ λογισμῷ δὲ χρώμενος ὁ ὄψις 
τοῦτο πεποίηκεν, ἀλλὰ κινοῦμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ 
ἐνεργοῦντος εἰς αὐτὸν δαίμονον· ἐπηρεάσθηναι δὲ 
λέγων τὴν γυναίκα καὶ τὸν ἀνδρα, κουφίζει διὰ 
τοῦτο τὸ πολὺ τῆς τούτων κατηγορίας.

κείμενον

Ομοῦ δὲ τοῦ τῆς ἐωθῆς ξύλου καὶ τοῦ παραδείσου 
καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τὴν κακίαν ἐξοριστὸς γίνεται, καὶ 
τοὺς δερματίνους ἀμφιέννυται χιτώνας, ἵσως τὴν 
παχυτέραν σάρκα καὶ θυνήθη καὶ ἀντίτυπον.

σχόλιον

Καὶ ἢς εἴχε πρὸς Θεοῦ παραφορίας· κακίαν δὲ καλεῖ 
τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, ὡς ἀντικειμένην τῇ ἀρετῆς 
ἐξοριστος δὲ, ὅτι ἐξέβαλε φησὶν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν Ἀδαμ

617–621 Καὶ…γεύσεως Greg.Naz, In Theophania, Orat. 38, 12, 
19-23, PG 36, 324 C (In Sanctum Pascha, Orat. 45, 8, PG 36, 633 A, 
Theophania, Orat. 38, 12, 22-26 PG 36, 324 C (In Sanctum Pascha, 
Orat. 45, 8, PG 36, 633 A, Pnpl., PG 130, 212, A 2-6) 

620–621 cf. Gen. 3, 6 637–638 τοῦ···γίνεται cf. Gen. 2, 9; 3, 
23-24 638–639 καὶ···χιτώνας cf. Gen. 3, 21 
644–646 ἐξέβαλε···παραδείσου Gen. 3, 24
καὶ κατώκισεν ἀπέναντι τῆς τρυφῆς τοῦ παραδείσουν τὸ μὲν οὖν ἦλων τῆς γνώσεως ἂθλον ἢν καὶ γυμναῖα τῆς αὐτεξουσιότητος: τὸ δὲ ἦλων τῆς ζωῆς, φυτὸν μὲν εἰναι κατὰ φύσιν, ἐχειν δὲ δύναμιν δωρητικὴν ἀθανασίας τοιούτων γὰρ ἑστι καὶ τὸ ἦλων τοῦ δεσποτικοῦ σταυροῦ.

κείμενον

Καὶ τούτῳ πρῶτον γινώσκει τὴν ἴδιαν αἰσχύνην καὶ ἀπὸ Θεοῦ κρύπτεται. Κερδαίνει μέντοι κανταύθα τὸν θάνατον καὶ τὸ διακοπῆται τὴν ἀμαρτίαν, ἵνα μὴ ἀθάνατον ἢ τὸ κακόν. Καὶ γίνεται φιλανθρωπία τιμωρία. Ὑστερο γὰρ πειθομαί κολάζειν Θεον. Πολλοῖς δὲ παιδευθεῖς πρότερον, ἀντὶ πολλῶν τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων, ἢν ἡ τῆς κακίας ὁία ἐβλάστησε κατὰ διαφόρους αἰτίας καὶ χρόνους.

|σχόλιον

Ἐπεὶ γὰρ γνώσεως ἦν τὸ ἦλων, πρῶτον τὴν ἐαυτῶν ἐγνωσαν γυμνωσιν ἡτις ἢν αἰσχύνη· εἴτε συνήκαν, ὅτι καλὸν μὲν ἢ φυλακῇ τῆς ἐντολῆς, πονηρὸν δὲ ἡ παράβασις· εἴτε φησιν, ἐκρύβησαν ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ Θεοῦ. Πρὸ μὲν γὰρ τῆς ἀμαρτίας, εἰς τὸν Θεον καὶ τὸν παραδείσουν ἀπασχολοῦντες τοὺς τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τοῦ σώματος ὀφθαλμοὺς, οὐκ ἠσθάνοντο τῆς γυμνώσεως· μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀμαρτίαν, ἐπιστραφέντων αὐτοῖς τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς, ὁ τοῦ συνειδότος ἐργὸν, τοῖς μὲν τοῦ σώματος, εἰδὼ τὴν γυμνωσιν, τοῖς δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς, εἰδὼν τὸ καλὸν καὶ τὸ πονηρόν. Αἰσχύνη δὲ ἦν ἡ τῶν παιδιγόνων μορίων, ἀφ’ ἒς καὶ αἰδοίᾳ κέκληνται, ἐφ’ οίς καὶ περικώματα φησιν ἔκ

652–660 Καὶ...χρόνους Χρ.Ναζ., In Theophania, Orat. 38, 12 -13, 26-3, PG 36, 324 C-325 A; In Sanctum Pascha, Orat. 45, 8-9, PG 36, 633 A -B, Plp., PG 130, 212, A 6-14] 662–682 Επεὶ...καλύπτοτοιν Nik. Serr. P. f. 30r.

652 τούτῳ| τούτῳ| 657 Θεον| 672 τοῖς] τῆς I

652–653 Καὶ...κρύπτεται cf. Gen. 3, 7-8 657 Πολλοῖς...παιδευθεῖς cf. Hebr. 12, 6 665–666 ἐκρύβησαν...Θεοῦ cf. Gen 3, 8 675–676 ἔκ...ἔρχασαν cf. Gen. 3, 7
φύλλων συκής ἔφαγαν· πλατύ γάρ καὶ στερρὸν τὸ τοιοῦτον φύλλον. Η ἀισχύνη δὲ περὶ τὰ αἴδια, ὅτι καὶ μετὰ τὴν παράβασιν πρώτη κίνησις περὶ ταῦτα γέγονεν· ὀξύτατον γάρ τὸ περὶ ταῦτα πάθος· καὶ τὰ νῆπια γὰρ πέξεως ἀρχὴν τοῦ νῦν λαμβάνοντα, αἰσχύνονται ταῦτα καὶ παντοῖς καλύπτονται. Ἀπὸ παραφρήμην δὲ μετασχημάτισεν εἰς ἐνεστῶτα τῶν λόγων, ὅτι γίνεται καὶ ἀμφιέννυται, καὶ τὰ ἔξης, τὸτε μὲν, ποικῖλλων τὸν λόγου τὴν ύφην, τοῦτο δὲ, καὶ πάθος τοῖς ἀκροαταῖς ἐνείες, ὡς τοῦ ἐνεστῶτας δοκοῦντος ὑπ’ ὅψιν ἄγειν τὰ | γεγενημένα τῷ Αδαμ δὲ τὸ πάν ἀνατιθήσων…τῶ καὶ στερεφτέρῳ τῆς γυναικὸς.

κείμενον

690

Λόγῳ, νόμῳ, προφήτηαις, εὐεργεσίαις, ἀπειλαῖς, πληγαῖς, ύδαις, ἐμπροσθοῖς, πολέμοις, νίκαις, ἔτης, σημείως εἰς οὐρανοῦ, σημείος εἰς ἄφος, εἰ γῆς, ἐκ θαλάττης, ἀνδρῶν, πόλεων, ἐθνῶν ἀνελπίστως μεταβολαῖς, ὑπ’ ὅν ἐκτριβήναι τὴν κακίαν τὸ σπουδαζόμενον ἢν. Τέλος ἱσχυροτέρου δεῖται φαρμάκῳ ἐπὶ δεινοτέροις τοῖς ἀρχωστήμασιν, ἀλληλοφονίαις, μοιχείαις, ἐπιφανίαις, ἀνδρομανίαις, τὸ πάντων ἐσχατὸν τῶν κακών καὶ πρῶτον, εἰδωλολατρείαις, καὶ τῆ χειρασθεῖς τῆς προσκυνήσεως ἀπὸ τοῦ πεποιηκότος ἐπὶ τὰ ἱερῶτα. Ταῦτα ἐπειδῆ μείζονος ἐδείτο τοῦ βοηθήματος, μείζονος καὶ τυχανύν εἶδεν· τὸ δὲ ἦν αὐτὸς ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγος, ὁ προανών, ὁ ἄριστος, ὁ ἀπερίληπτος, ὁ ἀσώματος, ὁ ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἀρχή.

σχόλιον

Λόγῳ μὲν, τῷ δι’ ὅμιλίας· αὐτῷ τῇ γὰρ τῷ πρωτοπλάστῃ καὶ πολλοῖς τοῖς εἰς αὐτοῦ


700–702 καὶ…κτίσματα cf. Rom. 1, 25
διαλεχθείς ὁ Θεὸς ἱστόρηται, τοὺς μὲν ἐλέγχων, τοῖς δὲ τὸ προκέτειν ὑποτιθέμενος. Νόμῳ δὲ, τῷ γορατῷ τῷ διὰ Μωσεῶς, προφήταις δὲ, τοῖς διὰ προφητῶν παραγγέλμασιν. Ἐπεὶ δὲ οἱ προφῆται φυλάττουσι μὲν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, τὰ θεία προστάγματα, προεμβισσάνε τὴν εὐεργεσίαν εἰς Θεοῦ, παρατρέπομένοις δὲ, κατήγγελλον ἀπειλαὶς - τούτῳ γὰρ ἔργον προφήτου - καὶ ἀμφότεροι καὶ ἐκ εὐεργεσίας μὲν ταῖς παρὰ ἐλπίδα πᾶσαν εὐτυχίας, ἐν τῇ λύσει πολυφρικίας |...<καὶ ἐν> καθαιρεῖται εὐθρὸν καὶ εἰς ἀπαλλαγῇ λιμῷ καὶ τοιοῦτων ἄλλων, ἄ πολλάκις ἐπὶ πολλῶν γεγονέναι μεμαθήκαμεν· ἀπειλαὶς δὲ καὶ πληγαῖς, ὅτι πρῶτον ἠπείλει τοὺς ἀμαρτάνουσιν ὁ Θεὸς καὶ διεμαρτύρετο, εἰτὰ μεμενήκοισιν ἀδιόρθωτοις, ἐπίγεια τάς πληγάς. Ἐπεὶ δὲ αἱ παιδεῖα πολυειδεῖς· ἀθρόας ταύτας εἰπόν, ἀνέδραμεν ἐπὶ τὰ παιδιά καὶ ὑδασὶ μὲν λέγει τοῖς κατακλυσμοῖς· ἐμπυρησμοῖς δὲ, τοῖς Σωδόμων· πολέμοις δὲ, τοῖς δι' ὅλων καὶ δι' ὅλου μέχρι τῆς ἐπιθυμίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ· νίκαις δὲ καὶ ἡ ἠτταῖς, αἷς τε κατώρθουσιν πολεμοῦντες, καὶ αἷς ἐσφαλλόντο, σημειώσεις δὲ εἰς ὄφρανον καθάπερ ἐπὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναυπ., τοῦ ἡλίου μὴ μόνον στάντος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀναποδίαντος καὶ οὕτω πάλιν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ πορείαν ἀναλαβόντος· εἰς, ἀέρος δὲ, ὡς ἐπὶ τῶν Ἀγιουπαραγόν πληγῶν, λέγω δὲ, τῆς κυνομίας καὶ τῆς χαλάζης καὶ τοῦ ψηλαφητοῦ σκότους, καὶ τοῦ ἐν ἡμέρα μὲν στῦλη τῆς νεφέλης, ἐν δὲ νυκτὶ στῦλη πυρὸς καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων· ἐκ γῆς δὲ, ὡς ἐπὶ τῶν μεταστραφέντων εἰς αἶμα ποταμών καὶ τῶν βατράχων καὶ τῶν σκιώδων καὶ τῶν φλυκτίδων καὶ τῶν τοιούτων τεραστίων· ἐκ θαλάσσης δὲ, ὡς ἐπὶ τῆς διαστάσεως τῆς ἐρυθρᾶς, ἢν ἑκατερίτης λαὸς ἀφρόχως ἐπέέλεεται. Ὡρὰ ὁπώς ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄφρανον καὶ τοῦ ἄερος ἐτήρησε τὴν τάξιν - μετα
τὸν οὕρανόν γὰρ ὁ ἄγροι, ἐτὶ δὲ τῆς γῆς καὶ τῆς θαλάττης θαύμα μετὰ τὰς ἄλλας ἐτέρας<...> …μάστιγας, ἵνα μὴ λέγωμεν... τὴν ἐρυθράν θάλασσαν, ἵδια τοῖς Ἑβραίοις γεν<ομένας> παραδοξοποιοῖς. Περὶ μεταβολῶν δὲ προθέμενος εἰπεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδικατέρων ἐπὶ τὰ κοινότερα πρόειον ἀνδρῶν μὲν, ὡς ἐτὶ τῶν Σαμψών καὶ τοῦ Δαυιδ καὶ τοῦ Σολομόντος καὶ τοῦ Ναβουχοδονώσου καὶ πολλῶν ἄλλων, πὴ μὲν εὐδοκιμησάντων, πὴ δὲ ἀτυχησάντων πόλεων δὲ, ὡς ἐτὶ τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ οὐκ ὀλιγόν ἐτέρων, αἱ μέχρι πολλοῦ δοξασθείσαι, τέλεον ἡρμωθέσαι ὑστερον ἔθνων δὲ, καθάπερ τὴν μὲν τῶν Μηδέων βασιλείαν, ἡ τῶν Ασσυρίων κατεστρεψε, τὴν δὲ τῶν Ασσυρίων, ἡ τῶν Περσῶν, κακείνην ἡ τῶν Μακεδονῶν καὶ ταύτην, ἡ τῶν Ρωμαίων. 

Δεινοτέροις δὲ εἶπεν ἀρρωστήμασιν, οὐχ ὡς μὴ οὖσι πρόετερον καὶ γεγονός δυσμεταχειρίστος εἶτα τὸ τῆς εἰδωλολατρίας ἐξήλθον ὅνομα, αὐτάν τὸν ἀλογίαν τοῦ τοιοῦτοι σεβάσματος ἔσχατον μὲν οὖν τῶν κακῶν, ὡς τελευταῖον - μετὰ γὰρ τὸν κατακλυσμὸν ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις Σεροῦχ, ἀπογόνου Νῶς, εἰδωλολατρεῖν οἱ τότε ἀνθρωποὶ ἠρέαντο - πρῶτον δὲ, ὡς χειρὸν καὶ χαλεπώτερον.

κείμενον

Τὸ ἐκ τοῦ φωτὸς φῶς, ἤ πηγὴ τῆς ζωῆς καὶ τῆς ἀθανασίας, τὸ ἐκμαγείον τοῦ ἀρχιτύπου, ἡ μὴ κινουμένη σφαγῆς, ἡ ἀπαράλλακτος εἰκών.

772–774 Τὸ... εἰκὼν Gog, Naz, In Theophania, Orat. 38, 13, 16-18, PG 36, 324 B (In sanctum Pascha, Orat. 45, 9, PG 36, 633 C)

762–753 τοῦ Σαμψών cf. Jud. 13-16 ἤτοι Δαυιδ cf. II Reg. 12, 1 - 3, 25 τοῦ Σολομόντος cf. III Reg. 11, 1-13 754 τοῦ Ναβουχοδονόσορ cf. Dan. 1, 1 - 4, 37 755 Σεροῦχ cf. Gen. 11, 20-23; Par. I, 1, 26; Le. 3, 35 Σεροῦχ cf. Gen. 11, 20-23; Par. I, 1, 26; Le. 3, 35 772 ἐκ... φῶς cf. Jo. 8, 12 ἤ... ζωῆς cf. Ps, 35, 10; Jo. 1-4; Jo. 4, 14; Αροκ. 21, 6 773 τὸ... ἀρχιτύπου cf. Hebr. 1, 3 773–774 ἢ... σφαγῆς cf. Jo. 6, 27 774 ἢ... εἰκών cf. Col. 1, 15; II Cor. 4, 4
σχόλιον

Αὐτός γὰρ φησιν ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις: Ἐγὼ εἰμὶ τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου. Πηγὴ δὲ τῆς ζωῆς, ὅτι πάλιν αὐτός φησιν Ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ἡ οδός, καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωή πηγὴ δὲ, διὰ τὸ ἀέναν, ζωή<><> δὲ, οὐ τῆς προσκαίρου μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς αἰδίου τούτου γὰρ ἐνεκεν ἡ προσθήκη | τῆς ἀθανασίας.

Ἐκμαγεῖον δὲ νῦν τὸ ἐκτύπωμα, παρά τὸ ἐκμάσειν καὶ οἴοι ἀνιμᾶσθαι τὸν τύπον τῆς μορφῆς μορφή δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς θεότητος ἡ φύσις, τουτέστιν ὁ αὐτοφυής τῷ πνεύματι. Μὴ κινούμενη δὲ σφραγίς, τὸ ἀπαραποίητον ἐκτύπωμα τοῦ πρωτοτύπου πάλιν, καὶ ἀπαράλλακτος δὲ εἰκών, ὁμοίας τοῦ πρωτοτύπου. Τὰ τρία γὰρ ταυτί κάλα τὸ ὀμούσιον Πατρός καὶ Υἱοῦ βούλονται δηλοῦν, διὸ καὶ καθεξῆς ἔκκεινται, καὶ ἐστὶ τοῦ μὲν ἐκμαγεῖον ἢ σφραγίς σαφηνειστική, ταύτης δὲ πάλιν ἡ εἰκών.

κείμενον

Ὅ τοῦ Πατρός ὅρος καὶ Λόγος ἐπὶ τὴν ἱδίαν εἰκόνα χωρεί καὶ σάρκα φορεῖ διὰ τὴν σάρκα, καὶ ψυχῆ γοερὰ διὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχὴν μίγνυται, τῷ ὁμοίῳ τὸ ὀμοῖον ἀνακαθαίρων.

σχόλιον

Ἡ εἰκών τοῦ Πατρός ἐπὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ εἰκόνα χωρεί· ἐπεὶ γὰρ εἰκόνα μὲν ἐστὶ Θεοῦ ὁ ἀνθρωπός, ἐν δὲ

---


779 ζωής] ζωή I

776–777 Jo. 8, 12 778–779 Jo. 14, 6 795 ἐπί...εἰκόνα cf. Gen. 1, 26-27; 2, 7; 9, 6
πρόσωπον τῆς θεότητος ὁ Υἱός, εἰκών ἂν εἶη καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ. Ἀλλ' οὕτως μὲν εἰκών ἀπαράλλακτος τοῦ Πατρὸς, ὁ ἀνθρώπως δὲ ὀλίγην ἔχει πρὸς θεόν τὴν ἐμφάνειαν. Χωρεῖ δὲ, ἀντὶ τοῦ ὁμοί ἐπὶ σωτηρίας εἰκόνα δὲ θεοῦ νῦν, ὦ τῇ τῆς ψυχῆς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ σῶμα νοησάμεθα, ως ἀπὸ μέρους τὸ πάν καὶ ὁ εὐαγγελισθῆς γὰρ Ἰωάννης ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐδήλωσεν, εἰπὼν Καὶ ὁ Λόγος, σάρξ ἐγένετο. Εἰτα μερίζει τὸν προσληφθέντα ἀνθρώπον εἰς σάρκα καὶ ψυχήν καὶ σάρκα μὲν φωτεινὴ διὰ τὴν σάρκα, ἵνα τῇ προσληφθείσῃ σαρκὶ τὴν ἀμαρτησοσαν σάρκα τοῦ Ἀδαμ ἀποκαθάργῃ ψυχὴν δὲ μέγνυται, ἵνα πάλιν τῇ ψυχῇ | τῆς προσληφθείσης σαρκὸς ἀποσιμήξῃ οὐκ ἐπὶ καὶ πρῶτον ἐδήλωσεν, εἰπὼν τῷ ὁμοίῳ τῷ ὁμοίῳ ἀνακαθάρσῃ. Σκόπῃ δὲ πᾶς ἐπὶ μὲν τῆς σαρκὸς φωτεινὴ εἰρηκεν, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς μέγνυται καὶ γὰρ μέγνυται μὲν ἀμέσως η θεότης τῇ ψυχῇ, διὰ τὴν τῆς εἰκόνος οἰκείωσθαι, ἢ δὲ σάρξ ἐξο περιτείθεται τῇ ψυχῇ, δικὴν περιβλήματος, καὶ μέσον μὲν θεότητος καὶ σαρκὸς ἡ ψυχὴ, μέσον δὲ ψυχῆς καὶ θεότητος οὐδέν. Διὰ τῆν ἐμῆν μὲν ψυχὴν εἰπεν, οἰκείωμενος τὰ τῆς κοινῆς φύσεως.

κείμενον

Καὶ πάντα γίνεται πλὴν τῆς ἀμαρτίας ἀνθρώπος, κυηθεῖς μὲν ἐκ τῆς παρθένου, καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σάρκα προκαθαρθεῖσθαι τῷ Πνεύματι - ἐδει γὰρ καὶ γέννησαν τιμηθήναι ὑπὸ προσθεών τοῦ Θεοῦ μετὰ τῆς προσλήψεως.

σχόλιον

Κατὰ πάντα τέλειος ἀνθρωπός η ἀμαρτία γὰρ οὐκ ἐκ φύσεως, ἀλλ' ἐκ προαγίσεως πῶς δὲ πλὴν τῆς ἀμαρτίας μόνης καὶ γὰρ ἡ σύλληψις καὶ ἡ γέννησις ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπου η μὲν γὰρ ἀσπορος, ἢ δὲ

826–830 Καὶ...προσλήψεως Gen.Naz, In Theophania, Orat. 38, 13, 21-26, PG 36, 325 B (In Sanctum Pascha, Orat. 45, 9, PG 36, 633 D, Pnpl., PG 130, 212 C 2-7)

826 γίνεται...ἀμαρτίας cf. Hebr. 4, 15 827–828 κυηθείς... Πνεύματι cf. Le. 1, 35
αφθορος, μή φθείμασα τὰς σφοδριές τῆς παρθενίας, ὅτι καὶ ἡ δίᾳ σποράς σύνηψες καὶ ἡ κατὰ ἀνθρώπον γέννησες, τῆς ἄμαρτίας εἰςι, καθά φησι Δαυιδ: Ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἐν ἀνομίας συνελήφθην καὶ ἐν ἁμαρτίαις ἐκίσσησε· με ἡ μήτηρ μουν' μετὰ γὰρ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, κινηθεὶς ἔγνω Δαμι. Εἶδαν τὴν γυναικα αὐτὸν καὶ συλλαβοῦσα ἔτεκε τὸν αῖν· καὶ ἡ μὲν ἁμαρτία, αἰτία τῆς συλλήψεως, ἢ δὲ συλλήψεις, τῆς γεννήσεως, καὶ οὔτως ἀμφω ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἦτοι παρανομιαν.

κείμενον

Ἐν ἐκ δύο τῶν ἐναντίων, σαρκός καὶ πνεύματος |, ὁν τὸ μὲν ἐθέωσε, τὸ δὲ ἐθεώθη.

σχόλιον

Ἐν πρόσωπον, ἦτοι μία ὑπόστασις· οὐδὲν δὲ ἐκεῖν διὰ καὶ «εἰς» εἰπεῖν· καὶ τοῦτο γὰρ κακείνα ἐπὶ τῆς ὑποστάσεως τάττεται. Σάρκα μὲν οὖν λέγει τὸν ἁνθρώπον συνεκδοχικῶς· δῆλον γὰρ, ὅτι σάρκα ἐμψυχωμένην ποτὲ μὲν γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ χειρονος μέρους ὁ ἁθρώπος ὀνομάζεται, ποτὲ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ κρεῖττονος, ὡς προείρηται. Πνεῦμα δὲ τὸν Θεόν· Πνεῦμα γὰρ φησιν ὁ Θεός. Αλλ᾽ ἐνταῦθα τὸν λόγον γενόμενος ὁ Θεολόγος, καὶ οἰον εἰς ἐκπληξίν ἐμπεσὼν, ἀναφορεῖ μετὰ θαύματος.

κείμενον

Ὡ τῆς καινῆς μίξεως, Ὡ τῆς παραδόξου κράσεως.

σχόλιον


839–840 Ps. 50, 7 841–842 Gen. 4, 1 857 Jo. 4, 24
Τῆς καίνης μίξεως· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ λέγεται μίξις μὲν ἐπὶ τῶν διαφορμένων καὶ ἀσυνχώτων, οἶον σῖτον καὶ κρασίς, κράσις δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀδιαφέρων καὶ συγχωμένων, οἶον οἶνου καὶ ὦδατος, οὐκ ἔχουν ἐπὶ τῆς συνδρομῆς τῶν δύο φύσεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡ μίξις ἀπλῶς εἰπεῖν - ἀπαξ, γὰρ συνελθοῦσα, ἀδιαφέρεται μεμενήκαςιν - ἡ κράσις - ἀσύνχυτα γὰρ τετήρηται καὶ καθ’ ἑαυτάς σώζονται - καὶ τήν μίξιν καὶ τήν κράσιν ἀναγκαίως παρέλαβε μετὰ προδιορισμοῦ καὶ ταύτην κακείνην τὴν μὲν γὰρ εἰτε καίνην, τὴν δὲ παράδοξον, ὥστε καὶ ὑπερφύσης ἀμφότερα καὶ γὰρ ἡ μίξις ἐνταῦθα τὸ μὲν ἀσύνχυτον ἔχει, τὸ δὲ διαφέρετον οὐκ ἔχει, καὶ ἡ κράσις δὲ τὸ μὲν αὐταῖον ἔχει, τὸ δὲ συγκεχυμένον οὐκ ἔχει.

κείμενον

Ὁ ὁν γίνεται καὶ ὁ ἀκτιστός κτίζεται.

σχόλιον

Ὁ ὁν Θεὸς γίνεται ἀνθρώπος· ἡ τὸ εὐαγγελικὸν ἐνταῦθα μετείληται ὥστε, τὸ αἱ ὁ Λόγος σάρξ ἐγένετο. Κατὰ διαφόρους δὲ τρόπους τὸ ὁν γίνεται ἡ ἐνταῦθα μὲν, ὅταν τῆς προοπάρχουσας οὐσίας διαφθαρείσης, ἔτερον ἐξ αὐτῆς γένηται, καθ’ ὅ ἐγένομεν τὸ ἄνοιχτον ἐμφανίζεται καὶ γὰρ τῆς τοῦ ὦνος, καθ’ ὅ ὄνομαν ὑπάρχει, τὸ ὄνομα εἰς τὸ εἶναι παράγεται· κατὰ τοῦτο τὸ σημαινόμενον, καὶ τὸ γάλα γίνεται τυφός, καὶ ὁ πηλός, ὀστρακὸν, καὶ ἡ ψάμμη, ἑκάστος. Κατὰ δεύτερον δὲ τρόπον, ὅταν τῆς προοπάρχουσας οὐσίας σωζομένης ἀφρέτως, προοιμικαὶ τὰ κατὰ συμβεβηκός, καθ’ ἂν οἰκομένικον τὸν ἀνδριάντα γεγενήθηκαί· σωζομένης γὰρ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ χαλκοῦ, προηγεόμενο μόρφωσις καὶ σχηματισμὸς· κατὰ τοῦτο δὲ τὸ σημαινόμενον, καὶ


879 Ex. 3, 14 882–883 Jo. 1, 14
τὸν ἀνθρώπον δίκαιον καὶ ὁσίον λέγομεν. Τρίτος δὲ τρόπος, ὅταν τῆς προκειμένης οὐσίας μενουσῆς ἀβλαβοῦσ᾿, ἀλλὰ προσληφθῇ οὐσία, καθ᾿ ὁ φαμέν ὑπλισμένον γεγονέναι τὸν στρατηγὸν ὅπερ γὰρ ἦν κατ᾿ οὐσίαν μείνας, προσέλαβεν ὅπλα. Όυτε οὐν κατὰ τὸν πρῶτον τρόπον ὁ Λόγος σαρξ ἐγένετο - οὐ γὰρ διαφθαρείσθη τῆς προὐπαρχούσης οὐσίας, ἔτερον τὶ γέγονεν ἐξ αὐτῆς· ἔμειναι γὰρ ὅπερ ἦν ὁ Λόγος -, οὕτε κατὰ τὸν δεύτερον - οὐ γὰρ ἠ προσγενομένη σάρξ συμβεβήκος, ἀλλ᾿ οὐσία - λοιπὸν οὐν κατὰ τὸν τρίτον τρόπον οἴειν τὸ ὤητον· δικὴν γὰρ στρατηγοῦ, τὴν σάρκα περιθέμενος, τὸν πολέμιον τῆς ἡμετέρας κατεσιλέμησε φύσεως. Δοκεῖ δὲ ἀναπόδοτον, τὸ προσελθὼν δὲ Θεὸς μετὰ τῆς προσλήψεως τὸ γὰρ ὥν γίνεται, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς, εἰ καὶ ἀποδόσεως ἔχουσι τάξιν, ἀλλὰ γε | τοῦ θαυματος εἰσὶν ἐξήγησις. Ἐστι τοῖσιν καὶ τοῦτο τοῦ ἐνδιαθέτου λόγου, συνεξομολογήθην τῷ περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς παθεῖ τῆς ἐκπληρητικῆς ἐκστάσεως καὶ παραφορᾶς. Ὁ ὥν δὲ γίνεται, ὁ ἀκτίστος κτίζεται, καὶ τὰ τοιαύτα, τῷ τρόπῳ λέγεται τῆς οἰκειοθέτους ἡ ἀντιδύσεως· τὰς γὰρ τοῦ κτίσματος ὁ κτιστὴς οἰκειοθείᾳ φονᾶς, ὡσπέρ πάλιν καὶ τὰς τοῦ κτίσματος τὸ κτίσμα. Ἐξαιτον δὲ τι κατανεοήκαμεν ἐνταῦθα, καὶ τῆς τοῦ διδασκαλίου σοφίας ἀξιων· ἀνω μὲν γὰρ, ἐνθα περὶ τῆς ἀπλῆς τοῦ Λόγου θεότητος ἐφιλοσόφη άπλοις ἑχρότο καὶ τοῖς νοήμασιν, οἰνον ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγος, ὁ προαίονις, ὁ ἀόρατος, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς, κάτω δὲ, ἐνθα περὶ τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ συνθέσεως διαλέγεται, συντίθησι τοῖς ονόμασι όρίματα, οἰνον ὥν γίνεται, καὶ ὁ ἀκτίστος κτίζεται, καὶ ὁ ἀχώρητος χωρεῖται· ὡσπέρ δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ συνθέσεως ὁ Θεός κρείττων τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ἐν λόγῳ ταύτης συνθήκης, τὸ όνομα κρείττον ἐστὶ τοῦ όρίματος.

κείμενον
Ὁ ἀχώρητος χωρεῖται, διὰ μέσης ψυχῆς νοερᾶς, μεσιτευούσης θεότητι καὶ σαρκὸς παχύτητι.

σχόλιον

Τὰ μὲν ἄλλα, εἰ καὶ θαυμαστά, ἀλλ’ οὖν κατὰ πρόσληψιν ὁ γὰρ ἦν μείνας, ὁ οὐκ ἦν προσέλαβε. Τὸ δὲ τὸν ἀχώρητον χωρηθῆναι, τούτο καὶ ἀποροφο καὶ ἀπόρφηθον, καὶ οὐκ ἐστιν ἔτερον εἰσεῖν ὡς ὅτι δὲ ὑπερβολὴ δυνάμεως. Λέγει δὲ καὶ τὸν τρόπον τῆς χωρήσεως, ὅτι διὰ μέσης ψυχῆς νοερᾶς ἐξο μὲν γὰρ ἦν τὸ σῶμα, ἐνδον δὲ ἡ ψυχή, ἐνδοτέρα δὲ ἡ θεότης, ἀπεριγράπτως καὶ ὑπὲρ ἡννοια, ὡστε μέση ἐκεῖνο ἡ ψυχή τῆς θεότητος καὶ τῆς σαρκὸς· οἰκεία γὰρ ἡ ψυχή Θεοῦ, καὶ διὰ τὴν εἰκόνα καὶ διὰ τὸ νοερὸν· διὰ μέσης μέντοι τῆς ψυχῆς ἡννοι καὶ τῇ σαρκὶ ἡ θεότης. Προσέθηκε δὲ τὴν παχύτητα πρὸς ἐνδειξιν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀφατοῦ συγκαταβάσεως, ὡπεις ἐννοηθήναι τῇ ὕλῃ διὰ φιλανθρωπίαν οὐκ ἀπηξώσεν.


943 διὰ μέσης| διαμέσης I 948 διὰ μέσης| διαμέσης I

938–953 Τὰ...ἀπηξώσεν] Nik. Serr. P, f. 33v.-34r.: Τὸ μὲν οὖν τὸν ὅτα γίνεσθαι, καὶ τὸν ἀκτιστὸν κτίσθαι, εἰ καὶ θαυμαστά, ἀλλ’ οὖν οὐ κατὰ μεταβολὴν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ πρόσληψιν ὁ γὰρ ἦν μείνας, ὁ οὐκ ἦν προσέλαβε. Τὸ δὲ τὸν ἀχώρητον χωρηθῆναι, τούτο καὶ ἀποροφο καὶ ἀπόρφηθον, καὶ οὐκ ἐστιν ἔτερον εἰσεῖν ὡς ὅτι δὲ ὑπερβολὴ δυνάμεως τοῦτο γέγονε καὶ καταρθώσει λέγει δὲ καὶ τὸν τρόπον τῆς χωρήσεως· ϕησὶ εὐεισέτευσε τῇ θεότητι καὶ τῇ σαρκὸς παχύτητι, τούτεστι διὰ μέσης τῆς ψυχῆς ὁ Θεός σαρκὶ συνεπλάκασε οἰκειοτέρα γὰρ ἡ ψυχὴ Θεοῦ καὶ διὰ τὴν εἰκόνα, καὶ διὰ τὸ νοερὸν, διότι καὶ ἡ θέωσις πρώτη αὐτὴ (πρώτη αὐτῆς cod.P ) ὡς αὐλα μεταδόθη, δι’ αὐτῆς δὲ καὶ τῇ σαρκὶ· οὐ γὰρ ἐνδεχόμεθα τὸ καθ’ ὑπόστασιν ἐννοεῖν, μὴ μεταλαβεῖν τὸν αὐχεμίματος τῆς θεότητος· πρὸς μέση ἐκεῖνο ἡ ψυχὴ τῆς θεότητος καὶ τῆς σαρκὸς, καὶ δ’ αὐτῆς ἡννοεῖ καὶ τῇ σαρκὶ ἡ θεότης. Τὴν δὲ παχύτητα προσέθηκε πρὸς ἐνδειξιν τῆς ἀφατοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ συγκαταβάσεως, ὡπεις ἐννοηθήναι τῇ ὕλῃ διὰ φιλανθρωπίαν οὐκ ἀπηξώσε. 1

190
κείμενον

Και ὁ πλούτιζων πτωχεύει πτωχεύει γὰρ τὴν ἐμὴν σάρκα, ἵν' ἐγὼ πλουτίζω τὴν αὐτοῦ θεότητα. Καὶ ὁ πληρόςς κενοῦται κενοῦται γὰρ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ δόξης ἐπὶ μικρόν, ἵν' ἐγὼ τῆς ἐκείνου μεταλάβω πληρώσως.

σχόλιον

Ἠ Πλούτιζων ἄλλους, αὐτὸς πτωχεύει. Πλούτον δὲ καὶ πτωχεύαν, οὐκ ἐν χρήματι λέγει, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν φύσιν· ἐπήγαγε γὰρ τὴν ἐμὴν σάρκα· ἢ μὲν γὰρ σάρξ πτωχεύει ἑστιν, ὡς δεομένη πολλών εἰς σύντασιν, ἢ θεότης δὲ πλούτους, ὡς ἀνενδεχὴς παντάπασιν, ο καὶ διὰ τῶν ἐξής ἐδήλωσε τρανότερον.

κείμενον

Τίς ὁ πλούτος τῆς ἀγαθότητος; Τί το πείρα ἐμὲ τοῦτο μυστήριον;

σχόλιον


961–967 Ὡ...τρανότερον] cf. Nik. Serr. P, f. 34v: Καί ὁ πλούτιζων ἄλλους, πτωχεύει, οὐκ ἐν χρήματι, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐμὴν σάρκα πτωχεύει μὲν γὰρ ἡ σάρξ, ὡς δεομένη πολλών εἰς σύντασιν, ἢ θεότης δὲ πλούτους, ὡς ἀνενδεχὴς παντάπασιν. Εκ δὲ τῆς πρὸς τοὺς Κορινθιοὺς δευτέρας ἐπιστολῆς ἐλαβέν ὁ ἄγιος ταῦτα τὰ ὀχήματα· ἐν εἰκήν γὰρ γέγορασεν γινόμενες τὴν χάριν τοῦ ὑμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτε δι' ἑμάς ἐπτωχεύειν πλουσίως ἄν, ἵνα ὑμεῖς τῇ ἐκείνου πτωχεύει πλουτήσητε (II Cor. 8, 9).

955 πλούτιζων cf. Rom. 10, 12; II Cor. 8, 9 957 ὁ πληρόςς cf. Col. 2, 9 | κενοῦται cf. Phil. 2, 7
Πλούτος μὲν ἡ δαφύλεια. Μυστήριον δὲ, πὰν ἀποφημητόν, ὃ χρῆ τὸν μυστήρειν τηρεῖν, καὶ μὴ ἐκφέρειν πρὸς τοὺς πολλοὺς. Τὸ αὕτο δὲ, καλεὶ καὶ πλούτον ἀγαθότητος καὶ μυστήριον, ὃ μέλλει ἐρείν, ἥγουν τὸ μεταλαμβάνον τῆς ἐμῆς σαρκός.

κείμενον

Μετέλαβον τῆς εἰκόνος, καὶ οὐκ ἐφύλαξα· μεταλαμβάνει τῆς ἐμῆς σαρκός, ἵνα καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα σῶσῃ, καὶ τὴν σάρκα ἀθανατίσῃ. Δευτέραν κοινωνεῖ κοινωνίαν, πολὺ τῆς προτέρας παραδοξοστέραν, ὡσ τότε μὲν τὸν κρείττονος μετέδωκε, νῦν δὲ μεταλαμβάνει τοῦ χείρονος.

σχόλιον

Εκοινώνησα τῷ Θεῷ τῆς εἰκόνος, περὶ ἂς διαφορὰς εἴρηται, καὶ οὐκ ἐφύλαξα ταύτῃν ἀπαραχάρακτον, ἀλλ᾿ ἀμαρτήσας ἐφέσωσα τὸν τύτον αὐτῆς. Κοινωνεῖ δὲ αὐτὸς ἐμοὶ τῆς σαρκός, ἥγουν τῆς ἐμψυχωμένης, ἵνα τὸ ἐμὸν υπότητα ἀναπληρώσας, σῶσαι τῇ τυχήσει τῆς εἰκόνα, δηλαδὴ τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀξίωμα, καὶ τὴν σάρκα ἀθανατίσῃ, διὰ τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν αὐτοῦ ἀναστάσεως. Δεῖξαι δὲ βουλόμενος ὅτι τὴν κοινωνίαν καλεῖ μεταληψιν, ἐπιφέρει ὡσ τότε μὲν τὸν κρείττονος μετέδωκε καὶ τὰ ἐξής· κρείττον μὲν πρὸς τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, τὸ μεταδοθὲν ἀρχικὸν καὶ βασιλικὸν καὶ θειὸν ἀξίωμα, χείρον δὲ πρὸς τὴν θεότητα, ἡ μεταληψθείσα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου φύσις.


986 τὸ μεταδοθέν] ὁ μεταδοθεὶς I

978 Metélabon...eikónos cf. Gen. 1, 26-27; 2, 7, 9, 6
κείμενον

Τὸ θείον, ἀκατανόμαστον καὶ τούτο δηλοῦσιν οὐχὶ λογισμοὶ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἑβραῖων οἱ σοφώτατοι καὶ οἱ παλαιότατοι ὅσον εἰκάζειν ἔδοσαν.

σχόλιον

Ὅνομα κύριον οὐκ ἔχον. Καὶ τοῦτο δηλοῦσιν οὐχὶ λογισμοὶ μόνον· συλλογιζόμεθα γὰρ ὅτι οὗ ἡ φύσις ἀνεννύητος, τούτου πάντως οὐδὲ ὅνομα ἐστὶ κύριον, δηλωτικὸν τῆς τούτου φύσεως.

κείμενον

Οἱ γὰρ χαρακτήρισιν ἱδίοις τὸ θείον τιμήσαντες, καὶ οὐδὲ γράμμασιν ἀνασχόμενοι τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἀλλὸ τι γράφεσθαι τῶν μετὰ θεόν, ὡς δέον.

σχόλιον

Τὸ γὰρ ὅνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸ «ὁ ὄν», οὐκ ἔγραφον διὰ τῶν συνήθων γραμμάτων, ἀλλὰ χαρακτήρισιν ἱδίοις, ἃ ἔκαλουν τετράγραμμα, οἷς οὐκ ἤνειχοντο γράφειν αὐτόν τε τὸν Θεόν, καὶ ἀλλὸ τι τῶν σαν μετὰ Θεόν, ἀλλὰ μόνον τὸν Θεόν, ἦτοι τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὅνομα, τὸ «ὁ ὄν», ὡς δέον τὸ θείον ἀκοινώνητον εἶναι τοῖς ἡμετέροις, ἤγγον πρὸς τὰ ἡμετέρα, καὶ μέχρι τοῦ μὴ γράφεσθαι τοῖς αὐτοῖς γράμμασι, τουτέστιν εἰς τοῦτο.

κείμενον

---

999–1000  Ἐτι... Υὐσ Pnpl., subtitulus, PG 130, 193 A 7-9
1002–1005  Τὸ... ἔδοσαν Greg, Naz., De Filio, Orat. 30, 17, 1-4 (Pnpl., PG 130, 192 A 10-12) 1012–1014  Οἱ... δέον Greg, Naz., De Filio, Orat. 30, 17, 4-6 (Pnpl., PG 130, 192 A 12-15)
1018  ἔκαλουν τετράγραμμα] ἔκαλουν τε γράμματα I
1020  τῶν] τὸν I  1021  τοῦ] τοῦ I
Ἀκοινώνητον εἶναι καὶ μέχρι τοῦτο τὸ θεῖον τοῖς ἡμετέροις, πότε ἀν δέξαστο, λυμένη φωνὴ δηλούσθαι τὴν ἄλυτον φύσιν καὶ ἰδιαίτεραν· οὔτε γὰρ ἀέρα τις ἐπενευσεν ὅλον πάσοτε, οὔτε οὕσιαν παντελῶς Θεοῦ ἢ νοὺς κεχώρηκεν, ἢ φωνὴ περιέλαβεν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐκ τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν σκιογραφούντες τὰ κατ᾽ αὐτὸν, ἀμυδρὰν τινα καὶ ἀσθενὴ καὶ ἄλλην ἀπ᾽ ἄλλου φαντασίαν συλλέγομεν.

σχόλιον

Λυμένη εἰς συλλαβὰς καὶ στοιχεία, ἢ εἰς ἁέρα σκεδασμοῦ ἄλυτος ἐς φύσις, ὡς ἀπλὴ καὶ ἀσυνθέτους· ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ οἱ ἁγγελοὶ καὶ οἱ ψυχαὶ ἄλυτοι εἰς, προσέθηκεν ὅτι καὶ ἰδιαίτερα· ἄλυτος γὰρ, ὑπὲρ πάσαν ἄλυτον φύσιν, | μηδαμὴ μηδαμὸς ὄν, ἀλλ᾽ ἰδιοτρόπως, ἀγεννητὸς καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀγεννητὸν.

κείμενον

Λόγος δὲ, ὦτος ἔχει πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα, ὡς πρὸς νοῦν λόγος, οὐ μόνον διὰ τὸ ἀπαθὲς τῆς γεννήσεως, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ συναφὲς καὶ τὸ ἔξαγγελτικὸν.

σχόλιον

Ἐπεὶ καὶ νοῦς ὁ Πατήρ λέγεται παρὰ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ Τίς ἔγναν νοῦν νρίου, ἢτοι τοῦ Υἱοῦ; Τινὲς δὲ καὶ ὁ φησιν ὁ αὐτὸς Παῦλος παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς νεοχήκασι.

κείμενον

1026–1034 Ακοινώνητον...συλλέγομεν Greg. Naz., De Filio, Orat. 30, 17, 6-13(Pnpl., PG 130, 192 A 15 - B 8)
1037–1040 ἄλυτος...φύσιν cf. Elias Cret., PG 36, 320 A
1044–1047 Λόγος...ἔξαγγελτικὸν Greg. Naz., De Filio, Orat. 30, 20, 5-7 (Pnpl., PG 130, 193 B 12 - C 1)

1030 ἡ ἢ ἡ I
1050 Rom. 11, 34; I Cor. 2, 16 (Is. 40, 13) 1051 I Cor. 2, 16
Τάχα δ’ ἂν εἰποί τις, ὅτι καὶ ὡς ὁρος πρὸς τὸ ὀρισμένον, ἑπεδῆ καὶ τοῦτο λέγεται λόγος· οὗ γάρ 
νενοθίκως φησὶ τὸν Υἱὸν· τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ, ὦ ἔωρακάς· νενόηκε τὸν Πατέρα καὶ σύντομοις ἀποδείξεις καὶ ραδία τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς φύσεως, ὦ 
Υίός· γέννημα γάρ ἀπάν τοῦ γεγεννηκότος, σωτόν λόγος. Εἰ δέ καὶ διὰ τὸ ἐνυπάρχειν τοὺς 
οὕτω λέγοι τις, οὕτω ἀμαρτήσεται τοῦ λόγου· τί γάρ 
ἐστιν ὁ μῆς λόγῳ συνεστηκε; Σοφία δέ, ὡς ἐπιστημὴ 
θείων τε καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων· πῶς γάρ 
οίον τὸν πεποιηκότα, τοὺς λόγους ἀγνοεῖν ὄν 
πεποίκε; - δύναμις δὲ, ὡς συντηρητικός τῶν 
γενομένων καὶ τῆς τοῦ συνέχεσθαι ταῦτα 
χορηγῶν δύναμιν ἀλήθεια δὲ, ὡς ἐν, οὐ ποιλά τῇ 
φώσει.

σχόλιον

Ὁ γάρ ὁρος δηλοῖ τήν φύσιν τοῦ ὑποκειμένου 
πράγματος.

κείμενον

Τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἀληθές, ἔν, τὸ δὲ ψεύδος, πολυσχίδες 
καὶ ὡς καθάρα τοῦ Πατρὸς σφραγίς, καὶ χαρακτήρ 
ἀφευδέστατος.

σχόλιον

1054–1068 Τάχα…φώσει Greg. Naz., De Filio, Orat. 30, 20, 7-20  
(Pspl., PG 130, 193 C 1 - 14) 1062–1063 ὡς…πραγμάτων 
Sextus Empiricus, Adversus Mathematicos, IX, 125, 2; Clemens 
Alex., Paedag., II, II, 25, 3, 1 et VII, XII, 70, 5, 3 ; 
Caesariensis, 
Enmaratio in prophetan Isiaian, 5, 156, p. 123, 30; Jo. Damascenus, 
Sacra Parallela, PG 96, 360 D 3-4; Ὄροι καὶ ὑπογραφαι (ed. 
Phil., Proleg. (p. 12, 4-5) 1073–1075 Τὸ…ἀφευδέστατος Greg. 
Naz., De Filio, Orat. 30, 20, 20-22 (Pspl., PG 130, 193 C 14 - D 1)

1074 καὶ ἔν] πολυσχίδες I

1056–1057 ὦ…Πατέρα cf. Jo. 14, 9 1062 Σοφία cf. I Cor. 1, 24 
1065 δύναμις cf. I Cor. 1, 24 1067 ἀλήθεια cf. Jo. 14, 16 
1075 ἀφευδέστατος cf. Hebr. 1, 3
Ὀ Σωκράτης, ἄνθρωπος. ἵδε τὸ «ἄνθρωπος», ἀλήθεια καὶ ἐν. Εἰ δ’ εἰπος «ὁ Σωκράτης, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος», ἰθέδος καὶ πολυσχιδές· τὸ γὰρ «οὐκ ἄνθρωπος», εἰς πολλὰ μερίζεται, εἰς βοῦν, ἵππον, κύνα, καὶ συντόμως εἰπεῖν εἰς ὅσα δηλοῦσιν ἄνθρωπον.

κείμενον

Εἰκὼν δὲ, ὡς ὀμοουσιον, καὶ ὅτι τοῦτο ἐκείθεν, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐκ τούτου Πατήρ. Αὕτη γὰρ εἰκόνος φύσις, μιμημα εἶναι τοῦ ἀρχετύπου, καὶ οὐ λέγεται πλὴν ὅτι καὶ πλείον ἐνταῦθα.

σχόλιον

Εἰκόνα νῦν, οὐ <τήν μιμητικήν, ἀλλὰ τήν φυσικήν λέγει, οία ἢν ο Σήθ, εἰκὼν κληθεῖς τοῦ Αδάμ· ἡ μιμητική γὰρ οὐχ ὀμοουσία. Τὸ δὲ μιμήμα εἶναι τοῦ ἀρχετύπου, τῆς μιμητικῆς εἰκόνος ἰδιον· ἔλαβε γὰρ καὶ ταύτης τὸ ἱδιον εἰς παράστασιν τοῦ ὅτι τοῦτο ἐκείθεν· τὸ γὰρ μιμημα ἐκ τινος μιμημα.

κείμενον

Εκεῖ μὲν γὰρ ἀκίνητος κινουμένου, ἐνταῦθα δὲ, ζώντος καὶ ζώσα, καὶ πλείον ἐχουσα τὸ ἀπαράλλακτον, ἢ τοῦ Αδάμ ὁ Σήθ, καὶ τοῦ γεννοντος παντός, τὸ γεννώμενον· τοιαύτη γὰρ ἢ τῶν ἀπλῶν φύσις, μὴ τῷ μὲν ἑοικέναι, τῷ δὲ ἀπεοικείναι, ἀλλ’ ὅλον ὅλου τύπων εἶναι, καὶ ταύτων μᾶλλον ἢ ἀφομοιώμα. Φῶς δὲ, ὡς λαμπρότητις ψυχῶν και λόγω καὶ βιω

---


1096 ἀκίνητος] in marg. alia manu: σχόλιον ἀμψύχος ἐμψύχω
1101 τύπων] in marg. alia manu: σχόλιον εἰκόνα

1084 Εἰκών cf. II Cor. 4, 4; Col. 1, 15 1090 ὁ...Αδάμ cf. Gen. 5, 3
καθαυρομένων· εἰ γὰρ σκότος ἡ ἀγνοία καὶ ἡ ἁμαρτία, φῶς ἀν εἰ ἡ γνώσις καὶ βίος ὁ ἐνθεός.

κείμενον

Ζωὴ δὲ ὅτι φῶς, καὶ πάσης λογικῆς φύσεως σύστασις καὶ οὐσίωσις.

σχόλιον

Τοῖς ζωῆι γὰρ ἀνείται τὸ φῶς, καὶ τῶν ζώντων ἐστι τοῦτο ἀπόλαυσις· καὶ ἄλλως δὲ· φῶς μὲν ἡ ἐλλαμψίς καὶ γνώσις, αὕτη δὲ τροφή καὶ ζωή τῶν νοερῶν φύσεων καὶ τῶν λογικῶν ψυχῶν.

κείμενον

Εν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζωῆι, καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν. Κατὰ τὴν διττὴν τοῦ ἐμφυσήματος δύναμιν, καὶ πνεῦμα ἐκεῖθεν ἐμφύσωμενοι πάντες καὶ Ἰνεὺμα ἁγιόν, ὡς κωρημοὶ, καὶ τοσοῦτον, καθόσον ἀν τὸ στόμα τῆς διανοούσας ἀνοιξιως. Δικαιοσύνη δὲ, ὅτι τοῦ πρῶς ἀξίων διαφέτης, καὶ διαίτων δικαίως τοῖς υπὸ νόμον καὶ τοῖς υπὸ χάριν ψυχῆ καὶ σώματι, ὅτε τὸ μὲν ἄρχειν, τὸ δὲ ἀρχεῖθαι, καὶ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἔχειν τὸ κρείττον κατὰ τοῦ χείρονος, ὡς ἡ τὸ χείρον επιστείπται τῷ ἐμπλήνον.

|Καὶ οὕτως ἀριστος ἡμῖν θεολόγος, οὐχ ὅς εὑρε τὸ πάν· οὐ γὰρ δέχεται τὸ πάν ὁ δεσμός, ἀλλ’ ὃς ἐὰν ἄλλων φαντασθῆ πλέον, καὶ πλείον ἐν ἑαυτῷ συναγάγῃ τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐνδαλμα ἢ ἀποσκίασμα, ἢ ὅτι καὶ ὄνομισομεν.

σχόλιον


1105 φῶς cf. Jo. 8, 12 1107 Ζωή cf. Jo. 11, 25 et 14, 6 1115 Act. 17, 28 1119 Δικαιοσύνη cf. I Cor. 1, 30
Ἡ σάρξ: αὕτη γὰρ δεσμός τῆς ψυχῆς.

κείμενον

Ὄσον δ’οὖν ἐκ τῶν ἡμῖν ἐφικτών, ὁ μὲν ὅν καὶ ὁ Θεὸς, μᾶλλον παρ’ τῆς οὐσίας οὖν μᾶλλον τὸν ὅπως θεοποιήθη χορηματίζων ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους καὶ τὴν κλήσιν ἀπαιτούμενος, ἢ τίς ποτε εἰπεῖ, τούτῳ προσεἴπεν ἑαυτὸν, ὃ ὁποῖον ἀπέσταλκε μὲ τῷ λαῷ κελεύσας εἰπεῖν, ἀλλ’ ὅτι καὶ κυριοτέραν ταύτην εὐρίσκομεν.

σχόλιον

Τὸ πώς πρόσκειται, διὰ τὸ δηλοῦν μὲν τὴν οὐσίαν, ἢγουν τὸ εἶναι τὸν Θεόν, οὔ μὴν δὲ τὸ τί ἐστι.

κείμενον

Ἡ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ Θεοῦ, κἂν ἀπὸ τοῦ θέειν ἢ αἰθεῖν ἡτυμολογήται τοῖς περὶ ταύτα κομψοῖς, διὰ τὸ ἀεικήντον καὶ ἀπανθητικὸν τῶν μυθηρῶν ἔξων καὶ γὰρ πῦρ καταναλίσκον ἐντεύθεν λέγεται.

κείμενον

Ἀλλ’ οὖν τῶν πρός τι λεγομένων ἐστί, καὶ οὐκ ἄφετος, ὀσπερ καὶ ἢ "Κύριος" φωνή, ὅνομα εἶναι Θεοῦ καὶ αὕτη λεγομένη Ἐγὼ γὰρ φησὶν Κύριος ὁ

---

1131  Ἡ…ψυχῆς cf. Epiph., Panarion, II, p. 439, 8
1150–1154  Ἀλλ’ οὖν…αὕτω Greg. Naz., De Filio, Orat. 30, 18, 7-14 (Pnpl., PG 130, 192 C 11 - D 2)

1146  κομψοῖς in marg. σχ(όλιον) τεχνικοῖς I

1135–1139  ὃτι…εἰπεῖν cf. Ex. 3, 14  1148  Deut. 4, 24 et 9, 3
1152–1153  Ἐγὼ…νομαὶ Is. 42, 8; cf. Ex. 20, 5; 3, 15
Θεός σον τούτο μου ἐστίν ὄνομα· καὶ ύριος ὄνομα αὐτῶ.

σχόλιον

Θεὸς γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ, καὶ Θεὸς τοῦδε ἡ τοῦδε, καὶ τὸ Κύριος ὁμοίως.

κείμενον

Ἡμεῖς δέ φύσιν ἐπιζητούμεν, ἢ τό εἶναι καθ' ἐαυτό καὶ οὐκ ἀλλὰ συνδεδεμένον· τό δὲ ὄν, ἵδιον ὄντως Θεοῦ καὶ ὅλον, μήτε τῷ πρὸ αὐτοῦ, μήτε τῷ μετ' αὐτοῦ, οὐ γὰρ ἦν ἡ ἐσταὶ περατοῦμεν ἡ περικοπτόμενον. Τὸν δὲ ἅλλων προσηγοροῦν, αἰ μὲν τής ἐξουσίας εἰσὶ προφανῶς, αἰ δὲ τής οἰκονομίας, καὶ ταύτης διττῆς, τής μὲν ὑπὲρ τό σῶμα, τής δὲ ἐν σώματι. Οἷον ὁ μὲν παντοκράτωρ καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης, ἢ τῶν | αἰῶνων, ἢ τῶν δυνάμεων τῶν ἀγαπητοῦ, ἢ τῶν βασιλευόντων, καὶ ὁ ύριος, ἢ Ἑβραῖο, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τῶν στρατευόν, ἢ τῶν δυνάμεων, ἢ τῶν κυριεύοντων, ταύτα μὲν σαφῶς τής ἐξουσίας· ὁ δὲ Θεὸς, ἢ τόν σῶζειν, ἢ ἑκδικησεῖν, ἢ εἰρήνης, ἢ δικαιοσύνης, ἢ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ ἢ Ἰακὼβ, καὶ παντὸς Ἰσραήλ, τοῦ πνευματικοῦ καὶ ὀρθοτος Θεὸν.

κείμενον

1159–1174 Ἡμεῖς...Θεὸν Greg. Naz., De Filio, Orat. 30, 18, 14 -19, 12 (Pppl., PG 130, 192 C 2 - 193 A 7)

1159 ἐπιζητούμεν] in marg. δι' ὀνόματος Ι
Ταύτα δὲ τῆς οἰκονομίας.

σχόλιον

Παρέλκοντο δὲ κατὰ αὐτικοῦς. (sic)

κείμενον

Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τοσί τούτοις διουκόμεθα, δέει τε τιμωρίας, καὶ σωτηρίας ἐλπίδα, πρὸς δὲ καὶ δόξης, καὶ ἀσκήσει τῶν ἀρετῶν.

Εἴς ὁν ταύτα, τὸ μὲν τῶν ἐκδικήσεων όνομα οἰκονομεῖ τὸν φόβον, τὸ δὲ τῶν σωτηριῶν τὴν ἐλπίδα, τὸ δὲ τῶν ἀρετῶν τὴν ἀσκησιν, ἵνα, ως τὸν Θεόν ἐν ἑαυτῷ φέρων, ὁ τούτων τι κατορθῶν, μᾶλλον ἐπείγεται πρὸς τὸ τέλειον καὶ τὴν εξ ἀρετῶν οἰκείωσιν. Ταύτα μὲν οὖν ἐτι κοινά θεοτήτως τὰ ὀνόματα, ἱδιον δὲ τοῦ μὲν ἀνάρχου, Πατρὸς, τοῦ δὲ ἀνάρχως γεννηθέντος, Υἱός, τοῦ δὲ ἀγεννήτως προελθόντος ἢ προίόντος, τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον. Ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τάς τοῦ Υἱοῦ κλίσεις ἐλθαμεν, ὅπερ ὑμηθη λέγειν ὁ λόγος.

κείμενον

Δοκεὶ γὰρ μοι λέγεσθαι Υἱός μὲν, ὅτι ταύτων ἐστι τῷ Πατρῷ κατ’ οὐσίαν, καὶ οὐκ ἐκείνῳ μόνον, ἀλλὰ κάκειθεν, μονογενῆς δὲ, οὐχ ὅτι μόνος ἐκ μόνον καὶ μόνον.

σχόλιον

Μόνος Υἱός, χωρὶς ἀδελφῶν, ἐκ μόνου Πατρός, χωρὶς μητρός, καὶ μόνον τοῦτο, ἤγουν ἄπαξ, μηδενὸς ἐτέρου τοιαύτην ὑπαρξιν ἐχοντος.
γεννήσεως ἡ μόνος Υἱός, οὕτω δέ καὶ Πατήρ, ἐκ μόνου Πατρός, οὕτω δέ καὶ Υἱός τό δέ καὶ μόνον, ὡς εἰσηται.

κείμενον

Ἀλλ᾽ ὦτι καὶ μονοτρόπως, οὕτως τὰ σώματα.

σχόλιον

Ἀπαθώς καὶ ἀχρόνως Καὶ γὰρ καὶ Πατήρ ἀγέννητος λέγεται, οὕτως ὡς μήτω γενόμενος, οὐδὲ ὄς | μηδαμὴ μὴ γὰρ ἐν μέν, τὸ πρῶτον καὶ ζωτικὸν, ἦτοι τὸ δημιουργικὸν τῆς ψυχῆς - ἐνεφύσης γὰρ φησίν εἰς τὸ πρῶτον αὐτῶν πνεύμων ζωῆς, καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἀνθρώπος εἰς ψυχὴν ἔσωσιν , ὅπερ ἀπαξ εἰς τὸν Ἀδὰμ ἐμφυσηθὲν, ἐνέγει και εἰς τοὺς ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντας δευτερόν ἐδ. ὅπερ ἐνεφύσης τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις ἐνεφύσης γὰρ φησὶ, καὶ λέγει αυτοῖς ἀλβετε Πνεῦμα ἁγιον.

κείμενον

Ἀγιασμὸς δέ, ὡς καθαρότης, ἵνα χωρῆται τὸ καθαρόν καθαρότητι. Ἀπολύτρωσις δὲ, ὡς ἐλευθερών ἡμᾶς ὑπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας κατεχομένους, καὶ λύτρον ἐαυτὸν ἀντιδίδους ἡμῶν τῆς οἰκουμενίς καθάρσιον. Ἀναστασίς δὲ, ὡς ἐνετέθην ἡμᾶς ἀπαντίστας, καὶ πρὸς τὴν ζωὴν ἐπανάγων νεκρωμένους ὑπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας. Ταῦτα δὲν οὐν ἐτί κοινὰ τοῦ τε ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς καὶ τοῦ δι ἡμᾶς, ἀ δὲ Ἰδίως ἡμέτερα.

σχόλιον


1221 καθαρότηθι in marg. σχ. τῇ τῶν ἀνθρώπων

1213-1214 Gen. 2, 7 1217–1218 ἐνεφύσης ἡμῶν Jo. 20, 22 1220 Ἀγιασμὸς I Cor. 1, 30 1221 Ἀπολύτρωσις Ibid. 1223 λύτρον Mt. 20, 28; Mc. 10, 45 1224 Ἀναστασίς Jo. 11, 25 1226 νεκρωμένους . . . ἁμαρτίας cf. Gen. 2, 17
Τού τε ύπερ ἡμᾶς Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ δι’ ἡμᾶς ἀνθρώπου.

κείμενον

Καὶ τῆς ἐντεθεν προσλήψεως ἀνθρωπός μέν, οὔχ ἤνα χωρηθῇ μόνον διὰ σώματος σώματι, ἀλλὰς οὔκ ἄν χωρηθέει διὰ τὸ τῆς φύσεως ἀλητόν, ἀλλ’ ἤνα καὶ ἀγάπη δι’ ἑαυτοῦ τὸν ἀνθρώπον, ὡσπερ ζύμῃ γενόμενος τῷ παντὶ φυσάματι, καὶ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἐνώσας τὸ κατακρίθην ὅλον λύσι τοῦ κατακρίματος, πάντα ύπερ πάντων γενόμενος, ὡσα ἡμεῖς πλὴν τῆς ἀμαρτίας- σώμα, ψυχή, νοῦς.

σχόλιον

Γνωρισθῇ, ὑμιλήσῃ, παραδεχθῇ.

κείμενον

Δι’ ὅσων ο ἡθανατος τὸ κοινὸν ἡ ὕπο τῶν, ὁ ἀνθρωπος, Θεὸς ὁρῶμενος, διὰ τὸ νοουμενον, νῦς δὲ ἀνθρωπον, καὶ διὰ τὸν Ἀδὰμ, καὶ διὰ τὴν παρθένου, ἐξ ἓν ἐγένετο, τοῦ μὲν ὡς προπάτορος, τῆς δὲ ἠς μητρός.

σχόλιον

Διὰ τούτων γὰρ γίνεται, χωρίζων ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος τὴν ψυχὴν οὔτε γὰρ σώμα μόνον θνῄσκει - ἐν ἑφυκὸν γὰρ ἵνα οὔτε μὴν ψυχή, ἀλλὰ δι’ ἀμφοτέρων ὁ θάνατος, διαίρεσις τούτων ὄν.

κείμενον

1233–1240  Καὶ... νοὺς Greg. Naz., Oratio 30, 21, 2–9 (Pnpl., PG 130, 196 B 13–C 7)  
1244–1248  Δι’ ὅσων... μητρὸς Greg. Naz., De Filio, Orat. 30, 21, 9–12 (Pnpl., PG 130, 196 C 7–11)

1233  ἀνθρωπος  Ἰο. 9, 11  1237  ἠμ... ψυχάματι cf. Ἡ Cor. 5, 6 et Gal. 5, 9  
1238–1239  ὅλον... κατακρίματος cf. Ῥom. 5, 16; cf. ibid. 5, 18; cf. ibid. 8, 1  
1239–1240  πάντα... ἀμαρτίας cf. Ἡ Cor. 5, 21 et I Petr. 2, 21–22  
1245–1246  Mt. 9, 6; Ἰo. 5, 27
Νόμω.

σχόλιον

‘Ότι ἐκ γυναικὸς.

κείμενον

Καὶ οὐ νόμω γεννήσεως χρίσας γὰρ αὕτη τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος, οὐκ ἐνεργεία κατὰ τοὺς ἄλλους χριστοῦς ἀγάξουσα, παρουσία δὲ ὅλου τοῦ χριστοῦς· ἢς ἐργὸν ἀνθρωπόν ἀκούσα τὸ χρίσα, καὶ ποιήσαι θεόν τῷ χριστούν. Ὅδος δὲ, ὡς δι’ ἐαυτοῦ φέρων ἡμᾶς. Χριστὸς δὲ διὰ τὴν θεότητα. Θυρᾶ δὲ ὡς εἰσαγωγεύς.

κείμενον

Ποιμὴν δὲ, ὡς εἰς τόπον χλόης κατασκηνῶν, καὶ ἐκτρέφον ἐπὶ ἱδατος ἀναπαύσεως, καὶ ἐντεθήν ὁδηγόν, καὶ προσπολεμὼν κατὰ τῶν θηρίων· τὸ πλανώμενον ἐπιστρέφουν, τὸ ἀπολωλός ἐπικαλάγων, τὸ συντετριμμένον καταδεικτόν, τὸ ἴδια ὕπαλλισθον καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἐκείθεν μάνδραν συνάγων λόγοις ποιμαντικῆς ἐπιστήμης προβατον δέ, ὡς σφάγιον· ἀμνὸς δὲ, ὡς τέλειον.

σχόλιον


1259 νόμω γεννήσεως] in marg. σχ. ὑπὲρ τῆς παρθένου

1257 Ὅτι...γυναικός cf. Gal. 4, 4 1260–1261 κατὰ...χριστοῦς cf. Ex. 30, 30 1263 Ὅδος Jo. 14, 6 1264 Χριστὸς Mt. 1, 16 θεότητα Jo. 10, 9 1267 Ποιμὴν Jo. 10, 11 | εἰς...κατασκηνῶν cf. Ps. 22, 2 1268 ἐκτρέφων...ἀναπαύσεως cf. ibid. 1268–1269 ἐντεθήν ὁδηγόν Jo. 10, 4 1269–1270 τὸ...ἐπιστρέφον cf. Ezek. 34, 16 1270–1271 τὸ...ἐπικαλάγων cf. ibid. 1271 τὸ1...καταδεικτόν cf. ibid. 1271–1272 τὸ2...φυλάσσον cf. ibid. 1272–1273 καὶ...συνάγων cf. Is. 43, 11 (?) 1273 ἐπιστήμης Is. 53, 7 1274 σφάγιον·ibid. | ἀμνὸς Is. 53, 7; Jo. 1, 29; 1-36 | τέλειον Ex. 12, 5
Τόπος μὲν οὖν χλόης ἢ ἐκκλησία, χλόη δὲ οἱ πιστοὶ, ἀνθούντες κατ' ἄρετην, ἢ καὶ ὁ τῶν Χριστιανῶν πίστις, νεάζουσα πάντοπε ἡ γάρ τῶν Ἑλλήνων, ὡς χόρτος ἑγήσατο καὶ ἀπεξηράθη ἡ χλόη λέγει τὰ εὐσεβὴ δογματα, τρέφοντα ψυχὴν καὶ πιαίνοντα. Ύδρῳ δὲ ἀναπαύσεως, τὰ ζωηρὰ λόγια τῆς θείας γραφῆς, οὐ ποτίζοντα μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τρέφοντα τοὺς πεινῶντας καὶ διψῶντας αὐτῆς, καὶ δηλῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδρος ἀναπαύσεως ὀνομασθῆναι ὁ γάρ ἔσθιν καὶ πίνων οὗτος ἀναπαύσεται λέγεται δὲ ὕδρῳ ἀναπαύσεως καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα, ὡς καθαίρων τὸν ὄμον, καὶ ἀποφορτίζων τὸ ἐπίπονον βάρος τῆς ἀμαρτίας.

κείμενον

Ἀρχιερεὺς δὲ, ἡς προαγωγεὺς.

σχόλιον

Τοῦ Ἀποστόλου: Ὅπως πρὸδρομὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εἰσῆλθεν Ἰησοῦς, κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ, ἀρχιερεὺς γενόμενος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. | Ὅπως γὰρ ὁ Μελχισεδέκ, βασίλευς Σαλήμ, ἱερεὺς τῶν Θεοῦ, ὁ συναντήσας τῷ Αβραάμ ὑποστρέφοντι ἀπὸ τῆς κοπῆς τῶν βασιλέων, καὶ εὐλογήσας αὐτῶν, ὡ καὶ δεκάτας ἀπὸ πάντων ἐμέρισον Αβραὰμ, πρώτα μὲν ἐρμηνεύσας βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης, ἐπείτα δὲ βασιλεὺς Σαλῆμ, ὁ ἐστὶ βασιλεὺς εἰρήνης, ἀπάτωρ, ἀμῖτος, ἀγενεαλόγητος, μήτε ἁρχὴν ἡμερῶν, μήτε ζωῆς τέλος ἔχων, ὡ καὶ δεκάτας Αβραὰμ ἔδωκεν ἔκ τῶν ἀκροβατιῶν ὁ πατριάρχης. Ταῦτα μὲν τοῦ Ἀποστόλου, ἡ δὲ ἱστορία κεῖτα ἐν βιβλίῳ Γενέσεως.


1276 Ps. 22, 2 1281 Ps. 22, 2 1283 πεινῶντας...δυσώντας Cf. Mt. 5, 6 1284 Ps. 22, 2 1290 Hebr. 2, 17; 5, 10; 6, 20 προαγωγεὺς cf. Hebr. 8, 3 1292–1303 Ὅποιο...πατριάρχης Hebr. 6, 20 - 7, 4 1304–1305 ἔν...Γενέσεως cf. Gen. 14, 17-24
κείμενον

Μελχισεδέκ δέ, ὡς ἀμήτωρ τὸ ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἀπάτωρ τὸ καθ’ ἡμᾶς· καὶ ὡς ἀγενεαλόγητος, τὸ ἀνό - τὴν γὰρ γενεὰν αὐτοῦ φησὶ, τις διηγησάται - καὶ ὡς βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ - εἰρήνη δὲ τούτο - καὶ ὡς βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης.

σχόλιον

Ἀμήτωρ μὲν ὁ Χριστὸς κατὰ τὴν ἄνω γέννησιν, ἀπάτωρ δὲ κατὰ τὴν κάτω. Αλλ’ ὁ μὲν Μελχισεδέκ, ἀμήτωρ καὶ ἀπάτωρ καὶ τὰ τοιαύτα, οὐ τῇ φύσει, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἁγνοίᾳ καὶ στιγῇ τοῦ ἱστορησάντος τὰ κατ’ αὐτὸν, οὕτω τοῦ Θεοῦ οἰκονομήσαντος, ὁ δὲ Χριστὸς τῇ φύσει διὰ τούτο γὰρ ἐκείνος μὲν εἰκὼν, <ἀυτός δὲ> ἀλήθεια. Χρή μὲντοι γινώσκειν ὅτι ἐκείνων ποτὲ μὲν προτερεύει, ποτὲ δὲ υστερίζει καὶ προτερεύει μὲν ἐπὶ τῶν συμβόλων, ὡς ἐπὶ τῶν νομικῶν θυσιῶν καὶ τῶν ἀλλῶν τῆς παλαιᾶς καὶ τοῦ Μελχισεδέκ, υστερίζει δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν μεταλαμβανομένων ἀπὸ πρωτοτύπου, ὡς ὁ γραπτὸς Παύλος, εἰκὼν τοῦ ζῶντος, καὶ τὰ τοιαύτα.

κείμενον

1507–1311 Μελχισεδέκ...δικαιοσύνης Greg. Naz., De Filio, Orat. 30, 21, 26-30 (Pipl., PG 130, 196 D 10 - 197 A 2)
1313–1326 ἀμήτωρ...τοιαύτα cf. Nik. Serr. P, f. 166r

1319 εἰκών οὕτως] hic quoddam cecidisse videtur, οὕτως δὲ addendum senseo; διατύπο τὰς ἐκείνους μὲν εἰκών καὶ ἀλήθεια I


1307 Μελχισεδέκ Hebr. 6, 20; 7, 1 s. | ἀμήτωρ Hebr. 7, 3
1308 ἀπάτωρ ibid. | ἀγενεαλόγητος ibid. 1309 τὴν... διηγήσεται Is. 53, 8 1310 βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ Gen, 14, 18; Hebr. 7, 1 | εἰρήνη Hebr. 7, 2 1311 βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης ibid.
Καὶ ὡς ἀποδεκατῶν πατριάρχας, κατὰ τῶν πονηρῶν δυνάμεων ἀριστεῦοντας.

σχόλιον

Εφημερύνευσε τοῦτο διὰ τῆς προσθήκης· ἦτοι δῶρα, τὴν ευαρέστησιν· ἥ πατριάρχας μὲν νοήσεις τούς ἐξάρχους καὶ ……….. τῶν πιστῶν, δεκάται δὲ τοὺς δι’ αὐτῶν προσαγομένους τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ πάντες γὰρ οἱ τούτοις μαθητευόμενοι σώζονται.

| Τοῦ αὐτοῦ έκ τοῦ δευτέρου λόγου τῶν περὶ υἱοῦ 100¢

κείμενον

Εἰ μὲν οὖν μεῖζον μὲν ἐλέγετο, μὴ ἴσον δὲ, τάχα ἄν ἦν τι τούτο αὐτοῖς· εἰ δὲ ἀμφότερα σαφῶς εὑρίσκομεν, τί φήσουσιν οἱ γεννάδαι; Τί τὸ ἰσχυρὸν αὐτοῖς; Πάς συμβήσεται τὰ ἀσύμβατα; Τὸ γὰρ αὐτὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὁμοίως μεῖζον καὶ ἴσον εἶναι τῶν ἀδενάτων. Ἡ δὲλον ὅτι τὸ μεῖζον μὲν ἐστὶ τῆς αἰτίας, τὸ δὲ ἴσον τῆς φύσεως, καὶ τούτο υπὸ πολλῆς εὐγνωμοσύνης ὁμολογοῦμεν ἡμεῖς. Τάχα δ’ ἂν εἰπού τις ἀλλὸς τῷ ἡμετέρῳ λόγῳ προσφιλομενῶν, μὴ ἔλαττον εἶναι τὸ ἐκ τοιαῦτης αἰτίας εἶναι τοῦ ἀναιτίου τῆς τε γὰρ τοῦ ἀνάρχου δόξης μετέχοι ἃν, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἀνάρχου, καὶ πρόσεστιν ἡ γέννησις, πράγμα τοσοῦτον, τοῖς γε νοῦν ἔχουσιν, καὶ οὕτω σεβάσμιον.

σχόλιον

Εἰ μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ τοῦ Πατρὸς τὸ μεῖζον μὲν ἐλέγετο, τὸ ἴσον δὲ μὴ ἐλέγετο, τάχα ἄν ἦν τι τούτο αὐτοῖς εἰς ἀπολογίαν. Νῦν δὲ ἀμφότερα εὑρίσκομεν παρὰ τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ ὁ Πατήρ μου γὰρ φήσι μεῖζον μου

---

1328–1329 Καὶ … ἀριστεῦοντας Greg, Naz., De Filio, Orat. 30, 21, 30-31 (Pnpl, PG 130, 196 D 10 - 197 A 2-4) 1339–1352 Εἰ … σεβάσμιον Greg, Naz., De Filio, Orat. 30, 7, 2-13, Pnpl. PG 130, 581 B-C

1328 ἀποδεκατῶν] ἀπὸ δεκατῶν I

1331 προσθήκης cf. Hebr. 7, 9 1339 μεῖζον Jo. 14, 28 | ἴσον Jo. 10, 30 1357–1358 ο……ἔστι Jo. 14, 28
ἐστί, καὶ πάλιν ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ Πατήρ μον ἐν ἐσμέν. Ἀλλ’ ἡμεῖς μὲν ὑπὸ πολλῆς εὐγνωμοσύνης πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα τὸ μείζον γὰς αἰτίω μόνον αὐτῷ διδάσκαμεν, ἀλλὰς δ’ ἂν τις οὐκ ἔλαττον τοῦ ἀναίτιου εἶναι φησὶ, τὸ ἐκ τουαυτῆς αἴτιας, εἰ γὰρ καὶ μεγάλῳ τούτῳ πρόσεστι τῷ Πατρὶ τὸ ἀναίτιον, ἀλλὰ οὐκ ἔλαττον καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ τὸ ἐκ τουαυτῆς αἴτιου εἶναι.

κείμενον

Τὸ γὰρ δὴ λέγειν, ἃτι τοῦ κατὰ τὸν ἀνθρώπον νουμένου μείζον, ἀληθὲς μὲν, οὐ μέγα δὲ. Τί γὰρ τὸ θαυμαστὸν, εἰ μείζον ἀνθρώπων Θεός; Ταύτα μὲν οὖν ἡμῖν εἰρήνοφοι πρὸς τοὺς τὸ μείζον κομπάζοντας. Θεός δὲ λέγοιτ’ ἂν οὐ τοῦ Λόγου, τοῦ ὁφομένου δὲ - πῶς γὰρ ἐν εἰς τοῦ κυρίου Θεοῦ Θεός - ὥσπερ καὶ Πατήρ, οὐ τοῦ ὁφομένου, τοῦ Λόγου δὲ- καὶ γὰρ ἦν διπλοὺς.

σχόλιον

Ὅτι τοῦ κατὰ τὸ πρόσλημα νουμένου Υἱῷ μείζον λέγεται τὸ μείζον.

κείμενον

Ὡστε τὸ μὲν κυρίως ἐπὶ ἀμφοῖν, τὸ δὲ οὐ κυρίως, ἐναντίως ἢ ἐφ’ ἡμὼν ἔχει ἡμῶν γὰρ κυρίως μὲν Θεός, οὐ κυρίως δὲ Πατήρ. Καὶ τούτῳ ἐστὶν ὁ ποιεῖ τοῖς αἰρετικοῖς τὴν πλάνην, ἦ τῶν ὁνομάτων ἐπίζευξες, ἐπαλαμματομένον τῶν ὁνομάτων διὰ τὴν σύγκρασιν.

σχόλιον

1366–1373 Τὸ...διπλοὺς Greg, Naz., De Filio, Orat. 30, 7, 14-8, 4
1378–1383 Ὡστε...σύγκρασιν Greg, Naz., De Filio, Orat. 30, 8, 4-8

1366 λέγειν] post hoc verbum ὡς τοῦ conieici

1358 ἐγὼ...ἐσμέν Jo. 10, 30 1370–1373 Θεός...δὲ cf. Jo. 10, 30
Καί ἀπὸ τοῦ φάσκοντος εὐαγγελικοῦ ὑποτίμας ἀναβαίνω πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα μου καὶ Πατέρα ὑμῶν καὶ Θεόν μου καὶ Θεόν ὑμῶν, οἱ Εὐνομιαὶ ἐλάττωσιν τῷ Υἱῷ προσήπτων, μεθ’ ἡμῶν τῶν κτισμάτων καὶ τούτων τάττοντες, ὡς ἐπίσης ἡμῖν ἔχοντα καὶ Πατέρα καὶ Θεόν, τῶν Πατέρα. Πρὸς οὖς ἀντιβαίνων ὁ Θεολόγος φησὶν ὅτι τῶν δύο τούτων ὁνόματων “τοῦ τε Πατήρ καὶ τοῦ Θεός,” ἵνα ἀμφότεροι τῶν φύσεων του Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῆς τε ἀνθρώπου καὶ τῆς οραμάτως, τὸ μὲν κυρίως λέγοιτο ἀν, τὸ δὲ οὐ κυρίως· ἐπὶ τῇ γὰρ τῆς ἀνθρώπου, τὸ μὲν Πατήρ, κυρίως, τὸ δὲ Θεός, οὐ κυρίως, τὸ ἐπὶ τῇ τῆς οραμάτως, τὸ μὲν Θεός κυρίως, Πατήρ δὲ οὐ κυρίως. Ἐπὶ πρὸς τὴν ἀνθρώπου ἀπειράν, περὶ ὡς τὸ σύμπας αὐτῶν, εἰς ὡς ὃ ἐννυμένοι καὶ ἐφ’ ἡμῶν ἔχει, δηλοῦτο λέγοιτο ἀν τὰ δηλοῦντα ὅνομα. Τούτῳ δὲ ποιεῖ, φησί, τοῖς αἰρετικοῖς τὴν πλάνην, ἢ κατὰ τὴν μᾶς συνθέσεως ὑποστάσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπιφορᾶ τῶν δύο τούτων ὁνόματων, τοῦ τε Πατήρ καὶ τοῦ Θεός· ἀλλάττονται γὰρ παρ’ αὐτοῖς ταῦτα ἐπὶ ταῖς φύσεις καὶ ἄλλην ἄλλας προσάττονται διὰ τὴν ἐννυσιν.

κείμενον

Σημείον δὲ.

σχόλιον

|Σημείον δὲ τοῦ οὗτος ἔχειν, ὁ ἐρώ..|10iv

κείμενον

Ἡνίκα αἱ φύσεις διότι τὰς ἐπινοίας, συνδιαφέρει καὶ τὰ ὄνομα, Παύλου λέγοντος ἀκούσον· Ἡνίκα ὁ Θεός τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ Πατήρ τῆς δόξης.

1412–1415 Ἡνίκα...δόξης Greg. Naz., De Filia, Orat. 30, 8, 9-11

1390 τοῦ...1398 κυρίως] conieci: ἐπὶ τῇ γὰρ τῆς ἀνθρώπου, τὸ μὲν Πατήρ κυρίως, τὸ δὲ Θεός οὐ κυρίως· τὸ δὲ Πατήρ οὐ κυρίως I 1399 σύμπας] σύμπαν I

1386–1387 Jo. 20, 17 1414–1415 Eph. 1, 17
σχόλιον

Αδύνατον γάρ ἄλλως διαστήναι, διὰ τὴν ἄκραν ἐνσαίν.

κείμενον

Χριστοῦ μὲν, Θεός, τῆς δὲ δόξης, Πατήρ. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ
τὸ συναμφότερον ἐν, ἄλλ᾽ οὖν τῇ φύσει, τῇ δὲ
συνόδῳ τούτων. Τί ἂν γένοιτο γνωριμότερον.

σχόλιον

Τῆς θείας καὶ ἀπροσίτου φύσεως;

| Τοῦ Θεολόγου ἐκ τοῦ δευτέρου λόγου τῶν περὶ
Υἱοῦ|

κείμενον

Δευτέρον δὲ, τί τῶν μεγίστων αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀμάχων;
δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλεύειν ἀχρὶ τούτων.

σχόλιον

Τοῦ Ἀποστόλου Παύλου δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλεύειν
ἀχρὶς ἂν οὐθεν πάντας τους ἑχθροὺς ὑπὸ τούς
πῶς αὐτὸν.

κείμενον

Καὶ ὑπ᾽ οὕρανος δεχθῆναι ἀχρὶ χρόνων
ἀποκαταστάσεως.

---


σχόλιον

Ἐν τῇ βιβλίῳ τῶν Πράξεων λέγει Πέτρος· ὁν δὲι οὐρανὸν μὲν διέξασθαι ἀχρὶ χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων.

κείμενον

Καὶ τὴν ἑκ δεξιῶν καθέδραν ἔχειν, ἐως τῆς τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἐπικρατήσεως. Τὸ μετὰ τούτο δὲ, τί λέξαι τῆς βασιλείας, ἢ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀπωσθῆναι τίνος παύσωντος, ἢ δὲ ἢν τινα τὴν αἰτίαν; ὡς τολμηρὸς ἐξηγητής σὺ.

σχόλιον

Τοῦ Δανίδος ἄθουν ἑκ δεξιῶν μου, ἐως ἵνα θω τοὺς ἐχθροὺς σου ὑποστῶν τῶν ποδῶν σου.

κείμενον

Καὶ λίαν ἀβασίλευτος.

σχόλιον

| Ὡς ἐκβάλλων τῆς βασιλείας τὸν Υἱὸν.

κείμενον

Καὶ μὴν ἀκούεις τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ μὴ εἶναι πέρας.

σχόλιον

---


Τοῦ ἀρχαγγέλου Γαβριήλ ἐν τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ καὶ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐσται τέλος.

κείμενον

Αλλὰ τούτο πάσχεις παρὰ τὸ μὴ γινώσκειν, ὅτι τὸ ἐως οὐ πάντως ἀντιδιαφεῖται τῷ μέλλοντι.

σχόλιον

Οὐκ ἐξ ἀνάγκης· οὐκ ἂεὶ ἀντιδιαστέλλεται.

κείμενον

Αλλὰ τὸ μέχρι μὲν τούδε τίθησι, τὸ μετὰ τούτο δὲ οὐκ ἀναίνεται. Ἡ πᾶς νοήσεις, ἵνα μὴ τάλλα λέγω, τὸ Ἐσομαι μεθ’ ὑμῶν ἐως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος; ἄρ’ ὡς μετὰ τούτο οὐκ ἔσομένου; καὶ τίς ὁ λόγος.

σχόλιον

Τούτῳ Εὐαγγελικόν· καὶ ἰδον ἐγὼ μεθ’ ὑμῶν εἰμι ἐως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος· ὅρα δὲ ὦτι καὶ ἐκεῖ τὸ "εἰμι" δύναμιν ἔχει τοῦ ἔσομαι.

κείμενον

Οὐ μόνον δὲ, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρὰ τὸ μὴ διαφεῖν τὰ σημανόμενα· βασιλεύειν γὰρ λέγεται, καθ’ ἐν μὲν, ὡς παντοκράτῳ, καὶ θελόντων καὶ μὴ βασιλεύς.

σχόλιον

---


1464–1462 Lc. 1, 33 1471–1472 Ἐσομαι...αἰῶνος cf. Mt. 28, 20 1475–1476 Mt. 28, 20 1481–1482 παντοκράτωρ...βασιλεύς cf. Macc. 1, 25, Mal. 1, 14; Jer. 28, 57
Τούτο δηλαδή πάσχεις καὶ παρὰ τόδε.

κείμενον

Καθ’ ἐτερον δὲ, ὡς ἐνεργῶν τὴν ὑποταγήν, καὶ ὑπὸ τὴν ἐαυτοῦ βασιλείαν τιθεὶς ἡμᾶς, ἐκόντας δεχόμενους τὸ βασιλεύσθαι. Τῆς μὲν οὖν ἐκείνης νοομένης βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται πέρας. Τῆς δευτέρας δὲ, τί; τὸ λαβεῖν ἡμᾶς ὑπὸ χείρα καὶ σωζόμενους. Τί γὰρ δεὶ τὴν ὑποταγήν ἐνεργεῖν, ὑποτεταγμένοις, μεθ’ ἡν ἁνίσταται κρίνων τὴν γῆν, καὶ διαφῶν τὸ σωζόμενον καὶ τὸ ἀπολλύμενον;

σχόλιον

Τοῦ Δαυὶδ· Ἀνάστα, ὁ Θεός, κρίνων τὴν γῆν ἀνάστασιν μὲν ἐνταῦθα λέγοντες τὴν ἐνεργειαν τοῦ κρίνειν, γῆν δὲ τοὺς τὰ γεώδη φρονήσαντας, καὶ ταῦτα τῶν οὐρανίων προκρίναντας.

κείμενον

Μεθ’ ἡν ἱσταται Θεός ἐν μέσῳ θεών, τῶν σωζόμενον | δια<κρίνον> καὶ διαστέλλων, τίνος ἐκαστος τιμης καὶ μονης ἄξιος.

σχόλιον

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ· Ὁ Θεός ἔστη ἐν συναγωγῇ θεών, ἐν μέσῳ δὲ θεοὺς διακρινει· θεους δὲ λέγει τοὺς σωζόμενους, ἡς ὀμοιωθέντας Θεῶ, κατὰ τὸ δυνατὸν ἀνθρώπῳ.


1486 τὴν ὑποταγήν] in marg. σχ. τουτέστι διὰ τοῦ Ἐυγγελίου

1488–1489 Τῆς…πέρας cf. Lc. 1, 33 1492–1493 ἁνίσταται…γῆν cf. Ps. 81, 8 1493–1494 διαφῶν…ἀπολλύμενον cf. Mt. 25, 32 1496 Ps. 81, 8 1501 ἱσταται…θεών cf. Ps. 81, 1 1502–1503 τίνος…ἀξίος cf. Jo. 14, 2 1505–1506 Ps. 81, 1
κείμενον

Τούτῳ σύναπτε καί τήν ὑποταγήν, ἂν ὑποτάσσεις τῷ Πατρὶ τὸν Υἱὸν. Τί λέγεις, ὡς νῦν οὐχ ὑποτεταγμένου; δεῖται δὲ ὅλας ὑποταγήναι θεῶ, Θεός ἃν; Ὡς περὶ ληστοῦ τινὸς ἢ ἀντιθέου, ποιή τὸν λόγον. Ἀλλ' οὕτως σκόπει.

σχόλιον

Φησίν ὁ μέγας Ἀπόστολος Παῦλος; ὅταν δὲ ὑποταγῇ αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, τότε καὶ αὑτὸς ὁ Υἱὸς ὑποταγήσεται τῷ ὑποτάζαντί αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα.

κείμενον

Ὅτι ἄσπερ κατάρα ἰκουσε δ' ἐμέ, ὁ τὴν ἐμὴν λύσιν κατάφαν, καὶ ἁμαρτία, ὁ αἵρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ Ἀδάμ ἄντι τοῦ παλαιοῦ γίνεται νέος, οὕτω καὶ τὸ ἐμὸν ἀνυπότακτον ἐαυτοῦ ποιεῖται.

σχόλιον

Κατάρα, ἀντὶ τοῦ κατάρατος· ὁ μὲν οὖν Θεολόγος, ἐκ τοῦ Ἀποστόλου μετέλαβε τούτο, λέγωντος ὅτι ὁ Χριστὸς γέγονεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα, ὁ δὲ Ἀπόστολος ἐκ τοῦ Δευτερονομίου, ἐν ὧν γέγραφαι ὅτι ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὁ κρεμάμενος ἐπὶ ἔναν· τοὺς γὰρ πάντες τίνα πλημμεληθάντος, καὶ ἄξιόν κατάρας, οἱ παλαιοὶ τῶν σταυρῷ ἀνήρουν· Ἁμαρτία δὲ ἤκουσεν, ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν Παύλου λέγωντος· τὸν γὰρ μὴ γινόντα ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν ἀντὶ τοῦ, ὡς ἁμαρτωλὸν ἀφήκεν ἀποθανεῖν, ὁ Πατήρ δηλονότι.
κείμενον

Ως κεφαλή τοῦ παντὸς σώματος ἔως μὲν οὖν ἀνυπότακτος ἐγὼ καὶ στασιώδης, τῇ τε ἀρνήσει τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῖς πάθεσιν, ἀνυπότακτος τὸ κατ᾽ ἐμὲ καὶ Χριστὸς λέγεται.

σχόλιον

Τοῦ ἀποστόλου Παύλου καὶ αὐτὸς ἐστιν ἢ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος, τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

κείμενον

Ὅταν δὲ ὑποταγῇ αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, —ὑποταγήσεται δὲ καὶ τῇ ἐπίγνωσι καὶ τῇ μεταποίησει, —τότε καὶ αὐτὸς τὴν ὑποταγήν πεπλήρωκεν, προσάγων ἐμὲ τὸν σεσωσμένον.

σχόλιον

Ἀλλασσομένης τῆς κτίσεως, τότε γὰρ πληροφορηθέντες, ἐξ ἀνάγκης ὑποταγήσονται, ὡσοι μὴ διὰ τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου τούτου ἐπέγνωσαν.

κείμενον

Τούτῳ γὰρ ἡ ὑποταγὴ Χριστοῦ, κατὰ γε τὸν ἐμὸν λόγον, ἢ τοῦ πατρικοῦ θελήματος πλήρωσις. ὑποτάσσει δὲ καὶ Υἱὸς Πατρός, καὶ Υἱὸς Πατέρα, ὁ μὲν ἐνεργῶν, ὁ δὲ εὐθοκῶν, ὁ καὶ πρότερον εἰπομεν.

σχόλιον


1548 ὑποταγήν πεπλήρωκεν] in marg. σχ. ἦγουν ὑπετάγη τῷ Πατρῷ

1538 Ὁς...σώματος cf. I Cor. 15, 45  1543–1544 Coloss. 1, 18  1546 I Cor. 15, 28
Πατρικὸν θέλημα, τὸ ύποτάξαι τὸν λαὸν καὶ προσαγαγεῖν αὐτὸν δηλόνοις σεσωσμένον.

κείμενον

Καὶ οὕτω τὸ ύποτεταγμένον ὁ ύποτάξας Θεῷ παρίστησιν, ἐαυτοῦ ποιοῦμενος τὸ ἡμέτερον. Τοιοῦτον εἶναι μοι φαίνεται καὶ τῷ Ὁ Θεὸς, ὁ Θεὸς μου, πρὸσχεῖς μοι, ἵνα τί ἐγκατέλιπτες με; οὐ γάρ αὐτὸς ἐγκαταλέλειπται, ἢ ὑπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἢ ὑπὸ τῆς αὐτοῦ θεότητος, ὃ δοκεῖ τισιν, ὡς ἀν φοβουμένης τὸ πάθος, καὶ διὰ τούτο συστελλομένης ἀπὸ τοῦ πάσχοντος. Τίς γάρ, ἢ γεννηθῆναι κατ’ τὴν αρχήν, ἢ ἐπί τὸν σταυρὸν ἀνελθεῖν, ἠνάγκασεν;

σχόλιον

Καὶ τούτον τὸν τρόπον, ὡς εἰσήτατι, τὸ διὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ύποτεταγμένον τῷ Ῥώμ., ὁ ύποτάξας Ἰησοῦς, τῷ Πατρὶ παριστήσατε, ἐαυτοῦ ύποταγήν ποιουμένος τὴν ἡμετέραν ύποταγήν, καὶ οἰκείουμένος αὐτήν, τῷ λέγεσθαι ύποταγηθεικαὶ τῷ Πατρὶ ἡμείς γάρ ύποταγησόμεθα.

κείμενον

| Ἕν ἐαυτῷ δὲ, ὅπερ εἶπον, τυποὶ τὸ ἡμέτερον. Ἡμεῖς γὰρ ἔχουμεν οἱ ἐγκαταλειμμένοι καὶ παρευφαρμένοι πρότερον, εἰτὰ τῶν προσελθομένων καὶ σεσωσμένων τοῖς τοῦ ἀπαθοῦς πάθειν ὡσπερ καὶ τὴν ἀφροσύνην ἡμῶν καὶ τὸ πλημμέλες οἰκείουμένους, τὰ ἔξης διὰ τοῦ ψαλμοῦ φησιν, εἰς οὗτοι ἡμείς παρίστησιν tf. I Cor. 15, 28 Ps. 21, 1802–1803 ἡμεῖς …πρότερον cf. Is. 53, 6

1563–1564 Καὶ …παρίστησιν cf. I Cor. 15, 28 1565–1566 Ps. 21, 2 1578–1579 ὑποταγήσεσθαι…Πατρὶ cf. I Cor. 15, 28 1582–1583 ἡμεῖς …πρότερον cf. Is. 53, 6


1569 φοβουμένης I φοβουμένους I 1574 τοῦ] ύποτεταγμένον a. corr. I
ἐπειδή προδήλως εἰς Χριστόν ὁ εἰκοστός πρώτος ψαλμός ἀναφέρεται.

σχόλιον

Καὶ μήν, οὐκ ἐν τῷ εἰκοστῷ πρώτῳ ψαλμῷ, περὶ ἀφροσύνης κεῖται καὶ πλημμελείας, ἀλλὰ ἐν τῷ ἔξηκοστῷ ὕψῳ ὁ Θεός, σὺ ἐγνώς τὴν ἀφροσύνην μον' καὶ αἱ πλημμελείαι μον' ἀπὸ σοῦ οὐκ ἀπεκρύψαν' ἀλλὰ τὸ ὅσπερ παραδειγματικὸς τεθὲν, εἰς ἐκεῖνον ἡμᾶς τὸν ψαλμὸν παραπέμπει, ὥσπερ φησὶ καὶ ἐν ἐτέρῳ ψαλμῷ, τὴν ἀφροσύνην ἡμῶν καὶ τὸ πλημμέλεια οἰκειούμενον, τὰ ἐξ ἑαυτῶν όρτῶν συνεργεῖσθαι, διὰ τοῦ ψαλμοῦ ἑκείνου διεξείσθαι· εἰπῶν γὰρ ὅτι προσώπῳ ἡμῶν εἰρήκεν ὁ Χριστός, τό, ἵνατε ἐγκαταλείπετε με, προσεπηγαγεί καὶ παράδειγμα, τὰ ὑπό τῷ δηλωθέντος ἔξηκοστοῦ ὕψους ψαλμοῦ, ἃ κάκεινα, προσώπῳ ἡμῶν ἐφόρηθαι· τό δὲ ἐπειδή προδήλως εἰς Χριστόν ὁ εἰκοστός πρῶτος ψαλμός ἀναφέρεται, οὐ πρὸς τὴν ἀφροσύνην καὶ τὸ πλημμέλεια, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὴν ἐγκατάλειψιν εἰρήκειν.

κείμενον

Τῆς δὲ αὐτῆς ἐχεῖται θεωρίας καὶ τὸ μαθεῖν αὐτὸν τὴν ὑπακοήν ἐξ ἑν ἐπαθεῖν.

σχόλιον

Τοῦ ἀποστόλου Παύλου· ἀἵπτερ ὁ νῦς, ἐμαθεῖν ἀφ' ὧν ἐπαθεῖ τὴν ὑπακοήν.

κείμενον


1595 σχόλιον supra lin.

1592–1594 Ps 68, 6 1600 Ps. 21, 2 1609–1610 το...ἐπαθεῖν cf. Hebr. 5, 8 1612–1613 Hebr. 5, 8
"Η τε κραυγή, και τά δάκρυα, και τό ίκετεύσαι, και τό εἰσακουσθήναι, και τό εὐλαβές.

σχόλιον

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ὁς ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, δεήσεις τε καὶ ικητηρίας πρὸς τὸν δυνάμενον σωζεῖν αὐτὸν ἐκ θανάτου, μετὰ κραυγῆς ἱσχυρᾶς καὶ δακρύων προσενέγκας καὶ εἰσακουσθείς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας.

κείμενον

Ἄ δραματουργεῖται καὶ πλέκεται θαυμασίως ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.

σχόλιον

Σχηματίζεται, πλάττεται θαυμασίως δέ, διὰ τὸ προσφύεις ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν δέ, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀνθ' ἡμῶν.

κείμενον

Ὡς μὲν γὰρ Λόγος, οὐτε ὑπήκοος ἦν, οὐτε ἀνικόος· τῶν γὰρ ὑπὸ χέιρα ταύτα, καὶ τῶν δευτέρων, τὸ μὲν τῶν εὐγνωμονεστέρων, τὸ δὲ τῶν ἁξίων κολάσεως. Ὡς δὲ δούλου μορφή, συγκαταβαίνει τοῖς ὀμοδουλοῖς καὶ δούλοις.

σχόλιον


1630 Λόγος [in marg. sx. ὡς Θεός 1633 κολάσεως] κολάσεων a. corr I | δούλου μορφή] in marg. sx. ὡς ἀνθρώπος φύει γενόμενος

1615–1616 Ἡ... εὐλαβές cf. Hebr. 5, 7 1618–1622 Hebr. 5, 7 1633 δούλου μορφή Philip. 2, 7
Συνεξομοιούται, συνταπεινούται τοις ὀμοδούλοις μὲν, πρὸς τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα αὐτοῦ δούλοις δὲ, πρὸς τὴν θεότητα.

κείμενον

Καὶ μορφοῦται τὸ ἄλλοτριον. 1640

σχόλιον

Σχηματίζεται, ὑποδύεται τὴν μὴ προσήκουσαν τῇ αὐτοῦ θεότητι ὑποταγήν· τὸ γάρ ἐμαθεν, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐνήργησεν.

κείμενον 1645

’Ολον ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἐμὲ φέρων μετὰ τῶν ἐμῶν.

σχόλιον

’Ολην ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ θεότητι τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν φέρων, μετὰ τῶν ἀδιαβλήτων αὐτῆς παθῶν καὶ ἰδιωμάτων καὶ λόγων, καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως ἐμὲ μετὰ τῶν ἐμῶν. 1650

κείμενον

’Ἰν’ ἐν ἑαυτῷ δαπανήσα τὸ χείρον, ὡς κηρόν πῦρ, ἢ ὡς ἀτμίδα γῆς ἠλιος, κἀγὼ μεταλάβω τῶν ἐκείνου διὰ τὴν σύγκρασιν. 1655

σχόλιον

Τῆς καθαιρότητος· τῆς ἀπαθείας, τῆς θεώσεως.
’Ἡν πρὸς τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν ὡς εἰρηται.

κείμενον


1643 ἐμαθεν cf. Ἐπ. Hebr. 5, 8
Διατούτο ἐργά την ὑπακοήν, καὶ πειράται ταύτης ἐκ τοῦ παθεῖν.

σχόλιον

Ἔνεργεὶ ταύτην ἐκ τοῦ παθητὴν φύσιν προσλαβεῖν ἄνθρωπος γὰρ γενόμενος, ἐνήργησε τὴν ὑπακοήν.

κείμενον

Οὐ γαρ ἰκανὸν ἢ διάθεσις, ὡσπερ οὐδὲ ἡμῖν, εἰ μὴ καὶ διὰ τῶν πραγμάτων χωρίσαμεν ἐργὸν γὰρ ἀπόδειξις διαθέσεως.

σχόλιον

| Τὸ διατεθήκαι αὐτὸν, ὡς ἄνθρωπον ἀπλῶς ἀλλ` ἐδει καὶ τῆς δι` ἐργῶν ὑπακοῆς.

κείμενον

Οὐ χείρον δὲ ἴσως κακεῖνο ὑπολαβεῖν, ὅτι δοκιμάζει τὴν ἡμιτεράν ὑπακοήν.

σχόλιον

Ἐπάγει καὶ δευτέραν ἐξήγησιν, ὦτι καὶ ὡς Ἡθος ἀκριβῶς ἐν τῷ ἄνθρωπιν ἑαυτῶν τῇ παρ ἡμῶν ὀφείλομένην ὑπακοήν, ὅπως ἡμᾶς εἰσάγειν χορή, ὡστε ἔχειν εἰδέναι, μὴ μόνον ἀπλὴ γνώσει τὰ ἡμέτερα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ πάθεσι, τοιτέστιν, ἀφ' ὄντος κατὰ τὸ πρόσλημμα πέπονθε, καὶ πόσον μὲν ἀπαιτούμεθα, ὡς δυνάμεις, πόσον δὲ συγχωροῦμεθα, ὡς ἄσθενεις, κατὰ τούτο ταττομένης καὶ τῆς ἁσθενείας μετὰ τοῦ πάθους, ὡς λογίζεσθαι καὶ ταύτην πάθος· οὐ μόνον γὰρ λέγοιτ' ἂν πάθος ἡ ἐπήρεια τοῦ ἐχθροῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ ἁσθενεία τῆς ἄνθρωπινῆς φύσεως· καὶ οὕτως

κείμενον

Καὶ πάντα μετρεῖ τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ πάθεσι, τέχνη φιλανθρωπίας, ὡστε ἔχειν εἰδέναι τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ τὰ ἡμέτερα, καὶ πόσον μὲν ἀπαιτοῦμεθα, πόσον δὲ συγχαροῦμεθα, ἢν μηδεὶς κρινόμενος ἔχοι λέγειν, ὅτι εἰ ἐπεπείρατο τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως, οὐχ οὕτως ἂν ἀπ.τει παρ᾽ ἡμῶν τὴν ὑπακοὴν εἴτα ὑπεραπολογεῖται τοῦ πάθους, ὅτι ἀναγκαῖος πάσχομεν.

σχόλιον

Εἰ γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ Θεός, ὡς ἀνθρωπός πέπονθε, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἤμεις. Εἰλήφηται δὲ ἡ ἔννοια ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἐυαγγελίου γέγραπται γὰρ καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ ὄν κατέλαβε. Φῶς μὲν γὰρ λέγει τὸν Χριστὸν διὰ τὴν θεότητα. Σκοτίαν δὲ, μίαν μὲν τὸν βίον διὰ τὸν απὸ τῶν πάθων ζόφον καὶ τὴν πλάνην, ἔτεραν δὲ τὸν διάβολον, ὡς ἀντικείμενον τῷ δηλωθέντι φωτὶ, καὶ ὅτι σκότος διὰ τὴν ἐπαρχίαν γέγονε τε καὶ λέγεται σκότος δὲ τρίτον καλεῖ τὸν ἀνθρωπὸν διὰ τὴν παχύτητα καὶ τὴν ἐπιφρόσυνη τῆς σαρκοῦς κατέδραμε γὰρ καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁ διάβολος,
πειράζων αὐτὸν ὡς ἀνθρώπον διὰ τὸ πρόβλημα τῆς σαρκός, ἦγουν διὰ τὸ ὁρμέμενον· εἰ γὰρ τὸ φῶς ἐδιώκθη φησί, τούτεστιν ἐπειράσθη, τὸ σκότος πόσον ἀρὰ πειρασθήσεται, οἷα καὶ ἀσθενέστερον, λέγω δὴ, ὁ τυχῶν ἀνθρώπος.

κείμενον

Καὶ τί θαυμαστόν, εἰ ἐκείνου διαφυγόντος παντάπασιν, ἡμεῖς ποιῶς καὶ καταληψθεῖμεν; μείων γὰρ ἐκείνῳ τὸ διωχθῆναι, ἤπερ ἡμῖν τὸ καταληψθῆναι, παρὰ τοῖς ὀρθῶς ταῦτα λογιζομένοις. Ἐτι δὲ προσθῆσω τοῖς εἰρημένοις ἐκεῖνο, ἐνθυμηθεῖς, τὸ Ἔν ὡς πέπονθεν αὐτὸς πειρασθεῖς, δύναται τοῖς πειραζόμενοις βοηθῆσαι, σαφῶς πρὸς τὴν αὐτὴν φέρον ἐννοιαν.

σχόλιον

| Οὐκ ἐστὶ φησὶ θαυμαστόν εἰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ πα.........τος τὸν ἐξθόν· εἰτον κατὰ μηδὲν ἠττηθέντος ... καὶ μερικῶς καταληψθεὶμεν· ἐκεῖνος μὲν γὰρ, καὶ Θεὸς ἢ ἀπρόσιτος, ἡμεῖς δὲ χούς βαφῆς, ὡστε πρόσεστιν ἐκείνῳ μείζον εἰς θαυμα τὸ ὅπως διωχθῆναι τοιοῦτοι ὁντε, ἢ ἡμῖν τὸ καταληψθῆναι ὡς εἰρηται, διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἀσθενείαν.  

Εἰς τὸ, ἑσται δὲ ὁ Θεὸς τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν· ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ λόγου

κείμενον

Ἐσταὶ δὲ ὁ Θεὸς τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν.

σχόλιον


1729–1730 Hebr. 2, 18 1743–1745 ἐν... cf. I Cor. 15, 28 1746–1748 I Cor. 15, 28
Καὶ τοῦτο Παύλου τοῦ Ἀποστόλου εἰπόντος· ἵνα ἢ ὁ Θεὸς τὰ πάντα ἐν πάσιν, ἐξελάμβανον δὲ καὶ τοῦτο - κακοῦργοις οἱ αἰρέτικοι κανέναι ἡλάττουν τὸν Ὕιον λέγοντες, ὅτι μόνος ὁ Πατήρ ἐσται τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν, ἀλλ’ ὁ Θεολόγος καὶ τοῦτο σαφῶς ἐπιλύεται, ὅτι Θεὸν ἐνταῦθα μὴ μόνον τὸν Πατέρα νοήσει, ἀλλ’ ὅλον τὸν ἐν τοίο προσώποις θεωρούμενον οὐ μόνον γὰρ φησιν ὁ Πατήρ ἐσται τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν ὡς εἰς αὐτὸν ἀναλυομένου τοῦ Ὕιου. Ἀνάλυσιν δὲ ἐνταῦθα λέγει τὴν οίνον ἀνάχυσιν καὶ ἀνάκρισιν, ὅ τις Σαβελλανής ἐστι ληρῳδίας δόγμα· καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι τὸν Ὕιον καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα εἰς τὸν Πατέρα συνείσιον, ὅνοματα μόνον τοῦ Πατρὸς λέγοντες ἀνοῦσια, τὸν Ὕιον καὶ τὸ θεῖον Πνεῦμα.

κείμενον

Ἐν τῷ καρφῷ τῆς ἀποκαταστάσεως· οὐκ’ ὁ Πατήρ, πάντως εἰς αὐτὸν ἀναλυθέντος τοῦ Ὕιου, ὅπερ εἰς πυρᾶν μεγάλην λαμπάδας πρὸς καρφὸν ἀποσπασθείς, εἶτα συναφείσθης, —μηδὲ γὰρ Σαβέλλιοι τῷ ὤτῳ τοῦτῳ παραθερεύουσαν, —ἀλλ’ ὅλος Θεός, ὅταν μηκέτι πολλὰ ἁμέν, ὅπερ νῦν, τοῖς κινήσας καὶ τοῖς πάθεσιν, | οὐδὲν ὅλως Θεοῦ, ἢ ὅλιγον, ἐν ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς φέροντες, ἀλλ’ ὅλοι θεοειδεῖς, ὅλον Θεοῦ χωφτικοὶ καὶ μόνον. Τοῦτο γὰρ ἡ τελείωσις, πρὸς ἢν σπεύδομεν· τεκμηριοὶ δὲ μάλιστα Παύλος αὐτός· ὁ γὰρ ἐνταῦθα περὶ Θεοῦ φησιν ἀορίστως, ἀλλαχοῦ σαφῶς περιουρίζει Χριστῷ λέγων· Ὄπον οὐκ ἔνι Ἔλλην, οὐδὲ Ιουδαῖος, περιτοιχικὴ καὶ ἀκροβυστία, βαρβαρός, Σκύθης, δοῦλος, ἐλευθερος· ἀλλά τὰ πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσι Χριστῷ.

σχόλιον

Εἴτουν τῆς ἀποκαταστάσεως, ὅτε αἰ ψυχαὶ ἀποκαθίστανται εἰς τὰ ἑαυτῶν σώματα. Τότε γὰρ,

——

τῶν μὲν δαιμόνων παυθόντων, τῶν δὲ παθῶν
σχολασάντων, τῆς δὲ ἁμαρτίας ἁγγειόσης, οὐκέτι
eis πολλὰ διαφερηθούμεθα, καθάπερ νῦν, τοῖς
kīnēmasi τῆς ψυχῆς, ἤγουν ταῖς διαφόροις
gνώμαις καὶ τοῖς ποικίλοις πάθεσιν, οὐδὲν ὅλως
Θεοῦ, ἢ ὁλίγον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς φέροντες. Νῦν γὰρ εἰς
πολλὰ μεριζόμενοι, ἢ ουδὲ μιὰν περὶ Θεοῦ
θεωριάν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς φέρομεν διὰ τὴν ζώφωσιν τοῦ
νοὸς, ἢ μικρὰν τινα φαντασίαν τότε δὲ, ὅλοι
θεοεἰδεῖς, ὁ ἐστι θεῖος, ἐσώμεθα καὶ ὅλης τῆς
θεότητος χαρητικοὶ, μυσταγωγούμενοι τὰ περὶ
tῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος, εἰκηλότερον, ἢ τὸν
ἀφευδοὺς ὑπόσχεσις, καὶ μόνης αὐτῆς ὡς μηδὲν
ἐτερον δυνάμενοι βλέπειν, ἢ διανοεῖσθαι καὶ
οὕτως ἐσται ὁ Θεὸς ἀντὶ πάντων λόγων καὶ ἔργων
καὶ ἐνθυμήσεων ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς δικαίοις. Ὅτι δὲ Θεὸν
ὁλην ἑνταῦθα τὴν θεότητα χρῆ νοεῖν τεκμηρίω
μάλιστα Παύλος, ἦγουν τεκμαίρεσθαι διδασκαλία καὶ
πληροφορεῖ ὁ γὰρ νῦν ἄφριστως περὶ Θεοῦ φήσι, διη
διαδὴ τὸ εἶναι τὰ πάντα ἐν πάσιν, ἀλλὰχοι τῶν |
ἐπιστολῶν αὐτοῦ, μόνω τῷ Χριστῷ τοῦτο ἀφοφέξει
καθαρὰς ἐν ὡς φήσιν, ὅτι οὐκ ἐσται τηνικαύτα
διαφορά γένους ἢ τύχης,
ἡ τινος τοιούτου, ἀλλὰ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν ὁ
Χριστὸς. Παραθεομένωσαν δὲ, ἀντὶ τοῦ
παρεισπεσέτασαν ἐπὶ φθορὰ τῶν ἀκρωμένων.
Τούτο οὖν εἰδότες οἱ θεολόγοι, καὶ ὡς ἀνώνυμον αὐτόν ὑμνοῦσι, καὶ ἐκ παντὸς ὀνόματος. Ἀνώνυμον μὲν, ὡς ὅταν φασί τὴν θεαρχίαν αὐτῆν, ἐν μιᾷ τῶν μυστικῶν τῆς συμβολικῆς θεοφανείας ὀράσεων, ἐπιπλήξατο τῷ φήματι, τι τὸ ὄνομά σου· καὶ ὡς- | περ ἄυτόν ἀπὸ πάσης θεωνυμικῆς γνώσεως ἀπάγουσαν, φάναι καὶ ἵνα τί ἐρωτάτο τὸ ὄνομα μου καὶ τούτο ἐστὶ βαυμαστὸν ἢ οὐχὶ τούτο ὄντως ἐστὶ τὸ βαυμαστὸν ὄνομα· τὸ υπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα: τὸ ἀνώνυμον τὸ παντὸς ὑπεριδρομένον ὄνομας· ὀνομαζομένου, εἰτε ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, εἰτὲ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι: Πολυωνυμὸν δὲ, ὡς ὅταν αὐθεὶς αὐτὴν εἰσάγωσα φάσκουσαν ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὁ ἄν: ἢ ζωὴ τὸ φῶς· ὁ θεὸς· ἢ ἀληθεία· καὶ ὅταν αὐτοὶ τὸν πάνταν αἰτίον οἱ θεοσφόροι πολυωνυμός ἐκ πάνταν τῶν αἰτιατῶν ὑμνώσαν, ὡς ἀγαθόν· ὡς καλὸν· ὡς σωφρόν· ὡς ἀγαπητὸν· ὡς θεόν θεόν· ὡς κυρίον κυρίων· ὡς ἄγιον ἄγιων· ὡς αἰώνιον· ὡς ὄντα καὶ ὡς αἰώνων αἰτίον· ὡς ζωῆς χορηγὸν· ὡς

1811–1843  Τούτο...όντων Ps. Dion. Areop., De div. nomin, I 6
Suchla p. 118, 2-119, 9

1816  αὐτόν...πάσης] αὐτόν ἀπὸ πάσης; ἀπὸ πάσης αὐτόν: Suchla, sine variante. 1817  φάναι...1818 βαυμαστὸν] φάναι· καὶ ... βαυμαστὸν· recte; Suchla: φάναι καὶ « Ἰνα τί ἐρωτάτο τὸ ὄνομα μου »; καί: Τούτο « ἐστι βαυμαστὸν ». - fals; cf. Jud. 13, 18; 1818  ἢ] ἤ fals; ἢ Suchla recte; 1825  θεοσφόροι] Suchla: θεοσφόροι

1815  τί...σου cf. Gen. 32, 30; cf. Jud. 13, 17 1817–1818 καὶ... βαυμαστὸν cf. Gen. 32, 30; Jud. 13, 18 1819  τό...όνομα cf. Ps. 8, 2; Jud. 13, 18 1819–1820  τό...όνομα cf. Phil. 2, 9 1820–1822  τό...μέλλοντι vide Eph. 1, 21 1823  εἰγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄνω vide Ex. 3, 14 1823–1824  ἢ ζωὴ Jo. 11, 25; 14, 6 1825  ὁ φῶς Jo. 8, 12 1826  ὁ θεός vide Gen. 28, 13 | ἢ ἀληθεία vide Jo. 14, 6 1825  θεοσφόροι 1826  ἀγαθόν cf. Mt. 19, 17; Lc. 18, 19 1827  καλὸν cf. Cant. 1, 16 1828  κυρίον κυρίων Deut. 10, 17; Ps. 135, 3; Ἀποκ. 17, 14; 19, 16 | ἄγιον ἄγιων vide Dan. 9, 24; Is. 6, 3 | αἰώνων vide Bar. 4, 8; cf. Is. 40, 28; Bar. 4, 10 1829  ὄντα cf. Ex. 3, 14 | αἰώνων αἰτίων cf. Ecle. 3, 11-14; Ἱερ. 1, 2 | ζωῆς χορηγὸν cf. Gen. 2, 7; Ἰοβ 10, 12; Jo. 10, 10; Ἀεt. 17, 25
σοφίαν· ώς νοῦν· ώς λόγον· ώς γνώστην· ώς προέχοντα πάντας τοὺς θησαυροὺς ἀπάσις γνώσεως· ώς δύναμιν· ώς δυνάστην· ώς βασιλέα τῶν βασιλεύσων· ώς παλαιὸν ἡμερῶν· ώς ἀγήρα καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον· ώς σωτηρίαν· ώς δικαίουσθην· ώς ἀργασμὸν· ώς ἀπόλυτῳς· ώς ἐν μεγέθει πάντων ὑπερέχοντα καὶ ὡς ἐν αὐρα λεπτῇ, καὶ ἐγκόσμων· ὑπερουρίαν· ἡμίον· ἀστέρα· πῦρ· ὑδωρ· πνεῦμα· ὁδόσον· νεφέλης· αὐτὸ, λίθον· καὶ πέτραν, καὶ πάντα τὰ ὄντα καὶ οὐδὲν αὐτῶν ὄντων.

σχόλιον

1835 ὡς...μεγέθει Suchla: ὡς μεγέθει 1838 καὶ...γῆς] Suchla: καὶ ἐν ἡ sine variante 1839 ἐγκόσμων...1840 ὑπερουρίαν] Suchla: ἐγκόσμων, ἐπερουρίαν, ὑπερουρίαν sine variante 1842 αὐτὸ λίθον] Suchla: αὐτόλιθον
Οὐ γὰρ ἡ φύσις ἀνεννόητος, τούτου πάντως οὐδὲ ὄνομα κύριον εὐφθῆσεται δηλωτικόν γὰρ φύσεως, τὸ κύριον ὄνομα.

24v | Τίτλος ζ’ τοῦ Αρεοπαγίτου περὶ τῆς θείας ἐνανθρωπίσεως ἐκ τοῦ α’ κεφαλαίου τοῦ περὶ θείων ὄνομάτων.

25v | Φιλάνθρωπον διαφερόντως ἢ θεαρχία ὑποτεκτήτως ἐκ τοῦ καθ’ ἡμᾶς πρὸς ἀλήθειαν, ὁλικῶς ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἐαυτῆς ὑποστάσεων ἐκοινώνησεν ἀνακαλομένη πρὸς ἐαυτὴν καὶ ἀνατίθεσα τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην ἐσχατιὰν ἐξ ἡς ἀφθέγκατος ὡς ἀπλωῦς Ἰησοῦς συνετέθη καὶ παράτατιν ἔληφε χρονικὴν, ὃ ἀδίδως· καὶ εἰσὶ τῆς καθ’ ἡμᾶς ἐγεγόνει φύσεως, ὁ πάσης, τῆς κατὰ φύσιν πάσαν τάξεως, ὑπερουσίως ἐκβεβηκὼς· μετὰ τῆς ἀμεταβολοῦ καὶ ἀσυγχύτου τῶν οἰκείων ἱδρύσεως.

Ἐκ τοῦ β’ κεφαλαίου τοῦ περὶ ἡνωμένης καὶ διακεκριμένης θεολογίας.

Αλλὰ καὶ τὸ πάσης θεολογίας ἐκφανέστατον· ἢ καθ’ ἡμᾶς Ἰησοῦ θεσπλαστικό, καὶ ἀρχητός ἐστὶ λόγῳ παντὲ καὶ ἀγνώστος νῦ παντὲ καὶ αὐτῷ τῷ πρωτότῳ τῶν προσβυτάτων ἁγγέλων· καὶ τὸ μὲν ἀνθρικὸς αὐτὸν οὐσωθημάτης, μυστικὸς παρελθήσαμεν· ἀγνοοῦμεν δὲ ὅπως ἐκ παρθενικῶς αἰμάτων, ἑτέρῳ παρὰ τὴν φύσιν διεπλάττητο θεσμῷ καὶ ὅπως ἀβρόχοις ποσὶ

1851–1860  Φιλάνθρωπον… ἱδρύσεως Ps. Dion. Areop., De div. nomin., I 4 Suchla p. 113, 6-12  1863–1874 Αλλὰ… φυσιολογίας Ps. Dion. Areop., De div. nomin., II 9, Suchla p. 133, 5-12

1845 ἀνεννόητος emendavi; ἀνεννόητος in codice
1851 Φιλάνθρωπον sic in codice et textu Areopagitico
1853 ἐαυτῆς in codice; Suchla: αὐτῆς sine variante
1855 ἀφθέγκατος cum permultis codicibus; Suchla: ἀφθέγκας
1858 κατὰ… τάξεως Suchla: κατὰ πάσαν φύσιν τάξεως sine variante
1870 διεπλάττητο θεσμῷ Suchla: θεσμῷ διεπλάττητο sine variante

1865–1866 ἀγνωστος… ἁγγέλων cf. Tob. 12, 15
1870–1872 ὅπως… οὐσίαν cf. Mt. 14, 25-34; Mc. 6, 48-51; Jo. 6, 19-21
σωματικόν ὁγκὸν ἔχουσι καὶ ὑλῆς βάρος, ἐπεπορεύετο τὴν ύγραν καὶ ἄστατον οὐσίαν· καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ὅσα τῆς ὑπερφυοῦς ἐστὶν Ἰησοῦ φυσιολογίας.

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς πρὸς Γαίων θεραπευτὴν ἐπιστολής. 1875

κείμενον

Πῶς φήσε Ἰησοῦς ὁ πάντων ἐπέκεινα, πάσι μὲν ἐστὶν οὐσιώδες καὶ συντεταγμένας· οὐ γὰρ ὡς αὐτίος ἀνθρώπων, λέγεται ἀνθρώπος· ἀλλ᾽ ὡς αὐτό κατ' οὐσιάν ὅλην, ἀληθῶς ἀνθρώπος ἂν. Ἡμεῖς δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ὡς ἀνθρωπικός ἀφορίζομεν οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀνθρώπος μόνον; | ὦν ἐπειδή ὑπερούσιος ἢ ἀνθρώπος μόνον ἀλλὰ ἀνθρώπος ἀληθῶς· ὁ διαφέροντας φιλάνθρωπος. 1885

σχόλιον

Τοιοῦτοιν οὐχ ὡς ψελόν ἀνθρώπων ὀριζόμεθα· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀνθρώπως μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ Θεός, ὅσπερ καὶ οὐ Θεός μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄνθρωπος. 1890

κείμενον

Ὑπέρ ἀνθρώπους καὶ κατ᾽ ἀνθρώπους ἐκ τῆς ἀνθρώπων οὐσίας ὁ ὑπερούσιος οὐσιαμένος.

1878–1885 Πως...φιλάνθρωπος Ps. Dion. Areop., Epistula 4, Ritter p. 160, 1-8
1891–1892 Ὑπέρ...οὐσιαμένος Ps. Dion. Areop., Epistula 4, Ritter p. 160, 8-9

1878 πως...1879 συντεταγμένας] Ritter: πάσιν ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος· οὐσιώδες συντεταγμένος, recte 1880 ἀνθρώπων λέγεται]
Ritter: ἀνθρώπων, ἔνθεδε λέγεται 1884 ἢ ἄνθρωπος] ἢ ἄνθρωπος recte; Ritter: ἢ ἄνθρωπος fals | ἀλλὰ ἄνθρωπος]
Ritter: ἀλλ᾽ ἄνθρωπος sine variante
1891 κατ᾽ ἄνθρωπος[ Ritter: κατὰ ἄνθρωπους
σχόλιον

Ὑπέρ ἀνθρώπους μὲν ουσιωμένος, ὅτι ἐκ παρθένου. Κατὰ ἀνθρώπους δὲ, ὅτι ἐκ γυναικός.

Ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων δὲ οὐσίας, ὅτι οὐκ ἐξ ἄλλης οὔτε γὰρ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ τὴν σάρκα κατηγαγεν; οὔτε ἐκ γῆς ἐτεροφυή τινά σάρκα παρὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην ἑαυτῷ περιέθετο· οὔτε κατὰ φαντασίαν ἐννημοσύνης.

κείμενον

Ἔστι δὲ οὐδὲν ἦττον, ὑπερουσιώτητος ὑπερπλήρης, ὁ ἀεὶ ὑπερουσίος· ἀμέλει τῇ ταύτῃ περιουσίᾳ, καὶ εἰς οὐσίαν ἀληθῶς ἐλθὼν· ὑπερουσίως οὐσιώθη· καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων ἐνήγχει τὰ ἀνθρώπου· καὶ δηλοὶ παρθένους ὑπερφυώς κύουσα· καὶ ὕδωρ ἀστατον, ὅλικων καὶ γερμῶν ποδῶν, ἀνέχον βάρος· καὶ μὴ ὑπείκον ἀλλ’ ὑπερφυεῖ δυνάμει πρὸς τὸ ὀδυρμένον συνιστάμενον· τί ἀν τά πολλά, πάμπολλα ὄντα, διέλθοι δι’ ἧν ὁ θεῖος ὅρων, ὑπὲρ νοῦν γνώσεται, καὶ τὰ ἐπί τῇ φιλανθρωπίᾳ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ καταφασκόμενα, δύναμιν ὑπεροχικῆς ἀποφάσεως ἔχοντα· καὶ γὰρ, ἵνα συνελόντες εἰπαμεν, οὐδὲ ἀνθρώπος ἢν, οὐχ ἄκα τὸ ἀνθρώπος· ἀλλ’ ὡς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, ἀνθρώπων ἐπέκειναι καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων, ἀληθῶς ἀνθρώπως γεγονὼς.

σχόλιον

Ὅτι ὑπερουσίοισι καὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα· καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐτὴ ὑπερουσίος, ὡς ἐκ παρθένου· καὶ ἀνευ σπερματος· καὶ ὡσπερ ἡ θεότης αὐ<ω>ὑπὲρ νοῦν καὶ λόγον. νοομενὴ γὰρ τὸ ἀγνωστὸν ἔχει· καὶ λεγομένη, τὸ ἀρθητὸν· ὁ κατὰ φύσιν· καὶ ὑπὲρ

---

1902–1917 Ἔστι... γεγονὼς Ps. Dion. Areop., Epistula 4, Ritter p. 160, 9-161, 7
1909 τὰ πολλά] falsa; Ritter: τὰ λοιπά sine variante
1919 καὶ αὐ[τῆ] id est: καὶ ἡ ἀνθρωπότης
1921 αὐ[της] finis verbi paene illegibilis est

1906 παρθένος... κύουσα cf. Lc. 1, 26-38; 2, 1-14; Mt. 1, 18-25
1906–1908 ὕδωρ... βάρος Mt. 14, 25-34; Mc. 6, 48-51; Jo. 6, 19-21
φύσιν ὃτι μὲν γὰρ ἀνθρωπίνης οὐσιώθη, γινώσκομεν τε καὶ λέγομεν· πῶς δὲ ἐκ παρθενικῶν αἰμάτων ἐπέρῳ παρὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν θεσμῷ, οὕτω οἴδαμεν, οὕτε λέγομεν.

κείμενον

Καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν οὐ κατὰ θεὸν τὰ θεία δρᾶσας οὐ κατὰ ἀνθρώπουν τὰ ἀνθρωπίνα· ἄλλα ἀνδρωθέντος Θεοῦ, καὶ τὴν τινα τὴν θεανδρικὴν ἐνέργειαν, ἦμιν πεπολεμεμένοις.

σχόλιον

Ὁ Χριστός, οὕτε κατὰ θεὸν ἐδρασε τὰ θεία, οὕτε κατὰ ἀνθρώπων τὰ ἀνθρωπίνα· οὕτε γὰρ θεῖκς μόνον, ἄλλα καὶ ἀνθρωπικός, οὕτω ἀνθρωπικός μόνον, ἄλλα καὶ θεῖκς διὰ τὴν ἁχώριστον καὶ ἀσυγχύτουν ἔνωσιν ἄνθρωπέντος γὰρ Θεοῦ, τούτωσιν ἑνανθρωπισμάντος Θεοῦ, καὶ τὴς θεανδρικῆς ἐνέργειας ἐγίνετο· καὶ οὐκ ἐν ἀλήθειαν θεία άμα καὶ ἀνθρωπίνην ἑστερφο γὰρ τοῦ πυρακτωθέντος ξίφους, τὸ τμητικὸν γέγονε καυστικὸν καὶ τὸ καυστικὸν τμητικὸν, ἠνώθε γὰρ, καθάπερ τῷ σιδήρῳ τὸ πῦρ, οὕτω καὶ τῷ τοῦ σιδήρου τμητικῷ, τὸ τοῦ πυρὸς καυστικὸν καὶ γέγονε καυστικός μὲν οὐκ ἐν τῷ σιδήρῳ, ἑνώσει τῇ πρὸς τὸ πῦρ, τμητικὸν δὲ τὸ πῦρ, ἑνώσει τῇ πρὸς τοῦ σιδήρου, οὐδετέρον δὲ τροπὴν πέπονθε, τῇ καθ’ ἑνώσιν πρὸς θάτερον ἀντιδότης, ἄλλ’ ἐκάτερον· καὶ τῇ τοῦ συγκειμένου καθ’ ἑνώσιν ἑνότητι· μεμενήκε <ἐκ> τῆς κατὰ φύσιν οἰκείας οἰκεστήτης ἀνέκπτωσιν, οὕτω καὶ τῷ μυστηρίῳ τῆς θείας ἑνανθρωπισιμάς, θεότης

26ος


1930 οὐ²…1931 ἀνθρωπίνα] Ritter: οὐ τὰ ἀνθρώποια κατὰ ἀνθρώπουν
1932 ἀνθρωθέντος] Ritter: ἄλλ’ ἀνθρωθέντος
1946 τμητικὸν] e iotacismo
καὶ ἀνθρωπότης ἦνώθησαν καθ᾽ ὑπόστασιν, μηδ᾽ ἔτερας ἐκστάσεις τῆς φυσικῆς ἐνεργείας, διὰ τὴν ἐνώσιν· μήτε μὴν ἄσχετον αὐτὴν κεκτημένης μετὰ τὴν ἐνώσιν· μὴ δὲ τῆς συγκειμένης διακεκριμένην.

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν θεολογικῶν στοιχείωσεων τοῦ Ἁγίου Ἰεροθέου

oggler

Ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ ἦσας φύσεως ὑπὸ φιλανθρωπίας ἔληλυθε· καὶ ἀληθῶς οὐσιώθη καὶ ἀνήρ ὁ ὑπερθέος ἐχομάτισεν· ἔλεος δὲ εἰπ τρός ἡμῶν τὰ ὑπὲρ νοῦν καὶ λόγων ὑμνοῦμενα, κάν τούτως ἔχει τὸ ὑπερφυὲς καὶ ὑπεραύοιον, οὐ μόνον ἡ ἀναλλοίωτος ἡμῖν καὶ ἀσυγχύτως κεκοινώνηκε· ὑπέρ ξεσπενθάς εἰς τὸ ὑπερθέρησεν αὐτοῦ πρὸ τῆς ἀφθονητοῦ κενώσεως, ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι καὶ τὸ πάντων καίνον καινότατον, ἐν τοῖς φυσικοῖς ἡμῶν, ὑπερφυῆς ἢν, ἐν τοῖς κατ οὐσίαν ὑπεραύοιος· πάντα τὰ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς ὑπερέχων.


CONCLUSIONS

This thesis deals with the *Panoplia Dogmatike*, the patristic anthology which was compiled under the guidance of Euthymios Zygadenus by the best court theologians in Constantinople at a personal request of Emperor Alexios Komnenos in order to be used as a source on Orthodox theology and as a weapon with arguments against each important heresy. In the subsequent centuries the anthology was copied in a significant number of Greek manuscripts. Becoming a basis for similar anthologies, the text was also translated into Slavonic and Latin.

Despite the fact that the *Panoplia* is well known to scholars dealing with Byzantium, it has remained largely unexplored because of its length and monumental tradition, but also because of the view which for a long time regarded Byzantine anthologies as merely mechanical compilations. This view has already been moderated by discussions on the Byzantine phenomenon of excerpting and repeating (*l'encyclopédisme, la cultura della sylloge*) and by the editions of the great anthologies of Byzantium which clearly show their value.

Until now, the studies on the *Panoplia* have followed two main approaches – on the subject of heresiology it was employed as a source of information on contemporary heresies, and, as a Patristic anthology, it was used as a testimony for the indirect tradition of ancient texts. My thesis has taken another possible direction – that of a reception history which combines elements from the traditional approaches in order to present an integrated view of the development of the *Panoplia* over a period of time.

The thesis gave snapshots on the anthology in two different periods – on the first printed Greek edition and on a single Greek manuscript from the Palaeologian period which differs most from the text as we know it today. These two sections, each dedicated to a different period and introduced by different methodology, are unified as prolegomena to a
possible critical edition of the *Panoplia*. They could be an impetus for similar studies on the reception history of Patristic and Byzantine texts in the period after the Fall of Constantinople in the countries of Eastern Europe. This field is well studied for Western Europe but has not received attention in the countries which once were part of the Byzantine Commonwealth.

The point of departure for the investigation was the Greek printed text of the *Panoplia* which is available only in one edition, published in the year 1710 in Tîrgoviște (Wallachia) and re-printed in volume 130 of the *Patrologia Graeca*. In the re-print in the *Patrologia* the text is enriched with the additional texts published by Friedrich Sylburg, and with the notes of the German scholar Friedrich Matthäi, who visited Russia in 1780 and consulted manuscripts there. Edited in this way, this text is used and quoted by the scholars today as testimony for the text of the *Panoplia* as it was compiled at the beginning of the twelfth century.

The first section of this study traces the publication history of the Greek *editio princeps*. It presents the anthology of Emperor Alexios Komnenos in the new context in which it re-appeared in the eighteenth century, attempting to provide a view on the period from the vantage point of one single edition. My aim was to trace the reasons for the publication and to give an example of how the function of this important text changed through the centuries. Thus, by putting together the details of the publication, it became clear how the major events necessitated and influenced the first Greek printed edition of this famous book.

The Early Modern Period was the time when, facing the influence of Catholics and Protestants, the Orthodox had to present their teachings in order to defend their theology and to outline their dogmatic differences from their opponents. For this reason they elaborated new Confessions and published key books from their past. Among these books the *Panoplia Dogmatike* had a special place because it was an ancient source for Orthodox theology and a powerful symbol of Orthodox identity, tradition, and unceasing spiritual battles.
Nonetheless, the publication history of the *Panoplia* epitomized characteristic trends for the period -- it was a product of what Father George Florovsky called “pseudomorphosis” of the Orthodox Church at a time when Orthodox teaching was heavily influenced by foreign concepts. The direct impetus for the edition of the *Panoplia* came from outside the Orthodox lands. In fact, the book came as an echo of discussions which had begun in Western Europe and the interpretation which it received was a combination of the Catholic and Orthodox theological traditions. In the West the interest in this anthology was mainly related to the Eucharistic controversies between Catholics and Protestants. Orthodox theologians educated in the West introduced the interpretations related to the Eucharist on native Orthodox soil. This, however, did not change the traditional view on the anthology but rather enriched it with one more aspect -- indirectly introducing a chapter against the Protestants. The publication itself happened against the background of the Jansenist controversy, during which the theologians of the Port Royal were arguing with the Calvinists and both sides turned to the Orthodox Church for arguments. To a certain extent, the history of the *Panoplia* in the early modern period is a history of the relations between the Orthodox and their main Christian opponents – the Catholics and the Protestants. Even if on the surface they were openly hostile to each other, they often used the same texts and, in the case of the anthology of Emperor Alexios I, they agreed on an astonishing number of points in their interpretations.

Inevitably, the situation of this *editio princeps* was different from the time of the original compilation, when the anthology was part of the new religious policy introduced with the establishment of the Komnenian Dynasty. In this religious policy the role of the emperor was to be a guardian of the monumental Orthodox tradition. Thus, one of the achievements of the twelfth-century theologians was the creation of a theological synthesis of the existing tradition. At the personal behest of the emperor, the *Panoplia* itself was compiled exclusively from texts of the Church Fathers. In addition to this, in the context of the twelfth
century, the anthology was not a single book but rather a volume in a series. Euthymios Zygadenos composed three other major works – *Commentaries to the Psalms*, *Commentaries to the Gospels*, and *Commentaries to the Epistles of Saint Paul*. At the time of their compilation, all these works were part of one construction. However, from the later reception of this theological series, it is apparent that the *Panoplia* was the most successful part of the project.

In contrast to the original composition of the *Panoplia*, at the beginning of the eighteenth century the situation was entirely changed. First and foremost, the Great Church was in a new subordinate position with an unstable Orthodox patriarchate in Constantinople and without a Christian emperor. For the Orthodox the century was marked by significant events – the reforms of Patriarch Nikon in Russia and the Confession of Faith, tinged with Calvinist views, which was published in 1629 under the name of the Constantinopolitan Patriarch Kyrillos Lukaris. The publication of this Confession opened wide debates and necessitated the convocation of three important councils of the Orthodox Church at the time – those of Constantinople (1638), Jassy (1642), and Jerusalem (1672).

In the present research into the reception history of the *Panoplia*, the first important task I set for myself was to discover who actually stood behind the publication. My research has shown that those who actually initiated the publication are not directly mentioned anywhere in the edition of the Greek *Panoplia*. These were two patriarchs of Jerusalem, Dositheos and Khrysanthos Notaras, his nephew and successor to the patriarchal throne. The initiator of this edition was Patriarch Dosithheos, who became the undisputed leader of the Orthodox after he was elected patriarch of Jerusalem at the age of 28. His involvement in the edition provided a wide context and value for the edition of the *Panoplia* because there was hardly any important event for the Orthodox Church in which Dositheos did not have an
active engagement. Several events in particular are important for reconstructing the background of the Panoplia.

One of these events happened in 1669, when the Jansenists, looking for support for their views from the teachings of the Orthodox on the Eucharist, approached the representative Orthodox leaders of the time – Patriarch Dositheos himself, Patriarch of Constantinople Dionysios, and the translator (dragoman) of the Ottoman Sultan Panagiotis Nikousios. The result of this collaboration was that the third volume of La perpétuité de la foy de l’Eglise Catholique touchant l’Eucharistie by Antoine Arnauld and Pierre Nicole contained a detailed view of the Orthodox teaching on the Eucharist clearly against the Calvinists. Among the numerous other testimonies from the Greek Church Fathers, La perpétuité contained a reference to the Panoplia in relation to the Eucharist.

Another important event concerned the relations between the Catholics and the Orthodox. In 1672 the French ambassador to the Ottoman Empire paid a visit to the Holy Places in Jerusalem. The result of this was that for various political reasons the protection of the Holy Places was taken from the Orthodox and given into the care of the French Franciscans. This cut off any further collaboration of the Orthodox with the Catholics, although, for a moment, the two parties appear to have fought together against the teaching of the Calvinists. It also diminished the hope that the Orthodox could print their books in Western Europe with Catholic support. For this reason, Patriarch Dositheos finally chose to establish a Greek printing press in lands autonomous from the Ottoman Empire – the Principalities of Moldovia and Wallachia. This is the explanation for why the Panoplia was published in Tîrgovişte, the Metropolitan town of Ungrovlachia.

The first attested evidence of the intentions of Patriarch Dositheos to publish the Panoplia comes from 1690. In that year he sent Khrysanthos an order to arrange for the publication of a polemical collection of books in Moscow, among them one manuscript of the
Panoplia (GIM 225). None of the books was printed because such a project did not fit into the political vision of Peter the Great.

On the other side, this first move of Dositheos to publish the Panoplia coincided with the escalation of an internal conflict (between 1689 and 1691) in the Orthodox church over the Eucharistic mystery. This was a repercussion from the coeval debates in Western Europe. On Orthodox soil the conflict acquired a local dimension and consisted of debates over the proper usage of terms for the Eucharist. One of the parties insisted that the new term μετουσίωσις should be avoided as a foreign concept and a literal translation of the Latin transsubstantiation and, instead, the established terms such as μεταβολή, μεταποίησις, μεταρρύθμισις, μεταστοιχείωσις should be used, all of which were attested in the tradition of the Orthodox church. The main representative of that view at the time was the philosopher and theologian John Matthew Karyophylles, who was engaged in bitter personal enmity with Patriarch Dositheos. The main argument of the patriarch and his supporters was that the rejection of the word μετουσίωσις meant, in fact, a rejection of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, thus raising fears that this was actually Calvinism infiltrating the Orthodox tradition. At certain points the arguments of the circle around Karyophylles seem to have been closer to the traditional views, including the Orthodox tradition of συνουσίωσις — the real presence of the body and blood of the Lord in the Eucharist, without the destruction or disappearance of the substance of the bread and the wine. Nonetheless, the opponents of Karyophylles, led by Dositheos, condemned his views as heretical at a Synod of Constantinople, convoked for this purpose in 1691.

Although Patriarch Dositheos praised the anthology as the “most beautiful book which was to exist in the church,” there was a specific entry in the anthology which was of interest to the Orthodox theologians proving the involvement of the edition in the Eucharistic
debates. The entry in question is now published in PG 130 as the separate chapter 25 On the Baptism, the Body and Blood of Christ and the Cross, col. 1244 in the PG).

The relation between the Eucharistic controversies and the publication of the Panoplia becomes clear from the writings of one of the most erudite Orthodox theologians of the time, Meletios Syrigos. In 1638 the patriarch of Constantinople, Kyrillos Kontaris, ordered him to write a refutation of the Confession of Kyrillos Lukaris. The resulting book acquired undisputed authority, it was published by Dositheos in 1690, partially translated for La perpétuité, also translated into Russian, often referred to and quoted. In this volume, the section with the evidence from auctores gives an intriguing reference to Euthymios Zygadenos. According to the interpretation of Syrigos, the Panoplia was created as a result of the fight against Berengar of Tours whose teaching, according to Meletios, had reached Byzantium in the twelfth century. Syrigos quotes a section of the Panoplia which has not received attention in the modern scholarship – this is an entry from Chapter 25 which is entitled. Περὶ τῆς μεταλήψεως τοῦ Δεσποτικοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος – it contains two texts on the Eucharist – one from Gregory of Nyssa and the other from John Damascene’s Expositio fidei.

The period of the seventeenth century is often referred to as the Age of Confessions. When the Great Church was approached by Catholics and Protestants enquiring about the Orthodox dogma on the disputed questions, it was necessary that the Orthodox also elaborate their Confession of Faith, with the first Orthodox Confession of time being prepared by the metropolitan of Kiev Peter Moghila (1633-1647). The present study has shown that the Panoplia of Emperor Alexios found a place in the next important Orthodox Confession, written by Patriarch Dositheos himself and approved by the Synod of Jerusalem in 1672. In the third edition of this Confession, published in Bucharest in 1690 (the first and the second being published in Amsterdam, 1670, and also in Leipzig. Dositheos simply took and
reworked the aforementioned work of Syrigos, including the interpretation which connected the creation of the *Panoplia* with Berengar. Because of the importance of the Confession, the text has seen numerous editions ever since, thus establishing the connection of the *Panoplia* with Berengar and repeating it numerous times.

Further, the present investigation succeeded in establishing the direct source of the erudite Meletos Syrigos for the notion that the *Panoplia* was connected with Berengar. This was *De controversiis*, one of the most thorough and popular refutations of the Protestants, authored by the Catholic cardinal and polemicist Roberto Bellarmino. A comparison of the two texts has made their relationship apparent and beyond any doubt, but it also demonstrated the process in which the Orthodox Syrigos re-worked the text, adding details of his own and excluding all references to the Western tradition.

However, the connection of the *Panoplia* with the Eucharistic controversy in the West had deeper roots. The evidence for this comes, once again, from the account of the anthology relating it to Berengar. In fact, Roberto Bellarmino did not invent this connection and his text is not original either. The reference he gave was based on a tradition of around a hundred and forty years in which a series of Catholic theologians had included the *Panoplia* as a small argument in the refutation of the Protestants. The same account was briefly mentioned in the polemical treatises of theologians like Possevino, Tomas Stapleton, Peter Canisius, and others. The present study has not been able to establish the identity of the person who introduced this interpretation. I have limited myself to listing all the references I found because this story went too far away from the Greek *editio princeps*. However, the earliest references gathered show the direction for further research – the Latin translation of *Panoplia* which was published in 1555 in Venice and coincided with the Synod of Trent. The Catholic Cardinal Reginald Pole, an active participant in this Synod, is mentioned in the preface as a patron of this translation into Latin. I have not been able to establish how much Pole actually
contributed to the edition. Still, it is known that in the next year – 1556 – the second edition of the Latin translation of the *Panoplia* appeared. This coincided with the time when Cardinal Pole, the last heir to the house of the Plantagenets, returned to England after the enthronement of Queen Mary and the country’s temporary return to Catholicism. The first references to the *Panoplia* come from the milieu of the English Catholics, many of whom had formed a recusant community in Leuven. In particular, the references are related to the discussions between the English Catholic theologian Harpsfield and his Anglican opponent John Jewel and also follow accounts by John Martiull and Thomas Harding. However, I felt that this track of investigation was going too far afield; thus, for the moment, it suffices to say that the Latin translation had an intriguing history of its own. Apparently, the *editio princeps* in Greek, which was made around a hundred and sixty years later, was indirectly influenced by this Latin translation. A further path of research in this direction should include details on the publication history of the Latin translation of the anthology.

Nonetheless, when the Orthodox theologians decided to publish the *Panoplia*, they considered it a pristine, authentic Byzantine text which was not contaminated by an edition prepared in the West. They described it as their hidden golden treasure. It is an irony of fate that, in fact, they were publishing their *Panoplia* on the basis of Greek manuscripts but within the framework of an interpretation elaborated in the West.

Further, the publication history has given me the opportunity to present the anthology in the context of a sociology of theological texts by presenting the people and the places involved in the edition. Once again, a vivid picture of the period appeared behind the details, with a characteristic mobility of people, texts, and ideas. To a different extent the history of the edition became connected with three leading cities of the Ottoman Empire – Konstantiniye (Constantinople, later Istanbul), Jerusalem, and Adrianopolis; it also included a small frontier town on the bank of Danube, Silistra, and the autonomous territories of the
Romanian Principalities. The geographical framework of the edition reached as far as Vienna and Moscow.

The people who participated in the edition also presented a colorful view of different origins and social standings. The initiators of the edition were two patriarchs of Jerusalem – Dositheos and Khrysanthos -- who originally came from Corinth, from the noble family of the Notaras. The editor – Hieromonk Metrophanes Gregoras -- was an adventurous monk from Northern Greece who had a long life full of adventure, suffering, and even miracles, which happened in Macedonia on the eve of St. Demetrios’ day. The sponsor of the edition was a certain Athanasios, a metropolitan of Silistra. The authors of the dedicatory verses included a pilgrim to the Holy Places and two brothers, both of whom were teachers at the Patriarchal School in Constantinople and one of whom had completed his studies in Padua.

The search for the actual manuscripts which were used for the edition has not yielded any definitive results. The difficulty of finding these is understandable taking into account the stages before the edition and the many people involved. The most likely location of these manuscripts would be present-day Romania because the edition was made on its territory. During the Communist regime, the larger manuscript collections in Romania were taken and deposited at the Library of the Romanian Academy of Science. The Greek manuscripts of this collection are catalogued (Litzica, 1900; Camariano, 1940; Caratasu 2004). According to these catalogues, there is no complete copy of the PD which could have been used for the edition. My work in the archives of the Academy in Bucharest confirmed these results.

The only secure information on the manuscripts of the edition is that Khrysanthos used manuscripts from Vienna which had the original verses and the table of contents. Following the catalogue description of Hunger and Kresten, it is possible to suggest three manuscripts: Theol. Gr. 76 (twelfth century); Theol. Gr. 34 (sixteenth century); Theol. Gr. 270 (fourteenth century). The copy of the Panoplia which was to be published in Russia is
still deposited in the manuscript collection of Moscow (GIM 226) and contains the handwritten notes of Dositheos.

Testimony that the edition was not an artificial project of the patriarchs of Jerusalem is the fact that it coexisted with manuscripts of the anthology – at the time of the publication the *Panoplia* was still copied in manuscripts or, in other cases, older manuscripts were restored. The latest manuscripts date after the edition, with the interesting example of manuscript RAS 1300, which is an anti-Islamic collection directly referring to the chapter against the Saracens and explaining that the entry is missing from the edition because the editors were afraid of the Turks.

 Nonetheless, examining the impact of the project, it can be said that it was carefully thought out but it did not gain the popularity which was expected from it. No second edition was issued or a translation made into a modern language. The reason for this was that the *Panoplia* was a book of high literary style, the reading of which required a sound education and erudition. The anthology was published as a part of a polemical series, which, apart from the numerous more recent authors, included also the publication of John Damascene’s *Expositio fidei* (1715). But there was another publication which perhaps most fully reached the aims and the expectations of its initiators -- the treatise *Against Heresies* by Symeon of Thessaloniki, an author with simpler language and composition influenced by the *Panoplia*. This treatise was commonly referred to and, in translation, in Russia became a kind of school book on heresies. In the early modern period the Latin translation of the *Panoplia* was more successful, with three reprints and numerous references to it. Nonetheless, the edition of the Greek *Panoplia* had a special place of its own because for the Orthodox it was a symbol of their identity, tradition, and fight against religious opponents.

 The reliance on the existing edition of the *Panoplia* has led modern scholars to overlook important aspects of the anthology which are not discernible on the basis of the
Tîrgovişte edition. For this reason the second part of my study has treated a single manuscript—Iviron 281—which attests the anthology in a version that is divergent from the edition and the manuscripts consulted during this study. It raised questions concerning the existence of later recensions of the *Panoplia* and the annotation of the corpus with *scholia*.

When Friedrich Matthäi compared the Tîrgovişte edition with the manuscripts in Moscow he made intriguing observations on a copy of the *Panoplia* in which many of the edited texts were missing while it contained additional texts *quae curiosius tractanda sunt a futuro editore*. The present catalogue description of the Moscow manuscripts does not provide more detailed information concerning changes in the contents and annotation. In addition, among the other manuscripts of the *Panoplia* the catalogues do not indicate copies corresponding to Matthäi’s description.

Iviron 281 itself was not known as a copy of the *Panoplia* and was identified in the process of my work. The only description of this manuscript is provided by Lampros, who classified the manuscript as an unknown anonymous fragment from the fourteenth century. There is no sound reason to contest the proposed dating, with the addition that it was probably copied in the first decades of the century. The manuscript is anonymous and mutilated, without any watermarks. The only scribal note indicates, in allusion to a text of the Synaxarion, that the book was an offering to Christ, like the oil which the Myrophoroi presented on the morning after the Resurrection. With this limited data many of the questions it poses will be answered only when the missing parts are found or a manuscript with similar contents is discovered.

Nonetheless, Iviron 281 deserves attention because it opens doors for future research. Compared to the printed edition, in Iviron 281 many of the patristic fragments are missing, while the manuscript contains *scholia* to the fragments excerpted from Pseudo-Dionysious the Areopagite and Gregory of Nazianzus. These *scholia* are not *propria* in a strict sense, but
represent a re-working of already existing scholia. Apparently, Ivron 281 (or its original) was a kind of medieval edition of the *Panoplia*, created for own purposes.

There are only five scholia to fragments of the Areopagite, previously unpublished. The immediate source of most of the last one is Maximus Confessor’s *Ambigua ad Thomam* (P.G. 91, B1 - C5). A definitive influence of the same *Ambigua ad Thomam* of Maximus can also be recognized from the second to the fourth scholia. These scholia do not introduce any new interpretation of the text of the Areopagite, but have their own value as an individual reworking. It is clear that the text of the scholia is independent of the mistakes or variant readings contained in the commented version of the text in the *Panoplia*; thus they are not based on the text of the *Panoplia* but on a different source. The rest of the scholia are on texts from Gregory of Nazianzus. He is one of the authors who has the most fragments included in the *Panoplia*, but in the Ivron manuscript only five of the orations are annotated -- *Orationes Theologicae* 28, 29, 30, 31, and *In Theophania* Oratio 38. In the tradition of Gregory of Nazianzus’ commentaries, the orations which were read during the liturgical service, the ἀναγινωσκόμενοι λόγοι, and those which were used for personal reading were often annotated by different authors. For this reason I have decided to present a sample of both types of orations in my editio princeps – that is, Oratio 38 for the ἀναγινωσκόμενοι - *In Theophania* and Oratio 30 *De Filio* for the μὴ ἀναγινωσκόμενοι.

In Ivron 281, the scholia to Oratio 38 *In Theophania* are appended to the part of the oration which is identical to another oration of Gregory – *In Sanctum Pascha*, Oratio 45. Several of these texts have not yielded identification until this moment. However, a considerable number of them are based on (or share a common source with) the scholia to Oratio 45, *In Sanctum Pascha*, authored by Niketas of Herakleia, a twelfth-century scholar and teacher in the patriarchal school of Constantinople. The comparison shows that Ivron 281 does not contain the whole commentary of Niketas but only a selection of passages.
Some of these passages are reworked. Apparently, the scholia also incorporated parts of a Byzantine dictionary to the works of Gregory of Nazianzus.

From the Theological Orations I have chosen to publish the scholia to *Oratio* 30. The major source of these scholia is Elias of Crete. One small fragment was identified as identical with a *Commentary on the Psalms* by Zigadenus; apparently other small fragments were taken from a collection with definitions.

In the process of the work I have transcribed in about 100 pages the rest of the scholia of Gregory of Nazianzus. They were not included in this dissertation but will be treated in a further study as they seem to give a direction to the the authoritative commentator of Nazianzus’ theological orations - the tenth-century theologian Elias of Crete.

Described briefly, the characteristics the scholia to these texts are the following: Oratio 28 (13 pages of text and scholia) contains scholia on references to the Bible, on the mixture of the elements, and Aristotle’s teaching on species. One scholion comments on apophatic and kathaphatic theology; Oratio 29 (60 pages of text and scholia) attests the most interesting scholia, the text of which is related to Elias of Crete; Oratio 31 (30 pages of text and *scholia*) – contains the most fragmented scholia among all the orations.

The scholiasts of Gregory of Nazianzus represent a field which clearly requires more study. Such studies would make it possible to identify the collection from which the *scholia* in Iviron 281 are taken and to better understand the sources that were used and the reasons behind the selection.

However, even in this fragmented and mutilated form, these scholia still have value in themselves. They give a glimpse of what an anonymous religious man considered important to select – his section included scholia pertaining to Biblical quotations, scholia containing expressive metaphors which presented theological questions in a clear and simple way (like different metaphors for the union of the two natures in Christ), explanations of words, of
certain philosophical concepts (some sources on Aristotle), scholia explaining cosmological topics, such as the measurement of time and the creation of the human being. They all have the immediacy of displaying personal interest, which makes them a special case of the reception history of the Panoplia.

Even after finishing this thesis, research on the Panoplia is far from being completed. My study took a novel approach and presented two snapshots of the anthology which opened doors for further research. A complete history of the Panoplia should also integrate the translations into Latin and Slavonic. Until then, many of the secrets of Euthymios Zygadenos’ Panoplia Dogmatike will still remain as “hidden as gold.”
APPENDIX 1: EDITION OF THE ORIGINAL PROLOGUE BY FRANCESCO ZINI TO THE LATIN TRANSLATION OF THE PD

(I am thankful to professor Jan Papy (KULeuven) and to Dr. Cristian Gaspar (CEU, Budapest) for consulting me on the texts in Latin)

Euthymii Monachi Zigabeni
Orthodoxae fidei Dogmatica Panoplia
Hucusque Latinis incognita et nunc primum
Per Petrum Franciscum Zinum Veronensem e Graeco translata

Vis edoceri, quomodo contra haereses sit disserendum? Lege hunc librum priscorum patruum doctrinis conspicuum.

Cum indice praecipuarum locupletissimo, PARISIIS, Apud Franciscum Bartolomei Honorati
In via D. Iacobi, Sub scuto Veneti
M.D. LVI

Optimo atque eruditissimo Veronae pontifici A. Aloisio Lipomano P. Franciscus Zinus S. D.

Summa Dei benignitas est et singularis erga genus humanorum atque incredibilis amor, Aloisi, Pontifex optime ac sapientissime, qui nos felices essemus, mera benignitate adductus e nihilo procreavit. Et quia felices esse non poteramus, nisi eo frueremur, nec frui, nisi illum amaremus, nec eum amare, qui nobis incognitus esset, et cui nos esse charos non intelligeremus, omnia facit, ut se nobis et amabilissimum et nostri amantissimum indicaret. Si quis enim tum universam mundi fabricam, tum singulas eius partes contempletur, ex magnitudine, ordine et concinnitate infinitam ipsius potentiam, sapientiamque facile perspiciet. Si quis consideret, in hoc ipso universitatis veluti amplissimo quodam theatrum, nullum esse animal, quod eius pulchritudinem cognoscat, praeter hominem, nullum, quod maiorem ex rebus omnibus utilitatem voluptatemque percipiat, adeo, ut omnia illius causa facta fuisse videantur, immensam conditoris in nos benevolentiam animadvertet. Iam si quis divinum in homine fabricando artificium spectet et corpus eius eo consilio, ut animo serviat, apte formatum, et animum sic affectum inveniet, ut miro quodam tum veri intelligendi, tum pulchri et boni adipiscendi studio cupiditateque teneatur. Ex quo perspicuum sit, nec hominem nisi in Deo, qui ipsa et veritas, et pulchritudo, et bonitas est, posse beatum conquiescere, nec Deo esse felicitate hominis optatius qui quam. Nihil autem est, quod felicitatem nobis queat adimere, nisi amorem in Deum adimat, qui sane amor non nisi sublata cognitione Dei amitti potest, aut eripi. Itaque perpetuus Dei, atque hominum hostis Diabolus
totis simper viribus contendit, ut cognitionem hanc in animis nostris imminueret, vel funditus everteter. Everti principio tota non poterat. Recens enim mentibus impressa penitus insederat. Quam ob rem operam dedit callidus adversarius, ut illam imminueret, et paulatim labefactaret. Quod sibi successurum speravit, si posset primis parentibus persuadere, Deum non benevolentia, sed invidia impulsum prohibuisse, ne arboris illius, qua boni, malique scientia continebatur, fructibus uescerentur. Quod enim illis interdictum fuerat, ut Deum cognoscerent cognitumque diligenter, atque felices essent, ipse persuasit, idcirco fuisse vetitum, ne Diis similes beatique forent. Qua fallacia decepti, ex amoenissimo illo deliciarum loco in has miserias detrusi sunt et ignorantiae tenebris circumfusi tantum divini amoris, quantum Dei cognitionis ob peccatum sibi detraxerant, amiserunt. Hic vero magis adhuc incautos et insidiis expositos, Deique formidine plenissimos adortus occasionem arripuit, qua nos diversis rationibus impugnaret. Fingens enim calamitates nostras omnes ex inani Deo metu pendere nostras omnes ex inani Dei metu pendere, quo dies noctesque discruciabamur eo nos praecipites impellere conatus est, ut nullum esse crederemus Deum. Verum quia paucis id poterat pesuaderi, divina illa imagine mentibus humanis insita, quae tametsi propter peccatum infecta, non tamen prorsus erat extincta, repugnante faciliorem illam aggressum introcueret. Quae quidem fraudem illi e sententia cessit, ut totum propemodum orbem invaderet et gentem etiam, quam sibi Deus unam ex omnibus delegerat, corrumpere et inquinare. Verum cum versatissimus hostis speraret omnia, quae optaverat, perfecisse, nec homines posse perfectam amplius veri Dei cognitionem assequi tum vero clementissimus hominem procreator manuum suarum opus miseratus audacissimi adversarii dolos detexit, vim comminui et dominatum evertit. Misit enim filium suum, qui tenebris ignorantiae discussis disperses veritatis lumine mundum illustret. Hic hominibus persuasit, Deum non eorum commodis invidere, sed nihil magis cupere, quam ut essent in perpetuum felicissimi. Sic enim homines dilexisse, ut se filium unicum daret, qui morte sua genus humanum vindicaret in libertatem, ut omnes, qui sibi fidem haberent, vitam assequerentur beatissimam ac sempiternam. Hac autem vitam in eo sitam esse, ut ipsum vetum Deum cognoscerent, et se, qui ab eo missus esset, Iesum Christum, ad quam veritatis cognitionem velle omnes homines pervenire. Sic igitur inimici serpentis caput collusion, afflictum et contritum est, nec tamen destitit membra, quibus perniciosum virus infuderat, circumvolvere et novas repugnandi artes excogitare. Primum enim coepit a se deficientes et Imperatoris Christi militia sequentes per impios principes et crudeles tyrannos interficere. Sed cum animadverteret, quo plures trucidandos curabat, eo magis Christianorum militia numero
augeri et confirmari, ad alias fraudes et dolos sibi confugiendum existimavit. Desperans enim tantas, tamque coniunctas opes externis posse viribus perfringi, sciensque nullum esse tam amplum….regnum, quod non domesticis inimicitiae et simulatibus tandem ruat et concidet, nihil intentatum reliquit, ut inter eos discordia atque dissidium excitaret. Quamobrem varios homines ambitiosos et arrogantes impulit, qui simulacione pietatis novas et falsas opiniones defendentes quasi venena quaedam in veritatem polculo commiserent. Verum Ecclesiae suae non defuit benignissimus Deus. Quemadmodum enim nec per malos philosophos, nec per tyrannos unquam permisserat totam sui cognitionem deleri, ita nec eam perverti a pertinacibus rerum novarum inventoribus et Haereticis passus est, sed magnos semper illis viros opposuit, qui disputationibus scriptisque suis tanquam gladiis et propugnaculis adversarios confodientes et repellentes, veram in Ecclesia doctrinam pietatemque retinuerunt ac defenderunt. Hi Christianae Reipublicae magnopere quidem omnes profuere, sed precipe tamen Euthymius Monachus Zigabenus, qui Alexii Imperatoris iussu non unam aut alteram, aut paucas haereses, ut reliqui, sed omnes, quae superioribus temporibus ad suam aetatem usque debacchatae fuerunt, aut certe plurimas, atque praecipuas insectatus, rationem edocuit qua possent omnes labefactari atque convelli. Omnia enim armorum genera, quibus Christianae veritatis propugnatores diversis temporibus adversarios prostraverunt, et veritatem ipsam tutati sunt, congregavit et pulcherrimum quodam veluti armamentarium constituit, et adornavit, in quo et pacis tempore magna cum voluptate licet intueri, quo genere armorum qui hostes devicti sint, et bellis ingruitibus tela ad novos hostes superandos depromere. Quo quidem in munere operae pretium est, molestiam et prudentiam hominis admirari, qui, ut ex aliis ipsius scriptis facile potest intelligi, cum esset doctissimus, et marte suo posset argumentum hoc pertractare, tamen ut arrogantiam fugeret, et operi suo plus authoritatis conciliaret, magisque legentibus prodesset, nec frustra librorum numerorum, qui iam, ut aetate etiam hac nostra fieri cernimus, nimio plus excreverat, adaugeret, nihil fere de suo promens, omnia ex probatissimis scriptoribus diligentis apiculae in morem mirabili judicio collegit, et excellenti ordine collocavit. Etenim cum Ecclesiae Dei, veraeque pietatis cognitionem vel ab externis hostibus impugnetur, vel ab inimicis intimis, quibus ipsa Ecclesia defecerunt. Externi autem sint tum reliqui populi, quos sacri scriptores antiqui, vel Graecos, vel Gentes, vel Ethnicos; novi autem minus quidem latine, sed aperte tamen et commode rem exprimentes, Paganos, aut Gentiles appelant, tum ipsi Iudaei. Intimi vero inimici sunt homines seditiosi, qui vel gloriae, vel quaestus cupiditate ducti a nobis quidem, ut Ioannes Apostolus scribit, prodierunt, sed non erant ex nobis, si enim e Christi grege fuissent, in eo utique permansissent (cf. Jo. 2, 19). Quaedam sunt in omnibus adversariis communia,
quaedam singulorum praecipua contra tela. Quidam enim a nobis in omnibus fere dissentient, quidam videntur nobiscum vel paucis vel multis in rebus convenire. Quare ne saepius idem esset repetendum, et confuse et sine ordine cum periculo dimicandum, vir prudentissimus sibi faciendum putavit, ut primum adversus eos qui nulla prope in re nobiscum consentiunt, arma nobis subministraret, in iis duntaxat rebus, quae sunt ipsorum propriae. Itaque principio contra Graecos nos instituit, quorum id erat proprium, aut vel nullum esse Deum dicerent, vel plures Deos asserent, ita tamen, ut multi nullam illis esse mundi curam affirmarent. Pauci simis verbis istos confutat, licet enim numero plures sint, quam reliqui omnes adversarii et a nobis maxime discrepent, inermes tamen quomadmod a sunt, facileque vel superantur, vel cedunt, vel sese veritatis luce perspecta nobis adiungunt. Deinde nos docet, qua ratione Iudaeorum agmen, hostium genus obstinatissimum, propriis ipsorum armis profligetur et concidatur. Postremo diligentissime nos adversus intimos hostes et Christianae militiae desertores armat et munit. Quod quidem agmen et copiarum numero et armorum genere et pugnandi ratione est instructissimum. Numero quidem, quoniam tanquam ergastula solentes undique cogunt auxilia. Armorum genere, pugnandique ratione, quia cum a nobis desciverint, et armis, et dimicandis rationibus uturunt iisdem, quibus nos utimur, nempe testimoniis scripturarum. Itaque periculosa admodum cum istis esset decertatio, nisi et ipsi inter se dissiderent et ipsa arma, quae in manibus nostris sunt validissima et acutissima, in manibus eorum virtute Spiritus spoliatis plumbea quodammodo, obtusaque evaderunt, atque inutilia. Adversus hos igitur fere omnes, a quibus periculum impendebat, quicke fortiores et paratiores videbantur, arma nobis ita comparavit, ut nos tamen prius nostrique communiere. Facile enim est, veritate bene perspecta et cognita quodvis mendacium confutare. Itaque septem titulis, sic enim huius operis partes appellat, primum ostendit Deum esse unum tribus distinctum personis. Deinde communia quaedam de Deo tradit. Tum, quia maxime Dei cognitio est, ut sciamus, naturam eius a nobis perfecte cognosci non posse demonstrat, illam esse incomprehensam. Post de nominibus illius disputat. His enim fere continetur quicquid de Deo vel possumus, vel nobis expedt intelligere. Ad haec, quia gloria ipsius in eius operibus appareret clarissima, de opificio Dei, seu de rerum universitatis procreatione loquitur. Deinde quoniam nihil est, quod infinitam illius erga nos benevolentiam magis indicet, quam quod filium suum in mundum misit, ut homo factus homines Deos efficeret, de divina humanae carnis assumptione disserit. Atque his quidem titulis nihil meo quidem iudicio nihil praec klarus, nihil eruditis, nihil divinius, iucundius, utilius legi potest. Constitutis autem iis, quae ad veram pietatem, religionemque pertinent, illius reliquos adversarios et oppugnatores expugnandi convinciendique rationes docet, primumque Iudaeos.
amabilis in omnes comitas et mansuetudo illa singularis, qua te adeo summisse geris, adeo de te modeste sentis, ut facile appaerat, te tam egregiis virtutibus nihil extolli, sed eas omnes Deo acceptas referre et divinum in omnibus illis munus agnoscere. Non igitur, quod te ullis adminiculis ad gloriam, ad quam, licet eam nihil cures, rectissima tamen contendis virtutum via, putarem indigere, sed ut animum meum tui studiosissimum et amantissimum, quod mihi semper in optatis fuit, aliquo pacto declararem, monumenta haec nomini tuo consecravi. Quanquam ea quoque de causa tibi potissimum debentur, quod me ad hanc provinciam susciendam hortatus es, et Verona exemplari misso multum adiuvis. Licet enim Illustri[mus] et Reverend[issimus] Marcellus Ceruinus Cardinalis, qua est in studiosos omnes singulari humanitate, ex Bibliotheca Vaticana mihi vetustum exemplar accommodarit, quod multo libentius fecit, cum intelliageret, me causa tua cupere illud e Graeco in Latinum convertere, tuum tamen mihi multum attulit adiumenti. Accesit huc et Illustri et Reverendi Reginaldi Poli Cardinalis, cuius liberalitate studia mea foventur et sustentantur, voluntas, qui cum audisset ex me, te mihi mandasse, ut Dogmaticam hanc Orthodoxae fidei Panopliam ipsi, ut eximio Ecclesiae Catholicae defensori consecrarem, licet animi tui studium et benevolentiam libenter agnoseret, et complecteretur, noluit tamen, ut consilium mutaret, iussitque ut nomine tuo, qui tanquam unus e strenuis illis Machabaeis eodem tempore Dei Ecclesiæm, et exemplo orationeque communis atque confirmas et scriptis atque industria tua defendis adversus eos qui extremis istis temporibus, ab ea defecerunt, ornata in lucem, et manus hominum prodiret. Huiusce viri nec auctoritati scio me posse non obtemperare, cum illi debeam omnia, persuasumque habeam, nihil ab eo mihi praecipi, quod non sit aequissimum atque honestissimum, et tale de virtute tua testimoniun tanti te facturum existimo, ut vel ob id sperem munus hoc nostrum tibi fore gratissimum.


[Lugduni, excudebat Iacobus Faure]
APPENDIX 2: PD IN THE JANSSENIST CONTROVERSY – AN ACCOUNT BY ANTOINE ARNAULD


Chapitre XII

**Septième Preuve de la Créance de l'Eglise Grecque, Tirée D'Euthymius Zigabenus.**

Je rapporte au douzième siècle Euthymius Zigabenus, Religieux Grec, encore qu'il ait passé la plus grande partie de sa vie dans l'onzième, parce qu'il a survécu l'Emperer Alexis Comnene, qui ne mourut que l'an 1118. Il fut connu particulièrement de cet Empereur, & ce fut par son ordre qu'il dressa sa Panoplie, qui n'est autre chose qu'un recueil des passages des Pères opposés aux principales hérésies, dont il rapporte les dogmes au commencement de chaque titre.

Cet Auteur nous fournit de deux sortes de preuves sur notre sujet: les unes négatives, les autres positives.

La preuve négative est, que, parlant dans sa Panoplie des principales hérésies, il ne fait aucune mention de la doctrine de la Transubstantiation; & cependant s'il l'avait prise pour une erreur, il aurait dû la marquer comme la plus dangereuse de toutes; puisqu'il ne pouvait ignorer qu'elle était suivie de tout l'Occident. L'on ne peut pas dire que cet Auteur ait eu dessein d'épargner les Latins, puisqu'on trouve encore dans la Bibliothèque du Roi le manuscrit de l'un de ses ouvrages, où il les attaque expressément. Le titre en est comme nous avons déjà dit: *Euthymii Monachi Zigabeni adversus Romae veteris cives, capita duodecim,
demonstrantia non ex Filio procedere Spiritum Sanctum. C'est la seule opinion qu'il leur reproche.

La preuve positive est tirée d'un passage que M. Claude allege contre la Transubstantiation. Mais pour le faire fervir à ce dessein, il n'en cite qu'une partie, & il retranche tout le reste. Les Grecs, dit-il, disent [note] bien que le pain & le vin sont changés au corps & au sang du Seigneur: mais ils disent aussi des choses qui témoignent que c'est un changement non de substance, mais d'efficace & de vertu; comme ce que dit Euthymius, qu'il ne faut pas regarder à la nature des choses qui sont proposées, mais à leur vertu.

C'est tout ce qu'en cite M. Claude. Mais pour détruire les vaines conséquences qu'il en tire, il n'y a qu'à rapporter le passage tout entier, comme il est dans le commentaire d'Euthymius sur S. Matthieu Chapitre LXIV. Comme l'Ancien Testament, dit-il, a eu des hosties & du sang, le Nouveau en a aussi, qui sont le corps & le sang du Seigneur. Il n'a pas dit, ces choses sont les signes de mon corps & de mon sang; mais il a dit, ces choses sont mon corps & mon sang. Il ne faut donc pas considérer la nature des choses qui sont mises sur l'Autel, mais leur vertu. Car de même que le Verbe déifie (s'il est permis d'user de ce mot) la chair à laquelle il s'est uni d'une manière surnaturelle, de même il change, par une opération ineffable, le pain & le vin en son corps même, qui est une source de vie, & en son précieux sang, & en la vertu de l'un & de l'autre. Or il y a quelque rapport du pain au corps, & du vin au sang: car le pain & le corps sont d'une matière terrestre, & le vin & le sang sont d'une matière chaude & subtile comme l'air. Et comme le pain fortifie, de même le corps de Jésus-Christ fortifie aussi, en sanctifiant & l'âme & le corps: & comme le vin donne de la joie, le sang de Jésus-Christ a le même effet, & nous est de plus un puissant secours. Que si tous tant que nous sommes de fideles, nous participons au même corps & au même sang, la participation de ce mystère nous unit tous ensemble; nous sommes tous en Jésus-Christ & Jésus-Christ est en tous, selon que Jésus Christ même le dit: Celui qui mange ma chair &
boit mon sang, demeure en moi, & moi en lui. Le Verbe s'est uni à la chair par l'Incarnation, & cette chair nous est unie lorsque nous participons à ce Sacrement.

1°. Euthymius ruine & exclut en même temps, par ce passage, ces deux clefs célèbres, dont les Ministres se servent pour éluder tous les passages des Pères. Il exclut la clef de figure, en remarquant que Jésus-Christ n'a pas dit: Ces choses sont les signes de mon corps & de mon sang; mais qu'il a dit: Ces choses sont mon corps & mon sang. Et il nous donne lieu d'exclure la clef de vertu par le même raisonnement; puisque Jésus-Christ n'a pas dit non plus: Ceci est la vertu de mon corps; mais qu'il a dit: Ceci est mon corps. La propriété des paroles à laquelle Euthymius s'attache, bannit également la figure & la vertu séparée du corps de Jésus-Christ, & elle ne peut exclure l'une qu'en excluant l'autre.

2°. Euthymius, en concluant que le pain & le vin ne sont pas les signes du corps & du sang, parce que Jésus-Christ n'a pas dit: Ceci est la figure de mon corps &c, fait voir qu'il n'a pas pris dans les paroles de l'Institution le mot est, dans le sens de significat; c'est-à-dire, qu'il ne les a pas prises dans un sens de figure. Donc il les a prises dans un sens de réalité, & il a cru que les choses dont Jésus-Christ a dit: Ceci est mon corps, ceci est mon sang, étaient réellement son corps & son sang.

3°. Mais cette solution des Ministres, que par le corps de Jésus-Christ il faut entendre la vertu du corps, & non le corps même, est encore plus clairement détruite par ces paroles d'Euthymius, qui assure, que Jésus-Christ change le pain & le vin en son corps même, qui donne la vie; en son précieux sang, & en la force ou la grace de l'un & de l'autre: & in gratiam ipsorum. Car afin qu'on ne pût pas séparer cette force & cette grace du corps même de Jésus-Christ, & qu'on ne pût pas dire, comme fait M. Claude, qu'il entend un changement de vertu, & non de substance, Euthymius a pris soin d'unir expressément la substance & la vertu, en disant que Jésus-Christ change le pain & le vin en son corps & en son sang, & in gratiam ipsorum; c'est-à-dire, & en la vertu de l'un & de l'autre.
Il est étrange que les Ministres nous veuillent persuader que des gens, sans avoir perdu l'esprit, pour faire entendre que Jésus-Christ communique au pain la vertu de son corps, aient choisi cette bizarre expression, Jésus-Christ change le pain en son corps même. Il est étrange qu'ils prétendent, que les Pères aient supposé qu'ils seraient entendus, en parlant un langage si contraire au sens commun; & enfin il est bien étrange, qu'ils veuillent que le commun du monde ait été assez subtil pour deviner un sens si étrangement éloigné des paroles, & si peu autorisé par des expressions semblables. Mais au moins devraient-ils mettre quelque borne à cette licence, avec laquelle ils disposent & des paroles des uns, & de l'intelligence des autres: car certainement il vaudrait mieux qu'ils déclarassent une fois pour toutes, que les passages signifient tout ce qu'ils veulent qu'ils signifient, & qu'il ne faut juger du sens des Auteurs que par leurs caprices, que de donner aux paroles d'Euthymius, le sens auxquel il les faut prendre pour les rendre conformes à leur sentiment.

Euthymius dit, que Jésus-Christ change d'une manière ineffable le pain en son corps même. Cela signifie, dit M. Claude, qu'il le change, non en son corps, mais en la vertu de son corps. Euthymius dit, qu'il change le vin en son sang même. Cela signifie, dit M. Claude, qu'il le change, non en son sang, mais en la vertu de son sang. Euthymius ajoute, qu'il les change en la vertu de l'un & de l'autre: in gratiam ipsorum. Cette addition a incommodé M. Claude, & il a trouvé bon de n'en point parler. Mais en l'y ajoutant, parce qu'elle y est en effet, l'expression d'Euthymius toute entière, expliquée au sens des Calvinistes, sera, que Jésus-Christ change le pain en la vertu du corps, & le vin en la vertu du sang, & en la vertu de l'un & de l'autre. Qui a jamais ouï parler d'une pareille folie, de joindre ensemble le terme métaphorique, & l'explication du terme métaphorique, comme deux choses distinctes & séparées? Dirait-on, par exemple, que la pierre était Jésus-Christ, & le signe de Jésus-Christ? Que l'arche était l'Eglise, & la figure de l'Eglise? Que l'Agneau Paschal était Jésus-Christ & l'image de Jésus-Christ? Que la colère change les hommes en bêtes, & en la fureur des bêtes?
Qui ne voit que la nature de notre esprit répugne manifestement à ces expressions; puisque l'on ne se sert de termes métaphoriques, que parce qu'on veut éviter en cet endroit les termes propres comme trop faibles? Et ainsi l'esprit, dans cette disposition, n'a garde de joindre à l'heure même, à ce terme métaphorique, le terme simple qu'il a évité, & encore dans un arrangement qui le fait regarder par nécessité, comme quelque chose de séparé du terme métaphorique.

Ce passage d'Eutymius pourrait fournir plusieurs autres réflexions; mais quelles qu'elles soient, elles ne sauraient être si claires que l'idée que le passage donne, de lui-même & par la simple lecture: & c'est pourquoi M. Claude s'est bien donné de garde de le rapporter tout entier.

Il suffit donc de demander à Mrs. les Religionnaires, s'il y a de l'apparence qu'un homme, pour instruire un autre de leur opinion, voulût emprunter les paroles d'Eutymius? S'ils voudraient eux-mêmes s'en servir: si la manière dont ils conçoivent leur sentiment les a jamais portés à de semblables expressions, s'il leur est jamais arrivé de dire à quelqu'un, que Jésus-Christ nous donnait, non la figure de son corps, mais son corps, parce qu'il n'avait pas dit: *Ceci est la figure de mon corps*; mais *Ceci est mon corps*: s'il leur est arrivé de dire, qu'il change le pain & le vin en son corps même, en son sang même, & en la vertu de l'un & de l'autre: s'il leur est arrivé de dire, que comme le Verbe est uni à la chair, ainsi cette chair nous est unie par la participation de l'Eucharistie? C'est par-là qu'ils doivent juger si ce passage est propre à prouver ou à détruire la Transubstantiation.

Mais que veut donc dire Eutymius, lorsqu'il dit: *Oportet autem non ad naturam eorum quae proponuntur aspicere, sed ad virtutem eorum?* C'est une chose admirable, que des personnes si fertiles en solutions, & qui se contentent si facilement de celles qu'ils inventent, n'en veuillent pas voir une si aisée! M. Claude n'avait qu'à consulter Aubertin, & il aurait appris de ce Ministre, que le mot de nature est souvent pris pour l'amas des accidents.
qui forment l'apparence extérieure: & cela supposé, il n'y a nulle difficulté dans ce passage; puisqu'Euthymius ne voudra dire autre chose, sinon, qu'il ne faut pas avoir égard à ce que ces choses paraissent, mais à leur vertu; c'est-à-dire, comme nous l'avons montré dans l'examen du passage de Théophylacte, à leur vérité intérieure, à ce qu'elles sont dans la vérité. Il voudra dire ce que Paschase a exprimé quand il a dit, que la vertu des choses était plus considérable que l'apparence: potior virtus rerum quam species; & que celui qui donne à toutes choses la vertu de leur nature, a donné à ce Sacrement d'être le corps & le sang de Jésus-Christ. De sorte que, selon cet Auteur, la vertu du Sacrement de l'Eucharistie est d'être le sang de Jésus-Christ.

Euthymius ne veut donc pas que l'on s'arrête à l'apparence, qui ne nous donnerait pas sujet de concevoir une grande idée de ce mystère: il veut qu'on en considère la vertu; mais une vertu qui vient de son essence, & de l'opération ineffable de Jésus-Christ, qui y change le pain en son corps même plein de vertu & d'efficace, comme Euthymius le dit ensuite. Voilà la vertu qu'il veut qu'on y considère; vertu jointe au corps, & non séparée du corps.

Mais sans avoir même recours à cette solution autorisée par Aubertin, on peut encore prendre ces paroles dans un sens plus simple, qui est, de dire que la nature qu'Euthymius ne veut pas qu'on regarde, n'est pas la nature présente de ces dons, mais la nature passée; c'est-à-dire, qu'il enseigne qu'il ne faut pas considérer ce que ces dons étaient lorsqu'ils ont été présentés, mais ce qu'ils ont été faits. Car la nature subsistant encore selon l'apparence, on a raison de nous avertir de ne la regarder plus, parce qu'elle n'est plus en effet, & que, comme dit S. Ambroise, ce n'est plus ce que la nature a formé, mais ce que la bénédiction a consacré; & qu'ainsi il ne faut plus avoir égard à leur première nature, qui est changée, mais à la vertu dont ces choses sont remplies, par l'opération qui les a changées au corps & au sang de Jésus-Christ. C'est l'avertissement qu'Euthymius nous donne, premiérement en abrégé, en disant qu'il ne faut pas avoir égard à la nature des dons présentés, mais à leur vertu; & ensuite
plus au long, lorsqu'il nous enseigne, que *comme Jésus-Christ a déifié la chair qu'il a unie à sa divinité, de même il change les dons, par une opération ineffable, au corps même & au sang même de Jésus-Christ, & en la vertu de l'un & de l'autre.*

Ce passage d'Euthymius, tiré de son commentaire sur S. Matthieu, est ordinairement allégué par les Auteurs qui traitent des controverses: mais il me semble qu'on ne fait pas ordinairement assez de réflexion sur ce que l'on voit dans la Panoplie du même Auteur, au titre des *Pauliciens.*

C'était une espece d'hérétiques qui avaient renouvellé une partie des erreurs des Manichéens, & qui y en avaient ajouté quelques autres; & surtout ils avaient une hérésie fort bizarre sur le fait de l'Eucharistie; car ils disaient que Jésus-Christ, en instituant ce mystère, n'avait point distribué de pain & de vin à ses Disciples, & que ces paroles, *Prenez & mangez,* ne s'entendent que de ces paroles mêmes, qu'il proposait à ses disciples comme leur pain & leur nourriture. Et par une suite de ce principe ils disaient, que communier n'était autre chose que méditer les paroles de Jésus-Christ, & s'en nourrir.

Cette hérésie détruisait nettement la présence réelle & la Transubstantiation; de sorte que si Messieurs les Ministres sont tant en peine de trouver des exemples parmi les Grecs, de personnes qui aient combattu cette doctrine, on ne désavouera pas qu'ils n'en puissent trouver parmi ces détestables hérétiques.

Euthymius donc, après avoir représenté leur erreur, entreprend ensuite de la réfuter; & il le fait à son ordinaire, en choisissant les passages des Pères qu'il a cru les plus propres pour instruire les fideles de la vérité de ce mystère, & de la foi de l'Eglise Catholique. Ce choix est extrêmement considérable pour découvrir son véritable sentiment: car ayant à choisir dans toute la Tradition, & n'étant lié par aucune loi, le sens commun fait voir qu'il a choisi sans doute les passages les plus précis, les plus clairs, les plus dogmatiques, les plus propres pour donner une connaissance nette du mystère, selon l'idée qu'il en avait & que l'on en avait de
son temps; & qu'il est sans apparence que pour représenter la foi de l'Eglise, il ait fait choix au contraire des passages les plus obscurs, les moins dogmatiques, les plus hyperboliques qui se trouvent dans les Auteurs Ecclésiastiques. En effet, qui aurait prié Aubertin ou M. Claude de nous citer les lieux qu'ils croient les plus propres pour nous instruire de leur doctrine, ils ne manqueraient jamais de nous alléguer le passage de Facundus, quelques lieux de S. Augustin, & le célèbre passage de Tertullien. Et s'ils étaient obligés d'en citer des Grecs, ils nous allégueraient quelque passage obscur de Clément Alexandrin, ou d'Origène, ou le passage des Dialogues de Théodoret: mais ils se donneraient bien de garde de nous renvoyer à la Catéchèse de S. Grégoire de Nysse, ou au Chapitre XIV. du quatrième livre de S. Jean de Damas. Ce seraient les derniers lieux qu'ils allégueraient sur ce sujet-là; & encore ils ne les citeraient jamais qu'en objections, puisque, pour les réduire à leur sens, ils ont besoin de mille machines, & qu'il faut donner une infinité de contorsions à l'esprit, afin de les rendre susceptibles des solutions qu'ils y apportent.

Mais les sentiments d'Euthymius ont si peu de rapport avec ceux de ces Messieurs, que les deux passages de toute l'Antiquité qui expriment le plus nettement la présence réelle & la Transubstantiation au sens des Catholiques, & qui sont les plus hyperboliques, les plus faux & les plus trompeurs au sens des Ministres, sont justement ceux qu'Euthymius choisit pour représenter la foi de l'Eglise Grecque.

Si l'on veut donc savoir quelle était la doctrine de ce savant Religieux sur l'Eucharistie, & quelle était celle de l'Eglise Grecque de son temps, il n'y a qu'à voir celle qui est contenue dans ces deux passages, pris littéralement & dogmatiquement: car c'est en cette manière qu'il les produit.

Il croyait avec S. Grégoire de Nysse, que le corps de Jésus-Christ entrait en nous par le moyen du boire & du manger: que nos corps étaient joints avec ce corps immortel: que ce corps étant un, était distribué tous les jours à une infinité de personnes; que chacun le recevait
tout entier, & qu'il demeurait tout entier en soi. Il croyait que le pain sanctifié était changé par
la parole de Dieu au corps du Verbe-Dieu, & qu'il devenait tout d'un coup le corps du Verbe,
étant changé par cette parole: Ceci est mon corps. Il croyait que, par une dispensation de
grace, Jésus-Christ se donne à tous les fidèles par sa chair; afin que l'union avec cette chair
immortelle les rende participants de son immortalité.

Il croyait de même, comme il est dit dans le passage de S. Jean Damascène, que si l'on
demande comment le pain est fait le corps de Jésus-Christ, & le vin son sang, il n'y avait rien
demeurer de Dieu du Verbe-Dieu, & qu'il devenait tout d'un coup le corps du Verbe,
etant changé par cette parole: Ceci est mon corps. Il croyait que, par une dispensation de
grace, Jésus-Christ se donne à tous les fidèles par sa chair; afin que l'union avec cette chair
immortelle les rende participants de son immortalité.

Il croyait de même, comme il est dit dans le passage de S. Jean Damascène, que si l'on
demande comment le pain est fait le corps de Jésus-Christ, & le vin son sang, il n'y avait rien
demeurer de Dieu du Verbe-Dieu, & qu'il devenait tout d'un coup le corps du Verbe,
etant changé par cette parole: Ceci est mon corps. Il croyait que, par une dispensation de
grace, Jésus-Christ se donne à tous les fidèles par sa chair; afin que l'union avec cette chair
immortelle les rende participants de son immortalité.

Il croyait de même, comme il est dit dans le passage de S. Jean Damascène, que si l'on
demande comment le pain est fait le corps de Jésus-Christ, & le vin son sang, il n'y avait rien
demeurer de Dieu du Verbe-Dieu, & qu'il devenait tout d'un coup le corps du Verbe,
etant changé par cette parole: Ceci est mon corps. Il croyait que, par une dispensation de
grace, Jésus-Christ se donne à tous les fidèles par sa chair; afin que l'union avec cette chair
immortelle les rende participants de son immortalité.

Il croyait de même, comme il est dit dans le passage de S. Jean Damascène, que si l'on
demande comment le pain est fait le corps de Jésus-Christ, & le vin son sang, il n'y avait rien
demeurer de Dieu du Verbe-Dieu, & qu'il devenait tout d'un coup le corps du Verbe,
etant changé par cette parole: Ceci est mon corps. Il croyait que, par une dispensation de
grace, Jésus-Christ se donne à tous les fidèles par sa chair; afin que l'union avec cette chair
immortelle les rende participants de son immortalité.

Il croyait de même, comme il est dit dans le passage de S. Jean Damascène, que si l'on
demande comment le pain est fait le corps de Jésus-Christ, & le vin son sang, il n'y avait rien
demeurer de Dieu du Verbe-Dieu, & qu'il devenait tout d'un coup le corps du Verbe,
etant changé par cette parole: Ceci est mon corps. Il croyait que, par une dispensation de
grace, Jésus-Christ se donne à tous les fidèles par sa chair; afin que l'union avec cette chair
immortelle les rende participants de son immortalité.

Il croyait de même, comme il est dit dans le passage de S. Jean Damascène, que si l'on
demande comment le pain est fait le corps de Jésus-Christ, & le vin son sang, il n'y avait rien
demeurer de Dieu du Verbe-Dieu, & qu'il devenait tout d'un coup le corps du Verbe,
etant changé par cette parole: Ceci est mon corps. Il croyait que, par une dispensation de
grace, Jésus-Christ se donne à tous les fidèles par sa chair; afin que l'union avec cette chair
immortelle les rende participants de son immortalité.

Il croyait de même, comme il est dit dans le passage de S. Jean Damascène, que si l'on
demande comment le pain est fait le corps de Jésus-Christ, & le vin son sang, il n'y avait rien
demeurer de Dieu du Verbe-Dieu, & qu'il devenait tout d'un coup le corps du Verbe,
etant changé par cette parole: Ceci est mon corps. Il croyait que, par une dispensation de
grace, Jésus-Christ se donne à tous les fidèles par sa chair; afin que l'union avec cette chair
immortelle les rende participants de son immortalité.

Il croyait de même, comme il est dit dans le passage de S. Jean Damascène, que si l'on
demande comment le pain est fait le corps de Jésus-Christ, & le vin son sang, il n'y avait rien
demeurer de Dieu du Verbe-Dieu, & qu'il devenait tout d'un coup le corps du Verbe,
etant changé par cette parole: Ceci est mon corps. Il croyait que, par une dispensation de
grace, Jésus-Christ se donne à tous les fidèles par sa chair; afin que l'union avec cette chair
immortelle les rende participants de son immortalité.

Il croyait de même, comme il est dit dans le passage de S. Jean Damascène, que si l'on
demande comment le pain est fait le corps de Jésus-Christ, & le vin son sang, il n'y avait rien
demeurer de Dieu du Verbe-Dieu, & qu'il devenait tout d'un coup le corps du Verbe,
etant changé par cette parole: Ceci est mon corps. Il croyait que, par une dispensation de
grace, Jésus-Christ se donne à tous les fidèles par sa chair; afin que l'union avec cette chair
immortelle les rende participants de son immortalité.
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des Calvinistes est fondée sur certains passages écartés & inconnus au commun du monde, & qui n'ont rien contribué à former la croyance des peuples; & que la foi des Catholiques est tirée, au contraire, des passages sur lesquels l'Eglise a réglé ses sentiments, & qu'elle a regardés comme contenant précisément & littéralement ce qu'il faut croire de l'Eucharistie. D'où il s'ensuit manifestement, qu'il ne faut pas expliquer les passages des Catholiques par ces passages écartés; par un lieu de Facundus, par une lettre de S. Augustin, par un endroit des Dialogues de Théodoret; mais que s'étant instruit de la foi de l'Eglise, dans les lieux des Pères qu'elle a toujours regardés comme les plus propres pour la faire connaître, il faut se servir de la lumière que l'on trouve, pour y réduire les passages plus obscurs; c'est-à-dire en un mot, que la raison nous oblige à regarder les passages des Catholiques comme des preuves & des règles de la foi, & ceux dont les Calvinistes abusent, comme des difficultés à éclaircir, & que l'on peut même négliger, puisqu'il n'est pas nécessaire pour croire un mystère, que l'on n'y trouve aucune difficulté.
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CHAPITRE VI. COMPARAISON DES DÉCRETS DU SYNODE DE JÉRUSALEM, COMME ILS PARURENT EN 1672, & DE LA NOUVELLE FORME DANS LAQUELLE DOSITHÉE LES FIT IMPRIMER EN 1690.

Comme l'Enchiridion de Dosithée, & la plupart des livres que les Grecs ont imprimés depuis environ trente ans sont fort rares, il ne sera pas inutile de donner une plus grande connaissance de l'ouvrage de ce Patriarche, qui mériterait d'être imprimé de nouveau, avec les additions qu'il y a faites. La rareté de ce livre & de divers autres semblables, ne vient pas seulement du peu de commerce qu'on a en Walaquie & en Moldavie, mais d'une raison particulière que nous avons apprise par des Lettres des Grecs de Venise. C'est que la plupart de ces Livres ont été imprimés par les soins & par la libéralité des Vayvodes; & entr'autres l'Enchiridion de Dosithée avec la Réfutation de la Confession de Cyrille Lucar par Melece Syrigus, fut imprimé aux dépens du Vayvode de Walaquie Jean Constantin Basaraba, à Buchorest, comme il est marqué à la fin du Livre. Ce Prince, par un exemple de zèle pour sa Religion, & d'une magnificence digne de plus grands qu'il n'était, ordonna que tous les exemplaires seraient distribués aux Grecs gratis; & afin que ceux qui les auraient ne pussent les vendre, il obtint des Evêques & de Dosithée Patriarche de Jérusalem qu'ils publiaient une Sentence d'excommunication contre les Grecs qui vendaient ces livres.
On peut encore faire une remarque qui donne une nouvelle autorité à ces impressions; & c'est que celui qui gouvernait l'Imprimerie de Buchorest était Métrophane, ci-devant Evêque de Chusion, & que celui qui fit l'impression fut un autres Grec nommé Michel Macri, de Joannina, Notaire de la grande Église. C'est donc l'ouvrage de deux fameux Grecs, qui sont Melece Syrigus, considéré comme un des plus grands Théologiens du dernier siècle, & un Patriarche de Jérusalem aussi fameux qu'a été Dosithée: imprimé chez un Grec & par un Grec, sous les ordres, aux dépends & dans le pays d'un Prince faisant profession de la Religion Grecque. Ce ne sont pas là des impressions de Geneve, à la tête desquelles on fait parler un Imprimeur qui n'avait rien à perdre, pour débiter des faussetés pareilles à celles que contient la Préface de la Confession de Cyrille, Ce sont des Grecs constitués en dignité dans leur Église, qui recommandent l'ouvrage de Syrigus contre cet Apostat, comme étant très orthodoxe & très utile pour confondre les Luthériens & les Calvinistes, qui le dédient à un Prince de la Religion Grecque, & qui le font imprimer par des Grecs & pour les Grecs. On ne dira pas que la Cour de Rome ait eu part à ces ouvrages, puisqu'elle condamne une partie de ce qu'ils contiennent touchant les points qui regardent le schisme de l'Église Grecque, & qu'il est sorti des mêmes impressions un livre aussi violent contre la Primauté du Pape, que celui de Nectarius.

Dosithée avait donné à son ouvrage en 1672, le titre de *Bouclier de la foi orthodoxe*: dans l'édition de Buchorest il l'a ainsi intitulé. *Manuel pour réfuter l'extravagance des Calvinistes, qui calomnient la sainte Église Catholique & Apostolique d'Orient, lui attribuant qu'elle a sur Dieu & sur les Mystères de la Religion leurs mauvaises opinions, appuyant ce qu'ils avancent sur les Chapitres attribués à Cyrille Lucar: composé par Dosithée Patrirche de la sainte ville de Jérusalem en 1672*. Le titre courant dans tout le livre est, *contre les Calvinistes & les Luthériens.*
La Préface & le Discours préliminaire ne sont point changés. Dans le Chapitre 1 au commencement Dosithée a fait deux changements considérables. Le premier en ce qu'il a ajouté ces paroles. Nous ne promettons pas de dire avec certitude présentement, de quelle conscience était Cyrille, c'est-à-dire, ce qu'il pensait en sa conscience. Le second changement est, qu'au lieu que dans le Synode il avait dit que Cyrille avait été élevé au Patriarcat de Constantinople d'un commun consentement de tout le Clergé, il a mis ὁπωςδήποτε, de quelque manière que ce fût. Ces deux changements font connoître que Dosithée à l'occasion des louanges outrées que les Calvinistes avaient données à ce malheureux, ayant examiné plus sérieusement la matière, avait reconnu que ceux qui avaient justifié Cyrille à cause du désaveu de sa Confession réitéré plusieurs fois avec serment, & parce qu'on lui avait vu pratiquer tout le contraire de ce qu'elle contenait, ou qui pouvaient s'être laissé persuader que Cyrille de Berroée, par intérêt ou par passion, avait poussé le zèle trop loin en faisant pronoucer anthème contre lui, avaient été trompés. Il a donc mieux aimé suivre Melece Syrigus, qui en a parlé de la même manière. laissant la chose au jugement de Dieu. Il paraît aussi qu'il reconnut que son élection au Patriarcat de Constantinople n'avait pas été fort canonique, puisqu'il a retranché ce qui pouvait le faire croire.

Il ajoute aux extraits des Homélies de Cyrille contre le Chapitre du culte des Saints, un passage tiré d'un Sermon sur S. Demetrius. Il a aussi changé le titre du premier extrait contre le Chapitre XVI, & il a mis ces paroles. Que le Baptême efface le péché originel absolument, & non pas lni seulement des prédestinés. On ne remarque aucun autre changement dans ces extraits.

On en trouve un fort considérable dans le Chapitre IV, car il est omis entièrement avec toutes les citations contre les Iconomaques, qui sont seulement indiquées; en sorte que le Chapitre IV est celui qui faisait le cinquième dans le Synode de Jerusalem. Il est inutile d'en deviner
les raisons; mais ce retranchement ne change rien à toute l'économie de l'ouvrage. Il poursuit jusqu'à l'endroit de la page 150 de l'édition de Paris, qui en fait la dernière ligne, & il retranche une partie de ce qui suit. Il inséré à la place une digression touchant l'opposition que firent les Grecs dans le Concile de Florence à l'addition au Symbole, pour montrer qu'il n'étoil pas permis, même aux Conciles Oecuméniques, de rien ajouter aux expositions de la foi, particulièrement sur la Sainte Trinité; ce qui fait voir qu'il ne perdait pas la moindre occasion d'attaquer les Latins: mais que cela ne l'avait pas empêché d'écrire contre les ennemis de l'Église, & de défendre la foi sur l'Eucharistie. Puis il reprend ce qui est à la page 153, & il ajoute à l'exemple de S. Basile, qui se justifia contre ses calomniateurs, celui de Denys d'Alexandrie, après quoi il continue de même que dans l'imprimé, ce qui y est marqué touchant l'ambition & l'avarice de Cyrille, les maux & les dépenses qu'il causa à l'Église; le soupçon que produisit sa liaison avec l'Ambassadeur de Hollande, duquel il se servit pour parvenir à ses fins; & que non seulement il ne doit pas être regardé comme un Martyt, n'ayant pas souffert la mort pour le nom de Jésus-Christ, mais comme un malheureux qui n'a aucune part avec lui. Dosithée avait mis dans le premier Ecrit, qu'il avait usurpé trois fois le Siège de Constantinople, après la première élection qui paroissait légitime: dans l'Edition il a mis six fois, ce qui est plus conforme à la vérité, comme on a foit voir par la liste des Patriarches que nous avons insérée ci-dessus.

Après cela on trouve les Actes du Synode tenu sous Cyrille de Berroée: puis de ceux de Jassi & de Constantinople sous Parthenius le Vieux, qui sont insérés en entier avec les signatures: & Pépilogue qui les suit finit à la troisième ligne de la page 217, l'Auteur ajoutant seulement que le Synode de Jassi avait particulièrement combattu contre les Calvinistes, en dressant la Confession Orthodoxe. Mais il a retranché ce qui suit dans le manuscrit & dans l'impression de Paris, où il rend raison pourquoi le premier Synode anthématisa la personne de Cyrille, & qu'au second on se contenta de condamner sa doctrine. En effet, cela était inutile, & une
partie de ce que contenait cet article se trouvait ailleurs. Ces Actes des deux Synodes ont dû faire le Chapitre V, mais on ne l'a pas marqué, & celui qui suit est le sixième.

Dosithée a retranché la seconde période, qui commençait par l'adresse qu'il faisait de l'Exposition de la Foi qui suit, & telle qu'il la devait faire en parlant à la tête de son Synode; mais qui n'était plus nécessaire pour un ouvrage comme l'Enchiridion. Pour les Chapitres opposés à ceux de Cyrille, il ne se trouve aucune différence qui mérite d'être remarquée, entre ce qui fut proposé & approuvé au Synode de Jérusalem, & cette dernière édition, si ce n'est dans le dix-septième qui concerne l'Eucharistie, qu'il a tellement augmenté, que les additions font presque la moitié de tout l'ouvrage. Or ce n'a pas été pour se rétracter de ce qu'il avait publié en 1672, ni pour s'expliquer dans un sens qui eût le moindre rapport aux idées que M. Claude attribue à ses Grecs non latinisés: c'est pour s'expliquer d'une manière si nette & si claire, qu'il n'y a point de commentaire qui soit capable de l'obscurcir. Comme l'Enchiridion est fort rare, & qu'il ne servirait de rien d'indiquer l'endroit où l'Auteur s'explique sur la Transsubstantiation d'une manière plus étendue qu'il n'avait fait dans le premier ouvrage, nous rapporterons cet endroit, que chacun pourra comparer avec ce qui se trouve dans l'édition grecque & latine de 1676. Voici les paroles de Dosithée.

Par le mot de Μετουσίωσις, ou Transsubstantiation, nous ne croyons pas qu'on fasse entendre clairement la manière selon laquelle le pain & le vin sont changés au corps & au sang du Seigneur; car cela est incompréhensible & impossible à tout autre qu'à Dieu, & fait voir en même temps l'ignorance & l'impiété de ceux qui calomnient l'Église Catholique d'avoir cette pensée: mais elle croit que le pain & le vin après la consécration sont faits véritablement, réellement & substantiellement, le pain le véritable corps du Seigneur, & le vin son véritable sang. Cela ne doit pas s'entendre comme s'il y était figurément, par manière de type; représentativement, par manière d'image; ni spirituellement, ainsi qu'on appelle
spirituels les Sacrements de l'ancien Testament, qui n'étaient que des types & des ombres, & qui étaient principalement appelés Sacrements, en ce qu'ils signifiaient ceux du Nouveau Testament, qui étaient la vérité. Car lorsque les anciens mangeaient la manne, & qu'ils buvaient l'eau de la pierre qui les suivait, ils mangeaient & buvaient le corps & le sang du Seigneur, mais en figure; & nous le buvons & le mangeons véritablement. Ils n'avaient pas les choses qui étaient, mais qui devaient être, & nous avons celles qui sont: elles étaient absentes pour eux, & elles nous sont présentes: elles étaient significatives à leur égard, & pour nous elles existent véritablement. Ce n'est point non plus par une grace qui surpasse celle dont sont remplis les autres Sacrements; ni par la communication & par la présence de la seule divinité du Fils unique, selon ce que quelques Pères ont dit en parlant du divin Baptême: ni par une véritable & certaine présence de Notre Seigneur Jésus-Christ que la seule foi produit, comme Calvin a eu l'impiété d'avancer; puisqu'une telle présence n'est ni véritable, ni certaine, mais fantastique, & une pure imagination, n'étant ni substantielle ni réelle: ni par une espèce de composition, en sorte que le corps du Seigneur étant infini, parce qu'il a été uni à la divinité du Fils unique, soit uni pareillement au pain proposé de l'Eucharistie, & que le pain par metonymie soit corps, & le vin sang, & non par le changement, comme veut le furieux Luther; ni qu'aucun accident du pain & du vin soit changé en quelque accident du corps & du sang de Jésus-Christ par quelque changement ou altération. Mais le pain est fait véritablement, réellement & substantiellement le véritable corps du Seigneur, & le vin son véritable sang (a).

Dosithée continue en ces termes. Il est clair que comme l'Église Catholique a tiré de l'Écriture le terme de Consubstantiel & l'Union hypostatique, & d'autres dogmes conformes à la Religion, & nécessaires, qui sont contenus dans les sept Synodes Oecuméniques, de même elle en a tiré le mot de Transsubstantiation dans les temps auxquels on en avait besoin pour détruire l'hérésie de Bérenger, & des autres Hérétiques qui ont paru devant & après lui, qui
ont blasphémé contre ce Sacrement, & qui ont détourné le sens des paroles de Notre Seigneur, & des Saints Pères interprètes de la Sainte Ecriture, & la décision du septième Synode Oecuménique touchant le Sacrement, par de fausses interprétations, suivant l'ancienne coutume des Hérétiques. Ainsi ce mot n'est point une invention des Latins, ni d'un de leurs Conciles, comme prétendent les Luthériens & les Calvinistes, croyant tromper par une telle sottise quelques Orthodoxes: mais c'est une définition de l'Église Catholique pour renverser les hérésies contre ce Sacrement. Ce que disent aussi ces Hérétiques dont il a été parlé, que nous avons été trompés par les Papistes, car c'est ainsi qu'ils appellent les Occidentaux, pour embrasser touchant la sainte Eucharistie, le dogme signifié par le mot de Transsubstantiation, est un mensonge. Car le septième Concile que nous suivons en tout touchant le très saint Sacrement, & les Pères d'Orient l'ont confirmé (b); c'est-à-dire, qu'ils ont établi la doctrine signifiée par ce mot.

Ensuite il partage son discours en plusieurs sections, suivant lesquelles il rapporte un grand nombre de passaes de Pères, & d'autres Ecrivains Ecclésiastiques, qui marquent une prodigieuse lecture, & qui peuvent faire voir aux Calvinistes que les Grecs ne sont pas si ignorants que le prétendait M. Claude, qui certainement n'aurait pas connu plusieurs Auteurs cités par ce Patriarche, car Aubertin n'en avait pas fait mention.

La première section commence par cette remarque, que presque du temps des Apôtres il y eut des hérétiques, comme les disciples de Simon & de Saturnin, qui, selon le témoignage de S. Ignace dans l'Epître à ceux de Smyrne rapporté par Théodoret, eurent des opinions erronées sur le Sacrement de l'Eucharistie: mais qu'elles finirent bientôt, & qu'au septième Concile Oecuménique il fut décidé contre les Iconomaques, que c'était une hérésie de dire que l'Eucharistie était le type, l'image, le signe ou le sumbole du corps & du sang de Jésus-Christ. Il rapporte les paroles dites en cette assemblée par Epiphane Diacre, que jamais ni Jésus-
Christ, ni les Apôtres, ni les Pères, n'ont dit que le sacrifice non sanglant offert par le Prêtre fût une image, mais le véritable corps & le sang de Jésus-Christ. Il confirme cette vérité par des passages de S. Jean Damascène, d'Elie de Crete dans son Commentaire sur l'Apologie de S. Grégoire de Nazianze, de Théodore Graptus en son Traité de la foi infaillible des chrétiens, de s. Jean Chrysostôme, Homélie XXVI sur S. Matthieu, d'Origène sur le même Évangile, de Théodoret Dialogue II, d'Anastase d'Antioche contre les Gaïanites, de Samonas de Gaze, de Pierre de Sicile contre les Manichéens, de Nicolas Cabasilas, Livre IV de la vie en Jésus-Christ, de Théophane de Nicée Livre IV. contre les Juifs Chapitre XIX, de Jean Patriarche d'Antioche contre les Azymes, de S. Denys & de S. Mxime son Interprete. Enfin il fait voir qu'il n'y a aucune contradiction, en ce que quelques Pères ont appelé Antitypes les sacrés Mystères, & que d'autres ont dit qu'ils ne l'étaient pas, parce qu'ils prenaient ce mot en différents sens.

Dans la seconde section, il dit que Bérenger avait avancé que le pain & le vin étaient un simple type ou figure du corps & du sang de Jésus-Christ: qu'il fut condamné par le Pape Nicolas II, dans un nombreux Synode, & en plusieurs autres, particuliérement dans celui de Latran en 1215, & que le Synode général en prononçant anathème contre cette hérésie, fit une décision conforme à l'Ecriture, aux Pères, & au septième Concile, quoiqu'en d'autres articles il ne lui ait pas été conforme. C'était-là une occasion de déclamer contre les Latins, si les Grecs avaient cru qu'ils eussent introduit un nouveau dogme, en établissant celui de la Transsubstantiation, les Calvinistes prétendant qu'il a commencé au Concile de Latran. Mais au contraire Dosithée loue l'Église Latine d'avoir condamné ce qu'ils veulent faire passer pour la créance de toute l'Antiquité, & il prétend qu'en cela elle a suivi ce que l'Église Grecque avait décidé dans le septième Concile.
Dans la section troisième, il prouve l'horreur qu'elle a toujours eue de cette hérésie, par la punition rigoureuse que fit l'Empereur Alexis Commene en 1081, de Basile, Chef de la Secte des Bogomiles, qui niaient le changement dans le Mystère de l'Eucharistie, & qu'il fit brûler vif dans l'Hippodrome, après avoir fait condamner ses erreurs dans une assemblée Synodale d'Ecclésiastiques & de Sénateurs: & qu'à cette occasion, il ordonna à Euthymius Zygabenus d'insérer dans sa Panoplie les témoignages de S. Grégoire de Nysse & de S. Jean Damascène, qui établissent le changement réel du pain & du vin au corps & au sang de Jésus-Christ.

Dans la section quatrième, il parle de la dispute qui arriva sous l'Empereur Manuel Comnene, à l'occasion d'un Diacre nommé Basile, qui avait dit dans un sermon que le Fils de Dieu avait été la victime, & qu'il avait reçu le sacrifice avec le Père (c): & qui fut accusé d'hérésie comme introduisant deux hypostases ou personnes en Jésus-Christ. Que Soterichus Panteugenus élu Patriarche d'Antioche, Eustathe Métropolitain de Dyrrachium, & d'autres qui attaquèrent cette proposition furent excommuniés dans un Synode tenu en 1056. Sur quoi il cite Cinnamus Livre IV. Nicetas Choniates, la Chronique en vers d'Euphraïm: puis il rapporte la décision de ce Synode, & les anathèmes prononcés contre ceux qui nient que Jésus-Christ est le Sacrificateur & le Sacrifice; & le troisième est contre ceux qui disent que le Sacrifice qui est offert tous les jours par les Ministres sacrés, selon que notre Sauveur & le Seigneur de toutes choses l'a ordonné, renouvelle dans l'imagination & par manière d'image celui qui a été offert sur la croix par notre Sauveur de son corps & de son sang, pour la délivrance & l'expiation du genre humain, mais qu'il n'est pas le même (d). Il rapporte ensuite divers passages pour confirmer cette doctrine, entr'autres de Nicolas de Méthone contre Soterichus, d'Etienne κεγαο δρουγγύριος contre le même; de s. Athanase, de S. Grégoire de Nazianze, de S. Cyrille de Jérusalem ἐλς ὑπαπάνην, de S. Grégoire de Nysse, Homélie sur la Pâque, de S. Cyrille d'Alexandrie contre Théodoret, & de sa Lettre aux Empereurs, de Cabasilas Livre I, de la vie en Jésus-Christ, & Chapitre XLV de son Exposition de la Liturgie; Nicolas de
Méthone contre les Azymes; de Théophane discours huitième contre les Juifs; d'Oecumenius sur le cinquième Chapitre aux Hébreux; de Siméon de Thessalonique, en son Dialogue contre les hérésies; & de la Confession de Germain Patriarche de Constantinople, qui vivait peuaprès.

Il parle dans la Section V de Sicidites Religieux, qui fut, dit-il, Chef d'une hérésie, disant que dans le Sacrement de l'Eucharistie, le corps de Jésus-Christ n'était pas incorruptible comme après sa Passion & sa résurrection, mais corruptible. Il rapporte ce que dit Nicetas, que ceux qui étaient dans les bons sentiments lui prouvaient par S. Jean Chrysostôme, S. Grégoire de Nysse, S. Cyrille & Eutychius Patriarche de Constantinople sous Justinien, que dans le Sacrement le corps de Jésus-Christ était incorruptible, étant celui qui après la résurrection était impassible, & non pas celui qui était passible avant la Passion: & quiconque reçoit une partie du pain eucharistique, reçoit Jésus-Christ entier. L'Empereur Alexis Comnène fit assembler un Synode en 1199, qui condamna Sicidites. Dosithée rapporte divers passages sur ce sujet de la Chronique en vers d'Euphraïm, de Michel Glycas au Moine Joannicius, de S. Cyrille de Jérusalem, de S. Ephrem, de la Lettre de Pierre Patriarche d'Antioche, de Nicolas de Méthone, d'Isidore Pelusiote & de Siméon de Thessalonique, pour prouver que ce qui est dans le Sacrement, c'est-à-dire, le corps & le sang du Sauveur, sont incorruptibles (e).

La Section sixième regarde une question assez extraordinaire: quelques Prêtres vers l'an 1440, en distribuant la Communion, disaient recevez le S. Esprit, & d'autres les accusèrent comme des blasphémateurs. Cependant Marc d'Éphese entreprit de les justifier; ce qu'il fait par un raisonnement qui consiste principalement, en ce que le corps que nous recevons dans la Communion étant uni à la divinité, en participant au corps & au sang du Seigneur, nous participons aussi au S. Esprit, la divinité des deux personnes étant inséparable. (f) Il prouve très-certainement le dogme de la présence réelle, & c'est l'usage qu'en a fait Dosithée; mais il
ne justifiait pas ces Prêtres d'une nouveauté inconnue à toutes les Églises, & qui n'avait aucun fondement dans la discipline grecque.

La septième section, qui est plus étendue que toutes les autres, a pour Préface ce qui a été rapporté ci-dessus touchant le commencement des hérésies de Luther & de Calvin, & comme elles furent combattues par Jérémie Patriarche de Constantinople & Melece d'Alexandrie. Ensuite Dosithée rapporte un grand nombre de passages de Pères, & d'Auteurs ecclésiastiques sous ce titre général. *Exposition d'autres témoignages tirés de quelques anciens Pères, & de plusieurs Ecrivains ecclésiastiques orthodoxes, qui prouvent la présence réelle & substantielle du Sauveur dans l'adorable Sacrement, par le changement substantiel du pain & du vin, au propre corps précieux & au sang du Sauveur, ce qui est la Transsubstitution dans le Sacrement* (g).

Dosithée distribue ces passages sous différents titres d'autant de mots employés par les Ecrivanins ecclésiastiques anciens & modernes, pour signifier le changement qui se fait dans le Mystère de l'Eucharistie: & il fait voir que tous reviennent à un même sens, qui est celui du changement véritable, réel & substantiel, & qui est par une conséquence nécessaire celui de la Transsubstitution. Ces mots sont μετέχω, τρόγω, πίνω, σιτούμαι, μεταλαμβάνω, κοινωνώ, ἀγιάζω, ἱερουργῶ, ἀποφαίνομαι, γίνομαι, ἄναδεξιονυμί, τελῶ, χαρίζομαι, παράδεικται, λατρεύεται, μεταποιεῖται, μεταβάλλεται, μεταστοιχείονυται, μετασκευάζειν, κατασκευάζειν, μεταρρυθμίζειν, ἄλλοιούσθαι, μετουσιοῦσθαι. Sous chacun de ces titres, il rapporte les passages de presque tous les anciens Pères Grecs; même sur l'adoration de l'Eucharistie, ceux de S. Ambroise & de S. Augustin. Il cite aussi plusieurs auteurs plus récents, dont quelques-uns ne sont pas imprimés, ce qui fait voir le soin avec lequel il avait étudié cette matière. On trouve cités entr'autres Nicetas d'Iconie contre les Azymes, Cabasilas, Siméon de Thessalonique, S. Nil l'ancien, les Réponses de Photius à Amphilochius, Nicéphore
Patriarche de Constantinople contre les Iconomaques, Proclus, Nicolas de Méthone contre Soterichus, & contre les Azymes, Jean de Jérusalem, Matthieu le Religieux, Pierre d'Antioche, Siméon de Jérusalem, Théodore Curopalate, Méthodius de Constantinople, & divers anonymes contre les Latins, Glycas, Nicétas, Théodore Graptus, Michel Coniates, Soterichus Panteugenus, les Liturgies & l'Euchologe.

Sur le mot de Transsubstantiation, il rapporte le Discours de Gennadius, que Melece Syrigus a inséré à la fin de sa Réfutation de la Confession de Cyrille Lucar, & qui a été imprimé depuis peu avec la grande Homélie du même Auteur: & par cette raison il ne se trouve pas dans la traduction en grec vulgaire de cet ouvrage, quoiqu'il soit dans le manuscrit copié sur l'original qu'avait Panaiotti; parce que les deux ouvrages ayant été imprimés en même temps & pour être reliés ensemble, Dosithée n'a peut-être pas cru qu'il fallût le mettre deux fois. Il a joint divers passages des Pères pour prouver que dans les Mystères de la Religion, il ne faut pas chercher comment une chose se fait, mais la croire humblement lorsque la foi nous l'enseigne: & qu'il suffit de savoir que ce changement se fait surnaturellement & par l'avénement du S. Esprit. Il finit par un extrait de la Lettre de Melece d'Alexandrie à Edouard Barton, que nous avons rapporté ci-dessus.

La dix-huitième Section est pour marquer qua la Confession de Cyrille, qui parut en 1633, & qui dans le dix-septième Chapitre expliquait le Mystère de l'Eucharistie selon l'opinion de Calvin, avait été condamnée en un Synode tenu l'an 1638, & à Jassi en 1642, que Melece Syrigus & George Coressius la réfuterent, anathématisant par-tout Luther & Calvin & leurs Sectateurs, & expliquant clairement cæ que l'Église Catholique enseigne de toute antiquité, touchant le Sacrement de l'Eucharistie.

Le reste est conforme à ce qu'il publia dans la Synode de Jérusalem, excepté qu'il n'a pas rapporté les signatures, & qu'il a changé ce qui regardait le dix-huitième article de Cyrille.
touchant l'état des âmes après leur mort; ayant marqué à la marge, qu'il s'était trompé en quelques endroits dans la réfutation de cet article, & que pour cela il l'avait corrigée. Mais comme cela ne regarde pas la matière que nous traitons, nous n'en parlerons pas présentement. Chacun peut aisément comprendre que ce seul ouvrage de Dosithée détruit entièrement tout ce que M. Claude, M. Smith, & ceux qui les ont copiés, ont avancé touchant la créance des Grecs sur l'Eucharistie. Ce n'est pas un Gergan, ni des vagabonds, comme ces prétendus Archevêques de Tibériade & de Samos, qui donnent en secret des témoignages informes: c'est un des quatre Patriarches Grecs, qui ayant publiquement déclaré la foi de son Église dans un Synode nombreux, confirme au bout de dix-huit ans ce qu'il avait publié alors, & qui, au lieu de se rétracter, ajoute à son premier ouvrage un très grand nombre de nouvelles preuves: qui condamne expressément les Calvinistes & les Luthériens: qui cite tous les passages des Pères dans le même sens que les Catholiques les entendent: qui se sert avec éloge des témoignages des Grecs modernes, que M. Claude veut faire passer pour latinisés: qui cite les Synodes que ce Ministre traite de pièces supposées: enfin qui fait imprimer, au vu & au su de toute l'Église Grecque, dans un pays où elle est publiquement professée, un ouvrage qui est reçu avec une approbation générale, sans que depuis vingt ans il ait essuyé la moindre contradiction. On peut juger que puisque Dosithée eu l'attention d'y faire quelques chagements dans des choses indifférentes, il en aurait fait de même dans les articles essentiels, s'ils ne s'étaient pas trouvés conformes à la doctrine de son Église sur l'Eucharistie. Il l'a encore plus nettement confirmée dans son Traité contre Caryophylle, imprimé quelques années après l'Enchiridion, & par la déclaration publique qu'il fit contre les Grecs qui envoyaient leurs enfants au College d'Oxford.
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Title 5, On the divine naming, of the Areopagite

From the treatise On the Divine Names

[DN I,6] Knowing this, the theologians praise him as one who is without any name, and also from of all the names. As being nameless, on the one hand, when they say that the Principle-of-divinity in one of the mystical visions of symbolic theophany reproached the man who asked “What is your name?” and when He, leading that man away from any possible knowledge according to the divine names, said “And why are you asking for my name, when it is a wonderful name?” (Jud 13:17-18)\(^{315}\) Now is this not the “wonderful name” (Ps 8:2), the “one beyond all names” (Phil 2:9), the nameless name, which is established “above all names” named “either in this age or in that to come” (Eph 1:21)?\(^{316}\) As the one with many names, on the other hand, when they introduce the Principle-of-divinity saying “I am the Being, the life, the light, God, the truth,” (Gen 28:13, Jn 8:12, 14:6) and when the same divinely wise men in many names celebrate the Cause of everything from all its effects – as good, as beautiful, as wise, as lovely, as God of gods, as Lord of lords, as the Holy of holies, as eternal, as being and as the cause of the ages, as the giver of life, as wisdom, as mind, as word, as the one who knows, as having in advance all the treasures of every knowledge, as power, as powerful, as King of kings, as the Ancient of Days, as ageless, as unchangeable, as salvation, as justice, as sanctification, as redemption, as in greatness exceeding everything and also as the one in the gentle breeze. Moreover, they also say that he is in the minds and in the souls and in the bodies, in the heavens and on the earth, at the same time remaining in himself; in the world and above the world, around the world and above the heavens,

\(^{315}\) As Jud 13:17-18 is being rendered here is a variant or, rather, a paraphrase of the Septuagint text. This is clearly rendered by the punctuation of the manuscripts, which indicates that the text belongs together. Beate R. Suchla's punctuation in her edition is erroneous.

supersubstantial, sun, star, fire, water, spirit, dew, cloud, that-which-is-the-stone, rock, every
being and nothing from among these beings.\textsuperscript{317}

Scholion

For the one whose nature is unthinkable no proper name can be found, given that the proper
name indicates the nature.

Title 6, of the Areopagite, On the divine incarnation
From the first chapter of the treatise On the Divine Names
The Principle-of-divinity is especially man-loving, because in one of its hypostases it truly
and completely took share in all that belongs to us, calling back to itself and elevating the
humanity, of which ineffably the simple Jesus became composite, and the one who is eternal
took a temporal extension, and the one who supersubstantially transcends all order according
to all nature appeared within our nature, with the unchanged and unconfused establishment of
his own characteristics.

From the second chapter of the Areopagite
But also the most evident subject of theology – the divine formation of Jesus according to us
– is ineffable to all word and unknowable to all mind, even to the very first among the most
venerable angels. And that he was substantiated as a man, this we have received in secret
transmission, but we do not know how, according to a law other than the natural, he was
formed from virginal blood and how he walked on the humid and unstable substance without
moistening his feet having corporeal volume and the weight of matter; and all the rest that
pertain to Jesus! supernatural physiology.

IVLetter 25v –26v
of the same [Dionysius], from his letter to the monk Gaius
How do you say that Jesus, the one Who is beyond all things, is substantially ranked together
with all men? For He is not called here man as the Cause of men, but as being precisely what means to be truly

\textsuperscript{317} For the scriptural passages cited here see the apparatus of the edition of the text on p. 224-225.
man in the entire substance. However, we do not define Jesus in a human way. For He is neither only man, nor only supersubstantial (as far as He is a man), but truly man is the exceedingly manloving one.\textsuperscript{318}

Scholion

This means that we do not determine him as mere man, for he is not only man, but also God, just as he is not only God, but also man.\textsuperscript{319}

Text

The Supersubstantial substantiated above men and according to men, from the substance of men.\textsuperscript{320}

Scholion

He is substantiated above men, because from a virgin, but according to men because from a woman; from the substance of men because not from another substance; for neither had he brought the flesh down from heaven, nor did he take on himself an earthly flesh of a nature other than human, nor did he become man [only] in appearance.

Text

This notwithstanding, the one Who is always supersubstantial remains more-than-full of supersubstantiality. Moreover, when because of the abundance of the latter He has also truly come to substance, He was substantiated above substance and performed the human deeds above man. This is shown by the Virgin who supranaturally gives birth and by the unstable water that bears the weight of the material and earthly feet, and does not yield, but through a supernatural power is coagulated to a non-liquid state. many\textsuperscript{321} Why would one enumerate the rest, which are indeed many? Through which the one who sees in a divine


\textsuperscript{319} Cf. Maximus Confessor, Ambigua ad Thomam, PG 91, col. 1048 B-C Janssens, l. 32-34: “Neither is he only man, because he is also God, nor is he only supersubstantial, because he is also man, given that he is neither a mere man, nor naked God.” (tr. I. Perczel, ibid. 434).

\textsuperscript{320} Tr. I. Perczel, ibid. 442-443.

\textsuperscript{321} Clearly, this variant is due to a scribal error, writing τὰ πολλὰ instead of τὰ λοιπὰ.
manner will know above intellect that even those things that are predicated about the manlovingness of Jesus in fact have the sense of transcendent negation. For to say it shortly, He was not even man, not as if He were no man, but from men and beyond men and above man He has truly become man.  

Scholion

That even this [that is, the substantiation of Jesus] is supersubstantial and according to the divinity. Supersubstantial as being from a virgin and without [the] seed [of a man] and, just like the divinity, <in the same way> it is above mind and word. For even when conceived, it preserves unknowability, and when said, ineffability. The one who is according to nature, is also above nature. We know and say that he was substantiated from human nature [?] but neither do we know nor do we say how this occurred from virginal blood according to a law other than [that of] the human nature.

Text

And for the rest, he performed the divine deeds not as God, nor the human deeds as man, but being God man-ified, he exerted for us a kind of new god-manly activity.

Scholion

Christ neither performed the divine deeds as God, nor the human deeds as man. For [he performed them] not only divinely but also humanly and not only humanly but also divinely because of the indivisible and inconfusable union. For by means of the man-ification of God, that is, by the inhumanation of God, a kind of new god-manly activity came into existence. It is new, because neither did he divinely operate the divine deeds, nor humanly the human deeds, but in a god-manly manner, as it [the activity] is simultaneously divine and human. Just as the cutting capacity of a brazing sword has become its burning capacity and its burning capacity has become its cutting capacity – for just as the fire has become united with the iron, so also the burning capacity of the fire has become united with the cutting capacity of the iron, so that the iron become burning because of the union with the fire and the fire become cutting because of the union with the iron and neither of the two suffer any alteration

322 Tr. I. Perczel, ibid. 443.
because of the exchange between each other in the union, but each of the two, even while in
the union sharing in the property of the other element, remain without falling out from its
own natural property – so also even in the mystery of the divine inhumanation, divinity and
humanity has become united according to the hypostasis, without any of the two abandoning,
because of the union, its natural operation, although without keeping it unrelated to the other
element, or separated from it.

26.v (DN, II, 10)

Of the same [Dionysius] from the Elements of Theology of the holy Hierotheus

Since because of man-lovingness he descended even as far as nature and was truly
substantiated and the One who is more-than-divine was called a man – let those things that
we celebrate above mind and word be merciful! – even in these [earthly] things he possesses
supernaturality and supersubstantiality – not only because he communicated to us
unchangeably\(^{323}\) and unconfusedly, without any damage to his more-than-fullness before [to
be corrected to “because of”] the ineffable self-emptying [kenosis], but also – which is the
greatest novelty among all novelties – he was supernatural even in our natural conditions and
supersubstantial in the substantial characteristics, in a transcendent manner possessing above
us all that belongs to us.

\(^{323}\) This translation presupposes the emendation of an error in the text, due to iotaism
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