

THEODORE METOCHITES AND HIS LOGOS
ON THE ARCHANGEL MICHAEL
AN ESSAY ON THE TEXT'S SOURCES
AND ITS INTELLECTUAL BACKGROUND

ELENI KALTSOGIANNI

Palaiologan hagiography, often criticized in the past as devoid of content due to the high rhetorical elaboration of the texts,¹ has attracted in the last decades scholarly attention as a means of understanding the aesthetic values and ideological concerns of the time.² Research has focused especially on authors such as Constantine Akropolites and Nikephoros Gregoras, the two most prolific hagiographers of the Palaiologan period.³ Theodore Metochites, the leading figure

* A very short, primary draft of this paper was presented in the 22nd International Congress of Byzantine Studies (Sofia, 22-27 August 2011); cf. Proceedings of the 22nd International Congress of Byzantine Studies (Sofia, 22-27 August 2011). III. Abstracts of free communications. Sofia 2011, 158-159 – I would like to thank Prof. I. Polemis (Athens) for critically reviewing my article.

- ¹ Cf. e.g. the words of H.-G. BECK, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (*Byzantinisches Handbuch*, II/1). München ²1977, 697: “Das 13. und das beginnende 14. Jahrhundert gehören nicht zu den großen Zeiten der byzantinischen Hagiographie. Zwar finden sich eine Reihe von Enkomien, aber an eigentlichen Bioi ist wenig zu nennen”.
- ² For an overview of Palaiologan hagiography, with references to the most recent literature, see A.-M. TALBOT, *Hagiography in Late Byzantium (1204-1453)*, in: ST. EFTHYMIADIS (ed.), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography. I. Periods and Places*. Farnham 2011, 173-195.
- ³ Cf., e.g., the studies of M. HINTERBERGER, *Les Vies des saints du XIV^e siècle en tant que biographie historique: l'oeuvre de Nicéphore Grégoras*, in: P. ODORICO – P. A. AGAPITOS (éd.), *Les Vies des Saints à Byzance. Genre littéraire ou biographie historique? Actes du II^e colloque international philologique «ΕΡΜΗΝΕΙΑ»*, Paris, 6-7-8 Juin 2002 (*Dossiers Byzantins*, 4). Paris 2004, 281-301, and idem, *Hagiographische Metaphrasen. Ein möglicher Weg der Annäherung an die Literarästhetik der frühen Palaiologenzeit*, in: A. ΡΗΟΒΥ – E. SCHIFFER (Hrsg.), *IMITATIO – AEMULATIO – VARIATIO. Akten des internationalen wissenschaftlichen Symposions zur byzantinischen Sprache und Literatur* (Wien, 22.-25. Oktober 2008) (*Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften*, 402). Wien 2010, 137-151. For the hagiographical work of Nikephoros Gregoras, see also the recent monograph of I. PARASKEVOPOULOU, *Το αγιολογικό και ομιλητικό έργο του Νικηφόρου Γρηγορά (Βυζαντινά κείμενα και μελέτες, 59)*. Thessaloniki 2013.

of the so-called “Early Palaiologan Renaissance”, has only rarely –and secondarily– been taken into consideration in the framework of these studies, probably due to the fact that his hagiographical work remains until now only partly and insufficiently edited.⁴

Metochites’ hagiographical production has come down to us, along with the rest of his rhetorical work, in the codex Vindobonensis Phil. gr. 95, a manuscript produced during the author’s lifetime and copied, in all probability, under his supervision.⁵ We have to do with six texts, covering about 140 folios in the Vindobonensis; of these only three (the *Logoi* on the Saints Demetrios [BHG 547g], Michael the New [BHG 2273] and John the New of Didymoteichon [BHG 2192]) have been edited in the past, while the other three, concerning Saint Marina (BHG 1169b), the Archangel Michael (BHG 1209c) and Saint Gregory of Nazianzus (BHG 726b), are still unpublished.⁶ In view of the first critical edition of the whole hagiographical corpus of Metochites that is under preparation, I will focus in the present contribution on one of the hitherto unedited texts, the *Logos* on the Archangel Michael.

The *Logos* on the Archangel Michael survives on ff. 32v-59 of the Vindobonensis and it is the third text to be found in the codex; it is placed between two other hagiographical pieces of Metochites, his *Logoi* on the Saints Marina and Demetrios respectively. The place of the text in the codex seems to be significant with regard to its dating, for according to the prevalent view, at first supported by the late I. Ševčenko, we have to do with a collection arranged according to the chronological order of creation of its individual pieces (of course, with some

⁴ On Theodore Metochites, see *PLP* 17982 (with references to the older literature).

⁵ For the description of the manuscript, see H. HUNGER, *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der österreichischen Nationalbibliothek. I. Codices historici, codices philosophici et philologici*. Wien 1961, 202-204; see also I. ŠEVČENKO, *Observations sur les recueils des discours et des poèmes de Th. Métochite et sur la bibliothèque de Chora à Constantinople. Scriptorium* 5 (1951) 279-288, and idem, *Études sur la polémique entre Théodore Métochite et Nicéphore Choumnos (Corpus Bruxellense Historiae Byzantinae. Subsidia, 3)*. Bruxelles 1962, 177-184. For some of Metochites’ hagiographical texts (the *Logoi* on the Saints Marina, Demetrios, Gregory of Nazianzus and Michael the New) there are also other witnesses.

⁶ The *Logos* on Saint Marina has been analysed in the past by E. Gamillscheg in his unpublished dissertation *Die griechischen Texte über die heilige Marina* (Wien 1974, 170-217), while I. Ševčenko has dealt in an article with the *Logos* on Gregory of Nazianzus (see I. ŠEVČENKO, *The Logos on Gregory of Nazianzus by Theodore Metochites*, in: W. SEIBT [Hrsg.], *Geschichte und Kultur der Palaiologenzeit. Referate des internationalen Symposions zu Ehren von H. Hunger* [Wien, 30. November bis 3. Dezember 1994]. Wien 1996, 221-233).

minor exceptions).⁷ If we take this strictly, then we should argue that the *Logos* on the Archangel Michael was written after the *Logos* on Saint Marina and before the *Logos* on Saint Demetrios. Neither of these texts can be dated safely; however, it is possible that the *Logos* on Saint Marina was written sometime after 1285,⁸ while the *Logos* on Saint Demetrios must have been written around 1290 and probably before 1294/95.⁹ Therefore, we can assume that Metochites composed his *Logos* on the Archangel Michael sometime between 1285-1290/92 and so the text belongs to the works of his youth, since he was born in 1270.¹⁰

The motives for the composition of the *Logos* are explained by the author both in the prologue and at a further point of the text: he is responding to the request of his friends, who have been long urging him to write an eulogy on Michael, the leader of the Celestial Orders.¹¹ Of course, the reference to a request by

⁷ Cf. ŠEVČENKO, *Études* (cited n. 5), 135-144.

⁸ *Terminus post quem* is the date of composition of the *Logos* on Saint Marina by Gregory of Cyprus, which served Metochites as his model. According to GAMILLSCHEG (*Die griechischen Texte*, 194 n. 4), Gregory must have composed this text around 1285; see also S. KOTZABASSI, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der rhetorischen und hagiographischen Werke des Gregor von Zypern (Serta Graeca, 6)*. Wiesbaden 1998, 11 n. 77. On Gregory of Cyprus, see *PLP* 4590.

⁹ For the dating of this text, see B. LAOURDAS, Ἐγκώμια εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Δημήτριον κατὰ τὸν δέκατον τέταρτον αἰῶνα. *EEBS* 24 (1954) 277-279, ŠEVČENKO, *Études* (cited n. 5), 270-271, and E. KALTSOGIANNI – S. KOTZABASSI – I. PARASKEVOPOULOU, Ἡ Θεσσαλονίκη στη βυζαντινὴ λογοτεχνία. Ρητορικά καὶ αγιολογικά κείμενα (*Βυζαντινὰ κείμενα καὶ μελέται*, 32). Thessaloniki 2002, 154 with n. 357. Laourdas dated the text in 1292, while Paraskevopoulou has proposed a dating before 1290, when Metochites was still living in Asia Minor together with his exiled father, based on the author's statement that he composed the *Logos* on Saint Demetrios in return for his miraculous healing from an illness that attacked him ἐπ' ἄλλοδαπῆς (see B. LAOURDAS, *Βυζαντινὰ καὶ μεταβυζαντινὰ ἐγκώμια εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Δημήτριον. Μακεδονικά* 4 [1955-1960] 57.34; see also p. 81.977: ὡς ἄρ' ἔκαμνον ἐπ' Ἰωνίας); this statement suggests, in my view, that at the time of the composition of the *Logos* Metochites was no more ἐπ' ἄλλοδαπῆς, but he had already returned to the capital, which happened around 1290 (cf. ŠEVČENKO, *Études* [cited n. 5], 271). As for the *terminus ante quem* 1294/95, this results from the dating of Metochites' first imperial oration that follows in the manuscript, which must have been composed around 1294/95; for the dating of this text, see I. POLEMIS, Θεόδωρος Μετοχίτης, Οἱ δύο βασιλικοὶ λόγοι. Εἰσαγωγή – Κριτικὴ ἔκδοση – Μετάφραση – Σημειώσεις (*Κείμενα βυζαντινῆς λογοτεχνίας*, 4). Athens 2007, 33-42.

¹⁰ For the date of Metochites' birth, see ŠEVČENKO, *Études* (cited n. 5), 129.

¹¹ See cod. Vind. phil. gr. 95, f. 33: ἐπεὶ δὲ οὕτω ταῦτα· καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀντερεῖ πάντως τῶν βουλομένων τιμᾶν τάληθές, τί ποτ' ἄρα χρῆσαιμέθα τῷ τε λόγῳ τὸ προσήκον ἐαυτῷ συνορῶντι καὶ καλῶς αἰρουμένῳ· καὶ φίλοις ἀνδράσιν οἱ πρὸς ὑψηλότερα τοῦτον διανιστῶσι καὶ πῶς ἂν εἶποι τις εὐ μάλα τυραννοῦσι καὶ βιάζονται; ὁ μὲν γάρ, ταῖς ἀγγελικαῖς οὐσίαις προσιέναι· καὶ εἰσφορὰν τινα δικαίαν ἀφοσιοῦσθαι, ποθεῖ μὲν ἐπιεικῶς· ἄλλ' ἤττων ἔχων αἰσθάνεται· οἱ δὲ καθόσον οἶον τε προτρεπόμενοι καὶ τὸν πόθον ἐξάπτοντες· ἐφῶ τῷ τῆς

a third person as a motive for the composition of a hagiographical text belongs to the hagiographical/literary *topoi*,¹² but if we take into consideration that Metochites mentions this request twice, then it is quite possible that we have to do with true facts. On the other hand, we have no evidence concerning the possible oral delivery of the *Logos* or its association with a certain feast in honour of the Archangel Michael.¹³

Before proceeding to the discussion about the text's models and sources, it would be useful to give a summary of its content:

In the prologue (ff. 32v-34) Metochites meditates upon the ability of the human word to describe whatever stands above the senses, and compares literature

ἀγγελικῆς χοροστασίας ἡγεμόνι τὸν δυνατὸν ὕμνον εἰσενεγκεῖν, οὐκ ἀνιάσι πολὺς ἤδη χρόνος· οὐδὲ φασὶν ἀνήσειν, μέχρις ἂν, περιγένοιτο· καὶ δὴ περιγίνονται, and f. 48v: φέρε τὸν λόγον ἀναληπτέον· μᾶλλον δὲ τῶν ἐξαρχῆς ἡρημένων ἀντιληπτέον ἡμῖν· καὶ τὴν γιγνομένην εὐφημίαν ἀποδοτέον· καὶ φορὰν ὡς προυθέμεθα, τῷ πρωτοστάτῃ τῶν ἄνω ταγμάτων Μιχαὴλ· ὡς ἂν, οὕτως ἐκ τῶν ἐνότων ἀποδοίημεν ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τοῖς προτρεψαμένοις τὸ χρέος.

¹² See TH. PRATSCH, *Der hagiographische Topos. Griechische Heiligenviten in mittelbyzantinischer Zeit (Millenium-Studien/Millennium Studies, 6)*. Berlin – New York 2005, 26-28 (Auftragstopos), and CHR. ΜΙΤΑΚΙ, *Τα προοίμια των αγιολογικών κειμένων της παλαιολόγειας περιόδου. Δομική και θεματική ανάλυση. Unpublished Master Thesis. Thessaloniki 2005*, 105-108.

¹³ The two major feasts of the Archangel Michael, were on 6th September (commemoration of Michael's miracle at Chonai) and 8th November (*Synaxis* of the *Asomatoi*); see H. DELEHAYE, *Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae. Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum Novembris*. Bruxelles 1902, 19.6-20.23 and 203.5-204.17, and J. ΜΑΤΕΟΣ, *Le typicon de la Grande Église. I. Le cycle des douze mois (OCA, 165)*. Roma 1962, 94. The cult of the Archangel Michael was widespread in Byzantium: we know of at least twenty four churches dedicated to him in Constantinople (most of them belong to the early and middle Byzantine period; the most reknown was the church of the Archangel Michael at Sosthenion, an establishment of the eleventh [?] century that was still functioning in the early Palaiologan period; see R. JANIN, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin. Première partie. Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat oecuménique, III. Les églises et les monastères*. Paris 1969², 337-350, esp. 346-349). There were also many sanctuaries dedicated to the Angels in Asia Minor, and especially in its west coast, but we do not know which of them (probably very few) were still in function in the later period (see R. JANIN, *Les églises et les monastères des grands centres byzantins [Bithynie, Hellespont, Latros, Galésios, Trébizonde, Athènes, Thessalonique]*. Paris 1975, 9, 18, 21, 38, 42, 43, 48, 49, 52, 59, 66, 85-86, 95, 100, 112, 165, 167, 168, 183-184, 206-207, 222-223, 234, 239, 260); safe evidence for the Palaiologan period we have only about the monastery dedicated to the Archangel Michael on the Auxentios mountain, which was restored by the emperor Michael VIII (see JANIN, *Grands centres*, 48). If Metochites composed his *Logos* while he was living in Asia Minor, a possibility that cannot be excluded, then the widespread cult of the Archangel in this region could have played a role in the choice of the topic by his assignors.

(i.e. the art of words) to painting; if painters, whose art is bound to the senses and the material world, dare sometimes to depict the immaterial nature of the Angels, then the man of letters is much more legitimized to speak about those issues, because through the words he serves the intellect, the only part of the human being that can attain a view of the incorporeal substances; moreover, the author refers to the request of his friends as the basic motive for the composition of the *Logos* and expresses his certainty that the Archangel Michael will supervise and assist him with his enterprise.

The main part of the speech begins with a summary of the Orthodox Trinitarian creed (f. 34rv): God, who stands above time and space and whose nature is inconceivable by the human senses and mind, has created both the material and the immaterial world and through his providence holds it together; the three persons of the Holy Trinity form an entity, yet only the Father has no beginning, while the Son and the Holy Spirit, though timeless, they both have their beginning in the Father – it is interesting to note Metochites' careful formulation of the doctrine about the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone, obviously in an effort to keep his distance from the views of his own father, George Metochites,¹⁴ who had been condemned and exiled as heretic, because of his support of the Latin creed.¹⁵

¹⁴ On George Metochites, see *PLP* 17979.

¹⁵ Cf. cod. Vind. phil. gr. 95, f. 34v: τὸ δὲ (sc. πνεῦμα), τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον ὑπὲρ λόγον· ὑπὲρ χρόνον, ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευεται· μόνον αὐτὸν τὸν πατέρα τῆς οἰκειᾶς ὑπάρξεως ἔχον αἴτιον. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν εἰς τοσοῦτο. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἴσως ὑπὲρ ταῦτα δέον ἡμῖν ἐκτείνεσθαι· ἀλλὰ ταῖς ἀπλαῖς τῆς θεολογίας ἰστάνειν τὸν νοῦν θέσεσιν· ὅτι μήτ' ἄλλοτ' ἦν ἀσφαλὲς· μήτ' ἐν τοῖς νῦν μάλιστα καιροῖς, περαιτέρω προϊέναι καὶ διερευνᾶσθαι τὰ περὶ Θεοῦ. ἐξὸν δὲ οὕτως ἀπλῶς εὐσεβεῖν, καὶ ῥᾶστα καλῶς τε καὶ ἀσφαλῶς, ἔχειν, φεύγοντα τὸ δυσχερὲς τῆς ζητήσεως· ἀνοία πάντως ἂν εἴη μεγίστη, κινδύνων ἀλόγως τοσοῦτων κατατολμᾶν, καὶ λόγον ὑπέχειν τοῖς πλείοσιν. About 15 years later, in c. 1305, Metochites will introduce the main part of his *Ethikos* with the same summary of the Orthodox creed and will repeat his fears for the accusation of heresy; see I. ΡΟΛΕΜΙΣ, Θεόδωρος Μετοχίτης, Ἡθικὸς ἢ περὶ παιδείας. Εἰσαγωγή – Κριτικὴ ἔκδοση – Μετάφραση – Σημειώσεις (*Κείμενα βυζαντινῆς λογοτεχνίας*, 1). Athens ²2002, 22.8-42.17, esp. 36.7-16: ἡμῖν δὲ οἷς μεγίστη ζημία, οἷς ἐπαχθέστατον ἐγκλημα, ἐνὸς ὄντος τάληθους περὶ θεοῦ, ὡσπερ ἄρα καὶ περὶ παντὸς ἄλλου πράγματος ἁμαρτεῖν κατὰ βραχύ, πᾶν ἄλλ' ὁτιοῦν τιθεμένοις, τί τὸ κινοῦν, τίς ἀνάγκη καθ' οὕτω μεγίστου κινδύνου κύβον ῥιπτεῖν καὶ ὠθεῖσθαι, καὶ μάλιστα νῦν ἀμέλει τούτων τῶν καιρῶν, ἠνίχ' ὡς οὐδὲν ἄλλο τι τῶν ἀπάντων τοῖς πλείοσι πρόχειρον ἐπὶ γλώσσαις ἐπενεγκεῖν ἐγκλημα δόγματος ἀλλοτριότητα καὶ κακοδοξίαν, ῥᾶον ἢ σκῶμμά τι τῶν οὐδενός λόγου; see also *ibid.*, 141*, and I. ŠEVČENKO, Theodore Metochites, the Chora, and the Intellectual Trends of His Time, in: P. UNDERWOOD (ed.), *The Karije Djami. IV. Studies on the Art of the Karije Djami and its Intellectual Backgrounds*. Princeton – New Jersey 1975, 52-53. For Metochites' "fideism" and his denouncing of the theological speculation as dangerous, see the discussion in B. BYDÉN, *Theodore Metochites' Stoicheiosis Astronomike*

After this short, doctrinal introduction the author proceeds to his main subject and speaks at first about the nature of the Angels: those were created by God, either before or together with the rest of the material world (Metochites avoids to take stand on this matter), they are immaterial beings and though incorporeal, they are countable and they can be limited in space (ff. 34v-35); each of these views is analysed further with the help of scriptural quotations and logical arguments (ff. 35v-36). As we will see below, Metochites insists especially on the question whether the corporeal and the incorporeal should be regarded as opposite categories, in order to prove through this discussion that the Angels can be circumscribed within spatial limits (ff. 36v-38).

A new section deals with the supremacy of the Angels over all other forms of being: the incorporeal angelic substances are superior to the heavenly bodies (f. 38v) and, of course, to everything terrestrial: the plants, the animals and the man (f. 39rv). Since they are totally disconnected from everything material, their nature is closer to the nature of God, and this is the reason why they are described as wind (πνεῦμα) and fire (πῦρ), properties that are also attributed to Him (f. 40rv) – in a long digression the author explains why the use of such *typoi* is necessary for the representation of the immaterial nature, so that this can be better perceived by the human mind. Then, returning back to his main subject, he comes to speak about the *theoria* as the basic function of the angelic intellect: being totally intellectual substances, the Angels can get to know God directly, without the intervention of science, only through divine illumination (ff. 42v-44). As for the practical function of their intellect, this proves also superior to that of the man, for it is not directed towards the material world, but it seeks to imitate God; consequently, the virtues of the Angels should not be compared to the common human virtues (ff. 44v-46v). The Angels serve as links between God and the mankind and they are those who announce His mysteries to the people (f. 47rv). Their hierarchy reminds also of the Trinity, for they are divided in three different ranks, each consisting of three angelic orders (f. 47v).

Having reached this point of the *Logos*, Metochites “realizes” that he has dealt so far with subjects that are above him and he has swerved from his original purpose, which was to praise Michael, the leader of the Celestial Orders (f. 48rv). Thus, for the rest of the speech he will focus on the eulogy of the Archangel and will recount in detail his miracles according to the Scriptures (ff. 48v-58v). At the end he will pray to Michael, in order to intervene with God for him on the Day of Judgement (f. 59).

and the Study of Natural Philosophy and Mathematics in Early Palaiologan Byzantium (*Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia*, 66). Göteborg 2003, 273-277.

Metochites' *Logos* has a bipartite structure: there is a first, theoretical part, which the author later describes as a deviation from the main purpose of his speech,¹⁶ although it covers about 2/3 of the whole, and a shorter narrative part dealing with the miracles of the Archangel Michael. Such a bipartite structure is not, of course, original within the framework of the Byzantine homiletic tradition on the Angels. The eulogy, e.g., of Chrysippus of Jerusalem on the Archangel Michael, dating back to the fifth century, has a similar structure with a small introductory part that summarizes basic positions of Christian angelology (the nature of the Angels as wind and fire) and an encomiastic part dedicated to the praise of Michael.¹⁷ This is also the case with John Mauropous' Oration on the feast of the *Synaxis* of the Angels.¹⁸ Nevertheless, Metochites is original in another aspect: the part of his *Logos* that deals with angelology has rather the character of a theological treatise, where theology is often mixed with "pagan" philosophy, for the author draws on ancient Greek philosophers in order to support his arguments. In this vein, the study of the text's sources is of special interest, for it can reveal among others Metochites' intellectual concerns and preoccupations, as well as his own perception of what we usually call "Christian Humanism".

The primary source a Byzantine author would be expected to draw upon when dealing with angelology¹⁹ was the work of Pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite, and especially his treatise *De caelesti hierarchia*. Influenced by the Neoplatonic Proclus, Pseudo-Dionysios spoke in his work about the role of the Angels as those who, according to their name, announce (ἐξαγγέλλειν) and reveal (ἐκφαίνειν) the mysteries of God, and transmit (διαπορθμεύειν) Divine Illumination to the lower orders of the Celestial Powers and to the people.²⁰ Accord-

¹⁶ Cf. cod. Vind. phil. gr. 95, f. 48: ἔλαθον ἑμαυτὸν τοῖς ἀδύτοις εἰσπηδήσας ἀκαίρως· ἔλαθον ἑμαυτὸν πορρωτάτω παρενεχθεὶς, ἢ κατὰ τὴν πρόθεσιν· μᾶλλον δὲ κατὰ τὸ προσήκον αὐτὸ καὶ δίκαιον, ἔμοιγ' οὖν· ἐπεὶ πρὸς ἄλλοις ἔχων τὴν ἀρχὴν κινήσαι τὸν λόγον, οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ἐκκλίνας τῆς προκειμένης εἰς ἄλλην· καὶ μέχρι πόρρω ταύτης ἐχόμενος, μόλις ἠσθόμην γενόμενος ἑμαυτοῦ ἐπιβαλὼν ὑψηλοτέροις ἢ κατ' ἐμὲ, and f. 48v: φέρε τὸν λόγον ἀναληπτέον· μᾶλλον δὲ τῶν ἐξαρχῆς ἡρημένων ἀντιληπτέον ἡμῖν· καὶ τὴν γιγνομένην εὐφημίαν ἀποδοτέον· καὶ φορὰν ὡς προουθέμεθα, τῷ πρωτοστάτῃ τῶν ἄνω ταγμάτων Μιχαήλ.

¹⁷ See A. SIGALAS, Χρυσίππου πρεσβυτέρου ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν ἀρχάγγελον Μιχαήλ. *EEBS* 3 (1926) 85-93 (*BHG* 1290b).

¹⁸ See P. DE LAGARDE, Iohannis Euchaitorum metropolitae quae in codice Vaticano Graeco 676 supersunt. Amsterdam ²1979, 95-106 (*BHG* 128).

¹⁹ As far as I know, there is no comprehensive study of the Byzantine texts dealing with the Angels. Very useful are the references to Christian/Byzantine authors that can be found in the article "Engel" of the *RAC* 5 (1962) 109-200 (Engel IV [christlich]).

²⁰ See Pseudo-Dionysios, *De caelesti hierarchia*, ed. G. HEIL – A. M. RITTER, *Corpus Dionysiacum II: Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita, De caelesti hierarchia – De mystica theologia*

ing to Pseudo-Dionysios, the Celestial Hierarchy consists of three triads, called διάκοσμοι or διακοσμήσεις or ἱεραρχίαι, and each of these triads comprises three angelic orders: the first triad, divided in Seraphim, Cherubim and Thrones, is in immediate communion with God and receives directly the illuminations of His Light; so it can reach the utmost point of purity, enlightenment and perfection, and thus it serves as a model for the rest two triads. The second and the third hierarchy communicate with God through the intervention of the first; the second hierarchy is divided in Dominions, Virtues and Powers, while the third in Principalities, Archangels and Angels.²¹

The basic notions of Pseudo-Dionysios' angelology can be easily detected in Metochites' *Logos* on the Archangel Michael. Metochites comments on the role of the Angels with reference to the etymology of their name: ὁ δὴ καὶ τὰς νοερὰς ἀγγελικὰς οὐσίας, δρᾶν ὑπὸ φιλανθρωπίας· κατιούσας τὲ ἡμῖν, πρὸς τὰ κρείττω συμμαχεῖν· καὶ χεῖρα διδόναι· καὶ ἡγεῖσθαι τῶν ἀγαθῶν· καὶ μεσάζειν κοινωνικῶς τὴν θεῖαν αἴγλην καὶ τὰς ἐκεῖθεν ἐλλάμψεις, καὶ διαγγέλλειν οἷα εἰκὸς· καὶ ὅσα εἰκὸς· τὰ τῆς θεῖας οὐσίας ἀπόρρητα. παρὸ δὴ καὶ πάσας μὲν κοινῶς ὀνομάζεσθαι τὰς νοερὰς οὐσίας ἀγγέλους· διὰ τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλας καὶ πρὸς ἡμᾶς, κατὰ τοὺς ἄνω τῆς τάξεως νόμους, τῶν θεῖαν ἐξαγγελίαν τὲ καὶ φανέρωσιν,²² and he also describes in summary the structure of the angelic hierarchies: τὰ δὲ δὴ κατὰ ταύτην τὴν τῶν αὐτῶν ἱεραρχίαν ὡς ἔχει κατὰ φύσιν, ἱστορεῖν, ὑπὲρ τὸν παρόντα τοῦ λόγου σκοπὸν· μᾶλλον δ' ὅλως ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς. τοῦτο γε μὴν εἰρήσθω τό γε νῦν ἔχον·

– Epistulae (*Patristische Texte und Studien*, 36). Berlin 1991, 21.9-14: αὐταί (sc. αἱ τῶν οὐρανίων οὐσιῶν διακοσμήσεις) γοῦν εἰσιν αἱ πρῶτως καὶ πολλαχῶς ἐν μετουσίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ γινόμεναι καὶ πρῶτως καὶ πολλαχῶς ἐκφαντορικαί τῆς θεαρχικῆς κρυφιοτήτος, διὸ καὶ παρὰ πάντα τῆς ἀγγελικῆς ἐπωνυμίας ἐκκρίτως ἠξίωνται διὰ τὸ πρῶτως εἰς αὐτὰς ἐγγίνεσθαι τὴν θεαρχικὴν ἔλλαμψιν καὶ δι' αὐτῶν εἰς ἡμᾶς διαπορθμεύεσθαι τὰς ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς ἐκφαντορίας. See also R. ROQUES, *L'univers dionysien. Structure hiérarchique du monde selon pseudo-Denys*. Paris 1983, 135.

²¹ See Pseudo-Dionysios, *De caelesti hierarchia*, ed. HEIL – RITTER, 26.11-27.3: πάσας ἡ θεολογία τὰς οὐρανίας οὐσίας ἐννεὰ κέκληκεν ἐκφαντορικαῖς ἐπωνυμίαις· ταύτας ὁ θεῖος ἡμῶν ἱεροτελεστής εἰς τρεῖς ἀφορίζει τριαδικὰς διακοσμήσεις. Καὶ πρῶτην μὲν εἶναι φησὶ τὴν περὶ Θεὸν οὖσαν αἰεὶ καὶ προσεχῶς αὐτῷ καὶ πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἀμέσως ἠνώσθαι παραδεδομένην. Τοῦς τε γὰρ ἁγιωτάτους θρόνους καὶ τὰ πολυόμματα καὶ ἀπολύπτερα τάγματα Χερουβὶμ Ἑβραίων φωνῆ καὶ Σεραφίμ ὀνομασμένα κατὰ τὴν πάντων ὑπερκειμένην ἐγγύτητα περὶ Θεὸν ἀμέσως ἰδρῦσθαί φησὶ παραδιδόναι τὴν τῶν ἱερῶν λογίων ἐκφαντορίαν. Τὸν τριαδικὸν οὖν τοῦτον διάκοσμον ὡς ἓνα καὶ ὁμοταγῆ καὶ ὄντως πρῶτην ἱεραρχίαν ὁ κλεινὸς ἡμῶν ἔφη καθηγεμών, ἧς οὐκ ἔστιν ἕτερα θεοειδεστέρα καὶ ταῖς πρωτουργοῖς τῆς θεαρχίας ἐλλάμψεσιν ἀμέσως προσεχεστέρα, δευτέραν δ' εἶναι φησὶν τὴν ὑπὸ τῶν ἐξουσιῶν καὶ κυριοτήτων καὶ δυνάμεων συμπληρουμένην καὶ τρίτην ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν οὐρανίων ἱεραρχῶν τὴν τῶν ἀγγέλων τε καὶ ἀρχαγγέλων καὶ ἀρχῶν διακόσμησιν. See also ROQUES, *L'univers dionysien* (cited n. 20), 136-147.

²² See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 47.

ὅτι κἀνταῦθα δὴ τὸ σεμνὸν τῆς τριαδικῆς, ἀριθμήσεως δείκνυται· τετράγωνον ὡς ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν θεωρουμένης. τριχῆ γὰρ διαιρεθεῖσα, διὰ τριῶν ἐκάστη ταγματῶν συνίσταται· ὡς τὴν μὲν πρώτην ἐν Θρόνοις εἶναι Χερουβίμ τε καὶ Σεραφίμ· μεθ' ἣν ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ καὶ μέση, τὰς Κυριότητας καὶ τὰς Δυνάμεις ἀριθμεῖσθαι, καὶ τὰς Ἐξουσίας· Ἀρχαὶ δὲ τὴν τρίτην κοσμοῦσιν, Ἀρχάγγελοί τε καὶ Ἄγγελοι.²³

A further idea put forward by Pseudo-Dionysios and repeated by Metochites is that the Angels live an intellectual life and they are the first to receive the illuminations of the Divine Light:

Pseudo-Dionysios

νοητῶς γὰρ ἐπὶ τὸ θεομίμητον ἑαυτὰς ἀποτυποῦσαι καὶ πρὸς τὴν θεαρχικὴν ἐμφερειαν ὑπερκοσμίως ὀρῶσαι καὶ μορφοῦν ἐφιέμεναι τὸ νοερὸν αὐτῶν εἶδος, ἀφθονωτέρας εικότως ἔχουσι τὰς πρὸς αὐτὴν κοινωνίας, προσεχεῖς μὲν οὔσαι καὶ αἰεὶ πρὸς τὸ ἀναντες ὡς θεμιτὸν ἐν συντονίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀκλινοῦς ἔρωτος ἀνατεινόμεναι καὶ τὰς ἀρχικὰς ἐλλάμψεις αὐλως καὶ ἀμιγῶς εἰσδεχόμεναι καὶ πρὸς αὐτὰς ταττόμεναι καὶ νοεράν ἔχουσαι τὴν πᾶσαν ζωὴν.²⁴

Metochites

τὴν νοητὴν λέγω πᾶσαν φύσιν, πρώτως δεχομένην τὴν ἄνωθεν θεῖαν αἴγλην· τῷ μᾶλλον πρὸς Θεὸν ἐγγίζειν καὶ μεσάζειν ἐντεῦθεν ἡμῖν φυσικῶς· καὶ διαπορθμεύειν ἐκεῖθεν τὴν ἔλλαμψιν²⁵ ... ὥσπερ δὴ τοὺς ἀγγέλους νόας, ὁ ποιητὴς λόγος οὐσίωσεν ἀνωτέρους πάσης τῆς ὑλικῆς συμπλοκῆς· καὶ ὅλως καὶ μόνως τῇ κατὰ νοῦν ζωῇ χρωμένους, ὡς αὐτονόας τὲ ὄντας καὶ αἰεὶ περὶ τὸν πρῶτον τὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντα νοῦν, νοῦν στρεφομένους καὶ φωτιζόμενους κατὰ πρώτην μεθέξεως ἔλλαμψιν.²⁶

The degree to which they are illuminated by God depends on their proximity to Him, and the lower orders receive the Divine Light through the intervention of the superior:

Pseudo-Dionysios

κατὰ γὰρ τὸν πολλάκις ἡμῖν ὀρθῶς ἀποδοθέντα λόγον αἱ μὲν ὑπερβεβηκυῖαι διακοσμήσεις περισσῶς ἔχουσι καὶ τὰς τῶν ὑφειμένων ἱεράς ιδιότητος, αἱ δὲ τελευταῖαι τὰς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ὑπερκειμένας ὀλότητος οὐκ ἔχουσι μερικῶς εἰς αὐτὰς τῶν πρωτοφανῶν ἐλλάμψεων διὰ τῶν πρώτων ἀναλόγως αὐταῖς διαπορθμεομένων.²⁷

Metochites

ὁ δὲ περὶ τὰς ἀγγελικὰς οὐσίας ὁ λόγος βούλεται· παρατοσοῦτον καθορᾶν τὴν ὑπερτάτην ἐκείνην, καὶ ἀχώρητον φύσιν καὶ ἀθεώρητον, καθάπαξ, παρόσον ἂν, ἐκεῖθεν φωτίζονται· ἔλλαμπομένας ἴσως κατὰ τὸ μέτρον, ἧς πρὸς ἐκείνην ἐγγύτητος ἔχει.²⁸

²³ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 47v.

²⁴ See Pseudo-Dionysios, *De caelesti hierarchia*, ed. HEIL – RITTER, 21.3-9.

²⁵ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 34v.

²⁶ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 39v.

²⁷ See Pseudo-Dionysios, *De caelesti hierarchia*, ed. HEIL – RITTER, 42.8-12.

²⁸ See Pseudo-Dionysios, *De caelesti hierarchia*, ed. HEIL – RITTER, 21.3-9.

For Pseudo-Dionysios the ulterior purpose of the Celestial Hierarchies is the likeness to God; this is also what Metochites seems to imply, when he argues that God is the pattern, which the angelic intellect seeks to imitate:

Pseudo-Dionysios

σκοπὸς οὖν ἱεραρχίας ἐστὶν ἢ πρὸς θεὸν ὡς ἐφικτὸν ἀφομοίωσις τε καὶ ἕνωσις.²⁹

Metochites

ὅτι μὲν οὖν τὸ τοῦ ἀγγελικοῦ νοὸς πρακτικὸν, ἢ πρὸς τὸ θεῖον κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν ἐστὶν ἀφομοίωσις.³⁰

In the same vein, both authors support the idea that the description of the Angels as wind and fire (according to Hebr. 1.7: ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγα) suggests their likeness with God:

Pseudo-Dionysios

τοῦτο γοῦν εἰδότες οἱ θεόσοφοι τὰς οὐρανόσας οὐσίας ἐκ πυρὸς διαπλάττουσιν, ἐμφαίνοντες αὐτῶν τὸ θεοειδὲς καὶ ὡς ἐφικτὸν θεομίμητον³² ... Εἶποι δ' ἄν τις τὴν τοῦ ἀερίου πνεύματος ἀνεμιαίαν ἐπωνυμίαν καὶ τὸ θεοειδὲς τῶν οὐρανίων νοῶν ἐμφαίνειν. Ἔχει γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο θεαρχικῆς ἐνεργείας εἰκόνα καὶ τύπον.³³

Metochites

καὶ τὴν φύσιν οὕτως ἄν, εἴη μάλιστα ἔγγυτάτῳ τῇ θεῖα φύσει καὶ παρὰ τοῦτο καὶ μᾶλλον θεοειδῆς, ἢ κατὰ τὰλλα πάντα. ταύτη τοι καὶ πῦρ καὶ πνεῦμα παρὰ τῆς γραφῆς ὀνομάζεται. ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ φησὶ πνεύματα καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγα· τὸ κοῦφον ἐντεῦθεν εἰκονίζων καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἀνωτάτω θεῖαν φύσιν, ἀνατακτικὸν καὶ μετάρσιον ...

²⁹ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 43v.

³⁰ See Pseudo-Dionysios, *De caelesti hierarchia*, ed. HEIL – RITTER, 17.10-11.

³¹ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 46v.

³² The nature of the Angels as wind and fire has been discussed already by the Church Fathers; see, e.g., Basil of Caesarea, *De spiritu sancto* XVI 38 (ed. B. PRUCHE, Basile de Césarée, Sur le Saint-Esprit [SC, 17bis]. Paris 1968²): οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν οὐρανίων δυνάμεων, ἢ μὲν οὐσία αὐτῶν, ἀέριον πνεῦμα, εἰ τύχοι, ἢ πῦρ ἄῤῃλον, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον: «Ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγα», and Gregory of Nazianzus, Or. 28.31 (ed. J. BARBEL, Gregor von Nazianz. Die fünf theologischen Reden. Düsseldorf 1963): οὐκ ἔχομεν οὐδὲ ταύτην (sc. τὴν νοητὴν φύσιν καὶ ἐπουράνιον) ἀσωμάτως ἰδεῖν, εἰ καὶ ἀσώματος, πῦρ καὶ πνεῦμα προσαγορευομένην ἢ γινομένην. Ποιεῖν γὰρ λέγεται τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα, καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγα· εἰ μὴ ποιεῖν μὲν ἐστὶ τὸ συντηρεῖν τῷ λόγῳ, καθ' ὃν ἐγένοντο. Πνεῦμα δὲ ἀκούει καὶ πῦρ· τὸ μὲν ὡς νοητὴ φύσις, τὸ δὲ ὡς καθάρσιος· ἐπεὶ καὶ τῆς πρώτης οὐσίας τὰς αὐτὰς οἶδα κλήσεις. It has been argued that the terminology used by the Church Fathers in order to describe the angelic body reminds of the Aristotelian theory of the fifth element, of which consist the heavenly bodies; see J. RÉPIN, *Théologie cosmique et théologie chrétienne* (Ambroise, Exam. I 1, 1-4). Paris 1964, 314-319. For the discussion on the nature of the heavens, see below.

³³ See Pseudo-Dionysios, *De caelesti hierarchia*, ed. HEIL – RITTER, 53.4-5.

καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πῦρ ἀκούει καὶ πνεῦμα. οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ θεοειδὲς αὐτὸ ἐκ τούτων καθιστορεῖται· καὶ πρὸς τὴν θείαν ἐμφερὲς μάλιστα φύσιν· ὅτι δὴ καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν αὐτῆ λόγων, εἵνεκα τούτοις αὐτοῖς εἰκονίζεται.³⁴

It is when Metochites comes to speak about the need of the human mind to use material forms, in order to perceive the immaterial nature of the Celestial Hierarchies that his dependence on Pseudo-Dionysios becomes clearer: the author uses the words *περοφυῖα* and *θηριομορφία*, which are characteristic of Pseudo-Dionysios' text; moreover, he describes the material as leading the mind by the hand, a metaphor also used by Pseudo-Dionysios in the same context:

Pseudo-Dionysios

ἐπεὶ μηδὲ δυνατόν ἐστι τῷ καθ' ἡμᾶς νοῖ πρὸς τὴν ἄυλον ἐκείνην ἀναταθῆναι τῶν οὐρανίων ἱεραρχιῶν μίμησιν τε καὶ θεωρίαν, εἰ μὴ τῇ κατ' αὐτὸν ὑλαίᾳ χειραγωγίᾳ χρήσαιτο³⁵ ... Ὅπως μὴ καὶ ἡμεῖς ὡσαύτως τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀνιέρως οἰώμεθα τοὺς οὐρανίους καὶ θεοειδεῖς νόας πολυποδας εἶναι τινὰς καὶ πολυπροσώπους καὶ πρὸς βοῶν κτηνωδίαν ἢ πρὸς λεόντων θηριομορφίαν τετυπωμένους καὶ πρὸς ἀετῶν ἀγκυλόχειλον εἶδος ἢ πρὸς πτηνῶν τριχῶδη περοφυῖαν διαπεπλασμένους.³⁶

Metochites

καὶ δεῖται τῆς ὕλης (sc. ὁ καθ' ἡμᾶς νοῦς)· τὸν δεῦτερον πλοῦν ὃ φασι χειραγωγούσης πρὸς τὰ ποθούμενα· καὶ ταύτης τὰς εἰκόνας τῶν ζητουμένων, ἐκ τοῦ προχείρου πορίζεται· καὶ λαμβάνει μέντοι ῥαδίως μεταδιδούσης· καὶ χαρακτηρίζει τυπωτικῶς ἐντεῦθεν, καὶ τὸν τρόπον οὕτω γνωρίζει τὸ παραστάν· καὶ θεραπεύει τὸν πόθον· καὶ ἀφοσιοῦται τὴν ἔφεσιν· καὶ γίνεται γραφεὺς τις οὕτω καινὸς καὶ τεχνίτης· μορφαῖς ὑλικαῖς ὑποδεικνύων, τὴν ἀόρατον φύσιν καὶ ἀσώματον³⁷ ... καὶ τί γὰρ ἂν, ἀτοπώτερον εἶη, ἢ πρὸς τῷ κατασπᾶν τὴν ἀσώματον φύσιν ἐν σώματι· ἔτι καὶ περοφυῖαν αὐτῇ περιτιθέναι, καὶ θηριομορφίαν παντοίαν τὴν καὶ πολυειδῆ σύνθετον;³⁸

Finally, both authors give the same definition of the word *Σεραφεῖμ* as those who raise fire and warm up:³⁹

³⁴ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 40rv.

³⁵ See Pseudo-Dionysios, *De caelesti hierarchia*, ed. HEIL – RITTER, 8.19-21.

³⁶ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 42.

³⁷ See Pseudo-Dionysios, *De caelesti hierarchia*, ed. HEIL – RITTER, 9.21-10.

³⁸ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 41rv.

³⁹ This is, of course, a classic definition that can be found in authors earlier than Pseudo-Dionysios; see, e.g., Eusebios of Caesarea, *Commentarius in Isaiam prophetam* I 42 (ed. J. ZIEGLER, Eusebios Werke, Band 9: Der Jesajakommentar [GCS]. Berlin 1975): ἐνθεν εἰκότως ἐρμηνευόμενα τὰ Σεραφεῖμ εἰς Ἑλλάδα φωνὴν ἐμπιπνῶντες ἢ ἐμπρησταὶ σημαίνουσιν, and Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarius in Isaiam prophetam*, PG 70, 173C8-9: διερμηνεύεται δὲ Σεραφεῖμ, ἐμπρησταὶ ἤτοι θερμαίνοντες.

Pseudo-Dionysius

καὶ τὴν μὲν ἁγίαν τῶν Σεραφίμ ὀνομασί-
αν φασὶν οἱ τὰ Ἑβραίων εἰδότες ἢ τὸ ἐμ-
πρηστὰς ἐμφαίνειν ἢ τὸ θερμαίνοντας.⁴⁰

Metochites

καὶ μὴν ἔτι καὶ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων ὑψηλότερα
νοερῶν ταγμάτων Σεραφίμ, δηλοῖντ' ἄν,
ἐξελληνιζομένης τῆς ἐπωνυμίας ἐμπρησται
καὶ θερμαίνοντας.⁴¹

The angelology of the Church Fathers does not seem to have left any clear traces on the *Logos*, with one possible exception: Theodoretos of Cyrus. The context is the following: Metochites discusses two different views as to whether the Angels were created before or simultaneously with the rest of the material world.⁴² The first was supported, e.g., by Basil the Great, who argued in his first Homily on the Hexaemeron that before this world there existed a condition of things suitable for the exercise of supernatural powers, when God created the intellectual and invisible natures.⁴³ Similarly, Gregory of Nazianzus in his 38th Oration on the Epiphany placed the creation of the material world after the creation of the immaterial one.⁴⁴ As John Philoponos informs us, it was Theodore of Mopsuestia

⁴⁰ See Pseudo-Dionysius, *De caelesti hierarchia*, ed. HEIL – RITTER, 27.6-7. Cf. Pseudo-Dionysius, *De ecclesiastica hierarchia*, ed. HEIL – RITTER, 101.10-12: εἶπερ οὖν, ὡς οἱ τὰ Ἑβραίων ἀφερμηνεύοντες φασιν, οἱ θεϊότατοι Σεραφίμ ἐμπρησται καὶ θερμαίνοντες ὑπὸ τῆς θεολογίας ἠνομάσθησαν ἐκφαντορικῶ τῆς οὐσιώδους αὐτῶν ἕξεως ὀνόματι.

⁴¹ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 40v.

⁴² See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 34v-35: ταύτας δὴ τὰς νοεράς οὐσίας, οἱ μὲν, οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς· καὶ τῶν ὀρωμένων ἀπάντων κτισμάτων, προγεγενῆσθαι φασίν· ὡς ἄν, περὶ Θεὸν αἰεὶ στρεφομένης, οικειότερον· καὶ νοεῖν· καὶ ὑμνεῖν, | εἰ καὶ μὴ καθόσον εἰκὸς, τὴν θείαν οὐσίαν καὶ δύναμιν· οἱ δὲ, τῶν ὀρωμένων τούτων, μὴ προδεδημιουργῆσθαι βούλονται ὡς οὐδεμίαν οὐσαν ἀνάγκην τῶν ὑμνούντων δεῖσθαι τὸ θεῖον.

⁴³ See Basil of Caesarea, *Homiliae in hexaemeron* I 5 (ed. S. GIET, Basile de Césarée, Homélie sur l'héxaemeron [SC, 26bis]. Paris 1968²): ἦν γάρ τι, ὡς ἔοικεν, καὶ πρὸ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, ὃ τῇ μὲν διανοίᾳ ἡμῶν ἐστὶ θεωρητόν, ἀνιστόρητον δὲ κατελείφθη, διὰ τὸ τοῖς εἰσαγομένοις ἔτι καὶ νηπίοις κατὰ τὴν γνῶσιν ἀνεπιτήδειον. Ἦν τις πρεσβυτέρα τῆς τοῦ κόσμου γενέσεως κατάστασις ταῖς ὑπερκοσμίοις δυνάμεσι πρέπουσα, ἢ ὑπέρχρονος, ἢ αἰωνία, ἢ αἰδιος. Δημιουργήματα δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ ὁ τῶν ὄλων κτίστης καὶ δημιουργὸς ἀπετέλεσε, φῶς νοητὸν πρέπον τῇ μακαριότητι τῶν φιλοῦντων τὸν Κύριον, τὰς λογικὰς καὶ ἀοράτους φύσεις, καὶ πάσαν τὴν τῶν νοητῶν διακόσμησιν, ὅσα τὴν ἡμετέραν διάνοιαν ὑπερβαίνει, ὧν οὐδὲ τὰς ὀνομασίας ἐξευρεῖν δυνατόν.

⁴⁴ See Gregory of Nazianzus, Or. 38.10, PG 36, 321A12-B3: οὕτω μὲν οὖν ὁ νοητὸς αὐτῶ, καὶ διὰ ταῦτα ὑπέστη κόσμος, ὡς ἐμὲ γοῦν περὶ τούτων φιλοσοφῆσαι, μικρῶ λόγῳ τὰ μεγάλα σταθμώμενον. Ἐπεὶ δὲ τὰ πρῶτα καλῶς εἶχεν αὐτῶ, δεύτερον ἐννοεῖ κόσμον ὑλικὸν καὶ ὀρώμενον· καὶ οὗτός ἐστι τὸ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, καὶ τῶν ἐν μέσῳ σύστημά τε καὶ σύγκριμα. Cf. John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei* 17.75-81 (ed. P. B. KOTTER, Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos. II [Patristische Texte und Studien, 12]. Berlin 1973, 48): τινὲς μὲν οὖν φασιν, ὅτι πρὸ πάσης κτίσεως ἐγένοντο, ὡς ὁ θεολόγος λέγει Γρηγόριος: «Πρῶτον ἐννοεῖ τὰς ἀγγελικὰς δυνάμεις καὶ οὐρανίους, καὶ τὸ ἐννόημα ἔργον

in the first place that opposed the teaching of Basil the Great, arguing that the Angels could not have been created before the rest of the material world, for they can be limited in space, so they cannot have existed before spatial dimensions.⁴⁵ Theodore's position was further supported by Theodoretos of Cyrus, who insisted on the simultaneous creation of the heavens and earth on the one hand and the immaterial substances on the other, on the basis of the idea that the Angels can be circumscribed within spatial limits, thus the content could not have existed before the space containing it.⁴⁶ Yet Theodoretos admitted in the end that his arguments are actually negative and it is dangerous to prove negatively what is not clearly stated by the Scripture; it would not harm orthodoxy, he concludes, if we argued in favour of the view that the Angels pre-existed the material world.⁴⁷ Epiphanius of Salamis also spoke about the simultaneous creation of the material and the immaterial world, but without taking into consideration the parameter of spatial dimensions.⁴⁸

Although Metochites avoids to side with the one or the other view and he does not mention the names of their supporters, nevertheless the way he presents the arguments of the second group points, probably, to a direct dependence from Theodoretos and his *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*:

ἦν» ἕτεροι δέ, ὅτι μετὰ τὸ γενέσθαι τὸν πρῶτον οὐρανόν. Ὅτι δὲ πρὸ τῆς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πλάσεως, πάντες ὁμολογοῦσιν. Ἐγὼ δὲ τῷ θεολόγῳ Γρηγορίῳ συντίθεμαι ἔπρεπε γὰρ πρῶτον τὴν νοερὰν οὐσίαν κτισθῆναι καὶ οὕτω τὴν αἰσθητὴν καὶ τότε ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

⁴⁵ See John Philoponos, *De opificio mundi* I 8 and 16 (ed. W. REICHARDT, Joannis Philoponi de opificio mundi libri vii. Lipsiae 1897, 16.15-18.25 and 35.11-40.26). See also C. SCHOLTEN, Antike Naturphilosophie und christliche Kosmologie in der Schrift „De opificio mundi“ des Johannes Philoponos (*Patristische Texte und Studien*, 45). Berlin – New York 1996, 147-185.

⁴⁶ See Theodoretos of Cyrus, *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, ed. N. FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS – A. SÁENZ-BADILLOS, Theodreti Cyrensis quaestiones in Octateuchum (*Textos y Estudios “Cardenal Cisneros”*, 17). Madrid 1979, 5.3-9.8. See also John Philoponos, *De opificio mundi* I 16, ed. REICHARDT, 36.19-37.3.

⁴⁷ See Theodoretos of Cyrus, *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, ed. FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS – SÁENZ-BADILLOS, 9.8-17. See also John Philoponos, *De opificio mundi* I 14, ed. REICHARDT, 33.6-34.4.

⁴⁸ See Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion* 65.4 (ed. K. HOLL, Epiphanius, Bände 1-3: Ankoratus und Panarion. III [GCS, 37]. Leipzig 1933, 7.5-11): προγενομένων δὲ θαλάσσης καὶ ξύλων καὶ καρπῶν, στερεώματός τε γῆς καὶ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἀγγέλων ἅμα σὺν τούτοις γεγονότων· εἰ μὴ γὰρ ἅμα οὐρανῶ καὶ γῆ καὶ ἀγγελοι ἐκτίσθησαν, οὐκ ἂν ἔλεγε τῷ Ἰωβ ὅτι ὅτε ἐγενήθησαν ἄστρα, ἦνεσάν με πάντες ἀγγελοὶ μου φωνῆ·.

Theodoretos of Cyrus

ἀλλά, φασί τινες, χρήναι λέγειν προϋπάρχειν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς τοὺς ἀγγέλους· ἀγγέλων γάρ, φησί, οὐκ ὄντων πῶς ὁ τῶν ὄλων ὑμνεῖτο Θεός; Ἄλλ' οἱ ταῦτα λέγοντες ἀγνοοῦσιν ὡς καὶ ἀνάρχους αὐτοὺς καὶ αἰδίους οὗτος ὁ λόγος ποιεῖ· εἰ γὰρ ἐδεῖτο τῶν ὑμνούντων ὁ τῶν ὄλων Θεός, αἰεὶ δὲ τούτους εἶχεν ὑμνούντας, συναῖδιοι ἄρα οἱ ἄγγελοι τῷ τῶν ὄλων Θεῷ. Εἰ δὲ οὐκ αἰεὶ, ἀλλ' ὅτε περ ἠβουλήθη τούτους ἐδημιούργησεν, ἦν ἄρα τις αἰὼν, ἐν ᾧ περ τοὺς ὑμνούντας οὐκ εἶχεν ὁ τῶν ὄλων Θεός ... Ἀλλὰ γὰρ οἱ προϋπάρχειν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς τοὺς ἀγγέλους ἰσχυριζόμενοι, ὡς ἰσχυρὸν ἡμῖν καὶ ἄμαχον προβάλλονται ἐκεῖνο τὸ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν ὄλων πρὸς τὸν Ἰωβ εἰρημένον· «ὅτε ἐποίουν ἄστρα, ἦγεσάν με πάντες ἄγγελοί μου». Καὶ οὐ συνωρῶσιν, ὡς τῇ τετάρτῃ ἡμέρᾳ σὺν τῷ ἡλίῳ καὶ τῇ σελήνῃ τὰ ἄστρα παρήγαγεν ὁ τῶν ὄλων Θεός. Εἰκὸς δὲ τοὺς ἀγγέλους σὺν οὐρανῷ δημιουργηθῆναι καὶ γῆ, ἵνα καὶ τὸ φῶς ὀρώντες ἐξ οὐδενὸς ὑποκειμένου δημιουργούμενον, καὶ τὸ στερέωμα ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ ὕδατος συμπηγνύμενον, καὶ τὴν ὑγρὰν οὐσίαν χωριζομένην τῆς γῆς, καὶ τὴν γῆν ἅμα τῷ θεῷ λόγῳ παντοδαπῶς διακοσμουμένην βλαστήμασι καὶ τ' ἄλλα πάντα πρὸς τὸ θεῖον γινόμενα βούλημα, γνῶσι δι' ὧν ὀρώσιν, ὡς καὶ αὐτοὶ κτιστὴν ἔχουσι τὴν φύσιν παρ' αὐτοῦ τὸ εἶναι δεξάμενοι⁴⁹ ...

Εἰ τοίνυν ὁ μὲν τούτων, ὁ δὲ ἐκείνων ἄρχειν ἐτάχθη, ἕκαστος δὲ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὑπὸ τὴν ἐνὸς φροντίδα τελεῖ, εὐδηλον ὡς περιγεγραμμένην ἔχουσι τὴν οὐσίαν. Εἰ δὲ τοῦτο ἀληθές, ὡς περ οὖν ἀληθές, τόπου

Metochites

οἱ δὲ, τῶν ὀρωμένων τούτων, μὴ προδεδημιουργῆσθαι βούλονται ὡς οὐδεμίαν οὐσαν ἀνάγκην τῶν ὑμνούντων δεῖσθαι τὸ θεῖον· καὶ τούτου διὴ πάντως χάριν πάντων, ὑποστῆναι πρότερον τοὺς αὐτοὺς τῶν ἄλλων πάντων, τιμιωτέρους ὑμνωδοὺς τῆς ἄνω μεγαλοπρεποῦς ἐκείνης λαμπρότητος. ἢ γὰρ ἂν, φασίν οὕτω, καὶ εἰς πάνυ τοι τὸν λόγον ἄτοπον καὶ τολμηρὸν προάγειν ὡς καὶ συναϊδίους τῷ δημιουργῷ συστάσεως; τῶν ὄλων, τὰς ἀγγελικὰς οὐσίας ἐντεῦθεν καταναγκάζειν· εἴπερ τῶν ὑμνούντων αἰεὶ προσδεόμενος· καὶ εἶχε πάντως αἰεὶ· τὸ γὰρ προσδεόμενον μὴ τυγχάνειν, τολμᾶν λέγειν· μὴ καὶ ἀσεβέστατον ἢ καὶ πολλῷ γε ἄτοπώτερον. ὁ δὲ πρὸς τὸν Ἰωβ εἴρηται παρὰ Θεοῦ, 'ὅτε ἐποίουν ἄστρα ἦγεσάν με πάντες ἄγγελοί μου', οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸν λόγον εἶναι φασίν· οὐδὲ πούργου τῷ σφετέρῳ σκοπῷ· ἄστρα μὲν γὰρ· καὶ ἡλιον· καὶ σελήνην, ἡμέρα γενέσθαι τετάρτη, τὰς ἱεράς ἱστορεῖν βίβλους· ἀγγέλους μὲν γε τῇ πρώτῃ τῶν ἡμερῶν, εἰκὸς εἶναι συνδημιουργηθῆναι τοῖς πρώτοις οὐρανῷ τὲ καὶ γῆ· τοῦτό τε καὶ ἅμα προσεπάγουσιν· ὡς ἐπεὶ Θεὸς μόνον τῶν ἀπάντων ἀπερίγραπτον· ἄγγελοι δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις· καὶ εἰ νοεροὶ τὴν φύσιν, περιγράφονται γοῦν ὁμῶς καὶ τόποις ὀρίζονται, πῶς ποτ' ἂν, οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς πρότερον, φθάσαντες ἂν, γεγένητο, μὴ τινος οὐσης διαστάσεως τοπικῆς, πρὸ τῆς τοῦ παντός τοῦδε δημιουργίας τὲ καὶ συστάσεως; μὴδὲ γὰρ εἶναι φύσιν περιεχόμενον ὅλως εἶναι τι, μὴ φθάσαντος ἤδη καὶ προὑποκειμένου τοῦ περιέχοντος.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ See Theodoretos of Cyrus, *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, ed. FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS – SÁENZ-BADILLOS, 8.1-9.7.

⁵⁰ See Theodoretos of Cyrus, *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, ed. FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS – SÁENZ-BADILLOS, 7.16-21.

ἄρα προσδέονται. Μόνον γὰρ τὸ θεῖον, ὡς ἀπερίγραφον, οὐκ ἐν τόπῳ. Εἰ δὲ τὸ περιγεγραμμένον ἐν τόπῳ, πῶς οἶόν τε προὔρχειν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς τοὺς ἀγγέλους; Οὐ γὰρ ὄντος τοῦ φέροντος, πῶς ἔνεστι τὸ φερόμενον εἶναι;⁵¹

A consultation of John Philoponos' *De opificio mundi*, where the arguments of Theodore of Mopsuestia have been preserved, can also not be excluded, as we can infer from the verbal similarities between the texts:

Philoponos (Theodore of Mopsuestia)

τούτων οὖν ἀληθῶν ὄντων ἴδωμεν καὶ ὅσα πρὸς συνηγορίαν τοῦ συνυποστήναι τοὺς ἀγγέλους οὐρανῶ τε καὶ γῆ κατασκευάζει Θεόδωρος ἀγράφῳ δόγματι συνηγορῶν· λέγει γὰρ οὕτω· 'θαυμαστὸν μὲν οὖν ἔμοιγε φαίνεται τό τινας οἶεσθαι πρὸ οὐρανοῦ τε καὶ γῆς τὰς ἀοράτους καὶ λογικὰς οὐσίας ὑπὸ Θεοῦ γεγονέναι, ἃς ἔνδον τε τούτων εἶναι καὶ περιγράφεσθαι ὑπ' αὐτῶν διὰ πάσης παιδευόμεθα τῆς θείας γραφῆς. Ποῖος γὰρ δὴ παραδέξεται λόγος τὰ ἐντὸς πρὸ τῶν ἐκτὸς ὑπάρχειν καὶ πρὸ τῶν περιεχόντων εἶναι τὰ περιεχόμενα; Ἀνάγκη δὴ ἄρα κάκεινο ζητεῖν ὅπου τότε ἦσαν αἱ νῦν τῷδε περιγεγραμμένα τῷ τόπῳ'.⁵²

Metochites

τοῦτό τε καὶ ἅμα προσεπάγουσιν· ὡς ἐπεὶ Θεὸς μόνον τῶν ἀπάντων ἀπερίγραπτον· ἄγγελοι δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις· καὶ εἰ νοεροὶ τὴν φύσιν, περιγράφονται γοῦν ὅμως καὶ τόποις ὀρίζονται, πῶς ποτ' ἂν, οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς πρότερον, φθάσαντες ἂν, γεγένηντο, μὴ τινος οὐσης διαστάσεως τοπικῆς, πρὸ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς τοῦδε δημιουργίας τὲ καὶ συστάσεως; μὴδὲ γὰρ εἶναι φύσιν περιεχόμενον ὅλως εἶναι τι, μὴ φθάσαντος ἤδη καὶ προὔποκειμένου τοῦ περιέχοντος.⁵³

Very close to Theodoretos stands Metochites also in the following, when he discusses the nature of the angelic substances: both authors use the same basic arguments and scriptural quotations, in order to prove that the Angels are created beings, they are countable and, though incorporeal by nature, they can be limited in space:

Theodoretos of Cyrus

1) ὅτι δὲ κτιστὴν ἔχουσι φύσιν καὶ ἄγγελοι καὶ ἀρχάγγελοι, καὶ εἴ τι ἕτερόν ἐστι ἀσώματον, πλὴν τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος, ἡ θεία σαφῶς ἡμᾶς διδάσκει γραφή. Ὑμνεῖν γὰρ καὶ τούτοις Δαβὶδ παρακελεύεται ὁ προ-

Metochites

ὅτι δὲ καὶ αὐταὶ πάντως αἱ νοεραὶ δυνάμεις, μετὰ πάντων παρὰ τοῦ πάντων ποιητοῦ καὶ γεγόνασι καὶ ἀρχὴν χρονικὴν ἔσχον· εἰ καὶ τὴν φύσιν λοιπὸν ἄφθαρτοι μένουσιν ἐκεῖθεν καὶ ἀτελεύτητοι, τοῦτο

⁵¹ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 35.

⁵² See John Philoponos, *De opificio mundi* I 16, ed. REICHARDT, 35.15-36.1.

⁵³ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 35.

φήτης· «αἰνεῖται γὰρ αὐτόν, φησί, πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ, αἰνεῖτε αὐτόν πάσαι αἱ δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ». Καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν διδάσκων ἐπήγαγεν· «ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπε, καὶ ἐγενήθησαν, αὐτὸς ἐνετείλατο καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν». Καὶ πάλιν ἐν ἑτέρῳ ψαλμῷ, «ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα, καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγα». Καὶ οἱ τρεῖς μακάριοι παῖδες ἐν τῇ καμίνῳ τὸν θεῖον ὕμνον ὑφαίνοντες, καὶ τὸ πανάριστον ἐκείνο καὶ λίαν ἀρμόδιον εἰρηκότες προοίμιον· «εὐλογεῖτε πάντα τὰ ἔργα Κυρίου τὸν Κύριον», εὐθὺς ἐπήγαγον, «εὐλογεῖτε ἄγγελοι Κυρίου τὸν Κύριον, πάσαι αἱ δυνάμεις Κυρίου τὸν Κύριον». Ἀλλὰ γὰρ παρέλκον οἶμαι περὶ τούτων μακρηγορεῖν· πάσα γὰρ ἡ θεόπνευστος γραφή τῆσδε τῆς διδασκαλίας ἀνάπλεως.⁵⁴

- 2) οὐκοῦν καὶ ἀσώματον λέγοντες εἶναι τῶν ἀγγέλων τὴν φύσιν, περιγεγράφθαι φαμέν αὐτῶν τὴν ὑπόστασιν. Πῶς γὰρ ἄν τις νοῆσαι «χιλίας χιλιάδας καὶ μυρίας μυριάδας», κατὰ τὸν θεῖον Δανιήλ, μὴ ἕκα-

καὶ παντάσιν ἀληθές καὶ πάντων μάλιστα ἄναγκαῖον ἐρεῖν. οὐδὲν γὰρ τῶν ὄντων ἄνευ τῆς ὑπὲρ πάντα τὰ ὄντα θείας τριάδος, ὡς ἡ καθ' ἡμᾶς φιλοσοφία φησὶν, ὃ μὴ γένεσιν ἔσχεν δουλεύουσαν χρόνῳ· καὶ τοῦτο γε μὴν ἄρα· κὰν τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῖς, ῥημάτων ἕξεστι γραφικῶν πιστοῦσθαι. ὕμνεῖν γὰρ τὸν Θεὸν καὶ τούτοις Δαβὶδ ἐγκελεύεται. 'αἰνεῖτε γὰρ αὐτὸν' φησὶ 'πάντες ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ· αἰνεῖτε αὐτόν πάσαι αἱ δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ·' καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐπάγει δι' ἧν, 'ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπε καὶ ἐγεννήθησαν. αὐτὸς ἐνετείλατο καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν.' καὶ αὖθις ἐν ἑτέροις, 'ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα· καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγα·' τὸ πρὸς τὴν θεῖαν φύσιν ἐοικὸς ἐντεῦθεν ὑπογράφων· ὅτι Θεὸς, καὶ πνεῦμα καὶ πῦρ ὀνομάζεται τῇ γραφῇ. τὸ δ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο καὶ οἱ μακαριστοὶ παῖδες ἐκείνοι, περὶ τῆς ἀγγελικῆς τρανοῦσιν οὐσίας. τὴν γὰρ θαυμασίαν ἐκείνην ὕμνωδῖαν ἐπὶ τῆς καμίνου· τῷ κτίστῃ τῶν ὄλων καταριθμοῦντες καὶ συνείροντες· τοῦ λόγου παντὸς ἐκείνο προθέμενοι, 'εὐλογεῖτε πάντα τὰ ἔργα κυρίου τὸν κύριον·' εὐθὺς ὡς πρῶτον τῶν ἄλλων ἐκείνου δημιουργημάτων καὶ τιμιώτερον, ἐπάγουσιν αὐτίκα προτάττοντες· 'εὐλογεῖτε ἄγγελοι κυρίου τὸν κύριον.' καὶ τί δεῖ προστιθέντα πάνθ' ἐξῆς ἀπειροκάλως ἴσως ἐνθάδε τρίβειν; ἀποχρώντως γὰρ ἔχειν μοι δοκῶ, καὶ ταῦτα πρὸς τὴν τοῦ λόγου βούλησιν.⁵⁵

ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀριθμητοὶ τὸ πλῆθος καὶ περιγραπτοὶ τὴν φύσιν οἱ ἄγγελοι· καὶ οὕτως ἄρα πέρας ἔχουσιν ἀριθμῷ· καὶ τῷ περιγράφεσθαι τοπικῶς· καὶ τούτων ἑκάτερον, διὰ θάτερον· | ἀριθμητοὶ τὸ πλῆθος

⁵⁴ See Theodoretos of Cyrus, *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, ed. FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS – SÁENZ-BADILLOS, 5.18-6.12.

⁵⁵ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 35v.

στον λογιζόμενος ἐν ἰδίᾳ εἶναι περιγραφῆ; Ἄλλ' ὅτι μὲν περιγεγραμμένην ἔχουσιν οἱ ἄγγελοι τὴν οὐσίαν, οὐδένα ἀντερεῖν οἶμαι· καὶ γὰρ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἕκαστον ὑφ' ἐνὸς ἔφη τετάχθαι κηδεμονίαν ὁ δεσπότης Χριστός· «ὄρατε γάρ, φησί, μὴ καταφρονήσετε ἐνὸς τῶν ἐλαχίστων τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ· ὅτι οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτῶν διαπαντός ὄρωσι τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς». Καὶ ἐκάστῳ δὲ ἔθνει ἄγγελον ἐφεστάναι φησὶν ἡ θεία γραφή. Ὁ γὰρ τῷ προφήτῃ Δανιὴλ προσδιαλεγόμενος ἄγγελος, καὶ ἄρχοντα Περσῶν εἶρηκε, καὶ ἄρχοντα Ἑλλήνων, καὶ Μιχαὴλ τὸν ἄρχοντα τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Καὶ Μωϋσῆς δὲ ὁ μέγας ἐν τῇ ᾠδῇ φησὶν· «ὅτε διεμέριζεν ὁ Ὑψιστος ἔθνη, ὡς διέσπειρεν υἱὸς Ἀδάμ, ἔστησεν ὄρια ἔθνῶν κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων Θεοῦ». Εἰ τοίνυν ὁ μὲν τούτων, ὁ δὲ ἐκείνων ἄρχειν ἐτάχθη, ἕκαστος δὲ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὑπὸ τὴν ἐνὸς φροντίδα τελεῖ, εὐδῆλον ὡς περιγεγραμμένην ἔχουσι τὴν οὐσίαν.⁵⁶

ὅτι περιγραπτοὶ. εἰ γὰρ πᾶσα τοπικὴ τις διάστασις, ὀρίζεται τῷ παρόντι κόσμῳ καὶ συγκλείεται· καὶ οὐδὲν ἐστὶ τοπικῶς περιέχον, τοῦ κόσμου τοῦδε πάντως ἐκτὸς· οὗτος δὲ πεπερασμένος ἐστὶ, τὰ γε παρὰ τούτου λοιπὸν ἐχόμενα· καὶ εἰ πάνυ τοι πρὸς πλῆθος μερίζονται, οὐκέτι καὶ μέτρον ὑπερβαίνει· πρὸς τόπον οὐκ ἄπειρον, κἂν εἰ διωρισμένως ἀριθμῶ περαίνοντα. περιγραπτοὶ τὴν φύσιν αὐθις ὅτι κατὰ τοπικὰς διαιρέσεις ἀριθμητοὶ. εἰ γὰρ ὁ μὲν, τοῖσδε· ὁ δὲ, τοῖσδε τοῖς ἔθνεσσι τε καὶ τόποις, καὶ κλίμασιν ἐφεστήκασι· καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὸ θεῖον ἡμέτερον δόγμα παρέπεταί τις ἄγγελος καὶ σύνεστι καὶ πρὸς τὰ κρείττω καὶ βιοῦν εὖ συναίρεται καὶ ἡγεμονεῖ, μήποτε λείπων ᾧ ξυνέλαχεν, ἐντεῦθεν οἶμαι δηλον, ὡς καὶ περιέχονται τοπικῶς καὶ περιγράφονται. ἢ πῶς ἂν τις νοήσῃε τὰς παρὰ τῷ θαυμαστῷ Δανιὴλ χιλίας χιλιάδας· καὶ μυρίας μυριάδας ἀγγέλων μηδαμῶς ὀρίζων αὐτὰς· τοπικαῖς διαιρέσεσιν· ἢ τὰς τῶν ἔθνῶν τε· καὶ τὰς καταμέρος τῶν ἀνθρώπων προστασίας τὲ καὶ ἡγεμονίας; ὅπερ αἱ θεῖαι γραφαὶ καὶ Χριστὸς ἐπὶ πᾶσι φησὶν ἡ αὐτοαλήθεια· μὴ καταφρονεῖν ἐνὸς δὴ τούτων, τῶν εἰς αὐτὸν πιστευόντων ἐγκελευόμενος· καὶ τὸ τῆς ἐντολῆς εἰκὸς προστιθεῖς· τοὺς γὰρ ἀγγέλους αὐτῶν, τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ πρόσωπον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ὄραν. Μωσῆς δὲ ὁ μέγας· καὶ πάντων σχεδὸν ἐπόπτης τὲ καὶ διδάσκαλος, καὶ τῶν τοῖς πλείστοις ἀρρήτων καὶ ἀπορρήτων, καὶ τοῦτο δὴ πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις ἱστορεῖ· ὡς ἄγγελοι παρὰ Θεοῦ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἅπασιν, ἐπιστάται νενέμνηται. 'ὅτε γὰρ διεμέριζε' φησὶν 'ἔθνη ὁ ὕψιστος, ἔστησεν ὄρια ἔθνῶν, κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων.' ὁρᾷς ὡς καὶ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων· καὶ τοπικὸν ὄρον ἐν τούτοις

⁵⁶ See Theodoretos of Cyrus, *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, ed. FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS – SÁENZ-BADILLOS, 6.22-7.18.

Μωσῆς ὁ θεῖος νομοθετεῖ, καὶ δοκεῖν δίδωσι; τοιγαροῦν ὁ τῷ Δανιὴλ διαλεγόμενος ἄγγελος· καὶ Περσῶν φησὶ καὶ Ἑλλήνων ἄρχοντα· καὶ Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος, τὸ | τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθνος κληροῦται· καὶ ἄλλος ἄλλο.⁵⁷

- 3) οὐκοῦν οὐ δεῖται τῶν ὑμούντων ὁ δεσπότης Θεός· ἀνευδεῆ γὰρ ἔχει τὴν φύσιν· δι' ἀγαθότητα δὲ μόνην καὶ ἀγγέλοις, καὶ ἀρχαγγέλοις, καὶ πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει τὸ εἶναι δεδωρηται.⁵⁸

ὅτι Θεὸς ἦν μὲν καὶ ἔστι φύσις ἀνευδεῆς· ἀγαθότητι δὲ μόνον, οὐ πρὸς χρεῖαν, δημιουργεῖ· καὶ πρὸς οὐσίαν προάγει, τὴν τε ὀρωμένην ταύτην κτίσιν, καὶ ὅση τοῖς αἰσθητοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἀθεώρητος· τὴν νοητὴν λέγω πᾶσαν φύσιν.⁵⁹

Although Metochites states explicitly that all experts in theology agree that the incorporeal angelic substances can be circumscribed within spatial limits,⁶⁰ he examines further the possible objections to this view. The author refers probably to John Philoponos, who argued in his *De opificio mundi* that the Angels, being incorporeal, can not have spatial limits like the corporeal beings.⁶¹ According to

⁵⁷ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, ff. 35v-36.

⁵⁸ See Theodoretos of Cyrus, *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, ed. FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS – SÁENZ-BADILLOS, 8.7-10; IDEM, *Graecarum affectionum curatio* IV 35 (ed. P. CANIVET, Théodoret de Cyr, *Thérapeutique des maladies helléniques* [SC, 57]. Paris 1958): κἀναυθα πάλιν ἀνευδεῆ τὸν Θεὸν ἔφησεν εἶναι, καὶ δι' ἀγαθότητά γε μόνην τὰ πάντα πεποιημένα, and John Chrysostomus, *In Genesim* hom. 3, PG 53, 35.48-51: ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ οὐ διὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ χρεῖαν παρήγαγε τι τῶν ὄντων· οὐδενός γὰρ δεῖται ἀνευδεῆς ὢν· ἀλλὰ φιλανθρωπία τινί, καὶ ἀγαθότητι τὰ πάντα ἐτεκτήνατο.

⁵⁹ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 34v.

⁶⁰ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 36v: καὶ ἅμα περιττὸν ἴσως ἐξ ὧν ὅτι περιγραφτῆ τῶν ἀγγέλων ἢ φύσις ἔξεστιν ἀσφαλῶς συλλογίζεσθαι· τοῦτο γε μὴν καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς τῶν θεῖων ἐπιστήμοσι· καὶ δοκεῖ· καὶ τρανῶς εἴρηται.

⁶¹ See, e.g., John Philoponos, *De opificio mundi* I 16, ed. REICHARDT, 36.7-18: τὸ γὰρ ἐν τόπῳ εἶναι μόνων ἐστὶ σωμάτων, ἅπερ τριχῇ διέστηκε. Καὶ γὰρ ὁ τόπος ἐστὶ διάστημα. Δεδείχαμεν δὲ ὅτι μὴδὲ σώματα εἰσὶν ἐκεῖναι μὴδὲ ἀσωμάτοις οὐσίαις ὀργανικὰ σώματα ἐξήπται ὡς ταῖς ἡμετέραις ψυχαῖς. Δι' ὅπερ οὐ καθ' αὐτὰς ἐν τόπῳ ἀλλὰ κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς εἰσὶν αἱ λογικαὶ ψυχαί, διὰ τὸ τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν, ἅπερ εἰδοποιούσιν, ἐν τόπῳ εἶναι, ὡς καὶ κινούνται κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς τοπικῶς κινουμένων ἐκείνων· αἱ δὲ παντελῶς ἐξηρημέναι σώματων οὐδὲ κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς εἰσὶν ἐν τόπῳ οὐδὲ κινεῖσθαι κατὰ τόπον αὐτὰς τῶν ἐνδεχομένων ἐστὶ, 38.2-4: εἰ οὖν ὁ τόπος σωματων ἐστὶ μόνων περιεκτικὸς, οὐδεμίαν ἄρα οὐσίαν ἀσώματων ἐν τόπῳ εἶναι καθ' αὐτὴν δυνατόν, 38.16-20: οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡ ψυχὴ ὡς ἐν τόπῳ ἐστὶ τῷ ἡμετέρῳ σώματι, ἀλλ' ὡς εἰδοποιούσα τὸ ζῶον. Δι' αὐτὸ δὲ κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς ἐν τόπῳ ἐστὶν, ὅτι τὸ ἐν τόπῳ ὄν εἰδοποιεῖ, καθ' αὐτὴν δὲ οὐκ ἔστι. Μόνων γὰρ σωματων ἐστὶν, ὃ πολλακίς εἶπον, τὸ ἐν τόπῳ εἶναι, 39.12-23: ἐντεῦθεν οὖν ἡ ἀσώματος οὐσία πάσης ἐστὶν ἐκτὸς διαστάσεως. Εἰ μὲν οὖν ἡ οὐσία τῶν ἀγγέλων τριχῇ διέστηκε, σῶμα πάντως ἐστὶν, ὅπως ἂν εἴη λεπτότατον καὶ διαφεύγον τῆς αἰσθήσεως τὴν ἀντίληψιν. Εἰ δὲ ἀσώματοι εἰσὶν, ὡς ἐδείξαμεν, οὐδεμίαν διάστασιν ἔχουσι. Πῶς ἂν οὖν εἴη τὸ ἀμερὲς

philosophy, meaning in this case Aristotelian philosophy, the opposites should have the opposite traits; thus, the question to be answered is whether the corporeal and the incorporeal should be regarded as opposite categories.⁶² It is one of these cases that Metochites' text seems to go, as we shall see also in the following, beyond the limits of theology and ranges to the field of philosophy. The author examines at first the way the corporeal and the incorporeal oppose one another, based on Aristotle's *Categories*: these do not belong to the contraries that have an intermediate, but either the one or the other can be present in a subject;⁶³ yet this is again incongruous according to Aristotle, for the corporeal and the incorporeal should be regarded as substances, and substance has no contrary.⁶⁴

καὶ ἀδιάστατον ἐν τόπῳ, ὁπότε οὔτε ἐπιφάνεια ἐν τόπῳ ἐστὶν καθ' αὐτὴν οὔτε γραμμὴ, διαστήματα μὲν οὔσαι, ἀσώματοι δέ; Μόνα οὖν τὰ σώματα ἐν τόπῳ ἐστὶν· καὶ εἶ τι ἐν τόπῳ, σῶμα πάντως ἐστί· σωμάτων γὰρ ὁ τόπος, οὐκ ἀσωμάτων. See also the analysis in SCHOLTEN (cited n. 45), 167-185.

⁶² See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 36v: εἰ δέ τις τοῦθ' ἡμῖν ἴσως προφέρει ὡς δὴ τι μέγα προφέρων· καὶ ἀναγκαιῶς αἰρήσων· ὡς ἀσωμάτων οὔσας τὰς ἀγγελικὰς οὐσίας, καὶ ἀνάγκη μὴ περιγράφεσθαι· ἐπειδήπερ τῶν σωμάτων τὸ περιγράφεσθαι· τὸ γὰρ ἐναντίον τῷ ἐναντίῳ λόγος ἐστὶν ἐκ φιλοσοφίας, ὡς τάχα δοκεῖ τισιν, ἀξιωματικῶς προτεινόμενος; cf., e.g., Aristotle, *Topica* 113b: ἐπεὶ δὲ τῶν ἐναντίων σκοπεῖν εἰ τῷ ἐναντίῳ τὸ ἐναντίον ἔπεται; see also *ibid.*, 114a, 123b, 124a, 125b, 135b.

⁶³ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 36v: ὡς οὐδεμίαν οὔσαν ἀνάγκην, τὸ ἀσώματον ἐκ τούτων ἀπερίγραπτον ἀποδείκνυσθαι· μέχρις ἂν μηδαμῶς ἐναντίον ὄρωτο τῷ σώματι, τὸ ἀσώματον. ἐπεὶ λοιπὸν ἂν, ἔγωγε ἐροίμην, πῶς ἐναντίον τῷ σώματι τὸ ἀσώματον, ὡς μέσον ἄρ' ὅτιοῦν ἔχον, ἢ τουναντίον ἅπαν, εἰς ἀδιάλλακτον μάχην ἀντικείμενον; ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν τὸ πρῶτον, ζητῶ τὸ μέσον. δεῖξάτω τις ὄρον ἐν τούτοις κοινὸν τῆς σωματικῆς καὶ ἀσωμάτου φύσεως· ἐκατέρωθεν συνιστάμενον· καὶ μήτε ταῦτὸν ἀμφοτέροις μήτε πάμπαν ἀλλότριον· ὡσπερ ἐν τοῖς τοιοῦτοις ἡ φύσις οἰκονομήσασα τὴν τέχνην ἔσχε κάλλιστον ἐρμηνέα· σοφῶς τοῖς πολλοῖς ὑποδεικνύσαν. εἰ δὲ τοῦτο παντάπασι τῶν ἀδυνάτων ἐστὶ καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀντερεῖ, λείπεται τῶν μέσων ἐναντίων εἶναι τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὸ ἀσώματον. Cf. Aristotle, *Categoriae* 12a: ὅσα δὲ τῶν ἐναντίων τοιαῦτά ἐστιν ὥστε ἐν οἷς ἐπέφυκε γίγνεσθαι ἢ ἂν κατηγορεῖται ἀναγκαῖον αὐτῶν θάτερον ὑπάρχειν, τούτων οὐδὲν ἐστὶν ἀνὰ μέσον· [ὧν δὲ γε μὴ ἀναγκαῖον θάτερον ὑπάρχειν, τούτων ἔστι τι ἀνὰ μέσον πάντως.] οἷον νόσος καὶ ὑγεία ἐν σώματι ζῆου ἐπέφυκε γίγνεσθαι, καὶ ἀναγκαῖον γε θάτερον ὑπάρχειν τῷ τοῦ ζῆου σώματι ἢ νόσον ἢ ὑγίειαν· καὶ περιττὸν δὲ καὶ ἄρτιον ἀριθμοῦ κατηγορεῖται, καὶ ἀναγκαῖον γε θάτερον τῷ ἀριθμῷ ὑπάρχειν ἢ περιττὸν ἢ ἄρτιον· καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶ γε τούτων οὐδὲν ἀνὰ μέσον, οὔτε νόσου καὶ ὑγείας οὔτε περιττοῦ καὶ ἄρτιου. Ὡν δὲ γε μὴ ἀναγκαῖον θάτερον ὑπάρχειν, τούτων ἔστι τι ἀνὰ μέσον; οἷον μέλαν καὶ λευκὸν ἐν σώματι ἐπέφυκε γίγνεσθαι, καὶ οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον γε θάτερον αὐτῶν ὑπάρχειν τῷ σώματι, – οὐ γὰρ πᾶν ἦτοι λευκὸν ἢ μέλαν ἐστὶν – καὶ φαῦλον δὲ καὶ σπουδαῖον κατηγορεῖται μὲν καὶ κατ' ἀνθρώπου καὶ κατ' ἄλλων πολλῶν, οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον δὲ θάτερον αὐτῶν ὑπάρχειν ἐκείνοις ὧν κατηγορεῖται· οὐ γὰρ πάντα ἦτοι φαῦλα ἢ σπουδαῖα ἐστὶν. Καὶ ἔστι γέ τι τούτων ἀνὰ μέσον, οἷον τοῦ μὲν λευκοῦ καὶ τοῦ μέλανος τὸ φαῖον καὶ ὠχρὸν καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα χρώματα, τοῦ δὲ φαύλου καὶ τοῦ σπουδαίου τὸ οὔτε φαῦλον οὔτε σπουδαῖον.

⁶⁴ Cf. Aristotle, *Categoriae* 3b: ὑπάρχει δὲ ταῖς οὐσίαις καὶ τὸ μηδὲν αὐταῖς ἐναντίον εἶναι.

Going a step further, Metochites observes that contraries are supposed to destroy one another,⁶⁵ something that does not happen in the case under examination: the corporeal can exist together with the incorporeal and they often complement one another, as in the case of the human being, which combines the corporeal flesh with the incorporeal soul. The relationship between the corporeal and the incorporeal was discussed by the Byzantine commentators of the Aristotelian *Categories*, such as Porphyrius and Olympiodoros; Porphyrius argued that the corporeal and the incorporeal should not be regarded as contraries, for they do not belong to the same genre;⁶⁶ Olympiodoros' treatment of the subject, on the other hand, is of special interest for our investigation, because Metochites seems here to repeat his arguments:

Olympiodoros

δευτέρα ἀπορία· τὸ λογικὸν καὶ τὸ ἄλογον καὶ τὸ θνητὸν καὶ τὸ ἀθάνατον καὶ τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὸ ἀσώματον ἐναντία εἰσὶ, καίτοι γε οὐσίαι ὄντα· πῶς οὖν φησι τῇ οὐσίᾳ μηδὲν εἶναι ἐναντίον; ταύτης πάλιν τῆς ἀπορίας δύο ἐπιλύσεις προβαλλόμεθα, πρῶτον μὲν λέγοντες ὅτι οὐκ εἰσιν ἐναντία· τὰ γὰρ ἐναντία ἀλλήλων εἰσὶ φθαρτικά, ταῦτα δὲ οὐ μόνον ὅτι οὐκ εἰσιν ἀλλήλων φθαρτικά, ἀλλὰ καὶ σωστικά ἀλλήλων εἰσὶ· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἄλογον ὑπὸ τοῦ λογικοῦ σώζεται, τὸ δὲ ἀσώματον εἰ μὲν χεῖρον εἴη σώματος, σώζεται ὑπὸ τούτου ὡς τὰ συμβεβηκότα ἐν τῇ οὐσίᾳ ὄντα, οἷον τὸ λευκὸν τὸ ἐν Σωκράτει, εἰ δὲ κρεῖττον εἴη σώματος, σώζει, ὃν τρόπον ἔχει ἐπὶ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος· αὕτη γὰρ κρεῖττων οὐσα τοῦ σώματος σώζει. Δηλοῖ δὲ ὁ χωρισμὸς αὐτῆς διαλύων τὸ σῶμα εἰς τὸ μὴ ὄν, τὸ πῆ, μὴ ἢ δηλονότι. Τὰ εἰρημένα ἄρα οὐκ εἰσιν ἐναντία.⁶⁷

Metochites

ἀλλὰ καὶ οὕτω τιθεμένων, ἀδύνατα πλεῖστα τὸν λόγον ὀρῶμεν ἐπαγόμενον. | ἔν μὲν δὴ τοῦτο πρῶτον καὶ μέγιστον· ὅτι καὶ περὶ οὐσίαν ἐναντιότης ἐντεῦθεν φαίνεται· εἴ γε πάντως οὐσία καὶ τὸ σῶμα· καὶ τὸ ἀσώματον· ἄμφω δὲ γ' ἐναντία κατὰ τὸν λόγον ἔστων· ὅπερ ἀδύνατον ὃν Ἀριστοτέλους καὶ φιλοσοφίας ἠκούσαμεν· ἐναργεῖς ἐκ τῶν πραγμάτων αὐτῶν φερόμενον τὰς ἀποδείξεις, ἔπειτ' οὐ γὰρ οὐδὲ τοῦτο μικρὸν πρὸς τὴν ζήτησιν. τοῖς μὲν ἐναντίοις ἢ φύσις ἀλλήλων ἔστι φθαρτικὴ· καὶ μάλιστα τοῖς τοιοῦτοις περὶ ὧν νῦν ὁ λόγος, τοῖς ἀμέσως κεκτημένοις τὸ διαφέρεσθαι. τὸ δ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο, χάριεν ἂν, εἴη περὶ τῆς σωματικῆς καὶ ἀσωμάτου φύσεως, οἴεσθαι ὡς ἀλλήλων ἔστι φθαρτικά· ἥπερ τοῖς ἐναντίοις ἢ φύσις ἔστι. καίτοι τίς οὐκ οἶδε καὶ τῶν μετρίως τὸν νοῦν προσεχόντων τοῖς πράγμασιν, ὡς ἐν ταυτῷ πολλάκις τὸ σῶμα, καὶ τὸ ἀσώματον, καὶ συγγίνονται καὶ συν-

⁶⁵ Cf. Aristotle, *Physica* 192a: φθαρτικά γὰρ ἀλλήλων τὰ ἐναντία; see also *Metaphysica* 1092a and *Ethica Eudemia* 1235b.

⁶⁶ See Porphyrius, *In Aristotelis categorias expositio per interrogationem et responsionem*, ed. A. BUSSE, Porphyrii eisagoge et in Aristotelis categorias commentarium (CAG, 4/1). Berlin 1887, 106.25-27: τὸ οὖν ἀσώματον οὐκ ἐναντίον τῷ σώματι; Οὐδαμῶς· τὰ γὰρ ἐναντία ὑπὸ τὸ αὐτὸ ἂν εἴη γένος, τοῦ δὲ σώματος καὶ ἀσωμάτου οὐδὲν ἔστι κοινὸν γένος.

⁶⁷ See Olympiodoros, *In Aristotelis categorias commentarium*, ed. A. BUSSE, Olympiodori prolegomena et in categorias commentarium (CAG, 12/1). Berlin 1902, 74.4-15.

ίστανται· πάνυ γε συμβατικῶς· καὶ τοσοῦ-
τω μᾶλλον εὖ ἔχει, ὅσω καὶ μᾶλλον ἔχει
συμβατικῶς· εἶ γε σῶμα τὸ καὶ ψυχὴ τὸν ἄν-
θρωπον οὐσιοὶ λόγοις ἀρρήτοις, συναπτό-
μενά τε καὶ συνεχόμενα· καὶ ζῶον ἐν· καὶ
μίαν ὑπόστασιν ἀπαρτίζοντα· οὕτω μέντοι
ὡς θάτερον συνιστᾶν θάτερον· εἶπερ δὴ
ψυχὴ σώματος σύστασις;⁶⁸

At the end of this part of his argumentation the author concludes that only God, being incorporeal, cannot be circumscribed in space, while all other incorporeal substances can exist within spatial limits. The wording of the text has again Aristotelian reminiscences: the angelic substances are compared to the human soul that is only accidentally (κατὰ συμβεβηκός) in place, through the body carrying it,⁶⁹ as well as with the water that is contained in a ceramic vessel and the

⁶⁸ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, ff. 36v-37.

⁶⁹ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, ff. 37v-38: *ταύτη τοι καὶ τὰς ἀγγελικὰς οὐσίας τόπω | περιο-
ρίζεσθαι· καὶ μετὰ τούτων καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς ἐξεληθούσας ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος· μενούσας δ' ἔτι,
τοῖς σώμασι περιγράφεσθαι· καὶ οὐ τοῦτο μόνον· ἀλλὰ καὶ τόπω μένειν καὶ κινεῖσθαι κατὰ
συμβεβηκός ἤπερ δοκεῖ τῷ τόπω τοῦ σώματος. Cf. Aristotle, *Physica* 212b: καὶ τὰ μὲν
καθ' αὐτὰ (sc. ἐστὶν ἐν τόπω) ... τὰ δὲ κατὰ συμβεβηκός, οἷον ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ ὁ οὐρανός. See
also Alexander of Aphrodisias, *De anima*, ed. I. BRUNS, *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis praeter
commentaria scripta minora* (CAG, suppl. 2/1). Berlin 1887, 22.20-21: καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ δὴ κατὰ
συμβεβηκός ἑαυτὴν κινήσει τότε, ὅταν τὸ ἔχον αὐτὴν ζῶον κινεῖται κατ' αὐτήν, and idem,
In Aristotelis topicorum libros octo commentaria, ed. M. WALLIES, *Alexandri in Aristotelis
topicorum libros octo commentaria* (CAG, 2/2). Berlin 1891, 321.14-16: ἐνδέχεται γὰρ
αὐτὴν (sc. τὴν ψυχὴν) καὶ χωρὶς τοῦ κινεῖσθαι εἶναι, ἐπεὶ κατὰ συμβεβηκός κινεῖται· τοῦ
γὰρ σώματος μεταβαίνοντος, ἐν ᾧ ἐστὶν ὅταν <δ' > ἠρεμῆ τὸ σῶμα, δηλον ὅτι οὐδ' ἂν
ἡ ψυχὴ κινεῖτο; Simplicius, *In Aristotelis physicorum libros commentaria*, ed. H. DIELS,
Simplicii in Aristotelis topicorum libros octo commentaria. I (CAG, 9). Berlin 1882,
592.11-14: εἰπὼν δὴ ταῦτα περὶ τῶν τριῶν τοῦ ἐν τόπω τρόπων ἐπάγει καὶ τὸν τέταρτον.
Τὰ δὲ κατὰ συμβεβηκός ἐστὶν ἐν τόπω οἷον ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ ὁ οὐρανός. Καὶ ἡ μὲν ψυχὴ δηλον
ὅπως κατὰ συμβεβηκός ἐν τόπω (τὸ γὰρ σῶμα ᾧ συμβέβηκεν ὡς εἶδος καθ' αὐτό ἐστὶν
ἐν τόπω); John Philoponos, *De officio mundi* I 16 (38.16-20 Reichardt): οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡ ψυχὴ
ὡς ἐν τόπω ἐστὶ τῷ ἡμετέρῳ σώματι, ἀλλ' ὡς εἰδοποιούσα τὸ ζῶον. Δι' αὐτὸ δὲ κατὰ
συμβεβηκός ἐν τόπω ἐστίν, ὅτι τὸ ἐν τόπω ὄν εἰδοποιεῖ, καθ' αὐτὴν δὲ οὐκ ἔστι. Μόνων
γὰρ σωμάτων ἐστίν, ὃ πολλάκις εἶπον, τὸ ἐν τόπω εἶναι, idem, *In Aristotelis physicorum
libros commentaria*, ed. H. VITELLI, *Ioannis Philoponi in Aristotelis physicorum libros
octo commentaria*. II (CAG, 17). Berlin 1888, 595.6-9: κατὰ συμβεβηκός δὲ κινεῖσθαι
λέγεται τὰ συμβεβηκότα πάντα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ, εἴτε ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ εἴη σώματι εἴτε χωριστῆ·
ταῦτα γὰρ οὐδέποτε καθ' αὐτὰ ἐν τόπω γίνεται· ἀσώματα γὰρ ἐστὶ, and idem, *In Ari-
stotelis libros de anima commentaria*, ed. M. HAYDUSCK, *Ioannis Philoponi in Aristotelis
de anima libros commentaria* (CAG, 15). Berlin 1897, 95.29-33 and 97.18-22: ἔοικεν ὁ
Ἀριστοτέλης πρὸς μόνους τὰς σωματικὰς κινήσεις ἀποβλέπων οὕτω λέγειν τὴν ψυχὴν μὴ
κινεῖσθαι· δηλον δ' ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν παρ' αὐτοῦ λεγομένων. εἰ γὰρ κινεῖται, φησὶν, ἡ ψυχὴ
μὴ κατὰ συμβεβηκός, φύσει ἂν ὑπάρχοι κινήσει αὐτῆ, εἰ δὲ τοῦτο, καὶ τόπος· πᾶσαι γὰρ*

passengers of a ship.⁷⁰

One more philosophical argument, based in this case on Platonic philosophy, will be adduced by Metochites as a final proof of his position. The idea is that movement by locomotion means, according to Plato, movement in place: if the Angels are sent by God to serve the people and if they are present in the places,

αἱ λεχθεῖσαι κινήσεις ἐν τόπῳ ... ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ ἐρέται κινουῦντες τὸ σκάφος συγκινουῦνται αὐτῷ κατὰ συμβεβηκός, ὥστε αὐτοὶ ἑαυτοὺς κατὰ συμβεβηκός κινουῦσιν. Ὡς τὸ πῶς καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ κινουσα τὸ σῶμα αὐτὴ ἑαυτὴν κατὰ συμβεβηκός κινεῖ· εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἀπολιμπάνει τὸ σῶμα κινουμένου αὐτοῦ, ἐν αὐτῷ δ' ἐνεργεῖ, δηλον ὡς συγκινεῖται αὐτῷ κατὰ συμβεβηκός; Michael Psellos, *Collectiones variae*, ed. D. J. O'MEARA, Michaelis Pselli philosophica minora. II. Leipzig 1989, 40.10-13: κατὰ τοῦτο τὸ σημαινόμενον λέγει Ἀριστοτέλης κινεῖν τὴν ψυχὴν τὸ σῶμα, ὡς οἱ ἐρέται συγκινουῦνται τῷ σκάφει. Συγκινεῖται οὖν καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ τῷ σώματι, ἀκίνητος καθ' αὐτὴν οὖσα, ἀλλὰ κατὰ συμβεβηκός, and IDEM, *In Aristotelis physycorum libros commentarium* VIII 29 (ed. L. G. BENAKIS, Michael Psellos Kommentar zur Physik des Aristoteles [*Corpus philosophorum Medii Aevi. Commentaria in Aristotelem Byzantina*, 5]. Athens 2008): αἴτιον γὰρ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἑαυτοῦ κινεῖν ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ, κινουσα γὰρ ἡ ψυχὴ τὸ σῶμα, κινεῖται καὶ αὐτὴ σὺν τῷ σώματι, καὶ ἀπὸ τόπου εἰς τόπον ἔρχεται, κινουμένου τοῦ σώματος. Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο κατὰ συμβεβηκός; Sophonias, *In Aristotelis libros de anima paraphrasis*, ed. M. HAYDUCK, Sophoniae in libros Aristotelis de anima paraphrasis (CAG, 23/1). Berlin 1883, 27.26-29: κατὰ συμβεβηκός δὲ κινεῖσθαι τὴν τοπικὴν κίνησιν ἔστι καὶ κινεῖν ἑαυτὴν, καθάπερ εἴπομεν, οἷον κινεῖσθαι μὲν τὸ σῶμα ἐν ᾧ ἔστιν, τοῦτο δὲ κινεῖσθαι ὑπὸ ψυχῆς· ἄλλως δ' οὐχ οἷον τε κατὰ τόπον κινεῖσθαι. A similar passage from Metochites' commentary on the *De anima* reads as follows: τὰς γοῦν τέτταρας ταύτας κινήσεις, ἧτοι τὴν ἀλλοίωσιν· τὴν φορὰν· τὴν αὐξησιν καὶ τὴν φθίσιν, ἐν τόπῳ συμβέβηκε θεωρεῖσθαι· ὡς καὶ τοῦτο ἐν τῇ φυσικῇ ἀκροάσει δέδεικται. ἡ μὲν γὰρ φορὰ καὶ ἡ αὐξησις καὶ ἡ φθίσις, πρόδηλον παντὶ συνιδεῖν, ὡς ἐν τόπῳ θεωροῦνται. ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ ἀλλοίωσις αὐτὴ ἐπειδὴ μεριστὴ ἔστι καὶ περὶ μεριστὸν ὑποκείμενον, καὶ αὐτὴ ἐν τόπῳ θεωρεῖται. ἡ ψυχὴ δέ, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τόπῳ· ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἀσώματός ἐστιν ὡς ἅπαντες σχεδὸν φυσικοὶ· καὶ μάλιστα ὁ Πλάτων ταύτην φησὶν· ὁ καὶ μάλιστα ταύτην κινεῖσθαι λέγων· ὥστε πῶς ἂν, κινεῖτο, ἐπεὶ μὴ ἐν τόπῳ ἔστι; πᾶσα δὲ κίνησις ἢ κατὰ τοὺς εἰρημένους τέσσαρας τρόπους, ἐν τόπῳ θεωρεῖται· εἰ μὴ τις οὕτω ταύτην λέγει κινεῖσθαι κατὰ τὸ συμβεβηκός, ὡς καὶ τὸ λευκὸν καὶ τὸ τρίπηχον αὐτὸ τὸ διάστημα, τὰ ἐν τῷ σώματι λέγονται κινεῖσθαι κατὰ τὸ συμβεβηκός, καὶ συγκινεῖσθαι, | κινουμένῳ τῷ σώματι. ἐν τόπῳ μέντοι οὐκ εἰσὶ τὸ λευκὸν καὶ τὸ τρίπηχον· ἀλλ' ἢ κατὰ συμβεβηκός· ὅτι τὸ σῶμα ἐν ᾧ εἰσὶν, ἐν τόπῳ ἔστιν. ἀλλ' εἰ κατ' οὐσίαν καὶ καθ' αὐτὸ ἔστι τῇ ψυχῇ, ὡς ὑποτιθέμεθα τὸ κινεῖσθαι, εἶη ἂν ἐν τόπῳ ὅπερ ἀδύνατον ὡς εἴρηται (cod. Marc. gr. 239, f. 224rv). For Aristotle's theory of the soul (its "movement" included) and its reception by the (Byzantine) commentators, see further the discussion in BYDÉN, *Stoicheiosis* (cited n. 15), 74-101.

⁷⁰ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 38: ὡςπερ δὴ καὶ τὸ ἐν κεραμείῳ ὕδωρ περικλειόμενον, προσεχῆ μὲν ἔχει τόπον τοῦ κεραμείου, τὴν ἐντὸς ἐπιφάνειαν καὶ δι' ἐκείνου πάλιν τὸν περιλαμβάνοντα τόπον ἐκείνο· ὡςπερ δὴ καὶ ὁ μένων ἐν τῇ νηὶ πρῶτον μὲν αὐτὴν ἐκείνην ἔχει τὴν νῆα τόπον περιορίζοντα· καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἐκείνης, αὐτὴς τὴν θάλασσαν. Cf. Aristotle, *Metaphysica* 1023a: ἕνα δὲ ὡς τὸ περιέχον τὰ περιεχόμενα· ἐν ᾧ γὰρ ἔστι περιέχοντι, ἔχουσθαι ὑπὸ τούτου λέγεται, οἷον τὸ ἀγγεῖον ἔχειν τὸ ὑγρὸν φαμεν καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἀνθρώπους καὶ τὴν ναῦν ναύτας.

where they have been sent, in the side of the people, then this means that they move in place and, thus, they can be circumscribed within spatial limits;⁷¹ they can exist simultaneously in various places, but they must not be supposed to be everywhere, for it is only God who is infinite and indefinite.⁷²

“Philosophical” digressions, based especially on Aristotle, form a special feature of the *Logos*. One more characteristic case is the following: in order to prove

⁷¹ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 38: εἰ γὰρ ἐστὶ τοῦτο τοῖς ἕξω παντὸς μᾶλλον ἀληθὲς εἰρημένον· ὡς ἢ κατὰ φορὰν κινήσις ἀρχὴ πως, τῆς περὶ τόπου δόξης τῆ φιλοσοφία γεγένηται· ὡς ἀδύνατον ὄν, εἴ τι τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον κινεῖται, μὴ καὶ ἐν τόπῳ κινεῖσθαι καὶ παρὰ τοῦτο, τόπῳ περιορίζεσθαι, κἀντεῦθεν οὐχίκιστα δεδειγμένον ἄν, εἴη, πάντως τὸ ζητούμενον τῷ λόγῳ· ὡς περιγραπτοὶ τὴν φύσιν οἱ ἄγγελοι. εἰ γὰρ ἐκπέμπονται πρὸς Θεοῦ· καὶ τοῖς τόποις οἷς ἐξεπέμφθησαν ἐπιδημοῦντες ἐμφαίνονται· εἰ συνοδεύουσι τοπικῶς ἀνθρώποις καὶ συγγίνονται· εἰ πάντες εἰσὶ ἑπιτελετικὰ πνεύματα πρὸς διακονίαν, ἀποστελλόμενα διὰ τοὺς μέλλοντας κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν· ὁ θεὸς φησὶν ἀπόστολος, εἰ πάνθ' ὅσα τῆς τοπικῆς κινήσεως καὶ μονῆς ἵνα συνελὼν εἴπομι, περὶ αὐτοὺς ἐκ τούτων φαίνεται, τίς ἀντρεῖ τῶν αἰδουμένων ἀλήθειαν, μὴ καὶ τοπικῶς αὐτοὺς ὀρίζεσθαι τε καὶ περιγράφεσθαι; Cf. Plato, *Leges* 893d: τὰ δέ γε κινούμενα ἐν πολλοῖς φαίνη μοι λέγειν ὅσα φορᾶ κινεῖται μεταβαίνοντα εἰς ἕτερον αἰεὶ τόπον, and Aristotle, *Topica* 122b: ἢ ὡς Πλάτων ὀρίζεται φορὰν τὴν κατὰ τόπον κίνησιν.

⁷² See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 38rv: ἐπεὶ τί σοι δοκεῖ ὁ νῦν μὲν ἐνταῦθα νῦν δ' ἐκέισε τισὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων συγγινόμενος ἄγγελος· οἶον ὁ τῷ Ζαχαρία πρὸς τοῖς ἀδύτοις καὶ τῷ νεφ' ἢ τῆ θεοτόκῃ καὶ παρθένῳ διαλεγόμενος, ἴν' ἐκ τῶν πολλῶν ταῦτα τῷ λόγῳ προθεῖν· μηδαμῶς ἐκέισε παρεῖναι τοπικῶς ἢ μόνον ἐκέισε, ἢ πρὸς τὸ ἐκέισε καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ· εἰ δὲ βούλει, πανταχοῦ καὶ ὑπὲρ τὸ πᾶν; ἀλλ' ὅτι μὲν οὐδαμῶς ἐκέισε παρὴν οὐδαμῶς ἄν, ἐρεῖν οἶμαι, τὸν (an τῶν scribendum?) νοῦν μετρίως | ἐχόντων τινά. εἰ δ' ἐκέισε πάντως παρὴν· εἰ μὲν μόνον ἐκέισε τὸν τρόπον ἄν, εἴη τοῦτον ἀποδεδειγμένον, τὸ τῷ λόγῳ ζητούμενον· εἰ δὲ πρὸς τῷ ἐκέισε· καὶ πανταχοῦ· καὶ ὑπὲρ τὸ πᾶν, ποῦ τὸ τῆς θείας μονῆς τριάδος ἄπειρον καὶ ἀόριστον, εἰ πρὸς αὐτῆ καὶ ἀγγέλοις τοῦτο κοινόν; εἰ δ' ἄρα πρὸς τῷ ἐκέισε παρεῖναι, παρὴν μὲν καὶ ἄλλῃ πη· οὐ μὴν εἰς ἄπειρον τοῦτο μὲν οὐδὲν ἄν, εἴη τῷ παρόντι σκοπῷ λυμαινόμενον. ἐκεῖν δὲ τί ποτ' ἄν εἴη τοῦτο φέρον ἡντιναοῦν ὄντων εἰς τὸν λόγον· ἐφ' τὸ ἀσώματον ἐντεῦθεν εἶναι καὶ ἀπερίγραπτον; Cf. Nicetas Stethatos, *Ep.* 5, 8.10-9.7 (ed. J. DARROUZÈS, Nicéas Stéthatos, *Opuscules et Lettres* [SC, 81]. Paris 1961): εἰ γὰρ καὶ σωματικῶς ἐν τόπῳ οὐ περιέχονται ὥστε τυποῦσθαι καὶ σχηματίζεσθαι, ἀλλ' ὅμως ἐν τόπῳ λέγονται εἶναι διὰ τὸ παρεῖναι νοητῶς καὶ ἐνεργεῖν κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτῶν φύσιν καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ μὴ εἶναι, ἀλλ' ἐκέισε νοητῶς περιγράφεσθαι, ἔνθα καὶ ἐνεργοῦσι. Οὐ γὰρ δύναται κατὰ ταῦτον ἐν διαφόροις ἐνεργεῖν τόποις. Τοῦτο γὰρ μόνου Θεοῦ ἐστὶ, τὸ πανταχοῦ κατὰ ταῦτον ἐνεργεῖν. Διὸ καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενος ὁ Γαβριὴλ ἐπὶ γῆς τῆ Παρθένῳ τὴν προαποκειμένην τοῦ Θεοῦ οἰκονομίαν, ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς οὐκ ἦν· καὶ τὸ Σεραφὶμ τῷ ἀνθρακί καὶ τῆ λαβίδι τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τῶν τοῦ Ἡσαίου χειλέων ἀπτόμενον ἐπὶ γῆς κατελθὼν ἦν καὶ οὐκ ἐν ταῦτῳ παρίστατο ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ τῷ θρόνῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τῶν ὄντων οὐδὲν οὐδαμῶς ἀόριστον πλὴν ἑνός, τοῦ ὄντως ὄντος, καθὰ καὶ εἰς τὸν περὶ ὄρων ζωῆς μοι λόγον ἐφιλοσοφήθη πλατύτερον – μόνος γὰρ ἀόριστος ὁ αἰεὶ ὢν Θεὸς καὶ τὰ πάντα ὀρίζων ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ πάσαν ὑπερεκπίπτων κατάληψιν –, ἀνάγκη τὰ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γεγονότα πάντα, ὡς ἕξ οὐδενὸς εἰληφότα τὸ εἶναι, ὑφ' ὄρον εἶναι καὶ πέρασ καὶ ἀριθμόν.

that the Angels are superior to everything terrestrial and even to the heavens, Metochites resorts to the *De anima* and summarizes the teaching of Aristotle regarding the various forms of existence: at first, there are the inanimate things that are incapable of movement; then there are the animate beings that have the capacity of movement: the plants that have as their basic trait the power of self-nutrition and growing as well as the ability to give birth to other beings like them, the animals that in addition to the above traits possess also the power of sensation, and, finally, the beings gifted with mind that can move voluntarily and that approximate closer to God than all others. Being by nature totally disconnected from everything material, the Angels stand, according to Metochites, above all the named categories.⁷³ This chapter of the *Logos* serves somehow as a mirror of the author's philosophical preoccupations: the hint to the nature of the heavens at the beginning reflects a philosophical discussion going back to Aristotle's *De caelo* and its commentators,⁷⁴ a discussion touched upon also in the framework of the controversy between Metochites and Nikephoros Choumnos, when the former was challenged by the latter to take stand on the question of the five-elements

⁷³ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 39rv: τὴν γὰρ τῆς φύσεως ἀκολουθίαν ἢ ποιητικὴ σοφία, τάξει συνεχῶς δημιουργεῖ καὶ προάγει· ὡς πάντα μὲν αὐτῆς ἠρτήσθαι· κἀντεῦθεν οὐσι-οῦσθαι τὲ καὶ ἴστασθαι. οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν, μᾶλλον τὰ δ' ἦττον· καὶ τις ἐστὶν ἁρμονία τοῖς οὐσί· καὶ προχώρησις κατὰ λόγον ἐπειθ' ἐξῆς, ἔστι μὲν οὖν ἐκείνης πορρωτάτω ὅσα σωματικῶς παχυνθέντα παντελῶς ἄψυχα· καὶ τὴν προαιρετικὴν, ἀκίνητα κίνησιν. τὴν γὰρ πολυειδῆ κίνησιν οὐδὲν ἀμέλει τῶν φύσει συνεστώτων καθάπαξ ἀφήρηται· εἴ γε φύσις ἐστὶν ἡρμείας οἰκοθεν ἀρχὴ καὶ κινήσεως· ἀλλ' ἔστιν ἕξις ἐν φυσικοῖς ἅπασιν δεικνυμένη· καὶ οἷον κοινός τις διὰ πάντων χωρῶν σύνδεσμος· εἰ καὶ μὴ πᾶσιν ἄρα τοῖς αὐτῆς εἶδεσιν, ὅμως δ' οὖν ἐνόις, πάντ' ἀλλήλοις συνδέουσα. ἀκολούθως δ' ἡ φύσις πρόεισι· καὶ τελειοῖ τὸ εἶναι πρὸς τὸ βέλτιον ἐξῆς αἰεὶ· τῷ ὄντως ὄντι κατὰ πρόδοον ἄγουσα σὺν τάξει, καὶ συνάπτουσα· ὡς εἶναι τῶν προειρημένων λοιπὸν, ἐφεξῆς οὐσίαν· ἢ τὴν κατὰ τὸ ἔμψυχον προσείληφε κίνησιν· καὶ ταύτην μάλιστα πρῶτως κατὰ τὸ φυτικὸν· ἦν τριχῆ φιλοσοφία τέμνει θρηπτικῶ τε καὶ αὔξειν πεφυκότι· καὶ τρίτῳ γεννᾶν ὅμοια τὴν φύσιν καὶ δημιουργεῖν | παραπλήσια· ἐν οἷς δὴ πρῶτοις, τὴν ἔμψυχον ἕξεισιν οἶμαι κίνησιν ὁρᾶν, καὶ καταριθμεῖν καὶ λογίζεσθαι. τοῦ λοιποῦ δὲ τῷ ζωτικῷ προχωρεῖ· καὶ προσέτι λαμβάνει τὴν αἴσθησιν ἢ φαντασίαν πάντως σύνεστιν ἀχώριστος· ἀναγκαῖον σύζυγον· καὶ φύσις ἄτμητος· καὶ πρῶτον εἰς νοῦν ὄχημα. κᾶτα ἐπὶ δὴ τούτοις, τὰ τῆς λογικῆς ἀξίας τὲ καὶ περιουσίας· τὴν προαιρετικὴν προσκτησάμενα κίνησιν· καὶ τῷ θεῷ πλεῖν ἢ κατὰ τᾶλλα πάντα τέως ἐγγίσαντα. ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ εἰκῶν ἢ λογικῆ ψυχῆ τοῦ Θεοῦ· ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ τᾶλλα πάντα ὑπερβαίνει, ἀλλ' οὕτω τὸ πέρας ἐνταῦθα δὴ, τῆς τῶν ὄντων προαγωγῆς· ἀλλ' ἔστιν ἄρα καὶ πρόσω· καὶ ταύτης ἔθ' ὑψηλότερόν τε καὶ τελεώτερον· καὶ μᾶλλον ἐγγίστα Θεῷ, ἢ τῶν ἀγγέλων φύσις· ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἄρα τοῖς ἡριθμημένοις πλεονάζουσα παντάπασιν ἔξω τῆς ὕλης καὶ πάχους σώματος· κἀν τούτῳ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων μᾶλλον Θεῷ συνάπτουσα. Cf. Aristotle, *De anima* 413a-414b. The Aristotelian distinction of the various powers of the soul was adopted by many Christian authors; see I. POLEMIS, Theodoros Metochites, Poem 10. Introduction, Critical Text, Translation and Notes (*Classical and Byzantine Monographs*, 61). Amsterdam 2006, *112 n. 155.

⁷⁴ See BYDÉN, *Stoicheiosis* (cited n. 15), 171-210.

theory;⁷⁵ it was, of course, difficult for the Christians to endorse the Aristotelian theory of the fifth element and the eternity of the heavenly bodies, yet those who dealt with the subject – Metochites among them – pleaded for the supreme nature of the heavens that ‘possess the most honourable and divine position among the things perceptible by our senses.’⁷⁶ Aristotle’s *De anima*, on the other hand, was also popular among the “philosophers” of the early Palaiologan period: in c. 1300 the monk Sophonias composed a paraphrase of the work,⁷⁷ and so did Metochites around 1310-1312;⁷⁸ moreover, Metochites’ adversary, Nikephoros

⁷⁵ See BYDÉN, *Stoicheiosis* (cited n. 15), 171-174 and 188-195; see also ĐEVČENKO, *Études* (cited n. 5), 29 and 105. A systematic refutation of Aristotle’s views can be found in Choumnos’ treatise *De natura mundi*; see K. P. CHRESTOU, *Τὸ φιλοσοφικὸ ἔργο τοῦ Νικηφόρου Χούμνου*. Thessaloniki 2002, 2.21-3.22 and 5.20-15.24, as well as the analysis on pp. LVII-LX; see also J. VERPEAUX, *Nicéphore Choumnos. Homme d’état et humaniste byzantin* (ca 1250/55-1327). Paris 1959, 126-128.

⁷⁶ Cf. BYDÉN, *Stoicheiosis* (cited n. 15), 197.

⁷⁷ On Sophonias, see *PLP* 26424 (with literature). For his paraphrase, see above n. 69 and for the dating, see Bydén, *Stoicheiosis* (cited n. 15), 196.

⁷⁸ For the dating, see BYDÉN, *Stoicheiosis* (cited n. 15), 35 and n. 114; Bydén prepares the first critical edition of this work. Some passages that display affinities with the relevant section of the *Logos* are the following – they are given according to the codex Marcianus gr. 239, which is one of the oldest manuscripts: (f. 235) δηλοποιῶν δὲ καὶ διοριζόμενος τὰ ἔχοντα ζῶην, ταῦτα εἶναι φησίν, ὅσα ἀφ’ ἐαυτῶν ἔχει δυνάμιν κινήσεως θρηπτικῆς καὶ αὐξητικῆς· πάντως δὲ καὶ τοῦ ἐναντίου τοῦ φθίνειν· οὐχ’ ὅτι ταύτας μόνας ἔχει τὰς δυνάμεις τὰ ψυχὴν ἔχοντα (πρόδηλον γὰρ ὡς ἔνια ψυχὰς ἔχοντα, καὶ ἄλλας δυνάμεις ἔχει· ἥτοι αἰσθητικὴν καὶ διανοητικὴν εἴτουν λογικὴν)· ἀλλ’ ὅτι πρώτως κατὰ τὰς εἰρημένας δυνάμεις θεωρεῖται ἡ ψυχὴ· καὶ ἀδύνατον πᾶσαν ψυχὴν, μὴ ταύτας ἔχειν τὰς δυνάμεις· ἔνια μὲν γὰρ ψυχὰ καὶ πλείους τούτων ἔχουσιν ὡς εἴρηται· τό γε μὴν ἐπ’ ἐλάχιστον ἀδύνατον ὅλως εἶναι ψυχὴν μὴ ἔχουσαν τὰς εἰρημένας δυνάμεις, διατοῦτο καὶ ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἐστὶ τὰ ὅλως ἔχοντα σώματα ψυχὴν εἴτουν ζῶην, τὰς εἰρημένας ἔχειν δυνάμεις, οἰκοθεν καὶ ἀφ’ ἐαυτῶν· καὶ ἄπερ μὴ ταύτας ἔχει τὰς δυνάμεις τὸν εἰρημῆνον τρόπον, οὐδόλως εἰσὶν ἔμψυχα – (f. 238) κατὰ πολλοὺς γὰρ τρόπους θεωρουμένου τοῦ ζῆν (ἐστὶ γὰρ καὶ κατὰ νοῦν ὡς ἔχει τὰ λογικὰ ζῶα· ἐστὶ καὶ κατ’ αἰσθησιν, ὡς ἔχει τὰ πάντα ζῶα, καθόλου· καὶ κατὰ τὸ κινεῖσθαι καὶ ἴστασθαι κατὰ τόπον, ὡς ἔχει τὰ κινούμενα τῶν ζῶων· ἐπειδὴ τινὰ τῶν ζῶων κατὰ αἰσθησιν ζῶντα, ἀκίνητεί παντάπασιν ἐφ’ ἐνός ἐστῶτα· καὶ οἰοεὶ πεπηγότα, τόπου· οἶα δὴ τὰ λεγόμενα ζωόφυτα ἦτοι τὰ ὄστρεα. καὶ ταῦτα γὰρ δὴ κατὰ τὴν αἰσθησιν· αἰσθάνεται γὰρ τῆ ἀφῆ· ἔτι δὲ σὺν τούτοις καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἄλλην κίνησιν· ἦτις ἐστὶ κατὰ τὴν τροφήν φησὶ καὶ τὴν αὐξησιν· ἅμα δὲ καὶ τὴν φθίσιν)· κατὰ πολλοὺς οὖν οὕτω δὴ τρόπους λεγομένου τοῦ ζῆν, καὶ τῆς ζωῆς εἰ καὶ μὴ κατὰ πάντας τοὺς τρόπους ἐστὶν ἐνίοις, ἀλλὰ καθ’ ἕνα τούτων, ζῆν ὅμως ἐστὶ καὶ τοῦτο· καὶ ζωὴ ἐστίν, ἐν οἷς ἂν εἴη· ὥσπερ ἔχει, ἐπὶ τοῖς φυτοῖς. ταῦτα γὰρ οὔτε τὴν κατὰ νοῦν, οὔτε τὴν κατ’ αἰσθησιν ἀπλῶς· οὔτε τὴν κινήτικὴν κατὰ τόπον ἔχει ζωὴν· ἀλλ’ ἢ μόνον τὴν κινήτικὴν, ὥστε τρέφεσθαι καὶ αὐξεῖν· ἅμα δὲ καὶ φθίνειν· καὶ ταύτην μόνην ἔχοντα, ζῆν γε ὅμως καὶ τὰ φυτὰ λέγεται καὶ εἰ μὴ ζῶα ταῦτα λέγεται· καὶ πρώτη γε ἐστὶν ἡ φυτικὴ ψυχὴ οἰκοθεν τῶν τῶν φυτῶν ἔχόντων, τὸ θρηπτικὸν· καὶ τὸ αὐξητικὸν· ἅμα δὲ καὶ τὸ ἐναντίον καὶ πρὸς πάντα τὰ μέρη – (f. 238v) ἀλλ’ ὡς ἐλέγετο ἐν τοῖς θνητοῖς, ἀδύνατον εἶναι τὰς ἄλλας ζωὰς· ἦτοι τὰς λογικὰς καὶ τὰς αἰσθητικὰς, τὰς τε μετὰ κινήσεως τοπικῆς καὶ τὰς ἄνευ τοπικῆς

Choumnos, made use of the *De anima* in two of his philosophical treatises:⁷⁹ *Antitheticus adversus Plotinum de anima*⁸⁰ and *De anima nutribile et sensibile*.⁸¹

κινήσεως ὡς διώρισταί, ἄνευ τῆς φυτικῆς ζωῆς, τῆς ἐχοῦσης τὴν θρεπτικὴν· καὶ αὐξή-
τικὴν δύναμιν· ὥστ' ἔοικεν αὕτη εἶναι, τοῦ ζῆν ἀρχή· καὶ διὰ ταύτην τὴν ἀρχὴν, ὑπάρχει
τὸ ζῆν τοῖς ζῶσι. ζῶα δὲ ἐστὶ κατὰ δεύτερον ἐξῆς λόγον, διὰ τὴν αἴσθησιν οἷα ἐστὶ καὶ τὰ
κινούμενα κατὰ τόπον ζῶα καὶ τὰ μὴ κινούμενα· ζῶα γὰρ κάκεῖνα διὰ τὸ αἰσθάνεσθαι
καὶ εἰ ζωόφυτα λέγεται διὰ τὸ ζῶντα κατὰ τὰ φυτὰ ἀκίνητα πεπηγένοι πῶς· ἔχει γὰρ
καὶ ταῦτα τὴν ἀπτικήν αἴσθησιν – (f. 240rv) τινὰ μὲν τῶν ἐμψύχων, πάσας ἔχει τὰς τῆς
ψυχῆς δυνάμεις· τινὰ δὲ οὐ πάσας· ἀλλὰ τινάς· τινὰ δὲ καὶ μίαν μόνην· δυνάμεις λέγων
τὸ λογικὸν· τὸ κατὰ τόπον κινήτικόν· τὸ αἰσθητικόν· τὸ θρεπτικόν. καὶ τοῖς μὲν φυτοῖς
ἐστὶν αὐτὸ τὸ θρεπτικὸν εἶτουν τὸ φυτικόν· ἅμα γὰρ τῷ τρέφεσθαι καὶ τὸ αὐξεῖν· καὶ τὸ
γεννᾶν· τοῖς δὲ ζῶοις ἐστὶ φησὶ πρὸς τούτῳ | καὶ τὸ αἰσθητικόν – (f. 241) ἔπεται δὲ φησὶν
ἐπ' ἐνίων ἐχόντων τὴν ἀφήν καὶ τὸ κατὰ τόπους κινήτικόν οἷον ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων ζῶων
τῶν πλέον μετεχόντων ψυχῆς, ἢ κατὰ τὰ ζωόφυτα· ἔτι δὲ κατὰ προσθήκην, ἐνίοις ἔπεται
καὶ τὸ διανοητικόν αὐτὸ ἦτοι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις· ἴσως δὲ καὶ τούτων ἐστὶν, ἔτι τί τιμιώτε-
ρον· καὶ ὑψηλότερον· τοῦτο δὲ λέγει ἢ πρὸς τὰ οὐράνια, ἀφορῶν· ἃ καὶ κατὰ τόπον ἐστὶ
κινήτικα· καὶ ἐμψυχα, καὶ διανοητικά δοκεῖ τοῖς φιλοσόφοις εἶναι· ἀπαθὴ μὲν γε ἄλλως
καὶ ἀνευδεῆ τροφῆς καὶ αὐξήσεως· ἢ πρὸς τινὰς ἄλλας φύσεις δαιμονίας· ἃς μεταξὺ τῆς
θείας καὶ ἀνθρωπίνης ζωῆς ἐδόξασαν οἱ τῶν Ἑλλήνων σοφοί.

⁷⁹ Choumnos' philosophical treatises are roughly dated between 1305 and c. 1325, as proposed by VERPEAUX, Choumnos (cited n. 75) 54-55; see also BYDÉN, *Stoicheiosis* (cited n. 15), 119 with n. 51. On the other hand, I. POLEMIS (Theodore Metochites' *Byzantios* as a testimony to the cosmological discussions of the early Palaiologan period. *REB* 66 [2008] 246 n. 15) suggested that Metochites had probably in mind Choumnos' treatise *De anima nutribile et sensibile* when he made this certain digression in his *Logos* on the Archangels, which would point to an earlier dating of this work (?).

⁸⁰ See, e.g., CHRESTOU, *Τὸ φιλοσοφικὸ ἔργο* (cited n. 75), 66.23-67.20: καὶ γοῦν εἰ βούλει εἰς τρία ταῦτα διελέσθαι ψυχὴν πᾶσαν καὶ ζωὴν, νοῦν δηλονότι καὶ αἴσθησιν καὶ τὴν ὀρωμένην ἐν τοῖς φυτοῖς, ὀρθῶς ἂν διέλαιοι. καὶ τοῦτον ἔχει τὸν τρόπον ὁ περὶ ψυχῆς λόγος πᾶς. Ἔστι δ' οὐδὲν δεινόν, ὡσπερ καὶ κοινωνοῦσιν ἀλλήλαις καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ συμμετέχουσι ψυχῆς ὀνόματος, οὕτω δὴ καὶ πρώτην καὶ δευτέραν καὶ τρίτην ταύτας νοεῖν· καὶ τὰς μὲν ἀμέσως ἀλλήλων κοινωνεῖν, τὰς δὲ διὰ τῶν ἐν μέσῳ τῶν πόρρω καὶ ὅσαι μὴ ἐγγίζουσιν αὐταῖς. ψυχὴ μὲν γὰρ νοερά πρώτη, οὐκ αὐτὸ δὲ τοῦτο, τὸ εἶναι ψυχὴ· ἐπεὶ κατὰ γε τοῦτο, οὐχ ἢ μὲν μᾶλλον, ἢ δ' ἦττον· πᾶσαι γὰρ ἐξίσου ψυχαί· ἀλλ' ὅτι ἀκήρατος, καὶ αἰεὶ ζῆ καὶ νοεῖ καὶ γνησίως ἔχει πρὸς τὸ πρῶτον αἴτιον, καὶ γε τὰς περὶ αὐτὸ φύσεις καὶ νοεράς. δευτέρα δ' αἴσθησις καὶ ἢ κατὰ ταύτην ψυχὴ, ἅτε δὴ καὶ δεκτικὴ τῆς πρώτης, καὶ δυναμένη συμμίγνυσθαι ταύτῃ καὶ συνανακεκράσθαι καὶ μετ' αὐτῆς ἐνεργεῖν. τρίτην δὲ θετέον, τροφῶν μόνων ἀντιληπτικὴν. εἰ δέ γε καὶ αἰσθήσεως καὶ αὐτῆς δὴ ταύτης τῆς θρεπτικῆς ἐστὶν ἕτερον μέσον, ἀτελὲς μὲν τὴν αἴσθησιν καὶ ὀλίγον αὐτῆς μετέχον, τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν ἅπαν κατὰ τὰ φυτὰ· καὶ οὕτω δὴ μεσιτεῦον, οὐκ ἀκοινωνήτων παντελῶς εἶναι ποιεῖ τὴν τῶν αἰσθανομένων φύσιν πρὸς τὴν ἐν τοῖς τρεφομένοις μόνον καὶ αὐξανομένους ζωὴν. See also *ibid.*, LXXXI-LXXXIII, and VERPEAUX, Choumnos (cited n. 75), 141-143.

⁸¹ See, e.g., CHRESTOU, *Τὸ φιλοσοφικὸ ἔργο* (cited n. 75), 94.7-22: τῆς τοίνυν ψυχῆς καὶ ζωῆς πολλαχῆ διηρημένης, καὶ γὰρ τὸ θρεπτικὸν μέρος αὐτῆς, καὶ γε ζωὴ τελεία. ἐπὶ δὲ τούτῳ καὶ τὸ κατ' αἴσθησιν ζῆν, ἕτερον εἶδος ψυχῆς, καὶ τὸ γε λογιστικόν, ἄλλο τι ἀπαθὲς παντάπασι καὶ ἀκήρατον καὶ θείας μοίρας ἐξημμένον κατὰ τὰ τοιαῦτα δῆπου

If the *Logos* on the Archangel Michael is an early work of Metochites, as it has been suggested above, then it “presages” in a way the author’s later preoccupations and the intellectual trends of its time.

But Metochites’ source of inspiration seems to be even wider, always reflecting his philosophical interests. As I. Polemis has shown, the vocabulary used in this section of the *Logos* is rather technical: the author makes use of the terminology of the Stoics regarding the cosmic ἔξις or *pneuma* that extends from body to body and pervades even the farthest-separated parts of the world.⁸² According to Polemis, it is probably through the intervention of Pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite that Metochites comes to speak here about the world as a constitution harmoniously arranged by the divine wisdom, which diffuses in each single part of the universe, from the most inconsiderable to the most superior;⁸³ this idea also puts the author close to the philosophical thought of the learned emperor Theodore II Laskaris, who proposed, about half a century before Metochites, in his work *De naturali communione* a complete theory on the structure of the world and the diffusion of the spirit of the Creator in it.⁸⁴

Having proved with the help of Aristotelian psychology the superiority of the Angels over all other forms of existence, Metochites deals in a new section with the *theoria*⁸⁵ of the angelic intellect and the way it gets to know God; ancient Greek philosophy serves also here for the author as the starting point, in order to formulate his argumentation. At first Metochites evokes the old distinction between *noesis* (immediate apprehension) and *dianoia* (discursive thinking), introduced by Plato⁸⁶ and adopted later by Aristotle.⁸⁷ The definition of *dianoia*

μόρια τῆς ζώσης ὅλης ψυχῆς, καὶ τὰς κινήσεις τὰς γ’ ἐν τοῖς θνητοῖς σώμασι καὶ ταύτης μετεσχηκόσιν, ἔστι καὶ συνδιηρησθαι, καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν ἔχειν, οὐκ ἄλλοθεν οὐσας ἢ ἐκ ψυχῆς, γέννησίν φημι καὶ αὔξησιν, ἔτι δ’ ἀλλοίωσιν καὶ τὴν γε κατὰ τόπον μεταβολήν· γέννησις μὲν γὰρ καὶ αὔησις, τοῦ τρέφοντος εἶδους ψυχῆς, ἀλλοίωσις δ’ αἰσθήσεως καὶ ἢ γε κατὰ τόπον φορὰ καὶ ὀρμή. τοῦ δὲ λογιστικοῦ ἐτέρου δὴ τινος ὄντος καὶ χωριστοῦ τῶν σωμάτων καὶ καθ’ ἑαυτὸ δυναμένου καὶ ζῆν καὶ εἶναι καὶ ἐνεργεῖν, καὶ ἢ κατ’ αὐτὸ κινήσις, ἄλλη τις καὶ οὐ κατὰ ταύτας τὰς σωματικὰς. For the content of this treatise, see *ibid.*, LXXXIII-XCV, and, VERPEAUX, Choumnos (cited n. 75), 143-145.

⁸² See POLEMIS, Poem 10 (cited n. 73), *104-*106.

⁸³ See POLEMIS, Poem 10 (cited n. 73), *106-*116.

⁸⁴ Cf. POLEMIS, Poem 10 (cited n. 73), 117*-121*.

⁸⁵ On the term and its meaning, as well as its use in other works of Metochites, see POLEMIS, Ἡθικός (cited n. 15), 43*-105*, and *idem*, **Κόσμου θεωρία: cosmic vision and its significance** in the works of Theodore Metochites, in: S. ΚΟΤΖΑΒΑΣΣΙ (ed.), *A Companion to the Intellectual Life in the Palaiologan Period* (forthcoming).

⁸⁶ Cf. Plato, *Republica* 510b-511d.

⁸⁷ For the cognitive powers of the soul according to Aristotle, see *De anima* 427b-431b; see also G.-G. GRANGER, *La théorie aristotélicienne de la science*. Paris 1976, 11-27.

is given with reference to the Platonic *Sophist*: “*dianoia* is the internal dialogue of the soul to herself”,⁸⁸ while its relationship with the *nous* is described in terms that are rather Aristotelian: *nous* provides the *dianoia* with the principles, which the latter uses in order to produce science (*episteme*).⁸⁹ Since the angelic sub-

⁸⁸ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 42v: ἦν ἄρα δὴ τις διάνοιαν τῶν ἕξωθεν ἀστείως ἐγχαράττει καὶ καθυποδείκνυσι καὶ τυποῖ μεγαλοφυῆς ἀνὴρ ἐννοῆσαι τὲ, καὶ τὴν τοῦ νοηθέντος ἐρμηνεῖαν ἐκθέσθαι, διάλογον αὐτῆς τῆς ψυχῆς, αὐτῆς ἐντὸς πρὸς αὐτήν; cf. Plato, *Sophista* 264a. For the identification, see POLEMIS, Ἠθικός (cited n. 15), 263 n. 193.

⁸⁹ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, ff. 42v-43: ταῦτ’ ἄρα καὶ πρὸς λόγον ταύτης (sc. τῆς διανοίας) πάντως ἢ γένεσις ἐπιστήμη· καὶ τοῦ νοὸς ὡς εἴρηται, δι’ αὐτῆς· ὅτι δὴ διανοία τὰς ἀρχὰς ὁ νοῦς ὑποτίθησιν ἀμέσους· αὐτὰς ἐκεῖνος καὶ πρῶτας καὶ μεγαλοπρεπεῖς· καὶ ἀλόγους ἴν’ οὕτως εἶπομι προεuerγετῶν καὶ χαριζόμενος· δι’ ὧν ἐκείνη τοῖς ζητουμένοις προσάγεται· ὡς ἂν, ἐν ταύταις ἐρειδομένη κινεῖσθαι· καὶ τὸ πρὸς βουλῆς δι’ αὐτῶν ἀνύτειν ῥᾶστα. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἄλλως ἔχει προαχθῆναι καὶ ὄπωσοῦν· καὶ συγγενέσθαι τοῖς οὔσι· καὶ περὶ αὐτῶν κατοπτεῦειν καὶ νομοθετεῖν ἀσφαλέστερον ὅτι μὴ προϋποθεμένη τὰ τοῦ νοῦ δῶρα, καὶ διὰ τούτων τὰ τῆς προκειμένης ἀνάγκης περαίνουσα. αὕτη τῆς γνωστικῆς ἐνεργείας ἢ τάξις· αὕτη τῆς ἀπονευμημένης ἐκάστω δυνάμεως κατὰ λόγον | φυσικῆς ἢ διαίρεσις· τὸν νοῦν μὲν, ἀνευδεῶς τοῖς πράγμασι συμφύεσθαι· καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῶς καὶ βασιλικῶς ἐπιχειρεῖν, μετ’ ἐξουσίας καὶ ὡσπερ εἰπεῖν αὐτοκρατορικῶς· τὴν δὲ διάνοιαν τὰς ἀρχὰς ἐκεῖθεν πορίζομένην, δι’ αὐτῶν ἐφάπτεσθαι τῶν ὄντων. Cf. Aristotle, *Analytica posteriora* 72b: καὶ οὐ μόνον ἐπιστήμην, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀρχὴν ἐπιστήμης εἶναι τινὰ φαμεν, ἢ τοὺς ὄρους γνωρίζομεν, and *ibid.*, 88b: λέγω γὰρ νοῦν ἀρχὴν ἐπιστήμης. For the treatment of the subject by the Byzantine commentators of Aristotle, cf. John Philoponos, *In Aristotelis libros de anima commentaria* 2.2-8 HAYDUCK: διανοίας γὰρ ἔργον τὸ οἰωνεῖ ὁδόν τινα διανοεῖν μεταβαίνουσαν ἀπὸ προτάσεων ἐπὶ συμπεράσματα, ὅθεν ἔσχε καὶ τοῦνομα ... τοῦ δὲ νοῦ ἔργον τὸ ἀπλαῖς ἐπιβολαῖς κρειττόνως ἢ κατὰ ἀπόδειξιν ἐπιβάλλειν τοῖς πράγμασιν, and *ibid.*, 3.13-4.2: εἰ δὲ ποτε ἢ διάνοια συλλογίζεται καὶ περὶ τῶν νοητῶν, ἀλλ’ οὐ καθ’ αὐτήν, ἀλλὰ τῷ νῷ συμπλακεῖσα, ὡσπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν αἰσθητῶν συλλογίζεται συμπλακεῖσα τῇ φαντασίᾳ. τούτου τοίνυν τοῦ νοῦ εἰ καὶ μὴ μετέχομεν οἱ πολλοί, ἀλλ’ οὖν ἴχνη τινὰ καὶ ἰνδάλματα διαβέβηκεν καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς· ταῦτα δὲ ἔστιν αἰ κοινὰ ἔννοια, ἃς ἀναποδείκτως, μᾶλλον δὲ κρειττόνως ἢ κατὰ ἀπόδειξιν πάντες γινώσκομεν ... αὗται οὖν, ὡς εἶπομεν, αἰ κοινὰ ἔννοια αἰ διὰ πάντων χωροῦσα ἰνδάλματα τοῦ νοῦ ἐναργῶς εἰσιν. περὶ τούτου καὶ ἐν τοῖς Ἀποδεικτικοῖς ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης πρὸς τοὺς νομίζοντας μὴ εἶναι ἐπιστήμην ἔλεγεν, ὅτι οὐ μόνον ἐπιστήμην εἶναι λέγομεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀρχὴν ἐπιστήμης, ἢ τοὺς ὄρους γινώσκομεν, ὄρους λέγων ἤτοι τὰς κοινὰς ἔννοιας καὶ τοὺς ἐν τοῖς συλλογισμοῖς ὄρους ... ἀρχὴν οὖν ἐπιστήμης φησὶ τὸν νοῦν εἶναι· δι’ αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἔχομεν τὰς κοινὰς ἔννοιας, ὅθεν ἢ διάνοια ὡς ἀπὸ ἀρχῶν τὰς ἐπιστημονικὰς ἀποδείξεις ποιεῖται, and Sophonias, *In Aristotelis libros de anima paraphrasis* 122.3-123.2 HAYDUCK: ταύτη γὰρ (sc. τῇ διανοίᾳ) τὰς τε τῶν ὄντων γνωρίζομεν κοινωνίας καὶ ἑτερότητας καὶ τὰς κρίσεις καὶ ζητήσεις ποιούμεθα καὶ τὸ ἀληθὲς ἢ μὴ θηρώμεθα· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἕτερόν ἐστι διάνοια ἢ συλλογισμός. αὕτη ἢ περὶ τῶν αἰδίων πραγματεύεται αἰτολογοῦσα, καὶ ἔστι τούτο ἐπιστήμη καὶ θεωρία ἀναγκαῖα καὶ ἀληθεῖς τὰς προτάσεις λαμβάνουσα, καὶ τὰς μὲν δεομένας ἀποδείξω, οἷον ὅτι τὸ σημεῖον ἀμερές, παρ’ ἑαυτῆς εἰς γένεσιν ἐπιστήμης εἰσφέρουσα, τὰς δὲ αὐτοπίστους, οἷον ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἀγαθὸς καὶ τὰ ὅμοια, παρὰ τοῦ νοῦ ... ἢ τε γὰρ αἰσθησις ἀχρόνως ἐπιβάλλει τοῖς αἰσθητοῖς καὶ ἀπλῶς οὐ δεῖται τοῦ διδάξοντος ἐν

stances are totally intellectual, their apprehension of the Divine Light should be immediate, like in the case of the *nous*, though, to put it more correctly, this happens actually through the Divine Illuminations.⁹⁰ At this point Metochites resorts again to Plato and the image of the reflection of the sun on the surface of water used by the philosopher in the *Republic*,⁹¹ as well as to the comparison between intelligence and vision to be found in the same work:⁹² just like vision needs the light as a medium in order to perceive the visible things, in the same vein the substance of God, which is immaterial, can only be perceived by the angelic intellect through the illuminations of His Light.⁹³

τοῖς ἰδίοις ἐκάστη, ὅτι τόδε ἐστὶ τὸ προσπεσόν, ἀλλ' ἅμα τε προσέβαλε καὶ ἅμα ἦσθητο τοῦ ἀληθοῦς, οἷον ἡ ὄψις ἀθρώως λευκῶ ὀμιλήσασα εὐθὺς ἐπέγνω αὐτὸ ἄνευ ἀπάτης ἀσυλλογίστως καὶ ἔτι οὐ πραγματεύεται. κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ οὖν καὶ ὁ νοῦς τὴν τε τῶν ὄρων ποιεῖται λήψιν καὶ τῶν κοινῶν ἐννοιῶν, οἷον ὅτι τόδε ζῶον ἢ ἄνθρωπος ἢ οὐσία καὶ τὰ τῷ αὐτῷ ἴσα καὶ ἀλλήλοις ἐστὶν ἴσα. νοῦ γὰρ εὗρεμα οἱ ὄροι καὶ αἱ ἀπλαῖ φωναὶ αἱ δέκα κατηγορίαι, ὅθεν καὶ τὰ πολλὰ ὁ νοῦς οὐ συντίθησι (διανοίας γὰρ τοῦτο καὶ δόξης), ἢ μόνον ἐν τοῖς κοινοῖς ἀξιώμασιν, and *ibid.*, 124.7-10: λαμβάνει μέντοι ἡ διάνοια, ὡς γε εἴρηται, ἀπὸ νοῦ τὰς ἀρχὰς τῶν ἐπιστημῶν· νοῦς γὰρ ἀρχὴν ἐπιστημῶν, ἢ τοὺς ὄρους γινώσκομεν. ὄροι δὲ αἱ τε κοιναὶ ἔννοιαι καὶ οἱ ἐν συλλογισμοῖς ἀπλοῖ. The relationship between *nous* and *dianoia* is also discussed by Nikephoros Choumnos in his treatise *De anima nutribile et sensibile* (CHRESTOU, Τὸ φιλοσοφικὸν ἔργο, 141.16-25): καὶ μὲν δὴ νοῦς μὲν ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὦν καὶ κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας κινούμενος κινήσεις, οὔτε κατὰ διάνοιαν οὔτε κατὰ δόξαν ἐνεργεῖ· τοῦ γὰρ πρακτικοῦ ταῦτα· καὶ ὀρθῶς ἢ οὐκ ὀρθῶς. ὁ δὲ, ἀμέσως καὶ ἀψευδῶς νοῦς, θεωρητικὸς ὦν, ἐπεὶ δέ, τρόπον ὃν ἐφημεν, εἰς μίξιν ἦκε τῶν σωματικῶν, φῶς ὦν, τὴν διάνοιαν ἀκτίνας δίκην ἐνίησι τῷ φανταζομένῳ, καὶ οὕτω σύνεστιν αὐτῷ, πρακτικὸς ἐνταῦθα νοῦς ὦν, καὶ μὴ τὸ πᾶν ὡς ἐν τῇ θεωρίᾳ κἀνταυθοῖ ἐπιλάμπων.

⁹⁰ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 43: ἐπεὶ δὲ οὕτω ταῦτα· καὶ τοσοῦτον ὁ νοῦς παρὰ τῆς φύσεως ἀξίωμα κεκλήρωται· νοεράν δὲ τὴν τῶν ἀγγέλων ἀσώματον οὐσίαν φαμέν, ἀκόλουθον ὁ λόγος εἶναι φησὶ ταῖς περὶ αὐτοῦ θεωρίαις, ἀμέσως τοὺς ἀγγέλους, τῷ θείῳ φωτὶ συνάπτει μᾶλλον δὲ τάληθες εἶρεῖν διὰ μέσων τῶν ἐκεῖθεν ἐλλάμπωσιν.

⁹¹ Cf. Plato, *Respublica* 516b.

⁹² Cf. Plato, *Respublica* 507c-508d.

⁹³ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 43rv: μᾶλλον δ' εἰ δοκεῖ καταδηλότερον διὰ τῶν ὀρωμένων ἐνταῦθα, καθόσον οἷόν τε, εἰκονιστέον, τὸ σκέμμα· ἴνα μὴ δ' οὕτως ἀποστώμεν τῆς ὕλης· ἀλλ' αὐτόθεν παραχρήμα τὴν πίστιν ἔχει (an ἔχη scribendum?) τὸ πρότερον ἢ διήρηθεν· ὡς περὶ τὰ νοητὰ σπουδὴν ἔχον ὁ νοῦς· καὶ ἀπορῶν ἐφικέσθαι τελείως· κἀντεῦθεν εἰκονικῆς ἡγεμονίας ἐπὶ τὰ ζητούμενα χειραγωγούσης δεόμενος, αὐτίκα τῶν ἀνωτάτων περὶ τὰ τῆδε πίπτων ὀράται· καὶ τοῖς ὑλικοῖς συμφυόμενος δι' αὐτῶν ἀμυδρῶς ὑποφαινότων, πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἐρευνημένων ἐνέργειαν ἀνατείνεται· ὡσπερ δὴ ποιούσιν ἀτεχνῶς, οἱ δι' ὑδάτων τὸν ἥλιον βλέποντες· ὡς ἂν, πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀντωπῆσαι, μὴ κατισχύοντες. τὸ μὲν αἰσθητικὸν ἐν ὄν πνεῦμα, ὄργανα ταῦτα δὴ πενταχῶς πρὸς διαφόρους ἐνεργείας διανενέμνται· ἐπεὶ δὲ τούτων πάντων ὄρασις ἔχει τι συγγενὲς πρὸς νόησιν, ὡς ἂν, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων ἀυλότερόν τε καὶ τιμιώτερον, φέρε τὰ κατ' αὐτὴν ὅσα πρὸς τὸν παρόντα τείνει τοῦ λόγου σκοπὸν, θεωρήσομεν. ὄρασις τοίνυν τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις αὐτῇ σχεδὸν ἀχρόνως συναπτομένη, αὐτοτελὴς ἐστὶν ἐνέργεια. οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ χρόνου διαστή-

Metochites' final argument in this section, which leads him back to the issue of the supremacy of the angelic substances, is inspired once again by the Aristotelian psychology and the theory of the distinction between a practical and a theoretical part of the intellect introduced by the philosopher in the *De anima*. According to Aristotle, we have to distinguish between the practical mind, which calculates means to an end, and the speculative mind, which differs from the practical in the character of its end;⁹⁴ this distinction is further reflected in

ματος ένδεης, κατολίγον προαγομένη κατά τούς | νόμους τούς τής κινήσεως· περί ήν ό χρόνος ούσίωται· άλλα παρ' αυτά τελεία τίς όράται τήν οικείαν ένέργειαν· και τοίς όρωμένοις άμα τώ βούλεσθαι, προσβάλλει και συμπλέκεται. ού μήν άλλα καιπερ ούτω δραστικωτάτη τίς ούσα, δείται μέσου φωτός· ό τοίς αισθητοίς πλουσίως έπιχεόμενον, ώσπερ τις αύτοίς δευτέρα φύσις είδος δημιουργεί· μάλλον δε τώ παρα τής φύσεως τήν άρχήν γεγονός, εις ένάργειαν έμφανίζον, αίσθησιν δεξιούται· και κατευθύνει και συνάπτει πρός ά βούλεται· και σπεύδει και ποθει· ού μόνον δε άλλα και πρό γε τούτου πρός τήν αυτό έαυτού μεσάζει ταίς αισθήσεσι συμπλοκήν. ού γάρ άλλου δείται τού μέσου πρός έαυτό. τώ δ' αυτό κατίδοι τίς άν, έν τοίς νοητοίς εί γε καλώς τόν νοϋν έπίσθησι. τώ γάρ αυλον τής θεότητος φώς νοητόν· μάλλον δ' άνόητόν τε και άκατάληπτον, πάσι τοίς τε νοούσι και τοίς νοουμένοις· μεσάζον και συνδέον άμφοτέρα, πρός αυτό, μάλιστα πρότερον αυγάει πάσαν όρμήν θεωρίας και γνώσεως· και φιλανθρώπως έφέλκεται. ού γάρ έστι νοϋν άλλως έν όψει τών κρειπτόνων γενέσθαι, ότι μη ταίς εκείθεν χειραγωγούμενον ακτίσιν. ό δη περί τας άγγελικας ούσις ό λόγος βούλεται· παρατοσοϋτο καθοράν τήν υπερτάτην εκείνην, και άχώρητον φύσιν και άθεώρητον, καθάπαξ, παρόσον άν, εκείθεν φωτίζονται. For the distinction between ένέργεια and κίνησις alluded here by the author, cf. Aristotle, *Metaphysica* 1048b: τούτων δη <δεί> τας μεν κινήσεις λέγειν, τας δ' ένεργείας. πάσα γάρ κίνησις άτελής, ισχνασία μάθησις βάδισις οικοδόμησις· αύται δη κινήσεις, και άτελείς γε. ού γάρ άμα βαδίζει και βεβάδικεν, ούδ' οικοδομεί και ψκοδόμηκεν, ούδε γίνγεται και γέγονεν ή κινείται και κεκίνηται, άλλ' έτερον, και κινεί και κεκίνηκεν· έώρακε δε και όρα, άμα τώ αυτό, και νοεί και νενόηκεν. τήν μεν οϋν τοιαύτην ένέργειαν λέγω, εκείνην δε κίνησιν, and for the connection between movement and time, cf. Aristotle, *Physica* 219a: ότι μεν οϋν οϋτε κίνησις οϋτ' άνευ κινήσεως ό χρόνος έστι, φανερόν· λεπτόν δε, έπει ζητοϋμεν τί έστιν ό χρόνος, έντεϋθεν άρχομένοις, τί τής κινήσεως έστιν. άμα γάρ κινήσεως αισθανόμεθα και χρόνου· και γάρ εάν ή σκότος και μηδέν δια τού σώματος πάσχωμεν, κίνησις δε τις έν τή ψυχή ένη, εϋθύς άμα δοκεί τις γεγονέναι και χρόνος. άλλα μήν και όταν γε χρόνος δοκη γεγονέναι τις, άμα και κίνησις τις δοκεί γεγονέναι. ώστε ήτοι κίνησις ή τής κινήσεως τί έστιν ό χρόνος. έπει οϋν οϋ κίνησις, ανάγκη τής κινήσεως τι είναι αυτόν. Metochites' treatment of visual perception in this passage seems to side rather with the Aristotelian doctrine on sight and the role attributed by the philosopher to the light as a medium (cf. *De anima* 418b), while in a later work, the *Semeioseis Gnomikai*, Metochites seems to endorse the Platonic theory of the emission of light through the eyes (cf. *Timaeus* 45b-46c), a theory accepted also by other early Palaiologan authors (see the discussion in BYDÉN, *Stoicheiosis* [cited n. 15], 199-210).

⁹⁴ See Aristotle, *De anima* 433a: νοϋς δε ό ένεκά του λογιζόμενος και ό πρακτικός· διαφέρει δε τού θεωρητικού τώ τέλει. Cf. cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 43v: έπει δε πάς νοϋς πρός δύο μερίζει ταϋτα τήν οικείαν ένέργειαν· πρός τε θεωρίαν τώ πρώτον· και πρός πράξιν τώ δεύτερον· ώσπερ δη και τοίς ένταϋθα σοφοίς και τεχνίταις όνομάζεται· νοϋς θεωρη-

the division of the branches of philosophy, where practical philosophy aims at action, while theoretic knowledge has the truth as its object.⁹⁵ If the theoretical part of the angelic intellect is orientated towards the knowledge of God, argues Metochites,⁹⁶ the same applies, according to the author, to the practical part of the angelic *nous*, which in its turn is not directed towards the material world like in the case of the man, but it also follows the pattern of God.⁹⁷ This posi-

τικὸς· καὶ νοὺς πρακτικὸς. For the distinction between the theoretical and the practical part of the *nous* as this is applied by Metochites' contemporary Nikephoros Choumnos in his treatise *De anima nutribile et sensibile*, see ΧΗΡΕΣΤΟΥ, Τὸ φιλοσοφικὸ ἔργον (cited n. 75), 91.3-11: καὶ ἐνεργεῖ ἐν τούτοις νοὺς ὁ πρακτικὸς κατ' ὄρεξιν καὶ βούλησιν, ὅτε μὲν ὀρθῶς, ὅτε δ' οὐκ ὀρθῶς, πλανώσης αὐτῆς γε τῆς φαντασίας, πλανώσης ἅμα καὶ μεθ' ἧς ἐστὶν αὐτῆ αἰσθήσεως ... νοὺς δ' ὁ θεωρητικὸς, οὐδὲν οὔτε κατὰ διάνοιαν οὔτε κατὰ φαντασίαν οὔτε κατ' αἴσθησιν ἐνεργεῖ, ἀλλ' ἀμέσως ἅμα δ' ἀπταιστώως καὶ ἀψευδῶς σύνεστι τοῖς νοητοῖς. See also the passage quoted above, n. 88.

⁹⁵ See Aristotle, *Metaphysica* 993b: ὀρθῶς δ' ἔχει καὶ τὸ καλεῖσθαι τὴν φιλοσοφίαν ἐπιστήμην τῆς ἀληθείας, θεωρητικῆς μὲν γὰρ τέλος ἀλήθεια, πρακτικῆς δ' ἔργον. Cf. cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 43v: τούτων γὰρ δὴ χάριν, καὶ φιλοσοφία πρὸς δύο τὴν φύσιν τέμνεται: ὡς νοῦ πάντως ἔκγονον· πράξει μὲν τέλος ἔχουσα τὸ καλὸν· θεωρία δὲ τὴν τοῦ ὄντος ἀλήθειαν, as well as the following passage from Metochites' commentary on the *De anima* (cod. Marcianus. gr. 239, f. 276v): τοῦ μὲν γὰρ πρακτικοῦ νοός, ἐστὶν ἡ εὐρέσις τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ· καὶ κακοῦ εἴτουν τοῦ διωκτοῦ· καὶ φευκτοῦ· τοῦ δὲ θεωρητικοῦ νοός, τοῦ ἀληθοῦς τὸ καὶ ψευδοῦς ἐστὶν ἡ εὐρέσις.

⁹⁶ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 44: ὅτι μὲν οὖν ἡ πρώτη καὶ τιμιωτέρα μάλιστα κατὰ φύσιν τοῖς νοεροῖς καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῖς, ἢ κατὰ θεωρίαν ἐστὶν ἐνέργεια: ὡς ἂν τῇ ἀνωτάτῳ θεωρίᾳ τοῦ ὄντος ὄντως, πᾶσαν τὴν σχολὴν ἔχουσι· καὶ τελειώτερον ἐφικνουμένοις, εὖ μάλα τῆς ἐνταῦθα σπουδῆς ἢ περὶ οἱ καθ' ἡμᾶς πάντες νόες, μέγιστα τούτοις προσισταμένου τοῦ τῆς ὕλης συνδυασμοῦ· μᾶλλον δ' ὡς ἀληθῶς εἰπεῖν ἀρρήκτου δεσμοῦ καὶ τῆς ἐντεῦθεν καθάπαξ ἐπιθέσεως καὶ τῶν ὄχλων, τίς ἀντερεῖ, τῶν καὶ μετρίως ἀγομένων νοῦ κρίσει, καὶ σώφροσι λογισμοῖς; Cf. Aristotle, *Ethica Nicomachea* 1177a: εἰ δ' ἐστὶν ἡ εὐδαιμονία κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐνέργεια, εὐλογον κατὰ τὴν κρατίστην· αὐτὴ δ' ἂν εἴη τοῦ ἀρίστου. εἴτε δὴ νοὺς τοῦτο εἴτε ἄλλο τι, ὃ δὴ κατὰ φύσιν δοκεῖ ἄρχειν καὶ ἡγεῖσθαι καὶ ἐννοίαν ἔχειν περὶ καλῶν καὶ θείων, εἴτε θεῖον ὄν καὶ αὐτὸ εἴτε τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν τὸ θεϊότατον, ἢ τούτου ἐνέργεια κατὰ τὴν οἰκείαν ἀρετὴν εἴη ἂν ἡ τελεία εὐδαιμονία. ὅτι δ' ἐστὶ θεωρητικὴ, εἴρηται. ὁμολογούμενον δὲ τοῦτ' ἂν δόξειεν εἶναι καὶ τοῖς πρότερον καὶ τῷ ἀληθεῖ. κρατίστη τε γὰρ αὐτὴ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐνέργεια (καὶ γὰρ ὁ νοὺς τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ τῶν γνωστών, περὶ ἃ ὁ νοὺς)· ἔτι δὲ συνεχεστότη· θεωρεῖν [τε] γὰρ δυνάμεθα συνεχῶς μᾶλλον ἢ πράττειν ὄτιοῦν.

⁹⁷ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 45: ὃ δὲ ὁ λόγος ἠβούλετο· τὸ τοῦ ἀγγελικοῦ νοός θεωρησάμενος βουλόμενος πρακτικόν, ὅτι τοῖς νοεροῖς ἐκείνοις πνεύμασιν, οὐκ ἔστιν ὡς περὶ ἡμῖν περὶ τὴν ὕλην ἢ περὶ τοῦτο τὸ μέρος ἐνέργεια· ἀλλ' ἔστιν ἀνωτέρα ταύτης ἅτε καὶ φύσεως ἀσυνδέτου παντάπασι, ὕλη λαχοῦσι· καὶ παρὰ τοῦτο πρακτικῆ περὶ τὸ καλὸν εὐρέσει καὶ χρήσει τῆς ἀρετῆς ὑψηλοτέρῳ χρωμένοις ἢ περὶ ἡ καθ' ἡμᾶς. ὡς ἄρα τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον, ἀλογώτατον ἂν εἴη τοῖς ἐξηρημένοις οὕτω τῆς ὕλης εἴ τις τὰς καθ' ἡμᾶς ἠθικὰς ἀρετὰς ἐνθεωρεῖ καὶ ὅλως ἀντεξετάζει αἰς ἡ πρᾶξις περὶ τὴν ὕλην οὐσίωται· ὡς περὶ ἂν, εἴ τις καὶ κάλλους αὐτοῖς, ἀρμονίας σωματικῆς καὶ ὑγείας μεταδιδοίη· μέγα τι πάντως οἰόμενος

tion is supported further with the help of the Aristotelian theory of measure and the way this influences the formation of the four cardinal virtues (justice, wisdom, courage, prudence) according to the *Nicomachean Ethics*,⁹⁸ as well as with an aphorism based on Plato's *Republic*, namely that those gifted with genius, whether they tend towards excellence or towards badness, they prove to be out of the common; consequently, the virtues of the Angels should not be regarded as equal to those of the man.⁹⁹

χαρίζεσθαι· ὁ δὴ ποιεῖν ἢ μᾶλλον τάληθές εἰπεῖν πάσχειν εἰώθασιν· οἷς ὁ νοῦς εἴθισται περὶ ταπεινὰ· λίαν εὐτελῶς, μηδὲν μέγα φρονεῖν· μὴ δ' ὑπερβαίνειν· τῶν περὶ αὐτοὺς καὶ τῶν ὑπὲρ αὐτοὺς, τῆς μεγαλοφυΐας στοχάζεσθαι, and f. 46: ἡμῖν δὲ ἄλλη πη θεωρητέον τὸ σπουδαζόμενον. ἔστι μὲν οὖν τοῖς οὔσι τοῦ τε εἶναι· καὶ τοῦ εὔ εἶναι, πᾶσιν ἢ θεία φύσις ποιητικὴ τις ἀρχὴ· οὐ μὴν ἄλλ' ἐκ περιουσίας, τοῖς νῶ τε καὶ λόγῳ κεκοσμημένοις, καὶ τὴν παραδειγματικὴν αἰτίαν χαρίζεται καὶ προσεπιτίθησιν. οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἄλλως τοῖς κατὰ νοῦν κινουμένοις, ἢ κατ' αὐτὸν τελειότης τοῦ εὔ εἶναι, ὅτι μὴ πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἀγαθῶν πάντων ἀρχὴν, τὴν ἀνωτάτῳ καὶ θείαν οὐσίαν, τὸ πρακτικὸν κατορθοῦν πειρωμένοις· καὶ καθόσον οἷόν τε τῆς ὁμοιότητος ἔχομενοις· συνταπεινουμένης κἀκείνης καὶ καταβαινουσῆς, ἀμωσγέπως· καὶ τοῖς πολλοῖς χωρεῖσθαι, κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς φύσεως οὐκ ἀπαξιούσης· καὶ τοῖς ἐπιεικέσι μετριάζουσης, περὶ τὴν δυνατὴν ἰσομοίωσιν.

⁹⁸ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, ff. 44v-45: καθ' ὃ δὴ καὶ νοῦν πρακτικὸν, ὁ μὲν δημιουργικὸς καὶ πρῶτος νοῦς ἡμῖν δωρεῖται· ἡ φιλοσοφία δὲ ζυνεῖδε τὸ καὶ διείλετο. ἡμῖν μὲν οὖν ἡ τοῦ νοῦς ἐνέργεια· περὶ τὸ πράττειν ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, ὅλη τῆς ὕλης ἐξήπται· ὡς ἂν, περὶ αὐτὴν αἰετρίβουσα· καὶ κρίσιν τινὰ καὶ λογισμοὺς ποιουμένη, πρὸς τινὰ κοινὸν ὄρον ὑποτεθέντα· διὰ πάντων, τοῦ μετρίου τοῖς περὶ τὴν ὕλην, πάθεσί τε καὶ πράξεσιν. οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἄλλῃ ποιητικὴν τῶ νῶ, περὶ τοῦτο τὸ μέρος γιγνομένη, ὅτι μὴ τοῖς εἰρημένους τὴν χρῆσιν ὀριζόμενον καὶ μετροῦντα, καθότι τὸ καλῶς ἔχει, καὶ καθότι μὴ· καὶ πράξει μὲν νομοθετοῦντα καθάπερ εἴρηται πρὸς τοὺς κανόνας καὶ τὰς ὑποθέσεις τὰς τῆς μεσότητος· ἐξ ὧν ἡμῖν δικαιοσύνη καὶ φρόνησις· καὶ ὅσαι μερικῶς ὑπ' αὐτὰς τέμνονται· τῶ δὲ περὶ τὴν ὕλην ἢ παρὰ τῆς ὕλης παθητικῆς τῆς ψυχῆς, μὴ συγχωροῦντα παρὰ τὸ εὔ· ἀλλὰ χρώμενον ἢ καλῶς αὐτὸς ἐπιστατεῖ καὶ νομίζει· καὶ συμβαίνει τοῖς αὐτοῦ λογισμοῖς καὶ μέτροις· ἢ πείθοντα, ἢ καὶ ἴσως βιάζομενον· ἢ δὴ καὶ ἀνδρία καὶ σωφροσύνη· καὶ ὅσαι πάλιν ὑπ' αὐτὰς ταξιαρχοῦνται καὶ κατακοσμοῦνται τὸ μέρος, καὶ συνελόντ' εἰπεῖν ὁ νοῦς ὡς ἄρα τι κάλλιστον εἶδος ὕλη χρώμενον, σὺν λόγῳ καὶ μέτροις τοῖς ὑλοκοῖς αὐτοῖς, | ἐπιφύεται τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον, καὶ οὐσίωται περὶ τὸ πράττειν. Cf. Aristotle, *Ethica Nicomachea* 1106a-1109a, 1115a-1119b, 1129a-1138b, 1140a-1145a.

⁹⁹ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 45v: καὶ ποῦ τις ἔφη κάλλιστα τῶν ἕξω σοφῶν εἰς ταῦτ' ἀπιδῶν, ὡς αἱ μεγάλα φύσεις ὅπῃ ἂν, νεύσωσιν· εἴτ' εἰς ἀρετὴν· εἴτ' εἰς κακίαν, καθ' ἑκάτερον περὶ τὰ δέικνυνται· καὶ ῥοπήν βάρους ἔχουσι· καὶ τοσοῦτο νικῶσαι, τοὺς ἥττονος λαχόντας τῆς φύσεως, καθόσον ἂν, καὶ μεγαλοφυΐας ἔχουσι· καὶ τὴν ἀξίαν τῆς φύσεως ὑπεραίρωσι. μαρτυρεῖ τῶ λόγῳ πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις πολλοῖς, τὸ περὶ τὰς ἀγγελικὰς οὐσίας αὐτὰς, πάλαι πρότερον τὴν ἀρχὴν, ὡς αἱ μὲν ἄρα βεβαίως στᾶσαι, περὶ τὴν τοῦ καλοῦ μονὴν· καὶ μηδαμῶς ἐκκλίναςαι, μεγάλην τινὰ παρ' αὐταῖς τὴν ἀγαθοουργίαν, καὶ θαυμαστὴν παρέχονται καθορᾶν· αἱ δὲ τῆς θείας αὐτῆς ἐκτραπόμεναι καὶ πρὸς τὸνναντίον νεύσασαι, τὰς ἀποστατικὰς φημί δυνάμεις, τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον περὶ τὰ φαῦλα, τὴν μεγαλοουργίαν παρέχονται θαυμάζειν· καὶ εἰσὶν ἀμφοτέροι τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ἀρετῆς, καὶ κακίας ἐπίσης κατὰ τὴν οἰκείαν ἐνέργειαν ὑπερβαίνουσαι. διὰ ταῦτα τοίνυν τό γ' ἐμοὶ δοκοῦν ἔστι,

The division of the branches of philosophy touched upon by Metochites in this section of the *Logos* will be thoroughly discussed by the author in his later work *Stoicheiosis Astronomike*:¹⁰⁰ ἀλλ' ὡς εἴρηται, φιλοσοφία τῆς ἡμετέρας φύσεως τὸ κράτος καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν ἢ κατὰ τὰλλα γυμνάσασα τελεσιουργεῖ, κακ ταύτης ἔχομεν ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς κατὰ φύσιν χρῆσθαι, καὶ τοῦτό γε μὴν πάντως διπλῆ· ἅ τε ξὺν λόγῳ ποιητέον ἐστί, καὶ ἅ ξὺν λόγῳ θεωρητέον. ἔχει γὰρ κατ' ἀμφοτέρα καὶ δύναται τὴν τοῦ ἀληθοῦς διὰ φιλοσοφίας ἢ φύσις ἡμῶν εὔρεσιν. τοιγαροῦν εἰς δύο διαιροῦμεν τὴν τῆς φιλοσοφίας χρῆσιν, εἰς εὔρεσιν τε καὶ ἐπιμέλειαν τοῦ πρακτοῦ, καθ' ἣν τὸ ποιητέον καὶ κατὰ φύσιν καλὸν καταλαμβάνεται καὶ νομοθετεῖται τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ ἐργασία, καὶ εἰς θεωρίαν τῶν ὄντων ἀπάντων.¹⁰¹ As we have seen, this is not the only case where the *Logos* mirrors Metochites' later philosophical preoccupations; this applies especially to the notion of *theoria* that appears already in the *Logos* and which will be central to the author's "Weltanschauung" in writings such as the *Ethikos* and the *Gnomikai Semeioseis*, although, as I. Polemis has observed, the term is used in our text with reference to the supernatural substances and not to the study of the rules of the universe.¹⁰² In the same context Metochites speaks in several instances in the *Logos* about the relationship of the *nous* to the lower cognitive powers of the soul, *phantasia* and *aisthesis*, that hold him quasi-bound with chains to the material world, and the way he acts like an emperor upon them; similar thoughts are repeated about 30 years later in some of the essays of the *Gnomikai Semeioseis*:¹⁰³

Logos on the Archangel Michael*Gnomikai Semeioseis*

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) τοῦ λοιποῦ δὲ τῷ ζωτικῷ προχωρεῖ· καὶ προσέτι λαμβάνει τὴν αἴσθησιν ἢ φαντασία πάντως σύνεστιν ἀχώριστος· ἀναγκαῖον σύζυγον· καὶ φύσις ἄτμητος· καὶ πρῶτον εἰς νοῦν ὄχημα. ¹⁰⁴ | ἐπὶ τὴν θεωρίαν οὐκ ἄλλως ὀρμώμεθα, ὅτι μὴ φαντασία συγχρώμενοι, φαντασίας δ' αἴσθησις ὄχημα. ¹⁰⁵ |
|--|--|

τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἀρετὴν καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἡμετέρου πρακτικοῦ νοῦς, περὶ ταύτην ἐνέργειαν, μὴ προσάγειν ἀλόγως τῇ ἀγγελικῇ μεγαλοφυΐᾳ· καὶ πρὸς ἐκείνην ὡς ἄν, πρὸς κοινὸν τινὰ γνώμονα τῶν ἀγγέλων ἐπιζητεῖν, τὴν ἐνταῦθ' ἔξιν. Cf. Plato, *Republica* 491b-e.

¹⁰⁰ This work was finished in c. 1316/17; see BYDÉN, *Stoicheiosis* (cited n. 15), 35.

¹⁰¹ *Stoicheiosis* I 2, 4, ed. BYDÉN.

¹⁰² Cf. POLEMIS, *Ἠθικός* (cited n. 15), 48*-49* and n. 101.

¹⁰³ For the dating of this work, see BYDÉN, *Stoicheiosis* (cited n. 15), 36 (they were published sometime between May 1326 and May 1328).

¹⁰⁴ For the dating of this work, see BYDÉN, *Stoicheiosis* (cited n. 15), 36 (they were published sometime between May 1326 and May 1328).

¹⁰⁵ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 39v.

- 2) ἐπεὶ ποθεῖ μὲν ὁ λογισμὸς, ἀκραϊφινῶς ἐντυχεῖν τοῖς ἄνω· διὰ τὸ φύσιν εἶναι τοῦ μείζονος τὸ ἦττον ἐφίεσθαι· ἢ τὸ αὐτὸ γενέσθαι· ἢ αὐτῶ συγγενέσθαι τὸ δεύτερον· καὶ ἀμέσως ἐντρυφῆσαι τῇ θεωρίᾳ· καὶ κατιδεῖν ἅπασαν ἥπερ ἔχει τὴν τῶν ὄντων οὐσίαν· οὐκ ἐφικνεῖται δὲ καθελκόμενος τῷ σωματικῷ πάχει· καὶ τῆς ὕλης μὴ δυνάμενος ἀποστήναι καθάπαξ· καὶ τῶ τῶν αἰσθήσεων ὄχλω, πέδαις ἀρρήκτοις δεσμούμενος· οἷς καὶ φύσις καὶ χρόνος τοῦτον ἐθίζει· καὶ ὧν ἀποδράναι παντάπασιν οὐκ ἔστι.¹⁰⁶
- 3) εἰ γὰρ τις ἑαυτὸν, πρὸς τὴν τῶν ὑψηλοτέρων ἀνατείνειε νόησιν, ὅπως ἔχει κατασκοπούμενος, οὐκ ἐλεύθερος τῷ νῶ μόνον καὶ κούφως ἄνω χωρεῖ, ἀλλ' αἰσθησίν τε καὶ φαντασίαν ἀχωρίστους ἔλκων καὶ συνεπαγόμενος· φεῦ τῶν δεσμῶν· φεῦ τῆς ὕλικῆς ἐπιθέσεως.¹⁰⁸
- 4) αὕτη τῆς γνωστικῆς ἐνεργείας ἡ τάξις· αὕτη τῆς ἀπονενεμημένης ἐκάστω δυνάμεως κατὰ λόγον | φυσικῆς ἢ διαίρεσις· τὸν νοῦν μὲν, ἀνενδεδῶς τοῖς πράγμασι συμφύεσθαι· καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῶς καὶ βασιλικῶς ἐπιχειρεῖν, μετ' ἐξουσίας καὶ ὡσπερ εἰπεῖν αὐτοκρατορικῶς.¹¹⁰
- ἐνοχλεῖ γὰρ ἐκάστοτε διὰ τὴν ἄτμητον κοινωνίαν, καὶ τοὺς ἀρρήκτους ὑπὸ παντὸς τρόπου καὶ ἀφύκτους δεσμοὺς, καὶ οὐς οὐκ ἔστιν ὄλως ὑπεραναβῆναι καὶ ἀποθέσθαι καὶ παρελθεῖν· καὶ τὸ τῆς σαρκὸς τόδ' ἐπιτείχισμα μάλιστα ἐπέχει τὴν τοῦ νοῦ καὶ τῆς ἐποπτείας πρόοδον.¹⁰⁷
- καὶ ταῦτα δὴ πάνθ', ὡς εἴρηται καὶ ὁ λόγος προύθετο, τῆς σωματικῆς καὶ ὕλικῆς ἐπιθέσεως ἐν τῇ μετὰ τῆς ψυχῆς συζυγίᾳ κατ' αὐτῆς δὴ τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τῶν αὐτῆς ἐνεργημάτων, καὶ ὁ τῆς σαρκὸς ὄχλος καὶ ὁ μέγας καὶ δυσδιεξιίτητος αὐτῆς ἐπιτειχισμὸς χωρεῖν κατὰ φύσιν ἐπιβαλλούσης καὶ τῶν νοερῶν ἐργασιῶν ἄπτεσθαι.¹⁰⁹
- ὁ δὲ (sc. νοῦς) μανθάνων αὐτῶν περὶ ἐκάστων ἐτάζει, καὶ κατασκεπτόμενος οἷός τέ ἐστι χρῆσθαι καὶ ἀποφαίνεσθαι, ἢ δοκεῖ βέλτιον, συλλογιζόμενος αὐτὸς τῶν δεδομένων προτάσεων καὶ τῆς ὕλης, καὶ περαίνων αὐτοκρατορικῶς κατ' ἐξουσίαν ἀνεύθυνον μὲν, ἀσφαλῆ δὲ ἐπὶ τε τῇ θεωρίᾳ τῶν ὄντων καὶ τοῖς πρακτέοις.¹¹¹

Finally, it is interesting to note that Metochites' predilection for certain authors can also be detected already in the *Logos*. This is, e.g., the case with Philo of Alexandria. Metochites derives from Philo twice: the first instance, to be found in the second part of the text, has been pointed out by I. Polemis and concerns the

¹⁰⁶ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 41.

¹⁰⁷ See *Gnomikai Semeioseis* 31, ed. MÜLLER – KIESSLING, 210.2-8.

¹⁰⁸ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 41.

¹⁰⁹ See *Gnomikai Semeioseis* 41, ed. MÜLLER – KIESSLING, 296.11-18; see also POLEMIS, Ἠθικός (cited n. 15), 96*-97*.

¹¹⁰ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, ff. 42v-43.

¹¹¹ See *Gnomikai Semeioseis* 89, ed. MÜLLER – KIESSLING, 577.12-18.

comparison of the world with a well-ordained city.¹¹² In the second case Philo seems to be the direct source of our author for the idea that *nous* can be described as “the soul of the soul” and functions somehow like the pupil in the eye:

Philo of Alexandria

ἐπὶ δὲ πᾶσιν, ὡς ἐλέχθη, τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ὃν νοῦν ἐξαίρετον ἐδωρεῖτο, ψυχῆς τινα ψυχὴν καθάπερ κόρην ἐν ὀφθαλμῷ.¹¹³

Metochites

εἰ γὰρ ἐστὶ νοῦς ψυχῆ κόσμος· ὥσπερ ψυχὴ σώματι ψυχῆς οἶονεὶ ψυχῆ· ὅνπερ οἶμαι τρόπον ὀφθαλμῷ κόρη λόγον ἔχουσα τὸν αὐτὸν ὄν ὀφθαλμὸς ὅλος αὐτῷ σώματι.¹¹⁴

Summarizing the results of the above analysis, there is one last point to make: Metochites’ theological views as presented in the *Logos* do not differ from those of a “mainstream” Byzantine theologian; and yet, in dealing with theological issues, he turns to Ancient Greek philosophy – which is, of course, already present in the writings of the Church Fathers – and gives the impression that philosophy rather than theology is what actually matters for him, although he ends up to repeat basic positions of Byzantine orthodoxy. As I. Polemis has put it, “Metochites, like other intellectuals of his time (e.g. Joseph the Philosopher, George Pachymeres, Nikephoros Gregoras) enjoys mixing Christian views with arguments taken from Ancient Greek philosophical thought, and he doesn’t always bother if he eventually deviates from dogmatic orthodoxy”.¹¹⁵ This is also the case with the *Logos* on the Archangel Michael: although the subject is the nature of the incorporeal beings and although the author analyses basic principles of Byzantine angelology, the reader has the impression that he has heard more about Plato and Aristotle rather than “pure” theology. This is probably the way the intellectuals of the Palaiologan period understood “Christian Humanism”.

University of Ioannina

¹¹² See POLEMIS, Βασιλικοί λόγοι (cited n. 9), 375 n. 257.

¹¹³ See Philo of Alexandria, *De opificio mundi* 66.7-9 (ed. L. COHN, *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*. I. Berlin 19622).

¹¹⁴ See cod. Vind. Phil. gr. 95, f. 39v.

¹¹⁵ See POLEMIS, Poem 10 (cited n. 73), 77; for similar observations resulting from the analysis of the *Ethikos*, see POLEMIS, Ἠθικός (cited n. 15), 98-99 and n. 208.

ABSTRACT

The article deals with one of the hitherto unedited hagiographical works of Theodore Metochites, the *Logos* on the Archangel Michael. Emphasis is put on the investigation of the text's sources and especially on the use of arguments based on ancient Greek philosophy, which bring the *Logos* very close to Metochites' philosophical treatises. In this vein the *Logos* also reflects the intellectual trends and preoccupations of the early Palaiologan period.