

PHILIPPOS MONOTROPOS' *DIOPTRA* AND ITS SOCIAL MILIEU:
NIKETAS STETHATOS, NIKOLAOS III GRAMMATIKOS
AND THE PERSECUTION OF BOGOMILISM

EIRINI AFENTOULIDOU-LEITGEB

I. Introductory remarks

The *Dioptra*¹ consists of over 7000 political verses and several prose-insertions divided into five books (λόγοι): the *Klauthmoi*, a poem of contrition; and four books of dialogue between the Soul (ψυχή) and the Body (σάρξ), who are personified as Mistress and Maid respectively. The dialogue part is a didactic poem, in which the Mistress poses her Maid questions on various theological and anthropological issues. The five books are accompanied by prefaces written by Philippos and his circle, an epilogue in verse written by the author, and annexes. The *Dioptra*

This article was written in the framework of the project “*Dioptra*. Edition der griechischen Version/ *Dioptra*. Edition of the Greek Version”, which is financed by the Austrian Science Fund (ASF) (Einzelprojekte P21811). I wish to express my thanks to the supervisor of this project, Prof. Dr. W. Hörandner, as well as Prof. Dr. J. Koder for their valuable suggestions. I also thank Dr. Oren Margolis for polishing the English text.

¹ A non-critical edition was provided by SPYRIDON LAVRIOTES (Ὁ Ἄθως 1.1). Athens 1920. This edition was republished by J. FUCHSBAUER in G. M. PROCHOROV – A. B. BIL'DJUG – H. MIKLAS, “Диоптра” Филиппа Монотропа. Антропологическая энциклопедия православного средневековья (Dioptra Filippa Monotropa. Antropologičeskaja enciklopedija pravoslavnogo srednevekov'ja). Moskow 2008. The *Klauthmoi* were edited by E. AUVRAY, *Les Pleurs de Philippe, poème en vers politiques de Philippe le Solitaire*. Paris 1875. A modern critical edition is being prepared in the framework of the above mentioned project. For further bibliography s. L. HOFFMANN, *Wie sieht wohl die Hölle aus? Bemerkungen zum Charakter byzantinischer Dialog- und Zitationstechnik am Beispiel der Dioptra des Philippos Monotropos*, in: W. HÖRANDNER – J. KODER – M. A. STASSINOPOULOU (ed.), *Wiener Byzantinistik und Neogräzistik. Beiträge zum Symposium „Vierzig Jahre Institut für Byzantinistik und Neogräzistik der Universität Wien im Gedenken an Herbert Hunger“* (Wien, 4.-7. Dezember 2002) (*Byzantina et Neograeca Vindobonensia* 24). Wien 2004, 203-219 and E. AFENTOULIDOU-LEITGEB, *Eine Dioptra-Adaptierung aus dem Kreis Michaels Kantakuzenos*, in: A. RHOBY – E. SCHIFFER (ed.), *Imitatio – Aemulatio – Variatio. Akten des internationalen wissenschaftlichen Symposions zur byzantinischen Sprache und Literatur* (Wien, 22.-25. Oktober 2008) (*Veröffentlichungen zur Byzanzforschung XXI*). Wien 2010, 45-56.

was written in 1095 and revised two years later (redactions Y and X resp.).² It is written in a low-register Byzantine Koine, which, though simple, does not lack literary ambitions.³ The manuscript tradition and the translations or paraphrases testify to the enormous popularity of the text. The *Dioptra* is preserved as a whole or in fragments in 80 manuscripts, the earliest of which date from the end of the 12th / beginning of the 13th century.⁴ During the first half of the 14th century some of the annexes in prose were translated into Slavonic in a hesychast milieu; another Slavonic translation of the whole poem in prose was made independently before the middle of the same century. This translation is transmitted in ca. 200 manuscripts.⁵ Also from the 14th century dates the first Greek paraphrase of the *Dioptra*, made by Theodoros Phialites⁶ in political verses and in a more classicizing language register. From the circle of Michael Kantakuzenos, possibly by Ioannes Malaxos, originates a vernacular rendering in political disticha.⁷ In the year 1639 another adaptation of the *Dioptra*, also in political disticha, was made by Georgios Rhetor.⁸ Two further vernacular texts used extensive passages from the *Dioptra*:

² The first to notice that the *Dioptra*-manuscripts are divided in two “families”, X and Y, was E. AUVRAY in his edition of the *Klauthmoi* (cited n. 1). AUVRAY considered X to be closer to the original. On the other hand, V. GRUMEL (Remarques sur la *Dioptra* de Philippe le Solitaire. *BZ* 44 [1951] 198-211) noticed that in some manuscripts the *Klauthmoi* are the first and in other manuscripts the fifth book; moreover, he noticed that some manuscripts transmit the year 1095 and other manuscripts the year 1097. GRUMEL came to the conclusion that the *Klauthmoi* and the “Dialexis” were originally two separate works, written 1095 and 1097 respectively. A closer study of all known manuscripts makes clear that manuscripts transmitting the year 1095 have the *Klauthmoi* as the first book and are to be classified to the “family” – rather redaction – Y, whereas all manuscripts transmitting the year 1097 bear the *Klauthmoi* as the fifth book and belong to the redaction X. The originality of the redaction Y is supported by textual criticism. A description and classification of the *Dioptra*-manuscripts exceeds the scope of the present article, but will form part of my forthcoming edition of the *Dioptra*.

³ Ei. AFENTOULIDOU-LEITGEB, Language and style of the *Dioptra*. *BSI* 70 (2012) 113-130.

⁴ Vindobonensis theologicus gr. 193 (ca. a. 1200), Sinaiticus gr. 490/ Petropolitanus RNB (olim GPB) gr. 88 (12th-13th c.), Parisinus gr. 2874 (end of 12th c.).

⁵ Cf. H. MIKLAS, Die *Dioptra* des Philippos Monotropos im Slavischen. Allgemeine Untersuchung und Text des ersten Buches (unpublished PhD thesis). Graz 1975, XIX-XXXI; for an outline of the current state of research with further bibliography see J. FUCHSBAUER, Die Übertragung der *Dioptra* ins Slavische. Ein Beispiel mittelkirchenslavischer Übersetzungstechnik (dargestellt anhand des vierten Buches des Werkes) (PhD thesis). Wien 2010, 261-271 and 295-305 (<http://othes.univie.ac.at/9921/>). A critical edition of the Slavonic *Dioptra* is being prepared by J. Fuchsbauer in course of the ASF-project “Die slavische *Dioptra*-Übersetzung” (P21250; supervisor: H. Miklas).

⁶ PLP 29715.

⁷ Ei. AFENTOULIDOU-LEITGEB, *Dioptra*-Adaptierung (cited n. 1).

⁸ W. HÖRANDNER, Notizen zu Philippos Monotropos. *Byzantina* 13 (1985) 817-831, here

an anonymous partial paraphrase of the New Testament (15th c.)⁹ and the dialogue between the Poet and Verity by Leonardos Dellaportas (17th c.).¹⁰ The *Dioptra* was also translated into Latin by J. Pontanus in 1604, and into Romanian.¹¹

II. Philippos Monotropos

Philippos belongs to the Byzantine authors who are known only from the sparse textual and paratextual evidence provided in their own work. He was a monk, as is stated in numerous instances and in various ways – μονότροπος, which has become his standard epithet in modern bibliography, not being one of them.¹² He wrote his only hitherto known work, the *Dioptra*, at an advanced age: τί ὡς ἀρχὰς ἔχων τοῦ ζῆν ῥαθύμως βιοτεύεις;/ ὁ θερισμὸς παρέστηκε· λευκὴ ἐστὶν ἡ χώρα· αἱ τρίχες μου τὸ τέλος σε διδασκέτωσαν ἄρτι,/ ὅτι λευκαὶ γεγένηται πρὸς δρέπανον θανάτου· [...] δι' ἣν αἰτίαν τοῖς κακοῖς ἐπὶ γήρους ἐμμένεις;¹³ The composition of the *Dioptra* was a response to a request by his spiritual father, the otherwise unknown Kallinikos Charsenites,¹⁴ who at the time of the composition lived in the mountains τῶν Σμολένων.¹⁵ Philippos apparently did not live there:

819-821.

⁹ G. ΜΑΥΡΟΜΑΤΙΣ, Ἐμμετρὴ παράφραση τῆς Καινῆς Διαθήκης του δέκατου πέμπτου αἰώνα, in: *Prosa y verso en griego medieval. Rapports of the international congress "Neograeca Medii Aevi III"* Vitoria 1994. Amsterdam 1996, 243-258.

¹⁰ Μ. Ι. ΜΑΝΟΥΣΑΚΑΣ, Λεονάρδου Ντελλαπόρτα Ποιήματα (1403/1411). Ἐκδοσὴ κριτικὴ, εἰσαγωγὴ, σχόλια καὶ εὐρετήρια. Athens 1995, 205-328 (Text) and 62-65 (Citations from the *Dioptra*).

¹¹ J. PONTANUS, *Philippi Solitarii Dioptra*, Ingolstadt 1604 (PG 127, 701-878). The date of the Romanian translation is unknown; the only hitherto known manuscript, Codex Petropol. BAN, sobr. Syrku 60/13.5.20, was written in the 19th c.

¹² The epithet appears in the preface titled Πρόγραμμα εἰς τὴν παροῦσαν βίβλον τὴν λεγομένην Διόπτραν in the codex Athonensis, Ἱερὰ Μονὴ Βατοπεδίου 165, which is very close to the model of the archaic paraphrase by Theodoros Phialites; Phialites used the term μονότροπος often. This paraphrase was the model for the Latin translation by J. PONTANUS (cited n. 11), who translated μονότροπος as *solitarius*. As the translation was included in the PG, it was for a long time the only version of the *Dioptra* easily accessible to scholars. Thus, the author of the *Dioptra* is known in modern scholarship as Philippos Monotropos / Solitarius.

¹³ The Roman numerals refer to the books of the *Dioptra*, the Arabic to the verse. I use the book counting of the first redaction of the *Dioptra*, in which the *Klauthmoi* appear as the first book. II 1172-1175 and 1091.

¹⁴ Kallinikos is mentioned in Philippos' *Letter to Kallinikos* (ed. ΣΥΡΙΔΟΝ ΛΑΥΡΙΟΤΕΣ, cited n. 1, p. 12), which functions as a preface to the *Dioptra*, and in the Epilogue, v. 8-9.

¹⁵ Epilogue, v. 9. The region or *thema* Σμολένων is the south-western part of the Rhodope Mountains. See P. SOUSTAL, Thrakien (Thrakē, Rhodopē und Haimimontos) (TIB, 6). Wien 1991, 451.

τὰς ψυχὰς οὐδ' ἐν ἀκαριαίῳ διαζεύγνυμεν, κἄν τὰ σώματα.¹⁶ The also otherwise unknown Konstantinos Vestes Granatos composed an epigram that accompanied the *Dioptra* and he therefore must have known Philippos personally.¹⁷ The title βέστης indicates that Konstantinos was a lower dignitary. The attribution of the preface titled Πρόγραμμα εἰς τὴν παρούσαν βίβλον τὴν λεγομένην Διόπτραν to Michael Psellos, introduced in one manuscript family and perpetuated in both hitherto extant editions of the *Dioptra*, is apparently wrong.¹⁸ Though not an outstanding scholar, Philippos had a remarkable education: he had a wide, if not profound, theological knowledge and a fascination with physiology, grammar, arithmetic and astronomy, at least at an elementary level.¹⁹

Nothing is said explicitly on Philippos' geographical and social milieu. However, a closer study of the *Dioptra* and contemporary texts allows some conclusions.

1. *Excursus on Bogomilism*

The *Dioptra's* focus is not on dogmatic, but rather on moral and anthropological questions. However, there is an excursus on a dualist faith, whose followers Philippos apostrophizes in a polemic tone unusual for the *Dioptra*.²⁰ This must be Bogomilism,²¹ a heresy which had appeared in Macedonia in the first half of the 10th century and reached Constantinople at about the middle of the 11th cen-

¹⁶ “We do not separate our souls, not even for a moment, even if we separate our bodies”, Kallinikos' *Letter to Philippos* (ed. SPYRIDON LAVRIOTES, cited n. 1, p. 11).

¹⁷ The epigram consists of 21 dodecasyllables, which mostly follow some basic Byzantine prosodic rules. It is transmitted as an epilogue in the Y redaction (inc.: Ὁ τήνδ' ἀναγνοὺς εὐπροσέκτως τὴν βίβλον) and as a preface in the X redaction (inc.: Ὁ τήνδε θέλων ἀναγῶναι τὴν βίβλον).

¹⁸ The manuscripts are Parisinus gr. 2874 (12th c., end), Oxoniensis Bodleianus Clark. 1 (13th c., end) and Athonensis, Ἱερὰ Μονὴ Μεγίστης Λαύρας Ω 17 (14th c.; served as basis for the edition of SPYRIDON LAVRIOTES); these codices are very close to the codex that Theodoros Phialites used for his paraphrase, which in turn served as basis for the Latin translation adopted in the *PG* (cited n. 11). The Πρόγραμμα to the *Dioptra* borrows several passages from the preface to the *Chronicle* of Georgios Monachos, a fact which alone would suffice to question the attribution to Michael Psellos. See A. KARPOZIOLOS, *When Did Michael Psellus Die? The Evidence of the Dioptra*. *BZ* 96 (2003) 671-677.

¹⁹ See E. AFENTOULIDOU-LEITGEB, *The Dioptra of Philippos Monotropos: Didactic Verses or Poetry?*, in: F. BERNARD – K. DEMOEN (ed.), *Poetry and its Contexts in Eleventh-century Byzantium*. Farnham – Burlington 2012, 181-191.

²⁰ Book V 974-1048.

²¹ On the Bogomils see D. OBOLENSKY, *The Bogomils: A Study in Balkan Neo-Manichaeism*. Cambridge 1948 (Middlesex 1972); also D. ANGELOV, *Bogomilstvoto v Bǎlgarija*. Sofia 1969 (ital. translation, V. SPASOVA: *Il Bogomilismo. Un'eresia medievale Bulgara*. Roma 1979).

tury. Unlike the Paulicians,²² the Bogomils were not militarily active, but, as they had penetrated many parts of the Byzantine society, they were seen as a danger for church and state. The emperor Alexios I Komnenos took a personal interest in combating Bogomilism in Constantinople, either by theological debates or through violent measures. A central character in these events was Basil, the head of the Bogomils in Constantinople. Basil was arrested after one of his disciples betrayed him under torture. Alexios feigned interest in Basil's faith and managed to extract from him an exposition of the Bogomil doctrines, which a secretary secretly wrote down. After failing to convert him, Alexios I, the Patriarch Nikolaos III (1084-1111)²³ and the Synod decided that he should be publicly burned. Other Bogomils either converted or were put to jail. Moreover, Alexios commissioned Euthymios Zigabenos (or Zygadenos) to write an exposition and refutation of all known heresies. The text bears the title Πανοπλία δογματική.²⁴ Of the heresies refuted by Zigabenos, Anna Komnene mentions explicitly Bogomilism; according to her, he describes the heresy just as Basil had exposed it.²⁵ This means in all likelihood that Zigabenos had the minutes of Basil's exposition at his disposal. Alexios' engagement against Bogomilism must have begun at around the time of the composition of the *Dioptra* or earlier, and continued for many years; the exact dates are unknown.²⁶

²² See Ch. ASTRUC et al., *Les sources grecques pour l'histoire des Pauliciens d'Asie Mineure. Texte critique et traduction. TM 4 (1970) 1-226* and P. LEMERLE, *L'histoire des Pauliciens d'Asie Mineure d'après les sources grecques. TM 5 (1973) 1-144*. See also N. G. GARSOÏAN, *The Paulician Heresy. A Study of the Origin and Development of Paulicianism in Armenia and the Eastern Provinces of the Byzantine Empire*. The Hague – Paris 1967.

²³ On Nikolaos III Grammatikos see J. DARROUZÈS, *L'éloge de Nicolas III par Nicolas Moutzalon. RÉB 46 (1988) 5-53*. Also see below (2. The *Poem on Fast Days* by Nikolaos III Grammatikos and the *Dioptra*).

²⁴ *Panoplia Dogmatike*, PG 130, 9-1362. See also A. N. ΠΑΠΑΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΟΥ, *Εὐθύμιος – Ἰωάννης Ζυγαδηνός. Βίος – Συγγραφαί*. Nicosia ²1979, 59-130.

²⁵ D. R. REINSCH – A. KAMBYLIS (ed.), *Annae Comnenae Alexias (CFHB, XL/1)*. Berlin – New York 2001, XV 8-10 (p. 485.35-493.90). On Zigabenos' dependency on Basil's account see Alexias XV 9 (p. 489.56-63): τοῦτον (sc. μοναχὸν τινὰ Ζυγαδηνόν) ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ μεταπεψάμενος ἐπέταξεν ἀπάσας τὰς αἱρέσεις ἐκθέσθαι [...] καὶ αὐτῶν δὴ τῶν Βογομίλων τὴν αἴρεσιν, καθὼς ὁ ἀσεβὴς ἐκεῖνος Βασίλειος ὑφηγήσατο.

²⁶ Alexios pretended that also his brother Isaakios was interested in the Bogomil faith; Isaakios died between 1102 and 1104 (D. ΠΑΠΑΧΡΥΣΣΑΝΘΟΥ, *La date de la mort du Sébastocrator Isaac Comnène, frère d'Alexis 1er, et de quelques événements contemporains, RÉB 21 [1963] 250-255*). Basil's execution took place under the Patriarch Nikolaos III (terminus ante quem 1111). On the chronology concerning Basil s. also B. ΣΚΟΥΛΑΤΟΣ, *Les personnages byzantins de l'Alexiade: analyse prosopographique et synthèse (Recueil de travaux d'histoire et de philologie 6^e série, fasc. 20)*. Louvain 1980, Nr. 25 (p. 39-42).

Philippos does not name the dualist heretics, but alludes to their self-identification as Christians, of course in order to refute it.²⁷ It is, however, apparent that he refers to the Bogomils, since his brief presentation of the dualist movement bears similarities to the accounts on Bogomilism by 11th/12th-century Constantinopolitan authors. Philippos' excursus on Bogomilism testifies to his interest in contemporary church politics; his perspective and his knowledge indicate a Constantinopolitan milieu, close to the court and/or the patriarchate.

First, Philippos considers the heresy novel: ὡς καὶ νῦν παρεισάγουσι τινὲς τῶν ἀβελτέρων.²⁸ In a similar way Zigabenos writes: Ἡ τῶν Βογομίλων αἵρεσις οὐ πρὸ πολλοῦ συνέστη τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς γενεᾶς [...] διεγνώσθη δὲ κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους Ἀλεξίου τοῦ θεοκυβερνήτου βασιλέως ἡμῶν.²⁹ Anna Komnene supposes that it probably existed even before her father's times, but in secret.³⁰ The monk of the Peribleptos Monastery in Constantinople, Euthymios, who wrote in the mid-11th century, met a Bogomil during a journey to Jerusalem; returning to Constantinople, he found that the Bogomils had infiltrated his monastery; in retrospect, he recognised that the encounter with the Bogomil during his journey was a divine *oikonomia* to draw his attention to this heresy.³¹ This latter comment shows that Euthymios had not expected the Bogomils to be an issue in Constantinople at that time. The letter of the Patriarch Kosmas I (1075-1081) on Bogomilism is addressed to the Metropolitan of Larissa and refers to the heresy as spread in "almost the entire land of the Bulgarians, or rather the greatest part of the western region"; nowhere is it mentioned that it had also reached other parts of the empire, or the capital, which is a telling omission, considering that

²⁷ εἴπατε γὰρ φρενοβλαβεῖς ψευδόμενοι τὴν κλήσιν, / αὐχεῖτε γὰρ ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ τὴν κλήσιν ἔχειν μάτην ("say, you deranged, who lie about your appellation – for you boast in vain that you have your appellation from Christ". V 991-992).

²⁸ "As some of the stupid ones now introduce", V 976.

²⁹ "The heresy of the Bogomils arose not long before our generation [...] but it was discerned during the years of Alexios, our God-governed emperor".

³⁰ Τὸ τῆς αἰρέσεως εἶδος καινόν, μήπω πρότερον ἐγνωσμένον τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. [...] καὶ ὡς ἔοικεν, ἦν μὲν κὰν τοῖς πρὸ τοῦμοῦ πατρὸς χρόνοις, ἐλάνθανε δέ (Alexias XV 8, cited n. 25, p. 485, 36-42).

³¹ Τὸ δὲ τοῦ τοιοῦτου κυνὸς συνάντημα ἐκ θείας οἰκονομίας συνέβη εἰς ἐμὲ γενέσθαι, πρὸς τὸ διαγεῖραι μου τὸν νοῦν εἰς ἀκρίβειαν, καὶ προσοχὴν τῶν τοιούτων ἀσεβῶν (The encounter with such a dog happened to me out of a divine *oikonomia*, to arouse my mind towards accuracy and attention of such impious people). Euthymii monachi contra Phundagiatas, PG 131, 47-58, here 52 B-C. Cf. also Euthymii monachi Peribleptae epistula invectiva contra Phundagiagitas sive Bogomilos haereticos, ed. G. FICKER, in: Die Phundagiagiten. Ein Beitrag zur Ketzergeschichte des byzantinischen Mittelalters. Leipzig 1908, 1-86. Incidentally, one of the manuscripts transmitting the latter text among other short treatises against various contemporary heresies is Vindob. theol. gr. 193 (ca. a. 1200; Euthymios' treatise is on ff. 186^v-209^r), which transmits also the *Dioptra*.

the author was Patriarch of Constantinople.³² Here one should be reminded that Philippos' spiritual father, Kallinikos, lived in the mountains of the Smolenoi, a stronghold of Bogomilism for well over a century. The fact that Philippos stresses the novelty of the heresy indicates that, although he had contacts with the Balkans, his perspective was closer to that of Constantinopolitan authors.

Moreover, Philippos opposes to the dualistic cosmology the Orthodox faith in the Trinitarian God, ὃς μετὰ τὴν παραγωγὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γαίας/ πνοὴν πτηνοῖς ἐπέθηκε καὶ κτήνεσιν ὡσαύτως.³³ According to this argumentation, it is considered as accepted by both sides that God created heaven and earth, and the dispute concerns only the rest of the creation. This refers to a Bogomil doctrine, exposed in detail by Euthymios Zigabenos, according to which heaven and earth were created by God, while the firmament (interpreted as second heaven) and the rest of the creation, as described in the Genesis, were subsequently created by Satanael.³⁴ This specific form of the dualistic cosmology is not found in any other sources: most of them do not elaborate, while the 11th-century monk Euthymios of Peribleptos preserves a different version, namely that, of the visible world, God created the sun. Considering that knowledge of Bogomilism was not readily available – both the monk Euthymios and the Emperor had to apply cunning to elicit information on the Bogomil faith, and even simpler converts were not fully instructed in Bogomil doctrines³⁵ – it is unlikely that this detail was commonly known. It is also highly improbable that the *Dioptra* was written after the *Panoplia*

³² Μικροῦ δεῖν τὴν τῶν Βουλγάρων πᾶσαν χώραν, μᾶλλον δὲ τὸ πολὺ τοῦ δυτικοῦ κλίματος. Ed. J. Gouillard, Une source grecque du Sinodik de Boril: La lettre inédite du Patriarche Cosmas. *TM* 4 (1970) 361-374 (repr. in: J. GOUILLARD, *La vie religieuse à Byzance*. London 1981, Nr. XV), here 371.18-19. The identity of the Patriarch Kosmas is not undisputed: Kosmas II Attikos (1146-1147) comes also into consideration. I find, however, Gouillard's arguments in favour of Kosmas I convincing.

³³ "Who, after the production of heaven and earth, / put breath onto birds and beasts as well". V 1008-1009.

³⁴ *Panoplia Dogmatike* (cited n. 24), PG 130, 1296-1297.

³⁵ Ἐν ἀρχῇ μὲν τοὺς εἰσαγωγικοὺς ἀπλῶς διδάσκουσι παρεγγυώμενοι πιστεῦειν εἰς Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱόν, καὶ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα [...] Καὶ ὅταν τοὺς ἀθλίους χειροῦθεις καὶ πειθηνίους ἐργάσωνται [...] τότε δὴ τὸν κυκεῶνα τοῦ δηλητηρίου ποτίζουσιν ("At the beginning, they simply teach the beginners, exhorting them to believe in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost [...] and when they have made the wretched ones submissive and obedient [...], then they give them the poisonous potion to drink". *Panoplia Dogmatike* (cited n. 24), PG 130, 1320-1321). Euthymios of Peribleptos asked the monk of his monastery who had been proselytised by Bogomils to take him to his teachers, so that he may learn more about this faith: Σὲ γὰρ μήπω τὴν τοιαύτην διδασκαλίαν ἀκριβῶς διεγνωκότα, διδάσκαλον ἔχειν ταύτης ἀδύνατον ("For it is impossible to have you as instructor to such teaching, since you have not discerned it exactly yet". *Contra Phundagiatas*, cited n. 31, PG 131, 53).

Dogmatike.³⁶ Thus, Philippos must have had access to the same source, as Euthymios Zigabenos had some years later, in all probability the minutes of Basil's exposition of Bogomil doctrines. This would mean that Philippos had contacts with imperial or patriarchal authorities. Incidentally, if it is true, then the year of the composition of the *Dioptra* (1095) is a new terminus ante quem for Basil's first encounter with the Emperor.

2. *The Poem on Fast Days by Nikolaos III Grammatikos and the Dioptra*

The *Poem on Fast Days* consists of 423 political verses.³⁷ After a lengthy introduction on Christian commandments in general, canonical rules on fast days are epitomised. Most manuscripts, including the earliest ones, attribute the poem to the patriarch Nikolaos; this is Nikolaos III Grammatikos (1084-1111), who had already dealt with canonical questions on fasting on several occasions.³⁸ KODER argued convincingly that the poem was composed at about the year 1107,³⁹ that

³⁶ The chronology of the events concerning Basil the Bogomil is not secure. Anna claims that the persecution of Bogomilism was the last of her father's great deeds (Alexias XV 10.5). This is problematic, since Alexios died 1118, his first encounter with Basil dates before 1102 or 1104, and Nikolaos III, who was Patriarch during Basil's execution, died 1111. REINSCH supposes that Anna concentrates a long series of events to the year of Basil's execution (Anna Komnene, Alexias. Übersetzt, eingeleitet und mit Anmerkungen versehen von D. R. REINSCH. Berlin – New York 2001, p. 540, fn. 116). This execution is mentioned in the *Panoplia Dogmatike* (cited n. 24, PG 130, 1332 B-D). If the *Dioptra* were based on the latter, it would mean that Basil's execution would have taken place before 1095 – more than twenty-three years before Alexios' death. Despite all uncertainties concerning the chronology, that would be highly improbable. A *Neara* issued in 1107 by Alexios Komnenos contains implicit references to the Bogomils, without any mention of Basil's execution or other violent measures; the main concern is the education of the *didaskaloi*, whose ignorance had brought the Church in great danger: Ἰδοὺ γὰρ κινδυνεύουσιν αἱ ψυχαὶ τῶν ὀρθοδόξων καὶ μᾶλλον τῶν ἀπλουστέρων (for, lo! the souls of the orthodox, and especially the simpler ones, are in danger, l. 4-5); ὡς γὰρ τὸ κρυβὲν ἐν εὐαγγελίοις τάλαντον, οὕτω σχεδὸν τὸ ὀρθόδοξον δόγμα κρύπτεται νῦν (for, like the talent hidden in the Gospels, the orthodox dogma is now almost being hidden, l. 73-75). Ed. P. GAUTIER, L'édit d'Alexis Ier Comnène sur la réforme du clergé, *RÉB* 31 (1973) 165-201. Cf. also DARROUZÈS, Éloge (cited n. 23), l. 685-704.

³⁷ J. KODER, Das Fastengedicht des Patriarchen Nikolaos III. Grammatikos. Edition des Textes und Untersuchung seiner Stellung innerhalb der byzantinischen Fastenliteratur. *JÖB* 19 (1970) 203-241. See V. GRUMEL – J. DARROUZÈS (ed.), Les registres des actes du Patriarchat de Constantinople. Vol. I. Les actes des patriarches. Fasc. II-III. Les registres de 715 à 1206. Paris ²1989, 443-444 (Nr. 982 [975]).

³⁸ GRUMEL – DARROUZÈS (cited n. 37), Nr. 972 [977], 977 [982], 979 [984] and 980 [985].

³⁹ The time of the composition of the *Poem on Fast Days* is not mentioned in the sources. Hypotheses are based on the information given in the title and on the comparison with other writings of Nikolaos. GRUMEL (Les registres des actes du Patriarchat de Constan-

is, about ten years after the *Dioptra*. The idea of epitomising canonical rules in political verses proved successful: more than 30 manuscripts transmit the text in the original or in an abridged version.⁴⁰ Moreover, the poem was included in the florilegium (Λόγος ἀσκητικός) of Mark the Monk (14th c.).⁴¹ Nikolaos does not mention the *Dioptra* in his opus. However, in numerous cases the phraseology, the choice of words and their placement in the political verse have parallels in the *Dioptra*.

These cases, which are examined in detail in the Appendix, can be classified into three types: 1. Identical or almost identical phrases are used in the same metrical position. Often there are further similarities in the wording. The content or the function of the verses is in most, though not in all cases, comparable (i-xiii). 2. Biblical passages are paraphrased in a similar manner, with common phraseology and words in the same metrical position; some elements in Nikolaos' biblical allusions come from the *Dioptra* rather than the biblical text (xiv-xvii). 3. Some ideas are expressed with similar phraseology, although in a different metrical position (xviii-xx). Many of these similarities would have been insignificant, if they appeared isolated; but their extent – twenty cases, involving about 50 out of 423 verses – shows a clear influence of the *Dioptra*.

The beginning 'Πολλάκις' (number xviii) indicates that Nikolaos had the *Dioptra* in mind when he decided to popularise church canons in political verses – although the choice of the political verse was not exclusively influenced by the *Dioptra*, since it was a popular form of transmitting knowledge in the second half of the 11th and the 12th centuries.⁴² Many passages have a formulaic

tinople. Vol. I. Les actes des patriarches. Fasc. III. Les registres de 1043 à 1206. Paris 1947, 59-61, Nr. 975) accepted as addressee the Protos Ioannikios, whose name is given in several codices and who is mentioned in a document of the year 1096; therefore, he dated the poem to around 1096. However, he recognised that some views on the fast of August expressed in the poem were different from those held by Nikolaos at this early time, and closer to his later views. GRUMEL considered possible that the poem in its present form is a revised redaction, in which the patriarch's later views were taken into account. KODER argued that not only the treatment of the August fast, but also several other elements show a remarkable correspondence in content and phrasing with the synodal canons dated to the year 1107. He rejected the name Ioannikios, which is transmitted only in later codices, and proposed Iannes Tarchaniotes, who was Protos in the years 1107/1108.

⁴⁰ See KODER, *Fastengedicht* (cited n. 37), 204-205 and the database Pinakes of the IRHT (<http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/>).

⁴¹ Marci Monachi Opera ascetica, ed. Ph. ROELLI (CCSG, 72). Turnhout 2009, F, XXIX, p. 66-71 (ROELLI uses the older edition by MAI and follows the latter's erroneous attribution to Nikolaos Mystikos, cf. PG 111, 392-405).

⁴² W. HÖRANDNER, *The Byzantine Didactic Poem – A Neglected Literary Genre? A Survey with Special Reference to the Eleventh Century*, in: *Poetry and its Contexts* (cited n. 19), 55-67. See also M. LAUXTERMANN, *Byzantine Didactic Poetry and the Question of*

character, according to PARRY's definition of the formula as "a group of words which is regularly employed under the same metrical conditions to express a given essential idea".⁴³ Some of the formulas recur in the *Dioptra* itself. They are rarely longer than a hemistich; if the influence of the *Dioptra* extends over several verses, the formulas are combined in a new order. In some cases, the structure of the verse(s) is similar as well. Most of these verses belong to the introduction, to transitional parts or the conclusion. The others are paraphrases of biblical passages, or phrases in a new context. Nikolaos rarely borrowed whole ideas from the *Dioptra* to promote his argument; rather, he borrowed useful phrases without consulting a copy of the *Dioptra*, as the several unnecessary alterations suggest. In two cases there are indications that Nikolaos had known the redaction X of the *Dioptra* (iii and xvi). Twelve out of twenty passages are taken from book II (I in redaction X). This is the first and perhaps more readable of the dialogue books: it deals with the urgent question of the way to achieve salvation; it has relatively frequent changes of speaker, no prose-insertions, and two vividly written extended narrations from the Old Testament. The other *Dioptra* passages come from the other four books, the prefaces and the epilogue. Thus, Nikolaos must have read the whole *Dioptra*, but used mostly the part that he knew best. These observations show that Nikolaos knew the *Dioptra* well, so that formulas emerged in his mind responding to the needs of the composition; he did not try to imitate it, but he apparently regarded the *Dioptra* as a successful exemplar of the genre in which he intended to write himself, i.e. didactic poetry.

The direct involvement of Philippos in the composition of the *Poem on Fast Days*, e.g. as the Patriarch's "ghost-writer", should be excluded, mainly for two reasons. The first is that the political verses in the *Poem on Fast Days* are much more often metrically "irregular", than in the *Dioptra*: for example, 3% of the verses in the *Poem on Fast Days* have a paroxytone first hemistich, compared to 0,6% in the *Klauthmoi* and 0,3% in book II. The second argument is less secure: there are some indications that Philippos could already have been dead at the time of the second redaction of the *Dioptra*. These are that a passage in the *Klauthmoi* was clearly misunderstood in the redaction X,⁴⁴ and that in a comment which is

Poeticity, in: "Doux remède": Poésie et poétique à Byzance (*Dossiers byzantins*, 9). Paris 2009, 37-46.

⁴³ M. PARRY, Studies in the epic technique of oral verse-making. I. Homer and Homeric style. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 41 (1930) 73-147, here 80.

⁴⁴ Among the stages that the soul goes through after the departure from the body is the journey to *both* the place of the righteous and the place of the sinners, *before* it is judged (v. 131-180, or AUVRAY, Pleurs [cited n. 1], v. 134-188). This is an unusual, but not unknown topic in Byzantine literature – not to be confused with the rather common visions of the other world granted to selected individuals during lifetime. In the redaction X, several

transmitted only in the margin of the redaction X Philippos is referred to in the third person as πατήρ.⁴⁵

The fact that Nikolaos, who was patriarch at the time of the composition of the *Dioptra*, counted among its early readers, is significant for Philippos' position in the intellectual and ecclesiastical milieu of his time. The recognition and approval, which the *Dioptra* enjoyed in the circle of the Patriarchate, makes it very probable that its author had close contacts with the ecclesiastical authorities of Constantinople – regardless of whether he died before Nikolaos wrote his poem.

3. Niketas Stethatos and Symeon Neos Theologos

A different milieu, that of mystical monasticism, is represented by texts of Symeon Neos Theologos and his disciple Niketas Stethatos. The first nine verses of the *Klauthmoi*, v. 329-330 of the same book, as well as IV 523-534 are loans from three of Symeon's Hymns.⁴⁶ Moreover, several prose inserts and annexes of the *Dioptra* are excerpts of works by Niketas Stethatos.⁴⁷

Symeon (949-1022) held unconventional views, which led to tense relations with some of the ecclesiastical authorities: he stressed the importance of mystical experiences, claiming that the church sacraments were not enough, unless they were accompanied by the experience of the divine light, and that only those who were enlightened during their lifetimes would see God in afterlife. He also venerated his deceased spiritual father Symeon, a controversial mystic himself, as a saint by holding festive celebrations. This latter was the official reason for his exile in the Propontis.⁴⁸ He wrote, among other texts, non-liturgical Hymns, in

verses are altered clumsily, so that the soul does not visit both places, but is assigned to either of them according to her deeds. In his edition, AUVRAY misunderstands this passage too, and regards the redaction X as the original (p. 8-13 and 52). The relation between the two redactions will be discussed at length in my critical edition of the *Dioptra*.

⁴⁵ Ὅρα μοι τὰς ἀστεϊότητας τοῦ πατρὸς ἐφελκόμενος ταύταις τὸν ἐντυγχάνοντα (Look, for my sake, at the father's jokes, through which he attracts the reader), scholion to the humorous v. II 606-610.

⁴⁶ Hymns 22.80-87, 24.348-350 and 26.92-100 resp. Ed. A. KAMBYLIS, Symeon Neos Theologos, Hymnen. Prolegomena, kritischer Text, Indices (*Supplementa Byzantina*, 3). Berlin – New York 1976 and J. KODER, Syméon le Nouveau Théologien, Hymnes. Introduction, texte critique et notes, Traduction par J. PARAMELLE – L. NEYRAND. Vol. I-III (SC, 156.174.196). Paris 1969.1971.1973.

⁴⁷ See Ei. AFENTOULIDOU-LEITGEB, Die *Dioptra* des Philippos Monotropos und ihr Kontext. Ein Beitrag zur Rezeptionsgeschichte. *Byz 77* (2007) 9-31.

⁴⁸ For an outline of Symeon's biography and especially on his confrontation with the official church see J. KODER, Normale Mönche und Enthusiasten: Der Fall des Symeons Neos Theologos, in: D. SIMON (ed.), *Religiöse Devianz. Untersuchungen zu sozialen, rechtlichen und theologischen Reaktionen auf religiöse Abweichung im westlichen und östlichen*

which he described his mystical experiences. These were edited posthumously by his disciple, Niketas Stethatos. In contrast to Symeon's more conventional prose works, the circulation of the Hymns in Byzantine times was limited.⁴⁹ The fact that Philippos quotes three of Symeon's Hymns is, therefore, significant and indicates that Philippos had contacts with the circle of his older contemporary, Niketas Stethatos. It is very likely that Philippos knew Niketas personally; this hypothesis is strengthened by the fact that Philippos uses lengthy passages of the latter's texts. Here it should be remembered that Niketas Stethatos, although a disciple and editor of an unconventional mystic, and author of – less provocative – treatises of mystic theology himself, was also a central figure in the Constantinopolitan ecclesiastical establishment of his time.⁵⁰

4. Material Culture

Occasional details give the impression of a wealthy ecclesiastical milieu. In one case, Philippos describes a dream of a church in a faraway land, in which he is reunited with a friend; the church is large and wealthy: μαρμάρων βλέπεις καλλονήν, διαφορὰν ποικίλην,/ καὶ τῶν μουσῶν τὴν σύνθεσιν καὶ τῶν ψηφίδων αὐθις,/ κηρία ἄπτοντα πολλὰ ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ φατλία,/ καὶ τὴν λοιπὴν εὐπρέπειαν τῆς ἐκκλησίας πᾶσαν,/ ἀνθρώπους ἱεροπρεπεῖς ἐντίμους καὶ ὠραίους,/ ἡδὺ τὸ μέλος ἐν αὐτῇ ἄδοντας καὶ ὑμνοῦντας.⁵¹ In another occasion, Philippos distinguishes between those commandments whose observation is required by every Christian and those whose observation is optional; the former are the charitable deeds enumerated in Mt 25.34-36 (scene of the Last Judgment); the latter include both ascetic feats and the works of wealthy benefactors: τὸ ἐκκλησίας κτίζειν τε αὐτὰς καὶ ζωγραφεῖσαι,/ καὶ τὸ κοσμεῖσαι ταύτας μὲν ἀνελλιπῶς ἐν πᾶσιν.⁵² In one

Mittelalter. Frankfurt/ Main 1990, 97-119. See also H. J. M., TURNER, St. Symeon the New Theologian and Spiritual Fatherhood (*Byzantina Neerlandica*, 11). Leiden – New York – København – Köln 1990 and H. ALFEYEV, St Symeon the New Theologian and Orthodox Tradition (*Oxford Early Christian Studies*). Oxford 2000. See also A. ΜΑΡΚΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ (ed.), Τέσσερα κείμενα για την ποίηση του Συμεών του Νέου Θεολόγου. Athens 2008.

⁴⁹ See ΚΑΜΒΥΛΙΣ, Hymnen (cited n. 46), CCXCVI-CCXCVII and CCCXV-CCCXXII.

⁵⁰ On Niketas Stethatos s. J. DARROUZÈS, Nicéas Stéthatos, Opuscules et lettres. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes (SC, 81). Paris 1961, 7-10.

⁵¹ “You see the beauty of the marbles, the variety, and the composition of the mosaics and the tesserae, many candles burning and oil-lamps as well, and all the further comeliness of the church, people beseming a sacred space, honourable and handsome, who are singing in this (church) a sweet chant and hymns” (V 2045-2050).

⁵² “To build churches and to paint them,/ and to fully decorate them in every aspect” II 105-106. The other good deeds are of ascetic nature: Τὸ παρθενεύειν τοιγαροῦν· ὁμοῦ καὶ τὸ μονάζειν,/ τὸ χαμευνεῖν καὶ ἀγρυπνεῖν καὶ ἀσιτεῖν καὶ τρύχειν,/ τὸ ξενιτεύειν καὶ ῥιγᾶν, ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις πέλειν,/ περιβεβλησθαι ῥάκια μεμεστωμένα φθείρας (“Well, to lead a virgin

passage, Philippos names earthly pleasures that will be no more after death: luxurious meals, musical instruments and songs, and “the relaxation of baths”.⁵³ Depending on the austerity of their ascetism, Byzantine monks could visit baths; these could be public, which presupposes some degree of urban infrastructure, or monastic, which would indicate a large, affluent monastery.⁵⁴ These passages are perhaps *topoi*, but the choice of *topoi* may characterise the author's world.

III. Conclusions

Earlier judgements on the *Dioptra* emphasised the monastic-ascetic element and its simplicity. E. AUVRAY, after commenting on Philippos' non-classic language, continues: “Mais s'il ignore les lettres humaines, en revanche il est très-versé dans la connaissance de l'Écriture et des Pères”.⁵⁵ H.-G. BECK covered the *Dioptra* in a chapter on “Asketik und Mystik”; he characterises the *Klauthmoi* and the dialogue as “Werke asketischer Natur, die trotz ihrer Schlichtheit [...] infolge der Wärme ihrer Empfindungen und der Aufrichtigkeit ihres Tones einen großen Lesekreis gefunden haben”.⁵⁶ V. GRUMEL refers to the *Dioptra* as “ouvrage ascétique”; the political verse, “assez indigente et monotone, n'explique assurément pas le grand succès du poème. Il est dû surtout à l'accent de sincérité humaine et chrétienne qui l'anime et s'exprime en langage simple et coulant”. L. HOFFMANN considers the *Dioptra* “primär monastisch-asketischer Ausprägung”, although he correctly remarks that it “bewegt sich im Rahmen fester theologischer bzw. (natur)philosophischer Traditionen”.⁵⁷ To these can be added that Philippos' epithet was increasingly distorted in a chain of translations: the original μοναχός,

life, and also to be a monk,/ to lie on the ground and to keep vigil and to abstain from food and to be worn-out,/ to live as a stranger and to shudder and to be in the deserts,/ to be vested with tatters full of lice”. II 101-104).

⁵³ Ποῦ τραπεζῶν ἀβρότητες, μαγείρων μαγγανείαι,/ βρωμάτων καὶ πομάτων τε κόρος καὶ ποικιλία;/ ποῦ τῶν λουτρῶν ἡ ἄνεσις, αἱ σαρκὸς θεραπείαι;/ ποῦ τῶν αὐλῶν τὰ θέλητρα, τὰ τύπανα καὶ λύραι,/ ἠδυσφωνία, φόρμιγγες καὶ πάντα τὰ σπιλοῦντα (Where are the luxuries of the table, the charms of the cooks,/ the satiety and variety of foods and drinks?/ Where is the relaxation of baths, the treatment of the flesh?/ Where are the spells of the flutes, the drums and the lyres,/ the sweet chants, the phorminx and all staining things? *Klauthmoi* 62-66).

⁵⁴ On baths in Byzantium s. A. BERGER, *Das Bad in der byzantinischen Zeit (Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia, 27)*. München 1982. See also P. A. AGAPITOS, *Zwischen Grauen und Wonne: Das Bad in der byzantinischen Literatur. JÖB 54 (2004) 19-37*.

⁵⁵ AUVRAY, *Pleurs* (cited n. 1), 3.

⁵⁶ H.-G. BECK, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, XII.2.1)*. München 1959, 642.

⁵⁷ L. HOFFMANN, *Die „Dioptra“ des Philippos Monotropos. Eine Studie zu Verfasser, Werk und dessen Quellen* (master thesis). Wien 1992, 3-4.

μονάζων etc. was rendered as μονότροπος, which in turn was translated into Latin as *solitarius*, which became *solitaire*, *solitary*, *Einsiedler* in modern bibliography; those terms imply a stricter kind of anchoritism than Philippos probably exercised.⁵⁸

Views on Byzantine Greek written language and political verse have become more differentiated in the last decades.⁵⁹ a low-register language does not necessarily mean lack of education or sophistication, and the simple written Koine, political verse and popularised contents are often associated with state or church functionaries of higher or lower rank. Several examples from the 11th and 12th centuries can be named: Kekaumenos, whose surviving text is written in a low-register language, held an official position and had a certain degree of formal education;⁶⁰ Michael Psellos addressed several didactic poems written in a simple Koine to emperors;⁶¹ the *Poem on Fast Days*, examined above, was written by a patriarch; the political verses addressed to Eirene the Sebastokratorissa, while praising her intelligence and love for the letters, were rather simple – which can only be partially explained by the hypothesis that Eirene’s mother tongue was not Greek.⁶² Between Anna Komnene and those who could not afford or were not interested in any kind of formal learning, there was a wide spectrum of degrees of literacy, and even those who would understand and appreciate an elaborate poem in hexameters on a festive occasion would probably find it easier to write a simple Koine or seek answers to their numerous questions in straightforward political

⁵⁸ Fn. 12. Cf. for example the modern translations Philippe le Solitaire (AUVRAY, Pleurs [cited n. 1] and GRUMEL, Remarques [cited n. 2]), Einsiedler Philippus (FICKER, Phundagiagiten, [cited n. 31], p. 141) or the comment to the lemma Philip Monotropos in ODB II 1652 (A. KAZHDAN): lit. “solitary”.

⁵⁹ Cf. S. WAHLGREN, Byzantine Literature and the Classical Past, in: E. J. BAKKER (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language* (Blackwell Publishing). Malden, Mass. etc. 2010, 527-538; idem, *Towards a Grammar of Byzantine Greek*. SO 77 (2002) 201-204; M. HINTERBERGER, How should we define vernacular Literature? in: *Unlocking the Potential of Texts: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Medieval Greek*. Cambridge, 18-19 July 2006 (<http://www.mml.cam.ac.uk/greek/grammarofmedievalgreek/unlocking/pdf/Hinterberger.pdf>, last accessed on 2012-02-08); E. TRAPP, Learned and Vernacular Literature in Byzantium: Dichotomy or Symbiosis? *DOP* 47 (1993) 115-129; I. ŠEVČENKO, Levels of Style in Byzantine Prose. *JÖB* 31/1 (1981) 289-312. See also J. NIEHOFF-PANAGIOTIDIS, *Koine und Diglossie (Mediterranean Language and Culture Monograph Series, 10)*. Wiesbaden 1994.

⁶⁰ Cf. Ch. ROUECHÉ, The rhetoric of Kekaumenos, in: E. JEFFREYS (ed.), *Rhetoric in Byzantium. Papers from the Thirty-fifth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Oxford, March 2001*. Aldershot 2003, 23-37.

⁶¹ Ed. L. G. WESTERINK, *Michaelis Pselli Poemata (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana)*. Stuttgart – Leipzig 1992, poems 1-8.

⁶² M. and E. JEFFREYS, Who was Eirene the Sevastokratorissa? *Byz* 64 (1994) 40-68.

verses.⁶³ The way that Nikolaos III was influenced by the *Dioptra* show that he did not merely consider it a successful means of edifying the less educated, but that he counted among its attentive readers himself. The language of the *Dioptra* allowed for many more non-classical elements than was usual in Byzantine literary Koine, and it could be probably understood also by illiterate monks when read aloud in the *trapeza*; but this meant neither the lack of a literary character, nor a lack of education,⁶⁴ nor, as shown in this article, a lower social milieu.

As far as the monastic-ascetic element is concerned, it is a fact that Philippos was a monk, as was a large part of his readership.⁶⁵ It is also true that the *Klauthmoi* was a poem of contrition in the face of death, and that this theme appears occasionally elsewhere in the *Dioptra*. Several verses in the *Klauthmoi* are borrowed from the Hymns of Symeon Neos Theologos, and it has been shown that Philippos had a certain relation to mystic monasticism. Philippos speaks also of ascetic deeds, although he considers them less important than social virtues such as charity and love. But the ascetic element, important as it may be, is not the only, and in fact not the main aspect of the *Dioptra*. The four dialogue books are a somewhat simplistic exposition of a Christian humanistic theology and anthropology⁶⁶ – PROCHOROV characterises the *Dioptra* as “antropologičeskaja enciklopedija”.⁶⁷ The questions that the personified Soul poses concern human nature as a whole and its position in a world, visible and invisible, which was created by God and which will eventually be renewed by God. It is an inherently optimistic view, according to which almost everything, including disabilities or social inequality, has an explanation. This explanation is easy to understand by means of basic intellectual skills, rather than extraordinary spiritual achievements; if something is incomprehensible, it is because human nature is still bound to the

⁶³ Cf. R. BROWNING, Literacy in the Byzantine World. *BMGS* 4 (1978) 39-54 (Repr. in R. BROWNING, *History, language and literacy in the Byzantine world* [Collected Studies Series, 299]. Northampton 1989, Nr. VII). On Byzantine didactic poetry and (linguistic) simplicity s. HÖRANDNER, Didactic poem (cited n. 42).

⁶⁴ On the literary character of the *Dioptra* and on Philippos' education s. EI. AFENTOULIDOU-LEITGEB, Didactic Verses or Poetry? (cited n. 19).

⁶⁵ Of the texts transmitted in the same manuscripts as the *Dioptra*, many are similar to the “florilèges monastiques” (cf. M. RICHARD, *Florilèges spirituels grecs*, in: *DS V*. Paris 1962-1964, 499-510. Repr. in: M. RICHARD, *Opera Minora I* 1. Turnhout – Leuven 1976). See AFENTOULIDOU, *Kontext* (cited n. 47).

⁶⁶ On Christian humanism in Byzantium s. G. PODSKALSKY, *Von Photios zu Bessarion: Der Vorrang humanistisch geprägter Theologie in Byzanz und deren bleibende Bedeutung*. Wiesbaden 2003. PODSKALSKY counts Philippos Monotropos to the humanist theologians, without going into details; he mentions the fact that Philippos names the three Cappadocians among his sources (p. 50-51).

⁶⁷ PROCHOROV et al., *Dioptra* (cited n. 1).

corruptible world, but this obstacle will be eventually overcome.⁶⁸ The answers to the questions are based on the Scripture and the Church Fathers, but also on natural sciences and logic (Philippos names Aristotle, Hippocrates and Galen),⁶⁹ within the frame of Christian anthropology. This view of the world is perhaps not unrelated to the conclusion that the *Dioptra* was created in an urbane, wealthy and educated monastic/ecclesiastical milieu close to the patriarchal and imperial authorities.

APPENDIX

Literary Parallels in the *Poem on Fast Days* by Nikolaos III and the *Dioptra*

i) The two verses are similar in content and the first hemistich is identical:

καὶ τοὺς ἁγίους ἅπαντας προσκαλούμενος πρέσβεις (*Poem on Fast Days* 23).
καὶ τοὺς ἁγίους ἅπαντας μὴ παύσῃ δυσωπούσα (*Dioptra, Klauthmoi* 303).

ii) The two verses are similar in content (each concluding a quotation from the Gospel) and phrasing. The second hemistichs are identical:

καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ὁ κύριος ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις (*Poem on Fast Days* 76).
ταῦτα πιστοῦται ὁ Χριστὸς ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις (*Dioptra* II 1416).

The hemistich ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις appears in several other verses in the *Dioptra* and is also used by other authors, e.g. in the didactic poems written by or ascribed to Michael Psellos.⁷⁰ Its presence in both the *Dioptra* and the *Poem on Fast Days* could be coincidental, but in the context of the numerous other more significant parallels it strengthens the hypothesis of an influence.

⁶⁸ Cf. III 685-689 and IV 411-425. Diametrically opposite views are expressed by the mystic Symeon Neos Theologos: knowledge can only be gained by divine illumination; one can see God in this life, or rather, one *must* see God in this life, in order to see Him in afterlife (cf. G. PODSKALSKY, *Religion und religiöses Leben im Byzanz des 11. Jahrhunderts. OCP* 57 (1991) 371-397, here 385-397); Symeon estimates that only one in ten thousand can achieve this (Hymn 50, 157-163).

⁶⁹ III 274-276 and Epilogue 150 a-c (Redaction X). It goes without saying that Philippos probably knew these ancient authors from anthologies or school texts.

⁷⁰ *Dioptra* II 204, 458, 1565; III 209, 392, 429, 1227; V 995, 1000, 1263; Michael Psellos, *Poem* 2.336 (In canticum): ὁ λέγων γὰρ αὐτός ἐστιν ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις; Pseudo-Psellos, *Poem* 54.61 (Commentarius in Psalmos): ἄλλως τε πάλιν ὁ Χριστὸς ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις. Ed. WESTERINK, *Michaelis Pselli Poemata* (cited n. 60).

- iii) In the following two passages, identical or similar hemistichs are used to describe the universal character of moral commandments in the first case, of the resurrection in the second case:

προσπατειῖσθαι μέλλομεν μικροί τε καὶ μεγάλοι
ἐπίσκοποι καὶ βασιλεῖς, μοναχοὶ καὶ μιγάδες
ἄρχοντες τε καὶ πένητες καὶ πᾶς πιστῶν ὁ δῆμος

(*Poem on Fast Days* 127-129).

ἅπαντες ἀναστήσονται μικροί τε καὶ μεγάλοι,
ἁμαρτωλοὶ καὶ δίκαιοι ἐλεύθεροι καὶ δοῦλοι,
καὶ ἄρχοντες καὶ βασιλεῖς καὶ πένητες ὁμοίως,
καὶ πλούσιοι καὶ πένητες, μονασταὶ καὶ μιγάδες

(*Dioptra, Klauthmoi* 187-190, redaction X).

In this *Dioptra*-passage the redaction Y has some minor, but for our case significant variants, which prove that Nikolaos knew the text of the redaction X:

ἅπαντες ἀναστήσονται μικροί τε καὶ μεγάλοι,
ἁμαρτωλοὶ καὶ δίκαιοι ἐλεύθεροι καὶ δοῦλοι,
βασιλεῖς τε καὶ ἄρχοντες καὶ πένητες ὁμοίως,
σὺν τοῖς πλουσίοις ἅπασι μονασταῖς καὶ μιγάσι.

- iv) In the following verses, the phrase εἰς ἄκρον is employed in the same metrical position and παρθενίαν in a different position. The adjective παντελῆ occupies the same metrical position as ἀληθῆ. Both passages refer to aspects of spiritual perfection:

ἀκτημοσύνην παντελῆ, παρθενίαν εἰς ἄκρον (*Poem on Fast Days* 137).
καὶ παρθενίαν ἀληθῆ ὁμοῦ καὶ ἀγρυπνίαν,
εὐχὰς νηστείαν δάκρυα, καὶ ἄσκησιν εἰς ἄκρον (*Dioptra* II 134-135).

- v) Nikolaos uses the phrase ἐκ τῶν πολλῶν ὀλίγα twice as the second hemistich of a transitional/concluding verse. The same hemistich is used by Philippos, also in a concluding verse:

Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν σοι ἔγραψα ἐκ τῶν πολλῶν ὀλίγα (*Poem on Fast Days* 157).
Ταῦτα σοι τοίνυν ἔγραψα ἐκ τῶν πολλῶν ὀλίγα (*Poem on Fast Days* 402).
Ἴδου ψυχὴ μου εἶπον σοι ἐκ τῶν πολλῶν ὀλίγα

(*Dioptra* IV 446, book II in redaction X).

- vi) The first hemistich of two verses in Nikolaos' poem is almost identical to a hemistich from the *Dioptra*; ἐορταῖς and ἐντολαῖς are phonologically

similar. In both poems the verses conclude and comment on a list of feasts or commandments respectively:

Ἐν ταύταις οὖν ταῖς ἑορταῖς εἰ μέλλεις καταλύειν (*Poem on Fast Days* 213).

ἐν ταύταις οὖν ταῖς ἑορταῖς ἔκλυε τὴν νηστείαν (*Poem on Fast Days* 232).

ἐν ταύταις γὰρ ταῖς ἐντολαῖς ταῖς δυσι πᾶς ὁ νόμος (*Dioptra* II 205).

- vii) The word ἀρκέσθητι is used in both texts in the same metrical position, although in a different context:

καὶ ταῖς λοιπαῖς ἀρκέσθητι εἰς ἰχθύας καὶ οἶνον (*Poem on Fast Days* 220).

ἀλλὰ τοῖς σοῖς ἀρκέσθητι μὴ γίνου πλεονέκτης (*Dioptra* II 885).

- viii) A concluding verse of similar content begins with the same words in both texts:

Ἐγὼ δὲ περὶ τούτων νῦν καταπαύσω τὸν λόγον (*Poem on Fast Days* 239).

ἐγὼ δὲ πέρας ἐνταυθοῖ τῷ λόγῳ ἐπιθήσω (*Dioptra* II 1578).

- ix) The structure and the idea of the following verses are similar in both texts: if you follow these rules, you will etc. The verb φυλάττειν (-σσ-) appears in the same metrical position:

Εἰ δὲ καὶ ταύτας δύνασαι φυλάττειν ὡς τὰς ἄλλας,

ἔξεις πλείστην ὠφέλειαν τὴν ἐντολήν πληρώσας

(*Poem on Fast Days* 263-264).

ἂν ταῦτα καὶ σπουδάξῃς φυλάσσειν ᾧ κυρία,

ἐκτήσω τὴν ταπείνωσιν ἀκόπως καὶ ἀπόνως

(*Dioptra* IV 668-669, book II in redaction X).

- x) The beginning of the following transitional verses of similar content is identical in both texts:

καὶ περὶ τούτων δὲ λοιπὸν ἀρκέσθητι ἐνταῦθα (*Poem on Fast Days* 304-305).

καὶ περὶ τούτων ἰκανῶς εἰρήκαμεν ὧδέ πως (*Dioptra* V 1866-1867).

- xi) The transitional verse in the poem of Nikolaos is comparable in content and has a similar second hemistich to two passages from the *Dioptra*. Moreover, the word αὐτῆς in the *Poem on Fast Days* is in the same position as αὐτὰ in *Dioptra* IV 766:

καὶ ἄλις μὲν περὶ αὐτῆς, οὐ γὰρ δεῖ πλέον γράφειν (*Poem on Fast Days* 317).

ἀλλὰ παρέσθωσαν αὐτὰ οὐ χρή με ταῦτα γράφειν (*Dioptra* IV 766).

παρήσω δέ γε τὰ πολλὰ σύσσημα καὶ τὰς θέσεις,

ποικίλα ὄντα καὶ πολλὰ οὐ χρὴ γὰρ ταῦτα γράφειν (*Dioptra* V 168-169).

- xii) The following concluding verses are similar in structure and comparable in content: if one does not accept what I have just said/ is arrogant etc., he can do/say whatever he likes. The initial phrase is identical:

εἰ δέ τις οὐ προσίεται οὐδὲ πιστεύει ταῦτα,
ὡς θέλει καὶ ὡς βούλεται, οὕτως καὶ πορευέσθω (*Poem on Fast Days* 388-389).
εἰ δέ τις ἢ ὑπέροφρος ὑψαύχην ὑψιτένων,
ἀγακλυτὸς μεμψίμοιρος καὶ φιλοσκώπτῃς ὄντως,
λεγέτω οὗτος τὸ δοκοῦν ἐξουσίαν ὡς ἔχων (*Dioptra*, Epilogue 31-33).

- xiii) Nikolaos begins his recapitulation with ἰδοῦ, as is the case several times in the *Dioptra*. Further elements remind strongly of the *Dioptra*: the phrase κατὰ δύναμιν is in (almost) the same metrical position, as ὡς δύναμις in *Dioptra* V 2178. Although placed in different metrical positions, the verb πεπλήρωκα (*Dioptra* II 908) is common. The expressions of modesty ὡς ἐφικτὸν ὑπῆρχε μοι καὶ δυνάμεως εἶχον remind of ὡς ἐχώρουν and ὡς δύναμις (*Dioptra* V 2176 and 2178). Moreover, the *Poem on Fast Days* continues with conditional clauses comparable to *Dioptra* II 908-914 and II 1574-1577: if you find my words acceptable/true, then etc., if you find them burdensome/untrue/if you procrastinate, then etc.

Ἴδου τοίνυν πεπλήρωκα τὴν αἴτησίν σου, τέκνον,
ὡς ἐφικτὸν ὑπῆρχε μοι καὶ δυνάμεως εἶχον (...)
εἰ δὲ τὸ κατὰ δύναμιν φίλον Θεῶ ὑπάρχει,
δέξαι καὶ σὺ ὡς ἀγαθὸν τὴν προαίρεσιν μόνην (...)
εἰ μὲν ἀποδεκτέα σοι, Θεῶ χάρις ἐν τούτῳ,
εἰ δὲ πολλάκις φορτικά, ὡς βούλει λοιπὸν πράττε
(*Poem on Fast Days* 408-416).

Ἴδου τὰ παραδείγματα πεπλήρωκα κυρία (...)
ἂν μὲν ψευδῆ σοι φαίνωνται τὰ εἰρημένα πάντα,
ἀντίθεος εἶτι δύνασαι πρὸς ταῦτα δέσποινά μου·
εἰ δ' ἀληθῆ καὶ βέβαια τὰ προγραφέντα πάντα,
σπουδαίως διεγέρθητι διὰ πολλοῦ τοῦ τάχους (*Dioptra* II 908-914).

Ἴδου κυρία εἶπόν σοι μερικῶς ὡς ἐχώρουν,
εἰς ὅσα ἤρου με τὰ νῦν καὶ τὰ ζητήματά σου
ἐλύσαμεν ὡς δύναμις θεοῦ τῆ συνεργία (*Dioptra* V 2176-2178).

Ἴδου κυρία εἶπόν σοι καὶ πῶς καὶ τίνι τρόπῳ
καλεῖται ἢ μετάνοια καὶ λέγεται καὶ ἔστιν·
εἰ ταύτη μέλλεις προσδραμεῖν καὶ προσφυγεῖν ἐν τάχει,

ἀπολογία ἄπεστιν οὐδεμία παρὲί σοι (*Dioptra* II 1574-1577).

- xiv) The phrase κατ' ἐμὲ ἰδιώτη (ἰδιώτας) τῷ λόγῳ is used both by Nikolaos and by Philippos in the Στίχοι ἀπολογητικοὶ that precede the *Dioptra*. It is an allusion to 2 Co 3.1 (εἰ δὲ καὶ ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ, ἀλλ' οὐ τῇ γνώσει). “κατ' ἐμὲ” is an addition by Philippos, otherwise not found in TLG in this context, and is adopted by Nikolaos:

οὐ μόνον δὲ τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ ἰδιώτη τῷ λόγῳ (*Poem on Fast Days* 8).⁷¹

τοὺς ἰδιώτας κατ' ἐμὲ τῷ λόγῳ καὶ τῇ γνώσει

(*Dioptra*, Στίχοι ἀπολογητικοὶ 4).

- xv) The following verses paraphrase Christ's words, quoting Dt 6.5, which are transmitted with variations in Mt 22.37-40, Mc 12.30-33 and Lc 10.27. Philippos combines elements from Matthew and Mark, which Nikolaos adopts: the prepositional phrases with ἐξ are from Mark (Matthew and Luke have ἐν, Matthew omits ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου), the remark ἐν ταύταις ταῖς δυσὶν ἐντολαῖς ὅλος ὁ νόμος κρέμαται καὶ οἱ προφῆται is found only in Matthew. Several phrases are employed in the same metrical position in both texts:

ἀγάπη τε πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος

ἐξ ὅλης διανοίας τε καὶ ἐξ ὅλης ψυχῆς τε·

ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸν πλησίον ὡς ἑαυτὸν οὕτως ἔχειν.

Ἐν ταύταις οὖν ταῖς ἐντολαῖς, ὡς ἔφη ὁ δεσπότης,

ὅλος ὁ νόμος κρέμαται καὶ οἱ προφῆται πάντες (*Poem on Fast Days* 28-32).

ἐν ταύταις γὰρ ταῖς ἐντολαῖς ταῖς δυσι πᾶς ὁ νόμος,

καὶ οἱ προφῆται κρέμανται πᾶσα γραφὴ πληροῦται,

ἐν τῷ τὸ πρῶτον ἀγαπᾶν τὸν θεὸν ἐκ ψυχῆς σου,

ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος,

καὶ τὸν πλησίον σου φησὶν ὡς ἑαυτὸν ψυχὴ μου (*Dioptra* II 205-209).

- xvi) Nikolaos paraphrases Lc 18.22 (διάδος πτωχοῖς, cf. Mt 19.21 and Mc 10.21) with word forms taken from the *Dioptra* rather than the biblical text:

καὶ ἐπιδοῦναι τοῖς πτωχοῖς σὺν προθυμίᾳ πάσῃ (*Poem on Fast Days* 73).

⁷¹ The orthography τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ is apparently transmitted by the manuscripts (no variant τῷ is mentioned in the critical apparatus) and accepted by KODER, who translates the verse as “nicht nur was mich persönlich betrifft, der ich ein Dilettant des Wortes bin”. In the *Dioptra* κατ' ἐμὲ refers to ἰδιώτας and the verse should be translated as follows: “those who, like me, are unskilled in word and knowledge”.

καὶ διαδοῦναι τοῖς πτωχοῖς καὶ τυχεῖν βασιλείας (*Dioptra* II 820, redaction X). The redaction Y of the *Dioptra* has διανεῖμαι instead of διαδοῦναι, which is a further indication that Nikolaos knew the redaction X.

xvii) The following verses paraphrase 1 Co 6.9-10: οὔτε πόρνοι οὔτε εἰδωλόατραι οὔτε μοιχοὶ οὔτε μαλακοὶ οὔτε ἀρσενοκοῖται οὔτε κλέπται οὔτε πλεονέκται, οὐ μέθυσοι, οὐ λοῖδοροι, οὐχ ἄρπαγες βασιλείαν θεοῦ κληρονομήσουσιν. Nikolaos uses the word ἀρσενοκοῖται at the same position, as in the *Dioptra*. Moreover, in the hemistich οὐχ ἄρπαγες, οὐ λοῖδοροι the word order is that of the respective hemistich of the *Dioptra*, and not of the Pauline text:

οὔτε μοιχοί, οὔτε πόρνοι, οὔτε ἀρσενοκοῖται
οὐχ ἄρπαγες, οὐ λοῖδοροι ἢ μαλακοὶ ἢ κλέπται,
οὐ μέθυσοι, οὐκ ἄδικοι, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ πλεονέκται
βασιλείαν τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐ μὴ κληρονομήσουσιν (*Poem on Fast Days* 86-89).
οὐχ' ἄρπαξ οὔτε λοῖδορος οὐ μέθυσος οὐ πόρνος,
οὔτε μοιχὸς οὐ μαλακὸς οὔτε ἀρσενοκοίτης
οὐ κλέπτης οὐ μνησικάκος οὔτε εἰδωλόατρης (*Dioptra* II 856-858).

xviii) In the introductory verses of both works, the impulse for the composition comes from a person/persona who demands instructions in questions of religious practice; the first word of the *Poem on Fast Days* (Πολλάκις) reminds of the initial word of the *Dioptra* (Πολλούς):

Πολλάκις με ἐβίασας καὶ ἐξέθλιψας, τέκνον (*Poem on Fast Days* 1).
Πολλοὺς μὲν ἔχομεν ὁμοῦ καὶ χρόνους καὶ καιροὺς τε (*Dioptra* II 1).

xix) The terms ιδιωτεία and ἀγροικία are used twice in the Letter to Kallinikos, which functions as a preface to the *Dioptra*, and are adopted by Nikolaos. The combination of the words ιδιωτεία and ἀγροικία was not uncommon from the Late Antiquity onwards:

ἀρωγὸν προβαλλόμενος τῆς ἐμῆς ἀσθενείας
ιδιωτείας μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ πολλῆς ἀγροικίας (*Poem on Fast Days* 19-20).
συγγνώμην ἀπόνειμε τῇ ιδιωτεία καὶ ἀγροικία ἡμῶν, οὐ τοῖς λεγομένοις
ἐνατενίζων, καὶ τὸ κάλλος τῶν λέξεων σκοπῶν· εὐτελεῖ γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς καὶ πάσης
ἀγροικίας καὶ ιδιωτείας ἀνάμεστα (*Dioptra*, Letter to Kallinikos).

xx) Both Nikolaos and Philippos claim that their work is based on the Scripture/ the Church Fathers; should somebody have further questions on the sources, they should search diligently and find the answers themselves (ἐρευνησάτω καὶ εὔρη / ζήτησον καὶ εὐρήσεις / ἐρεύνα καὶ εὔρισκε ... φιλοπονώτερον /

φιλόπονον / φιλόπονος); for the author or his persona cannot / does not intend to tell everything:

Ἄλλ' ἴσως ἀντιφθέγξοιτο τις τῶν γνωστικότερων·
καὶ ποῦ ταύτης ἐμνήσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ τοῦ λόγου;
Ἐρευνησάτω ἀκριβῶς καὶ πάντως εὕρη τοῦτο·
ἀδυνατῶ γὰρ ἐν λεπτῶ πάντα ἀναδιδάσκειν,
οἱ δὲ φιλοπονώτερον τὴν γραφὴν ἐρευνῶντες
πληροφορίαν λάβωσιν ἐξ αὐτῆς τὴν τελείαν (*Poem on Fast Days* 396-401).

Ψυχὴ: Καὶ τίνες οὗτοι φράσον μοι ποίας φυλῆς καὶ γένους,
οἱ ταῦτα ῥητορεύσαντες καὶ ἐκφράσαντες οὕτως;
Σάρξ: Τὸ τίνες μὲν οὐ λέγω σοὶ ἀλλ' εἰ θέλεις τοῦ γινῶναι,
καθὼς ἐγὼ ἐζήτησα ἐπιμελῶς καὶ εὖρον,
οὕτως οὖν ζήτησον καὐτὴ ἐμπόνως καὶ εὐρήσεις,
καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα αὐτῶν καὶ γένος καὶ πατρίδα,
καὶ τῶν ἐξῆς γε τὰ ἐξῆς τὸ οἶα καὶ ὀπόσα·
οὐ θέλω εἶναι σε νωθρὰν καὶ ἀναπεπτωκυῖαν,
ζητητικὴν δὲ μάλιστα καὶ φιλόπονον μᾶλλον·
καὶ ὅταν μέλλης τοῦ μαθεῖν γραφικὸν τι καὶ θεῖον,
ἐρεύνα οὖν καὶ εὕρισκε τὸ ζητούμενον ἅπαν (*Dioptra* III 1545-1555).

A similar idea is expressed in the Epilogue of the *Dioptra*, although not dramatised:

ὁ μέλλων τούτοις ἐντρυφᾶν εἴτι δ' ἂν καὶ εὐρήσης
ὡς ξένον τί φαινόμενον καὶ καινόν σοὶ δοκοῦν τι,
ἀνενδοιάστως δέδεξο ὡς γραφικὸν καὶ τοῦτο·
ζητητικὸς, φιλόπονος, εἴπερ τυγχάνεις φίλε,
τοῦ καθενός γε τὸ ῥητὸν ἐνταῦθα ἐπιγνοίης·
καὶ ποίας βίβλου πέφυκε καὶ ποίου λόγου τοῦτο (*Dioptra*, Epilogue 171-176).

ABSTRACT

This article aims to investigate the social milieu of Philippos Monotropos, author of the *Dioptra*. Explicit evidence on Philippos is scarce, but the comparison with contemporary texts allows some conclusions. Indeed, the way that Philippos treats Bogomilism indicates connections with imperial and patriarchal circles. Moreover, numerous parallels between the *Dioptra* and the Poem on Fast Days written by Nikolaos III Grammatikos shows that the Patriarch knew and appreciated the *Dioptra* very soon after its composition. The hypothesis that Philippos belonged to an educated, urbane ecclesiastical milieu is in accordance with the assessment of the *Dioptra* as a simplistic epitome of Christian humanistic theology – contrary to previous views that overemphasised its ascetic element.

