

CHAPTERS, EPISTOLARY ESSAYS AND EPISTLES.
THE CASE OF MICHAEL GLYKAS' COLLECTION
OF NINETY-FIVE TEXTS IN THE 12th CENTURY*

EIRINI-SOPHIA KIAPIDOU

Besides the *Biblos Chronike*, a chronicle of events from the creation of the world to the death of Alexios I Komnenos,¹ the two vernacular poems to Manuel I Komnenos² and the collection of twenty proverbs,³ the well-known 12th-century scholar Michael Glykas also wrote ninety-five texts of theological content, which have been published by Sophronios Eustratiadis in two volumes under the title *Εἰς τὰς ἀπορίας τῆς θείας γραφῆς κεφάλαια*.⁴ Eustratiadis was the first to consciously

* This article is a revised version of the paper I presented in the workshop on Byzantine Literature «Παρεκβολών Ημέρα» held at the University of Athens, Department of Philology (14.12.2012). I wish to thank the two anonymous readers for making valuable suggestions on earlier versions of this paper.

¹ Michaelis Glycae Annales, ed. I. BEKKER (*CSHB*). Bonn 1836. On the text see S. ΜΑΥΡΟΜΑΤΙ-ΚΑΤΣΟΥΓΙΑΝΝΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ, *Η Χρονογραφία του Μιχαήλ Γλυκά και οι πηγές της (περίοδος 100 π.Χ. – 1118 μ.Χ.)*. Thessaloniki 1984; ΕΑΔΕΜ, *Η Διδασκαλία παντοδαπή του Μιχαήλ Ψελλού και η Χρονογραφία του Μιχαήλ Γλυκά*. *Βυζαντινά* 15 (1989) 143-153; ΕΑΔΕΜ, *Η Εξαήμερος του Μιχαήλ Γλυκά: Μία εκλαϊκευτική επιστημονική πραγματεία του 12ου αιώνα*. *Βυζαντινά* 17 (1994) 7-70; more recently ΑΡ. ΚΑΡΡΟΖΙΛΟΣ, *Βυζαντινοί Ιστορικοί και Χρονογράφοι, 11ος-12ος αιώνας, III*. Athens 2009, 585-624.

² Στίχοι οὓς ἔγραψε καθ' ὃν κατεσχέθη καιρόν, ed. E. ΤΗ. ΤΣΟΛΑΚΙΣ. Thessaloniki 1959; Στίχοι πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα κυρὸν Μανουὴλ τὸν Κομνηνόν, ὅτε λαμπρὸς ἀπὸ Οὐγγρίας στεφανίτης ὑπέστρεψε, in: *Μιχαὴλ τοῦ Γλυκά, Εἰς τὰς ἀπορίας τῆς θείας Γραφῆς Κεφάλαια*, ed. S. ΕΥΣΤΡΑΤΙΑΔΙΣ, I. Athens 1906, ρνζ' -ρξα' (II. Alexandria 1912). On the first poem see K. ΒΟΥΡΔΑΡΑ, *Οἱ βυζαντινὲς φυλακὲς*, in: ΣΡ. Ν. ΤΡΟΙΑΝΟΣ (ed.), *Ἐγκλημα και τιμωρία στο Βυζάντιο*. Athens 1997, 317-336; E. C. ΒΟΥΡΒΟΥΗΑΚΙΣ, 'Political' personae: the poem from prison of Michael Glykas: Byzantine literature between fact and fiction. *BMGs* 31/1 (2007) 53-75.

³ [Ἀναγωγή δημοτικῶν τινῶν ῥητῶν], in: ΕΥΣΤΡΑΤΙΑΔΙΣ, *Κεφάλαια I* (cited n. 2), ρξβ' - ρπγ'.

⁴ ΕΥΣΤΡΑΤΙΑΔΙΣ, *Κεφάλαια* (cited n. 2). Although the last text of the edition bears the number 98, the real number of the epistles is ninety-five: their numbering begins with number 3 (the first chapter is Glykas' first poem from prison and the second chapter comprises his second poem together with his proverbs) and moreover, as number 95 is omitted, moves straight from 94 to 96.

introduce the term “chapters” instead of “epistles”, the widely-used term for Glykas’ texts in the various editions and studies,⁵ since “the oldest manuscripts as well as Glykas himself name the collection as chapters”.⁶ Apart from the accuracy of Eustratiadis’ statement, which will be examined thoroughly in the following pages, it remains a fact that his edition did not manage to impose thenceforth the use of a common term for this part of Glykas’ work. On the contrary, the variety of the relevant terms in use is so wide as to cause wonder as well as confusion regarding the genre of these ninety-five texts.

In his review on Eustratiadis’ edition E. Kurtz already refers continuously to epistles,⁷ as do later D. George,⁸ M. Grünbart⁹ and Ap. Karpozilos,¹⁰ although with no emphasis on the use of this specific term instead of another. O. Kresten prefers to use it in quotation marks,¹¹ defining as λύσις (= solution) text no. 40, which he is interested in, namely Glykas’ famous refutation of Manuel I Komnenos’ defence of astrology.¹² On the other hand, N. B. Tomadakis in his classic book

⁵ See for example *Deliciae Eruditorum seu veterum ἀνεκδότων opusculorum collectanea*. III: Michaelis Glycae epistolarum pars secunda, ed. Io. LAMIUS. Florence 1739. On previous editions see EUSTRATIADIS, Κεφάλαια I (cited n. 2), ρε’-ρστ’ and N. B. TOMADAKIS, Εἰσαγωγή εἰς τὴν Βυζαντινὴν Φιλολογίαν 3: Βυζαντινὴ Ἐπιστολογραφία. Thessaloniki³ 1969-1970 (Thessaloniki 1993), 167. When J.-P. Migne reprinted in 1866 the whole or a part of twenty-nine texts of Glykas’ collection for the series *Patrologia Graeca* based on their previous editions (see PG 158, 647-958), he initially used the Greek title Εἰς τὰς ἀπορίας τῆς θείας γραφῆς λόγοι. However, in the Latin translation of the title (In Divinae Scripturae dubia disputationes sive epistolae) as well as in the headings of the single texts and their comments the term “epistles” is constantly used (see Epistola I, Ἐπιστολή α’ etc.). See also K. KRUMBACHER, Michael Glykas. Eine Skizze seiner Biographie und seiner litterarischen Tätigkeit nebst einem unedierten Gedichte und Briefe desselben. *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch – philologische Klasse* 3 (1895) 391-460; IDEM, Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des oströmischen Reiches (527-1453). Munich 1897, 88.383-384.

⁶ οἱ τε ἀρχαιότεροι κώδικες καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Γλυκάς κεφάλαια ἀποκαλοῦσι τὴν συλλογὴν; EUSTRATIADIS, Κεφάλαια I (cited n. 2), μα’.

⁷ BZ 17 (1908) 166-172.

⁸ D. GEORGE, Manuel I Komnenos and Michael Glykas: A Twelfth-Century Defense and Refutation of Astrology, Part 1. *Culture and Cosmos* 5.1 (Spring/Summer 2001), 3-48 (see <http://www.demetra-george.com/resources/history-astrology>).

⁹ M. GRÜNBART, Formen der Anrede im byzantinischen Brief vom 6. bis zum 12. Jahrhundert (WBS, 25). Wien 2005, 22, 95, 158 and passim.

¹⁰ ΚΑΡΠΟΖΙΛΟΣ, Βυζαντινοὶ Ἱστορικοὶ καὶ Χρονογράφοι (cited n. 1), 600-601.

¹¹ O. KRESTEN, Zum Sturz des Theodoros Styppieotes. *JÖB* 27 (1978) 93-95.

¹² Ἀνταπολογητικὸν ἐκ μέρους πρὸς τὴν ἐγχειρισθεῖσαν αὐτῷ γραφὴν τοῦ κραταιοῦ καὶ ἀγίου ἡμῶν βασιλέως κυροῦ Μανουὴλ τοῦ Κομνηνοῦ, τὴν ἀπολυθεῖσαν πρὸς τινα μοναχὸν ἐπιμεψάμενον οὐ μικρῶς αὐτῷ διὰ γε τὸ τῆς ἀστρολογίας μάθημα καὶ φιλονεικοῦσαν τὸ τοιοῦτον συστήσασθαι μάθημα φυσικαῖς καὶ γραφικαῖς ἀποδείξει [EUSTRATIADIS, Κεφάλαια I (cited n. 2), 476-500].

on epistolography mentions λόγους ἐν εἴδει ἐπιστολῶν (= epistolary essays) and presents them as a special category of Byzantine epistolography – according to his own definition this comprises texts which either refer to several issues or express feelings or inform about various events – for they were composed “for different purposes”.¹³ These purposes were didactic, according to H. Hunger, who incorporates Glykas' letters into the broad category of philological-didactic letters, namely texts written without necessarily having a direct cause, but intended later to be gathered into a single corpus.¹⁴ Eustratiadis identifies Glykas' epistolary theological essays with theological chapters,¹⁵ a designation he eventually applies to the whole collection. P. Magdalino¹⁶ and, more recently, L. Aviluškina follow his choice.¹⁷ However, in several cases scholars use the different terms freely, adopting occasionally one or another,¹⁸ or they simply reproduce verbatim the title of Eustratiadis' edition.¹⁹

The case is equally perplexed when it comes to the popular and widely used internet databases. To be more specific, in the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* site (<http://www.tlg.uci.edu>) the collection is entitled *Quaestiones in sacram scripturam*. Apparently this is the Latin rendering of the edition's Greek title which directly links Glykas' work with the genre of *erotapokriseis*²⁰ (question-and-an-

¹³ ΤΟΜΑΔΑΚΙΣ, Βυζαντινὴ Ἐπιστολογραφία (cited n. 5), 24-25.

¹⁴ H. HUNGER, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, I. Munich 1978, 204-205.

¹⁵ EUSTRATIADIS, Κεφάλαια I (cited n. 2), μα'; see also on the same page the title of the introductory chapter «Θεολογικὰ κεφάλαια τοῦ Γλυκά».

¹⁶ P. MAGDALINO, *The Empire of Manuel Komnenos, 1143-1180*. Cambridge 1993, 370: "... the *Theological Chapters* of Michael Glykas: a collection of 95 replies to problems addressed to the author..."; see also IDEM, *L'Orthodoxie des astrologues. La science entre le dogme et la divination à Byzance (VII^e-XIV^e siècle)*. Paris 2006, 122, where though the term "letters" appears as well (p. 123, 124 etc.).

¹⁷ L. AVILUŠKINA, *The Theological Chapters of Michael Glykas in the Codex Guelf. 73 Gudian gr.*, in: *Proceedings of the 22nd International Congress of Byzantine Studies, Abstracts of Free Communications, III*. Sofia 2011, 157-158.

¹⁸ See for example H.-G. BECK, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*. Munich 1959, 654-655: in the main presentation of Glykas' work Beck refers to λύσεις (= interpretations; see Liddell-Scott's Greek Lexicon s.v. "λύσις"), while in references at the end he uses the term "epistles". Moreover, E. TH. TSOLAKIS simultaneously refers to theological epistles, theological essays and replies in epistolary form to inquiries posed to Glykas by senior officers and monks (Βυζαντινοὶ ἱστορικοὶ καὶ χρονογράφοι 11ου καὶ 12ου αἰώνα. Thessaloniki 1974, 169, 172 and 173 respectively), while S. ΜΑΥΡΟΜΑΤΙ-ΚΑΤΣΟΥΓΙΑΝΝΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ uses the terms "epistles", "treatises" and "λύσεις" all on a single page [see Η Εξαήμερος του Μιχαήλ Γλυκά (cited n. 1), 19].

¹⁹ See for example B. ΚΑΤΣΑΡΟΣ, *Ιωάννης Κασταμονίτης. Συμβολή στη μελέτη του βίου, του έργου καὶ τῆς ἐποχῆς του (Byzantine Texts and Studies, 22)*. Thessaloniki 1988, 105.

²⁰ On the current study of this genre see *Erotapokriseis: Early Christian Question-and-*

swer literature) or the *quaestiones* of Western Medieval philosophy.²¹ Moreover, in the *Pinakes: Textes et manuscrits grecs* site (<http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr>) Michael Glykas' work is distinguished into *chronicon*, *opera*, *epistulae* and *capitula de Sacra Scriptura* – the last three concerning the one and only work studied here. The editors of this website obviously reproduce the respective titles of the collection in its numerous manuscripts or more often in the various commentaries of the manuscript catalogue editors. As it will be shown below, the confusion concerning the genre of the collection dates back to the beginning of its manuscript tradition (according to my research so far it comprises about ninety codices) and to me is intensified later, mainly for the following reasons: (a) the restrictive perception of contemporary researchers on defining what an epistle actually was in Byzantine times, and (b) the ambiguous genre distinction within Byzantine theological literature in comparison with the Western one, which allows the use of one or another term without further justification – absolutely necessary, though, for understanding and correctly evaluating Glykas' work in the context of middle-Byzantine literature.

A recent experience from the 22nd International Congress of Byzantine Studies in Sofia is illustrative of the issue: due to the term “theological chapters” in the title of her free communication on Glykas' collection, L. Aviluškina participated in session FC16: Hagiography and Homiletic,²² while I, having preferred the term “letters”, gave a speech on the same work in session FC15 : Secular Literary Genres II!²³

Answer Literature in Context. Proceedings of the Utrecht Colloquium, 13-14 October 2003, A. VOLGERS, C. ZAMAGNI (eds.). Leuven 2004. More specifically on works written in the same format after Photius see the article of A.-L. REY, *Les Erotapokriseis dans le Monde Byzantin: Tradition Manuscrite des Textes Anciens et Production de Nouveaux Textes*, in: *Erotapokriseis* (cited above), 165-180. Very useful on the difficulties in defining one genre given the variety of forms, origins and aims of the literature studied is A. Papaconstantinou's review of the volume (*Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2005.04.48), especially her critique on R. Teske's hypothesis that epistles 135-137 and 198-199 of Augustine of Hippo belong to the *quaestiones* genre [R. TESKE, *Augustine of Hippo and the Quaestiones et Responsiones Literature*, in: *Erotapokriseis* (cited above), 127-144].

²¹ Under their influence a great number of Byzantine texts with certain form and aims were written in the late Byzantine era. See more in J. A. DEMETRACOPOULOS, *Thomas Aquinas' Impact on Late Byzantine Theology and Philosophy: The Issues of Method or 'Modus Sciendi' and 'Dignitas Hominis'*, in: *Knotenpunkt Byzanz. Wissensformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen*, A. SPEER, P. STEINKRÜGER (eds.) (*Miscellanea Mediaevalia*, 36). Berlin 2012, 334-336.

²² See n. 17; also 22nd International Congress of Byzantine Studies, Sofia, 22-27 August 2011. Program. Sofia 2011, 35.

²³ E.-S. KIIAPIDOU, *The Letters of Michael Glykas and his biography*, in: *Proceedings of the*

As I have pointed out in an earlier paper,²⁴ the use of the term “theological chapters” without further clarification can to a degree be misleading, because it creates, at first at least, the impression that Glykas’ texts belong to the literary genre of monastic chapters.²⁵ These are collections of laconic texts (usually consisting of a single sentence), where a certain thesis is presented regarding an issue that is often declared at the beginning, in order to provoke the reader’s questioning on it. Evagrius Pontikos is considered to be the father of this literary genre, which was very popular in the Byzantine period. Maximos the Confessor, Symeon the New Theologian, Nicetas Stethatos and Gregorios Palamas are only a few of the writers who composed chapters. Consequently, the field is that of ascetic literature, and a simple comparison between the chapters of Maximos the Confessor, for example, *Περὶ ἀγάπης*,²⁶ or those of Kallistos I Patriarch of Constantinople *Περὶ καθαρότητος τῆς ψυχῆς*,²⁷ and Glykas’ collection suffices to show that the latter is a totally different kind of work as regards its structure, length, content, etc.

As mentioned above, Eustratiadis chooses consciously to use the term “chapters” instead of “epistles”, for both the older manuscripts as well as Glykas himself refer respectively to this collection.²⁸ As to the first argument, according to my research so far the oldest codices that deliver the whole or a part of Glykas’ collection are five and date back to the 13th century: Paris. gr. 228, Athous Pantel. 212, Vatic. gr. 690 (a. 1279-1280), Mone Panagias Kamariotisses 82 (Patriarchal Library of Constantinople) and Bodl. Laud. gr. 40 (a. 1289/90).

Paris. gr. 228 does not preserve a title for the collection, neither before its texts nor in the table of contents (f. 1r), which was added by a later hand. The abbreviated word *κεφάλαιον* accompanied by the serial number appears only in the margin of the following folia, beside the header of each text, and it is added

22nd International Congress of Byzantine Studies (cited n. 17), 148-149. See also Program (cited n. 22), 35.

²⁴ E.-S. ΚΙΑΡΙΔΟΥ, On the epistolography of Michael Glykas. *Byzantina Symmeikta* 21 (2011) 178.

²⁵ On Byzantine *κεφάλαια* and their position in the framework of the ascetic literature see E. VON IVÁNKA, *Κεφάλαια. Eine byzantinische Literaturform und ihre antiken Wurzeln. BZ* 47 (1954) 285-291; also *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*, F. YOUNG, L. AYRES, A. LOUTH (eds.). Cambridge 2004, 373-381; E. BÜTTNER, *Erzbischof Leon von Ohrid (1037-1065): Leben und Werk (mit den Texten seiner bisher unedierten asketischen Schrift und seiner drei Briefe an den Papst)*. Bamberg 2007, 132-138.

²⁶ A. CERESA-GASTALDO, *Massimo confessore. Capitoli sulla carità*. Rome 1963, 48-238.

²⁷ A. RIGO, *Callisto I Patriarca, I 100 (109) capitoli sulla purezza dell'anima. Introduzione, edizione e traduzione. Byzantion* 80 (2010), 333-407.

²⁸ See n. 6.

by a later hand. In any case, H. Omont's catalogue refers explicitly to epistles.²⁹ The same is true of Sp. Lampros' catalogue regarding the codex Athous Pantel. 212,³⁰ in whose table of contents (f. 3v) the later (probably from the 16th century) note Σύνταγμα Γλυκά Μιχαήλ τουτι φέρον λύσεις γραφικῶν ἀποριῶν πανσόφως [cod. o] was added. In the margin of each text's header a single serial number is found, without any word. In codex Bodl. Laud. gr. 40³¹ the header of the first text ends with the abbreviation of the word κεφάλαιον and the serial number γ' (f. 208r), but whenever afterwards the copyist adds a word before any serial number, it is the abbreviation of the word λόγος. Similarly, the writer of Vatic. gr. 690³² adds the abbreviated word κεφάλαιον with the serial number γ' only at the end of the header of the first text. In the following folia the serial numbers of the texts are added in the margins by a later hand, accompanied constantly by the abbreviation of the word λόγος. As far as the codex Mone Panagias Kamariotisses 82 is concerned, which delivers only twenty-six texts of Glykas' collection, M. Kourouppou and P. Géhin's catalogue is, unfortunately, far from enlightening, for it reproduces the edition's Greek title using the words *chapitre* or *lettre* for each text depending on whether the citation comes from the Eustratiadis edition or the *Patrologia Graeca* respectively.³³

Of the five above-mentioned codices Eustratiadis was aware of only two, the Paris. gr. 228 and the Athous Pantel. 212, which preserve almost the entire Glykas collection, and out of those two he took into consideration only Paris. gr. 228. Consequently, when he refers to ἀρχαιότεροι κώδικες, he actually means those that he himself used, namely Paris. gr. 228 from the 13th century as well as Marc. gr. II 89 and Vind. theol. gr. 155 from the 14th century.

The codex Marc. gr. II 89, on which Eustratiadis' edition was based, for it

²⁹ See the short title of the collection «Michaelis Glycae versus et epistolae»; H. OMONT, *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque nationale*, I. Paris 1886, 26.

³⁰ «Μιχαήλ Γλυκά Ἐπιστολαί»; SP. LAMPROS, *Κατάλογος τῶν ἐν ταῖς βιβλιοθήκαις τοῦ Ἁγίου Ὁρους ἐλληνικῶν κωδίκων*, II. Cambridge 1900, 330.

³¹ Turyn's description is indicative: «Michael Glykas, Capitula in Sacrae Scripturae dubia (only 14 epistles)»; A. TURYN, *Dated Greek Manuscripts of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries in the Libraries of Great Britain* (*Dumbarton Oaks Studies*, 17). Washington, D.C., 56.

³² R. DEVREESSE, *Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae Codices Vaticani graeci, III: Codices 604-866*. Vatican City 1950, 154-160.

³³ M. ΚΟΥΡΟΥΠΟΥ-Ρ. ΓΕΪΝ, *Catalogue des manuscrits conservés dans la Bibliothèque du Patriarcat Oecuménique. Les manuscrits du monastère de la Panaghia de Chalki*. Turnhout 2008, 245-247. See also n. 5. The great delay due to restoration procedures in the Patriarchal Library of Constantinople has prevented me from taking into account the relevant readings of this manuscript before the publication of this paper.

delivers the most complete – compared to the codices available to him – version of the original text,³⁴ it bears a clear resemblance to Athous Pantel. 212 and also preserves the later note Σύνταγμα γλυκᾶ μιχαῖλ τουτὶ φέρον λύσεις γραφικῶν ἀποριῶν πανσόφως.³⁵ However, an interesting point is to be found here: Marc. gr. II 89 begins with the phrase ὁ πίναξ τῶν ἐκ περιεχομένων τῆ δέλτω ταύτη κεφαλαίων. In the following table of contents two of Glykas' poems are named as the first and the second chapter of the book, although neither of them is actually delivered in it, and the titles of the collection's texts follow without any reference to their recipients' names, which are only cited in each text title (in margins the copyist of the codex has added here only the serial number of each text). The same is the case with Athous Pantel. 212; the only difference being that the controversial word κεφαλαίων is missing. As regards the codex Vind. theol. gr. 155, whose beginning as well as ending are missing – thus, only fifty-eight of Glykas' texts are here delivered – and almost all the recipients' names omitted, the chapter distinction was added later on in margins.

It is thus evident that the word κεφάλαιον, which is found in some of the oldest codices of Glykas' manuscript tradition known today – that is Paris. gr. 228, Athous Pantel. 212, Vatic. gr. 690, Mone Panagias Kamariotisses 82 and Bodl. Laud. gr. 40 as well as Marc. gr. II 89 and Vind. theol. gr. 155 – regardless of whether it was added by the writer of the codex or a later hand, does not belong to the collection's title but apparently serves a practical need, namely the distinction of an extended work into separate units.

Apart from the codices Paris. gr. 228, Marc. gr. II 89 and Vind. theol. gr. 155 Eustratiadis' edition took into account the codices Vind. theol. gr. 47 and Vind. theol. gr. 67 from the 16th century, as well as Vind. theol. gr. 83 and Vind. hist. gr. 28 from the 17th century. In the latter codex (f. 286) the collection begins with the phrase τοῦ σοφωτάτου καὶ μακαριωτάτου κυροῦ Μιχαῖλ τοῦ Γλυκᾶ ἐπιστολὴ α'. The term ἐπιστολὴ occurs in other manuscripts as well.³⁶ In Vind. theol. gr. 67

³⁴ EUSTRATIADIS, Κεφάλαια I (cited n. 2), ριστ'.

³⁵ I note that in the commentary of his catalogue E. ΜΙΟΝΙ (Codices Graeci Manuscripti Bibliothecae Divi Marci Venetiarum, I/2. Rome 1972, 260-264) refers initially to «Epistolae et capita», distinguishing subsequently one from the other just like M. Kouroupanou and P. Géhin; namely depending on whether he refers to the Patrologia Graeca or the Eustratiadis edition.

³⁶ See for example Guelf. 73 Gud. graec. (15th c.; O. VON HEINEMANN, Die Handschriften der Herzoglichen Bibliothek zu Wolfenbüttel, IV. Wolfenbüttel 1913, 45): Michaelis Glycae: λόγοι καὶ ἐπιστολαὶ (f. IIIr by later hand); Athous Hagias Annas 9 (90 Lambros, 16th c.): Μιχαῖλ γραμματικῶ τοῦ Γλυκᾶ Ἐπιστολαὶ θεολογικαὶ νδ' (see SP. LAMPROS, Κατάλογος τῶν ἐν ταῖς βιβλιοθήκαις τοῦ Ἁγίου Ὁρους ἑλληνικῶν κωδίκων, I. Cambridge 1895, 12-13).

the word κεφάλαιον appears in the margin of the first page of each text, again for easily distinguishing purposes; in Vind. theol. gr. 83 (f. 29r) the phrase κεφάλαιον α΄ appears once after the title τοῦ σοφωτάτου καὶ λογιωτάτου κυροῦ Μιχαήλ τοῦ Γλυκᾶ εἰς τὰς ἀπορίας τῆς θείας γραφῆς. Only in codex Vind. theol. gr. 47 (f. 1r) has the word κεφάλαια been incorporated by a later copyist into the title of the collection, which is mistakenly attributed to Theodoretos (Θεοδωρήτου εἰς τὰς ἀπορίας πάντα τῆς θείας γραφῆς κεφάλαια νε΄; a later scribe “corrects” the title to “Glycae Quaestion. in S. Scripturam per epistol. expositae”). However, another contemporaneous codex, also unknown to Eustratiadis, the Matritensis 4774 from the year 1561, containing thirty-six texts of the collection, bears the entirely different title Συνάθροισις πλείστων διδασκάλων, καὶ ἱστορίαι τῆς θείας γραφῆς λίαν ἀναγκαιόταται, ἐρμηνευόμεναι ὑπὸ κυροῦ Μιχαήλου Γλυκᾶ,³⁷ which is copied by two other codices of the same period, the Vatic. gr. 689 (1563)³⁸ and the Escor. Ψ.I.7 (date 1574).³⁹

Consequently, the manuscript tradition of the collection not only does not justify its designation as chapters but, on the contrary, bears a wide variety of titles and terms which definitely need further palaeographical research.

As far as Eustratiadis’ second argument is concerned, regarding Glykas’ own use of the word κεφάλαιον, the relevant passages can be sorted according to the various definitions of this word into the following four groups: (I) κεφάλαιον = issue,⁴⁰ (II) κεφάλαιον = definition of another specific work,⁴¹ (III) κεφάλαιον =

³⁷ G. DE ANDRÉS, *Catálogo de los códices griegos de la Biblioteca Nacional*. Madrid 1987, 365-366.

³⁸ Βλ. ANDRÉS, *Catálogo de los códices griegos de la Biblioteca Nacional* (cited n. 37), 366.

³⁹ G. DE ANDRÉS, *Catálogo de los códices griegos desaparecidos de la Real Biblioteca de El Escorial*. Madrid 1968, 10-12.

⁴⁰ See for example Πρῶτον μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ τούτοις ἀναγκαῖον εἰπεῖν, θεοεἶκελε ἄνερ, ὅποια τίς ἐστιν ἢ ἐκέισε τοῖς δικαίοις ἀποτεταμειμένη κατάστασις καὶ ὅπως αὐτῶν ἕκαστος καὶ τίνα τρόπον μετὰ τὴν ἐνθὲνδε βιοτήν ἀναπαύσεται· οὕτω γὰρ ἂν καὶ ἡ περὶ τοῦ κεφαλαίου τοῦδε συζήτησις ἐκφαντικωτέρα γένηται τοῖς προσέχουσιν [EUSTRATIADIS, *Κεφάλαια I* (cited n. 2), 129.5-9]; Μὴ οὖν ἐπὶ πλεόν ἀμφίβαλλε τοσαύτας ἤδη καὶ περὶ τοῦδε τοῦ κεφαλαίου τὰς ἀποδείξεις δεξάμενος [EUSTRATIADIS, *Κεφάλαια II* (cited n. 2), 7.6-7]; Εἶχε μὲν οὖν ὁ λόγος, ἀγαπητέ, καὶ ἕτερ’ ἄττα περὶ τοῦδε τοῦ κεφαλαίου διεξελεθῆναι ψυχῆς δηλαδὴ καὶ νοός· ἀλλ’ ἐπειδὴ τοῖς ἐχέφροσι κατὰ σὲ καὶ εἰς λόγος ἀρκεῖ πρὸς γε τὴν τοῦ κρείττονος εὔρεσιν, σιωπῇ τὰ τοιαῦτα δοθῆναι δέον ᾤθημεν· εἶγε καὶ μᾶλλον ὁ καιρὸς πλείω λέγειν οὐ συγχωρεῖ [EUSTRATIADIS, *Κεφάλαια II* (cited n. 2), 321.17-22] etc.

⁴¹ See for example Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ὑπεμφαίνεῖν ἔοικε καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐκεῖνος Μακάριος ὁ Αἰγύπτιος· ... Καὶ ἄκουε τί κατὰ ῥῆμά φησιν ὁ θεὸς οὗτος ἀνὴρ ἐν Κεφαλαίοις αὐτοῦ [EUSTRATIADIS, *Κεφάλαια I* (cited n. 2), 64.6-12]; Καὶ εἰ βούλη, πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων αὐτῷ τῷ θεοτάτῳ πρόσχες Ἀθανασίῳ· ἐν γὰρ τοῖς πρὸς Ἀντίοχον Κεφαλαίοις οὕτω λέγων εὔρηται [EUSTRATIADIS, *Κεφάλαια I* (cited n. 2), 90.4-6]; Τὰ αὐτὰ τοῖς διαληφθεῖσι καὶ τῷ χρυσορρήμονι Ἰωάννῃ διείληπται. Ἐν οἷς γὰρ ἐξέθετο κεφαλαίοις περὶ τε γάμου

unit of another specific work⁴² and (IV) κεφάλαιον = unit of Glykas' own collection; it is two passages from texts no. 59 and 91 that Eustratiadis has in mind when he mentions that Glykas himself names the collection chapters: a. (from text no. 59) Ὁ μὲν οὖν ἄρτος τῆς προθέσεως, καθὰ δὴ καὶ ἐν ἐτέρῳ κεφαλαίῳ πρὸς τὸ [cite Eustr.] τέλει τῆς βίβλου ταύτης ὄντι τὰ περὶ τούτου μαθήσει πλατύτερον,⁴³ b. (from text no. 91) Ὅτι δὲ ἡ νοερὰ ψυχὴ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ νοῦς ἐν εἰσι κατὰ φύσιν, εἰ καὶ τοῖς ὀνόμασι διαλλάττουσι, καὶ ὅτι ταυτοφυῆς ὁ νοῦς ἐστι τῇ ψυχῇ, κατὰ τὸν μέγαν Βασίλειον, καὶ ὅτι ψυχὴν νοερὰν εἰπὼν αὐτὸν εἶπας τὸν νοῦν, καὶ νοῦν αὐθις εἰπὼν αὐτὴν εἶπας τὴν νοερὰν ψυχὴν, εἰ βούλει, κεφάλαιον ἀνάγνωθι τὸ ὀγδοηκοστὸν· καὶ γὰρ ἐκείσε τὸν περὶ τούτου λόγον εὐρήσεις πλατύτερον ὁμοῦ καὶ σαφέστερον.⁴⁴

Text no. 59 and mainly text no. 84, which is cited by text no. 59, are delivered in fewer manuscripts than the rest of the collection's texts, apparently because of their content, namely the presentation of Glykas' position on the corruptibility of the Eucharist:⁴⁵ text no. 59 is preserved in codices Paris. gr. 228, Athous Pantel. 212, Vatic. gr. 690, Marc. gr. II 89, Guelf. 73 Gud. graec., Marc. gr. 575, Mosq. Synod. gr. 219 (230 Vlad.), Mosq. Synod. gr. 434 (435 Vlad.) and Marc. gr. II 66;

καὶ παρθενίας, καὶ τάδε περὶ τούτου διέξεισι [EUSTRATIADIS, Κεφάλαια I (cited n. 2), 92.19-21]; Αὐτίκα γὰρ ὁ Δαμασκηνὸς Ἰωάννης ἄκραν ἔχειν ἀπάθειαν ἔλεγε τὸν πρὸ τῆς παραβάσεως ἄνθρωπον· πεῖνα γὰρ καὶ δίψα, κόπος, ὕπνος καὶ ἰδρῶς, ὡς ὁ θεῖος οὔτος ἀνὴρ ἐν ἐξηκοστῷ ἐνάτῳ κεφαλαίῳ αὐτοῦ λέγων εὐρήται, μετὰ τὴν παράβασιν εἰς τὸν ἀνθρώπινον βίον εἰσήλθοσαν [EUSTRATIADIS, Κεφάλαια I (cited n. 2), 45.4-9]· Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ὁ θεῖος οὔτος ἀνὴρ –namely John of Damascus– ἐν τῷ ὀγδοηκοστῷ ἐνάτῳ τῶν δογματικῶν αὐτοῦ κεφαλαίων [EUSTRATIADIS, Κεφάλαια II (cited n. 2), 254.11-12] etc. Out of all those works which Glykas names as chapters only Ἐκδοσις ἀκριβῆς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως of John of Damascus is actually such a text, [ed. B. KOTTER, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, 2. (*Patristische Texte und Studien*, 12). Berlin 1973]. The rest of these works are either in question-and-answer form or essays. This fact shows that Glykas understands and uses the term “chapter” loosely for texts with obvious differences between them as to their form and consequently their genre, with the common parameter, however, that they initially raise an issue which is subsequently examined.

⁴² See for example ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ δὲ βιβλίῳ τῶν αὐτῶν διατάξων κατὰ τὸ ἐνακαιδέκατον κεφάλαιον... [EUSTRATIADIS, Κεφάλαια II (cited n. 2), 34.1-2]; Ἰστέον ὅτι ἐν εἰκοστῷ πρώτῳ κεφαλαίῳ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ Ἰωάννου καὶ τάδε διεήληπται [EUSTRATIADIS, Κεφάλαια II (cited n. 2), 256.6-7] etc.

⁴³ EUSTRATIADIS, Κεφάλαια II (cited n. 2), 133.20-134.2.

⁴⁴ EUSTRATIADIS, Κεφάλαια II (cited n. 2), 416.26-417.4.

⁴⁵ See respectively Ἐτι καὶ τοῦτο ἠπόρηται εἴτε φθαρτὴ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγία τοῦ Χριστοῦ μετάληψις εἴτε καὶ ἄφθαρτος [EUSTRATIADIS, Κεφάλαια II (cited n. 2), 133-135], Τῷ τιμωτάτῳ μοναχῷ κυρῷ Ἰωαννικίῳ τῷ Γραμματικῷ. Ἀπολογητικὸν ἐκ μέρους πρὸς τὸν μοναχὸν ἐκείνον τὸν ἀποκαλέσαντα κακοδόξους ἡμᾶς, ἐπειδὴ λέγομεν ὅτι ὁ τῆς προθέσεως ἄρτος τοιοῦτός ἐστι κατὰ φύσιν, ὅποια ἦν ἡ ἀγία τοῦ Χριστοῦ σὰρξ ἡ ἐπὶ τοῦ μυστικοῦ δείπνου τοῖς μαθηταῖς εἰς βρώσιν δοθεῖσα [EUSTRATIADIS, Κεφάλαια II (cited n. 2), 348-379].

text no. 84 appears only as a title in Athous Pantel. 212 and Mosq. Synod. gr. 219 (230 Vlad.), and as a text as well in Paris. gr. 228, Vatic. gr. 690 and Mone Panagias Kamariotisses 82. Therefore only two codices today transmit both texts: Paris. gr. 228 and Vatic. gr. 690. Paris. gr. 228 is a really valuable manuscript not only because it dates back to the 13th century and preserves almost the entire Glykas collection, but also because in some cases it delivers the short version of certain texts and thus represents, according to Eustratiadis, the first revision of the collection made by Glykas himself. From this particular codex though (f. 121r) as well as from the Vatic. gr. 690 (f. 244r) the controversial designation is absent. It should be considered to have been added later by Glykas, for it is already transmitted in Athous Pantel. 212 (f. 183r), as well as later codices.

On the other hand, text no. 91 is delivered in six codices today (Athous Pantel. 212, Paris. gr. 228, Vatic. gr. 690, Marc. gr. II 89, Guelf. 73 Gud. graec. and Mosq. Synod. gr. 219 (230 Vlad.). All of them also include text no. 80. The two most recent codices (Guelf. 73 Gud. graec. and Mosq. Synod. gr. 219 (230 Vlad.) are of less interest to our research, for it is obvious that they uncritically copy the cross-reference κεφάλαιον ἀνάγνωθι τὸ ὀγδοηκοστόν, even though it does not correspond to their own numbering.⁴⁶ The same applies to Vatic. gr. 690, where text no. 80 is actually the fifty-eighth of the collection according to Eustratiadis' edition. In the rest of the codices the above mentioned cross-reference is correct. However, it should be noted that in Athous Pantel. 212 as well as in Marc. gr. II 89 the text numbering in margins begins with the number 3 (γ'), since according to the table of contents numbers 1 and 2 deliver Glykas' poems and collection of proverbs. Therefore, the cited text referred to by Glykas is the κεφάλαιον ὀγδοηκοστόν of the collection, only because numbers 1 and 2 are also counted. Curiously enough the cross-reference is correct in Paris. gr. 228 as well, even if its numbering starts from the number 1: the ὀγδοηκοστόν chapter is in fact the text implied, as text no. 34 is repeated and there is also a separate chapter regarding magnets.⁴⁷ Here once again the two poems of Glykas precede, but are not counted when it comes to the manuscript's numbering.

⁴⁶ In codex Guelf. 73 Gud. graec. the numbering begins with number 1 and since the intermediate texts no. 3 and 41 are omitted, the κεφάλαιον ὀγδοηκοστόν is actually no. 85 – and not 80 – of Eustratiadis' edition. The case is similar in the codex Mosq. Synod. gr. 219 (230 Vlad.), where the sequence of the texts is completely different [see Vladimir, *Sistematičeskoe opisanie rukopisej Moskovskoj Sinodal'noj (Patriaršej) biblioteki. I: Rukopisi grečeskie*. Moscow 1894, 288-296]; text no. 80 of the collection is actually text no. 22 of Eustratiadis' edition.

⁴⁷ In Eustratiadis' edition the text under the title Τί δ' ἂν τις εἶπη καὶ περὶ τῆς μαγνήτιδος; is a part of chapter 33.

Conclusively, Glykas added the word κεφάλαιον in text no. 91 during an overall editing not only of the collection of his ninety-five texts but of his overall work (namely his two poems, his proverbs and the collection),⁴⁸ when he apparently considered his various texts as units of a single book. That he mentions himself in the text no. 59 (ἐν ἑτέρῳ κεφαλαίῳ πρὸς τὸ τέλει [cite Eustr.] τῆς βίβλου ταύτης ὄντι) is a habit of other Byzantine authors as well.⁴⁹

Based on these data, even if the term κεφάλαια is maintained in contemporary references to Glykas' work, two points should be made clear at the very beginning: (a) it does not carry any genre content, but instead is of a general use in order to describe texts of various genres,⁵⁰ and mainly (b) it concerns more texts than the ninety-five of the collection under discussion here, whose title in any case varies so much in the manuscript tradition that it needs to be re-examined.

But if those ninety-five texts are not chapters in the sense of a genre, and more importantly are not considered to be such by Michael Glykas himself, even during their editing for incorporation into a collection, what kind of texts are they? Speeches, epistolary essays, epistles? And are they all of the same genre?

According to Eustratiadis these ninety-five texts compose a "set of epistolary theological essays or chapters",⁵¹ which were written and sent to different people, who had previously "addressed Glykas via epistles asking him for answers to various theological questions and issues".⁵² Eustratiadis' description clearly points to epistolography, even if the deviation of Glykas' texts from the ἐπιστολιμαῖος χαρακτήρ regarding (mainly) their length is very common, mostly as a result of his constant citations of ecclesiastical sources.⁵³ That is the reason why they are sometimes defined as epistolary theological essays. According to I. Sykoutris⁵⁴ neither the length of a text nor its content suffices to justify whether it is a piece of writing addressed to a specific person or an epistle. The basic distinctive feature is the introductory form of address. In the essays addressed to a person the name of the recipient is given in the first line of the text. This is not the case in the epistles: the name of the recipient already appears in the title and so in the

⁴⁸ These are also included in Eustratiadis' edition (see n. 4).

⁴⁹ See the paper of I. PÉREZ MARTÍN, *Les Kephalaia* de Chariton des Hodèges (Paris, Bnf, gr. 1630), in: P. VAN DEUN, C. MACÉ (eds.), *Encyclopedic Trends in Byzantium? Proceedings of the International Conference held in Leuven, 6-8 May 2009 (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, 212)*. Leuven 2011, 363-385.

⁵⁰ Βλ. PÉREZ MARTÍN, *Les Kephalaia* (cited n. 49), 366, n. 20.

⁵¹ EUSTRATIADIS, *Κεφάλαια* I (cited n. 2), α'.

⁵² EUSTRATIADIS, *Κεφάλαια* I (cited n. 2), γγ'.

⁵³ See more in ΚΙΑΡΙΔΟΥ, *Michael Glykas* (cited n. 24), 176-177.

⁵⁴ I. SYKOUTRIS, *Epistolographie*, in: *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, Supplemente*, 5. Stuttgart 1931, 187-188.

epistle text only a polite form of address to the correspondent, similar to the ones found in many of Glykas' texts (see ὦ θεία καὶ ἱερὰ κεφαλή, ἄνθρωπε τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀγαπητέ, θεοεἶκελε ἄνερ, ὀσιώτατε ἄνερ, ἡγαπημένε μοι πάτερ, ἀδελφὲ etc.⁵⁵) may be found. Thus, according to Sykoutris' schema on ancient epistolography at least sixty-nine out of Glykas' ninety-five texts addressed to specific recipients can be characterized as letters.⁵⁶

From my point of view, the key to understanding Michael Glykas' collection lies in its comparison with other relevant collections of the middle Byzantine era. I am going to refer to four – in my opinion – typical cases: the *Epistles* and the *Amphilochia* of Photius⁵⁷, the epistles of Nicetas Stethatos⁵⁸ and the *Ponemata diaphora* of Demetrios Chomatenos.⁵⁹

To begin with Chomatenos' work, this consists of one hundred and forty-nine texts, traditionally known as “chapters”⁶⁰ (!) because of their first edition in 1891 by J. B. Pitra.⁶¹ G. Prinzing's critical edition in 2002 established the title *Ponemata diaphora*, which is actually found in the manuscript tradition of this work in contrast with the term “chapters”, which was apparently introduced by Pitra for the classification of the texts. It is indeed an extensive collection of various works, which the editor Prinzing divided according to specific criteria into four basic categories. Of those, the ones of interest for our study are the “Briefe-Responsa” (epistles replying to questions mainly on Canon Law) and the “Responsa” (essays on relevant issues). The guiding principle for the distinction between the “Briefe-Responsa” and the simple “Responsa” was the reference to a recipient as well as, more often, a personal greeting or wish at the end.⁶² Moreover, these replying letters may be lengthy, full of passages cited by Chomatenos in answering the questions posed, and their title includes the topic of the letter

⁵⁵ For the typical forms of address in Byzantine epistolography see GRÜNBART, *Formen der Anrede* (cited n. 9).

⁵⁶ For the rest twenty-six texts see specifically p. 61-62.

⁵⁷ *Epistles*: Photii Patriarchae Constantinopolitani Epistulae et Amphilochia, eds. B. LAOURDAS-L.G. WESTERINK (*Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana*), I-III. Leipzig 1985; *Amphilochia*: Photii Patriarchae Constantinopolitani Epistulae et Amphilochia, ed. L.G. WESTERINK (*Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana*), IV-VI.2. Leipzig 1986-1988.

⁵⁸ Nicétas Stéthatos, *Opusculs et Lettres*, ed. J. DARROUZÈS. Paris 1961.

⁵⁹ Demetrii Chomateni *Ponemata diaphora*, ed. G. PRINZING (*CFHB*, 38). Berlin 2002.

⁶⁰ PRINZING, *Ponemata diaphora* (cited n. 59), 46*.

⁶¹ *Analecta sacra et classica Spicilegio Solesmense parata*, ed. J. B. PITRA (*Juris ecclesiastici Graecorum selecta paralipomena*, VI [VII]). Paris-Rome 1891.

⁶² PRINZING, *Ponemata diaphora* (cited n. 59), 62*-307*; especially 270*-273* and 285*-291*.

besides its recipient's name. On the other hand the introductory table of contents of the collection gives only the theme of each text and a few words from its initial lines; as for the epistles, the recipient's name is not cited, a fact that shows the interest of the collection's author to have been focused basically on the content of each text and not on its initial form.

The study of Demetrios Chomatenos' *Ponemata diaphora* from the perspective of the data of Glykas' collection, then, suggests that (a) it is probably a habit of previous editors to name as chapters Byzantine collections of texts of various genres; (b) the length of a text does not define its genre, for the basic criterion is the reference to a recipient; thus, based also on Prinzing's schema, most of Glykas' texts are replying letters;⁶³ and (c) the manuscript tradition does not focus on the original form of the texts, but rather demonstrates interest mainly in their content; that is the reason why the tables of contents usually omit the names of the texts' recipients.

Even more interesting is the case of Patriarch Photius, who composed epistles as well as essays of theological content. The conditions under which these two different collections were formed, the features of their texts as well as the classification criteria used for one collection or the other, all these are obviously closely related to the questions raised in the present paper.

More specifically, Photius' *Amphilochia* includes three hundred and twenty-nine usually brief replies to questions on various interpretative issues concerning the Bible and patristic texts. Their recipient was a specific person, the metropolitan of Cyzicus Amphilochius. The conditions under which this collection was formed remain fairly vague.⁶⁴ According to the introductory epistle to Amphilochius, at his request Photius gathered some of his past replies on various matters and sent them to Amphilochius after revising them.⁶⁵ We do not know what was

⁶³ See also relevant text references: Ἄλλ' ἵνα μή, τὸ σὸν ἐπίταγμα παρ' οὐδὲν θέμενοι, τῷ τῆς ἀνηκοΐας ἐγκλήματι περιπέσωμεν, ἰδοῦ, τῇ σῇ θαρρήσαντες ὁσιότητι, καὶ τῶν ἀνεφίκτων κατατολῶμεν, καὶ ὡς δύναμις περὶ ὧν ἠρώτηκας ποιούμεθα τὴν ἀπόκρισιν· ἔνθεν τοι καὶ ἄκουε [EUSTRATIADIS, Κεφάλαια I (cited n. 2), 3.6-10]; Ἐφ' οἷς ἠπόρηκας, ὁσιώτατε ἄνερ, πῶς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστήσονται τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, λέγων, σώματα, καὶ ποίω τῷ σχήματι, καὶ εἰ ἔστι διαφορὰ ἄρρενός τε καὶ θήλεος, ἀμηχανία καὶ ἡμᾶς οὐ μικρὰ πολὺν ἤδη κατέχει καιρὸν· ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ πρὸς ἰσχύος οὐκ ἔχομεν εὐχερῶς ἐπὶ τούτοις ἀποκρίσιν δοῦναι σοι [EUSTRATIADIS, Κεφάλαια I (cited n. 2), 89.5-9]; Τί δέ σοι καὶ περὶ τῆς ἀρρήτου τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος ἐκπορεύσεως ἀποκριθεῖν ἐγώ, πῶς δὲ καὶ τὸν περὶ τούτου διευκρινήσαιμι λόγον τῇ θεοφιλίᾳ σου, σάρκινος ὢν ἄνθρωπος καὶ περὶ τὴν γῆν ἰλυσπῶμενος καὶ χοῦν ἐσθίων κατὰ τοὺς ὄφεις αἰεῖ; [EUSTRATIADIS, Κεφάλαια I (cited n. 2), 335.6-9] etc.

⁶⁴ Epistulae et Amphilochia (cited n. 57), IV, XVI-XXII.

⁶⁵ Epistulae et Amphilochia (cited n. 57), IV, 1.1-2.25.

the original form of these replies. Were they notes, brief theological essays or epistles? The customary forms of address to Amphilochius,⁶⁶ the usually short length of the texts as well as the rest of their references⁶⁷ imply epistolography – that is the reason why modern scholars often refer to the epistolary type of the *Amphilochia* – even if their final form is that of erotapokriseis.⁶⁸ Given, however, that according to the six-volume common edition of the two collections entitled *Epistulae et Amphilochia* eighty epistles of that collection are also incorporated in the *Amphilochia*,⁶⁹ the possibility that other texts of the *Amphilochia* may have originally been epistles is very strong – and at the same time highly interesting in the framework of the study of Michael Glykas' own collection.

Comparison of these two collections reveals the obvious similarities concerning the content of their texts (a great part of Glykas' writings too consider the interpretation of the Bible and patristic works), to a degree their form and their structure (e.g. a theme heading in every text, forms of address, invocations using second person singular, etc.), and of course their initial aim to incorporate dispersed texts into a single book in order to preserve them. However, as far as the degree of their final editing is concerned the two collections differ considerably. The existence of a specific title (Ἀμφιλόχια, ἢ λόγων ἱερῶν καὶ ζητημάτων ἱερολογίαι πρὸς Ἀμφιλόχιον τὸν ὀσιώτατον μητροπολίτην Κυζίκου, ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῶν πειρασμῶν ζητημάτων διαφόρων εἰς ἀριθμὸν τριακοσίων συντεινόντων ἐπίλυσιν αἰτησάμενον) and, mainly, the inclusion of an introductory dedicatory epistle to Amphilochius, the recipient of all the following texts, constitute signs of great care on Photius' part. All the same, it is a fact that regardless of their original form – an issue to be studied in the *Amphilochia* as well – the texts collected and sent together have for the most part come down to us as brief replies without thematic overlaps. Michael Glykas, on the contrary, seems to have been content

⁶⁶ φιλολόγων ἱερῶν ἄριστε [Epistulae et Amphilochia (cited n. 57), IV, 129.6], βέλτιστε [Epistulae et Amphilochia (cited n. 57), IV, 105.4], ἱερώτατον τέκνον καὶ ἀδελφέ [Epistulae et Amphilochia (cited n. 57), V, 125.2] etc.

⁶⁷ See indicatively Τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τῆς ὑμῶν ἱεροπρεποῦς ὀσιότητος ἐδεξάμεθα, τὴν καρτερίαν σου καὶ ὑπομονὴν καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἔνστασιν καὶ διδασκαλίαν καὶ ἐπαινοῦντες καὶ μακαρίζοντες... Περὶ δὲ τῆς ὑποθέσεως ἥς τὸ γραφόμενον ἠξίωσας... [Epistulae et Amphilochia (cited n. 57), V, 124.2-6]; Καὶ ἀρτίως εὐπορήσαντες, θεοφιλέστατον τέκνον, μόλις ἐπιστοληφόρου, καὶ τῶν χειραγωγικῶν ὁδῶν μικρὸν ἀπολυθέντες, τὴν ὑμῶν αἴτησιν ὡς χρέος ἀποτινύομεν [Epistulae et Amphilochia (cited n. 57), V, 126.2-4] etc.

⁶⁸ Photius is chronologically the last author mentioned in the classic account of the genre by H. DÖRRIES, *Erotapokriseis*, in: RAC 6 (Stuttgart 1966), 342-370).

⁶⁹ See Epistulae et Amphilochia (cited n. 57), I, IX-X and Epistulae et Amphilochia (cited n. 57), IV, XVIII.

with a first level of classification of texts of various recipients and lengths, with regular overlapping.⁷⁰

Finally, as for the collection of Photius' epistles, it is well known that epistolography's theoretical requirement of conciseness is not always followed, even though Photius is well aware of the ἐπιστολιμαῖος χαρακτήρ.⁷¹ Consequently, some of his epistles are so extensive as to constitute treatises.⁷² Obviously, when conditions warrant, Photius does not feel restricted by the ancient theory of epistle writing. If this is the case for Photius, the same is all the more likely to be true for Michael Glykas, who nonetheless experiments as a scholar by composing (for example) a chronicle enriched with theological interpretations or poems in popular language, in the century of Byzantine writing innovations par excellence.

Nor is Michael Glykas the only one composing this kind of texts in the middle Byzantine period. Epistles similar in length and form were written, for example, by Iakovos Monachos (forty-three letters),⁷³ by St. Symeon the New Theologian (four letters)⁷⁴ or later by Symeon's student Nicetas Stethatos (ten letters).⁷⁵

⁷⁰ He deals with the topic of fasting on Wednesday and Friday, for example, in texts no. 46 (Τῷ τιμιωτάτῳ μοναχῷ κυρῷ Μελετίῳ τῷ Κριτοπούλῳ. Εἰ χρῆ προσέχειν τοῖς λέγουσιν, ὅτι οὐκ ἐπάναγκες ἡμῖν τὸ ἐν Τετραδοπαρασκευαῖς νηστεύειν, τοῦ Κυρίου λέγοντος ὅτι οὐ τὰ εἰσερχόμενα κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐξερχόμενα), no. 47 (Τῷ τιμιωτάτῳ μοναχῷ κυρῷ Ἡσαΐᾳ. Εἰ χρῆ κρέας ἐσθίειν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ Τετράδι τυχὸν ἢ Παρασκευῆ, δεσποτικῶν ἐμπιπτουσῶν ἑορτῶν· καὶ εἰ ἐπάναγκες ἡμῖν τοῦτο, καθάτινες οἴονται), no. 68 (Τῷ τιμιωτάτῳ μοναχῷ κυρῷ Βαρλαάμ. Εἰ χρῆ προσέχειν τοῖς λέγουσιν ὅτι οὐκ ἔξεστι καταλύειν ἐν κρέατι ὀπηνίκα δεσποτικά συμπίπτουσιν ἑορταὶ Τετράδι τυχὸν ἢ Παρασκευῆ, καὶ ὅτι οὐκ ἐπάναγκες ἡμῖν τὸ νηστεύειν ἐβδομάδα μίαν μετὰ τὴν τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς ὅλης ἑορτῆν) and no. 81 (Τῷ τιμιωτάτῳ μοναχῷ κυρῷ Ἰωαννικίῳ τῷ Γραμματικῷ. Εἰ χρῆ προσέχειν τοῖς λέγουσιν ὅτι οὐκ ἔξεστι καταλύειν ἐν γε Τετράδι καὶ Παρασκευῇ τὰ τῆς νηστείας, εἰ καὶ τύχη συμπεσεῖν αὐταῖς οἰανδήποτε δεσποτικὴν ἑορτῆν).

⁷¹ See for example Letter 2: Καὶ μυρία ἂν τις τὴν ἄθεον αὐτῶν γνώμην διελέγχων τοῖς εἰρημένοις ἐπιμετρήσειεν, ἃ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς ὁ νόμος οὐκ ἔἴ νῦν ἐντάττειν οὐδὲ παρατίθεσθαι [Epistulae et Amphilochia (cited n. 57), I, 56.1-56.81].

⁷² A characteristic example is Letter 1 Τῷ περιφανεστάτῳ καὶ περιβλέπτῳ ἡγαπημένῳ ἐν Κυρίῳ πνευματικῷ υἱῷ Μιχαὴλ τῷ ἐκ Θεοῦ ἄρχοντι Βουλγαρίας [Epistulae et Amphilochia (cited n. 57), I, 2.1-39.1208]. See also Letter 249 Τῷ φιλοχρίστῳ καὶ μεγάλῳ βασιλεῖ Βασιλείῳ ἀρξαμένῳ γράφειν καὶ ἀποριῶν τινων ἐπιζητήσαντι λύσεις [Epistulae et Amphilochia (cited n. 57), II, 183.1-186.102] and others.

⁷³ Iacobi Monachi Epistulae, eds. E. & M. JEFFREYS (*Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca*, 68). Turnhout 2009.

⁷⁴ The Epistles of St. Symeon the New Theologian, ed. H.J.M. TURNER (*Oxford Early Christian Texts*). Oxford 2009.

⁷⁵ Opusculum et Lettres (cited n. 58), 228-291 (eight letters), 464-471 καὶ 476-485 (two letters; these are not taken into account in the most recent catalogue of Byzantine epistolographers by M. GRÜNBAERT, *Epistularum Byzantinarum Initia*. Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 2001, 6*-40*).

Stethatos' epistles especially bear important information on the conditions of production as well as the issues covered by the theological correspondence of the Byzantines: for example, that epistles used to act as an introduction to posted epistolary essays⁷⁶ or that extensive epistles replied methodically to questions that had been raised after the study of those epistolary essays.⁷⁷ There is, furthermore, a point of even greater interest. Three adequately long theological epistles are delivered under the title Ἀπὸ τῆς τρίτης ἑκατοντάδος τῶν ἐπιστολῶν Νικήτα τοῦ Στηθάτου; the first and the third were written by Stethatos himself (Ἀθανασίῳ ἡγουμένῳ τῆς μονῆς τοῦ Παναγίου περὶ κανόνων and Νικήτας Ἀθανασίῳ, περὶ κανόνων οἰκονομίας), while the second belongs to abbot Athanasios and is a reply to Stethatos' first letter (Ἀντιρρητικὴ εἰς αὐτό. Ἀθανάσιος Νικήτα).⁷⁸ All three are transmitted in Stethatos' collection of letters, which must have comprised numerous texts, classified in at least three groups of a hundred texts, following the tradition of ascetic chapters in this respect.

It is obvious that, in contrast to other epistolary categories, where the literary and aesthetic features play the leading role, theological epistolography between churchmen as well as faithful laymen with theological interests or simple questions arising from their everyday Christian life has an objective and practical aim: the interpretation and teaching of Christian texts in the most persuasive way. That is the main reason why its basic features are the usually extensive length of the epistles, the regular references to other sources (mainly the Bible and patristic texts), the limited personal details or direct references to those concerned, when compared to other epistles, etc. Those who tend to characterize such texts as epistolary essays rather than epistles, due to the above-mentioned particular features, underestimate the context of personal correspondence in which these texts were composed, placing instead more emphasis on the content

⁷⁶ See for example Stethatos' two letters on his treatise Περὶ ψυχῆς [Opuscules et Lettres (cited n. 58), 56.1-62.15] and his two others on his treatise Περὶ ἱεραρχίας [Opuscules et Lettres (cited n. 58), 292.1-296.34].

⁷⁷ See for example the beginning of Letter IV: Ἀεὶ μοι τὰ σὰ πάντα φίλα, δέσποτα φίλε, καὶ ἐκθύμως κατασπαζόμενα... Διὸ καὶ τὰ ἐν τοῖς λόγοις ζητηθέντα μετὰ τοῦ λόγου καὶ σκοπηθέντα καλῶς δεξάμενος, δεῖν ἔγνω ἀπολογήσασθαι ὑπὲρ ὧν ἐζήτησας μαθεῖν ὁ φίλος ἐμὸς καὶ δεσπότης μου. Μαθεῖν ἐρωτᾶς πῶς τοῦ φωτισμοῦ μετέχει τοὺς ἀγγέλους... [Opuscules et Lettres (cited n. 58), 234.4-236.1]; moreover, Letter I: Προσεκοψέ τις τῶν σοφῶν τῷ περὶ ψυχῆς καὶ παραδείσου μοι λόγῳ, πρὸς ὃν ἐπιστείλας τὰς τε προτάσεις αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ ζητήματα, τὰς μὲν, ἀγνωσίας καὶ ἀτοπίας οὔσας ἐσχάτης, ὡς εἰκός, ἀνεσκεύασα... Δεῖν οὖν ἔγνω τὰς πρὸς τὸν τοιοῦτον ἐπιστολάς πέμψαι σοι, ἐπεὶ τῶν ῥηθέντων ποιῆ τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν, ἵν' εἰδῆς καὶ αὐτόθεν τὴν τῶν λόγων πυκνότητα καὶ ἀκρίβειαν... [Opuscules et Lettres (cited n. 58), 228.1-10].

⁷⁸ Opuscules et Lettres (cited n. 58), 464-485. See also n. 75.

of the texts; in other words, they equate them with the essays written and sent to a recipient without that necessarily being at the recipient's wish or without taking his personality into account. In my view, a recording and systematic philological study of the theological letters focusing on their manuscript tradition and basic features will, first of all, provide justification to those who are hesitant about or even avoid the characterization "epistle". It will, moreover, make it possible to distinguish among several categories of these epistles and will clarify the specific conditions of the composition of these collections, as they end up being something between collections of letters and question-and-answer literature.⁷⁹

Especially, as far as Michael Glykas is concerned, the constant references in the manuscript tradition to recipients of usually more than one text, their various and multiple forms of addresses in the texts, Glykas' few but nevertheless existing references to his personal feelings, illness, etc. – all these define the epistolary genre of the texts of his collection, while the headings are related to their didactic use in the framework of this collection.

All these things are, of course, valid for the sixty-nine out of the ninety-five texts that bear recipients' names. However, interspersed among these sixty-nine texts are twenty-six others, mostly short and of various content, with no recipient named in their superscription but only a statement of the subject, usually after the opening phrase Ἔτι καὶ τοῦτο ἠπόρηται.⁸⁰ The origin as well as the location of these texts in Glykas' collection will be the subject of my future research, given that several of these texts deal with topics which are not treated elsewhere,⁸¹ while there are others which repeat issues already discussed, possibly more thoroughly and more adequately in another text.⁸² No. 12, however, may also be the only text

⁷⁹ See indicatively Bussièrès' final remark: "...Faut-il considérer ces lettres comme une sous-catégorie du genre littéraire des questions et réponses? Quelle est la nature de la frontière entre la réponse par lettre et le genre des questions et réponses?... le procédé large des questions et réponses nous place devant un schéma de travail assez flottant pour qu'on puisse y distinguer des sous-genres. Ou est-ce au contraire la forme des questions et réponses qui serait un cadre méthodologique appliqué à d'autres genres?" [M.-P. BUSSIÈRÈS, Conclusions: Questions (encore) sans réponses, in: *Erotapokriseis* (cited n. 20), 184-185].

⁸⁰ See more in ΚΙΑΡΙΔΟΥ, Michael Glykas (cited n. 24), 184-185. Meanwhile the further study of the manuscript tradition has shown that these particular texts have come down to us constantly without recipients being mentioned.

⁸¹ See no. 18 Ἐπεξηγησις τῶν ἐν τῷ θείῳ τελουμένων λουτρῶ [EUSTRATIADIS, *Κεφάλαια I* (cited n. 2), 222-224] or no. 64 Καὶ τοῦτο πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις ἠπόρηται, εἰ κατὰ πάντα καιρὸν συναφείαις κεχρησθαι τοῖς ὁμοζύγοις οὐκ ἔξεστιν [EUSTRATIADIS, *Κεφάλαια II* (cited n. 2), 175-179].

⁸² See for example no. 59 [EUSTRATIADIS, *Κεφάλαια II* (cited n. 2), 133-135] compared with no. 84 [EUSTRATIADIS, *Κεφάλαια II* (cited n. 2), 348-379] regarding the corruptibility of

for which we can assume with relevant certainty that its initial version was not a letter, for from its beginning Glykas states that he is recording the oral answer he gave to a question τοῦ κραταιοῦ καὶ ἁγίου ἡμῶν βασιλέως⁸³ – the emperor’s reaction is described at the end of the text.⁸⁴

Glykas’ collection may finally be shown to be even closer to the logic of the *Amphilochia* or Demetrios Chomatenos’ *Ponemata diaphora*; to comprise, that is, various texts, mostly epistles as well as short theological treatises or notes, which for some reason were incorporated later into the collection on following the same pattern as the epistles.

Eirini-Sophia Kiapidou
University of Patras

the Eucharist, or no. 93 [EUSTRATIADIS, Κεφάλαια II (cited n. 2), 436-444] compared with no. 37 [EUSTRATIADIS, Κεφάλαια I (cited n. 2), 416-461] regarding Divine Providence.

⁸³ Καὶ τοῦτο τοῦ κραταιοῦ καὶ ἁγίου ἡμῶν βασιλέως ἐπαποροῦντος οὕτω καὶ λέγοντος· ἐὰν ἐπὶ σωτηρία τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἢ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου γέγονεν ἐνανθρώπησις, διατί μὴ πολλῶ πρότερον αὐτὴ ἐγένετο, ὥστε καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐκείνους ἐπιγνῶναι τὸν Κύριον, ὅσοι δι’ ἄγνοιαν ἐν ἀσεβείᾳ τὸν βίον κατέστρεψαν; τοιαύτην ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀπόκρισιν ἐποιήσαμεν λέγοντες [EUSTRATIADIS, Κεφάλαια I (cited n. 2), 150.7-12]. Glykas is obviously referring to Manuel I Komnenos even though he does not name him (see also no. 40 Ἀνταπολογητικὸν ἐκ μέρους πρὸς τὴν ἐγχειρισθεῖσαν αὐτῷ γραφὴν τοῦ κραταιοῦ καὶ ἁγίου ἡμῶν βασιλέως κυροῦ Μανουὴλ τοῦ Κομνηνοῦ...).

⁸⁴ Καὶ ἡμεῖς μὲν τοιαύτην ἐπὶ τῷ ἀπορήματι δεδώκαμεν τὴν ἀπόκρισιν· ὁ δὲ πλήρης πάσης συνέσεως βασιλεὺς οὐκ ἐπὶ πλέον ἀντέπεσε, μᾶλλον μὲν οὖν ὑπερηγάσατο τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦτο καθ’ οὓς οἶδε τρόπους οἰκονομήσαντος [EUSTRATIADIS, Κεφάλαια I (cited n. 2), 153.22-154.4].

ABSTRACT

It is a fact that the variety of terms in use (“chapters”, “epistolary essays”, “epistles” etc.) regarding Michael Glykas’ ninety-five texts of theological content, which have been published by Sophronios Eustratiadis in two volumes under the title *Εἰς τὰς ἀπορίας τῆς θείας γραφῆς κεφάλαια*, is so wide as to cause wonder as well as confusion regarding their genre. Eustratiadis was the first to consciously introduce the term “chapters” instead of “epistles”, the widely-used term for Glykas’ texts in the various editions and studies, since “the oldest manuscripts as well as Glykas himself name the collection as chapters”.

This paper examines thoroughly the accuracy of his statement and shows that the manuscript tradition of the collection does not justify its designation as chapters. On the other hand, when Glykas referred to his texts as chapters, it was during an overall editing not only of the collection of his ninety-five texts but of his overall work (namely his two poems, his proverbs and the collection), when he apparently considered his various texts as units of a single book. Based on these data, even if the term *κεφάλαια* is maintained in contemporary references to Glykas’ work two points should be made clear at the very beginning: (a) it does not carry any genre content, but instead is of a general use in order to describe texts of various genres, and mainly (b) it concerns more texts than the ninety-five of the collection under discussion here, whose title in any case varies so much in the manuscript tradition that it needs to be re-examined.

Moreover, the comparison of Glykas’ collection with other relevant works of the middle Byzantine era, namely the *Epistles* and the *Amphilochia* of Photius, the epistles of Nicetas Stethatos and the *Ponemata diaphora* of Demetrios Chomatenos, lead to the assumption that Glykas’ collection comprise various texts, mostly epistles as well as short theological treatises or notes, which for some reason were incorporated later into the collection on following the same pattern as the epistles.

