

# Historical Memory of Byzantine Iconoclasm in the 14<sup>th</sup> c.: the Case of Nikephoros Gregoras and Philotheos Kokkinos

Lev Lukhovitskij

The Synodikon of Orthodoxy of AD 843 solemnly proclaimed the final defeat and condemnation of the iconoclastic heresy. It stated explicitly that it was not possible anymore to revitalize it as God “bestowed upon us unworthy liberation from calamities, redemption from sorrows, new proclamation of piety, and safety of icon veneration” (κατηρτίσατο τοῖς ἀναξίοις ἡμῖν τὴν τῶν δυσχερῶν ἀπαλλαγὴν καὶ τῶν λυπούντων τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν καὶ τῆς εὐσεβείας τὴν ἀνακύρησιν καὶ τῆς εἰκονικῆς προσκυνήσεως τὴν ἀσφάλειαν), whereas those who attempted to smear the holy images proved to be “cowards and fled away” (δειλοὺς καὶ πεφευγότες).<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, the history of the iconoclastic controversy in Byzantium did not come to an end with the restoration of Orthodoxy. Although iconoclasm did not exist anymore as a coherent theological and philosophical doctrine, an accusation of iconoclasm became a powerful polemical weapon in the hands of those who sought to compromise their political and ideological opponents. As we know, “la religion officielle tend toujours à assimiler une hérésie nouvelle à une ancienne”.<sup>2</sup> As soon as the partisans of icon veneration (Ioannes Damaskenos, Nikephoros of Constantinople, Theodoros Stoudites etc.) and their spiritual heirs (Photios of Constantinople) established an inextricable theological link between iconoclasm and earlier Christological heresies, a charge of iconoclasm became equal to an accusation of all these previous blasphemies taken together (Arianism, Nestorianism, Docetism, etc.).

Throughout the ages from the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the 9<sup>th</sup> c.<sup>3</sup> until the fall of Byzantium<sup>4</sup> the iconoclastic issue acquired relevance or, on the contrary, remained only in the background of the doctrinal controversies of the time. The sources inform us

1 J. GOUILLARD. Le Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie: Édition et commentaire. *Travaux et mémoires* 2 (1967), 1–316, 47, l. 41–43; 49, l. 51.

2 P. LEMERLE. L'histoire des Pauliciens d'Asie Mineure d'après les sources grecques. *Travaux et mémoires* 5 (1973), 1–144, 124.

3 The Photian period (858–886) must be treated with great caution as it was too closely linked to the iconoclastic period itself. It was rather a final stage of the controversy than its revival: C. MANGO. The Liquidation of Iconoclasm and the Patriarch Photios. In: *Iconoclasm (Papers given at the 9th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Birmingham, March 1975)*. Ed. by A. BRYER and J. HERRIN. Birmingham, 1977, 133–140; H. G. THÜMMEL. *Bilderlehre und Bilderstreit: Arbeiten zur Auseinandersetzung über die Ikone und ihre Begründung vornehmlich im 8. und 9. Jahrhundert*. Würzburg, 1991, 115–126.

4 E.g., Patriarch Gennadios Scholarios (1403/05–1472/73) on the eve of the Turkish conquest makes intensive usage of passages borrowed from Nikephoros' of Constantinople (758–828)

that it was of great urgency during the reign of Alexios I Komnenos (1081–1118): byzantine historians (e.g. Anna Komnene) testify that Ioannes Italos was guilty of iconoclasm, although this charge was not included into the relevant section of the Synodikon of Orthodoxy;<sup>5</sup> several years later the issue was renewed by Leo of Chalcedon.<sup>6</sup>

Still, beyond any doubt the period of the most intensive usage of the charge in question was the epoch of the Hesychast controversy. The polemicists of the period re-discovered iconophile theological texts that had been of minor interest throughout the previous centuries and scrutinized them with vivid interest in pursuit of passages appropriate to condemn their opponents as iconoclasts. Despite their diligence and philological thoroughness, their awareness of actual history and subject of the iconoclastic controversy was far from complete. Consequently, the picture of the iconoclastic crisis they drew was full of distortions and misinterpretations. It is crucial, therefore, to determine the sources they employed to reconstruct the ideology of iconoclasts and their opponents. I believe that answering this seemingly purely philological question will help to approach a much more complicated issue of Byzantines' perception of past and to distinguish some underlying heresiological principles that determined the character and originality of Byzantine theological literature on the whole.

Fortunately, these sources (perhaps it is more correct to treat them as one integrate source) are preserved and well-known to byzantinists. These are two theological treatises composed ca. 815–820 by Nikephoros, Patriarch of Constantinople (806–815) and confessor of the second iconoclasm.<sup>7</sup> The first bears a conventional title *Apologeticus atque Antirrheticus*, comprises 4 sections (*Apologeticus maior* and

---

treatise *Apologeticus atque Antirrheticus* in the 1<sup>st</sup> *Treatise on the Procession of the Holy Spirit* (ca. 1445), *Against Bessarion* (ca. 1443), and *On the words of Theodoros Graptos* (1445): SCHOL. II, 145, l. 14–16 = ΝΙΚΕΡΗ. *Apol.* 581A; II, 238, l. 11–18; III, 102, l. 21–29 = ΝΙΚΕΡΗ. *Apol.* 580D–581A; SCHOL. III, 210, l. 35–211, l. 17 = ΝΙΚΕΡΗ. *Apol.* 304C–305A. Also he provides evidence that Markos Eugenikos has been likewise engaged in a debate over a controversial passage from Pseudo-Theodoros Graptos (i.e. Nikephoros of Constantinople – see below) (SCHOL. III, 212, l. 7–12).

- 5 For a theological evaluation of Italos' argumentation see T. SCHUKIN. Iconoclastic Fragment of the Apologetic Note by John Italos. *Scrinium, Revue de patrologie, d'hagiographie critique et d'histoire ecclésiastique* 4 (2008), 249–259.
- 6 A. A. GLAVINAS. Ἡ ἐπιτὶ Ἀλεξίου Κομνηνοῦ (1081–1118) περὶ ἱερῶν σκευῶν, κειμηλίων καὶ ἁγίων εἰκόνων ἐρις (1081–1095). Thessalonike, 1972; V. LOURÉ. Une dispute sans justes: Léon de Chalcedoine, Eustrate de Nicée et la troisième querelle sur les images sacrées. *Studia Patristica* 42 (2006), 321–339.
- 7 For his biography see P. J. ALEXANDER. *The Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople. Ecclesiastical Policy and Image Worship in the Byzantine Empire*. Oxford, 1958, 54–155; T. PRATSCH. Nikephoros I. (806–815). In: *Ralph-Johannes Lilie, editor: Die Patriarchen der ikonoklastischen Zeit: Germanos I. – Methodios I. (715–847)*. Berliner byzantinische Studien 5. Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, and Bern, 1999, 109–147; PMBZ, N5301.

three *Antirrhetici*), and aims to resist the second iconoclasm introduced in 815 by emperor Leo V the Armenian (813–820), by means of refutation of the doctrine of the first iconoclasm, i. e. the teaching of Constantine V (741–775). Despite unambiguous manuscript evidence, it was published as 4 separate treatises (and to make the things worse, in reverse order – *Antirrhetici* followed by *Apologeticus maior*) by cardinal Angelo Mai in 1849 and as such reprinted by J.-P. Migne in 1865; arguments for integrity of the treatise are listed by ALEXANDER.<sup>8</sup> The second, known as *Contra Eusebium*, is a supplement to the first and deals with one of the patristic testimonies employed by iconoclasts (e.g. at the iconoclastic Council of Hieria in 754: MANSI. XIII, 313AD), namely, the famous iconoclastic letter to Constantia Augusta, Constantine's the Great sister, ascribed to Eusebius of Caesarea.<sup>9</sup> The authenticity of this letter has been subject of scholarly debate,<sup>10</sup> yet at the present moment this problem is of minor importance for us, suffice it to say that neither Nikephoros himself,<sup>11</sup> nor the fathers of the 7<sup>th</sup> Oecumenical Council in 787 expressed any doubts about its genuineness. A quite understandable tactic, given the fact that the probative value of the passages in question was being rejected by referring to Eusebius' of Caesarea alleged connection to Arius.<sup>12</sup> This method of refutation would not have worked properly, if one could still doubt that Eusebius quoted by iconoclasts and the author of the *Ecclesiastical history* had actually been one and the same person. Recently CHRYSOSTALIS presented strong evidence that *Contra Eusebium* should be treated not as a separate treatise, but as a final section of *Apologeticus atque Antirrhetici*.<sup>13</sup>

This fact is embarrassing by itself as we know that Nikephoros' writings were not easily accessible already from the second half of the 9<sup>th</sup> c. More precisely, after the death of Patriarch Methodios (June 14, 847), when his archive containing a

8 ALEXANDER, see n. 7, 167–173.

9 ALEXANDER, see n. 7, 173–178.

10 S. GERO. The True Image of Christ: Eusebius' Letter to Constantia Reconsidered. *The Journal of Theological Studies* 32.1 (1981), 460–470; A. I. SIDOROV. Послание Евсевия Кесарийского к Констанции (К вопросу об идейных истоках иконоборчества). *Vizantijskij Vremennik* 1951 (1990), 58–73; A. von STOCKHAUSEN. Einige Anmerkungen zur Epistula ad Constantiam des Euseb von Cäsarea. In: *Die ikonoklastische Synode von Hieria 754*. Ed. by T. KRANNICH, C. SCHUBERT, and C. SODE. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 15. Tübingen, 2002, 92–96.

11 With the exception of one passage: “Now it is worth investigating, whether this Eusebius, who says such things, is actually Eusebius, the author of the *Ecclesiastical history*” (Ζητεῖν ἄξιον ἔνταῦθα, εἰ ἐκεῖνος οὗτός ἐστιν Εὐσέβιος, ὁ ταῦτά τε λέγων, καὶ ὁ τὴν καλουμένην Ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ἱστορίαν συνθεῖς – ΝΙΚΗΡΗ. *Euseb.* 460, l. 15–17).

12 MANSI XIII, 316A.

13 A. CHRYSOSTALIS. La reconstitution d'un vaste traité iconophile écrit par Nicéphore de Constantinople. *Semitica et classica* 2 (2009), 203–215.

two-volume edition of Nikephoros' theological writings was hidden in the Stoudios monastery.<sup>14</sup>

Nevertheless, all polemicists of the 14<sup>th</sup> c. remained completely ignorant of the real author of these treatises since they had been ascribed to another confessor of the second iconoclasm – namely, saint Theodoros Graptos (literally “Branded” as the iconoclastic emperor Theophilus in 836 ordered to inscribe on his face iconoclastic verses; for Theodoros' biography: PMBZ, N7526). Unfortunately, Theodoros' genuine polemical writings mentioned in his *Enkomion* by Theophanes of Caesarea (BHG, N1745z) and the *Life of Michael the Synkellos* (BHG, N1296), are not extant anymore.

The identification of the passages ascribed by 14<sup>th</sup> c. theologians to Theodoros Graptos as actually belonging to Nikephoros of Constantinople was established by Jean Boivin in 1702.<sup>15</sup> He also examined two codices containing Nikephoros' writings under Theodoros' Graptos name: Parisinus graecus 910 and Parisinus graecus 909.<sup>16</sup> The first may be dated to the 9<sup>th</sup> c.;<sup>17</sup> or to the late 9<sup>th</sup> – early 10<sup>th</sup> c.<sup>18</sup> The second is an apograph of the first and goes back (as clearly stated by its colophon on fol. 341) to March 1368.<sup>19</sup> One more Nikephoros' codex bearing Theodoros' name is Scorialensis. Ψ.I.15, a 16<sup>th</sup> c. copy of Parisinus graecus 909.<sup>20</sup>

This identification having been established,<sup>21</sup> the following generations of scholars, however, did not come to agreement as for the chronology of this misinterpretation. BOIVIN and PITRA concluded that the part of the title of Parisinus graecus 910 containing Theodoros' name had been written “manu recentiore”,<sup>22</sup> whereas

14 D. AFINOGENOV. Did the Patriarchal Archive End up in the Monastery of Stoudios? Ninth Century Vicissitudes of Some Important Document Collections. In: *Monastères, images, pouvoirs et société à Byzance*. Ed. by M. KAPLAN. Byzantina Sorbonensia 23. Paris, 2006, 125–133.

15 GREGORAS, *Historia*. II, 1297–1300.

16 These manuscripts were also known to BANDURI (as Codices Regii 1989 and 1826), who at the time was preparing a full edition of Nikephoros' writings that, unfortunately, has not ever seen the light (A. BANDURI. *Conspectus operum sancti Nicephori Patriarchae Constantinopolitani, quae propediem duobus tomis edenda sunt* [...] Paris, 1705).

17 B. MONDRAIN. L'ancien empereur Jean VI Cantacuzène et ses copistes. In: *Gregorio Palamas e oltre. Studi e documenti sulle controversie teologiche del XIV secolo bizantino*. Ed. by A. RIGO. Orientalia Venetiana 16. Firenze, 2004, 249–296, 266; CHRYSOSTALIS, see n. 13, 204.

18 В. Л. ФОНКИТЧ. Греческие рукописи европейских собраний: Палеографические и кодикологические исследования 1988–1998 гг. Москва, 1999, 75.

19 MONDRAIN, see n. 17, 265. Against R. BLAKE. Note sur l'activité littéraire de Nicéphore Ier Patriarche de Constantinople. *Byzantion* 14.1 (1939), 1–15 and J. M. FEATHERSTONE. An iconoclastic episode in the Hesychast Controversy. *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 33 (1983), 179–198, who supposed Parisinus graecus 909 to be a 16<sup>th</sup> copy of a 14<sup>th</sup> c. archetype.

20 CHRYSOSTALIS, see n. 13, 209.

21 Cf. an extravagant assertion of CHRESTOU that Nikephoros' treatises in fact contain argumentation going back to Theodoros Graptos (PALAMAS. IV, 327, note 3).

22 GREGORAS, *Historia*. II, 1298; NIKEPH. *Euseb*. LXVIII–LXIX.

BLAKE and ALEXANDER assumed that the attribution of Nikephoros' writings to Theodoros Graptos went as far as 10<sup>th</sup> c., thus, being roughly contemporary with the production of Parisinus graecus 910 itself.<sup>23</sup>

FEATHERSTONE, on the other hand, who was the first to pay attention to the perception of Nikephoros' literary legacy during the Hesychast controversy concluded that the misleading inscription had been added in the 14<sup>th</sup> c. He also drew (on paleographical grounds) an attractive picture of adventures of Parisinus graecus 910. According to his theory, the manuscript was discovered by Nikephoros Gregoras around 1320 in the Chora monastery in Constantinople with title erased. The gap was filled by Gregoras with Theodoros' Graptos name that was familiar to him as he was composing at the time his own version of the *Life of Michael the Synkellos* (BHG, N1297), and Theodoros Graptos had been playing an important role in its earlier version (BHG, N1296).<sup>24</sup> After 1350 the codex was stolen from Gregoras and fell into the hands of his enemy Patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos, then returned to the anti-Palamite party and was used by Gregoras' disciple Ioannes Kyparissiotis, only to fall at last into Ioannes Kantakouzenos' hands. FEATHERSTONE claimed also to distinguish Gregoras', Kokkinos', Kyparissiotis', and possibly Kantakouzenos' hands in the marginalia of Parisinus graecus 910.<sup>25</sup>

The weakness of this hypothesis was demonstrated by FONKITCH and VAN DIETEN who pointed out that there existed no paleographic evidence to see Gregoras' hand in the title of Parisinus graecus 910,<sup>26</sup> whereas some marginal notes erroneously identified as belonging to Kokkinos went back to the 12<sup>th</sup> c.<sup>27</sup>

At the present moment, I can hardly claim to have solved this problem. I assume it sufficient to say that all 14<sup>th</sup> c. authors I deal with, without any exception, believed that they quoted Theodoros Graptos, and the majority of them had no idea of who Nikephoros of Constantinople had been. The bitter irony of fate made Gregoras (unaware of the fact that he was thereby involuntarily helping to

23 BLAKE, see n. 19, 8; ALEXANDER, see n. 7, 156.

24 Note that later this *Life* was by no means the unique source of information on Theodoros Graptos for Gregoras. In the *Historia Rhomaike* Gregoras also quoted the liturgical canon in Theodoros' honor composed by his brother Theophanes (GREGORAS, *Historia*. III, 387, l. 4–388, l. 11), as well as the Metaphrastic version of Theodoros' *Life* (BHG, N1746). Textual parallels between his account (GREGORAS, *Historia*. III, 385, l. 1–387, l. 4) and this *Life* are listed by TINNEFELD (GREGORAS, *Geschichte*. VI, 95–96). On Gregoras' hagiographical writings see M. HINTERBERGER. Les Vies des Saints du XIVE siècle en tant que biographie historique: l'œuvre de Nicéphore Grégoras. In: *Les Vies des Saints à Byzance. Genre littéraire ou biographie historique? (Actes du IIe colloque international philologique «EPMHNEIA», Paris, 6–8 juin 2002)*. Ed. by P. ODORICO and P. A. AGAPITOS. Dossiers Byzantins 4. Paris, 2004, 281–301.

25 FEATHERSTONE, see n. 19.

26 GREGORAS, *Geschichte*. IV, 276–277; FONKITCH, see n. 18, 75–76.

27 FONKITCH, see n. 18, 88, 92.

obliterate the memory of a true confessor and champion of orthodoxy) to praise God for protection of Theodoros' Graptos writings:

Μάρτυρας δ' εἶναι φησι τῆς αὐτοῦ σοφίας καὶ τῆς πρὸς τυράννους ἐνστάσεως ἃς ὑπὲρ εὐσεβείας ἐκεῖνος ἐξέθετο βίβλους, διασωζομένας ἀεὶ προνοίᾳ Θεοῦ, πολύτιμον οἷς εὐσεβεῖν ἐστι θέλησις θησαυρόν.<sup>28</sup>

He [Symeon Metaphrastes – *L.L.*] says that for his [Theodoros' – *L.L.*] wisdom and resistance to the tyrants testify his books composed for the sake of piety that are eternally preserved by God's providence as a precious treasure for those who desire to be pious.

My research is based on a completely different methodology in comparison with that of FEATHERSTONE: he made a convincing attempt to scrutinize one single manuscript in order to identify the authors of its marginal notes, I, on the contrary, undertook to compare direct quotations from Nikephoros in published 14<sup>th</sup> c. theological texts. It seems obvious that if a later author makes use of some Nikephoros' passages unknown to his predecessors, it means that he has got access to a full Nikephoros' manuscript and does not borrow his quotations from the earlier author he refutes or supports. Whether his and his opponent's manuscripts are one and the same codex or not, seems to be of minor importance at the present stage of the research.

In order to investigate the mutual relationship of the relevant 14<sup>th</sup> c. texts from the standpoint of usage of Nikephoros' (Pseudo-Theodoros' Graptos) passages I made a comparison table.<sup>29</sup> The conclusions one can draw from it may be summarized as follows:

1. Among the nine authors who made use of Nikephoros' passages were Palamites and anti-Palamites as well.

Palamites:

- Joseph Kalothetes (PLP, N10615; died after 1355/56) in the *Oration against Nikephoros Gregoras* (ca. 1355/56).<sup>30</sup>
- Gregorios Palamas (PLP, N21546; according to RIGO,<sup>31</sup> died November 14, 1357) in the *3rd Oration against Nikephoros Gregoras* (1356/57).<sup>32, 33</sup>

28 GREGORAS, *Historia* III, 385, l. 15–18.

29 See *Appendix*.

30 KALOTHESES 303–341.

31 A. RIGO. La canonizzazione di Gregorio Palama (1368) ed alcune altre questioni. *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici* 30 (1993), 155–202, 159.

32 The date accepted in the edition of CHRESTOU (“autumn 1358” – PALAMAS. IV, 181) is impossible since Palamas by that time had already passed away.

33 PALAMAS IV, 321–340.

- Philotheos Kokkinos (PLP, N11917; Patriarch of Constantinople in 1353–1354 and 1364–1376; died ca. 1378) in the *11<sup>th</sup> Oration against Nikephoros Gregoras*.<sup>34</sup> The date of this refutation of some unnamed Gregoras' writings (*2<sup>nd</sup> Antirrheticus?*) composed in response to the *Tomos* of the Council of 1351 is uncertain. The internal evidence is contradictory: on the one hand, Philotheos mentions Ioannes VI Kantakouzenos as “our present mighty and saintly emperor” (ὁ νῦν κραταίος καὶ ἅγιος ἡμῶν αὐτοκράτωρ).<sup>35</sup> This suggests a date prior to Kantakouzenos' abdication in December 1354. Nevertheless, PAPAZZI demonstrated that this indication might be misleading: “In realtà bisogna considerare che anche da monaco il Canatacuzeno continuò a godere il prestigio dell'ex-regnante, e spesso anche il titolo; questo titolo da solo, perciò, non può essere un indizio probante per la datazione”, and proposed 1358 as a plausible date.<sup>36</sup> The issue of Kantakouzenos' influence after his abdication is discussed by MEYENDORFF.<sup>37</sup> On the other hand, Philotheos speaks of Nikephoros Gregoras as of already deceased: “We have not got hold of his writings before, when he was alive [...] Now, when we have got acquainted with them [...]” (Πρώην μὲν οὖν οὖπω τοῖς γράμμασιν ἐντετυχηκότες αὐτοῦ περιόντος ἔτι τῷ βίῳ [...] Νῦν δὲ καὶ τοῖς συγγράμμασι τούτοις ἐντετυχηκότες ἐκείνου [...])<sup>38, 39</sup> Since Gregoras died in 1361<sup>40</sup> or, according to a more careful dating of TINNEFELD, “nicht vor Herbst 1358”<sup>41, 42</sup> the traditional dating of the *11<sup>th</sup> Oration* to 1353–1354<sup>43</sup> is at least attackable. RIGO accepts even a later date: Kokkinos' second patriarchate or at least a period after the death of Patriarch Kallistos I (September 1363, according to PLP, N10478) who is also mentioned by

34 KOKKINOS 407–478.

35 KOKKINOS 412, l. 148; 451, l. 1435.

36 M. PAPAZZI. Appunti per lo studio degli inediti Antirrheticus posteriores di Niceforo Gregoras. *Atti della Accademia nazionale dei Lincei. Rendiconti Lincei. Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* 28 (1973), 921–951, 930–933, 938.

37 J. MEYENDORFF. Projets de Concile Oecuménique en 1367: Un dialogue inédit entre Jean Cantacuzène et le légat Paul. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 14 (1960), 147–177, 149–152.

38 KOKKINOS 418, l. 378–419, l. 388.

39 Cf. “And if he were present and among the living [...]” (Καὶ εἴγε παρῶν ἦν ἔτι κἀν τοῖς ζῶσι διατελῶν [...]) – KOKKINOS. 413, l. 178).

40 PLP, N4443; GREGORAS, *Geschichte* I, 34.

41 GREGORAS, *Geschichte* VI, 3.

42 For more arguments see H.-V. BEYER. Eine Chronologie der Lebensgeschichte des Nikephoros Gregoras. *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 27 (1978), 127–155, 153–155.

43 G. MERCATI. *Notizie di Procoro e Demetrio Cidone, Manuele Caleca e Teodoro Meliteniota ed altri appunti per la storia della teologia e della letteratura bizantina del secolo XIV*. Studi e testi 56. Vaticano, 1931, 244.

Kokkinos as already deceased.<sup>44</sup>

- Ioannes (Joasaph) VI Kantakouzenos (PLP, N10973; emperor in 1341–1354, died 1383) in the *1<sup>st</sup> Refutation of Prochoros Kydones* (before April 1368 – KANTAKOUZENOS. XV–XVII).<sup>45</sup>

#### Anti-Palamites:

- Nikephoros Gregoras (PLP, N4443) in the *1<sup>st</sup> Antirrhetici*,<sup>46</sup> the *Historia Rhomaike* (chapters 19–20, 23–24 were composed in June–August 1352,<sup>47</sup> and chapters 30 and 32–34 in spring/summer 1355 and summer/autumn 1356 respectively),<sup>48</sup> and the *2<sup>nd</sup> Antirrhetici*.<sup>49</sup> Nikephoros' passages borrowed by Gregoras in the *2<sup>nd</sup> Antirrheticus* are not included in the table as they are available only in an unpublished PhD thesis of M. Paparozzi (1971) that, unfortunately, remained inaccessible to me. It seems highly doubtful yet that there are any new quotations to be found, given that the most relevant sections of the *2<sup>nd</sup> Antirrheticus* (VI B, C, D) dealing with the Palamite teaching of the Tabor Light coincide “praticamente alla lettera” with the chapters 32–34 of the *Historia Rhomaike*.<sup>50</sup>
- Isaak Argyros (PLP, N1285; died ca. 1375) in the *Letter to the monk Gedeon on the Tabor Light* (according to POLEMIS, this *Letter* is prior to two surviving letters of Theodoros Dexios).<sup>51</sup>
- Theodoros Dexios (PLP, N5194) in the *Appellation against Ioannes Kantakouzenos* (after the Council of 1351, “probably in the last months of the same year, or sometime in 1352” – DEXIOS. XXXI),<sup>52</sup> and the *1<sup>st</sup> Epistle* (early 1360s – DEXIOS. XLII).<sup>53</sup>

44 A. RIGO. L'epistola a Menas di Gregorio Palamas e gli effetti dell'orazione. *Cristianesimo nella storia* 9 (1988), 57–80, 61.

45 KANTAKOUZENOS. 1–105.

46 According to BEYER, he started to work on them in 1346/47 on the request of Anna of Savoy – GREGORAS, *Ant.* 111.

47 GREGORAS, *Geschichte* IV, 1–5.

48 GREGORAS, *Geschichte* VI, 41, 86.

49 According to PAPAPOZZI, see n. 36, 936, 1358. The precise date of the composition of the *2<sup>nd</sup> Antirrheticus* is still debatable. PAPAPOZZI argued that the meeting at the Mangana monastery, described in the section VI B (= Chapter 32 of *Historia Rhomaike*), took place in 1357. This view was corrected by BEYER who demonstrated that this meeting was held in summer-autumn 1356 (BEYER, *Eine Chronologie der Lebensgeschichte des Nikephoros Gregoras*, see n. 42, 149).

50 PAPAPOZZI, see n. 36, 935.

51 DEXIOS XXVI–XXIX.

52 DEXIOS 1–185.

53 DEXIOS 187–223.



- Ioannes Kyparissiotēs (PLP, N13900; died ca. 1378) in the *Decades* (after 1368, the Greek text remains unedited, references are given to the 16<sup>th</sup> c. Latin translation by Fr. Torres).<sup>54</sup>
- Manuel Kalekas (PLP, N10289; died ca. 1410) in the treatise *On the essence and operation* (composed in Pera in 1396–1399 – KALEKAS. *Corr.* 30).<sup>55</sup>

2. It is crucial to determine which of the two parties was the first to bring a charge of iconoclasm upon their opponents and which could only return this accusation.

It should be observed that, at the present stage of the research, I'm dealing only with a charge of iconoclasm *sensu stricto*, i.e. iconoclasm taken as an independent doctrine with its theology and history and not as an element of another heresy, e. g., Messalianism or Bogomilism. Iconoclastic practices (desecration, burning or destruction of icons) nearly always constituted an essential part of accusation of these heresies.<sup>56</sup> Such charges were wide-spread during the Hesychast controversy as well. The Palamites were accused of Messalianism already in the early 1340s. The *Athonite Tomos* containing such accusations goes back either to 1341/42,<sup>57</sup> or to 1344,<sup>58</sup> or to March/April 1345.<sup>59</sup> This case was adopted by all prominent anti-Palamites, among them Gregorios Akindynos<sup>60</sup> and Gregoras.<sup>61</sup> It is noteworthy though that the latter rarely combines two polemical strategies: if he quotes Nikephoros, he never mentions Messalians and their abominable rituals,

54 According to FEATHERSTONE, see n. 19, 195, there are more Nikephoros' passages in the inedited part of Kyparissiotēs' treatise *On the transgressions of Palamites*. Cf. V. L. DENTAKES. Ιωάννης Κυπριαρισσιώτης, ο σοφός και φιλόσοφος. Athens, 1965.

55 This list is far from exhaustive. Some authors not mentioned above most likely had access to Nikephoros' writings, e.g. Prochoros Kydonēs, who used one Nikephoros' passage as a marginal note to the translation of Thomas Aquinas preserved in Vaticanus graecus 1102 (MERCATI, see n. 43, 34).

56 A. RIGO. *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili: Le accuse di messalianismo e bogomilismo rivolte agli esicasti ed il problema dei rapporti tra esicasmo e bogomilismo*. Firenze, 1989, 198–200.

57 GREGORAS, *Geschichte* III, 326.

58 RIGO, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili: Le accuse di messalianismo e bogomilismo rivolte agli esicasti ed il problema dei rapporti tra esicasmo e bogomilismo*, see n. 56, 167–168.

59 M. HINTERBERGER. Die Affäre um den Mönch Niphon Skorprios und die Messalianismus-Vorwürfe gegen Kallistos I. in: *Gregorio Palamas e oltre. Studi e documenti sulle controversie teologiche del XIV secolo bizantino*. Ed. by A. RIGO. Orientalia Venetiana 16. Firenze, 2004, 211–248, 217–227. Cf. also a brief recapitulation of the main arguments for different dates in: GREGORAS, *Historia*. VI, 153.

60 AKINDYNOS 222; HINTERBERGER, *Les Vies des Saints du XIVe siècle en tant que biographie historique: l'œuvre de Nicéphore Grégoras*, see n. 24, 225.

61 According to RIGO, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili: Le accuse di messalianismo e bogomilismo rivolte agli esicasti ed il problema dei rapporti tra esicasmo e bogomilismo*, see n. 56, 248–254, Gregory Palamas and his followers were not openly hostile to sacred images, but they did not play any important role in their teaching.

if he enumerates Messalian blasphemies,<sup>62</sup> he never refers to Theodoros Graptos. Only occasionally Gregoras argues that his opponents are guilty of iconoclasm put into practice:

“Οτι μὲν γὰρ καὶ θεῖαι τῶν ἁγίων εἰκόνες καὶ τοῖς περὶ τὸν Παλαμᾶν ἐρρίπτοῦντο πρὸς πῦρ, δῆλον μὲν τοῖς θεασαμένοις τε καὶ τὸ ἀπόρρητον ἐξιποῦσι καὶ ὄρκω βεβαιωσαμένοις τουτὶ πρὸς πολλούς· ὅτι δὲ φωραθέντες, καὶ δείσαντες τὴν τοῦ πλήθους ὀρμὴν, καὶ μάλιστα διὰ τὸ ἐπεισπεσὸν ἕτερον νέφος τῶν ἐγκλημάτων αὐτοῖς, προσκυνεῖν ὑποκρίνονται καὶ αὐτοὶ, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς θείους συνεισιέναι ναοὺς, σιωπῇ καλύπτεσθαι ἐπεπράχσαν.”<sup>63</sup>

That Palamas’ satellites threw the divine icons of saints into fire is evident to those who witnessed it and revealed this mystery, binding themselves with a public oath. But they managed to cover with silence that, having been caught red-handed and in fear of people’s wrath (first of all, in view of the flurry of new accusations brought against them), they pretend to venerate icons and to attend our divine churches.

Nevertheless, such iconoclasm is just a symptom of another heresy and does not presuppose any strong theological foundation. Thus, these two accusations (iconoclastic practices of Bogomils and Messalians, on the one hand; iconoclastic theology of the Tabor light, on the other) are present in Gregoras’ writings separately, without any confluence.

The earlier evidence for the use of Nikephoros’ texts for polemical purposes during the Hesychast controversy present the *1<sup>st</sup> Antirrhetici* of Gregoras (1346/47). His adversaries, on the contrary, at that stage were not familiar neither with the name of Theodoros Graptos, nor with the treatises in question and, thus, attempted to question their authority.

This conclusion is supported by Gregoras’ account of a dispute held at the Mangana monastery in summer/autumn 1356<sup>64</sup> in presence of the ex-emperor Ioannes Kantakouzenos. In course of the debate one of the monks from Kantakouzenos’ entourage stepped forward and delivered a speech concerning the authority of Theodoros’ Graptos testimonies. He wondered:

Καὶ ποία τοῦτον, ἔφασκεν, οἶδεν ἐκκλησία; καὶ τίς αὐτοῦ ποτὲ μνημην πεποιήται τῶν ἡμερῶν<sup>65</sup>; [. . .] ὅτι πάνθ’ ὅσα βιβλία πεποιή-

62 E.g. GREGORAS, *Historia* III, 543, l. 4–6; GREGORAS, *Ant.* 131, l. 20–21.

63 GREGORAS, *Historia* II. 943, l. 13–19.

64 See note 49 on p. 212 above.

65 I accept the emendation ἡμετέρων proposed by VAN DIETEN (GREGORAS, *Geschichte* VI, 92).

σθαι λέγεται κατὰ τῶν εἰκονομάχων αὐτῷ αἰρέσεων γέμει μακρῶν. καὶ εἰ μὲν ἕτεροὶ τινες ὑποβολιμαῖα παρεισενέγκαντες τὸ αὐτοῦ γε ἐπέγραψαν ὄνομα, ἀνέγκλητος μὲν ἔσται αὐτός, τὰ δὲ βιβλία οὐ· εἰ δ' αὐτοῦ τῷ ὄντι βεβαίως εἰσίν, ὁμοῦ τοῖς βιβλίοις ἄρα ἀπόβλητος καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις αἰρετικοῖς ἐναριθμῖος.<sup>66</sup>

What church knows him? Who of us commemorates him? [...] All books he allegedly wrote against iconoclasts are full of abominable heresies. If it were the others who intentionally forged them and inscribed his name, he will be innocent of the charges, whereas his books – in no case. If, on the other hand, these books actually belong to him, he and his writings as well will be expelled and he will be numbered among other heretics.

That Gregoras became the first to lay an accusation of iconoclasm and consequently to introduce Theodoros Graptos, confirms even his ardent opponent Philotheos Kokkinos. His main goal was to lure (if this expression is appropriate) Theodoros Graptos onto his side, proving that Gregoras was deluding himself as far as all Theodoros' testimonies he had presented, actually witnessed against him. Kokkinos even confessed gratitude towards his opponent, since he had provided him with an effective (although previously ignored) polemical weapon:

“Ὅτι μὲν οὖν καὶ Ἀρειανοῖς καὶ εἰκονομάχοις τὰ Γρηγορᾶ τε καὶ Ἀκινδύνου πολυτρόπως συμβαίνει, τὰ κατ'ἐκείνων ἤδη ρηθέντα τῷ θαυμαστῷ Θεόδωρῳ δείκνυσιν ἐκδηλότατα, οὐ παρ' ἡμῶν, ἀλλὰ παρ' αὐτοῦ φημι Γρηγορᾶ καθ' ἡμῶν τῷ λόγῳ παρεισαχθέντα, καθάπερ αὐτὸς οὗτος κακῶς ὑπέιληφεν.<sup>67</sup>

That the teaching of Gregoras and Akindynos matches in many ways that of Arians and iconoclasts, demonstrate in the clearest way the words of the wondrous Theodoros directed against them, these sayings having been employed in the dispute not by us, but by Gregoras himself, as he erroneously assumed against us.

Τί πρὸς ταῦτά φασιν οἱ τὰ Βαρλαάμ τε καὶ Ἀκινδύνου διεκδικοῦντες σύν γε τῷ Γρηγορᾶ τουτῶι, ὃς καὶ τὸν σοφὸν θεολόγον, Θεόδωρόν φημι τουτονὶ τὸν μέγαν, καθ' ἡμῶν εἰς μαρτυρίαν προήνεγκεν, εἷ ποιῶν, οὐ μάλα τοι γινωσκόμενον καὶ ἡμῖν πρότερον [...],<sup>68</sup>

66 GREGORAS, *Historia* III. 381, l. 19–382, l. 4.

67 KOKKINOS 453, l. 1483–1487.

68 KOKKINOS 467, l. 1949–468, 1953.

What are going to respond to this those who rival the fame of Barlaam and Akindynos, the adherents of Gregoras who brought the wise theologian (I speak of the great Theodoros) as a witness against us, thereby doing a noble deed since we had not been familiar with this saint previously [...]?

The discourse closes with an ironic passage:

Καὶ μικροῦ καὶ χάριτας ἐν τούτῳ τέως ὁμολογεῖν ἔχω τῷ φιλοσόφῳ [...] ὅτι, φημί, τὸν μέγαν τουτονὶ τῆς εὐσεβείας διδάσκαλον μετὰ τῆς ἱεραῆς θεολογίας παρῆχεν εἰς μέσους.<sup>69</sup>

I am compelled almost to confess gratitude to the philosopher [...] since he has introduced to the public this great teacher of piety with his sacred theology.

Unfortunately, we do not know exactly, what decision was made regarding Nikephoros' testimonies at the Council of 1351. The *Tomos* does not specify it, although makes clear that it were "the leaders of the heretics" (οἱ τῆς αἰρέσεως προϊστάμενοι), i.e. anti-Palamites, who made use of Pseudo-Theodoros' quotations "distorting and reinterpreting them to fit their impiety" (διαστρέφοντες καὶ παρερμηνεύοντες πρὸς τὴν οἰκείαν δυσσέβειαν). It is worth noting that Graptos is referred here as a "saint confessor" (ἐν ἀγίοις ὁμολογητοῦ).<sup>70</sup> Nevertheless, Theodoros Dexios in his *Appellation* to Ioannes Kantakouzenos argues that Theodoros Graptos was "a saint, recently dishonored and cast off contemptuously by the Council proclaiming a new faith with your [Kantakouzenos' – *L.L.*] tacit approval" (ὁ τὰ ἔσχατα περιῦβρισμένος καὶ ἀπεσκυβαλισμένος ἅγιος, σοῦ γε ἀνασχομένου, παρὰ τῆς τὴν νέαν παραδούσης πίστιν συνόδου).<sup>71</sup> The emphatic verb ἀποσκυβαλίζω implies that during the Council Palamites did not re-interpret in their own way, but rejected Pseudo-Theodoros' testimonies.

My conclusion is that the accusation of iconoclasm originated within the anti-Palamite circles and at least on the first stages of the controversy it were anti-Palamites who attacked and Palamites who were forced to defend.<sup>72</sup>

3) This being established, we focus on later authors. It is evident that neither Kalothetes nor Palamas worked with original Nikephoros' treatises as soon as all

69 KOKKINOS 478, l. 2279–2282.

70 KARMIRIS 383.

71 DEXIOS 152.

72 LOURIE expressed an opposite view: anti-Palamites were hostile to sacred images since their teaching inevitably deprived God's energies of the ability to be actually present in the icon, thus, Palamites actually revealed their enemies' hidden iconoclasm (V. LOURIE. Работы Антонию Ригу по истории византийского исихазма. *Vizantijskij vremennik* 55 (1994), 332–336).

quotations they made use of were borrowed indirectly via Gregoras, whom they sought to refute. E. g., both Nikephoros' passages in the *Oration against Nikephoros Gregoras* of Kalothetes actually form a part of a more extensive quotation from the Chapter 30 of Gregoras' *Historia Rhomaike*, which includes also a quotation from Basil the Great<sup>73</sup> and Gregoras' own remark.<sup>74</sup>

Whether Ioannes Kyparissiotēs and Manuel Kalekas had access to Nikephoros' manuscripts or not, is not clear yet. A few new excerpts they add might go back to an unknown anti-Palamite florilegium.<sup>75</sup> Neither of them, anyway, shows any particular interest to the history of the iconoclastic controversy or to the life and deeds of Theodoros Graptos.

On the other hand, the comparison demonstrates, that Isaak Argyros, Theodoros Dexios, Philotheos Kokkinos, and Ioannes Kantakouzenos did use Nikephoros' passages unknown to Gregoras. The mutual relationship of Argyros' and Dexios' texts is not clear yet. It is highly probable that Argyros knew Nikephoros only via Dexios' lost letter.<sup>76</sup>

In the cases of Kokkinos and Kantakouzenos we possess external supportive evidence allowing to suppose that they enjoyed direct access to Nikephoros' writings.

Philotheos Kokkinos after having quoted Gregoras citing Nikephoros (such *citatio citationis* is a common case in the texts we are dealing with), begins refutation with the following remark:

Πρῶτον μὲν οὖν ἐκεῖνο πρὸς Γρηγορᾶν καὶ αὐτὸς εἰπεῖν ἔχομεν, ὡς οὐδ' ἐνταῦθα τοὺς τοῦ διδασκάλου τουτουὶ λόγους ὡς ἔχουσι καλῶς προὔθηκεν, ἀλλὰ κὰν τούτοις πλεῖστά τινα τῶν ἀναγκαίων ὑφεῖλεν, ὡς ἔθος αὐτῶ, τῇ τοῦ λόγου λυμηνάμενος ἀκολουθίᾳ καὶ τάξει.<sup>77</sup>

First of all we can tell Gregoras straight away the following: even here he did not quote the teacher's words in their correct form, but in this passage also, according to his habit, excluded many significant fragments and, thus, ruined the consistency and sequence of the argument.

This reproach indicates that Kokkinos had at his disposal a fuller text and could verify the testimonies introduced by Gregoras. It is noteworthy that Kokkinos'

73 KALOTHETES l. 969–971 = GREGORAS, *Historia* III, 309, l. 10–11 = BASIL. *Contra Eunomium* 716B.

74 KALOTHETES l. 980–982 = GREGORAS, *Historia* III, 310, l. 7–10.

75 On florilegia containing Nikephoros' passages see MERCATI, see n. 43, 192–197.

76 DEXIOS XXVI–XXIX.

77 KOKKINOS 447, l. 1303–1306.

own citations from Nikephoros are, as a rule, much more extensive than those of Gregoras. Suffice it to say that Gregoras' longest quotation comprises 30 lines (in Bekker's edition), whereas the correspondent Kokkinos' – about 100. Gregoras' method of quoting also confirms the correctness of Philotheos' reproach: he often makes an amalgam of Nikephoros' words combining different passages, reorganizes Nikephoros' syntax and makes additions, while Kokkinos tries to quote his source in full without any omissions. A rough idea of Gregoras' quoting method may be obtained from a close look at the Chapter 34 of the *Historia Rhomaïke*. There on 5 pages of Bekker's edition he assembles a mosaic of Nikephoros' testimonies without any division (with the exception of καὶ πάλιν on 466, l. 15) or regard to the composition of the original Nikephoros' text:

GREGORAS, <i>Historia</i> III	NIKEPH. <i>Euseb.</i>
464, l. 11	<i>Euseb.</i> 417, l. 34;
464, l. 11–465, l. 17	<i>Euseb.</i> 415, l. 40–417, l. 26 (omitting 416, l. 17–29; 417, l. 6–10; 417, l. 16–24)
465, l. 18–466, l. 1	<i>Euseb.</i> 413, l. 1–13 (omitting l. 7–9)
466, l. 1–6	<i>Euseb.</i> 411, l. 2–9
466, l. 6–15	<i>Euseb.</i> 414, l. 23–36
466, l. 15–23	<i>Euseb.</i> 410, 13–34 (omitting l. 19–27)
466, l. 23–467, l. 5	<i>Apol.</i> 269A (with minor changes)
467, l. 6–468, l. 9	<i>Euseb.</i> 418, l. 1–41
468, l. 9–22	<i>Euseb.</i> 420, l. 10–27

Ioannes Kantakouzenos' interest in the writings of Nikephoros is confirmed by the colophon of the Parisinus graecus 909:

Τὸ παρὸν βιβλίον τοῦ ἁγίου Θεοδώρου τοῦ Γραπτοῦ τῷ μακρῷ χρόνῳ ἀφανισθέν, τῇ περὶ τὰς θείας γραφὰς φιλευσεβεῖ σπουδῇ καὶ φιλοκαλίᾳ τοῦ ἁγίου ἡμῶν αὐθέντου καὶ βασιλέως κυροῦ Ἰωάσαφ τοῦ Καντακουζηνοῦ ζητηθέν, ἐνὸς μόνου βιβλίου εὐρεθέντος κακείνου πάνυ μὲν σαθοῦ διὰ παλαιότητα χρόνου, ἐσφαλμένου δὲ τῇ τοῦ γεγραφότος ἐκεῖνο ἰδιωτεῖα, μετεγράφη εἰς ὠφέλειαν τῶν ἐντευξομένων ἐν ἔτει ᾿ζωσς' μηνὶ μαρτίῳ ἰνδ. ζ' (fol. 341)<sup>78</sup>

The present book of saint Theodoros Graptos lost many years ago has been retrieved due to the pious zeal and diligence towards the Sacred Scripture of our saint lord and emperor Joasaph Kantakouzenos. But as only one copy was found, very age-worn and abundant in scribal

78 Quoted after FEATHERSTONE, see n. 19, 196, but in a revised orthography.

errors, it was copied to benefit the future readers in March of the year 6876, 6<sup>th</sup> indiction.

The above observations may be summarized as follows. The first accusation of iconoclasm was brought against Palamites no later than the mid-1340s. At this stage, however, it constituted only an element of a broader charge of Messalianism and Bogomilism. Nikephoros Gregoras became the first to elaborate this accusation basing on the writings of Pseudo-Theodoros Graptos (Nikephoros of Constantinople) in 1346/47. His adversaries' attitude towards Nikephoros' testimonies changed significantly over time: at first they attempted to cast doubt on their authority (*Tōmos* of 1351, anonymous monk during the meeting at the Mangana monastery in 1356), then proceeded to re-evaluate the evidence presented (Palamas, Kalothetes), and finally undertook to acquire a fuller version of the texts in question in order to make their refutation more profound (Kokkinos, Kantakouzenos). Thus, within 20 years, which separate the 1<sup>st</sup> *Antirrhetici* of Gregoras and the colophon of the Parisinus graecus 909, their feeling towards Pseudo-Theodoros' testimonies changed from rejection to acceptance and admiration. Unable to compromise Theodoros, Palamites chose to make him their own champion.

As soon as a corpus of testimonies and a list of authors are established, let us proceed to the evaluation of the evidence.

As it has been said above, Nikephoros' testimonies were employed by both parties to prove that their opponents were guilty of iconoclasm. But it is crucial to take into account that the charge of iconoclasm did not necessarily presuppose accusation of any actual hostility to sacred images. "Iconoclasm" as seen by 14<sup>th</sup> c. authors was equal to a spiritualistic doctrine of Christ's Transfiguration elaborated by (Pseudo?)-Eusebius of Caesarea and refuted by Nikephoros. For a 14<sup>th</sup> c. author to be an iconoclast did not imply to destroy holy icons or prohibit their veneration. It meant only to accept Eusebius' teaching of "a form of a slave [i.e. human nature assumed by Christ in His Incarnation – *L.L.*] completely transformed under such conditions into ineffable and unutterable light, the light fitting to the Divine Logos Himself" (ἡ τοῦ δούλου μορφή ἐν τοιοῦτοις γινομένη, ἐξ ὅλων ὅλη μεταβέβληται ἐπὶ φῶς αὐτοῦ ἄρρήτον καὶ ἀνεκδιήγητον αὐτῷ τῷ Θεῷ Λόγῳ πρέπον φῶς).<sup>79</sup> For Eusebius this meant that, since Transfiguration had taken place, one could not dare anymore to depict Christ with dead colors as His humanity was not anymore distinguishable from His divinity.

Nevertheless, being a starting point for nearly all 14<sup>th</sup> c. authors I deal with (this Eusebian passage was known to Gregoras, Palamas, Dexios and Kokkinos),<sup>80</sup> this assertion was by no means immanent to the iconoclastic controversy itself.

79 NIKEPH. *Euseb.* 385, l. 10–14 = 415, l. 40–416, l. 1.

80 This quotation is second in frequency (8 occurrences, 4 authors) after NIKEPH. *Apol.* 304CD

Strictly speaking, Eusebius' teaching was bound to remain marginal even in the eyes of the iconoclastic party, as it was of little help for those who were seeking a proof that it had been Incarnation, but not Transfiguration that had rendered impossible every pictorial representation of Christ. Thus, the doctrine of uncircumscribability was elaborated, according to which, Christ's divine nature prevailed over His humanity making His hypostasis uncircumscribable too.<sup>81</sup> Consequently, the main point for Nikephoros was the discussion of Christ's circumscribability. He tried to confirm it appealing to *communicatio idiomatum* that made Christ circumscribable as a man and uncircumscribable as God at once.<sup>82</sup> According to his teaching, Christ can not be deprived of circumscribability as it would make the human nature He assumed imperfect, whereas "What has not been assumed cannot be restored" (τὸ ἀπρόσληπτον ἀθεράπευτον).<sup>83</sup> However, we find no traces of these debates during the Hesychast controversy.

A close reading of the sources allows to point out one more peculiarity: the actual history of the iconoclastic debate was of minor interest to the majority of 14<sup>th</sup> c. authors. The only exception is Nikephoros Gregoras who sought to actualize not only the ideological basis of the controversy, but also its history, thereby distorting the historical memory of the period.

E. g., in his writings Eusebius of Caesarea (an author of the 4<sup>th</sup> c.) was not anymore distinguishable chronologically from Theodoros Graptos. Gregoras repeatedly speaks of him as of a contemporary of Theodoros Graptos and the iconoclastic emperor Theophilos (829–842; PMBZ, N8167), as if he had been a central figure of the iconoclastic controversy. Introducing Nikephoros' testimonies, he attests Theodoros Graptos and Eusebius in the following manner:

Δῆλον δ' ἐκ τῶν τότε ἀγωνισαμένων κατὰ τῆς αἰρέσεως θεολόγων ἀνδρῶν γε ποιήσομαι, ἓνα διὰ τὸ σύντομον Θεόδωρον προχειρισάμενος τὸν Γραπτόν, ὃς Εὐσεβίῳ τῶν τότε λογίων εἰκονομάχων τῷ πρώτῳ συμπλακεῖς [. . .]<sup>84</sup>

I'm going to demonstrate it [that Palamite teaching is merely a renovated iconoclasm – *L.L.*] with the help of theologians of the time who combated this heresy, for the sake of time putting forward only one of

---

(11 occurrences, 5 authors), which deals with the notions of God's energy and essence: Nikephoros states that it is both impossible to imagine "an essence without energy" (οὐσία ἀνεέργητος) and "an energy without essence" (ἀνούσιος ἐνέργεια).

81 ΝΙΚΕΦΗ. *Apol.* 236CD; MANSI XIII, 252AB.

82 ΝΙΚΕΦΗ. *Apol.* 585CD.

83 On this issue see ALEXANDER, see n. 7, 191–193 and K. PARRY. *Depicting the Word: Byzantine Iconophile Thought in Eighth and Ninth Centuries*. The Medieval Mediterranean 12. Leiden, New York, and Köln, 1996, 99–113.

84 GREGORAS, *Ant.* 313, l. 1–3.



them – Theodoros Graptos who entered a hand-to-hand battle with Eusebius, the first among the eminent iconoclasts of the time.

The words τῶν τότε λογίων εἰκονομάχων clearly indicate that for Gregoras Eusebius was a full participant of the iconoclastic controversy. A similar expression is employed in Gregoras' *Historia Rhomaike*:

Θεόδωρος [...] πλείσταις μὲν καὶ ἄλλαις ἱεραῖς αὐτοῦ βίβλοις τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησίαν κεκόσμηκε, μάλιστα δ' αἷς κατὰ τῶν εἰκονομάχων ἐξέθετο, τοῖς συγγράμμασιν ἐντυγχάνων τοῦ τότε τὰ πρῶτα φέροντος ἐν λόγοις ἄσεβοῦς Εὐσεβίου.<sup>85</sup>

Theodoros [...] adorned God's Church with many other sacred books but in the first place with the writings he composed against iconoclasts, having read the treatises of impious Eusebius, the first in scholarship at that time.

Moreover, Gregoras was completely ignorant of the real iconoclastic leaders and consequently Nikephoros' of Constantinople opponents. Quoting a few lines belonging to the iconoclastic emperor Constantine V,<sup>86</sup> he says that these are "warlike words of the heads of iconoclasm" (τὰ τῶν προέδρων τῆς εἰκονομαχίας ἐναγώνια ῥήματα),<sup>87</sup> without mentioning any names.

As a result, Theodoros Graptos transformed into the most important figure of the iconophile resistance:

Ὅτε δὴ καὶ πάσας μὲν ἀρχὰς, πάσας δ' ἐξουσίας, οἱ τῆς νόσου ταύτης ὑπηρεταὶ διενενέμηστο [...] καὶ σχεδὸν ὁ τῶν τηνικαῦτα βίος ἀνθρώπων, διὰ τρυφὴν καὶ βλακείαν, εἰς τὴν τῶν βασιλικῶν θεσπισμάτων ἔκλινε κολακείαν, καὶ πάνυ βραχεῖς τινες ἦσαν, ὧν ἐλεύθερον τῆς ψυχῆς ὑπῆρχε τὸ φρόνημα, καὶ ἔζει τὸ τῆς καρδίας πῦρ [...] ὧν εἷς καὶ Θεόδωρος ἦν, ὁ πολλὴν μὲν τὴν ἐκ λόγων σοφίαν, πολλὴν δὲ τὴν τοῦ σώματος καρτερίαν πρὸς τὰς τῶν πολεμίων ἐκείνων πληγὰς ἐνδειξάμενος, καὶ δι' αὐτῶν τοῖς πατρίοις τὸ βέβαιον καὶ ἀσάλευτον χαρισάμενος δόγμασι τὸ νεμόμενον ἔπαυσε τῆς κακίας ἐκείνης.<sup>88</sup>

When all ranks and powers were divided between the servants of the illness [...] and due to the slackness and stupidity the very human life

85 GREGORAS, *Historia* III. 463, l. 22–464, l. 10.

86 GREGORAS, *Historia* II. 1138, l. 23–1139, l. 4 = NIKEPH. *Apol.* 333B.

87 GREGORAS, *Historia* II. 1138, l. 22.

88 GREGORAS, *Historia* II. 1138, l. 1–14.

was inclined to flatter the emperor's decrees, and few were those whose mind was free and heart was burning with fire [...] one of them was Theodoros who showed both great wisdom in preaching and great bodily firmness towards his enemies' strokes, thereby strengthening and confirming the steadfastness of the teaching of the Fathers, and stopped the diffusion of evil.

It is evident from the last words (τὸ νεμόμενον ἔπαυσε τῆς κακίας ἐκείνης) that it was neither Patriarch Methodios, nor Empress Theodora in Gregoras' eyes but only Theodoros Graptos who had put an end to the iconoclastic heresy.

I believe that this chronological discrepancy should not be interpreted as a rough mistake – Gregoras was too well educated not to realize, that Eusebius had lived 400 years before the outbreak of the iconoclastic controversy.<sup>89</sup> This seeming contradiction is rather a realization of a basic heresiological principle employed by Gregoras. He believed that in the sphere of heresiology the chronological factor is insignificant in comparison with the typological one: all heresies are ever-existing and can return to life at every moment, giving birth to every possible hybrid.<sup>90</sup> The only rule is that, within Gregoras' eschatological perspective, every new heresy was worse than previous:

Τοιούτους γε μὴν καὶ νῦν ἐφ' ἡμῶν τὴν περὶ τὸν Παλαμᾶν συμμορίαν ἔθεασάμεθα, οἱ πάντας ἐκείνους μακροῖς τοῖς ὅροις παρήλασαν, ὥσπερ μιμουμένου τοῦ βίου τοὺς ῥήτορας κὰν ταῖς τῶν χρόνων τούτων ἐσχατιαῖς ἀνακεφαλαιουμένου καὶ ὥσπερ ἐπανάληψιν<sup>91</sup> ποιουμένου διὰ τῶν μιαρῶν τουτωνὶ καὶ πάσας συλλήβδην εἰπεῖν τὰς ἄλλοτ' ἄλλας ἀναφυσίσας αἰρέσεις συνυφαίνοντός τε καὶ δεικνύοντος ἠθροισμένης ὁμοῦ [...].<sup>92</sup>

Nowadays, we have witnessed the Palamas' gang, which far outstripped all predecessors, do the same, as if our very life in these last times imitated public speakers summing up, making a recapitulation, and (to

89 Surprisingly, Gregoras' *Life of Constantine the Great* (BHG, N369) was greatly inspired by Eusebius (HINTERBERGER, *Les Vies des Saints du XIVe siècle en tant que biographie historique: l'œuvre de Nicéphore Grégoras*, see n. 24, 297–298). One may wonder, whether Gregoras was fully aware of the fact that he was thus quoting a “heretic”.

90 In this respect Gregoras might have also followed Nikephoros of Constantinople. Cf.: “To sum up, one can say that from the alliance of the Manichean echidna and the Arian asp a new two-headed reptile was born [...]” (Καὶ ὡς ἂν συλλαβῶν τις εἴποι, ἐκ τῆς Μανιχαϊκῆς ἐχίδνης, καὶ τῆς Ἀρειανικῆς ἀσπίδος, ἕτερός τις ἐκ συμπλοκῆς τούτων οἶον ἔρπυστῆς ἀμφικέφαλος ἐξέφυ [...]) – ΝΙΚΗΡΗ. *Apol.* 209CD).

91 Note the rhetorical *termini technici*.

92 GREGORAS, *Ant.* 153, l. 5–10.

put it briefly) using these filthy men to sew together and demonstrate united all heresies that have ever existed.

To withstand such an enemy is hardly an easy task since it escapes like a moving target and shifts its shape at will like Proteus.<sup>93</sup> Speaking of heresies of Bogomils and Eunomians, Gregoras makes the following remark:

Ἐν γὰρ ἄλλοις ἐνίοτε καὶ ἐνιαχοῦ νῦν μὲν συμφωνοῦντες, νῦν δὲ νικῶντες τῇ τῆς κακίας ἀλλήλους ὑπερβολῇ κατὰ γε ταυτὶ κοινωνοῦσιν ἀλλήλοις σαφῶς ὥσπερ ἄσπις τὸ θηρίον ἐχίδνη καὶ λύκος ἀλώπεκι, κακίας μεταδιδόντες ἀλλήλοις καὶ σπονδὰς οὕτως ἠθριώδεις ποιοῦμενοι.<sup>94</sup>

Being like-minded from time to time in some regards, and sometimes surpassing each other in evil, they unite and enter into beastly alliance just as an asp with an echidna or a wolf with a fox and share their wickedness.

In Gregoras' view, there was no chronological gap between Eunomians, Bogomils, iconoclasts, and Palamites since "the likeness of behavior somehow unites what has been separated by chronological dissociation" (Αἱ γὰρ τῶν τρόπων ὁμοιότητες συνάπτουσι μὲν πῶς τὰς χρονικὰς διαστάσεις).<sup>95</sup>

This clearly stated typological principle allows Gregoras to use anti-arian, anti-eunomian and anti-iconoclastic sources to refute what he calls "Palamite heresy". Precisely for this reason "the sayings of divine Fathers that at that time stopped Eunomius' mouth, being put forward now, will likewise make silent Palamas" (ὅσα τοῖς θείοις λεχθέντα πατράσι τὸν Εὐνόμιον ἐπεστόμισαν τότε, ταῦτ' εἰς μέσον ἀχθέντα καὶ Παλαμᾶν ὁμοίως ἐπιστομίσουσι νῦν).<sup>96</sup>

After having quoted a relevant passage from Pseudo-Theodoros, Gregoras appeals to his audience with the following remark:

Ἀκούετε πῶς καὶ Εἰκονομάχοις ταῦτὰ φθεγγόμενος Παλαμᾶς, ὁ τῆς νῦν ἐκκλησίας διδάσκαλος, τοῖς αὐτοῖς βάλλεται βέλεσι πρὸς τοῦ στρατηγοῦντος γενναίως ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐσεβείας πατρὸς καὶ διδασκάλου τῆς ἐκκλησίας.<sup>97</sup>

93 GREGORAS, *Ant.* 153, l. 15–17, 20.

94 GREGORAS, *Ant.* 251, l. 22–26.

95 GREGORAS, *Ant.* 221, 2–3.

96 GREGORAS, *Ant.* 225, 1–2.

97 GREGORAS, *Historia* II. 1143, l. 11–14.

You hear how Palamas, the teacher of the nowadays church, declaring the same things as iconoclasts did, is wounded by the same arrows of our father and teacher of the Church who fights boldly for piety.

If Hesychasm in Gregoras' interpretation was no more than a renovated iconoclasm in combination with other heresies of old times, if Palamas was a heretic par excellence (new Arius, Eunomius, and Eusebius), Gregoras himself would naturally become a new confessor Theodoros Graptos, and Ioannes Kantakouzenos – a new impious tyrant Theophilos. It seems highly probable that Gregoras did have this picture in mind when he wrote, e. g., these lines:

Ἐμοὶ δὲ σκοπὸς τε καὶ πρόθεσις ἦν τῆς ψυχῆς [...] πρόμαχον παρ-  
ρασχέσθαι γλῶτταν, ὅσον ἐφικτόν, ἐκείνω τῷ σοφῷ Θεοδώρῳ καὶ  
μάρτυρι τῆς ἀληθείας, περιφανῶς συκοφαντούμενῳ νῦν πρὸς τῶν  
Παλαμιτῶν, καθάπερ πρὸς τῶν εἰκονομάχων τότε [...] οἷς κἀγὼ  
τῆμερον, τοῖς τῶν ἐκείνου λόγων ὄπλοις θαρρήσας, ἀνθίσταμαί  
τε καὶ ἀντιστήσομαι, καὶ τοὺς ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας ἀνακαινίζειν ἄθλους  
ἐκείνου τό γε εἰς ἐμὲ ἦκον οὐ κατοκνήσω κατὰ τῶν τῆν αἴρεσιν  
ἐκείνην ἀνακαινίζειν τολμώντων τῆμερον [...].<sup>98</sup>

My aim and desire of the soul was to stand up with my speech (as it would be within my power) for wise Theodoros who martyred for truth and now is apparently calumniated by Palamites just as he was by iconoclasts in old days [...] and today relying on the weapons of his words, I resist and shall resist and shall not be afraid to renew to the best of mine his exploits for truth against those who dare to renew today this heresy.

These recurring juxtapositions (Palamites – iconoclasts, νῦν – τότε, ἀνακαινίζειν ἄθλους – ἀνακαινίζειν αἴρεσιν) allow Gregoras to transmit the whole 9<sup>th</sup> c. ideological situation (as he understood it) into the 14<sup>th</sup> c. and make it seem up-to-date and actual. It is noteworthy that Gregoras was not the unique 14<sup>th</sup> c. author who attempted to find parallels between the life of Theodoros and Theophanes Graptos and his own fate. Half a century before him, Theodora Raoulaina composed the *Life of Theophanes and Theodoros Graptos* (BHG, N1793), drawing strong parallels between the heresy of iconoclasm and the contemporary unionist politics, by comparison of her brothers'-in-law (Isaak and Manuel) sufferings at the

<sup>98</sup> GREGORAS, *Historia* III. 458, l. 6–18.

hands of Michael VIII Palaiologos with those of Theodoros and Theophanes at the hands of Theophilos.<sup>99</sup>

Gregoras' concern with the history of the 9<sup>th</sup> c. is quite evident if we have a look at his hagiographical writings. Three of them deal with 9<sup>th</sup> c. saints (Michael the Synkellos, Empress Theophano, and Patriarch Antonios II).<sup>100</sup> Moreover, Gregorios Akindynos praises Gregoras for using the *Life of Theophano* (BHG, N1795) to refute Palamites.<sup>101</sup> This means that a tendency to reinterpret the past within the framework of actual polemics is not an isolated device, but a permanent feature of Gregoras' writings.

Moreover, Gregoras was sure that he possessed every right to lay claim to Nikephoros' legacy:

[...] οἱ τότε σοφοὶ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ Ἐκκλησίας [...] συνεγράψαντό τε καὶ ἡμῖν τοῖς μετ' ἐκείνους ἰοῦσι συμμαχίας προεμνηστεύσαντο κρατίστης ὑπόμνημα. προήδεσαν γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι, τῷ θείῳ φωτιζόμενοι πνεύματι, τὴν ἐν τῷ τέλει τῶν αἰώνων τῆς εἰκονομαχίας ἀναβίωσιν ταυτηνί, ἣν Παλαμᾶς μὲν ὠδίνησέ τε καὶ ἔτεκεν, αἱ δὲ τηρικαῦτα ἡγεμονίαι καὶ ἐξουσίαι τοῦ παρόντος αἰῶνος καὶ σκότους [...] ἐμειύσαντό τε καὶ ἐξέθρεψαν.<sup>102</sup>

[...] the wise of the God's Church who flourished at that time [...] composed and bequeathed to us coming after them their treatises as a reminder of powerful alliance. The reason is that, being enlightened by the Divine Spirit, they foreknew the revival of iconoclasm at the end of times that has been begotten by Palamas and nourished and cultivated [...] by the powers and authorities of the present age and darkness.

Nevertheless, as the preceding analysis shows, there was hardly any grain of truth in this assertion: the opponents of Gregoras based their refutations on similar methodological principles (though did not ever stated them explicitly) and

99 A.-M. TALBOT, *Bluestocking Nuns: Intellectual Life in the Convents of Late Byzantium. Harvard Ukrainian Studies (Okeanos. Essays, presented to Ibor Ševčenko on his 60th Birthday by his Colleagues and Students)* 7 (1983), 604–618, 615.

100 According to HINTERBERGER, it is a mere coincidence: “[...] je crois cependant qu’il s’agit plutôt de pur hasard. On ne peut pas attribuer à l’écrivain une certaine préférence pour cette époque[.]” (HINTERBERGER, *Les Vies des Saints du XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle en tant que biographie historique: l’œuvre de Nicéphore Grégoras*, see n. 24, 295).

101 AKINDYNOS 66; HINTERBERGER, *Les Vies des Saints du XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle en tant que biographie historique: l’œuvre de Nicéphore Grégoras*, see n. 24, 293–294.

102 GREGORAS, *Historia* III. 463, l. 7–16.

believed with all their heart that it were them who had every right to lay a claim to Nikephoros' of Constantinople legacy.

Thus, we may ascertain that within the domain of theological literature, just like in historiography, and perhaps in other seemingly remote spheres,<sup>103</sup> the two opposing tendencies of recollection and oblivion<sup>104</sup> are mutually complementary and parallel. A desire to draw an analogy between the epoch they lived in and the era of iconoclasm coerced Palamites and their adversaries to retrieve from oblivion Nikephoros' treatises. However, all their efforts resulted in nothing but further distortion of the historical memory they wished to preserve. The history of the iconoclastic controversy did acquire an up-to-date dimension, but only at the cost of Nikephoros' of Constantinople and Theodoros' Graptos memory.

---

103 For a convincing attempt to trace the obsession with the 9<sup>th</sup> c. during the Hesychast controversy (and even more broadly, during the whole Palaiologan period) on the iconographic level see D. ΚΟΤΟΥΛΑ. The British Museum Triumph of Orthodoxy Icon. In: *Byzantine Orthodoxies (Papers from the 36th Spring symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Durham, 23–25 March 2002)*. Ed. by A. LOUTH and A. CASIDAY. Aldershot, 2006, 121–130. Note that among the saints portrayed in the icon in question (Triumph of Orthodoxy icon, British Museum, late 14<sup>th</sup> c.) we do not see Patriarch Nikephoros, whereas brothers Theodoros and Theophanes Graptoi are quite expectedly present.

104 From the point of view of methodology, cf. I. Роров. “Историческая память в Византии: Представления византийских хронистов VI–XII вв. об эпохе становления христианского царства”. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Moskva: Institut Vseobshchej istorii, 2011.

## Sources and Abbreviations

- AKINDYNOS: A. C. HERO. *Letters of Gregory Akindynos*. Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, Series Washingtonensis 21. Washington DC, 1983
- ARGYROS: M. CANDAL. Argiro contra Dexio. *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 23 (1957), 80–113
- BASIL. *Contra Eunomium*: J. P. MIGNE. *Basilii Caesareae Cappadociae archiepiscopi Libri quibus impii Eunomii apologeticus evertitur*. Vol. 29. Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca. Paris, 1857, 497–774
- BHG: F. HALKIN. *Bibliotheca hagiographica graeca*. 3rd ed. Bruxelles, 1957; F. HALKIN. *Novum auctarium bibliothecae hagiographicae graecae*. Bruxelles, 1984
- DEXIOS: I. D. POLEMIS. *Theodori Dexii Opera omnia*. Corpus christianorum, Series graeca 55. Turnhout and Leuven, 2003
- GREGORAS, *Ant.*: H.-V. BEYER. *Nikephoros Gregoras. Antirrhetica I*. Wiener Byzantinistische Studien 12. Wien, 1976
- GREGORAS, *Geschichte*: J. L. van DIETEN and F. TINNEFELD. *Nikephoros Gregoras. Rhomäische Geschichte (Historia Rhomaike)*. 6 vols. Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur 4, 8, 9, 24, 39, 59, 66. Stuttgart, 1973–2007
- GREGORAS, *Historia*: E. BEKKER and L. SCHOPEN. *Nicephori Gregorae Byzantina historia*. 3 vols. Bonn, 1829–1855
- KALEKAS *Ess.*: *Manuelis Calecae De essentia et operatione*. J. P. Migne. Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca. Vol. 152. Paris, 1866, 283–428
- KALEKAS *Corr.*: R. J. LOENERTZ. *Correspondance de Manuel Calecas*. Studi e testi, 152. Vaticano, 1950
- KALOTHESES: D. TSAMES. Ἰωσήφ Καλοθέτου συγγράμματα. Thessalonike, 1980
- KANTAKOUZENOS: E. VOORDECKERS and F. TINNEFELD. *Iohannis Cantacuzeni opera. Refutationes duae Prochori Cydonii ed Disputatio cum Paulo Patriarcha latino epistulis septem tradita*. Corpus christianorum, Series graeca 16. Turnhout, 1987
- KARMIRIS: I. KARMIRIS. Τὰ δογματικά καὶ συμβολικά μνημεῖα τῆς ὀρθοδόξου καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας. 2nd ed. Vol. 1. Athens, 1960
- KOKKINOS: D. B. KAIMAKES. Φιλοθέου Κοκκίνου Δογματικά ἔργα. Thessalonike, 1983
- KYPAR: *Joannis Sapientis cognomeno Cyparissiotae Expositio materiaria eorum quae de Deo a theologis dicuntur in decem decades partita*. J. P. Migne. Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca. Vol. 152. Paris, 1866, 737–992
- MANSI: J. D. MANSI. *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*. 31 vols. Florentiae and Venetiae, 1759–1798

- NIKEPH. *Apol.: Nicephori archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani Antirrhethici tres. Apologeticus pro sacris imaginibus.* J. P. Migne. *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca.* Vol. 100. Paris, 1865, 205A–832A
- NIKEPH. *Euseb.: Eusebii Caesariensis confutatio.* J. B. Pitra. *Spicilegium Solesmense complectens sanctorum patrum scriptorumque ecclesiasticorum anecdota hactenus opera.* Vol. 1. Paris, 1852, 371–503
- PALAMAS: P. CHRESTOU. Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ Συγγράμματα. 5 vols. Thessalonike, 1988–1992
- PLP: E. TRAPP, R. WALTHER, and H.-V. BEYER. *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit.* 12 vols. Wien, 1976–1996
- PMBZ: R.-J. LILIE et al. *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit. Erste Abteilung (641–867).* 7 vols. Berlin and New York, 1998–2001
- SCHOL: M. JUGIE, L. PETIT, and X. A. SIDERIDES. *Œuvres complètes de Georges (Gennadios) Scholarios.* 8 vols. Paris, 1928–1936



Appendix: Direct quotations from Nikephoros of Constantinople /  
Pseudo-Theodoros Graptos



	Græc. <i>Anr.</i> (page, line)	Græc. <i>Hist.</i> (vol., page, line)	ARGYROS (page, line)	DEXIOS. <i>Appellation</i> (chap., line)	KALOTHETES (line)	ΠΑΛΑΜΑΣ. IV (page, line)	KOKKINOS (line)	DEXIOS. <i>Epistle I</i> (chap., line)	ΚΑΝΤΑΚΟΥΖ. (chap., line)	ΚΥΡΠΑΡ. (col.)	ΚΑΛΕΚΑΣ <i>Ess.</i> (col.)
ΝΙΚΗΑΓΓ. <i>Apol.</i> (column)											
269AB	315, 26–317, 2 323, 6–8	II. 942, 22–943, 4 II. 948, 11–15 II. 1143, 1–6 III. 460, 22–461, 2 III. 466, 23–467, 5					500–504 1298–1302				
297C	317, 3–5	II. 943, 5–8									
297D	325, 11–12	II. 943, 5–8 II. 952, 18–20									
304CD	323, 24–325, 1 237, 17–239, 6	II. 951, 6–16 III. 309, 22–310, 7		47, 34–36 50, 51–54 60, 11–16 60, 18–20	974–979					971AB	357D- 360A
320A									43, 26–33		
325B	325, 2–4	II. 951, 16–19 III. 309, 18–22			971–974					849B	360A
333B		II. 1138, 23–1139, 4									
336BC		II. 1139, 5–16									
ΝΙΚΗΑΓΓ. <i>Ei- seb.</i> (page, line)											
384, 10–385, 12		III. 462, 1–24 (with omissions)	94, 21–28 (484, 10–24 only)								
385, 9–14 (= 415, 40–416, 3)	313, 3–6	II. 940, 21–941, 2 III. 460, 13–15	96, 25–27			324, 32–325, 3 327, 18–21		7, 7–9 7, 29–30			



417, 34-418, 41	313, 7-14 (up to 418, 16)	GREG. <i>Ant.</i> (page; line)	GREG. <i>Hist.</i> (vol., page, line) II. 941, 2-14 (up to 418, 15) III. 464, 11 III. 467, 6-468, 9 (418, 1-41 only)	ARGYROS (page; line)	DEXIOS. <i>Appellation</i> (chap., line)	KALOTHETES (line)	PALAMAS. IV (page; line)	KOKKINOS (line) 427-429 (417, 34-36 only) 1264-1272 (418, 1-15 only)	DEXIOS. <i>Epistle I</i> (chap., line)	KANTAKOUZ. (chap., line)	KYPAR. (col.) 848D-849A (up to 418, 15)	KALEKAS (col.) Ess.
418, 22-419, 7	313, 18-315, 14	GREG. <i>Ant.</i> (page; line)	II. 941, 14-942, 10					1273-1289 1479-1483 (418, 29-34 only)				
420, 10-27	315, 17-23 (420, 13-24 only)	GREG. <i>Ant.</i> (page; line)	II. 942, 10-22 (420, 13-24 only) III. 468, 9-22					1289-1298 (from 420, 13)			849AB	
420, 29	315, 23	GREG. <i>Ant.</i> (page; line)										
421, 12-422, 4		GREG. <i>Ant.</i> (page; line)		98, 13-27								
428, 3-10		GREG. <i>Ant.</i> (page; line)							9, 17-23 9, 25-32			
428, 34-36		GREG. <i>Ant.</i> (page; line)	III. 460, 20-22									
429, 33-430, 10		GREG. <i>Ant.</i> (page; line)							9, 32-41			
430, 22-431, 2		GREG. <i>Ant.</i> (page; line)						1731-1742				
446, 19-447, 11		GREG. <i>Ant.</i> (page; line)						1793-1813				
466, 38-472, 13		GREG. <i>Ant.</i> (page; line)						1850-1948				

