

ELIZABETH JEFFREYS

Mimesis in an Ecclesiastical Context

The Case of Iakovos Monachos

Many interpretations of mimesis were put forward during the symposium that has led to this volume – from the straightforward, along the lines hallowed amongst Byzantinists by the late Herbert Hunger’s well-known article,¹ to the complex and abstracted. But few of us are willing to take the issue back to its Platonic origins and face up to that philosopher’s rejection of all literary activity on the grounds that it was an inadequate reflection of reality. This line of argument, of course, has a particular bearing on texts which convey a narrative that is fictive, fictional, does not report a “reality” and is guilty of an indefensible mimesis of reality.² However, interesting though such discussions are, these are not issues with which this present paper will be concerned; instead, it will consider in a straightforward way a set of letters from which a narrative of sorts can indeed be extracted, though not – almost certainly – a fictional one.³ The letters allude to events which it would be hard to deny took place, although their correlation with narrative histories and other corroborative texts is hard to pin down. Part of the barrier to such comprehension and to the identification of events is the fact that the language of the letters, as we shall see, has been strongly affected by mimesis. The case, in fact, is almost a *reductio ad absurdum* of mimesis, and has at times frustrated the editors of the letters and given them great sympathy with Platonic condemnation of the practice.

The letters in question are those sent in the 1140s by the Monk Iakovos, perhaps more often referred to as Iakovos Monachos, to the sevastokratorissa Eirene. Iakovos Monachos is not the best known figure in Byzantine literature, though he does have a modest claim to fame. Two works are associated with him: a set of six Homilies on the Theotokos and the letter collection to be discussed here. The Homilies are the better known since they are transmitted in two of the most splendid examples of Komnenian manuscript illuminations – the Vatican and Paris manuscripts of the so-called Kokkinobaphos Homilies, so-called because the otherwise little-known monastery of Kokkinobaphos is claimed by Iakovos as his home-base, as it were.⁴ Iakovos Monachos is also Iakovos of Kokkinobaphos. But the Homilies are famed for their illustrations rather than their texts, which have yet to be fully published and lack a critical edition.⁵ The Homilies have two peculiarities. One is that they do not deal with the regular feasts of the Theotokos (Birth, Annunciation, Dormition) but rather narrate the life of the Virgin from conception to her pregnancy, though they stop short of the birth of Christ. These thus present a rather unusual and non-liturgical slant on the Virgin’s life which

¹ HUNGER, On the imitation.

² A complex topic much debated in recent years; see, e.g. S. HALLIWELL, *The Aesthetics of Mimesis: ancient texts and modern problems*. Oxford 2002, an important and nuanced study of the processes of mimesis from before Plato to the present day; cf., also, C. GILL – T.P. WISEMAN (eds.), *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World*. Exeter 1993, especially the essays by GILL (pp. 38–87) and WISEMAN (pp. 122–146); G. BOWERSOCK, *Fiction as History*. Berkeley 1994; P. LAMARQUE – S.H. OLSEN, *Truth, Fiction and Literature: a philosophical perspective*. Oxford 1994, especially pp. 222–251 on narrative and the imagination; and K. WALTON, *Mimesis as Make-believe: on the foundations of the representational arts*. Cambridge, Mass. 1990.

³ Others in the future may wish to explore the structure of the letter collection and debate the artificiality or otherwise of the events implied.

⁴ Vat. Gr. 1162: for a facsimile see I. HUTTER – P. CANART, *Das Marienhomiliar des Mönchs Jakobos von Kokkinobaphos*. Codex Vaticanus Graecus 1162. Zurich 1991; and Par. Gr. 1208: see the facsimile in H. OMONT, *Miniatures des homélies sur la Vierge du moine Jacques (Ms. grec 1208 de Paris)*. Paris 1927. On Iakovos and the manuscripts of his works, see especially J.C. ANDERSON, *The illustrated sermons of James the Monk: their dates, order and place in the history of Byzantine art*. *Viator* 22 (1991) 69–120; more recently M. EVANGELATOU has explored some aspects of the images: *Pursuing salvation through a body of parchment: books and their significance in the illustrated homilies of Iakovos of Kokkinobaphos*. *Medieval Studies* 68 (2006) 239–284.

⁵ The text of homilies 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 and a short extract from 4 are printed in *PG* 127, cols. 544–700 from A. BALLERINI, *Sylloge monumentorum ad mysterium conceptionis Immaculatae Virginis deiparae illustrandum*, I. Paris 1855.

has still to be fully explicated: one possible interpretation is that they were produced specifically for a female audience who would respond to the, admittedly a-typical, story of the progression of a girl child to womanhood. The second unusual feature is that not only is the narrative based closely on passages from the Proto-evangelium of James but that this rather sparsely told story is bulked out with extensive quotations from earlier homilies. Iakovos' first homily, for example, is almost entirely derived from George of Nikomedeia.⁶ It is this characteristic use of quotations that has clinched the identification of the Iakovos Monachos of the Homilies with the Iakovos Monachos of the letters, given also that Iakovos – though not rare as a name – is not particularly common either.⁷ The letters of Iakovos Monachos are also made up of quotations.

The letters are addressed to the *sevastokratorissa* Eirene. The essential information about Eirene is that ca. 1125 she became the wife, then in 1142 the widow of the *sevastokrator* Andronikos, second son of the emperor John Komnenos.⁸ She had a turbulent time in the decade of the 1140s, in her widowhood, with her son John functioning as the heir apparent to the young and childless emperor Manuel and her daughters being used as marriage pawns, both within and outside the empire. She came under Manuel's severe displeasure, was imprisoned at least twice and had her funds confiscated at least once; she spent some time exiled from Constantinople, probably cooped up in Manuel's army camps in Bulgaria.⁹ Nonetheless she managed to maintain her reputation for lavish patronage of writers and craftsmen.¹⁰

The letters attracted our attention¹¹ many years ago whilst exploring the literature of twelfth-century Constantinople in an attempt to evaluate the role of the *sevastokratorissa* Eirene in the literary movements of the period. Referred to by Chalandon in *Les Comnène*, and listed by Beck in *Kirche und theologische Literatur*, Iakovos' letters promised tantalising insights, and they were unedited: nearly thirty years later, the *editio princeps* has just appeared.¹² While the embarrassingly long gestation has been due as much to the pressure of other commitments as to the complexity of the edition, aspects of the edition did throw up a number of problems, mainly concerning the presentation of the author's relationship to his sources. It must also be admitted that expectations that the letters would offer telling insights into the events and literary groupings of the mid-twelfth century have been disappointed, though once these texts are in the public domain others may prove the editors wrong. Certainly once the poems of Manganeios Prodromos, with which the letters show many points of shadowy interconnection, are fully edited more imaginative reconstructions might become possible.¹³

Iakovos is writing to Eirene as her spiritual father. This relationship is not stated overtly, but the themes are such that no other interpretation is possible.¹⁴ Spiritual fatherhood is a very common element in an Orthodox Christian society like that of Byzantium in the mid-twelfth century. It is often alluded to in the sources, such as histories and hagiographies, but not so often attested in the written record with samples of

⁶ Passages are taken from the first three of George of Nikomedeia's sermons on the Theotokos (*PG* 100).

⁷ ANDERSON, Illustrated sermons 87, note 99.

⁸ K. BARZOS, Ἡ γενεαλογία τῶν Κομνηνῶν. Thessaloniki 1984, 362–378; E.M. JEFFREYS – M.J. JEFFREYS, Who was the *sevastokratorissa* Eirene? *Byz* 64 (1994) 40–68.

⁹ J.C. ANDERSON – M.J. JEFFREYS, The decoration of the *sevastokratorissa*'s tent. *Byz* 64 (1994) 8–18; M.J. JEFFREYS, Manuel Komnenos' Macedonian military camps: a glamorous alternative court? In: *Byzantine Macedonia: identity, image and history* (ed. J. BURKE – R. SCOTT). Melbourne 2000, 184–191.

¹⁰ E.M. JEFFREYS, The *sevastokratorissa* Eirene as literary patroness: the monk Iakovos. *JÖB* 32/3 (1982) 63–71.

¹¹ By "our" I mean Michael Jeffreys and myself.

¹² F. CHALANDON, *Les Comnène: études sur l'empire byzantin au XIe et au XIIe siècle II. Jean II Comnène et Manuel I Comnène*. Paris 1912, 212–213, note 1; BECK, *Kirche* 629; *Iacobi Monachi epistulae* (ed. E. JEFFREYS – M. JEFFREYS [*CCSG* 68]). Tournhout 2009; hereafter *Iacobi Monachi epistulae*.

¹³ Manganeios Prodromos is the conventional name for an otherwise anonymous poet who is not to be confused with Theodore Prodromos; he is author of a large corpus of verse preserved mainly in Marc. Gr. XI 22. Elizabeth and Michael Jeffreys are currently completing the *editio princeps* of this corpus. On Manganeios, see, still, S. PAPANIMITRIOU, Ὁ Πρόδρομος τοῦ Μαρκανοῦ κώδικος XI 22. *VV* 10 (1903) 102–163 and, e.g., E.M. and M.J. JEFFREYS, The "Wild beast from the West": immediate literary reactions in Byzantium to the Second Crusade, in: *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World* (ed. A. LAIOU – R. MOTTAHEDEH). Washington, D.C. 2001, 101–116.

¹⁴ *Iacobi Monachi epistulae* xxxii–xxxvi.

the relationship; this collection is thus an interesting addition to a poorly attested genre.¹⁵ The letters exist because Iakovos will have needed to replace the face-to-face contact that he normally would have had with Eirene, with written communications because of her absence from her regular place of residence. The title page states as much: “These are the letters of Iakovos Monachos sent to the sevastokratorissa Eirene, when she was abroad in the entourage of our mighty and holy emperor (συνέκδημον οὕσαν σὺν τῷ κραταιῷ καὶ ἁγίῳ ἡμῶν βασιλεῖ)”.¹⁶ As implied above, this very likely means that Eirene was resident in the army camps that kept Manuel out of Constantinople in the northern Balkans for lengthy periods in the late 1140s and early 1150s.¹⁷ There are 43 letters, and one treatise on the Holy Spirit, in the collection. It is not clear over how long a period this correspondence continued, nor whether it was brought to a conclusion by Eirene’s return to Constantinople, or by her death.¹⁸

The letters are preserved in a large and handsome manuscript, now in the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris (Par. Gr. 3039), dating from the early 1150s, and thus contemporaneous with the conclusion of the correspondence. It was produced by the scribes and painters identified as connected with the workshop of the Kokkinobaphos Master, and is bound up somehow with Eirene’s acts of patronage in a complex nexus too involved to set out here.¹⁹ There are also two early seventeenth-century partial apographs that derive from the circle of Maximos Margounios and Gabriel Severos, learned Cretan priests resident for a time in Venice.²⁰ The collection did not circulate widely, if at all, before it was dispersed, presumably in 1453, from wherever it had been held in Constantinople.

Several themes emerge in the letters. One constant motif is Iakovos’ firm exhortation that Eirene should avoid secular texts:²¹ it is this that has caught scholarly attention in the past, and was one of the reasons why the present edition was begun. Iakovos is also concerned about the religious books that Eirene is reading – there is an undercurrent of doctrinal irregularity in the charges that seem to be being brought against her, though it is very hard to tie these in with any religious controversy in the 1140s.²² Such doctrinal advice as Iakovos offers is to do with the place of the Holy Spirit within the Trinity.²³ He also appears to be offering advice on meditation, with a series of rather improbable images, derived from Gregory of Nyssa’s commentary on the Song of Songs, to aid her progress.²⁴ He also comments on how she should manage her household, that she should choose her associates carefully: this seems wise advice given that it is a member of her household who eventually precipitates what seems to be a major, if not final, breach with the emperor with some piece of tale-telling or συκοφαντία.²⁵

This cursory survey of the nature of Iakovos’ work might lead to questions over its relevance to a symposium on mimesis and imitatio. The answer is that Iakovos, in each of his literary works, the homilies as well as the letters, can arguably be seen as a supreme example of a Byzantine practising mimesis of his predecessors in the genre in which he has chosen to write. He does it on a large scale as well as on a small scale. And the evidence for this comes from his use of quotations.

¹⁵ See, e.g., I. HAUSHERR, *Direction spirituelle en Orient autrefois* [OCA 144]. Rome 1955 (on the fourth century); H.J.M. TURNER, *St Symeon the New Theologian and Spiritual Fatherhood*. Leiden 1990; R. MORRIS, *Monks and Laymen in Byzantium 843–1118*. Cambridge 1995, 90–102.

¹⁶ Letter 1, title.

¹⁷ ANDERSON – JEFFREYS, *The sevastokratorissa’s tent* 9; JEFFREYS, *Macedonian military camps 185–186*.

¹⁸ *Iacobi Monachi epistulae* xxix–xxxii.

¹⁹ See ANDERSON, *Illustrated sermons* 89–95; JEFFREYS, *Who was Eirene?* 50; EVANGELATOU, *Pursuing salvation* 242–243.

²⁰ M (= Marc. Gr. II 93 [562], ff. 33r–92v); V (= Vat. Gr. 1759, ff. 261r–303v); one further apograph (Pa = Par. Suppl. Gr. 98) was made in the Bibliothèque nationale in the eighteenth century. For a discussion of the relationships of these manuscripts, see *Iacobi Monachi epistulae* l–lxi. Aspects of the intellectual circles involving Margounios and Severos are explored in P. CANART, *Alvise Lollino et ses amis grecs*. *Studi Veneziani* 12 (1970) 553–587.

²¹ See, e.g., *Letters* 14.5, 87–88; 22.34–35, 50–51; 24.57–59, 90–91; 36.37–38, 57–60; 37.115–117.

²² Cf. *Iacobi Monachi epistulae* xxxvii–xxxviii.

²³ This is the theme of the lengthy treatise *On Faith* found towards the end of the collection.

²⁴ *Iacobi Monachi epistulae* xxxviii–xxxix; cf. E.M. JEFFREYS, *The Song of Songs and twelfth-century Byzantium*. *Prudentia* 23 (1991) 36–54.

²⁵ See, e.g., *Letters* 8.43–45 or 39. 63–85.

Letter 37 is an extreme example.²⁶ This letter comes towards the end of the collection. The letters would seem to be in chronological order: for example, letter 33 speaks of a disaster for which there were rumbling premonitions in letter 32 and the catastrophe of letter 41 is preceded by hints of impending trouble. From internal comments it can be calculated that Iakovos has received at least 16 letters from Eirene, with occasional hiatuses:²⁷ Letters 23–24, for example, come at a point when Eirene's side of the correspondence seems to have dried up completely, and what Iakovos sends at this point amounts to a series of sermons, almost entirely taken from Prokopios of Gaza's commentaries on the book of Proverbs, and cast hopefully in her direction. Letter 37 comes after what sounds like another, though brief, hiatus in the correspondence. It can be summarized as follows:

Lines 1–23 The letter opens with a *captatio benevolentiae*. Iakovos acknowledges enthusiastically the arrival of Eirene's letter. It reveals her admirable character and her condescension to him. Distance has been obliterated. **24–51** Implying that she is above flattery, that he is an eager though humble friend – yet even the strongest need friends – he warns her to beware of falling into snares. She needs to purify her soul. **52–69** Eirene would thus acquire true wisdom and be able to ride out all misfortunes, her mind stable. **70–86** This leads to a discourse on the nature of mind, as a reflection of the archetypal good, evil being caused by the removal of the good. **87–119** It is mind that enables us to comprehend the divine wisdom and God through contemplation of the wonders of the natural world. But only *θεία μαθήματα*, divine instruction [in **bold**: these are Iakovos' own words], can give true understanding, not Hellenic wisdom, which is inherently evil [also in **bold**]. **120–137** So Eirene needs to follow the examples of David, Solomon and Isaiah and rejoice in the Lord, with due attention to Eucharistic celebrations [if that is how lines 125–6 are to be interpreted], and then she will discover true wisdom.

It is always necessary to remember that the real message may have been delivered orally by the letter-carrier, that the formal letter, allusive rather than explicit, may well have been read aloud to an audience and that the written words are often a flourish to impress the audience as well as the recipient. In this case the underlying message would seem to be a warning to Eirene not to stray into unorthodox areas of thought (lines 36–40), with a further sub-text that there are those around who wish her ill (lines 41–42), though Iakovos is claiming most definitely that he is not one of them (lines 26–29). It is futile to speculate here on the nature of Eirene's heterodoxy, whether she was espousing doctrinally suspect views or whether the problems are no more than her interests in secular literature which Iakovos' monastic background rejects.²⁸ More relevant is to ask how this can be claimed as an example of mimesis.

The answer is that in the correspondence as a whole Iakovos is emulating the hortatory letters of the spiritual giants of the church of the fourth century, the Cappadocian Fathers Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory of Nazianzos. He models himself on their discourse in general and he also models himself on their structures. This is mimesis on a large scale. Letter 21 is an excellent demonstration of the process. A letter of consolation to Eirene after a bereavement, it moves from horror at the event, to praise of the dead, to Iakovos' need to offer consolation, to a reminder of the divine purpose for mankind and finally to the Chris-

²⁶ See Appendix. The conventions of the edition follow those of the *CCSG*, with apparatuses for sources, scriptural citations and textual points with two additions – an apparatus for parallel passages (where Iakovos is quoting himself) and another for readings which diverge from the standard editions and could help to indicate the manuscript exemplar that Iakovos was using (cf. the use made of this apparatus in C. LAGA, *Entering the library of Jacobus Monachus: the exemplar of Jacobus' quotations from the Commentary of the Song of Songs by Gregory of Nyssa*, in: *La spiritualité de l'univers byzantin dans le verbe et l'image: hommages offerts à Edmond Voordeckers à l'occasion de son éméritat* (ed. K. DEMOEN – J. VERECKEN [*Instrumenta Patristica* 30]. Turnhout 1997), 151–161. In the text itself, **bold** print indicates words that cannot be attributed to any source and are arguably those of Iakovos himself: there are remarkably few of these. *Italics* indicate verbatim quotations from scripture while *bold italics* indicate scriptural passages which have not been derived through a patristic intermediary.

²⁷ *Iacobi Monachi epistulae xxix–xxx*. He may of course have received other letters about whose arrival he makes no comment.

²⁸ It is not easy to associate Eirene with any of the doctrinal issues of the 1140s and 1150s: *Iacobi Monachi epistulae xxxvii–xxxviii*.

tian duty to look to the future life. Whilst being a good twelfth-century example of the genre, it is based almost entirely on extensive passages taken from three consolatory letters of Basil (letters 29, 6 and 5) and one of Gregory of Nazianzos (letter 238), with some shorter bridging passages.²⁹ Letter 37 does not show such neat devotion to genre, though it does start with a *captatio benevolentiae* in the best manner, taken from Basil (the openings of Basil, letters 100 and 193).

Iakovos models himself much more on his predecessors' words than on issues of genre. This is mimesis on the small scale, but it covers most of his oeuvre. It is not a slavish mimesis. Iakovos selects phrases from earlier writers and adapts them to present his own thoughts. The Apparatus Fontium in the edition indicates how quotations from one source flow on to the next. The transition is not always smooth.³⁰ In letter 37, for example, at line 8 there is an awkward junction between the end of a quotation from Basil and the beginning of one from John Chrysostom. The sentence starting ὄθεν (37. 7, from Basil, Letter 163.1) ended originally with a verb of providing and now does not sit well with εἰστίασεν. The sense is acceptable on a first reading but a pause for analysis brings puzzlement. At 37. 32 παράκλησιν ends a sense unit in both Iakovos and his source (Gregory of Nazianzos, Letter 181), but the source then goes on to express the content of the request, whereas Iakovos veers off in another direction, again leaving a sense of puzzlement.

The process of adaptation involves omissions, like the one mentioned above in connection with 37. 8, which is supplemented from the next quotation. It also involves additions. The most obvious are the insertion of references to ἡ βασιλεία σου, which are frequent throughout the correspondence (here at 37. 1, 23, 52, 122) or ἡ δέσποινά μου (37. 124) or conjunctions – καί (37.14), Διὰ τοῦτο (37. 36), ἀλλὰ (37. 67); linking phrases can be added such as τὸν σύνοικον ταύτην ἔχοντα (37. 47), Διὸ καὶ ἡμεῖς διὰ τοῦ νοῦ (37. 87) as well as phrases to point the argument, like θεῖα μαθήματα and ἑλληνικὴ σοφία (37. 91, 115, 116), or the adaptations such as 37.6 where the more forceful δίκαιον (“right”, “just”) has replaced καίριον (“appropriateness”) in Basil’s Letter 101. The length of the passages used varies greatly, from entire paragraphs (e.g. 37. 8–14, 59–67, 92–115), to two or three words (125). On occasions it is possible to be clear, from the context and the striking form of the word, that a single word has been picked up from the source text, as at line 49, where it is clear from the surrounding quotations that παντοδαπούς must have been prompted from Procopius of Gaza’s Commenting on Proverbs.³¹

The authors used in letter 37 are representative of those used in the correspondence as a whole: Basil of Caesarea, John Chrysostom, Gregory of Nazianzos, Prokopios of Gaza, Gregory of Nyssa. The only major source not found in Letter 37 is the most recent author, the late eleventh or early twelfth-century Niketas of Herakleia whose (largely unpublished) commentary on Gregory of Nazianzos’ liturgical homilies³² is quarried extensively in the treatise *On Faith* and whose catena on the book of Job is the basis for the letters 33 and 41, which are a stream of vituperation against Eirene’s foes.

This process of combination finds parallels, of course, in verse centos, such as the Homeric centos of the empress Eudokia or the *Christos Paschon*,³³ though it should be noted that these are in verse and not prose. But the centos are written to show mastery of the genre being imitated, and make clever intertextual links between the culture (usually pagan) of the imitated model and that (usually Christian) of the cento itself. The editors of Iakovos’ letters have concluded that there is another reason for his patchwork of quotations: the combination of quotations, often representing the high classicism of the Cappadocians, with the linking pas-

²⁹ Thus: Basil (ed. COURTONNE) 29, 1–19 = Iac. Mon. 21.1–18, Basil 29, 24–26 = Iac. Mon. 21. 18–21; Basil 6,1.1–12 = Iac. Mon. 21. 27–38, Basil 6,1.16–2.11 = Iac. Mon. 21. 39–56; Basil 5.1.25–2.33 = Iac. Mon. 21. 57–93; Gregory of Nazianzos (ed. GAL-LAY) 238.1–7 = Iac. Mon. 21. 95–121. Shorter extracts: Basil 301,1–6 = Iac. Mon. 21. 21–25, Basil 301, 9–10 = Iac. Mon. 21. 25–26; Basil 67, 21–22 = Iac. Mon. 21. 94.

³⁰ For a detailed discussion of how process can work, see M.J. JEFFREYS, Iakovos Monachos, Letter 3, in: Maistor: Classical, Renaissance and Byzantine Studies for Robert Browning (ed. A. MOFFATT). Canberra 1984, 241–256.

³¹ Cf. also 8. 46 ἐπεαναγιεύσαντο = Basil, Letter 130, 2.1.

³² Cited in the edition from D. HOESCHEL, Homiliae quaedam sacrae Basilii M., Gregorii Nysseni, Nazianzeni ... in praecipuas anni ferias. Augsburg 1587, for homily 41 and ms Oxford, Trinity College 44 (a reasonably representative version of the text) for the remainder.

³³ As discussed in Iacobi Monachi epistulae xxiii.

sages in a much more awkward style gives an irresistible impression of a sense of linguistic inferiority on his part. There is also some evidence that Iakovos may not be a native-speaker of Greek.³⁴ Nonetheless, despite the dysfunctional elements in his syntax, Iakovos displays a formidable command of the texts that he manipulates. He seems to have known the library of his monastery well, so as to be able to select passages for inclusion in his work.³⁵ Perhaps it would be more accurate to describe this as a mimesis born of admiration rather than inferiority. Yet Iakovos is apparently reluctant to trust his own ability with words since even the passages which the editors have been unable to attribute to a patristic source (in the widest sense) often come from the scriptures, as is the case at the end of letter 37 (126–137). In other cases one suspects Iakovos' apparent independence derives from a paraphrase of a liturgical text which is yet to be included in current publications and search tools.

There is one further oddity in connection with this letter collection, and letter 37 displays this additional element very clearly. Moat of the letter is doubly mimetic. Apart from the opening sentence, every other sentence in this letter is repeated elsewhere in the correspondence, several more than once, as the apparatus for parallel passages makes clear. Why? Was Iakovos overcome with admiration for his own selection of phrases? Had the selection and composition process been such an effort that he could not refrain from re-using his choice words? Did he not notice the duplication? Yet there remains a disjunction between the broad, mimetic knowledge of the source texts shown by Iakovos and the quality of the prose and disjointed thought that is produced. This is a phenomenon that will repay further investigation.³⁶

General questions remain, notably about possible intertextual uses of the quotations and the reception of the “cento” by its recipient Eirene, about whose own level of linguistic, literary and theological sophistication there are some justifiable doubts. Whilst intertextual issues at the level of genre are well-matched between Iakovos' composition and his sources for situations such as lament or consolation, more precise links slide into ambiguity and it is with difficulty that close readings of the source texts can be used to interpret Iakovos' compilation as, for example, the multiple possible interpretations of *πατρὶς* indicate.³⁷ The conclusions reached by the editors of the letters include bafflement over the sophistication of Eirene's reception and Iakovos' level of subtlety.

Finally, Iakovos' homilies, with their similar use of extensive quotations, show a similar disjunction in skills: the flaccid narrative, where the terse account from the Protoevangelium of James is overlaid with the somewhat bombastic rhetoric of, *e.g.*, George of Nicomedeia, is in striking contrast to the imaginative vigour of the illustrations that accompany it. A critical edition of the homilies might offer a solution.

³⁴ This depends on the interpretation of *πατρὶς* in letters 12.7 and 21.39, Iakovos' claim to share a *πατρὶς* with Eirene, and the possibility that Eirene is of non-Greek background, possibly Norman (JEFFREYS, *Who was Eirene?* 56–65).

³⁵ Discussion at the symposium suggested that research into Byzantine techniques for note-taking and marking selected passages for, *e.g.*, florilegia could be instructive.

³⁶ See the paper by Alice-Mary Talbot in this volume (pp. 253–259), on the techniques of Theoktistos Stoudite, where thoughtful intertextuality seems to be at work. Antonia Giannouli pointed out in discussion that the commentaries on the canons of Andreas of Crete make extensive use of continuous quotations in a manner similar to that of Iakovos, though frequently with an identifiable acknowledgement of indebtedness (A. GIANNOULI, *Die beiden byzantinischen Kommentare zum Großen Kanon des Andreas von Kreta* [WBS XXVI]. Vienna 2008).

³⁷ And as set out in detail by JEFFREYS, Letter 3.

APPENDIX (IAC. MON. EP. 37)

From the same, letter 37

I beheld the letter of your Majesty just as men at sea would behold a beacon shining from afar upon the deep. For in reality no painter can grasp so accurately the features of the body as words can portray the secrets of **your** soul. [5] For the words of your letter depicted adequately for us the stability of your character, and the truth of your worth and the **justice** of your opinion in everything, and so with a great comfort for your absence **your** tongue has feasted us sufficiently— your tongue which flows with true and pure gold and has streams of honey in your mouth, [10] or rather it conceals the pleasure of every honeycomb; since, according to the philosophy that befits you, you do not despise the offerings of my poor and humble self, but you admire what has great authority and you condescend to the words of my feebleness **and** you multiply [15] the small quantity of the seed by your own power, not through our experience but through your desire. These, in all truth, are our concerns. Even if we are separated from each other by a great distance yet we are near each other by reason of our union; **wherefore** we are also rejoicing with you who are glorying, while the grace of God grants you every protection from the storm [20] of the winds of wickedness. **And** so this is sufficient, for I do not wish to disturb **your Majesty** further.

If therefore it were necessary to flatter and to do less desirable things, I would have found [25] many ways to flatter, all the more because this is easier and now many people are successful at it. But since it is not my intention to do harm, listen to the truth. You know **therefore** that we are eager and pray especially that it be within **us** to celebrate with you as soon as possible the festival of thanksgiving. Therefore we address you and following your desire [30] we explain our circumstances. Even if the eminence of your authority were unapproachable, yet friendship is benevolent, through which we are so bold as to present **even** this request to you. **For even** Herakles, so the story goes, was great among men, but he would not have been so great if he had not had Iolaos to fight with him, especially against the Hydra, [35] that fierce and many-headed monster; one cut off its heads, the other applied fire. **For this reason** this excellent consideration of affairs will protect you from every unexpected event and the true thought of God which surpasses every other thought will preserve you from [40] every deceptive thought that separates you from God. **I wish** you to be so disposed that you are protected from the multiform snares of the mischief-initiating enemy, leaping over these things by means of virtue like some swift-footed and high-bounding gazelle, or soaring above them like an air-borne high-flying bird by means of knowledge, [45] which knowledge is of the divine and of human matters and is a useful training for the soul, purifying often with much labour from the stains of wrong-doing **the inmate which possesses the soul** and understands the words that bring profit of all kinds, **raising up** wise men's words which [50] possess the depth of knowledge and riddles which indicate the truth in a concealed fashion.

When **your Majesty** hears these words she will progress towards wisdom; **then** she will come to a more perfect inclination to it, having been instructed in many matters concerning the divine and having been taught many things [55] about human matters by **the** Word, which in different ways repels evil and by many devices also reintroduces virtue. He who thereafter acquires the true knowledge of what truly exists and knows how one can pass beyond the shifting path of human affairs, has his mind [60] like a helmsman controlling as it were the ship of his body and turning his reasoning like a rudder, and he will ride out nobly the waves of misfortune that rise up like a violent squall of bodily desire; and he will be high above these and difficult to affect, and in no way [65] filled with bitterness from them, and he will always remain constant in himself, neither raised up in good times nor cast down in bad, **but** when everything comes at him in a rush, he will accept all reversals and will not rest in the present as though it is eternal.

[70] Because of this we say that the mind, which is made in the image of the most beautiful, abides in the beautiful for as long as it partakes in the archetype of the likeness in so far as it receives it, but if it departs from this it is stripped of **the** beauty in which it dwelt since the image of God can no longer be seen in the appearance [75] of the creature. For mind places the idea of the good like a mirror behind the back and throws out the reflections of the **radiance** of the good, and gathers into itself the material distorted. The genesis of evil takes place in this way, arising out of the removal of the good. [80] Everything is good **which**

happens to belong to the primal good; **when** it departs from its bond and likeness to this, it is entirely without a share in the beautiful. If therefore one thing that is truly good exists according to the word that is contemplated, mind itself is capable of becoming beautiful [85] through being created in the image of the beautiful **and** nature which is contained by the **beautiful** is as it were an image of an image.

Wherefore we through our mind are led to the understanding of the object and concept that is beyond perception and **mind** becomes for us the **interpreter** of the all powerful wisdom which is [90] perceived in all things. Creation openly cries out **to** its creator, **through** the wise and constructive word **of divine teachings**, while the *heavens* – as the prophet says – *declare the glory of God* in unutterable voices. For who, looking at the universal harmony, both of the heavens and [95] the wonders of **the** earth and [seeing] how the elements in nature set in opposition to each other are all functioning towards the same purpose through some ineffable association – who **will not wonder** how each contributes its own force to the stability of all and neither the unmixed and incommunicable separate out [100] according to the idiosyncrasy of their qualities nor are they destroyed by being stirred up together in the company of other qualities but those whose nature is to rise upwards are borne downwards by the warmth of the sun **as it streams down**; the heavy elements of the bodies are lightened as [105] they are reduced by the [removal of] atoms as when water can be lifted up contrary to its own nature when it is heaped up by the wind into waves and when the etherial fire comes close to earth, and when the deeps are not without their part of warmth, and the moisture from the clouds falls on the earth and being in unity with nature generates multitudinous myriads [110] of budding shoots appropriate to all circumstances, and when both the acutest revolution of the pole and the reverse movement of the inner cycles is implanted, both the running under and the conjunctions and the harmonious distancing of the stars. He who contemplates these things with the intellectual eye of the soul, how can he not be taught [115] clearly from the phenomena that the letter **of Hellenic wisdom** kills (for it has examples of evil matters within itself) but **divine instruction** brings life, for it transforms the surface and false meaning into more divine interpretations.

[120] **But it is excellent** to take the great David and the wise Solomon as teachers in the exposition of this word. For both consider that there is one grace for **your Majesty**, the true good, which is all good. David says, **my lady**, “*Take delight in the Lord*”; and Solomon, [125] “*Eat my bread*”; and the great Isaiah, “*Drink the joy of his nobleness*”. **Wherefore, he who loves wisdom loves life, and those who keep vigil for it will be filled with joy, and he who possesses it will inherit glory. Likewise he who attends to it will dwell in security.** [130] *For wisdom is what her name implies, and for most men is not clear.*

Because of this come to her [wisdom] with all your soul and follow her ways with all your might. Enquire and seek her out and she will be known to you, and when you possess her do not let her go. For at the last you will find her comfort and [135] she will direct you to joy; and her fetter will become your strong defence and her collars a glorious robe for your Majesty.

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐπιστολὴ λζ'

190^r

37 Οὕτως εἶδον τὸ γράμμα τῆς βασιλείας σου ὡς ἂν ἴδοιεν οἱ
θαλαττεύοντες πυρσὸν ἐν πελάγει πόρρωθεν φρυκτωρούμενον.
Καὶ γὰρ οὐδεὶς γραφεὺς χαρακτῆρα σώματος οὕτως ἀκριβῶς
ἐκλαβεῖν δύναται, ὡς λόγος ἐξεικονίσει τῆς ψυχῆς σου τὰ
5 ἀπόρρητα. Τό τε γὰρ τοῦ ἥθους εὐσταθὲς καὶ τὸ τῆς τιμῆς
ἀληθὲς καὶ τὸ τῆς γνώμης ἐν πᾶσι δίκαιον ἱκανῶς ἡμῖν ὁ ἐν
τοῖς γράμμασι λόγος ἐχαρακτήρισεν· ὅθεν καὶ μεγάλην ἡμῖν
παραμυ|θίαν τῆς ἀπολείψεώς σου εἰστίασεν ἢ χρυσὸν δόκι- 190^v
μον καὶ καθαρὸν βέουσα γλῶττά σου, καὶ πηγὰς ἔχουσα μέ-
10 λιτος ἐν τῷ στόματι, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ κηρίου παντὸς ἀποκρύπ-
τουσα τὴν ἡδονήν· ἐπειδὴ δὲ κατὰ τὴν πρέπουσαν ὑμῖν φιλο-
σοφίαν οὐδὲ τὰ τοῦ πένητος ἐμοῦ καὶ πτωχεύοντος
ἀτιμάζεις, ἀλλὰ θαυμάζεις μὲν τὰ πολλὴν ἔχοντα ὑπεροχὴν,
προσίεσαι δὲ καὶ τὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας εὐτελείας | ῥήματα, καὶ 191^r
15 τὴν ὀλιγότητα τῶν σπερμάτων διὰ τῆς οἰκείας δυνάμεως
πλεονάζεις, οὐ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐμπειρίαν ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν ὑμε-
τέραν ἐπιθυμίαν. Ταῦτά ἐστι τὰ ἡμέτερα μετὰ πάσης ἀλη-
θείας. Εἰ καὶ πλεῖστον ἀλλήλων διωρίσμεθα, ἀλλὰ τῷ γε
λόγῳ τῆς συναφείας ἐγγὺς ἀλλήλων ἐσμέν· διὸ καὶ συγχαίρο-
20 μεν ὑμῖν δοξαζομένοις, τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτος πᾶσαν ὑμῖν
σκέπην χαριζομένης ἀπὸ τῆς ζάλης τῶν πνευμάτων | τῆς 191^v
πονηρίας. Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἱκανῶς, οὐδὲ γὰρ βούλομαι
διοχλεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν σου μακρότερον.

Εἰ μὲν οὖν κολακεύειν ἔδει καὶ χεῖρω ποιεῖν, πολλὰς ἂν
25 εὔρον κολακείας ὁδοῦς, ὅσον καὶ ῥᾶον τὸ πρᾶγμα καὶ πολλοῖς
νῦν κατορθούμενον· ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ βλάπτειν οὐ πρὸς ἡμῶν, ἄκουε
τάληθῆ. Ἡμεῖς οὖν ἴσθι προθυμουμένους καὶ εὐχομένους μά-
λιστα μὲν γενέσθαι μέχρις ἡμῶν ὡς τάχιστα συνεορτάσαι τὰ
χαριστήρια. Διὰ τοῦτό σε καὶ προσφθεγγόμεθα καὶ ποθοῦση
30 | παραστήσομεν τὰ ἡμέτερα. Εἰ καὶ τὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς 192^r
ὑψος ἀπρόσιτον, ἀλλὰ φιλόανθρωπον ἢ φιλία, δι' ἣν ἐθαρρήσα-
μεν καὶ ταύτην σοι προσαγαγεῖν τὴν παράκλησιν· καὶ γὰρ μέ-
γας ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὁ Ἑρακλῆς, ὡς ὁ λόγος, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἂν τοσοῦ-
τος ἦν, εἰ μὴ τὸν Ἴόλαον εἶχε συναγωνιζόμενον, καὶ κατὰ τῆς
35 Ἰδρας μάλιστα, τοῦ πικροῦ τούτου καὶ πολυκεφάλου θηρίου,
ῆς ὁ μὲν ἐξέτεμε τὰς κεφαλὰς, ὁ δὲ ἐπέκαιε. Διὰ τοῦτο αὕτη
ἢ τῶν πραγμάτων ἀρίστη περίσκεψις ἀπὸ πάσης παραλόγου |
περιφυλάξει σε πράξεως, ἢ δὲ πάσης ἄλλης ἐννοίας 192^v
ὑπερκειμένη ἀληθῆς περὶ Θεοῦ ἐννοια διατηρήσει σε ἀπὸ
40 πάσης ἐννοίας ἀπατηλῆς καὶ διασπώσης ἀπὸ Θεοῦ. Οὕτω
δέ σε διακεῖσθαι βούλομαι, ὅπως φυλάττη τῶν ποιικιλοτρό-
πων ἀγρευτηρίων τοῦ ἀρχεκάκου ἐχθροῦ, οἷα μὲν τις ὀξυδρο-
μος καὶ ἀλτικωτάτη δορκάς, ὑπερπηδῶσα ταῦτα κατ' ἀρε-
τὴν, οἷα δὲ τι ἀεροπόρον καὶ ὑψιπετὲς πτηνὸν ὑπεριπταμένη |

45 αὐτὰ κατὰ γινῶσιν, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐπιστήμη θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρω- 193^f
 πίνων πραγμάτων καὶ ὠφέλιμος τῇ ψυχῇ ἀγωγή, ἐπιπόνως
 πολλάκις τῶν ἀπὸ κακίας κηλίδων τὸν σύνοικον ταύτην ἔχον-
 τα ἐκκαθαίρουσα καὶ καταλαβεῖν λόγους τὸ συνοῖσον ὑποτιθε-
 μένους παντοδαπούς **διεγείρουσα** ῥήματά τε σοφῶν βάθος
 50 ἔχοντα γνώσεως καὶ αἰνίγματα μετ' ἐπικρύψεως σημαίνοντα
 τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

Τούτων γὰρ τῶν λόγων ἀκού|σασα ἡ **βασιλεία σου** εἰς 193^v
 σοφίαν προκίψει· **εἶτα** εἰς τὴν ταύτης φθάσει τελειότεραν
 ἔξιν, πολλὰ μὲν περὶ τῶν θεῶν παιδευθεῖσα, πολλὰ δὲ καὶ
 55 περὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἐκδιδασκομένη παρὰ τοῦ Λόγου, ποι-
 κίλως μὲν ἐξορίζοντος τὴν κακίαν, πολυτρόπως δὲ πάλιν τὴν
 ἀρετὴν ἀντεισάγοντος. Ὁ δὲ ἐντεῦθεν τὴν ἀληθῆ τῶν ὄντων
 ἐπιστήμην λαβὼν καὶ εἰδὼς ὅπως τὴν ἄστατον φορὰν τῶν
 ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων περαιουῖσθαι προσήκει, τὸν | νοῦν 194^f
 60 ἔχει ὡσπερ τινα κυβερνήτην, οἶονεὶ πλοίου τῆς σαρκὸς κυ-
 ριαρχοῦντα καὶ ἐμπείρως τοὺς λογισμοὺς οἷον οἶακας περι-
 στρέφοντα, τά τε ὡς ἔκ τινος ζάλης βιαίας τοῦ σαρκικοῦ
 φρονήματος ἐπεγειρόμενα τῶν παθῶν κύματα καταπατήσει
 γενναίως· καὶ ὑψηλὸς τούτοις καὶ δυσπρόσιτος ἔσεται, μη-
 65 δαμῶς τῆς ἀπὸ τούτων ἄλμης ἀναπιμπλάμενος, καὶ ὅμοιος
 μὲν αἰεὶ αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ διαμείνη, μήτ' ἐπαιρόμενος | ἐν ταῖς 194^v
 εὐθυμίαις, μήτε καταπίπτων ἐν ταῖς συμφοραῖς, **ἀλλὰ** πάντων
 αὐτῷ κατὰ ῥοῦν προϊόντων, τὰς μεταβολὰς ἐκδέξεται καὶ οὐχ
 ὡς ἀθανάτοις ἐπαναπαύσεται τοῖς παροῦσι.

70 Διὰ τοῦτό φαμεν καὶ τὸν νοῦν κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ καλλίστου
 γενόμενον, ἕως ἂν μετέχη τῆς πρὸς τὸ ἀρχέτυπον ὁμοιότητος
 καθόσον ἐνδέχεται, καὶ αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ καλῷ διαμένειν, εἰ δέ
 πως ἔξω γένοιτο τούτου, γυμνοῖσθαι τοῦ κάλλους τοῦ ἐν ᾧ
 ἦν, ὡς μηκέτι τοῦ Θεοῦ | τὴν εἰκόνα ἐν τῷ χαρακτῆρι καθο- 195^f
 75 ρᾶσθαι τοῦ πλάσματος. Οἷον γάρ τι κάτοπτρον κατὰ νότου
 τὴν τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἰδέαν ὁ νοῦς ποιησάμενος, ἐκβάλλει μὲν τῆς
ἐλλάμψεως τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ τὰς ἐμφάσεις, τῆς δὲ ὕλης τὴν ἀμορ-
 φίαν εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἀναμάσσειται. Καὶ τούτῳ γίνεται τῷ τρόπῳ
 τοῦ κακοῦ ἢ γένεσις, διὰ τῆς ὑπεξαιρέσεως τοῦ καλοῦ παρυ-
 80 φισταμένη. Καλὸν δὲ πᾶν **ὅτιπερ** ἂν τύχη πρὸς τὸ πρῶτον
 ἀγαθὸν οἰκείως ἔχον· **ἐπειδὴν** | ἔξω γένηται τῆς πρὸς τοῦτο 195^v
 σχέσεώς τε καὶ ὁμοιώσεως, ἄμοιρον τοῦ καλοῦ πάντως ἐστίν.
 Εἰ οὖν ἐν μὲν κατὰ τὸν θεωρηθέντα λόγον τὸ ὄντως ἀγαθόν,
 ὁ δὲ νοῦς τῷ κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ καλοῦ γεγενῆσθαι καὶ αὐτὸς ἔχει
 85 τὸ καλὸς εἶναι, καὶ ἡ φύσις ἢ ὑπὸ τοῦ καλοῦ συνεχομένη, κα-
 θάπερ τις εἰκὼν εἰκόνος ἐστί.

Διὸ καὶ ἡμεῖς διὰ τοῦ νοῦ εἰς τὴν τοῦ ὑπὲρ αἴσθησιν πράγ-
 ματός τε καὶ νοήματος ἔννοιαν ὀδηγούμεθα, καὶ γίνεται ἡμῖν
 ὁ νοῦς ἐρμηνευτῆς | παντοδυνάμου σοφίας τῆς τῷ παντὶ ἐν- 196^f

- 90 θεωρουμένης. Βοᾶ γὰρ ἀντικρυς πρὸς τὸν ποιητὴν ἢ κτίσις
διὰ τοῦ σοφοῦ τε καὶ τεχνικοῦ λόγου **τῶν θείων μαθημάτων**,
 αὐτῶν τῶν οὐρανῶν, καθὼς φησιν ὁ προφήτης, ταῖς ἀλλή-
 τοις φωναῖς τὴν δόξαν τοῦ Θεοῦ διηγούμενων. Τίς γὰρ
 βλέπων τὴν τοῦ παντὸς ἀρμονίαν, τῶν τε οὐρανίων καὶ τῶν
 95 κατὰ τὴν γῆν θαυμάτων, καὶ ὡς ἐναντίως ἔχοντα πρὸς ἄλ-
 ληλα τὰ στοιχεῖα κατὰ φύσιν, πρὸς | τὸν αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα 196^v
 σκοπὸν διὰ τινος ἀρρήτου κοινωνίας συμπλέκεται, **οὐ θαυμά-**
σει τὴν παρ' ἑαυτοῦ δύναμιν ἕκαστον πρὸς τὴν τοῦ παντὸς
 διαμονὴν συνεισφέρων, καὶ οὔτε τὰ ἄμικτά τε καὶ ἀκοινωνήτα
 100 κατὰ τὴν ιδιότητα τῶν ποιότητων διαχωρεῖ ἀπ' ἀλλήλων,
 οὔτε ἐν ἀλλήλοις φθείρεται κατακιρνάμενα πρὸς ἄλληλα ταῖς
 ἐναντίας ποιότησιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἷς ἀνωφερῆς ἐστὶν ἡ φύσις,
 ἐπὶ τὰ κάτω φέρεται, τῆς ἡλιακῆς θερμότητος | **κάτω ἐπι-** 197^f
ρεούσης· τὰ τε ἐμβριθῆ τῶν σωμάτων ἀνακουφίζεται διὰ τῶν
 105 ἀτμῶν λεπτυνόμενα, ὡς καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ παρὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ φύσιν
 ἀνωφερὲς γίνεσθαι δι' ἀέρος ἐπὶ πνευμάτων ὀχούμενον καὶ τὸ
 αἰθέριον πῦρ πρόσγειον γίνεσθαι, ὡς καὶ τὸ βάθος μὴ ἀμοι-
 ρεῖν τῆς θερμότητος, ἐπιχειρομένην δὲ τῇ γῆ τὴν ἐκ τῶν
 ὄμβρων ἱμάδα μίαν οὔσαν τῇ φύσει, μυρίας γενεᾶν βλαστη-
 110 μάτων διαφορὰς πᾶσι καταλλήλως τοῖς ὑποκει|μένοις ἐμφυο- 197^v
 μένην, τὴν τε ὄξυτάτην τοῦ πόλου περιφορὰν καὶ τῶν ἐντὸς
 κύκλων τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ ἔμπαλιν κίνησιν, τὰς τε ὑποδρομάς καὶ
 τὰς συνόδους καὶ τὰς ἐναρμονίους ἀποστάσεις τῶν ἄστρον.
 Ὁ ταῦτα βλέπων τῷ διανοητικῷ τῆς ψυχῆς ὀφθαλμῷ, ἄρ' οὐχὶ
 115 φανερῶς ἐκ τῶν φαινομένων διδάσκεται, ὅτι τὸ γράμμα **τῆς**
Ἑλληνικῆς σοφίας ἀποκτενεῖ (πονηρῶν γὰρ ἔχει πραγμάτων
 ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὑποδείγματα), τὰ δὲ **θεῖα μαθήματα** ζωοποιεῖ· |
 Μετατίθενται γὰρ τὴν ἀπεμφαίνουσάν τε καὶ διαβεβλημένην 198^f
 ἔννοιαν εἰς θειοτέρας ἐμφάσεις.
- 120 **Ἄλλὰ καλὸν** τὸν μέγαν Δαυὶδ καὶ τὸν σοφὸν Σολομῶντα
 διδασκάλους τῆς τοῦ λόγου τούτου παραλαβεῖν ἐξηγήσεως.
 Ἀμφότεροι γὰρ **τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου** μίαν ἠγοῦνται τὴν χάριν, αὐ-
 τὸ τὸ ὄντως ἀγαθόν, ὃ δὴ καὶ πᾶν ἐστὶν ἀγαθόν, Δαυὶδ μὲν
 λέγων, **δέσποινά μου· κατατρώφησον τοῦ Κυρίου, Σολομῶν**
 125 **δέ· φάγετε τῶν ἐμῶν ἄρτων**, καὶ ὁ μέγας Ἡσαΐας· **πίε |** 198^v
εὐφροσύνην τῆς μεγαλοφυΐας αὐτοῦ. **Διὸ ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὴν** 198^v
σοφίαν ἀγαπᾷ ζωὴν, καὶ οἱ ὀρθρίζοντες πρὸς αὐτὴν ἐμπλησθή-
σονται εὐφροσύνης, καὶ ὁ κρατῶν αὐτῆς κληρονομήσει δόξαν·
ὡσαύτως καὶ ὁ προσέχων αὐτῇ κατασκηνώσει πεποιθώς. Σο-
 130 **φία γὰρ κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς ἐστὶ καὶ οὐ πολλοῖς ἐστὶ φανερά.**
 Διὰ τοῦτο ἐν πάσῃ ψυχῇ σου πρόσελθε αὐτῇ καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ ду-
 νάμει σου συντήρησον τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτῆς· ἐξίχνευσον καὶ ζήτησον 199^f
 αὐτήν, καὶ γνωσθήσεται σοι, καὶ ἐγκρατῆς γενομένη μὴ
 135 **ἀφῆς αὐτήν. Ἐπ' ἐσχάτων γὰρ εὐρήσεις τὴν ἀνάπαυσιν αὐτῆς,**
καὶ στραφήσεται σοι εἰς εὐφροσύνην· καὶ ἔσονται σοι αἱ πέδαι
 αὐτῆς εἰς σκέπην ἰσχύος καὶ οἱ κλοιοὶ αὐτῆς εἰς στολὴν δόξης
 τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου.

Fontes

37/1/2 Οὕτως - φρυκτωρούμενον Bas., Ep. 100, 1-3 3/8 Καὶ γὰρ - ἀπολείψεώς σου Bas., Ep. 163, 1-7 8/14 εἰστίασεν - ῥήματα Ioh. Chrys., De proph. obs. 2 (176.31-41)

15/16 τὴν ὀλιγότητα - πλεονάζεις Ioh. Chrys., De proph. obs. 2 (176.5-7) 16/17 οὐ διὰ - ἐπιθυμίαν Ioh. Chrys., De proph. obs. 2 (176.29-31) 17/18 Ταῦτά - ἀληθείας Bas., Ep. 226, 3.39-40 18/19 Εἰ καὶ - ἐσμέν Bas., Ep. 243, 1.8-10 19/20 καὶ συγχαίρομεν ὑμῖν δοξαζόμενοις Bas., Ep. 243, 1.14-15 20/22 τῆς τοῦ - πονηρίας Bas., Ep. 243, 4.12-14 22/23 ταῦτα - μακρότερον Greg. Naz., Ep. 139.3 (II, 27.18-19) 24/27 Εἰ μὲν - ἀληθῆ Greg. Naz., Ep. 217.2 (II, 107.13-18)

27/28 Ἡμεῖς - μέγιστος Greg. Naz., Ep. 20.7 (I, 29.6-8) 28/29 ὡς τάχιστα - χαριστήρια Greg. Naz., Ep. 20.8 (I, 29.10-11) 29/30 Διὰ - ἡμέτερα Greg. Naz., Ep. 132.2 (II, 21.11-12) 30/32 Εἰ καὶ - παράκλησιν Greg. Naz., Ep. 181.1 (II, 70.11-13) 33/36 μέγας - ἐπέκαιε Greg. Naz., Ep. 156.1 (II, 47.13-18) 36/40 αὕτη - Θεοῦ Proc. Gaz., In Prou. 2.11 (1237.12-18) 40/45 Οὕτω - γινώσκιν Proc. Gaz., In Prou. 6.5 (1269.20-25)

45/49 ἦτις - ὑποτιθεμένους Proc. Gaz., In Prou. 1.2 (1221.33-37) 49 παντοδαπούς Proc. Gaz., In Prou. 1.6 (1224.54) 49/51 ῥήματα - ἀλήθειαν Proc. Gaz., In Prou. 1.6 (1224.57-1225.2) 52/59 Τούτων - προσήκει Proc. Gaz., In Prou. 1.5 (1224.25-35) 59/67 τὸν νοῦν - συμφοραῖς Proc. Gaz., In Prou. 1.5 (1224.43-51) 67/69 πάντων - παροῦσι Proc. Gaz., In Prou. 1.5 (1224.38-41)

70/74 Διὰ - ἦν Greg. Nys., De op. hom. 12 (161.31-36) 74/86 ὡς - ἐστὶ Greg. Nys., De op. hom. 12 (164.1-15) 87/90 εἰς τὴν - ἐνθεωρουμένης Greg. Nys., De an. et res. (28.32-37) 90 Βοᾶ - κτίσις Greg. Nys., De an. et res. (25.17-18) 91 τοῦ σοφοῦ - λόγου Greg. Nys., De an. et res. (29.1) 92/115 αὐτῶν - διδάσκονται Greg. Nys., De an. et res. (25.18-28.5)

115/119 ὅτι - ἐμφάσεις Greg. Nys., Cant. Prol. (7.12-16)

120/125 τὸν μέγαν - Σολομών δέ Greg. Nys., De op. hom. 19 (197.11-16) 125 φάγετε - ἄρτων Greg. Nys., De op. hom. 19 (196.32) 125/126 καὶ ὁ - αὐτοῦ Greg. Nys., De op. hom. 19 (196.36-37)

Parall.

37.3/8 Καὶ γὰρ - ἀπολείψεώς σου = 26.1/7 8/17 εἰστίασεν - ἐπιθυμίαν = 35.69/77

17/45 Ταῦτά - γινώσκιν = 34.11/39 22/23 οὐδὲ - μακρότερον = 3.69/70

30/32 Εἰ καὶ - παράκλησιν = 40.38/40 36/40 αὕτη - Θεοῦ = 29.38/42

45/69 ἦτις - παροῦσι = 43.8/32 48/51 λόγους - ἀλήθειαν = 28.28/32

59/67 τὸν νοῦν - συμφοραῖς = 28.20/28 67/69 πάντων - ἐπαναπαύσεται τοῖς παροῦσι = 28.16/18

70/119 Διὰ τοῦτό - ἐμφάσεις = 24.12/61

120/126 Ἀλλὰ - αὐτοῦ = 24.67/73 126/137 Διὸ - βασιλεία σου = 24.102/113