

F. Lauritzen

AREOPAGITICA IN STETHATOS: CHRONOLOGY OF AN INTEREST

Abstract: Niketas Stethatos' works can be organised chronologically into three phases. Before 1019 one does not see quotations of Dionysius the Areopagite. In the period 1019–1042 there are numerous and extensive quotations from the *Divine Names*, *Celestial Hierarchy* and *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*. After 1043 there are rare and short reference to the *Areopagitica*. Together with the internal references to his works, it is possible to establish a sequence for the undated works and to narrow his lifespan to the period ca. 1000–1065.

Keywords: Niketas Stethatos, Dionysius the Areopagite, Symeon the New Theologian, Psellos, neoplatonism.

Niketas Stethatos (ca. 1005 — ca. 1065)¹ is probably one of the most important readers of Dionysius the Areopagite in the Byzantine Empire². His systematic use of the Areopagites' works in interpreting the hymns of Symeon the New Theologian have awarded him a lasting place in the history of byzantine thought³. Darrouzès claims that a defining feature of Stethatos was his 'areopagitisme'⁴. Nevertheless Stethatos' reading is progressive: as his life went on he changed his preference and therefore it is important to establish a chronology of the works he read. It is certain that in his earliest text there are no references to Dionysius the Areopagite and there are very few in his later works. However, in the 1030s he seems to have employed Dionysius the Areopagite extensively. Thus the areopagitisme indicated by Darrouzès concerns only one of three possible phases of Stethatos' writing.

There are few secure dates of Stethatos' life which allow one to have an initial framework. Before 1022, at the age of 14 he entered the Studios Monastery where

¹ For a list of editions see appendix. On the name Stethatos see: *Hinterberger M.* Niketas Stethatos der «Beherzte»? // *BZ*. 2010. Bd. 103.1. S. 49–53.

² On the reception of Dionysius the Areopagite in Byzantium see: *Andia Y. de.* Denys l'Aréopagite et sa postérité en Orient et en Occident // *Actes du Colloque International*, Paris, 21–24 septembre 1994. P., 1997.

³ One should not forget that Gregory Palamas prefers to quote Niketas Stethatos' *Life of St Symeon* rather than the texts of St Symeon himself.

⁴ Darrouzès 34ff; *Alfeev H.* Symeon the New Theologian and the Orthodox tradition. Oxford, 2000. P. 275. N. 9 says: «It has been noticed that in his theology Nikitas was much more dependent on Dionysios than on Symeon; in spite of his high veneration of Symeon, he never quotes the latter in his theological tracts».

he became a disciple of Symeon the New Theologian⁵. At some point he wrote the defence of the Symeon⁶. He started writing down the hymns of Symeon the New Theologian⁷ but there was a falling out between the two recorded both in the life of the Saint by Stethatos⁸ and by a letter written by Symeon the New Theologian to Stethatos⁹. In 1035 Stethatos published the edition of the hymns of Symeon with his own preface¹⁰. In 1044 Scylitzes records that he was one of the most important theologians of the capital¹¹. There appears to be a political conflict in which Stethatos was involved regarding the relation between the emperor and his mistress which is mentioned in Scylitzes in the year 1044. Later in 1054 there is a mention of the fact Keroularios had long tried to defeat the studite monks over their practices in a letter of the patriarch of Antioch to Keroularios¹². Thus between 1043–1054 Stethatos was in a controversy with Patriarch Keroularios. In other words the treatise *On the Studite Practices* is to be dated between 1043 and 1054 during this turbulent period for Studite monks and practices. In 1052 Stethatos publishes the life St Symeon¹³. In 1054 Humbert of Silva Candida records that Stethatos was involved in the dis-

⁵ ἔμοῦ δὲ ἐπὶ πολλὰς ἀναβαλλομένου ἡμέρας διὰ τὸ μὴ πείραν ἐσχηκέναι ποτὲ τῆς ἐπὶ τὸ γράφειν τὰ τοιαῦτα τέχνης, οὐ γὰρ ἔφθασα τῇ θύραθεν γνώσει καταπυκνωθῆναι καλῶς καὶ στομωθῆναι τοῖς λόγοις νέος καὶ τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτης τὴν ἡλικίαν τῷ βίῳ καὶ τοῖς θορύβοις ἀποταξάμενος, καὶ τὴν διατριβὴν τῶν μαθημάτων ἀπολιπών, οὐκ ἦν μοι νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν ἀνάπαυσις ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐμπυριζόντος με πνεύματος ἔνδοθεν καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦτο σφόδρα με νύσσαντος καὶ κινουόντος (*Niketas Stethatos. The Life of Saint Symeon the New Theologian. 135.20–27 Hausherr*).

⁶ Edited by Paschalides (see appendix).

⁷ ἔτι περιόντος τοῦ μακαρίου ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ ταύτῃ ζωῆ καὶ τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος χορηγούμενα μυστήρια τῷ νοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἄκοντος αὐτοῦ γράφοντος ἐν νυκτὶ καὶ ἡμέρα (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦν αὐτῷ ἄνεσις ἢ καθόλου ἐδίδοτο παρὰ τοῦ σφύζοντος ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀλλομένου πνεύματος, ἕως οὐ ἂ ἐκεῖνο λαλοῦν ἦν καὶ ἐνεργοῦν ἔνδοθεν αὐτοῦ γραφῆ παραδέδωκεν), ἐδίδου κάμοι τὰ σχεδιαζόμενα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ μετέγραφον ταῦτα εἰς τε βιβλίον βιβλίων καὶ κοντάκια ἕτερα. ἐπεὶ δὲ μετὰ τὸ ταῦτα μεταπῆξαι ἀνέστρεφον πάλιν αὐτὰ πρὸς αὐτόν, ἔδοξε μοι ἐν μιᾷ ποτε παρ' ἐμοῦτῷ ἐν παρακατασχέει τῶν κοντακίων (*Niketas Stethatos. The Life of Saint Symeon the New Theologian. 131.6–15 Hausherr*).

⁸ τοῦτο τοῖνυν ἀκηκοῶς ἐγὼ ὤμην ὅτι δόλον τινὰ ὑπέλαβε κατ' ἐμοῦ ὁ μακάριος (*Ibid. 131.18–19*).

⁹ *Ibid.* 132.

¹⁰ Οὕτω τοιγαροῦν τῆς ὄψεως τὴν κρίσιν ὑπὸ τοῦ διανοίγοντος ἡμῶν τὸν νοῦν εἰς τὸ συνίεναι τὰς γραφὰς καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ παλαιοῦ τῶν ἡμερῶν σοφωτάτου γέροντος μυσταγωγηθεὶς, ἐμνήσθην αὐτίκα καὶ τῆς πρὸς μέ ποτε γενομένης γραφῆς παρὰ τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ τῶν θεοπνευστῶν συγγραμμάτων αὐτοῦ καὶ καθὼς τῆνικαῦτα προφητικώτατα γέγραφε πρὸς με, οὕτω πάντα εἰς τὸν ἴδιον ἐξέβη καιρόν, πιστεύω δὲ ὅτι καὶ ἔτι ἐκβήσεται, πάντων δηλαδὴ τῶν συγγραμμάτων αὐτοῦ ἐλθόντων εἰς τὰς ἐμὰς χεῖρας ὑπ' ἄλλου δυσκόλου κεκρατημένον καὶ ὡσπερ βασιλικῷ θησαυρῷ φυλαττομένον ἐπὶ χρόνοις τρισκαίδεκα, ὡς καὶ ἐνὸς βιβλίου διαπραθέντος ἀπὸ τῶν συγγραμμάτων αὐτοῦ πρὸς ἐμὲ διακομισθῆναι καὶ ἐπισυναφῆναι τοῖς ὑπολοίποις (*Ibid. 140.1–12*). The hymns are edited by *Kambylis A. Symeon Neos Theologos, Hymnen. B., 1976*.

¹¹ παλλακευομένης γὰρ τῆς θυγατρὸς τοῦ Σκληροῦ τῷ βασιλεῖ οὐκ ὀλίγος ἦν γογγυσμὸς τοῦ τε δήμου καὶ τῆς συγκλήτου καὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν καὶ δεσποινῶν. ὃν καὶ τῆνικαῦτα ἐν μοναχοῖς διαπρέπων ὁ οὕτω Στηθάτος λεγόμενος ἐκόλυε μὲν, ἦγνε δὲ οὐδέν. πάντη γὰρ ἤτητο τῆς ὥρας αὐτῆς ὁ βασιλεὺς. ἦν δὲ ὁ Στηθάτος οὗτος ἀρετῆς εἰς ἄκραν ἐπιμελούμενος καὶ νηστεία καὶ σκληραγωγία καὶ πάσῃ ἄλλῃ ἀρετῇ ἐντήκων τὸ σῶμα ἑαυτοῦ, ὡς καὶ ποτε τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας ἄσιτος διατελέσαι, μηδενὸς τὸ παράπαν ἐν τῷ μέσῳ γευσάμενος (*Ioannes Scylitzas. Synopsis historiarum // Ed. H. Thurn. B., 1973. 28–34*).

¹² ἐν τῇ ἀγαεστάτῃ μονῇ τοῦ Στουδίου ζώννυνται οἱ διάκονοι πρᾶγμα ποιῶντες ἐκκλησιαστικῆ παραδόσει ἀνακόλουθον. Καθ' ὅρα, ὅπως πολλὰ κοπιάσας καὶ σπουδάσας τὴν τοιαύτην οὐκ ἡδυνήθης ἐκκόψαι μονολόγιστον συνήθειαν (*Will C. Acta et scripta quae de controversiis ecclesiae Graecae et Latinae saeculo undecimo composita extant. Leipzig, 1861. Parag. 17. P. 200*).

¹³ *Niketas Stethatos. Life of Saint Symeon... 129*.

cussions between Byzantines and Latins¹⁴, of which survives the treatise against the Latins of 1054¹⁵.

From this scanty data one may see that there are only a few works which are more or less securely dated: *Against the accusers of the Saint*, κατὰ Ἀγιοκατηγόρων (before 1035 probably before ca 1019), introduction to hymns (1035), the *Studite Practices* (1043–1054), *Life of Saint Symeon* (1052), *Against the Latins* (1054). Beside this information Stethatos gives us internal evidence to understand the relative chronology of other works. The *Introduction to the Hymns* quotes the *Defence against the Accusers of the Saint*¹⁶. The treatise *On Paradise* cites the one *On the soul*¹⁷, which was written during his old age¹⁸. The *On the soul*¹⁹ cites the *Hundred Chapters*. The treatise *On the soul* cites the text *On Hierarchy*²⁰. As one can see the two lists, those of the dated works and those with relative chronology still need to be unified. Schematically one may present it thus:

1019 (?)	<i>Defence against the accusers of the Saint</i>
1035	<i>Introduction to hymns</i>
1043–1054	<i>Studite practices</i>
1052	<i>Life of Saint Symeon</i>
1054	<i>Against the Latins</i>
?	<i>On hierarchy</i>
?	<i>Hundred chapters</i>
?	<i>On the soul</i>
?	<i>On Paradise</i>

The most important direct evidence of Stethatos' reading of the Areopagite is that Niketas writes in the life of St Symeon that the saint after his death appeared to him and said that he had correctly reinterpreted the texts according to Dionysius²¹. The text was written in 1052 as a justification for the rereading Stethatos had done of the hymns. Indeed, there is an open question concerning how much Stethatos rewrote the hymns and what need there is to add references to Dionysius the Areopagite whom Symeon never quotes directly²². The need for such justification reveals a break between Symeon

¹⁴ Will C. Acta et scripta... P. 136–150; 137a24; 138b15; 151a4.

¹⁵ Niketas Stethatos. Contra Latinos. P. 126–139 Will. Niketas Stethatos. Contra Armenios et Latinos. P. 139–154 in: Hergenröther. Monumenta graeca ad Photium eiusque historiam pertinentia. Regensburg, 1869.

¹⁶ Niketas Stethatos. Introduction to Hymns of Symeon the New Theologian in: Kambylis A. Symeon Neos Theologos... Prologue 4.266–267.

¹⁷ οὗτος γὰρ ὁ σκοπὸς ἡμῖν τοῦ λόγου, δι' ὃν καὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα τούτου μετὰ τὸν περὶ ψυχῆς μοι πονηθέντα λόγον ὑπεδυσάμην (Niketas Stethatos. On Paradise oration. 2.1.2–3 Darrouzès).

¹⁸ Φιλοσοφῆσαι δεῖν ἔγνων περὶ ψυχῆς ἐν τῷ γήρα καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς περὶ τὰ τέλη ζωῆς (Niketas Stethatos. On the soul oration. 1.1.1–2 Darrouzès).

¹⁹ ὡς ἄνωθεν κἀν τοῖς Κεφαλαίοις ἡμῶν διεμνημονεύσαμεν (Ibid. 1.19.3–4), ὡς μοι κἀν τοῖς Κεφαλαίοις πεφίλοσόφηται, (Ibid. 1.57.4–5), καθὼς καὶ ἐν τῷ πονηθέντι μοι λόγῳ τῆς τρίτης ἑκατοντάδος τῶν γνωστικῶν Κεφαλαίων, ναὶ διὴ καὶ ἐν τῇ Θεωρίᾳ τῆς οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς ἱεραρχίας διεξοδικώτερον περὶ τῶν θείων δυνάμεων καὶ τοῦ τρόπου τῆς οικειώσεως πρὸς αὐτὰς τῶν τελείων ἀνεγραψάμην ψυχῶν (Ibid. 1.71.25–29).

²⁰ Ibid. 1.71.25–29.

²¹ Niketas Stethatos. The Life of Saint Symeon... P. 139.6–11.

²² The rewriting of the hymns is discussed at Kambylis A. Symeon Neos Theologos... P. CCXCIX–CCCIX. The scholion of Hymn 15.80 ff points out how Symeon may refer to Dionysius but without quoting him directly.

and Niketas and may explain the letter written by Symeon the New Theologian to Niketas where he points out that his original message had been altered. Stethatos says he was shocked when he read it:

Ταῦτα τοιγαροῦν πρὸς ἐμὲ γεγραφώς, ἐπεὶ ἔτι νέος ὢν ἐγὼ καὶ ἀτελὴς τὸν λόγον τῆς γνώσεως ἄρτι τὸν ἰουλον ἐπανθοῦντα ἐπιφερόμενος, τὴν δύναμιν τῶν ῥημάτων αὐτοῦ γνῶναι μὴ δυναθεὶς, γραφῆ τέως ταύτην τε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν καὶ ἄς ἐπέστειλε διαφόρως πρὸς με παρέδωκα, ἄνωθεν οἶμαι καλῶς κινηθεὶς ἐπὶ τοῦτο. χρόνων δὲ παρεληλυθότων ἑκκαίδεκα καὶ πολλοῖς μαχόμενος καὶ προσπαλαίων, ὡς ἄνωθεν εἴρηται, διὰ μέσου τοῖς πειρασμοῖς, οὐ μόνον ταύτης λήθην ἔλαβον τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντων ἄλλων τῶν θεοπνεύστων αὐτοῦ συγγραμμάτων (*Niketas Stethatos*. Life of Saint Symeon the New Theologian. P. 133.1–6 Hausherr).

So he wrote this to me, when I was still young and immature for what concerned knowledge and my beard was just beginning to grow. Since I was not capable of bearing the power of his words, I put aside the letter and those which he had variously written to me, I think I was well inspired from above to do this. Sixteen years passed [1019–1035] and, as I said before, I was fighting and battling in the meantime with many temptations, and not only did I forget this letter, but also all his other divinely inspired writings.

The second part of this quotation gives us some important chronological information, since it claims that sixteen years passed during which he never read the works of Symeon the New Theologian. If we subtract this figure from the date of publication it seems clear that the separation between the two happened in 1019²³. This year coincided with the appointment of the new patriarch Eustathios (1019–1025)²⁴. One should point out that the patriarch reversed some decisions of Sergios II (1001–1019), whose long patriarchate had defined many aspects of Symeon the New Theologian's life²⁵. Moreover his synod decision was in favour of a loosening of some strict directives applied beforehand²⁶. Within such changes Stethatos may have found a more favourable atmosphere within the capital while St Symeon remained in the monastery of Saint Marina. Such distance may also explain why a letter survives of Symeon written to Niketas at this time, since it would imply geographical distance.

One may summarize the situation thus: before 1019 Niketas was with Symeon and wrote the *Defence against the accusers of the Saint* and he transcribed the hymns as Symeon had proposed. Niketas started reading the Areopagite and then there was a rupture between them. Indeed there seems to be no evidence of such interests in the defence of the Saint. Thus this text was written in the first phase when he was not reading assiduously the areopagitica. Moreover his reading does not seem to be encouraged by Symeon. It is for this reason that the introduction of 1035 is so important. There it is stated that the message of Symeon coincided with that of the areopagitica as he says in the introduction chapter 14, which is the first explicit reference by name of the Areopagite. The novelty can be seen by the fact it is one of the few times the name and nickname are mentioned together before this date. The text of 1035 is important since it quotes verbatim long passages of the *Divine Names* of Dionysius. The following list

²³ The date is also established in: *Niketas Stethatos*. Life of Saint Symeon... P. XC.

²⁴ *Ibid.* P. 94.

²⁵ The exile to the monastery of Saint Marina. *Ibid.* P. 100.

²⁶ *Lauritzen F.* Synod decrees of the eleventh century (1025–1081): A classification of the documents of the synodos endemousa // *BZ*. 2012. Bd. 105.1.

taken from the apparatus of the *Introduction to the Hymns of Saint Symeon* edited by Kambylis illustrates the situation:

<i>Line</i>	<i>Divine names</i>	<i>Line</i>	<i>Divine names</i>
4	DNo 1.3	178f	DNo 1.4
68f	DNo 1.6	184–190	DNo 1.5
69–80	DNo 1.6	191–194	DNo 1.6
84–88	DNo 1.7	194–198	DNo 1.8
88–91	DNo 1.7	202–205	DNo 1.8
92–101	DNo 1.8	225	EH 1.1
144–149	DNo 1.2	232	DNo 4.2
151–159	DNo 1.3	233–238	DNo 4.9
163f	DNo 4.14–17	238–243	DNo 4.2

Indeed the quantity of citations is impressive, especially since all come from the *Divine Names* and only one passage is from the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*. The quotations attempt to prove that the hymns of Symeon were in tune with the ideas expressed by Dionysius.

Ἦθεν καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ πολὺς τὰ θεῖα Διονύσιος ἐν τῷ Περὶ θεῶν ὀνομάτων συντάγματι, τῷ τρόπῳ καὶ τῇ πρὸς Θεὸν ἐκστάσει τοῦ θεσπεσίου τούτου πατρὸς οἷα δι' ὧν γράφει συμ-μαρτυρῶν, τοιάδε φησὶν (*Niketas Stethatos*. Preface to the Hymns of Symeon the New Theologian 5.81–83 Kambylis).

So also the expert in theology, Dionysius, testifies in the text of *Divine Names* on the method and the ecstasy towards God similar to our divine father, and says this:

Thus in 1035 Niketas quotes the *Divine Names* to prove his argument²⁷. The technique of quoting Dionysius to prove his point is also used in the *Studite Costumes* dated between 1043–1054, though the citations are quite few²⁸. Thus one can see three distinct phases: one before he studied Dionysius the Areopagite, one when he is devoted to his study and the final phase when he uses Dionysius quite rarely. This classification allows one to suspect that the treatise on the Hierarchies can be placed in the middle period (sometime between 1035 and 1059). Indeed in his treatise on the identification of the celestial with the church hierarchy he quotes extensively from Dionysius. This time he quotes from the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* and the *Celestial Hierarchy* of Dionysius the Areopagite.

<i>Line</i>	<i>Ecclesiastical Hierarchy</i>	<i>Line</i>	<i>Ecclesiastical Hierarchy</i>	<i>Line</i>	<i>Ecclesiastical Hierarchy</i>
7.5–8	EH 6.2.5	14a	CH 1.3	44a	CH 8.1
7.10–13	EH 1.2	16a	CH 5	46a	CH 8.1
7c	EH 1.2	17a	CH 6.2	49a	CH 9.1
8a	EH 1.3	25a	CH 7.1	51a	CH 9.2
9a	EH 1.4	27a	CH 7.1	53a	CH 9 9,2
10a	EH 1.5	29a	CH 7.1	57a	CH 3.2
11a	EH 1.5	34a	CH 12.1–2	57c	CH 3.3
12c	CH 1.1	35a	CH 12.2–3	58a	CH 3.3
13a	CH 1.3	42a	CH 8.1	58b	CH 4.1

²⁷ Moreover Dionysius is mentioned explicitly at Scholia to Hymn 15.80.

²⁸ Other quotations of Dionysius are: *Niketas Stethatos*. *Studite Costumes* 1.17–21 Darrouzès.

These quotations reveal that Niketas Stethatos employed only the *Divine Names*, *Ecclesiastical* and *Heavenly Hierarchy*. One of the treatises which he wrote in old age contains only one reference to Dionysius which is not a direct quotation but a reference to the EH²⁹. One should differentiate clearly the introduction of 1035 from the Hierarchy. In the first case he employs a well-accepted church father in order to guarantee the orthodoxy of a new church father, namely Symeon the New Theologian. This operation is successful and Niketas was recognised as the best theologian in the city. The other operation creates something new from two existing texts of Dionysius. Indeed in the introduction of this work he specifies it was composed by him (πονηθέντα μοι) and appears to be creative. This data allows one to establish four phases of composition in Stethatos' career:

- 1st (before 1019) transcription of Symeon's work and defence of his ideas (*κατὰ τῶν Ἁγιοκατηγόρων*);
- 2nd (ca. 1019–1035) study of Dionysius the Areopagite (*Divine Names*, *Heavenly Hierarchy* and *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*) and separation from his master. Publication of argument that Symeon's hymns are simply new expressions of the Areopagite's ideas. (edition of Hymns and preface in 1035);
- 3rd (ca. 1043–1059) defence of studite practice with rare use of Dionysius (*Studite Practices*, *Against the Latins*);
- 4th (undated but at the end of his life — after 1059?) philosophical treatises with scanty references to Dionysius. (*On the soul*, *On the limits of life*).

The transition from the first to the second phase represents the change from being a student to presenting new ideas in favour of one's master. However the third phase seems to illustrate the political role of theology. Stethatos writes the treatise for the Studite monks in order to defend them from the attack of the Patriarch Keroularios, who had also tried to strike out the name of Theodore Studites from the Synodikon:

Μιχαὴλ δὲ ὁ πατριάρχης ἅμα τῷ χειροτονηθῆναι τὸν πάπαν Ῥώμης τῶν διπτύχων ἐξέβαλε, τὸ τῶν ἀζύμων ζήτημα ἐπενεγκῶν αὐτῷ τῆς ἐκβολῆς αἰτίον· συνήργει δὲ τούτῳ Πέτρος τε ὁ Ἀντιοχείας πατριάρχης καὶ Λέων ὁ Βουλγαρίας ἀρχιεπίσκοπος καὶ τὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἅπαν ἔλλογιμώτερον, προσκρούον δὲ καὶ πρὸς τὸν τηρικαῦτα τῆς μονῆς τοῦ Στουδίου ἠγούμενον Μιχαὴλ, ὃν Μερμέντουλος τὸ ἐπώνυμον, τοῦ ἐπ' ἐκκλησίας ἀναγιγνωσκόμενου συνοδικοῦ τὸν ἐν ἁγίοις Θεοδώρον τὸν Στουδίτην ἐξέβαλε. μὴ ἐνεγκῶν δὲ ὁ Μερμέντουλος τὸ γεγονός, τῷ βασιλεῖ προσελθὼν τοῦτο αὐτῷ διανήγγειλε. διὸ προστάζει βασιλικῇ ἀνεγνώσθη τὸ συνοδικὸν τῇ κυριακῇ τῆς Σαμαρείτιδος, καὶ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα πάντα κατὰ τὸ ἔθος ἀνεγνώσθησαν, τὸ δὲ τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοδώρου ὄνομα ὁ πατριάρχης ἀναστὰς ἐξεφώνησε μεγάλῃ καὶ διατόρῳ φωνῇ, καὶ οὕτω κατευνάσθη ἢ περὶ τούτου τῶν τε μοναχῶν καὶ τοῦ Μερμεντούλου στάσις (*Scylitzes*. *Synopsis*. Const 9.7.3–13 Thurn).

As soon as Michael was elected patriarch, he erased the Pope of Rome from the diptychs, adducing the question of unleavened bread as reason for the exclusion. The Patriarch of Alexandria and Leo the archbishop of Bulgaria assisted him in this as well as all the most intellectual part of the church. He also attacked the then abbot of the Studios monastery, whose surname was Mermentulos. The patriarch removed Saint Theodore from the Synodikon read in church. Since Mermentulos could not bear what had happened, he went to the emperor and told him. Therefore by imperial decree the Synodikon was read on the Sunday of the Samaritan woman. Everything else was read according to custom, and the

²⁹ ὡς τῷ ἀρεοπαγίτη μεγάλῳ Διονυσίῳ ἐν τῷ τῶν ἱερῶς κεκοιμημένων μυστηρίῳ δοκεῖ (*Niketas Stethatos*. *On the soul oration*. 1.13–14 Darrouzès).

patriarch stood up and recited the name of the great Theodore with a loud and clear voice. So the rebellion of the studite monks and Mermentulus was put to rest.

This passage illustrates clearly the conflict between the Patriarch Michael Keroularios and the Studios Monastery³⁰. Thus it is unlikely Stethatos would defend the church hierarchy theologically as he did in the *On Hierarchy*. One may imagine a time for its composition before 1043, when Keroularios became patriarch. Moreover, the numerous quotations of Dionysius in the treatise of *On Hierarchy* seem similar to the *Preface to the Hymns* (1035) and therefore places it is rather in the second phase (1019–1043). Therefore, it was written during the patriarchate of Alexios Studites (1025–1043). This would also have the advantage of being written for a patriarch who had been monk in the same monastery.

If one turns to the polemics against the Latins published in 1054, and surviving in Latin³¹, it is clear that it is a polemical work written for the Latins and without any references to Dionysius the Areopagite. This would seem to imply as well that the polemics against the Armenians and Jews fit in a period when Stethatos was writing polemical works with few references (if any) to Dionysius the Areopagite for the benefit of people outside his inner circle, and especially with the aim of conversion. Thus one could place the polemics against the Jews and Armenians between 1043–1059, during the patriarchate of Michael Keroularios. Moreover the treatise against the Armenians could be connected with the conquest of the Armenian kingdom of Ani in 1045³², or slightly later to the residence of the Armenian Patriarch in Constantinople in ca 1049–1054³³. In both cases it would seem that during the patriarchate of Keroularios, Stethatos offered his polemical works without complex quotations from the Areopagite. That this was a decade dedicated to polemics is clearly visible from the account written by Humbert of Silva Candida who begins by describing his attack on Stethatos:

Anno duodecimo imperii Constantini Monomachi indictione VII, ipso die nativitatis beati Ioannis Baptistae, advenientibus a domino Papa Leone nono apocrisariis sanctae romanae et apostolicae sedis. Humberto scilicet cardinali episcopo Silvae Candidae et Petro Amalphitanorum archiepiscopo, Friderico quoque diacono et cancellario, ad monasterium Studii intra urbem Constantinopolitanam Nicetas monachus, qui et Pectoratus, ante praesentiam praefati imperatoris et procerum ejus insistentibus ipsis nuntiis Romanis anathematizavit quoddam scriptum sub nomine contra sedem apostolicam et omnem Latinam ecclesiam editum et praetitulatum: De azymo, de sabbato et de nuptiis sacerdotum. Insuper anathematizavit cunctos, qui ipsam sanctam ecclesiam Romanam negarent primam omnium ecclesiarum esse et qui illius de fide semper orthodoxam praesumerent in aliquo reprehendere. Post haec statim in conspectu omnium ad suggestionem eorumdem nuntiorum Romanorum jussit idem orthodoxus imperator praefatum incendi scriptum

³⁰ One cannot underestimate the importance of this political conflict. Much of book five of Psellos' *Chronographia* is devoted to the protection sought by Michael V Kalaphates at the Studios monastery.

³¹ Part of the Greek original of this text and is edited in *Analecta sacra et classica Spicilegio Solesmensi parata* / Ed. J.-B. Pitra. Vol. 6. P., 1891. P. 761–782.

³² The importance of Ani at the time is revealed by the direct reference in Psellos' encomium 2 dated between 1050–1054 as well as in the typikon of Mt Athos of Monomachos of 1045 edited in *Papachryssanthou D. Actes de Prôtaton* [Archives de l'Athos VII. P., 1975]: 224–232. Both these texts refer to the conquest of cities with large populations. The main one is of course Ani as explained by *Attaleiates*. *Historia* 79.14 Bekker.

³³ *Bayer A. Spaltung der Christenheit*. Köln, 2002. S. 68. N. 34. According to Barmin the fifth speech against the Armenians should be dated before 1054 since it quoted in the antilatin polemics. See: *Бармин А.В. Polemica и схизма*. М., 2006. С. 145–148, 172–176.

sicque fuit discessum. Sequenti autem die praedictus Niceta urbe est egressus (Humbertus Silva Candida. Brevis Commemoratio 150–151 Will).

In the twelfth year of the reign of Constantine Monomachos, in the seventh indiction, the very day of the birth of the blessed John the Baptist, the apochrysarii of the holy roman and apostolic see sent by pope Leo the ninth, Humbert, cardinal bishop of Silva Candida and Peter the archbishop of Amalfi, and a certain deacon and chancellor Frederick, arrived at the monastery of Studios within the city of Constantinople. The monk Nicetas, who is also Pectoratus (Stethatos), before the presence of the abovementioned emperor and before him, while the roman ambassadors were insisting, he anathematized a treatise in his name published against the apostolic see and against the entire latin church and entitled: On unleavened bread, on Saturday and marriage of priests. He anathematized also all those who refused that the same holy roman church is the first of all churches and those who always presumed his orthodox faith but reprehended him elsewhere. After this the orthodox emperor ordered him immediately before everyone according to the suggestion of those roman ambassadors to burn the above mentioned treatise and so it was done. The next day the above mentioned Nicetas left the city.

This passage illustrates the will of the emperor to avoid conflict among the theologians of the patriarch and those of the pope. The latter asked for action to be taken against Stethatos and specifically the three works: *de azymo*, *de sabato*, *de nuptis sacerdotum*. He requested the works be burned. This would imply, as one may see from the passage above, that the surviving treatises against the Latins are new ones³⁴ written after the previous had been burned. These older works should be therefore dated before 1054 and probably after 1043 when Patriarch Keroularios inspired polemical works. From this passage though one understands that the conflict between Niketas and Keroularios continued during the entire patriarchate. It would be tempting to see the profession of faith as a document produced for the synod of 1053/4 in which Stethatos had to defend himself. However there is no internal proof³⁵. Moreover it is further confirmation that the essay on the spiritual elevation of the church hierarchy can only have been written before 1043. Therefore this would mean that current hypothesis would be

Phase 1 until ca. 1019 — With Symeon without Dionysius

ca. 1019 *Against the accusers of the Saint (κατὰ Ἀγιοκατηγόρων)*

Phase 2 ca. 1019–1043 — Distance from Symeon but study of Dionysius

1022 death of Symeon
1035 publication of hymns and introduction
1025–1043 *On the hierarchies*

Phase 3 1043–1059 — political defence of studite practice and polemics

1043–1054 *Studite costumes*

³⁴ Indeed Barmin correctly points out that the three treatises in Vat. gr. 1151, Vat. gr. 1105, Caes. Vindob. 306 are to be dated to the early summer 1054. Бармин А.В. Полемика и схизма. С. 165–166.

³⁵ This also adds to the problem that Leo metropolitan of Arcadioupolis (*Niketas Stethatos*. Profession of Faith 14 Darrouzès) is undatable at present though Darrouzès believed that he was appointed after 1080: P. 23–24.

1043–1054	<i>De azymo</i>
1043–1054	<i>De Sabato</i>
1043–1054	<i>De Nuptis Sacerdotis</i>
1052	<i>life of Saint Symeon</i>
1053/4	exile of Niketas Stethatos from Constantinople
1054	<i>against the Latins</i>
1043–1059	<i>against Armenians</i>
1043–1059	<i>against Jews</i>

Phase 4 — philosophical phase

On the limits of life
On the soul
On Paradise

This new chronological framework allows one to seek examples of evolution within the texts. These considerations do not constitute proofs but rather illustrations of the chronology argued above. If we compare the first phrase from a text of the first and second period the difference is apparent. The first tends to introduce the subject gently and with a biblical reference. The second begins with extremely technical vocabulary.

Καλὸν ἐκ τοῦ Ἰερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου προοιμιᾶσθαι τήμερον καὶ οὕτω κατ' ἐκεῖνον μέσον τῆς παρουσίας γενεᾶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων γεγωνότερον ἐκβοῆσαι (*Niketas Stethatos*. Against the accusers of the Saint 1–2 Paschalides).

It is good to begin the treatise today with a passage from Jeremiah and so to illustrate by that means who is more suited to the present generation of men.

Τὸ λίαν ἀνατακικόν τε καὶ διηρμένον αὐτὸ τε τὸ ὑπὲρ αἴσθησιν τῶν ἐγγεγραμμένων ἐν-ταῦθα καὶ τὸ ὕψος τῆς θεολογίας καὶ τὸ βάθος τῆς τούτων ἀντικρυς γνώσεως οὐ πᾶσιν, οἶμαι, καταληπτὸν τε καὶ εὐεπιβιβατὸν ἐστὶ (*Niketas Stethatos*. Prologue to Hymns of Symeon New Theologian 1.4–7 Kamyblis).

The excessively recondite, the elevated subject and the nature beyond perception of what is written here as well as the highbrow theology and depth of knowledge of these matters, I think, is not comprehensible or accessible to all.

The transition from the first two lines of the *Defence against the Accusers of the Saint* (κατὰ Ἀγιοκατηγόρων) and the first two lines of the prologue of 1035 is dramatic. While the first passage slowly introduces a biblical quotation from Jeremiah and tries to captivate the audience's benevolence, the second text begins with a word ἀνατακικόν employed by Dionysius the Areopagite, Theodore the Studite and John Damascene and states that most people will not be able to follow the rest of the text. Such a technical discourse and in some ways such arrogance leads to a more modest introduction of the Hierarchy where however it is clear he is using complex ideas:

Τὸν εἰς τὴν οὐρανίαν ἱεραρχίαν καὶ τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ὡσαύτως ἱεραρχίαν διὰ θεωρίας πονηθέντα μοι λόγον, εὐλογημένε μου δέσποτα, τῇ σῇ σοφωτάτῃ κρίσει καὶ ἐπισκέψει ὁ ἀμαθὴς ἔστειλα καὶ ἀγύρτης ἐγὼ καὶ γεώδης τὸν νοῦν (*Niketas Stethatos*. On the Hierarchy Oration 3.1–5 Darrouzès.)

Blessed lord of mine, I am ignorant, lowly and earthly in the mind, I have sent you this essay written by me on the heavenly hierarchy and on our church hierarchy for your judgement and consideration.

Like the introduction of 1035, the text from the outset declares its dependence on the text of Dionysius the Areopagite quoting both the title of the treatise on the heavenly hierarchy and the ecclesiastical one. The next phase is characterised by a return to introducing the subject matter in a less intellectual manner. The Studite costumes is clearly intended as a political defence and its vocabulary is less technical from the outset and desires to explain the subject matter.

Ἡ ζώνη τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς διακόνων οὐχ ὡς δοκεῖ τισι περιττή τις ἐστίν ἢ λόγου χωρίς, ἀλλ' ἀρχαίωτος τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑπάρχει παράδοσις, καθὼς ἐν τῇ θεωρίᾳ τοῦ πονηθέντος ἡμῖν λόγου περὶ ταύτης πλατύτερον ἀπεδείξαμεν καὶ νῦν πεζῶ καὶ συντετριμένῳ τῷ λόγῳ σαφέστερον δείκνυμεν (*Niketas Stethatos*. On Studite Costumes Oration 8.1.1–6 Darrouzès.)

The belt of our deacons does not seem to be superfluous or without reason, but is an ancient tradition on the model of the apostles, as we demonstrated in the discussion of the speech written by me in more detail about this question, and now we show more clearly in a concise prose work.

There are few technical terms present in this beginning, though not specifically connected to Dionysius the Areopagite. The life of Saint Symeon combines intellectual interests with elegant writing, but without being too weighty on the technical side. He is trying to attract readers, not only monks.

Χρῆμα θερμὸν ἀρετῇ, καὶ δεινὸν μὲν ἐμφυσῆσαι τοῦ πόθου τοὺς ἄνθρακας καὶ πῦρ αὐτόχρομα τὴν ψυχὴν ἀπεργάσασθαι, δεινὸν δὲ πτερωῆσαι νοῦν ἀπὸ γῆς καὶ πρὸς οὐρανούς ἐπάραι τῷ πνεύματι καὶ θεὸν ὄλον ἀποδείξαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον (*Niketas Stethatos*. Life of Saint Symeon the New Theologian 1.1–4 Hausherr)

Virtue is a warm thing, and it good at inspiring the coals of desire and to elaborate quickly the fire in the soul, it is good to elevate the mind from the earth and to raise it towards heaven with the spirit and to demonstrate that man is entirely divine.

The passage shows clarity of intent and desire to employ the life of Saint Symeon as a model of elevation of one's soul to God. Though some of the expressions can be found in some church fathers the text does not indicate a clear link with specific texts as he had done during the 'Dionysian' phase. The three polemical treatises Latins, Jews and Armenians also reveal an audience generally interested in the question but without any specific reading of Dionysius.

The last phase seems to be more philosophical. Indeed it would fit well with phase three if it were not so specifically dedicated to pure theology rather than polemics. In both the introductions to the *Limits of life*, *On the soul* and *On Paradise* we see introductory remarks which do not need well-read readers.

Τὸ πολλάκις περὶ τῶν ὄρων παρὰ τινων προτεθὲν ἡμῖν ζήτημα, ὥσπερ δὴ καὶ νῦν, φιλονεικούμενον ἀρχῆθεν ἐστὶ τοῖς λαλεῖν τι καὶ ἀκούειν ἐσπουδακόσι καινόν, ὡς τὰς αὐτὰς χρήσεις τῶν θείων γραφῶν ἐκλαμβάνεσθαι παρ' ἑκατέρου τῶν πρὸς τὰ τοιαῦτα σπουδαίων εἰς τὴν τούτων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ κατασκευῆν τε καὶ ἀνασκευῆν καὶ τοὺς μὲν τῶν σοφῶν συνιστᾶν αὐτοὺς ὡς πεπηγότας παρὰ Θεοῦ τῇ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ζωῇ, τοὺς δὲ ἀναλύειν ὡς μηδαμῶς εἶναι, ταῖς αὐταῖς χρωμένους περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ζητήσεων χρήσεις, ὥσπερ εἴρηται (*Niketas Stethatos*. On the Limits of Life Oration 4.1.1–10 Darrouzès).

The question of the limits was often brought to our attention by some, as is now. At first it is difficult for those who try to say or hear something new since the same uses of the Holy Scripture are employed by each of those who deal with such matters for the their descent or ascent for this reason and since the wise one begin as if they were fixed by God for the life

of men, while others undo them as not existing, employing the same uses of the questions as has been said.

Φιλοσοφῆσαι δεῖν ἔγνων περὶ ψυχῆς ἐν τῷ γήρα καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς περὶ τὰ τέλη ζωῆς, ψυχῆς τῆς νοερᾶς καὶ ἀθανάτου καὶ θείας, δι' ἧς ἐγὼ κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ ἐμὲ πλαστουργήσαντος φαίνομαι καὶ μεθ' ἧς ἐκείνου τὸ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν ἐπιφέρομαι καὶ ἧς ὑπάρχει τὸ τοῦ λόγου ἀξίωμα (*Niketas Stethatos*. On the soul, oration 1. 1.1–5 Darrouzès).

I knew that it was necessary to philosophize about the soul in my old age and at the end of my life, the intellectual immortal and divine soul, through which I appear to be in the image of him who forged me and with which I follow in his likeness and of which it is the honour of the speech.

Ἄγε δὴ καὶ περὶ παραδείσου φιλοσοφήσωμεν· οὗτος γὰρ ὁ σκοπὸς ἡμῖν τοῦ λόγου, δι' ὃν καὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα τοῦτου μετὰ τὸν περὶ ψυχῆς μοι πονηθέντα λόγον ὑπεδυσάμην (*Niketas Stethatos*. On Paradise Oration 2.1.1–3 Darrouzès).

So, let's philosophize about heaven. This is the aim of our speech, because of which I have undertaken the task of this after I had written the treatise on the soul.

The last three introductions to the philosophical treatises are without the technical language of the areopagitic texts. Therefore the period during which Stethatos quotes the areopagitic corpus is also the most complex stylistically.

Stethatos was not the only author who suffered from a period of complex and technical language. Later on, Psellos has a similar development especially after 1047 when, nearly thirty, he was appointed consul of the philosophers, his language became very technical as can be seen in the encomia 5–7³⁶. This phase lasted only a few years when he became more eloquent and more interested in pleasing rhetorically again, starting in 1051³⁷. If one transposes the same chronology to Stethatos one may suppose that he was 30 in 1035 and therefore born c 1005. Psellos vanishes from the public scene in 1078, when he was sixty. If one applies this chronology to Stethatos then he would have also retired from public life around 1065. Of course this is speculative but may allow one to have a better idea of the timeframe within which Stethatos is writing.

Another important consequence is prosopographical. If the dating is correct for these works, then it would seem that the persons mentioned in the texts or the letters connected to the texts may be dated as well. Niketas Chartophylax Coronidos wrote after 1054³⁸. Gregory the sophist wrote after 1054³⁹. Niketas oikoumenikos di-

³⁶ Lauritzen F. Il nesso tra stile e contenuto negli encomi di Psello // Medioevo Greco. 2007. Vol. 7. P. 1–10.

³⁷ The proximity of the dates of regained eloquence for Psellos and the writing of the life of Symeon by Stethatos may not be accidental. 1051 marked a turning point in politics in the city with a new μεσάζων Constantine the Alan and the rise of Leo Paraspondylos. For Psellos the period 1052–1054 was when he wrote some of his most important encomia from a literary point of view.

³⁸ Letter of Niketas Stethatos to Niketas Chartophylax Νικήτα συγκέλλη καὶ Χαρτοφύλακι τῆς Κορωνίδος Νικήτας εὐτελής μοναχός καὶ πρεσβύτερος μονῆς τῶν Στουδίου ὁ καὶ Σπηθαῖος (*Niketas Stethatos*. On the soul oration 1. pr1 title Darrouzès) (*Niketas Stethatos*. On Paradise Oration 2. letter 1 title) Niketas Chartophylax is identified as Niketas 180 in PBW.

³⁹ *Niketas Stethatos*. On Paradise letter 5–8 (Gregory 164 PBW).

daskalos wrote ca. 1035–1054⁴⁰. Alexios monk, deacon wrote after 1054⁴¹. Manuel wrote after 1054⁴².

The first major consequence of this chronology is that Stethatos rediscovered the Areopagite between 1019–1043. The three primary texts he was interested in were the *Divine Names*, employed to justify St Symeon's vision of the uncreated light, and the *Ecclesiastical* and *Heavenly hierarchy* in order to prove that each hierarchical level indicates a step of spiritual advancement. The rediscovery of Dionysius the Areopagite by Niketas Stethatos and especially the application of these texts to interpret the theology of Symeon the New Theologian had an immediate effect on the culture of the capital. One may think of the poem written by Christopher Mitylenaios on Dionysius:

Εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Διονύσιον ἔν(εκα)...

Ἐγὼ, Διονύσιε, τολμῶ καὶ λέγειν,
ὡς οὐκ ἐπλάσθης ἐν γυναικὸς κοιλίᾳ,
ἀλλ' ἄγγέλοις μάλιστα συντεταγμένους
5 ἄνωθεν ἦλθες ἐκ πόλου, φύσις ξένη,
βροτοῖς ἀπαγγέλλουσα πάντα πρὸς μέρος
τὰ τῶν ἀύλων ταγμάτων ὅπως ἔχοι.
οὕτω γινώσκεις τὰς ἀύλους οὐσίας·
οὕτω θεωρεῖς ἐνθέους θεωρίας·
οὕτω θεωρεῖς τὰς φύσεις τῶν ἀγγέλων·
10 οὕτω, τὸ μεῖζον, ἄγγελος σὺ τὴν φύσιν.

(Christophoros Mitylenaios Poem 86 Kurtz)

Saint Dionysius

Dionysius, I dare also to say
That you were forged from the side of a woman
But you were enrolled among the angels.
You descended from heaven above, as a exceptional nature
Announcing in part to humans all the ranks
Of the immaterial beings how they are.
So you know the immaterial being
So you contemplate the nature of the angels
So, rather, you are an angel by nature.

However this is not the only text from someone of the Mangana circle. Psellos also wrote about his quest to find texts of Dionysius and even claimed that he sought and collected his works which were in different manuscripts:

Σὺ δὲ μηδὲ τοῦτο θαυμάσης, εἰ ἐνταῦθα μόνον ἐνήλλακταί μοι τοῦ λόγου ὁ χαρακτήρ· αὐτὰς γάρ σοι σχεδὸν πάσας τὰς τοῦ Ἄρεοπαγίτου Διονυσίου συγγραφικὰς ῥήσεις σποράδην

⁴⁰ Letter of Niketas Chartophylax (Niketas 179 PBW) to Niketas Stethatos Νικήτα τῷ θεοφιλεστάτῳ διακόνῳ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας καὶ οἰκουμενικῷ διδασκάλῳ Νικήτας εὐτελῆς μοναχὸς καὶ πρεσβύτερος ὁ καὶ Στηθάτος, περὶ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ εἰς τὴν οὐρανίαν ἱεραρχίαν καὶ εἰς τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς ὡσαύτως ἱεραρχίαν (*Niketas Stethatos*. On Hierarchy, Oration 2 preface Darrouzès).

⁴¹ Letter of Alexios to Niketas Stethatos Ἀλέξιος μοναχὸς καὶ διάκονος ὁ φιλόσοφος Νικήτα μονάζοντι τῷ Στηθάτῳ (*Niketas Stethatos*. On Hierarchy, Oration. 2.361–365 Darrouzès).

⁴² Τοῦ αὐτοῦ, πρὸς τινα Μανουὴλ περὶ ὄρων ζωῆς (*Niketas Stethatos*. On the Limits of life Oration 4 title Darrouzès).

συλλεξάμενος παρατέθεικα. Μόνος γάρ οὗτος παρὰ τοὺς ἄλλους ἀκριβεστέραν τὴν πραγματείαν πεποίηται περὶ τὸν θεῖον διάκοσμον (*Psellos*. *Theologica* 1.112.84–88 Gautier).

Do not be amazed about this, if now only the character of my speech has changed: I have assembled for you nearly all the texts of Dionysius the Areopagite which were dispersed and offered them to you. For he alone has accomplished a more accurate subject concerning the divine universe.

Psellos did not limit himself to collect the texts of Dionysius he also used them to justify his interest in the neoplatonist Proclus which he found similar to the church father (just as the *Suda* had done):

τοῦτο δὲ τὸ κεφάλαιον πρότερον μὲν τῷ Ἀρεοπαγίτῃ Διονυσίῳ πλατύτερον διερμήνεται, ὕστερον δὲ καὶ τῷ Λυκογενεῖ Πρόκλῳ συλλογιστικῇ μεθόδῳ ἠκριβώται (*Psellos*. *Philosophica Minora* II 118.3–119.3 O' Meara).

This principle has been explained first by Dionysius the Areopagite more extensively, then it was clarified by the syllogistic method by Proclus of Lycia.

Thus Stethatos' rediscovery of Dionysius seems to have an important role on the subsequent rediscovery of Plato and especially the neoplatonist Proclus within secular circles⁴³. In the case of both these authors it is difficult to imagine they had composed these two texts before Stethatos published the hymns in 1035. In the case of Psellos he was ca. seventeen years old and he mentions the study of poetry at this time, rather than philosophy⁴⁴. However the period of Psellos' study of philosophy which seems to have included such thinkers as Proclus and probably Dionysius should be dated before he was promoted consul of the philosophers in 1047. In other words the period in which he studied such matters was the ten years after the publication of the introduction of Stethatos. There does not seem to be evidence of Psellos' interest in Symeon the New Theologian at this time. However the poem of Christopher Mitylenaios on the Areopagite, the references to the Areopagite in the Psellos' philosophical writings seems to imply that the circle around the Mangana monastery may have had an interest in this sort of text. One may seek the figure of Maria Skleraina, mistress of Constantine Monomachos and about whose liason, Stethatos expressed reservations. The only mention of Stethatos in a historical narrative is in relation with Skleraina and it may not be accidental since it was Maria Skleraina who bought the monastery of St Mamas after the death of saint Symeon the New Theologian and who had been its abbot⁴⁵. Her interest in monasticism is also expressed in her support also for St Lazaros of Mt Gale-sion⁴⁶ and by the imperial foundation of the Nea Moni on Chios. Thus one may see

⁴³ On the relation between Stethatos and Psellos see: *Lauritzen F.* Psello discepolo di Stetato // *BZ*. 2008. Bd. 101.2. P. 715–725.

⁴⁴ *Psellos*. *Chronographia*. 4.4.1–3 Impellizzeri.

⁴⁵ The acquisition of Saint Mamas can be seen at Eustathios Rhomaios, *Peira* 15.16 (*Zepos J.*, *Zepos P.* *Ius Graeco-Romanum*. Athens, 1931. Vol. 41.48); On the church of Saint Mamas see: *Εὐστρατιάδης Σ.* *Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει μονῆς τοῦ ἁγίου μεγαλομάρτυρος Μάμαντος* // *Ἑλληνικά*. 1928. T. 1. Σ. 256–314, with text at Σ. 256–311. See also corrections by *Laurent V.* *Remarques critiques sur le texte du typikon du monastère de Saint-Mamas* // *EO*. 1931. T. 30. P. 233–42, and by *A. Σιγαλάς* in: *ΕΕΒΣ*. 1930. T. 7. Σ. 399–405.

⁴⁶ Ὁ δὲ γε μοναχὸς Γαβριὴλ πείθει τὸν βασιλέα γράψαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα προστατικῶς μεταβῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους εἰς τὰς Βέσσας διὰ τὸ μὲν ὄρος ὑπάρχειν τῆς μητροπόλεως Ἐφέσου, τὸν δὲ τῶν Βεσσῶν τόπον παρ' αὐτοῦ δὴ τοῦ βασιλέως ἀποχαρισθῆναι τῷ τιμίῳ ἡμῶν πατρὶ εἰς αὐτοῦ τε μνημόσυνον καὶ Μαρίας τῆς λεγομένης Σκληραίνης· καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὕτη παρὰ τοῦ ἰδίου ἀδελφοῦ μαθοῦσα τὰ περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς

that the combined interest in monasticism, philosophy and poetry is connected with the circle of Maria Skleraina.

If father Golitzin is correct in saying that Stethatos had something of a snob⁴⁷, this would mean that his promotion of Symeon the New Theologian, interpreted according to Dionysius the Areopagite's ideas among the aristocratic landowning families such as the Skleroi⁴⁸, was a success. It would also mean that during this period 1035–1043 it was fashionable to write about Dionysius. It was fashionable to think of questions discussed directly by Dionysius and Symeon the New Theologian, such as divine illumination as one may see in Psellos, Mitylenaios and Mauropos⁴⁹. It is in these circumstances that the manuscript Sinaiticus 319 was copied in 1048 as the colophon says⁵⁰:

ἔτελειώθη σὺν θεῷ ἡ ἱερὰ καὶ ψυχοφελὴς καὶ θεολογικωτάτη βίβλος τοῦ Ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Διονυσίου μηνὶ Ἰουλίῳ γ, ἡμέρα κυριακῆ, ἔτους ςϋνς, ινδ' α. Γραφεῖσα διὰ χειρὸς Χριστοφύρου, ἐλαχίστου καὶ ἀναξίου διακόνου ἐπὶ Μιχαὴλ τοῦ εὐλαβεστάτου ἡγουμένου μονῆς τῶν Στουδιτῶν. Δυσωπῶ δὲ πάντας τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας ἐνταῦθα ἵνα εὐχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῆς ταπεινῆς καὶ ἀμαρτωλοῦ μου ψυχῆς· ὅπως εὖροιμι ἔλεος ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς κρίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀποδίδοντος ἐκάστω κατὰ τὰ ἴδια ἔργα (*Gardhausen V. Catalogus Codicum Graecorum Sinaiticorum*. Oxford, 1886. P. 62–63).

The holy, beneficial to the soul and most theological book of our blessed father Dionysius was completed with [the help of] God in the month of July, 3rd, on a Sunday of the year 6556 [1048 AD] of the first indiction. It was written by Christopher, the lowliest and unworthy deacon when Michael was abbot of the monastery of Studios. I beg that all those who encounter this book will pray for the humble soul and me, a sinner: in order that I may find forgiveness in the day of judgement of God who rewards each one according to his deeds.

This is an interesting manuscript since it was written at the Studios monastery in 1048 exactly at the time when such texts were becoming fashionable thanks to Niketas who was, after all, a studite monk.

Thus Stethatos only employs three texts of Dionysius, the *Divine Names*, the *Heavenly Hierarchy* and the *Earthly Hierarchy*. Moreover he only quotes them extensively specifically in the period of 1019–1043. He does so in order to render acceptable the innovative hymns of Symeon the New Theologian and to justify the proximity of the church hierarchy to God. This implies that there are two other phases of his writing one before 1019 and another after 1043. The texts of both these phases present only a few quotations of Dionysius the Areopagite. The phase of 1019–1043 coincides mainly with the period of the patriarchate of Alexios Studites (1025–1043) who had been a

ἀπέστειλε πρὸς τὸν πατέρα νομίσματα ἐπτακόσια πρὸς τοῖς εἴκοσι καὶ ἓν ἐκ τῶν βασιλικῶν ἐπίπλων, ἐξ ὧν δὴ νομισμάτων ἡ πλείων οἰκοδομὴ τῆς Πανσολύτης ἐγένετο (*Gregorius Monachus. Vita Lazari Mt Galesii // Acta Sanctorum Novembris / Ed. H. Delehaye. T. III. Brussels, 1910. P. 245.17–29*).

⁴⁷ Golitzin A. Hierarchy versus anarchy? Dionysius Areopagite, Symeon the New Theologian, Nicetas Stethatos and their common roots in ascetical tradition // *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*. 1994. Vol. 38.2. P. 131–179; Lauritzen F. An ironic portrait of a social monk: Christopher of Mytilene and Niketas Stethatos // *BS*. 2007. Vol. 65. P. 201–210.

⁴⁸ Seibt W. *Die Skleroi*. Wien, 1976.

⁴⁹ Lauritzen F. Psellos the Hesychast, a neoplatonic reding of the Transfiguration of Mt Tabor // *BS*. 2012. Vol. 70. P. 167–180.

⁵⁰ The following poem may also be found in this manuscript ἀγγελικῆς σοφίης ἀμαρύγματα πολλὰ κινήσας | ἀνθρώποισι ἀνέφηνας ἰδεῖν νοοσύνθετον Ἄστρον (PG. T. 3. P. 116). The poem is striking also for the reminiscences of Nonnos of Panopolis. For the question see: Lauritzen F. The miliaresion poet: the dactylic inscription of a coin of Romanos III Argyros // *Byz*. 2009. T. 79. P. 231–240.

monk at the Studios monastery. Therefore Stethatos' interest in the divine inspiration of the hierarchy may be explained by his proximity to those in power. Moreover his use of the Areopagite to promote his master's hymns was a success and may have been also interesting for such wealthy patrons as the Skleroi and specifically Maria Skleraina. In any case, the patroness bought the St. Mamas monastery where St Symeon was abbot at the time when Niketas was the prominent theologian of the capital and her circle of intellectuals refer to Dionysius the Areopagite in their poems and works of prose. The importance of Niketas' interest in Dionysius the Areopagite is that he promoted a renewed interest in Dionysius the Areopagite's writings in the eleventh century which Darrouzes identified as his defining feature: 'areopagitisme'.

List of works by Stethatos

Editions

- Darrouzès = *Nicétas Stethatos. Opuscules et lettres* / ed. J. Darrouzès. P., 1961.
- Paschalides = *Πασχαλίδης Σ. Ὁ ἀνέκδοτος λόγος τοῦ Νικήτα Στηθάτου Κατὰ Ἀγιοκατηγόρων καὶ ἡ ἀμφισβήτηση τῆς ἀγιότητος στὸ Βυζάντιο κατὰ τὸν 11ο αἰῶνα // Κουντούρα-Γαλάκη Ε. Οἱ ἥρωες τῆς ὀρθόδοξης ἐκκλησίας. Αθήνα, 2004. Σ. 493–518.*
- Will 1861 = *Will C. Acta et scripta quae de controversiis ecclesiae Graecae et Latinae saeculo undecimo composita extant.* Leipzig, 1861.
- Hergenröther 1869 = *Hergenröther J. Monumenta graeca ad Photium ejusque historiam pertinentia, quae ex variis codicibus manuscriptis.* Ratisbonae, 1869.
- Šlenov 2008 = *Шлёнов Д. Первое обличительное слово против армян // Богословский вестник. 2008. Т. 7. С. 39–104.*
- Šlenov 2010 = *Шлёнов Д. Второе и третье обличительные слова против армян // Богословский вестник. 2010. Т. 9. С. 32–124.*
- Hausherr 1928 = *Hausherr J. Vita S. Symeonis Novi Theologi // Orientalia Christiana. 1928. Т. 12.*

Works

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <i>Defence</i> | Paschalides 2004 |
| <i>Dialogue Against the Latins</i> | Will 1861, 127–136 |
| <i>Against the Armenians</i> | Šlenov 2008, Šlenov 2010 |
| <i>Life of Saint Symeon</i> | Hausherr 1928 |
| <i>Centuries</i> | Patrologia Graeca 120, 851–1010 |
| <i>On the soul</i> | Darrouzès 1961, 56–148 |
| <i>On Paradise</i> | Darrouzès 1961, 154–214 |
| <i>On hierarchy</i> | Darrouzès 1961, 292–364 |
| <i>On the limits of life</i> | Darrouzès 1961, 366–408 |
| <i>Treatise against the Jews</i> | Darrouzès 1961, 412–444 |
| <i>Profession of faith</i> | Darrouzès 1961, 444–464 |

Studite costumes Darrouzès 1961, 486–507
New heavans and new earth Darrouzès 1961, 508–517

Lost works and where they are indicated

De Azymo Humbertus Silva Candida, Brevis Commemoratio 150–151 Will
De Sabato Humbertus Silva Candida, Brevis Commemoratio 150–151 Will
De Nuptiis Humbertus Silva Candida, Brevis Commemoratio 150–151 Will
Sacerdotum
Περὶ προνοίας Oration 4.46.2–3
Νέα κλίμαξ see Darrouzès. P. 13

Literature Cited

- ALFEEV, H. *Symeon the New Theologian and the Orthodox tradition*. Oxford 2000.
- ANDIA, Y., de. “Denys l’Aréopagite et sa postérité en Orient et en Occident.” In *Actes du Colloque International, Paris, 21–24 septembre 1994*. Paris 1997.
- BARMIN, A. V. *Полемика и схизма*. Moscow 2006.
- BAYER, A. *Spaltung der Christenheit*. Köln 2002.
- EUSTRATIADĒS, S. “Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει μονῆς τοῦ ἁγίου μεγαλομάρτυρος Μάμαντος.” *Ἑλληνικά* 1 (1928).
- GOLITZIN, A. “Hierarchy versus anarchy? Dionysius Areopagite, Symeon the New Theologian, Nicetas Stethatos and their common roots in ascetical tradition.” *St Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* 38.2 (1994).
- Gregorius Monachus. “Vita Lazari Mt Galesii.” In *Acta Sanctorum Novembris*. Ed. by H. DELEHAYE. T. III. Brussels 1910.
- HAUSHERR, J. “Vita S. Symeonis Novi Theologi.” *Orientalia Christiana* 12 (1928).
- HERGENRÖTHER, J. *Monumenta graeca ad Photium ejusque historiam pertinentia, quae ex variis codicibus manuscriptis*. Ratisbonae 1869.
- HINTERBERGER, M. “Niketas Stethatos der «Beherzte?»” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 103/1 (2010).
- Ioannes Scylitzas. *Synopsis historiarum*. Ed. by H. THURN. Berlin 1973.
- KAMBYLIS, A. *Symeon Neos Theologos, Hymnen*. Berlin 1976.
- LAURENT, V. “Remarques critiques sur le texte du typikon du monastère de Saint-Mamas.” *Échos d’Orient* 30 (1931).
- LAURITZEN, F. “An ironic portrait of a social monk: Christopher of Mytilene and Niketas Stethatos.” *Byzantinoslavica* 65 (2007).
- LAURITZEN, F. “Il nesso tra stile e contenuto negli encomi di Psello.” *Medioevo Greco* 7 (2007).
- LAURITZEN, F. “Psello discepolo di Stetato.” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 101/2 (2008).
- LAURITZEN, F. “The miliaresion poet: the dactylic inscription of a coin of Romanos III Argyros.” *Byzantion* 79 (2009).
- LAURITZEN, F. “Psellos the Hesychast, a neoplatonic reiding of the Trasfiguration of Mt Tabor.” *Byzantinoslavica* 70 (2012).
- LAURITZEN, F. “Synod decrees of the eleventh century (1025–1081): A classification of the documents of the synodos endemousa.” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 105/1 (2012).
- Nicetas Stethatos. *Opuscules et lettres*. Ed. by J. DARROUZÈS. Paris 1961.
- PAPACHRYSSANTHOU, D. *Actes de Prôtaton*. Paris 1975 [Archives de l’Athos VII].
- PASCHALIDĒS, S. “Ο ἀνέκδοτος λόγος τοῦ Νικίτα Στηθάτου Κατὰ Ἁγιοκατηγόρων καὶ ἡ ἀμφισβήτηση τῆς ἀγιότητος στὸ Βυζάντιο κατὰ τὸν 11ο αἰῶνα.” In ΚΟΥΝΤΟΥΡΑ-ΓΑΛΑΚĒ, E. *Οἱ ἥρωες τῆς ὀρθόδοξης ἐκκλησίας*. Athens 2004.

- PITRA, J.-B., ed. *Analecta sacra et classica Spicilegio Solesmensi parata*. Vol. 6. Paris 1891.
- SHLYONOV, D. “Первое обличительное слово против армян.” *Богословский вестник* 7 (2008).
- SHLYONOV, D. “Второе и третье обличительные слова против армян.” *Богословский вестник* 9 (2010).
- WILL, C. *Acta et scripta quae de controversiis ecclesiae Graecae et Latinae saeculo undecimo composita extant*. Leipzig 1861.
- ZEPOS, J., and ZEPOS, P. *Ius Graeco-Romanum*. Vol. 41.48. Athens 1931.

Frederick LAURITZEN

PhD

Fondazione per le Scienze Religiose Giovanni XXIII

Via San Vitale 114

40125 Bologna

e-mail: lauritzen@fscire.it



ВИЗАНТИЙСКИЙ ВРЕМЕННОК. 2013. Т. 72 (97)
ISSN 0132–3776

Ф. Лауритцен

АРЕОПАГИТИКИ У СТИФАТА: ХРОНОЛОГИЯ ИНТЕРЕСА

Аннотация: Сочинения Никиты Стифата можно разделить на три группы в зависимости от времени их написания. До 1019 г. в них не встречается заимствований из Дионисия Ареопагита. Для периода 1019–1042 гг. характерны многочисленные и обширные цитаты из сочинений «О божественных именах», «О небесной иерархии» и «О церковной иерархии». После 1043 г. ссылки на ареопагитики становятся редкими и небольшими по объему. Принимая во внимание внутренние датирующие признаки, мы можем установить последовательность написания для недатированных сочинений Никиты Стифата и приблизительно определить время его жизни периодом 1000–1065 гг.

Ключевые слова: Никита Стифат, Дионисий Ареопагит, Симеон Новый Богослов, Михаил Пселл, неоплатонизм.

ЛАУРИТЦЕН Фредерик

PhD

Фонд религиозных наук имени Иоанна XXIII

Via San Vitale 114

40125 Bologna

Электронная почта: lauritzen@fscire.it