

# ORIENTALIA CHRISTIANA PERIODICA

COMMENTARII DE RE ORIENTALI AETATIS CHRISTIANAE  
SACRA ET PROFANA EDITI CURA ET OPERE  
PONTIFICII INSTITUTI ORIENTALIUM STUDIORUM

E X T R A C T A



PONTIFICIUM INSTITUTUM ORIENTALIUM STUDIORUM  
PIAZZA S. MARIA MAGGIORE, 7  
**ROMA**

Nr. 1 / 2022

Poste Italiane s.p.a.  
Spedizione in abbonamento postale.  
D.L. 353/2003 (conv. in L. 27/02/2004 n° 46) art. 1, comma 2, DCB Roma.  
Semestrale. Taxe perçue.

# ORIENTALIA CHRISTIANA PERIODICA

Piazza S. Maria Maggiore 7 — 00185 Roma

www.orientaliachristiana.it

tel. 0644741-7104; fax 06446-5576

**ISSN 0030-5375**

This periodical began publication in 1935. Two fascicles are issued each year, which contain articles, shorter notes and book reviews about the Christian East, that is, whatever concerns the theology, history, patrology, liturgy, archaeology and canon law of the Christian East, or whatever is closely connected therewith. The annual contribution is € 46,00 in Italy, and € 58,00 or USD 76,00 outside Italy. The entire series is still in print and can be supplied on demand.

Subscription should be paid by a check made to Pontificio Istituto Orientale or a deposit to ccp. 34269001.

International Bank Account Number (IBAN):

Country	Check Digit	CIN	Cod. ABI	CAB	Account Number	BIC- Code
IT	54	C	07601	03200	000034269001	BPPIITRRXXX

Edited by Philippe Luisier (Editor), e-mail: plusier@orientale.it; Jarosław Dziejewicki (Managing Editor), e-mail: edizioni@orientaliachristiana.it, with the Professors of the Pontifical Oriental Institute.

All materials for publication (articles, notes, books for review) should be addressed to the Editor.

---

## SUMMARIUM

### ARTICOLI

<b>Orly Mizrahi</b> , The Peshitta of 1 Sam 21:2-7 and its Reception History .....	5-24
<b>Gabriele Winkler</b> , Armenia's Treasure Trove: Its Liturgy Revisited .	25-64
<b>Francesca Prometea Barone</b> , La notice sur le Livre de <i>Job</i> transmise dans la <i>Synopse de la Sainte Écriture</i> attribuée à Jean Chrysostome	65-80
<b>Barbara Roggema</b> , The Intimate Conversations of God with Moses on Mount Sinai ( <i>Munājāt Mūsā</i> ). An Apocryphon from Islam to Christianity to Judaism .....	81-104

<b>Mikhail Bernatsky</b> , An Edition of the New-found Forgery of Constantine Paleocappa — the Treatise of Nicholas of Methone: Πρὸς τοὺς διαστάζοντας καὶ λέγοντας, ὅτι ὁ ἱερουργούμενος ἄρτος καὶ οἶνος οὐκ ἔστι σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ . . . . .	105-129
<b>Aleksandr Andreev</b> , The Ruthenian Editions of the Slavonic Sluzheb- bnik and Trebnik. Part 2: The Trebniki Printed in Vilnius before 1650 . . . . .	131-150
<b>Mireille Issa</b> , Quelques aspects du style de Joseph Simon Assémani dans les <i>Préfaces</i> de la <i>Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementino-Vaticana</i> .	151-168
<b>David Tinikashvili</b> , An Anti-Catholic Georgian Treatise by Patriarch Bessarion: Polemical Pathos and Theological Arguments . . . . .	169-191
<b>Luisa Valmarin</b> , Il Pontificio Istituto Orientale nella visione del beato Ioan Bălan . . . . .	193-202

#### ANIMADVERSIONES

<b>Vincenzo Ruggieri</b> , La basilica a transetto di Tlos: un nuovo libro sulla Licia bizantina . . . . .	203-217
<b>Elie Essa Kas Hanna – Antonina Arena</b> , Nuova stagione di studi in contrada Realmese, Calascibetta, Sicilia . . . . .	219-238

#### RECENSIONES

ALEXANDRU, Stefan, <i>A never yet deciphered Greek palimpsest codex</i> Athous Zographou Il'inskiy 40 (V. Ruggieri) . . . . .	239
BACCI, Michele – BAY, Caterina, ed., <i>Giunta Pisano e la tecnica pittorica</i> <i>del Duecento</i> (L. Lechintan) . . . . .	239-241
BRAILOVSKIJ, Leonid e Rimma, <i>Visioni della Vecchia Russia</i> . Браилов- ские, Леонид и Римма, <i>Видения Староῦ Русси</i> , a cura di Gianpaolo RIGOTTI (V. Ruggieri) . . . . .	241-245
BRUGNOTTO, Giuliano – JAMIN, Jürgen – NAONYR SOMDA, Sébastien, ed., <i>Sistematica e tecnica nelle codificazioni canoniche del XX secolo</i> (S. Rossano) . . . . .	246-248
DÉDÉYAN, Georges, A. DEMIRDJIAN, Ago, SALEH, Nabil, <i>Les Justes et gens</i> <i>de bien du génocide des Arméniens</i> . Préface de Yves TERNON (G. Ruyssen) . . . . .	248-251
ISACCO DI NINIVE, <i>Discorsi ascetici. Prima collezione</i> , introduzione, tra- duzione e note a cura di Sabino CHIALÀ (P. Dufka) . . . . .	251-253

ΚΑΡΔΑΡΑΣ, ΓΕΩΡΓΙΟΣ Θ. (a cura di), <i>Το Βυζάντιο και η Ρωσία του Κιέβου (882-1240)</i> , Εθνικό Ίδρυμα Ερευνών, Ινστιτούτο Ιστορικών Ερευνών, Τομέας Βυζαντινών Ερευνών (Το Βυζάντιο σήμερα 8) (A. Fyrigos) . . . . .	253-254
KARTALOFF, Kiril Plamen, ed., <i>Identità europea e radici cristiane</i> , Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studio, Veliko Tarnovo, 26 maggio 2018 (E. G. Farrugia) . . . . .	254-259
ΚΟΟΝΑΜΜΑΚΚΑΛ, Thomas, <i>The Theology of Divine Names in the Genuine Works of Ephrem</i> (E. Vergani) . . . . .	259-265
Κωνσταντίνος Άμαντος, Δάσκαλος Επιστήμων Πολίτης. Πρακτικά Επιστημονικού Συνεδρίου, Χίος, 6-8 Μαΐου 2016 [Konstantinos Amantos, Mentor Scholar Citizen, Proceedings of the Scientific Symposium, Chios, May 6 <sup>th</sup> -8 <sup>th</sup> , 2016] (A. Fyrigos) . . . . .	265-266
LÜSTRAETEN, Martin – BUTCHER, Brian – HAWKES-TEEPLES, Steven (eds), <i>Let us be attentive! Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of the Society of Oriental Liturgy, Prešov (Slovakia), 9-14 July 2018</i> (E.G. Farrugia) . . . . .	266-270
MECHERRY, Antony, <i>De Syrorum orientalium Erroribus. Auctore P. Francisco Ros S.I. A Latin-Syriac Treatise from Early Modern Malabar (1586)</i> (H. Teule) . . . . .	270-272
PÉNICAUD, Manoël, <i>Louis Massignon. Le « catholique musulman »</i> (Ph. Luisier) . . . . .	272-274
<i>Gli studi di storiografia. Tradizione, memoria e modernità</i> , a cura di Alba FEDELI, Rosa Bianca FINAZZI, Claudia MILANI, Craig E. MORRISON, Paolo NICELLI (V. Ruggieri) . . . . .	274-277
TERNON, Yves, <i>La Turquie aux Turcs. Destruction de communautés chrétiennes de l'Empire ottoman: nestoriens, chaldéens, syriaques et Grecs (1914-1924)</i> (G. Ruyssen) . . . . .	277-279
<i>Tracing Written Heritage in a Digital Age</i> . Edited by Ephrem A. ISHAC, Thomas CSANÁDY and Theresa ZAMMIT LUPI (Ph. Luisier) . . . . .	279-282
SCRIPTA AD NOS MISSA . . . . .	283-284

Mikhail Bernatsky

## An Edition of the New-found Forgery of Constantine Paleocappa — the Treatise of Nicholas of Methone:

Πρὸς τοὺς διαστάζοντας καὶ λέγοντας,  
ὅτι ὁ ἱερουργούμενος ἄρτος καὶ οἶνος οὐκ ἔστι σῶμα  
καὶ αἷμα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ\*

### *The edition of 1560 and the falsifications of Constantine Paleocappa*

The treatise «To those who doubt and say that the sacred bread and wine are not indeed the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ» by the eminent philosopher, theologian and polemicist of the XII c. Nicholas of Methone<sup>1</sup> first appeared in print as part of a small volume published in 1560 in Paris by the Royal publisher Guillaume Morel. This volume,<sup>2</sup> which was prepared for publication by the liturgist Jean de Saint-André, contains the rites of the Divine Liturgies, as well as the writings of Church fathers and writers dedicated to the sacrament of the Eucharist, and has the title: Λειτουργίαι τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων. Ἰακώβου τοῦ ἀποστόλου καὶ ἀδελφοθέου. Βασιλείου τοῦ μεγάλου, Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου. Περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ λειτουργίᾳ Διονυσίου τοῦ Ἀρεοπαγίτου. Ἰουστίνου τοῦ φιλοσόφου καὶ μάρτυρος. Γρηγορίου τοῦ Νύσσης ἀρχιεπισκόπου. Ἰωάννου τοῦ Δαμασκηνοῦ. Νικολάου τοῦ Μεθώνης ἐπισκόπου. Σαμωνᾶ τοῦ Γάζης ἀρχιεπισκόπου. Μάρκου τοῦ Ἐφέσου ἀρχιεπισκόπου. Γερμανοῦ τοῦ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἀρχιεπισκόπου. Πρόκλου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἀρχιεπισκόπου. ED1560 was based on the autographs of a famous copyist of Greek manuscripts and author of forged works in the XVI c. Constantine Paleocappa<sup>3</sup> — Paris. suppl. gr. 146 and 303, which

---

\* The article is written within the framework of the research project “History of Eucharistic Disputes in the Christian East: Correspondence between Patriarch of Alexandria Gerasimos Palladas and Syrian Christians” with the support of the St Tikhon’s University and the Living Tradition Foundation.

<sup>1</sup> Nicholas (died before 1166), about whose life almost no information has been preserved, became the Bishop of the city of Methone (modern Metoni, Μεθώνη) of the Metropolis of Patras under the Emperor Manuel I Komnenos, whose official adviser in theological matters he was.

<sup>2</sup> Infra: ED1560.

<sup>3</sup> The most relevant review of his life and works: C. García Bueno, “El copista cretense Constantino Paleocapa: un estado de la cuestión”, *Estudios bizantinos* 1 (2013), 198-218.

were made for his prominent employer, Charles de Guise, cardinal of Lorraine (1524-1574).<sup>4</sup>

In ED1560 the *editio princeps* of the Greek text of the Liturgy of James the Apostle<sup>5</sup> appeared.<sup>6</sup> Therefore, this edition and its manuscript tradition became the subject of close study by liturgists. Ch. Mercier, who undertook a critical edition of JAS in 1946,<sup>7</sup> noted that a version of JAS with a number of emendations is presented in the *editio princeps* and the autographs of Constantine Palaeocappa (first of all, Paris. Suppl. gr. 303).<sup>8</sup>

In 1946 M. Jugie<sup>9</sup> proved that the work of an unidentified Archbishop Samon of Gaza, the «Dialogue of the blessed Samon with Ahmed the Saracen, showing that the bread and wine, sacrificed by the priest, are the true and entire body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ»<sup>10</sup> published in ED1560, is a pseudepigraph. The «Dialogue» was compiled in the XVI c. by Constantine Paleocappa and is a compilation from the works of other church writers (Anastasius of Sinai, John of Damascus, Theodore Abu Qurrah, Theophylact of Ohrid, Nicholas Cabasilas) made for the needs of anti-Protestant Eucharistic polemics in order to demonstrate the unity of the Latin and Greek Churches in the question of the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament.

In 1962 F. J. Leroy<sup>11</sup> demonstrated that the treatise of Proclus of Constantinople Λόγος περί παραδόσεως τῆς θείας λειτουργίας,<sup>12</sup> printed in ED1560, is also a pseudoepigraph. This case is of particular interest for our study.

In the post-iconoclastic period in Byzantium appeared a legend about

---

<sup>4</sup> See the history of ED1560 in details: H. Brakmann, "Divi Jacobi testimonium. Die Editio princeps der Jerusalemer Liturgie durch Jean de Saint-André und der Beitrag des Konstantinos Palaiokappa", in D. Findikyan – D. Galadza – A. Lossky (eds), *Sion, mère des Églises: Mélanges liturgiques offerts au Père Charles Athanase Renoux* (Semaines d'études liturgiques Saint-Serge. Suppl. 1), Münster 2016, pp. 49-77.

<sup>5</sup> *Infra*: JAS.

<sup>6</sup> *Editiones principes* of the Liturgies of St. John and St. Basil were printed earlier in Rome in 1526.

<sup>7</sup> B.-Ch. Mercier (ed.), *La Liturgie de St. Jacques* (PO 126 [26.2]), Paris 1946.

<sup>8</sup> The interpolation of Paleocappa in the anamnesis of the anaphora of the Liturgy of St. James was first noted by C. A. Swainson (*The Greek Liturgies: Chiefly from Original Authorities*, Cambridge 1884, pp. xxxiv-xxxv).

<sup>9</sup> M. Jugie, "Une nouvelle invention au compte de Constantin Palaeocappa: Samonas de Gaza et son dialogue sur l'eucharistie", in *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, vol. 3: *Letteratura e storia bizantina* (ST 123), Città del Vaticano 1946, pp. 342-359.

<sup>10</sup> Migne reprinted the text from ED1560: PG 120, coll. 821-832.

<sup>11</sup> F. J. Leroy, "Proclus, «De traditione Divinae Missae»: un faux de C. Palaeocappa", OCP 28 (1962), 288-299; a more detailed study on the treatise of pseudo-Proclus: Id., *L'homilétique de Proclus de Constantinople. Tradition manuscrite, inédits, études connexes* (ST 247), Città del Vaticano 1967, pp. 329-354.

<sup>12</sup> PG 65, coll. 849-852.

the origin of the rites of the liturgies of Basil the Great and John Chrysostom as a sequential reduction of the ancient Liturgy of James the Apostle. This legend was recorded in the Synaxarion of the Great Church in the middle of the X c. and in the Menologion of Basil II.<sup>13</sup> According to the legend, due to the infirmity of the faithful St. Basil and then St. John abridged the text of James, who was the first to write down (ἐγγράφως ἐξέθετο), accepting it personally from Jesus Christ. Apparently, the legend depends on the 32<sup>nd</sup> Canon of the Quinisext Council in Trullo (691-692), which was addressed to the Armenian usage of unmixed wine during the eucharistic celebration. The fathers of the Council sequentially called to witness of James the Apostle and St. Basil, who «in writing transmitted to us the mysterious service» (ἐγγράφως τὴν μυστικὴν ἡμῖν ἱερουργίαν παραδεδωκότες).<sup>14</sup>

In the XV c., this legend was mainstreamed by Mark of Ephesus at the Council of Florence in 1439 in a debate with Latins on the question about the precise moment of the consecration of the Holy Gifts — the question that became the subject of Greek-Latin controversy as far back as in the XIV c. Mark built a chain of Apostolic origin of the Byzantine Liturgies, containing the epiclesis, and he also added the testimony of anaphora (*institutio* and epiclesis) from the book VIII of the pseudepigraphal «Apostolic Constitutions»<sup>15</sup> (IV c.).<sup>16</sup> This fact of usage of the anaphora from CA by Mark is particularly important for our topic!

Constantine Paleocappa made a literary rework of the legend on the base of the treatise of Mark of Ephesus, but most importantly, attributed its authorship to a disciple of John Chrysostom — St. Proclus of Constantinople, thus giving the legend an ancient and indisputable authority, which it enjoyed among the scholars until the XX c.

### *The treatise of Nicholas of Methone in the edition of 1560*

In 2019<sup>17</sup> I made an attempt to prove that the treatise of Nicholas of

<sup>13</sup> See *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae e codice Sirmondiano*, ed. H. Delehay. Bruxellis 1902, coll. 155-156; PG 117, col. 121. F. J. Leroy considered that the tradition of attributing the reduction of the ancient Liturgy to St. John Chrysostom and St. Basil should be dated to the XV c., but supposed that in the future it would be possible to trace its origins to the time of Symeon the Metaphrast, i.e. the 2nd half of the X c. (Leroy, “Proclus, «De traditione Divinae Missae»”, 294). So now we have the proofs for his suggestion. See also: S. Parenti, *L'Anafora di Crisostomo. Testo e contesti* (Jerusalem Theologisches Forum 37), Münster 2020, pp. 80-94.

<sup>14</sup> Mansi 11, col. 957.

<sup>15</sup> *Infra*: CA.

<sup>16</sup> Const. App. VIII. 12. 35-39 in M. Metzger (ed.), *Les Constitutions Apostoliques* (SC 336), t. III, livres VII et VIII, Paris 1987, pp. 196-200

<sup>17</sup> М. М. Бернацкий, “Трактат Николая Мефонского «К сомневающимся и говорящим»,

Methone in ED1560 does not belong to Nicholas and that it is another compilation and forgery of Constantine Paleocappa. This work was recognized as authentic by the previous researchers of the legacy of Nicholas. As early as 1888, Johann Dräseke suggested that this short treatise was written in the 40s of the XII c. in connection with the Bogomil heresy,<sup>18</sup> which was shaking the Byzantine Church at that time.<sup>19</sup>

A careful reading of the text has led us to the conclusion that this treatise is a compilation, made by Paleocappa on the base of literal citation of a few fragments of the original writing by Nicholas — the «Treatise on azymes to Latins» (Λόγος περὶ τῶν πρὸς λατίνους ἀζύμων), published in 1897 by Russian Bishop Arseny (Ivaschenko).<sup>20</sup> Here is our more detailed textual analysis of the newly discovered pseudepigraph of Paleocappa in comparison with our paper of 2019.

The earliest known manuscript of the authentic «Treatise on azymes to Latins» Athous Laur. 163 (B 43) belongs to the XII c. We can assert with confidence that Paleocappa got an opportunity to work closely with this original work of Nicholas with the help of his co-worker in the Royal library Jacobos Diassorinos (d. 1563), which copied a part of the codex Paris. gr. 2830 in 1535.<sup>21</sup> The Nicholas' writing can be found on the foll. 252r-267v of this manuscript.

Paleocappa's autograph Paris. Suppl. gr. 303 does not contain the fake treatise «To those who doubt...», but includes the excerpts from the authentic «Treatise on azymes to Latins» (Paris. Suppl. gr. 303, foll. 141r-142v). These excerpts,<sup>22</sup> although they were cleared of the topic of unleavened bread, had no chance to be included in ED1560 due to an ambiguous wording of Nicholas, that could be misinterpreted in the context of anti-Protestant polemic. Thus, he used the terminus «σύμβολον» applied to the Holy Gifts and spoke of the sacrament of the Eucharist as a commemoration of a once (ἐφάπαξ) happened grace, because Christ does not die every day

что священнодействуемые хлеб и вино не суть Тело и Кровь Господа нашего Иисуса Христа» (PG 135, coll. 509-518) — еще одна подделка Константина Палеокаппы (XVI в.)», *Богословские труды*. Москва 49 (2019), 170-190.

<sup>18</sup> J. Dräseke, "Zu Nikolaos von Methone", *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 9 (1888), 583-584; see also Id., "Nikolaos von Methone", *BZ* 1 (1892), 438-478, here: 466-467.

<sup>19</sup> The recent scholars followed Dräseke: A. D. Angelou (ed.), *Nicholas of Methone. Refutation of Proclus' Elements of Theology*, Athens – Leiden 1984, pp. xxi-xxii; J. M. Robinson, *Nicholas of Methone's Refutation of Proclus: Theology and Neoplatonism in 12th-century Byzantium*, Dissertation, University of Notre Dame 2014, p. 69.

<sup>20</sup> For the edition of the Greek text and the Russian translation see: Арсений (Иващенко) еп., *Два неизданных произведения Николая, еп. Мефонского, писателя XII века*, Новгород 1897, pp. 51-116.

<sup>21</sup> See the scribe on fol. 285v: ἔτους ζμγ'.

<sup>22</sup> See Иващенко, *Два неизданных произведения Николая*, pp. 95-96; 101, 103-105



(liturgy), but the one death of Christ is enough for the redemption of the faithful. The commemoration must be done to not forget the original sinful state of the faithful before the receiving of grace.<sup>23</sup> This word (ἐφάπαξ) refers to the Epistle to the Hebrews (cf. 7, 27; 9, 12; 10, 10) — the main source of Luther's critique of the Catholic concept of the Mass as a sacrifice. Of course, the statements of Nicholas can be interpreted in an Orthodox manner and in the context of polemics in the middle of XII c. against Soterichos Panteugenos<sup>24</sup> that is confirmed in other works of the Bishop, but in XVI c. in Paris Paleocappa had other tasks from the employer. Therefore, he made a decision to create a fake based on the «Treatise on azymes», that was easily available.

The original writing of Nicholas set a polemical form for the composition of Paleocappa's forgery with new, relevant to the XVI c. subjects of anti-Protestant polemics — the Apostolic origin of the Orthodox and Catholic Liturgies and the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist.

Below in our new edition of the treatise «To those who doubt...» for clarity we highlighted with semi-bold the corresponding places of literal borrowings, accompanying them with references to the edition of Arseny Ivaschenko. The fragments from the lengthy «Treatise on azymes to Latins» were mixed by Paleocappa with the quotations and reminiscences from the Holy Scripture, the church fathers (John Chrysostom, John of Damascus) and liturgical texts (e.g., Octoechos). Here is an example of almost verbatim adoption from scholia «Ἰωάννου [Χρυσσοστόμου]» from «Catena on 1 Corinthians». To all appearance, Paleocappa worked with the late manuscript of Catenae (typus Vaticanus, CPG. C 160) — Paris. gr. 227 (XVI c.) to which he had an access in the Royal Library at Fontainebleau:

---

<sup>23</sup> Ἔδει δὲ καὶ τοῖς μύσταις τῆς χάριτος τὸ μυστήριον προπιστευθῆναι τὸ εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τῆς **ἐφάπαξ** γενομένης χάριτος εἰσέπειτα τελείσθαι προωρισμένον. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ οὐκ ἔδει πολλάκις ὡς τὸ καθεκάστην ἀποθνήσκειν Χριστόν, ἀρκούντος ἡμῖν τοῦ ἐνός θανάτου πρὸς ἀπολύτρωσιν, ἀναγκαῖα δὲ ἡμῖν ἀνθρώποις τε οὐσι καὶ ὑπὸ χρόνον, τὸν πατέρα λήθης, τελοῦσιν ἢ τῆς εὐεργεσίας ἀνάμνησιν, ἵνα μὴ λάθωμεν ἑαυτοὺς ἐξ ἀγνωμοσύνης ὡς τὸ ἀπαρχῆς γεγονότες, ὅτε τῆς χάριτος οὐ μετείχομεν, διὰ τοῦτο ἄρτος καὶ οἶνος **τὰ μυστικά** ταῦτα παραλαμβάνεται **σύμβολα**, τὰ διὰ τῆς πνευματικῆς ἀγιοστείας εἰς σῶμα Χριστοῦ καὶ αἷμα μεταποιούμενα, δι' ὧν ὁ θάνατος τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ ἡ ζωοποιὸς ἀνάστασις διαπαντός καταγγέλλεται (*ibid.*, p. 105).

<sup>24</sup> The Byzantine controversies of the XII c. could be of great interest to Catholic polemicists of the XVI c., because the same themes of the real presence and relationship of the sacrifice at Golgotha and the Eucharist as sacrifice formed the main subject of controversy with Protestants from the very beginning. Therefore, it is not surprising that in the Preface to the Latin edition of 1560 (without pagination), addressed to cardinal Charles, Jean de Saint-André recounts the events of the late XII c., when the doctrine of Michael Sykidites (Glykas) became the subject of polemic, which is reflected in the «History» of Nicetas Choniata.

Catenae (typus Vaticanus)	«To those who doubt...» Paris. suppl. gr. 143, fol. 73; PG 135, col. 512
Εἶτα ἐπάγει καὶ λογισμὸν, πῶς γινόμεθα σῶμα Χριστοῦ. τί γάρ ἐστι σῶμα; φησὶν, ὁ ἄρτος δηλὸν ὅτι σῶμα Χριστοῦ. τί δὲ γίνεται ὁ μεταλαμβάνων; δηλὸν ὅτι σῶμα Χριστοῦ. μετέχοντες γὰρ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐκεῖνο γινόμεθα· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἡ παλαιὰ σὰρξ ἐφθάρη ὑπὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας, ἐδέησεν ἡμῖν σαρκὸς νέας <sup>25</sup>	Εἶτα ἐπάγει καὶ λογισμὸν, πῶς γινόμεθα σῶμα Χριστοῦ, καὶ φησὶ τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστίν; (1 Cor 10, 17) ... Τί γάρ ἐστι, φησὶν, ὁ ἄρτος; δηλονότι σῶμα Χριστοῦ. Τί δὲ γίνονται οἱ μεταλαμβάνοντες; δηλονότι σῶμα Χριστοῦ. Μετέχοντες γὰρ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἐκεῖνο γινόμεθα· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἡ πᾶσα ἡμῶν σὰρξ ἐφθάρη ὑπὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας, ἐδέησεν ἡμῖν σαρκὸς νέας

In one case Paleocappa manifests himself explicitly, and here the data on his other falsifications can help us. In the last section of the original «Treatise on azymes to Latins» Bishop Nicholas reproduced the symbolic interpretation of leavened bread, developed in the XI c. by Nicetas Stethatos in the controversy against Armenians and Latins: «animate» leavened bread corresponds to the «living» body of Jesus Christ, which was not left by the deity after the death on the Cross.<sup>26</sup> The Lord Jesus Christ passed the use of «living» leavened bread to the apostles, and they did the same by turn to the entire Church. According to Nicholas, Peter and Paul could not contradict themselves and the other apostles and pass on to the Roman Church the practice of using unleavened bread, which was different from the other Churches.

What did Paleocappa do with this passage from the original Nicholas' treatise? He took out of context the quotation about the transmission of the liturgical rite through the apostles, and interpolated in it the citations from the treatise of Mark of Ephesus concerning the recording of the Apostolic Liturgy by James and Clement. Then Paleocappa cited the part of the anaphora from the book VIII of CA *in exactly the same form* (*institutio* and *epiclesis*) as it was quoted by Mark in his writing «On the consecration of the divine Gifts». Paleocappa's interpolations are completely dependent on Mark's writing<sup>27</sup> (see the table below). Here is this fragment that clearly

<sup>25</sup> *Catenae Graecorum patrum in Novum Testamentum*, ed. J. A. Cramer, V, Oxford 1841 (repr.: Hildesheim 1967), p. 194.

<sup>26</sup> See in detail G. Avvakumov, *Die Entstehung des Unionsgedankens: Die lateinische Theologie des Hochmittelalters in der Auseinandersetzung mit dem Ritus der Ostkirche*, Berlin 2002, pp. 109-111.

<sup>27</sup> We can say with confidence that Paleocappa obtained access to Mark's treatise by means of Paris. gr. 1261 — the manuscript of the XV c. available to him in the Royal library. This observation about the dependence of the text of Mark in ED1560 on Paris. gr. 1261 was

demonstrates the compilation method of our forger. The corresponding places of literal borrowings in the forgery from the original treatise by Nicholas are highlighted with semi-bold. In the right column there are corresponding passages from the writing of Mark.

<p>Λόγος περὶ τῶν πρὸς λατίνους ἀζύμων (Ивашенко, pp. 114-115)</p>	<p>«To those who doubt...» Paris. suppl. gr. 143, foll. 74v-75; PG 135, col. 513</p>	<p>«On the consecration of the divine Gifts» by Mark in ED1560 (p. 139)</p>
<p><b>Οὕτω</b> πιστεύομεν, οὕτω προσφέρομεν ἄρτον τέλειον ζῶντα, εἴτουν σῶμα Χριστοῦ, τέλειον καὶ μετὰ τὸ πάθος διαμεμενηκὸς καὶ ὀλόκληρον. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁστοῦν αὐτοῦ συνετρίβη. Καὶ τῆς θείας ζωῆς ἀχώριστον τοιοῦτον, οἷον αὐτὸς ὁ πρῶτος ἡμῶν καὶ μέγας ἀρχιερέυς, καὶ θύτης καὶ θῦμα, τοῖς οἰκείοις μύσταις παρέδωκεν· αὐτοὶ τε πάλιν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται τοῦ Λόγου καὶ ὑπηρέται τῇ καθολικῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ, τῇ ἀπὸ περάτων ἕως περάτων τῆς οἰκουμένης, παρέδωκαν, πάντες μὲν τῇ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις,</p>	<p>Διὰ τοῦτο αὐτῷ πιστεύοντες, <b>οὕτω προσφέρομεν ἄρτον τέλειον ζῶντα, εἴτουν σῶμα Χριστοῦ, τέλειον καὶ μετὰ τὸ πάθος διαμεμενηκὸς καὶ ὀλόκληρον</b> (οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁστοῦν αὐτοῦ συνετρίβη) καὶ τῆς θείας ζωῆς ἀχώριστον. τοιοῦτον, οἷον αὐτὸς ὁ πρῶτος ἡμῶν καὶ μέγας ἀρχιερέυς, καὶ θύτης καὶ θῦμα, τοῖς οἰκείοις μύσταις παρέδωκεν· αὐτοὶ τε πάλιν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται τοῦ Λόγου καὶ ὑπηρέται τῇ καθολικῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ, τῇ ἀπὸ περάτων ἕως περάτων τῆς οἰκουμένης, παρέδοσαν, πάντες μὲν τῇ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις</p> <p>(ὅπου καὶ ὁ θεῖος Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ πρώτου καὶ μεγάλου ἀρχιερέως ἀδελφὸς, καὶ διάδοχος τὴν μυστικὴν καὶ ἀναίμακτον λειτουργίαν ἐξέθετο),</p>	<p>Ὁ δὲ γε θεῖος Ἰάκωβος ὁ τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων πρῶτος ἐπίσκοπος καὶ τοῦ πρώτου καὶ μεγάλου ἀρχιερέως ἀδελφὸς ὁμοῦ καὶ διάδοχος, καὶ αὐτὸς τὴν μυστικὴν ἐκτιθέμενος λειτουργίαν &lt;...&gt;</p>

already made by L. Petit (*Documents relatifs au Concile de Florence*, II: *Œuvres anticonciliaires de Marc d'Éphèse* [PO 83/17.2], Paris 1923, p. 426).

<p>Πέτρος δὲ καὶ Παῦλος τῇ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ, Παῦλος δὲ ἰδίως καὶ πάσῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ, Μάρκος τῇ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ, Ἰωάννης καὶ Ἀνδρέας τῇ ἐν Ἀσίᾳ τε καὶ Εὐρώπῃ, καὶ πάντες τῇ πανταχοῦ.</p>	<p><b>Πέτρος δὲ καὶ Παῦλος τῇ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ, Παῦλος δὲ ἰδίως καὶ πάσῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ, Μάρκος τῇ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ, Ἰωάννης καὶ Ἀνδρέας τῇ ἐν Ἀσίᾳ τε καὶ Εὐρώπῃ, καὶ πάντες τῇ πανταχοῦ</b></p> <p>Ἐκκλησίᾳ διὰ τῆς συγγραφείσης τῷ ἱερῷ Κλήμεντι λειτουργίας παραδεδώκασιν· ἐν ἣ ταῦτα οὕτω ῥητῶς κεῖται· «Μεμνημένοι οὖν ὧν δι' ἡμᾶς ὑπέμεινεν, εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, Θεὲ παντοκράτορ...»</p>	<p>Ταῦτα μὲν οἱ θεῖοι ἀποστολοὶ διὰ τῆς συγγραφῆς τοῦ μακαρίου Κλήμεντος τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ παραδεδώκασιν. &lt;...&gt;</p> <p>Ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῇ συγγραφείσῃ διὰ Κλήμεντος λειτουργίᾳ &lt;...&gt; οὕτω κεῖται ῥητῶς· «Μεμνημένοι οὖν ὧν δι' ἡμᾶς ὑπέμεινεν, εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, Θεὲ παντοκράτορ...»</p>
---	--	--

It is noteworthy that this very fragment of the treatise of pseudo-Nicholas (οὕτω προσφέρομεν — διὰ τῆς συγγραφείσης τῷ ἱερῷ Κλήμεντι λειτουργίας παραδεδώκασιν) precedes and serves as a separate historical commentary to the text of JAS in the manuscript Florentinus Laurentianus Acquisti e Doni. 179 (Suppl. gr. 22), copied out by Andrija Dudić from the autograph of Paleocappa (Bodl. Misc. E.1.16) in 1555.<sup>28</sup>

In addition, when creating his pseudepigraph, Paleocappa made similar interpolations in the text of the *institutio* of the CA anaphora, as in the case of the anaphora of JAS.<sup>29</sup> The text of the treatise of Mark of Ephesus was also corrected in the same way by Paleocappa for ED1560.<sup>30</sup> We can see these corrections in the table below.

<sup>28</sup> See N° 2 and 5 of the manuscript list below.

<sup>29</sup> These interpolations in JAS were first noted by C. A. Swainson, see note 8 above.

<sup>30</sup> See also the *variae lectiones* in the critical edition of the treatise of Mark in Petit, *Documents relatifs au Concile de Florence*, p. 427.

Const. App. VIII. 12. 35-39	«To those who doubt...» (Paris. Suppl. gr. 146, foll. 75r-75v)	«On the consecration of the divine Gifts» by Mark in ED1560 (p. 139)
λαβὼν ἄρτον... ἔδωκεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ...	λαβὼν ἄρτον... ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν...	λαβὼν ἄρτον... ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν...
καὶ τὸ ποτήριον... ἔπέδωκεν αὐτοῖς...	καὶ τὸ ποτήριον... ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν...	καὶ τὸ ποτήριον... ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς...

On this occasion our forger creates the illusion of authenticity of pseudo-Clement's anaphora. However, as we can see, the text of the treatise of Mark in ED1560 was corrected by Paleocappa inconsistently: ἡμῖν was not interpolated in the second part of the *institutio*.

The case of using of the CA anaphora by Paleocappa is rather important. The only source of his acquaintance with the anaphora of CA was a fragment, cited in the writing of Mark,<sup>31</sup> and the unavailability of the full text of the pseudo-Clement's Liturgy was a problem for Paleocappa. Why? Because the text of the Liturgy attributed to Clement of Rome should have occupied one of the first places in ED1560,<sup>32</sup> along with JAS, as one of the Apostolic sources of the Roman Mass according to the legend laid down in the foundation of ED1560 and recorded in the treatise of pseudo-Proclus. We find confirmation of this in an explanation given in the dedication of Paleocappa to cardinal Charles in the manuscript Paris. gr. 303, the main manuscript for the 1560 edition. Our forger wrote in this dedication that he deliberately had omitted from this manuscript the Liturgy that the Apostle Clement left to the Catholic Church in writing «simultaneously» with JAS. The reason is because the Liturgy of Clement of Rome was not written very carefully and clearly in the «exemplar» of the codex, therefore, our falsifier could not do anything to write it down in a clearer and more legible hand and dedicate (*dicarem*) it to the cardinal.<sup>33</sup> Obviously, he meant here

<sup>31</sup> The *variae lectiones* of this citation testify that Mark possessed the manuscript of CA, which belonged to the manuscript family H, according to the CA stemma by Metzger (ed.), *Les Constitutions Apostoliques* (SC 336), t. III, livres VII et VIII, Paris 1987, pp. 196-198; *ibid.* (SC 320), t. I, livres I et II, Paris 1985, pp. 78-79.

<sup>32</sup> The editio princeps of CA appeared in Venice in 1563 (*ibid.*, p. 75). So just three years after ED1560.

<sup>33</sup> *Omitto prudens divum Clementem apostolum σύγχρονον sacrificium illud litteris mandatum ecclesiae catholicae reliquisse. In cujus libri exemplum una cum reliquis scriptis celeberrimorum partum (quos Augustinus ecclesiae lumina haud injuria appellat), non adeo diligenter ac nitide descriptum cum incidissem, nihil potius habui quam ut nitidioribus ac regiis notis transcriberem, tuaeque amplitudini dicarem* (Paris. Suppl. gr. 303., fol. 1r; H. Omont, "Catalogue de manuscrits grecs copiés à Paris au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle par Constantin Palaeocappa",

the manuscript Paris. Suppl. gr. 143, which was presented by Paleocappa to cardinal Charles as a copy from the very ancient manuscript. The passage of pseudo-Clement's anaphora was written out in Paris. Suppl. gr. 143 on foll. 94r-94v apart along with excerpts from JAS<sup>34</sup> and the Liturgies of John and Basil. But exactly the same codex is the main manuscript of the treatise «To those who doubt...». Thus, the inclusion of this passage from the work of Mark into the forgery of pseudo-Nicholas was a forced step for Paleocappa to satisfy his Catholic benefactors by multiplying so valuable, although brief, testimony for polemic goal.

The work of the Metropolitan of Ephesus, on which the treatises of pseudo-Proclus and pseudo-Nicholas depend, was included in ED1560 by Jean de Saint-André and printed next to them. There was no reason to conceal it, since the creation of forgeries with attributions to Proclus (V c.) and Nicholas of Methone (XII c.) made the work of Mark chronologically secondary to them in the framework of the falsified model of Paleocappa, and not vice versa.

At last, Claude de Saintes<sup>35</sup> devoted the 8<sup>th</sup> chapter of his Preface of the 1560 Latin edition to the authenticity of JAS. There he refers to the authority of Proclus, Nicholas and Mark («licet non sincere catholicus») as the church fathers and writers who acknowledge the authorship of the Apostle James. Thus, the falsified model of Paleocappa was successfully used by his Catholic customers in their polemical purposes.

\* \* \*

So let me summarize. In the 50s of the XVI c. the Cretan copyist and forger Constantine Paleocappa was under the protection of the cardinal de Lorraine Charles de Guise and together with the other Greek copyists Angelos Vergecios and Jacobos Diassorinos worked on creating a catalog of Greek manuscripts in the Royal Library at Fontainebleau.<sup>36</sup> At that time by commission from the cardinal, Paleocappa created several liturgical and theological florilegia that became a basis of the Parisian edition in 1560. The publication was intended to help in the controversy between Catholics and Huguenots over the theology of the Eucharist. As part of this commission, Paleocappa created three pseudepigraphs: the treatises of pseudo-Sa-

---

in *Annuaire de l'Association pour l'Encouragement des études grecques en France. 20<sup>ème</sup> année*, Paris 1886, p. 273).

<sup>34</sup> Here Paleocappa forgot to make the specified interpolation (ἡμῖν).

<sup>35</sup> A French Catholic controversialist (1525-1591), member of the Council of Trent (1545-1563).

<sup>36</sup> See the catalog in the manuscript Paris. suppl. gr. 10.

mon, pseudo-Proclus of Constantinople, and pseudo-Nicholas of Methone, as well as making a number of corrections to the version available to him of the Liturgy of James.

*The manuscript tradition of the treatise «To those who doubt...»*

As in the case of the works of pseudo-Samon and pseudo-Proclus,<sup>37</sup> the manuscript tradition of the treatise «To those who doubt...» is not older than the XVI c.

Here is a list of sixteenth-century manuscripts containing our treatise:

1) Parisiensis Suppl. gr. 143, foll. 71v-77v. The autograph of Constantine Paleocappa, written between 1550 and 1559.<sup>38</sup> The manuscript was made by Paleocappa for cardinal Charles de Guise. Paris. Suppl. gr. 143 is a florilegium of the liturgical (excerpts from JAS, the Liturgies of St. John and St. Basil, anaphora of pseudo-Clement from the book VIII of CA) and patristic texts on topical issues of controversy with Protestants: the real presence of the body of Christ in the Eucharist, the veneration of icons and relics, prayers for the dead.

This manuscript was presented by Paleocappa to cardinal Charles as an alleged copy from an ancient, largely corrupted and barely readable manuscript, which was delivered to Paris by Constantine's brother. This copy was made a long time before in Aptera in western Crete.<sup>39</sup>

Together with Paris. Suppl. gr. 303, another autograph of Paleocappa, Paris. Suppl. gr. 143 — the main manuscript for ED1560; it contains almost all the texts included in this edition, in particular the treatises of pseudo-Samon and pseudo-Proclus.

2) Bodleianus Miscellaneus, E.1.16 (Misc. 134), foll. 266v-269.<sup>40</sup> The autograph of Paleocappa. The content is similar to Paris. Suppl. gr. 143.

3) Bodleianus Laudianus, 6, foll. 41-65.<sup>41</sup> A small manuscript that con-

<sup>37</sup> Leroy, *L'homilétique de Proclus de Constantinople*, pp. 333-339.

<sup>38</sup> *Catalogue des manuscrits grecs*, Supplément grec numéros 1 à 150, par Ch. Astruc et al., Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris 2003, pp. 315-323; Mercier, *La Liturgie de St. Jacques*, pp. 141-142.

<sup>39</sup> See his preface, addressed to the cardinal in Paris. Suppl. gr. 143, fol. 1r: Cum frater meus e patria ad me venisset... librum hunc secum attulit, quem ego jam pridem Apterae, quae urbs est Cretensium, ex quodam exemplari vetustissimo descripseram, usque adeo vetustate carioso putrique ut vix legi posset, mihi que non humano, sed Apollinis plane ad divinandum ingenio opus esset (Omont, "Catalogue de manuscrits grecs", p. 269).

<sup>40</sup> *Catalogi codicum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae*, pars 1, Oxonii 1853, p. 701; Mercier, *La Liturgie de St. Jacques*, p. 142.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 495.

tains extracts from the works of St. John of Damascus and St. Gregory of Nyssa (these extracts were included in ED1560) as well as the «Prayer to the one and three hypostatic God» by Gennadios Scholarios.

4) Scorialensis Ω IV 16, foll. 59-68.<sup>42</sup> The first third of the manuscript contains: the treatise of pseudo-Proclus, the 32nd Canon of the Council in Trullo, JAS, the treatise of Nicholas of Methone «To those who doubt...», an extract from the 37th Chapter of the «Great Catechism» of Gregory of Nyssa and the treatise of pseudo-Samon. This manuscript is the autograph (foll. 1-86v) of Andrew Darmarios, a friend and collaborator of Makarios Melissenos, Metropolitan of Monemvasia in the middle of XVI c.<sup>43</sup>

5) Florentinus Laurentianus Acquisti e Doni. 179 (Suppl. gr. 22).<sup>44</sup> A small manuscript (ff. 15), written in 1555 in London by Andreas Dudith (Andrija Dudić) (1533-1589).<sup>45</sup> The text of JAS is preceded by an excerpt from the treatise of Nicholas «To those who doubt...» Ch. Mercier demonstrated<sup>46</sup> that the text of JAS in this codex was copied from Bodl. Misc. E.1.16 (Misc. 134) (see N° 2 in our list).

6) Athous Vatoped, Σκήτης Ἁγίου Δημητρίου, 33, foll. 41-44.<sup>47</sup> The manuscript is for the most part an exact copy of ED1560, including the treatises of pseudo-Samon and pseudo-Proclus.

7) Monacensis gr. 601, foll. 62v-71.<sup>48</sup> The content is similar to Scorialensis Ω IV 16: the treatise of pseudo-Proclus, the 32nd Canon of the Council in Trullo, JAS, the treatise of Nicholas «To those who doubt...», the 37th Chapter of the «Great Catechism» of Gregory of Nyssa and the treatise of pseudo-Samon.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>42</sup> See the manuscript description: E. Miller, *Catalogue des manuscrits grecs de la bibliothèque de l'Escurial*, Paris 1848, p. 491; G. De Andrés, *Catálogo de los códices griegos de la Real Biblioteca de El Escorial*, III, Madrid 1967, pp. 221-223.

<sup>43</sup> Both are well-known forgers: Makarios is the author-compiler of the «Great Chronicle» by George Sphrantzes, which does not actually belong to him, unlike the «Small Chronicle». On the forgeries of Darmarios, see: O. Kreşten, «Phantomgestalten in der Byzantinischen Literaturgeschichte», *JÖB* 25 (1976), 207-222.

<sup>44</sup> E. Rostagno, *Indicis codicum graecorum bybliothecae Laurentianae supplementum / Studi italiani di filologia classica*, VI, Firenze – Roma 1898, p. 137.

<sup>45</sup> Hungarian humanist, Catholic Bishop, who converted to Protestantism after 1565.

<sup>46</sup> Mercier, *La Liturgie de St. Jacques*, pp. 142-143.

<sup>47</sup> E. Lamberz – E. K. Λίτσας, *Κατάλογος χειρογράφων τῆς Βατοπεδίνης Σκήτης Ἁγίου Δημητρίου*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1978, pp. 65-68.

<sup>48</sup> F. Berger, *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München. Bd. 9: Codices graeci Monacenses 575-650* (Handschriften des Supplements), Wiesbaden 2014, pp. 98-100.

<sup>49</sup> Angelou (*Nicholas of Methone*, p. XXXI). did not mention this manuscript and indicated



Thus, the treatise «To those who doubt...» has a shared manuscript tradition with the works of pseudo-Proclus, pseudo-Samon and the Paleocappa's revision of JAS. The manuscripts are closely related to ED1560 and have a somewhat similar composition.

\* \* \*

Our new edition of the Greek text of the treatise «To those who doubt...» is based on the autograph Paris. Suppl. gr. 143 with indication of the quotes and reminiscences used by Constantine Palaeocappa when composing the pseudepigraph. The corresponding passages of literal borrowings from the original writing of Bishop Nicholas are highlighted with semi-bold, accompanied by the references to the edition of Arseny Ivaschenko. The marginalia, made by the hand of Paleocappa, are marked by the sign †. These marginalia have been incorporated into the main text in ED1560. A new edition perfectly illustrates the results of our research and the method of compilation of original texts by the Cretan forger.

## SIGLA

*MK* — Marcus Ephesius, *Libellus de consecratione*, in L. Petit (ed.), *Documents relatifs au Concile de Florence, II: Œuvres anticonciliaires de Marc d'Éphèse* (PO 83, 17.2), Paris 1923, pp. 427-434.

*DA* — Nicolaus Methonensis, *De Azymis*, in Arseny (Ivaschenko) bishop, *Dva neizdannyykh proizvedeniya Nikolaya Mefonskogo, pisatelya XII veka*, Novgorod 1897, pp. 53-56.

*CA* — *Constitutiones apostolorum*, in M. Metzger (ed.), *Les Constitutions Apostoliques* (SC 336), t. III, livres VII et VIII, Paris 1987.

---

Μετόχιον τοῦ Παναγίου Τάφου 321 (foll. 49-56) as a manuscript dated to XVI c. But Μετόχιον τοῦ Παναγίου Τάφου 321 must be dated back to XVIII c. and its content is almost identical to ED1560, see: Α. Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, *Ἱεροσολυμιτική Βιβλιοθήκη, ἤτοι κατάλογος τῶν ἐν ταῖς βιβλιοθήκαις τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου ἀποστολικοῦ τε καὶ καθολικοῦ ὀρθοδόξου πατριαρχικοῦ θρόνου τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ πάσης Παλαιστίνης ἀποκειμένων ἐλληνικῶν κωδίκων*, IV, Πετρούπολη 1899. pp. 294-296.

[Paris. suppl. gr. 143, fol. 71v] Νικολάου τοῦ μακαριωτάτου ἐπισκόπου Μεθώνης, πρὸς τοὺς διαστάζοντας καὶ λέγοντας, ὅτι ὁ ἱεουργούμενος ἄρτος καὶ οἶνος οὐκ ἔστι σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

Τὴν μυστικὴν<sup>50</sup> ταύτην καὶ ἀναίμακτον ἱεουργίαν, καθ' ἣν τὸν ἄρτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον καθαγιαζόμενα εἰς τὸ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα<sup>51</sup> τοῦ Κυρίου μεταποιεῖσθαι πιστεύομεν, παρὰ τίνος ἂν τὴν ἀρχὴν φαίης δοθῆναι;<sup>52</sup> Ἄρ' οὐχὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καθὼς ἡμᾶς τὰ ἱερά<sup>53</sup> διδάσκουσιν εὐαγγέλια; Παρ' αὐτοῦ πάντως. Οἶος δὲ καὶ ὁ λόγος τῆς παραδόσεως τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, φησὶν, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.<sup>54</sup> καὶ ὁ θεῖος Παῦλος ὁσαύτως γὰρ ἐσθίητε τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο πίνετε, τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Κυρίου καταγγέλλετε.<sup>55</sup> [fol. 72r] Πῶς καὶ τίνι τρόπῳ,<sup>56</sup> παρ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἐμάθομεν· λαβὼν γάρ, φησί, τὸν ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασε καὶ ἔδωκε τοῖς μαθηταῖς, καὶ εἶπε· λάβετε, φάγετε, τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν<sup>57</sup> κλώμενον<sup>58</sup> καὶ διδόμενον· ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι, λέγων· τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου.<sup>59</sup> ταυτὸν δὲ εἰπεῖν κατὰ τὸν θεῖον Ματθαῖον<sup>60</sup> τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ αἷμά μου, τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν<sup>61</sup> ἐκχυνόμενον. Ὁ δὲ σκοπὸς τίς, καὶ τὸ τέλος τῆς παραδόσεως τί ἄλλο, ἢ μετουσία Χριστοῦ καὶ ζωὴ ἐν Χριστῷ τῶν μετεχόντων αἰώνιος; Ἐάν τις, γὰρ φησι, φάγη ἐκ τούτου τοῦ ἄρτου, ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· καὶ ὁ ἄρτος δέ, ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω, ἡ σὰρξ μου ἐστίν, ἣν ἐγὼ δώσω ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς.<sup>62</sup> Καί· ἐάν μὴ φάγητε τὴν σάρκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πίνετε αὐτοῦ τὸ αἷμα, [fol. 72v] οὐκ ἔχετε ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς· ὁ τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα καὶ πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα, ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον.<sup>63</sup> Καὶ πάλιν, Ὁ τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα καὶ πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα ἐν ἐμοὶ μένει καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ· καθὼς ἀπέστειλέ<sup>64</sup> με ὁ ζῶν Πατὴρ καὶ ἐγὼ ζῶ

<sup>50</sup> Τὴν μυστικὴν : Τὴν τοίνυν μυστικὴν DA

<sup>51</sup> αἷμα : τὸ αἷμα DA

<sup>52</sup> δοθῆναι : παραδοθῆναι DA

<sup>53</sup> τὰ ἱερά om. DA

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Lk 22, 19; 1 Cor 11, 24.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. 1 Cor 11, 26.

<sup>56</sup> τίνι τρόπῳ : τίνα τρόπον PG

<sup>57</sup> ὑμῶν : ὑμῶν καὶ DA

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Lk 22, 19; Mk 14, 22; 1 Cor 11, 24.

<sup>59</sup> 1 Cor 11, 25. Cf. Lk 22, 20.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Mt 26, 28.

<sup>61</sup> ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν : ὑπὲρ πολλῶν DA περὶ πολλῶν Mt 26, 28.

<sup>62</sup> Jn 6, 51.

<sup>63</sup> Jn 6, 53-54.

<sup>64</sup> ἀπέστειλέ : ἀπέσταλκέ DA

To those who doubt and say that the sacred bread and wine are not indeed the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ

**Can you tell us from whom this mysterious and bloodless service began, during which, as we believe, the consecrated bread and chalice are transmuted into the Body and Blood of the Lord? Is it not from God and our Saviour Jesus Christ Himself, as the Holy Gospels teach us? Of course, from Him! What is then the basis of this tradition? Do this, says the Lord, *in remembrance of Me* (Lk 22, 19; 1 Cor 11, 24); and the divine Paul [says]: *For every time you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the death of the Lord* (1 Cor 11, 26). How and in what manner we are taught from the Saviour Himself: *for taking bread, says [Paul], and giving thanks, he broke it, and gave it to the disciples, and said: Take, eat, this is My Body, which is broken and given for you; also the cup after supper, and said: this cup is the New Testament in My Blood* (1 Cor 11, 24-25). The same is said by the divine Matthew: *This is My Blood of the New Testament, which is poured out for you* (Mt 26, 28). What is the purpose and result of tradition? Is it anything other than a participation in Christ and the eternal life of the communicants in Christ? For, says the Lord, *if anyone eat of this bread, he will live forever* (Jn 6, 51); and: *the bread that I will give is My Flesh, which I will give for the life of the world* (Jn 6, 51); and: *if you do not eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood, you will not have life in you; he who eats My Flesh and drinks My Blood has eternal life* (Jn 6, 53-54). And again: *he that eats My Flesh and drinks My Blood abides in Me, and I in him. As the living Father sent Me, and I live by***

διὰ τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ τρώγων<sup>65</sup> με, κακεῖνος ζήσεται δι' ἐμέ<sup>66, 67</sup>. Τὴν γὰρ αὐτοῦ σάρκα ὡς δέλεαρ ἐν ἀγκίστρῳ περιτιθέμενος, τῇ θεΐᾳ αὐτοῦ δυνάμει τὸν μὲν ὄφιν καθέλκει, ἡμᾶς δὲ ἀνάγει.<sup>68</sup> Βαβαὶ τί<sup>69</sup> φρικτὸν καὶ φοβερὸν τὸ μυστήριον· ὁ παραδεδωκὼς τοῦτο, Θεὸς ἐστι, διὰ φιλανθρωπίαν καὶ ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος,<sup>70</sup> καὶ ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγὴν καὶ θάνατον προερχόμενος, ἵνα τὸν ὑπόδικον τῷ θανάτῳ διὰ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἄνθρωπον τοῦ θανάτου ἐξέλθῃται. Αἰτία δὲ<sup>71</sup> τῆς παραδόσεως, ἡ τῆς μεγάλης ταύτης εὐεργεσίας ἀνάμνησις· σῶμα καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ τὰ τελούμενα· τῆς τελετῆς τέλος, [fol. 73r] μετουσία Χριστοῦ καὶ ζωὴ αἰώνιος ταῦτ' ὅν εἰπεῖν, τῶν μετεχόντων ἐκθέωσις<sup>72</sup> ὡς καὶ ὁ θεσπέσιος Παῦλος μεγαλοφώνως βοᾷ, τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστίν;<sup>73</sup> εἶτα ἐπάγει καὶ λογισμόν, πῶς γινόμεθα σῶμα Χριστοῦ, καὶ φησι· τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστίν; ὅτι εἷς ἄρτος, ἐν σῶμα, οἱ πολλοὶ ἐσμεν, οἱ γὰρ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν.<sup>74</sup> Τί γὰρ ἐστι, φησίν, ὁ ἄρτος; δηλονότι σῶμα Χριστοῦ. Τί δὲ γίνονται οἱ μεταλαμβάνοντες; δηλονότι σῶμα Χριστοῦ. Μετέχοντες γὰρ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἐκεῖνο γινόμεθα· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἡ πᾶσα ἡμῶν σὰρξ ἐφθάρη ὑπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ἐδέησεν ἡμῖν σαρκὸς νέας.<sup>75</sup>

Τίς οὖν<sup>76</sup> οὕτω θρασὺς καὶ πάντολμος, ὡς καινοτομεῖν τὴν παράδοσιν καὶ

<sup>65</sup> τρώγων : ὁ τρώγων DA

<sup>66</sup> Jn 6, 56-57.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. Ивашенко, *Два неизданных произведения Николая*, pp. 53-54.

<sup>68</sup> Τὴν γὰρ αὐτοῦ σάρκα ὡς δέλεαρ ἐν ἀγκίστρῳ περιθέμενος, τῇ θεΐᾳ δυνάμει, τὸν μὲν ὄφιν καθέλκει, ἡμᾶς δὲ ἀνάγει. This phrase almost verbatim coincides with the text of the 1<sup>st</sup> troparion of the 7<sup>th</sup> ode of the Sunday Canon (tone 5) in Octoechos: Σάρκα περιθέμενος, ὡς ἀγκίστρῳ δέλεαρ, τῇ θεΐᾳ δυνάμει σου, τὸν ὄφιν καθείλκυσας, ἀνάγων τοὺς βοῶντας· ὁ Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἶ. Cf. τῷ προκαλύμματι τῆς φύσεως ἡμῶν ἐνεκρύφθη τὸ θεῖον, ἵνα κατὰ τοὺς λίχνους τῶν ἰχθύων τῷ δελέατι τῆς σαρκὸς συγκατασπασθῇ τὸ ἀγκίστρον τῆς θεότητος (Greg. Nys., *Orat. catech.* 24, 34-36, in Grégoire de Nysse, *Discours Catéchétique* (SC 453), ed. E. Mühlenberg, Paris 2000, p. 254); Greg. Nys., *De tridui inter mortem et resurrectionem domini nostri Jesu Christi spatio*, in PG 9, col. 281.

<sup>69</sup> τί : ὡς ED1560

<sup>70</sup> ὁ παραδεδωκὼς ... γενόμενος : τὸ μυστήριον ὃ παρέδωκε τοῦτο Θεὸς διὰ φιλανθρωπίαν καὶ ἄνθρωπος γέγονεν DA

<sup>71</sup> δὲ om. DA

<sup>72</sup> Cf. Ивашенко, *Два неизданных произведения Николая*, p. 55.

<sup>73</sup> 1 Cor 10, 16.

<sup>74</sup> 1 Cor 10, 17.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. scholia «Ἰωάννου»: εἶτα ἐπάγει καὶ λογισμόν, πῶς γινόμεθα σῶμα Χριστοῦ. τί γὰρ ἐστὶ σῶμα; φησίν, ὁ ἄρτος δηλονότι ὅτι σῶμα Χριστοῦ. τί δὲ γίνεται ὁ μεταλαμβάνων; δηλονότι ὅτι σῶμα Χριστοῦ. μετέχοντες γὰρ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐκεῖνο γινόμεθα· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἡ παλαιὰ σὰρξ ἐφθάρη ὑπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ἐδέησεν ἡμῖν σαρκὸς νέας (*Catena Graecorum patrum in Novum Testamentum*, ed. J. A. Cramer, V, Oxford 1841 [repr.: Hildesheim 1967], p. 194).

<sup>76</sup> Τίς οὖν : Καὶ τίς DA

*the father, so he who eats Me will live because of Me* (Jn 6, 56-57). For He overthrows the serpent by His divine power, putting his Flesh as bait on the hook, and we are raised up by Him. **Oh, what a wonderful and terrible Mystery! The one, who transmitted it, is God that became also man because of philanthropy, and like a lamb coming to the slaughter and death, in order to get rid a man of death, who is subjected to death through sin. The reason for the tradition is the remembrance of this great kindness: the accomplishment of the Body and Blood of Christ. The result of the office — participation of Christ and eternal life, or, in other words, the deification of the communicants,** as the divine Paul loudly proclaims: *the cup of blessing, that we bless, is it not a participation in the blood of Christ* (1 Cor 10, 16)? Then he also discusses how we become the Body of Christ, and says: *the Bread that we break, is it not a communion of the Body of Christ? Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body; for we all partake of the one bread* (1 Cor 10, 16-17). Indeed, what is the bread, says [the Apostle]? Of course, the Body of Christ! And what do the communicants become? Of course, the body of Christ! In fact, when we partake of the Body of Christ, we also become it. For since all our flesh was destroyed by sin, we needed new flesh.

**Now, who is so bold and impudent as to alter the tradition and**

παραγράφεσθαι τὸ μυστήριον καὶ ἀθετεῖν οὕτω τὸν παραδόντα τε καὶ μνησάντα; [fol. 73v] Ἀθετήσας τις νόμον Μωϋσέως, φησὶν ὁ ἀπόστολος, χωρὶς οἰκτιρμῶν ἐπὶ δυσὶν ἢ τρισὶ μάρτυσι ἀποθνήσκει· πῶσω δοκεῖς<sup>77</sup> χείρονος ἀξιωθήσεται τιμωρίας ὁ τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καταπατήσας, καὶ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης κοινὸν ἠγησάμενος, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος καθυβρίσας<sup>78;79</sup> Ἀλλὰ τίς ὁ καταπατῶν τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τᾶλλα τὰ<sup>80</sup> εἰρημένα κατηγορούμενος; Ἦ δῆλον ὡς ὁ<sup>81</sup> τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ διὰ τῆς ἀχαριστίας ἀθετῶν καὶ μὴ ἀποδεχόμενος, καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἀψευδοῦς στόματος παράδοσίν τε καὶ ἔνταλμα ἐξουθενίζων; Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου<sup>82</sup> εἰπόντος· καὶ τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου.<sup>83</sup> καὶ ἐὰν μὴ φάγητε τὴν σάρκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πῖντε αὐτοῦ τὸ αἷμα, οὐκ ἔχετε ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς.<sup>84</sup> Τί διστάζεις; Τί τῷ παντοδυναμῷ ἀδυνατίαν περιάπτεις; Οὐκ αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ ἐκ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι τὰ πάντα παραγαγών;<sup>85</sup> ὁ εἷς τῆς τρισυποστάτου θεότητος, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων [fol. 74r] τῶν χρόνων σαρκωθείς, καὶ ὁ τὸν ἄρτον εἰς τὸ αὐτοῦ σῶμα μεταβάλλεσθαι προστεταχώς; Ἦ τί πάλιν ζητεῖς αἰτίαν καὶ τάξιν φύσεως τῆς τοῦ ἄρτου μεταβολῆς εἰς τὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σῶμα, καὶ τοῦ ὕδατος καὶ οἴνου εἰς αἷμα· ἐπεὶ ὑπὲρ φύσιν καὶ λόγον καὶ νοῦν καὶ ἔννοιαν ἐκ Παρθένου ἐτέχθη;<sup>86</sup> Ἀπιστήσεις ἄρα καὶ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν, καὶ τὴν εἰς οὐρανοῦς αὐτοῦ ἀνάληψιν, καὶ τᾶλλα τοῦ Χριστοῦ θαύματα ὑπὲρ φύσιν, καὶ νοῦν καὶ ἔννοιαν ὄντα.<sup>87</sup> Τοῦτό σοι γίνεται, ὅτι τὸν Χριστὸν, οὐ Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν καὶ Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁμολογεῖς, ἀλλ' ἀρειανίζεις, μᾶλλον δὲ ἰουδαίζεις.

Ἄλλ' ἴσως πάλιν ἀμφιβάλλεις καὶ ἀπιστεῖς, ὅτι οὐχ ὁρᾶς σάρκα καὶ αἷμα, ἀλλ' ἄρτον καὶ οἶνον. Περί οὗ εἰδέναι σε χρή, ἀχάριστε καὶ ἀγνώμων, περὶ τὸν εὐεργέτην, ὅτι ὁ τὰ πάντα εἰδώς Θεός, φιλανθρωπότατος ὢν, οἰκονομικῶς τοῦτο ἐποίησε, τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ ἀσθενείᾳ συγκαταβαίνων· ἵνα μὴ ἀποστρέφονται οἱ πολλοὶ Ἦ τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς, καὶ<sup>88</sup> δυσχεραίνωσι, σάρκα καὶ

<sup>77</sup> δοκεῖς : δοκεῖτε DA

<sup>78</sup> καθυβρίσας : ἐνυβρίσας DA

<sup>79</sup> Cf. Heb 10, 28-29.

<sup>80</sup> τὰ om. DA

<sup>81</sup> Cf. Иващенко, *Два неизданных произведения Николая*, pp. 55-56.

<sup>82</sup> Mt 26, 26.

<sup>83</sup> Mt 26, 28.

<sup>84</sup> Jn 6, 53.

<sup>85</sup> Cf. the anaphora of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom: Σὺ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς παρήγαγες <...>; cf. also Ioan. Chrys., *In Genesim. passim*; Id., *Catechesis ad illuminandos* 8. 19.

<sup>86</sup> Τί ... ἐτέχθη; *marg. Paris. Suppl. gr. 143*

<sup>87</sup> Cf. Joan. Damasc., *Expositio fidei* 84, in B. Kotter (Hrsg.), *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos* (Patristische Texte und Studien 12), Berlin 1973, II, pp. 186-187.

<sup>88</sup> τὸν ... καὶ *marg. Paris. Suppl. gr. 143*

**pervert the Sacrament, and reject the One who has transmitted and taught in this way?! Anyone who has set aside the law of Moses, the Apostle says, dies without mercy on the evidence of two or three witnesses. How much worse punishment, do you think, \* will be deserved by the one who has trampled underfoot the Son of God, and has profaned the blood of the Testament by which he was sanctified, and has outraged the Spirit of grace (Heb 10, 28-29)? But who is the one who tramples on the Son of God and is guilty of the rest of what [the Apostle] said? Is it not obvious that he who ungratefully rejects and does not recognize His Body and despise the tradition and commandment of the truthful mouth of [the Lord]? *This is My Body (Mt 26, 26)*, says [the Lord], and *this is My Blood (Mt 26, 28)*; and *if you do not eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood, you will not have life in you (Jn 6, 53)*. Why do you doubt it? Why do you bind the Almighty with infirmity? Did He not lead everything from non-existence to being? Was it not He, One of the triipostatic Deities, who incarnated in the last times and appointed that the bread should be changed into His Body? Why do you then investigate the cause and natural order of the change of the bread into the body of Christ, and of the water and wine into the blood, when he was born of the Virgin contrary to nature, logic, reason, and understanding? Therefore, you will not have faith in the Resurrection from the dead, and in His Ascension to heaven, and in the other miracles of Christ, which were contrary to nature, sense and comprehension. And so it turns out that you do not agree that Christ is the true God and the Son of God, but you arianize, rather, you judaize.**

But you probably still doubt and disbelieve because you do not see flesh and blood, but [only] bread and wine. Concerning this you, ungrateful and unreasonable in relation to the Benefactor, should know that the omniscient God, being loving to mankind, created so according to economy, having condescension to human infirmity, so that many would not reject the pledge of eternal life and did not feel disgust when they saw flesh and

\* Paleocappa uses a singular verb.

αἷμα βλέποντες. Διὸ διὰ τῶν συνηθεστέρων τῆς φύσεως τοῦτο γίνεσθαι ἡβουλήθη, συζεύξας αὐτοῖς τὴν αὐτοῦ θεότητα,<sup>89</sup> τοῦτό [fol. 74v] ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμά μου, καὶ τοῦτό ἐστὶ τὸ αἷμά μου, εἰπὼν· καί· λάβετε, φάγετε, καὶ πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες εἰς ἄφρασιν ἁμαρτιῶν.<sup>90</sup> καὶ πάλιν· ὁ ἄρτος ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω, ἡ σὰρξ μου ἐστίν, ἣν ἐγὼ δώσω ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς.<sup>91</sup> καὶ ἐὰν μὴ φάγητε τὴν σάρκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πίητε αὐτοῦ τὸ αἷμα, οὐκ ἔχετε ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς.<sup>92</sup> Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, φησὶν, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.<sup>93</sup> Διὰ τοῦτο αὐτῷ πιστεύοντες, οὕτω προσφέρομεν ἄρτον τέλειον, ζῶντα, εἴτουν σῶμα Χριστοῦ, τέλειον καὶ μετὰ τὸ πάθος διαμεμνηκὸς καὶ ὀλόκληρον (οὐδὲ γὰρ ὅστοῦν αὐτοῦ συνετριβή)<sup>94</sup> καὶ τῆς θείας ζωῆς ἀχώριστον· τοιοῦτον, οἷον αὐτὸς ὁ πρῶτος ἡμῶν καὶ μέγας ἀρχιερεύς, καὶ θύτης καὶ θῦμα, τοῖς οἰκείοις μύσταις παρέδωκεν· αὐτοῖ τε πάλιν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται τοῦ Λόγου καὶ ὑπηρέται τῇ καθολικῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ, τῇ ἀπὸ περάτων ἕως περάτων τῆς οἰκουμένης, παρέδοσαν, πάντες μὲν τῇ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις (ὅπου καὶ ὁ θεῖος Ἰάκω[fol. 75r]βος ὁ τοῦ πρώτου καὶ μεγάλου ἀρχιερέως ἀδελφὸς, καὶ διάδοχος τὴν μυστικὴν Ἦ καὶ ἀναίμακτον<sup>95</sup> λειτουργίαν ἐξέθετο<sup>96</sup>), Πέτρος δὲ καὶ Παῦλος, τῇ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ, Παῦλος δὲ ἰδίως, καὶ πάση τῇ οἰκουμένῃ, Μάρκος δὲ, τῇ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ, Ἰωάννης καὶ Ἀνδρέας, τῇ ἐν Ἀσίᾳ τε καὶ Εὐρώπῃ, καὶ πάντες τῇ πανταχοῦ<sup>97</sup> Ἐκκλησίᾳ διὰ τῆς συγγραφείσης τῷ ἱερῷ Κλήμεντι λειτουργίας παραδεδώκασιν· ἐν ἧ ταῦτα οὕτω ῥητῶς κεῖται·<sup>98</sup>

<sup>89</sup> Cf. Joan. Damasc., *Expositio fidei* 86, in *ibid.*, p. 194. Cf. also pseudo-Samon: «Τούτοις τοῖνυν, τῷ ἄρτῳ φημί καὶ τῷ οἴνῳ καὶ ὕδατι ἡμῖν ἐθισθεῖσι συζεύξας ὁ Κύριος τὴν αὐτοῦ θεότητα, τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ ῥήματος αὐτοῦ, ἧ τὰ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι παρήγαγεν, εἰς τὸ ἴδιον αὐτοῦ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα μεταβάλλει» (PG 120, col. 829).

<sup>90</sup> Cf. Mt 26, 26-28.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. Jn 6, 51.

<sup>92</sup> Jn 6, 53.

<sup>93</sup> Lk 22, 19; 1 Cor 11, 24.

<sup>94</sup> Cf. Jn 19, 35; Ex 12, 46; Num 9, 12.

<sup>95</sup> καὶ ἀναίμακτον *mag. Paris. Suppl. gr. 143.*

<sup>96</sup> Ὁ δὲ γε θεῖος Ἰάκωβος ὁ τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων πρῶτος ἐπίσκοπος καὶ τοῦ πρώτου καὶ μεγάλου ἀρχιερέως ἀδελφὸς ὁμοῦ καὶ διάδοχος, καὶ αὐτὸς τὴν μυστικὴν ἐκτιθέμενος λειτουργίαν (*MK*, p. 428; ED1560, p. 139).

<sup>97</sup> Cf. Иващенко, *Два неизданных произведения Николая*, pp. 114-115. Cf. also the passage of Nicholas in his 4<sup>th</sup> Oration: Οὕτω καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα διήρχοντο οἱ Ἀπόστολοι εὐαγγελιζόμενοι, τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ κηρύττοντες πανταχοῦ. Εἰ δ' ὕστερον Πέτρος μὲν τὴν Ῥώμην, Ἰάκωβος δὲ τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα, Ἰωάννης τὴν Ἀσίαν, Ἀνδρέας τὴν Εὐρώπην, καὶ ἄλλος ἄλλην διεκκληρώσατο, οὐδὲ τοῦτο πρὸς τὸ μερίζεσθαι τὴν ἱεραρχίαν ἢ τῆς ἀποστολῆς τὴν ἀξίαν· ἐπεὶ καὶ μετὰ τῷ κληρωθῆναι Πέτρῳ τὴν Ῥώμην διὰ τῆς Ἀσίας ἢ τῆς Εὐρώπης παριῶν οὗτος, οὐχ ὡς ἀλλότριος Ἀπόστολος ἢ ἐπίσκοπος παρέπεμπετο, οὐδὲ σιγᾶν καὶ ἀργεῖν καὶ μὴ κηρύττειν ἢ βαπτίζειν ἢ μὴ τῷ τῆς ἱεραρχίας χρίσματι χρεῖν, εἴ που ταῦτα ποιεῖν ἐδέησεν, εἶχεν ἀνάγκην... (Oratio 4, in A. Demetrakopoulos, *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη*, I, Leipzig 1866 [repr. 1965], p. 290)

<sup>98</sup> Cf. Ταῦτα μὲν οἱ θεοὶ ἀπόστολοι διὰ τῆς συγγραφῆς τοῦ μακαρίου Κλήμεντος τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ παραδεδώκασιν. <...> Ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῇ συγγραφείσῃ διὰ Κλήμεντος λειτουργίᾳ τῶν ἱερῶν ἀποστόλων



blood. Therefore, He wished that [communion] used to happen with the more usual for [human] nature [bread and wine], connecting with them His Deity, when he said: *This is My Body* (Mt 26, 26), and: *Take, eat, and drink all of it for the remission of sins* (Mt 26, 26.27.28). And again: *the bread that I will give is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world* (Jn 6, 51); and: *if you do not eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood, you will not have life in yourself* (Jn 6, 53). *Do this in remembrance of Me* (Lk 22,19; 1 Cor 11, 24). Therefore, **we believe in Him, and thus we offer the perfect, living bread, that is, the perfect Body of Christ, which remained intact even after the Passion (for His bone was not broken) and from the divine life inseparable, as our first and great Bishop Himself, the Priest and the Sacrifice transmit. In turn, they, being the original witnesses of the Word and [His] ministers, transmitted [the rite] to the Catholic Church from the limits to the limits of the universe. Namely, all of them [transmitted the sacrament] to the Church of Jerusalem** (where, among others, the divine James, brother and successor of the first and great Bishop, expounded the mysterious and bloodless Liturgy); **Peter and Paul — to [the Church] in Antioch; separately, Paul — to the entire oikumene; Mark — to [the Church] in Alexandria; John and Andrew — to [the Church] in Asia and Europe. Thus, all [the apostles] transmitted [the rite] to the entire Church** by means of the Liturgy recorded by the holy Clement, which literally contains the following:

«Μεμνημένοι οὖν ὧν δι' ἡμᾶς ὑπέμεινεν, εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, Θεε παντοκράτορ, οὐχ ὅσον ὀφείλομεν, ἀλλ' ὅσον δυνάμεθα, καὶ τὴν διάταξιν αὐτοῦ πληροῦμεν. Ἐν ἧ γὰρ νυκτὶ παρεδίδοτο, λαβῶν ἄρτον ταῖς ἀγίαις καὶ ἀμώμοις αὐτοῦ χερσὶ, καὶ ἀναβλέψας πρὸς σέ, τὸν Θεὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ Πατέρα, καὶ κλάσας ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν<sup>99</sup> εἰπὼν· λάβετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ, φάγετε, τοῦτό [fol. 75v] ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ περὶ πολλῶν θρυπτόμενον εἰς ἄφεςιν ἀμαρτιῶν. Ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον κεράσας ἐξ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος καὶ ἀγιάσας ἐπέδωκεν ἡμῖν<sup>100</sup> λέγων· πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες, τοῦτό ἐστὶ τὸ αἷμά μου τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον, εἰς ἄφεςιν ἀμαρτιῶν· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. Μεμνημένοι τοίνυν τοῦ πάθους αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ θανάτου καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως καὶ τῆς εἰς οὐρανοῦς ἐπανόδου καὶ τῆς μελλούσης αὐτοῦ δευτέρας παρουσίας, ἐν ἧ ἔρχεται κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκροὺς καὶ ἀποδοῦναι ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, προσφέρομέν σοι, τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ Θεῷ, κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ διάταξιν τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον, καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο, εὐχαριστοῦντές σοι δι' αὐτοῦ ἐφ' οἷς κατηξίωσας ἡμᾶς ἐστάναι ἐνώπιόν σου καὶ ἱερατεύειν σοι. Καὶ ἀξιουμέν σε, ὅπως εὐμενῶς ἐπιβλέψῃς ἐπὶ τὰ [fol. 76r] προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα ἐνώπιόν σου, σὺ ὁ ἀνευθεὶς Θεός, καὶ εὐδοκήσῃς ἐπ'<sup>101</sup> αὐτοῖς εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου καὶ καταπέμψῃς τὸ ἅγιόν σου Πνεῦμα ἐπὶ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην, τὸν μάρτυρα τῶν παθημάτων τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ὅπως ἀποφήνῃ τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον, σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο, αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου».<sup>102</sup>

Καὶ πάλιν ὁ μέγας Παῦλος· Ἐγὼ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἧ παρεδίδοτο ἔλαβεν ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασε καὶ εἶπε· λάβετε, φάγετε, τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.<sup>103</sup> ὡσάκις γὰρ ἂν ἐσθίητε τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον, καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο πίνητε, τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Κυρίου καταγγέλλετε ἄχρις οὗ ἂν ἔλθῃ.<sup>104</sup> Εἰ δὲ ὑπονοεῖς τοῦτο τὸ παρ' ἡμῶν ἐπιτελούμενον ἔλαττον εἶναι ἐκείνου, οὐκ [fol. 76v] οἶδας ὅτι ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ νῦν ἐνεργεῖ, καὶ νῦν πάρεστιν· ἔσομαι γὰρ μεθ' ὑμῶν τὰς ἡμέρας ἀπάσας ἄχρι τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος,<sup>105</sup> ἐπηγγείλατο. Τοῦτο τὸ μυστήριον πάλιν ὑπερεκπληττόμενος ὁ θεῖος Ἀπόστολος,

μετὰ τὸ διηγῆσασθαι τὰ Δεσποτικά θαύματα καὶ τὰς πράξεις, ἔτι δὲ τὰ περὶ τὸ πάθος καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν καὶ τὴν εἰς οὐρανοῦς ἄνοδον, οὕτω κεῖται ῥητῶς· «Μεμνημένοι...» (MK, p. 428; ED1560, p. 139).

<sup>99</sup> ἡμῖν : τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ CA MK

<sup>100</sup> ἡμῖν : αὐτοῖς CA MK

<sup>101</sup> ἐπ' : ἐν CA

<sup>102</sup> MK, p. 427. Cf. Const. App. VIII. 12, 35-39 // CA, pp. 196-200.

<sup>103</sup> 1 Cor 11, 23-24.

<sup>104</sup> 1 Cor 11, 26.

<sup>105</sup> Cf. Mt 28, 20.

«So, remembering what He endured for us, we thank You, almighty God, not as much as we ought, but as much as we are able, and we fulfill His command. For on the night when He was betrayed, He took the bread with His holy and blameless hands and, looking up to You, His God and Father, and breaking it, gave it to us, saying: “Take of it, eat: this is My Body that is broken for many for the remission of sins”. Likewise, he also mixed the Cup of wine and water, sanctified it and gave it to us, saying: “Drink from this, all of you: this is My Blood that is shed for many for the remission of sins. Do this in remembrance of Me”. Thus, remembering His passion and Death and Resurrection and Return to heaven and His future Second Coming, in which He comes to judge the living and the dead, and to reward to each according to his works, we offer to You, the King and God, according to His commandment, this bread and this cup, giving You thanks through Him that you have deemed us worthy to stand before You and serve You as priests. And we beseech You to mercifully look down upon these gifts which are here set before You, O God who needs nothing, to accept them both in honor of Your Christ and to send down Your Holy Spirit upon this sacrifice, the witness of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus, that He may reveal this bread as the Body of Your Christ, and this cup as the Blood of Your Christ» (Const. App. VIII. 12. 35-39).

And again the great Paul [says]: *For I received from the Lord what I also delivered to you, that the Lord Jesus on the night, when He was betrayed, took bread, and, having given thanks, He broke it and said: take, eat, this is My Body, which is broken for you; do this in remembrance of Me (1 Cor 11, 24-25). For whenever you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until He comes (1 Cor 11, 26).* If you think that what we accomplish is less than what the Lord has done, then you do not know that Christ both acts now and present now. It was promised [by the Lord]: *I will be with you always to the end of the age (Mt 28, 20).* And again the divine Apostle, being amazed by this sacrament, calls to participate in it in a worthy

μετὰ φόβου Θεοῦ καὶ πίστεως ἀξίως ἡμᾶς αὐτοῦ μετέχειν παρακελεύεται, καὶ τιμωρίαν τοῦ παραβαίνοντος ἀφορίζειται· ὥστε ὃς ἂν ἐσθίῃ, λέγων, τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον, ἢ πίνη τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ Κυρίου ἀναξίως, ἔνοχος ἔσται τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Κυρίου.<sup>106</sup> Ταῦτὸν δὲ εἰπεῖν, κατὰ τὸν θεῖον Χρυσόστομον, καθάπερ παρέδωκε μὲν αὐτὸν Ἰούδας, ἐπαρώνησαν δὲ εἰς αὐτὸν Ἰουδαῖοι,<sup>107</sup> οὕτως ἀτιμάζουσιν αὐτὸν οἱ τὸ πανάγιον αὐτοῦ σῶμα ἀναξίως τῷ στόματι δεχόμενοι, καὶ ἐναγεῖ προσφέροντες σώματα. Διὸ φησι· δοκιμαζέτω ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτόν, οὐχ ἕτερος τὸν ἕτερον· τοῦτο γὰρ κρῖναι ἔστιν· [fol. 77r] ἀλλὰ πρῶτον ἕκαστος ἑαυτόν· καὶ οὕτως ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου ἐσθιέτω καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ποτηρίου πινέτω.<sup>108</sup> ὁ γὰρ ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων ἀναξίως, κρίμα ἑαυτῷ ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει, μὴ διακρίνων, τουτέστιν ἐξετάζων καὶ ἐννοῶν,<sup>109</sup> τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου<sup>110</sup> προκειμένου. **Εἰ δὲ ὁ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἔν τινι τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων παθῶν ὀλισθαίνων, καὶ προσίων ἀδιακρίτως, ὡς ἀναξίως μετέχων,<sup>111</sup> τοσαύτης ἀξιούται τῆς κατακρίσεως, ὁ περὶ αὐτὴν τὴν ἱερουργίαν ἐξαμαρτάνων<sup>112</sup> καὶ ἀμέσως αὐτὸ τὸ Κυριακὸν καθυβρίζων<sup>113</sup> σῶμα καὶ ἀπαρνούμενος,<sup>114</sup> τὴν τε παράδοσιν ἀθετῶν καὶ τὸν παραδεδωκότα καταπατῶν, τίνος ἂν εἴη καὶ πόσῳ μᾶλλον χείρονός τε καὶ μείζονος ἄξιος καὶ κατηγορίας καὶ τιμωρίας<sup>115,116</sup>**

Ἄρ' οὐ φρίκης γέμει τὰ εἰρημένα; Ἄρ' ὑπολέλειπται τις ὑπερβολὴ τῷ τῆς καινοτομίας καὶ παραβάσεως καὶ ἀθεΐας τολμήματι; [fol. 77v] Ἄλλὰ ρῦσαι, Κύριε, διὰ τοῦ ἔλεους σου τοιαύτης ἀπάτης τε καὶ παραφροσύνης πάντας τοὺς μὴ ὀρθῶς ὁμολογοῦντας τὸν ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἱερουργοῦμενον ἄρτον καὶ οἶνον σῶμα τέλειον καὶ αἷμα τίμιον εἶναι τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου.

<sup>106</sup> 1 Cor 11, 27.

<sup>107</sup> Cf. *Ioan. Chrys.*, In epistulam I ad Corinthios. 27. 5; *Idem*, In Ioan. 47. 5.

<sup>108</sup> 1 Cor 11, 28.

<sup>109</sup> Cf. *Ioan. Chrys.*, In epistulam I ad Corinthios. 28, in PG 61, col. 233: Μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου. Τουτέστι, **μὴ ἐξετάζων, μὴ ἐννοῶν**, ὡς χρῆ, τὸ μέγεθος τῶν προκειμένων, μὴ λογιζόμενος τὸν ὄγκον τῆς δωρεᾶς.

<sup>110</sup> 1 Cor 11, 29.

<sup>111</sup> μετέχων, τοσαύτης : μετέχων καταπατεῖν τε τὸν Υἱὸν Θεοῦ λέγεται καὶ τοσαύτης *DA*

<sup>112</sup> ἐξαμαρτάνων : ἀμαρτάνων *DA*

<sup>113</sup> καθυβρίζων : ἐξυβρίζων *DA*

<sup>114</sup> καὶ ἀπαρνούμενος : τῇ πρὸς τὸ ἦττον, εὐλαβοῦμαι γὰρ καὶ χεῖρον εἰπεῖν, μεταθέσει καὶ μεταπλάσει, καὶ ἀπεντεῦθεν *DA*

<sup>115</sup> καὶ κατηγορίας καὶ τιμωρίας : τιμωρίας καὶ κατηγορίας *DA*

<sup>116</sup> Cf. *Иващенко, Два неизданных произведения Николая*, p. 56.

manner with the fear of God and faith and determines the punishment for the transgressor: *Therefore, whoever eats this bread or drinks the cup of the Lord unworthily will be guilty against the Body and Blood of the Lord (1 Cor 11, 27)*. Or rather (according to the divine Chrysostom), just as Judas betrayed Him and the Jews insulted him, so those despise Him who unworthily accept His most holy Body with their mouths and foul bodies. This is why [the Apostle] says: *Let a person examine himself* — not one another, for this is condemnation, but first of all each one himself; *and so eat of the bread and drink of the cup; for anyone who eats and drinks unworthily, he eats and drinks judgment on himself without discerning* (that is, without examining or understanding) *the body of the Lord (1 Cor 28-29)* that is set before. **If, however, one who commits himself any of the human sins and proceeds without discerning to receive unworthy communion is worthy of such condemnation, then how much worse and greater blame and punishment is worthy the one who transgresses against the very service and directly insults and rejects the very Body of the Lord, denying the tradition and trampling on the One who has transmitted it?!**

Does this not inspire awe? Is there anything left that can surpass the audacity of innovation, crime and godlessness? But deliver, O Lord, by Your mercy, from such deceit and folly all those who do not correctly confess that the bread and wine which we consecrate are the perfect Body and honest Blood of Your Christ!

Ecclesiastical Institutions Research Laboratory      Mikhail Bernatsky  
St. Tikhon Orthodox University of Humanities  
Moscow, Russia

#### SUMMARY

The treatise «To those who doubt and say that the sacred bread and wine are not indeed the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ» (PG 135, coll. 509-518) by Nicholas of Methone (XII c.) first appeared in print in the well-known edition in 1560 along with the *editio princeps* of the Greek text of the Liturgy of James. Following J. Dräseke all previous scholars recognized this work as authentic and suggested that this short treatise was written in the 40s of the XII c. in connection with the Bogomil heresy. However, recently, we proved that the treatise does not belong to Nicholas and that it is another compilation and forgery of a famous copyist of Greek manuscripts and author of forged works in the XVI c. Constantine Paleocappa. Our research was based on the textual analysis of the treatise, appealing to other forgeries of Paleocappa and the original work of Nicholas — Λόγος περί τῶν πρὸς λατίνους ἀζύμων. In this paper we present a new edition of the Greek text of the treatise based on Paleocappa's autograph Paris. Suppl. gr. 143 with indication of the quotes and reminiscences. The edition perfectly illustrates the results of our research and the method of compilation of original texts by Cretan forger. An English translation is included.

