

ANDRÁS KRAFT

An annotated bibliography of John Italos (fl. 1070s)¹

The Byzantine philosopher John Italos (PBW: Ioannes 66) is a prominent figure in the intellectual history of the Christian East. His argumentative rigor and foreign temperament aroused admiration as well as envy among his contemporaries. He excelled at expounding and assessing the classical philosophical heritage. At the same time, he challenged many an established custom and etiquette among the Constantinopolitan intelligentsia. Italos' meteoric rise and sudden fall have provoked much discussion among scholars, who try to make sense of his condemnation. As a result, Italos' legacy is a contested one. This extensive bibliography aims to give a state-of-the-art overview of the scholarship on this remarkable medieval philosopher.

Italos was born around 1030 in southern Italy and arrived in Constantinople in the 1050s, where he became a disciple of Michael Psellos. He quickly gained a reputation of a gifted and adamant dialectician and was sought after by crowds of students. His fame reached as far as the imperial court; the Emperor Michael VII (r. 1071–1078) and his brother Andronikos Doukas requested the philosopher's instruction and advice. Italos succeeded Psellos in leading the imperially sponsored school of philosophy as “Consul of the philosophers” (ὑπατος τῶν φιλοσόφων) in the mid-1070s. At that time, Italos was first accused of heterodoxy, possibly due to factional rivalry. He was acquitted owing to favorable political conditions: the emperor (Michael VII) intervened and ensured that Italos would be acquitted. But the stigma of heterodoxy never left the philosopher, and in March 1082 he was put on trial again. By then political circumstances had changed, and Italos was condemned for heterodoxy by an ecclesiastical synod. Ten (plus one) anathemas were subsequently added to the *Synodikon of Orthodoxy*, a liturgical document that originally celebrated the restoration of icon veneration in the ninth century and that was updated several times starting in the second half of the eleventh century. The final anathema, which explicitly named Italos, was eventually dropped. This omission may reflect a partial

1. This work was produced within the framework of the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 101019501.

rehabilitation. In fact, there is some evidence that Italos may have served as a chartophylax (an ecclesiastical dignitary) years later. Be that as it may, he was never reinstated in his teaching position.

Scholars are divided with regard to the legacy of John Italos. Since the late nineteenth-century, when F. Uspenskiy sparked the interest in Italos by editing the *Synodikon of Orthodoxy* and highlighting the anathemas contained therein, scholars have debated the significance of Italos' condemnation. Many scholars have sought to defend Italos, arguing that it was his scientific method – and not any heretical view – that triggered suspicion among anti-intellectual (esp. monastic) groups. Accordingly, Italos is seen as a Socratic figure, whose condemnation was tantamount to the repression of humanist and enlightenment values. In contrast, some scholars, who accept the official verdict at face value, have argued that Italos was an inveterate heretic, who sought to subvert Orthodoxy with pagan doctrines.

Our most important sources of Italos' actual views are the few works that have come down to us. We have a collection of 93 aporetic chapters, entitled *Quaestiones quodlibetales*, which contains a miscellany of Italos' lectures and didactic treatises on logic, epistemology, ethics, physics, and theology. Furthermore, we have his epitomes on a variety of logical topics (*De dialectica*, *De syllogismis*, *In Aristotelis Topicorum commentaria*, *Synopses minores in Porphyrii Isagogem*) and his manual on rhetorics (*De rhetorica*). Also, we have an apologetic letter that may have been penned by Italos (*Epistula apologetica ad patriarcham*).

In addition, we have a number of (near-)contemporary accounts on Italos. Michael Psellos wrote a eulogy on him (*Oratio* 19) and addressed a letter to him (*Oratio* 18). The trial records of Italos' condemnation in 1082 as well as the anathemas, which were inserted in the *Synodikon of Orthodoxy*, give us crucial information about Italos' confession of faith and his reputed teachings. Furthermore, we have the important (and much studied) account by Anna Komnēnē, who at the end of book V of her *Alexiad* presents a vitriolic description of Italos' character and recounts his downfall. Also, the *Timarion*, a satirical play, makes mention of Italos, mocking his deficient knowledge of Greek grammar and his obstinate adherence to Christianity. Finally, Nikētas Chōniatēs in his *Treasure of the Orthodox Faith* paraphrases Komnēnē's account of Italos' life and heterodox views, supplementing it with the fantastic story how one of his (allegedly) paganizing students threw himself off a cliff and into the sea crying out loud: "Take me, Poseidon!"

This bibliography provides a comprehensive overview of the scholarship on John Italos. It is divided into two sections: section I lists Italos' works and the (near-)contemporary accounts about him. Section II surveys the scholarly literature. With regard to the latter, I strove for the objective presentation of the various scholarly views, with little to no evaluative comments. The primary sources (editions, translations, testimonies) are chronologically ordered, the secondary literature alphabetically. All known manuscript witnesses of Italos' works have been listed. The manuscript references are linked to the *Pinakes* database.² The genre of book reviews has not been systematically integrated; only the most significant reviews are mentioned below. Moreover, works that merely mention Italos but do not engage with his life or work are tacitly omitted. Although the intention is to present an exhaustive bibliography, a couple of studies may have been overlooked. I apologize for any such oversight and ask for the reader's indulgence and support. Missing titles can be supplemented in the future, as the bibliography will be periodically expanded online under: <https://synteleia.hypotheses.org/italos-bibliography>. Finally, the original spelling of Cyrillic and Greek names and titles has been retained; that is, contemporary (post-reform) orthography has not been retrojected.

Abbreviations

BA	Byzantinisches Archiv
BSGRT	Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana
CAG	Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca
CFHB	Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae
CPMA	Corpus philosophorum Medii Aevi
OCA	Orientalia christiana analecta
OLA	Orientalia Lovaniensia analecta
SC	Sources chrétiennes
<i>Qu</i>	<i>Quaestio</i> (Ioannis Itali)

2. The *Pinakes* database gives a useful but partial overview of the manuscripts that contain Italos' works: Alternative (but less complete) manuscript lists can be found under cagb-digital.de and aquinas.huma-num.fr (last accessed September 15, 2023).

Contents

I.1. Italos' oeuvre: Editions, translations, and manuscripts	12
I.2. Testimonia	19
I.2.1. Michaelis Pselli Oratio 18 (Epistula ad Langobardum)	19
I.2.2. Michaelis Pselli Oratio 19 (Laudatio Itali)	19
I.2.3. Acta iudicii Ioannis Itali	20
I.2.4. Synodicon orthodoxiae, Capita contra Italum	20
I.2.5. Timarion, §§ 43–44	22
I.2.6. Annae Comnenae Alexias, lib. V.8–9	22
I.2.7. Nicetae Choniatae Thesaurus orthodoxae fidei, lib. XXIII	22
II.1. Secondary literature	23
II.2. Encyclopedias and handbooks	67
II.3. Bibliographies	71

I.1. Italos' oeuvre: Editions, translations, and manuscripts

Quaestiones quodlibetales (Ἀπορίαι καὶ λύσεις)

Editions

BEZOBRAZOV, PAVEL [Безобразовъ, Павелъ]. “Рецензія: Θ. Успенскій, Очерки & Синодикъ” [Book review: F. Uspenskiy, Essays & Synodikon]. *Византийскій временникъ* 3 (1896): 125–150, at 128–131.

[Partial transcriptions of *Qu* 7, *Qu* 36, *Qu* 50, *Qu* 71]

SERETELI, GREGORIUS. *Ioannis Itali opuscula selecta, Vol. 1*. Tbilisi: Typis et impensis Universitatis Tphilisiensis, 1924, 29–33.

[*Qu* 43, *Qu* 86]

SERETELI, GREGORIUS. *Ioannis Itali opuscula selecta, Vol. 2*. Tbilisi: Typis et impensis Universitatis Tphilisiensis, 1926, 47–76.

[*Qu* 71, *Qu* 77, *Qu* 50, *Qu* 51, *Qu* 36]

JOANNOU, PERIKLES. *Ioannes Italos. Quaestiones quodlibetales (Ἀπορίαι καὶ λύσεις)*. *Studia patristica et byzantina* 4. Ettal: Buch-Kunstverlag, 1956.

[Critical edition]

KECHAGMADZE, NATELA. *Ioannis Itali opera*. Tbilisi: Metsniereba, 1966, 49–234.

[Critical edition]

O'MEARA, DOMINIC J. *Michaelis Pselli philosophica minora. Vol. 2: opuscula psychologica, theologica, daemonologica*. BSGRT. Leipzig: Teubner, 1989, 103–104.

[Edition of *Qu* 86]

KRAFT, ANDRÁS, and ISTVÁN PERCZEL. “John Italos on the eternity of the world.” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 111/3 (2018): 659–720, at 674–681.

[Critical edition of *Qu* 71]

Translations

MARR, НИКО [Марръ, Нико]. “Іоаннь Петрицскій, грузинскій неоплатоникъ XI–XII вѣка” [John Petritsi, Georgian Neoplatonist of the XI–XII centuries]. *Записки восточнаго отдѣленія Императорскаго*

Русского Археологического Общества 19 (1909): 53–113, at 108.
[Partial Russian translation of *Qu* 64]

KECHAGMADZE, NATELA. *Ioane It' alosis shemokmedeba* [*The works of John Italos*]. Tbilisi: Metsniereba, 1970, 153–157.
[Russian translation of *Qu* 64]

SHCHUKIN, TIMUR [Щукин, Тимур]. “Иоанн Итал” [John Italos]. In *Антология восточно-христианской богословской мысли. Ортодоксия и гетеродоксия* [*Anthology of Eastern Christian theological thought. Orthodoxy and heterodoxy*], Vol. 2. Edited by Grigoriy I. Benevich and Dmitriy S. Biryukov, 321–340 [334–338]. Moscow: Никея, 2009.
[Russian translation of *Qu* 67 (in part) and *Qu* 69]

SHCHUKIN, TIMUR [Щукин, Тимур]. “Эсхатология Иоанна Итала” [The Eschatology of John Italos]. *Вестник русской христианской гуманитарной академии* 11/4 (2010): 116–120, at 119–120.
[Partial Russian translation of *Qu* 71 and *Qu* 86]

SINIOSSOGLOU, NIKETAS. *Radical Platonism in Byzantium: illumination and utopia in Gemistos Plethon*. Cambridge classical studies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011, 82.
[Partial English translation of *Qu* 68]

MARIEV, SERGEI. “Neoplatonic philosophy in Byzantium.” In *Byzantine perspectives on Neoplatonism*. BA – Series Philosophica 1. Edited by Sergei Mariev, 1–29 [at 10–11]. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2017.
[English translation of *Qu* 89]

KRAFT, ANDRÁS, and ISTVÁN PERCZEL. “John Italos on the eternity of the world.” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 111/3 (2018): 659–720, at 681–690. [English translation of *Qu* 71]

Manuscripts

- Ambrosianus A 80 sup. (MARTINI-BASSI 17), s. XV^{EX}, fols 260v–261v³
- Ambrosianus Q 13 sup. (MARTINI-BASSI 667), s. XV, fols 141r–152r⁴
- Berolinensis Phillipps 1558 (154), s. XVI, fols 62v–77v⁵
- Escorialensis gr. X-I-11 (ANDRÉS 353), s. XVI^{MED}, fols 80r–192r, 256v–263v⁶

3. *Qu* 27a, *Qu* 28 (in part).

4. *Qu* 27a, *Qu* 28, *Qu* 45, *Qu* 87, *Qu* 28.

5. *Qu* 27a, *Qu* 28, *Qu* 45, *Qu* 55 (in part).

6. Fols 256v–262r contain *Qu* 88, and fols 262r–263v contain a table of contents of the

- Marcianus gr. Z.265 (coll. 516), s. XIII^{IN}, fols 1r–124v, 193v–200v⁷
- Matritensis 4754, c. ann. 1550, fols 44r–150v
- Monacensis gr. 99, c. ann. 1550, fols 279r–385v
- Oxoniensis Aedis Christi 46, s. XVI, fol. 31r⁸
- Parisinus gr. 1843, s. XIII/XIV, fols 62r–67r⁹
- Parisinus gr. 2002, ann. 1620, fols 1r–364r
- Vaticanus Barb. gr. 296, s. XV, fols 32v–44r¹⁰
- Vaticanus gr. 316, s. XIII, fols 1r–85r, 145v–149v¹¹
- Vaticanus gr. 1457, s. XVI^{MED}, fols 1r–176v
- Vaticanus gr. 1735, s. XVI, fols 207r–211v¹²
- Vaticanus gr. 2220, ann. 1304/05, fol. 37v¹³
- Vindobonensis phil. gr. 203, s. XV¹, fols 1r–147r

In Aristotelis Topicorum libros II–IV commentaria (Ἔκδοσις εἰς τὸ β', γ', δ' τῶν Τοπικῶν)

Editions

WALLIES, MAX. *Die griechischen Ausleger der aristotelischen Topik*. Berlin: R. Gaertner, 1891, 24–27.

[Partial edition from Vindob. phil. gr. 203]

KECHAGMADZE, NATELA. *Ioannis Itali opera*. Tbilisi: Metsniereba, 1966, 42–48.

[Partial edition]

KOTZABASSI, SOFIA. *Byzantinische Kommentatoren der aristotelischen Topik. Ioannes Italos & Leon Magentinos*. Εταιρεία Βυζαντινῶν Ερευνῶν 17. Thessaloniki: Εκδόσεις Βάνιας, 1999, 63–108.

[Critical edition]

Quaestiones quodlibetales.

7. Fols 193v–199v contain *Qu* 88, and fols 199v–200v contain a table of contents of the *Quaestiones quodlibetales*.

8. Excerpt from *Qu* 6 (introduced with the title of *Qu* 5).

9. *Qu* 27a, *Qu* 28, *Qu* 45, *Qu* 55, *Qu* 87, *Qu* 28.

10. *Qu* 88.

11. Fols 145v–149v contain *Qu* 88.

12. *Qu* 29, *Qu* 29a, *Qu* 5, *Qu* 3, *Qu* 4, *Qu* 1, *Qu* 2, *Qu* 29a (continued).

13. *Qu* 86 (The text appears among Michael Psellos' works).

Manuscripts

- Escorialensis gr. X-I-11 (ANDRÉS 353), s. XVI^{MED}, fols 193r–232r
- Marcianus gr. Z.265 (coll. 516), s. XIII^{IN}, fols 125r–165v
- Matritensis 4754, c. ann. 1550, fols 1r–37v
- Monacensis gr. 99, c. ann. 1550, fols 386r–422v
- Parisinus gr. 2002, ann. 1620, fols 364v–500r
- Vaticanus gr. 316, s. XIII, fols 85r–125r
- Vaticanus gr. 1457, s. XVI^{MED}, fols 177r–234r
- Vindobonensis phil. gr. 15, s. XVI, fols 9r–48v
- Vindobonensis phil. gr. 203, s. XVI, fols 147v–198v

De dialectica (Μέθοδος συνοπτική τῆς διαλεκτικῆς)

Editions

WAITZ, THEODOR. *Aristotelis Organon graece*. Leipzig: Hahn, 1844, 18–19.

[Partial edition from Marc. gr. Z.265 and Marc. gr. Z.519]

USPENSKIY, FEODOR [Успенский, Феодоръ]. *Образование второго Болгарскаго царства* [*The formation of the Second Bulgarian Empire*]. Odessa: Типографія Г. Ульриха, 1879, 9–10.

[Transcription and Russian translation of the initial section, based on cod. Vat. gr. 316]

CERETELI, GREGORIUS. *Ioannis Itali opuscula selecta, Vol. 1*. Tbilisi: Typis et impensis Universitatis Tphilisiensis, 1924, 1–28.

[Critical edition]

KECHAGMADZE, NATELA. *Ioannis Itali opera*. Tbilisi: Metsniereba, 1966, 1–16.

[Critical edition]

Manuscripts

- Escorialensis gr. X-I-11 (ANDRÉS 353), s. XVI^{MED}, fols 232r–241r
- Laurentianus plut. 71.32, s. XIV, fols 74r–79r
- Marcianus gr. XI.22 (coll. 1235), s. XIII^{EX}, fols 183r–185v
- Marcianus gr. Z.265 (coll. 516), s. XIII^{IN}, fols 166r–176v
- Marcianus gr. Z.519 (coll. 773), s. XV^{MED}, fols 56r–69v
- Matritensis 4754, c. ann. 1550, fols 150v–159r
- Matritensis 4832, c. ann. 1775, fols 423r–507v

- Monacensis gr. 99, c. ann. 1550, fols 423r–431r
- Parisinus gr. 2002, ann. 1620, fols 500v–532r
- Parisinus suppl. gr. 655, s. XIV, fols 85v–88v
- Vaticanus gr. 316, s. XIII, fols 125r–134v
- Vaticanus gr. 1457, s. XVI^{MED}, fols 234r–247r
- Vindobonensis phil. gr. 203, s. XV1, fols 198v–210v

De syllogismis (Ἐκδοσις περὶ τῆς τῶν συλλογισμῶν ὕλης)

Editions

CERETELI, GREGORIUS. *Ioannis Itali opuscula selecta, Vol. 2*. Tbilisi: Typis et impensis Universitatis Tphilisiensis, 1926, 1–32.
[Critical edition]

KECHAGMADZE, NATELA. *Ioannis Itali opera*. Tbilisi: Metsniereba, 1966, 16–34.
[Critical edition]

Manuscripts

- Escorialensis gr. X-I-11 (ANDRÉS 353), s. XVI^{MED}, fols 241r–251r
- Laurentianus plut. 71.32, s. XIV, fols 79r–84r
- Marcianus gr. XI.22 (coll. 1235), s. XIII^{EX}, fols 185v–188v
- Marcianus gr. Z.265 (coll. 516), s. XIII^{IN}, fols 177r–187r
- Marcianus gr. Z.519 (coll. 773), s. XV^{MED}, fols 69v–85r
- Matritensis 4754, c. ann. 1550, fols 159r–168r
- Monacensis gr. 99, c. ann. 1550, fols 431v–440v
- Parisinus gr. 2002, ann. 1620, fols 532r–566v
- Parisinus suppl. gr. 655, s. XIV, fols 88v–92r
- Vaticanus gr. 316, s. XIII, fols 134v–141v
- Vaticanus gr. 1457, s. XVI^{MED}, fols 247r–261v
- Vindobonensis phil. gr. 203, s. XV1, fols 211r–224r

De rhetorica (Μέθοδος ῥητορικῆ ἐκδοθεῖσα κατὰ σύνοψιν)

Editions

CERETELI, GREGORIUS. *Ioannis Itali opuscula selecta, Vol. 2*. Tbilisi: Typis et impensis Universitatis Tphilisiensis, 1926, 33–46.
[Critical edition]

KECHAGMADZE, NATELA. *Ioannis Itali opera*. Tbilisi: Metsniereba, 1966, 35–42.

[Critical edition]

CONLEY, THOMAS M. “John Italos’ Methodos Rhetorikê: text and commentary.” *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine studies* 44 (2004): 411–437.

[Reproduction of CERETELI’s edition with extensive commentary]

Manuscripts

- Escorialensis gr. X-I-11 (ANDRÉS 353), s. XVI^{MED}, fols 251r–256v
- Marcianus gr. Z.265 (coll. 516), s. XIII^{IN}, fols 187r–193v
- Matritensis 4754, c. ann. 1550, fols 38r–43r
- Matritensis 4832, c. ann. 1775, fols 365r–418v
- Monacensis gr. 99, c. ann. 1550, fols 440v–446r
- Parisinus gr. 2002, ann. 1620, fols 566v–585v
- Vaticanus gr. 316, s. XIII, fols 141v–145v
- Vaticanus gr. 1457, s. XVI^{MED}, fols 261v–269v
- Vindobonensis phil. gr. 203, s. XV1, fols 224r–232r

Scholia in Dionysium Areopagitam (Ἰωάννου φιλοσόφου τοῦ Ἰταλοῦ σχόλια)

Edition & translations

RIGO, ANTONIO. “Giovanni Italos commentatore della Gerarchia celeste dello Pseudo-Dionigi l’Areopagita.” *Néa Póμη* 3 (2006): 223–232, at 226–227, 229–232.

[Partial Italian translation and edition]

SHCHUKIN, TIMUR [Щукин, Тимур]. “Иоанн Итал” [John Italos]. In *Антология восточно-христианской богословской мысли. Ортодоксия и гетеродоксия* [Anthology of Eastern Christian theological thought. Orthodoxy and heterodoxy], Vol. 2. Edited by Grigoriy I. Benevich and Dmitriy S. Biryukov, 321–340 [338–340]. Moscow: Никея, 2009.

[Russian translation]

Manuscript

- Laurentianus plut. 5.13, s. XI, fols 8r–9r, 10r–v

Synopses minores in Porphyrii Isagogem (Συνοψεις τῶν ε΄ φωνῶν)

Editions

NIARCHOS, CONSTANTINE G. “God, the world and man in the philosophy of John Italos.” PhD diss., University of Oxford, 1978, appendix.
[Edition from Escorialensis Ω.IV.14]

ROMANO, ROBERTO. “Un opuscolo inedito di Giovanni Italo.” *Bollettino dei classici*, ser. III, 13 (1992): 14–24.
[Edition from Escorialensis Ω.IV.14]

ROMANO, ROBERTO. “Nuove testimonianze sul Traghelaphos in Giovanni Italo.” In *Σύνδεσμος. Studi in onore di Rosario Anastasi, Vol. 2*, 339–342 [at 340–341]. Catania: Università di Catania, 1994.
[Partial transcription from Escorialensis Ω.IV.14]

Manuscripts

- Escorialensis Ω.IV.14 (ANDRÉS 566), s. XIV^{MED}, fols 37v–43v, 61v–64v
- Monacensis gr. 99, c. ann. 1550, fol. 77v¹⁴
- Oxoniensis Aedis Christi 46, s. XVI, fol. 32v¹⁵

Epistula apologetica ad patriarcham (Επιστολή ἀπολογητική πρὸς ἀρχιερέα)

Editions & translations

KECHAGMADZE, NATELA. *Ioannis Itali opera*. Tbilisi: Metsniereba, 1966, 234–236.
[Edition with Russian translation]

CLUCAS, LOWELL. *The trial of John Italos and the crisis of intellectual values in Byzantium in the eleventh century*. *Miscellanea byzantina Monacensia* 26. Munich: Institut für Byzantinistik, 1981, 65–66, 216–217.
[English translation and reproduction of KECHAGMADZE’s edition]

GOUILLARD, JEAN. “Une lettre de (Jean) l’Italien au patriarche de Constantinople?” *Travaux et mémoires* 9 (1985): 175–179.
[Edition with French translation]

14. Excerpt (ed. ROMANO 1992, 22, ll. 133–139).

15. Excerpt (ed. ROMANO 1992, 23, ll. 1–17).

Manuscript

- Berolinensis Phillipps 1611 (208), s. XV, fol. 11r

I.2. Testimonia

I.2.1. Michaelis Pselli Oratio 18 (Epistula ad Langobardum)

BOISSONADE, JEAN F. *Ψελλός. Michael Psellus: De operatione daemonum cum notis Gaulmini*. Nuremberg: Campe, 1838, 164–169.

[Edition]

LITTLEWOOD, ANTONY R. *Michaelis Pselli oratoria minora*. BSGRT. Leipzig: Teubner, 1985, 65–69.

[Critical edition]

MOORE, PAUL. *Iter Psellianum. A detailed listing of manuscript sources for all works attributed to Michael Psellos, including a comprehensive bibliography*. *Subsidia mediaevalia* 26. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2005, 347.

[Bibliography]

I.2.2. Michaelis Pselli Oratio 19 (Laudatio Itali)

KURTZ, EDUARD, and FRANZ DREXL. *Michaelis Pselli scripta minora, Vol. 1. Orationes et dissertationes*. *Orbis Romanus* 5. Milan: Società editrice “Vita e pensiero”, 1936, 50–54. [Edition]

LITTLEWOOD, ANTONY R. *Michaelis Pselli oratoria minora*. BSGRT. Leipzig: Teubner, 1985, 69–72.

[Critical edition]

WILSON, NIGEL G. *Scholars of Byzantium*. Revised edition. London: Duckworth, 1996, 155–156.

[Partial English translation]

MOORE, PAUL. *Iter Psellianum. A detailed listing of manuscript sources for all works attributed to Michael Psellos, including a comprehensive bibliography*. *Subsidia mediaevalia* 26. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2005, 347–348.

[Bibliography]

I.2.3. Acta iudicii Ioannis Itali

USPENSKIY, FEODOR [Успенский, Феодоръ]. “Дѣлопроизводство по обвиненію Іоанна Итала въ ереси” [Proceedings of the heresy charges against John Italos]. *Извѣстія Русскаго Археологическаго Института въ Константинополѣ* 2 (1897): 1–66.

[Edition with Russian translation]

GOUILLARD, JEAN. “Le procès officiel de Jean l’Italien: les actes et leurs sous-entendus.” *Travaux et mémoires* 9 (1985): 133–174.

[Critical edition with French translation]

GRUMEL, VENANCE, and JEAN DARROUZÈS. *Les registes des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople, Vol. 1. Les actes des patriarches. Fasc. II et III. Les registes de 715 à 1206. Le patriarcat byzantin 1.* Second edition. Paris: Institut français d’études byzantines, 1989, 392 [no. 907], 400–403 [no. 923–927].

[Synopsis with bibliography]

DÖLGER, FRANZ, and PETER WIRTH. *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches von 565–1453, Vol. 2: Regesten von 1025–1204.* Corpus der griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der neueren Zeit. Reihe A: Regesten. Abt. 1. Second edition. Munich: Beck, 1995, 92–93 [no. 1078–1079].

[Synopsis with bibliography]

MINCIN, ELISABETH C. “Curing the common soul: rethinking Byzantine heresy through the literary motif of disease (11th–12th centuries).”

PhD diss., University of St Andrews, 2015, 253–265.

[English translation]

I.2.4. Synodicon orthodoxiae, Capita contra Italum

USPENSKIY, FEODOR [Успенский, Феодоръ]. *Образование втораго Болгарскаго царства* [The formation of the Second Bulgarian Empire]. Odessa: Типографія Г. Ульриха, 1879, 1–5.

[Transcription from cod. Casanatense 334 (olim G.IV.14) with Russian translation]

USPENSKIY, FEODOR [Успенский, Феодоръ]. *Синодикъ въ Недѣлю Православія. Сводный текстъ съ приложеніями* [The Synodikon of the Sunday of Orthodoxy. Summary with appendices]. Odessa: Типо-

- графія Одесскаго Военнаго Округа, 1893, 14–18.
[Edition with Russian translation]
- ΕCONOMOS, LYSIMAQUE. *La vie religieuse dans l'empire byzantin au temps des Comnènes et des Anges*. Paris: E. Leroux, 1918, 25–28.
[French translation]
- STÉPHANOÛ, PELOPIDAS ÉTIENNE. *Jean Italos: philosophe et humaniste*. OCA 134. Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1949, 46–49.
[French translation]
- GOUILLARD, JEAN. “Le Synodikon de l’orthodoxie, édition et commentaire.” *Travaux et mémoires* 2 (1967): 1–316, at 56–61.
[Critical edition with French translation]
- CLUCAS, LOWELL. *The trial of John Italos and the crisis of intellectual values in Byzantium in the eleventh century*. *Miscellanea byzantina Monacensia* 26. Munich: Institut für Byzantinistik, 1981, 140–161.
[English translation]
- WILSON, NIGEL G. *Scholars of Byzantium*. Revised edition. London: Duckworth, 1996, 154.
[Partial English translation]
- AGAPITOS, PANAGIOTIS A. “Teachers, pupils, and imperial power in eleventh-century Byzantium.” In *Pedagogy and power: rhetorics of classical learning*. Edited by Yun Lee Too and Niall Livingstone, 170–191 [at 187]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
[Partial English translation]
- CONTICELLO, CARMELO G., and VASSA KONTOUMA-CONTICELLO. “Philosophie et théologie à Byzance.” In *Philosophie et théologie au Moyen Âge. Anthologie, Vol. 2*. Edited by Philippe Capelle-Dumont and Olivier Boulnois, 43–61 [at 56–57]. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2009.
[Partial French translation]
- WESSEL, KLAUS. “Dogma und Lehre in der orthodoxen Kirche von Byzanz.” In *Die christlichen Lehrentwicklungen bis zum Ende des Spätmittelalters*. Edited by Carl Andresen, Ekkehard Mühlberg, Adolf M. Ritter, et al., 289–410 [at 341–343]. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.
[Partial German translation]

I.2.5. Timarion, §§ 43–44

ROMANO, ROBERTO. *Pseudo-Luciano, Timarione: testo critico, introduzione, traduzione, commentario e lessico*. Byzantina et Neo-Hellenica Neapolitana 2. Naples: Università di Napoli, 1974, 88–89, 117–118.
[Edition and Italian translation]

BALDWIN, BARRY. *Timarion*. Byzantine texts in translation. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1984, 72–74.
[English translation]

I.2.6. Annae Comnenae Alexias, lib. V.8–9

LEIB, BERNARD. *Anne Comnène: Alexiade. Règne de l'empereur Alexis I Comnène, 1081–1118. Vol. 2 (Livre V–X)*. Second edition. Paris: Belles Lettres, 1967, 32–40.
[Edition with French translation]

REINSCH, DIETHER R., and ATHANASIOS KAMBYLIS. *Annae Comnenae Alexias. Vol. 1*. CFHB 40/1. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001, 161–167.
[Critical edition]

REINSCH, DIETHER R. *Anna Komnene, Alexias*. Second edition. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001, 185–193.
[German translation]

SEWTER, EDGAR R.A., and PETER FRANKOPAN. *Anna Komnene. The Alexiad*. Penguin Classics. London: Penguin, 2009, 146–152.
[English translation]

I.2.7. Nicetae Choniatae Thesaurus orthodoxae fidei, lib. XXIII

TAFEL, GOTTLIEB L. F. *Annae Comnenae supplementa, historiam ecclesiasticam Graecorum seculi XI et XII spectantia*. Tübingen: Hopfer de l'Orme, 1832, 1–3.
[Edition with Latin translation]

USPENSKIY, FEODOR [Успенский, Феодоръ]. “Богословское и философское движение въ Византіи XI и XII вѣковъ” [The theological and philosophical movement in Byzantium during the XI and XII centuries]. *Журналъ Министерства народнаго просвѣщенія* 277 (1891): 102–159, 283–324, at 111–112.
[Russian translation]

II.1. Secondary literature

AGAPITOS, PANAGIOTIS A. “Teachers, pupils, and imperial power in eleventh-century Byzantium.” In *Pedagogy and power: rhetorics of classical learning*. Edited by Yun Lee Too and Niall Livingstone, 170–191. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

[The study discusses John Mauropous’ intellectual circle, the attacks against it, and the significance of the cult of the Three Hierarchs. AGAPITOS presents Italos’ condemnation as an attempt by Emperor Alexios Komnēnos to suppress a potentially dangerous intellectual movement and to present himself as the protector of the Church. He assumes – based on *Alexiad* V.9.7 – that the personal ban on Italos was eventually lifted (pp. 184–187).]

ALEXAKIS, ALEXANDER. “Was there life beyond the life beyond? Byzantine ideas on reincarnation and final restoration.” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 55 (2001): 155–177.

[The article studies the origins and prominent adherents of the doctrine of metempsychosis (the transmigration of souls). The third anathema against Italos is mentioned, which accuses the philosopher of having taught this doctrine. ALEXAKIS argues that the anathema is self-contradictory and, thus, cannot reflect Italos’ actual view (p. 172).]

ANASTASI, ROSARIO. “Psello e Giovanni Italo.” *Siculorum Gymnasium* 28/2 (1975): 525–538.

[The author argues that Psellos’ *Eulogy of Italos* and his *Letter to John the Lombard* were both addressed to John Italos. Furthermore, he argues that the accusations leveled against Italos originated in Psellos’ school.]

ANGELOU, ATHANASIOS D. *Nicholas of Methone: Refutation of Proclus’ Elements of Theology*. CPMA, Philosophi byzantini 1. Leiden: Brill, 1984.

[In the introduction to this critical edition, Angelou points out that Nicholas of Methōnē’s *Refutation* (*Ἀνάπρωξις*) was directed against the tradition of Psellos, Italos, and Eustratios. ANGELOU discusses the intellectual background of the work and refers sporadically to Italos (pp. liii–lxiv).]

ANGOLD, MICHAEL. *Church and society in Byzantium under the Comneni, 1081–1261*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

[The author discusses Italos’ trial and its context during the early reign of Alexios Komnēnos (pp. 50–54). He holds that Alexios shared monastic sensitivities that disagreed with Italos’ humanist attitude. He reconstructs Italos’

trial of 1082 and observes that it marked the beginning of the cooperation between emperor and patriarchal clergy.]

ARABATZĒS, GEŌRGIOS [Αραμπατζής, Γεώργιος]. “Βοιωτούς ονομάζεις”. Σημειώσεις για την πολιτική φιλοσοφία της Άννας Κομνηνής.” *Βυζαντικά* 21 (2001): 121–132.

[This study of the *Alexiad* briefly contrasts Anna Komnēnē’s caustic description of Italos (pp. 123, 125) (i.e., Italos’ uncouth language and manners) with her favorable characterization of Emperor Alexios and Eustratios of Nicaea.]

ARABATZIS, GEORGES. “Blâme du philosophe, éloge de la vraie philosophie et figures rhétoriques: le récit d’Anne Comnène sur Jean Italos revisité.” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 95/2 (2002): 403–415.

[The author shows that Anna Komnēnē’s portrayal of Italos is a rhetorical construction that aims at presenting Italos as the absolute contrast to Emperor Alexios, who is characterized as the realization of the Byzantine ideal type, personifying eloquence, self-control, physical beauty, orthodoxy, and piety.]

ARABATZĒS, GEŌRGIOS [Αραμπατζής, Γεώργιος]. *Παιδεία και επιστήμη στον Μιχαήλ Εφέσιο. Εις περί ζώων μορίων Α 1,3–2,10*. Athens: Ακαδημία Αθηνών, 2006.

[The book contains a few intermittent references to Anna Komnēnē’s hostile attitude towards Italos (pp. 14, 24, 29, 31, 91, 93).]

ARABATZĒS, GEŌRGIOS [Αραμπατζής, Γεώργιος]. *Βυζαντινή φιλοσοφία και εικονολογία*. Athens: Ινστιτούτο του βιβλίου – Α. Καρδαμίτσα, 2012.

[The author remarks that the precise context of Italos’ trial is still debated (pp. 162–164). Some scholars see in Italos a freethinker even though the *Timarion* presents him as a die-hard Christian. Italos was accused of holding Neoplatonic views although he commented much on Aristotle. It is noted that a comprehensive study of Italos’ philosophy has not yet been produced.]

ATANASOVA, MARIA. “Être ‘hérétique’ à Byzance à l’époque des Comnènes.” *Revue belge de philologie et d’histoire* 87 (2009): 533–543.

[The article surveys the terms that were used to denote heresy in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The author observes that Italos was not called a heretic but a heterodox. Heterodoxy signified a different way of thinking, which was not necessarily based on a deliberate decision. In contrast, heretics were seen to choose voluntarily their erroneous views.]

BARANOV, VLADIMIR. “The iconophile fathers.” In *The Wiley Blackwell companion to patristics*. The Wiley Blackwell companions to religion.

Edited by Ken Parry, 338–352. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2015. [The study includes a brief discussion of Italos’ Platonizing view of icon theology (p. 346).]

BARBER, CHARLES. *Contesting the logic of painting: art and understanding in eleventh-century Byzantium*. Visualising the Middle Ages 2. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

[The monograph includes a review of Italos’ trial with quotes from the trial dossier and the *Synodikon* anathemas (pp. 117–127). The author focuses on the charge of Italos’ alleged iconoclasm. He provides a translation of *Qu* 87, in which Italos paraphrases John of Damascus concerning the different meanings of images. There is no indication that Italos professed an iconoclastic attitude. BARBER suggests that the charge arose in connection with Italos’ profession of faith (contained in the trial dossier), which he had borrowed from Psellos.]

BECK, HILDEBRAND. *Vorsehung und Vorherbestimmung in der theologischen Literatur der Byzantiner*. OCA 114. Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1937.

[Italos’ trial is briefly discussed on pp. 93–94. Most notably, BECK observes that there is no need to see a contradiction between anathema 3 and 9, as is often assumed: Italos subscribed to the resurrection of the body and the last judgment but considered these events to be merely transitional stages in the afterlife, which are followed by the ultimate dissolution of the individual.]

BENAKIS, LINOS G. “The problem of general concepts in Neoplatonism and Byzantine thought.” In *Neoplatonism and Christian thought. Studies in Neoplatonism: ancient and modern 3*. Edited by Dominic J. O’Meara, 75–86, 248–249. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1982.

[The study shows that Byzantine philosophers followed the Alexandrian tradition in assuming three modes of existence for universals (i.e., πρὸ τῶν πολλῶν, ἐν τοῖς πολλοῖς, ἐπὶ τοῖς πολλοῖς). Universals in our mind (ἐπὶ τοῖς πολλοῖς) derive from the apprehension of common characteristics in the particulars, which denotes a (moderate) conceptual realism. Italos, too, is said to have subscribed to this view (p. 85).]

BENAKIS, LINOS G. “Commentaries and commentators on the logical works of Aristotle in Byzantium.” In *Gedankenzeichen. Festschrift für Klaus Oehler zum 60. Geburtstag*. Edited by Regina Claussen and Roland Daube-Schackat, 3–12. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag, 1988.

[Italos’ works are listed on pp. 5–6.]

- BENAKIS, LINOS G. *Michael Psellos: Kommentar zur Physik des Aristoteles. Editio princeps. Einleitung, Text, Indices.* CPMA, Commentaria in Aristotelem byzantina 5. Athens: Ακαδημία Αθηνών, 2008.
[BENAKIS notes in the introduction (pp. 61*–62*) that Italos – in his *Qu* 91 – does not refer to the *Commentary of the Physics*, which BENAKIS attributes to Psellos. He speculates that Italos may have written his *Qu* 91 beforehand.]
- BENAKIS, LINOS G. “Aristotelian ethics in Byzantium.” In *Medieval Greek commentaries on the Nicomachean Ethics.* Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 101. Edited by Charles Barber and David Jenkins, 63–69. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
[The study mentions Italos’ treatment of ethical virtue in the *Quaestiones quodlibetales* (p. 68)]
- BEZOBRAZOV, PAVEL [Безобразовъ, Павелъ]. “Рецензія: Θ. Успенскій, Очерки & Синодикъ” [Book review: F. Uspenskiy, Essays & Synodikon]. *Византійскій временникъ* 3 (1896): 125–150.
[The article reviews, among others, USPENSKIY’s work on John Italos (pp. 126–132). BEZOBRAZOV criticizes USPENSKIY’s approach to evaluate Italos’ teachings solely on the basis of hostile sources and calls for an investigation of Italos’ own writings. He transcribes and discusses passages from Psellos’ *Eulogy of Italos* and from Italos’ *Qu* 7, *Qu* 36, *Qu* 50, *Qu* 71, which give a different picture of Italos’ teachings than the anathemas. BEZOBRAZOV emphasizes the Aristotelian elements in Italos.]
- BIRIUKOV, DMITRY. “Nicholas of Methone and his polemics against Proclus in the context of the early Byzantine theological and philosophical thought.” In *Saint Emperor Constantine and Christianity, 2 vols.* Edited by Dragiša Bojović, II, 181–187. Niš: Centre of Church Studies, 2013.
[BIRIUKOV argues that Nicholas of Methōnē diverted from traditional views regarding causal hierarchy and universals in order to refute Proklos. In particular, he diverted from the traditional theory of conceptual realism (to which, among others, Italos and Eustratios subscribed) so as to preclude the co-eternity of created beings with God, which had been condemned in the fourth anathema against Italos.]
- BRISSON, LUC. “Pléthon et les Oracles Chaldaïques.” In *Philosophie et sciences à Byzance de 1204 à 1453. Les textes, les doctrines et leur transmission. Actes de la table ronde organisée au XXe Congrès International d’Études Byzantines (Paris, 2001).* OLA 146. Edited by

Michel Cacours and Marie-Hélène Congourdeau, 127–142. Leuven: Peeters, 2006.

[The author refers in passing to Italos' trial and speculates that numerous books may have been burned following his condemnation in 1082, including Proklos' (now lost) *Commentary on the Chaldaean Oracles* (pp. 134–135).]

BROWNING, ROBERT. “Enlightenment and repression in Byzantium in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.” *Past & Present* 69 (1975): 3–23.

[This seminal study discusses changes in Byzantine higher education with a focus on the Komnēnian period. BROWNING holds that Italos was condemned for political reasons and claims that his condemnation “mark[ed] the beginning of the emasculation of Byzantine culture” (p. 15).]

BROWNING, ROBERT. *Church, state, and learning in twelfth century Byzantium*. London: Dr Williams's Trust, 1981. [Reprint in: Idem. *History, language and literacy in the Byzantine world*. Collected studies series 299. Northampton: Variorum, 1989, no. VI]

[BROWNING reiterates his conviction that the condemnation of Italos “had political overtones” (p. 14).]

BRYANTSEV, DIMITRIY [Брянцевъ, Димитрій]. “Юаннь Италъ и его философско-богословскія воззрѣнія, осужденныя Церковью” [John Italos and his philosophical-theological views, condemned by the Church]. *Вѣра и разумъ* 7 (1904): 243–272; 8 (1904): 305–336; 10 (1904): 402–422; 11 (1904): 435–452; 19 (1904): 231–246; 20 (1904): 255–276; 21 (1904): 293–304; 22 (1904): 305–324; 23 (1904): 337–357; 24 (1904): 371–381.

[This series of studies discusses Italos' life, the chronology of his trials, the anathemas, and his confession of faith. As Italos' texts had not been edited yet, the author had to rely on testimonies: the *Alexiad*, the *Synodikon* anathemas, and the trial records. Italos is seen as a Neoplatonist who held some of the heretical views he was accused of. Among others, it is argued that he taught the deification of Christ's human nature, which is reflected in his idiosyncratic attitude towards icons (Italos is recorded to have held that one ought to worship (λατρεύειν) Christ's icon and not merely to venerate it).]

BUCKLER, GEORGINA. *Anna Comnena. A study*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929.

[The monograph contains a discussion of the different accounts of Italos' condemnation (pp. 319–324). BUCKLER observes that Anna Komnēnē's account roughly corresponds to the *Synodikon* anathemas but significantly differs from

the trial records. She proposes that the trial records report on a first trial, which took place in 1082, while Anna Komnēnē and the *Synodikon* summarize a second trial, which occurred “a year or more later” (p. 323).]

BUCKLEY, PENELOPE. *The Alexiad of Anna Komnene: artistic strategy in the making of a myth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

[In her close study of the *Alexiad*, BUCKLEY points out that Anna Komnēnē’s description of Italos is an inversion of her portrayal of Alexios (pp. 125–129). Italos is presented as an uncouth foreigner and traitor, as a subversive heretic and a short-tempered man, who could not control himself. His lack of self-control and his heretical views are said to have destabilized the state and to have generated social disorder. Komnēnē asserts that Alexios restored social order by condemning Italos’ errors and by reestablishing the proper balance between Holy Scripture and Hellenic culture.]

BYDÉN, BÖRJE. “‘No prince of perfection’: Byzantine anti-Aristotelianism from the patristic period to Pletho.” In *Power and subversion in Byzantium: papers from the Forty-third Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Birmingham, March 2010. Publications of the Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies* 17. Edited by Dimiter Angelov and Michael Saxby, 147–176. Farnham: Ashgate, 2013.

[BYDÉN shows that after limited criticism in the early and middle Byzantine period, Aristotle came to face increasing disapproval in late Byzantium. It is argued that the emerging anti-Aristotelianism was, first and foremost, directed against the Latins. The study contains occasional references to Italos’ works.]

CACOUROS, MICHEL. “Survie culturelle et rémanence textuelle du néoplatonisme à Byzance. Éléments généraux – éléments portant sur la logique.” In *The libraries of the Neoplatonists. Philosophia antiqua* 107. Edited by Cristina D’Ancona, 177–210. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

[The author refers in passing to Italos’ condemnation (pp. 178–179), quoting from anathema 7 & 8 and stating that Italos was condemned for having taught and believed in Neoplatonist views.]

CAMPO ECHEVARRÍA, ALBERTO DEL. *La teoría platónica de las ideas en Bizancio (siglos IX–XI)*. Nueva Roma 36. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2012.

[The last chapter of the book (pp. 253–307) explores in detail Italos’ views on universals. It is shown that Italos taught conceptual realism, which was typical of Byzantine intellectuals. Accordingly, Italos rejected austere nominalism as

well as Platonic realism, of which he was accused in anathema 4.]

CARR, JOHN C. *The Komnene dynasty: Byzantium's struggle for survival, 1057–1185*. Barnsley: Pen & Sword Military, 2018.

[The popularizing book briefly refers to Italos, who is described in judgmental terms as a “disputatious and superficial young firebrand”, an “aggressive public speaker”, and a “garrulous philosopher” (pp. 77, 107–108).]

CASTELLI, CARLA. “La Quaestio De iconis e tre scritti logici di Giovanni Italo: un nuovo testimone e altre tracce.” *Miscellanea graecolatina V*. Edited by Stefano Costa and Federico Gallo, 291–308. Milan: Biblioteca Ambrosiana, 2017.

[CASTELLI introduces two new witnesses of Italos' *Quaestiones quodlibetales*, i.e., Ambrosianus Q 13 sup. and A 80 sup. The author collates Ambrosianus Q 13 sup. with Parisinus gr. 1843 and establishes that the former is not an apographon of the latter. The two manuscripts contain a selection of Italos' *Quaestiones*. The selection deals with Aristotelian logic (*Qu* 27a, *Qu* 28, *Qu* 45, *Qu* 55) and includes Italos' paraphrastic treatise *De iconis* (*Qu* 87). Two further witnesses of the selection are identified and discussed, i.e., Ambrosianus A 80 sup. and Berolinensis Phillipps 1558.]

CERETELI, GREGORIUS. *Ioannis Itali opuscula selecta*, 2 vols. Tbilisi: Typis et impensis Universitatis Tphilisiensis, 1924, 1926.

[This two-volume work provides the *editio princeps* of some key works by Italos, namely *De dialectica*, *Qu* 43, *Qu* 86 (Vol. 1) and *De syllogismis*, *De rhetorica*, *Qu* 71, *Qu* 77, *Qu* 50, *Qu* 51, *Qu* 36 (Vol. 2). Both volumes are prefaced with solid introductions that discuss the transmission of Italos' works and the contents of the edited texts.]

CHALANDON, FERDINAND. *Essai sur le règne d'Alexis Ier Comnène (1081–1118)*. Mémoires et documents 4. Paris: A. Picard: 1900.

[The author discusses Italos' life, trial, and teachings at the end of the monograph (pp. 310–316). He summarizes Anna Komnēnē's account of Italos' life, the chronology of his condemnation (as known from the trial records), and the eleven *Synodikon* anathemas. He concurs with USPENSKIY (1891, 107) that Italos was condemned because his philosophical system contradicted church dogma.]

CHEYNET, JEAN-CLAUDE. *Pouvoir et contestations à Byzance (963–1210)*. Byzantina Sorbonensia 9. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1990.

[CHEYNET states on pp. 364–365 that Italos' trial was politically motivated:

Alexios sought to appease the Church and to intimidate his political rivals. Moreover, he notes that two of Italos' disciples were later involved in actions against the emperor. CHEYNET wonders whether Italos incited his disciples to be hostile to the emperor or whether civil administrators who were already hostile to the emperor grouped around Italos.]

CLUCAS, LOWELL. *The trial of John Italos and the crisis of intellectual values in Byzantium in the eleventh century*. Miscellanea byzantina Monacensia 26. Munich: Institut für Byzantinistik, 1981.

[CLUCAS discusses the events, causes, and repercussions of Italos' trial, contrasting them with developments in the Latin West. In essence, he argues that Italos' trial was politically and religiously motivated. Italos did not hold heterodox views, given that his writings do not correspond to either the anathemas or his confession of faith (as reported in the trial dossier). The anathemas merely testify to Italos' maladroitness use of theological terminology. CLUCAS asserts that philosophical studies declined after Italos' condemnation, in contrast to the West.]

CONLEY, THOMAS M. "Notes on the Byzantine reception of the Peripatetic tradition in rhetoric." In *Peripatetic rhetoric after Aristotle*. Rutgers University studies in classical humanities 6. Edited by William W. Fortenbaugh and David C. Mirhady, 217–242. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1994.

[The author advances various notes on the Byzantine reception of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, including a summary of Italos' *De rhetorica* (pp. 230–235).]

CONLEY, THOMAS M. "The alleged 'synopsis' of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* by John Italos and its place in the Byzantine reception of Aristotle." In *La Rhétorique d'Aristote: traditions et commentaires de l'Antiquité au XVIIIe siècle*. Tradition de la pensée classique. Edited by Gilbert Dahan and Irène Rosier-Catach, 49–64. Paris: J. Vrin, 1998.

[CONLEY shows that Italos' *De rhetorica* is not a synopsis of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* but rather an introductory guide written for Andronikos Doukas. Furthermore, CONLEY discusses Italos' life and intellectual milieu. He observes that the study of Aristotle during the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries was promoted by two female patronesses, Maria of Alania and Anna Komnēnē – at a time when both were out of public life.]

CONSTANTELOS, DEMETRIOS J. *Christian hellenism: essays and studies in continuity and change*. New Rochelle, NY: Aristide D. Caratzas, 1988.

[The collection of essays makes occasional reference to Italos, who is seen as a humanist on a par with Gemistos Plethon; both are said to have promoted Greek learning vis-à-vis church tradition (pp. 52, 63, *passim*).]

CONSTANTINIDES, COSTAS N. *Higher education in Byzantium in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries (1204–ca. 1310)*. Texts and studies on the history of Cyprus 11. Nicosia: Zavallis Press, 1982.

[The author interprets Italos' condemnation as an intervention by the Church to curb secular philosophical thought (pp. 113–114, 131, 161).]

CUNNINGHAM, MARY B. "The Orthodox Church in Byzantium." In *A world history of Christianity*. Edited by Adrian Hastings, 66–109. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

[The study includes a brief mention of Italos' trial (pp. 92–93). Italos is seen as a humanist, whose use of classical paideia was equated with heresy. Emperor Alexios used the trial to impose imperial authority over the patriarchate.]

DARROUZÈS, JEAN. *Nicētas Stēthatos: opuscules et lettres*. SC 81. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1961.

[DARROUZÈS translates (p. 21) the conspicuous scholion from cod. Angelicus 90 (fol. 249r), which was added to Nikētas Stēthatos' refutation of the "dead-soulers" (θνητοψυχῖται) in his *On the Soul* (§74). The scholion uses derogatory language against a certain John the philosopher, whom DARROUZÈS identifies with John Italos. It should be noted that there is a typo on p. 21: the correct manuscript is cod. Angelicus 90 (and not 30). Also, DARROUZÈS curiously omits the name Ἰωάννης from the transcription of the scholion (p. 136) although it is clearly legible in the manuscript and is included in DARROUZÈS' French translation (p. 21). Both lapses have often been reproduced in the secondary literature.]

DE GARAY, JESÚS. "The reception of Proclus: from Byzantium to the West (an overview)." In *Byzantine perspectives on Neoplatonism*. BA – Series philosophica 1. Edited by Sergei Mariev, 153–173. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2017.

[The article gives a succinct survey of the reception of Proklos in the Latin West and Byzantium. Italos is briefly mentioned and said to have made "conscious use of Proclus's works" (p. 157), but without giving examples.]

DE MURALT, EDOUARD. *Essai de chronographie byzantine 1057–1453, Vol. I*. St Petersburg: Eggers et Comp., 1871.

[Italos' condemnation is mentioned in the chronological table for the year 1084 (p. 54).]

- DIAMANTOPOULOS, GEORGIOS. *Die Hermeneutik des Niketas Stethatos*, 2 vols. Münchner Arbeiten zur Byzantinistik 3. Neuried: Ars una, 2021. [The author argues (Vol. 2, pp. 609–613, 671–673, *passim*) that Nikētas Stēthatos’ refutation of the so-called deadsoulers (θνητοψυχῆται) in his *On the Soul* (§74) was directed against Psellos and not against Italos.]
- DIAS, JOÃO VICENTE DE MEDEIROS PUBLIO. “The political opposition to Alexios I Komnenos (1081–1118).” PhD diss., University of Mainz, 2020. [The dissertation briefly discusses Italos’ trial and refers to different motivations that might have been at play (pp. 103–105, 111). It is stressed that the trial had a philosophical-theological as well as a political dimension.]
- DUJČEV, IVAN. “L’umanesimo di Giovanni Italo.” In *Atti del V Congresso Internazionale di Studi Bizantini (Roma, 20–26 settembre 1936)*, Vol. 1. *Storia, filologia, diritto*. Studi bizantini e neoellenici 5. Rome: Tipografia del Senato, 1939, 432–436. [Reprint in: IDEM. *Medioevo Bizantino-Slavo*, Vol. 1. *Saggi di storia politica e culturale*. Storia e letteratura. Raccolta di studi e testi 102. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1965, 321–326.] [DUJČEV discusses the Byzantines’ appreciation of classical authors, highlighting the importance of John Italos, in whom he sees a “true precursor of the Renaissance” for having sought to revive the content (and merely the form) of classical culture.]
- DYCK, ANDREW R. “Philological notes on Byzantine texts.” *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 38 (1988): 159–163. [The article advances six philological notes. One of them discusses Eustathios of Thessaloniki’s testimony on Italos’ exegesis of *Odyssey* 19.562, which Italos interpreted in *Qu* 43 (pp. 161–163).]
- EFTHYMIADIS, STEPHANOS. “Questions and answers.” In *The Cambridge intellectual history of Byzantium*. Edited by Anthony Kaldellis and Niketas Siniossoglou, 47–62. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017. [The article includes a brief discussion of Italos’ *Quaestiones quodlibetales* (pp. 56–57). It is said that Italos’ inquiries paid little attention to contemporary theological issues and that it is uncertain whether the work presents a compilation of Italos’ lecture notes or preliminary material for treatises.]
- ERISMANN, CHRISTOPHE. “Logic in Byzantium.” In *The Cambridge intellectual history of Byzantium*. Edited by Anthony Kaldellis and Nike-

tas Siniossoglou, 362–380. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

[The author surveys the use of logic in Byzantium, focusing on the middle Byzantine period and on the issue of universals. Italos’ views on universals and substance are briefly discussed (pp. 374–376).]

FRANKOPAN, PETER. “The literary, cultural and political context for the twelfth-century commentary on the Nicomachean Ethics.” In *Medieval Greek commentaries on the Nicomachean Ethics*. Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 101. Edited by Charles Barber and David Jenkins, 45–62. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

[The study contains sporadic references to Italos. The unfavorable portrayal by Anna Komnēnē is mentioned (p. 52), and the thesis by MAGDALINO (1996, 23) regarding Italos’ eventual rehabilitation is endorsed (p. 51).]

FUCHS, FRIEDRICH. *Die höheren Schulen von Konstantinopel im Mittelalter*. BA 8. Leipzig: Teubner, 1926.

[FUCHS’ classical study provides a brief sketch of Italos’ life based on Anna Komnēnē’s account (pp. 33–34). He identifies the addressee of Psellos’ *Letter to John the Lombard* with Italos.]

GARLAND, LYNDA, and STEPHEN RAPP. “Mary ‘of Alania’: woman & empress between two worlds.” In *Byzantine women: varieties of experience 800–1200*. Centre for Hellenic Studies, King’s College London, Publications 8. Edited by Lynda Garland, 91–123. London: Ashgate, 2006.

[The authors note that Italos enjoyed the patronage of Maria of Alania. Moreover, they favor the identification of Ioane Petritsi with the addressee of Italos’ *Letter to the Abkhazian grammarian* (*Qu* 64) (p. 113).]

GAZĒ, ΕΡΗĒ [Γαζή, Έφη]. *Ο δεύτερος βίος των Τριών Ιεραρχών: μια γενεαλογία του ‘ελληνοχριστιανικού πολιτισμού’*. Athens: Νεφέλη, 2004.

[The author sketches Italos’ trials and argues that Emperor Alexios sought to condemn Italos in order to appease the Church, which was dissatisfied with the emperor’s confiscation of church treasures (pp. 172–180). Furthermore, she establishes a connection between Italos’ condemnation and the emergence of the feast of the Three Hierarchs: both developments aimed at rebalancing the uneasy relationship between Hellenic learning and Christian dogma (pp. 180–191).]

GAZI, EFFI. “Reading the ancients: remnants of Byzantine controversies in the Greek national narrative.” *Historein* 6 (2006): 144–149.

[The article reflects upon Byzantine and modern Greek attitudes towards the relationship between Hellenism and Christianity. GAZI sees in the condemnation of Italos a reaction to his “upset[ing] the balance between classical philosophy and Christian doctrine” (p. 147). Furthermore, she notes that Italos’ condemnation coincided with the exclusion of Gregory of Nyssa from the orthodox canon, as both were deemed to be too ‘philosophical’.]

ΓΙΑΚΟΥΜΑΚĒS, ΝΙΚΟΛΑΟΣ [Γιακουμάκης, Νικόλαος]. “Ἡ πνευματικὴ κίνησις ἐν Βυζαντίῳ κατὰ τὸν ἰα΄ αἰῶνα.” *Νέα Σιών* 8 (1909): 159–181.

[The study explores intellectual developments in Constantinople during the eleventh century, focusing on the revival of philosophical studies in the school of Michael Psellos. It contains a brief quotation from the *Alexiad* (V.8.2), which mentions Italos in connection with the ostensible revival of the sciences by Emperor Alexios (p. 165).]

ΓΙΑΚΟΥΜΑΚĒS, ΝΙΚΟΛΑΟΣ [Γιακουμάκης, Νικόλαος]. “Ἡ φιλοσοφικὴ κίνησις ἐν Βυζαντίῳ κατὰ τὸν ἰα΄ αἰῶνα.” *Νέα Σιών* 9 (1909): 371–384; 10 (1910): 92–100, 173–188.

[The multi-part article surveys the history of Byzantine philosophy from the sixth to the eleventh century with a focus on Michael Psellos and John Italos (pp. 380–384), whose lives and careers are described. Agreeing with the characterization by Anna Komnēnē, the author asserts that Italos’ philosophical training was incomplete, as he did not master either grammar or rhetoric. While Psellos is seen as a staunch Platonist, Italos is said to have introduced a more balanced approach that sought to “reconcile” Platonic and Aristotelian tenets (pp. 182–188).]

ΓΙΑΚΟΥΜΑΚĒS, ΝΙΚΟΛΑΟΣ [Γιακουμάκης, Νικόλαος]. “Ἡ ἐν Βυζαντίῳ αὐτοκρατορικὴ ἀκαδημία ὡς κέντρον τῶν φιλοσοφικῶν σπουδῶν κατὰ τὸν ἰα΄ αἰῶνα.” *Νέα Σιών* 10 (1910): 529–537; 11 (1911): 12–16, 318–329.

[The tripartite study reviews the subjects taught and studied in the school of philosophy led by Psellos and Italos. Anna Komnēnē is quoted specifying that Italos drew not only on Aristotle and Plato but also on the Neoplatonists Porphyry, Iamblichos, and Proklos (p. 12). Furthermore, Italos’ curriculum (pp. 318–319) and his students (p. 325) are mentioned. It is noted that Italos’ condemnation did not lead to the cessation of the philosophical school in the late eleventh century (p. 329).]

GIGINEISHVILI, LEVAN. *The Platonic Theology of Ioane Petritsi*. Gor-

gias Eastern Christian studies 4. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2007. [In his monograph on Ioane Petritsi, GIGINEISHVILI takes a cautious stance towards the thesis (first proposed by MARR 1906, 108) that Ioane Petritsi was a student of John Italos. Furthermore, he is hesitant to affirm that the addressee of Italos' *Letter to the Abkhazian grammarian* (*Qu* 64) was Petritsi (pp. 17–19).]

GIOCARINIS, KIMON. “Eustratius of Nicaea’s defense of the doctrine of ideas. ‘Et nihil valent rationes suae, et commentator solvit eas.’” *Franciscan studies* 24 (1964): 159–204.

[The study reconstructs Eustratios’ defense of Platonic ideas and recurrently refers to the works of Psellos and Italos (pp. 166–168, 173–174, *passim*).]

GLAVINAS, APOSTOLOS A. [Γλαβίνας, Απόστολος Α.]. *Ἡ ἐπὶ Ἀλεξίου Κομνηνοῦ (1081–1118) περὶ ἱερῶν σκευῶν, κειμηλίων καὶ ἁγίων εἰκόνων ἔρις (1081–1095)*. Βυζαντινὰ κείμενα καὶ μελέται 6. Thessaloniki: Κέντρον Βυζαντινῶν Ἐρευνῶν, 1972.

[The study contains a brief overview of Italos’ life and condemnation (pp. 27–28). Italos is presented as a Hellenizing philosopher who promulgated views that contradicted the orthodox faith.]

GOLITSĒS, PANTELĒS [Γκολίτσης, Παντελής]. “Αρχαίο ελληνικό και βυζαντινό φιλοσοφικό υπόμνημα: ζητήματα συνέχειας και ασυνέχειας.” *Υπόμνημα στη φιλοσοφία* 6 (2007): 197–208.

[The study argues that the philosophical commentary tradition of Late Antiquity did not continue uninterrupted in Byzantium. The Byzantine tradition is said to have been eclectic and focused on producing epitomes, while the late antique tradition sought to be exhaustive and to recover the ‘hidden truth’ in the ancient sources. John Italos is seen to have merely continued the method of producing epitomes (pp. 202–203), and his condemnation is said to have ended philosophical autodidacticism in Byzantium (pp. 207–208).]

GOUILLARD, JEAN. “La religion des philosophes.” *Travaux et mémoires* 6 (1976): 305–324.

[GOUILLARD discusses Italos’ and Psellos’ teachings, arguing that both were pious Christians with a keen interest in Hellenic wisdom. He stresses that Italos was not heretical but only unversed in theological expressions.]

GOUILLARD, JEAN. “Léthargie des âmes et culte des saints: un plaidoyer inédit de Jean Diacre et Maïstôr.” *Travaux et mémoires* 8 (1981): 171–186.

[The article publishes an eleventh-century text that defends the intercessory

power of the saints. The text is attributed to a certain John the Deacon and Maistor (Ἰωάννου διακόνου καὶ μάιστορος), whom GOUILLARD identifies with John the Maistor of the rhetoricians (Ἰωάννου μάιστωρος τῶν ῥητόρων), who is recorded to have been present at Italos' trial (p. 179). Moreover, GOUILLARD suggests that the text was written against Italos (pp. 182–183).]

GOUILLARD, JEAN. “Review of L. Clucas, The trial of John Italos.” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 76 (1983): 31–33.

[In this book review, GOUILLARD corrects a number of mistakes and harshly criticizes CLUCAS, contending that his knowledge of Greek was insufficient to deal properly with the subject.]

GOUNARIDIS, PÂRIS. “Le procès de Jean dit Italos révisé.” *Historiein* 6 (2006): 35–47.

[The author reevaluates the significance of Italos' trial, arguing that Italos was the first victim of Emperor Alexios' campaign to demote the meritocratic system of the civil aristocracy and to promote instead his own, authoritarian and centralized regime.]

GRUMEL, VENANCE. “Le symbole ‘Quicumque’ et Jean Italos.” *Échos d'Orient* 37 (1938): 136–140.

[GRUMEL shows that Italos' profession of faith (as contained in the trial dossier) is an adaptation of the Ps-Athanasian (*Quicumque*) creed. Italos' Italian provenance readily explains his knowledge of that creed, which was widely used by the Latins.]

GUILLAND, RODOLPHE. “Review of P. É. Stéphanou, Jean Italos: philosophe et humaniste.” *Revue des études grecques* 64 (1951): 400–401.

[The short review provides a table of contents and the main thesis of STÉPHANOU's monograph, namely that Italos was wrongly condemned for heterodoxy, given that Italos was not a theologian but a humanist scholar.]

GUTAS, DIMITRI and NIKETAS SINIOSSOGLOU. “Philosophy and ‘Byzantine philosophy’.” In *The Cambridge intellectual history of Byzantium*. Edited by Anthony Kaldellis and Niketas Siniossoglou, 271–295. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

[The authors argue that the Byzantines did not engage in proper philosophy but merely produced commentaries on ancient philosophers, as Orthodoxy did not allow for independent research. However, they allow for one possible exception, namely John Italos, who “was perceived to be introducing a breach in a collective orthodox identity inspired by Hellenic teachings”. At the same time, the authors are uncommitted as to whether Italos, in fact, deviated from ortho-

dox dogma and emphasize that he was condemned for having overstepped “the limits of free inquiry” (pp. 290–291).]

HUGGINS, MARK P. “The reception of John Chrysostom in the middle Byzantine period (9th–13th centuries): a study of the Catechetical Homily on Pascha (CPG 4605).” PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 2020.

[The thesis contains a subchapter (pp. 204–208) that presents Italos as a victim of Emperor Alexios’ policy to style himself as the guardian of Orthodoxy. Italos is said to have defended church doctrine although his concession of faith contained some “theological solecisms”. HUGGINS follows GAZĒ (2004) in holding that Italos was condemned for the same reason that led to the exclusion of Gregory of Nyssa from the Three Hierarchs: his strong appreciation of the classical Hellenic heritage.]

HUSSEY, JOAN M. *Church and learning in the Byzantine Empire, 867–1185*. London: Oxford University Press, 1937.

[HUSSEY discusses Italos’ trial on the basis of the *Alexiad*, the trial dossier, and the *Synodikon* (pp. 91–94). Among others, she notes inaccuracies between Italos’ writings and the *Synodikon* accusations and suggests that the latter do not represent Italos’ actual teachings but only views that were debated in Italos’ school.]

HUSSEY, JOAN M. *Ascetics and humanists in eleventh-century Byzantium*. London: Dr Williams’s Trust, 1960.

[In this lecture, HUSSEY supplements CARL NEUMANN’s (1894) study on the state of the Byzantine Empire prior to the Crusades by examining the achievements of eleventh-century monks and schoolmasters. She argues that neither group could escape secular (Hellenic) learning. With regard to Italos, HUSSEY holds that his condemnation was to a large extent politically motivated (pp. 5–9).]

IERODIAKONOU, KATERINA. “John Italos: a fervent defender of the autonomy of philosophy?” In *Proceedings of the Twenty-first International Congress of Byzantine Studies, London, 21–26 August, 2006, Vol. 2: abstracts of panel papers*. Edited by Elizabeth Jeffreys, 200. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.

[In this abstract, IERODIAKONOU sets out to examine Italos’ metaphysical teachings (including his theory of universals) in order to evaluate his contribution to the autonomy of philosophical inquiry vis-à-vis church doctrine.]

IERODIAKONOU, KATERINA. “John Italos on universals.” *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale* 18 (2007): 231–247.

[The study demonstrates that John Italos was a moderate realist with regard to universals, thereby reaffirming the thesis by BENAKIS (1982) that Byzantine philosophers generally adhered to a moderate (or conceptual) realism.]

IERODIAKONOU, KATERINA. “Byzantium.” In *The Cambridge history of medieval philosophy, Vol. 1*. Edited by Robert Pasnau, 39–49. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

[The bulk of the article discusses Italos’ views on universals. IERODIAKONOU shows that Italos followed (but also diverted from) Ammonios’ threefold distinction of universals (πρὸ τῶν πολλῶν subsistence in God’s mind; ἐν τοῖς πολλοῖς subsistence in the things; ἐπὶ τοῖς πολλοῖς subsistence in the human mind). She agrees with BENAKIS (1982) in calling Italos a conceptual (or moderate) realist.]

IERODIAKONOU, KATERINA. “The Byzantine reception of Aristotle’s theory of meaning.” *Methodos: savoirs et textes* 19 (2019);

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/methodos.5303>.

[The article contains a brief section on Italos and his works.]

IRMSCHER, JOHANNES. “Die Verurteilung des Johannes Italos.” *Jahrbuch für Geschichte des Feudalismus* 6 (1982): 117–122.

[IRMSCHER gives a synopsis of the eleven anathemas against Italos and summarizes the events surrounding his two trials. He sees in Italos a “humanist” and calls for further study on his philosophical oeuvre.]

JAWORSKA-WOŁOSZYN, MAGDALENA. “John Italos seen by Anna Komnene.” *Peitho. Examina antiqua* 5 (2014): 279–294.

[The author quotes and paraphrases Anna Komnēnē’s characterization of Italos.]

JENKINS, DAVID. “Michael Psellos.” In *The Cambridge intellectual history of Byzantium*. Edited by Anthony Kaldellis and Niketas Siniosoglou, 447–461. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

[This study on Psellos makes a brief mention of Italos (p. 459). JENKINS notes that Italos lacked “rhetorical finesse” and that he was indebted to Psellos’ Neoplatonism.]

JOANNOU, PERIKLES. “La doctrine de l’illumination dans l’ontologie et l’épistémologie du XIe siècle (Jean Italos).” In *Atti dello VIII Congresso Internazionale di Studi Bizantini (Palermo 3–10 Aprile 1951), Vol. 1. Filologia, letteratura, linguistica, storia, numismatica*. Studi

bizantini e neoellenici 7. 130–131. Rome: Associazione Nazionale per gli Studi Bizantini, 1953.

[The short communication sketches the author’s interpretation of Italos’ system of Christian metaphysics.]

JOANNOU, PERIKLES. *Christliche Metaphysik in Byzanz, Vol. 1. Die Illuminationslehre des Michael Psellos und Joannes Italos*. Studia patristica et byzantina 3. Ettal: Buch-Kunstverlag, 1956.

[The monograph discusses Italos’ and Psellos’ views on the cosmos and the human soul. JOANNOU argues that both professed a coherent and independent philosophical system of Christian metaphysics. He asserts that Italos was condemned for purely political reasons and that the condemned views cannot be found in Italos’ writings; any Neoplatonizing (or heretical) tendency in Italos’ oeuvre is explained away.]

JOANNOU, PERIKLES. “Metaphysische Problematik in der byzantinischen Philosophie.” In *Πεπραγμένα τοῦ Θ’ Διεθνοῦς Βυζαντινολογικοῦ Συνεδρίου (Θεσσαλονίκη, 12–19 Ἀπριλίου 1953)*, Vol. 2. Edited by Stilpōn Kyriakidēs, Andreas Xyngopoulos, and Panagiōtēs Zepos, 133–138. Athens: Τυπογραφεῖον Μυρτίδη, 1956.

[JOANNOU argues that the works by Psellos and Italos contain a genuine and coherent metaphysical system.]

JOANNOU, PERIKLES. “Die denkende Seele in der byzantinischen Metaphysik.” *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 64 (1956): 228–244.

[JOANNOU presents Italos’ doctrine of the soul and discusses its ramifications for his epistemology and ethics.]

JOANNOU, PERIKLES. “Zwei vermisste Traktate aus den 93 Quaestiones Quodlibetales des Johannes Italos: De iconis und De duabus naturis in Christo.” In *Silloge bizantina in onore di Silvio Giuseppe Mercati*. Studi bizantini e neoellenici 9. 233–236. Rome: Associazione nazionale per gli studi bizantini, 1957.

[JOANNOU announces his discovery of manuscripts containing *Qu* 87 (*De iconis*) and *Qu* 88 (*De duabus naturis in Christo*), which are missing from most manuscript witnesses of the *Quaestiones quodlibetales*. It should be noted that the manuscript containing *Qu* 87 is Parisinus gr. 1843 (and not 1868, as specified on p. 234). JOANNOU suggests that Italos’ extant works constitute only a fraction of his literary production. He conjectures that the extant works were saved by Michael VII, after he had abdicated and retired to a monastery.]

JUGIE, MARTIN. *Theologia dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium ab*

Ecclesia Catholica dissidentium, Vol. 2. Theologiae dogmaticae Graeco-Russorum expositio. Paris: Letouzey, 1933.

[This extensive study of orthodox theology includes a couple of references to Italos. The author reproduces Italos' views on the Trinity (as quoted in the trial records) (pp. 251–252), his alleged teachings on matter and Platonic ideas (as recorded in anathema 4 and 8) (pp. 539–540), his controversial views on the incarnation (as mentioned in anathema 1) (pp. 651–652), and his attitude towards icon veneration (as quoted in the trial records) (pp. 715–716).]

KALDELLIS, ANTHONY. *Hellenism in Byzantium. The transformations of Greek identity and the reception of the classical tradition.* Greek culture in the Roman world 4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

[The monograph includes two digressions on Italos. First, *Psellos' Praise of Italos* is discussed, in which Psellos recounts Italos' dissatisfaction with the knowledge of Hellenic culture in Byzantium vis-à-vis the Arab world (pp. 220–221). Second, Italos' trial is discussed. KALDELLIS raises doubts as to whether the trial was motivated by purely political concerns. He assumes that Italos held secret teachings, which have not survived (pp. 228–230).]

KALDELLIS, ANTHONY. “The Timarion: toward a literary interpretation.” In *La face cachée de la littérature byzantine. Le texte en tant que message immédiat.* Dossiers byzantins 11. Edited by Paolo Odorico, 275–287. Paris: EHESS, 2012.

[KALDELLIS argues that the *Timarion* reflects – satirically – upon debates in Theodoros of Smyrna's school regarding the relationship between philosophical (pagan) culture and the soul's salvation. It is noted that the *Timarion* depicts Italos as a steadfast Christian, who is rejected by ancient philosophers in Hades. The satire thus inverts Italos' condemnation, which had denounced his alleged disregard for Christian dogma in favor of ancient philosophy (pp. 280, 285).]

KALDELLIS, ANTHONY. “Byzantine philosophy inside and out: orthodoxy and dissidence in counterpart.” In *The many faces of Byzantine philosophy.* Papers and monographs from the Norwegian Institute at Athens, Series 4/1. Edited by Börje Bydén and Katerina Ierodiakonou, 129–151. Athens: The Norwegian Institute at Athens, 2012.

[The study discusses an inherent tension in Byzantine philosophy and examines a number of case studies. Concerning Italos, it is suggested that he used dissimulation to cover his real, heterodox thought (pp. 141–142).]

KAPRIEV, GEORGI. *Philosophie in Byzanz*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2005.

[This general survey of the history of Byzantine philosophy contains a short section on Italos (pp. 212–213), which sketches Italos’ life and condemnation. Italos is seen as a Neoplatonist with an Aristotelian proclivity. Most of Italos’ writings are said to be lost or destroyed, presumably due to his condemnation.]

KARPOZĒLOS, APOSTOLOS [Καρπόζηλος, Απόστολος]. *Βυζαντινοὶ ἱστορικοὶ καὶ χρονογράφοι. Τόμος Γ΄: (11ος–12ος αἰ.)*. Athens: Εκδόσεις Κανάκη, 2009.

[The book contains a discussion of Italos’ trial, based on the *Alexiad* and the trial dossier (pp. 426–436). It is argued that Italos’ condemnation was politically motivated and that the anathemas do not correspond to Italos’ actual teachings. The discussion is followed by an annotated citation of *Alexiad* V.8–9 (pp. 437–445).]

KAZHDAN, ALEXANDER P., and ANN WHARTON EPSTEIN. *Change in Byzantine culture in the eleventh and twelfth centuries*. Transformation of the classical heritage 7. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.]

[The monograph argues that eleventh-/twelfth-century Byzantium underwent significant change. Chapter 4 discusses changes in higher education, in particular the wave of new rationalism among the urban intelligentsia. Concerning Italos, the partisan nature of our sources is highlighted: we only have the accusations leveled against Italos and “his most benign writings” (pp. 158–160). What is certain is that Italos’ use of logic was deemed excessive and unacceptable.]

КЕСНАКМАДЗЕ, НАТЕЛЛА [Кечакмадзе, Нателла]. “Грамматико-логический трактат Иоанна Итала” [A grammatical-logical treatise by John Italos]. *Византийский временник* 27 (1967): 197–205.

[The study argues that the addressee of Italos’ *Letter to the Abkhazian grammarian* (*Qu* 64) is Ioane Petritsi.]

КЕСНАКМАДЗЕ, НАТЕЛЛА [Кечакмадзе, Нателла]. “Из истории общественной мысли Византии в XI в.” [From the history of Byzantine social thought in the eleventh century]. *Византийский временник* 29 (1968): 170–176.

[КЕСНАКМАДЗЕ sketches Italos’ “rationalist” scientific approach and discusses his views on the soul, matter, the resurrection, and universals. She asserts that Italos professed an eternal world and a resurrection in different

bodies. Yet she holds that the real motivation behind Italos' condemnation was his opposition to Alexios' policies; she finds a testimony to Italos' opposition in *Qu* 71, which – she assumes – was addressed to Emperor Alexios.]

KECHAGMADZE, NATELA. *Ioane It'alysis shemokmedeba* [*The works of John Italos*]. Tbilisi: Metsniereba, 1970.

[The monograph discusses Italos' life, condemnation, and teachings, as well as his relationship to Ioane Petritsi. The book provides a Russian translation of Italos' *Letter to the Abkhazian grammarian* (*Qu* 64) and gives a paraphrase of USPENSKIY's seminal study on Italos' school (1891).]

KLDIASHVILI, DAREJAN, and MAGDA MTCHEDLIDZE. "V. Constantino-ple." In *Medieval Georgian literary culture and book production in the Christian Middle East and Byzantium*. Jerusalem: Theologisches Forum 42. Edited by Tamar Otkhmezuri, 365–416. Münster: Aschendorff, 2022.

[The chapter presents prominent Georgian figures who promoted Byzantine-Georgian relations. Among others, the Georgian philosopher Ioane Petritsi is discussed. It is said that Petritsi presumably studied in the philosophical school of Michael Psellos and John Italos. Hints that buttress this supposition are adduced before the alternative view is mentioned, according to which Petritsi lived a century later, i.e., in the late twelfth century (pp. 382–387).]

KOTZIA-PANTELEĒ, PARASKEUE [Κοτζιά-Παντελή, Παρασκευή]. "Το 'Περὶ τῶν σοφιστικῶν ἐλέγχων' τοῦ κώδικα Marc. gr. XI, 22." *Επιστημονική Επετηρίς Φιλοσοφικής Σχολῆς Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης* 18 (1979): 207–221.

[The article provides the critical edition of a commentary on Aristotle's *Sophistical Refutations*, which the author attributes to Nikēphoros Blemmydēs and not to John Italos (p. 209) as was suggested by ELPIDIO MIONI in his manuscript description of Marc. gr. XI.22, ff. 188v–189v.]

KRAFT, ANDRÁS. "A clash of eschatological paradigms? The condemnation of John Italos revisited." In *Dissidence and persecution in Byzantium: from Constantine to Michael Psellos*. Edited by Danijel Džino and Ryan W. Strickler, 193–213. Leiden: Brill, 2021.

[The study argues that Italos adhered to a Christian Platonist belief system ('Origenism') that teaches spiritual resurrection and universal salvation. Furthermore, it is argued that Italos' eschatological views were seen as a threat by the new Emperor Alexios I Komnēnos, who needed an apocalyptic frame of reference to legitimize his usurpation.]

KRAUSMÜLLER, DIRK. “What is mortal in the soul?” *Mukaddime* 6/1 (2015): 1–17.

[The article explores whether souls can change after death according to Eustratios of Constantinople and Anastasios the Sinaite, on the one hand, and Nikētas Stēthatos and John Italos, on the other. Italos is shown to argue in *Qu* 50 that the soul, as a substance, is immortal, but, as an activity, it is mortal. Accordingly, the soul becomes inactive with death. Furthermore, Italos is shown to be the “deadsouler” against whom Nikētas Stēthatos argued in his *On the Soul* (§74).]

KRAUSMÜLLER, DIRK. “Between Tritheism and Sabellianism: trinitarian speculation in John Italos’ and Nicetas Stethatos’ confessions of faith.” *Scrinium* 12 (2016): 261–280.

[KRAUSMÜLLER examines the confessions of faith of John Italos and Nikētas Stēthatos and argues that both held heretical trinitological views. Italos and Stēthatos drew on earlier creeds, which they subtly modified to conceal their real views. Drawing upon the Aristotelian distinction of first and second substances, they held that the divine nature (second substance) is a mental construct and that God’s oneness rests on the level of hypostases (first substance). This view comes close to tritheism. Italos sought to counterbalance tritheism with a Sabellian solution; that is why he was accused, among others, of Sabellianism.]

LAURITZEN, FREDERICK. “Italos’ struggle with classical culture.” In *Proceedings of the Twenty-first International Congress of Byzantine Studies, London, 21–26 August, 2006, Vol. 2: abstracts of panel papers*. Edited by Elizabeth Jeffreys, 221–222. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.

[The abstract reiterates the view that Italos upset the Byzantine synthesis of rhetoric and philosophy (cf. MAGDALINO 1993, 331). Italos did not master the Greek language and overvalued syllogisms, as the result of which he failed to be persuasive.]

LAURITZEN, FREDERICK. “The debate on faith and reason.” *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 57 (2007): 75–82.

[The study argues that in the eleventh century a “religious” faction, which included Nikētas Stēthatos and the authors behind the expansion of *Synodikon of Orthodoxy*, fought against a “secularist” group of scholars, who used “pagan methods” to find solutions to Christian questions. Italos is said to have belonged to that “secularist” group. He is also likened to Averroës, who is said to have favored form (logic) over content (dogma).]

LAURITZEN, FREDERICK. “Psello discepolo di Stetato.” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 101/2 (2009): 715–725.

[The article argues that Michael Psellos followed Nikētas Stēthatos in three key issues, namely the post-mortem relationship of body and soul, the limits of divine causality, and the nature of evil. Furthermore, it is argued that John Italos challenged all three views. Italos is said to have taught metempsychosis, secondary causality (God must act through intermediaries), and the absolute existence of evil.]

LEMERLE, PAUL. *Cinq études sur le XIe siècle byzantin*. Le monde byzantin. Paris: Éditions de CNRS, 1977.

[LEMERLE notes in passing (p. 247) that Italos lost out to a new moral order, which enforced the role of the Church in every domain, including education.]

LLOYD, ANTHONY C. *The anatomy of Neoplatonism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

[The book briefly touches upon Italos’ understanding of universals (pp. 71–72, 74). Italos is said to have taken a nominalist (or conceptualist) position.]

LOUTH, ANDREW. “Platonism from Maximos the Confessor to the Palaiologan period.” In *The Cambridge intellectual history of Byzantium*. Edited by Anthony Kaldellis and Niketas Siniossoglou, 325–340. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

[The study includes a short overview of the anathemas against Italos (pp. 335–336), noting that the general tone of the condemnation is expressed in anathema 7, which interdicts Hellenic learning to be endorsed; it may only be used as an educational exercise.]

LUKHOVITSKIY, LEV [Луховицкий, Лев]. “Споры о святых иконах при Алексее I Комнине: полемические стратегии и выбор источников” [A debate about the holy icons under Alexios I Komnenos: polemical strategies and the choice of sources]. *Византийский временник* 73 (2014): 88–107.

[The author discusses the revival of the memory of iconoclasm under Emperor Alexios Komnēnos, in particular in regard to John Italos, Leo of Chalcedon, and Eustratios of Nicaea. It is noted that the term εἰκονομαχία was not explicitly applied to them; Italos was not accused of iconoclasm *expressis verbis*. The cautious and moderate wording allowed for compromise.]

MACDONALD, JEFFREY L. “The condemnation of John Italos.” MA thesis, St. Vladimir’s Orthodox Theological Seminary, 1982.

[The thesis analyzes the *Synodikon* anathemas and the trial dossier, arguing

that Italos held most of the doctrines he was accused of. Italos' condemnation was not only politically but also ideologically motivated, as his adaptation of Neoplatonism differed from Orthodoxy.]

MACRIDES, RUTH, and PAUL MAGDALINO. "The fourth kingdom and the rhetoric of Hellenism." In *The perception of the past in twelfth-century Europe*. Edited by Paul Magdalino, 117–156. London: Hambledon Press, 1992.

[The authors analyze the revival of Hellenism in twelfth-century Byzantium as it appeared in historiography and prose. Italos' trial is briefly mentioned (p. 118) and characterized as a show trial that was symptomatic of three developments: (i) the rise of the Komnēnian dynasty with its regime of extended family, (ii) the consolidation of the cathedral clergy of Constantinople, and (iii) imperial defensiveness vis-à-vis perceived outsiders.]

MAGDALINO, PAUL. *The empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

[MAGDALINO's seminal study of Manuel I's reign includes a brief evaluation of Italos' condemnation. He is said to have upset the balance between rhetoric and philosophy (p. 331), which was the Byzantine norm; philosophy depended on rhetoric for its reputation (p. 334). Italos' purge led to the promotion of Aristotelian studies, which was visible in Anna Komnēnē's philosophical circle (p. 332) as well as in the field of medicine (p. 363).]

MAGDALINO, PAUL. *The Byzantine background to the First Crusade*. Toronto: Canadian Institute of Balkan Studies, 1996.

The lecture reevaluates the Byzantine contribution to the First Crusade and argues that the Latins were seen as Roman allies. MAGDALINO mentions Italos' career and his lament over the deplorable state of Hellenic culture in Byzantium. Most importantly, Magdalino introduces a hitherto unnoticed testimony by Nikētas Seidēs, which gives reason to believe that Italos was eventually rehabilitated and appointed chartophylax at Antioch (p. 23).]

MAGDALINO, PAUL. "The Porphyrogenita and the astrologers: a commentary on Alexiad VI.7.1–7." In *Porphyrogenita: essays on the history and literature of Byzantium and the Latin East in honour of Julian Chrysostomides*. Edited by Charalambos Dendrinos, Jonathan Harris, Eirene Harvalia-Crook, Judith Herrin, 15–31. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.

[The study argues that Anna Komnēnē's digression on astrology reacts to Manuel's propaganda war against the Normans over the use and value of as-

trology. Furthermore, Komnēnē's criticism of astrology (lib. VI.7) and her account on Italos (lib. V.8–9) are said to make the same claim: John Italos' dialectic and Symeōn Sēth's astrology were foreign (i.e., Latin and Arab) elements that threatened the orthodox faith and the classical ideal of paideia (p. 26).]

MAGDALINO, PAUL. "Prosopography and Byzantine identity." In *Fifty years of prosopography: the later Roman Empire, Byzantium and beyond*. Proceedings of the British Academy 118. Edited by Averil Cameron, 41–56. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

[The article reviews the recent history of prosopographical studies, stresses its pivotal role for historiography, and discusses five individuals: Eustathios Rōmaios, John Italos, Michael Italikos, Landulf Butrumile, and Theorianos. Regarding Italos (pp. 50–51), MAGDALINO reiterates his view that the philosopher was rehabilitated after his condemnation, as evinced by Nikētas Seidēs' testimony.]

MAGDALINO, PAUL. *L'orthodoxie des astrologues. La science entre le dogme et la divination à Byzance (VIIe–XIVe siècle)*. Réalités byzantines 12. Paris: Lethielleux, 2006.

[The monograph mentions Psellos' *Eulogy of Italos*, in which Italos is quoted to have lamented that the wisdom of the ancients had passed from Greece to the Orient. Italos' lament draws upon a topos that originated in the Islamic world (p. 105).]

MAGDALINO, PAUL. "Deux philosophes italiens face à la xénophobie byzantine: répétition ou évolution d'un schéma?" *Cahiers d'études italiennes* 25 (2017): 1–14; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/cei.3561>.

[MAGDALINO argues that John Italos and Barlaam the Calabrian were treated dismissively because both were seen as foreigners who upset the Byzantine balance of rhetoric and philosophy.]

MALAMUT, ÉLISABETH. "Les hérésies à Byzance sous le règne d'Alexis I (1081–1118)." In *Politique, religion et laïcité. Le temps de l'histoire*. Edited by Christine Peyrard, 27–42. Aix-en-Provence: Presses universitaires de Provence, 2009.

[MALAMUT discusses heresy trials under Alexios I with a focus on John Italos. It is said that the emperor saw a danger to society in Italos, as his intellectual activity threatened traditional values. Furthermore, Italos' condemnation is said to have had considerable consequences: it inhibited the subsequent development of critical rationalism and humanism in Byzantine intellectual life.]

MAMAGAKĒS, DIONYSIOS A. [Μαμαγκάκης, Διονύσιος Α.]. “Ο αυτοκράτορας, ο λαός και η Ορθοδοξία: Αλέξιος Α΄ Κομνηνός (1081–1118): κατασκευάζοντας την δημόσια αυτοκρατορική εικόνα.” PhD diss., University of Athens, 2014.

[The dissertation examines the political history of the reign of Emperor Alexios I Komnēnos. Chapter 4 discusses the trials against John Italos and Basil the Bogomil. Both trials are seen as attempts by Alexios to gain popular support and to present himself as the guardian of Orthodoxy. On pp. 139–161, MAMAGAKĒS discusses Italos’ condemnation. Among others, he holds that the wording of Italos’ confession of faith is clumsy (rather than heretical) and that Alexios sought to deflect attention from his confiscation of church treasures by accusing Italos of iconoclasm.]

MARCHETTO, MONICA. “Nikephoros Chumnos’ treatise On matter.” In *Aesthetics and theurgy in Byzantium*. BA 25. Edited by Sergei Mariev and Wiebke-Marie Stock, 31–55. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2013.

[The study surveys late antique debates on matter and situates Nikēphoros Choumnos’ treatise *On matter* within this exegetical tradition. The study closes (pp. 52–55) with a reference to Italos’ treatise on matter (*Qu* 92). Italos is said to prove that matter does not exist; the same view that Choumnos takes. Although Italos and Choumnos are said to share the same opinion, it cannot be ascertained whether Italos actually influenced Choumnos.]

MARIEV, SERGEI. “Neoplatonic philosophy in Byzantium.” In *Byzantine perspectives on Neoplatonism*. BA – Series Philosophica 1. Edited by Sergei Mariev, 1–29. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2017.

[The introductory chapter of this collected volume sketches the most important individuals and texts in the history of Byzantine philosophy. Concerning Italos (pp. 10–12), the author highlights the ambiguity that characterizes Italos’ writings. Furthermore, Italos’ views on the notion of matter are discussed, and a translation of *Qu* 89 is provided.]

MARIEV, SERGEI, and MONICA MARCHETTO. “The divine body of the heavens. The debates about the body of the heavens during Late Antiquity and their echoes in the works of Michael Psellos and John Italos.” In *Byzantine perspectives on Neoplatonism*. BA – Series Philosophica 1. Edited by Sergei Mariev, 31–65. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2017.

[The article surveys the views of late antique philosophers as well as of Psellos and Italos regarding the nature of the heavens. Italos discusses the issue in *Qu* 42, where he argues that Plato and Aristotle are in agreement about the existence of a fifth body. Italos thus follows Proklos’ reconciliatory attitude:

while Plato talks about mathematical figures, Aristotle talks about physical qualities (pp. 57–62).]

MARINIS, VASILEIOS. *Death and the afterlife in Byzantium. The fate of the soul in theology, liturgy, and art*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

[The monograph includes a brief mention of Italos' discussion on the post-mortem advancement of the soul in *Qu* 50 (pp. 105, 163–164). Italos is said to express himself ambivalently on the issue: on the one hand, he doubts the soul's advancement after death; on the other, he allows for its possibility in the last sentence of *Qu* 50.]

MARR, НИКО [Марръ, Нико]. “Іоаннь Петрицкій, грузинскій неоплатоникъ XI–XII вѣка” [John Petritsi, Georgian Neoplatonist of the XI–XII centuries]. *Записки восточнаго отдѣленія Императорскаго Русскаго Археологическаго Общества* 19 (1909): 53–113.

[In this pioneering study on the Georgian philosopher Ioane Petritsi, MARR identifies Petritsi with a student of John Italos (pp. 99–109). MARR observes that Petritsi and Italos had a similarly resolute character and shared a common interest in Neoplatonism. Furthermore, he suggests that the addressee of Italos' *Letter to the Abkhazian grammarian* (*Qu* 64) was Ioane Petritsi (p.108).]

MASAI, FRANÇOIS. *Pléthon et le platonisme de Mistra. Les classiques de l'humanisme*. Paris: Belles Lettres, 1956.

[The monograph contains a brief digression on John Italos (pp. 289–294). Building upon the testimony of the *Timarion*, Italos is said to have been “a clumsy Christian rather than an apostate” (p. 294). Masai suggests that Italos genuinely sought to harmonize Hellenic learning with the Christian faith and thus stood between two extremist factions, between radical Hellenizers and orthodox fundamentalists.]

MATSOUKAS, ΝΙΚΟΣ Α. [Ματσούκας, Νίκος Α.]. *Ιστορία τῆς βυζαντινῆς φιλοσοφίας. Μέ παράρτημα τό σχολαστικισμό τοῦ Δυτικοῦ Μεσαίωνα*. Thessaloniki: Εκδόσεις Βάνιας, 2001.

[The author briefly refers to Italos (pp. 31–32, 157), asserting that Italos tried to replace church dogma with his own views. But Italos failed to situate his scholarship into the context of lived experience: he did not differentiate between charismatic and scientific theology and thus sought to replace charisma with arguments.]

MEEUSEN, MICHIEL. “Salt in the holy water: Plutarch's *Quaestiones naturales* in Michael Psellus' *De omnifaria doctrina*.” In *Plutarch in*

the religious and philosophical discourse of Late Antiquity. Edited by Lautaro R. Lanzillotta and Israel M. Gallarte, 101–121. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

[The author asserts that Italos was condemned “for his endorsement of Platonic heresies” and reproduces AGAPITOS’ (1998, 187) translation of anathema 2 & 7 (pp. 102–103).]

MELIKISHVILI, DAMANA. “Ioane Petritsi and John Italos on two original causes.” In *Georgian Christian thought and its cultural context. Memorial volume for the 125th anniversary of Shalva Nutsubidze (1888–1969)*. Edited by Tamar Nutsubidze, Cornelia B. Horn, and Basil Lourié, 236–243. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

[The author argues that Italos and Petritsi differ in their teaching on the substantiality of evil. Italos is said to profess the substantiality of evil in *Qu* 59, while Petritsi denies it. This difference marks Petritsi as a Christian and Italos as a (crypto-)pagan. Moreover, Italos is said to have favored apodeictic proof, while Petritsi favored analogical reasoning (examples, parables). Thus, it is unlikely that Petritsi was Italos’ student.]

MERIANOS, GERASIMOS [Μέριανος, Γεράσιμος]. *Οικονομικές ιδέες στο Βυζάντιο τον 12ο αιώνα. Οι περί οικονομίας απόψεις του Ευσταθίου Θεσσαλονίκης*. Ινστιτούτο Βυζαντινών Ερευνών, Μονογραφίες 13. Athens: Εθνικό Ίδρυμα Ερευνών, 2008.

[The author briefly refers to Italos’ condemnation as an example of when the Orthodox Church suppressed new and heterodox ideas with state support (p. 90). Furthermore, Italos is mentioned as a commentator of Plato (p. 95) and of Aristotle (p. 145).]

MEŠKO, MAREK. *Alexios I Komnenos in the Balkans, 1081–1095*. New approaches to Byzantine history and culture. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2023.

[The author notes in passing (pp. 143, 170) that Anna Komnēnē’s account of Italos’ trial distorts the chronology, as she suggests that his trial took place after Emperor Alexios had defeated Bohemond at Larissa in 1083. But the trial already occurred in 1082.]

MEYENDORFF, JEAN. *St Grégoire Palamas et la mystique orthodoxe. Maîtres spirituels*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1959.

[MEYENDORFF remarks (pp. 101–102) that Italos was condemned because he sought to produce a new synthesis between Hellenism and the Gospels, which was intended to replace the synthesis of the church fathers.]

MEYENDORFF, JEAN. *Le Christ dans la théologie byzantine*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1969.

[According to MEYENDORFF (pp. 267–269), Italos constructed a metaphysical system that was based on Neoplatonic views and that sought to be independent from Christian revelation. Italos taught that the human intellect is essentially divine and capable of reaching salvation through illumination. His use of the Platonic tradition had been considered heretical since the Origenist condemnations in the sixth century.]

MEYENDORFF, JEAN. *Byzantine theology: historical trends and doctrinal themes*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1974.

[The seminal monograph discusses Italos' trials on pp. 63–65, 87. Meyendorff points out that Italos' writings do not contain all the condemned teachings and that one cannot exclude the possibility that he taught them orally. The anathemas addressed two main issues: (1) they reaffirmed that ancient Greek philosophers were heresiarchs and (2) condemned anew Origenistic theses. Italos' condemnation is said to have reinforced the “traditional monastic abhorrence of ‘Hellenism’”.]

MINCIN, ELISABETH C. “Curing the common soul: rethinking Byzantine heresy through the literary motif of disease (11th–12th centuries).” PhD diss., University of St Andrews, 2015.

[The thesis investigates the role of heresy and its conception as a disease in the early Komnēnian period. It is argued that Emperor Alexios instrumentalized heresy trials, such as the one against John Italos, to bolster his authority. The thesis contains a survey of the primary sources of Italos' trial (pp. 112–126, 140–151) and a discussion of Italos' condemnation (pp. 165–174). Following CLUCAS (1981) and PARASKEVOPOULOU (1976), the author holds that Italos “was fundamentally guilty of methodological failings” and not of any doctrinal heterodoxy (pp. 169, 173).]

MTCHEDLIDZE, MAGDA. “‘Saghmrtō bunebis samobit khedvisatvis’ (Michael Pselos, Ioane It'alsos, Nik'oloz Metoneli, Ioane P'et'ritsi)” [‘For a triadic vision of divine nature’ (Michael Psellos, John Italos, Nicholas of Methōnē, Ioane Petritsi)]. In *Philosophy in global change. Jubilee volume dedicated to the 65th anniversary of Burkhard Mojsisch*. Philosophy, sociology, media theory 5. Edited by Tengiz Iremadze, 109–124. Tbilisi: Nek'eri, 2011.

[The article compares the views of four eleventh- and twelfth-century philosophers on a key trinitological expression by Gregory the Theologian. Italos' discussion thereof is shown to interpret the Trinity in Neoplatonic terms.]

MTCHEDLIDZE, MAGDA . “Mikael Pselosis da Ioane It’alosis k’oment’ arebi Grigol Ghvtismet’q’velis gamonatkvamze: ‘...amit’om monada, dasats’ q’isidan diadisak’en dadzruli, t’riadamde dadga” [The commentaries of Michael Psellos and John Italos on Gregory the Theologian’s expression: ‘Therefore the monad moved from the beginning to the dyad, stood until the triad’]. *Humanit’aruli k’vlevebi ts’elits’deuli* [*Studies in the humanities annual*] 2 (2012): 203–220.

[The article compares the commentaries of Psellos (*Opusc. theol.* 20) and Italos (*Qu* 69) on a key trinitological expression by Gregory the Theologian. While Psellos’ discussion is said to be rhetorically refined and in accordance with church tradition, Italos’ analysis is seen as rhetorically unpolished, linguistically faulty, and overtly Neoplatonic in content.]

MTCHEDLIDZE, MAGDA. “Two conflicting positions regarding the philosophy of Proclus in Eastern Christian thought of the twelfth century.” In *Byzantine perspectives on Neoplatonism*. BA – Series Philosophica 1. Edited by Sergei Mariev, 137–152. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2017. [The author briefly talks about Italos’ approach to ancient philosophers (p.145).]

NIARCHOS, CONSTANTINE G. “God, the world and man in the philosophy of John Italos.” PhD diss., University of Oxford, 1978.

[The dissertation surveys the life, work, and philosophy of John Italos. The author focuses on Italos’ theology, cosmology, and epistemology, arguing that the accusations of heresy leveled against Italos are largely unjustified. Italos was not a heretic but merely “ill-acquainted with theological expressions” (p. 430). He is presented as an eclectic dialectician, who lacked a comprehensive world view and failed to create a lasting school of thought.]

NIARCHOS, CONSTANTINE G. “The philosophical background of the eleventh-century revival of learning in Byzantium.” In *Byzantium and the classical tradition*. *University of Birmingham Thirteenth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies 1979*. Edited by Margaret Mullett and Roger Scott, 127–135. Birmingham: Centre for Byzantine Studies, 1981.

[The article outlines the revival of philosophy under John Mauropous, Michael Psellos, and John Italos. Italos is said to have been an eclectic and autonomous philosopher, who mainly drew upon Aristotle and the Neoplatonists (except for Plotinos).]

NIARCHOS, KŌNSTANTINOS G. [Νιάρχος, Κωνσταντῖνος Γ.]. “Ο Ἀριστοτέλης γιὰ τὴ φύση καὶ ἡ κριτικὴ τοῦ Ἰωάννου Ἰταλοῦ.” In *Proceedings of the World Congress on Aristotle (Thessaloniki August 7–14, 1978)*,

Vol. 2, 40–49. Athens: Ὑπουργεῖο Πολιτισμοῦ & Ἐπιστημῶν, 1981.
[The article shows that Italos did not consider “nature” to be the principle of motion and rest (as Aristotle had argued) but to be the receptacle that contains all beings.]

NIARCHOS, KŌNSTANTINOS G. [Νιάρχος, Κωνσταντῖνος Γ.]. “Κριτικὲς παρατηρήσεις τοῦ Ἰωάννου τοῦ Ἰταλοῦ στὴν ἀριστοτελικὴ θεωρία γιὰ τὴ φύση.” *Παρνασσός* 24 (1982): 10–40.

[The article is an expanded version of the previous study by NIARCHOS (1981). He discusses Aristotle’s definition of “nature” as the principle of motion and rest and reconstructs Italos’ refutation of this definition.]

NIARCHOS, CONSTANTINE G. “John Patricios: Michael Psellos in praise of his student and friend.” *Βυζαντινά* 11 (1982): 225–242.

[The study examines Psellos’ funeral oration in praise of John Patrikios. NIARCHOS paraphrases the main philosophical tenets of the oration and refutes the identification of its addressee with John Italos since Italos died long after Psellos. Also, Italos did not hold any imperial administrative position as the title “Patrikios” would require (p. 228).]

NIARCHOS, CONSTANTINE G. “John Italos and Aristotle: some new aspects of interpreting certain Aristotelian theories on nature and man.” In *The Seventeenth International Byzantine Congress. Abstracts of short papers*. Washington, D.C., August 3–8, 1986. Edited by Gary Vikan, 239–240. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 1986.

[The abstract emphasizes Italos’ critical attitude towards Aristotelian teachings, some of which he is said to have endorsed while refuting other ones, such as Aristotle’s theory of nature.]

NIARCHOS, CONSTANTINE G. “The Aristotelian roots of John Italos’ ontology.” In *La cultura filosofica della Magna Grecia*, 127–147. Messina: Edizioni G.B.M., 1989.

[NIARCHOS discusses Italos’ views on being, genera/species, substance, and hypostasis. He points out differences between Italos’ and Aristotle’s use of these key ontological terms.]

NIARCHOS, KŌNSTANTINOS G. [Νιάρχος, Κωνσταντῖνος Γ.]. *Ἑλληνικὴ φιλοσοφία κατὰ τὴ βυζαντινὴν τῆς περιόδου*. Athens: Ἐκδόσεις τοῦ Πανεπιστημίου Ἀθηνῶν, 1996.

[This extensive survey of Byzantine philosophy includes two discussions of Italos (pp. 28–38, 250–258). First, Italos is described as an eclectic and dialectic philosopher, who applied classical philosophy upon contemporary theolog-

ical issues, which his contemporaries misunderstood as heresy. NIARCHOS suggests that Italos' condemnation inhibited the revival of philosophical studies in the East (p. 38). Second, Italos' theology is discussed. It is argued that Italos' application of the Neoplatonic triad of rest, procession, return (μονή, πρόοδος, ἐπιστροφή) to the Godhead is, in fact, in harmony with Christian trinitology (pp. 250–258).]

NICOL, DONALD M. “The Byzantine Church and Hellenic learning in the fourteenth century.” *Studies in Church History* 5 (1969): 23–57. [Reprint in: Idem. *Byzantium: its ecclesiastical history and relations with the western world*. Collected studies series 12. London: Variorum, 1972, no. XII.]

[In this study, NICOL refers in passing to Italos on p. 26. He says that Italos was condemned in 1082 because he preferred ancient philosophy over church dogma and authority. His condemnation discouraged further philosophical inquiry in Byzantium.]

NICOLAIDIS, EFTHYMIOS. *Science and Eastern Orthodoxy: from the Greek fathers to the age of globalization*. Medicine, science, and religion in historical context. Translated by Susan Emanuel. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011.

[The monograph mentions Italos in passing (pp. 64–65, 67). Italos is presented as a heretic who “flagrantly contradicted” church dogma. NICOLAIDIS suggests that Italos taught all the views he was condemned of.]

NIKOLAOU, THEODOR. “Grundlegende Gedanken über die byzantinische Philosophie.” *Βυζαντινά* 9 (1977): 167–186.

[The article sketches some general characteristics of Byzantine philosophy. With regard to Italos, it is said that he vindicated the independence of philosophy concerning theology and that he understood the primary task of philosophy to be the dialectical exploration of ontology (p. 179). John Italos and Gemistos Plēthōn are juxtaposed (pp. 183, 186), and Italos is said to have reintroduced pagan elements with his philosophy (p. 179).]

NIKOLAOU, THEODOR. “Eine quellenkritische Untersuchung des Traktats (87) De iconis der Quaestiones Quodlibetales und seine Bedeutung hinsichtlich der Verurteilung von Johannes Italos.” In *Μνήμη Μητροπολίτου Ίκονίου Ιακώβου*, 279–294. Athens: Ἐστία Θεολόγων Χάλκης, 1984. [Reprint in: Idem. *Glaube und Forsche. Ausgewählte Studien zur griechischen Patristik und byzantinischen Geistesgeschichte*. Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Orthodoxe Theologie der Ludwig-

Maximilians-Universität München 10. 375–392. St. Ottilien: EOS-Verlag, 2012.]

[The article discusses Italos' short treatise on icons (*Qu* 87). The author argues for the authenticity of the work and shows that Italos borrows heavily from John of Damascus: *Qu* 87 testifies to Italos' orthodoxy vis-à-vis icon theology. NIKOLAOU suggests that his condemnation was probably due to political (and not theological) reasons. It is noteworthy that the article gives the wrong manuscript designation (following JOANNOU 1957, 234): the manuscript containing *Qu* 87 is not Parisinus gr. 1868 (as stated on pp. 377, 383) but cod. Parisinus gr. 1843.]

NILSSON, JONAS. "The emperor is for turning: Alexios Komnenos, John the Oxite and the persecution of heretics." In *Trends and turning points: constructing the late antique and Byzantine world*. The medieval Mediterranean 117. Edited by Matthew Kinloch and Alex MacFarlane, 185–202. Leiden: Brill, 2019.

[The study argues that Emperor Alexios began to persecute heretics systematically in the 1090s. The persecutions were an act of penitence and an attempt to correct public piety, so as to allow Alexios to regain God's favors and to respond to criticism voiced by John the Oxite. Italos' trial is briefly discussed (pp. 192–194): the trial was not part of Alexios' (later) program of persecuting heretics but was an "improvised and hasty attempt to divert attention" from the defeat at Dyrrhachium (1081) and to find a "scapegoat" (pp. 201, 193).]

ŒCONOMOS, LYSIMAQUE. *La vie religieuse dans l'empire byzantin au temps des Comnènes et des Anges*. Paris: E. Leroux, 1918.

[Chapter 2 (pp. 18–37) discusses John Italos and his impact on twelfth-century intellectuals. The author retells Italos' life as it is known from the *Alexiad* and summarizes Italos' hearings on the basis of the trial records. ŒCONOMOS compares the accusations mentioned by Anna Komnēnē with the eleven *Synodikon* anathemas, providing a French translation of the latter. He concludes that Italos was condemned because his philosophical system contradicted church dogma. It is noteworthy that the structure and content of the discussion follows closely CHALANDON 1900, 310–316.]

OEHLER, KLAUS. *Antike Philosophie und byzantinisches Mittelalter. Aufsätze zur Geschichte des griechischen Denkens*. Munich: Beck, 1969.

[In this selection of essays, OEHLER refers in passing to Italos' works and remarks that the eleventh century was virtually insignificant for the history of philosophy (pp. 278, 284).]

O'MEARA, DOMINIC. "Empédocle fragment 143: un nouveau témoignage chez Jean Italos." *Revue des études grecques* 123 (2010): 877–879.

[O'MEARA identifies a new fragment of Empedoklēs in Italos' *Qu* 82. It is shown that Italos' fragment is a rewording of fragment 143 DK, quoted by Theōn of Smyrna (fl. 100 AD). O'MEARA suggests that Italos' fragment provides an emendation of Theōn's testimony.]

O'MEARA, DOMINIC. "Conceptions of science in Byzantium." In *The Cambridge intellectual history of Byzantium*. Edited by Anthony Kaldellis and Niketas Siniosoglou, 169–182. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

[The study includes a discussion of Italos' definition of philosophy (pp. 174–176). Italos is said to have drawn from Proklos and Aristotle in endorsing a hierarchical notion of the sciences, in which philosophy (i.e., metaphysics) serves as the highest discipline.]

O'MEARA, DOMINIC. "Greek philosophical ethics in Byzantium: Michael Psellos and John Italos." In *Menschenbilder Ost und West. East and West. Philosophy, ethics, politics and human rights 6*. Edited by Hans-Christian Günther, 423–447. Nordhausen: Traugott Bautz, 2018.

[O'MEARA demonstrates that Psellos and Italos integrated Aristotle's notion of ethical virtue into the Neoplatonic hierarchy of virtues. They equated the Aristotelian ethical virtue with the Plotinian political virtue, which constitutes a means between extremes (a characteristic that does not apply to the higher forms of virtue). Furthermore, it is shown that Italos uses Porphyry's *Sententiae* in *Qu* 81 and Plato's *Phaidros* in *Qu* 63.]

O'MEARA, DOMINIC. "Aristotelian and Neoplatonic ethics in Michael Psellos and John Italos." *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai Theologia Orthodoxa* 66/1 (2021): 135–146.

[O'MEARA reiterates his demonstration that Psellos and Italos held a coherent theory of ethics, which identified Aristotle's ethical virtues with Neoplatonic political virtues. Aristotelian ethics are thus subsumed by the larger Neoplatonic worldview that considers mankind's current embodied existence to be a mere transitory stage. Our true self is the rational part of the soul, which strives to return to the intelligible and incorporeal God.]

OSTROWSKI, DONALD. *Europe, Byzantium, and the “intellectual silence” of Rus’ culture*. Beyond medieval Europe. Leeds: Arc Humanities Press, 2018.

[The author recurrently refers to John Italos (pp. 31–33, 69, *passim*) as an exceptional “secular” intellectual who applied dialectic upon theological matters. Italos is seen as an anomaly because dialectic and analytic reasoning were not part of Byzantine curricula. The author argues that the lack of logical training set Byzantium apart from the Latin West. Italos is compared to his near-contemporary Peter Abelard.]

PAPAIOANNOU, STRATIS. *Michael Psellos: rhetoric and authorship in Byzantium*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. [Revised Greek edition: Παπαϊωάννου, Στρατής. *Μιχαήλ Ψελλός. Ἡ ρητορική καὶ ὁ λογοτέχνης στὸ Βυζάντιο*. Heraklion: Πανεπιστημιακές Εκδόσεις Κρήτης, 2021, 31, 284, 287, *passim*]

[The book occasionally refers to Italos (pp. 10, 244, *passim*). At p. 241, PAPAIOANNOU notes that the character Theoklēs in Theodoros Prodromos’ *Xenedēmos* may be a literary combination of Psellos and Italos.]

PARASKEVOPOULOU, VASSILIKI. “Some aspects of the phenomenon of heresy in the Byzantine Empire and in the West, during the 11th and 12th centuries.” PhD diss., New York University, 1976.

[The thesis explores continuities among heretical movements in Byzantium and the Latin West. It contains a discussion of Italos’ condemnation (pp. 59–76). The author examines the validity of the anathemas and argues that they do not reflect Italos’ teachings. Italos’ condemnation is said to have resulted from an ideological confrontation with Byzantine mysticism (spearheaded by the teachings of Symeōn the New Theologian), which opposed the “hellenic, secularized movement of the intellectuals” (p. 66).]

PARRY, KEN. “Reading Proclus Diadochus in Byzantium.” In *Reading Plato in Antiquity*. Edited by Harold Tarrant and Dirk Baltzly, 223–235. London: Duckworth, 2006.

[The study surveys the Byzantine reception of the late antique philosopher Proklos. Italos is briefly mentioned (pp. 228–229). His condemnation is said to have limited the promotion of pagan Greek culture. PARRY translates anathema 7, which declares that Hellenic philosophy can only be used for didactic purposes. Parry mistakenly remarks that Italos belonged to the circle of Anna Komnēnē (p. 229)]

PASCHALIDIS, SYMEON A. “The hagiography of the eleventh and twelfth

centuries.” In *The Ashgate research companion to Byzantine hagiography, Vol. 1*. Edited by Stephanos Efthymiadis, 143–171. Farnham: Routledge, 2011.

[PASCHALIDIS concurs with GOUILLARD (1981, 182–183) in holding that John the Deacon and Maistor composed his defense of the cult of saints against John Italos, who stands accused in anathema 6 of having called into question the miracles and post-mortem efficacy of the saints (pp. 147–148).]

PODSKALSKY, GERHARD. *Theologie und Philosophie in Byzanz*. BA 15. Munich: Beck, 1977.

[PODSKALSKY briefly discusses John Italos on pp. 114–116. Italos is said to have been a “theological amateur” who did not develop a theological system but merely raised questions out of dialectical zeal. His epistemology allowed for multiple means of proof, which PODSKALSKY sees as an indication for a “double truth” theory. Also, Italos is said to have promoted a fideistic theology in *Qu* 87 and *Qu* 93, which further reinforces PODSKALSKY’s view that Italos believed in an unbridgeable gap between faith and reason.]

PODSKALSKY, GERHARD. *Von Photios zu Bessarion. Der Vorrang humanistisch geprägter Theologie in Byzanz und deren bleibende Bedeutung*. Schriften zur Geistesgeschichte des östlichen Europas 25. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003.

[The monograph contains recurrent references to Italos. Most notably, on pp. 26, 57 it is assumed that most of Italos’ writings have not survived, while on pp. 72–74 it is said that – according to the scholarly consensus – Italos’ condemnation was politically motivated. PODSKALSKY also notes that Italos did not properly know the theological terminology and that he faced hostility because of his foreign descent.]

POLEMIS, DEMETRIOS I. *The Doukai: a contribution to Byzantine prosopography*. London: Athlone Press, 1968.

[POLEMIS notes (p. 47) that Andronikos Doukas (c. 1057 – after 1081) was the addressee of two of Italos’ writings, namely his *De dialectica* and *Qu* 43.]

POLOVINKIN, SERGEY M. [Половинкин, Сергей М.]. “Антиплатонизм Льва Шестова и анафема на Иоанна Итала” [The antiplatonism of Lev Shestov and the anathema against John Italos]. *Философские науки* 8 (2006): 137–138.

[The short essay discusses the position of the Russian philosopher Lev Shestov (d. 1938) regarding the difference between limited divine omnipotence (*potentia ordinata*) and absolute divine omnipotence (*potentia absoluta*). Shestov

is said to have dismissed the former as a misconception created by philosophers. POLOVINKIN exemplifies Shestov's position by quoting from the anathemas against Italos, which are seen to reflect Italos' endorsement of God's limited power.]

PONTANI, FILIPPOMARIA. *Sguardi su Ulisse: la tradizione esegetica greca all'Odissea*. Sussidi eruditi 63. Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 2005.

[This monograph on the Greek exegetical tradition of the *Odyssey* makes a brief mention of Italos' exegesis of a key Homeric passage (*Odyssey* 19.562) in *Qu* 43 (pp. 157, 177)]

PONTIKOS, ĒLIAS [Ποντικός, Ηλίας]. “Η αναβίωση του φυσικού Αριστοτέλη τον 11ο αιώνα στο Βυζάντιο.” *Δωδώνη* 21/3 (1992): 83–99.

[The study examines the revival of Aristotelian physics in the eleventh century with a focus on Michael Psellos and Symeōn Sēth. A general characteristic of this revival was the notion of the hierarchy of causes, to which also Italos subscribed. Italos' *Qu* 51 is given as an example. *Qu* 51 explains solar eclipses by asserting that the primary cause is God the Creator, while the secondary cause is the moon covering the sun (p. 91). Furthermore, Italos is said to have agreed with Plotinos on the notion of matter (p. 92). Finally, Italos' condemnation is seen as an indication that his inquiries had a metaphysical trajectory (p. 97).]

RHOBY, ANDREAS. “Rezension von S. Kotzabassi, Byzantinische Kommentatoren der aristotelischen Topik.” *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 50 (2000): 386–388.

[The book review gives a short overview and positive evaluation of KOTZABASSI's edition (1999) of John Italos' und Leōn Magentēnos' commentaries. A few typos and mistakes in the German commentary are noted.]

RICKLIN, THOMAS. *Der Traum der Philosophie im 12. Jahrhundert. Traumtheorien zwischen Constantinus Africanus und Aristoteles*. Mitteleinische Studien und Texte 24. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

[A subchapter (pp. 278–284) is dedicated to Italos' views on dreams as expounded in *Qu* 43 (wrongly identified as *Qu* 53 on p. 280). In *Qu* 43, Italos interprets the famous Homeric passage from *Odyssey* 19, 562–567, which distinguishes between two kinds of dreams. Italos explains the passage in view of his Platonic doctrine of the soul and assigns dreams from the “horn gate” to the intellect (νοῦς) and dreams from the “ivory gate” to the lower realm of sense perception.]

- RIGO, ANTONIO. “Giovanni Italos commentatore della Gerarchia celeste dello Pseudo-Dionigi l’Areopagita.” *Nέα Πρόμη* 3 (2006): 223–232.
 [The study edits three scholia by Italos (contained in cod. Laurentianus plut. 5.13), which comment on the first chapter of Ps-Dionysios’ *Celestial Hierarchy*. RIGO shows that the scholia differ from those of John of Scythopolis and resemble Italos’ heavy reliance on Aristotle and the commentators. It is unclear whether Italos composed more scholia or only those three.]
- ROMANO, ROBERTO. “Due nuove testimonianze su Speusippo e Pirrone.” *Orpheus: rivista di umanità classica e cristiana* n.s. 6 (1985): 165–167.
 [The short article contains a quotation and discussion of Italos’ testimony on the ancient philosopher Speusippos in *Qu* 91.]
- ROMANO, ROBERTO. “Per la fortuna di Giovanni Italo nell’Italia meridionale.” *Ιταλοελληνικά* 1 (1988): 131–138.
 [ROMANO discusses three manuscripts that contain Italos’ writings (codd. Vat. gr. 316, Marc. gr. Z.265, Escor. Ω.IV.14) and that are of southern Italian provenance. He suggests that Nicholas of Otranto (d. 1235) may have brought Italos’ works from Byzantium to southern Italy.]
- ROMANO, ROBERTO. “Nuove testimonianze sul Traghelaphos in Giovanni Italo.” In *Σύνδεσμος. Studi in onore di Rosario Anastasi, Vol. 2*, 339–342. Catania: Università di Catania, 1994.
 [The study quotes and discusses three passages from Italos’ oeuvre (*Qu* 3, *Qu* 28, *Synopses minores in Porphyrii Isagogem*), in which the philosopher mentions the term τραγέλαφος as an example of a non-existent being.]
- RUNCIMAN, STEVEN. *The last Byzantine Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
 [RUNCIMAN briefly refers to Italos’ trial (p. 33) as a rare example when the Church broke with its hesitancy to persecute intellectuals.]
- SALAVILLE, SÉVÉRIEN. “Philosophie et théologie ou épisodes scolastiques à Byzance de 1059 à 1117.” *Échos d’Orient* 29 (1930): 132–156.
 [The article includes a chronology of Italos’ trial and a summary of the eleven anathemas (pp. 141–145). As Italos’ writings had not been edited yet, SALAVILLE suspends his verdict as to whether Italos actually taught heretical views. Yet, he observes resemblances with Psellos’ apology vis-à-vis Xiphilinos and suggests that the trial condemned a general philosophical-theological movement that had developed over the course of the late eleventh century.]

SCHUKIN, TIMUR. “Iconoclastic fragment of the apologetic note by John Italos.” *Scrinium* 4 (2008): 249–259.

[The author argues that Italos’ wording in his confession of faith, which talks about icon worship (λατρεύειν τὴν εἰκόνα), did not result from a lack of theological knowledge but from his specific icon theology. Italos deliberately chose the term worship (λατρεία), by which he meant ‘service’ to sensible shadows as a means to ascend to the intelligible archetype. Italos may have supported such usage of the term with Heb. 8:5 and Plato’s Analogy of the Cave.]

СНЧУКИН, ТИМУР [ЩУКИН, Тимур]. “Эсхатология Иоанна Итала” [The eschatology of John Italos]. *Вестник русской христианской гуманитарной академии* 11/4 (2010): 116–120.

[The study examines Italos’ views on the resurrection. The author contrasts anathema 3, 9, and 10 with Italos’ *Qu* 71 and *Qu* 86. It is shown that Italos taught the world to be perishable and a person’s identity to lie in their form. This form survives death and is eventually resurrected.]

SINIOSSOGLOU, NIKETAS. *Radical Platonism in Byzantium: illumination and utopia in Gemistos Plethon*. Cambridge classical studies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

[The monograph contains a few scattered references to Italos. SINIOSSOGLOU asserts that the *Synodikon* anathemas do not faithfully represent Italos’ views and that they were politically motivated (p. 28). Elsewhere, the idea is entertained that Italos may have used dissimulation to hide his philosophical paganism (pp. 82–85).]

SKEDROS, JAMES C. “‘You cannot have a Church without an empire’: political orthodoxy in Byzantium.” In *Christianity, democracy, and the shadow of Constantine*. Edited by George E. Demacopoulos and Aristotle Papanikolaou, 219–231. New York: Fordham University Press, 2017.

[The paper argues that as imperial power declined in the Palaiologan period, the role of the emperor became increasingly focused on the defense of Orthodoxy. Emperor Alexios I is said to have initiated this tendency by reinventing the *Synodikon* as a statement of Orthodoxy and expanding it with the anathemas against John Italos (p. 224). Alexios promoted “orthodoxy” as a defining element of Byzantine identity.]

SKOULATOS, BASILE. *Les personnages byzantins de l'Alexiade. Analyse prosopographique et synthèse*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Collège Érasme, 1980.

[The book contains a prosopographical entry on Italos on pp. 150–153. The entry recounts Italos' biography (based on the *Alexiad*) and his condemnation (based on the trial records). It is noted that the John Italos described in the trial records differs from the man presented by Anna Komnēnē.]

SMYTHE, DION. "Byzantine perceptions of the outsider in the eleventh and twelfth centuries: a method." PhD diss., University of St Andrews, 1992.

[The dissertation contains a detailed review of Anna Komnēnē's portrayal of Italos (pp. 248–265). Her account is shown to be a classical invective (ψόγος), which is not intent to show Italos as he actually was but to assimilate his character to the needs of the narrative. Komnēnē argues that Italos was an outsider and that her father, Emperor Alexios, put him in his rightful place by having him condemned.]

SMYTHE, DION. "Alexios I and the heretics: the account of Anna Komnene's *Alexiad*." In *Alexios I Komnenos, Vol. 1: papers of the Second Belfast Byzantine International Colloquium, 14–16 April 1989*. Belfast Byzantine texts and translations 4/1. Edited by Margaret Mullett and Dion Smythe, 232–259. Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 1996.

[The author discusses four heretics described by Anna Komnēnē in her *Alexiad*, namely Basil the Bogomil, John Italos, Neilos, and Leo of Chalcedon. It is argued that Emperor Alexios' anti-heretical actions were mostly politically motivated. With regard to Italos, SMYTHE summarizes Komnēnē's account of the philosopher and asserts that his condemnation was driven by imperial (rather than ecclesiastical) considerations (pp. 244–249).]

SPYRIDONOVA, LYDIA, ANDREY KURBANOV, and OKSANA YU. GONCHARKO. "The dialogue *Xenedemos*, or *Voices*, by Theodore Prodromos: a critical edition, with English translation." *Scrinium* 13/1 (2017): 227–275.

[The twelfth-century dialogue *Xenedēmos* contains the literary figure of a distinguished philosopher named Theoklēs. This figure may reflect a historical character. Among others, it has been suggested that it alludes to John Italos (pp. 229–230). However, the authors of the article prefer to identify Theoklēs with Michael Italikos (d. before 1157).]

STÉPHANOU, PELOPIDAS ÉTIENNE. “Jean Italos: l’immortalité de l’âme et la resurrection.” *Échos d’Orient* 32 (1933): 413–428.

[STÉPHANOU discusses Italos’ views on the immortality of the soul, the eternity of the world, and the resurrection. He compares the anathemas with Italos’ *Qu* 36, *Qu* 50, *Qu* 71, and *Qu* 86. It is shown that Italos taught the immortality of the intellect (νοῦς) and the corruptibility of the world, which contradict the third and fourth anathemas. With regard to the resurrection, Italos’ views resemble the Origenist doctrine of a spiritual resurrection, which accords with the ninth anathema. Stéphanou notes that Italos’ ‘mistake’ was to inquire about the post-mortem nature of the soul, which was considered a mystery by the Church.]

STÉPHANOU, PELOPIDAS ÉTIENNE. *Jean Italos: philosophe et humaniste*. OCA 134. Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1949.

[This seminal work examines Italos’ trial and teachings. STÉPHANOU assumes that Italos did not write any systematic exposition and that many of his extant writings are lecture notes. Occasional contradictions indicate that these texts are scholastic exercises and not doctrinal treatises. Furthermore, STÉPHANOU asserts that Italos was an eclectic: he adopted various tenets from Neoplatonism and Aristotelianism without adhering exclusively to any single school. Italos is seen as a commentator and educator rather than a genuine philosopher (p. 116).]

STÉPHANOU, PELOPIDAS ÉTIENNE. “Review of P. Joannou’ *Quaestiones Quodlibetales & Die Illuminationslehre*.” *Orientalia christiana periodica* 23 (1957): 431–436.

[The review discusses the critical edition of Italos’ *Quaestiones quodlibetales* (1956) and the monograph on Psellos and Italos (1956) by P. JOANNOU. While JOANNOU sees in Italos a clear-cut Christian philosopher, STÉPHANOU expresses his reservations. He points out that it is difficult to reconstruct a philosophical system merely on commentary and didactic texts. Moreover, he assumes that Italos’ most compromising writings have not reached us.]

THEODORIDIS, CHRISTOS. “Bemerkungen zum Text der Kommentare des Johannes Italos und Leon Magentinos zu den aristotelischen Topika.” *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 52 (2002): 191–196.

[This book review criticizes KOTZABASSI’s edition (1999) of John Italos’ and Leōn Magentēnos’ commentaries on Aristotle’s *Topics*. The reviewer draws attention to improperly identified sources, underestimated lacunae, and erroneous emendations.]

- TRIAN TARĒ-MARA, SŌTĒRIA (Τριαντάρη-Μαρά, Σωτηρία). “Η ρητορική στο φιλόσοφο Ιωάννη Ιταλό.” *Βυζαντινός Δόμος* 13 (2002–2003): 13–25.
 [The author discusses Italos’ concise treatise *De rhetorica*. Among others, it is shown that Italos distinguished different types of rhetoric and that he was well aware of the need to know one’s audience when setting the tone of a speech.]
- TRIZIO, MICHELE. “Ancient physics in the mid-Byzantine period: the Epitome of Theodore of Smyrna, consul of the philosophers under Alexios I Komnenos (1081–1118).” *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 54 (2012): 77–99.
 [The study shows that Theodore of Smyrna’s *Epitome* is a didactic compendium that was written either as a schoolbook or as an anthology of philosophical opinions. Theodore’s approach to teaching philosophy is said to be identical with Psellos’ and Italos’ approach, which indicates that the teaching of philosophy did not change after Italos’ condemnation in 1082.]
- TRIZIO, MICHELE. “A new testimony on the Platonist Gaius.” *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine studies* 53 (2013): 136–145.
 [The article draws attention to a hitherto unknown testimony by John Italos on the second-century middle Platonist Gaios. In *Qu* 44, Italos gives a short description of Gaios’ view on contradictories. TRIZIO argues for the authenticity of the testimony and suggests a first interpretation thereof.]
- TRIZIO, MICHELE. “Escaping through the Homeric gates: John Italos’ Neoplatonic exegesis of Odyssey 19.562–567: between Synesius and Proclus.” In *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale* 24 (2013): 69–83.
 [TRIZIO shows that Italos draws upon Synesios and Proklos in his interpretation of a key Homeric passage in *Qu* 43. It is argued that his interpretation is not an allegorization but a philosophical explication that uses Neoplatonic vocabulary.]
- TRIZIO, MICHELE. “A late antique debate on matter-evil revisited in 11th-century Byzantium: John Italos and his Quaestio 92.” In *Fate, providence and moral responsibility in ancient, medieval and early modern thought. Studies in honour of Carlos Steel*. Edited by Pieter d’Hoine and Gerd Van Riel, 383–394. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2014.
 [The study argues that Italos did not advance his own views on matter (*Qu* 92) and nature (*Qu* 93) but merely laid out the inconsistencies that pagan philosophers showed forth regarding those notions. Accordingly, Italos did not en-

dorse pagan tenets but rather followed the church fathers; he is said to have been a Christian philosopher and not a dissenter (pagan) Platonist.]

TRIZIO, MICHELE. “Eleventh- to twelfth-century Byzantium.” In *Interpreting Proclus: from Antiquity to the Renaissance*. Edited by Stephen Gersh, 182–215. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 2014.

[This article surveys references to and attitudes about Proklos in John Italos, Eustratios of Nicaea, and Nicholas of Methōnē. With regard to Italos it is said (pp. 182–190) that he recognized Proklos as the archtypical Platonist and that he refers to him throughout his *Quaestiones* (e.g., *Qu* 15, *Qu* 68, *Qu* 92). TRIZIO observes that most of Italos’ references to Proklos are taken from the *Elements of Theology*.]

TRIZIO, MICHELE. *Il neoplatonismo di Eustrazio di Nicea*. Biblioteca filosofica di Quaestio 23. Bari: Edizioni di Pagina, 2016.

[The monograph explores the life, work, and philosophical views of Eustratios of Nicaea, one of Italos’ students. Italos is said to have been critical of specific Neoplatonic teachings (p. 57) and to have adhered to the patristic fathers. Furthermore, Anna Komnēnē’s unfavorable characterization of Italos (as someone who read the ancient philosophers carelessly) is said to be a rhetorical inversion of the description of her mother, Eirene (p. 67).]

TRIZIO, MICHELE. “Reading and commenting on Aristotle.” In *The Cambridge intellectual history of Byzantium*. Edited by Anthony Kaldellis and Niketas Siniossoglou, 397–412. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

[The survey contains a couple of references to Italos. Among others, Italos is said to have composed a number of short treatises for his students and members of the aristocracy (e.g., *Qu* 50, *De dialectica*), which drew on the practice of excerpting from authoritative sources, such as Alexander of Aphrodisias and Philoponos (p. 407).]

TRIZIO, MICHELE. “Trials of philosophers and theologians under the Komnenoi.” In *The Cambridge intellectual history of Byzantium*. Edited by Anthony Kaldellis and Niketas Siniossoglou, 462–475. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

[TRIZIO surveys trials against philosophers and theologians during the eleventh and twelfth centuries and asserts that these testify to the vitality of Byzantine intellectual thought. The study begins with Italos’ trial in 1082 (pp. 463–464). It is said that the allegations leveled against Italos cannot be unambiguously found in his writings, as he was careful to avoid endorsing pagan views.]

TRIZIO, MICHELE. “Forging identities between heaven and earth: commentaries on Aristotle and authorial practices in eleventh- and twelfth-century Byzantium.” In *Byzantine commentaries on ancient Greek texts, 12th–15th centuries*. Edited by Baukje van den Berg, Divna Manolova, and Przemysław Marciniak, 61–99. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022.

[The study explores authorial practices of middle Byzantine philosophical commentators. Italos is said to have valued oral communication in addition to written instruction and to have taken into consideration his audience’s expectations and social status (pp. 65–71). Also, it is suggested that the copying of Italos’ commentary on Ps-Dionysios in cod. Laurentianus plut. 5.13 may have been interrupted by Italos’ condemnation (p. 65).]

USPENSKIY, FEODOR [Успенский, Феодоръ]. *Образование второго Болгарскаго царства [The formation of the Second Bulgarian Empire]*. Odessa: Типографія Г. Ульриха, 1879.

[The appendix (pp. 1–10) of USPENSKIY’s dissertation on the Second Bulgarian Empire gives a transcription and Russian translation of the Synodikon anathemas based on cod. Casanatense 334 (olim G.IV.14). He also transcribes and translates the initial section of Italos’ *De dialectica* on the basis of cod. Vat. gr. 316.]

USPENSKIY, FEODOR [Успенский, Феодоръ]. “Богословское и философское движеніе въ Византіи XI и XII вѣковъ” [The theological and philosophical movement in Byzantium during the XI and XII centuries]. *Журналъ Министерства народнаго просвѣщенія* 277 (1891): 102–159, 283–324. [Reprint in: Успенский, Феодоръ. *Очерки по исторіи византійской образованности [Essays on the history of Byzantine education]*. St Petersburg: Тип. В.С. Балашева, 1891, 146–245.]

[In his groundbreaking study, USPENSKIY reviews the main testimonies of Italos, i.e., the Synodikon anathemas and the accounts by Anna Komnēnē and Nikētas Chōniatēs. He attempts to reconstruct Italos’ teachings on the basis of those testimonies and argues that Italos was a Platonic realist. He draws parallels with intellectual developments in the Latin West (pp. 105–145).]

USPENSKIY, FEODOR [Успенский, Фёдор]. “Иоанн Итал и его школа” [John Italos and his school]. In Natela Kechagmadze, *Ioane It’alosis shemokmedeba [The works of John Italos]*, 158–173. Tbilisi: Metsniereba, 1970.

[KECHAGMADZE reproduces here the section from USPENSKIY’s seminal

study (1891) that discusses Italos; she omits all Greek quotations and reduces the study to its core arguments. USPENSKIY argues that Italos' views can be reconstructed based on the anathemas and that his philosophy contradicted church teachings. Furthermore, he compares Italos with scholastic philosophers, namely with Abelard (dialectic) and Roscellinus (nominalism).]

VASILIEV, ALEXANDER. *A history of the Byzantine Empire, 324–1453, 2 vols.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1952.

[VASILIEV briefly touches upon Italos' condemnation and its significance (Vol. 2, pp. 473–474). He sums up the different interpretations by USPENSKIY, BEZOBRAZOV, and BRYANTSEV, before hinting at the resemblance between John Italos and Peter Abelard.]

VIGLAS, KATELIS. "A historical outline of Byzantine philosophy and its basic subjects." *Res cogitans* 3 (2006): 73–105.

[The article discusses various aspects of Byzantine philosophy, especially during the Palaiologan period. It is asserted that Byzantine philosophy emerged in the ninth century due to the "awakening of a scientific interest" (p. 78) and polemics with the Latin West. Italos is seen as a heretic who "paid for his Neoplatonism and his criticism of the Christian dogma" (p. 80).]

WALLIES, MAX. *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis In Aristotelis Topicorum libros octo commentaria.* CAG 2.2. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1891.

[In the preface (pp. xlvii–l), the author lists lectiones variorum on Alexander of Aphrodisias' *Commentary on Aristotle's Topics* based on Italos' commentary on the Aristotelian work, which heavily depends on Alexander's *Commentary*. The lectiones variorum are taken from cod. Vindob. phil. gr. 203.]

WALTER, DENIS. *Michael Psellos. Christliche Philosophie in Byzanz. Quellen und Studien zur Philosophie* 132. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2017.

[The monograph contains a few scant references to Italos. The author asserts that the tendency to favor rational argumentation over reliance on the Holy Writ culminated with John Italos (pp. 49, 170). Psellos is said to have been politically more adroit than Italos, as he managed to avoid condemnation (p. 20). At one point, John Italos is confused with Michael Italikos (p. 8).]

WALTER, DENIS. "John Italos on authypostaton and authyparkton in Quaestio 7 and his processing of Psellos's Phil. min. I, Op. 7." In *The Byzantine Platonists, 284–1453*. Edited by Frederick Lauritzen and Sarah K. Wear, 192–206. Steubenville, OH: Franciscan University Press, 2021.

[The author shows that Italos followed Psellos in identifying the Neoplatonic concept “authypostaton” with substances (*ousiai*), i.e., with entities that are created by God and that are – once created – sufficient to exist by themselves. Psellos considered also souls, intellects, and (to a lesser extent) bodies to qualify as “authypostata”.]

WILSON, NIGEL G. *Scholars of Byzantium*. Revised edition. London: Duckworth, 1996.

[Chapter 8 contains a brief discussion of Italos (pp. 153–156). WILSON sketches Italos’ life, translates some of the Synodikon anathemas as well as an excerpt from Psellos’ *Eulogy of Italos*. It is said that Italos’ condemnation had no drastic effect on Byzantine higher education (p. 154) although it “signified the reassertion of ecclesiastical power and the suspension of freedom of thought” (p. 166).]

WOLSKA-CONUS, WANDA. “Les écoles de Psellos et de Xiphilin sous Constantin IX Monomaque.” *Travaux et mémoires* 6 (1976): 223–243.

[The author holds that Italos was appointed to the post of ‘Consul of the philosophers’ in 1075–1077 (p. 242).]

ZERVOS, CHRISTIAN. *Un philosophe néoplatonicien du XIe siècle: Michel Psellos. Sa vie, son œuvre, ses luttes philosophiques, son influence*. Paris: E. Leroux, 1919.

[John Italos is briefly mentioned on pp. 223–225. It is said that he developed further the Neoplatonist tendency of Psellos’ school and that his “intellectual paganism” provoked an orthodox reaction that led to his condemnation.]

II.2. Encyclopedias and handbooks

ADAMSON, PETER. “Hooked on classics: Italos and the debate over pagan learning.” In *Byzantine and Renaissance philosophy. A history of philosophy without any gaps* 6. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022, 45–51, 401–403.

BECK, HANS-GEORG. *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 12/2.1. Munich: Beck, 1959, 57, 92, 340, 542.

BENAKIS, LINOS G. [Μπενάκης, Λίνος Γ.] “Ιωάννης Ιταλός.” In *Παγκόσμιο βιογραφικό λεξικό: εκπαιδευτική ελληνική εγκυκλοπαίδεια, Vol. 4*. Athens: Εκδοτική Αθηνών, 1985, 174. [Reprint in: Idem. *Texts and studies on Byzantine philosophy*. Athens: Παρουσία, 2002, 656–657.]

- BRÉHIER, LOUIS. *La civilisation byzantine. Le monde byzantine 3*. Paris: Éditions Albin Michel, 1970, 362–363.
- БРОКГАУЗЪ & ЕФРОНЪ [Брокгаузъ & Ефронъ]. *Энциклопедическій словарь, Vol. 13a*. St Petersburg: Типо-литографія И.А. Ефрона, 1894, 716–717.
- BUCHWALD, WOLFGANG, ARMIN HOHLWEG, and OTTO PRINZ, eds. *Tusculum-Lexikon griechischer und lateinischer Autoren des Altertums und des Mittelalters*. Third edition. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1982, 396–397.
- CACOUROS, MICHEL. “De la pensée grecque à la pensée byzantine.” In *Encyclopédie philosophique universelle, Vol. 4: le discours philosophique*. Edited by Jean-François Mattéi, 1362–1384 [at 1367–1368, 1371, 1378]. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1998.
- CACOUROS, MICHEL. “Eustrate de Nicée.” In *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques, Vol. 3*. Edited by Richard Goulet, 378–388 [at 379–380]. Paris: CNRS, 2000.
- CONTICELLO, CARMELO G., and VASSA KONTOUMA-CONTICELLO. “Philosophie et théologie à Byzance.” In *Philosophie et théologie au Moyen Âge. Anthologie, Vol. 2*. Edited by Philippe Capelle-Dumont and Olivier Boulnois, 43–61 [at 45, 56–57]. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2009.
- DE LIBERA, ALAIN. *La philosophie médiévale*. Second edition. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1995, 30–31.
- DENNIS, GEORGE T. “John Italus.” In *New Catholic encyclopedia, Vol. 7*. Second edition. Detroit: Gale, 2003, 958–959.
- ELEUTERI, PAOLO. “La filosofia.” In *Lo spazio letterario di Grecia antica, Vol. 2: la ricezione e l’attualizzazione del testo*. Edited by Giuseppe Cambiano, Luciano Canfora, and Diego Lanza, 437–464 [at 446–447, 455–457]. Rome: Salerno Editrice, 1995.
- FIACCADORI, GIANFRANCO, and PAOLO ELEUTERI. *I Greci in Occidente. La tradizione filosofica, scientifica e letteraria dalle collezioni della Biblioteca Marciana*. Venezia: Il Cardo, 1996, 78.
- HILL, JONATHAN. *Dictionary of theologians to 1308*. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 2010, 373–374.
- HUNGER, HERBERT. *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzan-*

- tiner*, Vol. 1. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 5/1. Munich: Beck, 1978, 33–34, 43–44.
- HUNGER, HERBERT. “Philosophie. B. Byzanz.” In *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, Vol. 6, cols 2092–2100 [at col. 2097]. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 1999.
- IERODIAKONOU, KATERINA, and BÖRJE BYDÉN. “Byzantine Philosophy.” In *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta. URL: <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2018/entries/byzantine-philosophy/> (First edition: 2008; second edition: 2018).
- IERODIAKONOU, KATERINA. “John Italos.” In *Encyclopedia of medieval philosophy: philosophy between 500 and 1500*. Edited by Henrik Lagerlund, 623–625. Dordrecht: Springer, 2011.
- IERODIAKONOU, KATERINA. “Johannes Italos.” In *Die Philosophie des Mittelalters. Vol. 1: Byzanz. Judentum. Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*. Edited by Alexander Brungs, Georgi Kapriev, and Vilem Mudroch, 64–66. Basel: Schwabe Verlag, 2019.
- KAZHDAN, ALEXANDER, et al., eds. *The Oxford dictionary of Byzantium*. 3 vols. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991, II, 1059–1060.
- KRUMBACHER, KARL. *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des oströmischen Reiches (527–1453)*. Second edition. Munich: Beck, 1897, 444–455.
- NICOL, DONALD. *A biographical dictionary of the Byzantine Empire*. London: Seaby, 1991, 52–53.
- PAPADOPOULOS, STYLIANOS G. [Παπαδόπουλος, Στυλιανός Γ.] “Ἰωάννης ὁ Ἰταλός.” In *Θρησκευτικὴ καὶ ἠθικὴ ἐγκυκλοπαιδεία*, Vol. 7/1. Athens: Ἄθην. Μαρτίνοσ, 1965, 6–9.
- PELIKAN, JAROSLAV. *The Christian tradition: a history of the development of doctrine*, Vol. 2: *the spirit of Eastern Christendom (600–1700)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974, 250.
- PETIT, LOUIS. “Jean Italos.” In *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, Vol. 8/1. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1924, cols 826–828.
- PHEIDAS, VLASIOS I. [Φειδάσ, Βλάσιος Ι.]. *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία Β΄: ἀπὸ τὴν εἰκονομαχία μέχρι τὴ Μεταρρύθμιση*. Second edition. Athens: n.p., 1994, 282–293.

- PRANTL, CARL. *Geschichte der Logik im Abendlande, Vol. 2*. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1861, 293–295.
- RIGO, ANTONIO. “Johannes Italos.” In *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche, Vol. 5*. Third edition. Freiburg: Herder, 1996, col. 917.
- RIGO, ANTONIO. “Giovanni Italo.” In *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani, Vol. 56*. Rome: Istituto dell’Enciclopedia Italiana, 2001, 62–67.
- ROSENQVIST, JAN OLOF. *Die byzantinische Literatur. Vom 6. Jahrhundert bis zum Fall Konstantinopels 1453*. Translated by Jan O. Rosenqvist and Diether R. Reinsch. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007, 105.
- SHCHUKIN, TIMUR [Щукин, Тимур]. “Иоанн Итал” [John Italos]. In *Антология восточно-христианской богословской мысли. Ортодоксия и гетеродоксия [Anthology of Eastern Christian theological thought. Orthodoxy and heterodoxy]*, Vol. 2. Edited by Grigoriy I. Benevich and Dmitriy S. Biryukov, 321–340. Moscow: Никея, 2009.
- SMITH, WILLIAM. *Dictionary of Greek and Roman biography and mythology, Vol. 2*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1867, 598–599.
- STEPHANIDĒS, VASILEIOS K. [Στεφανίδης, Βασίλειος Κ.]. *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία: ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς μέχρι σήμερον*. Second edition. Athens: Ἐκδοτικὸς οἶκος Ἀστῆρ Ἀλ. & Ἐ. Παπαδημητρίου, 1959, 423–424.
- TATAKIS, BASILE. *La philosophie Byzantine*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1949, 210–215, 226–227. [Translations: Tatakēs, Vasileios [Τατάκης, Βασίλειος]. *Ἡ βυζαντινὴ φιλοσοφία*. Βιβλιοθήκη γενικῆς παιδείας 5. Translated by Eva Kalpourtzē. Athens: Ἐταιρεία Σπουδῶν Νεοελληνικοῦ Πολιτισμοῦ καὶ Γενικῆς Παιδείας, 1977, 201–206, 329–331; Tatakis, Basil. *Byzantine philosophy*. Translated by Nicholas J. Moutafakis. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2003, 169–174, 186–187, 322–323.]
- TATAKĒS, VASILEIOS N. [Τατάκης, Βασίλειος Ν.]. *Θέματα χριστιανικῆς καὶ βυζαντινῆς φιλοσοφίας*. Βιβλιοθήκη Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας 37. Athens: Τυπογραφεῖον τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, 1952, 180–182. [Translation: Tatakis, Basil N. *Christian philosophy in the patristic and Byzantine tradition*. Orthodox theological library 4. Translated by George D. Dragas. Rollinsford, NH: Orthodox Research Institute, 2007, 263–266.]
- TATAKIS, BASILE. “La philosophie grecque patristique et byzantine.” In

Histoire de la philosophie, Vol. 1. Orient. Antiquité. Moyen Âge. Encyclopedie de la Pléiade 26. Edited by Brice Parain, 936–1005 [at 1001]. Paris: Gallimard, 1969. [Translation: TATAKĒS, VASILEIOS N. [Τατάκης, Βασίλειος Ν.]. “Η έλληνική πατερική και βυζαντινή φιλοσοφία.” *Δευκαλίων* 4/14 (1975): 146–202, at 199–200.]

TODT, KLAUS-PETER. “Johannes Italos.” In *Biographisch-bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon, Vol. 3*. Edited by Friedrich W. Bautz and Traugott Bautz, cols 399–400. Herzberg: Verlag Traugott Bautz, 1992.

WESSEL, KLAUS. “Dogma und Lehre in der orthodoxen Kirche von Byzanz.” In *Die christlichen Lehrentwicklungen bis zum Ende des Spätmittelalters*. Edited by Carl Andresen, Ekkehard Mühlenberg, Adolf M. Ritter, et al., 289–410 [at 339–345]. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.

II.3. Bibliographies

BENAKIS, LINOS G. “Grundbibliographie zum Aristoteles-Studium in Byzanz.” In *Aristoteles. Werk und Wirkung, Paul Moraux gewidmet, Vol. 2*. Edited by Jürgen Wiesner. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1987, 352–379, at 354–355, 372.

LAURITZEN, FREDERICK. *The depiction of character in the Chronographia of Michael Psellos*. Byzantios 7. Turnhout: Brepols, 2013, 232.

NESSERĒS, ĒLIAS CH. [Nέσσερης, Ηλίας Χ.]. “Η παιδεία στην Κωνσταντινούπολη κατά τον 12ο αιώνα,” 2 vols. PhD diss., University of Ioannina, 2014, II, 241–249.

ANDRÁS KRAFT
University of Vienna
andras.kraft@univie.ac.at

Index

- Adamson, Peter, 67
Agapitos, Panagiotis A., 21
Alexakis, Alexander, 23
Anastasi, Rosario, 23
Angelou, Athanasios D., 23
Angold, Michael, 23
Arabatzēs, Geōrgios, 24
Atanasova, Maria, 24
- Baldwin, Barry, 22
Baranov, Vladimir, 24
Barber, Charles, 25
Beck, Hans-Georg, 67
Beck, Hildebrand, 25
Benakis, Linos G., 25, 26, 67, 71
Bezobrazov, Pavel, 12, 26
Biriukov, Dmitry, 26
Boissonade, Jean F., 19
Brisson, Luc, 26
Brokgauz, 68
Browning, Robert, 27
Bryantsev, Dimitriy, 27
Bréhier, Louis, 68
Buchwald, Wolfgang, 68
Buckler, Georgina, 27
Buckley, Penelope, 28
Bydén, Börje, 28
- Cacouros, Michel, 28, 68
Campo Echevarría, Alberto del, 28
Carr, John C., 29
Castelli, Carla, 29
Cereteli, Gregorius (Grigol), 12, 15, 16, 29
Chalandon, Ferdinand, 29
- Cheyne, Jean-Claude, 29
Clucas, Lowell, 18, 21, 30
Conley, Thomas M., 17, 30
Constantelos, Demetrios J, 30
Constantinides, Costas N., 31
Conticello, Carmelo G., 68
Cunningham, Mary B., 31
- Darrouzès, Jean, 20, 31
de Garay, Jesús, 31
de Muralt, Edouard, 31
Dennis, George T., 68
Diamantopoulos, Georgios, 32
Dias, João V. de Medeiros Publico, 32
Drexler, Franz, 19
Dujčev, Ivan, 32
Dyck, Andrew R., 32
- Efron, 68
Efthymiadis, Stephanos, 32
Eleuteri, Paolo, 68
- Fiaccadori, Gianfranco, 68
Frankopan, Peter, 22
Fuchs, Friedrich, 33
- Garland, Lynda, 33
Gazi, Effi, 33
Giakoumakēs, Nikolaos, 34
Gigineishvili, Levan, 34
Giocarinis, Kimon, 35
Glavinas, Apostolos A., 35
Golitsēs, Pantelēs, 35
Goncharko, Oksana Yu., 61
Gouillard, Jean, 18, 20, 21, 35, 36

Gounaridis, Pâris, 36
 Grumel, Venance, 20, 36
 Guillard, Rodolphe, 36
 Gutas, Dimitri, 36

 Hill, Jonathan, 68
 Hohlweg, Armin, 68
 Huggins, Mark P., 37
 Hunger, Herbert, 68, 69
 Hussey, Joan M., 37

 Ierodiakonou, Katerina, 37, 38, 69
 Irmscher, Johannes, 38

 Jaworska-Wołoszyn, Magdalena,
 38
 Jenkins, David, 38
 Joannou, Perikles, 12, 38, 39
 Jugie, Martin, 39

 Kaldellis, Anthony, 40
 Kambylis, Athanasios, 22
 Kapriev, Georgi, 41
 Karpozēlos, Apostolos, 41
 Kazhdan, Alexander P., 41, 69
 Kechagmadze, Natela, 12–18, 41,
 42
 Kldiashvili, Darejan, 42
 Kontouma-Conticello, Vassa, 68
 Kotzabassi, Sofia, 14
 Kotzia-Pantelē, Paraskeuē, 42
 Kraft, András, 12, 13, 42
 Krausmüller, Dirk, 43
 Krumbacher, Karl, 69
 Kurbanov, Andrey, 61
 Kurtz, Eduard, 19

 Lauritzen, Frederick, 43, 44, 71
 Leib, Bernard, 22
 Lemerle, Paul, 44
 Littlewood, Antony R., 19

 Lloyd, Anthony C., 44
 Louth, Andrew, 44
 Lukhovitskiy, Lev, 44

 Macdonald, Jeffrey L., 44
 Macrides, Ruth, 45
 Magdalino, Paul, 45, 46
 Malamut, Élisabeth, 46
 Mamagakēs, Dionysios A., 47
 Marchetto, Monica, 47
 Mariev, Sergei, 13, 47
 Marinis, Vasileios, 48
 Marr, Niko, 48
 Masai, François, 48
 Matsoukas, Nikos A., 48
 Meeusen, Michiel, 49
 Melikishvili, Damana, 49
 Merianos, Gerasimos, 49
 Meško, Marek, 49
 Meyendorff, Jean, 49, 50
 Mincin, Elisabeth C., 20, 50
 Moore, Paul, 19
 Mtchedlidze, Magda, 42, 50, 51

 Nesserēs, Ēlias Ch., 71
 Niarchos, Constantine G., 18, 51,
 52
 Nicol, Donald M., 53, 69
 Nicolaidis, Efthymios, 53
 Nikolaou, Theodor, 53
 Nilsson, Jonas, 54

 Œconomos, Lysimaque, 21, 54
 Oehler, Klaus, 54
 O’Meara, Dominic J., 12, 55
 Ostrowski, Donald, 56

 Papadopoulos, Stylianos G., 69
 Papaioannou, Stratis, 56
 Paraskevopoulou, Vassiliki, 56

Parry, Ken, 56
Paschalidis, Symeon A., 56
Pelikan, Jaroslav, 69
Perczel, István, 12
Petit, Jean, 69
Pheidas, Vlasios I., 69
Podskalsky, Gerhard, 57
Polemis, Demetrios I., 57
Polovinkin, Sergey M., 57
Pontani, Filippomaria, 58
Pontikos, Ēlias, 58
Prantl, Carl, 70
Prinz, Otto, 68

Rapp, Stephen, 33
Reinsch, Diether R., 22
Rhoby, Andreas, 58
Ricklin, Thomas, 58
Rigo, Antonio, 17, 59, 70
Romano, Roberto, 18, 22, 59
Rosenqvist, Jan Olof, 70
Runciman, Steven, 59

Salaville, Sévérien, 59
Schukin, Timur, 60
Sewter, Edgar R.A., 22
Shchukin, Timur, 17, 60, 70
Siniosoglou, Niketas, 13, 36, 60
Skedros, James C., 60
Skoulatos, Basile, 61
Smith, William, 70
Smythe, Dion, 61
Spyridonova, Lydia, 61
Stephanidēs, Vasileios K., 70
Stéphanou, Pelopidas Étienne, 62

Tafel, Gottlieb L. F., 22
Tatakis, Basile, 70
Theodoridis, Christos, 62
Todt, Klaus-Peter, 71

Triantarē-Mara, Sōtēria, 63
Trizio, Michele, 63–65

Uspenskiy, Feodor, 20, 22, 65

Vasiliev, Alexander, 66
Viglas, Katelis, 66

Wallies, Max, 14, 66
Walter, Denis, 66
Wessel, Klaus, 21, 71
Wharton Epstein, Ann, 41
Wilson, Nigel G., 19, 21, 67
Wolska-Conus, Wanda, 67

Zervos, Christian, 67