

Paper given at the conference “[Unlocking the Potential of Texts: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Medieval Greek](http://www.mml.cam.ac.uk/greek/grammarofmedievalgreek/unlocking/Dendrinios.pdf)” at the Centre for Research in the Arts, Social Sciences, and Humanities, University of Cambridge, 18-19 July 2006.

Please quote with the URL

“<http://www.mml.cam.ac.uk/greek/grammarofmedievalgreek/unlocking/Dendrinios.pdf>”
and the date you have last accessed the file.

© 2007, Charalambos Dendrinios

Charalambos Dendrinios
Royal Holloway, University of London

Co-operation and friendship among Byzantine scholars in the circle of Emperor Manuel II Palaeologus (1391-1425) as reflected in their autograph manuscripts*

Between October 1414 and March 1415 Emperor Manuel II Palaeologus, on his way to Constantinople from the Peloponnese, visited Thessalonike. There he attended state matters and met old friends, among them his spiritual fathers hieromonks David and Damianos of Vatopedi. About a year later Manuel sent two letters addressed to both friends, together with a lengthy composition. In the first well-known letter, which has been edited twice in the past,¹ Manuel analysed the situation he faced in the Morea and explained the reasons for the delay in sending

* This paper is dedicated to my teacher Miss Julian Chrysostomides who suggested its title and offered valuable suggestions throughout its preparation. It is offered to her as an expression of gratitude for our μακρὰ συνεργασία καὶ βαθεῖα φιλία.

¹ Inc. Οἶδα βραδύτερον τῶν ὑμετέρων ἐλπιδῶν. Eds. R-J. Loenertz, ‘Épître de Manuel II Paléologue aux moines David and Damien 1416’, in *Sylloge Byzantina in onore di Silvio Giuseppe Mercati* (= *Studi bizantini e neoellenici* 9 [1957]), pp. 294-304, and G.T. Dennis, *The Letters of Manuel II Palaeologus*, *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*, VIII (Washington, D.C., 1977) [henceforth: *Manuel Palaeologus, Letters*], 68, pp. 206-18 and 218 n. 1. See R-J. Loenertz, ‘Écrits de Macaire Macrès et de Manuel Paléologue dans les mss. Vat. gr. 1107 et Crypten. 161 [Z.δ.Ι.]’, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 15 (1949), 185-193 at 191 (=idem, *Byzantina e Franco-Graeca*, *Storia e Letteratura*, *Racolta di Studi e Testi*, 2 vols., nos. 118, 145 (Rome, 1970, 1978), I, pp. 71-79 at 77); J.W. Barker, *Manuel II Palaeologus (1391-1425). A Study in Late Byzantine Statesmanship* (N. Brunswick, N.J., 1969), pp. 300-301.

the work to them as he had promised.² The second letter, so far unpublished, which Manuel wrote by way of introduction to his composition, recalls the incident of his previous meeting with David and Damianos in Thessalonike.

“So, when you entered my room”, he writes, “you were asked to be seated, and as you found me still writing this work, which I am now sending you, you looked at it and asked me what was it all about, and why, as it seemed, was I wrapping it up in great hurry ... I did not answer, but I stretched my right hand and gave you the book ... As soon as you took it, you unfolded it quickly. It looked like an outline, and not a complete work ... Time not permitting, you only went through some parts of it without reading them carefully — for this is something people do who can afford leisure time”. The Emperor then goes on to describe his friends’ positive response and suggestion that “it is not right to leave it half-finished, just like an aborted foetus”. Therefore, despite his own reservations in the face of possible negative reviews, Manuel decided to persevere with it and bring it to completion.³

The work in question was composed by Manuel in the form of a *Confession* to his spiritual father on the occasion of his own recovery from a serious illness. It was supposed to be shown, as he says, “to my fathers in God, to teachers and friends, from whom it was not right to hide my thoughts”. “It was prepared”, he goes on, “like some kind of remedy against oblivion, as a slap in the face to remind me of things, whose recollection would benefit me greatly. For what makes one try to get help is by repenting. So, if anyone reads <this composition>, even if he were to criticize its author on the basis of vocabulary, plan and order, he will not succeed much. For he will not deflect me from my purpose, unless he judges that my

² In this letter Manuel states that given the situation it is not surprising that the work ‘was not completed sooner; the surprising thing is that it has been finished at all, even after such a long time’ (ed. and trans. Dennis, *Manuel Palaeologus, Letters*, 68, pp. 206-207).

³ Inc. Χρόνω πέρας εἰληφὸς τὸ βιβλίον. Vat. gr. 1107, fol. 318v.3-21: ... εἰσιόντες τοῖνυν ὡς ἐμὲ, ὡς δεδομένον ἦν ὑμῖν κεκαθήκατε· ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐν ταῖν χεροῖν, ἔτι ὑφαινόμενον εὐρεθείη τὸ νῦν ὑμῖν πεμπόμενον πόνημα, καὶ ὀφθαλμοῖς τοῖς ὑμετέροις ὀφθείη, κινήσειέ τε τὴν γλῶτταν ἐρέσθαι, τί ποτ’ ἂν εἴη τὸ θεαθέν, καὶ διατί σὺν οὐ μικρᾷ τινι διαθέσει δοκεῖ περιελήφθαι μοι ταῖν χεροῖν, ὡδί πως τοῖνυν τούτων γεγενημένων, ἀπεκρινάμην μὲν οὐδέν· προύτεινα δὲ τὴν δεξιὰν παρεχομένην τὴν δέλτον· ἦν περ ἀνὰ χειρὸς δεξάμενοι δόντος ἐμοῦ, σκιαγραφία προσεοικυῖαν, οὐκ ἐχρωσμένη γραφῇ, τῇ μηκέτι δεομένη τελειώσεως, ἀναπτύξαντες ὡς ἔχετε τάχους, εἴτ’ ἐπὶ τροχάδην διεξελθόντες ἑνὶά τινα ταύτης μέρη, τοῦ καιροῦ μὴ συγχωροῦντος, μήτ’ ἀναγνῶναι τὸ πᾶν, μήτ’ ἀκριβοῦν τὸ ἀναγνωσθέν, ταῦτα δὴ τὰ τῶν σχολαζόντων, εἰρήκατε τῇ τοῦ πονήματος ἡσθῆναι πραγματεία· καὶ καλὸν εἶναι κεκρίκατε, μὴ καθάπερ ἄμβλωμα, ἡμιτελὲς τοῦτ’ ἀφεῖναι· κἂν ἐκβαίη μοι τὸ πρᾶγμα κατὰ νοῦν, τῆς τελεσιουργοῦ δυνάμεως συνεφαπτομένης τῶν πόνων, ἀναβολαῖς ἀπάσαις χαίρειν εἰπόντα, ἀξιώσαι με φροντίσαι, ὅπως ὡς ὑμᾶς τὸ τάχος ἀφίκοιτο.

thought is fruitless and worthy of criticism”.⁴ In this spirit he asked his spiritual fathers, “should the work be found to be entirely unsound, feel free to correct it, that is, if the faults are curable. But if they are found to be incurable, it should be burnt in the all-devouring fire”.⁵

This lengthy composition Manuel sent to David and Damianos together with the accompanying letter is preserved in codex *Cryptensis* Z.δ.I (161).⁶ This handsome and richly decorated Ms. contains a selection of the Emperor’s rhetorical, literary and theological works,⁷ copied by Isidore (later Metropolitan of Kiev and Cardinal), who was Manuel’s main scribe and close collaborator.⁸ This Ms. seems to have been the Emperor’s personal copy, containing the final ‘edited’ version of his works. This codex was possibly passed on to his son and successor John VIII, before it came into Bessarion’s possession as the *ex libris* indicates,⁹ and subsequently deposited in the Library of the Abbey of Santa Maria Grottaferrata in 1462, when he was named *abate*

⁴ Vat. gr. 1107, fols. 319r.17-319v.1: ... ὥς τι λήθης κέκραται φάρμακον, κονδυλίζειν ἀμηγέπη καὶ μιννήσκειν ἡμᾶς πραγμάτων, ὧν τὸ μεμνήσθαι, πολὺ τι κέρδος· ἐκ τοῦδε γὰρ οἶμαι συμβαίνειν, πειρᾶσθαι καρποῦσθαι τῇ μετανοίᾳ βοήθειαν· ὥστ’ εἴ τις τοῦτο θεάσαιτο, κἂν νεμεσίῃ τῷ γεγραφότι, τῶν ὀνομάτων ἕνεκα, καὶ τῆς πλοκῆς φημι καὶ τῆς τάξεως, μικράττα δῆξει καὶ πλήξει· οὐ γὰρ λυμανεῖται μου τῇ προθέσει, ἕως ἂν μὴ καὶ τὸν νοῦν ἐξελέγξῃ, ἄκαρπον παντάπασιν ὄντα, καὶ διαβολῆς ἡστινosoῦν ἄξιον. ἔπειτ’ οὐδὲ τοῖς τυχοῦσι φανησόμενον ἔρχεται· πατράσι δὲ κατὰ Θεὸν καὶ διδασκάλους καὶ φίλους, οἷς οὐδὲ τοὺς λογισμοὺς ἥ κρύπτειν θέμις.

⁵ Vat. gr. 1107, fol. 320r.5-8: εἰ δὲ οὐδὲν ἱερόν, φασιν, ὅπερ ἀπήει, ἀλλ’ ὅμως γε διορθοῦσθε, εἰ ἰάσιμόν ἐστι τὸ κακόν· θεραπείας δὲ κρεῖττον παντάπασιν εὐρεθέν, πυρὶ παμφάγῳ μιγείτω (cf. Euripides, *Medea* 1187).

⁶ Manuel’s letter (fols. 3r-10v) is followed by his work (fols. 12r-65v, 75r-81v) entitled Τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου καὶ φιλοχρίστου βασιλέως Μανουὴλ τοῦ Παλαιολόγου, πρὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ πνευματικόν, ὑπὲρ τῶν καθ’ ἑαυτὸν μετὰ τὸ ράϊσαι δεινῶς κατασκευάσης αὐτῷ χαλεπωτάτης νόσου, inc. Καὶ πᾶσι μὲν χρεῶν εἶναι νομίζω, Θεῷ χάριτας εἰδέναι. For a description of *Crypten*. Z.δ.I (161), see D.A. Rocchi, *Codices Cryptenses seu Abbatiae Cryptae Ferratae in Tusculano digesti et illustrati* (Grottaferrata, 1883), pp. 501-502. Both texts are preserved also in two seventeenth-century copies of the Grottaferrata Ms.: *Par. suppl. gr.* 1018, fols. 1r-6v (Letter), 7r-52r (Confession), and *Pontificio Collegio Greco, Roma*, cod. 11, fols. 1r-8r (Letter) 9r-69v (Confession); cf. Dennis, *Manuel Palaeologus, Letters*, 68, p. 218 v. 1.

⁷ The layout and decoration of the Ms. is very similar to those of *Vat. gr.* 1619, fols. 1v-54v, 186r-210v; *Barb. gr.* 219; and *Vindob. phil. gr.* 98, all containing Manuel’s works copied by Isidore. It is interesting to note that these four Mss. are complementary to each other, thus forming, with the exception of Manuel’s lengthy *Dialogues with the Persian*, a complete collection of the Emperor’s published works: see Ch. Dendrinos, *An annotated critical edition (editio princeps) of Emperor Manuel II Palaeologus’ treatise ‘On the Procession of the Holy Spirit’* (unpublished PhD thesis, Royal Holloway, University of London, 1996) [henceforth: *Manuel Palaeologus, On the Procession of the Holy Spirit*], pp. lxii-lxiii with n. 354.

⁸ On Isidore and his co-operation with Manuel, see Dendrinos, *Manuel Palaeologus, On the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, pp. lx-lxv.

⁹ *Crypten*. 161 (Z.δ.I), fol. 2v top margin: + ἐκ τῶν βησσαρίων(ος) καρδινάλεως τὴν ἀξίαν, τὸ γένος Ἕλληνας. See Rocchi, *Codices Cryptenses*, pp. 501-502.

commendatario of the Abbey by Pope Pius II.¹⁰ This Ms. is beautifully bound in blue-green silk, bearing on its cover the insignia of the Palaeologi, the double-headed eagle and their monogram (ΠΑΛΓ).¹¹

No trace of the working copy with the draft of the *Confession* has so far been found. However, an earlier version of the same *Letter to David and Damianos* is contained in another important Ms., Vat. gr. 1107, fols. 315r-321r. The letter in this codex has a slightly different inscription.¹² In addition, it bears the note ‘imperial’ (βασιλικόν) on the top margin.¹³ Closing his letter, the Emperor asked David and Damianos to remember him to their friend “Makarios the priest”.¹⁴ It appears that this ‘Makarios’ is no other than the Thessalonian scholar and theologian Makarios Makres (1382/3-7.I.1431), then hieromonk and David’s disciple in Vatopedi, both members of Manuel’s intellectual entourage.¹⁵ This assumption is based both on textual and palaeographical evidence.

First, the phraseology in Manuel’s remarks on Makarios’ talents and character in this letter is echoed in the *Life of Makarios Makres*, where the anonymous biographer, evidently a member of Makarios’ close circle of fellow-monks, states that Manuel

¹⁰ See P. Eleuteri in *Bessarione e l’Umanesimo: Catalogo della mostra*, ed. G. Fiaccadori (Istituto Italiano per gli studi filosofici, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana: Naples, 1994), pp. 385-86.

¹¹ See J. Irigoin, ‘Un groupe de reliures byzantines au monogramme des Paléologues’, *Revue française d’histoire du livre*, n. s. 36 (1982), 273-85; I. Hutter ed., *Byzanz und der Westen. Studien zur Kunst des europäischen Mittelalters* (Vienna, 1984), Plate XXI, no. 17; Ph. Hoffmann, ‘Une nouvelle reliure byzantine au monogramme des Paléologues (Ambros. M 46 sup. = Gr. 512)’, *Scriptorium* 39 (1985), 274-81, esp. 278f. n. 26; H. Hunger, *Schreiben und Lesen in Byzanz. Die byzantinische Buchkultur* (Munich, 1989), p. 37 and n. 55, pl. 11; Eleuteri in *Bessarione e l’Umanesimo*, p. 386, pl. 5.

¹² Vat. gr. 1107, f. 315r: Τοῖς ὁσιωτάτοις ἐν ἱερομονάχοις καὶ πνευματικοῖς πατράσι Δαυὶδ καὶ τῷ συνωνύμῳ. Cf. *Crypten*. Z.δ.Ι (161), f. 3r: Τοῖς ὁσιωτάτοις ἐν ἱερομονάχοις καὶ πνευματικοῖς πατράσι Δαυὶδ καὶ Δαμιανῷ, εἰ καὶ ἐκ προοιμίων τὸ γράμμα, θατέρῳ δοκεῖ πέμπεσθαι.

¹³ For this term used in imperial letters see E. Vranoussi, *Βυζαντινὰ Ἐγγράφα τῆς Μονῆς Πάτμου*, vol. Α’: *Αὐτοκρατορικά* (Athens, 1980), pp. 322-26.

¹⁴ Vat. gr. 1107, fols. 320v.22-321r.1: ... τῷ ... ἱερεῖ Μακαρίῳ, τῷ διὰ τὴν περόεσσαν ὑπακοὴν ἐφθακότι πρὶν ἢ βαδίσαι ἐφ’ ᾧ καὶ ἀπεκείρατο, χαίρειν τὲ καὶ ἅμα προκόπτειν ταῖς τῆς ἀρετῆς ἀναβάσεσιν ὃ δὴ φιλεῖ συμβαίνειν ἀνδράσι, τοῖς τῶν μὲν ὀπισθεν διὰ γενναιότητα τὴν ἐκ μετριότητος μὴ δὲ μεμνημένοις, τοῖς δὲ ἔμπροσθεν, τῷ πρὸς τὸ μόνον ἐφετὸν [scil. Θεὸν] κεχηγνέναι ἐκτεινομένοις (my italics). Cf. below, n. 16.

¹⁵ For Makarios Makres, see E. Trapp et al. eds., *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit*, fasc. 1-12 (Vienna, 1976-90), I/7, no. 16379, pp. 41-42; A. Argyriou, *Macaire Macrès et la polémique contre l’Islam*, *Studi e Testi*, 314 (Vatican City, 1986); idem, *Μακαρίου τοῦ Μακρῆ Συγγράμματα*, *Βυζαντινὰ Κείμενα καὶ Μελέται*, 25 (Thessalonike, 1996); S. Kapetanaki, *An annotated critical edition of Makarios Makres’s, Life of St Maximos Kausokalyves, Encomion on the Fathers of the Seven Ecumenical Councils, Consolation to a sick person, or reflections on endurance, Verses on the Emperor Manuel II Palaeologos, Letter to hieromonk Symeon, A Supplication on barren olive trees* (unpublished PhD thesis, University of London, 2002); eadem, ‘An Unpublished Supplication on Barren Olive Trees by Macarius Macres’, in *Porphyrogenita: Essays on the History and Literature of Byzantium and the Latin East in Honour of Julian Chrysostomides*, eds. Ch. Dendrinos, E. Harvalia-Crook, J. Harris and J. Herrin (Aldershot-Burlington, 2003), pp. 457-60.

knew Makres personally as they shared the same spiritual father, David of Vatopedi. He also states that the Emperor was highly appreciative of Makarios' literary skills. More importantly for our case, the biographer points out that "whenever the Emperor sent David some of his compositions, especially those appropriate for monks" at the end of the accompanying letter he would ask him to show them to Makarios.¹⁶ This statement is confirmed by the closing remarks in Manuel's *Letter to David and Damianos* mentioned above. It seems, therefore, that Makarios' biographer had first-hand knowledge of this letter.

This textual evidence is supported by certain palaeographical observations in *Vat. gr.* 1107 which preserves the earlier version of the letter. This is a miscellaneous codex comprising theological, religious, ethico-political, and rhetorical compositions by Manuel II and Makarios Makres.¹⁷ A short autograph epistolary discourse by the anti-Palamite theologian and teacher Manuel Calecas was added at the back of the codex at a later stage.¹⁸ Among Manuel's works in this Ms. are early versions of his *Precepts on the Education of a Prince*, addressed to his son and successor John VIII, with what seems to be an autograph note which he subsequently deleted.¹⁹ The Ms. also contains the Emperor's lengthy treatise *On the Procession of the Holy Spirit* (fols. 1r-130v).²⁰ It is this second work that provides evidence on Manuel's co-operation with Makarios on what seems to be a working copy of the text.

¹⁶ Anonymous, *Life of Makarios Makres*, ed. Argyriou, *Macaire Macrès*, p. 198 § 29: ὁ θεῖος βασιλεὺς ... τῶν αὐτοῦ συγγραμμάτων ἔνια, ὅσ' ἦν μάλιστα ἀναχωρηταῖς ἐπιτήδεια, ταῦτα τῷ θείῳ Δαυίδ πέπομφεν ... ὁ κρατῶν ἐπιστέλλων ... τελευτῶν τῇ γραφῇ προσετίθει δεικνύναι ταῦτα καὶ τῷ ἰδίῳ φοιτητῇ Μακαρίῳ. Ἦιδει γὰρ τὸν ἄνδρα καὶ πρὸ τῆς παρουσίας ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς καὶ τισι τῶν αὐτοῦ συγγραμμάτων, ἅττ' ἦν ἐκεῖνος δημιουργῶν. Πρὸς δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις πλεονεκτήμασιν, οἷς ὁ θεῖος οὗτος ἀνὴρ ἐπλούτει καλοῖς, καὶ τὸ λογογραφεῖν ἀρίστως καὶ τοὺς πάλ' εὐδοκιμηκότας ἐν τούτῳ οὐκ ἡσχύνετο δοκῶν πρῶτος εἶν' ἐν τοῖς δευτέροις. Ὅθεν καὶ προσεπῆνει τοῖς λόγοις ... Συζευχθεῖσα τοίνυν ὑπακοή τοῖς λόγοις, ἔφασκεν ὁ ἀοίδιμος [scil. βασιλεὺς], τούτοις ὡς χρυσαῖς πτέρυξι ταχέως εἰς ὕψος τὴν πορείαν ποιήσεται (my italics). Cf. above, n. 14.

¹⁷ See Loenertz, 'Écrits de Macaire Macrès'. For a more analytical description and study of *Vat. gr.* 1107 see Dendrinos, *Manuel Palaeologus, On the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, pp. xl-lvii, lxxvi-xciii.

¹⁸ See Dendrinos, *Manuel Palaeologus, On the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, pp. xl-xli, lvii. Calecas' autograph epistolary discourse *On the Circumcision* has been edited by the University of London Seminar on Editing Byzantine Texts.

¹⁹ Manuel's hand has been identified in his personal working copy *Par. gr.* 3041. See J.F. Boissonade, *Anecdota nova*, vol. VI (Paris, 1844; repr. 1962), p. 249 n. 1; J. Berger de Xivrey, 'Mémoire sur la vie et les ouvrages de l'empereur Manuel Paléologue', *Mémoires de l'Institut de France, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* XIX, 2 (Paris, 1853), pp. 1-201, at 3-4; Dennis, *Manuel Palaeologus, Letters*, p. xii; A. Angelou ed., *Manuel Palaiologos, Dialogue with the Empress-Mother On Marriage*, Byzantina Vindobonensia, XIX (Vienna, 1991), p. 14. For samples of Manuel's autograph corrections in *Par. gr.* 3041 (fols. 1r, 2v and 3r) and the possibly autograph note in *Vat. gr.* 1107 (f. 140v, bottom margin), see Dendrinos, *Manuel Palaeologus, On the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, pp. xlvi-xlvii with Plates XX-XXI.

²⁰ Ed. Dendrinos, *Manuel Palaeologus, On the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, pp. 1-317.

The treatise *On the Procession of the Holy Spirit* is copied in this codex by a competent, clear, yet non-calligraphic, and so far anonymous hand in brown ink. This main copyist made some corrections to the text. A second hand introduced minor corrections and additions in a lighter brown-orange ink, while a seemingly third hand has intervened more extensively in the text using darker brown ink. The impression, however, that there are two corrective hands because of the different colour of ink and size of letterforms, is deceptive. Actually these are one and the same, as a collation of letterforms and ligatures show. In reality, therefore, we have only two hands: of the copyist and the corrector. At the beginning of the text the corrector made an effort to preserve the style of the main copyist, one assumes for reasons of uniformity and aesthetics. This, however, was soon abandoned and he proceeded to make more extensive interventions.²¹

These additions and corrections are not only of stylistic nature (including word order, substitution of words, clarifications, and so forth), but also syntactical and grammatical. Most of the corrections and suggestions were adopted in the final ‘edited’ version of the treatise copied by the familiar hand of Isidore of Kiev in *Vat. Barb. gr.* 219, fols. 93r-179r.²² For some unknown reason, a single original leaf with a section of the treatise in *Vat. gr.* 1107 was replaced by a new one (presently folios 50r-v), which was copied by the corrector.²³ A collation of this hand with the one that copied Manuel’s *Letter to David and Damianos* and a number of Makres’ works, contained in the same codex, *Vat. gr.* 1107, indicate that they are one and the same.²⁴

This raises the question of the identity of this hand. This codex in its original form, as we have said, contained solely works by Manuel and Makarios. Secondly, Manuel’s *Letter to David and Damianos* where Makres is explicitly mentioned by the Emperor, is the only letter among the extensive collection of the Emperor’s correspondence (comprising at least 69 letters)²⁵ which is included in this Ms. The

²¹ See Dendrinis, *Manuel Palaeologus, On the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, Plates I, III, V, VII-IX.

²² See Dendrinis, *Manuel Palaeologus, On the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, pp. xlii-lvii, lxxix-lxxx, lxxxiii-xciii.

²³ The same is the case with a single leaf (*Vat. gr.* 1107, fols. 137r-v) containing a section of Manuel’s epistolary prologue to his *Precepts on the Education of a Prince* (*Patrologia Graeca* 156, cols. 313A-316B.13). This was replaced and copied by the same corrective hand. See Dendrinis, *Manuel Palaeologus, On the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, pp. xlvi-xlviii, Plate VI.

²⁴ See Dendrinis, *Manuel Palaeologus, On the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, pp. lxxix ff.; idem, ‘An Unpublished Funeral Oration on Manuel II Palaeologus († 1425)’, in *Porphyrogenita*, eds. Dendrinis et al., pp. 423-56, at 424-27.

²⁵ 68 Letters were edited by Dennis, plus the second *Letter to David and Damianos*, an edition of which is under preparation together with Manuel’s *Confession*.

person who copied this letter had some particular reason for doing so. It is reasonable to assume that this person was no other than Makres, who seems to have kept it as a personal souvenir that reminded him of Manuel's expressed feelings towards him. If so, he must have copied this letter in Vatopedi, presumably with David's permission.

If this hypothesis is correct, it would seem that Makarios compiled this *dossier* made up of his own works, some of which are autograph, and of Manuel's working copies, including the theological treatise on which they had co-operated.²⁶ In this case, the subscription *Μακαρίου ἱερομονάχου* in one of Makarios' own works in the same hand that copied the text, must be his autograph signature (fol. 323r, bottom margin).²⁷ The fact that this signature appears in red ink is not unusual in Byzantine autographs.²⁸

The assumption that this hand belongs to Makarios is further supported by additional textual and palaeographical evidence. A certain, hitherto unidentified, 'Makarios' is mentioned in another of Manuel's *Letters* addressed *To Gabriel Metropolitan of Thessalonike* (1397-1418).²⁹ In this letter, dated between 1408-1410, the Emperor expresses his appreciation to Gabriel for his co-operation on another of his compositions, the *Oration on Sin and Penance or on St Mary of Egypt*.³⁰ Closing his letter Manuel asked Gabriel, as he did to David and Damianos in the letter already

²⁶ Other well-known scribes who contributed to the copying of this codex include George Vaiophoros (Part IV, fols. 200r-298v) and Leo Atrapes (Part IV, fols. 204r-264r) – the latter taught rhetoric in Constantinople in 1426: see E. Gamillscheg and D. Harlfinger, *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten, 800-1600*, vol. I: *Handschriften aus Bibliotheken Grossbritanniens* (Vienna, 1981), no. 55 (Vaiophoros); vol. II: *Handschriften aus Bibliotheken Frankreichs und Nachträge zu den Bibliotheken Grossbritanniens* (Vienna, 1989), no. 328 (Atrapes). See also Dendrinis, *Manuel Palaeologus, On the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, pp. xl ff.

²⁷ For a facsimile of Vat. gr. 1107, fol. 323r, see Dendrinis, 'An Unpublished Funeral Oration', Plate V.

²⁸ For example, Neophytos Prodromenos, monk at the Monastery of Prodromos-Petra in Constantinople during the second half of the fourteenth century (cf. Gamillscheg and Harlfinger, *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten*, II, no. 411), included his name in the rubricated heading of his autograph *Commentary on Aristotle* in Par. gr. 1846, fol. 1r, top margin. I would like to thank Professor Annaclara Cataldi Palau, for kindly drawing my attention to this. For a facsimile of Vat. gr. fol. 323r, see Dendrinis, *Manuel Palaeologus, On the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, Plate XVIII.

²⁹ Ed. Dennis, *Manuel Palaeologus, Letters*, 52, pp. 149 and 151 (text), 148 and 150 (trans.)

³⁰ Cf. F. Halkin, *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca*, Subsidia Hagiographica, 8a (Brussels, 1957³), 1044c; idem, *Novum Auctarium Bibliothecae Hagiographicae Graecae*, Subsidia Hagiographica, 65 (Brussels, 1984), p. 137.

discussed, to show this work 'to the good Makarios, a really close friend and distinguished for his virtue'.³¹

This *Oration* on which they co-operated is preserved in two codices, *Vat. gr.* 1619, fols. 15r-29v³² and *Vat. gr.* 632, fols. 336r-350v.³³ The accompanying letter, however, is preserved only in the second Ms. (*Vat. gr.* 632, fols. 350v-351v)³⁴. Once again Manuel's *Letter* to Gabriel is the only letter of the Emperor in this miscellaneous codex. Equally important is the fact that sections of this Ms. appears to be in the same hand which copied the *Letter to David and Damianos* in *Vat. gr.* 1107.³⁵ In addition, we know that Makarios was Gabriel's protégé.³⁶ Given these striking similarities, and Gabriel and David's close association with both Manuel and Makarios, it is reasonable to conclude that the 'Makarios' mentioned in the *Letter* to Gabriel is no other than Makres, who must have had this letter copied for him.³⁷

In *Vat. gr.* 632 Makarios compiled the table of contents and copied works composed by three other members of the same circle, the great mystic Nikolaos

³¹ Ed. and trans. Dennis, *Manuel Palaeologus, Letters*, **52**, p. 151.36-41: καὶ εἰ μὲν εὖρηταί τι χρήσιμον ἐν αὐτῷ [scil. τὸ ὑπὸ χεῖρα παράδειγμα], δείξεις τε οἷς ἂν εἰδείης καὶ οὐ καθέξεις παρὰ σαυτῷ· εἰ δὲ τῶν πάντη φαύλων κριθήσεται, «σπογγία» μὲν, εἶπεν Ἀριστείδης, «ιάσεται» [XLVII *Ad Capitonem*, 2, 419], ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω, «ἢ παραδοθεῖτω Ἡφαίστῳ ἢ μηδοτωοῦν θεαθῆτω»· οὐ λέγω δὲ περὶ τοῦ καλοῦ Μακαρίου φίλου τε ὄντος σαφοῦς καὶ ἀρετῇ κοσμουμένου (my italics).

³² For an analytical description and study of *Vat. gr.* 632 see R. Devreesse, *Codices Vaticani graeci*, III: *Codices 604-866* (Vatican City, 1950), pp. 40-43; Dendrinos, 'An Unpublished Funeral Oration', pp. 424-436.

³³ Inc. <Ὁ> λόγος οὗτος, τῆς ὁσίας ἡμῖν τὸν βίον ἄριστα διαζωγραφήσας. The Oration is entitled Τοῦ αὐτοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου καὶ φιλοχρίστου βασιλέως Μανουὴλ τοῦ Παλαιολόγου, λόγος, ὅτι ἡ μὲν ἁμαρτία τὸ πάντων χεῖριστον· δεῖ δέ, μηδὲνα ἀπογινώσκειν· μήτε ἑαυτὸν, μήτε ἕτερον· κρίνειν δὲ ἑαυτόν, καὶ οὐχ ἕτερον· καὶ τοὺς ἡμαρτηκότας, οὐ μισεῖν, ἀλλ' ἐλεεῖν· καὶ περὶ μετανοίας, καὶ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ προνοίας, καὶ ἀγάπης καὶ φιλανθρωπίας (*Vat. gr.* 1619, f. 15r). The title in *Vat. gr.* 632 is followed by the note: ἀναγινώσκεται δέ, μετὰ τὸ ἀναγνωσθῆναι τὸν βίον τῆς ὁσίας Μαρίας τῆς Αἰγυπτίας. In his introduction Manuel states that this Oration is a revised abridged version of his VI *Ethico-political Oration* with the same title (inc. Περὶ ἡδονῆς προδιαλεχθέντες) addressed to his son and co-emperor John VIII: *Vat. gr.* 1619, f. 15v: ὁ τοίνυν ῥηθισόμενος ἤδη λόγος, ἔστι μὲν ἐκ τῶν ἡμῖν εἰρημένων, πρὸς τὸν υἱόν τε καὶ βασιλέα ... δόξας δὲ πάνυ συμβαίνειν τῇ παρούσῃ ἐορτῇ, ταύτῃ παρ' ἡμῶν νῦν προσφέρεται· οὐχ ὡς τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐξεδόθη, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρηλλαγμένος ἔνθα προσῆκε, καὶ συνεσταλμένος, φυγῇ τοῦ κόρου. See Dendrinos, *Manuel Palaeologus, On the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, p. 442, no. 26*. An edition of the Oration is under preparation together with the rest of Manuel's hitherto unpublished opuscula.

³⁴ Ed. Dennis, *Manuel Palaeologus, Letters*, **52**, pp. 149 and 151 (text), 148 and 150 (trans.) with nn. 1-5. On the hand that copied these folios see Dennis, p. 150 n. 4; Dendrinos, 'An Unpublished Funeral Oration', pp. 425 (n. 13), 433 (Section XIV), 434 (items 2-3).

³⁵ See Dendrinos, 'An Unpublished Funeral Oration', p. 427.

³⁶ Makarios composed an encomium on Gabriel just after his death (1418), ed. E. Syndika-Laourda, "Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν Ἀρχιεπίσκοπον Θεσσαλονίκης Γαβριήλ", *Μακεδονικά* 4 (1955-1960), 352-70; cf. Argyriou, *Makrès*, pp. 17ff. and nn. 61, 23; cf. *ibid.*, no. 4, p. 13.

³⁷ Dennis, *Manuel Palaeologus, Letters*, **52**, p. 150 n. 6, failed to identify Makarios.

Kabasilas, his uncle Neilos, and Manuel's mentor Demetrios Kydones.³⁸ This Ms. contains also a short autograph poem *On the Passion of Christ* by another distinguished member of the circle and Makres' student, George Scholarios (later Ecumenical Patriarch Gennadios) (fol. 97v). The codex closes with two of Manuel's most extensive works, the *Seven Ethico-political Orations* addressed to his son and successor John VIII,³⁹ and his *Funeral Oration on his brother Theodore*. The latter work is preceded by a preface by George Gemistus, a note on the character of the funeral oration by Ioasaph, and epigrams by the Emperor, Demetrios Magistros and Matthaïos Chrysokephalos.⁴⁰ It is not unreasonable to assume that this miscellany was owned at some stage by one of these fellow-scholars. If so, the palaeographical evidence, strengthened by the textual evidence in Manuel's *Letter to Gabriel*, point once more to Makarios Makres.

Makres' involvement in the production of manuscripts of other scholars belonging to Manuel's circle, is attested in another codex containing the works of Joseph Bryennios (ca. 1350-1432), one of the most, if not the most, distinguished Orthodox theologian of his generation. As a thinker he was deeply respected by fellow-scholars, including the Emperor Manuel.⁴¹ But above all, Bryennios was a talented teacher. This becomes quite clear when reading his works. Difficult and complex theological and philosophical concepts are clearly structured and explained with patience for the non-expert, with the help of examples and metaphors, which often can be used also as mnemonics. Bryennios' talent as a teacher, his erudition and profound knowledge of Greek theological thought, competent also in Latin theological teachings, including those of Thomas Aquinas,

³⁸ Theodore of Andida, Preface to the *Commentary on the holy Liturgy*; Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the holy Liturgy, Sermons, Treatise Against Usurers*, and his *Life in Christ* (Books I-VI); Neilos Kabasilas, *Letter to his Nephew Nikolaos Kabasilas*; Demetrios Kydones, *Letter (406) to the monk Ioasaph* (Later Bishop of Ephesus). See Dendrinos, 'An Unpublished Funeral Oration', pp. 424-436.

³⁹ Ed. J. Löwenklau (=Leunclavius), *Praecepta educationis regiae* (Basle, 1578), pp. 134-419; repr. *Patrologia Graeca* 156, cols. 385A-561A.

⁴⁰ See J. Chrysostomides ed., *Manuel II Palaeologus, Funeral Oration on His Brother Theodore*, *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*, XXVI (Thessalonike, 1985).

⁴¹ See in general N.C. Ioannides, *Ἰωσήφ Βρυέννιος: Βίος, ἔργο, διδασκαλία* (Athens, 1985). See also H. Bazini, 'Une première édition des œuvres de Joseph Bryennios: les Traités adressés aux Crétois', *Revue des études byzantines* 62 (2004), 83-132 with updated bibliography.

together with his expressed cautious views on Church union, were put to good use by Manuel during the negotiations with the Papacy.⁴²

Scholars have suggested that two Mss. preserving Bryennios' works must be his autograph.⁴³ The first codex contain his *Orations on the Holy Trinity* and the second preserve his *Theological Chapters* and his *Report of the Acts of the Synod of the Church of Cyprus* (1406) in which he represented Emperor Manuel II and the Patriarch of Constantinople Matthaios I (1397-1410). The latter text is of great importance both from the historical and linguistic point of view.⁴⁴ Originally, part of the collection of the Monastery of Panagia Acheiropoietos in Pangaion, more widely known as Eikosiphoinissa or Kosinitza, these two codices were removed together with a large number of Mss. by the Bulgarian army in the spring of 1917. They are now kept in the *Ivan Dujčev Centre for Slavonic and Byzantine Studies* in Sofia, under nos. D 268 and D 262, respectively.⁴⁵ We shall concentrate on the first Ms. (D 268).

The hypothesis that this paper codex is Bryennios' autograph seems to be confirmed by fresh palaeographical evidence involving Makarios Makres. During the examination of the Ms. through microfilm with our student Mr Michael Platis, who is currently preparing a critical edition of Bryennios' *Orations on the Holy Trinity* for his doctoral thesis in the University of London, we observed that this is a

⁴² See G. Patacsi, 'Joseph Bryennios et les discussions sur un concile d'union (1414-1431)', *Κληρονομία* 5.1 (1973), 73-96. See also M. Chivu, *Ἡ ἔνωσις τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν κατὰ τὸν Ἰωσήφ Βρυέννιον* (PhD thesis, University of Thessalonike, 1985) which I have been unable to consult (cited by Bazini, 'Une première édition', p. 83 n. 2.).

⁴³ E. Velkovska, 'Chronologie et contenu des manuscrits grecs de la collection du Centre d'Études Slavo-byzantines «Ivan Dujčev»', in *Actes de la Table Ronde, Principes et méthodes du catalogage des manuscrits grecs de la collection du Centre Dujčev, Sofia, 21-23 Août 1990*, Publications du Programme de la coopération entre le centre «Ivan Dujčev» de l'Université «St. Clement d'Ochrid» de Sofia et l'Université Aristote de Thessalonique, 1 (Thessalonike, 1992), p. 50. Bazini, 'Une première édition', p. 92, repeats this information leaving the question open.

⁴⁴ Professor Vasileios Katsaros who edited this text expressed the view that this is not his autograph mainly on the grounds of several spelling conventions which are not consistent with Bryennios' knowledge of grammar: '<Ἰωσήφ Βρυεννίου> Τὰ Πρακτικά τῆς Συνόδου τῆς Κύπρου (1406)', *Βυζαντινὰ* 21 (2000), 21-56 at pp. 24-25 with n. 16. On this work see also Bazini, 'Une première édition', pp. 112-116, 127.

⁴⁵ D 262: 1st ¼ 15th c.; paper, fols. I + 278; 215x150 mm. D 268: 1st ½ 15th c.; paper; fols. 380; 220x145mm. See V. Atsalos, A. Džurova, V. Katsaros and Kr. Stančev, «Checklist» de la Collection des manuscrits grecs conservée au Centre de Recherches Slavo-byzantines «Ivan Dujčev» auprès de l'Université «St. Clement d'Ochrid» de Sofia, Ἀριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης, Publications du Programme de la coopération entre le centre «Ivan Dujčev» de l'Université «St. Clement d'Ochrid» de Sofia et l'Université Aristote de Thessalonique, 3 (Thessalonike, 1994), p. 36, no. 262, p. 65; V. Katsaros, *Τὰ χειρόγραφα τῶν Μονῶν Τιμίου Προδρόμου Σερρών καὶ Παναγίας Ἀχειροποιήτου τοῦ Παγγαίου (Κοσίνιτσας)*, Δημοσία Κεντρική Βιβλιοθήκη Σερρών, Σειρά Ἐκδόσεων γιὰ τὴν Πόλη καὶ τὸ Νομὸ Σερρών, 4 (Serres, 1995), pp. 202 (D 262), 203 (D268), 218 with n. 38 (D 262), 293 (D 262); idem, '<Ἰωσήφ Βρυεννίου> Τὰ Πρακτικά τῆς Συνόδου τῆς Κύπρου (1406)', pp. 24-25 with nn. 13-16. For a more full description of D 262, see Bazini, 'Une première édition', pp. 91-93.

working, rather than a fair copy. The largest part of the codex was copied by a trained, slightly shaky hand which seems to belong to an aged person. The text copied by this hand is remarkably free of errors. In some cases the same hand added in red ink the names of persons in dialogues (e.g., fol. 169r) and the titles of the works in the space reserved for this purpose. Not always this space was adequate, and therefore the titles were squeezed in (e.g., fol. 130v).

Concerning the date of this Ms., on the basis of the watermarks it belongs to the beginning of the fifteenth century.⁴⁶ Admittedly, these observations alone, in the absence of a colophon, cannot prove that this Ms. is Bryennios' autograph. However, a section of this codex (fols. 9-84), has been copied by another, experienced hand, which is the same with the one identified as that of Makres in the two previously mentioned Vatican Mss. (*Vaticani graeci* 632 and 1107). The co-operation between the two scribes in D 268 is not limited to copying sections of the text in succession, but extends to mutual interventions and additions to the text. For example, in the text of the *Seventeenth Oration on the Holy Trinity*, copied by the first copyist, the second hand added on fol. 117v bottom margin the phrase κ(αὶ) τοῦ πν(εύματος). This note, preceded by a reference sign of three dots, refers to the text in the last line of the folio, to be placed after the word π(ατ)ρ(ός)ς marked by the same reference sign. The sentence, with the added phrase (*italicised*), reads as follows: “εἴπερ ἡ τοῦ πν(εύματος) ὑπόστασις ὡς ἐξ ἑνὸς αἰτίου τ(ῆς) τοῦ π(ατ)ρ(ός)ς (καὶ) υἱοῦ προβλητικ(ῆς) δυνάμε(ως) ἐκπορεύε(ται), ἔπε(ται) πιστεύειν (καὶ) τ(ῇν) τοῦ υἱοῦ ὑπόστασ(ιν), ὡς ἐξ ἑνὸς αἰτίου τῆς γεννητικ(ῆς) δυνάμε(ως) τοῦ π(ατ)ρ(ός)ς κ(αὶ) τοῦ πν(εύματος) γεννᾶσθαι.”⁴⁷ This is a significant addition, for it expresses with greater accuracy an argument put forward by the Orthodox theologians against the Latin doctrine of the dual procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son as emanating from one source rather than from two separate sources, decreed at the Second Council of Lyons in 1274.⁴⁸

One of the most important additions in the Ms. appears in Bryennios' *Sixth Oration on the Holy Trinity* (fols. 30r-v). This time the marginal addition is by the first

⁴⁶ Velkovska, 'Chronologie et contenu', p. 50.

⁴⁷ Bryennios, *Seventeenth Oration on the Holy Trinity*, ed. E. Voulgaris, *Ἰωσήφ μοναχοῦ τοῦ Βρυεννίου τὰ Εὐρεθέντα*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1768; Thessalonica, 1991²), I, pp. 276.38-277.8, addition at p. 277.3.

⁴⁸ Concilium Lugdunense II, *Constitutio II*, *De summa Trinitate et de fide catholica*, 1: “Fideli ac devota professione fatemur, quod Spiritus Sanctus aeternaliter ex Patre et Filio, non tanquam ex duobus principiis, sed tanquam ex uno principio, non duabus spirationibus, sed unica spiratione procedit”, ed. G. Alberigo et al., *Conciliorum oecumenicorum decreta* (Bologna, 1991), p. 314.9-11.

copyist in the section copied by the second hand. It refers to Bryennios' observations on the linguistic problems encountered in the dialogue between the Greek and Latin theologians. Bryennios was aware that one of the main obstacles in reaching an understanding concerning the doctrine of the Trinity was the indistinguishable use by the Latins of the term *substantia* to render both Greek terms οὐσία and ὑπόστασις, namely *essence* and *hypostasis/Person*. This lack of distinction, according to Bryennios, inevitably led to a different theological interpretation with reference to the procession of the Holy Spirit and ultimately to the schism. On fol. 30r the first hand added in the margin the Latin term as a clarification: οὕτω λεγομένη παρ' αὐτῶν ἡ σουμεπιστάντζια.⁴⁹ Again the same clarification was added twice in the margin on the next folio (30v) by the first hand, in the text copied by the second scribe, with σουμεπιστάντζιαμ twice replacing the word ὑπόστασιν which appears to have been erased.⁵⁰

The nature of these emendations is such that they cannot be attributed to mere scribal additions, but they must have originated from the author himself. In the first case (fol. 117v), the second hand, that of Makres, made an addition which must have been approved by Bryennios, while in the second case (fols. 30r-v) it must have been

⁴⁹ Bryennios, *Sixth Oration on the Holy Trinity*, D 268, f. 30r.22-27 (ed. Voulgaris, I, pp. 105.11-17): 'Ἡ Λατίνων φωνή, διὰ στενότητα ἑαυτῆς, ἣ οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ἂν εὐφημότερον ἐξαγγέλοιμι, τὸ τῆς οὐσίας ἅμα καὶ τὸ τῆς ὑποστάσεως ὄνομα οὐ δυσὶν ὥς ἡ Ἑλλήνων, ἀλλ' ἐνὶ μόνῳ [add. οὕτω λεγόμενον παρ' αὐτῶν ἡ σουμεπιστάντζια in marg.] σημαίνει ὀνόματι μιᾷ λέξει, διττὴν ἔννοιαν τοῖς συνιέναι δυναμένοι παρέχουσα· κἀντεῦθεν ἐγγίγνεται τὸ σχίσμα τῶν δυτικῶν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐκπορεύσεως, "The Latin language, because of its own limitations, for I do not know how to put it more mildly, calls both terms of the essence and the hypostasis not as two (understood "separate") words as in Greek, but by using a single term [add. "which they call *substantia*" in marg.], in a single word they render a double concept to those capable of thinking. This was the reason that brought about the schism of the Westerners *vis-à-vis* us concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit" (my trans.). For this linguistic problem, he goes on to explain, created confusion between the essence and hypostasis of the Spirit with reference to the perception of the common essence shared by the three hypostases (Father, Son and Holy Spirit) and the unconfused hypostases on account of their unique hypostatic attributes (the *unbegotten* Father, the *only-begotten* Son and the *projected* Spirit); see below, n. 50.

⁵⁰ Bryennios, *Sixth Oration on the Holy Trinity*, D 268, ff. 30r.27-30v.5-8 (ed. Voulgaris, I, pp. 105.23-106.1): ὅτι τῷ κατὰ τὴν σημασίαν διπλῶ ὀνόματι τούτῳ, ἐπὶ τοῦ προσκυνητοῦ || χρώμενοι Πνεύματος, ὡς ἕκαστος θέλει, νοεῖ· ὁ μὲν ἀντὶ τῆς οὐσίας, ὅτε σημαίνει ὑπόστασιν· ὁ δὲ ἀντὶ τῆς ὑποστάσεως ὅτε δηλοῖ οὐσίαν· ὁ δὲ εἶναι τοῦτο καὶ κατὰ τὴν σημασίαν ἀμφοῖν, ἀδιάφορον οἴεται· καὶ διαταῦτα τῆς ἀληθοῦς θεολογίας ἑαυτοὺς ἀποσχίζουσι· τὰς γὰρ τῶν θεολόγων διερχόμενοι χρήσεις καὶ τὴν σουμεπιστάντζιαμ (in marg. et erasit ὑπόστασιν) ἔχειν ἐκ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα εὐρίσκοντες ἐκεῖ πολλαχοῦ, οὐκ εἰς τὸ πρῶτον σημαίνόμενον παρὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τούτου δηλαδὴ τὴν οὐσίαν, δέχονται τὴν σουμεπιστάντζιαμ (in marg. et erasit ὑπόστασιν) [σουμεπιστάντζιαμ om. ed.] ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν πρὸς ἡμᾶς ζῆλον, εὐθὺς εἰς τὸ δεύτερον, τὴν ὑπόστασιν ἤγουν [εἰς hab. ed.] τὸ πρόσωπον [τὸ πρόσωπον], τὸν λόγον ἀνάγουσι· καὶ περὶ τούτου μόνον διαβεβαιουσι λέγεσθαι· καὶ τοῦτο ἐστὶν [τοῦτο ἐστὶν ed.], ἡ τῆς αὐτῶν πρὸς ἡμᾶς ὁμοιοῦς διάστασις. These emendations have been adopted in the same text repeated by Bryennios in his *Third Dialogue on the Holy Spirit*, ed. Voulgaris, I, pp. 383.29-384.13, addition at pp. 383.32, 384.4 and 6.

Bryennios himself who added this autograph clarification to his own text which was copied by Makres. This palaeographical evidence in Ms. D 268 is further supported by information contained in the *Life of Makarios Makres*. The biographer states that when Makarios visited Constantinople at the Emperor's invitation for the second time in 1421, before he was received by Manuel he provisionally stayed in the Monastery of Charsianites where Bryennios was residing. There, the two theologians, who had met during Makres' first visit in 1419, became close friends, sharing mutual respect and admiration. According to Makres' biographer, it was during this period that Bryennios, at Manuel's request, composed and delivered the *Twenty-One Orations on the Holy Trinity* during the negotiations with the papal envoys. So great was Bryennios' appreciation of Makres' theological knowledge that, according to the biographer, he explicitly commended Makarios in the middle of one of his *Orations*.⁵¹

Makarios Makres and Joseph Bryennios were not the only clergymen who belonged to Manuel II's intellectual circle. In his *Letter to the priest Euthymios* (54) (written before he was elevated to the Patriarchal throne of Constantinople in 1410),⁵² the Emperor expressed his appreciation for the completion of their joint project. This concerns a clarification (σαφηνεία) in the debate between his close friend and fellow-theologian Demetrios Chrysoloras and Antonio d'Ascoli on the philosophical question *If it is better to be than not to be, how could Christ say of Judas that it would be better for him if he had never been born?* (cf. Matth. 26:24).⁵³ "The present work", Manuel says in his letter to Euthymios, "is the child of both of us, I mean yours and mine, not only because friends share, but also because it belongs almost as much to you as it does to me. While *I* gave birth to it, it was you who helped it grow by adding your ideas. Now, if a being, once born, must be provided with

⁵¹ Anonymous, *Life of Makarios Makres*, ed. Argyriou, *Macaire Macrès*, p. 204, § 47.2-18, § 48.1-5. See also § 50.3-5.

⁵² Ed. and trans. Dennis, *Manuel Palaeologus, Letters*, 54, pp. 153 (text), 152 (trans.).

⁵³ Ed. F. Tinnefeld, "Es wäre gut für jenen Menschen, wenn er nicht geboren wäre". Eine Disputation am Hof Kaiser Manuels II. über ein Jesuswort vom Verräter Judas. *Einleitung, kritische Erstedition und Übersetzung (II)*, *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 45 (1995), 115-58 (text: Version I [from Vat. gr. 1879], pp. 118-124; Version II [from *Crypten*. Z.δ.Ι (161) and *Pontificio Collegio Greco*, Roma, cod. 11], pp. 124-131); cf. idem, "Es wäre gut für jenen Menschen, wenn er nicht geboren wäre". Eine Disputation am Hof Kaiser Manuels II. über ein Jesuswort vom Verräter Judas. *Einleitung, kritische Erstedition und Übersetzung (I)*, in *Ἀνδριάς. Herbert Hunger zum 80. Geburtstag (=Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 44 [1994]), 421-30. To Tinnefeld's list of extant Mss. containing Version II, should be added *Vall. gr.* 215 (*Carte Allacci* CXL), fols. 1-6v, 7-14, containing two copies of the work by two different 16th/17th century hands, and *Par. suppl. gr.* 1018, fols. 67r-74r.

nourishment, if it is to survive, then its ownership is shared by the one who brought it into being and by the one who raised it. You may therefore do what seems best for it, just as I would. At your discretion add or remove whatever you think fit.”⁵⁴ This time we are very fortunate to have the actual draft of Manuel’s clarification with Euthymios’ autograph emendations, a draft of Euthymios’ autograph reply, and the final ‘edited’ version, preserved in two inserted leaves in another Vatican Ms., *Urb. gr. 80* (fols. 8r-9v).⁵⁵

Our last example of co-operation and friendship among scholars of this circle is Manuel Chrysoloras, who also served as Manuel’s ambassador.⁵⁶ In June 1407 Emperor Manuel was plunged into deep grief on account of the death of his loyal brother Theodore, to whom he was deeply attached. As a result of this, the Emperor abandoned all other endeavours, as he states, to devote himself to the composition of the *Funeral Oration* on his brother.⁵⁷ Once he completed the composition, after a number of revisions, on which he co-operated closely with his chief copyist Isidore of Kiev, the Emperor sent it together with a covering letter to Manuel Chrysoloras.⁵⁸ In this *Letter* the Emperor requested his friend’s criticism. “Erase what is superfluous in the present composition”, he said, “do not shrink from making changes in it and additions of your own as well, for I know that it stands in need of all these.”⁵⁹ In his reply from Florence, where he taught Greek, Chrysoloras comments on the literary qualities of the *Funeral Oration* and states that he has nothing to add, remove or change; in any case, he cannot possibly consider

⁵⁴ My translation based on Dennis, *Manuel Palaeologus, Letters*, **54**, p. 152.

⁵⁵ See G. Mercati, *Notizie di Procoro e Demetrio Cidone, Manuele Caleca e Teodoro Meliteniota ed altri appunti per la storia della teologia e della letteratura bizantina del secolo XIV: Aggiunte agli scritti d’Isidoro il Cardinale Ruteno*, Studi e Testi, 56 (Vatican City, 1931), p. 517 n. 1; Dennis, *Manuel Palaeologus, Letters*, **56**, pp. 153-154 n. 2-3 (for Euthymios’ reply to the Emperor, see Appendix I, p. 221)

⁵⁶ On Chrysoloras see in general G. Cammelli, *I dotti bizantini e le origini dell’umanesimo*, I: *Manuele Crisolora* (Florence, 1941); H. Hunger ed., *Johannes Chortasmenos* (a. 1370-ca.1436/37). *Briefe, Gedichte und kleine Schriften, Einleitung, Regesten, Prosopographie, Text*, Wiener Byzantinistische Studien, VII (Vienna, 1969), pp. 96-101.

⁵⁷ Ed. and trans. Chrysostomides, *Manuel Palaeologus, Funeral Oration on his Brother Theodore*, p. 77.23-25 (text), 76 (trans.).

⁵⁸ Manuel Palaeologus, *Letters*, ed. Dennis, **56**, pp. 159 (text) 158 (trans.): *Τῷ Χρυσολωρᾷ κυρῷ Μανουήλ*, inc. Στέλλω σοι τὸν πρὸς ἀδελφὸν ἐπιτάφιον ὃς ἐμοὶ δεδημιούργηται δακρύνοντι μᾶλλον ἢ γράφοντι.

⁵⁹ Manuel Palaeologus, *Letters*, ed. Dennis, **56**, p. 159. 29-32: σὺ μέντοι τουτοῦ τοῦ συγγράμματος — δεῖ γάρ σε τοῖς ἐμοῖς βοηθεῖν ἅπασι τρόποις— τὰ μὲν ἀφαίρει τὰ περιττά, τὰ δ’ ἐναλλάττων μὴ ἀποκνήσῃς: προσδίδου δέ τι τούτῳ καὶ τῶν σαυτοῦ, οἶδα γάρ ὡς τούτων αὐτῷ δεήσει (trans. Dennis, p. 158).

“patching with rags clothes made of golden thread”.⁶⁰ Chrysoloras’ reply was composed in the form of a lengthy *Epistolary Discourse* preserved in a so far unique autograph Ms., cod. 154 of the Monastery of Metamorphosis on Meteora.⁶¹ The *Discourse* bears Chrysoloras’ own ‘editorial’ hand, in the form of marginal and interlinear corrections and additions.⁶²

These palaeographical details, and there are many more, though they may appear as *minutiae*, shed light on the co-operation and friendship amongst these scholars, and point to a wider perspective, namely, what made possible such co-operation in thinking, in discussing and in reasoning. I refer to the long tradition of culture and education, despite its vicissitudes, that the Byzantines were aware of, and no more so than Manuel Chrysoloras who as we have seen co-operated with the Emperor on literary and state matters. Under the imminent Ottoman threat Chrysoloras appealed to the Emperor putting forward suggestions for the rejuvenation of society, using as a point of departure to his argument the by then well-established view in Byzantium of the double Greco-Roman national and cultural identity,⁶³ whose cornerstone was education. He urged the Emperor to do his utmost to foster παιδεία. This can be achieved, he says in his *Epistolary Discourse*, by securing teachers, the existing ones being sufficient and therefore no need to summon them from elsewhere (ἄλλοθεν ... μεταπέμπεσθαι). Students, on the other hand, not only of rich but also of poor background, should be encouraged to pursue their studies. “The obstacle is not poverty and lack of money”, he says, “but

⁶⁰ Eds. Ch.G. Patrineles and D.Z. Sophianos, *Manuel Chrysoloras and his Discourse Addressed to the Emperor Manuel II Palaeologus* (Academy of Athens, Research Centre for Medieval and Modern Hellenism: Athens, 2001), p. 126.16-17: ἅμα θρασὺ καὶ ἀπαδὸν ράκια καταχρύσοις ἱματίοις παραρράπτειν.

⁶¹ Completed before or shortly after 15 July 1414, when Chrysoloras left from Bologna to Venice: see Patrineles & Sophianos eds., *Manuel Chrysoloras, Epistolary Discourse*, pp. 16ff. and 43 ff. with nn. 26-34.

⁶² Recorded by Patrineles & Sophianos in the *apparatus criticus* of their edition of the text, pp. 61-131 (cf. Plates ζ'-ι').

⁶³ Ed. Patrinelis & Sophianos, *Manuel Chrysoloras, Epistolary Discourse*, p. 117.4-13: Μεμνώμεθα οἶων ἀνδρῶν ἔκγονοι γεγόναμεν ... τῶν πρεσβυτάτων καὶ παλαιῶν Ἑλλήνων ... [καὶ] τῶν μετ'ἐκείνους γενομένων ἡμῖν προγόνων, τῶν παλαιῶν Ῥωμαίων, ἀφ' ὧν νῦν ὀνομαζόμεθα ... μᾶλλον δὲ ἄμφω τούτῳ τῷ γένει ἀφ' ἡμῖν δῆπου συνελήλυθε καὶ εἴτε Ἑλληνας βούλοιτό τις λέγειν εἴτε Ῥωμαίους, ἡμεῖς ἐσμὲν ἐκείνοι καὶ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου δὲ ... ἡμεῖς σώζομεν διαδοχὴν ...; see also pp. 27-28 and 51 with n. 53, with reference to Isidore of Kiev, ed. S. Lampros, *Παλαιολογία καὶ Πελοποννησιακά*, vol. III (Athens, 1926), p. 152: [Ὁ μέγας Κωνσταντῖνος] τοὺς ἄνωθεν εὐγενεῖς καὶ ἀνδρείους φέρων Ῥωμαίων ἐνοῖ καὶ συνοικίζει τοῖς εὐγενεστέροις τῶν Ἑλλήνων ... καὶ γέγονε γενοῖν ἐξ ἀμφοῖν τοῖν ἐπισήμοιιν γένος ἓν, τὸ ἐπισημώτατόν τε καὶ κάλλιστον, οὗς καὶ εἴ τις Ῥωμέλληνας εἴποι, καλῶς ἂν εἴποι. Michael Apostoles uses the same term (in Crete in 1467/8) to denote the unionists: H. Noiret ed., *Lettres inédites de Michel Apostolis* (Paris, 1889), p. 102, cited by Patrinelis & Sophianos, n. 53.

negligence.”⁶⁴ All wisdom does not spring automatically in society, but it needs diligence (ἐπιμέλεια) and forethought (πρόνοια). For once this wisdom is lost, Chrysoloras stresses, it is difficult to be restored.⁶⁵ “It is absurd (ἄτοπον)”, he exclaims, “that our own literature should be studied by some people in Italy, perhaps elsewhere too, and it is *they* who now possess knowledge, yet this is neglected in Greece and in the metropolis.”⁶⁶ One is tempted to compare his comments with the present state of Hellenic Studies!

Ultimately, the collaboration amongst these intellectuals is an expression of the values, ideals, purpose and vision for their nation and for society at large that they shared in a spirit of friendship and mutual respect. This element is borne out in the letters they exchanged. By exploring their autograph Mss. and concentrating on such details, we can indeed “unlock their potential”, thereby being in a better position to assess the extent of their co-operation and to examine more closely aspects of their literary and scholarly activities, thus enriching further our understanding and appreciation of their contribution to Byzantine culture.

Charalambos Dendrinios
Lecturer in Byzantine Literature and Greek Palaeography
The Hellenic Institute
Royal Holloway
University of London
Egham
Surrey TW20 0EX
e-mail: ch.dendrinios@rhul.ac.uk

⁶⁴ Manuel Chrysoloras, *Epistolary Discourse*, pp. 120.24-121.22: “Ἐτι γὰρ οἶδα καὶ φύσεις αὐτοῖς [scil. σπουδάζουσι καὶ φιλοσοφοῦσι] οὕσας ἀρίστας καὶ δεξιὰς καὶ οὐδὲ δεήσει ἄλλοθεν αὐτοῖς διδασκάλους μετατέμπεσθαι οὐδ’ εἰς τούτους ἀναλίσκειν, ἀλλ’ ἀρκεῖ τοῖς οἴκοι διδασκάλοις χρησθαι· μόνον μετὰ φιλοτιμίας τινὸς γινέσθω καὶ τῆς σῆς ἀπολαυέτωσαν προνοίας καὶ βοηθείας οἳ τε παιδεύοντες, οἳ τε παιδεύόμενοι καὶ τιμῶν ἀξιούσθωσαν. Οὗτοι πενία οὐδὲ ἀπορία ἐστὶ τὸ κωλύον· οὕτω γὰρ οἱ τῶν πλουσιωτέρων καὶ εὐπορωτέρων παῖδες ἔμελλον ἀεὶ γίνεσθαι σοφώτεροι καὶ πόλεις δέ, αἱ πλείω ἀεὶ ἔχουσαι, λογιώτεραι εἶναι τῶν ἀπορωτέρων. Νῦν δὲ τοῦτο οὐχ ὁρῶμεν οὔτε ἐν πόλεσιν οὔτε ἐν ἀνδράσιν. Ἔστι γὰρ καὶ πένητος καὶ προσαίτου υἱόν, μηδὲ βιβλίου εὐποροῦντα μήτε μὴν τῶν ἀναγκαίων πρὸς τὸ ζῆν, ἄνδρα σοφὸν γενέσθαι καὶ πλουσίου ἀμαθῆ· καὶ πόλιν ταπεινότεραν καὶ ἀπορωτέραν πλουσίας καὶ δυνατωτέρας σοφωτέραν καὶ εὐμαθεστέραν εἶναι· καὶ πένητας δὲ ὁρῶμεν πολλάκις εἰς διδασκάλου πέμποντας τοὺς ἑαυτῶν, πλουσίων δὲ ἀμελούντων. Οὐκ οὖν ταῦτα ὑπὸ πλούτου ἢ ἀπορίας ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ ἀμελείας ἢ ἐπιμελείας γίνεται ... Ὡς περ δὲ τᾶλλα τῶν σπουδαίων καὶ ἀγαθῶν οὐκ αὐτόματα ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι φύεται ἀλλὰ δεῖ τοὺς ἐπιμελουμένους καὶ προνοουμένους τούτων εἶναι, τὰ γὰρ κοινωφελῆ δεῖ κοινῆς καὶ τῆς ἐπιμελείας τυγχάνειν, οὕτω καὶ τῆς τῶν λόγων τέχνης καὶ δυνάμεως δεῖ τοὺς προνοουμένους εἶναι· καὶ τούτου μᾶλλον ἢ τινὸς ἑτέρου. Τὰ γὰρ μείζω μείζονος καὶ τῆς κηδεμονείας δεῖται· ταῦτα δὲ ἐξήρτηται τοῖς ἄρχουσιν ἢ φαῦλον ἢ ἡν ἢ σοφία αὐτόματη φυομένη, ὃ μηδὲ τοῖς φαυλοτέροις δέδοται.

⁶⁵ Manuel Chrysoloras, *Epistolary Discourse*, 119.14-120.5; 119.36-120.4: Σοφίαν δὲ καὶ τοιαῦτα ἔργα οὐ ῥάδιον συνθεῖναι αὐθις ἀπολωλότα.

⁶⁶ Manuel Chrysoloras, *Epistolary Discourse*, pp. 119.11-13: Ἄτοπον δὲ καὶ ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ μὲν, ἴσως δὲ καὶ ἄλλοθι, τινὰς σπουδάζειν περὶ τοὺς ἡμετέρους λόγους καὶ νῦν εἶναι τοὺς γινώσκοντας, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς Ἑλλάδος καὶ τῆς μητροπόλεως ἀμελεῖσθαι.

