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**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, Manuel analysed the situation he faced in the Morea and explained the reasons for the delay in sending

---

1 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 βαθειὰ φιλί.

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 The second letter, so far unpublished, which Manuel wrote by way of introduction to his composition, recalls the incident of his previous meeting with David and Damianos in Thessalonike.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

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. Χρόνῳ πέρας εἴληφὸς τὸ βιβλίον. Vat. gr. 1107, fol. 318v.3-21: ... εἰσιόντες τοίνυν ὡς ἐμὲ, ὡς δεδομένον ἢ ὡς κεκαθήκατε ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐν ταῖν χεροίν, ἔτι ψαρινόμενον εὑρεθείη τὸ νῦν ὡς μὲν πεμπόμενον πόνημα, καὶ οὐδὲν ἡμεῖς τοῖς ἑπείροις όφθη, κινήσει τὴν γλῶσσαν ἐρέσθαι, τί ποτ´ ἄνει τὸ θεαθέν, καὶ διατι σύν ὡς μὴ συγχωροῦντο, αὐτοῖς μὴν ἔγκυοι εἰρήκατε τῇ τοῦ πονήματος ἡσθῆναι πραγματείᾳ. καὶ καλὸν εἶναι κεκρίκατε, μὴ καθάπερ ἀμβλώμα, ἡμιτελὲς τὸν δέναινεν ἕκατον κατὰ νοῦν, τῆς τελειουργοῦ δυνάμεως συνεφαπτομένης τῶν πόνων, ἀναβόλασας ἀπάσιας χοίρειν εἰσόντα, ἄξιον μὲ φροντίσαι, ὡς ἡμᾶς 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: ... ως τι λήθης κέκραται φάρμακον, κονδυλίζειν ἁμηγέτη καὶ 

μμνήσκειν ἡμᾶς πραγμάτων, ὥν το μεμνήθη, πολύ τι κέρδος ἐκ τούτων γὰρ οἷμα συμβαίνειν, 

πειράζαι καρποθείαν εἰ μετανοια βοήθειαν ὅπως εἰ τι τοῦτο θέασητο, κἂν νεμεσία τῷ γεγραφότι, 

tῶν ὄνομάτων ἕνεκα, καὶ τῆς πλοκῆς ὕμη καὶ τῆς τάξεως, μικράττα δήξει καὶ πληξεῖν οὐ γάρ 

λυμανεῖται μου τῇ προθέσει, ἔως ἃν μὴ καὶ τὸν νοῦν ἐξελέγξῃ, ἀκαρπὸν παντάπασι δόντα, καὶ 

διαβολῆς ἥστηνον ἄξιον. Ἐπεῖ οὔδε τοῖς τυχούσι φανησόμενον ἔρχεται πατράσι δι κατὰ θεόν καὶ 

διδασκάλοις καὶ φίλοις, οἷς οὔδε τοὺς λογισμοὺς || κρύπτειν θέμις.

5 Vat. gr. 1107, fol. 320r.5-8: εἰ δὲ οὔδεν ἱερόν, φασιν, ὅπερ ἀπήτη, ἄλλ’ ὑμείς γε διορθοῦσθε, εἰ 

ιάσομον ἐστὶ τὸ κακόν θεραπείας δὲ κρεῖττον παντάπασιν εὐρέθεν, ποι παμφάγῳ μμεῖτω (cf. 

Euripides, Medea 1187).

6 Manuel’s letter (fols. 3r-10v ) is followed by his work (fols. 12r-65v, 75r-81v) entitled Τοῦ 

evφεβεστάτου καὶ πιλοχρίστου βασιλέως Μανουὴλ τοῦ Παλαιολόγου, πρὸς τὸν ἐαυτὸν πνευματικόν, 

ὑπὲρ τῶν καθ’ ἐαυτὸν μετὰ τὸ βάσισα δεινός κατασκηνώσας αὐτῷ χαλεπωτάτης νόσοι, inc. Καὶ 

πάσι μὲν χρεῶν εἶναι νομίζω, θεῶ 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. Iv-54v, 186v- 

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 


pp. lxiii-lxv with n. 354.

8 On Isidore and his co-operation with Manuel, see Dendrinos, Manuel Palaeologus, *On the Procession 


9 Crypten. 161 (Z.δ.I), fol. 2v top margin: + ἕκ τῶν βιοσαρίων(ος) καρδινάλεως τὴν ἄξιαν, τὸ γένος 

commendatario of the Abbey by Pope Pius II.\textsuperscript{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 (ΠΑΛΙΓ).\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{12} In addition, it bears the note ‘imperial’ (βασιλικόν) on the top margin.\textsuperscript{13} Closing his letter, the Emperor asked David and Damianos to remember him to their friend “Makarios the priest”.\textsuperscript{14} It appears that this ‘Makarios’ is no other than the Thessalonian scholar and theologian Makarios Makres (1382/3-1431), then hieromonk and David’s disciple in Vatopedi, both members of Manuel’s intellectual entourage.\textsuperscript{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


\textsuperscript{12} Vat. gr. 1107, f. 315r: Τοῖς ὀσωτάτοις ἐν ἱερομονάχοις καὶ πνευματικοῖς πατράσι Δαυίδ καὶ τῷ συνανόιῳ. Cf. Crypten. Z.Δ.Ι (161), f. 3r: Τοῖς ὀσωτάτοις ἐν ἱερομονάχοις καὶ πνευματικοῖς πατράσι Δαυίδ καὶ Δαμιανῷ, εἰ καὶ ἐκ προοιμίων τὸ γράμμα, θατέρῳ δοκεῖ πέμπεσθαι.

\textsuperscript{13} For this term used in imperial letters see E. Vranoussi, Βυζαντινά Στύλια τῆς Μονῆς Πάτμου, vol. Α’: Αἴτωρκρατοκάδ (Athens, 1980), pp. 322-26.

\textsuperscript{14} Vat. gr. 1107, fols. 320v-321r.1: ... τῷ ... ιερεῖ Μακαρίῳ, τῷ δὲ τὴν περίοδον ὑπακοήν ἐφθανότι πρὶν ἡ βαδίσει ἐφ' ὑπὲρεκλείσες, χαίρειν τὲ καὶ ἁμα προκόπεσιν τοῖς τῆς ἁγίας ἀνάβασιν' δι' ἑτ' ἐφελει συμβαίνει ἀνάβασις, τοῖς τῶν μὲν ὅπως δι' ἐνανιοίας τὴν ἐκ μεταράστης μὴ δὲ μεμνημένοις, τοῖς δὲ ἐμφανίσθην, τοῖς τὸ μόνον ἐφετὸν [scil. Θεόν] κεχκηνέται ἐκτεταμένος (my italics). Cf. below, n. 16.

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 Macrè, p. 198 § 29: ὃ ὥτεος βασιλεύς... τῶν αὐτοῦ συγγραμμάτων ἔννυ, ὃ' ἡ μάλιστα ἀναχωρητικάς ἐπιτάξεω, ταῦτα τῷ ὥτεος Δαυὶδ πέπομασ τῷ κρατῶν επιστέλλω... τελεύτην τῇ γραφῇ προσετίθεν δεικνύναι ταῦτα καὶ τῷ ἰδίῳ φοιτητή Μακριὼς. Ἡδίει γὰρ τὸν ἄνδρα καὶ πρὸ τῆς παρουσίας τῶν ἐπίστολας καὶ τοῦ τῶν αὐτοῦ συγγραμμάτων, ἅττ' ἦν ἐκείνους δημιουργοὺς. Πρὸς δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις πλεονεκτήσας, οἶς ὃ ὥτεος ὁὕτος ἀνὴρ ἐπλουτεὶ καλοῖς, καὶ τὸ λογογραφεῖν ἀρίστως καὶ τοὺς πάλι' εὐδοκιμηκότας ὑπὸ τούτῳ οὐκ ἠχύνετο δοκῶν πρῶτος εἶν' ἐν τοῖς δευτέροις. Ὅθεν καὶ προσετίθην τοὺς λόγους... Συζυγίας τοῖν ὑπακοή τοῖς λόγοις, ἐφάσκεν ὃ δοιδήμος [scil. βασιλεύς], τοῦτον ὡς χρυσὰς πτέρυξι ταχέως εἰς ύψος τὴν πορείαν ποιήσεται (my italics). Cf. above, n. 14.


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


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 Dendrinos, *Manuel Palaeologus, On the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, pp. xlvi-xlvi, Plate VI.


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. 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). The fact that this signature appears in red ink is not unusual in Byzantine autographs.

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). 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. 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 Dendrinos, Manuel Palaeologus, On the Procession of the Holy Spirit, pp. xl ff.

27 For a facsimile of Vat. gr. 1107, fol. 323r, see Dendrinos, ‘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 Dendrinos, 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.)

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 Makros, 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

33 Inc. ‘Ο λόγος οὗτος, τῆς θου ἡμῖν τὸν βίον ἁριστα διαζωγραφήσας. The Oration is entitled Τοῦ αὐτοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου καὶ φιλοχρίστου βασιλέως Μανουὴλ τοῦ Παλαιολόγου, λόγος, δι’ ἐν μῖν ἀμαρτία τοῦ πάντων χείριστον· δε δέ, μηδένα ἀπογινώσκειν· μήτε ἐαυτόν, μήτε ἔτερον· κρίνειν δὲ ἐαυτόν, καὶ οὕτε ἔτερον· καὶ τοὺς ἡμαρτηκότας, οὐ μοιεῖν, ἀλλ’ ἐλεεῖν· καὶ περὶ μετανοίας, καὶ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ προοίμιος, καὶ ἀγάπης καὶ φιλανθρωπίας (Vat. gr. 1619, f. 15r). The title in Vat. gr. 632 is followed by the note: ἀναγινόκηται δέ, μετὰ τὸ ἀναγνωσθῆναι τὸν βίον τῆς θου Δηοῦς 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 προδιαλεξθέντες) addressed to his son and co-emperor John VIII: Vat. gr. 1619, f. 15v: ὁ τοίνυν τῆς φυγῆς τοῦ ἡμῶν ἵππος, ἔστι μὲν ἐκ τῶν ἡμῶν εἰρημένων, πρὸς τὸν κυνὸν τοῦ καὶ βασιλέα ... δόξας δὲ πάνυ συμβαίνειν τῇ παρούσῃ ἔστρην, ταύτῃ παρ’ ἡμῶν νῦν προσφέρεται· οὔ ως τὴν ἄρχην ἐξεδόθη, ἀλλὰ καὶ παραλληλομένοιν ἐνθα προσφέρηκε, καὶ συνεσταλμένα, γυνὴ 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).
37 Dennis, Manuel Palaeologus, Letters, 52, p. 150 n. 6, failed to identify Makarios.
Kabasilas, his uncle Neilos, and Manuel’s mentor Demetrios Kydones. 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, 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 Matthaios Chrysokephalos. 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. 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,

---


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


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

Scholars have suggested that two Mss. preserving Bryennios' works must be his autograph.\textsuperscript{43} The first codex contain his \textit{Orations on the Holy Trinity} and the second preserve his \textit{Theological Chapters} and his \textit{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.\textsuperscript{44} Originally, part of the collection of the Monastery of Panagia Acheiropoietos in Pangaion, more widely known as Eikosiphoinissa or Kosinitsa, 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 \textit{Ivan Dujčev Centre for Slavonic and Byzantine Studies} in Sofia, under nos. D 268 and D 262, respectively.\textsuperscript{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' \textit{Orations on the Holy Trinity} for his doctoral thesis in the University of London, we observed that this is a

\textsuperscript{42} See G. Patacsci, 'Joseph Bryennios et les discussions sur un concile d’union (1414-1431)', \textit{Κληρονομία} 5.1 (1973), 73-96. See also M. Chiu, 'Ἡ ἕνωσις τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν κατὰ τὸν ᾽Ιωσήφ Βρυέννιον' (PhD thesis, University of Thessalonike, 1985) which I have been unable to consult (cited by Bazini, 'Une première édition', p. 83 n. 2).


\textsuperscript{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 Βρυέννιον> Τὰ Πρακτικὰ τῆς Συνόδου τῆς Κύπρου (1406), Βυζαντινά 21 (2000), 21-56 at pp. 24-25 with n. 16. On this work see also Bazini, 'Une première édition', pp. 112-116, 127.

\textsuperscript{45} D 262: 1\textsuperscript{st} 1/4 15th c.; paper, fols. I + 278; 215x150 mm. D 268: 1\textsuperscript{st} 1/4 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, Αριστοτέλειο 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 Προδότου Σερρῶν καὶ Παναγίας Άγιου Σερρῶν τοῦ Πατριαρχού Κοσίνιτσας, Δημοσία Κεντρική Βιβλιοθήκη Σερρών, Σεμινάριο «Εκδόσεων γιὰ τὴν Πόλη καὶ τὸ Νομό Σερρῶν», 4 (Serrès, 1995), pp. 202 (D 262), 203 (D268), 218 with n. 38 (D 262), 293 (D 262); idem, '<Ἰωσήφ Βρυέννιον> Τὰ Πρακτικὰ 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. 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(αι) τοῦ πν(εύματο)ς. 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(ατρός)ς marked by the same reference sign. The sentence, with the added phrase (italicised), reads as follows: “εἴπερ ἡ τοῦ πν(εύματο)ς ὑπόστασις ὡς ἐξ ἑνὸς αἰτίου τῇ τῆς τοῦ π(ατρός)ς (καὶ) νῦν προβλητικής δυνάμεως ἐκπορεύεται, ἐπετ(αι) πιστεύεσθαι (καὶ) τῇ τῆς τοῦ νῦν ὑπόστασις, ὡς ἐξ ἑνὸς αἰτίου τῆς γεννητικής δυνάμεως τοῦ (καὶ) τοῦ πλ(εύματο)ς γεννᾶσθαι.” 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.

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.
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 υπόστασις 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: οὗτω λεγομένη παρ’ αὐτών ἡ σουμπστάντζια. 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 σουμπστάντζια twice replacing the word ὑπόστασιν which appears to have been erased.

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 (fol. 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 Λατινών φωνή, διὰ σενέστητα ἑαυτῆς, ἢ οὐκ οἷς ὅπως ἐν εὐφωμήτερον ἐξαγγέλειμι, τὸ τῆς ὑποστάσεως ἅμα καὶ τὸ τῆς ὑποστάσεως ὅνομο οὐ δυσῶν ὡς ἡ Ἑλλήνων, ἄλλ’ ἐνί μόνῳ [add. οὗτο λεγόμενον παρ’ αὐτών ἡ σουμπστάντζια in marg.] σημαίνει ὑπόστασιν. Μιὰ λέξει διετήν ἐννοίαν τοῖς συνιέναι δυναμένοις παρέχουσα κάντευθεν ἑγεγόνει τὸ σχῆμα τῶν δυτικῶν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, περὶ τῆς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Πνεύματος ἐκπορεύεσθαι. “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.

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 Charistianites 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 Macrê, 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.).
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. 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).

Our last example of co-operation and friendship among scholars of this circle is Manuel Chrysoloras, who also served as Manuel’s ambassador. 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. 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. 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.”

---

57 Ed. and trans. Chrysostomides, Manuel Palaeologus, *Funeral Oration on his Brother Theodore*, p. 77.23-25 (text), 76 (trans.).
“patching with rags clothes made of golden thread”. 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. The Discourse bears Chrysoloras’ own ‘editorial’ hand, in the form of marginal and interlinear corrections and additions.

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, 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


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 οἵων ἀνδρῶν ἐκγονοὶ γεγόναμεν ... τῶν πρεσβυτάτων καὶ παλαιῶν Ἑλλήνων ... [καὶ] τῶν μετ’ἐκείνους γενομένων ἡμῖν προγόνων, τῶν παλαιῶν Ῥωμαίων, ἂρ’ ὅν νῦν ὀνομαζόμεθα ... μάλλον δὲ ἁμφοτέρων τῷ γένει αὐτήν ἡμῖν συνελήλυθε καὶ εἶπε Ἑλληνικά βουλοντὶς τὰς λέγειν εἶπε Ῥωμαίους, ἠμεῖς ἐσμέν ἐκεῖνοι καὶ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου δὲ ... ἡμεῖς σώζουμεν διαδοχὴν ...; see also pp. 27-28 and 51 with n. 53, with reference to Isidore of Kiev, ed. S. Lampros, Παλαιολόγεια καὶ Πελοποννησιακά, vol. III (Athens, 1926), p. 152: Ὁ μέγας Κωνσταντῖνος τοὺς ἄνωθεν εὐγενεῖς καὶ ἀνδρεῖοις φέρων Ῥωμαίων ἐνόι καὶ συνοικίζει τοὺς εὐγενεστέρους τῶν Ἑλλήνων ... καὶ γέγονεν γενοῦν ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν ἐπισημότερων γένος ἐν τῷ ἐπισημάτω τούτῳ τῷ καλλίστῳ, οὗ καὶ εἰ τῇ Ῥωμελήσῃς εἶποι, καλὸς ἰν ἔποιο. 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 (ἀτοπον)”, 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 Dendrinos
Lecturer in Byzantine Literature and Greek Palaeography
The Hellenic Institute
Royal Holloway
University of London
Egham
Surrey TW20 0EX
e-mail: ch.dendrinos@rhul.ac.uk

---

⁶⁴ Manuel Chrysoloras, Epistolary Discourse, pp. 120.24-121: “Ετι γάρ οίδα καὶ φύσεις αὐτῶς [scil. σπουδάζουσι καὶ φιλοσοφοῦσι] οὕτως ἀρίστας καὶ δεξιάς καὶ οὕτω δεξιώθηκε ἄλλοθεν αὐτῶς ὁδοσκάλους μεταπέμπεται οὕτῳ τούτῳ ἀναλίσκειν, ἀλλὰρκεὶ τοῖς οἷοι διδασκάλους χρήσαν

mόνον μετὰ φιλοτιμίας τινὸς γινέσθω καὶ τίς σής ἀπαλαμβάνειν προνοίας καὶ βοηθείας οῖ τε παρεῦθοντες, οἳ τε παρεῳμένοι καὶ τιμῶν ἄξιοοιςωσαν. Οὕτῳ πενία οὐδέ ἀπορία ἐστὶ τὸ κυλών

οὕτῳ γάρ οἱ πλουσιώτεροι καὶ ἐπορωτέροι παῖδες ἔμελλον ἀεὶ γίνεσθαι σοφώτεροι καὶ πόλεις ἀεὶ, αἱ πλείω ἀεὶ ἔχουσα, λογιστέραι εἰναι τῶν ἐπορωτέρων. Νῦν δὲ τοῦτῳ οὐχ ὄρμουν οὕτε ἐν πόλειν οὕτε ἐν ἄνδράσιν. Ἡ τε γάρ καὶ πέντησις καὶ προσαίτου ὑἱόν, μηδὲ βιβλίον ἐποροφύτευτα μητὲ

μὴν τῶν ἀναγκαίων πρὸς τὸ ζην, ἀνδρὰ σοφῶν γενέσθαι καὶ πλουσίου ἀμαθῆ καὶ πόλην ταπεινοτέραν καὶ ἐπορωτέραν πλουσίας καὶ ὑπωτέρας σοφωτέραν καὶ ἐυμαθετέραν εἰναι καὶ πέντησις δὲ ὄρμουν πολλάκις εἰς διδασκάλου πέμποντας τοὺς ἐαυτῶν, πλουσίουν δὲ ἀμποτύντον. Οὕτως ταῦτα ἐπὶ πλουσίουν οὐ ἀπορίας ἀλλ’ ἐπιμέλειας ἢ ἐπιμελείας γίνεται ... Ἡς σὲ περὶ τὰ λόγα τῶν σπουδαίων καὶ ἀγαθῶν γὰρ αὐτόματα ἐν ταῖς πόλεις φύσει ἄλλα δὲ τοῖς ἐπιμελουμένοις καὶ προνοουμένοις

τοῖς οὕτως εἶναι, τὰ γὰρ κοινοφήλη δει κοινῆς καὶ τῆς ἐπιμελείας τυγχάνει, οὕτω καὶ τῆς τῶν λόγων τέχνης καὶ δυνάμεως δὲ τοῖς προνοουμένοις εἶναι καὶ τοῦτο μᾶλλον ἢ τίνος ἐτέρου. Τὰ γὰρ μείζω

μείζονος καὶ τῆς κηδεμονίας μεῖται ταῦτα δὲ ἐξήρτηται τοῖς ἀρχομέναι οὐ σει οὐ καὶ τοῖς αὐτόματῃ φυλοφένῃ, δὲ μηδὲ τοῖς προνοουμένοις δέδοται.

⁶⁵ Manuel Chrysoloras, Epistolary Discourse, 119.14-120.5; 119.36-120.4: Σοφιάν δὲ καὶ τοιαῦτα ἐργά οὐ ράδιον συνθέτως αὕτης ἀπολογώτα.

⁶⁶ Manuel Chrysoloras, Epistolary Discourse, pp. 119.11-13: Ἀποστόλου δὲ καὶ ἐν Ἂτηλία μὲν, ίσως δὲ καὶ ἄλλοθι, τινάς σπουδαίζειν περὶ τοὺς ἡμετέρους λόγους καὶ νῦν εἶναι τοῦ γυνώκοςκοντας, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς Ἑλλάδος καὶ τῆς ἡμπροπόλεως ἀμελείσθαι.