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

---

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 φιλία.

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 The second letter, so far unpublished, which Manuel wrote by way of introduction to his composition, recalls the incident of his previous meeting with David and Damianos in Thessalonike.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

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 ἐιληφὸς τὸ βιβλίον. Vat. gr. 1107, fol. 318v.3-21: ... εἰςιόντες τοίνυν ὡς ἔμε, ὡς δεδομένον ἢν ὡμὴν κεκαθήκατε ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐν ταῖν χεροῖν, ἔτι ύπαραν ὡμὴν εὑρεθείη τὸ νῦν ὡμὴν πεμπόμενον πόνημα, καὶ ὀφθαλμοῖς τοῖς υμετέρους ὥρθει, κινησεῖ τε τὴν γλῶσσαν ἐρείπθαι, τί ποἳ ἀν εἶτ τὸ θεαθὲν, καὶ διατὶ σὺν οὐ μικρὰς τινὶ διαθέσει δοκεῖ περιειλῆφθαι μου ταῖν χεροῖν, ὡδί πως τοίνυν τούτων γεγενημένων, ἀπεκρίναμην μὲν οὐδὲν προὔτεινα δὲ τῇ δεξαίῃ παρεχομένῃ τὴν δεξαίῃ ἔπεραν ἀνὰ χείρας δεξαμενήν δόντος ἑμοῦ, σκιαγραφίᾳ προσεικὼς, ύπα ἑκρωσμένη γραφή, τῇ μηκέτι δεομένῃ τελειώσεως, ἀναπτύσσοντας ὡς ἔχετε τάχους, ἐπὶ τροχάδην διεξελθόντες ξινά τινα ταύτης μέρη, τοῦ καιροῦ μὴ συγχωροῦντος, μὴ ἀναγγέλλειν τὸ πᾶν, μὴ ἀκριβοῦν τὸ ἀναγγελθέν, ταῦτα δὲ τὰ τῶν σχολαζόντων, εἰρήκατε τῇ τοῦ πονήματος ἑρθαίη πραγματείας καὶ καλὸν εἶναι κεκρίκατε, μὴ καθάπερ ἄδελφωμα, ἡμιτελὲς τοῦ ὁδεγίας κἂν ἐκβαίνῃ μοι τὸ πράγμα κατὰ νοῦν, τῆς τελεσιουργοῦ δυνάμεως συνεφαπτομένης τῶν πόνων, ἀνάβολας ἀπάσας χαίρειν εἰπόντα, ἀξιῶσαι με φροντίσαι, ὡς ἕμας τὸ τάχος ἀφίκοιτο.
thought is fruitless and worthy of criticism”.

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”.

This lengthy composition Manuel sent to David and Damianos together with the accompanying letter is preserved in codex Cryptensis Z.δ.I (161). This handsome and richly decorated Ms. contains a selection of the Emperor’s rhetorical, literary and theological works, copied by Isidore (later Metropolitan of Kiev and Cardinal), who was Manuel’s main scribe and close collaborator. 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 entered Bessarion’s possession as the ex libris indicates, and subsequently deposited in the Library of the Abbey of Santa Maria Grottaferrata in 1462, when he was named abate

---

4 Vat. gr. 1107, fol. 319r.17-319v.1: ... ώς τι λήθης κέκραται φάρμακον, κονδυλίζειν ἁμηγέτῃ καὶ μυμνήσκειν ἡμᾶς πραγμάτων, ὅν τὸ μεμνήσθαι, πολλὶ τὸ κέρδος ἐκ τούθε νά γάρ οίμαι συμβαίνειν, πειράζαι καρποῦδαι ἐ ἡ μετανοία βοήθειαν ὅπως ε ἐκ τούθε θέασί τοῖς, κἂν νεμονόν τῷ γεγραφότι, τῶν ὄνομάτων ἐνεκα, καὶ τῆς πλοκῆς φημι καὶ τῆς τάξεως, μικράτα δήξει καὶ πληξὶν τὸ γάρ λυμανεῖται μου τῇ προθέσει, ἣς ἀν η ἤ καὶ τὸν νόον ἐξελέγξει, ἀκαρπον παντάπασαν ὄντα, καὶ διαβόλης ἠστινούσιν ἄξιον. Ἑπετεὶ οὔδε τοῖς τυχοῦσιν φανησόμενον ἔρρεται πατράς δ ε ἐκ τὰ θεόν καὶ δίδακτρας καὶ φίλοις, οίς οὔδε τούς λογισμοὺς θέμενος || κρίστειν δέμιος.

5 Vat. gr. 1107, fol. 320r.5-8: εἰ δὲ οὔδεν ἁγγέν, φανον, ὅπερ ἀπής, ἀλλ’ ὑμεῖς γε διορθοῦσθε, εἰ ιδαμόν ἔστι τὸ κακὸν θεραπείας δὲ κρίεται παντάπασαν εὑρεθέν, ποι παμφάγον μυείως (cf. Euripides, Medea 1187).

6 Manuel’s letter (fol. 3r-10v ) is followed by his work (fol. 12r-65v, 75r-81v) entitled Τοῦ εὐερεβεστάτου καὶ φιλαχρίστου βασιλέως Μανουήλ τοῦ Παλαιολόγου, πρὸς τὸν ἐαυτοῦ πνευματικὸν, υπὲρ τῶν καθ’ έαυτὸν μετὰ τὸ δόραι δεινός κατασκηψάσης αὐτοῦ χαλεπωτάτης νόσου, ἵνα καὶ πᾶσα μὲν χρείαν 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, fol. 1r-6v (Letter), 7r-52r (Confession), and Pontificio Collegio Greco, Roma, cod. 11, fol. 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, fol. lv-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 Ms. 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-lxxv.

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 (1382/3-71.1431), 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

---

12 Vat. gr. 1107, f. 315r: Τοῖς σωτήτοις ἐν ἱερομοναχίας καὶ πνευματικοῖς πατράδη Αὐαίδ καὶ τῷ συννομνύμῳ. Cf. Crypten. Z.Δ.Ι (161), f. 3r: Τοῖς ὅσιοτοις ἐν ἱερομοναχίας καὶ πνευματικοῖς πατράδη Δαυίδ καὶ Δαμιανῷ, τί καὶ ἐκ προευμφύμ ἑκ γράμμα, θετέρῳ δοκεὶ πέμπτεσθαι.
14 Vat. gr. 1107, fols. 320v.22-321r.1: ... τῷ ... ἱερεῖ Μακαρίῳ, τῷ δὲ τῆς πενείσσαν ὑπακοῆν ἐφθάσοτι πρὶν ἡ βαδίση ἐφ’ ὑπὸ καὶ ἀπεκείριο, χάριν τὲ καὶ ἄμα προκόπεπτην ταῖς τῆς ἀφρος ἀνάφθοσεν δὲ δὴ διὰ υμείς ἀνδραῖος, τοῖς τῶν μὲν ὕποθεν διὰ γενναίοτητα τῆς ἐκ μετράτητος μη δὲ μεμνήμηνος, τοῖς δὲ ἐμπροσθέν, τῷ πρὸς τὸν μόνον ἐφετὼν [scil. Θεὸν] κεχηρίζεται ἐκτεινόμενος (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 Macrés, p. 198 § 29: ὁ θείος βασιλεύς πάντων αὐτοῦ συγγραμμάτων ἔννοι, δι’ ἑνή μάλιστα ἀναχωρητικῆς ἐπιτίθεια, τάδε τῷ θείῳ Δαυίδ πέπομφεν ... ὁ κρατῶν ἐπιστεάλλων ... τελευτῶν τῇ γραφῆ προσετίθει δεικνύον τάστα καὶ τῷ ίδιῳ φωτιτῇ Μακραίῳ. Ἡδεὶ γὰρ τὸν ἄνδρα καὶ πρὸ τῆς παρουσίας ταῖς ἑπιστολαῖς καὶ τις τῶν αὐτοῦ συγγραμμάτων, ἃττ’ ἡν ἐκεῖνος δημιουργῶν. Πρὸς δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις πλεονεκτήσας, οἷς ὁ θείος οὕτος ἀνή ἐπλούσει καλοῖς, καὶ τὸ λογογραφεῖν ἀρίστως καὶ τοὺς πάλι εὐδοκιμικότας ἐν τούτῳ οὐκ ῥησόνετο δοκῶν πρῶτος εἶν’ ἐν τοῖς συνετέροις. Ὁθεν καὶ προσετίθει τοῖς λόγοις ... Συζευξείθεσα τοῖνυν ὑπακοὴ τοῖς λόγοις, ἔρασκεν ὁ ὁδόντιος [scil. βασιλεύς], τούτοιν ὡς χρυσαίς πτέρυξι ταχέως εἰς ψύφος τὴν πορείαν ποιήσει (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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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)\textsuperscript{25} which is included in this Ms. The

\textsuperscript{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.
\textsuperscript{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. xi 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 Paualu, 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’.  

This Oration on which they co-operated is preserved in two codices, Vat. gr. 1619, fols. 15r-29v and Vat. gr. 632, fols. 336r-350v. The accompanying letter, however, is preserved only in the second Ms. (Vat. gr. 632, fols. 350v-351v) 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. In addition, we know that Makarios was Gabriel’s protégé. 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.

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 θείας ἡμᾶς τῶν βίων ἁρίστα διαζωgráfης. The Oration is entitled Τὸν Μανουὴλου εὐμεταστέατον καὶ φιλοχρίστον βασιλέως Μανουὴλ τοῦ Παλαιολόγου, λόγος, ὅτι μὲν ἁμαρτία τὸ πάντων χειρίσετο· δεῖ δὲ, μηδένα ἀπογινώσκειν· μήτε ἑαυτὸν, μήτε ἑτερον· κρίνειν δὲ ἑαυτὸν, καὶ οὐχ ἑτερον· καὶ τοὺς ἤμαρτηκότας, οὐ μισεῖν, ἀλλ’ ἐλεεῖν· καὶ περὶ μετανοίας, καὶ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ προνοίας· ἡμῖν καὶ θείας καὶ φιλανθρωπίας (Vat. gr. 1619, f. 15r). The title in Vat. gr. 632 is followed by the note: ἀναγνώσκεται δὲ, μετὰ τὸ ἀναγνωσθῆναι τὸν βίον τῆς θείας 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 προδιαλεξθέντως) addressed to his son and co-emperor John VIII: Vat. gr. 1619, f. 15v: ὁ τοῖν τὴν θησαυροὺς ἡμὴ λόγος, ἐστὶ μὲν ἐκ τῶν θείας εἰρημένων, πρὸς τὸν ὑιόν τε καὶ βασιλέα ... δοξάς δὲ πάνυ συμβαίνειν τῇ παρουσίᾳ ἑορτή, ταῦτα παρ’ ἡμῶν νῦν προσφέρεται· οὐκ ἡς τὴν ἁρκήν ἔξοδον, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρηλλαγένος ἐνδέκιε, καὶ συνεσταλμένος, φυγῇ τοῦ κόρον. 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.\(^{42}\)

Scholars have suggested that two Mss. preserving Bryennios’ works must be his autograph.\(^{43}\) The first codex contains 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 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 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)’, *Kληρονομία* 5.1 (1973), 73-96. See also M. Chivu, *’Η ἕνωσις τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν κατὰ τόν 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.).


\(^{44}\) 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: ‘’Ιωσήφ Βρυέννιον’ Τά Πρακτικά 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.

\(^{45}\) D 262: 1\(^{s}\) ¼ 15th c.; paper, fols. 1 + 278; 215x150 mm. D 268: 1\(^{s}\) 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. Clerment d’Ochrid» de Sofia, Αριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης, Publications du Programme de la coopération entre le centre ‘Ivan Dujčev’ de l’Université «St. Clerment 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 Τμίου Προθρόνων Σερρῶν καὶ Παναγίας Ἀγαθοποιίας τοῦ Παγγαίου (Κοσινίτσας), Δημωσία Κεντρικῆς Βιβλιοθήκης Σερρών, Ζεύγα Έκδοσεων 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, ‘’Ιωσήφ Βρυέννιον’ Τά 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. 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(ατ)ρ(ὸς)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 ἐνὸς αἰτίου τ(ῆς) τοῦ π(ατ)ρ(ὸς)ς (καὶ) νιόν προβλητικ(ῆς) δυνάμε(ως) ἐκπορεύεται(α), ἔπεται(α) πιστεύειν (καὶ) τ(ῆν) τοῦ νιόν ὑπόστασι(ν), ὡς ἐξ ἐνὸς αἰτίου τῆς γεννητικ(ῆς) δυνάμεως(ως) τοῦ π(ατ)ρ(ὸς)ς κ(αὶ) τοῦ πν(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 *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 ἢ σομαστάντζια.\(^{49}\) 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 σομαστάντζια 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 (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 φωνὴ, διὰ στενότητα ἐαυτῆς, ἢ οὐκ οἷς ὅπως ἐν εὐφημήτωρ ἐξαγελοῦμε, τὸ τῆς οὐσίας ἁμα καὶ τὸ τῆς ὑπόστασεως ὅνων οὐ δυσιν ὡς ἢ Ἑλλήνων, ἀλλ’ ἐνι μόνον [add. οὕτω λεγόμενον παρ’ αὐτῶν ἢ σομαστάντζια in marg.] σημαίνει ὄνοματ μιᾷ λέξει, διετήν ἐννοιαν τοῖς συνενία δυναμένοις παρέχουσα κἀντεύθεν ἐγενόμενο τὸ σχῆμα τῶν δυτικῶν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, περὶ τῆς τοῦ Ἱς 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 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 Macrés, 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.”

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 Euthymius’ reply to the Emperor, see Appendix I, p. 221)
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 Χρυσολώρῳ κυρίῳ Μανουῆ, εἰς τὸν πρὸς ἀδελφὸν ἐπιτάφιον ὡς ἠμοὶ δεδημιοῦργητα δακρύον ἔχω ἀποκομῆσθαι προσδίδωμαι τοῦτον μή γράφοντι.
“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’).
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 Dendrinos
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e-mail: ch.dendrinos@rhul.ac.uk

\(^{64}\) Manuel Chrysoloras, Epistolary Discourse, pp. 120.24-121: Ἡττε γὰρ οἶδα καὶ φύσεις αὐτοῖς [scil. σπουδαζούσι καὶ φιλοσοφοῦσι] οὔσας ἄριστας καὶ δεξιὰς καὶ οὐδὲ δησὶ ἄλλοθεν ἀὑτοῖς διδακτικοὺς μεταπέμπετον οὐδὲίς τούτους ἀναλίσκειν, ἀλλ᾽ ἄρκει τοῖς οίκοι διδακτικοίς χρήσαθι μόνον μετὰ φιλοτιμίας τινὸς γινέσθω καὶ τῆς σῆς ἀπαλαμβάνουν προνοιας καὶ βοηθείας οὐ τε παιδεύοντες, οὐ τε παιδεύομενοι καὶ τιμων ᾠδιούσθωσαν. Οὕτως εὖ ἀνάδει πορωτέρως ἄρα τῶν πλουσιώτερων και εὐπορωτέρων παῖδες ἐμελλον ἄει γίνεσθαι σοφώτεροι καὶ πόλεις δε, αἱ πλεῖον ἄει ἔχουσαι, λογιστέραι εἰναι τῶν ἀπορωτέρων. Νῦν δε τούτο οὐ ρώμεν οὔτε ἐν πόλειν οὔτε ἐν ἀνδράσιν. Ἡττε γὰρ καὶ πέντης τοίς προσαίτου ὑμῶν, μηδε βιβλίον εὐποροῦντα μήτε μὴν τῶν ἀναγκαῖων πρὸς τὸ ξῆν, ἄνδρα σοφὸν γενέσθαι καὶ πλουσίου ἀμαθῆ καὶ πόλιν ταπεινότεραν ἀπορωτέρων πλουσίας καὶ δυνατωτέρας σοφωτέρας καὶ εὐμαθετέρας εἰναι καὶ πέντης δε ὀρώμεν τολλάκις εἰς διδακτικὸν πέμποντας τοὺς ἔωτον, πλουσίων δὲ ἀμελοῦντων. Οὕτως ταῦτα ὑπὸ πλοῦτου ἢ ἀπορίας ἀλλ᾽ ὑπὸ ἀμελείας ἢ ἐπιμελείας γίνεται ... Ἡς περ δε τὰλ οι σπουδαῖων καὶ ἄγαθον οὐκ αὐτόματα ἡν ταῖς πόλεις φύεται ἄλλα δει τῶν ἐπιμελουμένους καὶ προνοιμένους τούτων εἰναι, τὰ γάρ κοινωφελῆ δει κοινῆς καὶ τῆς ἐπιμελείας τυφύχειν, οὔτω καὶ τῆς τῶν λόγων τήνης καὶ δυνάμεως δει τῶν προνοιμένους εἰναι καὶ τούτου μάλλον ἢ τινὸς ἔτερον. Τὰ γάρ μείζων μείζονος καὶ τῆς κηδεμονίας δεῖται ταῦτα δε ἐξήρηται τοὺς ἐρχονταν ή φασθὸν ἡν ἢ οὐφρα αὐτόματα φυσεμένη, δ μηδε τοῖς φαυλοτέροις δέδοται.

\(^{65}\) Manuel Chrysoloras, Epistolary Discourse, 119.14-120.5; 119.36-120.4: Σοφίαν δε καὶ τοιαύτα ἔργα οὐ ράδιον συνειλθία σώφεις ἀπολογίων.

\(^{66}\) Manuel Chrysoloras, Epistolary Discourse, pp. 119.11-13: Ἀποτελεῖ δε καὶ ἐν Ἡνταλία μὲν, ἵσως δε καὶ ἄλλοθι, τινάς σπουδαζείν περὶ τοὺς ἡμετέρους λόγους καὶ νῦν εἶναι τοὺς γινόσκοντας, ἐπὶ δε τῆς Ἐλλάδος καὶ τῆς μητρόπολεως ἀμελεῖσαθί.