THE LETTERS OF GEORGE-GENNADIOS SCHOLARIOS TO MEMBERS OF THE RULING ELITE IN FIFTEENTH-CENTURY PELOPONNESE: INTRODUCTION, TRANSLATION, AND COMMENTARY

ABDULKERİM KARTAL

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2013

THE LETTERS OF GEORGE-GENNADIOS SCHOLARIOS TO MEMBERS OF THE RULING ELITE IN FIFTEENTH-CENTURY PELOPONNESE: INTRODUCTION, TRANSLATION, AND COMMENTARY

Thesis submitted to the

Institute for Graduate Studies in the Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

History

by

Abdulkerim Kartal

Boğaziçi University

2013

The Letters of George-Gennadios Scholarios to Members of the Ruling Elite in Fifteenth-Century Peloponnese: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary

The thesis of Abdulkerim Kartal

has been approved by:

Prof. Dr. Nevra Necipoğlu _____

(Thesis Advisor)

Assist. Prof. Koray Durak _____

Assist. Prof. Chryssi Sidiropoulou _____

June 2013

Thesis Abstract

Abdulkerim Kartal, "The Letters of George-Gennadios Scholarios to Members of the Ruling Elite in Fifteenth-Century Peloponnese: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary"

George-Gennadios Scholarios (ca. 1400-ca. 1472) is a late Byzantine intellectual and a man of religion. He was born a Byzantine and died an Ottoman, which highlights his witnessing a crucial transition period. Scholarios held different positions throughout his life: he was imperial secretary, official sermonist, general judge, monk, and in the end the first patriarch under Ottoman rule. His last position itself is adequate to recognize his importance. Scholarios left abundant literary material that is compiled in eight volumes yet not fully translated into a modern language. This study aims at translating six of his letters that were sent to various members of the ruling elite in the Peloponnese in the first half of the fifteenth century, and evaluating the findings in light of fifteenth-century Peloponnesian politics; in a modest attempt to fill a gap in the relevant historiography. The addressees are Despot Theodore II, Alexios Laskaris, Despot Constantine, Despot Demetrios, and Manuel Raoul Oises. They are either people who could assist Scholarios leave Constantinople and start a new career in the Peloponnese, or anti-Unionists like him with whom Scholarios felt the need to cooperate against the Union. In the end he neither had the opportunity to leave Constantinople for the Peloponnese, nor hinder the eminent Union, which came about in 1452, months before the fall of Constantinople.

Tez Özeti

Abdulkerim Kartal, "George-Gennadios Scholarios'un On Beşinci Yüzyılda Mora'daki Yönetici Üst Sınıfa Mektupları: Giriş, Çeviri ve Yorum"

George-Gennadios Scholarios (1400?-1472?) bir son dönem Bizans düşünürü ve din adamıdır. Bir Bizanslı olarak doğup Osmanlı olarak ölmesi önemli bir geçiş sürecine tanıklık ettiğini gösterir. Scholarios hayatı boyunca çeşitli görevlerde bulunmuştur: imparator sekreterliği, vaizlik, yüksek yargıçlık, rahiplik ve en nihayetinde Osmanlı yönetimi altında ilk patriklik. Sadece bu son görevi bile onun önemini kavramak için yeterlidir. Scholarios sekiz ciltte derlenmiş ve hiçbir kısmı tam olarak modern bir dile çevrilmemiş olan bol miktarda edebi kaynak bırakmıştır. Bu çalışma on beşinci yüzyılın ilk yarısında Mora'daki yönetici üst sınıfın çeşitli üyelerine gönderilen altı mektubun çevirisini, bulguların on beşinci yüzyıl Mora siyaseti ışığında değerlendirilip naçizane bir şekilde ilgili literatürdeki bir açığı kapatmayı hedeflemektedir. Mektupların alıcıları Mora Despotu II. Theodore, Aleksios Laskaris, Despot Konstantin, Despot Demetrios ve Manuel Raoul Oises'tir. Bu kişiler ya Scholarios'un Konstantinopolis'ten gitmesine yardımcı olup Mora'da yeni bir kariyere başlamasına yardımcı olabilecek, ya da iki kilisenin birleşmesine karşı işbirliği yapma ihtiyacı hissettiği kendisi gibi Birlik'e karşı olanlardır. Sonunda Scholarios ne Konstantinopolis'ten ayrılıp Mora'ya gidebilmiş, ne de 1452'de Konstantinopolis'in düşüşünden aylar önce gerçekleşen Birleşme'yi engelleyebilmiştir.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Chryssi Sidiropoulou, with whom I worked on the present translation of Scholarios' letters for a long time and who always encouraged me and made me feel as if I studied with my friend.

However, I would like to bid very many thanks especially to my advisor Prof. Nevra Necipoğlu, who suggested this topic to me and never deprived me of her help in the most difficult moments of this process. I am grateful to Dr. Koray Durak, and the editors as well.

Other than the members of the thesis committee, I would like to thank Dr. Anestis Vasilakeris and Dr. Kyriaki Konstantinidou for their help in the translation; also Dr. Ayşe Ozil, Dr. Noémi Lévy-Aksu and Dr. Meltem Toksöz who never withdrew their support from me.

Lastly I would like to thank my mother and my sister who offered their unconditional assistance to me every moment, and my dearest friends Merve Aydın, Şebnem Usluer, Ebru Salgun, Nurhan Erdoğan, Naz Özkan, Akif Şimşek, and Egecan Erdoğan, who always encouraged me and set me at ease. Without their help it would have been impossible to complete my work.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION……..……1

CHAPTER II: BIOGRAPHY OF THE ADDRESSER AND HIS RELATIONS WITH THE ADDRESSEES……..…….…….8
Addresser: George-Gennadios Scholarios……..…….……..8
Addressee I: Despot Theodore II Palaiologos…….……...20
Addressee II: Alexios Laskaris Philanthropenos…..……...23
Addressee III: Despot Constantine Palaiologos..…….……...23
Addressee IV: Despot Demetrios Palaiologos…..……...26
Addressee V: Manuel Raoul Oises……...……...29

CHAPTER III: TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY…….....30
Letter VI to the Despot Theodore II ….……...……...30
Letter VII to the Despot Theodore II...…….……...33
Letter to Alexios Laskaris…….……...36
Letter to Despot Constantine……..……..……...39
Letter to Demetrios Palaiologos…..…….……...44
Letter to Manuel Raoul Oises……...……...84

CHAPTER IV: EVALUATION…….……..……...110
The Byzantine Empire in the First Half of the Fifteenth Century…….…..…..110
The Despotate of the Morea in the First Half of the Fifteenth Century…..…..113
Scholarios' Views on Major Events That Took Place during 1435/6-1450/1...116

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION…….……132

APPENDIX : THE LETTERS…….……135

BIBLIOGRAPHY ……...……178

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Gennadios Scholarios was one of the greatest late Byzantine intellectuals and a man of religion who lived in the fifteenth century, and also the first Orthodox patriarch under Ottoman rule. It was partly thanks to his efforts that the Orthodox Church underwent transformation which would help ensure its survival under Ottoman domination. Scholarios was born around 1400 and died after 1472. The fact that he was born a Byzantine and died an Ottoman displays how representative a figure he was with regard to the Byzantine intellectual and religious legacy in the Ottoman period. Even so, he was not just an influential figure in intellectual and religious matters; he was also instrumental in Byzantine politics. Any scholar who attempts to study Scholarios encounters some basic questions: what was his position regarding the Union of the Catholic and the Orthodox Churches? Why did he shift from a pro-Unionist position to an anti-Unionist one? Did he volunteer to be a patriarch under Ottoman rule, or was he forced to do so?

Scholarios left us abundant information on various issues from politics to religion and from philosophy to grammar. His writings were compiled in eight volumes, edited by Louis Petit, X. A. Sideridès, and Martin Jugie with the title *Oeuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, during 1928-1936 in Paris, where most of the manuscripts are.[1] This study does not try to provide answers to the abovementioned questions, yet it will briefly touch upon them. Only a thorough

[1] L. Petit, X.A. Sideridès, M. Jugie, ed. *Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, 8 vols., Maison de la Bonne Presse, Paris, 1928-1936. Hereafter it will be referred to as *Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios.* For a general presentation of his works, see M.H. Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios (vers 1400-vers 1472): un intellectuel Orthodoxe face à la disparition de l'Empire byzantin*, Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, Paris, 2008, pp. 478-81. Hereafter it will be referred to as Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios.*

study of his works might yield answers to those questions. The contents of the eight volumes are as following: vol. I – oratorical works, and theological treatises on the divine providence and spirit; vol. II – polemical treatises on the procession of the Holy Spirit; vol. III – polemical works, theological questions, and apologetic writings; vol. IV – polemics against Gemistos Plethon, pastoral, ascetic, liturgical, and poetic works, letters, and chronography; vol. V – summary of *Summa Contra Gentiles* and the first part of *Summa Theologicae* of Thomas Aquinas; vol. VI – summaries, translations, and commentaries of Thomas Aquinas' and Aristotle's works; vol. VII – translation and commentaries of Aristotle's works; vol. VIII – philosophical translations, grammar, and various other works.

Those eight volumes also include various letters of Scholarios,[2] which are found primarily in the fourth volume,[3] addressed to people from various circles. The fact that they have not been translated yet by anyone –except for some partial translations-[4] drove me to the translation work that I have undertaken, and at the same time reveals the aim of this thesis, that is, to incorporate the findings in Scholarios' letters into fifteenth-century Byzantine historiography. For practical purposes, I needed to limit the translation; therefore, I chose Scholarios' letters sent to the ruling elite of the Despotate of the Morea in the Peloponnese during the Byzantine period, namely before 1453. This automatically eliminates the letters sent

[2] For the list of the works in which these letters were found before the publication of *Oeuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, see T. Zissis, *Γεννάδιος Β' Σχολάριος: Βίος, Συγγράματα, Διδασκαλία*, Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies, Thessaloniki, 1980, pp. 358-9. Hereafter it will be referred to as Zissis, *Γεννάδιος Β' Σχολάριος*.

[3] Only the letter to the Despot Demetrios Palaiologos is found in the third volume among the selected ones. For the chunk of the letters found in the fourth volume, see *Oeuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, vol. IV, pp. 398-503.

[4] Blanchet and Livanos have undetaken such partial translations in their books. See Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, and C. Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence in the Work of George Scholarios*, Gorgias Press, New Jersey, 2006. Hereafter it will be referred to as Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence.*

to the clergymen, as well as texts sent to the same addressees but not classified as letters by the editors. The letters include religious issues as well, but they will be out of my venture in this thesis. The findings of this study will shed light on the relations between Constantinople and the Peloponnese, implying the intellectual and economical superiority of the Peloponnese over Constantinople.

Working on a Byzantine letter is not an easy job. Jenkins wrote: "To us a letter is a message accompanied by an expression of personal regard; a Byzantine letter is an impersonal rhetorical flourish which either contains no message at all, or if it does, the message is couched in so obscure and allusive a fashion as to be nearly unintelligible."[5] It will be wrong if one asserts that this statement is universally correct for any Byzantine letter, Jenkins is still right in my case, since I had to put a lot of effort and time not only to extract meaning out of Scholarios' letters, but also to relate and incorporate what he narrates to the historiography.

Scholarios wrote 53 letters, however this is a collection which has not been studied separately. Therefore, it is not among the 150 major collections mentioned by Mullett.[6] The number of all the Byzantine letters might be around 15,000, yet "no exhaustive survey of the Byzantine letter exists; there is no corpus of Byzantine letters or even a checklist."[7] The general characteristics of a Byzantine letter is its length which might be regarded as relatively short, its obscurity, inclusion of exchange of compliments, use of superlatives and proverbs, its friendly and

[5] R. J. H. Jenkins, "The Hellenistic Origins of Byzantine Literature", *DOP* 17 (1963), p. 45, as quoted in M. Mullett, *Theophylact of Ochrid: Reading the Letters of a Byzantine Archbishop*, vol. II, Variorum Ashgate Publishing Ltd., Hampshire, 1997, p. 23. Hereafter it will be referred to as Mullett, *Theophylact of Ochrid*.

[6] Mullett, *Theophylact of Ochrid*, p. 11; M. Mullett, *Letters, Literacy, and Literature in Byzantium*, Ashgate Publishing, USA, 2007, pp. 78-9. Hereafter it will be referred to as Mullett, *Letters, Literacy*.

[7] Mullett, *Letters, Literacy*, pp. 78-9.

sentimental tone and vivid depiction of –sometimes political- events.[8] Byzantine letter writing tradition evolved through time.[9] The late Byzantine letters are more open, thus less obscure, according to Mullett.[10] However, this statement definitely cannot be applied to the letters of Scholarios, which are as obscure as the ones written in the earlier periods. The absence of the mention of Scholarios' letters in the works of Mullett, a great scholar of Byzantine epistolography, is no exception in the historiography. Thus, it may be asserted that the letters of Scholarios are relatively understudied, which was a factor that inspired and encouraged me to undertake the present study.

The structure of this thesis is as follows: in the present introductory chapter one may find the aim as well as the limitations of this study, and technical details of the translation; the second chapter presents a biography of Scholarios and brief identification of the selected addressees as well as Scholarios' motives to write to them; the third chapter includes the translations and commentaries of the six letters that provide explanations of some significant events, places, and proper names mentioned; the fourth chapter aims to examine the six letters in light of fifteenth-century Peloponnesian politics and to incorporate all the findings into the historiography by crosschecking Scholarios' accounts with those of his contemporaries and stating their accord or discordance with them; and the fifth chapter attempts to propound a general conclusion. In the appendix, one may find the letters in their original language, namely in the fifteenth-century Byzantine Greek.

[8] E. Jeffreys, *et al.* (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Studies*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2008, pp. 882-4. Hereafter it will be referred to as *OHBS*.

[9] A brief overview on this evolution can be found in Mullett, *Letters, Literacy*, pp. 85-93.

[10] Mullett mentions the letters of Demetrios Kydones, patriarch Athanasios, Gregory Akindynos, Nikephoros Gregoras, Theodore Metochites, John Chortasmenos, Symeon of Thessalonike, and Manuel II as an example to openness; apparently disregarding those of Scholarios. *OHBS*, p. 887; Mullett, *Letters, Literacy*, pp. 87-8.

Below are the chronologically listed short descriptions of the six letters that are selected:[11]

1. Letter VI to the Despot Theodore II (1430/2):[12] In this letter, Scholarios expresses his wish to leave Constantinople for the Peloponnese to the Despot Theodore, who ruled there during 1407-1443. He also thanks for the letter the Despot Theodore II sent to him, but the letter has not survived.
2. Letter VII to the same (Despot Theodore II) (1430/2): This letter is undoubtedly written after letter VI, since it mentions Scholarios' disappointment due to not having been invited to the Peloponnese by the Despot Theodore II, a wish which was clearly stated in the former letter.
3. Letter to Alexios Laskaris (Philanthropenos) (1435/6): In this letter, Scholarios repeats his wish, this time to the governor of Vostitsa in the Peloponnese, who was in the service of the Despot Constantine. It is apparent that Alexios made a promise to Scholarios beforehand since Scholarios states that he is waiting for departure.
4. Letter to the Despot Constantine (1443-1448):[13] In this letter, Scholarios no more mentions his wish to go to the Peloponnese, which was probably extinguished after his return from the Council of Ferrara-Florence, but he requests donations, without specifying what they refer to.

[11] Some of these letters are mentioned by Zakythinos. See D. Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée: Histoire politique*, éd. revue et augmentée par C. Maltézou, Variorum, 2 vols., London, 1975, vol. II, p. 332. Hereafter it will be referred to as Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée.*

[12] There are two basic sources for the dating of the letters: Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios* and the editors. I will keep using Blanchet's not only for the sake of consistency, but most importantly because her dating is much more recent and well-founded than the editors'.

[13] This is my dating. For its explanation, see p. 23.

5. Letter to Demetrios Palaiologos against the Union of Florence[14] (end of 1449): This is one of the longest letters which Scholarios wrote, and it bears the title "George Scholarios before the steps of the holy *synaxis* of the Father, striving after the true dogma". Out of the nineteen pages, the first half is devoted to political issues, whereas the next half is spared for the discussion of a hot theological debate, that is, the issue of the *filioque*. Some of the political issues Scholarios touches upon are no less than the Council of Ferrara-Florence, Demetrios' attack on Constantinople in 1442 together with the Ottomans, the Battle of Varna, and the succession problem over the Byzantine throne after the death of the penultimate Emperor, John VIII.
6. Letter to Manuel Raoul Oises (1451/2): This letter is an invaluable source, since it is one of the two sources that recount Manuel's execution of a man called Iouvenalios, a neo-pagan whom Scholarios detests. The letter expresses Scholarios' appreciation of and gratitude for Manuel over his act.

It is a challenge to translate a fifteenth-century text written in Byzantine Greek. Even though mastering Ancient Greek helps with grammar and syntax, the vocabulary of the letters is an instance of mixed and complex language in transition; since often the meaning of words has already shifted and become closer to what one has in Modern Greek. One important note for the reader about the technical details of the translation is the paragraphs. Unfortunately I have not seen the original manuscript. However in the edited text, the editors seem to have stuck to the original make-up which is quite reader-unfriendly. Therefore, to make it more legible, I have reorganized the letters by dividing them into more paragraphs. As for the dating of

[14] Scholarios' lobbying activities on the part of anti-Unionists are not limited to his letter to the Despot Demetrios. He also wrote to Loukas Notaras and John IV Komnenos, the Emperor of Trebizond. See Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* pp. 413-4.

the letters, there are two major sources: the editors and Blanchet. I preferred that of Blanchet's merely because hers is more recent.

This thesis would be developed if certain drawbacks are overcome. One of the most principal out of them is the exclusion of the texts that are not labeled as letters by the editors, although they were written at the same time interval and to the same people. For example, a text which is addressed to the Despot Demetrios, written in 1452, exists in the third volume.[15] Likewise, the geographical criterion that I restricted myself with prevented me from translating a letter to the Emperor Constantine XI.[16] My last criterion, which is to limit the letters sent to politicians made me skip the ones sent to important people during the same period, to the same geography. An example of it is a letter sent to the *Nomophylax*,[17] that is, John Eugenikos.

[15] *Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, vol. III, pp. 174-8.

[16] *Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, vol. IV, pp. 463-473.

[17] A. Kazhdan, A.-M. Talbot, A. Cutler, T. E. Gregory, N. P. Ševčenko, *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, 3 vols., (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press), 1991, pp. 1491-2. Hereafter it will be referred to as *ODB.* For the letter to the *Nomophylax*, see *Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, vol. IV, pp. 454-7. This letter is not included in the translation since a *nomophylax* is a church official.

CHAPTER II

BIOGRAPHY OF THE ADDRESSER AND HIS RELATIONS WITH THE ADDRESSEES

Addresser: George-Gennadios Scholarios[1]

Scholarios, an idiosyncratic man who had Thessalian origins, was born around 1400 in Constantinople;[2] and died after 1472 probably in the Prodromos Monastery in Serres, where he had been since 1464 or 1467.[3] These dates are important since they indicate that his life started in the Byzantine Empire and ended in the Ottoman Empire, a fact which makes him a special and distinguished person who lived a tempestuous life in a transition period.[4] Be that as it may, Scholarios is a prolific writer and one of the last representatives who wrote in a classicizing Attic style. A complete edition of his works in eight volumes by L. Petit, X. A. Sideridès, M. Jugie was published between 1928 and 1936 in Paris,[5] nevertheless this important corpus

[1] E. Trapp, *et al*. (eds.) *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit,* Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna, 1976–94, no. 27304. Hereafter it will be referred to as *PLP*; *ODB*, p. 830; Editorial staff at the Catholic University of America, *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, McGraw Hill, New York, 1989, p. 494.

[2] The birth date of Scholarios is not certain. Scholars put forward dates between 1385 and 1405, however Blanchet's proposal will be taken into account in this study since her hypothesis is the most recent. See Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, p. 15. For the other accounts, see A.E. Vacalopoulos, *The Greek Nation 1453-1669: The Cultural and Economic Background of Modern Greek Society*, trans. by Moles, I & Moles, P., Rutgers University Press, New Jersey, 1976, p. 1405. Hereafter it will be referred to as Vacalopoulos, *The Greek Nation*; J. Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1964, p. 79. Hereafter it will be referred to as Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence*; Zissis, *Γεννάδιος Β' Σχολάριος*, p. 63.

[3] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, p. 16. Today Scholarios rests in that monastery.

[4] ibid., p. 13; T. Papadopoullos, *Studies and Documents Relating to the History of the Greek Church and People under Turkish Domination*, AMS Press, New York, 1973, pp. 16-17. Hereafter it will be referred to as Papadopoullos, *Studies and Documents.*

[5] All of his works are compiled in those eight volumes except for one text attributed to him which is equivocal. See C. J. G. Turner, "Another anti-Latin work attributed to Gennadius Scholarius", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 58, 1965, pp. 337-347 cf. Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 480.

has not been fully translated. Two-thirds of the works are on philosophy and theology, some of them being his own, others being translations from Latin.[6] He was not mentioned abundantly in contemporary sources.[7]

Lots of issues concerning Scholarios are debated, including his name. He was born with the name George, later on called Scholarios; and lastly Gennadios which is his monastic name. However, there is one more name which is found in some of the manuscripts, none of them being his autograph: Kourtesis or Kourtezis.[8] Another debate about him is whether there were multiple *Scholarioi*.[9] Before delving into more serious debates, it is necessary to cite the major modern works on Scholarios. There are three works that attempted to provide a thorough account of his life. Starting from the most recent to the oldest, they are Blanchet's book called *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios (vers 1400-vers 1472): un intellectuel Orthodoxe face à la disparition de l'Empire byzantine*,[10] Livanos' book entitled *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence in the Work of George Scholarios*,[11] and Theodoros Zissis' book

[6] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, p. 478. See also the list of his writings given above, p. 2.

[7] The chronicler Sphrantzes does not mention his name. Doukas, Chalkokondyles, Kritovoulos, Syropoulos, and some short chronicles mention his name, yet the most abundant mention among these sources is found in Syropoulos. Some later sources also touch upon Scholarios, such as Makarios Melissenos, also known as Pseudo-Sphrantzes. See ibid., p. 17.

[8] According to Zissis, no one called Scholarios as Kourtesis, therefore he thought that the sources bearing this name were forgery. Kourtesis must have been added by the copyists posthumously. Some scholars think that this might be his mother's last name. See Zissis, *Γεννάδιος Β' Σχολάριος*, pp. 69-72; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, pp. 286-8. For the authors who called Scholarios as Kourtesis, see Vacalopoulos, *The Greek Nation*, p. 101; *PLP*, 27304; Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence*, p. 79.

[9] Blanchet and Livanos, authors of the most recent works on Scholarios, refute this claim. See Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, p. 48; Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, pp. 121-2.

[10] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*. Blanchet's book analyzes basically the period between 1430 and 1460. She used both primary and secondary sources extensively, with one exception, that is, the Ottoman sources which, according to her, were not accesible to her and were of no interest to her study. See Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, p. 21.

[11] Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence.*

called *Γεννάδιος Β' Σχολάριος: Βίος, Συγγράματα,* Διδασκαλία (Gennadios II Scholarios: Life, Writings, Doctrine).[12]

Scholarios defined himself as Constantinopolitan, Thessalian, and Orthodox.[13] In his youth he taught himself Latin, and taught grammar, logic and other subjects related to philosophy to his students.[14] Being a student of Markos Eugenikos,[15] he studied Aristotle, and thanks to his proficiency in Latin he could also study and appreciate Latin scholars, primarily Thomas Aquinas.[16] Later this would result in his being charged with being a pro-Latin by people who opposed the Union of the Orthodox and the Catholic churches.[17] As Blanchet argues, identifying someone interested in the Western culture does not make him a pro-Western and he may still oppose the Union.[18]

Scholarios, one of the greatest fifteenth-century Byzantine intellectuals,[19] had basically three professions: he was the general judge[20] of the Romans, general

---

[12] Zissis, *Γεννάδιος Β' Σχολάριος.*

[13] Actually he used the term 'Byzantine'. In order to avoid confusion, I translated it as 'Constantinopolitan'. He added Thessalian due to his father's origins. See ibid., p. 63.

[14] Livanos believes that Scholarios was more interested in philosophy than theology. See Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, pp. 21-2; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 304; Vacalopoulos, *The Greek Nation,* p. 101.

[15] Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence*, p. 79; Vacalopoulos, *The Greek Nation,* p. 101; S. Runciman, *The Last Byzantine Renaissance*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1970, p. 82. Hereafter it will be referred to as Runciman, *The Last Byzantine Renaissance.* For Markos Eugenikos, see note 145 in Letter to Demetrios Palaiologos.

[16] Zissis, *Γεννάδιος Β' Σχολάριος,* p. 83; Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, pp. 21-2; Runciman, *The Last Byzantine Renaissance*, pp. 82-3; D.M. Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, p. 354. Hereafter it will be referred to as Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*; Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence,* p. 79.

[17] Vacalopoulos, *The Greek Nation,* p. 101.

[18] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 21.

[19] Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, p. 89.

secretary of the emperor,[21] and teacher or official sermonist[22] at the Byzantine court.[23] However, due to the reasons that will be discussed shortly, he chose to quit the worldly life and became a monk adopting the name Gennadios, by retreating to a monastery, either Charsianites or Pantokrator in Constantinople, where he presumably stayed until 1453, namely the end of the Byzantine Empire.[24] Nevertheless this does not mark the end of the changes of his professions. Between 1453 and 1454, the date when he was made the first patriarch under Ottoman rule by Sultan Mehmed II,[25] he was ordained deacon, presbyter, and bishop respectively,[26] to

---

[20] Καθολικὸς κριτής.

[21] Γραμματικός. However, Zissis uses the term γενικός σεκρετάριος. See Zissis, *Γεννάδιος Β' Σχολάριος*, pp. 164, 171.

[22] Διδάσκαλος.

[23] V. Laurent. *Les "Mémoires" du grand ecclésiarque de l'Église de Constantinople Sylvestre Syropoulos sur le Concile de Florence (1438-1439)*, Centre national de la recherche scientifique, Paris, 1971, p. 141. Hereafter it will be referred to as *Syropoulos*; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, pp. 15, 281, 308, 316; Zissis, *Γεννάδιος Β' Σχολάριος*, pp. 164, 171; Vacalopoulos, *The Greek Nation*, p. 102; Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence*, p. 81; Runciman, *The Last Byzantine Renaissance*, p. 82.

[24] *Syropoulos*, p. 63; Doukas, *Decline and Fall of Byzantium to the Ottoman Turks*, trans. by Harry Magoulias, Wayne State University, Detroit 1975, p. 204. Hereafter it will be referred to as Doukas; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, pp. 16, 68; Zissis, *Γεννάδιος Β' Σχολάριος*, pp. 68, 167, 182; Vacalopoulos, *The Greek Nation*, p. 103; S. Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity*, Cambridge University Press, London, 1968, p. 160. Hereafter it will be referred to as Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity*; S. Runciman, *The Fall of Constantinople, 1453*, Cambridge University Press, 1965, p. 18. Hereafter it will be referred to as Runciman, *The Fall of Constantinople*; D.M. Nicol, *The End of the Byzantine Empire*, Holmes & Meier Publishers, Inc. London, 1979, p. 86. Hereafter it will be referred to as Nicol, *The End of the Byzantine Empire*; D.M. Nicol, *The Immortal Emperor*, Cambridge University Press, Great Britain, 2002, p. 42. Hereafter it will be referred to as Nicol, *The Immortal Emperor*; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, p. 371; T. Gregory, *A History of Byzantium*, Blackwell Publishing, United Kingdom, 2005, p. 330. Hereafter it will be referred to as Gregory, *A History of Byzantium*.

[25] C.M. Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon: The Last of the Hellenes*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1986, pp. 357, 361. Hereafter it will be referred to as Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*; Vacalopoulos, *The Greek Nation*, p. 103; Papadopoullos, *Studies and Documents*, pp. 1-2; Runciman, *The Fall of Constantinople*, p. 155; S. Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium*, I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd. New York, 2010, pp. 101-2, 104. Hereafter it will be referred to as Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium*; J. Meyendorff, *The Orthodox Church: Its Past and Its Role in the World Today*, St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, New York, 1996, p. 78. Hereafter it will be referred to as Meyendorff, *The Orthodox Church*; Nicol, *The End of the Byzantine Empire*, p. 91; Nicol, *The Immortal Emperor*, p. 42; N. Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 2009, p. 232. Hereafter it will be referred to as Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans*

be eligible for patriarchate. His patriarchate lasted for only two years, and he returned to monastic life some time after 1463, probably at the Prodromos Monastery, where he stayed until his death.[27]

So far a brief overview has been given about the life of Scholarios; however, certain controversial points which have attracted the attention of scholars need to be mentioned. Blanchet, who wrote the most comprehensive and recent book on Scholarios and aimed to deconstruct Scholarios' image as the savior of Orthodoxy, states two major problems in his career: What position Scholarios should take concerning the Union of the two churches, and how Scholarios became patriarch.[28] The first question will be discussed in this section; however the second question is an irrelevant one, which does not cover the period after 1453. Therefore it will be only briefly examined.

Scholarios, as a young person with ambitions in the 1430s, who knew Latin, dreamed of a career abroad, presumably in Italy, where intellectual life was flourishing thanks to the Renaissance, or in the Peloponnese.[29] According to Ševčenko, Scholarios thought that the intellectuals were despised in Constantinople,

---

and the Latins; Gregory, *A History of Byzantium*, p. 344; Livanos, *Greek Traditions*, pp. 25-6; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* pp. 13, 16, 80-2. According to Ware, Mehmed II's choice of Scholarios was doubtlessly political, since Scholarios was a stout anti-Unionist. See Ware, T. *The Orthodox Church*, Penguin Books, London, New York, 1997, p. 88. Hereafter it will be referred to as Ware, *The Orthodox Church.*

[26] Vacalopoulos, *The Greek Nation,* p. 103.

[27] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 16.

[28] ibid., pp. 13-14.

[29] ibid., pp. 300-2.

which is why he wished to leave the city.[30] He was in search of a position worthy of his merits.[31] He expressed his wish to several people, including the Despot Theodore II Palaiologos in two of his letters, and in a letter to Alexios Laskaris Philanthropenos;[32] however, he could not realize his dreams and ended up getting frustrated. Then he tried his chance of departing to Italy, probably to serve in the papal court,[33] when he got an opportunity with the Council of Ferrara-Florence in 1438.[34]

Presumably favoring the Union, Scholarios went to Italy as the adviser of the Emperor John VIII, namely as a layman,[35] which signifies that he would not be able to vote in the Council.[36] There were other laymen in the Byzantine delegation, including Gemistos Plethon, George of Trebizond, and George Amiroutzes.[37] Scholarios, according to Nicol, was chosen by the Emperor due to his knowledge of Latin.[38] He seemingly favored the Union before he went to the Council;[39] however, it

[30] I. Ševčenko, "Intellectual Repercussions of the Council of Florence", *Church History 24*, no. 4 (1955), p. 292.

[31] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 314.

[32] See Letters 6 & 7 to the Despot Theodore II; Letter to Alexios Laskaris. For these letters, see also Zissis, *Γεννάδιος Β' Σχολάριος,* pp. 360-1. For Scholarios' departure, see *Syropoulos,* p. 461; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 332; Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol. II, p. 326.

[33] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 304.

[34] For the Council of Ferrara-Florence, see note 38 in the evaluation chapter.

[35] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 333.

[36] ibid., p. 308.

[37] Runciman, *The Fall of Constantinople*, p. 17. Blanchet gives the following list of the imperial advisers: Gemistos Plethon, Scholarios, and George Amiroutzes. See Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 323.

[38] Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium,* p. 354.

[39] Gill, *The Personalities of the Council of Florence,* p. 79; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 15.

is not that certain. That there is no surviving work of Scholarios on religious issues before the Council of Ferrara-Florence renders such an assertion difficult.[40] One should bear his personal ambitions to go abroad in mind. In addition to that, the fact that he willingly departed to Italy and wished the Union to take place does not clearly indicate his pro-Unionism before his departure. If this was true, then Markos Eugenikos, one of the two members of the Byzantine delegation who refused to sign the decree of the Union, must have been a pro-Unionist before his departure.

The Byzantine delegation, comprised of about seven hundred people, arrived in Ferrara in 1438, where Scholarios arrived a little bit later due to an illness.[41] Later on the Council was transferred to Florence, from where Scholarios left together with Gemistos Plethon and the Despot Demetrios Palaiologos in 1439 before the completion of the Union.[42] Scholarios already could not vote since he was a layman, but according to Syropoulos, he left it because he did not want to assist in its completion.[43] In the Council, five basic theological subjects were discussed; the most exhaustively discussed being the *filioque*.[44] Nevertheless, the schism between the Eastern and the Western churches was more complex than merely due to theological issues; it is very much connected to cultural and political differences as well. The

---

[40] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 282.

[41] ibid., p. 253; Runciman, *The Last Byzantine Renaissance*, p. 83.

[42] See Letter to the Despot Demetrios Palaiologos below, p. 58; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 322; Zissis, *Γεννάδιος Β' Σχολάριος*, pp. 143, 164, 174;

[43] *Syropoulos*, p. 17.

[44] Zissis, *Γεννάδιος Β' Σχολάριος*, p. 264. For *filioque*, see note 110 in Letter to the Despot Demetrios; Zissis, *Γεννάδιος Β' Σχολάριος*, pp. 253-4.

Union was debated in the Orthodox world until 1484, when it was officially repudiated by the Orthodox patriarch.[45]

According to Vacalopoulos, Scholarios advocated the Union because of the interests of the Byzantine state, and as soon as he returned to Constantinople he chose to remain silent on the issue.[46] Although before the Council Scholarios' stance concerning the Union was blurry, his position towards it after 1444/5 turned completely against it, with no reservation. The period between his arrival at Constantinople in 1440 and the death of his teacher Markos Eugenikos in 1444/5 is a transition period for Scholarios.[47] On his deathbed, Markos presumably pointed at Scholarios as his successor to lead the anti-Unionist camp.[48] He gradually passed from a supposedly Unionist position to neutrality, then to the opposite camp, namely the anti-Unionist side.[49] In 1440/1, Scholarios wrote a refutation of the syllogisms of Markos Eugenikos,[50] which shows that he still had not passed to his teacher's camp.

The anti-Unionist camp was getting so strong that some members of the delegation withdrew their signatures from the decree of the Union, because they –

[45] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 14.

[46] Vacalopoulos, *The Greek Nation,* p. 102.

[47] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* pp. 315, 369.

[48] Vacalopoulos, *The Greek Nation,* p. 102; Papadopoullos, *Studies and Documents, Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins,* pp. 1-14, 17; Runciman, *The Fall of Constantinople*, p. 18; Runciman, *The Last Byzantine Renaissance*, p. 82; Nicol, *The Immortal Emperor*, pp. 360-1; Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence,* p. 79; Gregory, *A History of Byzantium,* p. 329; *Syropoulos*, p. 13; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* pp. 15, 385-90, 390-6.

[49] Vacalopoulos thinks that this gradual passage took place in 1443. He probably refers to the date of the formation of the *synaxis*. See Vacalopoulos, *The Greek Nation,* p. 102; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* pp. 410-4.

[50] *Syropoulos,* p. 11.

including Scholarios himself despite not having signed anything-[51] were accused by the anti-Unionists as betrayers of the faith.[52] Scholarios later on defended himself in his justificatory discourses.[53] Led by Markos Eugenikos, the camp gradually took the shape of an assembly called *synaxis*,[54] after the death of Patriarch Metrophanes II, to stress that they repudiated the Unionist patriarchate.[55] Scholarios attended it as soon as Markos Eugenikos died, as stated before.

But why did Scholarios shift sides? There are numerous hypotheses, which are summarized by Blanchet, who built her hypothesis on that of Turner's. The reasons why Scholarios shifted to the anti-Unionist camp might be personal, psychological, political, theological, and patriotic. Personal reasons are his disappointment for not having found what he had been searching for in Italy and thus quitting the idea of leaving Constantinople; psychological reasons refer to the anti-Unionist pressure on him and friendly approach by his teacher; political reason is connected with the idea that although the Pope promised to launch a crusade against the Ottomans, it was not tangible and even if the promise was kept it could not guarantee the defeat of the Ottomans and salvage of the Byzantines; theological reason is related to some of the Catholic doctrines' discord with Eastern fathers' dogmas; and lastly there should be a patriotic reason as well which might be connected to Scholarios' translation of

[51] Scholarios' probably personal zeal, according to Ševčenko, seemed unpatriotic to the anti-Unionists. That was why he was accused anonymously. See I. Ševčenko, "Intellectual Repercussions of the Council of Florence", *Church History 24*, no. 4 (1955), p. 299.

[52] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, pp. 353-5.

[53] ibid., pp. 359-67.

[54] See below note 3 in Letter to the Despot Demetrios; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, pp. 414, 417; *Syropoulos*, p. 13; Nicol, *The Immortal Emperor*, p. 41. According to Runciman, the anti-Unionist camp could not name their assembly a synod, since a synod could not be assembled without a patriarch. See Runciman, *The Fall of Constantinople*, p. 63.

[55] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, pp. 255-6.

Western religious and philosophical works having thought that the Byzantines should catch up with the superior West and his adoption of the Eastern fathers' dogma as his ancestral dogma.[56] The year 1444 might also have played an instrumental role, since it was the time when the promised Crusade of Varna was launched but crushed by the Ottomans. This might have led Scholarios to think that the West could not help the Byzantine Empire by any means from then on.[57]

Scholarios proved himself as an ardent anti-Unionist in the discussions in the palace of Xylalas against a Catholic called Barthélémy Lapacci in 1445-6.[58] About one year later he quit his posts in the palace and just remained as the adviser of John VIII, who died the following year. The death of John VIII created the last succession problem between the despots Demetrios and Constantine, which was resolved bloodlessly when Demetrios gave up his claim of emperorship and agreed to rule in the Peloponnese, while Constantine became the last Byzantine emperor. Scholarios expressed his thanks to Demetrios in his letter, emphasizing that if Demetrios had not ceded his right of emperorship, the state would have come to an end easily.[59]

After Despot Constantine's accession to the throne as Constantine XI, probably having anticipated the new emperor's support for the Union, Scholarios gave up his

[56] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* pp. 259-60, 367, 376-80.

[57] Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins,* pp. 219-20; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 255; Runciman, *The Last Byzantine Renaissance*, p. 83.

[58] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* pp. 255, 400-6; Zissis, *Γεννάδιος Β' Σχολάριος*, pp. 165-6; *Syropoulos,* p. 573.

[59] See Letter to the Despot Demetrios, p. 55 below; Blanchet mentions Demetrios' presence at the deathbed of John VIII and Constantine's being in the Peloponnese, which would facilitate Demetrios' accession to the throne. See Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* pp. 419-22; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon,* pp. 175, 220, 308, 314. Scholarios' letter to Demetrios must have been written after Constantine's accession to the throne and before Scholarios became monk. See Zissis, *Γεννάδιος Β' Σχολάριος,* p. 285.

post in the palace and shortly afterwards became monk with the name Gennadios,[60] which he told to Constantine beforehand.[61] Presumably in his cell in the Pantokrator Monastery, he carried on his struggle against the Union even more vehemently.[62] The contemporary chronicler Doukas asserts that he put a notice on the door of his cell, berating the ones who embraced the Union.[63] The Union accomplished at the Council of Ferrara-Florence had been put into effect not until December 1452, when it was celebrated in the church of Hagia Sophia.[64] Scholarios stoutly opposed the celebration and presumably distributed twenty-five copies of the notice he wrote to districts of Constantinople.[65]

Months later the Byzantine Empire came to an end with the capture of its capital by the Ottomans in 29 May 1453. Scholarios was probably in the Pantokrator Monastery during the capture, and he is believed to have continued his struggle against the Union even during the siege.[66] He was taken captive by a supposedly wealthy Ottoman, who brought Scholarios with him to Adrianople. As soon as Mehmed II heard about his fame, he summoned Scholarios to Constantinople, and made him patriarch on 6 January 1454.[67] Mehmed II granted him privileges,

[60] See *supra* note 26.

[61] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 424.

[62] ibid., p. 426.

[63] Doukas, pp. 204, 208; Papadopoullos, *Studies and Documents,* p. 18; Nicol, *The Immortal Emperor*, p. 58; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, p. 377; Nicol, *The End of the Byzantine Empire*, p. 86.

[64] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* pp. 16, 437-44.

[65] I. Ševčenko, "Intellectual Repercussions of the Council of Florence", *Church History 24,* no. 4 (1955), p. 300.

[66] Vacalopoulos, *The Greek Nation,* p. 103.

[67] Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, pp. 25-6; Kritovoulos, *History of Mehmed the Conqueror* trans. by Charles T. Riggs, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1954, p. 94. Hereafter it will be referred to as Kritovoulos; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* pp. 16,

including tax exemption.[68] According to İnalcık, Scholarios was made patriarch to encourage the repopulation of Constantinople after the capture.[69] Between his return to Constantinople and his enthronement, he presumably helped the restoration of some churches and tried to ransom some monks.[70] Unsurprisingly, one of his first deeds was to renounce the Union officially.[71] Soon, he burnt the book of Gemistos Plethon, called *Laws*, which most probably included dangerous pagan elements, according to Scholarios.[72] Mehmed II asked for a treatise from Scholarios to explain the difference between Christianity and Islam, and Scholarios handed it in.[73]

Scholarios served as patriarch for two years (1454-1456), in which he had difficulty in adapting himself and the institution of the patriarchate to the new circumstances to such an extent that he considered resignation even in the first year.[74] His request of resignation was probably unwillingly accepted by Mehmed II

70; Vacalopoulos, *The Greek Nation,* p. 103; Papadopoullos, *Studies and Documents,* pp. 1-2; Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity*, pp. 168-9; Runciman, *The Fall of Constantinople*, p. 154; Nicol, *The End of the Byzantine Empire*, p. 90.

[68] Kritovoulos, p. 94; Vacalopoulos, *The Greek Nation,* p. 104; Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity,* p. 170; Runciman, *The Fall of Constantinople*, p. 155; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 97.

[69] H. İnalcık, "The Policy of Mehmed II toward the Greek Population of Istanbul and the Byzantine Buildings of the City", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 23/24 (1969/1970), p. 236. On the relations between Scholarios and Mehmed II, see A. Papadakis, "Gennadius II and Mehmet the Conqueror", *Byzantion* 42 (1972), pp. 88-106.

[70] Vacalopoulos, *The Greek Nation,* p. 103.

[71] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* pp. 239-42; Meyendorff, *The Orthodox Church,* p. 52.

[72] Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol. II, pp. 366-7; Runciman, *The Last Byzantine Renaissance*, p. 79; Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, p. 71; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* pp. 16, 183-92; C. J. G. Turner, "An Anomalous Episode between Scholarius and Plethon", *Byzantine Studies*, III, 1 (1976), pp. 56-63.

[73] Two of Scholarios' Works were translated into Turkish, therefore probably they were the ones that Scholarios handed in to the Sultan. See Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* pp. 104-5; Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, p. 78; Papadopoullos, *Studies and Documents,* p. 3.

[74] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* pp. 123, 200.

only the following year, namely in 1456. Some historians believe that he served as patriarch not once, but three times; the second being in 1462, third in 1464.[75] Even so, Blanchet claims that he only served once, during 1454-1456. There are several reasons about why he wanted to resign or why he was forced to do so.[76] One of them might be his uneasiness and fear in Ottoman Constantinople;[77] the other may be the presumptive corruption among the clergy, specifically simony.[78] All in all, he retreated again to a monastery, this time away from Constantinople, to the Prodromos in Serres in 1464 or 1467, and stayed there until his death, some time after 1472.

Below is brief representation of Scholarios' relations with his addressees:

Addressee I: Despot Theodore II Palaiologos[79]

Despot Theodore II was the second son of Emperor Manuel II. He was born some time between 1394 and 1399, and died in 1448. During his early minority, he succeeded his uncle who bore the same name with him, Theodore I, in 1407;[80] and he ruled in the Peloponnese until 1443. During 1407-1428 he ruled there alone. However, during 1428-1443, he shared the rule with two of his younger brothers,

[75] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, pp. 16, 468.

[76] ibid., pp. 206-210.

[77] After an incidence that happened in the neighborhood of the Church of the Holy Apostles where the Patriarchate had been first, Scholarios requested its transfer to somewhere else. It was transferred to the Church of Pammakaristos, the vicinity of which was occupied by Christians. See Runciman, *The Fall of Constantinople*, p. 158; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 94.

[78] ibid., pp. 123, 200.

[79] See below note 1 in Letter VI to the Despot Theodore II.

[80] H. F. Tozer, "A Byzantine Reformer", *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 7, (1886), p. 367; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon,* p. 29; Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins,* p. 259; Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol. I, p. 166.

despots Constantine and Thomas.[81] Constantine arrived at Constantinople in 1442 to help his brother, the Emperor John VIII, drive off the attack by the Despot Demetrios who allied himself with the Ottomans, and then Constantine was installed in Selymbria presumably to keep an eye on his brother Demetrios, who was ruling Mesembria and its environs around that time.[82] In 1443, Constantine changed his appanage in Selymbria with that of Theodore II; therefore, Theodore II started to rule in the Peloponnese until his death in 1448.[83]

Theodore II "had grown up to be a strange, neurotic young man, an eager and distinguished scholar who was considered to be one of the best mathematicians of his time".[84] Under his rule, intellectual and artistic life in the Peloponnese flourished.[85] Nevertheless, due to some reason, Manuel II felt the need to check his actions and went to the Peloponnese twice during Theodore II's rule.[86] Theodore II had some military successes, though. In 1417, he and his brother John VIII marched against the Principality of Achaia, and its ruler, Centurione, submitted to them.[87] Even so, he tried to cede the defense of the Hexamilion to the Venetians around 1423,[88] the year when Thessalonike was ceded to the same power as well. In the late 1420s, this time

[81] Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol. I, p. 119; Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium*, pp. 68, 70.

[82] Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium*, p. 71.

[83] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 419; Woodhouse, *Geroge Gemistos Plethon,* p. 269; Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium*, pp. 72-3, 205, 217.

[84] Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium*, p. 65; Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol. II, p. 340.

[85] Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium*, p. 66.

[86] Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins,* p. 260.

[87] Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol. I, p. 181.

[88] Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins,* p. 268; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon,* p. 110; Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol. I, 195.

with Constantine, he could regain some territories in the peninsula and liberated almost the whole Peloponnese.[89]

In the 1430s, just before the Council of Ferrara-Florence, Constantine went to Constantinople to claim the throne. He stayed there during the Council as the regent emperor, whereas Theodore II took care of Constantine's appanage in the Peloponnese. However, both despots had ambitions on the throne and quarreled over it.[90] Theodore II was as legitimate as Constantine as an emperor, yet when his age was taken into account, he might be considered as more legitimate. According to Zakythinos, the legitimate one was Theodore II, but John VIII just wanted Constantine for his bravery and energy.[91] Nonetheless, Theodore II did not live enough to rival his brother Constantine, and died only months before the Emperor John VIII. Scholarios wrote a funeral oration for him.[92]

Other than the funeral oration, Scholarios wrote two letters to the Despot Theodore II in 1430/2, the first being letter VI, the second letter VII as a reply to the Despot's letter. Whereas in the former he expressed his plea for going to the Peloponnese and serve in his court,[93] in the latter he sounds rather disappointed but takes his not being invited to the Peloponnese for granted. The reason why Scholarios might have felt the need to write to Theodore II seems to be related only to his wish to leave Constantinople.

---

[89] Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium*, p. 70; Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol. I, pp. 124, 206.

[90] Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol. I, pp. 120, 213.

[91] ibid., p. 212.

[92] ibid., vol. II, p. 341.

[93] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, pp. 300-1; Letter VI to the Despot Theodore II.

Addressee II: Alexios Laskaris Philanthropenos[94]

Alexios was the governor (*kephale*) of Vostitsa in 1429, and he became the governor of Patras in 1445. Little is known about him due to the scarcity of sources. Among his contemporaries, only Sphrantzes and Scholarios mention him, besides a short chronicle.[95] Alexios served the Despot Constantine in the Peloponnese.[96] Cardinal Bessarion wrote a treatise dedicated to him on the procession of the Holy Spirit.[97]

Scholarios, a few years later than his letters to the Despot Theodore II, wrote to Alexios, more or less for the same reason: to express his wish to leave Constantinople for the Peloponnese. Alexios had seemingly promised Scholarios to get him to the Peloponnese, although Alexios' lord Constantine deemed it cowardice.[98] He presumably made Scholarios wait for some more time in Constantinople, which Scholarios thought might have been due to the preparations of the Council of Ferrara-Florence, yet in the end it is obvious that this plea of Scholarios did not become real.

Addressee III: Despot Constantine Palaiologos[99]

The most abundant information is on this addressee of Scholarios, namely the Despot Constantine. There are numerous books on him, since Constantine XI is the last Byzantine Emperor who defended his city when it was besieged by the Ottomans in

[94] *PLP*, 29753.

[95] ibid.

[96] Zissis, *Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 361.

[97] Zakythinos, *Le Despotat Grec de Morée,* vol. II, p. 360; Blanchet, p. 494.

[98] See Letter to Alexis Laskaris, p. 35 below; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, pp. 306-7; Zissis, *Γεννάδιος Β' Σχολάριος*, p. 130.

[99] *PLP*, 21500; *ODB*, p. 505.

1453 and captured in the same year.[100] He died during the siege, most probably while he was fighting. Since Scholarios wrote to him when he was despot in the Peloponnese, and since the aim of this section is to present his relations with Scholarios, only his despotate will be dwelled on.[101]

Constantine was born in 1405, after his father Manuel II's return from his visit to Europe, and died on 29 May 1453, the day of the capture of Constantinople by the Ottomans.[102] He was a despot in the Peloponnese during 1428-1448, sharing the rule there with his brothers Theodore II and Thomas. Constantine, with his brothers, was successful in reasserting Byzantine rule in the former Byzantine lands that had been captured during the Fourth Crusade by the Crusaders. During the Council of Ferrara-Florence, he acted as the regent of John VIII, who went to Italy with Demetrios.[103] His appanage in the Peloponnese was taken over by Theodore II during the Council.

Constantine rushed to Constantinople in 1442 to help ward off the joint attack of Demetrios and the Ottomans directed at the City.[104] On his way, he defended the island of Lesbos which was being attacked by the Ottoman fleet. After the repulse of the attack, he was proclaimed by John VIII as his successor around 1443. As soon as John VIII died in 1448, the mother of the despots, Helena Dragases, acted as regent and waited for the arrival of Constantine, who was her choice as opposed to Demetrios who also had an eye on the throne. Constantine was crowned in Mistra,

[100] On Constantine, see Nicol, *The Immortal Emperor*.

[101] For the period when he shared the rule with Theodore II and Thomas, see Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol. I, pp. 204-225; for the one with Thomas, see ibid., pp. 226-240.

[102] Runciman, *The Fall of Constantinople*.

[103] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 322.

[104] See note 61 in the evaluation chapter below for the siege in 1442.

the capital of the Despotate of the Morea, and set out for Constantinople where he ruled for four years until 1453.[105] It was Alexios Laskaris who went to Mistra to bring the imperial crown to him.[106]

Since Scholarios' letter is entitled "to the Despot Kyr Constantine", it is obvious that it was written before 1448. Nevertheless, neither the editors nor Blanchet proposed a date for it. Constantine's stance must have been not that much of a Unionist; otherwise Scholarios might not have used so many compliments for him. Supposing that the letter was written during 1443-1448 since Constantine returned to his appanage in 1443 after the attack,[107] one might expect Scholarios at least to warn Constantine gently due to his Unionism. Constantine proved to be a Unionist when he became emperor, though. It is probable that as soon as Scholarios recognized Constantine's Unionist stance, being at the peak of his anti-Unionist zeal, he quit his post at the palace and became a monk in 1450. If one takes Blanchet's argument into account in which she propounds that Scholarios gave up his hopes of leaving Constantinople at the beginning of the 1440s after his return from the Council, then Scholarios must have written his letter to Constantine during 1443-1448.

In his letter -which is highly personal- to Constantine, Scholarios not only supported Constantine's emperorship, but also asked for donations while highly praising his despot. He no longer pushes for his wish to go serve the Despot

[105] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 256. Also see note 76 in the evaluation chapter.

[106] Runciman, *The Fall of Constantinople*, p. 52.

[107] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 371.

Constantine, since Constantine had already found it inappropriate by calling it cowardice and Scholarios took it for granted.[108]

Addressee IV: Despot Demetrios Palaiologos[109]

Demetrios Palaiologos, the son of the Emperor Manuel II Palaiologos, was born after 1402 in Constantinople.[110] He had a tempestuous life and he has been regarded by several historians as ambitious and by Mijatovich even as selfish.[111] He is known to have fled to the Ottomans in 1423,[112] and later, in 1442, he ventured to attack Constantinople with the help of the Ottomans.[113] He was Despot mainly in three regions throughout his lifetime: he was the Despot of Lemnos together with the region around Mesembria[114] in 1425-1449, of the Morea in 1449-1460, and of Ainos together with the islands of Lemnos, Thasos, Samothrace, and Imbros after 1460.[115] He accompanied Emperor John VIII as he went to Florence to take part in the

[108] Letter to Alexios Laskaris, p. 35.

[109] *PLP*, 21454; *ODB*, pp. 606-7.

[110] Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium*, p. 62.

[111] Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol.I, p. 241. Zakythinos states that Demetrios was not loyal to John VIII. C. Mijatovich, Constantine: *The Last Emperor of the Greeks or The Conquest of Constantinople by the Turks (A. D. 1453)*, Sampson Law, Marston & Company, London, 1892, p. 78. Hereafter it will be referred to as Mijatovich, *Constantine*. Blanchet also implies the ambitious nature of Demetrios in Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 421.

[112] Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins,* p. 278.

[113] ibid. Also see Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol. I, p. 241; ibid., vol. II, p. 343; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon,* p. 220; Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium*, p. 71; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 421; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, p. 360; P. Schreiner, ed. *Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, 3 vols., Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien, 1979, p. 216. Hereafter it will be referred to as Schreiner, *Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken.*

[114] Demetrios was the Despot of the region around Mesembria only during 1441-2. See Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol. II, p. 343.

[115] Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée*, vol. II, pp. 74-5. Blanchet dates Demetrios' being Despot in those islands to the beginning of 1444. Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 420.

Council of Ferrara-Florence in 1439 together with a delegation of ecclesiastical and lay people including the Patriarch of Constantinople Joseph II, the philosopher George Gemistos Plethon, and George Scholarios;[116] yet he left the Council a little while before its completion together with Scholarios.[117] Woodhouse adds that Demetrios was not allowed to enter the Pope's palace; furthermore his brother John VIII treated him like a little child.[118] All these as well as his possible disapproval of the decree of Union might have been reasons for his early departure.

Soon after his return to the Byzantine land, his brother the Emperor John VIII died in 1448, leaving Constantine as his successor.[119] His brother Theodore II had already died in the same year,[120] hence there were only two candidate brothers left who might rival Constantine: Demetrios and Thomas. Demetrios arrived in Constantinople.[121] The presence of Demetrios in the city meant that rivalry was at hand.[122] They disputed for the throne at Constantinople; however, Empress Helena Dragases saved the empire by acting as regent and putting her weight on the side of Constantine.[123] At the end of the day, the solution was as such: Constantine was

[116] Schreiner, *Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, pp. 215, 462.

[117] Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol. I, p. 241; ibid. vol. II, p. 326; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon,* pp. 139-140, 175; Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium*, p. 71; *Syropoulos*, p. 461; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* pp. 332-3.

[118] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* pp. 138-141.

[119] Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium*, p. 77; Nicol, *The End of the Byzantine Empire*, p. 83.

[120] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 419.

[121] Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins,* p. 277; Schreiner, *Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken,* pp. 100, 269.

[122] C. J. G. Turner, "The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius", *Byzantion 39* (1969), p. 433; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon,* p. 269; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, p. 368.

[123] Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium*, p. 77; Nicol, *The End of the Byzantine Empire*, pp. 83-4; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, pp. 369-370.

crowned as Emperor in Mistra and came to Constantinople; Demetrios and Thomas shared the Byzantine lands as Despots in the Peloponnese,[124] which they ruled together until the fall of the Despotate of the Morea to the Ottomans in 1460.[125]

Scholarios wrote a 19-page-long letter to Demetrios Palaiologos, and the letter can be divided into two sections regarding its content: the first half in which Scholarios wrote mostly about political issues, and the second half in which he mostly dealt with theological issues, specifically the issue of the *filioque*, as he attempted to justify his own point of view concerning the issue.[126]

The fact that Scholarios resorted to Demetrios' help is no surprise, since Demetrios had already been anti-unionist during his career, presumably for political rather than religious reasons.[127] Whatever the reason is, it is undeniable that "Demetrios and Gennadios were close together in their shared hostility to the Union" as Woodhouse has argued.[128] We know that Scholarios served in the court of John VIII as judge and secretary[129] and as the head of the *Synaxis*, therefore it might be argued that Demetrios and Scholarios had common benefits as Demetrios might well have asked for Scholarios' assistance as he tried to get to the throne in 1448.[130]

[124] Schreiner, *Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, p. 270.

[125] Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol. I, p. 119; Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium*, p. 78.

[126] For a theological explanation of *filioque*, see Zissis, *Γεννάδιος Β' Σχολάριος*, pp. 460-7.

[127] Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium*, p. 71.

[128] Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon,* p. 312.

[129] Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, p. 371.

[130] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, p. 422.

Scholarios' letter to Demetrios against the Union of Florence is, according to Zakythinos, a precious text in which Scholarios attempts to drive Demetrios to intransigence.[131]

Addressee V: Manuel Raoul Oises[132]

Oises was an *archon* in the Peloponnese during 1450-1454, who had supposedly been an army leader as well. Sources are extremely scarce on him; there are actually two, one of them being Scholarios' letter.[133] He is renowned for the execution of a neo-pagan follower of Gemistos Plethon, whose name was Iouvenalios. Called a thrice-cursed man by Scholarios because of murdering some monks on Mount Athos and converting some people to his 'new religion', Iouvenalios was an ambitious man harboring as great an ambition as becoming emperor.

Scholarios presumably wrote a letter to Manuel Raoul Oises in 1451/2, which makes the letter the only one written when Scholarios was a monk and fighting the Union from his cell in the Pantokrator. The reason why he wrote to Oises is not undoubted. Scholarios had always regarded paganism as dangerous as the eminent threat that the Ottomans posed against the Byzantines. Therefore, to encourage someone who executed 'an enemy of Christianity' is something to be expected from Scholarios, who at the same time attempted to exculpate him by giving examples from similar cases and the reaction of the Orthodox Church against them.

---

[131] Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol. II, p. 360.

[132] *PLP*, 24133.

[133] Zissis, *Γεννάδιος Β' Σχολάριος*, p. 362; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon,* pp. 35, 271-2, 315-18; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* pp. 182-3; Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium*, p. 102; *Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, vol. IV, p. XXVIII; Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol. II, pp. 280, 360-1.

CHAPTER III

TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

Letter VI to the Despot Theodore II[1] [1430/1432]

(p. 417) The ever-good *megas stratopedarches*[2] has come to us, whose faith to the sender is official[3] and who brought the letters of your authority to us.[4] We have given to them[5] all these things that we also owe to the one who has sent them, bowing [and] kissing them like being the arms and legs of him, never getting enough satisfaction with holding them; and considering that we became the happiest of all men as if we are not about to see him,[6] since we are worthy of such letters, like [we are worthy] of his donations and orders.

We have not added only one thing, that although we did not abandon everything, we came immediately very close to the source of this letter, from which drawing off [strength] is the same as sharing immortality. But we should also say that this would appear difficult to us although we really want it. But let it be given by the time, the fortune, and the rest of the obstacles here.[7]

---

[1] Despot Theodore II Palaiologos (b. 1394-1399, d. 1448): Second son of Emperor Manuel II Palaiologos. He succeeded his uncle Theodore I as the Despot of the Morea during 1407-1443. For more see *ODB*, p. 2041; *PLP*, 21459; Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée*, vol. I, pp. 165-204.

[2] Μέγας στρατοπεδάρχης: Having different meanings throughout centuries, during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries it refers to commander of troops, although few people who had this title were actually commanders. See *ODB*, pp. 1966-7.

[3] Literally 'distinguishing'.

[4] The messenger is the μέγας στρατοπεδάρχης. See *supra* note 2.

[5] The letters.

[6] The sender of the letter, i.e. the Despot Theodore II.

[7] Scholarios does not seem to refer to a specific event here. He probably refers to general difficulties that the Byzantines were undergoing.

So finally we have been breathing thanks to your letters and there is double spring for us after the double winter.[8] For everything here for us [is] winter, it is neither easy to leave, nor to stay putting up with [the affairs here].[9] But these[10] came, a spring in spring and released us from the winter, if not totally, since [we have been] reminded of the previous benefits and [we are] hoping for the next ones.[11] In other words it showed us that [our] Despot is healthy, which we desire more than anything else, and also from where we have been waiting for [our] benefactor for a long time, from the earth and the sea. If someone looks also at the material resources in the letters, alas of the shouts! From these shouts even stones could be moved. For loving, being with your intimates, always sending letters, receiving with great pleasure those [letters] that are coming; what kind of sadness would these not extinguish, what kind of pleasure would these not bring, or more than this, unless one regards these qualities as coming from your soul, another quality of which is to be well-disposed towards everyone as well, like others have other qualities.

Since these [qualities] are so great, what could we give in return that is worthy [of them]? Good will? Faith? Indeed these are owed to you although you keep silent.[12] Or letters? And who, being so good-willed that he would want even to give his soul, will be in need of more letters? Or wishes? But indeed these as well will be owed to you from everywhere as a very great Despot, (p. 418) the common good of

[8] The metaphor 'double winter/double spring' does not necessarily denote two negative incidences and relief after them, but it might or might not be an expression to stress the dire conditions and the relief.

[9] It is evident that Scholarios is experiencing some hardships in Constantinople. According to Blanchet, Scholarios even has the idea of leaving Constantinople for the Peloponnese. See below note 13.

[10] The letters.

[11] Literally 'secondary things'.

[12] In other words Theodore II does not ask for good will or faith.

the Christians, the fame of our people. Thus, if nothing else, these would have persuaded us to wish you benefits from God. Or praises? But even these could not have been more from the people who love you or those of them who do not want to deny the truth, for this common present comes to you by all. No, indeed not, but if it is not possible to pay back to you your gratitude with anything from us, since so much and great gratitude and of such kind would be from such a great person; however, we shall not deprive your habitual and great contribution of anything: good will, praises, letters, [and] wishes. And you, holiest of all despots, to the things you always give to us, maybe somehow you will add good treatment and you will totally relieve us from the winter,[13] if this seems better to you. May God decide for us.

[13] The fact that Scholarios expects the Despot Theodore II to relieve him from the winter is interpreted by Blanchet as a clear sign of Scholarios' wish to go to the Peloponnese and serve the Despot. It is not possible to talk about an idea of leaving the City merely by bearing this sentence in mind. However, Blanchet uses two other sources to strengthen her attestation: Letter VII by Scholarios to the Despot Theodore II, and a letter sent by Bessarion to Scholarios. See the translation of Letter VII for the former source. In the latter, Bessarion awaits Scholarios' company in the Peloponnese and acts as an intermediary between the Despot Theodore II and Scholarios. See Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, p. 300.

To the Same[1] [Before the Departure for Italy] [1430/1432]

(P. 418) Much gratitude [is] to you, the holiest of the despots, because you replied to our letters, even though we were not expecting such a reply at all.[2] For the fact that not everything has been given to us, who were in need, can be attributed to external factors: either the present scarcity of the revenue, or blaming [your] brother who was demanding these, or our own uselessness by which you had to be imprisoned[3] although you were eager [to give], or all these together; for [it is] possible that all these [might have] played a role. Asking for these letters and wanting to get joy by them, although you thought that this occasion would cause grief since you refrain from openly inviting us back;[4] it is truly a feature[5] of your soul which has learned to love everyone, and wanting good things for everyone. And for me whatever anyone would say, you have shown good things, and indeed you deemed unworthy to invite me openly, having judged that this was the best [option].

But you used to invite the people for whom you took to give your apologies and to add [to your apology] the reasons for not inviting them not only because these actions were showing you as a loving man, - and everyone could approach such a person with courage even if [this] person has not invited him; - but also because after

[1] Despot Theodore II. For more information on the Despot Theodore II, see note 1 in the letter VI to the Despot Theodore II.

[2] It might be argued that this letter is a reply to the one sent by Scholarios in which Scholarios seems to have asked for some financial aid from the Despot Theodore II.

[3] Scholarios, in another letter of his to the Despot Demetrios Palaiologos, uses the verb εἴργεσθαι with the meaning 'to imprison'. However, there is no source to confirm whether the Despot Theodore II was ever imprisoned.

[4] Apart from getting no financial help from the Despot Theodore II, Scholarios seems to be frustrated for the second time, since he was not invited to the Peloponnese where he probably wanted to go. See Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 300. In the letter VI to the same person, Scholarios still had hope to go there.

[5] Literally 'deed'.

the obstacles were removed, you used to say [that] you would invite them and you would simply show the affairs of the host[6] to the one coming here, even if you were not bringing these to an end explicitly.

I purposely keep silent, which is to me more explicit than inviting you,[7] in order to learn what opinion you had for me. However, writing about such things gave no less pleasure to me than inviting and receiving you, and asking for the things I needed. Then, for if it was necessary to depart from the letters taking something [out of them] as we please, and if I had to get rid of these letters after getting one pleasurable thing [from them]; (p. 419) what is more pleasurable than considering the Despot as a good and loving person, and how else would I be safer regarding my greater hopes[8] for the future, and who else would be a more worthy guarantor of these marvelous letters?

Therefore [may] much gratitude [be] to you, the holiest Despot, for you had given us the things that we have and the things that we hope for; and greater gratitude to God who is moving you towards this direction and who presents you to those who are experiencing these in exactly the way that they would wish, since indeed our affairs are in general worse than valuing highly one good thing. We would not have turned your holy soul towards good will, regarding any of these, if it[9] did not know the way but it was searching how it should move. May you always be such, not to say better, if one needs to say this.

[6] Literally 'the one who invites'.

[7] There is no other source that mentions Scholarios' invitation to the Despot Theodore II.

[8] Although not clear enough, Scholarios here might have implied either more financial aid, or the repetition of his wish to go to the Peloponnese.

[9] Your soul.

For us the opinion about sailing[10] has not changed, but maybe it would move; if, staying here, we were to try a better luck. Why should we be in agony, missing our homeland, while it is possible to be happy as we stay at home? Therefore if the opinion[11] is staying still, and the master does not want to honor us, and we do not deem worthy to stay here, and we do not like his judgment about us; God will mark the end of our journey.[12] But we will have willingness towards the one[13] we long for, who looks at us with pleasure and for whom we can experience everything that is about to happen as a result of our hopes, if indeed we could claim something else out of everything, as we found out not now for the first time, but in the past.

[10] Blanchet claims that 'sailing' refers to sailing to the Peloponnese. Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 301.

[11] Namely the Despot Theodore II's opinion concerning Scholarios' staying in Constantinople.

[12] Even though it is clear that Scholarios wanted to go to the Peloponnese yet was not invited, he did not push his desire further.

[13] Despot Theodore II.

Letter 17 to Alexios Laskaris [Philanthropenos][1] [1435/1436]

(P. 435) Although I have been a debtor of much gratitude to you for your previous good will, now I cannot find any gratitude worthy of the opinion that you have offered to us and the care that you have shown for us. To investigate and to learn that we have prepared for our departure,[2] and to write what seems good and blame the inappropriateness of the circumstances and to withhold the speed of our departure with hopes that have been granted many times in the past, how is it not obviously a feature of someone who loves us and arranges our affairs and wishes to accept every favor, which someone might try to offer? I knew that you loved me since old times, and I was opposing those who were claiming that I am deceived (there were many who were claiming this) saying that I can get adequate proofs of your love that are stronger than any suspicion. But now, more than ever, I am convinced that you love us and you think of our affairs.

Seeing that the Despot,[3] as it seems, is not happy with the rumor of my departure and he calls this cowardice; if now, when I need to see my past hopes fulfilled, I want to betray everything because of laziness, after living for a long time with the hopes of seeing him and after being kept away from staying in my homeland because of him. But you considered worthy to write and to advice me to stay, so that my hopes will be granted immediately, and not to look for better luck anywhere further, since it is possible to get it from somewhere near. (p. 436) For I would not think that you offered that opinion for different reasons and you wanted to prevent

[1] Alexios Laskaris (Philanthropenos): Κεφαλή of Vostitsa, in the northern Peloponnese in 1429, of Patras in 1445. See *PLP*, 29753.

[2] Departure from Constantinople for another place.

[3] Probably Despot Constantine. See Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium*, p. 71. Another less probable option is that the word *despotes* is not necessarily used to denote a despot, but merely means 'master' or 'lord'.

us, and that you do not know anything or you do not you have any means through which you will help a friend, after neglecting the expected benefits from somewhere else. Thus I offer in addition this gratitude endorsing your advice and your moving good will for it and also for us, wherever fortune and good opinion ever lies.

Therefore you need to know that I had prepared all my belongings for my departure and that those who reported these to you were by no means lying, and that we had not been prevented either by the honor that the Emperor[4] intended to offer us; and which I am not mentioning to those who already know of it, or by the coming synod. Since I learned to avoid the synod which was fitting for other matters until now, it would persuade us to go away than to teach us to be tranquil.[5] But I have been mostly convinced by your advice. I believed that you advised me in the best way, and you seemed to give such great courage to the one who wished that good fortune will be promised not very far in the future, after getting this from the vote[6] of the Despot.

Maybe I was defeated by some thoughts which say to me that my absence will be brighter this winter. I shall sleep indeed and I shall try again the winds of the Bosporus[7] and the snow there, making myself happy here with the hopes; and on the other hand, considering all the present things, except the books and the words as a pretext for the unpleasantness, and with the swallows I myself shall see those who

[4] John VIII Palaiologos. See note 10 in Letter to Demetrios Palaiologos.

[5] Blanchet argues that this 'tranquility' implies Scholarios' intention of being a monk. See Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 308.

[6] Judgment.

[7] Bosporus: Modern Boğaziçi, Turkey. Strait that connects the Black Sea to the Propontis. Divides Europe and Asia, western part being Europe and eastern being Asia. See *ODB*, pp. 312-3.

long for us,[8] whom, as I believe and wish, the foresight has offered to us plenty and different ones everywhere on earth, but you more than the others. But if I, having hoped in all the rest, should entrust myself to you contrary to expectations - I certainly do not know-, you could make plans beforehand with the help of God both depending on the thread of the letters and until you arrange the definite moment of our departure.

[8] It is highly possible that Scholarios was not happy in Constantinople because he anticipated its near future, thus he searched for ways to leave for somewhere else. According to Blanchet, Scholarios had in his mind going preferably to the Peloponnese, or to a Greek island under Latin rule, or even to Rome to serve the Pope Eugenios IV. Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* pp. 304-8.

To the Despot Kyr[1] Constantine[2] [1443-1448]

(P. 428) What kind of a vote[3] one would cast about me observing your orders? Will he consider the one who has been so honored by [your] letters a fortunate person, or rather an unfortunate one who has come to the worst of misfortunes, [and] who has been drifted apart from the splendid and provident Despot by the evil luck? [It is] quite evident that everyone will vote for me for the latter, since I have that opinion about myself. (p. 429) For all the previous time you did not give up honoring [us], but you were showing to many others that you remembered and cared for us, deeming worthy the ones who were away of your good will which you were about to transfer to [the ones] who were there.

And I myself was pleased, because of the honest and true opinion you had been holding for me and also because this opinion made the hopes that I had for the future safe for me. But I was suffering because I had been away from the fortune I used to have for such a long time – and this was not because I betrayed it out of sluggishness, but because I found escape in this situation out of some circumstances and a wrong decision - I could not treat the evil and escape [from] the bad luck. For the circumstances [are] like an iron wall and the greatest [part] of human affairs has come into these; and thus I myself being deprived of my Despot due to these

[1] Kyr: Form of κύριος meaning lord or sir. Used as title of respect. See G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961). Hereafter it will be referred to as Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, p. 788. In his letters, Scholarios uses this title only in secular contexts.

[2] Constantine XI Palaiologos: Firstly Despot of the Morea during 1428-1448 with his brothers Thomas and Theodore II, and then Emperor during 1449-1453, succeeding his brother John VIII. He undertook successful campaigns in the Peloponnese, defended Constantinople and his Empire during the final Ottoman siege in 1453, and died during the siege. See *ODB*, p. 505; *PLP*, 21500. The date when this letter was sent to the Despot Constantine in unknown, yet it is certainly before 1449 since Constantine was not emperor yet.

[3] Opinion.

circumstances, I often hastened to reach him back but I was again prevented by them,[4] while other [circumstances] were begetting different ones at other times.

When I received the present letters that arrived a bit later and I went through them, paying honor to them and putting them over my head,[5] I was no longer able to withhold myself but being under threat [since I found myself] in the middle of an unspoken pleasure and sadness, I was in danger of experiencing something bad and I was just about to lose my sense from my soul. So much you allured me with your benevolence, and such a bitter arrow came into my soul when I looked towards the excessive honors and the view that these honors brought forward. I remembered how great you were for me, finding time about everything and providing every possible service.[6] You care so much and greatly about me, although I am not there, and you considered worthy of such a great care everything related to me.

To praise myself, because I have enjoyed few things, shows the virtue of my opinion through which I have learned to owe gratitude to you for lesser things as [if they are] greater ones. This is worthy of your magnanimity; [and] whenever you offer great gifts, you believe that you have not given anything considering this much less than your opinion and your preparation. But for me this is in no way proper and I would even be embarrassed to talk about this; does my admirable master consider me worthy of small things? And how -since he indeed did not lack any honor and care that the time allowed- did the one who shared the things that are fitting for the elderly care less about the deficiencies of the old age, since he knew that I loved him

[4] The circumstances.

[5] Considering them extremely important.

[6] What Scholarios is narrating here dates back to pre-1428, since from 1428 on Constantine was in the Peloponnese and Scholarios in Constantinople. Although not clear enough, it might be speculated that this statement of Scholarios' might be linked to his desire to go to the Peloponnese, which he had already expressed to Theodore II in his letter to him. See notes 9 and 13 in Letter VI to Theodore II.

and I cared about his honor and fame? I would not be embarrassed to boast about this. I would indeed pray that all people believe so in me, and take courage and think the same things about me.

But so that I would not use many words for the most evident things, God knows, the one who is conscious [about it] never ever subjects to me, since you needed my honor less throughout this time. I myself have been persuaded against everything and I would try to persuade all others (p. 430) that you have loved and honored me more than I deserve; and now, if something good is for me, I bring it into your foresight and attention. For they say that beginning is the half of everything, you not only opened the door into life for me, but also gave [everything for me] to proceed, and according to you our matters were in much better [condition]. Therefore comparing your benefactions to me to bountiful attitudes [coming from your] soul, show what you also wish concerning them, and regard the great things as small. For it is possible, I myself might approve [that] the tendency of eagerness you developed throughout time concerning the good things is less than what you have. Consider that I know very well the extravagance of all of your benefactions you have offered, and I remember all these as greatest and I would not know a favor worthy of your offers, nor would I offer the same things; for in this way I would not be so furious to think about these things differently.

And you, the holiest of the despots, knew that you should add this great gratitude upon [your] other great gratitudes,[7] making this your own as well, you are never fully satisfied with giving. You give the impression that you reproached our amnesty, although on the one hand these are under our possession. While we were

[7] Scholarios here clearly expects more donations from the Despot Constantine, after having praised his benevolence highly.

expecting much more, we do not take the side of the one who has given those, but who will give these additionally only to those who have shown great will. However you will not blame us as time passes. We will make sure in every possible way that we would both do just things and those things instead of all that will be in our benefit.

For the letters came altogether at the time and found us considering these [issues]; just one thing left: a friend to come, for whom we rather wish that his arrival to us will be easy because of this, because he seems to us the messenger[8] of your orders. But we were longing for the man even without these orders, and we would pay a lot to see him. This man is the most faithful to the sender [of the letter], and loves me very much because of the great love and honor he received, and wants good things. As he has the power to do this from you, whenever he returns, if it is God's will, he will bring maybe not an ungracious gift to you.[9]

May these still be kept in silence, just in case some evil demon may be jealous and may raise great difficulties against us; which only the grace of God will indeed resolve. Whenever they[10] appear, also the power of your virtue and opinion [will resolve them]; however [it is] better that these do not arise from the beginning. Know well that I ask for these two [things] from God: the relief in the next life, when nobody will be set against my mistakes and will take away my good fortune; and in the present life, your much venerable and much desired presence,[11] even if

[8] Literally 'seaman'.

[9] It is not certain who this messenger is, but he might be Alexios Laskaris Philanthropenos.

[10] Negative affairs.

[11] Scholarios seems to support Despot Constantine's any possible claim of emperorship underlyingly.

every obstacle has been between us; whenever I am given the honor to pay respect to it,[12] I shall immediately be convinced that I have achieved the rest of my claims, too.

[12] Your presence.

Letter to Demetrios Palaiologos[1] against the Union of Florence [1449]

(p. 117) George Scholarios before the steps of the holy *synaxis*[2] of the Father, striving after the true dogma [to Demetrios Palaiologos][3]

1. The most sublime, the most pious, the bravest,[4] the all-prosperous, our lord the purple-born Despot, I received the orders[5] of your holy rule for which I am thankful. You have not found it unworthy to write to us about what happened there and about your most beautiful and fairest opinions.[6] Because we are familiar to you, we care to bring to light a piece of justice and a piece of truth with God in all matters. I report myself as much as someone would talk about his disposition. But the truth itself favors nothing, as I myself believe, [and] I swear upon what is going to be told.

Therefore you, best and wisest leader, have been praised almost by all circles about [your] governing and [being] just; which is worthy of lots of praises. I do not

[1] Despot Demetrios Palaiologos: (b. 1407/8, d. 1470) Fifth son of Emperor Manuel II Palaiologos. He was Despot in the Peloponnese together with his brother Thomas during 1449-60. For more, see *ODB*, pp. 606-7; *PLP*, 21454.

[2] Synaxis: It means assembly or communion, which requires a suitable dress. It sometimes refers both to the assembly for the Eucharist, and to where it takes place. See *ODB*, p. 1992. Scholarios asserts that *synaxis* and κοινωνία can be used interchangeably. See *Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios,* vol I, section 5, line 3. Scholarios served as the head of the *synaxis*, which was formed by the anti-Unionists after their repudiation of the Patriarchate. He says "οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ διὰ τοῦ μοναχικοῦ σχήματος μετονομασθεὶς Γεννάδιος, τότε δὲ πρωτασηκρήτης ἦν καὶ καθολικὸς κρητὴς Ῥωμαίων, καὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς θεολογίας διδάσκαλος ἐν τῷ παλλατίῳ κεχειροτονημένος, καὶ τῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων συνάξεως ἐπάρχων". See *Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios,* vol. VI, p. 178.

[3] The expression 'to Demetrios Palaiologos' is not found in the original manuscript. In the original manuscript, it says: "He had written [it] to Demetrios, brother of John Palaiologos." Therefore, there is no doubt if the addressee is Demetrios Palaiologos or not. See *Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios,* vol. III, p. 117.

[4] Γενναιότατε might be translated as 'the noblest' as well.

[5] No source mentions what those orders were.

[6] Demetrios' letter to Scholarios does not survive.

say you are praised only by our citizens;[7] for maybe they, both favoring the familiarity being indebted to your kinsmen,[8] and by this remembering the favor bestowed by you upon them, would not probably become your incorruptible inspectors and judges. But when you were with that Emperor,[9] as he was dealing with the Italians over the religious issues unsuccessfully, it was necessary for you to go through many cities and many states to meet with many rulers,[10] and you did not appear to the ones among the best individuals worse than your brother and Emperor (for this is less offensive to say it) or except what you concealed; and even though that one[11] was admired by the best people there, he seemed to them to be worthy of many praises for the most part, [and] you obeyed your father[12] being similar to him in all aspects. For at some time he went to the West because of the need of help [expected] from there to this city of ours.[13] Many [people] remembered him, and they were with you, they used to see in you a great resemblance to him, and a kinship not only by nature, but also in all other aspects. (p. 118) Your qualities that

[7] Bearing the date of the letter, 'the citizens' refers to the Peloponnesians.

[8] Other *Palaiologoi* who ruled in the Peloponnese, such as Theodore I, Theodore II, Constantine, and Thomas.

[9] Emperor John VIII Palaiologos: Ruled during 1425-1448. Son of Manuel II, who has five brothers who have been despots in the Empire. He could regain some territories in the Peloponnese. See *ODB,* p. 1053; *PLP*, 21481.

[10] Demetrios accompanied his brother John VIII as they went to the Council of Ferrara-Florence. He departed with Scholarios and Gemistos Plethon. See Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol. I, p. 241; Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol. II, p. 326; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon,* pp. 139-140, 175; Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium*, p. 71; *Syropoulos,* p. 461; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* pp. 332-3; Schreiner, *Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken,* pp. 215, 462.

[11] Emperor John VIII.

[12] Emperor Manuel II Palaiologos: Son of John V Palaiologos, who ruled during 1391-1425. He is the father of six sons, including Demetrios. He visited Europe during 1399-1403 in order to get help. See *ODB,* p. 1291; *PLP*, 21513.

[13] Constantinople. Scholarios is referring here toManuel II's trip to Europe during 1399-1403 in order to get help against the Ottomans.

led most people to admiration were truthfulness, chivalry and not despising your subordinates because of your imperial blood. You would not tolerate shameful people for being abroad and also for being sent back along with all the sailing companions just as an ordinary anchor, not separating the ones who followed you from the ones who followed your brother,[14] but through pouring forth the good wishes to everybody alike, just as nobody who has come about failing to reach [somewhere] and return in pain.[15] You would understand the ones who are hungry in silence by bashfulness; [and] the understanding in you to them of their misfortune was an independent compassion, without cry and supplication. And these charity activities[16] were made by you not out of surplus, but sharing all the treasures. Therefore nothing from what you brought has been left over to you at the end, for which you were praised by the people around you. You were admired by the strangers who were there, since the reason of the charity activities was running through the ears of everyone. You were bearing the piety of your father so carefully that, as you foresaw, either out of need or out of the ignorance of the truth, or by the falsity of the opinion that they will certainly turn themselves towards sharing without scrutiny what earlier was thought to be inconceivable.

Leaving behind your brother, you went to Venice, and we went together with you, both Gemistos and I; even though these were pleasing neither to your brother[17]

[14] Most probably Emperor John VIII. See *supra* note 9.

[15] Scholarios here refers to Demetrios' departure from the Council of Ferrara-Florence in 1439.

[16] There is no detail on these charity activities.

[17] John VIII.

nor to Eugenios.[18] But your priority was piety[19], not pleasing them; for you were not seeing them examining the dogmas well according to law.[20] Having returned from there,[21] you ruled the coast of Pontos[22] close to us so beautifully and well that now, its inhabitants shout your name, [and] want to be ruled by nobody else but you. If it really was like this, just as when they were governed by the present emperor, it never seemed to happen more fortunate to them.[23]

2. However, having been that much praised, you were judged by your own people and by foreigners as the best ruler, and the demon envied you [and] roused an unbearable contempt in you against your brother the Emperor,[24] [and] it urged you to defend yourself. You wanted him to abandon that power [and] to drag him against his will.[25] When he strived with anger, you had to fight each other like the worst enemy. The one was closed together with others inside the gates,[26] the others[27] did

[18] Pope Eugenios IV: in service during 1431-1447, also during the Council of Ferrara-Florence. Supported the Crusade against the Ottomans in 1444. See *ODB*, p. 744; *PLP*, 6200.

[19] Literally 'doing the piety'.

[20] Scholarios evidently refers to Orthodoxy here.

[21] Italy.

[22] Mesembria: City on the Black Sea coast that is close to Burgas, Bulgaria today. See *ODB*, pp. 1347-8. Before he was installed to the Peloponnese, Demetrios had been the Despot of Mesembria and its environs during 1441-2. See Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol. II, p. 343.

[23] Sources are silent on whether Scholarios has ever been to Mesembria and gathered such information from the local people. Therefore, this claim of his is probably based on hearsay.

[24] Emperor Constantine XI Palaiologos: See note 2 in Letter to Despot Constantine.

[25] This event corresponds to Demetrios' siege of Constantinople with the help of the Ottomans to get to the throne. See Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, p. 278; Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol. I, p. 241; ibid., vol. II, p. 343; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, p. 220; Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium*, p. 71; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 421; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium 1261-1453*, p. 360; Schreiner, *Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken,* p. 216.

[26] The fight between him and his brother Emperor John VIII. However, he was not successful in his venture, and he was imprisoned. According to Nicol, Demetrios was taken prisoner and put under house arrest after the unsuccessful siege. See Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, p. 360.

nothing wrong but were being enslaved or were killed not in small numbers, and the countryside was ravaged and burned. Those who suffered these and those who shared the suffering hated neither the other one, nor anyone who was the most responsible.[28] And according to the laws if it really seems to the one who does not prevent him from doing this although he could, even if some of the holy men say that the one who is victorious is more miserable in worthless contest,[29] [and] the one who does not concede is quarreling not to give up the things which he promised for a long time, as we all know, and the things which were probably fair; and it was necessary not to refuse such things even if they are not fair. It is [also] necessary to prevent the future evils, but they hated only you, (p. 119) neither were they occupied with what was fair, nor were they considering to investigate and to find out and consequently to loathe the primary cause of the events greatly. That misfortune more than injustice, just as a cloud covering your goodness now still gives freedom of speech against you to the unjust judges. For being able to accuse you of nothing else, they grow out of the misfortune, [and] I am going to explain the reason of this to you.

Of the other rulers, or if you want indeed of all the people, they are able to accuse different people for different things; and because of this, they fill their souls with their own disadvantages, for all rulers are fond of accusing, they do not want to

---

[27] The local people in the environs of Constantinople.

[28] Scholarios here seems to be trying to lower any possible tension on the part of Demetrios, and tries to vindicate him. See Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 420.

[29] The only source Scholarios might be referring to is the 'Epistulae paschales sive Homiliae paschales' of Cyril of Alexandria who lived in the fifth century AD: "θετεῖν προελόμενοι, καὶ πολλῇ χρημάτων ζημίᾳ τὴν ἐπὶ τούτῳ προσηγορίαν ὠνούμενοι, ἱδρῶτα προθέντες τοῖς νέοις ἀμιλλητήριον, πλουσίοις μὲν ἄλλοις ἄθλοις τὸν νικήσαντα γεραίρουσι, μικρὰ δὲ ὅμως τῶν δοθέντων ἡ χάρις, καὶ μέχρι τῶν τῇδε φέρουσα τὴν ἀπόλαυσιν." See J.-P. Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus (series Graeca) (MPG)* 77, Paris: Migne, 1857-1866, Vol. LXXVII, p. 409, lines 2-7.

inspect the errors in public. Let it be possible to call these misfortunes, even if someone would call these in whatever way, there is almost nobody among the known rulers who has experienced what has happened to you. Not being able to criticize you for such a thing, they threw stings from there. If you were not praiseworthy to the others, the envious people would rather try to put down your fame. Because much disgrace is to the ruler if he handles the rule badly in peace and if he does not manage other things healthily; or if he attacks a foreigner or an acquaintance, thinking that they have done wrong [to him], he would become merciless to whom he would attack, or he would hurt whoever the acquaintances were.

For he handles the rule in this way, as the eclipses follow the brightest bodies in the sky through time, which are rather our sufferings: regarding the brightness [and] other vigor in this land and towards us, nobody would have been delighted and surprised through this less than the sun. Therefore they are not able to get hold of you by your own actions, for you shine out with your righteousness among all the people; and you are compared to the most sublime nature regarding [your] philanthropy, sympathy and clemency; also, regarding your independence and magnanimity. You do not allow anyone to come close to you and you are not less high-born than these regarding your bravery in truth, observing and praising the whole virtue among those who have it and, as [it] is possible giving it back and being reasonable in words and deeds without lacking the following: the thing that might be necessary, and also the austerity which is fitting to a ruler. Having known that you have been adorned by these and by all such things, they stay away from your own privileges; but they make an uproar turning more against the injustice of others and your misfortune, even though now [they are] not even able to make an

uproar and [are] kept away by your distinguished virtue after these and by the events that have happened among your brothers, except if anyone might behave imprudently towards the most obvious things.[30]

3. And let us examine the events after these. The barbarian[31] was thinking that you would submit the land to your brother, and he[32] was offering you another land instead of this not smaller in the inland, promising to help after the war.[33] (p. 120) For when he[34] learned exactly that the Hungarians were on the way, the barbarian knew that it was necessary on the one hand not to make the Emperor[35] sad, and on the other hand to serve you and to have you ready for use for his defense against the Emperor.[36] If indeed he[37] feels that he[38] has contributed some good will and help to the enemies, at the same time he hoped that you would help him a lot when you go to war with him not by addition of power, but by the rumor that even the brother of the Emperor is allied to him. In this way he seemed to be more terrifying to the invaders, and he would have used all better and friendlier Christians

[30] What Scholarios narrates in the whole paragraph, namely some envious people who are trying to slander Demetrios after the siege of Constantinople, is not possible to be crosschecked with another contemporary source.

[31] Ottoman Sultan Murad II: Ruled during 1421-51. Had tough relations with Manuel II, moderate relations with John VIII, and considerably peaceful with Constantine XI, during whose reign he died. See *ODB*, p. 1423; *PLP*, 19504.

[32] Murad II.

[33] Other contemporary sources do not state anything on this promise of Murad II.

[34] Murad II.

[35] John VIII.

[36] Battle of Varna: As a reward of the Union achieved in the Council of Ferrara-Florence in 1439, Pope Eugenios IV promised military help to the Byzantines. To fulfill the promise, he organized a crusading army led by the Hungarians that fought the Ottomans in 1443-4. Despite initial success, the Crusaders were decisively defeated in Varna in 1444. See C. Imber, *The Crusade of Varna, 1443–45,* Aldershot, 2006, pp. 41–106.

[37] Murad II.

[38] John VIII.

in Europe for the present matters. But gathering together all the Christians,[39] you cared for your people rather than your own benefit, which someone would bear with difficulty, for we see many people putting pressure on those who would have been elected to the power; and because of the disgrace of seeming inferior in some way to the opponents they commit the greatest mistakes and misfortunes, if it happens indeed to choose this themselves.

But in fact you, having joined your brother the Emperor in the status of a suppliant, did not allow even the one who would want to remember bad things; for he respected your virtue and he paid thanks to the one who has chosen the most profitable things for everyone. Then he loved and honored you immediately, I do not know how much and up to the most extreme end he spared what was proper [for you]. It was befitting for the one who has not only stopped grieving but also has shown great conscience, and for the one who has carried away the proof of many virtues to give back what is present along with the aid and to use what is left as faithfully as possible. Thus, God not only agrees with us who are the suppliant of His, whenever we regret doing something wrong,[40] but also He delivers His grace. You were bearing it even though your entire household was putting pressure on you because of the need, and you turned your hope to God.

Then Theodore,[41] one of your brothers, had taken the side of the Emperor himself clearly as he moved on, but you were waiting, and you were about to ally

[39] The Byzantines.

[40] Scholarios might refer to the possibility that Demetrios might have regretted it after the siege of 1442. By checking this statement, it may be argued that Scholarios actually disapproves of Demetrios' venture. Blanchet affirms this argument by saying that Scholarios, until that date [1442], was an ardent supporter of John VIII. See Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, p. 370.

[41] Theodore II: See note 1 in Letter VI to the Despot Theodore II.

with the Emperor himself and with justice; and in this way you had prepared. The Emperor knew that injustice was done to you, wishing by no means to release the injustice, [and] fearing that he might carry on making you sad again and you might work together for the defense with your brother rather easily, he shuts [you] in the palace and he puts a guard there. And the security maintained by oaths, alas, radically withdraws towards fear when you were triggered by what made you suffer badly rather than by what made you angry. However, the guard of justice releases you from the oath, putting a deed to [his] mind very smart to be thought of [and] hardest to be accomplished without the help of God and His influence. Having been free from dangers by [the help of] God, you neither bear malice, nor brought about anything by anger to be defended, even though it was the right time for you to do these. Your brother[42] needed you to make alliance with him, and promised many things [to you]. If he had what he desired through you, he could have compensated you duly.

(p. 121) But at that time, rather than having appeared both kind and beneficial to the Emperor,[43] you showed on the one hand that these things were truly a slander of the accusers and an incoherent intrigue; and on the other hand cowardice and the unnecessary fear of the believer.[44] And the Emperor[45] thought that he needed to do the right things late and to soothe the anger [of the injustice] of your brother.[46]

---

[42] John VIII.

[43] ibid.

[44] It is not possible to know what the intrigue and the injustice were, or of what Demetrios was accused; since it is not possible to crosscheck this statement with other contemporary sources; nor does a single secondary source put forward a hypothesis about that.

[45] ibid.

[46] Theodore II.

Rendering your well-being in danger, he gave the islands[47] at once and took over the former power. He did not stop writing letters and sending ambassadors to you who had obeyed [him] and who was in the islands.[48] What does he not give, and what does he not announce for the future?

However, you did not find it worthy to reply to him and to your elder [brother][49] who summoned you for his own benefit, because he saw many people were in pain because of apostasies. Although the situation was not inversed for a long time, he needed your companionship and you were convinced [that you were] doing the right thing; and the need was over even before your arrival, since the battle was determined by death. Therefore, he was that glad to receive you in this way, and there was nothing which he did not do royally to display his favor. He was about to fulfill his promises with actions at once and to give back those cities [which] had been given in a written form long time ago,[50] but nevertheless he had been seized by death.

4. As far as these [are concerned], someone would be able to praise your patience, justice, providence, [and] dignity; which would be too long to go through in words, indeed [it is not possible] to relate and attribute the suitable praise to each

[47] In the second half of the fifteenth century, Byzantine presence in the Aegean islands was limited only to some of the Northern Aegean islands. Because Scholarios here refers to the events after 1442, the islands he mentions can only be Lemnos and Imbros. Thasos was lost in 1434, Tenedos in 1381, and Lesbos in 1354. One may add Samothrace as well, however it was ruled by another ruler around those years. See *ODB*, pp. 1205, 989, 2013, 2025, 1219, 1837, respectively.

[48] According to Blanchet, Demetrios was in Lemnos in 1444. See Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 420.

[49] Manuel II had six sons. From the oldest to the youngest, they were: John VIII, Theodore II, Andronikos, Constantine XI, Demetrios, and Thomas. Since Scholarios calls John VIII as emperor and since Demetrios hardly had any interaction with Andronikos, two options left for the 'older': Theodore II and Constantine XI. I believe that he is Theodore II, because Scholarios has been writing on an incidence among John VIII, Theodore II, and Demetrios.

[50] This document, which Scholarios alleges to have existed, does not survive.

one properly. And I believe that nobody among the famous philosophers have behaved that well to the ones who begged for their help, but rather they would not have been able to show you in words what would have been very easy; neither Plato[51] himself, if he was around, nor Dion,[52] nor anybody else [would be able to describe] how you applied every principle in action. Everybody would say that the consecutive actions better than a miracle were accomplished by heroic and divine spirit rather than –if one must say according to Aristotle-[53] human attitude. For the Emperor was departing,[54] everybody –except a few-was advising you to take the greater title-[55] which was in your hands; and even when laymen seized it, it [the power] did not change its mind. People were telling you that both [because] your father was an emperor [and] your brother had ruled a short time ago, [and] you were present in his death and carried the burden of the matters. You will have no lesser legitimacy from the people older than you.[56]

[51] Plato: Ancient Greek philosopher who lived during the 5-4 centuries BC. Church Fathers made use of his ideas and Platonic vocabulary to support theological issues, and this period covering the third and the fourth centuries AD is called Neo-Platonism. See *ODB*, pp. 1683-4.

[52] Dion: Tyrant of Syracuse during 356-354 BC, and pupil of Plato. Uncle of Dionysios II, who was the tyrant of the same place before him. See J. Roberts (ed.), *The Oxford Dictionary of the Classical World*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2005, p. 230; J. Boardman, J. Griffin, O. Murray (eds.), *The Oxford History of the Classical World*, Oxford University Press, Great Britain, 1986, p. 840.

[53] Aristotle: Ancient Greek philosopher who lived during the fourth century BC. Byzantine higher education centered on his philosophy. The most widely copied and commented on Ancient Greek author during the Middle Ages. Due to the systematic style of Aristotle, his works are more used than those of Plato by the Church Fathers. See *ODB*, p. 171. "Scholarios wrote an ardent defense of Aristotle" as well. See *ODB*, p. 830.

[54] Namely 'passing away'.

[55] Emperorship.

[56] He refers to Constantine XI here.

And with such words, they were obviously provoking you to attempt the greatest things.[57] But in fact you, exhibiting your own nature, in case at some point there was need of advisors, turned not to this reckless one but to the wisest and assumed that the rule was suitable more to the one who chose to save the populace. The royal dignity is not befitting to the ones who preferred to remember the love of strife and the destruction of the matters instead of the safety and security of all. You were considering that rather [than these], you should take the glory and the good reputation.[58] For this reason, with a wonderful consistency in thought, you went through all the matters. Although you did not interfere with the public affairs in any way, (p. 122) you negotiated for the sake of peace marching against the enemy bravely and taking care of guarding the walls, and getting hold of the empire at the same time with your older brother. Through all these, you were made as if you were put in charge of safety and protection of all in the city by God.[59]

Even though the slanderers, because they want to disturb your thought, were fabricating many things, you were unshaken indeed; for it did not escape your notice

---

[57] Demetrios had some partisans who ardently supported him and helped him to get the throne in Constantinople. There were at the same time some intriguers, yet it is uncertain who they are. See Mijatovich, Constantine: *The Last Emperor,* pp. 84-5; Nicol, *The End of the Byzantine Empire*, p. 81; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* pp. 420-2.

[58] When Emperor John VIII died without an heir in 1448, and there were two candidate brothers for emperorship: Demetrios and Constantine XI, since Theodore II had already died in the same year. See Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 419. Runciman and Nicol argue that John VIII nominated Constantine XI as his successor. However, the presence of Demetrios in the city meant that rivalry was at hand. They disputed for the throne at Constantinople; however, Empress Helena Dragases saved the empire by acting as regent and putting her weight on the side of Constantine. At the end of the day, the solution was as such: Constantine was crowned as Emperor in Mistra and came to Constantinople; Demetrios and Thomas shared the Byzantine lands as Despots in the Peloponnese, which they ruled together until the fall of the Despotate of the Morea to the Ottomans in 1460. See Turner, "The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius" *Byzantion* 39 (1969), p. 433; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon,* p. 269; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium 1261-1453,* pp. 368-70; Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium,* pp. 77-8; Nicol, *The End of the Byzantine Empire*, pp. 83-4; Schreiner, *Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken,* p. 270; Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol I, p. 119.

[59] It is not clear which city Demetrios defended with his older brother.

where these were sown regarding the rule, and those who get the sown seeds were growing them. Indeed I, by the sacred truth, was often surprised by your patience much more than [your] magnanimity and forethought, and I know very well that unless the shouts and annoyances of the slanderers were preventing you, even though engaged more vigorously with the matters, you would make a treaty with our enemies and you would give back the rule, [which is] healthy in every aspect, to the one who was both your brother and Emperor, as soon as he comes from the Peloponnese.[60]

Neither the dwelling would be totally destroyed nor would that trouble attack the islands, since it would never fall upon them[61] in a similar way as upon us. And the beginning of the troubles that followed these ones was those forgeries; [so] how did this happen? I let those who can judge properly to examine it. Therefore for ceding the most pleasant title of the emperorship, for which a son quarrelling with the father and a father quarrelling with the son have often perished, and having foreseen the forthcoming dispute and the confusion and the destruction of other things, showing affection for a second time; how much philosophy do these have, and how much are we grateful to you![62] How is there not need to lead the miserable slanderers, if somebody knew your will and thought exactly, would he put the conspired matters by them against this, and would he show the unsuitable matter? They would prove themselves to be the most wretched ones to those who choose to

[60] It is known that Demetrios ceded his claim of emperorship, and Constantine XI hastened to Constantinople from the Peloponnese having been crowned there in 1449.

[61] The islands.

[62] Although Scholarios formerly stated that it was Demetrios' right to be the emperor, it is obvious that he told this merely to soothe the Despot.

do evil. Those who trusted them were utterly deceived, and they were more ignorant and less evil regarding their meanness.

5. After these, considering the matters, I very much find them more amazing than [what was] told. To wish to struggle for the things that are yours, not from an advantageous position, but having sat among your brothers and the slanderers by whom you had been greatly affected, and what comes out again from their mouths. Is it not brave and magnanimous to struggle for the things that are right which of course nobody among those rulers whom we know would have ventured? However, there were many who were advising you to claim your rights in case of need and when you are safe; but you thought that there was no great security than the oaths of the Emperor. You had to think such about him and for him about himself, and not to lay foundation to the contempt of the oaths ever; [you also had to think that] nobody would accuse the one who demand the things that are right, nor if something bad would happen to the person who is disposed thus to claim what is right, [and you had to think that] it is more shameful for the one who suffered it rather than for those who brought it about, and to defend God before all. Then you have ventured out of conscience and out of that model.

(p. 123) Therefore, having put such things in [your] mind, you stayed and did not esteem to show favor to the ones who wished to see the brothers stand apart in order to distribute what belongs to them better. For me [it is] worse, if I need to tell the truth; for they greatly damage both public [property] and their own belongings undoubtedly. When you[63] had to deliberate in common, as you have come together, on whether you have to depart to the Peloponnese or stay enjoying the former rule;

[63] Demetrios and Constantine XI.

you did not hesitate to propose what was indeed beneficial, even if you knew that you were not pleasing [others], you were ready to do the thing which would have been judged by the others as beneficial.[64] Even if it is possible for you to have the expenses –which are gratitude- from the Peloponnese and to stay in the fatherland; firstly many advise to send away the piety and the things which they dreamed [to have] from the Latins, [and] to add them in reality to the city together with living piously. It would be possible to provide maintenance to over three hundred men with the money from the Peloponnese, who - being native [Peloponnesians] - would have twice the capacity than those who come from somewhere outside.[65] Again, even if something which might be abominable may take place contrary to our opinion, for the moment there is somebody among us who would reflect upon the situation.

We had to suffer the things which we suffered at the time of the former Emperor[66] and we prophesized and foretold [it], thus it happened such. If it happened indeed, we would not have benefitted from the experience [and] maybe our enemies would be in a stronger position, and we would be much weaker because of many things, which would be tiresome to go through in detail. Therefore these can become such and to rid you of [too much] effort, because these did not seem good to the council. But those which were happening, it might be through help, you obeyed (for you were not thinking that you would owe in the future, and if some

[64] Scholarios praises Demetrios' act of ceding his right of emperorship and going to the Peloponnese, and he does not mention the role of the mother of the despots, Helena Dragases. See Nicol, *The End of the Byzantine Empire*, pp. 83-4; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium 1261-1453*, pp. 369-370; Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium*, p. 77.

[65] Scholarios in a sense agrees with his contemporaries Gemistos Plethon and Bessarion, who are for raising native soldiers in the Peloponnese instead of hiring mercenaries for a better defense mechanism. See Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, p. 274.

[66] John VIII.

other thing might have turned out), and you concerned yourself in whatever way you could arrive in the Peloponnese with all who you could go with. For this was so from then on; most of the people were still negatively disposed towards you.

The Emperor[67] considered very much [and] wanted to do just things; for it did not escape his notice just like it did not escape the notice of everyone who cares a little bit about justice in which manner you should be sent to the ruling of the Peloponnese instead of your office here. Or if you want indeed, also because you are senior, which carries so much power, as it is reasonable. Indeed having sat down with the council, the things which seemed good to the ones who participated in the council would bring peace between you and your brother; they were trying to convince you, and you yourself were convinced with your good will, and you yielded to the younger[68] the things which he wanted to have.[69] And the oaths about these matters were full of awe upon this, the holiest things claimed for Christians are received by us in word, in writing and in action; these things which should not be violated in any part of the whole land, let alone in such a small dominion, indeed by those who have placed their hope of prosperity truly upon them and by those who care a little about honoring in action, we all respect them in word.[70]

(p. 124) Alas, it pains me, it is swollen, I have a lot of pain, but I do not want to burst out. I wish to be in a position to reproach those who deserve it only by

[67] Constantine XI.

[68] Despot Thomas, since he is the only one among the six brothers who is younger than Demetrios.

[69] There is no evidence concerning what Thomas asked for, however it might be some territorial adjustments in the Peloponnese, since the remainder of the Byzantine possessions in the peninsula was divided between Demetrios and Thomas from 1449 on after Demetrios agreed to share the rule in the Peloponnese with Thomas.

[70] Scholarios warns Demetrios of any probable tumult in the Peloponnese, as he seems to suspect that Demetrios might stir up the rule there as well.

tongue. Those things that are written will reach the ears of many, and I reserve my good will; for we are kind to them even if they strike against Christ and therefore annoy us, they dishonored everything under the pretext of loving him. So let it be possible to say this with him; [and] let there be mercy upon them. He will give you a wreath for the sake of your piety, do not have any doubt.

6. Hitherto I return to the sequence of [my] words. So you had already foreseen the things which had happened afterwards, I know it well and many were foretelling; nonetheless you were departing wholeheartedly. This is one [virtue], [so] how many virtues do the ones who wish to judge properly have? For you were foreseeing the future with your prudence, you did not wish to grieve the ones who were sending you away, [on the contrary] you were offering a great sign of obedience and love towards them. Since you wished to come to the war which was foreseen, you showed that you were very brave; [and] you hoped to survive it thanks to your piety towards God.

You put up with all these because you did not want to appear to have bad intentions against the rule, and in order that those ill-intentioned ones are not able to make a strong accusation, [and] to shut their mouths. Having changed the direction of the accusations, and for all the [abovementioned] reasons you immediately departed to the island,[71] something that very few people would undertake, given that

[71] Scholarios, when he refers to the Northern Aegean islands, consistently uses the plural form. Since it is known that Demetrios departed from Constantinople for the Peloponnese, it might be argued that that island is actually not an island but the Peloponnese, a word which already bears the word 'island' in Greek; its meaning being 'the island of Pelops'. See H.G. Liddell, and R. Scott, and H.S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon,* (9th ed., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940), p. 541. Hereafter it will be referred to as Liddell, *A Greek-English Lexicon.*

all the small towns nearby were seized,[72] [and] the barbarians of that place were transferred; [and] the relationship was for the sake of the resistance, something which is highly possible. For you had not encountered unexpected things and in order that you are caught unaware by them you would have to think over this again. But indeed you had wisely judged that you admitted both the things you have to stay behind and [the things you] fight against. Having met them, you were doing the things which you had ratified, because they were pleasant to the Emperor and beneficial to us all.

You have not struggled for the things that are rightfully yours but on behalf of this miserable corpse of the Greeks,[73] which would be completely destroyed by your difference even faster; if someone was greedy he may compel those disadvantaged to take revenge. And you also have struggled for the sake of piety no less than all [your] virtue. Everybody must not tolerate those who violate what is right, but they should resist in whichever way it would be possible and they should prevent [it], even if none of them make a difference for them. Or indeed, how shall we be different from beasts, or if we do not take a true oath, or if we do not turn against those who violated things that are sworn upon?[74] For nothing may become a

[72] This negative picture seems to be the legacy of the 1446 expedition of Murad II to the Peloponnese, when the Ottoman army laid waste the northern part of the peninsula: "After destroying the Hexamilion, Murad led the main Turkisharmy through Corinth, past Sikyon and Vostitsa (Aigion) to Patras, burning the towns and villages as he passed. He found Patras deserted. The population had fled across the gulf to Naupaktos; but he did not trouble to attack it and marched on to Clarenza. Meanwhile, a second army under Turakhan Bey marched towards Mistra; but, no doubt owing to the difficulty of crossing the mountains in the wintry weather, it seems that he did not reach the vale of Sparta. He eventually turned west to join the Sultan at Clarenza." See Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium*, p. 76.

[73] Scholarios somestimes uses the term 'Greek' with a meaning of 'pagan'. Here, though, he uses it to refer to the Byzantines. See note 75 below.

[74] Scholarios covertly keeps warning Demetrios in case of violation of the oath Demetrios had taken in front of the emperor over the division of the Peloponnese between him and Thomas. See Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol. I, p. 242.

plausible pretext for a man to neglect such things or to give the impression to neglect.

Up to these matters, everything has been determined and has been accomplished bravely, prudently and piously by you. And now I went through, only by touching upon the main points; but whenever we have free time from the matters that draw us in a contrary direction, your affairs would get into order, [and] we will chant for you with respect to all purposes of life, (p. 125) having been placed in this conveniently. And consider how the matters after these will be in accordance with the former ones, which now are worthy of praising both by us and by the ones who think like us and speak the truth. For the things that have been shown by you up to now will be sealed in the future, you will make use of your powers and affairs, and if the same things are set up, none among the common people and the rulers will put up with you as you consider and display yourself as the best.

We are not doubtful that you seem to be worthy of your fame. We reckon that you will show yourself much wiser both to the friends and to others who do not see you as a friend by inducing and giving to each of them what is appropriate to their character due to your good reputation. For God to whom you express your piety will guide you and will lead you to whatever would be best, if He still has a word of us indeed, and as He will bring us to benefit, seeing the ones who have chosen to live piously are very much thriving in this life; if He does not, which I wish that it may not happen, you had better not cease living piously. For our limit is not here in this world, we should forbid the ones who obviously do not benefit from anything on account of virtue. However the compensations of the good ones are given somewhere else, offering unlimited happiness to those who will be adorned with virtue. Even if the deeds of virtue have their own self-sufficiency here; if you

want, certainly even if others do not know, the habit will not be rewarded to the benefit of the ones who live according to it. But we hope that you become eminent in this life as well being as a model of piety, and on account of that a model of love of God standing for the ones who see.

Do not think that you are only commanded by yourself, but consider that everything is achieved by you clearly thanks to your piety. In order to face the difficulties of the affairs, one must provide the origin of all and the scantiness of the Greek[75] affairs and other crookedness without doubt. Many things certainly came upon you contrary to your opinion, and perhaps things like this are given to you to train your virtue. We may not have perceived your patience, bravery, justice and dignity if you were not tested by the webs of fortune concerning these. To go through all these difficulties with virtue keeping your tender, and still with glory and power, and hardly; we consider them to progress with all justice.

Indeed what else, unless one would consider what you get guarding you on a good day just like he himself doubtlessly says that he guards over those who are against him on an unfortunate day, even if in the present situation he seems to do better. I have not acknowledged a piety anywhere in the present people greater than yours; for I have not been afraid of a piety lest you become presumptuous. Of all the other things [your] modesty of character, or rather moderation let us say, adorns you. And I leave aside your loyalty to oaths now; for I have talked about it before adequately.

[75] Pagan.

Then what would be more pious than always to regret the former things,[76] just as attributing everything only to himself, (p. 126) and to be distressed by sorrow and not being uncomfortable towards those whom he should remember [in his prayers], if possible, and often many times a day and always to be gracious to God and to think that he can never go through adequate trial by those who would purify one, just like one commits the same sin all the time, but not having ceased from sin for a long time? And who, even a commoner, has humbled himself so much? Who has been crushed by the pain brought by sins? Actually to tell the truth, no one even among the hermits has done that much. It is always the easiest thing to reproach them due to inexperience and to call upon the smallest of the sins due to much moderation, as much as you yourself have been capable in the middle of so much trouble. Is this not the expression of purest piety? Not of utmost prudence? Not of perfect thoughtfulness? Who would not have dared to approach such a person? Who would not welcome to be appointed by such a person? And who, even he is not there; would not praise [him] even in so doing he would displease some people?

7. Now I come towards the main point of piety, stopping at this point. Many of those who do not have a firm belief but overlook their belief in their minds, they pretend in some other matters, and those things which they claim to respect in word, they ally themselves with those who attempt to destroy them in action; the wretched ones, [they are] just like someone who may not want to kill the flock himself but lets the shipyard open to bandits and wild beasts and hands [them] over to slaughter and plunder. You are not such a person, but as soon as this innovation[77] first emerged,

[76] Scholarios might still be imlpying the siege of 1442 here, thinking that Demetrios regrets it. Whether Scholarios is right or not is something impossible to know of.

[77] This should be regarded with a negative sense.

you were present and saw the human predicament in order not to say something worse. Having nothing sacred, you stood firm; and you were not present in the voting; for you would not give your consent. You departed both with me and with decent Gemistos,[78] even though they,[79] who instigated the dreadful developments, were repeatedly asking you to stay.[80] On the other hand they hardly allowed us to go away from those good deeds; for on the other they could not do anything decently but forcefully.

From that time up to now you kept on guarding well the appropriate faith and the religion that have been coming down to you from the fathers, [and] you did not consider it worthy of yourself to mix with alien elements and associate [yourself] with them, thus to turn away from your ancestral faith and to show your soul to be just like a monster with many faces and something variegated.[81] For many do [so] either because they are deceived in thinking that they do not get a part of this wit, or they overlook it thinking that there is nothing different. However you stay clean and unaffected out of those and (p. 127) in that way the leaders of our faith would have wished you lived as they themselves were living, in no way mixing with those who

[78] George Gemistos Plethon: Fifteenth-century Byzantine neo-Platonist philosopher, who lived during ca. 1360-1452. Scholarios had long debates with him being an ardent supporter of the Aristotelian philosophy. Plethon, as he wrote to Despot Thodore II, supported a self-sufficient government for the Peloponnese. Scholarios had most of his works burnt after Plethon died. See supra note 53; *ODB,* p. 1685; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon."*The debates between Plethon and Scholarios concerning Plato and Aristotle turned in part on the compatibility of Platonic or Aristotelian philosophy with Christian doctrine." See *OHBS*, p. 715.

[79] Probably the pro-Unionist Byzantines.

[80] Scholarios himself left the Council of Ferrara-Florence with Demetrios, and this action was a legitimate one according to Blanchet, inasmuch as Scholarios already did not have the right to vote there since he was a layman. See Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* pp. 332-3; Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol. I, p. 241; ibid., vol. II, p. 326; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon,* pp. 139-140, 175; Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium,* p. 71; *Syropoulos,* p. 461.

[81] Scholarios expresses his deep gratitude to Demetrios for he did not cast his vote in the Council and left it. See Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 332.

think many different things concerning God,[82] even though you used to foresee that many difficult situations would emerge as it has exactly happened as you dismissed noble hopes, which those who disagreed with you were forwarding to you.

Instead of those, you were thinking that piety can give you much both to yourself and to the ones who are with you. Considering that neither you or anybody in the right path should pay attention to those who lead the simpler ones to astray through the tricks which they found but receive support from the judgment of those blessed ones, who have indeed become independent and truthful leaders to us in the debate with the Latins for such a long time; you despise those who demand some other thing. And having added yourself to the familiar among the wise from both sides, I would even say to the wiser, which you did entirely well. On the other hand, you consider those who are now among our opponents who you regard as excrements of the older ones, and you were right [in saying this]. "Then we will be ludicrous", says Plato[83] in Theaetetus,[84] "if we think that we say something important while being paltry, and if we denounce the very old and wise men. And see, he says, Theodore, if it is better to throw yourself to such a danger."[85]

8. Therefore you do not want to denounce very old and wise men, nor the ones who joined together by means of some golden line up to and at our time. I

[82] The Latins.

[83] See *supra* note 51.

[84] Theaetetus: One of the works of Plato in the form of dialogues, in which knowledge is defined in multiple ways. See M. F. Burnyeat, *The Theaetetus of Plato* (with a translation by Jane Levett). Hackett, 1990.

[85] J. Burnet, *Platonis opera*, vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1900 (repr. 1967): p. 181.

mean Joseph;[86] for I should start from the later ones; your father[87] the wisest Emperor, Neilos of Thessalonike,[88] Neilos of Constantinople,[89] Patriarch Philotheos,[90] Theophanes of Nicaea,[91] Patriarch Gregory,[92] a man no less than the former ones, having convened the holy synod at his time with over seventy chosen ones, Gregory of Thessalonike,[93] Patriarch Germanos[94] and the decisions taken concerning him and by him.[95] I keep silent at the testimony of the enemies [I mean] Barlaam;[96] I leave aside Eustratios of Nicaea[97] and the things having been discussed

[86] Joseph (Bryennios): (ca. 1350-probably 1430/1) This Joseph can be no one but Joseph Bryennios. An ardent supporter of Orthodoxy. A Palamite, who defended the Orthodox doctrine of the procession of the Holy spirit. Scholarios, himself a Palamite, cites his name here not only because Joseph was a Palamite but also strictly adhered to Orthodoxy. See *PLP*, 3257; *ODB*, p. 330. Palamism was born out of the teachings of Gregory Palamas, who was archbishop of Thessalonike. It was a subject of hot debate in the fourteenth century, since it claimed that God is accessible to men through his uncreated energies. See *ODB*, pp. 1561-2.

[87] Manuel II.

[88] Neilos of Thessalonike: No information is found about him.

[89] Neilos (Kerameus): Palamite patriarch of Constantinople during 1380/1-1388. Served as *hegoumenos* through his patriarchate. See *ODB*, p. 1449-50; PLP, 11648.

[90] Philotheos (Kokkinos): (ca. 1300-ca. 1377/8) Patriarch of Constantinople during 1354-5, and 1364-76. Fervent supporter of Palamism. See *ODB*, p. 1662.

[91] Theophanes (Graptos): (778-845) Probably Theophanes Graptos. Archbishop of Nicaea after the end of Iconoclasm. Punished and exiled due to being iconodule. See ibid., p. 2062.

[92] Gregory II (of Cyprus): Patriarch of Constantinople during 1283-9. Rejected the Union of Lyons and restored Orthodoxy. See *ODB*, pp. 876-7.

[93] Gregory (Palamas): (ca. 1296-1359) Archbishop of Thessalonike and saint. The goal of Palamism was "to give an objective theological foundation to the theory and practice of monastic contemplation or Hesychasm." See ibid., p. 1560. Hesychasm refers to a monastic practice of citation of a prayer in silence "to achieve communion with God". The same word also refers to religious, social, and political movements in the fourteenth and the fifteenth century related to the concept mentioned in the penultimate sentence. See ibid., pp. 923-4.

[94] Germanos II: Patriarch of Constantinople during 1223-1240. Close ally of the Nicene ruler John III Vatatzes. Opponent of the Union of the Churches. Wrote several anti-Latin treatises. All these led Scholarios to add him in the 'golden line'. See ibid., p. 847.

[95] In the margins of the original manuscript, it says "in the time of the Laskarids".

[96] Barlaam (of Calabria): (ca. 1290-1348) Born Orthodox, but later on converted to Catholicism. Attacked Hesychasm, and wrote against Palamism. See *ODB*, p. 257.

and done,[98] John of Russia named after Christ,[99] Leo of Bulgaria[100] and Theophylaktos of the same place,[101] Nicholas of Modon,[102] Niketas called the ecumenical teacher,[103] the highest of the philosophers Psellos,[104] other countless –up to and in the time of- the wisest among the emperors Leo[105] and the blessed Photios,[106] those who have been listed in all ranks and in all manners, all of whom criticize those people who assert that the Son of God is the beginning or cause of the

---

[97] Eustratios of Nicaea: Philosopher and theologian, who lived in the eleventh and the twelfth centuries. Wrote against *filioque*, but condemned with heresy since he was accused of distinguishing the divine *Logos* and Christ. See *ODB*, p. 755.

[98] In the margins of the original manuscript, it says "in the time of the Komnenians".

[99] John II: Scholarios probably refers to John II, the metropolitan of Kiev during ca. 1077-89. Wrote on Latin additions to the Creed. "The tone is firm but conciliatory". See *ODB*, pp. 1045-6.

[100] Leo of Ohrid: Polemicist, who lived in the eleventh century. Spokesman of Patriarch Michael I Keroularios. Mainly attacked the Latin idea of azymes, See ibid., p. 1215.

[101] Theophylaktos: Archbishop of Ohrid during 1088-9. Pupil of Michael Psellos. Rejected the *filioque*, and wrote against the Latins, although being an opponent of schism. See below note 104. See ibid., p. 2068.

[102] Nicholas of Modon/Methone: Theologian who lived in the twelfth century. Pro-unionist, yet wrote against *filioque*. See *ODB*, p. 1469.

[103] Niketas (of Herakleia): (ca. 1050-after 1117) Probably this Niketas is Niketas of Herakleia, since he was the *didaskalos* of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople. Little is known about his career. See ibid., p. 1481.

[104] (Michael) Psellos: (1018-after 1081) Intellectual, writer, and court philosopher. Being an individualist, he leaves little room for divine providence and miracles in his work. See ibid., pp. 1754-5.

[105] Emperor Leo VI (the Wise): Emperor during 886-912. Called the wise or the philosopher. Mostly unsuccessful politically and militarily in the international arena. See ibid., pp. 1210-1.

[106] Photios: (ca. 810-after 893) Patriarch of Constantinople during 858-67 and 877-86, scholar, and politician. Excommunicated the Pope over his support of the previous Patriarch who abdicated, and his abdication resented the Pope. See ibid., pp. 1669-70.

all-holy Spirit in the confession of faith[107] with many noble books [that are] now still preserved.[108]

(p. 128) They teach us to think that the Father is the only cause, the only beginning and origin of both the Son and the Spirit; and that they both proceed in the sense of the cause[109] and the hypostasis[110] only from Him. In their opinion they both and each causally receive [their] being only from Him. Leading forward the hypostasis of the Spirit from the hypostasis of the Son, so that in this way a hypostasis would derive from another hypostasis on which it depends; and just like they separate from the Father through Himself and not from what comes from Himself, only the causes of the Spirit, even if the Latins would not say so, namely the hypostases each of which personally posits the Spirit are not as God would be one in both. In order that something even worse than the former does not happen, they try to disperse all the abysmal and precipitous assumptions, putting boundaries and threatening those who dare transgress. They teach us, in other words, to confess that the Spirit proceeds from both, namely from the Father through the Son.

When He approves only the betterment of the creature, so as to say or rather to put it like this, the creature receives the participation towards himself anywhere

---

[107] The Creed.

[108] What Scholarios argues here is the concept of *filioque,* introduced by the Catholics and not accepted by the Orthodox. Scholarios' attempts to refute this concept dominates the rest of the letters.
Filioque: Latin word that can be translated either as 'also from the son', or 'and through the son'. Latin addition to the Creed in a council in Toledo in the sixth century. It denotes that the Holy Spirit proceeds not only from the Father but also from the Son. It is believed that this addition became formal in 1014, and reaffirmed in the Council of Lyons and in the Council of Ferrara-Florence. See *ODB,* pp. 785-6.

[109] For a detailed lexical and contextual description of αἰτία see Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, p. 54.

[110] For a detailed lexical and contextual description of ὑπόστασις, see ibid., pp. 1454-61.

through the graces granted to it, of the common goodness of the Father and the Son and of the oneness of their will. Or the goodness of the Spirit is also a good will, having led the genuine believers to goodness by means of spiritual support; and for this, the Spirit is said to proceed, to be offered, and to take the lead and to be given and to be sent from the hypostasis which share the same nature and from Himself, too. With that order we chant praises to the divine hypostases, that is to say to receive our single grace of divinity which is both sent and comes upon us from the Father through the Son in the Spirit, and revealing to us the power of the Spirit itself, and of all the divinity through the grace which enlightens us.

Therefore upon this notion, they strongly claim that the Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son, allocating the creation and the betterment of the creatures together with Father and the Son against those who give it blasphemously the second or third rank of nature. They also teach to honor the eternal progression of the Spirit through the Son, first as nobody would suppose the Spirit is begotten from Father since it depends on the Father, because the Father is said in relation to the Son; and it would derive from the Father, as the name father implies, as begotten. But through the insertion of 'the Son' for the specific indication of Father, as it indicates the begetter only in relation to the Son, immediately put in order with the Spirit which is drawn together [with the Son], (p. 129) not as if with someone who begets it, but leading forward in another way they would have been referred to properly.

In this way it would be possible to say both that the Spirit emerges from the Father through the Son, and to assert that the Spirit proceeds from the Father, not like the Son by being begotten, nor as coming from the Father in the specific sense, but in another way, by narrowly reflecting the addition 'through the Son' with

respect to the power of those many words. And in addition to this, if they retain that the most unutterable and the most secret productivity in the Father towards the special manifestation [that] both His Son and the Spirit are one in substance, and they are in each other; because we immediately put the Son together with the Father according to transmission of holy words, it is reasonable to believe that the Spirit proceeding from the Father also proceeds through the Son himself, that is to say not external to the Son according to the blessed Athanasius,[111] but indeed in him no less than with him. For in this way the Spirit would be of the Son just as [it would be] naturally of the Father, not being attached from outside, but being together in His nature, together with the other good things of the Father in the Son and this one reaching him from the Father, if indeed we should say so according to Cyril;[112] thus reaching with the Son of God towards His own hypostasis, being defined and revealed through being separated only personally, otherwise staying in Him and resting according to the saints who said so.

For it is distinguished from the Son by proceeding from the Father as a hypostasis on its own by the power of the cause that is leading forward, it is not only distinguished from the Father through a causal connection, but also from the Logos[113] who have derived together with it through a different explanation and a supernatural manner of progression; through it having derived in other words not having derived something out of himself, taking the same substance in number and

[111] Athanasios: (295-373) Archbishop of Alexandria. Theologian, philosopher, and saint. Strongly opposed to Arianism, thus exiled a lot of times. See *ODB*, pp. 217-8.

[112] Cyril: (ca. 348/50-386/7) Bishop of Jerusalem, and saint. The first theologian to discuss transubstantiation. Followed the Nicene Creed. See *ODB*, pp. 571-2.

[113] *Logos:* Means 'word' or 'reason'. Used not only by the Stoic philosophers, but also by early Christian theologians. According to the latter, Christ is the 'Logos of God'. See ibid., p. 1246. It is also used in the New Testament. For an example see *Holy Bible: Old and New Testaments*, Ramboro, London, 1994, John 1:1, p. 43. Hereafter it will be referred to as *Holy Bible*.

being understood to have proceeded in this way; it becomes one and attached, so that the Spirit does not take from the Son what makes it the Spirit considering the Son as from the personal principle which posits the Spirit. In no way the Spirit receives from the Father what it receives but rather that of the Son receives it; neither before nor later, nor out of the Logos, but through the Logos itself, namely both in Him and with Him, just as the light of the sunrise which is emitted by the sun together with the beam reaches us, or the human spirit accompanying the word and revealing its activity, as it is present in anywhere in these corporeal realities as a kind of indication having used piously of what is to be found in the highest and the most incorporeal.

And it is possible to leave aside all that makes this revelation, the Son of God, putting forward the Spirit from the Father depending on it by the same cause, however the Spirit rather taking that, (p. 130) just as proceeding in Him and taking the progression of the Spirit through Him, which is the manner that He takes; in other words having been begotten, taking out all corporeal and temporal notion. For God the Father shares all that are attached to Him through the persons brought forward by Him, not His very own actual essence, which He has through being the source of all these. Therefore, He shares with His Son the Spirit and also his commonality with the Spirit, not His own essence regarding the Spirit. But He makes it possible for the Son himself in some other way to be distinguished from the Spirit, and being both of them in some other way giving the same essence, not in the same way supernaturally.

9. Exactly as the Son has [his] being because he received it from the Father, which is only the Father, himself by the Father, but he is not the cause to himself of being from the Father. In the same way the Son has received the Spirit, but he is not

the cause of the Spirit's presence in himself, not at all, unless the Spirit is the cause of the Son in having the Son present in itself. The Son of God has the spirit of God having advanced through its substance, so as to say, having become one nature with him not in an alien way, nor in an odd manner, nor through insertion from outside, nor by sharing, and far away from this corporeal notion substantially and divinely of being in and diffused, just as we believe the Son is in the Father and the Father is in the Son in a way which befits the divine and far from any imagination less dignified than this, something which is said by the very truth.

The Son of God, having the Holy Spirit in this way, treats the Spirit in a way proper to divine. He is posited and originated from the Father, just as He has always been treating Himself. For he[114] himself is the Spirit itself, and they are both one except the supernaturally substantial character; given that He is all Son, and only Son in substance, and the Spirit is all Spirit and only Spirit in substance; and because of this "the wind bloweth where it listeth",[115] and the Son of God sends the Spirit like the Father does. Spirit is of the Son, just like of the Father. For there is some natural quality of the holy and wise divinity, which is thought of as being in the Father and in the Son and in the Spirit itself according to Cyril,[116] blessing and deifying the ones who are worthy of sharing, being the substance just as the Son, which has been posited from the same source as the Son, and it is projected and proceeds only from the Father. So, in this way the teachers[117] give theological

[114] The Son.

[115] For the sake of consistency, King James's Bible is used in all translations. The meaning of this phrase is 'the Spirit blows where it wishes'. *Holy Bible,* John 3:8, p. 44.

[116] See *supra* note 112.

[117] Latin teachers.

discourses that the Spirit proceeds from the Father, in some places, they insert the addition 'through the Son', because they did not know the Son of God is the cause of the Spirit. For if they had known this, they would have said somewhere that the Son of God is the originator and the cause and the origin of it; and they would not have connected these things only to the Father and attribute them to Him. They would also have said that the Spirit proceeds from the Son and gets its substance and origination and procession from him.

The things which they say about the Father, or to say more precisely, (p. 131) towards the Father concerning Him, they also would have said to have been from Him, and to proceed through Him in that way, and just like they said that the beings have been made in that way through the Son, not adding the Father; the others who said everything in the opposite way. But because they rather knew that it receives its being only from the Father, namely proceeding according to the command of the Savior,[118] immediately and subsequently; as the Son can be immediately born from the Father, and hurrying to show this everywhere by words. Hence in order that nobody would crudely assume the progression of the Son to be utterly detached from the progression of the Spirit, and one person [of the trinity] from the other, attached only by origin, not by themselves; as if someone would think the two branches having come from the same stem, or two rivers flowing away from the same spring, and when they use these examples.

Therefore they consider to display it with such examples, even if having been received due to need as it should, and throwing out that assumption, and proving the unity according to the substance of the separated ones as far as the procession is

[118] Jesus Christ.

concerned, saying together through the Son, so that by means of this addition to what is put forward this way, they present the indistinguishable unity of substance. For they did not think that the mediation of the Son and their including the Son in the procession of the Spirit for the aforementioned cause will compel some people to keep the Spirit away from its natural relation to the Father and from its direct ascent towards its very own cause, as if paying attention to the divine Logos thinking that he is in the middle of and adjacent to the Spirit, just like it also happened to the others to believe that it is the third by nature, given that the Son stands by the Father and is attached [to Him]. On the contrary they were thinking that from here a more pious way of thinking will keep the quality of being the only-born only for the Logos, given that the Logos ascends only to his begetter who is adjoining to him, and only the Spirit is about to bring up to the originator; as it is proper to say and as the holy scriptures require, the one who is the same in each condition, the Father originally being called as the source, namely both the begetter and specifically the originator, as such source.

Thus we had to bring up a what is true and familiar gathering them together from everywhere in a sophisticated way, and for those who observe the unshaken position of the faith, not disturbing the Spirit by saying that it is of the Son or the Son is of the Spirit, or by the Spirit through the Son, or by the Son not ever has been said through the Spirit. For so far as the Son and the Spirit are in each other according to Cyril, they are also through one another, and are of one another, just as our fathers and reason[119] want us to understand the relation of being through one another. But the meaning of the Son is neither to preconceive how the Spirit meets

[119] Λόγος.

the Son, nor to say that the Son is of the Spirit, so that the order of the divine persons would be preserved, (p. 132) namely the non-confusedness of the characters. It is not proper to conceive another order there, in accordance with which the divine word would put the names of the divine persons in order in the transmission of the divine baptism. Even though the teachers[120] explain the order by reference to the purpose and posit what is familiar, the identity of the substance is clearly deduced from here; [and] they rebuke what is alien, namely the ascent of the cause and the cause of the beginning in the procession of the Spirit.

10. But some people, in interpreting the sayings of the saints sophistically, just like the Scriptures; they want to extend the contentiousness even further. Then they assert that it is to express the cause by reference to the purpose in saying that the Holy Spirit proceeds through the Son, [and] they also say that the Son is the beginning and the cause of the Spirit, insofar as the issue concerns its procession through him; just like upon those words, whenever they hear that everything is begotten through the Son, and no less than they are created by the Son, in like manner in the Spirit, namely from the Spirit. Or whenever they hear that the Spirit is given and revealed from the Father through the Son, clearly in both of which the Son of God is believed and preached to be the cause; on the one hand the beginning of being, on the other hand the spiritual formation and the betterment of him. All these become the divinity and of the same category. For such a progression and procession of the Spirit is into hypostasis and form, and in this [process] the Spirit gives rather than takes. For its eternal progression is into hypostasis of the divine person, they neither display each matter, nor see the dangers from there, clearly the cause and effect and the inappropriate scale of the hypostases, and a devaluation and

[120] Probably Church fathers.

exaggeration not fitting to the divine, and the extremity and moderateness, and being the first and the second and the third and all other characteristics in God, and the first and the second actualities, and various signs of thoughts either as believes and reality which do not introduce non-existent or empty sounds; or if they really would have the truth and existence together with the word following which would be no different than those extraordinary positions, which were well thrown out far from the church.

And in addition to this, I leave aside most of the details, either the division of power according to the separation of the power of each person which they claim, or the unity of the persons according to the unity of the power of each person would be such indeed, or the reversal of the generation in the Father concerning the communicability of the hypostatical power, or the devaluation of the Spirit in that non-communicability is worse than those [positions] above. It is absolutely necessary for the position to be conceived by someone, even if the ones who put it forward would neither want nor believe such. For they neither believe nor want but have been involved with innovations of dogma; (p. 133) they look for an escape, in which it is only to be expected to fall into even if they do not want because they do not want to make. Having returned to the common agreement of faith, the Son of God the mediator of the quarrel whom the ecumenical synods were contended to have him as the accurate teacher of the procession of the Spirit, and because they do not want, by silencing the suspicious dogmas to unite the church and the faith in the ineffable and unambiguous word of the Lord, just as they were united by the most prudent, ancient and blessed men[121] long ago; for they do not want to believe that the

[121] The Apostles.

Son is of another hypostasis besides the Father. But no pious person would agree either with them or with us to confess that he is less than the Father having used what greater things having been said concerning the Father as a decent-looking pretext.

Therefore, even if they do not utterly deny all those follies, they will persuade us to admit the position,[122] up to the point that they are not able to persuade, just as they are not strong, no corrupt thing follows their position. Or indeed our old teachers of the Church feared something else, they did not put it anywhere, and they showed many words and signs by reproaching, even if there was no power in us the later ones, or in those before us to see what kind of things are generated by this.[123] One must denounce it through these: to say that the preposition διὰ[124] has no more force than the preposition ἐκ,[125] and that it adds the cause to the word after the preposition which comes from the cause; or simply, as in the claim that being has been generated through the Son, and in the phrase "I have gotten a man from the Lord".[126] To claim such things is a sign of people ignorant of the language of Greeks, [and] this is worse for those who have been brought up with Greek education.[127] But indeed Chrysostom[128] received very well the preposition διὰ

[122] It might be argued that Scholarios suspects Constantine XI to put the Union into effect. He is right in that it was during Constantine XI's reign that the Union was proclaimed in Hagia Sophia in December 1452. See Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins,* p. 219.

[123] The position.

[124] Through.

[125] 'From' or 'out of'.

[126] The editors, who usually provide the biblical references, seemingly did not notice this one and forgot to provide reference. See *Holy Bible*, Genesis 4:1, p. 6.

[127] 'Greek' does not have the sense 'pagan' here. It has the linguistic sense.

instead of μετά[129] in many places, among them in what he says to the Thessalonians; also the preposition ἐν[130] instead of διὰ, and διὰ instead of ἐν, having known that such uses are common both in Aristotle and Plato. Let me not tell the other uses of this preposition among the Greeks, which are not relevant to our present concern such as the preposition μεταξύ,[131] δίχα[132] and διόλου,[133] and many such others.

If we perceive the progressive cause everywhere, then it is time to consider the hypostasis of the angels as a progressive cause of the consecration in them, whenever Basil the Great[134] says, as the heavenly powers from the proximity to the one who is holy by nature through all their hypostasis having proceeded and become a second nature have their holiness; and we will fail to grasp the true meaning in many places, if we follow the canon of those who think contrarily. However, it is proper to do everything in the opposite way, even if nowhere in the Greek language such a thing had been found. Thence, at least they introduce something new concerning the art of speech [in Greek letters], (p. 134) and they believe that the Holy Spirit proceeds also through the Son [and] gets its hypostasis from the Father, thinking that the Spirit is obviously not external to the Son according to

---

[128] John Chrysostom: (340/350-407) Bishop of Constantinople, saint, and orator. Depicted in the pose of an evangelist in iconography. See *ODB*, pp. 1057-8.

[129] After.

[130] In.

[131] In between.

[132] Separately.

[133] Not at all.

[134] Basil the Great: (ca. 329-379) Saint and bishop of Caesarea. Brother of Gregory of Nyssa and of Peter of Sebaste. One of the Cappadocian Fathers. Contributed to the development of Trinity based on the principle of *homoousion*. Defended the idea of cenobitic monasticism. See *ODB*, p. 279.

Athanasios,[135] yet it extends from the Father into the Son according to Cyril, so that we clearly present the inseparable unity of the nature according to Maxim. And we believe that the Spirit itself is attached together in union with the Son on the basis of *homoousios*,[136] and it proceeds from the Father according to Cyril; however not as if it has the existence from the Son. For the Father is the only cause and the Son is not the cause of the procession of the Holy Spirit, but it has everything the Father has except being a cause, as it seems to Damascene[137] and to Maxim [the Confessor][138] and to the great Gregory,[139] being thought of an immanent existence and of extension in a way appropriate to God, just as of other things which are said and believed about that blessed and the simplest unity. This would be much better than confusing qualities of the persons [of the Trinity] and also would be to give passage to those groundless claims. For this does not bring malice to anyone, yet both the unity of the divine hypostasis through all the persons and their order are guarded well, so as to say the non-confusedness of the attributes and the intention and words of all the teachers are preserved, and nothing unbefitting takes place.

11. However concerning these let this be enough in the course. I return from there, because people who both wrote and also taught these and have been

---

[135] See *supra* note 94.

[136] *Homoousios:* Meaning "of the same substance of stuff" See Lampe, pp. 958-60. Though not biblical, an important term to understand the relation among the persons of the Trinity. *ODB*, p. 945.

[137] John of Damascus: (ca. 675-749) Theologian and saint. Wrote many works against Iconoclasts. See ibid., pp. 1063-4.

[138] Maxim the Confessor: (580-662) Theologian and saint. Fought against Monotheletism. Supported by Pope I martin, but accused by Emperor Constans II of treason. Human will, which is crucial in the deification of men, plays an important work in his theology. See ibid., pp. 1323-4.

[139] Gregory of Nyssa or Gregory of Nazianzos: It is not clear which Gregory Scholarios refers to. Both are Cappadocian fathers. There is a chance that he might refer to Gregory of Nyssa, since Scholarios calls him 'great', and Gregory of Nyssa is referred as 'the father of fathers'. See *ODB*, pp. 882-3 for Gregory of Nyssa and pp. 880-2 for Gregory of Nazianzos.

proclaimed through the very deeds (for many of them also adorned with the honor of the martyrs by the church, in recognition of all the things they suffered as they confirmed the dogma, they are praised together with the first martyrs of the truth). You, the best and the bravest, consider those shepherds and trustful teachers doing very well, since we all give ear to their voices, and since they enter through the known door and lead others as well, and since they teach things in harmony with canonical words, with the Holy Gospels, with Paul the mouth of Christ,[140] with those ecumenical synods,[141] with the teachers who become prominent in them, on whose common agreement those who contend that they follow them should remain loyal and not fragment forcefully what some of them say and pull their words as they like; just as in the courts they make the violent and treacherous interpreters of the laws.

The blessed Markos[142] frequented the beaten track of those holy fathers, the shepherd of Ephesos, a man who has become the best in word and also in life among all of us, and who knew well to distinguish sophism from the genuine word, and remained undeceived through knowledge. He was not drifted at all by the desire of temporary matters so as not to concede anything appropriate through these, and because of this he could express his objection in support of the ancestral dogma in an excellent and appropriate way having struggled for it with the zeal and sayings of those fathers up to the extent that it is possible.

---

[140] Paul: Apostle and saint. The author of the 14 epistles in the New Testament. See *ODB*, pp. 1604-5.

[141] Synod: meaning 'council' or 'assembly'. "Formal deliberative bodies of bishops and ecclesiastical representatives that gathered to discuss and regulate disputed questions of church doctrine and discipline". Some types of synods are ecumenical, metropolitan, episcopal, and patriarchal. See ibid., pp. 540-3.

[142] Markos of Ephesos: (1394-1445) Also known as Markos Eugenikos, the leader of the anti-Unionist camp. Although Scholarios' position towards the Union might be regarded as blurry before the death of Mark Eugenikos, there is no doubt that after his death his stance as an anti-unionist was certain. See Woodhouse, p. 237; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, p. 360; *PLP*, 6193; *ODB*, p. 742.

(p. 135) We are of this opinion, and we shall not break away from that chorus of the fathers, nor shall we ever consider the people among us who differ understand the truth better than them, [given that] those who hardly give ear to their [fathers'] voices, but due to some intrigue or ambition or indifference they hold all their attention towards things beyond their limits rather than matters close to them and the truth, which is even worse, and they attached the reputation of bad opinion to the true and close matters, or they tolerate the inflicted [reputation of bad opinion] because of the vote in Florence. They cherished the vote against their own fathers and the truth as if it was brought from the sky. And through this, with the truth and the doctrine of the fathers, we express our gratitude to you who is standing bravely, and who is holding nothing prior to the pure faith, and who is confirming some people through your example and some others you bring them back.

Before us, that blessed chorus and Jesus the great leader and the scholar of our doctrine and the overseer of the truth and the giver of the eternal prize to the ones who turn to him knows your grace, and he will put you together with the blessed people in that life, just as now you celebrate the good confession of faith with them in word and in soul and in all your public expressions, as it truly befits to the pious; thus at that time sharing the crown on behalf of the truth. And you should exchange this for the entire rule and the whole form and for the apparent prosperity as much as it would be. Do hope here as well to encounter with the more fluent matters on account of the genuine faith in Christ and the unfeigned observation of the paternal doctrine; and just as until now God helped you get rid of many difficult things thanks to your piety, and He leads and shapes [your thought] for [your]

decisions. Just as He urges [you], He has given the most sublime Empress[143] to you as a companion of life, of will and of the rule, [a woman] not inferior in piety and prudence to the ones who are praised. For do not think of her to have become yours without a divine share.

12. Therefore may God help you as you deliberate about the matters of closest interest to you now as safe and pious as possible; and you would deliberate in the best way to yourself, having deliberated on the most beneficial matters for the unfortunate remnants of our people, to be blown apart indeed by a light breeze and to be thrown into the mouth of the enemy.[144] If what serves the common interest is brought first, your own interest will follow [it] in the best way. How? In this way: God is not unjust so as to abandon the one who may care for the common salvation more than for all other goods unaided and without reward. It is not difficult for Him to honor virtue. Whenever He wishes, He would be fair. If you manage everything well, God will manage your life and fortune, too.

(p. 136) Therefore, care for everything so that God cares for you. And just like you often preferred the common good to what seemed beneficial to you as an individual, as reminded in these letters. Thus now you would want this, would pray for this, would place the common good before everything, and would not be deprived of the best will of God, so that in such manner the affairs of Christians would be saved and you would be highly honored by all.

[143] Theodora Asanina: Second wife of Demetrios. See *PLP*, 1530.

[144] The Ottomans.

Letter II to Manuel Raoul Oises[1] [1451-1452]

[From] Gennadios to the most prudent and pious ruler, Kyr[2] Manuel Raoul Oises.

(P. 476) "Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? says blessed Paul[3] in 'to the Romans'. Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same; for he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil."[4] Therefore rejoice, the most pious Manuel, in that you fulfilled the deed of service to God lawfully.[5] Rejoice in that you made the sword given to you by God shine against those who persecuted Christ. I would like you and all the rulers ordained by God to peoples or cities to kill the sinners of the earth until morning, [and] to annihilate those who work for lawlessness in the cities of the Lord. If you spare all other evil people and give freedom of speech to those who corrupt and to the scab sheep which annihilate and destroy all the flocks, namely these profane and scourge Hellenists;[6] throw the shameless deserters of piety out of the present life by fire, iron, water, and by all possible means, if you care about being truthful to the Christians, [and] about the salvation of your subjects.

---

[1] Manuel Raoul Oises: *Archon* in the Peloponnese during 1450-4. Army leader (?). Apart from Scholarios, only one other primary source mentions him: F. Miklosich - I. Muller, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi I-VI*. Wien 1860-1890, as quoted in *PLP* 24133. Had a neo-pagan called Iouvenalios thrown into the sea after having been offended by him. See *PLP*, 24133; Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium*, p. 102. Received a letter from Mehmed II sent to the notables of the Peloponnese. See Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée*, vol. I, p. 250.

[2] Kyr: See note 1 in Letter to Despot Constantine.

[3] See note 143 in the Letter to Demetrios Palaiologos.

[4] *Holy Bible*, Romans, 13:3-4.

[5] Murdering Iouvenalios.

[6] Pagans.

Or you do not see the advancing evil given that that abominable and satanic Iouvenalios[7] is allowed to live in the Christian cities[8] and to corrupt the ones who are near him and also some others. Among the latter who are the ones that taught this apostasy, [and] who are the ones that were badly instructed by him? Who failed to notice that very evil which is increasing day by day? Whom among the pious did it not upset? I was explicitly crying to all and foretelling this.[9] But among those who could prevent this some were laughing, others were disbelieving, and some others were considering the matter to be a slander which was organized by me towards those unlucky people because of malice. For they are unlucky, if they find the matter outside, [they are] the ones who threw away the hope of salvation [and] our Jesus; even though the letters[10] of the thrice-cursed which are saved by us disgrace the men, if indeed one should call them men but not children with respect to their folly and thoughtlessness, and beasts with respect to their madness against their own salvation.

For in those letters he brings together, as he writes to one of his friends and fellow apostates, (p. 477) the ones who were in the Peloponnese and in Ainos[11] and people from various places of his faction and who were the members of it, acquired

[7] Iouvenalios: Latinized form: Juvenal. Pagan student/follower of George Gemistos Plethon. Executed by Manuel Raoul Oises in 1450. Allegedly murdered some monks in Mt. Athos. See PLP, 8221; Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol. II, pp. 360-1. "Clearly embarrassed the Imperial family by claiming to be a bastard son of the Emperor Andronicus, Manuel II's eldest brother. The Emperor John VIII exiled him from Constantinople at the request of the local hierarchy, and later from Aenos, where he had taken refuge. So he moved to the Peloponnese, where he had studied in earlier days. There he managed to shock and offend Oises and so met his terrible fate." Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium,* p. 102.

[8] Iouvenalios had been to various places such as Constantinople, Ainos, Albania, Apulia, and in the end the Peloponnese.

[9] Scholarios requested banishment of Iouvenalios from the Emperor John VIII. See Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol.II, p. 280. In the end, he escaped to Ainos and other places, and then banished to the Peloponnese. See *supra* note 7.

[10] Correspondances among Iouvenalios and his supporters. It seems that Scholarios collected those letters after the execution of Iouvenalios in order to make sure that they were not circulated.

[11] Ainos: Modern Enez, Turkey. City in Thrace on the coast of the Aegean Sea. Lost in 1384, passed to the Genoese until 1456. See *ODB,* pp. 41-2.

the same reputation as him.[12] The pious men took and brought those things and put them in our hands. Indeed we did not hear such things at all that were later detected by your piety. Of these latter things, as we heard, impiety and nonsense were away from the holy and divine, our [own] matters are preserved through them. How the wretched covertly united Hellenism[13] by calling the Greek[14] *polyarchy*[15] and polytheism as a system of one principle[16] and putting forward other such monstrous things! He did not dare to rise up against our sacred matters yet. This happened to him, because he was afraid of your excellent opinion[17] from afar.

But the cloth [is understood] from the edge and the donkey from the claws,[18] as the proverb says, I understand better by observing well. Also given that his fame which makes me realize the harmful things that he did to the ones who are around [him], he was more audacious in speech or in the letters, as there he rather hopes to be about to escape notice of the pious ones. They were indignant against him and against the ones like him whom he was proclaiming in the letters, especially because they became responsible for this ecclesiastical controversy;[19] even though it is conspicuous that without that testimony from the letters, as someone would not have

[12] Blanchet argues that Iouvenalios is linked to Plethon because of this sentence. See Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 183.

[13] Paganism.

[14] Pagan.

[15] Scholarios uses this term to contrast it with μοναρχία, that is, the notion of having one ruler instead of many.

[16] Μοναρχία.

[17] Literally 'vote'.

[18] This proverb may mean that something can be understood as soon as a part of it is seen. Seeing the whole is not necessary. It exists in Ancient Greek texts as early as the second century AD. For the earliest example, see F.G. Schneidewin and E.L. von Leutsch, *Corpus paroemiographorum Graecorum*, vol. I. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1839 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1965): centuria 5, section 15, line 3.

[19] Iouvenalios is alleged to be a pro-Unionist during 1438-1445. See *PLP*, 8221.

despised the true dogma of the fathers and would not have dared to step over the doctrines[20] of so many fathers for such long time, if he had not despised the whole faith in advance.

For no matters concerning Latins or anybody else had remained unclear to us from our fathers. Emperors, patriarchs, bishops, monks and wise men alike had defined each thing in both their private lives and in public meetings with horrible threats. They were neither unaware of those new and recent dogmas, which shook and divided the Church;[21] nor were they neglecting, nor were they the enemies of peace. It is not possible for someone who takes all evil things to deliver them to our fathers, by contrast bringing all the best things to us, who now judge differently concerning such people. And contrarily it might be proper.

For those were countless, wise, noble,[22] unaffected, loved-by-God, and judging the matters concerning God together with God; and it is evident what kind of people we are. We cannot even stand next to their shadows, nor are we worthy to stand next to their rubbish. Would it not be a matter of thoughtlessness rather than of disbelief and impiety to depart from the opinion[23] of those fathers concerning the slightest of dogmas? And if someone would dare this, perhaps handling some other opinion in his soul [and] having lightly esteemed the Christian faith, he adds the thing [thanks to] which he thinks he will live in a more glorious and pleasant way,

[20] Literally 'votes'.

[21] The issue of the *filioque* might be one example of this.

[22] Can be translated as 'brave' as well.

[23] Literally 'vote'.

the thing which also happened to them concerning the matters which he goes through in his letter.[24] It had been written before the synod in Italy.[25]

(p. 478) Therefore I was irritated when I saw from afar the matters growing up, [yet] I was unable to endure and I was distressed. And I am leaving behind the rest. However, having learned that the thrice-cursed Iouvenalios utterly destroyed[26] many people in Ainos, there were some people from Ainos [who were] still pious [and] who let me know of the danger. They wrote many times to Gateliuzos,[27] the archon of the city, [and] I was advising him either to imprison or to drive out the offenders. He [28]drove him out without any delay. Unless it would happen in this way, whole Ainos would have been destroyed by him. Although many people were pushed out, they were saved without any harm.

After Iouvenalios came from there to here, I did not spare any effort to rectify and heal him. I invited him to talk [and] brought honors from the Emperor[29] for him, if he would wish to go away from deceit as he had formerly been persuaded by just and truthful words. He was hiding from me and he was saying that he was neither thinking nor teaching anything against the Christian faith. When he was around the monasteries, he was talking nonsense against the virginity of Mary and the revered garment of the monks or some other stuff. In this way he corrupted the more simple-

[24] Non-existent today.

[25] Council of Ferrara-Florence: Opened at Ferrara, then moved to Florence due to plague. Aimed at the Union of the Churches. Sides were unequal, and the East-West antagonism was still alive. While Papacy looked the Byzantines with contempt, the Byzantines were politically motivated and aimed to get military help against the advancing Ottoman threat. See *ODB*, p. 783.

[26] Scholarios probably means that Iouvenalios converted them to Paganism.

[27] (Palamedes) Gateliuzos: Archon of Ainos/Thrace during 1409-1455, ruler of Samothrake during ca. 1431-1455, and of Imbros during 1453-1455. See *PLP*, 3583.

[28] Gateliuzos.

[29] John VIII. See note 9 in the Letter to Demetrios Palaiologos.

minded ones. As Kyr Makarios of Coron[30] and Dionysius of Sardis[31] learned this, having me as their companion, they went to the Emperor.[32] They have the accursed driven out of the city. I actually advised them to imprison him.

Again, after some time, having returned after the conflict of the Church, he was the same and even worse. And for a long time I had him brought to me twice and thrice: Brother, I said, why do you corrupt the souls of the most modest ones as you wander from here to there, and why do you venture again to be driven out from the cities by us, or to suffer something even worse? If you think that what you teach to the uneducated is true, share them also with us, and we will teach these things together. And if you come to know that these are the tricks of demons and the demonic people who taught you these, you will entirely benefit by coming back to the truth. If you really love this [truth], as it is proper for a human to long for truth; and unless I could ease your difficulties and persuade you to change, let it be possible for you to stick to your opinion. Nobody will force you with respect to your opinion.[33] Your opinion according to those who know and are able, either to help you or to disgrace you for attacking yourself in a hidden way to the ones who were persuaded without investigation because of frankness, this is the opinion of the ones who hate the salvation of the other and also yours. And no enemy would have harmed you more than you would be harmed by yourself.

[30] Makarios: Bishop of Coron. Pro-Unionist (?), since he probably served in a Unionist Church in Coron. See *PLP*, 16193.

[31] Dionysios of Sardis: Metropolit of Sardis during 1437-8. Patriarch of Jerusalem appointed him as his representative to the Council of Ferrara-Florence, and Dionysios died there. See *PLP*, 5486.

[32] John VIII.

[33] What irritates Scholarios seems to be the alleged missionary activities of Iouvenalios, not his thoughts.

And they are again hiding from me and utterly denying being such kind [of people] as many people say, when he was around the monasteries, guest-chambers and festivals he sowed impiety; when he became conspicuous to many and received a lot of ridicule by many people and was afraid that he may be driven out again. Then as he came to the great *protosynkellos* Kyr Gregory,[34] (p. 479) [who is] now the patriarch, he pretends that he accepts the Latin dogmas and promises to cooperate with him, and to assist him in the matters related to the Union, having hoped to be sheltered by his warmth in this way and to be set free from the ones who chase [him], and stay away from fear being the enemy of Christ in the middle of Christians.

After I had learned about the issue and not became unable to tolerate the sarcasm of [this] impure person against the faith any longer, I sent a letter to the great *protosynkellos*[35] [in which] I explained what was necessary. That person immediately persuaded the Emperor[36] and it was good that he did so, and he[37] had already been persuaded to drive out the godless before I wrote [this letter]. May the Lord have mercy to the soul of that Emperor, because he hated the impious and drove out the impiety, and he was eager to secure and exalt the faith of Christ by teaching and also by other methods. For the only thing one could charge him[38] with is the ecclesiastical confusion. He participated in it against his will and as far as it was up to him he was getting away [from the ecclesiastical confusion]. Being compelled to procure something for himself, he nevertheless proved himself with all his deeds and signs

[34] Gregory III: Patriarch of Constantinople during 1445-1451. Megas protosynkellos during 1439-1445. Latin titular patriarch of Constantinople in 1452 (?) See *PLP*, 4591.

[35] ibid.

[36] John VIII.

[37] ibid.

[38] ibid.

both to God and to the ones who pay attention to the truth; and he was the only one who made it possible for us to fight back that defeat.

But the impious Iouvenalios fled to the Peloponnese again, for he learned that that island[39] is more congenial to his evil seeds. Obviously on the spot he rages against his own salvation, as he became a more foolish one than those who taught [him]-since for sure those people who turn against Hellenism[40] both by talking and writing- genealogies of gods and immaculate expressions [taken] from the poets and convenient rites, as they say. On the one hand the administration and they[41] may try well to bring them back to life, all the things that have been totally rotten and erased; and on the other hand they did not freely venture to talk and write openly against the sayings, the doctrine, and the deeds of Christ and our holiest religion, even if they are busy with the demolition of the sacred, through which they exalt and revere the profane. Therefore they are honored as they escape notice of many people, and upon being honored they corrupt others; those whom they have corrupted honored them, even if they are now recognized well. That who moves his shameful tongue against the holy found the most worthy end of his life by the pious ones.

And such people among us as well are not few in number, and we showed some of them to the ones who can prevent or dishonor, or drive out, or send to the depth [of the sea]. But how tolerant you are, our Lord Christ, and the means is given to them rather to damage others and sow the seeds of the impious. And a place is given to them so that they speak about the holy dogmas and they venture to talk about religious matters of the Christians, just as the ones who have great license to

[39] Peloponnese. See note 71 in the Letter to Demetrios Palaiologos.

[40] Paganism.

[41] The teachers of Iouvenalios.

dance war dances impiously among the profane people, [I mean] the ones whose souls are infected with Zeus,[42] Apollo,[43] Cronus,[44] and with such mucus. And what they do would not be the greatest evil, (p. 480) but who in their right mind would pay attention to the ones who knew these, and to those who agree, and to those who want to be such as if they were pious? For it says: "shew me thy faith without thy works"[45] and "wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them."[46] Who will be the Jeremiah[47] to lament on these? From here who will not foretell the greatest disaster to us? And rather, paying good attention, who will not see and remember many origins of the present evils?

It is gone, alas, the faith has been despised. Disbelief is always an evil; some were possessed by the mania of Hellenism,[48] some others by idleness and godlessness, indifference and obscurity about the faith and concerning the paternal heritage, apostasy, and overall impiety, as they had found a pretext for all this ecclesiastical confusion. Who among such people care about what is going to happen? None at all. They care about presidency, empty names, great pieces of land, money, rule, and the honors in the palace. Why did I give up spending time in the palace? Why am I busy with my own matters being confined by borders? Except for

[42] Zeus: Supreme god of the Greek pantheon. Father of mortals and immortals, ruler of heavens. See Gagarin, M. (ed.) *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece and Rome*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2010, vol VII, pp. 277-81. Hereafter it will be referred as *OEAGR*.

[43] Apollo: God of purification, prophecy, oracles, healing, music and poetry. Son of Zeus and Leto. See *OEAGR*, vol I, pp. 131-7.

[44] Cronus: One of the local gods. Castrated his father. See *OEAGR*, vol III, p. 317.

[45] *Holy Bible*, James, 2:18.

[46] ibid., Matthew, 7:20.

[47] Jeremiah: One of the four great prophets. Considered to be the author of the book Lamentations. See *ODB*, p. 1032.

[48] Paganism.

a few people to whom it is possible to hide coming with piety, why do I not open the door of my chamber to the others?[49] Why have I kept silent? Because the time is evil as the prophecy goes, and the one who understands will keep silent. Because formerly I was listened as I was talking, now I am talking to the ones who do not listen. Because we the people became wolves or leopards to each other as we slander, malign, deceive, fabricate tales and kill, if we hoped to be unnoticed. Where are these from? [It is] from indifference towards faith. Where is this [indifference] from? [It is] from being silent about the word of God, from the worst hunger of all hungers. It is the last blow that God holds up against the cities that have been hostile. He says: "And how shall they believe unless they unite, and how shall they unite, unless they obey?"[50]

From here it is obvious that our end is at hand. The blessed Paul,[51] as he writes to Timothy, says: "In the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God, having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away"[52] he says. The priesthood is cheap, the archbishopric is buyable, [and] all the ecclesiastical posts are for sale for money. The

[49] Scholarios is known to shut himself in a monastery as he was struggling against the pro-Latin Byzantines: "Then the schismatic group, coming to the cell of Gennadios, the former George Scholarios, in the Monastery of Pantokrator, said to him, 'And what shall we do?' He was in seclusion, but he took paper and set down his opinion in writing, thus making his counsel known. His message read as follows: 'Wretched Romans, how you have been deceived! Trusting in the might of the Franks you have removed yourselves from the hope of God…'" See Doukas, p. 204.

[50] *Holy Bible*, Romans, 10:14.

[51] See note 140 in the Letter to Demetrios Palaiologos.

[52] *Holy Bible*, II Timothy, 3: 1-5.

gifts of the Spirit are measured from the treasure of Mamonas.[53] Holy settlements and the things consecrated to God are sold. What an uninhibited sacrilege of the ones who buy and sell these.

(P. 481) And could we not be abandoned by God, given that we do these or tolerate them? And what is abandonment? We rejected to serve God. How? We do not have the Church. The dogmas of the fathers have been ignored by us, they have been despised. We exchanged them for hopes out of fear, with the offers of gifts. Such things in Italy,[54] [and] others from there up to now, we have given holy things to dogs, pearls to pigs. Common people among Jews and Saracens, who were committed to the worldly matters, do not dare to say out loud something against those who are knowledgeable in the holy matters and are responsible for them. Among us, namely the Christians, the matters of faith are treated in no appropriate way. Nobody among them dares to talk against the ancestral faith let alone disbelief or praise some other faith before it, only someone to be stoned and burnt.

We speak in public shamelessly against the fathers and the faith, and who [are] these? [They are] some artisans, ill-trained people, sorcerers, and people incapable of saying something about the holy matters even once. It is necessary to impale those who dare these, and they also praise them. Those who know and those who can say something concerning the holy matters with piety and those who judge happiness and the bold defense of truth, and those who are annoyed by these evils, we chase [them] as if they were trump and harmful to the society. O Lord, be

[53] Mamonas: Probably one of the pirates operating in Monemvasia. See Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée*, vol. I, p. 88.

[54] Reference to the Council of Ferrara-Florence.

gracious to this remnant of Orthodox Christians. Do not abandon, but amend as you know them; and have mercy on me, the useless and sinful servant of yours.

But if I were to talk about these tragedies, I would need many words. And you, the most pious Manuel, cheered us through what you have done to the impious Iouvenalios;[55] and we, who were suffering, could breathe in the midst of what happened thanks to the fame of those greatest deeds of yours. For you removed the plague from the council, you [also] removed the blame on our faith and our people. You saved the ones who would be harmed by that, if their incessant pain was being stretched out very much. You helped the ones who got damaged, on condition that they want to come to the right mind even late and to understand the right thing. For they are able to reflect upon that most pitiable life and the dishonorable death, which took place according to and in line with his evil purpose and distorted dogmas.[56]

What [is] revered and graceful about him, through which he would be persuasive to a sensible person? He had no wisdom, and he was absolutely ignorant about the sublime and holy matters. He differed from the most uneducated people only by some small measure, because his tongue had been moderately trained to speak and write. He kept his soul rough, and he had not tasted or heard any wisdom.

(P. 482) What was more vulgar in his direction, through which he was not [considered] worthy of priesthood even if he desired it?[57] This is what made him turn mad against the faith in the beginning. He was a glutton, a drinker, a jester, an

[55] Execution of Iouvenalios.

[56] Runciman and Blanchet give different accounts on which part of Iouvenalios' body was severed before he was cast into the sea. "Juvenal was condemned to have his limbs broken and to be cast into the sea." Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium,* p. 102. "Il a enfin pris la sanction qui s'imposait contre Juvénal en le mettant à mort après lui avoir fait couper la langue et en dispersant ses restes dans la mer." Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 183.

[57] ibid., p. 182.

incontinent, a licentious, and an unstable. First he was a Christian, then he became a Jew, then he celebrated together with the heretic followers of Mohammad,[58] then he was acting offhand, then he betrayed the Christians, this was the most remarkable of [his] evils and the peak of them. - But he was not wise, not holy, and not even prudent. –

Who would not go mad having said this? What sign of prudence did he bring about during all his lifetime? Did he not become the chief of robbers in the Holy Mountain,[59] intending to do the most evil things there against the monks? Did he not become the slayer of the monks who did nothing wrong, because of which he was arrested in the end by the people of the Holy Mountain and was held fast in bonds for some time, then being released by the ones who treated [him] humanely?[60] Did he not want to do similar things in and out of the Peloponnese at the time of the blessed and purple-born Theodore?[61] Did he not pretend like the holy men in Apulia[62] and Albania being unholy, and at the moment he was recognized he wanted to get away like mice of pitch? Was he not captured upon [doing] the most evil things everywhere? Was he not gathering gold coins by every means, living in hunger [and] begging for more?

For the demons he cured prophesized to him that he would be emperor and such things, and because of this he gathered money as he lived in hunger; how fool

[58] See note 86 below.

[59] Mount Athos: Known as ἅγιον ὄρος in Greek with the meaning 'Holy Mountain'. Today an autonomous state in Greece, hosting twenty monasteries which were built during the tenth and the seventeenth centuries. See *ODB*, pp. 224-7.

[60] *PLP*, 8221.

[61] Despot Theodore II. See note 1 in the Letter VI to Despot Theodore II.

[62] Apulia: Region in the southeastern Italy. Contested among the Byzantines, Arabs, and the Lombards; the Byzantine control ended in the eleventh century. See *ODB*, pp. 144-5.

was he to venture such things with such little money? Was he not saying to others that he had been born as the bastard of Emperor Andronikos,[63] conferring to his own mother such a big honor [as to be the mistress of Andronikos]?[64] Having taken the monastery here, that of the Commander-in-chief, did he not dig up the graves of the dead and bring out their bones, put some of them on fire at nightfall [and] threw some others to the places that happened to be open areas, only in order that he would throw out the scabs of the graves and sell the iron and would find some gold, as he thought, buried together with those dead people?

Of whose notice do these escape, who ignores them? And [are] these whether of the prudent and pious people, or of the ones who think according to some faith, or of some unintelligent, unholy and brutish people? Also his pupils and teachers are such people. The fact that they are such people escapes the notice of many; none of them indeed escapes the notice of God and of prudent and pious people.

His end was in accordance with his life. The vain one wanted quickly to be anointed with myrtle to get rid of his lie. As he hated that painful life worthy of his choice, he intended to disregard it[65] notably to his own friends, because he died on behalf of the dogma and [he was] enraged, and because he was punished for murder, which he ventured against the monks, who did nothing wrong. For our teacher is God, one who blasphemes was the one [for whom] it has been said: "all they that

[63] Emperor Andronikos IV Palaiologos: Emperor during 1376-9. Eldest son of John V, brother of Manuel II. Joined forces with Savcı Bey, son of Murad II, and conspired against his father. Deposed his father with Genoese and Ottoman help in 1376. Imprisoned later on. See *ODB*, pp. 95-6.

[64] Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium*, p. 102.

[65] His life.

take the sword shall perish with the sword"[66] and "for with the same measure that ye mete withal it shall be measured to you again".[67]

(P. 483) However, for him to come to the end of his life in this way is appropriate. But you, just like I said, helped those who could consider all these through bringing an end for him worthy of his impious life, [and] you met the need of the others, they were not tearing him in pieces despite seeing him offending the faith. You frightened the same ones, so that they could not attack pious hands like those of yours. Yet you made the ones who were able to prevent such matters but still do not prevent until now appear more sensible concerning such matters. For now we will demand back the same vehement zeal from them, and maybe feeling ashamed they will manage the matters concerning Christ; thus they will not be cold avengers of our salvation and of our faith. For until they become such, they arouse the Holy Spirit and they will tear our conscience in pieces.

You punished the hand that audaciously moves against the Creator, [and] you severed the tongue that is prone to enrage God, [and] the ears which do not pay attention to the holy sayings.[68] God also punished [them] by worms before those, whom you could find that accursed and impure corpse by its stench and putrefaction; but before he neither paid attention to the divine justice which was enraged at once, nor was he punished by the human avenge later on. Indeed on the one hand he gave up both lives, on the other hand he appears to have preserved for himself the glory of witnessing and guarding the law of Christ also in his struggle against Christ, and

[66] *Holy Bible*, Matthew, 26:52.

[67] ibid., Luke, 6:38.

[68] Unless Scholarios wrote metaphorically, this statement confirms both Blanchet and Runciman. See *supra* note 57.

treading on the Greek[69] laws in favor of the Greek[70] doctrines. Thus the vain one was not even in line with his own impiety.

Therefore rejoice, just like I said in the beginning, the soldier of Christ and the advocate of his glory. I kiss your mouth, which brought the vote[71] against the stained tongue. I kiss your soul before the tongue, which gathered the defense in the Christian way on behalf of Christ against Christ-defiling. I would have kissed your hands, if you were ruling over the impious by those hands of yours. O blessed hands, which once dragged that evil remnant of men into the sea and happily gave [it] to the bottom of the sea, having imitated the zeal of the best rulers. They say that the one who is dragged and sunk sent the glory up to the first cause.[72] The one who disregarded nothing of impiety and foolery concerning the first cause of everything indeed glorified Him well. And glory be from us to the first cause of everything, because He did not overlook the impious in disgrace and wantonness against it; and that best management and the laws, through which he improved the rational nature extraordinarily, distancing the simplest ones from the faith in him and dragging them to the cliff of polytheism and the dangerous deception of daemons. But (p. 484) here as well the trespassers received the punishment, the forerunners of the evils[73] [fallen] upon him after these [was] like prophetic.

Pardon me, man of God, because I do not praise you worthily of your virtue. Now I might have timely used rhetorical methods and wise words to show you the

[69] Pagan.

[70] ibid.

[71] The judgment.

[72] Not a biblical reference. Probably a proverb. No information on any other usage.

[73] Punishments.

superiority of the perfectness of Christ; but the manner [of this letter] prevents [me]. Hence I send [this letter] to you more solitarily and privately. For we always neglected the external matters[74] and we only see one thing, to serve God and to wail on behalf of the sinful, and to wish for God as much as we were given mercy. And a great love towards you and your greatest deeds persuaded [me] to write these. In addition to these there was another reason as well, [which] I am also telling.

Now ignorance and envy against good people and their good deeds have arisen everywhere. Therefore, it is natural that some people have slandered your most pious deed. And those who accused you through ignorance and inexperience of the good or because of the impiety same as his,[75] I let them aside; but maybe some people felt disgraced about their own indifference concerning faith as they consider your warmness. These people will accuse you forcefully finding some impropriety in your deeds. Therefore in order that your zeal towards Christ does not lose heart upon hearing these, or [in order that] you are not made afraid by an accusation from the things that they judge badly, but rather [in order that] you agree with the opinion of the prudent and pious people.

Indeed there are many here who praise you, as I think; especially because of this I endeavored to write to you. I express my opinion to you, which I have from God. For it is from God and His selected holy saints, even if I become its[76] servant and a letter-bearer to you [and] His useless slave. Let the others talk foolishly. They claim something else either through idiocy or through whatever other reason. And there are some people who are on the verge of not agreeing with that opinion. Do not

[74] Matters external to religion.

[75] Iouvenalios'.

[76] The letter's.

think of them; "they be blind leaders of the blind".[77] Rather pity them, because laymen bring them forward into the palace/empire, and they are not ashamed. For they had to be zealous, those who prevail over the stunning depth and being ill-intentioned against the ones who are awake, some of them also truly embraced the crime of Iouvenalios, even if [they were] not within them. Because of their indifference to the faith they do not care if the Church and the faith in Christ are harmed and humiliated, but they flatter and let those who dishonor so that some good thing happens to them in time.

You, having received and embraced that opinion, should not care about those. If human thought, not divine, exalted you towards that murder of the man; and another purpose, neither the zeal of faith nor the hatred of his impiety and the desire of Christ and the mysteries of faith, against which he[78] was howling, nor the thought of salvation of brothers, (p. 485) in this case you are reproached. You pleased God by removing the impious one from among us, to whom[79] he was acting impiously. Good things happen to you even if you did not have such a purpose. You should owe your words to God, and you should be purified and struck by repentance through some deeds regardless of your original purpose, with which you endeavored the murder of the impious.

For all judges judge according to purpose and the lawgivers stipulate the right matters, and God certainly tracks the hearts of people and sees the purposes without inquiry. I do not talk about whether something good came upon those who worked for the punishment of the impious from his money, which he acquired in an evil

[77] *Holy Bible*, Matthew 15:14.

[78] Iouvenalios.

[79] God.

manner and saved in a worse way. If he was conveniently punished because of his impiety, he met this subsequently. It is natural that he was murdered and [his property] was distributed to some people. This does no harm to the ones to whom it is distributed. However, I advised you to gain no advantage out of such things indeed, but to leave these to other attendants, or to the public treasury not because of your certain misdeed to them. For as it has been said, there is no such thing; but in order that the favor which you did in the name of Christ to the ones who do not know well to judge would not be foul, and in order that the impious people do not benefit from your life even by accident, and in order that you would take the compensation of the freedom of speech on behalf of Christ only from Christ, as no temporary benefit would come to you through it. I do not say these because I heard of someone talking about such a thing, but because I give the canon of truth to you in every manner and I apply it in all likely occasions of this issue, which is correct according to our own judgment, even according to the saints.

If conveniently and originally and just like deceitfully for benefit, either for defense or generally for human passion you brought out that vote.[80] You owe some apology and purification through this purpose. If the zeal of faith conveniently and originally moved your pious soul against his[81] dirty life, just as we had been convinced; for what could you bear ill-will to him, or hope goodness from his end? Or who would claim that he sends out the executioner against him to have him killed, but rather than having any pity for the everyday murder of the others and caring the souls murdered by him?

[80] Judgment.

[81] Iouvenalios'.

Then if, to sum up, on behalf of the glory of Christ as you punished that thrice-cursed spoiler in this way, and as both you and whoever else shared the vote; [let] your very sin [be] upon me and my head,[82] and you [are] not only pure, but also worthy of many rewards. You will be honored distinguishably by your people on earth, and by that pious vote of yours in the heaven. You are truly Manuel, because you did not neglect Emmanuel[83] as you were abused by those who should not offend him. God is with you, who moved you towards his own zeal. Indeed, in those days of ours you proved yourself to be the true Christian good Manuel. (p. 486) We know your piety and zeal as counterbalancing the impiety of Iouvenalios in those cold days, whose impiety was at an utmost level. If we all had taken up your zeal on behalf of faith, only unintelligent and fool men would have stirred up the sacraments of Christ both in the Peloponnese and here.

This is the conclusion I have come to. Consider the testimony of the Spirit, and let everyone who knows and believes correctly consider [it]. To be a heretic is one thing, and to be a non-believer is another; and to be an apostate of the faith [is] also another thing. For the one who does not want to ally himself with Christ at all is a non-believer, just like Jews and Greeks.[84] The one who allies himself with Christ [but] utterly destroys his teachings either obliquely or by falling into fallacy concerning the theology or *oikonomia*[85] is a heretic.[86] For any teaching which

[82] Namely Scholarios accepts the sin unconditionally.

[83] Emmanuel: Meaning 'God with us' and denotes Christ. See Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon,* p. 454; *ODB,* p. 438.

[84] Pagans.

[85] *Oikonomia:* "The theological concept of *oikonomia* was based on the idea of relationship between righteous God and sinful man that required God's dispensations of grace and mercy culminating in the economic sacrifice of the Son. God's *oikonomia* operated through sacraments and revelations."See *ODB*, pp. 1516-7; Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon,* pp. 940-3.

contradicts with the faith either directly or indirectly is heretic concerning either theology or *oikonomia*, and anyone who has that doctrine [is] a heretic. The one who has allied himself with everything of the faith but then departed from it[87] is an apostate, about whom it is said in the Proverbs; "An apostate is a useless man"; for he looks like dead, or accepted faith as he rejected the cause of eternal life in the faithful.

The Church of Christ does not allow the rulers to punish the unfaithful who have never received the faith. The holy apostle,[88] in the Corinthians, says "For what have I to do to judge them also that are without?"[89] Regarding the heretics, he awaits Paul himself as Paul writes to Timothy;[90] "A man that is an heretick after the first and second admonition reject; knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself." Such a thing is accomplished thanks to its great reasonableness and compassion which it has for the return of the ones who are misled.

It[91] admonishes the heretics once and twice, and seeing them resisting again, losing hope of their return, then considering the salvation of the others, and then separating them from the pious taking the decision of excommunication against them, so that nobody who would be close to them would be harmed. Having been

---

[86] If this is taken into consideration as a default definition of heresy, which Scholarios clearly distinguishes from non-belief, then Islam falls into the category of heresy rather than non-belief, since Scholarios previously called Muslims as "heretical followers of Mohammad". See *supra* note 58.

[87] The faith.

[88] Paul. See note 140 in Letter to Demetrios Palaiologos.

[89] The meaning is "How is it up to me to judge the outsiders/non-believers?". See *Holy Bible*, I Corinthians, 5:12.

[90] Editors have corrected Scholarios' error: it should not be Timothy but Titus.

[91] The Church.

separated from the Church and having brought the separation, when they suffer incurably, if they guard the distorted dogmas only to themselves, they stay unaffected of the evils [done] by the secular rulers, just as the unfaithful. If they secretly sow love of strife and contend for their own dogmas, [there would be] a necessity to force the secular rulers, to imprison [them], or to do such things to them so that they would not be able to harm the others. When the apostate of the faith prevails over both the heretics and the outright unfaithful with many in the middle; the blessed Peter tells [them] "For it had been better for them (p. 487) not to have known the way of righteousness".[92]

The Church in no way clearly allows the secular rulers to punish them; if however the rulers do this as they have been motivated by the zeal of faith and achieved security on behalf of the Church, it accepts and rewards them. This is not to prescribe and to praise, but the Church praises many things among the things that happen, and wishes them to be such. It does not impose them clearly in this way. For example, it does not order to kill the ones who adulterated the money, neither if a certain ruler, who arrested a certain person, was asking the Church what he should do to him, nor [the Church] would say that the ruler should kill that man. If the ruler who arrested him would impale or mutilate him according to the laws which are found and operated everywhere, the Church would not have been vexed at the ruler, rather it would have praised the ruler and blame him.[93] On average, how much worse is the corruptor of faith, through which the salvation comes to the souls of people, than [the one who causes] the adulteration of money, through which we are aided in

[92] *Holy Bible*, II Peter, 2:21.

[93] Scholarios is covertly attempting to vindicate the Church in case of any charge of supporting a murderer, who is Manuel Raoul Oises in this case. That is why he passively and cautiously approaches the issue of the murder.

the transient life? In this way the ones who have the imperial sword from God must punish the other wrong-doers to the extremity, just like the apostates of the faith with that much punishment.

Such was that lamentable Iouvenalios; for contrary to the contracts, which he had confessed towards his mother Church [when he was] baptized, which he diverted towards the Greek[94] superstition. Then he talked and wrote against the faith. And then he contrived every evil thing wholeheartedly so that he separated from the faith only the ones who were with and near him. Then he did not use reason and arguments; for he would neither had [them], nor was he such a man; but he was no longer tolerable because of [his] shamelessness, blasphemies, and wantonness against his own head. Who will dare to bring in a charge of murder against the punisher of such a man, only if would he not be the enemy of the salvation of Christians, or a childish person, otherwise a superannuated person? Much rather, how could those who tolerated his being alive until now not be the murderers of Christian souls?

Listen also what the imperial ordinance says: "The ones who were deemed worthy of holy baptism but then Hellenized[95] long time ago are subject to extreme retribution"; and it says: "If Jews would dare to distort Christian sayings, they are subject to a major retribution." Therefore how greater condemnation is to him [who is] after the baptism and the faith not just Hellenizing,[96] but distorting Christian sayings with silly sayings, writings and all ways [and] with violence of madness

[94] Pagan.

[95] Became pagan.

[96] Heathenizing.

against the honorable people? And I skip to declare many people against Manichaeans[97] and Donatists[98] and Hellenists.[99]

(p. 488) Does the Church consider it terrible to guard these laws, or does it exact punishment for the ones who want to guard them? And how would the story go on? First the ones who put those laws would not even have started it, unless they also satisfied the Church. Then how would the Church canonically consider the sinners, the ones who contend together with it[100] and those who both legislate and act upon such things on her behalf? Unless the Church does this by its own hand, that is why the secular rulers were ordered to be extremely just, so that they themselves do the things which were not proper for the Church on behalf of the Church by its own means. And the Emperor swears to advocate the doctrines of the Church, promising in return a reward for he was proclaimed [to be] recognized from there. The eparches who are sent to the cities swear to guard the imperial edicts; [and] the edicts state what we exactly heard. Therefore everything accords with the purpose of the Church through all means, even if in this way it is not said openly by the Church.

So you, the bravest and the most pious of men and rulers, [as you are] convinced by me, be grateful to Christ for what has happened; for many crowns[101] are made for you. Because of this if you detect some other person suffering the same illness as Iouvenalios and bringing away those who were close to him from the true

[97] Manichaeanism: Belief system formulated by its leader, Mani, who lived in the third century AD. After his death, Manichaeanism spreaded to the Roman Empire, also as far as China. Influenced by Zoroastrianism, Judeo-Christianity, and by Gnosticism. See *ODB*, pp. 1285-6.

[98] Donatism: Rigorist sect founded by Donatus in the fourth century AD. Emerged in the African Church, prevailed until the end of Christianity in North Africa. Outlawed and followers persecuted many times. See *ODB*, p. 650.

[99] Pagans. See Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, p. 451.

[100] The Church.

[101] Rewards.

faith [and] dragging them towards the tricks of demons, which God left ineffective by means of Himself and by His best *oikonomia*;[102] whip [him] after second and third warning, imprison [him], then take his tongue out, and then sever his hands. In this way if he [still] remains evil, send [him] to the depth of the sea. After second and third warning, I report [what] the holy apostle says "if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth; and that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil."[103]

This is likely to happen to many people, even if a possible repentance was never possible on the part of Iouvenalios. For his shameless and oppressive madness against piety was indeed a deception and a mental disorder that the demons beset him with; those demons found him hollow and inclined to error both out of ignorance and baseness. Indeed they brought wretched one to the very edge of mania against his own salvation. Therefore many times and by many people warned by the Church, he was to be rejected as [he was] entirely deviated, the most extreme retributions were to be for him by the secular rulers. Even if neither the Church nor the rulers were doing every necessary thing, they belittle, alas, the human souls killed by the sword of the accursed.

However your matter is such; I foresee that all the greater and lesser rulers, if they do not punish these Hellenists,[104] (p. 489) [and] if they tolerate seeing Hellenism[105] advance and do not examine properly how to correct it as soon as

[102] See *supra* note 85.

[103] *Holy Bible*, II Timothy, 2:25.

[104] Heathenizers.

[105] Paganism.

possible; either they attempt to escape notice as they are Greek,[106] or they will be judged by God and people as Greeks.[107] Nobody including the ones here and among us and the ones who sowed its seeds and those who accepted it is aware how big the disaster is. Neither your rulers nor ours gathered themselves together nor cooperated with the Church, rather they summoned the Church for this reason as they cooperated with the Church.

For these tribulations happened because of the ecclesiastical confusion, let them do every necessary thing together with their piety being lost. Everything will get away from us including the holiest, royal, free things as well as laws and customs, and our matters will become upside down not before long. And I, the guiltless of the remaining ones, was often discussed and protested solemnly both privately and publicly concerning these [matters]. Those who pierce Christ or those who take pleasure seeing the ones piercing Christ will see whom they pierce both here and there, for all the tribulations that will happen they will pay the penalty because of the things here.

[106] Pagan.

[107] ibid.

CHAPTER IV

EVALUATION OF SCHOLARIOS' LETTERS IN LIGHT OF FIFTEENTH-CENTURY PELOPONNESIAN POLITICS

In this chapter, Scholarios' six letters sent to some of the fifteenth-century politicians in the Peloponnese -namely Despot Theodore II, Alexios Laskaris Philanthropenos, Despot Demetrios, Despot Constantine, and Manuel Raoul Oises- will be evaluated in a chronological manner in light of fifteenth-century Peloponnesian politics. The years in which the letters were sent to the Peloponnesian politicians are 1430/6-1451/2,[1] which means the post-Byzantine period will not be dwelled on. Major events that Scholarios addresses in the letters will be crosschecked with other contemporary sources, any accordance or discordance with those sources will be stated; and the ones he does not refer to will only be supported with secondary sources. Before focusing our attention at the Peloponnese, it would be convenient to talk about what was happening in the rest of the Byzantine Empire, especially Constantinople, the imperial capital, at the turn of the fifteenth century, since Scholarios did not write only on the Peloponnesian-specific issues.

Byzantine Empire in the First Half of the Fifteenth Century

Byzantine Empire got through hard times in the fourteenth century. It experienced major civil wars, the bubonic plague, and attacks of aggressive foreign powers; all of which devastated the economy and reduced the Empire to a tiny state tributary to the

[1] There are two major sources for the dating of Scholarios' letters: the editors, and Blanchet. That of Blanchet will be taken into account in this study since it is more recent that the former. Only for the date of the letter to the Despot Constantine the editors' dating will be used, because Blanchet does not propose a date for that letter.

Ottomans.[2] At the turn of the fifteenth century, the Byzantine Emperor Manuel II was not in Constantinople but in France, touring European countries to get military and financial aid against the Ottomans; and he left his nephew John VII as the regent emperor. He left Constantinople in 1399 and spent three years in Europe, reaching as far as England, and returning with rather inadequate subsidy and soldiers in 1403. Chronologically speaking, this is the first event Scholarios mentions in six of his abovementioned letters, in the one which he wrote to the Despot Demetrios.[3] Other primary sources that touch upon Manuel II's visit to Europe is Doukas,[4] Sphrantzes,[5] Chalkokondyles,[6] and six of Manuel II's own letters (letters 37-42) sent from Europe to Constantinople and Italy.[7] All these contemporary sources agree on the fact that Manuel II's visit is to obtain aid for his country against the Ottoman threat.

At the time Manuel II departed from Constantinople, the city was being besieged by Bayezid I for almost five years. The Ottoman siege would only be lifted by an external factor, that is, the Mongol attack on the Ottoman soil.[8] The threat the

[2] *OHBS*, p. 291.

[3] Scholarios writes: "For at some time he went to the West because of the need of help [expected] from there to this city of ours." See Letter to Demetrios Palaiologos, p. 45.

[4] Doukas, p. 87.

[5] G. Sphrantzes *The Fall of the Byzantine Empire* trans. by Marios Philippides, The University of Massachusetts Press, Amherst, 1980, p. 21. Hereafter it will be referred to as Sphrantzes.

[6] L. Chalkokondyles, *Demonstrations of Histories* trans. by Nicolaos Nicoloudis, Historical Publications St. D. Basilopoulos, 1996, p. 211. Hereafter it will be referred to as Chalkokondyles.

[7] G.T. Dennis, trans. *The Letters of Manuel Palaeologus*, Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, Washington D.C., 1977, pp. 98-112. Hereafter it will be referred to as Dennis, *The Letters of Manuel Palaeologus*. On Manuel's visit to Europe during 1399-1403, see Doukas, p. 87; Sphrantzes, p. 21; Dennis, *The Letters of Manuel Palaeologus*, p. 100; Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, p. 160.

[8] On Bayezid's siege of Constantinople, see J. Haldon, *Byzantium: A History*, Tempus Publishing, Gloucestershire, 2005, p. 64. Hereafter it will be referred to as Haldon, *Byzantium: A History*; R. Browning, *The Byzantine Empire*, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D.C., 1992, p. 243. Hereafter it will be referred to as Browning, *The Byzantine Empire*; C. Mango, *The Oxford History of Byzantium*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2002, pp. 273-4. Hereafter it will

Mongols posed on the Ottoman Empire was a serious one. A battle took place in Ankara in 1402 between the two powers, in which Bayezid I was defeated and taken captive by the Mongol ruler Timur. The Ottoman defeat is undoubtedly a relief of almost two decades on the part of the Byzantines because of the rivalry among the sons of Bayezid I over the Ottoman throne that lasted a decade.[9] The enthronement of the Byzantine-backed Mehmed I (1413-1421) added another decade of respite which would last until the reign of the next Ottoman Sultan, Murad II (1421-1451). During the Interregnum Period (1402-1413) and the reign of Mehmed I, the Byzantines could regain some of the lost territories and could shake the Ottoman yoke. They were no longer to pay tribute to the Ottomans, and Mount Athos and Thessalonike were restored.

Nevertheless, following the completion of the first year of Murad II's reign, tides turned against the Byzantines. In 1422, Murad II besieged and attacked Constantinople, only to re-experience his grandfather Bayezid I's failure.[10] Immediately after the abandonment of the siege, Manuel II's son, the next emperor John VIII, repeated what his father Manuel II did two decades ago. He went to Europe in 1423 to seek aid against the Ottoman aggression. What he could get was conditional aid: while Venice asked for commercial privileges, Hungary demanded

---

be referred to as *OHB*; Gregory, *A History of Byzantium,* pp. 320-1; C. Diehl, G.B. Ives, trans. *History of the Byzantine Empire*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1925, p. 166. Hereafter it will be referred to as Diehl, *History of the Byzantine Empire*; *OHBS*, p. 292; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, p. 302; Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, pp. 149-183.

[9] On the Battle of Ankara and the Interregnum Period, see Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, p. 315; *OHBS*, p. 292; Gregory, *A History of Byzantium,* p. 322; Browning, *The Byzantine Empire*, p. 244; Haldon, *Byzantium: A History*, p. 65; Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, pp. 32-4.

[10] Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, pp. 332-3; Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, pp. 187-8.

union of the two churches.[11] In the same year Thessalonike was given to the Venetians, who could hold it only until 1430, when it was taken by the Ottoman army together with Ioannina, the capital city of Epiros.[12] The Constantinopolitans had to endure one more attack in 1442, this time with the help of someone from the royal family, that is, Despot Demetrios. This event together with the Council of Ferrara-Florence in 1438-9 and some other events will be examined in detail in the third section with Scholarios' statements.

Even though the Byzantine Empire was shrinking, it was expanding in the Peloponnese until the collapse of the Despotate of the Morea in 1460. In the section below, the Peloponnese's superiority over Constantinople will be clearer, thus it will be an attempt to legitimize Scholarios' wish to go to the Peloponnese .

Despotate of the Morea in the First Half of the Fifteenth Century

While all these were taking place in and around the capital, the Peloponnese was going through a divergent path and displaying a better image than Constantinople in terms of economy, cultural and intellectual life. The Despotate of the Morea was founded after the Fourth Crusade, and controlled by people from the Byzantine imperial family, firstly by the Kantakouzenoi during 1348-1384 and then by the Palaiologoi during 1384-1460. It had occasionally unsteady relations with the Latins, and had often been exposed to the incursions of Ottomans, who supposedly had no intention to conquer it yet. Another threat to the Despotate was local Peloponnesian aristocrats, who sometimes allied with the enemies of the Despotate. Whenever the

[11] Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium,* p. 334; Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins,* p. 272.

[12] *OHBS*, p. 292; Diehl, *History of the Byzantine Empire,* p. 164; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium,* pp. 347-50; Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins,* p. 86.

Byzantines were in dire conditions, the impacts were felt in the peninsula as well, an example of which would be Bayezid I's attacks on the Despotate during the siege of Constantinople in the last years of the fourteenth century.[13]

At the turn of the fifteenth century, the peninsula was under the rule of Theodore I, who ruled there until his death in 1407. His nephew, Theodore II, succeeded him and ruled alone until 1428. Although his rule alone does not seem to be a military and political success story, the intellectual life flourished with his and his Latin wife Cleope Malatesta's patronage. The presence of great intellectuals of the time like Bessarion and Gemistos Plethon shows how attractive the peninsula was for them. If Scholarios' wish to go there is evaluated in this framework, it should be considered as legitimate. From 1428 to 1443, Theodore II was no longer ruling alone, but shared the rule with two of his brothers, Constantine and Thomas. When Theodore II left the Peloponnese for his appanage at Mesembria and its environs, Constantine and Thomas continued ruling there until the coronation of the former as the last Byzantine Emperor in 1449. From 1449 until the fall of the peninsula to the Ottomans in 1460, two rulers shared the rule there, namely Thomas and Demetrios.[14]

It would be wrong to think of the Peloponnesian peninsula as a single and undivided unit under the Byzantine rule. Until 1430, aside from the Despotate of the Morea, there were still some Western principalities that were remnants of the Fourth Crusade: the Franco-Navarrese Principality of Achaia, Archbishopric of Patras, the County of Corinth, and the Duchy of Athens that dominated the peninsula and its

[13] For a discussion of the early years of the Palaiologan rule in the Peloponnese, see Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, pp. 235-258; Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol. I, pp. 119-165.

[14] Gregory, *A History of Byzantium,* p. 326; Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol. I, pp. 119-20.

environs.[15] However, thanks to the wars with the abovementioned powers, the Despotate of the Morea was able to extend its domains, and dominated almost whole peninsula with the exception of some coastal towns such as Modon and Coron.[16]

On the one hand the Western powers were losing power in the peninsula, yet on the other hand the Ottomans were encroaching towards it. The wall at the Isthmus of Corinth, also known as Hexamilion, had been rebuilt by Manuel II during his visit to the Peloponnese in 1414-6 to defend the Peloponnese against any attack that would come from the mainland.[17] However, the Ottomans destroyed it in 1423.[18] It was restored, but then re-demolished by the Ottoman forces in 1446 so that they could penetrate into the Peloponnese and ravage the countryside.[19] The efforts to rebuild it unfortunately proved vain in the aftermath of the pillage of 1446.[20] As mentioned before, after 1449, two despots shared the rule in the Peloponnese: Demetrios and Thomas. To put it simply, Demetrios was a pro-Ottoman, and Thomas was a pro-Western. Be that as it may, the quarrels between the last two despots of the Despotate helped bring the end of their rule there.[21] The Ottomans, upon the calls of the despots over obtaining aid for the dispute between them, got into the peninsula gradually with their army during 1452-60. It was able to survive only seven years

[15] Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée*, vol. I, p. 122.

[16] Nicol, *The Immortal Emperor*, pp. 10-1.

[17] Gregory, *A History of Byzantium,* p. 323; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, p. 328.

[18] Kalligas, H. *Monemvasia: A Byzantine City State*, Routledge, New York, 2010, p. 45. Hereafter it will be referred to as Kalligas, *Monemvasia*; Nicol, *The Immortal Emperor*, p. 8; Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, p. 272.

[19] Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, p. 364; Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins,* p. 286.

[20] Kalligas, *Monemvasia*, p. 48.

[21] Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, pp. 233-4.

longer than Constantinople until its corporation into the Ottoman Empire in 1460. After the demise of the Despotate, Demetrios submitted his portion of the peninsula to the Ottomans and he was awarded with land in Thrace and some northern Aegean islands and he died after 1470, whereas Thomas took refuge in Rome, receiving a pension from the Pope until his death in 1465.[22]

Scholarios' Views on Major Events That Took Place during 1435/6-1450/1

So far, major events that took place in the Byzantine Empire in the first half of the fifteenth century have roughly been covered. The principal aim of this study, however, is incorporation of Scholarios' view on the fifteenth-century Peloponnesian politics, and it will be attempted in this section. The earliest event that he touched upon had been Manuel II's tour to Europe to seek help. Chronologically speaking, the second event Scholarios reflected on is 'the need'. Scholarios wrote about a need in several letters of his, without explicitly stating what it was. The first instance in which Scholarios stated his need is the letters, letter VI and VII, which he sent to the Despot Theodore II. Scholarios asked for donations and good treatment from the Despot Theodore II in letter VI,[23] yet he seemingly did not get what he asked for, as can be understood from letter VII to the same person.[24] In letter VII, he added that he

[22] For the political situation in the Peloponnese between 1449-1460, see Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, pp. 370-98; Kalligas, *Monemvasia*, p. 48; Gregory, *A History of Byzantium*, p. 340; Haldon, *Byzantium: A History*, p. 65; Diehl, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, pp. 174-5; *OHBS*, p. 293; Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée*, vol. I, pp. 241-84; Runciman, *The Fall of Constantinople*, pp. 181-2; Nicol, *The End of the Byzantine Empire*, p. 92; Nicol, *The Immortal Emperor*, pp. 113-4.

[23] "And you, holiest of all despots, to the things you always give to us, maybe somehow you will add good treatment and you will totally relieve us from the winter…" […] "we are worthy of such letters, like [we are worthy] of his donations and orders." See Letter VI to the Despot Theodore II, p. 32.

[24] "For the fact that that not everything has been given to us, who were in need, can be attributed to external factors…" See Letter VII to the Despot Theodore II, p. 33.

was going to have greater hopes against all odds.[25] As for what the donation was or what Scholarios asked for, all sources are silent. Nevertheless, it can be asserted with some reservation that the demand might have been financial. Another letter in which Scholarios asked for donations is the letter to the Despot Constantine, who seems to have been granting lots of donations until then.[26]

As a matter of fact, what Scholarios asked for was indeed to leave Constantinople for the Peloponnese, specifically for the court in Mistra. The only secondary source that addresses this wish of Scholarios is Blanchet's book on Scholarios. Blanchet, by taking the two letters that Scholarios sent to the Despot Theodore II and another letter that Cardinal Bessarion sent to Scholarios into account, puts forward the clearness of Scholarios' wish to go to the Peloponnese. Blanchet believes that Bessarion was playing an intermediary role between the Despot Theodore II and Scholarios.[27] Scholarios' wish of departure might be clear in Bessarion's letter to Scholarios; however, in the letter VI, it is not that evident. In the letter VII, though, it is crystal-clear.[28] Another obvious statement is Theodore II's

[25] "…and how else would I be safer regarding my greater hopes for the future…" Letter VII to the Despot Theodore II, p. 34.

[26] "And you, the holiest of the despots, knew that you should add this great gratitude upon [your] other great gratitudes, making this your own as well, you are never fully satisfied with giving." See Letter to Despot Constantine, p. 41.

[27] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 300.

[28] "since you refrain from openly inviting us back…", "indeed you deemed unworthy to invite me openly…", "For us the opinion about sailing has not changed". See Letter VII to the Despot Theodore II, p. 33. Here 'sailing' refers to sailing to the Peloponnese according to Blanchet. See Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* p. 300.

declination of Scholarios' demand, which Scholarios appears to have taken for granted.[29]

The two letters that were sent to the Despot Theodore II are not the only sources which exhibit Scholarios' wish and attempt to leave Constantinople. The next source is the letter to Alexis Laskaris Philanthropenos,[30] an *archon* in the Peloponnese under the service of the Despot Constantine. According to Blanchet, the letter was written either in the end of 1435 or in the beginning of 1436; and according to the editors in 1438.[31] In any case, what is certain is that it was written before the Council of Ferrara-Florence, inasmuch as Scholarios talked about preparations of departure from Constantinople for somewhere else, an idea that was not favored by the Despot. Although Scholarios did not specify his name, there is no doubt that the Despot was Constantine, since the Despot Theodore II was not in Constantinople at that time.[32] In the letter, Scholarios clearly stated his trust in Alexis in that Alexis would assist him to go to the Peloponnese, yet with some delay. There were two matters that seemed to legitimize the delay: either the Emperor's[33] honor to be about to be bestowed on Scholarios, or the coming synod.[34] All in all, although Scholarios could stay in Constantinople and continue serving the Emperor,[35] he still

[29] "Therefore if the opinion is staying still, and the master does not want to honor us, and we do not deem worthy to stay here, and we do not like his judgment about us; God will mark the end of our journey." See Letter VII to the Despot Theodore II, p. 33.

[30] See note 1 in Letter to Alexios Laskaris; *PLP*, 29753.

[31] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, p. 482.

[32] ibid., p. 307.

[33] John VIII.

[34] The Council of Ferrara-Florence.

[35] Scholarios was the imperial secretary at that time. See Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, p. 309.

wanted to quit everything there. Nevertheless, he had to conform to what Alexis exhorted him to do, namely to stay in Constantinople for some more time.[36]

In the end of the day, Scholarios never had the chance to go to the court in Mistra to serve the Despot Constantine. In the 1430s, he wished to be at "somewhere fitting for his merits", be that land Byzantine or Latin.[37] However, he appeared to have seized an opportunity to leave Constantinople in 1438, the year when he departed from Constantinople for the Council of Ferrara-Florence.[38] The Council aimed at uniting the Catholic and the Orthodox churches, which had been officially separate since the Great Schism in 1054. The Byzantine delegate the members of which would have difficulty in affording the journey would be furnished with papal sustenance. The Council's ecumenicity was assured with the representatives coming from the Patriarchates of Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem. That it is called the Council of Ferrara-Florence stems from the change of its place from the Italian city of Ferrara to Florence, due mostly to pestilence –although none among the Byzantine delegate died because of it- and Pope's concern over Ferrara's military insecurity.[39]

---

[36] "But if I, having hoped in all the rest, should entrust myself to you contrary to expectations - I certainly do not know-, you could make plans beforehand with the help of God both depending on the thread of the letters and until you arrange the definite moment of our departure. ". See Letter to Alexios Laskaris, p. 38.

[37] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, p. 314.

[38] As opposed to his stout anti-Unionist stance after 1445, Scholarios was in favor of the Union and of going to the Council. See Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence*, p. 81.

[39] On the Council of Ferrara-Florence, see Chalkokondyles, pp. 62, 71, 257; Doukas, pp. 179-188; *Syropoulos*; Sphrantzes, pp. 49-50, 52; also see *OHBS*, p. 292; Diehl, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, p. 167; Haldon, *Byzantium: A History*, p. 65; Gregory, *A History of Byzantium*, pp. 328-9; I. Ševčenko, "Intellectual Repercussions of the Council of Florence", *Church History*, vol. XXIV, no. 4 (1955), pp. 291-323; Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium*, p. 71; Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, pp. 209-11; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, pp. 119-53; Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée*, vol. I, pp. 191, 213, 224, 241, 354; ibid., vol. II, pp. 99, 262, 278-9, 280, 286, 292, 323, 326, 327, 331, 334, 343, 350, 359-61, 370-1, 398; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, pp. 249-352; Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence*, pp. 1-14; Nicol, *The Immortal Emperor*, pp. 16-17, 21-2, 28, 33, 36-7, 49-51, 58, 74, 109, Runciman, *The Fall of Constantinople*, pp.

Many issues were discussed in several sessions, including purgatory, the Eucharist, the papal privileges, and maybe most importantly the issue of the *filioque* on which Scholarios devoted almost half of the letter he wrote to the Despot Demetrios to its explanation, clarification, and defense against the Latin doctrine.[40]

The Byzantine delegate, numbering around 700, arrived at Venice in 1438, yet Scholarios arrived there a little later due to his illness.[41] He arrived there with the Despot Demetrios and Gemistos Plethon.[42]The Council lasted for more than one year, yet Scholarios left it without waiting for its completion with the Despot Demetrios and Gemistos Plethon.[43] The fact that he left the Council early might indicate his discontent about it,[44] although he was for the Union of the two churches before and when he had gone there. Scholarios already could not vote, since he was an adviser of the Emperor,[45] in other words he was a layman.[46] Interestingly, he

---

16-19, 45, 49, 53, 63, 70-1, 174, 178; Nicol, *The End of the Byzantine Empire*, pp. 78-81, 83-6, 94, 102.

[40] Letter to Despot Demetrios, pp. 44-83.

[41] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* pp. 253, 316.

[42] "Leaving behind your brother, you went to Venice, and we went together with you, both Gemistos and I…" See Letter to Demetrios Palaiologos, p. 45.

[43] Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence*, p. 85; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios,* pp. 332-3; *Syropoulos*, p. 461. Scholarios and Plethon, even though their intellectual and religious stance were opposite to each other, were good friends. For the polemic between them, see M. Jugie, "La Polémique de Georges Scholarios contre Pléthon", *Byzantion 10* (1935), pp. 517-30. One of the few things they agreed on was the idea of raising native soldiers in the Peloponnese instead of hiring foreign mercenaries. See Letter to the Despot Demetrios, p. 54.

[44] The reason why Scholarios left the Council early is open to debate. Though it may sound hypothetical, it may be alleged that Scholarios might have endeavored to stay in Italy where he wanted to go before; and when he could see no possibility for that, he might have decided to go back, having no right to vote after all.

[45] Gill, p. 82.

[46] ibid., p. 85; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, p. 333.

congratulated Demetrios for not having voted there as well, as if Demetrios, being a layman as well, had had the right to do so.[47]

In the end, the Union was signed in the absence of Scholarios. Only two people from the Byzantine delegate refused to sign it: Markos Eugenikos, the bishop of Ephesos, and Isaias, the metropolitan of Stauropolis.[48] Some of the members of the delegate, either because of their repentance[49] or because of the fear of the stoutly anti-Unionist Constantinopolitans, repudiated their signatures after they got back to Constantinople.[50] One of the most notable members to do so was Sylvestre Syropoulos.[51] Bearing all these people in mind, it should be noted that Scholarios was not alone in his shift. The letter sent to Demetrios was written probably in the end of 1449, long after Scholarios' shift to anti-Unionism and repenting having attended the Council. Scholarios' shift can be seen in his identification of John VIII's efforts unsuccessful[52] and defining the delegate as a mass that had been led by someone else as if its members had no free will.[53] Scholarios went as far as asserting

[47] "…you stood firm; and you were not present in the voting; for you would not give your consent. You departed both with me and with decent Gemistos, even though they, who instigated the dreadful developments, were repeatedly asking you to stay. On the other hand they hardly allowed us to go away from those good deeds; for on the other they could not do anything decently but forcefully." See Letter to the Despot Demetrios Palaiologos, p. 59.

[48] Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence*, p. 10.

[49] Doukas depicts a scene where members of the Byzantine delegate returned to Constantinople and encountered the Constantinopolitans, and expressed their repentance to them. See Doukas, p. 181.

[50] Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence*, p. 11; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, p. 354.

[51] Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence*, p. 12.

[52] "But when you were with that Emperor, as he was dealing with the Italians over the religious issues unsuccessfully, it was necessary for you to go through many cities and many states to meet with many rulers…" See Letter to the Despot Demetrios Palaiologos, p. 44.

[53] "You would not tolerate shameful people for being abroad and also for being sent back along with all the sailing companions just as an ordinary anchor…" See Letter to the Despot Demetrios Palaiologos, p. 45.

that even the Emperor attended the Council against his will, a claim that is not convincing.[54]

Scholarios experienced a radical shift regarding his opinion over the Union, and it is generally believed that he was a pro-Unionist before 1445, namely before the death of his teacher Markos Eugenikos,[55] and took over the flag of anti-Unionism from him after the latter's death.[56] It is known that Scholarios was proficient in Latin, and admired Thomas Aquinas.[57] Part of the options as a place to migrate, Scholarios considered Rome to serve the Catholic Church.[58] Nevertheless, if it is checked with scrutiny, it will be manifest that Scholarios' religious stance towards the Union was not that clear before the Council, for the reason that there is no religious work of Scholarios that predates the Council of Ferrara-Florence from which his point of view regarding religion would be deduced.[59] The period between the accomplishment of the Union and the death of Markos Eugenikos is also debated in terms of Scholarios' stance towards the Union,[60] in which Scholarios, having shifted from a Unionist position to neutrality, engaged in a debate with Markos Eugenikos who wanted him on his side, namely into the anti-Unionist camp.[61]

---

[54] "For the only thing one could charge him with is the ecclesiastical confusion. He participated in it against his will and as far as it was up to him he was getting away [from the ecclesiastical confusion]". See Letter to Manuel Raoul Oises, p. 90.

[55] See note 145 in Letter to the Despot Demetrios Palaiologos.

[56] Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence*, p. 79; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, p. 237; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, p. 360; Runciman, *The Last Byzantine Renaissance*, p. 82.

[57] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, p. 283. For Thomas Aquinas, see *ODB*, p. 146.

[58] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, p. 304.

[59] ibid., p. 282.

[60] Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, pp. 353-382.

[61] Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence*, p. 85.

Scholarios' addressees, as mentioned in the biographies chapter, are largely anti-Unionist. Put it simply, he attempted to gain their support and to help preserve the Orthodoxy. He did his best for that, as can be seen in the way he wrote to the Despot Demetrios on the latter's attack on Constantinople with the help of the Ottomans in 1442.[62] A contemporary historian, Sphrantzes, asserted that Demetrios had gotten disgruntled when the Emperor John VIII, having no son, considered Despot Constantine as his successor. Demetrios apparently had an eye on the throne. That was why he attacked Constantinople having joined with the forces of the Ottoman Sultan Murad II. The attempt was a failure, and it further drove a wedge between the Emperor and Demetrios.[63] Despot Constantine, who was preoccupied with the defense of Lesbos which was attacked by the Ottoman fleet, rushed to Constantinople to assist the Emperor in defending the city.[64] He was later on granted Selymbria as an appanage, probably to keep an eye on the probable malevolent activities of Demetrios in the future, considering Selymbria's proximity to Constantinople.[65] This reflects a covert distrust against Demetrios.

Scholarios, in his letter to the Despot Demetrios, touched upon the siege in 1442. He, in a sense, confirmed Sphrantzes without mentioning Constantine's

---

[62] On the siege in 1442, see *Sprantzes*, p. 53; Chalkokondyles–Darko, vol. II, p. 80 as quoted in Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins,* p. 141; Schreiner, *Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken,* vol. I, Chr. 29/11, 62/10; vol. II, p. 461; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, pp. 370, 420, 466; Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins,* pp. 141, 190, 278; Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium,* p. 71; Runciman, *The Fall of Constantinople*, p. 49; Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol. I, p. 216; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, p. 360; Nicol, *The Immortal Emperor*, p. 19.

[63] Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins,* p. 141.

[64] Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée,* vol. I, p. 216.

[65] Nicol, *The Immortal Emperor*, p. 19.

nomination as John VIII's successor.[66] He only presented Demetrios' contempt against his brother as a pretext, and pointed the demon as the driving force. The loss after the siege was heavy: many people were killed, and the countryside was ravaged.[67] Scholarios in no way approved Demetrios' act, however, he tried to soothe Demetrios,[68] who was imprisoned and put under house arrest in the palace.[69] Demetrios was forgiven later on. According to Scholarios everything went back to normalcy, and the brothers did not intend to take any revenge from each other.[70] This does not seem to reflect the truth, in that a covert distrust dominated the relations between the two brothers, as discussed above. Scholarios, having attempted to soothe Demetrios, went one step further when he mentioned some "unjust judges" who found Demetrios guilty in the aftermath. Demetrios should not worry, though, since they had the habit of accusing everyone.[71] In other sources, there is unfortunately no clue about who those judges were.

---

[66] "You wanted him to abandon that power [and] to drag him against his will." See Letter to the Despot Demetrios Palaiologos, p. 46.

[67] "…the others did nothing wrong but were being enslaved or were killed not in small numbers, and the countryside was ravaged and burned." See ibid.

[68] "However, having been that much praised, you were judged by your own people and by foreigners as the best ruler, and the demon envied you [and] roused an unbearable contempt in you against your brother the Emperor, [and] it urged you to defend yourself." See ibid.

[69] "The one was closed together with others inside the gates…" See ibid.; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, p. 360.

[70] "Those who suffered these and those who shared the suffering hated neither the other one, nor anyone who was the most responsible." See Letter to the Despot Demetrios Palaiologos, p. 46; Runciman, *The Fall of Constantinople*, p. 49.

[71] "…they hated only you, neither were they occupied with what was fair, nor were they considering to investigate and to find out and consequently to loathe the primary cause of the events greatly. That misfortune more than injustice, just as a cloud covering your goodness now still gives freedom of speech against you to the unjust judges. For being able to accuse you of nothing else, they grow out of the misfortune…", "Of the other rulers, or if you want indeed of all the people, they are able to accuse different people for different things; and because of this, they fill their souls with their own disadvantages, for all rulers are fond of accusing, they do not want to inspect the errors in public. Let it be possible to call these misfortunes, even if someone would call these in whatever way, there is almost nobody among the known rulers who has experienced what has happened to you. Not being

According to Scholarios, the alliance between the Ottomans and Demetrios was seemingly broken before the Battle or the Crusade of Varna that took place in 1444 as a reward of the Union given by the Pope to the Byzantines.[72] The Crusaders were composed of different peoples: primarily the Hungarians, the Venetians, the Wallachians, and so forth. They firstly advanced through present day Serbia into Bulgaria, capturing Nis and then Sofia. Murad II did not immediately respond to the invasion of the Crusaders, instead he signed a truce valid for ten years with them. The reason why such a truce was signed was presumably to gain time.[73] In the end, the Ottomans gained the upper hand and annihilated the Crusader army, which might have actually aimed at invading Constantinople if it had become victorious.[74] Scholarios, in his letter to Demetrios, presented an interesting detail that cannot be crosschecked with any other contemporary source. The detail was not commented on in a secondary source, either. He narrated that the Ottomans wanted Demetrios at least to appear to support them if not assisting militarily, and they offered some land to Demetrios for the fear that he might submit his appanage to his brother.[75]

---

able to criticize you for such a thing, they threw stings from there. If you were not praiseworthy to the others, the envious people would rather try to put down your fame." See Letter to the Despot Demetrios Palaiologos, pp. 46-7.

[72] For the Battle of Varna, see *Sphrantzes*, p. 55; Doukas, pp. 184-5; Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, pp. 17, 37, 212, 218-9; Imber, *The Crusade of Varna*, pp. 41-106; Blanchet, pp. 64, 255, 372-3, 378, 381-2, 390, 454, 466, 494; Runciman, *The Fall of Constantinople*, pp. 19, 46, 50, 56, 61; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, pp. 361-3; Nicol, *The Immortal Emperor*, pp. 29, 52; Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée*, vol. I, pp. 231, 237; Gregory, *A History of Byzantium*, p. 329; Haldon, *Byzantium: A History*, p. 65; Diehl, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, pp. 164-5; Nicol, *The End of the Byzantine Empire*, pp. 81-2.

[73] Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, p. 362.

[74] ibid., p. 363.

[75] "For when he learned exactly that the Hungarians were on the way, the barbarian knew that it was necessary on the one hand not to make the Emperor sad, and on the other hand to serve you and to have you ready for use for his defense against the Emperor. If indeed he feels that he has contributed some goodwill and help to the enemies, at the same time he hoped that you would help him a lot when you go to war with him not by addition of power, but by the rumor that even the brother of the Emperor is allied to him. In this way he seemed to be more terrifying to the invaders, and he would

Nevertheless, Scholarios asserted that Demetrios declined the offer of the Sultan and voluntarily submitted to the Emperor.[76]

So far Demetrios' relation with his brothers had been turbulent. As stated before, it is known that Demetrios wished to be the next emperor after John VIII,[77] who supposedly considered Constantine as his successor. Demetrios, however, had not yielded yet; he grabbed another chance with the death of John VIII in 1448, rivaling his brother Constantine. At that time he was closer to Constantinople than Constantine, since his appanage was the Byzantine possessions along the Black Sea coast, around Mesembria;[78] whereas Constantine was in the Peloponnese. According to Scholarios, there were some people who 'provoked' Demetrios to rival Constantine. Those people incited Demetrios by saying that he had no lesser legitimacy than Constantine, since he was with the Emperor on his deathbed and shouldered the burden caused by the Emperor's death; and also he was part of the

---

have used all better and friendlier Christians in Europe for the present matters." See Letter to the Despot Demetrios Palaiologos, p. 48.

[76] "But gathering together all the Christians, you cared for your people rather than your own benefit…", "But in fact you, having joined your brother the Emperor in the status of a suppliant, did not allow even the one who would want to remember bad things; for he respected your virtue and he paid thanks to the one who has chosen the most profitable things for everyone. Then he loved and honored you immediately, I do not know how much and up to the most extreme end he spared what was proper [for you].", "When it was necessary to deliberate in common when we come together, whether you have to depart to Peloponnese or stay enjoying the former rule, you did not hesitate to propose what was indeed beneficial, even if you knew that you were not pleasing, you were ready to do the thing which would have been judged by the others as beneficial." See ibid.

[77] For the coronation of Constantine and installation of Demetrios in the Peloponnese, see Schreiner, *Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, vol I, p. 269; *Sphrantzes*, p. 57-8; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, pp. 368-70; Nicol, *The Immortal Emperor*, pp. 36-8; Mijatovich, *The Last Emperor*, p. 85; Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium*, p. 77; Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, pp. 219, 278; Runciman, *The Fall of Constantinople*, p. 52; Nicol, *The End of the Byzantine Empire*, pp. 83-4; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, pp. 420-1; Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée*, vol. I, pp. 241-2.

[78] Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée*, vol. I, p. 241.

imperial family.[79] Scholarios seemingly agreed with them, but still praised Demetrios' cession of his right.

At last, Demetrios ceded his claim to be emperor, and Constantine was coronated in the Peloponnese and rushed to Constantinople to reign from 1449 until 1453 as the last emperor of the Byzantines, Constantine XI Palaiologos. Present scholarship does not deny the role of the mother of the despots, Helena Dragases, who acted as regent in Constantinople until the arrival of Constantine. Helena was in favor of Constantine's emperorship, and seems to have played an important role in those critical moments.[80] However, Scholarios did not mention her role and depicted the last decision as that of Demetrios', who, according to him, was a perfectly legitimate candidate for the throne but chose what was beneficial in the end of the day to save the Empire. Scholarios expressed his gratitude to Demetrios for ceding his right of emperorship for the rule in the Peloponnese, which he carried on until 1460.[81] According to Sphrantzes, the Constantinopolitans already disfavored Demetrios' emperorship.[82] Scholarios so far had not openly and harshly criticized Demetrios in his long letter; when he did, he did it covertly. His vote was for

[79] "For the Emperor was departing, everybody –except a few-was advising you to take the greater title- which was in your hands; and even when laymen seized it, it [the power] did not change its mind. People were telling you that both [because] your father was an emperor [and] your brother had ruled a short time ago, [and] you were present in his death and carried the burden of the matters. You will have no lesser legitimacy from the people older than you. And with such words, they were obviously provoking you to attempt the greatest things." See Letter to the Despot Demetrios Palaiologos, p. 51.

[80] Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium*, p. 77; Nicol, *The End of the Byzantine Empire*, pp. 83-4; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, pp. 369-370.

[81] "Therefore for ceding the most pleasant title of the emperorship, for which a son quarrelling with the father and a father quarrelling with the son have often perished, and having foreseen the forthcoming dispute and the confusion and the destruction of other things, showing affection for a second time; how much philosophy do these have, and how much are we grateful to you!" See Letter to the Despot Demetrios Palaiologos, p. 52.

[82] Sphrantzes, p. 57.

Constantine, as he implied so in the letter that he sent to Constantine.[83] In the letter to the Despot Demetrios, he narrated signing of an oath over Demetrios' installation in the Peloponnese to share the Despotate with his younger brother Thomas, and the coronation of Constantine. He urged Demetrios to obey the oath,[84] feeling and implying that Demetrios might create trouble there as well.[85]

Scholarios wrote the letter to the Despot Demetrios probably in the end of 1449. The next year would be a turning point in his life: he became a monk and took the name Gennadios.[86] Out of the six letters evaluated in this chapter, only one was written by Scholarios when he was a monk: the one he sent to Manuel Raoul Oises, who was an *archon* in the Peloponnese during 1450-1454.[87] This letter is an invaluable source, in that it provides an account that is not possible to find in other sources, apart from only one.[88] The account is about a man called Iouvenalios, or Juvenal, who was a pagan follower or student of Gemistos Plethon.[89] Iouvenalios

[83] "…and in the present life, your much venerable and much desired presence…" See Letter to the Despot Despot Constantine, p. 42.

[84] "And the oaths about these matters were full of awe upon this, the holiest things claimed for Christians are received by us in word, in writing and in action; these things which should not be violated in any part of the whole land, let alone in such a small dominion, indeed by those who have placed their hope of prosperity truly upon them and by those who care a little about honoring in action, we all respect them in word." See Letter to the Despot Demetrios Palaiologos, p. 55; Sphrantzes, p. 58.

[85] "Or indeed, how shall we be different from beasts, or if we do not take a true oath, or if we do not turn against those who violated things that are sworn upon?" See Letter to Demetrios Palaiologos, p. 56; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, p. 370.

[86] ibid., p. 371; *Syropoulos*, p. 63.

[87] See note 1 in Letter to Manuel Raoul Oises; Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée*, vol. II, pp. 360-1; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, pp. 183; Runciman, *Lost Capital of Byzantium*, p. 102.

[88] F. Miklosich - I. Müller, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi I-VI*, Wien, 1860-1890.

[89] See note 80 in Letter to the Despot Demetrios Palaiologos; H. F. Tozer, "A Byzantine Reformer", *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, vol. 7 (1886), pp. 353-80.

was an interesting figure.[90] Little is known about him, much of which is the several charges put against him, like murder of monks and robbery of monasteries in Mount Athos,[91] distorting Orthodoxy and trying to convert people to a different sort of paganism[92] wherever he went,[93] claiming to be the bastard son of Emperor Andronikos, Manuel II's eldest brother, and so forth. His religious views are rather pejoratively described as being variegated.[94] Scholarios' less credible and weirder accusations against him are Iouvenalios' saving money to be emperor which can be related to his claim of being the son of Andronikos IV, and his exhumation of some dead people's bones to find gold and silver in their tombs.[95]

Iouvenalios firstly had been in Constantinople, from where he was banished to Ainos, which Scholarios claims that his banishment was requested from John VIII

[90] *Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios,* vol. IV, p. XXVIII.

[91] "Did he not become the chief of robbers in the Holy Mountain, intending to do the most evil things there against the monks? Did he not become the slayer of the monks who did nothing wrong, because of which he was arrested in the end by the people of the Holy Mountain and was held fast in bonds for some time, then being released by the ones who treated [him] humanely?" See Letter to Manuel Raoul Oises, p. 96.

[92] "How the wretched covertly united Hellenism by calling the Greek *polyarchy* and polytheism as a system of one principle and putting forward other such monstrous things!" See ibid., p. 86.

[93] "Or you do not see the advancing evil given that that abominable and satanic Iouvenalios is allowed to live in the Christian cities and to corrupt the ones who are near him and also some others." See ibid., p. 85.

[94] "First he was a Christian, then he became a Jew, then he celebrated together with the heretic followers of Mohammad, then he was acting offhand, then he betrayed the Christians, this was the most remarkable of [his] evils and the peak of them." See ibid., p. 96; Zissis, *Γεννάδιος Β' Σχολάριος,* p. 362.

[95] "For the demons he cured prophesized to him that he would be emperor…", "…did he not dig up the graves of the dead and bring out their bones, put some of them on fire at nightfall [and] threw some others to the places that happened to be open areas, only in order that he would throw out the scabs of the graves and sell the iron and would find some gold, as he thought, buried together with those dead people?" See Letter to Manuel Raoul Oises, pp. 96-7.

by himself together with two bishops.[96] Having been driven out of Ainos too, Iouvenalios had been to Albania and Apulia, and ended up to be in the Peloponnese. There he offended Manuel Raoul in such a way that he had to face a terrible death inflicted upon him by the *archon*. Some of his limbs were removed including his tongue, and then he was cast into the sea. Scholarios thanked a lot Manuel Raoul for this execution,[97] and did his best to exculpate him.[98] Scholarios' implication of ecclesiastical support for Manuel Raoul over the execution of Iouvenalios might evoke inquisition practices that prevailed in certain parts of Europe in the fifteenth century.

The emergence of people like Iouvenalios drove Scholarios to pessimism over the future of the Empire and Orthodoxy. He expressed his concern over this in his letters to Demetrios and Manuel Raoul, the latter having been written a few years later than the former. Scholarios told Demetrios the gravity of the situation in Constantinople,[99] and told Manuel Raoul that they were having their last days.[100] In

[96] "As Kyr Makarios of Coron and Dionysius of Sardis learned this, having me as their companion, they went to the Emperor. They have the accursed driven out of the city. I actually advised them to imprison him." See Letter to Manuel Raoul Oises, p. 89.

[97] "Therefore rejoice, the most pious Manuel, in that you fulfilled the deed of service to God lawfully. Rejoice in that you made the sword given to you by God shine against those who persecuted Christ. I would like you and all the rulers ordained by God to peoples or cities to kill the sinners of the earth until morning, [and] to annihilate those who work for lawlessness in the cities of the Lord." See ibid., p. 84; "And you, the most pious Manuel, cheered us through what you have done to the impious Iouvenalios; and we, who were suffering, could breathe in the midst of what happened thanks to the fame of those greatest deeds of yours." See ibid., p. 95.

[98] "Now ignorance and envy against good people and their good deeds have arisen everywhere. Therefore, it is natural that some people have slandered your most pious deed. And those who accused you through ignorance and inexperience of the good or because of the impiety same as his, I let them aside; but maybe some people felt disgraced about their own indifference concerning faith as they consider your warmness. These people will accuse you forcefully finding some impropriety in your deeds. Therefore in order that your zeal towards Christ does not lose heart upon hearing these, or [in order that] you are not made afraid by an accusation from the things that they judge badly, but rather [in order that] you agree with the opinion of the prudent and pious people. " See ibid., p. 100.

[99] "and you would deliberate in the best way to yourself, having deliberated on the most beneficial matters for the unfortunate remnants of our people, to be blown apart indeed by a light breeze and to be thrown into the mouth of the enemy" See Letter to Demetrios Palaiologos, p. 73.

the same letter, because Scholarios thought that people were indifferent to their faith and because there was corruption everywhere in their lives, he quitted his post in the palace and retired to a monastery; closing the door of his chamber.[101] Doukas believes that Scholarios put a notice on the door of his chamber, castigating the Union and accusing the Unionists.[102] One question may be posed regarding the importance of the Union as a matter of debate for the contemporary intellectuals, who in one way or another engaged in it. The answer might be, as discussed before, the complexity nature of the debate since it was so much associated with the very future of the state.

Lastly, although where Scholarios exactly was during the capture of Constantinople in 1453 is unknown, it is known that he was taken captive and brought to Adrianople, from where he was brought in front of Mehmed II to be made the first Patriarch of Constantinople under Ottoman rule with the name Gennadios II. During his patriarchate he opposed the Union expectedly, thereby rendering its revival impossible.

---

[100] "From here it is obvious that our end is at hand." See Letter to Manuel Raoul Oises, p. 93.

[101] "Why did I give up spending time in the palace? Why am I busy with my own matters being confined by borders? Except for a few people to whom it is possible to hide coming with piety, why do I not open the door of my chamber to the others? Why have I kept silent? Because the time is evil as the prophecy goes, and the one who understands will keep silent. Because formerly I was listened as I was talking, now I am talking to the ones who do not listen. Because we the people became wolves or leopards to each other as we slander, malign, deceive, fabricate tales and kill, if we hoped to be unnoticed. Where are these from? [It is] from indifference towards faith. Where is this [indifference] from? [It is] from being silent about the word of God, from the worst hunger of all hungers." See ibid., pp. 92-3.

[102] Doukas, p. 204.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

George-Gennadios Scholarios was one of the most influential intellectual and religious figures who lived in a transition period from the Byzantine Empire to the Ottoman Empire in the fifteenth century. When he was a layman, he served the Byzantine state as general judge, and general secretary of the emperor, and official sermonist who preached in the palace. Being a stout anti-Unionist after his teacher Markos Eugenikos, due very much to Emperor Constantine XI's Unionist policies which he did not favor, he retreated to a monastery and became a monk in 1450. From there he was captured by a lord during the fall of Constantinople to the Ottomans. Later on he was released and made patriarch by the Ottoman Sultan Mehmed II. He served as patriarch during 1454-6. In 1456, he resigned and retreated to a monastery again, and died as a monk in Serres, in present-day Greece.

Scholarios was a very much debated figure. Whoever studies him cannot escape dealing with certain questions such as his stance concerning the Union of the Catholic and the Orthodox churches which had been separate since the Great Schism that took place in 1054, how and why he shifted from pro-Unionism to anti-Unionism, and whether his patriarchate was a forced one or not. To be able to answer such questions, one has to examine his works thoroughly which are all edited in eight volumes and have not been fully translated yet.

This study, however, does not deal with such questions. Its primary target is a small part of the eight volumes, namely six of his letters. Three criteria have been applied in the selection of the letters: They must be sent 1. To the ruling elite, 2. To those who resided in the Peloponnese, 3. Before 1453. Chronologically speaking, the

addressees of the letters are Despot Theodore II, Peloponnesian governor Alexios Laskaris Philanthropenos, Despot Constantine, Despot Demetrios, and a ruler called Manuel Raoul Oises. The main aim of this thesis is to translate, comment on, and evaluate the findings of the abovementioned letters in light of the fifteenth-century Peloponnesian politics, thereby to integrate the findings to the historiography.

Although Scholarios sometimes gives the account of specific incidents like the execution of a neo-pagan called Iouvenalios by Manuel Raoul Oises in his letter to the latter, there are some patterns that he repeats. One is his zeal for cooperating with the anti-Unionists by various means and preserving Orthodoxy; and the other is his wish to leave his hometown Constantinople for another place, such as the Peloponnese or Italy. This study reveals that Scholarios' wish to leave Constantinople not only implies unfavorable conditions in the City, but also the intellectual opportunities that the Peloponnese offers to scholars. This study propounds novelties to the existing historiography, too. Some of them are the dating of Scholarios' letter to the Despot Constantine, finding the counterparts of some of the proverbs that Scholarios mentions, an imperial ordinance that he states, Scholarios' definition of heresy, apostasy and disbelief in the letter to Manuel Raoul Oises, uncertainty of Scholarios' so-called Unionist stance before the Council of Ferrara-Florence, Ottomans' offer of land to the Despot Demetrios on condition that he helps them during the Battle of Varna in 1444. All these are new additions to the historiography.

This study, however, has certain drawbacks due to the criteria that are applied when selecting the letters. Those criteria made me unable to study some texts of Scholarios which are of almost equal importance with the selected ones. Therefore, it might be improved with the inclusion of those texts. Due to my language capacity, I

could only read the Ancient Greek, Modern Greek, English, French, and German works. Another action that may improve this study is to study the works in Slavic languages and Ottoman sources as well. Another attempt to improve this study would be to examine Scholarios' relations with contemporary intellectuals by working on the letters being circulated among them.

Bearing all these in mind, Scholarios is a very important and influential figure, yet his works, especially his letters, are understudied. Because of this reason, translating his works thus making them accessible to the historians is of utmost importance. Hopefully in the future, other historians will undertake such translation works and contribute to the fifteenth-century Peloponnesian historiography, which still lags behind compared to the literature on Constantinople that cover the same period.

APPENDIX

SCHOLARIOS' SIX LETTERS TO DESPOT THEODORE II, ALEXIOS LASKARIS, DESPOT CONSTANTINE, DESPOT DEMETRIOS, AND MANUEL RAOUL OISES

The letters presented below are found in L. Petit, X.A. Sideridès, M. Jugie, ed. *Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, 8 vols., Maison de la Bonne Presse, Paris, 1928-1936.

Letter VI to the Despot Theodore, vol. IV, pp. 417-418.

Letter VII to the same, vol. IV, pp. 418-419.

Letter to Alexios Laskaris, vol. IV, pp. 435-436.

Letter to the Despot Constantine, vol. IV, pp.428-430.

Letter to the Despot Demetrios, vol. III, pp. 117-136.

Letter to Manuel Raoul Oises, vol. IV, pp. 476-489.

VI.

Au despote Théodore (1436?).*

Τῷ δεσπότῃ κυρῷ Θεοδώρῳ. Paris. 1932

Ἦκεν ὁ μέγας στρατοπεδάρχης, ὁ πάντα καλός, οὗ τὸ ἐπίσημον ἡ πρὸς τὸν πέμψαντα πίστις, καὶ τὰ τῆς σῆς βασιλείας ἡμῖν ἐνεχείρισε γράμματα. Τούτοις ἀπεδώκαμεν πάντα ἐκεῖνα, ὅσα καὶ τῷ πεπομφότι ταῦτα ὠφείλετο, τὸ προσκυνῆσαι, τὸ κατασπάσασθαι καθάπερ ἐκείνου χεῖρας καὶ πόδας, τὸ μηδένα κόρον αὐτῶν λαβεῖν ἐπιόντας, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ τῆς ἐκείνου θέας ἐμέλλομεν ἕξειν, τὸ πάντων ἀνθρώπων εὐδαιμονέστατοι γενέσθαι νομίζειν, εἰ τοιούτων ἀξιοίμεθα γραμμάτων, ὥσπερ ποτὲ δωρεῶν ἐκείνου καὶ προσταγμάτων. Ἓν μόνον οὐ προσεθήκαμεν, ὅτι μὴ πάντα καταλιπόντες πρὸς τὴν ἐκείνων ἥκομεν αὐτίκα πηγήν, ἧς ἀπαρύσασθαι ταὐτόν ἐστι καὶ μετασχεῖν ἀμβροσίας. Ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μὲν ἔστι μὲν εἰπεῖν, ὅθεν ἂν καὶ βουλομένοις ἡμῖν ἐφαίνετο δυσχερές· δεδόσθω δ' ὅμως τῷ καιρῷ καὶ τῇ τύχῃ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐνταῦθα τῶν κωλυμάτων. Τέως δ' οὖν ὑπὸ τῶν σῶν γραμμάτων ἀναπεπνεύκαμεν, καὶ διπλοῦν ἡμῖν ἔαρ ἦν μετὰ διπλοῦν τὸν χειμῶνα. Ἡμῖν μὲν γὰρ τὰ ἐνταῦθα πάντα χειμών, οὔτ' ἐξιέναι πρόχειρον ὄν, οὔτε μένειν ἀνεχομένοις· τὰ δ' ἦλθεν, ἔαρ ἐν ἔαρι, καὶ λέλυκεν ἡμῖν, εἰ καὶ μὴ παντάπασι, τὸν χειμῶνα, τῶν μὲν προτέρων ἀναμνησθεῖσι καλῶν, ἐλπίσασι δὲ τὰ δεύτερα· καὶ ἄλλως δέ, ἐδείκνυ μὲν ὑγιαίνοντα τὸν δεσπότην, πρᾶγμα πάντων ἡμῖν ποθεινότατον, καὶ οὐ πάλαι τινὰ περιεμένομεν εὐεργέτην, ἀπὸ γῆς ἐκ θαλάττης· εἰ δέ τις καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἐκείνων ἀποβλέψειεν ὕλην, βαβαὶ τῶν ἰύγγων, ὑφ' ὧν καὶ λίθος ἂν ἐκινήθη· τὸ γὰρ φιλεῖν, τὸ τῶν οἰκείων τιθέναι, τὸ γράμματα τὰ μὲν πέμποντα καὶ πέμψειν ἀεί, τὰ δ' ἥκοντα δέξεσθαι μεθ' ἡδονῆς, τίνα μὲν οὐκ ἂν ἐξέβαλε λύπην, τίνα δ' οὐκ ἂν ἀντεισήγαγεν ἡδονήν, ἢ μᾶλλον τίνος, εἰ μὴ τῆς σῆς ἄν τις θείη ταῦτα ψυχῆς, ἧς, εἴπερ ἄλλο τι, καὶ τὸ πρὸς ἅπαντας εὐμενές, ὥσπερ ἄλλων ἄλλα γνωρίσματα. Τούτοις, τοσούτοις οὖσι, τί ἂν ἀνταποδοίημεν ἄξιον; εὔνοιαν, πίστιν; Καὶ μὴν ταῦτ' ὀφείλεταί σοι καὶ σιωπῶντι· Ἀλλὰ γράμματα; Καὶ τίς εὐνοῶν οὕτως ὡς καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἂν αὐτὴν θελῆσαι προέσθαι, ὡς πολλοῦ τινος φείσεται τῶν γραμμάτων· Ἀλλ' εὐχάς; Καὶ μὴν καὶ αὗταί σοι πολλαχόθεν ὀφείλονται ὡς

* P = Parisinus 1932, f. 59-60ᵛ, autographe de Scholarios;
A = Laurentianus Pl. 74, cod. 13, f. 278ᵛ-280, du XVᵉ s.;
B = Édition de S. Lambros, op. cit., p. 290-291, d'après A.

9-10 *εὐδαιμονέστατον εἶναι* AB 12 *ἀπαρρύσασθαι* PAB 21 *οὐ* B 25 *πέμψειεν* B 26 *ἄν* avant *ἀντεισήγαγεν* om B 29 *καὶ* après *μὴν* add B 31 *ἄν* om AB

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

δεσπότῃ, ὡς ἀρίστῳ, ὡς κοινῷ τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀγαθῷ, ὡς δόξῃ τοῦ γένους· ὥστ', εἰ μηδὲν ἄλλο, ταῦτα γοῦν ἔπεισεν ἂν ἡμᾶς εὔχεσθαί σοι παρὰ Θεοῦ τἀγαθά. Ἀλλ' ἐπαίνους; Ἀλλὰ καὶ οὗτοι οὐ μᾶλλον γένοιντ' ἄν σοι παρὰ φιλούντων ἢ τἀληθῆ μὴ βουλομένων ἀρνεῖσθαι· δῶρον γάρ σοι παρὰ πάντων ἥκουσιν οὗτοι κοινόν. Οὐ μὴν ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ μηδενὶ τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν ἀμείψασθαί σου τὰς χάριτας ἔστιν ἀξίως, οὕτω πολλαὶ καὶ μεγάλαι καὶ οἷαι γένοιντ' ἂν παρὰ τηλικούτου, τῆς ἐξ ἔθους μέντοι καὶ δυνατῆς εἰσφορᾶς οὐδὲν καθυφήσομεν, εὐνοίας, ἐπαίνων, γραμμάτων, εὐχῶν. Καὶ σὺ δέ, θειότατε δεσποτῶν, οἷς ἀεὶ δίδως ἡμῖν, ἴσως ποτὲ καὶ τὸ χρῆσθαι προσθήσεις καὶ τὸν χειμῶνα λύσεις παντάπασιν, εἰ μή τι βέλτιον. Ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ὁ Θεὸς ἀποφήναιτο.

VII.

Au même (avant le départ pour l'Italie).*

Paris. 1932 f. 59

Τῷ αὐτῷ.

Χάρις πολλή σοι, θειότατε δεσποτῶν, τοῖς ἡμῶν ἀποκριναμένῳ γράμμασιν, εἰ καὶ μὴ παντάπασιν οἷα προσεδοκῶμεν ἡμεῖς· τὸ γὰρ μὴ πάντα χαρίσασθαι δεομένοις ἡμῖν εἰς ἕν τι τῶν ἔξωθεν ἔστιν ἀνενεγκεῖν· καὶ ἢ τὴν στενότητα τῶν αὐτόθι προσόδων, ἢ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αἰτιάσασθαι ταῦτ' ἀξιοῦντα, ἢ τὴν ἡμῶν αὐτῶν ἀχρηστίαν, ὑφ' ἧς ἐχρῆν σε καὶ προθυμούμενον εἴργεσθαι, ἢ πάντα ἐκεῖνα ὁμοῦ· εἰκὸς γὰρ ἅπαντα συνδραμεῖν. Τὸ δὲ γραμμάτων ἀξιῶσαι καὶ τούτοις εὐφρᾶναι θελῆσαι, ὃν λυπεῖν ᾧου τοῦ φανερῶς μετακαλεῖσθαι φειδόμενος, τῆς σῆς ὄντως ἔργον ψυχῆς τῆς πάντας μὲν εἰδυίας φιλεῖν καὶ πᾶσι τἀγαθὰ βουλομένης, ἐμοὶ δ' ὅ τι ἂν εἴποι τις τῶν ἀγαθῶν πεφηνυίας, καί τοι γε καλεῖν μὲν φανερῶς ἀπηξίωσας,
f. 59v τοῦτο κρίνας | ἄριστον εἶναι· ἐκάλεις δέ, οἷς ἀπολογεῖσθαι καὶ προστιθέναι τὰς τοῦ μὴ καλεῖν αἰτίας ἐφρόντιζες, οὐ μόνον ὅτι ταῦτα ἐδείκνυέ σε φιλοῦντα, τοιούτῳ δὲ καὶ μὴ καλοῦντι πᾶς ἄν τις προσέλθοι θαρρῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅτι, τῶν κωλυμάτων ἀφαιρεθέντων, καλέσειν τε ἔλεγες καὶ αὐτόθεν ἥκοντι τὰ τοῦ καλοῦντος ἀτεχνῶς ἐπιδείξασθαι, εἰ καὶ μὴ ταῦτα διαρρήδην ἐπέραινες. Σιγῶ δ' ἑκὼν ὅ μοι τοῦ καλέσαι φανερώτερον ἦν, ὥστε μαθεῖν ὡς εἶχες πρός με τῇ γνώμῃ· ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῦ καλέσαι καὶ δέξασθαι καὶ ὧν ἐχρῆν ἀξιῶσαι τὸ γράψαι περὶ τοιούτων οὐδὲν ἐλάττω παρέσχε τὴν ἡδονήν. Εἴτε γὰρ ἐχρῆν ἐκ τῶν γραμμάτων λαβόντα τι τῶν

* Mêmes manuscrits que pour la lettre précédente. P = f. 59-59v; A = f. 279-280; B = p. 291-292.

15 *σοι πολλὴ* AB *ἀποκρινομένῳ* AB 21-22 *ᾧοντ' οὐ* B 22 *ἔργον ὄντως* AB 27 *τοσούτῳ* B 28 *ἀφαιραιθέντων* P

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

καθ' ἡδονὴν ἀπαλλάξαι, τίνος οὐχ ἥδιον τὸ δεσπότην ἀγαθὸν φιλοῦντα λαβεῖν, πρός τε τὰς περὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος ἀμείνους ἐλπίδας πῶς ἂν ἄλλως ἀσφαλέστερον εἶχον, τίς δ' ἂν ἦν ἀξιοχρεώτερος ἐγγυητὴς τῶν θαυμαστῶν ἐκείνων γραμμάτων; Χάρις σοι τοίνυν πολλή, θειότατε δέσποτα, ὧν τ' ἔχειν καὶ ὧν ἐλπίζειν ἡμῖν ἐδεδώκεις, μᾶλλον δὲ χάρις τῷ πρὸς ταῦτά σε κινοῦντι Θεῷ καὶ ὃς ἀποφαίνει σε τοῖς πειρωμένοις, οἷον ἂν αὐτοὶ βουληθεῖεν, ὡς τά γε ἡμέτερα παντάπασι χείρω ἢ ὥστε τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἑνί τινι σπουδασθῆναι. Καὶ τὴν σὴν δὲ θείαν ψυχὴν οὐδενὶ τούτων πρὸς εὔνοιαν ἐπήραμεν ἄν, μὴ χρωμένην τῷ τρόπῳ, ἀλλὰ ζητοῦσαν ὅθεν ἂν κινηθείη. Εἶης τοίνυν ἀεὶ τοιοῦτος, μᾶλλον δ' εἶης ἀεί· οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ὅπως ὢν οὐκ ἔσῃ τοιοῦτος, ἵνα μὴ λέγω βελτίων, εἰ δεῖ τοῦτο εἰπεῖν.

Ἡμῖν δὲ τὸ περὶ τοῦ πλεῖν οὐ κεκίνηται δόγμα, ἴσως ἂν κινηθέν, εἰ μένοντες τῆς ἀμείνονος ἐπειρώμεθα τύχης. Τί γὰρ ἔδει γῆν ἀμείβοντας πονεῖν, ἐξὸν οἴκοι καθημένους εὐδαιμονεῖν; Μενούσης τοίνυν ἀκινήτου τῆς ψήφου, καὶ τοῦ μὲν ἄρχοντος οὐκ ἀξιοῦντος τιμᾶν, ἡμῶν δὲ μένειν ἀπαξιούντων καὶ μὴ τὴν ἐκείνου περὶ ἡμᾶς κρίσιν στεργόντων, τὸ μὲν τῆς ὁδοῦ πέρας ὁριεῖται Θεός. Ἀλλ' ἡμῖν ἡ προθυμία πρὸς τὸν ποθούμενον ἔσται, ὑφ' οὗ καὶ μεθ' ἡδονῆς ἂν ὀφθῆναι καὶ πάντα παθεῖν ἃ ταῖς ἡμῶν ἐλπίσιν ἔσται συμβαίνοντα, εἴπερ ἄλλο τι τῶν πάντων ἰσχυρισαίμεθα ἄν, οὐ νῦν πρῶτον, ἀλλὰ πάλαι μαθόντες.

VIII.

Au prêtre Bessarion (début de 1436?).*

Τῷ παπᾷ κυρῷ Βησσαρίωνι. Paris. 1932 f. 59v

Τοὺς μὲν ἐκ Πελοποννήσου πρέσβεις ἐχρῆν περάναντας ἐφ' οἷς ἐπέμποντο προῦργου, ὀψὲ καὶ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἥκειν, ὁδοῦ πάρεργον τὰ τῇδε ποιησαμένους. Τῷ δ' ἀπὸ Ῥώμης ἐπανήκοντι φίλῳ σπεύδειν ἐδόκει, τοῦ μένειν οὐκ ἔχοντι πρόφασιν. Ἦλθε τοίνυν πολὺ πρὸ ἐκείνων καὶ τὰ σὰ γράμματα, εἴτ' ἐκ προνοίας εἴθ' ὅπως ποτὲ δίχα διαιρεθέντα, τὰ μὲν ἦλθε τὰ πλείω, τὰ δ' ἔμελλε. Καὶ ἦν αὐτὸς ἐν τοῖς ληψομένοις, οὐ τοῖς ἤδη λαβοῦσι· καίτοι πολλῷ πλέον τῶν ἄλλων ἐπόθουν τε ταῦτα καὶ δίκαιος ἡγούμην εἶναι λαβεῖν. Εἰ μὲν οὖν ἃ κατεῖχε δοὺς ὁ ἀνήρ, περὶ τῶν ἄλλων εἶχέ τι λέγειν, μεμψάμενος ἴσως τὴν τύχην, ἤ με κατόπιν τίθησι πανταχοῦ, ὡς αὐτίκα ληψόμενος οὐκ ἂν ἐνόμιζον ὑφ' ὑμῶν ἠδικῆσθαι. Τοῦ δὲ μηδὲν πλέον εἰδότος ἠνιώμην καθήμενος καὶ τοὺς παρόντας ᾐσχυνόμην, ἀτιμασθεὶς ὑπ' ἀνδρὸς ὃν οὐδεὶς ἂν εἶπε προδεδωκέναι τὰ δίκαια καὶ σιγᾶν

* Mêmes manuscrits: P = f. 59v-60v; A = f. 280-281v; B = p. 293-296.

24 *Πελοποννήσου* B 25-26 *ποιησομένους* AB 35 *εἶπε*: *εἶχε* B

27*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

τροφῆς ἔσθ' ὅτε καὶ ὕπνου κατολιγωρεῖν προαιρούμενον. Δεῖ γὰρ πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις καὶ ἥπιον εἶναι τὸν δικαστὴν καὶ ἱλαρότητι τὴν ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας αὐστηρίαν κιρνῶντα, οὕτω τάττειν τὰ δίκαια, καὶ τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν νόμων πικρίας, ἧς ἀνάγκη πειρᾶσθαι τοὺς ὑπ' αὐτῷ ἐξεταζομένους, ταῖς ἐκ λόγων ἐπῳδαῖς ἀφαιρεῖν· μέγα δέ, εἴ τις δύναιτο τὰς ἐκ τῶν νόμων ποινὰς εὐχαρίστως πείθειν ὑφίστασθαι.

Ὑπὸ τούτων τοίνυν καὶ πολλῶν ἑτέρων τοιούτων, ἅπερ ἧττον ἐνοχλοῦντα σιγῶ, συγγνοίης ἂν οὐκ ἀποδιδόντι τὰ δίκαια. Ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸν Πέτρον πολλῶν εἵνεκα πεφιληκὼς πρότερον, σοῦ χάριν πολύ τι τῷ φίλτρῳ προστίθημι νῦν· βοηθεῖν δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ πάνυ βουλόμενος εἴργομαι. Ὁ δέ γε δίκαιος ὤν, ὧν μὲν αὐτῷ συμπράττειν δυνάμεθα ὡς τοῦ παντὸς ἀπολαύων χάριτας οἶδεν, ἐν οἷς δὲ ἀτυχεῖ, ἀλγεῖ μὲν αὐτός, ἡμῖν δ' ὡς παρὰ γνώμην ἀφισταμένοις ἥκιστα μέμφεται. Θαυμάσεις δέ, οἶδ' ὅτι | τὸν ἄνδρα, οὔτε f. 6v χρόνῳ καὶ χωρὶς τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν διδασκάλων πάνυ ῥοπῆς ἀπὸ βαρβάρου καθαρῶς δεχόμενος Ἕλληνα· φαίης ἂν αὐτὸν τῶν Ἰσοκράτους διατριβῶν μεστὸν ἐπανήκειν.

XVII.

A Alexis Lascaris (1438).*

Ἀλεξίῳ τῷ Λάσκαρι. Laur. 74, 13 f. 289

Πολλῶν ὑπὲρ τῆς προτέρας εὐνοίας χαρίτων ὀφειλέτης σοι γεγονώς, νῦν ὑπὲρ ἧς εἰσήνεγκας γνώμης καὶ ἧς ἡμᾶς φροντίδος ἠξίωκας οὐδ' ἔχω χάριν ἀξίαν εἰδέναι. Τὸ γὰρ ἐξετάσαι μὲν καὶ μαθεῖν ὡς ἄρα παρεσκευάσμεθα πρὸς τὸν πλοῦν, γράψαι δὲ τὰ δοκοῦντα καὶ μέμψασθαι μὲν τὴν ἀκαιρίαν τοῦ πράγματος, ἐλπίσι δέ τισι καὶ πολλάκις ἄλλοτε δεδομέναις τὴν πρὸς τὸν πλοῦν ὁρμὴν ἐπισχεῖν, πῶς οὐ φιλοῦντος ἄντικρυς κἀν τοῖς γνησίοις ἡμᾶς καὶ τὰ ἡμέτερα τάττοντος καὶ πᾶσαν παρελαύνειν χάριν ἐθέλοντος, ἣν ἄν τις εἰσφέρειν πειρῷτο; Ἐγὼ μέν σε καὶ πάλαι μὲν ᾔδειν φιλοῦντα, καὶ τοῖς ἠπατῆσθαί με φάσκουσιν (πολλοὶ δ' οἱ τοῦτο φάσκοντες ἦσαν) ἀντέλεγον, ἱκανὰς ἀποδείξεις τοῦ φιλεῖσθαι λέγων λαβεῖν καὶ κρείττους ὑπονοίας ἁπάσης. Ἀλλὰ νῦν, εἴπερ ποτέ, σὲ καὶ φιλεῖν καὶ προνοεῖν τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐπείσθην. Τὸν γὰρ δεσπότην, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἰδὼν τῇ τῆς ἐμῆς ἀποδημίας δυσχεράναντα φήμῃ καὶ μικροψυχίαν τὸ πρᾶγμα καλέσαντα, εἰ, τοσοῦτον χρόνον ταῖς εἰς αὐτὸν συζήσας ἐλπίσιν καὶ τοῦ μένειν ἐν τῇ πατρίδι δι' αὐτὸν ἀνασχόμενος, νῦν, ὅτε τῶν ἐλπισθέντων ἔδει τυχεῖν, διὰ ῥᾳθυμίαν προδοῦναι πάντα βουλήσομαι, γράψαι καὶ συμβουλεῦσαι μένειν

* A = f. 289-289v; B = p. 312-313.

4 *αὐτοῦ* B 5 *τῶν* devant *λόγων* add AB 7 *ὑπὸ τοιούτων* A 10 *γε* om A 18 *πάνυ* devant *τὸν* add AB 21 *εἰσενέγκαι* B 32 *δυσχεραίνοντα* B

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ἠξίωσας, ὡς αὐτίκα τῶν ἐλπίδων ἐκβησομένων καὶ μὴ πόρρωθεν τὴν ἀμείνω τύχην ζητεῖν, ἐξὸν ἐγγύθεν ταύτην λαμβάνειν. Οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἄλλως ἐγώ σε νομίσαιμι τὴν γνώμην ἐκείνην εἰσενεγκεῖν καὶ κωλῦσαι μὲν βουληθῆναι, εἰ|δέναι δὲ πλέον μηδὲν μηδ' ἔχειν ὅτῳ θεραπεύσεις τὸν φίλον διὰ σὲ τῶν ἄλλοθ' ὅπου προσδοκωμένων ἀγαθῶν ἀμελήσαντα. Χάριν οὖν καὶ τῆς συμβουλῆς καὶ τῆς πρὸς ταύτην κινησάσης εὐνοίας ὁμολογῶν, καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐμῶν, ὅπῃ ποτὲ κεῖται τύχης καὶ γνώμης, προστίθημι. f. 289v

Ἴσθι τοίνυν ἐμὲ παρεσκευασμένον μὲν πᾶσιν οἷς εἶχον πρὸς τὸν ἀπόπλουν καὶ τοὺς ταῦθ' ὑμῖν ἀπαγγείλαντας οὐδαμῶς τούτους ψευσαμένους, κωλυθέντας δὲ οὔθ' ὑπὸ τῆς τιμῆς, ἣν ἡμῖν ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπενόησεν καὶ ἣν εἰδόσιν οὐ λέγω, οὔθ' ὑπὸ τῆς προσδοκωμένης συνόδου· ἐπεὶ τὴν μὲν ὡς ἄλλοις μᾶλλον προσήκουσαν φεύγειν ἔγνων ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν, ἡ δὲ καὶ πείσειεν ἂν μᾶλλον ἀποδημεῖν ἢ διδάξειεν ἡσυχάζειν· ἀλλὰ μάλιστα μὲν τῇ σῇ συμβουλῇ πεπεισμένον· ᾤμην γάρ σε κράτιστα συμβουλεύειν, καὶ μεῖναι βεβουλημένῳ τὴν ἀγαθὴν οὐκ εἰς μακρὰν ὑπισχνεῖσθαι τύχην ἐδόκεις τοσαῦτα θαρρεῖν, ἐκ τῆς τοῦ δεσπότου ψήφου λαβών· ἴσως δὲ καὶ λογισμῶν τινῶν ἡττηθέντα, οἵ μοι τὴν ἀπουσίαν μετὰ τοῦτον τὸν χειμῶνα λαμπροτέραν ἔσεσθαι λέγουσιν. Καθεδοῦμαι δὴ καὶ τῶν ἐκ τοῦ Βοσπόρου πνευμάτων πάλιν πειράσομαι καὶ τῶν ἐνταῦθα νιφάδων, εὐφραίνων μὲν ἐμαυτὸν ταῖς ἐλπίσιν, τὰ δὲ παρόντα πάντα πλὴν βιβλίων καὶ λόγων πρόφασιν ἔχων εἰς ἀηδίαν, μετὰ δὲ τῶν χελιδόνων καὶ αὐτὸς τοῖς ποιηοῦσιν ὀφθήσομαι, οἷους πολλοὺς μὲν καὶ ἄλλους πολλαχοῦ τῆς γῆς ἡ πρόνοια δέδωκεν, ὑμᾶς δὲ πλέον τῶν ἄλλων, ὡς ἐγὼ νομίζω καὶ βούλομαι. Εἰ δὲ δεῖ με τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασιν ἐλπισθέντα ὑμῖν ἐμαυτὸν ἐγχειρίσαι, καὶ παρὰ δόξαν, ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ οἶδα, προνοήσαις δ' ἂν μετὰ Θεοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς ὡς ἀπὸ μίτου τῶν γραμμάτων ἀρτήσας καὶ μέχρις ἡμῶν τὸν πλοῦν ποιήσας ὁρίσασθαι.

XVIII.

A un inconnu.*

Paris. 1289 f. 1

Πολλάκις με βουληθέντα σοι γράψαι, ἐξότου τοὺς τελευταίους περὶ τῶν ζητημάτων ἐκείνων λόγους ἀπέστειλα, τὰ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπέσχε προσ-

* A = Parisinus 1289, f. 1-1v, copie autographe de Scholarios;
B = Édition de S. Lambros, *op. cit.*, t. II, p. 213-214, d'après le Taurinensis B-V-2, f. 8 sq., du XVe siècle, détruit en 1904;
C = Parisinus 1932, f. 61, autographe de Scholarios;
T = Taurinensis B-V-2, f. 8 sq.

A: Dans la marge supérieure: *† : Ἐκ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν Γεωργίου τοῦ Σχολαρίου τοῦ ὕστερον Γενναδίου: †* A la marge inférieure: *† Εὑρέθη τὸ βιβλίον τῶν ἐπιστολῶν μετὰ τὴν ἅλωσιν καὶ ἐξ ἐκείνου μετεγράφησαν αὗται ὀλίγαι ἐπιστολαὶ καὶ ὁ ἐπιτάφιος.*

T: Dans la marge: *Κυροῦ Γενναδίου ἐπιστολαί.*

16 τῆς om B

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

καὶ ἢ κατασχεῖν ἐφ' οἷς ἠξίους ἔδει τὸν λόγον, ἢ μηδὲ κατασχεῖν, ἐπέμψαμεν ἄν σοι τοῦτον εὐθύς, οὐδέν τι τοιοῦτον, οἷον ζητεῖν ἐδόκεις, συνειδότες ἡμῖν αὐτῷ χαρίσασθαι δυναμένοις. Νῦν δ' ὁ μὲν λόγος ἐστὶ μεθ' ἡμῶν, οὕτω βέλτιον δόξαν, καὶ θαύματος ἀπολαύει καὶ κρότων, ὧν δήπου χάριν ἀφίκται· οὓς γὰρ ἡ τῶν γραμμάτων χάρις ἐξέπληξε, καὶ τούτων ἴσως οὐ μετὰ σπουδῆς συντεθέντων, τί παθεῖν εἰκός, τηλικούτοις ἐντυχόντας ἀγῶσιν; Ἃ δ' ἡμᾶς ἠξίους ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ δίκαιος ὤν, τούτων οὐδὲν ἡμᾶς ἀπαιτήσεις, ὅταν ἀπολάβῃς τὸν λόγον.

Οὐκοῦν τίκτοις ἀεὶ τοιαῦτα καὶ τοὺς φίλους εὐφραίνοις, ὥσπερ τὴν γνώμην, οὕτω δὴ καὶ τὴν τέχνην | ἄριστος ὤν. Ἡμῖν μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἄλλως f. 285
πολλοῦ τιμᾶται σπουδῆς ἄξιόν τι φανὲν ἐν τηλικαύτῃ σπάνει τῶν ἀγαθῶν, ὥσπερ ἀνθέων κάλλος ἐαρινὸν πάσαις ὄψεσιν ἥδιστον ἐν μέσῳ φαινομένων χειμῶνι· σοῦ δὲ καὶ τῶν σῶν ἐξεχομένοις ἀεὶ καὶ πάντα βουλομένοις σοι τἀγαθὰ πολλῷ μᾶλλον τοῦ συνήθους χαίρειν συμβαίνει, ἐπειδὰν αἰσθανώμεθα τὸν φίλον εὐδοκιμεῖν. Ὁμοῦ τε δὴ περὶ λόγους εἴης τοιοῦτος καὶ τῆς τύχης ἀμείνονος πειραθείης· μᾶλλον δὲ σὲ μὲν αὕτη τοῖς βελτίοσιν ὧν εἶχε κεκόσμηκε, τὸ δὲ κοινὸν ἀτυχοῦν καὶ σὲ τὴν ἐπὶ τοῖς προσοῦσιν ἡδονὴν ἀφαιρεῖται. Ὑπὲρ τούτου τοίνυν εὔχεσθαι δεῖ. Τούτου γὰρ χειρὸς ἀγαθῆς καὶ γνώμης τυχόντος, αὐτός τε ἄμεινον ἕξεις καὶ πᾶς ὁστισοῦν. Ἁπάντων μὲν οὖν τῶν κατὰ σὲ Θεῷ πρὸ πάντων μελήσει· τουτωνὶ δὲ τῶν μικρῶν μὲν καὶ ὀλίγων, τὸ δὲ τῶν φροντίδων πλῆθος ἀμηγέπη σοι παραμυθησομένων, εἰ γένοιτο, μέλει μὲν ὁμοίως τοῖς φίλοις ἀμφοῖν, ὡς ἂν μηδέν τι περὶ τὸν φίλον ἁμάρτοι μὴ χαριζόμενος ἑμαυτῷ, ἰσχὺς δὲ τοῦ πράττειν οὐ παντάπασιν ἴση, ἀλλ' ὃ μέν, πρὸς τῷ βούλεσθαι, καὶ ὅσα ἄν τις εἴποι πλεῖστα ποιεῖ· ἡμεῖς δὲ βουλόμεθα μέν, πράττειν δὲ μὴ τοσαῦτα δυνάμενοι, συναγωνιζόμεθα ταῖς εὐχαῖς. Τέως δ' οὖν ἕξει πάντα καλῶς, Θεοῦ καὶ σοῦ βουλομένου, καὶ οὐδὲν ἡμῖν πρὸς τὸν σκοπὸν ἀντιστήσεται.

XIII.

Au despote Constantin.*

Laur. 74, 13 f. 285

Τῷ δεσπότῃ κυρῷ Κωνσταντίνῳ.

Τίνα δή τις, τίνα περὶ ἐμοῦ πρὸς τοὺς σοὺς ὁρισμοὺς ἀπιδὼν ἐξοίσει τὴν ψῆφον; Ἆρα εὐδαίμονα νομιεῖ τὸν οὕτω τετιμημένον τοῖς γράμμασιν, ἢ μᾶλλον δυστυχῆ καὶ δεινῶν εἰς ἔσχατον ἥκοντα, ὃν οὕτω θαυμαστοῦ δεσπότου καὶ προμηθέως ἡ πονηρὰ διέστησε τύχη; Εὔδηλον, ὅτι πᾶς τις ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ τὰ δεύτερα ψηφιεῖται, ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸς ὑπὲρ ἐμαυτοῦ ταύτην

* A = f. 285-286v; B = p. 305-308.

18 *τούτων* B 22 *μέλλει* A [*μέλοι δὲ καὶμοὶ*] add B 23 *ἂν μηδέν τι περὶ* om B *ἁμάρτοι με* B

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ἔχω τὴν γνώμην. Καὶ πάντα μὲν γὰρ τὸν ἔμπροσθεν χρόνον οὐκ ἀνίεις τιμῶν, καὶ πολλοῖς δὲ ἄλλοις ἐδείκνυς μεμνημένος ἡμῶν καὶ κηδόμενος, καὶ ἀπόντας ἀξιῶν ἧς ἔμελλες μεταδιδόναι παροῦσιν εὐνοίας. Καὶ αὐτὸς ἔχαιρον μέν, οὕτως ἀκραιφνοῦς τῆς σῆς φυλαττομένης μοι γνώμης καὶ τιθείσης ἐν ἀσφαλεῖ ἃς περὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος εἶχον ἐλπίδας, ἤλγουν δέ, ὅτι τοσοῦτον ἤδη χρόνον ἀπῳκισμένος ὧν εἶχον ἐν χεροῖν ἀγαθῶν, οὗτοι γε ταῦτα προδοὺς | ὑπὸ ῥᾳθυμίας, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τοῦ καιροῦ καὶ βουλῆς τινος οὐχ f. 285 ▾
ὑγιαινούσης εἰς τοῦτο συνελαθείς, οὐκ εἶχον ὅπως ἰάσωμαι τὸ δεινὸν καὶ φευξοῦμαι τὴν δυστυχίαν. Σιδηροῦν γὰρ τεῖχος αἱ περιστάσεις, καὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων εἰς ταύτας ἥκει τὸ πλεῖστον. Καὶ αὐτὸς οὖν, ὑπὸ τούτων τὸν ἐμὸν δεσπότην ἀφαιρεθείς, ἀπολαβεῖν πολλάκις ὥρμησα μέν, ὑπ' αὐτῶν δὲ πάλιν ἐκωλυόμην, ἄλλων ἄλλοτε τικτομένων. Ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ τῶν νῦν ὕστερον ἀφιγμένων γραμμάτων ἡψάμην, καὶ ταῦτα ἐπῆλθον, προσκυνήσας αὐτὰ πρῶτον καὶ θεὶς ἐπὶ τῆς ἐμῆς κεφαλῆς, οὐκέτι κατέχειν οἷός τ' ἦν ἐμαυτόν, ἀλλ' ἡδονῆς ἀρρήτου καὶ λύπης μέσον ἀπειλημμένος ἐκινδύνευσά τι καὶ παθεῖν καὶ τὸ φρονοῦν ἐγγὺς ἦλθον ἀποβαλεῖν τῆς ψυχῆς. Οὕτω μὲν ἔθελγες οἷς εὐηργέτεις, οὕτω δὲ πικρὸν βέλος εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν εἰσῄει ψυχήν, ὅτε πρὸς τὴν ὑπερβολὴν ἔβλεπον τῶν τιμῶν καὶ ἧς ἐκεῖναι γνώμης προῆεσαν. Ἐνεθυμούμην γὰρ ἡλίκος ἂν ἦσθα περὶ ἐμὲ παρὰ πάντα τε συνόντα τὸν χρόνον καὶ τὴν δυνατὴν λειτουργίαν εἰσφέροντα, ὃς καὶ μὴ παρόντος οὕτω σφόδρα φροντίζεις καὶ τὰ κατ' ἐμὲ σπουδῆς ἄξια τοσαύτης ἡγῇ. Τὸ δ' ἐπαινεῖν ἐμέ, ὅτι μικρῶν ἀπολελαυκώς, μεγίστην οἶδά σοι χάριν καὶ τοῦτο τῆς ἐμῆς γνώμης ἀρετὴν ἀποφαίνεσθαι, δι' ἣν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐλάττοσιν ὡς ἐπὶ τοῖς μεγίστοις ἔγνωκα χάριν ὀφείλειν, τοῦτο τῆς σῆς μὲν ἄξιον μεγαλοψυχίας, ὃς ὁπόταν τὰ μεγάλα δωρῇ, οὐδὲν διδόναι νομίζεις, τῆς γνώμης καὶ τῆς παρασκευῆς ἐλάττω σφόδρα ταῦτα νομίζων, ἐμοὶ δὲ οὐδένα τρόπον τοῦτο προσήκει, ὥστε καὶ αἰσχυνθείην ἂν πρὸς τοῦτό τι λέγειν, Ἐμὲ μικρῶν ὁ θαυμαστὸς δεσπότης ἠξίωσεν; Καὶ πῶς, ὃς γε καὶ τιμῆς καὶ προνοίας οὐδὲν ἐνέλιπεν ὧν ὁ καιρὸς συνεχώρει· ὅστις τῶν τοῖς γέρουσι προσηκόντων μετέδωκεν, τῶν ἐκ τῆς ἡλικίας ὑστερημάτων ἧττον φροντίσας, ἐπεὶ φιλοῦντά με ἔγνω καὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ τιμῆς καὶ δόξης φροντίζοντα; Τοῦτο γὰρ οὐκ ἂν αἰσχυνθείην καυχήσασθαι. Εὐξαίμην ἂν ἔγωγε καὶ πάντας ἀνθρώπους οὕτω μοι πιστεῦσαί τε καὶ θαρρῆσαι καὶ ταὐτὰ φρονῆσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ.

Ἀλλ' ἵνα μὴ πολλοῖς ὑπὲρ τῶν προδηλοτάτων χρήσωμαι λόγοις, ὁ Θεὸς οἶδεν, οὐδέποτέ μοι | τὸ συνειδὸς ὑποβάλλει, ὅτι μοι τῆς ἀξίας f. 286
ἔλαττον ἐχρήσω κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν χρόνον. Τοὐναντίον μὲν οὖν ἅπαν αὐτός τε πέπεισμαι καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους πάντας πείθειν πειρῶμαι, ὅτι με καὶ τῆς

---

2 *τιμῶν*: peut-être *τιμᾶν* A 11-12 *ὠρμήσαμεν* A 35 *πανδηλοτάτων* B

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ἀξίας πλέον ἠγάπηκας καὶ τετίμηκας, καὶ νῦν, εἴ τι καλοῦ μοι πρόσεστιν, εἰς τὴν σὴν πρόνοιαν τοῦτο καὶ σπουδὴν ἀναφέρω. Τὴν μὲν γὰρ ἀρχὴν ἥμισυ τοῦ παντὸς εἶναί φασιν, αὐτὸς δ' οὐ μόνον μοι θύραν εἰς τὸν βίον ἀνέῳξας, ἀλλὰ καὶ προβαίνειν ἔδωκας, καὶ τὸ κατὰ σὲ ἦν ἂν ἐν πολλῷ βελτίοσι τὰ ἡμέτερα. Τὰς πρὸς ἐμέ σου τοίνυν εὐεργεσίας τῇ φιλοδώρῳ προθέσει παραμετρῶν τῆς ψυχῆς, ἀποφαίνου περὶ αὐτῶν ὅ τι καὶ βούλει, καὶ νόμιζε μικρὰ τὰ μεγάλα· ἔξεστι γάρ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἂν συμφαίην, ἐλάττω παντάπασιν εἶναι τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν καιρῶν σοι ῥοπὴν ἧς ἔχεις περὶ τὰ καλὰ προθυμίας. Ἐμὲ δὲ οἵου πᾶσιν οἷς εὐηργέτηκας πᾶσαν ὑπερβολὴν συνειδέναι καὶ τούτων ὡς μεγίστων μεμνῆσθαι καὶ μηδ' ἔχειν ὅπως ἂν ἀξίαν χάριν εἰδείην, μήτοι γε καὶ πράγμασιν αὐτοῖς εἰσενέγκαιμι· μὴ γὰρ ἂν οὕτω μανείην ἐγώ, ὥστε περὶ τούτων ἄλλως ὑπολαβεῖν.

Σὺ μὲν οὖν, ὦ θειότατε δεσποτῶν, ταύτην μεγίστην ἐπὶ μεγίσταις χάρισι προσθεῖναι δεῖν ἔγνως, τὸ σὸν δὴ τοῦτο ποιῶν καὶ μηδένα κόρον τοῦ διδόναι λαμβάνων· ἔοικας δέ πως καὶ ἡμῖν ὀνειδίζειν τὴν ἀμνηστίαν, καὶ ὡς ἄρα, τοιούτων μὲν ἡμῖν ὑπηργμένων, πολλῷ δὲ μειζόνων ἐλπιζομένων, πρὸς τὸν ἐκεῖνα μὲν δεδωκότα, ταῦτα δὲ προσθήσοντα βουληθεῖσι μόνον, οὔπω κινούμεθα. Οὐ μέντοι μέμψῃ προϊόντος τοῦ χρόνου· ὅπως γὰρ τά τε δίκαια πράξαιμεν καὶ ἅπερ ἡμῖν ἀντὶ πάντων συνοίσει, πάσῃ μηχανῇ φροντιοῦμεν. Ἦλθε γὰρ καὶ τὰ γράμματα πάνυ κατὰ καιρὸν καὶ περὶ τῶν τοιούτων εὗρε σκοπουμένους ἡμᾶς· ἓν δὴ λείπεται μόνον, τὸ καὶ τὸν φίλον ἐλθεῖν, ᾧ ῥᾳδίαν τὴν εἰς ἡμᾶς ἄφιξιν καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μᾶλλον εὐχόμεθα, ὅτι τῶν σῶν προσταγμάτων ἡμῖν φανεῖται πορθμεύς· καίτοι καὶ χωρὶς τούτων ἐποθοῦμεν τὸν ἄνδρα, καὶ τὸ τοῦτον ἰδεῖν πολλοῦ τινος ἂν ὠνησάμεθα. Οὗτος τῷ μὲν πέμποντι πιστότατος ὤν, ἐμὲ δὲ διὰ τὸ πάνυ φιλεῖσθαι καὶ τιμᾶσθαι σφόδρα φιλῶν καὶ βουλό-
f. 286 v μενος | μὲν τἀγαθά, παρὰ σοῦ δὲ καὶ τὴν τοῦ πράττειν δύναμιν ἔχων, ὅταν ἐπανήκῃ, Θεοῦ διδόντος, δῶρόν σοι κομιεῖ, καὶ ἴσως οὐκ ἄχαρι. Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἔτι σιγάσθω, μὴ καί τις πονηρὸς δαίμων φθονήσῃ καὶ πάλιν ἐγείρῃ περιστάσεις ἡμῖν, ἃς λύσει μὴν ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ χάρις, ὁπόταν φανῶσι, καὶ τῆς σῆς ἀρετῆς καὶ γνώμης ἡ δύναμις· ἄμεινον μέντοι ταύτας μηδὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐγερθῆναι. Ἐμὲ δὲ ἴσθι παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ δύο ταῦτα ζητοῦντα, τὴν ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι βίῳ ῥᾳστώνην, μηδενὸς τῶν ἐμῶν πταισμάτων προσισταμένου καὶ τῆς εὐδαιμονίας ἐκείνης ἀπάγοντος, κἀν τῷ παρόντι βίῳ τὴν σὴν ὄψιν τὴν ἐμοὶ σεβασμίαν καὶ ποθουμένην, παντὸς κωλύματος ἐκ μέσου γεγενημένου, ἣν ὁπόταν ἀξιωθῶ προσκυνῆσαι καὶ τοῦ λοιποῦ τῶν αἰτημάτων εὐθὺς τετυχηκέναι πεισθήσομαι.

---

13 ὦ̄ B 21 *καὶ* devant *περὶ* om B *εὕρεσιν ποιουμένους* B *ἐν δὲ δὴ* B

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

11.

Lettre à Démétrius Paléologue contre l'union de Florence (1450).*

Γεωργίου τοῦ Σχολαρίου ἐκ προτροπῆς τῆς ἱερᾶς συνάξεως τῶν τοῦ πατρίου καὶ ἀληθοῦς δόγματος ἀντιποιουμένων [πρὸς Δημήτριον τὸν Παλαιολόγον]. Marcianus Class. II, 186 f. 193

1. Ὑψηλότατε, εὐσεβέστατε, γενναιότατε, πανευτυχέστατε αὐθέντα ἡμῶν δέσποτα πορφυρογέννητε, τὸν ὁρισμὸν τῆς ἁγίας βασιλείας σου ἐδεξάμην, ἐφ' ᾧ δὴ εὐχαριστῶν, ὅτι τῶν αὐτόθι συμβεβηκότων καὶ τῆς καλλίστης καὶ δικαιοτάτης σου γνώμης καὶ ἡμῖν οὐκ ἀπηξίωσας γράψαι σοί τε οὖσιν οἰκείοις καὶ ἄλλως φροντίζουσί τι τοῦ δικαίου τε καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐν πᾶσι πράγμασι σὺν Θεῷ φάναι, ἀναφέρω καὶ αὐτός, μεθ' ὅσης ἄν τις εἴποι τῆς διαθέσεως, οὐδὲν χαριζόμενος ἢ αὐτῇ ἀληθείᾳ, ὡς ἔγωγε οἶμαι, ἣν δὴ καὶ ἐπόμνυμι τοῖς ῥηθησομένοις.

Τὸ σὸν τοίνυν, ἄριστε καὶ φρονιμώτατε ἡγεμών, ἐπῃνέθη μὲν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐκ πάντων σχεδόν, καὶ δικαίως· ἐπαίνων γὰρ ἦν καὶ πάνυ πολλῶν ἄξιον. Καὶ οὔ φημι ἐκ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐπαινεθῆναί σε πολιτῶν μόνον· ἴσως γὰρ αὐτοί καὶ τῇ συνηθείᾳ τι χαριζόμενοι καὶ τοῖς σοῖς συγγενέσιν ὀφείλοντες, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀπομνημονεύοντές σοι τὴν εἰς αὐτοὺς χάριν, οὐκ ἐγίνοντ' ἂν τῶν σῶν ἀδέκαστοι ἐξεταστὰι καὶ κριταί· ἀλλ' ὅτε συνῆσθα τῷ βασιλεῖ ἐκείνῳ τὰ περὶ τῆς θρησκείας μετὰ τῶν Ἰταλῶν πραγματευομένῳ οὐκ εὐτυχῶς, καὶ ἔδει σε διὰ πολλῶν ἰέναι πόλεων, καὶ πολλαῖς μὲν πολιτείαις, πολλοῖς δὲ ἄρχουσιν ἐντυγχάνειν, καὶ ἰδιωτῶν τῶν βελτίστων τοῖς πλησιάζουσιν οὐ χείρων ἐφάνης τἀδελφοῦ τε καὶ βασιλέως (οὕτω γὰρ ἀνεπαχθέστερον εἰπεῖν), ἢ ὅ τι ἀπέκρυψας, καίτοι ἐκεῖνος ἐθαυμάζετό τε ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρίστων ἐκεῖ, καὶ ἐδόκει αὐτοῖς τά γε πλεῖστα ἐπαίνων εἶναι πολλῶν ἄξιος, τῷ πατρὶ δὲ ἤκουες ὅμοιος παρὰ πάντων. Ἦλθε γάρ ποτε καὶ ἐκεῖνος εἰς Ἑσπέραν, χρείᾳ τῆς ἐκεῖθεν βοηθείας τῇ πόλει τῇδε ἡμῶν· καὶ πολλοὶ ἦσαν οἳ, μεμνημένοι μὲν ἐκείνου, σοὶ δέ συγγινόμενοι ἐς τὸ παρόν, πολλὴν ἀνεώρων σοι τὴν πρὸς ἐκεῖνον ὁμοιότητα καὶ τὸ μὴ φύσει μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐς τὰ ἄλλα ἅπαντα συγγενές. Ἃ δέ σου μάλιστα

* A = Marcianus Class. II, cod. 186, XVIe s., f. 193-200;
L = Édition de Sp. Lampros, *Παλαιολόγεια καὶ Πελοποννησιακά* (Athènes, 1912), t. II, p. 52-76, d'après le même manuscrit.

Tit. Les mots: *πρὸς Δημήτριον τὸν Παλαιόλογον* ne se trouvent pas dans le manuscrit. Celui-ci porte en haut du f. 192^v cette note non signalée par L: *Μαξίμου· γέγραπτο ἴσως εἰς Δημήτριον τὸν Ἰωάννου τοῦ Παλαιολόγου ἀδελφόν.* L'adresse à Démétrius Paléologue n'est pas douteuse.

11 *δὴ* om L 18 *μετὰ*: *μὲν* L

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ἐν θαύματι ἦγον, ἥ τ' ἀλήθεια ἦν καὶ ἡ γενναιότης καὶ τὸ μήτε τῶν ὑπαρχόντων μείζω φρονεῖν διὰ τὸ βασίλειον αἷμα, μήτ' ἀνασχέσθαι ἂν αἰσχροῦ τινος διὰ τὸ ἐν ἀλλοτρίᾳ εἶναι καὶ τὸ τοῖς συνεκπεπλευκόσιν ὥσπερ ὅρμον ἀνεῖσθαι κοινὸν ἅπασιν, οὐ διακρίνοντα τῶν τἀδελφῷ ἑπομένων τοὺς σοὶ ἠκολουθηκότας, ἀλλὰ διὰ πάντων τὸ εὐμενὲς ὁμοίως ἐκχέοντα, ὥστε μηδένα μὲν προσελθόντα ὑπὲρ ὁτουοῦν ἀποτυγχάνοντα καὶ ἀλγοῦντα ἐπανιέναι· ὧν δ' ἂν αἴσθοιο πεινώντων σιωπῇ ὑπ' αἰδοῦς, τούτοις γενέσθαι τὴν ἐν σοὶ κατανόησιν τοῦ ἐν σφίσι κακοῦ πρὸς οἶκτον αὐτάρκη, ἄνευ βοῆς τε καὶ ἱκεσίας. Καὶ ταῦτα οὐκ ἐκ περιουσίας σοι ἐφιλανθρωπεύετο, ἀλλὰ τῶν κειμηλίων πάντων μεριζομένων, ὥστε μηδὲν ὧν ἐπεφέρου σχεδὸν ὑπολελεῖφθαί σοι τελευταῖον, δι' ἃ καὶ ἐπῃνοῦ μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν οἰκείων, ἐθαυμάζου δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν ξένων τῶν ἐκεῖ, τοῦ λόγου τῆς φιλανθρωπίας εἰς τὰς ἁπάντων ἀκοὰς διατρέχοντος. Εὐσεβείας δὲ οὕτως ἀντείχου τῆς πατρίου ἐπιμελῶς, ὥστε προειδόμενος, ὡς εἶθ' ὑπ' ἀνάγκης, εἴτ' ἀγνοίᾳ τοῦ ἀληθοῦς, εἴτε γνώμης φαυλότητι τρέψονταί γε ἐπὶ τὸ κοινωνῆσαι ἀβασανίστως τῶν πρὶν ἀνηκέστων δοκούντων, τὸν ἀδελφὸν καταλιπών, ᾧχου ἐπὶ Οὐενετίαν, καὶ ἡμεῖς σοι συγκατῄειμεν, ὅ τε Γεμιστὸς καὶ ἐγώ, καίτοι οὔτε τῷ ἀδελφῷ ἤρεσκε ταῦτα οὔτε τῷ Εὐγενίῳ. Ἀλλὰ σύ γε πρὸ τοῦ αὐτοῖς ἀρέσκοντος τὴν εὐσέβειαν ἐποιοῦ· οὐ γὰρ ἑώρας κατὰ νόμον αὐτοὺς τὰ δόγματα ἐξετάζοντας. Ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ἐπανεληλυθώς, τῶν πρὸς ἡμῖν παραλίων τοῦ Πόντου ἦρξας οὕτω καλῶς τε καὶ εὖ ὥστε τοὺς ταύτῃ οἰκοῦντας καὶ νῦν ἔτι τὸ
f. 193v σὸν βοᾶν ὄνομα καὶ ὑπ' οὐδενὸς ἄρχεσθαι βουλῆθῆναι ἂν ἢ σοῦ, εἴπερ οἷόν τε ἦν, ὥσπερ καὶ ὅτε ὑπὸ τοῦ νῦν βασιλέως ἐκυβερνῶντο, οὐδέποτε ἐδόκει αὐτοῖς εὐτυχέστερον τοῦδε συμβεβηκέναι.

2. Ἀλλ' οὕτως ἐπαινεθέντι σοι καὶ τοῖς τε οἰκείοις τοῖς τε ξένοις ἄρχοντι βελτίστῳ κριθέντι οὐκ εἰς μακρὰν ἐβάσκηνε τὸ δαιμόνιον, καὶ τὴν ὑπεροψίαν σοι ἐπεγείραν τἀδελφοῦ τε καὶ βασιλέως οὐκ ἀνεκτήν, ἀμύνεσθαί σε παρώξυνε. Καὶ ἐβούλου μὲν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐκεῖνον λιπεῖν καὶ ἄκοντα ἐφ' ἃ ἐνόμιζες δίκαια ἕλκειν. Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐφιλονείκησε πρὸς ὀργήν, καὶ ἦν ἀνάγκη μάχεσθαι ἀλλήλοις ὡς πολεμιωτάτω, ὃ μὲν συνεκέκλειστο ἔνδον πυλῶν, οἱ δὲ μηδὲν ἀδικοῦντες, ἠνδραποδίζοντό τε καὶ ἐκτείνοντο οὐκ ὀλίγοι, καὶ ἡ χώρα ἐκείρετό τε καὶ ἐνεπίμπρατο. Οἱ δὲ ταῦτα πάσχοντες καὶ οἱ συναλγοῦντες ἐμίσουν οὔτε ἀμφοτέρους ὁμοῦ, οὔθ' ὅστις αἰτιώτατος ἦν, εἴ γε καὶ τοῖς νόμοις δοκεῖ τὸν μὴ κωλύοντα, δυνάμενον, αὐτὸν πράττειν, κἂν ταῖς πονηραῖς ἁμίλλαις ἀθλιώτερον τὸν νικήσαντα φησί τις εἶναι τῶν θεσπεσίων· ἐνίκα δέ που φιλονεικῶν ὁ μὴ συγχωρῶν ἃ τε ὑπέσχετο πάλαι, ὡς ἅπαντες ἴσμεν, καὶ ἃ δίκαια ἦν ἴσως, ἔδει δὲ καὶ μὴ ὄντα, τοιαῦτα μὴ ἀνανεύειν, δέει τῶν ἐσομένων δεινῶν· ἀλλὰ σὲ δὴ μόνον

---

10 *ἐπέφερον* L 15 *τῷ* A 28 *λυπεῖν* L

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ἐμίσουν, οὔτ' ἔμελεν αὐτοῖς περὶ τῶν δικαίων, οὔτ' ἐφρόντιζον τοῦ τὴν πρώτην τῶν συμβαινόντων αἰτίαν ἀνιχνεύειν τε καὶ εὑρίσκειν καὶ ταύτῃ ὡς μάλιστα ἀπεχθάνεσθαι. Ἐκεῖνο δὲ τὸ ἀτύχημα πλέον ἢ ἀδίκημα, καθάπερ τι νέφος τοῖς σοῖς ἐπιπροσθῆσαν καλοῖς, ἔτι καὶ νῦν τοῖς ἀδίκοις κριταῖς κατὰ σοῦ δίδωσι παρρησίαν. Ἕτερον γὰρ οὐδὲν ἔχοντες ἐγκαλεῖν, ἐκ τοῦ ἀτυχήματος ἐπιφύονται, καὶ τούτου τὴν αἰτίαν ἐγώ σοι δίειμι.

Τῶν μὲν ἄλλων ἀρχόντων, ἢ, εἰ βούλει γε, καὶ ἀνθρώπων πάντων ἄλλα ἄλλων ἔχουσιν ἐγκαλεῖν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὸν θυμὸν ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις αὐτῶν ἐλαττώμασιν ἐμπιπλάντες, τὸ γὰρ ἀρχόμενον ἅπαν φιλαίτιον, τὰ ἐς τὸ κοινὸν ἠδικημένα σκοπεῖν οὐ βούλονται. Ἐξέστω δ' αὐτὰ καὶ ἀτυχήματα λέγειν, καίτοι γε ὁποτέρως ἄν τις ταῦτα προσαγορεύοι, οὐδείς ἐστι σχεδὸν ὅτῳ οὐ χείρω τῶν σοὶ συμβεβηκότων συμπέπτωκεν ἐν τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῖς ἐγνωσμένοις. Σοὶ δὲ οὐδὲν ἔχοντες τοιοῦτον ἐπιτιμᾶν, ἐκεῖθεν ἀφιᾶσι τὸ κέντρον. Εἰ γὰρ ἦσθα τἆλλὰ οὐκ ἐπαινετός, ἐντεῦθεν ἂν μᾶλλον οἱ βάσκανοι ἐπειρῶντό σοι τὴν δόξαν κολούειν. Πολὺ γὰρ μεῖζον ἄρχοντι ὄνειδος, εἰ φαύλως τε διέποι τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ τἆλλα οὐχ ὑγιῶς διαιτῷτο, ἢ εἰ ἐπιών τῳ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων ἢ τῶν οἰκείων, νομίζων τε ἠδικῆσθαι, ἐπαχθὴς γένοιτο οἷς ἂν ἐπίοι, ἢ ἔσθ' ἃ καὶ τῶν οἰκείων συγκαταβλάψειε. Ταυτὶ γὰρ ἕπεται ταῖς ἀρχαῖς, ὡς τοῖς λαμπροτάτοις ἐν οὐρανῷ σώμασιν αἱ κατὰ χρόνους ἐκλείψεις, πάθη μᾶλλον οὖσαι ἡμέτερα· λαμπρότητος δὲ πέρι καὶ τῆς ἄλλης δραστηριότητος ἐν τοῖς ἐγγείοις τούτοις καὶ πρὸς ἡμῖν, οὐδεὶς ἂν δι' ἐκεῖνα ἧττόν τι ἡλίῳ ἡσθείη τε καὶ θαυμάσειε. Καὶ σοῦ τοίνυν μὴ ἔχοντες ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων λαβέσθαι, δικαιοσύνῃ μὲν γὰρ διαπρέπεις ἐν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, φιλανθρωπίᾳ δὲ καὶ συμπαθείᾳ καὶ ἡμερότητι πρὸς τὴν ὑψηλοτάτην φύσιν ἀπείκασαι, ἐλευθεριότητος δὲ καὶ μεγαλοψυχίας οὐδ' ἐγγύς σου συγχωρεῖς ἐλθεῖν οὐδενί, τούτων δὲ οὐδὲν ἧττον γενναῖος εἰ τὴν ἀληθῆ γενναιότητα, τὴν ἀρετὴν ξύμπασαν ἐπιγινώσκων τε καὶ ἐπαινῶν ἐν τοῖς ἔχουσιν καὶ ὡς ἔξεστιν ἀμειβόμενος, λόγῳ τε καὶ ἔργῳ ἐπιεικής, οὗ δ' ἂν δέοι καὶ αὐστηρίας ἄρχοντι πρεπούσης, οὐδὲ τούτου ἐλλείπων· τούτοις οὖν καὶ τοῖς τοιοῖσδε ξύμπασιν εἰδότες σε κεκοσμῆσθαι, ἀφίστανται μέν σου τῶν ἰδίων πλεονεκτημάτων, ἐπὶ δὲ τὸ ἄλλων ἀδίκημα μᾶλλον, σὸν δὲ ἀτύχημα τρεπόμενοι, θορυβοῦσιν, καίτοι νῦν οὐδὲ θορυβεῖν δύνανται, ὑπό τε τῆς μετὰ ταῦτα ὑποδεδειγμένης σοι ἀρετῆς, | καὶ ὧν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς συνέβη εἰργόμενοι, πλὴν εἴ τις καὶ πρὸς f. 194
τὰ φανερώτατα ἀναιδεύοιτο.

3. Σκοπῶμεν δὲ καὶ τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα. Ὁ βάρβαρος ἠξίου μέν σε παραχωρεῖν τἀδελφῷ τῆς χώρας, ἐδίδου δὲ ἀντ' αὐτῆς ἑτέραν οὐκ ἐλάττω ἐν μεσογείᾳ, ὑπισχνούμενος μετὰ τὸν πόλεμον βοηθήσειν. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ

---

1 *ἔμελλεν* A 10 *εἰς* L 25 *ἀπείκασας* L 36 *σε* om L

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ἐπυνθάνετο ἀκριβῶς ἐπιόντας τοὺς Οὔγγρους, τὸν μὲν βασιλέα δεῖν οὐκ ἔγνω λυπεῖν, σὲ δὲ θεραπεύειν καὶ ἑτοίμῳ χρῆσθαι ἂν πρὸς τὴν κατὰ βασιλέως ἄμυναν, εἴπερ αἴσθοιτο αὐτοῦ εὐνοίας τι τοῖς ἐχθροῖς εἰσενηνοχότος καὶ βοηθείας· ἅμα δὲ καὶ σὲ πολύ τι αὐτῷ συμβαλεῖσθαι ἤλπιζε πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον συστρατεύοντα, οὐ προσθήκῃ δυνάμεως, ἀλλὰ τῇ φήμῃ τοῦ καὶ τὸν βασιλέως ἀδελφὸν αὐτῷ συμμαχεῖν. Καὶ ἐδόκει δὲ τοῖς τε ἐπιοῦσιν ἔσεσθαι ταύτῃ φοβερώτερος καὶ τοῖς ἐν Εὐρώπῃ χριστιανοῖς σύμπασιν εὐνουστέροις τε καὶ χρηστοτέροις κεχρήσεσθαι ἐς τὰ παρόντα. Ἀλλὰ σοί γε τοῦ πᾶσι χριστιανοῖς συνοίσοντος μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς ἰδίας ἐμέλησεν ὠφελείας, οὐ χαλεπῶς ἄν τις ἠνέσχετο· τοὺς γὰρ πλείους τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὁρῶμεν ἰσχυριζομένους ἐφ' οἷς ἂν ἕλοιντο τὴν ἀρχήν, καὶ ὑπ' αἰσχύνης τοῦ δόξαι τι ἧσσῆσθαι τῶν ἀνταγωνιζομένων, τὰ μέγιστα ἐξαμαρτάνειν τε καὶ ἀτυχεῖν, εἴ γε συμβαίη προαιρουμένους. Ἀλλὰ σύ γε ἐν ἱκέτου τάξει πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτομολήσας καὶ βασιλέα, οὐδὲ βουληθέντι ἂν μνησικακεῖν ἐπέτρεψας· ἠδέσθη γάρ σου τὴν ἀρετὴν καὶ χάριν ὡμολόγει τὰ πᾶσι λυσιτελέστατα ἠρημένῳ. Ἐφίλει μὲν οὖν σε καὶ ἐτίμα τότ' εὐθύς, τῶν δὲ πρεπόντων οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως καὶ μέχρι πλείστου ἐφείδετο. Προσῆκε δὲ ἄρα μὴ πεπαυμένῳ λυπεῖν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ σύνεσιν ἐπιδεδειγμένῳ μεγίστην καὶ ἐνὶ ἔργῳ πλείστων ἐξενηνοχότι τεκμήρια ἀρετῶν τά τε ὑπάρχοντα ἀποδοῦναι μετὰ προσθήκης καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ κεχρῆσθαι ὡς πιστοτάτῳ. Οὕτω γὰρ καὶ τὸ θεῖον ἡμῖν ἱκέταις αὐτοῦ γινομένοις, ἐπειδάν τι ἐξαμαρτόντες μετανοῶμεν, οὐ συγγινώσκει μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ χάριν προστίθησι. Σὺ δὲ ἠνείχου, ξυμπάσης σοι τῆς οἰκίας ἐνδείᾳ πιεζομένης, καὶ ταῖς εἰς τὸ θεῖον ἐλπίσι προσεῖχες.

Εἶτα ὁ μὲν Θεόδωρός σοι τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτῷ τέτακτο τῷ βασιλεῖ φανερῶς ἐξελθών, σὺ δὲ μένων, ἔμελλες συμμαχεῖν βασιλεῖ τε αὐτῷ καὶ τῷ δικαίῳ· καὶ οὕτω γε παρεσκεύασο. Ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἀδικεῖσθαι μέν σε εἰδώς, λύειν δὲ τὴν ἀδικίαν οὔπω βουλόμενος, δεδιὼς δὲ μή τι καὶ ἀντιλυπεῖν προαχθείης καὶ τἀδελφῷ συνεξεργάσαιο τὴν ἄμυναν μάλα ῥᾳδίως, εἶργε τε ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις καὶ φρουρὰν ἐφίστησι. Καὶ ἡ παρὰ τῶν ὅρκων ἀσφάλεια, φεῦ, δεινῶς ὑπεχώρει τῷ δέει, ὑφορμοῦντι μᾶλλον ἐξ ὧν ἔφερες πάσχων κακῶς, ἢ ἐξ ὧν ἠγανάκτεις. Ῥύεται δέ σε ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἔφορος καὶ τῶν ὅρκων, δρᾶμα ἐπὶ νοῦν ἐμβαλὼν συνετώτατον μὲν διανοηθῆναι, ἀνῦσαι δὲ χαλεπώτατον, μὴ σὺν Θεῷ καὶ τῇ παρ' ἐκείνου ῥοπῇ· καὶ ἔξω δεινῶν ὑπὸ Θεοῦ γεγονώς, οὔτ' ἐμνησικάκησας, οὔθ' ὑπ' ὀργῆς προήχθης τι καὶ ἀμύνασθαι, καιρὸν ἔχων ταῦτα ποιεῖν. Ὁ γὰρ ἀδελφὸς ἐδεῖτό σου αὐτῷ συμμαχεῖν, πολλὰ ὑπισχνούμενος, εἰ διὰ σοῦ τετυχηκὼς ὧν ἐπεθύμει, δύναιτό σε ἀμείβεσθαι τὰ εἰκότα.

---

4 *συμβαλέσθαι* L 19 *ἐνὶ*: *ἐν* L 29 *προαχθείη* L *συνεξεργάσαι* L

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Ἀλλὰ τότε μᾶλλον ἢ πρόσθεν εὔνους τε τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ ὠφέλιμος πεφηνώς, ἔδειξας ἐκεῖνα συκοφαντίαν μὲν ὡς ἀληθῶς τῶν κατηγορηκότων καὶ σκευωρίαν ἀσύστατον, μικροψυχίαν δὲ καὶ δέος ἀδεὲς τοῦ πιστεύσαντος. Καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς ᾤετο μὲν δεῖν ὑψὲ τὰ δίκαια πράττειν, τὴν δὲ τἀδελφοῦ θεραπεύων νέμεσιν, ἐν δεινῷ τὴν σὴν εὐδοκίμησιν ποιουμένου, ἐδίδου μὲν αὐτίκα τὰς νήσους, τὴν δὲ προτέραν ἀρχὴν ἀνέλαβεν. Ὑπακούσαντι δέ σοι καὶ ἐν ταῖς νήσοις ὄντι οὐκ ἐπαύετο ἐπιστέλλων αὖθις καὶ πρεσβευόμενος ὁ νεώτερος, τί μὲν οὐ διδούς, τί δὲ οὐκ | ἐπαγγελλόμενος f. 194ᵛ εἰς τὸ μέλλον; Ἀλλ' ἐκείνῳ μὲν οὐδ' ἠξίωσας ἀποκρίνασθαι, τῷ δὲ πρεσβυτέρῳ μεταπεμπομένῳ σε ἐπί τῇ αὐτοῦ ὠφελείᾳ, ἐπεὶ ἑώρα πολλοὺς ἀποστασίαν ὠδίνοντας, εἰ καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα οὐκ εἰς μακρὰν ἀντέστραπτο, καὶ ἔδει δὴ τῆς σῆς συνουσίας αὐτῷ, σὺ μὲν ἐπείθου καλῶς ποιῶν, ἡ δὲ χρεία καὶ πρὸ τῆς σῆς καθόδου ἐπέπαυτο, θανάτῳ κεκριμένης τῆς μάχης. Ὁ δὲ καὶ οὕτως ἅσμενος ὑπεδέχετό σε, καὶ οὐδὲν ὅ τι οὐκ ἐποίει βασιλικῶς εἰς εὐνοίας ἐπίδειξιν. Ἔμελλε δὲ αὐτίκα καὶ τὰς ὑποσχέσεις ἔργῳ πληροῦν καὶ τὰς πόλεις ἐκείνας παραδιδόναι· γραφῇ γὰρ πάλαι ἐδέδοντο· ἀλλ' ἐν τούτοις καὶ αὐτὸς θανάτῳ ἀνήρπαστο.

4. Μέχρι μὲν οὖν τούτων ἔχοι τις ἂν καὶ ἐπαινεῖν σου τὴν καρτερίαν, τὴν δικαιοσύνην, τὴν πρόνοιαν, τὴν ἐμβρίθειαν, ἃ καὶ τῷ λόγῳ ἐπιδραμεῖν μακρὸν ἂν εἴη, μὴ ὅτι γε ἱστορῆσαι καὶ ἑκάστῳ τὴν πρέπουσαν εὐφημίαν τάξαι καλῶς. Καὶ οἶμαι μηδένα ἂν τῶν ἐπὶ φιλοσοφίᾳ βεβοημένων οὕτω τοῖς προσπεπτωκόσι καλῶς χρήσασθαι, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐδὲ λόγῳ δηλῶσαι ἄν σοι δυνηθῆναι, μήτε Πλάτωνα αὐτόν, εἰ περιῆν, μήτε Δίωνα, μήθ' ὁντινοῦν, ὃ πολὺ ῥᾷον ἂν ἦν, ὡς αὐτὸς ἔργῳ ἕκαστα μετεχείρισας. Τὰ δ' ἐφεξῆς καὶ κρείττω θαύματος πᾶς τις ἂν ἀποφήναιτο καὶ ἡρωϊκῇ καὶ θείᾳ ψυχῇ μᾶλλον, εἰ δεῖ κατὰ Ἀριστοτέλη εἰπεῖν, ἢ ἀνθρωπείᾳ πρέποντα ἐξειργάσθη. Ὤχετο μὲν γὰρ ὁ βασιλεύς· σοὶ δὲ πλὴν ὀλίγων ἅπαντες συνεβούλευον τὴν μείζω λαμβάνειν προσηγορίαν ἐν χεροῖν οὖσαν, ἣν καὶ ἰδιώταις ἁρπάσασιν ἔσθ' ὅτε οὐ μετεμέλησε· σοὶ δὲ ἔφασκον βασιλεὺς μὲν ὁ πατήρ, ἀδελφὸς δὲ ὁ πρὸ μικροῦ βεβασιλευκώς, τὸ δὲ θνήσκοντι παρόντα τυχεῖν καὶ τὸ τῶν πραγμάτων ἄχθος διενεγκεῖν, οὐδὲν ἧττον εἰς δικαίωμα ἔσται σοι τῶν ἐκ τοῦ χρόνου πρεσβείων, καὶ τοιούτοις τισὶν ἠρέθιζόν σου τὴν γνώμην φανερῶς ἐπιχειρῆσαι τοῖς μείζοσιν. Ἀλλὰ σύ γε τῇ σαυτοῦ φύσει μᾶλλον χρησάμενος, εἰ δὲ ἔδει τι καὶ συμβούλων, οὐ τοῖς ῥιψοκινδύνοις τούτοις, ἀλλὰ τοῖς σωφρονεστάτοις προσεσχηκώς, καὶ τὴν μὲν βασιλείαν προσήκειν μᾶλλον τῷ τοὺς ἀρχομένους προαιρουμένῳ σῴζειν ὑπειληφώς, τὸ σχῆμα δὲ οὐ συνοίσειν τῷ φιλονεικίαν καὶ φθορὰν μνωμένῳ τοῖς πράγμασιν ἐκ τῆς τῶν ὅλων σωτηρίας καὶ ἀσφαλείας, ᾧπου δεῖν λαμβάνειν μᾶλλον τὴν εὔκλειαν καὶ τὴν δόξαν, καὶ διὰ τοῦθ' εἱρμῷ τινι θαυμασίῳ πᾶσιν ἐπεξῆλθες τοῖς πράγμασιν, ἁψάμενος μὲν οὐδαμῇ τῶν κοινῶν,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

πρεσβευόμενος δὲ ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰρήνης, ἀντεπεξιὼν δὲ τοῖς πολεμίοις γενναίως καὶ τῆς τῶν τειχέων ἐπιμελόμενος φυλακῆς καὶ τῷ μείζονι τῶν ἀδελφῶν τὴν βασιλείαν συγκατακτώμενος, ὥσπερ ἐπίτροπος τῆς τῶν ὅλων σωτηρίας καὶ φυλακῆς τῇ πόλει καταστὰς ἐκ Θεοῦ. Καίτοι συνέπλαττον μὲν οἱ συκοφάνται πολλά, ταράξαι τὴν σὴν γνώμην βουλόμενοι· ἀλλὰ σύ γε ἀκλόνητος ἦσθα· οὐ γάρ σε ἐλάνθανεν, ὅθεν ταῦτα ἐσπείρετο τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ ὅσοι τὰ σπειρόμενα λαμβάνοντες ἔτρεφον, καὶ ὅτου χάριν. Καὶ ἔγωγε, νὴ τὴν ἱερὰν ἀλήθειαν, πολλάκις ἐξεπεπλήγμην σου τὴν καρτερίαν πολὺ μᾶλλον ἢ τὴν ἄλλην μεγαλοψυχίαν καὶ πρόνοιαν, καὶ οἶδα πάνυ καλῶς, ὡς εἰ μὴ τῶν συκοφαντῶν αἱ βοαὶ καὶ προσενοχλήσεις ἐκώλυον, κἂν ἐρρωμενέστερον τῶν πραγμάτων ἥμμένος, συνθήκας τε ἐποίεις πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους ἡμῖν καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν ὑγιαίνουσαν τοῖς ὅλοις ἀπεδίδους ἂν ἥκοντι ἐκ Πελοποννήσου τἀδελφῷ τε καὶ βασιλεῖ, καὶ οὔτ' ἂν ἡ περιοικὶς ἐκείρετο πᾶσα, οὔτε ταῖς νήσοις ἂν τὸ δεινὸν ἐπῆλθε ἐκεῖνο, οὐδέποτε αὐταῖς ὁμοίως ἐφ' ἡμῶν ἐπεληλυθός. Ἀρχὴ δὲ τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα δεινῶν ἐκεῖνα ἦν τὰ συμπλάσματα· ὅπως δέ, ἐῶ τοῖς ὀρθῶς κρίνειν δυναμένοις σκοπεῖν. Τὸ τοίνυν ὀνόματος ἥδιστου τῆς βασιλείας παραχωρῆσαι, οὗ καὶ πατρὶ παῖς, καὶ παιδὶ πατὴρ διαμφισβητοῦντες πολλάκις διώλοντο, καὶ τὴν ἐσομένην προ-
f. 195 ειδόμενον φιλονει|κίαν καὶ σύγχυσιν καὶ τὴν τῶν ἄλλων φθορὰν στέρξαι τὰ δεύτερα, πόσην ἔχει φιλοσοφίαν, πόσην δὲ ἡμεῖς σοι χάριν ὀφείλομεν; Πῶς δὲ οὐκ ἀθλίους χρὴ τοὺς συκοφάντας ἡγεῖσθαι, εἴ τις τὴν σὴν βουλὴν καὶ γνώμην εἰδὼς ἀκριβῶς, παρὰ ταύτην τὰ ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἐσκευωρημένα τιθείη, καὶ δεικνύοι τὸ ἀφαρμόζον; Ἀθλιώτεροι δ' ἂν φαίνοιντο δικαίως ὅσοι αὐτῶν ἐθελοκακοῦσιν. Ὅσοι γὰρ αὐτοῖς πειθόμενοι ἐξηπάτηντο, ἀμαθίᾳ μὲν χείρους, φαυλότητι δὲ ἐλάττους εἰσί.

5. Τὰ δὲ δὴ μετὰ ταῦτα σκοπῶν, εὑρίσκω πολὺ τῶν εἰρημένων θαυμασιώτερα. Ποίαν γὰρ οὐ παρελαύνει γενναιότητα καὶ μεγαλοψυχίαν τὸ μὴ ἐκ περιουσίας ἀγωνίσασθαι πρὸς τῶν σαυτοῦ βουληθῆναι, ἀλλὰ μεταξὺ τῶν ἀδελφῶν καθήμενον καὶ τοῖς τῶν συκοφαντῶν αὖθις ἐγκείμενον στόμασιν, ὑφ' ὧν πολλὰ ἐπεπόνθεις, περὶ τῶν δικαίων διαγωνίζεσθαι, ὅπερ οὐδεὶς ἂν ἐθάρρησεν, οὔκουν γε ὧν ἡμεῖς ἴσμεν, ἀρχόντων; Καίτοι πολλοὶ συνεβούλευον ἐν ἀσφαλείᾳ ὄντα τὰ δίκαια ἀπαιτεῖν σὺν ἀνάγκῃ· ἀλλὰ σύ γε τῶν βασιλέως ὅρκων οὐδεμίαν νομίσας εἶναι μείζω ἀσφάλειαν· οὕτω γὰρ σοί τε χρῆναι διανοηθῆναι περὶ ἐκείνου καὶ αὐτῷ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, μηδ' ὑποβαλέσθαι ἄν ποτε κρηπῖδα τὴν τῶν ὅρκων ὑπεροψίαν, τῷ δὲ τὰ δίκαια ἀπαιτοῦντι μηδένα ἂν μέμψασθαι, μηδ' εἴ τι καὶ γένοιτο κακὸν τῷ οὕτω διακειμένῳ, τῷ πεπονθότι μᾶλλον τὸ αἰσχος ἔχειν ἢ τοῖς ἐπείγουσι καὶ Θεὸν πρὸ πάντων ὑπερασπίσειν. Εἶχες δὲ ἄρα ἔκ τε τοῦ συνειδότος

---

31 ὧν: ὡς L

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

καὶ ἐκ τοῦ παραδείγματος ἐκείνου θαρρεῖν. Τὰ τοιαῦτα τοίνυν ἐν νῷ θέμενος, ἔμεινας μὲν καὶ οὐκ ἠξίωσας χαρίσασθαι τοῖς εὐχομένοις διεστῶτας βλέπειν τοὺς ἀδελφούς, ὡς ἂν αὐτοὶ τὰ αὑτῶν ἄμεινον διαθεῖεν, χεῖρον μὲν οὖν, εἰ δεῖ τἀληθὲς εἰπεῖν· τῷ γὰρ κοινῷ καὶ τὰ αὑτῶν δήπου συγκαταβλάπτουσιν. Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἔδει κοινῇ βουλεύσασθαι συνελθόντας, πότερον δεῖ σε ἐς Πελοπόννησον ἀπιέναι ἢ μένειν ἀπολαύοντα τῆς προτέρας ἀρχῆς, τὸ μὲν τῷ ὄντι συμφέρον οὐκ ὤκνησας προτιθέναι, καίτοι γε ἐγίνωσκες οὐκ ἀρέσων, ἕτοιμος δὲ ἦσθα πράττειν ὅ τι ἂν τοῖς ἄλλοις συμφέρον κριθείη. Ἔξὸν οὖν μένοντά σε ἐν τῇ πατρίδι ἐκ Πελοποννήσου τὰ ἀναλώματα ἔχειν, καὶ πρῶτον μὲν ὧν χάριν ἔνιοι προΐεσθαι τὴν εὐσέβειαν συμβουλεύουσι καὶ ἃ ἐκ Λατίνων ὀνειροπολοῦσι, ταῦτα ἔργῳ τῇ πόλει προσεῖναι μετὰ τοῦ εὐσεβεῖν, ἄνδρας ὑπὲρ τριακοσίους τοῖς ἐκ Πελοποννήσου χρήμασι τρεφομένους, οἳ διπλάσιον ἂν δύναιντο τῶν ἔξωθέν ποθεν εἰσιόντων, ὄντες ἡμεδαποί, ἔπειτα καὶ εἴ τι ἀπευκτὸν μέν, οὐ μέντοι γε καὶ παρὰ δόξαν συμβαίη, εἶναι αὐτίκα ἐν ἡμῖν ὃς ἂν ἀντιλήψαιτο τῶν πραγμάτων, καὶ μή, ἃ ἠλγοῦμέν τε ἐπὶ τοῦ προτέρου βασιλέως καὶ ὠνειδίζομεν καὶ ἐμαντευόμεθα καὶ ξυνέπεσε δὴ οὕτω, ταῦθ' ὑποσταίημεν, εἴ γε συμβαίη, μηδὲ τῇ πείρᾳ ὠφελημένοι, ὅτ' ἴσως καὶ τὰ τῶν ἐχθρῶν μὲν ἰσχυρότερα, τὰ δ' ἡμέτερα ἀδρανέστερα ἔσται πολλῶν ἕνεκα, ἅπερ ἔργον ἂν εἴη ἐπεξιέναι· ταῦτά τε τοίνυν ἐξὸν γίνεσθαι οὕτω καὶ σὲ ἀπηλλάχθαι πόνων, ἐπεὶ μὴ ταῦτα ἐδόκει τῷ συνεδρίῳ, ἀλλ' ἃ ἐγίνετο, καὶ εἴη γε ἐπ' ὠφελείᾳ, ὑπήκουσάς τε (οὐ γὰρ ᾧου λοιπὸν ὀφλήσειν, εἰ καί τι ἄλλο ἐκβαίη), καὶ ὅπως ἂν εἰς Πελοπόννησον μετὰ παντὸς ἀφίκοιο τοῦ γιγνομένου ἐσπούδακας. Τοῦτ' γὰρ λοιπὸν ἦν· κἀν τούτῳ τοίνυν τῷ μέρει ὑπὸ τῶν πλειόνων ἐπεβουλεύου.

Ὁ δὲ βασιλεύς, πάνυ ἐννοῶν τὰ δίκαια καὶ πράττειν βουλόμενος· οὐ γὰρ ἐλελήθει αὐτόν, εἴ γε μηδὲ πάντας, οἵς τι τοῦ δικαίου ἐμέλησεν, οἵῳ σε σχήματι ἔδει ἐπὶ τὴν τῆς Πελοποννήσου ἀρχὴν ἐκπέμπεσθαι ἀντὶ τῶν ἐνταῦθα δικαίων, ἤ, εἰ βούλει γε, καὶ διὰ τὸ τοῦ χρόνου πρεσβεῖον, ὃ τοσαῦτα δύναται, ὡς εἰκός· τῷ μέντοι γε συνεδρίῳ συγκαθιεὶς ἃ τοῖς συνεδρεύουσιν ἐδόκει, δίκαιά τε | ὁμοῦ καὶ τῇ πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν εἰρήνῃ f. 195v συνοίσοντα, ταῦτ' ἐπειρᾶτό σε πείθειν, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπείθου εὐνοίᾳ τῇ πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ τῷ νεωτέρῳ συνεχώρεις ἃ ἔχειν ἐβούλετο. Καὶ οἱ ὅρκοι δὴ ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐγίνοντο φρίκης μεστοί, τὰ θειότατα τῶν χριστιανοῖς πρεσβευομένων ἡμῖν λόγῳ τε καὶ γραφῇ καὶ ἔργῳ παρειλημμένα, ἃ μηδ' ὑπὲρ τῆς ξυμπάσης γῆς ἔδει παραβαίνεσθαι, μὴ ὅτι γε ἀρχῆς οὕτω μικρᾶς, τοῖς γε ὡς ἀληθῶς ἐπ' αὐτοῖς τὴν τῆς εὐδαιμονίας τιθεμένοις ἐλπίδα καὶ οἷς τι μέλει τοῦ καὶ ἔργῳ τιμᾶν ἃ γλώττῃ σέβομεν.

---

6 *εἰς* L 13 *οἱοι* L 26 *δίκαια*: *δέοντα* L

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Φεῦ, φλεγμαίνει μου τὰ ἔνδον, κυμαίνεται, ὠδίνω πάνυ πολλά, ἀλλ' ἐκρηγνύναι οὐ βούλομαι. Εὐξαίμην ἂν μᾶλλον γλώττῃ ὀνειδίσαι οἷός τ' εἶναι οἷς πρόσῃκει. Τὰ γὰρ ἐν γραφῇ πρὸς πολλῶν ἀκοὰς διαβήσεται, καὶ φείδομαι τῆς εὐνοίας· εὖνοι γάρ ἐσμεν αὐτοῖς, εἰ καὶ τῷ Χριστῷ προσκόπτοντες ἀνιῶσιν ἡμᾶς, οἷς πάντα ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν ἀγάπης ἠτίμασται. Ἐξέστω δὲ σὺν αὐτῷ τοῦτ' εἰπεῖν· Ἵλεως αὐτοῖς γένοιτο· σὲ δὲ στεφανώσει τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν εὐσεβείας εἵνεκα, μὴ ἀμφίβαλλε.

6. Ἀλλ' ἐπάνειμι πρὸς τὴν τῶν λόγων ἀκολουθίαν. Σύ τε οὖν προῄδεις ἃ νῦν ἐγεγόνει, τοῦτ' οἶδα καλῶς, καὶ πολλοί προὔλεγον, ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ἧττον ἀπῄεις φέροντι τῷ θυμῷ. Ἐν δὴ τοῦτο πόσων ἀρετῶν γέμει τῷ βουλομένῳ κρίνειν καλῶς; Τῇ μὲν γὰρ φρονίσει προεώρας τὸ μέλλον, λυπεῖν δὲ οὐ βουλόμενος τοὺς ἐκπέμποντας, εὐπειθείας καὶ φιλίας τῆς πρὸς αὐτοὺς παρείχου μέγα σημεῖον· τῷ δ' εἰς προὔπτον πόλεμον ἐθελῆσαι ἐλθεῖν, ἀνδρειότατος ἔδειξας ὤν, τὸ δ' ἐλπίσαι περιέσεσθαι, ἐκ τῆς πρὸς Θεόν σοι γέγονεν εὐσεβείας.

Ἠνέσχου δὲ ταῦτα ἅπαντα τὴν ἀρχὴν τῷ μὴ βούλεσθαι δοκεῖν ἐθελοκακεῖν, καὶ ὡς ἂν μηδὲ βουλομένοις τοῖς πονηροῖς ἐξείη τι καταμέμφεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἐμφράττοιτο αὐτοῖς τὰ στόματα, τῶν αἰτιῶν εἰς ἑτέρους μεθισταμένων, δι' ἃ δὴ καὶ εἰς τὴν νῆσον ἐξῄεις εὐθύς, πρᾶγμα ὀλίγοις ἂν τολμηθέν, κατειλημμένων μὲν τῶν πολιχνίων πάντων σχεδόν, μεταπεπτωκότων δὲ τῶν ταύτῃ βαρβάρων, τῆς δὲ συνηθείας πρὸς τῶν ἀντιτεταγμένων οὔσης, ὃ μέγα δύναται. Οὐ γὰρ ἀπροσδόκητά σοι ἀπήντηκεν, ὥστε καὶ καταπληχθέντα ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἄλλο τι βουλεύσασθαι, ἀλλ' οἷά τε προσεδέχου, καὶ ἃ ὑπομένειν καὶ οἷς διαμάχεσθαί σοι ἐκέκριτο μάλα γε συνετῶς, τοιούτοις ἐντετυχηκώς, ἔπραττες ἃ ἐκεκύρωτο σαυτῷ μὲν πρέποντα, τῷ δὲ βασιλεῖ ἡδέα, ἡμῖν δὲ πᾶσι συμφέροντα. Οὐ γὰρ περὶ τῶν σῶν δικαίων ἠγώνισαι μόνον, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τοῦ δυστυχοῦς τούτου τῶν Ἑλλήνων λειψάνου, ὃ θᾶττον ἂν ἀπόλοιτο ταῖς ὑμετέραις διαφοραῖς, εἴ τις πλεονεκτῶν ἀναγκάζοι ἀμύνεσθαι τὸν μὴ φέροντα. Ἠγώνισαι δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ εὐσεβείας οὐδὲν ἧττον καὶ συμπάσης ἀρετῆς. Οὐ γὰρ δεῖ οὐδένα τοῖς ὑπερβαίνουσι τὰ δίκαια συγχωρεῖν, ἀλλ' ἀνθίστασθαι ὅπως ἂν ἐξείη καὶ εἴργειν, κἂν μηδὲν αὐτῷ διαφέροι· ἢ τί γε θηρίων διοίσομεν, ἢ μὴ εὐορκοῦντες, ἢ τοῖς τὰ ὠμοσμένα παραλύουσιν οὐκ ἀγανακτοῦντες; Οὐδεμία γὰρ ἂν πρόφασις γένοιτο εὐπρεπὴς ἀνθρώπῳ τῶν τοιούτων ὀλιγώρως ἔχειν ἢ ἔχειν δοκεῖν.

Μέχρι μὲν οὖν τούτων ἅπαντά σοι γενναίως τε καὶ φρονίμως καὶ εὐσεβῶς βεβούλευταί τε καὶ ἤνυσται. Καὶ νῦν μὲν διεξῆλθον, μόνον ἁπτόμενος ὡς ἐν κεφαλαίῳ· ἀλλ' ἐπειδὰν ἡμῖν σχολὴ γένοιτο ἐκ τῶν ἀνθελκόντων, καὶ τὰ σὰ παγεῖη που εὐτυχῶς, ᾄσομεθά σοι τὴν σύμπασαν τοῦ

---

2 *οἷός* L 29 *Ἠγώνισται* L 32 *ὁμωσμένα* A

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

βίου προαίρεσιν, προὔργου τοῦτ' ἐνστησάμενοι. Σκόπει δ' ὅπως καὶ τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα συνάδοντα ᾖ τοῖς προτέροις, ἃ νῦν ὑπό τε ἡμῶν καὶ τῶν ὁμοίως εἰδότων καὶ τἀληθῆ λεγόντων ἐπαίνων ἠξίωται. Σφραγὶς γὰρ ἔσται τοῖς μέχρι νῦν ἐπιδεδειγμένοις σοι, ἃ ἐς τὸ μέλλον χρήσῃ σαυτῷ καὶ τοῖς πράγμασι, καὶ εἴ γε ὅμοια ἐπιτεθείη, οὐδεὶς ἀνέξεται μὴ οὐ βέλτιστον | καὶ f. 196
ἰδιωτῶν καὶ ἀρχόντων πάντων σε οἴεσθαί τε καὶ ἀποφαίνειν. Οὐκ ἀμφιγνοοῦμεν οὖν σαυτῷ ὁμοιότατόν σε φανεῖσθαι. Μαντευόμεθα μὲν οὖν καὶ πολὺ σοφώτερον ἐπιδείξειν σαυτὸν τοῖς τε φίλοις καὶ τοῖς ἄλλως διακειμένοις, ἑκατέροις τὸ οἰκεῖον τῇ διαθέσει πάθος ἐκ τῆς σῆς εὐδοκιμήσεως ἐμποιοῦντά τε καὶ ἐμβάλλοντα. Ἡγήσεται γάρ σοι τὸ θεῖον περὶ ὃ εὐσεβεῖς, καὶ ἄξει ἐφ' ὅ τι ἂν ᾖ βέλτιστον, εἴ γε λόγος ἐστὶν αὐτῷ ἔτι ἡμῶν, καὶ ὡς ἂν ἡμεῖς ὠφελοίμεθα, ὁρῶντες τοὺς εὐσεβεῖν ᾠρημένους πολύ τι δὴ καὶ ἐν τῷδε τῷ βίῳ εὐδοκιμοῦντας· εἰ δὲ μή, ὅπερ ἀπεύχομαι, ἀλλὰ σύ γε μὴ παύσαιο εὐσεβῶν. Οὐ γὰρ ἐνταῦθα ἡμῶν ἐστι τὸ πέρας, ὥστε ἀπαγορεύειν τοὺς μὴ φανερῶς τι ὠφελουμένους δι' ἀρετήν, ἀλλ' αἱ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀμοιβαὶ ἄλλοθί που ἱδρυμέναι, ἀπέραντα εὐφρανοῦσι τοὺς ἀρετῆς χάριν ὑπ' αὐτῶν κοσμηθησομένους· καίτοι καὶ ἐνταῦθα αὐτάρκη ἔχει τὴν ἡδονὴν τὰ ἔργα τῆς ἀρετῆς· εἰ δὲ βούλει, σὲ καὶ ἡ ἕξις τῷ κατ' αὐτὴν ζῶντι, εἰ καὶ μηδεὶς συνειδοίη, μήτε ἀμείβοιτο ὁπηοῦν· ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς ἐλπίζομέν σε καὶ ἐν τῷδε διαπρέψειν τῷ βίῳ, παράδειγμα εὐσεβείας ἱστάμενον τοῖς ὁρῶσι, καὶ τῆς διὰ ταύτην θεοφιλίας. Μηδὲ οἷου στρατηγεῖσθαι ὑπὸ σαυτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τῆς καθαρᾶς εὐσεβείας πάντα σοι νόμιζε κατωρθῶσθαι. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ καὶ δυσκολίαις ἐντυγχάνειν πραγμάτων, τῇ τε φύσει τῶν ὅλων δοτέον καὶ τῇ τῶν ἑλληνικῶν πραγμάτων στενότητι καὶ ταῖς ἄλλων σκολιότησι δήπου, δι' ἃς μάλιστα καὶ πολλά σοι οὐ κατὰ γνώμην ἀπήνυστο· ἴσως δὲ καὶ γυμνασία τῆς σῆς ἀρετῆς εἰσι τὰ τοιαῦτα. Οὐ γὰρ ἂν ᾐσθόμεθά σου καρτερικοῦ καὶ γενναίου καὶ δικαίου καὶ ἐμβριθοῦς, μὴ ἐν τοιαύταις ἐξεταζομένου τύχης πλοκαῖς. Τὸ δὲ διαγίνεσθαι πάντων ἀπαθῆ μετὰ ἀρετῆς, καὶ ἔτι τὴν δόξαν σοι καὶ τὴν δύναμιν, σχολῇ μέν, προϊέναι δ' οὖν σὺν ἅπαντι τῷ δικαίῳ, τί γε ἄλλο, εἰ μὴ τῆς ἐκ Θεοῦ θείη τις ἀντιλήψεως εἰς ἡμέραν ἀγαθήν σε τηρούσης ὥσπερ δήπου τοὺς ἐναντίως διακειμένους εἰς ἐναντίαν τηρεῖν αὐτός φησι, κἂν ἐν τῷ παρόντι δοκῶσιν ἄμεινον πράττειν. Εὐσέβειαν δέ που οὐδενὶ ἐγὼ μείζω σύνοιδα τῶν νῦν ὄντων ἀνθρώπων ἢ σοί· οὐ γὰρ δέδια μὴ μέγα φρονήσῃς. Ἐπικοσμεῖ γάρ σοι τἄλλα τῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ ἡ τοῦ φρονήματος μετριότης, ἢ μᾶλλον μεσότης εἰπεῖν. Καὶ τὸ μὲν εὐορκεῖν σε παρίημι· ἱκανῶς γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν εἴρηκα· ἀλλὰ τί ἂν γένοιτο εὐσεβέστερον τοῦ μετανοεῖν μὲν ἐπὶ τοῖς προτέροις ἐκείνοις ἀεί, ὥσπερ ἑαυτῷ μόνῳ ἅπαντα ἐπιγράφοντι,

---

11 ἄν ᾖ: αὐτίκα L 18 σε: γε L 36 σὲ: σοι L

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

καὶ ἄγχεσθαι ὑπὸ λύπης καὶ μὴ αἰδούμενον πρὸς οὓς ἂν δέοι ἀπομνημονεύειν, εἰ οἷόν τε, καὶ μιᾶς ἡμέρας πολλάκις καὶ ἱλεοῦσθαι τὸ θεῖον ἀεὶ καὶ μηδέποτε οἴεσθαι ἱκανὴν ὑποσχεῖν δίκην τοῖς τῶν τοιούτων καθαίρουσιν, ὥσπερ ἐν τῷ ἐξαμαρτάνειν ὄντα ἀεί, ἀλλ' οὐ πάλαι πεπαυμένου τοῦ ἁμαρτήματος; Τίς καὶ ἰδιώτης οὕτω τεταπείνωκεν ἑαυτόν; τίς οὕτω συντέτριπται ὑπὸ τῆς ἐν τοῖς ἁμαρτήμασι λύπης; μᾶλλον δέ, εἰ γε δεῖ τἀληθῆ λέγειν, οὐδὲ τῶν ἐν ἐρημίαις φιλοσοφούντων ἐδυνήθη τοσοῦτον οὐδείς, οἷς δι' ἀπραγμοσύνην ῥᾷστόν ἐστιν ἀεί τι καταμέμφεσθαι ἑαυτῶν καὶ τὰ ἐλάχιστα τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων διὰ πολλὴν μετριότητα ἀνακλάεσθαι, ὅσον αὐτὸς ἐν τοσούτῳ πραγμάτων ὄχλῳ δεδύνησαι. Τοῦτο οὐκ εὐσεβείας καθαρωτάτης; οὐ συνέσεως ἄκρας; οὐ φρονήσεως ἐντελοῦς; Τίς ἂν οὖν οὐ θαρρήσειε προσελθεῖν τοιούτῳ; τίς οὐκ ἂν ἀσπάσαιτο ὑπὸ τοιούτῳ τετάχθαι; τίς οὐκ ἂν καὶ ἀπὼν ἐπαινοίη, εἰ καὶ οὐστινασοῦν μέλλοι λυπεῖν;

f. 197 7. Ἔρχομαι δὴ καὶ πρὸς τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας κεφάλαιον, ἐν τούτῳ παυσόμενος. Οἱ μὲν πολλοὶ τῶν οὐκ ἀσφαλῶς πιστευόντων ἄλλα μὲν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ κεύθουσιν, ἄλλα δὲ προσποιοῦνται, καὶ ἃ σέβειν ἰσχυρίζονται λόγῳ, ταῦτα τοῖς καθαιρεῖν ἐπιχειροῦσιν ἔργῳ συγκαταλύουσιν, ἄθλιοι, ὥσπερ εἴ τις αὐτὸς μὲν μὴ βούλοιτο κτείνειν τὸ ποίμνιον, λῃσταῖς δὲ καὶ θηρίοις τὴν αὔλειον ἀνιείς, ἐκδιδοίη σφάττειν καὶ διαρπάζειν. Σὺ δ' οὐ τοιοῦτος, ἀλλ' εὐθὺς μὲν ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τῆς καινοτομίας ταύτης συστάσει παρών τε καὶ τὴν πραγματείαν ὁρῶν ἀνθρωπίνην, εἰ μή τι πρέποι καὶ χεῖρον εἰπεῖν, ἱερὸν δὲ μηδὲν ἔχουσαν, ἀπεπήδησας, καὶ οὔτε παρῆσθα ταῖς ψήφοις ἐκείναις· οὐ γὰρ ἔμελλες συναινεῖν· καὶ τόν τε χρηστὸν Γεμιστὸν κἀμὲ εἶχες συναπιόντας, καίτοι σοῦ τε ἐδέοντο πολλὰ μένειν οἱ τὸ δεινὸν συσκευάζοντες, καὶ ἡμῖν μόγις συνεχώρουν προεξιέναι τῶν καλῶν ἔργων ἐκείνων· οὐ γὰρ εἶχόν τι καὶ πρὸς βίαν ποιεῖν εὐπρεπῶς· ἐκεῖθέν τε μέχρι καὶ νῦν διέμεινας τὴν ἐκ πατέρων σοι καθήκουσαν πίστιν τε καὶ θρησκείαν διαφυλάττων καλῶς, οὐδ' ἠξίωσας ἐν οὐδενὶ τοῖς ἀλλοτρίοις ἐπιμιγνύμενος καὶ συναναχρωννὺς ἑαυτόν καταψεύδεσθαι τῆς πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ὁμολογίας, καὶ ὥσπερ θηρίον τι ποικιλόμορφον ἀποφαίνειν σοι τὴν ψυχήν. Οὕτω γὰρ οἱ πολλοὶ πράττουσιν, ἢ μηδέν τι οἰόμενοι προσλαμβάνειν ἐκ τῆς τοιαύτης εὐτραπελίας, ἐξηπατημένοι, ἢ καὶ ὡς οὐδὲν διαφέρον περιορῶντες. Ἀλλὰ μένεις ἐκ τῶν τοιούτων ἄρρυπός τε καὶ ἀπαθὴς καὶ οἷον

---

18 Après *λυπεῖν* finit la première partie de la lettre adressée par Scholarios à Démétrius Paléologue de la part de l'assemblée des antiunionistes. Le fol. 196ᵛ du manuscrit étant resté inutilisé, le copiste a reproduit, fol. 197ʳ, le titre du début, qui est en partie coupé ici. Pour suppléer à cette lacune, une main postérieure a écrit à la marge gauche: *Est composita in laudem imperatoris qui tunc regno potiebatur.* Un autre lecteur a ajouté: *Σχολαρίου λόγος.* En realité, il s'agit bien d'un seul et même morceau. 16 Iliade, 9, 313 22 *ἀνεπήδησας* L

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ἂν βούλοιντο οἱ τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν ἡγεμόνες καὶ ὡς ἐβίουν ἐκεῖνοι, οὐδαμῇ τοῖς ἕτερ' ἄττα οἰομένοις περὶ τοῦ θείου ἐπιμιγνύντες, καίτοι γε ἐκ τῆς τοιαύτης βεβαιότητός σοι καὶ εὐσεβείας οὐκ ὀλίγα τε ἑώρας ἀπαντήσοντα δυσχερῆ, ὥσπερ οὖν καὶ ἀπήντηκε, καὶ ἐλπίδας προέμενος, ἃς σοι προὐτείνοντο ἐκ τῶν ἄλλα φρονούντων οὐκ ἀγενεῖς. Ὅρου δὴ ἀντ' ἐκείνων μεῖζόν τι ἀγαθὸν τὴν εὐσέβειαν σαυτῷ τε καὶ τοῖς συνοῦσιν ἐκποριεῖν, τοῖς τε σοφίσμασιν, ἃ ἐξευρόντες τοὺς ἁπλουστέρους παρασύρουσι τοῦ ὀρθοῦ, οὔτε σοι καὶ οὔτ' ἄλλῳ νοῦν ἔχοντι προσέχειν χρῆναι ἡγῇ, ἀλλὰ τῇ τῶν μακαρίων ἐκείνων ἐπερειδόμενος κρίσει, οἳ αὐτάρκους ἡμῖν ὑπῆρξαν ἡγεμόνες γε τἀληθοῦς ἐν τοῖς πρὸς Λατίνους τοσοῦτον χρόνον διαμφισβητουμένοις, τῶν ἄλλο τι ἀξιούντων καταφρονεῖς. Καὶ τῶν μὲν σοφῶν ἑκατέρωθεν προστιθεὶς τοῖς οἰκειοτέροις σαυτόν, πάνυ καλῶς ποιῶν, φαίην δ' ἂν ὅτι καὶ σοφωτέροις, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἑτέροις ἡμῖν, τοὺς νῦν ὄντας σκύβαλα ἡγῇ τῶν ἀρχαιοτέρων, οἰόμενος τἀληθῆ. „Γελοῖοι γοῦν, φησίν, ἐσόμεθα, Πλάτων ἐν Θεαιτήτῳ, ἡγούμενοι ἡμᾶς μέν τι λέγειν φαύλους ὄντας, παμπαλαίους δὲ καὶ πανσόφους ἄνδρας ἀποδεδοκιμακότες". Ὅρα οὖν, φησίν, ὦ Θεόδωρε, εἰ λυσιτελεῖ εἰς τοσοῦτον προσιέναι κίνδυνον.

8. Καὶ σὺ τοίνυν οὐ βούλει παμπαλαίους καὶ πανσόφους ἄνδρας ἀποδοκιμάζειν, οὔτε τοὺς αὐτοῖς ὡς ἐν χρυσῇ τινι συνηρμοσμένους σειρᾷ μέχρι καὶ ἐφ' ἡμῶν, Ἰωσὴφ ἐκεῖνόν φημι· δεῖ γὰρ ἄρχεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν ὑστέρων· τὸν σὸν πατέρα καὶ σοφώτατον βασιλέα, τὸν Θεσσαλονίκης Νεῖλον, τὸν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Νεῖλον, τὸν πατριάρχην Φιλόθεον, τὸν Νικαίας Θεοφάνην, τὸν πατριάρχην Γρηγόριον, ἄνδρα οὐδενὸς τῶν ἀρχαιοτάτων ἐλάττω, τὴν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ σύνοδον ἱερὰν ὑπὲρ ἑβδομήκοντα λογάσι συγκεκροτημένην, τὸν Θεσσαλονίκης Γρηγόριον, τὸν Γερμανὸν πατριάρχην καὶ τὰ ἐπ' αὐτοῦ ἐψηφισμένα καὶ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. Σιωπῶ τὴν ἐκ τῶν ἐχθρῶν μαρτυρίαν, τὸν Βαρλαάμ· παρίημι τὸν Νικαίας Εὐστράτιον καὶ τὰ ἐπ' αὐτοῦ διειλεγμένα καὶ πεπραγμένα, τὸν Ῥωσίας Ἰωάννην τὸν φερωνύμως Χρηστόν, Λέοντα τὸν Βουλγαρίας, Θεοφύλακτον τῆς αὐτῆς, τὸν Μεθώνης Νικόλαον, Νικήταν τὸν οἰκουμενικὸν ἐπονομασθέντα διδάσκαλον, τὸν ὕπατον τῶν φιλοσόφων Ψελλόν, ἄλλους ἀναριθ-
|μήτους <μέχρι καὶ ἐπὶ> τὸν σοφώτατον τῶν βασιλέων Λέοντα καὶ τὸν f. 197v
μακάριον Φώτιον, ἐν πάσῃ τάξει καὶ σχήματι παντὶ κατατεταγμένους, οἳ πάντες βιβλίοις πολλοῖς καὶ γενναίοις ἔτι νῦν σῳζομένοις ἐλέγχουσι τοὺς

---

1 *οὐδαμοῦ* L 3 *σου* L 4 *αἳ* L 6 *νοοῦσιν* L 18 et sq. Cf. *Exposé de la foi orthodoxe* (3e traité sur la procession du Saint-Esprit) dans le t. II, p. 485-486 21 *τὸν σὸν πατέρα* = Manuel Paléologue 26 Après *αὐτοῦ*, en marge: *ἐν τῷ τῶν Λασκαρίων καιρῷ* A 28 Après *πεπραγμένα*, en marge: *ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις τῶν Κομνηνῶν* A 32 <*μέχρι καὶ ἐπὶ*> = ... *χ* .... dans L; cf. t. II, p. 485

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀρχὴν ἢ αἴτιον τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος ἀποφηναμένους ἐν τῷ συμβόλῳ τῆς πίστεως. Αὐτοὶ δὲ διδάσκουσιν ἡμᾶς τοῦ τε Υἱοῦ τοῦ τε Πνεύματος μόνον αἴτιον καὶ μόνην ἀρχὴν καὶ πηγὴν τὸν Πατέρα φρονεῖν, καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ μόνου ἄμφω κατ' αἰτίαν προϊέναι καὶ καθ' ὑπόστασιν, ὡς δὲ παρ' αὐτοῦ μόνου τὸ εἶναι λαμβάνοντα ἄμφω τε καὶ ἑκάτερον, αἰτιατικῶς. Τὸ δ' ἐκ τῆς ὑποστάσεως τοῦ Υἱοῦ τὴν ὑπόστασιν τοῦ Πνεύματος προαχθῆναι, οὕτως ὡς ἂν ὑπόστασις ἐξ ὑποστάσεως ὑφισταμένη προέλθοι, καθάπερ ἄρα καὶ ἐκ Πατρὸς τῷ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ διακρινομένων μόνον τῶν αἰτίων τοῦ Πνεύματος, κἂν μὴ προσποιῶνται Λατῖνοι, τουτέστι τῶν ὑποστάσεων, ὧν ἑκατέρα προσωπικῶς τὸ Πνεῦμα ὑφίστησι, καὶ οὐ καθὸ Θεὸς εἷς εἰσιν ἄμφω, ἵνα μή τι καὶ τοῦ προτέρου χεῖρον συμβαίη, τοῦτο τοίνυν καὶ τὰς ἐπικινδύνους ταύτας καὶ κρημνώδεις ὑπολήψεις ἁπάσας ἀποβουκολοῦσιν, ὅρους τιθέντες καὶ ἀπειλοῦντες τοῖς ὑπερβαίνειν τολμήσουσι. Διδάσκουσι δὲ ἄλλως ἡμᾶς ἐξ ἀμφοῖν προϊέναι τὸ Πνεῦμα ὁμολογεῖν, τουτέστιν ἐκ Πατρὸς δι' Υἱοῦ, ὅτε μόνον πρὸς τὴν βελτίωσιν ἐπινεύει τοῦ κτίσματος, ὡς οὕτως εἰπεῖν, ἢ μᾶλλον φάναι, πρὸς ἑαυτὸ καὶ τὴν αὐτοῦ μέθεξιν ἀμηγέπη τὸ κτίσμα ἀναλαμβάνει ταῖς ἐνδιδομέναις αὐτῷ παρ' ἑαυτοῦ χάρισι, τῆς κοινῆς ἀγαθότητος Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ τῆς ὁμόνου τούτων θελήσεως, ἣ καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἀγαθότης ἐστὶ καὶ θέλησις ἀγαθή, κινούσης τοὺς γνησίως πιστεύοντας ἐπ' αὐτὸ ταῖς πνευματικαῖς ἀντιλήψεσι, καὶ διὰ τοῦτ' ἄρα προϊέναι τε καὶ ἐκχεῖσθαι καὶ χορηγεῖσθαι καὶ δίδοσθαί γε καὶ πέμπεσθαι λεγομένου τοῦ Πνεύματος παρά τε τῶν συμφυῶν ὑποστάσεων καὶ παρ' ἑαυτοῦ. Μετ' ἐκείνης τῆς τάξεως καὶ τὰς θείας ὑποστάσεις ὑμνοῦμεν, τουτέστιν ἐκ Πατρὸς δι' Υἱοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι τὴν μίαν τῆς θεότητος χάριν ἡμᾶς ἐκεῖθεν ἀφιεμένην τε καὶ ἐνιεμένην εἰσδέχεσθαι, καὶ διὰ τῆς χάριτος ἡμῖν φανεροῦσθαι φωτιζούσης ἡμᾶς αὐτοῦ τε τοῦ Πνεύματος τὴν δύναμιν καὶ τῆς ὅλης θεότητος.

Ἐπὶ τοίνυν ταυτησὶ τῆς ἐννοίας, ἐκ Πατρὸς δι' Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα προϊέναι καὶ μάλα λέγουσι, τὴν δημιουργίαν αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν βελτίωσιν τῶν κτισμάτων ἀνατιθέντες μετὰ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ κατὰ τῶν αὐτῷ διδόντων βλασφήμως τὰ δεύτερα ἢ τὰ τρίτα τῆς φύσεως. Διδάσκουσι δὲ καὶ τὴν ἀΐδιον τοῦ Πνεύματος πρόοδον ἀνυμνεῖν δι' Υἱοῦ, πρῶτον μὲν ὡς ἂν μηδεὶς ὑπολάβοι τὸ Πνεῦμα γεννᾶσθαι παρὰ Πατρὸς διὰ τὸ ἐκ Πατρὸς ὑφεστάναι λέγεσθαι, ἐπειδὴ πρὸς τὸν Υἱὸν ὁ Πατὴρ λέγεται, καὶ προέλθοι ἂν τὸ ἐκ Πατρός, ὡς τὸ πατρικὸν ὄνομα βούλεται, γεννηθέν, ἀλλὰ τῇ τοῦ δι' Υἱοῦ παρενθέσει τῆς εἰδικῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς σημασίας, ὡς τὸν γεννῶντα σημαίνει ἐν τῇ πρὸς τὸν Υἱὸν ἀναφορᾷ μόνον, εὐθὺς συντεταγμένον συνελκομένης

---

9 διακρινόμενον L 21 αὐτὸ: ἀγαθῷ L 24 καὶ: κατὰ L

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

τὸ Πνεῦμα, μὴ πρὸς γεννῶντα λοιπόν, ἀλλ' ἕτερόν τινα τρόπον προάγοντα, οἰκείως ἀνενεχθῇ· καὶ οὕτω ταὐτὸν δύναιτο τὸ ἐκ Πατρὸς δι' Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα προβάλλεσθαι λέγειν, καὶ τὸ φάσκειν ὅτι τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται, οὐ καθάπερ ὁ Υἱὸς γεννητῶς, οὐδ' ᾗ Πατρὸς κατὰ τὴν εἰδικὴν σημασίαν, ἀλλ' ἕτερόν τινα τρόπον, τῆς δι' Υἱοῦ προσθήκης στενῶς τὴν τῶν πολλῶν ἐκείνων λόγων δύναμιν ἐμφαινούσης. Καὶ πρὸς τούτῳ, εἰ συνανίσχουσι μὲν ἐκ τῆς ὑπεραρρήτου καὶ κρυφιωτάτης ἐκείνης γονιμότητος ἐν Πατρὶ πρὸς ἔκφανσιν εἰδικὴν ὅ τε Υἱὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα, ἓν δέ εἰσι κατ' οὐσίαν καὶ ἐν ἀλλήλοις εἰσίν, ἐπεὶ τὸν Υἱὸν εὐθὺς συντάττομεν τῷ Πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἱερῶν λογίων παράδοσιν, εὔλογόν ἐστι καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα προϊέναι πιστεύειν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς προϊόν, τουτέστιν οὐκ ἐκτὸς τοῦ Υἱοῦ κατὰ τὸν ἱερὸν Ἀθανάσιον, ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτῷ γε οὐδὲν ἧττον ἢ σὺν αὐτῷ. Οὕτω γὰρ ἂν καὶ Υἱοῦ Πνεῦμα εἴη καθάπερ καὶ τοῦ Πατρὸς φυσικῶς, οὐκ ἔξωθεν ὥσπερ προσηρ|τημένον, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ φύσει f. 198 συνόν, καὶ μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων τοῦ Πατρὸς ἀγαθῶν ἐν Υἱῷ καὶ τοῦτο διῆκον παρὰ Πατρός, εἰ δεῖ γε οὕτως εἰπεῖν κατὰ Κύριλλον, καὶ οὕτω συνδιῆκον τῷ Υἱῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ πρὸς τὴν οἰκείαν ὑπόστασιν, τῷ διακεκρίσθαι μόνον προσωπικῶς διοριζόμενόν τε καὶ ἐκφαινόμενον, ἄλλως δὲ μένον ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀναπαυόμενον κατὰ τοὺς τοῦτο εἰπόντας ἁγίους. Διώρισται μὲν γὰρ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τῷ εἰς ἰδίαν ὑπόστασιν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς προαχθῆναι τῇ δυνάμει τῆς προαγούσης αἰτίας, οὐ τοῦ Πατρὸς μόνον διακρινομένην τῷ τῆς αἰτίας λόγῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ συμπροεληλυθότος Λόγου τῷ διαφόρῳ τῆς προόδου λόγῳ καὶ τρόπῳ ὑπερφυῶς· τῷ δὲ δι' αὐτοῦ, τουτέστιν οὐκ ἐκτὸς αὐτοῦ προελθεῖν, τὴν αὐτὴν ἀριθμῷ λαμβάνον οὐσίαν καὶ οὕτω νοεῖσθαι προεληλυθός, ἑνοῦταί τε καὶ συνάπτεται, ὥστε λαμβάνειν οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τὸ εἶναι τὸ Πνεῦμα ὡς ἐξ ἀρχῆς προσωπικῆς τε καὶ ὑφισταμένης αὐτό, οὐδαμῶς, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον τὸ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ ὅπερ ἐστὶν ὁ Υἱὸς λαμβάνειν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ αὐτό, οὔτε πρότερον οὔθ' ὕστερον, οὔτ' ἔξω τοῦ Λόγου, ἀλλὰ δι' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Λόγου, τουτέστιν ἐν αὐτῷ τε καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ, ὥσπερ αὐγήν τινα τῇ ἀκτῖνι συνεκπεμπομένην ἐκ τοῦ ἡλίου καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς συνδιήκουσαν, ἢ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον πνεῦμα τῷ λόγῳ συμπαρομαρτοῦν καὶ φανεροῦν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνέργειαν, ὡς ἔνεστιν ἀμηγέπη τοῖς σωματικοῖς τούτοις πρὸς ἔνδειξίν τινα τοῦ προκειμένου ἐπὶ τῶν ὑψηλοτάτων τε καὶ ἀσωματωτάτων εὐσεβῶς χρησαμένους τὸ ἀπεμφαῖνον ἅπαν ἐᾶσαι· ἑπομένως δὲ καὶ τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ μὴ λαμβάνειν τό, τὸ Πνεῦμα προβάλλειν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τῇ ἰδίᾳ αἰτίᾳ τοῦτο συνυφιστάνειν, ὥσπερ δὴ καὶ τὸ δημιουργεῖν, τῇ τῆς οὐσίας ἑνότητι συνεπόμενον, ἀλλὰ τὸ Πνεῦμα μᾶλλον λαμβάνειν αὐτόν,

---

1-5 *προάγοντα — τινα τρόπον* om L 15 *μετὰ*: *κατὰ* L 29 *ἀλλὰ — Λόγου* om L 35 *τό*, om L

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ἅτ' ἐν αὐτῷ προϊὸν καὶ τὴν δι' αὐτοῦ λαμβάνειν τοῦ Πνεύματος πρόοδον, ὃν δὴ τρόπον καὶ τὸ εἶναι λαμβάνει, τουτέστιν ἔχων γεγέννηται, πάσης ἐξῃρημένης σωματικῆς ἐννοίας καὶ χρονικῆς. Κοινωνεῖ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Πατὴρ τῶν προσόντων αὐτῷ πάντων τοῖς ἐξ αὐτοῦ προαγομένοις προσώποις, οὐ τῆς ἐν τοῖς πράγμασιν ἰδιότητος, ἣν ἔχει τῷ τούτων εἶναι πάντων πηγή· οὐκοῦν καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ τοῦ τε Πνεύματος αὐτῷ κοινωνεῖ καὶ τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸ κοινωνίας, οὐ τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸ ἰδιότητος, ἀλλὰ δίδωσιν αὐτῷ μᾶλλον τῷ Υἱῷ ἑτέρως διακρίνεσθαι πρὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα, ἕτερόν τινα τρόπον ἀμφοῖν τὸ εἶναι διδοὺς καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν οὐσίαν, οὐ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ὑπερφυῶς.

9. Ὥσπερ οὖν τὸ εἶναι ἔχει λαβὼν ὁ Υἱὸς τὸ τοῦ Πατρός, ὅ ἐστιν ἁπλῶς ὁ Πατήρ, ἐκ τοῦ Πατρός, ἀλλ' οὐκ' ἔστιν αἴτιος ἑαυτῷ τοῦ εἶναι αὐτοῦ, οὕτω καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα λαβὼν ἔχει, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστιν ἑαυτῷ τοῦ Πνεύματος αἴτιος, οὔθ' ὅλως, εἴ γε μηδὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐστιν αἴτιον, ἔχον ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸν Υἱόν. Ἔχει δὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ κεχωρηκός, ὡς οὕτως εἰπεῖν, καὶ συμπεφυσιωμένον οὐκ ἀθνείως, οὐδ' ἐπεισάκτως, οὐδ' ἐπεισκρινόμενον ἔξωθεν, οὐδ' ἐκ μετοχῆς, ἀλλ' οὐσιωδῶς καὶ θεοπρεπῶς καὶ πόρρω πάσης τοῦ ἐνεῖναι καὶ συνδιήκειν σωματικῆς ὑπολήψεως, ὥσπερ καὶ τὸν Υἱὸν ἐν Πατρὶ καὶ τὸν Πατέρα ἐν Υἱῷ, θεοπρεπῶς καὶ πόρρω πάσης τοῦ χείρονος φαντασίας εἶναι πιστεύομεν, ὑπ' αὐτῆς εἰρημένον τῆς ἀληθείας. Οὕτω δὲ ἔχοντα τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, κεχρῆσθαι τούτῳ θεοπρεπῶς, ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὑποστάντι τε καὶ ὑφισταμένῳ, καθάπερ ἄρα καὶ ἑαυτῷ κέχρηται. Αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν αὐτό, καὶ ἓν εἰσιν ἄμφω πλὴν τῆς ὑποστατικῆς ὑπερφυῶς ἰδιότητος, ὅτι αὐτός τε ὅλος Υἱός ἐστι, καὶ μόνον Υἱὸς καθ' ὑπόστασιν, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὅλον Πνεῦμά ἐστι καὶ μόνον Πνεῦμα τῇ ὑποστάσει, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο „πνεῖ τε τὸ Πνεῦμα ὅπου θέλει“, καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ πνεῖ αὐτὸ καθάπερ καὶ ὁ Πατήρ, καὶ Πνεῦμά ἐστι τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καθάπερ καὶ τοῦ Πατρός. Ὥσπερ γὰρ ποιότης τίς ἐστι φυσικὴ τῆς ἁγίας τε καὶ σοφῆς θεότητος, τῆς ὡς ἐν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ νοουμένης καὶ αὐτῷ Πνεύματι κατὰ Κύριλλον, ἁγιάζουσα καὶ θεοῦσα τοὺς μετέχειν ἀξιωθέντας, ὑπόστασις δὲ ὄν, καθάπερ καὶ ὁ Υἱός, ἐκεῖθεν ὑφέστηκεν ὅθεν αὐτός, καὶ μόνου τοῦ Πατρός ἐστι πρόβλημα καὶ ἐκπόρευμα. Ταῦτ' ἄρα καὶ τοὺς διδασκάλους
f. 198ᵛ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεσθαι | τὸ Πνεῦμα θεολογοῦντας ἔστιν οὗ τὸ δι' Υἱοῦ παρενθεῖναι, οὐχ ὅτι τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ Πνεύματος αἴτιον ᾔδεσαν· εἰ γὰρ τοῦτ' ᾔδεσαν, εἶπον ἄν που καὶ προβολέα τοῦτον αὐτοῦ καὶ αἴτιον καὶ ἀρχήν· καὶ οὐκ ἂν ταῦτα μόνῳ τῷ Πατρὶ φέροντες ἀπεδίδουν, εἶπον ἂν ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι τὸ Πνεῦμα καὶ ὑφεστάναι, καὶ αὐτοῦ πρόβλημα εἶναι καὶ ἐκπόρευμα· ἃ δὴ περὶ τοῦ Πατρὸς λέγουσιν, ἢ μᾶλλον

1 *προϊὸν*: *περιὸν* L 10 *τὸ* après *Υἱὸς* om L 26 Ioh. 3, 8

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

φάναι, πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα περὶ αὐτοῦ, εἶπον ἂν καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὸ εἶναι ἔχειν, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι οὕτωσί, καθάπερ ἄρα καὶ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ φασι τὰ ὄντα γεγονέναι οὕτωσί, τὸν Πατέρα μὴ προστιθέντες· οἳ δὲ τοὐναντίον ἅπαν φασίν· ἀλλ' ὅτι μᾶλλον ᾔδεσαν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς τὸ εἶναι μόνον λαμβάνον, τουτέστιν ἐκπορευόμενον κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Σωτῆρος φωνήν, ἀμέσως καὶ προσεχῶς, ὡς ὁ Υἱὸς ἐκ τοῦ Πατρός ἐστι γεννητῶς ἀμέσως, καὶ τοῦτο πανταχοῦ τοῖς λόγοις δεικνύναι σπουδάζουσιν, ἵνα μηδεὶς ἐντεῦθεν ὑπολάβῃ παχέως τὴν πρόοδον τοῦ Υἱοῦ τῆς προόδου τοῦ Πνεύματος παντελῶς ἀπηρτῆσθαι, καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ προσώπου, τῇ ἀρχῇ μόνον συνημμένα, οὐχ ἑαυτοῖς, ὡς ἂν εἴ τις δύο κλάδους νοήσειεν ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ προελθόντας στελέχους, ἢ δύο ποταμοὺς ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς πηγῆς ἀποβλύζοντας, ἐπεὶ καὶ τούτοις χρῶνται τοῖς παραδείγμασι.

Τὸ τοίνυν ἀπεμφαῖνον τῶν τοιούτων παραδειγμάτων ἰώμενοι, καίτοι πρὸς τὴν χρείαν δεόντως παρειλημμένων, καὶ τὴν ὑπόνοιαν ἐκείνην ἐκβάλλοντες, καὶ τὴν κατ' οὐσίαν ἑνότητα τῶν διακεκριμένων ταῖς προόδοις δεικνύντες, τὸ δι' Υἱοῦ συνείρουσιν, ἵνα τὸ συναφὲς τῆς οὐσίας ἐν τοῖς οὕτω προαγομένοις καὶ ἀπαράλλακτον τῇ προσθήκῃ ταύτῃ παραστήσωσι δήπου. Οὐ γὰρ ἤλπισαν ὡς ἡ τοῦ Υἱοῦ μεσιτεία καὶ τὸ τὸν Υἱὸν συνείρειν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ προόδῳ τοῦ Πνεύματος διὰ τὴν εἰρημένην αἰτίαν τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς φυσικῆς πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα σχέσεως καὶ τῆς ἀμέσου πρὸς τὴν οἰκείαν αἰτίαν ἀναφορᾶς ἀπείργειν ἀναγκάσει τινάς, ὥσπερ μέσῳ καὶ προσεχεῖ τοῦ Πνεύματος αἰτίῳ τῷ θείῳ Λόγῳ προσέχοντας, καθάπερ ἄλλοις συνέβη ποτὲ τρίτον αὐτὸ πιστεύειν εἶναι τῇ φύσει, ὡς τοῦ Υἱοῦ προσισταμένου τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τοῦτο συνάπτεσθαι. Ὥροντο γὰρ τοὐναντίον τοὺς εὐσεβεστέρῳ λογισμῷ κεχρημένους τό τε μονογενὲς ἐντεῦθεν φυλάξειν τῷ Λόγῳ, μόνῳ πρὸς τὸν γεννήτορα μόνον προσεχῶς ἀναφερομένῳ, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα μόνον πρὸς τὸν προβολέα μόνον ἀνοίσειν, ὡς θέμις καὶ ὡς τὰ θεῖα βούλεται λόγια, ὅς ἐστιν ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν ἑκατέρᾳ τῇ σχέσει, Πατὴρ γενικῶς ὀνομαζόμενος ὡς πηγή, τουτέστι γεννήτωρ τε καὶ προβολεὺς εἰδικῶς, ὡς τοιῶνδε πηγή. Οὕτω γὰρ ἐχρῆν ἡμᾶς ἀναφέρειν λεπτότητι διανοίας πανταχόθεν συνάγοντας τἀληθῆ καὶ οἰκεῖα, καὶ τὰς θέσεις διατηροῦντας ἀπαρασαλεύτους τῆς πίστεως, οὐ θραττομένους τῷ Πνεῦμα μὲν Υἱοῦ λέγεσθαι, Υἱὸν δὲ Πνεύματος οὐδέποτε λέγεσθαι, καὶ τῷ Πνεῦμα μὲν δι' Υἱοῦ λέγεσθαι, τὸν Υἱὸν δὲ μὴ εἰρῆσθαι διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος. Ἕως γὰρ ἐν ἀλλήλοις εἰσὶν ὁ Υἱὸς καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα κατὰ τὸν Κύριλλον, καὶ δι' ἀλλήλων εἰσίν, καὶ ἀλλήλων εἰσίν, ὡς τὸ δι' ἀλλήλων οἵ τε πατέρες ἡμῶν ὅ τε λόγος νοεῖσθαι βούλονται, ἀλλ' ἡ σημασία τοῦ Υἱοῦ οὔτε προεπινοεῖν πῶς τὸ Πνεῦμα συγχωρεῖ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, οὔτε τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Πνεύματος λέγειν, ἵνα τῶν θείων

4-5 *λαμβάνειν*: *λαμβάνον* A (?) 6 *γεννητὸς* L

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

προσώπων ἡ τάξις σῴζηται, τουτέστι τὸ τῶν ἰδιοτήτων ἀσύγχυτον. Ἄλλην γὰρ ἐκεῖ τάξιν οὐ θέμις ἐπινοεῖν, ἢ συμφώνως τὰ τῶν θείων προσώπων ὀνόματα ἐν τῇ παραδόσει τοῦ θείου λουτροῦ ὁ θεῖος συνετάξατο λόγος· καίτοι φανερῶς οἱ διδάσκαλοι τὴν διὰ πρόθεσιν ἑρμηνεύουσι, τιθέντες μὲν τὸ οἰκεῖον, τὴν ταὐτότητα δηλονότι τῆς οὐσίας ἐντεῦθεν σημαινομένην, ἐπιρραπίζοντες δὲ τὸ ὀθνεῖον, τουτέστι τὴν τῆς αἰτίας ἀναφορὰν καὶ τὸ αἴτιον τῆς ὑπάρξεως ἔν γε τῇ προόδῳ τοῦ Πνεύματος.

10. Ἀλλ' ἔνιοι καὶ τὰς τῶν ἁγίων ῥήσεις συφιστικῶς ἐξηγούμενοι, καθάπερ δήπου καὶ τὰς Γραφάς· μέχρι γὰρ περαιτέρω τὴν φιλονεικίαν ἐκτείνειν ἐθέλουσιν· εἶτα τὴν διὰ πρόθεσιν σημαίνειν αἰτίαν φασὶν ἐν τῷ δι' Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκπορεύεσθαι λέγεσθαι, καὶ φασὶ τὸν Υἱὸν ἀρχὴν τοῦ Πνεύματος καὶ αἰτίαν, ὅσον ἥκει εἰς τὴν διά· καθάπερ ἐπ' ἐκείνων τῶν λόγων, ὅταν δι' Υἱοῦ τὰ πάντα γεγενῆσθαι ἀκούωσιν, οὐδὲν ἧττον ὄντων καὶ ἐξ Υἱοῦ δημιουργικῶς, ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ ἐν Πνεύματι, τουτέστιν ἐκ Πνεύματος· ἢ ὅταν ἐκ Πατρὸς δι' Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα δίδοσθαι καὶ φανε-
f. 199 ροῦσθαι ἀκούωσιν, ἐν οἷς προδήλως ἀμφοῖν αἴτιος ὁ | Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ πιστεύεται καὶ κηρύττεται ἔνθεν μὲν τῆς τῶν ὄντων ὑπάρξεως, ἔνθεν δὲ τῆς πνευματικῆς αὐτῶν μορφώσεως τε καὶ βελτιώσεως, δι' ὅλης τῆς θεότητος γινομένων καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ γένους ὄντων. Ἡ γὰρ τοιαύτη τοῦ Πνεύματος πρόοδός τε καὶ ἔξοδος εἰς ὑπόστασιν καὶ μόρφωσίν ἐστι κτίσεως, καὶ δίδωσιν ἐν ταύτῃ μᾶλλον, οὐ λαμβάνει τὸ Πνεῦμα. Ἡ δὲ ἀΐδιος αὐτοῦ πρόοδος εἰς ὑπόστασίν ἐστι θείου προσώπου, καὶ οὔτε τὸ ἀπεμφαῖνον ἑκατέρας τῆς ὕλης, οὔτε τοὺς ἐκεῖθεν συνορῶσι κινδύνους, τὸ αἰτιατοαίτιον δηλονότι καὶ τὴν τῶν ὑποστάσεων ἀδόκιμον κλίμακα, καὶ τὰς οὐ θεοπρεπεῖς ὑφέσεις καὶ ὑπερθέσεις, καὶ ἀκρότητας καὶ μεσότητας, καὶ πρωτότητας καὶ δευτερότητας καὶ τριτότητας καὶ ἕξεις ἐν τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ πρώτας καὶ δευτέρας ἐντελεχείας, καὶ σημεῖα ποικίλα νοήσεων ἢ ὡς ἀνύπαρκτα καὶ ψόφους κενοὺς μηδὲν εἰσάγοντα δόγμα καὶ πρᾶγμα, ἢ εἴπερ ἔχοιεν συνεπομένην τῷ λόγῳ τὴν ἀλήθειαν καὶ τὴν ὕπαρξιν, οὐδὲν διαφέροντα τῶν ἐκτόπων ἐκείνων θέσεων, αἳ πόρρωθεν καλῶς ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀπερραπίσθησαν· καὶ πρὸς τούτοις, ἵνα τὰ πλεῖστα παρῶ, ἢ τὴν διαίρεσιν τῆς ἀρχῆς κατὰ τὴν διάκρισιν τῆς προσωπικῆς δυνάμεως ἣν φασιν, ἢ τὴν ἑνότητα τῶν προσώπων κατὰ τὴν ἑνότητα τῆς προσωπικῆς δυνάμεως, ἂν ᾖ γε τοιαύτη, καὶ ἢ τὴν ἀντιστροφὴν τῆς θεογονίας ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ κατὰ τὸ κοινωνητὸν τῆς οὐσιώδους δυνάμεως, ἢ τὴν τοῦ Πνεύματος ὕφεσιν ἐν τῷ ἀκοινωνήτῳ ταύτης, τὸ χεῖρον· ὧν ἑνί τῳ πᾶσα ἀνάγκη συνειλῆφθαι τὴν θέσιν, κἂν μὴ βούλωνται μήτε πιστεύωσιν οὕτως οἱ τιθέντες αὐτήν. Οὔτε γὰρ πιστεύουσιν οὔτε βούλονται δήπου, ἀλλ' ἐνισχημένοι τῇ καινοτομίᾳ

---

29 *ἔχοιεν* om L

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

τοῦ δόγματος, εἰς ἀποφυγὰς ἀφορῶσιν, ἐν αἷς δεῖ καὶ μὴ βουλομένους ἁλίσκεσθαι διὰ τὸ μὴ βούλεσθαι πρὸς τὴν κοινὴν ἐπανελθεῖν ὁμολογίαν τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ διαλλακτὴν ποιεῖσθαι τῆς ἔριδος, ὃν καὶ αἱ οἰκουμενικαὶ σύνοδοι διδάσκαλον ἀκριβῆ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐκπορεύσεως ἠρκέσθησαν ἔχειν, καὶ μὴ θέλειν, τῇ σιωπῇ τῶν ὑπόπτων δογμάτων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ τὴν πίστιν ἑνοῦν ἐν τοῖς ἀπεριγράπτοις καὶ ἀναμφιβόλοις τοῦ Κυρίου ῥήμασιν, ὥσπερ οὖν ὑπὸ φρονιμωτάτων καὶ παμπαλαίων ἀνδρῶν καὶ ἱερωτάτων τὸν πρόσθεν ἤνωτο χρόνον· οὐδὲ γὰρ τὸν Υἱὸν βουληθεῖεν ἂν ἑτέρας οὐσίας παρὰ τὸν Πατέρα πιστεύειν· ἀλλ' οὐδεὶς ἂν αὐτοῖς οὔθ' ἡμῖν συγχωρήσειεν εὐσεβῶν ἐλάττω τοῦτον ὁμολογεῖν τοῦ Πατρὸς προφάσει κεχρημένους εὐπρεπεῖ δοκούσῃ, τῷ μείζονι περὶ τοῦ Πατρὸς εἰρημένῳ.

Οὐκοῦν οὐδ' εἰ τὰς ἀτοπίας ἐξαρνοῦνται πάσας ἐκείνας, πείσουσιν ἡμᾶς τὴν θέσιν προσέσθαι, ἕως ἂν μὴ δύνωνται πεῖθειν, ὥσπερ οὖν οὐδ' ἰσχύουσιν, ὡς ἄρα τῇ θέσει μηδὲν ἕπεται φαῦλον. Ἤ τί γε ἄλλο δεδιότες οἱ ἀρχαῖοι παρ' ἡμῖν τῆς ἐκκλησίας διδάσκαλοι, οὔτ' ἐτίθουν οὐδαμοῦ ταύτην, καὶ πολλοῖς λόγοις καὶ τεκμηρίοις κακίζοντες ἔδειξαν, εἰ καὶ μηδεμία δύναμις ἦν ἐν ἡμῖν τοῖς ὑστέροις, ἢ καὶ τοῖς πρὸ ἡμῶν συνορᾶν οἷων ἐξ αὐτῆς τικτομένων, δι' αὐτὰ καὶ ταύτην ἀποπεμπτέον· τό τε λέγειν ὡς ἡ διὰ πρόθεσις τὴν ἐκ πρόθεσιν δύναται μόνον, καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν τῷ πτωτικῷ ἐπιτίθησι τὴν ἀπ' αἰτίας, ἢ καὶ ἁπλῶς, ὡς ἐν τῷ δι' Υἱοῦ γεγονόναι τὰ ὄντα, καὶ τῷ „Ἐκτησάμην ἄνθρωπον διὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ", ἀγνοούντων ἐστὶ τὴν τῶν Ἑλλήνων φωνήν, ὃ χεῖρόν ἐστι πεπονθέναι τοὺς ἐν Ἕλλησι τεθραμμένους. Ἀλλ' ὅ γε Χρυσόστομος τὴν διά πρόθεσιν ἀντὶ τῆς μετά πολλαχοῦ, κἀν τῇ πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς, τήν τε ἐν ἀντὶ τῆς διά, καὶ τὴν διά ἀντὶ τῆς ἐν πάνυ καλῶς μετείληφεν, εἰδὼς καὶ Ἀριστοτέλει καὶ Πλάτωνι τὰς χρήσεις ταύτας συνήθεις, ἵνα μὴ λέγω τὰς ἄλλας ἐκλήψεις τῆς προθέσεως ταύτης παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν, αἳ τῆς χρείας οὐχ ἅπτονται πάνυ γε τῆς παρούσης, τὸ μεταξὺ καὶ τὸ δίχα καὶ τὸ διόλου καὶ πολλὰ τοιαῦθ' ἕτερα. Ἢ εἰ πανταχοῦ τὴν προακτικὴν αἰτίαν νοήσομεν, ὥρα καὶ τὴν τῶν ἀγγέλων ὑπόστασιν αἰτίαν τοῦ θεόθεν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἁγιασμοῦ γινομένου νομίζειν προακτικὴν εἶτουν ποιητικήν, ἐπειδὰν ὁ μέγας λέγῃ Βασίλειος, ὡς αἱ οὐράνιαι δυνάμεις ἐκ τῆς πρὸς τὸν φύσει ἅγιον κοινωνίας δι' ὅλης τῆς αὐτῶν ὑποστάσεως κεχωρηκότα καὶ συμπεφυσιωμένον οἷον εἰπεῖν τὸν ἁγιασμὸν ἔχουσι· καὶ ἄλλοθι | πολλαχοῦ τῆς ἀληθοῦς ἐννοίας f. 199v ἁμαρτησόμεθα, τῷ κανόνι τῶν ἀντιδοξούντων ἀκολουθοῦντες. Ἀλλὰ τοὐναντίον ἅπαν πρέπει ποιεῖν, εἰ καὶ μηδαμοῦ τῶν ἑλληνικῶν λόγων τοιοῦτό τι εὕρητο. Ἐνταῦθα γοῦν τι καὶ περὶ τὴν τέχνην καινοτομεῖν, καὶ δι' Υἱοῦ

---

19 τά L

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

προϊέναι πιστεύειν τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐκ Πατρὸς ὑφιστάμενον, ὡς οὐκ ἐκτὸς δηλονότι τοῦ Υἱοῦ κατὰ τὸν Ἀθανάσιον, ἀλλ' ἐν Υἱῷ διῆκον παρὰ Πατρὸς κατὰ τὸν Κύριλλον, ὡς ἂν ἐντεῦθεν τὸ συναφὲς τῆς οὐσίας καὶ ἀπαράλλακτον κατὰ τὸν Μάξιμον παριστάνωμεν, καὶ τῷ τῆς ὁμοουσιότητος λόγῳ συνῆφθαι πρὸς ἕνωσιν τῷ Υἱῷ πιστεύομεν αὐτό, κἂν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύηται κατὰ τὸν Κύριλλον, οὐ μέντοι γε ὡς ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τὴν ὕπαρξιν ἔχον· μόνος γὰρ αἴτιος ὁ Πατήρ· ὁ δὲ Υἱὸς οὐκ ἔστιν αἰτία τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐκπορεύσεως, ἀλλ' ἔχει πάντα τὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς πλὴν τῆς αἰτίας, ὡς Δαμασκηνῷ καὶ Μαξίμῳ καὶ τῷ μεγάλῳ Γρηγορίῳ δοκεῖ, τοῦ ἐνυπάρχειν καὶ τοῦ διήκειν θεοπρεπῶς νοουμένων, καθάπερ δὴ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων, ἃ περὶ τῆς μακαρίας ἐκείνης καὶ ἁπλουστάτης ἑνότητος λέγονται καὶ πιστεύονται· τοῦτο γὰρ πολὺ βέλτιον ἂν εἴη τοῦ τὰς ἰδιότητας τῶν προσώπων συγχεῖν καὶ τοῖς ἀτόποις ἐκείνοις διδόναι πάροδον. Τουτὶ γὰρ οὐδαμοῦ φέρει κακίας, ἀλλ' ἥ τε τῆς θείας οὐσίας ἑνότης διὰ πάντων τῶν προσώπων τηρεῖται καλῶς καὶ ἡ τάξις αὐτῶν, τουτέστι τὸ τῶν ἰδιωμάτων ἀσύγχυτον, καὶ τῶν διδασκάλων ἁπάντων ὅ τε σκοπὸς αἵ τε λέξεις τηροῦνται, καὶ οὐδὲν ἀπᾷδον συμβαίνει.

11. Ἀλλὰ περὶ μὲν τούτων ἀρκείτω τοσοῦτον ἐν ἐκδρομῇ. Ἐκεῖθεν δ' ἐπάνειμι, ὅτι τοὺς ταῦτα συγγραψαμένους τε καὶ διδάξαντας καὶ ἔργοις αὐτοῖς ἀνακηρυχθέντας (πολλοὶ γὰρ αὐτῶν καὶ τῇ τῶν μαρτύρων κεκοσμημένοι τιμῇ παρὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἀνθ' ὧν ὑπέστησαν ἐπὶ βεβαιώσει τοῦ δόγματος, ἀνυμνοῦνται μετὰ τῶν πρώτων τῆς ἀληθείας μαρτύρων), τούτους ποιμένας ἡγῇ καὶ διδασκάλους ἀληθινούς, ἄριστε καὶ γενναιότατε, πάνυ καλῶς ποιῶν, ὅτι τῶν φωνῶν αὐτῶν ἐπαΐομεν πάντες, ὅτι διὰ τῆς ἐγνωσμένης εἰσίασι θύρας καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους εἰσάγουσιν, ὅτι σύμφωνα τοῖς κανονικοῖς διδάσκουσι λόγοις, τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις τοῖς ἱεροῖς, τῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ στόματι Παύλῳ, ταῖς οἰκουμενικαῖς συνόδοις ἐκείναις, τοῖς ἐν αὐταῖς διαπρέψασι διδασκάλοις, ὧν τῆς κοινῆς ὁμολογίας ἔχεσθαι χρὴ τοὺς σφίσι προσέχειν ἰσχυριζομένους, καὶ μὴ βίᾳ τὰς ἐνίων αὐτῶν ῥήσεις σπαράττειν πρὸς τὸ δοκοῦν ἕλκοντας, καθάπερ ἐν δικαστηρίοις οἱ βίαιοι καὶ νόθοι τῶν νόμων ἐξηγηταὶ πράττουσιν. Ἐκείνων τῶν ἱερῶν πατέρων τὴν τρίβον καὶ ὁ μακάριος ὧδευσε Μάρκος, ὁ τῆς Ἐφέσου ποιμήν, ἀνὴρ τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῶν ἁπάντων ἄριστος γεγονὼς ἔν τε λόγοις καὶ βίῳ, καὶ εἰδὼς μὲν καλῶς διακρῖναι σόφισμα καὶ λόγον ἀληθινόν, καὶ δι' ἐπιστήμην ἀνεξαπάτητος μείνας, ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς τῶν προσκαίρων ἐπιθυμίας μηδόλως παρασυρείς ὥστε συγχωρῆσαί τι τῶν οὐ καλῶν διὰ ταῦτα, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὴν ὑπὲρ τοῦ πατρίου δόγματος ἔνστασιν ἄριστά γε καὶ οἰκείως τῷ τῶν πατέρων ἐκείνων ἐνδειξάμενος ζήλῳ καὶ λόγοις ὑπὲρ ταύτης ἠγωνισμένος ἕως ἐξῆν.

---

7 ἔχειν L

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Ταύτης ἐσμὲν τῆς δόξης ἡμεῖς, καὶ οὐκ ἀπορρήξομεν ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς τοῦ τῶν πατέρων ἐκείνων χοροῦ, οὐδὲ νομιοῦμέν ποτε τοὺς νῦν ἐν ἡμῖν διαφερομένους ἄμεινον ἐκείνων τἀληθῆ συνορᾶν, οἳ μηδὲ τῶν φωνῶν σχεδὸν ἐπαΐουσιν, ἀλλ' ἔκ τινος ἐριθείας ἢ φιλοδοξίας ἢ ἀδιαφορίας τοῖς ὑπερορίοις ἀντὶ τῶν οἰκείων καὶ ἀληθῶν ἀξιοῦσι προσέχειν, ὃ δὲ χεῖρόν ἐστι, καὶ τὴν τῆς κακοδοξίας δόξαν τοῖς ἀληθέσι καὶ οἰκειοτέροις προστρίβεσθαι, ἢ προστριβομένην διὰ τὴν ἐν Φλωρεντίᾳ ψῆφον ἀνέχεσθαι· ἣν ψῆφον αὐτοὶ περιθάλπουσι κατὰ τῶν οἰκείων πατέρων καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ὡς ἐξ οὐρανῶν ἐνεχθεῖσαν. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ σοὶ χάριτας ἅπαντες ἴσμεν μετὰ τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τῆς τῶν πατέρων δόξης ἱσταμένῳ γενναίως, καὶ τῆς εἰλικρινοῦς πίστεως οὐδὲν πρότερον ἄγοντι, καὶ τῷ κατὰ σὲ παραδείγματι τοὺς μὲν βεβαιοῦντι, τοὺς δὲ ἐπανάγοντι. Οἷδέ σοι χάριν καὶ πρὸ ἡμῶν ὁ μακάριος ἐκεῖνος χορὸς καὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας δόξης ὁ μέγας ἡγεμὼν καὶ διδάσκαλος Ἰησοῦς καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἔφορος καὶ τῶν ἀϊδίων ἄθλων τοῖς αὐτῷ προσέχουσι χορηγός, καὶ στήσει σε μετὰ τῶν μακαρίων ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ βίῳ, καθάπερ αὐτοῖς νῦν τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν συνᾴδεις γλώττῃ | τε καὶ ψυχῇ καὶ πάσαις ταῖς ἔξωθεν ἐπιδείξεσιν, ὡς ἄρα προσήκει f. 200 τοῖς ἀληθῶς εὐσεβοῦσιν, οὕτω καὶ τότε τῶν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀληθείας στεφάνων συγκοινωνήσοντα. Καὶ τοῦτό σε πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ παντὸς σχήματος διαμείβεσθαι χρὴ καὶ τῆς φαινομένης εὐδαιμονίας, ὅση τις ἂν εἴη. Ἔλπιζε δὲ κἀνταῦθα πολὺ τοῖς πράγμασιν εὐρωτέροις συντεύξεσθαι διὰ τὴν εἰς Χριστὸν ἀκίβδηλον πίστιν καὶ τὴν τοῦ πατρίου δόγματος ἀπροσποίητον τήρησιν· ὥσπερ καὶ μέχρι νῦν πολλῶν σε δυσχερῶν ὁ Θεὸς ἀπήλλαξε διὰ τὴν εὐσέβειαν, καὶ πρὸς τὰ βελτίω τῶν βουλευμάτων ἐν ταῖς σκέψεσιν ἄγει τε καὶ ἰθύνει, καὶ ὥσπερ συνεπωθεῖ, κοινωνόν σοι τοῦ βίου καὶ τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς δεδωκὼς τὴν ὑψηλοτάτην βασίλισσαν, εὐσεβείᾳ τε καὶ συνέσει μηδεμιᾶς λειπομένην τῶν ὑμνουμένων. Μηδὲ γὰρ οἷου καὶ τοῦτ' ἄνευ θείας μοίρας σοι γεγονέναι.

12. Γένοιτό σοι τοίνυν ἐκ Θεοῦ καὶ περὶ τῶν προκειμένων σοι νῦν ὡς ἀσφαλέστατά τε καὶ εὐσεβέστατα βεβουλεῦσθαι· βουλεύσῃ δὲ τὰ βέλτιστα σεαυτῷ, τὰ τῷ δυστυχεῖ λειψάνῳ τῷδε τοῦ γένους ὠφέλιμα βουλευσάμενος, ὑπὸ μικρᾶς αὔρας κινδυνεύοντί γε διαπνευσθῆναι καὶ τοῖς τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἐμβληθῆναι στόμασι. Τοῦ γὰρ κοινῇ συνοίσοντος προηγουμένου, καὶ τὸ σὸν ἄριστα ἕψεται. Καὶ πῶς; Οὑτωσί. Οὐκ ἔστιν ἄδικος ὁ Θεός, ὡς ἂν ᾧ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων μελήσει καλῶν, τοῦτον ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις καταλιπεῖν ἀβοήθητόν τε καὶ ἀστεφάνωτον, οὔτε χαλεπόν ἐστιν αὐτῷ τιμῆσαι τὴν ἀρετήν, ἐπειδὰν βουληθῇ καὶ δίκαιον ᾖ. Ἂν οὖν ἐπιτροπεύσῃς τῶν ὅλων καλῶς, καὶ τῆς σῆς ἐπιτροπεύσει ζωῆς καὶ τύχης

---

2 *ἐκείνων* corr. de *ἐκείνου* A 9 *μετὰ*: *μὲν* L 23 *δυσχερειῶν* L

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ἐκεῖνος. Φρόντισον τοίνυν ἁπάντων, ὅπως σοῦ γε φροντίσῃ Θεός. Καὶ ὥσπερ πολλάκις τὸ κοινὸν ἀγαθὸν τοῦ ἰδίᾳ σοι φαινομένου λυσιτελεῖν προετίμησας, ὡς ἐν τούτοις ὑπεμνήσθη τοῖς γράμμασιν, οὕτω καὶ νῦν τοῦτο βουληθείης, τοῦτ' εὔξαιο, τοῦτο προστίσαιο τὸ κοινὸν ἀγαθόν, καὶ οὐχ ἁμαρτήσεις βουλῆς ἐκ Θεοῦ τῆς ἀρίστης, ὅπως ἂν καὶ τὰ τῶν χριστιανῶν σῴζοιτο πράγματα καὶ σὺ διὰ πάντων εὐδοκιμοίης: †

12.

Lettre au Grand Duc contre l'union de Florence (1451).*

Paris. 1297 f. 1 Τῷ μεγαλοπρεπεστάτῳ καὶ ἐκλαμπροτάτῳ καὶ περιφανεστάτῳ ἄρχοντι, τῷ μεγάλῳ δουκί, ὁ ἐλάχιστος Γεννάδιος χαίρειν εὐτυχῶς καὶ θεοφιλῶς.

1. Λατίνων τις ἐμοὶ τῶν σπουδαιοτέρων πρότριτα προσελθών, τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ἐπῄνει με καὶ ὑπὲρ τὸν οὐρανὸν αὐτὸν ἀνῆγε τοῖς λόγοις, ὡς ἐκείνοις ἔθος ἐστὶν εἰς τοὺς συνόντας ποιεῖν, κἂν μὴ σφόδρα εἰδῶσιν ὄντας τοιούτους, ὠνείδιζε δέ, οὐκ οἶδ' ὅθεν ἐπὶ τὴν χρείαν ταύτην ἐλθών, ὅτι τομεὺς ἐγὼ τῆς ἑνώσεως (τῷ γὰρ ἐκείνου χρήσομαι ῥήματι), καὶ ὅτι τὸν μὲν ἄριστον βασιλέα καὶ τὸν μέγαν δοῦκα καὶ τοὺς τῆς συνάξεως πάντας σχεδὸν ἴσασι πάντες Λατῖνοι πρὸς τὴν μετ' αὐτῶν ἑτοίμως ἔχοντας ἕνωσιν, τὸ δ' ἐμὸν προσίσταται μόνον, πέρα τοῦ δικαίου φιλονεικοῦντος καὶ βλάπτοντος μὲν τὴν ξύμπασαν πόλιν, τῆς ἐκ τοῦ πάπα στερομένην ἐπικουρίας, ἀδικοῦντος δὲ καὶ αὐτὴν τὴν ἀλήθειαν καὶ δόγμα ἐλαύνοντος ὑγιὲς καὶ πολλὰς ἔχον τὰς ἀποδείξεις καὶ ἐν συνόδῳ κεκριμένον κοινῇ, καὶ τοιαῦθ' ἡμῖν ἀνεκάλει μετ' εὐλαβείας ἄλλως ἱκανῆς τοὺς λόγους ποιούμενος. Ἐγὼ δὲ τὴν μὲν σύνοδον ἐκείνην, ἄνθρωπε, εἶπον, ἴσασι πάντες ὁποία τις ἦν, καὶ εἴην ἂν ἐπαχθὴς οὐ σοὶ μόνον κατ' ἐκείνης τι λέγων, ἀλλ' ἤδη καὶ ἐμαυτῷ, περὶ τῶν προδήλων ἀγωνιζόμενος· ἀπόχρη γὰρ τοσοῦτον εἰπεῖν, ὡς οὐδὲν
f. 1v ἱερὸν ἐκ κεφαλῆς, | φησίν, ἄχρι ποδῶν. Ἐκεῖνοι συνοίδασιν, οἷς μετῆν ἀκριβῶς τῶν ἀρχομένῃ τε καὶ τελευτώσῃ παρόντων, καίτοι μάρτυρα καλῶ τὸν Θεόν, ὡς εἰ καὶ τὰς οἰκουμενικὰς ἐκείνας συνόδους τοιαύτας ἐπεπείσμην γενέσθαι, εὐθὺς ἂν πάσας ὑπέλαβον ἐγκαταλειφθείσας ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος

---

* A = Parisinus 1297, XVIe s., f. 1-16;
B = Édition de Constantin Simonidès, Londres, 1858, p. 53-72 (voir l'introduction).

Tit. *ἄρχοντι* om B et met à la place: *κυρίῳ μου*. Le même porte *εὐσεβῶς* au lieu de *θεοφιλῶς*.

---

21 *προσίσταμαι* B 22 *σύμπασαν* B 23 *τὴν* om B 26 *μὲν* om B
29 *φασίν* AB cf. Is. 1, 6 30 *καί σοι* B

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

II.

A Manuel Raoul Oisès (1451—1452).*

Taurinensis 195, f. 81

Ὁ Γεννάδιος τῷ φρονιμωτάτῳ καὶ εὐσεβεῖ ἄρχοντι κυρῷ Μανουὴλ Ῥαοὺλ τῷ Οἰσῇ.

„Θέλεις μὴ φοβεῖσθαι τὴν ἐξουσίαν, φησὶν ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος; Τὸ ἀγαθὸν ποίει καὶ ἕξεις ἔπαινον ἐξ αὐτοῦ· Θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονος ἔστι σοι εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν· ἐὰν δὲ τὸ κακὸν ποιῇς, φοβοῦ· οὐ γὰρ εἰκῇ τὴν μάχαιραν φορεῖ· Θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονός ἐστιν, ἔκδικος εἰς ὀργὴν τῷ τὸ κακὸν πράσσοντι.“ Χαίρε τοίνυν, εὐσεβέστατε Μανουήλ, ὅτι τὸ ἔργον τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ διακονίας νόμοις ἐπλήρωσας· χαῖρε ὅτι τὴν ἐκ Θεοῦ δοθεῖσάν σοι μάχαιραν ἐστίλβωσας κατὰ τῶν διωκτῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Ἐγὼ μὲν καὶ σὲ καὶ πάντα ἄρχοντα ἐκ Θεοῦ καθεστῶτα ἔθνει ἢ πόλει βουλοίμην ἂν εἰς τὰς πρωΐας ἀποκτείνειν πάντας τοὺς ἁμαρτωλοὺς τῆς γῆς, τοῦ ἐξολοθρεῦσαι ἐκ πόλεως Κυρίου πάντας τοὺς ἐργαζομένους τὴν ἀνομίαν. Εἰ δὲ φείδεσθε τῶν ἄλλων κακῶν καὶ δίδοτε παρρησίαν τοῖς διεφθορόσι καὶ ψωριῶσι προβάτοις ἀπολλύναι καὶ διαφθείρειν ὅλα τὰ ποίμνια, τοὺς γοῦν δυσσεβεῖς καὶ ἀλάστορας τούτους ἑλληνιστάς, μᾶλλον δὲ τῆς εὐσεβείας ἀναιδεῖς ἀποστάτας καὶ πυρὶ καὶ σιδήρῳ καὶ ὕδατι καὶ πᾶσι τρόποις ἐξαγάγετε τῆς παρούσης ζωῆς, εἰ μέλοι ὑμῖν τοῖς Χριστιανοῖς ἀληθέσιν εἶναι, ἢ τῆς τῶν ἀρχομένων σωτηρίας φροντίζετε. Ἢ οὐχ ὁρᾶτε τὸ κακὸν καὶ δὴ προχωροῦν ἐκ τοῦ συγχωρηθῆναι καὶ τὸ κατάπτυστον ἐκεῖνον καὶ δαιμονιώδη Ἰουβενάλιον ζῆν ἐν ταῖς τῶν Χριστιανῶν πολιτείαις καὶ διαφθείρειν τοὺς πλησιάζοντας καί τινας ἄλλους, ὧν οἱ μὲν ἐκεῖνον ἐδίδαξαν τὴν ἀποστασίαν ταύτην, οἱ δὲ παρ' ἐκείνου κακῶς ἐμυήθησαν; Τίνα ἐλάνθανε τὸ κακὸν τοῦτο καθ' ἡμέραν αὐξάνον, τίνα οὐκ ἐλύπει τῶν εὐσεβῶν; Ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ διαρρήδην πᾶσιν ἐβόων καὶ προὔλεγον. Ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν ἐγέλων τῶν δυναμένων κωλύειν, οἱ δὲ ἠπίστουν, οἱ δὲ διαβολὴν εἶναι τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐνόμιζον, φθόνῳ τῷ πρὸς τοὺς δυστυχεῖς ἐκείνους ὑπ' ἐμοῦ συσκευαζομένην. Δυστυχεῖς γάρ εἰσιν, εἰ καὶ τοῖς ἔξω πράγμασιν εὐροοῦσιν, οἱ τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς σωτηρίας ἀποβεβληκότες, τὸν ἡμέτερον Ἰησοῦν, καίτοι παρ' ἡμῖν σῳζόμενα τὰ τοῦ τρισκαταράτου γράμματα τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐλέγχουσιν, εἴ γε ἄνδρας χρῆ καλεῖν αὐτούς, ἀλλ' οὐ παῖδας μὲν τὴν ἄνοιαν καὶ τὴν ἀφροσύνην, θηρία δὲ τὴν κατὰ τῆς ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίας μανίαν. Ἐν γὰρ ἐκείνοις τοῖς γράμμασι συνίστησι, τῶν συναποστατῶν καὶ φίλων τινὶ

* A = Taurinensis 195 (ancien B-V-33), f. 81-85ᵛ, à moitié détruit par l'incendie de 1904;
B = Édition de Sp. Lambros, *op. cit.*, t. II, p. 247-265, d'après A.

3-7 Rom. 13, 3-4 11 cf. Ps. 100, 8 14 ἀπολύναι A

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

γράφων, ἄλλους ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ καὶ Αἴνῳ καὶ πολλαχοῦ τῆς ἐκείνου γενομένους φατρίας καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς αὐτῷ χρηματίσαντας ὑπολήψεως. Εὐσεβεῖς δὲ ἄνδρες ἐκεῖνα λαβόντες ταῖς ἡμετέραις χερσὶν ἐνέθεσαν φέροντες, οὐδὲ τοιαῦτα πάνυ γε ὄντα οἷα ἠκούσαμεν εἶναι τὰ ὑπὸ τῆς σῆς εὐσεβείας φωραθέντα νῦν ὕστερον. Τούτων μὲν γὰρ τῶν ὑστέρων, ὡς ἡ[μεῖς] ἐπυθό- 5
μεθα, οὐδὲν εὐσεβείας καὶ φλυαρίας κατὰ τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ θείων ἀπῆν, ἐν ἐκείνοις δὲ τὰ παρ' ἡμῖν σῴζεται. Λαθραίως πως συνίστησε τὸν ἑλληνισμόν, μοναρχίαν ὁ δείλαιος ἀποκαλῶν τὴν ἑλληνικὴν πολυαρχίαν τε καὶ πολυθεΐαν καὶ τοιαῦτα ἄλλα τερατευόμενος· τῶν δὲ ἡμετέρων τιμίων οὔπω ἐτόλμησε κατεξανίστασθαι· ὃ πέπονθεν ἐκ τῆς σῆς ἀρίστης 10
ψήφου, πόρρωθεν δεδιώς. Ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ κρασπέδου τὸ ὕφασμα καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀνύχων τὸν ὄνον μᾶλλον ἤ, ὡς ἡ παροιμία φησίν, ἐπιγινώσκων ἐγὼ καλῶς καὶ τῆς φήμης ἔτι παραπεμπούσης τὰς ἐξ ἐκείνου γινομένας βλάβας τοῖς πλησιάζουσιν· ἐν γὰρ τῷ λόγῳ θαρραλεώτερος ἦν ἢ ἐν τοῖς γράμμασιν, ὡς ἐκεῖ μᾶλλον λήσειν ἐλπίζων τοὺς εὐσεβεῖς· κατ' αὐτοῦ τε ἠγανάκτουν 15
καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων, οὓς ἀνεκήρυττεν ἐν τοῖς γράμμασιν, καὶ μάλισθ' ὅτι τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ταύτης συγχύσεως γεγόνασιν αἴτιοι· καίτοι καὶ χωρὶς τῆς ἐκ τῶν γραμμάτων μαρτυρίας ἐκείνης ἔκδηλόν ἐστιν, ὡς οὐκ ἄν τις καταφρονήσειε πατρίου δόγματος ἀληθοῦς καὶ τολμήσειεν ἂν ψήφους
ὑπερβῆναι τοσούτων | ἐν τοσούτῳ χρόνῳ πατέρων, μὴ πρότερον ὅλης τῆς f. 81 v
πίστεως καταπεφρονηκώς. Οὐ γὰρ τὰ πρὸς Λατίνους ἡμῖν ἢ οὐστινασοῦν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀδιόριστα παρὰ τῶν ἡμετέρων πατέρων μεμένηκεν, ἀλλὰ βασιλεῖς τε καὶ πατριάρχαι καὶ ἐπίσκοποι καὶ θρησκευταὶ καὶ σοφοὶ ἄνδρες ἰδίᾳ καὶ ἐν συλλόγοις κοινοῖς σὺν ἀπειλαῖς φρικώδεσιν ἕκαστα διωρίσαντο, καὶ οὔτ' ἠγνόουν τὰ νέα ταῦτα καὶ πρόσφατα δόγματα, τὰ 25
τὴν οἰκουμένην ταράξαντα καὶ διελόντα τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν, οὔτ' ἠμέλουν, οὔτε τῆς εἰρήνης ἦσαν πολέμιοι, οὐδὲ λαβών τις πάντα μὲν τὰ κακὰ τοῖς ἡμῶν προσθήσει πατράσιν, ἡμῖν δὲ τοὐναντίον πάντα τὰ κρείττω, οἳ νῦν ἄλλως περὶ τῶν τοιούτων κρίνουσιν. Τοὐναντίον μὲν οὖν πρέπον ἂν εἴη. Ἐκεῖνοι μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἀναρίθμητοι καὶ σοφοὶ καὶ γενναῖοι καὶ ἀπαθεῖς 30
καὶ θεοφιλεῖς καὶ μετὰ Θεοῦ τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ κρίνοντες· ἡμεῖς δὲ ὁποῖοί τινες ἐσμὲν πρόδηλον· οὐδὲ σκιαῖς ἐκείνων, οὐδὲ σκυβάλοις ἄξιοι παραβάλλεσθαι. Οὐκ ἄρα ἀφροσύνης ἂν εἴη μᾶλλον ἢ ἀπιστίας καὶ δυσσεβείας τὸ τῆς τῶν πατέρων ἐκείνων ψήφου περὶ τοῦ μικροτάτου τῶν δογμάτων ἀποχωρεῖν; Καὶ εἴ τις τοῦτο τολμῴη, ἄλλην τινὰ δήπου δόξαν ἐν τῇ 35
ψυχῇ περιέπων, τῆς δὲ χριστιανικῆς ὠλιγωρηκὼς πίστεως, προστίθεται οὗ μᾶλλον οἴεται βιώσεσθαι ἐνδοξότερόν τε καὶ ἥδιον, ὃ δὴ κἀκείνοις συνέβη περὶ ὧν ἐκεῖνος διέξεισιν ἐν τοῖς γράμμασιν. Ἐγέγραπτο δὲ πρὸ τῆς ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ συνόδου.

5-6 *πυθόμεθα* A, *πειθόμεθα* B 22 *μεένμηκεν* B

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Ταῦτα τοίνυν πόρρωθεν ὑποφυόμενα ὁρῶν ἠσχαλλον, ἐδυσχέραινον, ἠνιώμην. Καὶ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ἐῶ. Ἀλλὰ τὸν τρισκατάρατον τοῦτον Ἰουβενάλιον πυθόμενος ἐν τῇ Αἴνῳ διεφθαρκέναι πολλούς, αὐτῶν Αἰνειτῶν τῶν ἔτι εὐσεβούντων ἐξειπόντων μοι τὸ δεινόν, γράψας τῷ τῆς πόλεως ἄρχοντι Γατελιούζῳ πολλάκις συνεβούλευον ἢ καθειργνύναι, ἢ ἐξελαύνειν τὸν ἀλιτήριον. Κἀκεῖνος ἐξήλαυνεν οὐδὲν μελλήσας, καὶ εἰ μὴ οὕτως ἐγένετο, κἂν ἡ σύμπασα Αἶνος διέφθαρτο ὑπ' ἐκείνου. Ἀλλ' ἐξωσθέντος, ἀπαθεῖς πολλοὶ διεσώθησαν. Εἶτα ἐλθόντος ἐκεῖθεν ἐνταῦθα, οὐδ' ἑνὸς ἠμέλησα πρὸς διόρθωσιν καὶ ἰατρείαν αὐτοῦ, προσκαλούμενος ἐπὶ λόγους, ἐπαγγελλόμενος ἐκ βασιλέως αὐτῷ τιμάς, εἰ ἀποστῆναι βουληθείη τῆς πλάνης, λόγοις πρότερον πεπεισμένος δικαίοις καὶ ἀληθέσιν. Ὁ δὲ πρὸς ἐμὲ μὲν ἐκρύπτετο καὶ μηδὲν ὑπεναντίον τῇ χριστιανῶν πίστει μήτε φρονεῖν μήτε διδάσκειν ἔλεγεν. Τὰ δὲ μοναστήρια περιῴων, κατὰ τῆς παρθενίας καὶ τοῦ σεμνοῦ τῶν μοναχῶν σχήματος καὶ ἄλλ' ἄττα ληρῶν, τοὺς ἁπλουστέρους διέφθειρε. Τοῦτο μαθὼν ὁ Κορώνης ἐκεῖνος κῦρ Μακάριος καὶ ὁ Σάρδεων Διονύσιος, ἐμοὶ πρὸς τοῦτο συνεργῷ κεχρημένοι, τῷ βασιλεῖ προσελθόντες, τὸν ἐναγῆ τῆς πόλεως ἐξελαύνουσιν. Ἐγὼ δὲ μᾶλλον συνεβούλευον εἴργειν αὐτόν. Πάλιν μετά τινα χρόνον ἐπανεληλυθὼς μετὰ τὴν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας σύγχυσιν ταύτην, ὁ αὐτὸς ἦν καὶ χείρων. Κἀγὼ πάλιν δὶς καὶ τρὶς ἐκεῖνον μεταπεμψάμενος· Ἄνθρωπε, εἶπον, τί περιπατῶν τῇδε κἀκεῖσε φθείρεις τὰς τῶν ἁπλουστέρων ψυχὰς, καὶ κινδυνεύεις πάλιν τῆς πόλεως ἐξελαύνεσθαι ὑφ' ἡμῶν, ἢ καὶ χεῖρόν τι πάσχειν; Εἰ μὲν νομίζεις ἀληθῆ εἶναι ἃ τοὺς ἀπαιδεύτους διδάσκεις, κοίνωσαι ταῦτα δὴ καὶ ἡμῖν, καὶ γυμνάσομεν ταῦτα ὁμοῦ. Κἂν μὲν γνῶς ἀπάτην ὄντα δαιμόνων καὶ δαιμονοφορήτων ἀνθρώπων, οἵ σε ταῦτα ἐδίδαξαν, ὠφεληθήσῃ πάντως εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐπανελθών, εἴ γε ταύτης ἐρᾷς, ὡς ἀνθρώπῳ προσήκει καὶ ἄλλως λόγου τινὸς μετέχοντι· εἰ δὲ μὴ δυνηθείην ἐγὼ τὰς σὰς ἀπορίας λῦσαι καὶ μεταπεῖσαί σε, ἐξέστω σοι πάλιν μένειν ἐπὶ τῆς δόξης· οὐδείς σου τὴν γνώμην βιάσεται. Τὸ δὲ πρὸς τοὺς εἰδότας καὶ δυναμένους ἢ ὠφελεῖν σε ἢ ἐλέγχειν κρυπτόμενον τοῖς ἀνεξετάστως δι' ἁπλότητα πειθομένοις σοι ἐπιφύεσθαι καὶ τὴν τῶν ἄλλων σωτηρίαν καὶ τὴν σὴν μισοῦντός ἐστι, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἂν ἐχθρὸς βλάψειέ σε πλέον ἢ αὐτὸς ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ βλάπτῃ.

Ὁ δὲ πάλιν κρυπτόμενος πρὸς ἐμὲ καὶ τοιοῦτος ἐξαρνούμενος εἶναι οἷον οἱ πολλοὶ λέγουσιν, τὰ μοναστήρια καὶ τοὺς ξενῶνας καὶ τὰς πανηγύρεις περιῴων ἔσπειρε τὴν ἀσέβειαν, ἕως, πολλοῖς κατάδηλος γεγονὼς καὶ πολλὰ ὑπὸ πολλῶν δεξάμενος σκώμματα καὶ φοβηθεὶς μὴ πάλιν ἐξελαθείη, προσελθὼν τῷ μεγάλῳ τότε πρωτοσυγκέλλῳ κυρίῳ Γρηγορίῳ,

---

1 *ἐδυσχέραινον* B 11 *Ὁ δὲ* B 18 *εἶργον* A 38 *πρωτοσυγγέλῳ* A

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ἂν εἴη δεινόν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς εἰδόσι ταῦτα καὶ συγχωροῦσιν καὶ βουλομένοις γίνεσθαι οὕτως τίς ἂν νοῦν ἔχων ὡς εὐσεβέσι προσέχοι; „Δεῖξον γάρ μοι τὴν πίστιν σου, φησίν, ἐκ τῶν ἔργων σου," καί· „Ἐκ τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιγνώσεσθε αὐτούς." Τίς Ἱερεμίας ταῦτα θρηνήσει; Τίς οὐκ ἐντεῦθεν μεγίστας ἡμῖν μαντεύσεται συμφοράς; μᾶλλον δὲ τίς οὐκ ὄψεται προσέχων καλῶς καὶ διαμνημονεύσει πολλὰ καὶ τῶν νῦν ὄντων κακῶν γεγενημένα προοίμια;

Οἴχεται, φεῦ, ἡ πίστις, καταπεφρόνηται· ἀπιστία πάντα δεινή· τοῖς μὲν ἑλληνισμός, τοῖς δὲ αὐτοματισμός τε καὶ ἀθεΐα, τοῖς δὲ ἀδιαφορία καὶ ἀμαυρία περὶ τὴν πίστιν καὶ τῶν πατρικῶν ὅρων ἀποστασία καὶ ὅλως δυσσέβεια ἐνεβάκχευσε, πρόφασιν εὑρηκυῖα τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ταύτην σύγχυσιν. Τίνι τῶν τοιούτων μέλει ὁπόσοις ἐπίκειται μέλειν; Οὐδ' ἑνί δή που. Προεδριῶν μὲν οὖν αὐτοῖς μέλει καὶ ὀνομάτων καινῶν καὶ κρασπέδων μακρῶν καὶ χρημάτων καὶ ἀρχῶν καὶ τῶν ἐν βασιλείοις τιμῶν. Διὰ τί τὰς ἐν βασιλείοις διατριβὰς ἔφυγον ἐγὼ προτροπάδην; Διὰ τί γωνίᾳ συγκλείσας ἐμαυτὸν ἰδιοπραγμονῶ, καὶ πλὴν ὀλίγων πρὸς οὓς ἔξεστι κρύπτεσθαι προσιόντας μετ' εὐσεβείας, τοῖς ἄλλοις οὐκ ἀνοίγνυμι τοῦ δωματίου τὴν θύραν; Διὰ τί σεσιώπηκα; Διότι καιρὸς πονηρός ἐστι, τὸ προφητικόν, καὶ ὁ συνιὼν σιωπήσεται. Διότι πρότερον μὲν ἠκουόμην λαλῶν, νῦν δὲ λέγω πρὸς οὐκ ἀκούοντας. Διότι λύκοι κατ' ἀλλήλων ἐγενόμεθα ἢ παρδάλεις οἱ ἄνθρωποι, συκοφαντοῦντες, βασκαίνοντες, διαf. 82v βάλλοντες, λογοποιοῦντες, κτείνοντες, | εἰ λήσειν ἠλπίσαμεν. Ταῦτα δὲ πόθεν; Ἐκ τῆς περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἀδιαφορίας. Αὕτη δὲ πόθεν; Ἐκ τοῦ σιωπᾶσθαι τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον, ἐκ τοῦ χειρίστου πάντων λιμῶν λιμοῦ, ὃν ὡς ἐσχάτην πληγὴν ταῖς παροξυνούσαις αὐτῷ πόλεσι τὸ θεῖον ἐπανατείνεται. „Πῶς πιστεύσουσι, φησίν, ἐὰν μὴ συνίωσιν, καὶ πῶς συνήσουσιν, ἐὰν μὴ ἀκούσωσιν;"

Ἐντεῦθεν δῆλον, ὅτι τὸ τέλος ἡμῶν ἐγγύς ἐστιν. „Ἐν γὰρ ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἐνστήσονται, φησὶν ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος πρὸς Τιμόθεον γράφων, καιροὶ χαλεποί· ἔσονται γὰρ οἱ ἄνθρωποι φίλαυτοι, φιλάργυροι, ἀλαζόνες, ὑπερήφανοι, βλάσφημοι, γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς, ἀχάριστοι, ἀνόσιοι, ἄστοργοι, ἄσπονδοι, διάβολοι, ἀκρατεῖς, ἀνήμεροι, ἀφιλάγαθοι, προδόται, προπετεῖς, τετυφωμένοι, φιλήδονοι μᾶλλον ἢ φιλόθεοι, ἔχοντες μόρφωσιν εὐσεβείας, τὴν δὲ δύναμιν αὐτῆς ἠρνημένοι. Τούτους ἀποτρέπου," φησίν. Ἡ ἱερωσύνη εὔωνος· ἡ ἀρχιερωσύνη σιμωνιακή· χρημάτων ὤνιος πᾶσα ἐκκλησιαστικὴ πραγματεία· ἐκ τῶν τοῦ Μαμωνᾶ θησαυρῶν τὰ δῶρα τοῦ Πνεύματος ταλαντεύεται· ἱεροὶ οἶκοι πιπράσκονται· τὰ τῷ Θεῷ ἀφιερωμένα πωλοῦνται. Ὦ τῆς τολμηρᾶς ἱεροσυλίας καὶ τῶν ὠνουμένων καὶ

2 Jac. 2, 18 3 Matth. 7, 20 22 . *Εἰλήσειν* B 26 Cf. Rom. 10, 14 28-34 II Tim. 3, 1-5

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ἂν εἴη δεινόν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς εἰδόσι ταῦτα καὶ συγχωροῦσιν καὶ βουλομένοις γίνεσθαι οὕτως τίς ἂν νοῦν ἔχων ὡς εὐσεβέσι προσέχοι; „Δεῖξον γάρ μοι τὴν πίστιν σου, φησίν, ἐκ τῶν ἔργων σου," καί· „Ἐκ τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιγνώσεσθε αὐτούς." Τίς Ἱερεμίας ταῦτα θρηνήσει; Τίς οὐκ ἐντεῦθεν μεγίστας ἡμῖν μαντεύσεται συμφοράς; μᾶλλον δὲ τίς οὐκ ὄψεται προσέχων καλῶς καὶ διαμνημονεύσει πολλὰ καὶ τῶν νῦν ὄντων κακῶν γεγενημένα προοίμια;

Οἴχεται, φεῦ, ἡ πίστις, καταπεφρόνηται· ἀπιστία πάντα δεινή· τοῖς μὲν ἑλληνισμός, τοῖς δὲ αὐτοματισμός τε καὶ ἀθεΐα, τοῖς δὲ ἀδιαφορία καὶ ἀμαυρία περὶ τὴν πίστιν καὶ τῶν πατρικῶν ὅρων ἀποστασία καὶ ὅλως δυσσέβεια ἐνεβάκχευσε, πρόφασιν εὑρηκυῖα τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ταύτην σύγχυσιν. Τίνι τῶν τοιούτων μέλει ὁπόσοις ἐπίκειται μέλειν; Οὐδ' ἑνί δή που. Προεδριῶν μὲν οὖν αὐτοῖς μέλει καὶ ὀνομάτων καινῶν καὶ κρασπέδων μακρῶν καὶ χρημάτων καὶ ἀρχῶν καὶ τῶν ἐν βασιλείοις τιμῶν. Διὰ τί τὰς ἐν βασιλείοις διατριβὰς ἔφυγον ἐγὼ προτροπάδην; Διὰ τί γωνίᾳ συγκλείσας ἐμαυτὸν ἰδιοπραγμονῶ, καὶ πλὴν ὀλίγων πρὸς οὓς ἔξεστι κρύπτεσθαι προσιόντας μετ' εὐσεβείας, τοῖς ἄλλοις οὐκ ἀνοίγνυμι τοῦ δωματίου τὴν θύραν; Διὰ τί σεσιώπηκα; Διότι καιρὸς πονηρός ἐστι, τὸ προφητικόν, καὶ ὁ συνιὼν σιωπήσεται. Διότι πρότερον μὲν ἠκουόμην λαλῶν, νῦν δὲ λέγω πρὸς οὐκ ἀκούοντας. Διότι λύκοι κατ' ἀλλήλων ἐγενόμεθα ἢ παρδάλεις οἱ ἄνθρωποι, συκοφαντοῦντες, βασκαίνοντες, διαf. 82v βάλλοντες, λογοποιοῦντες, κτείνοντες, | εἰ λήσειν ἠλπίσαμεν. Ταῦτα δὲ πόθεν; Ἐκ τῆς περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἀδιαφορίας. Αὕτη δὲ πόθεν; Ἐκ τοῦ σιωπᾶσθαι τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον, ἐκ τοῦ χειρίστου πάντων λιμῶν λιμοῦ, ὃν ὡς ἐσχάτην πληγὴν ταῖς παροξυνούσαις αὐτῷ πόλεσι τὸ θεῖον ἐπανατείνεται. „Πῶς πιστεύσουσι, φησίν, ἐὰν μὴ συνίωσιν, καὶ πῶς συνήσουσιν, ἐὰν μὴ ἀκούσωσιν;"

Ἐντεῦθεν δῆλον, ὅτι τὸ τέλος ἡμῶν ἐγγύς ἐστιν. „Ἐν γὰρ ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἐνστήσονται, φησὶν ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος πρὸς Τιμόθεον γράφων, καιροὶ χαλεποί· ἔσονται γὰρ οἱ ἄνθρωποι φίλαυτοι, φιλάργυροι, ἀλαζόνες, ὑπερήφανοι, βλάσφημοι, γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς, ἀχάριστοι, ἀνόσιοι, ἄστοργοι, ἄσπονδοι, διάβολοι, ἀκρατεῖς, ἀνήμεροι, ἀφιλάγαθοι, προδόται, προπετεῖς, τετυφωμένοι, φιλήδονοι μᾶλλον ἢ φιλόθεοι, ἔχοντες μόρφωσιν εὐσεβείας, τὴν δὲ δύναμιν αὐτῆς ἠρνημένοι. Τούτους ἀποτρέπου," φησίν. Ἡ ἱερωσύνη εὔωνος· ἡ ἀρχιερωσύνη σιμωνιακή· χρημάτων ὤνιος πᾶσα ἐκκλησιαστικὴ πραγματεία· ἐκ τῶν τοῦ Μαμωνᾶ θησαυρῶν τὰ δῶρα τοῦ Πνεύματος ταλαντεύεται· ἱεροὶ οἶκοι πιπράσκονται· τὰ τῷ Θεῷ ἀφιερωμένα πωλοῦνται. Ὦ τῆς τολμηρᾶς ἱεροσυλίας καὶ τῶν ὠνουμένων καὶ

2 Jac. 2, 18 3 Matth. 7, 20 22 . *Ελλήσειν* B 26 Cf. Rom. 10, 14 28-34 II Tim. 3, 1-5

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

τῶν πιπρασκόντων αὐτά. Καὶ δυνατὸν ἦν μὴ ἐγκαταλειφθῆναι ἡμᾶς ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ταῦτα πράττοντας ἢ γενομένων ἀνεχομένους; Καὶ τίς ἡ ἐγκατάλειψις; Ἀπεβάλομεν τὴν θεοσέβειαν. Πῶς; Οὐκ ἔχομεν Ἐκκλησίαν. Ἠγνόηται ἡμῖν τὰ τῶν πατέρων δόγματα, καταπεφρόνηται· ἀνταλλαττόμεθα αὐτὰ φόβῳ ἐλπίδων, ἐπαγγελίᾳ δόσεων. Ταῦτα ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ, ταῦτα ἐκεῖθεν μέχρι καὶ νῦν· τὰ ἅγια δεδώκαμεν τοῖς κυσί, τοὺς μαργαρίτας τοῖς χοίροις. Ἐν Ἰουδαίοις καὶ Σαρακηνοῖς οἱ ἰδιῶται, οἱ τοῖς τοῦ κόσμου πράγμασι προσηλωμένοι, οὐ τολμῶσιν ἐναντίον τῶν εἰδότων καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἱερῶν τεταγμένων τι φθέγγεσθαι· ἐν ἡμῖν δέ, χριστιανοῖς οὖσιν, ἄγουσι καὶ φέρουσι τὰ τῆς πίστεως ὅσοις οὐδαμόθεν τοῦτο προσήκει. Ἐν ἐκείνοις οὐδεὶς τολμᾷ τι κατὰ τῆς πατρίου πίστεως μᾶλλον ἢ ἀπιστίας εἰπεῖν, ἢ ἄλλην τινὰ πίστιν πρὸ αὐτῆς ἐπαινέσαι, ἢ λιθόλευστος καὶ πυρίκαυστος. Ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀναιδῶς ἐπ' ἀγορᾶς κατὰ τῶν πατέρων δημηγοροῦμεν καὶ τῆς ἐκείνων πίστεως, καὶ ταῦτα τίνες; Βάναυσοί τινες καὶ ἀνάγωγοι καὶ γόητες καὶ ἀνάξιοι καθ' ἅπαξ τοῦ περὶ τῶν θείων τι φθέγξασθαι, καί, δέον ἀνασκολοπίζειν τοὺς ταῦτα τολμῶντας, καὶ ἐπαινοῦσι· τοὺς δὲ εἰδότας καὶ δυναμένους εὐλαβῶς περὶ τῶν θείων τι λέγειν καὶ μόνην εὐδαιμονίαν τε καὶ τρυφὴν τὴν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀληθείας κρίνοντας παρρησίαν καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν δεινῶν τούτων ἀγανακτοῦντας ὡς ἀλιτηρίους διώκομεν καὶ τῷ κοινῷ βλαβερούς. Ἵλεως γενοῦ, Κύριε, τῷ λειψάνῳ τούτῳ τῶν ὀρθοδόξων χριστιανῶν. Μὴ ἐγκαταλίπῃς, ἀλλὰ διόρθωσαι ὡς οἶδας αὐτός, καὶ ἐμὲ τὸν ἁμαρτωλὸν καὶ ἀχρεῖόν σου δοῦλον ἐλέησον.

Ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ἐκτραγῳδεῖν πολλῶν ἂν δέοι λόγων. Σὺ δέ, εὐσεβέστατε Μανουήλ, εὔφρανας ἡμᾶς δι' ὧν εἰς τὸν ἀσεβῆ πεποίηκας Ἰουβενάλιον καὶ ὡς ἐν τοιούτοις κακοῖς ὀδυνωμένοις ἡμῖν ἀναπνεῦσαί τι συνέβη διὰ τὴν φήμην τοῦ καλλίστου σου ἔργου ἐκείνου. Ἐξεῖλες γὰρ λοιμὸν ἐκ τοῦ συνεδρίου, ἐξέκοψας τὸ τῆς ἡμετέρας πίστεως καὶ τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν ὄνειδος· ἔσωσας τοὺς βλαφθέντας ἂν ὑπ' ἐκείνου, εἰ ἐπὶ πλέον ἡ πονηρὰ αὐτοῦ ζωὴ παρετείνετο· ὠφέλησας καὶ τοὺς βεβλαμμένους, εἰ νοῦν λαβεῖν ὀψὲ βούλονται καὶ συνεῖναι τὸ δέον. Ἔχουσι γὰρ ἐνθυμηθῆναι τὴν οἰκτίστην ἐκείνην ζωὴν καὶ τὸν ἀτιμότατον θάνατον συμφώνως γεγενημένα καὶ ἀκολούθως τῇ πονηρᾷ αὐτοῦ προαιρέσει καὶ τοῖς διεστραμμένοις δόγμασιν.

Τί γὰρ οὖν σεμνὸν ἐκείνῳ καὶ χάριεν, δι' ὃ πιθανὸς ἂν ἦν τινι νοῦν ἔχοντι; Σοφίαν οὐκ εἶχεν οὐδεμίαν, ἀλλ' ἰδιώτης ἦν καθάπαξ περὶ τὰ ὑψηλά τε καὶ θεῖα. Μικρῷ τινι μόνῳ μέτρῳ τῶν ἀπαιδευτοτάτων διέφερεν, ὅτι τὴν γλῶτταν ἤσκητο μετρίως λέγειν καὶ γράφειν, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν παχυτάτην εἶχε καὶ φιλοσοφίας ἁπάσης ἄγευστον καὶ ἀνήκοον. Τῆς

5 *ἐπαγγελιῶν δόσεων* B 6 *μαργαρίταις* B

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ἀγωγῆς ἐκείνου τί χυδαιότερον ἦν, δι' ἣν καὶ τῆς ἱερωσύνης ἐπιθυμῶν
f. 83 οὐκ ἠξίωτο; ὃ δὴ καὶ κατὰ τῆς πίστεως αὐτὸν μανῆναι πεποίηκε τὴν ἀρχήν. Φάγος ἦν, πότης, γελοιαστής, ἀκρατής, κόρδαξ, ἄστατος. Πρῶτον ἦν χριστιανός, εἶτα γέγονεν Ἰουδαῖος, εἶτα τοῖς τοῦ Μωάμεθ συνωργίαζεν αἱρεσιώταις, εἶτα αὐτοματιστής, εἶτα χριστιανοκατήγορος, τοῦτο δὴ τὸ τῆς πονηρίας ἐπισημότατον καὶ ἡ τῶν κακῶν αὐτοῦ κορωνίς. — Ἀλλὰ σοφὸς μὲν οὐκ ἦν, οὐδὲ ἱερός, φρόνιμος δέ. — Καὶ τίς τοῦτο εἰπὼν οὐκ ἂν μαίνοιτο; Τί σημεῖον φρονήσεως ἐξήνεγκεν ἐκεῖνος παρὰ πάντα τὸν βίον τὸν ἑαυτοῦ; Οὐκ ἐγένετο λῃσταρχος ἐν τῷ Ἁγίῳ Ὄρει, μεγάλα κατὰ τῶν ἐκεῖ μοναχῶν διανοούμενος πράττειν; Οὐ φονεὺς ἐγένετο μοναχῶν μηδὲν ἀδικούντων, δι' ὃ καὶ κρατηθεὶς τελευταῖον ὑπὸ τῶν Ἁγιορειτῶν καὶ ἐν δεσμοῖς ἐπί τινα κατεχόμενος χρόνον, εἶτα φιλανθρωπευσαμένων ἀφείθη; Οὐχ ὅμοια ἐβούλετο καὶ ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ καὶ ἔξω ταύτης ποιεῖν ἐν τοῖς τοῦ μακαρίτου Θεοδώρου τοῦ πορφυρογεννήτου καιροῖς; Οὐ τὰ τῶν ἱερέων ἐποίει ἐν Ἀπουλίᾳ καὶ τῇ Ἀλβανιτίᾳ, ἀνίερος ὢν καὶ γνωσθεὶς μόλις οἷα μῦς πίττης ἀπηλλάγη; Οὐ πανταχοῦ ἐπὶ τοῖς χειρίστοις ἠλίσκετο; Οὐ τοὺς χρυσίνους παντὶ τρόπῳ συνῆγεν, αὐτὸς δὲ πεινῶν ἢ προσαιτῶν ἔζη; Προὔλεγον γὰρ αὐτῷ οὓς ἐθεράπευε δαίμονας βασιλείαν καὶ ἄλλα τοιαῦτα, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πεινῶν συνῆγε τὰ χρήματα· τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ μικροῖς οὕτω χρήμασι τὰ τοιαῦτα θαρρεῖν πόσης ἦν ἀφροσύνης; Οὐκ ἔλεγεν ἑαυτὸν νόθον τοῦ βασιλέως Ἀνδρονίκου γεγονέναι, τὴν ἑαυτοῦ μητέρα πάνυ τιμῶν; Οὐ λαβὼν ἐνταῦθα μοναστήριον, τὸ τοῦ Ἀρχιστρατήγου, τὰς ἐκεῖ τῶν νεκρῶν θήκας ἀνώρυξε καὶ τὰ ὀστᾶ ἐκφορήσας, τὰ μὲν πυρὶ παραδέδωκεν ὑπὸ νύκτα, τὰ δ' ἔρριψεν ὅποι ἔτυχεν ὕπαιθρα, μόνον ἵνα τὰ ἐσχαρώματα τῶν τάφων ἐκβάλῃ καὶ πωλήσῃ τὸν σίδηρον καὶ ἵνα εὕρῃ χρύσεά τινα, ὡς ἐνόμιζε, τοῖς νεκροῖς ἐκείνοις συντεθαμμένα;

Ταῦτα τίνα λανθάνει, τίς ἀγνοεῖ; Καὶ πότερον φρονίμου ταῦτα καὶ εὐσεβοῦς ὄντος, ἢ δοκοῦντος κατά τινα πίστιν ἢ ἀνοήτου καὶ ἀνοσίου καὶ βοσκηματώδους ἀνθρώπου; Τοιοῦτοί εἰσι καὶ οἱ ἐκείνου μαθηταὶ καὶ διδάσκαλοι. Τοιοῦτοι δὲ ὄντες λανθάνουσι τοὺς πολλούς· Θεὸν δὲ καὶ φρονίμους καὶ εὐσεβεῖς οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν λέληθεν.

Ἀκόλουθον οὖν αὐτοῦ τῇ ζωῇ καὶ τὸ τέλος ἦν. Ἠθέλησεν ὁ μάταιος τάχα ὡς μύρτυς γενέσθαι τοῦ ψεύδους, καὶ τὴν ὀδυνηρὰν ἐκείνην καὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ προαιρέσεως ἀξίαν μισήσας ζωήν, ἐνενόησεν ἀποθέσθαι ταύτην ἐνδόξως τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ φίλοις, ὅτι ὑπὲρ τῆς δόξης ἀπέθνῃσκεν καὶ μαινόμενος, ὅτι δίκας ἐδίδου τοῦ φόνου, ὃν κατὰ τῶν μοναχῶν ἐτόλμησε, τῶν μηδὲν ἀδικούντων. Ὁ γὰρ διδάσκαλος ἡμῶν καὶ Θεός, εἰς ὃν ἐβλασφήμει, ἐκεῖνος ἦν ὁ εἰπών, ὅτι ὁ ἐργαζόμενος μάχαιραν ἐν μαχαίρᾳ ἀποθανεῖται, καὶ ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε ἡμῖν μετρηθήσεται.

38-39 Matth. 26, 52, Luc. 6, 38

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Ἀλλ' ἐκείνῳ μὲν οὕτω προσῆκεν ἐκμετρῆσαι τὸν βίον. Σὺ δέ, ὅπερ εἶπον, ὠφέλησας μὲν τοὺς ταῦτα πάντα λογίζεσθαι δυναμένους, ἄξιον τῆς ἀσεβοῦς ζωῆς ἐκείνῳ τὸ τέλος ἐπενεγκών, τὴν δὲ τῶν ἄλλων ἀνεπλήρωσας ἔνδειαν, οἳ τὸν ὑβριστὴν ἐκεῖνον τῆς πίστεως ὁρῶντες οὐ διεσπάραττον. Ἐφόβησας τοὺς ὁμοίους, μή ποτε καὶ αὐτοὶ χερσὶν εὐσεβέσιν ἐμπέσωσιν, ὡς ἐκεῖνος ταῖς σαῖς. Ἐποίησας ἔτι καὶ τοὺς δυναμένους τὰ τοιαῦτα κωλύειν καὶ μὴ κωλύοντας μέχρι τοῦ νῦν σωφρονεστέρους φαίνεσθαι περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα. Καὶ παρ' αὐτῶν γὰρ σφοδρότερον ἀπαιτήσομεν νῦν τὸν ὅμοιον ζῆλον, καὶ ἴσως αἰδούμενοι θερμότερον τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ πραγμάτων ἐπιτροπεύσουσιν, οὐδ' οὕτω ψυχροὶ τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν ἐκδικηταὶ καὶ τῆς πίστεως ἔσονται. Ἕως γὰρ ἂν ὦσι τοιοῦτοι, παροξυνοῦσι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ θεῖον καὶ τὰς ἡμῶν σπαράξουσι συνειδήσεις. Ἐκόλασας χεῖρα κατὰ τοῦ δημιουργοῦ τολμηρῶς κινουμένην· ἀπέτεμες γλῶτταν προπετῶς κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ μαινομένην ὠτα, ἃ τῶν θείων λογίων παρήκουσαν. Ἐκόλασε καὶ πρὸ τούτων | σκώληξιν ὁ Θεός, ὧν εὕροις τὸ ἐναγὲς ἐκεῖνο πτῶμα καὶ f. 88v
βέβηλον καὶ τῇ δυσοσμίᾳ καὶ τοῖς ἰχῶρσιν· ἀλλ' οὔτε πρότερον ἐπεστρέφετο πρὸς τὴν θείαν δίκην καθάπαξ μανείς, οὔθ' ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἐσωφρονίζετο ποινῶν ὕστερον. Τῷ ὄντι τῷ μὲν ἑκατέρας ἀπεγνωκὼς τῆς ζωῆς, τῷ δὲ δοκεῖν μαρτυρίας ἑαυτῷ δόξαν περιποιούμενος καὶ νόμον Χριστοῦ τηρῶν ἐν τοῖς κατὰ Χριστοῦ ἀγωνίσμασι, καὶ νόμους Ἑλλήνων πατῶν ἐν τοῖς ὑπὲρ τῶν ἑλληνικῶν δογμάτων ἀγῶσιν, οὕτως οὐδὲ τῇ ἑαυτοῦ δυσσεβείᾳ σύμφωνος ὁ μάταιος ἦν.

Χαῖρε τοίνυν, ὅπερ καὶ ἐν ἀρχῇ εἶπον, στρατιῶτα Χριστοῦ καὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ δόξης ὑπέρδικε. Κατασπάζομαί σου τὸ στόμα, ὃ τὴν κατὰ τῆς μιαρᾶς γλώττης ἤνεγκε ψῆφον· κατασπάζομαί σου τὴν ψυχὴν πρὸ τῆς γλώττης, ἣ χριστιανικῶς τὴν ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ κατὰ τοῦ μυσοχρίστου συνέλαβεν ἄμυναν. Κατησπασάμην ἄν σου καὶ χεῖρας, εἰ καὶ αὐτοχειρίᾳ διεχειρίζου τὸν δυσσεβῆ. Ὦ μακάριαι χεῖρες, ὅσαι τὸ πονηρὸν ἐκεῖνο τοῦ ποτὲ ἀνθρώπου λείψανον ἐπὶ τὴν θάλατταν εἵλκυσαν καὶ τῷ βυθῷ δεδώκασι χαίρουσαι, ἄρχοντος καλλίστου μιμησάμεναι ζῆλον. Ὁ δέ, φασίν, ἑλκόμενος καὶ βυθιζόμενος ἀνέπεμπε δόξαν τῇ πρώτῃ αἰτίᾳ. Καλῶς γε τὴν πρώτην αἰτίαν πάντων ἐδόξασεν ὁ μηδὲν ἀσεβείας καὶ φλυαρίας εἰς αὐτὴν παριείς. Δόξα μὲν οὖν τῇ πρώτῃ πάντων αἰτίᾳ παρ' ἡμῶν, ὅτι μὴ περιεῖδε τὸν ἀσεβῆ ταῖς εἰς αὐτὴν ἀχαριστίαις καὶ ὕβρεσι καὶ τὴν ἐκείνης ἀρίστην οἰκονομίαν τε καὶ τοὺς νόμους, οἷς τὴν λογικὴν φύσιν ὑπερφυῶς ἐβελτίωσε, τῆς μὲν εἰς αὐτὸν πίστεως ἀφιστῶντα τοὺς ἁπλουστέρους, ἐπὶ δὲ πολυθεΐας κρημνοὺς καὶ δαιμόνων ἀπάτης δεινῆς ἕλκοντα, ἀλλὰ δίκας

---

30 *Ὁ δέ φασιν* B

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

εἰσεπράξατο κἀνταῦθα τὸν ὑβριστήν, προδρόμους αὐτῷ τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα ποινῶν καὶ ὥσπερ προφήτιδας.

Σύγγνωθί μοι, ἄνθρωπε τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅτι μὴ ἀξίως τῆς ἀρετῆς πλέκω σοι τὸ ἐγκώμιον. Νῦν ἂν ἐχρησάμην ἐγκαίρως καὶ μεθόδοις ῥητορικαῖς καὶ λόγοις σοφίας δεῖξαι τὴν ὑπερβολήν σοι τοῦ κατὰ Χριστὸν κατορθώματος· ἀλλὰ τὸ σχῆμα κωλύει. Διὸ μοναχικώτερον καὶ ἰδιωτικώτερον ἐπιστέλλω σοι. Πάντα γὰρ ἤδη καὶ ἡμῖν τὰ ἔξω ἠμέληται καὶ πρὸς ἓν μόνον ὁρῶμεν, τὴν θεοσέβειαν καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡμαρτημένων θρηνεῖν καὶ δεῖσθαι τοῦ Θεοῦ ὅπως ἐλεηθῶμεν. Καὶ ταῦτα δὲ ἡ πολλὴ ἀγάπη πρὸς σὲ καὶ τὸ κάλλιστόν σου ἔργον γράψαι ἀνέπεισε καὶ πρὸς τούτοις αἰτία τις ἑτέρα, ἣν καὶ δὴ λέγω. Νῦν ἄγνοια καὶ φθόνος κατὰ τῶν καλῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῶν καλῶν αὐτῶν ἔργων ἐγείρεται πανταχοῦ. Εἰκὸς οὖν ἐστιν καὶ τὸ σὸν εὐσεβέστατον ἔργον διαβληθῆναί τισι. Καὶ τοὺς μὲν δι' ἄγνοιαν καὶ ἀπειρίαν τῶν καλῶν ἢ διὰ τὴν ὁμοίαν ἐκείνῳ δυσσέβειαν αἰτιασαμένους ἐῶ, ἀλλά τινες ἴσως ἔλεγχον τῆς ἑαυτῶν περὶ τὴν πίστιν ψυχρότητος τὴν σὴν ἡγούμενοι θέρμην, προπέτειάν τινα τοῦ ἔργου καταιτιάσονται. Ἵνα τοίνυν μὴ ἀμβλυνθῇ σου ὁ πρὸς Χριστὸν ζῆλος ταῦτα ἀκούοντος, ἢ δειλιάσῃς ὡς ἐπ' ἐγκλήματι ἐξ ὧν αὐτοὶ κακῶς κρίνουσιν, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον προστεθῇς τῇ γνώμῃ τῶν φρονίμων καὶ εὐσεβῶν· εἰσὶ δέ γε καὶ πολλοὶ αὐτόθι, οὓς ἐπαινέτας ἔχεις, ὡς οἶμαι· διὰ τοῦτο μάλιστα προήχθην σοι γράψαι. Δίδωμι δέ σοι γνώμην ἐμήν, ἣν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἔχω· Θεοῦ γάρ ἐστι καὶ τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ, εἰ καὶ ἐγὼ διάκονος ταύτης καὶ διακομιστής σοι γίνομαι ὁ ἀχρεῖος αὐτοῦ δοῦλος· τοὺς ἄλλους ἔα ληρεῖν, οἵτινες ἢ δι' ἰδιωτείαν, ἢ δι' οἱονδήτινα αἰτίαν ἄλλο τι λέγουσιν. Εἰσὶ δέ τινες τοῦ βήματος ὄντες [οἳ] οὐ συμφωνοῦσι ταύτῃ τῇ γνώμῃ. Τούτων μὴ φρόντιζε· „ὁδηγοὶ γάρ εἰσι τυφλοὶ τυφλῶν“· ἐλέει τε μᾶλλον αὐτούς, ὅτι προάγουσιν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν οἱ κοσμικοί, καὶ οὐκ αἰσχύνονται. Αὐτοὺς γὰρ ἔδει ζηλοῦν ἐπὶ τοῖς τοιούτοις· οἳ δὲ βαθεῖ κάρῳ κατισχημένοι καὶ τοὺς ἐγρηγορότας κακίζουσιν, ἔνιοι δὲ αὐτῶν ἀληθῶς καὶ τῷ Ἰουβεναλίου περιπεπτώκασι κρίματι, εἰ καὶ μὴ ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς· διὰ πίστεως γὰρ ἀδιαφορίαν ἀδικουμένης καὶ ἀτιμαζομένης τῆς
f. 84 Ἐκκλησίας καὶ τῆς Χριστοῦ πίστεως οὐ φροντίζουσιν, ἀλλὰ | τοὺς ἀτιμάζοντας κολακεύουσι καὶ συγκαθιᾶσιν, ἵνα τι αὐτοῖς ἀγαθὸν ἐξ αὐτῶν πρὸς καιρὸν γένηται. Σὺ δέ, τὴν γνώμην ταύτην λαβὼν καὶ ἐνστερνισάμενος, ἐκείνων μὴ φρόντιζε. Εἰ μὲν ἀνθρώπινός σε λογισμός, οὐ θεῖος, ἐπῆρε πρὸς τὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου φόνον ἐκεῖνον, καὶ σκοπὸς ἄλλος, οὐ ζῆλος τῆς πίστεως οὐδὲ μῖσος τῆς ἀπιστίας ἐκείνου καὶ πόθος Χριστοῦ καὶ τῶν μυστηρίων τῆς πίστεως, καθ' ὧν ἐκεῖνος ὑλάκτει, οὐδὲ φροντὶς τῆς σωτηρίας

---

26 Matth. 15, 14 28 οἱ δὲ B

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

τῶν ἀδελφῶν, ἔχει τινά σοι τὸ πρᾶγμα μέμψιν. Καὶ τῷ μὲν ἐξελεῖν ἐκ μέσου τὸν ἀσεβῆ εὔφρανας τὸν Θεόν, εἰς ὃν ἐκεῖνος ἠσέβει· ὅτι δέ σοι παρὰ τὸν σκοπὸν ἐγένετο τὸ καλὸν τοῦ σκοποῦ, τῷ Θεῷ τὸν λόγον ὀφείλεις, καὶ δεῖ σε καθαρθῆναι καὶ συντριβῆναι μετανοίας ἔργοις τισὶν ὡρισμένοις ἀντὶ τοῦ σκοποῦ, μεθ' οὗ πρὸς τὸν φόνον τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς ἐξώρμησας. Πρὸς γὰρ τὸν σκοπὸν ἅπας δικαστὴς κρίνει καὶ νομοθέτης τάττει τὰ δίκαια, καὶ Θεὸς μάλιστα, ὁ τὰς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀνιχνεύων καρδίας καὶ τοὺς σκοποὺς ἀνεξετάστως ὁρῶν. Οὐ λέγω δὲ εἰ καὶ τοῖς ὑπηρετησαμένοις τὴν τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς τιμωρίαν ἀπήντησέ τι καλὸν ἐκ τῶν ἐκείνου χρημάτων, ἃ φαύλως συναγαγὼν χεῖρον ἐφύλαττεν. Εἰ γὰρ διὰ τὴν ἀσέβειαν κεκόλασται προῦργου, τοῦτο δὲ ἀκολούθως ἀπήντησεν· ἔδει γάρ, αὐτοῦ φονευθέντος, τὰ ἐκείνου διανεμηθῆναί τισιν· οὐδεμίαν τοῦτο τοῖς διανειμαμένοις βλάβην ἐργάζεται. Σοὶ μέντοι γε συνεβούλευσα ἂν μηδὲν ἐκ τῶν τοιούτων παρακερδᾶναι, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὑπηρέταις ταῦτα λιπεῖν, ἢ τῷ δημοσίῳ οὐ διὰ τὴν σὴν ὑπάρχουσαν αὐτοῖς ἁμαρτίαν· οὐδεμία γάρ, ὡς εἴρηται, σύνεστιν· ἀλλ' ἵνα μὴ τὸ καλὸν ὃ πεποίηκας ὑπὲρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῖς οὐ καλῶς εἰδόσι κρίνειν ῥυπαίνηται, καὶ ἵνα ἐκ τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς μηδὲ κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς ὠφεληθῇ σοι ὁ βίος, καὶ ἵνα τὴν ἀμοιβὴν τῆς ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ παρρησίας ἐκ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μόνου λάβῃς, μηδεμιᾶς ὠφελείας προσκαίρου δι' αὐτήν σοι γεγενημένης. Ταῦτα δὲ οὐ φημι, διότι λέγοντος ἀκήκοά τι τοιοῦτόν τινος, ἀλλ' ὅτι πανταχόθεν σοι τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας κανόνα δίδωμι καὶ πάσαις ἐφαρμόζω ταῖς ἐνδεχομέναις τοῦ πράγματος περιστάσεσι τὸν ὀρθὸν τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς, μᾶλλον δὲ κατὰ τοὺς ἁγίους, κρίσεως λόγον.

Εἰ μὲν οὖν προῦργου καὶ πρωτοτύπως καὶ ὥσπερ ἐπίτηδες διὰ κέρδος, ἢ ἄμυναν, ἢ ὅλως πάθος ἀνθρώπινον ἐξήνεγκας τὴν ψῆφον ἐκείνην, ὀφείλεις τινὰ διὰ τὸν σκοπὸν τοῦτον ἀπολογίαν καὶ κάθαρσιν. Εἰ δὲ προῦργου καὶ πρωτοτύπως ὁ τῆς πίστεως ἐκίνει ζῆλος τὴν εὐσεβῆ σου ψυχὴν κατὰ τῆς μιαρᾶς ἐκείνου ζωῆς, ὥσπερ οὖν καὶ πεπείσμεθα· τί γὰρ εἶχες ἐκείνῳ δυσμεναίνειν ζῶντι, ἢ τὸ ἐκ τῆς ἐκείνου τελευτῆς ἐλπίζειν καλόν, ἢ τίς ἂν φαίη φονῶντα κατ' ἐκείνου τοὺς δημίους ἐκπέμψαι, ἀλλ' οὐ μᾶλλον τοῦ καθ' ἡμέραν φόνου τῶν ἄλλων οἶκτον λαμβάνοντα καὶ κηδόμενον τῶν ὑπ' ἐκείνου κτεινομένων ψυχῶν;

Εἰ τοίνυν, τὸ σύμπαν εἰπεῖν, ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ δόξης ὡς λυμεῶνα ταύτῃ τὸν τρισάθλιον ἐκεῖνον ἐκόλαζες σύ τε καὶ ὁστισοῦν ἐκοινώνει τῆς ψήφου, ἐπ' ἐμὲ καὶ τὴν ἐμὴν κεφαλὴν ἡ ἁμαρτία σου αὕτη, καὶ σὺ μὴ μόνον καθαρός, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλῶν ἀμοιβῶν ἄξιος. Ἔντιμον ἔσται τὸ γένος σου ἐν τῇ γῇ καὶ ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἐπίσημον διὰ τὴν εὐσεβῆ ταύτην ψῆφον. Ἀληθῶς εἶ Μανουήλ, ὅτι τὸν Ἐμμανουήλ, ὑβριζόμενον ὑφ' ὧν οὐκ ἐχρῆν, οὐ περιεῖδες. Ὄντως ὁ Θεὸς μετὰ σοῦ, ὅς σε πρὸς τὸν αὐτοῦ ζῆλον ἐκίνησεν. Ὄντως ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἡμῶν χριστιανὸς ἀληθὴς ὁ καλὸς Μανουήλ

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ἀπεδείχθης. Εἴδομεν ἐν ταῖς ψυχραῖς ταύταις ἡμέραις ἀντίρροπον τῇ δυσσεβείᾳ τοῦ Ἰουβεναλίου, ἧς οὐδὲν ἦν δυσσεβέστερον, τὴν σὴν εὐσέβειαν καὶ τὸν ζῆλον. Εἰ δὲ τὸν σὸν πάντες ἐνεδεδύμεθα ζῆλον ὑπὲρ τῆς πίστεως, οὐκ ἂν ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ καὶ ἐνταῦθα τὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μυστήριον ἐσαλεύετο παρὰ ἀνοήτων καὶ φαύλων ἀνθρωπαρίων.

Τοῦτο μὲν τῆς ἐμῆς διακρίσεως τὸ συμπέρασμα. Σκόπει δὲ καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν τοῦ Πνεύματος, καὶ πᾶς εἰδὼς καὶ ὀρθῶς πιστεύων σκοπείτω. Ἄλλο ἐστὶν αἱρετικός, καὶ ἄλλο ἄπιστος καὶ ἄλλο ἀποστάτης τῆς πίστεως. Ἄπιστος μὲν γάρ ἐστιν ὁ μὴ βουλόμενος ὅλως συντεθῆναι Χριστῷ, ὥσπερ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ Ἕλληνες· αἱρετικὸς δέ ἐστιν ὁ συντιθέμενος μὲν τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ δὲ ἐκείνου δόγματα διαφθείρων, εἴτε προηγουμένως τοῦτο ποιοίη, εἴτε πλαγίως, καὶ εἴτε περὶ τὴν θεολογίαν, εἴτε περὶ τὴν οἰκονομίαν ἐξαμαρ-
f. 84v τάνοι. | Ἅπαν γὰρ δόγμα ἐναντιούμενον ἄρθρῳ τῆς πίστεως εἴτε κατ' εὐθείαν, εἴτε πλαγίως, καὶ ἢ περὶ τὴν θεολογίαν, ἢ περὶ τὴν οἰκονομίαν, αἱρετικόν ἐστιν, καὶ ἅπας ὁ τοιοῦτον ἔχων δόγμα, αἱρετικός· ἀποστάτης δέ ἐστιν ὁ συντεθειμένος μὲν πᾶσι τοῖς τῆς πίστεως, εἶτα ἀποχωρίσας αὐτῆς, περὶ οὗ λέγεται ἐν παροιμίαις· „Ἄνθρωπος ἀποστάτης, ἀνὴρ ἄχρηστος“· νεκρῷ γὰρ ἔοικεν· ἢ ἐδέξατο πίστιν ἀποβαλὼν τὴν τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς αἰτίαν ἐν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν.

Τοὺς μὲν οὖν ἀπίστους τοὺς μήπω παραδεξαμένους τὴν πίστιν ἡ Ἐκκλησία Χριστοῦ κολάζειν οὐκ ἐπιτρέπει τοῖς ἄρχουσιν. „Τί γὰρ ἐμοὶ καὶ τοὺς ἔξω κρίνειν;“ φησὶν ἐν τῇ πρὸς Κορινθίους ὁ θεῖος Ἀπόστολος. Περὶ δὲ τῶν αἱρετικῶν ὑπομένει αὐτῷ τῷ Παύλῳ πρὸς Τιμόθεον γράφοντι· „Αἱρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον μετὰ μίαν καὶ δευτέραν νουθεσίαν παραιτοῦ, εἰδὼς ὅτι ἐξέστραπται ὁ τοιοῦτος.“ Τοιοῦτόν τι διαπράττεται διὰ τὴν πολλὴν αὐτῆς ἐπιείκειαν καὶ τὸν οἶκτον ὃν ἔχει πρὸς τὴν τῶν πλανωμένων ἐπιστροφήν· ἅπαξ καὶ δεύτερον νουθετεῖ τοὺς αἱρετικούς, καὶ αὖθις δὲ ἐνισταμένους ὁρῶσα, ἀπογνοῦσα τὴν ἐκείνων ἐπιστροφήν, τῆς σωτηρίας λοιπὸν φροντίζει τῶν ἄλλων, καὶ ἀπόφασιν ἀφορισμοῦ κατ' αὐτῶν φέρουσα χωρίζει τούτους τῶν εὐσεβῶν, ἵνα μηδεὶς προσιὼν αὐτοῖς βλάπτηται. Χωρισθέντες δὲ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας καὶ τὸν χωρισμὸν ἐνεγκόντες, ἐπεὶ νοσοῦσιν ἀνίατα, εἰ μὲν ἑαυτοῖς μόνοις τὰ διεστραμμένα φυλάττουσι δόγματα, μένουσιν ἐκ τῶν κοσμικῶν ἀρχόντων κακῶν ἀπαθεῖς, ὥσπερ οἱ ἄπιστοι. Εἰ δὲ φιλονεικίας ὑποσπείρουσιν καὶ τοῖς ἑαυτῶν ἐπαγωνίζονται δόγμασιν, ἀνάγκη τοῖς κοσμικοῖς ἐπίκειται ἄρχουσιν ἀπειλεῖν, εἴργειν, τὰ τοιαῦτα ποιεῖν ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, ὡς ἂν μὴ δύναιντο βλάπτειν τοὺς ἄλλους. Ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ ἀποστάτης τῆς πίστεως καὶ τοὺς αἱρετικοὺς καὶ τοὺς καθ' ἅπαξ ἀπίστους ὑπερβάλλει πολλῷ τῷ μέσῳ· „Βέλτιον γὰρ ἦν, φησὶν αὐτοῖς ὁ μακάριος Πέτρος, τὴν

17 Prov. 21 I Cor. 5, 12 24 Tit. 3, 10 (non Timoth.) 35 ἄρχουσαν B 38 II Pet. 2, 21

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ἀλήθειαν μὴ ἐπιγνῶναι ἢ μετὰ τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν ἀναχωρῆσαι“· ἐπιτρέπει μὲν οὖν οὐδαμῶς φανερῶς οὕτως ἡ Ἐκκλησία τοῖς κοσμικοῖς ἄρχουσι κολάζειν αὐτούς· εἰ μέντοι γε τοῦτο ποιοῖεν οἱ ἄρχοντες τῷ τῆς πίστεως ζήλῳ κινούμενοι καὶ τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ τὴν ἀσφάλειαν κατακτώμενοι, ἀποδέχεται τούτους καὶ στεφανοῖ· οὐ γὰρ ταὐτόν ἐστιν ἐπιτάξαι καὶ ἐπαινέσαι, ἀλλὰ πολλὰ ἐπαινεῖ μὲν ἡ Ἐκκλησία γιγνόμενα καὶ βούλοιτ' ἂν οὕτω γίνεσθαι· οὐκ ἐπιτάττει δὲ φανερῶς οὑτωσί. Οἷον οὐκ ἐπιτάττει τοὺς κιβδηλεύοντας τὸ νόμισμα κτείνειν, οὐδ' εἰ τοιοῦτόν τινα λαβών τις ἄρχων ἐπυνθάνετο τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τί ἂν δέοι ποιεῖν ἐπ' αὐτῷ, εἶπεν ἂν ἐκείνη δεῖν κτείνειν τὸν ἄνθρωπον· εἰ δ' ὁ ἄρχων λαβὼν ἀνασκολοπίσειεν ἢ ἀκρωτηριάσειεν κατὰ τοὺς ἑκασταχοῦ κειμένους καὶ ἐνεργουμένους νόμους, ἡ Ἐκκλησία οὔτ' ἀγανακτήσει τῷ ἄρχοντι, καὶ ἐπαινέσεται μᾶλλον, καὶ ἀφιέντα ψέξειεν ἄν. Πόσῳ δὲ τῷ μέσῳ χείρων ἐστὶν ὁ διαφθείρων τὴν πίστιν, δι' ἣν ἡ σωτηρία ταῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ψυχαῖς, τοῦ τὸ νόμισμα κιβδηλεύοντος, δι' οὗπερ εἰς τὴν πρόσκαιρον ζωὴν βοηθούμεθα; Ὥσπερ οὖν τοὺς ἄλλους κακοποιοὺς τοῖς ἐσχάτοις κολάζειν ὀφείλουσιν οἱ ἐκ Θεοῦ τὴν ἀρχικὴν ἔχοντες μάχαιραν, οὕτω καὶ πολλῷ μᾶλλον τοὺς ἀποστάτας τῆς πίστεως.

Τοιοῦτος ἦν ὁ θρηνούμενος ἐκεῖνος Ἰουβενάλιος· ἀπ' ἐναντίας γὰρ τῶν συνθηκῶν, ἃς τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ βαπτιζόμενος ὡμολόγησεν, ἐπὶ τὴν ἑλληνικὴν δεισιδαιμονίαν ἀπέκλινεν. Εἶτα κατὰ τῆς πίστεως ἔλεγε καὶ συνέγραφεν. Εἶτα ἐμηχανᾶτο κακὸν ἅπαν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, ἵνα μόνον τοὺς συνόντας καὶ πλησιάζοντας αὐτῷ χωρίζῃ τῆς πίστεως. Εἶτα οὐ λόγοις ἐκέχρητο καὶ ἐπιχειρήμασιν· οὔτε γὰρ ἂν εἶχεν, οὔτε τοιοῦτος ἦν· ἀλλ' ἀναιδείαις καὶ βλασφημίαις καὶ ὕβρεσι κατὰ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ κεφαλῆς, δι' ἃς οὐκέτ' ἀνεκτὸς ἦν.

Τὸν οὖν τοιούτου κολαστὴν τίς τολμήσει γράψασθαι φόνου, ἂν μὴ μόνον πολέμιος ᾖ τῆς τῶν χριστιανῶν σωτηρίας, ἢ νηπιώδης ἄλλως καὶ βεκκεσέληνος, μᾶλλον δὲ πῶς οὐ φονεῖς τῶν χριστιανικῶν ἦσαν ψυχῶν οἱ μέχρι τοῦ νῦν ζῆν αὐτῷ συγχωροῦντες;

| Ἄκουε δὲ καὶ τῶν βασιλικῶν διατάξεων, τί φασιν· „Οἱ ἀξιωθέντες f. 85
τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος καὶ πάλιν ἑλληνίζοντες ἐσχάτῃ τιμωρίᾳ ὑπόκεινται“· καί· „Ἐὰν Ἰουδαῖος τολμήσῃ, φησί, διαστρέψαι χριστιανικὸν λογισμόν, ὑπόκειται κεφαλικῇ τιμωρίᾳ.“ Πόσῳ τοίνυν μείζονός ἐστιν κατακρίσεως [ἄξιος] ὁ μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα καὶ τὴν πίστιν μὴ μόνον ἑλληνίζων αὐτός, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς χριστιανικοὺς λογισμοὺς διαστρέφων καὶ λόγοις καὶ γράμμασι καὶ πᾶσι τρόποις φλυαρῶν μετὰ σφοδρᾶς τῆς κατὰ τῶν τιμίων μανίας; Καὶ παρίημι τοὺς κατὰ Μανιχαίων καὶ Δονατιστῶν καὶ Ἑλλη-

19 θρηνώνυμος A, θρηνούμενος B

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

νιστῶν πολλοὺς αὖ νόμους περὶ τούτων διαγορεύοντας. Ἆρ' οὖν ἡ Ἐκκλησία δεινὸν ἡγεῖται τοὺς νόμους τούτους τηρεῖσθαι, ἢ τοὺς τηρεῖν ἐθέλοντας δίκας εἰσπράττεται; Καὶ πῶς ἂν ἔχοι λόγον; Πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔθεντο ἂν τούτους οἱ θέμενοι, εἰ μὴ καὶ τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ συνήρεσαν· ἔπειτα, πῶς ἂν ἡ Ἐκκλησία ὡς ἁμαρτάνοντας κανονίζοι τοὺς αὐτῇ γε συναγωνιζομένους [καὶ] τοὺς ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς τὰ τοιαῦτα καὶ νομοθετοῦντας καὶ πράττοντας; Εἰ δὲ μὴ αὐτοχειρίᾳ ἡ Ἐκκλησία τοῦτο ποιεῖ, ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦτο τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ὑπέρδικοι οἱ κοσμικοὶ ἐτάχθησαν ἄρχοντες εἶναι, ὡς ἂν ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας οὗτοι ποιῶσιν ἅπερ αὐτῇ δι' ἑαυτῆς ποιεῖν οὐ προσήκει. Καὶ ὁ μὲν βασιλεὺς ὄμνυσιν ὑπερδικεῖν τῶν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας δογμάτων, μισθὸν ἀνθυπισχνούμενος αὐτῇ τῆς ἐκεῖθεν ἀνακηρύξεως· οἱ δὲ πεμπόμενοι ταῖς πόλεσιν ἔπαρχοι τὰς βασιλικὰς ὀμνύουσι διατάξεις τηρεῖν· αἱ δὲ διατάξεις λέγουσιν ἅπερ ἠκούσαμεν. Οὐκοῦν πάντα τῷ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας διὰ πάντων συνᾴδει σκοπῷ, κἂν μὴ ῥητῶς οὑτωσὶ παρ' αὐτῆς λέγηται.

Σὺ μὲν οὖν, ἀνδρῶν καὶ ἀρχόντων γενναιότατε καὶ εὐσεβέστατε, ἐμοὶ πειθόμενος, χάριτας μὲν ἔχε Χριστῷ τοῦ γεγενημένου· πολλοί σοι γὰρ ἐκεῖθεν στέφανοι πλέκονται· εἰ δέ τινα ἄλλον φωράσεις ἀληθῶς ὁμολογουμένως τὰ αὐτὰ τῷ Ἰουβεναλίῳ νοσοῦντα καὶ τῆς μὲν ἀληθοῦς πίστεως ἀφιστῶντα τοὺς χρωμένους αὐτῷ, ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν τῶν δαιμόνων ἀπάτην, ἣν ὁ Θεὸς δι' ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀρίστης ἐκείνης οἰκονομίας κατήργησεν, ἕλκοντα, μετὰ δευτέραν καὶ τρίτην παραίνεσιν ῥάβδιζε, εἶργε, εἶτα γλῶσσαν ἀφαίρει, εἶτα χεῖρα ἀπότεμνε, κἂν καὶ οὕτω μένῃ κακός, θαλάττης πέμπε βυθῷ. Φημὶ δὲ μετὰ τρίτην καὶ δευτέραν παραίνεσιν, „μήποτε δῷ αὐτοῖς, φησὶν ὁ θεῖος Ἀπόστολος, μετάνοιαν πρὸς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας, καὶ ἀνανήψωσιν ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου παγίδος." Τοῦτο δὲ πολλοῖς συμβαίνειν εἰκός, εἰ καὶ τῷ Ἰουβεναλίῳ ἀδύνατον ἦν μετάνοιαν συμβαίνειν ποτέ. Ἡ γὰρ ἀναίσχυντος ἐκείνου καὶ φορτικὴ κατὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας μανία τῶν δαιμόνων ἦν ὁμολογουμένως φενάκη καὶ φρενοβλάβεια, οἳ κοῦφον εὑρόντες καὶ πρὸς τὴν πλάνην ὑπ' ἀμαθίας τε ἅμα καὶ πονηρίας ἐπιρρεπῆ ἐξεβάκχευσαν ὁμολογουμένως τὸν δεῖλαιον καὶ κατὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ σωτηρίας ἐξέστησαν καὶ ἐξέμηναν. Διὸ καὶ πολλάκις καὶ παρὰ πολλῶν οὐ δὶς οὐδὲ τρὶς μόνον παραινεθεὶς τῇ μὲν Ἐκκλησίᾳ παραιτητέος ἦν ὡς ἐξεστραμμένος, τοῖς δὲ κοσμικοῖς ἄρχουσι ταῖς ἐσχάταις τιμωρίαις ὑπέκειτο, εἰ καὶ μήτε ἡ Ἐκκλησία, μήτε οἱ ἄρχοντες τὸ δέον ἅπαν ἐποίουν, ἀλλὰ τῷ ξίφει τοῦ καταράτου κτεινομένων τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων, φεῦ, ὠλιγώρουν ψυχῶν.

Καὶ τὸ μέντοι σὸν τοιοῦτόν ἐστιν· πᾶσι δὲ ἄρχουσι προλέγω μείζοσι καὶ ἐλάττοσιν, ὅτι, ἂν μὴ τοὺς Ἑλληνιστὰς τούτους κολάζωσιν, ἂν προ-

---

24-26 II Tim. 2, 25 31 *ἐξέστωσαν* A

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

βαίνοντα τὸν ἑλληνισμὸν ὁρῶντες ἀνέχωνται καὶ μὴ ποιῶνται τὴν προσήκουσαν ἐξέτασιν, ὡς ἂν ταῦτα θᾶττον διορθωθῇ, ἢ Ἕλληνες ὄντες καὶ αὐτοὶ πειρῶνται λανθάνειν, ἢ ὡς Ἕλληνες Θεῷ καὶ ἀνθρώποις κριθήσονται. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ κακὸν ὁπόσον ἐστὶν οὐδένα λανθάνει καὶ αὐτόθι καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν, καὶ τίνες οἱ τούτου σπορεῖς, καὶ οἱ τοῦτο δεχόμενοι. Ἂν οὖν μὴ συστραφέντες οἱ παρ' ὑμῖν τε καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν ἄρχοντες καὶ τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ χρησάμενοι συνεργῷ, μᾶλλον δὲ πρὸ τούτου ποιήσαντες Ἐκκλησίαν, ὡς ἂν αὐτῇ συνεργῷ χρῷντο· ἐκ γὰρ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς συγχύσεως τὰ δεινὰ ταῦτα συμβέβηκε· τὸν δέον ἅπαν ποιήσωσιν, ὁμοῦ μετὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας ἀπολλυμένης καὶ πάντα ἡμῖν οἰχήσεται τὰ σεμνότατα, καὶ βασιλεία καὶ ἐλευθερία καὶ νόμοι καὶ ἔθη, καὶ πάντα οὐκ εἰς μακρὰν ἄνω καὶ κάτω γενήσονται τὰ ἡμέτερα. Κἀγὼ μὲν ἀναίτιος τοῦ λοιποῦ, περὶ τούτων πολλάκις καὶ ἰδίᾳ καὶ δημοσίᾳ διαλεχθεὶς τε καὶ διαμαρτυράμενος· οἱ δὲ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐκκεντοῦντες ἢ τοῖς εἰς Χριστὸν ἐκκεντοῦσιν ἐνασμενίζοντες ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐκκεντοῦσιν κἀνταῦθα κἀκεῖ, καὶ τῶν ἐντεῦθεν συμβησομένων πάντων δεινῶν τίσουσι τὰς εὐθύνας.

III.

A un inconnu (avant 1453).*

Τῆς σῆς μὲν πρότερον εὐσεβείας ἀγγελλομένης ἡμῖν ἐτερπόμεθα, καὶ τοῦ μὴ μόνον σαυτῷ τὴν ἀρίστην προελέσθαι μερίδα, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλοῖς ἄλλοις ταύτην βούλεσθαι προξενεῖν· τῆς γὰρ φήμης πάντη ῥᾳδίως παραπεμπούσης, οὐδὲν ἡμᾶς τῶν ἐν τῇ νήσῳ γινομένων ἐλάνθανεν· ὅθεν οὐδεὶς ἡμῖν τὰ κατὰ τὴν νῆσον διεξῄει καλά, μηδὲ τὴν σὴν εὐσέβειαν προστιθεὶς καὶ τὸ πάντων σε τῶν καλῶν ἐπιμελῆ γεγονέναι. Ἠλπίζομεν οὖν διὰ ταῦτα καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἐπερχομένους πειρασμούς σε βεβαιότερον στήσεσθαι, καὶ τὴν οἰκίαν μιμήσεσθαι | τὴν ἐπὶ τῶν πετρῶν ᾠκοδομημένην, ἣ πρὸς ὑδάτων ἐπιφορὰς καὶ πνευμάτων ἀκίνητος διαμένουσα, τοῖς ἐπ' αὐτὴν καταφεύγουσι μετ' ἀσφαλείας πολλῆς ἀποδίδωσι τὴν ζωήν· οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὸ σὸν ἂν εἶχεν, εἰ μέχρι θανάτου τὴν πρὸς τοὺς ἐναντίους πάλην ὑφίστασο, καὶ στήλη τις ἀθάνατος καρτερίας ἔμελλες ἑστήξειν παρὰ πάντα τὸν χρόνον, πολλοὺς τῷ καθ' αὑτὴν ὑποδείγματι σῴζουσα καὶ πείθουσα σωφρονεῖν. Τί γὰρ θανάτου σεμνότερον, ὃν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀληθείας στηριζομένης ἄν τις αἱροῖτο; Τί δὲ ζωῆς ἀθλιώτερον, τῇ προδοσίᾳ τῆς ἀληθείας

Paris. 1289 f. 12 v

f. 13

* A = Parisinus 1932, f. 12v-14, copie autographe de Scholarios;
B = Taurinensis B-V-5, f. 15-15v, du XVe siècle;
L = Édition de S. Lambros, *op. cit.*, t. II, 2e édition (1924), p. 243-246, d'après A et B.

26 *μιμεῖσθαι τὴν ἀπὸ* L

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Works for Reference

Bakker, E. J., ed. *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd., Singapore, 2010.

Balme, M., Lawall, G. *Athenaze: An Introduction to Ancient Greek*, 2 vols., Oxford University Press, New York, 2003.

Boardman, J., Griffin, J., Murray, O. (eds.) *The Oxford History of the Classical World*, Oxford University Press, Great Britain, 1986.

Editorial staff at the Catholic University of America, *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, McGraw Hill, New York, 1989.

Gagarin, M. (ed.) *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece and Rome*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2010.

Greek Word Study Tool from http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/morph

Holy Bible: Old and New Testaments, Ramboro, London, 1994.

Jeffreys, E. *et al.* (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Studies*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2008.

Kazhdan, A., Talbot A.-M., Cutler, A., Gregory, T. E., Ševcenko, N. P. *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, 3 vols., (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press), 1991.

Lampe, G.W.H. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961).

Liddell, H.G. and Scott, R., Jones, H.S. *A Greek-English Lexicon*, (9th ed., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940).

Roberts, J. (ed.) *The Oxford Dictionary of the Classical World*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2005.

Trapp, E. *et al*. (eds.) *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit*, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna, 1976–94.

Primary Sources

Chalkokondyles, L. *Demonstrations of Histories* trans. by Nicolaos Nicoloudis, Historical Publications St. D. Basilopoulos, 1996.

Dennis, G. T., trans. *The Letters of Manuel Palaeologus*, Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, Washington D. C., 1977.

Doukas, *Decline and Fall of Byzantium to the Ottoman Turks*, trans. by Harry Magoulias, Wayne State University, Detroit 1975.

Kritovoulos, *History of Mehmed the Conqueror* trans. by Charles T. Riggs, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1954.

Laurent, V., ed. and trans. *Les "Mémoires" du grand ecclésiarque de l'Église de Constantinople Sylvestre Syropoulos sur le Concile de Florence (1438-1439)*, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris, 1971.

Miklosich, F. - Müller, I., ed. *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi I-VI*. Vienna, 1860-1890.

Petit, L., Sideridès, X.A., Jugie, M., ed. *Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, 8 vols., Maison de la Bonne Presse, Paris, 1928-1936.

Schneidewin, F.G. and von Leutsch, E.L., *Corpus paroemiographorum Graecorum*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1839 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1965).

Schreiner, P., ed. *Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, 3 vols., Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien, 1979.

Sphrantzes, G. *The Fall of the Byzantine Empire* trans. by Marios Philippides, The University of Massachusetts Press, Amherst, 1980.

Secondary Sources

Blanchet, M. H. *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios (vers 1400-vers 1472): Un intellectuel Orthodoxe face à la disparition de l'Empire byzantin*, Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, Paris, 2008.

Browning, R. *The Byzantine Empire*, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D.C., 1992.

Burnet, J. *Platonis opera*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1900 (repr. 1967).

Burnyeat, M.F. *The Theaetetus of Plato* (with a translation by Jane Levett). Hackett, 1990.

Diehl, C., Ives, G.B., (trans.) *History of the Byzantine Empire*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1925.

Gill, J. *Personalities of the Council of Florence*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1964.

Gregory, T. *A History of Byzantium*, Blackwell Publishing, United Kingdom, 2005.

Haldon, J. *Byzantium: A History*, Tempus Publishing, Gloucestershire, 2005.

Hatlie, P. "Redeeming Byzantine Epistolography", *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies 20* (1996), pp. 213-248.

Imber, C. *The Crusade of Varna, 1443–45*, Aldershot, 2006.

Inalcik, H. "The Policy of Mehmed II toward the Greek Population of Istanbul and the Byzantine Buildings of the City", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, vol. 23/24 (1969/1970), 229-249.

Kalligas, H. *Monemvasia: A Byzantine City State*, Routledge, New York, 2010.

Livanos, C. *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence in the Work of George Scholarios*, Gorgias Press, New Jersey, 2006.

Mango, C. *The Oxford History of Byzantium*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2002.

Meyendorff, J. *The Orthodox Church: Its Past and Its Role in the World Today*, St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, New York, 1996.

Mijatovich, C. Constantine: *The Last Emperor of the Greeks or The Conquest of Constantinople by the Turks (A. D. 1453)*, Sampson Law, Marston & Company, London, 1892.

Migne, J.P. Patrologiae cursus completus (series Graeca), *(MPG)* 77, Paris: Migne, 1857-1866.

Miller, W. "Monemvasia" *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, vol. 27 (1907), 229-301.

Mullett, M. *Letters, Literacy, and Literature in Byzantium*, Ashgate Publishing Ltd., USA, 2007.

---------- *Theophylact of Ochrid: Reading the Letters of a Byzantine Archbishop*, 2 vols., Variorum Ashgate Publishing Ltd., Hampshire, 1997.

Necipoğlu, N. *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 2009.

Nicol, D. M. *The End of the Byzantine Empire*, Holmes & Meier Publishers, Inc. London, 1979.

---------- *The Immortal Emperor*, Cambridge University Press, Great Britain, 2002.

---------- *The Last Centuries of Byzantium 1261-1453*, 2nd ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.

Papadakis, A. "Gennadius II and Mehmet the Conqueror" *Byzantion* 42 (1972), 88-106.

Papadopoullos, T. *Studies and Documents Relating to the History of the Greek Church and People under Turkish Domination*, AMS Press, New York, 1973.

Runciman, S. *Lost Capital of Byzantium*, I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd. New York, 2010.

---------- *The Fall of Constantinople, 1453*, Cambridge University Press, 1965.

---------- *The Great Church in Captivity*, Cambridge University Press, London, 1968.

---------- *The Last Byzantine Renaissance*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1970.

Ševčenko, I. "Intellectual Repercussions of the Council of Florence" *Church History*, vol. 24, no. 4 (1955), 291-323.

Tozer, H. F. "A Byzantine Reformer" *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, vol. 7 (1886), 353-380.

Turner, C. J. G. "An Anomalous Episode in Relations between Scholarius and Plethon" *Byzantine Studies*, III, 1 (1976), 56-63.

---------- "Another Anti-Latin Work Attributed to Gennadius Scholarius" *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 58 (1965), 337-347.

---------- "George Gennadius Scholarius and the Union of Florence," *The Journal of Theological Studies* 18 (1967), 83–103.

---------- "The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius" *Byzantion* 39 (1969), 420-455.

Vacalopoulos, A. E. *The Greek Nation 1453-1669: The Cultural and Economic Background of Modern Greek Society*, trans. by Moles, I & Moles, P., Rutgers University Press, New Jersey, 1976.

Ware, T. *The Orthodox Church*, Penguin Books, London, New York, 1997.

Woodhouse, C. M. *George Gemistos Plethon: The Last of the Hellenes*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1986.

Zakythinos, D. *Le Despotat grec de Morée: Histoire politique*, éd. revue et augmentée par C. Maltézou, Variorum, 2 vols., Londres, 1975.

Zissis, T. *Γεννάδιος Β' Σχολάριος: Βίος, Συγγράματα, Διδασκαλία* (*Gennadios II Scholarios: Life, Writings, Doctrine*), Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies, Thessaloniki, 1980.