GREEKS AND LATINS IN RENAISSANCE ITALY

Studies on Humanism and Philosophy in the 15th Century

John Monfasani

VARIORUM COLLECTED STUDIES SERIES

Also in the Variorum Collected Studies Series:

JOHN MONFASANI
Language and Learning in Renaissance Italy
Selected Articles

JOHN MONFASANI
Byzantine Scholars in Renaissance Italy: Cardinal Bessarion and Other Emigrés
Selected Essays

F. EDWARD CRANZ (Eds Thomas M. Izbicki and Gerald Christianson)
Nicholas of Cusa and the Renaissance

W. KEITH PERCIVAL
Studies in Renaissance Grammar

JOSEPH S. FREEDMAN
Philosophy and the Arts in Central Europe, 1500–1700
Teaching and Texts at Schools and Universities

CHARLES TRINKAUS
Renaissance Transformations of Late Medieval Thought

MARION LEATHERS KUNTZ
Venice, Myth and Utopian Thought in the Sixteenth Century
Bodin, Postel and the Virgin of Venice

EDWARD P. MAHONEY
Two Aristotelians of the Italian Renaissance
Nicoletto Vernia and Agostino Nifo

JILL KRAYE
Classical Traditions in Renaissance Philosophy

MICHAEL J.B. ALLEN
Plato's Third Eye
Studies in Marsilio Ficino's Metaphysics and its Sources

WILLIAM A. WALLACE
Galileo, the Jesuits, and the Medieval Aristotle

VARIORUM COLLECTED STUDIES SERIES

Greeks and Latins in Renaissance Italy

Professor John Monfasani

John Monfasani

Greeks and Latins in Renaissance Italy

Studies on Humanism and Philosophy
in the 15th Century

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2004 by Ashgate Publishing

2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxfordshire OX14 4RN
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

First issued in paperback 2018

ISBN 978-0-86078-951-2 (hbk)
ISBN 978-1-138-38249-7 (pbk)

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Monfasani, John
Greeks and Latins in Renaissance Italy: studies on humanism and philosophy in the 15th century. – (Variorum collected studies series)
1. Philosopy – Italy – History – To 1500 2. Humanism – Italy – History – To 1500 3. Philosophy, Renaissance 4. Italy – Intellectual life – 1268–1559
I. Title
195

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Monfasani, John.
Greeks and Latins in renaissance Italy: studies on humanism and philosophy in the 15th century / John Monfasani.
p. cm. – (Variorum collected studies series; 801)
Includes indexes.
ISBN 0–86078–951–9 (alk. paper)
1. Classical philology – History – To 1500. 2. Classical philology – Study and teaching – Italy. 3. Philosophy, Ancient – Study and teaching – Italy.
4. Classical literature – Appreciation – Italy. 5. Renaissance – Italy.
6. Humanists – Italy.
I. Title. II Collected studies; 801

PA57.M66 2004
480'.09–dc22 2004047620

VARIORUM COLLECTED STUDIES SERIES CS801

DOI: 10.4324/9781003418672

To Mark

CONTENTS

This volume contains xii + 334 pages

PREFACE

This is my third volume in the Variorum Collected Studies Series. It contains some new topics for me: Marsilio Ficino, Nicholas of Cusa, Giovanni Gatti, OP, and Italian Scholasticism. It also represents another installment in what has now become thirty years of work on several other interests: Lorenzo Valla, Theodore Gaza, the Plato-Aristotle controversy, and Greek émigrés to Renaissance Italy. All these articles must be judged on their own merits. Nonetheless, what I noted in the preface to my first Variorum volume in 1994 remains true for this one, namely, that one way or another they have come out of the interests I developed in the late 1960s and early 1970s while writing my dissertation on George of Trebizond, the one subject about whom I have yet to write an article. But George makes a conspicuous appearance in several articles in the volume and is a bit player in a few others. So, willy nilly, this third volume finds me plowing the same old furrows. My only defense is that I love what I am doing and plan to keep on doing it until the Good Lord calls me away.

As usual, my debts are many. Every one of the articles save two ("The Averroism of John Argyropoulos" and "Aristotelians, Platonists, and the Missing Ockhamists") reflects an invitation by a conference organizer or volume editor. Hence, I wish first of all to thank Michael J.B. Allen, Marco Bertozzi, Concetta Bianca, Marcello Fantoni, Vincenzo Fera, Giacomo Ferraú, Anthony Grafton, Lucia Rosa Gualdo, Jill Kraye, Riccardo Maisano, Anthony Molho, Marianne Pade, Valery Rees, Antonio Rollo, Nancy Siraisi, M.W.F. Stone, Martin Thurner, and Fosca Mariani Zini, all of whom, either directly or indirectly, had a hand in the invitations which resulted in these articles. In several instances, the invitation became the start of a rewarding friendship and in others the confirmation of a friendship of now long standing.

I owe a further debt of thanks to many of the aforementioned for their scholarly help in the preparation of the articles. But others also must be included in this category: Ernesto Berti, Martin Davies, Arthur Field, Riccardo Fubini, Paul Grendler, Edward P. Mahoney, Angelo Mazzocco, Stefano Perfetti, Anna Pontani, Mariangela Regoliosi, Antonio Rigo, Silvia Rizzo, David Rutherford, Chris Schabel, and Viktor Tiftixoglu. A simple alphabetical listing does little to reveal the myriad ways these scholars

have helped and influenced me in writing and correcting these articles, but I take satisfaction in at least acknowledging my debt to them.

Over the years I have been fortunate enough to receive support from various institutions. Critical specifically to the articles in this volume were the travel grants I received from The University at Albany, State University of New York, in 1998, 2001, and 2002 and from the American Philosophical Society in 1999. To both institutions I express my sincere gratitude.

As in the other Variorum volumes, I have taken the opportunity to correct some minor typographical errors and to add an appendix of *Addenda/Corrigenda* in addition to indices of manuscripts and names.

JOHN MONFASANI

Albany, New York
March 2004

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Grateful acknowledgement is made to the following persons, institutions and publishers for their kind permission to reproduce the papers included in this volume: Marcello Fantoni, Editor, *Italian History and Culture* (I); the Editors, *I Tatti Studies*, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Florence (II); Marco Bertozzi, Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, Università degli Studi di Ferrara (III); Riccardo Maisano, Editor, *Manuele Crisolora e il ritorno del greco in Occidente* (IV); Museum Tusculanum Press, University of Copenhagen (V); The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts (VI); Editrice Antenore, Padova (VII); Martin Thurner, Editor, *Nicolaus Cusanus zwischen Deutschland und Italien* (VII); E.J. Brill, Leiden (IX); The Renaissence Society of America, Inc., New York (X); Routledge, London/New York (XI); Fosca Mariani Zini, Editor, *Penser entre les lignes* (XII).

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

The articles in this volume, as in all others in the Variorum Collected Studies Series, have not been given a new, continuous pagination. In order to avoid confusion, and to facilitate their use where these same studies have been referred to elsewhere, the original pagination has been maintained wherever possible.

Each article has been given a Roman number in order of appearance, as listed in the Contents. This number is repeated on each page and is quoted in the index entries.

Corrections noted in the Addenda and Corrigenda have been marked by an asterisk in the margin corresponding to the relevant text to be amended.

I

Greek Renaissance Migrations[1]

Migrations are deeply woven into the fabric of Greek history. Even the standard Western word for the dispersal of a people, *Diaspora*, is Greek. Ever since the Greeks entered the Balkans around 2,000 B.C., they have been a people on the move.[2] From the Balkans they proceeded to Crete, the Aegean islands, and western Asia Minor. From about 800 B.C. onward they established outposts across the whole Mediterranean and the Black Sea. Five hundred years later Alexander the Great enlarged Greek horizons still further by conquering the ancient Near East and laying the foundations for a vast Hellenic world that stretched from Mesopotamia to the Western Mediterranean. But the subsequent shrinkage was as dramatic as had been the expansion. The Romans Latinized the West, including Magna Graecia in southern Italy.[3] The Moslems drove the Greeks from the whole ancient Near East save for Asia Minor. Finally, the great Slavic inundation of the Balkans cost the Greeks Greece herself. The land once called Greece, the Greeks in eighth-century Constantinople called "Sclavonia," the land occupied by the "Sclavs."[4] Medieval Greece had, in effect, become the land we today call Turkey, classical Asia Minor. The Byzantines gradually recovered classical Greece, but the eventual loss to the Turks of medieval Greece, that is to say, Asia Minor, and its transformation into Turkey effectively spelt the ruination of the Byzantine Empire.[5] Ironically, a secondary effect of the Slavic takeover of the Balkans was the partial

---

[1] This paper is based on talks I delivered at Mount Holyoke College, 14 April 1998, the American Historical Association Meeting, Washington, D.C., 9 January 1999, and the Georgetown University Center in Florence, Villa Le Balze, 5 October 1999.

[2] On this general theme see J. M. Fossey and J. Morin, eds., *Proceedings of the First International Congress on the Hellenic Diaspora from Antiquity to Modern Times (Montréal, 17-22.iv.1988; Athens, 26–30.iv.1988)*, 2 vols., Amsterdam, 1991.

[3] Already at the beginning of first century A.D., Strabo (d. *ca.* 19 A.D.), who lived for a time in Rome, could comment that Greek was no longer spoken in southern Italy save in Naples, Taranto, and Reggio (*Geogr.* 6:1.2). For the debate on how much Greek from classical times survived in southern Italy see E. C. Polomé, "The Linguistic Stituation in the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire," in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*, Part 2, ed. H. Temporini and W. Haase, 29.2, Berlin-New York, 1983, p. 522.

[4] A handy discussion can be had from A. J. Toynbee, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus and His World*, Oxford, 1973, pp. 95-97 and 619-51; for a balanced opinion see G. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, tr. J. M. Hussey, revised ed., New Brunswick, NJ, 1969, p. 94.

[5] On the loss of Asia Minor from the late eleventh century on, see S. Vryonis, Jr., *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century*, Berkeley, 1971.

DOI: 10.4324/9781003418672-1

re-Hellenization of southern Italy. The Greek villages in Apulia and Calabria that survived into the twentieth century were remnants not of classical Magna Graecia, but of the early medieval wave of Greek émigrés fleeing the Slavic invasion of the Balkans.[6] Monks and priests were, of course, part of this second Greek migration into Italy. Their monasteries and churches became important centers of Greek culture through the Middle Ages, even beyond the eleventh century when the Byzantine Empire lost control of southern Italy.[7] But perhaps the most startling immediate religious effect of the dislocations caused by the Slavs and the Moslems in the early Middle Ages was the fact that nine of the ten popes at Rome in the 67 years between 685 and 752 were either Greek or Syrian by origin.[8]

The fall of Constantinople in 1453 marked the end of the medieval Greek empire, but it did *not* mark the start of still another massive Greek migration to the West. The main reason why not was that the Greeks had in fact long been retreating westward. The retreat from Asia Minor had started with the victory of the Seljuk Turks at Manzikert in 1071.[9] The year 1354 inaugurated a new stage in the westward retreat of the Greek. In 1354 the Ottoman Turks seized Gallipoli and began to expand on the European side of the Straits. The Greek retreat now began to take place within Europe proper. We have lots of evidence of European Greeks in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries fleeing the advance of the Ottomans by migrating to the Aegean islands, to safe cities like Thessalonica and Constantinople, and to Venetian possessions such as Negroponte and Crete.[10] Moreover, the Turks were not the only ones moving in. Albanians did so as well, and in large number, either spontaneously or with the encouragement of the Venetians and other governments.[11] The Albanians therefore contributed to a sec-

---

[6] See Polomé cited in n. 3 above and K. M. Setton, "The Byzantine Background to the Italian Renaissance," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 100 (1956), pp. 2-4.

[7] See R. Weiss, "The Greek Culture of South Italy in the Later Middle Ages," in his *Medieval and Humanist Greek*, Padua, 1977, pp. 13-44; and Setton, "The Byzantine Background," 1-52. A detailed snapshot of Greek monastic culture in southern Italy during the Renaissance can be had from M.-H. Laurent and A. Guillou, *Le 'Liber Visitationis' d'Athanase Chalkéopoulos (1457-1458). Contribution à l'histoire du monachisme grec en Italie méridionale*, Studi e Testi, 206, Vatican City, 1960.

[8] See A. Fliche and V. Martin, *Histoire de l'église depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours*, vol. 5 (L. Bréhier and R. Aigrain, *Grégoire le Grand, les États barbares et la conquête arabe (590-757)*), Paris, 1938, 401-30; and P. Levillain, ed., *Dictionnaire historique de la papauté*, Paris, 1994, for Popes John v (685-86, Syrian origin), Conon (686-87, Greek origin), Sergius i (687-701, Syrian origin), John vi (701, Greek origin), John vii (701-08, Greek origin), Sisinnus (708, Syrian origin), Constantine i (708-15, Syrian origin), Gregory ii (715-31, Roman origin), Gregory iii (731-41, Syrian origin), Zachary (741-52, Greek origin).

[9] Vryonis, *Decline of Medieval Hellenism*.

[10] See A. E. Vacalopoulos, "The Flight of the Inhabitants of Greece to the Aegean Islands, Crete, and Mane, during the Turkish Invasions (Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries)," in *Charanis Studies: Essays in Honor of Peter Charanis*, ed. A. E. Laiou-Thomadakis, New Brunswick, NJ, 1980, pp. 272-83.

[11] P. Topping, "Albanian Settlements in Medieval Greece: Some Venetian Testimonies," in *Charanis Studies*, 261-71; Titos Jochalas, "Über die Einwanderung der Albaner in Griechenland," in *Dissertationes Albanicae* (Munich, 1971), pp. 89-106.

ond partial medieval de-Hellenization of Greece. The shrinkage of the Greek population was a growing problem. Constantinople herself hardly had enough manpower to defend her walls in 1453; her population had shrunk by then to perhaps no more than 50,000 souls,[12] which made her about half the size of Venice in terms of population; and her fall meant that there were no longer any genuinely safe areas of refuge under Greek control, least of all after the Ottomans conquered the Peloponnesus in 1460. European Greeks in essence stayed put. And more than staying put, despite some 370 years of Ottoman rule, remained Greek – in contrast with what happened in most of Asia Minor as medieval Greece became modern Turkey.

In the Renaissance, there were some large-scale Greek migrations.[13] A great many Greeks fled to Venetian-ruled Crete, though we have no way of establishing their number.[14] We do know, however, that in 1473, 10,000 Greeks and Albanians moved from their villages in Elis to the island of Zante (or Zakynthos) under the protection of the Venetians because they had sided with the Venetians in the latter's war with the Ottomans. Fortunately for these immigrants, Zante remained under Venetian control from 1482 to the end of the Venetian Republic itself in 1797. The Venetians attracted other colonists to Zante and in the process made Zante one of the most flourishing of Greek communities.[15]

But Zante, Crete, and the other islands bordering the southern Balkans were Greek to begin with. One place Greeks did not flee to in massive numbers in the Renaissance was Western Europe. Whole villages of the Maina region of the southern Peloponnesus migrated to various places in Italy and even Corsica. But these migrations date mainly from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and were not notably successful.[16] We can document Greek aristocrats and commoners traveling around fifteenth-century Europe, in Italy, England, France, and the territory of the Dukes of Burgundy, seeking subsidies in order to ransom fa-

---

[12] See Cyril Mango, "Constantinople," in *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, Oxford, 1991, 1, pp. 508-12.

[13] On the general theme of Greek migration in the Renaissance see J. Harris, *Greek Emigres in the West, 1400-1520*, Camberley, Surrey, 1995; and M. Manoussacas, "Structure social de l'hellénisme post-byzantin," *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik*, 31.2 (1981), pp. 791-821; idem, "Le grandi comunità elleniche in Italia (1453/1821)," in *Risorgimento greco e filellenismo italiano*, Rome, 1986, pp. 43-48; idem, [in Greek], "The Great Greek Colonies of Italy (Venice, Naples, Livorno, Trieste) from the Fall of Constantinople (1453) to Today," in Fossey-Morin, *Greek Diaspora*, 2, pp. 1-12, which is the same article in Greek as "Grandi comunità," plus a bibliographical appendix.

[14] See D. Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice: Studies in the Dissemination of Greek Learning from Byzantium to Western Europe*, Cambridge, MA, 1962, pp. 41-52; Manoussacas, "Structure social," pp. 796-99.

[15] W. Miller, *Essays on the Latin Orient*, Cambridge, 1921, repr. Amsterdam 1964, 203; Manoussacas, "Structure social," p. 803.

[16] See Manoussacas, "Structure social," pp. 810-11.

mily members enslaved by the Turks.[17] We can identify immigrant clusters in Taranto,[18] Ancona,[19] Naples,[20] Rome,[21] and Venice.[22] We can also tell of the attempt of the wealthy refugee Anna Notaras to found a new Greek town in the territory of Siena in the 1470s.[23] That scheme fell through, incidentally. These movements do not amount to much demographically. Hence, except for their colony in Venice, émigré Renaissance Greeks were everywhere demographically an insignificant group. Nor should we exaggerate the Greek colony in Venice. True, the Greek cardinal Bessarion called Venice "almost another Byzantium."[24] But until the fall of Constantinople in 1453, the Greeks in Venice were so small in number that they made do with borrowed Latin chapels for their religious services.[25] Only in 1470 did they gain a side chapel of their own in the church of San Biagio; they did not organize a religious confraternity (called a *scuola* in Venice) until 1494 and did not have their own church until 1511.[26] From the late fifteenth and through the sixteenth century, there seems to have been between 4,000 and 6,000 Greeks in Venice, which would have made resident Greeks 2-3% of a Venetian population of *ca.* 190,00 by mid-sixteenth century.[27] In short, Greek Renaissance migration to the West was a very minor demographic event.

---

[17] Much of the literature is captured in Harris, *Greek Emigres in the West*. For an interesting case in northern Europe, see H. Taparel, "Notes sur quelques refugies byzantins en Bourgogne après la chute de Constantinople," *Balkan Studies*, 28 (1987), pp. 51-58.

[18] Manoussacas, "Structure social," pp. 810-11.

[19] See Manoussacas, "Structure social," pp. 809-10.

[20] See J. K. Hassiotis, "La comunità greca di Napoli e i moti insurrezionali nella penisola balcanica meridionale durante la seconda metà del XVI secolo," *Balkan Studies*, 10 (1969): 278-88; and Manoussacas, "Structure social," 808-09; idem, "Grandi comunità," pp. 45-46; idem, "Great Greek Colonies," pp. 5-7; Harris, *Greek Emigres*, pp. 27-29.

[21] Harris, *Greek Emigres*, pp. 29-32.

[22] The best recent study for Venice is B. Imhaus, *Le minoranze orientali a Venezia 1300-1510*, Rome, 1997; see also Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars*, pp. 41-70; Manoussacas, "Structure social," 805-08; idem, "Grandi comunità." pp. 44-45; idem, "Great Greek Colonies," pp. 3-5.

[23] G. Cecchini, "Anna Notara Paleologa: Una principessa greca in Italia e la politica senese di ripopolamento della Maremma," *Bullettino senese di storia patria*, n. s., 9 (1938), pp. 1-41; M. Manousakas, "Recherces sur la vie de Jean Plousiadénos (Joseph de Méthone) (1420?-1500)," *Revue des études byzantines*, 17 (1959), pp. 41-43.

[24] L. Labowsky, *Bessarion's Library and the Biblioteca Marciana: Six Early Inventories*, Rome, 1979, p. 148, lines 5-6 from the bottom: "quasi alterum Byzantium." Bessarion (d. 1472) made this statement in 1468 in the letter to Doge Cristoforo Moro and the Venetian Senate that is the first document in his official *donatio* of his library to Venice.

[25] Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars*, p. 62.

[26] *Ibid.*, 63; Harris, *Greek Emigres*, pp. 26-27.

[27] Cf. Imhaus, *Le minoranze orientali a Venezia*, who shows that the bulk of the Greek inhabitants of Venice came from the Greek colonies, especially Crete, Corfu, and Negroponte. She could only count 232 Greek immigrants between 1454 and 1509 (p. 42). A figure commonly cited is G. Veludo's estimate, in 1893, of 15,000. But that does not in any way correspond to the listing of immigrants in Imhaus or the parish records given by G. S. Ploumidis, "Considerazioni sulla popolazione greca a Venezia," *Studi Veneziani*, 14 (1972), pp. 219-26, who records only 149 Greeks in occupations in the mid-sixteenth century; or E. Liata, [in Greek] "Menzioni di morti di greci di Venezia dai libri di conti della Confraternita Greca (1536-1576)," *Thesaurismata*, 11 (1972), pp. 191-239, who could count on average only 12.5 deaths per year for 41 years. These numbers suggest a resident Greek population of 3,000 or less. Imhaus even states that the Dalmatians outnumbered the Greeks in Venice.

But culturally the Greek Renaissance migration was of enormous importance. It was in a way the first great brain drain of Western history.

Two of the more obvious aspects of the Renaissance are the flood of educated Byzantine émigrés into Europe in the fifteenth century and the massive hellenization of Western intellectual culture in the Renaissance. We no long believe in the myth that Greek émigrés fleeing the fall of Constantinople in 1453 caused the Renaissance in Italy.[28] Nonetheless, émigré Greeks patently influenced Renaissance culture in significant ways. Without the Greek educator and diplomat Manuel Chrysoloras coming to teach Greek in Florence in 1397, the history of the Renaissance would have been very different.[29] Without Chrysoloras, Florence would not have claimed the unequivocal leadership in humanist studies at the start of the fifteenth century as in fact she did. Several generations later, the arrival of John Argyropoulos at the University of Florence, in 1457, restored Florentine leadership in Greek studies and prepared the way for the Platonic Academy.[30] But Florence was not the only center of Greek studies. Even earlier, George of Trebizond had established himself first in the Veneto, then in Florence, and finally in Rome as one of the leading humanist teachers of his time.[31] Another émigré, Theodore Gaza, had followed a somewhat similar route, first working in Manuta, then in Ferrara before receiving the call to Rome.[32] In the second half of the fifteenth century, Constantine Lascaris made Messina a virtual Mecca of Greek studies.[33] At Florence Demetrius Chalcondyles became a fixture of Greek studies, associating with Marsilio Ficino and Angelo Poliziano.[34] From

---

[28] See W. K. Ferguson, *The Renaissance in Historical Thought: Five Centuries of Interpretation*, Cambridge, MA, 1948, pp. 72, 75-76.

[29] See E. Trapp, R. Walther, and H. V. Beyers, eds., *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit* [henceforth = *PLP*], 19 vols., Vienna 1976-96, no. 31165 and *Gesamtregister*, 183: Χρυσολωρᾶς Μανουήλ; and for the most recent literature A. Rollo, "Sul destinatario della Σύγκρισις τῆς παλαιᾶς καὶ νέας Ῥώμης di Manuele Crisolora," in V. Fera and A. Guida, eds., *Vetustatis Indagator: Scritti offerti a Filippo Benedetto*, Messina, 1999, pp. 61-80; and M. Crisolora, *Roma parte del cielo: Confronto tra l'Antica e la Nuova Roma*, introd. E. V. Maltese, tr. G. Cortassa, Turin, 2000.

[30] See A. Field, *The Origins of the Platonic Academy of Florence*, Princeton, 1988, pp. 53-126; and my "The Averroism of John Argyropoulos and His *Quaestio Utrum Intellectus Humanus Sit Perpetuus*," in *I Tatti Studies: Essays in the Renaissance*, 5 (1993), pp. 157-208; and and *PLP*, 1267, and *Gesamtregister*, p. 97: Ἀργυρόπουλος Ἰωάννης.

[31] See my *George of Trebizond: A Biography and a Study of His Rhetoric and Logic*, Leiden, 1976; and *PLP*, 4120, and *Gesamtregister*, p. 110: Γεώργιος Τεαπεξούντιος, which means that *PLP* mistakenly takes * George's last name as a toponymic when in fact it is a patronymic. His standard English name ("of Trebizond") continues the confusion. In point of fact, he is "of Crete." In Latin, he is Georgius Trapezuntius Cretensis, as he rightly called himself.

[32] See my "L'insegnamento di Teodoro Gaza a Ferrara," in M. Bertozzi, ed., *Alla corte degli Estensi: filosofia, arte e cultura a Ferrara nei secoli xv e xvi. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi, Ferrara, 5-7 marzo 1992*, Ferrara, 1994, pp. 5-17; and *PLP*, 3450, and *Gesamtregister*, p. 108: Γαζῆς Θεόδωρος.

[33] See T. Martínez Manzano, *Konstantinos Laskaris: Humanist, Philologe, Lehrer, Kopist* (= *Meletemata*, 4), Hamburg, 1994; and *PLP*, 14540, and *Gesamtregister*, p. 146: Λάσκαις, Κωνσταντῖνος.

[34] G. Cammelli, *I dotti bizantini e le origini dell'Umanesimo. III: Demetrio Calcondila*, Florence, 1954; A. Petrucci, "Calcondila ..., Demetrio," in *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, 16 (1973), pp. 542-47; and *PLP*, 30511, and *Gesamtregister*, 181: Χαλκοκανδύλης Δημήτριος.

the late fifteenth into the early sixteenth century, Janus Lascaris made a name for himself in Florence, Paris, Venice, and Rome,[35] while Marcus Musurus enjoyed a European-wide reputation at Padua and Venice.[36]

Events and institutions were important as well. The Council of Ferrara-Florence in 1438-39 was one of the most dramatic moments of the fifteenth century.[37] Led by their Emperor and the Patriarch of Constantinople, the Greek delegation agreed to union with Rome. One of the Greeks who shone at the Council was Bessarion, the young bishop of Nicaea. Bessarion soon became a Roman cardinal, and by the conclave of 1455 one of the leading candidates for the Latin papacy.[38] He never became pope, but his household did become the leading center of humanism in Rome, as he attracted into his orbit Italian scholars as well as a whole coterie of Greeks. After the fall of Constantinople Bessarion consciously sought to salvage Greek civilization by collecting as many Greek manuscripts as he could. His library became the greatest Greek library of the day. By the time he bequeathed it to the Republic of Venice to form the modern Biblioteca Marciana, Bessarion had in fact rescued some of the most precious Greek manuscripts and texts extant today.[39]

Venice had both the Biblioteca Marciana and the most distinguished publisher of Greek and Latin classical texts of the the Renaissance, the Aldine Press and the group of scholars associated with it, popularly called the Aldine Academy.[40] As is well known, émigré Greeks constituted a significant portion of the Aldine Academy, and it was while working with the Greeks of the Aldine circle in the early sixteenth century that Erasmus experienced a sort of finishing school for his Greek studies.[41]

Émigré Greeks were, in fact, quite active in the early printing industry. Not only printers such as Zacharias Calliergis, Nicholas Vlastos, Demetrius Damilas, Laonicus of Crete, and Alexander of Crete publishing Greek works, but even more so editors such as Janus Lascaris, Marcus Musurus, Demetrius Ducas, John

---

[35] B. Knös, *Un ambassadeur de l'Hellénisme, Janus Lascaris, et la tradition gréco-byzantine dans l'Humanisme français*, Uppsala-Paris, 1945, is quite inadequate; see *PLP*, 14536, and *Gesamtregister*, p. * 145: Λασκαρις, Ἰωάννης Ῥυνδαληνός.

[36] See Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars*, pp. 111-66; N. G. Wilson, *From Byzantium to Italy: Greek Studies in the Italian Renaissance*, Baltimore, 1992, pp. 148-56.

[37] See J. Gill, *The Council of Florence*, Cambridge, 1961.

[38] See L. Mohler, *Kardinal Bessarion als Theologe, Humanist und Staatsmann. Funde und Forschungen*, 3 vols., Paderborn, 1923-42, repr. Aalen-Paderborn, 1967, vol. 1: *Darstellung*; and *PLP*, 2707, and *Gesamtregister*, 104: βησαρίων, Kardinal.

[39] See Labowsky, *Bessarion's Library and the Biblioteca Marciana*; and M. Zorzi, *La Libreria di San Marco: Libri, lettori, società nella Venezia dei Dogi*, Milan, 1987, pp. 23-85; and *Bessarione e l'Umanesimo: Catalogo della mostra*, ed. G. Fiaccadori, Naples, 1994.

[40] See A. Firmin-Didot, *Alde Manuce et l'Hellénisme à Venise*, Paris, 1875, pp. 441-70 ("Notice sur les membres de l'Academie Aldine"); and Wilson, *From Byzantium to Italy*, pp. 127-56.

[41] Geankopolos, *Greek Scholars*, pp. 256-78.

Gregoropoulos, and Arsenios Apostolis played pivotal roles in the publication, very frequently of first editions, of classical, Byzantine, and Renaissance Greek authors.[42] Without the labor of these Greek émigrés, the Greek culture of the Renaissance would have been noticeably retarded.

Émigré Greeks were even more important as translators. George of Trebizond, Theodore Gaza, John Argyropoulos, and Bessarion remained well-known names in the Renaissance in large measure because collectively their translations of Greek classical and patristic authors were numerous and still read into the second half of the sixteenth century.[43]

Yet, simply to list the achievements of the émigré Greeks is to distort what happened in the Renaissance; indeed, it actually is to do nothing more than give an updated version of the old myth of how the émigré Greeks started the Renaissance. In the updated version, the émigré Greeks revitalized and transformed rather than started the Renaissance. But put into context, the achievements of the émigré Greeks look a bit different.

If the Greeks who came to Italy were relatively few in number and exercised limited influence as a group, what is no less significant is the fact that many of them came not fleeing the Turks, but seeking Latin culture. Since the end of Antiquity, Byzantine intellectuals had maintained a superiority complex toward the Latins. But starting in the thirteenth century, Byzantines began to see value in Latin culture. Scholars such as the monk Maximus Planudes translated Cicero, Ovid, Caesar, and Macrobius.[44] However, by the fourteenth century, it had become abundantly clear that what attracted the Byzantines was not so much the literary culture of Latin Antiquity, but rather the scientific, philosophical, and theological culture of the Latins from late antiquity through the Middle Ages. Already in the thirteenth century, Maximus Planudes had translated St. Augustine's *De Trinitate* and Boethius' *Consolation of Philosophy*. In the fourteenth-century Byzantines such as Manuel Calecas, Prochorus Cydones, and especially Demetrius Cydones translated Boethius' *De Trinitate*, Augustine's *De Vera Religione* and *De Libero Arbitrio*, and Thomas Aquinas's *Summa contra Gentiles*, *Summa*

---

[42] The fullest attempt to capture the printing of and by Greeks in the Renaissance is E. Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique des xv^e^ et xvi^e^ siécles*, 4 vols., Paris, 1885-1906, reprint Paris, 1962. But Legrand is in no way complete. See also *Graecogermania: Griechischstudien deutscher Humanisten. Die Editionstätigkeit der Griechen in der italienischen Renaissance (1469-1523)*, ed. D. Harlfinger, R. Barm, et al., Weinheim-New York, 1989. Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars*, treats Musurus, Arsenios Apostolis, Zacharias Calliergis, Demetrius Ducas in separate chapters.

[43] See my "L'insegnamento universitario e la cultura bizantina in Italia nel Quattrocento," in my *Byzantine Scholars in Renaissance Italy: Cardinal Bessarion and Other Emigrés*, Aldershot, Hampshire, 1995, article XII, pp. 56-58.

[44] See W. O. Schmitt, "Lateinische Literatur in Byzanz: Die Übersetzungen des Maximos Planudes und die moderne Forschung," *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinischen Gesellschaft*, 17 (1968), pp. 127-47; and H. Hunger, *Die hochsprächliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, 2 vols., Munich, 1978, 2, pp. 68-71.

Theologiae, *Quaestio de Potentia*, and *De Rationibus Fidei*. In the fifteenth century, Georgius Scholarius continued the tradition, translating Peter of Spain's *Summulae Logicae*, Gilbert de la Porrée's *De Sex Principiis*, and still more works of Thomas Aquinas, including the *De Esse et Essentia*.[45] Demetrius Cydones in the late fourteenth century and the three brothers Chrysoberges (Maximos, Theodore, and Andreas) in the fifteenth century even joined the Dominican Order.[46] Cardinal Bessarion did not know Latin before coming to Italy, but he had demonstrably studied Thomas Aquinas – in Greek translation – and once he arrived in Italy, he learned Latin quite well and became the leading Greek advocate of union with Rome.[47]

Bessarion's arch-enemy, George of Trebizond, made himself into one of the great Latin stylists of the fifteenth century and was, not coincidentally, a staunch supporter of Greek union with Rome. Indeed, George portrayed himself in the Plato-Aristotle controversy as the champion of medieval scholasticism against its humanist critics. George singled out for special praise Thomas Aquinas and his Dominican confrère Albert the Great.[48] Theodore Gaza and John Argyropoulos were excellent Latinists and staunch Unionists. Argyropoulos, I might

---

[45] On the Byzantine reception of classical and medieval philosophical and theological literature see M. Rackl, "Die griechischen Augustinusübersetzungen," in *Miscellanea Francesco Ehrle*, 1 (*Studi e Testi*, 37), Rome, 1934, pp. 1-38; A Pertusi, "Gli studi latini di Manuele Caleca e la traduzione del *De Trinitate* di Boezio,"in *Miscellanea Giovanni Galbiati*, 3, Milan, 1951, pp. 283-312; S. Papadopulos, *Greek Translations of Thomistic Works: Philothomists and Antithomists in Byzantium* (in Greek), Athens, 1967; idem, "Thomas in Byzanz: Thomas-Kritik in Byzanz zwischen 1354 und 1435," *Philologie und Philosophie*, 49 (1974), pp. 274-303; G. Podskalsky, "Die Reception der thomistischen Theologie bei Gennadios II. Scholarios (ca. 1403-1472)," *ibid.*, pp. 305-23; idem, *Theologie und Philosophie in Byzanz: Die Streit um die theologische Methodik in der spätbyzantinischen Geistesgeschichte (14./15. Jh.), seine systematischen Grundlagen und seine historische Entwicklung*, Munich, 1977, pp. 173-230; D. Z. Nikitas, *Eine byzantinische Übersetzung von Boethius; "De hypotheticis syllogismis"*, Göttingen, 1982; idem, ed., *Boethius' De topicis differentiis und die byzantinische Reception dieses Werkes*, Athens, 1990; H. Hunger, *Prochoros Kydones, Übersetzung von acht Briefen des Hl. Augustinus*, Vienna, 1984; G. Scholarius *Oeuvres complètes*, 8 vols., ed. L. Petit, Z. A. Sidèrides, and M. Jugie, Paris, 1928-36, 8, pp. iii-viii (M. Jugie); Demetrius Cydones, *Thomas d'Aquin: Somme théologique, traduite en grec*, ed. P. A. Démétracopoulos, G. Leontsinis, A. Glycofrydou-Leontsinis, S. E. Sidéri, P. Photopoulou, and A. Brentanou, 4 vols. to date (Corpus Philosophorum Graecorum Recentiorum, 2.15-17A-B), Athens, 1976-82.

[46] For the large literature on Demetrius Cydones, see PLP, 13876, and *Gesamtregister*, 143: Κυδώνης Δημήτριος, in addition the references in the previous note; for the brothers Chrysoberges, see V. Grumel, "Chrysobergès (Maxime)," in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, 12 (1953), p. 786; P. Loenertz, "Les dominicains byzantins Théodore et André Chrysoberges et les négotiations pour l'union des églises grecques et latine de 1415 à 1430," *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 9 (1939), pp. 5-61; idem, " La Société des frères pérégrinants de 1374 à 1475: Étude sur l'Orient dominicain, II," *ibid.*, 45 (1975), pp. 122-23; P. Cherubini, "Crisoberga (Chrysoberges), Andrea," in *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, 30 (1984), pp. 776-79; and PLP, 31106, 31113, 31123, and *Gesamtregister*, p. 182: Χρυσοβέργης Θεόδωρος, Χρυσοβέργης Μάχιμος.

* [47] See A. De Halleux, "Bessarion et le palamisme au concile de Florence," *Irénikon*, p. 62 (1989): 307-32; and J. Gill, "Was Bessarion a Conciliarist or a Unionists before the Council of Florence," *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 204 (1977), pp. 201-19. The argument of E. Mioni, *Vita del Cardinale Bessarione* (= *Miscellanea Marciana*, 6, anno 1991), Venice, 1993, pp. 63-65, that Bessarion knew Latin before coming to Italy, is mistaken.

[48] See my *George of Trebizond*, pp. 155-56.

add, even took a degree from the University of Padua and was in fact a well trained scholastic in the Latin tradition.[49]

George Scholarius is an interesting case. A layman in Constantinople in the 1420s and 30s, he taught himself Latin while excoriating his countrymen as ignoramuses for not keeping up with Latin advances in philosophy, science, and theology. As a layman, he could not vote at the Council of Ferrara-Florence, but his speeches at the time favored union and even endorsed the Latin position on the much debated issue of the *Filioque*.[50] When he returned home to Greece, Scholarius experienced a nationalistic conversion and, after the death of Mark Eugenicus, the then leading opponent of the Union, Scholarius, took over the leadership of the anti-Unionists. Despite his conversion to the anti-Unionists, Scholarius could not surrender his admiration of Latin scholasticism. His resumés of Aquinas's *Summa Theologicae* and *Summa contra Gentiles* actually date from the last, anti-Unionist period of his life.

Another interesting case is the much less well-known Cretan priest John Plusiadenos.[51] Plusiadenos started out as a staunch anti-Unionist. But he eventually learned Latin and became a leading supporter of the Union in his native Crete. He even wrote a liturgical hymn in praise of Thomas Aquinas. The result was that he became so despised by his compatriots for his philo-Latinism that he eventually had to seek a career in Italy. In time, he was appointed bishop of Methone on the Greek mainland, a site which the Venetians could make more liveable for him than his native Crete. Plusiadenos died in Methone as a defender of the Christian faith when the Turks stormed this Venetian port in 1500.

Finally, we should look again at the Greek who started the hellenization of the Italian Renaissance, Manuel Chrysoloras. Chrysoloras may have seemed to his humanist admirers to have been a great Greek sage; but he himself was much attracted to contemporary Latin culture. He converted to Roman Catholicism in the first decade of the fifteenth century. Moreover, he become a priest. What is even more extraordinary, he petitioned the pope for permission to say the

---

[49] Esp. see my "The Averroism of John Argyropoulos," cited in n. 30 above.

[50] See M. Jugie, Scholarios, Georges," in *Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique*, 14 (1939-41), pp. 1543-70; J. Gill, "George Scholarius," in his *Personalities of the Council of Florence*, Oxford, 1964, pp. 79-94; C. J. G. Turner, "George-Gennadius Scholarius and the Union of Florence," *Journal of Theological Studies*, n. s., 18 (1967), pp. 83-103; S. Ebbesen and J. Pinborg, "Gennadios and Western Scholasticism: Brito's *Ars Vetus* in Greek Translation," *Classica et Mediaevalia*, 33 (1981-82), pp. 263-319. T. N. Zissis, [in greek] *Gennadius II Scholarius: Life, Writings, Teachings*, Saloniki, 1980, is a polemical work intent on showing that his hero could never have had any leanings toward union with the Latin Church.

[51] See M. Manoussakas, "Recherches sur la vie de Jean Plousiadénos (Joseph de Méthone) (1429?-1500)," *Revue des études byzantins*, 17 (1959), pp. 28-51; *PLP*, 23385, and *Gesamtregister*, 170: Πλουσιαδηνὸς Ἰωάννης, and most recently B. Schartau, "A Checklist of the settings of George and John Plousiadénos in the Kaophonic Sticherarion Sinai Gr. 1234," *Cahiers de L'Institut du Moyen-Âge Grec et Latin*, 63 (1993), pp. 297-308.

mass in Greek according to the Latin rite (in other words, he wanted to celebrate a translated Latin mass) even though as a Uniate Greek he could already say the mass in Greek according to the Greek rite.[52]

These biographical profiles tell us three things. First, that before and during the period when some Latin intellectuals, namely, humanists, became seriously interested in learning Greek, some Greek intellectuals, namely, theologians and philosophers, were themselves diligently learning Latin. Second, that what especially interested these Greek intellectuals was not Latin classical culture or contemporary humanist literary culture, but rather late antique Christian theology and contemporary Latin philosophy and theology, in short, medieval scholasticism. And, third, that whereas for the Latins learning Greek meant essentially an increase in their professional competence, for the Greeks learning Latin meant a profound transformation of their personal lives and careers. The two experiences were not commensurate. The real revolution was on the side of the Greeks, not the Latins. Furthermore, whereas I do not know of a single Latin Renaissance intellectual, humanist or scholastic, who converted to Greek Orthodoxy, we have seen that commitment to Latin studies by a Greek more often than not culminated in union with Rome. For the Greeks, the study of Latin led to a conversion experience. For the Latins, the study of Greek just led to broader intellectual horizons.

The interests of the Latin humanists and their Byzantine teachers were not commensurate in another way. Byzantine scholars were trained classicists. In this they were like their Latin humanist counterparts. However, whereas the Byzantines had a great interest in medieval Latin culture, the Latin humanists had a minimal interest in medieval Greek culture. For the Latin humanists, their Byzantine teachers were channels to the treasures of classical Greek. Byzantine philosophers such as Psellus, Nicephorus Blemmydes, Theodore Metochites, and Nicephorus Chumnos were given little attention by the Latins in the fifteenth century and only modestly more so in the early sixteenth century.[53] Even the con-

---

[52] See G. Cammelli, *I dotti bizantini e le origini dell'Umanesimo. I: Manuele Crisolora*, Florence, 1941, p. 141.

[53] Apart from Marsilio Ficino's translation of Psellus' *De daemonibus*, I could find no incunabulum by these authors and only scattered printings in the first three decades of the sixteenth century, taking the death of Arsenius Apostolis in 1535 as the terminus of fifteenth century émigré Greeks. For a sample case, see Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique*, who only records Psellus, *In Sex Philosophiae Modos*; Blemmydes, *De quinque vocis*; and George Pachymeres, *Opuscula logica*, edited by Arsenius Apostolis at Venice in 1532 (1, pp. 209-11, no. 86); that same year in Venice Apostolis edited Psellus, *De quattuor scientiis mathematicis* (1, pp. 212-15, no. 88); the next year in Venice, Apostolis edited Manuel Philes, *De animalium proprietate* (1, pp. 215-18, no. 89). Zacharias Calliergis, printed in 1517 in Rome Thomas Magister *Ecloga per alphabetum* (1, pp. 150-53, no. 52). Without a doubt, there were other printings of Byzantine authors before 1535, not listed by Legrand, such as Georgius Valla's translation of Psellus's *De victus ratione*, that appeared at least in 1529 in Paris and in 1530 in Basel, but there is no reason to think that Legrand missed so many imprints that the general picture would change.

temporary Byzantine philosopher George Gemistus Pletho had to wait until 1540 to be printed.[54]

Moreover, despite all the glamor that attaches to them today and despite the clear success some of them enjoyed, the Greek émigrés had a difficult time in Renaissance Italy. In a famous letter of the late Quattrocento, Constantine Lascaris lamented the fate of the Greek émigrés:[55] Theodore Gaza, he said, died in exile, driven by poverty to his isolated benefice in Calabria; Andronicus Callistus died while seeking a safe haven in England; Demetrius Castrenus out of desperation returned to Greece; John Argyropoulos ended his days alone in Rome selling his library to put food in his mouth. And Lascaris himself lived in Messina, far away from the main centers of Renaissance culture. The fact is that there was really only a limited need of Greek émigrés in Renaissance Italy. Many fifteenth-century Italian humanists desirous of learning Greek simply went to Greece, and once they returned, became competitors of the Greek émigrés for jobs. Furthermore, Italy did not hold that many attractive jobs in Greek.[56] This explains why soon after his arrival George of Trebizond made his career as a teacher of Latin rather than of Greek.[57] It also explains why Theodore Gaza gave up teaching Greek as soon as he could and became instead, first, a professional translator at the papal court and then an ecclesiastical benefice holder.[58] John Argyropoulos never taught Greek publicly. Instead, he taught philosophy, and, specifically, Aristotelian philosophy at the University of Florence.[59] Andronicus Callistus started out in Italy as a Greek scribe, but eventually got a job at the University of Bologna, where in 1458-59, and again from 1462 to 1466 he taught Greek. But he could not attract enough students. So he began to teach *in Latin* Aristotle's *Physics*, *Politics*, and *Economics*, that is to say, in order to make ends meet, Callistus tried to recast himself as something of a medieval scholastic.[60]

In fact, we need to look again at exactly what did the fifteenth-century Greek émigrés accomplish. They were teachers, to be sure. But, as we have seen, except for Chrysoloras, the first of the émigré teachers, it cannot be said that their teaching made a dramatic difference on Greek learning in Renaissance

---

[54] In 1540, his *De gestis Graecorum post pugnam ad Mantineam* appeared at Basel translated by Antonius Antimachus, and his *De differentiis Platonis et Aristotelis* in Greek in Venice edited by Bernardinus Donatus.

[55] J. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. 161, p. 958.

[56] See my "L'insegnamento universitario," pp. 45-50.

[57] See my *George of Trebizond*, esp. p. 22 n. 99, where the reference is now published in my *Collectantea Trapezuntiana: Texts, Documents, and Bibliographies of George of Trebizond*, Binghamton, NY, 1984, 183 § 85.

[58] See my "L'insegnamento di Teodoro Gaza a Ferrara."

[59] See Field, *Origins of the Platonic Academy*, pp. 114-115, for the dating of his courses in Florence.

[60] See my "L'insegnamento universitario," p. 63.

Italy, and some of the émigré teachers, such as Trebizond and Argyropoulos, publicly taught subjects other than Greek.

It is true that the émigrés were prodigious translators. But if we examine what they translated, we find that they translated almost exclusively scientific works, especially Aristotelian texts. But if as translators the émigré Greeks were marginalized into a narrow specialty, what about their activity as editors and printers of Greek texts? Their most important work in this respect was with the Aldine Press in Venice. Arsenios Apostolis, John Gregoroupolos, Demetrius Ducas, and, most of all, Marcus Musurus played critical roles in the success of the Aldine Greek editions. But we must keep in mind that the Aldine Press was a Latin conceived and a Latin run enterprise and that Latins, including Aldo Manuzio himself, were also involved in the editing of Greek texts.[61] One might also note that Janus Lascaris was active as an editor. However, his activity was sporadic. The same is true of the printers Demetrius Damilas, Zacharias Callierges, and Nicolaos Blastos, all spasmatically active in Venice, Florence, and Rome in the late fifteenth and early sixteenty centuries. Their activity simply did not have staying power. Callierges, for instance, eventually gave up printing altogether to concentrate on a career in Rome as a Greek copyist.[62] In the end, however, though the Greek émigrés made a critical contribution as editors and printers, the vast bulk of the editing and printing of Greek first editions in the early as well as later Renaissance was the work of Latins, not Greeks. Even more importantly, in terms of philology and critical method, the Greek editors paradoxically counted hardly at all. Though some, especially Musurus excelled as editors, we do not have from their hands manifestos and/or explanations of method as we have from Latins such as Lorenzo Valla, Angelo Poliziano, Ermolao Barbaro, Erasmus, and Beatus Rhenanus.[63] The Latins, not the Greeks, were the theoreticians of Greek as well as Latin philology.

Indeed, in at least several respects émigré influence was baneful. The Byzantines taught the Latins a medieval pronunciation of Greek. It was actually Erasmus who first began to distinguish Byzantine from classical pronunciation of Greek.[64] Byzantine tastes even affected the history of texts in the Renaissance. For instance, two texts unknown in the West which the Byzantines pre-

---

[61] See C. Dionisotti, *Aldo Manuzio, umanista e editore*, Milan, 1995, pp. 67-76.

[62] Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars*, p. 221.

[63] For example, the Greek émigrés are conspicuous by their absence in A. Grafton, "Quattrocento Humanism and Classical Scholarship," in A. Rabil, Jr., *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms, and Legacy*, 3 vols., Philadelphia, 1983, 3, pp. 23-66.

[64] See I. Bywater, *The Erasmian Pronunciation of Greek and Its Precursors*, London, 1908; Desiderius Erasmus, *De Recta Latini Graecique Sermone*, ed. M. Cytowska, in idem, *Opera Omnia*, 1.4, Amsterdam, 1973, pp. 1-103; idem, *De Recta Latini Graecique Sermonis Pronuntiatione Dialogus*, tr. and comment. J. Kramer, Meisenheim am Glan, 1978; and Adolf van Meetkercke, *De Veteri et Recta Pronuntiatione Linguae Graecae Commentarius*, ed. and tr. J. Kramer, Meisenheim am Glan, 1981.

served but had little interest in were Aristotle's *Poetics* and pseudo-Longinus' *On the Sublime*. Neither fitted into the Byzantine rhetorical curriculum dominated by Hermogenes.[65] Only in the late Renaissance, when direct Byzantine influence had ceased, did the West come to see these texts for what they really were, namely, the two greatest works of literary theory preserved from classical antiquity.

To close, I would like to pose a "what-if" question. After Manuel Chrysoloras, the second most important émigré was Bessarion. For thirty years in the fifteenth century, he was the grand protector and advocate of Greek interests in Italy, in addition to being the creator of the greatest Greek library of the day. What if he had become pope in 1455 as some thought he would at the start of the conclave?[66] There is no reason to suppose that he would not have lived the twenty or so more years that in fact he did live. In those twenty years, he would have done two things. First, he would have made Rome the prime center of Greek studies in the whole world, decisively continuing and expanding the philohellenistic policies of his predecessor Nicholas V. More Byzantine scholars would have been attracted to Italy than did actually come and even more Latin humanists would have had incentives and opportunities to master Greek. He would have hellenized more rapidly Latin culture, but by the same token he would have latinized Greek intellectuals on a larger scale. We have from Bessarion a famous letter in which he explained how the Greeks needed to latinize if they were going to modernize – and by latinizing in this context he was not talking about religion.[67] The other thing Bessarion would have accomplished would have been to launch the Crusade to recapture Constantinople. I doubt, however, he would have succeeded; nor, if by some miracle, he had recover Constantinople, I doubt that he would have been able to save the Union between Greeks and Latins, the cause to which he gave the last thirty years of his life. The Council of Ferrara-Florence had failed and had failed irreversibly within a decade of its achievement in 1439.[68] But he, in conjunction with George Scholarius, the other great student of Latin scholasticism among the Greeks and as Gennadius II, the then patriarch of Constantinople, Bessarion would have continued the increasing latinization of the Greek intelligentsia.

But events turned out differently. The Turkish conquest ended the Byzantine Empire. It also ended the latinization of the Byzantines in Greece.

---

[65] See my "The Byzantine Rhetorical Tradition and the Renaissance," in my *Byzantine Scholars*, article XIV, pp. 184-85.

[66] See Mohler, *Kardinal Bessarion*, 1, pp. 267-69.

[67] See A. G. Keller, "A Byzantine Admirer of 'Western' Progress: Cardinal Bessarion," *Cambridge Historical Journal*, 11 (1955), pp. 343-48.

[68] See Gill, *Council of Florence*, pp. 349-411.

I

The Turkish conquest thrust Greek culture into a two-hundred year dark age at the very time that the Latins were entering the Renaissance. From that point on, the Latins, not the Greeks, became the best trustees of the Greek classical tradition.

II

THE AVERROISM OF JOHN ARGYROPOULOS AND HIS *QUAESTIO UTRUM INTELLECTUS HUMANUS SIT PERPETUUS*

I

Textbooks, the last havens of old orthodoxies, no longer teach that refugee Greeks began the Italian Renaissance.[1] But this seventeenth-century notion contains a grain of truth. Byzantine scholars incontestably influenced Renaissance culture and were responsible directly or indirectly for some of its most important achievements.[2] Among the émigrés, John Argyropoulos holds a special place. His tenure as professor of philosophy at the University of Florence coincided with the emergence of Florentine Platonism as a major cultural force in Italy; his translations of Aristotle became the standard versions read in the Latin West for the next hundred years;[3] and his biography resonates with refer-

I thank Professor PAUL O. KRISTELLER and Professor ARTHUR FIELD for commenting on an earlier draft of this article. I am also grateful to Professor FIELD for allowing me to consult his collection of microfilms of Argyropoulos manuscripts. Afterwards, in June, 1991, I was able to consult the relevant manuscripts *in situ*.

[1] This thesis first came into vogue with its assertion by PIERRE BAYLE and the nowadays lesser known German pedagogue CHRISTOPH KELLER (CELLARIUS, who also popularized the division of history into ancient, medieval, and modern; see W. K. FERGUSON, *The Renaissance in Historical Thought: Five Centuries of Interpretation*, Cambridge, Mass., 1948, pp. 72, 75-76).

[2] For recent overviews and bibliography, see D. J. GEANAKOPLOS, "Italian Humanism and the Byzantine Emigré Scholars", in A. RABIL, Jr. (ed.), *Renaissance Humanism: Foundation, Forms, and Legacy*, 3 vols., Philadelphia, 1988, II, pp. 350-381; IDEM, *Constantinople and the West: Essays on the Late Byzantine (Palaeologan) and Italian Renaissance and the Byzantine and Roman Churches*, Madison, Wisc., 1989; and J. MONFASANI, "L'insegnamento universitario e la cultura bizantina in Italia nel Quattrocento", in L. AVELLINI - A. CRISTIANI - A. DE BENEDICTIS (eds.), *"Sapere e/è potere": Discipline, dispute e professioni nell'università medievale e moderna. Il caso bolognese a confronto. Atti del 4° Convegno, Bologna, 13-15 aprile 1989*, 3 vols., Bologna, 1990, I, pp. 43-65.

[3] For literature on him, see E. TRAPP-R. WALTHER-H.-V. BEYER (eds.), *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit*, Vienna, 1976, I, pp. 118-119, num. 1267; and A.

DOI: 10.4324/9781003418672-2

ences to the greatest intellectual, political, and religious figures in contemporary Greece and Italy. Of late, scholars have paid special attention to his Platonism.[4] I propose instead to focus on his Aristotelianism and to see what it can tell us about the relationship between Greek and Latin cultures in the Renaissance.

As is the case for other Byzantine émigrés, what little we think we know about Argyropoulos' life before he settled in Italy is fraught with doubt, confusion, and error. We cannot even be sure of when he was born. His modern biographer, Giovanni Cammelli, argued for c. 1415;[5] I prefer a date c. 1405;[6] and if we accept the ascription to him of the invective against Katablattas, as I think we should, then a date as early as 1393 is at least conceivable.[7]

PERTUSI, "Argiropulo, Giovanni", in *Dizionario critico della letteratura italiana*, I, Turin, 1986, cols. 107-111; C. LOHR, "Medieval Latin Aristotle Commentaries", *Traditio*, XXIII-XXX, 1967-1974, *passim*, at XXVI, p. 153; cf. also A. F. VERDE, *Lo Studio Fiorentino 1473-1503. Ricerche e documenti*, 4 vols. in 6, Florence, 1973-85, II, pp. 316-321 and IV.1, pp. 273-274.

[4] Most recently by A. FIELD, *The Origins of the Platonic Academy of Florence*, Princeton, 1988, chap. 5, who argues against the tradition seemingly first established by Vespasiano da Bisticci in the fifteenth century and maintained in modern times by A. Della Torre and E. Garin which would make Argyropoulos into a pioneer of Florentine Neoplatonism. See also F. MASAI, *Pléthon et le platonisme de Mistra*, Paris, 1956, pp. 339-343, who believed Argyropoulos disseminated George Gemistos Pletho's Platonic neopaganism in Italy. I am preparing a study of Argyropoulos' role in the Plato-Aristotle controversy of the fifteenth century where I shall discuss his Platonism and general philosophical orientation.

[5] See G. CAMMELLI, *I dotti bizantini e le origini dell'Umanesimo*, 3 vols., III: *Giovanni Argiropulo*, Florence, 1941, pp. 9-10. His only evidence is Paolo Giovio's statement in the sixteenth century that Argyropoulos was seventy years old when he died (in 1487).

[6] See the next note and J. MONFASANI, *George of Trebizond: A Biography and a Study of His Rhetoric and Logic*, Leiden, 1976, pp. 375-378.

[7] See P. CANIVET - N. OIKOMINODÈS "[Jean Argyropoulos], *La Comédie de Katablattas*. Invective byzantine du XV^{e} s. Edition, traduction et commentaire", Δίπτυχα, III, 1982-1983, pp. 5-97. The *codex unicus* identifies the author merely as "John". I am persuaded that he is Argyropoulos because of the many common passages the invective shares with the letters of Argyropoulos discussed in nn. 9-10 below. (Canivet and Oikonomidès fail to mention that Argyropoulos plagiarized himself on even a grander scale in two orations addressed to the Emperor Constantine XII; cf. S. P. LAMPROS, Ἀργυροπούλεια, Athens, 1910, pp. 11.25-25.15 with pp. 50.16-64.18). Also, some internal references and circumstantial evidence point toward Argyropoulos. However, I doubt that he was born in 1393-1394, as the editors suggest. That would make him absurdly old, i.e., about fifty, when he studied at Padua in 1441-1444. He would also have had to have been nearly sixty-five when he first began to teach at Florence in 1457. The invective requires only that Argyropoulos be old enough to have become a schoolmaster (p. 73.639-640) during

Contrary to accepted opinion, it is dubious that he first came to Italy as a member of the Greek delegation to the Council of Florence in 1438-1439.[8] And certainly we must reject as wrong the supposed date of the semi-autobiographical letters upon which modern scholars have based the early part of his biography.[9] Argyropoulos wrote these letters in Constantinople, but not, as generally believed, in the 1440s while a professor of philosophy and medicine at the Xenon. Rather, he wrote them in the 1430s or even 1420s, while still a relatively young schoolmaster.[10] The let-

---

the dual emperorship of Manuel II (d. 21 July 1425) and John VIII (crowned 19 Jan. 1421). Starting his career in the early 1420s permits a date of birth in 1400-1405. The argument for an earlier date rests on the conjectural identification of the Katablattas invective with the notary Demetrius Katablattas and on speculation concerning Katablattas' career.

[8] This belief relies on a false supposition and a mistaken text. The tone of Francesco Filelfo's letters of 13 April 1441 from Milan to Argyropoulos and Pietro Perleone in Constantinople (see the end of n. 11 below) strongly suggests that Filelfo was already personally acquainted with Argyropoulos' erudition. The false supposition is that the Council would have been the only occasion for Francesco Filelfo to have gotten to know Argyropoulos before 1441 since he, Filelfo, left Constantinople in 1427 when Argyropoulos was twelve or so (CAMMELLI, *op. cit.* [see note 5], 11). This logic collapses if Argyropoulos was born in 1405 or earlier. The mistaken text is a reference in DOUCAS' *Historia Byzantina* (I. BEKKER [ed.], Bonn, 1834, pp. 213.23-214.2; J. MIGNE [ed.], *Patrologia Graeca*, CLVII, Paris 1866, col. 1057C) to the three learned laymen, George Gemistos Pletho, George Scholarius, and "Argyropoulos" who attended the Council of Florence ("ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς συγκλήτου ὁ Γεμιστὸς ἐκ Λακεδαιμονίας, Γεώργιος ὁ Σχολάριος καὶ καθολικὸς κριθὴς καὶ 'Αργυρόπουλος"; in his accompanying Latin translation, Bekker treated the καθολικὸς κριθής as a separate, fourth person, not realizing that this was Scholarius' official title. H. J. MAGOULIAS in his translation of DOUKAS, *Decline and Fall of Byzantium to the Ottoman Turk*, Detroit, 1971, p. 180, avoids this mistake). But all other contemporary sources refer to the three lay Greek *periti* as being Pletho, Scholarius, and George *Amiroutzes*, and they never mention Argyropoulos. Furthermore, even though Argyropoulos spent most of his later career in Florence, neither he nor any Italian source ever spoke of an earlier connection with Florence, which would be amazing if Argyropoulos had been at the Council. As I suggested in *George of Trebizond* (*op. cit.* [see note 6], p. 376), I think Doukas was guilty of a lapse when he wrote "Argyropoulos" instead of "Amiroutzes".

[9] These are the three letters to and against George of Trebizond edited in LAMPROS, *loc. cit.* (see note 7), pp. 68-106.

[10] What follows is a summary, with some minor revisions, of MONFASANI, *George of Trebizond* (*op. cit.* [see note 6], pp. 375-378). The letters know only one emperor (LAMPROS, *op. cit.*. [see note 7], p. 71.22-23) and therefore postdate the dual emperorship which ended with the death of Manuel II on 21 July 1425. They are addressed to George of Trebizond as resident in Constantinople; but we can document George's presence in Italy for every year from March 1426 to the fall of Constantinople. So if George is the true addressee, the letters were written between August 1425 and February 1426. Between

ters reveal an Argyropoulos proud of his knowledge of Plato and Aristotle,[11] who claimed that he was admired for his knowledge of Aristotelian physics and logic.[12] Nonetheless, he was defensive

---

1423 and 1426, George did leave Italy for his native Crete (MONFASANI, *George of Trebizond*, *op. cit.* [see note 6], p. 20). Perhaps he also travelled to Constantinople. The problem is that the picture of the addressee that emerges from the letters does not correspond to young George of Trebizond, sympathetic to the Latin Church, a rhetorician more skilled in Latin than in Greek eloquence, trained in Crete and Italy, and hardly more than a visitor, if indeed he did go, to Constantinople. The addressee, on the other hand, was an established teacher in the city (LAMPROS, *op. cit.* [see note 7], p. 85.11-13), as was his teacher, who also publicly criticized Argyropoulos (*ibid.*, p. 72.4-5). The addressee professed to be an Aristotelian philosopher and logician (*ibid.*, pp. 71.22-24, 78.7-8, 83.7, 83.15-16, 83.29-30, 84.4, 84.26-85.1, 85.9-10, 90.20, 90.27, 91.4-5); he heaped scorn upon Argyropoulos as a mere grammarian and rhetorician (*ibid.*, pp. 73.9-10, 78.1-4, 83.1-2, 91.4-5); and he had sufficient standing in the Church of Constantinople to attack Argyropoulos in some sort of ecclesiastical setting (*ibid.*, pp. 69.18-20, 72.18-19, 96.5), though Argyropoulos was himself a church official with the titles *Diakon* and *Archon ton ekklesion* (*ibid.*, p. 68.2; for the meaning of these titles see H.-G. BECK, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich*, Munich, 1959, pp. 98-99, 109, 113). The addressee was also a student of Latin scholasticism. In a revealing passage, Argyropoulos quotes the addressee as saying that unlike the Greeks, the Latins used grammar in philosophical ways (LAMPROS, *op. cit.* [see note 7], p. 90.9ff.); ignorant of the logico-philosophical discussions of grammar in Latin scholasticism, Argyropoulos completely missed the point and denied that Greek and Latin grammar differed in essence since the latter derived from the former. Because of these characteristics and despite the witness of the manuscripts (Milan, Ambros. C 114 sup.; Rome, Vallicel. F 20), I believe that the addressee was really George Scholarius rather than George of Trebizond. In the years before the Council of Florence, Scholarius was the only person in Constantinople who was a teacher, an important figure in the Church (lay preacher), an Aristotelian philosopher aggressively criticizing the philosophical ignorance of his Greek contemporaries, and an admirer of Latin scholasticism. Assuming that the addressee is Scholarius, I would place the letters between 1425 and the departure of the Greeks for the Council of Florence in 1437, with a date in the mid-1430s probable.

[11] See LAMPROS, *op. cit.* (see note 7), pp. 70.19, 73.23-24, 74.15-16, 104.19-20. The invective against Katablattas (on the assumption that it is Argyropoulos') says nothing about Argyropoulos' philosophical training, though it is informative on other points, i. e., that as an orphan Argyropoulos was sent from Constantinople to the school of Constantine Ibankos in Thessalonica when he was ten; that he returned to Constantinople when he was fourteen and studied especially with an unnamed teacher, who treated him as his own son, seeing to his incorporation into the clergy of Hagia Sophia and also to his marriage. Finally, the invective confirms an item of information which we otherwise know only from two brief references of Francesco Filelfo, namely, that Argyropoulos was a priest (CANIVET - OIKOMINODÈS, *loc. cit.* [see note 7], p. 73.643; LAMPROS, *op. cit.* [see note 7], p. 204.5-6, ["παπᾷ" and "ἱερεῖ"] and p. 312.5 ["*presbytero*"]).

[12] *Ibid.*, pp. 73.24-74.6. This is an interesting passage for several reasons. First, because Argyropoulos says that when he became an adult, the emperor appointed him to the position of teacher. This has been taken to mean appointment to the school of the Xenon, where we know Argyropoulos taught in the 1440s; but the passage says nothing

about his philosophical erudition and apparently quite ignorant concerning philosophical currents in the Latin West.[13] This last weakness may have contributed to his decision to study at the University of Padua, where we first find him in 1441 copying manuscripts for the rich Florentine exile Palla Strozzi.[14] We do not know exactly when Argyropoulos arrived in Padua nor when he left.[15] But we can document that from 13 October 1443 to 22 July 1444, when he received his doctorate in arts,[16] Argyropoulos acted as the rector of students in the arts faculty (*artistae*).[17] His teachers

---

of the sort. I think Argyropoulos is simply referring to the same early appointment of the 1420s which he speaks about with greater precision in the invective against Katablattas as being made by the two emperors (see note 7 above). Note that the appointment was made when Argyropoulos entered manhood: κἀπειδὴ καὶ εἰς ἄνδρας ἐτέλεσα. A second interesting aspect is Argyropoulos' assertion that he had many Italian students, who admired especially his knowledge of Aristotelian physics and logic. One would very much like to know who were these Italians who came to Greece to study Aristotle. The only known Italian students of Argyropoulos were Giammario Filelfo and possibly Pietro Perleone (CAMMELLI, *op. cit.* [see note 5], pp. 11, 13-14), and neither ever distinguished himself as a student of Aristotle. Finally, Argyropoulos asserts that because of various calamities he now discounts these glories. I wonder if he was referring to the loss of some of his children. Early in the pontificate of Pope Nicholas V (1447-1455), he mentions having two sons (LAMPROS, *op. cit.* [see note 7], p. 140.24), though he apparently had been married since the 1420s or early 1430s (see note 11 above).

[13] For his ignorance of Latin scholasticism see the end of note 10 above.

[14] MS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, gr. 1908, containing Simplicius' commentary on Aristotle's *Physics*, is written in part in Argyropoulos' distinctive hand. On fol. 213v is a well known colophon in another hand, identified by A. DILLER, "Three Greek Scribes Working for Bessarion: Trivizias, Callistus, Hermonymus", *Italia medioevale e umanistica*, X, 1967, pp. 403-410, at p. 407, as Andronicus Callistus'. I translate: "This book was written in the year of our Lord 1441 for the nobleman Palla Strozzi residing in Padua by the hand of the Greek John Argyropoulos of Constantinople while he studied philosophy in Padua. Part [of the book], however, is written in the hand of Palla". In his life of Palla Strozzi, Vespasiano da Bisticci asserted that "Venuto meser Palla a' confini a Padova ... tolse in casa, con bonissimo salario, meser Giovanni Argiropolo, a fine che gli legesi più libri greci ... Meser Giovanmni gli legeva opere d'Aristotele in filosofia naturale, de la quale egli aveva bonissima notitia" (*Le Vite*, ed. A. GRECO, 2 vols., Florence, 1970-1976, II, pp. 159-160).

[15] He did not arrive in Padua before 1441 since we have two letters of Francesco Filelfo dated Milan, 13 April 1441, which presume that Argyropoulos was in Constantinople (see the end of note 11 above). Filelfo may not have known that Argyropoulos was on his way to, or had recently arrived in, Padua, but he would not have remained ignorant very long of Argyropoulos' presence there; cf. the discussion in CAMMELLI, *op. cit.* (see note 5), pp. 11-14.

[16] See G. ZONTA-G. BROTTO, *Acta graduum academicorum Gymnasii Patavini ab anno 1406 ad annum 1450*, 2nd ed., II.2, Padua, 1970, num. 1858.

[17] For the first notice as rector see note 19 below; for notices for every month from

included the Scotist Francesco della Rovere, O.F.M. (the future Pope Sixtus IV),[18] and perhaps the celebrated Aristotelian Gaetano da Thiene.[19] Argyropoulos was also a student of medicine;[20] and when he returned to Constantinople, he seems to have taught this subject as well as philosophy in the school attached to the hospital of the *Xenon tou Kralou*.[21] He also began to take on an active, public role in religious affairs.[22] The fall of Constan-

---

October 1443 to July 1444 except December and February, see ZONTA-BROTTO, *op. cit.* (see note 16), nums. 1745-1747, 1757, 1761, 1768, 1776-1777, 1793, 1810, 1812-1815, 1817, 1820, 1825-1826, 1833-1834, 1836, 1846, 1852, 1855, 1858.

[18] In an oration before Sixtus IV, the humanist Naldo de' Naldi asserted (C. PIANA, *Chartularium Studii Bononiensis S. Francisci (saec. XIII-XVI)*, Florence, 1970, p. 83): "Ioannes Bizantius [Bizantio *Piana*], acerrimo vir ingenio, multis audientibus saepissime testatus est quod [eum *Piana*] non minus ille se iactitet praeceptorem habuisse te [*sc.*, *Sixtus IV*] quam Plato Socratem illum ..." As is well known, Argyropoulos was in attendance as *rector artistarum* when della Rovere was awarded the degree of doctor of theology at Padua on 14 April 1444 (ZONTA-BROTTO, *op. cit.* [see note 16], num. 1820).

[19] Though Argyropoulos quoted Gaetano in his lectures on Aristotle (see *infra*), he did not call him his teacher. So the only argument for the connection is the probability that Argyropoulos would have wanted to hear the most illustrious Aristotelian at the university; cf. SILVESTRO DA VALSANZIBIO, *Vita e dottrina di Gaetano di Thiene, filosofo dello Studio di Padova (1387-1465)*, Padua, 1949, p. 15.

[20] In a university notice of 12 Oct. 1443, he is called *art(ium) et med(icinae) scolaris, rect(or) artistarum* (ZONTA-BROTTO, *op. cit.* [see note 16], num. 1745); and in a letter of Pope Calixtus III dated 11 March 1456, he is called *magister artium et medicinae* (LAMPROS, *op. cit.* [see note 7], p. 314; CAMMELLI, *op. cit.* [see note 5], p. 75).

[21] We have an extremely laudatory reference by a student to him and his comments concerning σφυγμός (throbbing of inflamed parts); see the note of G. MERCATI in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XIX, 1910, pp. 580-581, at p. 580, reprinted in IDEM, *Opere minori*, III, Vatican City, 1937, p. 124. At the school of the *Xenon tou Kralou* in Constantinople (concerning which see F. FUCHS, *Die höheren Schulen von Konstantinopel im Mittelalter*, Leipzig, 1926, pp. 71-72), he counted medical doctors among his students (see the celebrated sketch of him teaching there and accompanying captions in MS Oxford, Bodleian Library, Barocc. 87, reproduced in LAMPROS, *op. cit.* (see note 7), pp. κγ' - κδ' and Πίναξ Β'; CAMMELLI, *op. cit.* (see note 5), pp. 30/31, 32, gives the sketch, and an Italian summary of the captions). In addition, LAMPROS, pp. 142-174, edits Argyropoulos' solutions to twelve questions posed by someone who is identified as interested in philosophy and medicine; the last five are physical questions of direct interest to doctors, e. g., Question 11: "How does fever occur and at what temperature does it begin?".

[22] His treatise on the procession of the Holy Spirit to the prominent political figure Lucas Notaras (LAMPROS, *op. cit.* [see note 7], pp. 108-128) seems to date from the mid- or late 1440s since George Gemistus Pletho published his refutation of it in or shortly before 1450 (MASAI, *op. cit.* [see note 4], pp. 389-392). We have several witnesses to his taking a forceful pro-union position in public discussions in Constantinople before the fall; see CAMMELLI, *op. cit.* (see note 5), pp. 41-42.