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A Lesser-Known Member of Bessarion’s Milieu: The Scribe-Bishop Makarios

Abstract: This paper aims to examine some Greek manuscripts produced in the mid-fifteenth century. Prosopographic, palaeographic and codicological pieces of evidence lead to the identification of the handwriting of the scribe-bishop Makarios.

1

Coordinated by Cardinal Bessarion, the intense campaign of transcription of manuscripts that led to the rescue of many works of ancient Greek literature has long been the subject of historical, philological, codicological, and, above all, palaeographic studies. Fundamental works about the activity of the copyists recruited by Bessarion between the 1440s and the 1470s represented the basis for all later studies which, in turn, contributed towards progressively detailing the graphic and intellectual environment of that period.¹

Within the framework of this fruitful field of research, recent studies are gradually bringing to light some lesser-known Byzantine émigrés in fifteenth-century-Italy who performed, either intensely or marginally, the task of copying manuscripts in the cardinal’s milieu.² These are mostly neglected characters, who have been left in the shadows for different reasons.

More than once the impossibility of associating a name and a well-defined historical background with the manuscripts copied by scribes working for the Cardinal has been complained about, despite considerable discoveries; and this is the case, for instance, with some anonymous scribes who were grouped together a few decades ago by Dieter Harlfinger. Only in more recent times has it been possible to recognize historical personalities among them: consider the

---

¹ The articles by Diller 1967 and Mioni 1976 have been pioneering in investigating this topic. Most of the copyists working for Bessarion are recorded among the specimina published in Harlfinger 1974.
² Fundamental are the findings of Speranzi 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018; see also Giacomelli and Speranzi 2019, Martínez Manzano 2013, Martinelli Tempesta 2013 and 2015, Orlandi 2015, 2019b and 2020b.
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case of the monk Gregorios (formerly *Anonymus KB*) or that of Emmanuel of Constantinople (formerly *Anonymus Ly*). In contrast, historical personalities – well-known to contemporary literary and documentary sources and yet lacking a definite shape from a palaeographic point of view – had to wait many years before they were finally assigned a handwriting. The long path that led to the identification of the hand of the Moreote émigré Alexios Keladenos is striking. When he was still a boy, Alexios was greeted by Bessarion at the time of the Turkish conquest of the Peloponnese (which led to the surrender of Mystras in 1460), and he was initiated by the Cardinal himself into an undemanding ecclesiastical career in Italy. Much about him was known, save for his writing.

Eventually, under peculiar circumstances, it was only a change of perspective that made it possible to gather together manuscripts that appeared incongruent to each other. This is the case with Theodoros Gazes’ – whose writing bears two stylistic forms (calligraphic and cursive, the latter resembling Bessarion’s own writing) – and with Athanasios Chalkeopulos, whose manuscripts have sometimes been unduly attributed to the Cardinal.

A similar case, briefly outlined in these pages, concerns a scribe who has remained anonymous until now, and yet had already been inscribed among Bessarion’s collaborators for some time; this copyist contributed to the making of at least two manuscripts produced in the Cardinal’s *milieu: most of Proclus’.../

---

3 See Harlfinger 2011, 289 n. 13 and Martinelli Tempesta 2013, 126–130. A detailed biographical account of Gregorios (along with an update on his movements in Italy and his contacts to Italian humanists) is now provided in Giacomelli and Speranzi 2019.

4 See Orlandi 2019b.

5 For Keladenos, who has long been known as ‘*Anonymus δ-καί Harlfinger*’ (= no. ‘2’ of the list by Harlfinger 1971, 418) see Speranzi 2015 (with previous bibliography, necessary to follow the steps leading to the identification). Outside of the circle of Bessarion, we can refer to the case of Georgios Amirutzes; for a tentative identification of his writing see Orlandi 2019a.

6 For a study on the versatility of Gazes’ writing refer to Speranzi 2012. This contribution provided the basis for a series of new findings: see Martinelli Tempesta 2013, 144; Orlandi 2015; Speranzi 2016, 83–87; Speranzi 2018, 195; Orlandi 2020a and 2020b.

7 See Speranzi 2018.
Munich, BSB, Cod.graec. 547 (hereafter Monac. gr. 547) and a great number of folios within Aristotle’s Vienna, ÖNB, phil. gr. 64 (hereafter Vind. phil. gr. 64).  

Within the manuscript Monac. gr. 547 (see Fig. 1), a small fifteenth-century paper codex, dating to c. 1455–1460 as both internal and external evidence shows, Henri-Dominique Saffrey found autograph notes, written by the hand of Bessarion himself, including some accounting for the Cretan properties of the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople; this is a first clue to a connection between the activity of the scribe and the Cardinal’s milieu. Moreover, the Munich manuscript, which was still preserved in Venice in 1562, was proved to have been part of Bessarion’s collection, as its inclusion in the inventories of the Marciana studied by Lotte Labowsky clearly shows: in the catalogue ‘B’, compiled in 1474, it corresponds to item 529 Theologiae Platonis per Proculum. The results of philological investigations confirm in turn that the Munich manuscript originated in Bessarion’s circle, as the text of Proclus’ Theologia Platonica at fols 1r–301r is supposed to be a ‘clean’ transcription of that from another book owned by the Cardinal (that is Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, gr. Z. 192). Then, in a codicological unit which is independent of the previous one, the transcription of the text of Proclus’ Institutio theologica (fols 304r–354r) – descending from the more ancient Marc. gr. Z. 512 (thirteenth century) – was started by a still-unidentified Byzantine hand (fols 304r–335v l. 3) and was then completed by Bessarion himself (fols 335v l. 4–354r).

In the Vienna Aristotle, Phil. gr. 64, completed in Rome on March 25, 1457 (‘in the second year of the papacy of Callistus III’, as explicitly mentioned in the

---

9 Diktyon 44995. See a description by Paolo Eleuteri in Fiaccadori 1994, 419 no. 35 (with a specimen of the writing).
10 For further details regarding these chronological terms see here below.
11 Saffrey 1965.
12 These notes have been published and studied by Saffrey 1979.
13 See more below, n. 18.
14 Labowsky 1979, 219 and 487.
15 See Saffrey and Westerink 1968, CXXVII. See also Giacomelli 2020, 284–288.
16 Diktyon 69663. Details about the making of this ‘allogenetic’ manuscript – which is in fact a result of a project that took place over the sixth decade of the fifteenth century at different times and places (between Bologna and Rome), and involved more than one scribe working for Bessarion – are in Speranzi 2016, 63 n. 55.
17 Diktyon 69983. More information on the manuscript tradition of this work in Dodds 1963, XXXIII-XLI.
18 A copy of the text transmitted by the Monac. gr. 547 is found in Paris, BnF, gr. 1828 (Diktyon 51454), copied in Venice by Nicola Della Torre in the year 1562; see Dodds 1963, XXXVIII.
subscription), the anonymous copyist of the Munich Proclus – collaborating in this case with Manuel Atrapes, Johannes Rhosos, Hysaias of Cyprus (formerly known as ‘Anonymus 25 Harlfinger’) and the ‘Anonymus 26 Harlfinger’ – was responsible for fols 139r–216v (see Fig. 2). The Vienna manuscript, which belonged to Hysaias of Cyprus, provides therefore a first precise chronological and geographical frame of reference to date and locate the activity of this copyist: Rome, at the end of the 1450s.

3

On closer inspection, it is possible to associate the Greek hand of Monac. gr. 547 and Vind. phil. gr. 64 with a name. If we compare Figs 1–2 to Fig. 3, we will immediately notice the identity of the hands. The folio shown in Fig. 3 is from a volume of miscellaneous content, Arundel 528, currently in the British Library in London. As already indicated in the first volume of the Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten, the main copyist of Arundel 528 (fols 9r–60v, 111r–181r, 185r–192v) signed his name in the London manuscript four times, presenting himself as Makarios, Bishop of Halicz (or Galyč), which is the eponymous city of the

---

19 ἐτελειώθη τὸ παρὸν βιβλίον ἐν ἔτει ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ ἡμιδικτιώνος (sic) πέμπτης μηνὸς μαρτίου κενη, τῆς ἀρχιερωσύνης τοῦ μακαριωτάτου κυρίου Καλλίστου πάπα Γʹ ἔτει βα[...].
20 Harlfinger 1971, 419. See more about this scribe below, p. 757 and 758 n. 33.
21 A detailed description of the hands involved in the making of codex Vindobonensis (studied by Harlfinger 1971, 409, 419 and Rashed 2001, 31–32, 295–304) can be found in Speranzi 2013, 126–128. Speranzi was the first to connect the writing of fols 139r–216v with that of Monac. gr. 547. A full-page reproduction of this copyist’s writing is already in Rashed 2001, Plate 46 (fol. 139v). For the critical edition of Theodoros Gazes’ Solutions (that is, solutions to problems dealing with Aristotelian physics) see Brockmann, Lorusso and Martinelli Tempesta 2017.
22 Dyktion 39279. A complete digitisation, including an analytical description of the content, is available at <bl.uk/manuscripts/>. From a philological point of view the manuscript was studied in Darrouzès 1961 and was used for the publication of the writings and letters of the monk Niketas Stethatos (for details on the manuscript transmission see Darrouzès 1961, 40–51).
23 See RGK I 244.
24 Fols 1r–8v and 63r–110v are the work of other hands (see more below).
25 Here is the text of the four subscriptions: τοῦ ταπεινοῦ ἐπισκόπου τοῦ γαλίτζης μακαρίου (‘by the humble Bishop of Halicz, Makarios’, fol. 60v); ὁ γαλίζης μακάριος (‘Makarios of Halicz’, fols 162r and 181v, both as a monokondylion); μακάριος (‘Makarios’, fol. 182v).
historical region of *Galicia*, incorporated during the fifteenth century into the Kingdom of Hungary and today under the jurisdiction of Ukraine.

Before moving on with further considerations about Makarios’ activity, we shall examine other palaeographic aspects of the London manuscript, for two more hands appear in this book. While the one responsible for fols 1r–8v cannot be identified for now, the hand of fols 63r–110v is not at all unknown: we are dealing with a little-known Byzantine copyist, whose name is Philippos. The identity of this scribe was acknowledged some time ago by Rudolf S. Stefec. To the documentation collected by Stefec we can add evidence highlighted by other scholars. In a recent paper David Speranzi has attributed to an anonymous copyist – who is actually none other than Philippos – the following pieces: Vatican City, BAV, Vat. gr. 133 (Dyktion 66764); Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, A 159 sup. (Dyktion 42245); part of Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, gr. Z. 523 (Dyktion 69994) (fols 166r–186v, 187r–198r), copied in collaboration with Emmanuel Zacharides, whose activity on the island of Crete is well-known. In a detailed description of the Venice manuscript, Ciro Giacomelli pointed out that part of London, BL, Add. 58224 (Dyktion 39250) (fols 1v–65r) is work of the same scribe; the collaboration with Zacharides in this manuscript, just as in Marc. gr. 523, is remarkable. Of Philippos’ hand, in addition to Arundel 528, I have found three more witnesses, which I report here for the first time: the whole manuscript Paris, BnF, gr. 1969 (Dyktion 51596) (containing Plotinus’ *Enneads* and dating to March 1467); Paris, Bnf, gr. 2141 (Dyktion 51770) (with exception of fols 348v l. 10 [ἡρτύετο]–349r); parts of Paris, BnF, gr. 1815 (Dyktion 51441) (fols 71r–82r, 221r col. B–269r, 267r–307v l. 20, 325r–348v).

Besides the subscriptions by Makarios, Arundel 528, a small paper volume, also stands out due to the presence of some sections (fols 61v–62r, 183r–184r) containing religious writings in mixed ecclesiastical Slavonic, Bulgarian and Serbian. In his surveys of manuscripts in Cyrillic alphabet kept in English and Irish collections, Ralph Cleminson already pointed out that Arundel 528 shows some similarities in language, writing and content with Arundel 527, another Greek codex (with musical writings) containing short Slavonic texts (fols 129v–131v). It will not

---

28 See RGK I 114 = II 146 = III 189.
29 Available online at <cagb-db.bbwa.de>.
30 In a forthcoming study I shall present further insights into Philippos’ activity as a scribe.
31 Cleminson 1988, 144–147.
32 A full digitisation and a detailed description of this manuscript is available at <bl.uk/manuscripts/> as well.
come as a surprise to find here, too, though only on the two folios (5r–6r), the hand of Makarios, which had so far gone unnoticed (see Fig. 4). 33

With the group of the four manuscripts entirely or partially written by Makarios it is possible to associate a further witness, Paris, BnF, gr. 1312 (Dyktion 50921; see Fig. 5). This small-sized paper manuscript, which is entirely written by Makarios’ hand, contains an anonymous collection of 137 Capita moralia et theologica, to which a long index covering almost the whole first two quires (fols 1r–15r, 1. 5) is premised. In order to support the arguments addressed by these Capita, statements have been extracted from various types of texts: religious, liturgical, patristic, juridical, council acts. 34 Copied in the monastery of St John the Prodrome-Petra, Par. gr. 1312 still preserves its original Byzantine binding. This kind of binding has been studied by a specialist such as Dominique Grosdidier de Matons, who called it ‘couture provisoire par surfilage’. 35 According to these elements, the Paris manuscript should therefore be considered a product of Makarios’ scribal activity in the Byzantine East, which had remained in the shadows until now.

The Greek handwriting of Makarios, as it appears from the examination of the collected material (see Figs 1–5), is characterized first of all by a significant inclination of the axis to the right; generally speaking, it appears accurate and confident, not without a certain tendency to a calligraphic style. It is possible to give an account of some of its peculiar features (see Table 1): delta (1) is provided with a hook at its upper extremity and is mainly capital shaped; zeta, when tied with the previous letter (2), is traced in a peculiar way by means of the sequence of two left-handed loops; rho (3), as well as tau, ordinarily ties at the bottom with the following letter; peculiar is the sigma in ligature with the circumflex accent (4), produced by the upward extension of the horizontal stroke of the letter; very showy and characteristic is, finally, a flourish on the lower margin in the shaping of the abbreviation for the word καὶ (5), when it occurs within the text on the last line of the written area. 36

---

33 Fols 1r–5r and 100v–116r are the work of different hands. On the name and the activity of the main scribe (see, for instance, fols 1r–100r, containing musical works, ἀναγραμματισμοὶ and τροπάρια), whom I here identify as the so-called ‘Anonymus 26 Harlfinger’, who worked for Bessarion too, I shall give further insights in a forthcoming paper.
34 In the first chapter, for instance, which addresses the question of obedience to the monarch as the guarantor of divine order on earth, there are excerpts from St Peter and St Paul’s sayings, a short passage Περὶ ὕβρεων from the Synopsis basilicorum and, at the end, a few lines from the liturgy of St Basil.
35 See Grosdidier de Matons 2008.
36 See also Figs 2, 3 and 5.
Having completed these first palaeographic surveys concerning the five manuscripts which are witnesses to the activity of Makarios as a copyist, it is possible to proceed further to some biographical remarks. The personality of Makarios is not unknown in the studies of Byzantine prosopography, as an entry in the Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit (PLP 16192) was dedicated to him. A member of the clergy and of Serbian origin, Makarios, before becoming bishop, had been a monk of the Basilian monastery

### Table 1: The handwriting of Makarios of Halicz (details)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>1. delta (in ligature)</th>
<th>2. zeta (in ligature)</th>
<th>3. rho (in ligature)</th>
<th>4. sigma (+ circumflex)</th>
<th>5. καὶ (abbreviation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vind. phil. gr. 64</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monac. gr. 547</td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lond. Arundel 527</td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image13" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image15" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lond. Arundel 528</td>
<td><img src="image16" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image17" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image18" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image19" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image20" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par. gr. 1312</td>
<td><img src="image21" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image22" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image23" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image24" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image25" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of St Cyprian in Constantinople. His appointment as bishop of Halicz took place in Rome on January 16, 1458 on the initiative of Pope Callistus III.\textsuperscript{37} This historical event matches perfectly in terms of chronology with what we already knew about the activity of Makarios; that is his participation in the making of the Vienna manuscript Phil. gr. 64, which was completed in Rome in 1457 in cooperation with other scribes working for Bessarion.

In the frame of a structural reorganisation of the Byzantine-Slavic metropolis, the aim of the Roman Curia in those years was to gain jurisdiction over people following the Eastern rite and living in the Kingdom of Hungary (which also included the region of Halicz) by appointing a Byzantine-Slavic orthodox bishop who was not at odds with the stance of the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1437–1439); a project strongly contested by the Hungarian bishops and Latin clergy, who had never even officially signed the definitive document of the Union in 1439. Cardinal Isidoros, who had signed the Council Acts as Metropolitan of Kiev and All Russia, was at that time pontifical legate for those regions but not for the lands of Hungary, whose rulers were continuously quarrelling with the popes of Rome due to the long-standing issue of the direct nomination of the bishops.\textsuperscript{38}

Makarios seems to have distinguished himself in the eyes of Callistus III for his many qualities (\textit{religionis zelus, litterarum scientia, vite mundicia, honestas, morum spiritualium prudencia, and temporalium circumspetio}).\textsuperscript{39} Given his intimacy with Cardinal Bessarion, Makarios could have been appointed bishop of Halicz through the intercession of the Cardinal himself (and of the former Metropolitan Isidoros of Kiev). He certainly maintained his office, despite opposition from the Latin Hungarian clergy, at least until some time after 1466, when he was confirmed by Pope Paul II.\textsuperscript{40} From this date on, there is no more evidence about the activity of this scribe-bishop.

\textsuperscript{37} The text of the letter granting Makarios the nomination as bishop is published in Prochaska 1923, 64–65.
\textsuperscript{38} For a reconstruction of the story see Hofmann 1946, 227–229 and, more recently, Adam 2008. An updated biographical account of Isidoros is found in Philippides and Hanak 2018. Makarios’ predecessor in Halicz was another orthodox monk, a certain Matthaios (remaining in office for the years 1440–1458): see Adam 2008, 333–336.
\textsuperscript{39} See Prochaska 1923, 65.
\textsuperscript{40} See Adam 2008, 336–337; the text of the letter of Paul II to the Archbishops of Esztergom and Kalocsa confirming the authority and jurisdiction of Makarios can be found in Bunea 1904, 301–303.
We will now try to take a further step in the shaping of the biographical and intellectual profile of Makarios of Halicz by examining the possibility of a shared identity with other contemporary namesake individuals.

The first figure to be taken into consideration is the half-unknown Makarios of Serres, who has also been recorded, under different entry numbers, in the prosopographic and palaeographic repertoires (PLP 16274; RGK III 402). The only information referring to this Makarios, otherwise unknown to the documentary sources of the time, comes from a short letter handed down by the manuscript Vatican City, BAV, Vat. gr. 1858 (Dyktion 68487) (fols 2v–3r). The text of the epistle dates to the year <1447> and is in all likelihood autograph, as some editorial corrections show. Makarios, who presents himself in the first lines as the Metropolitan of Serres, addresses a request to an orthodox monk and hegumenos, named Isidoros: the purpose of the letter is to obtain permission to return to the monastery he belonged to – unfortunately it is not specified which one – provided that Makarios refuses the unionist positions of the Council of Ferrara-Florence which he had supported for some time.

The handwriting of Makarios of Serres as it appears in the Vatican manuscript (fols 2v–3r) is marked by an extremely cursive style, which perfectly fits the ‘personal’ character of the document, but which does not easily match with the pieces of evidence previously ascribed to the hand of Makarios of Halicz, as they were are all quite calligraphic. Because of this formal distance, the two writings would therefore seem, at first sight, completely foreign to each other. Nevertheless, as shown by some palaeographic features (listed below in Table 2), the main characteristics of the writing of Makarios of Serres overlap with those of the Greek hand of the Bishop of Halicz, some of which have

---

41 See Mercati 1926, 36, who pointed out the autography and the dating of the epistle. In this regard, convincing arguments have been presented by Mercati for dating the manuscript at <1447> on the basis of the indication of the month (August) and of the indiction (the tenth). During the middle decades of the fifteenth century the indiction fell in August only in the years 1432, 1447, 1462, 1477: the first date is for obvious reasons impossible since the text mentions the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1437–1439); the last two appear far away in time from the events reported and are therefore not suitable.

42 Not to be confused with the better known Isidoros of Kiev, who had already embraced the cause of the Union of Churches for several years.

43 The text, which is also preserved in manuscript Vatican City, BAV, Vat. gr. 1147 (Dyktion 67778) (sixteenth century; fols 215r–216v), has been published and translated into French by Laurent 1959, 198–200.
already been highlighted earlier. Consider, for example: the ligature of rho with the following letter, traced from the descender stroke (1); the sequence pi-alpha-rho (2), with an upwards bending of the head-stroke of the minuscule letter pi, letter alpha above the headline and the bow of rho originating from the descender stroke of alpha (the same occurs in the sequence alpha-rho in ligature with the following letter [3]); sigma conjoined with the circumflex accent (4), as already noticed above; the ligature sigma-omega (5), realised by means of a series of left-turning curves leading to the making of two bows for the closed omega; sigma conjoined with iota (6); the sequence tau-rho-iota, made up of the succession of four strokes (7); finally, the ligature iota-omega realised beneath the baseline (8).

Table 2: Makarios of Halicz and Makarios of Serres: two hands or one?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Makarios of Serres</strong> <em>(PLP 16274)</em></td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Image 1" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Image 2" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Image 3" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Image 4" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Image 5" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Image 6" /></td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Image 7" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Makarios of Halicz</strong> <em>(PLP 16192)</em></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Image 8" /></td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Image 9" /></td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Image 10" /></td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Image 11" /></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Image 12" /></td>
<td><img src="image13" alt="Image 13" /></td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="Image 14" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image15" alt="Image 15" /></td>
<td><img src="image16" alt="Image 16" /></td>
<td><img src="image17" alt="Image 17" /></td>
<td><img src="image18" alt="Image 18" /></td>
<td><img src="image19" alt="Image 19" /></td>
<td><img src="image20" alt="Image 20" /></td>
<td><img src="image21" alt="Image 21" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The palaeographic examination carried out on Vat. gr. 1858 unexpectedly raises the question – not uncommon in the case of Byzantine scholars and copyists of the Renaissance period – whether two different styles and graphic expressions may actually be attributed to a single historical personality. Here are some observations on this topic by David Speranzi:

The gap between the different expressions of the same hand [...] and the difficulty of clearly tracing the boundaries of the variability of a writing are the reasons why works by several scribes of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries have been assigned to their
An unintentional conflation of the two figures – which probably originated from the indication by Mercati – had already emerged in a study by Georg Hofmann, in which, about the Greek monk Makarios appointed as bishop of Halicz by Pope Callistus III, is said: ‘Es ist bis jetzt kein Beweis dafür gebracht worden, dass Makarios von der katholischen Kirche wieder abgefallen sei’;\(^4\) the statement made by Hofmann, as is easy to understand, makes sense only if one identifies Makarios of Halicz as a well-known member of the clergy who had already rejected the Union promoted by the Catholic Church, such as Makarios the Metropolitan of Serres.

Provided that the hypothesis of a conflation is right, it might be easier to understand at this point the decision taken by the Roman Curia on the issue of the appointment of a bishop charged with task of safeguarding the concerns of the Eastern-rite Greeks of Galicia: an orthodox monk of some reputation, who had already been a metropolitan and who had in the past – even if only temporarily – embraced the concepts of the Council of Ferrara-Florence, might be in the end the most suitable candidate.

A last, a not insignificant detail pointing to a shared identity between the two Makarioi comes from the manuscript itself which preserves the letter of the Metropolitan of Serres. In fact, some sections of the Vatican codex, which is composed of multiple independent codicological units to be ascribed to different periods, most probably belonged to Isidoros of Kiev, who also transcribed some folios (fols 44r–47r, 49r–50r);\(^4\) with these sections, in addition to the letter by Makarios, it should also be associated the first sheet, containing the draft of Bessarion’s epistle to the sons of Georgios Gemistos Plethon, in the hand of Bessarion himself (fol. 1rv).\(^4\) It is difficult to imagine that the recurrence of these

\(^{44}\) Speranzi 2013, 15–16: ‘Proprio la distanza tra le diverse manifestazioni di una stessa mano [...] associata alla difficoltà di tracciare con nettezza i possibili limiti della variabilità di una scrittura, ha fatto sì che diversi scribi dei secoli XV e XVI abbiano visto alcuni dei propri prodotti assegnati a loro “doppie paleografici”, rivelatisi poi privi di consistenza storica. [...] Un problema [...] sintetizzabile nell’interrogativo “due o uno?”’.

\(^{45}\) Hofmann 1946, 228–229.

\(^{46}\) Within this quire one finds a fair copy of the text *Sermo V inter concilium Florentinum*, edited by Hofmann and Candal 1971, 81–94; regarding the manuscript’s belonging to Isidoros, see Mercati 1936, 36–39.

\(^{47}\) Identification by Mercati 1917. The known hands recognized in the Vatican manuscript are those of Dositheos of Drama (4r–5r), Manuel Kalekas (fols 7r–8r), Makarios of Ancyra (fols 28r–42r), Gregorios Alyates (fols 60r–62r), Georgios Moschos (fols 250r–257r); for these attributions
figures (Isiropdos and Bessarion), who are central to the biography of Makarios of Halicz, fatty in the only manuscript that has preserved the memory of the Metropolitan of Serres is due to a mere coincidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, phil. gr. 64, fols 139r–216v</td>
<td>Aristotle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, gr. 547, fols 1r–301v</td>
<td>Proclus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>London, British Library, Arundel 527, fols 5r–6r</td>
<td>music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>London, British Library, Arundel 528, fols 9r–60v, 111r–181v, 185r–192v</td>
<td>miscellany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, gr. 1312</td>
<td>ethics, theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 1858, fols 2r–3v</td>
<td>miscellany</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the data collected so far about Makarios – former metropolitan of Serres (before 1447), later a monk of the Basilian monastery of St Cyprian in Constantinople and then, once he arrived in Italy, a copyist working in the circle of Bessarion before his nomination as bishop of Halicz at the end of the 1450s – match with another namesake personality. We learn from Athanasios Chalkeopulos (a Byzantine scholar from the Cardinal’s circle), the author of the Liber Visitationis, that he was accompanied on his journey to the monasteries of southern Italy by a certain Makarios, archimandrite of the Basilian monastery of St Bartholomew of Trigona. Fat The journey was undertaken at the behest of Pope Callistus III; it began in Rome on 1 October 1457 and ended on 5 April 1458. The purpose of the

---

48 See above, p. 759–760. 49 It is worth remembering that the ecclesiastical dignity of archimandrite was mostly a title of honour and did not require settlement in the eponymous monastery; for the history of this cloister refer to Falkenhausen 1999.
mission was to gather information on the history of southern monasticism through the exploration of 78 Basilian monasteries.\textsuperscript{50}

The coincidence of characters (again Pope Callistus III and Bessarion), times (the months between the end of 1457 and the beginning of 1458) and places (the city of Rome) is undoubtedly striking. The hypothesis of a shared identity between the one Makarios (first metropolitan of Serres and later bishop of Halicz) and the other, archimandrite of Trigona, may not rely on a mere combination of coincidences. Unfortunately, nothing emerges from the pages of the \textit{Liber Visitationis}. It will be the task of future investigations to find new evidence that will enable us to give this hypothesis a confirmation.
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