

Zdzisław Szmańda OP

# A Byzantine encounters Italy and Moscow

The life and thought of Maximus the Greek

in the inter-confessional context

*Dissertation submitted  
to the Faculty of Theology of the University of Fribourg (Switzerland)  
for the Degree of Doctor in Theology*

*Directed by Prof. Franz Mali*

**Fribourg 2020**

# CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	5
Chapter 1	
CONTEXT: THE THREE WORLDS OF MAXIMUS THE GREEK	14
1. Byzantium – the world of Greek Christianity and the ruins of the Empire	17
2. Italy – the world of Latin Christianity and the humanism	20
3. Moscow – the world of Slavonic Christianity and its relationship with Byzantium and the West	23
Chapter 2	
BIOGRAPHY	
1. Greece	30
2. Studies and work in Italy	34
Florence	36
Venice and around	54
Greeks and other friends of Aldo Manuzio's circle	60
Padua and Ferrara	63
Lombardy	65
Other places, other moments	69
National and religious ideas of Michael Trivolis during his itinerant years	70
3. Mirandola and San Marco	80
4. Athos	98
Vatopedi	105
5. Invitation and the road to Moscow	114
6. The situation in Moscow on the eve of Maximus' arrival	121
7. The first period in Moscow before the trial of 1525	127

First translations	128
Improving and corrections of Russian books	135
A literary club, a conspiracy or a group of reformers?	137
Anti-Latin polemics	140
Anti-astrological polemics	144
Contacts with Vassian Patrikeev and the question of Maximus' participation in monastic polemics	146
Approaching storm	152
8. Investigation and the trial of 1525	164
In the Grand Prince's chamber	169
In the Metropolitan's chamber	173
Sentence	175
9. In Volokolamsk	178
10. Year 1531: the new trial	182
Charges concerning heresy	185
Questioning of the authority of the Muscovite Church	188
Other charges	192
Sentence	194
11. Return to prison	195
12. Liberation and the last years	215
Chapter 3	
IDEAS AND TOPICS OF MAXIMUS' WORK	
1. Maximus' philosophical and theological backfround	226
Maximus a Platonist?	227
Eastern Fathers of the Church and othe Eastern authors	230
Western Fathers of the Church	232
Western medieval tradition and thinkers contemporary to Maximus	234
2. Earthly knowledge or revealed wisdom	238
Ficino and Giovanni Pico	240
Savonarola and Gianfrancesco Pico	241
Intellectual climate in Muscovy	243
Maximus in Moscow	246

Hellenic deceit	248
Relative value of human knowledge	251
Boundaries	253
Dialectics in theology	257
Ancilla theologiae	259
Humble approach to divine mysteries	261
Role of human intelligence	265
Believe as a child	265
Human authority and divine revelation	267
3. Antropology of freedom	271
Structure of the human being	271
The Fall and its effects	274
Human freedom and astrology	280
Beyond astrology: to grow towards freedom	287
Struggle with passions	290
Fulfilling the commandments	291
Spiritual life	292
Dignity of man	296
4. Socio-religious ideas and social ethics	297
Monastic life and social justice	297
Law and administration of justice	308
Concept of power and the ideal ruler	311
Limits of the tsar's power	329
5. In defence of faith – against heresy	336
Two challeges: Latins and Islam	337
Against Latins	338
Predecessors and Maximus' contemporaries	342
Maximus' approach to polemics	343
The Trinitarian question	344
Purgatory	357
Bread for the Eucharist	359
Prerogatives of the bishop of Rome	380
In pursuit of unity	361

CONCLUSIONS	368
BIBLIOGRAPHY	376

# INTRODUCTION

The literature concerning Maximus the Greek in Russian is copious. In other languages there are also a few important works devoted to him and many smaller contributions. Yet, the amount of research is not tantamount to the knowledge of who was Maximus and what was the significance of his work.

He was well known in Russia as the Greek monk who came to Moscow at the request of the Grand Prince Basil III and who, already during his lifetime, and even more after his death became an authority for Russian Orthodoxy, and particularly for the Old Believers. In the nineteenth century a large part of his works was published, as well as some sources concerning his biography.<sup>1</sup>

Based on the achievements of his predecessors and on the in-depth analysis of sources, V.S. Ikonnikov wrote the first important monograph devoted to Maximus' life and output.<sup>2</sup> He elucidated many facts of the Italian period of Maximus' life, using only his Muscovite works, and extensively analysed the Muscovite part of his biography and his writings. A substantial part of Ikonnikov's work remains a valid source of information.

Russian historians continued his work even in the dark 1930's when V. F. Rzhiga wrote a long article (almost a book) focused mainly on the social aspects of Maximus' thought and published a few of his works that had remained up until then, as manuscripts.<sup>3</sup>

Yet, the turning point in research on Maximus' legacy was Elie Denissoff's thesis defended at the University of Louvain and published in 1943: *Maxime le Grec et l'Occident*. He demonstrated that three figures: a Greek copyist working in Italy – Michael Trivolis, a monk Maximus (Trivolis) from Mount Athos and Maximus the Greek known in Muscovy were, in fact, one person. He based his conclusions on the consistency of the biographical data, on the analysis of style and of the hands in manuscripts.<sup>4</sup> Already before Denissoff, at the

---

1 Majority of Maxims' works were published in Kazan' edition. The document of the investigation was published both by M.A. Obolensky (SD-Ob) and in the first volume of the Acts of Archeographic Expedition (ASo=AAЭ, I, 141-5). An incomplete and deformed record of Maximus' trial was published by O.N. Bodianskii (ChOidr 1847, no. 7).

2 See: IKONNIKOV 1915. It was an extended version of his thesis published for the first time in 1865-66.

3 See: RZHIGA 1934 (on social aspects) and RZHIGA 1935-36.

4 Denissoff did not avoid some errors in his identification. E.g. he was persuaded that the MSS with two verses for patriarch Niphon reliquary (cf. DENISSOFF 1943, planche VIII) were written by Maximus hand but FONKICH 2003, 73, note 10, questioned this affirmation.

beginning of the twentieth century, Spyridion Lambros presumed that the author of an epigram on Manuel of Corinth, a certain monk Maximus, and Maximus the Greek known from Muscovite sources was one and the same person.<sup>5</sup>

Not all of Denissoff's conclusions were reliable but the huge quantity of biographical coincidences and, at least, a part of palaeographical evidence made Denissoff's interpretations the most probable, especially in the absence of alternative explanations.<sup>6</sup>

The second half of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first century have brought a large number of new works about Maximus the Greek, though of uneven value.

Bernhard Schultze (1963) devoted his book to the analysis of Maximus' theological views, he identified a number of patristic quotations used by the Greek and forwarded a (controversial) thesis that Maximus was a Palamite. The core of his text is focused on Maximus' anti-Latin polemics and occasionally reveals some Catholic apologetics.

In 1969 Aleksei Ivanov published the result of many years of his work: the commented catalogue of Maximus' literary output. This book remains a reference for scholars, even if in individual cases Ivanov's attributions, conclusions or hypotheses were questioned by other historians. It contains a bibliography of works on Maximus, both in Russian and in other languages. Ivanov also wrote a series of articles devoted, principally, to the question of how Maximus' Western experience influenced (or not) his beliefs.

Jack V. Haney in his thesis (1973) attempted to present both Maximus' biography and his ideas. It was published shortly before the appearance of a few important works on Maximus in Russian, so Haney's book contains important lacunas. Besides, he seems to be more competent in Platonic than in Christian tradition, and this fact resulted in a number of his misinterpretations.<sup>7</sup>

An important discovery was made by N.N. Pokrovskii who found a more complete relation of Maximus' trial and published it in 1971. A few years later (1977) Nina N. Sinitsyna,

---

5 Cf. SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 18.

6 Nina V. Sinitsyna, expressed (SINITSYNA 2006<sup>b</sup>, 195) some hesitations concerning Denissoff's identification but no other Maximus the Greek's scholar articulated such serious doubts. Earlier, in turn, Donald Ostrowski in his review of SINITSYNA 1977 pronounced some skepticism concerning Sinitsyna's identification of Maximus's hand but, according to OLMSTED 1987, 9, "the authenticity of this [Maximus'] hand has been argued persuasively."

7 Cf. just two example of Haney's Platonic approach. He quotes (HANEY 1973, 145-6) a fragment where Maximus enlists virtues: wisdom, courage, justice, temperance, meekness and humility. Then he says: "They are all attributable qualities and are perfectable absolutes. As such it is clear that Maxim intended that they be understood as *Ideas* or *Forms* in the Platonic sense." Haney did not even try to say a word about the Christian conception of virtues. Next, on the page 147 instead of obvious allusion to the Psalm 103: 15-16 and 90: 5-6 he tries to find in Maximus' text Platonic reminiscences. Apart from that, he tries to link, without any sound justification, the modern legend about Faustus with Maximus' mention about Faust, the father of saint Clement (*ibid.*, 156-7). There are more similar errors in his book.

one of the most authoritative scholars working on the Greek's legacy, issued her fundamental book *Maximus the Greek in Russia* (Максим Грек в России). Later she also published many important articles and a few of the earliest biographical accounts on the Athonite monk.

In the same year, 1977, Hugh M. Olmsted defended in Harvard his (unpublished) doctoral dissertation *Studies in the Early Manuscript Tradition of Maksim Grek's Collected Works* and later published a few in-depth works on the particular question of the manuscript legacy and language of Maximus the Greek.

A significant step forwards in the examination of Maximus' heritage was the research and book by Dmitrii Bulanin (1984) who both published for the first time some of Maximus' works and translations and made a insightful analysis of Maximus' classical reminiscences, of his translations and commentaries to Gregory of Nazianzus, of sources of his anti-Latin works and of the influence of Byzantine epistolography on the Greek's missives.

Also in 1984 Paul Bushkovitch announced a discovery of two Greek variants of the Maximus' Slavonic, already known, works. The Greek versions were dedicated to his unknown friend. This fact considerably extended the knowledge of his literary activity and was evidence that even after many years spent in Muscovy he still kept contacts with his old friends (Greek or Italian). Bushkovitch's publication (1993) of these two Greek poems was however far from being perfect and they were republished by Ihor Shevchenko (1997) with an abundant commentary. Other scholars also discovered a few Greek manuscripts copied by Michael Trivolis during his Italian period.

In the second part of the twentieth century many excellent authors, both Russian and Western, wrote occasionally on the Greek monk. These works did not change significantly the state of our knowledge but gave new interpretations, new points of view or proposed new lines of research. There were also made many detailed corrections and adjustments.<sup>8</sup>

---

8 In Russia, N.A. Kazakova published a few works. She examined especially the circumstances of Maximus' trial. From among other excellent Russian historians valuable contributions were written by S. Kashtanov and A.A. Zimin. B.L. Fonkich discovered or identified a few manuscripts, M.N. Gromov wrote a popular but helpful synthesis, A.T. Shashkov worked on the Old Believers context of Maximus' works. Also philologists, as L.S. Kovtun, analysed Maximus' language. In other languages and countries Slavists and Byzantinists published some contributions: A. Langelier (1986), D. Obolensky (1988), R.A. Klosterman (mainly about legend on Maximus the Greek) or M. Baracchi Bavagnoli. Maximus' compatriots did remember him. In 1951 C. Papamichael issued a book on Maximus but he used none or very few Russian sources: Γρ. Παπαμιχαηλ, Μάξιμος ὁ Γραικός. Ὁ πρῶτος φωτιστής τῶν Ρώσων Ἀθηναῖς 1950 (GEANAKOPIOS 1988, 447, note 3 and GEANAKOPIOS 1992, 449 contradicted this opinion). Some bibliography of the papers in Greek devoted to Maximus can be found in HGV. As far as palaeography is concerned, information about newly discovered manuscripts copied by Maximus (besides already mentioned works by B.L. Fonkich) can be found in RGK I, 287 and in HARLFINGER 2000. The literature (especially of minor works and of lower quality) is immense and there is not exhaustive bibliography. Apart from already mentioned works by Ivanov and Bulanin, a newer bibliography can be found in the new edition on Maximus' works, in ZHUROVA 2008 and 2011 and in KONOVALOV



The beginning of the twenty-first century brought the long-awaited critical edition of Maximus the Greek's works. It is the fruit of a painstaking labour by Nina V. Sinitsyna and Liudmila I. Zhurova as well as their collaborators. At the moment two volumes have been published in Moscow (volume I containing the works written before 1525 and volume II – the so called Ioasaf collection) and another one in Novosibirsk by Zhurova which embraces the writings common for the Ioasaf, the Khludov and the Rumiantsev collections which were gathered during Maximus' lifetime. The critical edition is far from being complete but we have at our disposal a large part of Maximus' compositions and virtually all his important works.

In the new century scholars produced also a large number of researches of unequal quality. Besides the excellent works by Zhurova (2008) and Pliguzov (2002 – two chapters of this work are devoted to Maximus), a book by Konovalov (2014) giving some interesting observations, there exist also a number of dissertations that say more about their authors than about their subject.<sup>9</sup>

Previous studies have focused largely on philological and textological questions that was necessary for the preparation of the critical edition of Maximus' works. Now, when the essential part of his corpus is published, it is necessary to pay more attention to the Greek's ideas.

Certainly, scholars have already studied his thought and a part of this research remains valuable. Many of them were however charged with unsatisfactory knowledge of sources. An even a more important problem was that scholars not rarely succumbed to the temptation of prejudices or of instrumental use of their research. Such temptations always threaten historians, but Maximus' complex biography and his link with the complicated problems of the relationship between the Christians in the East and West increased the inclination to win the Greek over to one's own side.

Thus, Denissov tries to depict him as more occidental and looked even (rather groundlessly) for Thomas Aquinas' impact on his thought, Ivanov attempted to show that he was not *latinised*, while Greek authors tended to call him *enlightener* of the Russian people.<sup>10</sup>

---

2014, 4-12 (see below). The most recent summary on Maximus the Greek, with an extensive bibliography, can be found in GRAZANITI 2019<sup>c</sup>.

9 Among important contributions new works by M. Gromov (1983), V. Krutetskii (1991), H. Olmsted (1989, 2002), E. Romodanovskaia (2000), A. Shashkov, O. Straknov (1994) should be enumerated.

10 On Denissov cf. e.g. chapter III, note 21. NB, Denissov wrote a book *L'Eglise russe devant le Thomisme*, Paris 1936. On Ivanov: chapter II, note 190. For Greek authors see: Γρ. Παπαμιχαηλ, Μάξιμος ὁ Γραικός. Ὁ πρῶτος φωτιστής τῶν Ρώσων Ἀθηναίς 1950; Βλ. Φειδας, in: Εκκλησια 65 (1988), pp. 274-277, 315-317, 351-353, 387-390; Ἅγιος Μαξιμος ὁ Γραικος, ὁ φωτιστής τῶν Ρώσων, Μεταφρασις - ἐπιμελεῖα Ἱερας Μονῆς Ὁσίου

Ivanov was especially tempted to use a priori judgments. It was visibly hard for him to imagine that Maximus would have done anything that was in opposition to the main line of Orthodoxy, especially the Russian Orthodoxy. Consequently, he considered that the Greek could not speak against Basil III's second marriage because the Church allowed it, nor could he question the independence of the Muscovite Church from Constantinople.<sup>11</sup>

Similarly, the conviction of Maximus' sanctity (even before his official canonisation) resulted in a quasi-persuasion of some authors that Maximus could not do anything wrong, as if all saints should be holy from the very beginning of their lives.<sup>12</sup>

In addition to that, in the Western literature there were quite many factual errors or loose interpretations, even among excellent authors, that resulted from relying entirely on secondary literature.<sup>13</sup>

Therefore Maximus' history should be written anew, especially for those who do not know the Russian language. And the question: who was Maximus? still awaits a fuller answer. The first attempt to integrate the figure of Maximus was undertaken 70 years ago by Denissoff. The development of detailed studies calls for a new synthesis.

Similarly, much wider knowledge about the situation of Maximus' three worlds induce us to rethink the interaction between the ideas coming from these worlds in Maximus' literary output.<sup>14</sup> The understanding of this osmosis in the Greek monks' thought could contribute to a broader vision of the interaction (and isolation) between Christian East and West.

Maximus was Orthodox but he knew the West. In Moscow he met at least one Catholic (Nicholas Bülow) who had learnt much more about Muscovite Orthodoxy than Western

---

Γρηγορίου Αγίου Ορους, Αθήνα 1991. Recently BULANIN 2017, 90 formulated a thesis that the conflict which resulted in Maximus' incarceration was in fact a confrontation of two cultures: The Byzantine one and the Muscovite. Further Bulanin tries to explain (unconvincingly) that later (when he received the possibility to read and write again) he was incorporated in a new Muscovite ideology.

11 On second marriage: IVANOV 1976, 288; on the Muscovite Church, *ibid.*, 293-5.

12 Cf. Ivanov's reaction (IVANOV 1976, 289-90) to A.A. Zimin's opinions. In his letter to the metropolitan Daniel (ZHUROVA 1998, 31-2) Maximus confessed that perhaps some of his mistakes could have resulted from excessive drinking. The Russian translator hastened to add in the note that it was Maximus' collaborators who could allowed themselves to do that, not Maximus himself even if in the text the Greek speaks unambiguously about himself (cf. *Сочинения преподобного Максима Грека в русском переводе, Свято-Троицкая Сергиева Лавра 1910, vol. 1, 234*).

13 E.g. S. Runciman in his foreword to MEDELIN – PATRINELIS 1971, 8 says that Maximus was a friend of Savonarola. GEANAKOPOLOS 1988, 453 says that Maximus was Nil Sorskii's friend. In the latter work (p.452-3) references to KAZAKOVA 1960 do not correspond to the real text. Many authors repeat, without evidence, that Maximus knew Giovanni Pico and so on.

14 E.g. BULANIN 1984, 8 thinks that, because Maximus' stay on Athos is little researched, too much weight is attached to the impact of the Western Renaissance on Maximus' work. OBOLENSKY 1999, 219 considers that, in order to estimate the role each of three culture played in his life and beliefs, one should answer following questions: "[...] what was the nature of his Platonisme, and how did he square it with his Christian beliefs? What led him to leave the Dominican order and retire to Mount Athos? And what impact did his writings have upon later Russian literature?"

travellers to the exotic northern country and knew at least a few Muscovites who were eager to know more about the Western thought. Living in Muscovy, Maximus kept contact with his old friends (probably Greek but perhaps even Italian). His experience gives us a unique possibility to observe how a certain sense of Christian unity survived the worst tests and, at the same time, how, because of the progressing estrangement, the divisions were becoming more and more profound.

The aim of this study is obviously more modest than a new synthesis. First of all I want to gather the results of newer detailed research and to integrate them into a fuller portrait of Maximus. The sufficient reason to ponder over his troubled life is the fact that it offers a unique insight into the human condition of that time. Yet, for a historian, especially the historian interested in the divided Christianity, the impact of different traditions on the Greek's life and the interaction of different sources (Western, Byzantine and Muscovite) in his literary output makes it especially instructive. Both through the events of his biography and through his ideas one can observe a crucial period in the relationship between divided Christians, after the council of Florence and the fall of Constantinople. The feeble chances for dialogue and obstacles to it can be this way better understood. Finally, as an engaged foreigner, he gives us a particular possibility to observe the evolution of the Orthodoxy in Muscovy, the state of the largest Orthodox population then and today.

The short first chapter of this work presents the situation of Maximus' three *worlds* (post-Byzantine Greece, Renaissance Italy and the growing Muscovy) at the dawn of his life. Relations between the three realms, particularly between Moscow and Western Europe, began to intensify in the fifteenth century. The previous remoteness caused misunderstandings and a sense of estrangement. The rapprochement sparked mutual interest, but also revealed differences. Each of these *worlds* influenced the formation of Maximus' worldview and the choices he made.

Chapter two presents a comprehensive account of Maximus' biography, distinguishing between factual information and conjecture. It incorporates recent research (often dispersed in many various publications) that sheds light on previously unknown aspects of Maximus' life. Considerable space is devoted to presenting the views of Maximus' contemporaries, both the people he met in Italy and his interlocutors in Muscovy. In this way Maximus' life path becomes more clear and his works more readable, since they were often written as a response to someone's question, an objection to someone's views or a reaction to an event. When the

lack of data did not allow me to reconstruct the events of his own life (especially when the Italian and Athonite period is concerned), I attempt to depict his environment in order to give at least a contour of the situation in which he dwelt.

For chapter three which is dedicated to Maximus' ideas, I have selected a few key themes that were important to him and reflect the various influences on Maximus' thought. Analysing his views provides an opportunity to better understand the tensions, discords but also the possibilities for rebuilding bridges between Western Christianity which had not yet been divided and Orthodoxy.

The concern of how to do theology, the permissibility of using philosophical tools (syllogisms) in theology and the relationship between secular knowledge and revealed wisdom came to the fore very clearly during the discussions at the Council of Florence. The works of Maximus demonstrate that these problems were still relevant and impeded mutual understanding.

The topic of human freedom, as explored by Maximus in relation to astrological beliefs, was a subject of intense debate during the first half of the sixteenth century between Luther and Erasmus, to mention only the most famous example.

Reflecting on the use of religious argumentation in resolving of socio-political problems provides an opportunity to observe the diversification of the traditional approach dominant in the Christian world. An analysis of Maximus' views is a good starting point for scrutinising the beginnings of this evolution.

Finally, this study examines how Maximus approaches the traditional themes of the Catholic-Orthodox polemic. Although the themes may remain the same as in previous generations, the way in which they are developed can indicate the direction in which the relationship will evolve.

Each subchapter of the chapter three could be developed into a separate book. Here they are gathered together to give an introductory vision and, at the same time, to outline perspectives for further research.

My study is based almost entirely on printed sources since, as it has been said, the core of Maximus' corpus is today available in the critical edition. We have at our disposal two volumes of Maximus' collected works edited by Nina V. Sinitsyna (and her collaborators), a volume edited by Liudmila I. Zhurova and a number of dispersed works edited separately by various authors. An important fact is that in last thirty years a number of Maximus' works in Greek (original writings or copies executed by him) were discovered and it seems that new

discoveries are still possible.<sup>15</sup>

Older editions of Maximus' works are still useful but must be used carefully, in the light of contemporary scholarship because they contain both works that belong indisputably to Maximus, those where that authorship is disputed, his translations considered as his original works and compilations that have a connection with his output but cannot be considered as his own creativity.

Besides Maximus' own works, other contemporary documents shed light on his biography and help to understand his writings. Early biographies (edited critically by Nina V. Sinitsyna) are generally short. They require particular verification, when the Italian and the Greek period of Maximus' life is concerned. From among other biographical sources, Maximus' life written by an Old Believer, Simeon Mokhovikov, deserves special attention. It was written only at the beginning of the eighteenth century but it sheds light on events or circumstances not mentioned in other sources. It should be however read with caution because it contains some improbably information beside possibly valuable data.

Testimonies of and letters both to and from his friends and acquaintances (it concerns both the Greek and Italian period as well as the rest of his life spent in Muscovy) are valuable sources because their authors were not interested in deforming information concerning facts. Sometimes they are the only source of details (especially concerning private life of their authors) not known otherwise.

Some information can be found in statements of people not so close to Maximus as a foreign observer – Herberstein (he repeats what he learned about Maximus) and Zinovii Otenski who probably did not know him personally. Their knowledge was limited since they did not have a direct contact with described facts but they neither had reason to distort the particulars they had learned.

Very important but biased are the sources concerning the events that shaped Maximus' destiny in Muscovy i.e. both trials in 1525 and 1531. The *Sudnye spiski*, pretending to be records of court proceedings, are rather a compilation of the real minutes (which certainly existed) with partisan insertions of a later editor.<sup>16</sup> Similarly the records of the investigation carry traces of manipulation.<sup>17</sup> Also *Sudnoe delo* of Vassian Patrikeev brings some information about Maximus who was judged together with Patrikeev in 1531. These three documents were edited by Maximus' and Patrikeev's adversaries so they cannot be taken at face value. They are

---

15 Cf. BULANIN 2017, 85-87.

16 Cf. KAZAKOVA 1970, 189-93.

17 Cf. e.g. below, chapter II, note 380 and the entire edition by Obolensky (cf. bibliography).

a precious source but must be used with precaution. Again, all of them have not been preserved in their entirety which makes their interpretations more difficult.

Finally, we found scanty but important records in chronicles and in the diplomatic correspondence of the Grand Prince's chancellery. They are most often credible, as far as facts are concerned, because they were written shortly after the events described had taken place. Yet, the circumstances and motivations of described persons, shown in them, need a critical approach. In the case of chronicles, the way the events described were presented depended on the current policy of the authorities. The Prince's emissaries, in their letters, conveyed to Moscow what they saw or heard but their understanding of the foreign context was sometimes limited and knowledge not sufficient.

Maximus the Greek was an eclectic writer and also my approach to the subject is eclectic. I do not follow any particular methodological school. Many previous researchers were ideologically overburdened and one of my main concerns was to avoid, as far as I could, presuppositions and to let Maximus alone speak for himself. My awareness of the bygone tendentious interpretations does not guarantee that I will avoid errors but it is at least an opportunity to be more watchful.

Some sociological ideas concerning the *our vs stranger* paradigm and research on heresy and orthodoxy were an inspiration for me but no more than that.<sup>18</sup> The principal aim of this work is to reconstruct how Maximus lived and what he thought. The comparative approach was here necessary because, against the background of his contemporaries' ideas, his own beliefs become more understandable. Further research will allow more generalised conclusions.

---

18 We can identify in Maximus' works some classic motives of the attitude towards strangers, e.g. in his *Съвѣтъ къ Събору православному на Исака Жидовина* Maximus inscribes himself clearly into the model *our vs stranger* when he says about "our Orthodox land" and those Jews who "crucified the One whom we worship" (M-II, 339). Even more however the way of understanding the world according to the scheme: our vs stranger was revealed in Maximus' Muscovite accusers to himself: cf. also chapter II, note 479.

# Chapter 1

## CONTEXT: THE THREE WORLDS OF MAXIMUS THE GREEK

I have borrowed the title of this chapter from Dimitri Obolensky (*Italy, Mount Athos and Muscovy. The three Worlds of Maximus the Greek*) because the various spheres of Maximus' experience were not just different countries but they were indeed different worlds. Christianity, from the very beginning of its history experienced divisions. The fracture between the East and the West, however, was incomparable. It was not a separation of a group which, in consequence, became more or less marginal. It was a division of two halves.<sup>1</sup>

In this chapter I am going to give a general outline of the situation of divided Christianity and the interaction between its parts on the eve of Maximus' activity. Through the understanding of his intellectual, spiritual but also political and even emotional heritage we will be well-equipped to understand his own thought.

During the first centuries both parts of Christianity (still in communion) developed more or less at the same pace. However, from the fourth century their routes had diverged. The West declined while the Byzantine Empire continued to flourish. In the Church, there were divisions but they always ended in reconciliation between the Greeks and the Latins. Culturally the estrangement grew.

After the purely symbolic date of 1054 the awareness of a unity persisted and the very existence of the schism was not obvious to everyone. Yet, the balance of power was changing in favour of the Latins and the Greeks felt badly the arrogance of the Latins. The capture and the sack of Constantinople in 1204 was a sign of this change and, at the same time, one of the decisive factors of the Byzantine anti-Westernism, since the fellow Christians turned out to be enemies.

The most interesting and fruitful for the relationship between the East and the West was the epoch from about 1261 until the fall of Constantinople. During this period mutual interest

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. OBOLENSKY 1999. SHEVCHENKO 2009 writes even about four world of Maximus.

grew, even if it concerned only a part of the upper class of both societies. The majority of the population remained in isolation strengthened by reciprocal stereotypes and rancour. Yet among the intellectuals the situation was different. Western humanists turned to the Byzantines who had preserved the legacy of both pagan and Christian antiquity. Some Eastern thinkers regarded Western theology as a valuable source of inspiration and translated its classics.

In each period, apart from the mainstream of mutual reluctance, if not enmity, there were always people who were capable of a wider vision and who strove to overcome divisions. Shortly after the symbolic division of 1054, Theophylact of Ohrid in the East did not think that Rome and Constantinople were in schism. He warned Eastern Christians not to exclude Western Christians from the Church lest they should find themselves excluded from the Kingdom of heaven. Roughly at the same time in the West, Anselm of Canterbury also adopted a conciliatory attitude. Following generations had also their peacemakers.<sup>2</sup>

The awareness of a certain communion, although it was impaired, brought about initiatives to renew it. Political motives played an important part in these attempts but also a sincere pursuit of unity that had never completely ceased.

It was also the case with the Council of Florence which took place during the lifetime of Maximus' parents. Then, for the first time in the second millennium, Eastern and Western theologians gathered to hold a discussion on theological issues (there had not been a serious discussion at the previous unionist council in Lyon). It brought new contacts between Orthodox and Catholics. It aroused new hopes. Nevertheless the union did not bring unity. Judgements about reasons of this failure are as divergent today, as they were directly after the council. Steven Runciman rightly noticed:

“The debates make sterile reading; for they never got down to the fundamental issue. The real bar to union was that Eastern and Western Christendom felt differently about religion; and it is difficult to debate about feelings. [...] The whole question of mysticism and mystical theory, which was of fundamental importance to the Byzantines and on which the West held other opinions, was kept out of the debates, deliberately, it seems, in the case of the Union Council of Florence, because the issue could not be resolved by the methods used in the debates.

---

2 There are many works describing extensively the relationship between Christian East and West. I draw on here from a very synthetic and instructive description by GEANAKOPOLOS 1976, 281-93. On the arrogance of the Latins: CHADWICK 2003, 226. Chadwick (ibid., 219-27) also shows that during the eleventh century on both sides there was genuine hope for the renewal of unity and efforts to maintain good relationship despite differences. On uncertainty concerning the fact of schism, ibid., 222. On Theophylact: THEOPHYLACT OF OHRID, *Against Latins*, 246-7. 280-1; on Anselm: CHADWICK 2003, 224-5; on later generations: GEANAKOPOLOS 1966, 2-5.



The debates were also sterilised by the avoidance of a direct discussion of the essential practical issue, which was the Pope's claim to supremacy over the whole Church. [...] If the average Byzantine had no confidence in the value of a Union council, it was because he saw that its intention was to force his religious life under the control of a foreign potentate whose claims he thought to be uncanonical and whose doctrines faulty, and whose followers in the past had shown themselves to be hostile and intolerant. The most for which he could hope from such a council was to be graciously permitted to retain certain of his ritual usages.”<sup>3</sup>

Runciman is however incorrect when he says sceptically: “The debaters [...] spent their time in hurling texts at each other. The texts were often misquoted or mistranslated and were seldom conclusive.” It is true that the texts were often contaminated and interpolated but the debaters did not know that. What they knew was the fact that the authors of these texts were very often saints and the Byzantine had deep-rooted belief that the saints necessarily have to agree because they are inspired by the same Holy Spirit. This conviction stimulated to a search for compromise. Joseph Gill described in this way the Byzantine approach: “No Saint could err in matters of faith, for they all – this was taken almost as a definition of sanctity – were inspired by the one Holy Spirit. So what they said about the Holy Spirit, no matter how different it might seem to be, could not in actual fact be different. The divergence must be only apparent: it could not be real.”<sup>4</sup>

The union was signed but not implemented. On the Latin side the failure was the result of the tough negotiating position and the tendency to subjugate the Orthodox Church. The Byzantine adherents of the union showed a lack of determination. This lack was used by its more active opponents. The fate of the agreement signed in Florence was sealed because the majority of the lower strata of Byzantine society was hostile to the Latins and a part of elites considered the Ottoman domination to be a better solution than subordination to Rome.<sup>5</sup>

The way in which the decline and the fall of the Byzantine Empire shortly after the union was interpreted, is instructive. The Latins considered the lamentable state of the Byzantine empire as God's just retribution for the Greeks' dalliance with the union while the Greek adversaries of the union regarded it as God's punishment for its signing!<sup>6</sup>

---

3 See: RUNCIMAN 1968, 85-6.

4 On the debaters: RUNCIMAN 1968, 85. On saints in Florence: GILL 1959, 230-1. Cf. also *ibid.*, 240, 242.

5 See: GILL 1959, 395-410. Gill however does not mention that the Latin attitude to subjugate the Orthodox Church was a problem. On the Ottoman domination see below, note 9.

6 Cf. GILL 1959, 378.

## 1. BYZANTIUM – THE WORLD OF GREEK CHRISTIANITY AND THE RUINS OF THE EMPIRE

The Roman state that progressively became an empire had existed since 753 BC but even if we only take into consideration the period from the moment when the emperor Constantine moved the capital to Constantinople, it was one of the most stable organisms of the ancient and medieval world. Before the fall, the empire was gradually losing its strength but it did not lose its splendour. The two last centuries of the political decline was a time of a cultural and religious revival. Arts and learning were in bloom. There was a renewed interest in ancient tradition, so it is not without reason that scholars have named this period: the Palaiologian Renaissance. In religion, the late Byzantine ideas of Gregory Palamas and his followers formed a new spiritual school that not only shaped religious life for a long time but had also an influence on politics.<sup>7</sup> Byzantine culture remained vital and able to enter into dialogue with others (cf. at least the well-known Manuel II's dialogue with his Muslim interlocutor), especially in the domain of spiritual and timeless issues. It was more difficult for Byzantine society to adapt to the changing sublunar reality. The Byzantine State was considered to be a reflection, by mimesis, of the Heavenly Kingdom.<sup>8</sup> Since the latter was unchangeable, it was difficult to change the former. At the dawn of the modern period the Byzantine (and, more widely: the Orthodox) world had a different, from the West, conception of the relationship between the earthly and eternal reality. The West tended towards the appreciation of autonomous value of earthly reality. The Byzantine world remained in the older paradigm that each event or phenomenon of the earthly reality had to be examined in the direct connection to eternity and judged them in the light of eternity. Solutions of social problems were seen in the perspective of the Parousia. Moreover, when the core values were threatened, a tendency appeared in the Byzantine society to defend its identity and to reject what was foreign to it.<sup>9</sup>

The fall of the empire obviously meant that insecurity increased. The famous phrase: "Better a Turkish turban than a Latin tiara" repeated before the fall remained current also after it.<sup>10</sup> It is not astonishing because the Latin policy and unionist tendency caused fears among the

---

7 On the political influence of palamism see: AMAND DE MENDIETA 1955, 40 although it is a biased study.

8 Cf. GEANAKOPOLOS 1976, 27.

9 Cf. GEANAKOPOLOS 1976, 4 attempted to use sociological terms of *nativistic reaction* and *revitalisation movement* to describe the situation of the late Byzantine society.

10 The phrase: "Better a Turkish turban than a Latin tiara." is ascribed to Loukas Notaras, cf. EVERT-KAPPESOWA 1953, 245. HERRIN-McMANUS 2012, 52-3, note 55 say: "This statement is attributed to the historian Doukas, 37.

Byzantines (not without grounds) about losing their identity. These fears were reinforced by the fact that the Western culture was attractive for a part of Byzantine elites. As a matter of fact, more than once, initiatives appeared in the West aimed at the Catholicising of the Byzantine privileged class. Among them expediency competed with the attachment to their own roots and, as a result, in the territories where the union was implemented (predominantly in Venetian possessions), a part of Greeks, accepting formally the union, secretly remained Orthodox.<sup>11</sup>

Islam was too remote to pose a real ideological threat. Conversions to Islam did happen but they were motivated rather by a desire to build a career. There were also cases (it is difficult to estimate how numerous) of CryptoChristianity: the preserving of Christian beliefs with the apparent, superficial acceptance of Islam.<sup>12</sup>

Besides Catholicism and Islam, there was one more element which influenced Byzantine identity. It was the Hellenic heritage. In Byzantium the term Hellenes was, for a long time, synonymous with pagans. Only the Palaiologian Renaissance brought a change to this attitude and some parts of the elites began to refer to the Hellenic tradition.<sup>13</sup> The violent quarrel concerning Plato between two Greeks, Bessarion and George of Trebizond, took place in the West and touched many burning issues concerning the role of Plato and Aristotle in the Christian thought. Some wanted to see Plato as an inspired thinker. Others believed that God aided Aristotle in his work and in Platonic thought they perceived an instigation to heresy or even a role in the rise of Islam.<sup>14</sup>

Despite all the fears and resentment, not all doors were closed for the meeting of Christian East and West. The first eastern council summoned after the seizure of the empire (1484) considered, among other things, the question of how to deal with the Latins converted to the Orthodoxy. It was decided that they should not have to be re-baptised but only to receive

---

10 (see: Vasile Grecu, ed., *Istoria turco-byzantina (1341-1462)*, Bucarest 1958, 329; English translation by Harry Magoulias, *Decline and Fall of Byzantium to the Ottoman Turks*, Detroit 1975, 110). [...] *Papal tiara* is however an incorrect understanding of the Greek phrase *kalyptra latinike*, which seems to refer to political rather than ecclesiastical authority." They refer to: Diether Roderich Reinsch, *Lieber der Turban als was? Bemerkungen zum Dictum des Lukas Notaras*, in: *ΦΙΛΕΛΛΗΝ. Studies in Honour of Robert Browning*, ed. by Costas N. Constantinides et al., Venice 1996, 377-389. On another versions of this saying: Nevra Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, Cambridge 2009, 184, 216-17.

11 On the Byzantine fear of being Latinised: GEANAKOPOLOS 1976, 292-3 and EVERT-KAPPESOWA 1953, 251. On the western initiatives *ibid.*, 12, 16-17 and GEANAKOPOLOS 1966, 2-3. The Greek theologians were, for the most part, anti-Latin, RUNCIMAN 1968, 215. On secretly Orthodox Greeks: HARRIS 1995, 58-9.

12 On conversions to Islam: GEANAKOPOLOS 1976, 174; RUNCIMAN 1968, 184-206. On CryptoChristianity: FRANGEDAKI 1984-85. Michael Apostolis seemed to approve such a solution.

13 See: GEANAKOPOLOS 1976, 18. E.g., there is the still unresolved discussion over whether Gemistos Plethon was really a follower of a pagan religion or only an unorthodox Christian.

14 See: MONFASANI 2008, esp. p. 3 and 9.

the sacrament of confirmation. The fact of the mutual recognition of baptism was an acid test of the relationship between Catholics and Orthodox.<sup>15</sup>

Perhaps even more important than the official, canonical decisions, were the examples of good collaboration between Catholics and Orthodox both under Ottoman rule and in the Venetian provinces, even if the authorities of the Serenissima did not treat its Greek subjects and especially Greek priests on a par with the Latins.<sup>16</sup>

The collapse of the Empire, paradoxically, contributed to a rapprochement of the two communities in places where they already had some contact. For example in Crete, after a period of violent clashes between the Greeks and their Venetian rulers, the situation slowly evolved towards a more peaceful assimilation on both sides. In the second half of the fifteenth century, when – after 1453 the hope for independence became a pure dream – this process started to regain importance.<sup>17</sup>

Greek and Latin scholars had been in contact even earlier. A deeper interest in Latin thought among Byzantine intellectuals had begun in the fourteenth century, as is put in evidence by the translations of Augustine and Thomas Aquinas executed by the Kydones brothers and others. The council of Florence gave an opportunity for new encounters. Yet it was the fall of Constantinople, when many Greeks were forced to seek in the West a possibility of earning their living, that contributed to the enlargement of the relationship between Greek and Latin scholars. The presence of Greek intellectuals in the West was also instrumental in the full bloom of the Renaissance that was partially an afterlife of the Palaiologian renaissance.

The Byzantines themselves, at least some prominent personages from the generation of the council of Florence, seem to be much more interested in the scholastic thought than in Latin humanism. Bessarion's rich library contained more works of Thomas Aquinas than of any other Latin author.<sup>18</sup> Gennadius Scholarius himself translated Thomas Aquinas' works. Despite common intellectual interests, their later life strategies were different. Bessarion remained faithful until the end of his days to the union he had signed in Florence while Scholarius, having been one of the leaders of the Greek unionist faction in Florence, later became Mark of Ephesus' spiritual successor and the head of the anti-union movement.

---

15 Cf. RUNCIMAN 1968, 228.

16 Cf. RUNCIMAN 1968, 227 on positive examples and on Venetian injustice towards Greeks. Also GEANAKOPOLOS 1966, 3 gives examples of a more open attitude both on Catholic and Orthodox sides in a longer perspective, from the eleventh century.

17 See: PANAGIOTAKES 1995, 319-20 and passim.

18 Bessarion's latin scholastic library contained over two hundred volumes, including thirty Thomas Aquinas' books, MONFASANI 2008, 2.

There were also people among their contemporaries, such as Michael Apostolis, who was not free from old stereotypes and prejudices but in whom, especially in the face of the common enemy, a tendency to search for unity prevailed. Michael was persuaded of the Greeks' absolute intellectual superiority but, at the same time, he prayed to Christ: "Remove from us the bitter executioner and enemy; grant harmony to all who bear the name of Christ even if this hitherto has been impossible. But now let them [the Christians] enjoy concord because of the Turks, who commit evil acts without ceasing and tread upon your holy vessels, insulting the pure faith and the Church itself, to which you have promised, *Nor can the gates of Hell prevail over the Church.*"<sup>19</sup>

## 2. ITALY – THE WORLD OF LATIN CHRISTIANITY AND THE HUMANISM

The West was evolving and one of the privileged places of this evolution was Italy. Often this social and cultural transformation is described as a passage from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance. These terms are, however, conventional and of limited utility in scholarship. In some places the Middle Ages lasted until the eighteenth century, in others the Renaissance began as early as the twelfth century. The change of paradigm however did take place, even if it proceeded unevenly. It was especially visible among the educated parts of society where, since the second half of the fifteenth century, the new ideas spread incomparably faster thanks to the invention of printing.

One of the originalities of the new intellectual landscape was a renewed appreciation of nature, of human nature first of all. In fact, it was rather a new understanding of nature, considered without a direct connection with its Creator. This fact was the cause of more attention being paid to secular activity in social life, in education and art. Secular values were regarded more often outside their relationship to the eternal world, as autonomous values. Another significant factor was the new understanding of human creativity. It was seen more and more often not only as imitation of nature, but as its transformation and improvement that would have been unthinkable for previous generations.<sup>20</sup>

Further, a more challenging approach to the existing tradition was born. It was still far

---

19 Apostolis' speech was published by: Βασ. Λαούρδας, Μιχαήλ Αποστόλη λόγος περί Ελλάδος και Ευρώπης, "Επετηρίς Εταιρείας Βυζαντινών Σπουδών" 19 (1949), 235-44. I used the translation by GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 109-10. Another fragment of this speech is quoted in chapter II, text and note 19.

20 On the extensive discussion about the relationship between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance see entries in EoR: *Middle Ages* (BERSTEIN 1999) and the subentry *The Renaissance in Historical Thought* (GRENDLER 1999). This passage is based on these entries and on DUPRÉ 1993, part I; VASOLI 1988; KRISTELLER 1988.

from the Enlightenment with its glorification of progress but respect for received heritage was not strong enough to refrain thinkers from questioning some elements of tradition. Certainly, critical thinking had existed before. Medieval scholars were not less thorough and acute in their approach towards their sources. Yet, where the established authorities were concerned, they preferred to save them (resorting to the *expositio reverenter*) rather than to prove their inaccuracy. Their Renaissance counterparts were bolder and less reverential. The classic example is Lorenzo Valla's demonstration that the *Donatio Constantini* was a forgery. The results of Valla's work overstepped the boundaries of pure scholarship. It signified a criticism of the Constantinian model of Christianity where spiritual and secular spheres were interwoven and supported one another.

Since the monastic movement, starting from the fourth century, was a reaction to this model, the criticism of the Constantinian model meant also an alteration of the role monasticism played in Christianity. The monastic path was more rarely understood as a privileged, if not unique, way to Christian perfection. The ideal of contemplative life was no longer reserved for monks. It was secularised and also humanists considered themselves as people who led contemplative lives.

Similarly, in humanist theology, influenced by Nominalism, major changes occurred. Analogy, as a method in theological investigation was rejected. This resulted in the impossibility to infer conclusions about eternal things, based on temporal realities. The place which philosophy had occupied in theological research (especially in scholasticism), was now accounted for linguistic study. Philological methods of text analysis, applied to the Bible, became the principal instrument of the new theology.<sup>21</sup>

These new ideas influenced education. Humanists introduced a new curriculum, so the transformation of the cultural paradigm, which at first concerned only a narrow circle, in following generations included wider and more diverse social groups.

The followers of the new cultural pattern drew abundantly and with admiration from ancient sources that were unknown or little known before in the West. Many of them had become accessible thanks to the Byzantine scholars, especially those who arrived at the council of Florence. The use that Western Renaissance thinkers made of them and their conclusions were however often alien to the Byzantine spirit. The Byzantines did not want to represent nature but rather through symbols to refer to the heavenly origins. They did not want to grant autonomy to earthly realities but to regard them in the light of eternity. The Byzantine Church,

---

21 Cf. CAMPOREALE 1993, 104-5 and, for contemplative life, KRISTELLER 1988, 127-9.

finally, was not ready to modify the role of monasticism within Christianity. On one hand monks were too powerful to undermine their position. On the other, the conviction that monasticism was the exemplary realisation of a Christian vocation, was very deeply rooted in the Byzantine consciousness.

The crisis in the Western Church did not help the renewal of mutual understanding between the East and the West. First the Western schism and then the contention concerning the authority of pope and council undermined the authority of ecclesiastical institutions. Not less consequential was the decay of morals among the clergy and the quarrels between Christian princes. This situation led to the healthy reaction of demanding the reform of the Church, *in capite et in membris*. Subsequent councils, embroiled in the conciliarist controversy, were unable to carry out the radical renewal. This dispute also rendered the negotiation with the Eastern Church more difficult. When finally the representatives of both Churches met at the council, the Western fathers were so absorbed in the question of the union that they neglected the work of reforms. This fact contributed to the emergence of the Reformation and, in consequence, to the division within Western Christianity.<sup>22</sup>

Thus, structural factors were not conducive to the reconciliation between the East and the West. Yet, in the everyday life, the Western approach towards Eastern Christian began to change.

The fall of Constantinople caused a shockwave in the West. People spoke about a great loss for the whole of Christianity, people composed poems and prayed in churches. At first, the old stereotypes and enmity still played a considerable part, strengthened by the new conviction that the fall of the city was God's punishment for the rejection of the union. Yet, in the biggest Greek diaspora, in Venice, the Greeks slowly obtained the recognition (even if limited) of their right to preserve their religious identity.

However, as time passed, a sense of Christian solidarity came to the fore. Both the pope and princes used their influence to help the refugees from Constantinople. In the second half of the fifteenth century the Greeks were more and more seen as co-religionists. The practice of keeping Greek captives as slaves gradually decreased since sermons were preached against the evil of enslaving fellow-Christians.<sup>23</sup>

Compared to the decadent and then fallen Byzantium, the West took on a force and

---

22 GILL 1959, p. VII expresses such an opinion. It is also shared by other scholars.

23 See: HARRIS 1995, 39-84; MANOUSSACAS 1989, 322-323 and ff. Cf. also GEANAKOPOLOS 1976, 177-178.

developed. Yet, its foundations were shaken and the fifteenth or sixteenth-century observer could not be sure that the changes would lead to a happy ending.

### 3. MOSCOW – THE WORLD OF SLAVONIC CHRISTIANITY AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH BYZANTIUM AND THE WEST

Muscovy was in a completely different situation both compared to Rome and to Byzantium. Russian culture and political structures were much younger. Official Christianisation of Rus' began at the end of tenth century but Christianity had already permeated there earlier. The Tartar invasion and the dependence on the Horde in thirteenth and fourteenth centuries had isolated most of Russian lands from the rest of the Christian world. In the second part of the fourteenth century Kievan Rus' entered into the sphere of influence of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and, still keeping contact with the Christian East, had more and more contacts with Western Christianity. Muscovy remained longer in the sphere of the Horde's influence and its political significance grew during this period. From a peripheral and insignificant principality it gradually gained more independence and weight. Yet, up until 1502 the khan of the Great (Golden) Horde was its nominal sovereign and received tribute from Muscovy. Even in 1521 it was constrained to pay tribute to the Crimea Khanate (the successor of the Great Horde) after the devastating invasion of that year. The isolation had also a significance in the religious sphere. While in the twelfth century Western Christians were still considered as co-religionists, in fourteenth century they were described using the word that meant pagans.<sup>24</sup>

The geographical distance and the long isolation was the cause of the Byzantine and, more widely, ancient heritage being little known in Muscovy. Bonds with Byzantium were close but, in the field of learning, they did not manage to bear the fruit of an insightful reception of Byzantine and ancient thought. Kievan Rus' and Muscovy knew, some liturgical, canonical and ascetic literature, and yet only in a limited quantity. Philosophical and theological dogmatic works were almost absent in the Muscovite library. The very fact that the word *philosophy* appears in Russian manuscripts does not mean that the classical philosophical tradition was present. The term *philosophy* was used to describe wisdom, education or even a certain cunning in the use of intellectual capacities.

---

<sup>24</sup> An overview of the relationship between Muscovy and Tartars: OSTROWSKI 2006<sup>a</sup>, 235-8. On the changed attitude towards Western Christians: KOZLOV-STRUTINSKII-PARFENT'EV 2014, 15-102.



We also have to treat with caution the presence of philosophical passages or ideas in Muscovite manuscripts. This presence does not ensure that they were actually understood and discussed and this was still the case when Maximus the Greek lived in Muscovy. Nevertheless, a basic philosophical terminology in Russian began to take shape.<sup>25</sup>

As for the Fathers of the Church, a few works by Gregory of Nazianzus, John of Damascus, John Climacus and Cyril of Alexandria were known. Apart from that the patristic tradition was known only from the fragments quoted by other authors and sometimes in a simplified form. Knowledge of Greek scientific texts was negligible.<sup>26</sup>

The long period of the Tartar domination was the cause that, even after the liberation from the Tartar yoke, Tartar influences remained in social life and the remembrance of the previous dependence evoked an ideological anti-muslim reaction.<sup>27</sup> After the period of prevailing eastern domination, in the fifteenth century the direction of influence began to reverse and a Western impact entered into Muscovite life.<sup>28</sup>

It was in this period that the council of Florence took place. Apart from social and political changes, Muscovy had to face a religious challenge. The council was one of the crucial events that shaped the further development of the relationship between Muscovy and both the Western and the Greek Christianity. It seems that before the council the attitude of its Muscovite participants towards the West was not particularly negative and that the results of the council were not immediately questioned in Moscow. For some time Isidore had a freedom

---

25 The discussion on the *intellectual silence* of Muscovy was often charged ideologically and scholars more than once expressed value judgements concerning this question (or were suspected to do that). An example of the importance of this question could be the fact that the first woman in Russian history who became doctor of philosophy, Мария Владимировна Безобразова, devoted her thesis to the presence of the classical tradition in Rus': "Handschriftliche Materialien zur Geschichte der Philosophie in Russland" (defended at the University of Bern and published in Leipzig in 1892). An important stage of this discussion were the works of Francis Thomson. His articles on this question are collected in THOMSON 1999. He expressed a radical but a well founded position that the reception of the classical tradition in Muscovy was insignificant. NB, he thinks that it was not the Mongols who were responsible for Russia's intellectual isolation but the Church (ibid., I, 120). He summarises his view and discussion on the intellectual silence in the introduction (Intellectual silence of Early Russia, ibid., esp. xi-xxii). Cf. also a review of his book by Pierre Gonneau, RES 73 (2001), 535-7, with a short description of the discussion on the book. Thomson is a fierce polemist and even if he is against value judgments (THOMSON 1999, Intellectual silence of Early Russia, xx), he himself uses such judgement speaking e.g. about obscurantism of the [Orthodox] Church (ibid., xvi). Yet, he rightly maintains that his opponents have not submitted weighty arguments against his views. On the development of the Russian philosophical terminology: KOVTUN 1963, 257.

26 About limited reception of patrology (on the example of John of Damascus who was known in narrow circles, in a simplified form and with moralistic additions): GROMOV 1983, 93. On meagre reception of Greek scientific works: SHEVCHENKO 1981. Cf. also FRANKLIN 2002. In a newer literature MIL'KOV 2008 is a good example of the confusion. He wrote about the tradition of the Greek classical philosophy in Rus' giving examples of rare and late manuscripts.

27 Cf. OSTROWSKI 2006<sup>a</sup>, 2, 237 and a vivid discussion on this topic around Ostrowski's book (OSTROWSKI 1998) in "Kritika" vol. 1 (2000), no. 2 and 4. On anti-muslim reaction see below, note 30.

28 See: OSTROWSKI 2006<sup>a</sup>, 219.

of action in Moscow but eventually, probably because of his lack of diplomacy, he had to depart from Muscovy.<sup>29</sup> After rejecting Isidore as metropolitan, the problem arose of how act in the new situation. It is true that Rus' had made some attempts before to obtain more ecclesiastical independence but the authority, especially the doctrinal authority, of the Mother Church was not questioned. Now the problem appeared of how to appoint a new metropolitan. The Church in Moscow was not prepared to solve this difficulty and during seven years after Isidore's departure from Moscow there was no metropolitan.

When the decision was finally taken and, in 1448, Jonas (Иона) was appointed metropolitan in Moscow without the approval of Constantinople, the Grand Prince, Basil II, emphasised that it was only because of the difficulties of going to Constantinople and of domestic troubles. Basil wanted to ask the patriarch (the letter containing this request was written but never sent) to grant Muscovy the freedom to elect and consecrate metropolitans. It signifies that Moscow was not eager to break with its Mother Church. Eventually however the isolationist tendencies won and Muscovite authorities declared that the union was an act of treason of Orthodoxy.

In the religious realm, by nature conservative, radical rearrangements evoke unrest. It was all the more true in isolated Muscovy. The rupture with Constantinople meant that Muscovite Orthodoxy found itself deprived of a spiritual reference point.<sup>30</sup>

Relatively shortly after these events, Muscovy started to be more interested in contacts with the West. It did not mean, of course, a religious rapprochement to the West, since it was precisely because of the union with the West that Moscow turned away from Constantinople. Paradoxically, however, the participation of the Muscovite delegation in the Council was one of the events which revived the contacts of Muscovy with the West.<sup>31</sup> There were also other factors. Novgorod which had had intense contacts with the West, especially with the Hanseatic states, was conquered by Moscow in 1478 and became Muscovy's window to the West (even if Novgorod's association with the Hansa was ended). The Russian lands of the Grand Duchy of

---

29 On the attitude towards the West before the council: KOZLOV-STRUTINSKII-PARFENT'EV 2014, 77-9. They advance an interesting hypothesis that the union was not immediately rejected in Muscovy: KOZLOV-STRUTINSKII-PARFENT'EV 2014, 81-89. It seems that pursuit of autocephaly preceded the declaration the Council was un-orthodox and that the so called *Слово на латыню* was an attempt to find ideological basis to justify the rupture with Constantinople, *ibid.* 94-6.

30 Cf. ALEF 1961 and RUNCIMAN 1968, 321-3. Alef (*op. cit.*, 390) maintains that "the consecration of a native metropolitan in Moscow was a consequence of severe secular pressures resulting from a local crisis." Cf. also PLIGUZOV 2002, 11. On attempts to obtain more ecclesiastical autonomy by Kiev and Moscow see: OBOLENSKY 1957, *passim*. Some of his conclusion are however based on uncertain source data.

31 On two relation of this journey and two other works concerning the West (descriptions of European rulers) see: SINITSYNA 1997, 43. A broader description of sources concerning Muscovite reception of the council of Florence: KOZLOV-STRUTINSKII-PARFENT'EV 2014, 72-3.

Lithuania that had many links with the West and, at the same time, were close to Muscovy because of their orthodox population. This closeness facilitated mutual contacts and made possible the influx of Lithuanian nobility into Muscovite service.

The reign of Ivan III was crucial. He consolidated the state, he brought about the codification of the law (*Sudebnik*, 1497), he developed diplomatic relations with the West and skilfully strove to obtain the recognition of his tsar's dignity, understood as equal to that of the emperor. The growth of his country was also reflected in the construction of the new buildings of the Muscovite Kremlin that were designed or overseen by Western (especially Italian) architects, engineers and other specialists.

This turn towards the West did not mean a sense of proximity, it happened out of expediency. Yet, it caused new relationships also in other domains, mutual curiosity and intellectual interests since Muscovy and the West were for each other *terra incognita*.<sup>32</sup>

Ivan III's policy, although it was not his principal aim, contributed to Muscovy's growing openness towards the West. In this process the attraction of the Western civilisation was blended with a feeling of a cultural and religious strangeness.

For the Orthodox Church it was also a period of changes when external factors played a role and the attitude towards the outer world had to be reconsidered. After the above-mentioned rejection of the council of Florence and emancipation from the Patriarchate of Constantinople also the political factors weighed on her internal life. During the period of the dependence on the Tartars, the Orthodox Church had gained a privileged position and recognised the khan as the legitimate ruler. After the liberation from the Tartar yoke an ideological adjustment was necessary and the Church developed radically hostile anti-Tartar writings.<sup>33</sup>

The life of the Church was also shattered by heterodox movements. The new heretics (called *Judaizers*) had first appeared in Novgorod. The Archbishop of the city, Gennadii (1484-1504, †1505) began to fight them in 1487. After the council of 1490 which judged heretics, Joseph of Volokolamsk joined him and both of them became the most relentless enemies of Muscovite heresies. They were anxious about the general doubts among orthodox people, both clergy and laity, about the influence of heretics and the deserted churches.<sup>34</sup>

---

32 See: OSTROWSKI 2006<sup>a</sup>, 232-4 and *passim*. Western interest in Muscovy was also stimulated by current need, especially political ones. The pope and the emperor wanted to construct a broad anti-Turkish alliance and, by the way, a curiosity concerning the distant and unknown nord-eastern country appeared in the West. Cf. ZIMIN 1982, 73-4 and KUDRIAVTSEV 1997, 10 and *passim*.

33 On the privileged position of the Church and recognition of the khan: MARTIN 2006<sup>a</sup>, 149. 153. On anti-Tartar ideology: OSTROWSKI 2006<sup>a</sup>, 213-14. 237.

34 On heresies: MILLER 2006, 348-51; KLIER 1997 and PLIGUZOV 1992. On anxiety: "... ныне же и в домах, и на путех и на торжищех иноци и мирстии вси сомнятся", JOSEPH OF VOLOKOLAMSK, *Missives*, 170; Gennadii's

The problem was domestic but its sources might have been external. At least Gennadii searched for foreign origins. The term *Judaizers* which was used in reference to the heretics (Gennadii imputed them Jewish beliefs or customs), was neither primordial nor did it describe the essence of their beliefs. At first they were accused of iconoclasm and of preferring the Old Testament. Only later the accusations were, in one way or another, linked to the rejection of Christ's divinity. As often happens in cases against heresy, it is not easy to distinguish the heretics' real views from the incriminations of their enemies who had won and it was mainly their writings that survived.<sup>35</sup>

Judaism was almost a synonym of any heresy but even if the problem was really linked to the Jews, strangers par excellence, the Novgorod Archbishop looked for the sources of heresy among Jews who had arrived in Muscovy as foreigners. According to him, the heresy appeared in Novgorod with a Jew who came with the retinue of Kiev prince Michael Olel'kovich (1470), so, for him, it was a Lithuanian intrigue. In Moscow the problem allegedly appeared when Theodore Kuritsyn returned having fulfilled his diplomatic mission in Hungary in 1485.<sup>36</sup>

The conviction of a foreign influence was a handy approach because it made it possible to conserve the opinion about the purity of Muscovite Orthodoxy. It does not change the fact that, in that period, the Western impact, as we have already seen, was growing in Muscovy and it might have been that it contributed to the emergency of unaccepted beliefs. Significantly, the new heresy developed in Novgorod, as had the fourteenth-century heresy of *strigol'niki* in Pskov, both cities that had the most external contacts. Yet, the situation was new, compared to the struggle with heresy in the fourteenth century. People suspected of heresy, at least a part of them, considered themselves to be true Christians, they wanted to remain within the Church and, unlike *strigol'niki*, most of them were members of the clergy.<sup>37</sup> They considered themselves as those who renewed the Church rather than those who ruined her. Scarcity of sources does not give a sufficient basis to call them heretics *sensu stricto*.

---

letter to metropolitan Zosima, AFED 377 and his letters to bishops Prokhor and Ioasaf in AFED. In his letter to archbishop Ioasaph, Gennadii says that "Новгород с Москвою не едино православие" (heretics were influential in Moscow at the Grand Prince court), see: AEFD.

35 On the so called Judaizers see, e.g. PUGUZOV 1992. Cf. also KORETSKII 1963, 357.

36 The question of the Jewish influences is not resolved, cf. MILLER 2006, note 31. An example that the Jewish tendency could be used as almost a synonym of any heresy, cf. АНКНИМУК 1990, 139 and 143 ("Недостойно бо есть им зде быти, жидове бо, не исповедующе Господа нашего Иисуса Христа истинного Бога, ни Богородицу святую Марию." - quotation from the page 143). Cf. also KLIER 1997, 345. On Kiev prince: AFED 375, on Kuritsyn, *ibid.*, 377. The tendency to see sources of heresy as foreign was also expressed Joseph of Volokolamsk. In the beginning of his *Prosvetitel* (Enlightener) he says that during the first 409 years of Christianity in Rus' there was no heresy.

37 See: KLIER 1997, 347.

Gennadii realised that his flock hardly knew the truths of their own faith and that the heretics were far better educated. Strikingly, he decided to use the Western experience to prepare a new, more complete, translation of the Bible and to translate other texts, that would be useful in the struggle against heretics. One of the translators was a Dominican, Benjamin who translated from the Vulgata. Translators employed also German and Czech (Hussite) versions of the Bible.<sup>38</sup>

Gennadii drew from the West not only knowledge but also a practical solution concerning the struggle with heresies. He recalled, with appreciation, the account of the imperial envoy on how the king of Spain had cleansed his country of heretics and he sent this account to the authorities in Moscow. The methods of the Spanish inquisition might have influenced Gennadii's own belief that heretics should be exterminated or, at least, have confirmed his point of view.<sup>39</sup>

Another testimony that the Western ideas penetrated into Muscovy is a work by the already mentioned Dominican Benjamin. In the discussion, at the turn of the fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries, concerning ecclesiastical proprieties, he wrote *Slovo kratko* (probably commissioned by archbishop Gennadii) where he gave arguments that the Church lands are unalienable. This question, as well as the problem of simony, were discussed during the, so called, council in 1503 (if, in reality, it took place). The reappearance of these issues, as often happened in the history of the Church, both in the East and the West, was a sign of a renewal in the Church. This time in Muscovy, at least partially, the Western factor played a role, in the person of Benjamin. Yet, the fact that this question was raised almost at the same time as the reformatory movements in the West dealt intensively with simony and criticised the huge ecclesiastical properties, just when Muscovy was broadening its contacts with the West, suggest that the Western factor was more important than it is apparent from the direct records.<sup>40</sup>

The next council, in 1504, applied Gennadii's *Spanish* solutions to people accused of

---

38 See: MILLER 1978, KLIER 1997, KOPREEVA 1982 and, on Benjamin: LUR'E 1988<sup>a</sup> (SKK). Probably, apart from the Western learning, the Byzantine tradition was also at work since in Gennadii's circle the Greeks, Trachaniota brothers, were active.

39 Most probably the imperial envoy was George von Thurn, cf. AFED 378 and PLIGUZOV 1992, 275. On Gennadii's methods: KLIER 1997, 347. The conviction that heretics should be combated did not divide Joseph of Volokolamsk and Gennadii on one side and Nil Sorskii on the other, as it was maintained by earlier historiography. The difference concerned the way the converted heretics should be treated. Joseph and especially Gennadii were not adherents of a merciful approach towards them while Nil was, cf. MILLER 2006, 350-1.

40 See: MILLER 2006, 350-3. On the problem of simony in the Byzantine empire: MACRIDES 1991; on the problem of the growth of monastic land properties and attempts to limit it: TALBOT 1991. On the council of 1503 and its existence see the sceptical position of OSTROWSKI 2003 and the more moderate opinion of SINITSYNA 1990 and SINITSYNA 2002<sup>b</sup>, 138. On the problem of the, so called possessor and non-possessor monastic parties see chapter II, note 345.

heresy. A few of them were burned at the stake, others imprisoned. Admittedly, Byzantine tradition also applied capital punishment for serious heresy (even burning) but it was sentenced very rarely. So here also we may find a probable trace of the Western factor.<sup>41</sup>

These facts show how, independently of their ideological choices, people in Muscovy entered into contact with the Western world. The majority of prominent Muscovites did not aim at an openness towards the West. Nevertheless, the connections resulting from practical reasons led to a kind of osmosis. Having left the door ajar that had been closed up until now, it was impossible, after that, to fully control the exchange of thoughts. While the contact with foreign ideas had been very limited before, at the turn of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries it began to develop and to have an impact on domestic affairs. Various ways of development were open to Muscovy and no direction had yet been determined.

---

41 On the Byzantine tradition see: PLIGUZOV 1992, 275; PLIGUZOV 2002, 70; KAZHDAN 1991<sup>c</sup> and BURGMANN 1991.

## Chapter 2

### BIOGRAPHY

#### 1. GREECE

Michael Trivolis was born on the ruins of Byzantium. After the fall of the city there remained only the memories of the glorious past. Thus, the young Trivolis inherited the memory: of a splendid empire, a Great Church and also his reputed family. Over the years there had been a few influential Trivolis who – close to the rulers of Constantinople and later Mistra – played a significant part at court.<sup>1</sup>

There were also outstanding representatives of the family, contemporaries of Michael. Demetrius Trivolis, probably his uncle, was a good, critical copyist and a learned man who owned a rich library. Janus Laskaris, searching for manuscripts for Lorenzo de' Medici visited him and described this library in Arta and another one, probably in Corfu. Jakobos Trivolis, Demetrios' son, was a gifted poet who published in Venice. Another member of the family, Constantinos, was also a copyist.<sup>2</sup>

The Trivolis family came from Serres (Macedonia) and then lived in Constantinople. In the 13<sup>th</sup> century they settled in Mistra on the Peloponnese. This fact explains why Michael called himself “Lacedaemonian from Sparta”<sup>3</sup>. In the second half of the fifteenth century, fleeing from the Turks, Demetrios Trivolis with his family moved to Corfu. Michael's parents had, perhaps, already moved to Arta (in Epirus). The town had been captured by Turks in March 1449 so it would have been senseless to flee there in the second part of the fifteenth century.

Michael's date of birth is unknown. Previous biographers, basing themselves on Trivolis' own testimony that he was young when he stayed in Italy, assumed that he was born

---

1 OLEROFF, 1950<sup>b</sup>, 261-2. Probably the patriarch Calixtus I (1350-54 and 1355-63) was also the member of this family, *ibid.*, 261.

2 On Demetrios see above and: RGK, I-A, no. 103 and: PLP, XII, 29. 298. On his library: MÜLLER 1884, 392.394. On Constantinos: RGK, I-A, no. 103 and II-A, no. 318.

3 OLEROFF, 1950<sup>b</sup>, 261 and Michael's letter to John Gregoropoulos, M-I, 94. Also Urceo Codro wrote that Michael was from Sparta. On his letter see below, note 105. Again in a copy of the *Geography* by Strabo (see below, note 35), copied partially by Michael, he described himself as Spartan, cf. SPERANZI 2010, 277.

between 1470 and 1480. Thanks to recent research we can infer that he was born in about 1475.<sup>4</sup> The laconic record in the Russian manuscript from the sixteenth century adds a few more details about his origins: “He was born in the town of Arta [...], the son of Manuel and Irene, [who were] Christians, Greeks, philosophers.”<sup>5</sup> The term *Greeks* does not need an explanation. Maximus often emphasised that he was a Greek from Greece, a descendant of Hellenes, and that his mother tongue was Greek.<sup>6</sup> The word *Christians* can be taken literally, perhaps as “Christians *par excellence*” i.e. Orthodox.<sup>7</sup> The least clear of the terms is *philosophers*. In the same text both Maximus and his parents are named in this way. In Muscovy quite different authors were called *philosophers*: Homer, Menander, Virgil as well as Hippocrates, prince Vladimir and Theophanes the Greek. Similarly saint Cyril (Constantine) was called *philosopher*. The word *philosophy* should be understood as a synonym of education or learning. Consequently, the term *philosopher* meant an educated person.<sup>8</sup>

Michael certainly spent his childhood in Arta. One can suppose however that the two branches of the family, the one from Arta and the one from Corfu, remained in contact. Perhaps

- 
- 4 DENISSOFF 1943, 138-9, on the base of: K-III, 123 (= Z 147) and M-I, 345; IKONNIKOV 1915, 81. If the identification of Maximus’ grave during archeological excavations is correct and if the remains do belong to Maximus the Greek, according to anthropological research of these remains the man buried there was over 80 years old, cf. BELYAEV 2007, 31. Michael Trivolis (Maximus the Greek) died in 1555/56 so he would have been born in about 1475. Moreover his bonds with Musurus (who was probably born 1475-8 – see below, note 14), their common education (cf. Musurus’ letter to Trivolis, *ibid.*) might suggest that they were roughly the same age.
- 5 SINITSYNA 2006<sup>a</sup>, 10 (text and note about the manuscript) and СКАЗАНИЕ В КОРПУСЕ СОЧИНЕНИЙ, 79 (variant of the text). This information corresponds with that of the *Liber Vestitionum* from San Marco, see below, note 179. It is interesting to note that in a much later MS (1699), containing works of Maximus the Greek, Procopius Sergiev, a student in Moscow and copyist of this MS wrote that Maximus came from Trikala town (Thessaly), see: Catalogue UNDOLSKII 1870, 356. 363. The copy was made (according to the information of Procopius) on the basis of a book from the library of the Trinity – St Sergius Lavra and Undolskii emphasised that it is a very good, diligently made copy. So the information about Maximus’ links with Trikala should be taken seriously even if it is improbable that he was born there. All other sources say that he was born in Arta. In СКАЗАНИЕ МОХОВИКОВА, XLIV-XLV we read that the future Maximus the Greek was originally named: Makarios. It is obviously an error but this name can be an indicator of an unknown fact of Maximus’ life. Mokhovikov’s work should not be underestimate. It is a late source (about 1720) but it may provide some valuable information since the Old Believers (Mokhovikov was one of them) preserved carefully old manuscripts. Some biographical data in this work (even if they are not known from other sources) may be true although they are mixed up with not very reliable, sometimes even fantastic, information. On Mokhovikov cf. also below, note 522 and 535.
- 6 See: e.g. M-II, 57 (“грек бо азъ и въ Гречѣстѣи земли и родився и въспитанъ”); M-I, 162 (“сами естественѣ греци глаголалием есмы”); RZHIGA 1935-36, 101 (“моих прародителех еллинех”). NB, in M-I, 193 Maximus uses the term *римляне* to describe the Latins, as if the Greeks are for him no longer *Ρωμαῖοι*. It corresponds to the evolution which took place in Byzantium from thirteenth century when the Byzantines started to identify themselves as Hellenes, Greeks and not as Romans, cf. HARRIS 1999, 195-7. 200.
- 7 DENISSOFF 1943, 132, understand this term as underlining that they did not converted to Islam. In another place (Z 137) Maximus adds that he was born from faithful parents (“от благовѣрных родителей родився”). Both expressions underline their piety.
- 8 That Maximus is called philosopher see: SINITSYNA 1977, 146 and e.g. SINITSYNA 2006<sup>a</sup>, 77, note 1-1. On Muscovite terminology: SHEVCHENKO 1991, 93-4. The term *философ* could sometimes also denote a monk but certainly it is not the case in reference to Michael’s parents.



Demetrios Trivolis was even one of young Michael's tutors and thus he would have had access to his uncle's library. Arta lies not far from Corfu and there were many links between the two towns, even after Arta was captured by the Turks. At the same time there was one important division between them. Arta, as other Greek territories under the Turks remained Orthodox while Corfu, as a result of the Venetian policy in all Greek territories belonging to this state, was, at least officially, Uniate.<sup>9</sup> So, Michael already in his youth may have experienced the tension between the pro-Roman and the Orthodox stance among the Greek population.

The noble background (testified by the expression: *son of voivode*) and the erudition of his parents were for Michael a good point of departure for his own education.<sup>10</sup> All early biographical sources testify unanimously that Maximus at first learnt in Greece. Letters sent from Vatopedi to Basil III and the metropolitan Varlaam confirm this conviction emphasising that he studied from his early youth. Finally, Maximus himself says that he was brought up in Greece.<sup>11</sup> The education in question was the initial one. Greek schools at that time were poor. Maximus' biographer put into his mouth a statement which says that in his homeland he did not receive a philosophical education due to a great lack of books. The author of this biographical note adds that when the Grand Prince Basil asked the monks for a translator, there was also a great lack of philosophers in the country. Therefore elementary and some secondary education was accessible in Greece but to receive a solid philosophical formation one had to go abroad.<sup>12</sup>

9 The hypothesis that Demetrios was Michael's tutor is reinforced by the observation of SPERANZI 2010, 267, note 31 who suggests that Michael could learn the art of copying books also from Demetrios. The question of the option for the Orthodoxy and for the Union in various Greek territories was not profoundly researched. DENISSOFF 1943, 130-5 was persuaded about a vast difference between the situation in Corfu and in Arta. See some newer preliminary remarks in: NIKOLAIDIS 2014, 155-6.

10 The term "сын воеводский" (son of voivode) that appears in Muscovite records on Maximus' life (SINITSYNA 2006<sup>a</sup>, 75, 89, 94 and other places) indicated surely the noble background. The most convenient Greek equivalent for *воевода* is ἄρχων (see: SREZNEVSKIJ, entry: *воевода*). In a MSS from Athos he is called: κύριος (DENISSOFF 1943, 412, 414). Similarly, in one Russian MS (BELOKUROV 1898, X), he is called: курь. This term also refers to nobility. On the other hand Maximus noted that he was not a son of the priest (FILARET 1842, 84).

11 On his education in Greece or in Greek: SINITSYNA 2006<sup>a</sup>, 76, 89, 91, 93. In СКАЗАНИЕ ИЗВЕСТНО, 93 the author says that Maximus learnt "во своем, в Палестинѣ и во Италии". According to DENISSOFF 1943, 53, the word *Палестина* in the Slavonic language was a synonym of homeland. Maximus about himself: К I, 36. ZINOVII OTENSKIИ, ИСТИНЫ ПОКАЗАНИЕ, 964 says that Maximus was a learned man. In a letter from the Vatopedi monastery to Basil III it is emphasised that Maximus is well educated and that he learnt from his early youth: RGM I, 130; similarly in the letter to metropolitan Varlaam, *ibid.*, 336. That he learnt from early youth see also: СКАЗАНИЕ В КОРПУСЕ СОЧИНЕНИЙ, 80.

12 See: СКАЗАНИЕ В КОРПУСЕ СОЧИНЕНИЙ, 80 and 86 (about books), 85 (about philosophers). Denissoff erroneously attributed the phrase on the decline of studies in Greece (M-I, 325 = K-I, 363f) to the period after the fall of Constantinople. Maximus says that the fall of the Hellenic learning occurred after the time the Incarnated Word came and not: after the fall of Constantinople. On the situation of education in Greece: RUNCIMAN 1968, 208-225, esp. 209 where he quoted M. Cursius (Germanograecia, 18): "In all Greece studies nowhere flourish..." Runciman adds: "We know of not a single Greek of intellectual distinction living within the bounds of the Ottoman Empire during the later fifteenth century and the first years of the sixteenth. There were distinguished Greeks alive at the time; but they were to be found in the West, mainly in Venice." The school in Candia founded by Bessarion (1462) was probably an exception.

For lack of more precise information we are condemned to speculation concerning the place in Greece where the young Trivolis began his schooling. The very beginnings he owed certainly to his learned, and rather well-to-do, parents. They certainly assured him good tutoring. Probably he received an initial education at home and later he had either a private teacher or attended school, certainly also private because already in the Byzantine period most schools were private. Even more so, after the fall of Constantinople, only private teachers could provide instruction for young Greeks. The efforts and sacrifices necessary to learn the Greek grammar remained in his memory. In Moscow he described them for one of his acquaintances, referring certainly to his own experience.

Denissoff, convinced that Michael was a candidate to local elections in Corfu, thought that he attended the school of John Moschos on this island. It turned out however that this archival record about the elections does not concern the future Greek monk. Still, Michael's stay in Corfu cannot be excluded because of his family relationship (Demetrios Trivolis lived in Corfu) and Moschos' school remains one of a few possible places where, theoretically, Michael Trivolis might have gone.<sup>13</sup> Another possibility is that his uncle, Demetrius, was his private teacher. Yet another is that Michael might have studied in Crete. His close bonds with the Cretans: Mark Musurus and John Gregoropoulos suggest the latter. Later, Musurus in his letter to Trivolis mentions their common education and formation (κοινῶς τροφῆς καὶ παιδείας). This expression may refer both to the earlier, almost *domestic*, stage of their formation and to their studies together in Florence.<sup>14</sup> From other sources we know that Musurus and Gregoropoulos studied together, so it is possible that they had all met in a school in Crete.<sup>15</sup>

In Greek schools pupils probably received only an elementary education although in Candia (Crete), where the teachers were Michael and Aristobulos Apostolis, the level must have been higher. We know little about what was taught in Greek schools after the fall of

---

13 On efforts and sacrifices: IAGICH 1885-95, 594. On Moschos' school: DENISSOFF 1943, 140-3, on Trivolis' alleged stay in Corfu: *ibid.*, 84-86 and 143-145. Yet PIERIS 2003, 74-6, shows that it was another Michael Trivolis (Demetrios' son) who participated in the election in Corfu.

14 Musurus was the most eminent of Trivolis' friends. Even Erasmus, who was not quick to praise, extolled his erudition. On Musurus biography see: CATALDI PALAU 2004 (with further bibliography), here esp. 296-303; GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 111-166; LEGRAND 1885, I, CVIII-CXXIV and also STAIKOS 1998, ad indicem. The last book must be however used very cautiously because it contains many mistakes. Cf. the review by Martin Davies in "Library", 2000, 1, 453-455. Earlier it was assumed that Musurus was born around 1470 (LEGRAND 1885, I, CVIII; CATALDI PALAU 2004, 296). More recent research suggest that it was slightly later, between 1475 and 1478, cf. PAGLIAROLI 2004, 225-7, note 2 and SPERANZI 2013, 29. The letter is published by BELLONI 2002, 651. See also below, note 141, on literary links between this Musurus' letter and Synesios of Cyrene's letter that Musurus edited.

15 On common education of Musurus and Gregoropoulos see: CATALDI PALAU 2004, 299-302 who quotes Musurus' letter to Gregoropoulos from 1502, (LEGRAND 1885, II, 394) and Georgios Gregoropoulos' letter to his son, John (LEGRAND 1885, II, 269); cf. also GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 112.

Constantinople. No doubt, they continued the Byzantine model of education that was the heir of two not homogeneous traditions: the ancient idea of the *paideia* and the Christian educational pattern. The tension between the secular learning and the teaching coming from the revelation that later Maximus the Greek struggled with, lay at the heart of his education. However, when he decided, as many other young Greeks, to continue his studies in Italy, he certainly did not realise this tension. He went to Italy – according to his own words – driven by the “desire of the Hellenic learning”.<sup>16</sup>

## 2. STUDIES AND WORK IN ITALY

The Greek intellectuals and students arriving in Italy at the end of the fifteenth century faced a hard situation. First of all, as all immigrants, they were not always received with open arms. Bessarion confessed with a heavy heart: “How deeply it grieves me to see our [Greek] people suffering everywhere publicly and privately, esteemed lightly, hated, persecuted, abused ... Learn to bear the jealousy flourishing everywhere ... especially against foreigners, the more so if they are learned men.” However, as time went by, the attitude of the Westerners towards Greeks who had lost their homeland changed for the better.<sup>17</sup> An additional burden was the relationship within their community (especially among intellectuals): that of envy, unfair competition for rich positions and careerism were not rare. Michael Trivolis himself mentioned a *crafty Cretan*, perhaps Aristoboulos Apostolis, with whom he was in conflict.<sup>18</sup>

It was also not without significance that, after centuries when the Greeks had prided themselves on their cultural superiority over the West, now they observed with fascination the dynamically developing West and had to acknowledge that they came from a declining world. Not long after the fall of Constantinople, a representative of Michael Trivolis’ parents generation, Michael Apostolis, gave voice to this feeling. At first he emphasised the greatness of Greek thought saying that none of the Western thinkers (perhaps except for Cicero) could be compared with the Greek ones, both pagan and Christians, but then he wrote: “You Italians of the present age are the foremost (*ta prota*) of the Italians. I say that you are the foremost and

---

16 The history of Byzantine education is still little researched, see: VIKAN 1991; WILSON 1992, 158-9. On the desire of the Hellenic learning: RZHIGA 1935-36, 99.

17 See: HARRIS 1995, 27-57. 62-84 on initial problems with the acceptance of the Greeks in the West and on the subsequent change for better. Bessarion’s words: GEANAKOPOLOS 1976, 22. He quotes Ludwig Mohler, *Aus Bessarions Gelehrtenkreis: Abhandlungen, Reden, Briefe*, Paderborn 1942, 481.

18 In a letter to Gregoropoulos, M-I, 94-5. Fonkich, *ibid.*, note 4, does not agree with DENISSOFF 1943, 403, that it could be a mention about Apostolis. On possible conflict between Arsenios (Aristoboulos) Apostolis and Musurus: GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 177 and generally about Arsenios, *ibid.*, 178 – 181.

that we are the remnants (*ta leipsana*) because, in the cycle of civilisation, which has a beginning, a middle, and an end, we are in the closing stage of our culture, while you are in the first phase.”<sup>19</sup> Their pride however did not disappear completely and the Greeks were aware that their heritage had not lost its value.<sup>20</sup> Indeed, the West was, at that time, much more developed in terms of civilisation but with regard to culture, philosophy and even literature it continuously turned towards the ancient world and Greek scholars were experts in this field.

There was also another important difference between the Italian humanists and the Greek itinerant scholars (and future scholars). They shared with their Italian colleagues a common passion to study the ancient legacy, but their attitude towards this heritage was not the same. Byzantines did not have to rediscover Greek literature and philosophy. It had been studied and taught in Byzantium without interruption from Antiquity. Thus, for Greeks it was rather about continuing and preserving their own tradition than returning to the ancient models to which the Italian humanists strove. The eminent representative of the previous generation, cardinal Bessarion, already in 1455, wrote that he gathered manuscripts not so much for himself but “for the sake of the Greeks who are left now as well as those who may have a better fortune in the future (for many things may happen in the course of the years). Thus the Greeks may be able to find intact and preserved in a safe place all the records of their language which remain up to now, and, finding these, may be able to multiply them, without being left completely mute. Otherwise, they would lose even these few vestiges of these excellent and divine men – which have been saved from what we have lost in the past – and they [future Greeks] would differ in no way from barbarians and slaves.”<sup>21</sup>

These differences and also the policy of some Western states (even in Venice the Greeks did not have full civil rights)<sup>22</sup> despite the general attitude changed for better, did not create favourable conditions for integration of Greeks into the Western societies.

---

19 GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 109-110. On the Greeks converts admiration for Italy: HARRIS 1995, 49 (with literature).

20 Other examples of the conviction about the Greeks superiority in Chalkondyles’ speech, GEANAKOPOLOS 1976, 244.

21 See: GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 81-2 who translated the letter published by Ludwig Mohler, Aus Bessarions Gelehrtenkreis: Abhandlungen, Reden, Briefe, Paderborn 1942, 478-79.

22 GEANAKOPOLOS 1976, 286. It is worth noting that even in the twentieth century the debate on the contribution of the Greeks and of the Italians (and other Westerners) scholars to the Renaissance provokes, sometimes violent, dispute. See e.g.: DIONISOTTI 1995, 69 and GEANAKOPOLOS 1962 (also STAIKOS 1998) on the question whether the input of the Greek scholars was really significant or not.

Despite all the difficulties, the lack of good schools and teachers in Greece and the demand for people who knew the Greek language well in the Western humanistic world, both induced many young Greeks who had intellectual ambitions to leave their homeland and search for a better life in Italy and other western countries.

## FLORENCE

Florence was probably the first Italian city Michael Trivolis saw. It was one of these particular places in Europe where the changes of the social, economical and cultural paradigm, mentioned in the chapter one, had occurred most quickly. Despite political and social turbulences, at the end of 15<sup>th</sup> century Florence shone in the Italian firmament as a leading centre of humanist studies. The patronage of Lorenzo de' Medici over artists and philosophers and his efforts to collect manuscripts of ancient authors favoured the development of the humanist movement. New ways for European culture were being paved here.

Two of the most distinctive Florentine circles at this time were: humanists and philosophers fascinated by the heritage of antiquity and religious reformers led by Girolamo Savonarola. These two groups were interconnected and influenced each other. It was precisely these people that first came to Maximus' mind when he remembered his Florentine years in Moscow.

### *In the Laskaris' circle*

Michael Trivolis' stay in Florence is indisputable. He says that he saw with his own eyes events which he describes and which took place in Florence. Apart from that, his Florentine memories are the most extensive and contain the greatest number of details.<sup>23</sup> Most probably he came to Florence with Janus Laskaris in the early summer of 1492 and in any case he arrived not later than 1494.<sup>24</sup>

---

23 See: Z-254 and the whole story about Savonarola (Z-249 ff). More generally about what he saw with his own eyes in Italy: RZHIGA 1935-36, 99. While the fact that Maximus visited Florence and other places in Italy mentioned below does not raise doubts, the order in which he visited them is a reconstruction open to corrections.

24 The exact date of Michael's arrival at Florence is not known. Maximus mentioned Savonarola's five-year-preaching and treated this time of predication as a whole. The end of this period in his account is Savonarola's execution in 1498 ("нынѣ же къ концу пятолѣтнихъ учении его обращу стремление словесное" – Z-251) so this five-year-period must be 1493-1498. The question is whether Maximus distinguished these five years as the time when he listened to Savonarola's preaching or that he just said that there was such a separate period in Savonarola's preaching but not necessarily that he had listened to Savonarola throughout this period. In the former case Trivolis had to have arrived in Florence not later than 1493, as maintains DENISSOFF 1943, 161. In the latter case we can only say that Trivolis visited Florence within the period 1493-1498. According to WEINSTEIN 1970, 74-76. 127, the turning point in Savonarola's life was the year 1494. It was the beginning of his *prophetic* preaching even if he had preached before and arrived to Florence for good in 1490. So when Maximus distinguishes this five-year-period of Savonarola's preaching (more less: between 1493/1494 and

Laskaris was one of the most eminent Greek intellectuals of his age.<sup>25</sup> He arrived in Italy for the first time shortly after the fall of Constantinople. After his studies in Padua with Demetrius Chalcondyles he worked for Lorenzo de' Medici and went twice through the former Byzantine Empire in search of Greek manuscripts for Lorenzo's library. During one of these trips, he visited Corfu and Arta where he purchased books from Demetrios Trivolis. On April 3<sup>rd</sup> 1492 he was on Crete where he again bought manuscripts for his patron.<sup>26</sup> Finally, he arrived back in Florence in the summer of 1492, not only with manuscripts but also with young Greeks.<sup>27</sup> He mentioned in one of his epigrams that Lorenzo entrusted him not only with searching for books but also with finding Greek boys who could finish their studies in Italy and teach Italians the Greek language. Michael Trivolis may have been among them and arrived in the city on the Arno with his future teacher either from Corfu (if he was there at that time) or from Crete.<sup>28</sup> Laskaris clearly put great weight to the education of his young compatriots and looked after them with sincere commitment and dedication. An exterior witness, the Italian student, Girolamo Amaseo, in a letter written to his friend in May 1493 mentioned "Greeks from Greece" who learnt Latin with Laskaris at his home.<sup>29</sup> One can find more details in Mark Musurus' writings. He was, as Michael Trivolis, a disciple of Laskaris and we owe to him a testimony of respect, deep attachment and gratitude towards his master. In a letter to Michael, written in 1500, he emphasised that Laskaris is "a truly noble Greek" and in his hymn to Plato (1513) he wrote:

The first from Graecia, of distinguished fame,  
To whom, derived from Lascar's noble race,

---

1498) he would have been right, taking into account his possible lack of precision since he wrote about Savonarola many years later. Other possible evidence that Trivolis came to Florence before 1494 is that fact that he described Angelo Poliziano (M-I, 363) as if he had met him in his own lifetime. Poliziano died in 1494. So probably Michael had lived in Florence in the nineties leaving the city for shorter or longer periods to visit other places. Because of his links with Laskaris, the most probable date of his arrival is 1492. On Musurus' arrival in Florence (in the summer 1492) and other details concerning Laskaris' initiative to bring young Greeks to Florence: SPERANZI 2013, 44-5. Cf. also SPERANZI 2010, 274-5.

25 On Laskaris see: LEGRAND 1885, I, CXXXI-CLXII; GRAFTON 1985-87; MONFASANI 1999<sup>b</sup> and IRIGOIN 1997.

26 For chronology: LEGRAND 1885, I, CXXXVI and II, 325. On purchasing books from Trivolis: MÜLLER 1884, 392 and 394; SPERANZI 2010, 269.

27 About his presence in Florence in August 1492 testifies his letter to Ficino, cf.: MÜLLER 1884, 362. 337, note 3. On young Greeks: SPERANZI 2010, 264-5.

28 On Greeks boys see: LASKARIS, Epigrammi greci, no. 73, p. 84-5 and p. 193. The editor apparently does not know the letter of Amaseo published by Pozzi (see the next note) and this is the reason that she cannot reconcile the fact that Laskaris named *Lorenzo* as the initiator of getting young Greeks and the later foundation of the Greek College in Rome by the pope *Leo X*. She thinks of these Greek boys in the context of the Greek College but this mention clearly concerns the initiative of Lorenzo (unknown from other sources). SPERANZI 2010, 265, note 16 and passim gives circumstantial evidence that Trivolis came to Florence with Laskaris.

29 He wrote in 1493 (POZZI 1966, 194, v. 64-67): "Nec te praetereat complures Graecos ex Graecia in Laschari domum confluisse et latinas litteras discunt ut possint postmodum profiteri: unus ex ipsis mihi tragoediam, quam mense maio <expl>icaturus est Lascharus, conscribit."

The triple-fronted God concedes his name.  
 'Twas he my infant steps, with ceaseless care,  
 Guarded, and loved me with a parent's love;  
 He bade me to the Muse's hill repair,  
 And pointed out the glorious meed above.<sup>30</sup>

We know less about Trivolis' attitudes towards his teacher from his own words but the tone of Musurus' letter allows us to judge that Michael shared Mark's opinion of him. Undoubtedly he was one of the "outstanding masters" Maximus mentioned in one of his Slavonic works (M-I, 162; cf. also K-III, 178). Prince Kurbskii, who was himself a student and friend of Maximus, called him "a disciple of Laskaris".<sup>31</sup>

The generous help of this established master was priceless to Greek students both as a matter of expediency and for cultural reasons. Girolamo Amaseo complains about the arduousness that foreign students encountered in Florence such as expensive food or poor housing. If these difficulties concerned a student from another Italian state who came from a relatively well-to-do family, his Greek fellows would have felt these problems all the more. The cost of studies were often too high for young immigrants. Michael's frequently expressed concern about the fees, allows us to think that, when he was a student, his financial situation was far from stable.<sup>32</sup> Certainly he benefited, as other Greek students, from the support of Laskaris but he also worked for him. The copying of manuscripts was for Greek students a normal way to earn their living or supplement their budget. We know about a few young Greeks who worked for Laskaris at that time (between 1492 and 1495) in Florence or collaborated with him.<sup>33</sup> It is quite possible that an agreement existed between Laskaris and his

30 The Greek original of the "Hymn to Plato" was printed in Aldo's edition of Plato (1513). The English translation by W. Roscoe, *The life and Pontificate of Leo X*, Liverpool 1805, II, 24, quoted by GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 114. Cf. also Musurus' touching letter of dedication to the edition of Pausanias (1516) in: LEGRAND 1885, I, CXLVII (introduction) and 144ff (text) concerning the Venetian period of Laskaris' life. It was assumed (LEGRAND 1885, I, CVIII; GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 113-5; CATALDI PALAU 2004, 303) that Musurus studied with Laskaris in Florence between 1486 and 1492/3 but – according to recent research – he rather arrived in Florence with Laskaris (and Trivolis) in 1492: PAGLIAROLI 2004, 225-7, note 2 and SPERANZI 2013, 45-8. According to custom, well-born children from Crete continued their education in Italy, especially in Florence (CATALDI PALAU 2004, 303).

31 See: KURBSKII, *История о осьмомъ соборѣ*, 476. Kurbskii mentions Laskaris but in the context of Maximus' alleged studies in Paris.

32 See: POZZI 1966, 213. DENISSOFF 1943, 173-4 emphasises Trivolis' constant care about remuneration for his work among others in his letter to Nicholas of Tarse (*ibid.*, 396-7) and Gregoropoulos (*ibid.*, 398-9). Denissoff finds traces of this care about fees not only in Italian period but also in Maximus' work in Muscovy (*ibid.*, 173-4). Perhaps his mention about generous pay (from the royal treasury) of lecturers in philosophy and theology in Paris (Z 240) is a reflection of the constant lack of money experienced by the young Greek.

33 On young Greeks in Florence in relation with Laskaris: SPERANZI 2010, 276-82. Still some time later a Greek boy copied a book for Laskaris. In 1530, in a letter to Guillaume Maine (MERCATI 1910, 621-2) Laskaris wrote: "Quod ad libellum [...] puer quem apud me vidisti Parisiis, iussus exscripsit".

protégés who – thanks to his support – were able to study in Italy.

There are a few manuscripts that testify to Trivolis' activity in Florence and of his links with the circle of young Greeks gathered around Laskaris. One of them (discovered already by Denissoff) is a copy of the *Geoponica* [On tilling the soil]. At the end of this work the copyist wrote: "In twice ten and twice four days I, Michael, wrote this work *Geoponica* for Laskaris." Some codicological studies indicate that probably Trivolis copied the *Geoponica* in parallel with his friend, Marc Musurus, and that he used the same prototype.<sup>34</sup>

At least three or four other manuscripts were copied by Trivolis (together with other copyists) during the same period: the *Geography* by Strabo (where Michael left at the end of his work, as in the *Geoponica*, a verse translation of his work in the form of an epigram in elegiac distichs), commentaries to Hermogenes of Tarsus and the *Idylls* by Theokritos.<sup>35</sup> The last codex (in which Janus Laskaris corrected the copy made by Trivolis) was used in the Aldo Manuzio's printing shop for his second edition of Theokritos (1496). Probably it was Michael's first contact with the Venetian enterprise but he might have been also useful to Laskaris for other works that the latter undertook during his stay in Florence.<sup>36</sup>

No less important than the material aid was Laskaris' part in teaching them the language of their new world; language understood both literally and metaphorically. Greeks coming to

---

34 Trivolis' copy of the *Geoponica* is preserved in Bibliothèque nationale, Paris, MS gr. 1994, fol. 155v. Cf. SHEVCHENKO 1997, 64 and DENISSOFF 1943, 87 (+ facsimile, Pl. III). SHEVCHENKO 1997, 63 thinks that the date put at the fol. C of the MS (21.07.1498) indicates when it was completed. FONKICH 2003, 74-5, moves this date for 1492-1495 (according to him watermarks indicate rather early than late nineties) and regards the date 21.07.1498 as the date of binding the book. On the probable parallel work with Musurus: SPERANZI 2010, 275-6.

35 The *Geography* by Strabo: Vat. Reg. gr. 83, 157-245 (RGK 3-A, no. 469, on the epigram: SPERANZI 2010, 277, cf. also SPERANZI 2013, 64-5, 79, 96); commentaries to Hermogenes of Tarsus, so called *Dreimänner-Kommentar*: Laur. Plut 55.20 (SPERANZI 2010, 278-80); the *Idylls* by Theokritos: Vat. gr. 1379, 1-24 (RGK 3-A, no. 469). SPERANZI 2010, 276-282 linked these MSS with the Florentine period, with Laskaris, and showed evidence of the participation of other young Greeks in the production of these MSS; cf. also SPERANZI 2013, 66. NB, in this circle was also executed restoration of a MS where we find the monokondylion with the name of Michael's father, Manuel Trivois (Laur. Conv. Soppr. 64, fol. 174v), cf. DENISSOFF 1943, 136; OLEROFF 1950b, 263; SPERANZI 2010, 280. Recently another MS copied by Trivolis was discovered. It is a copy of Pseudo Dionysius, *De divinis nominibus* (Laur. Conv. Soppr. 104). The MS was executed in Florence at the turn of fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. It comes from the library of San Marco priory in Florence and its antigraph was also in the same library. Yet, there are no conclusive arguments for dating this MS during Trivolis' first stay in Florence or during his noviciate in San Marco, cf. SPERANZI 2016, 194-7. On other MSS copied by Trivolis see below: note 84 (Crem. Cod. 177); note 165 (Oxon. Canon. Gr. 27 and Vat. Barb. 100). One more MS copied by him is difficult to date. London, This is: the British Library, Harley 5663, ff. 17r-22v – Eunapius of Sardis, *Vitae Sophistarum*; cf. SPERANZI 2016, 193, note 13 and SPERANZI 2013, 361. Since it contains mainly biographies of neoplatonic philosophers, so perhaps it could be attributed to Florentine period of Maximus' life. We do not know any Aldo's edition of this work. Trivolis probably also organised a MS (Vat. Barb. gr. 140), cf. below note 194.

36 On the use of Vat. gr. 1379 in Aldo's print: SPERANZI 2010, 280-3. At this time Laskaris published the first edition of the Greek Anthology, the *Hymns* of Callimachus and four tragedies of Euripides (GRAFTON 1985-76, 293). He also compiled the inventory of Lorenzo de' Medici's library in 1495: KNÖS 1945, 77. Musurus copied in Florence about ten MSS: CATALDI PALAU 2004, 303.



Italy often did not know Latin sufficiently well which was an obstacle to be able to study or to find a job. Thus, Laskaris taught them Latin “ut possint postmodum profiteri” according to the expression of Amaseo.<sup>37</sup>

### *Study*

The next question is where they were going to study? A possibility could be the renewed *Studio fiorentino* and its outstanding scholars. In 1492 Janus Laskaris also became a teacher of Greek literature at this school.<sup>38</sup> This is the reason that historians maintained – following Elie Denissoff – that the young Trivolis was a student of the *Studio*. However no document confirms this. There is no strong evidence either of Musurus’ stay at Studio Fiorentino.<sup>39</sup> It is possible that both Musurus and Trivolis took private lessons with Laskaris and, at the same time, occasionally attended some courses at the *Studio*.

Certainly Trivolis was in contact with the academia. He seems to know the western educational system. Speaking about the skills essential for a translator he listed grammar, poetics, rhetoric and philosophy which were at that time basic elements of the humanistic educational model.<sup>40</sup> The early Muscovite biographical records about Maximus confirm that he studied in Italy, in Florence (and “in many other cities” as we can read in one redaction).<sup>41</sup>

---

37 The word *profiteri* here can be understood either as: *to be a professor* (this word is used in this sense in: LEGRAND 1885, I, 88) or as: *to enrol*. In our context, the first meaning is more probable. On Amaseo: above, note 29. On other examples of Greek immigrants who learnt Latin only in Italy (e.g. George of Trebizond, Bessarion), cf. MONFASANI 1999<sup>a</sup>, 86.

38 Laskaris taught in Florence from 1492 until 1496: VERDE, *Studio*, IV/3, 1083 and II, 363.

39 Verde put among students both Trivolis and Musurus but this is not based on an official document from the *Studio* but on indirect evidence. For Trivolis, Verde quotes Denissoff for whom it was a strongly maintained but pure hypothesis. The only explanation was the coincidence of events: Laskaris taught at the *Studio* and Trivolis was linked with Laskaris. See: VERDE, *Studio*, III/ 2, 623 (for Mark Musurus), 659 (for Michael Trivolis). Cf. also the lists of students where both of them are absent: pp. 957-1002. It should be however admitted that these lists are incomplete so the absence of a name does not rule out the possibility that a person studied there. I found in Verde’s lists only two students who were or could have been Greek: Bernardinus de Ferrariis de nobilibus Candie (VERDE, *Studio*, III/1, 175) and Seraphinus magistri Baldaxaris de Septia (VERDE, *Studio*, III/2, 884). Moreover, GRENDLER 2002, 79-82 says that in the *Studio* studied only single foreigners.

40 There were certainly other possibilities for young Greeks to study in Florence. MONFASANI 1999<sup>b</sup> mentions that Laskaris founded a private school in Florence but he does not give any evidence. FIELD 2002, 375 (and *passim*) is convinced that Ficino had a private school in Florence. DENISSOFF 1943, 175, related the list of subjects listed by Maximus (K-III, 62=M-II, 136) to the medieval *trivium* but this list is closer to the *studia humanitatis* which included grammar, rhetoric, poetics, history and moral philosophy. The medieval system contained logic (*dialectica*) which was absent in humanistic education, cf. KRISTELLER 1988, 113-114. Maximus says that he also became a participant in the Western fascination with Aristotle and Plato (M-I, 362) and that at Italian schools Plato and Aristotle were profusely used (M-I, 181).

41 See: СКАЗАНИЕ В КОРПУСЕ СОЧИНЕНИЙ, 79 (in Florence and in many other cities), 85; СКАЗАНИЕ ИЗВЕСТНО, 93. Also in СКАЗАНИЕ МОХОВИКОВА, XLIV about Florence. In other sources we find more general statements: that he studied philosophy first in his mother tongue and then in Latin (по римски - СВИДЕТЕЛЬСТВО НИЛА, 76, see also DENISSOFF 1943, 139) or that he studied theology and sacred philosophy in his country in Greek and in Italy in Latin (СКАЗАНИЕ ИСАИИ, 89 and 91).

### *Intellectual life in Florence*

Even if Michael and his compatriots did not study at the *Studio Fiorentino*, undoubtedly they participated in the intellectual life of the city. Laskaris who was in close contact with Florentine intellectuals, can have provided a link between them and the young Greeks.

At the close of the fifteenth century, shortly before a crisis, the fruits of the Renaissance ripened in Florence. For over a century scholars in the city explored and made accessible the ancient heritage. The refreshing impulse coming from the antiquity together with the still lively (especially in Pico's thought) medieval erudition resulted in original and independent philosophical works.

Among others, it was Marsilio Ficino, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola and Angelo Poliziano who moulded the intellectual landscape of Florence of this time and a confrontation with their thought was unavoidable for an educated man like Michael Trivolis.

Admittedly, Maximus the Greek in his Slavonic works did not mention either Ficino or Giovanni Pico but we should not jump to the conclusion that he did not know of them. He did not mention either Janus Laskaris who was his benefactor.<sup>42</sup> Maximus selected the material for his Italian memories not because of their importance for him but because of their utility for his activity in the Muscovite Church. We will see later that he reacted in his writing (affirmatively or critically) to their ideas.

The task that Florentine philosophers undertook was to reconcile the Christian message and the ancient thought. The first steps in this work had been taken by the generation of the Council of Florence but Trivolis' contemporaries went much further. In the second half of the fifteenth century the emblematic figure of this current and the greatest authority for the Platonist was Marsilio Ficino. The reconciliation was needed because on one hand they strongly retained their Christian identity but on the other the (re)discovery of the ancient non-Christian religious and philosophical texts filled them with a genuine admiration. Also the exploration of ancient Christian thought that took place on a much deeper and wider plane than before, stimulated the quest for their reconciliation. Humanists found in Platonic and Neo-Platonic works a deep religious thought and a clear description of the mystical ascent to God that led them to the conviction about the fundamental conformity of these ancient books with the Gospel. They considered their authors as though they had received a kind of pre-Christian revelation and they were close to the ancient concept of philosophy understood as both

---

42 DENISSOFF 1943, 157.

intellectual and spiritual quest.<sup>43</sup>

The *reconciliation attitude* manifested itself also in an attempt to overcome the old argument between supporters of Stagirite and followers of the founder of the Academy that was fired again during the Council of Florence. In the city, at that time, the Platonic tendency prevailed but both Ficino and Giovanni Pico (although in different ways) recognised a fundamental concord between Platonism and Aristotelianism.<sup>44</sup>

Yet, it was Plato who inspired Ficino first of all and guided him to the quest for the unity of philosophical and religious experience. The Florentine philosopher, speaking of the two roads to happiness, one philosophical, one religious, says: “Our friend Plato admirably combined the two in one. At all points he is equally philosophical and religious, being a subtle disputant, a devout priest and an eloquent orator. So if you follow in the footsteps of the divine Plato, as you have begun to do, you will find and achieve happiness, God pointing the way and leading you on. This is all the more certain because our friend Plato with his Pythagorean and Socratic arguments follows the law of Moses and prophesies the law of Christ.”<sup>45</sup>

Pico also searched “[...] for the deepest common truth, where *sapientia* and its various temporal manifestations might reside, untroubled by doctrinal squabbles.”<sup>46</sup>

Both thinkers did not restrict their research to Greek philosophy and Christianity but consistently applied their method to other authors called sometimes: *prisci theologi*. The idea of the profound convergence of these various sources was possible to maintain because they (especially Ficino) were convinced that ultimately *prisci theologi* drew their wisdom from the same ageless source. Moreover, if a recourse to the ancient philosophy could be more easily acceptable, the fact that Ficino and Pico resorted also to the esoteric traditions (magic, Kabbalah and other occult practices) excited more serious debate. What was acceptable to Neoplatonists, could not be admissible to Christians. Pico’s and Ficino’s bold project drew criticism from their contemporaries in Italy.<sup>47</sup>

43 Ficino, speaking about Plato’s philosophy used the word *mysteria*, that indicates the spiritual or religious dimension of these ideas. In his preface to the translation of Plotinus he says (FICINO, Opera, II, 1537): “Plethonem quasi Platonem alterum de *mysteriis* [my italic – ZS] Platonis disputantem frequenter audivit.” Similarly on the next page (1538) he speaks about *mysteria platonica*. Cf. also the quotation in the next note. Obviously, the idea of a pre-Christian revelation had already existed in the Christian antiquity.

44 Ficino treated Aristotle’s thought in a rather utilitarian way, as an indispensable step to understanding mysteries of Plato: “From natural things one ascends to divine things, and this is why no one can ever understand the sublime mysteries of Plato unless he has already been initiated into the disciplines of Aristotle.”, see: Ficino, Opera omnia, 953, translated and quoted by LACKNER 2002, 40. Giovanni Pico went his own philosophical way. He who studied, among other places, in Paris and knew scholasticism much better, was inclined to appreciate Aristotle more than Ficino did, cf. COPENHAVER 1999, 17.

45 Ficino’s letter of 1489 quoted by WILSON 1992, 92.

46 VASOLI 1988, 68-69. See also: CRINITO, De Honesta, 104-105.

47 The problem was, that some sources used by Ficino “gave directions for summoning demons and contained

Later, Maximus the Greek would oppose the *Hellenic deceit*. The question of whether it was a reference to the works of the two eminent Florentine philosophers remains open. In any case, their ideas were not self-evident for Christian authors and required an explanation.

Ficino justified his activity as a method used by man to rule over created nature which should be submitted to him according to the Biblical commandment. Pico expressed a similar attitude towards magical practices and took great care to distinguish good natural magic and evil magic. He “[...] praised magic and man’s ability to control the most occult powers of nature because he regarded them as *the practical part of the natural sciences*, able to increase our freedom in a world over which God had given us dominion.”<sup>48</sup>

Ficino also defended himself saying that he did not contribute to the revival of classical paganism and that “his purpose in publicising the thought of the ancients was to serve the cause of true religion. Although precise anticipation of Christian doctrine was not to be expected from the pagans, nevertheless the most acute thinkers among them understood the truth. Ficino’s doctrine is expressed as follows: *And so through the wish of divine providence to attract to itself in wondrous fashion all men in accordance with their intellectual ability, it came about that a religious philosophy arose long ago among the Persian thanks to Zoroaster and among the Egyptians thanks to Mercury [Hermes Trismegistos], without any discrepancy between the two. The doctrine was then sustained among the Thracians under Orpheus and Aglaophemus. It soon flourished also through Pythagoras among the Greeks and Italians. But it was finally consummated at Athens by the divine Plato.*”<sup>49</sup>

One can suppose that, besides the desire to reconcile Christian and ancient pagan ideas, their interest in the *prisca theologia* was a sign of an ossification of the Christian thought and

---

much else that was acceptable to Neoplatonists and repugnant to Christians.” Magic and occult practices constituted a part of the Neoplatonic doctrine, WILSON 1992, 92. About links between Neoplatonism and magic Wilson quotes R.T. Wallis, *Neoplatonism*, London 1972, 70-2. I have not consulted the last work directly. MARCEL 1958, 538-42 shows how Pico and Ficino resorted to the esoteric sources (respectively Qabalah and astrology) and, even after their death, their friend, Jerome Benivieni tried to whitewash them (saying that they discussed these texts but did not practice such activities), visibly aware that their esoteric interests might have harmed their reputation. The Church’s authorities expressed doubts concerning Ficino’s and Pico’s orthodoxy. Ficino, after he had become a priest, was suspected by Rome of unorthodox beliefs in some fragments of his *De vita* 1489 (KRISTELLER 1985, 93-5) while Pico was earlier (in 1486 after publication of his 900 thesis) accused of unorthodoxy, cf. WEINSTEIN 2011, 69-72.

48 VASOLI 1988, 69 and COPENHAVER 1999, 19.

49 The whole quotation comes from WILSON 1992, 91 and Ficino’s own words from: FICINO, *Opera*, I, 871 (the same text *ibid.*, II, 1537. On Ficino cf. also: ALLEN 1999, 353-357. As far as magic is concerned, the *Corpus Hermeticum* was not particularly used by Ficino. “Along with Zoroaster (to whom Ficino usually gives priority as an inventor of magic), Orpheus, Plato and other *prisca sapientes*, Hermes could lend eponymous authority to the practice of magic even if his contributions to its theory were slight.” – COPENHAVER 1988, 281. NB, in a codex, partially copied by Michael Trivolis (Vat. Gr. 1379), we find a passage from the *Corpus Hermeticum*, copied however by another copyist, cf. SPERANZI 2010, 280, note 94.

the weak presence of the mystical dimension in Western Christianity. Florentine philosophers probably would not have experienced so intensely the meeting with the ancient thought if they had found in the Western Church an equally attractive, mystical teaching. Their quest did not signify the intention to act against the Church nor to leave it.<sup>50</sup> Quite the opposite, their activity could be taken as a part of a wider movement that aimed to reform the Church. Their biographies confirm such intentions. It is true that some of their decisions were understood by contemporaries as conversions but, at the same time, a continuation is perceptible in their thought.

In 1473 Ficino became a priest. This fact did not trigger – it seems – any particular protest which may be a sign that it was treated as a sincere commitment.<sup>51</sup> Ficino’s decision was not opportunistic. His position and his fame as a scholar were well established by this time so he was not forced to look for additional income or recognition. As documents show, he took his priestly vocation very seriously.<sup>52</sup>

Pico, despite his tempestuous youth and the suspicion provoked by the publication of his 900 thesis, through his scholarly activity sought for a new vision of Christianity. Finally, reconciled with the Church, started to live an austere life and planned to write a monumental work in defence of Christian faith.<sup>53</sup>

Apart from this religious-philosophical activity, a not less essential aspect of Florentine intellectual life were the works in the field of philology. At Trivolis’ time Angelo Poliziano was the most representative figure in this domain. He was the only Florentine personage, apart from Savonarola, named by Maximus the Greek: “Who did not know Angelo Poliziano who lived in Florence!” Admittedly, he mentioned the Italian scholar as an example of reprehensible fascination of paganism among Italian humanists but this exclamation reveals his popularity.

Poliziano was among the best classical scholars of the Renaissance. Some foundations of the philological science had already been laid by Petrarch but it was Poliziano, in his *Miscellanea* (1480), who established the rules for the modern philology. His methods of textual

---

50 E.g. when Ficino was not able to find a philosophical or Platonic explain of a theological problem, he quoted Thomas Aquinas, cf. LAUSTER 2002, 68 and passim.

51 WILSON 1992, 92. Cf. also SERRACINO-INGLOTT 2002, 9 who says that, although Ficino experienced a kind of crisis, his ordination did not mean that he rejected Platonism. For him the profession of a doctor and of a priest are identical in their function. Or – to put it in another way – Christ wanted his priests to heal also bodies. One cannot divide the treatment of the soul and of the body. “Both priest and doctor are guides to a better and higher life.” Ficino, being a doctor, decided to put his theory into practice.

52 SERRACINO-INGLOTT 2002, 9-10 and passim.

53 He managed to write only the first, unfinished part of his *Disputationes adversus astrologiam divinatricem*, cf. COPENHAVER 1999, 16.

criticism were ahead of his time.<sup>54</sup> Seemingly neutral, philology had a great impact on the evolution of the minds at that period. Philological research was a fruit of the increasing spirit of criticism. The questioning of the authority of important texts, considered up to then as authentic, undermined the established order (also ecclesiastical) based on these texts. The best known example are the results of Lorenzo Valla's research on the *Donatio Constantini* or Apostles' Creed. Maximus' later experiences in Muscovy connected with translations undertaken by him were also a manifestation of the danger of philology.

The above quoted Maximus' exclamation may indicate that he met Poliziano in his lifetime (he died 1494). The great scholar was probably – directly or indirectly – one of the sources of Maximus' philological competences.<sup>55</sup>

From the lack of more precise data we can only presume through which channels Trivolis might have familiarised himself with these new intellectual streams. Besides the Florentine *Studio* and private schools, it was in various informal groups or private associations where these ideas were discussed and disseminated. It is not difficult to imagine the young Trivolis listening to discussions in the library of San Marco's priory (so called *Accademia Marciana*) or attending meetings of the Camaldolese circle led by Ficino in Santa Maria degli Angeli or in the famous Rotunda designed by Brunelleschi where Ficino also preached.<sup>56</sup> Maybe already then, at this *Camaldolese Academy* Michael made the acquaintance of Pietro Candido, a Camaldolite who later helped him during the difficult moments after Trivolis gave up his Dominican life. Candido at that time travelled throughout Greece but occasionally visited S. Maria degli Angeli.<sup>57</sup> It is also possible, as Denissoff maintained, that during these Florentine years and in the same milieu the relationship began between him and Scipio Fortegueri (Carteromachos). Yet, in sources concerning Trivolis he would appear later.

---

54 Maximus' mention of Poliziano (M-I, 363): “Аггела же Полициана, въ Флорентии бывшаго, кто не вѣсть...” On Poliziano: COLILLI 1999.

55 Angelo Poliziano also became a priest some time before 1486, see the previous note. Maximus' care about using good manuscript for his translation in Moscow reveal a good philological school (see below). Mark Musurus, Michael's friend, was also an outstanding philologist.

56 The term *Platonic Academy*, appearing in sources is ambiguous, see: FIELD 2002, 359-376, esp. 375. On meetings in the Camaldolese circle: LACKNER 2002, 15-44. This name *Accademia Marciana* (and also: *Christiana academia*) is used by CRINITO, De honesta, 104, cf. also 72 and 117, when he describes the discussion held in San Marco priory in Florence. Cf. also: RIDOLFI 1981, 146. 188-190.

57 I would like to thank Dennis Lackener, who prepares a book on Camaldolese culture in fifteenth – sixteenth centuries, for sharing with me this information on Candido. Apart from that, a MS suggests possible contacts between Candido and Michael Trivolis: the former made a note in Vat. gr. 1379 which was partially copied by Michael (SPERANZI 2010, 280, note 94). Also Arsenios Apostolis copied for Candido a MS of Sophocles, cf. GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 173. The circles of Candido's and Trivolis' acquaintances crossed each other. On Candido see also below, note 192.

### *Florentine life*

The intellectual dimension of Michael's experience in Florence was essential in shaping his view of the Western world but undoubtedly also the everyday life of the city contributed to the way he saw the West. Little of this daily experience was reflected in his writings. Amid the few mentions we find an expression of a belief, deep-rooted among Florentines, about the exceptional vocation of their city. This conviction, shared also by Savonarola, is present, in a way, in Maximus the Greek's *Terrible Story* where he speaks about Florence as the most beautiful and the best of Italian cities. The power and splendour of the city certainly impressed the young stranger from provincial Greece but also the messianic mission, that Savonarola invested Florence with, may have influenced the Greek's opinion.

Maximus' account of the newly discovered America that he made for his Russian readers might have also mirrored what the city lived and breathed. News of the world arrived quickly in Florence thanks to its extensive economical and political connections. Columbus's letters, published in Rome in 1493 circulated at about that time in Florence. Amerigo Vespucci whose reports were published slightly later, was also a Florentine.<sup>58</sup>

Finally, Maximus' first contact with astrology, that he so persistently fought in his Muscovite works, must have also occurred in Florence. The judicial astrology was commonly used and the city (as other Italian cities and Italian rulers) had its own official astrologer to foresee favourable moments for important enterprises. Savonarola's work against astrology testifies that it was a pastoral challenge in Florence.<sup>59</sup>

### *Savonarola*

Against these scraps of reminiscence stand out the strongest and the best remembered experience that Michael Trivolis had in Florence. This was hearing Savonarola preach and observing his lifestyle. Maximus remembered Italy and the people he met there but only to the recollection of Savonarola's life and activity did he devote a separate work.

The pitiful state of the Church at this time, on one hand, and the millenarian, eschatological mood of the *fin de siècle* on the other, laid the ground for the teaching of the Dominican prophet.<sup>60</sup> People expected extraordinary events and the troubled times favoured the

---

58 On Maximus' account of Florence: Z-249; of America: K III, 44-45. On Columbus' letters: DENISSOFF 1943, 153. Maximus' account might have been also written under the influence of Amerigo Vespucci's letters, published at the beginning of the sixteenth century. NB, Zanobi Acciaiuoli, a probable Trivolis' acquaintance, was a friend of Amerigo Vespucci, see: VERDE, *Studio*, III, 944. On Acciaiuoli see below, note 160ff.

59 Cf. SAVONAROLA, *Contra li astrologi*. On the situation in Florence cf., e.g., LUCAS-DUBRETON 1958, 42. Writing about astrology in Italy Maximus invoked first of all his Milanese experience (see below) but the very beginnings of his interest in astrology were very likely connected with Florentine years.

60 The passage on Savonarola is based on the classic works by RIDOLFI 1981 and WEINSTEIN 1970 as well as

spreading of apocalyptic ideas.

For those who desired the renewal of Christianity, the necessity of the reform of the Church was evident. Less evident was the way of realising it. Pragmatic projects of healing ecclesiastical structures coexisted with prophetic visions of the approaching scourge of God provoked by the misdeeds of Christians. The turbulences were to be followed by the arrival of the new age of a renewed Christianity and the reign of the Angelic Pope. These elements run through the majority of the contemporary prophesies.

Savonarola can be placed in the current of the millenarian movement. His rhetoric was that of other millenarian prophets. He warned against the arrival of God's punishment as a result of the sinful life of Florence, called for conversion both in the individual and the social dimensions,<sup>61</sup> summoned the clergy to reform and promised renewal of the Church. However, unlike other millenarian preachers, only fra Girolamo remained vivid in Christians' memory. His uniqueness consisted in fact that he aimed and, to a certain extent, succeeded to transform the whole life of the city according to the principles of Christian virtues. His role was simultaneously political and religious. He not only warned about the results of immoral life but managed to introduce some measures to remove immorality and injustice from social life, to help those who, because of poverty, found themselves on the margin of society. His consistency and zeal in putting his teaching into practice enhanced his credibility. Last but not least, the fact that his prophecies came true (or were interpreted as coming true) was for his adherents a sign of a supernatural confirmation.<sup>62</sup>

Savonarola became a symbol of the long-awaited reform of the Church and gathered around his ideas not only an easily impressionable crowd but also the elite of Florence. His solid intellectual formation and intelligence helped him to find a way of making contact with demanding listeners. It was, among other things, the intellectual level of his preaching and writings that distinguished him from many other prophets of the coming Millennium.

As his importance and his influence grew, also opportunists acceded to the Savonarolian camp but there were still many enthusiastic people, attracted by the power of his personality, who followed him ready to commit themselves to the renewal of Florence and the Church. San

---

WEINSTEIN 1999 and recent works by POLIZZOTTO, 1994 and 1998.

61 On the general mood of this period in Florence: WEINSTEIN 1970, chapter I. According to WEINSTEIN 1970, ch. I and II, Savonarola only in the last period of his predication (1494-1498) directed his attention to Florence and its special vocation. But it was the most important moment of his activity and the time of his greatest influence.

62 E.g. eradication of gambling universally practised despite bans of secular and ecclesiastical authorities, expelling prostitutes, creating the *Monte pieta* – institution which helped poor girls who could not marry because of the lack of a dowry.



Marco registered a huge growth in the number of novices among whom were sons of the most influential Florentine families and people holding important offices in the city. The Prophet's charismatic teaching convinced also a part of the brethren already in the Order to join him.<sup>63</sup> Savonarola's charisma and the example of his life were so strong that many of his followers remained faithful to the memory of their master and to the desire of renewing the Church, even in the midst of persecution, for years and often till the end of their life.

Especially interesting for us is the attitude of the intellectual and artistic circle that Trivolis moved in. Despite the radicalism of Savonarola's ideas (or: because of this) he was able to influence many of them. Sandro Botticelli experienced a radical conversion, Girolamo Benivieni *Christianised* the second edition of his *Buccolica*, Giovanni Pico changed his life, Gianfrancesco Pico (Giovanni's nephew and later Savonarola's biographer), was influenced profoundly by the prophet and became one of his most persistent adherents. Some of them strove to combine the philosophical ideas of Florentine humanists with Savonarola's principles. Giovanni Nesi, Ficino's disciple and a friend of Gianfrancesco Pico, depicted the Dominican prophet as a Hermetic seer or a new Socrates. It was not an opportunism. Nesi, who became a truly devoted Savonarolian, did not give up his previous ideas that he shared with Ficino. On the contrary, he showed that Savonarola was a sign of accomplishment of his and his fellows expectations.<sup>64</sup>

The Dominican, for his part, sought to win eminent scholars and artists over to the cause of reform. Contrary to popular belief, he did not reject either certain values of ancient philosophy nor all innovations made by humanists in Italian culture.<sup>65</sup> He had however a very clear vision of what should be removed and what should be introduced to heal the Church and society. Therefore, in order to protect the purity of the Christian faith, he was against blind fascination for Plato and other ancient thinkers and emphasised the *pagan* elements present in

---

63 The history of the reformed Congregation of San Marco is not very well researched yet. Older bibliography can be found in AOP, 1895, 47-8. There is an important study by CREYTENS 1970. POLIZZOTTO 1998, 41 advances a thesis that not only Savonarola's preaching but also the good organisation of the reformed congregation contributed to Savonarola's success. He emphasises that San Marco, except for the short period of St.

Antoninus, was not a dynamic and interesting priory, capable to attract Florentine aristocracy. About important personalities who entered San Marco at that time see: RIDOLFI 1981, 85-6. 188-9.

64 On Nesi see: WEINSTEIN 1970, 197, 202 and POLIZZOTTO 1994, 87. On Giovanni Pico: WEINSTEIN 1970, 211-14; Benivieni: *ibid.*, 216-17. The question: to what extent Savonarola influenced humanists is still discussed (e.g. RIDOLFI 1981, 145-6 thinks that Savonarola greatly influenced the evolution of Giovanni Pico while WEINSTEIN 1970, 211-12, is convinced that Pico evolved as a result of his own reflections because it happened before Savonarola's return to Florence) but certainly the Dominican was a catalyst that caused some attitudes to crystallise.

65 E.g. he made a difference between Plato and Platonists in order not to ascribe to Plato the errors of Platonists but he himself preferred Aristotle, see: GARIN 1961, 201-202. 204. Furthermore, Savonarola's care about San Marco library where many ancient work were collected and the discussions held there are also significant.

their thoughts. His main objection was the fact that, without the light of faith, they were not able to have the true cognition of God and of the end of human life. For this reason, their wisdom was – at best – of relative value. There are also in their thought – reckoned the Dominican – elements contrary to Christian faith that led them, from time to time, to behaviour far from Christian standards. Savonarola’s assessment of the Florentine Platonists displays a sober realism. His stance does not imply a total rejection of Plato’s philosophical value but a dissent from the way the Florentine humanists incorporated him into Christian thought. By defending the Christian faith he defended also, in a way, the identity of the ancient philosophers: “Let Plato be Plato and Aristotle Aristotle and not Christians, for they are not”.<sup>66</sup> For the friar, the value of the Christian revelation was incomparable to anything else and that is why he acted in defence of this absolute value and attached smaller significance to relative values.<sup>67</sup>

The effort to overstep the boundaries between philosophy and faith, Christianity and other religions was therefore of little significance for him if it was not harmful. Such a position inevitably caused tensions between Savonarola and some Florentine intellectuals. Ficino (for whom Savonarola’s approach may have signified a rejection of the work of his life) and Pietro Delfino ultimately turned their backs on him. Giovanni Pico’s case was particular. He and fra Girolamo influenced one another. The friar’s preaching impressed Pico very much but also the count’s intelligence and theological erudition commanded Savonarola’s respect. While the friar’s general criticism directed at people fascinated by ancient philosophy was very determined, his attitude towards Pico was more balanced. It is true that he warned Pico not to equate rashly the ideas of ancient philosophers with Christian notions and encouraged him to search for the truth rather in Salomon’s portico than in the pagan Academia but at the same time appreciated his knowledge and considered him equal to the Fathers of the Church!<sup>68</sup>

---

66 “Si vuol fare che Platone sia Platone, Aristotile Aristotile, e non che siano cristiani, perché non sono.” SAVONAROLA, *Prediche sull’Esodo*, II, 290-1 (trans. JURDJEVIC 2004, 66-7). To show the impossibility of Plato’s or Socrates’ transformation into Christians, Savonarola gives examples: Plato ascribed the whole glory to himself and not to God, Socrates was led by a *daimonion* who was not a good angel (“Socrate dice che seguitava uno demonio...; onde lui dice che non lo provocava mai al bene, *ergo* non era buon angelo”) and consider offering a cock to an idol, GARIN 1961, 202 and *passim* the whole chapter, p. 201-212.

67 See: SAVONAROLA, *Prediche sopra i Salmi*, I, 255-256. Cf. also: CRINITO, *De honesta*, 104-5.

68 On the evolution of Savonarola’s followers: POLIZZOTTO 1994, 95-96 and WEINSTEIN 1970, 186-91. Of course there was no shortage of people who were Savonarola’s adversaries from the very beginning. There were also different than ideological reasons of the conflict between Ficino and Savonarola. “The fact that Ficino wrote a rather venomous invective against Savonarola after the friar’s death [...] is quite understandable, since Ficino as a person must have resented the execution of Bernardo del Nero and other friends in 1497 [...]”, KRISTELLER 1985, 95 (he quotes his *Supplementum Ficinianum*, II, 76-9). Ficino did not withdraw from the Florentine life in 1494, when Savonarola won serious influence in the city (as it was maintained up to now) cf. JURDJEVIC 2004, *passim*. WEINSTEIN 1970, 192, thinks that the crisis and polarisation among Florentine intellectuals was

From among other Florentine intellectuals Gianfrancesco Pico and Zanobi Acciaiuoli (to name just those with whom Trivolis was in touch) remained faithful to the friar.<sup>69</sup> Michael was also one of them.

The portrait of Savonarola that he would transmit to his readers and the course of events during the prophet's preaching are very close to the one we know from the Italian sources. He emphasised that he had been the eyewitness of these events and that he had often listened to the Prior's of San Marco cycle of five-year teaching. He accurately described that at first Savonarola preached in San Marco priory and then was invited to preach in the cathedral church where people listened to his homilies on Sundays and feast days as well as each day of Lent. He admired the preacher's education and theological wisdom and said that the Dominican could preach two hours and more not using any book but drawing "from the treasury of his memory" where he preserved the wisdom of the Holy Scripture. Perhaps even more admirable for Maximus – as Ivanov rightly observed – was Savonarola's zeal in God's cause, the desire to show sinners the way of conversion. One can later observe tracks of the Master's zeal in the Disciple's life.<sup>70</sup> The spiritual transformation of the city influenced by the preaching of the Dominican also made a great impression on the young Greek. As an example he told the story of a poor widow who brought Savonarola a pouch with a large amount of money she had found on a street and asked him to find the owner despite her own poverty.<sup>71</sup>

---

caused by the death of Lorenzo de' Medici and Savonarola only exploited this situation. Some scholars (above-mentioned JURDJEVIC 2004; GARFAGNINI 1996, 59 or BROWN 1986, 403) maintain that Savonarola's attack on Platonism was motivated politically but their arguments are frail. On Savonarola's attitude towards Giovanni Pico see, e.g. CRINITO, *De honesta*, 104: "Cave – inquit [Savonarola] – Laurentiane, ne verba pro rebus accipias. Nam qui veteres philosophos in academiam pertrahunt, perfacile quidem vel falluntur ipsi vel alios fallunt. Plato enim ad animi insolentiam, Aristoteles vero ad impietatem instruit; quo magis te – inquit – Laurentiane, hortamur, ut ab ipsis philosophiae spatiis atque umbraculis ad Salomonis porticum deficias, in qua certissima vitae ratio atque veritas continetur." Further (ibid., 105) we read: "Et unus tu – inquit – es, Pice, aetate nostra, qui omnium veterum philosophiam ac religionis Christianae praecepta et leges percalleas, ut haec tua quidem rerum paene omnium cognitio antiquioribus illis Hieronymo, Augustino, Basiliis, Gregoriisque ac Dionysiis merito conferri possit." It did not prevent him threatening Pico with God's punishment if he resisted his vocation and did not enter the Dominican order, see: RIDOLFI 1981, s. 147, n. 9 who quotes: Domenico Benivieni, *Trattato... in defensione e probazione...*, Firenze, Buonaccorsi, 28 maggio 1496 (Audin 157; Hain - Copinger, 2784; G.W. 3849). Ridolfi did not indicate the page of Benivieni's work. Benivieni says that Pico was halfway to joining the Order and again moved back. Cf. also RIDOLFI 1981, note 10 and note 11 - 12 (about a concubine and that Pico changed his mind after the stay in Ferrara 1492)

69 On Gianfrancesco Pico see below, text and note 159, on Zanobi Acciaiuoli below, note 160.

70 On Maximus' description of Savonarola: Z-250. See also note 24 above about the five-year-period. On Savonarola's preaching customs: Z-254. On his zeal (ревность по Бозе): Z-253 and Z-250. Cf. also: IVANOV 1973, 115.

71 Cf. Z-250: "И толико възможе слово его, яко большая часть града възлюбивши крѣпкая и спасительная учения его, отступити съврѣшено коемуждо своя многвременныя злобы и лукавства и възлюбити вмѣсто всякого блуда, и студодѣяния, и нечистоты плотскыя всякое цѣломудрие и чистоту; неправеднаго же, и лихоимца, и рѣзоимца немилосерда видѣти бѣ абие праведнѣиша, и милостива, и човеколюбца бывша. И нѣкымъ от сицевыхъ подражающимъ Закхѣя, начальника мытаремъ, иже въ Еуагелии, злѣ и неправеднѣ събрана бывша ими имѣния, расточающимъ добрѣ сущимъ в нуждахъ руками

Maximus' fascination for Savonarola did not lead him however to create a naïve hagiography. He saw clearly and soberly the tension that the prior of San Marco provoked in Florence and understood the changeability in the mood of the Florentine people. He did not write about it directly but he was obviously aware of it. The juxtaposition of two quotations underlines this: in one place Maximus said that the whole of Florence loved Savonarola and the citizens invited him to preach in the cathedral, in another that half the citizens were against him because of his criticism of their mores.<sup>72</sup>

Maximus saw clearly that the heart of the matter was the prophet's confrontation with Church hierarchy. Savonarola, according to his account, radically accused the clergy (including the pope) of not living according to the Apostles.<sup>73</sup> The Greek rightly observed that the argument with the Church authorities activated those who were the Dominican's adversaries from the very beginning and directly contributed to his fall.

The more Maximus' story comes closer to the end of Savonarola's life, the more he stylises him as a perfect Christian in whose life Christ's prophecies are fulfilled and the experiences of Christ and his apostles repeated. Savonarola is Christ-like.<sup>74</sup> The Greek monk contrasted the hatred of Savonarola's enemies with his own perseverance in his mission. They treated him as a heretic and blasphemer and threatened to excommunicate him if he did not stop preaching. He, in answer, continued his prophetic activity all the more. Maximus depicted the canonical attempts to silence him as being unlawful (беззаконный).<sup>75</sup> The fact that this argument, frequently used by the pro-Savonarolian propaganda, was adopted by the Greek again indicates his close bonds with this circle.<sup>76</sup>

---

учителя своего. И да не вся по ряду исправления его глаголя, стужаю прочитающим списания сия: множае града того преложишяся от всякыя злобы ихъ въ всякый образ добродѣтели достохвалныя." On Italian witnesses of the transformation of the city see: RIDOLFI 1981, 191-2. The story of the poor widow: Z 250-1.

72 See: Z-250 ("И възлюбленъ бывъ от всего града [...] большая часть града възлюбивши крѣпкая и спасительная учения его") and Z-251 ("[...] а другая половина [...] враждоваше ему"). This description corresponds well to the account of a Florentine chronicler (Parenti, Storia, I, 299-302), cf. WEINSTEIN 2011, 180.

73 See: Z-252, esp. "[...] въ властѣхъ церковныхъ суть, а не апостолоподобнѣ живутъ" and "Аще бы мы жительствовади достоино Еуагтелию Спаса Христа, вся убо всяко иновѣрныя языки обратилися бы къ Господу, зряще наше равноаггельно житие..."

74 Maximus quotes e.g. Mt 23: 14 and Acts 4: 17 (Z-252) in relation to the conduct of Savonarola's enemies. Other quotations (Lc 22: 15 and Phil 1: 23.21) he uses in Z-253 as a testimony of a zeal similar to that of Savonarola.

75 In Z-252 Maximus compares this ban on preaching to Acts 4: 17. To show Savonarola's perseverance and the hatred of his enemies the Greek related, inter alia, that his enemies dirtied the pulpit, where the Dominican preached, with faeces (Z-251). A very similar story can be found in Pseudo-Burlamacchi, cf. RIDOLFI 1981, 287-8.

76 Savonarola himself declared that the excommunication bull is invalid, see POLIZZOTTO 1994, 88-91 and 296-297. On further discussions concerning the validity of the excommunication see: RIDOLFI 1981, 298. Gianfrancesco Pico also contested the validity of the excommunication in his *Opusculum de sententia excommunicationis iniusta pro Hieronymi Savonarolae innocentia* published in Florence in 1498 (RIDOLFI

His description of the Dominican's imprisonment and death is hagiographical but not deprived of realism. Maximus writes that the prior of San Marco decided to die "for [the true] devotion and God's glory" (за благочестие и Божию славу, Z-253) if it was necessary. He relates the events as someone being close to them, emphasising his conviction about rectitude of his judgement. Maximus depicted Savonarola as a martyr (as did other of the prophet's followers), a saintly, unblemished preacher opposed to the pope Alexander VI (portrayed as the worst sinner) and his envoys. Most instructive is the short account about the trial. The prophet answered in such a way to the accusations that the judge could not have found him guilty. Only the testimonies of perjured witnesses made it possible to condemn him.<sup>77</sup> Of course, Maximus does not mention Savonarola's breakdown when he was subjected to torture but other details he provides (the Master of the Order participation in Savonarola's condemnation, the fact that he was hanged together with his two brothers and that all their bodies were burned) prove his well-founded knowledge about the end of the Prophet's life. We do not know what he saw with his own eyes and what he heard but surely he was very close to the events he retold.

Towards the end of his *Terrible Story* Maximus again contrasted Savonarola's zeal to preach the Gospel, his concern for the change of Florentines' morals and the unjust sentence. Then, he wrote these amazing words: "I would make them equal, with joy, to ancient defenders of the true faith if they were not Latins. So great was their zeal for the glory of God and the salvation of the faithful."<sup>78</sup>

In this way Trivolis became a witness of two phenomena that were fundamental for Western culture of this period: the confrontation between pagan and Christian thought as well as the formation of the dissent within the Church that changed radically the religious landscape of Europe. This tension that Michael experienced in the late fifteenth century Italy can be felt

---

1981, 628, n. 10). Giustiniani seems to suggest that Savonarola had the right not to obey the excommunication since it would have been an act against charity, cf. WEINSTEIN 1970, 360. Maximus does not use this argument *ex caritate* neither say directly that the excommunication was illegitimate. However he often describes Savonarola's enemies' activity as illegal or unlawful (беззаконные, несправедливо, etc – Z-252-4). The similarity with the language of the pro-Savonarolian propaganda is striking. This story reveals an erosion of the spiritual authority in the Western Church, the fact that certainly had an impact of Maximus' thought. There was a similar although less grave case of Giovanni Caroli OP (1428-1503) who, in his controversy with the Master of the Order expressed an opinion that "disobedience to a tyrant [i.e. the Master of the Order] can be justified, even if he is a Christian magistrate" see: EDELHEIT 2008, 57.

77 See: Z-253. This report could be formed under the influence of Pico's *Vita Savonarolae*, esp. of the last chapter that was entitled: *De conformatione Hieronymi ad Christum* (PICO, *Vita Savonarolae*). See also *ibid.*, 170 where Pico, like Maximus, juxtaposes Savonarola with ancient Christian martyrs.

78 Maximus correctly named the Master of the Order involved in the anti-Savonarolian action as Иакымъ (Z-253). It was Gioacchino (Joachim) Torriani. Maximus' praise of Savonarola and his brethren (Z-254): "Азь же, толико совѣтенъ бывати, несправеднымъ онѣмъ судиямъ отстою, яко и прикладоваль бы убо ихъ с радостію древнимъ защитителемъ благочестію, аще не быша латыня вѣрою."

in his work of the Muscovite period. Savonarola played a significant part in shaping his views and the encounter with him made an indelible mark on Trivolis. The friar became a part of a stream that flowed through Europe crossing confessional boundaries. Catholic reformers cited him as a reference, Luther published his writings and Maximus the Greek, who ultimately realised his vocation in the Orthodox Church, even in Moscow remained a disciple of the great Dominican. His commitment to the reform of the Church became apparent later, in the Orthodox Rus', but it must have been moulded in Italy, under the prior of San Marco's influence.<sup>79</sup>

We do not know when Michael Trivolis left Florence. A series of unfavourable events and disasters caused Florence to no longer be an attractive place to study: Lorenzo de' Medici died in 1492, Poliziano and Giovanni Pico in 1494, Laskaris left Florence with Charles VIII probably towards the end of the year 1496 (or even earlier), Ficino would die in 1499 and the Italian wars ruined the country. The standard of teaching fell and there were no classes at all in *Studio Fiorentino* between 1494 and 1495.<sup>80</sup> Trivolis' companion, Mark Musurus, probably left Florence in 1494 and certainly he was in Venice at least from July 11<sup>th</sup> 1495. Other young Greeks similarly abandoned the city in 1495-6. All these facts allow us to assume that Trivolis also left Florence in 1495 or 1496.<sup>81</sup>

It is also possible that he used to leave Florence from time to time before 1496 and visited the city again after this date. Maximus writes about Italian schools, as observed Denissoff, in the plural and seems to talk about them as an eyewitness. He may have listened to some lectures or just visited universities in Padua, Bologna and Ferrara at roughly the same time.<sup>82</sup>

---

79 In 1524 in Strasbourg Luther published Savonarola's *Meditations*. Similarities between Savonarola's and Maximus' works will be discussed in chapter III.

80 See: VERDE, *Studio*, III/2, 997 and IV/3, 1148-49, DENISSOFF 1943, 167-169. Laskaris was still in Florence in October 1495, see: KNÖS 1945, 77.

81 Musurus already in 1494 collaborated with Aldo: LEGRAND 1885, I, CIX and CATALDI PALAU 2004, 309. On Musurus and other young Greeks: SPERANZI 2010, 282-3. On Trivolis: DENISSOFF 1943, 90. He thinks that Trivolis was still in Florence in 1495 (p. 166. 170-171) because he mentioned *their* preaching. Domenico Buonvicini's (Savonarola's companion) preaching was popular only from 1495. Yet, the fact that he listened to the five-year predication by Savonarola is not decisive for the chronology because it does not imply that he was in Florence incessantly during these five years.

82 Cf. the expression: "иди умом ко училищем италииским" (M-I, 181) and M-I, 333. The stay in Lombardy and a possible visit to the University of Pavia may have happened some time later. Cf. also below about Milan and Savoy.

## VENICE AND AROUND

Directly or not, possibly visiting in the meantime his homeland, Michael Trivolis went to Venice. On the way he probably stopped in Bologna. Urceo Codro in his letter of 1498 writes about a young Greek called Michael whom Denissoff identified with Trivolis. It is possible therefore that he was in the city before June 1497 and met Urceo Codro there.<sup>83</sup>

His presence in Venice is better attested. The manuscript he copied indicates that he was there not later than 15<sup>th</sup> of March 1498. His links with Aldo Manuzio are testified by both Italian and Muscovite sources.

After the decline of Laurentian Florence, Venice assumed the role of the capital of the Italian Renaissance. Bonds between these two cities, despite political differences or sometimes enmity, were natural and humanists moved from one to another and kept mutual contacts. Trivolis was not an exception in this respect.

No less important for him was the fact that Venice (with Padua which belonged to the Republic) was the largest centre of Greek immigrants in Italy. Their position was still fragile and they had to struggle for the recognition of their rights but Venice's traditional links with Levant and the relative religious freedom created favourable conditions for Greek settlement. Many eminent Greeks treated Venice as their second home. Bessarion called Venice *quasi alter Byzantium* in a letter to the Doge concerning the donation of his priceless library to the Serenissima. The letters of people close to Trivolis (M. Musurus, J. Gregoropoulos, Michael Apostolis, Demetrius Ducas) bear testimony to their attachment to Venice. Laskaris did not cease to treat Venice in the same way even when it could have caused the disgrace of Louis XII

---

<sup>83</sup> Codro writes on April, 15<sup>th</sup> 1498 to Battista Palmieri: "Scripseram ad te superioribus mensibus de quodam iuvene Graeco, ut mihi significares an ex patria reversus fuisset; rescripsisti non reversum fuisse seu nihil de eo accepisse. Et ego nunc audio illum esse cum Aldo iam tres sunt menses. Vide, Baptista mi, qua diligentia in rebus amici uteris! Sed dices: Est alius qui est cum Aldo. Ego illum ex signis mihi dictis esse intelligo quem quaero. Nomen eius est Michael, Spartiates patria; iuvenis est longo collo. Sed quid haec scribo? Rogato tu illum Michaelem an unquam fuerit Bononiae, et an me norit, an alium Bononiensem, an Nicolaum illum nostrum, qui obiit mortem, et qua aetate sit, mihi rescribe, te obsecro, quamprimum; item an velit redire Bononiam unquam. Noli autem illi dicere haec a me tibi scripta fuisse [...] Memento rescribere quid mihi ab illo Graeco iuvene intellexeris & an fit ille que quaero. Discesserat enim in patriam circa Iulij mensis finem vel Iunij potius, ut reor." CODRO 1540, 267. 268-9. Denissoff identifies this Michael with Trivolis because he does not see any other possible person who could be this young Greek, sought by Codro. DOREZ 1896, 325, note 1 says that according to [Henri] Omont (without any reference, probably it was an oral information) this Michael is Michael Souliardos. DENISSOFF 1943, 92-93 disagrees with him saying that Souliardos executed the profession of copyist already in 1475 so he cannot have been called *young* in 1498. The first known copy made by Souliardos comes from 1477 (RGK 2-A, no. 392). Since Michael, has been for three months *with Aldo* and earlier he left for his homeland in June or July so his previous stay in Bologna must have been before 1497. Denissoff (ibid., 254-256) finds in Maximus' work some reaction against Bolognan nominalism. The mention about an offer of a job that Trivolis received from Bologna (M-I, 90) corresponds with the above quoted letter by Codro. SINITSYNA 2006<sup>b</sup>, 199, thinks that Trivolis started working for Aldo only in 1503 but the MS mentioned above, note 36, suggest earlier collaboration.

of whom he was the ambassador to the Republic. A work of Maximus the Greek also shows a liking for Venice when he described its conflict with Milan.<sup>84</sup>

The strong Greek presence in Venice on one hand and the good printing infrastructure on the other caused the city to become not only the humanist but also the most important centre of Greek printing during this period. Both Greek entrepreneurs and the Italian, Aldo Manuzio, opened their printing shops here.

The first Greek initiatives were ephemeral. The most important of them was Zacharias Kalliergis' and Nicholas Vlastos' enterprise. It operated for a short time (1499-1500) but its activity is significant because of the quality of its production.

Nicholas Vlastos was more an investor whereas Zacharias Kalliergis supervised the publishing process. It seems that this printing shop employed exclusively Greeks and not only that but strictly Greeks from Crete. In a poem on the first leaf of their edition of the *Etymologicum Magnum* Musurus who worked for Kalliergis and Vlastos, proudly described how all activity of the production of books were carried out by Cretans. Gregoropoulos was also involved in publishing initiatives of Kalliergis/Vlastos.<sup>85</sup> Their friend Michael Trivolis was in this circle too. His ties with Musurus and Gregoropoulos are confirmed, but he also seems to know Kalliergis and Vlastos. About his participation in their activity one can only make a supposition on the basis of an isolated remark in his letter to Gregoropoulos: "I told Zacharias that he should think about fulfilling what he promised me when I left." It could be about – as Denissoff implies – a fee for Trivolis' work for Kalliergis printing shop that was, as yet, unpaid. The *Etymologicum Magnum* published by them in 1499 had been preparing to print – as we read in the preface to this work – for six years. Kalliergis needed many assistants for this extensive project. Admittedly Musurus, in the preface, maintains that all essential works in the

---

84 Trivolis copied in Venice the *Commentary on Prior Analytics* by Ioannes Philoponus, Crem. Cod. 177 (cf. HARLFINGER 2000, 768-9). This MS is dated: 5.03.1498 in Venice. On relative religious and academic freedom in Venice: RUNCIMAN 1968, 212; BLACK 2001, 200-3. At least partially this freedom resulted from the dominance of the political factor over the religious which is attested by the famous Venetian saying: *Semo Veneziani e poi Cristiani*, see: GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 43 where he quotes Stephanos Xanthoudides, *Ἡ Ἐνετοκρατία ἐν Κρήτῃ*, Athens 1939, 156. On situation of the Greek community in Venice with its advantages and difficulties of Greeks in Venice: MANOUSSACAS 1989, 322-323 and ff.; GEANAKOPOLOS 1976, 177-178. On the Greek intellectuals' attachment to Venice, *ibid.* On Bessarion: GEANAKOPOLOS 1966, 115. On Laskaris: LEGRAND 1885, II, 330f and DENISSOFF 1943, 224. Maximus expresses a liking for Venice (the fact noticed by DENISSOFF 1943, 224) when he describes Lodovico il Moro and his action against Venice in alliance with the sultan Bajazet: M-I, 289 (=K-I, 427).

85 Musurus' poem see: LEGRAND 1885, I, 58-9, its English translation: GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 125. On Musurus see above, note 14. Gregoropoulos' part in Kalliergis & Vlastos enterprise is signalled in his epigram printed in the *Etymologicum Magnum*: LEGRAND 1885, I, 59. Generally, Cretans were over-represented among the Greek population in Venice and especially among Greek intellectuals, cf. FONKICH 1965, GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 41-52 and PANAGIOTAKES 1995.



process of preparing the book for printing were executed by Cretans but it does not exclude that there were other collaborators. There is also a feeble trace of Michael's possible bonds with Vlastos. In his two letters to Carteromachos he asks the addressee to greet Nicholas the Cretan who might be identified with Vlastos.<sup>86</sup>

Larger, much more important and longer lasting was Aldo Manuzio's publishing house. This eminent Italian publisher made available to West-European readers virtually all the fundamental works of ancient Greek philosophers and writers, among them many *editiones principes*. He set himself a target to make this legacy available in the most accurate way, seeing that the previous editions were full of mistakes. It was a pioneering venture. The textual research progressed however slowly. Only the best scholars had enough knowledge to improve unintelligible fragments. Average editors often had little courage to change the established lections. Even Aldo himself confessed that he had not dared to change the received text but only juxtaposed it with available variants.<sup>87</sup>

He managed however to gather round him many, often outstanding, collaborators who contributed to the considerable progress made in classical scholarship. Among them were Greeks (also those who worked in Kalliergis – Vlastos printing shop), Italians and humanists from Northern Europe. Trivolis' friends (John Gregoropoulos, Mark Musurus and Scipio Forteguerra) were closely associated to this undertaking. Other people who Michael knew and mentioned in his letters or who he might have known (Pietro Candido, other Camaldolese

---

86 On Kalliergis & Vlastos printing shop see: STAIKOS 1998, 391ff; STAIKOS 2000; GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 201-222 and passim. Kalliergis' press was at that time "at the shop of Luca Antonio the bookseller, next to the *Crucechieri*" (LEGRAND 1885, II, 312). GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 123 says: "According to G. Tassini, *Curiosita veneziana*, 6th ed. Venice 1933, 31 the *Crucechieri* are the *Crociferi*; these fathers are nonexistent today in Venice. But the location would be in the Campo de' Gesuiti at the Fundamenta Nuova." The fragment of Musurus preface where he mentions the contributions of Cretans is published by GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 125. The original of the preface was published by FIRMIN-DIDOT 1875, 549. For Trivolis' see his letters: M-I, 86-101, esp. 94 (for Zacharias) and 98. 100 (for Nicholas). DENISSOFF 1943, 204-5, observed that in an epigram, Gregoropoulos gave Vlastos the nickname *the Cretan*, cf. LEGRAND 1885, I, 59. Yet, it is not out of question that Trivolis' greetings concern Nicholas Kalliergis, son of Zacharias. On him: LAYTON 1990. Finally, it is worth to be noted that in the MS copied by Trivolis (Vat. gr. 1379) we find a marginal note (f. 26r) attributed to Zacharias Kalliergis: RGK, 3-A no. 197.

87 For Manuzio biography and further bibliography: M. LOWRY 1999, AQUILON 1997 and INFELISE 2007. M. LOWRY 1979, 8 (based on information from: M.-A. Sabellico, *De Latinae Linguae Reparatione*, in: *Opera Omnia*, vol. IV, Basel 1560, 321) says that printers in Venice settled in the parishes of San Zulian i San Paternian "and by the early 1489s rank upon rank of bookstalls tempted the passer-by as he walked from the Rialto down the Merceria towards San Marco." *Περίστον in Panaria* from Trivolis' letter (M-I, 88) is the Rialto (MANOUSSACAS-PATRINELIS 1960, 174). A letter to Aldo was addressed: "Venetij. A Sancto Paterniano ouer appresso del ponte di Rialto" other similarly: "A San Paternian. In casa di m. Andrea d'Asola" [Aldo's father-in-law], NOLHAC 1967, 64. On the imperfection of previous editions cf. the dedicatory letter of the *editio princeps* of Aristophanes in 1498: ALDO MANUZIO EDITORE, I, 24. On the slow progress of the scholarship: WILSON 1992, 134-135. 149. 152. 158. Aldo mentions his lack of courage in the preface to John Philoponus' commentary on *Analytica posteriora*, *ibid.*, 141.

humanists and a certain Paul of Padua, Arsenios Aristobulos Apostolis, Zanobi Acciaiuoli) were also connected with Aldo. Michael again found himself in the very centre of the new intellectual movement of this age.

His relationship to Manuzio was not so close as that of his friends. At the end of his stay in Italy after leaving San Marco, he asked Scipio Forteguerra to recommend him to Aldo. He would not have done this if he had been a close friend of Manuzio.<sup>88</sup> Nevertheless, through his friends who belonged to the circle of Aldo's closest collaborators, the ideas that animated their activity had to be known to him and certainly the questions that appeared in their work were not alien to him.

Scipio Forteguerra, in his lecture published by Aldo in 1504 expressed the conviction that was certainly shared by his colleagues: the Greek scholarship is indispensable for developing both philosophy and sciences because the Greeks' achievements exceed the accomplishments of other nations. Theologians need Greek and the classical thought too since "the whole of the literary tradition about Christ, with the exception of St. Matthew's Gospel, was originally composed in Greek, so that for certain matters recourse to the Greek source is essential."<sup>89</sup>

The number of people with whom Aldo had personal relationships or kept in touch by mail is impressive. Among them were the greatest minds of his time. His house was constantly full of visitors: authors, scholars, wealthy patrons and other people involved in the production and distribution of books. It was a space where he met his partners (Italian, Greek and others), discussed with them and developed new projects. They constituted more than a group of people working together. Their sense of a common mission to preserve and disseminate the legacy of the ancient thought caused them to work with the enthusiasm characteristic of pioneers. The tragicomical descriptions, even if we take into account the hyperbolic rhetoric, illustrate well

---

88 See: M-I, 98. Another sign that Trivolis was not very close to Manuzio is the fact that he is wrong when he explains the significance of Aldo's typographic mark. He admits that he is not sure whether he understood it correctly. He presented to prince Tuchkov a very pious interpretation. The anchor could be taken as a symbol of the stability of faith and the fish (dolphin) – as a human soul. So the entire mark was to illustrate the necessity of the fear of God (M-I, 345-7). In fact, the dolphin coiled around the anchor illustrated the proverb: *Festina lente*. "Sum ipse mihi optimus testis me semper habere comites, ut oportere aiunt, delphinum et anchoram. Nam et dedimus multa cunctando, et damus assidue." (Aldo to Alberto Pio of Carpi about the end of the collection of the Ancient Astronomers, 1499, FIRMIN-DIDOT 1875, 211) In any case, a double meaning of the mark is not to be excluded. Aldo announced that he had adopted this mark, in the preface to Proclus (1499) and it appeared for the first time as a typographic mark in 1502 (Poetae christiani veteres). STAIKOS 1998, 304. 306, thinks that it was taken from the woodcut illustration for the *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* rather than from Vespasian's medal (as others maintain).

89 This lecture inaugurated his course on Demosthenes: "Quid quod omnia quae de Christo literis mandata sunt graece primum composita feruntur, excepto Matthaei evangelio? quare fieri non potest ut nonnullorum fides a graeco petenda non sit.", quoted by: WILSON 1992, 132.

their commitment. Manuzio writes in the preface to the *Erotemata* (1512) that “he lacked a moment to snatch a bite of food, to relieve himself, or to wipe the drop off the end of his nose.” Erasmus echoes him saying that (during the editing of the *Adagia* – 1508) he was too busy to scratch his ears.<sup>90</sup>

The bold project of Aldo and his associated required an institution that would have ensured the permanence of the process they had initiated and the fruits of their work. A germ of this plan was to be certainly the *Neakademia* but we know very little about its activity, as such. The earliest information about it comes from the year 1502 but the ideas that were behind this initiative must have been formed in Aldo’s circle earlier. Gregoropoulos and Forteguerra, Michael’s two closest friends as we know from his letters, were co-founders, with Aldo, of this society. Mark Musurus was also a member.<sup>91</sup>

Aldo’s plans were not limited only to a publishing activity but he wanted to create an institution gathering Hebrew and Greek scholars, to publish books and lead a new educational movement. This educational dimension of his work is worth underlining.<sup>92</sup> Already the *Neakademias Nomos* began with the phrase about “serious lovers of education”. Also, in prefaces to his books, Aldo often expressed concern for good quality teaching for the young but even more for instilling moral values in pupils.<sup>93</sup> In this context, the confrontation between pagan and Christian thought, that Trivolis had experienced in Florence, gained additional weight.

Manuzio was a devout Christian and, publishing many pagan texts, he felt obliged to provide some of them with writings of Christian apologists who polemicised with them. He worried that pagan works would corrupt Christian students. In his dedicatory letters pious

---

90 On Aldo: ALDO MANUZIO EDITORE, I, 106, trans. by LOWRY 1979, 110. On Erasmus: M. M. Philips, *The adages of Erasmus...*, Cambridge 1964, 67-68, “Opulentia sordida” and “Apologia adversus Rhapsodias...” quoted by M. LOWRY 1979, 94. Musurus worked equally enthusiastically when he taught in Padua, see below, note 138.

91 The history of the Neakademia is still little researched. The expression: *Venetiis in Aldi Romani Academia* (instead of the previous: *apud Aldum* or *in domo Aldi* or *in aedibus Aldi*) appeared for the first time in August 1502 in the colophon of the first edition Sophocles’ tragedies published in August 1502 (DIONISOTTI 1995, 61). Judging from the expression: *ex academia nostra* which appears in Aldo’s publications, Academia shaped the publishing policy of Aldo’s firm, see: GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 128, n. 71. In the prefaces to his books Manuzio speaks about various people who proposed books for printing.

92 Aldo’s initiative was very much in the spirit of humanism that was an educational movement par excellence. On his plans see: WILSON 1992, 129 who quotes Johannes Cuno’s letter to Willibald Pirckheimer from 21.12.1505. Manuzio sent Cuno in 1505 to Germany to win emperor Maximilian’s support for his project to move the Neakademia to the North.

93 Cf. ALDO MANUZIO EDITORE, I, 40: “Itaque enitendum pro viribus ut et sanctos mores et bonas litteras simul edoceantur adolescentuli, quando alterum sine altero facere nullo modo licet; at si in altero peccandum foret, potior mihi ratio vivendi honeste, quam vel optime discendi videretur. Malo enim eos nullas scire litteras ornatos moribus, quam omnia scire male moratos, malisque simillimos esse daemonibus qui multa scientes - nam id ideo illis inditum est a Graecis nomen - sunt quam pessimi.” Cf. also the preface to the *Erotemata* by C. Laskaris (ibid., 3), preface to John of Damascus, below, note 94 and others. See also DIONISOTTI 1995, 59.

appeals and expression of devotion often appeared. Also the question of the reform of the Church was close to his heart.<sup>94</sup> One can observe that, with time, he emphasised more and more sharply the truth of the Christian faith.<sup>95</sup>

First of all, however, the emphasis he accorded to both Hebrew and Greek studies reveals that the research on the Bible was of fundamental significance for him. Indeed, already in 1494 he published the Psalter (edited by Dekadyos) and later he intended to print an edition of the polyglot Bible. These publications required a huge and long-lasting philological and textual research that began at least as early as 1504.<sup>96</sup> So, very likely, it was in Aldo's company

---

94 E.g. Aldo's edition of Apollonius' of Tyana life by Philostratus was accompanied by the refutation of Philostratus' view by Eusebius. Further, in the preface to *Prudentii, Prosperi, Ioannis Damasceni Opera* (1501) he wrote that he published it "ut loco fabularum et librorum gentilium infirma puerorum aetas illis imbueretur, ut vera pro veris et pro falsis falsa cognosceret, atque ita adolescentuli non in pravos et in infideles, quales hodie plurimi, sed in probos atque orthodoxos viros evaderunt [...] Tandem, Iesu Christo Deo optimo maximo adiuvante – nam, si ipse pro nobis, quis contra nos?..." (ALDO MANUZIO EDITORE, I, 34). In another place (the preface to the *Erotemata* by C. Laskaris, 1495, *ibid.*, 3) he considers Italian wars as God's punishment for *our sins*: "[...] tum status et conditio horum temporum et bella ingentia, quae nunc totam Italiam infestant, irato Deo vitii nostris, et mox totum orbem commotura ac potius concussura videntur, propter omnifariam hominum scelera multo plura maioraque iis, quae causa olim fuere ut totum humanum genus summergeret aquisque perderet iratus Deus." One can find many others similar examples. An exception is a rather liberal romance, full of pagan reminiscences, *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili*. An explanation could be the fact that Aldo was not completely free in his editorial policy because his owned only a minority of shares in his enterprise (INFELISE 2007). One might think that Aldo was a little bit embarrassed publishing it because his name appears only in the colophone while in other books he usually printed his preface. Just after that (15.09.1500) Aldo published (perhaps as a kind of counterbalance) Catherine de Siena's letters. In the preface addressed to cardinal Francis Piccolomini of Siena (the future pope Pius III, the successor of Alexander VI Borgia) he mentioned a few times the reform of the Church (cf. ALDO MANUZIO EDITORE, I, 32-3 and INFELISE 2007). I would like to express here my gratitude to prof. Marcello Garzaniti who drew my attention to this preface and who expressed his conviction that it is a sign of Manuzio's involvement on the part of Savonarola. Generally, the atmosphere of Manuzio's milieu seems to be different from that of Florentine or Lombardic intellectual circles. It can be hardly said that Venetian humanists were more pious than their colleagues but undoubtedly Aldo was a man of a more traditional devotion than the humanists from Florence. Perhaps the well known strict morals of Venetians (in comparison with the rest of Italy) was not without significance.

95 In 1500 Aldo wrote that Lucretius is worth reading "non quod vera scripserit et credenda nobis, - nam ab academicis etiam et peripateticis, nedum a theologis nostris multum dissentit - sed quia epicureae sectae dogmata eleganter et docte mandavit carminibus." In 1515, in the new edition of Lucretius (and this is the last preface written and published by Aldo) he wrote: "En igitur tibi Lucretius, et poeta et philosophus quidem maximus vel antiquorum iudicio, sed plenus mendaciorum. Nam multo aliter sentit de Deo, de creatione rerum, quam Plato, quam caeteri Academici, quippe qui epicuream sectam secutus est. Quamobrem sunt qui ne legendum quidem illum censent Christianis hominibus, qui verum Deum adorant, colunt, venerantur. Sed quoniam veritas quanto magis inquiritur, tanto apparet illustrior et venerabilior, qualis est fides catholica quam Jesus Christus Deus Opt. Max. dum in humanis ageret praedicavit hominibus, Lucretius et qui Lucretio sunt simillimi, legendi quidem mihi videntur, sed ut falsi et mendaces, ut certe sunt. Haec autem attigimus ut siquis haec nostra legens nesciat deliramenta Lucretii, ea discat a nobis." See: ALDO MANUZIO EDITORE, I, 34 and 153. This evolution observed DIONISOTTI 1995, 56-57. He thinks that Aldo in case of the relationship between the Christian faith and pagan philosophy took rather the stance of Gianfrancesco Pico than that of Giovanni, *ibid.*, 58. Lucretius was considered by many humanists as an immoral author while, even for Aldo, Plato and Aristotle in above quoted passages are placed on the side of truth, not of error.

96 On the edition of the Psalter and preparation for the polyglote Bible: GEANAKOPLIS 1962, 245 and LEGRAND 1885, I, CII-CIII. The first traces of Aldo's preparation to publish the polyglot Bible come from 1504, a time when Trivolis might have been in contact with him. Aldo published also the Fathers of the Church (Gregory of Nazianzus) and works of popular piety (the *Hours of Our Lady*, in Greek! - 1497).

that Trivolis acquired competences that he would use in Moscow for his own biblical translations.<sup>97</sup>

His connections with Manuzio are undeniable but we can say less about the character of this relationship. In his Italian correspondence, he mentioned *expressis verbis* and greeted Aldo. In Moscow he admitted that he had often visited him on literary affairs. He called Manuzio: “Aldo Romanus” as did his close friends and collaborators and as he did himself. At the end of his life Maximus told Andrew Kurbskii about the *Romans* who translated works by the Fathers of the Eastern Church, printed them and sold them at low price in Western countries “to correct and enlighten Christian peoples”.<sup>98</sup> It was certainly a reflection of (among others) Manuzio’s activity. Aldo also published Eastern Fathers and his edition were really relatively cheap.

Admittedly, Trivolis’ name does not appear in any of Manuzio’s editions but this fact does not give grounds to deny his collaboration with Aldo. It was also the fate of other people who executed work for Manuzio. Very likely, he produced at least some minor works for the printing shop. Trivolis’ expression that Aldo is “our common benefactor” speaks in support of this hypothesis. The above mentioned manuscript of the *Commentary* by Ioannes Philoponus on Prior Analytics, copied by Trivolis in 1498 in Venice, was perhaps one of these works, realised in preparation to the publication of the *Commentary* by Aldo.<sup>99</sup>

## GREEKS AND OTHER FRIENDS OF ALDO MANUZIO’S CIRCLE

Venetian intellectual and publishing circles were a space where Trivolis and other Greeks developed their careers but it was in their Greek community where they felt much more

---

97 A return to the Bible was noticeable before the Reformation. Michael encountered it in Florence where Savonarola expressed his desire to revive the interest in Holy Scriptures and to base Christian piety on the Gospel, see: WEINSTEIN 1970, 183-184 who quotes *Prediche italiane ai Fiorentini*, vol. III – 2, p. 215. 316. Similarly Gianfrancesco Pico encouraged Santi Pagnini to translate the Bible to render it accessible (POLIZZOTTO 1994, 163) and Acciaiuoli to translate Fathers. Cf. also GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 248. Venice was therefore for Michael another step towards both a deeper understanding of the Bible in Christian life and acquiring philological skills necessary to publish and to interpret it.

98 See: the letter to Gregoropoulos (M-I, 94); letters to Scipion Forteguerra (M-I, 98-100) and the letter to prince Tuchkov (M-I, 345), written already in Moscow. Additional evidence of Michael’s bonds with Manuzio might be Codro’s letter where he writes that a young Greek, possibly Trivolis, is *cum Aldo* (see above, note 83). Kurbskii’s account (KURBSKII, Новый магарит, 5v): “на исправление и просвѣщение народов хрестиянских”. The whole account *ibid.*, 5v, 7-8).

99 Trivolis says about Aldo as the *common benefactor* in his letter to Carteromachos (M-I, 100). Cf. also DENISSOFF 1943, 192-194 who emphasises that many Aldo’s collaborators were unnamed. For the MS see above, note 84. Manuzio wanted to publish Philoponus’ commentary both to Prior and to Posterior Analytics. Yet, finally he published only the Posterior in March 1504, cf. ALDO MANUZIO TIPOGRAFO, 126, no. 82. Perhaps the MS copied by Trivolis did not satisfy Aldo or it was executed for another purpose, a private commission. One of his first (if not the first) owners could be Daniele Caetani, cf. HARLFINGER 2000, 769.

at ease. Their, often uncertain, situation in a foreign country, induced them to a form of mutual aid. Sometimes they lived together as did presumably Zacharias Kalliergis and Mark Musurus for some time in Padua, at the Borgo Zocco, “opposite the well”.<sup>100</sup> Certainly, some of Aldo’s collaborators (including the Greeks) shared also a form of common life in his house. One of them may have been John Gregoropoulos since Michael Trivolis addressed a letter to him as follows: *in domo domini Aldi Venetiis*. Others letters are a similar heading.<sup>101</sup> Perhaps Trivolis, during his stay in Venice, lived there too.

A few of these Greek scholars who worked in the city of saint Mark forged ties stronger than those which would have resulted simply from a common destiny. The collection of Gregoropoulos’ correspondence gives an impression of a deep, sincere friendship. The fragmentary nature of these sources does not allow us to create a complete image of their relationship. If we judge from these randomly preserved letters, particularly close ties united Mark Musurus, John Gregoropoulos, Michael Trivolis, Zacharias Kalliergis and – the least known – Paul of Padua. All of them – apart from Michael – were Cretan. In their letters they referred to each other as *brother* (ἀδελφός). Towards other Greeks, connected both with them and with Aldo (Nicholas Vlastos, Arsenios Aristobulos Apostolis) they did not use this form of address.<sup>102</sup>

---

100On Kalliergis and Musurus see: GEANAKOPLIS 1962, 133-135 and 210. Geanakoplos established that Borgo Zocco is today’s via Aristide Gabelli.

101M. LOWRY 1979, 94 (where he quoted C. Castellani, *la stampa in Venezia*, 1973, 56) says: “Since the master-printer was normally responsible for housing and feeding his staff, we should almost certainly think of Aldus’ original base as a substantial complex, with work-space below and living accommodation above: one of those combined *botteghe e case* whose rents, generally ranging from forty to sixty ducats per year, occur frequently on the tax-returns of city landlords. As far as we can reconstruct them, the conditions reflect a now almost incredible mixture of the sweat-shop, the boarding house, and the research institute.” Michael’s letter to Gregoropoulos: M-I, 92. Cf. also his letter to Carteromachos: *Venetiis*, [a la stampa] *de miser Aldo Manutio Romano* (M-I, 100) and the mention in Codro’s letter (Michael is *cum Aldo*), see: above, note 83. Other known cases of humanists’ cohabitation (in palaces of wealthy patrons of the arts) justify such a hypothesis. The fact that they addressed letters to Aldo’s house (or, more often, to his printing shop) could have arisen from the fact that it was more reliable way of exchanging correspondence. From these letters we know that it was not always easy to find a courier and Aldo’s firm was a place visited by many.

102The name *brother* is used in Paul of Padua’s letter to J. Gregoropoulos (LEGRAND 1885, II, 300), in Trivolis’ to J. Gregoropoulos (M-I, 92), many times in Musurus’ letters to Gregoropoulos (e.g. LEGRAND 1885, II, 312). In one of Musurus’ letters to Gregoropoulos Z. Kalliergis is described as a brother, and N. Vlastos (although Musurus gives his greetings him too) – not! (LEGRAND 1885, II, 313); Musurus is named *my brother* by Kalliergis in a letter to Gregoropoulos (LEGRAND 1885, II, 297) and Kalliergis signs his letter to Gregoropoulos *your brother* (LEGRAND 1885, II, 298). With reference to both the members of above-mentioned group and other friends they use the word ἑταῖρος. In the correspondence of the Greek humanists not belonging to this group, even if they are acquaintances, other titles than *brother* are used. Musurus, when he writes to Vlastos, uses the name φίλτατε, not ἀδελφός (LEGRAND 1885, II, 395) as does Apostolis in his letters to Gregoropoulos (LEGRAND 1885, II, 337-338). Emil Legrand thought that this form of address was common among Greeks (“Celui-ci [Musurus], *selon l’usage grec* [my italic - ZS], ne l’appelle jamais [Gregoropoulos], dans ses lettres, autrement que *frère*.” - LEGRAND 1885, II, 264) but – as we have seen – it concerns only a small group of Greek humanists.

Trivolis probably met Gregoropoulos for the first time in Venice, if not earlier, in Crete.<sup>103</sup> Through his three letters to John we are able, to a certain extent, perceive the character of their relationship. Michael, who certainly arrived in Italy earlier, cared for Gregoropoulos and tried to find him a good job. In a letter he emphasised that he wanted John to have an equally good position as he had himself. At the same time he knew that he could rely on his friend. He did not hesitate to ask him a favour and even demanded a prompt reply. Michael's words express the intimacy of their friendship when he confesses that Gregoropoulos' letter evoked an impression of a direct meeting: "It seemed to me that I was talking to you and I was joking, taking you by the hand, as we used to do."<sup>104</sup>

Equally close seem to be his ties with Mark Musurus, the most eminent Greek scholar of this group. Unfortunately, to comprehend this relationship, we have at our disposal only one letter by Musurus and a simple mention of him in Trivolis' letter to Scipio Forteguerra. Mark's epistle is however the clearest and perhaps the most beautiful expression of mutual relationship between the young Greeks. It was written in 1501. In it Mark reproaches Michael for not having either visited or written to him but at the same time he expresses his belief that their friendship endures even when there are no material signs of it, even if their contacts with each other are very limited, even if the external circumstances, as he says, are not favourable and regardless of the opinions of "lords and the crowd".

"Our mutual affection (*eros*) is neither destroyed nor fragile but consolidated when we write to each other and does not oscillate when we are silent. [...] Indeed, if we stay together or if we are distant; if we write or remain silent, we meet and remain united with the mysterious ties of this god."<sup>105</sup>

A few years later, Michael's memory of his friend confirmed the permanence of their relationship: he shared Musurus' joy because of his appointment and greeted him warmly.<sup>106</sup>

About Trivolis' bonds with other Greeks we find only skimpy mentions: he greets "above all" Georges Moschos and asks Gregoropoulos to send him a book which Paul had bound in Padua which indicates that these people were also known to him.<sup>107</sup>

---

103Gregoropoulos arrived in Venice about the end of 1494: MANOUSSACAS 1982, 224. More information on him is dispersed in other works by Manoussacas.

104Here: M-I, 88 and other letters, *ibid.*, 90-6.

105On Musurus see above, note 14. His letter to Trivolis is published by BELLONI 2002, 651-2; the quoted passage on the page 651. Musurus used a changed quotation from Synesios introducing the expression: "of this god".

106Trivolis' mention of a Mark who received a sign of respect, in his letter to Carteromachos, must have concerned Musurus, M-I, 100.

107George Moschos was John Moschos' son, a scholar from Corfu (see above, note 13) and brother of Demetrius

Amongst his Italian acquaintances within Aldo's circle the one we know most about is Scipio Forteguerra (Carteromachos). He also must have been one of Michael's closest friends judging from the confidence the latter placed in him at a difficult moment of his life after leaving the San Marco priory. There exist two of Trivolis' letters to him dealing precisely about this matter. Michael addresses Scipio as "his dearest friend" and says that Scipio cares about his affairs more than even "our own fathers would do". Their paths may have crossed in Florence as Carteromachos was a disciple of Poliziano before 1493.<sup>108</sup> Certainly they met in Venice where he stayed between 1495 and 1504 and was one of the pillars of the Neakademia. Trivolis' letters from the period after he had left San Marco imply that they had been on familiar terms for some time.

Other people of the Venetian humanist circle who appear in Michael's correspondence are: Pietro Candido and Maestro Francesco who was identified by Denissoff as Francesco Rosetto of Verona. All we know about their relationship is the fact that Trivolis greeted him in a letter to Gregoropoulos.<sup>109</sup>

#### PADUA AND FERRARA

Trivolis' tracks lead also to Padua that from 1405 belonged to the Venetian Republic and was the largest centre, after Venice, of the Greek diaspora. Among Michael's acquaintances who lived in the city were: Paul of Padua, Zacharias Kalliergis (from 1501) and later Mark Musurus so Trivolis had personal reasons to visit Padua.<sup>110</sup> Not less important was however the fact that in the city the university of the Serenissima, one of the best Italian universities, had its seat. Contacts between the administrative centre (as well as the publishing one) and the university city were intense so it was not difficult for Trivolis to visit Padua when he lived in Venice.

Another reason that Michael is supposed to have been in Padua is his mention of

---

Moschos who was in Mirandola at roughly the same time as Trivolis. George also spent some time in Mirandola and Ferrara, see: LEGRAND 1885, I, XC; *ibid.*, vol. II, 313. For newer bibliography see: RGK I-A, no. 67, II-A, no. 88, III-A, no. 111. Trivolis mention him in his letter to Gregoropoulos (M-I, 92). Paul of Padua was a Greek from Crete and friend of John Gregoropoulos. He also stayed in touch with other people of Manuzio's group. DENISSOFF 1943, 404-405, erroneously considered him to be Paul de Canale, cf.: MANOUSSACAS 1976, 34; RGK I-A, no. 342, II-A, no. 460, III-A, no. 539. Trivolis mentions Paul in another letter to Gregoropoulos (M-I, 94-5). There appear in Trivolis' correspondence also other people, like a certain Ieronymo di Pichi, that are completely unknown.

108About Forteguerra see: PIOVAN 1997. The letters are published in M-I, 98-101. The quotation, *ibid.*, 100. On his studies in Florence: VERDE, *Studio*, III/ 2, 874-877.

109See: DENISSOFF 1943, 210-11; MANOUSSACAS-PATRINELIS 1960, 195, n. 1 and FIRMIN-DIDOT 1875, 438. The mention about Maestro Francesco in Trivolis' letter: M-I, 94. On Candido see below, note: 192.

110On Paul see above, note 107. On Zacharias' stay in Padua: GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 209ff. Musurus from 1503 taught in Padua: CATALDI PALAU 2004, 318.



Agostino Nifo (who taught there from 1492 till ca. 1499) in one of Muscovite works. Trivolis talks about him to illustrate the corruption of the Italian scholars. He depicts a little scene where Nifo, going to church, says to his friends: “Let’s go, us as well, to the general deception.”<sup>111</sup> Yet, it might be one of many rumours that circulated within and about the humanists circles.

More important is the fact that Maximus the Greek’s later opposition to the use that the Latin theologians made of Aristotle could indicate that he had some contacts with Padua because its university was a stronghold of Latin Aristotelianism. He was against the attempt to force the mysteries of the Christian faith into the syllogistic reasoning and the distortion of the Christian eschatology. Maximus did not name directly any representative of Latin Aristotelianism but Nifo is evoked in the same place where he criticised the overuse of ancient philosophy in the Western Christian thought.<sup>112</sup> It was hardly accidental because this Paduan professor originally had Averroistic views. It is true that he abandoned them quite early, in 1503 (*De intellectu*) when Trivolis was still in Italy and later he expressed the conviction, based on arguments drawn both from Plato and Ficino as well as Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas, that the immortality of the soul can be proved philosophically. Yet, Michael might have not known about his conversion.

Maximus’ criticism of Latin Aristotelianism and its implications may have also reflected Pietro Pomponazzi’s ideas. He taught in Padua between 1488 and 1509 (except for the years 1496-1499) and argued that the immortality of the human soul is impossible to prove philosophically.<sup>113</sup>

---

111See: M-I, 363. Nifo’s expression, if genuine, was not necessarily a critic of the Church as such but of her present state.

112M-I, 181 (about syllogisms and the immortality of soul); M-I, 183 (against dialectics in theology); M-I, 200-1 (that among Latins the authority of Aristotle is equal the authority of Christ); M-I, 361-2 (about vain attempts to force the mystery of the Trinity into syllogisms and on the next page about Nifo). More on Maximus’ attitude towards Aristotelianism see chapter III. NB, Scipio Forteguerra followed Nifo’s lecture in Padua 1494-5: PIOVAN 1997, 164 so he can have been Trivolis’ source about Nifo!

113Pomponazzi opinions provoked such a violent controversy that his books were even burned publicly in Venice. It was after Nifo’s (among others) attacks that Pomponazzi withdrew saying that he had presented only a philosophical position but he had not intended to claim anything contrary to the faith, see: SOUTH 1999<sup>a</sup> (on Nifo) and SOUTH 1999<sup>b</sup> (on Pomponazzi). Musurus, who was a friend and consultant of Pomponazzi, might have been for Trivolis a possible source of information about Pomponazzi. Both Musurus and Pomponazzi stayed together at Alberto Pio’s court in Carpi (ZAMBELLI 1994, 46). Pomponazzi maintained that demons cannot influence physical objects because they cannot know singulars and are incapable of contact action (cf. COPENHAVER 1988, 273). A reflection of his consideration may be Maximus’ phrase (M-I, 187): “коим чиномъ, сирѣчь, разумное чювственному смѣшено есть, или кое есть съвокупление и съюз ихъ?” It was KONNIKOV 1915, 111-114; 124f., who identified the name of Nifo (Сеса философ неаполитский – M-I, 363), Lelio Cosmico (Козмикъ ферариский – M-I, 362, see below) and Ambrose Varese da Rosate (Амъвьросии Розада – M-I, 289) that were distorted by the Russian copyists of Maximus’ texts.

Finally, the fact that Maximus mentions Niccolo Lelio Cosmico suggests he had contacts with the humanists of Ferrara. Maximus called him *Ferrarian* so he had to have heard about or have met Cosmico after the latter had finished the turbulent period of his life and settled down in Ferrara where he lived between 1490 and 1500. Trivolis may have been in touch with the Ferrarian humanists during his time in Mirandola because of the geographical proximity between Ferrara and Mirandola as well as because of Gianfrancesco Pico's bonds with the court of the Este family.

Cosmico preached philosophical determinism or even fatalism. He doubted about the possibility of human free choice. His views caused him problems with the Inquisition and he managed to avoid trial probably only thanks to the intercession of a mighty patron, Lodovico Gonzaga. Cosmico was therefore for Maximus yet another useful example, as was Agostino Nifo, to depict the destructive fascination of Italian scholars for pagan antiquity. He noted that Niccolo on his deathbed said to his friends and disciples: "Be glad with me, beloved, because tomorrow I will rest in the Elysian Fields with Socrates, Plato and with all the other heroes."<sup>14</sup>

#### LOMBARDY

Another important place on Michael Trivolis' itinerary was Lombardy. His travels give the impression that he was not only looking for a job but consciously wanted to visit the most important centres of humanism in the Italy of the late fifteenth century. As well as Florence, Ferrara and Venice, Milan under the rule of Lodovico il Moro had one of the most splendid Renaissance courts that attracted artists and scholars from all over Italy. Leonardo da Vinci, Bramante and Chalkondyles are only the most famous among many others. Maximus the Greek recalling his stay in Milan writes about the wealth and hospitality of the city as well as about the wise and noble people who lived there. This image of prosperity indicates that Trivolis knew Milan before the war between Lodovico il Moro and Louis XII which began in 1499 (cf. M-I, 288-9).

The main reason however that Maximus described Milan and Lombardy was the fact that these places reminded him of people influenced by the astrological beliefs that he fought. Trivolis certainly came across astrology in other places in Italy. We have already mentioned the strong presence of astrology in the intellectual and everyday life of Florence. Astrology was officially taught at the Italian universities and practised in virtually every humanistic centre in Italy but the Lombardic experience was for Michael especially striking.

---

114M-I, 362. On Cosmico see: RICCIARDI 1984. Cosmico died on 28<sup>th</sup> of July 1500 in Teolo near Padua.

The Italian period of his life fell at the golden age of Western astrology. In the fifteenth century it gained the status of science and was publicly taught at universities in a close relationship to mathematics, natural philosophy, and medicine. So virtually every domain that could have been called in the fifteenth – sixteenth century a science, was, in one way or another, connected to astrology. At the same time natural sciences (including astrology and medicine) were also connected with that which was called natural magic, i.e. an attempt to understand, to control and to use the hidden forces of nature.<sup>115</sup> The authority of the ancients whose knowledge exceeded that which Western Europe had known about nature before that time and a humanistic desire to control its forces explain, at least partially, why astrology and magic were so popular among the Renaissance elites.

Many serious thinkers (e.g. Ficino) did not see a reason to oppose astrology (seen as a science) and Christianity if – of course – the former was not connected with demonic practises. Yet, a certain determinism of the Hellenist thought from which the Westerner mainly drew their astrological knowledge, was hardly reconcilable with Christian faith. This fact gave the weapon to the hand of the opponents of astrology. Admittedly, astrologers provided their predictions with formulas that allowed the preservation, at least seemingly, of the respect for God's providence and human *liberum arbitrium* but it was not enough to solve the problem.<sup>116</sup>

A number of authors at the end of the fifteenth century questioned the reliability and legitimacy of judicial astrology. One of them was Giovanni Pico della Mirandola who expressed his opinion in *Disputationes adversus astrologiam divinatricem*<sup>117</sup> which was used later by Savonarola. It was certainly under their, among others, influence that Trivolis' views on astrology would be formed. In Muscovy, he continued, in a way, the discussions that he had observed in Italy. However, before that occurred, he shared fascinations of his Italian colleagues.

Michael must have spent some time in Milan as he knew many details concerning il Moro's reign and its decline caused by his war with Louis XII. At the court of Lodovico Sforza astrology enjoyed special interest so it is not surprising that later, the duke's life would be for Maximus a useful and vivid example that would prove his theoretical position on the destructive effects of the belief that human life is determined by the stars.<sup>118</sup>

---

115See: AZZOLINI 2006, 190-1 and passim; COPENHAVER 1988, 270-1 and passim. On astrology taught at the Italian universities: GRENDLER 2002, 408ff.

116See: BOUDET 1997

117See: AZZOLINI 2006, 186. Giovanni Pico accepted astrology and natural magic but refused determinism: COPENHAVER 1988, 268-9.

118On his stay in Lombardy and being eyewitness of the events he described see: M-I, 288ff (=K I, 426) and 462-

Lodovico, like many others of his time, used to take important decisions based on the opinion of astrologers but his contemporaries bear witness to the fact that astrology had an especially great importance in his life. His astrologer (and the court physician) was Ambrose Varese da Rosate whose name is known to Maximus. He describes Ambrose as the man who enjoyed considerable influence over the duke of Milan. In fact, he was very influential at court and il Moro did not question his credibility even if his prediction was not fulfilled or was not fulfilled exactly. Teodora Angelini, a lady-in-waiting of the court in Mantua, in a letter of January 1493 writes that without da Rosate “he [il Moro] did not do anything.” Maximus depicts the duke in a very similar way and quotes even a grotesque example that Lodovico decided to mount on his horse or not depending on his astrologer’s advice.<sup>119</sup> He also describes a portrait ordered by the duke which represented him sleeping on his left arm and embracing the earth with his right hand. It was – according to Maximus – a sign of his unhealthy ambition provoked by Ambrose’s prophecies to rule the whole of Italy and even of his monocracy.<sup>120</sup>

Apart from the description of the part astrology played at the Milanese court, Maximus talks also about people “in Italian schools and in Gallic” who practised astrology in secret, in fear of papal punishment.<sup>121</sup> The adjective *Gallic* certainly concerns (among others) the university of the duchy of Milan which had its seat in Pavia. The court in Milan and the

---

463 (more generally about Italy). On his own astrological experience: M-I, 334 (=K-I, 375). See also M-I, 362 (=K I, 462) where he speaks generally about his participation in the Westerners’ errors that could concern astrology. Denissoff believed that Trivolis visited Lombardy in spring 1497 (i.e. when – according to Urceo Codro – the young Greek should have been in his homeland). He is convinced that Codro, knowing that Trivolis left Bologna, had simply wrong information about his abode.

119Only at the end of Lodovico’s reign, when Ambrose compromised himself more and more, he fell into disgrace with the duke. Maximus’ description of il Moro and the Milanese court: M-I, 288-291. On Ambrose Varese da Rosate and his influence see: PELISSIER 1896, ad indicem; MALAGUZZI-VALERI 1915-1929, I, 34, 325-6, 333-4; AZZOLINI 2006, passim. The last work shows also how seriously the Sforza treated the astrological instructions, which is mirrored in their correspondence. The opinion of Teodora Angelini: “Senza quello non si fa niente”, quoted by MALAGUZZI-VALERI 1915-1929, I, 326. The whole letter (preserved in Archivio di Stato di Mantova) was published by Attilio Portioli, (La nascita di Massimiliano Sforza, Arch. St. Lombardo, 1882, p. 329) but, according to Malaguzzi – Valeri, with many mistakes. This article contains further examples on the importance of astrology at the court of Ludovico il Moro.

120See: M-I, 289. This account could be a reflection of an earlier prophecy by frate Giovanni da Viterbo OP in his letter written from Genoa (10.01.1473) to Galeazzo Maria Sforza that he was born under a good constellation and that he would rule many countries (among others Cyprus, Babilonia, Asia Minor, Romania, Constantinople, Macedonia, Arabia, Africa!), see: FUMI 1910, 77-78 quoted also by MALAGUZZI-VALERI 1915-1929, I, 145.

121Cf. M-I, 333-4. The term *Gallic* can concern both Northern Italy and France. Maximus calls Louis XII “the king of Western Gauls” or “the French king” (M-I, 289-90; cf. also Z-239: “[...] вЪ Галиехъ, яже нынѣ глаголются Франза”). This term was in use at the end of 15<sup>th</sup> century. E.g. Savonarola calls Charles VIII “the king of the Gauls” (WEINSTEIN 1970, 70), Demetrius Moschos dedicates his work about Helen and Alexander “Lodovice Galliarum” (LEGRAND 1885, I, 67) and Gianfrancesco Pico says about the Dominican congregation that “Cisalpinam incolit Galliam” (PICO, Vita Savonarolae, 127). Therefore while the adjective *Italian* can concern the schools south of the Po river (Florence, Bologne, Padua), *Gallic* can describe both Lombardic and French schools.

academic circles of Pavia were closely linked. Ambrose da Rosate, who was so influential at court, had also taught at the University since 1485 and was in charge of the employment policy of the university. Other scholars moved without difficulty between these two spheres as perhaps Trivolis also did.<sup>122</sup>

His remark about astrologers who acted in hiding can hardly concern astrology as such which was officially taught. Only its abuses and other occult practises were persecuted by the Church. Most authorities differentiated between the permissible natural magic and the forbidden demonic one.<sup>123</sup> The borderline between these two spheres was, however, very thin and easy to cross. Natural magic and astrology were threatened to be embroiled in practises of demonic magic. Despite that, there was no lack of adventurers, also in academic circles, who did not hesitate to enter dangerous areas. The problem must have been serious as the Inquisition, which was relatively strong in Lombardy, and that the duke supported, had often the opportunity to judge cases concerning sorcery and occultism. Papal interventions against these practises also occurred at that time. These measures were not able to stop the activities. Maximus captured well this peculiar combination of excitement and fear. The perspective of acquiring new knowledge induced people to pursue it but the fear of consequences forced them to hide.<sup>124</sup> An echo of occult practices is the Greek's mentions of a rumour that Ambrose da Rosate trapped an evil spirit from whom the duke learnt about future events.<sup>125</sup>

It was certainly at the same time as Trivolis was in Lombardy that he visited Savoy and

---

122AZZOLINI 2006, 195. Ambrose da Rosate took over lecturing of *Almansor* (a textbook written by Persian physician al-Razi or: Rhazes, 860-932) after Cristoforo da Soncino's death in 1485. He received a very high salary of 800 florins (data from "il ritolo del 1485-86), see: SOTTILI 1993, 128. Da Rosate did not publish any known book but is mentioned in prefaces to three books published between 1490 and 1495 what testifies about his influence, see: ROGLEDI MANNI 1980, no. 42, 117, 489. GROMOV 1983, 77, says that Rosate published *Monumenta Philosophiae et Astronomiae* but gives no evidence.

123Cf. COPENHAVER 1988, 267-83.

124On various theories concerning a possibility of demonic interventions into human world see: COPENHAVER 1988, passim. The classic example of a very thin borderline between natural and demonic magic was the question of magic images. Already Thomas Aquinas grudgingly acknowledges that some images (talismans) that do not contain words can be acceptable for Christians but talismans with words – as addressed to personal intelligence – are impermissible, *ibid.*, 282-3. Meanwhile Augustin Nifo shows how great was interest in magical images: "Vidi tot libros de imaginibus quot sunt infiniti, et omnes testantur istam artem esse veram in se, licet difficilis inventionis, et sine dubium faciunt rapere mulieres et multa. Praeterea videmus omnes leges prohibere istam, quod non esset nisi esset vera in se: dicunt enim quod ex hac sequuntur effectus mirabiles extranei. Praeterea in multis universitatibus legitur et ibidem apparent res terribiles, et difficilis est salvare talia per fundamenta peripatetica." (A. Nifo, *De daemonibus*, Venezia 1553, f. 72va, quoted by ZAMBELLI 1996, 212. NB, in P. Zambelli, *I problemi metodologici del necromante Agostino Nifo, "Medioevo"*, I (1975), 129-171, p. 142 as a source of this quotation is given Nifo's commentary on "Destructio destructionum" of Averroes from 1503.) On occult practises and sorcery in Lombardy as well as the Inquisition activity against these practises writes FUMI 1910, 72 ff.

125K I, 428. Other famous figures were also considered to have trapped spirits at their service. E.g. Pietro d'Abano was said to have seven spirits closed in a crystal.

the margravate of Montferrato. There is no trace of that in Russian sources but Michael's correspondence imply this visit. His letter to Nicholas di Tarsia, a canon of Vercelli, indicates that they were on good terms and that Trivolis knew the lord of Desana (Lodovico II Tizzoni). Another passage, from Michael's letter to John Gregoropoulos, suggests that he left some of his things in Vercelli which only later a traveller took to Venice. It was therefore not only a short stop on the way. Trivolis must have stayed long enough to earn confidence and recognition because, being already in Mirandola, he received, through Nicholas, an invitation to work for the lord of Desana. Michael did not take advantage of this opportunity having already a rewarding job in Mirandola but he proposed that Gregoropoulos might replace him.<sup>126</sup>

Perhaps Michael's acquaintanceship with Nicholas di Tarsia dated back from the beginning of his Italian period and that he was one of Michael's first contacts in this country. He had a stable position at the court of Savoy and was relatively well-to-do. His brother, Jacomo, was "capetanio di le fantarie a Corfu". The Trivolis family may have known Jacomo in Corfu since di Tarsia family was also Greek. They possibly recommended young Michael to Nicholas through Jacomo. From what Michael says in his letter to Nicholas, it appears that the latter was his patron.<sup>127</sup>

#### OTHER PLACES, OTHER MOMENTS

Being reconstructed from scraps of information, Trivolis' life in Western Europe still contains many imponderables. The number of people he was in touch with was certainly more extensive than we know. Probably he visited also other centres than those we have already mentioned. The most likely are Paris and Rome.

His early biography notes that he studies in Paris. It is not impossible. Maximus wrote a detailed description of the University life. Also his disciple, prince Andrew Kurbskii testified that his master studied in Paris with Laskaris. There is however room for doubt. Maximus usually stressed clearly when he had seen with his own eyes a situation or event he described. Whereas talking in detail about the University of Paris he says that he has *heard* it.<sup>128</sup>

---

126See letters to Nicholas di Tarsia and John Gregoropoulos in: M-I, 86-90. Trivolis asked Gregoropoulos to hand over his letter "ἐκείνῳ τῷ ἄρχοντι τῷ τὸ κιβώτιόν μου παραδεδωκότι μοι". DENISSOFF 1943, 202-3 identified the lord of Desana (ὁ ἄρχων τῆς Δεκλιανῆς) with Ludovico II Tizzoni.

127On Nicholas di Tarsia see: GABOTTO 1895, 237 and SANUTO IV, 730. 815. 821-2. About Nicholas as a patron – Michael says in his letter: "also during our absence you do not stop to care about us" (M-I, 86).

128The anonymous author of Maximus' early biography says that he studied in Paris but the author admits that he took this information from Maximus' works (СКАЗАНИЕ В КОПИУСЕ СОЧИНЕНИЙ, 78-9 and 85). The term *Gallic schools* that Michael uses (see above, note 121), may have concerned also the University of Paris. He explains (Z-239) that the city of Paris is "in Gaul that now is called France" and says that in the city lecturers in philosophy and theology are generously paid from the royal treasury (Z 240). This piece of Trivolis'

Denissoff based his conjecture that Trivolis was also in Rome on Maximus' short description of the papal court passing through the city's streets. Because of its vividness, as in the case of other places that Trivolis visited, it appears to be written by an eyewitness.<sup>129</sup>

## NATIONAL AND RELIGIOUS IDEAS OF MICHAEL TRIVOLIS DURING HIS ITINERANT YEARS

On the threshold of the new stage of Michael's Italian experience, which was his stay in Mirandola, one should stop here in order to examine and understand his ideas and beliefs at this stage of his intellectual and spiritual development. It will help to understand the subsequent changes in his life.

Unfortunately, the sources that are at our disposal say very little about that. Maximus' Muscovite memories were written many years later and from a perspective of a man who had changed his views to a considerable degree. Trivolis' six Italian letters speak mainly of everyday affairs. It is necessary therefore to support our modest data by analysing the dominant features and views of the circles wherein he lived.

It has been already mentioned that the situation of the Greek humanists differed markedly from that of their Italian colleagues. Some of the Greek exiles, such as Laskaris or Musurus, integrated into the new environment but many remained on its borders. Certain signs of solidarity from the Westerners<sup>130</sup> cannot have sweetened the bitterness of exile. They were,

---

information may have come from Laskaris who spent the years between 1495 and 1503 at the French court. We know that another young Greek accompanied Laskaris during his stay in Paris in 1526 (LASKARIS, *Epigrammi greci*, 92 and 204; cf. also above, note 33) so it can have occurred also earlier, with Michael. Again another possible source of Trivolis' information about Paris may have been scholars from Savoy. Savoyards used to study also in Paris. On Kurbskii's testimony see: KURBSKII, *История о осьмомъ соборѣ*, 476. A late biography of Maximus written about 1720 by an old-believer, Mokhovikov, also mentions that Maximus studied in Paris (СКАЗАНИЕ МОХОВИКОВА, XLIV): "И послушаша родители же его и отдадоша его нѣкоему философу именемъ Фарсису, во Фряской земли, во градѣ Паризии. Изучи же ся сей отрокъ Макарий [= Michael] всю фарисию 11 мѣсяцовъ; и сей философъ Фарсисъ почудися вельми и послаша его отрока Макария во градъ Флоренцій к мудрейшему своему брату философу именемъ Гавърасу." The text contains a lot of unreliable information but its author may have used a source unaccessible for us. Although the data are deformed, some informations may be authentic. Фарсис may be an echo of Laskaris? Or Nicholas di Tarsia? ROMOLI 2020, 36 speculates that Laskaris, met in Venice in 1503 or later, may have provided information about the University of Paris.

129ЗНАКИН 1881, приложения, 83-4 (Letter about wearing a beard, IVANOV 1969, no. 313). The question of the authenticity of this letter is open. An argument for Maximus' authorship may be the use of the word *Тайноглагольник* (ibid., 84) – characteristic for Maximus. In the fragment concerning Rome Maximus talks about *seeing* something while in the next passage he says that he *heard* something, not saw. It is difficult to judge whether he really was in Rome or not. Denissoff thought that also the fragment: M-I, 175 (a variant of the text, note 62; in K-I, 239 it is put in the main text) indicates a personal experience, DENISSOFF 1943, 164-6. Cf. however also the story of Maximus' teacher in Rome, mentioned in SUDNYE SPISKI, 114, cf. below, note 194.

130On differences between Greek and Italian humanists see above, text and note 21; on the Westerners' solidarity: HARRIS 1995, 62-72.

as a matter of fact, not as numerous as the cases of indifference or mistrust. The professional life of the Greek scholars was closely linked to the Western humanistic groups (as Manuzio's publishing house or the Laurentian circle in Florence in the case of Trivolis) but their social life and the majority of affairs they lived through were concentrated within their own Greek world, that of people of similar experience.<sup>131</sup> The foreigners from Greece did not accept Western customs quickly but remained rather on their own predilection. Their formation was more Byzantine than Western.<sup>132</sup> Their literary output eventually, apart from the classic motives of ancient literature, to a large extent explored the doom of exiles, the grief for their lost homeland and a desire to induce the West to liberate Greece from the yoke of the *infidels*.<sup>133</sup>

The famous "Hymn to Plato" by Mark Musurus, dedicated to the pope Leo X, gives the best literary expression of these sentiments:

"Then [O Pope, says Plato] turn the tide of war on Turkey's shores,  
And curb the wolf-like, unbelieving band,  
Whose tyrant Empire fainting Greece deplores: (...)  
On Asia's shores let warlike myriads gleam.  
There let the Gaul, in mailed armour bright,  
Spur his proud steed, conspicuous from afar; (...)  
Germania's giant offspring too be there,  
And, loved of Mars, Brittain's hardy race (...)  
And Venice there her countless fleets shall send;  
Imperial Venice mistress of the flood.  
Spain's floating battlements, of mountain size,

<sup>131</sup>Already a cursory reading of the correspondence of humanists shows that their social life, their friendships were to a large extent restricted to their national circle although we find of course exceptions: Scipio and Trivolis, Filelfo and Chalkondyles. NB, the Greeks are virtually absent in the immense correspondence of Pietro Bembo, who enjoyed trust of our Greeks, collaborated with them (LEGRAND 1885, II, 313 = FIRMIN-DIDOT 1875, 519-520). See also GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, p. 211 (mention about Bembo in Kalliergis' letter to Gregoropoulos: LEGRAND 1885, II, no. 3, 298 = FIRMIN-DIDOT 1875, 527-8). The Greeks did not translate Greek works into Latin (with some considerable exceptions, e.g. Musurus). The reason might have been that they did not know Latin well or that many works were already translated (GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 296) but perhaps they were not interested in it.

<sup>132</sup>Musurus' biography offers instructive examples. WILSON 1992, 148 says: "at some stage in his career he [Musurus] included in his programme a text more typical of the Byzantine than the Italian curriculum, selected orations by St Gregory of Nazianzus." On the Byzantine curriculum cf. also chapter III, note 1 and 2. About Musurus' Byzantine taste, *ibid.*, 150. 155. The hexametric paraphrases of prayers (cf. Musurus' works below or Maximus' compositions from Athos) and poetical theological treatises (cf. Maximus' works written in Muscovy, below) are also examples of the Byzantine style, cf. PONTANI 2002-2003, 191.

<sup>133</sup>This phenomenon, already present among the representatives of the previous generation (e.g. Laskaris – in his literary production the pain of living and dying far away from the homeland was a leitmotif: LASKARIS, *Epigrammi greci*, no. 7, p. 38-39, 105 – 107, or Michael Apostolis – see above), lasted also in Trivolis' generation. The grief after the fall of Constantinople was a stable motive in Murullus' epigrams (e.g. II, 49 – *Ad patriam* – see: STAIKOS 1998, 217). The fate of the Greeks deprived of their homeland expresses an anonymous poem *On exile* (Περὶ ξεντείας, ca. 1500) from Crete (PANAGIOTAKES 1995, 318).



Towards the wide Hellespont their course shall steer,  
 And whilst their towering masts salute the skies,  
 Each warlike prow the healing cross shall bear.  
 Then over Byzantium's towers, if once again  
 The light of freedom dawn; if then, repress  
 By thy victorious arms, on Graecia's plain  
 The poisonous dragon lower his hateful crest,  
 'Tis all achieved – for then, from bondage freed,  
 Achaia's sons their ancient fires shall feel (...)"<sup>134</sup>

Other Greek intellectuals, contemporary to Michael Trivolis, also made appeals for national renewal and the liberation of their homeland.<sup>135</sup>

This motive appears not only in literary production but also in personal contacts. Musurus, in a letter to John Gregoropoulos, says: "It does not sadden me that I will die because it is our common fate but that I will finish my life in a foreign land, separated from friends, deprived of kith and kin."<sup>136</sup> Certainly Michael Trivolis shared these feelings when he lived in Italy although we only find in his Slavonic writings the literary evidence of his patriotic convictions.

Their attachment to the Greek heritage was the same as that of their parents but their experience was different. They were born after the fall of Constantinople. They had never lived in an independent Greek state and in a Church that could freely exercise her mission. They had to find their own approach to the national and religious heritage.<sup>137</sup>

The practical expression of their bonds with the homeland was a concern for preservation of the Byzantine heritage. Witnesses bore testimony to their commitment to this cause. Erasmus attested to Musurus' exceptional perseverance in this work as a professor in Padua. He lectured at seven in the morning (even in winter when young students could not bear the cold but Raphael Regius, professor of Latin who was over 70 years old came to listen to his lecture) and took only four days' of holiday per year.<sup>138</sup> An inventory of Greeks authors that

<sup>134</sup>See: GEANAKOPIOS 1962, 152 who quotes the translation by W. Roscoe, *The Life and pontificate of Leo X*, Liverpool 1805, II. The original poem was published in Manuzio's edition of Plato's work in 1513. Other examples of the Greek intellectuals' patriotic appeals see: GEANAKOPIOS 1976, 179-181.

<sup>135</sup>GEANAKOPIOS 1976, 174, 181 n. 25. See also the address of Michael Apostolis to Emperor Frederick III, GEANAKOPIOS 1962, 97-99. Filelfo in his letter to Chalkondyles speaks about his efforts to stimulate the Western rulers to act against the Turkish occupation of Greece, see: FILELFO, *Letters*, 190-194.

<sup>136</sup>LEGRAND 1885, II, 313 (French translation in: FIRMIN-DIDOT 1875, 520).

<sup>137</sup>HARRIS 1995, 197, even maintains that the second generation in the West lost its contact with the Byzantine past but he does not give strong evidence. On Maximus' patriotism see e.g.: note 6, above and IAGICH 1885-95, 594.

<sup>138</sup>Erasmus' description in his letter to Jodocus Gaverius (*Opus epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami*, ed. H.M.

should be published to save them from loss, made later by Musurus, shows also that he was profoundly worried about the preservation of the Greek legacy. His activity was, in a way, a continuation of Bessarion's endeavours to collect Greek manuscripts.<sup>139</sup>

Unlike the national legacy, controversies of the bygone time did not interest them very much. Neither did the heated discussions between Platonists and Aristotelians that earlier fired the enthusiasm of some Greek intellectuals nor the struggle with colonial Venice. After a time of fighting, a period of a new, progressing, although still fragile, stabilisation came. The violent clash between the Greeks and their Venetian rulers slowly evolved towards a more peaceful assimilation on both sides.<sup>140</sup>

In the new circumstances to be a Greek did not mean only conservation of the past. It was a way of life. The pride of the glorious past accompanied – *noblesse oblige* – an appeal to live in a way worthy of this heritage. Such an image emerges at least from the only preserved letter by Musurus to Trivolis. Janus Laskaris, the Greek *par excellence*, was presented in it as the epitome of the nobleness of their Greek tradition. The tone of the letter signals the weight of their meeting with Laskaris that shaped their way of thinking and their attitude towards national tradition. Musurus invoked the name of their master when he wanted to dispel Trivolis' anxiety about the durability of their friendship because of the rarity of their contacts. Underlying the noble character of their ties they had struck up during the years of their studies, he appealed “not to dishonour” the community with Laskaris, the noble Greek indeed. Musurus uses here almost a literal quotation from a letter of Synesios of Cyrene that he had recently edited for Manuzio, but with a significant change. While Synesios writes about not

---

Allen and H.W. Garrod, vol. 5, Oxford 1992, 244, letter no. 1347 of 1523): “Patauii neminem vidi celebrem (mortuos tantum commemoro) praeter Raphaellem Regium; hominem admodum natu grandem, sed cruda viro viridisque senectus. Erat tum, vt opinor, non minor annis lxx; et tamen nulla fuit hyems tam aspera quin ille mane hora septima adiret Marcum Musurum Graece profitentem: qui toto anno vix 4<sup>or</sup> intermittebat dies quin publice profiteretur. Iuuenes hyemis rigorem ferre non poterant; illum senem nec pudor nec hyems abigebat ab auditorio.” Also Paolo GIOVIO (quoted by GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 139 who does not give the exact page number of the *Elogia*) in his *Elogia doctorum virorum* mentions that Musurus took only four days' vacation in the year. We know also that Musurus was later a member of the Greek Confraternity in Venice. He joined the Confraternity on December the 5<sup>th</sup> 1514 and renew his membership a year later. He was registered as: “Marco Musuro filoxofo” [sic!], MANOUSSACAS 1973, 53. See also MANOUSSACAS 1989, 324, note 16; CATALDI PALAU 2004, 334 and bibliography in PONTANI 2002-2003. I use here the example of Musurus because we have much more sources concerning his biography and because his closeness to Trivolis. Even if the latter did not share all his views, they must have influenced him.

139Cf. his letter, from a little later period (1515), to French bibliophile, Grolier, where he asks Grolier to encourage Andrea Torresano, the successor of Aldo Manuzio, to continue the publication of ancient authors from the Bible through interpretations of Aristotle to Diodor, Polibius and Plutarch (LEGRAND 1885, I, 133). In another letter, to Nicholas Vlastos (FIRMIN-DIDOT 1875, 522; trans. GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 207), Musurus lauded the type produced by Vlastos/Kalliergis printing shop emphasising that this work “will contribute both to your glory and to the common benefit of our people.”

140Such an evolution took place at least on Crete (PANAGIOTAKES 1995, 295. 319-320) but probably also in other places.

dishonouring the education given by philosophy, Musurus replaced “the education given by philosophy” with the name of Laskaris.<sup>141</sup>

Trivolis’ generation was touched by the consequences of the fall of Byzantium not only in the national but also in the religious sphere. Earlier, the attempt to introduce the decision of the Council of Florence coincided with the end of the Byzantine empire. Both events profoundly shook the Greek world and also struck at the personal faith of many Greeks. Some of them were convinced that the fall of Constantinople was God’s punishment for the Union with schismatic Rome. Others (much less numerous) thought too, it was God’s punishment but rather for not fulfilling the decision of the Council of Florence. When the empire fell, the structures of the Orthodox Church were left deprived of the State’s support and virtually all Greeks found themselves under the rule of an un-Orthodox power: those who had already been under Venetian rule and those who had just been conquered by the Ottomans. Both powers promoted conversion: respectively to Islam or to Catholicism.

In the Greek lands that had been under Venetian rule (Crete, where Gregoropoulos and Musurus were born and received their primary education, and Corfu, where Trivolis might have spent some time as an adolescent) during the several decades after the fall of Constantinople the upper classes underwent, process of Catholicising while the masses remained Orthodox. Some conversions to Catholicism were sincere (e.g. Michael Apostolis) but, doubtless, many of them were opportunistic, motivated more by reasons of politics or personal career than religious ones. Probably, they often did not entail a profound change of view but were an adaptation to a new situation.

In the part of the former Empire conquered by Turkey (Arta, where Trivolis was born) Christians became second-class citizens which favoured their conversions to Islam. Thus, wherever Greeks lived, their faith was put to the test, they were confronted with stark choices. The compromises infringed on the moral fibre of Greek society and contributed to slackening of morals.<sup>142</sup>

---

141 Musurus writes: “εἰ μὴ τὰς Λασκάρεως τοῦ ὄντως Ἑλληνοῦ τούτεστι γενναίου μέλλοιμεν συνουσίας αἰσχύνειν...”; see: BELLONI 2002, 652. Cf. SYNESIUS, *Correspondance*, 282: “Ἐκεῖθεν ποθεν ἠρτῆσθαι δεῖ τὸ ἡμέτερον εἰ μὴ τὰ φιλοσοφίας τροφεῖα μέλλοιμεν αἰσχύνειν...”. BELLONI 2002, 653, noted another (almost literary) quotation from the same letter of Synesios concerning friendship but did not notice this similarity. Synesius’ letter used by Musurus was included in the *Epistolae diversorum philosophorum* – an anthology of Greek letters edited by Musurus and published by Aldo in 1499. Musurus’ letter can also reflect Aristotle’s view that the permanence of a community relied on friendship of its members. It should be noted that Laskaris is the only Maximus the Greek’s secular master who is named in Russian sources, see above, note 31.

142 In the closest environment of Trivolis: the question of George Gregoropoulos’ doubtful morals (LEGRAND 1885, II, 262 but cf. MANOUSSACAS 1956, 164 who is against this opinion); the behaviour of Michael Apostolis’ uncle

It should be however noted that, regardless of personal decisions that individual Greeks had had to take, most of them remained attached to their *Greek* religion, to the tradition of the Byzantine Church which was closely linked with their identity.<sup>143</sup>

The parents of Trivolis' closest friends from Crete belonged to those who accepted Catholicism and so their children were baptised in the Catholic Church.<sup>144</sup> Michael however was born in a Greek family in the part of the country that was under Turkish rule. The Union was not accepted there so he was Orthodox. For all of them however the encounter with Western Christianity was a challenge and constituted the other factor that modified their religious attitude. The particularity of their religious experience consisted in the fact that both factors that shaped it (Eastern and Western Christianity) were in the course of serious transformation that rendered their situation more complex.

The links of Gregoropoulos or Musurus with the Western Church were more natural because they were, at least nominally, Catholics. It is more difficult to determine when Michael became closer to the Catholic tradition. The circumstances were favourable to make such a move. His Greek environment in Italy was largely Unionist or Roman Catholic. His patron, Laskaris, was Bessarion's protégé and later a collaborator of the pope Leo X. Undoubtedly Savonarola played an important part in this process but perhaps already before, during his stay in Corfu or after his arrival in Italy Michael approached the Catholic Church.

The important aspect of this encounter was the fact that when Michael got to know the

---

who supposedly lost his fortune to prostitutes (but it could have also been the case of a Catholic bishop of that time), GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 90-1; Arsenios (Aristobulos) Apostolis from Trivolis' generation and his biography full of twists and turns (GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, chapter: Arsenios Apostolis). IMHAUS 1997, 169, observes, on the basis of "i registi della cancelleria episcopale", the low moral standards of the clergy of Balkan descent in Venice. Many petty crimes committed by them were due, the author explains, to their poverty. On conversions to Islam and on CryptoChristianity in the territories captured by the Turks see chapter I, note 12. On cryptounionists, *ibid.* note 11.

143 Certain people of those who converted to Islam tried to help Orthodox Church as they could (RUNCIMAN 1968, 184-5. 194-5). Instructive is the history of the Greek Confraternity of saint Nicholas that had been founded and existed under the jurisdiction of the Western hierarchy but in a favourable moment was moved to the patriarch of Constantinople's authority, see: MANOUSSACAS 1989, 322-3 and GEANAKOPOLOS 1976, 177-8.

144 John Gregoropoulos was certainly baptised into the Catholic Church because his father, George Gregoropoulos was Catholic priest: CATALDI PALAU 2004, 344. Yet in AALBERTS 1995, 153, quoted by Cataldi Palau, there is no mention that he was *Roman-Catholic* priest as Cataldi Palau suggests. Musurus was probably also baptised into the Catholic Church: CATALDI PALAU 2004, 344. GEANAKOPOLOS 1976, 179, speaks about Musurus' conversion but it must be a mistake. He did not give any evidence in support of his opinion. He also mentions (GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 202-3) that there were two branches of the Kalliergis family in Crete: one of them "supporting Venetian domination, the other actively opposing it. [...] We do not know to which line of the Calliergis family Zacharias belonged. But there seems little doubt that for several generations before his birth, his immediate forebears had been on favourable terms with the Venetian government." STAIKOS 1998, xlix, on the contrary maintains (but without any evidence) that Zacharias remained Orthodox. Yet another Greek linked with Trivolis (although he was rather from the generation of his parents) was obviously of Latin rite: Nicholas di Tarsia, a canon in Vercelli.

Western Church, she was also undergoing serious troubles and was on the threshold of the greatest shock – the Reformation. Harbingers of this event were already perceptible in the growing criticism of the state of the Church: both her structures and morals of her clergy. Challenges appeared also on the intellectual level.

The understanding of the Christian tradition and its relation to pre-Christian religions and thoughts were subject to modification. This evolution concerned only limited circles and did not influence popular belief but it was precisely within these circles that Greek scholars had contacts. The fundamental question, in the eyes of worried critics, was not first of all the immoral life of which both Renaissance rulers, high clergy and scholars were accused of but the contamination of Christian beliefs with paganism.

The use of pagan motives, especially mythological, in literary production was common and acceptable.<sup>145</sup> The real doubts arose from the above mentioned ideas of *prisca theologia* that risked blurring the line between Christianity and ancient philosophy, mainly Neoplatonism as well as from the overuse of Aristotelian methods in theology.

These ideas were criticised by people important for young Trivolis: Savonarola and Gianfrancesco Pico. Maximus in his Muscovite writings would take up this issue. His commitment to these critics brings to light that the confrontation with that what he considered the paganism of Italian scholars marked significantly his religious experience. He would condemn Western intellectuals for their excessive confidence in syllogistic methods i.e. desecrating the Christian mysteries by an excess of philosophy in Christian reflection, for esteeming the authority of the pagan philosophers over and above Christian dogmas, for the distortion of Christian eschatology and finally for the acceptance of astrological beliefs. All these phenomena were, one way or another, a token of pagan inspiration.<sup>146</sup>

The doctrinal level was essential for Maximus and the edge of his criticism was directed to the deformation of the faith. Moral imperfections existed always in the history of the Church and he criticised them severely. It seems however that he believed that philosophers' moral weaknesses resulted from doctrinal errors. He only *generally* described those who put the authority of Plato or Aristotle higher than the Revelation but he *named* those whose deformed doctrine became visible in their life. This way, portraying the blatant moral imperfections he led to distinct visualisation their doctrinal roots. As an illustration Maximus depicted three

---

145Petrarch, Boccaccio, Salutati and others made a clear distinction between the only real God and pagan gods that may be used in literature as representing some features, vices or virtues but they cannot be identified with the real Godhead (cf. TRINKAUS 1999<sup>b</sup>, 363). Maximus himself also did it in his works written on Athos.

146See: M-I, 181-2. On astrology e.g. M-II, 150ff and the subchapter about Lombardy, above. Similar critics may be observed in Erasmus' *Ciceronianus* (1528).

scholars: Lelio Cosmico, Agostino Nifo and Angelo Poliziano. We have already quoted his short accounts concerning the two former. The third, Angelo Poliziano, was mentioned in a similar way: as the one who had been notoriously godless and had finished badly his life (“во всяком нечестии восиавшаго и нечистѣ и злѣ душу свою испустившаго”, M-I, 363). Only in this description the doctrinal base of his disorderly life is not directly suggested but the context implies it.

Having described these three people he adds that in other places there were others, full of every godlessness, who would have built chapels devoted to idols if the fear of papal punishment had not restrained them. The emphasis put on the practical effects of the pagan inspiration reveals that this question was not only an *intellectual* challenge but in Maximus’ religious *experience* it constituted a real problem. It indicates also how strong was the impression the pagan impact made on him or at least how radical was his conversion afterwards.<sup>147</sup>

This was however only one aspect of his religious experience in the West. Maximus depicted also another side. In his works it was symbolised by Savonarola, his profoundly evangelical piety and commitment to the cause of the Church’s reform. These two facets of Trivolis’ meeting with the Western Christianity were not isolated one from another. He certainly knew about the spectacular conversions of humanists and artists occasioned by Savonarola’s preaching. Other eminent Italian humanists at the turn of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries also experienced a considerable religious transformation. The unstable world of Italian wars, filled with millenarian prophecies, created favourable conditions to seek a deeper stability. Even if we take into account only those whom Trivolis knew or may have known, we find a group of people who underwent a long-lasting, slowly maturing change. The early biographer of Marsilio Ficino, Giovanni Corsi, commented Ficino’s decision to take holy orders (1473) in these words: *ex pagano miles Christi*. His later commitment to pastoral work

147Cf. M-I, 362-3. Maximus rather repeats here unverified rumours that circulated widely in Italy than talks about events he himself witnessed. Some of them might have some basis in reality but were often embellished. E.g. Lelio Cosmico’s well known and openly expressed homosexuality could have provoked moral disapproval. In many other places, concerning both Italy (Florence of Savonarola) and Moscow Maximus radically condemned homosexuality but here he mentioned only his *pagan* expression. Lelio Cosmico was in danger of the Inquisition, see above, text and note 114. The veracity of the legend about the scandalous end of Poliziano’s life is doubtful. Otherwise it would be difficult to imagine that Savonarola agreed for him to be buried in San Marco, wearing the Dominican habit, cf. STEWART 1997, passim. The reason that Maximus follows the black legend of Poliziano could have been the fact the Poliziano was in conflict with Laskaris, Trivolis’ protector (on this conflict see: KNÖS 1945, 68 and LEGRAND 1885, I, CXXXVIIIf). When Maximus described all these three philosophers he used the word impious (нечестивый) or impiety (нечестие). It should be however emphasised that those who went so far in their admiration for pagan antiquity as to forget Christianity, were rather a marginal phenomenon. Renaissance was a Christian culture (see: TRINKAUS 1999<sup>b</sup>). On relationship between doctrinal and moral dimensions (in a different context) see below, note 173.

testified that this expression were not vain. Pietro Bembo, after a tempestuous youth, became a faithful servant of the Church. Poliziano was ordained in 1486. At that time he was sufficiently wealthy and well-known not to have to seek in priesthood an improvement on his situation. Vincenzo (Pietro) Quirini resigned from a good prospective career and became a Camaldoli monk. Not to mention the conversions influenced by Savonarola.<sup>148</sup> Thus, the later conversion of Trivolis was not an isolated case. More than one person from his environment took a similar decision.

There is however no evidence that, before the process of his conversion began, religious issues were for him, as for Musurus and Gregoropoulos, especially important. The Christian motives in their works of this period were rather conventional. A unique and interesting example is a hexametric paraphrase of the *Credo* by Mark Musurus. He omits the Latin *Filioque* and, at the same time, he puts in this work formulations characteristic for Western professions of faith which – although not alien to the Orthodox faith – did not appear in Eastern Creeds.<sup>149</sup> Was this proof of his attachment to the Eastern Church, of a desire for reconciliation between the divided Churches or rather of a conviction that in spite of divisions, the Church preserved a fundamental unity? Musurus' paraphrase is open to different interpretations, especially since it is a literary essay rather than a theological work. It may have demonstrated his ability to overcome a narrow confessional mentality but also the lassitude arising from the fierce and unresolved arguments of the bygone period may have had a role to play and contributed to a certain indifference.

---

148On Ficino see: SERRACINO-INGLOTT 2002, 1-11 and CELENZA 2002, 72. “Ex pagano miles Christi”: MARCEL 1958, 683. Even if it was not a radical change of views, nevertheless it was a new, serious Christian involvement, cf. above, note 51. On the *savonarolian* conversions see above, note 64. The case of Codro is also symptomatic. Erasmus (and others) accused him of Epicurean sympathies: “Circa christianum dogma si non re, saltem verbis plerumque claudicabat.” Cf. GUALDO ROSA 1983, 775 who quotes *Dialogus Ciceronianus*, Opera Omnia, I, 2, Amsterdam 1971, 665. Yet, Codro himself before his death declared (see: MALAGOLA 1878, 502): “In primis animum meum, seu animam, omnipotenti Deo commendo, per eius verba sic dicens: In manus tuas domine commendo spiritum meum. Quem quidem animum semper immortalem duxi, contra Epicurum oscitantem, et eos qui sub christiano nomine nihil christiani agunt.” Maximus mentioned that Epicurus was considered an atheist (M-II, 305, cf. also: SHEVCHENKO 1997, 37). While the question of the *prisca theologia* or the use of Aristotelian syllogisms in theology were still under discussion, Epicureanism was universally condemned. Cf., e.g., the case of Marullus (KIDWELL 1989, 200. 249. 256-7) and above, note 95.

149It is symptomatic that there was not in this generation, even among Greek who seriously practised their faith and strove to support the Orthodox Church, a religious thinker and activist of such a calibre as Bessarion had been before. On Musurus' Creed see: PONTANI 2002-2003, 192-3. Elements that he took from Latin Creeds are e.g.: Christ's descent into hell and the mention of forty days from Resurrection to Ascension. Previously Michael Apostolis, although a fervent Uniate, defended the Easter theology of the Holy Trinity without the *Filioque*, see: GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 109. In Musurus' letter from about 1504 – 1506 (BELLONI 2002, 567) he asked Laskaris to destroy *infamous additions*. If Cataldi Palau's conjecture (CATALDI PALAU 2004, 346) is correct, Musurus might have been afraid of something which he had written about the *Filioque*. The hexametric paraphrases of Christian prayers, as a literary exercise, are well known in Byzantine literature (PONTANI 2002-2003, 191).

The question of the necessary reform of the Church seems to not absorb them either. Those Greeks who had the possibility, used ecclesiastical benefices, as the Italians humanists did, not caring about pastoral duties. Musurus, a modest man and of high moral standards, was an exception against this background. He sincerely and honestly expressed in a letter his joy to be able to use a benefice not connected with any ecclesiastical duties. Nevertheless he found it convenient to participate almost every day in the Divine office because it was “beneficial for the soul” and “the best way to practice virtue.”<sup>150</sup>

It was Greek literature that fascinated them. The Gospel not so much. Musurus, in his letter to Trivolis, reminded his friend that letters were their common delight.<sup>151</sup> Maximus confessed that he had arrived in Italy driven by the desire to study Greek and that the Greeks (certainly: ancient Greeks, Hellenes) were his teachers. When he later described how the intellectuals in Italy deformed the dogmas of the Christian faith exalting the authority of pagan philosophers beyond the authority of the Word of God, he admitted briefly that he was their accomplice.<sup>152</sup>

Speaking about his complicity in the sins of Italian scholars he probably also referred to astrology. His remark that he learnt from his own experience of long years the illusiveness of its theories indicates that he also surrendered to this fascination. Even if he did not directly rank astrology among the *Hellenic deceits* in his later works, it is clear that the Renaissance astrology drew profusely from the Greek tradition. Maximus approached this discipline in the religious context, as a threat to the faith. He emphasised that he had not known anybody who had accepted astrological sciences and preserved the purity of their faith. His encounter with astrology, or rather his gradual liberation of it, was therefore a part of the religious experience

---

150Musurus wrote about that to Gregoropoulos, see: FIRMIN-DIDOT 1875, 31-2 (translation); *ibid.*, 501-7 and LEGRAND 1885, II, 316-19 (original). Cf. also: GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 127. 162-4 and, about opinions concerning Musurus’ noble life: *ibid.*, 226-229. Also Musurus’ later appointment by Leo X as bishop of Monemvasia and Hierapetra was not primarily for the pastoral care of these dioceses but signified an appreciation of his scholarly achievements and the creation of favourable financial conditions for his future work. In fact, Musurus did not intend to reside in his dioceses (GEANAKOPOLOS 1976, 227). Even Laskaris, the great authority, instructed Arsenios Apostolis, a man of doubtful reputation, to try to get an episcopal see. Laskaris was motivated, as we can suppose, by patriotic and not religious motives: to help the social advancement of the Greeks from diaspora which would promote the cause of the liberation of their homeland, see: GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 188.

151“...μὰ τοὺς λόγους τὰμὰ τε καὶ σὰ παιδικὰ”, BELLONI 2002, 652. See also above, note 141.

152About Trivolis’ beliefs during his Italian years we know only from his later Slavonic works. On his complicity in the errors of Italian humanists: M-I, 362. In his short text on Franciscans and Dominicans (RZHIGA 1935-36, 99) he confessed that he had spent a lot of time in Italy “похотью еллинских учений”. The word *похоть* can be understood both as *desire* and as *lust*. In his letter to metropolitan Daniel (Z-139) Maximus says that the Greeks were his teachers. In Moscow Maximus wrote also a polemical treatise against Hellenic deceit where he says that the Greek (Danaan) education has as its goal “death and underground Erebus”, see: SHEVCHENKO 1997, 35.



and maturing into conversion.<sup>153</sup>

We lack many details to be able to fully understand Trivolis' long and complicated spiritual evolution. One point seems to be however clear: the turbulence that were undergoing both Eastern and Western Churches caused anxiety and religious restlessness that was a characteristic feature of Michael's generation. In a changing situation it was difficult to find solid points of reference. It was probably even more difficult for people rooted in the static structures of Byzantine tradition who were confronted with new ideas engendered by the dynamically developing Western society. The anxiety provoked, in turn, the seeking of a new stability. Some of this research led to new forms of religiousness or new religious identity, some resulted in indifference. Yet another possible scenario was the return to the tradition of the ancestors. Michael had first adhered to Savonarolian views. This constitutes the uniqueness of his biography because no other Greek intellectual that we know of became a follower of the Friar. Eventually, his roots in the Byzantine tradition appeared to be stronger and enabled him to find himself anew in the Orthodox Church. The awareness that her values were threatened aroused a feeling of the necessity to defend her.<sup>154</sup>

### 3. MIRANDOLA AND SAN MARCO

Trivolis' time in Mirandola begins a new period in his life. The four letters preserved that he sent from Gianfrancesco Pico's castle allow us to know more about him and not only about the circumstances of his Italian adventures. Mirandola was a significant place for Trivolis' intellectual and spiritual biography. He found some stability there after travelling across Italy but first and foremost it was undoubtedly there, that his Savonarolian views were definitively confirmed and his decision to join the San Marco priory was taken.

---

153M-I, 333-4 – about his astrological experience. Against Sinitsyna's conviction, Maximus used the word *нечестие* in the context of astrology, see: M-I, 291. It does not appear explicitly from the text that he practised astrology. His conclusions may have been based on observation of others but the tenor of this passage suggests personal involvement.

154GRENDELER 1981 noticed the religious restlessness in the sixteenth century, starting from about 1520s - 1530s. He said (*ibid.*, 26) that in the early years of the sixteenth century Italians "in secular unconcern ignored religious revival". This position seems to be false judging at least from Savonarola's affair. On the religious crisis in Early Modern Italy see also BLACK 2004, 1-7 who emphasizes that the religious crisis should be seen in the context of other crises provoked mainly by the Italian wars. Cf. also BLACK 2001, 7-8; EDELHEIT 2008, 26-9 and note 76 above. Examples concerning people of the circles close to Trivolis can be multiplied. WEINSTEIN 1970, 216 points at Jerome Benivieni's spiritual crises. CROUZEL 1977, 58-81 describes a confrontation between Giovanni Pico's nuanced position in a theological discussion and Peter Garcia's defensive ossification which required Origen to be condemned. Such a hardening was certainly a crisis-driven to defend a stability. Cf. also interesting observations by GEANAKOPOLOS 1976, 4, on "nativistic reaction" and revitalisation movement" adapted to the situation of Greeks in their encounter with the West.

Trivolis was in Mirandola at least twice: probably for the first time in 1499 and for the second from March 1500 until he entered San Marco. Since he was vested on July 14<sup>th</sup> 1502 he could have remained there till March – April 1502. Between the first and the second stay in Mirandola he undertook a voyage, plausibly to Greece, because on the way he was in Venice.<sup>155</sup> It is possible that he went to Greece more than once. It would be odd if he had not visited his homeland and his family during the long stay in Italy. His Cretan fellows travelled to their island quite frequently, sometimes for prolonged periods.<sup>156</sup>

Being in Mirandola Michael travelled however less than before. The employment he had there satisfied him. The Lord spared no expense to promote learning and arts. He was more generous than other patrons and kind to Trivolis (M-I, 86. 94). The latter wrote to Nicholas di Tarsia that he was loved and esteemed and because of this he should not leave to serve others (M-I, 86). He appreciated not only Pico's generosity but also his commitment to Greek studies. He called his benefactor obsessed by Hellenism (ἑλληνομανῆς – M-I, 94).

Pico was indeed a distinguished intellectual and among his friends and correspondents were eminent humanists both from Italy (above all his uncle, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola and also Girolamo Benivieni, Ficino, Manuzio, Zanobi Acciaiuoli, Alberto Pio) and from Northern Europe (Reuchlin, Pirckheimer, Beatus Rhenanus and many others). At his court Demetrius Moschos, Lilio Gregorio Giraldi and Giovanni Mainardi stayed at different times.<sup>157</sup> Mirandola was an important humanistic centre.

Trivolis knew some of Pico's acquaintances. He might have known others. Many of them were also connected to other circles with which Michael was connected, first of all Manuzio's printing shop. The collaboration with Gianfrancesco Pico must have been for him

---

155On chronology see Trivolis' letters from the Italian period with Fonkich's chronological notes in M-I, 86-101. In the letter to Gregoropoulos from March 1500 (DENISSOFF 1943, 402-4) Trivolis says the he came to Mirandola and that the Lord (Pico) is not less well disposed towards him than previously so obviously it was his second time in Mirandola. Musurus mentions Trivolis' stay in Venice in his letter to him: BELLONI 2002, 651.

156Michael previously probably visited his homeland in 1497 (see the letter of Codro, above). The next trip most probably took place at the end of 1499 and the beginning of 1500. Cf. Fonkich's comments in M-I, 92 and 94 based also on Denissoff's conclusions. In one letter to Gregoropoulos Trivolis asks about the security of the voyage through the Adriatic (DENISSOFF 1943, 400-1, written probably in 1499) and in another one he says that he has returned to Mirandola (DENISSOFF 1943, 402-3, written in March 1500). About Cretans travelling to the island: GEANAKOPILOS 1962, 54 where he says that the journey from Crete to Venice usually took somewhat less than a month and that such voyages were very frequent. Thus, from Corfu the voyage had to take proportionally about three weeks. Musurus was in Crete plausibly from the end of 1495 until the end of 1496 or even early 1497 (CATALDI PALAU 2004, 309). Zacharias Kalliergis in 1499-1501 (GEANAKOPILOS 1962, 209 and MANOUSSACAS 1976, 34).

157Demetrius Moschos was the son of John Moschos who was a teacher in Corfu and brother of Georges Moschos who worked for Manuzio. See: FORMENTIN 1998; see also: SCHMITT 1967, 12-24. Possibly through his Greek contacts (Trivolis? Demetrius Moschos?) Pico learnt about the miraculous healing of an Italian from Crete, through the intercession of Savonarola, see: PICO, Vita Savonarolae, 187.

no less interesting and stimulating for his intellectual development than his previous occupations.

Gianfrancesco's Greek interests were, however, only partially in the mainstream of the Italian Renaissance. He had much less confidence in human nature and in the possibility of human intellect than the majority of the Italian intellectuals of that time. His research within the ancient tradition was focused to a large extent on the opposition – radically emphasised in his work – between human knowledge and revealed wisdom. Moreover, he and many of his friends were adherents to Savonarola's thought or were inspired by his ideas. Trivolis' sojourn in Mirandola is therefore important for understanding his further evolution.

Pico's friendship with Savonarola, that began earlier, was consolidated during the most difficult of Savonarola's years. The Count of Mirandola wrote several works in defence of the Dominican. The most famous of them, the *Vita Hieronymi Savonarolae*, is an example of his endless fascination with the Friar. Pico characterised him as the one who combined in himself the wisdom of previous generations of Christian thinkers.<sup>158</sup>

After the martyrdom of Fra Girolamo, Pico and other followers of Savonarola did not cease to strive to realise their Master's ideas. Pico, together with Girolamo Benivieni, Zanobi Acciaiuoli and others, were – according to Polizzotto – representatives of the conservative group of Savonarolians. Indeed, they, unlike the more radical popular or mystical movements, accepted the structures of the Church, and endeavoured to reform her within the institutional framework. Gianfrancesco was however more radical, or less critical of everything that concerned Savonarola, than his friends.<sup>159</sup>

---

158See: PICO, *Vita Savonarolae*, 140: "Conarer lectoribus librorum huiusmodi utilitatem pandere, ni verer in re tam aperta verba prodigere. Illud dumtaxat proferam, praeter philosophorum, praeter Thomae Aquinatis theologica dogmata, praeter proprias in utraque facultate nonparum nobiles inventiones, quibus referti sunt ipsimet libri, tria tamen haec in eis peculiaria nec laudata satis plurimum elucere, maximum fidei lumen, clarissimum prophetiae iubar, ardentissimam in Deum hominesque caritatem. Tria quoque alia, in quorum singulis magnos excelluisse viros magno est honori datum, in eo uno etiam simul egregie fuere collecta, hoc est partis rationalis et irascentiae et concupiscentiae munia quae in eo peculiari quodam modo fulsere, cum tamen laudi non modicae sit Augustino tributum et Thomae quod in rationali parte fuerint eminentes, Hieronymo et Ambrosio quod irascentiae, Gregorio et Bernardo quod concupiscentiae facultatem exornaverint, primi ordinis viri contemplatione veritatis celebres habiti, secundum criminum osores et expulsos egregii, tertii praecellentes divinae bonitatis dulcedinisque scrutatores. Et quamquam propriae virtutes quas recensuimus in antiquioribus illis communes non excluserint, Hieronymi tamen opera seorsum simulque omnia illa et quodcumque egregie videntur complecti."

159On the conservative group of Savonarolians see: POLIZZOTTO 1994, chapter 4. Some facts reveal that Pico was more radical in his Savonarolianism than his friends: in 1502 he gave shelter in Mirandola to Pietro Bernardino and his followers, the so called *anointed (unti)*, radical Savonarolians, while the intellectual elite of Florence did not treat Bernardino seriously. Even Domenico Benivieni who was the spiritual director of Bernardino, muted their relationship, no doubt because of Bernardino's radicalisation (see: WEINSTEIN 1970, 328 and POLIZZOTTO 1994, 117; 133-136.) Later, Luca Bettino OP, an active *Piagnone*, found refuge in Pico's castle when the authorities of the Order took some measures against him (ibid., 305-306). Polizzotto (ibid., 139) writes: "Although [Gianfrancesco Pico and Girolamo Benivieni] never to devote all their energies to the

Yet another person in this circle of conservative Savonarolians may have been more closely connected to Trivolis. This was Zanobi Acciaiuoli whom we find also within other groups that Trivolis was part of. He was in Florence at the same time as Michael and in 1495 received the Dominican habit from Savonarola's hands. Later he collaborated with Manuzio and became a friend of Gianfrancesco Pico. Unfortunately, the only tangible track of their possible contact is Gianfrancesco Pico's letter to Zanobi where the former at the end of his letter writes: "Michael greets you."<sup>160</sup>

Being in Mirandola meant that Trivolis was immersed in the problems that his patron worked on and shared with his friends. Two of these questions are important within the context of Maximus the Greek's stance in Muscovy: the relation between human knowledge and revealed wisdom (including the astrological argument) and the issue of the reform of the Church. These themes had already run through earlier stages of Michael's intellectual itinerary in Italy. Each of them was in the centre of Savonarola's attention and his follower, Gianfrancesco Pico, was inspired by his reflections.

The former question is as old as Christianity. At the turn of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries it returned and became again urgent in face of the rediscovery and a much better knowledge of ancient philosophy that was possible thanks to the work of humanists. It provoked inevitably a new confrontation between this thought and the Christian faith. We have seen how Giovanni Pico and Ficino attempted to reconcile these two worlds. Gianfrancesco Pico and thinkers close to him chose different approaches.<sup>161</sup> They were afraid of the negative influences of pagan thought on Christianity. The way to salvation – argued Pico – is shown in the Bible, not in philosophers' works. He feared excessive interest in pagan philosophy would draw Christians away from the true path. His activity aimed therefore to show the relative value of this philosophy and the absolute value of Christian revelation. His fight against astrology

---

Savonarolan cause, which, while it was an important concern, always remained only one of several interests, they were never to renounce their allegiance to it." Pico's wife, Giovanna Carafa, also was in touch with Savonarola and corresponded with him: DENISSOFF 1943, 235 and SCHMITT 1967, 15.

<sup>160</sup>On Zanobi Acciaiuoli see: REDIGONDA 1960. Born into one of the great families of the city he studied at the *Studio Fiorentino*. In Gianfrancesco Pico's letter to Acciaiuoli (PICO, Opera omnia, II, 1278, cf. DENISSOFF 1943, 94) we read: "Michael te salutat". The letter is dated on September the 13<sup>th</sup> (with no year). DENISSOFF 1943, 246, who discovered this note, thought that there was no any other known Michael within Pico's milieu so it must be about Trivolis. He dated the letter to 1501 because Pico talks about a threat to his castle and about his military preparations. Mirandola was captured on 6<sup>th</sup> of August 1502.

<sup>161</sup>One of people close to Gianfrancesco Pico was Giovanni Mainardi. He lived at the court in Mirandola in the years 1493-1502 when Trivolis was also there. He rejected the astrological conception of medicine and wanted to introduce Greek medicine based on Galen and Dioskorides (Trivolis, being in Mirandola, ordered the last book from Manuzio). Later he sought a medicinal herb described by Dioskorides and after many trials he received it via Moscow! It probably happened when Maximus was already in the city, see: NUTTON 1997, 11 and passim. See also: MUGNAI CARRARA 1994, 31.

was a part of the same battle. Astrological practices were for him an attempt of human reason to explore the reality that is accessible only to God, to explore the space where rational searching is vain.<sup>162</sup>

Gianfrancesco Pico wanted therefore to investigate the sources of true cognition in order to expose the unjust claims of human knowledge and – against this background – to show the origin of real wisdom. His first, more moderate, reflections on this subject were expressed in *De studio divinae et humanae philosophiae* finished in 1496 but published in 1497, shortly before Trivolis settled in Mirandola. Already in this work he did not want to reconcile the Bible with philosophy but rather to show distinctly the difference between human and divine philosophy. The former is fallible and not necessary for the Christian, the latter is reliable because it is based on God's knowledge and it is necessary for salvation.<sup>163</sup> Therefore a Christian can easily manage without pagan thought. Christianity is self-sufficient.

Much more radical is his *Examen vanitatis gentium*. The first three books of this work are a general attack on pagan science and knowledge, the remaining three – on Aristotelian philosophy. Pico focused his criticism on Aristotelianism because it was popular and influential in the sixteenth-century Italy. This philosophy, especially dynamically developed by the so called school of Padua, was the basis for teaching in Italian schools. His project was however wider: he wanted to demolish all vain philosophy of Gentiles and to exalt divine wisdom revealed in the Scriptures as the only source of certain and reliable knowledge. An instrument that he used to execute this plan was the sceptical doctrine of Sextus Empiricus.

Admittedly, the *Examen* was published in 1520, long after Trivolis had left Mirandola but the opinions expressed in this book were taking shape far earlier and may have formed the young Greek's ideas. In his *Vita Hieronymi Savonarolae* Pico mentions that when the friar heard about the writings of Sextus Empiricus where all human learning is refuted, he had commissioned it to be translated into Latin and wanted Zanobi Acciaiuoli to accomplish it.<sup>164</sup>

162Cf. SCHMITT 1967, 38-40. Gianfrancesco Pico published Giovanni Pico's *Adversus astrologiam* and then wrote his own *Questio de falsitate astrologiae*. Also his *De rerum praenotione* contains some anti-astrological ideas.

163The description of Gianfrancesco Pico's views in this passage is based on SCHMITT 1967, here esp. 39.

164“Quod aetate procedente, sumpto iam religionis habitu et claritate nominis eius sese diffundente, multo ostendit apertius, quippe qui audiens graeca quaequam Sexti philosophi monumenta asservari, in quibus universae doctrinae humanitus inventae <confutatae> essent, ea e graeco transferri in latinum, paululum antequam moreretur, mandaverat, perosus multorum, qui se scire iactabant, arrogantiam. Idque ipsum muneris Georgio Antonio Vespuccio utriusque linguae gnaro, qui ex eius erat sodalitate, delegarat, volebatque eidem operi Zenobium etiam Acciaiolum, utriusque linguae compotem eiusdemque virum sodalitatis, incumbere, fecissentque votis satis ni mors ipsum violenta rapuisset.” PICO, *Vita Savonarolae*, 112-113. NB, also Giovanni Pico used in his theology some typically sceptical notions, like *probabilitas* and *verisimile*, see: EDELHEIT 2008, 29. In the library of San Marco (a considerable part of it was purchased from Giovanni Pico) there was a copy of Empiricus works: “no. 1142]3. Sexti Epyrici Piromorum dogmatum libri decem” – ULLMAN-STADTER 1972, 257 (according to the catalogue from Milan: M 94: “Pyrroniorum hypotyposes, et Sextus Empiricus in

We know nothing about the success of this plan but Acciaiuoli did not remain indifferent to the challenge that Greek philosophy posed to Christianity. In the preface to his translation of the *De curatione Graecarum affectionum* by Theodoret of Cyrus, he showed that some ideas of Greek authors are pernicious for the Church and – when published – should be accompanied by the Christian opinion on them. Significantly, he admitted that it was Gianfrancesco Pico who had attracted his attention to this work and had encouraged him to translate it. Pico, in turn, translated Pseudo-Justin’s *Admonitorius gentium liber* (which is also a refutation of pagan doctrines) and dedicated it to Acciaiuoli.<sup>165</sup>

Other people close to Pico also wrestled with this problem. His friend, Girolamo Benivieni, expressed his conviction that “Scripture alone was needed to direct the Christian on

---

Pyrhionios”, *ibid.*, 277). SCHMITT 1967, 193, thinks that *Examen* “was probably begun before Gianfrancesco’s first exile from Mirandola in 1502, but was not completed until after his final return in 1514”.

165“Equidem non sine Dei consilio factum puto, quod hos mihi Theodoriti libros Joannes Franciscus Picus princeps aetatis nostrae doctissimus indicarit, meque ut Latinos facerem magnopere adhortatus fit. Etenim sicut olim cum Philostrati de Apollonio Tyaneo historia typis excusa in vulgatum prodiiit, ego Caesariensis Eusebii librum mihi ab Joanne Laschari indicatum Latinum feci, qui contra venenum Philostrati antidotum quoddam esset &c. ita nunc quoque cum Platonem Graece impressum circumferri audiam, cujus quidem philosophi singularis est eloquentia, sed plurimis tamen locis perniciose christianae Ecclesiae semper fuit auctoritas & doctrina, non ab re fecisse me putem, qui libros eos Theodoriti Latinos fecerim, quibus & Platonis & multorum praeterea philosophorum pugnantibus sibi maximis de rebus sententiae, perniciosaque instituta humanae vitae moribus proderentur, ut evitare possit, que apud philosophos noxia esse cognorint &c. Marsilius Ficinus saepius mihi dicere inter loquendum solebat, factum providentia Florentini praesulis Antonini, quo minus e Platonis lectione, quam inde a pueris summopere adamavit, in perniciosam haeresim prolapsus fuerit: bonus enim pastor cum adolescentum clericum suum nimi plus captum Platonis eloquentia cerneret, non ante passus est in illius philosophi lectione frequentem esse, quam eum D. Thomae Aquinatis quatuor libris contra gentes conscriptis, quasi quodam antipharmaco praemuniret.” (QUÉTIF - ÉCHARD 1719-21, II, 45-6 who quoted the edition of Paris 1519, 223) It is worth noting that also the names of Ficino and Laskaris appeared in this context! On Pico’s translation of Pseudo-Justin (Gianfrancesco was convinced that it was Justin’s genuine work): SCHMITT 1967, 200. In the introduction to this translation Pico thanked Acciaiuoli for providing him with the Greek text of the *Admonitorius* (= *Cohortatio ad Graecos*), cf. POUDERON 2009, 76, note 4. The work of Pseudo-Justin was copied for Gianfrancesco Pico by Michael Damasceno (SPERANZI 2016, 191-2). NB DENISSOFF 1943, 231 wrongly maintains that Pico translated *De monarchia Dei*. From among Pseudo-Justin’s works (*Cohortatio ad Graecos*, *Oratio ad Graecos* and *De monarchia Dei*) Pico translated only *Cohortatio ad Graecos*. Zanobi Acciaiuoli also translated St Justin, see: REDIGONDA 1960, 94. Perhaps with this activity was also linked another MS copied by Trivolis (Vat. Barb. 100, cf. RGK 3-A, no. 469 and SPERANZI 2016, 193, note 13) containing Josephus Flavius’ *Contra Apionem*. Flavius’ work was used by Christian apologist, perhaps also Pseudo-Justin was familiar with *Contra Apionem*, cf. HARDWICK 1996, 380. An understanding of further ideological bonds between Pico and Acciaiuoli could rise from a thorough lecture of the *Liber de providentia Dei contra philosophastos* by Pico (printed in November 1508) and the unfinished Acciaiuoli’s translation of *De providentia Dei* by Theodoret (BAV Ottob. Lat. 1404, 155r-270r – in the same codex we find also *De curatione Graecarum affectionum*, see: Supplementum Ficinianum, II, 204). For the last work cf. ASSONITIS 2003, 268. Probably with this program was linked another codex copied by Michael Trivolis (RGK 1-A, no. 287): Oxon. Canon. Gr. 27 which contains precisely *De curatione Graecarum affectionum* by Theodoret of Cyrus (cf. Henry O. Coxe, *Catalogi codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae pars tertia codices Graecos et Latinos Canonicianos complectens*, Oxford, 1854). SHEVCHENKO 1997, 63, also confirms this identification from autopsy. Acciaiuoli’s translation was published in 1519 but – since Pico and Acciaiuoli strove to resist pernicious pagan influences before – Trivolis’ copy was most probably linked with Acciaiuoli’s translation. Cf. also ASSONITIS 2006, 57-8 on the efforts of conservative Savonarolians to show to the pope Leo X the danger of pagan literature, in a broader context of the reform of the Church.

his way".<sup>166</sup> Aldo Manuzio, when he published the life of Apollonius of Tyana by Philostratos, provided this edition with the *Opusculum in Hieroclem* by Eusebius of Cesarea against Philostratos and dedicated this publication to Zanobi Acciaiuoli who had translated Eusebius' *Opusculum* for this edition.<sup>167</sup>

It is visible that Pico and his circle shared the same anxiety in reference to the spread of pagan thought within Christian culture but they had also a clear programme of counteracting these tendency. Trivolis' connection with Pico (and possibly with Acciaiuoli) as well as his Muscovite writings suggest that he could have also been involved in realisation of this project.

Pico, with much the same group of friends, were no less concerned by the state of the institutional Church and the question of her reform occupied an important place in their literary output. Also in this case the spirit of Savonarola, who preached the *renovatio Ecclesiae*, was an inspiration for them. Gianfrancesco defended the case of Savonarola and he remained faithful to this task till the end of his life. He expressed also his own views, as in his appeal to the fathers of the Lateran Council *De reformandis moribus oratio*.

Alike Zanobi Acciaiuoli in his *Oratio [...] habita Romae coram Summo Pontifice dominica prima Adventus MDVII* called for the introduction of indispensable reforms. These conservative followers of Savonarola's ideas wanted to carry out the reforms within the existing structures of the Church. Although their disagreement with the corruption of morals might have brought them closer to Luther, Gianfrancesco Pico in *Dialogus de adoratione* or Girolamo Benivieni in *Apologia pro veritate* categorically opposed the reformer from Wittenberg as a man who caused a schism in the Church. The work of reform, as they understood it, did not aim to replace the existing structures but to heal them.<sup>168</sup>

---

166The passage from *Laude dello amore di Iesu Christo, chiamata la savia pazerella*, in: Opere, fos. 137r-139r, foll; in another place he says: „For human wisdom / is folly in God's presence”, *ibid.*, 136, foll (an obvious reference to 1 Co 1,22 ff.). Both fragments are quoted by: POLIZZOTTO 1994, 154-5. Another of Benivieni's expressions bears testimony to the fact that the religious situation in Italy was dramatic for him: „All Italy, even the women, have lost their Christian faith”, DUNAEV 1916, 5.

167Aldo's dedicatory letter to Acciaiuoli and the confutation of Philostratos' views by Eusebius of Casearea (translated by Acciaiuoli himself) in the edition of *De vita Apollonii Tyanei* by Philostratos (from 1501-1504), see: ALDO MANUZIO EDITORE, I, 41ff and note 94 above. Gianfrancesco Pico wrote about this edition to Acciaiuoli (PICO, Opera omnia, II, 1275-1276). An interesting fragment of Acciaiuoli's obituary sheds some light on his attitude towards humane knowledge: “Fuit valde humilis et abiectus nec eum scientia inflavit sed potius humilem fecit. Taceo reliquas eius laudes ne, dum volo eum laudare, propter ignorantiam minuat eius virtutes.” VERDE 1983, 184.

168On the conservative Savonarolians: POLIZZOTTO 1994, 159, 165 and chapter 4 passim. Santi Pagnini, another Dominican – Savonarolian of Trivolis' generation, preached in Lyon views similar to the beliefs of Pico and Benivieni. In the same group of conservative followers of Savonarola Polizzotto placed the Camaldolese reformers (Orlandini, Quirini). They also had contact with Gianfrancesco Pico, Pagnini and Zanobi Acciaiuoli and formulated their reformatory demands in a way close to that of Gianfrancesco Pico. Paolo Orlandini “took [as GF Pico did] a firm stand against the pretensions of profane learning”, POLIZZOTTO 1994, 149. Quirini invited a few Savonarolan friars of San Marco to join the Camaldolese Order. About that and other links

In such a milieu Trivolis spent about two years. Mirandola was probably a place where he passed the longest period of his Italian years and it seems to be most probable that Gianfrancesco Pico with other Savonarolians contributed, more than any other of Trivolis' Italian contacts, to form his views and to introduce him more profoundly into the tradition of the Church.<sup>169</sup>

We do not know much about his work in Mirandola. His collaboration with Pico visibly went well. As it appears in Trivolis' letter, the Lord was pleased with him and welcomed him graciously at the beginning of his second stay in Mirandola (M-I, 94-5). Probably Trivolis was responsible for Pico's library because he ordered some books from Aldo and also helped Pico translate Greek texts. He may have taught Pico's children as did other Greek scholars (e.g. Musurus) working for Italian aristocrats.<sup>170</sup>

Among these daily activities a change of fundamental importance in Michael's life took place and it certainly occurred, or at least began, in Mirandola.<sup>171</sup> Trivolis – as we have seen – accused himself of participation in – harmful for the faith an exaggerated – passion for Hellenic thought. The intellectual atmosphere of Pico's court: both his above-mentioned opinions concerning the disproportion between human knowledge and the Bible as well as his polemics against astrology in the spirit of Savonarola, was an ideal environment to reject these convictions. One can suppose that Gianfrancesco Pico – somehow or other – contributed to Michael's conversion. The reminiscence of Savonarola's preaching was very strong but apparently Trivolis needed time and support so that his meeting with the Dominican might result in a real change of life, of his way of thinking and finally in his decision to enter San

---

between Dominican Savonarolians and Camaldolese reformers see: POLIZZOTTO 1994, 156; WEINSTEIN 1970, 360; ASSONITIS 2003, 254. Later the Camaldolese reformers distanced themselves from the prophetic and millenarian activity of some of Savonarola's followers (WEINSTEIN 1970, 356) but without abandoning the struggle for reform. Orlandini, after a period of fascination, renounced Savonarola but his vision of the reforms remained essentially Savonarolian (POLIZZOTTO 1994, 151-152). On Acciaiuoli: ASSONITIS 2003, 269. A possible link of Trivolis to the Camaldolese milieu could have been Pietro Candido who helped him after he had left San Marco, see below. Yet, it is not obvious. Candido was linked with Pietro Delfino who became anti-savonarolian.

169 DENISSOFF 1943, 235, rightly observed that Maximus' words about learned men among whom he lived for some time in Italy (K-III, 123=Z-147) should be a reference to Mirandola.

170 Trivolis ordered the book by Dioscorides published by Aldo and some other books (M-I, 94-7). In 1506-7 Pico published his translation of *Iustini philosophi et martyris admonitorius gentium liber* but he had worked on it already before (see above, note 165). At the turn of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries he worked intensively on his *De imaginatione*, *De rerum praenotione* and *Theoremata de fide et ordine credendi*. These works contain many passages taken from Greek thinkers (as Denissoff noticed) and likely Trivolis helped Pico prepare material for these books.

171 DENISSOFF 1943, 185. 236-237, tried to determine more precisely the moment of Trivolis' conversion but his arguments are weak. The fact that the last event of a few mentioned by Maximus in Moscow in the context of his conversion (the death of Cosmico) took place in 1500 does not mean necessary that Trivolis converted afterwards. Also the analysis of his letter does not allow one to infer precise conclusions because a tenuous hint about Epicurean motives does not determine that this letter was written before the conversion.



Marco. Otherwise, he would have become a Dominican much earlier.

Maximus described this breakthrough in these words: “If God who cares for the salvation of all people had not had mercy upon me, quickly visited me with his grace and enlightened my thoughts with his light, a long time ago I would have died together with godless people living there.” And again: “Almost forty years have passed since I renounced the corrupt tales and teachings of my forefathers, the Greeks, and I listened to the secret Master. And I will never recall their name with my mouth.”<sup>172</sup>

Trivolis confesses that the prime mover of this transformation came from outside (the secret Master, grace, light) and under this influence he decided to renounce his previous beliefs. There were however also external factors that may have helped to take this decision. It was not a return to religion from atheism (that almost did not exist as an intellectual position at that time) but a rejection of opinions considered before as reconcilable with Christianity. Now he recognised them as erroneous.<sup>173</sup> Possibly, Greek thought that had been a subject of his fascination before, resulted in disenchantment. Even if exploited as a useful instrument in polemics (Pico’s use of scepticism) or giving a more or less coherent vision of the universe (Platonism or Aristotelianism for many humanists), it was not able to answer many questions of a Christian’s mind. Thus, a turn towards the Bible and the Fathers of the Church was understandable. The role of the Bible in Christian life was emphasised by Savonarola and Michael may have remembered this aspect of his predication. The contact with the Fathers he owed at least partially to Pico who knew the patristic tradition. Maximus’ remark directed to his disciple in Moscow about the Romans who translated the Fathers of the Eastern Church may refer also to his experience in Mirandola.<sup>174</sup> Finally, the above-mentioned evolution of

---

172The first quotation from M-I, 362 and the second from RZHIGA 1935-36, 101: “40 лѣтъ безмала прошли ужь, отнели отрекохся гнилых басней и ученій моих прародителех еллинех, послушавъ глаголющаго тайноучителя, и не въспомяну именъ ихъ устны моими и инде: «повѣдаша ми законопреступници суесловіа, а не яко же законъ твой, Господи».” According to BULANIN 1984, 46-7, the latter work was written shortly before 1548. If this is correct, Maximus’ conversion should be dated only about the beginning of his stay on Athos, or, at least, after leaving San Marco. Yet, Maximus’ mention about forty years may be an approximation. Cf. striking similarity with Savonarola’s description of his conversion (*Prediche sopra i Salmi*, I, 256, May 31, 1495, quoted by WEINSTEIN 2011, 8): “Look, today all you hear out there is *Plato, that divine man*. I was in that same misapprehension myself and I studied Plato’s dialogues a lot, but then, when God gave me light, I tore up everything I had written about them.”

173DENISSOFF 1943, 241-242, groundlessly, I think, maintained that Trivolis’ conversion took place mainly “sur le plan moral” and added (*ibid.*, 242): “C’est donc sur le plan de l’action et de la volonté que Maxime condamne le paganisme.” It seems that Maximus’ intention was just the opposite. One of texts quoted by Denissoff (K-I, 68 = M-II, 73 = SHEVCHENKO 1997, 24/26 – text and 25/27 – translation) from the *Invective against Hellenic deceit* (Слово обличительно на еллинскую прелесть) suggests rather that the moral errors were a consequence of doctrinal unorthodoxy. It is still more visible in M-I, 159: “поелику въ нравы учительство проливают”. Cf. also below, chapter III, note 69.

174About the Fathers translated by the Latins: KURBSKII, *Новый марнарит*, 5-5v, see also above, note 98. On Pico’s translation of Pseudo-Justin: above, note 165. On Savonarola’s desire to base Christian piety on the

other humanists – may have also played a role in Trivolis' decision.

This breakthrough was something more than a purely intellectual change of view. It was a reorientation of his whole existence and it led him, in consequence, to San Marco's priory. He still needed some time before he found his definitive place but the fundamental attitude of his life already appeared clearly enough. He wanted to be a religious and he consistently aimed at that. All other reasons for his entering the Savonarolian priory, shown by historians, are secondary in the face of this fundamental choice.<sup>175</sup> There was in this decision, taken shortly after his conversion, a zeal of a neophyte but not a temporary enthusiasm. Later events would show that the unsuccessful attempt in San Marco did not cause Trivolis to give up this idea.

It is not obvious that the Dominican life was the only possibility that he took into consideration. His description of the Carthusians suggests that Michael was in touch with a charterhouse and perhaps also deliberated on becoming a son of S. Bruno. The account of Carthusian life is however less detailed than that of Dominican customs so his connection with the white monks must have been more casual.<sup>176</sup>

The fact that he chose San Marco did not arise only from his fascination in the person of Savonarola. Certainly significant for him was the fact that the Friar's ideas were still alive among some Dominican brothers and his other followers. The desire to reform the Church according to his ideas did not disappear on his death.<sup>177</sup>

---

Bible: above, note 97.

175E.g. IVANOV 1973, 116, (and others) underline the significance of the splendid library of San Marco. IVANOV 1972-74, part I, 149, also noted that the significance Savonarola attached to poverty was important for Maximus. Poverty was however only one factor of Savonarola's reform.

176Cf. the legend about the beginnings of the Carthusian Order: Z- 240-2 and the description of Carthusians' life: Z-242-4. Maximus admitted that he had heard this story and he even did not know the name of the Parisian canon, the circumstances of whose death induced St Bruno and his companions to begin monastic life. Trivolis may have encountered Carthusians during his stay in Lombardy (the famous charterhouse in Pavia) or in Florence. Maximus description suggests that the charterhouse he knew was close to a town, cf. Z 247-8, noted by ROMOLI 2019, 208. Niccolo Acciaiuoli (a Zanobi's relative from fourteenth century) founded near Florence (Galluzzo) a charterhouse. Next to it he built a palace for his family (cf. LEONCINI 1979). This charterhouse owned a rich library visited by humanists (CHIARELLI 1984, vol. I, 58). It is worth noting that the then prior of the Florentine charterhouse, badly informed, looked upon Savonarola with disapproval (TROMBY 1779, vol. IX, 230-231). Perhaps Maximus' interpretation of the *Imago Pietatis* (Christ's representation as Man of Sorrows - Z-146-7) is also linked with his contacts with Carthusians. This image, at first a Byzantine mosaic venerated in the Carthusian church of Santa Croce in Gerusalemme in Rome, was often copied (also in printed form) in the West. On Maximus' description of the Carthusian Order and on the legend about the beginnings of the Order cf. ROMOLI 2019, 201-9. ROMOLI 2021, 66-90 provides a detailed analysis of Maximus' account and his possible sources. Regrettably, I discovered this book after completing the editing of my thesis.

177IVANOV 1973, 115, thinks that it was the example of Savonarola's zeal that induced Trivolis to enter San Marco. Trivolis may have had other contacts with Dominicans, not only in Florence but also in Venice. His friend, John Gregoropoulos, lived in 1497 in the Dominican priory in Venice (MANOUSSACAS 1956, 186-187); also Musurus' favourite copyist, Cesare Stratego, spent some time in this priory and Musurus entrusted him with his books. He was also a copyist of G. Torriani, the master of the Dominican Order and one of the main opponents of Savonarola (CATALDI PALAU 2004, 310. 315; MANOUSSACAS 1982, 226, n. 32). The history of the Savonarolian movement after the friar's death describes POLIZZOTTO 1994.

Groundless is the conjecture – expressed by Ivanov – that Trivolis may have wanted to enter San Marco immediately after Savonarola’s death. As we have seen, his conversion probably took place in Mirandola, or even later, and it was the Savonarolian movement that made the seeds sown in him by the Dominican Preacher grow. It was not out of fear of persecution that Trivolis did not dare make such a decision in 1498 or 1499. There were many more candidates who knocked at San Marco’s gate directly after the Prophet’s death than in 1502 when Trivolis became a novice. Clearly, he was not ready to make such a move earlier. However, once he had taken the decision, he persevered despite the fact that in 1500 – 1501 the Savonarolian influences had weakened in the Tusco – Roman Congregation.<sup>178</sup>

Trivolis entered San Marco in 1502 and received the Dominican habit on 14<sup>th</sup> of June of that year. The only source that mentions clearly this fact is the *Liber vestitionum* of the priory. The laconic note reads as follows: “Frater Michael Emmanuelis de civitate Arta, eodem nomine prius in seculo dictus, accepit habitum a venerabili Fratre Mattheo Marci, die quartadecima Iunii circa horam primam noctis anno Domini 1502.”<sup>179</sup> From this short record there is more information than scholars have noticed until now.

First, it is worth paying attention to the date of Trivolis’ vestition. In principle, the dates of these kind of ceremonies are not established accidentally in the Order. In this case the date of June the 14<sup>th</sup> was chosen, when – according to the calendar then in use – the feast of St. Basil the Great was celebrated.<sup>180</sup> No doubt, the superiors chose this day on purpose. Michael Trivolis began his religious life on the day (or rather the night) when the Church commemorates the patriarch of monastic life in the East. Michael’s bonds with the Church from which he originated were not forgotten but just the opposite: emphasised. It seems therefore that it was not the intention either of Michael or of his superiors to blot out his bonds with Eastern Christianity.

There is nothing unusual in the fact that Michael Trivolis received his habit at about one

178Cf. IVANOV 1973, 115. On the situation within the Congregation see: POLIZZOTTO 1994, 185-186. For comparison: in 1496 twelve brothers pronounced their vows, in 1497 – 53, in 1498 – 19, in 1499 – 13, in 1500 – 3, in 1501 – 13, in 1502 – 3, in 1503 – 1, in 1504 – 4, see: VERDE 1983, 198-210. In the years 1498-1501 the authorities of the Order made efforts to halt the development of the Savonarolian movement within the Order. NB, Mirandola castle was besieged in July 1502 and taken by Gianfrancesco Pico’s enemies on 6<sup>th</sup> of August 1502 (cf. SCHMITT 1967, 18; FARMER-VANDEN BROECKE 2006, 666 say that the castle was taken in June 1502). Yet, Trivolis certainly had taken his decision before because in June he received his Dominican habit. There is no evidence that the Pico’s troubles influenced Trivolis’ decision to enter San Marco.

179Archive of the San Marco Priory, MS no. 5. It was Denissoff, who discovered the connection between this note and Maximus the Greek. There is no family name of the novice in this document so his identification is not absolutely sure (see: SINITSYNA 2006<sup>b</sup>, 194-5). However the similarity of the biographical data is so striking that it leaves little place for doubt.

180Both in the Dominican and in general liturgical calendar, see: MORTIER 1921-24, VII, 366-367 and CAPPELLI 1952, 127.

hour after sunset, probably during the compline which was solemnly celebrated in the Order. The records preserved from the priory of San Marco testify that often both vestitions and professions took place at night.

Neither is there anything unprecedented in the fact that Michael kept his baptismal name after entering the Order. Some authors see here a similarity with Savonarola but the coincidence is probably accidental. Among the novices who entered the priory during this period, such a practice occurred many times.

Fr. Mattheus Marci (Matteo di Marco Quirici), from whom Michael received his habit was elected prior of San Marco just two weeks before the vestition (1.06.1502). He was a significant figure in the Tusco – Roman Congregation and Savonarola’s collaborator. He twice held the office of prior and was also twice general vicar of the Congregation. It is not clear what his later attitude towards Savonarola was.<sup>181</sup>

In any case the times were not encouraging for Piagnoni. From the very beginning the young novice had to observe the authorities of the Order’s attempts to eradicate memory of his Master. The brothers in San Marco who remained faithful to the ideas of fra Girolamo could accomplish little at that time.

We do not know what internal struggle Trivolis underwent in these circumstances. What we do know is the framework of his existence in the priory. Being a novice he led a regular life. Later, in Muscovy, he recounted extensively the observances of the Latin religious. In the first part of the *Terrible Story* he describes in detail the customs of the mendicant orders but he neither made the slightest allusion to the fact that he had been a Dominican nor even named the Western Orders the practises of which he described. Only in the second part of this work, devoted directly to the person of Savonarola, Maximus says that his community was called *preachers* (Z-249).

His report is very accurate. He starts with the way of government in the mendicant orders. He talks about the significance of general chapters that care for the observance of rules, dismiss bad superiors and transfer brothers from one priory to another according to the needs.

---

181 On the hour of vestition cf. CREYTENS 1970, e.g. p. 210, 212; VERDE 1983, *passim*. “In Savonarola’s time the hours were counted from sunset in a twenty-four-hour sequence. The first hour was an hour after sunset, the second two hours after sunset, and so on.” - WEINSTEIN 2011, xi. IVANOV 1973, 116 and DENISOFF 1943, 247 thought that Trivolis retained his baptismal name following Savonarola. On other novices retaining their baptismal name cf. VERDE 1983, *passim*. On Mattheus Marci: ORLANDI 1964, 98; cf. also CREYTENS 1970, 212. On his collaboration with Savonarola, cf., e.g., WEINSTEIN 2011, 102. There are however some doubts concerning a later period. In 1517 Cajetan, being already cardinal, forbade to confirm as the prior of San Marco any Piagnone. Meanwhile a Piagnone, Luca Bettini, was confirmed. Cajetan appointed in his place Mattheus Marci so he probably was not a Piagnone, cf. POLIZZOTTO 1994, 305-306 and CREYTENS 1970, 167-8.

He shows the significance of the general superiors who often visit priories, also out of concern for keeping the observance. Then Maximus describes the life of a priory. He emphasises the equality of brethren. Even the prior does not use the "hegumen's (= prior's) rod" and does not stand out from his brethren through his clothes. The Greek also explains the way of begging for alms and the customs prevailing in refectory (e.g. that the youngest receive food first). Sometimes – he says – someone brings to the priory enough food for the whole day for the brethren and asks the prior that his brethren pray for him that God may save him from his sorrow. In such a situation, after the meal, the superior orders the brethren to pray, each in his cell, for this person so that God might save him.

The Greek relates also that every Saturday, in the evening, regular chapters were held. At the beginning, the prior exhorts the novices and other brothers. Then, after sending them to their cells, he teaches the deacons and priests. Next, each of them is supposed to tell the prior about which of the brothers had sinned and in what manner, during the week. Finally, the brethren kneel down, uncover their right shoulder and recite psalm 50. During this time one of them, on the order of the prior, hits each brother in turn with a bunch of twigs.

Maximus does not give an account on the brothers studies. He only says that – in order to live according to the Gospel – they study Holy Scriptures "day and night". From this study divine desires are fired within them and from that their preaching has its origins. He also underlines that their representatives who gathered for a general chapter were well educated in *every philosophy* and the Bible.<sup>182</sup>

This description of the Western religious life is so extensive and precise that it appears to be its author's personal experience. At the same time it is not devoid of an idealisation because Maximus' goal was not simply to share his knowledge of the Western world but to stimulate the zeal of the Russian monks.<sup>183</sup> He knew very well that in the Order of the Preachers the corruption of morals, lack of adherence to the rule and actions motivated completely by earthly desires were not rare.

---

182The whole account on the life in the priory: Z-243-9 (on study: 243 and 245, on general chapters that they are thousand of them gathered or even more: 243). The fact that Maximus did not say anything about his Dominican experience is not surprising, especially in the light of the fantastic story about 200 disciples of a Roman teacher who were burnt on the stake – see below, note 194. ROMOLI 2019, 209-11, notes in Maximus' description a certain confusion between the customs of Carthusians and Dominicans. ROMOLI 2021, 90-160 provides a much more detailed analysis of Maximus' description of Dominican life and of Savonarola. As I mentioned before, I discovered this book after completing the editing of my thesis.

183There are interesting parallels between Maximus' way of describing Western monks and a way that some Western travellers of the sixteenth century (e.g. Fabri) projected their ideas of an ideal society onto Muscovy, see: KUDRIAVCEV 1997, 18-20. However the Western travellers' idealisation was a projection of their ideas without good understanding of the Muscovite reality while Maximus knew both Italian and Muscovite realities! See also chapter III, text and note 201.

One can suppose that the contrast between Michael's conception of the Dominican life, based on his memories of his Florentine years, and the reality may have been one of the reasons for his decision to leave San Marco. It was surely not the same priory as when fra Girolamo moved the whole city by his preaching of the *renovatio*. It can be however hardly maintained that Trivolis left the priory in the first place because of the anti-Savonarolian action of the Order's authorities.<sup>184</sup> He entered the Dominican Order at a moment not very favourable to the Savonarolian movement but during his stay in the Florentine priory the situation of the Piagnoni in the Congregation had improved and they were regaining their influence after the persecution that exploded after Savonarola's death.<sup>185</sup>

One can easily imagine other reasons that caused the beginning of Michael's religious life to be difficult. In San Marco he found himself in a completely different milieu. His Greek world was left behind. There is no sign of the presence in the priory of any other Greek. Furthermore, there was only one brother, apart from him, in the noviciate, Iohannes Maria, who had entered about three months before. Many years later, when Iohannes Maria died, brothers wrote about him: "Hic etiam agriculturae potius quam litteris frequenter operam navavit et ruricola magis quam civis ab omnibus haberetur. Videbatur namque proposito talem vivendi modum delegisse pro Dei amore qui vilitatem et abiectioem quandam prae se ferret."<sup>186</sup> He was clearly not the kind of company that Michael was used to. Admittedly, Zanobi Acciaiuoli, Michael's acquaintance and a sincere Savonarolian, was also at that moment a member of the community but he seems have travelled a lot and was already a full member of the priory which probably created a certain distance between Trivolis, who was only a novice, and himself.<sup>187</sup>

Michael Trivolis probably stayed in the priory less than a year. The noviciate lasted one year and after this year novices pronounced their profession. In the Chronicle of San Marco, where professions made during the second priorship of fr. Mattheus Marci are noted, there is no mention that fr. Michael took his vows. He must have already left San Marco by April 1503 and his two letters written to Scipio Carteromachos after having left the priory should be rather

<sup>184</sup>So thinks IVANOV 1973, 116-117. DENISSOFF 1943, 265, also mentions anti-Savonarolian atmosphere in San Marco as one of two principal reasons.

<sup>185</sup>POLIZZOTTO 1994, 185-186, shows that the Piagnoni's influence grew after 1502. The fact that the Master of the Order, Vincenzo Bandelli, issued some anti-Savonarolian acts in 1503 does not prove that they were observed. Malatesta Sacramoro, anti-Savonarolian, finished his term as the General Vicar of the Congregation in 1503, CREYTENS 1970, 154.

<sup>186</sup>Trivolis' fellow brother from the noviciate is registered as: Johannes Maria m' Zenobii de Casa, prius Johannes, de Florentia: VERDE 1983, 200.

<sup>187</sup>On Acciaiuoli see: REDIGONDA 1960. He was at that time librarian of the priory (ULLMAN-STADTER 1972, 34. 257) but at the same time preached outside Florence.

dated from this year.<sup>188</sup> Michael explained to his friend that the only reason that he abandoned religious life were his numerous weaknesses and nothing else. Denissoff however rightly noted that his explanations are inconsistent and a certain emotional instability is mirrored in these letters.<sup>189</sup> Certainly, the disappointments about the situation in the priory coincided with his own personal troubles. All these elements taken together caused Trivolis to decide to leave the priory.

The Dominican episode of his life usually induced scholars to ask the question about Trivolis' so called *latinisation*. The fact that the great authority of the Russian Orthodox Church was for some time a novice in a Catholic priory provoked divergent interpretations. They often depended on religious or cultural background of the scholar. Several Russian researchers emphasised that the Latin world influenced Trivolis only superficially<sup>190</sup> while Denissoff, on the contrary, pointed out the permanence of the Latin impact.<sup>191</sup> The term *latinisation* may not accurately reflect Trivolis' evolution. Instead, it is more appropriate to speak of his interest in the tradition of the Western Church, which goes beyond the established patterns of the Orthodox world regarding the Catholics. This process did not take place in San Marco or shortly before. On the contrary, his decision to enter the priory was made possible by his discovery of people within the Catholic Church who were inspired by the Gospel and put that inspiration into practice, most notably in his meeting with Savonarola. Importantly, this did not lead to a renunciation of his country or its tradition, nor did it necessarily result in a profound change in his dogmatic beliefs.

188On the duration of the noviciate: VERDE 1983, *passim*. There was a possibility to prolong the noviciate (e.g. such was the case of Georgio Vespucci, *ibid.*, 194) but no record indicates that Trivolis' noviciate was prolonged. In the *Chronicon Conventus S. Marci* (BLF, San Marco 370, f. 99r) we find a note: "Tempore secundi prioratus venerandi patris Mathei Marci florentini infrascripti professi sunt de more solemniter [...]" Fr. Michael Emmanuelis is not listed among them while his fellow brother from the noviciate, Johannes Maria is. Cf. also: VERDE 1983, 200 and SINITSYNA 2006<sup>b</sup>, 195. It is possible that during his stay in San Marco Trivolis copied Pseudo-Dionysius' *De divinis nominibus*, cf. above, note 35. Denissoff believed that the letters to Scipio (DENISSOFF 1943, 95-6 and 404-9) come from 1504 but it is more probable that they were written in 1503 (cf. also Fonkich's remarks in M-I, 98 and 100). A point of reference for the dating of these letters are Michael's mention of an honour that Mark (certainly Musurus) was granted. This information can have concerned either Musurus' professorship in Padua or the decision of the Senate of the Serenissima to appoint him censor of Greek books. Musurus was invited to Padua on 22<sup>nd</sup> of July 1503 (if Trivolis writes about this event, the dating of 1504 is more probable but still the nomination could be known before its official announcement so the dating in 1503 is also possible). As for the appointment for censorship the date is less precise. In 1516 Musurus wrote that it had been 13 years before so it could have happened in 1503 (if Trivolis refers to this fact, the dating of 1503 could be probable). Cf. LEGRAND 1885, I, CXII-CXIII and 140.

189Especially in first of them (DENISSOFF 1943, 404-7). See also DENISSOFF 1943, 261ff.

190E.g. IVANOV 1972-74, part I, 152ff, thinks when Trivolis entered San Marco he did not disavow Orthodoxy but neopaganism and nobody demanded of him to change his dogmatic beliefs. Also HANEY 1973, 26 says: "The Church itself attracted him, but it was the Church of the Greek Fathers, not the Church of Pope Alexander VI. His conversion was to Christianity and not to Catholicism."

191Cf. DENISSOFF 1943, 376. The Greek scholars, respectively, emphasised the permanence of the Greek influences.

It is difficult to imagine that Trivolis entered the Catholic order without feeling a bond with that Church. There are two possible explanations of his attitude: either he did not perceive the division between Eastern and Western Churches as radical and was persuaded that a communion between them still existed or he regarded himself as a Catholic in a more narrow sense. In each situation the bonds between him and the Catholic community existed.

Even after leaving San Marco Michael did not immediately return to Orthodoxy but remained for some time in the same environment as before. Moreover, in this difficult period the two men who offered him a helping hand were Latins, not Greeks: Scipio Forteguerra (Carteromachos) and Pietro Candido. They all already knew each other. Michael wrote to Scipio as to a good and close friend. He also wrote to him about Candido as their *beloved and reverend* Pietro so their relationship had existed at least for some time. A possible place of their first meeting was Manuzio's printing shop because all of them in some way collaborated with him. In the case of Forteguerra, it may have happened even earlier, in the Florentine humanist circle. Perhaps it was precisely on account of the old friendship that Scipio especially committed himself to come to Michael's aid. When Trivolis wrote to him, he had already taken some steps to resolve his friend's problems.<sup>192</sup> Michael had to find again his „bread and butter” and visibly he did not succeed finding employment in Florence. He wrote to Scipio: “I did not find anything from anybody here...” (M-I, 98-9). Clearly, he saw greater chances for a job in Venice. Moreover his friends: John Gregoropoulos, Forteguerra and probably also Nicholas Vlastos were there. Mark Musurus worked in nearby Padua. In Venice Trivolis could have found support relatively easily. So, in the same letter to Scipio Trivolis he asked his friend to „draw him to them” and to recommend him to Aldo (M-I, 98).

In 1503 and 1504 Manuzio published many books in Greek and surely he needed experienced proofreaders. Moreover, from June 6<sup>th</sup> till the end of August 1503 Laskaris visited Venice as an envoy of the French king. Later he lived there as the ambassador of Louis XII from 1504 to 1509. His presence may have also attracted Michael to Venice.

It is also conceivable that Trivolis renewed his collaboration with Gianfrancesco Pico. In February 1503 Pico returned to Italy from Germany and tried to regain Mirandola. Although these endeavours cost him a lot of trouble, what we do know from his letters is that he did not give up his intellectual work during this period. The generous patron may have been ready to engage the Greek again. In the spring of 1505 Pico again left for Germany. It is not out of the

---

<sup>192</sup>On Pietro Candido: ORVIETO 1974. Trivolis mentions Pietro in M-I, 98-101. On Scipio's action for Trivolis' sake, *ibid.*



question that Trivolis went with him.<sup>193</sup>

Finally, it is worth pondering on the possibility that Trivolis later went to Rome. Weakened, Venice slowly lost its role as the capital of the Italian Renaissance to Rome and many humanist moved to the Eternal City. Carteromachos, who helped Michael the most when the latter finished his Dominican adventure, lived mainly in Rome from November or December 1504 onwards.<sup>194</sup>

Trivolis had a few possibilities to rebuild his life after leaving San Marco but we can only speculate on what he did during the years before he entered the Vatopedi monastery. The only sources concerning this period are his two letters to Forteguerra which enlighten exclusively the time directly after the end of his Dominican life.

Despite this shortage of documentation one thing is sure: Michael Trivolis returned to Orthodoxy. This fact evokes many more interesting and difficult questions than that of his

---

193 On Forteguerra's presence in Venice: PIOVAN 1997, 164; on Gregoropoulos: MANOUSSACAS 1976, 32, SAFFREY 1971, 28 and GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 136. On Laskaris: KNÖS 1945, 102-3 (from 22<sup>nd</sup> of November 1504 he resided in the city as French ambassador) and CERESA 2004. In 1503 Aldo published a new edition of the *Anthologia Graeca* (the previous one was edited by Laskaris for Alopa in Florence in 1494) and in 1504 a reprint of Homer, printed previously in 1488 by an unknown publisher in Florence and edited by Laskaris, cf. IRIGOIN 1997, 485. Trivolis who collaborated with Laskaris in Florence may have been useful also in preparing the reprints. On Pico: SCHMITT 1967, 19-20. 23.

194 On Forteguerra's presence in Rome: PIOVAN 1997, 164-5. Laskaris went from Venice to Rome in September 1503 in order to keep cardinal d'Amboise company during the conclave (KNÖS 1945, 103-4). On other circumstantial evidence of Trivolis' stay in Rome see above, text and note 129. On the other hand in Muscovite sources (SUDNYE SPISKI, 114) appears information that Maximus was a disciple of a Greek teacher in Rome who apostatised and accepted Judaism. He was burnt and his disciples dispersed. A few of them, including Maximus, escaped to Athos. In this account an echo of Savonarola's life merged with another story (SINITSYNA 2006<sup>a</sup>, 65-6). Nevertheless the mention about Rome may mirror true information about Trivolis' stay in the city. He neither denied nor confirmed his presence in Rome during the trial. Striking is the fact that later, when Trivolis was a monk on Mount Athos, his acquaintances, one after another, settled down in Rome. On the same Quirinal hill there were, one not far from another, the Greek College founded by Leo X (where Laskaris and Musurus worked) and the Dominican house, San Silvestre, where Zanobi Acciaiuoli lived and which was visited by many of Trivolis' acquaintances. San Silvestre was a kind of Roman hospice for the friars from San Marco and a haven for Piagnoni in Rome (On San Silvestre see: ASSONITIS 2003). Many pinned their hopes for the reforms on Leo X's pontificate, some even believed that he was the Angelic Pope foretold by Savonarola (see: POLIZZOTTO 1994, 157. 248). Kalliergis was in the City from 1511 (GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 213; on his contacts with the Roman Curia: CHAPTZOPOULOU 2012, 5). NB, in 1516 Kalliergis published in Rome Thomas Magister's *Συλλογή ὀνομάτων Ἀττικῶν* (cf. MIONI 1973). A MS of this work (Vat. Barb. gr. 140) was organised by Trivolis who left in it some marginalia (SPERANZI 2016, 193, note 13). Perhaps after leaving San Marco he worked for some time for Kalliergis (quite often an edition was prepared many years before publication)? Acciaiuoli (REDIGONDA 1960, 94) and Laskaris (IRIGOIN 1997, 487) arrived in Rome in 1513, Musurus from 1515 or 1516 (cf. CATALDI PALAU 2004, 336; Pontani 2002-2003, 175; WILSON 1992, 154). Gianfrancesco Pico also visited Rome and maintained contacts with Acciaiuoli (FARMER - VANDEN BROECKE 2006). Quirini and Giustiniani, the Camaldolese reformers frequented this priory too. Only Gregoropoulos disappeared from Italy. The last news of him is the note by Cuno who listened to him in 1504 (OLEROFF 1950<sup>a</sup>; SAFFREY 1971, 28; MANOUSSACAS 1976, 32). Maximus' friends kept in contact with him after he had left Italy. San Silvestre, where their paths crossed, was a privileged place to exchange information. Unfortunately, we do not have a source evidence of it. A possibility of such an exchange could have been Neagoe's mission to the pope Leo X in 1519 and Neagoe (PIPPIDI 2006, 104 and DUMITRIU-SNAGOV 1996, no. 33). An indication that Maximus contacted his Italian companions after having left Italy could be the fact that in 1518 Zanobi Acciaiuoli was interested in the *filioque* question (BERTOLA 1942, 116).

*latinisation*. What caused this resolution? Was it only a result of his own reflections? Perhaps an event or a person contributed to his decision. In any case, it did not happen directly after he left San Marco because, as we have seen, his internal problems and the state of the Congregation were more likely the reasons that caused him to leave the Dominicans. Moreover, he still kept his contacts with the same milieu as before (Forteguerra, Candido).

There were however a few people among the Greek intellectuals in Italy that could have had an impact on this subsequent turn in Trivolis' life. One of them was Justinos Dekadyos. He collaborated with Aldo in Venice at approximately the same time as Trivolis. As we can deduce from his own words, he had at heart the cause of Orthodoxy from the very beginning of his stay in Italy. In the preface to the Psalter that Dekadyos edited, addressed to the Greeks in Hellas, he expressed his joy that Aldo was going to produce a trilingual Bible and he himself promised to publish liturgical books for the needs of the Greek Church. His later activity confirmed his commitment to the Eastern Church.<sup>195</sup>

Some other Greek intellectuals in the West, in roughly the same period, went through a revival in an interest for the Eastern Church if not closer ties to Orthodoxy. In 1509 Zacharias Kalliergis published the *Horologion* (a prayer book). In the preface to this edition he wrote that nowadays many printers publish works of the pagan antiquity and he, Zacharias, decided, for the benefit of Orthodox Christian, to publish religious and liturgical books. He requested them to support this project. Greek liturgical books – he says – are rare “because of the bitter misfortune of our nation”.<sup>196</sup> Later, in 1526, another Greek publisher, Demetrius Ducas, also published Greek liturgical books and explains that those who have published Greek works “do not devote their time to the highest type of learning which is theology. Whoever, then, has published, for those eager to read, the spiritual instructions of the Bible as well as the prayers and discourses of the holy fathers, by which our souls will be enabled to live together with the heavenly angels, has provided us with true nourishment for both the present life and that of the

---

<sup>195</sup>On Dekadyos, a person who seems to be important but is still little known, see: LEGRAND 1885, I, CII-CIV and 22-25. His preface to the Psalter (which was published in 1496 or 1497): LEGRAND 1885, I, 24f; cf. also ALDO MANUZIO TIPOGRAFO, 60, no. 29. RENOARD 1834, 259 thinks that he have also edited the *Hours of Our Lady* (in Greek, 1497, reprinted in 1505). He notes (ibid., 15): “L’impression est fort belle; en rouge et noir, du même grec que la préface du Psautier in-4<sup>o</sup>.” Cf. however a reserve of LEGRAND 1885, I, CIII and STAIKOS 1998, 389. Aldo wrote about Dekadyos in his praeface to his edition of Aristotle and Theophrastos from February 1497 (ALDO MANUZIO EDITORE, I, 16): “Iustinus etiam Corcyraeus, miro ingenio adolescens Graeque sane quam eruditus”. The fact the he was born in Corfu about 1472 increases the probability of his contacts with Trivolis. About Dekadyos' later activity, in the circle of Neagoe Basarab, also his correspondence with Arsenios Apostolis, see below, note 236. Aldo did not manage to publish the trilingual Bible, there is only one page known (Parisianus Graecus 3064), probably a harbinger of the project which was not realised. Aldo mentioned this project in his letter from July 9<sup>th</sup>, 1501 to Conrad Celtes and Vincent Longin, cf. RENOARD 1834, 516.

<sup>196</sup>See: GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 212. The Greek text: LEGRAND 1885, I, 97.

future.”<sup>197</sup>

Trivolis’ decision was not therefore an isolated case. On his way back to Orthodoxy some other Greek intellectuals accompanied him. His return was a revival of his roots, a means to regain stability after the failed attempt of Catholic religious life. For some time he was at peace.

#### 4. ATHOS

The resolution to enter Orthodox monastic life followed Trivolis’ reconversion. However he reached Athos only about 1506. There is a gap between the last Italian sources, of 1503 or – at the latest – 1504, concerning him and the time he arrived at Athos. It is quite probable that during this interval he visited his homeland, his parents – if they were still alive – in Arta, perhaps the Moschos family in Corfu or even John Gregoropoulos on Crete.<sup>198</sup>

When Trivolis arrived in Vatopedi, that was to become his monastery, the Republic of Monks had already been under Ottoman rule for almost one hundred years.<sup>199</sup> The monks, who had been before under the protection of the Christian emperor, became the subjects of the *infidel* sultan. The protection was replaced by a threat to both the very existence of the Christian institution and of the incidence of taxes. Nevertheless their position was often better than that of other Christian subjects of the Sublime Porte. They succeeded in obtaining from the sultans tolerable conditions: taxes imposed on monasteries were often limited to a lump sum. Monks did not pay tithes and the extraordinary taxes. This liberality of the Turkish

---

197GEANAKOPILOS 1962, 248. The Greek text: LEGRAND 1885, I, 193. The fact that Musurus enrolled in 1514 in the Greek Confraternity in Venice (and a year later renewed his membership) may have been a similar phenomenon. The Confraternity was a religious association, cf. above, note 138. Musurus in 1516 prepared the edition of the orations by Gregory of Nazjanzus. GEANAKOPILOS 1962, 157, emphasised this fact as a turn to ecclesiastical writings.

198The last evidence of Gregoropoulos’ presence in Italy comes from 1504 (OLEROFF 1950<sup>a</sup>). On the conjecture that he was in Crete in 1508 see: MANOUSSACAS – PATRINELIS 1960, 165. The hand of the scribe who wrote Maria Stephanopoulina’s testament (she was George Gregoropoulos’ widow) is very similar to that of John Gregoropoulos. Maximus left Athos in 1516 – 1517 (see below) and he says that he was there about ten years (K-II, 377) so he must have arrived at the monastery in 1506 – 1507. Denissoff and Haney assume that Trivolis left Italy in 1506, Klosterman and IKONNIKOV 1915, 140 that it was in 1508. The moment he left Italy is more difficult to be determine but his arrival on Mount Athos occurred most probably in 1506. SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 27 notices that: 1) Maximus said in his *Confession* that he had served Basil III for nine years (M-II, 57); 2) he also maintained that he spent ten years on Athos (K-II, 377). Therefore, since he was arrested in 1525, the beginning of his service for Basil would be the year of his departure from Athos in 1516, therefore he should have arrived on Athos in 1506. Janus Laskaris may have helped Trivolis to establish contact with Athos because he had already visited the republic of monks and certainly was on good terms with them since he bought some manuscripts there, among others in Vatopedi, the monastery where Trivolis would become a monk (LEGRAND 1885, I, CXXXIII).

199In 1423/24 Athos definitively fell under Turkish rule, see: CHRYSOCHOÏDIS 1998, 54.

authorities was certainly an endeavour to enhance their prestige among the Orthodox population of the empire. The Orthodox princes on their part, through interventions to the sultan and donations tried to support Athos.<sup>200</sup> All these factors and the actions of a few Western rulers, were however insufficient to maintain the monasteries on the Holy Mountain. Monks were forced to borrow money from Jews and to send brothers far away to beg for alms in order to pay the taxes and to sustain their houses.<sup>201</sup>

The uncertainty of their situation must have been more severely felt than the weight of the financial burden. The Sultans' edicts, favourable to Athos, were not issued once and for all. The authorities of individual monasteries as well as those of the whole monastic republic repeatedly had to try to obtain confirmation of these documents. Monasteries lost large parts of their land and the arbitrary behaviour of state officials did not allow them to forget that they were second-class subjects.<sup>202</sup>

This harshness is embodied in Maximus' works. The sense of uncertainty is palpable when he talks about Athos.<sup>203</sup> He mentions e.g. difficulties with transporting crops to Athos from distant *metochia*. A number of times the ships carrying corn fell into pirates' hands. Monasteries lost thus their crops, the money spent to pay the harvesters and their ships.<sup>204</sup> However, while he treats the pirates almost as if they were a natural disaster, the ruling Muslims are for him the *enemies of God*. He quotes edifying stories to show that the Muslim authorities' injustices would not escape punishment. Among them, he spoke of a counsellor of the sultan Bayezid II (1481-1512) who wanted to expel monks from the Holy Mountain and settle Muslims there. Knowing about this plan, the monks prayed to the Mother of God for help and the persecutor met a violent end. A similar story says that a Turkish scribe was sent to make a list of the monastery estates and wanted to impose upon the Holy Mountain a high tribute. He stayed in a place belonging to the Vatopedi monastery. He went to bed healthy and

---

200See: CHRYSOCHOÏDIS 1998, 55; ZACHARIADOU 1996, 127-8. Thanks to intervention of Radu, the prince of Wallachia Vatopedi payed "a lump-sum tax of 697 aspra for a metochi near Thessaloniki", see: SALAKIDES 1995, 71-74, 83-84; CHRYSOCHOÏDIS 1998, 57. In the fifteenth and the early sixteenth centuries Athos benefited from the general prosperity of the Ottoman State. In such a situation a lump sum tax was favourable for the monks. Later the economic situation of Athos would deteriorate, see: H. LOWRY 1981, 129. DEMETRIADES 1997, 51, thinks that the Sultans wished to be seen as protectors of Orthodoxy but also the influence of Christian wives and concubines from the Sultan's palace worked in favour of the monasteries.

201See: SALAKIDES 1995, 104, 152. On the Western support for Vatopedi: CHRYSOCHOÏDIS 1998, 56-57.

202See: CHRYSOCHOÏDIS 1998, 55. Later, in 1569 there was even a general confiscation of the properties of the monasteries and the monks had to buy them back from the Turkish authorities.

203Maximus wrote a few works describing Mount Athos: a letter to Basil III (M-I, 119-132), a letter to a certain bishop (RZHIGA 1935-36, 95-9), a description for Patrikeev's *Kormchaia* (M-I, 341-2=K III, 243-245) and unpublished (mainly legendary stories): IVANOV 1969, no. 325, 326, 327, 328 (Ivanov says that another redaction of the text no. 328 is the one that is published in M-I, 341-2), 329, 330.

204See: RZHIGA 1935-36, 96.

was dead by morning.<sup>205</sup> These stories that Maximus repeated came from the tradition of Vatopedi because each of them is connected in one or another way with this monastery. They are a kind of passive resistance against the conqueror, an instrument of ideological struggle. Knowing the considerable standing the monks had in Greek society, one can easily imagine how quickly such news spread across the country. Maximus still remembered them well in Moscow.<sup>206</sup>

He also recalled the self-sacrifice of monks who bore unjust persecution for the love of Christ and were ready to accept voluntarily imprisonment or even to die if it could help their monastery. The account with sharply outlined contrasts reveals that Maximus comprehended the confrontation with Muslims in absolutely unequivocal categories: as a struggle of good and evil. The situation required simple, black and white patterns: Turks are godless (нечестивии) and monks God-fearing (благочестивии).<sup>207</sup>

In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries the monastic republic underwent also a more difficult, because internal, shake-up. It concerned the very nature of monastic life and monastic spirituality. From the beginning of the fifteenth century onwards the monks of Athos started distancing themselves from old cenobitic ideals. A new model of monasticism had appeared: idiorhythmy. The essential change consisted in a more individual (or: individualistic) approach to the rule. The monastery became a kind of federation of small communities of several monks. Individual brothers could possess some private property and ascetic discipline was also established for each individual. The power of the hegumen was progressively restrained and the part played by the council (*synaxis*) of superiors of small communities grew. This shift was however not a linear process. The struggle between the idiorhythmic tendency and the followers of the cenobitic tradition lasted from the end of the fourteenth until nineteenth century. In many monasteries endeavours to restore the cenobitic discipline alternated with returns to the idiorhythmic way of life.<sup>208</sup>

The appearance of idiorhythmy was concomitant with the above mentioned political and economical turbulences on Athos. An influx of quasi-monks to the Holy Mountain who

---

205Muslims are *богоборцы* and *нечестиви* (M-I,130-1) or *христианоборцы* (RZHIGA 1935-36, 99). The edifying stories are noted in: M-I, 130-2. Some of them come from the period of Maximus' stay in Athos or shortly before. In one of these stories Dionysios, the patriarch of Constantinople is mentioned (M-I, 130). Bayezid's successor, Selim I (1512-20), was especially badly disposed towards Christians, see: PAPADOPOULLOS 1990, 4.

206Maximus also mentioned a betrayal of a monk and his collaboration with Turks (M-I, 131-2). Monks can be hardly suspected to like the Muslims dominion but ZACHARIADOU 1996, 128 writes about a possible collaboration of certain monks with the Turkish authority.

207“и оно едино приобретение помышляюще, аще своею смертию честных обителей съставление искупити възмогут”, M-I, 122.

208See: CHRYSOCHOÏDIS 1998, 60-61; CAPUANI – PAPAIOZZI 1997, 30. 120; MEYER 1894, 58; SALAKIDES 1995, 104.

sought refuge for themselves or even for their fortunes, when the Ottomans conquered Byzantium, certainly infringed on monastic discipline. The fact that some of them had even their own apartments and servants was far from monastic ideals.<sup>209</sup> The deterioration of economical conditions rendered impossible some aspects of common life and weakened the authority of superiors. It should be however emphasised that these new economical and political factors only created favourable *conditions* for internal changes on Athos. The question why a large part of the brethren was ready to accept them as they concerned crucial questions about monastic life (poverty and obedience) remains still open. A shift in mentality was necessary.

Apart from that, the idiorhythmic pattern fell outside the unambiguous judgment. It had its fierce opponents, such as Pachomios, a monk contemporary of Maximus and often quoted in this context, because the new model was a departure from the primitive monastic standard. There were however no lack of supporters which is not astonishing in view of the fact that idiorhythmic monasteries developed well at that time. In them one cared about education of monks, one was interested in culture and national questions. Individuals were more independent.<sup>210</sup>

The core of the argument (although it was not formulated this way) was a general vision of monastic life in the changing world or, in other words, the question whether the model of monastic life can be changed. We do not know much about whether, and to what extent, the Western transformation of mentality afflicted the Greek monasticism as it did the mentality of the Greek intellectuals who took refuge in Western Europe after the fall of Constantinople. The possible relationship between the more weight that the West started to attach to individual needs and experiences and the idiorhythmic pattern within the Eastern monasticism needs further research.

The tension between the adherents of the traditional form and the proponents of idiorhythmy is reflected in Maximus' writings. He lived in an idiorhythmic monastery (Vatopedi) but he had close connections to a cenobitic one (Dionysiou). Thus, he had an opportunity to learn the differences between these two tendencies. Descriptions of the cenobitic (he called them *общий* – common) and idiorhythmic (*особный* – separate, or *Лавра* – Lavra) monasteries occupy a large part of his reports about the Holy Mountain.<sup>211</sup> The former model is,

209 ZACHARIADOU 1996, 128-132; OIKONOMIDES 1998, 50.

210 On Pachomios see: MEYER 1894, 212-214. On the situation in the idiorhythmic monasteries, *ibidem*, 1-5, 59-60.

211 His reports about life on Athos (as those about his Italian experiences) were written in Moscow in answer to questions and problems of the Russian Church and are adapted to the needs of his interlocutors so they can

according to him, the original and the perfect one. In these monasteries everything is held in common and a possible material contribution brought by a candidate did not change his situation in the monastery in any way. Each brother worked as much as he could and everything he needed, he received from his community. As examples of this kind of monastery he gives Dionysiou and Zografou.<sup>212</sup>

In the idiorhythmic monasteries, those who offered an appropriate contribution were not obliged to take part in monastery work but they could *live in peace*, receiving during the first year everything that was necessary from their monastery before they became self-sufficient living from a garden they cultivated. They may have been allowed to keep some private property and one or two servants.<sup>213</sup>

Maximus regarded the idiorhythmic system as a decline but with understanding. The cause of this decadence he saw first of all in “our sins” (as he, and many other authors starting with the *Primary Chronicle*, often used to write when something evil happened). As the second reason he regarded political and economical factors: the lack of help from kings and despots and the impoverishment of monasteries.<sup>214</sup> Originally cenobitic monasteries (such as Lavra and Vatopedi) were not able – he said – to feed all their monks. This was the reason that they – with the patriarch’s synod consent – introduced the idiorhythmic system. Maximus’ comprehension went so far that he described this decision as an act of filial love. Monks living in small communities did not burden their *mother* – monastery in her old age but helped her.<sup>215</sup> Thus, the

---

only partially shed light on his experience on Athos. In his letter to Grand Prince Basil (M-I, 121ff) and in the letter to a bishop (RZHIGA 1935-36, 96ff) he distinguished two forms of monastic life: cenobitic and idiorhythmic. Apart from these two examples, in another work Maximus mentioned also a third one: *skyt'skoe* (скытьское – M-I, 341) but he neither explained what is the difference between the last and two former ones nor did he describe this third form. According to MEYER 1894, 70, sketes (gr. σκήτη) are mentioned for the first time in patriarch Jeremias’ typikon from September 1574. Cf. also AMAND DE MENDIETA 1955, 47. A reason that Maximus did not describe sketes might have been the fact that this form was *in statu nascendi*. In any case he did not consider skete as a form of idiorhythmy. Otherwise he would not have described it as a third form. It seems that it was he preferred one, cf. also below, note 224. The metropolitan Daniel distinguished three types of monastic life: cenobitic (общее), idiorhythmic (особное) and hermitic (пустынное), cf. ZHUROVA 2016, 50. So probably *пустынное* corresponds to *скытьское* in Maximus’ description.

212See: M-I, 120-5, RZHIGA 1935-36, 96; M-I, 341-2. In M-I, 124 Maximus enumerates Vatopedi, Lavra, Zografou and Dionysiou. Vatopedi is mentioned for obvious reason, Lavra as the best known idiorhythmic monastery, with Dionysiou he was linked through the person of patriarch Niphon, so – perhaps – he had also some links with Zografou.

213See: M-I, 125; RZHIGA 1935-36, 96-97. On servants, *ibid.*, 97: one of them replaced an idiorhythmic brother in monastery works and another served him. They were obviously monks because there were no lay servants – as Maximus said – on Athos, only one or two to care about monastery horses and oxen M-I, 342. On those who made contribution see also: M-I, 341-2.

214On “our sins”: M-I, 121; on kings and despots *ibid.*, 123.

215M-I, 122. See also SINITSYNA 1965, 122. Maximus wrote also that in small community it is easy to lead a common, cenobitic life but it is difficult, almost impossible, in big communities of 200 – 300 monks. (“Въ которой обители мало братія, легко ест обще жити, а в которой 300 или 200, или полтретиаста, нужно велми, паче же немочно.” RZHIGA 1935-36, 96) The problem certainly was that big cenobitic monasteries had

introduction of the idiorhythmic model is interpreted in the spirit of the Orthodox principle of *oikonomia*.

Visibly, the Greek monk did not want to criticise idiorhythmy too harshly although he regretted the departure from cenobitic perfection and saw its bad results: “they’d better have one working brother than ten bringing a contribution” (M-I, 125).<sup>216</sup> The presence of idle pseudo-monks did not act in favour of monastic discipline.

This ambiguity of his approach was probably conditioned by the Russian context in which the work was composed. Maximus wrote much more in defence of the Holy Mountain against unjust accusations – as he admitted<sup>217</sup> – than to criticise idiorhythmy. Another reason of his – at the same time – critical and understanding attitude towards idiorhythmy arose no doubt due to its diversity. According to this pattern lived both those who thanks to a contribution secured for themselves a quiet and quite comfortable life, as those who really sought a spiritual life but preferred small communities rather than big cenobitic monasteries.

As if wanting to counterbalance the imperfections of the Holy Mountain, Maximus wrote about other elements of daily life on Athos that were in conformity with monastic tradition or – if new – that were useful to the community. Even if idealised, this account gives a picture of life on Athos at the time when he lived there.

Thus, he mentions some fundamental, disciplinary questions (e.g. beardless candidates

---

to maintain some common institutions like libraries, refectories (they absorbed some brothers who did not work for their living and were an additional burden) that did not exist in small idiorhythmic communities where monks fed themselves. Amazingly, and without any proof, SALAKIDES 1995, 104, writes that idiorhythmy developed during the economic prosperity of monasteries on Athos, and the return to cenobitic model was linked with the economic crisis.

216Some scholars (DENISSOFF 1943, 294-5; SINITSYNA 1965, 123) emphasised that Maximus criticism of idiorhythmy in this work was severe compared to a later writing (published by RZHIGA 1935-36, 95-9). It is only partially true. The only really severe criticism (that Sinitsyna quoted) is a fragment from Maximus’ letter to Basil III: “Аще же нѣкы от приходящих приносят съ собою сребро, не истязуются сиа нужнѣ или аки о согласии вѣклада, – да не буди таковое сребролюбие и безмѣстие, – но сами, яко уже чада обители бывше, самоизволнѣ и свободнѣ сие принесутъ Богови и братству.” This is however a criticism of those who wanted to live in cenobitic monastery and keep their money; and further: “Ниже сребро нужне истязується отцы, ниже аще не дасть, изженуть его; не буди таковое братоненавидение, но и приат бысть любезне в монастырь и упокоен бысть добре, наипаче лучше имѣють единаго трудника брата, неже 10 вѣкладщика” (M-I, 125). The second fragment seems to criticise the contribution as a condition to be admitted to monastery and not idiorhythmy as such. Denissoff thought also that the way Maximus writes about idiorhythmy is similar to that of the above mentioned (note 210) monk Pachomios. However he considered idiorhythmic brothers as semi-monks while Maximus, as we demonstrated, is much more lenient towards idiorhythmy.

217M-I, 119-120. He did not specify what kind of accusation concerned his apology. Probably he responded to some reservations about the Holy Mountain in Moscow. It may have been connected with the general decline of the authority of the Greek Church in the eyes of Orthodox Russian after the Council of Florence. Perhaps he defended his monastery also against Greek (local) critics that he remembered from his Athonite years. The fragment published by RZHIGA 1935-36, 95-99 has also apologetic character.



were not accepted, monks must not change their monasteries),<sup>218</sup> he presents the way authority was exercised on Athos and he devoted quite a lot of space to the question of the collegial way of making decisions both by a monastery (hegumen with the council) and by the whole Republic (the *protos* with representatives of all monasteries). Nothing that affected a monastery – he underlined – should be decided without advice of the council.<sup>219</sup> Although this decentralisation of power was an element of the idiorhythmic system and enhanced the part played by individual entities, Maximus considered it clearly as a positive element. The picture of Athos he painted is that of a well regulated organisation.<sup>220</sup>

Speaking about poverty Maximus put the accent rather on earning one's living by honest work than on absolute non-possession. He emphasised that all brethren worked. First of all it concerned cenobitic monasteries where even hegumen toiled as the others (M-I, 342). Also with regard to idiorhythmic monks Maximus related that they took part in the common work ordered by hegumen (and it was not rare – he added) readily and with joy. The report was completed with the information that there were virtually no lay servants on the Holy Mountain<sup>221</sup> and that monks did not have savings, neither in treasury nor kept by people outside

218It is possible that Maximus, writing these pages, had before his eyes a document, perhaps a *typikon*. The closest in time to him (and known to us) *typikon* written for Athos is that of Manuel II Palaiologos from June 1406 (see: BMFD, 1613-24). It repeated some older regulations and it cannot be excluded that Maximus used this or a similar document. In 1508 a new *typikon* of Vatopedi was written but it remains unpublished (hegumen Ephraim mentions it in his introduction to HGV, I). There are some parallels between the *typikon* of Manuel II and Maximus' account: on beardless candidates (BMFD, 1621, no. 13 and M-I, 342; in fact this rule exists in almost all *typika*); on *stabilitas loci* (BMFD, 1620, no. 8 and M-I, 126, RZHIGA 1935-36, 99); on monks' private property that becomes again monastery property after a monk's death (BMFD, 1619, no. 2 and M-I, 127, cf. also: MEYER 1894, 62); on servants in monastery (BMFD, 1619, no. 2. 5 and RZHIGA 1935-36, 97, M-I, 342). Besides, both the *typikon* of Manuel II and Maximus' account on Mount Athos seem to express a similar attitude towards idiorhythmy: the desire of the original perfection and the consciousness that the elimination of idiorhythmy is now impossible (BMFD, 1614 and above-mentioned texts by Maximus). See also below, on administration and poverty.

219Again see some parallels between Maximus' report and the *typikon* of Manuel II: on the participation of the council in administration see: M-I, 125-6. 342 and BMFD, 1619, no. 3 and 1620, no. 6; a similar formula in the *typikon* of Manuel II: “ἐκκρίτ(ων) ἀδελφῶν” (Actes of Prôtaton, I, 258) and Slavonic: “честнейшии братиа” (M-I, 125); on the election and installation of hegumen see: RZHIGA 1935-36, 98 and BMFD, 1619, no. 3. NB Maximus' text implies rather universal suffrage (“тогда събором и изволеніемъ всей братіи и игумень поставляеться темъ образом...” - RZHIGA 1935-36, 98) while the *typikon* provides for election by the council. On the council of the representatives of monasteries with the Protos: M-I, 127; see also the next note.

220Another example worth to be quoted is the mention about *skevophylax* (in the *typikon* of Manuel II it is a duty of a γραμματικός, Actes of Prôtaton, I, 259 = BMFD, 1620, no. 7) who is obliged to report on incomes and expenditures every six months. Cf. M-I, 129.

221On brothers working in the cenobitic monasteries without laziness and complaining (“без лени и роптанія” RZHIGA 1935-36, 96) and in the idiorhythmic ones (see also above, note 215). On the virtual absence of lay servants on the “whole Holy Mountain” (only one or two to care about monastery horses and oxen): M-I, 342 and about the complete absence of lay servants in cenobitic monasteries RZHIGA 1935-36, 97. About work in idiorhythmic monasteries readily and with joy: M-I, 122. In another place (M-I, 341) he says that even those who – because of the contribution that they made are not obliged to work, nevertheless they work within the limits of their ability. This part of Maximus' report is marked, more strongly than others, by the Muscovite context, see also the next note and below in this chapter about discussion concerning monastic non-possession in Muscovy. In his later work, probably in the context of some practices in Muscovite

the monastery (privately). It was one more proof that brothers lived from the work of their hands and that they did not earn from usurious percentages.<sup>222</sup> Despite the fact that this image is obviously idealised there is no reason to doubt that personal work in Maximus' time was considered as one of the main points to be observed, in conformity with saint Basil's rule which was the basic text for Eastern monasticism.

Maximus' narration about the Holy Mountain, besides its informative dimension, is also evidence of his bonds with Athos. Despite the crisis it was still the point of reference for Eastern monasticism and for Trivolis, personally, it became a place where he found a haven. During all his Muscovite years he always wanted to return there (e.g. K-II, 356).

### VATOPEDI

The young Greek humanist became a monk in Vatopedi monastery. It was hardly an accidental choice due to the fact that Vatopedi was an idiorhythmic monastery which gave more space for individual development. Its rich library and intellectual tradition may have been of some importance. Besides it was an aristocratic place, appropriate for a member of the Trivolis family.<sup>223</sup>

Michael Trivolis became a novice again. This time he abandoned his baptismal name and took the name Maximus, probably after the great theologian of the Eastern Church, Maximus the Confessor. He had to go through a three-year trial before he became a full member of the community. Afterwards he could have attained higher ranks in the monastic hierarchy (which he described in detail for one of his Muscovite interlocutors) but all his life he remained a simple monk despite his education and his noble background. Perhaps it was his

---

monasticism far from the ideals of monastic life, Maximus says (RZHIGA 1935-36, 96 and 97) that both in cenobitic and in idiorhythmic monasteries candidates entered for the sake of God ("стригутъ же Бога ради"). In the same place (RZHIGA 1935-36, 97) Maximus says that in idiorhythmic monasteries monks lived "in love and truth". With time he idealised more and more Athos.

222 "Нест у них в казне сребро лишне лежаще, ни в людех по *здеишему* [my italic – ZS] обычаю; чиста ест святаа гора от сицевыхъ непохвалныхъ прибытковъ." RZHIGA 1935-36, 96. Certainly it is for Maximus an aspect of monastic poverty since he mentioned it together with the fact that they did not own villages and that they worked. The underlined word shows again the Muscovite context of Maximus' account.

223 Maximus described Vatopedi as idiorhythmic monastery (M-I, 123. 341). We know however that from time to time an attempt to introduce cenobitism was made there. In 1449 brothers decided that their monastery ceased to be idiorhythmic and became cenobitic but clearly the pressure of the idiorhythmic tendency was very strong, see: CHRYSOCHOÏDIS 1998, 61-2. The library of Vatopedi contained, inter alia, books and manuscripts from collections of Andronicos II and John VI Cantacuzenus. In this monastery Laskaris purchased manuscripts for Lorenzo de' Medici, see: LEGRAND 1885, I, CXXXIII, who quotes MÜLLER 1884, 397-8. Among important personages in Vatopedi were Gennadios Scholarios (LAURENT 1968, 245-6). Marc Eugenicos had close contacts with Vatopedi and wanted to live there. Macarios, the metropolitan of Thessaloniki at the time of Maximus lived at Vatopedi between 1527 and 1546. Large number of prelates had direct relations with the monastery and some monks were nominated bishops, cf. CHRYSOCHOÏDIS 1998, 59, 89n. On the aristocratic character of the monastery: OIKONOMIDES 1998, 46. 49.

personal decision, or his Italian past (as Denissoff supposed) became an obstacle to having a more important position. His praise of quiete life in a small community (M-II, 167) gives some grounds to believe that he lived in a skete and preferred this modest way of monastic life. It might have been Saint Demetrios skete, belonging to Vatopedi.<sup>224</sup>

Maximus' life in Vatopedi was filled with work and prayer. Like every monk he must have attended liturgy, carried out work ordered by the hegumen and – like each monk – he received a modest meal: two loaves of bread every day except for Wednesdays and Fridays when they received only one (M-I, 341). Maximus mentioned that he worked both physically and *spiritually* on the Holy Mountain for many years.<sup>225</sup> His manual work, no doubt, was not different from that done by other brothers. Spiritual work may have meant both his studies or literary work and his activity as a missionary-apologist.

Judging from how many authors he quoted in his Russian writings (often from memory), he studied diligently Eastern theology in the abundant library of Vatopedi. As a matter of fact he himself emphasised his knowledge of the patristic theology (M-I, 174). The foundation of this erudition in Christian tradition he owed to his Italian masters, but this knowledge was substantially developed and broadened, especially with reference to Eastern patristics, on Athos. His studies began to bear fruit already on the Holy Mountain. Maximus related to the metropolitan Makarios that he had written many works against major heresies, not only in Muscovy but also before.<sup>226</sup>

Trivolis worked also as a copyist. So far, we know of only one copy made by him in 1512/13 but it bears testimony to his reliability. In those times when the biggest quantity of forgeries in the history of the Holy Mountain came into being, Maximus scrupulously marked the details of the original, the damage of it, as a good disciple of Italian philologists.<sup>227</sup>

---

224On three-years trial (and on a possible shortening of it): DENISSOFF 1943, 282. In all known documents Maximus is described as a simple brother (e.g. the letter from Vatopedi to Basil III, RGM I, 130; similarly *ibid.*, 337). He said of himself that he was not priest or even a deacon but a simple monk (SUDNYE SPISKI, 115; FILARET 1842, 84). He mentions successive ranks in the monastic hierarchy (RZHIGA 1935-36, 98) describing them as subsequent grades on the road to hegumenship. On DENISSOFF conjecture concerning Trivolis' Italian past: 1943, 289-290. Also GEANAKOPOLOS 1988, 448 supposes that Maximus might have lived in a skete. My conjecture that it could have been the St Demetrios skete arises from the fact that Maximus probably wrote a short verse on St Demetrios, cf. below, note 228.

225M-II, 251: “трудихся и телеснѣ и духовнѣ”; M-I, 165 – about his works and efforts on Athos during many years.

226K-II, 364. Perhaps the Greek versions of Maximus' *Elegiac Verses Urging Repentance* and *Invective against Hellenic Deceit* were conceived already on Athos. It can concern also Maximus' other polemical works in Slavonic. Shevchenko supposes that they may have had the Greek prototypes, as did the two above mentioned works. See: SHEVCHENKO 1997, 56-7 and SHEVCHENKO 1998<sup>a</sup>, 49-50. Maximus says about his erudition in the patristic theology (M-I, 174): “...и да познаеши и ты и прочии словом и дѣлом, яко ничто же Максим храмлет въ извѣстнѣишеифеологии богоносныхиблаженныххотець...”

227The document copied by Maximus is published in: ACTES DE KASTAMONITOU, I, 25-30. On identification of the

His creativity during the these years resulted as well in poetical works. A few of them have survived: the *Intercessory canon to John the Baptist*, *Canon to Erasmus martyr* (with his life, written or restored by Maximus) and five modest verses.<sup>228</sup> The former work was designed for liturgical use but it contains some autobiographical elements. Maximus confessed his youthful indiscretions and admitted that he dissipated the heritage of his ancestors.

Remaining works, small in size, reveal a real network of links between the people named in them and Maximus. The lynchpins of it were Niphon II (+1508), ex-patriarch of Constantinople and Neagoe Basarab (1512-1521), the ruler (*voivode*) of Wallachia (called at that time: Ungrovlachia – Οὐγγροβλαχία). After the fall of Constantinople, this semi-independent country played an important part in the Orthodox world and its rulers were among the greatest benefactors of the Holy Mountain. Wallachia was also one of the places where Byzantines, deprived of their homeland, sought refuge.<sup>229</sup>

Niphon however was not a refugee in Wallachia. Dismissed from the patriarchate, he lived in Adrianopol from 1498. Radu IV the Great, the *voivode* of Wallachia (1495-1508), who came to the city with tribute for the sultan, invited him to his country to reform the Wallachian Church. Niphon went there with the sultan's consent in 1503 and undertook the renewal of ecclesiastical life according to the discipline of the Orthodox Church. In the course of his activity an event led to a clash with Radu. The *voivode* married his daughter to a Moldavian boyar who was a refugee in Wallachia. This man already had a wife in his country. Niphon could not accept such violation of canon law and he objected to the marriage. As a result of this

---

hand as Maximus' see: FONKICH 1979, 393-394. Maximus' note on the copy is reprinted in M-I, 108. On forgeries on Athos in the sixteenth century: OIKONOMIDES 1997, 69.

228The five verses and the *Canon to John Baptist* were published by DENISSOFF 1943, 412-420. The new, revised and improved edition of the five verses: SHEVCHENKO 1997, 63-70. He also found a new copy of two works by Maximus and, next to them, another anonymous verse (on St Demetrius). Shevchenko, *ibid.* 66 says: "This poem stands in the *Vindobonesis* without attribution, but its position after texts identified as being by Maksim Grek makes the latter's authorship likely." Shevchenko did not notice that the particular stylistic form of this verse called *ethopoiia* increases the probability of Maximus' authorship because he used sometimes such a rhetorical figure. On this figure and on other examples of the use of *ethopoiia* by Maxims see below, note 491. In another work Maximus similarly puts his words into saint Peter's mouth: M-II, 65. Denissoff published the *Intercessory canon to John the Baptist* basing on MS Iviron 538, no. 18. The new edition of this work, based on MS Vatopedi 1016, was published by Ph. Demetrakopoulos, see: SHEVCHENKO 1997, 64. These two editions differ significantly, cf. Fonkich's remarks in: M-I, 83. There is also another MS containing this canon: Lavra 2032, 3 (Catalogue Lavra 1925). The *Canon to Erasmus martyr* was published by K. Τσιλιγιάννης, 'Αγίου Μαξίμου τοῦ Γραικοῦ ἱερά Ακολουθία γιά τόν ἅγιο Ἐρασμο, Ἅγιον Ὅρος, 2005. In the MS, after this canon, we find the life of Erasmus. According to BULANIN 2017, 86, the life is not a copy of any another life of this martyr known up until this discovery. I did not have access to this edition. Some details concerning this Canon are given by BULANIN 2017, 85-6.

229On the care provided by the rulers of Wallachia for the Athos monasteries see: NASTUREL 1986, *passim*, esp. 89-90 on the earliest document concerning Radu the Great's help for Vatopedi. On Byzantine refugees in Wallachia see, e.g., HARRIS 1995, 15. NB, Laskaris met Niphon in Sozopolis where the latter lived in St John monastery (1489-91), cf. DENISSOFF 1943, 283.

conflict, the patriarch had to leave Wallachia and went to Athos where he settled at Vatopedi monastery not later than 1505.<sup>230</sup> He lived there *incognito* a little more than one year and then moved to Dionysiou. On the Holy Mountain he gathered round himself a group of disciples. A few of them were from Vatopedi. Niphon died in Dionysiou *in odore sanctitatis* on 11<sup>th</sup> of August 1508.<sup>231</sup>

Maximus certainly met Niphon on Athos, perhaps he was even one of his disciples from Vatopedi. In a letter to the Grand Prince Basil III he mentioned that he had visited Dionysiou many times and added that it was the monastery where “the saintly and divinely enlightened by God patriarch Niphon departed this life”.

Three short poetical works by Maximus (out of five preserved!) are dedicated to Niphon: two verses for his reliquary and one epitaph. They are written in the high classical Greek style and extol his virtues.<sup>232</sup>

Another of Maximus’ short poetical works is dedicated to Manuel of Corinth (Corinthios). As the Grand Rhetor and the Logotheta of the Great Church, Manuel for many years served the patriarchs of Constantinople. He was the author of theological writings (a large part of them contains anti-catholic and anti-unionist polemics) as well as liturgical (canons about neo-martyrs), canonical and musical works.<sup>233</sup>

---

230NĂSTUREL 1986, 142-4. Niphon was again, for a short time on the patriarchal throne in 1502 (FEDALTO 1988, 10).

We do not know the exact date of Radu’s visite to Adrianopol. Perhaps Niphon was in Wallachia only for a short period after 1502. Another version of the *Vita* of Niphon (by Justin Dekadyos) says that Niphon left Wallachia in peace, and was given gifts by Radu, NĂSTUREL 1986, 143.

231See: NĂSTUREL 1986, 144. On Niphon’s disciples from among Vatopedi monks: DENISSOFF 1943, 284. Among them was Makarios, later martyr, who had accompanied Niphon before and arrived with him on Athos (CHRYSSOCHOÏDIS 1998, 115 with bibliography). Nektarios and Theophanes, the founders of the St. Varlaam monastery on the Meteora, were also, for some time, his disciples in Dionysiou (*terminus post quem* of their discipleship with Niphon is 1505 – the death of their previous spiritual master, Saba, and *terminus ante quem* – 1508, Niphon’s death), cf. NICOL 1975, 134-6. It was in the St Varlaam monastery where a manuscript containing Niphon’s life (by Justin Dekadyos, dated 1518) was found and yet another life of Niphon by the bishop of Stagoi, Parthenios (eighteenth century), NĂSTUREL 1986, 143 and 148.

232M-I, 124. Maximus also wrote that Dionysiou significantly expanded thanks to Niphon’s material support, *ibid.* It could be about the gifts of Radu the Great that Niphon received according to his *Vita* by Dekadyos, cf. above, note 230. A story of a monk told by Maximus may also indicate his connection with Niphon because of a similarity with the life of the above-mentioned Niphon’s disciple, Makarios. He accompanied Niphon for a long time and finally confessed to his spiritual father his desire of martyrdom. Blessed by Niphon, he went to Thessaloniki, preached there the Gospel openly and was martyred (CHRYSSOCHOÏDIS 1998, 115). Maximus in turn recalled an anonymous monk from Thessaloniki who had taken refuge in Vatopedi; he had read there with interest a book by the emperor John Kantakuzene against Mohammed. Then he returned to Thessaloniki where he was captured by the Turks. Here the similarities end because this monk finally betrayed Christianity (M-I, 131). Perhaps Makarios was an inspiration for others who, however, were not equal to his standards. The epitaph on Patriarch Niphon was published by DENISSOFF 1943, 412-13 (on the basis of MS Ambrosianus A 115 sup., fol 505r) and by SHEVCHENKO 1997, 65 (on the basis of MS Vindobonensis hist. gr. 122 fol. 1r); the first and the second verse for Niphon reliquary: DENISSOFF 1943, 414 (on the basis of MS Athos, Dionysiou, 282, no. 58, fol. 125r) and reprinted by SHEVCHENKO 1997, 67-8, with commentaries.

233On Manuel see: SHEVCHENKO 1997, 70 (bibliography); PODSKALSKY 1988, 87-8. On the act that Manuel wrote in 1506 in the name of the patriarch Pachomios (the answer to Arsenios Apostolis): GEANAKOPOLOS 1962, 181.

Manuel collaborated also with Neagoe Basarab who, using his extensive connections, researched the question of the differences between the Catholic and Orthodox Church. It was certainly linked with Neagoe's negotiations with Rome which concerned political and military cooperation in order to oppose the Turkish threat. This rapprochement obviously raised theological questions. The Grand Rhetor wrote, at Neagoe's request, a treatise explaining why "the Latins departed from the true faith and became heretics".<sup>234</sup>

Even more important is the fact that Manuel was a co-author (if not the author) of the famous *Teachings of Neagoe Basarab to his Son Theodosius*, the most important politico-theological treatise of the Romanian Middle Ages. This compilation contains advice for Theodosius concerning the way of governing, diplomacy, morals and religion; in a word, everything that the author considered necessary for an heir to the throne. Abundant quotations from ancient literature, the Bible and the Fathers reveal that the author was a well educated man. Behind Neagoe's desire to give his son an instrument to exercise his authority well were Manuel's erudition and his literary skills.<sup>235</sup>

The epigram that Maximus dedicated to the learned Manuel, praises – with elegance and erudition not lesser than that of Manuel's – songs written by the latter. This verse may have been intended for an edition of Corinthios' musical works. It was customary that different sorts of introductions or small works accompanying an edition were written by the author's friends, colleagues or collaborators. Sometimes they were dedicated to the author, sometimes to an influential patron. Maximus' poem indicates therefore a link between the two Greeks. Probably it resulted from the fact that both of them, each in his own way, played a part in the initiatives undertaken by Neagoe Basarab.

---

According to GEANAKOPLIS 1962, 149f. 181. 200, Manuel Corinthios may have been related to Arsenios Apostolis. Michael Apostolis' second wife (and certainly the mother of Arsenios) was a daughter of a Count Theodosios Corinthios, a Greek from Monemvasia.

<sup>234</sup>On Manuel's reply to Neagoe's question about Latin faith see: VRANOUSIS 1978, 381, on his other anti-Catholic treatise, cf. the bibliography in the previous note. Before 1519, Neagoe together with the ruler of Moldavia, Stefanita (1517-1527), sent a mission to Rome to negotiate their involvement in the crusade against the Turks. The pope, Leo X, answered favourably but the crusade was not initiated before the death of either Neagoe or Leo (1521). See: DUMITRIU-SNAGOV 1996, no. 33 (Leo's X reply to Neagoe and Stefanita) and PIPPIDI 2006, 104.

<sup>235</sup>The problem of the authorship of the *Teachings* was a subject of a violent discussion. In September 1515 Neagoe was in Constantinople where he may have met Manuel and given him some instruction concerning the composition or the editing of the work, cf. PIPPIDI 2006, 99-108 and NASTUREL 1986, 148. One of manuscripts of the *Teachings* (Biblioteca Vallicelliana, MS Greek R 100, see: PIPPIDI 2006, 99) is connected with Muscovy. It is based on the MS Dionysiou 221 (the Greek version of the *Teachings* – the autograph by Manuel of Corinth, see: VRANOUSIS 1978, 380). Only two proper names were changed in this copy: Neagoe to Barlaam (the religious name of the Grand Prince Basil III) and Theodosius to Ivan. This MS belonged to Theodore Mamalachos, a member of the Ivan IV's embassy to Constantinople in 1557 (LUCA 1988, 665; PIPPIDI 2006, 115). Taking into consideration the bonds between Maximus and Manuel, it is possible that Maximus took a copy of the *Teachings* to Moscow.

There is one more person that should be named here to complete the picture of Maximus' relationships during his Athonite years. It is Justin Dekadyos. We have already mentioned his presence in Aldo's circle. There is no direct evidence of his links to Maximus neither in Venice nor on Athos. However, the similarity of some elements of their biographies and the ideological bonds between Dekadyos, Manuel of Corinth, Niphon and finally Maximus the Greek encourage one to mention him. Justin corresponded with Manuel of Corinth and – like Manuel and Maximus the Greek – was an apologist for Orthodoxy. Dekadyos and Manuel cared also for the memory of the recent martyrs (so called neo-martyrs) of the Orthodox Church under the Turkish yoke, writing offices to their honour. Finally, both Maximus and Dekadyos dedicated their verses to Niphon. Justin moreover wrote a life of the patriarch.

This group is knit together by two persons: patriarch Niphon and Neagoe Basarab. The saintly patriarch was a spiritual authority which must have been an inspiration for their activity. His influence certainly was not limited to a narrow group of his disciples, and even then it cannot be excluded that Trivolis and Dekadyos were related to this group. Their works indicate that the patriarch was a significant figure for them. His commitment to the reform of the Church, demonstrated during his work as metropolitan of Wallachia, might have also shaped (among other factors) Maximus' activity for renewal in the Russian Church. Neagoe in turn was the patron who made it possible for them to fulfil their aspirations.<sup>236</sup>

A kind of symbolic culmination of their activity was the event that took place on August the 15<sup>th</sup> 1517. On this day Neagoe Basarab planned the consecration of the monastery church in Curtea Argeş which was his foundation. The canonisation of the patriarch Niphon, the spiritual father of Neagoe, took place on the same day. The patriarch of Constantinople, Theoleptos, many bishops and the delegation of the Holy Community with protos Gabriel at the head, and twenty hegumens, came to this celebration. The representatives of Athos, at Neagoe's request, brought the relics of Niphon with them. They were to be put in the newly built monastery.<sup>237</sup> Manuel of Corinth may also have been there because he always accompanied the patriarch. We do not know anything about the presence of Justin Dekadyos in Curtea Argeş but it was about

---

<sup>236</sup>On Dekadyos' correspondence, his offices to neo-martyrs and his desire to publish liturgical books for Greek Church: LEGRAND 1885, I, CIII and CV-CVII. On his letter addressed to Manuel of Corinth (LEGRAND 1885, I, CVI and PATRINELIS 1971). In another letter he explained the mysteries of the Orthodox faith to someone who had doubts (LEGRAND 1885, II, 349-50). On his life of and canons to St Niphon: NĀSTUREL 1986, 143. Dekadyos also corresponded with Arsenios Apostolis, see: MANOUSSACAS 1958-59. Another sign of bonds joining people of this group is the fact the Manuel might have met Niphon in Constantinople, as he worked in the patriarchate. In addition to all these connections, Niphon, in his youth, lived in Arta, Trivolis' home town where he was a disciple of a monk Zacharias from Vatopedi: NĀSTUREL 1967, 43

<sup>237</sup>See: GURAN 2001, 22 and PIPPIDI 2001, 291; NĀSTUREL 1986, 92.

this time, that is in 1517 or 1518 when he wrote his *Life of patriarch Niphon*.<sup>238</sup>

Eventually, four of short literary forms written by Maximus the Greek on Athos are an indication that he had also his part in this celebrations. They were: two epigrams for Niphon's reliquary, the epitaph for Niphon and the – yet unmentioned – epitaph for the patriarch Joachim (1498-1502, 1504). All these compositions were probably linked with the planned solemnity.

Joachim was buried in Dealu – a monastery founded by Radu the Great (this *voivode* also lays there) but maintained and developed by Basarab.<sup>239</sup> The delegation of monks from the Holy Mountain, carrying Niphon's relics, also stopped on the way, as it was planned, in Dealu. The scenario of the festival underlined the link between two ex-patriarchs who had been metropolitans of Wallachia. Since in both epitaphs a certain *here* is mentioned where – Niphon and Joachim respectively – lie, it is probably that they were commissioned by Basarab and designed as inscriptions for their gravestones which were to be put up before the celebration of 1517.<sup>240</sup>

The epigrams, in turn, were intended either for the reliquary in Curtea Argeş or for the one that Neagoe donated to the monks of Dionysiou after the celebration in Curtea Argeş, as he gave them back a part of Niphon's relics. In one of them Neagoe is mentioned as that who – incited by God – contributed to the exaltation of Niphon.<sup>241</sup> Thus, one can suppose that Maximus was involved in the preparation of the solemnity and that these four works were written precisely for this occasion.

All these preparations were an element of a broader plan undertaken by Basarab. Surely, he wanted to pay homage to his spiritual master but at the same time to strengthen his state, to reinforce the authority of the Wallachian rulers and to fulfil his duty as a Christian monarch

---

238See: VRANOSSIS 1978, 381 (on Manuel) and 385 (the author dated the *Life* by Dekadyos ten years after Niphon's death).

239That Neagoe continued the foundation in Dealu: PAUN 2001, 198.

240On the place where the patriarch Joachim was buried, Radu's ideas and the fact that Niphon, being in Wallachia, probably celebrated Joachim's funeral: NĂSTUREL, 2002.

241The epigrams and the epitaphs may have been commissioned separately since they are preserved in separate manuscripts. The epigrams for the reliquary has survived only in the library of Dionysiou (MS Dionysiou 282 - Denissoff erroneously considered this MS to be Maximus' autograph. Ivanov repeated this error. This inaccuracy was discovered by FONKICH 1979, 393-394). Perhaps they were commissioned by the monks from Dionysiou or (as NĂSTUREL 1986, 144 supposes) were a free expression of Trivolis' creative writing in relation to the ceremony in Curtea Argeş. See also: SHEVCHENKO 1997, 67-8. The two known manuscripts that contain (each of them) both the epitaph for Niphon and the epitaph for the patriarch Joachim, can be found in two Western libraries (*Vindobonensis hist. gr.* 122, fol. 1<sup>r</sup> and *Ambrosianus* A 115 sup., fol. 504<sup>v</sup>). The *Vita* of Niphon, written by the protos Gabriel, speaks about a reliquary of Niphon in gold, silver and precious stones (in accordance with the description in Maximus' epigram) left in Curtea de Argeş. The reliquary of Niphon kept in this place until today comes however from the eighteenth century. The inscription on another reliquary of Niphon that exists still in Dionysiou (also commissioned by Neagoe and dated 1515) is in prose and "teems with spelling errors", SHEVCHENKO 1997, 68.



according to the Byzantine model. The ruler's tasks were not limited only to temporal things. The Byzantine idea of the symphony of powers assumed that both authorities, ecclesiastical and secular, would cooperate in the salvation of their subjects. Also both of them ensured the cohesion of society. It was not by accident, therefore that the delegation of Athos carrying relics of the Patriarch stopped in Dealu and a kind of posthumous encounter of Niphon and his former persecutor, Radu, took place.<sup>242</sup> It was a sign of the responsibility of the ruler for his country. This act should have been done in order to reconcile Radu and Niphon and to heal in this way the state's history in the hope of its future flourishing. Through this gesture the bond of both authorities was also underlined.

The commemoration of Joachim on the occasion of Niphon's canonisation was also a demonstration of the close links between Wallachia and Byzantium. Joachim and Niphon, acting as metropolitans of Wallachia, were previously patriarchs of Constantinople. It lent an additional splendour to the country and revealed Neagoe's ambition to continue the imperial tradition in a more modest, post-Byzantine way.

Eventually, Basarab's *Teachings* for his son, that expressed his concern for the future, for the continuation of his work were also profoundly rooted in the tradition of the Eastern Christianity. To fulfil this undertaking Neagoe engaged Manuel of Corinth.

Certainly, Neagoe Basarab's motivations on the one hand were not identical with Niphon's, Manuel's, Dekadyos's, or Maximus' motivations on the other. However, serving Neagoe Maximus and his acquaintances served the continuation of Byzantium, their homeland and their Church. Basarab was one of the most powerful Orthodox rulers at that time and those who worked for the cause of Orthodox Church turned to him and hoped for the liberation of Greece. Similarly, Maximus in the future would attempt to spur the Grand Prince Basil III to act for Greece and the Greek Church.

Another aspect of what Maximus called his *spiritual work*, apart from his literary activity, was his practical apologetic preaching. The Vatopedi superiors sent him to collect alms (K-II, 365) but he used this opportunity (certainly not against their intention) also to teach the Orthodox faith. This educated monk obviously encountered on his journeys people seeking an explanation concerning the relationship between Orthodoxy and other beliefs. His literary works against un-orthodox doctrines may have been an answer to questions that he came

---

<sup>242</sup>On the events concerning the transportation of Niphon's relics to Wallachia and the return of some of it to Dionysiou: NASTUREL 1986, 144; PAUN 2001, 195-7 and *passim*.

across. The questions were urgent. The true Orthodox faith was humiliated while Islam was victorious and the West, still Catholic, was expanding dynamically. It must have provoked both practical and theological problems (see above, note 142-3). For the Greek Orthodox Church the situation was all the more burdensome and unusual because through the centuries she had become accustomed to having the support of the *brachium seculare* of which she was now deprived. In one word, the destabilised Greek Orthodoxy was in a weak position and desperately needed to reinforce its identity. Maximus took part in this struggle.

It seems that he travelled both across Turkish and Venetian territories. Monks collected alms first of all there where the Union was not accepted, that is, under Turkish rule. When Maximus writes that he was sent back to Athos with honours, it is more likely that he referred to this part of Greece where the Union was not already implemented. When he mentions his struggles against the Latins during his travels, it could mean either episodes that happened on Greek territories under Latin control or on the Ottoman territory where perhaps some people were in favour of the Union.<sup>243</sup> It was of course much more difficult to find a support in the West for the monastic republic but nevertheless the monks sought it too and sometimes succeeded. In 1512, when Maximus was still on the Holy Mountain, the marquis William of Monferrato issued a document in which he urged Christians to come to the rescue of the Monastery of Vatopedi. If we take into consideration that the Lord of Desana (who had previously wanted to employ Trivolis) lived in the margravate of Monferrato and Nicholas di Tarsia (Michael's protector) was the canon of a nearby Vercelli; from this one can suppose that Trivolis played a part in maintaining relationships with some of the Western benefactors of Vatopedi and during his voyages to collect alms he reached Italy again. Furthermore, his writings bear testimony to the fact that he kept in contact with Italy after leaving because he wrote about events that happened when he was already on Athos.<sup>244</sup>

There are some grounds to suppose that Maximus undertook even bolder expeditions. Denissoff thought that he might have visited Egypt, Gorski found traces of his possible contact with Poles.<sup>245</sup>

---

243On the honours he received: K-II, 365; on struggles: Z 138. There is no reason to maintain that Maximus was active *only* in the Venetian territories (as GOLUBINSKII 1900, 674-5 thought based on Maximus' words that he strengthened the Orthodox faith against the Latins) or *above all* under Turkish rule (as DENISSOFF 1943, 324, argued against Golubinskii).

244E.g. Maximus says about the end of Lodovico il Moro's reign and about his death in French captivity (1508), see: M-I, 291.305. The help from William of Monferrato (CHRYSSOCHOIDIS 1998, 56) was probably easier to obtain because he was a descendant of Palaiologos but earlier (1456) Vatopedi had also managed to obtain a support from Alfonso, the King of Spain (CHRYSSOCHOIDIS 1998, 57 who quotes: W. Regel, *Chrysobula kai grammata*, St. Petersburg 1898, no. XVI, pp. 51-53).

245DENISSOFF 1943, 328-9, thinks that the intervention of the Patriarch of Alexandria, Ioakim, for the liberation of

No doubt, both his literary competence and his experience acquired during his voyages were the reasons the superiors of Vatopedi thought of Maximus when Basil III asked them to send a skilful monk in order to translate the Holy Scriptures.

## 5. INVITATION AND THE ROAD TO MOSCOW

The diplomatic mission from Moscow to Athos left on March 15<sup>th</sup> 1515 together with envoys for Constantinople. The Grand Prince Basil gave great weight to this mission. He often enquired about his envoys and systematically controlled the development of the situation. Even after the departure of the emissaries he withdrew the previous letters conveyed to the patriarch and to Athos and sent new ones. Perhaps because of the changing situation, or because of having changed his mind. Whatever, he continuously had his finger on the pulse of events.

Constantinople was the most important goal of the delegation. Basil Korobov, who was sent there, was also the head of the whole expedition. It was he who received the orders from the Grand Prince and transferred them to others (Basil Kopyl and Ivan Voravin who were sent to Athos), he also received missives for the sultan and for the patriarch. The relationship with the sultan was crucial for Basil III. He needed, at least, his neutrality in order to deal with his enemies on other fronts. At the same time he attached significant weight to the religious aspect of the mission. For a long time (from the Council of Florence) the relationship between Moscow and the patriarch of Constantinople (or wider: with Greek Orthodoxy) had been suspended so Basil's initiative reveals an intention to renew the canonical relationship with the patriarch and Greek Orthodoxy.<sup>246</sup> Admittedly, some monks from Athos used to visit Moscow

---

Maximus (RGM I, 352ff; Maximus is called there a teacher of the Orthodox faith!) suggests some links between him and Egyptian Orthodoxy. A MS of Maximus' work is to be found in the Patriarchal Library in Alexandria (DENISSOFF 1943, 328-9 who refers M. Vogel, V. Gardthausen, *Die griechischen Schreiber*, Leipzig 1909, 285, cod. 285, undated. I was not able to find this MS in the newer catalogue: T.D. Mosconas, *Catalogue of manuscripts of the Patriarchal Library of Alexandria*, Alexandria 1945, reprint. Salt Lake City 1965). DENISSOFF 1943, 328 also thinks that Maximus' voyage to Egypt was possible. As evidence that such voyages might have happened at that time he points at the alleged mission of the monks from Athos to Sultan Selim II in Egypt in 1517. Also Maximus' description of the Egyptian pyramids (K III, 46) – Denissoff notices – appears to be an eyewitness account. NB, in March - April 1517 Laskaris prepared a voyage to Egypt as an envoy of the pope Leo X to form an alliance with the sultan of Egypt against the Turks. The new victories of Selim I prevented Laskaris' departure (see on the preparation: SANUTO XXIV, 106, 143, 168, 171-2 and that he did not go any more: *ibid.*, 182. Cf. also: DENISSOFF 1943, 357). GORSKII 1859, 170, found in one MS of Maximus' missive to the metropolitan Makarius, (ГИМ, Синод. № 491 (191); IVANOV 1969, no. 243), the word "ляхъ" that can suggest some Maximus' contact with Polish people (if it is not an error of a copyist). Polish people living next to Muscovites, are also mentioned in Z-227.

<sup>246</sup>On the date of the departure and the fact that Korobov was sent to Constantinople while Kopyl and Varavin (who accompanied him) to Athos: the note about their departure and Basil III's letter to the protos Simeon in: RGM I, 153. The Grand Prince wanted the mission to reach Constantinople as soon as possible (Instruction for Korobov, PDS-KNT, 109). On the withdrawal of previous letters: Basil III's letter to Korobov, sent after

(and returned with alms) from the end of the fifteenth century onwards<sup>247</sup> but the present mission was much more important as is testified by the letters sent with the envoys. The contents of the letter to the patriarch is not known but in the one to the *protos* Simeon (Семион) and to the whole Athonite community Basil III announced that he was sending rich alms of 2000 roubles (1000 out of a legacy from his parents and 1000 from himself) plus some other precious gifts and he told the monks to pray for him, his wife and his country as well as for his ancestors. In the second letter, sent at the same time, he asked the *protos* and the monks to send the elder (*starets*) Sava, a book translator, for some time to Moscow.<sup>248</sup> The sumptuous alms were a clear sign that Moscow seriously wanted to renew contacts with the Greek Church. The demand to send a translator expressed recognition of the authority of the Greeks.

The journey was very long. They went through Riazan', Azov and Kaffa. From Kaffa (where they spent eight weeks) they took a ship to Constantinople. Korobov, having accomplished his mission returned to Moscow on February 19<sup>th</sup> 1516 with a friendly letter from the sultan. Voravin stayed in Constantinople and Kopyl spent the winter with the sultan in Adrianopol, probably waiting for permission to go to Athos. He departed only just before Easter 1516 that fell in that year on March 23<sup>rd</sup> so he must have reached Athos for the feast or slightly later. On the way he experienced serious difficulties from the part of the Ottoman authorities and he lost a part of the gifts meant for the Holy Community.<sup>249</sup>

---

Korobov's departure, PDS-KNT, 128. The action of V.A. Korobov, the envoy to the sultan, was to depend on development of the situation – according to Basil's instruction (PDS-KNT, 129). The Grand Prince instructed Korobov (instruction written March 15, 1515) that the latter should have assured the sultan of his friendship (PDS-KNT, 107). Later, Basil, with visible impatience, enquired about the arrival of the Turkish envoy (instruction for Iliya Chelishchev, PDS-KNT, 407; letter to the sultan of April, 22 1517, PDS-KNT, 426; Chelishchev's and Shadrin's letter to Basil III, PDS-KNT, 473).

247See: DUNAEV 1916, 8.

248The letter on alms see: RGM I, 155-7 (no. 38); the letter concerning the translator: *ibid.*, 157-8 (no. 39). In the Moscow diplomatic archive there is also another of Basil's letters sent to Athos at the same time (a week before the letter no. 38: RGM I, 158-9, no. 40), similar to no. 38 but much shorter. The alms of 2000 roubles is not mentioned there. It is probably the previous version of this letter that was withdrawn and replaced by the letter no. 38, see: above, note 246.

249They were in Riazan' before March 20<sup>th</sup> 1515 (cf. a note to Korobov's letter to Basil III of March, 20 1515: "А поѣхалъ Василей съ Рязани на пятой недѣли поста, въ пятницу." PDS-KNT, 130), in Kaffa at the beginning of June and spent about 8 weeks there. They left for Constantinople only on August 3<sup>rd</sup> (Korobov's letter to Basil III of December 5, 1515, PDS-KNT, 229). Basil wanted them to go directly to Constantinople but they were forced to accompany the Turkish envoy, Kamal, who wanted to go to Kaffa and there he explained to them that they had to wait for orders from the sultan. That Korobov was sent to the sultan and Voravin with Kopyl to Athos: PSRL VIII, 259. On Korobov's return to Moscow: a note to the Sultans letter to Basil III, brought by Korobov: PDS-KNT, 236; cf. also *ibid.*, 244. Voravin reported to the Grand Prince that the Turkish authorities exacted taxes (тамгу) from them and wanted to exact more. He also reported that Kopyl had gone to Athos. This information was sent in Ivan Mamonov's letter which reached Basil III in on October 22, 1517: PDS-KNT, 369-370. This information corresponds with the letters sent later from the Holy Mountain to Moscow where monks complained that Kopyl reached Athos with great difficulty, that Muslims took him some gifts for the Holy Mountain and he managed to bring only that which he saved from the hands of infidels, see: the letter from Vatopedi to Basil III, RGM I, 130 (no. 3) and Anthime, hegumen of Vatopedi's letter to

When he arrived on Athos it turned out that the monk Sava whom the Grand Prince wanted to have in Moscow was not able to undertake such a long voyage because of his age and the state of his health. The monks therefore had to find another translator to fulfil the desire of their benefactor.

The Athonite documents only indicate that the hegumen (or the brothers from Vatopedi according to another document) chose brother Maximus, who was able to translate and to explain both the Holy Scriptures and Hellenic literature “because he had studied from his early youth”.<sup>250</sup> He was to replace Sava.

Early Muscovite biographies of Maximus inform us however that the patriarch and also – surprisingly – the sultan were involved in seeking someone who could have replaced Sava. This information, although not to be believed unreservedly, makes us ponder on the question of other possible reasons of Maximus’ voyage to Moscow, besides the translation of books.

The monks wanted to answer Basil’s need having in mind one fundamental purpose: to receive alms. The hope that Maximus would return to Athos with gifts from the Grand Prince is expressed quite clearly in letters sent from the Holy Mountain to Moscow. There is no reason to think that they either had other goals and ambitions linked with this mission or aimed to collaborate with the patriarch. Bonds between the Holy Mountain and the patriarchate loosened towards the end of the fifteenth century.<sup>251</sup>

The patriarch Theoleptos, in turn, did have some reasons to use Maximus’ expedition to Moscow not only in order to obtain material support although this factor was vital for the impoverished patriarchate. He was certainly interested in renewing the canonical relationship between Constantinople and Moscow as well as confirming the superiority of the see in Constantinople. He is mentioned in the context of the Moscow mission in Maximus’ *Life* compiled shortly after his death (the so called Сказание в корпусе сочинений, с. 1587). According to this source it was the *patriarch* whom the Grand Prince Basil asked for a translator, rather than the monks. This is not impossible because we know that Korobov, the

---

metropolitan Varlaam, *ibid.* 337.

<sup>250</sup>See: the letter from Vatopedi brothers to Basil III, RGM I, 130 and from the hegumen of Vatopedi to metropolitan Varlaam, *ibid.* 337. Maximus also recalled that it was Sava whom Basil III wanted to invite to Moscow: M-I, 154.

<sup>251</sup>See the above mentioned letter from Vatopedi hegumen: RGM I, 337. Russian chronicle also say that Maximus and other monks came in order to obtain alms, see: PSRL VI, 260f.; VIII, 263; XX, I, 393; XXI, 595. In PSRL XIII, 28 we find the same information about the arrival of the monks but no mention about alms! Metropolitan Daniel also said during the trial 1531 that Maximus came to Moscow on account of alms (SUDNYE SPISKI, 97). Maximus himself in his missive to Basil III hinted at possible alms from Basil for Athos (M-I, 122). As for the relationship between Athos and the patriarch, we know from the document issued by patriarch Ioakim in 1498 that both the *protos* and the hegumen of Lavra were no longer ordained by the patriarch, see: MEYER 1894, 69.

head of the mission to Constantinople, carried also a letter from Basil III to the patriarch. This letter is not preserved but it related to Basil's demand to commemorate his ancestors, the same request that appeared in his letter sent to Athos. Therefore, it cannot be excluded that he wrote about another demand also to both addressees. Unfortunately, neither in the responses sent to Moscow from Athos nor in the missive of Theoleptos to the metropolitan Varlaam (that the Muscovite envoys brought back to their city) is there a mention about the patriarch's mediation in the search for a translator.<sup>252</sup> Yet, there is another source that supports the version about the patriarch's involvement. Sigmund Herberstein who visited Moscow twice (1516/17 and 1526/27) as an envoy of the emperor Maximilian noted that the patriarch of Constantinople sent to Moscow, at the request of the Grand Prince, a monk named Maximilian, in order to correct books and principles referring to the faith. One can assume that Theoleptos may have wanted to exploit the opportunity presenting itself in order to induce the Muscovite Church to recognise the supreme authority of the See of Constantinople. The voyage to Moscow of a monk who was well educated and devoted to the Greek Orthodoxy, opened prospects to win over this cause so Maximus may have been entrusted with this delicate mission. It was safer to commend it to Maximus' memory than to paper.<sup>253</sup>

In another Russian source we find yet one more account concerning the demand of the Grand Prince but – astonishingly – he asked the *sultan* rather than the patriarch to send him a translator. The former found an appropriate man who was however married and had children. According to this source the man begged the sultan to free him from this mission and proposed that his companion with whom he had shared the same teacher both in Greece and in Italy

---

<sup>252</sup>Early Maximus' *Life*: СКАЗАНИЕ В КОРПУСЕ СОЧИНЕНИЙ, 78 (on Basil's demand to the Patriarch) and *ibid.*, 79 and 86 (that Maximus went to Moscow with the Patriarch's blessing). Basil's letter to the patriarch is mentioned in the former's instruction for Korobov: PDS-KNT, 128. The Patriarch's action in search of a translator is mentioned in СКАЗАНИЕ В КОРПУСЕ СОЧИНЕНИЙ, 78. Theoleptos's letter to Varlaam: RGM I, 339-340.

<sup>253</sup>Maximus may have encountered the patriarch Theoleptos in Curtea. In Muscovy Maximus underlined that the Muscovite Church had not the right to appoint her metropolitan on her own. The patriarch expected also material aid from the Grand Prince that he spoke about in his letter to the metropolitan Varlaam (RGM I, 339). Yet Maximus is not mentioned in this letter among with those who were sent to Moscow by Theoleptos but only metropolitan Gregory and deacon Dionysius, *ibid.* HERBERSTEIN 2007, 156 related: "Accepimus Moscovuiae, patriarcham Constantinopolitanum ad petitionem ipsius Mosci, misisse quendam monachum Maximilianum nomine, ut omnes libros, Canones, & singula statuta ad fidem pertinentia, in ordinem recto iudicio redigeret. Quod cum fecisset, multisque & gravissimis erroribus animadversis, coram Principe pronunciasset, eum plane esse schismaticum, qui Romanum aut Graecum non sequatur ritum: haec inquam ubi dixisset, non multo post (etsi eum summa prosequeretur Princeps benevolentia) dicitur evanuisse, ac multorum opinione submersum esse." NB, Theoleptos was previously the metropolitan of Janina, a town situated not far from Trivolis' home town Arta. Nectarios and Theophanes, disciples of the patriarch Niphon in Dionysiou and the founders of Varlaam monastery on Meteora, lived also for some time on an island on the lake Janina (NICOL 1975, 134-6). From the Varlaam monastery comes a MS of Niphon's life by Dekadyos, cf. VRANOUSIS 1978, 385. GEANAKOPOLOS 1988, 499 believes that Maximus was in Constantinople on his way to Moscow but does not give any evidence.

could replace him. When they left school the former got married while his colleague became a monk on Athos. This was Maximus the Greek who was eventually charged with the task.<sup>254</sup> This version is improbable but not impossible. The patriarch, very dependent on the Ottoman ruler, might have agreed (or might have been forced to agree), for political reasons, to collaborate with the sultan on this matter.

One more trace reinforces the supposition that Maximus' goal went beyond his translation activities. The hegumen of Vatopedi wrote to metropolitan Varlaam that Sava was supposed to have gone to Moscow on account of "certain things needed for this country" (RGM I, 337). Since he did not simply write: "on account of translating books" so perhaps at the very beginning of this enterprise there had been other reasons on Basil's side to demand Sava to go to Rus'.

Maximus inherited all these tasks. Certainly, his superiors attached great significance to this expedition. Now they were no longer only beggars, in desperate need of financial help from the Muscovite monarch. This time their situation was more comfortable because the Grand Prince needed their help. Therefore the superiors made efforts to portray Maximus to Basil as the one who would be able to answer his expectations. The hegumen of Vatopedi expressed his hope that even if he did not know Slavonic, he would learn quickly.<sup>255</sup>

Thus, Maximus was sent to Moscow with the blessing of the whole Holy Community. He took with him a few books and his brothers from Vatopedi gave him for companions Neophyt, a spiritual father and Lawrence (Lavrentii) from Bulgaria who probably taught him Slavonic on the way. The mission carried also letters from Vatopedi to Basil III and the metropolitan Varlaam.<sup>256</sup>

---

254This story is told in СКАЗАНИЕ ИЗВЕСТНО, 93-4. This source comes probably from the 1620-30-ties: SINITSYNA 2006<sup>a</sup>, 71. On the demand sent to the Sultan cf. also *ibid.*, 66-7. Sinitsyna noted that the description of the sultan's favourable attitude to Orthodoxy, is not an exception in the milieu of learned Muscovites of that time. One can find a similar approach in the works of Peresvetov. DENISSOFF 1943, 343 guessed that the man who was previously selected to be sent to Basil III may have been John Gregoropoulos. If this is true, it would be an argument in favour of Trivolis' education in Crete because Gregoropoulos studied in Apostolis' school in Candia.

255The hegumen's letter to the metropolitan Varlaam: RGM I, 337. See also note 250, above. It cannot be excluded that Maximus' Greek circle in Italy, first of all Laskaris, had an impact on what Maximus said and did in Muscovy. Laskaris was still active and worked strenuously, whenever he had the possibility, for the liberation of Greece. Earlier he had collaborated with Bessarion who had sent Zoe Paleolog to Moscow and later he directed (from 1513) the Roman college founded by Leo X (IRIGOIN 1997, 487).

256Maximus emphasised that the mission was not taken on his own initiative but he was sent by his brothers (M-I, 165) with their blessing: PHILARET 1842, 84. On books see below, note 63; on his companions: RGM I, 337. On the fact that Lawrence was a Bulgarian: PSRL XXVI, 308. On south-Slavonic influences in Maximus Slavonic language: SOBOLEVSKII 1903, 262-3, 36-8 and SPERANSKII 1960, 178-9 who considered it very probable that Maximus had already in Vatopedi some contact with (south)-Slavonic language and books. The letters from Vatopedi to Moscow: RGM I, 129-131 and 336-8. At the same time a few brothers from the saint Pantaleon monastery were also sent to Moscow (protohegumen Sava, priest Pachomius and brother Matthew – Марфей)

We do not know either when they left Athos or which way they chose to travel. What we do know are a few events relating to their journey that can be dated with certainty.

In July 1516 the patriarch Theoleptos issued the missive to metropolitan Varlaam in which he referred to the miserable situation of the Church in Constantinople and asking for help. He also announced that he was sending to Moscow metropolitan Gregory and deacon Dionysius with relics, wishing Varlaam peace. This document, delivered to Moscow by Gregory, does not contain any information about monks from Athos.<sup>257</sup> Then, in May 1517, the group composed of Kopyl and Varavin, the metropolitan and some monks left Constantinople for Moscow via Kaffa. Finally, on February 12<sup>th</sup> 1518 the mission was on its way from Crimea to Moscow and the envoy of the Grand Prince informed him that in this group were: Kopyl and Varavin; metropolitan Gregory and his companion, both delegated by the patriarch; Sava, protohegumen of the Pantaleimon monastery and Maximus with his two companions from Vatopedi.<sup>258</sup> This is the first mention of Maximus the Greek in Russian sources.

On the base of the fact that this group arrived in Moscow together, some historians come to the conclusion that they had travelled together at least from Constantinople. But it is not self-evident. A long interval separated Kopyl's arrival at Athos (March 1516), Theoleptos' letter to metropolitan Varlaam (July 1516), the departure of the mission from Constantinople for Kaffa (May 1517) and finally the last stretch of the road from Crimea to Moscow which they covered in February 1518. Kopyl may have hardly wanted to spend much time on Athos. His journey had already lasted a very long time and the Grand Prince was awaiting their return impatiently. The reason of their long stay in Constantinople was probably due to the fact that they looked forward to the appointment of the Turkish envoy to Moscow with whom they were to return to their country (Sb RIO, 95, 407, 428). Taking into consideration Basil III's

---

with letters to Basil III and to metropolitan Varlaam (RGM I, 127-9 and 334-6). At least from Crimea, but perhaps already from Athos, protohegumen Sava (two other monks are not mentioned in Russian source) travelled together with Kopyl, Varavin and Maximus the Greek to Moscow, cf. Basil Shadrin's letter to Basil III of February 12, 1518, PDS-KNT, 495.

257See: RGM I, 339. Theoleptos also sent a letter to Basil III but its content has not been preserved, *ibid.*, 127.

258See V. Shadrin's and I. Chelishchev's letter to Basil III of May, 30 1517 (PDS-KNT, 441): "Да здѣсе, государь, Божѣимъ милосердѣемъ, да и твоимъ государьскимъ здоровьемъ Копылъ Иваравинъ въ Кафу вышелъ поздраву совсѣмъ, а съ нимъ, госудор, вышелъ митрополить, да и иные съ нимъ черныци, а дополна, государь, не вѣдаемъ, сколко съ нимъ чернцовъ." See also Shadrin's letter to Basil III of February 12, 1518 (PDS-KNT, 495-6): "Да ѣдетъ, государь, со мною Копиль Иваравинъ, а съ ними, государь, ѣдутъ митрополить самъ-дугъ отъ пагриярха изо Царя-города, да изъ твоего, государь, монастыря отъ Понталѣймона святого ѣдетъ Сава проигумень, а изъ Ватопѣта, государь, ѣдетъ къ тебѣ государю Максимъ старецъ самъ-третей, а торговыхъ, государь, людей со мною съ Чарыгомъ Загрегубъ кафинець. Да милосердѣемъ Божѣимъ, да твоимъ государьскимъ здоровьемъ доѣхали есмя до Сулы, даль Богъ, поздраву."



impatience, it is very likely that Kopyl with the monks (or a few of them) left Athos quite quickly and Theoleptos' letter dated July 1516 indicates that they also hoped to leave straightaway from Constantinople to Moscow. The wait for the Turkish envoy and, perhaps, other tasks or problems, extended their time in Turkey. The prolonged delay may have inclined Maximus (perhaps with other monks belonging to the mission) to join the patriarch Theoleptos who went to Curtea Argeş for the celebration organised by Neagoe Basarab on August 15<sup>th</sup> 1517. The *protos* Gabriel moved in same direction from Mount Athos with his impressive retinue of twenty hegumens. Maximus's links with Neagoe and people collaborating with him justified his presence in Curtea. Not knowing how long the stopover in Constantinople could last, some of the monks may have decided to go to Wallachia while others, with metropolitan Gregory waited together with Kopyl and Varavin in the city. Kaffa was a perfect place to meet again in order to pass together the last and dangerous part of their itinerary.<sup>259</sup> Maximus recalled later that the way to Moscow was difficult and that he encountered a lot of trouble on the way (K-II, 378).

Without any doubt, the last part of their road they travelled together. As other Muscovite envoys, they certainly voyaged from Kaffa to Azov (via Kerch) by ship. Then they may have sailed on the Don and finally, passing Riazan', Kopyl and Varavin, metropolitan Gregory and deacon Dionysios, Sava from saint Pantaleimon, a monk Isaiah, Serbian from Xeropotamou [Жеропота] monastery together with Maximus, Nephytos and Lawrence from Vatopedi they finally reached Moscow on March 4<sup>th</sup> 1518. It was Thursday of the third week of Lent.<sup>260</sup>

## 6. THE SITUATION IN MOSCOW ON THE EVE OF MAXIMUS' ARRIVAL

Muscovy, when Maximus arrived, was emerging from the shadows and reconstructing

---

<sup>259</sup>Kopyl, Varavin, metropolitan Gregory and a few monks certainly did not go to Curtea because they left Constantinople for Kaffa in May 1517. The author of the report for Basil III wrote however that he did not know how many monks travelled with Kopyl and Varavin and he did not name them. Since Maximus with his companions are named only when the mission left Crimea for Moscow in February 1518 so he may have been in Curtea and have joined the mission only in Kaffa, cf. the fragment of the letters quoted in the previous note: PDS-KNT, 441 and 495-6. Monks used to travel from Moscow to Athos through Wallachia so it was not an unusual itinerary, cf. SINITSYNA 1965<sup>a</sup>, 116-7 and NASTUREL 1986, 277. The Grand Prince was interested in Wallachia, see: PDS-KNT, 407, 441, 473. SHEVCHENKO 1997, 64, thinks Maximus' presence in Curtea was possible. SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 19 was of the opposite view.

<sup>260</sup>PSRL VI, 260-1; VI – 2, 412-13 (here Maximus is omitted); VIII, 263; XIII, 28; XXVI, 308 and IOASAFOVSKAIA LETOPIS', 102. For a more detailed description of the mission from Athos to Moscow see: SINITSYNA 1965<sup>a</sup>, 117-119. For the usual itinerary of Muscovite envoys cf. e.g. PDS-KNT, 140, 428, 432. NB, Gregory was the metropolitan of Janina (GEANAKOPILOS 1988, 499). That fact is one more element of interesting connections: Niphon – Maximus – Theoleptos – Dekadyos (cf. above, note 253) which could shed some more light on Maximus' mission.

its independence after the period of the Tartar yoke. The state was growing in strength and becoming a more and more important player in European politics. Its future was however far from being sure. Its political interests were focused on the neighbourhood: relationships with the Kazan', Crimea and Astrakhan khanates, as well those with the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Moldavia were essential. As we have already seen, the Grand Prince Basil III also attached a great importance to good relations with the Porte.<sup>261</sup> Muscovy was still a threatened state and had to struggle for its independence. Maximus' interlocutor, Bersen'-Beklemishev as late as in 1520-ties said that there was no peace for Moscow and that it was surrounded by enemies almost from every side.<sup>262</sup>

Besides the neighbours, diplomats of the Grand Prince kept contact with more distant partners, first of all with the emperor and the pope but also with Denmark and Lübeck. Initiators of these relations were rather Muscovy's counter-partners, especially the emperor and the pope who tried to win over Moscow to the common crusade against the Turks, than Moscow itself.<sup>263</sup> When the emperor Maximilian changed his policy and tried to enter into an alliance with the Jagiellonians, correspondence between Moscow and the empire became much less frequent.<sup>264</sup> Muscovite political authorities did not hasten to create close relationships with the West. What they wanted was a kind neutrality from Europe and help to acquire much needed specialists from the West. Probably this was the reason that Basil's diplomats sustained hopes for the possibility of Moscow's collaboration with the West. At the same time Basil III certainly wanted Europe to recognise his royal title. He wanted to give the impression, that he was equal to the emperor.<sup>265</sup>

While political authorities assumed a cautious attitude towards the West, at least part of

---

261In this period Grand Princes of Moscow were still nominal vassals of the khans and paid tribute to them. The first direct contact with the Ottoman Empire is dated 1496: OSTROWSKI 2006<sup>a</sup>, 235.

262SD-Ob, 5-6 and 11.

263See: SINITSYNA 1977, 75-6 and SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 39-40. On contacts with Lübeck see: BULANINA 1988 (SKK).

264About frequency we can judge from the documents published in PDS-R.

265See: KUDRIAVTSEV 1997, 10 and 22; SINITSYNA 1997, 36. Leo X proposed to grant Basil III the royal title if Basil accepted the Union and joined the anti-Turkish crusade. This proposal was not very attractive so Basil replied that he wanted to live in peace with the pope but to retain his *Greek* faith, cf. KUDRIAVTSEV 1997, 21 and SINITSYNA 1997, 41. Already PIERLING 1906, I, 313-15 emphasised that the popes had a false image of Muscovy's attitudes towards the union and towards collaboration with the West. SINITSYNA 1997, 58, emphasised the formal equality of Basil's and Maximilian's titles. They called themselves mutually *brothers* in diplomatic correspondence and also in the chronicles Maximilian is called Basil's brother, e.g.: PSRL VIII, 259. 263; XIII, 28. An example of the attitude of Muscovy towards the West was the fact that in 1500 Novgorod, conquered earlier by Moscow, had to break its bonds with the Hanse. Admittedly in 1510 Lübeck's envoys were received in Novgorod but that were the Muscovite diplomats who negotiated with Lübeck. Moscow authorities did not want that their subjects had any independent contacts of with the West. More about the international diplomatic context at the moment of Maximus' arrival to Moscow in: GARZANITI 2019<sup>a</sup>. Among others, it was Nicholas (von) Schönberg who was sent to Moscow by the pope Leo X. Nicholas had become Dominican in San Marco a few years before Trivolis. He was a Savonarolian, cf. *ibid.* 59-60.

the elite displayed a growing interest in both the Byzantine and the Western intellectual tradition and even their fashions. Thanks to Muscovy's ever widening international relationships, more and more information reached Moscow. The newly acquired knowledge created curiosity and a favourable atmosphere for further contacts. It concerned only a narrow social group but it was precisely with this group that Maximus would communicate and it would be this group that formed the future shape of the country.<sup>266</sup>

Muscovy's links with Byzantium were natural as it was the source from which it received the Orthodox faith. The previous reception of the Byzantine tradition had been however selective and superficial. The presence of the Greek exiles in Moscow after the fall of Constantinople, among them educated representatives of great families, may have helped a deeper encounter with the Byzantine thought.<sup>267</sup>

Contacts with the West also broadened. Europe was little known in Moscow and evoked a greater curiosity than Byzantium. Apart from factors mentioned in chapter one, new channels of communication appeared: the presence of Western specialists in Muscovy, voyages of Russian diplomats to the West and the fact that individuals (such as Dimitri Gerasimov) studied abroad, in German schools in Livonia. Also contacts with the Russian lands of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania developed. These factors made a more intensive osmosis between Moscow and the West possible.

Europe appeared to Russians as a source of both theoretical scholarship and practical skills. Much more developed than their own country, it drew attention, all the more so because the previous cultural centre, Constantinople, had fallen while the West was in full bloom. The contact with Western knowledge was considered valuable. Fedor Karpov, one of the most trusted diplomats of the Grand Prince and a well educated man, thought that ignorance of *artes liberales* brought shame on him in front of foreigners and would later accuse Maximus the Greek of wanting to dissuade his acquaintances from studying (M-I, 331).<sup>268</sup> The attraction of Western knowledge explains why Nicholas Bülow, a German physician of the Grand Prince, had such influence on Karpov. Many questions that learned people directed later to Maximus,

---

<sup>266</sup>One should note that a similar rapprochement between a part of Orthodox elite and the West took place earlier, in Greece, before the Council of Florence and later, in Polono-Lithuanian state, before the Union in Brest. Perhaps the position of the most learned people in Muscovy caused Western diplomats to believe that an ecclesiastical union with Moscow was possible although the Grand Prince did not intend to do that. Besides people who knew Maximus, there were of course others, like Michael Munekhin (Misiur'), who had wide intellectual interests. He contacted e.g. the monk Philotheus (Филофей) and Dmitrii Gerasimov, cf. DMITRIEVA 1989<sup>b</sup> (SKK).

<sup>267</sup>On the superficial reception of the Byzantine tradition see above, chapter I. On Greeks in Moscow: ALEF 1979.

<sup>268</sup>See: SINITSYNA 1977, 96, KAZAKOVA 1988<sup>d</sup> (SKK) and BULANIN 1988<sup>d</sup> (SKK).

attested to the huge intellectual curiosity and to the lack of alternative sources of knowledge.<sup>269</sup>

Another sign of Moscow's opening up was the so called *Chronograf of 1512*. In this source the history of Muscovy and other Slavic countries was incorporated into the global history of world. The earlier Russian historiography had not done that.<sup>270</sup>

Muscovy's widening connection with Europe is testified also by the events from the sphere that we would call today popular culture. The *Almanac*, a work forecasting a new deluge widely distributed in Europe, was also easily accessible in Moscow. Another example of this phenomenon may have been the visit to Moscow of an alchemist, Philip Bombastus von Hohenheim called Paracelsus. A star at European courts of that time, he allegedly reached Moscow about 1521, invited by Basil III, perhaps on the initiative of people from the Prince's retinue interested in the West.<sup>271</sup>

The opening up of the society that had remained in isolation during the long age of the Tartar yoke, perforce, provoked a ferment. The first half of the sixteenth century in Moscow was a period of passionate discussions. One debated questions of political models, ways of monastic life, the approaches towards heretics, the reform of the Church or the relationship between the state and the Church. This eruption of new ideas and an unprecedented intellectual activity may have evoked the impression that the old, well known, world was going to collapse. After many years of intellectual stagnation, this moment of an opening up must have come as a shock. The virulent, conservative reaction against new ideas was therefore comprehensible. The anxious voices of Abp Gennadii and Joseph of Volokolamsk quoted in chapter I were now joined by others. Bersen'-Beklemishev, Maximus' interlocutor, confessed that "now, there is no justice within people". Significantly, he linked the change for worse in Moscow with the arrival of strangers, Zoe Paleolog and her Greek retinue.<sup>272</sup>

Thus, we can observe two parallel processes: the opening up of the Muscovite mind and the counter reaction of those who saw stigmas of a fall in the changes taking place. Both the

---

269E.g. Tuchkov asked about Aldo, somebody else about Franciscans and Dominicans. About Bülow cf. below, text and note 325.

270See: TVOROGOV 1975, 32-43, esp. 41-2; cf. also: SINITSYNA 1997, 44.

271On *Almanac*: SINITSYNA 1997, 45; on Paracelsus: TELEPNEF 1945, 39-41. Paracelsus could be a source of the interest in the Western astrology in Moscow. It might have been Nicholas Bülow who contributed to his invitation.

272“Нынѣ въ людехъ правды нѣтъ”, SD-Ob, 8. About Zoe, *ibid.*, 5. 11. Slightly later (before 1539), also Fedor Karпов, in his missive to metropolitan Daniel, expressed his anxiety about the decline of his contemporaries quoting Ovid (BLDR, vol. 9, 356-7): “Нынѣ живутъ от похищения; нѣсть гостиниць от гостя безъ боязни. Нѣсть тещь от зятя; и братская убо любовь редка есть.” Certainly, these texts have a stereotypical character. This kind of complaining appeared in every historical period but its frequency in the late fifteenth and the first half of the sixteenth century allow us to think that feeling of the fall and threat was particularly intense during the period under discussion. Additional evidence of the anxiety of this time was the popularity of the above-mentioned *Almanac*.

conservative forces and those who were ready for change appealed to external sources (Byzantine or Western) acknowledging in this way their authority or at least their usefulness. A chasm separated however Abp Gennadii or Joseph of Volokolamsk from e.g. Vassian Patrikeev. Gennadii ordered some parts of the Bible to be translated from the Vulgate so showing he was ready to use the fruits of the Western scholarship but in a purely utilitarian way, to avoid the influence of new ideas, to preserve a *status quo ante*. Similarly conservative was Joseph and his disciples. Whereas Patrikeev referred to the Byzantine learning so as to improve customs of the Russian Church. Of course, all of them looked for a remedy from the past. One however treated tradition as an unchanging monolith while the other tried to interpret it.<sup>273</sup>

It was in the religious sphere, by nature more conservative than others, that the tension between those who promoted change and those who did not want it was the most felt. Joseph of Volokolamsk, writing in about 1510/11 to the Grand Prince was visibly horrified by the progress heresy had made. A dozen years later a monk Philotheus (Филофей) from Pskov would formulate the idea of Moscow being the Third Rome. The letter where he conveyed his idea expressed, against the established interpretation of older historiography, more an anxiety about the future of the Russian Orthodoxy (the only real one!) than a triumphalism.<sup>274</sup>

The council of 1504 (see: chapter I) did not destroy the dissident movement within the Church but seriously weakened it. The situation changed around 1509. A conflict between Joseph of Volokolamsk and Serapion, the archbishop of Novgorod, led to a new turmoil in the Church. Joseph, because of a conflict with the previous patron, the prince of Volokolamsk, donated his monastery to the patronage of the Grand Prince. It signified that the monastery was exempt from the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Novgorod and surrendered to the metropolitan. This decision was made without the consent of Serapion and the latter excommunicated Joseph. Then, the metropolitan Simon and the synod deposed Serapion and

---

273E.g. metropolitan Daniel (in a text assigned to Joseph of Volokolamsk) tried to reconcile different texts of the tradition while Patrikeev showed contradictions to justify a critical work, reflection over sources, cf. PUGUZOV 2002, 169.

274Joseph wrote to Basil III (AFED, 520): “Да ныне аще ты, государь, не подпишиши и не подвигнешися о сих, не утолиши скверных еретик, темное их еретическое учение, — ино, государь, погибнути всему православному христианству от еретических учений, яко ж и прежа много царства погибоша сим образом: ефиопское великое царство, и арменское, и римское, иже много лета пребыша в православной вере христианстей, тако погибоша. Прихожаху бо преже мнози еретицы втай царствия и прельщаху преже нищая человеки и убогия, потом же и благородныя, потом же прияха учение их и великия власти. Во многа же лета вся царства отступиша от соборных и апостольских церкви и от православных христианских веры.” On the transformations of the idea of the Third Rome (the original idea and its ideological use by nineteenth and twentieth century historians): POE 2001. Cf. also: SINITSYNA 1998 (she considers that the Third Rome should not be identified with Muscovy but that it is a supranational Orthodox state, the last empire, *ibid.*, 38-9, 248-9), OSTROWSKI 2006<sup>b</sup>, NITCHE 1990 *passim*, esp. 205 and below, in chapter III, notes 26.

sent him to a monastery. Bishops had often been deposed at that time but this decision triggered heated disputes. Joseph's position was however still strong. In 1509 at least five out of eight dioceses were administrated by Joseph's supporters.<sup>275</sup>

These were the circumstances under which Vassian Patrikeev arrived in Moscow. He was a member of a noble family, close to the court, which had fallen into disgrace during the struggle for the succession to the throne around 1490. In about 1509 or 1510 he was allowed to return to the capital, he became Basil III's trusted counsellor and began publicly to deliberate on the question of monastic life. A little later polemics concerning heretics erupted anew. Monks from Volokolamsk denounced the presence of heretics in the Kirillo-Belozerskii monastery where Patrikeev was in exile and where he became a disciple of Nil Sorskii. The attack against this monastery was certainly directed against Patrikeev. The issue must have concerned repented dissenters as later the arguments were focused on how to treat heretics who expressed remorse. Both sides referred to sources drawn from the Bible and from the Fathers of the Church.<sup>276</sup> Joseph supported the isolation and elimination of heretics. He urged the Grand Prince to fight heresy and not to believe in conversion of those who were imprisoned. To validate his theses Joseph quoted Chrysostom who recommended terminating all contacts with heretics.<sup>277</sup> Patrikeev, for his part, accused Joseph of the heresy of Navat, i.e., of a conviction that Christians who renounced their faith could not be reconciled with the Church through penitence.<sup>278</sup> Perhaps his appeal to treat heretics more mercifully resulted from a desire to open up more space for discussion, also in other issues; to avoid the situation where the authorities would quickly silence someone who preached controversial ideas.

During this struggle the adversaries of Joseph progressively gained more and more influence. In 1511 Basil III told metropolitan Simon to revoke Serapion's excommunication. He also expressed a desire for Joseph to be reconciled with the archbishop Serapion. In April

---

275See: LUR'É 1960, 431; about dioceses: ZIMIN 1977, 283-4. On the persisting conviction about the Judaizers threat: KLIER 1997, 348. He quotes Ivan IV's letter to the King of Poland: "they [the Jews] lead our people away from Christianity."

276See: KAZAKOVA 1988<sup>b</sup> (SKK) and ANKHIMIUK 1990, 130, 132; 126-7 and passim; PLIGUZOV 2002, 79-81, 278 and the whole first chapter in Pliguzov's book on the context of this new scene of the polemics.

277PLIGUZOV 2002, 79-80; Joseph of Volokolamsk's missive to Basil III in: AFED, 520.

278PLIGUZOV 2002, 79-80. 262-3; ANKHIMIUK 1990, 130 and *Слово на "Списание Иосифа"*, *ibid.*, 142, 145. Cf. also above, chapter I, note 39. Patrikeev describes the views of the Novatianists. Eusebius de Caesarea and the Greek writers who followed him confused a Carthaginian priest, Novat, with Novatian, cf. ROMERO POSE 2006, 3552. KLIER 1997, 343 says (referring to AFED 521-3) that the supporters of a more lenient treatment of heretics were not motivated by religious toleration but were convinced that "punishment [...] was better left to God than to church or state" but this interpretation is not clear from the text to which he refers. NB, ANKHIMIUK 1990, 137 shows that Patrikeev modified his views: in *Slovo otvetno* [KAZAKOVA 1960, 270-1] he was absolutely against the capital punishment of heretics while in *Slovo o eretikakh* and *Prenie s Iosifom* [KAZAKOVA 1960, 272. 276-7] he allowed such a possibility. Cf. also below, chapter III, note 278.

1511 Simon left the metropolitan chair and in August Varlaam became metropolitan.<sup>279</sup> He had a good reputation and was probably appointed by the Grand Prince rather than elected by the bishops. Patrikeev may have influenced this decision.<sup>280</sup> Further important changes took place between 1514 and 1518 when the Josephian bishops gradually lost control of the Russian Church.<sup>281</sup> Thus, Maximus was invited to Moscow when the anti-josephian party had become more established. It was the Grand Prince who was the author of the invitation but it seems – as a letter sent from Athos testifies – that metropolitan Varlaam was also involved in this enterprise.<sup>282</sup> Obviously both of them were keenly interested in solving the problem. The tension that arose within the Muscovite Church needed a solution. Joseph, and later his followers, repeatedly harassed the grand Prince demanding the trial of heretics. It seems that Varlaam was more on the side of Patrikeev but we do not have enough data to confirm this hypothesis.<sup>283</sup> During the discussion between Joseph’s adherents and adversaries, both parties mainly used arguments from tradition, so Moscow – which suffered from a lack of its own well-trained experts – needed a learned man able to interpret the ancient texts.

The very fact that a learned translator from Athos was invited, proved that the discussion was deemed necessary and that a demand for an intellectual confrontation with adversaries or heretics had grown. Instead of a simple isolation or extermination of heretics (as Gennadii, Joseph and their successors wanted) the authorities decide to confront them.<sup>284</sup>

This was not however a message intended for a larger public. The demand to send a translator to Moscow we find in official letters of the Grand Prince but not in any chronicles. They only mention that the reason of the Greek monks’ arrival was to collect alms. At the same time, however, they noted that the Grand Prince welcomed the monks, as well as the metropolitan Gregory, with great favour. He ordered them to live in the Chudov monastery in

279On Joseph: LUR’E 1998<sup>b</sup> (SKK) and on Serapion: LUR’E 1989 (SKK). On Russian ecclesiastical hierarchy chronology see: STROEV 1877.

280See: SHEREMETEVSKII 2000, 91-2. HERBERSTEIN 2007, 111 describes Varlaam as “vir sanctae vitae”.

281Nicodem, bishop of Vologda and Perm left in 1514, Protasii, bishop of Riazan’ in 1516 (both acted against Abp Serapion). In 1515 died: Vassian, bishop of Rostov (and Joseph’s brother) and Symeon of Suzdal (Joseph’s disciple). Mitrofan of Kolomna left in 1518, cf. ZIMIN 1977, 283-4.

282Cf. the letter from Vatopedi to Basil III: RGM I, 130 and the hegumen’s of Vatopedi letter to Varlaam: RGM I, 337. Varlaam is not mentioned as an initiator of the invitation but – since he also received information about Maximus – probably he was also involved in the whole process. Also chronicles say that monks from Athos arrived to see the Grand Prince and Varlaam while the metropolitan Gregory is only said to come to see the Grand Prince, e.g. PSRL VI, 411; XXVI, 308.

283For Joseph’s letter to the Grand Prince against the heretics see: JOSEPH OF VOLOKOLAMSK, *Missives*, 229-32; on Varlaam above, note 280. Varlaam was before in the Kirillo-Belozerskii monastery, the same where Patrikeev was also a monk, KAZAKOVA 1970, 106.

284Gennadii did not want to discuss with heretics because (AFED, 381): “Да еще люди у нас простые, не умеют по обычным книгам говорить: таки бы о вере никаких речей с ними не плодили; токмо того для учинити собор, что их казнити – жечи да вешати!” Cf. PUGUZOV 1992, 276.

the Kremlin which was the monastery under the patronage of the metropolitan of Moscow and satisfied all their need from the prince's own table.<sup>285</sup> Certainly, not every Greek monk who visited Moscow in order to collect alms could have counted on such a warm reception.

## 7. THE FIRST PERIOD IN MOSCOW BEFORE THE TRIAL OF 1525

While Basil III showed the monks respect, he visibly was not in a hurry to meet Maximus and the others. Metropolitan Varlaam however, according to a chronicle, from the very beginning met them and held talks on spiritual matters. Therefore one may suppose that, although the Grand Prince officially invited the translator, the metropolitan was the *spiritus movens* of this invitation. Maximus himself recalled that he had had to wait for an audience with the prince. His first work written in Moscow was the *Missive to the Moscovite Grand Prince about the Athonite monasteries* (Послание московскому великому князю Василию III об афонских монастырях) and it was commanded by Basil. Maximus wrote it before his first audience with the Grand Prince, so the command must have been transferred by an intermediary.<sup>286</sup>

The interest of the Prince in this problem testifies that, on one hand, the question of monastic life was already the centre of attention and, on the other hand, that Athonite monasteries still carried great authority in the eyes of the Russian Church even if the authority of the Greek Church was questioned. Maximus mentioned that he had also written his missive in order to defend the monasteries of Athos against unjust accusation. He described extensively cenobitic and idiorhythmic monasteries, relating the main offices and recounted legends

---

<sup>285</sup>Probably also the Metropolitan, in his letter to Athos, wrote about the need of a translator since he was informed by monks from the Holy Mountain, as was the Prince, about the development of the situation. Cf. the above-quoted letters. HERBERSTEIN 2007, 156, was also convinced that Maximus was called in order to improve Russian religious books, see above, note 253. Cf. also M-II, 57 where Maximus mentioned correction of Russian books. Monk Selivan noted just that “старца Максима [...] самодръжець своим царским посланием от Святыя Горы призва”, СВИДЕТЕЛЬСТВО СЕЛИВАНА, 74. As for chronicles: PSRL VI, 260f., VIII, 263; XIII, 28; XX, I, 393; XXI, 595; XXVI, 308. Cf. also SUDNYE SPISKI, 97 where Daniel says that Maximus came to Moscow to collect alms. On Chudov as a monastery under the metropolitan see: KOLYCHEVA 2002, 85. Perhaps the chronicles give an official version about the welcome that the Greek guests received. In reality it is possible that there was some tension between the Grand Prince and the Metropolitan on one side and the archbishop Gregory on the other (see below, note 369) but at least in PSRL XXVI, 309 it is said: “[...] Варлам, митрополит всея Руси, къ Григорью митрополиту и къ старцем святыя Горы велию любовь и честь имѣя...”. The Archbishop arrived in Moscow with Maximus on 4<sup>th</sup> of March 1518 and left on 11<sup>th</sup> of September 1519 (PSRL XIII, 28 and 35).

<sup>286</sup>On Basil's and Varlaam's attitude towards the guests: PSRL XXVI, 309. In the *Missive* Maximus says that, more than once, the prince asked him to write about organisation of those monasteries (M-I, 119) but he had had to wait for the audience (M-I, 132).



concerning the Mountain. The missive seems to be intended to share the experience of Greek monasticism rather than to polemicise with the monastic order in Muscovy.<sup>287</sup>

## FIRST TRANSLATIONS

Finally Maximus was summoned before the Grand Prince who entrusted the monk with the translation of the *Commented Psalter* (Толковая Псалтырь). The whole early biographical tradition, followed by later historians, put this task in the centre of Maximus' work during the period before the trial in 1525. The Greek himself wrote that Basil III had taken the decision to translate the Psalter before the inviting the translator from Athos and that metropolitan Varlaam was actively involved in this action enterprise, giving advice and blessing the initiative.<sup>288</sup>

Archive data prove, however, that the order of the works was different to that which the scholars had previously assumed. The first book Maximus started translating in Moscow was not the Psalter but the *Apostol* (a book containing the Acts and the Apostolic letters). In March 1519 the translation of the *Commented Apostol* was in process (the Acts were finished). Probably he continued this work by June 1521 (or even later) and only between June 1521 and December 1522, did he translate the Psalter.<sup>289</sup>

What then was the reason that both Maximus and his contemporaries seem to neglect the translation of the *Apostol*?<sup>290</sup> The simplest explanation is that the *Apostol*, as Maximus' first translation, was not completely satisfactory and that the author was not content with it. We do not even know whether this work was finished or not. But one cannot exclude the possibility that there were other reasons to put the *Apostol* in the shadow. Confronted by heated discussions concerning the organisation and customs of the Muscovite Church, books describing principles of the early Church, quite distant from the customs of the then Russian

---

287On avoiding polemics: SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 52. On cenobitic and idiorhythmic monasteries in Muscovy as well as on attempts of reform see below, text and note 346. We do not know from what kind of accusation Maximus defended Athos.

288See the early biographical sources published by SINITSYNA 2006<sup>a</sup>. Maximus mentioned the history of the translation in his letter to Basil after finishing the work (M-I, 153-4). Also Gerasimov, in his letter to Michael Munekhin (Misiur') mentions that the translation of the Psalter was executed *for the Grand Prince*, cf. GORSKII 1859, 190. An alternative relation about these events gives СКАЗАНИЕ В КОРПУСЕ СОЧИНЕНИЙ, 79-81. It says that the decision was taken after Maximus' visit to the Prince's library where the ruler ordered Maximus to select books that were not yet translated into Slavonic. This version is much less probable as it is difficult to imagine that Maximus, not knowing Slavonic well, would have known which works had already been translated or not. On the vast discussion concerning the prince library: GROMOV 1983, 59-60.

289See: SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 37-8 and also M-I, 154 where Maximus says that he translated the Psalter in one year and five months. Cf. also: СКАЗАНИЕ В КОРПУСЕ СОЧИНЕНИЙ, 81 and СКАЗАНИЕ ИЗВЕСТНО, 94. In one MS we find a mention that Maximus finished the translation of the *Apostol* on March 7<sup>th</sup> 1521 (IVANOV 1969, no. 5, p. 47).

290Maximus, describing his translations from before 1525 mentioned the Psalter and "other inspired books", M-II, 57.

Church, may have been quite embarrassing. The Psalter was a much safer option for the ritualised Church than the description of the dynamic early communities narrated by S. Luke, S. Paul and other authors of apostolic letters. Apart from that, his enemies did not find serious errors in his translation of the Psalter so there were no obstacles to introduce it into ecclesiastical use.<sup>291</sup>

Primarily however, the Psalter was much needed for the Muscovite Church, being a liturgical book and a primer. It shaped the imagination of religious people and – because of the messianic prophecies it contains – witnessed to the continuity of the history of salvation. Foreigners noted that Russians held the Psalter in great respect.

An important question is: what was the weight of the Psalter in the discussion with heretics? Scholars noted that already during the polemics with the *Judaizers* archbishop Gennadii maintained that the heretics distorted David's psalms. Also the struggle between the *Josephians* and Patrikeev was full of mutual recrimination of heresy. We do not know of the particular significance of the Psalter in this battle but Prince Vassian, at least, used in his *Kormchaia* (a collection of Ecclesiastical law, the Nomocanon) fragments from the Commented Psalter translated by Maximus.<sup>292</sup>

Maximus himself, in his letter to Basil III about the translation of the Commented Psalter, emphasised that his work was a weapon against the founders of heresies. He carefully distinguished who was and who was not a heretic, providing, e.g., the information that Origen's commentary to the Psalms came from the period when he was still orthodox. Yet, the Greek did not refer to any particular Russian heresy.<sup>293</sup>

The problem of heresy returned frequently to Muscovite ecclesiastical life and provoked great anxiety. Now, the old Muscovite problems were amplified with a new challenge: the Western ideas that were penetrating into Moscow. Abp Gennadii, e.g., linked the beginning of the Novgorod heresy with Fedor Kuritsyn's return to Moscow after his long travels around

---

<sup>291</sup>There are MSS of the Commentary to the Acts and to some letters. This translation was little researched and it is not clear whether Maximus translated the commentary to all canonical letters of the New Testament, cf. some information in SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 37 and Ivanov 1969, 44-7 (here the dating of one MS in 1550 introduces a confusion). In one MS of Maximus' letter to metropolitan Daniel we find the version that Maximus admitted some little errors in the translation of the *Commented Psalter*. In other MSS this fact concerns Maximus' translations in general (see: Z-137 = ZHUROVA 1998, 31). This Psalter remained in manuscript through a few centuries and was published for the first time in 1896 in Moscow by the Old-believers.

<sup>292</sup>On the role of the Psalter in Muscovy: KOVTUN 1963, 162-166, esp. 164. The Psalter was also used for fortune telling, cf. GROMOV 1983, 61. On Gennadii's opinion cf. his letter to Ioasaf of Rostov from February 1489, AFED, 316 and 319. Patrikeev was accused of supporting heretics because of his lenient attitude towards them but he also accused Josephians of a heresy of Navat, see: above, text and note 278, and ANKHIMIUK 1990, 131-3. On Vassian's use of Maximus' translation of the *Commented Psalter*: PLIGUZOV 2002, 151. 262-3.

<sup>293</sup>On founders of heresies and Origen: M-I, 156-7. Similarly, in Maximus' missive about the translation of John Chrysostom's *Homilies on St Matthew*: M-I, 356.

Europe. New pre-reform religious movements in the West were connected with a rediscovery of the Bible as a spiritual nourishment for the faithful. Independently from the strength of occidental influences, a shift, parallel to that in the West, occurred in Moscow, even if it concerned an incomparably smaller group of people.<sup>294</sup>

The sacred, indisputable text, now had to be interpreted seriously so as to give an answer to the dissidents. Church authorities were not prepared for this challenge. The weakness of the local elite and a lack of an intellectual tradition caused the confrontation with dissidents to be extremely difficult. Muscovy, through the centuries, had not even had the whole canon of the Bible, only recently had it received the *Gennadii's Bible*. Help from outside, a good exegete, was needed.

Maximus himself, perhaps influenced by Western tendencies, also seems to support the idea of making the Bible available for Christians when he says that the Greek manuscripts remained in the Kremlin eaten by moths and were of no use to the people. Later, he demanded that the manuscripts should not be hidden again as his aim was precisely to be useful to refute heresy.<sup>295</sup>

All Maximus' translations, biblical or relating to the Bible, were revelatory works in Muscovy and the Greek was aware of the weight of his achievement. This was the work of a modern editor who compares text variants, checks various different translations and carries out grammatical and lexical analysis to render the translated text as accurately as possible in Slavonic. In his introductory letter to Basil III about the translation of the Psalter, behind the conventional humility of an author, can be heard the pride of a pioneer. He mentioned the difficulty of his task and, addressing those who would have corrected his opus, he emphasised how many various skills such a work required (M-I, 162-164). This letter, written in an elegant style, echoed Renaissance prefaces like those published in Manuzio's books. The translation of the Psalter, according to the concordant transmission of early biographies, met at first with an enthusiastic reception. The Metropolitan, together with the synod, praised the work and called it the "source of piety" while the Grand Prince rewarded the translator lavishly.<sup>296</sup> The praises

---

<sup>294</sup>Gennadii linked the beginning of the heresy with Kuricyn's return from Hungary: BEGUNOV 1957, 223, note 62.

<sup>295</sup>Savonarola and Gianfrancesco Pico, people close to Trivolis, emphasised the role of the Bible in the Christian life, see above, note 97. On MSS eaten by moths: M-I, 153. Maximus praised the Latins that they explained the Scripture to the simple folk, Z-248. On Maximus' desire to make his work available: M-I, 164. It is perhaps not without significance that Vassian Patrikeev in his *Slovo otvetne*, during the discussion concerning monastic life, used only arguments from the Bible, not from councils and synods of the ancient Church.

<sup>296</sup>Maximus worked on the translation of the Psalter almost until the end of his life. In the *Commented Psalter* he mainly translated commentaries sometimes adding corrections to the psalter text itself, much later he copied the Greek text and in 1552 made a new translation of the psalter with some glosses, cf. VERNER 2017, esp. 51-3. She views this work as a continuous process that spanned the entire Muscovite period of Maximus' life. On the

were a ritual. There was nobody in Moscow who was competent to estimate the quality of Maximus' work.

Having finished the translation of the Psalter, Maximus had hoped to return soon to Athos. His time in Moscow had not been an easy experience. He asked Basil III to allow him and his companions to regain their Holy Mountain and thus liberate him from "a long lasting sadness". This request was repeated a few times in the letter to the Grand Prince and the desire to return to Athos was emphasised so strongly that, perhaps, some gossip had already appeared that the ruler might have wanted to retain the Greeks in Moscow (M-I, 165). Later, Beklemishev said that Maximus would not leave Moscow: "You are a wise man, and you have seen here our good and evil, and you will go there to talk all that".<sup>297</sup> Maximus had become an inconvenient guest. Allowing him leave seemed to be dangerous, keeping him in Moscow awkward. According to Tuchkov's account the Grand Prince said to him: "Live a little more here" (Поживи еще зжесь, *Sudnye spiski*, 116).

Maximus had little room for manoeuvre and so he continued his much needed service to the Russian Church. Before finishing the Psalter he had already started translating the *Lives of saints* by Simeon Metaphrastes. The life of Our Lady was ready in 1521. We know nothing of his reasons to translate these works but they enjoyed a certain popularity. Medovartsev copied it for himself and Isaac Sobaka executed a copy for Vassian Patrikeev who in turn gave it to the Grand Prince (*Sudnye spiski* 127). At that time probably, before the Greek completed his translation of the Psalter, Maximus and Vassian met for the first time.<sup>298</sup>

A more voluminous work, the *Homilies on St Matthew* and the *Homilies on St John* by St John Chrysostom, were commissioned by the Church authorities. The *Homilies on St Matthew* were finished in 1524 so probably launched after completing the Psalter. The

---

reception, praises and reward see: СКАЗАНИЕ В КОРПУСЕ СОЧИНЕНИЙ, 81-2 and 87-8 (two different redactions of the same text).

<sup>297</sup>"а человекъ еси разумной, и ты здѣсь увѣдалъ наше добрая и лихая, и тебѣ тамъ пришедь все сказывти", SD-Ob, p. 6; "а человекъ еси разумной, а отвѣдалъ еси наша добрая и лихая, и тебѣ тамо то шедь сказати.", *ibid.*, p. 12. Maximus also asked to let him return to Athos in his letter concerning the invasion of Tartars (1521-2), M-I, 150. In this place he says that if he cannot be allowed to return to Athos, let the Grand Prince allow him to go where a monk, Clement, was allowed to go. On Clement see: RZHIGA 1934, 96 and RGM, I, 159 (no. 41). Maximus was not alone at that moment and he asked Basil III to let him go together with his brethren, M-I, 165. The Greek was not the only foreigner in Muscovite service whom the authorities did not allow to return to their homelands. Nicholas Bülow was not allowed to return to Germany (MILLER 1978, 399); a certain Greek, Mark met the same fate (PDS-KNT, 623-4 and HERBERSTEIN 2007, 156-7). Other similar stories in: MEDELIN – PATRINELIS 1971, chapter III.

<sup>298</sup>On these and other translations (on those completed for Vassian Patrikeev – below) cf. IVANOV 1969, 48-65. The earliest evidence of Maximus' meeting with Patrikeev come from the period when the former's knowledge of the Slavonic language was poor (during or at the end of the translation of the Psalter): RZHIGA 1934, 7, note 3. On the fact that the *Life of Our Lady* by Metaphrastes was translated 10 years before the trial 1531: KAZAKOVA 1960, 295.

translation of the *Homilies on St Matthew* was probably fulfilled jointly by Maximus and the monk of the Trinity – St Sergius monastery, Selivan, who constantly collaborated with the Greek throughout this period and his work was supervised and encouraged by Maximus. The Greek must have been especially proud of the *Homilies on St Matthew* because he wrote a special letter addressed to “Russians, Serbs and Bulgarians” on this translation.<sup>299</sup> The Greek was not the only person convinced of the importance of these works. It was confirmed by his contemporaries. Maximus’ translations (as well as his other works) aroused special interest among monks from the Kirillo-Belozerskii monastery, in the circle of Gurii Tushin, and progressively became more and more popular and copied.<sup>300</sup>

Most of the above mentioned translations (the *Psalter*, the *Homilies* by John Chrysostom and the *Lives of Saints* by Metaphrastes) were made by Maximus the Greek in cooperation with all, or some, of his four assistants. Two translators, Dimitri Gerasimov and Vlas were already experienced in Biblical translation. They participated in the initiative of Abp Gennadii, translating for him some parts of the Bible from Latin. The two copyists were: the above-mentioned monk Selivan (who learnt Greek with Maximus and became also a translator) and Michael Medovartsev. Isaac Sobaka, another professional copyist and a partner of Medovartsev, also collaborated with Maximus.

It was well known that Gerasimov, Vlas, Selivan and Medovartsev helped Maximus during his work on the *Psalter* but earlier, at least Vlas, had also helped him to translate the *Apostol*.<sup>301</sup>

299On both translations: IVANOV 1969, 48-9. On the *Homilies on St Matthew* see: SINITSYNA 2006<sup>a</sup>, 16-17; СВИДЕТЕЛЬСТВО СЕЛИВАНА, 74; СКАЗАНИЕ ИЗВЕСТНО, 95. We do not know exactly when Maximus worked on the *Homilies on St John* but it had to be done roughly at the same period as the previous ones, cf. SINITSYNA 1977, 66. Maximus translated also Gregory of Nazianzus (cf. BULANIN 1984, chapter II) and other patristic fragments. The whole catalogue of these translations: BULANIN 1984, 182-190. The Letter to Russian, Serbs and Bulgarians: M-I, 355-7. Maximus and Selivan probably worked together on the *Homilies on St Mathew* because Selivan says that the work was executed “разумом же и наказанием премудрѣшаго старца Максима” (СВИДЕТЕЛЬСТВО СЕЛИВАНА, 74) and Maximus says that it was done by Selivan (M-I, 355).

300See: SINITSYNA 1977, 66-7 and M-I, 492. The works of Maximus and information about him certainly reached Kirillo-Belozerskii monastery through Vassian Patrikeev, a former member of this community, and – as Gurii Tushin – a disciple of Nil Sorskii. Tushin had in his hand a copy of Patrikeev’s *Kormchaia*. He edited it and copied some articles from this work, see: PLIGUZOV 2002, 53 and KAZAKOVA 1988<sup>c</sup> (SKK). We know nothing about Maximus’ contacts with Tushin but the earliest, known to us, copy of Maximus’ letter to Basil III about Athonite monasteries was made by the Greek’s collaborator, monk Selivan in Mikhail Medovartsev’s workshop and sent to Kirillo-Belozerskii monastery for Gurii, M-I, 407. CHRYSOCHOÏDIS 1998, 109 says that a copy of the *Homilies on St Matthew* from about 1560 is preserved also in the library of Vatopedi and “seems to have been sent to Vatopaidi as a sign of the regard of Russians for the monastery from which Maximus originated.”

301See corresponding entries in SKK: KAZAKOVA 1988<sup>d</sup>, BULANINA 1988, BULANINA 1989, DMITRIEVA 1989<sup>a</sup>, DMITRIEVA 1988<sup>c</sup>. On Vlas’ help with the translation of the *Apostol*: IVANOV 1969, 44; on Vlas’ and Gerasimov’s participation with the *Homilies on St John*, *ibid.*, 48; on Selivan’s and Medovartsev’s participation in the translation of the *Life of Our Lady* by Metaphrastes: SUDNYE SPISKI, 100-102; on Vlas’ and Gerasimov’s participation in the correction of the *Triodion*: M-II, 55. In time, the help of Gerasimov and Vlas was not so

These four collaborators were assigned to the Greek because his grasp of the Slavonic language was insufficient. The process of translating was therefore quite complicated. Gerasimov wrote to his friend: “And now, my lord, he [Maximus] is translating the Commented Psalter from Greek for the Grand Prince, and we, with Vlas, stay with him alternating: he speaks in Latin and we speak in Russian to the scribes.”<sup>302</sup> Another reason for employing as many as four assistants was certainly a desire to accelerate the work. It must have been a tough task for Maximus. He was alone while his helpers alternated. No wonder that he complained to Karpov that he had no time to breathe calmly.<sup>303</sup>

They worked in the monastery of Nicholas the Old (Николы Старого), where non-Russian Orthodox monks used to stay in Moscow. Medovartsev had a well equipped scriptorium there that produced books of high quality. It was very close to the Kremlin where Maximus lived in the Chudov monastery so he was able to walk to the scriptorium every day. Certainly during the corrections of the Russian books, and perhaps from the very beginning of Maximus’ translation in Medovartsev’s scriptorium, the work was supervised by Vassian Patrikeev.<sup>304</sup>

These circumstances show again that the authorities attached great significance to this mission. Maximus received as helpers the best translators and scribes in Moscow and their work was overseen by a man who was, at the time, one of the most important personages in the state. Maximus, with his philological and editorial competences had not his equal in Moscow.

Firstly he brought with him his erudition but also some books. Both were new in Moscow. Before Maximus, philological and grammatical knowledge in Muscovy was very poor.<sup>305</sup> His appearance in the northern country meant an essential change. Thanks to his

---

necessary. Maximus continued learning Slavonic and became more and more proficient. Apart from that, especially Gerasimov had other important diplomatic duties. Selivan and Medovartsev however worked with Maximus probably till his imprisonment. The translation of the *Homilies on St Matthew* was finished in 1524.

302“А нынѣ, господине, переводить Псалтирь съ греческого толкововую великому князю, а мы съ Власомъ у него сидимъ перемѣняяся: онъ сказываетъ по-латыньски, а мы сказываемъ по-русски писаремъ”, GORSKII 1859, 190. In the СКАЗАНИЕ ИЗВѢСТНО, 94f we read that Maximus *wrote* in Latin and the translators *talked* in Slavonic. Cf. also M-II, 55.

303See: M-I, 174. This expression is surprisingly similar to Manuzio’s and Erasmus’ expression on the intensity of work in Manuzio’s printing shop, see above, note 89.

304See: SUDNYE SPISKI, 107. On Medovartsev’s scriptorium see: DMITRIEVA 1989<sup>a</sup> (SKK), with further literature.

305See: IVANOV 1972-74, part II, 119. Ivanov enumerates grammatical and lexical works by Maximus and supposes that the Greek may have wanted to write a kind of grammatical manual. NEMIROVSKII 1964, 79 quotes Abakumov (С.И. Абакумов, Вопросы пунктации в трудах русских книжников XV - XVIII вв., in: Ученые записки, Т. 12. Фак-т языка и литературы, Труды кафедры русского языка, Вып. 1, Москва 1948, с. 9; Московский областной педагогический университет) who considered that Maximus the Greek’s remarks about grammar are based on Constantine Laskaris’ Grammar. ИКОННИКОВ 1915, 583 says that since the second half of the sixteenth century, under influence of Maximus and his disciples, John of Damascus’ Grammar had started being used in teaching.

excellent Italian teachers and his contact with Manuzio he was able not just to translate but also to use modern philological instruments that render his translations much more faithful. Being aware of the distance separating Western philology from the competence of Muscovite translators, he enumerated what is required in order to render a text correctly: not only a good command of the foreign language (which, in case of Greek, is not an easy task in itself) but also proficiency in grammar, rhetoric, poetics and even philosophy.<sup>306</sup>

His achievements confirmed that he himself was able to fulfil this requirement. An example of his philological skills was the identification of Chrysostom's authorship of a commentary to a psalm on the base of an analysis of the author's language.<sup>307</sup>

The books that Maximus brought from Greece were also important for the Russian culture because they contained the heritage of the Byzantine thought and learning, largely unknown in Moscow. The encyclopaedia of *Suida* was one of them. Probably Maximus also took with him a collection of Greek poetry. An interesting question, still unsolved, is whether he also owned an edition of the printed Bible.<sup>308</sup>

## IMPROVING AND CORRECTIONS OF RUSSIAN BOOKS

Maximus, with his philological knowledge and editorial practice, did not need much

---

306On the competence of a translator: M-I, 164; M-II, 136-7.145. Cf. IAGICH 1885-95, 585-6 and IKONNIKOV 1915, 583-4. 588. Selivan (СВИДЕТЕЛЬСТВО СЕЛИВАНА, 74) wrote about Maximus that he was fluent in Greek, Latin and Russian, that he could compose [poems] in classical metre and “и во всѣх благоискусна суца, и много от человекъ нынешняго времени отстоаща мудростию, и разумом и остроумиемъ” Cf. however STRAKHOV 1994, 101 who considered that Maximus did not avoid some literal translations (which is not the best practice in the work of a translator). Yet Strakhov herself says that this problem needs further research. Cf. also below, note 425.

307Cf. M-I, 161. SINITSYNA 1977, 69 shows how Maximus worked on a translation looking for a synonym, returning to the same text a few times in order to render it in the best possible way. Cf. also: KOVTUN 1975, 50-1.

308About the Greek books that Maximus brought with him: K-II, 419 and PHILARET 1842, 95. Possibly he brought the *Life of saint Sava, Serbian archbishop* (SUDNYE SPISKI, 113). The fact that he owned a copy of the *Suida* Lexicon is indisputable. BULANIN 1979, 274-5 found that he had the copy of the 1499 edition. BULANIN 1984, 17 (note 24), 18-19, 24 (note 54), 27 gives some evidence that Maximus had also the Anthology of Greek poetry. It could be the Greek Anthology (Anthology of Planudes), edited by Laskaris, published in Florence in 1494 by Lawrence de Alopa and reprinted in 1503 by Aldo (Bulanin is wrong that this anthology was published in 1495 by Aldo). NB, a copy of this work, with Laskaris' personal notes is preserved in the Library of the Russian Academy of Science in Petersburg (incunabulum no. 56, see: Catalogue BAN BOBROVA 1963 and FONKICH 1965, 269). It is worth examining whether Maximus may have brought other manuscripts like Synod. 470 (see: CATALOGUE SINOD VLADIMIR 1894) with the epigram by Gregoropoulos or a few MSS from the sixteenth century containing work by Manuel of Corinth and preserved in Russia (cf. MANUEL, Reply to Francis and MANUEL, On Mark of Ephesus. Two MSS of this work was certainly not brought to Moscow by Maximus. These are: ГИМ, СИН. No. 244 ЛЛ. 112-123 об; No. 243, ЛЛ. 79-82 об. They were sent to Moscow by Dositheos, patriarch of Jerusalem in 1692, cf. FONKICH 2003, 258. I do not have information about other MSS). Before 1525 he also used in his writings Gregory of Nazianzus' homilies but employed rather the existing Slavonic translation, see: BULANIN 1984, 38-40. Perhaps Maximus had a printed edition of the Bible. It is very probable that he had the edition of the book of Psalms by Dekadyos, cf. VERNER 2017, 51-3.

time to notice that the old Russian translations of the Bible and of liturgical books contained many errors, sometimes seriously distorting the sense of the original. His first corrections were certainly spontaneous. Maximus said that – when he read the Triodion and saw the errors – he could not bear such blasphemies and corrected the text (M-II, 137). He probably had introduced the first corrections in the *Tolkovyj Apostol*, and certainly in the *Psalter*,<sup>309</sup> then he corrected other works. Later, defending his amendments and justifying his actions, Maximus proved to his interlocutors the many mistakes made by previous translators and copyists, underlining the fact they resulted from their very weak knowledge of the Greek language.<sup>310</sup>

It seems that the first spontaneous corrections turned into a wider programme of improving old Russian ecclesiastical books. The question is: whether this idea had been a part of the task foreseen for the Greek translator from the very beginning when the Grand Prince had decided to invite him to Moscow or had it appeared only after Maximus' discoveries. Patrikeev said – if we can believe Medovartsev's account during the trial of 1531 – that it was Maximus who made Muscovites aware that their books were corrupted: “[Our Russian books] By the devil are written and not by the Holy Spirit. [...] And all local books are false, and local rules are mis-rules and not rules. Until Maximus we used these books to blaspheme God, and not to glorify or pray to him. Now, through Maximus and his teaching, we have come to know God.”<sup>311</sup>

In any case, important people and institutions were involved in correction of the Russian ecclesiastical books. At least some of these works were done in Michael Medovartsev's scriptorium and probably supervised by Patrikeev. His personal commitment was understandable. Maximus' discoveries corresponded with the prince Vassian's own research. Roughly at the same time as Maximus came to Moscow, Patrikeev realised that

---

309Maximus was accused (but he denied this accusation) that he had removed from the canonical text the verse Acts 8, 37 (SUDNYE SPISKI, 104) which – as a matter of fact – is absent in the main manuscripts. Since this verse contains a profession of faith in Jesus Christ, the accusation against Maximus was particularly serious. Regardless of Maximus' denial, this fact could indicate that he had introduced some correction in the *Apostol*. On corrections of the *Psalter* see: KOVTUN 1975, 50; SINITSYNA 1977, 71f. The correction of the book of *Triodion* is best documented because we have the MS which Maximus, together with Medovartsev, used to establish the accurate text and where he noted his comments, see: SINITSYNA 1977, 70; FONKICH 1977, 15.

310Maximus devoted two of his works to the question of the correction of Russian books: *Слово отвѣщательно о исправлении книгъ русских* (M-II, 136-144) and *Слово отвѣщательно о книжном исправлении* (M-II, 145-149). On errors of both previous translators and copyists: M-III, 136. A similar statement in СКАЗАНИЕ В КОРПУСЕ СОЧИНЕНИЙ, 82, 88. In his *Confession of the Orthodox faith* (M-II, 57) he told that he had translated the *Psalter* and corrected other books that contained many errors.

311See: SUDNYE SPISKI, 105: “От диявола писаны, а не от святаго Духа [...] А здешние книги все лъжбывы, а правила здешние кривила, а не а правила. А до Максима есмя по тем нашим книгам Боша хулили, а не славили, ни молили. А ныне есмя Бога опознали Максимом и его учением.” I improved the English translation by OBOLENSKY 1999, 213. Maximus reacted to this testimony disapprovingly so it could be yet another forgery of this lawsuit.



Russian ecclesiastical books contained contradictions. The presence of the learned monk from Athos was therefore an opportunity he eagerly seized, asking him for translations for his *Kormchaia* (see below).<sup>312</sup>

However, the prince-monk probably acted not only in his own name. Both Patrikeev and Maximus during the trial of 1531 independently testified that metropolitan Varlaam and other bishops ordered them to introduce changes into ecclesiastical books.<sup>313</sup> Since Vlas and Gerasimov, the Grand Prince's highly qualified diplomats, were involved at least in one of these corrections, the *Triodion*, it cannot have been done without the Grand Prince's consent.<sup>314</sup> Thus, the idea to correct the books was not a private initiative but on the wish of, at least, a part of the ruling circles. A part only, because there were also conservative forces in these circles and they did not surrender. The very idea of correcting sacred books was a shock for those in Muscovy who pursued a traditionally solemn attitude to the written heritage. There were people from Maximus' entourage who had broader views, knew Greek (Selivan, Nil Kurliatev) and who accepted the corrections but others, such as Medovartsev, reacted with religious awe: "I cannot expunge, my lord. A trembling seized me and a terror fell on me." The sacred text was often treated as an inspired icon, without taking into account its human, historical aspect, so every change was a sacrilege. The Slavonic language was holy, so the old translation was the original, not the Greek archetype! The text and the language were considered as one entity so grammar may have been treated as a devil's invention.<sup>315</sup> One can hardly imagine an approach more distant to Maximus'. For him, who was trained in Laskaris' school, grammatical knowledge was not only good and important. It was essential for the proper understanding of a text. Two worlds clashed here, one with another.

---

312On Medovartsev scriptorium: M-I, 76 and DMITRIEVA 1989<sup>a</sup> (SKK). Patrikeev's involvement in the activities of Medovartsev's scriptorium when Maximus worked there is attested in SUDNYE SPISKI, 102-106. Patrikeev lived in the same monastery of Nicholas the Old where Medovartsev had his workshop. Probably between 1517 and 1520-ties Patrikeev realised that the Russian books contained contradictions, cf. PLIGUZOV 2002, 139. A certain Greek merchant, Mark, who also considered Russian books to be corrupted, was captured. Jurij D. Trachaniota interceded for him and because of that he was temporarily deprived the Prince's favour, see: HERBERSTEIN 2007, 156-7. This passage concerns the year 1522-23 so Mark might have been influenced by Maximus. On Mark see also above, note 297.

313See: SUDNYE SPISKI, 106-7 and KAZAKOVA 1960, 286. More details concerning this question below in this chapter, text and note 463.

314On Vlas' and Gerasimov's involvement in the translation of the *Triodion* see: K-I, 33-34. Later, in 1530-ties Maximus addressed towards ruling group saying that he had translated and corrected books *for them* (see below, note 254). We do not know whether he referred to his works from before 1525 or to his late writings.

315Medovartsev: "Не могу, господине, заглаживать, дрожь мя великая поимала и ужас на меня напал" (SUDNYE SPISKI, 106), cf. also SINITSYNA 1977, 73. Books were esteemed in Rus' very much to the extent that they acquired a quasi dogmatic significance and therefore should have been unchangeable, IKONNIKOV 1915, 11-12. An example of the solemn attitude towards the inherited text was also the fact the apocrypha remained within the Russian canon of the Bible very long time, till seventeenth century. On the sacred text as an icon: KAMCHATNOV 2002, 21. 23.

The tension was all the stronger because – as Maximus documented – errors in old translations resulted in grave dogmatic misconceptions. The Greek found in old, corrupted translations traces of Arianism, Nestorianism and other heresies (M-II, 137-43). The presence of these heretical passages gave irrefutable arguments justifying the correction of the old translations. The effects of Maximus' work exceeded however the expectations of those who commanded the emendations. Unfortunately, he himself could not avoid errors. They resulted from his still weak command of Slavonic and the necessity to use the mediation of Latin in his work (M-II, 55). Inaccuracies that arose from this mediation would become later one of reasons for Maximus' condemnation.

### A LITERARY CLUB, A CONSPIRACY OR A GROUP OF REFORMERS?

Maximus rapidly became aware of the degree of corruption in the Russian books, the educated people in Muscovy also quickly realised how useful his learning could be to enlarge their own, modest knowledge. The ancient tradition was appropriated in Moscow only to a very little extent. Maximus' erudition was an opportunity to fill this gap. A large part of his works were replies to various questions directed to him. Also his translations from the *Suida* Lexicon were made in order to help his interlocutors understand both ancient and modern texts.<sup>316</sup>

Maximus works were only one aspect of the impact he had on Muscovite elite. His personal meetings with people had equal if not greater significance. They took place in the two monasteries where Maximus lived in Moscow: in Chudov and in Simonovo. Some scholars wanted to find in these gatherings a kind of literary club, analogical to Italian academies, others: dissident meetings.<sup>317</sup> We have no information about the meetings in Maximus' cell in the Chudov monastery but the minutes of the investigation before the trial in 1525 bring some details of people visiting him in Simonovo. Athanasius (Афонасей), living in the same cell as Maximus, testified that the following people visited Maximus: Ivan Bersen' -Beklemishev,

---

<sup>316</sup>See, e.g.: letters to Vassilij Tuchkov (M-I, 345-353); the letter to Karpov about Leviathan (M-I, 335-6).

Maximus probably used the *Suida* as an instrument during his translation of the Psalter (SINITSYNA 1977, 67) but his written translations from some entries of this book were executed for others. On these translations: BULANIN 1984, chapter III and PLIGUZOV 2002, 90, 189, 202-3. On the page 189 Pliguzov supposes that Maximus used for his translation the edition of *Suida* published by Aldo in 1514 but more convincing are Bulanin's arguments for the 1494 edition, cf. above, note 308. On limited reception of the ancient tradition in Moscow see: THOMPSON 1999.

<sup>317</sup>Cf. KAZAKOVA 1970, 155; KLUCHEVSKIJ 1957, 161-4. The latter think that Maximus' circle in Simonovo was a group of dissidents. He emphasised that Kholmokoy was a relative of the disgraced Bersen's and that Tuchkov was the one who was the most rude person to Ivan III. If Maximus really was inspired by Italian academies, the first point of reference may have been Aldo's Neakademia but – since meetings in Moscow were held in monastery – so, perhaps, the Greek had in front of his eyes rather the Camaldolese academy in Florence (see above, notes 56 and 57).

kniaz Ivan Tokmak, Vassilij Tuchkov, Ivan Danilov Saburov and kniaz Andrej Kholmokoy. Athanasius said that they spoke “about books and discussed literary questions”. It was certainly the main subject of these meetings and Athanasius assisted at them. Sometimes, however, when Ivan Bersen’ came to visit Maximus, the Greek asked them to leave (Athanasius with other monk probably, because Athanasius used plural) and spoke to Bersen’ face to face. Then, they certainly discussed delicate issues. Some of them were named during the investigation: the comparison between the Grand Prince and the sultan, the Grand Prince’s attitude towards Beklemishev, injustices of the ruler and others.<sup>318</sup>

Maximus’ guests, belonged to the higher strata of society. They had received an education so they were able to discuss with the Greek monk some philosophical problems. For some of them the Athonite was like a window that allowed them to see the world they had heard about but almost none of them had seen.

The cell in Simonovo may have been indeed a kind of academy visited by high society, especially by those who were interested in contacts with the outside world. Tuchkov may have been one of this kind of visitors, wanting, e.g., to satisfy his curiosity concerning about Manuzio’s typographical sign (M-I, 345-7). For Maximus however these meetings with his noble interlocutors may have been something more than just answering their questions. The selection of entries that he translated from the Suida was not accidental and it rather suggests that Maximus had a deliberate educational program that he wanted to implant in their minds.<sup>319</sup>

There were however also those who turned to Maximus not only out of curiosity but with questions of great importance for them. Fedor Karpov, who considered himself Maximus’ friend, confessing his doubts and great anxiety (M-I, 337) asked the Greek to clarify a few biblical passages. The whole letter testifies to something more than just searching for an answer to a specific question. It seems to be a struggle for clarity, to avoid doubts when a mind strives to explain the incomprehensible in the most important text, the Bible. Other people again, such as Ivan Bersen’-Beklemishev, tried to use Maximus’ experience, in order to analyse the political and social situation of Muscovy. Surprisingly various people were Maximus’ companions: on one hand the above mentioned Beklemishev who regarded the past with

---

<sup>318</sup>We do not know when Maximus moved from Chudov monastery to Simonovo but certainly he lived for some time in Simonovo, see: SD-Ob, 7. Athanasius’ words: “они говоривали съ Максимомъ книгами и спиралися межъ себя о книжномъ” *ibid.*, 3-4. On the subjects of the conversations with Bersen’ *ibid.*, *passim*. Vasilij Tuchkov visited Maximus more than once (“Василей ходил [so not only once] к Максиму”, *SUDNYE SPISKI*, 116). Perhaps he learned Greek, cf. *PLIGUZOV* 2002, 196. More information about participants of meetings in Simonovo: *ZIMIN* 1971, 66-70.

<sup>319</sup>*PLIGUZOV* 2002, 202-3.

nostalgia saying that Basil III had changed old customs and that with Zoe Paleolog disasters had come to Muscovy; on the other hand Vassian Patrikeev who wanted to change Russian ecclesiastical tradition, even if he did it in the name of the tradition.<sup>320</sup>

No less important for the Russian Church and perhaps even for society were Maximus' contacts with those who lived inside the monastery. Simonovo was the Grand Princely monastery and was directly answerable to the metropolitan. For some time very different people lived there. Prominent representatives of one group were: the prince-monk, Vassian Patrikeev, Maximus the Greek and, for a short period, also the metropolitan Varlaam after his dismissal from the see. In 1522 another group of monks came to Moscow. They arrived from Volokolamsk with the new metropolitan Daniel, and settled also in Simonovo. The presence, in the same place, of these influential personalities must have inevitably led to serious discussions on the present state and the future of the Muscovite Church. Among other topics, the legitimacy of the way Moscow metropolitans were instituted was probably discussed. Evidently Patrikeev discussed with Maximus his idea of the new redaction of the *Kormchaia*. We find also traces of the confrontation between Patrikeev, Nil of Sora's disciple and Dositheos (Досифей) Toporkov, Joseph of Volokolamsk's disciple (it was he, among others, who came to Simonovo when Daniel became metropolitan). Their cohabitation was not however limited to dissension. Some of them exploited the fruits of the others' work. Maximus translated also for Toporkov (or at least the latter used Maximus' translations in his work) and Patrikeev took advantage of Toporkov's work!<sup>321</sup> Simonovo was a privileged place, a real intellectual laboratory where the positions of the protagonists were shaped by mutual interaction. As time passed the tension grew so that purely intellectual solutions were insufficient. The authorities – knowing of the development of the situation – reached the conclusion that Maximus' and Patrikeev's ideas were too dangerous to allow them continue their work. The trial of 1525 with the accompanying events must have been a shock for the Simonovo. Between 1526 and 1530

---

320 Karpov names himself Maximus' friend in his letter to Maximus: M-I, 339. A phrase illustrates very well Karpov's mood (M-I, 337): "Азь же нынѣ изнемогаю умом, въ глубину впадъ съмнѣния, прошу и мил ся дѣю, да ми нѣкая целебная присыплеши и мысль мою упокоиши." The whole letter is in M-I, 337-9. Cf. also KLIBANOV 1996, 184. On Beklemishev: SD-Ob, 5. 11.

321 SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 51 observed that Maximus' letters, even those concerning ecclesiastical matters, were mostly directed to lay people. Perhaps it was caused by the fact that he discussed these issues with clergy rather orally, in the monastery. On Varlaam in Simonovo see: ZIMIN 1977, 284-5. Varlaam had also been archimandrite of Simonovo before he was appointed metropolitan. Sinitsyna in M-II, 409 shows that *Сказание о сохранении святости царствующими городами* (Z-156) was probably addressed to Gerasim Zamyckii, archimandrite of Simonovo before 1525. If, according to Maximus' conviction, Constantinople has not lost its status, then the arguments for the independent institutions of Moscow metropolitans lose their force. On Patrikeev and his confrontation with Toporkov: KAZAKOVA 1960, 296-7. Cf. also: PLOGUZOV 2002, 13, 90, 152, 165-8. Last two fragments show their collaboration.

the monastery did not have its own archimandrite and was administrated by a group of elders.<sup>322</sup>

#### ANTI-LATIN POLEMICS

It was probably before Maximus started to collaborate more closely with Patrikeev that he committed himself to anti-Latin polemics. His first letter on this topic (to Nicholas Bülow) was written in 1520-21. While the Greek certainly knew the themes and arguments of the Catholic – Orthodox polemics well, he needed more time to brief himself on the situation of the Muscovite Church.<sup>323</sup>

An intelligent opposition against the Latin propaganda was much needed in Moscow at that moment, in the face of a developing diplomatic action of Emperor Maximilian aimed at convincing Basil III to join the anti-Turkish crusade. At the same time, papal diplomacy strove to induce him to accept the ecclesiastical union. The reward for Basil was to be the royal title.

The Grand Prince was interested in maintaining a good relationship with the West but not in submission to Western authority. Muscovite diplomats knew how to shift efficiently between emphasising Basil's will to fight the *infidels* and, at the same time, not involve their country in a conflict with Turkey.<sup>324</sup>

An effective struggle against unionist activity was a much more difficult task and the Russian clerks were not equipped to do it. Their protagonist who represented the Roman idea of the union, a German doctor, Nicholas Bülow, was a very learned person and efficient in promoting this conception. His activity coincided – not accidentally as we can suppose – with other attempts of the Holy See to convince Moscow of the idea of the union and a common fight against the sultan. Bülow went to Rus' twice (1490 - about 1504 and 1508-1548?) so he lived there for about half of his life.<sup>325</sup> His good command of Slavonic, his erudition and clever strategy increased the number of his followers. He attempted to demonstrate that the

<sup>322</sup>See: PASSEK 1843, 215. Slightly different chronology gave STROEV 1877, 150.

<sup>323</sup>We still do not have a precise dating of many Maximus' works from this period. Recent research in this question we find in SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 34-50. Maximus recalled his confrontations with the Latins during his stay on Athos, see above note 243. Besides, his acquaintance, Manuel of Corinth, wrote a few works against the Latins, cf. PODSKALSKY 1988, 87-8.

<sup>324</sup>See above, note 265 and SINITSYNA 1998, 217-219 (here on the royal title). Nicholas (von) Schönberg, one of papal envoys was quite optimistic about the success of his mission and he wrote to the pope that his task may be hopefully fulfilled, *ibid.*, 218.

<sup>325</sup>On Bülow and the chronology of his stay in Muscovy: BULANIN 1988<sup>a</sup> (SKK). We do not have direct data that Bülow was sent to Moscow by the pope but the case of Centurione who fulfilled papal mission while being officially a merchant suggest that it was possible. Another indication is the fact that he received an annual rent from the pope. It is confirmed during Julius II's pontificate (Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste*, IV, 734, quoted by: SINITSYNA 2002<sup>a</sup>, note 15). About Bülow's stay at the papal court up to 1506: MILLER 1978, 399. On the links between Bülow's activity and other attempts of the Holy See: SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 39-41.

differences between the Orthodox and the Catholic Church were insignificant. Using the Eucharistic idea of the bread made from many grains and wine made from many grapes the German doctor tried to persuade the Orthodox that the acceptance of the union would be a gesture of Christian virtue. In order to achieve his goal – according to his Muscovite polemist – he glorified the Orthodox faith and avoided speaking about the differences.<sup>326</sup> Moreover, as Bülow maintained that both Catholics and Orthodox acknowledged the same baptism, the same faith and hope, so – therefore – he preached that they had the same Church!<sup>327</sup>

Such teaching, very different from the Orthodox exclusivism, found some adherents in Muscovy. Bülow's approach was especially attractive for those who considered Western thought as a value. Visibly, it allowed them to build bridges between their world and the newly discovered West. Among them were Fedor Karpov, Vlas, the translator and others.<sup>328</sup>

An amazing fact was that Bülow for some time was able to propagate his ideas without serious counteraction on the part of authorities. Visibly the ferment in the Muscovite Church and society gave this situation the opportunity to develop in various directions. The German doctor, through his activity in Moscow, managed to achieve great authority and his ideas circulated in Moscow. At the beginning of Maximus' polemics with him (about 1520-21), Bülow seemed to be, for Karpov, even more credible than the Athonite monk. Karpov had already consulted with Nicholas on some questions of the Trinitarian theology, and visibly accepted his point of view because he would later reproach Maximus for his interpretation which did not match the German's one.<sup>329</sup>

326See: M-I, 244, 251, 253 (the last fragment about concealing differences) and an anonymous Muscovite anti-Latin polemic published by ЗИМАКИН 1880, 321. On Nicholas' followers: *ibid.*, 320 and e.g. M-I, 176.

327Bülow's views are expressed in his letter to archbishop Vassian Sanin from Rostov quoted by a Russian polemicist whose work was published and commented by ЗИМАКИН 1880. According to this polemicist (*ibid.* 321-2) Bülow maintained: "Мы едины церков имамы с вашею, и едино тѣло есмь о Христѣ, и един дух и едина душа, и едины надежу [sic!] звания имѣюще, и единого с вами Господа чествующе, и едины вѣру держаще, и едино крещеніе приѣмлюще, и едины церковь почитающе, и единымъ всяческимъ началомъ и конечнымъ именованіемъ Единого быти Господа и Единого Бога и едины вѣру, и едины церков и едино крещеніе." The text of this anonymous polemic is not coherent. In one place Bülow seems to be conciliatory, in another he calls the Orthodox apostates. Perhaps the compiler of the document used various sources or introduced a gloss to the main text. Zhmakin thinks that the positive expressions concerning Orthodoxy come from Bülow and the mention of apostasy comes from the Russian polemicist who thought that it was Bülow's real (but hidden) idea (*ibid.* 322). This work was probably written between 1506 and 1515, cf. SINITSYNA 1998, 182 and BULANIN 1988<sup>a</sup> (SKK).

328That Karpov was interested in Bülow's ideas is clear from his whole correspondence with Maximus: M-I, 139-44, 172-242, e.g. 139, 173, 187, 230. On Vlas see: M-I, 139. See also: *ibid.*, 141-2 and SINITSYNA 1977, 79.

Maximus spoke about Bülow's supporters in plural (M-I, 176 and 187) so certainly they were more numerous than two.

329Only at the end of his life Bülow probably fell into disgrace, see: K-I, 455 and BULANIN 1988<sup>a</sup> (SKK). Perhaps his situation was similar to that of the so called judaizers. As long as they had support at court, no harm could happen to them. On the circulation of Bülow's ideas see M-I, 141-2 quoted below, note 331. On Bülow's authority and Karpov's reproaches for Maximus: M-I, 139 (this work was written about 1520-21) and also 173.

Yet, besides fascinated adherents, Bülow found determined critics. For people interested in contacts with the West his ideas may have been like a waft of fresh air but certainly for the majority of Orthodox people his propaganda provoked confusion.<sup>330</sup> Some tried to oppose Nicholas' ideas: Vassian, archbishop of Rostov (between 1506 and 1515) asked an unknown author to refute Bülow's ideas. Anxious Karpov turned to Maximus. A scene, described by Karpov himself, illustrates well the unrest among people who were confronted with Nicholas Bülow's activity and Maximus' answers. One day (it was about 1521-22) Karpov met in St. Nicholas church an agitated orthodox priest who showed him, written on a piece of paper, one sentence from Maximus' answer to Nicholas. Visibly either the priest or Karpov did not understand well the sentence which was a part of the trinitarian dogma concerning the Father. On Vlas' advice Karpov turned directly to Maximus, asking for clarification. Again Michael Munekhin (Misiur'), a *diak* (government official, clerk) of the Grand Prince in Pskov, who received a letter from Bülow containing his *philosophy*, wrote (about 1523-4) to Philotheus (Филофей), a monk from the Eleasar monastery in Pskov, asking for clarification.<sup>331</sup>

The appearance of Maximus must have been difficult for the German doctor whose teaching was spreading successfully in educated Muscovite circles. Up until then Bülow had not had a worthy opponent. In his argumentation he united skilfully the conviction about the real unity of both Churches with accusations against Muscovites that they neither wanted this unity, nor accept his teaching (M-I, 251. 248). He attempted to show that the Latin Church was faithful to the Gospel, that she had not introduced any changes to the Creed which was one of the main Orthodox accusation against the Latins.<sup>332</sup>

330On critics and confusion cf. anonymous Muscovite polemics in: ЗИМАКИН 1880, 321.

331The anonymous work was published by ЗИМАКИН 1880, for its dating, *ibid.* 321. Cf. also: СИНИТСЫНА 1997, 46.

The scene in St. Nicholas church was described by Karpov in his letter to Maximus dated 1521 22 (M-I, 141-2): «Преже бо малыхъ дней стоящу ми въ церкви святого Николы на мѣсте стояниа моего внезапно прииде священникъ тоя церкви ко мнѣ и глагола ми: «Вѣси ли, какова послания посла Максимъ къ Николаю?» Азъ же рѣхъ: «Ни». И подаде ми бумажку, в ней же написано: «Вѣруи просто и неиспытно въ Единого Бога, въ трехъ ипостасѣхъ и лицѣхъ познаваема, сирѣчь Отца нероженна и безначална, ниже от Себе, ниже от инаго бытие имущаго». Азъ же въспросихъ его: «Что суть сиа, и о чемъ блазнишися?» Онъ же отвѣща: «Како пишет, ниже от Себе, ниже от инаго бытие имущаго?» Азъ же рѣхъ ему: «Престани, Стефане, – се бо имя ему, – не можеша ты одолѣти словомъ ему, вѣмъ азъ Максима, не пишетъ безъ свидѣтельства отъ святого Писания, заимствуя, раздаваетъ намъ». И такимъ словомъ утолихъ того надмение. И послѣди, бумажку ону в руку имѣя, идохъ на великого князя дворъ и тамъ по случаю обрѣтохъ Власа толмача и бумажку ону ему явихъ. Онъ же рече ми: «Иди, посовѣтуй с нимъ самъ, да и бумажку, юже в руку имѣешь, ему яви, мнитъ ми ся, – рече, – о конечномъ непостиженствѣ то онъ писалъ». Азъ же рѣхъ: «Чего ради его тружу язъ давяго ради бумажку попа, яко по игрѣхъ приимъ, – глаголю, – с тобою рѣхъ, ижеа хошетъ с Максимомъ о богословии стязатися».» Munekhin's letter is not preserved but we have Philotheus' answer published by: СИНИТСЫНА 1998, 335-47. The link between Maximus' and Philotheus' answers to Bülow's ideas is also attested in the later manuscript tradition. In a MS from 1603, a short redaction of Maximus' letter to Karpov about astrology and Philotheus' letter to Munekhin appear together, cf. M-I, 465-6.

332M-I, 244. 251. To answer the Orthodox arguments concerning the Latin additions to the Creed Bülow appealed to the legend relating that the Symbol of the Apostles were written really by the Apostles, see: M-I, 249.

The Greek quickly recognised the danger the influential physician presented for the Orthodox community. A redactor of Maximus' letters against the Latins wrote that the Greek, when he saw one of Nicholas' writings, armed himself against his intrigues and wrote this *Slovo*.<sup>333</sup>

Maximus attempted to refute systematically Bülow's argumentation and, since Nicholas emphasised that the Catholic Church remained faithful to the Apostolic tradition, the monk encouraged him to reject the Latin addition and to accept the real Catholic (съборныя) and Apostolic faith, obviously the one preserved in the Orthodox Church (M-I, 134).

His first letter to Nicholas (about 1520-1) was gentle. It even ended with the elegant apostrophe to the addressee: "If you accept that [the teaching of the Orthodox Church] with faith [...] we not only would pray for you before the Lord [...] but also we would listen to you as a teacher of the truth."<sup>334</sup> Later (between 1520 and 1524) the polemics became harsher, both in works directed against Bülow himself and in the replies addressed to Karpov. The Greek polemicised however only with the German doctor and not with his Russian adherents.<sup>335</sup> Certainly, he did not want to hurt his Muscovite hosts but he did want to save them from the dangers of Nicholas' propaganda.

Bülow's preaching was probably partially oral but from time to time he also wrote a treatise to promote the question of the union. One of them, the *Word about uniting Russians and Latins* may have been directed personally to Maximus and evoked a reply from the latter.<sup>336</sup>

In his other anti-Latin works the monk dealt virtually only with the matter of the *Filioque* but here he also touched other classical topics of the Orthodox-Catholic polemics: the

---

Maximus, unlike the Muscovite polemicist described by Zhmakin, emphasised rather Nicholas' reproaches directed towards Orthodox.

333The redactor's words (M-I, 253): "Максим же инок, уведев его прелестное списание и въоружился против кознем его благодатию Святого Духа и написал Слово сие."

334"Аще убо съ вѣрою сия приимеши и дѣломъ пріяте утвердиши, блаженъ воистинну о Христѣ будеши и его царствию съобщникъ. И мы не токмо молитвы пролиемъ про тебе предъ Господемъ, но аще и что душеполезно и богоугодно начнеши учить нас, усердно ушеса наша откроемъ тебѣ и услышимъ тебе, акы учителя и проповѣдника истинноюю." – M-I, 138.

335On the chronology of Maximus' anti-Latin works see: SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 35-40 and SINITSYNA 1977, 78. Apart from the letter to Bülow (M-I, no. 2) he wrote during this period also two letters to Karpov concerning their acquaintance (about 1520-1; M-I, nos. 3-4), two letters to Karpov against the Latins (the first written between July 1521 and December 1522 and second slightly later; M-I, nos. 7-8) and a work against Bülow's *О соединении Русом и Латыном* (between 1520 and 1525; M-I, no. 9). Maximus spoke openly that his accusations were directed against Bülow: M-I, 176 and also 173. Cf. SINITSYNA 1977, 87.

336On the previous Nicholas' treatise see above, note 327. Maximus, in his *Slovo* against the Bülow's work (M-I, 243-52) wrote that this Bülow's work was composed *against us* ("списанаго тобою на нас" - M-I, 252). If we understand *us* (нас) as relating to Maximus himself and not to all Orthodox, it would be a proof that Nicholas wrote to Maximus. In this case it is likely (since it was a *new* work) that it was written after the anti-Latin letters to Karpov and certainly before Bülow's change of fortune, i.e. between 1523 and 1524 (Sinitsyna in M-I, no. 9 dates it less precisely, between 1520 and 1525). Nicholas' original work is not preserved.



problem of unleavened bread used for the mass and of purgatory. It is very probable that Maximus wanted to compose a systematic anti-Latin treatise. Besides the letters and answers to Bülow he also compiled a complex of anti-Latin articles, including Photius' letters, and probably also translated them. This work was interrupted by the Greek's imprisonment but the corpus was copied (even when his author was under excommunication) and included into the *Great Menology* (Великие чѣтѣй минеи) by archbishop of Novgorod, Macarius (Макарий).<sup>337</sup>

#### ANTI-ASTROLOGICAL POLEMICS

Around that time Maximus also wrote anti-astrological works. Two are letters sent to Fedor Karpov and another one to unknown addressee or to the general public.<sup>338</sup> In fact, his anti-astrological argumentation was an integral part of the anti-Latin polemics. Muscovy had its own system of astrological beliefs which was well developed but the Greek directed the edge of his criticism not against it but against Western astrological prophecies.<sup>339</sup>

Two texts distributed in Moscow triggered Maximus into his anti-astrological activity: a fragment from the Western astrological *Almanac* prophesying a new deluge and a text concerning "the beginning of the Turks" (о началѣ турковъ – M-I, 268). Both of them (or their prototypes) Maximus might have known before. The *Almanac* (*Almanach nova*) by Johannes Stöffler and Jakob Pflaum, published first in Ulm in 1499, were afterwards republished a few times in Venice between 1508 and 1518. Trivolis was no longer in Italy but, since he kept in contact with his friends, he may have known the gossip from Venice. He knew other astrological publications: he recalled that astrological predictions were copied in Venice and elsewhere and even accessible on the market place (M-I, 291). They were certainly popular calendars containing information in many different fields, from religion to housekeeping, similar to the *Almanac*.

The text about "the beginning of the Turks" was a variant of a prophecy widely distributed in Western Europe, also in Savonarolian circles, at the end of the fifteenth century,

---

337See: BULANIN 1984, 85-94 and SINITSYNA 2002<sup>a</sup>, 132. Maximus was conscious of the importance of his anti-Latin works. SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 64, thinks that probably even before his imprisonment he started composing the first cycle of these writings.

338The first anti-astrological letter to Karpov was written between October 1522 and August 1523, the second: between September 1523 and February 1524 (this is the only Maximus' dated work from the first period). The third letter came from the period between February 1524 and February 1525, see: SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 41-2.

339On the Russian astrology see: RYAN 1999, 373-90. Philotheus also polemicalised with astrology in the context of Latin astrological works, see: SINITSYNA 1998, 177 and 182. About the unity of anti-Latin and anti-astrological polemics testifies also the title of Maximus' work written when the forecasted deluge did not happen: *Слово обличительно отчасти латынского злославіа, в нем же и на Альманака, иже възвелерѣчева потопа всемирного быти иже нѣкогда поминаемых губительнѣиша [...]* M-I, 359. At the end of this work (M-I, 371-2), focused mainly on anti-astrological issues, Maximus touched also on the question of the *Filioque*.

concerning the victory over the Turks and renewing of the Eastern Empire.<sup>340</sup>

Both of these texts are millenarian in character and at least one of them was linked to the name of Nicholas Bülow. It was he who distributed and probably also translated the *Almanac*. Maximus however seems not to be aware of this connection. Writing about the *Almanac* he never alluded to Bülow.<sup>341</sup>

As for the other work about “the beginnings of the Turks”, the Greek only once referred to a *German*, saying that it was from him that he received the text. Perhaps it was not Nicholas to whom Maximus alluded since in his other work criticising Bülow’s theological ideas he often mentioned his name.<sup>342</sup> It might have been another German who was involved in the proliferation of Western astrology. It is also possible that the Greek did not want to make this polemic personal as it was in the case of the Orthodox – Catholic confrontation. Astrology was certainly much more widely accepted in Moscow than unionist conceptions.

Maximus was not the only one who led this battle. Philotheus of Pskov, both refuted Bülow’s unionist propaganda like Maximus and held a position, similar to Maximus’, on the subject of astrology. In his reply to Michael Munekhin (Misiur’), Philotheus attempted to show him that it is God, not stars, who rules the universe, countries and peoples.<sup>343</sup>

This mobilisation against astrology may have been the result of not only theological reasons. If Latin astrology turned out to be effective, it would have been an argument for the superiority of Western ideas.<sup>344</sup>

---

340About the *Almanac* see: MILLER 1978, 401. On the Savonarolian prophecy: WEINSTEIN 1970, 65 and 231.

Another text of this kind was found in Russian archives, see: KAZAKOVA 1975, 62-70. Against Kazakova’s opinion, Sinitsyna rightly maintains that the text published by Kazakova and the fragment included in Maximus’ first letter to Karpov against astrology (called “about the beginning of the Turks”) had a common source, see: SINITSYNA 1998, 178. Strikingly, the document published by Kazakova indicates the year 1496 as a beginning of epochal changes. From this year comes also a letter written by an eremite, Angelo Fondi, who replied to the Florentines that the Constantinople empire would be renewed soon and that Charles VIII was an instrument of God, WEINSTEIN 1970, 231.

341See: GOLDBERG 1974, 69-73. Bülow sent a text from the *Almanac*, among others, to Michael Munekhin (Misiur’). Contrary to what MILLER 1978, 401 maintained, Maximus did not mention Bülow as the translator of the *Almanac*.

342Maximus mentions a *German*, without naming him, M-I, 268.

343Philotheus’ reply is clearly directed against Bülow’s ideas: SINITSYNA 1998, 175, 182, 336-346. Cf. also above, note 331. Philotheus’ answer to Munekhin contains a description of Bülow’s *philosophy* with the accurate translation of a fragment from the *Almanac* concerning the astrological prophesy on *signum aqueaum* (it was understood as a flood). NB, it was in this letter where Philotheus mentioned the idea of the Third Rome. Bülow probably sent the translated fragment from the *Almanac* to many people, among others to Munekhin, cf. GOLDBERG 1974, 70.

344It seems that Bülow was conscious of that. There is a Russian translation of a narrative, written by an eyewitness, about the flood in Naples in 1523. Perhaps Nicholas decided to interpret the flood in Naples as the foreseen deluge, in order to save his credibility, cf. SINITSYNA 1998, 181. But the deluge may have been interpreted also symbolically, as a fall and a subsequent renewal of the Church, *ibid.*, 176.

## CONTACTS WITH VASSIAN PATRIKEEV AND THE QUESTION OF MAXIMUS' PARTICIPATION IN MONASTIC POLEMICS

Older historiography described Patrikeev's activity after his return to Moscow and Maximus' collaboration with him through the prism of the polemics between two monastic parties: the possessors and the non-possessors. Recent studies reveal that such parties did not exist until about 1520 or not at all in the first half of the sixteenth century.<sup>345</sup> Nevertheless the clash between Patrikeev and Joseph's disciples was real and one of the topics they did not agree on was the question of riches collected by monasteries. This was however only a part of the debate. It would be an error to treat the problem of monastic possessions as the starting point and then to make conclusions about monastic reforms while the question of the wealth of monasteries was only an aspect, along with many others, of the reshaping of the monastic life that the reformers wished. The question of the reform was central.

The changes and challenges that the Muscovite society had to confront did not omit monasteries. They had to decide whether they would accept a renewal inspired by a return to the roots of monastic life or rather keep to more recent tradition or even deformation. Fundamental forms of monastic life in Muscovy were analogical to those on Athos and there was also a similar tension between common (cenobitic) and idiorhythmic monasteries in Rus'. As on Athos, in Muscovy efforts to restore the primitive cenobitic rule were being made.<sup>346</sup>

Vassian Patrikeev was in the very centre of this passionate debate. He had a flair for polemics. After his return to Moscow his writings covered a wide spectrum of controversies. The first subject of his discussions with the Josephians was the way heretics were treated. This theme appeared in his work in the 1520-ties (*Slovo otvetne*) but – as time passed – new problems became the centre of his attention. One of them was the controversy on monastic land and villages owned by monasteries. Vassian wanted to know whether the Tradition allowed monasteries to own villages or not. Looking for an answer in old canonical texts Patrikeev found contradictions in them and asked himself: "... in which [text] can one trust? How can it be resolved? Only from the Gospel and the Apostle and with the sacred rules."<sup>347</sup> Maximus,

---

<sup>345</sup>This is a huge subject which exceeds the framework of my study. An extensive review of the historiography on it can be found in: PLIGUZOV 2002, Introduction; SINITSYNA 1977, 104, 108; OSTROWSKI 1986, OSTROWSKI 2003, 233 and also GOLDFRANK 2007, 375. Different historiographical schools are still at odds but the revisionist position is more and more widely accepted.

<sup>346</sup>See: KOLYCHEVA 2002, 90-2 (about a monastic reform in Novgorod in 1528); SINITSYNA 2002<sup>b</sup>, 117-130, 140-2.

<sup>347</sup>The *Slovo otvetne* was mainly devoted to the question of land properties, but also other questions were treated in this work, cf. PLIGUZOV 2002, 81-101 (on widening spectrum of questions: 81; on heretics: 99). Pliguzov thinks that after the first period of the polemics (1511-12), it was interrupted by Basil III's order. The next phase started when Daniel became metropolitan. Pliguzov's evidence concerning the interruption is however weak. Cf. *ibid.*, 100. On Patrikeev's research and the contradictions he found: SINITSYNA 1977, 127 and

with his erudition, was the obvious person to help Patrikeev with this task. Certainly also other people wanted to have first-hand information about Athonite monasticism. This is why Maximus, as an eyewitness, in a few works described various models of monastic life on Athos, starting with in his first missive to Basil III.

It is true that the issue of monastic possessions occupied a large part of Vassian's writings. There were reasons for that. In the sixteenth century the properties of monasteries constantly grew. The problem was both material, spiritual and even political. Grand Princes and local rulers were tempted to exploit these riches for their own purposes. Founders often treated the monasteries that they had established, as their private property. A founder wanted to control his foundation, monasteries tended to preserve their riches and obtain more independence. Moreover, as the structure of the state administration developed, Grand Princes (esp. Ivan III and Ivan IV) attempted not only to control their own foundations but also to introduce general rules concerning bequests of land to monasteries. They could and did use existing conflicts of interests in order to strengthen their power. Patrikeev's activity however was not linked to a secularisation policy. He wanted to free monks from the administration of their estates, not from estates themselves.<sup>348</sup>

Yet, Vassian's had broader plans. The issue of monastic properties was only one facet of a program aiming for monastic reform. In three successive variants of the *Collection of a staretz* (Собрание некоего старца) Partieev denounced various activities that monks should avoid and stigmatised their vices. He put particular emphasis on the abjuration of earthly power. He wrote: "[...] it is as unreasonable for a dead man to ride a horse, as for a monk to

---

PLIGUZOV 2002, 105. While Daniel tried to eliminate (or: reconcile) contradictions between various texts of the Tradition, Partieev emphasised the contradictions, cf. PLIGUZOV 2002, 169-70. The quoted Patrikeev's text comes from a later redaction of the *Sobranie neкоеgo startsa* (KAZAKOVA 1960, 234, note 19) so it was composed when Maximus was already in Moscow: "[...] ино которым верити? Чим то разрешити? Токмо Еуангелием и Апостолом и святыми правилами."

348On relationships between monasteries and their patrons see: KOLYCHEVA 2002, 85-88. On attempts to control the growth of monastic land properties and on possibility to adopt a secularisation policy by Grand Princes, *ibid.*, 107, OSTROWSKI 1986, 371 and OSTROWSKI 2006<sup>a</sup>, 238. The problem of the growth of the monastic land properties existed also before in Byzantium (cf. TALBOT 1991) as well as in the West. KOLYCHEVA 2002, 99 shows that the earlier estimations (based on an English traveller, Clement Adams' account) that the Muscovite Church owned one-third of the whole lands in Muscovy were exaggerated. She calculates (*ibid.*) that monastic land constituted about 20% of the whole lands. PLIGUZOV 2002, 29 (and appendix III, 321-9) thinks even that it was about 10%. He also indicates that not all monasteries were rich. A theme of poor monasteries appeared in the sixteenth century's documents, *ibid.*, 283. Patrikeev's thought evolved. Pliguzov emphasises (*ibid.*, 96, 139, 280-1) that he did not want to alienate ecclesiastical (including monastic) property. He even criticised monks who transferred their lands to secular owners because it worsened the situation of peasants, *ibid.*, 281. Yet Pliguzov mentions (*ibid.*, 279) that later Patrikeev even postulated alienation of monastic possessions but certainly he means an alienation within the Church and not by the secular power. A recapitulation of Patrikeev's views and their context: *ibid.*, 278-302. The issue of inalienability of monastic lands required further study, cf. KOLYCHEVA 2002, 85-88; SKINNER 2005, 406; PLIGUZOV 2002, 287-8.

assume power: lay men should deal with earthly matters and monks should follow the monastic path.”<sup>349</sup>

Thus, monks’ involvement in the matters of this world, which they had left for spiritual matters, was something unnatural for him. If he dealt with the problems of land and properties or other particular questions, it was on account of their influence on monks’ spiritual life.

Certainly, Vassian, as disciple of Nil, was inspired by his master but his aspirations went much further and he was, perhaps, motivated not only by monastic fervour. One does not have to doubt the sincerity of his desire to heal Muscovite monastic life but besides there were greater ambitions. Nil just wanted to create a more modest way of monastic life for *his* monks. Patrikeev desired more complex reforms and, besides monastic issues, considered in his works the possibility of removing of a bishop from his post and reducing him to simple priesthood, of the celibacy of bishops in the Church, as well as the already mentioned question of the way the repentant heretics should have been treated. Social issues were also important for him, as it is seen through his writings concerning the situation of the dependant peasants in ecclesiastical estates. Since his ideas were not always in line with the tradition, he decided to edit a new version of the *Kormchaia* which regulated not only the questions of monastic life but of the whole life of the Church. In order to change the ecclesiastical reality he had to modify the Church’s regulations.<sup>350</sup>

---

349Patrikeev’s expression (KAZAKOVA 1960, 225): “[...] яко нелепо мертвецу на коне ездити, тако мниху власть приемлющу: мирскому убо мирская подобает строити, а иноку иноческий путь правити [...]” That his idea was to separate monks from earthly matters cf. also PLIGUZOV 2002, 285. Perhaps it was also the desire that monks may not be involved in the earthly power. NB, a similar stylistic but in completely different context we find in one Maximus’ work (M-II, 256): “Чюже есть отнюдь чловѣчьскому естеству еже по въздуху лѣтати; и царю богомудренному отнюдь неподобно и неполезно есть еже хотѣти чюжим имѣномъ и стяжаниамъ [...]” As for monastic discipline, Patrikeev wrote in the same work about drunkenness and avoiding praying for someone for money, KAZAKOVA 1960, 226; on leading a life of virtue: 227; on avoiding greed: 229; on renouncing owning villages because of a danger to be entangled in earthly disputes: 230; on inappropriate contacts with women: 237; on striving to evangelical perfection: 257. Vassian was not the only one who saw and criticised breaches of monastic discipline and abuses in administrating ecclesiastical properties. On other authors who also noticed these problems and were not linked ideologically to Patrikeev or Maximus see chapter III, text and note 191.

350On Nil’s ideas in comparison with Patrikeev’s projects: PLIGUZOV 2002, 282-5. On various topics of Patrikeev’s ecclesiastical consideration: PLIGUZOV 2002, 279. His new *Kormchaia* had systematic structure, not chronological as previous ones, so the author wanted to focus on concrete problems (KAZAKOVA 1960, 61). On his attempts to solve ecclesiastical problems through his *Kormchaia* (the problem of appointing bishops by the secular power, of the way of exercising the ecclesiastical career, of bishops’ celibacy): PLIGUZOV 2002, 152-156. Some fragments of Patrikeev’s *Kormchaia* are directed against bishops’ abuses, not only against monastic disorders, *ibid.*, 138, 154. Vassian did not want the Church to deal with the earthly justice, *ibid.*, 69. On peasants in ecclesiastical estates, *ibid.*, 286. Pliguzov emphasises that it was Patrikeev who introduced into Muscovite thought the theme of situation of poor peasants. NB, when Patrikeev asked the blessing of the metropolitan Varlaam and the holy synod for his work on the new *Kormchaia*, he received it with an instruction: “ничего не выставливати”, cf. KAZAKOVA 1970, 111 (she refers to ЦГАДА, ф. 181, № 1597, л. 3а).

His thought developed gradually. The first version of his *Kormchaia* which was intended to serve the case of the reform, was ready in 1517 and the last was edited after Maximus' trial in 1525.<sup>351</sup>

Vassian's involvement in ecclesiastical reform was total. He had no scruples regarding as heretics even those who had only strayed a little from orthodoxy and sometimes manipulated his sources in order to use them for his cause. One can explain this behaviour in part to Patrikeev's violent temperament but it also reveals his great commitment to reform and the conviction that it was indispensable.<sup>352</sup> Yet, even his great energy and determination were not sufficient. Patrikeev needed an expert and asked Maximus for help when his work was already in progress.

The relationship between them is not simple to establish. Some authors described it as *friendship* but this is an exaggeration. The critical attitude towards the state of Muscovite Church was common to both of them but a certain concurrence of opinion does not attest to a friendship. It is true that Vassian admired the Greek's learning but later, during the trial in 1531 their relationship was anything but friendship.<sup>353</sup> One thing is certain: Maximus – judging from the number of translation he undertook for Patrikeev – devoted a lot of time and energy to Vassian's project. The prince's position made the possibility of a refusal by Maximus difficult and common interest was a motivation to collaborate. Thus, Maximus, replying to Patrikeev's demand, wrote both his own text about Athonite monasteries (M-I, 341-2) and translated many others for the *Kormchaia* and for the *Collection of a starets*.<sup>354</sup> He was also useful to the prince-monk in the process of editing the *Kormchaia* in which the Greek exploited the fifteenth

---

351 On Vassian's *Kormchaia* in general: PLIGUZOV 2002, 144-178, on chronology of its different redactions, *ibid.* 92, 139, 175. In parallel Patrikeev worked on the *Collection of a starets* (it were scholia, a collection of quotation from authorities) *ibid.*, 102-139.

352 On heretics: PLIGUZOV 2002, 139; on manipulation with the sources, *ibid.*, 128, 134, 137, 154, 156. Patrikeev's violent temperament is reflected in the *Sudnye spiski* and the minutes of the investigation before the trial.

353 PLIGUZOV 2002, 169 supposed that Maximus' *Слово къ хотящим оставляти жены своя без вины законныя и ити въ иноческое житие*, written to one of his friends (M-II, 286-9) may have been addressed to Patrikeev. His arguments are however very hypothetical. On Vassian's admiration above, note 311. During the trial 1531 Vassian said: "Мне [...] до Максима дела нет никакого" (SUDNYE SPISKI, 104) and Maximus a few times tried to shift the blame onto Vassian (*ibid.* 106, 113, 115). PLIGUZOV 2002, 131, writes that Maximus accused Vassian of trying to reform monastic life, being a simple monk, but his does not give any evidence. Maximus' and Vassian's behaviour during the trial can be of course explained by fear and the attempt of each of them to save his skin.

354 He translated council's canons with Balsamon's expositions, Basil the Great's rules, fragments from the *Ecclesiastical History* by Theodoret and Agapethos' *Advice*, see: PLIGUZOV 2002, 150 and also: 88-89, 132, 137. Balsamon's scholia were unknown in Muscovy before Maximus, cf. PLIGUZOV 2002, 302. Cf. also Sinityna's dating of the *Сказание об афонских монастырях*, in: M-I, 485. Maximus also translated fragments from John Zonaras' *Chronicles* (and provided this translation with commentary, cf. M-I, 343-4 and commentary, M-I, 486-8) and probably the *Martyrdom of St Dionysius* (cf. M-I, 405). Patrikeev also used Maximus' translation of the *Commented Psalter* (see above, note 47) and the *Homilies* by John Chrysostom. More about sources of Patrikeev's *Kormchaia*: PLIGUZOV 2002, 151.

century manuscript of the *Nomocanon*, brought to Rus' by the Kievian bishop Photius.<sup>355</sup> It is one more example that Maximus was a channel through which Byzantine thought reached Muscovy anew and more profoundly.

His own personal ideas concerning monastic life were probably not far from those of Patrikeev. He saw the necessity to renew monastic life in Muscovy, as Vassian did, but he was more moderate in his views than his patron.

In his Muscovite writings Maximus kept the balance between the indispensable observation of the primitive rule and the understanding of human weakness. He appealed to the original Byzantine roots, evoking fundamental principles: beardless boys are not accepted, monks should work, a hegumen cannot take decisions without the consent of his council and so on (M-I, 342). Presenting the perfect way of monastic life he indicated the imperfections of idiorhythmy but did not judge them severely. Even more, he emphasised the presence of real virtues in this imperfect state of religious life.<sup>356</sup> Unlike Patrikeev, Maximus (in his works written unquestionably before 1525) did not mention the problem of monastic possessions and villages. Yet, it does not mean that in his works of this period there are no references to Muscovite monastic life.<sup>357</sup>

Major themes of his two works concerning Athos and written before 1525 (the Missive to Basil III and the relation of Athonite monasteries prepared for Patrikeev's *Kormchaia*) were the question of monks' work, common property and common treasury. Maximus relates that in cenobitic monasteries on Athos all monks work, hegumen together with others (M-I, 124-5. 342) and that they did not have lay servants except two or three to take care of domestic animals (M-I, 342). Even in idiorhythmic houses those who were not obliged to work, often

---

355See: FONKICH 1977, 13. MS of the same Photius was also used for correcting the *Triodion*, *ibid.*, 15.

356More about Maximus account on cenobitic and idiorhythmic monasteries see above, the subchapter on Athos. Most of regulations Maximus mentioned, can be found in Manuel Paleologos' *typikon* for Athos from 1406 (BMFD, 1617-22) and that, in turn, quoted previous regulations. On the new *typikon* of Vatopedi from 1508 see note 218, above.

357In his works on Athonite monasteries written before 1525 (letter to Basil III, M-I, 119-32 and the text for Patrikeev's *Kormchaia*, M-I, 341-2) we do not find any allusion to monastic possessions and villages while in two later works such allusions are clear (RZHIGA 1935-36, 96 and an unpublished work, see: IVANOV 1969, no. 325). SINITSYNA 1977, 113 thinks that there is no reference to the reality of Muscovite monasticism either in Maximus' letter to Basil III or in the text for Patrikeev's *Kormchaia*. But the very mention made by Maximus in the former work that he had written it in order to refute false accusation against Athonite monasteries (M-I, 119-120) indicates that there were such accusations *in Moscow* rather but not in Athos! Scholars who described Maximus' writings in terms of his *non-possessor* views discussed the question of an evolution of his views. SINITSYNA 1965<sup>a</sup>, esp. 123 thinks that his *non-possessor* views before 1525 were not yet completely formed (cf. also SINITSYNA, 2008<sup>b</sup>, 52-3, that Maximus does not prefer one monastic model over another) while IVANOV 1968<sup>b</sup> and KAZAKOVA 1970, 167-8 plead the opposite. See also POKROVSKII 1971, 61-2 and Ivanov's answer: IVANOV 1976, 286. The discussion is misleading because it is focused on the term *non-possessor* which is not a good interpretation of Maximus' views (cf. above, note 345). E.g., he did not support the idea of secularisation of ecclesiastic properties, SINITSYNA 2002<sup>b</sup>, 143.

worked too (M-I, 122. 341). The Greek also emphasised that in idiorhythmic monasteries alms were put into the common treasury (M-I, 341). These questions were essential to Christian monasticism from its very beginning but they are only a few of much wider spectrum of possible essential issues. Since Maximus chose *these* questions describing life on Athos, probably a lack of balance in this respect in Muscovy was the reason.

The question of social justice also appeared in Maximus' writings with reference to the monastic issues. It is clearer in his later writings but his protest against usury (practiced by monasteries) and concern for the just treatment of peasants must have been known already before 1525. He himself mentioned his objection to usury during the trial in 1531 and it is hardly probable that he changed his views between 1525 and 1531. Similarly, he would write more resolutely about the situation of peasants in monastic properties in his later works but already his descriptions of Athos monasteries, where he mentions the land stewards concern about food for peasants working in monastery fields, made the impression that he wanted to contrast it with the situation in Moscow.<sup>358</sup>

The selection of themes concerning the life on Athos in Maximus' early Muscovite works arranges itself as a logical whole and suggests that in monastic life in Muscovy these aspects needed to be reformed even if neither in the Missive to Basil III (which is very diplomatic) nor in the account about Athonite monasteries for the *Kormchaia* (which seems to point more clearly to certain questions) we find no appeal to reform monasteries. Maximus did

---

<sup>358</sup>On usury: SUDNYE SPISKI, 112. On frequent usury practised by Muscovite monasteries: KOLYCHEVA 2002, 105. On peasants M-I, 129; on later works, see below, note 469. NB, Nil Sorskii, Patrikeev's spiritual father, accepted that monasteries hired workers under the condition that they would be treated justly, SINITSYNA 1965<sup>a</sup>, 127. The situation of peasants in Muscovy still needs further research. Some sources indicate that their conditions were relatively good (KOLYCHEVA 2002, 104, PLIGUZOV 2002, 290) but there was a general tendency in the sixteenth century to increase the serfdom. PLIGUZOV 2002, 132-4 maintained that Maximus "adapted" his translations to the needs of prince Vassian by rendering the term *προάστιον* as *пригородие сельное* (cf. also KAZAKOVA 1960, 62). Pliguzov was persuaded that it was a manipulation on the part of Maximus because he had to know that the word *προάστιον* meant at that time a domain with dependent peasants (Pliguzov refers to the research: Ф.И. Успенский, В.Н. Бенешевич, Вазелонские акты. Материалы для истории крестьянского и монастырского землевладения в Византии XIII-XV веков, Л. 1927, с. LXVIII; Г.А. Острогорский, Пронија, in: Српска Академија Наук, посебна издања, Београд 1951, кн. 176, с. 20; К.В. Хвостова, Особенности аграрно-правовых отношений, с. 209). Yet it is not so obvious and *προάστιον* might have been inhabited both by slaves and free peasants. Moreover, there is much less source data concerning *προάστιον* after thirteenth century so it is difficult to have a clear image of the situation in sixteenth century (cf. BARTUSIS 1991). Therefore, since Maximus emphasised the difference between the situation in Muscovy and on Athos, there is no reason not to believe him. If he had lied it would have been quickly disclosed because other Athonite monks visited Muscovy quite often. So his account should be considered as the most authoritative. There was therefore a fundamental difference between people working for Athos monasteries and those in Muscovite monastic estates. The first were free people, paid for their work and independent. The latter were serfs or on the track to serfdom. On this issue cf. also SINITSYNA 1965<sup>a</sup>, 126. The situation of villages or domains owned by Athos monasteries and by Muscovite monasteries was different. In Muscovy the ownership concerned both land and people living there while monks from Athos had lands outside the Mountain but they had to employ people to work there and they pay them.



not act in such a radical way as Vassian but certainly shared the Prince's conviction that changes in Muscovite monastic life were necessary.

### APPROACHING STORM

Maximus' presence in Moscow coincided with a stormy period for the state. Basil III was attempting to reinforce both his power and state security. Perhaps in a more stable situation Maximus' activity would have not evoked such tension. In uncertainty, criticism is often perceived as a threat, not as an opportunity to improve. Already the Greek's disapproval about some aspects of Muscovite ecclesiastical life (the way the metropolitan was appointed or the distortion of the ecclesiastic books) was met with dismay. The situation became even more tense when his denunciations became more personal. In Maximus' works we do not find any direct condemnation of Basil III's decisions. Sometimes he attempted even to whitewash him. Writing about the events of 1521, when Basil III escaped from Moscow in the face of the Tartars' descent, the Greek justified the Prince's behaviour, gave him advice and warned him rather than reproached him his mistakes.<sup>359</sup> However it cannot be ruled that he privately expressed his disagreement with the ruler's decisions. He may have spoken directly to the Grand Prince and presented him with his objections. Such frankness may seem hardly probable but we must take into account Maximus' formation. There was a clear Christian tradition of saintly people defying unjust rulers. Of such was patriarch Niphon, whom Maximus knew and who corrected prince Radu of Wallachia. John Chrysostom, whose works the Greek translated and respected very much, acted in a similar way.<sup>360</sup> So while in Maximus' work we do not find open criticism of the ruler, we encounter some trace of it in narrative sources. Circumspection was not Maximus' strongest quality. In some situations he was quite outspoken and sometimes it backfired on him. The previously mentioned aspects of his activity might have caused discontent among the Muscovite authorities. With the passage of time there were more and more reasons for this discontent.

---

<sup>359</sup>On the metropolitan's appointment: below text and note 365. On the errors in books above, esp. note 315. In his missive to the Gran Prince on the occasion of the Tartar invasion Maximus did not accused Basil of the escape from Moscow in 1521 but found biblical parallels demonstrating that king David also escaped his son Absalom (M-I, 146), he called to fight Tartars but not two enemies at the same time (ibid., 147) and emphasised that Christian ruler (Basil III) should have not appointed the devil's monarch (the khan) and that he should have not been on good terms with the enemy of the cross of Christ (ibid., 148). This work is known to us in one single copy, cf. SINITSYNA, 2008<sup>b</sup>, 54. PLIGUZOV 2002, 202-3 finds in Maximus' sets of translations from the *Suida Lexicon* a concealed criticism of Basil III. This set has as its main theme a pious and brave Christian leader. Pliguzov thinks that it was a negative background demonstrating Basil's lack of these virtues. On the invasion cf. RZHIGA 1934, 96-7, 100-3.

<sup>360</sup>On Niphon cf above, text and note 230. It is worth mentioning here the position of holy fools in Byzantium and Muscovy whose criticism of rulers were tolerated, cf. S. IVANOV 1996, 265ff.

Especially difficult for Basil III might have been the Greek's disapproval of his divorce from his wife, Solomonia Saburova. During the 20 years of their marriage they had had no children and, as in any monarchy, uncertainty concerning the heir was a destabilising factor for the country. To strengthen the state and his authority the Grand Prince had to have the heir to the throne. The decision took a long time to come to fruition because there was no legal basis for divorce. Canon law allowed divorce only in a few cases. Barrenness was not one of them. Solomonia was therefore forced to enter a convent to give a pretext, because entering a monastery *was*, according to Canon law, a reason for divorce. Contemporary sources describe this event in a very scanty way. The Chronicle of Pskov only says that: "In the year 7031 [1523] Grand Prince Vasilij Ivanovich veiled his princess Solomonia and took Elena [Glinskaya] to himself and all this is because of our sinfulness, for, as apostle has written, *If you send one wife away and marry another, you commit adultery.*"<sup>361</sup> Only later a more resolute recrimination of Basil III's deed appeared in the *Выпись о втором браке Василия III* and in the *History of the Grand Prince of Moscow* by Andrew Kurbskii.<sup>362</sup> These works mentioned that Maximus fell into disgrace because of his objection to the second marriage or, more precisely, that he (and Patrikeev) were imprisoned lest they objected to the new wedding. The value of these sources is still disputed but it is highly probable that Maximus' opinion about the princely divorce contributed to his troubles even if the Prince took the final decision after Maximus' imprisonment.<sup>363</sup> The fact that this quandary was not investigated during either of the two trials is understandable. It would have been extremely awkward for both Basil and for metropolitan Daniel (who was also involved in the divorce and blessed the second marriage) to examine the case, as it was obvious that the Prince's decision was against Canon law.<sup>364</sup> The aforementioned example of the patriarch Niphon who, in a similar situation, did not hesitate to

361See: PSKOVSKIE LETOPISI II, 227; translation by HANEY 1973, 53. On legal basis for divorce: SOKOLOV 1909, 1299-1300.

362See: ZIMIN 1976, 141-5 and KURBSKII, *History of the Grand Prince of Moscow*, 8-9.

363See: ZIMIN 1976; KAGAN 1989 (SKK, with further bibliography); SOLODKIN 1998, SINITSYNA, 2008<sup>b</sup>, 31-32.

Through the sequence of events we can see that the decision was taking shape long. As early as in 1521 Basil asked the patriarch of Constantinople about the possibility of divorce. In 7033 (July 1524 – August 1525) Basil still travelled with Solomonia and a precious offering was presented for the Trinity – St Sergius monastery to implore the gift of maternity. On the next journey (between 10<sup>th</sup> of September and 10<sup>th</sup> of November 1525) the Prince set out without his wife, ZIMIN 1971, 81. It would testify that the decision was taken more less between August and September 1525. OSTROWSKI 2006<sup>a</sup>, 219-23, suggests that perhaps after the death of Peter Ibraimov (13<sup>th</sup> of March 1523), foreseen as the heir, Basil decided to divorce from Solomonia. KAZAKOVA 1970, 115-20 is convinced that Patrikeev did not protest against the divorce in 1525 because in 1526 he was still in favour at the Prince. Sources united Maximus and Vassian in protests against the divorce.

364In PSRL XIII, 45 we read that in November 1525 Basil III sent Solomonia to a convent "тягости ради и болезни бездетства" and in January 1526 he married Helena, and that metropolitan Daniel blessed them. Sources sympathetic to Basil say that Solomonia herself made the decision to go to the convent. It was seen as a justification for the divorce, see: PSRL XXIV, 222-3 and ТИХОМИРОВ 1930, 112-4.

protest against the conduct of Radu the *voivode* of Wallachia, may have been an additional factor that encouraged Maximus to act resolutely.

The credibility of this narration enhances the fact that in the case of another canonical misconduct the monk also did not hesitate to reprove the appointing of metropolitans in Moscow without the approbation by the patriarch of Constantinople, required by ecclesiastical canons. After metropolitan Isidore's unsuccessful attempt to introduce the Florentine Union in Moscow, in 1448 the local bishops, under the dictation of the Grand Prince Basil II, elected bishop Iona of Riazan' as the metropolitan. Their original idea was to ask the patriarch for confirmation but Constantinople fell in 1453 and Iona died in 1461. From this time on the metropolitans of Moscow were appointed by local authorities, without the patriarch's blessing.<sup>365</sup> Maximus' firm position on this matter was used by his foes as an argument against him. According to them the Greek, with a certain dose of irony, underlined the fact that the establishment of the Muscovite Church, so eager to curse the heretics, did not see its own abuses. They anathematised themselves by rejecting the blessing of the patriarch and not wanting to officiate with Constantinople bishops.<sup>366</sup> Maximus' adversaries referred to a would-be charter issued by the patriarch who had supposedly allowed the appointment of Moscow metropolitans by the local bishops but nobody was able to produce this document.<sup>367</sup>

Moreover, the Greek was supposed to praise metropolitan Isidore, as a true preacher of the Orthodox faith, while he was being unjustly accused by the Grand Prince and Muscovite bishops. It is hardly imaginable that Maximus approved the Union. If his words were not invented by the witnesses to denigrate him, he rather desired to express his respect for the canonical order and the legitimately appointed metropolitan.<sup>368</sup>

Another example of the respect held by the Greek was his observation of the disdainful attitude of the Muscovite élite towards the patriarchate. He recalled how the Grand Prince and the metropolitan, without due regard, received archbishop Gregory who came to Moscow as a representative of the patriarch of Constantinople. This lack of respect towards hierarchy and Canon Law triggered Maximus' indignation. Herberstein confirmed that Maximus was

---

365See: MILLER 2006, 338. Cf. also below, note 494.

366See: SUDNYE SPISKI, 118-9. Maximus, in this account compares even their situation to Judas who betrayed Jesus but it may be an exaggeration of the witnesses.

367Cf. SUDNYE SPISKI, 111. It is a fragment of the 1531 trial but certainly it was not in prison, between the two trials but before 1525 when Maximus looked for the alleged document.

368See: SUDNYE SPISKI, 119. Maximus' words that Isidore was "пошлой учитель истинны" and his question during the trial of why the metropolitans did not go to Constantinople to be appointed while envoys can reach the city PLIGUZOV 2002, 240, understands as a quasi-reply to Basil II's unsent letters to emperor John VIII Palaiologos and patriarch Mitrophan (1441-43).

principled. He related that “after having revised and corrected Muscovite books and principles Maximus noticed many serious errors and *in the presence of the Prince* [my italic – ZS] declared that the latter was a complete schismatic because he did not observe either the Roman or Greek rite.”<sup>369</sup> Herberstein was not always well informed but the coincidence of data from different sources indicates that Maximus did resolutely defend canonical order. His reaction may have been more radical (as shown in the narrative of the trial) or more diplomatic but the core was the same.

This fact is also proved in Maximus’ own works where he polemicised with those who considered the Constantinople See as having no authority because of the Muslim occupation. Referring to the first three centuries of Christianity, he argued that at that time the civil authorities were also pagan but under their rule the Church glowed with holiness. The fact that she existed under an unchristian power did not destroy her holiness nor the validity of her order.<sup>370</sup>

Not less delicate was the question of the relationship between Moscow and Turkey. Basil III cared very much about the alliance with Turkey in order to be free to fight other enemies but the sultan was not eager to sign such a treaty.<sup>371</sup> Maximus’, as the other Greeks’, point of view was quite the opposite to that of Basil. The Greek saw in the Muscovite ruler an almost unique power which could bring about the liberation of Greece and of the Byzantine Church from the Turkish yoke. He expressed this openly in one of his letters to the Grand Prince (M-I, 166). These hopes had a broader ideological context of prophesies distributed both in the West and in Moscow but also of real attempts undertaken by various Greeks in order to

---

369On Archbishop Gregory: SUDNYE SPISKI, 119. PUGUZOV 2002, 240 is persuaded that it was Varlaam, and not Daniel, who did not accept the patriarchal blessing from Gregory. If it is the archbishop Gregory who arrived with Maximus, the official sources (chronicles) say that he was received with due honours, cf. above, note 285 and 282. It may be that: 1) the official sources do not say the whole truth and there was some tension between the Muscovite authorities and Archbishop Gregory; 2) the witnesses during the trial deformed Maximus’ relation about these events. Since this question is mentioned in the *Sudnye spiski* context of the appointment of Muscovite metropolitans, it is possible that generally Gregory was well received but his mention about the patriarch of Constantinople’s right evoked an angry reaction. On Maximus’ declaration in the presence of the Prince: HERBERSTEIN 2007, 156.

370See: M-II, 337. In two of his works Maximus deals with the problem of whether holy Christian places are desecrated under *infidel* power: M-II, no. 44 (about Constantinople) and Z-156-61 (about Jerusalem). IVANOV 1969, no. 225, links the first work with the appointment of the metropolitan Daniel in 1522 but without arguments for that. Even if these works were written after 1525, Maximus did not change his views during this period what arises from *Sudnye spiski*.

371Moscow at the moment was not an important partner for the Porte. It is visible in the way the Sultan treated Muscovite envoys, in a relatively low rank of Turkish envoys and in the fact that the Sultan did not answer the Grand Prince’s proposals of alliance, see: PDS-KNT, 107, 236, 369, 407, 426-7, 499 and SD-Ob, 6-7. The Grand Prince could only ask the Sultan to form an alliance. It was not a relationship of two equal partners. Cf. also DUNAIEV 1916, 19.

liberate their country. One of them was Maximus' master, Janus Laskaris.<sup>372</sup> We are not able to establish whether it was a secret mission from the patriarch of Constantinople (as Denissoff supposed) or just acting in the spirit of his Master. One thing is sure: Maximus ardently sought the liberation of his country and of his Church. Obviously the rapprochement between Moscow and Turkey, even if it had not produced a real alliance, had a disastrous effect on Greek hopes. The disputed question is: did the Greeks in Moscow undertake any real step to avoid this alliance? Later, during the trial, Maximus' enemies accused him and another Greek, Sava (hegumen of the Novospasskij monastery) of a secret correspondence with the Sultan and even of encouraging him to attack Muscovy. Their possible contacts with the Turkish ambassador Skinder (Iskander Saki, a Greek in the pay of the Sultan), who – according to Athanasius – aimed to provoke a war between Basil III and the Sultan, also worsened their situation because Maximus and Sava, knowing about it, did not inform the Grand Prince.<sup>373</sup>

What did Maximus really do and to what extent was he involved in political matters? Without a doubt Maximus was not pleased with the direction taken by the princely policy. Did he however commit any act against the Grand Prince or against the Muscovite state? The *Sudnye spiski* indicate rather suspicions and unsuccessful attempts to prove Maximus and Sava guilty than any real proof. The only thing the prosecutor managed to reveal later was vague information about alleged letters sent by Maximus and Sava to the Sultan through a Turkish pasha asking the Sultan to start a campaign against the Grand Prince. In fact, this was second-hand information which the investigator did not even try to verify. There was also a mysterious Greek document (грамота) in Maximus' possession which gave rise to suspicions.<sup>374</sup>

What was the real state of affairs? Maximus may have had contact with Skinder but it is not certain. During the investigation before his trial Maximus said that he had *heard* about the purpose of Skinder's arrival in Moscow. The latter was not important enough to be able to help the Greeks fulfil their desires to liberate their homeland with the help of Moscow and other

372See above, note 255 about Laskaris and his activity, and note 340 – on prophecies. Apart from that, an important part was played by the Byzantine political idea concerning a certain *русый род*. This term was later (in the *Русский хронограф* 1518-1522) transformed into *русский род*. In such a form it appears in Maximus' works, cf. SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 55 and, in a more detailed way: SINITSYNA 1998, 195. 275.

373DENISSOFF 1943, 345-52 expressed his theory that the patriarch wanted to use Maximus' expedition to reestablish his authority over the Muscovite metropolis. On Athanasius' deposition: SUDNYE SPISKI, 117 (cf. also DUNAEV 1916, 28). Maximus admitted that he was guilty of not informing the Grand Prince about Skinder's threats (SUDNYE SPISKI, 117). About alleged encouraging the Sultan to invade Muscovy: SUDNYE SPISKI, 116. KAZAKOVA 1967-68, part II, 120-3, doubts any Maximus' contacts with Skinder. Muscovy did not have enough force to fight with Turkey. In addition there was a secret, and unrealised, plan to direct the Turkish power against Lithuania, DUNAEV 1916, 19.

374See: SUDNYE SPISKI, 115-8; TIKHOMIROV 1930, 112, POKROVSKII 1971, 44. 66-7. The question of the Greek documents in Maximus' possession is even more vague because the passage in the SUDNYE SPISKI, 116 is damaged and therefore unclear in this place.

sources (besides those presented by the accusation) do not confirm the existence of such intentions.

Kashtanov's hypothesis that Sava may have been responsible for Basil III's foreign correspondence (and that Maximus through him may have had access to diplomatic documents) has weak foundations. Yet, it is not excluded that Maximus had access to information that was not supposed to be publicly known.<sup>375</sup> The Greek document at Maximus' disposal, as well as some official papers preserved by Sava, were probably neither secret nor dangerous.<sup>376</sup> Incomprehensible language combined with the Greeks' contacts with foreigners may have been (in the atmosphere of suspicion if one wanted to find an argument) circumstantial evidence which gave a sufficient base to accuse Maximus and Sava. There was however no real proof that Maximus acted against the Prince or the state, even in such a tendentious source like the *Sudnye spiski*. The remainder of the source material reveals just the opposite. Maximus may have not been very cautious, he criticised that which he did not like but he did not act against Muscovy. This is visible both from the documents of investigation and trial and through his own words. He did speak about the possibility of a Turkish invasion. It was however not a threat but a warning that if the Grand Prince was not able to defend the country against Tartars, he would be even less able to repulse a Turkish attack. Later, he even emphasised his affection for Muscovy though it is hard to say whether it was sincere or rhetoric.<sup>377</sup>

Moreover, attempting to provoke a war between Moscow and Turkey would have been

---

375On having heard about Skinder, SD-Ob, 6. 12. The fragment of the SUDNYE SPISKI, 117 (line 6-8), might suggest however that Maximus met Skinder. It seems that Skinder arrived principally in commercial purposes and was not an important representative of the Porte. He was in Moscow twice, in 1522 and 1524, cf. KAZAKOVA 1975, 67. The Grand Prince was very dissatisfied that Skinder was an ambassador of a low rank: ZIMIN 1971, 65. In addition, he was a rather despicable man, cf. DUNAIEV 1916, 28-9 (and generally about Skinder's mission, *ibid.*, 44). On hypothesis that Sava was responsible for the princely foreign correspondence: KASHTANOV 2001, 216. On the possibility that Maximus had access to classified documents may testify e.g. the fact that he knew about the negotiation with Lithuania (cf. M-I, 149).

376There were some Greek diplomatic documents ("грамоты греческие посольные") at Sava's disposal, see: ZIMIN 1978, I, 43 and 54. KAZAKOVA 1967-8, part II, 113-4, however, shows convincingly that these documents found at Sava were certainly ecclesiastical documents, probably brought by representatives of Greek monasteries and the patriarch, and not anything concerning political relationships with Turkey (cf. also KAZAKOVA 1970, 207-8). PLIGUZOV 2002, 197-200, believes that Maximus' mysterious Greek document was a letter of the Sultan Suleiman to the Doge of Venice, Antonio Grimani from 22.01.1522. A copy of this letter was found in Maximus' archives.

377In M-II, 56 Maximus says that he prays every day for the auspiciousness of the Muscovite state and further he adds (M-II, 57): "Аще ли же здѣ явихся есмь в чем ни буди обидивъ кого, или зла умысливъ на благовѣрнаго и преславнаго великаго князя рускаго, и доведут того клеветницы мои, не отрицаюся всякыа смертна казни [...]" Elsewhere he emphasises (Z-156): "азъ бо изначально и възлюбих, и почтох славный град Москву, и всегда люблю, и въ чести множайшии имамъ, и молюся о нем выну [...]" Similarly he wrote in a note to one of his works: M-II, 252. These texts were written when he was able to write again after his imprisonment but, at least in Z-156, he says about his original attitude. About "not threat but warning": SUDNYE SPISKI, 118. Cf. however Pliguzov's idea about Maximus' concealed criticism of Basil III, above, note 359.

a suicidal action from Maximus point of view and also from the point of view of Greek interests since he was conscious of the weaknesses of the Muscovite army. If he had succeeded in provoking this war, the realisation of his desire to liberate Greece would have been much more difficult because Moscow would have certainly been defeated by Turkey. He expressed his idea clearly in the work devoted to the Tartar invasion in 1521 (M-I, no. 5): one should not fight with many enemies at the same time. Certainly he had not forgotten his dreams about saving his country but – in order to realise them – he had to wait for the consolidation of Muscovite forces.<sup>378</sup>

Maximus did not devote much attention to political matters. Among his works only one was devoted to such a question and only one copy of this has been preserved, the above-mentioned missive concerning the Tartar invasion. However, in an autocratically ruled country, the border between the political and non-political is very thin. Any criticism may be interpreted as a political action. For his accusers his privately expressed opinions were also important and potentially dangerous because of Maximus' growing authority. Both the above-mentioned possibility of a Turkish attack and the conviction, articulated in a diplomatic way in his written work about the Tartars assault, might have been communicated in a more outspoken way directly to his acquaintances.<sup>379</sup>

Another example of the political significance of his non-political utterances was Maximus' appeal for mercy, both for himself and for others. In the course of the investigation in 1525 a witness related Maximus' words: "I will tell you, my lord, the truth, that is in my heart. I have not heard that from anyone or talked to anyone, and this my belief I kept in my heart: widows cry and the sovereign goes to the church, and widows cry and follow him, and they beat them. And I prayed God for the sovereign so that God put the sovereign's heart in it and that the sovereign shows them mercy."<sup>380</sup> Here we can see the concern that a ruler should

378A similar view expressed RZHIGA 1934, 91-2 and KAZAKOVA 1967-8, part II, 122-3. ZIMIN 1972, 268. 293, maintained that Maximus was for the war with Turkey. KAZAKOVA 1973, 155-6 emphasised that he was for the war only in the missive to Basil III of 1519 and in the missive to Basil of 1521 he spoke only to fight the Crimean Khanate. Similarly in a later work dedicated to Ivan IV's victory over the Crimean Khan in 1541 (K-II, no. XXI). The accusation to strive to provoke war between Turkey and Muscovy were perhaps an echo of Skinder's threat (see above, note 373 and 375) and an attempt to use these rumours against Maximus.

379Cf. SUDNYE SPISKI, 118 (line 18) and *ibid.*, lines 2-9. Most scholars are convinced that there was no or very little ground for the *political* accusations against Maximus, cf. e.g.: POKROVSKII 1971, *passim*; KAZAKOVA 1967-68, part II, 120-3; IVANOV 1976, 291; RZHIGA 1934, 86-95 and 102 (on the last page on unjust accusation against Maximus of scepticism about the chases of victory in the war with Kazan').

380See: SD-Ob, 10: "Истинну, господине, вам скажу, что у меня в сердце, ни от кого есми того не слышал и не говаривал ни с кем, а мненьем есми своим то себе держал в сердце: вдовицы плачют, а пойдет Государь к церкви и вдовицы плачют и за ним идут, и они их бьют; и яз за Государя молил Бога, чтобы Государю Бог на сердце положил и милость бы Государь над ними показал." This fragment was deleted from the document.

show mercy rather than attack. Nevertheless this testimony was placed in the record of the investigation. Later this fragment was removed from the document, perhaps considered useless, but, significantly, prosecutors were interested even in such innocent remarks.

More dangerous for the Greek was the criticism (if it really took place) directed personally against the Grand Prince. During the trial, Maximus was incriminated for reproaching Basil III for not being merciful to him when he wanted to go back to Athos. According to Vasilij Tuchkov, he said that he had hoped that Basil was a pious sovereign but in fact he was like previous rulers who were oppressors of Christianity (*гонитель на христианство*). Tuchkov perhaps exaggerated but it would be strange if the Greek had not complained about the Prince's orders, at least about not letting him go back to Athos. Yet, Basil's severity visibly was a sensitive subject. Other people also reproached him his ruthlessness.<sup>381</sup> Maximus' reproaches however were not linked with any action against the ruler. In his *apologia pro vita sua* he declared that if he had offended anybody or planned anything wrong against the Grand Prince, he was ready to accept the capital punishment if those who calumniated him would prove it.<sup>382</sup> This is the way a man talks when he knows that it is possible to find a pretext to blame him but who is convinced that he has not done anything wrong. No wonder that he did not admit that in court.

Maximus was in the middle of an adverse coincidence. Besides his own awkwardness or carelessness in expressing his views, he was linked with people who had their own reasons for discontent (political and personal) or who were potentially exposed to disgrace.

Thus, Ivan Beklemishev, a conservative, regretted that the old political and ecclesiastical customs were changing during Basil III's reign. He believed that Muscovy was declining. His objection to the Prince and the Metropolitan breaking their oath to Shemiachych was the result of ethical motivation rather than ideological. He also had personal reasons to be averse to the Grand Prince who had deprived him of a house in the capital.

Greeks in Moscow were naturally close to Maximus. Their knowledge may have been useful to Muscovy as – at the same time – this northern country may have helped them. Moscow was an incarnation of the Greek hope for the liberation of their homeland. No wonder that they were unhappy with the Prince's political rapprochement to Turkey. Yet this situation did not lead to the creation of any Greek party in Moscow. There was a kind of mutual aid among Greeks in Moscow but there are no grounds to see here anything more than a sense of

---

<sup>381</sup>Tuchkov's deposition: SUDNYE SPISKI, 116. Also Fedor Zharenoi says that Basil is "людемъ немилостивъ", see: SD-Ob, 7. Similarly Bersen' complains about Basil's behaviour, *ibid.* 5-6. Cf. also above, note 359.  
<sup>382</sup>M-II, 57, quoted above, note 377.



national solidarity. Nevertheless it seems that this solidarity provoked suspicion. The prosecutor in 1525 attempted to create a vision of a Greek conspiracy against Muscovy in which allegedly Maximus, Sava and Skinder participated although he had no real proof. We do not even know what linked Maximus and Sava apart from their shared nationality and the fact that their monasteries were not far from one another.<sup>383</sup> Finally Maximus' links with Patrikeev were, at first, advantageous but later, after the fall of the prince, worsened the Greek's situation.

Perhaps, in the eyes of the Muscovite authorities, Maximus and people, more or less connected to him, were a threat. In reality their ties were quite accidental and there is no evidence that they constituted a tight group. In any case, his adversaries were visibly afraid of his possible influence. The mixture of politics, personal resentments, and prejudices prevented him, for a long period, from continuing his work.

As we remember, at first Maximus' work was well received and appreciated in Moscow. He did not lack the Grand Prince's favour. Yet, in about 1521 the political and ecclesiastical context in Moscow changed and this fact affected Maximus's situation. Before his arrival, Joseph of Volokolamsk's adherents had lost much of their influence but now they began to regain power. In December 1521 metropolitan Varlaam was forced to leave his See. This particular moment may be perceived as the dawn of a new period.<sup>384</sup>

In secular politics the Grand Prince wanted to remove rivals to the throne and secure the succession for his offspring. In the ecclesiastical sphere, the new metropolitan, Daniel, wanted to ensure stability and security for the Church as well as the uniformity of beliefs.<sup>385</sup> A certain alliance was forged between ecclesiastical and secular power. Daniel supported the Grand Prince's actions and, in turn, received aid for his undertakings. An instrument to realise these plans was the removal of those who were, or might have been, potential obstacles. Some important people fell into disgrace and a few of them were put to death. It is impossible to lump together all those who suffered during the years after 1521. One group consisted of those who might have made the fulfilment of Basil III's dynastic plans more difficult. The reason for

---

383See KAZAKOVA 1970, 224-6; ZIMIN 1971 66-7. Beklemishev said (SD-Ob, p. 3): (“[...] хоти у васъ Цари злочестивые, а хотятъ такъ; ино у васъ еще Богъ есть.”). Cf. also *ibid.*, 4, 5, 9 and 10 (here allusion to broken oath) and 13. On Shemiachich see the next note. ROWLAND 1990, 127-8 (+ note 11) emphasises that ideology “played little role in court groupings, especially when compared with factors such as marriage ties and clan alliances.” Cf. also KAISER 1980, 174. 186. On the attempt to prove a Greek conspiracy: SUDNYE SPISKI, 115-19.

384GOLUBINSKII 1900, 697-699, guessed (and was supported by other historians) that Varlaam refused to sign a guarantee letter for Shemiachich and therefore he was deposed. The Grand Prince planed the letter as a ruse to bring Shemiachich to Moscow and it was him who decided to remove Varlaam, see: HERBERSTEIN 2007, 111-12; cf. also: MILLER 2011, 236. The letter of guarantee was signed afterwards by Varlaam's successor, Daniel.

385Cf. below, chapter III, note 210 and RUNCIMAN 1968, chapter VIII.

the dismissal of others might have been personal links. Some of those who fell into disgrace, at that moment or later, were linked one way or another to Maximus (e.g. Ivan Saburov, Bersen', Iushka Tiutin). Even if they all expressed disapproval towards the current order of the Muscovite state and the Church (as Bersen' did), their approaches were different and it is difficult to imagine any their common action.<sup>386</sup> A good example of this fact is the case of Beklemishev and Maximus who were judged together but who had quite different approaches to the Muscovite reality.<sup>387</sup>

The current political struggle or ideology overlapped intellectual and moral considerations as well as attempts to renew the Muscovite Church. In other words cultural and religious questions had also political dimensions. Even if Maximus himself was not at all or only slightly involved in political affairs, the political context of his undertakings contributed to his fall.

The situation of the country was at that period fragile. Development was not evident, external threats were serious. In such a delicate situation any careless move could have incalculable effects. Maximus made more than one such move.

There was an additional problem which aggravated Maximus' situation: his conflict with the metropolitan Daniel. This antagonism was partially a result of their fundamental strategies. Daniel, in order to reach the goals of his ecclesiastical policy, was sometimes ready to pay for that with doubtful moral compromises. For Maximus, justice and doctrinal purity took first place. There was also a more personal aspect of this clash. Maximus' letter to the Metropolitan reveal strained personal relations between them, a kind of dislike.

Daniel's public activity as the metropolitan began in 1522. He was a learned man, cared for monastic discipline and called those in power to fulfil their duties equitably but his vision of the Church and society was very strict, based on submission to authority, without mercy. His contemporaries expressed negative opinions on the way he himself exercised power. Beklemishev said that he did not know whether Rus' had a metropolitan because Daniel did not exhort the people and did not care for anybody. Fedor Zharenoi, *krestovyj diak* of the

---

<sup>386</sup>ZIMIN 1971, 68-70 about disgrace of various people in this period and *ibid.*, 63 and 78 about bishops close to Josephian movement, appointed by Daniel. Yet Zimin seems to exaggerate the political dimension of Maximus' case. It is true that in the second group of disgraced people we can find a few Greeks (Maximus, Sava, Mark and George (Юрий) Trachaniota (Малый) – the last two mentioned by HERBERSTEIN 2007, 156-7) but there is no proof that the Grand Prince directed his indignation against the Greek as such (as ZIMIN 1971, 66 and PLIGUZOV 2002, 101 maintained). It was not the national factor that was important for the Grand Prince.

<sup>387</sup>About differences between Beklemishev and Maximus: KAZAKOVA 1967-8, part II, 124-5. It is true if we believe that the document of investigation mirrors the real views of the suspects. One can add that Beklemishev saw the origin of Muscovite calamities in the arrival of the Greeks in Moscow together with Zoe Paleologina. He can hardly be Maximus' view.

Metropolitan, also mentioned his conflict with the latter. He said that he did not pay Daniel when the latter did not officiate. The core of this antagonism is not very clear but the information is sufficient to see Daniel as a prelate who cared much more for his personal position or – at best – for the temporary power of the Church, than for fulfilling his pastoral duties. A fragment of Zharenoi’s critical opinion about Daniel was removed from the minutes of the investigation. Visibly, Daniel was sensitive about negative opinions about himself.<sup>388</sup>

A good example of the tensions between Maximus and Daniel and of Daniel’s sensitivity was the Greek’s refusal (probably in about 1524) to translate for the Metropolitan a work by Theodoret of Cyrus. It was rather a result than the reason for the mutual antipathy but Daniel remembered it very well and during the trial brought it up again.

Maximus was very interested in Theodoret and had been acquainted with his works for many years. Theodoret seems to have been one of his favourite authors.<sup>389</sup> So this refusal is all the more riveting. Maximus explained later that the only reason was his anxiety that insufficiently educated people might have been scandalised or they might have lost their Orthodox faith. The tone of this explanation is however quite polemical.<sup>390</sup> Perhaps it was an angry reaction against the metropolitan.

---

388Maximus’ letter to the metropolita Daniel: Z-136-43. On Daniel biography: BULANIN 1988°. Cf. also his correspondence with Karpov, below, chapter III, text and note 249. Beklemishev’s expression: SD-Ob, 4. Zharenoi’s utterance: SD-Ob, 8-9 and 13. The removed critical expression: *ibid*, 9. HERBERSTEIN 2007, 112 also did not have a high opinion about Daniel. КРОМ 2010, 244-5, reveals that, after Daniel’s dismissal, chronicles gave, as a reason for this dismissal, Daniel’s links with the Belskie family. One chronicle, however, says that Daniel “учал ко всем людем быти немилосерд и жесток, уморял у себя в тюрьмах и окованных своих людеи до смерти, да и сребролюбие было великое” (PSRL XXXIV, 26). Krom emphasised that GOLUBINSKII 1900, 736-7, was of the same opinion about Daniel, as the author of the chronicle even though he did not know the text. Finally, KURBSKII, History of the Grand Prince of Moscow, 76 (who was, of course, far from being objective), says that Maximus suffered “по зависти Данила митрополита, прегордаго и лютаго, и ото вселукавых мнихов, глаголемых Осифлянских”.

389On Maximus’ refusal to translate Theodoret and Daniel’s reaction: Z 140. During the Italian period of his life Trivolis copied a work by Theodoret (RGK I, 287 – MS Oxon. Canon 27, cf. SHEVCHENKO 1997, 63) and his acquaintance, Zanobi Acciaiuoli translated another work by this author, see above, note 165. In one of Maximus’ manuscripts (a *catena* of the prophetic texts of the Old Testament), among patristic commentaries, the fragments drawn from Theodoret’s works are especially numerous, see: OLMSTED 1987, note 32. Also in excerpts from the *Suida Lexicon* and other works (that may be linked with the translation of the *Commented Psalter*) the fragments of Theodoret appear very frequently, SINITSYNA 1977, 67.

390ZHUROVA 1998, 34 (=Z 140-1). She also emphasised (*ibid.*, 7-8) that even if the *Missive to the metropolitan Daniel* was aimed as a letter of reconciliation, the final result was rather a polemical writing. Theodoret’s book which Maximus refused to translate must have been *De curatione Graecarum affectionum* (or another text containing refutation of errors) because Maximus justified his refusal saying that the book contain description of some heretical opinions that might have been misused by people of limited theological knowledge (Z-140-1). ИКОННИКОВ 1915, 486, thinks (without any argumentation) that the book Maximus refused to translate was the *Ecclesiastical History* and that additional reason of this refusal was the fact that this work contains information that monks in the ancient Church were allowed to possess lands. It is less probably since, as we have shown above, Maximus was not an absolute opponent of possessing lands by monasteries. It should be noted however, that Maximus translated a passage from the *Ecclesiastical History* for Partkievev’s *Kormchaia*, cf. PЛИГУЗОВ 2002, 150.

Regardless of the Greek's personal motivation, this refusal may have been understood as a demonstration of Daniel's imprudence. Therefore it cannot be excluded that this *personal* factor had significant weight in this affair. Admittedly, Daniel did emphasise that it was not Maximus' refusal but heresy that brought about the Greek's incarceration but the latter did not believe it. Indeed, Daniel's explication appears to be a rationalisation. In the Greek's later missive to Daniel he said that the errors in his translations resulted from his limited knowledge of the language and were not heresy. He emphasised that Daniel was looking for an excuse in order to justify his anger. The hypothesis about the personal dimension of their conflict is reinforced by Maximus' declaration that he wanted to be *reconciled* with the Metropolitan, while towards other influential people he just attempted to explain things as if the decision taken against him was a result of a simple misunderstanding.<sup>391</sup>

The concurrence of at least three factors led to Maximus' fall. None of them taken separately would have been sufficient. These factors were: Maximus' ideas and his openness in expressing them, the fact that Daniel gained an advantage by appointing bishops dependent on and followers of him and finally Maximus' personal conflict with Daniel. The driving force in preparing the trial was the Metropolitan and his entourage. Sources point to Daniel as the one who strove to condemn the Greek. The Grand Prince accepted, perhaps even unwillingly, the Metropolitan's action. Herberstein emphasised that Maximus disappeared although he enjoyed Basil's benevolence.<sup>392</sup> Again, an early biographical source says that Maximus' reputation was blackened before the Grande Prince from envy that "a foreigner had ascended so high". The name of the perpetrator of this denigration however is not mentioned.<sup>393</sup>

<sup>391</sup>About his explanation given later to the influential people see below, text and note 499 and 500; as for reconciliation: Z 138 and Z 141. About Daniel emphasising the heresy as a cause to condemn Maximus: Z 141-2. Maximus' words to Daniel (Z 143): "Ты же, аще еще извѣты творя, негодуеши на мене напрасно."

<sup>392</sup>HERBERSTEIN 2007, 156 (see above, note 253). СКАЗАНИЕ ИЗВѢСТНО, 98 says that it was Daniel who kept Maximus under guard ("во узах стража от Данила митрополита"), while Ivan IV, through the intercession of Artemii, the hegumen of the Trinity – St Sergius monastery, liberated him, *ibid.*, 96. Again later, in the letter to metropolitan Macarius, Maximus emphasised that Daniel was unjustly angry with him: FILARET 1842, 96. Similarly KURBSKII, History of the Grand Prince of Moscow, 76, emphasised Daniel's envy was the cause of Maximus' suffering. The whole *Sudnye spiski* portray Daniel as the main spring of the trial. The Prince is only mentioned while Daniel often intervened. In Daniel's letter (SUDNYE SPISKI, 121-2) he says that it have been him who presented Maximus' case before the council and the Grand Prince. So he was the initiator of the trial. PLOGUZOV 2002, 236 expresses a similar opinion. KAZAKOVA 1967-8, part II, 127 thinks that prosecutors tried to induce Basil's indignation against Maximus. It is true that all chronicles (cf. KAZAKOVA 1970, 182-3 and ТИХОМИРОВ 1930, 112) present the Grand Prince as the one who takes the decision (or as one of two main actors, besides the metropolitan). This way of describing the events resulted from the fact that without the Grand Prince's consent the condemnation was not possible. Perhaps it was only the question of divorce that changed Basil's favour to Maximus.

<sup>393</sup>In СКАЗАНИЕ В КОРПУСЕ СОЧИНЕНИЙ, 82-3, we read that the enemy of the mankind "[...] воздвиже нѣкоторых небратолюбцов на неприязненую зависть, яко иноплеменник человекъ в толику высоту воздвигся [...].

## 8. INVESTIGATION AND THE TRIAL OF 1525

We do not know which event or decision eventually caused Maximus to be placed under arrest.<sup>394</sup> It happened in mid-February 1525 if not earlier.<sup>395</sup> About a week later Ivan Bersen' Beklemishev and Fedor Zharenoi, were also arrested since they were examined on 20<sup>th</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> of February.<sup>396</sup> The fact that Maximus was arrested first may suggest that his case was essential and the two (or more) others were taken into custody because of their links with the Greeks (Sava, the hegumen of the Novospasskij monastery, was accused together with Maximus). For the Grand Prince however Beklemishev's case was certainly more important. For at least a year he had been out of princely favour (SD-Ob, 4). He disapproved of Basil's rule compared to the good rule of Basil's father, Ivan III and had also personal reasons for dissatisfaction (SD-Ob, 5. 8. 13. 14). Certainly, Beklemishev was a malcontent but there is no data about any plot in which he may have been involved. Nonetheless, in a situation of the constant threat of princely authority, it was enough to declare him guilty. His words hit at the key element of the ideological structure of the princely authority. Continuation and succession (especially in the case of the successful Ivan III) were a value *per se*. Bersen', speaking about disruption, undermined the foundation of Basil's reign.

Zharenoi seems to be simply unluckily involved in the contacts between Bersen' and

---

И сего старца Максима они неблазии оклеветаше къ православному государю еретиком и прелестником и врага богохранимей земли Русе, ови убо от них на клеветы воздвиже, и друзии от них лжесвидѣтельством утвержаху клевету.” In СКАЗАНИЕ ИЗВѢСТНО, 96, the author enumerated, within the context of Maximus' trial, various elements of Maximus' criticism but all of them concern morals (sodomy, injustice, usury and the exploitation of poor people). There is no mention of Maximus' criticism of the Muscovite ecclesiastical order, e.g. the way the metropolitans were appointed.

394Maximus' trial is one of the most discussed aspects of his biography. The review of historiography concerning this subject can be found in KAZAKOVA 1970, 177-80, SINITSYNA 1977, 130-1, PLIGUZOV 2002, 208-22 and a very general in VOLOVIK 2000.

395Ivan Bersen' says: “угонилъ меня, господине, Федко Жареной тому съ недѣлю против Николы, а Максима уже изымали...” SD-Ob, 9. Bersen' was examined on February 22<sup>nd</sup> 1525. If the expression *против Николы* is understood temporally Maximus was arrested about a week before the feast of St Nicholas, i.e. about 30<sup>th</sup> of November (PLIZGUZOV 2002, 176. 211 is of this view as were earlier Ikonnikov, Smirnov and Zimin; an example of this understanding of *против* in KROM 2010, 42). If the same expression is understood spatially (and this is more probable), the arrest took place about 15<sup>th</sup> of February (a week before the interrogation) and Zharenoi met Bersen' next to the Church or monastery of St Nicholas, certainly the Greek St Nicholas monastery, where Medovartsev had his workshop (SINITSYNA 1977, 134-5, SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 29, as earlier Golubinskii, is for this dating). The mention of hegumen Arsenii in this fragment speaks for the benefit of Sinitsyna because he was appointed only in January 1525 and the previous hegumen, Porfirii, left the monastery in September 1524 see: PSRL XXIV, 222; ZIMIN 1971, 78. STROEV 1877 thought that the appointment took place in January 1526 but the chronicle says clearly that it was in January 1525.

396See: SD-Ob, 9. 13. We have no information when Sava, hegumen of Novo-Spasskij monastery (who was judged together with Maximus), was arrested. There is also no data about the arrest of Peter Mukha Karpov who, according to one source, was sentenced together with Bersen' and Zharenoi, see: ТИХОМИРОВ 1930, 112.

Maximus. He was also in conflict with the metropolitan (SD-Ob, 9) and fell from princely favour. Therefore he desperately sought a protector from the Grand Prince (SD-Ob, 7). Someone decided to use his delicate situation. During the investigation Zharenoi declared that he was encouraged to denounce Maximus and even that the hegumen of the Trinity – St Sergius Lavra, in the name of the Grand Prince, tried to persuade him to “tell a lie” about Maximus (SD-Ob, 9). Was it really Basil III’s initiative? It does not seem very plausible that the Prince tried to persuade such not an influential person as Fedor to be an adverse witness. In the light of all what has been said, it may have rather been on Daniel’s initiative. The hegumen sent to Zharenoi must have been Arsenii Sakharusov. His predecessor, Porfirii, was deposed because he interceded for Shemiachich. It is therefore highly probable that Arsenii was Daniel’s man.<sup>397</sup>

Maximus’ enemies had certainly sought evidence against him for some time. The weakness of the arguments used during his trial reveals that it had not been an easy task. Probably information received from the Greek’s servant (келейникъ) Athanasius and a few monks seemed to be sufficient to find Maximus guilty. Athanasius’ information about meetings in the Greek’s cell allowed Beklemishev’s case to be linked to Maximus’. In this way the accusers were able to give the impression that a conspiracy did exist.<sup>398</sup>

Our knowledge about the course of the investigation is limited. The preserved records are only fragmentary and present a biased view of the situation.<sup>399</sup> In the part known to us, the

---

<sup>397</sup>For Arsenii, see: ZIMIN 1971, 78 and above, note 395. Both KAZAKOVA 1967-8, part II, 127 and PLIGUZOV 2002, 209 suggest that Daniel played a major part in the preparation of the trial. Strangely enough, in the version that was scratched out in the document we can read that the proposal of the hegumen was: “tell me the whole truth about Maximus”. The previous (scratched) version and the next one can be found in the draft of the document but none of them was placed in the version that can be considered as the final draft. Perhaps the change in the document was intended to compromise Fedor Zharenoi; cf. also: SINITSYNA 1977, 135. He was later sentenced to have his tongue cut out, PSRL XXIV, 222; XXVI, 313. It may have been either a punishment for the lie or prevention so that he would not repeat what he knew. Zharenoi probably collaborated with Maximus because he took from him fascicles (тетрадки), SD-Ob, 15. They may have been Maximus’ translation which Fedor, the Metropolitan’s *diak*, delivered to the chancellery of the Metropolitan. We know that Maximus’ translations were used after his imprisonment by Daniel. See below, note 435.

<sup>398</sup>Some older historian (Б. И. Дунаев, И. И. Смирнов, И. Б. Греков) maintained that Maximus was involved in a plot together with Skinder but the discovery of the *Sudnye spiski* made this hypothesis improbably, cf. Pokrovskii 1971, text and note 43. The information that the Greeks were judged for treason can be found only in two tendentious sources where we can suspect Daniel’s influence: the *Sudnye spiski* and the *Pafnut’ev Borovskaia chronicle*, see: ТИХОМИРОВ 1930, 112. Three other chronicles simply inform us that the Greeks as well as Beklemishev and Zharenoi were punished. In two of three chronicles where we find information about these events, there is no direct link between the Greek’s case and Beklemishev’s case. All three existing notes about these events are quoted *in extenso* by KAZAKOVA 1970, 182-3.

<sup>399</sup>In a few places in the records of the investigation the previous one was struck out. Visibly someone attempted to manipulate the record in order to defend the good name of the prince (SD-Ob, 10. 14), to compromise a defendant (*ibid.*, 9) or to conceal an event (*ibid.*). They are slightly chaotic. A detailed analysis of this source is given by SINITSYNA 1977, 131-9. Her general conclusion is that the document is tendentious and patchy. The compiler tended to make it one-dimensional and shortened it to a minimum (p. 139), to remove fragments that may have complicated the picture and revealed the ambiguity of the testimonies.

centre of attention are Beklemishev and – to a lesser degree – Zharenoi. Maximus, in this fragment, is a witness, not a defendant. When he spoke about himself, it was only in the contexts of Beklemishev's and Zharenoi's words.

At first the defendants tried to conceal the dangerous subjects of their conversations. Maximus initially told only about one, not the most compromising, topic of his talks with Beklemishev (SD-Ob, 3). Later his testimonies became more menacing, especially for Beklemishev, even if Maximus remembered that the former had asked him for discretion (SD-Ob, 8. 14-15). The litigants changed their statements, mutually questioned one another about their testimonies and only after confrontation with counter-testimonies admitted that some accusations were true. Maximus' statements seriously charged Beklemishev and Zharenoi.

Both the compiler's of the document manipulations and the behaviour of the defendants divulge that pressure was exerted to lead the investigation to the end desired by the accusation. The accused changed their statements rather through fear of an unknown future than under torture.<sup>400</sup> The pressure was sufficient to break the bonds joining them. Each of them tried to save his own skin. Maximus who remembered in detail Savonarola's martyrdom, was not ready at this moment to follow the Italian friar whom he admired so much. There was however a moment when a feeling of solidarity won him over. He declared that he wanted to say what was in his heart. He said that he had also noticed the unmerciful behaviour of the Grand Prince about which Beklemishev and Zharenoi complained. He emphasised that it was his own reflection, that he had neither heard it from anyone nor said it to anyone.<sup>401</sup>

With the passage of time Maximus certainly realised how critical his situation was. He was charged with serious offences: with deforming the Orthodox faith, with acting against *raison d'état* of Muscovy (both in ecclesiastical and secular domain) and perhaps also with wizardry.<sup>402</sup> He was judged first in Basil III's palace and then in the Metropolitan's chamber.

---

400Cf. WEICKHARDT 2007, 55: "There were few traces of inquisitorial procedure or judicial torture in Muscovy prior to the mid-sixteenth century." Only at the end of the sixteenth and at the beginning of the seventeenth century at the lists of questions for confessors of rulers we find questions like: "Did you not [...] order someone to be tortured?" Earlier such questions were unthinkable, see: KOROGODINA 2007, 387-8.

401See: SD-Ob, 10. This fragment was removed from the draft. Cf. also: SINITSYNA 1977, 132. Tendentiousness and fragmentariness of the document of investigation are the underlying causes of very different interpretations of Maximus' behaviour during the investigation. One may suspect that personal sympathies influenced these interpretations in the absence of essential arguments. ZIMIN 1971, esp. 71-2, drew Maximus' figure in black colours suggesting that he contributed to the fall of his companions. SINITSYNA 1977, 134-8, in discussion both with Zimin and Lur'e, emphasised that at the beginning Maximus' statements were equally dangerous for Bersen' and for himself. Then, both Beklemishev's deposition were more dangerous for Zharenoi than Maximus' and Zharenoi's deposition was also more dangerous for Beklemishev than Maximus' one, *ibid.*, 135-6, and so on. CHERNOV 1934, 473. 466-9, maintained forcibly that corrections and deformations introduced into the document of the investigation were made in favour of Maximus.

402The main source on Maximus' trials are the so called *Sudnye spiski*. It is not the minutes of the court case but a

The *Sudnye spiski* called the assembly in the palace a *council* (собор) and informs us that, apart from the Grand Prince, his brothers, the Metropolitan, bishops and boyars were also present there.<sup>403</sup> The hearing in the princely hall started after 22<sup>nd</sup> of February 1525 and had finished probably by the end of the month.<sup>404</sup> This event is named *council* but this word was used in Muscovy not only to describe an ecclesiastical assembly but also a lay gathering. Its composition and the place where it was held need further explanation. Admittedly, there were two separate judicial systems in Muscovy: lay and ecclesiastical but the Church and the state were not separated. On the contrary, in the first half of the sixteenth century a close collaboration between these two powers was being forged. Maximus' case was quite complicated and unprecedented. Some of its aspects (like the question of appointing metropolitans) concerned both authorities. Therefore we can understand that all the events that began with the hearing before the Grand Prince and ended with the verdicts after the examination of this case by the Church tribunal as one complex phenomenon.<sup>405</sup>

---

tendentious propaganda narrative based partially on documents. More information about this and other sources and MSS in: KAZAKOVA 1970, 182-4 and ff., POKROVSKII 1971, 18 ff. and PLIGUZOV 2002, chapter VI. In the *Sudnye spiski* accusations of the 1525 and 1531 trials are mixed so the important question is the attribution of these accusations to 1525 and 1531. An absolutely precise attribution seems to be difficult. PLIGUZOV 2002 gives however a well-grounded proposal of solving this problem and I follow his conclusions, rarely subjecting them to modifications. His above-mentioned book is a collection of articles. His conclusions in different articles are not completely coherent and show that he modified his views. E.g., in the essay about V. Tuchkov he maintains that the episode with Zakhar' in took place in 1525 (see p. 195) while in later text about the trial he gives convincing arguments that it happened in 1531, (p. 225). There is a general agreement that in 1525 Maximus was accused of criticism of the way Muscovite metropolitans were appointed and of the heretic formulation that Jesus *sat* at the right hand of the Father (SINITSYNA 2006<sup>a</sup>, 13 and SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 29). It cannot be excluded that other accusations which appeared in 1531, had already been put forward in 1525. PLIGUZOV 2002, 234. 236-7 also proposed a hypothesis that the 1525 fragment and the document of investigation (SD-Ob) are based on the same original which was the document “списки старца Максима и Савы Греков, и Берсеневы, и Федька Жареного”, preserved in the Tsar archives. Yet, it can hardly been maintained because there are some striking differences between these two documents: e.g. the *Sudnye spiski* consistently uses the phrase “и став [...] с очей на очи” while the document of the investigation: “и поставили [...] съ очи на очи”. Similarly, statements of witnesses in SD-Ob are longer and more narrative while in the *Sudnye spiski* they are rather short. PLIGUZOV 2002, 250 and KAZAKOVA 1970, 193 reason convincingly that the original minutes of both trials (1525 and 1531) existed and that they were preserved in the Tsar's archive. SINITSYNA 1977, 140 doubts whether minutes of 1525 ever existed.

403Both the *SUDNYE SPISKI*, 90; 99 (line 15-21); 108 (line 2-4); 121,25-122,1 and a chronicle (ТИХОМИРОВ 1930, 112) speak about two parts of the trial or about two trials and people taking part in these two trials. Cf. also: ZIMIN 1971, 78 and PLIGUZOV 2002, 237. The *Tipografskaya chronicle* (PSRL XXIV, 222) describes it as one event: “Того же мѣсяца бысть у великого князя соборъ с митрополитомъ и съ архиепископы и съ епископы на Максима на Грека да на архимандрита на Спасского с Нового на Саву на Грека.” If the mention “Того же мѣсяца” refers to the directly preceding event (the Grand Prince granted land to Ivan Vorotynskii) the council took place in February (PLIGUZOV 2002, 211) but if it refers to the last mention of a month it would be even in January since the last mention of a month is “мѣсяца ген[варя]”. Perhaps the council started even in January and only after some preliminary considerations, in February, Maximus and others were arrested.

404On the date of the hearings: SD-Ob, 9. Cf. the reconstruction of chronology by PLIGUZOV 2002, 211 based on the analysis of PSRL XXIV, 222. PLIGUZOV 2002, 238, proposed more detailed chronology, but purely hypothetical.

405The complexity of the situation is well shown in Herberstein's summary report where he says that Maximus,



The wide representation of prelates and lay notables attested to the significance of this lawsuit. Among the above-mentioned people, there was also a representation from the Josephian monastery of Volokolamsk and perhaps from others. Princely officers were also present.<sup>406</sup> The organisers endeavoured to be as convincing as possible. Many witnesses were summoned, sometimes even several for just one point of accusation. All the preparation did not prevent the architects of the trial from bending the facts from necessity and concealing the truth in documents. Some politically fragile issues should not have been revealed.<sup>407</sup> Neither should have been the relatively low importance of Maximus' real guilt in comparison with accusation which were ascribed to him.

The trial is reflected in the sources in a deformed way. The chronicles are not free of tendentiousness but they leave the facts unsaid rather than create an ideological interpretation. Other sources like the *Sudnye spiski* and a fragment from Pafnut'ev-Borovskii monastery's chronicle clearly attempt to construct a politically useful vision of the events. The last two sources do not portray real events but how the accusers wanted the events to be perceived. Both of them present Maximus (and Sava to a certain degree) as guilty of the two most grave offences in – respectively – the secular and ecclesiastical sphere: treason and heresy. Certainly in order to enhance the propaganda effect, the *Sudnye spiski* extensively relate the questions of the accusation but Maximus' answers are comparatively short. His explanations do not seem convincing.<sup>408</sup>

#### IN THE GRAND PRINCE'S CHAMBER

At first, in the Grand Prince's chamber, the council dealt with incriminations related to the political dimension of Maximus' activity. Together with him were judged: Sava, the

---

having discovered errors in Muscovite *ecclesiastical* books, tells the Prince that he is a schismatic (HERBERSTEIN 2007, 156). The issues of magical practices, blasphemy, offences against the Church belonged to competences of ecclesiastical courts, cf. RYAN 1999, 20.

406 PLOGUZOV 2002, 236 notices that Volokolamsk monks were present at the trial (cf. SUDNYE SPISKI, 124, lines 16-17. 19-20). If they came, it is highly probable that also other monasteries were represented. Since “списки старца Максима и Савы Греков, и Берсенева, и Федька Жареного” were preserved in the archives of the *Посольский Приказ*, clerks (дьяки) of this office must have been present too, infers Ploguzov, *ibid.*

407 See: KAZAKOVA 1970, 183; POKROVSKII 1971, 52-4.

408 The last fact was noticed by SINITSYNA 2006<sup>a</sup>, 13. On other manipulations of Maximus' adversaries see above, text and note 393 and 398. On the character of the *Sudnye spiski* and the document of the investigation, see above, notes: 399, 401 and 402. The *Pafnut'ev Borovskaia chronicle* reveals a strong political tendentiousness according to the line of the Josephian party (cf. ТИХОМИРОВ 1930). The fragment *About the Greeks* (О греках), concerning Maximus and Sava, comes from this chronicle. It is said in this passage that the Grand Prince proved the Greeks' treason and the Metropolitan – heresy. NB, the *Povest' o vtorom brake* (see: BEGUNOV 1970, 107-8), where the Greeks are not mentioned, is also biased to protect the Prince from suspicion that he has acted against the law.

hegumen of the Novospaskij monastery and – probably – Fedor Zharenoi and Ivan Bersen’ Beklemishev. We have however only some information about the cross-examination of Maximus and Sava.<sup>409</sup> A fragment of the *Sudnye spiski* describes this part of the proceedings.<sup>410</sup> The interest of the tribunal was focused on the Greeks’ attitude towards Basil III’s policies and towards his person. The most exploited theme was the issue of the alleged letters sent by Sava and Maximus to the sultan and his pashas (see above, text and notes 371-378). The accusation clumsily attempted to prove that Maximus and Sava contacted the Turkish authority to the detriment of Muscovy and of its ruler. Even the minutes fabricated in order to present the accusation as well-founded, reveals manipulations. One of the main witnesses, Athanasius the Greek, first testifies that Sava sent suspect letters (затворные грамоты) to the sultan. The next witness, Vasilij Tuchkov admits that he knows about a Greek charter or document (грамота) possessed by Maximus (the text of the source is damaged and unclear in this place). It seems that Tuchkov spoke about another document which did not contain anything which might have been useful for the prosecutor and therefore Athanasius is called to testify again. Now he says that both Sava and Maximus sent a letter to the pasha of Athens asking him to write to the sultan so that the latter could send an army against the Grand Prince. The witness says that he saw Fedor with the letter before he went to Constantinople but he was informed by another monk, Acacius (Окарей) about its content. Visibly Athanasius could not read or at least did not know the Greek language. Nobody even tried to interrogate Acacius. This charge was so poorly founded that Sava and Maximus without great effort could plead not guilty.<sup>411</sup>

At times, the examination looks like a ritual. The defendant pleads not guilty, witnesses give their testimony confirming the accusation and then the defendant admits his guilt. This

---

409The fact that they were judged together is confirmed in: 1) the *Tipografaskaia letopis*: “в том же деле”, cf. PSRL XXIV, 222; 2) the register of the Tsar archive: the documents concerning Maximus, Sava, Zharenoi and Beklemishev were placed together while the case of Peter Karpov-Mukha was clearly in a separate file, even if in the same box, cf. ZIMIN 1978, I, 43; 3) the *Pafnut’ev Borovskaia chronicle* which also links all of them with Karpov within the same case; 4) the document of the investigation (SD-Ob) can be also indirect evidence. In SUDNYE SPISKI, 99, the metropolitan Daniel says that Maximus’ “единомысленницы и советницы” were with him at the council. Cf. also: PLOGUZOV 2002, 234.

410PLOGUZOV 2002, 230-7. 244, established that the 1525 fragment contains information about the first, *secular* part of the trial (this question was studied before by Chernov, cf. POKROVSKII 1971, 52-3). Although this fragment seems to be close to the original minutes (PLOGUZOV 2002, 232-3, but cf. Kazakova’s opposite meaning, KAZAKOVA 1970, 190 ff.) it is not free of deformations. E.g. Vasilij Tuchkov’s witness seems to be artificially interjected into this fragment and in one place (SUDNYE SPISKI, 117, 19) reported speech appears.

411See: SUDNYE SPISKI, 115-7. PLOGUZOV 2002, 197-201. 231. 242, extensively analysed this part of the examination. Contrary to Pokrovskii, he shows (ibid., 231) that the accusation of contacts with the Sultan comes from the trial of 1525. As a matter of fact, POKROVSKII 1971, 65-7. 69, also emphasised that the prosecutor did not have any Greek document that could charge Maximus. Nevertheless the chronicle of the Pafnut’ev-Borovskii monastery presented Maximus’ and Sava’s secret correspondence with the sultan as proof of their guilt, cf. TIKHOMIROV 1930, 112.

was the case with two other accusations of not informing the ruler about Skinder's threats and of critical enunciation concerning weaknesses of Basil's policy towards the Tartars and Turkey. In the last occurrence Maximus, admitting his guilt, underlined the fact that he had spoken it as a warning to the Prince.<sup>412</sup>

The next allegation is astounding only at first glance. Again Athanasius testifies, and again he repeats what he heard from others, namely that Fedor and Lavrentii had said that Maximus, when the Grand Prince was angry with him, "writes words on his palms with salves and rubs them together, hand over hand, and then comes to the Grand Prince and the Grand Prince starts to speak to him, and he starts to give answers to the Grand Prince about that, and he puts his palms against the Grand Prince, and from that moment the Grand Prince's anger towards him is alleviated and [he] begins to laugh."<sup>413</sup> There was nothing surprising in the then Muscovy (as in Western countries) to take seriously the possible influence of magical practices on a monarch's life. The conviction that magic had been used against monarchs in Muscovy (in the mid-sixteenth century in Moscow the centre of gravity in beliefs concerning the presence of magic in rulers' lives moved from the prince's bedroom and dining room towards politics) and Maximus other *crimes* against the ruler were thus allowed to be easily and harmoniously added to the list of accusation: wizardry.<sup>414</sup> Perhaps Maximus' capacity to solve conflicts with Basil III led his accusers to the conviction that the Greek used magical forces. Admittedly, Maximus had been in touch with people practising a kind of magic in Italy but it is hardly imaginable that he tried to use his knowledge in this field when he was in a difficult position. The source does not note any of Maximus' reactions to this charge but only mentions a short dispute between him and Sava concerning Athanasius and Maximus' strange behaviour towards the Prince. Sava did not like that. The short clash finished with a reconciliation of the two monks (*Sudnye spiski*, 115-6).

At the end of this part of the trial, according to the *Sudnye spiski* narrative, Maximus was incriminated of rejecting the legitimacy of the appointment of the Moscow metropolitans by the local bishops. It is not by chance that this charge was examined at the end because it concerned both secular and ecclesiastical spheres. This case is relatively well-documented.

---

412See: SUDNYE SPISKI, 117-8. There is one more testimony in the 1525 fragment (SUDNYE SPISKI, 116), given by Vasilii Tuchkov. It was much more serious than the previous ones because Tuchkov maintained that Maximus called Basil a persecutor of Christianity, similar to previous persecutors. PLIGUZOV 2002, 181-196. 206, assumes that this accusation comes from the year 1531.

413SUDNYE SPISKI, 115-6, translated by KIVELSON 1997, 267.

414See: KIVELSON 1997, 268. 277. 283 and *passim*, with further bibliography. Daniel's letter to Volokolamsk after Maximus' trial gives an idea of the conviction that Maximus had almost miraculous capacity to influence other people, cf. below, text and note 430 and 432

Besides the partisan *Sudnye spiski* we have Maximus own works where he expressed his disagreement about the Muscovite practise of appointing metropolitans without the approval of the Constantinople patriarch. His statements quoted by witnesses during the examination in the princely chamber are much more radical than those that can be read in his works. Possibly the written works were aimed for a wider public while witnesses repeated the opinions he expressed in private.

The still unsolved question is whether Maximus pleaded guilty of this charge during the secular trial of 1525. When in 1531 bishop Dositheos (Досифей) summarised the results of the previous court case he affirmed that Maximus had pleaded not guilty six years before but in the fragment of the *Sudnye spiski* coming from 1525 we read that he did plead guilty.<sup>415</sup> One can just assume that in 1525 Maximus admitted only that he had really said what the witnesses testified to but he did not recognise it as a crime. In his last words noted in the fragment of 1525, confirming the witnesses' statements and despite his confession, he again attempted to defend his position saying that princely envoys used to go to Constantinople so why could not metropolitans do the same.<sup>416</sup>

With this, the first part of Maximus' trial ended. Even if during the few years spent in Moscow the Greek had become accustomed to local practises, this litigation must have been a shock to him. He knew the Roman legal tradition and what he experienced in Moscow was quite distant from the principles of Roman law. His behaviour, which is sometimes difficult to explain, must have resulted at least partially from the peculiarity of the situation, in which he found himself. It explains at least partially his – sometimes – strange behaviour before the court.

The hearings in the Grand Prince's palace did not last long.<sup>417</sup> Beklemishev and Zharenoi were quickly sentenced. The link between their case and that of Maximus and Sava's allows us to infer that a decision concerning the secular offences that the monks were accused

---

415See: SUDNYE SPISKI, 111 and 118-9. PLIGUZOV 2002, 231. 240, maintains that Maximus pleaded guilty during the secular part of the trial and refused to admit his guilt at the Metropolitan's court. It is however hardly probable because a part of those who participated in the secular hearing were also present during the ecclesiastical lawsuit. POKROVSKII 1971, 59 speculates, quoting Chernov, that Maximus pleaded not guilty in 1525, hoping for an acquittal.

416See: SUDNYE SPISKI, 119. We do not see such an attempt in 1531. Those who supported the idea that the metropolitans of Moscow should have been appointed by the local bishops argued that it was very difficult to go to Constantinople for the confirmation. It should be mentioned, as DEWEY 1957 shows, that generally Muscovite judges based their decision on a common-sense evaluation of the evidence presented in court. The abuses during Maximus' trial were rather something exceptional.

417Based on the analyse of the *Vologodsko-Permska chronicle*, PLIGUZOV 2002, 211 shows that the sentence on Beklemishev and Zharenoi was executed before 2<sup>nd</sup> of April 1525. The *Tipografskaya chronicle* (PSRL XXIV, 222) suggests that the Grand Prince's sentence and also the execution took place earlier, during February. Cf. above, notes 403 and 404.

of, was also taken not later than in March. The final verdict in their case was probably announced after the completion the ecclesiastical hearings about which we know little. The foregoing detailed description of proceedings in the Prince's palace is based on the *Sudnye spiski* but there is no similar document describing the second part of the trial. The chronicles are much more laconic than the *Sudnye spiski*. They say that Beklemishev was decapitated, Zahrenoi had his tongue cut out and the Greeks were sentenced to be incarcerated in two different monasteries. Political crimes – according to these sources – were investigated by the Grand Prince and only he pronounced the sentence. The investigation of the religious transgressions is ascribed by the chronicles to the Metropolitan with the council.<sup>418</sup>

In practice, the probable order of events was as follows: after the secular offences were investigated, Zharenoi and Beklemishev were executed. Then the monks were delivered to the Church authorities to be judged. The ecclesiastical court might have pronounced its own sentence but the final decision belonged to the ruler. Yet, taking into account the central role of the Metropolitan, one can assume that he was the real author of the sentence. The fact that the chronicles almost unanimously affirm that it was the Grand Prince who pronounced the sentence reveals that Basil III sealed by his authority the decision prepared by the metropolitan Daniel.<sup>419</sup>

Repeated information about *many councils* (which can be understood as many sittings) or Daniel's enunciation that he presented Maximus to the council "once, twice and three times" indicate that the ecclesiastical part of his trial was longer and more complicated than the secular.<sup>420</sup> Nonetheless it must have finished before 24<sup>th</sup> of May.

---

418Two of these documents (PSRL XXVI, 313 and the unpublished *Kholmogorskaja chronicle*, see: KAZAKOVA 1970, 183) describe the events as the Grand Prince's exclusive action. The *Tipografaska chronicle* talks about the common action of the Grand Prince and the Metropolitan (with the council) concerning Maximus and Sava but the decision concerning Beklemishev and Zharenoi are attributed only to the Grand Prince. Finally, in the *Pafnut'ev-Borovskaia chronicle* the Grand Prince examined the political accusations, the Metropolitan with the council scrutinised the religious offences and the Grand Prince determined the sentence. Only the *Sudnye spiski* mention a council at the princely chamber and at the Metropolitan's house.

419Only the *Tipografaska chronicle* which says *носнава* (PSRL XXIV, 222) suggests that the Prince with the Metropolitan and the council took the decision collectively.

420About *many councils* see: SUDNYE SPISKI, 99, 20-1; 108, 103, about presenting Maximus to the council even three times, *ibid.* 121, 26. PLIGUZOV 2002, 211 and 223 infers the conclusion (based on analysis of SUDNYE SPISKI, 124, 19-20) that the ecclesiastical part of the trial could not be held in May because the Volokolamsk monks were at that moment in their monastery. It cannot be excluded however that they participated only in the first part. He thinks (*ibid.*, 213 and 238) that the most probable reconstruction of the events is as follows: Maximus and Sava were judged by both the secular and ecclesiastical courts at the end of February (between 22<sup>nd</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup>) and then sent to Volokolamsk. On 24<sup>th</sup> of May the Prince and the Metropolitan sent there letters determining the way the condemned monks should be treated. Pliguzov does not try to harmonise his conclusions from different parts of his book which were written in different moments. In another place (p. 241) he says that the ecclesiastical trial ended shortly before 24<sup>th</sup> of May 1525.

## IN THE METROPOLITAN'S CHAMBER

We do not have any direct account about the proceedings of the ecclesiastical court in 1525. Only the particulars from chronicles, reminiscences made during the council of 1531 and a short reference in the *Sudnye spiski* inform us about it.<sup>421</sup> Its organisers had to make more efforts than during the receiving of secular indictments. Wanting to save face, they had to be more persuasive. The Muscovite authorities did not have clear consciences. The fact that Maximus was kept in Moscow against his will and the previous manipulation during the first part of the trial needed justification or – at least – explanation. If Maximus' heretical statements were proved, closer attention would have been paid to his guilt rather than to his accusers' abuses. The documents of Maximus' trial found in 1549 in the tsar's archives were entitled "About Maximus the Greek's heresy..." so heresy was presented as his main offence. In any case, he emphasised that ecclesiastical charges against him should have been examined by his Ordinary, i.e. the patriarch of Constantinople.<sup>422</sup>

We know with certainty that the conciliar tribunal dealt with the question of Maximus amendment in the Pentecostarion (Цветная Триодь). He was probably also accused of other heretical alterations but we cannot be sure which of them were relevant in 1525.<sup>423</sup> Maximus' problematic amendment concerned the office for the Ascension Day. He replaced expressions *седе одесную отця* and *седяй одесную отця* with – respectively – *седев* and *седевшаго одесную отця*. The grammatical form he used suggested that Christ's "sitting at the right hand of the Father" was a past event. The incrimination was obviously right because Christian dogma says that Christ sat, is sitting and will sit at the right hand of the Father forever. Strangely enough, Maximus consistently refused to recognise his error both in 1525 and 1531, maintaining that there is no difference between his variant and the original one. Only after the council of 1531, he understood the core of the problem and explained that the amendment resulted from his poor knowledge of Slavonic and from the fact that he introduced it via Latin.<sup>424</sup> The reason of Maximus' obstinacy was probably (and paradoxically!) his linguistic analysis. His search for the best translation guided him to find principles how to render particular Greek grammatical forms in Slavonic. His knowledge of the Slavonic language was

---

421See: PSRL XXIV, 222; ТИХОМИРОВ 1930, 112; СУДНЫЕ СПИСКИ, 90, 105, 108.

422ПЛИГУЗОВ 2002, 209 thinks that Daniel needed the Grand Prince's sanction because he had exceeded his own authority. Maximus on the fact that he should have been judged by the patriarch: K-I, 36. Cf. also IVANOV 1976, 290 and SINITSYNA 1977, 153. About the documents that were found in 1549: СУДНЫЕ СПИСКИ, 125.

423The question of "sitting at the right hand of the Father" is mentioned in СУДНЫЕ СПИСКИ, 90, 19; 99, 4; 105, 109, 126. In СУДНЫЕ СПИСКИ, 105, 25-6, Daniel says that in 1525 Maximus was sentenced and sent to Volokolamsk for the above-mentioned amendment and for *other* blasphemies.

424See: K-I, 32-4. On his earlier refusal: СУДНЫЕ СПИСКИ, 90, 109, 126.

however too weak and he had to rely on the intermediation and on the choices of his collaborators. The use of Latin (more structured and regular) as a way between the Greek original (with a richer choice of tenses) and the Slavonic (where rules of the Church Slavonic competed with evolving vernacular Russian of the sixteenth century) was an additional problem. Such was the origin of the calamities concerning the translation of the phrase about “sitting at the right hand of the Father”.<sup>425</sup> The prosecutors read a whole litany of quotations from the Bible and from other early Christian sources (even if a few passages from the Bible and the Fathers would have been enough) in order to demonstrate clearly Maximus’ error. Since previous accusations had not been sufficiently proved, now they wanted to remove any shadow of suspicion that Maximus was not guilty.<sup>426</sup>

Probably the issue of the appointment of Moscow metropolitans and the accusation of wizardry were examined again before the Metropolitan since these questions concerned also Canon Law but we do not have any precise information about that.<sup>427</sup>

There is one more question that is unclear relating to the conciliar court. Metropolitan Daniel recalled in 1531 that Maximus had been judged before the sacred council with his “like-minded people and advisors”.<sup>428</sup> It was the case during the princely court but the situation is less clear for the hearings before the Metropolitan. Admittedly two chronicles mention that Sava was also judged by the ecclesiastical tribunal but we do not know of any canonical

---

425Maximus came to the conclusion that the best translation of the Greek aorist would be the Slavonic verb in the perfect tense. Very often he replaced aorist with perfect in his translation of the Commented Psalter. However the automatic attribution of this rule, generally useful, did not always leads to the best results. The distinction between aorist and perfect was fading away in Slavonic and in the sixteenth century there were almost no difference between them but in some cases these grammatical forms were still distinct. See: ROMODANOVSKAIA 2000. On the influence of the choices of his Russian collaborators: MACROBERT 2008, 47. “The significance of this material [collected by MacRobert] is twofold. On the one hand it demonstrates Maksim’s dependence on his assistants [...] On the other hand it provides additional evidence of development and change in the norms of Church Slavonic which Maksim followed, presumably in response to his own reading and to his readers’ reactions – but change away from, not towards vernacular Russian. [...] In the light of these findings, some other features of Maksim’s Church Slavonic usage can be seen as following the accepted practice of his time rather than constituting marked, even deliberate innovation.”, *ibid.*, 55. Similarly in: MACROBERT 2015, 169-80. Cf. also: OLMSTED 2002, 15 and IKONNIKOV 1915, 470.

426Daniel recalled in 1531 that during the previous trial “more than one” evidence in this case was read Maximus (SUDNYE SPISKI, 99, lines 22-3). The long list of quotations from the authorities is included in this document (SUDNYE SPISKI, 90-96). It is not sure from which trial they come. IKONNIKOV 1915, 470 presumes that the list was compiled by Daniel who supported the views he expressed in his works, in a similar way, with a number of quotations.

427Perhaps the mention about the testimony of Gerasim Zamyckii (SUDNYE SPISKI, 111) concerns the ecclesiastical trial (as maintains PLOGUZOV 2002, 231. 240) but there is no convincing proof. It would have been understandable if Dmitri Gerasimov, who participated in Maximus’ correction of the Muscovite books, would have been summoned to testify in the case of Maximus’ amendment in the *Pentecostarion* but in this case no record survived either. Gerasimov was absent in Moscow from April 8<sup>th</sup> 1525 till July 20<sup>th</sup> 1526, see *ibid.*, 239.

428Daniel says that Maximus was judged with his “единомысленницы и советницы” (SUDNYE SPISKI, 99, 21).

accusation against him. In the *Sudnye spiski* there is only a reference to him in secular offences.<sup>429</sup> Probably Sava was not a defendant in the ecclesiastical part of the trial, or he was there only as a witness.

## SENTENCE

The conclusions of the trial were announced in the letters of Basil III and Daniel and sent to the monastery of Volokolamsk on 24<sup>th</sup> of May 1525. It is obscure whether the judicial proceedings lasted so long or other factors caused the issuing of the documents to be postponed. We can presume that either Maximus was transported earlier to Volokolamsk and the letters were sent on 24<sup>th</sup> of May or, for some reasons, after having been sentenced, he was detained in Moscow till May. The delay may have resulted just from the necessity to wait for a suitable convoy.

The Metropolitan's letter contains all the details concerning the way Maximus was to be treated in his place of exile. The ruler, in his missive, only confirmed the decisions taken by Daniel with the council and enforced the execution of the sentence with his own sanctions.

The tone of the Metropolitan's letter to the Volokolamsk monks give an idea of the atmosphere prevailing during the trial and of Daniel's attitude towards Maximus:

“[...] Versus the God-repugnant and Odious and Evil-scheming Monk, the Greek Maksim, who Blasphemed against our Lord God and Jesus Christ [here Daniel describes the Greek's guilt: blasphemy against Jesus Christ contained in the phrase on *sitting at the right hand of the Father* and his objection to the way Moscow metropolitans were appointed. He adds that Maximus committed also other offences but does not list them. Visibly, these two accusation were regarded as indisputably proven. Moreover, it was more comfortable and politically correct not to mention the remainder.]

Having ascertained him to be replete with the most diabolic infamy and heresy and perdition, we have judged it quite impossible for him to remain at liberty, lest he be responsible for inflicting spiritual damage upon the many with his continuing speculations; therefore we have commanded him sequestered in the honourable cloister of the most pure Mother of God, the Iosifov Monastery. [...]

He is to be kept locked in a cell in silence and on no account be permitted to

---

<sup>429</sup>The *Tipografaskaia chronicle* (PSRL XXIV, 222) mentions Sava only in general but it does not distinguish between the secular and the ecclesiastical court. Only the *Pafnut'ev-Borovskaia chronicle* (ТИХОМИРОВ 1930, 112) clearly says that Sava (together with Maximus) was accused of treason and heresy but it is not an impartial source. It might have been comfortable for Daniel and his followers to extend the notion of guilt in a maximal way on both monks.



leave, lest there, too, the harm which proceeds from him spread to even a single person; he is to converse with no one, neither with churchmen nor with simple folk, nor with the monks of that monastery or any other.

Nor is he to make statements or instruct anyone in written form, or undertake any of his sophistry, or send letters to anyone, or receive them from any person [...] Upon him is laid our Council's solemn seal that he remain in absolute isolation and seclusion.

He is to be provided with one of the trusty Orthodox monks as presbyter, to whom he should confess and repent. And let that monk beware and test that it be not deceitful, but true and constant repentance.

If he falls ill and is near death, then he may take Communion; but if he recovers he is to remain excommunicate.

For reading and chanting and praying let him have only those books exclusively which Our Humbleness and the Sacred Council order him to have, such as lead to conversion and repentance and preparation for the final conclusion of life and the future judgment, and humility and submission and lamentation [...]

Every person who keeps him under lock must guard himself with greatest care against becoming himself contaminated by him – thus also that same presbyter, lest he become seduced.<sup>430</sup>

The place of Maximus' incarceration, the Volokolamsk monastery, was a stronghold of Joseph's followers. The punishment was designed to bring the Greek to repentance and the conversion which they understood as being the rejection of his views. The condition of his detention was draconian. The convict was excommunicated and virtually completely isolated. He could only read those few books that Daniel considered useful for his conversion and *safe*, the classical works of Orthodox spirituality. The only people he was allowed to be in contact with were a priest whose task was to observe whether Maximus' repentance was sincere and a monk who was to live with him. If the conversion really took place they were to inform the Grand Prince and the Metropolitan. Daniel's warning to the Volokolamsk monks that the Greek had to be isolated in order not to inflict harm to the souls of others was repeated a few times. His exhortations gave the impression that he wanted to eliminate the danger of any contagion from the sick person. Basil III in his letter also emphasised that Maximus should be guarded to avoid depravation.<sup>431</sup> In the light of these instructions the accusations of wizardry becomes

---

430SUDNYE SPISKI, 121-3. The English translation by OLMSTED 1987, 4-5. Cf. also SINITSYNA 2006<sup>a</sup>, 13 and SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 29.

431See: SUDNYE SPISKI, 121-4. Sava's name does not appear in Daniel's and Basil III's letters to Volokolamsk. It is one more proof that secular offences were not well founded (besides Maximus' criticism of the metropolitans

more understandable. It seems that Maximus' antagonist attributed to him an almost miraculous capacity of convincing people. It is another question whether it was true belief or rather a way to enhance the climate of suspicion around the Greek. In this way his ideas would have been more easily recognised as doubtful. Maximus himself would confess later that he has fallen in disgrace through calumination of enemies.<sup>432</sup>

The punishment inflicted on Maximus, although cruel, was relatively lenient in comparison with the weight of the crimes he was accused of. Beklemishev and Zharenoi were treated far more harshly. It is another sign that the charges against the Greeks, at least those that concerned the secular sphere, were not very well founded. Besides, probably nobody in Moscow wanted the death of the two Greeks but also further activity on their part was not desired by the ruling circles. Their disappearance was the best solution. Herberstein could not find precise information about Maximus' fate. He got to know that the Greek monk had disappeared and that some people considered him to be drowned. Patrikeev, with whom Maximus would be judged in 1531, was still an influential man but we do not have any sign of his intercession for Maximus. Perhaps in this case, he was not able to do anything, perhaps it was thanks to him that the Greeks were treated more mercifully. It may also be that Maximus was not sufficiently important to him.<sup>433</sup>

After the sentence had been pronounced, all the storms created by Maximus died away. The day after the Metropolitan and the Grand Prince sent their letters to Volokolamsk was Ascension Day and in Muscovite churches the same hymns were sung, in which Maximus had wanted to introduce his unfortunate amendments.

A few months later, in November 1525, Solomonia, the first wife of Basil III was sent to a monastery and in January 1526 the Grand Prince married Helena Glinska.<sup>434</sup>

It did not upset anybody that some works initiated by Maximus were continued. He was already imprisoned when in March 1525 Michael Medovartsev finished correcting the Pentecostarion, the work that was carried out under Maximus supervision. Others from among

---

appointment). Nevertheless Sava was also incarcerated, probably just to show that he was not arrested without a reason. Both the *Panut'ev-Borovskaia chronicle* (ТИХОМИРОВ 1930, 112) and the *Tipografaskaia chronicle* (PSRL XXIV, 222) report that Sava was sent to Vozmishcha. The *Vologodsko-Permskaia chronicle* (PSRL XXVI, 313) says that he was incarcerated in Volokolamsk, as Maximus, and SUDNYE SPISKI, 120, 18 that he was sent to Levkein monastery (this part of the *Sudnye spiski* refers however rather to 1531, cf. PLIGUZOV 2002, 248). Both Vozmishcha and Levkein monastery were situated not far from Volokolamsk and were linked with Josephian circles. See also POKROVSKII 1971, 75 and the note 175, above. The *Panut'ev-Borovskaia chronicle* (ТИХОМИРОВ 1930, 112) says that also Athanasius was jailed even if he did a great service for the accusers.

432See M-II, 250: "поклепали мене государю моему преславному нѣщцы небратолюбцы"

433See: HERBERSTEIN 2007, 156 and (for Patrikeev) KAZAKOVA 1970, 119-20.

434See: PLIGUZOV 2002, 241 and 92.

Maximus' original works and translations were intensively copied and used during the years following his trial in 1525, also in the scriptorium of the Metropolitan Daniel.<sup>435</sup>

## 9. IN VOLOKOLAMSK

The Volokolamsk monks dealt with Maximus according to their instructions. The priest Iona was assigned as his *starets* and Tikhon Lenkov who had previously made his mark as a confidant of Joseph Volotskij and the Grand Prince became his *guardian angel*. The documents of the next trial in 1531 show that both of them fulfilled their task punctiliously.<sup>436</sup>

The zeal of the Volokolamsk monastery's superiors seems to have been even greater than the Metropolitan expected. The Greek was put in fetters and – according to his own words – he suffered from hunger, coldness and smoke. This last indicates perhaps a kind of refined torture. Maximus was not the only one who underwent such maltreatment.<sup>437</sup>

Prince Kurbskii who would meet Maximus in 1553 and who esteemed him greatly related that the Greek “had endured much – long-lasting and grievous chains and long-lasting imprisonment in the direst prisons”.<sup>438</sup>

The harshness of Maximus' situation resulted not only from the ruthless treatment but also from the lack of perspectives. He might have been released if he had rejected his *heresy*, but probably he did not even know to what extent he should have lied, in rejecting his own convictions and so be considered a real convert. Despair must have been often his temptation. Nonetheless, he did not lose heart. Two of his early biographies ascribe his perseverance to a supernatural intervention: an angel came to visit him in prison and consoled him. Having experienced this, Maximus composed a prayer to the Holy Spirit – Paraclete, writing with a piece of coal on the wall of his cell.<sup>439</sup> Some kind of intellectual activity was surely the only

---

435On copying Maximus' works after his imprisonment, see: SINITSYNA 1977, 66. 70; PLOGUZOV 2002, 302-3 and KLOSS 1976, 129. Kloss' conviction that Maximus translated the *Story about the capture of Constantinople* by Enea Silvio Piccolomini was supported by OLMSTED 2002, 21-2.

436See: POKROVSKII 1971, 55, IKONNIKOV 1915, 477, note and SUDNYE SPISKI, 98-9.

437See: IKONNIKOV 1915, 477 and the sources. About the fetters see: Z-138 = ZHUROVA 1998, 32, about hunger, coldness and smoke: K-II, 365, similarly SINITSYNA 2006<sup>a</sup>, 95. The last biographical fragment mentions also Selivan who was hung in smoke and killed this way.

438See: KURBSKII, History of the Grand Prince of Moscow, 76-7.

439See: СКАЗАНИЕ ИСАИИ, 89-90 and СКАЗАНИЕ ИЗВЕСТНО, 95 (only the latter text says about writing on the wall). Cf. IVANOV 1969, no. 349 (with references to MSS and early printed editions). OLMSTED 1987, 6-7 and 30, thinks that both the Canon to the Paraclete and another short text, *Words written by a monk Imprisoned and Disconsolate* (see below, note 486) were written after 1531 but the extreme circumstance of the composition of the Canon matches better to the period when conditions of his imprisonment were more severe. It is difficult to imagine that Maximus wrote on the wall the Canon in the form as we know it today but a short prayer to the Holy Spirit could be written in this way and later developed into a complete canon. It seems even more

possibility to preserve his mental balance in these extremely difficult circumstances.

There is one more trace of Maximus' attempts to exercise his mind. In a manuscript of the Slavonic Psalter belonging to the Volokolamsk monastery the psalm 109 in *Greek* was discovered. This text was scratched on the last pages of this manuscript. Boris Fonkich recognised Maximus' hand in this peculiar inscription. He had certainly tried to reconstruct these lines from memory because the scratched text differs seriously from the standard version. According to the information in the *Sudnye spiski* he also managed to write some missives.<sup>440</sup>

While intellectual activity was for Maximus a necessity for survival, for his enemies it was that which they feared most. The extraordinary means that were applied to him reveal that, even imprisoned, he did not cease to be a danger to them. The belief in his powerful influence is demonstrated in the letters sent to Volokolamsk and certainly the desire to justify his condemnation urged his enemies to combat his ideas and his reputation. The *Nikonovskaia chronicle* (Никоновская летопись), which was compiled in the late 1520-ties, probably on metropolitan Daniel's initiative, contains e.g. an overt polemic with Maximus' views which would have been examined before the council in 1531. The Greek's name is not mentioned in the document but a few characteristic topics indicate that it was a veiled polemics with him. In one place the Chronicle refers to the appointments of Moscow metropolitans as if in answer to Maximus' objections that it was done without the patriarch of Constantinople's consent. Also, we find a seemingly innocent story (because it concerns a much earlier period than sixteenth century) about bishops incarcerating heretics to bring about their conversion. Yet, it sounds like an echo of a passage from the *Sudnye spiski*. In another passage the compiler distorted the lives of saints that he quotes by adding fragments about possessions or bequeathing lands to monasteries. The last example was aimed first of all against Patrikeev but in 1531 the prosecutor tried to assign similar views to Maximus.<sup>441</sup>

Another attempt to fight Maximus' influence can be found in Daniel's Nomocanon (*Kormchaia*). The author includes a fragment from Theodore Balsamon, a text that Maximus

---

probable in the light of KAZIMOVA 2006, 289-92 where she shows the complex and heterogenous structure of the Canon: some of its elements were borrowed from other authors. On the Canon in general: KAZIMOVA 2006.

Another example of an unusual writing is the text scratched on the manuscript, see the next note. Therefore it seems that SINITSYNA 1977, 149 is incorrect when she maintains that we do not know Maximus' works that can be dated to the years 1525-1531.

440On the scratched text: FONKICH 1996. A similar text was found by Pliguzov and Tikhoniuk, *ibid.*, note 7. SUDNYE SPISKI, 97 say that Maximus wrote some missives in Volokolamsk. There is however no information whether they were sent or not.

441See: KLOSS 1976, 125-9. For the second case Kloss indicate, as a comparison, a fragment from SUDNYE SPISKI, 120. Some historians doubt Daniel's part in the compiling of the *Nikonovskaia chronicle*, cf. OSTROWSKI 1986, note 15.

had translated for Patrikeev's *Kormchaia* which concerns the alienation of the ecclesiastical properties. In Daniel's redaction however this fragment has a meaning contrary to the original one. He tried either to manipulate those who were not able to compare his translation with the original or to impose his interpretation using his ecclesiastical authority. Daniel's falsification must have been evident both for Patrikeev and Maximus.<sup>442</sup>

The Greek's enemies attached great importance to neutralising his influence. It is not however clear why they wanted him to be judged again. The fact – emphasised repeatedly by his accusers – that he did not show remorse does not explain why they organised a new trial. It would have been enough to keep him longer in jail. Even if, as maintained by Daniel and the compiler of the *Sudnye spiski*, the Greek did not observe the bans put on him and wrote missives as well as other works, it does not give a sufficient reason to organise a new lawsuit. A disciplinary penalty could have been imposed on him without new judicial proceedings.<sup>443</sup>

A more probable interpretation could be that newly discovered facts brought about a new trial. The affair probably started with Vasian Rushanin's denunciation of Maximus. Vasian lived in Novgorod and informed archbishop Macarius that some passages of the Greek's translation of the *Life of Our Lady* by Metaphrastes were unorthodox. Rushanin had become acquainted with this translation when he had lived in Chudov monastery with Maximus working as copyist. In his written testimony he maintained that he had tried to warn both Maximus and Patrikeev that Maximus' translation was not orthodox but they ignored his remarks.<sup>444</sup> It is however hardly possible that Rushanin operated on his own initiative. The revealing of this fact might have been dangerous also for himself and he did not have any reason, as far as we know, to denounce Maximus who was already incarcerated. It would have made sense before the trial in 1525 but not now. Certainly, more important people had an

---

442See: SINITSYNA 1977, 126-9.

443Maximus' lack of remorse is emphasised in SUDNYE SPISKI, 97. 100. HANEY 1973, 78. 83 pointed at this lack of remorse and at violation of the rules of his incarceration, as the cause of Maximus' second trial. Since the previous sentence was fairly lenient so Daniel – according to Haney – wanted to crush Maximus definitely. Yet, it is little probable as we have shown above.

444About newly discovered blasphemies in Maximus' works: SUDNYE SPISKI, 97. About Rushanin's denunciation: KAZAKOVA 1960, 295 and SUDNYE SPISKI, 103-4. It took place between March 4<sup>th</sup> 1526 (when Macarius became the archbishop of Novgorod) and 1531, cf. POKROVSKII 1971, 74. The problem concerned three places in the *Life of Our Lady* (see: SUDNYE SPISKI, 101-3 for the whole discussion, esp. 101 and 127 about the details of the accusation) which Maximus translated about 1521 when his knowledge of the Slavonic language was limited. All three fragments concern the context of Jesus' conception. The alleged Maximus' changes suggested that Jesus was conceived as a result of normal sexual intercourse. In two places Maximus used incorrectly the word *акы* (as if) instead of the normal *яко* (as or since). The usage of these two words was not always univocal but in this case Maximus' usage was evidently wrong, see: OLMSTED 2002, 18. In the third place Maximus translated the Greek text literally well but the context caused a heretical ambiguity, see: IVANOV 1969, no. 9. Cf. also above, note 425.

interest in a new sentence and encouraged Rushanin to expose Maximus. His denunciation was a useful point of departure for a new accusation.

Having received Rushanin's denunciation, Abp Macarius sent it to the Metropolitan in Moscow. Meanwhile, Vassian Patrikeev became aware that the translation he supported was found to be heretical and ordered the removal of the incriminating words from the copy he had sent to the Kirillo-Belozerskii monastery. Michael Medovartsev having heard from Patrikeev that people were already talking about Maximus' unfortunate translation, also corrected his own copy of this work, eliminating the problematic fragments.<sup>445</sup> These nervous reactions of people involved in Maximus' activity reveal that the newly discovered errors must have threatened Patrikeev, Medovartsev and others with serious consequences. One can hardly imagine, however, that a new trial was necessary for Maximus. The disclosure of these newly discovered errors was sufficient propaganda to justify the continuation of his imprisonment.

Some historians have conjectured that other documents confirmed Maximus' *political* guilt and that they brought about the new trial. Skinder died in Moscow in 1529 and after his death some of his papers were discovered. We do not have, however, any proof that among these papers there was anything that might have directly compromised Maximus.<sup>446</sup> Similarly conjectural are Sinitsyna's conclusions that the second lawsuit was a response to an intervention of the protos of the Athonite community, Anthime, identified by her with the former hegumen of Vatopedi, involved in Maximus's expedition to Muscovy. Even if the identification of the person of Anthime is correct (which is not obvious because we know of three Anthimes in the sixteenth century Athos), it was not necessary to organise a new trial to keep him in prison. Again, the above mentioned new data would have been sufficient justification.<sup>447</sup>

The question, therefore, still remains unsolved. Why did the Muscovite authorities decide to judge Maximus again? The most probable explication has been suggested by S.

---

445 Another monk, Vassian Rogata Vosh, denounced Patrikeev who allegedly had ordered to *clear* the copy in the Kirillo-Belozerskii monastery (KAZAKOVA 1960, 295). Medovartsev himself testified about clearing his copy, cf. SUDNYE SPISKI, 101 and 128. Patrikeev denied that he had ordered the removal of the questioned phrases but he admitted that he had asked the monks to send him this copy to Moscow, KAZAKOVA 1960, 295. About the circumstances: SINITSYNA 1972<sup>b</sup>, 316.

446 See: RZHIGA 1934, 90 and POKROVSKII 1971, 65.

447 One Anthime, hegumen of Vatopedi, sent in 1516 sent a letter to the metropolitan Varlaam concerning Maximus' travel to Moscow (RGM I, supplement, no. 2, 336-8). Sinitsyna pointed out that in the year 1531 Athonite protos, Anthime, send a letter to Moscow. The content of the letter is unknown but the coincidence of the names of hegumen of Vatopedi (from the time when Maximus was sent to Moscow) and protos in 1531 may suggest that it was the same person and that he intervened for the sake of Maximus (see: SINITSYNA 2006<sup>a</sup>, 14-15 and SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 30-1). There is another source probably mentioning protos Anthime in 1531, see: ACTES DU PRÔTATON, 145. On three different Athonite officials named Anthime in sixteenth century, *ibid*.

Chernov and confirmed by A. Pliguzov who demonstrated that it was Patrikeev who was aimed at. The Greek was in fact only an instrument to incriminate his mighty protector.

## 10. YEAR 1531: THE NEW TRIAL

The events of 1525 did not divest Patrikeev of his power. He still enjoyed his influence at court even if his position was weakened. Medovartsev's testimony in 1531 confirms this fact. He confessed that he had not denounced Maximus during the previous proceedings because he feared prince Vassian, a powerful man.<sup>448</sup> Nevertheless, the situation was progressively moving to prince Patrikeev's disadvantage. Maximus was imprisoned, Gurij Tushin died in the Kirillo-Belozerskii monastery in 1526, Selivan could have been killed later or sentenced again in 1531 and his other collaborators tried to adapt to the new circumstances.<sup>449</sup>

It was in this situation that in 1531, a new council was convoked. This time the group of defendants was larger. Maximus was brought to court once again. With him were Michael Medovartsev, Vassian Rushanin and Isaac Sobaka who were initially witnesses but they became also the accused. However, it is most probable that the person who was really targeted was Patrikeev.<sup>450</sup>

The link between Patrikeev's and Maximus' cases is obvious. The fact of their collaboration was not a secret. It is however not clear (even less clear than when we considered the events of 1525) what the aim of this trial was and what were the means to complete it. Did the accusation want first of all to eliminate Patrikeev (and employed the useful accusation of heresy as an excuse) or was the eradication of heresy in general the main goal?

It seems that the Muscovite ecclesiastical establishment primarily wanted to eliminate any danger of the questioning of the present ecclesiastical order. Daniel's *modus operandi* suggests that he aimed at homogenisation of Muscovite ecclesiastical life, not only on a

448On Patrikeev's influence after 1525 see: KAZAKOVA 1970, 119-20 and POKROVSKII 1971, 51. On Medovartsev testimony in 1531 see: SUDNYE SPISKI, 105/106 and 107.

449See: PLIGUZOV 2002, 13. On Selivan: BULANINA 1989 (SKK), note 455 below and KURBSKII, History of the Grand Prince of Moscow, 82.

450This idea was suggested by CHERNOV 1922, 71 and developed by PLIGUZOV 2002, 205. Patrikeev's trial began on 11<sup>th</sup> of May 1531, cf. *Судное дело Вассиана Патрикеева*, KAZAKOVA 1960, 285). Quite possibly Maximus' trial had begun slightly earlier. According to PLIGUZOV 2002, 246, the decision about the convocation of the council may have been taken on 5<sup>th</sup> of February 1531, cf. also *ibid.* 209. HANEY 1973, 83, is also of opinion that Maximus' trial was only a prelude to Patrikeev's one. Another explication gives Sinitsyna who thinks that ulterior motive behind the accusation against Patrikeev and Maximus was their attitude towards the Grand Prince's divorce. Basil III was able to act against Patrikeev when his position became stronger thanks to the birth of his son Ivan (25<sup>th</sup> of August 1530), cf. SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 31-32. Cf. also: POKROVSKII 1971, 74 and 77. Patrikeev's importance is also visible in Basil III's personal interest in the conditions of Patrikeev's incarceration, including the choice of monks who were appointed to oversee him, see: ZHMAKIN 1881, 231.

doctrinal but also a practical level, according to Josephian ideas. A symbolic sign of this pursuit was the canonisation (or a step towards the canonisation) of Pafnutii Borovskii, Joseph of Volokoloamsk's spiritual father, in May, 1531, at the moment of Maximus' and Patrikeev's trial.<sup>451</sup>

The essential charges against Patrikeev and Maximus can be divided into two groups: those concerning heresies (mainly Christological but also others) and others which were connected with the lack of respect for the ecclesiastical authority and tradition (additions into the *Kormchaia*, attitude towards the new Muscovite saints and the question of the monastic possessions). Additional accusations (especially in the case of Maximus) were there to give weight to their crimes, and to underline their disastrous activities.

The second group of indictments was based on solid ground. Vassian and Maximus had expressed critical views on the Muscovite ecclesiastical reality and the accusation strove to present their utterances in a way that would most incriminate them. Their views evoked fundamental questions concerning the ecclesiastical authority: who is worthy to be believed in the Church? As for the Christological heresies many of them were malevolently ascribed to the defendants when the real cause of these supposedly heretical expressions were mistakes by copyists or, in the case of Maximus, an insufficient understanding of the language.<sup>452</sup>

Maximus was probably brought to Moscow in April 1531 and was interrogated in April – May, certainly before May the 11<sup>th</sup> when Patrikeev's court hearing began.<sup>453</sup> The conciliar hearings doubtlessly took place at the Metropolitan's residence. The Grand Prince was absent. His representative may have been a boyar, prince Michael Yurievich Zakhar'in who participated in the trial. It seems that Maximus was brought to trial before Patrikeev. Some

---

451It is not sure when Paphnutius was canonised. In any case the council in May 1531 was an important step towards this canonisation. Cf. PLIGUZOV 2002, 376 and FEDOTOV 2011.

452Accusations against Maximus will be discussed in details below. In SUDNYE SPISKI, 97, in the introduction to the events of 1531, blasphemies against God and Mary as well as against ecclesiastical authority are mentioned. It confirms that these two groups of accusation were fundamental. As for Patrikeev's views concerning Muscovite saints the main problem was his radicalism and his rejection of every element of the tradition which could be used in favour of the monastic land possession (cf. e.g. KAZAKOVA 1960, 278, 287, 292, 297-8). Daniel rightly told him that one could not consider human weaknesses or sin as heresy (KAZAKOVA 1960, 292). On the accusation against Patrikeev of Christological heresy, see below, note 460. It is also interesting that the accusation attempted to impute Patrikeev that he added to ecclesiastical canons fragments from ancient philosophers works (KAZAKOVA 1960, 292). This fact weighs in favour of the hypothesis that the real reason to judge Patrikeev was the accusers' desire to avoid any changes, not to introduce any novelties to the Muscovite Church. Philosophical arguments could have led to a questioning of the status quo. Patrikeev's trial files begins with a lament that Patrikeev dared to rise against tradition (ibid., 285-6).

453On bringing Maximus to Moscow: SUDNYE SPISKI, 97 and 105. The date May, 11<sup>th</sup> is indicated at Patrikeev's trial files, see: KAZAKOVA 1960, 285. It seems that the mention about the council held in April and May (SUDNYE SPISKI, 108) refers to the year 1531, see: PLIGUZOV 2002, 223.



proceedings in his and Vassian's cases were however held together.<sup>454</sup>

The lawsuit was once again far from impartial. Daniel again gathered many witnesses but they were carefully selected. Some of them were dependent on the Metropolitan, others may have been easily intimidated because they were brought to court together with Maximus and Patrikeev (as in 1525 e.g. Athansius the Greek). Daniel did not summon those who could witness for Maximus, such as Karpov, Gerasimov or even Bülow. His passion is clearly visible when he addresses Maximus during the trial saying: "Your [damned] sins have caught you up, you wretched."<sup>455</sup>

The proceedings began with Daniel's speech for the prosecution. Then the Metropolitan interrogated Maximus, the witnesses and finally he asked bishop Dositheos to question Maximus in matters linked to the previous trial of 1525. Such is the course of events given by *Sudnye spiski*. The chronology of this document is however confused and the events of the year 1525 and 1531 are muddled. We can only try to analyse particular points of the accusation and strive to establish which point may be ascribed to which trial.<sup>456</sup>

## CHARGES CONCERNING HERESY

Almost all the incriminations of heresy (serious ones but based on tenuous assumptions) were linked with Maximus' translations or the corrections of the Muscovite books. There was

---

454Zakhar'in is mentioned both in Patrikeev's trial files, KAZAKOVA 1960, 285 and in SUDNYE SPISKI, 114. PLIGUZOV 2002, 246, infers about Basil III's absence from SUDNYE SPISKI, 101, 5-6. He gives some suggestions that Maximus was brought to trial before Patrikeev (PLIGUZOV 2002, 245). Besides, Vassian's interrogation is introduced in SUDNYE SPISKI, 104 by the words: "И по сем на соборе спросили старца князя В[асьяна]", i.e. he was heard after Maximus. Again, we can notice in the *Sudnye spiski* Cf. also: SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 31-2. Other fragments also testify that they were interrogated in part together: e.g. SUDNYE SPISKI, 104, 107, 113. Since in Patrikeev's trial files Maximus' presence is not mentioned then the probable sequence of events was as follows: first Maximus was interrogated, then Patrikeev was brought to trial and they were heard together. Finally, during the last part of the conciliar proceedings, Patrikeev was examined alone.

455The witnesses were: M. Medovartsev, Vasian Rushanin, Vasian Rogata Vosh, starets' from the Metropolitan house: Dionysius, Thomas, Isaiah (SUDNYE SPISKI, 115), protopop Athanasius, protodiakon Ivan Chiumka, pop Vasilii (SUDNYE SPISKI, 110). I. Sobaka, M. Medovartsev, Vasian Rushanin, Vasian Rogata Vosh and perhaps also Selivan were sentenced. The list may not be precise because the two sentences, from 1525 and from 1531, are also mixed in MS, see: KAZAKOVA 1970, 192 and PLIGUZOV 2002, 249. It is HANEY 1973, 83 who observed that Maximus' friends or those who would have been more unbiased were not summoned. ПОКРОВСКИЙ 1971, 66 notices that in 1531 when Maximus referred to one's testimony the confrontation with the witness always organised to verify his quotation. However when another person quoted one's testimony, it was not verified. KAZAKOVA 1970, 151, observed also Daniel's injustice towards Patrikeev. The metropolitan incriminated the latter that he introduced into the *Kormchaia* Greek philosophers' fragments (cf. KAZAKOVA 1960, 292). It was not true. We do not find such fragments in Patrikeev's *Kormchaia*. Daniel's expression to Maximus, see Z-140: "Достигоша тебе, бѣднии [окаанне] грѣхы твои [...]"

456The accusations and their chronology are extensively analysed by PLIGUZOV 2002 in the chapter devoted to Maximus' *Sudnye spiski*, esp. 222-4, 242-5. Another sign of disturbed narration can be seen at SUDNYE SPISKI, 105 where suddenly, during the investigation one more piece of information about bringing Maximus to trial appears.

no case where he attempted to promote any new doctrine. All his dogmatic statements were either an explanation of the Orthodox faith (in such a measure in which he was able to express it in Slavonic), or quotations of other people's views.

In his speech for the prosecution Daniel returned to the famous question of the "sitting at the right hand of the Father". It had already been processed in 1525 and again in 1531 Maximus pleaded not guilty. As it turned out later he had done it because of his insufficient knowledge of the Slavonic language.<sup>457</sup> The inaccuracy of Russian books, obvious to a Greek-speaking person, certainly fortified his self-confidence and caused him not to admit his mistakes for many years.

Rushanin's denunciation was probably the point of departure for further enquiries and Maximus' other Christological errors were discovered progressively before 1531.

The investigation progressed in similar order. For his first point the metropolitan interrogated Maximus on questionable passages from his translation of the *Life of Our Lady* by Metaphrastes that Rushanin had mentioned in his incrimination. The fragments that could have been understood as if Jesus was born in consequence of normal sexual intercourse were especially damaging. During the investigation Maximus confirmed that this and two others adduced fragments were heretical but he did not want to admit that he was the author of these errors. In fact they resulted again from linguistic, not dogmatic, problems.<sup>458</sup>

The Metropolitan presented also other suspect amendments by Maximus in a text of the Acts of Apostles. The Greek had ordered the removal of a verse from chapter 8 where an Ethiopian confessed that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. This passage is absent in the main manuscripts of the Acts but Daniel suggested that it was a sign of disbelief in the Son of God. In this situation Maximus claimed that he had not removed this verse and he shifted the blame on Medovartsev.<sup>459</sup> Finally Daniel asked Maximus more generally about a few others amendment that may have appeared heretical.

One can presume that this part of the trial, presided over personally by the Metropolitan, was the most important. Even if the real reasons to sentence Maximus may have been different,

---

457SUDNYE SPISKI, 109 and 126. See: above, note 425.

458See: SUDNYE SPISKI, 102/103. Maximus' reaction is just self-defence in face of possible condemnation. He probably did make these *linguistic* errors (see above, note 444) but now tried to clear himself of charges. It could seem to Daniel that Maximus intended a heretical translation (that was obviously wrong) or he cynically used Maximus' error. The case of the translation of Metaphrastes is an example of manipulation. Translation of the same work made by another author contains a similar textual variant as Maximus' one but we do not know any objections concerning the latter translation (SINITSYNA 1972<sup>b</sup>, 316, note).

459The passage is Acts 8, 37. Cf. SUDNYE SPISKI, 104. NB, it was very unlikely that Medovartsev initiated the removal of this verse. It is difficult to imagine that he was trained in the textual criticism of the Bible.

or, besides the alleged heresy, the council had other reasons to sentence him, the charge of heresy was to be one of the two the main official grounds to keep Maximus in jail.

The Christological question was useful to the accusation because it could be linked to the previous accusations against Maximus and also to Patrikeev's dogmatic inaccuracies. The intensity of the argumentation and the number of quotation from authorities adduced in this case indicated that the ecclesiastical officials treated this point very sternly. Perhaps, besides the desire to condemn and crush Maximus and Patrikeev, they were seriously afraid that Christological heresy could spread in Muscovy.<sup>460</sup>

The Christological theme returned during the second part of the investigation which the Metropolitan entrusted to bishop Dositheos. In this section the accusation seems to be almost absurd and, at the same time, it illustrates clearly the confusion concerning Christology prevailing in Muscovy, supposedly from the time of the Novgorod heretics. According to a few witnesses, Maximus allegedly voiced an opinion that Christ after the Ascension left his body on the earth and that it strayed and blackened from the sun.<sup>461</sup> Maximus rejected this accusation saying that he only quoted an unorthodox opinion. His explanation was more probable than any other. His activity in Muscovy was aimed precisely to eliminate contaminations within Muscovite Orthodoxy. In his *Discourse on the emendation of Russian books* (Слово [...] о исправлении книгъ русскихъ) he enumerated examples of distortions in sacred books and described his work as an attempt to improve them. In each example we can see his thoroughness in rendering these books to complete conformity with the tradition of the

---

460Some of Patrikeev's views were considered to be heretical on the basis of his two statements during his trial:

1) a witness, Dositheos maintained that Patrikeev had said: "Христос-де сам тварь, твари поклоняется тварь" – KAZAKOVA 1960, 296. Patrikeev resolutely declared that he had not said that. 2) "Плоть господня до воскресения нетьленна" – *ibid.*, 298. This time Patrikeev admitted that he considered Christ's body as incorruptible even before the resurrection. Daniel understood it as a sign of disbelief in the reality of the incarnation. More than a half of Patrikeev's trial file (*Судное дело Вассиана Патрикеева*) is devoted to this question. It is not clear whether Patrikeev's did not believe in the real incarnation of Jesus Christ. Inaccuracies in this text are possible. Cf. the fact that the accusation wanted to ascribe to Patrikeev mistakes made by a copyist: KAZAKOVA 1960, 294. There is some obscurity in this document because it seems that Vassian was accused of two contradictory heresies. It may be that his angry and ironic reaction was taken seriously and that his search for the true tradition of the Church was understood as a contestation of this tradition, cf. KORETSKII 1963, 358-360, KAZAKOVA 1970, 147. Generally on Patrikeev's freethinking: IKONNIKOV 1915, 491, note 1. Later, in 1550-ties, the heresies of Kosoy and Bashkin would appear in Moscow. The beginning of the Christological and Trinitarian heresies can be traced in Muscovy already at the turn of fifteenth and sixteenth centuries but it seems that they did not constitute the mainstream of the movements of this period. Cf. BEGUNOV 1957, 217 and KORETSKII 1963, 358.

461SUDNYE SPISKI, 109. Cf. IKONNIKOV 1915, 489, note 1, PLIGUZOV 2002, 224 and DENISSOFF 1943, 312. Denisoff quotes John of Damascus, *De haeresibus*, PG 94, 757. NB, some scholars' attempts to ascribe accusations mentioned in the Dositheos' examination to the year 1525 failed. E.g. the question of amendments in the Vespers of saint Trinity is mentioned both by the Metropolitan (SUDNYE SPISKI, 106) and by Dositheos (*ibid.*, 109-10). It could be that Dositheos investigated cases that happened before 1525 but were not revealed during the trial of 1525.

Orthodox Church.<sup>462</sup> More, smaller, dogmatic allegations against Maximus were either the effect of his efforts to rectify Muscovite books (most often in order to eliminate fragments absent in Greek originals) or copyists' blunders.

During the trial the Greek was far from coherent and his defence was chaotic. In the course of the interrogation at first he did not want to say why he had ordered the removal or the changing of some words in the ecclesiastical books. Sometimes he denied the accusations, sometimes he tried to give explanations, sometimes he restricted himself to a simple reaction towards a witness: "Your soul inflates" ("душа твоя подимет", e.g. *Sudnye spiski*, 105). If our source, the *Sudnye spiski*, is worthy to be believed in this case, such behaviour was certainly provoked by fear, as in 1525. The defendants tried to save their skin. Only Patrikeev preserved an aristocratic hauteur.

Confronted by Michael Medovartsev Maximus only answered in general that Michael (the witness of the accusation) knew the reasons of his editorial decisions. He did not plead guilty to the charges of heresy but his defence was weak because he did not give any reasonable explanation of his corrections. Finally, when Medovartsev insisted that Maximus and Patrikeev ordered him to remove the passages, Maximus said that they acted according to instructions received from metropolitan Varlaam, bishop Semion of Suzdal and bishop Dositheos of Krutitsa. Patrikeev confirmed this version.<sup>463</sup> Dositheos was present at the council of 1531 and strongly denied this allegation. It cannot be excluded that Maximus and Vassian tried to make the bishops responsible. More probable is however that the episcopate had really taken the initiative to review the Muscovite ecclesiastical books and that the request of the year 1515 to the Athos community to send a translator was a result of this initiative. Certainly, this plan may have been general and had not suggested that particular texts should be corrected.

---

<sup>462</sup>See: *Discourse on the emendation of Russian books* (Слово [...] о исправлении книгъ русских): М-II, no. 11, esp. 137-43. This work was written about 1540 (SINITSYNA 1977, 155) but it describes Maximus' activity before 1525. It is much more probable that the distortions in Russian books resulted from copyists' mistakes than from conscious heretical convictions, cf. above, note 460.

<sup>463</sup>Sensible explanation he will give in his later works, see below. On bishops' initiative see: *SUDNYE SPISKI*, 106-7. In this document, Patrikeev says that this action was mandated by metropolitan Varlaam and bp Dositheos (*SUDNYE SPISKI*, 107). According to Patrikeev's trial files (KAZAKOVA 1960, 286) he says in turn that the decision of correcting books (in his case correcting the *Kormchaia*) was suggested by metropolitan Varlaam with the council, and that Vassian of Rostov, Semion of Suzdal and Dositheos of Krutitsa were present at that council. There is a chronological problem here because bishop Semion died in 1515, before Maximus' arrival! Vassian of Rostov also died in 1515. Dositheos denied that he was present at this council and said that Patrikeev had written his new rule (= *Kormchaia*) 14 years before while Vassian of Rostov and Semion of Suzdal had died 16 years ago (KAZAKOVA 1960, 287)! The date of Varlaam's death is unknown. Perhaps there was an unknown council that should have taken place between 1511-15 (because of the chronology of the quoted bishops), cf. ZIMIN 1977, 282-3. The decision to correct Muscovite books might have been taken before Maximus' arrival and the Greek might have been informed about that.

Even this partial description reveals the complexity of the situation. Maximus denied that he introduced certain changes to Muscovite books but he admitted during the trial that Russian books were contaminated so they needed to be corrected. Therefore some accusations may have been materially justified. He may have ordered, indeed, the removal of some passages from manuscripts but there was not the slightest trace of heretical intention in this activity.<sup>464</sup> The absence is even more visible in the places in the manuscripts where obvious blunders of a copyist were ascribed to Maximus as a blasphemy. A simple lack of the word *no* changed an orthodox passage into heresy, clearly without any intention on Maximus' part.<sup>465</sup>

The lack of good will on the part of his accusers was blatant. Maximus' unfortunate stubbornness concerning "sitting at the right hand of the Father" was however a factor which facilitated their task.

Later, when the Greek was able to express his thoughts more freely, he manifested that it had been in no way his desire to distort the Orthodox faith. He emphasised the imperfection of any human endeavour, including his own translations and added that faced by human weaknesses and lapses one should not be confused and surprised and blame someone for heresy but rather show Christ-like charity and correct the mistakes with him (M-II, 57).

#### QUESTIONING OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE MUSCOVITE CHURCH

In 1531 another set of charges was linked to those of Maximus' views that were or may be considered as a questioning of the authority of the Muscovite Church. In the imputation of heresy there were serious discrepancies between Maximus and his accusers concerning *facts*. Now the description of the facts was quite similar on both sides but the contention referred to the *interpretations* of these facts.

Already the claim that the sacred books of the Church were distorted may have undermined the trust in her tradition. Maximus' editorial work was inspected by the council from the perspective of heresy but in fact the project of revising Muscovite books also touched on the problem of the authority in the Church. At the beginning of his stay in Moscow Maximus had had the confidence of his hosts but when his determination on certain points proved to be uncomfortable for them, his authority was put into question.

---

464Cf. the whole passage of SUDNYE SPISKI, 100-115. At the page 110 Maximus admitted that Muscovite books needed to be corrected. We observed a similar situation in the case of Acts 8, 37 (above, text and note 459). Maximus denied that he removed this verse from the Acts (SUDNYE SPISKI, 104) although there was a reason to do this. Similarly he denied his authorship of the suspect passages in his translation of Metaphrastes even if they reveal his style features, see: OLMSTED 2002, 18.

465See: SUDNYE SPISKI, 108 and KAZAKOVA 1970, 232, note 225.

Equally or even more important was the Greek's questioning the legitimacy of the way Moscow metropolitans were instituted. Maximus' view had been already condemned in 1525 and was examined anew in 1531. His position remained unchanged but this time his argumentation was more practical than theological. Supporters of the new practice by which the metropolitans were appointed referred to an alleged charter received from the patriarch of Constantinople who was supposed to agree that the metropolitans of Moscow should be appointed by local bishops. In 1531 the Greek reminded them that he had attempted to discover this document but he had not seen it up until then. It was difficult to reject his argument. Some *evidences* were read to him but they referred only to the fact that it was *inconvenient* to send envoys from a grand orthodox kingdom to another kingdom to appoint metropolitans.<sup>466</sup>

Probably Maximus preferred to use as an argument the absence of the alleged charter to dismiss the charge without a sterile discussion. The council, unfortunately, was not a place where a real dialogue was possible. Yet in one of his works he presented *theological* reasons to justify the rights of the patriarch. For him it was an essentially religious issue while for the Muscovite authorities it had also a political dimension, a question of prestige.<sup>467</sup> The Greek believed that the Muscovite Church needed to return to its Byzantine roots. Moscow authorities preferred to head for independence. It was a clash of two traditions: the old Byzantine and the younger but already established Muscovite.

Maximus' attitude towards new Muscovite saints also involved the problem of ecclesiastical authority. The metropolitan accused the Greek of insulting the Muscovite saints and of reproaching them of collecting riches, possessing villages, amassing tributes, having servants and meting out justice on their own initiative. Then, during the investigation by Dositheos, witnesses of the accusation, Fedor and Arsenii of Serbia, maintained that Maximus in the course of their dispute had discredited all Muscovite saints. They were scandalised and emphasised with indignation: "[You] called them disturbance-makers (чмyтoтвopицы) whereas thanks to them the blind receive their sight, and the deaf hear, and the lame walk and the lepers are cleansed!"<sup>468</sup>

---

466The question of the appointment of the metropolitans is mentioned in Daniel's speech for the prosecution (SUDNYE SPISKI, 98, lines 10-13) and in bishop Dositheos' examination (ibid., 111, lines 1-22). About *evidences*, ibid., 120, lines 9-11 but it is not clear to which trial this fragment can be ascribed. An interesting shift can be noted: while at first this document says that it is *inconvenient* (неудобно, ibid., 120) to go Constantinople to appoint the metropolitan (may it be in 1525 or in 1531), later (1549) it is quoted as *inappropriate* (неподобно, ibid., 129). If it is not a mistake of a copyist, the rejection of this idea was more and more determined. Cf. also above, note 367 on the patriarch's alleged document and below, note 494 on the metropolitan Ioasaf's attitude towards this question.

467For Maximus' work in defence of the patriarch's rights see above, note 370.

468The Metropolitan's accusation: SUDNYE SPISKI, 99; the investigation concerning the new saints, ibid., 112-113. In

The witnesses certainly exaggerated. In face of their general accusation the Greek pleaded not guilty but finally, when the name of Paphnutius Borovskii was mentioned, he confessed his serious doubts and asked rhetorically how he could have been a saint while possessing villages, reaping profit from usury, having servants, judging and beating peasants with the knout.

The bone of contention was *newly* canonised Muscovite saints.<sup>469</sup> Maximus and Vassian were not isolated in their reserve towards them. Other important people of the Muscovite Church expressed similar doubts in other cases.<sup>470</sup> The objections expressed by Maximus and Vassian had greater weight because of the context of their utterances. The impeachment of the Muscovite saints was a questioning of tradition and practice of the Church according to which they lived and which had canonised them. This was the core of the problem. Both the accusers and Maximus agreed on the description of events: that Paphnutius (who should be still treated here as *pars pro toto*) had nothing against monastic possession, that he had had servants and that he had punished people. Both sides, however, assessed these facts differently in every case. Even the severe penalties inflicted by Paphnutius were justified by his followers as a means of improvement and salvation of those who were punished.<sup>471</sup> For Maximus' adversaries Paphnutius was a saint. If he acted in this way, he was an example for his followers. This discussion was again not an exchange of rational arguments but a confrontation of authorities. In the course of the investigation Maximus represented the tradition of the Byzantine Church while the another side attempted to counterbalance it with the whole list of their Muscovite saints. At that stage it was apparently the only possible way to have a discussion for lack of other, commonly accepted, intellectual tools.

---

historiography this point of accusation was linked with so-called *non-possessors*. It is true that the Metropolitan in his speech first says that the Greek blamed monasteries for the riches and for villages they possessed. Only afterwards he mentioned the question of the new saints. Later however, in the course of the investigation, Maximus' condemnation of monastic wealth is examined as one of the few elements of his criticism towards Muscovite saints, see below.

469See: SUDNYE SPISKI, 112. Apart from Paphnutius, Patrikeev also treated with contempt both Macarius and Iona (KAZAKOVA 1960, 297-8). Daniel canonised Macarius in 1523 (PLIGUZOV 2002, 91) and Paphnutius in probably in 1531, (see above, text and note 451). Metropolitan Macarius canonised Iona and confirmed the cult of his namesake in 1547 (IKONNIKOV 1915, 494). Mentions about monastic wealth and usury can be also found in Maximus' own later works: in RZHIGA 1935-36, 96 and in an unpublished work (IVANOV 1969, no. 325) cf. SINITSYNA 1965<sup>a</sup>, 126. On the question of servants: RZHIGA 1935-36, 97. HANEY 1973, 74, based on Zinovii Otenskii, ИСТИНЫ ПОКАЗАНИЕ, says: "... the followers of Feodosij Kosoj believed that Maximus had denied the sanctity of these possessors." Cf. also SINITSYNA 1965<sup>a</sup>, 126. PLIGUZOV 2002, 375-6 published an unknown *Life* of Paphnutius where he is presented as an extremely severe if not cruel man. Perhaps this text had an impact on Maximus' view on Paphnutius, see *ibid.*, 91. The theme of the excessive severity of prelates was also a topic of Patrikeev's polemics, *ibid.*, 138.

470See: IKONNIKOV 1915, 494.

471See: SUDNYE SPISKI, 99, 112-3; 120 and cf. also *ibid.*, 128-9.

The judicial controversy concerning the new Muscovite saints evoked also the issue of monastic lands and villages. Certainly Patrikeev's ideas (with which Maximus was identified) required too many radical changes in the life of their adversaries' monasteries to be easily accepted. Resistance against them led to a search for the most convincing arguments. Maximus' opponents attempted to prove that their position could be confirmed not only by the local tradition but also by older ones, Greek or Serbian.

The questions of his accusers about the possessions of Greek monasteries put Maximus in a predicament and this was the reason for his incoherent answers. He knew that Greek monasteries owned lands but it was difficult to explain the differences before the court that was not very sensitive to subtlety. At first Maximus wanted to avoid replying to these questions excusing himself with ignorance. Finally however he had to admit that Greek monasteries had possessions saying unconvincingly that he had forgotten it.<sup>472</sup>

The authority of saints was also used when Maximus' work on Muscovite books were examined. This connection does not appear in the *Sudnye spiski* but Maximus' later work helps us to understand how his activity was linked to the question of the authority of the new saints. Visibly, people had asked how Muscovite books could contain errors if the saints had used them. They had prayed to God with these books in their lifetime and after death they worked miracles. The Greek attempted to show that God gives various gifts: the saints received a gift of healing through their humble and pious life and another person, even if he was a sinner, received a gift of philological competence. There is nothing strange in it, concluded the Greek. Even a saintly man could be admonished by less pious or less important person.<sup>473</sup>

The confrontation about the legitimacy of the Muscovite tradition is most visible in the few adduced examples but there were also other, smaller, facts which gave arguments to the prosecutors who held that Maximus did not respect their Church's praxis and deserved the prolongation of his imprisonment. The evidence used by his opponents and linked essentially to Maximus' activity before 1525 speak often about his rather spontaneous, sometimes ironic, reaction in the face of customs or convictions which demonstrated either the ignorance or the blunt obstinacy of their adherents. Nevertheless, all these facts disadvantaged the accused.<sup>474</sup>

---

472See: SUDNYE SPISKI, 112-113 and a parallel fragment of Patrikeev's trial files (KAZAKOVA 1960, 297-8). It was interesting that Maximus was questioned about the problem of monastic possessions as this issue was much more present in Patrikeev's works than in Maximus'. The link between the two defendants is not a sufficient historical justification to extrapolate Patrikeev's views to Maximus.

473M-II, 148-9. This work was written about 1540.

474An example of such a situation may be the description of Maximus and Patrikeev who allegedly ridiculed a fragment of Muscovite liturgy and called it a disorder (безчиние, cf. SUDNYE SPISKI, 114-15; KAZAKOVA 1960, 297). This fragment concerns the rite of benediction with two or three candles celebrated by bishop. The



He was paying for being outspoken.

The drama of this confrontation is even more perceptible in Patrikeev's behaviour. He was more straightforward in his opinion and more radical in his criticism than Maximus. Even friendly warnings that he might be killed did not stop him from expressing his views. If – and it is very probable – the witnesses radicalised Vassian's words in their testimonies, nonetheless they must have sounded revolutionary when he said that Russian ecclesiastical books were written by the Devil, not by the Holy Spirit, and that the local rules were completely wrong.<sup>475</sup>

These angry exclamations were rather signs of desperation than a well-balanced judgement. The court was biased but Patrikeev himself could not manage to find such a lecture of the texts of the Tradition that would have made reform possible without interrupting the course of the previous development of ecclesiastical institutions. The tension arose from the struggle for spiritual leadership in the Church but probably not less important was a lack of instruments and criteria to resolve the clash between the two parties.

#### OTHER CHARGES

In 1531 the council decided also to re-examine the alleged political charges and Daniel began his speech for the prosecution from this matter. Already in 1525 the prosecutors had not been very convincing when they tried to prove Maximus' political crime. It is hardly imaginable that he had committed any new political offence in prison. The assumption that his enemies had found additional evidence in this case was not confirmed either. Nevertheless, the court returned to this issue. It may have been due to the fact that, unlike in 1525, the Grand Prince was absent at the conciliar trial. The meeting was held exclusively in the Metropolitan's chambers. To obtain the princely sanction for the decisions of the new council, it was necessary to sustain his interest in Maximus the Greek's case and, as a consequence, in Vassian Patrikeev's. Therefore, it is not surprising that the political charges appeared in the first lines of Daniel's speech for the prosecution and apart from that, there was not the slightest mention of them in the fragments of the *Sudnye spiski* concerning the year 1531. In his speech the

---

charge is not clear but probably Maximus and Patrikeev noticed an incompatibility of the Muscovite tradition with the Byzantine liturgy. Another event was mentioned already in 1525. Maximus was supposed to have said that when the member of the Muscovite council cursed heretics (Did he though about the council of 1503?), they cursed themselves because they were not in conformity with the Church law, *SUDNYE SPISKI*, 118-119, cf. also *ibid.*, 98. His words about Muscovite prelates (“[...] What do they know? They need banquets and seek villages and laugh at thieves”, *ibid.*, 102), if true, proved his low opinion about Muscovite hierarchy.

<sup>475</sup>The expression “written by the Devil” can be found both in Patrikeev's trial files (KAZAKOVA 1960, 296) and in *SUDNYE SPISKI*, 105 (cf. above, note 311). According to the first source, Vassian denied that he had said these words. His desperateness is visible in his reaction to the warning when he said that he was not afraid of being killed, KAZAKOVA 1960, 296.

metropolitan quickly enumerated the accusations: of sending (with Sava) letters to pashas and to the sultan to incite him against Basil III and his country, of not telling the Grand Prince about Skinder's intentions, of criticising Basil's policy regarding to Kazan', of forecasting the sultan's attack against Moscow because he did not like the relatives of the Paleolog family and of describing the Grand Prince as an *oppressor*.<sup>476</sup>

Finally the Metropolitan returned to the inculcation of wizardry. One point of the account of Maximus' enchantments is almost repeated in verbatim after the 1525 narration (see above, text and note 413). Apart from that, Daniel referred to the events that had happened later, during Maximus' incarceration in Volokolamsk. The Greek allegedly boasted about his omniscience and it was understood as a sign of magical practice. The Metropolitan emphasised that other heretics acted similarly and this way they drove human souls to perdition. Like many others, this allegation could be based on some real events which were deformed and exaggerated in the court narrative. Taking into account the severe conditions of his incarceration, Maximus, tormented by the austerities in Volokolamsk, may have recklessly said something that was then used against him. Another incrimination had probably a similar genesis. Daniel quoted the words of Tikhon Lenkov and Iona to whom the Greek supposedly had said that he was sinless from the beginning of his life. His stubborn emphasising of his innocence may have grown to such an exaggerated form.<sup>477</sup>

The most unbelievable story, however, was told by the boyar Michael Iurevich Zakhar'in during the investigation led by bishop Dositheos. Michael related that he had learned from trustworthy witnesses that Maximus had been a disciple of a teacher in Rome where – with about 200 other pupils – he had studied philosophy. They apostatised and accepted Judaism. The pope, when he learnt about it, ordered their arrest, the confiscation of their possessions and finally to burn them. Only eight of them managed to escape and to take refuge on Mount Athos. Among them was Maximus.

When Dositheos asked the Greek about this teacher and his disciples the only answer which he gave was: "You see [...] in which misery I am [...], because of many misfortunes I have neither reason nor memory, I do not remember."

The story told by Zakhar'in, as other fantastic narrations that appeared in the course of conciliar hearings, had roots in reality. The source of the tragic fate of the teacher was presumably information about Savonarola's life, while the starting point for the account about

---

476SUDNYE SPISKI, 97-8.

477SUDNYE SPISKI, 98-100.

the Roman school may have been some fragmentary details about Maximus' period of study in Italy. He did not even try to explain that he had not had a teacher in Rome. The mention of his conversion to Judaism was one of the worst possible charges. Maximus' desperate answer illustrates again his fear that any reasonable explanation could help him. Fortunately for him no *witness* of this story appeared (despite Zakhar'in's ensuring that there were many of them) and this thread did not have a continuation.<sup>478</sup>

Zakhar'in's story demonstrates a certain regularity that the more distant were the events described, the more fantastic was their description. Both the peculiar accusations of magical practices and the attempt to describe the Italian period of Maximus' life as an almost esoteric initiation were possible simply because people thought that such things happened. Another important factor was the fact that the Greek was a foreigner. Metropolitan Daniel described him as "unfamiliar and unknown man, newly arrived from the Turkish land". Maximus did indeed feel strange in Muscovy.<sup>479</sup> His arrival from a remote and very little known world created more possibilities to ascribe to him strange activities. It concerns the whole trial. All Maximus' words and deeds which demonstrated his differences facilitated the work of the accusation.

#### SENTENCE

The new verdict was not a surprise. In Maximus' case, it was only a confirmation of the previous judgement and, at the same time, the emphasis of the rectitude of Muscovite traditions and customs. The Greek was to return to prison. Other defendants were sent to different monasteries or were to be kept under guard by bishops whom Daniel trusted: Patrikeev was sent to Volokolamsk, Isaac Sobaka to Yuriev monastery near Novgorod and later (perhaps after 1549 – see below) to Volosovo, Medovartsev to Kolomna under bishop Vassian. Those witnesses who had helped the accusation were also to be detained but at the Metropolitans court. It was a simulation of justice. They were punished to preserve the appearance of justice

---

<sup>478</sup>The story appears in SUDNYE SPISKI, 114. Some attempts to explain it may be found in: РОКРОВСКИЙ 1971, 63; SINITSYNA 2006<sup>a</sup>, 66 (she juxtaposes the fragment from the *Sudnye spiski* with a mention "Изшедшу же от училища..." in: СКАЗАНИЕ ИЗВЕСТНО, 93); КАЗКОВА 1970, 188. ПЛИГУЗОВ 2002, 196 finds here an echo of Maximus' collaboration with Manuzio. The Greek mentioned this fact in his letter to Tuchkov when he says that there was a philosopher in Venice, "ветхаго Рима отрасль", and that he, Maximus, visited him often. On ascribing this episode with Zakhar'in's testimony to the year 1531 see *ibid.*, 225. The Greek College in Rome was only founded in 1577 so the part of the story concerning the teacher may refer to the group of Greek students gathered around Janus Laskaris. See also above, note 194.

<sup>479</sup>Cf. SUDNYE SPISKI, 101: "неведомаго и незнаема человека, новопришедшаго ис Турские земли." Fedor Serbin testified that Maximus had told him once (SUDNYE SPISKI, 112): "А ты таков же, как москвитин, а все безверники, и москвичи, и сербьяне." One can feel here a hope that at least the Serbs might have been more familiar with Maximus but they were the same. Maximus denied that he had said that but nevertheless his feeling is well shown there.

(because they too had collaborated with Maximus or had not denounced Maximus earlier), but, considering their merits for the accusation, their punishment was purely nominal.<sup>480</sup>

Maximus' sentence again was rather lenient in comparison with the gravity of the charges. Now, however, the reasons may have been different than in 1525. Patrikeev was the centre of the lawsuit. Maximus was an important actor but he played only an instrumental role. Since the world had not forgotten Maximus (as perhaps Daniel hoped in 1525), one had to show that – despite his serious crimes – he was treated well.<sup>481</sup>

This incoherence of the accusations and the verdict is an additional sign of the manipulations made during the judicial proceedings. Apart from many above-mentioned injustices, another was revealed by Maximus in his letter to the metropolitan Daniel, written a few years after the trial. The *Sudnye spiski* declare, as one of the reasons for the second lawsuit, the fact that the Greek did not show remorse. Yet, as Maximus underlined in the letter, he prostrated himself three times before the sacred council and had asked forgiveness for the mistakes in translations. Instead of being forgiven – he said – I was put in chains again.<sup>482</sup>

## 11. RETURN TO PRISON

It is not clear which was the first place of Maximus' new incarceration. Most probably it was the Otroch monastery in Tver where the monk was to spend again many years and not Volokolamsk. Tver was certainly chosen by Daniel because of the bishop of this town, Akakij's fidelity to the Josephian ideas. Akakij became a monk in the Volokolamsk monastery and respected Joseph of Volokolamsk very much. He was appointed bishop by the metropolitan Daniel and the latter certainly hoped that under Akakij's supervision Maximus would be treated

---

480 KURBSKII, *History of the Grand Prince of Moscow*, 6 says that Vassian was sent “в монастырь ихъ [Осифлян]”) and *Выпись о втором браке Василия III* informs that he was placed “во обитель Пречистые Иосифова монастыря” (ZIMIN 1976, 143), perhaps to Vozmishcha where Sava had also been sent before (cf. above, note 431). Cf. also ZHMAKIN 1881, 231-2. The detainees' isolation places are enumerated in *SUDNYE SPISKI*, 120-1. In this part of the document the data of the two trials are again mixed, cf. PLIGUZOV 2002, 248-9. Sinitsyna thinks (SINITSYNA 2006<sup>a</sup>, 15-16; SINITSYNA 2006<sup>c</sup>, note 7; SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 30-1) that it was not accidental that the *Sudnye spiski* do not quote any final document of 1531 but after the sentence the letters from 1525 are adduced. It was a sign confirming that the previous sentence remained in force. No new arguments were necessary. About the witnesses who collaborated with the accusation: POKROVSKII 1971, 66. Perhaps Silvan was also sentenced in 1531, cf. BULANINA 1989 (SKK).

481 See above about the leniency of the previous sentence and POKROVSKII 1971, 77 commenting the seemingly merciful approach to Maximus and quoting GOLUBINSKII 1900, 715 and CHERNOV 1922, 71.

482 The letter to Daniel (Z-138): “Не точию же просто отвѣчах тогда, но еще и нить пад трижды пред Священнымъ съборомъ вашимъ, прощение просихъ, о нихъ же по невѣдѣнью описался. Преподобство же ваше, не вѣмъ, что о мнѣ свѣтоваше, вмѣсто прощения и милости, оковы паки дасте ми...” Since Maximus said that he was sentenced again, these words concern the year 1531. It is Sinitsyna who emphasised this example of judicial injustice: SINITSYNA 2006<sup>a</sup>, 14-15; SINITSYNA 2006<sup>c</sup>, 224 and SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 30-1.

according to Daniel's will.<sup>483</sup> The fact that Patrikeev was condemned to be enclosed in Volokolamsk enhances the probability that the Greek was moved to Tver immediately after the trial. It was the policy of the authorities (both in 1525 and in 1531) to separate the prisoners.<sup>484</sup>

Maximus remained incarcerated but a certain alleviation of his regime arrived quite quickly. Probably already in 1531 Maximus was allowed to write. He wrote a short opuscle the *Words written by a monk Imprisoned and Disconsolate* which is dated in the year 7040 (i.e. between September 1531 and August 1532). As Sinitsyna observed, Maximus rarely dated his works. He did it when the date indicated a really important event. Since while writing this work he was still in jail, this important event might have been the permission to write.<sup>485</sup> The above-mentioned work was a self-consolation: "Do not sorrow, do not grieve, nor yet lament, my gentle soul – he wrote – that you suffer unjustly at the hands of those from whom most of all you should have been rewarded." The author comforts himself by pointing out the merits of his soul-benefiting translations and indicating that the temporary sufferings will bring him to eternal joy.<sup>486</sup> The conditions were still arduous but the slightly more cheerful tone of this text indicates hope was being born. Probably the bishop of Tver was a source of hope for the Greek monk, a fact that could hardly have been foreseen by metropolitan Daniel. Akakii probably did not participate in the council that judged Maximus in 1531 (we do not have any information about his presence in Moscow during the council) and at first he relied only on the official news about the Greek. It was his personal meeting with the convict that must have impressed the bishop so much that he decided, probably on his own initiative, to alleviate Maximus' fate by allowing him to write. Certainly, the bishop thought the penalty imposed on Maximus too severe. It implies neither that Akakii changed his Josephian views nor that Maximus quickly won the full confidence of the bishop. Even after many years of acquaintance Akakii was confused about Maximus' translation of a psalm and objected to it though it was an absolutely correct variant. The opinion about Maximus heretical correction must have been still vivid in his memory.<sup>487</sup>

---

483Most scholars maintained that after the trial of 1531 Maximus was sent to Tver but this information is confirmed by a late source (*Выпись о втором браке*, see: ZIMIN 1976, 143) which mixes the data of the two trials. Sinitsyna suggests that the Greek might have been transferred at first back to Volokolamsk for a short period, before being moved to Tver, see: SINITSYNA 2006<sup>c</sup>, 225 and SINITSYNA 1977, 149. Akakij was appointed in 1522 when the Metropolitan strengthened his position by the nominations of Josephian bishops (ZIMIN 1971, 63). He was said to constantly read the canon to Joseph of Volokolamsk. Cf. also: IKONNIKOV 1915, 497 and 500; ZHMAKIN 1881, 192.

484The desire to separate the prisoners can be seen in the *Sudnye spiski*. Each of them was sent to a different place. Also ZHMAKIN 1881, 191-2 mentions that.

485See: SINITSYNA 2006<sup>c</sup>, 225 and SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 32.

486Z-131, translated by OLMSTED 1987, 7; cf. above, note 439.

487Cf. СКАЗАНИЕ В КОРПУСЕ СОЧИНЕНИЙ, 83 on Akakii's role in the alleviation Maximus' fate: "Въ градѣ Твѣри [...]"

Over time, Maximus' relationship with bishop Akakii, even if not deprived of temporary misunderstandings, became more and more marked by mutual respect. The Greek called Akakii his *protector* (or: *providential man*) and expressed profound gratitude towards him. He wrote that Akakii "favoured me and rested my soul during many years" and he remained grateful for that.<sup>488</sup> The bishop, in turn, respected Maximus. A late biographer of Maximus says that Akakii invited him to his table and they ate from one plate.<sup>489</sup> Such meetings however were probably not very frequent since even in important issues the bishop's deacon, Gregory, remained an intermediary between them.<sup>490</sup>

Later, in 1538 Maximus would dare to take a step that would be much less comprehensible if his relationship with Akakii had not been good. In 1537 a terrible fire destroyed the city of Tver. In face of this disaster Maximus behaved and wrote as a prophet. He did not speak in his own name but wrote a kind of imagined dialogue between Akakii and God. God's utterances are so authoritative but also so clear and persuasive that this work must have impressed his readers. In this dialogue the bishop of Tver says that he does not understand the reason of God's wrath which was manifested in the disaster and he emphasises that he had always taken care to render due veneration to God. He declares that he did not spare his efforts to celebrate the liturgy with solemn singing, the ringing of bells and the burning of incense. He also placed richly decorated icons in the church. The answer Maximus puts into God's mouth explains that worship without a righteous life is vain and the rich decoration of the church is not acceptable to God if it is not linked with the real care of the poor who are starving at the same time as when the sumptuous liturgy is being celebrated in church. Thanks to his literary

---

ослабу улучи от епископа тверскаго Акакия по благословению преосвященнаго Иасафа митрополита, таже по сих Макария митрополита благословением и къ церкви хождение и пречистых и животворящих таинъ Христовых причащение." Akakii's objection concerned Maximus' translation of the Psalm 89, 2 (K-II, 421-3). The bishop was visibly not very well educated (cf. BELOKUROV 1898, LXX). This story may be connected with the work on the Greek Psalter that Maximus copied in 1540 at Akakij's and his collaborator's expense, see below. It may be however that it concerns the new translation of the Psalter made by Maximus and Nil Kurliatev in 1552. IVANOV 1969, no. 309, dated Maximus' letter concerning this translation to Gregory (K-II, 421-3) in 1551-2.

488 Maximus called Akakii his *промысленник* (K-II, 359). "Жаловаль государь, упокоиль мене всякимъ довольствомъ многа лѣта" (K-II, 423).

489 See: СКАЗАНИЕ ИЗВѢСТНО, 95. Even if this information may not precisely reflect the real situation (it comes probably from the first half of the seventeenth century), it shows at least the general esteem Maximus enjoyed. IKONNIKOV 1915, 498, gives parallel places showing that eating together from one plate with an important person was considered as a great honour. Ivanov maintains that some other of Maximus' works were written for Akakii or for a person close to him but he does not give any evidence, see: IVANOV 1969, no. 123, 156, 230, 242, 263.

490 As in K-II, 421-3. NB, Maximus also criticised (but kindly) Gregory's habits: K-II, 386-8. Besides these two works directed to the deacon Gregory, IVANOV 1969 mentions again two works to a Gregory whom he identifies with the deacon Gregory: no. 121 – K-III, 54-60 (= Z 213-18; here on the page 213 Maximus called him *friend*) and no. 262 – K-III, 260-262. The only ground for this identification is the similarity of the name.

construction Maximus does not articulate the criticism himself but his work became a prophetic accusation of the injustice he saw and heard about. It is not difficult to find here an echo of the famous words by John Chrysostom in his homilies on St. Matthew, a work that was translated into Slavonic under Maximus' supervision. "Wouldest thou do honour to Christ's body? Neglect Him not when naked; do not while here thou honorest Him with silken garments, neglect Him perishing without of cold and nakedness. [...] For what is the profit, when His table indeed is full of golden cups, but He perishes with hunger? First fill Him, being an hungered, and then abundantly deck out His table also. For tell me, should you see one at a loss for necessary food, and omit appeasing his hunger, while you first overlaid his table with silver; would he indeed thank thee, and not rather be indignant?"<sup>491</sup>

Maximus' prophesy was not aimed at directly criticising Akakii. God, in his work, points as a reason for his wrath to *your sins*, in plural, so it is an attempt to show transgressions that were rooted in the everyday life of this community. Moreover, in another work, Maximus praises Akakii because he did not lose heart in face of the disaster and that he rebuilt the cathedral in Tver.<sup>492</sup> The Greek used the well remembered event to rouse the consciences of his readers.

Probably even before the above-described events Maximus' activity in Tver was noticed by the Muscovite authorities and it seems that Akakii's benevolence towards the Greek was not met with approval either.<sup>493</sup> Only the change of the political and ecclesiastical situation in Moscow brought about a new turning point in the Greek monk's life. On April the 3<sup>th</sup> 1538

491The fire is mentioned in PSRL VI, 303 and in the *Nikonovska chronicle* II, 226. Maximus' work on the fire in Tver (Какыя рѣчи рекъ бы убо к съдѣтелю всѣм епискорѣ тферьскыи...): М-II, 231-37. Maximus uses here a Byzantine rhetorical figure called *ethopoia*. It consists in putting in the mouth of a real person invented expression that he or she could say in a certain context (cf. SHEVCHENKO 2009, 485 and KAZHDAN-SHEVCHENKO 1991). Maximus used this literary genre more often, cf. BULANIN 1984, 204-5; M-I, 267-8; M-II,65; cf. also above, note 228. SHEVCHENKO 2009, 485 supposed that Maximus might have used a manual written by early Byzantine author, Aphonius. Maximus' use of this literary form (particularly the fact that he dared put invented words into God's mouth) did not get universal recognition, see: PHILARET 1842, 88, l. 5; 89, l. 24. This fact was noticed by IKONNIKOV 1915, 504. Maximus defended himself evoking the example of Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem, cf. PHILARET 1842, 86. The quotation from John Chrysostom: JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, In Matthaеum, 509 (homily 50<sup>th</sup>, 4). The English translation: Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Series I, vol. 10, 303.

492Another work (Сложение вкратцѣ о бывшем пожарѣ тферьском): М-II, 238-40. It was written at the same time as the previous one, in 1538, a year after the event. Therefore it was not a spontaneous reaction but a mature reflection. Probably in order to avoid possible accusation that he was especially critical towards Muscovy the Greek shows that his own country fell because of the sins of his compatriots even if God was worshipped in Byzantium in the most splendid way (M-II, 232). Maximus also wrote an inscription for the pulpit in the renovated cathedral (K-II, 295-6) – it could be a sign of good relationship between Akakii and himself.

493On the reaction of the Muscovite authorities: IKONNIKOV 1915, 498 who refers to СКАЗАНИЕ МОХОВИКОВА, LXIX-LXX. It is a late source but this information is plausible, taking into account the attitude of the authorities towards Maximus. Akakii was in Moscow in 1535 and participated in the liturgy on the occasion of Archbishop of Novgorod, Macarius' visit (PSRL VI, 295). Perhaps then, his attitude towards Maximus was criticised.

Helena Glinskaya died. She certainly remembered till the end of her days Maximus' objection to her marriage with Basil III and was not, thus, favourably disposed towards him. Some time after her death the Shuiskii boyars gained the upper hand and on February 2<sup>nd</sup> 1539 they forced Daniel (who had collaborated with their adversaries) to resign. A few days later Ioasaf Skripitsyn, hegumen of the Trinity – St Sergius monastery, was elected the new metropolitan. These events created a new situation.

Ioasaf was a learned man and a bibliophile, the owner of an impressive, for those times, library. Looking at his activity and his decisions we can also see an independent person. Even if appointed hegumen by metropolitan Daniel, he cannot be described as a representative of Josephian orientation. Yet, he enjoyed the confidence of Basil III: he baptised Basil's long awaited son, Ivan, as well as the second son, George, he accepted Basil to his monastery and was present at his death. He was also ready to intercede for the political losers even if he owed his exaltation to the metropolitan see to their adversaries. Unlike his predecessors and successors he did not repudiate Constantinople and recognised the orthodoxy of the Greek Church, probably influenced by Maximus. Later facts confirm the ideological link between the new metropolitan and the Greek. In one of his answers to the questions sent to Ioasaf by the Stoglav council, he attempted to protect peasants from excessive burdens and suggested drawing funds for the redeeming of prisoners of war from the Church treasury rather than overburdening countrymen. This idea clearly harmonised with Maximus' views. Finally, one of the first collection of Maximus' works (so called the Ioasaf collection, gathered about 1547-8) belonged to the metropolitan.<sup>494</sup>

With this new leader of the Muscovite Church Akakii could act more boldly. One of the early biographies maintains that Maximus received a relief (ослабу улучи) from bishop Akakii with the permission (по благословению) of metropolitan Ioasaf. It cannot be excluded however that it was an initiative of Ioasaf himself because he also released Isaak Sobaka who was sentenced in 1531 at the same time as Maximus.<sup>495</sup>

By now his situation must have improved in a significant way because we observe a

---

<sup>494</sup>See: MILLER 2011 (according to Miller, it was Macarius, archbishop of Novgorod who orchestrated Ioasaf's election), МАКАРИИ 2006, 3 and ДМИТРИЕВА 1988<sup>b</sup> (SKK, about Ioasaf and esp. on his answer to the *Stoglav*). Ioasaf repeated all main elements of the oath of his predecessors (with the rejection of the council of Florence and of un-Orthodox influences) but, unlike them, he accepted authority of the patriarch of Constantinople: ААЭ I, 158-62, esp. 162, cf. GOLUBINSKII 1900, 695 and 740, as well as SINITSYNA 1977, 174 who quoted MS ГБЛ Вол. 571, л. 159 об. and RZHIGA 1934, 89. On the political situation during Glinskaia's regency and a power struggle between different boyars groups afterwards: КРОМ 2010, 56-286.

<sup>495</sup>On the relief: СКАЗАНИЕ В КОРПУСЕ СОЧИНЕНИЙ, 83 (quoted above, note 487). 88; on Sobaka: SINITSYNA 2006<sup>c</sup>, 232 and SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 32-3.



considerable growth in his writing activity. Maximus not only writes new works but also organises them into collections and sends them to influential people and to his friends. The primitive collection which would become later the core of a broader anthology consisted probably of twelve pieces and was composed during the years 1540 – 1545. It cannot be excluded that Maximus started working on it even before Ioasaf's election but the change of metropolitan made it possible for him to accelerate the work and – which was especially important for him – to disseminate his writings.<sup>496</sup>

It seems that Maximus created the first set of his works mainly to achieve a practical purpose: to convince people of his orthodoxy and to regain his freedom. The primordial collection is logically linked by the first work, *Confession of the Orthodox faith* (M-II, no. 1) and the two last concerning the correction of Russian books (M-II, no. 11 and 12). In these three works the Greek declares his orthodoxy and loyalty towards Muscovy, seeks justice, explains the principles of his emendations into manuscripts and, as well, shows the reasons of his involuntary mistakes. Finally he asked to be sent back to Athos.<sup>497</sup> Between the first and the two last writings we find six works against heresies (M-II, nos. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10) and three works of piety (M-II, nos. 2, 3 and 4). The works against heresies, besides their primary purpose, were also to reconfirm Maximus' orthodoxy. Less obvious is the reason for which he added to the collection the prayers to Our Lady, to the Holy Trinity and a little work in which he described what Peter might have said after denying Christ. The main thread of all three works is human sinfulness, God's goodness revealed in salvation and the need for conversion. Perhaps the author wanted to emphasised his humility and the awareness of his own sinfulness so as to not be accused of self-exaltation, perhaps he intended to encourage the conversion of those who he considered to be persecuting him unjustly?

---

<sup>496</sup>On the dating: SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 33 (with a reference to GOLUBINSKII 1911, 237 concerning the *Confession*).

Sinitsyna says that in the oldest MS (PHБ, Col. 494/513) the date 1538 (7047) as the beginning of the work on the collection is indicated but the last digit was effaced and the date 1531 (7040) appeared. Sinitsyna maintains that both dates are possible. IKONNIKOV 1915, 505, thinks that Maximus started working on the collection in 1532 and refers to MSS МДА no. 42 and 153 and to GOLUBINSKII 1900, 804. OLMSTED 1987, 30 and passim, noticed the link between the collection and the prophetic miscellany but this question is not yet well researched. The core of the 12 chapters was identified by SINITSYNA 1972<sup>a</sup>, see also SINITSYNA 1977, 169-173 and SINITSYNA 2006<sup>c</sup>, 232. This core was later developed. The first collections composed during Maximus' lifetime (so called Ioasaf and Khludov collections) did not contain Maximus' works written before 1525. On collections of Maximus' works see: SINITSYNA 1977, 161-186. 265-70.

<sup>497</sup>About his loyalty see: M-II, 56. In M-II, 57 Maximus emphasised that he should have been judged by the patriarch. This argument is not repeated in later works, cf. SINITSYNA 1977, 153. Perhaps he had reached the conclusion that he had not been right in invoking in this case a canon of the Council of Nicaea. He asks to be sent back to Athos (among others places) in M-II, 143-4 and says it will be according to the will of the Lord expressed in Mk 6: 10. Maximus uses this passage with reference to monks (who follow the apostolic way of life) that they should stay at the same monastery all their life. It was also a weak argument and was not repeated later either by Maximus, SINITSYNA 1977, 153-4.

In the works included in the collection Maximus was finally able to explain the reasons of his emendations into Muscovite books and demonstrate their legitimacy. Possibly it was for the first time after the trials that he had an opportunity to recount the real story of his translation activity and reveal, in black and white, the absurd errors in the Muscovite manuscripts that resulted from the insufficient knowledge of Greek of the former translators. He referred also to the political accusations against him and did not hesitate to resort to a radical rhetorical formulation: I am ready to accept capital punishment if those who calumniated me would prove it. After a period of forced silence now the Greek attempted to actively promote his case. He tries to retain a humble tone in his letters but sometimes his voice becomes determined as if he could not bear any longer the narrow-mindedness and injustice of his enemies.<sup>498</sup>

After Basil III's death (1533) and much more after Helena Glinskaya's demise (1538) various groups clashed in the state struggle for supremacy. Maximus therefore attempted to reach, with his writings, as many different people as possible as it was difficult to predict who would finally come into power. Before having organised the first collection of his works he sent separate items to men of consequence. His *Confession of the Orthodox faith* was addressed to "every orthodox priest and prince" (M-II, 51), the two slightly later works on the emendation of Russian books were directed to "princes and boyars" (*князи и бояре* [sic!] – M-II, 143) and to "my lords" (*господа мои* or *государу мои* – M-II, 145) for whom – he said – he had translated and corrected books. He turned to people having power and participating in governing the country.<sup>499</sup> This pursuit did not bring about an immediate effect but certainly widened the circle of people interested in Maximus' thoughts and in his fate.

In time both the number of pieces in his collection and the number of addressees grew. Among them were influential people (the tsar, bishop Akakii, metropolitan Macarius, priest Sylvester), their collaborators (metropolitan Macarius' protosynkellos, Aleksiej; Gregory, deacon of bishop Akakii) and Maximus' friends like George.<sup>500</sup>

498Cf. OLMSTED 1987, 9, note 24. On capital punishment see also above, text and note 382.

499In a MS of the *Слово отвѣщательно о книжномъ исправлении* (ГИМ, Син. № 491) we find the mention that this work was written for "the bishop of Tver", supposedly Akakii, see: IVANOV 1969, no. 123. The text M-II, no. 12 directed to the *lords* (M-II, 145) is probably a compilation because in another place of this *Слово* Maximus addressed to "твое святолѣнное преподабство" (M-II, 147) so probably to a bishop. The expression *my lords* appears also in a MS of Maximus' letter to metropolitan Daniel. It may suggest that also this letter was a kind of open letter to the ruling group (or was transformed into such a letter), see: ZHUROVA 1998, 26 and Z-138 (= ZHUROVA 1998, 32). ZHUROVA 1998, 9-23 (cf. also Z-143), thinks that Maximus' letter to Daniel may have been written before 1539. Only in its late copy it might have receive the title: *Letter of reconciliation*, *ibid.*, 14 and 30. Cf. however Sinitsyna in M-II, 17 who links this letter with Maximus' letter to metropolitan Macarius (FILARET 1842, 91-6).

500The detailed description of Maximus' collections of works (both composed by himself and after his death) in:

Once again Maximus shared his knowledge with those who asked him for explications. That, which had taken place in his *literary club* before 1525, was continued through correspondence. With some people, like George, he had very close relationship and – since a face to face encounter was impossible – they exchanged thoughts from a distance (K-II, 424-5).

Apart from correspondence and answering people who wanted to benefit from his knowledge, the Greek devoted much time to a more systematic work. He knew the value of his industry. Discretely but clearly enough he demonstrated his pride in his achievements<sup>501</sup> but, at the same time, he improved his literary legacy and continued to develop it. This was especially the case with his anti-Latin polemical writings. He transformed the polemics directed to Karpov or Bülow and written before 1525 into compositions aimed to new addressees (like prince Ivan) or to a wider circle of readers and edited them anew. He also wrote a new polemical, anti-Catholic work, the *Praise for St Peter and Paul*.<sup>502</sup> He clearly paid special attention to this subject and was convinced that it was still important to work on it even if Nicholas Bülow was no longer active. Archbishop Macarius (the future metropolitan) had similarly thoughts. He placed one of Maximus' anti-Latin works, as well as another, anti-astrological, in his *Great menology*.<sup>503</sup>

There was one more topic that became very important for Maximus during this period. Already before his imprisonment he was sensitive to social problems but now this issue occupied a considerable place in his fervent writing. He tried various means to make his readers sensitive to social injustice and to denounce the lack of responsibility of those who ruled the state. Some of the new works were similar to those that were already present in the

---

SINITSYNA 1977, 161-86. 221-79. This study was supplemented by Д.М. Буланин and А.Т. Шашков in: BULANIN 1984, 220-51. Three of these collections were composed during Maximus' lifetime: 1) Ioasaf collection published in M-II (it is represented by two MSS that contain corrections made by Maximus himself. One of them belonged to metropolitan Ioasaf: РГБ, ф. 173, МДА 42); 2) Khludov collection (here also we meet in one MS corrections made by Maximus) and 3) Rumiantsev collection containing some autographs and also some translations but not organised systematically as the two previous collections. As for Maximus' correspondence, he wrote to the Tsar e.g. K-II, 376-9; to metropolitan Macarius: FILARET 1842, 91-6; to Sylvester: K-II, 379-81; to Aleksiej: K-II, 382-6; to George – see below, text and note 542. The precise dating of these letters is not established but all of them were sent roughly between 1532 and his liberation.

501 Maximus wrote e.g.: “посылаю [...] вещи, по моему суду, не худы” – K-II, 383. Later he wrote even more resolutely about “силе книжки сеа”, see: M-II, 49. SINITSYNA 2006<sup>a</sup>, 19-21 emphasised (as other authors do) Maximus' self-consciousness as an author composing the collection of his works. Yet, it is to be noticed that also Joseph Volotskii and metropolitan Daniel prepared collections of their own works, cf. ZHUROVA 2008, 4.

502 On the editing of old texts see: M-I, 428. 431-8. 456; on the *Praise for St Peter and Paul*: SINITSYNA 1977, 84. On unidentified prince (князь) Ivan: M-I, 172 and M-I, 428. NB Karpov career prospered during Glinskaya's regency, see: ZIMIN 1988, 264-5, quoted by KROM 2010, 131.

503 See: SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 58. See also above, note 335 and 435. It does not mean of course that Macarius or other prelates of the Volokolamsk faction approached other Maximus' ideas. E.g. they continued to elaborate a theological justification of the inalienability of ecclesiastical properties, see: PLOGUZOV 2002, 14 and PLOGUZOV 1990, 221-4.

primordial, twelve chapter, collection. They were based on a certain scheme that is mentioned above: the author describes human sinfulness contrasted with God's goodness and emphasises the need for conversion. Among other sins however Maximus censured especially social injustice (e.g. Z-219-38). As before, he does not say: *you are sinners* but speaks about *our sins* (similarly in M-II, no. 20, e.g. p. 221 – *we oppress the poor!*) This traditional way of describing social injustice can be seen here as a pedagogical measure (or: *captatio benevolentiae*), a sign of solidarity with those among whom he lived. Some of the people who were responsible for the lamentable situation in the state, such as kniaz' Shuiskii, were Maximus' acquaintances.

He also dared to express more audacious opinions. His allegorical work (Слово пространнѣ излагающе съ жалостию нестроения и бесчиния цареи и властелѣхъ послѣдняго вѣка сего – M-II, no. 26) tells about his imagined encounter with a disconsolate woman attired in black, weeping bitterly and complaining about her fate. This is Maximus' masterpiece where he uses the classical, sophisticated literary pattern. The woman introduces herself as Vasilia (Василиа) so for a person who thinks in Greek she would represent kingship (Василиа = βασιλεία). She is God's daughter (M-II, 265). Yet Maximus multiplies synonyms in this introduction (“Имя же мнѣ не едино, но различна. И начяльство наричюся и власть и владычство и господство, сущее же мнѣ имя, акы обдержителнѣ предреченных, Василиа имя есть мнѣ.” – M-II, 265) to show more clearly the symbolic meaning of this personage. She represents therefore authority in a broad sense of this word, authority which is the foundation of the ordered world.

The woman is disconsolate because those in power do not care about their subjects, about justice but only about their own self-interest. The kingdom is in a deplorable state.

The easiest interpretation says that the story is about Muscovy during the time of Helena Glinskaia's regency. This interpretation is not false but seems to be too narrow. Certainly the situation in Muscovy at that time invoked Maximus' reaction but on one hand the author did not want to be too literal thus avoiding the risk of new accusations (Vasilia tells Maximus that it is of no use for him to know the cause of her tears because he is not able to help her and the knowledge about her misfortunes may cause him to get into trouble – M-II, 264), on the other hand he visibly wanted to place his story into a wider context. Maximus speaks about calamities which overwhelm the *universe* (вселенная) so either the disorders in Muscovy was a *pars pro toto* for the whole Christendom or Maximus, through a general vision, wants to show more clearly Muscovite wretchedness.

Firstly the lay rulers are stigmatised in this text. Maximus, pointing at the example of

Herod (Mt 14: 1-12 & parall.) shows how the trespassing against God's Law leads to destructive and irreversible acts and subjects them to the power of the devil (M-II, 269-70). Spiritual leaders did not escape criticism either. There is no one among them like Samuel, Nathan, Elijah or Elisha who would have known how to reprimand the lay rulers in order that they should re-establish justice. Therefore the story about Vasilia may also symbolise the corruption of authority in the whole of Christendom where the Byzantine ideal of the harmony of powers is abandoned.<sup>504</sup>

With similar commitment Maximus denounced the injustices of the courts. He describes the barbarian practices of judges whom the tsar sent to towns. He mentioned that they planted material (certainly compromising) on a house or even a corps on a street to extort a fee from the local community responsible to find the culprit.<sup>505</sup>

Another work of this period, worthy of mention, is his text written after a victory of the

---

504On dating this work to Elena Glinskaia's regency: RZHIGA 1934, 55, and generally about this work *ibid.*, 50-9. On other possible dating of this work: GARZANITI 2019<sup>b</sup>, 157-8. The quotation of James 1: 17 used in this place (M-II, 265) indicates that Maximus discusses here a broader question of authority because he used the passage from James precisely in such a context (cf. also M-II, 157). Two glosses (noticed by GARZANITI 2019<sup>b</sup>, 171) confirm that authority is understood here as the foundation of the ordered world: "Василия / толк: сирѣчь царство, а тлѣкуется утверждение людемъ." – M-II, 390 and similarly in: ZHUROVA 2008, 228. Vasilia says that there were good spiritual leaders both in Old Testament times and in Christianity but now they are gone (M-II, 270). Thus she is something more universal than just the Muscovy. It is also visible when the author says also that the rulers care only about extending the borders of their own states and fight against one another. Their mutual feuds cause that they do not fight those who attempt to wipe the true faith off the surface of the earth and they do not care about the slandering of muslims (M-II, 270). On possible literary prototypes of this metaphorical work see: KAZIMOVA 1999; KROM 2010, 7-8; IKONNIKOV 1915, 426 (about Petrarch); IVANOV 1968<sup>a</sup>, 224 and HANEY 1973, 163 (on Savonarola's *De ruina Ecclesiae* as a prototype); RZHIGA 1934, 59, note 1; GROMOV 1983, 119. We find an interesting passage in PSRL VII, 253: "Нѣкто ходя по пустыни, и обрѣте жену, стоящу печалну, и рече къ ней: ты кто еси? Она же рече: азъ есмь истинна. И рече ей чаловѣкъ: которыя ради вины оставлещи градъ и въ пустыни живещи? Она же рече: въ прѣвая лѣта въ малыхъ бѣ лжа, нынѣ же во всѣхъ чаловѣцѣхъ, яко злое житіе лукаво будетъ въ чаловѣцѣхъ, егда лучше истинны будетъ." The ancient antecedent could be Hermas's *Shepherd* and perhaps also Dio Chrysostom's *Lady Royalty*, cf. GOLDFRANK 2005, 351. Recently GARZANITI 2019<sup>b</sup>, opted for strong influence of Savonarola's *De ruina Ecclesiae* and *De ruina mundi*. The motive of a woman in black is so popular in literature that these attempts to find a prototype are only conjectural. Maximus' work on social justice and the theological reflection on it is well visible in the above-mentioned prophetic miscellany (see above, note 496). The collection is focused on the question of the weak and the oppressed and the prophetic denunciation of the oppressors, see: OLMSTED 1987, 25-6.

505Z-227. Cf. KAISER 1980, 177-8: "[...] it [*verv'* = the local community] had special obligation in homicide suits. The duty to find the killer fell upon any *verv'* within whose territory a corpse was found. The only alternative was to pay the prince a fee which released the community from further obligations in the matter, and therefore afforded protection to one of the community's members were he the killer." Since Maximus mentions judges sent by the tsar, this passage may be linked with the reform of the criminal police. This reform introduced new officials who were elected by the local community, not appointed by the central government. Even if it was not a reform in the contemporary sense of the term (see: KROM 2009, 574), it may have been seen as a more just system and Maximus may have wanted to support this *reform*. The problem of the social injustice, raised in the above-quoted work, is more widely treated in RZHIGA 1934, 37-50. *Ibid.*, 46 he quotes IKONNIKOV 1915, 442-8, who shows examples from chronicles which could give to Maximus a basis for his denunciation of injustice, and emphasises that most of them concerns Pskov and Novgorod. Rzhiga thinks that Maximus describes a confrontation of Moscow central authority and local freedom of these, formerly independent, republics. It is only one of possible interpretations.

Muscovite army over the Tartars in 1541. At first glance it seems that Maximus wanted to create a political panegyric in the spirit of the Renaissance, perhaps to again convince his readers that the political accusations against him were false and that he was sincerely glad about this victory. More careful inspection of the text reveals the true sense of Maximus' *political* or social works.

The recollection of the battle serves as a pretext to present how true piety should be exercised. This work corresponds to other of Maximus' texts where he often spoke against the ritualism in religion. Here again he emphasised that it had been God who had given the victory and He would be still favourable to Muscovy if the people keep three fundamental commandments: preserve the true faith, sustain sincere love and care for justice.<sup>506</sup> It shed more light on the whole complex of Maximus' socially engaged writings. Certainly social justice was for him a value in itself but it was integrated into a program of religious renewal or rather of the healing of the Muscovite orthodoxy. After a long period of constrained silence the Greek monk returned to his ideas from before 1525. He strove to use all his forces and capacities to show the Muscovite people a more authentic way of living their faith.

Maximus' socially engaged texts also reveal, how extensive and detailed was his knowledge of the everyday life of Muscovy even while he was still incarcerated. It testifies that his contacts with the outside world (through his old and new friends, certainly), despite physical isolation, were quite extensive at that time. He knew the situation of the country quite well.

His commitment did not make Maximus neglect his literary interests and people round him did not stop taking advantage of his philological knowledge. In 1540 he copied the Greek Psalter commissioned by a deacon, Benjamin. The work was paid for both by Benjamin and by the bishop Akakii. Maximus also taught the deacon Greek because the manuscript contains glosses and notes useful to learning the language. They were written both by Maximus' and by another hand which could possibly be Benjamin's.<sup>507</sup>

In January 1542 the political situation in Moscow again changed. In the course of the

---

<sup>506</sup>The mentioned work is published in M-II, 241-6, and the passages on three commandments on the page 244. The triad: faith, love, justice is known from the patristic literature, cf. the so called epistle of Barnabas (Funk, cap. 1, 6). It is not clear whether this work was written immediately after the battle or later. In the main MS Macarius is mentioned (M-II, 245) as the metropolitan of all Russia but in one MS we find in the same place the name of Ioasaf. Macarius was appointed metropolitan on March 19<sup>th</sup> 1542 so if the MS with the name of Macarius contains the original variant of the text, Maximus wrote this text after March 1542.

<sup>507</sup>On this MS (РНЕ, Софийское собр., № 78) see: FONKICH 1971 and FONKICH 1977, 45-49. A scepticism concerning the identification of Maximus' hand is not well founded, cf. OLMSTED 1987, 9, note 23.

struggle between political factions the Shuiskii boyar family, after a temporary decrease in its power, once more prevailed. The shift in politics influenced the Church. In the same month metropolitan Ioasaf, sympathetic to Maximus, was deposed and on March 19<sup>th</sup> 1542, under the Shuiskii's guidance, archbishop Macarius of Novgorod was appointed metropolitan. He was one of the most important figures in the Muscovite Church in the second part of the sixteenth century and had an immense impact on the religious and political life of the state. Continuing Daniel's line (but in a much more noble way) he strove to consolidate the Muscovite Church and forge her ideology: he commissioned the composition of the Great Menology (Великие Минеи Четии) which served the unification of the Church and was a *sui generis* Orthodox encyclopaedia, he summoned and presided over a few councils and brought about the declaration of many new Russian saints. Even before his appointment to the Metropolitan See, as archbishop of Novgorod, he enjoyed considerable influence in the Grand Prince's court. This influence grew when he became metropolitan. It was he who orchestrated the coronation of the tsar Ivan IV, sometimes he replaced the tsar during his absence from Moscow and, at the end of his life, supervised the work on the *Books of Degrees* (Степенная книга). His ecclesiastical career may suggest that he could be considered as a member of Josephian *party*: he started his monastic life in the Pafnut'ev-Borovskii monastery and was the supporter of the cenobitic rule close to Joseph Volockii. Then, he was appointed bishop by the metropolitan Daniel.<sup>508</sup> He had however too rich a personality to be unambiguously identified with a single party.

In the new political constellation Maximus continued his efforts of exoneration and liberation. His previous endeavours had already born some fruit. Important people had begun to be interested in his case. In 1542 Peter Ivanovich Shuiskii visited him in Tver and they had a "most gracious colloquy". Probably during this conversation Maximus heard that his guest and his circle were not willing to let him return to Athos. Therefore, in his letter to Shuiskii written shortly after the meeting the Greek does not ask again to let him go to Vatopedi but only implored to be allowed to communicate anew for he had been deprived of Holy Communion for 17 years. Trying to gain what was possible, Maximus asks Shuiskii for the return of his Greek books which he had brought with him to Moscow and generally asked him to show mercy leaving it, however, to Shuiskii's generosity to decide how this mercy should be shown.<sup>509</sup>

508See: DROBLENKOVA 1989 (SKK) and HALPERIN 2014.

509On dating: OLMSTED 1989, 268, note 11 and FONKICH 2003, 90. On Shuiskii's visit, *ibid.*, 275 (=K-417); on books, *ibid.*, 277 (=K-II, 419) and above, note 308. The first draft of this letter was written in Greek. Even after many years spent in Muscovy it was easier for Maximus to write in his mother tongue than in Russian, cf. FONKICH 2003, 89-96 and OLMSTED 1989, 295-9. The best edition of the reserved Greek fragment of this letter is

Probably his request was satisfied and he received some books because in the same 1542 year he translated Cyril of Alexandria's text about the "outcome of the soul and the second coming of Christ". This translation is dated in the manuscript but there are many other patristic translations that we cannot date precisely. At least some of them may have been also executed during this period when the Greek obtained more freedom. Later (but still before the release) he would entreat protosynkellos Aleksiej to send to him a book by Gregory of Nazianzus (whose works he had translated before 1525) with exposition. He would comment this work by Gregory to give an explication to someone who did not understand the mythological allusions in it but he might have also planned a more serious enterprise.<sup>510</sup>

He certainly wanted to contribute, also this way, to a renewal of the Muscovite Church with the help of the patristic tradition. Some of his earlier works already evoked interest in the patristic thought. Vasilii M. Tuchkov, a participant of the meetings in Maximus' cell in Simonovo before 1525 (who during the trial in 1525 testified against Maximus) commissioned in 1545 a copy of Maximus' translation of John Chrysostom's commentary on the Gospel of John.<sup>511</sup>

Roughly at the same time when the Greek wrote to Shuiskii, he composed another letter to the newly appointed metropolitan, Macarius. It was his first known contact with the Metropolitan. The Greek asks once more to be allowed to receive Holy Communion and – unlike in his letter to Shuiskii – repeats his request to be allowed to return to Athos.<sup>512</sup> It was Maximus' constant desire. The fact that he had not asked Shuiskii for that (showing nevertheless clearly that it was his wish) demonstrated his respect for the will of the ruling group (or his fear not to upset them) but not his resignation from this pursuit. Perhaps his renewed hope that his liberation was possible was based on a certain change in the political climate. A sign of this change might have been the fact that Vassian Patrikeev, who died before

---

that of FONKICH 2003, 92.

510 On the translation of Cyril of Alexandria (and dating): Ivanov 1969, 63-4 (no. 52). On the book of Gregory of Nazianzus see below, note 518.

511 On this translation: BULANIN 1984, 190; on other patristic translations, *ibid.*, 182-190. In the above-mentioned MS containing the Greek Psalter of 1540 we find also a great deal of material linked to Maximus' translations and his two works in which he explained the reasons and principles of his emendation in Russian books, see: SINITSYNA 1977, 155. In one of these works he promised to translate also a work by John of Damascus (33<sup>rd</sup> chapter concerning some question linked with the Incarnation) if he only receives the book (M-II, 143). On Tuchkov's commission see: KALUGIN 1997, 137 who quotes MS GIM, Собр. Воскресенского Ново-Иерусалимского монастыря, № 82-бум. The same copyist executed also a copy of Maximus' translation of John Chrysostom's *Homilies on St Matthew*, *ibid.* The orderer of this MS is unknown.

512 K-II, 357-367. Dating of this letter is based on the same mention that its author was deprived Holy Communion for 17 years. Chronological problems are explained by Sinitsyna in M-II, 15. It was his first contact with Macarius because Maximus writes that he has *heard* about Macarius from bishop Akakii.



1545, received a decent tombstone in Volokolamsk monastery.<sup>513</sup> It was easier to honour the dead than to agree with the living but the very fact that Volokolamsk monks decided to commemorate prince Vassian signifies that the previous polemical obstinacy had quietened down.

Besides Maximus' own efforts, for some time his brothers from Vatopedi monastery and other people had endeavoured to liberate him. Probably, when the strict isolation ended and the monk gained some possibility, even limited, to contact the outside world, he managed to ask his friends to intervene. They were quite efficient in searching for the support from influential people. Not only the Athos community demanded the freeing of their brother but the patriarchs also intervened in his favour.<sup>514</sup>

Sources a few years posterior to Maximus' correspondence with Shuiskii and metropolitan Macarius confirm the Eastern patriarchs intercessions. The patriarch of Alexandria, Ioakim's letter is dated 4<sup>th</sup> of April 1545 and was written in a determined tone. The patriarch names Maximus as a *teacher of the Orthodox faith* and emphasised that he was unjustly imprisoned by the devil's action and intrigues of cunning people. Ioakim says that he had heard of him and had received letters "from many and great people in Christ both living here and on Athos" saying that Maximus was sentenced unjustly. "I have never written to you or asked you for anything – continues the patriarch – so do not offend me in this case and do not force me to write to you once again because [...] I will not stop writing to you [until you release Maximus]".<sup>515</sup>

Dionysius II of Constantinople was not so steadfast and authoritative. He was much more materially dependent on the Muscovite ruler's help. He wrote to Ivan IV directly after his election, in July 1546 to inform the Grand Prince that he was exalted to the patriarch see but virtually the whole letter concerns the monk Maximus. Dionysius II together with German, patriarch of Jerusalem, who happened to be in Constantinople at that time and with the whole

---

513See: ЗИМАКИН 1881, 232. Strangely enough, neither KAZAKOVA 1960 (the fundamental book on Patrikeev) nor SKK mentioned this fact at all. Kazakova (ibid., 77) quotes only a fragment from KURBSKII, История о великомъ князѣ Московскомъ, 164 (History of the Grand Prince of Moscow, 6), that Patrikeev was killed shortly after his imprisonment in Volokolamsk (but Kurbskii in 1545 was about 17 and again less at the moment of Patrikeev's death. Therefore his information about Vassian's death was not first-hand news) and says that a similar information can be found in the *Pismo o nelubkakh* (Прибавления к Творениям св. Отцов, X, 508).

514Earlier, Maximus' acquaintances may have not known clearly of Maximus' fate since even Herberstein, living in Moscow, did not have any precise information about his doom after 1525. Admittedly the first preserved document from a patriarch to Moscow authorities dates from 1545 (see below). Yet it is probable that there had been earlier interventions (perhaps transferred orally or not preserved). Cf. also above, note 447 about a possible intervention by Anthime, the *protos* of Athos.

515See Ioakim's letter: RGM I, 352-5.

sacred council (fifty bishop and hegumens), all of them asked Ivan IV to allow Maximus to return to his monastery on Mount Athos. Unlike Ioakim however, they do not mention Maximus' innocence but only say that he is poor and needy. He is close to gates of death and should be buried in the place where he took his monastic vows. At the end Dionysius with fifteen metropolitans who also signed the letter expressed firmly their hope that Ivan would not insult God as well as afflict them and liberate Maximus.<sup>516</sup> Interestingly, we find in neither letter a mention that Maximus was deprived Holy Communion. Perhaps the patriarchs' informers preferred not to transmit these particulars so as not to arouse unnecessary doubts.

Maximus knew about these interventions and probably he himself translated them into Slavonic.<sup>517</sup> Hope renewed by the intercession of the patriarchs was probably at the beginning of a few works written between 1542 and 1547 but rather closer to the last date. We do not have enough information to date them more precisely.

First of all he contacted the metropolitan Macarius and his protosynkellos Aleksei. The letter to Aleksei reveals a certain familiarity between them therefore they must have known each other for some time. This fact confirms the presumption that two known letters sent at the same time to Aleksei and to the Metropolitan had to be written some time after Maximus' first contact with Macarius. Maximus wrote also directly to the Metropolitan but Aleksei served as well as an intermediary because the Greek was on good terms with him and writes to him more directly. This correspondence testifies to Maximus' intensive writing activity. He both gathered and systematised his pervious works, wrote new ones, reacted to and answered current questions of his addressees.

Aleksei encouraged Maximus to prepare his apology to the Metropolitan ("по твоей грамотѣ и тетрадку ту приготовилъ" - K-II, 383) and visibly accompanied the Greek in his efforts to regain freedom since the later asked him to read the letter to the Metropolitan before

---

516See: RGM I, 355-7. Dionysius' letter may have reached Moscow at the end of 1546 – beginning of 1547. Cf. SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 33-4 about the possible influence of this letter on Maximus' liberation. Information about Maximus may have been transmitted directly from Moscow to Constantinople but this channel may have been more strictly controlled by the Moscow authorities. It is possible that Maximus managed to send some information to his Italian friends (via Western visitors or residents in Moscow) and they undertook an action. There were contacts between Dionysius II and Italy (admittedly it was slightly later than the patriarch's intervention for Maximus' sake but earlier contacts were also possible). Mitrofanos, metropolitan of Caesarea (who signed the letter for Maximus' sake as well as patriarch Dionysius), came to Venice in December 1546, as Dionysius II's exarch and went to Rome in May 1547 where he was received by the pope. See: MANOUSSACAS 1973, 54 who quotes A. Zachariadu, *Η πατριαρχεία του Διονυσίου... Θεσαυρισματα (Thesaurismata) I* (1962), 144-146 i 157-158; M.J. Manoussacas, *Ανεκδοτα πατριαρχικα...*, 7; and P. Canart, *Les manuscrits copie par Emmanuel Provataris (1546-1570)*, In: *Melanges Eugene Tisserant, VI*, Vatican 1964 (Studi e testi 236), 187-188 i 260 (nr 141) where the author gives a confirmation of this fact based on a MS from Vatican.

517See: OLMSTED 2002, 22-3. The mention about the patriarchs' intervention in Maximus' letter to Macarius (K-II, 366) is probably a later interpolation, cf. Sinitsyna's remarks in M-II, 15.

it was transferred to the addressee. On his own initiative Maximus added to the letter ten other sheets (*тетрадки*) containing his works and intended both for the metropolitan and for Aleksei and asked Aleksei to transmit them to Macarius (*ibid.*).

Maximus discussed with the protosynkellos also current questions and, as to a friend, presented openly his personal views and demands: to send him a book of Gregory of Nazianzus and even ... a Greek *klobuk* (K-II, 386). Aleksei was not just a transmitter of the messages but he also cared about the Greek's everyday needs. In this circle Maximus found also other benevolent people.<sup>518</sup>

To the Metropolitan Maximus wrote obviously in a different tone than to Aleksei and raised the most urgent, for him, issues: the lifting of the excommunication, liberation and return to Athos. In order to defend himself the Greek reacted to rumours about himself circulating in Moscow. They had to be provoked by the fact that his efforts to regain freedom had become a public affair. Maximus was stupefied when he had learned from Aleksei what people were saying about him. He told Macarius of his perplexity and fear. In order not to sin – he continued desperately, quoting Psalm 39, 2 – it would have been better to go deaf and become silent. Rumours that had reached him said that he allegedly had demanded a new conciliar trial and that only this way he had wanted to be reconciled with the Church. Maximus emphasised that this was not true and that he had asked for mercy not for a trial. Some people then suggested that the Greek could have received Communion having faked illness. He firmly rejected such a possibility by saying that he would never have wanted to communicate by cheating. Finally he repeated what he had written before, namely, that if his works contain any

---

<sup>518</sup>The letter to Aleksei was published in K-II, 382-6 and to the Metropolitan in FILARET 1842, 91-6. Aleksei is named protosynkellos and судохранитель ( $\approx$  sacristan) in FILARET 1842, 92. They were sent together (or roughly at the same time because) because in the letter to Aleksei Maximus talks about ten sheets of his works (10 тетрадок) destined for the metropolitan and for Aleksei himself (K-II, 383), and to the Metropolitan he mentions also ten sheets of his works delivered by Andrei [Semenov] who was Aleksei's servant (cf. FILARET 1842, 94; K-II, 382 and 386). These ten sheets certainly contained (as we can infer from Maximus' description in K-II, 383) at least a part of his primordial collection of twelve works. The work sent thanks to Aleksei encouragement was certainly Maximus' *Profession of faith* (M-II, no. 1), cf. FILARET 1842, 93 and Sinitsyna's commentary in M-II, 14. The current question discussed with Aleksei was e.g. the problem of muslim cloths worn by Christians (Maximus shared the Metropolitan opinion in this question but it was not important enough to write about it to the metropolitan himself). He also demanded his friend to help him to retrieve his book containing the works of Gregory of Nazianzus (K-II, 386). He continued to explain the works of the Fathers to his Muscovite readers, cf. also SINITSYNA 1977, 155-6. According to BULANIN 1984, 40-9, esp. 46-7, one commentary to Gregory (Послание о сказаниях античнѣй мифологии, RZHIGA 1935-36, 101-5) Maximus wrote before having received the MS and a second one when he received it (K-III, 42-9). RZHIGA 1934, 73 presumed that also a postscript to a missive to Ivan IV (M-II, no. 24) in which Maximus also asked for some everyday things (cf. M-II, 252) was directed to Aleksei, too. Among other people benevolent to Maximus was a certain deacon Vassian, sacristan with whom Maximus was visibly on good terms (cf. K-II, 386) and Andrei Semenov, messenger, with whom Maximus probably established closer contacts and who told him about Aleksei kindness and efforts (K-II, 382 and Filaret 1842, 94).

error he asks to be corrected and says that he would accept such correction with joy and would be very grateful.<sup>519</sup>

The opinions quoted by Maximus show the hypocrisy of their authors (most probably they were influential people since they suggested which solution the Muscovite authorities could have applied). On one hand they visibly considered that Maximus deserved to be liberated or at least have his sentence alleviated. Those who suggested that he could receive Communion by simulating illness certainly judged that Maximus' had not done anything that could justify depriving him of the Eucharist. On the other hand however, for some reason, they did not want to admit openly his innocence. The strangeness of this situation struck the Greek.

In the same letter Maximus also reacted to Macarius reply to his previous request for help. This answer has not been preserved but the Greek quoted a striking phrase from it: "We kiss your fetters as one of the saints', but we are unable to help you." It is difficult to say whether it was a sincere confession or a similar kind of hypocrisy as in the above mentioned anonymous opinions.

Maximus wondered and asked how a Metropolitan who was the highest authority in the Church and who had helped so many people, could not help him. Probably Macarius did not want to risk more determined action for Maximus as long as he was not sure how such a gesture would have affected his own position. It was not yet the moment when the Greek could see bright prospects for himself.<sup>520</sup>

Although Macarius did not want or was not able to help Maximus, his interest in the Greek monk's work was genuine. Maximus referred to this interest in his letter to the Metropolitan and, in response, he sent to Macarius a selection of his works (mentioned above). It is quite probable that the Metropolitan's attention was not only a manifestation of his personal curiosity. He had considerable influence in the court. The fact that he had introduced in Moscow new symbolic liturgical or para-liturgical rituals reveals his ambitions to shape the ideological aspects of Muscovite life. He also wanted to instil into young Grand Prince an ideal of Christian ruler, as we can infer from his sermons addressed to Ivan IV. To prepare an educational programme for the Grand Prince Maximus' knowledge and talents could be very useful. Thus, it is quite probable that, having learnt about the quality of Maximus' output,

---

<sup>519</sup>FILARET 1842, 92-5, here esp. 93. Cf. also: SINITSYNA 1977, 156-7.

<sup>520</sup>Macarius' phrase: "We kiss your fetters..." is quoted by Maximus in: FILARET 1842, 91 and translated by OLMSTED 1987, 1. On the metropolitan impuissance: FILARET 1842, 96. Macarius' answer gives some more information for dating the to parallel letters to Aleksei and Macarius. They come from the period between 1542 and 1547 when Maximus regained his liberty. Since in the letter to Macarius there are no sign of impending liberation, it had to be written some time before he regained freedom, perhaps in 1546.

Macarius asked him to write a work on good government. Such a presumption, at least, can be deduced from the fact that some motives present in the Greek's previous letter to Macarius (cf. K-II, 360) can be found later in the *Hortatory chapters* intended for Ivan IV (cf. M-II, 261).<sup>521</sup> Probably two factors were paramount at the beginning of Maximus' works written for the future Tsar: Macarius' encouragement and Maximus' desire to obtain freedom.

First the Greek dared to write directly a short letter to young Ivan, probably not earlier than in 1545, more likely in 1546. He explains his situation to the Grand Prince, recalls that it was on the invitation of his father, Basil III, that he came to Moscow, that he has already done the work for which he was invited (translation of the Psalter) and therefore he is no more needed in Muscovy. Nevertheless he is now kept in Muscovy by force. He asked Ivan to allow him to return to Athos and enclosed papers (*словесъ тетрачки*), which showed his loyalty and how much he had accomplished for the good of the Muscovite state. We do not know anything about Ivan's reaction but some time later Maximus transmitted, through Aleksei, another work for him, containing 27 chapters (*тетрачка в которой 27 глав*). They were the *Hortatory chapters* (Главы поучительны к начяльствующим правовѣрно) – a kind of mirror of princes. It is not accompanied by a letter to Ivan but, nevertheless, a clear message to the Prince was sent in this work. The last chapter is devoted to the ruler's attitude toward foreigners. The author calls his addressee to treat well strangers and to let them return to their country. Such a policy – continues Maximus – is beneficial for the ruler because it will attract other foreigners to work for him. Ivan IV could hardly not to notice here a reference to Maximus' own situation.

Probably soon after that, the Greek sent another work (*Слово к начяльствующему на земли*) to Ivan IV. This time, unlike the *Hortatory chapters*, it is directly addressed to the Prince. It contains some general admonition for the ruler and also an advice to read frequently the patriarch Photius' missive to Boris – Michael, tsar of Bulgaria. At the same time, Maximus submits to Ivan his personal request. He explains that he was unjustly calumniated, that for many years he has been separated from his brothers of Vatopedi and, almost with a sigh, asks Ivan for permission to return to Athos. If we can believe Mokhovikov, this writing was directly linked to the wedding of the Grand Prince.<sup>522</sup>

---

521In the letter to Macarius, Maximus mentions the metropolitan's interest in his work, FILARET 1842, 94.

Maximus mentioned the value of his works in the parallel letter to Aleksei, K-II, 383. On Macarius' influence: HALPERIN 2014, 451 and passim; on his attempts to educate the young Prince, *ibid.* 452-3. Cf. also above, text and note 508.

522Due to a lack of chronological evidence for dating, only the internal criticism of the text may help to establish the sequence of Maximus' letters to Ivan of this period. The letter published in K-II, 376-9 should be the

The freedom seemed to be at hand but, for the Muscovite authorities, there were still some reason to keep Maximus in jail. First, there were, as before, people who were opposed Maximus' liberation and calumniated him. From Maximus' letter to Macarius it appears that they were quite influential. Since he knew about their opinions from Aleksiej it is possible that in the metropolitan milieu the position of those who were ready to support Maximus' liberation clashed with that of their opponents.

Secondly, there were also people who maintained that if someone had been justly sentenced and the person who pronounced the sentence was still alive (and the former metropolitan Daniel was alive, he died in 1547), someone else could not cancel the verdict. They even insisted that – according to ancient rules – a conciliar excommunication could be lifted only by another council. Maximus tried to convince the metropolitan that it was not an authentic interpretation and that the Church constitution established by God is more important than an unwise decision of bishops.<sup>523</sup> In fact, it would appear later that it would have been

---

earliest because it is quite short, it has a character of a self-presentation and self-defence. Logically, this step was necessary before Maximus could present his ideas and advice concerning the ruling of the state. The mention of Ivan's father Basil III is also more understandable at the early stage of their acquaintance (to show that he worked for his father and thus to arouse Ivan's confidence) and because Ivan is very young. IVANOV 1969, 149 (who quotes Н.М. Карамзин, История государства российского, т. VIII, СПб 1892, 50) says that Ivan's first independent activity may be dated in 1543 but КРОМ 2010, 303-23 shows that Ivan was not interested in public affairs even in 1546. This year he visited Tver but his meeting with Maximus is not probable. Ivan's stay was short and he was not interested in local matters, cf. *ibid.*, 323 and PSRL XIII, part 1, 149. The *словесъ тетратки* mentioned in the letter, since they are a kind of apology for Maximus, must contain a few of the twelve works of the first collection or the whole primordial corpus of twelve pieces. Certainly it was not the *Hortatory chapters* (Главы поучительны) since their subject is completely different. The *Hortatory chapters* (M-II, no. 25, 253-63) were sent together with the letter to Aleksei (and at the same time as the second letter to the Metropolitan, cf. above text and note 518) because the Greek sent to Aleksei a work (*тетратка*) for the Grand Prince containing 27 chapters and the *Hortatory chapters* precisely count 27 chapters. The chapter on strangers is in M-II, 262-3. On various proposals of dating this work cf. BULANIN 1984, 46, note 69. Nevertheless, it is more probably that this work was written at least slightly before 1547 because the next text for the Grand Prince (M-II, no. 24) is linked with the latter's wedding. Therefore, probably, the *Hortatory chapters* (M-II, no. 25) are earlier than *Слово к начальствующему на земли* (M-II, no. 24). СКАЗАНИЕ МОХОВИКОВА, LXXI, dates this letter (M-II, no. 24) on February 3<sup>rd</sup> 1547 i.e. the day of Ivan IV's wedding (On Mokhovikov's work see above, note 5). It is difficult to imagine that Maximus wrote the letter in the very day of the wedding but the link with the wedding should be taken seriously. The second, more personal, part of this work is almost entirely quoted, with minor changes, by Mokhovikov, cf. СКАЗАНИЕ МОХОВИКОВА, LXXI- LXXII and M-II, 250-1. NB, Sinitsyna in M-II, 17 erroneously says that Mokhovikov quotes a fragment from K-II, 376. RZHIGA 1934, 72 thinks (but he does not give any evidence) that *Слово к начальствующему на земли* (M-II, no. 24) was sent after the *Hortatory Chapters* and not later than 1551. Both in the text and in a short note attached to the letter (M-II, 252) Maximus underlines his loyalty towards the Muscovite state. In the letter he asks Ivan his permission to return to Athos (M-II, 250-1) but does not mention about being deprived Holy Communion. RZHIGA 1934, 73 supposes that the note was addressed to Aleksei. It may be true because its tone and a request to send him necessary things are similar to Maximus' earlier letter to Aleksei (K-II, 382-6, esp. 386). The Greek's recommendation to Ivan IV to read the patriarch Photius' missive to tsar Boris – Michael: M-II, 248-9).

523 On the people who calumniated Maximus: FILARET 1842, 92-3. On the possibility to change the sentence, *ibid.*, 96. Maximus, as an example of such a possibility, describes the details of the conflict between John Chrysostom and Teophilus of Alexandria. The principle, quoted by Maximus' enemies was probably canon 6 of Council of Antioch (cf. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, 2nd series, xiv. 111). This canon is quoted in the

possible to lift the excommunication without the summoning of a new council.

Thirdly, the Muscovite authorities still followed their peculiar custom of not allowing foreigners who had spent a long time in Muscovy to leave the country, let alone captives who were, anyway, not easily released.<sup>524</sup>

Even knowing these facts, it is still not easy to understand clearly the situation. Which of these factors was decisive: were some principles considered to be inviolable or was it rather purely practical and political reasons? Since the excommunication imposed on Maximus by a council finally would be lifted without a new conciliar decision, this was not a real problem. Taking into account Macarius' strong position in the Muscovite Church, if he had wanted to release Maximus he could, most probably, have done it. The summoning of a new council was problematic indeed because it would have meant the questioning of Daniel's ecclesiastical policy which Macarius wanted to continue in many areas. Nevertheless it was possible. The metropolitan's situation was awkward indeed but the reason was his ideas rather than objective circumstances. His famous phrase: "We kiss your fetters as one of the saints', but we are unable to help you." should be understood: I appreciate your merits but taking into account my projects concerning the Muscovite Church I am not able to help you because it could damage my plans. In this light we can understand the metropolitan's gesture when he sends an amount of money to Maximus. He wanted to help to a certain extent but did not want to take radical decisions. Perhaps it was a way to ease his conscience.<sup>525</sup>

The political factor was not meaningless either. Besides the ecclesiastical officials Maximus asked also Peter Shuiskii to be allowed to communicate anew. The state administration had also something to say even in the purely religious question of lifting the excommunication. It was not a question of Byzantine symphony of powers but rather that of

---

SUDNYE SPISKI, 136, in the context of trial of Isaac Sobaka which was closely linked to Maximus' fate. Cf. FILARET 1842, 96 where the argument is practically the same as in the above-mentioned canon. The canon 6 was meant to avoid the escape of a convict from one bishop to another (it seems that it applied rather to synchronic situations while in Maximus' case was diachronic). The lifting of the excommunication without a conciliar decision, in Muscovite circumstances was risky. IKONNIKOV 1915, 509 thinks that Maximus' outspokenness gained him many enemies who were still active.

524Cf. Bersen's words to Maximus and other people's similar stories, above, note 297. IKONNIKOV 1915, 509 quotes, besides Maximus', the cases of Fioraventi and Iv. Friazin. Cf. also the case of Pietro Hannibale (KROM 2010, 237) and Bülow (MILLER 1978, 399).

525On sending money: FILARET 1842, 91. On difficulty to summon a new council: POKROVSKII 1971, 42. On the impossibility to release Maximus cf. also: IVANOV 1976, 297-8. Yet, in another context Macarius did manipulate to achieve his goals. During the preparation to the council of 1549, among his other machinations, he wrote to Ioasaf that he had not known anything about the reasons that Isaac Sobaka was sentenced while it was through him that Vassian Rushanin's denunciation concerning Maximus' translation of Metaphrastes (copied by Sobaka) was passed to the metropolitan, cf. above, note 444. In his letter to Macarius, Maximus repeats that he was imprisoned because of Daniel's unjust wrath, FILARET 1842, 96.

dependance. The political power in Moscow prevailed over the Church. Grand Princes and the ruling circles went for concessions to the Church, chartered for her (as previously the Tartars had done) and used the Orthodox ideology and phraseology but were ready to use force against her when it was profitable from their point of view. One can hardly imagine a Muscovite Canossa or even weight of the Moscow metropolitan comparable to that the Constantinople patriarchs enjoyed. Some of them were exiled by emperors but sometimes they returned. Even exiled they did not completely lose their authority. In Moscow a metropolitan could be killed, many of them were removed from their See but no one returned.<sup>526</sup>

## 12. LIBERATION AND THE LAST YEARS

Finally, Maximus lived to see freedom. Kurbskii says that Ivan IV freed him following some of his confidants' advice who confessed to him that the Greek was innocent. If Maximus' and his friends' activity finally bore longed-for fruit, it was not only an effect of their persistence but perhaps even more the result of a concurrence of favourable circumstances and of an agreement between secular and ecclesiastical authorities. Sources indicate the year 1547 as a subsequent turning point in the Greek's fate. Maximus' *Life* inserted into a collection of his works and composed shortly after his death (about 1587) asserts that he was imprisoned for 22 years and that it was metropolitan Macarius who lifted the excommunication. The liberation therefore took place in 1547. That year, on January the 16<sup>th</sup> Ivan IV's was crowned tsar, on February 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> a council was held which confirmed the cult of many new Russian saints (during this council and the next council of 1549 more Russian saints were declared than during all the preceding centuries!) and on February 3<sup>rd</sup> Ivan IV's wedding was celebrated. These events signified a consolidation and reinforcement of the Muscovite state and Church. Those who considered Maximus a danger for the Muscovite order may have had less reason for concern. The state and the Church demonstrated their ability to confirm their identity and tradition. Moreover, the celebrations for the tsar created a convenient circumstance to show

---

<sup>526</sup>On the Muscovite metropolitans dependance on secular rulers see: GOLUBINSKII 1900, 648-9. BUSHKOVITCH 2003 criticises Golubinskii's approach (cf. also BUSHKOVITCH 2015, 305) but his conclusions are similarly hypothetical. Moreover, his idea that Golubinskii's political views influenced his historiography is not convincing. E.g. Kartashev (Антон Владимирович Карташёв, Очерки по истории Русской Церкви. Том 1, 379-80) shared Golubinskii's opinion on the state – Church relationship in Muscovy (and was persuaded that the separation from Constantinople led to the dependance of the Muscovite Church on the secular power) while their political views were not the same. The divergence between scholars' opinions indicates that this problem needs further research.



clemency to the prisoner.<sup>527</sup>

Scholars, up until now, have not paid enough attention to one other element important to Maximus' fortunes. In the above-mentioned letter to him, metropolitan Macarius explained that it was impossible to lift the excommunication if the person who had imposed it was still alive and objected to it being lifted. And yet Daniel had died on May 22<sup>nd</sup> 1547.<sup>528</sup>

Hence, it should have seemed that all obstacles were removed. Macarius had already attempted to dispose the young and impetuous tsar to a responsible and merciful approach towards his subjects. He might have had some success in that endeavour but it was the event of June 1547 in Moscow that shook Ivan and Macarius used the moment to sway him. After a series of smaller fires, on June 21<sup>st</sup> a great blaze destroyed a part of the city and brought about death of at least 1700 inhabitants. It provoked a popular uprising. The mob killed cruelly kniaz' Jurij V. Glinskii (they suspected the Glinskiis of setting fire to the city). After having done that they went to look for other members of the family in Vorobevo, next to Moscow, where Ivan, along with his court, were sheltering from the fire. The tsar was shocked by these events, especially by the invasion by the mob, and became more susceptible to the Metropolitan's admonition. He made some penitential gestures and pardoned some of his adversaries.<sup>529</sup>

One can therefore assume that Maximus was released only in the autumn of 1547 and, at the same time, the excommunication was lifted. It was, however, significant that there was

---

527See: KURBSKII, *History of the Grand Prince of Moscow*, 76-8; СКАЗАНИЕ В КОРПУСЕ СОЧИНЕНИЙ, 83 and 88.

Sinitsyna emphasised the significance of the year 1547 already in her work of 1977 (SINITSYNA 1977, 149-150. 156) and developed this idea in SINITSYNA 2006<sup>c</sup>, 232, showing the circumstances of Ivan IV's coronation and wedding. On the 22 years spent in prison see: SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 33. СКАЗАНИЕ ИЗВЕСТНО, 98, says that Maximus was imprisoned 30 years but it is a much later work and contains other bits of more improbable information. The figure 30 could be put erroneously here instead of 31 years of the whole period Maximus spent outside Mount Athos as it is mentioned in СКАЗАНИЕ МОХОВИКОВА, LXXII. This Life contains both true and invented information, e.g. it gives a correct number of years (22) that Maximus spent in prison (ibid., LXXII) but also fantastic data about Maximus being a archimandrite. In the same text we find a mention that Ivan IV's wife intervened for Maximus' sake. It could be a kind of confirmation of a link between Ivan's marriage and Maximus' liberation. The question of the former metropolitan Daniel's participation in these events (cf. СКАЗАНИЕ МОХОВИКОВА, LXXIII-LXXVII) remains unresolved. Sinitsyna (M-II, 17 and SINITSYNA 1977, 151-2. 158) thinks that it should be taken seriously. It is quite possible because СКАЗАНИЕ МОХОВИКОВА contains, besides pure inventions, also credible information. Nevertheless it is also possible that the letter to Daniel was written before events described here, cf. above, note 499. OBOLENSKY 1999, 216-17 thinks that Maximus was liberated in 1548 when the excommunication was lifted.

528Macarius' words are mentioned in Maximus' reply: FILARET 1842, 96. On Daniel's death in 1547: ЗИМАКИН 1881, 247. See also above, note 520, about СКАЗАНИЕ МОХОВИКОВА, LXXI, which dates his letter to Ivan IV on February 3<sup>rd</sup> 1547 i.e. precisely the day of Ivan's wedding. This dating should not be considered as absolutely precise but indicates a link between Ivan's wedding and Maximus' liberation. We can suppose that the letter (M-II, no. 24) was the beginning of the process that led to his liberation.

529Some historians maintained that already in December 1546 Macarius managed to persuade the tsar to pardon disgraced boyars, see: КРОМ 2010, 325 and PSRL XXXIV, 28. On the events of 1547: КРОМ 2010, 327-48. Priest Sylvester had also an influence on Ivan's changing of habits (see: BULANIN-KOLESOV 1989, SKK). It was also after 1547 when former metropolitan, Ioasaf, was released from the Kirillov monastery and transferred to the Trinity – St Sergius monastery.

no formal rehabilitation of Maximus. The tsar just showed him his mercy.<sup>530</sup> The liberation did not mean either that he could return to Athos or even that he could move freely in Muscovy. It was too early to feel safe. In 1549 his name was invoked once again during the conciliar trial of Isaac Sobaka. It was not directed against Maximus but his name and his old *sins* were recalled.

Sobaka's case was quite mysterious. During Maximus' trial in 1531 he was also sentenced and sent to the Yuriev monastery in Novgorod. When Ioasaf became the metropolitan he released Isaac, ordained him and appointed him archimandrite of the Simonov monastery in Moscow. Metropolitan Macarius nominated him archimandrite of the metropolitan Chudov monastery in the Kremlin in Moscow but suddenly, for reasons unknown to us, in 1548 he decided to remove Sobaka.<sup>531</sup> Before, the decision to designate Sobaka as the superior of a monastery had not aroused any canonical doubt, so there had to be other reasons for this action against him but Macarius visibly wanted to use, as a pretext, *objective*, canonical arguments.

Officially, only in 1548 Macarius discovered – as he himself declared – that Sobaka had been sentenced in 1531. The metropolitan pretended not to have known of Isaac's canonical situation when he had appointed him archimandrite of Chudov. Ioasaf, in turn, when Macarius asked him in 1548 about Sobaka's case, covered himself with forgetfulness. Macarius wanted to find a culprit but Ioasaf did not want to participate in his game. He replied laconically and ignored Macarius' invocations about spiritual responsibility. Both prelates must have known the conciliar decisions in Isaac's case but none of them wanted to be the scapegoat. Even the tsar did not want to interfere although it was on his order that Isaac Sobaka became archimandrite of the Chudov monastery. Finally, all the blame was put on Sobaka (even if it seemed that Ioasaf might have been blamed, too, for ordaining Isaac) who took holy orders without asking Daniel and the council to lift his excommunication.<sup>532</sup>

---

530On the lack of rehabilitation: POKROVSKII 1971, 58-63.

531We know about this trial from the same (and the only one!) MS in which we find the fullest version of Maximus' *Sudnyi spisok*. PLIGUZOV 2002, 251 analysing the text shows that the *Sudnyi spisok na Sobaku* was compiled after February 24<sup>th</sup> 1549 while Maximus' *Sudnyi spisok* was created earlier. POKROVSKII 1971, 38-9 thinks that it was metropolitan Macarius who was responsible for creating *Sudnye spiski* (and that he aimed Sobaka). It is not likely that the accusation against Sobaka was directed towards Maximus. In the correspondence concerning Sobaka's case we do not see any accusations against the Greek, only a mention of his previous trial, see: POKROVSKII 1971, 81 and 84. On Sobaka see also: DMITRIEVA 1988<sup>c</sup> (SKK).

532That Macarius should have known Sobaka's situation see text and note 444 and 525 above. On Ioasaf: SUDNYE SPISKI, 138. Both Ioasaf and Macarius were so important people in the Muscovite Church of that time that it is impossible to imagine that they did not know Sobaka's case. Macarius mentions Sobaka's excommunication in his letter to Ioasaf (SUDNYE SPISKI, 130) but in the sentence of 1531 quoted in the same letter (SUDNYE SPISKI, 129) and in the parallel fragment (SUDNYE SPISKI, 120) we do not find any mention about excommunication! On the tsar: *ibid.*, 129. The description of the proceedings: *ibid.*, 125-139. Macarius, on spiritual responsibility: *ibid.*, 130. On Sobaka's responsibility: *ibid.*, 138.

The conciliar trial of Isaac Sobaka was held at the metropolitan court on February 24<sup>th</sup> 1549. Isaac was deprived of his ecclesiastical dignities and sent, as penance, to Nil Sorskii's Belozerski monastery.<sup>533</sup> The measures taken by the ecclesiastical authorities were surrounded by fulsome rhetoric, disproportionate to the importance of the event. As in the case of Maximus' trial the whole lawsuit seems to be a ritual performance. The achievement of the objective (in this case the removal of Sobaka) was more important than the judicial procedure.<sup>534</sup>

At that time when Sobaka was again sentenced, the Greek had probably left Tver. The sixteenth century Maximus' *Life*, inserted into a collection of his works, says that after the excommunication was lifted by metropolitan Macarius the tsar transferred the Greek to the Trinity – St Sergius monastery. Between these events however the author of this source informs us about a period of intense literary activity, visibly still in Tver.

In later sources there is a mention that the Greek first went to Moscow and only afterwards to the Trinity. These documents emphasise the role the hegumen Artemii played in these events. The fact that the mention about Artemii and Maximus' stay in Moscow appear in late and less reliable sources does not mean that the information is completely unbelievable. It is true that the Greek was unfettered in 1547 and Artemii became hegumen of the Trinity only in 1551 (earlier he had lived in the far-distant Kirillo-Belozerskii monastery). One can suppose therefore that the latter did not directly influence the decision to set Maximus free but later he may have favoured Maximus' settlement in the Trinity monastery where a few people ideologically close to Maximus had already lived. Besides Artemii himself, the former

---

533The trial took place in the White chamber of the Metropolitan palace, in the penultimate Sunday of the carnival (в мясопустную неделю на память страшного суда, в царствующем граде Москве в митрополичьей дворе, в белой полате), *SUDNYE SPISKI*, 139. We do not know of any links of this conciliar trial with the so called *Земский собор* of 1549 and with the canonisation council of the same year. The obscure reasons why Sobaka was judged and condemned contributed to a new hypothesis (cf. Sinitsyna in M-II, 18) that Sobaka's trial was intended to put the blame on him and – this way – to reduce Maximus' responsibility who had maintained during his trial that the errors in his translations were caused by the copyists. One of them was Sobaka. It is not very probable because, if both secular and ecclesiastical authorities finally decided to liberate the Greek (after years of his requests), there was no need, especially *ex post*, to justify this act. It is even less probable that Maximus' work *Съѣѣтъ къ Събору православному на Исака жидовина* (M-II, no. 45) was directed against Sobaka. It would be a manifestation of a revenge which is hard to be seen with Maximus, even after so many years of suffering. In the text of this work Isaac is not mentioned at all (only in the title). Moreover, the Greek seems to write about those who *come* to Muscovy and it was not the case of Sobaka. IVANOV 1969, 107 did not link this work with Sobaka (similarly as Golubinskii and Ikonnikov whom he quotes). Cf. also GOLUBINSKII 1900, 649. The possible context for Maximus' work *Съѣѣтъ къ Събору* could be Baskin's case, cf. below, note 549.

534In two cases: the question of sitting at the right hand of the Father (Maximus' trial) and the issue of ordination of an excommunicated man (Sobaka's trial) the *Sudnye spiski* quote a very long list of authorities as if the author of this document wanted to flood the adversaries with these quotations.

metropolitan Ioasaf was there and others (see below).<sup>535</sup>

After his release, Maximus tirelessly continued his work, even if the long incarceration had damaged his health and he was already an old man. Here again, we meet the already-mentioned difficulty with the precise dating of many of his works. Only some of them can be attributed to the last period of his life with a certain plausibility. An indication for the approximative dating of the later works can be taken from some biographical sources. One of them, the *Skazanie izvestno*, says that Maximus after his liberation was in bad physical condition. In parallel, we have a number of Maximus' writings in which he repeatedly complains about different diseases and ailments. It is most probable that these works come from the last period of his life. They were written either while he was still in Tver or in the Trinity – St Sergius monastery.<sup>536</sup>

Among the late works we have a copy of the Greek Apostol executed personally by Maximus. It was made later than the previously copied Greek Psalter, after the liberation. The Greek strove not only to render the text faithfully but also to help the reader understand it. Each book of the *Apostol* was preceded by an introduction (ὕπόθεσις), sometimes taken from a Father of the Church.<sup>537</sup>

During these years Maximus was still in touch with prominent people and, as it was the case before, he tried to use his contacts to help people in need. We have at least one evidence of his social sensitivity in the last period of his life in his only known letter to Sylvester, priest of the Annunciation Church in the Kremlin, the editor of the *Domostroi*. The document does not say a lot about their relationship. The Greek called Sylvester his benefactor (so it was not their first contact) and he used the acquaintance to ask Sylvester to intercede with the tsar in favour of an impoverished noble family. We do not know whether Sylvester acceded to this request or not but we can guess that apart the above-mentioned request also some intellectual interests linked the two churchmen or, at least, that Sylvester was interested in Maximus' intellectual

535Maximus' early *Life*: СКАЗАНИЕ В КОРПУСЕ СОЧИНЕНИЙ, 83-4 and 88. The author of this source says that during the period between the release and the transfer to Moscow Maximus wrote the Confession of the Orthodox faith (which was in fact written earlier) and other works. It is possible that during this period the Greek edited the Confession but also worked on other texts. The mention of Artemii and Maximus' stay in Moscow appears in a life from the seventeenth century, cf. СКАЗАНИЕ ИЗВЕСТНО, 96-7 (on this source: SINITSYNA 2006<sup>a</sup>, 48-9 and ff.; SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 34) and again in СКАЗАНИЕ МОХОВИКОВА, LXXVI- LXXVII. The last source mentions also that Artemii was a friend of Maximus (ibid., LXXVII). On Mokhovikov's work see above, note 5.

536See: СКАЗАНИЕ ИЗВЕСТНО, 96. This work says that the Greek was transferred to the Trinity immediately after his liberation and refers to his bad condition when he was already in the Trinity. In a missive on the Athos community (RZHIGA 1935-36, 95-6) Maximus complained about a problem with his hand, in a letter to his friend George he also refers to his diseases (K-II, 424) and in a short letter to M.V. Shuiskii he mentions his ailments (K-II, 421).

537On this MS (РНБ, собр. Кирилло-Белозерского мон. № 120/125) see: ФОНКИЧ 1969, 81-2. He dates this MS at the end of 1540-ties – beginning of 1550-ties. On the Psalter above, note 507.

work. Later two Greek manuscripts copied by Maximus belonged to his personal library: the *Psalter* and the *Apostol*.<sup>538</sup>

All his contacts gave also Maximus, when he regained a (relative) freedom, the possibility to spread further his ideas. The struggle between the two different models of Muscovite Church had not stopped. The Trinity – St Sergius monastery became a place where a new group of people sharing common ideas might have started to consolidate (even if the majority of monks was far from these views). After a period of exile the former metropolitan Ioasaf was settled into the Trinity and in 1551 Artemii arrived there to become hegumen. The affinity between Maximus and Ioasaf has been already shown. As for Artemii – we can observe a convergence of some of his views with those of Maximus'. Repeated information about their friendship and about Artemii's intercession for Maximus, even if they are absent in the earliest biographical sources, induces one to believe in a close relationship between them.

Artemii and Ioasaf, as was Maximus, were in favour of a less rigid Muscovite Church and desired a monastic life closer to the Gospel. All this, they wanted in a moderate, not in a revolutionary way. In the Kirillo-Belozerskii monastery where Artemii and Ioasaf had earlier spent some time (the former voluntarily and the later under duress), at the beginning of 1550-ties there was a group of monks who had started to be interested in Vassian Patrikeev's ideas. Now these ideas may have again got closer to the decision-making centres of the Church and state.<sup>539</sup>

Apart from Ioasaf and Artemii we see circumscribing Maximus a few other people who either sought wider knowledge (which was treated by many in the Muscovite Church with suspicion) or who were convinced that this Church needed to be reformed.

One of them, Nil Kurliatev, was a member of a princely family who had become a monk of the Trinity monastery. He asked Maximus to translate the *Psalter* from Greek to Russian and during this time he learned Greek. This work (Maximus' new translation of the *Psalter*) was accomplished in 1552. Kurliatev was impressed with Maximus' erudition and expressed this in his preface of the translation. The common project gave them the opportunity

---

538On Sylvester: BULANIN-KOLESOV 1989 (SKK). Historians' opinions about him are quite ambiguous. Maximus' letter to Sylvester: K-II, 379-81 (on benefactor – p. 379), cf. IVANOV 1969, 168. On Maximus' MSS belonging to Sylvester: FONKICH 1969 and 1977, 45-9. Cf. also IKONNIKOV 1915, 513-16. Ivan IV gave to Sylvester a MS containing, among other texts, Maximus' work against the Latins, *ibid.*, 517. Another example of Maximus' contacts with prominent people is his letter to Shuiskii, cf. above note 536.

539On Artemii: KAZAKOVA 1988<sup>a</sup> (SKK) and on Ioasaf: DMITRIEVA 1988<sup>b</sup> (SKK). Maximus' and Artemii's views converged e.g. in relation to the issue of excessive ritualism. We do not know the exact date of Ioasaf's arrival at the Trinity but it was after 1547. He died there in 1555 or 56. On the monks from the Kirillov monastery: PLIGUZOV 2002, 13. On moderate Artemii's views: IKONNIKOV 1915, 529.

to speak not only about philology but also about more current issues. There are reasons to suppose that Kurliatev was tried later, together or in connection with Artemii's case, so it is possible that they shared common ideas.<sup>540</sup>

One more significant figure that should be named in this context is prince Andrew Kurbskii. His first known encounter with Maximus occurred quite late, perhaps two or three years before Maximus' death, in 1553, but, taking into account Maximus' significance for prince Andrew, it cannot be excluded that they became acquainted earlier. Kurbskii called the Greek *beloved teacher*, recalled conversations that he had had with him, spoke with appreciation about his wisdom and erudition and emphasised that the Greek had suffered unjustly. He also recommended Maximus' writings and biblical translations to those around him. The meeting with the Greek monk was a remarkable moment in his life. After Kurbskii's flight to Lithuania he kept in touch with those who in Muscovy were also close to Maximus, first of all with Artemii.<sup>541</sup>

There was a certain community of ideas in Muscovy between people linked to Maximus. They were different, did not agree on certain issues, but they shared a common conviction that Muscovy needed more justice in social life and that the Church, cleansed of superstition and ignorance, should be rooted in the Orthodox theological tradition. For this purpose Maximus translated the Fathers of the Church and Kurbskii continued this work in the same spirit.

Further, among addressees of Maximus' letters we meet a certain George. There is not enough data to identify him but – judging from the tone of Maximus' letter (the Greek called him *beloved* and regretted that he could not meet his interlocutor in person) he was an intimate friend. They maintained a lively exchange of thoughts. What we know about George is the fact that he was interested in books and ideas coming from the West, as were Maximus' other acquaintances. He sent a work to Maximus and proposed that he should copy it. Maximus

---

540On Nil: PROKHOROV 1989<sup>a</sup> (SKK). His preface is edited by KOVTUN 1975, 94-8 (for another preface cf. M-I, no. 6a), and its fragments concerning Maximus reprinted in SINITSYNA 2006<sup>a</sup>, 75-6. On links between Nil and Artemii: PROKHOROV 1989<sup>a</sup>, KAZAKOVA 1988<sup>a</sup> (SKK) and IKONNIKOV 1915, 535, note 3. In СКАЗАНИЕ ИСАИИ, 90 (it is a kind of preface to the Psalter of 1552 included in a MS of 1591 – РГБ, ф. 304, Троицк. 62), its author says that this translation was examined by Ivan IV, metropolitan Macarius and the Council. Cf. also commentary: SINITSYNA 2006<sup>a</sup>, 58-9; GOLUBINSKII 1911, 244 and IVANOV 1969, 22. About entire Maximus' work on the Psalter see: VERNER 2017. In 1522 Maximus had translated mainly commentaries and now he translated the text of the Psalter itself.

541See: GLADKII-TSEKHANOVICH 1988 (SKK). Kurbskii's opinion about Maximus' works: KURBSKII, Послание Васьяну, 403 and KURBSKII, Отвѣтъ восточныхъ, 436. The expression *beloved teacher* in: KURBSKII, Новый маргарит, 5v, 9-10, cf. also KALUGIN 1997, 140. Geographical proximity favoured their contact. The Trinity – St. Sergius monastery was located between Moscow and the Kurbskii's family estate (Курба), cf. KALUGIN 1997, 137. Kurbskii continued Maximus' translation work: KALUGIN 2001.

conveyed in return his works and a critical commentary on a Western book.<sup>542</sup>

George's case shows us that we are far from knowing the exact extent of Maximus' impact and from understanding the width of the circle of his acquaintances. If we know so little about a person so obviously close to him, probably the list of his relations was longer than we can infer from preserved sources.

Finally, another touching token of Maximus' fidelity in friendship is worth relating here. The Greek not only maintained in relationship with his Muscovite acquaintances but also remembered his old friends from the pre-muscovite period of his life. In 1551 or 1552 he sent his two Greek poems in elegiac distichs (they are also known in the Slavonic translation), to a certain Macrobius whose identity has not been determined as yet. The monks' presentation, attached to his works, suggests that his friend has an excellent command of Greek and that he perhaps knew other people who were close to Maximus in Greece or Italy. The expression "brother in the Lord", that he used, may indicate that Macrobius was Orthodox, perhaps a monk from Athos or one of those who sought the intervention of the Eastern patriarchs for Maximus a couple of years before. The Greek sent his works (*Elegiac Verses Urging Repentance* and *Invective against Hellenic Deceit*) with hope that perhaps they could help someone to reject the exceeding love for *Hellenic babble*.<sup>543</sup> Maximus remained Greek until the end of his life, caring for the beauty of his language and, at the same time, a missionary struggling so that people like him should find the true faith and reject, as he had done, Hellenic deceit.<sup>544</sup>

We have also to recall here a few people who, if they did not meet Maximus in person, were impressed by his works and in this way were linked to him. Among the people known to us are: Iona Dumin, who contributed to the preservation of Maximus' legacy, German Polev, archbishop of Kazan, a contemporary of Maximus, who, according to Kurbskii, was *involved* in Maximus' teaching and prince Michael A. Obolensky.<sup>545</sup>

542A letter to George (K-II, 424-5) may come from the last period of Maximus' life because of the characteristic mention about the Greek's illness. George is interested in a work by Samuel the Jew. There is one more letter to George (K-III, 226-236). It is impossible to establish whether he is the same person or not (cf. IVANOV 1969, 171). Besides convergence of the name in both letters Maximus answers a question relating to his interlocutor's reading of a work coming from Western Europe.

543SHEVCHENKO 1997, 40-1. Both works belong to the first collection of Maximus' works containing twelve pieces so they were written significantly earlier, see: BULANIN 1993, 230.

544There are many other pieces of evidence that Maximus wrote (and also thought) in Greek till the end of his life, e.g. the above-mentioned letter to Shuiskii (cf. above, note 509) or his text *Како подобает входути во святыя Божия храмы* which was originally composed in Greek (cf. IVANOV 1969, 104 and BULANIN 2017, 87). SHEVCHENKO 2009, 479 maintains that also other works (e.g. M-II, no.7; M-II, no.43 and others) were originally written in Greek.

545On Iona Dumin: BULANIN 1988<sup>c</sup> (SKK). On German Polev: DMITRIEVA 1988<sup>a</sup> (SKK) and KURBSKII, *History of the Grand Prince of Moscow*, 242-4 ("А былъ той Герман светла рода человек [...] и в трудех духовных мног;

The last years of Maximus' life coincided with attempts to introduce the long-awaited changes in the life of the Church and society. They were understood, of course, not as some new regulation but as the restoration of the original order. Some of these initiatives enabled the implementation of the demands about which Maximus had repeatedly written in his works. Some of the above-mentioned people reflected in one way or another upon these adaptations. The tsar who had received from Maximus a few letters concerning his role as a monarch and the situation of his subjects was also active in this process.<sup>546</sup> We do not have any proof of the direct influence of Maximus' works on the tsar or high officials but knowing about the significance of the Greek's writings for his contemporaries and about his contacts with the metropolitan and other influential people we can say, without the risk of error, that Maximus participated in the ferment of the 1540-ties – early 1550-ties and, in consequence, indirectly in the preparation for the so called *Stoglav* council.<sup>547</sup>

Nothing is known about Maximus' presence at the Council that was held in the first half of 1551 but during its meetings many issues that Maximus had raised in his writings were discussed, sometimes on the initiative of a person close to the Greek like Ioasaf.<sup>548</sup>

From Macarius' point of view the council was a success. The goal had been achieved. The rights of the Church were defended and her tradition firmly established. Unification of the Church, which the metropolitan had previously sought, was reached. Yet, one can hardly

---

к тому и Максима Философа мало нечто отчасти учения причастен былъ...”) but Polev also copied himself Joseph of Volokolamsk's *Prosvetitel* (ROWLAND 1990, 148); on Obolensky (whom, NB, Kurbskii recruited for his translation project): THOMSON 1999, VI, 188-9 and ROZEMOND 1965-66, 175. Whereas, against some scholars' opinions, Zinovii Otenski was rather not Maximus' disciple, see: BULANIN 1988<sup>b</sup> (SKK).

546About the reforms generally and their interpretation as a restoration of the primordial order: KROM 2009, 571-3. There is one more of Maximus' letter to the tsar which might have been written about 1551 but its dating is not sure. It was published by RZHIGA 1934, 76-8 (commentary) and 117-9 (text). The fact that the author praises the tsar for rectifications he has made suggests the later dating because before 1547 Ivan IV was not politically active (cf. above, note 522). When Maximus says about himself: “лѣта ужь доволна удръжимъ” (RZHIGA 1934, 119), it may concern the fact that he was kept in Muscovy, and not necessarily his incarceration. The mention about difficulties the author experienced (ibid.) also indicates the last years of Maximus' life because in this period we meet such complains in his works. *Terminus ante quem* is 1553 when Maximus met Ivan IV (in the letter his says “Аще и не сподобихся видѣти царское твое лице...”, ibid.).

547Maximus' link with the preparation of the *Stoglav* should be sought not necessarily in textual convergences (e.g. those indicated by SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 18 are too general; they result from the common scriptural references) but in the fact that the Council dealt with the same problems that Maximus addressed in his works: usury, monastic and, broader, ecclesiastical discipline. Since his works were known in the ruling circles and taking into account his authority, probably they were at least considered during the preparation of the Council and during the Council itself, cf. RZHIGA 1934, 31-2. 106-7 and EMCHENKO 2010.

548E.g., the issue of the badly translated Muscovite ecclesiastical books (*Stoglav*, chapter 27-28), care about the poor (chapter 73), the question of homosexuality (chapter 33 and 41). Maximus drew attention to the plight of prisoners of war and the former metropolitan Ioasaf intervened in this case at the Council, see: IKONNIKOV 1915, 519. In the Ioasaf collection of Maximus' works the chapter 27 and 33 treat, respectively, the question of three-time-sung alleluia and making the sign of the cross with two fingers. These issues were also discussed during the Council, see: SINITSYNA 1977, 174.



imagine that Maximus was happy with the results of the Council. Although some of his desiderata were inscribed in the *Hundred Chapters*, the events and some decisions that followed the Council foretold of a future that the Greek would have not desired.<sup>549</sup>

The first warning was Artemii's withdrawal in 1552. He never explained the reasons of his resignation from the post of hegumen of the Trinity – St Sergius monastery. One can only presume that he did not see any sense continuing his mission because it was impossible to realise his ideals there.

Then, in spring 1553, Maximus met the tsar who visited the Trinity during his journey to the Kirillo-Belozerskii monastery. According to the account of Kurbskii who accompanied the tsar, Ivan had become seriously ill and when he recovered he made a vow to pilgrimage to Kirillovo together with his wife and a newborn child. Having met Ivan, the Greek tried to dissuade him from going and pointed out that it was not a reasonable vow. The true devotion would be rather – said Maximus – to take care of widows and orphans of the soldiers who had fallen in the recent war with Kazan'. Since Ivan refused to change his mind, Maximus in a prophetic inspiration, told him that if he did not show mercy to those in need and go, despite everything, to Kirillovo, his newborn son would die. Ivan went to Kirillovo and the child did die.<sup>550</sup> Maximus who often called upon his readers to show Christian charity and emphasised the necessity to apply the words of Gospel and not only to celebrate the rites of the Church, had in this instance another opportunity to see how deeply ritualism was rooted in Muscovy.

Other episodes during the last years of his life probably disappointed Maximus even more. In 1553, Maximus received a letter from the tsar who asked him to write a missive for the new conciliar trial, this time against Matthew Bashkin, a radical reformer who liberated his peasants from serfdom and let them decide for themselves whether they wanted to serve him or not. Bashkin had also unorthodox trinitarian views but – according to Artemii – it was rather out of ignorance than of a heretical tendency. The fact that a social utopian was to be judged as heretic did not bode well for the future. A short allusion in Ivan's letter reveals fears of innocent people, that they might be accused of heresy. The tsar wrote that he had heard about Maximus' fear that he might be counted among the heretics. Ivan reassured him saying that

---

549E.g.: contrary to the decision of the Council of 1503 (cf. ААЭ I, no. 382, p. 484: “не имати ничего никому” and ZIMIN 1978, 76, ящик 175) the fees for ecclesiastical investiture was levied. Metropolitan Macarius even included into his Great Menology a compilation about a *boon* of simony, cf. PLIGUZOV 2002, 154-5 who lists MSS containing this unpublished fragment.

550See: KURBSKII, *History of the Grand Prince of Moscow*, 76-90. It would be interesting to speculate on whether Maximus knew about Savonarola's prophecy concerning the death of Charles VIII's son, RIDOLFI 1981, 214. If it was the case, this story might have inspired Maximus.

“the faithful would not be counted among unfaithful”.<sup>551</sup>

Yet, the fear was not unfounded. Artemii who, at first, was summoned to the trial as a witness, then became a co-defendant. He was accused of heresy and in January 1554 sent, for life, to the Solovki monastery. The irony was, that writing the conciliar document concerning Artemii, the metropolitan Macarius used a fragment of another document written on May 24<sup>th</sup> 1525 by metropolitan Daniel. This document had been sent to Volokolamsk to describe Maximus’ guilt and determine the way Maximus should be treated there.<sup>552</sup>

In 1555 Artemii’s acquaintance and – in a way – disciple, Feodosii Kosoi, was sentenced in another trial for heresy. The same year both fled to Lithuania.

Maximus would have expected nothing good from Muscovy. Exhausted from hardship and long-term incarceration he died in 7064 (i.e. between 1<sup>st</sup> of September 1555 and 31<sup>st</sup> of August 1556), probably in December.<sup>553</sup>

In 1564 Andrew Kurbskii fled to Lithuania. Four years later his collaborator, perhaps also linked with Maximus, the young prince Obolensky followed in his footsteps. German Polev died in 1568, quite probably killed on the order of the tsar.<sup>554</sup>

---

551On Artemii’s opinion about Bashkin: KAZAKOVA 1988<sup>a</sup> (SKK). Ivan’s letter to Maximus is published in AI, I, no. 161, p. 296-8, esp. 298. Some authors supposed that Bashkin was Maximus’ disciple.

552See: PLIGUZOV 2002, 241, cf. SUDNYE SPISKI, 121-4 (Daniel’s letter) and ААЭ, I, no. 239 (Macarius’ letter).

553See: SINITSYNA 2006<sup>a</sup>, 18. The year 7064 comes from СКАЗАНИЕ В КОРПУСЕ СОЧИНЕНИЙ, 84 and 88. The date of Maximus’ funeral, 12<sup>th</sup> of December, is mention in СКАЗАНИЕ МОХОВИКОВА, LXXXI. The year 7064 is also mentioned in the copy of the ancient tombstone (староветхая таблица) on Maximus’ grave in the Trinity monastery. The copy was executed 1<sup>st</sup> of April 1702, cf. БЕЛОКУРОВ 1898, XL, on the date of Maximus death and *ibid.*, XLII, on the day when the copy was made. Belokurov published this document from the MS Императорской Публичной библиотеки (=РНБ), I.F. № 245, лл. 8-10. ZIMIN 1976, 148 mentions another MS (ГБЛ=РГБ, Собрание Егорова № 1512, лл. 17об - 29) where, among Maximus’ works and his *Life* (Сказание о Максиме Философе), one more copy of the inscription on his tombstone can be found.

554NB, in the penitential texts at the beginning of the seventeenth century we find a question (КОРОГОДИНА 2007, 381): “whether the penitent thought about *fleeing the country to go to the Germans (nemtsy) or to Lithuania.*”

## Chapter 3

# IDEAS AND TOPICS OF MAXIMUS' WORK

### 1. MAXIMUS' PHILOSOPHICAL AND THEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

In Muscovite sources both Maximus' parents and he himself, were called *philosophers*. This term describes educated people. Yet, we know little about the initial education given to Michael Trivolis. In Byzantine schools the instruction was based mainly on pagan authors (first of all Homer and other poets but also philosophers: Aristotle and Plato) with some readings of the Bible, especially the Psalms. More advanced students read Gregory of Nazianzus.<sup>1</sup> Irrespectively of whether Michael had Demetrios Trivolis as tutor or if he attended a school, the fundamentals of his education certainly did not differ essentially from the Byzantine curriculum. His time at school was shortly after the fall of Byzantium and his teachers had received their instruction in Byzantine schools. Therefore the young Trivolis must have begun his education reading Greek pagan authors, especially Homer. That was balanced against some fragments from the Bible and the Fathers of the Church. Probably at an early stage he also acquired a general vision of the world inherited from the ancient tradition, and shared by all educated people both in the East and in the West: that the earthly reality, including man, was built from four elements, that man's behaviour was influenced by four humours and the world had its hierarchy which passed from the most pure spirits to inanimate matter.<sup>2</sup>

It was however not this universally accepted knowledge that would become later problematic for Maximus but the relationship or balance between the pagan and Christian traditions. In Greece, both Plato and Aristotle were a part of the national heritage, universally read and, at the same time, from the Christian point of view, both were regarded with suspicion. Profound links between Neoplatonism and the patristic thought cannot be denied. Yet, there were also not less profound divergences. Neither the Platonic theory of ideas, of the

1 On Maximus' parents see: chapter II, text and note 8. On the Byzantine curriculum: WILSON 1992, 158-9 and VIKAN 1991. On the use of Aristotle in Greek education: DUFFY-KAZHDAN 1991 and on Plato and Aristotle in education: KRISTELLER 1979, 35.

2 On four elements: M-I, 270 (here only three elements are enumerated) and Z-215: "человѣкъ сложенъ есть от земли, и огня, и въздуха, и воды." On four humours: M-II, 298.

preexistence of souls nor that of metempsychosis could be reconciled with the Christian doctrine.

A similar problem concerned Aristotle. His methodology was a useful tool for theologians but the idea of the eternity of the world or the mortality of the human soul were unacceptable for a Christian.

In Byzantium Aristotle was thought alongside with Plato. These two philosophical currents coexisted and were sometimes blended. They were treated more or less similarly by those who were responsible in the Church: possible or real errors were rejected, possible benefits were used, sometimes with great caution, sometimes with genuine enthusiasm. It was Plato who seemed to be more perilous because – paradoxically – closer to Christianity. The Church authorities condemned a few times elements of his teaching.<sup>3</sup>

The understanding of this Byzantine background is indispensable to the interpretation of Maximus' life and writings. Its spirit was at work not only during his primary education in Greece but also had an impact on his studies in Italy. Many of Trivolis' teachers and friends there were either Greeks or philhellenics. Further, his stay on Mount Athos, if it remodified Michael's philosophical views, it was certainly in a Byzantine spirit.

#### MAXIMUS – A PLATONIST?

Scholars, like Denissoff or Obolensky, describing Trivolis' views, often suggested that Platonic ideas formed his outlook on life. Obolensky considered the question of the nature of Maximus' Platonism as one of the main issues in research of the Greek's thought.

During his childhood in Greece it was certainly too early for him to shape a mature philosophical position even if he probably had studied some philosophical texts during his initial instruction. It was only in Italy that his philosophical orientation was moulded under the influence of both the Byzantine tradition and the seminal environment of the Italian Renaissance. In the fifteenth and sixteenth century passionate discussions concerning the

---

3 On the Greek philosophy in Byzantium see, e.g., KRISTELLER 1979, 35 and 154-5. It was a Western Father, Augustine, who repeated that Platonism is closer to Christianity than any other pagan philosophy, *ibid.* 53. Platonism was censured at the council in Constantinople (553) and in the edict from 1082, linked with the condemnation of John Italos, cf. WILSON 1992, 158, see also p. 162. Cf. also HUSSEY 2010, 142-5. 154-5. Italos, however, was accused of errors originated both in Platonic and Aristotelian teaching. Cf. also Michael Psellos' fate: HUSSEY 1937, 86-8. Nevertheless the author says (*ibid.*, 90): "On the whole the years 867-1185 produced amazingly little evidence of controversy of this kind [concerning the Christian use of the pagan literature]." On Aristotle in Byzantium: DUFFY-KAZHDAN 1991. The simplistic approach that the West was more Aristotelian and the East – more Platonic has to be modified. Some important Eastern Orthodox writers used Aristotelian thought or, at least, inspirations, cf. DUFFY-KAZHDAN 1991. Cf. however KRISTELLER 1979, 155 (and generally his chapter 3 and 8), who held a different opinion, that the Byzantine theology became more Aristotelian and anti-Platonic only in fourteenth – fifteenth centuries, under Western influence.

significance of Plato and Platonism confronted with Aristotle and Aristotelianism were held by scholars. The violent quarrel in the fifteenth century between Bessarion and George of Trebizond was mentioned in the chapter I. Yet, there are more examples which show that Renaissance intellectuals (also those whom Trivolis contacted or might have contacted) strove to reconcile these two great schools of thinking, even those who – like Ficino – were Platonists.<sup>4</sup> Perhaps less balanced was the approach of Trivolis’ friend, Scipio Forteguerra. During his inaugural lecture published by Aldo in 1504 he categorically stated that “Platonic philosophy is more sublime than Aristotelianism and is consistent with Christian religion.”<sup>5</sup> Even this utterance was not as radical as the fifteenth century arguments.

Certainly, Florence, when Maximus arrived there, was the place where one could find everything necessary to study Plato and to become (if one wanted to) a Platonist. Yet the circumstances do not determine one’s choice. If he really was a Platonist, was his Platonism the dominant ideological motive of his thought or did he just incorporate some Platonic ideas into his Christian identity?

*Platonism or Platonic influence?*

Denissoff was convinced that Maximus adopted a specifically *Florentine* Platonism.<sup>6</sup> Indeed, when we read his phrase that Plato “the first from among the outer philosophers, was instructed either from the God-inspired writings or from the light of the natural reason” (M-I, 151-2) – it is not difficult to find an echo of the Florentine Platonists. Nevertheless, this kind of reverence for Plato can be found not only among the Florentines in the fifteenth century but also in other Christian authors, starting from the Fathers of the Church such as Clement of Alexandria.<sup>7</sup>

4 The opinions of scholars: DENISSOFF 1943, 160 and OBOLENSKY 1999, 219. HANEY 1973, 138-9 (and *passim*) accepted the thesis about Maximus’ Platonism with some restrictions. Already Boethius used both Platonism and Aristotle’s instruments in his theological reflection. Giovanni Pico’s *De ente et uno* was also an attempt to reconcile these two schools. Pico says however that Dionysius was greater than either Plato or Aristotle. Aldo Manuzio put both Plato and Aristotle rather on the side of truth, not of error (see above, chapter II, note 95). An effort to reconcile Plato and Aristotle was also made at the University of Padua. Ficino, a Platonist, saw the Peripatetic doctrine as a path leading to Platonic wisdom: “From natural things one ascends to divine things, and this is why no one can ever understand the sublime mysteries of Plato unless he has already been initiated into the disciplines of Aristotle.” (quoted in and translated by: LACKNER 2002, 40). Also Florentine iconography testifies to attempts to show Plato and Aristotle as allies of Christian doctrine, e.g. the *Triumph of saint Thomas Aquinas* by Benozzo di Lese di Sandro – Gozzoli, a picture that Maximus may have seen in Florence or in Pisa. See also: KRISTELLER 1979, chapter 2 and 3.

5 See: WILSON 1992, 132.

6 See: DENISSOFF 1943, 157-160. He also thinks (*ibid.*, 307-9) that Maximus had to conceal his Platonism because the mainstream of the Orthodox Church at that time was anti-Platonic. It is true that after the Council of Florence some prominent figures of the Byzantine Church, as Gennadius Scholarius or Mark of Ephesus, opposed Platonism. Manuel of Corinth was also an anti-Platonist.

7 A similar fragment to the quoted (M-I, 151-2) can be found in M-I, 317. It is worth mentioning here Gianfrancesco Pico’s opinion. He wanted to demonstrate the futility of any pagan philosophy for Christians but

Besides, Maximus' esteem for Aristotle was also great so it would be difficult to call him immediately a Platonist. He considered the Stagirite (along with Socrates and Plato) "the most honest and the most truth-loving among Greek philosophers" and he does not mention either Plato or Aristotle in his work *Against the Hellenic deceit*.<sup>8</sup> It could mean that he did not consider their works as an intellectual deception.

At the same time, we find also passages where Maximus says (against Vives' opinion) that Plato was not a saint and that he instructed people to worship many gods (Z-260). He emphasises the errors of both Plato and Aristotle, e.g. that the world is co-eternal with God (K-III, 228).

This seeming inconsistency of Maximus' views can be partially explained by a different context in his utterances. In the field of earthly knowledge Plato may be considered as one of the highest authorities while for a Christian, who has received God's revelation, his errors are plain. One can also notice that the most enthusiastic praises for Plato (and Aristotle) come from the first period of Maximus' life in Muscovy (before 1525). We do not find such expressions in his works written after his incarceration. More critical expressions were often written later, although not exclusively. They can be also seen in the period before 1525.<sup>9</sup> It may be that the Greek's thought evolved from a more positive approach towards ancient philosophy to a more critical opinion but, even if he had undergone a kind of evolution in this respect, he cannot be called Platonist in any period of his life. He was just an educated Byzantine who, admiring the genius and importance of the founder of the Academy, did not hesitate to reject everything that in his thought could not be reconciled with Christianity. Undeniably, he quoted Plato, borrowed

---

he directed his criticism first of all against Aristotle. He was not a Platonist. "If there is a certain sympathy for Plato in his writings, it is because he saw in Plato a compatibility to religion which he felt was absent in Aristotle." cf. SCHMITT 1967, 61-63. The quoted phrase is on the page 63. This approach, as other Pico's beliefs, might have influenced Maximus.

- 8 See: M-I, 281. See also: M-I, 321. These quotations come from the same period before Maximus' imprisonment as the above-mentioned praises of Plato. As for the *Against the Hellenic Deceit* – see: SHEVCHENKO 1997, 18-39. HANEY 1973, 139 quotes the last work but – as he is a follower of the theory of Maximus' Platonism – he perceives only the absence of Plato.
- 9 It is difficult to give a definitive verdict on Maximus' evolution because the dating of many of his works is uncertain. The above quoted praises for Plato and Aristotle (M-I, 151-2; M-I, 317; M-I, 281; M-I, 321) come definitely from the period before 1525. We find much criticism towards the ancient philosophy in his work against Vives (e.g. Z-260). BULANIAN 1977 dates it in 1530-ties – 40-ties. Nevertheless Vives' commentary was published first in 1521 so it cannot be excluded that Maximus might have written his work against Vives before 1525. There are also some critical remarks concerning ancient thought in the period before 1525, e.g. M-I, 315. Also, the *Against the Hellenic Deceit* is known to be from a later period of Maximus life, although, again, the dating is not sure. One more critical expression against opinions of Plato and Aristotle can be found in K-III, 228. This work has not been critically edited yet. A feeble basis to date it roughly after 1540 could be the name of the addressee (a certain George) to whom Maximus sent one more letter (if it is really the same person), written rather in the second period of his life in Muscovy when the condition of his imprisonment became less strict. On George see chapter II note 542.

some images from him or interpreted his works but this is not a sign that he was a Platonist. His more specific statements, mainly concerning anthropological questions, confirm this diagnosis.<sup>10</sup> The number of quotations indicates plainly that the Fathers of the Church were for him an incomparably greater authority than any Greek philosopher, including Plato.<sup>11</sup>

#### EASTERN FATHERS OF THE CHURCH AND OTHER EASTERN AUTHORS

The tradition of the Fathers is Maximus' main source of theological inspiration. He often expressed his respect for them and emphasised their significance for Christian reflection. "The Apostolic truth" – he says – is communicated through the Bible and then explained by the Fathers (e.g.: M-I, 135). They compiled and confirmed the foundations of "the divine house of our innocent faith" which was established by God ([...] основание всего божественного дому непорочныя вѣры нашея, укончянное убо преже от Бога [...] потом от божественных отецъ съставлено и утврѣжено – M-I, 183-4). Therefore they are the direct continuators of the divine labour. They convey the dogmas in the confession of faith fully and clearly (полнѣ и явственѣ – M-I, 188), i.e. in a perfect way.

The Greek had a particular esteem for John Chrysostom. Most often he called him *divine* (божественныи), he quoted him very often and lavished praise on him. He also described John, according to the Orthodox tradition, as a universal teacher (M-I, 327, 364). Having translated (with collaborators) Chrysostom's *Homilies on St. Matthew* he wrote a missive recommending this translation and explaining how beneficial was this *sacred* book (M-I,

---

10 To understand Maximus' random expressions better and put them in the context of Byzantine intellectual tradition it is worth to refer to a thinker a few centuries senior to Maximus: Michael Psellos. He wrote, referring to Plato: "I may belong entirely to Christ, but I refuse to deny the wiser of our writers or the knowledge of reality, both intelligible and sensible." The phrase quoted by PELIKAN 1974, 245. At the same time Psellos "did not hesitate to call attention to the *absurdities* in Plato, and he affirmed his loyalty to dogmatic orthodoxy, even against *thousands of Platos and Aristotles*.", *ibid.*, 245-6. The fact (adduced by DENISSOFF 1943, 158) that Maximus borrows images from *Phaedrus* and *Timaeus* (K-II, 437=M-II, 61 and K-II, 52=M-II, 159 – the last fragment is quoted below in this chapter, note 113) means that he uses a common language of an educated man and not that he is a Platonist. Other Denissoff's arguments for Maximus' Platonism are also weak. He says (DENISSOFF 1943, 314, referring to K-II, 5. 6. 8) that Maximus sees in God first of all the highest beauty (not the highest good) but Maximus also often quotes a passage from Plato's *Republic*, II, 379 (M-I, 152=K-II, 296, translated by HANEY 1973, 141, cf. also *ibid.* 143): "For God is in truth good and he cause of all good things but not the cause of all evil." DENISSOFF 1943, 309-11 evokes also anthropological passages (K-II, 177=M-II, 260; K-II, 22=M-II, 183-4). About these fragments see below, text and note 107 and 108. The fragment M-II, 159 is also indicated by SINITSYNA 1977, 190-1 as evidence that Maximus follows the Platonic model.

11 In the critical editions of Maximus' works (M-I, M-II and Z), including glosses, Plato is mentioned 10 times and Aristotle – 10 (both often critically). Among the Fathers and other ecclesiastical authorities John Chrysostom is quoted 34 times, Basil the Great – 21, Gregory of Nazianzus – 18, John of Damascus – 17 (he is also quoted many time in other works, see below, note 19), the patriarch Photius – 11, Dionysius the Areopagite – 12, Cyril of Alexandria – 10. Much more frequently are quoted, of course, biblical authors and people mentioned in the Bible.

355).<sup>12</sup> Judging from the way Maximus describes Chrysostom and from the quantity of his translation of John's works, this Father was the most valued by the Greek or was estimated to be the most expedient for his purpose in Muscovy. Chrysostom represents an established tradition. He was not a great innovator as a theologian but was a great pastor and preacher. This made him useful for Maximus.

The second Father of the Church, most quoted and translated by Maximus, was Gregory of Nazianzus. There is no particular evidence that Maximus followed any concrete trends of Gregory's theology but he appreciated him as an outstanding theologian and described him in such a way. He used him as a source of quotations to emphasise the truthfulness of the Orthodox faith, first of all choosing fragments that he needed in view of the polemics with the Latins.<sup>13</sup>

From among other early Christian authors, we discover in Maximus' works quotations or inspiration from Basil the Great (the Greek translated a few of his works), Gregory of Nyssa, Athanasius the Great. Besides he availed himself of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, Cyril of Alexandria and Theodoret. The Greek's namesake, Maximus the Confessor is his other important source. It seems that he had also a great respect for John of Damascus' authority but he is not so often quoted. In the anti-Latin works he referred to the classic of this polemic, the patriarch Photius. Many other ancient Christian authors are mentioned but only once or twice.<sup>14</sup>

---

12 Here and below I only note some general observations about the significance of some Fathers of the Church for Maximus. Particular identified cases of their influence on him are placed in different subchapters. The number of quotations is indicated above, note 11. Besides *Homilies on St Matthew*, Maximus also translated (or participated in the translation) Chrysostom's *Homilies on St John* (see chapter II, note 299) and his other works (see: BULANIN 1984, 186-8). SCHULTZE 1963, 109 identified that fragment quoted in M-I, 206 comes from 86<sup>th</sup> Homily on St John (PG 59, 471). He also analyses (SCHULTZE 1963, 112-14) another fragment, described in Maximus' text as taken from the *15 Слово нравуучении* (M-I, 209-10). Schultze shows that it is a compilation ascribed to Chrysostom and emphasised that neither Photius nor Maximus were critical enough to recognise that this work ("eine so unchrysostomische Rede") could not have been written by Chrysostom. Schultze did not notice a quotation from *In Matthaem*, 75, 4 (M-I, 278), cf. below, note 135. In an important discussion the Greek invoked Chrysostom's *Word about seraphim* (M-I, 182 and, similar: M-I, 241-2, cf. below, note 80), elsewhere he quoted him as unquestioned authority: K-III, 233. In M-I, 316, Maximus says with indignation that Karpov dares to write against Chrysostom (and Augustine).

13 Maximus described Gregory e.g. in such a way: "слышите разумнѣ великого и небомудренаго воистину учителя Григория Богослова" (M-I, 139). The identified quotations from Gregory are: M-I, 211 (from the *Oratio in sancta lumina* XII, PG 36, 348C, cf. SCHULTZE 1963, 95); M-I, 220-1 (perhaps from a florilegium, cf. SCHULTZE 1963, 99-101); M-I, 237 (PG 36, 169 B-C and 172 A-B, cf. SCHULTZE 1963, 103-5) and M-I, 276-7 (from *Oratio XIV, De pauperum amore*, PG 35, 900-1, nos. 32-33, cf. below note 135. BULANIN 1984, 184-5 notes other translated fragments from this Oration but not this one. For Maximus' translations of Gregory's works, see: BULANIN 1984, 184-6. It has not yet been established which of these translations are new Maximus' works and in which he used existing Slavonic translations (ibid., 36-7). The whole Bulanin's chapter two (ibid., 31-52) treats about Maximus' use of Gregory's writings. On Maximus' selective approach to Gregory see below, note 81.

14 For other examples of Maximus' patristic translations (besides Gregory of Nazianzus and Chrysostom, he translated Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa and others) cf.: BULANIN 1984, 182-190. SCHULTZE 1963, 122-3 has identified a quotation from Cyril of Alexandria (letter 39 to John of Antioch, PG 77, 181A), from Pseudo-



Generally, it is in Maximus' polemical, anti-Latin works, where we find the most quotations or arguments drawn from the Fathers of the Church. This concerns mainly works from before 1525, when the Greek had much easier access to books. Sometimes he just repeated sentences drawn from polemical florilegia, and did not use the original works. There is no evidence that the Greek made a thorough study of a particular author or of any particular patristic school. In different questions he referred to different Fathers. He also used the authority of the Fathers, taken collectively, as witnesses of the true Orthodox tradition. It is however only partially true to say – as Haney does – that for Maximus the Greek Orthodoxy “meant essentially the Greek Orthodoxy of the Fathers”.<sup>15</sup> Maximus was indeed persuaded that the Orthodox faith is based on patristic tradition. Nevertheless the tradition that he inherited was partially impoverished and adapted to the expediency of the current discussion. Maximus saw the Fathers through the tradition of the Orthodox Church at the end of the fifteenth century.

From among Byzantine authors, beside the above mentioned patriarch Photius, it was perhaps Theophylact of Ohrid who inspired the Greek monk. He quoted Theophylact's text but being convinced that it was a fragment of John Chrysostom's work. Besides, Maximus certainly read the works by his acquaintance, Manuel of Corinth.<sup>16</sup>

#### WESTERN FATHERS OF THE CHURCH

There is little trace that Maximus read and used the Western Fathers of the Church with one important exception: Augustine. He was generally considered in the East as a valid ecclesiastical authority, he was sometimes quoted in florilegia or conciliar discussions but, in fact, little known and rarely read. The activity of Maximus Planudes and the Kydones brothers in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries changed this situation to a certain degree.

Maximus visibly knew Augustine better than the average Orthodox author and was sincerely interested in his person and thought. He quoted at least two passages from his works and certainly read much more. Kurbskii recalled it was from Maximus (among other Orthodox sources) that he learned the legends about saint Augustine.<sup>17</sup> The Greek himself consistently

---

Dionysius (*ibid.*, 123-130) and from John of Damascus (*ibid.*, 130-1). On Theodoret see: chapter II, notes 354 and 389. On Maximus the Confessor, below, in the subchapter on anthropology, on translations of the Confessor's works: BULANIN 1984, 190. On Maximus' admiration of John of Damascus: M-II, 138, K-III, 227, 232-3. A broader list of authors quoted by Maximus can be found in IKONNIKOV 1915, 148-9 and 194-5.

15 See: HANEY 1973, 114-15; SCHULTZE 1963, 101.

16 On Theophylact: SCHULTZE 1963, 117-18. On Manuel below, esp. the subchapter on polemics against Latins.

17 On Augustine in the East see: CROSTINI 2013 and CVETKOVIĆ 2013. Maximus referred to *De Genesi*, in his polemic against astrology (M-I, 282, cf. below, note 146) and an unidentified Augustine work to support his argument for the inspired character of the LXX translation of the Bible (Z-266). Augustine, in fact, does not say in this sentence anything about the inspiration but admires the unity of the translators who worked

called him a saint and his book (*De civitate*) – sacred.<sup>18</sup> He used Augustine in the same way as he did the Eastern Fathers, mainly as an authority whom he quoted, especially in his polemics. For him the Western Doctor, who was a skilful critic of the ancient astrology, became especially useful in his own struggle against those who believed in the overwhelming influence of the stars. What is characteristic is that Maximus invoked Augustine’s views almost always together with an Eastern authority, the most often Chrysostom.<sup>19</sup> Since his polemic with astrological beliefs was, at the same time, a polemic with the Latins, it was useful to show that a Western Father was also against astrology and that he agreed with Eastern authorities.

The situation became more complicated when, on one hand Maximus did not want to undermine Augustine’s prestige but, on the other, did not accept some of Augustine’s ideas. The problem was serious because the Greek’s esteem for the Latin Father seems to be genuine and he did not treat him in a purely utilitarian way. It was visible when Maximus disagreed with Augustine’s position concerning human bodies at the resurrection. Perhaps to avoid direct reproval, the Greek did not name the author (it is the gloss that explains that this author is Augustine) but observed that the one who wrote a book concerning the city of God believed that each would be resurrected in his/her own body. Only then he presented his own position, compatible with Gregory of Nyssa and other Eastern fathers (Z-270-1).

Maximus was in an even more delicate situation when he wanted to preserve Augustine’s reputation when discussing the question of the *Filioque*. He began (M-I, 136) with a praise of Augustine, saying that he was a saintly man and a great philosopher, and his books are full of wisdom and spiritual benefit. Then he reproached Nicholas Bülow that the latter misinterpreted Augustine’s thought on the Trinitarian questions. Yet, visibly, Maximus was not completely sure about the Bishop of Hippo’s position because afterwards he added that even if the Doctor wrote about the *Filioque* as Nicholas maintained, he did not understand this problem better than the councils, with their excellent fathers.<sup>20</sup>

---

separately and delivered the same translation. Kurbskii quotes the well known legend about a boy trying to pour the ocean into a hole, see: КЛИБАНОВ 1996, 347 (this text was printed first in “Археографический ежегодник за 1962 год”, Москва 1963). The legend come from the LEGENDA AUREA, II, 958.

18 *Святой от блаженный*: Z-259, M-I, 136, 282, 294. On *De civitate* (священная книга): Z-259.

19 On Augustine’s critics of astrology: O’LOUGHLIN 2013. Besides the two quotations mentioned in the note 17 above, Maximus refers to Augustine views in: M-I, 283 (along with John of Damascus), 294 (and John Chrysostom), 302 (it is a shorter version of the previous work, the same passage as on the page 283), 316 (along with John Chrysostom), 317 (along with other Eastern Fathers). On Maximus’ interest in Augustine cf. also BULANIN 1977.

20 On patristic opinions concerning resurrected bodies cf. below, text and note 131. On the *filioque* (M-I, 136 – this is a variant of the text): “Августин святыи бысть на Соборѣ Карфагенскомъ Иpponeнский епископъ, мужъ святъ и философъ изящень во всѣхъ, и книги его нарочитѣиши и всякия мудрости и пользы духовныя исполнени. И ты его, Николае, симъ оболгуеши, что онъсице тако уставивша въ своихъ писаниихъ. И аще Августин будет се писалъ вашему закону, и онъсице не лучше всѣхъ съборъ разумѣши

Other Western Fathers appear in Maximus' works incidentally and mainly in one work: *Against Vives*. Only Jerome deserved slightly more than just a mention but there are generally critical remarks on his errors concerning the Septuagint (Jerome did not consider this translation as inspired and, instead, turned to Jewish sources which was unacceptable for Maximus) and his attitude to marriage.<sup>21</sup>

Thus, Augustine was the only Western Father really studied and used by Maximus. As it was in the case of the Eastern Fathers, Maximus referred to Augustine in the context of his polemical activity, predominantly during the first period in Muscovy, before 1525. Since the substantial part of his polemics was directed against the Latins, it was especially useful to quote a Latin authority in order to demonstrate: *your* Father also testifies in my favour.

#### WESTERN MEDIEVAL TRADITION AND THINKERS CONTEMPORARY TO MAXIMUS

It is difficult to identify any scholastic influences in Maximus' work. Denissoff, despite his efforts, failed to give any evidence for Thomas Aquinas' impact on him.<sup>22</sup> Other scholastics are mentioned in one of his works in peculiar company. Albert and Scotus (called *dark-named*, темноименитый, cf. σκότος) are listed together with the *damned Origen* and Eratosthenes, as those who like this world and speak according to earthly wisdom and not to the Holy Spirit (Z-262).

More can be said about the presence of the Western thinkers' ideas, contemporary with

---

[...]” Cf. also Zhurova's commentary in M-I, 415. NB, the patriarch Photius (in his letter to the archbishop of Aquileia and in *Mystagogy*) similarly “declares valid the authority of the Latin early Christian writers (Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine), while rejecting their assent to the *Filioque* as a pardonable mistake, which had better be passed over in silence” (R. Haugh, *Photius and the Carolingians*, Belmont 1975, 136, 151-3). Photius was not an adherent of a posthumous condemnation *since one who is dead is present neither through himself nor through others who would undertake his defence...* (PG 102, 816B), quoted by: CROSTINI 2013, 727-8. Maximus knew Photius' letter to the archbishop of Aquileia, see: BULANIN 1984, 92-3.

- 21 On LXX – Z-265-6, on marriage Z-264 (“неискусна мнить пръваго брака”). NB Vives in his commentary to the *De civitate* quoted Jerome's understanding of the Hebrew text next to the LXX version, see e.g. VIVES Comm De civitate, 3, 350. Lactantius is also mentioned twice (Z-263 and 268) – critically, Tertullian ones (Z-266), favourably, as a supporter of the idea that LXX was inspired and the pope Gregory (certainly the Great) also once, as an authority (Z-146). There are some other signs of Maximus' acquaintance with Western theology, e.g. he uses the expression “сосца непорочныя невѣсты Христовы” (to describe saint Peter and saint Paul in K-I, 194) which corresponds to the Latin *ubera Ecclesiae*, a term used rather in Western theology (cf. e.g. Beda Ven., In cant. VII – *ubera* as *doctores*; Honorius, In cant., PL CL XXII, 422B – *ubera* as *magistri in utraque lege docti*; Cassiodorus, In cant. 7, etc).
- 22 See: DENISSOFF 1943, 253-5; 260. The examples he gives could be drawn from many other authors. He, however, asks an important question (ibid., 260) why did Maximus never mention Thomas Aquinas (while he criticised Duns Scotus and Albert) as he had to know him. Denissoff's solution is that Maximus appreciated Thomas but he could not openly commend him in Moscow. It is a risky hypothesis. Maximus' disciple, KURBSKII, До Кузьмы Мамонича, 428 and KURBSKII, ОТВѢТЪ ВОСТОЧНЫХЪ, 435, considered Aquinas as John of Damascus' calumniator (in the context of the *Filioque*) and, as an antidote, recommends Maximus' second missive to Karpov (M-I, 200-242).

Maximus, in his works. The most significant was the influence of Savonarola and Gianfrancesco Pico but we can also trace some imprints that other scholars and humanists, whom he had met in Italy, might have left on Maximus' output.

In Maximus' literary activity in Muscovy this impact does not take the form of quotations or the invoking of their authority. It would not have been well received in Moscow. Nevertheless we can detect some literary and ideological connections.

### *Savonarola*

The exception is Savonarola whom Maximus mentioned by name, when speaking with appreciation about Western religious life and whom he candidly presented as a spiritual master. The Greek did not give as much space in his work to any other contemporary religious figure as he did to Savonarola and it is not difficult to notice that also for him, personally, the Italian Dominican was a master. Moreover, fra Girolamo is the only Western figure about whom we can say that he directly influenced the Greek. Therefore it is pivotal to discern which of Savonarola's ideas were adopted by Maximus and which were not. It will help us to understand how the Greek perceived Western thought and which elements he was ready to assimilate.

Scholars, especially Ivanov, have emphasised some affinities in the religiousness of Savonarola and Maximus. The religious zeal (*ревность по Бозе* – in Maximus' texts) was expressed in words and in deed by both. It led to the stigmatisation of a purely external piety that did not bear fruit in moral life.<sup>23</sup>

Another striking similarity is their desire to renew the Church (and society as the two realities were closely interwoven both for Savonarola and Maximus). In Savonarola's output it becomes an openly declared desire – *renovatio Ecclesiae*.<sup>24</sup> Maximus did not formulate such a program of activity but a large part of his work is devoted to denouncing vices and abuses both in social and religious life. Many themes of their castigation are the same: the depravation of the clergy, especially its opulence and lack of mercy towards the poor, usury, lack of poverty among monks and also astrology. There are also similarities in the approach to their subjects. Both monks, in principle, did not attack concrete people in their public addresses but rather criticised examples of unacceptable behaviour and conduct.<sup>25</sup>

---

23 See: IVANOV 1974, 189. Similarly IVANOV 1973, 115 where he gives examples of this returning expression about Maximus' zeal (*ревность*): K-III, 195 (=Z-249), K-III, 61 (=M-II, 136); K-II, 220. 322-3 (=M-II, 265). See also chapter II, note 70. On external piety: IVANOV 1974, 201-2.

24 Cf. his letter to Dominico da Pescia of March 10<sup>th</sup> 1491 (SAVONAROLA, Lettere, 21-22): "Ego saepissime denuntio renovationem Ecclesiae et tribulationes futuras, non absolute sed semper cum fundamento Scripturarum; taliter quod nullus potest me reprehendere, nisi qui non vult recte ambulare." On Maximus' desire to renovate the Church see below, the subchapter: *Social ideas and social ethics*.

25 On not attacking concrete people publicly by Savonarola: WEINSTEIN 2011, 80, with an exception: *ibid.*, 87.

Some of these similarities will be analysed in detail below in this chapter, while one major difference between the two religious should be discussed immediately. Savonarola's millenarianism was a hallmark of his preaching but we do not have any evidence that it impressed Maximus in any way. Both in Italy and in Muscovy an eschatological restlessness was perceptible in Maximus' time. Savonarola flowed in the millenarian stream and strove to construct a kind of God's kingdom on the earth, even if it was partial and imperfect. Maximus did not show any such an inclination. Every millenarian prophecy was met by an objection. Savonarola was a reformer, he wanted the transformation of the Florentine society to be a step towards universal regeneration. Maximus attempted to influence individuals. He was a spiritual guide, a counsellor, at best. It is true that he gave counsel even to the ruler and in this way he tried to change the situation in the state. Yet, there are no traces in his writings of the millenarian hopes that animated Savonarola. Partially it was due to his situation as a foreigner and a prisoner but the lack of the millenarian mood in his work and his disapproval of millenarian prophecies demonstrate that he remained in the paradigm of distrust towards the hope to transform the temporary reality into a kind of kingdom of God. This distrust dominated the Middle Ages in the West and continued until later among the Orthodox Christians.<sup>26</sup>

Finally, some scholars have endeavoured to find a literary affinity between Savonarola and Maximus. This venture is much less convincing. It seems that, so far, nobody has tried to compare the originals of Savonarola's works with Maximus'. Those historians who propagated this thesis contented themselves with quotations from the friar's biographers.<sup>27</sup> Yet, it is difficult to find convincing arguments for their stylistic resemblance between the compositions of their works or their approaches to the literary forms. The alleged similarities between Savonarola's *Triumphus crucis* and the core of Maximus's first collection of works disappears immediately when we just look at the table of contents of the *Triumphus*. Analogously, similar literary forms, such as dialogue, used by both authors do not attest to Maximus' literary

---

Maximus also criticised or rather admonished concrete people in letters directed to them personally, not publicly.

26 All Maximus' works directed against Bülow's astrological prophecies are indirectly aimed against millenarianism which was the context of Bülow's forecasts. Both in the East and in the West the idea of the New Jerusalem was linked with a kind of millenarian expectation but it was also used outside this context. On Savonarola millenarianism: WEINSTEIN 1970, chapter IV – Florence, the New Jerusalem; 310-11 and passim. On the use of this expression in Kiev: SHEVCHENKO 1991, 164. Jan Hus, in his preaching in the Bethlehem Chapel, described Prague as a New Jerusalem. In Moscow this term was incomparably more important (more often in the form of the New Israel) than the concept of the Third Rome: ROWLAND 1996. Maximus wrote against calling Moscow the New Jerusalem (Z-156-7), even if a millenarian character of this expression is not evoked in his work, so all the more millenarian theories had to be alien to him. Perhaps it was a result of his links with the Camaldolese Savonarolians who distanced themselves from millenarianism but remained faithful to the struggle for reform of the Church, see chapter II, note 168.

27 Cf. e.g. IVANOV 1968<sup>a</sup>, SINITSYNA 1972<sup>a</sup> or, before, DUNAIEV 1916.

dependence on Savonarola.<sup>28</sup>

Apart from Savonarola, the names of two other eminent Florentine intellectuals are adduced when the question of Western influences in Maximus' work is under discussion, namely: Marcilio Ficino and Giovanni Pico della Mirandola. They were two giants whose thought overwhelmed the intellectual atmosphere in Florence. In one way or another young Trivolis, while living there, must have at least known something about them. His negative attitude towards the striving to unite all possible wisdom, both Christian and pagan (see below, the next subchapter) must be a reflection of this meeting. The Greek does not name them however and there is no direct indication of their impact on the Greek's thought.<sup>29</sup>

More can be said about the correlation between Giovanni's nephew, Gianfrancesco Pico and Maximus. Their connection is confirmed in Trivolis' correspondence. Because of Pico's closeness to Savonarola, it is sometimes difficult to separate the individual impact of them on the young Greek. Another difficulty is that Pico tried to use the friar's authority after the latter's death to support his own intellectual interests.<sup>30</sup> Most clearly however Pico's significance for Maximus can be identified in the latter's struggle with astrology and in his ideas concerning the relationship between knowledge and divine wisdom.<sup>31</sup>

---

28 The *Triumphus crucis* is a kind of a small *Summa Theologiae* (cf. SAVONAROLA, *Triumphus*). Gianfrancesco Pico considered the *Triumphus* as one of Savonarola's most important works (cf. PICO, *Vita Savonarolae*, 137). Only the last short chapter of this work is devoted to the refutation of heresies. The list of the heresies only partially corresponds to the list of the first twelve in the early collection of Maximus' works. Dialogues were written by many writers, not only Savonarola. There are similarities between Savonarola's *Canzona de ruina Ecclesiae* (SAVONAROLA, *Poesie*, 6-9) and Maximus' *Слово пространнѣ излагающе съ жалостію нестроения* (M-II, 264-71) but the motive of a woman symbolising a community was popular in the European literary tradition, cf. chapter II, note 504. BOLENSKY 1999, 203 is neither convinced that Savonarola's *Canzona de ruina Ecclesiae* and his meditation on the psalm *Miserere* influenced Maximus.

29 DENISSOFF 1943, 159 wants to see Ficino's influence in Maximus' definition of the will as *умные мановения* (K-II, 52=M-II, 159). He saw here an equivalent of *nisus intelligentiae* used by Ficino. Such an understanding of will was shared by others thinkers. Cf. also below, note 151. On possible Ficino's influences on Maximus see e.g.: GROMOV 1983, 21-2; HANEY 1973, 143. On Giovanni Pico: HANEY 1973, 53; GROMOV 1983, 78.

30 E.g. Savonarola's interest in scepticism (on which Pico worked extensively) is not confirmed elsewhere than in PICO, *Vita Savonarolae*, 112-3. On Trivolis' connection with Gianfrancesco Pico see the former's letters to Nicholas de Tarsia: DENISSOFF 1943, 396-7 and to John Gregoropoulos, *ibid.*, 400-5.

31 On human knowledge and divine wisdom see below, the next subchapter. Gianfrancesco Pico might have told Maximus about Giovanni Pico's plan to write a monumental work against the seven enemies of the Church (among others against Judaism, Islam, pagan philosophy, astrology). Gianfrancesco mentioned Giovanni's project in his *Ioannis Pici [...] Vita*, see: PICO, *Opera Omnia*, fol \*4 verso. This attack embarrassed Ficino, as we see from his letter of August 20, 1494, to Poliziano (Ficino, *Opera*, vol. I, 968) and from Poliziano's reply (reprinted in Kristeler, *Supplementum Ficinianum*, vol. II, 278-9). Poliziano too referred to Pico's book as part of an attack against the seven enemies of the Church. Savonarola probably had an impact in this respect on Giovanni Pico. According to Giovanni Nesi Pico "often consulted with the friar and had his help in preparing this attack" (Nesi, *Oraculum*, sig. b, fol. 8 verso). All the information (together with bibliographical information) concerning Pico's project come from WEINSTEIN 1970, 213. Perhaps this idea, and not the *Triumphus crucis*, influenced the way Maximus constructed the core of the first collection of his works, cf. e.g. HANEY 1973, 53.

Such was Maximus' intellectual baggage, formed by both Western and Eastern traditions, on the eve of his arrival in Moscow. He had received his initial education in Greece but the real foundation of his intellectual culture was laid in Italy. There he found a mixture of humanist and Byzantine culture. The dominating pattern was certainly humanist but his closest circle of friends consisted of either Greeks or people interested in Greek culture. Finally, his stay on Athos strengthened his Byzantine, first of all patristic, roots but did not erase his humanist pattern. There is no reason, therefore, to attempt to separate artificially these two components of his erudition but there is a reason to identify them in his Muscovite writings. Maximus was an eclectic thinker. Some of his beliefs seem to be incompatible to others and this fact gives sometimes an impression of incoherence. If his ideas did not form an absolutely consistent system, it was caused by the difficulty in finding a satisfactory answer and by the makeshift character of certain of Maximus' solutions. All these elements existed however inside his theological, theocentric vision of the world as it was formed by the teaching of the Orthodox Church. This was the pivot on which Maximus' reflection was organised.<sup>32</sup>

## 2. EARTHLY KNOWLEDGE AND REVEALED WISDOM

In the Christian tradition the problem of the relationship between earthly knowledge and revealed wisdom is as old as the New Testament (e.g. 1 Cor 2: 4-8; Col 2: 8). The following generations of Christians did not avoid this question neither in the East nor the West. It was obvious for them that the revelation is an incomparably higher source of knowledge of God than human reason. The questions were: whether and how reason can be used to advance towards God's truth and how far it can go in the intellectual exploration of the revelation.

The question of the place of human wisdom within Christian reflection was frequently raised when the relationship between Christian East and West was discussed, often in a stereotyped form that the West was more rational and the East rather mystical.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> On his eclecticism: HANEY 1973, 113, SINITSYNA 1977, 98.

<sup>33</sup> Even a brief outline of this problem goes beyond the framework of this thesis. Just to indicate how confusing are the still existing oversimplifications one can point in was in the circle of Western theology that Tertullian wrote: "credibile est quia ineptum est" (*De carne Christi*, SC 216, 228) and asked: "What has Athens to do with Jerusalem" (*De praescriptione* VII). NB Tertullian's *Apologeticum* was copied in Politiano's circle ([http://www.tertullian.org/manuscripts\\_apologeticum/bl\\_addit\\_21187.htm](http://www.tertullian.org/manuscripts_apologeticum/bl_addit_21187.htm), consulted on April 11<sup>th</sup>, 2015). His name was mentioned by Maximus, see above, note 21. On the other hand Eastern Fathers used very subtle philosophical instruments during the Christological controversies of the first ecumenical councils in order to render unambiguously through words the mystery of the Trinity and the Incarnation., cf. SESBOÛÉ 1996, 47-8; BRADSHAW 2004, 158f.

Yet, the evolution of Christian thought between the third and sixth centuries tended towards developing theology as a more scientific discipline. The process occurred almost simultaneously in the East and in the West.<sup>34</sup> Both the use of Aristotle (which was more frequent) and the Neoplatonic philosophy aimed at the same goal: to attain a systematic and coherent knowledge of God.

Philosophy was needed by Christians. The crucial question was *how* to use it. Both classical schools: Platonic and Aristotelian were a possible source of heresy but also an opportunity to develop theological reflection.

In Byzantium, “As Aristotle’s logic was the beginning stage and Platonic metaphysics the highest level of the philosophical curriculum, the latter was least familiar and more exposed to the charge of heresy, whereas the former could be integrated more easily as a basic intellectual discipline.” Yet, the Byzantine worldview was based on the belief that revealed truth has absolute priority. While human knowledge may be useful, in cases of conflict or incompatibility between Orthodoxy and beliefs based on the authority of pre-Christian philosophers, Orthodoxy always takes precedence. No compromise can be made in this situation. The metaphors employed to describe the attitude of orthodox Christians towards pagan philosophy indicate that one had to select from inherited secular knowledge only what could serve the revealed religion and reject what was contrary to it. Thus, in the early days of the formation of Christian theology, Origen compared this action to the despoiling of the Egyptians by the Israelites during the Exodus. Similarly, during the decline of the Empire, Gregory Palamas referred to secular knowledge as a poisonous snake that can be cooked only if the head and tail are removed, meaning anything incompatible with Christian tradition. He emphasised the complexity and difficulty of the task.<sup>35</sup>

Suspensions concerning human knowledge influenced also the system of education that had remained in the state of unstable equilibrium between pagan and Christian elements. Christian doctrine was, of course, fundamental for education but it was difficult to manage without the ancient learning. As time passed, the situation evolved. The closer we come to the time of Maximus the lower (with some exceptions) was the standard of Byzantine schools.

---

34 See: SAFFREY 1996 and DALEY 1984. Daley says that a watershed was Chalcedon. NB, Boethius was up-to-date with the contemporary Greek theological discussions (in the East a significant figure at the same time was Leontius of Byzantium) and clearly reacted to them even if he knew first-hand only the so called *Epistula Orientalium*. On the scientific approach: DALEY 1984, 170-2. Similarities of method and content results from the common intellectual formation of both Boethius and Greek authors, *ibid.*, 188.

35 The quote comes from: O’MEARA 1991, 1661. On the radical priority of Orthodoxy cf. GUTAS-SINIOSSOGLOU 2017, 276-7. 280. 289-90 and *passim*. Cf. also O’MEARA 1991, 1660-1.



They rarely attained the level of ancient establishments and the level of discussion (also concerning the place of human wisdom in Christian reflection) was not as subtle as in ancient times.<sup>36</sup>

In the West scholastic thought began to develop on the foundation laid by Boethius. Schoolmen debated the limits of theological reflection but the prominent figures of the high period of scholasticism (Anselm, Albertus Magnus, Bonaventure, Thomas Aquinas) firmly believed in the essential harmony between faith and reason. Some scholastics, however, using their intellectual instruments, ventured into the realm of Christian mysteries with increasing boldness.<sup>37</sup> This audacity would later become a stumbling block for Byzantines.

Despite some excesses, the golden age of scholasticism managed to keep a harmony between the legitimate enquiring of the human mind and the integrity of the Christian mysteries. The late Middle Ages and the Pre-Reformation period saw a new imbalance and a distrust in the capacity of the human mind to seek for God. Yet, this approach competed with the humanistic renewal of the confidence in human nature.

When Trivolis arrived in Italy, at the end of fifteenth century, the discussion continued. Scholars debated the relationship between theology and philosophy, or, more widely, the whole pre-Christian heritage. Some ancient texts had been rediscovered, others for the first time appeared in the horizon of Western thinkers. For humanists, Christian tradition was of course their own but non-Christian works also represented a real value, all the more because the ancient scientific and philosophical achievements were still revelatory for Westerners.

#### FICINO AND GIOVANNI PICO

In Florence, first of all Marsilio Ficino and Giovanni Pico della Mirandola attempt to reconcile Christian tradition with pre-Christian thought (see: chapter II) but also to create a new, humanist, vision of theology. Giovanni Pico della Mirandola's plan for his nine hundred thesis meant to include "all teachers of philosophy, ... all writings, ... every school. [...] because each school offers something of value not found in others, he determined to choose the best from each."<sup>38</sup> The reconciliation of seemingly contradictory schools was linked to a plan of a daring synthesis.

Ficino also wanted to harmonise Christianity with the whole philosophical tradition and

---

36 Cf. VIKAN 1991 and KAZHDAN 1991<sup>a</sup>.

37 The bibliography of scholasticism is immense. For an overview of the discussed question cf., e.g., PELIKAN 1978, 52-66. 184-204. 255-67.

38 On humanist theology: EDELHEIT 2008, conclusions. On Pico's plan: COPENHAVER 1999, 17.

he feared lest perennial wisdom would be “endangered by impious pseudo-philosophers and incompetent theologians”.<sup>39</sup> He emphasised that when knowledge was separated from faith, the latter become vulgarised. “O happy age when, especially you, Jews and Christians, preserved whole this divine union of wisdom and piety! O wretched times when this union of Pallas and Themis was finally dissolved.”<sup>40</sup>

Ficino and Pico’s enterprise was bold but they had in this field outstanding predecessors, already among the Fathers of the Church. Nevertheless Pico’s and Ficino’s endeavour seemed to be too daring and provoked a counter-reaction. Both of them were suspected by Rome of unorthodoxy.<sup>41</sup>

### SAVONAROLA AND GIANFRANCESCO PICO

In comparison to Ficino and earlier Giovanni Pico, Savonarola and Gianfrancesco Pico (who admired the Friar) represented another option. They both had a great impact on the young Michael Trivolis. Both of them were well educated and had not rejected learning. Savonarola had received a solid intellectual formation in the Order, scholastic, not humanistic, yet he wanted a less speculative theology. He appreciated the value of learning but emphasised that the light of natural reason was insufficient to accept the Christian faith and to live accordingly to it.<sup>42</sup> Such a statement is not surprising and would be accepted by any Christian theologian.

39 The quotation concerning Ficino: VASOLI 1988, 68-9. On Ficino’s endeavours: WEINSTEIN 1970, 198.

40 See: WEINSTEIN 1970, 189. He quotes Ficino’s *Della religione cristiana*, Florence 1476, 7-8. I did not consult the original text *ex visu*. Ficino’s commitment to Christian faith was deep and serious. It is significant that when he could not harmonise some Platonic idea with Christianity, he preferred to quote Thomas Aquinas as an authority, see: LAUSTER 2002, 68. Essential arguments for the sake of Christ and for Christianity were for him the miracles, see: EDELHEIT 2008, 247-67.

41 On the Fathers of the Church see e.g.: PELIKAN 1971, 31-6 although they, unlike Pico and Ficino, argued that the Greeks borrowed ideas from the Hebrew tradition, cf. also JUSTIN, Apology, 282-9 that Plato took from Moses the doctrine on the creation of the world as well as other elements. About suspicions of unorthodoxy see chapter II, note 50. Yet it should be noted that Giovanni Pico’s evolution at the end of his life testifies that his enterprise evoked some doubts even in himself and he became more moderate and less optimistic about the possibility of using philosophy and human reason when seeking God and salvation, cf. chapter II, text and note 64. Cf also FIRMIN-DIDOT 1875, 14 and SCHMITT 1967, 33.

42 He was recognised as scholar. In 1487 was appointed as master of the Studium in Bologna, cf. RIDOLFI 1981, chapter III. On his rather traditional formation (his teachers were Pietro da Bergamo, Niccolò da Pisa and Vincenzo Bandelli, all of them rather scholastic theologians) cf. WEINSTEIN 2011, 25-26. Yet: „If he deplored humanist influence with its near-cultic veneration of classical literature and eloquence, he was also uncomfortable with the convent’s general preoccupation with *Aristotle, disputations, and debate*.”, *ibid.*, 24. That he wanted a less speculative theology: TAVUZZI 1999, 210 (text and note 49 with further bibliography). On Savonarola’s appreciation of learning: chapter II, note 65. On natural reason (SAVONAROLA, *De simplicitate*, I, 5, 25-26): “Praeterea si vita Christiana procederet a lumine naturali rationis, cum nulla ratione probari possint efficaciter ea quae Christianus credit et amat et pro quibus operatur, necesse est dicere, quod de illis opinionem habeat non scienciam. Opinio autem est habitus mentis qui non perfecte firmat animum ad assensum.” And in the *Triumphus crucis* (SAVONAROLA, *Triumphus*, 3) he says: “Licet autem fides ex causis principiisque naturalibus demonstrari non possit, ex manifestis tamen effectibus validissimas rationes adducemus, quas nemo sanae mentis inficiari poterit. Non quod fides his tantummodo innitatur, cum, teste Apostolo, *donum illa sit Dei non*

Savonarola however did not stop there. He emphasised that the religious ideas of the ancient philosophers were full of defects and errors. Philosophy, he says, does not give any stability or certainty to religious matters and those who seek in this way the end of human life, move in uncertainty and darkness.<sup>43</sup> Such an approach meant that the idea to combine harmoniously, within Christian reflection, philosophy with the revelation must have seem pointless.

Gianfrancesco Pico followed the same path as the friar and was – perhaps – less flexible. He opposed human philosophy and sacred philosophy. The former is good in itself and not deprived of a certain value but it does not give a definite knowledge because it starts with sense perception and knowledge based on sense perception is unreliable. Divine knowledge is reliable because it comes from God’s own revelation. True wisdom can be achieved only through this revelation conveyed by the Bible and *it* does illuminate the human mind. At the earlier stage of his evolution, writing *De studio divinae et humanae philosophiae*, Pico admitted that human philosophy can be used as an instrument to acquire the divine wisdom. Both should serve the contemplation and love of God. He was however persuaded that human knowledge could easily be overused and harmful for Christians. It was, he thought, not necessary for Christian life.<sup>44</sup>

In his later work, *Examen vanitatis gentium*, Pico definitely abandoned a more balanced approach towards the Christian quest for truth and moved his centre of gravity to the message revealed in the Bible. Using scepticism as an instrument he demonstrated that all philosophies,

---

*ex operibus, ne quis gloriatur* [Eph 2: 8-9].”

43 “Relligiones a philosophis traditas defectuum et errorum plenas fuisse.” (this is the title of chapter II in the book IV of *Triumphus*, SAVONAROLA, *Triumphus*, IV, II, 212). And further: “His igitur et huiusmodi circumveniuntur difficultatibus, qui per rationem naturalem humanae vitae finem investigare volunt; ideoque patet nil stabile ac certum de religione diffinire philosophos potuisse, cum circa huiusmodi positiones in ambiguo semper in tenebrisque versentur. Si quam ergo religionem unquam statuerunt, aut aliquando statuent, imperfectam incertamque, ac errorum plenam esse oportet. [...] Sed cum illi [i.e. the philosophers], ut dictum est, in multis deficientes erraverint, patet naturalis lumen rationis ad hominis salutem satis non esse.”, *ibid.*, 217-18. Cf. also the whole chapter, *ibid.* 212-20. SCHMITT 1967, 36 thinks that for Savonarola secular science is insignificant compared with the Scriptures. There is little reason to cultivate sciences (as evidence Schmitt quotes Savonarola’s sermon from August 15<sup>th</sup>, 1496, *Prediche di F. Girolamo Savonarola*, Firenze 1889, ed. Giuseppe Baccini, pp. 399-400). See also chapter II, notes 66 and 67.

44 “Nos autem humanam appellandam censuimus, tum quod humano ad Deum gradu promouet, hoc est, initio et adminiculis sensuum, tum quod pauca quaequam de Deo rimata est. Sacrae uero literae, quae diuina philosophia uere nominatur, retrogrado procedunt ordine. Nam et a Deo exordiuntur, et in Deum finiunt, et semper de Deo loquuntur, nihilque pertractant quod ad ipsius cultum in hac uita, et in alia ad fruitionem non pertineat, nec humano ingenio comprehensae, sed reuelatae diuinitus, ut ad ueram aeternamque sapientiam, quae nihil aliud est quam Deus, perueniremus.” (*De Studio*, prooem., in: PICO, *Opera omnia*, II, 4). See: SCHMITT 1967, 38-9 and also WEINSTEIN 1970, 222. On the use of both philosophies for the way towards God: PICO, *Opera omnia*, II, 5. Pico also quotes a phrase which he ascribes to the pope Urban (Ad Carolum, Dist. XXXVII): “Non in dialectica placuit Deo saluare populum suum. Regnum Dei in simplicitate fidei est, non in contentione sermonum.”, *ibid.*, 11. In fact these words were written by saint Ambrose in his *De fide*, I, 5 (AMBROSE, *De fide*, 18): “[...] non in dialectica conplacuit deo 'saluum facere populum suum'; regnum enim dei in simplicitate fidei est, non in contentione sermonis.”

arts and sciences surrender to sceptical criticism. Only revelation remains unscathed. Even more: controversy arose among Christian theologians due to the use of pagan philosophy in theology.<sup>45</sup> Such a stance practically closed the door to the application of the liberal arts to the interpretation of the Bible. It was a serious shift in Western tradition. And it occurred that these radical positions presented by Pico and Savonarola turned out to be the most persuasive for the young Trivolis. An explanation for this choice could be a kind of religious restlessness during this time of crisis at the turn of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. It created a favourable climate for uncompromising stances or incoherent positions. Those who were not ready to reconcile and to appreciate at the same time the value both of human wisdom and of the revelation had to choose either one of the extremes or to agree to incoherency in their thought.<sup>46</sup> Thus, both the Orthodox and Catholic reflection on the relationship between human philosophy and revealed wisdom formed Maximus' intellectual equipment when he began his journey to the unknown northern country.

#### INTELLECTUAL CLIMATE IN MUSCOVY

Moscow, at that time, was also experiencing a period of crisis when the existing religious order was challenged and new intellectual streams questioned the establishment.

As we saw in the first chapter, before Maximus' arrival, the Byzantine (and more generally: the ancient) heritage had been assimilated in Muscovy to a negligible degree. There is of course evidence of the multiplication of manuscripts, of a great respect for books and for learned people in Rus'.<sup>47</sup> It did not mean however that in Rus' and Muscovy there existed a systematic philosophical reflection, based on logical principles, nor a capacity to understand the classical philosophical legacy, common both to Christian West and East. Muscovite clerks were not able to enter into critical discussion with this heritage neither did they have the sufficient skills to develop it creatively. Books were more often an attribute of wisdom than an instrument of intellectual reflection. Translations were full of errors.<sup>48</sup>

Theological thought was more developed but it was rather about practical, especially

---

45 See: SCHMITT 1967, 44-48 and 73-4.

46 A striking example of such an attitude are the views of an Italian writer – freelancer, Ortensio Lando, born about 1512, so a generation younger than Trivolis. He wrote (the quotation in GRENDLER 1981, 30-1): “Science was an invention of the devil; Christ told men to forget the wisdom of this world and to know Him by ignorance. Scripture taught the word of God which was incomprehensible to reason. Theologians used all the trappings of reason - and ended by accusing one another of heresy. God came to simple, ignorant men who lived a good life in lowly places.” Cf. also above, chapter II, note 154.

47 See: IKONNIKOV 1915, 1-5.

48 Cf. THOMSON 1999, esp. the introduction: Intellectual silence of Early Russia. Cf. also above, chapter I, note 25.

monastic, issues than dogmatic, speculative aspects of theology.<sup>49</sup> Therefore it is not surprising that we do not have any evidence up until the sixteenth century of a Muscovite discussion concerning the relationship between philosophy and theology (or faith) because there was no philosophy in the classic sense of this term in Muscovy.

In the sixteenth century contacts with the external world became more frequent and also the interest in Western and Byzantine thought was growing. Slowly, philosophical ideas began to work their way into Muscovite thought. An important step, almost directly before Maximus' arrival, was made by Nil Sorskii who was one of the most educated people in Muscovy of his time and who drew abundantly from Byzantine tradition.<sup>50</sup> There were however serious difficulties in the diffusion of this knowledge. It was necessary to have access to books and to be determined to use them, also in ecclesiastical discussions. At that time however libraries were poor, containing mainly liturgical books and, if we judge from the number of books, the most important intellectual centre was located on the periphery of the country.<sup>51</sup> Even if a book existed, it was not necessarily accessible. The monks of Volokolamsk felt compelled to ask the elder, Jonas (Июна), to intercede for them to hegumen Daniel so that they might be allowed to keep the Holy Bible!<sup>52</sup> We ignore whether it resulted from the sense of poverty or from an ideological reason but a barrier existed.

Having overcome the material obstacle, one was exposed to more serious, mental, stumbling blocks. In the sixteenth century Muscovy, together with an increased hunger for knowledge, we can observe the conservative fear of the pernicious effects of bookish knowledge. The reading of books seemed to be something quite dangerous. Prince Kurbskii

---

49 Metropolitan Hilarion's outstanding work, *Слово о законе и благодати*, was an exception. On the absence of the translations of dogmatic theology cf. e.g. THOMSON 1999, X-XIII and on the absence of the dogmatic literature in Kievan Rus': PODSKALSKY 1996, 280. During the later period the situation has not changed much. The struggle with the Novgorod and other heretics can hardly be called a theological work. It was in the sixteenth century that original Muscovite theological production grew considerably.

50 See: GOLDFRANK 2007, 373.

51 THOMSON 1999, 1, 117 (XIII) (304-7 in the original edition) says that the whole corpus of translations accessible in Muscovy resembled the library of a big provincial Byzantine monastery, containing mainly liturgical and monastic texts. Dogmatic theology and philosophy were almost absent in the corpus. In the sixteenth century the library of the Trinity – St Sergius monastery (the biggest one in Muscovy) contained 469 books, of the Volokolamsk monastery – 690 while the Kirillo-Belozersky monastery in the far north had a library of 780 books, see: KOLYCHEVA 2002, 110. Cf. also the results of N.K. Nikol'skii's research described by GOLDFRANK 2009, 171: "Relying on pure numbers, he [Nicol'skii] noted that 67 percent of all the known Rus' books through 1400 were liturgical in nature, another 29 percent – hagiographic and (unoriginal) homiletic – were for reading in church, just 3 percent for the monk's cell-reading, and even the most popular book for cell-reading, the Psalter, was, in its form and appendices, subordinated to the church service. As the preponderance of service material continued into the next centuries, one must, in Nikol'skii's opinion, use liturgical texts to understand such leading writers as Nil Sorskii, Iosif Volotskii, and Metropolitans Daniil and Makarii, not to mention the Book of Royal genealogy (*Stepennaia kniga*)."

52 See: ЗИМАКИН 1881, приложения, 55-7.

evoked the example of some teachers who warned boys: “Do not read many books” and pointed to those who “fell into madness”, to whom “books hurt” and who “fell into heresy”.<sup>53</sup> Even in the second part of the sixteenth century hegumen Artemii in his letter to Ivan IV had to reject the belief that some people led a corrupt life and fell into heresy because they had read books. He objected: “They went astray not because they read books. It is out of their own unreason and spoiled wisdom.”<sup>54</sup>

The belief that the knowledge of books was harmful resulted, inter alia, from the emergence of critical attitudes towards the existing order. Those who read books learned that the Muscovite traditions were not the only ones possible. It could be difficult to stop criticism if it was once allowed. Metropolitan Daniel, during Patrikeev’s trial, gave examples of how dangerous was the critical approach. He mentioned a monk from Constantinople, Niphon, very learned in *books* (книжен zelo), who considered himself as the only just. He became so proud that he reviled all ecclesiastical officials. Another monk started by criticising his brothers and finished in impudent behaviour towards God.<sup>55</sup> More perilous than books in general were pagan books, especially when someone attempted to insert pagan thought into *sacred rules*. The Metropolitan Daniel, visibly wanting to destroy Patrikeev, said that the latter introduced into his rules (certainly to the *Kormchaya*) the thought of the pagan authors: Aristotle, Homer, Plato and others.<sup>56</sup>

This fear of the consequences of intellectual curiosity and discussions is summarised, in a way, in the last two sentences of the *Pis'mo o neliubkakh*, where we read: “Truly, it happens, as the Holy Fathers said that opinion is the second fall. And again they said: opinion is the mother of all passions.”<sup>57</sup> One can hardly imagine a discussion on the relationship between

53 See: ИКОННИКОВ 1915, 523 (he quotes Описание рукописей Румянцевского Музея, 557) and even later the bookish knowledge, especially occidental, was regarded with suspicion, *ibid.* 524-6.

54 АРТЕМИЙ, Missive to Ivan IV, 1435 (SINITSYNA 1977, 125 quoted erroneously page 1432): “Не от книжного читаниа прелщают себе. Не буди то! Но от своего неразумия и зломудрия.” Artemii was not one-sided uncritical. He repeated after Nil Sorskii: “писания много, но не вся божественна суть”, cf. КАЗАКОВА 1988<sup>a</sup> (SKK). We can find similar attitudes after Maximus’ death and later, in the seventeenth century, cf. e.g.: КАМЧАТНОВ 2002, 18.

55 See: КАЗАКОВА 1960, 293-4, cf. also *ibid.*, 297.

56 See: КАЗАКОВА 1960, 292 and КАЗАКОВА 1970, 151 where she says that we do not find such quotation in Patrikeev’s *Kormchaya*. Cf. also note 455 in chapter II.

57 “Во истину сбывается, якоже Святии Отци рекоша, яко мнѣние – второе падение. И паки рекоша: всѣмъ страстемъ мати – мнѣние.”, ГОРСКИЙ 1851, 508. NB Maximus, or his editor, expressed also his conviction concerning opinion (мнѣние) but his approach is different. He shows (M-I, 388) that the original fall was a result of a sin instilled into people by the devil: “Сирѣчь мнѣние, возношение.” Yet Maximus presents opinion as a wrong interpretation of the Bible or even opposes opinion and the Word of God: “Ибо от мнѣния мудръствуа и якоже хошетъ, себе прельщаетъ, а иже от Писания учаетъ себе, самую истину имать себѣ учителя.” The work from which come these quotations is a dubium. Zhurova supposes (M-I, 507) that it might have been a draft used afterwards by an editor and ascribed to Maximus.

philosophy and theology in such a context.

### MAXIMUS IN MOSCOW

Maximus, having arrived in Moscow, became, naturally, a source of knowledge for the protagonists of an intellectual openness in Muscovy. The kind of questions they asked shows however that his interlocutors were primarily interested in the *factual* level of the texts. Their questions concerned e.g. the mythological reminiscences in Gregory of Nazianzus' works or on the meaning of Aldo Manzio's typographical sign.<sup>58</sup> They were not yet ready to enter into a discussion on the *ideas* of the classical tradition. The Greek's consideration on the interconnection of human and divine knowledge fell on uncultivated soil. This kind of reflection was a novelty in Muscovy.

#### *Philosophy and theology*

Maximus did not write a systematic treatise devoted to this question. The attempt to reconstruct his conception is based on dispersed fragments in various works and on a few longer passages from works where this theme was one of the topics raised by him. The problems with the dating of Maximus' writings do not allow one to draw a definite conclusion about an evolution of his thought in this field. At least those works which can be dated do not indicate such an evolution.

Analysing Maximus' views we have to make a major reservation. In the above fragment of this subchapter the terms *philosophy* and *theology* were used with their classic Western meaning, perhaps most clearly exposed by Thomas Aquinas (e.g. STh I, q. 1, a. 2). In the late Byzantine thought the meaning was not the same, especially in the case of theology. For these Byzantines the term *theology* did not mean a purely rational reflection of the Revelation but rather a profound, even mystical experience. Whether an intellectual activity or a vision, theology in Byzantium was the highest, knowledge of God.<sup>59</sup> "What we today would call *theology* (which is contrasted primarily to philosophical concepts that do not derive from revelation), is understood [by a late Byzantine] under the formulas 'according to us' (*kath' hemas*) or 'the inner philosophy' (*eso philosophia*), in contrast to 'outer (*exothern*) philosophy

---

58 See above, chapter II, text and notes 319 and 510. Of course, there were also many questions concerning practical aspects of religious life.

59 See: UTHEMANN 1991, 2057-8, on the changing meaning of the term theology in the East. As for the late Byzantine period he quotes John Kyparissiotis, Barlaam of Calabria and adds that "In Gregory Palamas and in the reaction to scholasticism the concept of theology is placed in opposition to rational, scientific disputation..." Cf. also: MEYENDORFF 1983, introduction.

[...]”<sup>60</sup>

The distinction between the inner and outer philosophy suggests a certain vision of reality. The sharp separation of the inner and outer worlds can be perceived as evidence of a fossilisation. The endangered Byzantium abandoned, to a large extent, the creative exchange with the outer world. In contrast, the West, in Maximus’ time, was open to change and ready to draw from other traditions.

In the circle of his Western experience, as we have seen, Maximus met two, quite radical, positions concerning the correlation between human and divine knowledge. Marsilio Ficino and Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (the latter before the last period of his life when his views evolved considerably) wanted to harmonise, as far as it was possible, Christian doctrine and non-Christian wisdom. Gianfrancesco Pico and Savonarola underlined the contrast and distance between these two worlds. It is striking that Gianfrancesco Pico used terms that were closer to Byzantine thought rather than Western! What in the West was usually called metaphysics, first or divine philosophy, he named human philosophy, contrasted with the sacred philosophy based on the Revelation. It is difficult to say whether the Byzantine tradition via young Trivolis influenced Pico or, vice versa, Pico, having been in contact with Greeks, formed Trivolis’ ideas in the Byzantine spirit.<sup>61</sup>

The way Maximus himself used the terms *philosophy* and *theology* is a good example of his two-fold formation: Western and Byzantine. Generally he followed the Byzantine tradition but he modified it, visibly, under the Western influence. Maximus often used the classic Byzantine term the *outer philosophy* but it could be juxtaposed with the expression: “according to us sacred theology” (Z-240). The first part of this expression is typically Byzantine (according to us = *kath’ hemas*) but in the second part (sacred theology) the word *theology* is used where a Byzantine would have said *inner philosophy* so the meaning of *theology* is here rather Western. Besides, in the same text he used the expression: “our pious theology and

---

60 The quotation from: UTHEMANN 1991, 2058. Yet, again, we should avoid too schematic approach to the differences between East and West. We find a trace of an approach, similar to the one quoted above, in the West, see: Thomas Aquinas, STh I, 1, 8, ad 2.

61 On the position of Ficino and Giovanni Pico on one side as well as Savonarola and Gianfrancesco Pico on the other see above, chapter II, text and notes 43-49, 66-67, 162-164. WEINSTEIN 1970, 222 also noticed the contrast between younger Pico and Ficino: “It appears that Gianfrancesco was pulling apart the two poles of philosophy and divine revelation which the Ficinian syncretists had tried to bring together in their Platonic theologies and their theosophical harmonies...” For Gianfrancesco Pico’s terminology cf. WEINSTEIN 1970, 222 and SCHMITT 1967, 37-9 (with quotation from the *De studio divinae et humanae philosophiae*). Cf. also SCHMITT 1965, 307. This radically binary approach (but in a different sphere) was also present among other Savonarola’s follower: Fr Simone Cinozzi of San Marco did not avoid (as some previous apologists) difficult themes, esp. the question of Savonarola’s disobedience to the Pope but instead he drew a radical line between the good (Savonarola’s followers) and the evil (Florence’s authorities and the Pope), POLIZZOTTO 1994, 174.



sacred philosophy” (Z-240) which would be very confusing for a Byzantine thinker.<sup>62</sup> Maximus spoke also about the “intelligence (or: art) of the God-inspired writings” (“разум богодухновенных Писаний” – Z-249 and “искусство богодухновенных Писаний” –Z-254). This expression replaced in his works the term *inner philosophy*.

## HELLENIC DECEIT

In such a framework we can observe Maximus’ struggle with what he called in one of his works the *Hellenic deceit*. Against whom was his criticism directed? The Russian word *еллинский / еллинская* means both *Hellenic* and *pagan*.<sup>63</sup> It is hardly probable that he met many (if any) believers of Greek pagan religion in Italy, and even less in Moscow. His censure was aimed against pagan influences in general. When he highlighted the immoral conduct of mythological gods and of some pagan philosophers it was to convince his readers that the interest in them cannot be a way to a virtuous life. Just as human knowledge is incommensurate with divine wisdom, so pagan gods with Christian saints. Maximus criticised the attempt to compare the goddess Hera with the Virgin Mary even if the motivations of the author of this comparison (a so called Aphroditianin) was an apology of Christianity.<sup>64</sup>

Maximus’ biography shed light on his determination to fight the *Hellenic deceit*. The problem did not lie in ancient Greece itself but in humanist reception and application of its heritage. Trivolis experienced a radical conversion but even after this breakthrough he continued to use mythological motives in his Athonite writings and also in Moscow. His friends did the same, such as Acciaiuoli, who can hardly be suspected of a neopagan tendency.<sup>65</sup> Such an approach was possible because pagan gods in the Renaissance culture

---

62 On Maximus’ use of the term *outer philosophy* see e.g. Z-240 (внѣшняго наказанія всячская учения; премудрости внѣшнѣи), Z-249 (внѣшняго наказанія, сирѣчь философии). In another place he says about the “inner ecclesiastical God given philosophy” (внутренней церковной богодарованной философии - M-I, 181). He used also the expression *внѣшни мудрецы* (M-II, 150). He juxtaposes “outer philosophy” and “according to us sacred theology” speaking about Savonarola: “[...] нѣкый мужь, много въ всякой премудрости внѣшнѣи и еже по нас священномъ богословии учитель велик” (Z-240). He also applied the opposition inner – outer to the social sphere, the secular and spiritual power, see below in this chapter, text and note 220.

63 The expression *еллинская прелесть*, see: M-II, no. 6. In SHEVCHENKO 1997, 18-19 there is no title of this work. Maximus’ approach to this subject can be well seen *ibid.*, 36-7. This work was written probably after 1531 but Maximus treated this issue also in his letters to Karpov (M-I, 171-98; 199-242; 255-294; 311-34), so before 1525 and in the work against Vives’ ideas (Z-259-75). The last work could have been written either before or after 1525. For the meaning of the word *еллинский* see: SREZNEVSKII 1958, I, 824.

64 On the immoral conduct see: SHEVCHENKO 1997, 26-7. 35-7, on criticism of the Aphroditianin: M-II, 127. On the *Story of Aphroditianin* itself: IVANOV 1969, no. 166 (p. 127-8). Metropolitan Daniel quoted the canon 62 of the Council in Trullo where Greek gods are mentioned but it was only to condemn indecent – according to him – entertainment, cf. DANIEL, *Почтение*, 366.

65 On Maximus’ conversion: above, chapter II, text and note 172; on the alleged paganism in Italy, *ibid.*, notes 112, 113, 147. On Acciaiuoli cf., e.g., FIRMIN-DIDOT 1875, 15. It may also be that the criticism of paganism was

appeared to have a double function: that of demons (not real gods but servants of the Enemy) and as literary figures representing features, virtues or vices.<sup>66</sup> Maximus was faithful to this tradition. He used mythological motives in his works but outside the purely literary context, when pagan gods might have played another role than literary figures, he called pagan gods – demons! This corresponds to Gianfrancesco Pico's and Savonarola's views.<sup>67</sup>

When an element of the ancient heritage contradicted Christianity, it was treated by many Christian (also Byzantine) authors with insults. The same authors, including Maximus, eagerly quoted the pagan oracles when they pointed – sometimes compelled, as it was believed, by a power higher than themselves – at Christ's nativity and his triumph. When the incarnated Word appeared – says Maximus – Hellenic learning lost its strength and significance (M-I, 325). When the new light is coming, the old wisdom should remain silent.<sup>68</sup> For Maximus, as for many other Christian authors, humanity was plunged into darkness before Christ's nativity. The situation was the same for those who, after this key-point in history, remained outside Christ or departed from him, attracted by a captivation. We were – says the Greek – your enemies, sons of the devil and you have made us your friends; those who were befuddled by fascination of the reason (unworthy of this name) of outer sophists, you have illuminated by rays of divine understanding and the treasures of infallible theology and wisdom (M-II, 64).

Therefore Maximus' fight against *Hellenic deceit* was aimed not directly against a pagan religion but against a certain tendency among some humanists. Speaking about manifestation of a kind paganism in Italy he gives as examples only educated people. He clearly feared that a form of Hellenism could be so attractive that it would divert precisely

---

a kind of literary genre.

66 See: TRINKAUS 1999<sup>b</sup>.

67 In M-I, 360 astrology is called *Chaldean fiends-learning*. On pagan gods as demons: M-II, 127. Similarly wrote Savonarola in the *Trimphus crucis* (lib. IV, c. 4 fin, quoted by DENISSOFF 1943, 245). GF Pico believed that Prophyrius wrote with demonic aid (Porphyrio scribente daemones, cf. Gianfrancesco PICO, *Questio de falsitate astrologiae*, 146, line 20) and that Hermes Trismegistos collaborated with Satan (ZAMBELLI 1994, 49ff.). In Maximus' censure of Aphroditianin, (coming from Persia, cf. above, note 64) he says that Persian books are written in a demonic spirit and are demonic sources, M-II, 128, cf. also M-II, 125. At least in one place (M-II, 180) Maximus uses a mythological motive (Odysseus' story) as an example of the ancient conviction that after death man will be punished for his sins and rewarded for his virtues.

68 On the double approach to the pagan tradition and on Byzantine and Renaissance authors interests in pagan prophecies about the Messiah who was to be born: BULANIN 1984, 29. Maximus quotes: Plutarch (M-II, 129) on the fall of the pagan oracle (but his relation that the Oracles became silent 40 year before Christ does not correspond completely to Plutarch's *On the Decline of the Oracles*); a story of Apollo's priest (K-I, 176-7; perhaps it is Maximus' variation on a known passage about Pythia's answer to the emperor Augustus); on Orpheus prophecy (M-II, 110); on Sibyl's prophecy about passion and death of Christ (M-II, 110): BULANIN 1984, 19-22. Maximus also refers to an answer received by Hesiod (probably from an oracle, it is not clear in Maximus' text) that it is Zeus, not fortune, who decides on the fate of humans, M-II, 173. In his letter to Ivan IV (RZHIGA 1934, 117) Maximus says more generally that after the fall God did not leave humanity but raised signs and wise men to instruct people and finally he sent his Son. Surprisingly, the Chosen People, Israel, is not mentioned in this context.

learned people from Christianity. One may wonder if he meant Ficino and Giovanni Pico. Their ideas were far from a naïve fascination of paganism. Perhaps he was persuaded that they were able to preserve Christian identity in their reflection but that less subtle minds might have fallen into error that would ruin the integrity of the Christian doctrine and morals. He used therefore exaggerated (and probably known not at first-hand) stories about other figures: Poliziano, Nifo and Cosmico in order to emphasise the danger (M-I, 362-3). Maximus' Italian encounters influenced his Muscovite writings. He denounced ideas met in *Moscow* (e.g. those of so called Aphroditianin) but his sensitivity to the risk of a contamination of the faith was rooted in the observations he had made in *Italy*. Maximus wanted the faithful to live according to the Gospel and to derive wisdom from the pure tradition of the Church, without any heterogeneous additions.<sup>69</sup>

Maximus was not alone in his anxiety about the perilous impact of the Hellenic conceptions. People close to him visibly thought likewise and we can see in their intellectual enterprises a result of their common reflection. We have already seen the common concern of Zanobi Acciaiuoli and Gianfrancesco Pico. The former, encouraged by the latter, translated *De curacione Graecarum affectionum* by Theodoret of Cyrus and the latter dedicated his translation of Pseudo-Justin to the former. In the post-Byzantine world there existed a similar anxiety, though in a different context. Manuel of Corinth wrote about Bessarion and Gemisthos Plethon that they were not only heretics (since they conceded to the Latins in Florence) but also they preserved in their souls “ancient Hellenic superstition about gods or rather demons”. Manuel had to consider the Hellenic peril to be serious if he lumped together such different figures as Bessarion and Plethon.<sup>70</sup>

Thus, what for Ficino was a perspective for Christianity, for Maximus and other people close to him it appeared to be a threat for faith. The Greek's deep conviction, as he expressed it at least twice, was that a Christian thinker should not mix that which is unmixable.<sup>71</sup>

69 On Aphroditianin see: M-II, 127-8. For Maximus the basis of the moral deformation were doctrinal errors, cf. above, chapter 2, note 173.

70 On Pico and Acciaiuoli see chapter II, text and note 165. A post-Byzantine example: MANUEL, On Mark of Ephesus, 106 and ff.

71 Maximus' belief expressed in his work against Vives (Z-262): “Но ни философа чиста христиана могу именовати тебе, елма не подобнѣ имѣ любиши благоговѣиство ихъ еже о божественыхъ словесѣхъ, но во всѣхъ смѣшаеши несмѣшаемаа и смущаеши не в лѣпоту.” Further the Greek asked Vives on what he had in common with Origen or Albert or Scotus or Eratosthenes. This peculiar list of thinkers indicates that not only pagan but even Christian theologians, suspected of some unorthodox beliefs, were *unmixable* with the pure doctrine. Again in M-II, 173 Maximus says that, influenced by devil, some people dare “смѣшати несмѣшаемаа” and bring to the same truth and lie. A kind of *coincidentia oppositorum* is possible only in God (M-II, 74): “Яко же бо Единого подобаетъ вѣрити Его по существу, такожде и трегуба пакы по ипостасехъ исповѣдати Его нужно есть, ипостасѣми убо раздѣляема нераздѣлнѣ, существомъ же пакы съединяема несмѣснѣ, раздѣлению и съединению обоимъ же превосходящимъ всякого ума и слова

The rejection of any infusion of pagan thought *into* Christianity was just a preliminary step. The important question was whether a Christian could *use* the ancient heritage. Since it could not be accepted entirely, it was necessary to determine which elements of the classical tradition could be adopted by Christians. One of the most influential solution of this question was given by Basil the Great in his classic work: *To Young Men On How They Might Derive Benefit From Greek Literature*. His answer was that a Christian can assume from the pagan literature that which befits Christians and conforms to the truth. To illustrate his solution Basil uses the motif of a bee which collects from flowers everything that is beneficial for it and leaves the rest. The motif, probably first introduced by Isocrates, then reused in the Christian context by Basil and repeated afterwards many times, was also known in Rus'. An echo of this idea we find in Maximus' polemic with Nicholas Bülow. The Greek said that bees settle on all flowers but they collect honey only from some of them (M-I, 173). Another trace of his enquiry within the patristic tradition on the value of secular learning is in a fragment of the Funeral Oration on St Basil by Gregory of Nazianzus. We find in Maximus' manuscripts a translation of only a short passage from this Oration that deals precisely with the problem of pagan learning. Gregory says: "from secular literature we have received principles of enquiry and speculation, while we have rejected their idolatry, terror, and pit of destruction", he calls "not to dishonour education" and even ridicules those who do so.<sup>72</sup>

#### RELATIVE VALUE OF HUMAN KNOWLEDGE

Maximus, thus, was ready to admit the value of some 'flowers' of profane knowledge. We even find in his works a phrase that is worthy of Ficino: "Philosophy is a very sacred thing and truly divine [...]; it teaches diligently about God and his truth and about his all-encompassing, inscrutable plan even if it does not grasp everything because it does not participate in God's inspiration." (M-I, 319) This is however the only such ecstatic utterance that we find in his works. More often he emphasised utility of human knowledge for the governance of earthly things, especially in social and political life. In the latter part of the

---

человѣчна."

72 See: Isocrates, *Ad Demonium*, 51-2; BASIL THE GREAT, *To Young Men*, 92-4 (chapter 4, 8). The motive of bees appears in old Russian literature in the form of the so called old-Russian Bee (древнерусская Пчела), a translation of a Greek florilegium, cf. ТВОРОГОВ 1989<sup>b</sup> (SKK). A monk, George of Zarube from the twelfth century (Георгий, монах монастыря в Зарубе) uses technically this motive but the idea of a benefit from pagan literature is absent in his work, see: ВУЧКОВ 1917, 104-5. Maximus' translation of a fragment from Gregory's Oration of the St Basil is not published, cf. БУЛАНИН 1984, 185. Gregory's Greek text can be found in SC 384, 138. English translation is taken from: *Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers*, Series II, vol. 7, 398-9.

above-mentioned text we read that “philosophy establishes the best political order” (M-I, 319).<sup>73</sup> Similarly, in his narration about the University in Paris, Maximus underlined that those who received a good education became good counsellors and leaders for their countries. Knowledge acquired, served not only themselves but also others (Z-240, see also M-II, 253). Also in other fields Maximus recognised the relative value of human knowledge. Outer knowledge is useful but only [my Italic – ZS] to learn how to speak correctly or how to develop one’s intellect (M-I, 182). He even said that astrology should be neither completely rejected nor completely accepted (similarly he spoke about logic which – according to him – was also misused). It is acceptable when it is used for the glory of God, when it does not contradict the Word of God and helps to contemplate the Creator’s wisdom.<sup>74</sup>

The Greek did not want to pass as an enemy of science and when he admitted its value he was sincere. He protested when he was suspected of having wanted to censure human knowledge that is useful and confirmed by “almost all” pious people. He firmly opposed Karpov’s accusations that he had forbidden to study secular science and added that “they adorn God’s man”.<sup>75</sup> In Maximus’ conception there was even a little space for a higher vocation of philosophy when it could be used as a complementary argument that confirms the truth of the faith. One of the rare examples of such a use of philosophy we find in a polemical work against Armenians (*Слово на арменское зловѣрие*, K-I, 170) where Maximus demonstrates that since even the outer philosophers say that God is immortal so how can some Armenians maintain that Jesus’ divine nature died on the cross?

Outer knowledge can be also a kind of preceptor in the way to learn the truth. Its role is

73 M-I, 319 (=K-I, 357): “Филосовская бо вещь священна велми есть и поистинѣ божествена без малого чего, о Бозе бо и о правде Его и во вся приходящим непостижимом Его промыслѣ прилѣжнѣше повѣствует, аще и не во всѣх получает, зане божественаго вдохновения, якоже божественѣи пророцы, не причастия [...]” and “гражданство составляет нарочито”. Further, in the same passage (M-I, 319) Maximus inserted a borrowing from the *Suida* (cf. BULANIN 1979, 282, 2a): “Болши ми благотворит житие сие философ муж, нежели царь благии.”

74 On conditions under which astrology could be accepted (M-II, 170): “[...] нѣ едикю на славу всѣх Царю въздвижеть нас и душу разжигаетъ болшею Божию любовию, ниже противится отнюдь священным и богоглагольным словесем, нѣ прилѣжнѣ съгласует имѣ, и добро есть, о Душе, и взысковати е подобаетъ...” On the misuse of logic before the previous passage (M-II, 169) and further (M-II, 171): “Добро убо, о Душе, и благоразумнѣи мысли немало есть радование звѣздоявително учение. Како бо нѣсть, идѣже бо всепрекрасна премудрость зрима есть създавшаго всячьскаа Бога Слова, но еще и чловѣчьскому житию не мала оттуда полза, елико неблазнено знати солнечное и лунное течение и разсудити премѣнения четырех времянь и яже от сих бесчислена лѣта исчитати.”

75 On the accusation that he has censured the human knowledge (M-I, 362): “Но да не непщуете мене сего ради укаряти внѣшнее наказание, полезно сущее и мало не всѣми свидѣтельствуемо восиавшими въ благочестии. Не тако азъ неблагодаренъ ученикъ его, аще и ни въ предвериих его доволнѣ пребыхъ, но чрез лѣпаго износимому многоиспытному разуму взыскующих е зазираю.” On Karpov’s defamation (M-I, 331): “Не глаголю тебѣ не приобщатися наказания и словесных учениихъ, украшающих Божиа чловѣка [...]” Cf. also a similar passage: M-I, 334.

however negative, purifying and it should not be overdosed. Gianfrancesco Pico's point of view in was similar. He admitted that human philosophy is good in itself, can be acceptable when it helps to acquire divine philosophy but it also can be misused. The liberal arts are not necessary for salvation.<sup>76</sup>

## BOUNDARIES

It was the concerns about the possible misuse of earthly knowledge that alarmed Maximus. He denounced those who "seek excessively through the exalting curiosity of reason [...]"<sup>77</sup> He wanted to delimit spheres of competencies for human knowledge. It is visible in the above-mentioned fragment (M-I, 182) where he uses the word *only* which clearly indicates his intention.

The usefulness of the outer knowledge is limited to certain spheres. The question of boundaries was one of the central points in Maximus' reflection: "We do not forbid you to learn – he wrote to Karpov – but we advice you not to leap over abysses and not heed that which goes beyond the boundaries established by the sacred principles [...]"<sup>78</sup>

76 On purification of the soul: M-II, 180 (Maximus compares outer books to a plant purifying black bile). Pico in *De studio* says (PICO, Opera omnia, II, 8; the English translation by SCHMITT 1967, 39): "Patet itaque quodamtenus prodesse humanas scientias conducibilesque esse nobis non proprie necessarias ad beatitudinem, Alioquin Deus nobis perfecta dogmata non tradidisset, et in monstrando nobis coelesti itinere aberrauisset. Cum nullibi mentionem fecerit, oportere eos, quibus supernae Hierosolymae ostium [in this edition wrongly: *hostium*, corrected in later editions] aperietur, liberales artes seu primam aut naturalem philosophiam perculluisse..." Pico admitted that the pagan thought can lead "from a less noble consideration of the things of the world to a contemplation of what Plato called *the highest being*" (ibid., 41) but even these domains of scholarship which are linked to the Bible should not be studied by all because not everybody can do it without harming faith. Human philosophy can help Christians to reject false doctrines but even in this field its significance is limited. Heretics were not convinced by logical arguments. Neither pagan *scientia* nor *eloquentia* are necessary for a Christian (ibid., 40-1). In these pages Schmitt summarises Pico's view in *De studio*. Later, in the *Examen vanitatis*, Pico expressed more radical opinions. This position is striking when we compare it with, e.g., Peter Damiani, the epitome of the Christian reserve towards philosophy in the West, who spoke with great determination against the reducing of the Christian doctrine only to statements comprehensible for the dialectic mind. Yet, even he saw a place for philosophy within Christian reflection and maintained that the liberal arts were indispensable for a correct reading of the Bible and for the discernment of natural things. Yet they should be silent, he claimed, in the face of the divine truth that is far above them.

77 M-I, 362: "[...] чрез лѣпаго износимому многоиспытному разуму взыскующих е зазираю." An interesting counterpart could be Leonardo da Vinci who desired to explore, to study the world of nature but, at the same time, he confessed the fear of that, cf. GARIN 1990, 174-87 who quotes *Codex Arundel* 263 (British Library), 155r. Perhaps Maximus' approach was a kind of mirror reaction to Aristotelian philosophers, first of all in Padua (if he knew their ideas) where they made a strict distinction between philosophy and theology and defended the radical autonomy of philosophy, cf. VASOLI 1988, 70. The Greek, in turn, defended the radical autonomy of the theology. At the same time, he would have hardly accepted the autonomy of human knowledge.

78 On boundaries: "Не възбраям бо учитися, но не через раскопанна скакати совѣтуем ти и не внимати сим паче уставленных святыми Правила [...]" M-I, 323. Again about limited capacities of human mind (M-I, 187): "В коеи убо вышестественной силѣ разума высокого и постижимаго достоинства утвържаеми, в глубину ту неурзумѣваемую и неиспытанную божественного съкровения, еже съкры тма, по блаженному Давиду, «и положил, - глаголетъ, - тму съкровение свое», въврещи себѣ самѣх не страшимся, иже ниб своего естества разумѣти не можем, коим чиномъ, сирѣчь, разумное чювственному смѣшено есть, или кое есть съвокупление и съуз ихъ?"

An example of how Maximus applied his postulate was the study of celestial bodies. He was ready to admit the utility of astronomical investigation for time measurement and also for religion because dates of Easter were established astronomically. Yet, the conviction that human life was conditioned by the movements of heavenly bodies or an attempt to know the future through them, future that can be known only for God, was for him a transgression of the “sacred principles” and an abuse of science.<sup>79</sup>

The strict observance of boundaries was, therefore, the condition under which human philosophy might be useful for a Christian. Reason should not trespass its natural limits and intrude into the sphere where it is incompetent. To strengthen his arguments Maximus invoked the authority of the Fathers’ tradition which – according to him – forbids us to test and investigate what is above us and even above any angelic mind (M-I, 177). Maximus drew probably the conception of limits that should not be trespassed from the homily *In Seraphim*, written by his favourite John Chrysostom. He cited a passage from this work that contains a classic scriptural quotation: “Remove not the ancient landmark, which your fathers have set.” (Prov 22: 28) In another place Maximus quoted John of Damascus who used the same scriptural passage (Prov 22: 28) and developed the same idea: God has revealed what is necessary for us and concealed what we cannot bear. We should be content with that and not infringe (преступать) on the divine tradition.<sup>80</sup>

God’s revelation is a much richer source of wisdom than any human philosophy. The respect for the boundaries is therefore a way to protect the divine revelation so that it is not obscured or deformed by human activity. It means also an acceptance of the superiority of God’s initiative. In the space of the divine reality God decides what to reveal and what to

---

79 On the utility of astronomical investigation: M-I, 360-1. Cf. also M-II, 169-70. In his *Second missive to Karpov against astrology* Maximus four times says about the transgression of sacred principles in the context of astrology (M-I, 323-4. 326. 332). NB, Augustine, whom Maximus quoted in his anti-astrological works, also considers that the limited value of astronomical observations is the possibility to calculate the date of Easter, cf. O’LOUGHLIN 2013, 582.

80 The quotation from John Chrysostom (M-I, 182): “Еже убо видѣ – глагола, коим же чином – умолчя. Приемлю глаголемая, а не тонцѣ испытювая умолчанная. Разумею откровенная, не истязю скровенных, сего бо ради съкровена бяше. Постав златъ есть Писании чтение, основа злато и уток злат. Не сотку поучинных поставов, моих помышлений неможение вѣм. Не предлагаи предѣл вѣчных, глаголетъ, якоже положиши отцы твои [Prov 22: 28]. Предѣлы подвизаты небезбѣдно есть; и како, еже Богъ нашъ положил, предложим?” This fragment was identified by SCHULTZE 1963, 120, and it comes from the Homily 6 in *seraphim*, cf. PG 56, 136. John of Damascus is also quoted in M-I, 192. This fragment comes from *De fide orthodoxa*, I, 1, see: JOHN OF DAMASCUS, *De fide orthodoxa*, vol I, 139 (this quotation was also identified by SCHULTZE 1963, 131). Maximus also alluded to Prov 22: 28 in Z-262 and in Z-215. NB, the verse Prov 22: 28 was also used by Mark of Ephesus in Florence when discussed with the Latins the problem of additions to the Creed, GILL 1959, 147. Gianfrancesco Pico translated a work by Chrysostom but we do not know which one (this translation is mentioned in Pico’s letter to Giraldi from 1514, see: SCHMITT 1967, 202, no. 63 who refers to Opera, 880).

conceal. His decision is dictated by the concern for those who receive the revelation, for their good. Human rational endeavour should not infringe boundaries because it will not lead to a higher wisdom but astray.

Maximus' main scriptural reference in this context was Rom 12: 3. In this ambiguous passage Paul rather calls Christians not to think of *oneself* (as the context indicates) more highly than one ought to think. Yet Maximus interprets these words as an appeal not to philosophise more than one ought to, but to philosophise with continence, soberly (he renders the Greek expression “εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν” as “въ еже цѣломудръствовати”, Z-262). In another place (M-I, 246), where he referred to Rom 12: 3, the Greek also made an allusion to 1 Cor 4: 6 (“you may learn by us not to go beyond what is written”). Also here Paul's text concerns personal behaviour rather than a Christian reflection and the Greek again explained it unambiguously as an admonition not to go beyond what was “written and revealed by the Holy Spirit”. The truly Christian approach – according to Maximus – is to philosophise humbly i.e. to recognise the weakness of our thought, to abide within the limits of humility of mind and to abide firmly within the rule of faith (уставъ вѣры) expounded by the Apostles and Councils (M-I, 246). Therefore, for him these two factors (the Apostles and Councils) determine the space of its interpretation.<sup>81</sup> Although the Greek mentions that what was “written and revealed”, yet the emphasis is on the word *written*. It is visible elsewhere (M-I, 186) when Maximus comments the words of Pseudo-Dionysius. The Areopagite – according to him – teaches that it is something daring to speak and think about God except what was divinely revealed by sacred words. Maximus comments that it is daring to speak or think except what was *written*. Also his conviction that the Septuagint was inspired (Z-261) is not without significance. Certainly, it was shared by the majority of the Orthodox people of his time but in the context of the Greek's thought it acquires a particular importance. He says that a theologian

---

81 Among the Fathers Maximus prefers John Chrysostom who was quite sceptical about the possibility of human reason. He also quoted Gregory of Nazianzus but he chose the fragment quoted below, in note 92 (M-I, 314), rather than, e.g., the following (which he had to know): “Philosophise, if you wish, on the world or worlds, on matter, the soul, spiritual beings good and bad, the resurrection, the judgment, retribution, the sufferings of Christ; for on these subjects it is profitable to discover the truth, and not dangerous to be in error.” (Oratio 27, 10, according to the edition SC 250, quoted and translated by DALEY 1984, 191). The quotation of Rom 12: 3 (or its variants) can be found in Z-262 and M-II, 92 (in these two places the complete quotation: “Не хоти мудръствовати паче, еже подобает мудръствовати, но мудръствуи въ еже цѣломудръствовати.”), as well as in M-I, 138, M-I, 246, Z-215. Maximus says (M-I, 246) that saint Paul commanded us “не мудръствовати паче еже подобаетъ мудръствовати, сирѣчь паче писаных и откровеных Святымъ Духом, но мудръствовати яко цѣломудръствовати, сирѣчь познавающимъ худость наших помысль, пребывати внутрь уставъ смиреномудриа, да пребываемъ убо тврѣди и непоступни внутрь уставъ изложеня благочественя вѣры от святых апостоль и священных Сѣборь, и далѣ сихъ ниже възводимся, ниже възносимся.”



should be content with inspired translation and not investigate what is above him.<sup>82</sup>

Thus, the Tradition is narrowed down to its one particular variant. In such a situation, the possibilities of interpretation are almost null and the place for human intellectual activity *within* the space of the Revelation is very reduced. The Revelation and the doctrine of the councils are treated as one block. They are the safe teaching whereas the inexorable (“i.e. divine mysteries” – adds gloss) should not be explored (M-II, 89: “[...] мысли смѣющих дръзостию изъслѣдовати неизслѣдованна”).

The phrase: “not investigate what is above you” (or similar) returns often in Maximus’ work but in one place (M-I, 222) he explained clearly what can be and what cannot be explored. The opportunity was created by Nicholas Bülow who had most probably used the classic biblical reference on the possibility of human mind to know God, Rom 1: 20, to justify his rational approach in the trinitarian reflection since the Greek, in reply, referred to a commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, alleged to be by Chrysostom. The answer found by Maximus in the patristic commentary is: divine attributes can be known but God’s essence or substance – not.<sup>83</sup> Such an answer would have been confirmed also by a Western theologian. Yet, Maximus clearly considered Bülow’s (or, more broadly: the Latins’) reflection (particularly his geometrical trinitarian metaphors) as an unauthorised and bold attempt to enter

---

82 The quotation from Dionysius (M-I, 186 = De divinis nominibus I, 1, cf. SCHULTZE 1963, 127): “Весьма бо несмѣемо есть глаголати ни помышляти о вышесущественом и съкровенном Божествѣ кромѣ яже божественѣ нам от священных словес откровенна суть.” Then Maximus comments (M-I, 186-7): “Несмѣемо есть, глаголетъ, не токмо глаголати, но ниже помыслити нѣчто кромѣ написаных.” The emphasis put by Maximus on what is *written* seems to be in contradiction with the thought of important Eastern Fathers (Athanasius, Basil the Great, both Gregories, Chrysostom) or at least with the interpretation of their thought in twentieth-century orthodox theology, cf. STYLIANOPOULOS 2008, 21-4. On LXX (Z-261): “Неблазненный богословець вышшая себе без ума не взыскуеть, но доволенъ есть открытыми от Святаго Духа божественными пророки, изложенными от 72 тлъковниковъ, просвѣщенных Духомъ Святымъ. Maximus emphasised (Z-266) that, among others, also Justin testified to the miraculous unity of the LXX translators. It could be one more evidence of Trivolis’ collaboration with Pico who translated Pseudo-Justin’s *Admonitorium gentium liber* (see chapter II, note 165) where we read about the LXX translation: PSEUDO-JUSTIN, *Admonitorium*, 102v. (cf. also critical edition, SC 528, chapter 13-14). The translation of the LXX is also mentioned in Justin’s genuine work (JUSTIN, *Apology*, 208-11) but he does not mentioned the legend of the miraculous unity of the translators.

83 The commentary on the Epistle to the Romans: M-I, 222. SCHULTZE 1963, 117 established that the text which Maximus ascribed to John Chrysostom, was in fact written by Theophylact of Ohrid, cf. PG 124, 353 B-C. Chrysostom’s commentary on the same passage can be found in: PG 60, 411-12. Besides the texts quoted in the previous note, elsewhere Maximus quotes a sage (Z-264): “Ничим же ползующая: не взыскуи всеу” and directly continues: “Да взыскуем же паче, аще весма желаемъ мудри быти пред Богомъ, а не пред чловѣкы, образ, по немуже можемъ възвратитися въ пръвую яже преже преступлення честь и боговидную красоту нашу.” Again: Z-223, about the mystery of the Incarnation, that it is above any human understanding, with the quotation 1 Cor 2: 14 and 2 Cor 4: 3-4. Further: Z-270 on the reality of the infernal fire with the quotations: “Seek not out the things that are too hard for thee” (Sirach 3:21) and “Whoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall in no wise enter therein.” (Lk 18: 17). People who do not follow the tradition of the Church – as Maximus understood it – (in the context of the *Filioque*) were caught on a rod of haughtiness / hubris and opinion (M-I, 197): “Сего ради и тѣ, единою поглотивше удицу кичения и мнѣния, юже ловец злобы попустилъ имъ на пагубу, неисцѣлни пребыша и неисправлени.”).

with his reasoning into the space of God's essence and this was unacceptable for him.

All the Greek's objections were made, therefore, in a particular context but they reflect a more general tendency to delimit the boundaries in a safe manner. God's mysteries surpass any human understanding and this is why this sphere should not be scrutinised by human reasoning. The stress is laid on incomprehensibility and not on an attempt to describe or make more accessible the mystery. The Greek visibly considered that the approach which he criticised aimed implicitly to discover more about the divine reality than God himself wanted to reveal.

He gives an illustration of his views in a narrative text, the *Terrible Story*, where he mentions a legend on the beginning of the Carthusian order. He relates that a very learned Parisian professor boasted that he could explain a theological problem which saint Paul himself could have not explained better. Divine judgement which defies the proud – comments Maximus – came quickly. The professor died and appeared dead on his chair confessing that he had been judged (Z-241). Maximus indicates that the hubris of reason was punished.

The link between the legend about the Carthusians and the previously mentioned text where he calls to abide within the limits of humility of mind (M-I, 246) is emphasised by the fact that both fragments are accompanied by the same passage from the Gospel: "The disciple is not above his master..." (Mt 10: 24-5).<sup>84</sup>

#### DIALECTICS IN THEOLOGY

From Maximus' point of view the Latins who exploited dialectics in their theological investigations, presented an approach fundamentally different from humility of mind. Speaking about that Maximus uses the first person plural, as he used to when he lamented over impious behaviour. "We – he wrote (M-I, 183) – having kindled only a small spark of the outer knowledge and not true philosophy [...], we dare to tear the robe of the Church, woven from supreme theology, by our sophisms [...] We attempt in vain to show to people that the ineffable mysteries, known only to the Trinity, can be expressed." Already a few sentences before he emphasised that the outer philosophy cannot be used to assume [въ обрътение] the divine

---

84 On Parisian professor in the *Terrible story*: Z-241. Generally the Carthusian tradition is marked by a certain mistrust towards the possibility of human reason, especially towards dialectics. Perhaps Maximus heard this legend from Gianfrancesco Pico? At any rate it corresponds well to Pico's ideas. The fragment M-I, 246 is quoted above, in the note 81. The reference to Mt 10: 24-5 appears also in M-II, 92 in a similar context. Again in M-II, 90 we read (it follows the fragment mentioned in the main text above that the "inexplorable should not be explored" - M-II, 89): "Проявлена дръзость и уму вред, еже божественныя отвѣты и древними уставы уставлены без ума преступати, их же извѣстно испытание нѣсть емлемо человекъскими помыслы [...]"

dogmas and that only faith makes these mysteries available to us.<sup>85</sup> The Greek saw in dialectical theology useless deliberations and vain disputes which do not bring us closer to the truth. Gianfrancesco Pico had expressed a similar opinion that the Kingdom of God is based on faith and not on the discussions over words.<sup>86</sup>

Maximus' works concerning the question of secular knowledge within the Christian context were written in Muscovy but his views were formed, to a considerable extent, by his Italian experience. The position of his Muscovite opponents evoked his Italian memories and he quoted them as an example of the legitimacy of his concerns.

The Latins – he related – are plainly immersed in Aristotelian (and other) teachings that did not allow them to agree with what the prophets and apostles had said mysteriously about the Holy Trinity. They succumbed to the danger about which saint Paul had warned the Colossians (Col 2: 8): “Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.” At least twice, using almost the same words, the Greek wrote that no dogma can stand among them if it is not confirmed by syllogisms. If a dogma, either human or divine, does not conform to their intellectual approach, they either reject or refashion it so that it agrees to the peripatetic craft.<sup>87</sup> Thus, the Latins had drifted away from the true faith because they trusted more in the study of

---

85 Maximus says that the *great* John Chrysostom (whom he quoted a few phrases before – see above, note 80) was satisfied with words of a prophet and continues (M-I, 183): “Мы же большим многоразстоянием отстояще от благодати и премудрости [...] малою же нѣкоею искрою внѣшняго стяжания [another MS: любопрѣнїа] паче, неже философии, себе разжегше и отинуду инии въскочивше, аки дивни звѣри, ризу Церкви, истканную от вышняго богословіа, раздираем лютѣ диалитическими пострѣцании и софизматы, стяжаемся всуе показати же и челоуѣкомъ реченная священная таинства, яже отнюдь неизреченная и неудобъ разумѣваема, токмо же единѣи Святѣи Троицѣ вѣдомо суть.” The word *theology* [богословіе] is here probably used in its Byzantine sense. On faith (not outer philosophy) that makes mysteries available: M-I, 182 – text quoted below, in the note 96.

86 See Z-260: “И къ симъ котораа полза благочестивым от излишняго сего многыпытнаго взыскания? Въистину ни едина, точию спор презлишень и прѣние суетно.” Cf. also the sentence from the *Pis'mo o neliubkakh*, quoted above, note 62. Pico quotes in *De studio Divinae et humanae philosophiae* (Pico, Opera omnia, II, 11, cf. above, note 43): “Non in dialectica placuit Deo saluare populum suum. Regnum Dei in simplicitate fidei est, non in contentione sermonum.”

87 Maximus writes about the Latins attitude towards syllogisms in M-I, 180-1 and in M-I, 181 he says: “Иди умом къ училищем италииским, и тамо узриши по подобию потоков текущих, наипаче потопляющих, Аристотеля и Платона и иже окрѣсть их. И никакая в них догма крѣпка нещуется, ни челоуѣческая, ни божественная, аще нѣсть аристотельския силлогизмы тѣми утвердит сия догма. И аще не съгласится с художественным показанием, или яко худѣише то отринуше, или, еже видится супротивно быти художеству, сие отсѣцающе, къ угроженію аристотельскаго художества премѣниши, и яко истиннѣише заступаю.” And in M-I, 361-2: “Много бо у вас Стагирит, обтекая вас, паче же потапляя перипатитскими силлогисмы и хитрословіи, неже попущая вас удобъ слагатися реченым пророки и апостолы таинственѣ о горнѣишии Троицы, аще не по его хитрословным силлогисмом догма исправляется, но или яко гнилу сию отметати или претворити ю безстрашнѣ ко угодию перипатитския хитрости.” In a variant of the text M-I, 193 a similar thought is expressed. The fragment Col 2: 8 is quoted in both texts: M-I, 180 and M-I, 361-2. More about polemics against scholasticism below, in the subchapter devoted the polemics against the Latins.

Aristotle that in the Gospel. Maximus rhetorically wishes that the Saviour's words may be among them at least as honourable as Aristotle. This assertion again reminds us of a very similar expression used by Gianfrancesco Pico.<sup>88</sup>

Besides the abuse of philosophy in Latin theology, another occurrence when – according to Maximus – human reason intruded in an unauthorised manner into the sphere reserved for God (although it could not achieve with its own powers the knowledge to which it aspired) was astrology (this question will be discussed in the next subchapter). Significantly, the Greek did not struggle with domestic Muscovite astrology but with its Latin incarnation, popularised by Bülow. Thus, both main topics of Maxims' discussion on the possibility of human reason were inscribed into the Western – Orthodox relationship.

#### ANCILLA THEOLOGIAE

For the Greek, the true model of a Christian approach towards secular knowledge is the relationship of submission. As evidence he quotes St Paul's words (2 Cor 10: 5) that in the spiritual battle a Christian is "bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." In such a way this knowledge can contribute to the consolidation of Christian faith.<sup>89</sup> Otherwise, human philosophy can be pernicious for Christians. Maximus emphasised that St Paul called the dignity of philosophy – *vain* and added his own interpretation of Paul's words saying that this philosophy robbed the minds of the simple folk. Maximus worried therefore that philosophy can separate from God those who are not prepared to use it correctly. Certainly, the mention of simple folk was a hyperbole. The rate of lay literacy was low in sixteenth-century Muscovy and the simple folk could hardly read philosophy.<sup>90</sup>

88 M-I, 200. This fragment was also written in the context of the *Filioque*. Elsewhere Maximus writes that the Latins are seduced not only by Hellenic and Roman doctrines but also by Hebrew and Arabic books (K-III, 226-7 – this text has not yet been critically edited). Pico, *Vita Savonarolae*, 116, wrote that "alios vanis acquirendis literis et Aristoteli magis quam Christo deditos experiri" and contrasted them with the stance of Savonarola. NB, Gianfrancesco Pico devoted his *Examen vanitatis gentium*, first of all, to the critics of Aristotle's natural philosophy and epistemology.

89 M-I, 362: "Зане лѣпо им благочестиве проходити е и умнѣ причащаются, и собирающим споспѣшесвующаа ко утвержению христіанскіа вѣры, и еже божественныи Павелъ глаголетъ, «плѣняюще всякого разума въ Христа» и вездѣ понижати е, акы рабыню еуагельскіа истины водити и непщевати е." The passage 2 Cor 10: 5 was used in a similar context (Christian use of the pagan thought) by Gregory of Nazianzus (cf. his funeral *Oration on St Basil*, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, series II, vol. 7, 398-9) Precisely a translation of this fragment of Gregory's *Oration* (PG 36, 508-9, no. XI) we find in Maximus' papers: BULANIN 1984, 185. Maximus used the same scriptural argument as Gregory but his conclusions were far less optimistic with regard to the value of secular thought for Christians. Similarly in a text written after the imprisonment (M-II, 91): "Аще уздою [gloss: сирѣчь апостольскимъ учительствомъ] божественныхъ коней членовныа его [i.e. чюжихъ словесъ суетнаго поучения; a gloss explains *чюжихъ* as *еллинска философия*] възстягнеши твердо и под яремомъ подведешъ е божественныа четворицы [gloss: четырехъ еуагелии]" NB, we can see here that Maximus uses a Platonic language but not Platonic ideas!

90 On the dignity of philosophy (M-I, 181): "Павелъ философіи достоинство нарицаетъ тщетную и крадущу

The Greek did not use the formula: *philosophia ancilla theologiae* but the fragment he quoted (2 Cor 10: 5) is a common source of reflection both for him and for those who employed this formula. He comments that saint Paul wanted philosophy “to be lowered as a servant of the evangelic truth and to be considered as such”.<sup>91</sup>

Maximus attempted to balance his views on the subject of the relationship between human and divinely revealed knowledge. Theological wisdom occupied the supreme position in his outlook but he sought to do justice to the real though the very relative and limited value of pagan learning. Yet, it was difficult for him to maintain this equilibrium. Acknowledging some utility of secular knowledge, he almost immediately put it into question. Referring to Gregory of Nazianzus’ words, he wrote that the words of the Apostles and prophets were sweet while those left by the Hellenes are saline (i.e. bitter, he explained). They tried to present them as worthy of respect and great but they conceal in themselves a great disaster and abomination. Then the Greek continued to say that the outer sciences are good and useful for human life but they contain numerous, harmful and pernicious elements which could fill an entire book – if you want to enumerate them item by item. So much in them are lies and filth.<sup>92</sup> In another place he said that Plato, Aristotle, Plotinus and some other impious Hellenes philosophised nothing true and pleasing to God and at most times they contradicted each other. It is not difficult to hear here an echo of his Italian benefactor, Gianfrancesco Pico, who contrasted the fallibility of all human knowledge with the reliability of the Revelation.<sup>93</sup> Ancient philosophers did not

---

простых разумы, аки по преданию челоуѣкъ, по стихииа мира, а не по Христѣ сушу. Ни ли тою латынстии сынове ходят днесъ и прельщаютъ апостольскую истинну?” A similar expression in another text where Maximus says that the abuse of astrology (M-I, 361): “вѣрныхъ от Бога злохитренѣ отлучающее”. This concerned the verse Col 2: 8, quoted above. According to MARKER 1990, 89, the rate of rudimentary literacy in Muscovy in the second half of the seventeenth century was about 3%, so in sixteenth century the rate must have been lower. Between 1570 and 1600 no Slavic primer was printed in Moscow while 4 in Belorussia and 6 in Ukraine (MARKER 1989, 8).

91 Maximus quotes and comments 2 Cor 10: 5 in M-I, 362: “[...] и вездѣ понижати [variant: понужати и] е [i.e. philosophy], аки рабыню еуагельския истины водити и непщевати е.” Another possible translation (if we choose the variant понужати) would be that saint Paul wanted “to impel science to follow the evangelic truth, considering it a servant of this truth.”

92 A fragment from Gregory of Nazianzus can be found in M-I, 314. “Хотѣх убо во всемъ времени умертвитися житию и жити еже о Христе сокровенное житие и быти нѣкъи великъ купецъ, всѣми их же имѣю, честнаго бисера искупивъ, и вмѣсто стоящихъ и небесныхъ воздати текущаа и влекомая, яже убо купле и величаиша и твердѣиша есть умъ имѣющимъ; аще ли ни, но сие претръпѣти уступати престолавосходящимъ, сам же по всей жизни отрокъ быти и ученикъ, дондеже сладкими словесы сланныхъ омыю.” It is a translation of a passage from Gregory’s oration *Ad Julianum tributorem*, PG 35, 1045. Further (M-I, 315) Maximus comments: “Окружная бо учения добра и нужна суца челоуѣческому житию, - множайша нѣкая вредна и пагубна в нихъ скрываются, яже аще по единому исчитати восхощемъ, книгу цѣлу счинити понудимся, толика в нихъ многа лжа и нечистота.” Cf. above on Savonarola: texts and note 43, but he says about ancient philosophers’ *religious* ideas.

93 “Въскую, о Лодовиче, Платона и Аристотеля, и Плотина и ины нѣкъия нечестивыя еллинны, ничто же истинно ни Богу любезно мудръствующихъ и въ множайшихъ межи себе противящихся [...]” - Z-259. In the work against Vives such passages are frequent, e.g. on the following page (Z-260): “И аще многихъ боговъ

represent the revealed wisdom so he benefited from them when it was convenient for his argumentation (rather in minor cases) and criticised them when their views were unacceptable for him.

Maximus was in line with the humanist theology in this part of his reflection when he emphasised the impenetrability of mysteries and the necessity to return to the Fathers as those who guarantee the purity of the Apostolic faith against abuses and usurpations of dialectic. At the same time he was not keen to analyse critically the existing tradition, and this was what the humanists demanded. The lack of balance might be interpreted as contradictions in Maximus' thought but we should see here rather a testimony that it was difficult for him to find an adequate vision. He did not find a clear solution to the problem of coexistence of secular knowledge and the divine truth in Christian thought. In this lack of harmony and of the ability to find a balance, one should invest ones energy in that which matters most. All knowledge can be helpful but the most important is to know the essential things. Maximus, turning to Vives, appeals to him to abandon vain inquiries. Instead – he says – “Let us comprehend how the fear of God begins in our souls...”<sup>94</sup>

#### HUMBLE APPROACH TO DIVINE MYSTERIES

When Maximus moves from the borderline problems between philosophy and theology to a positive exposition of the intelligence given by faith, the lack of a balanced vision becomes unimportant compared to a lucid determination and confidence in the revealed truth. Our faith – says Maximus – is

“the uncovering of the divine mysteries which have shone on us by God’s benevolence and mercy (по благоволению и благоутробию Божию – cf. Luke 1: 78) from the highest treasury of the very substance of substance (от превыспрених съкровищъ самого сущее сущаго). [...] Therefore it excels any strength of learned sages and is

---

почитати завѣщаваеъ твои Платонъ, о Лодовиче, како его *святѣишаго* прочих философъ именуеши?” On Pico cf. above, note 45. The motive of the contradiction between various philosophical schools Maximus might have drawn from THEODORET OF CYRUS, *De curatione*, 1, 117-18.

94 The rejection of philosophical theology (or: dialectics) by humanists was a consequence of the rejection of analogy as theological tool. In this situation the philological tools (which are suitable for use in both philosophical and theological research) took on greater significance, cf. CAMPOREALE 1993, 118-19. A good example of the humanist theology is Lorenzo Valla whose pointed at the impenetrability of mystery, *ibid.*, 111-12 (and note 12 with further bibliography). It is not difficult to notice in Maximus' activity a reflex of such an approach. He wrote to Vives: “Да уразумѣмъ себе самѣхъ, якоже угодно естъ Богови, да научимся и разумѣмъ прилѣжно, како зачинается въ душахъ нашихъ Господень страхъ, а не еже въ чревѣ ражающихъ насъ скотское зачатие наше, ничто же отнуд пособствующе намъ къ спасению.” – Z-260. Cf. also similar Gianfrancesco Pico's utterances above, note 44.

protected from everywhere with the unbreakable seal of the ultimate unknowing. Because, by descending [to the earth], He covered his foot with the darkness of unknowing [...], similarly, ascending again from the earth to the heavenly high, he used the darkness to curtain Himself (cf. Ps 18: 12). This divine mystery is perceived only through faith and by sober intellect. For those who [...] have depraved habits and are filled with their proud Hellenic wisdom and [...] this mystery is a stumbling block and a darkness for their mind, similarly as a ray of the sun for an aching pupil and as for a bat – the light of day. [...] When however this mystery is received in one's heart with love and ardent faith as well as warmed and educated by good deeds, it gives health and divine light, expelling all evil from the soul [душевную вкупѣ изгнавъ злость]. If you are prudent and well-disposed [...] do not demand from the Lord reasons (слова) and causes (вины) because everything that is from Him is greater than mind (ум) and word (слово). Accept from him with faith his counsels and respect them with all your soul, and worship Him with awe. Consider [...] yourself always as a handful of soil or ashes [...] before Him because you are ashes and mud, slightly damp. There is however mind (ум) concealed in you as a pearl in a shell. Then you will comprehend the fog of unknowing when it is expelled from you by the divine light. The light of the Paraclete, having dwelt in you, will illuminate you like dawn and the divine mystery will sweeten your gullet more than honey and the honeycomb (cf. Ps 19: 11).”<sup>95</sup>

This way, through humility of reason, mentioned before, faith gives a real comprehension of divine mysteries. The divine dogmas, higher than any thought, any sight, substantial and non-substantial, inaccessible by the peripatetic craft, become visible and cognisable through faith. However, reading that, Nicholas Bülow would have immediately questioned that he himself also based his reflection on faith. The difference between them was based on approach to data of the Revelation. One explored them using philosophical instruments, the other maintained that he wanted just to accept them and to contemplate. Each of them was prompted by the polemical context to find arguments rather to defend his position than to present a coherent theological vision.

A schematic approach to this argument would lead to interpret it as a disagreement between Eastern apophatic theology and Western – cataphatic. Yet, we should consider whether

---

95 The quoted fragment comes *Молитва ко Пречистѣ Богородици*, M-II, 60-1. The ancient motive of a bat is borrowed from Aristotle (*Metaphysics*, book 2, A1). It was used by the Fathers (e.g. by Cyril of Jerusalem in his *Catechetical lectures*, Lecture VI. Concerning the unity of God, 29). Its variant was used by Gregory of Nazianzus in his fifth theological oration, XXVI which Maximus might have known. Cf. also Thomas Aquinas, STh I, 12, 1. Maximus' passage from rejection of the dialectical abuses to a positive presentation of his ideas is clearly seen in his first missive to Karpov against the Latins (esp. in M-I, 180-4) which was often quoted on the previous few pages.

Maximus' words are a sufficient reason to recognise him as a representative of the negative theology. Admittedly, he used some vocabulary characteristic to the adherents of the apophatic approach: fog of unknowing, unknowability of the Father, mysterious darkness. Yet, the negative theology is a speculative construction and Maximus strives to avoid speculation in theology. The language the Greek uses is that of a mystical approach and is closely linked with his ascetic teaching. The unknowability is not a sphere where Maximus wants to remain (as in the above quoted fragment on fog of unknowing) but it is to be dispersed by divine light in such a measure in which God wants this.<sup>96</sup>

The superiority of God's initiative in the revelation should lead a man who seeks the apprehension of divine mysteries to accept the way chosen by the Lord.<sup>97</sup> The Revelation opens a space for the contemplation of that which was revealed but not for intruding into that which is concealed.

Writing to a man who was hesitating on whether to become monk, the Greek gives as an example a certain learned John and Dionysius the Areopagite. John, "when a spark of the divine fire touched his heart, he spat out all that adorned the inner and outer man [...], for the sake of Christ he chose perfect silence, all his reason he gathered and locked into himself and always contemplated the invisible beauty of the *fairer than the children of men* (cf. Ps 45: 2)." Dionysius, having heard St. Paul's preaching, "spat out all wise exhortations of all outer philosophers and rhetors [...] and held tightly to the wisdom of fishermen and tax collectors" because it was the only way he could become close [приусвоити] to Christ. Maximus encourages his addressee to do the same and not look for another counsellor. In this way he will be greater than all philosophers.<sup>98</sup>

96 On cognition through faith: M-I, 182: "Понеже выше помышления всякого сиа [the divine dogmas] суть, и выше зрѣния всякого существенаго и несущественаго; вѣрою токмо зрима и познаваема, и всякого художества логикии отбѣгают и выспрь възлѣтают." Cf. also above, note 85. On God the Father (M-I, 134): "Отца [...] ниде от Себе ниже от инаго бытие имущаго, но ниже испытватися возможно от всякыя твари, како бѣ или есть, но в конечное непостижение обѣчеса, по глаголющему пророку: *И положи тму съкрытие свое* (Ps 18: 11 = 17: 12 in Russian version)." Mysterious darkness (таинственный мракъ) – M-II, 89. Similarly as in the fragment M-II, 60-1 quoted in the previous note, also in M-II, 89 Maximus saying about the unknowability and impossibility to know more than God has revealed, also points at the divine light which gives some knowledge.

97 See: M-I, 192. Similarly in M-I, 252 where Maximus first quotes Sirach 3: 21 and then continues: "Яко убо единъ Богъ есть безначаленъ и безконечнъ присносущенъ Святая Троица, вѣмы и вѣруемъ [...] и яко от Бога и Отца Сынъ раждается и Духъ Святыи исходит, и вѣмы и вѣруемъ. Образъ [a way] же рожению и исхождению ниже ищемъ достигнути, но ни можемъ. Сия бо отнюдь неизречена и непостижима суть всякому созданому естеству."

98 Maximus tells the story of John and Dionysius in K-II, 229-31 (source unidentified). The motive of the wisdom of fishermen comes from Gregory of Nazianzus (e.g. Oratio XXIII, De pace III, PG 35, 1164 CD). UTHEMANN 1991, 2058, says that it "became a part of the store of Byzantine tradition, was also applied in this connection to keep *specifically Christian doctrine*, that is, the unique tradition, separate from any theology consisting of rational or dialectical argumentation." Gianfrancesco Pico uses also this *topos* saying that the Apostles were



Here we can see clearly the logic of Maximus' reflection. The incommensurability between divine and human wisdom is such that the latter may be left behind, without loss. Its utility for earthly purposes was appreciated but there is no reason to deal with it further because it will not show the way to divine wisdom. It did not provoke a feeling of privation in Maximus. He appears to say that the magnificence of the Revelation makes the other possible sources of knowledge uninteresting and it delivers one from unnecessary curiosity concerning that which is concealed.

He refers also to the experience of some Fathers of the Church (Cosmas, Basil, both Gregories, Chrysostom) saying that at first they had studied human philosophy. When however they reached a higher wisdom, they dismissed what was *infantile*, not only deceitful astrology but also other redundant sciences that cannot edify piety and considered them also as impious and lies.<sup>99</sup>

While Maximus discussed extensively on the absolute superiority of divine wisdom (see above), he explained less *how* someone is able to obtain this wisdom. The Greek wrote little on any precise activity on the part of man on the way to illumination. We find some indications in the work cited above. Having said that the Fathers rejected human philosophy, he cited Gregory of Nazianzus' confession. The Father wrote that he had always wanted to be dead to this world and to live a hidden life in Christ. This hidden life in Christ, commented Maximus, gives purification to human mind through the fulfilling of the commandments and the conception in ones womb – as says Isaiah – the fear of God (M-I, 314). His positive explanation of how to acquire divine wisdom is quite laconic compared to his warnings about trusting human philosophy on the way to the wisdom given by God. The quoted fragment from St Gregory says rather about the latter's spiritual life than about his theological epistemology.<sup>100</sup>

---

simple people (*idiotae*), mainly fishermen (*De Studio*, I, 3, see: Pico, Opera omnia, II, 9).

99 Cf. M-I, 313. Maximus mentions in this fragment also Григорий Акраганский. I was not able to identify him. This text is one more example of the lack of balanced vision in the Greek's output. Here he seems again to detract the value of science. Partially, it can be explained by the fact that his main task in this text is to denounce astrology and not to present a relationship between human and divine knowledge. Rhetorical fervour did not help to express well-balanced opinions.

100The whole quotation from Gregory of Nazianzus (M-I, 314) see above, note 92. Perhaps Maximus wanted to follow the Evagrian tradition but he did not say that directly. Cf. HARRISON 2008, 87: "Yet, as Evagrius Ponticus [The Practikos, 1-2] and his successors in monastic life have understood, there is a way of contemplating nature that goes beyond scientific method. It is possible through prayer to perceive God within everything he has made, and at the same time to see God's ultimate purposes and plans at the heart of each created thing. Science can measure the outward surfaces of objects, but prayer can plumb their depths. In the end, we can come to see the whole creation as a vast burning bush, alight with God's glory." See also below, text and note 162, about possible Maximus' Hesychast inspirations. Cf. also Gianfrancesco Pico's position. He maintained that "The divine philosophy can help to know God's teaching and to open the treasury of faith. Francis of Assisi became a saint knowing neither Thomas Aquinas' doctrine nor Duns Scotus'. A Christian is not to follow a philosopher or theologian but a simple pious man. Human knowledge was useful for the Fathers but

## ROLE OF HUMAN INTELLIGENCE

It is also not apparent – in this situation – what is the place for human intelligence in the domain of faith. Maximus gives a preliminary condition in his *Conversation of the soul with the mind* (Беседа души и уму) where he says that intellect is an offspring of faith and refers to the book of Isaiah: “If you do not believe, you will not understand.” (Is 7: 9 – LXX)<sup>101</sup> This famous passage was a classic scriptural basis for the conviction that faith is necessary for true understanding. It introduces into the reality otherwise inaccessible. Interpretation of this passage in the mainstream of Western theology was shaped by Augustin and then by Anselm of Canterbury in his *Proslogion*. They were persuaded that faith is necessary to know God. Yet, it was not the end of the journey but rather a beginning. This expression was balanced with the conviction that inside the space delimited by faith the intellect has a possibility to make further investigation, to reflect on the data of the revelation.<sup>102</sup>

The conclusions that Maximus draws from the quotation of Is 7: 9 are not the same. In his thought it seems as if everything stops when understanding is born from faith. We virtually do not find in his works any idea on how a Christian can use his intellectual capacity within the area of faith, after the illumination given by faith. The intellect is illuminated but its own activity is as if faded, lost. The Greek says that the dogmas are conveyed by the Fathers in the Symbol fully and clearly and that they do not need *any theological elucidation* (M-I, 188 – my italic).

## BELIEVE AS A CHILD

Certainly this omission stemmed from the concern that it might arrive at a kind of syllogistic theology about which Maximus was so anxious. There were however serious consequences in this approach. Namely, the answer to some questions concerning the substance of the faith may have been: just believe! It is especially visible when Maximus polemicises with Nicholas Bülou on Latin theology and more precisely on the question of the *Filioque*. He consistently uses in this polemic an expression: believe as a child. Once he says (M-I, 137)

---

Francis became saint without it and the Apostles were simple people. Cf. SCHMITT 1967, 42-3 who refers to the *De Studio divinae et humanae philosophiae*, II, 8, p. 28.

101M-II, 160: “Отрод бо вѣры разумъ есть, якоже глаголетъ Исаино мудрое [gloss: глаголетъ нѣгде Исаиа пророк: *Аще не вѣрите, не имате разумѣти*] речение.”

102On the tradition based on Augustine and, much more, on Anselm, see: LOGAN 2009, 19-24. Anselm’s *Proslogion* was originally entitled: *Fides querens intellectum*, *ibid.*, 24. Cf. also Thomas Aquinas, *Sth I*, 1, 2, I. On the Byzantine scholasticism see above, note 34.

that a child cannot attain the Father's mind (разума) and being (бытие), as long as he is a child. Similarly we cannot know God's substance (существо) and his hypostases, nor how and what they are (како или что суть), whilst we are "in the body" (cf. 2 Co 5: 6). When perfection arrives then everybody will understand, according to the measure of his virtues and of his dignity. In two other places he quotes Christ's words that only those can enter the Kingdom of God who receive it as a little child. The Greek used these words to point that "we [the Orthodox people] accept all apostolic dogmas and the patristic tradition [...] unchanged as little children who accept the instruction of their teachers without doubt and we do not test their mysterious force" above our weakness.<sup>103</sup>

The conviction that the mysteries of Christian faith transcend the cognitive abilities of human mind was obvious for any Christian theologian. Yet, the conclusions Maximus inferred were not equally obvious. As we have seen, not only the Western scholasticism attempted to use the philosophical instruments in order to express the mysteries of faith in comprehensible terms. The Eastern Fathers during the Trinitarian and Christological controversies also abundantly employed philosophy. Among other cases, it also occurred when they discussed the relationships between the three Persons of the Trinity. This is precisely the same context in which Maximus wrote to Bülow: "believe as child". The Greek did not want to scrutinise these matters. The teaching of the Fathers seems to be sufficient for him as if they had said the ultimate word and he did not want to enter into any further discussion. When Nicholas used arguments from the Bible, juxtaposing and interpreting two fragments from the Gospel to show that the Holy Spirit comes also from the Son, Maximus did not discuss his interpretation but promptly referred to the authority of the Fathers: "They, the divine and filled with the wisdom from heaven Fathers, knew that [the mysteries of the Trinity] better than us and did not dare to add even one line to the words of the Holy Spirit..." The Fathers of the Church received a quasi canonical status.<sup>104</sup> Maximus did not want to add anything to the mysteries of faith but his

<sup>103</sup>One of two other places is M-I, 252: "мы дрѣжимъ вся благочестия тайны и богословная догмата апостольскихъ и отечьскихъ церковныхъ предании, царствие Божие приточнѣ глаголема вся вкупѣ приемлемъ и съблюдаемъ непремѣнна, якоже дѣти малы приимають учения отъ своихъ учителей безъ сомнѣния, и вышше наша немощи не испытуюемъ таинственую силу ихъ [...]" Before this phrase Maximus also quotes Mt 18: 3 and Lk 18: 17. Another similar passage is M-I, 246 (with the quotation Mk 10: 15). There are also other places, like M-I, 134, where, also turning to Bülow, Maximus repeats the same idea, even if the word child is not mentioned: "believe simply and not testing".

<sup>104</sup>The quoted fragment on the Fathers (M-I, 135): "Лучше насъ вѣдаша сиа божествении они и небомудрени отцы, но не дрѣзаша приложити поне едину чръту къ словесемъ Духа Святаго..." We do not have Nicholas' text but, as Maximus' reply indicates, the former juxtaposed a verse about the Spirit of truth (Jn 14: 17 or 15: 26 or 16: 13) with Jn 14: 6 (I am the way the truth and the life) to show that the Spirit is also the Holy Spirit of the Son. Also in other cases Maximus similarly used the authority of the Fathers. When he questioned what would have been the way of reproduction of the human race if the Fall had not happen (cf. also below, text and note 128), even if his answer was based only on the interpretation of some of the Fathers and was not taken

approach did not mean the acceptance of the *Sola Scriptura* principle. The untouchable point of reference was for him the tradition of the Fathers and the Seven Councils. The fact that he treated en bloc both the ecumenical councils and local synods (M-I, 134) did not make the discussion easier.

Was the expression “believe as child” an escape from a dialogue or a sincere conviction that everything had been already said by the Fathers and there was no need to add anything? Certainly the position of the Fathers of the Church in the Christian tradition can hardly be overestimated. Maximus understands their role as those who composed (съставлено) and reinforced the work begun by God – “the divine house of our innocent faith”. Against these stable foundations, the Latin theological tendencies were for him perilous because he saw in them an attempt to judge God’s designs with the human intellect. Nothing is for them [the Latins] – he says – a dogma, neither human nor divine, if it is not confirmed by Aristotelian syllogisms, whereas one should be guided by the inner Church philosophy, through faith, and not by syllogisms.<sup>105</sup> Elsewhere (M-I, 175) he emphasised that one has to trust in the name of Jesus Christ and not in mendacious evidence of Aristotelian philosophy. When he considered that the foundations of faith were threatened, he apparently could not see a more flexible approach to Western theology represented by Nicholas’ concepts.

## HUMAN AUTHORITY AND DIVINE REVELATION

The question of human authority versus divine revelation can be formulated in the following way: whether human philosophy can judge the way we understand the Revelation or, the other way round, Revelation gives the possibility to judge all human knowledge? Maximus’

---

directly from the Bible, he says (M-II, 279): “Не премудръствуимъ убо всеу въ превъсходящихъ разума и достижения нашего, иже бо по насъ разумъ и земень есть и немощен и въ множайшихъ погрѣшаеть [...]” In his *Praise for St Peter and Paul* (M-II, 89) Maximus wrote: “[...] како же есть Богъ, не испытovati, радовати же ся, удовляему открытыми от божественныхъ мужей, а вышше их не испытovati [...]” It is not clear in this fragment whether the Greek thought about the human authors of the Bible or about the Fathers of the Church. Maximus quotes also (in a similar context - M-I, 228) Basil the Great (Homily XXIV against Sabellians, PG 31, 609A-B, identified by SCHULTZE 1963, 92): “Вас же молимъ не всякимъ образомъ взысковати угодное вам слышати от нас, но еже Господеви благоугодно есть и согласно писанием и не несогласно святымъ отцемъ.” This fragment gives a broader perspective because it mentions three criteria (or three levels of criteria): what is God-pleasing, what is in accord with the Scripture and what is not contrary to the Fathers. In the further commentary however (M-I, 228-9) Maximus reduces the argumentation to the fact that the Latin teaching is new. An interesting parallel concerning the authority of the Fathers who become the mail point of reference in the place of the Bible can be found in ŠPIDLIK 1956, 29. He shows that for Joseph of Volokolamsk the “commandments” meant the teaching of the Fathers while for his source of inspiration, Basil the Great, the commandments were first of all the precepts drawn from the Bible.

<sup>105</sup>On the house of the faith (M-I, 183-4): “Ты же, Николае, не страшишися толь велие и крѣпкое основание всего божественаго дому непорочная вѣры наша, укончянное убо преже от Бога, потом о толиких и толь великих божественных отецъ съставлено и утврѣжено, подъемы софизматскими гнустными разорити покушаяся.” The full quotation on syllogisms (M-I, 181), above, note 87.

position (as demonstrated above) was that the human mind cannot intrude into the space of Revelation. It has little to do when the divine truth is revealed. Such an approach was far from the mainstream of Western theological tradition and this is why his confrontation with Nicholas Bülow was so passionate.

There was however another, perhaps unintended, result of Maximus' approach: the weight of authority in the human search for God had increased significantly, compared with the role of reason. It is not about the authority of the revealing God because, as we have said, the belief that there is no higher authority on divine matters than God's own revelation, Maximus shared with all Christian theologians. The point is here on *human* authority.

The above quoted Maximus' reaction to Bülow's interpretation of a scriptural passages concerning the proceeding of the Holy Spirit reveals that, for him, the interpretation based on authority is valued higher than a rational approach.<sup>106</sup>

Certainly, the Orthodox attachment to tradition played an important role here. This attitude contrasted sharply with his experience of the Western world which underwent, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, a period of revaluation of authorities which up until then had not been questioned. Lorenzo Valla's arguments demonstrating the *Donation of Constantine* to be a forgery and questioning that Dionysius the Areopagite was the author of *Corpus Dionysiacum* were perhaps known to Maximus. This percussion might have had an impact on Maximus' approach to authority, especially ecclesiastical authority. He (as many humanists, as a matter of fact) did not accept Valla's criticism.<sup>107</sup>

---

106On discussion with Bülow (M-I, 135): “И не глаголи мнѣ хитрословіа она, яко у апостола Духъ Сыновень глаголется и Духъ истинный, истина же Христось, тѣи от Сына исходит. Лучше насъ вѣдаша сиа вся божествении они и небомудрени отцы, но не дрѣзаша приложити поне едину чръту къ словесем Духа Святаго, слышаша бо божественаго гласа, зѣло заповѣдающа: «Овца Моя гласъ Мои услышат, чюжому не последуют.»” Garzaniti writes that Maximus “осознает традиционное разграничение, присутствующее в западной схоластике, между Священным Писанием, патристикой и античной философией”, see: GARZANITI 2017, 35, cf. also *ibid.*, 38. Certainly, Maximus distinguishes these three levels of authority but the authority of the Bible is almost inseparably associated with its patristic interpretation.

107Maximus, similarly as Muscovite authors, did not question neither the authenticity of *Donatio* nor Dionysius' authorship, cf. WIECZYNSKI 1969; M-I, 185 and K-II, 229. NB, verbatim excerpts from the *Donatio* appeared in Muscovy at the beginning of the sixteenth century but the document was known there already before (WIECZYNSKI 1969, 161.163). Marcilio Ficino and Gianfrancesco Pico, e.g., were convinced of Dionysius' authorship of the *Corpus*. Ficino translated and commented the *Corpus*. Pico devoted to this question an extensive letter “Pro asserendis a calumnia libris Dionysii Areopagite...epistola”. It was printed in 1523 but the date when it was composed is uncertain (cf. SCHMITT 1967, 195, no. 21). On questioning authorities in Italy, in Maximus' time, see also chapter II, note 76. Valla's ideas were universally accepted only in the eighteenth century. An example of Maximus' *modus procedendi* was his polemics relating to the length of time Adam stayed in Paradise. A medieval German compilation, translated into Russian, the *Lucidarius* contained information that Adam was in the Garden of Eden for two hours but, since John Chrysostom affirmed that he was there six hours (he explained that allegorically, giving, as a reason, the fact that Christ was crucified at the sixth hour), Maximus accepts John's opinion without any further discussion (K-III, 233). John's authority was a sufficient argument.

The questioning of the ecclesiastical authority, of the acknowledged authors, was one more element that proved that the “house of our faith” is under threat. Maximus’ respect and piety towards reputed ecclesiastical authorities was a defence of the very core of the ecclesiastical tradition. We can observe it when Maximus reproaches Karpov that the latter had not accepted the *truth* (my Italic) and “rose against the ecclesiastical thought” (восталъ на церковное мудрование) although Maximus had presented him as evidence the writings of the “holy men” (M-I, 312). The authorities are univocally identified with the truth.

The expression *ecclesiastical thought* may be considered as a synonym of the ecclesiastical Tradition. The question is therefore how he understood the tradition. We do not have evidence that Maximus reflected on its definition and on the internal tension within the tradition. There is no trace that he attempted to resolve a question of a conflict between two recognised ecclesiastical authorities, as Patrikeev did.

An exception is a certain conflict between authorities in one of Maximus’ works but it is rather a confrontation between holiness and knowledge than between two different authoritative opinions on the same subject. The Greek had to take a position towards those who criticised his corrections of the books saying that the Russian saints – thaumaturges used the books Maximus considered as contaminated. His answer was nuanced. He confirmed the fact that the saints used contaminated books and diplomatically emphasised that he venerates the Russian saints, too. Next, he explained that nobody receives all gifts from God. The thaumaturges received the gift of making miracles but someone else, even if he was more sinful than all people living on earth – confesses Maximus humbly – knows languages. Then, he gives examples from the Bible and the Church tradition that, by God’s will, an unimportant person instructed someone much more noble and high-ranking (M-II, 148-9). Yet, there is no real conflict here. Each of the protagonists is an expert in his own domain. Saints, so to speak, are experts in the field of holiness and their lack of linguistic skills is not an impediment for their holiness. Maximus is an expert in philology and this is his gift but he venerates their holiness.<sup>108</sup>

This particular case corresponds well with Maximus’ ideas described before. The space of reason and the space of faith are practically separated. Human reason has a say in the area of Revelation but is limited to the correct *reading* of the text. Thus, its activity is accepted but virtually restricted to temporal reality.

---

<sup>108</sup>On Patrikeev’s dilemma: chapter II, text and note 347. It may be that Maximus actively participated in solving Patrikeev’s question. On book correction and Muscovite thaumaturges: M-II, 148-9; cf. chapter II, text and note 468.

We have seen before that Maximus identified God's revelation with that what was *written*. God communicates his words by written text. Such an approach suggested that the human author was very directly led by God. Elsewhere, when he talks about the biblical interpretation, he rather juxtaposes the patristic exegesis with a new one (especially with Nicholas Bülow's one) and emphasises the dangers of departing from the patristic reading of a text.<sup>109</sup> All this he does in defence of tradition and he emphasises the necessity to keep it unchanged. There is no trace of his reflection on a possible development of tradition. It could be done with the use of human knowledge but it seems that Maximus wanted to avoid that, perhaps even not consciously.

At any rate, for him there is no passage from human to divine wisdom. One has to break with the former to gain the latter. Philosophy is not a *preambula fidei*. At the best, ancient prophecies can help one to accept the Gospel since the Saviour is foretold and announced not only by Jewish prophets but also by pagans.

Maximus' concept of the relationship between human knowledge and revealed wisdom was an echo of his itinerary, both geographical and spiritual. His education in Italy and its coincidence with the period when traditional paradigms were questioned had a strong impact on his ideas. Although his formation was deeply Byzantine, his views concerning the problem show a significant convergence with Gianfrancesco Pico's and Savonarola's ideas.

The intellectual atmosphere in Moscow, when Maximus arrived, was completely different, compared both to Italy and to the Byzantine worlds. Muscovite questions concerning books, education and their relationship to the human search for divine wisdom mirrored an initial level of thinking on these issues, whereas Maximus' answers were a result of a long-lasting reflection both in the West and in Byzantium. The cure he brought turned out to be stronger than the disease!

---

<sup>109</sup>See above, text and note 81 on that what "was written". In another place Maximus says that the Lord put the treasure (it means the content of the Revelation or the deposit of faith) into the apostolic ark "хартиями и чернилом и животворивыми словесы" (M-I, 186), as if the Lord himself guided the hand of a human author writing pages of the Bible. On interpretation (M-I, 214-5): "Еда разумѣем ли, какова пропасть погибели отворена есть истолкующи невнимателнѣ и не яко божествении отцы уразумѣша гласи божественаго Писания."

### 3. ANTHROPOLOGY OF FREEDOM

The cardinal question: who and what is man was posed by Maximus' contemporary humanists anew. He also made it one of central elements of his reflection. His vision was, in its essential elements, based on classic anthropological theories and the Christian anthropology of the Orthodox Church but, as we will see, some Western humanist inspiration cannot be excluded.<sup>110</sup>

#### STRUCTURE OF THE HUMAN BEING

Maximus did not write any anthropological tractate so his vision of the human being can be reestablished from a few larger fragments of three works of the later period (two dialogues between soul and intellect and an anti-astrological treatise) and occasional passages in other works.<sup>111</sup>

His fundamental conviction on the ontological structure of the human being was that it consists of two constitutive elements or dimensions: material (sensuous) and spiritual (intellectual) and that the soul is a principle of life and it governs the body.<sup>112</sup> Such an approach can be found both in the Bible and in the classical Platonic tradition.

We do find in Maximus' works some allusions to Plato but they were rather signs of his erudition than the full acceptance of Plato's anthropology. Such seems to be the vision of the soul in Maximus' *Conversation of the soul with the mind*. He refers to the image of a charioteer (known from *Phaedrus*) as a metaphor of the mind which should have control over the other faculties of the human being. Yet, he even does not mention the significance of the two horses,

---

110Already HANEY 1973, 146 noticed: "Central to all Maxim's philosophical speculation was man himself."

111The two dialogues, *Бесѣда Души и Уму, по вопросу и отвѣту, о еже откуда страсти ражаются въ них, в том же и о божественѣмъ промыслѣ и на звѣздочетцѣхъ* (M-II, 159-75) and *Словеса душеполезна зѣло внимающимъ ихъ, бесѣдуетъ Умъ къ Души своеи, в томъ же и на лихоимство* (M-II, 176-97), are dated to 1530-40. The anti-astrological treatise: *Слово о томъ, яко Промысломъ Божиимъ, а не звѣздами и колесомъ счастья вся чловѣчьскаяа устрояются* (M-II, 150-8), IVANOV 1969 and RZHIGA 1934, 60 date to the period before 1525 but SINITSYNA 1977, 90-1 opts for 1530-40.

112On soul as principle of life: Z-219. The Greek touched on also more complex anthropological questions but we can learn about them only from scanty allusions, e.g. he says (M-I, 187): "[...] иже ни своего естества разумѣти не можемъ, коимъ чиномъ, сирѣчь, разумное чювственному смѣшено есть, или кое есть съвоупление и съуз ихъ?" It is probably a recollection of philosophical discussions in Italy, esp. in Padua, on the difficulty / impossibility of a direct contact between the material and the spiritual, cf. COPENHAVER 1988, 273. As for the ontological structure of the human being two models competed with each other: dichotomous and trichotomous. The first one described the human being as a composition of body (σῶμα) and soul (ψυχή). The second distinguished three elements: flesh (σάρξ), soul (ψυχή) and spirit (πνεῦμα). The biblical authors preferred the first but there is also some evidence of the trichotomous anthropology in the New Testament (1 Thes 5: 23 and Heb 4: 12). These two models are not antithetic but accents are distributed differently.



the difference between them and other details that are important in Plato's narration.<sup>113</sup>

Also a certain disregard of the corporal dimension can be observed when Maximus underlines the transience of the human body and contrasts it with the divine mind (υμ) concealed as a pearl in a shell (M-II, 61), when he emphasises the importance and the main role of the soul and describes body as its corruptible clothing, showing the disgusting details of this corruption, or even, speaking about eternal life, he mentions the posthumous recompense or punishment of only the *soul*.<sup>114</sup> Elsewhere he says that the soul is attached to a ferocious beast (M-II, 183-4). One can seek here a Platonic flavour but these expressions result rather, as we will also see later, from an ascetic approach and an exaggeration of the superiority of the spiritual dimension over the material one.

The Christian doctrine is central and essential to Maximus. Describing the relationship between the soul and the body he says that both are created by God. He emphasises the fact that soul was *created* and excludes any emanationism. Finally, he expresses the belief that not *naked souls* will attain salvation but they will be reunited with their bodies.<sup>115</sup>

---

113The allusion to *Phaedrus* (246a-b) in M-II, 159: “[...] вся живородителны силы моеа и самую крайнѣишую тѣлеси часть дръжа, акы добръ нѣкый царь твердаго града, отнюду же, акы нѣкый крѣмчия искусень, все тѣло правишь благохитренными твоими умными мановении. Также акы конникъ нѣкый низведенъ сверѣпными конми и побѣды лишается, многожды и живота, сице же и ты, многожды мрачною нѣкоею обдѣржимъ страстию или завистию губительною или гнѣвомъ или скорбию [...]” It is more probable that Maximus took this image from Gregory of Nyssa, cf. MUCKLE 1945, 71-2. GROMOV 1983, 152, invokes, as evidence in the same case, the entry *Ψυχικός άνθρωπος* from the *Suida Lexicon*, translated by Maximus (cf. BULANIN 1984, 146 and 152). It is not convincing because this text describes (following 1 Co 2: 14-15) two levels of spiritual development: psychic man and spiritual man. It does not tell of an anthropological structure.

114See M-II, 260: “Душа всяка словесна и безсмертна есть, сила сущи мыслена, животворящи и правящи брѣнное сие и тлимое одѣвание свое въ нелико время пустится ей от обоя Създавашаго вселитися в немъ. Разлученна же сего Съдѣтелевымъ велѣниемъ прѣстное сие жилище оставися прочее без дыхания и без чювства и без движения, и по малѣхъ днехъ смръдяще и омрачивше, увы, червми изѣдено бысть, а сама отведеса в неже будетъ предуготовавши себѣ жилище, или благыми или паки лукавыми дѣлы, сирѣчь или в мѣсто пресвѣтло и всякого веселия и божественаго благовония исплѣнено, отнюду же «избѣже всяка болѣзнь, печаль же и въздыхание» [...]”

115That God is creator of both material and spiritual dimension of human being (Z-262): “человѣкъ и чувственъ, и мыслень създанъ есть”. Maximus quotes here JOHN OF DAMASCUS, *De fide orthodoxa* (SC 535, 290-1) where the latter uses terms *soma* and *psyche* so the vocabulary of the dichotomous model. A translation of this fragment can be found in Maximus' manuscript legacy, see BULANIN 1984, 190. On a general vision of the soul (with the rejection of emanationism) - Z-263: “А яже по нас душа, аще и словесна есть, и умна, и бесмертна, но нечистымъ страстемъ съвокупления еи плоти сладостно подпадаетъ и побѣждаема бываетъ недобрѣ. А дуновение оно божественое, еже вдуну Съдѣтель на лице прѣвозданнаго, не являетъ течение нѣкое божественаго существа. Никако же! Несѣкомо бо и нетлѣнно есть Божественое Существо, якоже предиречеса, но бесмертное и разумное, и самовластное души являетъ.” On the superiority of the spiritual over the material (M-I, 154): “Аще бо о чювственныхъ или зрении или дельтребуемъ бывшимъ въ искусстве сих и ухо им поведующимъ сладце приложим, множае паче и о божественныхъ и разумныхъ лепо нам творити сие, поелику высочайша многа божественаа человеческихъ суть и чювственныхъ разумнаа.” On *naked souls*: M-II, 74; cf. SINITSYNA 2014, 43. One of Maximus' possible sources of inspiration here could be Gregory of Nyssa. Cf. VERBEKE 1979, 148: “Selon Gregoire il est inconcevable que l'âme existe en dehors de toute union avec un corps: on l'a signalé ci-dessus, même dans le plérôme l'âme et le corps existent conjointement à l'état séminal; ils seront associés lors de la restauration finale.” The author refers to *De hominis opificio*, 225 C (chapter XXVII) and *De anima et resurrectione*, PG 46

His Christian anthropology is again most clearly expressed when he writes about the creation of man in God's image and after His likeness. These biblical terms were interpreted in various ways in Christian tradition. Privileged sources of Maximus' ideas concerning the God's image were Gregory of Nyssa and Maximus the Confessor. The former had not attached particular importance to distinction between image and likeness (as other Fathers had). Maximus the Greek generally follows the same path and if rarely (at least once: M-II, 176) he seems to notice the difference between these terms, he was probably inspired by the Confessor. In other cases he talks about the image of God in general (or about image and likeness, without distinguishing them: M-II, 164), in a narrow sense ascribing it, in accordance to widespread patristic opinion, to mind (ум - M-II, 256) and in broader – to soul (душа – M-II, 177) or even to both of them together (M-II, 176).<sup>116</sup>

Maximus also goes further and shows the trinitarian aspect of the image of God in the human being. Once (Z-187) he says that mind (ум), word (слово) and spirit (дух) constitute one soul (душа) and not three souls, as the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are one God, and not three Gods. In the work, against Hellenic deceit, speaking about the substantial unity of the holy Trinity (M-II, 74), the Greek says that God is not without the Word and the Spirit in the same way as the sun is not without warmth and rays, and the intellectual soul (словесна душа) without mind (ум) and word (слово). In this case we can identify precisely Maximus' terminology because this text exists both in a Slavonic and in a Greek variant. Soul (душа) is of course ψυχή, mind (ум) is νοῦς and word (слово) is λόγος. Finally, in his work on holy icons, he expresses his thought most clearly. Mind (ум), word (слово) and spirit (дух) are an image of the Holy Trinity: the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. There is no human being – he adds – without mind, word and spirit.

These three fragments are not completely consistent but the fundamental idea is always the same. Maximus anthropology is trinitarian. God's image (the cardinal term of any Christian anthropology) appears not only as a general similarity between the Creator and creation but the

---

p. 73 B ssq. Both the *Platonic* fragments and expressions of clearly Christian approach come from roughly the same period so we cannot discuss here about an evolution of Maximus' views.

116On patristic ideas concerning image and likeness: THUNBERG 1965, 128-31. That Gregory of Nyssa does not make a particular distinction between image and likeness cf. MUCKLE 1945, 56. Both AUGUSTINE, *De civitate* XIII, 24 (vol. 48, 410) and most of the Eastern Fathers (cf. HARRISON 2008, 83 and THUNBERG 1965, 120-4) saw, above all, the divine image in the highest part of the soul (*mens* or *nous*), as Maximus did in M-II, 176 where the Mind/ум says: “Образ е сме божественъ...” According to MUCKLE 1945, 64-70, Gregory of Nyssa saw the following elements of God's image in human being: immortality, Man's mind, Free-will and the Virtues. All these elements we can find in Maximus the Greek's works but never presented systematically: on the free will, cf. below, text and note 134, on immortality: M-II, 60 and 279, on the virtues: M-II, 160. It is one more indication that Gregory of Nyssa was one of the primary sources of the Greek's anthropology. On image and likeness in Maximus the Greek and in Maximus the Confessor see also below, text and note 155.

very Trinity is reflected in every human being.<sup>117</sup>

Here also, possible sources of these Maximus' trinitarian comparisons could be Maximus the Confessor who constructed various triads to show the trinitarian image in human being and, at the same time, did not attach particular importance to one concrete model, probably to avoid a too far-reaching anthropomorphism. Maximus the Greek, similarly, was not consistent in that. Flexibility in implementing these comparisons, both relating to inanimate realities and to anthropological structure, indicates that it was a search for inspiration or creative intuitions and not fixed models. The stable presence of the term *logos* in Maximus the Greek's comparisons also may have been an impact of Gregory of Nyssa or Maximus the Confessor, or both. This term is polysemic but here it can mean either an essential principle according to which man was created or practical reason, subordinated to νοῦς.<sup>118</sup>

#### THE FALL AND ITS EFFECTS

The fragile balance between the material and spiritual dimensions of the human being was upset by the Fall. God's image has been deformed. Maximus describes the tension between the spiritual and the material elements in man which was the consequence of this mysterious event in his *Conversation of the Soul with the Mind* (M-II, no. 14). In this work the Soul asks why the Mind, which is established to be king of the whole body, so often surrenders to dark passions. In reply, the Mind first describes the state of the primordial happiness with which God lavishly endowed man. Then mind and soul were "filled with divine love" (насыщаеми божественных рачении), free of passions and enjoyed virtues given by God. However, this state was not a state of perfection. God did not give to mankind perfect prosperity (преспѣяние) so that man would not be proud because of the many favours and, on the other hand, that he, being excited by the desire of the highest good, he would strive to obtain it. In this imperfection, the lack of faith and the love of God led to the infringement of his

117The Greek version of the second mentioned text (M-II, 74) can be found in: SHEVCHENKO 1997, 28-9. On the solar comparison see below, text and note 311. The third text (О святых иконах, 46): "Образ же есть Живоначальныя и Святыя Троицы Отца и Сына и Святаго Духа – ум, слово и дух. Кроме бо ума, слова же и духа быти человек не может, аще и верен, аще и неверен." It should be emphasised that Maximus uses these example in a Trinitarian, not in an anthropological discussion. The triad used for the description of the Trinity could hardly be an Augustinian influence. Augustine used abundantly a psychological metaphor to the Trinitarian discourse. Nevertheless, his triads are different: mens-notitia-amor or: memoria-intelligentia-voluntas, see: *De Trinitate*, book IX.

118On Maximus the Confessor and his various triads: THUNBERG 1965, 110ff, and 137-9. On the term *logos* in Maximus the Confessor: GARRIGUES 1976, 93. 105-7. On *logos* and *nous*: THUNBERG 1965, 118-9 and GREGORY OF NYSSA, *De hominis opificio*, 137B-C (chapter V). The triad: *nous - logos - psyche* was used also by Pseudo-Gregory of Nyssa (*Ad imaginem Dei et ad similitudinem*, PG 44,1373B). Later, in Ermolai-Erazm's works we also find the anthropological structure of the human being described by the triad: ум – слово – душа, cf. KLIBANOV 1960, 186.

commandment. The Mind explains that if man had a strong faith, he would have also had complete happiness. Finally the Mind adds that reason is an offspring of faith, as said prophet Isaiah.<sup>119</sup>

The fruit of the fall is: spiritual death, loss of beatitude and two faults – oblivion (забвение) and ignorance (невѣдѣние) that injure the spiritual (or: intellectual) eyes (умные очи). Through oblivion people forget God’s glory (божественна славы), and ignorance of the ultimate good (i.e. God, as explains the gloss in the manuscripts) makes the intellect and soul to be subjected to pernicious passions (страсти – М-II, 160-1). They begin to dominate human life, their offspring attack humans like wild beasts and cause people to leave the honest way of life. They are the principal enemy, the beginning of all evil (М-II, 161).<sup>120</sup> Maximus sometimes just enumerated various passions or vices but it happens (as in the *Hortatory chapters*) that he presents a more systematic approach. He says that any rational soul (душа словесна) is usually defeated by these three passions: voluptuousness (сластолюбие / φιληδονία), desire for fame (славолюбие / φιλοδοξία) and avarice (сребролюбие / φιλαργυρία). From among them Maximus points at avarice as the root of all evil. Probably this conviction resulted from Maximus’ own social sensitivity supported by the authority of St Paul (1Tim 6: 10). Yet elsewhere, he points that one of the most dangerous passion that is egoism (самолюбие, cf. Z 245 and also М-II, 159). This slavonic term is certainly an equivalent to the Greek *philautia*, which means more than just egoism. It is a kind of profound self-love.<sup>121</sup>

To illustrate the powerful impact of passions Maximus also refers to a metaphor of human life as a ship on a stormy sea. When passions prevail, it is like a ship without mast, sail

---

119The whole passage in М-II, 159-60. On the (lack of) faith (М-II, 160): “Аще бо твердое вѣры съврѣшено имѣль бы, имѣль бы убо и твердое преспѣяние. Отрод бо вѣры разумъ есть, якоже явѣ глаголетъ Исаино мудрое речение.” Here gloss explains: “Аще не вѣрите, не имате разумѣти.” This is the LXX translation of Is 7: 9 (If you do not believe, you will not understand). On the tension cf. below, text and note 125. It is interesting that in М-II, 160 lack of faith is the cause of the fall (besides the passage where Isaiah is mentioned, again, on the same page 160, Maximus writes: “виновно нам бысть падению нашему немощное вѣры нашеа”) while in Z-127 Maximus allows that it was pride (гордость).

120On passions: М-II, 160-1 and that they dominate human life: further on page 161. The glosses can be also found in М-II, 160-1. Strangely enough, Maximus calls oblivion and ignorance – *passions* (страсти - М-II, 161), similarly other qualities mentioned in the *Hortatory chapters* (cf. next note). In the Western tradition they would be rather qualified as vices.

121As for the classifications in the *Hortatory chapters* (М-II, 261), the greek equivalents for these three passions are based on SREZNEVSKII. This classification is a variation on traditional triad from 1 Jn 2: 16. Terms are different but the content is similar. Cf. also М-II, 75. On avarice as the root of every evil see also М-II, 161 and М-II, 227: “Люто бо, люто вѣистину желание злата и всѣх золь виновно, по апостолу.” (It is certainly an allusion to 1 Tim 6: 10.) In other situations Maximus emphasised other vices or passions as principal: the most pernicious is idleness (“[...] дѣланиемъ же рукъ отгоняи уныние мысли своеа. Ничто же губителнѣиши праздности.” - М-II, 187) or pride (“всѣмъ злымъ виновное гордость” – К-II, 246 and Z-127), cf. below, note 124 and 125. Sometimes he lists avarice and egoism almost in one breath as passions by which that monks are defeated (сребролюбие and самолюбие – М-II, 226, 229; cf. also the *Terrible Story* (Z 245). On egoism (самолюбие): М-II, 159, Z 245. On *philautia* – GARRIGUES 1976, 90/91.

and helm, buffeted by the wind. This image was abundantly used in patristic literature, among other authors, by Maximus the Confessor, one of principal sources of Maximus the Greek's anthropological ideas.<sup>122</sup>

The fact that the Greek attached such great importance to the question of passion shows his link with the ancient tradition of the Eastern monasticism. His anthropology is not purely theoretical but was shaped by monastic experience and spiritual struggle. He is in the centre of the great stream of Orthodox asceticism. The problem of passions and the struggle with them is in the very core of this tradition built mainly on Origen, Gregory of Nyssa and Evagrius. Yet, various spiritual authors did not understand the origins of passion in the same way and did not judge them unambiguously. Some of them (following stoicism) considered passions as something unconditionally negative, the others (after Aristotle) perceived them as neutral forces, a part of human nature. Respectively, according to the adherents of the former approach, passions should be eliminated. In the opinion of those who prefer the latter position, they should be redirected or transfigured.<sup>123</sup> Maximus is closer to the first position. He quotes, as an authority, his namesake, the Confessor, who opposed natural seeds (*естественнаа съмена*) that lead us towards good and passions which induce us to evil. Therefore passions are not natural.<sup>124</sup>

Considering these questions from a dogmatic point of view Maximus the Greek, as we

---

122In M-II, 162 Maximus uses the image of a ship. Slightly later (M-II, 165) he presents just man, influenced by passions, as a stormy sea. On the image of the ship cf. e.g.: GARRIGUES 1976, 85 and 87 or the 28<sup>th</sup> homily of saint Macarius (PG 34, 711).

123See: CHRYSAVGIS 2008, 156-7. This dividing line is drawn schematically but it reflects well the essence of the problem.

124On passions and *естественнаа съмена*: M-II, 155-6. More about this quotation and its source below, text and note 153. Apart from that, Maximus writes about *зубителны страсти* (M-II, 162, similarly, on particular passions: M-II, 161) which does not suggest anything positive and he maintains that before the Fall, man was free of passions (M-II, 159 and if the Fall had not happened he would have continued living this way (*безстрастнѣ* – M-II, 160). Maximus the Confessor says that passions were not in the human being from the very beginning, cf. GARRIGUES 1976, 89 who quotes *Questions to Thalassius*, 1 (PG 90, 268D-269A). Cf. also Chapters on Love II, 15 quoted in note 153 below. Therefore they are not con-natural to human life. For Gregory of Nyssa (another Maximus' source) passions neutral, not evil in themselves (cf. MUCKLE 1945, 71). So, in this case, the authority of the Confessor was more important for Maximus. The question of emotions is less clear. The Greek does not speculate about them but it seems sometimes that Maximus – ascetic does not agree in this question with Maximus – humanist. The ascetic repeats the widespread conviction that it is impossible that Jesus played or laughed (M-II, 132): “А идѣже духъ премудрости и разума и свѣта и крѣпости и благочестия и страха Божия, оттуду избѣже всяка челоуѣча легкость и буиство и несмыслие и безчювьствие. А яко не таковъ бѣ нравъ Спаса нашего, явлено естъ от божественныхъ Еуагелии и прочихъ богодухновенныхъ писании; нигдѣ же бо обрящеши Его повѣствуема, яко играше или смѣяся, или възглагола что къ челоуѣкоугодию, да от нихъ славу и похвалу въсприметь.” and condemns “смехотворное” (M-II, 253 – but this last occurrence is in the context of indecent joy). Emotions were suspect as a reality not easily controlled by the higher power, reason. The humanist considers joy as admissible, although with *с трепетом* (Z-34-5). The most open praise of joy is a mention about Jesus' presence at the wedding in Cana where he enjoyed himself with others, see below, note 132.

have seen, emphasises the fundamental goodness of the material aspect of human being, as coming from God. Yet, in the practical Christian life after the Fall a tension between body and soul, provoked by the passions, seems to be for him more apparent than their coexistence *in statu viae*.<sup>125</sup> He multiplies images to show the disastrous effects of this disorder within the human being. He says (M-II, 159) that when intellect succumbs to the passions, it loses balance and does not recognise neither its intimates (не знаеши тогды всѣх, и сродники и друзи) nor even God himself. Elsewhere (M-II, 178-9) he observes that when the soul succumbs to fleshly passions it cannot receive imperishable light. It is similar to a mirror covered with a thick layer of rust that cannot reflect sunshine. This imperishable light Maximus seems to identify or at least associate with divine love because he immediately continues: “The divine love (рачение) is the beauty of the intellectual soul. [...] All other beauty on earth is dung and false, completely vain and transient.” Deprived of this light human being is denatured.<sup>126</sup>

His preferred scriptural quotation used in this context to describe the degradation of the human being was Psalm 48: 13: “Man that is in honour, and understands not, equates irrational beasts and becomes like them.” He interpreted this verse of predilection in a particular way. Man does not understand his primordial dignity of the forefather and is reduced, in a way, to the status of a beast. His assimilation to beasts is not external animal appearance but consists in the fact that he, having been immortal and imperishable before, became mortal, perishable and subjected to passions.<sup>127</sup>

<sup>125</sup>We do not find in Maximus the Greek the classical (more balanced) trichotomy νοῦς – ψυχή – σῶμα, which was used by the Confessor, cf. THUNBERG 1965, 114-16. Maximus the Confessor did not depreciate the body and saw a human being as a composite nature, not as an accidental union of two substances (THUNBERG 1965, 110). Yet, on the doctrinal level the Greek seems to be closer to the Confessor than to Evagrius. Such a proximity is suggested by the question of *naked soul* (above, note 115), if we would understand the expression *naked soul* as an equivalent or a reflection of *naked mind* in Evagrius (cf. THUNBERG 1965, 116-17). It is the dramatical tension in Maximus’ anthropology that reminds one of the ascetic monastic tradition based on Origen and Evagrius. Maximus the Greek appreciates Origen’s merit (M-I, 156-7) but at the same time criticises him sharply (M-I, 250-1; M-II, 119, 185, 320 – in the last place Maximus says about Origen as “ересемь начялнику”). Cf. also: GARRIGUES 1976, 96.

<sup>126</sup>See M-II, 178-9: “Зерцало изооржавше тлѣстою грязью, никакo же противу блещетсѣ солнечным свѣтом, и душа повинующисѣ гнусным плотьскимъ страстем, не приемлет луча свѣта нетлѣннаго. Сего же лишаема, ничемъ же разликуеть отъ безсловесныхъ скотѣ; души бо словеснѣи красота есть божественное рачение. [...] Вся бо инаа, елика красна на земли, гноище есть и ложьна отнюдь, суетна и непробытна и бесчисленныхъ скорбеи исполнена.” It is an adaptation of Gregory of Nyssa’s idea, expressed e.g. in: GREGORY OF NYSSA, *De virginitate*, 11-12 (SC 119, 392-3). Cf. also MUCKLE 1945, 73-7. Yet again, for Gregory, this image is richer because for him human being can contemplate “the divine attributes of God as they are reflected in the mirror of the soul...”, *ibid.* 74. Or the clean mirror not only accepts the light of the sun (as in Maximus’ text) but also manifests it, *ibid.* 75-6. Also the quoted fragment from M-II, 159 (“не знаеши тогды всѣх, и сродники и друзи”) could be inspired by the same passage from *De virginitate*, cf. SC 119, 408-9, v. 56-57. It could be an indication that Maximus had at his disposal a manuscript of *De virginitate*.

<sup>127</sup>“и человекѣ въ чести бывѣ не разумѣ, приложисѣ скотомъ несмысленнымъ и уподобисѣ имъ” - see: Z-220, Z-263, Z-271, RZHIGA 1934, 117 and slightly different version of this Biblical verse in M-II, 278 and M-II, 160. Maximus gives his interpretation in Z-220 and in M-II, 278. Without this quotation but a similar motive: M-II,

One more aspect of this assimilation is the fact that man adopted a beast-like union with the female sex. Most of the Fathers who used Psalm 48: 13 in the context of the Fall did not draw such a conclusion. Only Gregory of Nyssa did it, so probably Maximus borrowed this idea from him. There are some people – he mentions in another work (M-II, 278) – who maintain that even if the first parents had not sinned, they would nevertheless have reproduced through sexual union and procreation. For him such a position is not acceptable. He thinks that it was not God’s primordial design and that God gave humans sexual, beast-like, organs, knowing about the future fall, so that humankind would be able to survive, since they, being before immortal and incorruptible, as a result of sin became subjected to death. He does not consider sexual reproduction as something natural for human beings. Paradoxically, it is not the most natural thing in the world but just a temporary remedy against the possible disappearance of humanity.<sup>128</sup>

Such an understanding of the human sexuality, was not his own invention. It arose from the specific idea of the double (or: twofold) creation of man that was used by some early Christian authors. According to this theory, God first created man as a purely spiritual being in God’s image. Only in the second stage did God create sexually differentiated bodies, forming Adam and Eve.<sup>129</sup>

---

176. I refer in the text to the numbering of the Psalms according to LXX (Ps 48: 13). Slavonic translations (Gennadii’s Bible and the Ostroh Bible) follow LXX. The English translation in my text is an adapted version of Ps 49, 20 according to KJV which is closer to Slavonic (and LXX) passage Ps 48: 13. In the Ostroh Bible (and in LXX) Ps 48: 13 = Ps 48: 21. In the English translations it corresponds roughly to Ps 49: 12 (=Ps 49: 20). This specific use of the quotation from Ps 48:13 Maximus drew from the tradition. Some Fathers of the Church had used it similarly. In M-I, 263 Maximus quotes this verse as a part of or: in the context of (the text is not clear enough) an unidentified quotation from Gregory of Nazianzus (another fragment of this is quoted below, note 141). The influence of GREGORY OF NYSSA, *De hominis opificio*, 192D-193D; 196A (chapter XVIII) could be also important here, even if Gregory did not use Ps 48: 13. Other Cappadocians did, e.g. Basil the Great in his *Homilies on the Psalms*, 19.8; before them Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 4, 41, 3; 5, 8, 2; later again Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary on Psalms*, 49.13, and so on. Also Maximus the Confessor was persuaded that “the image of God in fallen man has been replaced by a likeness to irrational animals”, see: THUNBERG 1965, 124, note 10. Maximus also uses (in M-II, 155) James 1: 13-15: “lust brings forth sin and sin [...] brings forth death.”

128Cf. GREGORY OF NYSSA, *De hominis opificio*, 189C-192A (chapter XVII), cf. also SC 6, 165-6. This aspect is present in many of the above mentioned fragments: Z-220, Z-263, Z-271 and M-II, 278-9. The last fragment comes from the *Сказание противу глаголющих, яко плотским съвокуплением и рождьством хотяще множитися чловѣчьскый род, аще не согрѣшили праотци* (M-II, 278-80) which is entirely directed against those who maintain that if there were no fall, humankind would have to have reproduced through sexual procreation. Here Maximus explains his understanding of God’s primordial design and his conviction that sexual reproduction is not natural for human beings but is a result of the Fall. He adds that without lust people would have never decided to have children because of the many pains and troubles linked with that. This coercion of lust he considers as dishonourable for a rational creature. If there were no Fall, humankind would have propagated in another, not known to us but a more honourable way, *ibid.*, 279.

129See: GREGORY OF NYSSA, *De hominis opificio*, 181 (chapter XVI). Cf. BØRRESEN 2013, 136: “Gregory [of Nyssa] explains this introduction of animal physicality, which assimilates humanity with beasts, with God’s foreknowledge of the first parents’ disobedience in paradise. Therefore, the punishment of sub-human mortality has to be counteracted by sub-human fertility.” She quotes also: Tertullian, *De cultu feminarum*, 1, 1-

Maximus was inspired by this patristic idea. For him there is something indecent in the concurrence of the immortality and incorruptibility of a rational creature bearing God's image that gives an angel-like existence and passionate life steered by lust.<sup>130</sup> For the ascetics who struggled with concupiscence in order to obtain spiritual purity and liberty it was difficult to imagine that the organs, which were associated with concupiscence, would remain in the renewed universe. Thus, the disharmony that was the result of the fall, would have to be eliminated in order to restore God's primitive design. Salvation, as a re-creation, implies a return to the pre-sexual human perfection, to the primordial design of the Creator.

Some Fathers maintained that humans would be resurrected in bodies that would not be sexually differentiated or even that women would be resurrected in male bodies. It was Augustine who held a different view and thought that everyone would be resurrected in his own body but then there would be no more lust and shame linked to the relationship between sexes. Maximus knew about it and struggled with Augustine's authority. In his critics of Vives' commentary to the *De civitate*, he first related Augustine's opinion and then expressed his own view: after the resurrection there will be no necessity to reproduce because humankind will return to the primordial, angel-like dignity and incorruptibility. Therefore these *bestly organs* will be unnecessary. Consequently, Maximus is persuaded that women will resurrect in a man's body and even finds evidence for that in the Bible. First, Jesus tells the Sadducees that those "in the resurrection [...] are as the angels of God in heaven" (Mt 22: 30) and – adds Maximus – angels do not have female sex. Then, Saint Paul says to Christians (Ga 3: 26): "all of you are sons of God". It is not written "sons and daughters" – emphasises Maximus – but only *sons*.<sup>131</sup>

Speaking about the state of perfection and the *future* life, he did not depreciate the dignity of marriage in *temporality*. He points out that if the Creator did not confirm marriage, Jesus would have not said: "What therefore God has joined together, let not man put asunder" (Mt 19: 6). He quotes: "Marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled" (Heb 13: 4) and

---

2 (he says directly that only Adam was created on God's image), Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, 6.12.100.3 and John Chrysostom who maintained that creation on God's image signifies man's dominion over the rest of creation, women included (*ibid.*). The idea of the two stages in the creation of man comes most probably from Philo of Alexandria (cf. SC 6, 155, note 1 and SELS 2009, 8, note 32). It was popular in the hellenic world, among Gnostic (e.g. *Gospel of Thomas*, logion 114) and in some Jewish authors, cf., e.g., BASKIN 1995, 68.

130See: Z-220 and M-II, 278-9. In another place (Z-271) he says directly that sexual organs are indecent and adduces a reminiscence of Ex 28: 42 and the passages from Ex 20: 26 as evidence.

131See: Z-270-1. Maximus also uses Eph 4: 13 as an evidence. NB, AUGUSTINE, *De civitate* XXII, 17 (vol. 48, 835), was the first Father of the Church who explicitly affirmed that women will not be resurrected in male or sexless body, cf. BØRRESEN 2013, 137. This problem is also treated by Maximus in a separate work (M-II, no. 29). On Maximus' struggle with Augustine's authority see above, note 20. This theme has a prehistory, at least from Aristotle, with his phrase that female is an anomalous male, phrase which was often misunderstood, cf., e.g., NOLAN 1994.



emphasises that if the Saviour did not praise marriage he would have not gone, when he was invited, to the wedding in Cana, and would have not made the water into wine, and would have not enjoyed himself with others.<sup>132</sup> The body is not rejected but certainly should be liberated.

## HUMAN FREEDOM AND ASTROLOGY

The awareness of the present human condition led unavoidably to the question of freedom. The liberation from passions was the way to regain the original dignity of people created in God's image. Yet, this process presupposes that the human being is capable to choose freely between good and evil. Often and emphatically Maximus defended this conviction. Perhaps he would have not so engaged himself with this question if he had not been confronted with the problem of astrology. To this issue he devoted a few works from the period before 1525 and constantly returned to it in his later writings.<sup>133</sup>

Maximus calls the capacity to choose freely between good and evil: *самовластие*. He emphasises with force that "from the beginning we have been honoured with free choice (*самовластие*) by the One who created us, we are the masters of our thoughts and deeds, both good and evil." He sees here an aspect of God's image in human being. The term *самовластие* is the precise translation of the Greek word *αὐτεξουσίος* used by the Fathers who were Maximus' sources.<sup>134</sup> In his dispute with astrology, he follows a traditional schema of

---

132See: Z-264. The most interesting fragment is: "и вкупѣ веселяшеся чловѣколѣпно [another MS: чловѣлюбно] съ прочими пиряны." Maximus also stressed that the seven councils accepted the second marriage because of human weakness and "your teacher Jerome" loathed it, *ibid*. A certain confirmation of the ontological goodness of the human body can be seen in a short passage in M-II, 176. The upright position of the human body (compared to animals which are horizontal to the ground) reminds one of the higher vocation of the human being. This is however a motive which comes from Aristotle, and then continued by the Fathers, cf. KONOVALOV 2014, 30.

133Maximus shows the primordial state of man as freedom from passions (M-II, 159): "свободни бѣхомъ, аз же и ты, от сих страстей"; he presents this state of original freedom as God-like quality (M-II, 177): "Станем же на тверди высокыя свободы, на тверди свободы богоподобныя, ею же преже обогатяше, преже неже впасти тебѣ под рукою губителнаго бѣса, преже неже, отпадши бесмерътныя чести твоя, уподобитися неразумнымъ скотомъ." In one place (M-II, 204) he points at self-knowledge as the way towards freedom: "Въистину сеи единъ позна себе, сеи неложень Вышняго угодникъ и единъ свободень." Maximus defends human capacity to choose between good and evil in many places, e.g.: M-I, 255-94, M-I, 311-34 and M-I, 358-72; M-II, no. 13; M-II, no. 14; Z-44-54. In principle, he struggles with astrology to defend God's Providence and human freedom (SINITSYNA 1977, 188). Yet, the first reason also serves to protect the true relationship between man and God (based on the Revelation). The anthropological question is in the centre. A list of Maximus' arguments against astrology in: HANEY 1973, 158.

134The quoted fragment comes from M-II, 154: "самовластиемъ почтени бывше изначяла от Създаващаго насъ, мы сами и властели есмы своих помысль и дѣль благых и лукавых." On God's image (M-I, 279): "Явьствено убо, яко самовластенъ сыи и самоизволенъ созданыи чловекъ по образу Божию. Ему же аще самоизволенъ мьсль свою приложить, никто же убо его удобъ отторгнет отизбраннаго, дондеже сам пакы волею ослабить, невидѣниемъ благаго себе осудивъ." On the same page as the previous quotation (M-II, 154), below, Maximus gives a translation of John of Damascus' passage. The same translation Maximus used before in M-I, 292-3. On this translation see below, text and note 137. In Z-49 Maximus repeats one phrase of the text quoted in M-II, 154. Cf. also M-I, 258-9. It is worth noting that Gregory of Nyssa (an

argumentation elaborated by a few ancient authors. He bases himself first of all on Basil the Great and John of Damascus, completing their arguments with some passages from Gregory of Nazianzus. John Chrysostom and Augustine.<sup>135</sup>

The main elements of Basil's teaching are as follows: astrology has a limited value to forecast natural phenomena, first of all the weather; celestial bodies do not forecast either events or destiny; astrology eliminates human *liberum arbitrium*; if stars caused evil, their Creator would have been responsible for this; if our actions were determined by horoscopes, we would not be responsible for our deeds.<sup>136</sup>

John of Damascus, similarly, considered that some natural phenomena depend on the influence of the stars but not our deeds. We are the masters of our actions. If we were subjected to stars, there would have been neither virtues nor vices, God would have not governed and his providence would have not existed. John also adds that our intellectual capacity would have been superfluous because if we were not masters of our deeds it is superfluous to deliberate on them. But this capacity is given to us essentially for this deliberation hence those who are endowed with intellect, have also *liberum arbitrium*.<sup>137</sup>

Maximus adopts their teaching as the core of his argumentation but also develops it. Following Basil, he emphasises that the acceptance of the determining force of stars would have meant that God is the author of evil because he is their creator. And this is against faith!<sup>138</sup> Generally, if stars had a decisive influence on our behaviour, moral life would have been senseless, as there would have been neither vices nor virtues and it would have been impossible to fulfil the commandments.<sup>139</sup> The followers of astrology, therefore, deprive us of the gift of

---

important source of Maximus' anthropology, as we have seen) was persuaded that from among the elements of God's image in humans (enumerated above, note 116) his capacity for free choice (as well as his intellectual capacity) was not destroyed by the Fall, cf. MUCKLE 1945, 67-8, esp. notes 54 and 56. Yet, Maximus does not mention Gregory of Nyssa in this context.

135On the patristic scheme of argumentation against astrology see: ALLAMANDY 2003. On Basil the Great and John of Damascus see two next notes. GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS, *De pauperum amore*, 900-1 (nos. 32-33) is quoted in M-I, 276-7; John Chrysostom, *In Matthaëum*, 75, 4 in M-I, 278 (see: JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, *In Matthaëum*, 691). On Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram*, II, 17, cf. below, note 146. Cf. also above, note 19 that Maximus quoted Augustine in his anti-astrological polemic, always together with an Eastern authority!

136Basil's arguments against astrology can be found in BASIL THE GREAT, *Hexameron*, 348-363. Maximus quotes a large part of this passage (pages 356-63) in M-I, 274-6 and an another Basil's (yet not identified) fragment in M-I, 271.

137John of Damascus' views are exposed in *De fide orthodoxa*. Maximus quotes a fragment of this work (JOHN OF DAMASCUS, *De fide orthodoxa*, vol. I, 256-9; cf. SINITSYNA 1977, 93 who identified the last fragment from John of Damascus) in M-I, 292-3 and, the same text, slightly shortened and in a different translation, again in M-II, 154 and in M-II, 164. The fragment about intellectual capacity is however quoted only once, in M-I, 293. John of Damascus says: "ὄθεν πᾶν λογικὸν καὶ αὐτεξούσιον" (JOHN OF DAMASCUS, *De fide orthodoxa*, vol. I, 258) and Maximus translates: "ГѢм же всяко словесно и самовластно есть" (M-I, 293). Two other, unidentified, references to John of Damascus' fragments against astrology are in M-I, 283 and M-I, 323.

138See: M-I, 317; M-I, 264-5; M-II, 155; cf. also: M-II, 162; M-II, 168; M-II, 174.

139See: M-I, 258-9; M-II, 162-3, M-II, 171-2; M-II, 164. The idea that astrological belief nullifies both vice and

*liberum arbitrium* (самовластный дар).<sup>140</sup> The capacity to make a choice, this power, results from the fact that a human person is created in God's image and after His likeness. This way of understanding God's image in man Maximus may have derived from Gregory of Nazianzus whom he quoted. Yet, possibly his other sources, Gregory of Nyssa and Maximus the Confessor, had even a greater impact on Maximus in this matter. Gregory of Nyssa shows that freedom is given to man when he was created in the image of God. Also for Maximus the Confessor human self-determination was an important aspect of God's image in man.<sup>141</sup>

The Greek's refutation of astrology was manifold but certainly the defence of human *liberum arbitrium* was his fundamental motivation to defy astrological beliefs. If he just wanted to refute astrological beliefs he could have done it without underlining the problem of *liberum arbitrium*. Yet, the key term, *самовластие*, appears on the first pages of his anti-astrological polemics (M-I, 257), even before he quoted the Fathers' opinions, and then he repeatedly returns to it (e.g. M-I, 263, 266 and so on). He did not follow slavishly the patristic path but adapted mainly Eastern but also Western sources to the circumstances in which he found himself. The general conformity to the patristic model did not hinder him from elaborating his own *modus procedendi*. At the beginning of his battle he says (rather ironically): "It seems to me that those [adherents of astrological beliefs] think secretly (though they do not dare openly to preach their lie) that our Saviour Jesus Christ was born through the movements of planets, out of necessity was incarnate and put to death on the cross." A few pages later he quotes the Gospel: "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself" (Mt 16: 24) and says that Jesus

---

virtue is also taken from BASIL THE GREAT, *Hexameron*, 356-7

140See: M-II, 154: "[...] лишаютъ насъ самовластнаго дара, им же почтени быхом отъ сътворившаго насъ [...]" Cf. also M-II, 164: "по образу и по подобию своему, сирѣчь самовольнымъ и самовластнымъ словомъ и изволениемъ [...] сътворишь естъ челоуѣка [...]"

141Maximus quotes Gregory of Nazianzus in M-I, 263: "образомъ Божиимъ почтени быхомъ, сирѣчь самовластиемъ; не соблюдохомъ еже по образу неврѣдно безумиемъ нашимъ и злымъ совѣтомъ змиинымъ, а не понужениемъ имарменинымъ". The word *εἰμαρμένῃ* (= имармения in Maximus) is rare. In Gregory's known works it occurs only three times: twice in *Carmina moralia* (PG 37, 695, line 4 and PG 37, 964, line 10) and once in a fragment from *Oratio contra astronomos* (PG 36, 678, 1-2 line). The quotation from M-I, 263 does not match any of these three places. An expression similar to Maximus' "образомъ Божиимъ почтени быхомъ [...] не соблюдохомъ..." appears in Gregory's works twice (PG 36, col. 636, line 8-9 and PG 36, col. 325, line 44: "μετέλαβον τῆς εἰκόνης, καὶ οὐκ ἐφύλαξα") but neither of the two cases corresponds exactly to the fragment quoted by Maximus. Therefore either Maximus mixed two of Gregory's passages or he quoted a work that we do not know. It is all the more probable because the last work (*Oratio contra astronomos*) is known from the only one MS which was preserved in Moscow (ΜΑΤΗΝΑΙ 1779, II, 38). Also in another place (M-I, 257), without quoting an authority, Maximus points at самовластие as aspect of God's image: "[...] и все, еже Содѣтелемъ всяжено бысть въ челоуѣце, по образу Божию созданомъ, самовластное своебожение разума, им же паче иныхъ еже по образу и по подобию Божию является [...]" On Gregory of Nyssa and Maximus Confessor see: THUNBERG 1965, 125-6. Cf. also above, note 134. Maximus the Greek quotes Gregory of Nyssa and Maximus the Confessor elsewhere, not in this context. Yet it seems clear that Gregory of Nyssa (with his more dramatic conception of human freedom, cf. GARRIGUES 1976, 90 and GREGORY OF NYSSA, *De hominis opificio*, 181 B-C, chapter XVI) and Maximus the Confessor had in this field an impact on the Greek. This problem requires a separate research.

would have not called people to follow him if they were not able to decide about their actions. He did not say *if you can* but *if you will*. Everybody is the master of his deeds.<sup>142</sup> The problem of free choice was therefore for Maximus not only a moral but also a religious question.

Without this capacity humans cannot respond to the key appeal of the Gospel.

The Greek's struggle proceeded in two phases, in two contexts, before 1525 and later, when he could write again after the first, very severe, period of his incarceration. In both of them however, he frequently returns to the question of *самовластие* and he uses his fundamental reference, a fragment about astrology from John of Damascus' *De fide orthodoxa* with his defence of *liberum arbitrium*. He constantly demonstrates his pastoral care and desire to protect those who are in danger of being seduced by the pernicious teaching.<sup>143</sup>

Maximus did not introduce the term *самовластие* into Muscovite thought. Considerations on *самовластие* existed in Muscovite literature at least from the end of the thirteenth century and were focused on the human ability (or inability) to make free choices, especially after the Fall. Yet, the term *самовластие* was not a univocal term. Maximus makes a conscious choice using this word to emphasise the human capacity to choose between good and evil.<sup>144</sup>

---

142On the influence of stars on Christ's life (M-I, 257): "Мнѣ же видятся иде сицевп глаголющеи мудръствовати вътай у себе, аще и ктому не смѣють проповѣдати лжу, яко и Спас наш от планитов обхожениа произвелень [...]" In the same work (First missive to Karpov against astrology) Maximus described his encounter with astrology in Italy so this reflection might have been shaped by this encounter. Cf. COMPENHAVER 1988, 273: "Pomponazzi argued that the stars rule not only nature but also history, even sacred history; a horoscope can account for the rise of Christianity, as of any religion." Pomponazzi is not mentioned in Maximus' works but he might have heard of his ideas. The commentary to Mt 16: 24 (M-I, 259): "[...] Сие же: хотѣти и не хотѣти, господа всякого проповѣдуетъ своих дѣль или злых, или благыхъ.". Similarly Maximus interprets (M-I, 266) the Psalm 84: 9. The Fathers did not use as an argument the passage from Mt 16: 24. Another example of Maximus' discretion to use the patristic sources is the way he quotes Augustine. He uses only a fragment about the demonic inspiration because the question of the *liberum arbitrium* was not important to Augustine in his refutation of astrology, see: O'LOUGHLIN 2013, 582.

143The passage from John of Damascus (SC 535, 256-8) was used by Maximus before 1525 in M-I, 292-3 and afterwards, in M-II, 154 and in M-II, 164, see above 137.

144On the *самовластие* in Muscovite thought before Maximus writes extensively KLIBANOV 1996. His main (and the most doubtful) thesis is that the discussion concerning *самовластие* was the discussion between heretics and the Orthodox faith, that in the Muscovite tradition the (heretical) tendency to human autonomy and self-determination opposed the Orthodox idea that God determines human condition (and that man is not able to recover, unaided, after the fall), the central tension he sees in the contrast between *самоопределение человека* and *Божие определение человека*, cf. *ibid.*, esp. 131. He even says: "Те, кто утверждал самовластие, отвергал божественное триединство, как и те, кто утверждал божественное триединство, отвергал самовластие." (*ibid.*, 162) Klibanov's conclusions are all the more questionable that he makes serious errors (the faith in the Trinity he names *tritheism*, *ibid.*, 152; he does not know that the word *mafimatika* is a synonym of astrology, *ibid.*, 173; he uses incorrect expression *principium individuationum* instead of *principium individuationis* and clearly does not understand it, *ibid.*, 155). Nevertheless, his work brings a lot of source references (cf. KLIBANOV 1996, 130-205) concerning the use and various understandings of the term *самовластие* in Russian culture before Maximus and also in sixteenth century. The term *самовластие* appears also in other Muscovite roughly contemporary with Maximus, cf. IVANOV 1972-74, III, 120 (on Theodor Kuritsyn) and SINITSYNA 1977, 102-3 (on Joseph Volotskii). NB, the term *самовластие* takes a specific meaning in relation to the ruler, e.g. Ivan Timofeev says that the tsar is *samovlasten* i.e. autocrat, cf.

There are differences in Maximus' approach to the subject before 1525 and later. Before his imprisonment in 1525, he reacted to the influences of Western astrology and in his polemics used examples taken from his Italian experience which was still vivid in his memory. It is primarily a doctrinal battle and the Muscovite context is poorly delineated. Maximus discusses mainly with Fedor Karpov (and, through him, with Nicholas Bülow) the question of his personal astrological fascination that was certainly evoked by his encounter with the Western theories. Therefore Maximus had a motive to avail himself of the Western anti-astrological polemics. However, in comparison to both Pico and Savonarola whose works he might have known, his argumentation is incomparably more theological. Of course all of them used the Bible in their polemics but Maximus did it much more often (cf. generally the two letters to Karpov and especially M-I, 360-1). And, the other way round, Maximus only mentioned philosophical arguments while both Gianfrancesco Pico and Savonarola abundantly enumerated philosophers averse to astrology and quoted philosophical evidence. As for patristic material, again, Pico and Savonarola quoted it less than the Greek, although some important references were common to them all. There are also similarities in their use of historical examples in the struggle against determinism. Maximus employs these examples much more abundantly than his Western counterparts but the logic they employ when using them is the same. Both Maximus and the Western polemicists juxtapose pairs of historical figures. One of them was a follower of astrology and was unlucky while the other refuted it and won.<sup>145</sup>

---

ROWLAND 1990, notes 15 and 50; similar ideas can be found in Ermolai-Erasm's works, cf. KLIBANOV 1996, 140. Also Kurbskii uses the question of *самовластие* in this discussion with Ivan IV, *ibid.*, 159.

145As for biblical evidence Savonarola used them mainly in the first chapter of the first tractate of his work (SAVONAROLA, *Contra li astrologi*, 279ff). In the whole work there are 10 quotations from the Bible. In Pico's work (PICO, *Quaestio de falsitate astrologiae*) they are dispersed in the whole text but there are in general 11 or 12 quotations and one allusion, while in Maximus in his first letter to Karpov – about 40 and in the second – 14. Two quotations are common to all three authors: Is 47: 12-14 (Pico, 139 and 159; Savonarola, 283 and Maximus – M-I, 280) and Jer 10: 2-3 (Pico, 139; Savonarola, 283 and Maximus – M-I, 281). Again three are common to Pico and Maximus: Col 2: 8 (Pico, 160; Maximus, M-I, 267) and Ga 4: 10-11 (Pico, 160; Maximus, M-I, 284). As for philosophers Maximus mentions mainly Socrates, Plato and Aristotle (cf. BULANIN 1984, 24-5) while both Pico and Savonarola, apart from them, quoted many others. Finally, as for patristic authorities all three authors refer to Basil's *Hexameron* (but PICO, *Questio de falsitate astrologiae*, 161, mentions only generally this work; SAVONAROLA, *Contra li astrologi*, 286, just says: „Santo Basilio sopra el *Genesi* dice questa arte essere una occupatissima vanità.” while Maximus quotes a considerable passage from Basil's work, see above, note 136). Similarly all of them refer to Chrysostom (Pico and Savonarola quoted the same fragment that astrology is “vana, falsa et ridicula” – 6<sup>th</sup> homily on Matthew, cf. PICO, *Questio de falsitate astrologiae*, 161, 4-7 and SAVONAROLA, *Contra li astrologi*, 286). John of Damascus is quoted by Maximus and mentioned by Pico, *ibid.* Pico and Savonarola refer also to Western Fathers and it is not the case in Maximus besides Augustine, see the next note. Gianfrancesco Pico's work was finished probably in 1510 and was not printed. Savonarola's work was published after 1497. As far as Muscovy is concerned, a refutation of the Western astrology we can find also in Philotheus' letter but his argumentation is much poorer than Maximus', cf. SINITSYNA 1998, 182. Giovanni Pico's anti-astrological work is incomparable. It is much vaster. In PICO, *Questio de falsitate astrologiae*, 166, 25-36 we find just one historical example. In SAVONAROLA, *Contra li*

There is little doubt, therefore, that the Western anti-astrological polemics were an inspiration for Maximus who adjusts these sources to the specific Muscovite audience. He decided to use simpler and more persuasive arguments when writing to people who did not know philosophy well. Since he wrote to Orthodox people, he quoted essentially Eastern Fathers. Only when he could not find a sufficiently convincing argument in the Eastern tradition, he looked for a Western authority who could be digestible for an Orthodox soul. This had to be the reason that he decided to draw on a Western Father for an idea that would deter people more resolutely from astrology. He turned to St Augustine from whom he took only one but a strongly effective argument: that astrologers act under demonic influence. Such a concept could be also found, although very incidentally, in some Eastern Fathers. Maximus might have not considered them emphatic enough and this is why he invoked a passage from *De Genesi*, most probably inspired by Savonarola or Gianfrancesco Pico who referred to *De Genesi ad litteram* in their anti-astrological works.<sup>146</sup>

Perhaps already during the period before 1525 Maximus became aware that domestic astrological beliefs and superstitions (that had, most likely, the same sources as Western astrology) were at least as important as the Western influence. When he opposed Karpov's conviction that astrology is a useful science for rulers (M-I, 322), he referred to authoritative commentary to the Canon Law by Matthew Blastares (M-I, 324). It is not clear in this case

---

astrologi, 345-346 there are a few historical examples – arguments. E.g. Zoroaster was a great astrologer and was unhappy while Nino who rejected astrology was successful (this pair is borrowed from Giovanni Pico), similarly: Pompey and Julius Caesar, Justinian and Julian the Apostate. Francesco Sforza could not bear astrology and he was successful (this example was also borrowed from Giovanni Pico). Generally, astrologers are unhappy. Ibid., 351-2 historical examples of prediction which did not come true. Savonarola largely based his argumentation on Giovanni Pico. Maximus juxtaposes Constantine the Great and Maxentius. The latter used astrology and lost (M-I, 321-2). The Greek also mentions Faustus' (Clement of Rome's father) dialogue with St Peter (M-I, 330-1).

146Cf. SAVONAROLA, *Contra li astrologi*, 285 and PICO, *Questio de falsitate astrologiae*, 163, 7-11 (cf. also *ibid.*, 163, 12-29 and 166, 12-16). Savonarola quoted *De Genesi ad litteram*, II, 17 (37) and Pico referred to Thomas Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae*, II-II, q. 95, a. 5, ad 2 where in turn the passage from *De Genesi ad litteram*, II, 17 is quoted (on Augustine's critics of astrology and his conviction about its demonic inspiration: O'LOUGHLIN 2013, 580-1). Maximus probably quoted from memory. He invokes (M-I, 282) Augustine's first chapter of *De Genesi* (Толковании миру бытия) but there is no such fragment in the first book of *De Genesi ad litteram*, neither in two other Augustine's works on Genesis. Therefore it can only be: *De Genesi ad litteram*, II, 17 and even in this case it is not an exact quotation but a kind of paraphrase. It is an argument that the Western anti-astrological works played an important role in Maximus' own polemics (I read AKOPYAN 2021, 160-75 only after finishing editing this chapter. For the most part his conclusions align with my own). In his refutation of astrology the question of demonic inspiration is present from the very beginning of his first letter to Karpov, see: M-I, 256-7, then M-I, 283; M-I, 294; M-I, 316-7; M-II, 156; M-II, 162 and M-II, 174. Augustine is mentioned in the context of demonic inspiration in astrology in more than a half of these passages (M-I, 282-3, M-I, 294, M-I, 316-7). An insignificant mention in John Chrysostom's 75<sup>th</sup> homily on Matthew (but demon is not named here as a source of astrology – see: M-I, 278 and JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, In Matthaëum, 691). From among Eastern Fathers not quoted by Maximus, demonic impact in astrology is raised by Gregory of Nyssa (*Against Fate*) and Diodorus of Tarsus (*Against Fate*), see: ALLAMANDY 2003.

whether Karpov meant Western astrology or domestic but the reference to the Byzantine authority may suggest that it could concern local Muscovite beliefs. Elsewhere he used more simple, unsophisticated arguments against it. Later, when he had the possibility to write again, he wrote at least another three anti-astrological works. It seems that he took into account local astrological beliefs (based mainly on the Byzantine tradition) and realised more clearly that they were the real challenge. In his writings from this later period there is almost no mention of Western astrology.<sup>147</sup> Maximus just describes people's behaviour and responds to it. He says that people do not believe that they can live virtuously because stars are not favourable. They consider useless both prayers and sacrifices if the stars are not conducive (M-II, 171-2). They say that they cannot stop doing wrong because the star that influences them leads them to such an action against their will (M-II, 162-3). These examples were visibly taken from Muscovite life.

Seeing all this, Maximus wants to demonstrate to his readers the liberating potential of Christianity and to bring them to the needed conclusion: it is God who is the Lord of the whole reality. He humbles and exalts (M-II, 151, M-II, 164 and M-II, 174 – here Maximus quotes Anne from 1 Sm 2), He rules the universe, he is the only sovereign over us, only He knows the future and every good gift comes from Him, not from stars. The human being is endowed by God with *liberum arbitrium* from the very beginning. He is the lord of his deeds, not an angel, a devil, a star, the zodiac, a planet or the wheel of fortune.<sup>148</sup> This is why humans should serve God and not the stars. If people had a fear of God – exclaims the Greek – they would have not surrendered their dignity to stars and they would have been, according to the Scripture, gods and sons of God, they would have been like angels, like Moses, Daniel and Joseph (M-II, 172). The whole reality, including the stars, was created for man so may they work for him and not rule him – says Maximus and concludes: “*Recognise [my italic] the gift of liberum arbitrium!*” It was quite an amazing proclamation of faith in human liberty in the country where the level of

---

147On Muscovite astrology: RYAN 1999, 373-93. On the influence of the Byzantine astrology in Muscovy: *ibid.*, 377-8. On the common sources of Western and Muscovite astrology: *ibid.*, 382. There is one mention about the German – Latin astrological influence in the later period of Maximus' activity in Muscovy in M-II, 151. Yet, the dating of this work is not sure. IVANOV 169, no. 158 and RZHIGA 1934, 60 think that this text is from before 1525, SINITSYNA 1977, 90-1 – that it was written in 1530-ties – 1540-ties. Another texts written after 1525 is M-II, 159-175 and M-II, 298-302. In these texts Maximus mentions Chaldean, Hellenic and other Middle Eastern sources of astrology (M-II, 150. 169. 174). Maximus mentions also predictions from observation of birds (M-II, 163). It can hardly be borrowed from the West in the sixteenth century.

148See: M-II, 163; M-II, 173 (Pythia's answer to Hesiod that Zeus, and not Fortuna, rules everything); M-II, 156 (“мы сами властели есме своих помысль и дѣянии”); M-II, 157 (here a reminiscence of James 1: 17) and Z-49 (=M-II, 300): “Мы бо от самовластни изначала от Съдѣтеля създани бывше, властели есме своихъ дѣль и благых, и лукавых. И никто же над нами властель, развѣ Съдавшаго нас: ни агтель, ни бѣсъ, ни звѣзда, ни зодии, ни планить, ни колесо фориуны, бѣсы изьобрѣтеныя.”

dependence of its people on the ruler was incomparably higher and the level of individual freedom incomparably lower than elsewhere in Europe. The word Maximus used to describe the human capacity to choose between good and evil (*самовластие*) some other authors employed to emphasised unrestricted freedom of the ruler.<sup>149</sup> The Greek's words sound as if he wanted to help people to discover a reality that they, up until then, had ignored.

## BEYOND ASTROLOGY: TO GROW TOWARDS FREEDOM

It remains to reflect on what was the cause of Maximus' sensitivity to the question of human freedom. Was the context of astrological fascinations both in Italy and in Muscovy a sufficient explanation? It cannot be excluded that the discussions among humanists on the free will or some Byzantine discussion concerning the same question played a role. Perhaps a contrast between Italian civil liberties and Muscovite autocracy had also an impact on the development of Maximus' thought. At the end of his life he still emphasised the significance of human free choice in relation with God against a ritualistic approach: when Ivan IV unwisely decided to go to the Kirillov monastery with his wife and the new born child, Maximus said that God hears prayer not because of a particular place when one prays but because of good will and a freely taken decision (*по самовластию*).<sup>150</sup>

Maximus reveals himself as an adherent of an optimistic anthropology. Human beings can make choices. They are not condemned to fatalism. They are the authors of both good and evil in their life. We have already seen that Maximus understood the *liberum arbitrium* as an

---

149М-П, 175: “Звѣзды же вся работны тебѣ, тебе бо ради създана быша вся, да работают тебѣ, а не да владѣють. Самовластный даръ твой познавай.” On other meanings of the term *самовластие* see above, note 144. KOLLMANN 1987, 146-8, interprets the testimonies about the dependence of all subjects, including the most powerful, on the ruler as the ideological construction aimed to preserve the cohesion and stability of the society (cf. also ROWLAND 1990, 154). Her arguments are convincing but the image should be more balanced because the situation depended on the real force and capabilities of the actors on the political stage. KIVELSON 2002 attempts to show that the members of the Muscovite society had a sense of belonging to a polity and were endowed with some rights. Certainly it is true even if some sources she uses can be interpreted differently to what the author does. This article contains a useful review of research on the subject. The new research brings important corrections to the traditional picture of the Muscovite society. Nevertheless, the level of individual freedom there was still much lower than in countries west of Muscovy. During the time of crisis the voice of the people should be heard (cf. *ibid.*, 474-5) but in normal circumstances obedience to the ruler (“like voiceless fish” - according to Ivan Timofeev's expression) is an essential virtue of a subject, cf. ROWLAND 2007, 281. KIVELSON 2002 describes the Muscovite political system (“citizenship”) as “rights without freedom” and says: “In Muscovy, in many (although not all) contexts, the word “liberty” carried a strongly negative connotation.”, *ibid.* 484. Cf. also in this work, 485-6, with further references. There is little place here for an individual's consideration of what is good and what is bad.

150The famous discussion between Erasmus and Luther on *liberum arbitrium* vs *servum arbitrium* took place in 1524-6 so when Maximus was already in Moscow. Nevertheless a problem of determinism was discussed in Italy before. Lelio Cosmico, mentioned by Maximus in one of his works, was an extreme determinist, cf. chapter II, text and note 114. Maximus' meeting with Ivan IV is described in KURBSKII, History of the Grand Prince of Moscow, 78: “... понеже Богъ и святые его не по месту объятія молитвамъ нашимъ внимаютъ, но по доброй волѣ нашей і по самовластію”.



important aspect of God’s image in human beings. He perceives this faculty (самовластие) as a spiritual one and naturally inclined to good.<sup>151</sup> Moreover, he explains that the qualities of the human soul convince us that “our homeland (отечество) is in heaven” (reference to Phil 3: 20) and that “God is our Father”. In such a context Maximus speaks also about liberty (свобода) which was a human quality before the Fall and can be achieved anew. Thus, his reflection goes further than only to point at the human capacity to choose (самовластие). There is a similarity between human liberty and God’s liberty. The Greek does not develop this thought so it is difficult to say how he understands this similarity but it is one more evidence that his struggle against astrological fatalism had deep roots.<sup>152</sup>

This vision gives hope and opens a way to a change. If human being has such a possibility, he or she can enter on the path of conversion to restore the lost unity with God and with others. There is a remedy for the harmful influence of passions. To underline it the Greek again refers to the authority of Maximus the Confessor who emphasised that there is no evil in beings (God is not responsible for evil). It appears as a result of succumbing to passions, i.e. through a neglect of spiritual (intellectual) activity (умнаго дѣлания небрежения). Therefore, to restore the inner harmony of the human being which has been disturbed by passions, the natural activity of mind is necessary. The harmony lies in the fact that the sensuous part is submitted to mind and mind obeys the Word of God.<sup>153</sup>

---

151 On human beings as the authors of good and evil (M-I, 333): “[...] якоже убо благому, такожде и злому себѣ виновни бываеми.” Cf. also above, note 148. On the *liberum arbitrium* as an aspect of God’s image cf. also above, note 134). On spiritual character of the *liberum arbitrium* (M-II, 155): “власть же есть уму [my Italic] нашему и сила, емуже хоцетъ или въслѣдовати, или противитися [...]” That it is naturally inclined to good: “*no estestvu* [my Italic] же ума дѣлание есть...” (ibid.) These two passages are parts of a larger quotation from Maximus the Confessor (or rather an exposition of his views), cf. the full quotation from M-II, 155 below, in the note 153. That the *liberum arbitrium* is naturally inclined to good cf. also M-II, 144: “Самовластна изначяла Съдѣтель сотвориль есть человекъ, да самоизволнѣ избирает *благое* [my Italic] и съвршаеть е, яко угодно есть Сътворшему его [...]” So, probably, Maximus the Confessor’s teaching formed Maximus the Greek’s view on free will.

152 In M-II, 176 he writes: “Прочяя бо боговидныя красоты твоя оставляю глаголати, ими же преукрашена еси зѣло боголѣпнѣ, довлѣть увѣряти небу быти намъ отечеству и хвалитися Самого Вышняго Отца имѣти. Сего ради потщимся присно горѣ ума въздвизати, идѣже Отець нашъ и жителство есть, сыны Своа Вышнии глагола и Боги быти. And further (M-II, 177): “Възненавидимъ от всего сердца нижняа, яремь работы страстныа отврѣзем от себе. Станем же на тверди высокыа свободы, на тверди свободы богоподобныа, ею же преже обогатяше, преже неже впасти тебѣ под рукою губителнаго бѣса, преже неже, отпадши бесмерьтныа чести твояа, уподобитися неразумнымъ скотомъ.” Maximus writes about it in the context of the necessity to free oneself from passions.

153 On the activity of mind (M-II, 155): “Нѣции убо рѣша, яко не бы убо было зло въ сущихъ, аще не бы была сила нѣкая привлачаща насъ на то. Сие же нѣсть ничто же ино, точию еже по естеству умнаго дѣлания небрежения, и сего ради прилѣжание того всегда творящии, добраа убо всегда творять, зла же никогда же, аще бо и ты хоцещи, отрини небрежение, и с нимъ отженеши злобу, яже есть съблазнено требование мысли, ему же послѣдуютъ неподобнаа дѣла. Что же есть естествоно ума нашего дѣлание, тои же учить явственѣ глаголя: по естеству же ума дѣлание есть, да сущаа въ насъ словеснаа часть повинуется всегда божественному слову, и да владѣть над сущемоу в насъ безсловесною чястикоу.” It is not an exact quotation. Maximus himself says that the Confessor “учитъ сиче нѣкако, глаголя [...]”. The ideas

Maximus the Greek quotes further the Confessor who pointed to three elements that lead us to good: holy powers, natural inclinations, good decisions (святѣя силы, естествонаа сѣмена, доброе изволение) and also three that lead to evil: demons, passions, bad decisions (бѣсове, страсти, злое изволение). The Greek provided this quotation with a scanty commentary in which he simplified the Confessor's idea rather than developed it. Where the latter talks about the neglect of spiritual activity, the former retells it (M-II, 156) as insanity and the neglect of God's commandments which is an impoverishment of the original idea.<sup>154</sup>

In another work, the dialogue between the Mind (Maximus' porte-parole) and the Soul, the Greek gives more detail on how to return to the original perfection, how to attain the original beauty. He mentions the activity of both the will and the intellect. He summons one both to think and to live accordingly to one's dignity. To achieve the likeness of his image, one should follow the commandments, dismiss the passionate lust of flesh and get rid of one's vices and of lies, should love the truth and in-malign life.<sup>155</sup>

---

contained in this passage can be found in: MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR, Chapters on love, III, 3-4, identified by KONOVALOV 2014, 84-86. Maximus the Confessor says in this fragment (English translation by SHERWOOD 1955): "3. It is with misuse of the soul's powers that the vices come upon us – the vices of the concupiscible, the irascible, and the rational element. Misuse of the rational power is found in ignorance and folly; of the irascible and concupiscible, in hate and intemperance. Their proper use is in knowledge and prudence, in charity and temperance. If this is so, nothing created by God is evil. 4. Food is not evil, but gluttony; nor is the begetting of children, but fornication; nor money, but avarice; nor glory, but vainglory. If this is so, nothing among creatures is evil except misuse which comes from the mind neglecting to cultivate itself as nature demands." In the same work (*ibid.*, II, 15) he also says: "The mind, when it applies itself to visible things, knows them naturally through the senses. So neither the mind is bad, nor the natural knowledge, nor the things, nor the senses ; for they are all the works of God. What then is bad? Evidently the passion which our natural ideas undergo. Indeed this need not be in our use of thoughts, if the mind keeps watch." Cf. also THUNBERG 1965, 127. Maximus the Greek expresses also elsewhere similar ideas, without quoting any authority, e.g. M-II, 204: happy is the one who subjugates his belly to mind (ум); M-II, 253: intellect (here Maximus uses the word *разумъ* and not *ум* as elsewhere; it seems that it can be translated as *intellect*) is able to control body and its organs and senses (NB, in one place the senses are called doors of the soul – M-II, 89) and M-II, 184: the Holy Spirit confirms the mast of human heart (утвержаючи непреклонну щоглу сердца своего).

154On the three elements see: M-II, 155-6. The source of this passage KONOVALOV 2014, 87-8 identified as MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR, Chapters on love, II, 32-33 but the Confessor treats this question more widely (English translation by SHERWOOD 1955): "32. There are three things that move us to the good: natural tendencies, the holy Powers, good choice. The natural tendencies – as, for instance, when what we wish men would do for us, we likewise do for them; or, when we see someone in sore straits, we then naturally have pity. The holy Powers – as when moved to some fine deed, we experience their good assistance and prosper. Good choice – when, for example, discerning good from evil, we choose the good. 33. There are likewise three things that move us to evil: the passions, the demons, and evil choice. The passions – as when we desire a thing out of reason; for example, food out of times or without necessity, or a woman without intention of begetting children or one not permitted us; or again, when we are angered or grieved more than is fitting, as against him who does us dishonor or harm." Maximus the Greek gives rather a summary than translation. The word *изволение* (доброе or злое) is, according to SREZNEVSKI, I, an equivalent of the greek *προαίρεσις* (this word is used by Maximus the Confessor), *αἴρεσις* or *ἀρετὴ* so should be translated as *choice* or *virtue* and not, as HANEY 1973, 153 translated it as good or bad fortune. Maximus' commentary in M-II, 156 simplifies the Confessor's thought also because his main goal in this fragment is to combat astrological beliefs.

155In the dialogue between the Mind and the Soul (M-II, 176) Maximus writes: "Образ есме – says Mind – божественъ, достойна тому да мудръствуим, да получим пръвообразныя красоты. Тогда же достойна образу вѣждь творящу себѣ, и емуже прилично подобие неложно имѣти, егда прилѣжно исправищи

A few elements are enumerated by the Mind in above-mentioned passage but, in his other works, Maximus mostly emphasised only two elements: fulfilling the commandments and the struggle with passions. These two essential directives illustrate the general rule, mentioned above, that the sensuous faculties should be submitted to mind and mind should obey God. The first aspect is realised through the struggle with passions, the second – by fulfilling the commandments which is a practical manifestation of the striving towards the divine wisdom.

## STRUGGLE WITH PASSIONS

We have already seen Maximus emphasising that oblivion of God's glory and the ignorance of true good opens the way for passions. Consequently, the return to original harmony requires a persistent memory (частаа память), an intellectual effort (притрудень разум) and the unceasing desire for God's glory (непрестаемое любление священнаго оногo и многожелаемаго рачения божественна славы). The stress on struggle with passions sheds also more light on Maximus' attitude towards possessions. Maximus considered that avarice (сребролюбие) is the offspring of the ignorance of the ultimate good (M-II, 161) and even sometimes pointed at avarice as the root of all evil. Therefore his attitude towards monastic possessions was not a question of belonging to a non-possessor party or an attempt of social reform but an essentially ascetic reflection. Monasticism was considered as a privileged way of Christian life and it was in monasteries where struggle against passions was especially important. Monks should be free from possessions to enter into the path leading to the restoration of the original harmony of human being.<sup>156</sup>

Consequently, his description of avarice and its effects is particularly vivid and he writes extensively on how to control this passion. Already in the *Terrible Story* Maximus wrote about Western monks that they liked non-possession (нестяжание) as a spiritual good which allows them to remain in silence, justice, firmness of their thoughts (съблюдаеть бо ихъ в тишинѣ и всякои правдѣ, и неколебании помысловъ) and outside any avarice (внѣ всякого

---

свою жизнь къ божественымъ Его заповѣдемъ даже до послѣдняго издыханія, егда отъ съдръжания страстныхъ похотей плоти далече отнюдь себе отведеши, егда всячьскую лжю истръгнеши сердца твоего ис корени и нравъ льстивый и зависть губителну, истину же вездѣ и прямо мудрованіе възлюбиши и священное беззлобие и святолѣпно житіе.” This is a quite exceptional passage where Maximus the Greek seems to see a difference between image and likeness but it is still far from the Confessor's thought. On Maximus the Confessor's teaching about image and likeness: THUNBERG 1965, 127-8. 133-7. Also in his work against Vives (Z-264) Maximus writes that it is necessary to seek the divine wisdom to restore God's image in human being: “Да възыскуемъ же паче, аще весма желаемъ мудри быти предъ Богомъ, а не предъ челоуѣкы, образъ, по немуже можемъ възвратитися въ пръвую яже преже преступленія честь и боговидную красоту нашу.”

<sup>156</sup>Cf. above text and note 119 about the primordial happiness, passions and obeying God's commandments; note 121 on avarice as the root of every evil. On the remedies for oblivion and ignorance: M-II, 167.

сребролюбия и лихоимания - Z 244). The opposite posture, the accumulating of wealth, increases avarice, as he eloquently shows in the dialogue of Aktimon and Philaktimon, does not give satisfaction, leads to bestiality and destruction (M-II, 227; cf. also about bestiality in M-II, 166-7). The concern over possessions not only brings harm and suffering but also deprives of spiritual good and causes a sterility of the soul (души бесплодие – M-II, 226). Liberation requires the renunciation of possessions and Maximus seems to say that it is closely related to the renunciation of power.<sup>157</sup>

### FULFILLING THE COMMANDMENTS

The stress on the commandments appears often in Maximus's works. This question is closely linked to the importance of faith. Maximus understood the Fall as a lack of faith and love (M-II, 160). Although both faith and love are mentioned here, the Greek pays more attention to faith being convinced that it is precisely in the observance of commandments that faith is manifested. Elsewhere Maximus says that faith in the true God is the first of all goods and unbelief is the worst of all evils (M-II, 163). Therefore, consistently and radically, he appeals that the commandments should be kept to the letter (исполняя всегда даже до единыя иоты – M-II, 186), to the last breath (M-II, 176). Similarly, the fear of God – says Maximus – should be also understood as the keeping of the commandments (M-II, 166).<sup>158</sup>

Obviously, the struggle with passions and fulfilling the commandments are not the full realisation of Christian life but an important step to regaining the original integrity of human being. The observance of the commandments opens the perspective of such a knowledge of God that was previously unavailable. Maximus expounds this idea using the words of a Father: “Where is fear of God – says blessed Gregory – there is also the observance of God’s commandments; where God’s commandments are observed, there is purification of mind (ум); and where is purification of mind, there is wisdom (премудрость) and reason (разумъ) and the

<sup>157</sup>Maximus says (M-II, 167): “Ничто же бо обыче толь възвѣрити нас, якоже еже господьскы владѣти стяжании.” This phrase seems to suggest also the renunciation of power. Cf. also M-II, 161 and above, chapter II, text and note 349. Example of the negative consequences of possessions can be multiplied: the soul “умом омрачися, изгубила есть умиление, и сердцем ожесточися жесточяише камени” (M-II, 167). KONOVALOV 2014, passim, looks for more specific sources of this ascetic tradition but it is rather a fruit of a generalised teaching of the Eastern Church. Cf. however GARRIGUES 1976, 91 who quotes Maximus the Confessor, Chapters on love, II, 89 about the relationship between passions and possessions. NB, other authors also called on the monks to reject possessions. Yet it was e.g. in metropolitan Daniel’s work a rather disciplinary measure, cf. ZHUROVA 2016, 48.

<sup>158</sup>The passage M-II, 160 is quoted in the note 112. Especially numerous are mentions about commandments in the *Слово на лихоимствующих* (Z-219-233), cf. pp. 226, 233; again M-II, 286-7 and so on. In Z-226 we read: “Како же славит Сынъ Отца Своего? Явлено, яко безпрестани угодная Ему творит и нигдѣ же преступаетъ ни наиненшу заповѣдь Его, но съ добрым изволениемъ послушаетъ Его въ всѣхъ, волею повинуюся Ему.” This attitude is opposed in this text to the attitude of a slave.

Holy Spirit's advent and illumination.”<sup>159</sup>

The Greek does not forget the significance of love in Christian life but such mentions are rarer. Nevertheless he shows that the commandments purify the soil of the soul so that the seeds of faith, hope and love may be sown.<sup>160</sup> Thus, as the Fall was caused by a lack of faith and love, so the observing of the commandments leads to the regaining of these virtues.

### SPIRITUAL LIFE

Maximus knew the mystical tradition of the Eastern Church but he devoted relatively little space for this dimension of Christian life even if it is a logical continuation of his ascetic considerations. His approach was more moralistic. Compared to the quantity of his moral admonitions, mentions about spiritual development are quite rare. He saw moral imperfections (worries of this life, passions, possessions) as an obstacle for spiritual life and he proposed some framework for those who wanted to escape spiritual danger: a modest life in a small community, in silence, renunciation of possessions, continence, meekness, contrition and tears. He also prescribed the reading of the lives of saints, the *meditatio mortis* and – to avoid idleness and as a remedy for *acedia* (уныние) – manual work. In a word, he repeated the guidelines set by the ascetic tradition of the Eastern Church.<sup>161</sup>

---

159The quoted fragment is from M-II, 257 and Maximus attributes this idea to “богословный Григоре” so probably to Gregory of Nazianzus. Cf. also: M-II, 161; M-II, 176 (here also about commandments). In Maximus' Western circles the link between the moral life and the capacity to know divine reality is also present. Cf., e.g., WEINSTEIN 1970, 194 on purification necessary for prophesy. There is no direct link between Maximus' ideas and Plato's and Plotinus' doctrine on catharsis, as thought DENISSOFF 1943, 313!

160On the significance of love in Christian life: M-II, 226 (a reference to 1 Cor 13); M-II, 244; M-II, 70; M-II, 248 (Maximus quotes here John 15: 14-15) and Z-245: “Едино у них [Western religious] преизобилно стяжание и съкровище неистоощаемо есть – прилъжнеише съблюденіе и скончаніе всѣхъ еуагелскихъ заповѣдей, имиже скоро и удобъ исправляется у них главизна добродѣтелей – любовь яже къ Богу и ближнему своему [...]” On the purifying role of commandments (M-II, 219-20): “Руку [reference to Lk 9: 62] убо нарицаа Владыка свое коегождо нас самовластное изволение и устремление, рало же глаголетъ святыа Его заповѣди; ими бо сердца нашего нива чистится, отсѣкаемымъ убо прозябаемымъ в немъ от длъгаго нашего лукаваго обычаа разумнымъ тръниемъ, сирѣчь лукавымъ помысломъ и плотскимъ хотѣниемъ, вмѣсто же ихъ саждаемымъ спасителнымъ сѣменемъ благовѣрія, сирѣчь вѣрѣ твердѣ и непоступнѣ и любви чистѣ, и нелицемѣрнѣи надежи непостижимѣ, ихъ же отроды – любы божествена [...]”

161Maximus' exhortations concerning spiritual life can be found, e.g., in M-II, 226: “[...] а идѣже житеиска попечения и плицы и свары и брани и тяжбы часты, сель ради и имѣнии житеискыхъ, отуду отбѣгоша и слезы и поувръзание и умиление и чиста молитва и память смертнаа.” Apart from the quoted fragment, the motif of the *meditatio mortis* appears also in M-II, 161 (“память смертная”). Another similar exhortation we find in M-II, 166-7: “Плоти же нашеи иссушаемѣ въздержаниемъ, вся наша в кротости мнозѣ и святѣи тихости есть. Къ сему же немало споспѣшествуетъ и еже вселитися или единому или съ иныма двѣма единоравнама. Еже бо съ многыма вселитися, много обыче творити одолѣну бывати яростию и нехотящу, или слухомъ услышавшу что нелѣпно или видѣвшу сътворено бывше что безчиннѣ и кромѣ отечьскаго обычаа. Къ симъ же всѣмъ еже нелюбостыжательнымъ житиемъ жити выну премногу обыче кротость даяти, и еже чястѣ бесѣдовати списаными преподобныхъ житии и безмолвию навькати и поучению смрътному.” Then follows a long fragment about the danger of possession. Manual work is mentioned in M-II, 187 (among other exhortations). On the ascetic tradition of the Eastern Church cf., e.g.,

There are, admittedly, sparse citations, which incited some scholars to consider Maximus a Hesychast. The possibility of such an association depends on how we define hesychasm. If it is understood very broadly, it would be perhaps justified to call Maximus a Hesychast. If it is defined in a more restricted way, it would be more accurate to say that Maximus drew from the same sources as Hesychasts. We do not find in his works an exposition of the Hesychast doctrine. Some mentions signify that Maximus was acquainted with it but not necessarily that it was his spiritual school.<sup>162</sup>

The most interesting and exceptional text can be found in Maximus' *Praise for St Peter and Paul* (M-II, 89). He refers to a few passages of the Bible which shed light on the central, in this fragment, story, telling Moses' mysterious encounter with God. Moses, covered by God's hand, could see only God's *back parts* but not his face (Ex 33: 20-23). First however, as an introduction, Maximus alludes to the narration of the theophany on Mount Sinai. He says: "let nobody approaches the mount in unclean clothes. Otherwise he will be stoned." He mixes here a text from the book of Exodus (Ex 19: 12-13) with an allusion to the Gospel story of those invited to supper (Mt 22: 11-12). While the book of Exodus just says that only the elect can ascend the mount, Maximus adds the allusion to the Gospel to underline the necessity of the purification of the one who wants to see God. Then he emphasises that one should go beyond that what is external, go beyond the door of the five senses into a mysterious darkness. Only then, avoiding an untempered search of that what exceeds mind (ум), may he, covered with God's hand, regard God's "back parts". It means – continues Maximus – that he, enlightened by God's light and purified by the firmness (твердостью) of God's commandments, may contemplate *словеса* (certainly he thinks: λόγοι) of beings. And he may not regard God's face i.e. inquire into what God is like (какоже есть Богъ). He should settle for what the divine men revealed and rather adjust (соглашати) it to the Holy Words than set one's hope upon one's own wisdom. Finally, Maximus repeats one of his fundamental convictions that: should not be investigated that which is uninvestigable, i.e. the divine mysteries. His understanding of the

---

CHRYSSAVGIS 2008.

<sup>162</sup>On various meanings of the term *Hesychasm*: MEYENDORFF 1974, 292-5. KONOVALOV 2014 quotes these rare fragments from Maximus and provides them with abundant quotations from the Hesychast tradition. He exposes the Hesychast doctrine well but failed to prove that Maximus was a Hesychast. At best it means that he explored this tradition and employed some of its elements. We find in Maximus' works words or expressions close to the Hesychast ideal, e.g.: "житие безмълвно и тихо" (M-II, 159) or: "безстрастныя же жизни" (M-II, 178). SCHULTZE 1963, 185 describes Maximus' thought as *hesychast Palamism* and (ibid. 185-201) tries to prove his thesis. Yet, he uses for this purpose the features which can describe also other hesychast authors (not only Palamas). KONOVALOV 2014, 6. 19-21 rightly says that Schultze meant rather generally Hesychasm and not Palamism which was a specific interpretation of Hesychasm. Besides, there was a certain reserve concerning Hesychasm at the aristocratic Vatopedi. OIKONOMIDES 1998, 49, says that this monastery "did not welcome some of the excesses of the Hesychast."

expression “God’s back parts” is inspired by Gregory of Nazianzus but the Greek modifies the original idea.<sup>163</sup>

There are two layers in this text. One is an exposition of the teaching represented here mainly by Gregory of Nazianzus (but it was developed also by other authors important for Maximus, such as Gregory of Nyssa and Maximus the Confessor), the second is Maximus’ reinterpretation of this tradition with the use of his favourite ideas (the stress on commandments, the interdiction to investigate the uninvestigable, the strong position of the authorities).

We have here certainly a reference to the stages of the spiritual way which can be called hesychast but the same stages were also described by the classics of the Western spirituality who drew on Pseudo-Dionysius. Thus, Maximus mentions *purification (katharsis)* which is the first stage of spiritual development, necessary in order to perceive God’s mysteries. He associates it with the fulfilling of the commandments. He also refers to *illumination (theoria)* which is linked with the contemplation of beings. But he virtually does not refer to the third stage, *deification (theosis)*. It is replaced by the emphasis on God’s unknowability. Contrary to Konovalov’s suggestions, Maximus rather transforms than exposes the Hesychast tradition.<sup>164</sup>

---

163See M-II, 89: “Страхом же многымъ, въздержанием же зълнымъ предистинившу земное сие обложение, и всему внѣ бывшу пяточисленныхъ двери, сице внити въ таинственныи мракъ. Въшедшу же в онъ не испытovati дръзостнѣ, ниже, елико мысль лакомуетъ, невъздѣжно възысковати всякого ума превъсходящаа, нѣ покровена бывша рукою божественною, сирѣчь Божиимъ свѣтомъ озарена, скважнею отъ камени сматрѣти Божиа задняа, сирѣчь, твердостию заповѣдеи предочищенну, словеса сущихъ щаднѣ разсматрѣти. Сиа бо таинственнѣ разумѣтися могутъ Божиа задняа, акы послѣ бывша. На лице же Божие не воззрѣти безъстудно, сирѣчь, како же есть Богъ, не испытovati, радовати же ся, удовлетворяему открытыми от божественныхъ мужей, а вышше их не испытovati, нѣ соглашати ихъ священнословиемъ, ниже грѣдѣтися, на свою уповающе мудрость.” The source of inspiration for Maximus was certainly Gregory of Nazianzus’ 28<sup>th</sup> oration (SC 250, 103-7). Gregory makes a distinction between God as He is known to Himself (His “face”) and as He is known to us (His “back parts”) through his Glory or Majesty manifested among the creatures He produced (cf. BRADSHAW 2004, 168). Maximus distinguishes between God in himself (God’s face) and God seen through his creation (beings). The gloss interprets beings (сущие) as visible and invisible creatures (сирѣчь тварей видимыхъ и невидимыхъ – M-II, 89). Partially (especially as far as the mysterious darkness is concerned) this passage might have been inspired by Gregory of Nyssa, cf. MUCKLE 1945, 82.

164Cf. KONOVALOV 2014, 119-128. The link between purification and fulfilling the commandments is also attested above, text and note 159. It is also interesting that Maximus (in the passage quoted in the previous note) seems to put illumination first and then purification, unless it is just a question of style. Maximus’ approach to *theoria* could be inspired by Gregory of Nyssa, cf. MUCKLE 1945, 79-80 (with reference to *In cantica canticorum* 11) but Gregory goes further than Maximus. According to him the soul not only contemplates His attributes but is led to a union with God. Yet both Gregory and Maximus emphasised that the capacity of human reason is limited and faith is necessary for a deeper knowledge of God, cf. *ibid.*, 81-2. Furthermore, there is only one clear mention about *apatheia* in Maximus’ output (SHEVCHENKO 1997, 14, v. 93). In a variant of the text M-II, 165 a passionless life (жизни бестрастнѣи) is presented as an ideal while in the main text we have: жизни безсмертнѣи. The evoking of the *tabula rasa*, also associated by Konovalov with Hesychasm, appears in Maximus’ text in a pedagogical, and not mystical context (M-II, 256, chapter 13). The shortcomings of Konovalov’s analysis are also visible elsewhere. In a quotation from K-I, 144 (=M-II, 121-2) he sees the *parousia* (KONOVALOV 2014, 120) while Maximus speaks about Jesus’ nativity.

Also in other Maximus' work, we find very little about the transfiguration of human life through ascetic practice or the union with God through deification (*theosis*). His stress on the commandments is certainly something normal for a Christian writer. The particularity consists in the fact that he speaks little about the transforming power of the Pascal mystery of Christ.

Therefore a question arises: how was Maximus' anthropological and ascetic position formed? His use of Maximus the Confessor is instructive. He sometimes gives a quotation, sometimes just refers to the Confessor's doctrine. Instead of a complex theological and ascetic vision, he gives a reduced perspective focused on the fear of God, of fulfilling the commandments and the struggle with passions. His vision of Christian life is poorer than that of the Confessor. There is no tractate on virtues and vices. While a certain reciprocity between God and man "expressed particularly clearly in the relationship between Incarnation and deification" was a characteristic feature of the Confessor's theology, this idea is virtually absent in Maximus the Greek's output. While the former saw human perfection as a participation in God's life, the latter seems to understand salvation as only a return to the primordial perfection which is much less than *theosis* (essential for the Confessor).<sup>165</sup>

Certainly, during his stay on Athos Maximus the Greek had the possibility to study extensively the Confessor's works. So what was the reason of his partial reception of the Confessor's heritage? Did Maximus the Greek not know much more of the Confessor's theology?

Did he adjust this rich and sophisticated thought *ad usum Delphini* of his public, being persuaded that it is too sophisticated for his Muscovite readers? Or did he himself not want to fully follow the way proposed by the Confessor? The same question is also valid where some other of Maximus' patristic sources are concerned.

His use of patristic tradition in Moscow had to be a conscious choice. The inaccuracy of his citations do not explain his selective approach. Quoting from memory was a normal phenomenon not only for the Greek in Moscow who had very limited access to books, but also for humanists who often did not check the correctness of their sources and quoted the

---

<sup>165</sup>The quoted phrase on the reciprocity between God and man see: THUNBERG 1965, 134. One can clearly observe the relationship between Maximus the Confessor's teaching and its reception by Maximus the Greek in his comment to the quotation (or rather a paraphrase) of Maximus the Confessor (M-II, 155-6), cf. above, text and note 154. The problem of the deification was explored by the Florentine philosophers. WEINSTEIN 1970, 199 points out that Pico talks about deification in his *Oratio de dignitate* and quotes Ficino who wrote: "Homo igitur qui universaliter cunctis et viventibus, et non viventibus providet, est quidam Deus" (Ficino, Opera, vol. I, p. 296). Yet, if we assume that Maximus was inspired by Gregory of Nyssa and used his terminology, then the return to the primordial perfection (or: restoration) would be something more than just a return to the past. On Gregory's terminology: SMITH 2006, 220.



fragments that they needed as they remembered them.

Perhaps, one factor that influenced his choice was the observation of Muscovite life and the conviction that, in that context, the commandments should be preached first. Another aspect, probably more important, was his option for a certain patristic tradition. In this respect, Basil the Great and John Chrysostom (with their stress on commandments and obedience) were visibly closer to him than more mystical authors, even if he referred also to such sources.<sup>166</sup>

## DIGNITY OF MAN

Similarly the *context* of his activity in Moscow had to bring him to turn his particular attention to the question of dignity of man. This theme is also present in patristic doctrine but it seems that in this case his thought was something more than a reception of the Eastern Orthodox tradition, and perhaps a lasting impression of his Western experience. Maximus consistently speaks about the *dignity* of the *liberum arbitrium* although this word *dignity* is not used by the Fathers in the context he quotes. The idea of the dignity of man is not alien to the Fathers but the way the Greek understood it might have been an echo of ideas coming from fifteenth century Italy. In Moscow, Maximus' teaching about the dignity of man was certainly a novelty.<sup>167</sup>

If, on the level of content, the dominating element of Maximus' anthropology was of Orthodox origin, the very fact that he focused precisely on anthropological and social problems, emphasising their moral dimension, gives the impression that a disciple of Italian humanists has also a say here. The shift of the humanistic education introduced a new program of study. Instead of the traditional *trivium* and *quadrivium*, the humanist curriculum contained grammar, rhetoric, poetry, history and moral philosophy. All these elements are more or less

---

<sup>166</sup>Most of his patristic studies must have been done on Athos, but Mirandola might have also been important since Gianfrancesco Pico studied the Fathers extensively. Maximus the Greek certainly became acquainted with Maximus the Confessor's thought on Athos because the Confessor was little studied in the West. The first printed editions of his works were published in the seventeenth century. About the number of quotes from the Fathers see above, note 11. For another example when Maximus conveys the patristic teaching (in this case of Gregory of Nyssa) in an impoverished form, see above, note 126. On the stress put on the commandments by Basil and Chrysostom (and the reception of this thought in Muscovy by Joseph of Volokolamsk) cf. ŠPIDLIK 1956, 27-34.

<sup>167</sup>Cf. TRINKAUS 1999<sup>a</sup>. During the patristic period the dignity of man consisted essentially in being created in God's image. E.g. for Gregory of Nyssa this notion contained also the capacity to choose freely, cf. VERBEKE 1979, 154 and GREGORY OF NYSSA, *De hominis opificio*, 136 B-C (chapter IV), cf. also SC 6, 94, note 1. Maximus wrote about the dignity of human *liberum arbitrium* many times in one of his letters to Karpov (M-I, 256- 94, e.g. 266); in M-I, 333. In Z-259 he says that if the stars decide about virtues, truth and untruth, wealth and poverty "гдѣ иже по образу Божию и по подобию *санѣ* [my Italic - ZS] нашъ? Гдѣ савмовластное и самосвободное нашего произволения?" Cf. also M-II, 278: "[...] не познавъ своя чести, сирѣчь нетлѣнню и безсмертию санѣ." As a contrast, Maximus mentions humiliation of one's soul "[...] над златом образѣ мѣдѣ навести" - M-II, 179.

present in Maximus' work but the human experience, in its individual and social dimensions, occupies the central place in the Greek's output. As far as an individual human being is concerned, the idea of the dignity of man reveals the uniqueness of every human person who, as a creation endowed with possibility to choose freely, is responsible for realisation of his or her vocation. Perhaps Maximus' anthropology is the most original and inventive part of his legacy.<sup>168</sup>

The same idea of the dignity of man can also seriously modify social relationships and it is not accidental that Maximus devoted so much space to social problems.

#### 4. SOCIO-RELIGIOUS IDEAS AND SOCIAL ETHICS

Michael Trivolis lived in a time of reform. In the religious sphere it was the Reformation of which the portents were already perceptible in Italy when he stayed there. The new religious ideas formed also the social space and that fact is particularly visible in the Florence of Savonarola's time. Therefore, when looking for the origins of Maximus' social sensitivity, we have again to juxtapose his Western, Italian, experience and his Byzantine formation. His closeness to the circle of the conservative Savonarolians who strove to implement fra Girolamo's vision of the *renovatio Ecclesiae* might be one important factor. Another one could be the patristic social thought that he had had to study on Athos. Perhaps the memory of patriarch Niphon's social sensitivity was for him of equal importance.

#### MONASTIC LIFE AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

From among the many topics of Maximus' social reflection, it is logical to begin with his own environment, with monastic life. The Greek himself indicates this path. He had a clear conscience of the necessity to introduce genuinely Christian standards first in his own home. Apart from that, monastic life was a model of Christian life in general. Its deformation was the *corruptio optimi* while the flowering of monastic virtues had – or at least should have had – an edifying impact on society as a whole.<sup>169</sup>

---

168Cf. SINITSYNA 1977, 147-8 who emphasised that the most important aspect of Maximus' contribution to Muscovite thought in the sixteenth century was precisely his moral reflection. The importance of the individual human being and his or her decisions is perhaps also reflected in Maximus' care of the editing and conservations of his works, cf. above, chapter II, text and note 501 and also SINITSYNA 1977, 9.

169On links between monastic and political structures in Muscovy: BOGATYREV 2000, 59-60. An analogy can be also found in Manuel II's typikon for the monasteries of Mount Athos (from June 1406, so close to Maximus' times). One interesting example can be also found in the *Typikon* of Manuel II Palaiologos (BMFD, 1620, 6) where both democracy and tyranny are treated as unwelcome extremes both in state and monastery. The

Monastic life in Muscovy at that time can hardly be called exemplary. Both Maximus and other observers noticed abuses, lack of education, drunkenness or excessive concern for material things. It seems that the Greek was especially outraged at the obtaining of hegumenship through bribery.<sup>170</sup> He points therefore at Athonite and Western monasteries to show a positive example. Athos was obviously closer to his heart and – knowing of some of its frailty – he attempts to defend it. The comments on Western friars are accompanied almost each time by a phrase on their unorthodoxy but are full of unconcealed and gratuitous respect for their virtues.<sup>171</sup> A few elements in Western religious life (especially in a mendicant friars' life) attracted Maximus' special attention: their way of government which favoured strict observance, the monastic discipline and the concern for the spiritual growth of friars (Maximus emphasised especially their position towards material goods and the modesty of their superiors), their assiduous study of the Bible and their apostolic fervour.

#### *Vita apostolica*

His preferences are therefore very close to the ideal of the *vita apostolica*, a formula used in the West from the time of the Gregorian reform, then by the mendicant orders and later by dissidents. It included three fundamental principles: imitation of the primitive Church, the desire for the salvation of souls and evangelical poverty. The idea of following the life of the Apostles existed also in the East. It is very probable that Maximus' translation of the entry “Ἀποστολική πολιτεία” from the Suida Lexicon was a step in the search of Eastern examples. This entry contains however only a brief clause on individual ascetic life without any allusion to pastoral activity or preaching so it was insufficient and perhaps even disappointing for Maximus.<sup>172</sup> We can assume that – for lack of convenient incarnation of his ideal among

---

prosperous cities – says the *Typikon* – are “administered by the council of the best citizens”. And further: “It would be right to have nothing affecting the monastery determined without the counsel of the leading monks.”

170See: Z 244-5 (a direct mention of bribery to obtain hegumenship) and Z 242-3 where indirectly, through a contrast, Maximus points at imperfections of Muscovite monasteries. In M-I, 126 Maximus mentioned monks passing from one monastery to another which was not accepted either in the West (Z 243) or on Athos (M-I, 126). On Maximus' censure of Muscovite monastic life see also below, note 180. The deformation of the Muscovite monastic life is visible in the documents of the Stoglav, cf. EMCHENKO 2010, 95-6. Foreigners noticed imperfections of Muscovite monasticism too. E.g. FLETCHER, Commonwealth, 84v, says in general about the clergy: “the whole Cleargie beyng vtterlie unlearned both for other knowledge, and in the word of God”, cf. also p. 89. He also describes deficiencies of Muscovite monasticism, *ibid.*, 87v-89.

171On Athos see: chapter II. On Western monasteries – the *Terrible Story* (Z 239-258) and a short text *On Franciscans and Dominicans* (RZHIGA 1935-36, 99-101). On unorthodoxy: Z 254 and RZHIGA 1935-36, 100.

172Maximus' account of Western religious life can be found primarily in the *Terrible Story* (Z 239-258, esp. 242-8) and in a short report *On Franciscans and Dominicans* (RZHIGA 1935-36, 99-101). On *vita apostolica* see: McDONNELL 1955, 15. On translation from the *Suida*: BULANIN 1984, 148-9, 162 and 173. Cf. also below, note 194. DENISSOFF 1943, 299 and IVANOV 1972-74, part I, 154 emphasised that the Western apostolic model of religious life influenced Maximus more than Athos. Some stress on preaching activity can be also found in Joseph of Volokolamsk but in a special context. He admitted that monks had the right “on their own to leave their cloisters or hermitages and wage battle against heresy in the face of indifferent or hostile authorities...”

Eastern monks – he decided to turn to the Western understanding of the *vita apostolica*. His desire for apostolic life was certainly inspired by Savonarola and his brethren but it did not end when he left the Dominicans. He defined monks as those who imitate apostolic life. He underlined many times the necessity of preaching the Gospel and demonstrated how harmful the lack of an *edifying word* was to the Church. He also recalled that Savonarola who, criticising the contemptible behaviour of pastors of the Church, had preached: “If we had lived suitably to the Gospel of Christ Saviour, all infidel people would have converted to the Lord, seeing our angel-like life...” (Z 252). The understanding of monastic life as the apostolic life was for Maximus not just a theoretical idea. He himself, when he had been sent by his monastery to collect alms, took advantage of this opportunity to preach the Orthodox faith.<sup>173</sup>

The stress on study and a preaching activity was clearly of Western origin. We have seen before how uneasy the Muscovite monks’ attitude was towards books and study. In the Byzantine world the majority of monks was similarly not very cultivated. There were among them learned men but Maximus virtually never speaks about them. Only in his memories of Western monasteries does he underline the wisdom of the religious, thorough study of the Bible and – resulting from it – preaching. Such an approach was a characteristic feature of the ideal of the apostolic life.<sup>174</sup>

One more element of this ideal was the voluntary poverty so this is not surprising that Maximus devoted much attention to the question of monastic possessions. The polemics concerning this subject was linked with the confrontation between idiorhythmic and cenobitic

---

GOLDFRANK 2007, 374.

173 Maximus defines monastic life as imitation of apostles (M-II, 144): “намъ инокомъ, апостольское житие подражающимъ...” In M-II, 225 he describes monastic life as angelic and apostolic. For him the life like the Apostles means also to earn one’s living with one’s own hands (M-II, 187). It is probable that not only Savonarola but generally the Dominican traditions of itinerant preachers was for Maximus an inspiration to adopt the ideal of apostolic life. In M-II, 120 the lack of an edifying word and pastoral care is mentioned. In Z 245 he underlines that Western religious preach and in Z 248 he says that blessed are those who study the Word of God and explain it to believers. Cf. also Z 252 – fragment quoted in chapter II, note 73. Last three fragments come from the *Terrible Story*. His own itinerant preaching is mentioned in K-II, 365. Cf. also: “[...] лучше [...] ниществующимъ за Христа обходити грады и страны [...] нежели обливаться серебром и златомъ и ограженомъ быти землями и селы, кромѣ заповѣди Господню.” (M-II, 227) Obviously Maximus idealised Western religious life. He had to know its deformations which, at the same time, scandalised e.g. Martin Luther. The Greek however needed it to stress the apostolic dimension, important for him and he sincerely pointed to Savonarola’s exemplary life. NB, Ioannes Fabri OP says that there are no monks-preachers in Muscovy. Besides, he contrasts the Muscovites who persist in the Christian faith with the crowd of those who departed from the faith of their fathers in Germany. Fabri attempted to struggle this way with the reformation. He had no personal experience of Muscovy. He wrote his account on the base of his conversation with Muscovite envoys, cf. KUDRIAVTSEV 1997, 10. 14.

174 In three of Maximus’ published accounts on Mount Athos, in two of them books are just mentioned: when Maximus says that those monks who know how to read, have in their cell a book, RZHIGA 1935-36, 97 and in the context of polemics against Islam, M-I, 131. In his detailed description of Mount Athos (M-I, 119-32) Maximus does not even mention libraries! About Western priories: RZHIGA 1935-36, 100 and Z 245. 248-9. 254. On the place of the Bible and preaching in the *vita apostolica* see: McDONNELL 1955, esp. 17.

way of monastic life and particularly with the controversy of how monastic poverty should be understood. Both sides had weighty arguments. Followers of the cenobitic model emphasised that they were the most faithful to the vow of poverty because they did not accept having any private properties whereas the idiorhythmic monks did. The latter answered that it was only an appearance of poverty when monks, admittedly, did not own anything in private but when their monasteries were very rich. Maximus himself ridiculed the idea that individual poverty justifies collective wealth.<sup>175</sup>

For him monastic life, in general, was incompatible with the amassing of riches. He very resolutely reasoned that riches possessed by monasteries meant a return to a mundane way of life and infidelity to religious vows. He showed that it led inevitably to abuses, was detrimental to spiritual life and monks in rich monasteries were much more exposed to the passions. He explained that wealth and acquiring goods are linked (съпряжена) with injustice and avarice. The link between his ascetic exhortations and his call for social justice is a characteristic feature of Maximus' reflection. It can be also seen in his commentary on the Beatitudes from Matthew 5 which is essentially a companion to spiritual, monastic life. Yet, the question of social justice occupies an important place in this text. Injustice to the poor, the subordinates, was for Maximus absolutely incompatible with monastic life (cf. e.g. M-II, 211-12).<sup>176</sup>

Maximus, using his literary talent and with fervour, showed the dramatic contrast between the wealth of monasteries and the poverty of peasants dependant on them. He says: "it was commanded to you that you should feed the poor and not to drink their blood by usury; to serve others and not to rule over them" (M-II, 188). Alluding to the parable of the Pharisee and publican, he says that, although the Pharisee is not approved, he gave tithes of all that he

---

175On poverty as an aspect of the idea of the apostolic life: McDONNELL 1955, 16. Maximus points at poverty as an aspect of the apostolic life in M-II, 209: "[...] от всѣх сих обнажену жити прочее апостольскы, въ всяком нестяжании и нищетѣ и безмльвии [...]" Metropolitan Daniel in his rule (DANIEL, О иноческом законе, 161) says that idiorhythmic monks are disposed to possess more than they need, even riches: "Аще ли же хошем Господа ради обнищати и отринуту от себе особнаго стяжания и особнаго рукоделия и особных вещей, а довольство и все имущее вси вкупе в казне обще, и чрез таковой покой особно богатство снискающе не по нужи; то убо не токмо от Бога осуждени будем и zde и тамо, аще не покаемся, но и от своєю совести всячески осуждаемы будем: понеже неправедне богатеяши и не по преданию Святых Отец живуще..." Maximus' words in M-II, 228-9 sound as if an answer to this passage. In this imaginary discussion the non-possessor ironically replies to a possessor's argument (very similar to that given by metropolitan Daniel) that common riches are like common fornication with a prostitute or a participation in a common robbery. On the question of possessors vs non-possessors controversy see above, chapter II, note 345.

176See: M-II, 220 (on the link between possession and passions, and that possession mean a return to mundane life) and M-II, 225 (about incompatibility between possession and monastic life and examples of injustice towards subordinates). The commentary to the Beatitudes: *Слово о покаании велми душеполезно* (M-II, no. 19). On spiritual damage provoked by possession see also above, text and note 157.

possessed, and we [monks] do not even give to the poor a tenth part of our possessions (although we are commanded to give everything) but we deprive them of their property through unjust usury (M-II, 224-5). The condemnation of loans at an unfairly high percentage is especially frequent in Maximus works. In one place he shows the results of usury and describes the peasants who – unable to pay the debt – were either banished from their villages or turned into slaves.<sup>177</sup>

Therefore Maximus considers indispensable that monks earn their living by their own efforts (what was also a constant element of the Western idea of apostolic life) and not exploiting the work of others. The only justifiable possession was the necessary for life, earned by one's own just work (M-II, 225). Probably the *just work* in this text was understood by Maximus as manual work but his praise of Savonarolian Dominicans indicates that he was ready to accept a broader meaning of this term. Dominicans did not work to earn their living and nevertheless they merited his recognition. So if he considered the alms they received as justified it was probably because they *worked* by preaching and praying. The Greek admired both Carthusians who earned their living (as many Eastern monks) and Dominicans who begged for alms.<sup>178</sup>

So, in the domain of monastic possessions Maximus' position was far from a narrow dogmatism. He was ready to accept various forms of religious life if their foundations were compatible to the Gospel and to the monastic vows. The postulate that monks should work could be realised in various ways. The Greek was ready to accept that monks possessed that which was necessary for life provided that they did not exploit the work of others. It seems that he applied this principle both to individual and collective possessions.<sup>179</sup>

---

177On the fate of peasants, expulsions and slavery: M-II, 191; M-II, 223; M-II, 225; M-II, 211-12. More quotations from Maximus on injustice towards peasants in RZHIGA 1934, 11-12. Generally, M-II, no. 14, 15 and 20 (cf. below, note 180) are devoted to the question of monastic discipline (to show the contrast between monastic vows and Muscovite monks real life) and the defence of the poor. Maximus also emphasised that Savonarola opposed usury as one of the two main sins of Florence (Z 249).

178On the Western idea see McDONNELL 1955, 28: "observance of the Pauline injunction to work remained consistently a prerequisite for the *vita apostolica*". On *just work* in M-II, 225: "праведным трудом добывать себѣ потребнаа." On manual work: M-II, 187; RZHIGA 1935-36, 96. An indirect argument can be found in M-II, 188 where the Soul is summoned to feed the poor of her own (Soul's) work. The whole passage is written in singular and there is no allusion to common property. Therefore IVANOV 1974, 195 is not correct when he says that Maximus forbade monks to have anything as personal property. At least some property might have been at the disposition of a monk even if it was considered as a part of the common property of the community. Cf. also the quotation from Z 244 in the next note.

179In the *Terrible story* (Z 242) Maximus says about the first Carthusians that they distributed their properties to the poor, leaving little resources for their monastery for their livelihood. Cf. also Z 244 ("Нѣсть у них нично же свое, но вся обща, нестяжание же любят, акы велие благожуховное") and M-II, no. 20. Maximus' common sense is especially visible in M-II, 220-1 and 227. Maximus represented a more individual approach to the problems of monastic life. He accepted e.g. that monks keep necessary books in their cells while metropolitan Daniel was against it. He accepted only the common reading being persuaded that monks are not

Maximus' views on monastic life underwent some evolution but all the essential elements, especially those concerning wealth, remained unchanged. In his early works, before 1525, we do not find a direct criticism of Muscovite monasticism, of its possessions, certainly because of his scant knowledge of Muscovite realities, especially outside the capital. Nevertheless, already then, we can notice Maximus' characteristic distance towards riches, his conviction about the incompatibility between monastic life and wealth. Later, when he got to know more, he consistently denounced the deformations of monastic life.<sup>180</sup>

#### *Broader social context*

When he considered life outside the walls of a monastery, his approach was more nuanced but his main principles were the same. In his two works written after the great fire which destroyed Tver with its richly decorated cathedral (1537), the Greek interpreted this disaster as God's punishment. Yet, it was not the grandiose resources which were used to decorate the cathedral that evoked Maximus protest, but the contrast between the richness in the church and the misery of the poor people. He wrote that if everything that had been done there for God's glory had been earned by honest work, God would have accepted it (M-II, 232). When, however, the poor suffer one cannot care for the splendour of church and forget the needy.<sup>181</sup>

As it was said, monastic life was a kind of model of the whole society. So even if most of Maximus' criticism was focused on the ecclesiastical reality it could be and was applied to the whole society. As a matter of fact, society was not seen as a reality separated from the Church.

Apart from the monastic path, another way to live a Christian life was for Maximus

---

able to understand the Bible and the Fathers on their own and doing that they may fall into heresy. Therefore he allowed only an appointed preacher to read and interpret the holy texts, cf. ZHUROVA 2016, 48-9 and above, text and note 52.

180In the first period, before 1525, Maximus wrote a letter to Basil III on Athonite monasteries (M-I, 119-32), and a short description of Athos for Patrikeev's *Kormchaya* (M-I, 341-2). The dating of the *Terrible Story* is uncertain. RZHIGA 1934, 6 and IVANOV 1969, no. 229 maintain that it was written before 1525. Such a dating would explain the vividness and freshness of the description. If this dating is true, it would be the earliest censure of Muscovite monastic life. Yet, Sinitsyna dates it rather after 1525. After imprisonment Maximus wrote on this subject in *Словеса душеполезна зѣло внимающим ихъ, бесѣдуетъ Умъ къ Души своеи* (M-II, no. 15); *Бесѣда Души и Уму, по вопросу и отвѣту, о еже откуда страсти ражаются въ нихъ* (M-II, no. 14) and *Стязание о извѣстномъ иночьскомъ жительствѣ, лица же стязующихся Филоктимонъ да Актимонъ* (M-II, no. 20). On other unpublished works see: ZHUROVA 2016, 46 and 52.

181Two works devoted to the fire in Tver were published in M-II, no. 21 and 22 (pp. 231-40). Cf. chapter II, text and notes 491 and 492. Maximus saw also other causes of God's wrath besides the wrong use of ecclesiastic wealth: drunkenness, injustice and debauchery (M-II, 234-5). Yet, the helplessness of the poor took a great place in his work. He enumerated all these sins and vices to prompt his readers to repentance and conversion, to a life according to the commandments (M-II, 233-4). It is not an accident that Maximus wrote a few works to urge repentance (M-II, no. 19; SHEVCHENKO 1997, 11ff; Z 71-75).

family life. It seems that he did not see any other possibility to attain salvation. In the second model, honestly acquired possessions are not damnable but the call to yield good fruit to God sounds with the same power as in the case of monks. Maximus summons everybody to cultivate the virtues of love and justice, to reject transient riches. Turning to those who had families he called on them to care for the poor, to be merciful and to aid the weak and vulnerable.<sup>182</sup>

His attitude towards amassing riches depended on one's way of life and his criticism was most sharply articulated in reference to monks. Yet, his denunciation of social injustice, especially usury, concerned all people.<sup>183</sup>

The Greek was not the only one who saw the injustice and denounced it. Yet, not all were unanimous about the question of how to find a remedy. A secularisation of ecclesiastical property was definitely not Maximus' idea but the appeal to share voluntarily one's wealth appears frequently in his work. It was natural in the case of those who had chosen a path of monastic life. The Greek persistently called on them to be faithful to their vow of poverty. He also encouraged others to get rid of their possessions, to give them to the poor and to enter a monastery. One of the most striking examples is Maximus' advice to a nun that she should distribute the unjustly acquired wealth, to forgive debts, to destroy the debt documents (кабалы) and to free indebted people, even providing them with a livelihood! It was *spiritual* advice for a person who was about to die or at least who was meditating on her mortality. Yet, this recommendation, even if he did not intend to cause a social revolution or formulate a universal rule, had the potential to provoke profound social changes.<sup>184</sup>

---

182On the two ways of Christian life and an appeal to share with the poor also for those who chose family life, see: M-II, no. 32 esp. p. 288-9 (in the Rumiantzev collection this text is entitled: "Поучение, яко мощно и легко есть спастися и мирском жителстве", cf. ZHUROVA 2016, 51); BULANIN 1984, 209-10. Cf. again Maximus' unpublished work mentioned by ZHUROVA 2016, 52. Cf. also M-II, 220 (even before the Law, Abraham and other patriarchs shared their richness); and BULANIN 1984, 206 (advice for a princess).

183The Greek wrote extensively against injustice in all possible spheres of social life, not only ecclesiastical, e.g. Z 219-238; Z 26-43. About usury in many places, e.g. M-II, 221; M-II, no. 39; M-II, no. 15; Z 219-238. Cf. also above, note 177.

184Maximus' appeals to monks to get rid of possessions sound especially in *Стязание о извѣстном иночьскомъ жителствѣ* (M-II, no. 20). Cf. also BULANIN 1984, 205-6. The Greek, in a letter to a nun (BULANIN 1984, 208), says that it is a work worthy of monastic life: "раздаание събранныхъ имений и стяжаний моихъ всякою неправдою и лихотмствомъ, оставити длѣгъ длѣжникомъ моимъ, раздрати кабалы, неправды всякыя и немилосердіа испльнены, отпустити в свободу еще с жалованиемъ люди моя кобалныя, да быша меня по смерти моей благословили, а не прокляли; а буду в чемъ обидилъ кого насиліемъ, каятися ему, и аще можемъ отдадимъ ему взятое силою и неправдою." In Muscovy even up until the mid-seventeenth century and onward monks and nuns descending from rich families possessed lands individually and freely disposed of their properties, MILIUTIN 1859-61, kn. 3, otd. 1, 157. Some scholars suppose that it was under Maximus' influence that Bashkin freed his peasants, cf. IVANOV 1972-74, part III, 127. For comparison: Joseph of Volokolamsk also cared for the poor, demanded social justice and the Volokolamsk monastery was known for his generosity towards the needy. Yet Joseph accepted the existing social order, cf. HAMBURG 2016, 40-1.



### *Innovation and continuity in Maximus' thought*

This appeal to free serfs which went beyond the mainstream of the social thought of his time is just one example of the Greek's originality. This fact induces us to examine in which way he continued the traditional orthodox reflection and when his ideas introduced some novelty (and of which origin) to socio-religious thought. It would be futile to maintain that Maximus had only one dominant source of inspiration in his reflection on monastic and social life.<sup>185</sup> Here, as in many other areas, he was eclectic. Reflecting on monastic life he incontestably appreciated some elements from the Western tradition (the stress on study, preaching), some others were a part of primitive monastic observance, common to East and West.

Maximus aimed at the renewal and integrity of Christian life. His social idea was a spiritual one, social issues were inseparably linked with religious ones. He believed that societies or states fall through the immoral life of their citizens and their infidelity to God's commandments but are strong when faithful to God.<sup>186</sup> It was obviously not his own invention. Such a motive had its roots in the Old Testament prophets (e.g. Is 58; the whole book of Amos) and then had been repeated by Christian authors throughout the centuries. In this broad stream we can however sometimes point more specifically to Maximus' sources of inspiration. The impact of the Fathers of the Church is hardly measurable since we deal most often with inspiration and not with quotations. Yet, the influence of one of the Fathers can be discerned more clearly. If we take into account Maximus' style, with sharply defined contrast and comparisons between ecclesiastical wealth and the misery of the poor, John Chrysostom's model is visible in Maximus' denouncements.<sup>187</sup>

We have to distinguish, however, between the origins of Maximus' ideas and the texts of the authorities that were used to support them. Certainly, he first developed his thought and then searched for patristic passages to support it. Such an order is testified in his translations.

---

<sup>185</sup>IKONNIKOV 1915, 561f, argued that Savonarola's influence was decisive. DENISSOFF 1943, 298-300 underlined both Western and Athonite impact but considered the former (esp. Savonarola's) as more important in many dimensions. RZHIGA 1934, 15-19 thought that Patrikeev's impact was the most important. The most balanced is Kazakova's position. She thinks that in the first period Maximus based on Byzantine and Western exemplars, later he adopted the perspective of Muscovite non-possessors and developed Patrikeev's thought, KAZAKOVA 1970, 176. Yet, one has to notice that there was a mutual influence between Maximus and Patrikeev. Besides, there is no evidence that later Patrikeev's influence was important for Maximus. Rather modifications of Maximus' views were linked with the broadening of his knowledge about Muscovite monasticism, as we have emphasised above.

<sup>186</sup>See: M-II, 88 (on Athens, Rome and Constantinople); M-II, 232; Z-231.

<sup>187</sup>For John Chrysostom cf. his *In Mattheum* 50, 4, quoted above, chapter II, text and note 491. The fact that Maximus was inspired by the role of the Old Testament prophets is visible in numerous quotations and testified by the Prophetic miscellany, contained in one of Maximus' MSS, see: OLMSTED 1987, 30ff. Cf. also, e.g., Z 229.

We find in Maximus' manuscripts translated fragments from the Fathers, relating to concrete topics, such as usury, unworthy bishops or poverty.<sup>188</sup> The texts had to be chosen as a support for an idea that had appeared earlier. One of these direct impulses was certainly the remembrance of Savonarola's religious and social activity. Some of them are particularly visible in Maximus' work. Fra Girolamo strongly emphasised monastic poverty but did not hesitate to spend a large sum of money to purchase Pico's library, an instrument that served the mission of the Order. His Greek follower likewise underlined the importance of monastic poverty but advocated flexibility where it was necessary or fruitful. Savonarola paid special attention to the care for the poor and the redistribution of goods and Maximus demonstrated the same attitude.<sup>189</sup> We can infer that the Greek's social sensitivity was formed under Savonarola's impact, reinforced by the reading of John of Chrysostom and it revealed itself fully in Muscovy. When he came into contact with the reality of local life he looked at it in the light of what he had seen or learned from Savonarola.

Eventually Savonarola's overwhelming idea of the *renovatio Ecclesiae*, which was also shared by his followers such as Gianfrancesco Pico, corresponds well to Maximus' multidimensional efforts to renew Muscovite ecclesiastical life.<sup>190</sup>

Apart from patristic and Western inspirations, a less obvious question should also be asked about a possible Muscovite authors' influence on Maximus. More often it was he who played a role of authority for them. If we however investigate questions of irregularities in monastic life or social injustice, obviously he was not the only one who noticed and condemned them. Such denunciations are to be found in various authors and in some anonymous works, independently of their position in monastic and social polemics. They existed before Maximus' arrival in Moscow and also among his contemporaries. Both Vassian Patrikeev and metropolitan Daniel wrote about them.<sup>191</sup> At the factual level, they censured the

---

188Maximus translated some entire works of the Fathers but there are also many fragments translated by him which concern often a particular subject. For a provisory catalogue of Maximus' patristic translations see: BULANIN 1984, 182-190. NB, similarly Maximus dealt with the translated entries of the *Suida Lexicon*, a part of them is organised in thematic groups, *ibid.*, 136-162

189On Savonarola's care for the poor and the redistribution of good: POLIZZOTTO 1994, 30 with further quotations. Savonarola's enemies attributed to him the fraticelli's views (that monks cannot possess anything) considered as heretical to fight him more easily (RIDOLFI 1981, 175 who quotes *Prediche sopra Giobe*, EON, vol. II, 218). In fact, Savonarola was much more flexible. He accepted monastic properties when they served for preaching but was severe with respect to brothers' attachment to temporal goods (RIDOLFI 1981, 100-102). Savonarola's love of poverty and his appeal to share with the poor are emphasised by PICO, *Vita Savonarolae*, 132. Maximus' flexibility is shown, e.g., in his approach to the question of idiorhythmy, see above, chapter II, text and notes 214-216 and the present chapter, text and note 178.

190Cf. POLIZZOTTO 1994, 163, who mentions, among other things, Gianfrancesco Pico's work: *De reformandis moribus...* addressed to the Fathers of the Fifth Council of Lateran.

191Apart from Patrikeev's (*Slovo otvetno* or *Sobranie nekoego startsa*) and Daniel's (e.g. his unpublished missive

same vices and at least once they even used in this context the same quotations from Pseudo-Chrysostom. Daniel seems to be equally concerned about the regularity of monastic life as Maximus. He rejects everything that is against the rule and criticises moral vices as greed and condemnable social behaviour as usury. Yet there are serious differences between them. Collective possessions owned by monasteries are not a problem for the metropolitan. Neither do we find in his works this merciful regard for poor peasants and an appeal to share richness with the poor, which are so characteristic of the Greek.<sup>192</sup>

The question of the mutual influences between Maximus and Patrikeev was different because they collaborated and agreed on fundamental ideas. They shared the same beliefs, particularly in the fields of monastic and social issues: they desired to renew monastic life and to purge it of everything contradictory to its substance, they objected to social injustice, especially committed by monks and they wanted the ecclesiastical wealth to be used to help those in need. Both of them underlined the contrast between monks' rich life and the poverty of peasants on monastic estates. Sometimes they use similar examples, like the already mentioned case of the inhabitants of villages owned by monasteries who were either banished or reduced to slavery when they were unable to pay their debts.<sup>193</sup>

They certainly influenced each other. Since Patrikeev began his polemics before Maximus' arrival in Moscow, and the latter did not know a lot about the Muscovite reality at the beginning of his northern adventure, one can infer that the first information and the first critical assessments of the state of the Muscovite Church and especially monasticism Maximus

---

to hegumen Paphnutius, cf. ZHUROVA 2016, 47-50; cf. also PLIGUZOV 2002, 94) works, see also the *Беседы валаамских чудотворцев* or *Слово къ вѣрнымъ*, quoted by RZHIGA 1934, 21-2 or some documents linked with Stoglav, *ibid.*, 35. These texts confirm the veracity of Maximus' descriptions. NB, IVANOV 1972-74, part I, 124 emphasised that Maximus' writing, compared to Daniel's, Joseph of Volokolamsk's or other, are a real protest to injustice and not a moralisation or a display of *совестливость*. His argumentation is however quite subjective.

192 Among Maximus' translated fragments from the Fathers (see: BULANIN 1984, 187, no. 22) there is a passage from Pseudo-Chrysostom (PG 59, 560-561), used also by Joseph Volotski and metropolitan Daniel (ZHMAKIN 1881, 411). On Daniel cf. also: RZHIGA 1934, 23. 28 and IKONNIKOV 1915, 490. When Daniel says that unworthy monks spend the Church's incomes for their own luxurious life and contrary to their purpose, he enumerates, in the same breath, that it should be spent for the Church's needs, for wanderers and for the poor (*ibid.*, 23).

193 IKONNIKOV 1915, 399-400 and RZHIGA 1934, 16-17. 28, pointed to these similarities. Rzhiga on the pages 17-19 emphasises Patrikeev's impact on Maximus in some cases. KAZAKOVA 1970, 173-5 shows both similarities and differences between Patrikeev and Maximus. She recapitulates that more united them than divided. Patrikeev, as Maximus, writes on monastic discipline (KAZAKOVA 1960, 265), on social injustice and the necessity to use ecclesiastical wealth to help the poor (*ibid.*, 266), on mercy (he also summons to share goods that are only *entrusted* to owners): “[...] аки божии венрны строителе *ввереное* [my Italic] им богатство скудным и убогим разделяху боголюбезне, по устроению правильному и господьскому повелению” (*ibid.*, 268). On peasants see above, note 177, for Maximus' and in KAZAKOVA 1960, 258 for Patrikeev's works. In SUDNYE SPISKI, 102, v. 9-10, Medovartsev testifies that Patrikeev and Maximus said about the metropolitan and bishops: “Им надобно пиры и села искати и смеяться с воры”. One can doubt that they really said that but the image of their conformity, here and elsewhere, seems to be genuine.

received from prince Vassian. The latter needed the erudition of the Greek monk to support his argumentation but, possibly, adopted some of Maximus' convictions. We can observe their collaboration in Patrikeev's *Slovo otvetno* which contains many similarities to Maximus' ideas: denunciations of the injustice against peasants, appeals to preserve the radicalism of monastic life and especially of the vow of poverty. In this work Vassian quotes two passages from Basil the Great that had been unknown in Slavonic tradition before Maximus translated them in Moscow. Quite an incidental mention in Basil the Great's letter to Amphilochius that he had no servant by whom to send the letter becomes for Patrikeev a proof of the Father's modest way of life and therefore an example of the ideal of the apostolic life. Basil's mention had to be striking against the background of the richness of the Muscovite bishops and monks.<sup>194</sup>

There were also discrepancies between Maximus and Patrikeev that reflect differences of their personalities. They are visible on the level of literary style. Prince Vassian was often ironic and sometime haughty while Maximus adopted rather a humble tone. The former named people whom he criticised, the latter used to say: "we committed sins, we are guilty". The Greek seems to be more sensitive to the misery of real people and not only incompatibility between the Muscovite monasticism and the tradition. In this respect he was perhaps more humanistic.<sup>195</sup>

Maximus the Greek's socio-religious thought is not easy to classify. He drew from various currents but cannot be described as a proponent of a precisely described school of thought or of spirituality. His connections with authors quoted by him have rather a form of inspiration than dependence.

## LAW AND ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

Maximus certainly was not a theoretician of law but his observations in this field deserve a mention because they give another opportunity to perceive how various cultural traditions were assimilated by him and incorporated into the system of his ideas.

---

<sup>194</sup>Patrikeev's quotations from Basil on the apostolic life can be found in the *Slovo otvetno*: KAZAKOVA 1960, 259 and from the letter to Amphilochius: *ibid.*, 266-7 (this quotation corresponds to PG 32, 715-16C=PG 138, 644D). On Maximus' translation of the entry *Apostolic life* (based on Basil the Great) from the *Suida Lexicon* see: PLIGUZOV 2002, 87-8 and above, text and note 172. On his translation of Basil's letter to Amphilochius: PLIGUZOV 2002, 88-9 (cf. also BULANIN 1984, 183, no. 8). More on Basil's passages in the *Slovo otvetno*: PLIGUZOV 2002, 87-90 and 184-5.

<sup>195</sup>RZHIGA 1934, 20 shows stylistic distinctions between Maximus and Vassian; KAZAKOVA 1960, 123 emphasises that it is impossible to identify an ideological current with a distinct literary tradition. Proponents of the same idea used various literary forms to present their beliefs. As a matter of fact, in the *Slovo otvetno* (an earlier work) Patrikeev also says *we*, *ibid.*, 257-8. On Maximus' sensitivity to the problems of real people and his ability to render social problems in well captured scenes see: KAZAKOVA 1970, 176 and RZHIGA 1934, 21.

Appeals for justice in the judiciary are known in Russian literature from early times, beginning with the *Russkaia Pravda*, Serapion Vladimirskii's works, then the collection *Merilo pravednoe* (Мерило праведное) or Photius, metropolitan of Kiev's writings (NB, Maximus used his *Nomokanon* in his work). All these texts, to a lesser or greater extent, repeat the biblical call (which is reflected in the *Merilo*) to protect the poor, with a particular stress on widows, orphans and foreigners (пришельцы). They also emphasised that those who govern and judge are responsible before God for their duties.<sup>196</sup>

#### *Maximus' contemporaries*

For Maximus' contemporaries, both his adversaries and followers, the question of justice was not alien either. Fedor Karpov wrote to the metropolitan Daniel that: "a great many superiors do not look after their subordinates but let their disloyal intermediaries oppress them."<sup>197</sup> The Metropolitan incites a disgraced dignitary to confess his sins and asked him some detailed questions: "Did you judge unjustly, slander, reproach or laugh at someone? Were you uncharitable to the poor and lowly? Did you fail to protect widows and help the unfortunate? Were you cruel and unmerciful to orphans?"<sup>198</sup>

#### *Maximus and Ivan Bersen'-Beklemishev*

This thread appears also in Maximus' thought, less before 1525 but more clearly afterwards. In the first period, his reflections are focused rather on the general foundations of the social order and the sources of just law. His exchange on justice (правда) with Ivan Bersen'-Beklemishev, recorded in the minutes of the investigation in 1525 is instructive. The source is far from being impartial but there is no reason to suspect that the ideas of the interlocutors were invented by the prosecutors. Bersen' expressed a belief that "a country which diverts its customs does not stand for long". Maximus' answer is nuanced. If a country violates God's commandments – he says – it will be faced with God's punishment. As far as sovereigns' and local customs are concerned, rulers change them for the good of their states. Maximus clearly stands in opposition not only to Bersen' but also to the entire Muscovite tradition which privileged *old rules*. His reserve towards such an approach could hardly be an

---

196Cf. RZHIGA 1934, 40-6. He thinks that in the second half of the fourteenth and in the fifteenth century (contrary to the situation in the thirteenth century) there were no original denunciations of injustice but only conventional, stereotypical admonitions, without a real social context (ibid., 44-5). He emphasised that Maximus' works are of similar character to those of the thirteenth century, through their openness, audacity and the link with reality, ibid., 46. This lack of details and vivid description was not, however, necessarily a default. More generalised ideas might have been estimated higher than descriptions of particular cases.

197See: *Послание митрополиту Даниилу*, BLDR, IX, 346-59. Translation by Natalia Jensen in KOROGODINA 2007, 379.

198See: DRUZHININ 1909, 105. The English translation from: KOROGODINA 2007, 379.

impact of ossified Byzantium although Roman law was of course well known there. It was Western humanism that attempted to reconstruct the social context of Roman law in order to understand it better and to comment on it within this context. This historical perspective may have had an impact on Maximus and his distance to the legal conservatism.<sup>199</sup>

In the same conversation, besides his refusal to sacralise the *status quo ante*, Maximus also employed an example taken from the contemporary history of his country. Answering Bersen' question about the situation of the Orthodox Greeks under Muslim rule he said that although the present rulers of Greece are infidel, they do not intervene in ecclesiastical courts. This phrase was certainly an allusion to Muscovite customs and it was clearly understood in such a way by Bersen' since he said: "You still have God."<sup>200</sup> Maximus utterance meant that the *infidels* in this case have arranged the social order more fairly than Christians in Muscovy. The Greek monk, attached to the Orthodox tradition, in social issues articulated quite liberal thoughts. He did not link the equitable organisation of society either with the foregone golden age or with religious orthodoxy. The latter does not entail automatically just law and just judiciary.

Like in the question of old customs, we can notice here some possible Western origins. An idealisation of others, unknown, people was not rare in the West in the fifteenth – sixteenth centuries, particularly in descriptions of the New World. Native American primitive societies appeared to explorers to be wonderfully innocent and devoid of many Western vices. We encounter a similar perspective in some sixteenth century Western accounts of Muscovy. It was not only a simple description but also a rhetorical figure aimed at spurring fellow citizens or co-believers to virtuous life since *they* are virtuous. Maximus adopted this angle giving the Western religious as an example for Muscovite monks and also in the conversation with Ivan Bersen' he points at others, *infidels*, as an example of just arrangement of the social question.<sup>201</sup>

---

199Beklemishev says (SD-Ob, 11): "которая земля переставливаетъ обычаи свои, и та земля не долго стоить", Maximus' answer (ibid.): "которая земля преступаетъ запоѣдей Божьихъ, та и отъ Бога казни чаеть, а обычаи Царьские и Земьские Государи перемѣняютъ какъ лутче Государьству его." On "old rules" cf. ROWLAND 1979, 267-8 where Ivan Timofeev's approach is described, ROWLAND 1990, 139-40 and KAISER 1980, 174f. 186. On Western humanist research on Roman Law within its historical context: МОННЕИТ 1999

200This part of their dialogue in: SD-Ob, 3. Bersen' says: "[...] хоти у васъ Цари злочестивые, а хотятъ [ZIMIN 1971, 76, using ААЭ, т. 1, №172, 141, reads: ходят] такъ, ино у васъ еще Богъ есть."

201The above-mentioned recapitulation was made by Beklemishev but it was his reaction to Maximus' assertion that the sultan does not intervene in ecclesiastical court. On the Western approach see: KUDRIAVTSEV 1997, 13-20. On Maximus' description of Savonarola and his brothers cf. chapter II, text and note 78 and the present chapter, above, note 173. Again an example when he gives the foreigners as an example, cf. below, text and note 204. NB, in one short passage Maximus also presents his vision of the New World although he ascribes the spectacular state of the new society to the fact that the Gospel reached those who earlier worshiped rather creation than the Creator. Then he says: "и нынѣ тамо новый миръ и ново составление чловѣческо" (К-

### *Attitude towards Muscovite practices*

In the later period Maximus, beside some theoretical reflection, more resolutely and concretely articulated his criticism of the Muscovite administration of justice (правосудие). He did not construct any model of how the administration should function but immediately and directly referred to Christian fundamental beliefs. The social sphere does not exist for him as an autonomous realm. In his *Word on God's inscrutable design* we find particularly many references to the question of just judiciary. The Greek appeals to justice in the judiciary *because* “we are Christian” and his admonitions in this sphere are immersed in considerations about God’s design and a Christian answer to this design.<sup>202</sup> In this work he describes the corruption of judges, unfair practices and abuse of power. He also mentions one particular case that arouses his firm reprobation, not because it was linked with an abuse but because the very idea of this custom is for him unacceptable. It was the so called *pole* (поле), a kind of judicial duel that was a part of Muscovite judicial tradition.<sup>203</sup>

Maximus, wanting to prompt his readers to live a really Christian life, returns to his strategy of showing *others* as an example to follow: even the Pharisees were more just, fulfilling God’s commandments, than we are (Z 230); even among pagans there is not such a barbarian practice as *pole*. Heathen settle disputes by referring to the testimony of credible witnesses or to an oath (Z 228). Even Poles and Germans, although they are heretics, are guided by laws instituted by wise rulers: Constantine the Great, Theodosius, Justinian and Leo (Z 227). While the remarks about the Pharisees and pagans are historical and stereotypical, the last mention refers to real life. Maximus talking about the Poles and Germans says that they live “in their [the Orthodox] neighbourhood” or even “among them” (о́крестъ себе живущих). It is one more example that he looked towards Western Christians in search of equitable social solutions and of course, as in the case of his references to Western monks, he provided these accounts with the restriction that they are heretics.<sup>204</sup>

---

III, 45).

202The *Discourse on God's inscrutable design* (Слово о неизглаголаном Божимъ Промыслѣ) is published in Z 219-233. See especially: Z-228, 226 and 233 where Maximus interprets the passage from the Psalm 112 (111): 2 “His seed shall be mighty upon earth” in such a way: “upon earth” i.e. in this life.

203On corruption and unfair practices: Z 226-9. Cf. also above, chapter II, text and note 505. On *pole*: Z 228 and RZHIGA 1934, 47-9. WEICKHARDT 2006 argues that *pole* is a legal fiction. His argumentation is only partially convincing. Maximus seems to describe real events so the *pole* was, at least somewhere, still practised. The Church for at least a century had attempted to eliminate duels from the judicial practice. Metropolitan Photius (†1431) whose *Nomokanon* Maximus used in his book corrections, fought the *pole* and ordered to treat its participants as suicides, see: RZHIGA 1934, 47 and PROKHOROV 1989<sup>b</sup> (SKK). The *Stoglav* took some steps to reduce *pole*. It will disappear in the second half of the sixteenth century, cf. ЕМЧЕНКО 2010, 94.

204In Z 227 Maximus says that the Latins administer using *градъские законы*. Under the name *Закон градский* a Byzantine legal collection, the so called *Procherios Nomos*, was known in Rus'. On the *Procherios Nomos* cf. SCHMINCK 1991, with further bibliography. It seems however that Maximus understands the term *градъские*

### *Further perspectives of research*

The lack of in-depth research does not allow us to measure how consequential was Maximus' thought both on later writers and on the evolution of the Muscovite judicial system. Some data suggests that it was. The *Domostroi*, edited by the archpriest Sylvester, shows a tendency to heal the judiciary. The chapter *On Unjust Living* contains a condemnation of dignitaries who "in their official capacity, impose heavy imposts and all sorts of illegal penalties". The closer to the end of the sixteenth century the stronger a social sensitivity reveals itself in sources, a sensitivity similar to Maximus' one. Obviously, he was not the only one possible cause of this shift but his authority, growing towards the end of his life, made his words significant. Penitential texts reveal, e.g., a concern for victims, known from Maximus' works: "Did you not knowingly buy or sell free male or female peasants?"<sup>205</sup>

### CONCEPT OF POWER AND THE IDEAL RULER

Above all Christian reflection on power, one of St Paul's idea floats constantly: "there is no power but of God" (Rom 13: 1). Maximus knows this, he refers to this passage once (in M-II, 153 where he quotes verses 1-2) but does not go beyond a simple quotation.

#### *Byzantine and Western concepts*

Much more important for his reflection is the prologue to Justinian's sixth novella which he quotes at least twice and his translation is more faithful than other Slavonic renderings: "The greatest gift among men made by supernal kindness are the priesthood and sovereignty, of which the former is devoted to things divine, and of which the latter governs human things and has the care thereof. Both proceed from the same beginning and are ornaments of human life."<sup>206</sup> Authority is not conceived as a form of a self-organisation of a

---

*законы* more broadly since he employs it in plural. RZHIGA 1934, 46 supposes that this mention about Poles and Germans refers to the region of Pskov and Novgorod, cf. chapter II, note 505.

205 On the *Domostroi* generally and on the chapter *On Unjust Living*: KOROGODINA 2007, 379 where the author quotes the text edited in 1985 by V.V. Kolesova, 100. On penitential texts – KOROGODINA 2007, 381-3 and passim but esp. 383: "[...] at the end of the sixteenth and the early seventeenth centuries new attitudes toward the privileged classes had taken shape in Russian society, and service to one's country surpassed in importance the accumulation of personal wealth and success." The quotation from a penitential text comes from KOROGODINA 2007, 381.

206 The sixth novella is one of the classical formulations of the relationship between secular and spiritual powers. It can be also found in the *Epanagoge* by Leo VI and other documents, cf. GEANAKOPOLOS 1965, 382. The English translation from Latin by Fred H. Blume, [http://www.uwyo.edu/lawlib/blume-justinian/ajc-edition-2/novels/1-40/novel%206\\_replacement.pdf](http://www.uwyo.edu/lawlib/blume-justinian/ajc-edition-2/novels/1-40/novel%206_replacement.pdf), consulted on February, 2<sup>nd</sup> 2018. The original text (NOVELLAE, 35-6): "Maxima quidem in hominibus sunt dona dei a superna collata clementia sacerdotium et imperium, illud quidem divinis ministrans, hoc autem humanis praesidens ac diligentiam exhibens; ex uno eodemque principio utraque procedentia humanam exornant vitam." Maximus' translation of this fragment can be found in *Послание Василию о переводе Толковой Псалтыри* (M-I, 152), written in 1522: "Превелиа въ челоуѣцѣхъ суть дарованія Божія отъ вышняго челоуѣколюбія дана, священство и царство, священство убо



society but as a gift from God. Both forms of authority come from the same source. Earthly order is an imitation of the divine order in heaven. In his *Hortatory Chapters* Maximus even says that they are two aspects of one pastoral mission over God's people: "if the vineyard and Lord's heritage is truly the people carrying the name of Christ [...] so the shepherds of the holy heritage [...] are tsars and bishops and other princes [...]"<sup>207</sup> It is a great good – he continues – if they, agreeing with each other, keep the commandments, and, according to them, paternally and sovereignly at the same time, establish the affairs of their subjects (M-II, 255). Therefore they are called to collaborate and their vocation is to be fulfilled jointly. This ideal is called in the Orthodox tradition the *symphony of powers*. The everyday reality was much more complex and the relationship between the two powers was subject to an evolution depending on the actual balance of power, the Church's efforts to limit the emperor's influence on her inner life and certain emperors' efforts to intervene in dogmatic issues or to use the Church for their own purposes. It was not only a problem for the Eastern Church. It concerned the whole of Christendom.<sup>208</sup>

The dissimilarity between the Eastern and the Western approaches to the problem of the relationship between the secular and the spiritual power resulted from both the disparity of the historical development and different ecclesiological concepts. In the political vacuum of the

---

божественным служаще, царство же человеческих вещей началствующе и промышляюще, и от единого и того же начала оба исходяща, человеческую украшают жизнь." The same idea, without the exact quotation, can be found in M-II, 255 (written in 1540-ties) and also in M-II, 150 (here only a fragment is quoted). The prologue to Justinian's sixth novella was used in Russian *Kormchie* (GROMOV 1983, 129). This text was also included into the documents of the *Stoglav* but translated differently, cf. RZHIGA 1934, 60 and EMCHENKO 2010, 97-8. NB, VALDENBERG 2006, 364-5 emphasised that the Slavonic translations of the sixth novella the *Kormchie* was far from being faithful, cf. also *ibid.* 121. Maximus' translation is much more in the spirit of the original, cf. *ibid.*, 210.

207M-II, 254: "Аще виноград убо и наслѣдие Господне въистину есть вручении им, христоименитии людие, пастьрие же священнаго сего наслѣдия Вышняго Владыки царие суть и святители и прочии князи [...]" Cf. also a similar passage further in the same work, M-II, 258 (святителем же и царемъ). Cf. also M-II, 150 and K-II, 360 where metropolitan Macarius and Ivan IV are together qualified as "пасущие благовѣрное наслѣдие твое" (Maximus' authorship of this work should be confirmed). Maximus' approach was not exceptional. FLIER 1994, 235 points out that "One of the common metaphors for Ivan in the apologetic literature and chronicles of his time is that of shepherd, leader of the flock." GOLDFRANK 2005, 342, note 6, shows that Joseph of Volokolamsk applied to the tsar the expression "popochenie i promyshlenie" which normally was "used for pastoral responsibility in the monastic tradition." Later Ivan Timofeev called Ivan IV *pastor*, see: ROWLAND 1990, 136 (he quoted the *Vremennik*, 16-17). On the earthly order as an imitation of the divine one – GEANAKOPOLOS 1965, 385. On the divine source of earthly power see also M-II, 247 where Maximus, classically, derives the tsar's power from God himself: Ivan IV received the sceptre of his tsarship from the Most High ("ему же увѣрена суть от Самого Вышняго скипетра царства").

208This subject has an immense bibliography. More than once it was observed in the comparative perspective, between the East and the West in order to present the superiority of the Eastern or of the Western solution. The term *symphony* is used in the above-quoted sixth novella (*consonantia* in the Latin text and *συμφωνία* in the Greek text, cf. NOVELLAE, 36). Cf. also: GEANAKOPOLOS 1965, 386. On the relationship between the emperor and the patriarchate of Constantinople: HUSSEY 2010, 299-303. She shows that in reality the harmony of the two powers was far from being ideal and points at the differences between Western and Eastern model.

Early Middle Ages in the West, *Sacerdotium* assumed some prerogatives of *Imperium* and, as a consequence, became more independent, also politically. Papal authority in spiritual matters was seldom questioned by the emperor but wars between them happened, sometimes motivated by the defence of the internal independence of the Church, sometime by differences in the political interests of both powers. It brought a clearer separation of the two powers. In Byzantium, there was no war between the emperor and the patriarch. Eastern Christianity was prone, both in ideology and in reality, to avoid a separation between earthly and heavenly realities, between spiritual and secular, also in the sphere of power. The result, for the Eastern Church, was that she was more than her Western counterpart, subjected to the emperor *de facto* although the ideal was the collaboration and balance of the two powers.<sup>209</sup>

### *Muscovy*

In Muscovy the situation was more complex than in Byzantium. After the council of Florence both political and religious reasons brought about a rupture with the Church of Constantinople and to the decision to appoint Muscovite metropolitans independently, without the consent of the patriarch. This emancipation coincided with a growing, although not linearly, subordination of the Church to political power. Strong ecclesiastical personalities, like the metropolitan Macarius, in favourable circumstances (tsar's minority) might have reached considerable influence but generally the metropolitan and the Church were dependent on the ruler to a high degree. This dependence was compensated in symbolic imaginary that elevated the metropolitan. In many documents he is called the *father* of the Grand Prince. One of the most important rituals performed in Muscovy sheds more light on the relationship between the metropolitan and the tsar. It was introduced by metropolitan Macarius already during Maximus' lifetime: in the course of the Palm Sunday procession the tsar afoot led the metropolitan (mounted on a horse or on an ass) who symbolised Jesus. Certainly it was an elevation of the metropolitan but even more, contrary to all appearances, signified the unique role of the tsar.<sup>210</sup>

209Cf. GEANAKOPOLOS 1965. He wants to avoid the term caesaropapism and emphasised that, in long term, emperors never succeeded to impose their will on the Church in the dogmatic sphere and that "the dramatic protests, in the seventh and eighth centuries, of Maximus the Confessor, John of Damascus, and Theodore Studites [...] had something to do with the stronger opposition of the church, serving to inspire patriarchs to more active resistance of imperial demands." (ibid., 386) In other spheres he admits the emperor's considerable impact on the Church. DAGRON 2003, esp. 147-55, tries to show the complexity of the situation and parallel evolutions in the East and in the West. That Papal spiritual authority was seldom questioned by the emperor cf. GEANAKOPOLOS 1965, 381.

210The question of the relationship between the secular and the spiritual power in Muscovy is still discussed among historians. GOLUBINSKII 1900, 648-9; MILLER 2006, 358; MILLER 2011, 234-5. 245 show rather the dependence of the Moscow metropolitans on the tsar. VALDENBERG 2006, 210 emphasises that Muscovite commentators of the introduction to the sixth novella before Maximus (monk Akindin and Joseph of Volokolamsk) used this text rather to defend the superiority of the secular power. However he does not give any textual evidence. He also says (ibid., 348-50, esp. 349) that from the fifteenth century onwards there were

It was not an easy task to orchestrate the symphony in Byzantium and again more difficult in Muscovy where the Byzantine ideas were absorbed slowly. Moreover, for Muscovite authors, it was often not the sources (both biblical and Byzantine) that influenced the way a political problem was understood but rather the previously accepted solutions modified the interpretation of the sources in such a way so that a particular source served as evidence of the chosen solution. Still, the impact of the Eastern Empire is palpable both on the institutional level and in the meta-political reflection. Byzantine texts concerning the relationship between secular and spiritual power, the Christian vision of government or the ideal of the Christian ruler were known in the Slavic world long before Maximus. In addition to conciliar decrees and canonical works various advice for rulers were translated into Slavonic and inspired also a similar vernacular literary production in Kievan Rus'.<sup>211</sup>

An important witness of the reception (and modification, at the same time) of the Byzantine tradition, on the eve of Maximus' arrival in Moscow, was one of the most influential sixteenth century Muscovite authors, Joseph of Volokolamsk. In his missive to Basil III he inserted a famous phrase, inspired by Agapetus, that the tsar "in his nature is like all men, yet in power he is like God". For Agapetus, exaltation means, at the same time, obligation. Yet Joseph infers another conclusion from this phrase than his Byzantine predecessor. The latter

---

two main tendencies (both of them recognised some normative limits of the princely power): one of them defended freedom of the Church and emphasised that she is not subordinate to the prince, the other subjugated ecclesiastical affairs, in one way or another, to the prince and gave him the right to intervene in the Church affairs. Cf. also above, chapter II, note 526. OSTROWSKI 2006<sup>a</sup>, 213-14. 219-20. 229, accentuates balances (even if fragile) and the collaboration between the two powers. Cf. also HALPERIN 2014. For the term *father* see, e.g., SUDNYE SPISKI, 96; metropolitan Simeon is called *father* of the Grand Prince ("Отец твой, господине, СИМОН МИТРОПОЛИТ всея Русии..."; see: KAZAKOVA 1970, 70); metropolitan Iov says about the Grand Prince: *my son*, MILLER 2006, 338; cf. also M-II, 255 (отечьскы промышляюще о подручных). And so on. On Palm Sunday procession: FLIER 1994. Some of his conclusions seem to be over-interpretations, e.g. the identifying of the tsar with John the Baptist but the main idea is well documented. The Palm Sunday procession in Moscow demonstrated at the same time the tsar's humility (before Christ, not before the metropolitan) and strength (it was he who led the horse), *ibid.* 232-5. It should be noted that *secular power* in Muscovy does not mean only the Grand Prince, or the tsar, as an absolute ruler, cf. below, note 258.

211 On the use of sources cf. VALDENBERG 2006, 365-6. He says, e.g., that a lot of material concerning the question of the limits of the tsar's power that was accessible in Byzantine sources, were not used by Russian bookmen, *ibid.*, 361-2. The root of Byzantine advice for princes lay in antiquity, see: BELL 2009, 27-32. On the relationship between secular and spiritual power in Byzantium see, e.g., HUSSEY 2010, 302. Agapetus' *Advice to the Emperor Justinian* was known in Muscovite tradition in two translations: first from the fourteenth century (incomplete, translated as *Поучения Агапита*) and second from the sixteenth century (translated as *Изложение Агапита*). On these translations: BULANIN 1989 (SKK), and SHEVCHENKO 1954. At the end of the fifteenth – beginning of sixteenth centuries, before Maximus' arrival, Photius' missive to the tsar of Bulgaria, Boris-Michael (*Фотиа патриарха Константинаграда послание учительню о седмих соборех и о православней вере и какову подобает быть князю. Пресветлейшему и обзрителному и возлюбленому духовному нашему сыну Михаилу от Бога князю болгарскому радоватися*), was known among Muscovite heretics, cf. SINITSYNA 1965<sup>b</sup>, esp. 96. Another work, known in Muscovy, was *Поучения императора Василия I Македонянина к сыну Льву Премудрому*, SINITSYNA 1965<sup>b</sup> and NIKOLOV 2009, 43. This work was probably written by the patriarch Photius, cf. SHEVCHENKO 1954, 163-4. In Rus' the most known was the *Instruction* by Vladimir Monomakh (*Поучение Владимира Мономаха*), cf. LIKHACHEV 1988.

says: “Like a man, therefore, he must not be puffed up; like God, he must not be angry.” The former: “As God wants to save all, so may the tsar keep all his subjects.”<sup>212</sup> The earlier, Kievan, tradition was not so keen to exalt the prince and rather emphasised the ruler’s humility. Joseph pays more attention to the tsar’s mission to his subjects than to his virtues. He exalted the Grand prince’s status in a significant passage: “God has chosen you [Basil III] in his [God’s] place on earth, elevated you on his throne, mercy and life given you at your disposal.” Yet, when the situation has changed, Joseph was also ready, to put, in his *Enlightener*, a very radical statement that if a tsar is dominated by passions and sins, he is not “God’s servant but a devil, not a tsar but a tormentor (мучитель) [...] You should not heed such a person who leads you into dishonour and cunning”.<sup>213</sup>

### *Maximus’ approach*

In comparison to Joseph, Maximus demonstrated a more moderate position. He could not observe the Byzantine symphonic collaboration in reality because he was born after the fall of Constantinople when there was no longer a Christian emperor. Nevertheless he was familiar with the Byzantine theory and referred to its various sources. In his papers and translations we find fragments both of authors who tipped the scales in favour of more entitlements of secular power and the other way round.<sup>214</sup> This fact could suggest that he did not focus on a precise

212 JOSEPH OF VOLOKOLAMSK, *Missives*, 184-5: “Царь убо естеством подобен есть всем человеком, а властию же подобен есть вышнему Богу. Но якоже Бог хочет всех спасти, такоже и царь все подручное ему да хранит [...]” but in AGAPETUS, *Advice* no. 21 we read: “In his bodily essence, the emperor is the equal of every man, but in the power of his rank he is like God over all men. He has no one on earth who is higher than he. Like a man, therefore, he must not be puffed up; like God, he must not be angry.” NB, a similar transformation / deformation of these Agapetus’ words we find in *Степенная книга*, cf. SHEVCHENKO 1954, 162. Another of Joseph’s quotations from Agapetus is a faithful translation (JOSEPH OF VOLOKOLAMSK, *Missives*, 184; cf. AGAPETUS, *Advice* no. 51): “Солнцу свое дело светити лучами всю тварь, царя же добрыдетели еже милovati нищаа и обидныа. Светлийши же того благоверный царь: солнце заходит приятием ноши, сей же не попускает восхищен быти злым, но светом истинным обличает тайнаа неправды.” The phrase comparing the tsar’s human nature and his God-like power was already known in Rus’ in the twelfth century, cf. SHEVCHENKO 1954, 148. On Joseph’s use of Agapetus: *ibid.*, 156ff.

213 On earlier, Kievan, tradition: SHEVCHENKO 1954, 148-9. 156. Joseph’s words to Basil III (JOSEPH OF VOLOKOLAMSK, *Missives*, 230=AFED, 519): “Вас бо Бог в себе место избра на земли и на свой престол вознес, посади, милость и живот положи у вас.” On tsar-tormentor: Joseph Volotskij, *Prosvietitel*, Kazan 1869, 287. NB, similarly Joseph stigmatises unworthy bishops. Yet, his approach was nuanced. Rowland notices: “[...] it was his [Joseph’s] perception of a given ruler or a particular situation that determined the choice of which image was appropriate.” Sometime he exalted a ruler, sometimes called him *tormentor*, see: ROWLAND 1990, 127 (with further literature). Cf. also OSTROWSKI 2006<sup>a</sup>, 228 on Joseph’s differentiated approach to the tsar, depending on his behaviour. Despite Joseph’s exaltation of the ruler he cannot be called an ideologist of autocracy, cf. GOLDFRANK 2005, 354 (note 58, fourth) and *passim*. NB, the *Editio princeps* of Agapetus was published on May, 11<sup>th</sup> 1509 (when Maximus was already on Athos) by Kalliergis, Maximus’ acquaintance, cf. LEGRAND 1885, I, CXXVIII and 95.

214 Balsamon, translated by Maximus, seems to be a follower of wider prerogatives of the emperor (cf. e.g. GEANAKOPOLOS 1965, 383 who quotes PG 138, 93. 1017-1018). Maximus however did not translate the fragment on the emperor’s prerogatives, see: above, chapter II, note 354. The Greek also knew Photius’ missive to Boris – Michael, tsar of Bulgaria (M-II, 248-9), the so-called *Поучения императора Василия* and Agapetus’ *Advice*, cf. below, note 225. During Photius’ time the patriarch’s position became stronger, cf. below, note 218.

determination of the prerogatives of the two powers. His main concern was the preservation of the symphony of powers in Muscovy which was one of few places among Eastern Christians where it was theoretically possible in his lifetime. This principle was known in Moscow but Maximus found it necessary to remind his readers of it. In his missive to Basil III (one of his first Muscovite writings) he enumerated historical examples of harmony between secular and spiritual power, starting with the Old Testament through Constantine the Great and pope Sylvester, Gregory of Nazianzus and emperor Theodosius the Great, John Chrysostom and emperor Arcadius, up to the addressee of his missive, Basil III and metropolitan Barlaam.<sup>215</sup> Both the historical precedents and the Muscovite reality were idealised. In fact, the equilibrium of the two powers was, at best, unstable, not rarely it was seriously shaken.

Further differences between Maximus and Joseph concern the role of the tsar in Christian society. They referred to the same Byzantine tradition but interpreted it differently. To describe the role of the tsar Maximus did not use Agapetus' formula "in his nature is like all men, yet in power he is like God" which was employed and reinforced by Joseph. Instead, he quoted another established Byzantine formula that the tsar is a "living icon of Christ". Introducing the theme of the tsar as an icon he first says however: "We have only one tsar, Jesus Christ." Only then, he elucidates to Basil III that "you are living icon of Christ, our true God".<sup>216</sup> His emphasis on Christ's kingship is significant, even if it appears just once. The

---

215Cf. M-I, 152 and 168.

216See (M-I, 148): "Един есть нам царь Иисус Христосъ. [...] ты [Basil III] же Христу, истинному Богу нашему, образ живъ и Святому Духу жилище, о Нем же и венчаея и освятиа." The motive of living icon returns in Maximus' works a few times and is linked with Menander. In a longer passage (M-II, 263) Menander is named: "Менандра философа. Три добродѣтели наипаче преславно и долговѣчно творять православное царство земское: правда, сирѣчь правъ судъ, иже не на лице тяжущихся смотреть, ниже мзды приемлеть; второе цѣломудрие, сирѣчь чисто сжителство съ воздержаниемъ богоугоднымъ движения естественна обуздывая; и третие къ подручникомъ кротость растворенна со устрашениемъ государскимъ на исправление ихъ, а не на погубление. Иже трети сими добродѣтелями править жизнь свою, суще воистину царь православень, образъ одушевленъ самого царя небеснаго." This fragment in some MSS is put at the end of the *Hortatory chapters* and sometimes exists as an independent quotation. In a shorter quotation (M-II, 248 - *Слово начальствующимъ*) Maximus just quotes "a Greek philosopher" who says to a tsar "Царству увѣренъ бывъ, буди тому достоинъ, царь бо Божий есть образъ одушевленъ, сирѣчь живъ." Maximus mentions the name of Menander once more, in: О СВЯТЫХЪ ИКОНАХЪ, 45. The Greek original of the longer quotation was not found in the *Greek Anthology* possessed by Maximus (cf. above, chapter II, note 308). BULANIN 1984, 27 has found the Greek original of Menander's short verse (translated in M-II, 248) and considers the longer variant (M-II, 263) as Maximus' creative development. Bulanin's research suggests that Maximus translated from Greek original even if Menander's monostichs had already been translated into Slavonic and known in Muscovite tradition as *Мудрость Менандра* (or other similar names, cf. TVOROGOV 1989<sup>a</sup>, SKK). Under the name: *Менандра мудрого о разуме*, it appears in a MS together with Maximus' metapolitical writing (his missive to Ivan IV) and the translations of Photius' missive to Boris – Michael, cf. SINITSYNA 1965<sup>b</sup>, 99 and also below, note 225. NB, a book by Menander was known before Maximus, as a book that existed among the heretics (among a few biblical books and some other writings), cf. the letter of archbishop Gennadii to Ioasaph of 1489, AFED, 320. The idea of a living icon appears also in other places in Maximus' works: in M-II, 253, an allusion in M-II, 247 (see below, note 219) and twice in the Introduction to the Ioasaf collection (M-II, 50). Maximus' authorship of this introduction is not absolutely sure (see M-II, 351)

earthly ruler is an icon, a representation of the divine reality on earth. The tsar does not replace, even on earth, the only king – Christ. The concept of the living icon is Byzantine but the emphasis on the Christ’s kingship might have had Western roots. It was Savonarola who tended in his preaching to proclaim Christ the king of Florence and, in his thought, this idea serves to limit monarchic power.<sup>217</sup>

Maximus therefore distances himself from Agapetus with his direct exaltation of the ruler’s power. He nowhere mentions the Byzantine deacon’s name even if he refers to him indirectly sometimes. He is all the more remote from Joseph and his idea of a certain substitution of God by the ruler. Obviously, in Joseph’s thought the tsar does not replace God’s presence among the faithful but in his logic the ruler assumes some of God’s functions on earth. Instead of Agapetus’ work (and far from Joseph’s ideas) Maximus recommended to Ivan IV, as a beneficial reading, Photius’ missive to Boris – Michael, tsar of Bulgaria. The Patriarch was an adherent of a more balanced vision of the functions of the two powers.<sup>218</sup>

Both Maximus and his Muscovite predecessor write that the tsar ought to live virtuously. Yet when Joseph radically separated the ruler from his subjects, Maximus was more inclined to see a certain community of the human condition between the monarch and his subjects. The abbot of Volokolamsk insisted that the tsar should have lived virtuously when he

---

but it summarises well the principal ideas of Maximus’ thought so if the concept of the tsar as an icon is repeated here twice, it means that this motive was important for Maximus. On the concept of the tsar as icon in the Byzantine tradition see: GEANAKOPOLOS 1965, 384. It is also present in Agapetus’ work (no. 21 and 37 – he used here the word: εἰκόβν). BELL 2009, 31 includes the iconic approach into the idea of a replacement but it seems that for Agapetus it has a different function than in Maximus. Besides, the iconic option was much more frequent in his output. Joseph of Volokolamsk, as far as I know, does not quote this *iconic* passage from Agapetus. On Joseph’s approach cf. also above, note 212.

217On Savonarola: WEINSTEIN 1970, 294-5. If Weinstein analyses well Savonarola’s political ideas, they are quite close to the Orthodox conception of collaboration between secular and spiritual power, cf. *ibid.* 310-11. At the early stage of his reflection Savonarola had monarchical views. The idea of Christ’s kingship marks his passage to republican ideas, *ibid.*, 295. Cf. also WEINSTEIN 2011, 32. ROWLAND 2007, 278 says: “Although Russian thinkers were ignorant of the concept of sovereignty as a term in formal political discourse, if we were to ask who was sovereign in the Russian state, the only correct answer from any abstract or theoretical point of view, would be that God Himself was sovereign.” Even if he is right, there is still a clear difference between Joseph’s and Maximus’ approach.

218It is true that Maximus uses once (K-II, 379) a unique phrase similar to Joseph of Volokolamsk’s one (quoted above, note 199): “ты же вмѣсто его царь и государь и властель на земли поставленъ еси отъ него.” Yet, this text is not a treatise on the tsars’ power but a humble request for liberation. It may be that Maximus, wanting to regain his freedom, used the Muscovite rhetoric, not necessarily close to him. Perhaps both Maximus and Joseph quoted an ancient source where these kinds of ideas were expressed, cf. BELL 2009, 29: “The essence of their [Hellenistic writers’] approach was to see the king standing in the same relation to the *city* as God to the cosmos and as the embodiment of law” and *ibid.*, 30-1 on Christian continuators. Maximus recommended (M-II, 248-9) Photius’ work to Ivan IV. Photius views on the relationship between the two powers can be seen in the *Epanagoge*. By Photius’ time the patriarch’s position had strengthened. It is reflected also in iconography: GEANAKOPOLOS 1965, 386, note 22. Still later, not only the emperor but also the patriarch was described as icon of Christ (by Balsamon in the twelfth century and Matthew Blastares in the fourteenth), cf. *ibid.*, 384, note 12.

wanted to defy the ruler in a particular situation. The Greek emphasised the necessity to struggle with passions as the way to realise the tsar's vocation. Joseph refers to the image of the sun (taken from Agapetus) and says – quite schematically – that as the sun enlightens all creatures, so the tsar should shine with his justice for all his subjects and care about the poor. For Maximus this question is integrally linked with the idea of an icon. The tsar is only then a living icon of Christ when he lives virtuously and overcomes his passions.<sup>219</sup>

Maximus makes a conscious choice. He visibly wants to preserve the sacred vocation of the tsar's power but to subordinate it and to include it into a vision and vocation of the whole Christian community. It is also perceptible elsewhere where he recognises unambiguously, as tradition wanted, obedience to the tsar as good deed. Yet, in the same breath, he says the same in reference to the metropolitan and bishops (M-II, 244-5).

The Greek understands the functions of both powers conventionally. Secular power is the outer one. It is responsible for inner peace and harmony within a state as well as for the defence against external enemies. Spiritual power is to take care of the salvation of the people, for their preservation in faith and love and the keeping of the commandments. Yet, even in such, seemingly, peaceably determined functions, it was not easy to keep a symphonic balance. Maximus was inclined to accord a higher position to spiritual power. This certain superiority was not about having more prerogatives but in a moral primacy: it is *sacerdotium* (святительство) that anoints, crowns and confirms (утверждает) the tsar, and not vice versa.<sup>220</sup> Consequently, spiritual power is called to instruct the ruler, to give advice and, in this way, to improve secular power. At the same time it acts as an intercessor when the people sin.

---

219On Joseph see: JOSEPH OF VOLOKOLAMSK, *Missives*, 184, cf. also below, note 227. Joseph's selective approach to Agapetus is significant, e.g. he does not mention Agapetus' words that the emperor is "together with everyone, the slave of God", cf. HAMBURG 2016, 51. Maximus speaks about the tsar's virtuous life e.g. in M-II, 247 and 263. He mentions the overcoming of his passions in M-II, 253. He also uses the metaphor of the sun (see below) but, again, he treats the tsar as a human being who, to be able to fulfil his vocation, has, as others, to combat his passions. Other passages also testify (less directly) that icon is real when the tsar lives virtuously. In *Слово начальствующим* (M-II, 247) we read: "Многа убо и ина суть уподобляющаа небесному Владыце благовѣрно царствующих на земли: и кротость бо и длъготрыпѣние, и еже о подручных прилѣжаніе, и еже ко своимъ бояромъ благоволеніе и веледарное, изряднѣ же правда и милость и еже не презрѣти обидимы, нѣ со многымъ челоуѣколюбіемъ и божественною ревностию вѣставлятися на отмщение ихъ." Slightly further, in the same work (M-II, 248), after the quotation from Menander, Maximus adds that may the tsar be Christ's friend "челоуѣколюбіемъ и благостию и правосудиемъ".

220On secular and spiritual powers: M-II, 150 and M-II, 339 (in the context of how to deal with heretics). The idea that secular power is the outer one comes from Eusebius' *Vita Constantini* (IV, 24) and was used in the *Vita* of patriarch Niphon, cf. BARBU 2001, 243. On the higher role of the spiritual power: M-II, 337. VALDENBERG 2006, 209 says that Maximus could take the idea of the superiority of spiritual power both from Western and from Orthodox sources. Yet he adds that the Orthodox thinkers, unlike Catholics, did not draw any further conclusions from this idea and that Maximus, in this respect, follows the Orthodox line. Cf. also *ibid.*, 313. Later, in the seventeenth century, patriarch Nikon expressed the same idea emphasising that the priesthood anoints rulers to the empire, cf. ROWLAND 2007, 285.

Maximus treated seriously the exhortative role of the *sacerdotium*. He believed that when this function is not fulfilled, when there are no zealous priests and prophets to reprimand the secular power, the whole state is in danger, as he presented it in his allegorical dialogue with the woman in black – Vasilia.<sup>221</sup> To accomplish this duty, the spiritual power needs a certain independence (within the symphony – Maximus would have probably added), first of all *moral*. Nevertheless the Greek cared also about the *institutional* autonomy of the ecclesiastical authority. It is apparent from his conversation with Beklemishev when he pointed out that even *infidel* secular authority in his conquered country did not intervene in the ecclesiastical court. It was a clear allusion that in Muscovy the situation was different.<sup>222</sup>

There was just one situation where Maximus clearly granted the secular power the right to correct the spiritual one. It was when wealth given by rulers for the sake of the poor, was used by the clergy for its own over-indulgence and comfort. The Greek first asks rhetorically: “who will manage to improve it? Unless God!” Then he adds, however, that it is necessary that the tsar should improve it.<sup>223</sup> In this situation his fundamental concern of the poor was for Maximus more important than the prerogatives of spiritual power.

#### *Advice for Christian ruler*

Besides these general considerations on the two powers and their relationship, Maximus both responded to particular circumstances and gave more detailed guidelines for the addressees of his meta-political works. In this reflection he was accompanied not only by old authors but also by his contemporaries. The European Renaissance witnessed the particular development of advice for rulers (called in the West *mirror of princes*) with the apogee at the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of sixteenth centuries, so precisely during the period of young Trivolis’ stay in Italy. Humanist believed that monarchs should be educated and the Greek shared this belief.<sup>224</sup>

221In the *Hortatory chapters* for Ivan IV, M-II, 255 (священство [...] исправляет всегда царския скипетра на лучшее). See also below, on the role of counsellors. The work on Vasilia (here see: Z-39-40) is slightly earlier (cf. also chapter II, note 504). Cf. K-II, 360 where Maximus describes Macarius like the one who gives advice and Ivan IV as the one who implements them. The tone and articulation of each of these works are influenced by the political situation when they were written (the work on Vasilia – during Helena Glinskaia regency; the *Chapters* and probably also K-II, 360 – during Ivan IV’s minority) but the general idea remains the same.

222“Цари у насъ злочестивые, а у Патриарховъ и у Митрополитовъ въ ихъ судъ не въступаются”, SD-Ob, 3. In penitentials for the tsar from the beginning of the seventeenth century (КОРОГОДИНА 2007, 388) the sovereign is asked whether he interfered in ecclesiastical matters when it was improper. The author sees here an influence of patriarch Philaret but, possibly, Maximus also, although indirectly, contributed to that.

223M-II, 260. It is not an invitation to secularise ecclesiastical goods. In the same work (the *Hortatory chapters* for Ivan IV – M-II, 256) Maximus says that the tsar should not expropriate somebody else’s property. NB, Savonarola believed that Florence’s civil authorities were responsible for removing bad priests and to established the correct divine cult, cf. WEINSTEIN 1970, 310.

224On the Renaissance Europe: BURNS 1999, 107. Maximus emphasised the benefit of educated rulers for society



Maximus had written only a few lines on these issues before 1525 but already by then he had investigated the subject, helping Vassian Patrikeev to edit his new *Kormchaya*.<sup>225</sup> Much more actively he participated in social and political reflection later, in one of decisive moments of Muscovite history. In mid-sixteenth century, the circumstances preceding Ivan IV's coronation resulted in a particularly abundant production of different kind of advice for the tsar.<sup>226</sup>

The Greek was in the middle of this stream. Writing his own advice, he drew profusely from Byzantine sources, freely choosing some elements and omitting others. Some fundamental texts, such as Justinian's sixth novella, he quotes accurately. Certain motives he transforms, giving them a new meaning. Such was the situation with Agapetus' idea of the emperor compared to the sun. For the Byzantine author the ruler is the sun of justice whose light reveals all injustice. Maximus also compares the tsar to the sun but in his vision the tsar, by his good deeds and virtues, enlightens and stimulates people to a virtuous life just as the sun with its warmth makes the earth bring forth the harvest. Eventually, he introduces sometimes completely new images, as the peculiar use of the parable of the lost sheep.<sup>227</sup>

He adapted his instructions to the actual situation and addressee. They are embedded in current events and many allusions to them can be identified in his works. It is especially visible in his *Hortatory chapters* (Главы поучительны начяльствующим правовѣрно) for Ivan IV. He wrote to a teenage ruler who needed an educator and the Greek strives to give him an instrument to understand himself, to control himself and to be a Christian. For this reason the *Chapters*, in large part, are just advice on how to live the Christian life. They are not only an

---

in the *Terrible Story*, see below. Also Manuel of Corinth, close to Maximus, was an author or co-author of a similar work, the *Teachings* by Neagoe Basarab, cf. chapter II, text and note 235. On Byzantine mirrors of princes: JEFFREYS-KAZHDAN 1991.

225See the fragment M-I, 148, quoted above, note 216. One MS of Patrikeev's new *Kormchaya* (Владимиро-Суздальский музей-заповедник, № В 5636/399) contains Maximus' translation (or adaptation of an old translation) of Agapetus' *Advice*, a mention (without quoting) of Photius' missive to Boris – Michael and *Поучения императора Василия* (cf. above, note 198). Further in this MS we find: *Сократа, мудреца еллинскаго, Епистолиа Аристотеля философа къ Александру великому царю Македоньскому* and *От беседы Александровы царя яже къ своему отцю царю Филиппу о царствии*. All these works had never been before included into a *Kormchaya*, see: SINITSYNA 1965<sup>b</sup>, 98, PLOGUZOV 2002, 150-1 and M-I, 486. One can suppose that it was Maximus' choice. Another MS (РГБ, Вол., № 522) contains a similar set of works: *Изложение Агапита, Василия, царя Греческаго, главизны учителны бб к сыну своему царю Лву*, Photius' missive to Boris – Michael, *Сократа, мудреца еллинскаго, Аристотеля, философа, от епистолеи ко Александру царю Македоньскому* and *Генадия, патриарха Константинаграда, слово о вере*, see: SINITSYNA 1965<sup>b</sup>, 99. It needs further research concerning the reception of these works in Muscovy before Maximus. Some of them exist also together in other MSS with other similar texts as *Менандра мудрого о разуме*, SINITSYNA 1965<sup>b</sup>, 99, cf. above, note 216.

226See: BOGATYREV 2000, 57 with further literature.

227On the sun: M-II, 256 and Joseph's version above, note 219. Joseph is more faithful to the original meaning of Agapetus than Maximus. On the lost sheep below, text and note 236.

exhortation for the tsar but also a description of the Christian way to perfection.<sup>228</sup>

Maximus, writing to the tsar, conveys to him basically the same moral teaching that he elsewhere recommended to other people. First of all, there is the necessity to struggle against passions and to avoid apparent values, such as bodily beauty, which is not only temporary but also mendacious because impure desires “obfuscate the spiritual goodness of the soul”. Virtues needed for a genuine Christian life, are all the more necessary for the ruler because of his influence over his subjects. Developing Agapetus’ metaphor of the sun, Maximus says that even a small cloud of passion that darkens the tsar’s soul, plunges his subjects also into darkness (M-II, 256). The Greek believed, as it has been said above, that the tsar realise his capacity to be an icon of Christ only when he overcomes his passions. Otherwise – Maximus dares to use strong words regarding the tsar – he is only a human-like simulacrum of irrational being. It was an approach similar to that of patriarch Photius in his letter to Boris – Michael of Bulgaria.<sup>229</sup> The control over passions is indispensable for the tsar. This is the true autocrat (самодержецъ) who has overcome the three fundamental passions (voluptuousness, desire for fame and avarice). He is well disposed to undertake good actions when his soul is free and has prevailed over any dependence. A similar but less developed thought was expressed by Agapetus.<sup>230</sup>

---

228NB, Agapetus’ work owed its popularity, especially in the sixteenth century, to its universality (and also to the quality of his style), see: BELL 2009, 27. Yet, in Maximus’ work there is much more advice concerning Christian life *tout court* than a technique of government. It is difficult to estimate it precisely because these two kinds of advice are interwoven but in Agapetus’ work general instructions about Christian life occupy perhaps 15 % of the whole work while in Maximus’ it is much more. Very clearly the mention of wax and a clear sheet of paper (M-II, 256) appeared in the educational context, and is not, as maintains KONOVALOV 2014, 122-5, a sign of Hesychast influence. RZHIGA 1934, 68ff writes more about the historic context of the *Chapters* and shows (ibid., 72) the difference between Maximus’ approach and the other authors, e.g. the priest Sylvester who tries to scare the tsar with questionable miracles (cf. KURBSKII, История о великомъ князѣ Московскомъ, 169). An allusion to Maximus’ personal situation is clear in the last chapter, on foreigners (M-II, 262-3).

229When the tsar does not control his passions he “нѣсть небснаго Владыкы образъ одушевленъ, но безсловеснаго естества челоукообразно подобие” (M-II, 253). On temperance and control over natural inclinations also in M-II, 263. Generally the first pages of the *Chapters* (M-II, 253-6 but also further, e.g. 261-2) contain exhortations to a moral and pious life. On Agapetus, see above, note 211. Photius, writing to Boris of Bulgaria, was not bold enough to say that ruler subjected to passions was only a human-like simulacrum of irrational being but he emphasised that the ruler should have overcome his passions (cf. SINITSYNA 1965<sup>b</sup>, 113-17. 121-23) and that his behaviour should have corresponded to his faith, e.g. Photius writes to the tsar: “стани крепце на камени веры” (ibid., 112), he mentions that “согласно же жительство вере” (ibid., 111). He also says, far from being conventional, about the importance of prayer (ibid., 113-14).

230See: “пред всякимъ царскимъ добрымъ дѣaniemъ предидеть доброизволение души свободныя и превъшедшиа всяко раболѣное тщетничество и скупость.” M-II, 257. On three passions see also above, note 121. Maximus enumerates them and says that any rational soul and especially of those who rule is usually conquered by them. Then he defines the true autocrat and quotes Jn 8: 34 “Whosoever commits sin is the servant of sin” (M-II, 262), cf. also M-II, 253 on the true autocrat. Both Agapetus (AGAPETUS, Advice, no. 68) and Photius (SINITSYNA 1965<sup>b</sup>, 117-18) say about the necessity to control oneself in order to be able to rule over the subjects. Yet, it is possible that Maximus has taken this idea directly from GREGORY OF NYSSA, De hominis officio, 136 B-C (chapter IV). On autocrat cf. also above, note 144 and below note 253.

Obviously, as other religious authors of *mirrors of princes*, Maximus also underlines that the tsar should base his life and his rule on piety, on the fear of God and on observing the commandments. In other words, the tsar, as other Christians, should live a Christian life. The difference between the ruler and others does not concern the essence of Christian life but only the scope of impact on the whole kingdom.<sup>231</sup>

#### *Ruler's virtues*

The above-mentioned qualities characterising the tsar were not sufficient to fulfil the vocation of a ruler. Speaking about good governance Maximus at least three times (M-II, 150, M-I, 317 and M-II, 255) returns to four classic cardinal virtues, indispensable in social life: prudence (смысль or разум), courage (мужество), justice (правда) and temperance (цѣломудрие). This quartet was taken over by Christians from the pagan philosophical tradition but it needed to be supplemented because it was insufficient as an endowment of a Christian ruler. Maximus follows here the approach of Byzantine authors of mirrors of princes who completed the quartet of cardinal virtues with specifically Christian values and adds to the list in one case meekness and humility (кротость and смиренномудрие – M-II, 150, obviously inspired by Mt 11: 29) and in the other: meekness, mercifulness, goodness and philanthropy (кротость, щедроты, благость, челоѡколюбие – M-II, 255), saying that because of such virtues the Son of God is described as the “more beautiful in his goodness than the sons of men” (ibid.). The Greek wants to complete the ancient thought with virtues (the reference to the Son of God is significant here) that were not or would have not been appreciated by the pagan philosophers. These qualities are not, on face value, especially necessary for the tsar but the Greek is not talking about any ruler but about a Christian ruler. So they are – in Maximus’ vision – most needed for such a monarch.<sup>232</sup>

---

231See: M-II, 257-8. A similar passage in K-II, 341-2 and 345 (here a beautiful passage about faith, hope and love). Two last fragments comes from a work which authorship is not confirmed (K-II, no. XXVII). Sinitsyna has not included it into her project of Maximus’ collected work. The ideas are however similar so if it is not Maximus’ genuine work, it is inspired by him. On the ruler’s piety cf. AGAPETUS, Advice, e.g. no. 5, 6, 58 and 70. Agapetus also emphasises (ibid., no. 10) the difference between mistakes of the ruler and of an ordinary man, using a naval metaphor of an ordinary sailor and the helmsman.

232In M-II, 150 Maximus says that he learned about it both in pagan and Christian books so he strives to combine these two kinds of wisdom. The quotation is from Ps 45: 2 (= 44: 3 in the Slavonic version). English translations do not correspond precisely with the Slavonic one (according to the Ostroh Bible): “красень добротою паче сыновъ челоѡечих”. As for Byzantine exhortations cf., e.g., AGAPETUS, Advice no. 18 on temperance and justice. He also mentions mildness (ἡμερος – no. 48 and 52) but the term *кротость*, used by Maximus, corresponds rather to the Greek word *πραότης* (cf. Mt 5: 5) and it is further evidence that Maximus’ approach was different from that of Agapetus. On the tsar’s meekness and mercy as features of ideal ruler, yet in a particular context of Fedor Ivanovich: ROWLAND 1990, 135. On Byzantine *mirrors of princes* where the four cardinal virtues were completed with Christian virtues see: PODSKALSKY 1991. A Byzantine catalogue of imperial virtues can also be found in Menander Rhetor who developed ancient models, cf. PODSKALSKY 1991 and MENANDER RHETOR, esp, 89-93. Perhaps Maximus’ Western experience was for him a point of reference also

### *Stress on justice and care about the subjects*

From the whole collection of pre-Christian and Christian virtues, some are for Maximus especially important. The few lists of virtues desirable for the tsar are not identical in Maximus' works but the general idea is the same. For him, the most important is that the ruler should be just, that he should promote justice and care about his subjects. To these two essential virtues Maximus adds sometimes others but the core remains constant: justice and the care of his subjects.<sup>233</sup> Perhaps it is most pointedly expressed in a passage of his *Hortatory Chapters* where, referring to the very nature of the tsarship, he specifies two features that are "inherent (своиственно) for the tsar": "дарование и исправление" (M-II, 257). The terms are different but the idea is clearly the same.

As for justice, it was commonplace to both Byzantine and Renaissance advice for rulers. Old-Russian authors (influenced by Byzantine tradition) proceeded in the same way. It seems however, that Maximus mentioned it with an especially great insistence. It was already to be seen in his concern for justice in villages owned by monasteries and of fair trials without bribes and respect of persons. All the more it had to be applied to rulers. The Greek says that nothing is more necessary for a good monarch than justice. Jesus Christ, who himself rules in justice, co-governs such a kingdom whose ruler is just (M-II, 254).<sup>234</sup>

To emphasise the significance of the ruler's care and responsibility for his subjects the Greek resorts do a hyperbole: "Greater than any human intellect and concept is the terrible mystery of the Word of God's incarnation; greater than any number and expression are the tsar's thoughts, all days and nights, about the firm establishment of his subjects affairs and care..."<sup>235</sup>

He continues this thought making an unusual use of the parable of the lost sheep. He

---

here. Mirrors of princes were abundantly produced in Renaissance Europe. Renaissance political thought considered the cardinal virtues both as a quality of a good citizen and of a good ruler, cf.: BURNS 1999, 108.

<sup>233</sup>The care for subjects he describes using the words *кѳорость*, *милость* or others, close in meaning. *Justice* is the English equivalent for *правда*. The combination of the terms *правда* + *кѳротость* or *милость* (or a similar term) appears often, see: M-II, 256; M-II, 248; K-III, 236-7; K-II, 338. Maximus' authorship of the last two quotations is not confirmed. Cf. also ruler's virtues quoted above in the note 202 and 204. NB, Maximus saw the reason for the fall of Byzantium in the injustice of its last rulers and in their lack of care for subjects, see: M-II, 249.

<sup>234</sup>For Byzantium: AGAPETUS, Advice no. 41 and 42 but also 66, 9, 33; for Renaissance: BURNS 1999, 107; for Old Rus' see above, text and note 196, for Maximus, besides already mentioned, also, e.g., M-II, 253; Z 31-2. KOLLMANN 2017, 7, writes about a slightly later period: "Early modern Russia before about 1700 grounded legitimacy primarily in claims of sovereign piety, benevolence and justice." Cf. also *ibid.*, 8 and ROWLAND 2007, 278-80. 289.

<sup>235</sup>M-II, 258: "Паче всякого ума и слова чловѣча есть страшная тайна воплощения Божия Слова. Паче же числа и изглаголения, яже по вся дни и нощи царскыя мысли о твердомъ устроении подручных печали и попечения."

interprets it as an “image and rule” (образ и уставъ) for those who preside over the Lord’s flock so that they care equally for *all* subjects. When Maximus mentions those who preside, he is thinking both about spiritual and temporal power and – without mentioning the formula – he emphasises the realisation of the symphony of power. He uses the image of the pastor searching for the lost sheep to show that those who are called to be pastors should care that their subjects keep (держатся) love and justice, and live according to the *holy commandments of the Ruler of all*. The lost sheep symbolises someone who commits injustice. The one who converts such a person is the veritable pastor of Christ’s sheep.<sup>236</sup> Thus, the concern of subjects is closely linked to the solicitude for justice.

Such a vision is a meta-political rather than political project, all the more that the prerogatives of the spiritual power and the tsar are not clearly differentiated. It is an inspiration and appeal to responsibility.

Yet, Maximus gives some more concrete exhortations concerning the care for subjects. He focuses on two aspects: consideration and generosity towards those who are the lynchpin of the tsar’s power and concern for the poor. Sometimes he talks about the two categories of people together. In a work aimed for *those who command* he urged the tsar to respect, protect and be generous towards princes, boyars, governors and warriors (князи, бояры, воеводы, воины) because by enriching them he strengthens the state and protects the poor.<sup>237</sup> Maximus encourages the tsar to benevolence towards his subjects adducing, as was his custom, historical examples, this time of Alexander the Great (his generosity and solidarity with his commanders and soldiers), or of Cyrus who – although he worshipped idols – was called the God’s anointed and his subjects, for his justice and mercy, called him father.<sup>238</sup>

In the *Hortatory chapters* (M-II, 257) the Greek compares the tsar’s benevolence towards grantees and servants to God’s philanthropy towards all people, alluding to Matthew 5: 45: “He makes his sun to rise on the evil and on the good...” An appeal to generosity can be found also in Agapetus and the comparison between his teaching and Maximus’ is instructive.

---

236See: M-II, 258. Photius quite similarly emphasises (SINITSYNA 1965<sup>b</sup>, 118) that the ruler should think of all his subjects.

237See: M-II, 249. In the same work we find a similar passage where Maximus talks about benevolence and generosity towards boyars and justice for victims (обидимыя), M-II, 247. The theme of benevolence towards boyars existed in Muscovite literature before (cf. БОГАТЫРЕВ 2000, 49) but Maximus’ characteristic feature is that he puts almost equal emphasis on care for boyars and for the poor.

238On Alexander the Great – RZHIGA 1934, 120; on Cyrus (NB one more foreign example of virtues) – M-II, 250. RZHIGA 1934, 82 mentions also a translation of the entry *archistrategos* from the *Suida Lexicon* (cf. BULANIN 1984, 172) where Belisarius is depicted as the one who took care of his soldiers and peasants, who was generous and just; cf. also PUGUZOV 2002, 202. Again about care for army and soldiers in M-I, 149. Cf. RZHIGA 1934, 83-4 who mentions parallel texts from chronicles and the so called *Царственная книга* on the tsar’s care of soldiers.

The Byzantine deacon encourages liberality so that the emperor could be honoured by “all men” and that his safety might be protected.<sup>239</sup> His advice concerns the techniques of government. Maximus, in turn, gives a vision of a society that could be named – anachronistically – inclusive because, as we have seen, he wants the ruler to protect *all* people (or reward *all* his boyars, or servants). His concern for the poor seems to be a part of this vision.

It is true that this concern is commonplace in Christian literature. It was probably Agapetus who introduced this motive of the poor into advice for the emperor. He presents it, traditionally, in the moral and eschatological perspective: “For as we treat our fellow slaves, so shall we find our Master treating us.” However, he also includes it into a consideration about how to govern well and to redistribute goods.<sup>240</sup>

Maximus enriched this tradition. He did not weary of reminding his readers to support the poor and sick. One line recapitulates his approach well: “mercy towards the poor as well as love of God and of all men is all what is required from us by Christ God”.<sup>241</sup> So concern for the poor is like the third part of the commandment of love. This general precept could not be omitted in exhortations for the tsar because of his key-significance for the life of the whole community. We have already seen that the Greek encouraged the tsar in the *Hortatory Chapters* to intervene when ecclesiastics used for their own needs the goods destined for the poor (M-II, 260). In the same work he uses the parable of the rich man and Lazarus in the context of death and the future destiny of a man. He says that the one who wants to avoid condemnation, to attain blessed peace and consolation “let him hate with all his soul the hatred of the poor [...]” Should not only avoid committing iniquity and not to lay up for himself treasures upon earth but also “let him provide the poor abundantly and let him defend them against offending and embezzling them, and let him not despise the hungry, thirsty and naked.” The dramatic expression (*to hate hatred*) used by Maximus illustrates his commitment, testified also in his other works and by witnesses.<sup>242</sup>

239Cf. AGAPETUS, Advice, no. 19 and 47. Again in no. 39, he encourages “to reward with more splendid gifts those who carry out your orders with goodwill”. Other fragments on generosity in: AGAPETUS, Advice, no. 44, 45 and 63.

240The quotation (translated by Bell) from AGAPETUS, Advice, no. 8; cf. also no. 44, 53, 60. This and similar motives appeared in Muscovite literature, inspired by Agapetus or directly by the Gospel. E.g. Joseph of Volokolamsk, writing to prince Yurii Ivanovich, admonished him to be merciful to be treated mercifully by the Lord, cf. JOSEPH OF VOLOKOLAMSK, Missives, 232-3. On redistribution *ibid.*, no. 16. On Agapetus who introduced the motive of the poor: BELL 2009, 45-6.

241M-II, 189: “Милость, яже к нищим и яже от чистаго сердца къ самому Господу и всѣм челоуѣком любви, то есть все, еже взыскует от нас Христос Богъ, их же кромѣ вся прочаа без успѣха суть, и въздержание от брашенъ и длѣгы подвигы молитвеннии.”

242Both quotation come from M-II, 261: “да възненавидит всею душею ненависть, яже къ убогим

Apart from the eschatological context, the Greek (perhaps inspired by a passage in Agapetus on the redistribution of goods or Savonarola's ideas) goes further and shows that the way the poor were treated in a country, had an impact on the whole society. He turns to the tsar and persuades him that the contempt of the poor "it is not beneficial for your empire" because God will not leave it unpunished. Maximus, in his style, does not accuse the tsar directly, he says about "our sin" but it could be understood that the tsar mistreated the poor (M-II, 250).<sup>243</sup>

The way Maximus spoke about the attitude towards the poor indicates that he perceived the far-reaching consequences of the lack of care for destitute and for people who had been harmed. In a positive way he expresses the same thought saying (M-II, 260): "Nothing can confirm the tsar's sceptre as much as the care for the poor and mercy for God's sake."

### *Гроза царя*

It is striking how much Maximus says to the tsar about the care of his subjects, especially the poor in comparison with some other themes important to Muscovite authors both before Maximus and by his contemporaries. One of these topics, very little employed by Maximus, was the question of the tsar's *гроза*. This term meant both his majesty and the fear he aroused. The Greek just mentions a similar idea, using another word and only in a quotation from Menander. We read there that tsar's meekness (кротость) should concur with lordly fear (с утрашением государскимъ) but it is "for their [his subjects] improvement, not for perdition" (на исправление ихъ, а не на погубление – М-II, 263).<sup>244</sup> The Greek does not develop this idea (present in Agapetus' mirror). We find in his writings the above mentioned quotation from Menander and virtually nothing more about *гроза*. Instead, we can detect an inspiration taken from Photius who accentuates that the prosperity (благоумие) of his subjects is a better foundation for the tsar's rule than fear.<sup>245</sup>

When he presented as models for rulers a few great emperors: Constantine the Great,

---

безмыслена оногo" and "да удовлетворить обильною рукою убогихъ, и да заступаеъ сырыхъ и вдовицъ и оборонитъ ихъ отъ обидящихъ и расхыщающихъ я, и да не презираеъ ихъ алчущихъ и жаждущихъ и наготующихъ." A witness of Maximus' commitment was, e.g., KURBSKII, History of the Grand Prince of Moscow, 76, who testifies that Maximus interceded for widows and orphans of those who had fallen in the war with Khanate of Kazan'.

243On redistribution: above, text and notes 189 (about Savonarola) and 240 (about Agapetus).

244The whole quotation from Menander above, note 202. On the Muscovite tradition of use of the term *гроза*: BOGATYREV 2000, 43 and 63-66. He shows the co-occurrence in the Muscovite literature of two realities: the tsar's majesty (*гроза*) and his meekness but groundlessly maintains that this dual approach is also present in Maximus, cf. BOGATYREV 2000, 63.

245See AGAPETUS, Advice, no. 48 and 52. Photius says (SINITSYNA 1965<sup>b</sup>, 116): "Началствууй убо подвластныхъ не надеасъ мучительствомъ, но началствуемыхъ благоумиемъ, благоумие бо больше начальства основание и утверженнейше, нежели страхъ [...]" Cf. also *ibid.*, 119 (l. 435v). The word *благоумие* may mean both happiness or prosperity (cf. εὐδαιμονία) and common sense. It seems that here the first meaning corresponds better with the context.

Theodosius I and his grandson Theodosius, instead of – what might have been expected – underlying their power and majesty, he says that they “always abided in peace and silence” (M-II, 247). This quotation comes from Maximus’ work of 1540-ties but, already at the beginning of his Muscovite adventure, he wrote to Basil III, presenting him the emperor Heraclius as an example of a good ruler and adduced a passage from a chronicle where it is said about him that he wanted to rule not by fear but by love.<sup>246</sup>

It is an instructive that when the Greek speaks about fear in his exhortation, it is rather the fear of God and his judgment (e.g. M-II, 256) that concerns equally great and small. Maximus treats the tsar as a Christian, like others. It is true, he is an important person, and this is why his behaviour, virtuous or wicked, had such significance. The Greek is not free of an exaltation of the person of ruler (as we have seen in his apostrophe on the grandeur of the tsar’s thought on his subjects – M-II, 258) but it does not reduce the fundamental appeal to the tsar to lead a truly Christian life.

In general, Maximus wrote little on coercion in government. In home affairs he referred essentially to justice. Regarding external enemies he was also restrained. In his *Hortatory Chapters* we find advice to the tsar that he should listen to those counsellors who suggest peace and reconciliation with neighbours and not to those who incite him to wage war (M-II, 255). In another missive (M-II, 326) he says, interpreting passages from the Bible: “do not start fighting and battles with others, even if they are infidels, even if they are foes but live with everyone in peace.” Only later adds that – faced by a threat of an enemy invasion (he thinks first of all about enemies of the faith and Christianity) the ruler should have an army ready to act. In such a situation he encouraged a military solution.<sup>247</sup> He resolutely called to combat in one case: to fight Muslim enemies – the Tartars.<sup>248</sup>

### *Maximus and Karpov*

In order to understand better the specificity of Maximus’ social ideas it is useful to

---

246M-II, 247: “в мирѣ глубоцѣ и тишинѣ пребываху присно”; cf. also M-II, 260. To Basil (M-I, 149): “Хотяше бо власть имѣти не столикo страхом, сколикo любовию”.

247In the quoted passage from M-II, 326 Maximus says: “не сами начинайте боехъ и бранехъ къ инымъ, аще и невѣрнии суть, аще и супостати, но съ всѣми миръ имѣйте.” In both texts (M-II, 255 and M-II, 326=Z 61) he employs the same two quotations from the Bible: 1) Ps 119: 6 (according to LXX and the Slavonic Bible: “съ ненавидящими мира бѣхъ миренъ”); it corresponds to Ps 120: 6 according to the Hebrew Bible and modern translations. In this place there is a difference between LXX and the Hebrew Bible); and 2) Rom 12: 18. It is interesting that in the first part of the Book of Royal Degrees (Степенная книга), composed between 1550 and 1563 in the circle of metropolitan Macarius, an approach quite similar to that of Maximus is expressed as far as the question of coercion and the use of violence is concerned. For its author, or compiler, the use of military force against the “Godless Pechenegs” is not a problem. In the domestic politics and in the relation among Christians he demonstrates a reluctance towards the use of violence, cf. HAMBURG 2016, 72.

248Cf. M-I, 145-50 and M-II, no. 23.



compare them with the beliefs of a person who was much less conservative than other Muscovite authors of that time: an innovative thinker, his contemporary and interlocutor interested in Western thought, Fedor Karpov. We have already seen (e.g. in the exchange between Maximus and Bersen' Beklemishev) the reluctance to change old established rules in Muscovy. Yet, another approach was possible even if rare.

In unknown circumstances metropolitan Daniel wrote a letter to Karpov, in which he asked a question which seems to be quite new in Moscow: what is the more important thing for stability of a country, kingdom or a nation: justice (правда) or forbearance (трѣпѣние)? Karpov, in reply, developed a short theory of government. In spiritual life – he writes – forbearance is a crucial virtue but if we decide that in social life forbearance is more important than justice, it would lead to the ruin of society. The more powerful will always oppress the weak and subjects will not fulfil their duties. Karpov invokes Aristotle who says that any city or kingdom should be ruled by justice (по правде) and according to a defined, just law (определенными законами справедливыми), and not by forbearance – adds Karpov. Then, he shows the ruler's crucial role: if he does not care about his subjects and permits that they, being blameless, are oppressed by the powerful, he will answer for sins of these oppressors before the Judge. Finally he clarifies, perhaps better than Maximus, the interdependence of justice and care for subjects: "For mercy without justice is a pusillanimity, and justice without mercy is a torment; and these two ruin the kingdom and the whole social life. But mercy supported by justice, and justice adorned with mercy preserve the kingdom for the king for long days."<sup>249</sup>

Karpov's vision was similar to Maximus'. He underlines the same two qualities: justice and care for subjects. He does not forget about the poor, either!<sup>250</sup> Both of them stood out against the background of the previous authors and many of their successors. In one important detail however Karpov differs from his interlocutor. Although they both remain within a Christian context and quote the Bible, but – speaking about forbearance and justice – Fedor expresses a, rather Western and modern, idea of a certain autonomy of social reality: not everything that is good in religious life, is also good in social life.

Maximus also writes in an innovative way. His works, although not completely

---

249See: КАРПОВ, *Poslanie Daniilu*, 354: "Милость бо безъ справды малодушество есть, а правда безъ милости мучительство есть, и сия два разрушаютъ царство и всяко гадосожительство. Но милость правдою пострекаема, а правда милостью украшаема сохраняють царя царство въ многодѣньствѣ." The tsar's responsibility to preserve his own righteousness and that of his subjects can be also found in a work written probably by Sil'vester, cf. ROWLAND 1990, 147-8.

250Cf. КАРПОВ, *Poslanie Daniilu*, passim. We find in КАРПОВ (*КАРПОВ, Poslanie Daniilu*, 354-5) also the motive of love and fear of the tsar: "Ради милости бо предстатель и князь от подвластных велми любитя, а истинны ради боится." On the fear of the tsar cf. also above, note 244.

deprived of old rhetoric, take the form of a conversation where the faces of real protagonist are clearly contoured, and not of an abstract and timeless exhortation. Unlike Karpov, however, his social ideas were completely immersed in the all-encompassing religious context and in pursuit of Christian perfection. There was no place in his thought for any autonomy of the temporal reality. He wanted to preserve, perhaps in a new way, the integrity of Christendom.

This comparison between Fedor Karpov and Maximus evokes the question of their mutual influence. Karpov was interested in Western thought and, taking into account the novelty of his convictions, one may conjecture that he was inspired by Western European conceptions. Some of Maximus' meta-political ideas may also have their roots in his European observations since political thought in the sixteenth century experienced a period of intense development, that was virtually absent in the Greek – Byzantine circle, after the fall of Constantinople.

Their opinions might have evolved in the course of their exchanges and disputes. Karpov wrote his reply to Daniel not later than 1539 so before Maximus' main writings on these issues. The chronological factor however does not determine the direction of a possible influence. It was Maximus whom Karpov asked for clarification on a few questions and the Greek's erudition was certainly broader than Karpov's. It cannot be excluded therefore that the ideas shared by both were a fruit of their discussions before 1525 and then were rendered in written form, first by Karpov, and later, perhaps only after his death by Maximus. We can only speculate whether Maximus and Karpov met after the imprisonment of the former.<sup>251</sup>

#### LIMITS OF THE TSAR'S POWER

The description of Maximus' ideas concerning government and the tsar's power would not be complete without analysing the question of limits on the power of the tsar and – linked to that – the place of his counsellors in government. Maximus, as other contemporary authors, did not write about the *limits of the tsar's power* because it is a modern expression. Yet the reality behind this expression is present in his works.

First of all the tsar is subject to God's Law, common for all people and this is the

---

251A little ground for this speculation is to be found in the fact that after Karpov's death one of his books went to the library of the Volokolamsk monastery where Maximus was imprisoned. The fact is known from the 1545 inventory but the book might have arrived before. The last information about Karpov comes from 1539 when Maximus was already in Tver. The inventory names the book: *Сава Сербьской*, so it contains works on which Maximus disputed with his opponents, cf. chapter II, note 308. On the inventory: BULANIN 1988<sup>d</sup> (SKK). Perhaps we can trace in Karpov's and Maximus' works a Muscovite echo of the development of legal thought in Renaissance Europe, cf. BURNS 1999.

fundamental limitation on his power. All that which has been said above on the importance of justice refers primarily to God's Law expressed mainly in the commandments. It creates the most basic limits for the tsar.<sup>252</sup> Then, his vocation is to organise the life of his subjects justly and according to the law. At the same time, "the true tsar and autocrat" should be able to control his passions (as we have already seen). This way, a choice is made concerning the understanding of the word *саможержец* (autocrat).<sup>253</sup> The one who is not capable of self-control can hardly be named the *true* tsar! Such a definition also sets certain limits on the tsar's power.

If God's law and the principles that follow from it are always binding, Maximus did grant the tsar the right to change regulations established by earthly rulers. Yet, most probably, it was not coincidence that he did not use the term *law* (закон) but *customs* (обычай).<sup>254</sup>

More complex was the situation when a tsar transgresses the accepted norms to such a degree that it threatens the foundations of the social order. It was the issue that had worried Christian thinkers both in the East and in the West, for centuries but in the fifteenth – sixteenth centuries the question of tyranny was especially and extensively discussed. Among other authors, Savonarola also dealt with it. In his political treatise, *Trattato circa el reggimento e governo della città di Firenze*, he pondered over the geographical determination of the form of government and quoted Thomas Aquinas' *De regimine*. The latter maintained, following Aristotle, that Eastern and Northern people, because of their natural predisposition, should be governed by a ruler with absolute power. Maximus might have known this work, published shortly before fra Girolamo's fall, or might have found this idea directly in Thomas Aquinas or Aristotle.<sup>255</sup> It could explain why the Greek did not write practically anything about tyrants in

252Maximus mentions not only the commandment but also God's law: M-II, 253; M-II, 266; M-II, 248; M-II, 249.

253On the veritable tsar (M-II, 253): "Царя истинна и самодръжца оногo мни, благовѣрнѣишы царю, которыи къ еже правдою и благозакониемъ устраати житеискаа подручниковъ прилежит и безсловеснымъ своеа души страстемъ же и похотемъ одолѣти тщится всегда, глаголю же ярости и гнѣву напрасному и беззаконнымъ плоти похотемъ." VALDENBERG 2006, 217 maintains that Maximus is the first one who proposed such an understanding of the term *autocrat* and that no other contemporary author repeats such an opinion, *ibid.*, 356. Other authors understood this term differently, e.g. for the author of the *Беседа валаамскихъ чудотворцев* 'autocrat' is the one who rules alone, the way he himself wants, *ibid.*, 248. Cf. also above, notes 144 and 230.

254On the change of customs see above, text and note 199. Some Byzantine authors examined the question on whether the ruler is subject to positive, human law. McCORMICK 1991, 692 says: "As the source of law, he [the emperor] was not bound by it (Basil. 2.6.1; cf. e.g. Leo VI, nov. 47)" Yet, it was a subject of discussion among the jurists. Maximus does not enter into this discussion at all. NB, VALDENBERG 2006, 359 says that nobody in Rus' till seventeenth century had expressed the idea that the tsar is not bound by the law.

255Western discussions were especially heated in the time of Reformation but Maximus might have known about it only from hearsay, at the best. Savonarola wrote: "Eastern peoples are deficient in spirit (*sanguis*), while northerners abound in spirit but are weaker intellectually." Savonarola quotes Thomas Aquinas' *De regimine* II, 9 and IV, 8 and the very idea is based on Aristotle, *Politics*, Book VII, chapter 7, cf. WEINSTEIN 1970, 292.

Moscow although criticism of tyranny is present in Muscovite literature of the sixteenth century in the form of the topos *tsar'-muchitel'* (i.e. tormentor).<sup>256</sup> This term, the analogue of the Greek *τύραννος* is mentioned just once in one of Maximus' important works ("мучители въмѣсто царевъ бывше" – Z 29), but not developed.

### *Councillors*

The other element that could constitute some limits on the tsar's power interested Maximus incomparably more: counsel and counsellors. The topos of the ruler's counsellors appears in the literature of each of Maximus' *worlds*. It exists in Byzantine circle in Agapetos' work, in patriarch Niphon's life it is emphasised that he was ready to come to Wallachia if the prince would heed all his advice. In Florence, when Maximus lived there, Piero de'Medici was widely criticised for not taking the good counsel of more experienced citizens. Savonarola considered the council to be sovereign in Florence and demanded a wider social representation on government. On Athos councils played an important role in the administration of monasteries and limited hegumens' power. Eventually, in Muscovy the motive of good advice for the tsar was widely discussed.<sup>257</sup> Recently, some researchers tend to demonstrate that the mode of government in Muscovy was rather collegial than autocratic.<sup>258</sup> We still do not know which *institution* (if any) was responsible for advising the tsar but even if it was not institutionalised, an inner circle of counsellors existed before the time of Ivan IV and the very idea that consultation is an important element of the tsar's government was shared by many significant figures in sixteenth century Muscovy. Source evidence confirms that this theory was linked with the political practice.<sup>259</sup>

---

Fra Girolamo develops this motive much more extensively than Aquinas, *ibid.*, 304. Weinstein is wrong, however, saying (*ibid.*) that this part of *De regimine* is an authentic work by Thomas Aquinas. It is not. An important contemporary of Savonarola (but of quite different views) Giovanni Caroli OP, was ready to treat even the master of his order as a tyrant and wrote: "disobedience to a tyrant can be justified, even if he is a Christian magistrate", see: EDELHEIT 2008, 57.

256See: ROWLAND 1990, 137. Metropolitan Macarius says that if a ruler ordered him to do something contrary to divine rules, he would not obey, *ibid.*, 146. Timofeev says that God would have permitted to murder such a tsar as Ivan IV, *ibid.*, 134. Some authors see in the *Povest' o Drakule* a covert criticism of tyranny, with possible Western influences (cf. MILLER 1978, 397. 403-4). On this motive in Joseph of Volokolamsk, above, note 213.

257As for Agapetus, see e.g.: AGAPETUS, Advice, no. 22, on Niphon see: BARBU 2001, 244. On Florence: WEINSTEIN 1970, 123, 254, 307. On Athos monasteries, see: chapter II, text and note 208. Maximus did not consider the limitation of the hegumen's power as a decline although it was linked with the development of idiorhythmy. Cf. also the case adduced above, note 157. On Muscovy: BOGATYREV 2000, 37-91 and *passim*. Interestingly, Joseph of Volokolamsk also introduced a co-governing council of Elders in his monastery, "morally independent check upon [...] the abbot", GOLDFRANK 2005, 354, note 58, point fourth.

258See: ROWLAND 1990, 126, text and note 5.

259The term *Boyar Duma* does not refer to any concrete *institution*, see: BOGATYREV 2000, 253. Similarly the Chosen Council (Избранная рада) is Kurbskii's expression and does not describe any officially established institution, *ibid.*, 90, note 157 (cf. also RZHIGA 1934, 75-6). On the inner circle: *ibid.*, 100. The ideological questions linked with the problem of counselling (both the use of the Byzantine sources and the works of Old Russian and Muscovite authors) Bogatyrev describes in chapter I, *ibid.*, 38-69. Cf., e.g., Bersen' -

Bogatyrev in his book on the tsar's counsellors underlines the ritualistic dimension of consultation and its extended ideological context. Counsellors are identified in a way to the tsar and consultation becomes a ritual play of good and evil forces. Maximus also reflected on the role and significance of the ruler's counsellors but only partially accepted Muscovite ideological patterns.<sup>260</sup>

Maximus' contemporary Muscovite authors used a ritualistic approach which consisted in a persuasion that the tsar, performing ritually his functions assures order, harmony and peace in the state. The Greek, quite often used a similar vocabulary but he did not necessarily put it into the traditional ritualised structure. He rather adopted it to construct a more personalised moral standard of a Christian monarch. Sometimes he avoided a term which was currently applied by authors, as we have seen in the example of his attitude to the notion of the tsar's majesty (*зрота*) which was one of key idioms of the ritualistic rhetoric. Maximus did not like purely external ritualism in Christian life in general and perhaps this orientation had an impact on his social thought. It is also possible that his encounter with Western thought that had earlier abandoned ritualism in political reflection, influenced his position.<sup>261</sup>

Thus, Maximus did not fully subscribe to Muscovite political ideology but shared some of its convictions. He emphasised the significance of the link between nobles and the tsar in public affairs. He called prince Peter Shuyskii (and probably also people close to him) co-rulers and helpers of Basil III (*соначальники и споспѣшники*). He did not clarify how he understood the co-ruling but certainly counselling was an expression of this participation in

---

Beklemishev's opinion in: SD-Ob, 5 and 11. On the Muscovite practice and its evolution between fourteenth and sixteenth centuries: BOGATYREV 2000, 78-218.

<sup>260</sup>On the ritualistic approach, BOGATYREV 2000, esp. 37-91 and *passim*. On the counsellors identification with the ruler, *ibid.*, 47-8 and 61. Bogatyrev (*ibid.*, 61-2) tried to incorporate Maximus' ideas into his vision but it is not a successful attempt. He based his conjecture only on a short fragment (K-III, 237-8) which may be an unidentified translation (we do not dispose a critical edition of this fragment yet) and not on Maximus' important works. This fragment just says that a tsar who rules together with his counsellors is respectful. Maximus' opinion is expressed first of all in his works devoted directly to the art of government. Bogatyrev refers also to these works but does not remark that they are devoid of ritualism.

<sup>261</sup>It was RZHIGA 1934, 46 who emphasised that Maximus' works stand out in Muscovite literature by their openness and bold contact with reality. Still at the end of the sixteenth century the ritualistic rhetoric was in use. ROWLAND 1990, 134-5 shows how Fedor Ivanovich who was feeble-minded, was nevertheless considered a good ruler because of his piety. He also describes the logic of the ritualistic rhetoric, *ibid.*, 131-3. The terminology used by Maximus and by other authors is often the same. Patriarch Job, describing the tsar Fedor Ivanovich employs a similar rhetoric as Maximus, cf. ROWLAND 1990, 135. Ivan Timofeev wrote similarly on Boris Godunov, *ibid.* 141, note 62. The essential difference is that in Maximus this terminology is an appeal while Job and Timofeev ascribe these qualities to a real person in a schematic way, as if the tsar was whom he should have been. The ritualist rhetoric was also associated with immutability of old customs, cf. above, note 186 and ROWLAND 1990, 139. 150-1. Ritualism is more natural, obvious to traditional societies. If Maximus stands against ritualism, this attitude is rather rooted in his Western experience, especially his meeting with Savonarola. WEINSTEIN 2011, 161 says that Savonarola "often criticised 'ceremony' as the tepid Christian's substitute for deep faith." On Maximus' critics of purely external ritualism: IVANOV 1974, 201-2.

government since, in his view, counsellors played an essential role in administration.<sup>262</sup> In his exhortations for both rulers (Basil III and Ivan IV) he recommends that they should listen to counsellors. He particularly stressed it when he referred to the metropolitan, his bishops and justified it with Christ's words (M-II, 249): "He that hears you hears me..." (Lc 10: 16) Yet, he did not limit the circle of potential advisers to the mighty ones. At the beginning of his Muscovite period, he expressed the conviction that even someone insignificant can give good advice and is worthy to be heard by the tsar. At that moment he primarily thought about himself but the idea was expressed in a more general way.<sup>263</sup>

Maximus does not develop a theory of consultation nor of counsellors. He places himself rather as a counsellor and gives advice. He does not employ the conventional scheme, distinctly present in Muscovite literature, of good and bad counsellors. There is no trace in his output of the belief, universally maintained in Muscovy in the sixteenth century, that the tsar is not guilty of any misdeeds nor bad decisions, but only his counsellors. His approach is moral and pragmatic. He says that a conversation while staying with a good and righteous man brightens and instructs our thought whereas conversation with a bad man darkens and corrupts it.<sup>264</sup>

### *Education*

With all his skepticism about the possibility of using philosophy to explore the *spiritual* world, Maximus did not hesitate to underline the value of education for the *temporal* reality. He described, with the greatest approbation, the desire of those in the West who want to receive a good education (*philosophy* – which should be understood here as a synonym of education). He emphasised that they descend from various backgrounds, starting with the simple folk to

<sup>262</sup>On co-rulers see: OLMSTED 1989, 277 (=K-II, 419). We find a similar expression in *Послание къ начальствующимъ праведно* (K- II, 338-346), e.g. on *соправящихъ царю князехъ и боярехъ* (K-II, 338) and on the necessity of unanimity among boyars and vоеvodas (ibid., 339). The authorship of the last work is not confirmed. Sinitsyna did not include it yet to her edition project of Maximus' collected works. Nevertheless the convergence of ideas indicates Maximus' authorship.

<sup>263</sup>Maximus recommends to listen to counsellors e.g. in M-I, 150; M-II, 249. 255; Z 240 and so on. In one of his exhortations (M-I, 150) Maximus shows that even someone insignificant could be a good counsellor: "[...] надѣваясь въ милость [other MSS: мистъ] Его [Basil III] и в дарованную Ему от Бога благоразумную мудрость, ею же кротко услышит всѣхъ могущихъ съвѣтовати, что полезно обществу и времени пристоящее, избираетъ же благоразумно ползующаа, аще и от худѣишаго будутъ реченаа." ROWLAND 1990, 141-2 says that "the function of giving advice was not specifically entrusted to any institution or social class; in theory anyone could be a wise adviser."

<sup>264</sup>See: M-II, 257. On Muscovite ideology of good and bad counsellors, see: BOGATYREV 2000, 27-8; 38-41; 53-6; 81-86. On the good tsar and bad counsellors: KOROGODINA 2007, 379-80 who emphasis Karpov's conviction that even superiors (so possibly also the tsar) are responsible for crimes. Cf. also KIVELSON 1997, 272-7 on evil advisers - sorcerers who "managed the cut the tsar's access to godly wisdom from above and to social truth from below", ibid., 276.

princely and royal children. Having finished their studies they return home “преполонъ всякыя премудрости и разума” and are for their countries good counsellors and leaders (Z 240). Maximus does not say: “counsellors for their rulers” but “for their countries”. He modifies and extends the topos of “tsar and his counsellors”. Education and wisdom are important not only for the ruler and his counsellors but for people from all social strata. Educated people benefit the whole country. Certainly the wisdom of the tsar and his intimates is crucial – Maximus would have said – but is not enough. Philosophy – he emphasised – introduces virtues and goodness into this world and establishes good civic order (гражданство).<sup>265</sup>

Maximus appeals to the tsar to hear beneficial advice can be understood in two ways: that it is always beneficial (полезно) to listen to advice or: that the tsar should listen to advice *if* it is beneficial. In any case, it reveals a belief that it is better to consider different reasons rather than just exercise power. Consultation with wise people helps to find the best solution.

Stressing the weight of education for the people responsible for public affairs Maximus was a good disciple of the humanists who were convinced of the importance of education in the service of good government. It was almost an antithesis to an opinion of Ivan IV’s counsellor, Vassian Toporkov, who advises the tsar to avoid counsellors wiser than himself in order to be better than all and to dominate all. Generally, Muscovy tradition attached little importance to the tsar’s education.<sup>266</sup>

Examining Maximus’ social ideas we have already noticed his freedom in relation to the existing models of social reflection. He was faithful to the tradition in the sense that he accepted and quoted fundamental elements of the traditional vision of the Christian ruler or the relationship (symphony) between spiritual and temporal power but he used these elements to construct his own approach. He did not create a new theory. He was a rather anti-systemic

---

<sup>265</sup>The fragment on the significance of education comes from the description of the University of Paris in the *Terrible Story* (Z-240). On the role of philosophy he says in the context of his struggle with astrology showing that rulers need philosophers more than astrologers. Philosophy “[...] всяко ино благоуукрашение нрава законополагае и гражданство составляет нарочито и, совокупльша рещи, всяку добродѣтель и благодѣть вводит в сем свѣте.” (M-I, 319). Elsewhere Maximus says that Plato “отгоняетъ е [astrology] от законоположенаго собою философскаго гражданства” (M-I, 317).

<sup>266</sup>Maximus writes that the tsar should listen to the metropolitan and bishops’ beneficial advice (“*полезнаа* [my Italic - ZS] богохранимѣи дрѣжавѣ твои свѣтующих послушай” – M-II, 249). Cf. also the passage from M-I, 150, quoted above, note 263. On humanists cf. BURNS 1999, 107; on the role of education in Western political thought: LLOYD-HUDSON 2007, 19-25. On Vassian Toporkov: KURBSKII, *History of the Grand Prince of Moscow*, 82. On Muscovite tradition: KOLLMANN 2017, 7.

thinker. Yet, his impact was significant.<sup>267</sup>

Maximus availed himself of key elements of Byzantine and earlier Russian literature (the tsar's justice, piety, mercy, meekness and generosity to widows and orphans) that described a good Christian ruler. Yet, he employed these elements in a particular way and formed his own personal vision, surpassing the confines of the traditional, ritualistic approach. Maximus' thought did introduce some changes into the heritage of the Byzantine reflection. For Muscovy it was a breeze of fresh air, fresh ideas. His distinctive feature was a more realistic approach to social reflection and a modified vision of social and political life. The tsar, although exalted, was called to lead the same Christian life as others. The common good of the country (although Maximus does not use this term) depended not only on the most powerful but on just government on every level. These elements suggest certain Western influences on Maximus' social reflection. In some cases the author pointed to it directly when he shows, in the example of the University of Paris, the significance of education; in others, we can detect in his ideas a humanist inspiration.

The Muscovite ground was not ready to assimilate the Greek's ideas. Shortly after his death, quite a different concept of the tsar's power came into force. Instead of a spirit of responsibility it was rather a conviction of the tsar's absolute exaltation above all and everything that inspired Ivan IV.<sup>268</sup>

## 5. IN DEFENCE OF FAITH – AGAINST HERESY

We have already noticed a couple of times that Maximus' *worlds* were in crisis: Greece after the fall of Constantinople, Italy with its religious restlessness and millenarian mood, Athos which hardly dealt with economic difficulties and with the tension between two model of monastic life (idiorhythmic and cenobitic), finally Muscovy with its tentative opening to the

---

<sup>267</sup>An important twentieth century scholar of Russian law and politics, Vladimir Valdenberg, even maintained that the Greek was the first in Muscovy who postulated to limit the tsar's power by a council or counsellors (VALDENBERG 2006, 214-16). He had, however, limited knowledge on Maximus' output (e.g. he maintained that the *Hortatory chapters* were written before 1525, see p. 216). RZHIGA 1934, 80 criticised Valdenberg's opinion.

<sup>268</sup>Ivan IV wrote to Kurbskii (IVAN IV – KURBSKII, Letters, 13-14) in such a way as if the latter's turning away from the tsar was a destruction of the whole social and religious order ("тогда ты и церкви разоряти, и иконы попирати и крестьян погубляти" - p. 13). Further (p. 14) Ivan wrote: "и на человека возъярився, на Бога восстал еси" and, referring to Rom 13: 2: "противляясь власти, Богу противится". Ivan described Kurbskii as a seed that fell upon stony places and did not bring fruit. He continued in the same breath: "к Богу веру истинну и к нам прямую службу - сие убо враг все и вся из сердца твоего изхитил есть [...]; божественная писания [...] не повелевают чадом отцем противитися, а рабом господиям, кроме веры." Thus, defiance of the tsar is a defiance of God.



outer world and persistent anxiety about it. These crises often evoked or brought to light the uncertainty concerning the identity of a group, society or country. Such a situation required a defence and we can see in Maximus' work precisely an answer to that threat. The quantity of polemical works in his output and their intensity demonstrates that insecurity had attained a high level.

It may be that in his contact with Western culture particularly stigmatising were the attempts to cross boundaries, to reconcile what seemed to be unreconcilable. It is true that only a narrow circle of people followed the path of the unifying tendency but among them were the greatest thinkers of that time. Yet, the general policy of European countries was a very limited toleration of dissidents. With the beginning of the Reformation and the reaction to it, a tendency to underline differences seized Europe. Maximus had not been able to see and experience that in Italy but he participated in a similar movement, in Moscow.

Of course, in many respects, the situation in Muscovy was different. Isolation was the point of departure there. We tried to demonstrate that a certain opening occurred in the sixteenth century but a sense of threat turned out to prevail. Maximus noticed the danger but does not seem to regard it as tragic. He confirmed Beklemishev's words that "Muscovy is surrounded by enemies" (Crimean Khanate, Khanate of Kazan', Gran Duchy of Lithuania) but all of them were either pagans or heretics so – continued Maximus – one should have not been afraid of them because "God is with us!"<sup>269</sup> This phrase shows why the preservation of orthodoxy was crucial not only for eternal salvation but also in temporality. God is with us when we guard purity of faith! The fact that Muscovy was surrounded by enemies, both in the material and spiritual sense, stimulated attempts to safeguard orthodoxy at least within the country. In Philotheus' works, his idea of the Third Rome revealed the feeling that all anchorage had failed and only Moscow still endured, keeping the true faith.<sup>270</sup> It was probably the reason that brought about such a violent reaction against domestic heretics in the sixteenth century.

---

<sup>269</sup>For this part of the conversation between Maximus and Beklemishev see: SD-Ob, 6. Penitentials of the 1500s identified the main enemies of Rus' as Tartars (*busurmane*), Poles (*liakhi*) and Roman Catholics (*latyne*), see: KOROGODINA 2007, 381. On the general policy in European countries see: chapter II, note 22. It would be instructive to investigate whether one can observe in Muscovy a similar process as that described by Jean Delumeau in *La Peur en Occident* and *Le Pêché et la peur*. It deserves a separate study.

<sup>270</sup>Philotheus' ideas are still a subject of very different interpretations. Cf., e.g., BUSHKOVITCH 2000, 393-4 and above, chapter II, note 274. NB, Maximus shared a few fundamental ideas with Philotheus. Both of them polemicalised with the Latins, fought astrology. Like Maximus, Philotheus emphasised the necessity to submit reason to the Revelation. See: GOLDBERG-DMITRIEVA 1989 (SKK). See also above, chapter II, notes 331 and 343. Perhaps Byzantium which tended to be confessionally monolithic was also in this respect an example for Muscovy.

## TWO CHALLENGES: LATINS AND ISLAM

In the religious sphere there were two uneven challenges facing Muscovy: Western Christianity and Islam. The latter ideologically was the most abominable enemy. Yet, in real life it was a different picture. Muscovite sovereigns did not have any particular reservations in allying themselves with Muslim rulers and the Muscovite state appropriated some institutions of their former oppressors. Muscovy's civil authority in the sixteenth century was not too eager to convert Muslims.<sup>271</sup>

Quite different was the situation with the Latins (which means Roman Catholics because the nascent Reformation was not yet a problem or a threat for Muscovy). Since they were incomparably closer to Orthodoxy, the danger of contamination was much stronger. Alienation had grown over the centuries and the reaction of Muscovy against the council of Florence (despite a moment of a relative openness directly after the council), sealed the estrangement. The Moscow metropolitans swore not to accept the “new heretical teaching brought by Isidor from the unholy Latin council [of Florence]”, to avoid everything *alien* and, among others, to oppose any family or brotherly links between Orthodox and un-Orthodox, especially Armenian and Latin. It had an impact on everyday life. Beklemishev was not the only person who did not call the Latins – Christians.<sup>272</sup>

---

271 On political relationships cf. above, chapter II and KHODARKOVSKY 1997, 259; on the Tartar institutions see discussion around OSTROWSKI 1998 in the review “Kritika” in 2000; on Muslim (and, more generally, non-Christians), KHODARKOVSKY 1997, 257-64. NB, similarly Spaniards, during the Reconquista, were not very eager to convert Muslim, cf. HANKE 1976, 366.

272 On the metropolitan oath see: *Исповѣдание о поставлении Иоасафа*, in: ASo, I, 162. Beklemishev said that Zoe Paleolog after her father was Christian but after her mother – Latin: SD-Ob, 10. On the Muscovite attitude towards the Latins: ALEF 1961, 391, esp. text and notes 11 and 12 (in the last note another example that only Orthodox were considered Christians by the Muscovites). Cf. however chapter I, text and note 29 that the rejection of the union was not necessarily immediate in Moscow.

Maximus entered into this threatened Muscovite world as a newcomer but he had some background experience of polemics with the Latins and possibly also with Muslims. His polemical activity in Muscovy became broader. The first collections of his works composed by himself, contain also refutations of Armenian and Jewish errors as well as a denunciation of the *hellenic deceit*. The author himself declared that these works were linked one to another as parts of a complex design to struggle against heresies.<sup>273</sup> Some of them might have been a real danger but for others (e.g. the Armenians) we do not have any evidence that they challenged Muscovite Orthodoxy. The whole complex was the demonstration of Maximus' orthodoxy and ability to defend it against all possible enemies. Perhaps even more: a kind of fundamental apologetic work.

Regarding Muslims, Maximus used exceptionally strong expressions and invectives.<sup>274</sup> The occupation of his homeland by the Turks and the danger of a Moscow – Turkish alliance might have inclined him to such radical utterances. As a matter of fact, the violent language was not rare in the history of Christian anti-Muslim polemics. Many Christian polemicists considered Muslims as heretics who had rejected Christianity.<sup>275</sup>

#### AGAINST LATINS

His approach towards the Latins is different. Many times he calls them *heretics* but they are closer to him than to any of his Muscovite co-religionists. In reference to the Latins Maximus also applies a radical rhetoric but it is rather a call to conversion than a rejection, as it was in the case of Muslims. Speaking to, or about them, he emphasised that the true faith is indispensable for salvation (cf. M-I, 186), as a missionary who wanted to convert them. At the same time, he assured his readers of his own orthodoxy and of his hatred towards any heresy and Latin novelties: before 1525 (M-I, 174) certainly to avoid suspicion (probably he felt or knew already of possible accusations) and after his trials when he composed the first collection

<sup>273</sup>On Maximus' previous experience of polemics against the Latins see: chapter II, note 243. On Maximus' idea to struggle against heresies comprehensively: SINITSYNA 1972<sup>a</sup>, 154-6 and on the early collections of his works: *ibid.*, 161-175. Perhaps Giovanni Pico's project to write a work against the enemies of the Church inspired Maximus to entertain a similar work, cf. above, note 31. Manuel of Corinth, Maximus' acquaintance, was also a polemicist. His activity was focused mainly on polemics against neo-paganism and on controversy concerning five differences between the Orthodox and Catholic theology and discussed at the council of Florence, cf. PODSKALSKY 1988, 87. Manuel's works certainly influenced Maximus. Both of them used the same authorities, rarely used by others (e.g. pope Celestine I's letter, see below, note 280); they both expressed similar thoughts concerning the doctrine of purgatory, see below, text and notes 323 and 325.

<sup>274</sup>For the examples of Maximus' language used in relation to Muslims see, e.g., M-I, 145-50; Z-186; M-II, 115. He also said to Ivan IV that soldiers who perished during the war against Khanate of Kazan', died "for the Orthodox faith" (KURBSKII, *History of the Grand Prince of Moscow*, 76-7).

<sup>275</sup>On the conviction that Islam is a Christian heresy: SMITH 1999, 321-3. Maximus describes Muslims as *Agarenes* (descendants of Hagar). It was an early term, later replaced by the Greek word *Saracens*, *ibid.* 321.

of his works directed chiefly against heresies.

### *Defining orthodoxy*

The question of heresy required from Maximus another approach than what he adopted in his exhortation to a moral and truly Christian life. The moral precepts were more sharply determined from the very beginning of the Church than other elements of the orthodox faith. Some articles of Orthodoxy were defined by different councils over the centuries, amidst bitter discussions. Maximus too, in the middle of the polemics had to determine how he distinguished orthodox and heterodox writings. He gave three criteria for an opinion (literally he wrote about a *писание*) to be considered as orthodox: 1) its author should be faithful (благовѣрный) and known to the Catholic (соборная) Church; 2) it should be compatible with the Apostolic dogma and tradition; 3) it should be completely coherent.<sup>276</sup>

### *How to treat heretics?*

Having determined who is orthodox and who is heretic, one should naturally confront the following question: how should heretics be treated? This question had been discussed in the West at least from the time of St Augustine. At the turn of the fifteenth and sixteenth century, the Western experience became interesting for the Muscovite hierarchy. The heated polemics in Moscow at the beginning of the sixteenth century on the way heretics should be treated illustrates that heresy had become a real problem but also that the attitude towards heresy and heretics was changing.<sup>277</sup>

It is not easy to reconstruct Maximus' views on this subject. There is just one work that

---

<sup>276</sup>See: M-II, 125. The source of such a definition of Orthodoxy was not identified. At any rate, DALEY 1984, 172 says that after the council of Chalcedon it "became increasingly important to show the continuity of one's own thought, and the discontinuity of one's opponents' thought." An interesting fragment concerning heretics and heresy can be found in *Послание Николаю Латинянину о латинском отлучении («Слово ответно»)*, M-I, no. 20. Sinitsyna placed this work among *dubia*. It is a compilation. Some fragments are taken from Maximus' genuine works and others from elsewhere. Sinitsyna doubts (M-I, 501) whether the passage concerning heresy was written by Maximus. Her arguments are based on the analyse of style and content. She sees even a possible link of this fragment with Karpov's missive to metropolitan Daniel. Nevertheless the manuscript tradition (including the best manuscripts) assigns this work to Maximus (M-I, 495). In this fragment the author distinguishes between heresy and delusion and quotes an authority in support of his view (M-I, 384-5): "Еретикъ бо онъ есть, кто мнѣнию своему лживому крѣпцѣ прилѣпляется и извѣстною совѣстью истинѣ вѣрной противу глаголетъ жестоцѣ без надежи исправления. Аще бо от невѣдения сие сотворит, тогда наречется заблудникъ, а не еретикъ. Иустинъ бо, святыи философ и мученикъ, епископъ Ипоненский, во своемъ лицѣ глаголетъ: «Заблудити убо, — рече, — могу, а еретикъ не буду»." The obvious confusion between Justin and Augustine indicate the copyist's lack of erudition. Nevertheless the presence of this phrase in the text is interesting. It is not an authentic quotation from Augustine but Bonaventura's summary of Augustine's idea, cf. JEAN DE ROQUETAILLADÉ, *Liber ostensor*, 109, note 2, cf. also: Bonaventura, *Expositio in librum sapientiae*, cap. VII. This phrase circulated broadly in works of European authors. Besides the above mentioned Jean de Roquetaillade we found it also, e.g., in Martin Luther's letter to Spalatin of 21<sup>st</sup> of August 1518 or in Clemens Dolera's *Catholicarum insitutionum ad christianam theologiam compendium*.

<sup>277</sup>See above, chapter I about bishop Gennadii and chapter II, text and note 277 and 278, about polemics between Iosifians and Patrikeev.

can be attributed to him without any doubt, but which was written in unknown circumstances: *Advice to the Orthodox Council against Isaac, the Jew*. In it he adopted a radical approach. He gives examples of how Moses, Phinehas and bishop Leo of Catania exterminated, without mercy, those who were a threat to the purity of the true faith. These examples (quite distant from the real situation in Muscovy) were also used by other authors who participated in the polemic on the way heretics should be treated in sixteenth century. First to use them was Joseph of Volokolamsk. He wanted the radical extermination of heretics, also those who converted.<sup>278</sup>

An author of the *Slovo na spisanie Iosifa*, most probably Vassian Patrikeev, polemicised with Joseph. He pointed that the same biblical figures, mentioned by Joseph, showed mercy to dissidents and that this mercy brought good fruit. He also added similar examples of the behaviour of the Fathers of the Church. Later, in another work (*Slovo o eretitsekh*), Patrikeev emphasised the difference between those heretics who repented (and should be treated mercifully) and those who did not want to abjure their convictions (in this case he accepted that the secular authority punished them).<sup>279</sup>

Maximus was less merciful than Vassian but also far from Joseph's radicalism. He adduced the same examples as Joseph but the latter's work does not contain conclusions drawn by the Greek. The examples serve Maximus as an introduction: first to exhort hierarchs to be zealous and then to present his *own* view of how heretics should be treated. To do this Maximus evoked the example of Leo of Catania who tried at first to apply lenient measures and only when there were no results, he decided to resort to force. The Greek considered that the one who provokes confusion among the faithful should be handed over to secular authority to

---

278It is unclear who the Isaac mentioned in the *Advice to the Orthodox council* was (M-II, 338-9). There is no reason to think that it was Isaac Sobaka. This Isaac is called Jew and he is just mentioned once in the title of this short work. In the closing part of this piece (M-II, 339) Maximus uses quite violent words "they [the Jews] crucified the one whom we worship, they [...] curse the one whom we [...] bless". In the text attributed to Joseph, the *Discourse on the Condemnation of Heretics* (cf. AFED, 490. 492), are used the same examples as in Maximus's work.

279The *Slovo na spisanie Iosifa* was published by АНКНИМУК 1990, 140-6 and, according to PЛIGUZOV 2002, 78 was written not later than in June 1512. NB, the author of this *Slovo* encouraged those who were strong in faith to discuss with heretics quoting, inaccurately, the *Ladder* by John Climacus ("Немощнии с еретики не ядят, силнии же да на славу Божию сходятся" – АНКНИМУК 1990, 142 with reference to Лествица, Слово к пастырю, ГБЛ Ф. 304, № 162, л. 182 об). Patrikeev's *Slovo o eretitsekh* was published by KAZAKOVA 1960, 272-4. The figures (Moses, Phinehas, Leo of Catania) were used as examples by Joseph, Maximus and also the author of the *Slovo na spisanie* referred to them. They are not mentioned in the *Slovo o eretitsekh* but they return later in the *Ответ Кирилловских старцев*. According to PЛIGUZOV 2002, 70-72. 76 this work was written between 1520 and 1550 not by Patrikeev but compiled on the basis of Joseph's letter to Basil III and the letter of the elders of the Kirillov monastery to the same addressee. In this work (that is clearly a reaction to Joseph's *Книга на еретиков*, book 13) the capital punishment for heresy is rejected and Joseph's reasoning ridiculed. This whole discussion was researched by PЛIGUZOV 2002, 69-80. Cf. also HANEY 1973, 133-4.

be punished (въ казнь) lest others fall into heresy too (M-II, 339).<sup>280</sup> This approach corresponds precisely to the way that the Catholic Inquisition acted, at least in theory. The ideas and the terminology used by Maximus indicate thus Western theories as his source of inspiration.

A short fragment from one of Maximus' anti-Muslim works sheds more light on his ideas concerning heretics. First of all, he wants to demonstrate that Islam has no divine origin but, besides the main theme, he also expresses the thought that God does not want to coerce people to believe but gently and with love (кротко и челоуѣколюбне) He summons them to Himself. Taking into account that in this work Maximus attributed to Muslims the opposite behaviour, it becomes clear (although he does not say that directly) that Christians should imitate God's gentleness.<sup>281</sup>

It may seem that Maximus' ideas of these two above-mentioned works are not easy to harmonise. Only when we assume that he was inspired by the Western concepts, does the reconstruction become understandable. Maximus accepted coercion and the handing of heretics to the secular power when they, being Orthodox, rejected the true faith, tried to distort it or introduce confusion. Yet, with regard to someone of another denomination, it was not coercion but gentleness that should be exerted. Such was, precisely, the approach of a classic example of Western thought, Thomas Aquinas.<sup>282</sup> Maximus applies this principle also to the Latins. He calls them heretics but does not propose to use force for their conversion.

Maximus' polemic with the Latins deserves the most attention because it is the largest one. It contains broad argumentation and through it the whole of Maximus' polemical activity

280Maximus mentions Leo of Catania in M-II, 338 and then, in M-II, 339, he exhorts hierarchs and continues: "[...] и смутившаго убо паству Спасову предадите внѣшнѣи власти в казнь, да и ины накажутся не приложити имъ смущати овця Спасова, ни приежжати в землю нашу православную." The word *казнь* does not mean necessarily capital punishment. According to SREZNEVSKII 1958, II, 1178-9 it can mean any punishment. Elsewhere (M-I, 188) Maximus quotes also a passage from the pope Celestine I's to Nestorius (PL 50, 475, 4; the Greek considers this letter to be sent to the Council of Ephesus) where the pope says: "Quis umquam non dignus est anathemate iudicatus, vel adjiciens vel detrahens fidei? Plene etenim ac manifeste tradita ab Apostolis nobis, nec augmentum, nec imminutionem requirunt. Legimus in libris nostris (Апос. xxii, 18), non addi debere, non detrahi: magna quippe et addentem et detrahentem poena constringit. Unde cauterium praeparamus et ferrum, quia ultra non erunt fovenda vulnera, quae merentur abscidi." Maximus gives a faithful translation of this passage and the expression *cauterium et ferrum* interprets as: "огнем и желѣзом, сирѣчь, прокляти и отлучении от вѣрных общества отсѣцает." NB, Manuel of Corinth also used in his polemics a letter of the pope Celestine I, cf. PODSKALSKY 1988, 88.

281 "[...] ни одинаго нудить Преблагыи [Бог] ... и ни одинаго бо нудить ниже убити кого велить, но сие кротцѣ и челоуѣколюбнѣ призываетъ всѣхъ к Себѣ... [further the quotation Mt 11: 28]" M-II, 100-1.

282On Thomas Aquinas: STh, II-II, 10, 8. Maximus expressed the idea that heretics should be handed over to secular power in M-II, 339, cf. above, note 280. In this case his views differed from those of Chrysostom who was against killing heretics. Maximus must have known about that because this conviction is expressed in JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, In Matthaeum, 477 (PG 58, 477), the work that Maximus translated. Therefore in this respect Maximus was closer to Thomas Aquinas than to Chrysostom. Cf. also below, note 296 with reference to M-I, 202 where Maximus quotes John Chrysostom's opinion that if someone destroys a part of ruler's image on a coin, he makes the coins false. Similarly, if someone changes an article of faith, he violates the whole faith. Perhaps Chrysostom was an inspiration for Aquinas who expressed a similar idea in STh, II-II, 11, 3.

can be perceived the most clearly.

## PREDECESSORS AND MAXIMUS' CONTEMPORARIES

The controversy between the Latins and the Greeks has a long history. Forms of this dispute and the methods of argument varied depending on the author and context: once more balanced and expressing a readiness for dialogue, another time full of violent insults. In the fifteenth century both Churches had behind them a few centuries of bitter disputes. The Council of Florence became a new turning point that was, by some, considered as a lost opportunity, by others as betrayal of the true faith. The failed union deepened the estrangement. A new wave of polemics appeared among Byzantines. Maximus' acquaintance, the Grand Rhetor Manuel of Corinth, was – according to Podskalsky – the first anti-Latin polemicist of this new epoch.<sup>283</sup>

In Rus', anti-Latin controversy rose with the beginning of Christianisation. Polemical works were sometimes translated integrally from Greek, often compiled. Some of these compilations were chaotic and made it difficult to understand the true reasons of the division. Besides theological argumentation, repeated mainly after Greek sources and often simplified, they contain also disgust with Latin customs (e.g. that they put their deceased's feet to point to the West and head to the East, they fast on Saturday – some of these accusations had also already existed in the Greek polemic works), insults and quite fantastic charges (e.g. that the Latins eat with dogs and chickens or drink their own urine or that they draw the cross on the earth, they kiss it and then they walk on it). Unknown strangers were even more bizarre. The lesser the contacts between the two parties, the more peculiar were the accusations. In such a situation the polemic became more a ritual activity than a real discussion. As time went on, theological topics were put into second place by the issues of ritual and custom: from the thirteenth century the question of unleavened bread used for the Eucharist ranked first, relegating the main, up until then, problem of the *Filioque*. The unfortunate reception of the council of Florence inflamed the dispute anew.<sup>284</sup>

---

<sup>283</sup>On Manuel cf. PODSKALSKY 1988, 88 and above, chapter I.

<sup>284</sup>On Russian anti-Latin polemics and the lists of charges see: POPOV 1875, PAVLOV 1878, 5 and passim. KIRILLIN 1996 attempts to explain the way strange accusations appeared and shows the real basis for charges which sound incredible. On peculiar accusation present already in the Greek polemic, cf. DARROUZÈS 1963, 68, no. 31; 70, no. 37; 73, no. 47; 80, no. 72 etc. E.g. the charge concerning the cross drawn on the earth and then step over is present in the thirteenth century Greek work (DARROUZÈS 1963, 73, no. 50) and in Russian sources (PAVLOV 1878, 5-6). On the changes of the order of issues in the polemics: ZHUROVA 2006, 145. UTHEMANN 1991, 2059, says that already in the mission of Constantine and Methodius the question of rites and discipline were

Muscovite polemicists, contemporary to Maximus, when they encountered Nicholas Bulow's unionist propaganda, repeated old insults or invented fantastic explanations. An anonymous author wrote: "your [i.e. Latin] Church is a plaything for evil demons..." and Philotheus of Pskov ascertained that although the great Rome was not conquered but "their souls had been enslaved by devil for the sake of unleavened bread."<sup>285</sup>

## MAXIMUS' APPROACH TO POLEMICS

Against this background Maximus' polemics was an exceptional phenomenon. He availed himself of the resources of the Greek anti-Latin polemics. The classic Byzantine author in this field was the patriarch Photius and virtually all those who continued the struggle after him repeated, at least a part, of his argumentation. Maximus most probably translated his encyclical on Latin errors, as well as the alleged missive of the pope John VIII to Photius and introduced them into the Muscovite anti-Latin controversy.<sup>286</sup> His censure of the Latins was resolute and adamant but he clearly distinguished theological and customary divergences. He often called the Latin heretics but we find a few places where he either hesitated ("they are worthy to be called schismatics and *partly* heretics" - M-I, 246, my Italic) or did not consider the Latins the same kind of heretics as others.<sup>287</sup> He focuses on only three main Latin errors: the

---

"the most prominent controversial issues". There were Greek polemicists (e.g. Photius, Theophylact of Ohrid, Peter of Antioch) who distinguished clearly the essential differences from secondary issues and dealt with the former, cf. DARROUZÈS 1963, 51-2. THEOPHYLACT OF OHRID, *Against Latins*, 252, tells the Latins that they err not by malignity of judgement but by ignorance of truth. Also among Russian polemicist we find authors who adopted much more conciliatory tone. The metropolitan of Kiev, John (Иоанн) II († 1089) wrote his missive to the (anti)pope Clement III with love and gentleness (see: PAVLOV 1878, 58-60). It was however rather a question of his personal qualities than the mainstream of the period. He was remembered as learned, good, merciful and humble man.

285A fragment from the anonymous polemicist (MS МДА №173 акад., 551 Волоколамский, л. 261-295) is quoted by ЗИМАКИН 1880, 329: "И ваша убо церкви злым бѣсом игралише, бѣси о ней радуются [...] У латынскіе церкви главу держит сам сатана, а шею - дѣмони; а двери алтарю - образ дѣволов." and contrasts this description of the Latin Church with an idealised picture of the Orthodox Church. This work is an answer for Nicholas Bülow's unionist ideas, *ibid.*, 319ff. Philotheus: "Аще убо великого Рима стѣны и столпове и трекровныя полаты не пленены, но душа их от диавола пленены быша опрѣснокъ ради." He continues again more bizarrely that Jesus commanded to prepare a double passover for him: one, according to the Law from unleavened bread, and second, in secret (тайную), from leavened bread. This is why it is called *таинаа вечеря* (a Slavonic name for the Last Supper), see: SINITSYNA 1998, 343-4. Philotheus repeats also a conviction of the Greek anti-Latin polemics that Muslim, unlike the Latins, when they conquered the *Greek kingdom* did not impair the [Orthodox] faith, *ibid.*, 343. THEOPHYLACT OF OHRID, *Against Latins*, 262-3 also considers that Jesus first ate the legal Passover meal and then conveyed the disciples the mystery of his own Passover. Cf. also KAZAKOVA 1970, 211 – for further examples how Muscovite authors idealised their own country and slandered the Latins.

286On Maximus' sources and translations: BULANIN 1984, 82-93. On one more of Photius' work (from the same complex of Maximus' translation materials) the *Missive to Romans on unleavened bread* (О опрѣснокѣх), unnoticed by Bulanin, cf. PLOGUZOV 2002, 204. ZHUROVA 2006, 158-60 notes that Maximus quotes abundantly patristic sources in the first period of his polemic and later just mentions his sources developing his own approach. She also compares there Maximus' sources with two other anti-Latin authors.

287Maximus writes to Fedor Karpov that he, Maximus, hates and averts "всѣх еретических велерѣчии и



## THE TRINITARIAN QUESTION

To approach his arguments against the Latin Trinitarian theology, which was for Maximus the most important part of the dispute, we have first to examine two other issues which were logically (not necessarily historically) prerequisites for the Trinitarian questions: of whether something could be added to the Creed and of the scholastic, syllogistic method in theology. The question of an addition to the Creed had been discussed at least from Photius' time and also during the Council of Florence. The problem of whether and how philosophy could be used in theology was not particularly discussed in Florence. Yet the Latins often justified their position using philosophical instruments. The majority of the Greek Fathers perceived their inferiority in the domain of the rationalised theology. In this field most of them were not able to discuss with the Latins as equals.<sup>289</sup>

### *Additions to the Creed*

The problem of additions to the Creed evokes a more general question of historicity and the attitude towards novelties in the Christian doctrine. Novelty was another name for heresy. For centuries this approach was the same both in the Christian East and in the West. That what was old, had a higher value than that which was novel. The Council of Florence revealed that a different experience brought about a split between these two parts of Christendom. It was still a long way to the Enlightenment apology of progress but Western theologians, in order to justify the *Filioque* which was introduced to the Creed after its text was established at the Council in Constantinople (381), began to speak about the development of the doctrine. It was not only an *ad hoc* argument for the expediency of discussion in Florence but a witness that the Western way of thinking was changing. The Greeks in Florence repeated: "we have neither changed nor adulterated anything of the divine dogmas transmitted to us from ages past; we have added nothing, we have taken nothing away, no innovation at all have we made." The Latins tried to show that a doctrinal development was possible, obviously organic, without introducing any new teaching.<sup>290</sup>

---

латынскиа послѣлния новины и суесловия" (M-I, 174), so he distinguished heretical ideas and Latin novelties. Perhaps he wanted to show a difference between them. Nevertheless, in many other places he applies the term *heretics* to the Latins, e.g. in M-I, 193; Z-255 and so on.

288He says that clearly in his *Praise for St Peter and Paul*. The work has a subtitle: "denunciation of the three major (большия) Latin heresies" (M-II, 81). In other works he also deals essentially with these three issues.

289The emperor John VIII and Gennadios Scholarios reproached the Greeks lack of learning. This fact was also noticed by an opponent of the union, Syropoulos, see: GILL 1959, 228-9.

290About Greeks in Florence: GILL 1959, 210. Andrew of Rhodes tried to convince the Greeks that the

Moscow was more closed and conservative than the late Byzantine Empire. Maximus' Muscovite contemporaries (e.g. already quoted archbishop Gennadii or Beklemishev) were convinced that their times were the time of decline. Changes for them were only changes for the worse. Metropolitan Daniel's bewilderment and indignation was all the greater against Patrikeev. At the beginning of his trial the Metropolitan underlined that Vassian dared to introduce changes to the Kormchaya that was confirmed and sealed by the Holy Fathers. Nobody dared to change or to dispute this book – he continued – from the seventh Council to the baptism of Rus' and during the five hundred years of the history of Rus'.<sup>291</sup> The unchangeability of the Kormchaya was a stable foothold. In crisis, when the current state of affaires required a revival, people sought inspiration and remedy from the past, in the lost golden age, in old customs and books. Similarly, the renewal of monastic life meant a return to the beginning, to the origin.

This situation shows the tension experienced by Maximus who – educated in Renaissance Italy – happened to live in Muscovy. His philological formation (regular or not but solid) had to be related, at the end of the fifteenth century, to an awareness of the historical changeability of language and, in consequence, to a more general understanding of the changes in social conventions, customs, etc. We have already seen that he accepted some scientific innovation for use of earthly society and was not against the modification of old customs in the domain of social and political regulations. Patriveev, during his collaboration with Maximus, also noticed contradictions between old canonical texts. It might have led to a consciousness of the historical changeability of ecclesiastical rules. This nascent sense of historicity contributed also, among other things, to the difference of perspective between Maximus and Patrikeev on one side and the metropolitan Daniel and his supporters on the other.<sup>292</sup>

It seems that sometimes Maximus tried to employ in his works a kind of historical argumentation. A trace of such an approach can be found in his comment on the passage Jn 15:

---

development is not forbidden. “the Church abides and must abide the same for ever, with its power intact. The prohibition [of ancient councils to add nothing to the Creed], however, as understood by the Greeks would reduce that power and render the Church unable to meet the crisis of the moment and so would prove itself harmful to the faithful.”, *ibid.*, 152. He saw therefore that there are new challenges that required new answers. Cardinal Cesarini showed that, despite previous prohibition to evangelise differently or to deliver a different doctrine, the councils had added something to the previous definition. Therefore the intention was to forbid introducing a new doctrine and not to add words, nor explanations which arose from the inherited doctrine, *ibid.*, 160.

291 In most cases Maximus discussed the prohibition of any changes in the Creed in connection with the *Filioque* but sometimes he refers to it also in other situations (e.g. Nestorianism – Z-214). About unchangeability of the Kormchaya (KAZAKOVA 1960, 285-6): “И тоє книги не смее никъто же разрешити или чем поколебати...”

292 The best examples of the nascent historical consciousness in the Renaissance Italy are Lorenzo Valla's works on the *Donatio Constantini* and the *Corpus Areopagiticum*. On Patrikeev: above, chapter II, note 347. On the dispute about the new Muscovite saints: above, chapter II, text and note 471.

26 that the Holy Spirit “proceeds from the Father” (M-I, 201). This fragment of saint John’s Gospel was one of the orthodox arguments that the Holy Spirit proceeds *only* from the Father. The Latins (probably Bülow) suggested another exegesis, namely that these words were intended to convince the Apostles to reason correctly about the Father whom they did not yet know. In his missive to Karpov the Greek rejects this interpretation. He answers that the Gospel according to John was written many years after Pentecost and when, thanks to the Holy Spirit, the Apostles had a profound understanding of the mysteries of faith. Thus, he thinks that, with time, the Apostle was able to better understand the mystery of faith than it was possible before. The proper understanding of a text depends also on placing it in its historical context.<sup>293</sup> At that, however, his historical approach in theology ended. He applied it to the crucial event of the Pentecost but clearly he did not see any other similar event in the later history of the Church that would have justified an opinion that the understanding of the Revelation could be developed in history. He could regard from a historical perspective the problems of secular knowledge or of ecclesiastical discipline but not of dogmas. He repeated very often the fundamental conviction of the Byzantine (and Russian) theology that nothing should be changed in the Creed (e.g. M-I, 135, 188. 191. 194). He presents himself in his *Confession of the Orthodox faith* as the one who has preserved the integrity of faith, has nothing added and nothing removed (M-II, 53).

In his two missives to Karpov against the Latins Maximus tried to demonstrate that over the centuries this principle of immutability was preserved. He mentions the decision of the Council of Ephesus, he quotes the Chalcedonian creed and adds that other councils repeated the same doctrine: nothing should be added to and nothing removed from the confession of faith. Further he multiplies references to the authorities, mainly Eastern but also Western, who confirm the same truth.<sup>294</sup> He does not mention at all the fact that the Council of Constantinople

---

<sup>293</sup>Maximus relates the Latins’ opinion that John wrote in his Gospel that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father “да увѣрит апостоловъ правѣ мудрствовати о Отцѣ” and argues against this interpretation in M-I, 201. Cf. also M-I, 161 where Maximus differentiated historical and moral explanation of a Psalm. NB, he was interested in Theodoret of Cyrus’ works. Theodoret belonged to the Antiochian school which was more *historical* compared to the more *allegorical* Alexandrian school.

<sup>294</sup>The Council of Ephesus is just mentioned in M-I, 188 and the final part of the Chalcedonian profession of faith is quoted faithfully in M-I, 191 (cf. COD, 63, 3ff.). Immediately afterwards he adds that other councils repeated the same (ibid.): “Таже аки тѣми же глаголы и прочии Съборы повелѣвают: и пятыи, и шестыи, и седмыи, еже и въиет свѣтлым гласомъ, глаголя: «Мы законы церковныя съблюдаем, мы предѣлы отечьския храним, мы прилогающихъ нѣчто или отъемлющихъ от Церкви проклинаем». И паки: «Аще кто все предание церковное написаное или ненаписаное отгѣтает, да будет анафема.»” The authorities and the Fathers are quoted in M-I, 189-191. Among Western authorities who confirm the principle of *add nothing* he mentions the missive of the pope Celestine I (M-I, 188; on this letter see above, note 280) and the letter of the pope John VIII to patriarch Photius (M-I, 193-4, cf. also M-I, 218-19). The documents that Maximus mentions in M-I, 188-91 (the pope Celestine’s letter to Nestorius, the patriarch John of Antioch’s letter and

modified the Nicene Creed.

Later, in a letter to his friend Gregory, he quotes the decision of the Council of Ephesus: “that no one, because of his ignorant insolence, would dare to add anything to it [the Symbol] or remove even a single tittle from it” (Z-214). Maximus thought certainly of its seventh canon that forbids proclaiming another faith from that which was formulated in Nicaea. Yet, we do not find in this canon the expression often used by Maximus that *nothing should be added and nothing removed*.<sup>295</sup> The Greek used an interpolated source or consciously hyperbolised to emphasis unchangeable character of the Creed.

In the same letter to Gregory, to emphasise how important the principle of immutability was, he describes a pious initiative by the emperor Justinian who wanted to augment about the Creed and to give to Our Lady the title of the Ever-Virgin (Приснодѣва Марія) instead of just Virgin Mary (Дѣва Марія). This request was rejected by the council, not because it was a heretical formula but because it was an addition to the Creed (Z-214-15).

To show that even a slight infringement of the deposit of faith destroys its whole he invokes Chrysostom who says: “For as he who but partially pares away the image on a royal coin renders the whole spurious, so he who swerves ever so little from the pure faith, corrupts the faith entirely.” Immediately afterwards he also refers to Isidore of Pelusium who insists that if anybody wants to add something to, or to eliminate something from the divine-inspired words, he is either non-believer or insane. The question was so burning because – as Maximus emphasised – to change something *in faith* means to lose the eternal life (M-I, 178) therefore the one who adds or removes something from the faith (въ вѣрѣ) deserves to be anathematised.<sup>296</sup>

---

Cyril’s letter to John of Antioch) could suggest that ha had at his disposal a collection of documents of the Council of Ephesus.

295In the letter to Gregory (Z-214) Maximus writes: “[...] святѣи Третии съборъ сѣи заключили и крѣпцѣ заповѣдали страшными клятвами святѣи Символѣ, изложенѣи прежными двоими съборы, дабы никто же прочее дрѣзнулъ по малоумнѣи своеи дрѣзости ни приложити что отнюдь к нему, ни уложити из него ни одну черту, ни иоту, ни премѣнитѣи ни едино речение, ни писмени от яже в нем. Иже и рекоша тако: *Аще кто послѣ нас дрѣзнетъ таково что въ Святѣм Символѣ православныхъ вѣры, да будет проклят и чюжь всякого благословения и собѣства христьянскаго.*” A very similar fragment can be found in M-I, 249 but without the last phrase. It is significant that the seventh canon of the Council of Ephesus refers to and quotes only the Nicene Creed (cf. COD, 54) while Maximus is persuaded that the decision of the Council of Ephesus was about two previous councils (in Nicaea and Constantinople)!

296The pair of quotations from Chrysostom and Isidore was used by Maximus both in his missive against the Latins to Karpov from before 1525 (M-I, 202-3; roughly the same quotations from Chrysostom and Isidore are repeated in a dubium, *Missive to Sigismund*, M-I, 402) and his letter to Gregory on how the Symbol of faith should be guarded, written in 1530-ties (Z-216). These two translations differ from one another. NB, in the latter work (Z-213-17) the rule *add nothing* is applied not only to the error of the Latins but also to Muscovite deformations of the Creed, *ibid.*, 214. Chrysostom’s words come from his Commentary on Galatians (PG 61, 622). I have adapted the English translation of an unknown author from [www.documentacatholica.omnia.eu](http://www.documentacatholica.omnia.eu) to render more precisely Maximus’ translation from M-I, 202: “Якоже въ царьскихъ златицахъ, иже мало что от

Treating the profession of faith as a monolith from the very beginning made it impossible to distinguish between the concrete formulation of the deposit of faith and the revealed truth itself. The principle *add nothing* became a quasi-dogma and the use of the original prohibition on changing anything in the Creed seems to expand beyond strictly dogmatic problems.

Either the Orthodox polemicists, including Maximus, had not known arguments of the Western theologians (expressed during the Council of Florence when the problem was discussed) or that they passed them over in silence. From the Western point of view it was not difficult to reconcile the authorities quoted by Maximus with a possibility of a development of the doctrine. In Florence Latin theologians argued that there is a difference between an alteration of the doctrine and the drawing from the deposit of faith conclusions which it contains implicitly and which was not, up until now, formulated. They emphasised that such a development is possible and did not undermine the true faith.<sup>297</sup>

We can observe in Maximus' works how the conviction that no innovation is allowed in the Creed was consolidated and ossified. He wrote to Nicholas Bülw, referring to the *Filioque*, saying that the belief that the Holy Spirit proceeds only from the Father was conveyed by the *Evangelical theology* (якоже еуагельское богословие предаде) and the seven sacred councils and the Holy Fathers transferred it one to another, and had strengthened it and secured it with fearsome malediction ("грозиѣшими проклинаньми затвориша" – M-I, 134) against those who would dare to alter it. Further, answering Bülw's scriptural argument, he continues that the Fathers knew these things "better than us" and they did not dare to add anything to the words of the Holy Spirit (M-I-135).<sup>298</sup> So, instead of a discussion on the meaning of a scriptural

---

образа отсѣчеть, всю златицу ложну содѣла, тако же и от здравыа вѣры и малѣишее преложивъ, всю поврежаеть." Finally, in his own Confession of faith (M-II, 53) Maximus says: "вседушно пребываю въ всѣхъ богословныхъ догматѣхъ и мудрованиихъ, ихъ же предаша намъ самовидци и слугы Бога Слова и яже по нимъ вси Вселенъстии Сѣбори богодухновенныхъ отецъ, ниже прилагая что к нимъ отнудъ, ниже улагаа, или пременяя ни едину иоту ли черту, нъ всю православную вѣру и богословие ихъ съблюдаю въ сердци моемъ цѣлу и непремѣнну."

297On the latin theologians in Florence see above, the note 289 and 290. NB, it seems that neither Nicholas Bülw used in his works the arguments of Catholic theologians from Florence. We cannot be sure about this because his polemical works have not survived and we know only the Orthodox answers to his ideas. Yet these answers do not suggest that he employed any Latin arguments from Florence against the Orthodox conviction *add nothing*.

298We find similar arguments in M-I,136. Nicholas Bülw probably referred in his argumentation to John 16: 13 because Maximus says to Nicholas (M-I, 135): "И не глаголи мнѣ хитрословіа она, яко у апостола Духъ Сыновень глаголется и Духъ истинный, истина же Христосъ, тѣи от Сына исходит." It seems that, progressively, the principle *add nothing* was expanded to other areas. Writing about icons, Maximus emphasised that the authors of icons should not add anything new to the old canon. Moreover the old canon is considered to be revealed to rather than elaborated by old masters (О СВЯТЫХЪ ИКОНАХЪ, 46-7): "И БЫЛЪ БЫ ИКОНОПИСЕЦЪ ХИТРЪ О ПОДОБИИ ДРЕВНИХЪ ПЕРЕВОДОВЪ И ПЕРВЫХЪ МАСТЕРОВЪ, БОГОМУДРЫХЪ МУЖЕЙ, ИМЪ ЖЕ ОТЪ НАЧАЛА ПРЕДАНО БЫСТЬ ПО ОБЪЯВЛЕНІЮ КОГОЖДО ГДЫ БЫВШАГО, ЧЮДЕСИ ИЛИ ЯВЛЕНІЯ, А СОБОЮ БЫ НОВО НЕ

passage, the Greek finds sufficient the recourse to an acknowledged authority.

Since the rule that the deposit of faith cannot be changed was obviously shared also by the West, the bone of contention was how this rule should be understood. Maximus in his *Praise for St Peter and Paul* presents the decision of the seven councils as a kind of direct transmission from the Holy Spirit: “seven times the councils of all-venerable and all-wise pastors, breathing with the Paraclete himself, and clothed themselves with the All-Holy Spirit who searches the depths of God, came from everywhere at God’s signal and confirmed the divine confession of the orthodox faith with the most strong regulations.”<sup>299</sup> There is practically no distinction here between the decision of the councils and God’s deeds or God’s decrees. The conciliar Fathers are endued with the Holy Spirit, clothed with the Holy Spirit (an allusion to Ga 3: 27). This closeness between the human authors of the Creed and God explains the prohibition to human change of the divinely established rules.

The first seven ecumenical councils had for Maximus an exceptional authority and their decisions could not be relativised even if he was aware of the historical development in various fields of human life, even if his Muscovite experience showed him a religious tradition can be distorted.<sup>300</sup>

He believed that the Latins had deformed the truth of the Revelation and not developed it in a justified way. His argumentation was theological but his motivations were probably associated with an experience of the conflict between the earthly knowledge and religion.

---

прибавлявал ни единый оты, аще убо и зело кто мнится смыслити, а кроме святых отец предания не дерзати. Аще же кто и зело имать быти хитр святых икон воображению, а живой не благолепотне, таковым писати не повелети.”

299From the *Praise for St Peter and Paul* (M-II, 87-8): “седмижды стекшеся отвсюду, Божиимъ мановением, Съборы всечестныхъ и всемудрыхъ пастырей, самѣмъ Параклитомъ дышущихъ, и в Него облькшихся Всесвятаго Духа, испытующаго глубины Божиа, уставы крѣпчайшими утвердиша божественое исповѣдание православныя вѣры.” Slightly further on, in the same work, Maximus writes (M-II, 88): “Слышите мыслено и ужасаетея от всеа души и разумѣвше каитеся, елицы дръзостию ума вашего чрез уставъ богословныхъ носитеся велми блазнено. Отлучая бо агтель внѣ съобщения Христова престающихъ Его божественыхъ уставы, Рима ли или Афинѣхъ или Византиа пощадит честныя уставы престающихъ?”

300In one place (Z-216) Maximus besides the seventh councils (and other witness of the tradition) mentions also the four patriarchs as those who transmitted the true Orthodox faith. He does not enumerate them but it is obvious that he eliminated Rome from the traditional Pentarchy. He is a witness of the divided tradition. For him, the patriarch of the separated Rome cannot be treated as an ecclesiastical authority and the Council of Florence as an ecumenical council. On his awareness of the historical changeability see above, his remarks on Jn 15: 26, text and note 293. Also in M-I, 178-9 he shows that the Law of the Old Testament could be changed and that Jesus’ words from Mt 5: 18 (“not one jot or one tittle shall in any wise pass from the law”) refer only to the New Testament. He also saw how ossified Muscovite practice had preserved heretical (as he discovered) opinions, probably because of uncritical copying of distorted texts but in the name of fidelity to tradition (M-II, 136-9). SINITSYNA 1977, 8 says that Maximus “стремился придать своим рассуждениям всеобщий характер, облечь аргументацию в традиционные формы, представить актуальные проблемы окружающей жизни как вневременные, а собственные решения не только как плод его личных размышлений, но как уже существующие в христианской литературе, уже найденные ответы, как вечные образцы...”

Maximus considered that Western thought intruded into a domain reserved for God and this fact induced him to remain in the safe space of the unchanged doctrine (understood as the doctrine of the seven ecumenical councils) and to reject any Western novelties in theology. In a sense, it is a testimony of resignation. He attempted to purify Muscovite tradition from the deformations that had occurred over the centuries but he did not manage to harmonise his modern historical consciousness (which he did not reject completely) with the possibility of development of Christian doctrine. We can encounter similar phenomena in Western Europe but the tendency to find a concord between philosophy (science) and religion was there incomparably stronger.<sup>301</sup>

*Controversy around scholastic theology*

The second element that formed the context for the reception of the *Filioque* was the Orthodox attitude towards Western scholasticism. The confrontation at the Council of Florence showed that the scholastic way in which the Latin theologian expounded the *Filioque* was alien for the Greeks. The problem did not concern only the Trinitarian theology. A Greek chronicler, Syropoulos, in his narrative on the Council of Florence, records the reaction of a Georgian envoy when a Latin theologian, Montenero, appealed to the authority of Aristotle: “He said: *What about Aristotle, Aristotle? A fig for your fine Aristotle.* And when I [Syropoulos] by word and gesture asked: *What is fine?* the Georgian replied: *St Peter, St Paul, St Basil, Gregory the Theologian; a fig for your Aristotle, Aristotle.*” The mistrust of the Orthodox participants of the Council towards syllogisms and the use of Aristotle in theology was provoked both by the lack of knowledge of the majority of them and by the fact that such a style of theological reflection did not have many followers in the late Byzantine period. Already before the Council some Greek Orthodox theologians demonstrated their reserve towards dialectical method in theology. Similar opinions were expressed by a few of the eminent Greek thinkers present at the Council.<sup>302</sup> The more the divisions between the Churches deepened, the more their theological

<sup>301</sup>Cf. GEANAKOPOLOS 1976, 4 (quoted above, in chapter II, note 154). There are some parallels between the question of national identity described there and the religious identity mentioned here.

<sup>302</sup>On Syropoulos’ account: SYROPOULOS, *Memoirs*, 464 (IX, 28), English translation by GILL 1959, 227. One of the best known examples of the reluctance to scholastic approach in the Late Byzantine theology is Gregory Palamas’ polemic against Barlaam (who used the scholastic method). Another Greek, George of Trebizond, criticised the sophistic logic of schools. His works were reprinted many times at the end of fifteenth and at the beginning of sixteenth century, cf. VASOLI 1988, 70. GILL 1959, 227 quotes also Isidore of Kiev who regretted that the Latins’ use of syllogisms rather deepened the schism (Gill refers to Vat. gr. 706, 12r-22r) and Bessarion who says to the Greeks (here Gill refers to Bessarion’s letter to Alexander Lascaris, PG 161, 360B): “The words [of the Fathers] by themselves alone are enough to solve every doubt and to persuade every soul. It was not syllogisms or probabilities or arguments that convinced me but the bare words [of the Fathers].” On the lack of knowledge among the Greeks present at the Council see above, note 289. The question of the anti-scholastic and anti-Latin tendency among Greek theologians requires further investigation. Perhaps the Greeks’ objection to the use of syllogisms (and scholastic methods) in theology were based on (among others) Neilos

traditions were isolated from one another and became alien to one another.

Maximus was probably better educated and less categorical than many Greek theologians of the Council of Florence and of the following century. Nevertheless his attitude towards scholasticism, the abuse of syllogisms and the use of Aristotelian philosophy in Western theology, was very censorious, as it has been already described. His judgement of the syllogistic theology had certainly two sources: the Greek tradition of the anti-Latin polemics and Western Renaissance criticism of scholasticism. The eastern roots are obvious through the use of the traditional arguments of the Greek anti-Latin controversy. The Western, mainly Italian, colour of his approach is visible at least through the legendary story about the beginning of the Carthusian Order which he quoted in his *Terrible story*. But also, more generally, his criticism of scholasticism combined with the return to the Fathers as the main point of theological reference corresponded exactly to the position of humanists. Although Maximus himself does not say that, we can guess that also Gianfrancesco Pico's and other anti-scholastic humanist writers contributed to his opinion on scholasticism.<sup>303</sup>

He describes dramatically the intrusion of human dialectical reason into the sphere of God's mysteries: "[...] the garment of the Church, woven of divine theology, we tear ferociously with dialectical harrows and sophism, we agonise in vain attempting to show to people the revealed sacred mysteries that are unspoken and inconceivable, and are only known to the sole Holy Trinity."<sup>304</sup>

Maximus saw a logical correlation between the introduction of the *Filioque* and dialectic theology which used Aristotelian instruments. In his first letter to Bülow he showed that the *Filioque*, a Latin *novelty* (synonym of heresy!), arose from human invention of Aristotelian wisdom and resulted in a distortion of the orthodox faith. It did not come from the Holy Spirit.<sup>305</sup> Then he wrote to Karpov that the *Filioque* was the main problem that divided the Latins and the Orthodox and the source of other Latin errors. And it is not surprising – he commented – because, deprived of the Paraclete's inspiration, they cannot adequately [правѣ]

---

Kabasilas. Yet, as we have seen that the scholastic approach existed also in the East.

303On humanistic approach represented e.g. by Lorenzo Valla, cf. CAMPOREALE 1993, 107-9.

304See the first letter to Karpov against the Latins (M-I, 183): “ризу Церкви, истканную от вышняго богословия, раздираем люте диалитическими пострѣцаниями и софизматы, стязаемся всуе показати же и чловѣкомъ реченная священная таинства, яже отнюдь неизреченная и неудобъ разумѣваема, токмо же единѣи Святѣи Троицѣ вѣдомо суть.”

305On the Latin theology (M-I, 135): “[...] ваше латинское ухыщенное паче суеслове, нежели богословие, вчера съ и перед малым временемъ почало мужми изобрѣтено, внѣшною мудростию и хитресловию аристотельскими хвалящимися, а не Святымъ Духомъ свыше възглашаемыми.” Maximus has reversed the true sequence of events. The *Filioque* had appeared long before scholasticism! It is not a conscious falsification but rather a conviction that such was the logical sequence of events.



theologise (M-I, 176). In the second part of his missive to Karpov he gives a kind of illustration of this opinion presenting a Latin exegesis of a passage from the Gospel according to John. The Latins think – he says – that they have authority to change the Saviour’s words and do not fear to distort the Gospel of John.<sup>306</sup> He does not permit that Latin theology could be a different (and acceptable!) interpretation of the Revelation.

*Discussion with Bülow*

Most of Maximus’ reflections concerning Latin theology, especially the problem of the *Filioque*, were written during his first few years in Moscow, before his imprisonment in 1525, as a reaction to Nicholas Bülow’s works and his unionist activity.<sup>307</sup>

Bülow’s works (except one text on the icon of the descent of the Holy Spirit) are not preserved. Therefore we can only infer about their content from works of his opponents, mainly Maximus the Greek. We know nothing about Nicholas’ theological formation. Francesco Da Collo, the emperor’s envoy to Moscow, spoke highly of him as of a “professor of medicine and of astrology and wise in all sciences”.<sup>308</sup> It may be that in theology he was an amateur although of considerable erudition.

According to Maximus’ account Bülow described the Holy Trinity and the relation within it using a model of a triangle. It was not his own invention. The triangle was used to present the Trinity both in popular iconography and in theological treatises. In Nicholas’ case it was something slightly more than a popular iconography. He wanted to propose a particular theological vision of the Trinity. He uses an image of the equilateral triangle at the top of which he places the Father and at the two bottom angles – the Son and the Holy Spirit. The triangle is inscribed into a circle that illustrates the path of the Spirit who proceeds from the Father

---

306On the Paraclete (M-I, 175-6): “[...] высота бо латынских недугования, яже промеж нас и их преграждает, сия есть. Пагубны убо и прочие их учения и мудрования, и богоносных отец седьмкраты събравшихся пре- данием и учением далече отстоят в толицѣ, яко Богу единому исправити могущу сия. [A variant of the text, probably a gloss (cf. commentary in M-I, 430-1), adds here: Но уразумѣет же глаголемых силу, иже не въ другии град, токмо в самыи Римъ и велеславный бывъ, яже тамо беззаконно съврѣшаемаа узрит от възвышающих на высоту бровь, и апостольскаа мѣста удержавати хвалящихся, вся убо, якоже рѣх, яже в них лютаа и велику отвращению достоина.] Но источник злых и основание все новина есть еже о Дусѣ Святѣмъ, яже и прочая злая вкупе введе. И не дивно есть, о премудрыи Феодоре, не бо кому възможно есть богословити правѣ и правила съставляти тѣм, Пораклитова вдохновения лишенымъ.” Cf. also M-I, 192-3. On changing the Saviour’s words (M-I, 201): “[...] не токмо прелогати Владычния гласы непщевати себе власть имѣти и отечьских уставъ преступати и ни едину бѣду оттуду пребыти себѣ мнѣти, но и на еуагелиста Иоанна лгати не боятсѣ...”

307Later Maximus wrote a few more works concerning the same problem. They are shorter, contain less quotations and more of Maximus’ own thoughts. The most important is the *Praise for St Peter and Paul*. In the later period he also continued editing his main works written before 1525, cf. chapter II, text and note 502.

308See: BULANIN 1988<sup>a</sup> (SKK) and MILLER 1978, 405. We know that Bülow studied for *Magister artium* degree in Rostock, in 1480-4, cf. ANGERMANN 1969, 408. SCHULTZE 1963, 208 considered even a hypothesis that Nicholas might have been a priest but there is no base for such a conjecture.

towards the Son and then returns to the Father. Yet, this model is quite schematic. Either Bülow advanced (consciously or not) an over-simplified vision of the Trinity and therefore was an easy target for the Greek's reproof or Maximus caricatured Bülow's ideas in order to ridicule them more easily.<sup>309</sup>

If Maximus' report is accurate, Bülow's model was too simplistic to be considered as a theological tool and was rightly rejected by Maximus. It becomes clear when we compare it with, e.g., Nicholas of Cusa's sophisticated and subtle vision of the Trinity in the *De docta ignorantia* where the latter also used a triangle but it was the triangle with three right angles so an infinite triangle, impossible to be represented in the plane. Unlike Bülow, Cusanus, through geometric analogies and using the notion of infinity, only strove to approach the mystery and did not pretend to give a clear explanation of the Trinity.<sup>310</sup>

Maximus criticised also other attempts to present the mystery of the Trinity through created examples, as the comparison of the Trinity to the sun, its warmth and rays. He considered it to be too material although he was ready to admit a limited usefulness of this metaphor.<sup>311</sup>

Bülow (again: if Maximus did not deform his ideas) was either persuaded that his public needed a simplified presentation or he himself was satisfied with such a simplification. Perhaps the second is true. Since we do not know anything about Nicholas' theological formation it is

---

309Maximus describes Bülow's concept in M-I, 224-5. Further on (M-I, 225) Maximus uses also, as an argument, a reference to the Pythagorean system where the right-angled triangle (and not equilateral) is an image of the number three. An example of the popular medieval representation of the Trinity in the form of triangle is reproduced, e.g. in: GEANAKOPOLOS 1966, 101.

310Cf. NICHOLAS OF CUSA, *De docta ignorantia* I, 12 (p. 24-5). SINITSYNA 1977, 86 mentions Nicholas of Cusa in this context but does not try to compare the two models.

311Maximus refers to this solar comparison in M-I, 234. Moreover, in M-I, 236, he says that if one can – with hesitation – use the image of the sun to elucidate the mystery of the Trinity, it is possible only to show that in the unity of the Trinity there are three hypostases, and not – as Nicholas does (so Bülow used this example too!) – to explain the relations between the divine Persons. As confirmation Maximus quotes (M-I, 237) a passage from Gregory of Nazianzus' *Fifth Theological Oration. On the Holy Spirit*, no. XXXII-XXXIII (PG 36, 169-172), where Gregory refers to the comparison of the Trinity with the sun but expresses a fear that such images could be deceptive. He prefers to reject images and shadows and to use the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Maximus summarises that it is better to avoid created analogies. Nevertheless Maximus himself returns to the solar comparison (the sun, its warmth and rays) in a work *Against Hellenic deceit*. This work was certainly written later, after 1525 (SHEVCHENKO 1997, 28-9 = M-II, 74). Probably he did so to show that even pagans can understand something of God's mysteries, without the Revelation. For Christians, it is definitely too little. On other trinitarian symbols: Z-178 and Z-187 where he presents both solar comparison (“дискос, свѣтъ, луча – едино солнце трия сия, а не три солнца”) and a psychological one (the three divine hypostases: the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are one God, and not three gods similarly as mind (умъ), word (слово) and spirit (духъ) are one soul and not three souls). Cf. also SCHULTZE 1963, 257 ff. He deliberates (ibid., 258) whether the solar schema could be borrowed from Gennadios Scholarios who gives a similar structure of argumentation (sol - radius - lumen; anima - verbum - flatus; ignis - calor - lumen; mens - intellectus – voluntas; Schultze refers to: M. Jugie, *Theologia dogmatica Christianorum ab Ecclesia Catholica dissidentium*, vol. I, Paris 1926, 461) but he does not consider it very probable.

probable that the superficiality of his knowledge in this domain led him to present his views without exposing all complexity of the subject. The way of his presentation was however in the spirit of his age. A tendency to use graphic representations to illustrate philosophical or theological reflection was in fashion. As a matter of fact, it was not only an inclination of early modern authors. Such an approach was also used by some ancient Eastern authors. In early Byzantine scholasticism we can observe the use of diagrams to explain theological ideas that was often linked to a pursuit of a more scientific theology.<sup>312</sup>

Maximus' reaction to what he presented as Nicholas' ideas is comprehensible. The image was too mechanical and too one-dimensional. Yet, the Greek's reprobation goes further and it is symmetric to his censure of astrology. He does not only reject a failed graphic model in theology but he protests against an unauthorised intrusion of human reason into the sphere of God's mysteries.<sup>313</sup> Maximus rejected the Western bold attempts to broaden the limits of knowledge, to enter into unexplored areas (both in astrology and theology). He repeated his leitmotiv: boundaries should not be trespassed!

For the Greek monk Nicholas' work seems to be a purely human endeavour and an abortive one because, based on earthly forms (as triangles), he wants to speak about God. Maximus juxtaposes it with the experience of patriarchs who, like Abraham and Moses, knew God through the gift of grace, i.e. they represent a top-down way and not a bottom-up one.<sup>314</sup>

The application of earthly images does not mean that Bülow did not refer to the Revelation. Such an approach would have been impossible for a Christian thinker speaking about the Trinity. Nicholas, as it is apparent from Maximus' answers, did use scriptural argument, mainly when discussing the *Filioque*.<sup>315</sup> In reply Maximus employed two main lines of reasoning (although they were developed into a number of more specific explanations): that Nicholas (and the Latins in general) confuse the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit with his temporal mission and that the Latin theology disturbs an adequate understanding of the relations between the divine Persons and of their properties.

---

312 Besides the above-mentioned Nicholas of Cusa, e.g. Charles de Bovelles in *De sapiente* (1510) and later Giordano Bruno. Among ancient Eastern authors using the metaphor of a triangle was Gregory of Nyssa (PG 46, 33 B-C) quoted by KLOSTERMANN 1964, 265. SCHULTZE 1963, 180-1 mentions in this context the twelfth century Nicetas of Maronea (referring to M. Jungie, *Theologia Dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium ab Ecclesia catholica dissidentium*, part I, Paris 1926, 411). On Byzantine scholasticism: DALEY 1984, 174.

313 Maximus writes about Bülow's *geometric* theology to Fedor Karpov in the missive against the Latins (M-I, 221-7). Especially clearly his criticisms are expressed on the page 225. In just one MS of Maximus' work the triangle is drawn in the text, see: M-I, 445. Maximus mentions also Bülow's geometric models in M-I, 176 and 187.

314 See: M-I, 222-3. It is SCHULTZE 1963, 182 who emphasised this contrast.

315 See: M-I, 235 and also M-I, 201. 203-5. On scriptural argument cf. also above, note 298.

### *Procession of the Holy Spirit*

He repeated the first argument everywhere where the biblical text suggests that it was Jesus who sent the Holy Spirit (e.g. M-I, 205-6). The discussion could hardly obtain conclusive results. The New Testament speaks about the Holy Spirit principally when his mission to the faithful is concerned and not in the context of the internal relationship of the divine Persons. For this reason the quotation that it is the Father who sends the Spirit or that it is the Son could not make the discussion on the *Filioque* move from a deadlock. The testimony of the early Church would have been more important. In Florence a large part of the discussion on the *Filioque* was centred on the understanding of the patristic evidence. From Maximus' texts it appears that he discussed with Bülow the interpretation of the scriptural arguments but – although the Greek, and probably also Nicholas, adduced patristic quotations – there are no traces that they discussed and attempted to clarify the meaning of these testimonies. Their function was rather to support argumentation by the force of an authority.<sup>316</sup>

Maximus' belief that the Latins confused the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit with his temporal mission may have come from Theophylact of Ohrid since Photius did not employ such an argument and Maximus may have read some of Theophylact's works.<sup>317</sup>

### *Identities of the divine hypostases*

The second block of Maximus' arguments against the Latin Trinitarian theology was focused on the reproach that it distorted the identities of the divine hypostases and their properties (свойство). He said that the thought that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father together with the Son violates the principle of properties (M-II, 90: *разорила есть грубно свойственнии уставъ*). These arguments are largely based on Photius' *Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit*. Like the Patriarch, the Greek monk accuses the Latins of repeating in their Trinitarian theology the ancient errors of Macedonius and Sabellius.<sup>318</sup> He attempts to show that to accept

---

316A modern analysis on the Filioque in the New Testament can be found in: SIECIENSKI 2010, chapter I, (The Procession of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament). On the discussion about patristic evidence in Florence: GILL 1959, 195-261. On scriptural arguments see the previous note.

317Maximus' source, the patriarch Photius also did not want to discuss the data of the tradition. SIECIENSKI, 2010, 8, says: "When confronted with Jerome and Augustine's writings on the Filioque, Photius immediately questioned whether they were authentic. [...] Most of the quotations used by Thomas Aquinas in the *Contra Errores Graecorum*, which had been taken from the *Libellus de fide ss. Trinitatis* of Nicholas of Cortone, have since proven to be spurious, and the version of Basil's *Contra Eunomium* employed by the Latins at Florence is now known to include sections of Eunomius's own work, added later by an ancient editor." Photius' argumentation is summarised *ibid.*, 101. Siecienski (referring to PG 126, 228-9) describes Theophylact's position in such a way (*ibid.*, 116): "The Latins, he argued, had confused the Spirit's eternal procession with his sending and economic manifestation, something attributable to the poverty of the Latin language and its inability to convey the necessary theological subtleties." Maximus, in another context, quoted Theophylact of Ohrid, thinking that it was the text of John Chrysostom, cf. above, note 83.

318Cf. a larger fragment about identities of the hypostases: M-I, 201-2. Maximus also underlines the necessity to

the *Filioque* would mean a complete confusion of the traditional teaching on the Trinity and that the hypostases of the Father and of the Son would somehow fuse.<sup>319</sup>

Maximus did not follow Photius completely. He did not use all the patriarch's arguments and, at the same time, discussed a question which was not raised by Photius and that was important in the Western vision of the Trinity: the understanding of the Holy Spirit as Love unifying the Father and the Son. From Maximus' account we can understand that Nicholas Bülow, referring to this element of the Western trinitarian theology, argued that since the Son loves the Father so Love (i.e. the Spirit) proceeds also from the Son (M-I, 238). He quoted (deceptively, as commented Maximus) a fragment from the Bible. It is not clear which passage Bülow used but Maximus said that he should rather have quoted Jn 14: 31 where Jesus shows his obedience to the Father and unanimity between them (M-I, 239). In reply the Greek first adduced many other quotations showing that the Father loves the Son which, in fact, was not an argument against Nicholas' opinion. Then he attacked the very basis of the German doctor's argumentation (and the conviction of the Western theology, as he understood it) saying that love (as wisdom or justice) is a quality of the divine essence and not of a person. And when it is said in the New Testament that the Father loves the Son, it means that the Father is the source of love and everything else in the Trinity (M-I, 240-1).<sup>320</sup> Maximus either did not know or did not accept the Western theory of appropriation in the Trinity.

This shows sufficiently that the discussion was hopeless. In Maximus' time the

---

preserve the faith in the inviolable properties of the divine Persons in M-I, 134-5. On Macedonius and his followers: M-I, 206. 215-16. 220 and Z-213. Cf. PHOTIUS, *Mystagogia*, no. 32 and 80 (PG 102, 313-14 and 363-4). In the tradition of the Church Macedonius was regarded (in the East from about 380 and in the West from the fifth century) as a founder of a heresy considering the Spirit to be inferior to the Father and the Son (even if during his lifetime Macedonius was not accused of heresy), cf. BARDY 1927, esp. 1464-68. Muscovy followed this path. Metropolitan Jonas (Июна) in his letter to Orthodox bishops in Lithuania identified the *filioque* with Macedonius' teaching and use of unleavened bread for the Eucharist with the heresy of Eunomius, cf. KOZLOV-STRUTINSKII-PARFENT'EV 2014, 98. On Sabellius and Sabellianism: M-I, 135. 232. Cf. PHOTIUS, *Mystagogia*, no. 9 and 15 (PG 102, 289-90 and 293-4). Maximus quoted a long passage from the *Mystagogy*, no. 53 (in M-I, 218). SCHULTZE 1963, 79-80 mentioned this quotation and identified again another two, *ibid.* 84-6.

<sup>319</sup>On merging the hypostases of the Father and of the Son: "сойдется Сыновня ипостась со Отчею" M-I, 232-3. It could be an allusion to the Latin theology presented at the council of Florence but it is an answer to a simplified version of this theology. On how it was presented in Florence cf. GILL 1959, 215. In M-I, 250 Maximus says that accepting the *Filioque* would mean that the Holy Spirit had two origins (два начала). It is certainly taken from PHOTIUS, *Mystagogy*, no. 4 (PG 102, 283-4). Maximus does not accept the formula *per Filium* either (M-I, 190): "[...] и Духъ же Святыи не от Сына или Сыномъ существо имѣя, но от Отца исходя [...]"

<sup>320</sup>Maximus does not use Photius' argument about perfection (if the Spirit's procession from the Father is perfect, and it is because it is a divine action, there is no reason that the Spirit proceeds also from the Son), cf. SIECIENSKI 2010, 101. Probably this argument was too speculative for Maximus' purpose. On the Holy Spirit as Love: M-I, 238-41. Similarly Maximus refutes a parallel Nicholas' argumentation on the Spirit as Fire. Bülow employed the passage: "I am come to send fire on the earth" (Lk 12: 49) and interpreted that Jesus sends the Holy Spirit which is described (according to the Western tradition) as fire. Maximus (M-I, 238) protested showing that not only the Holy Spirit but God as such is called "fire" (Heb 12: 38).

positions of both sides were so divided that there was virtually no chance of mutual understanding. As John Meyendorff put it: “Obviously, as long as the two schools of thought remained open to dialogue and mutual understanding, they could have developed in a complementary way. Unfortunately, the bitter polemics on the *Filioque* issue led to a stiffening of position and became one of the major causes of the schism.” The situation was aggravated by the fact that Bülou was not a good theologian, his theological language was far from being precise and he used doubtful arguments. Maximus, in turn, did not fully understand Latin theology or did not want to accept interpretations other than his own.<sup>321</sup>

## PURGATORY

Other traditional subjects of the polemics occupy incomparably less space in Maximus’ works. In a few of his works we find short comments on the Latin belief in purgatory. They are short because – as testifies the discussion on this subject during the council of Florence – the Orthodox Church had not developed precise definitions on the posthumous fate of man. The Greeks at the council did not want to discuss this issue in detail.<sup>322</sup> Polemicists were less restrained than the Greek conciliar fathers and attempted to show that the Catholic teaching is explicitly heretical. From among Maximus’ close circle we can point to Manuel of Corinth, the Grand Rhetor. He just briefly mentions the problem of purgatory in his letter to a Dominican, Francis, and maintains that there is no possibility to be purified after death. Only during earthly life can one be cleansed from sin. He takes his main argument from the narration of the last judgment in the Gospel according to Matthew (Mt 25: 46) where only two possibilities are mentioned: eternal life or eternal punishment. He adds, with full sincerity, that if purification from sin after death was possible, all souls would have been purified, in the unmeasurable interval of time from their death to the day of judgement and thus, at the day of judgment there would be no longer any souls deserving to be punished. Since Manuel identifies the Latin teaching on purgatory with Origen’s heresy (τῆς Ὠριγένους [...] αἰρέσεως) so – visibly – in his mind the idea of purgatory was associated with Origen’s idea of apocatastasis.<sup>323</sup> It was however very far from the real doctrine of the Catholic Church that taught that only those who

---

321See: MEYENDORFF 1983, 181. SCHULTZE 1963, 312-17, in a polemical spirit, shows how Maximus’ scriptural arguments against the *Filioque* are not necessarily the only possible ones.

322See: GILL 1959, 120-126 and 266.

323See: MANUEL Reply to Francis, 84-5 (Russian translation) and 86-7 (the Greek original text); cf. also FÖRSTEL 1999, 246. Marc of Ephesus and George Scholarios also mentioned within the same context Origen’s doctrine of apocatastasis but they did not confused them and did not considered Origen the originator of the doctrine of purgatory, cf. FÖRSTEL 1999, 247.

die “truly repentant in charity” can enter purgatory. The dogmatic definition was very restrained but preaching and popular beliefs went much further.<sup>324</sup> Manuel’s work shows that even an educated Greek author did not know the teaching of the Latin Church well (and reacted rather to the popular beliefs than to the real catholic doctrine) or that he consciously deformed it to be able to fight it more easily.

Maximus took the same path as his predecessor. He also refers to the Gospel of the Last Judgment and also sees in the Latin belief in purgatory Origenian and even Platonic influences (M-II, 320). The educational dimension is very strong in Maximus’ refutation of the idea of purgatory. He is afraid that this doctrine would lead to a moral laxity in society. Reacting against Bülow ideas he affirms that such a teaching makes people reluctant to improve their sinful behaviour and corrupts the doctrine about the just judgement.<sup>325</sup>

Even more clearly is expressed his understanding of the Latin teaching in a later work, the *Praise for St Peter and Paul*. In it he gives a stereotypical example of a man who had committed much wickedness but if when on his deathbed he repeated: *mea culpa*, he would be unintentionally [sic!] cleansed through fire after his death and filled with the divine glory.<sup>326</sup> Perhaps it is a reflexion of a Catholic exaggerated apology of purgatory in which someone who – after a sinful life – on his deathbed showed contrition, could be saved. For the Greek it was too easy a path and he insists that, to achieve salvation, it is necessary to abandon evil and to bear fruit of good deeds. He supports his explanation with a reference to Mt 3: 10 and emphasises (M-II, 84) that a tree that produces no good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire, and not: purified! Further he continues that those who have done good will resurrect for eternal life, not those who have done evil! And he adds that one gains eternal life not through

324On the catholic teaching on purgatory cf. EMERY 1999, esp. 43-6. Before Maximus lifetime there were two catholic dogmatic definitions of purgatory (or, more precisely, of purification after death) and both were composed during unionists councils with the Orthodox Church: in Lyon in 1274 (the confession of faith required of the Greek, cf. DS 856) and in Florence in 1439 (the decree *Laetentur caeli*, cf. CCE, 1080). Both documents say that people can be purified “si vere paenitentes in caritate (Dei) decesserint”.

325In M-I, 250 Maximus, like Manuel of Corinth, names the doctrine of purgatory: *Origenian heresy* and continues: “сие бо учение не точию лѣнивых творить многих на исправление съгѣшениих своих тѣм еже чаяти себѣ очищение по смерти въ очистителнѣм огни, но еще и слово еже о праведнѣм судѣ развращаетъ.” Slightly lower, on the same page, he quotes again Mt 25: 41. Similarly in M-II, 185-6 (where he adds the quotation from Mt 25: 11-12). The fact that Maximus linked directly Origen with the doctrine of purgatory (that which others – as far as we know – did not do) and the argument from the story of the Last Judgement in the Gospel of Matthew indicate the direct influence of Manuel. Maximus also rejects Origen’s doctrine of apocatastasis, and more precisely the idea the demons can be saved, in M-I, 242 and M-II, 129. It is possible that Maximus used a manuscript (Paris. Suppl. gr. 616), in which Manuel put a gloss against Origen in the context of purgatory. This MS could be possibly the same which Laskaris saw in the library of Vatopedi in 1491, cf. FÖRSTEL 1999, 246 and 250.

326M-II, 84: “[...] о единѣм же издыхающе глаголе сем: кулпа меа, кулпа меа, и трипрѣстнѣм и двоепрѣстнѣм ударениемъ своих устенъ и прѣсеи, внутрь абие будут божественныя славы, неволею очистившеся огнемъ по исходѣ своемъ.”

purification after death but through having done good deeds in this life (M-II, 84-5). Maximus affirms that if someone led a sinful life, he should produce fruits of repentance *before* his death, if he wants to enter eternal happiness.<sup>327</sup>

Maximus, as Manuel, thinks that some certainly will be condemned. He returns again to the motive of Judgement and asks who will be on the left hand of Christ. He ascertains that it would not be the pagans who had sinned without knowing the law and he affirmed that the whole labour (подвигъ) of the Judge refers to those who have sinned while in cognisance of the law (M-II, 85 with a reference to Lk 12: 48). Finally Maximus recapitulates telling an imaginary adherent of the belief in purgatory that he wants to be more merciful than the Creator (M-II, 86).<sup>328</sup> Certainly monastic asceticism left its mark on Maximus' views and formed his approach to eschatology. Yet, this asceticism formed Orthodox theology in general.

#### BREAD FOR THE EUCHARIST

The third classic theological reproach towards the Latins was the Western custom to use unleavened bread for the Eucharist. At the council of Florence it was the least controversial subject. The Greeks, as well as the Latins, without much difficulty, agreed that the both ways of celebrating the Eucharist are valid: with unleavened and leavened bread.<sup>329</sup> Again, polemicists did not accept this conciliar solution. Both Greek (e.g. Manuel of Corinth) and Muscovite authors rejected the Latin Eucharistic tradition. Philotheus, contemporary to Maximus, in one of his letters, interpreted the Latin custom as a new incarnation of the Apollinarian heresy. He linked the disbelief in the reality of the Incarnation with the use of unleavened bread for the Eucharist.<sup>330</sup>

Maximus devoted to the problem of Eucharistic bread even less space than to purgatory. He also associated the Western Eucharistic tradition with Apollinarius' error but, unlike Manuel, he explained, evoking Basil the Great's authority, that salt and leaven in bread

---

327See M-II, 82: "како въ божественни чертогъ внидутъ, не попекшеса, прежде исхода, сътворити плоды покаяния достойны прегрѣшени своих?"

328All these fragments come from the *Praise for St Peter and Paul*. NB Maximus also condemned Vives' views on the nature of the infernal fire and attributed them to an Origenian influence. The Greek emphasised the reality of this fire and the fact that it is hidden underground by the Creator for punishment of the damned, see: Z-268-70.

329Cf. GILL 1959, 266. 272.

330See: MANUEL Reply to Francis, 83-4. He based his argumentation only on interpretation of the Gospel. On Philotheus: SINITSYNA 1998, 342-3. Earlier, polemicists argued in a much simpler way. E.g. Theophylact of Ohrid says that Jesus used during the Last Supper the kind of bread he had at hand, i.e. unleavened but there is no reason to do the same. As an argument to use fermented bread he points simply at the Apostolic tradition of the Church, cf. THEOPHYLACT OF OHRID, *Against Latins*, 262-4. The conviction that the Latin Church had fallen into the heresy of Apollinarianism was not exceptional, cf. RUNCIMAN 1968, 331.



symbolise Jesus' human mind (умъ) and soul – the realities that Apollinarius questioned. It was not without significance for Maximus that the Jews use unleavened bread for their feast. It is shameful – he says – to be in communion with them.<sup>331</sup> Maximus (and other polemicists) did not try to look for a solution of the controversy on Eucharistic bread in the tradition of the primitive Church. The symbolic dimension was probably more important for him, and sufficient as an argument.

#### PREROGATIVES OF THE BISHOP OF ROME

The three, above enumerated, Latin heresies were the most important for Maximus (M-II, 81). Nevertheless, in a few places he also commented briefly on the question of papal authority and jurisdiction. The Western tendency to expand the Pope's prerogatives had to be little known in the East before the Council of Florence if we can judge from the Byzantine emperor John VIII's reaction. He was stupefied when the Pope's envoys conveyed to him which prerogatives the Pope demanded for himself.<sup>332</sup>

Manuel of Corinth was aware of Rome's claims and questioned above all its primacy, maintaining that it was Constantinople that received primacy, both through decisions of secular power and of councils. Rome was equated with it (sic!) but when the Pope deviated from the truth and accepted the addition to the Creed he was alienated from the Church and was no longer worthy either the first or second place.<sup>333</sup>

Maximus, as Manuel, thought that the Pope could be no longer considered as an orthodox bishop.<sup>334</sup> There is, however, in his works little theological reflection on the bishop of Rome's position and responsibility within the Church. In one place he gives two theological

---

331On Apollinarius: M-II, 92; on communion with the Jews (M-II, 93): “Елико же лють и заорно естъ, еже съпричястися чюжемудрѣным [...]” Cf. also M-I 246 and 250. Here also Apollinarius is mentioned. On Byzantine authors accusing the Latin Church of Apollinarianism and of practicing Jewish rituals because of the use of unleavened bread for the Eucharist: АΥΒΑΚΥΜΟΥ 2015, 259. The bread used for the Eucharist is an ἀντίτυπον of the body of Christ and therefore it should be animated, it should be the living body. Basil the Great, in his anaphora, used the word ἀντίτυπος with reference to the Eucharist, *ibid.* Was this anaphora the source Maximus referred to?

332The *Acta Graeca* of the Council relate (cf. GILL 1959, 282) the pope Eugenius' answer to the Emperor “that he [the pope] wanted all the privileges of his Church and wants to have right as a court of appeal and to direct and pasture all the Church of Christ as shepherd of the sheep; besides, to have authority and power to convoke an oecumenical Synod whenever there should be need, and all the patriarchs to be submitted to his will. When the Emperor heard this he gave up hope and made no other reply except: *Make arrangements for us to depart, if you will be so kind.*” One may suppose that if the Latins did not raise this theme, the Greeks would not have suspected such a pretension from the side of the Latins. Cf. SCHATZ 1990, Erster Hauptteil, V (I used the Polish translation, Kraków 2004, p. 53 and 81-2) and Zweiter Hauptteil, I, 4.

333See: MANUEL Reply to Francis, 86-7 (Russian translation) and 88-9 (the Greek original text).

334M-II, 337: “Римского убо папы, аки отпадашаго лика православных архиереевъ...” Cf. also Z-216. In neither place Maximus explains the reason for which the pope fall away from the ecclesiastic communion.

arguments, visibly answering two claims of his opponents. He introduces these arguments with an unrefined passage showing with disapproval that the Latins endow the pope with divine features and make him a *bugbear* (страшилище) to evoke fear among the simple folk. He contrasts this exaggerated practice with what he considers to be saint Peter's real vocation. First, he says that the power given to Peter to bind and to loose (cf. Mt 16: 19), was also given to the other Apostles (certainly he refers here to Mt 18: 18). He makes it clear that saint Peter's prerogatives are not something exceptional and that they do not elevate him above other Apostles. The privilege was given to Peter – he continues – not to change the Gospel and its theology on the Holy Trinity but to deliver those who repent of their sins by lengthening or shortening their penance to settle their way to salvation. This way he answers the claim of the Latin Church that the bishop of Rome, as Peter's successor, received a special mandate and that the passage from the Gospel which talks about this privilege should be understood as concerning also the doctrine (i.e. that the pope could issue doctrinal solutions).<sup>335</sup>

In another place, where he refers to the significance of the bishop of Rome and of the city itself as a privileged centre of Western Christianity, the Greek resolutely emphasises that it is not a place or a see that determines the Apostolic majesty but the purity of faith and conformity with the Apostolic tradition. In this way he strives to refute possible arguments that Rome has made a decisive judgment over a question (in this case he meant the *Filioque*). In a word, Maximus is not ready to accord to Rome any special privileges or rights unless it proves to be in concord with Orthodox teaching.<sup>336</sup>

## IN PURSUIT OF UNITY

335“ [...] в божественых папу вашего вездѣ предлагаете и данную верховную Петру власть, и тѣм, аки нѣким страшилищем, простѣших устрашающе не престаеете злѣ, и в сие, якоже и во иных мудръствующе. Ибо данная власть верховному, сирѣчь, елика аще рѣшити и связеть на земли, тако быти тѣм и на небеси, и прочимъ учеником такоже дана бысть, якоже тои же Матфеи свѣдѣтельствуеть. Также не дана бысть власть верховному претворяти Христово Еуагелие, сирѣчь законоположение еже в Немъ и еже о горнѣишии Троици богослове, но рѣшити кающихся съгрѣшения и спасение их отечьски устраати, не зрящу к лежащих правил свѣрѣпству, но къ устройению кающихся или сокращати время или простирати.” (M-I, 363) Cf. also M-I, 185-6 where Maximus says that saint Peter (and the pope) received the keys (Mt 16: 17) not to alter what he received from Christ but to dispose the richness put there by the Lord. NB, also some Western Fathers expressed the conviction that the power of keys was given not only to Peter but also to other Apostles or to the whole Church, cf. CYPRIAN OF CARTHAGE, *De Unitate Ecclesiae*, 4 (SC 500, 176-83); Augustine, *Tractatus 1 in Joannem*, n. 12 (PL 35, 1763); *Sermo CCXCV*, (PL, 38, 1349).

336“[...] и аще безчисленѣ славятся о Римѣ и о величесте его? Не бо от град и престолов апостольское величество и область състоится, но от догмат правых вѣры и съжития божественого апостольскими и отечьскими учительствы управляемо и есть и познавается, и аще в пустынях или въ разсѣлинах земных въдворяется.” (M-I, 191-2). An interesting example that Maximus was ready to admit pope's certain prerogatives can be found in the second missive to Karpov against the Latins. Maximus says that Photius “от самого преблаженнѣшаго папы Иоанна на престоль Константинаграда паки возвращенѣ соборнѣ ради чистыа вѣры и правослвия его...” (M-I, 218).

As it was in the case of other themes, it is also difficult to establish an evolution of Maximus' views concerning the Latins. The works which can be dated do not show such an evolution. Admittedly, there are differences between works written before 1525 and those which were composed later. During the first period Maximus' polemics were much more detailed, with the use of many, mainly patristic, authorities. In his later works he discussed the Latins' errors only in general. Yet, at the same time, he continued working on an anti-Latin polemical complex that consisted of his original works and translations. This task started before 1525, was interrupted by Maximus' imprisonment and prolonged when he could work anew. He and his collaborators edited his earlier anti-Latin texts, originally addressed to concrete people, and transformed them into more universal treatises, directed to a broad public.<sup>337</sup> Thus, there is no sign that Maximus changed his views but the function of his works has been changed.

Yet, there is one remarkable thing that shows the complexity of Maximus' views. He remained faithful to his determined censure of the Latin errors throughout the whole Muscovite period of his life but, at the same time, he was stable in expressing his desire that Christians should rediscover their unity.

The discourse on the unity in the Greek's works from before 1525 is related to Nicholas Bülow's unionist activity. For his Orthodox opponents the German doctor was doubly cunning. First – according to an anonymous Muscovite author – he voiced the idea that the Christians of the East and of the West, in fact, constituted one Church. Furthermore, he criticised what he considered as errors of the Orthodox people and passed over what – from the Orthodox point of view – was Latin error.<sup>338</sup>

---

337See textological commentaries to M-I, 436-8 and M-I, 440-2. Cf. also ZHUROVA 2006, 159-60. Maximus' authorship of Photius' works translation and of the conception of the whole complex is not absolutely sure but very highly probable: SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 64. A tendency to make Maximus' works more universal is especially noticeable in a group of manuscripts containing the second missive to Karpov against the Latins. Previously this work was directed personally against Nicholas Bülow and, in a new redaction, it was transformed into an anti-Latin work in general. The attempt to change the character of this work was not even finished. It concerns Maximus' works included into archbishop Macarius' *Great menology*, see: SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 62-4. These MSS, most probably, were not edited by Maximus. Nevertheless, some transformation were made earlier (possibly by Maximus) because the compilers of the *Great Menology* knew the second missive to Karpov against the Latins in a more generalised version, as *Слово*, *ibid.* 63. Cf. also above, chapter II, text and note 337.

338An anonymous Muscovite polemist wrote against Bülow (ЗНАКИН 1880, 321): "Пишетъ некоему господину великія области Васьяну, архіепископу Ростовскому, по тонку излагая о единствѣ вѣры истиннаго нашего православія великаго, святѣя наша вѣры, к соединенію латинскому приводить, и не стыдѣся вооружается на златеченіе, от многих писаний пишет и умудряет прелестію законопреступною, притчами приводит, от Божественных писаний евангельскаго благовѣстія и апостольских ученій, и пророческіе проповеди изъясляет и великою рѣчію гласует и нашу православную, великую, соборную и апостольскую церковь с латынскою воедино приводит, и св. нашу вѣру христианскую с латынскою едино нарицает, и крещение латынское с православным едино счиняет и многим православным велик соблазн приносит извѣтіем мерзких и безстудных словес неправедных яже суть неуютно Богу, и бесполезно

Maximus replies to Nicholas showing his own vision of Christian unity. He confirms that unity and unanimity are good and salutary but he underlines that it is necessary to be in conformity with Tradition in order to attain true unity. He says to Nicholas: “If you want us to be unified with you, unite first with [...] the Apostles, with the seven ecumenical councils, gathered in the Holy Spirit...”<sup>339</sup> Maximus sets obvious – for an Orthodox – conditions. Speaking about tradition, he understands it, of course, as it was understood in the Orthodox Church but it is not an attempt only to simulate a pursuit of unity and to forward conditions impossible to be fulfilled. His desire for this unity was genuine. Being firmly convinced that the Orthodox Church preserved the true Christian faith, he honestly acknowledged that the Latin Church also preserved a part of the deposit. Before having written the above-quoted missive, in his first letter to Nicholas, he was even more well disposed to the Latins and demonstrated his conviction that they proceeded in half the same way as the Orthodox. And, at the end of this letter, he expresses his readiness to listen to Bülöw as a teacher if only the latter accepts the true faith.<sup>340</sup>

An excellent, and the most often quoted, example of Maximus’ way of thinking about Western Christians is his *Terrible Story*. In this work Maximus also implied that there is a large part of the Christian heritage that is in common to the East and West. He talks about the professors in Paris saying that they teach “our pious theology”.<sup>341</sup> He does not say *their theology!*

---

души, а нашу великую, святую, соборную и апостольскую церковь в нечестіе полагають, и укоряют, и свою латынскую церквы [i.e. церковь - Zhmakin] свыше именуєт и всех православных укоряет и отступники нарицаєт.” Cf. a further fragment of this text, above, chapter II, note 327, as well as *ibid*, text and note 326. Similarly reacted an author of a short note put in a dozen of MSS at the end of Maximus’ anti-Latin work against Bülöw’s unionist ideas (M-I, 253), emphasising that Maximus saw his ruse and reacted against it.

339“Но, о премудрѣишыи Николае, аще весма хочете намъ по истинѣ съединитися с вами, преже съединитися сами вы съ богоглаголивыми апостолами, събравшимися въ Святѣмъ Дусѣ седьмыми Вселенскыми съборы...” – M-I, 244-5. Here we can observe an idea very similar to George Florovsky’s ecumenism in time, *avant la lettre*. The fragment comes from a work directed against Bülöw’s work on the unity of Latins and Russians. IVANOV 1969, 109 and SINITSYNA 2008<sup>b</sup>, 39-40 date this work before 1525. Zhurova is inclined, basing on stylistic features, to postpone the dating to a later period (Z-209-10 and ZHUROVA 2006, 159-60). It does not change much because, as we will see, Maximus did not change his views in this domain after 1525. It is worth to be noted that people in Italy with whom Maximus might have contacted (Quirini and Guistiniani who corresponded with Gianfrancesco Pico and were close to Savonarolians) also dealt with the unity of Christians in their *Libellus* addressed to the pope Leo X, cf. ASSONITIS 2003, 258. It was a part of their programme of the reform of the Church, cf. O’MALLEY 1976, 194.

340“Вѣждь убо, яко мы не токмо за вас, котории исполу являетесь тѣм же путем с нами шествовати, молитися научихомся святою Божиею Церковию, но и за всѣхъ вкупѣ неразумиємъ истины блудящих язык...” (M-I, 134-5). Another fragment, at the end of this letter, was quoted above: chapter II, text and note 334.

341Z-240: “нашего благочестиваго богословия” A similar fragment on a professor (from the legend on the beginning of the Carthusian Order) who was learned in “во всякой премудрости внѣшнѣи и еже *по нас* [my Italic - ZS] священномъ богословии”, *ibid*. On the Byzantine terminology that underwent a transformation here, cf. above, text and note 67.

Yet, the most important factor, that could also serve to overcome confessional barriers, was the Greek's personal fascination of Savonarola. He exalted fra Girolamo and his brethren's virtues so much that Zinovii Otenski accused him of discrediting Russian monasteries and preferring the Latin. Maximus' admiration was however accompanied by a restriction (Z-254): "I would make them equal, with joy, to the ancient defenders of the true faith if they were not Latins. So great was their zeal for the glory of God and the salvation of the faithful." The Greek attributes to the Latins the passage from Rm 10: 2 which was applied by St Paul to the Jews: "they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge" and continues: "they did not entirely fall from faith, hope and love in Christ the Saviour" (Z-255). Then, he constructs a parallel that introduces a certain equilibrium. The Latins – he says – will not become perfect if they do not reject their heresy but neither will we, the Orthodox, if we do not complete our true faith with the fulfilling of the commandments.<sup>342</sup> He shows that on each side there is a lack in Christian life. Orthopraxy is as necessary as orthodoxy.

Significant was also Maximus' attitude towards metropolitan Isidore, manifested during the trial in 1525. Admittedly, this information comes from a biased source (the *Sudnye spiski*) but it is worthy to be mentioned. Isidore, metropolitan of Kiev and all Rus', had been one of the Orthodox signatories of the Council of Florence. For most Orthodox people, especially for Muscovite Orthodox, he was treated as a traitor to the true faith. Yet Maximus says that "he was a genuine teacher of the truth [...] and preached good-benefiting and orthodox union of the truly orthodox faith".<sup>343</sup> This information comes from witnesses for the prosecution, unsympathetic towards Maximus, and the text itself is not entirely clear in this place. It might have been that Maximus considered Isidore's activity in Florence as justified (see below). The decrees of the Council of Florence can hardly be reconciled with the Greek's denunciations of Latin errors but perhaps at least a grain of truth in this account is the fact that Maximus approved the pursuit for unity.

342 "...якоже ихъ не съврѣшаетъ прилѣжно дѣлание заповѣдей Спасовыхъ, не отступающихъ своихъ си ересей, сиче ниже насъ съврѣшаетъ едина православная вѣра, аще не пристяжемъ и евангельскихъ заповѣдей прилѣжно дѣлание." - Z-255. It is striking that he gives as an example Latin priories although he had to know about the corruption in many Latin monasteries during his Italian period. About discrediting the Muscovite monasteries: ZINOVII OTENSKIИ, Истины показание, 896. He says (ibid. 897) that Maximus might have given as an example Egyptian monasteries and he instead pointed to the Latin. In Z-226 Maximus says about the Greeks that they rejected faith not in doctrinal sense but through a disobedience to the commandments.

343 See SUDNYE SPISKI, 119: "А что Сидор митрополит ходил в Рим, и князь великий и епископы изнесли на него в вере христьянстей хулу, а он был пошлой учитель истинны, а истинствовал о христьянстве гораздо и проповедал благоугодно и православно соединение ис[тин]но православныя веры." This phrase is placed in the document in the fragment from Maximus' opinion on the relationship between the Muscovite Church and the patriarchate of Constantinople. It is PLOGUZOV 2002, 229-230 who ascribed this fragment to the year 1525. Maximus nowhere in his works mentions the Union of Florence, cf. IKONNIKOV 1915, 246.

Finally, in a work written certainly after 1531, the *Praise for St Peter and Paul*, the Greek reiterates his call for unity. He says: “[...] come, having rejected the old contention, we will love again God-given peace”. He does not determine directly his addressee in this place but the immediate context of this fragment indicates that he turns to Western Christians.<sup>344</sup> A few pages later, his refutation of the Latin errors again co-exists with an encouragement to reestablish a common faith. Maximus, having repeated that it is against Tradition to celebrate Eucharist with unleavened bread, reproaches hierarchs of the Church (certainly Orthodox) for doing nothing to correct the erring.<sup>345</sup>

He behaved as a missionary. While in Muscovy the isolationist tendency dominated more and more, he would have preferred to approach the Latins, to persuade and to lead them to the unity of true faith.<sup>346</sup>

The tone of his later works is maybe more pessimistic. In a letter on Franciscans and Dominicans sent to a bishop, possibly Akakii, we even find a phrase that is perhaps the most despondent in relation to the Latins in the whole of Maximus’ output. He had never forgotten the Western friars’ virtues (non-possessing and fervent preaching of the Word) and he recalls them also here, but then he adds: “since they live outside the Orthodox dogmas, what is the use of their abundant wisdom and all reason? No use at all if the Lord did not lie: *He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathers not with me scatters abroad.* (Mt 12: 30)”<sup>347</sup> It is difficult to determine to what extent these words came from Maximus’ deep conviction and to what extent they were a concession to the current ideology or an attempt to protect himself against attacks.

344 “[...] аще есть вамъ отнудъ печаль о нужнѣ вашемъ доброхвалении и общемъ спасении, приидѣте, распрю древнюю отринувше, възлюбимъ паки богодарованныи миръ [...]” – М-II, 92. In different parts of this work Maximus once addresses to his personified soul, once to St Peter and Paul and another time to his readers. Before the quoted fragment he turns to “елицы дръзостию ума вашего чрез уставъ богословныхъ носитеся велми блазнено” and emphasised that the tradition should have not been changed (М-II, 88). After the quoted fragments he underlines that the Holy Spirit comes only from the Father (М-II, 92). So his utterance must be directed to the Latins. SINITSYNA 1977, 84 dates this works to 1530-40-ties.

345 First Maximus says (М-II, 93) about errors “яко же нынѣ зрится от небрежения предстоящихъ Христовы Церкви” and immediately continues: “Вѣдомо бо есть вамъ, аще не точию волею слѣпуете, в каковыя нелѣпоты и безчиния въздоша священническаа, за еже не исправляти ихъ прегрѣшения по древнихъ законъ и правилѣхъ, ихъ же честное и благочинное житие тѣхъ и брежения велиа достойно быти подобаеть, у нихъ же Христовъ законъ благоговѣнѣ съблюдается.”

346 Some examples of the isolationist tendency can be found in penitential texts, cf. KOROGODINA 2007, 382 (on ban on contacts with people of other faith) and 389 (on re-baptism of Catholics and rejecting heretical books).

347 See: RZHIGA 1935-36, 100-1: “но понеже внѣ православныхъ догматъ носятся, чимъ плъзуются от многыа ихъ премудрости и разума всяко ничимъ же, аще не ложь глаголяй Господь: *иже нѣст съ мною, на мя ест, и не събираяй съ мною, разсынает.*” IVANOV 1969, 157, no. 230 dates this small work to the period after 1531, in Tver. We have no data to establish whether it was anterior or posterior to the *Praise for St Peter and Paul* which tone is more optimistic about the Latins. Maximus used the term *heretics* (see above, note 287) with reference to the Latins but he also mentions a schism (“разколъ церковный, еже с римляны”, see: О СВЯТЫХЪ ИНОНАХЪ, 48), without any explanation of the circumstances of this schism.

His general attitude was however clear: he disregarded compromises in dogmas and condemned any Latin dissent from the Orthodox faith. At the same time, he did not want to accept indifferently the division of Christians. It is enough to compare cursorily his works with those of Muscovite polemicists to realise that there was an abyss between them.<sup>348</sup>

An exception was prince Andrew Kurbskii who considered himself to be Maximus' disciple. As it has been said, Maximus did not mention in his works the Council of Florence. Kurbskii did, and when describing it he invoked also information received – as he maintained – from Maximus. It is a very peculiar account, far from the state of affairs known from other sources. Kurbskii writes that the Fathers gathered first in Ferrara and then in Florence to end the schism. He emphasises the peaceful atmosphere of this gathering (тихо и со любовью). The Eastern representatives allowed [sic!] the pope and Western Christians to preserve all their customs except for their three major errors: the *Filioque*, unleavened bread for the Eucharist and purgatory. The Western hierarchs accepted the Greek solution and when everything was ready to sign the agreement, a rich abbot or master from the city of Rhodes arrived and, with threats, forced the pope to abstain from signing the document. With bribery the Romans induced the Eastern emperor, the patriarch of Constantinople and some Eastern bishops to accept the Western teaching. When Mark of Ephesus fled, they imprisoned other Eastern bishops and forced them to sign the new conciliar decisions. The representatives of the Rus' also managed to flee and they had not either accepted the new decision.<sup>349</sup>

---

348Already DENISSOFF 1943, 376 emphasised the difference between him and other (also Greek) polemicists (he interpreted it as a sign of Maximus' latinisation) but he used not very convincing arguments which was noticed by IVANOV 1973, 117-19. The latter, however, is not very rigorous when he quotes sources. BULANIN 1984, 82-3 draws attention to the fact that Maximus distinguished precisely dogmatic and customary differences. On Muscovite polemicist (with many source texts): POPOV 1875 and PAVLOV 1878.

349See: KURBSKII, История о осьмомъ соборѣ, 475, 24-9 on the gathering in Florence: “[...] духовно бесѣдующе и вопрошенъе о благочестивыхъ догматехъ, тихо и со любовью, отсецающе, и ичистити хотяще отъ расколовъ, наквашеныхъ отъ еретиковъ многими лѣты, и тщашеся зѣло со обою страну случити церковь Христову въ любовь духовную благочестивыхъ догматовъ.”; on the Eastern acceptance of Western customs besides three main errors, *ibid.* 476; on Western agreement, that the pope and cardinals “обещали церковь Божию во едино, да не будетъ радость безвѣрнымъ Жидомъ и поганомъ”, *ibid.* 477; on the intervention of master from Rhodes, *ibid.* 478 (in this column his is called *великого мѣста Радья опат или маистр* and in the column 481: *маистра Родисскаго*). The further development is described in the columns 479-80. Maximus as a source of (at least) some information is mentioned *ibid.*, 475. It is striking that Kurbskii knows many real historical events, as that the council was first summoned to Ferrara and because of the threat of epidemic was moved to Florence, *ibid.* 477. (In fact it was only an excuse. The main reason was the lack of resources in Ferrara, cf. GILL 1959, 173-6. Nevertheless pestilence was given in official documents as the reason of the transfer, *ibid.* 312.) The mention about the master from Rhodes could be a reminiscence of Andrew of Rhodes who played an important role at the Council, cf. above note 290 but the story Kurbskii certainly took from an anonymous sixteenth century author from Ostroh, cf. KOZLOV-STRUTINSKII-PARFENT'EV 2014, 80-1. In Kurbskii's narration however the order of the main events is completely reversed. Also the financial aspect existed in the post-conciliar Greek polemic. Yet, it was an accusation that the pope did not pay money promised for the Greeks maintenance and, through that, he put pressure on the Greeks, and not that the Latins attempted to bribe them. There was also a motive that the pressure was put through honours awarded to

Despite all the peculiar invention included in this legend and its strong anti-Latin tenor, its general tendency corresponds with Maximus' ideas: the importance of the pursuit of unity without any doctrinal concessions. The Greek could hardly invent the part of the story which Kurbskii took from him. It might have been a reflection of an attempt to save the honour of the Byzantine Church when the signatures of the Greek conciliar fathers on the act of the union seemed to be incompatible with the true Orthodoxy (possibly the information about the representatives of Rus' is a later interpolation). Maximus might have repeated a legend that he had heard from others. This way it was possible to maintain the desire of unity with the rejection of any doctrinal compromise. In this light the Greek's defence of metropolitan Isidore's orthodoxy is fully comprehensible.

Maximus was not an outstanding theologian but he was a remarkable person. In the Christian world that was transforming into a conglomeration of confessional chapels, distancing one from another and more and more antagonistic, he strove to behave worthily. He was Orthodox to the bone, deep-rooted in the patristic tradition. He did not think to relativise any single dogma of the Orthodox faith. Yet, he was able to see and appreciated real values among other Christians. In matters of social life (including religious life) he often looked to the West although he could find other examples. He did not lose hope that the Christian unity was possible.

This was a stable element in his beliefs. Yet, there was also instability. The changing social and religious situation, the time of crisis in places where Maximus' sojourned have been mentioned many times above. His thought was not completely coherent and consistent. In a wobbling world it was difficult to create a balanced intellectual vision. The creation of a new synthesis which would have integrated old values with new, the unalterable world of orthodox dogmas with the values of humanist thought, was a task that exceeded Maximus' capacity. He made some attempts but they could only partially respond to challenges he faced. The harmonious implementation of old principles in the new times required great intuition or ... a compromise. If his behaviour during the trial was not devoid of a moral ambiguity (and this statement would be true only when we accept that biased, at least partially, sources related his real behaviour), later his courage and fidelity to his beliefs made him unable to accept dubious compromises. There is a clear idea, central to Maximus' thought: to remain an Orthodox

---

conciliatory Greek ecclesiastics, GILL 1959, 406-8.



Christian in his belief and to follow the orthopraxy preached by the Lord in the Gospel. His integrity aroused respect for him during his lifetime and appreciation after his death.

## CONCLUSIONS

When Maximus the Greek was dying, he probably would not have predicted how many different and sometimes extreme reactions the memory of his life and his literary works would provoke. So, who was he? He was, at the same time, typical and exceptional. He was typical as a representative of the educated post-Byzantine Greek elite with its ideas, formation and a certain sense of instability. Typical representatives are interesting for a historian even more than outstanding figures because they illustrate better how new ideas and events shape social reality.

Maximus was also exceptional. His life itinerary was far from common and the effects of his stay in Muscovy exceeded the average impact that an individual can make on the society in which he lives.

Michael Trivolis was born in the post-Byzantine time where the memory of the Byzantine tradition and of the Christian empire was still vivid. Then he entered into the world of the Italian Renaissance, in which the heritage of the pre-Christian Roman and Greek culture was revived but he also acquired an experience of the life and thought of the Western Church. On Athos his Byzantine roots were renewed and strengthened. With such endowments he arrived in Muscovy, a new world, developing and becoming more and more important on the European scene.

It might seem that Maximus was predisposed to the role of an intermediary, a bridge builder or an author of a creative synthesis. Yet, another scenario was also possible, that of the subsequent overcoming of one current in his life by another.

The review of the historiography shows how such a biography can be set to work for the assumption accepted a priori. Thus, was Maximus a humanist enlightener who brought to barbarian Rus' the light of Western or Byzantine culture or an adherent of theocracy, stimulated by Savonarola and later strengthened in his views on Mount Athos? Was he one of those who supplemented the deficiencies of Eastern Christianity by contact with Western tradition or one who, having come into contact with Western thought, rejected it and returned to the bosom of true Orthodoxy? Depending on their different views, various authors, by confirming their convictions, wanted to claim him for their own. The real situation was more complex and there

is no doubt that every period of his life and every culture in which he lived influenced his thought and left durable traces in his work.

Similarly, the question of his sanctity opens a space for reflection. During his lifetime he was judged and imprisoned as a heretic. Yet, there were always people who respected him and, after his death, regarded him as a saint. The memory of his holiness, not immediately recognised, lasted for a few centuries and finally, in 1988 he was declared a saint by the Russian and by the Greek Orthodox Churches. His sanctity was a sanctity of an imperfect man who, through his weaknesses and his not always laudable behaviour, attained Christian integrity in his lifetime.

He lived in interesting times and it was certainly a curse for him. Both the typical and the exceptional in his life were entangled in epoch-making processes. The cultural diversity of his experience was one important element but the key word to Maximus the Greek's biography is *crisis*. Virtually every society where he lived was in a kind of crisis or experiencing serious changes.

His homeland underwent a crisis of identity when it was reduced from the state of an empire to that of a conquered country. The post-Byzantine society, after the collapse of the old order, had not yet found new references, a new model of existence, corresponding to its great heritage.

In the West the cultural paradigm was changing. Such a shift never occurs quickly and, in the case of the Renaissance Italy, it initially included only narrow circles. Yet, Trivolis' friends and acquaintances lived precisely in this milieu and, affirmatively or critically, reacted to new phenomena. The shift which began during the Renaissance set the direction for the further evolution of European culture, although some of the changes were only revealed on a wider scale much later.

Athos was also in an arduous position, impoverished and deprived of imperial protection. More important was however the tension between two models of monastic life and the question of whether idiorhythmy could be accepted as equal to cenobitism, as a form of striving for Christian perfection or it was an expression of laxity and were idiorhythmic monks were only semi-monks?

Finally it was Muscovy that was indeed a new world. From the Western perspective new, because distant and unknown but also in itself and for itself it was new because new, promising directions of development were opening before it. It was not evident which direction would bring what changes. Muscovy, after the period of isolation, returns (if we consider

Muscovy to be an heir of the pre-Mongol Rus') to more active contacts both with Western Europe and post-Byzantine society. Besides the ruler's relations with foreign courts, motivated by reasons of political strategy, the representatives of the higher strata of the society established more spontaneous connections resulted from a desire to exceed one's horizons or to change the circumstances of one's life. People of Russian origins from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania sought the opportunity to serve the tsar and Muscovite fugitives settled in the Polish-Lithuanian commonwealth. Diplomats from Moscow made personal acquaintances in foreign countries during their mission. At that time appeared the first Muscovites who had studied abroad.

In this changing world Maximus had to find a place for himself and to make the choice: what to preserve of the old realities, what to accept from the new patterns? The growing awareness of the historical variability may have helped to find some answers but first of all it was a threat. It was difficult to draw clear boundaries between what could be changed and what should remain immutable. The absolute truths were at stake and the newly acquired skills of historical analysis did not give relief.

Maximus was a guardian of tradition. He defended the established orthodox understanding of the deposit of faith, he strongly opposed heresies, he wanted to preserve the traditional ecclesiastical authorities and long-established ecclesiastical sovereignty of the Constantinople See.

Yet, the challenges he met on his way demanded answers. He was not, in any case, a fundamentalist (to use an anachronistic term) and he tried to confront the challenges. He observed how a new cultural model was arising among the Western (mainly Italian) humanists. Some of the changes were unacceptable for him.

Perhaps, apart from the common ideas, Savonarola was closest to Maximus because of this complicated, new situation when it was necessary to find an adequate Christian answer to the changing world. Both of them behaved like prophets. They wanted to cleanse, to reform the Church and social life. The situation was new and there were no ready-made ways of responding to such a situation.

As the challenges in the West, the crisis of the Byzantine society, and later the problems of Athonite monasteries, affected Maximus and were a test for him. In response to some questions Maximus found a flexible approach and adequate answers. He advanced fresh and unexpected ideas. Sometimes his solutions seemed to be revolutionary for his contemporaries. When he gave Western friars as an example for Muscovite monks, it did not make his life

easier. In the political sphere he accepted new solutions or new laws, against opinions of those who desired to conserve the old customs strictly. Seeing some of the imperfections of idiorhythmy, he was ready not only to indulge them but to adopt a sympathetic approach and to justify them. Finally, against the Muscovite hard conservatism, he defended a certain value of science, though limited, especially, when it concerned the field of his competence, philology.

Yet, there were situations where he was intransigent. In defence of human freedom and divine Providence he firmly rejected all astrological beliefs and explanations. He did not want to accept the astrologers' clarifications when they said that they did not aim to subdue people to the influence of stars but, quite to the contrary, to control this influence, and thus give more liberty to human beings. Visibly the appalling examples of the slavish subordination to astrology were for him more convincing than the arguments of learned astrologers.

These struggles had far-reaching consequences. Maximus' approach to astrology had an impact on his reflection on science in general since his opponents considered astrology as one of the sciences *tout court*. It also influenced the way he regarded Western thought because astrology (at least in the first period of his stay in Muscovy) was, in his mind, associated with Western impact.

Another, and more fundamental, problem was of course the *Filioque*. In the dogmatic issues Maximus did not see any possibility of compromise. The Western Church should have accepted the Eastern trinitarian views.

Thus, the West to which he owed his education, was, in his view, charged with the most serious errors. The problem with astrology could perhaps pass as a temporary fashion although it managed to shape Maximus' approach to Western science. The question of the *Filioque* was much more important because it touched the very core of the Christian dogma. If Maximus had accepted the *Filioque*, in his understanding he would have believed in another God. Here we can see the tension experienced by him. Western religious fascinated the Greek through their apostolic way of life but they confessed the *Filioque*. Truth and falsehood were tangled. It was not always easy to separate what he wanted to draw from Western thought and that which he in no way could tolerate.

Scholars, more than once, accused Maximus of incoherence and inconsistency. It is true that he did not create a new synthesis which would have united old and new patterns. Nevertheless he did try hard to preserve the integrity of the Christian faith without rejecting those novelties that he considered to be valuable.

That Maximus' works had a significant impact on Russian culture arises from the huge number of manuscripts that have been preserved. Besides the collection of his writings compiled during his lifetime and with his participation, after his death new collections appeared. The first people who worked to diffuse Maximus' heritage were archbishop of Vologda, Jonas Dumin (Иона Думин) and the monk Isaiah of Kamieniec-Podolskii. The latter wrote with genuine delight over his works: "Maximus' sacred book enlightens and cheers the souls of all men who want to be saved and find true understanding." The first patriarch of Moscow, Job (Иов), also played a certain role in spreading of Maximus' works. Dionysius Zobninovski (about 1570 – 1633) expressed his conviction about the sanctity of Maximus and cared about his legacy. Distinctive was however the fact that none of the Muscovite hierarchy rehabilitated Maximus but it was the patriarch of Constantinople, Jeremiah II, who did it in a way, when, visiting Muscovy in 1588/9, as he issued a charter releasing Maximus posthumously from all ecclesiastical censures and their effects.<sup>1</sup>

Wider reception was selective. The Old Believers remembered Maximus in relation to the polemics on how to cross oneself, how to sing alleluia and on the wearing of beards. Anti-unionist polemicists (in the context of the Union of Brest 1596) used his anti-Latin works. His praise of the Latin friars was less remembered. The author of the foreword to the nineteenth century Kazan' edition of his works wrote: "He defended the Russian Church against the claims of the Roman Church, wrote against the rationalistic doctrines of the Western Reformation, against Jews, pagans and Mohammadans; he corrected liturgical books, explained church rites, refuted various false and superstitious tales [...] His contemporaries could not appreciate Maximus' great merits: The light of truth was too harsh for their eyes, darkened by ignorance..."<sup>2</sup>

1 The monk Isaiah's words can be found in: СКАЗАНИЕ ИСАИИ – ПРЕДИСЛОВИЕ, 90: "[...] священная и богодухновенная книга Максимова просвѣщает и веселит душа всѣмъ человѣкомъ, хотящимъ спастися и в разум истинный приити." On the patriarch Jeremiah: KRUTETSKII 1991. NB, in Russian libraries there are a few charters written by an anonymous writer linked with the patriarch Jeremiah II. Their connection with Jeremiah's visit to Moscow is not established, see: FONKICH 1981, 124.

2 Words from the preface to the Psalter translated by Maximus (SINITSYNA 2006<sup>a</sup>, 64): "[...] священная и богодухновенная книга Максимова просвѣщает и веселит душа всемъ человѣкомъ, хотящимъ спастися и в разум истинный приити." In an early Maximus' biography (put in the metropolitan Macarius' Great Menology), *ibid.*, 96, where various themes of Maximus' polemics and criticism are enumerated, the question of the appointment of Muscovite metropolitans is not mentioned. Maximus' most popular work (ZHUROVA 1997, 5) was "Сказание о рукописании греховномъ" (Z-276-91). This is a repudiation of the idea, contained in аросурѣна popular in Muscovy, that Adam signed a pact with the devil during the temptation in paradise. The foreword to the Kazan' edition: K-I, 6-7: "Онъ защищаль русскую Церковь отъ притязаний римской Церкви, писалъ противъ рационалистическихъ учений западной реформы, противъ иудеевъ, язычниковъ и магометанъ; исправляль богослужебные книги, объяснялъ церковные обряды, опровергалъ разныя ложныя и суевѣрныя сказанія [...] Современники не могли оцѣнить великихъ заслугъ Максима: для ихъ очей, омраченныхъ невѣжествомъ, слишкомъ рѣзокъ былъ тотъ свѣтъ истины..."

The question of the reception of Maximus' output, both by contemporaries and by posterity is still the task awaiting for a future researcher. Here, I would only like to mention an observation which arose during my research but which also needs to be developed and confirmed.

I emphasised that when Maximus arrived in Muscovy, this state was experiencing an opening towards the West, after a period of isolation. It was a time of dynamic changes and development starting from the state administration and finishing with Muscovite culture.<sup>3</sup> Yet the second half of the sixteenth century was marked by a certain re-closing, of a consolidation of Muscovite values, independently to the rest of the Orthodox world and the rejecting of foreign influences. A few symptomatic examples give an idea of this process. By the mid-sixteenth century the Church "suppressed what could be considered the entire Trans-Volgan Left (Artemii et al.) and neglected Nil in official policies and publications aiming at national religious consciousness". The contacts with the West becomes less and less intense. The *Stoglav* Council, although it was conceived as a tool of certain reforms, rather stiffened the position of the Muscovite Church. The *Domostroi*, when it was introduced (in the earlier period such works were in use both in Novgorod and in the West), was an anachronistic, extremely patriarchal and ritualistic model; the ideology that was developed emphasised the uniqueness of Muscovy and did not stimulate a creative exchange with the others.<sup>4</sup> The earlier tendency to openness was rather spontaneous, while the closing seems to be a more conscious step.

One can hardly avoid a parallel with Peter the Great's reign. Some elements of the rapprochement to the West were similar (a desire of modernisation of the state, a search for well educated specialists from the West who were indispensable for the development of the state) but Peter's action was a top-down controlled process and it was realised against the desire of a large part of the society. One can only speculate on what would have been a more natural evolution of Muscovy if it had not been stopped in the second half of the sixteenth century. Peter's constrained modernisation led Russia another way.

We do not have enough data to say to *what extent* Maximus the Greek had an impact on

---

3 This development is emphasised and documented by BUSHKOVITCH 2015, 298-9. 303 and passim. He however is persuaded about a more linear development from the beginning of the sixteenth century, through Peter I's reform till the nineteenth century. My observations are different, as described below.

4 When the *Stoglav* canonised the tradition of the Muscovite Orthodoxy, the Russian monks from Athos, and others, protested, RUNCIMAN 1968, 329. On Nil and the Trans-Volgan elders: GOLDFRANK 2007, 375. He also says: "And the heresy trials, of Kosoi, Bashkin and others, effectively eliminated the diversity of voices that had existed in Muscovy for a century.", *ibid.* 272. MILLER 1978, 412 notes that, ironically, Bullow and Ghotan were catalysts to the emergence of Philotheus' letter which led towards Russian national exclusiveness. The reluctance to let foreigners leave the country is also significant.

these processes. We can notice however that he both contributed to the opening and might have had his share in the closing of Muscovy. Assimilation of the resources of Byzantine knowledge and some Western ideas, through him and thanks to his learning, created a favourable circumstance for the opening of the Muscovite mind. His firm disapproval of Western theology and Western science (represented by astrology) might have been an element that induced the Muscovite authorities to consolidate their own and only their own tradition, without confronting it with the Western world.

Yet, even if towards the end of his life he seems to become less optimistic, the most accusing phrases towards the West ascribed to Maximus (besides strictly theological questions), come from the time after his death and, perhaps, do not come from his pen. If, therefore, Maximus contributed to the closing of Muscovy, it happened not so much through his conscious action but due to a reduced reception of his works while forgetting his openness.

Apart from Maximus' significance for the history of Muscovy, his life and work give the possibility to observe the changing relationship between the Eastern and the Western Churches. Crisis in both communities contributed to the distancing of the Catholics from the Orthodox and vice versa. The consolidation of one's own identity, necessary at a critical point, quite naturally led to a growing separation from the other.<sup>5</sup>

After the council of Florence the division was far from being healed but there were some opportunities, as Joseph Gill attempted to prove, to sustain the union.<sup>6</sup> Yet, instead of a rapprochement, the two Christian Churches began to grow apart.

Maximus' experience illustrates well the elements that deepened the estrangement: the crisis in the Eastern and in the Western Church, the coupling of the new Western cultural paradigm with the image of the Western Christianity in the East and the identification of a certain aspect of the Western science (in Maximus' case it was astrology) with Western culture and Western religion as such.

Therefore the intuition, expressed by certain authors, that the two confessions, and their relationships, were definitely formed in the fifteenth – sixteenth centuries, seems to be correct. It is just intuition because we do not have a measure allowing us to determine the final phase of shaping a confession neither a precise definition of a confession within the Christian context.

---

5 Cf. a parallel made by GEANAKOPOLOS 1976, 4 between a revitalisation movement described by sociologists and the situation of the Greeks in Maximus' times. Also MEYENDORFF 1996, 1, mentions the crisis in the West as an important factor shaping the mutual relationships.

6 See: GILL 1959, Conclusions; cf. different opinion of MEYENDORFF 1996, 110-11.



Yet, the concept of confessionalisation, originally forged to analyse the relationship between Catholics and Protestants in Germany, may also be of limited use to study Catholic – Orthodox relationship.<sup>7</sup> Maximus was a witness of the progressing but not completed process of confessionalisation. His meeting with the Dominicans and the Carthusians in Italy prevented him from seeing separated Christian as completely divided.

The problems with uniatism and proselytism (which could be a sign that two distinct confessions were formed) begins when a consciousness of belonging to the one Church of Christ disappears. Then a tendency to re-baptise other Christians appears. Confessionalism is an effect of the victory of the spirit of the world over the spirit of the Gospel. I would like to believe that a better understanding of the causes of divisions could bring us closer to the moment when they will be overcome.

---

7 For a review of the discussion on confessionalisation as a historiographical category cf. LOTZ-HEUMANN 2001. As for important authors expressing the intuition that fifteenth – sixteenth centuries were decisive for forming two separate confessions (Catholic and Orthodox) and the definitive division between the East and the West, e.g. cardinal Walter Kasper in a conversation with me articulated this idea.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## General Abbreviations

AGOP – Archivum Generale Ordinis Praedicatorum, ad S. Sabinae, Romae

AFED – Наталия А. Казакова, Яков С. Лурье, Антифеодальные еретические движения на Руси XIV — начала XVI в. Москва – Ленинград 1955

AFP – “Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum”, Romae 1931 -

AI (АИ) – “Акты исторические, собранные и изданные Археографической комиссиею”, Санкт-Петербург, I-V 1841-43

AOP – “Analecta [Sacri] Ordinis [Fratrum] Praedicatorum”, Romae 1893 -

ASo (ААЭ) – “Акты, собранные в библиотеках и архивах Российской империи Археографической экспедицией императорской Академии наук”, Санкт-Петербург, I-IV 1836-38

BAN (БАН) – Library of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Saint Petersburg

BLDR – Библиотека литературы древней Руси, vol. I - XX, Санкт-Петербург 1997-

BLF – Biblioteca Laurenziana, Firenze

BMFD - Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents. A Complete Translation of the Surviving Founders' *Typika* and Testaments, ed. John Thomas and Angela Constantinides Hero, I-V, Washington D.C. 2000 (Dumbarton Oaks Studies XXXV)

BS – “Byzantinoslavica”, Praha 1929 -

CHRPh – The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy, ed. Charles B. Schmitt, Cambridge 1988

ChOИDR (ЧОИДР) – “Чтения в Императорском Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских при Московском Университете”, Москва 1846-1848

CoE – Contemporaries of Erasmus. A biographical Register of the Renaissance and Reformation, eds. Peter G. Bietenholz and Thomas B. Deutscher, vol. I-III, Toronto – Buffalo 1985-87

CCE – Les Conciles œcuméniques, vol. II-1, Les décrets, De Nicée à Latran V, Sous la direction

de G. Alberigo, Paris, 1994

COD – Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta. Edidit Centro di Documentazione – Istituto per le Scienze Religiose – Bologna. Curantibus Josepho Alberigo, Perikle-P. Joannou, Claudio Leonardi, Paulo Prodi. Consultante Huberto Jedin, Basileae – Barcinone – Friburgi – Romae – Vindobonae MCMLXII

DBI – Dizionario biografico degli Italiani, Roma 1960 -

DS – Heinrich Denzinger and Adolf Schönmetzer. Enchiridion symbolorum definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum. Freiburg, Basel, Rome & Vienna: Herder, 1997

EoR – Encyclopedia of the Renaissance, ed. Paul F. Grendler, vol. I-VI, New York 1999

GIM (ГИМ) – The State Historical Museum, Moscow (Государственный Исторический Музей, Москва)

HGV – The Holy and Great Monastery of Vatopaidi. Tradition - History – Art, ed. I. Papaggelos, vol. 1-2, Mount Athos 1998

MD – “Memorie Domenicane”, Florence 1926 -

OCP – “Orientalia Christiana Periodica”, Rome 1935 -

ODB – The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium, ed. Alexander P. Kazhdan, vol. 1-3, Oxford 1991

OGHRA – The Oxford guide to the historical reception of Augustine, editor-in-chief: Karla Pollmann, editor: Willemien Otten, vol. 1-3, Oxford 2013

PDS-KNT – Памятники дипломатических сношений древней России с державами иностранными : [7. Памятники дипломатических сношений Московского государства с Крымом, Ногаями и Турцией: Т. 2], in: Sb RIO, vol. 95 (1895)

PDS-R – Памятники дипломатических сношений древней России с державами иностранными. Памятники дипломатических сношений с Империей Римскою. Том I. С 1488 по 1594, Санкт-Петербург 1851.

PLP – Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit, ed. Erich Trapp, Wien 1976 -

PSRL – Полное собрание русских летописей

RBS – Русский Биографический Словарь, Санкт-Петербург 1992- (reprinted edition of 1896-)

REB – “Revue des études Byzantines”, Paris 1946 -

RES – “Revue des études Slaves”, Paris 1921 -

RGB (РГБ) – Russian State Library (Российская государственная библиотека) Moscow

(before: ГБЛ – Государственная библиотека СССР им. В. И. Ленина)

RGK – Ernst Gamillscheg, Dieter Harlfinger, Herbert Hunger, Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten 800 – 1600, vol. 1- , Wien 1981 -

RGM – Россия и греческий мир в XVI веке, ed. С. М. Каштанов, Л. В. Столярова, Б. Л. Фонкич, vol. I - , Москва 2004 -

RIB (РИБ) – Русская Историческая Библиотека, Санкт-Петербург 1872-1927

RNB (РНБ) – Russian National Library (Российская национальная библиотека), Saint Petersburg (before: Государственная публичная библиотека – ГПБ)

RR – “The Russian Review”, Kansas 1941 -

Sb RIO (Сб. РИО) – “Сборник Императорского Русского исторического общества”, Санкт-Петербург 1867-1916, том 1 - 148

SC – Sources Chrétiennes, Paris 1944 -

SKK 1 – Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси. Вып. 2 (вторая половина XIV – XVI в.), АН СССР. ИРЛИ, Отв. ред. Д. С. Лихачев. Ч. 1: А–К, Ленинград 1988  
(I used the digital version of SKK in: <http://lib.pushkinskijdom.ru>)

SKK 2 – Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси. Вып. 2 (вторая половина XIV – XVI в.), АН СССР. ИРЛИ, Отв. ред. Д. С. Лихачев. Ч. 2: Л–Я, Ленинград 1989  
(I used the digital version of SKK in: <http://lib.pushkinskijdom.ru>)

TODRL (ТОДРЛ) – “Труды Отдела древнерусской литературы”, Ленинград / Санкт-Петербург 1934 -

VV (ВВ) – “Византийский временник”, Санкт-Петербург 1894 -

## **A. SOURCES**

### **MAXIMUS THE GREEK’S WORKS**

Maximus’ works have not always the same titles in different manuscripts and editions. In order to facilitate orientation, I list below the works that were critically edited in the same order, as they were organised by the editors, i.e. in a chronological – systematic order. After the name of each work I put the abbreviation by which I refer to these works in the text of my thesis and, if possible, the reference to older editions. These abbreviations refer to edition, volume (if applicable) and page. Those works that have not yet been critically edited are quoted according to older editions and listed below the contents of the critical editions.

Abbreviations of the collected work:

– Critical editions

М-I – Преподобный Максим Грек, Сочинения, ed. Н.В. Сеницына and others, vol. I, Москва 2008

М-II – Преподобный Максим Грек, Сочинения, ed. Н.В. Сеницына and others, vol. II, Москва 2014

Z – Людмила И. ЖУРОВА, Авторский текст Максима Грека: рукописная и литературная традиции. Часть II. Сочинения, Новосибирск 2011

– Older edition

К-I, II, III – Сочинения преподобного Максима Грека, ed. И. Я. Порфирьев, vol. I-III, Казань 1859-62 (2<sup>nd</sup> edition: Казань 1894-7) I quote according to the first edition. In some parts of the second edition pagination is changed compared to the first edition.

## I. Writings of the years 1498–1516

– Colophon in MS of “Geoponica” (Bibliothèque national, Paris, MS gr. 1994, fol. 155v) copied by Michael Trivolis for Janus Laskaris (Shevchenko 1997, 64; Denissoff 1943, 87 + facsimile, Pl. III; M-I, 84)

– Letter to Nicholas of Tarsia from 29 of March [1498] (M-I, 86)

– Letter to John Gregoropoulos from 29 of March [1498] (M-I, 88)

– Letter to John Gregoropoulos [from 1499 г.] (M-I, 92)

– Letter to John Gregoropoulos from March [1500] (M-I, 94)

– Letter to Scipio Fortegueri from 21 of April [1503] (M-I, 98)

– Letter to Scipio Fortegueri from 24 of April 24 [1503] (M-I, 100)

– Epitaph for the patriarch Joachim I (M-I, 102)

– Epigram dedicated to Manuel the Grand Rhetor (M-I, 104)

– Epitaph for the patriarch Niphon II (M-I, 106)

– Note in a document of the Kastamonitou monastery (M-I, 108)

– First epigram for a reliquary of the patriarch Niphon II (M-I, 110)

– Second epigram for a reliquary of the patriarch Niphon II (M-I, 112)

– Verses dedicated to saint Demetrius [authorship probable] (M-I, 114)

## II. Writings of the years 1518–1525

- Missive to Basil III about Athonite monasteries (M-I, 119-32)
- Missive to Nicholas Bülow (Булев or: Немчин) (M-I, 133-8)
- Maximus' first missive to F. Karpov on the occasion of their acquaintance (M-I, 139-40)
- Maximus' second missive to F. Karpov on the occasion of their acquaintance (M-I, 143-4)
- Missive to Basil III on Mehmed Giray's invasion (M-I, 145-50)
- Missive to Basil III on the translation of the Commented Psalter (M-I, 151-66)
- First polemical missive to F. Karpov against the Latins (M-I, 172-98)
- Second polemical missive to F. Karpov against the Latins (M-I, 200-42)
- Polemical discourse against Nicholas Bülow's work «о соединении русом и латином» (M-I, 243-52 = Z-195-209 = K-I, 213-34)
- First missive to F. Karpov against astrology (M-I, 256-306)
- Second missive to F. Karpov against astrology (M-I, 311-34)
- Missive to F. Karpov about the Leviathan (M-I, 335-6)
- Story about Athonite monasteries for Vassian Patrikeev's Kormchaya (M-I, 341-2)
- Missive to V.M. Tuchkov about Aldo Manuzio's typographical sign (M-I, 345-7)
- Missive to V.M. Tuchkov, accompanying translations from the *Suida* lexicon (M-I, 348)
- Edifying Missive to V.M. Tuchkov (M-I, 351-3)
- Missive to Russian, Serbs and Bulgars about the translation of John Chrysostom's Homilies on St Matthew (M-I, 355-7)
- Discourse on the might-have-been deluge in February 1524 (M-I, 359-72)
- [Dubium] Missive to Nicholas the Latin about the excommunication of the Latins (M-I, 373-86)
- [Dubium] Missive to Nicholas the Latin (or to unknown person) (M-I, 387-98)
- [Dubium] Missive to the king (?) Sigismund (M-I, 399-404)
- [Dubium] Missive to unknown person (Vassian Patrikeev?) with the translation of a fragment from Simeon Metaphrastes' «Saint Dionysius the Areopagite's martyrdom» (M-I, 405)

### III. Ioasaf collection

- 1 – Исповѣдание православныя вѣры Максима инока изъ Святыя Горы, им же извѣщаеъ о Христѣ Иисусѣ всякаго православнаго священника же и князя, что по всему истиннѣиши есть православенъ инокъ, всю православную вѣру съблюдаа цѣлу и непремѣнну и непорочну, (М-II, 51-58)
- 2 – Молитва ко Пречистѣ Богородици, в тои же отчасти винословіе о страсти Спасовѣ, (М-II, 59-62)
- 3 – Пѣснь благодарствена къ пресвятѣи Троици глаголема въ всю Свѣтлую недѣлю Святыя Пасхы, (М-II, 63-64)
- 4 – Сказание, какаа словеса рекль бы Петръ, отверглься Христа и плакася горко, (М-II, 65)
- 5 – Слово о Рожествѣ Господа и Бога и Спаса нашего Иисуса Христа, в томъ же и на иудѣя, (М-II, 66-70)
- 6 – Слово обличително на еллинскую прелесть, (М-II, 71-77, Greek version of this work, with English translation, published by Shevchenko 1997, 18-39)
- 7 – Слово похвалное къ святым апостолом Петру и Павлу, в том же обличение и на латыньскыя три болшиа ереси, (М-II, 81-94)
- 8 – Слово обличителнона агаряньскую прелесть и умыслившаго еа сквернаго пса Моамефа, (М-II, 95-116)
- 9 – Слово о том же къ благовѣрным на богоборца пса Моамефа, в нем же и Сказание отчасти о кончинѣ вѣка сего, (М-II, 117-124)
- 10 – Слово обличително вкупѣ и разврацателно лживаго писания Афродитиана персянина зломудреннаго, (М-II, 125-135)
- 11 – Слово отвѣцателно о исправлении книгъ рускых, в нем же и на глаголющих, яко плоть Господня по въскресении из мрътвыхъ неописана бысть. Чтущеи внимайте прилѣжно и разсужайте богоугодно, вкупе и челоуѣколюбно, (М-II, 136-144)
- 12 – Слово отвѣцятелно о книжном исправлении, (М-II, 145-149)
- 13 – Того же инока Максима Грека Слово о том, яко Промыслѣмъ Божимъ, а не звѣздами и колесом счястиа вся челоуѣчьскаа устраяются, (М-II, 150-158)
- 14 – Бесѣда Души и Уму, по вопросу и отвѣту, о еже откуда страсти ражаются въ них, в том же и о божественѣмъ промыслѣ и на звѣздохетцѣх, (М-II, 159-175)
- 15 – Словеса душеполезна зѣло внимающим ихъ, бесѣдуеъ Умъ къ Души своеи, в томъ же и на лихоимство, (М-II, 176-197)

- 16 – Слово о покаании, (М-II, 198-200; the Greek version of this work, with English translation, published by Shevchenko 1997, 10-17)
- 17 – На несытное чрево и безчисленых золь виновно иночествующимъ, (М-II, 204)
- 18 – Словеса на общую прелестъ мечтаемыхъ во снѣ соннихъ, (М-II, 205-6)
- 19 – Слово о покаании велми душеполезно вѣрою и любовию нелицемѣрною внимающимъ его и с разумомъ трезвеннымъ прочитающимъ его, (М-II, 207-218)
- 20 – Стязание о извѣстномъ иночскомъ жительствѣ, лица же стязующихся Филоктимонъ да Актимонъ, сирѣчь Любостязетелныи да Нестязетелныи, (М-II, 219-230)
- 21 – Какыя рѣчи рекль бы убо к Съдѣтелю всѣмъ епископъ тѣрьскыи съжжену бывшу събрънному храму, (М-II, 231-7)
- 22 – Сложение вкратцѣ о бывшемъ пожарѣ тверскомъ, въ томъ же и похвала о обновлении церковного украшения, бывшаго боголюбивымъ епископомъ тверскимъ Акаиємъ, (М-II, 238-40)
- 23 – Слово благодарствено къ Господу нашему Иисусъ Христу о бывшей побѣдѣ на крымскаго пса, (М-II, 241-6)
- 24 – Слово к начяльствующему на земли, (М-II, 247-52)
- 25 – Главы поучительны к начяльствующимъ правовѣрно, (М-II, 253-63)
- 26 – Слово пространнѣе излагающе съ жалостию нестроения и бесчиния цареи и властелѣхъ послѣдняго вѣка сего, (М-II, 264-71)
- 27 – Слово къ смѣющимъ трижды глаголати “аллилуиа” а четвертое “Слава Тебѣ Боже”, (М-II, 272-5)
- 28 – От Еуагелиа еже от Иоанна, (М-II, 276-7)
- 29 – Сказание противу глаголющихъ, яко плотскимъ съвокуплениемъ и рождествомъ хотяще множитися чловѣчьскыи родъ, аще не согрѣшили праотци, (М-II, 278-80)
- 30 – Сказание о иже свыше мирѣ и о спасении душъ нашихъ Господу помолимся, (М-II, 281-3)
- 31 – Сказание о Иудѣ предатели на Аполинария, (М-II, 284-5)
- 32 – Слово къ хотящимъ оставляти жены своя безъ вины законныя безъ вины законныя и ити въ иноческое житие, (М-II, 286-9 = Z-85-92)
- 33 – Сказание, како знаменоватися крестнымъ знамениемъ, (М-II, 290-92)



- 34 – Сказание, яко не подобает отнудъ внимати глаголющим: не быти прочее им божественѣи литургии, не поспѣвшимъ прити къ чтению божественаго Еуагелиа, (М-II, 293-5)
- 35 – Сказание о освящении водѣ на заутриа святых богоявлении, (М-II, 296-7)
- 36 – Слово поучително, вкупѣ же и обличително прелести звѣздохотстѣи и утѣшително живущим въ скръбѣхъ, (М-II, 298-302)
- 37 – Послание къ нѣкоему иноку, бывшу въ игуменѣ, о нѣмецкой прелести, глаголемѣи фортунѣ, и о колесѣ ея, (М-II, 303-7 = Z-97-103 = K-I, 446-55)
- 38 – Слово въспоминательно о исправлении иноческаго житиа къ нѣкоим честным инокыням, и яко испльнение еуагельскихъ заповѣдей съ есть въ истину страх Божии, (М-II, 308-16)
- 39 – Словеса акы от лица Пресвятыя Богородицы къ лихоимцом и скверным и всякыя злобы исполненымъ, а каноны всякыми и различными пѣсньми угожати чающим, (М-II, 317-8)
- 40 – Послание къ нѣкоему другу его, в нем же тлъкование, нѣкоихъ рѣчении неудобъ разумѣваемыхъ в божественом писании, (М-II, 319-25)
- 41 – Послание къ иному нѣкоему другу, в нем же сказание триехъ нѣкихъ взысканий, нужныхъ всякому рачителю книжному, (М-II, 326-31)
- 42 – Сказание къ глаголющим, яко въ всю Свѣтлую недѣлю солнце не заходя стояло, и того ради глаголют: единъ день всю Свѣтлую недѣлю, (М-II, 332-4)
- 43 – Повесть самовидца бывша мучению нѣкоего новоявлена мученика въ Гречестей земли, (М-II, 335-6)
- 44 – Сказание къ отрицающимся на поставлении и кленущимся своимъ рукописаниемъ рускому митрополиту и всему священному Собору, еже не приимати поставления на митрополию и на владычества от Римскаго папы латынскыя вѣры и от Цареградскаго патриарха, акы въ области безбожныхъ турковъ поганаго царя, и поставленаго от нихъ не приимати, (М-II, 337)
- 45 – Съвѣт къ Събору православному на Исака жидовина, влхѣва и чародѣя и прелестника, (М-II, 338-9)
- 46 – Сказание о птици неясыти, (М-II, 340)
- 47 – Словеса възставлятелна къ покаянию, (М-II, 341)
- 48 [47-а] – Похвалная епи о преподобномъ Иоаннѣ, нареченномъ Тревеликомъ, (М-II, 342)
- 49 [47-б] – Похвалнаа епи о блаженѣи Фомаиди, мечемъ убитѣи от своего свекра, (М-II, 343)

50 [47-в] – Похвална епи о нѣкоторои добропобѣднѣи мученици, еи же имя Потамаи, еже глькуется Рѣчнаа, (М-II, 344)

51 [47-г] – Похвалнаа епи къ нѣкоему пречюдному древнему мученику, его же имя невѣдомо, (М-II, 345)

#### IV. Common chapters of the Rumiantzev collection and the Khludov collection

- Сказание о первородном грехе (Z-127 = К-I, 546-7)
- Сказание о небесной грамоте (Z-128 = К-III, 286)
- Сказание о свадебных венцах (Z-129 = К-III, 117-18)
- Слово утешительное инока в темнице (Z-131-2 = К-II, 452-3)
- Послание другу о избавлении от блудных помыслов (Z-133-5 = К-II, 248-51)
- Послание митрополиту Даниилу (Z-136-43 = Zhurova 1998, 30-7)
- Сказание об образе, называемом «Уныне» (Z-146-7)
- Слово об утопленниках и убитых (Z-148-54 = К-III, 170-8)
- Сказание о сохранении святости царствующими городами (Z-156-60 = К-III, 156-64)
- Сказание о том, что под крестом на церкви ставят (Z-162-3 = К-III, 124-5)
- Слово о содомском грехе (Z-164-9 = К-II, 251-60)
- Слово на хулителей Богородицы (Z-172-9 = К-I, 495-508)
- Ответы христиан агарянам (Z-182-91 = К-I, 151-68)
- Сказание о соблюдении Символа веры (Z-213-17 = К-III, 54-60)
- Слово на лихоимствующих (Z-219-33 = К-II, 185-212)
- Повесть о иноческом жительстве и Повесть о Савонароле (Z-239-56 = К-III, 178-205)
- Словеса против Иоанна Людовика Вивеса (Z-259-72 = К-III, 205-66)
- Сказание против апокрифического сочинения «О рукописании грехов» (Z-276-85 = К-I, 533-41)

#### V. Other dispersed works and those which are not yet critically edited in alphabetical order

- О веледушии и совѣтѣ (К-III, 237-8)
- О правдѣ и милости (К-III, 236-7)
- О святых иконах – Максим Грек, О святых иконах, in: Философия русского религиозного искусства XVI-XX вв. Антология, Сост., общ. ред. и предисл. Н. К. Гаврюшина, Москва 1993, 45-49
- Об Александре Македонском (Rzhiga 1934, 119-20)
- Отвѣтъ въ кратцѣ къ святому събору онихъ же оклеветанъ бываю (Filaret 1842, 84-91)
- Послания инокине (Bulanin 1984, 207-8)
- Послание къ начальствующимъ правовѣрно (К-II, 338-346)
- Послание къ нѣкому, желающу отрещися мира, и ити во иночествующий чинъ (К-II, 228-31)
- Послание къ нѣкому мужу поучительно на обѣты нѣкоего латынина мудреца (К-III, 226-36)
- Послание къ святѣишему Макарию, митрополиту всеа Русии (К-II, 357-67)
- Послание къ царию Иоанну Васильевичу всеа Русии (К-II, 376-79)
- Послания княгине (Bulanin 1984, 204-6)
- Послание митрополиту Макарию (Filaret 1842, 91-6, republished in: “Вышенский паломник” 1 (11), Рязань 2001, 90-1)
- Послания неизвестному / Поучение съкращено всякому обуеваемому в море житейском (Bulanin 1984, 208-11)
- Послание о Афонской горе (Rzhiga 1935-36, 95-99)
- Послание о сказаниях античной мифологии (Rzhiga 1935-36, 101-5)
- Послание о францисканцах и доминикрцах (Rzhiga 1935-36, s. 99-101)
- Послание царю Ивану IV (Rzhiga 1934, 117-9)
- Сказание о разрѣшении обѣта постнаго (К-II, 245-6)
- Сказание отчасти недоумѣнныхъ нѣкихъ рѣчений въ Словѣ Григория Богослова (К-III, 42-49)
- Слово на арменское зловѣрие (К-I, 169-80)

– Слово против скоморохов (Rzhiga 1935-36, s. 105-108)

## OTHERS

### ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL

– Agapetus, Advice – Agapetus, Advice to the emperor Justinian, in: Bell 2009, 99-121 (English translation based on the edition: Agapetos Diakonos. Der Fürstenspiegel des Kaisers Justinianos. Erstmals kritisch hrsg. von Rudolf Riedinger. Athen 1995, accessible online in *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*)

– Ambrose, De fide – Sancti Ambrosii Opera, pars octava (CSEL LXXVIII), De fide [Ad Gratianvm Avgustvm], recensuit Otto Faller S.I., Vindobonae MCMLXII

– Augustine, De civitate – Aurelius Augustinus, De civitate Dei libri 22, eds. B. Dombart and A. Kalb, Turnhout 1955 (Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, vol. 47-8)

– Basil the Great, Hexameron – Basile de Césarée, Homélie sur l'Hexaéméron, Paris 1949 (SC 26)

– Basil the Great, To Young Men – Basilio di Cesarea, Discorso ai Giovani (Oratio ad adolescentes), con la versione latina di Leonardo Bruni, a cura di Mario Naldini (Biblioteca Patristica 3), Florence 1984

– Cyprian of Carthage, De unitate Ecclesiae – Cyprien De Carthage, L'unité de l'Église, introduction Paolo Siniscalco et Paul Mattei, traduction Michel Poirier. Apparats, notes, appendices et index Paul Mattei, Paris 2006 (SC 500)

– Gregory of Nazianzus, De pauperum amore – Gregory of Nazianzus, Oratio XIV, De pauperum amore, PG 35, 858-910

– Gregory of Nyssa, De hominis opificio – S. Gregorii Nysseni De hominis opificio, in: PG 44, 123-256

– Gregory of Nyssa, De virginitate – Grégoire de Nysse, Traité de la virginité, Paris 1966 (SC 119)

– John Chrysostom, In Matthaem – S. Joannis Chrysostomi Commentarius in sanctum Matthaem Evangelistam, in: PG 57, 13-472 and PG 58, 471-794

– Jean de Roquetaillade, Liber ostensor – Jean de Roquetaillade [Johannes de Rupescissa], Liber ostensor quod adesse festinant tempora, éd. critique sous la dir. d'André Vauchez, par Clémence Thévenaz Modestin et Christine Morerod-Fattebert, avec la collab. de Marie-Henriette Jullien de Pommerol, sur la base d'une transcription de Bignami Odier, Roma 2005

– John of Damascus, De fide orthodoxa – Jean Damascène, La Foi orthodoxe, vol. I, 1-44,

Paris 2010 (SC 535), vol. II, 45-100, Paris 2011 (SC 540)

– Justin, Apology – Justin, Apologie pour les chrétiens, Paris 2006 (SC 507)

– Legenda aurea – Jacobus de Voragine, Legenda aurea: con le miniature del codice Ambrosiano C 240 inf. / Iacopo da Varazze; testo critico riveduto e commento a cura di Giovanni Paolo Maggioni; trad. italiana di Gianfranco Agosti [et al.]; coord. da Francesco Stella, vol. I-II, Firenze 2007

– Maximus the Confessor, Chapters on love – Massimo Confessore, Capitoli sulla carità; editi criticamente con introduzione, versione e note da Aldo Ceresa-Gastaldo Rome 1963

– Menander Rhetor – D. A. Russell and N. G. Wilson, Menander Rhetor. Edited with translation and commentary, Oxford 1981

– Nicholas of Cusa, De docta ignorantia – Nicolai de Cusa Opera omnia, vol. I, De docta ignorantia, ed. Ernestus Hoffmann et Raymundus Klibansky, Lipsiae 1932

– Novellae – Corpus Iuris Civilis, vol. III – Novellae, recognovit Rudolfus Schoell. Opus Schoellii morte interceptum absolvit Guilelmus Kroll, Hildesheim 1988

– Photius, Mystagogia – Photii patriarchae, Liber de sacra Sanctissimi Spiritus Doctrina, PG 102, 280-400 (I had no access to the new, critical edition: Fozio, Mistagogia del Santo Spirito, ed. Valerio Polidori, Roma 2018)

– Pseudo-Justin, Admonitorium – Ivstini Philosophi et martyris Admonitorium gentium liber, Ioanne Francisco Pico Mirandulae domino interprete..., Paris 1538 (contemporary edition: SC 528)

– Synesius, Correspondance – Synésios de Cyrène, Correspondance, ed. Antonio Garzya, vol. III, Lettres LXXIV-CLVI, Paris 2000

– Syropoulos, Memoirs – Les “Mémoires” du grand ecclésiarque de l’Eglise de Constantinople Sylvestre Syropoulos sur le concile de Florence (1438-1439), ed. and trans. by Vitalien Laurent, Paris 1971

– Theodoret of Cyrus, De curatione – Théodoret de Cyr, Thérapeutique des maladies helléniques, vol. 1-2, Paris 1958 (SC 57)

– Theophylact of Ohrid, Against Latins – Theophylact of Ohrid, Προσλαλιά τινι τῶν αὐτοῦ ὁμιλητῶν περὶ ὧν ἐγκαλοῦνται Λατῖνοι (Entretien avec l’un de ses élèves au sujet des griefs contre les Latins), in: Théophylacte d’Achrida, Discours, traités, poésies; introduction, text, traduction et notes par Paul Gautier, Thessalonica 1980, 246-85

#### SOURCES CONTEMPORARY TO MAXIMUS – WEST AND GREECE

– Actes de Dionysiou – Actes de Dionysiou, ed. Nicolas OIKONOMIDES, vol. 1-2, Paris 1968 (Archives de l’Athos, 4)

- Actes de Kastamonitou – Actes de Kastamonitou, ed. Nicolas OIKONOMIDES, vol. 1-2, Paris 1978 (Archives de l’Athos, 9)
- Actes du Prôtaton – Actes du Prôtaton, ed. Denise PAPACHRYSSANTHOU, vol. 1-2, Paris 1975 (Archives de l’Athos, 7)
- Aldo Manuzio editore – Aldo Manuzio editore: dediche, prefazioni, note ai testi, ed. Giovanni Orlandi, introd. by Carlo Dionisotti, vol. 1-2, Milano 1975
- Crinito, De honesta - Pietro CRINITO, De honesta disciplina, ed. C. Angeleri, Roma 1955
- Codro 1540 – Antonii Codri Urcei... opera que extant omnia..., Basileae 1540
- Ficino, Opera – Marsilii Ficini ...[et] quae hactenus extitêre [et] quae in lucem nunc primùm proditêre omnium artium [et] scientiarum ... refertissima: in duos tomos digesta, Basileae 1576 (reprint: Torino 1962)
- Filelfo, Letters – Cent-dix lettres grecques de François Filelfe, ed. Emil LEGRAND, Paris 1892
- Fletcher, Commonwealth – Giles FLETCHER, Of the Russe Commomwealth, London 1591 (reprint: Cambridge Mass. 1966)
- Herberstein 2007 - Sigismund von HERBERSTEIN, Rerum Moscoviticarum Commentarii, Synoptische Edition der lateinischen und der deutschen Fassung letzter Hand Basel 1556 und Wien 1557, eds. Frank Kämpfer, Eva Maurer and Andreas Fülberth, München 2007
- Laskaris, Epigrammi greci - Giano LASKARIS, Epigrammi greci, ed. Anna Meschini, Padova 1976
- Manuel, Reply to Francis – Архимандрит Арсений, Мануила, великаго ритора, отвѣтъ доминиканцу Франциску, “Чтения в обществе любителей духовного просвещения”, 1889, no. VII-VIII, приложения, 71-86; no. IX, приложения, s.87- 97
- Manuel, On Mark of Ephesus – Архимандрит Арсений, Ритора Мануила о Маркѣ Ефесскомѣ и Флорентийскомѣ соборѣ и пр, “Христианское чтение”, 1886, no. 7-8, 102-162
- Musurus, letter to Michael Trivilis – Belloni 2002, 651-2
- Pico, Opera omnia – Giovanni PICO DELLA MIRANDOLA, Gian Francesco PICO DELLA MIRANDOLA, Opera omnia, Basileae 1557-1573, vol. I-II (reprint Hildesheim 1969)
- Gianfrancesco Pico, Vita Savonarolae – Gianfrancesco PICO DELLA MIRANDOLA, Vita Hieronymi Savonarolae, ed. Elisabetta Schisto, Firenze 1999
- Gianfrancesco Pico, Quaestio de falsitate astrologiae – Walter CAVINI, Un inedito di Giovan Francesco Pico della Mirandola. La «Quaestio de falsitate astrologiae», “Rinascimento”, 13 (1973), 133-171

- Sanuto – Marino SANUTO, I diarii, vol. I-LVIII, Venezia 1879-1903
- Savonarola, Prediche sull’Esodo – Girolamo SAVONAROLA, Prediche sull’Esodo, ed. Pier Giorgio Ricci, Roma 1956
- Savonarola, De simplicitate – Girolamo SAVONAROLA, De simplicitate vitae Christianae, ed. Pier Giorgio Ricci, Rome 1959
- Savonarola, Triumphus – Girolamo SAVONAROLA, Triumphus crucis, ed. M. Ferrara, Roma 1961
- Savonarola, Poesie – Girolamo SAVONAROLA, Poesie, ed. Mario Martelli, Roma 1968
- Savonarola, Prediche sopra i Salmi – Girolamo SAVONAROLA, Prediche sopra i Salmi, ed. Vincenzo Romano, Roma 1969
- Savonarola, Contra li astrologi – Girolamo SAVONAROLA, Scritti filosofici, ed. Giancarlo Garfagnini and Eugenio Garin, vol. 1, Roma 1982, 275-370
- Savonarola, Lettere – Girolamo SAVONAROLA, Lettere e Scritti apologetici, ed. Roberto Ridolfi, Vincenzo Romano and Amadeo F. Verde O.P., Roma 1984
- Vives, Comm De civitate – Ioannes Ludovicus VIVES, Commentarii ad divi Aurelii Augustini *De civitate Dei*, vol. 1-, València 1992-

## MOSCOW

### DOCUMENTS AND CHRONICLES

- Arkhiv Rossii (Zimin) – Александр А. ЗИМИН, Государственный архив России XVI столетия. Опыт реконструкции, vol. 1-3, Москва 1978
- Ioasafovskaia letopis’ – Иоасафовская летопись, Москва 1957
- Pskovskie letopisi II – Псковские летописи, выпуск второй, ed. А. Н. Насонов, Москва 1955

Editions of diplomatic documents see above, in abbreviations section, under: RGM, PDS-KNT and PDS-R

### SOURCES CONCERNING MAXIMUS’ BIOGRAPHY

- Свидетельство Селивана – Свидетельство Троицкого монаха Селивана. 1524 г., in: – Sinitsyna 2006<sup>a</sup>, 74
- Свидетельство Нила – Свидетельство Троицкого монаха Нила (Курлятева). 1552 г., in: Sinitsyna 2006<sup>a</sup>, 75-6
- Сказание в корпусе сочинений – Сказание в составе корпуса сочинений преп. Максима Грека, in: Sinitsyna 2006<sup>a</sup>, 77-88

- Сказание Исайи – Предисловие – “Сказание” иеродиакона Исайи Каменчанина (ок. 1591 г.), in: Sinitsyna 2006<sup>a</sup>, 89-92
- Сказание известно – Сказание в составе Минеи Четых священника Иоанна Милютина (“Сказание известно”), in: Sinitsyna 2006<sup>a</sup>, 93-106
- Сказание Моховикова – Сказание о житии и страдании преподобного отца нашего Максима грека философа, in: Belokurov 1898, XLIII-CXXV
- SD-Ob – Слѣдственное дѣло Максима Грека, in: Сборник князя Оболенского, № 3, Москва 1838, 1 – 15. There is also another edition of this document in: ААЭ, т. I, №172, стр. 141 – 145. The original document is preserved in: Российский Государственный Архив Древних Актов (ф. 52)
- Sudnye spiski – Судные списки Максима Грека и Исака Собаки, in: Pokrovskii 1971, 90-139
- Sudnoe delo – Судное дело Вассиана Патрикеева, in: Kazakova 1960, 285-318

#### OTHER AUTHORS

- Artemii, Missive to Ivan IV – Старец Артемий, Послание къ царю Ивану Грозному, in: RIB IV, 1432-41
- Daniel, О иноческом законе – [metropolitan] Daniel, О иноческом законе, in: Древнерусские иноческие уставы, сост. Т. В. Суздальцева, Москва 2001
- Daniel, Поучение – [metropolitan] Daniel, Поучение Даниила, митрополита всея Руси, (BLDR, IX, 360-71)
- Ivan IV – Kurbskii, Letters – Переписка Ивана Грозного с Андреем Курбским, ed. Я.С. Лурье, Ю.Д. Рыков; Москва 1993
- Joseph of Volokolamsk, Missives – Послания Иосифа Волоцкого. ed. Александр А. Зимин, Яков С. Лурье, Москва – Ленинград 1959
- Karпов, Otvetnoe poslanie – Ответное послание Ф. И. Карпова Максиму Греку (M-I, 141-2)
- Karпов, Question about Leviathan – Предшествующее послание Ф. И. Карпова преп. Максиму Греку (M-I, 337-9)
- Karпов, Poslanie Daniilu – Ф. И. Карпов, Послание Митрополиту Даниилу (BLDR, IX, 346-59)
- Kurbskii, До Кузьмы Мамоница – Сочинения князя Курбскаго, Санкт-Петербург 1914, РИБ т. 31, 427-32



- Kurbskii, История о великомъ князѣ Московскомъ – Сочинения князя Курбскаго, Санкт-Петербург 1914, РИБ т. 31, 161-354
- Kurbskii, History of the Grand Prince of Moscow – Prince A.M. Kurbsky's History of Ivan IV, edited with a translation and notes by J.L.I. Fennell, Cambridge 1965
- Kurbskii, История о осьмомъ соборѣ – Сочинения князя Курбскаго, Санкт-Петербург 1914, РИБ т. 31, 473-484
- Kurbskii, Послание Васьяну – X. Послание къ старцу Васьяну, in: Сочинения князя Курбскаго, Санкт-Петербург 1914, РИБ т. 31, 383-404
- Kurbskii, Отвѣтъ восточныхъ – Отвѣтъ восточныхъ или щить церкви правовѣрной, in: Сочинения князя Курбскаго, Санкт-Петербург 1914, РИБ т. 31, 433-6
- Kurbskii, Новый маргарит – Andrej Michalovič Kurbskij, Novyj Margarit. Historisch-kritische Ausgabe auf der Grundlage der Wolfenbütteler Handschrift, ed. Inge Auerbach, Band 1, Lieferung 1-5, Giessen 1976
- Patrikeev, Sobranie – Вассиан Патрикеев, Собрание некоего старца, in: Kazakova 1960, 223-49
- Patrikeev, Slovo otvetno – Вассиан Патрикеев, Слово ответно, in: Kazakova 1960, 254-71
- Zinovii Otenskii, Истины показание – Зиновий (инок Отенский), Истины показание к вопросившим о новом учении, Казань 1865

#### CATALOGUES OF MANUSCRIPTS AND INCUNABULA

- Aldo Manuzio tipografo – Aldo Manuzio tipografo 1494-1515 (Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 17 giugno-30 luglio 1994), ed. L. Bigliuzzi, A. Dillon Bussi, G. Savino, P. Scapocchi, Firenze 1994
- Catalogue BAN Bobrova 1963 – Каталог инкунабулов / БАН. Сост. Е. И. Боброва. Москва – Ленинград 1963
- Catalogue Sinod Vladimir 1894 – Архимандрит Владимир (Филантропов). Систематическое описание рукописей Московской Синодальной (Патриаршей) библиотеки. Часть I: Рукописи греческие, Москва 1894.
- Catalogue Undolskii 1870 – В. М. Ундольский, Славяно-русския рукописи В. М. Ундольскаго, Москва 1870
- Catalogue Vatopedi 1924 – Eustratiades SOPHRONIOS and Arcadios [deacon of the Vatopedi monastery], Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts in the library of the Monastery of Vatopedi on Mt. Athos, Cambridge 1924 (Harvard theological studies 11)

Catalogue Lavra 1925 – (SPYRIDION, monk and Eustratiades SOPHRONIOS) Σπυρίδων, μοναχός, Εὐστρατιάδης Σωφρόνιος, Κατάλογος τῶν κωδίκων της Μεγίστης Λαύρας (τῆς ἐν Ἁγίῳ Ὄρει), Paris 1925

## **B. SECONDARY LITERATURE**

Aalberts 1995 – Joke AALBERTS, Νέα στοιχεῖα γιὰ τὸν Μιχαὴλ Ἀποστόλη καὶ τὸν Γεώργιο Γρηγορόπουλο στὴν Κρήτη, “Thesaurismata”, 25 (1995), 143-159

Aigrain 1950 – René AIGRAIN, entry: *Bruno (saint)* in: Catholicisme, Hier, Aujourd'hui, Demain : encyclopédie, vol. II, Lille 1950, 291-3

Akopyan 2021 – Ovanes AKOPYAN, Debating the Stars in the Italian Renaissance. Giovanni Pico della Mirandola's *Disputationes adversus astrologiam divinatricem* and Its Reception, Leiden 2021

Allamandy 2003 – Marie-Élisabeth ALLAMANDY, Les Pères de l'Église et l'astrologie. Origène, Méthode, Basile, Grégoire de Nysse, Diodore, Procope de Gaza, Jean Philopon, Paris 2003

Alef 1961 – Gustave ALEF, Muscovy and the Council of Florence, “Slavic Review” 20 (1961), 389-401 (reprinted in: idem, Rulers and Nobles in Fifteenth-Century Moscow, London 1983)

Alef 1979 – Gustave ALEF, Diaspora Greeks in Moscow, “Byzantine Studies” 6 (1979), 26-34

Allen 1999 – Michael J.B. ALLEN, entry: *Marcelio Ficino* in: EoR, II, 353-57

Amand de Mendieta 1955 – Emmanuel AMAND de MENDIETA, La presqu'île des Caloyers, le Mount-Athos, Paris 1955

Angermann 1969 – Norbert ANGERMANN, Neues über Nicolaus Bulow und sein Wirken im Moskauer Rußland, “Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas”, Neue Folge, 17, (1969), H. 3, 408-419

Ankhimiuk 1990 – Юрий В. АНХИМЮК, Слово на «Списание Иосифа» - памятник раннего нестяжательства, Записки ОР ГБЛ. Москва, 1990. Вып. 49, 115- 146

Aquilon 1997 – Pierre AQUILON, Manuce Alde, in: Centuriae Latinae, I, 531-5

Assonitis 2003 – Alessio ASSONITIS, Art and Savonarolan Reform at San Silvestre a Monte Cavallo in Rome (1507 - 1540), AFP 73 (2003), 205 – 288

Assonitis 2006 – Alessio ASSONITIS, Fra Zanobi Acciaiuoli's Oratio in laudem urbis Romae (1518): Antiquarianism and Savonarolism at the Time of Raphael, in: Watching art: writings in honor of James Beck, ed. Lynn Catterson, Mark J. Zucker, Todi 2006, 55-62

Avvakumov 2015 – Yury P. AVVAKUMOV, Sacramental Ritual in Middle and Later Byzantine Theology: Ninth - Fifteenth Centuries, in: The Oxford Handbook of Sacramental Theology, ed.

Hans Boersma and Matthew Levering, Oxford 2015, 249-266

Azzolini 2006 - Monica AZZOLINI, Reading Health in the Stars. Politics and Medical Astrology in Renaissance Milan, in: Horoscopes and Public Spheres: Essays on the History of Astrology, ed. Guenther OESTMANN, H. DARREL RUTKIN, Kocku von STUCKRAD, Berlin - New York 2006, 183-205

Barbu 2001 – Violeta BARBU, Lex animata et le remploides corps, in: L'empereur hagiographe. Culte des saints et monarchie byzantine et post-byzantine, ed. Petre Guran, Bucarest (New Europe College) 2001, 224-48.

Bardy 1927 – G. BARDY, entry: *Macédonius et les macédoniens*, in: Dictionnaire de théologie catholique, vol. 9-2, Paris 1927, 1464-78

Bartusis 1991 – Mark C. BARTUSIS, entry: *Proasteion*, in: ODB

Baskin 1995 - Judith R. BASKIN, Rabbinic Judaism and the Creation of Woman, “Shofar” 14 (1995), No. 1, 66-71

Begunov 1957 – Ю. К. БЕГУНОВ, Соборные приговоры как источник по истории новгородско-московской ереси, TODRL 13 (1957), 214-224

Begunov 1970 – Ю. К. БЕГУНОВ, Повесть о втором браке Василия III, TODRL 25 (1970), 105-118

Bell 2009 – Three political voices from the age of Justinian. Agapetus, *Advice to the Emperor. Dialogue on Political Science*. Paul the Silentiary, *Description of Hagia Sophia*, translated with an introduction and notes by Peter N. BELL, Liverpool 2009

Belyaev 1996 – Sergej Alexseic BELJAEV, Il ritorno trionfale di Massimo il Greco. Il racconto del ritrovamento delle sue sante reliquie nel 1996, MD 33 (2002), 267-284

Belyaev 2007 – Сергей Алексеевич БЕЛЯЕВ, Отчет о проведении в июне-июле 1996 года работ в Свято-Троицкой Сергиевой Лавре по обретению святых мощей преподобного Максима Грека, Санкт-Петербург 2007, published on-line: [http://andreyblag.ru/images/articles/prosveshenie/iliotropion/izdatelstvo/2/book/belyaev\\_sa-maxim-relic-revealed.pdf](http://andreyblag.ru/images/articles/prosveshenie/iliotropion/izdatelstvo/2/book/belyaev_sa-maxim-relic-revealed.pdf), consulted on December 4<sup>th</sup>, 2018

Belloni 2002 – Claudia BELLONI, Lettere Greche inedite di Marco Musuro (Cod. Ambr. D 137 suss. 41 - 41 bis), “Aevum. Rassegna di Scienze Storiche, Linguistiche e Filologiche”, 76 (2002), no. 3, 647 – 79

Belokurov 1898 – Сергей БЕЛОКУРОВ, О библиотеке Московских Государей в XVI-столетии, Москва 1898 (a part of the edition of this book was printed in 1899)

Bernstein 1999 – Alan E. BERNSTEIN, entry: *Middle ages*, in: EoR, IV, 131-134

Bertola 1942 – Maria BERTOLA, I due primi registri di prestito della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Codici Vaticani Latini 3964, 3966, Citta del Vaticano 1942

- Black 2001 – Christopher F. BLACK, *Early Modern Italy: a social history*, London 2001
- Black 2004 – Christopher F. BLACK, *Church, Religion and Society in Early Modern Italy*, NY 2004
- Bogatyrev 2000 – Sergei BOGATYREV, *The Sovereign and his Counsellors. Ritualised Consultations in Muscovite Political Culture, 1350s–1570s*, Helsinki 2000
- Børresen 2013 – Karla Elisabeth BØRRESEN, *Challenging Augustine in Feminist Theology and Gender Studies*, in: OGHRA, vol. 1, 135-44
- Boudet 1997 – Jean-Patrice BOUDET, entry: *astrologie* in: *Dictionnaire encyclopédique du Moyen Age*, ed. André Vauchez, Paris 1997, vol. I, 140-2
- Bradshaw 2004 – David BRADSHAW, *Aristotle East and West. Metaphysics and the Division of Christendom*, Cambridge 2004
- Brown 1986 – Alison BROWN, *Platonism in Fifteenth century Florence and Its Contribution to Early Modern Political Thought*, “*The Journal of Modern History*”, 58 (1986), no. 2, 383-413
- Bulanin 1977 – Дмитрий М. БУЛАНИН, *Об одном из источников сочинений Максима Грека*, TODRL 33 (1977), 432-3.
- Bulanin 1979 – Дмитрий М. БУЛАНИН, *Лексикон Свида в творчестве Максима Грека*, TODRL 34 (1979), 257-83.
- Bulanin 1984 – Дмитрий М. БУЛАНИН, *Переводы и послания Максима Грека. Неизданные тексты*, Москва 1984
- Bulanin 1988<sup>a</sup> – Дмитрий М. БУЛАНИН, entry: *Булев (Бюлов) Николай*, in: SKK 1
- Bulanin 1988<sup>b</sup> – Дмитрий М. БУЛАНИН, entry: *Зиновий Отенский*, in: SKK 1
- Bulanin 1988<sup>c</sup> – Дмитрий М. БУЛАНИН, entry: *Иона Думин*, in: SKK 1
- Bulanin 1988<sup>d</sup> – Дмитрий М. БУЛАНИН, entry: *Карпов Федор Иванович*, in: SKK 1
- Bulanin 1988<sup>e</sup> – Дмитрий М. БУЛАНИН, entry: *Даниил, митрополит Всея Руси*, in: SKK 1
- Bulanin 1989 – Дмитрий М. БУЛАНИН, entry: *Поучение Агапита*, in: SKK 2
- Bulanin 1993 – Дмитрий М. БУЛАНИН, *От переводчика*, in: Максим Грек. “Слово о покаянии” и “Слово обличительно на еллинскую прелесть” (перевод Д. М. Буланина), TODRL 47 (1993), 229-240
- Bulanin 2017 – Дмитрий М. БУЛАНИН, *Максим Грек: греческий писатель или московский книжник?*, “*Studia Slavica et Balcanica Petropolitana*” 22 (2017), no. 2, 85-98

Bulanin-Kolesov 1989 – Дмитрий М. БУЛАНИН, В.В. КОЛЕСОВ, entry: *Сильвестр (Стиридон), священник Благовещенского собора* in: SKK 2

Bulanina 1988 – Т. В. БУЛАНИНА, entry: *Влас Игнатов (Игнатъев)*, in: SKK 1

Bulanina 1989 – Т. В. БУЛАНИНА, entry: *Сиуан, переводчик и книгописец*, in: SKK 2

Burns 1999 – J.H. BURNS, entry: *Political Thought*, in: EoR, V, 107-14

Burgmann 1991 – Ludwig BURGMANN, entry: *Penalties*, in: ODB III, 1622

Bushkovitch 1993 – [Paul BUSHKOVITCH] Павел БУШКОВИЧ, Максим Грек - поэт “гипербореец”, TODRL 47 (1993), 215-228

Bushkovitch 2000 – Paul BUSHKOVITCH, Review of: Нина В. СИНИЦЫНА, Третий Рим: Истоки и эволюция русской средневековой концепции (XV – XVI вв.), Москва 1998, “Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History” 1, 2 (Spring 2000), 391–9

Bushkovitch 2003 – Paul BUSHKOVITCH, The Selection and Deposition of the Metropolitan and Patriarch of the Orthodox Church in Russia 1448–1619, in: *Être catholique—être orthodoxe—être protestant: Confessions et identités culturelles en Europe médiévale et moderne*, ed. Marek Derwich and M. V. Dmitriev, Wrocław 2003, 123–50

Bushkovitch 2015 – Paul BUSHKOVITCH, Change and Culture in Early Modern Russia, “Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History”, 16 (2015), no. 2, (New Series), 291-316

Vychkov 1917 – И. БЫЧКОВ, Новый список поучения Зарубского черноризца Георгия, in: “Библиографическая летопись”, 1917, т. 3, с. 101—105

Camporeale 1993 – Salvatore I. CAMPOREALE, Renaissance Humanism and the Origins of Humanist Theology, in: *Humanity and Divinity in Renaissance and Reformation. Essays in Honor of Charles Trinkaus*, eds. John W. O’Malley, Thomas M. Izbicki and Gerald Christianson, Leiden-New York 1993, 101-124

Cappelli 1952 – Adriano CAPPELLI, *Cronologia, cronografia e calendario perpetuo: dal principio dell’Era cristiana ai giorni nostri*, Milano 1952

Capuani – Paparozzi 1997 – Massimo CAPUANI et Maurizio PAPAROZZI, *Le Mont-Athos. Les fondations monastiques. Un millénaire de spiritualité et d’art orthodoxe*, trad. Philippe Baillet, Paris 1997

Celenza 2002 – Christopher S. CELENZA, Late antiquity and Florentine Platonism: the ‘Post-Plotinian’ Ficino, in: *Marsilio Ficino: his Theology, his Philosophy, his Legacy*, ed. Michael J.B. ALLEN and Valery REES with Martin DAVIES, Leiden 2002 (Brill’s Studies in Intellectual History, vol. 108), 71-97

Centuriae Latinae, I – *Centuriae Latinae: cent une figures humanistes de la Renaissance aux Lumières offertes à Jacques Chomarat, réunies par Colette Nativel*, Genève 1997

Centuriae Latinae, II – Centuriae Latinae II: cent une figures humanistes de la Renaissance aux Lumières: à la mémoire de Marie-Madeleine de la Garanderie, réunies par Colette Nativel, Genève 2006

Ceresa 2004 – Massimo CERESA, entry: *Lascharis, Giano*, in: DBI, 63 (2004)

Chadwick 2003 – Henry CHADWICK, *East and West: The Making of a Rift in the Church. From Apostolic Times until the Council of Florence*, Oxford 2003

Chatzopoulou 2012 – Venetia CHATZOPOULOU, L'étude de la production manuscrite d'un copiste de la renaissance au service de l'histoire des textes: le cas du Crétois Zacharie Calliergis, "Revue d'histoire des textes", n.s. 7 (2012), 1-36

Chernov 1922 – С.Н. ЧЕРНОВ, К ученым несогласиям о суде над Максимом Греком, in: Сборник статей по русской истории посвященных С.Ф. Платонову, Петербург 1922, 48-71

Chernov 1934 – С.Н. ЧЕРНОВ, Заметки о следствии по делу Максима Грека, in: Сборник статей к сороколетию ученой деятельности академика А.С. Орлова, Ленинград 1934, 465-74

Chiarelli 1984 – Caterina CHIARELLI, *Le attività artistiche e il patrimonio librario della Certosa di Firenze: dalle origini alla metà del XVI secolo (Analecta Cartusiana 102)*, Salzburg 1984

Chryssavgis 2008 – John CHRYSSEAVGIS, *The spiritual way*, in: *The Cambridge Companion to Orthodox Christian Theology*, ed. Mary B. Cunningham and Elizabeth Theokritoff, Cambridge 2008, 150-166

Chrysochoïdis 1998 – Kriton Chrysochoïdis, *From the Ottoman Conquest to the 20th Century*, in: HGV, I, 54-109

Clément 1997 – Olivier CLEMENT, *Rome autrement: une réflexion orthodoxe sur la papauté*, Paris 1997

Colilli 1999 – Paul COLILLI, entry: *Angelo Poliziano* in: EoR, V, 114-6

Contal 1961 – Pierre CONTAL, *Maxime le Grec et les mouvements d'idées de son temps*, RES, 38 (1961), 65-71

Copenhaver 1988 – Brian P. COPENHAVER, *Astrology and Magic*, in: CHRPh, 264-297

Copenhaver 1999 – Brian P. COPENHAVER, entry: *Pico della Mirandola (Giovanni)*, in: EoR, V, 16-20

Cosenza 1962-67 – Mario Emilio COSENZA, *Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Italian Humanists and of the World of Classical Scholarship in Italy: 1300-1800*, Boston 1962-1967

- Creytens 1970 – Raymond CREYTENS, Les actes capitulaires de la congrégation Toscano-Romaine O.P. (1496-1530), AFP 40 (1970), 125-230
- Crostini 2013 – Barbara CROSTINI, entry: *Byzantine world (to 1453)*, in: OGHRA, 726-34
- Crouzel 1977 – Henri CROUZEL, Une controverse sur Origène à la Renaissance: Jean Pic de la Mirandole et Pierre Garcia, Paris 1977
- Cvetković 2013 – Vladimir CVETKOVIĆ, entry: *Orthodox Church (since 1453)*, in: OGHRA, 1478-86
- Dagron 2003 – Gilbert DAGRON, Orient-Occident: césaropapisme et théorie des deux pouvoirs face à la modernité, “Revue d'éthique et de théologie moral «Le supplément»”, 227 (2003), 143-57
- Daley 1984 – Brian E. DALEY, Boethius Theological Tracts and Early Byzantine Scholasticism, “Mediaeval Studies” 46 (1984), 158-191
- Darrouzès 1963 – Jean DARROUZÈS, Le mémoire de Constantin Stilbès contre les Latins, “Revue des études byzantines” 21 (1963), 50-100
- Demetriades 1997 – Vassilis DEMETRIADES, Athonite Documents and the Ottoman Occupation, in: Mount Athos in the 14th - 16th centuries, ed. K. Chrisochoides, Athens 1997, 41-67
- Denissoff 1943 - Elie DENISSOFF, Maxime le Grec et l'Occident: Contribution à l'histoire de la pensée religieuse et philosophique de Michel Trivolis, Louvain 1943
- Dewey 1957 – Horace W. DEWEY, Judges and the Evidence in Muscovite Law, “Slavonic and East European Review” 36 (1957), 189-94
- Dionisotti 1995 – Carlo DIONISOTTI, Aldo Manuzio umanista e editore, Milano 1995
- Dmitrieva 1988<sup>a</sup> – Р.П. ДМИТРИЕВА, entry: *Герман Полев* in: SKK 1
- Dmitrieva 1988<sup>b</sup> – Р.П. ДМИТРИЕВА, entry: *Иоасаф (Скрипицын), митрополит Московский* in: SKK 1
- Dmitrieva 1988<sup>c</sup> – Р.П. ДМИТРИЕВА, entry: *Исаак (Исак) Собака* in: SKK 1
- Dmitrieva 1989<sup>a</sup> – Р.П. ДМИТРИЕВА, entry: *Медоварцев Михаил* in: SKK 2
- Dmitrieva 1989<sup>b</sup> – Р.П. ДМИТРИЕВА, entry: *Мунехин Михаил Григорьевич* in: SKK 2
- Dorez 1896 – Léon DOREZ, Etudes alduines. III. Alde Manuce et Ange Politien, “Revue des bibliothèques”, 6 (1896), 311-26
- Droblenkova 1989 – Н.Ф. ДРОБЛЕНКОВА, entry: *Макарий, митрополит Московский и всея Руси* in: SKK 2

- Druzhinin 1909 – В.Г. ДРУЖИНИН, Несколько неизвестных литературных памятников из сборника XVI-го века, Санкт-Петербург 1909
- Duffy-Kazhdan 1991 – John DUFFY, Alexander KAZHDAN, entry: *Aristotle*, in: ODB I, 171
- Dumitriu-Snagov 1996 – Ion DUMITRIU-SNAGOV, Monumenta Romaniae Vaticana. Manoscritti - Documenti - Carte. Catalogo della mostra. Salone Sistino, Roma BAV 1996
- Dunaev 1916 – Борис И. ДУНАЕВ, Преподобный Максим Грек и греческая идея на Руси в XVI веке, Москва 1916
- Dupré 1993 – Louis DUPRÉ, Passage to Modernity. An Essay in the Hermeneutics of Nature and Culture, New Haven and London 1993
- Edelheit 2008 – Amos EDELHEIT, Ficino, Pico and Savonarola: the evolution of humanist theology 1461/2-1498, Leiden 2008
- Emchenko 2010 – Е.Б. ЕМЧЕНКО, Священство и царство в XVI в. (Максим Грек и Стоглавый собор), in: Вопросы религии и религиоведения, выпуск 2: Исследования, сост. и общ. ред. В.В. Шмидта, И.Н. Яблокова, Книга 1 (I): Религиоведение в России в конце XX — начале XXI в., Москва 2010, 90-102
- Emery 1999 – Gilles EMERY, La doctrine catholique du purgatoire, “Nova et Vetera” 74 (1999), no. 3, 37-49
- Evert-Kappesowa 1953 – Halina EVERT-KAPPESOWA, ‘La tiare ou le turban’, “Byzantinoslavica” 14 (1953), 245-257
- Farmer-Vanden Broecke 2006 – Steve FARMER, Steven VANDEN BROECKE, entry: *Pic de la Mirandole (Jean-François)*, in: Centuriae Latinae, II, 663-71
- Fedalto 1988 – Giorgio FEDALTO, Hierarchia Ecclesiastica Orientalis. Series Episcoporum Ecclesiarum Christianarum Orientalium, Padova 1988, vol. 1-2
- Fedotov 2011 – С.В. ФЕДОТОВ, Канонизация Пафнутия Боровского, “Русская история”, 2011, №3. Святая земля, consulted on-line: <http://rus-istoria.ru/component/k2/item/549-kanonizatsiya-pafnutiya-borovskogo>, on September, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2018
- Field 2002 – Arthur FIELD, The Platonic Academy of Florence, in: Marsilio Ficino: his Theology, his Philosophy, his Legacy, Ed. Michael J.B. ALLEN and Valery REES with Martin DAVIES, Leiden 2002 (Brill’s Studies in Intellectual History 108), 359-376
- Filaret 1842 – Филарет [ГУМИЛЕВСКИЙ, архиепископ], Максим Грек, “Москвитянин”, VI (1842), no. 11, 43-96
- Firmin-Didot 1875 – Ambroise FIRMIN-DIDOT, Alde Manuce et l’hellénisme à Venice, Paris 1875



Flier 1994 – Michael S. FLIER, *Breaking the Code: The image of the Tsar in the Muscovite Palm Sunday Ritual*, in: *Medieval Russian Culture*, eds. Michael S. Flier and Daniel Rowland, vol. II, Berkeley 1994, 213-42

Fonkich 1965 – Борис Л. ФОНКИЧ, *Греческие писцы эпохи возрождения*, VV 26 (1965), 266-271

Fonkich 1969 – Борис Л. ФОНКИЧ, *Новый автограф Максима Грека*, BS, 30 (1969), no. 1, 77-82

Fonkich 1971 – Борис Л. ФОНКИЧ, *Русский автограф Максима Грека*, “История СССР”, 23 (1971), no. 3, 153-158

Fonkich 1977 – Борис Л. ФОНКИЧ, *Греческо-русские культурные связи в XV - XVII вв. Греческие рукописи в России*, Москва 1977

Fonkich 1979 – Борис Л. ФОНКИЧ, *Две палеографические заметки к изданию актов Кастамонита*, “Известия Академии Наук СССР. Серия литературы и языка”, 38 (1979), no. 4, 393-394

Fonkich 1981 – Борис Л. ФОНКИЧ, *Греческие писцы эпохи возрождения*. 3, VV 42 (1981), 124-128

Fonkich 1996 – Борис Л. ФОНКИЧ, *Максим Грек - узник Иосифо - Волоколамского монастыря*, in: *Русское подвижничество. Сборник статей в честь 90-летия Д.С. Лихачева*, Москва 1996, 156-158

Fonkich 2003 – Борис Л. ФОНКИЧ, *Греческие рукописи и документы в России в XIV – начале XVIII в.*, Москва 2003

Formentin 1998 – Maria Rosa FORMENTIN, *Il punto su Demetrio Mosco*, in: S. Lucà – L. Perria [eds.], *Ἐπιγραφαί. Studi in onore di Mgr Paul Canart per il LXX compleanno*, II, Grottaferrata: Monastero Esarchico di S. Maria di Grottaferrata, 1998 (= “Bollettino della Badia greca di Grottaferrata”, n.s., 52 (1998), 235-257)

Förstel 1999 – Christian FÖRSTEL, *Manuel le Rhéteur et Origène : note sur deux manuscrits parisiens*, “Revue des études byzantines”, 57 (1999), 245-254

Frangedaki 1984-85 – Anna FRANGEDAKI, *On fifteenth-century CryptoChristianity: A Letter to George Amoiroutzes from Michael Apostolis*, “Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies” 9 (1984-85), 221-4

Franklin 2002 – Simon FRANKLIN, *Byzantium and the origins of written culture in Russia*, in: *Literacy, education and manuscript transmission in Byzantium and beyond*, ed. by Catherine Holmes and Judith Waring, Leiden 2002

Fumi 1910 – Luigi FUMI, *L’Inquisizione Romana e lo stato di Milano. Saggio di ricerche nell’Archivio di Stato*, “Archivio Storico Lombardo: Giornale della società storica lombarda”, Serie IV, 13 (1910), fasc. 25-27

- Gabotto 1895 – Fernando GABOTTO, *Lo stato Sabauda da Amadeo VIII ad Emmanuele Filiberto (1496-1504)*, vol. III, Torino 1895
- Garfagnini 1996 – Gian Carlo GARFAGNINI, *La vita Savonarolae di Gianfrancesco Pico*, “Rinascimento” II s., 36 (1996), 49-72
- Garin 1938 – Eugenio GARIN, *La “dignitas hominis” e la letteratura patristica*, “Rinascita” ottobre 1938, no. 4, 102-146.
- Garin 1961 – Eugenio GARIN, *La cultura filosofica del rinascimento Italiano*, Firenze 1961
- Garin 1990 – Eugenio GARIN, *Le philosophe*, in: *L’homme de la Renaissance*, ed. by E. GARIN, Paris 1990, 174 - 212
- Garrigues 1976 – Juan- Miguel GARRIGUES, *Maxime le Confesseur*, Paris 1976
- Garzaniti 2017 – (Marcello GARZANITI) М. ГАРДЗАНИТИ, *Священное Писание и auctoritates у Максима Грека*, TODRL 65 (2017), 33-46
- Garzaniti 2019<sup>a</sup> – (Marcello GARZANITI) Марчелло ГАРДЗАНИТИ, *Прибытие Максима Грека в Москву (1518) и международная дипломатическая обстановка*, in: *У истоков и источников: на международных и междисциплинарных путях. Юбилейный сборник в честь Александра Васильевича Назаренко*, Ю. А. Петров (ed.), Москва 2019, 57-72
- Garzaniti 2019<sup>b</sup> – Marcello GARZANITI, *Il Discorso su instabilità e disordini (Slovo o nestroenijach i bezčinijach)* di Massimo il Greco. *Alle fonti del lamento della Vasilija*, “Studi slavistici”, 16 (2019), 2, 157-75
- Garzaniti 2019<sup>c</sup> – Marcello GARZANITI, *Michel Trivolis / Maxime le Grec (1470 env.-1555/1556). Sa vie et sa carrière*, RES 90 (2019), 3, 431-52
- Geanakoplos 1962 – Deno J. GEANAKOPLIS, *Greek Scholars in Venice. Studies in the Dissemination of Greek Learning from Byzantium to Western Europe*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1962
- Geanakoplos 1965 – Deno J. GEANAKOPLIS, *Church and State in the Byzantine Empire: a Reconsideration of the Problem of Caesaropapism*, “Church History” 34 (1965), 381-403
- Geanakoplos 1966 – Deno J. GEANAKOPLIS, *Byzantine East and Latin West: Two Worlds of Christendom in Middle Ages and Renaissance. Studies in Ecclesiastical and Cultural History*, Oxford 1966
- Geanakoplos 1976 – Deno J. GEANAKOPLIS, *Interaction of the “Sibling” Byzantine and Western Cultures in the Middle Ages and Italian Renaissance (330-1600)*, New Haven and London 1976
- Geanakoplos 1988 – Deno J. GEANAKOPLIS, *The Post-Byzantine Athonite Monk Maximos “the Greek”: Reformer of Orthodoxy in Sixteenth-Century Russia*, “Greek Orthodox

Theological Review”, 33 (1988), no. 4, 445-468

Geanakoplos 1992 – Deno J. GEANAKOPLAS, Maximos the Greek: his mission and aspects of his reform of orthodoxy in Muscovite Russia, in: *The Legacy of Saints Cyril and Methodius to Kiev and Moscow*, ed. Anthony-Emil N. Tachiaos, Thessaloniki 1992, 449 – 462

Getcha 2010 – Job GETCHA, *La réforme liturgique du métropolitain Cyprien de Kiev: l’introduction du typikon sabaïte dans l’office divin*, Paris 2010

Gill 1959 – Joseph GILL, *The Council of Florence*, London – New York 1959

Gladkii-Tsekhanovich 1988 – А.И. ГЛАДКИЙ, А.А. ЦЕХАНОВИЧ, entry: *Курбский Андрей Михайлович, князь* in: SKK 1

Goldberg 1974 – Александр Л. ГОЛЬДБЕРГ, Три «послания Филофея» (орыт текстологического анализа), *TODRL* 29 (1974), 68-97.

Goldberg-Dmitrieva 1989 – Александр Л. ГОЛЬДБЕРГ, Р.П. ДМИТРИЕВА entry: *Филофей, монах Псковского Елеазарова монастыря* in: SKK 2

Goldfrank 2005 – David GOLDFRANK, The Deep Origins of Tsar'-Muchitel': a Nagging Problem of Muscovite Political Theory, “*Russian History/Histoire Russe*”, 32, nos. 3-4 (Fall-Winter 2005), 341-54

Goldfrank 2007 – David GOLDFRANK, Recentering Nil Sorskii: The Evidence from the Sources, *RR* 66 (2007), issue 3, 359-376

Goldfrank 2009 – David GOLDFRANK, Review of: Tom E. Dykstra, *Russian Monastic Culture, “Josephism,” and the Iosifo-Volokolamsk Monastery, 1479–1607*. Munich: Otto Sagner, 2006 and: Nikolai Konstantinovich Nikol'skii, *Kirillo-Belozerskii monastyr' i ego ustroistvo do vtoroi chetverti XVII veka (1397–1625)*, 2: *Upravlenie. Obshchinnaiia i keleinaia zhizn' . Bogoslužhenie*, ed. Z. V. Dmitrieva, E. V. Krushitel' nitskaia, and T. I. Shablona. St. Petersburg: Dmitrii Bulanin, 2006, “*Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*” 10, 1 (Winter 2009), 169–75

Golubinskii 1900 – Евгений Е. ГОЛУБИНСКИЙ, *История Русской Церкви*, vol. II, I, Москва 1900

Golubinskii 1911 – Евгений Е. ГОЛУБИНСКИЙ, *История Русской Церкви*, vol. II, II, Москва 1911

Gorskii 1851 – [Александр В. ГОРСКИЙ, прот.], *Отношения иноков Кириллова Белозерского и Иосифова Волоколамского монастырей в XVI в., “Прибавления к Творениям св. Отцов”*, 10 (1851), кн. 3, 502-527

Gorskii 1859 – [Александр В. ГОРСКИЙ], *Максим Грек, святогорец, “Прибавления к Творениям св. Отцов”*, 18 (1859), кн. 2, 144-192

Grafton 1985-87 – Anthony GRAFTON, entry: *Janus Laskaris*, in: *CoE*, II, 292-4

Granstrem 1970 – Евгения Э. ГРАНСТРЕМ, Почему митрополита Климента Смолятича называли «философом», *TODRL* 25 (1970), 20-28

Grendler 1981 – Paul F. GRENDLER, Religious restlessness in Sixteenth-century Italy, in: idem, *Culture and Censorship in Late Renaissance Italy and France*, London 1981, 25-38 (This is a reprint. The text was published originally in 1966.)

Grendler 1999 – Paul F. GRENDLER, sub-entry: *The Renaissance in Historical Thought*, in: *EoR*, V, 259-268

Grendler 2002 – Paul F. GRENDLER, *The Universities of the Italian Renaissance*, Baltimore 2002

Gromov 1983 – Михаил Н. ГРОМОВ, Максим Грек, Москва 1983

Gualdo Rosa 1983 – Lucia GUALDO ROSA, entry: *Cortesi Urceo, Antonio, detto Codro* in: *DBI*, 29 (1983), 775

Guran 2001 – Petre GURAN, Introduction, in: *L'empereur hagiographe. Culte des saints et monarchie byzantine et post-byzantine*, ed. Petre Guran, Bucarest (New Europe College) 2001, 11-26

Gutas-Siniooglou 2017 – Dimitri GUTAS and Niketas SINIOSSOGLU, Philosophy and “Byzantine philosophy”, in: *The Cambridge Intellectual History of Byzantium*, ed. Anthony Kaldellis and Niketas Siniooglou, Cambridge 2017, 271-95

Halperin 2014 – Charles J. HALPERIN, Metropolitan Makarii and Muscovite Court Politics during the Reign of Ivan IV, *RR* 73 (2014), 447-64

Hamburg 2016 – Gary M. HAMBURG, *Russia's Path Toward Enlightenment: Faith, Politics, and Reason, 1500–1801*, New Haven 2016

Haney 1973 – Jack V. HANEY, *From Italy to Muscovy, The life and works of Maxim the Greek*, München 1973

Hanke 1976 – Lewis HANKE, The Theological Significance of the Discovery of America, in: *First Images of America: the impact of New World on the Old*, ed. Fredi Chiappelli, Berkeley – Los Angeles 1976, vol. 1, 363-389

Hannick 2010 – Christian HANNICK, La réception de la culture antique dans les œuvres de Maxime le Grec, “*Studi Slavistici*” 7 (2010), 339-48

Hardwick 1996 – Michael HARDWICK, *Contra Apionem* and Christian apologetics, in: Josephus’ “*Contra Apionem*”: studies in its character and context with a Latin concordance to the portion missing in Greek, ed. Louis H. Feldman and John R. Levison, Leiden 1996, 369-402

Harlfinger 2000 – Dieter HARLFINGER, *Codices Cremonenses Graeci. Eine kurze*

Neusichtung anlässlich des *V Colloquio Internazionale di Paleografia greca*, in: I manoscritti greci tra riflessione e dibattito. Atti del V Colloquio Internazionale di Paleografia Greca (Cremona, 4-10 ottobre 1998), Firenze 2000, 763-9

Harris 1995 – Jonathan HARRIS, *Greek Emigres in the West 1400 - 1520*, Camberley (UK) 1995

Harris 1999 – Jonathan HARRIS, *Common Language and the Common Good: Aspects of Identity among Byzantine Emigres in Renaissance Italy*, in: *Crossing Boundaries. Issues of Cultural and Individual Identity in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, ed. Sally McKee, Turnhout 1999, 189-202

Harrison 2008 - Nonna Verna HARRISON, *The human person as image and likeness of God*, in: *The Cambridge Companion to Orthodox Christian Theology*, ed. Mary B. Cunningham and Elizabeth Theokritoff, Cambridge 2008, 78-92

Herrin-McManus 2012 – Judith HERRIN and Stuart M. McMANUS, *Renaissance Encounters: Byzantium meets the West at the Council of Ferrara-Florence 1438-9*, in: *Renaissance Encounters: Greek East and Latin West*, ed. Dimitri Gondicas; Marina S Brownlee, Leiden 2012, 35-56

Hussey 1937 – Joan Mervyn HUSSEY, *Church and learning in the Byzantine Empire 867-1185*, Oxford - London 1937

Hussey 2010 – Joan Mervyn HUSSEY, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*, Oxford 2010

Iagich 1885-95 – И. В. ЯГИЧ, *Рассуждения южнославянской и русской старины о церковно-славянском языке. VI. Грамматическия свѣдѣнія Максима Грека*, in: *Изслѣдования по русскому языку, издание Отдѣления Русскаго Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук*, vol. 1, Санкт-Петербург 1885-1895, 582-633 and 970-981

Ikonnikov 1915 – Владимир С. ИКОННИКОВ, *Максим Грек и его время*, Киев 1915

Imhaus 1997 – Brunehilde IMHAUS, *Le minoranze orientali a Venezia 1300 - 1510*, Roma 1997

Infelise 2007 – Mario INFELISE, entry: *Manuzio, Aldo, il Vecchio*, in: *DBI* 69 (2007)

Irigoin 1997 – Jean IRIGOIN, entry: *Janus Lascaris Rhyndacenus*, in: *Centuriae Latinae*, I, 485-491

Ivanov 1968<sup>a</sup> – Алексей И. ИВАНОВ, *Максим Грек и Савонарола*, *TODRL*, 13 (1968), 217-226

Ivanov 1968<sup>b</sup> – Алексей И. ИВАНОВ, *К вопросу о нестяжательских взглядах Максима Грека*, *VV* 29 (1968), 135-47

Ivanov 1969 – Алексей И. ИВАНОВ, *Литературное наследие Максима Грека*:

характеристика, атрибуции, библиография, Ленинград 1969

Ivanov 1972-74 – Алексей И. ИВАНОВ, Максим Грек и итальянское возрождение. К постановке вопроса, VV 33 (1972), 140-157; 34 (1973), 112-121; 35 (1974), 119-136.

Ivanov 1973 – Алексей И. ИВАНОВ, О пребывании Максима Грека в доминиканском монастыре св. Марка во Флоренции, “Богословские Труды” 11 (1973), 112 - 119 (German translation of this paper: A.I. IVANOV, Maksim Grek im Dominikanerkloster zu Florenz, “Stimme der Orthodoxie” 1976, Н. 6, 49-58)

Ivanov 1974 – Алексей И. ИВАНОВ, Максим Грек и Савонарола, “Богословские Труды” 12 (1974), 184-208 (German translation of this paper: A.I. IVANOV, Maksim Grek und Savonarola, “Stimme der Orthodoxie” 1976, Н. 7. 46-64; Н. 8, 47-52)

Ivanov 1976 – Алексей И. ИВАНОВ, Несколько замечаний по поводу издания нового списка “Судново дела Максима Грека”, TODRL 30 (1976), 284 - 298

S. Ivanov 1996 – Sergei IVANOV, Holy Fool and Political Authorities: Byzantium and Russia, in: Acts, XVIIIth International Congress of Byzantine Studies: selected papers: main and communications, Moscow 1991, vol. I History, Shepherdstown (USA) 1996, 265-278

Jeffreys-Kazhdan 1991 – Elisabeth M. JEFFREYS, Alexander KAZHDAN, entry: *Mirror of princes*, in: ODB II, 1379-80

Jurdjevic 2004 – Mark JURDJEVIC, Prophets and Politicians: Marsilio Ficino, Savonarola and the Valori Family, “Past and Present” 183 (2004), 41-77

Kagan 1989 – М.Д. КАГАН, entry *Повесть о втором браке Василия III* in: SKK 2

Kaiser 1980 – Daniel H. KAISER, The Growth of the Law in Medieval Russia, Princeton 1980

Kalugin 1997 – Василий В. КАЛУГИН, Князь Андрей Курбский и Максим Грек, in: История и культура Ростовской земли – 1996, Ростов 1997, 137-142

Kalugin 2001 – Василий В. КАЛУГИН, Русские переводы Симеона Метафраста в забытом агиографическом своде, “Московский журнал”, 2001, по. 10, 59-62

Kamchatnov 2002 – А.М. КАМЧАТНОВ, Св. Максим Грек: грамматика судьбы и судьба грамматики, in: Кирилл и Мефодий: Духовное наследие, Калининград 2002, 14-24

Kashtanov 2001 – Сергей М. КАШТАНОВ, К истории русско-греческих культурных связей в XVI в., “Московия. Проблемы византийской и новогреческой филологии”, 2001, по. 1, 209-218

Kazakova 1960 – Наталия А. КАЗАКОВА, Вассиан Патрикеев и его сочинения, Москва – Ленинград 1960

Kazakova 1967-8 – Наталия А. КАЗАКОВА, Вопрос о причинах осуждения Максима Грека, VV 28 (1967), 109-126; VV 29 (1968), 108-134

Kazakova 1970 – Наталия А. КАЗАКОВА, Очерки по истории русской общественной мысли. Первая треть XVI века, Ленинград 1970

Kazakova 1973 – Наталия А. КАЗАКОВА, Максим Грек в советской историографии, "Вопросы истории" 1973, no. 5, 149 - 157

Kazakova 1975 – Наталия А. КАЗАКОВА, Новый памятник турецкой темы, "Новые открытия. Ежегодник" Москва 1975, 62-70

Kazakova 1988<sup>a</sup> – Наталия А. КАЗАКОВА, entry: *Артемий, игумен Троице-Сергиева монастыря* in SKK 1

Kazakova 1988<sup>b</sup> – Наталия А. КАЗАКОВА, entry: *Вассиан Патрикеев* in SKK 1

Kazakova 1988<sup>c</sup> – Наталия А. КАЗАКОВА, entry: *Гурий Тушин* in SKK 1

Kazakova 1988<sup>d</sup> – Наталия А. КАЗАКОВА, entry: *Дмитрий Герасимов (Митя Малый)* in: SKK 1

Kazhdan 1991<sup>a</sup> – Alexander KAZHDAN, entry: *Curriculum*, in: ODB I, 564-5

Kazhdan 1991<sup>b</sup> – Alexander KAZHDAN, subentry: *Apophatic theology*, of the entry: *Theology*, in: ODB III, 2058

Kazhdan 1991<sup>c</sup> – Alexander KAZHDAN, entry: *Torture*, in: ODB III, 2098-9

Kazhdan-Shevchenko 1991 – Alexander KAZHDAN and Ihor ŠEVČENKO, entry: *Ethopoia*, in: ODB, on-line access, version 2005

Kazimova 1999 – Галина А. КАЗИМОВА, Об источниках сочинения преп. Максима Грека *Слово пространнее излагающе с жалостию нестроения и безчиния царей и властей последнего века сего*, in: Ежегодная Богословская Конференция Православного Свято-Тихоновского Богословского Института, гл. ред. протоиерей Владимир Воробьев; отв. ред. Н. А. Кулькова, Москва 1999, 169-174

Kazimova 2006 – Галина А. КАЗИМОВА, Канон молебен к божественному и поклоняемому Параклиту" преподобного Максима Грека: к вопросу об атрибуции и функциональной трансформации текста /Лингвистическое источниковедение и история русского языка <2004-2005>, Москва 2006, 281-94

Khodarkovsky 1997 – Michael KHODARKOVSKY, Four Degrees of Separation: Constructing Non-Christian Identities in Muscovy, in: *Culture and Identity in Muscovy, 1359-1584*, eds. A.M. Kleimola and G.D. Lenhoff, Москва 1997, 248-266

Kidwell 1989 – Carol KIDWELL, *Marullus, Soldier Poet of the Renaissance*, London 1989

Kirillin 1996 – В. М. КИРИЛЛИН, Правота и логика антилатинского "послания" св. Феодосия Печерского, in: *Древняя Русь и Запад. Научная конференция. Книга резюме*,

ред. В.М. Кириллин, Москва 1996

Kivelson 1997 – Valerie A. KIVELSON, Political Sorcery in Sixteenth-Century Muscovy, in: Culture and Identity in Muscovy, 1359-1584, eds. A.M. Kleimola and G.D. Lenhoff, Москва 1997, 267-283

Kivelson 2002 – Valerie A. KIVELSON, Muscovite “Citizenship”: Rights without Freedom, “The Journal of Modern History”, 74 (2002), 465-89

Klibanov 1960 – Александр. И. КЛИБАНОВ, Сборник сочинений Ермолая-Еразма, TODRL 16 (1960), 178-207

Klibanov 1996 – Александр. И. КЛИБАНОВ, Духовная культура средневековой Руси, Москва 1996

Klier 1997 – John D. KLIER, Judaizing Without Jews? Moscow – Novgorod, 1470-1504, in: Culture and Identity in Muscovy, 1359-1584, eds. A.M. Kleimola and G.D. Lenhoff, Москва 1997, 336-49

Kloss 1976 – Борис М. КЛОСС, Никоновская летопись и Максим Грек, TODRL 30 (1976), 124-131

Klostermann 1958 – R.A. KLOSTERMANN, Legende un Wirklichkeit im Lebenswerk von Maxim Grek, OCP, 24 (1958), 353-370

Klostermann 1964 – R.A. KLOSTERMANN, Review of Bernhard Schultze, Maksim Grek als Theologe, OCP 30 (1964), fasc. 1, 260-8

Kluhevskii 1957 – Василий О. КЛЮЧЕВСКИЙ, Сочинения, т. II, Москва 1957

Knös 1945 – Börje KNÖS, Ambassadeur de l'hellénisme: Janus Lascaris, et la tradition gréco-byzantine dans l'humanisme français, Uppsala - Paris 1945

Kolycheva 2002 – Е. И. КОЛЫЧЕВА, Православные монастыри второй половины века XV - XVI, in: Монашество и монастыри в России XI-XX века. Исторические очерки, ed. Н. В. Синецына, Москва 2002, 81-115

Kollmann 1987 – Nancy Shields KOLLMANN, Kinship and Politics: The Making of the Muscovite Political System, 1345-1547, Stanford 1987

Kollmann 2017 – Nancy Shields KOLLMANN, Representing Legitimacy in Early Modern Russia, RR 76 (2017), 7–21

Konovalov 2014 – К. В. КОНОВАЛОВ, Влияние исихазма на антропологические и гносеологические воззрения Максима Грека (Михаила Триволиса) Барнаул 2014

Коргеева 1982 – Т. Н. КОПРЕЕВА, Западные источники в работе новгородских книжников конца XV - начала XVI в., in: Федоровские чтения 1979, Москва 1982, 138-152



Koretskii 1963 – В.И. КОРЕЦКИЙ, Христологические споры в России (сер. XVI в.), “Вопросы истории религии и атеизма” 11 (1963), 334 - 361

Korogodina 2007 – Maria KOROGODINA, Penitential Texts and the Changing Political Culture of Muscovy, RR 66 (July 2007), 377–90

Kovtun 1963 – Л. С. КОВТУН, Русская лексикография эпохи средневековья, Москва – Ленинград 1963

Kovtun 1975 – Л. С. КОВТУН, Лексикография в Московской Руси XVI – начала XVII вв., Ленинград 1975

Kozlov-Strutinskii–Parfent’ev 2014 – Станислав КОЗЛОВ-СТРУТИНСКИЙ, Павел ПАРФЕНТЬЕВ, История Католической Церкви в России, Санкт-Петербург 2014

Kristeller 1979 – Paul Oskar KRISTELLER, Renaissance Thought and its Sources, New York 1979

Kristeller 1985 – Paul Oskar KRISTELLER, Marsilio Ficino and the Roman Curia, “Humanistica Lovaniensia” 34A (1985), 83-98

Kristeller 1988 – Paul Oskar KRISTELLER, The meaning of humanism, in: CHRPh, 113-134.

Krom 2009 – Mihail M. KROM, État et réformes en Russie, “Annales” 64 (2009), no. 3, 561-578

Krom 2010 – Михаил М. КРОМ, “Вдовствующее царство”: политический кризис в России 30-40-х годов XVI века, Москва 2010

Krutetskii 1991 – Владимир Ю. КРУТЕЦКИЙ, Максим Грек и учреждение патриаршества (разрешительная грамота патриарха Иеремии II Максиму Греку, июнь 1588 г.), in: IV Centenario dell'istituzione del Patriarcato in Russia / 400-летие учреждения патриаршества в России, Roma 1991, 115-130.

Kudriavtsev 1997 – О.Ф. КУДРЯВЦЕВ, Россия в первой половине XVI в.: взгляд из Европы Москва 1997

Lackner 2002 - Dennis F. LACKNER, The Camaldolese Academy: Ambrogio Traversari, Marsilio Ficino and the Christian Platonic Tradition, in: Marsilio Ficino: his Theology, his Philosophy, his Legacy, Ed. Michael J.B. ALLEN and Valery REES with Martin DAVIES, Leiden 2002 (Brill's Studies in Intellectual History 108), 15-44

Langelier 1986 – Arno LANGELER, Maksim Grek, Byzantijn en humanist in Rusland, Amsterdam, 1986

Laurent 1968 – V. LAURENT, Les premiers patriarches de Constantinople sous domination Turque (1454-1476). Succession et chronologie d'après un catalogue inédit, REB 26 (1968), 229-263

Lauster 2002 – Jörg LAUSTER, Marsilio Ficino as a Christian Thinker: Theological Aspects of his Platonism, in: Marsilio Ficino: his Theology, his Philosophy, his Legacy, Ed. Michael J.B. ALLEN and Valery REES with Martin DAVIES, Leiden 2002 (Brill's Studies in Intellectual History 108), 45-68

Layton 1990 – Evro LAYTON, Zacharias and Nikolaos Kallierges, "Thesaurismata" 20 (1990), 206-217

Legrand 1885 – Emile LEGRAND, Bibliographie hellénique ou description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés en grec par des Grecs aux XV<sup>e</sup> et XVI<sup>e</sup> siècles, vol. I - II, Paris 1885

Leoncini 1979 – Giovanni LEONCINI, La certoza di Firenze, Salzburg 1979 (Analecta Cartusiana 71)

Likhachev 1988 – Дмитрий С. ЛИХАЧЕВ, entry: *Владимир Всеволодович Мономах*, in: SKK 1

Lloyd-Hudson 2007 – Howell A. LLOYD and Simon HUDSON, Background, in: European Political Thought 1450-1700: religion, law and philosophy, ed. by Howell A. Lloyd ... [et al.], New Haven 2007, 9-54

Logan 2009 – Ian LOGAN, Reading Anselm's Proslogion: The History of Anselm's Arguments and its Significance Today, Farnham 2009

Lotz-Heumann 2001 – Ute LOTZ-HEUMANN, The Concept of "Confessionalization": a Historiographical Paradigm in Dispute, "Memoria y Civilizacion" 4 (2001), 93-114

H. Lowry 1981 – Heath W. LOWRY, A Note on the Population and Status of the Athonite Monasteries under Ottoman Rule (ca. 1520), "Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes" 73 (1981), 115-135

M. Lowry 1979 – Martin LOWRY, The World of Aldus Manutius, Oxford 1979

M. Lowry 1999 – Martin LOWRY, entry: *Manuzio (Aldo)*, in EoR, I, 36-40

Lucà 1988 – Santo LUCÀ, Manoscritti greci dimenticati della Biblioteca Vallicelliana, "Augustinianum" 28 (1988), no. 3, 661-702

Lucas-Dubreton 1958 – Jean LUCAS-DUBRETON, La vie quotidienne à Florence au temps des Médicis, Paris 1958

Lur'e 1960 – Яков С. ЛУРЬЕ, Идеологическая борьба в русской публицистике конца XV - начала XVI века., Москва-Ленинград 1960

Lur'e 1988<sup>a</sup> – Яков С. ЛУРЬЕ, entry: *Вениамин, монах-доминиканец*, in: SKK 1

Lur'e 1988<sup>b</sup> – Яков С. ЛУРЬЕ, entry: *Иосиф Волоцкий*, in: SKK 1

Lur'e 1989 – Яков С. ЛУРЬЕ, entry: *Сератион, архиепископ Новгородский*, in: SKK 2

Macrides 1991 – R. J. MACRIDES, entry: *Simony*, in: ODB III, 1901-2

MacRobert 2008 – Catherine Mary MacROBERT, Maksim Grek and the Norms of Russian Church Slavonic, in: Papers to be presented at the XIV International Congress of Slavists, Ohrid, 10-16.09.2008, 45-63, on-line: <https://www.scribd.com/document/51247195/Papers-to-Be-Presented-at-the-XIV-International-Congress-of-Slavists>, consulted 30.08.2018  
(alternative acces: [https://docgo.net/philosophy-of-money.html?utm\\_source=papers-to-be-presented-at-the-xiv-international-congress-of-slavists-ohrid-10-16-09-2008](https://docgo.net/philosophy-of-money.html?utm_source=papers-to-be-presented-at-the-xiv-international-congress-of-slavists-ohrid-10-16-09-2008))

MacRobert 2015 – Catherine Mary MacROBERT, Maximos the Greek: Imprisoned in Polemic, in: Polemic. Language as Violence in Medieval and Early Modern Discourse, ed. A. Suerbaum, G. Southcombe, B. Thompson, London 2015, 165-80

Makarii 2006 – Архимандрит МАКАРИЙ (ВЕРЕТЕННИКОВ), Из истории русской иерархии XVI века, Москва 2006

Malagola 1878 – Carlo MALAGOLA, Della vita e delle opere di Antonio Urceo detto Codro, Bologna 1878

Malaguzzi-Valeri 1915-1929 – Francesco MALAGUZZI-VALERI, La corte di Lodovico il Moro, vol. 1-4, Milano 1915-1929 (reprint: Nandeln 1970)

Manoussacas 1956 – Μανούσος Ι. ΜΑΝΟΥΣΑΚΑΣ, Η αλληλογραφία των Γρηγοροπούλων χρονολογουμένη (1493- 1501), “Επετηρίς του Μεσαιωνικού Αρχείου” 6 (1956), 156-209

Manoussacas 1958-9 – Μανούσος Ι. ΜΑΝΟΥΣΑΚΑΣ, Αρσενίου Μονεμβασίας του Αποστόλη επιστολαί ανέκδοτοι (1521-1534) προς Κάρολον τον Ε΄, Κλήμεντα τον Ζ΄, τον Έρασμον, τους καρδινάλιους Niccolo Ridolfi και Egidio Canisio, τον Ιανόν Λάσκαριν και τον Ιουστίνον Δεκάδουν, “Επετηρίς του Μεσαιωνικού Αρχείου” 8-9 (1958-59), 5-56

Manoussacas 1973 – Manoussos I. MANOUSSACAS, La comunità greca di Venezia e gli arcivescovi di Filadelfia, in: La Chiesa Greca in Italia dall'VIII al XVI secolo. Atti del convegno storico interecclesiale, vol. I, Padova 1973, 45-87

Manoussacas 1976 – Manoussos I. MANOUSSACAS, Sept lettres inédites (1492 - 1503) du recueil retrouvé de Jean Grégoropoulos (Πίν. Α' – Β'), „Thesaurismata“ 13 (1976), 7-39

Manoussacas 1982 – Manoussos MANOUSSACAS, Una prefazione greca inedita di Giovanni Grigoropoulos per una edizione veneziana del 1498, in: Bisanzio e l'Italia. Raccolta di studi in memoria di Agostino Pertusi, Milano 1982, 218-228

Manoussacas 1989 – Manoussos I. MANOUSSACAS, The History of the Greek Confraternity (1498-1953) and the Activity of the Greek Institute of Venice (1966-1982), “Modern Greek Studies Yearbook” 5 (1989), 321-94

Manoussacas – Patrinelis 1960 – Μανούσος Ι. ΜΑΝΟΥΣΑΚΑΣ, Χρήστος Γ. ΠΑΤΡΙΝΕΛΗΣ, Η αλληλογραφία του Ίωάννου Γρηγορόπουλου μετά του Μ. Μουσούρου, Α. Αποστόλη, Ζ. Καλλιέργη και άλλων λογίων τής Αναγεννήσεως χρονολογουμένη (1494-1503), “επετηρίς του

Μεσαιωνικοῦ Ἀρχείου” 10 (1960), 163 – 201

Marcel 1958 – Raymond MARCEL, Marsile Ficin, Paris 1958

Marker 1989 – Gary J. MARKER, Primers and Literacy in Muscovy: A Taxonomic Investigation, RR, Vol. 48, No. 1 (Jan., 1989), 1-19

Marker 1990 – Gary MARKER, Literacy and Literacy Texts in Muscovy: A Reconsideration, Slavic Review, Vol. 49, No. 1 (Spring, 1990), 74-89

Martin 2006<sup>a</sup> – Janet MARTIN, North-eastern Russia and the Golden Horde (1246-1359), in: The Cambridge History of Russia, vol. I From Early Rus’ to 1689, ed. Maureen Perrie, Cambridge 2006, 127-57

Martin 2006<sup>b</sup> – Janet MARTIN, The emergence of Moscow (1359-1462), in: The Cambridge History of Russia, vol. I From Early Rus’ to 1689, ed. Maureen Perrie, Cambridge 2006, 158-87

Matthäi 1779 – Christian Friedrich von MATTHÄI, Lectiones Mosquenses, vol. I-II, Lipsiae, svmtv E.B. Schwickerti, 1779

McCormick 1991 – Michael McCORMICK, entry: *Emperor*, in: ODB, I, 692-3

McDonnell 1955 – Ernest W. McDONNELL, The "Vita Apostolica": Diversity or Dissent, "Church History" 24, (1955), no. 1, 15-31

Medelin – Patrinelis 1971 – W.K. MEDLIN, C.G. PATRINELIS, Renaissance Influences and Religious Reforms in Russia, Geneve 1971

Mercati 1910 – Giovanni MERCATI, Cenni di A. del Monte e G. Lascaris sulle perdite della Biblioteca Vaticana nel sacco del 1527. Seguono alcune lettere del Lascaris, in: Miscellanea Ceriani, Milano 1910, 607-632

Meyendorff 1974 – (John MEYENDORFF) И.Ф. МЕЙЕНДОРФ, О византийском исихазме и его роли в культурном и историческом развитии Восточной Европы в XIV в., TODRL 29 (1974), 291-305

Meyendorff 1983 – John MEYENDORFF, Byzantine theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes, New York 1983

Meyendorff 1996 – John MEYENDORFF, Rome, Constantinople, Moscow. Historical and Theological Studies, Crestwood (NY) 1996

Meyer 1894 – Philipp MEYER, Dia Haupturkunden für die Geschichte der Athosklöster, Leipzig 1894

Meyer 1899 – Philipp MEYER, Die Theologische Literatur der Griechischen Kirche in 16. Jahrhundert, Leipzig 1899

- Miliutin 1859-61 – Владимир О. МИЛЮТИН, О недвижимых имуществах духовенства в России, ChO IDR 1860 [1859-61?], кн. 3., отд. 1, 157-166
- Mil'kov 2008 – В. В. МИЛЬКОВ, Традиции Греческой классической философии в древней Руси, in: Российско-Греческие государственные, церковные и культурные связи в мировой истории. Материалы конференции, Афины – Москва 2008, 28-35
- Miller 1978 – David B. MILLER, The Lübeckers Bartholomäus Ghotan and Nicolaus Bülow in Novgorod and Moscow and the Problem of Early Western Influences on Russian Culture, “Viator” 9 (1978), 395-412
- Miller 2006 – David B. MILLER, The Orthodox Church, in: The Cambridge History of Russia, vol. I: From Early Rus' to 1689, ed. Maureen Perrie, Cambridge 2006, 338-359
- Miller 2011 – David B. MILLER, The Politics and Ceremonial of Ioasaf Skripitsyn's Installation as Metropolitan on February 9, 1539, in: RR 70 (April 2011), 234-51
- Mioni 1973 – Elpidio MIONI, entry: *Calliergi, Zaccaria*, in: DBI 16 (1973), s.???
- Morozova 1994 – Т.Я. МОРОЗОВА, История якобы “утраченного” рукописного сборника Максима Грека, хранящегося в фонде ВИЭМ, “Тверская старина”, 1994, no. 12-13, 123-126
- Monfasani 1999<sup>a</sup> – John MONFASANI, entry: *Greek émigrés* in: EoR, III, 85-8
- Monfasani 1999<sup>b</sup> – John MONFASANI, entry: *Janus Laskaris* in: EoR, III, 382
- Monfasani 2008 – John MONFASANI, A tale of two books: Bessarion's *In Calumniatorem Platonis* and George of Trebizond's *Comparatio Philosophorum Platonis et Aristotelis*, “Renaissance Studies” 22 (2008), no. 1, 1-15
- Monheit 1999 – Michael L. MONHEIT, subentry: *Legal Humanism*, in: EoR, III, 230-233
- Mortier 1921-24 – Daniel-Antonin MORTIER, La liturgie dominicaine, vol. 1-9, Lille – Bruges 1921-24
- Mowbray 2004 – Malcolm de MOWBRAY, Philosophy as Handmaid of Theology: Biblical Exegesis in the Service of Scholarship, “Traditio” 59 (2004), 1-37
- Muckle 1945 – J.T. MUCKLE, The Doctrine of St. Gregory of Nyssa on Man as the Image of God, “Mediaeval Studies” 7 (1945), 55-84
- Mugnai Carrara 1994 – Daniela MUGNAI CARRARA, Nicolo Leonicensi e Giovanni Mainardi: aspetti epistemologici dell'umanesimo medico, in: Alla corte degli Estensi: filosofia, arte e cultura a Ferrara nei secoli XV e XVI, ed. Marco Bertozzi, Ferrara 1994, 19-40
- Müller 1884 – K.K. MÜLLER, Neue Mittheilungen über Janos Laskaris und die Mediceische Bibliothek, “Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen”, 1 (1884), 333-412

Năsturel 1967 – Petre Ș. NĂSTUREL, Recherches sur les rédactions gréco-roumaines de la “Vie de saint Niphon II, patriarche de Constantinople”, “Revue des Études Sud-Est Européennes” 5 (1967), 41-75

Năsturel 1986 – Petre Ș. NĂSTUREL, Le Mont Athos et les Roumains: recherches sur leurs relations du milieu du XIVe siècle à 1654, Roma 1986 (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 227)

Năsturel 2002 – Petre Ș. NĂSTUREL, Radu Vodă cel Mare și Patriarhul de Constantinopol Ioachim I-ul, Studii și Materiale de Istorie Medie 20 (2002), 23-31

Nemirovskii 1964 – Евгений Л. Немировский, Возникновение книгопечатания в Москве. Иван Федоров, Москва 1964

Nikolaidis 2014 – Theodossios NIKOLAIDIS, “Local religion” in Corfu: sixteenth to nineteenth centuries, “Mediterranean Historical Review” 29 (2014), no. 2, 155-168

Nitche 1990 – П. НИЧЕ, Москва - Третий Рим?, in: Спорные вопросы отечественной истории XI - XVIII веков, Тезисы докладов и сообщений Первых чтений, посвященных памяти А. А. Зимины, Москва 1990

Nicol 1975 – Donald M. NICOL, Meteora. The Rock Monasteries of Thessaly, London 1975

Nikolov 2009 – Ангел НИКОЛОВ, Средневековый славянский перевод «Учительных глав» императора Василия I: проблемы изучения рукописной традиции и ранних печатных изданий, in: XIX Ежегодная богословская конференция Православного Свято-Тихоновского гуманитарного университета, vol. 1. Москва, 2009, 41-47

Nolan 1994 – Michael NOLAN, The defective male: What Aquinas really said?, New Blackfriars 75. 880(March 1994), 156-66

Nolhac 1967 – Pierre de NOLHAC, Les correspondants d'Alde Manuce. Matériaux nouveaux d'histoire littéraire, Torino 1967, (first edition: “Studi e documenti di Storia e Dritto”, VIII (1887), 247-299; IX (1888), 203-248)

Nutton 1997 – Vivian NUTTON, The rise of medical humanism: Ferrara 1464-1555, “Renaissance Studies” 11 (1997), fasc. 1, 2 -19

Obolensky 1957 – Dimitri OBOLENSKY, Byzantium, Kiev and Moscow: A Study in Ecclesiastical Relations, “Dumbarton Oaks Papers” 11 (1957), 21-78

Obolensky 1999 – Dimitri OBOLENSKY, Six Byzantine Portraits, Oxford 1999, (2nd edition), 201-219; the chapter devoted to Maximus was published before as: Italy, Mount Athos and Muscovy. The three Worlds of Maximus the Greek, “Proceedings of the British Academy” 67 (1981), 143-161

Oikonomides 1997 – Nicolas OIKONOMIDES, Le temps des faux, in: Mount Athos in the 14th - 16th centuries, ed. K. Chrisochoides, Athens 1997, 69-74

Oikonomides 1998 – Nicolas OIKONOMIDES, Byzantine Vatopaidi: a Monastery of the High

Aristocracy, in: HGV, I, 44-53

Oleroff 1950<sup>a</sup> – Alexandre OLEROFF, L’humaniste Dominicain Jean Conon et le Crétois Jean Grégoropoulos (À propos du ms lat. oct. 374 de la Staatsbibliothek de Berlin, actuellement à la Westdeutsche Bibliothek, Marburg); “Scriptorium” 4 (1950), 104-107

Oleroff 1950<sup>b</sup> – Alexandre OLEROFF, Démétrius Trivolis, copiste et bibliophile (À propos du ms grec Perizonianus F. 6 de la bibliothèque de l’Université de Leyde); “Scriptorium” 4 (1950), 260-3

Olmsted 1987 – Hugh M. OLMSTED, A Learned Greek Monk in Muscovite Exile: Maksim Grek and the Old Testament Prophets. “Modern Greek Studies Yearbook” 3 (1987), 1-73

Olmsted 1989 – Hugh M. OLMSTED, Maksim Grek’s letter to Prince Peter Shuiskii: The Greek and Russian Texts, “Modern Greek Studies Yearbook” 5 (1989) 267-319

Olmsted 1994 – Hugh M. OLMSTED, Modeling the Genealogy of Maksim Grek’s Collection Types. The “Plectogram” as Visual Aid in Reconstruction, in: Michael S. Flier and Daniel Rowland, eds., Medieval Russian Culture, vol. 2, Berkeley 1994, 107 - 133

Olmsted 2002 – Hugh M. OLMSTED, Recognizing Maksim Grek: Features of his Language, “Palaeoslavica” 10 (2002), 1-26

O’Loughlin 2013 – Thomas O’LOUGHLIN, entry: *Astrology and Astronomy*, in: OGHRA, 580-3

O’Malley 1976 – John W. O’MALLEY, The Discovery of America and Reform Thought at the Papal Court in the Early Cinquecento, in: First Images of America: the impact of New World on the Old, ed. Fredi Chiappelli, Berkeley – Los Angeles 1976, vol. 1, 185-200

O’Meara 1991 – Dominic J. O’MEARA, entry: *Philosophy*, in: ODB III, 1658-61

Orlandi 1964 – Stefano ORLANDI OP, La canonizzazione di S. Antonino nella relazione di Fra Roberto Ubaldini da Gagliano, MD 81 (1964) 85-115 and 131-162

Orvieto 1974 – Paolo ORVIETO, entry: *Candido, Pietro*, in: DBI, 17 (1974), 795-6

Ostrowski 1986 – Donald OSTROWSKI, Church Polemics and Monastic Land Acquisition in Sixteenth-Century Muscovy, “Slavonic and East European Review” 64 (1986), no. 3, 355-79

Ostrowski 1998 – Donald OSTROWSKI, Muscovy and the Mongols: Cross-Cultural Influences on the Steppe Frontier, 1304–1589, Cambridge 1998

Ostrowski 2003 – Дональд ОСТРОВСКИ, 500 лет спустя: Церковный Собор 1503 г., “Palaeoslavica” 11 (2003), 214-239

Ostrowski 2006<sup>a</sup> – Donald OSTROWSKI, The growth of Muscovy (1462-1533), in: The Cambridge History of Russia, vol. I From Early Rus' to 1689, ed. Maureen Perrie, Cambridge 2006, 213-239

- Ostrowski 2006<sup>b</sup> – Donald OSTROWSKI, “Moscow the Third Rome” as Historical Ghost, in: *Byzantium: Faith and Power (1261 – 1557). Perspectives on Late Byzantine Art and Culture*, ed. Sarah Brooks, New York 2006, 170-179.
- Pagliarioli 2004 – Stefano PAGLIAROLI, Giano Lascari e il Ginnasio Greco, “Studi medievali e umanistici”, 2 (2004), 215-293
- Cataldi Palau 2004 – Annaclara CATALDI PALAU, La vita di Marco Musuro alla luce di documenti e manoscritti, “Italia Medioevale e Umanistica”, 45 (2004), 295-370
- Panagiotakes 1995 – Nikolaos M. PANAGIOTAKES, The Italian Background of Early Cretan Literature, “Dumbarton Oaks Papers” 49 (1995), 281-323
- Papadopoullos 1990 – Theodore H. PAPADOPOULLOS, *Studies and Documents Relating to the History of the Greek Church and people under Turkish Domination*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. with supplementary material, Aldershot 1990
- Passek 1843 – [В. В. ПАССЕК], Историческое описание московского Симоново монастыря, Москва 1843
- Patrinelis 1971 – [Christos G. Patrinelis] Χρήστος Γ. ΠΑΤΡΙΝΕΛΗΣ, Δύο ανέκδοτα κείμενα περι τοῦ Μανοθῆλ Κορινθίου, “Πελοποννησιακά” (Athens) 8 (1971), 137-146
- Paun 2001 – Radu G. PĂUN, “La couronne est à Dieu”. Neagoe Basarab (1512-1521) et l’image du pouvoir pénitent, in: *L’empereur hagiographe. Culte des saints et monarchie byzantine et post-byzantine*, ed. Petre Guran, Bucarest 2001, 186-223
- Pavlov 1878 – А. С. ПАВЛОВ, Критические опыты по истории древнейшей греко-русской полемики против латинян. Санкт-Петербург 1878
- Pelikan 1971 – Jaroslav PELIKAN, *The Christian Tradition*, vol. 1: The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition: (100-600), Chicago - London 1971
- Pelikan 1974 – Jaroslav PELIKAN, *The Christian Tradition*, vol. 2: The Spirit of Eastern Christendom: (600-1700), Chicago - London 1974
- Pelikan 1978 – Jaroslav PELIKAN, *The Christian Tradition*, vol. 3: The Growth of Medieval Theology: (600-1300), Chicago - London 1978
- Pelissier 1896 – Leon-Gabriel J.B. PELISSIER, Louis XII et Ludovic Sforza (8 avril 1498 - 23 juillet 1500): Recherches dans les archives italiennes, Paris 1896
- Pierling 1906 – Paul PIERLING, *La Russie et le Saint-Siège*, vol. I, (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), Paris 1906
- Pieris 2003 – [Yiannis Pieris] Γιάννης ΠΙΕΡΗΣ, Ο Μάξιμος ο Γραικός και η κερκυραϊκή οικογένεια Τριβώλη, Δελτίο Αναγνωστικής Εταιρίας Κερκυρας [Bulletin of the Reading Society of Corfu], 25 (2003), 72-8.



Piovan 1997 – Francesco PIOVAN, entry: *Forteguerra (Carteromaco)*, *Scipione* in: DBI, 49 (1997), 163-7

Pippidi 2001 – Andrei PIPPIDI, L'Homélie prononcée par Etienne Cantacuzène, prince de Valachie (1716), in: *L'empereur hagiographe. Culte des saints et monarchie byzantine et post-byzantine*, ed. Petre Guran, Bucarest 2001, 281-293

Pippidi 2006 – Andrei PIPPIDI, Byzantins, Ottomans, Roumains. Le sud-est européen entre l'héritage impérial et les influences occidentales, Paris 2006

Pliguzov 1990 – Андрей И. ПЛИГУЗОВ, Апокрифические “правило святых отец 165 на обидящих Божия церкви”, in: Спорные вопросы отечественной истории XVI - XVIII веков. Тезисы докладов и сообщений Первых чтений, посвященных памяти А.А. Зимина, Москва, 1990, 221-24

Pliguzov 1992 – A. PLIGUZOV, Archbishop Gennadii and the Heresy of the “Judaizers”, “*Harvard Ukrainian Studies*” 16 (1992), no. 3/4, 269-288

Pliguzov 2002 – Андрей И. ПЛИГУЗОВ, Полемика в русской церкви первой трети столетия, Москва 2002

Podskalsky 1988 – Gerhard PODSKALSKY, Griechische Theologie in der Zeit der Türkenherrschaft (1453-1821): die Orthodoxie im Spannungsfeld der nachreformatorischen Konfessionen des Westens, München 1988

Podskalsky 1991 – Gerhard PODSKALSKY, entry: *Virtue*, in: ODB III, 2178

Podskalsky 1996 – (Gerhard PODSKALSKY) Герхард ПОДСКАЛЬСКИ, Христианство и богословская литература в Киевской Руси (988-1237 гг.), Санкт-Петербург 1996

Poe 2001 – Marshall POE, Moscow, the Third Rome: The Origins and Transformations of a “Pivotal Moment”, “*Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*”, Neue Folge, 49 (2001), H. 3, 412-429

Рокровскій 1971 – Николай Н. ПОКРОВСКИЙ, Судные списки Максима Грека и Исаака Собаки. Издание подготовил Николай Н. Покровский под редакцией С.О. Шмидта, Москва 1971; (reviewed by Н.В. СЕНИЦИНА, “*Вопросы истории*”, 1973, no. 2, 153 - 156)

Polizzotto 1994 – Lorenzo POLIZZOTTO, The Elect Nation. The Savonarolan Movement in Florence 1494-1545, Oxford 1994

Polizzotto 1998 – Lorenzo POLIZZOTTO, Savonarola, San Marco and the Reform, MD 29 (1998), 39-49

Pontani 1992 – Anna PONTANI, Per la biografia, le lettere, i codici, le versioni di Giano Lascaris, in: *Dotti Bizantini e libri Greci nell'Italia del secolo XV*, ed. M. Cortesi e E. V. Maltese, Napoli 1992, 363-433

Pontani 2002-2003 – Filippomaria PONTANI, Musurus' Creed, “*Greek Roman and Byzantine*

Studies” 43 (2002-2003), 175 - 213

Popov 1875 – А. Н. ПОПОВ, Историко-литературный обзор древне-русскихъ полемическихъ сочинений противъ латинянъ (XI-XV в.), Москва 1875

Pouderon 2009 – Bernard POUDERON, Introduction, in: Pseudo-Justin, Ouvrages Apologétiques (Exhortation aux Grecs, Discours aux Grecs, Sur la monarchie), SC 528, Paris 2009

Pozzi 1966 – Giovanni POZZI, Da Padova a Firenze nel 1493, “Italia Medioevale e Umanistica” 9 (1966), 191 – 227

Prokhorov 1989<sup>a</sup> – Г.М. ПРОХОРОВ, entry: *Нил Сорский* in: SKK 2

Prokhorov 1989<sup>b</sup> – Г.М. ПРОХОРОВ, entry: *Фотий, митрополит Киевский и вся Русь*, in: SKK 2

Quétif - Échard 1719-21 – Jacobus QUÉTIF, Jacobus ÉCHARD, Scriptorum ordinis praedicatorum recensiti notis historicis et criticis illustrati auctoribus, vol. 1-2, Lutetiae Parisiorum 1719-21

Redigonda 1960 – Abele L. REDIGONDA, entry: *Acciaiuoli, Zanobi*, in: DBI, 1 (1960), 93-4

Renouard 1834 – Antoine-Augustin RENOUARD, Annales de l'imprimerie des Alde ou histoire des trois Manuce et de leurs éditions, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, Paris 1834

Ricciardi 1984 – Roberto RICCIARDI, entry: *Cosmico, Niccolo Lelio*, in: DBI, 30 (1984), 72-6

Ridolfi 1981 – Roberto RIDOLFI, Vita di Girolamo Savonarola, Firenze 1981

Risaliti – Renato RISALITI, Massimo il Greco alla luce della più recente storiografia sovietica, MD 4 (1973), 392-403

Rogledi Manni 1980 – Teresa ROGLEDI MANNI, La tipografia a Milano nel XV secolo, Firenze 1980

Romero Pose 2006 – E. ROMERO POSE, entry: *Novato di Cartagine*, in: Nuovo dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane, vol. 2, 3351-2

Romodanovskaia 2000 – В.А. РОМОДАНОВСКАЯ, *Седе одесную отца или сидел еси?* К вопросу о грамматической правке Максима Грека, in: Проблемы истории, русской книжности, культуры и общественного сознания, Новосибирск 2000, 232-238

Romoli 2019 – Francesca ROMOLI, Писану видѣх / писано и вѣдах. Sulle fonti della *Povest' strašna* di Massimo il Greco, “Studi slavistici”, 16 (2019), 2, 199-218

Romoli 2020 – [Francesca ROMOLI] Франческа РОМОЛИ, Максим Грек на Западе. К реконструкции его пребывания в Италии, “Древняя Русь. Вопросы Мединистики”, 81 (2020), 3, 32-9

Romoli 2021 – Francesca ROMOLI, Massimo il Greco e gli ordini religiosi dell'occidente Esperienza ed evidenza documentaria nella testimonianza alla Moscovia cinquecentesca, Firenze 2021

Ropert 1992 – André ROPERT, La misère et la gloire: Histoire culturelle du monde russe de l'an mil à nos jours, Paris 1992

Rowland 1979 – Daniel ROWLAND, The Problem of Advice in Muscovite Tales about the Time of Troubles, "Russian History", 6 (1979), No. 2, 259-83

Rowland 1990 – Daniel ROWLAND, Did Muscovite Literary Ideology Place Limits on the Power of the Tsar (1540s-1660s)? RR 49 (1990), 125-55.

Rowland 1996 – Daniel ROWLAND, Moscow-The Third Rome or the New Israel? RR 55 (1996), no. 4, 591-614

Rowland 2007 – Daniel ROWLAND, Muscovy, in: European Political Thought 1450-1700: religion, law and philosophy, ed. by Howell A. Lloyd ... [et al.], New Haven 2007, 267-99

Rozemond 1965-66 – Keetje ROZEMOND, Aldus Manutius' Neakademia, Michael Trivolis en de Russische culturele centra in de zestiende eeuw, "Het Boek", 37 (1965-1966), fasc. 3, 163-177

Rubinstein 1991 – Nicolas RUBINSTEIN, Italian political thought, 1450-1530, in: The Cambridge history of political thought: 1450-1700, ed. by J. H. Burns, with the assistance of Mark Goldie, Cambridge 1991, 30-65

Runciman 1968 – Steven RUNCIMAN, The Great Church in Captivity, Cambridge 1968

Ryan 1999 – W. F. RYAN, The Bathhouse at Midnight: an historical survey of magic and divination in Russia, Sutton 1999

Rzhiga 1934 – Вячеслав Ф. РЖИГА, Опыты по истории русской публицистики XVI века. Максим Грек как публицист, TODRL 1 (1934), 5-120

Rzhiga 1935-36 – Вячеслав Ф. РЖИГА, Неизданные сочинения Максима Грека, BS 6 (1935-36), 85-108

Saffrey 1971 – Henri Dominique SAFFREY, Un humaniste dominicain, Jean Cuno de Nuremberg précurseur d'érasme à Bâle, "Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance" 33 (1971), 19-62

Saffrey 1996 – Henri Dominique SAFFREY, Les débuts de la théologie comme science (III<sup>e</sup>-VI<sup>e</sup> siècle), "Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques" 80 (1996), 201-220

Salakides 1995 – Georgios SALAKIDES, Sultansurkunden des Athos-Klosters Vatopedi aus der Zeit Bayezid II. und Selim I. Kritische Edition und wissenschaftlicher Kommentar, Thessaloniki 1995 (Institute for Balkan Studies 263)

Schatz 1990 – Klaus SCHATZ, *Der päpstliche Primat. Seine Geschichte von den Ursprüngen bis zur Gegenwart*, Würzburg 1990 (I used the Polish translation: Kraków 2004)

Schminck 1991 – Andreas SCHMINCK, entry: *Prochiron*, in: ODB, III, 1725

Schmitt 1965 – Charles B. SCHMITT, Gianfrancesco Pico's attitude toward his uncle, in: *L'opera e il pensiero di Giovanni Pico della Mirandola nella storia dell'umanesimo. II. Comunicazioni*, Firenze 1965, 305-313

Schmitt 1967 – Charles B. SCHMITT, Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola (1469-1533) and his Critique of Aristotle, The Hague 1967

Schultze 1963 – Bernhard SCHULTZE, *Maksim Grek als Theologe*, Rome 1963

Sels 2009 – Lara SELS, *The Slavonic De hominis opificio: Introduction to the Edition*, in: Gregory of Nyssa, *De hominis opificio / О образѣ чловѣка. The Fourteenth-Century Slavonic Translation. A critical Edition with Greek Parallel and Commentray* by Lara Sels, Köln Weimar Wien 2009

Serracino-Inglott 2002 – Peter SERRACINO-INGLOTT, Ficino the Priest, in: *Marsilio Ficino: his Theology, his Philosophy, his Legacy*, Ed. Michael J.B. ALLEN and Valery REES with Martin DAVIES, Leiden 2002 (Brill's Studies in Intellectual History 108), 1-14.

Sesboüé 1996 – Bernard SESBOÛÉ, *Histoire des dogmes*, IV, *La parole du salut*, Paris 1996

Sheremetevskii 2000 – В. ШЕРЕМЕТЕВСКИЙ, entry: *Варлаам, митрополит Всея Руси*, in: RBS, vol. VIII (Вавила - Витгенштейн), Москва 2000, 91-2.

Sherwood 1955 – St. Maximus the Confessor, *The ascetic life. The four centuries on charity*, translated and annotated by Polycarp Sherwood, New York 1955

Shevchenko 1954 – Ihor ŠEVČENKO, *A Neglected Byzantine Source of Muscovite Political Ideology*, "Harvard Slavic Studies" 2 (1954), 141-79

Shevchenko 1981 – Ihor ŠEVČENKO, *Remarks on the Diffusion of Byzantine Scientific and Pseudo-Scientific Literature among the Orthodox Slavs*, "The Slavonic and East European Review" 59 (1981), no. 3, 321-345

Shevchenko 1991 – Ihor ŠEVČENKO, *Byzantium and the Slaves in Letters and Culture*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1991

Shevchenko 1997 – Ihor ŠEVČENKO, *On the Greek poetic output of Maksim Grek*, BS 57 (1997), 1-70 [= "Palaeoslavica" 5 (1997), 181-276]. I quote following BS.

Shevchenko 1998<sup>a</sup> – И.И. ШЕВЧЕНКО (Ihor ŠEVČENKO), *О греческой поэтической продукции Максима Грека*, "Славяноведение" 3 (1998), 46-52

Shevchenko 1998<sup>b</sup> – Ihor ŠEVČENKO, *Regarding the Publication of the Article "On the Greek Poetic Output of Maksim Grek" by Professor Ihor Sevchenko: Reply*, "Palaeoslavica" 6 (1998),

303 [= BS 57 (1997), 430-431]

Shevchenko 2009 – И.И. ШЕВЧЕНКО (Ihor ŠEVČENKO), Четыре мира и две загадки Максима Грека, in: Море и берега. К 60-летию Сергея Павловича Карпова от коллег и учеников, ed. Р.М. Шукуров, Москва, 2009, 477-92

Špidlik 1956 – Thomas ŠPIDLIK, Joseph de Volokolamsk. Un chapitre de la spiritualité russe, Roma 1956

Siecienski 2010 – A. Edward SIECIENSKI, *The filioque: history of a doctrinal controversy*, Oxford 2010

Sinitsyna 1965<sup>a</sup> – Нина В. СИНИЦЫНА, Послание Максима Грека Василию III об устройстве афонских монастырей (1518 - 1519 гг.), VV 26 (1965), 110-136.

Sinitsyna 1965<sup>b</sup> – Нина В. СИНИЦЫНА, Послание константинопольского патриарха Фотия князю Михаилу Болгарскому в списках XVI в., TODRL 21 (1965), 96-125.

Sinitsyna 1972<sup>a</sup> – Нина В. СИНИЦЫНА, Максим Грек и Савонарола. О первом рукописном собрании сочинений Максима Грека, in: Феодалная Россия во всемирно-историческом процессе. Сборник статей посвящ. Л.В. Черкпнину, ed. В. Т. Паушто, Москва 1972, 149-156

Sinitsyna 1972<sup>b</sup> – Нина В. СИНИЦЫНА, Книжный мастер Михаил Медоварцев, in: Древнерусское искусство: Рукописная книга. Сборник 1, Москва 1972, 286-317

Sinitsyna 1973 – Нина В. СИНИЦЫНА, Review of Pokrovskii 1971, “Вопросы истории”, 1973, no. 2, 153 – 156

Sinitsyna 1977 – Нина В. СИНИЦЫНА, Максим Грек в России, Москва 1977

Sinitsyna 1990 – Нина В. СИНИЦЫНА, Спорные вопросы нестяжательства, или о логике исторического доказательства, in: Спорные вопросы отечественной истории XI - XVIII веков. Тезисы докладов и сообщений Первых чтений, посвященных памяти А.А. Зиминой, Москва, 1990, 250-4

Sinitsyna 1993-94 – Нина В. СИНИЦЫНА, Проект издания сочинений Максима Грека, “Cyrillomethodianum” (Thessaloniki), 17/18 (1993/94), 93-141

Sinitsyna 1997 – Нина В. СИНИЦЫНА, Два мира: возможности взаимопонимания, in: Kudriavcev 1997, 35-58

Sinitsyna 1998 – Нина В. СИНИЦЫНА, Третий Рим: Истоки и эволюция русской средневековой концепции (XV – XVI вв.), Москва 1998

Sinitsyna 2002<sup>a</sup> – Нина В. СИНИЦЫНА, Из истории полемики против латинян в XVI веке (о датировке и атрибуции некоторых сочинений Максима Грека), “Отечественная история” 2002, no. 6, 130-141

Sinitsyna 2002<sup>b</sup> – Нина В. СИНИЦЫНА, Типы монастырей и русский аскетический идеал (XV-XVI вв), in: Монашество и монастыри в России XI-XX века. Исторические очерки, ed. Н. В. Сеницына, Moscow 2002, 117-145

Sinitsyna 2006<sup>a</sup> – Нина В. СИНИЦЫНА, Сказания о преподобном Максиме Греке (XVI-XVIII вв.), Moscow 2006

Sinitsyna 2006<sup>b</sup> – Нина В. СИНИЦЫНА, Новые данные об итальянском периоде жизни преподобного Максима Грека, “Вестник церковной истории”, Москва 2006, no. 1, 193-199

Sinitsyna 2006<sup>c</sup> – Нина В. СИНИЦЫНА, Новые данные о российском периоде жизни преподобного Максима Грека, “Вестник церковной истории”, Москва 2006, no. 4, 221-236

Sinitsyna 2008<sup>a</sup> – Нина В. СИНИЦЫНА, О структуре и принципах издания, in: М-И, 9-14

Sinitsyna 2008<sup>b</sup> – Нина В. СИНИЦЫНА, Раннее творчество преподобного Максима Грека, in: М-И, 15-80

Sinitsyna 2014 – Нина В. СИНИЦЫНА, Творчество преподобного Максима Грека 30-50-х гг. XVI в. и собрание избранных сочинений из 47 глав, in: Преподобный Максим Грек, Сочинения, Том II, Москва 2014, 12-45

Skinner 2005 – Barbara SKINNER, rev. of (inter alia) Pliguzov 2002, “Kritika” 6 (2005), no. 2, 393-408

Smith 1999 – Jane I. SMITH, Islam and Christendom, in: The Oxford History of Islam, ed. John L. Esposito, Oxford 1999, 305-45

Smith 2006 – J. Warren SMITH, The Body of Paradise and the Body of the Resurrection: Gender and the Angelic Life in Gregory of Nyssa’s “De hominis opificio”, “The Harvard Theological Review”, 99, (2006), No. 2, 207-28

Sobolevskii 1903 – А. И. СОБОЛЕВСКИЙ, Переводная литература Московской Руси XIV – XVII веков, Библиографические материалы (Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук, т. 74), Санкт-Петербург 1903

Sokolov 1909 – И. СОКОЛОВ, О поводах к разводу в Византии IX - XV в., “Христианское чтение” 89 (1909), no. 10, 1289-1311; no. 11, 1420-1442; no. 12, 1565-1580

Solodkin 1998 – Я. Г. СОЛОДКИН, К датировке “Выписи” о втором браке Василия III, “Гуманитарные науки в Сибири”, Сер.: Отеч. История. 1998, no. 2, 59–63

Sottili 1993 – Agostino SOTTILI, L'Università di Pavia nella politica culturale sforzesca, in: idem, Università e cultura, Goldbach 1993

South 1999<sup>a</sup> – James B. SOUTH, entry: *Nifo* (Agostino), in: EoR, IV, 320-321

South 1999<sup>b</sup> – James B. SOUTH, entry: *Pomponazzi* (Pietro), in: EoR, V, 116-118

Speranskii 1960 – Михаил Н. СПЕРАНСКИЙ, Из истории русско-славянских литературных связей, Москва 1960

Speranzi 2010 – David SPERANZI, Michele Trivoli e Giano Lascari. Appunti su copisti e manoscritti greci tra Corfù e Firenze, “Studi Slavistici” 7 (2010), 263-97

Speranzi 2013 – David SPERANZI, Marco Musuro. Libri e scrittura, Roma 2013

Speranzi 2016 – David SPERANZI, Massimo il Greco a San Marco. Un nuovo manoscritto, in: *Mosty mostite*. Studi in onore di Marcello Garzaniti, ed. Alberto Alberti, Maria Chiara Ferro, Francesca Romoli, Firenze 2016

Sreznevskii 1958 – И. И. Срезневский, Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка по памятникам XI-XIV веков. В 3-х томах, Санкт-Петербург 1893-1903 (стереотипное издание Москва 1958)

Staikos 1998 – Konstantinos Sp. STAIKOS, Charta of Greek Printing. The Contribution of Greek Editors, Printers and Publishers to the Renaissance in Italy and the West, Vol. I: Fifteenth Century, Cologne 1998 (cf. however a very critical review: Martin Davies, “Library” 2000, 1, 453-455)

Staikos 2000 – Konstantinos Sp. STAIKOS, The printing shop of Nikolaos Vlastos and Zacharias Kallierges. 500 years from the establishment of the first Greek printing press, “La Bibliofilia” 102 (2000), no. 1, 11-32

Stewart 1997 – Alan STEWART, The singing boy and the scholar: the various deaths of Politian, in: Eros et Priapus. Erotisme et obscénité dans la littérature néo-latine; ed. Ingrid de Smet et Philip Ford, Genève 1997, 43-63

Strakhov 1994 – Olga STRAKHOV, The issue of a "Nonstandard" translation of the Holy Scriptures in Muscovite Rus'. Metropolitan Aleksij, Maksim Grek, Epifanij Slavineckij, in: Michael S. Flier and Daniel Rowland, eds., Medieval Russian Culture, Vol. 2, Berkeley 1994, 93-106

Stroev 1877 – П. СТРОЕВ, Списки Иерархов и настоятелей монастырей Россійскія Церкви, Санкт-Петербург 1877

Stylianopoulos 2009 – Theodore G. STYLIANOPOULOS, Scripture and tradition in the Church, in: The Cambridge Companion to Orthodox Christian Theology, ed. by Mary B. Cunningham and Elizabeth Theokritoff, Cambridge 2008, 21-34

Talbot 1991 – Alice-Mary TALBOT, entry: *Monasticism*, in: ODB II, 1392-4

Tavuzzi 1999 – Michael TAVUZZI OP, Savonarola and Vincent Bandello, AFP 59 (1999), 199-224

Telepnef 1945 – Basilio de TELEPNEF, Paracelsus: A genius amidst a Troubled World: a short essay on the life and the main works of this great physician, scientist and philosopher, St.

Gallen 1945

Thomson 1999 – Francis J. THOMSON, *The reception of Byzantine culture in Mediaeval Russia*, London 1999

Thunberg 1965 – Lars THUNBERG, *Microcosm and Mediator. The Theological Anthropology of Maximus the Confessor*, Lund 1965

Tikhomirov 1930 – М. ТИХОМИРОВ, *Новый памятник Московской политической литературы XVI в.* in: *Московский край в его прошлом. Очерки по соц. и экон. истории XVI-XIX веков*, vol. 2, Москва 1930, 105-114

Trinkaus 1999<sup>a</sup> – Charles TRINKAUS, entry: *Dignity of Man* in: *EoR*, vol II, 159-64

Trinkaus 1999<sup>b</sup> – Charles TRINKAUS, entry: *Paganism* in: *EoR*, vol. IV, 362-4

Tromby 1779 – Benedetto TROMBY, *Storia critico-cronologica diplomatica del patriarca S. Brunone e del suo ordine cartusiano*, vol. 9, Neapoli 1779

Tvorogov 1975 – Олег В. ТВОРОГОВ, *Древнерусские хронографы*, Ленинград 1975

Tvorogov 1989<sup>a</sup> – Олег В. ТВОРОГОВ, entry: *Мудрость Менандра* in: *SKK 2*

Tvorogov 1989<sup>b</sup> – Олег В. ТВОРОГОВ, entry: *Пчела* in: *SKK 2*

Ullman-Stadter 1972 – B.L. ULLMAN, Ph. A. STADTER, *The Public Library of Renaissance Florence. Niccolo Niccoli, Cosimo de' Medici and the Library of San Marco*, Padova 1972

Undolski 1870 – В. М. УНДОЛЬСКИЙ, *Славяно – русские рукописи В. М. Ундольскаго*, Москва 1870

Uthemann 1991 – Karl-Heinz UTHEMANN, entry: *Theology*, in: *ODB III*, 2057-60

Valdenberg 2006 – Владимир ВАЛЬДЕНБЕРГ, *Древнерусские учения о пределах царской власти*, Москва 2006

Vasoli 1988 – Cesare VASOLI, *The Renaissance concept of philosophy*, in: *CHRPh*, 55-74

Verbeke 1979 – Gerard VERBEKE, *La dignité de l'homme dans le traité "De hominis opificio" de Grégoire de Nysse*, "Roczniki Filozoficzne" (Lublin) 27 (1979), no. 1, 139-155

Verde 1983 – Armando F. VERDE, *La congregazione di San Marco dell'Ordine dei Frati Predicatori. Il "reale" della predicazione savonaroliana*, MD 14 (1983), 151-237

Verde, Studio - Armando F. VERDE, *Lo studio Fiorentino 1473 - 1503. Ricerche e Documenti*, vol. 1 - 4, Firenze 1973 - 1985

Vernazza 1964 – Giuseppe VERNAZZA, *Dizionario dei tipografi e dei principali correttori e intagliatori che operarono negli stati sardi di terraferma e più specialmente in Piemonte sino*



all'anno 1821, Torino 1964

Verner 2017 - Инна Вениаминовна ВЕРНЕР, К истории перевода Псалтыри Максимом Греком в 1522-1552 годах : хронология, текстология, методология, Славяноведение, 2 (2017), 40-54

Vikan 1991 – Gary VIKAN, entry: *Education*, in: ODB I, 677-8

Volovik 2000 – М. И. ВОЛОВИК, Из истории полемики по поводу “осуждения” Максима Грека, “Вестник Санкт-Петербургского Университета” 2000, Сер. 6, вып. 3, (no. 22), 148 - 150

Vranoussis 1978 – Léandros VRANOSSIS, *Les Conseils attribués au prince Neagoe (1512-1521) et le manuscrit autographe de leur auteur grec (ou la "question homérique" de la littérature slavo-roumaine enfin résolue!)*, Actes du IIe Congrès international des études Sud-Est européen, IV, Athènes 1978, 377-387

Weickhardt 2006 – George G. WEICKHARDT, Muscovite Judicial Duels as a Legal Fiction, “Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History” 7 (2006), no. 4, 713–32.

Weickhardt 2007 – George G. WEICKHARDT, Probable Western Origins of Muscovite Criminal Procedure, RR 66 (2007), 55-72

Weinstein 1970 – Donald WEINSTEIN, *Savonarola and Florence. Prophecy and Patriotism in the Renaissance*, Princeton 1970

Weinstein 1999 – Donald WEINSTEIN, entry: *Savonarola* in: EoR, V, 406-10

Weinstein 2011 – Donald WEINSTEIN, *Savonarola: the rise and fall of a Renaissance prophet*, New Haven 2011

Wieczynski 1969 – Joseph L. WIECZYNSKI, The Donation of Constantine in Medieval Russia, “The Catholic Historical Review” 55 (1969), no. 2, 159-172

Wilson 1992 – N.G. WILSON, *From Byzantium to Italy. Greek studies in the Italian Renaissance*, London 1992

Zachariadou 1996 – Elisabeth A. ZACHARIADOU, 'A safe and holy mountain': early Ottoman Athos, in: *Mount Athos and Byzantine Monasticism. Papers from the Twenty-eight Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies*, Birmingham, March 1994, ed. Anthony BRYER and Mary CUNNINGHAM, London 1996, 127-132

Zambelli 1965 – Paola ZAMBELLI, Giovanni Mainardi e la polemica sull'astrologia, in: *L'opera e il pensiero di Giovanni Pico della Mirandola nella storia dell'Umanesimo: Convegno internazionale (Mirandola: 15-18 settembre 1963)*, vol. II Comunicazioni, Firenze 1965, 205-279

Zambelli 1994 – Paola ZAMBELLI, Pomponazzi, i Greci e Ferrara, in: *Alla corte degli Estensi: filosofia, arte e cultura a Ferrara nei secoli XV e XVI*, ed. Marco Bertozzi, Ferrara

1994, 41-64

Zambelli 1996 – Paola ZAMBELLI, L'ambigua natura della magia: Filosofi, streghe, riti nel Rinascimento, Venezia 1996

Zhmakin 1880 – Василий ЖМАКИН, Памятник русской противокатолической полемики XVI века, “Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения” 1880, no. 10, 319-332

Zhmakin 1881 – Василий ЖМАКИН, Митрополит Даниил и его сочинения, Москва 1881

Zhurova 1996 – Людмила И. ЖУРОВА, “Послание Ивану IV” Максима Грека в составе Румянцевского собрания, in: Русское общество и литература позднего феодализма, Новосибирск 1996, 6-12

Zhurova 1997 – Людмила И. ЖУРОВА, О текстологических соотношениях сочинений Максима Грека в рукописных собраниях писателя, in: Проблемы межтекстовых связей, Барнаул 1997, 3-10

Zhurova 1998 – Людмила И. ЖУРОВА, “Послание митрополиту Даниилу” Максима Грека в составе рукописных собраний, in: История русской духовной культуры в рукописном наследии XVI-XX веков, Новосибирск 1998, 5-37

Zhurova 2001 – Людмила И. ЖУРОВА, Первое антилатинское послание Максима Грека в рукописных собраниях сочинении, in: Общественное сознание и литература XVI - XX вв, Новосибирск 2001, 43-74

Zhurova 2006 – Людмила И. ЖУРОВА, История антилатинской полемики в русской рукописной традиции и антилатинские сочинения Максима Грека, TODRL 57 (2006), 145-160

Zhurova 2008 – Людмила И. ЖУРОВА, Авторский текст Максима Грека: рукописная и литературная традиции. Часть I, Новосибирск 2008

Zhurova 2011 – Людмила И. ЖУРОВА, Авторский текст Максима Грека: рукописная и литературная традиции. Часть II. Сочинения, Новосибирск 2011

Zhurova 2016 – Людмила И. ЖУРОВА, Преподобный Максим Грек и митрополит Даниил: послания об иноческом жителстве, in: Труды Київської Духовної Академії, no. 25, Київ 2016, 45-53

Zimin 1961 – Александр А. ЗИМИН, Доктор Николай Булев - публицист и ученый медик, In: Исследования и материалы по древнерусской литературе, Москва 1961, 78-86

Zimin 1971 – Александр А. ЗИМИН, Максим Грек и Василий III в 1525г., VV 32 (1971), 61 - 84

Zimin 1972 – Александр А. ЗИМИН, Россия на пороге нового времени: (Очерки политической истории России первой трети XVI в.), Москва, 1972

Zimin 1976 – Александр А. ЗИМИН, Выпись о втором браке Василия III, TODRL 30 (1976), 132 – 148

Zimin 1977 – Александр А. ЗИМИН, Крупная феодальная вотчина и социально-политическая борьба в России (конец XV – XVI в.), Москва 1977

Zimin 1978 – Александр А. ЗИМИН, Государственный архив России XVI столетия. Опыт реконструкции, М. 1978, vol. 1-3

Zimin 1982 – Александр А. ЗИМИН, Россия на рубеже XV—XVI столетий (очерки социально-политической истории), Москва, 1982

Zimin 1988 – Александр А. ЗИМИН, Формирование боярской аристократии в России во второй половине XV — первой трети XVI в., Москва 1988