

This is an extract from:

Dumbarton Oaks Papers, No. 57

Symposium on Late Byzantine Thessalonike

Editor: Alice-Mary Talbot

Published by

Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection
Washington, D.C.

Issue year 2003

© 2004 Dumbarton Oaks

Trustees for Harvard University

Washington, D.C.

Printed in the United States of America

www.doaks.org/etexts.html

Intellectuals in Late Byzantine Thessalonike

FRANZ TINNEFELD

In all periods of Byzantine history the intellectuals formed a rather small but influential social group. The Palaiologan period, however, the last one of Byzantine history before the fall of Constantinople, was distinguished by a special intensity of intellectual life.¹

The notion “intellectuals” can be understood in a wider and in a narrower sense. In the wider sense, I define as a Byzantine intellectual any person sufficiently trained in the grammar, vocabulary, and style of ancient Greek, particularly Attic, authors to read and to write in that language, which was not identical with the everyday spoken language, but as a rule was used for written expression. Consequently, an intellectual in the wider sense was not only any person of whom written texts, or at least letters, have survived, but also any person known only as an addressee of letters or other literary works, which implied his/her ability to read and understand them and respond to them on a similar level, and even any person whose position in the hierarchy of the civil service required literacy. In the narrower sense, I term an intellectual any person who had a special reputation for his/her erudition or, through rhetorical activity, influence in public life. Since we are generally better informed about the latter persons, scholarly attention is, as a rule, more focused on these. This is also true for the present study, which is confined to intellectuals in Thessalonike during the late Byzantine period. As an “intellectual in Thessalonike” I define any person who lived for some time in the city and during that time participated in an intellectual activity.

In the late Byzantine period, from 1246 to 1387 or 1423, Thessalonike and, from the mid-fourteenth century, Mistra in the Peloponnesos were the only cities in the empire that competed to a certain extent with the capital, Constantinople. This is especially true of Thessalonike as it was time and again a residence of Byzantine empresses, princes, and even emperors, who perhaps encouraged achievements in intellectual life to some extent,² although we have little evidence on this influence. Another characteristic of late Byzantine Thessalonike was the active role its citizens played in public life. This also implied discord, splitting into groups and parties, and competing for political influence and power. Evi-

¹ Cf. E. Fryde, *The Early Palaeologan Renaissance (1261–c. 1360)* (Leiden–Boston–Cologne, 2000); K.-P. Matschke and F. Tinnefeld, *Die Gesellschaft im späten Byzanz. Gruppen, Strukturen und Lebensformen* (Cologne–Weimar–Vienna, 2001), chap. 5, “Die Gruppe der literarisch Gebildeten in der spätbyzantinischen Gesellschaft,” 221–385.

² K. Konstantinides, “Οι άπαρχές της πνευματικής άκμής στη Θεσσαλονίκη κατά τόν 14ο αιώνα,” *Δωδώνη* 21 (1992): 133–50, at 135 (with references to earlier publications on the matter).

dence for this is in some special cases provided by historians of the period, but can even more be derived from several appeals of the intellectuals to the citizens to live in harmony.

Since in earlier times as well outstanding intellectuals lived in the city, as for instance the famous metropolitan Eustathios in the late twelfth century, it is no wonder that in *encomia* of the late period Thessalonike is sometimes praised as a traditional and permanent center of intellectual life which particularly implied rhetorical activity. Although the praise often seems to be exaggerated, it is perhaps worthwhile to quote as an example the following passage from an *encomium* of St. Demetrios, the patron of Thessalonike, written by the well-known fourteenth-century theologian Nicholas Kabasilas Chamaëtos.³ “The city [Thessalonike] has many adornments, but the most important one and that which affords it the greatest distinction is its rhetorical force, a characteristic that is admired [there] more than in other cities. This city has such a special relationship with Hellenic speech and is so rich in this grace that on the one hand it is sufficient to secure its own happiness; but in addition this city can also impart [this grace] to other cities, transplanting words like colonies founded by the rulers of ancient Athens. Consequently there is none, I think, of all the Hellenes in our empire who does not call this city his ancestor and the mother of his Muses, since by claiming such descent he appears respectable.” Continuing this encomiastic passage on his hometown, Kabasilas refers to its rhetoricians, philosophers, and authors of belles lettres who in his opinion can be found in Thessalonike more than in any other city, and he asserts that these intellectuals have the power to influence the style of any Hellene who wants to write like Euripides, even if he had not been previously inspired by the Muses. Then Kabasilas also mentions the divine philosophy of the monks and their life on the holy mountain, Athos. There is, obviously, in his opinion no strict borderline between profane and spiritual education; profane and spiritual “philosophers” are considered and honored side by side in one passage.

From the modern point of view there is no common characteristic between philosophers and monks, but under the influence of the Christian fathers the understanding of the terms was different in Byzantium. The notion φιλοσοφία, which since the time of the ancient Greek philosophers meant “investigation into the crucial questions of human existence,” was from early Christian times understood in a double sense, since the church fathers distinguished between pagan philosophy (ἔξωθεν φιλοσοφία) on the one hand and the true philosophy of Christian belief and imitation of Jesus Christ on the other. A consequence of this distinction is that first the martyrs and then the monks as the uncompromising followers of Christ were called “philosophers.”⁴ But even if we do not adopt the Byzantine point of view, we should nevertheless include Byzantine theological and even spiritual authors in the category of intellectuals, since they shared with the others a basic literary and linguistic education. In this connection I refer to a passage from a letter of

³ Nicholas Kabasilas, “Προσφώνημα εἰς τὸν ἔνδοξον τοῦ Χριστοῦ μεγαλομάρτυρα Δημήτριον τὸν Μυροβλύτην,” in Th. Ioannou, *Μνημεῖα ἀγιολογικά* (Venice, 1884), 67–114, at 70. This work is mentioned as just completed in one of Kabasilas’ letters; cf. P. Enepekides, “Der Briefwechsel des Mystikers Nikolaos Kabasilas. Kommentierte Textausgabe,” *BZ* 46 (1953): 18–46, at 31, letter 3, line 19f. According to R.-J. Loenertz, “Chronologie de Nicolas Cabasilas 1345–1354,” *OCP* 21 (1955): 205–31, at 224–26 (repr. in idem, *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, vol. 1, ed. P. Schreiner [Rome, 1970], 303–28, at 321 f), letter 3 could be dated to 1351/52.

⁴ F. Dölger, “Zur Bedeutung von φιλόσοφος und φιλοσοφία in byzantinischer Zeit,” in *Τεσσαρακονταετηρίς Θεοφίλου Βορέα*, vol. 1 (Athens, 1940), 125–36; repr. in F. Dölger, *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt* (Ettal, 1953; repr. Darmstadt, 1964), 197–208. Cf. also G. Podskalsky, *Theologie und Philosophie in Byzanz* (Munich, 1977), 18–22.

Emperor Manuel II, written to Metropolitan Gabriel of Thessalonike around 1410, where the emperor is concerned about the decay of education and literary activity in his time, especially since education, in his opinion, is necessary to understand the doctrines (δόγματα) of faith, and this understanding is, on the other hand, necessary for a pious life.⁵

I begin this discussion of intellectuals in late Byzantine Thessalonike with a short general survey on the most important figures, followed by a more detailed account of the intellectual activities of these authors, divided into the following four categories: (1) exchange of letters as a basic source for intellectual life, (2) scholarly activities, (3) teaching, and (4) public speeches and sermons, especially as a source for political and social commitment of intellectuals.

After the Byzantine reconquest of Thessalonike in 1246, the first outstanding intellectual in the city seems to have been a certain John Pothos Peditasimos, whose identity was recently reconsidered in a convincing manner from a puzzle of source material by Costas Constantinides.⁶ Peditasimos, born in Thessalonike in the 1340s, seems to have acquired only an elementary and perhaps a secondary education in his hometown. At any rate, for studies on a higher level he went to Constantinople, where he finally was appointed consul of the philosophers (*hypatos ton philosophon*), probably by Emperor Michael VIII.⁷ He became a deacon of the Orthodox church around 1270, ca. 1280 *chartophylax* of the *metropolis* of Achrida (Ochrid), and in 1284 *megas sakellarios* of the *metropolis* of Thessalonike. From that time on he lived in Thessalonike, until his death between 1310 and 1314. From the fact that he pursued his higher studies in the capital, we may assume that before the 1280s intellectual life in Thessalonike was not yet very well developed. From Peditasimos' correspondence we learn of a few intellectuals in Thessalonike, such as Demetrios Beaskos, Petros Tziskos, and George Phobenos, who were, however, less important.⁸ In the next generation we find already several outstanding intellectuals in the city. The oldest of them was Joseph Rhakendytes, the "Philosopher," born on Ithaca around 1260, who seems to have lived mostly in Thessalonike during the years 1300–1308, and again from 1326 until his death ca. 1330.⁹ For some time he was the teacher and spiritual guide of Thomas with the family name Magistros, a native of Thessalonike, who was born ca. 1275 and became a monk, named Theodoulos, in a monastery of the city between 1324 and 1328;¹⁰ he was active in a number of intellectual fields, primarily in philology. A contemporary of Magistros was Demetrios Triklinios, born ca. 1280, known as the only serious textual

⁵ G. T. Dennis, *The Letters of Manuel II Palaeologus: Text, Translation, and Notes* (Washington, D.C., 1977), 149, letter 52.

⁶ C. N. Constantinides, *Higher Education in Byzantium in the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries (1204–ca. 1310)* (Nicosia, 1982), 117–25. Cf. also *PLP* 22235, and K. Konstantinides, "Οἱ ἀπαρχές," 142–44.

⁷ Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 120 and note 28; R. Romano, *Costantino Acropolita, Epistole* (Naples, 1991), 216, letter 121, lines 15–18.

⁸ Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 120 f. The five preserved letters of John Peditasimos have been edited by M. Treu, *Theodori Peditasimi eiusque amicorum quae extant* (Potsdam, 1899), 44–48.

⁹ D. Stiernon, "Joseph le Philosophe," *DSp* 8 (1974), 1387–92; M. Treu, "Der Philosoph Joseph," *BZ* 8 (1899): 1–64, with the edition of an *encomium* on Joseph, composed by Theodore Metochites. Metochites refers to Joseph's presence in Thessalonike and its environs on pp. 8–18. According to A. Hohlweg, "Johannes Aktuarios, Leben—Bildung und Ausbildung—De methodo medendi," *BZ* 76 (1983): 302–21, at 304 and note 20, Joseph was not born ca. 1280, but very probably already ca. 1260.

¹⁰ *PLP* 16045. St. K. Skalistes, *Θωμάς Μάγιστρος. Ο βίος και το έργο του* (Thessalonike, 1984), 30 f, gives convincing reasons for the fact that Magistros is his family name. The year of his birth is discussed by R. Aubretton, *Démétrius Triclinius et les recensons médiévales de Sophocle* (Paris, 1949), 19, and by Skalistes, *ibid.*, 28 f, both of whom argue for 1275. Skalistes also discusses the time he became a monk, *ibid.*, 46 f.

philologist of the whole Byzantine period; he seems to have lived in Thessalonike, although there is no sure evidence for this.¹¹ Isidore Boucheir,¹² born in Thessalonike shortly before 1300, was active there as a teacher and spiritual guide during a longer period before his patriarchate in 1347–50.

Between 1330 and 1350 two outstanding lawyers composed their law handbooks in Thessalonike, the monk Matthew Blastares¹³ and Constantine Harmenopoulos.¹⁴ Gregory Palamas,¹⁵ the leader of a spiritual movement, hesychasm, and creator of a special theological system, was born in Asia Minor and only in his last years came in closer touch with Thessalonike. Although he was named metropolitan of the city in 1347, he could not get to his see before 1350, but even then he did not live there permanently, before he died in 1357. The theologian Neilos Kabasilas,¹⁶ probably born in Thessalonike around 1300, mastered also Western theology and seems to have been the most influential teacher of Demetrios Kydones during his younger years, very probably in Thessalonike, although in his later years Neilos lived in Constantinople. There he wrote a treatise against the “Latins,” an attempt to refute scholasticism, but found a declared opponent in his former student Kydones.¹⁷ Not earlier than 1360 Neilos became metropolitan of Thessalonike, but died shortly after, ca. 1362, not having taken up residence there.

His student Demetrios Kydones,¹⁸ born in Thessalonike ca. 1324, spent his youth there until 1345 and from 1347 lived in Constantinople, but until his late years kept in touch with his friends in Thessalonike. The same seems to be true for his fellow student Nicholas Kabasilas Chamaëtos.¹⁹ After having come to Constantinople at the invitation of Emperor John Kantakouzenos, Nicholas seems to have stayed there most of his lifetime, but no less than Kydones maintained connections with his hometown.²⁰ A presumed relative of Demetrios Kydones, George Gabrielopoulos Kydones, called “the Philosopher,” apparently lived in the city only in his youth and never returned in his later years.²¹ The letters

¹¹ *PLP* 29317; cf. Aubreton, *Triclinius*, 21.

¹² *PLP* 3140. On his life and activities, cf. F. Tinnefeld, *Demetrios Kydones, Briefe*, 4 vols. (Stuttgart, 1981–2003), 1.1: 158–63. His assumed last name “Boucheiras” should be corrected to “Boucheir”; cf. *ibid.*, 1.1: 160, note 1.

¹³ *PLP* 2808; bibliography on Blastares: Skalistes, *Μάγιστρος*, 287 note 50.

¹⁴ *PLP* 1347.

¹⁵ *PLP* 21546.

¹⁶ *PLP* 10102. Cf. also Tinnefeld, *Briefe*, 1.1: 259 f.

¹⁷ There is no doubt that Kydones refers to Neilos as his teacher, although he does not mention his name, in his *Apology I*; cf. G. Mercati, *Notizie di Procoro e Demetrio Cidone* (Vatican City, 1931), p. 390, line 1006–p. 394, line 1088. In Constantinople, Neilos taught his nephew Nicholas Kabasilas Chamaëtos, according to a letter of Nicholas, ed. P. Enepekides, “Briefwechsel,” 29, no. 1, line 1. R.-J. Loenertz, “Chronologie,” 208 and 215 (also *idem*, *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, 1: 306 and 312) corrected the dating of the letter convincingly from 1320 to shortly after 1347. On the controversy between Neilos and Kydones, cf. Podskalsky, *Theologie und Philosophie*, 180–206; *ODB* 2: 1087 f, “Kabasilas, Neilos.” Neilos wrote his treatise against scholasticism (*Περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐκπορεύσεως κατὰ Λατίνων*) after he had read the *Summa contra gentiles* and parts of the *Summa theologiae* of Thomas Aquinas in the translation of Kydones. His treatise has only been partly edited so far by E. Candal, *Nilus Cabasilas et theologia S. Thomae de processione spiritus sancti* (Vatican City, 1945). Neilos’ arguments were refuted by Kydones’ (unedited) treatise in defense of Thomas Aquinas; cf. Tinnefeld, *Briefe*, 1.1: 63, no. 1, line 1.

¹⁸ For his biography cf. Tinnefeld, *Briefe*, 1.1: 4–52. Demetrios’ younger brother Prochoros, also born in Thessalonike and a highly educated intellectual, entered the Megiste Lavra on Mount Athos at a young age, and from then, as far as we know, his connections with the city were rather loose.

¹⁹ *PLP* 30589.

²⁰ Loenertz, “Chronologie,” 215 f or 312 f respectively.

²¹ Cf. F. Tinnefeld, “Georgios Philosophos. Ein Korrespondent und Freund des Demetrios Kydones,” *OCP* 28 (1972): 141–71. Additions to his biography: Tinnefeld, *Briefe*, 1.2: 310 f (II, BE); 3: 111 f (II, BE), 137 (X1, X4).

of Demetrios Kydones addressed to a rhetor and politician Tarchaneiotēs, whose first name was very probably Manuel, document a long-lasting connection with a friend and fellow student of Kydones' youth in Thessalonike. Also Kydones' extensive correspondence with Rhadenos, a former student who mostly lived in Thessalonike, should be mentioned here.²²

During the years 1382–87, the co-emperor Manuel II stayed in Thessalonike, in order to defend the city against the Turks. This well-educated ruler, a student of Demetrios Kydones, should certainly be included among the intellectuals in Thessalonike. His presence in the city is well documented by numerous letters he received from Kydones, and also by some letters he wrote to him.²³ To believe Kydones, the level of education in Thessalonike at the time of Manuel's stay was rather low. In one of his letters to the emperor he regretted that only a few people in his audience were educated enough to understand the refined style of a speech of counsel Manuel had given to the citizens.²⁴ But during that period there was by no means a total lack of intellectuals in Thessalonike. Particularly a certain Constantine Ibankos, who lived as a rhetorician, lawyer, and teacher in the city, seems to have provided constant moral support and counsel to the emperor during those years.²⁵

Between 1380 and 1430 there were three intellectual metropolitans in Thessalonike who determined the image of the intellectuals in this final phase. The first was Isidore Glabas,²⁶ born in 1342, monk since 1375, metropolitan of Thessalonike from 1380 until his death in 1396. He was a highly educated man, as can be assumed from his work (sermons, treatises, and letters, which show both his classical and theological education), but we have no information about his studies or teachers. Glabas' successor in the see of Thessalonike was Gabriel,²⁷ son of a priest and diocesan official in Thessalonike. He became a monk in his youth, in 1374 abbot of a monastery in Thessalonike, and after 1384 abbot of the Chora monastery in Constantinople. He returned in 1394 to Thessalonike, which was then in Turkish hands. From 1397 to 1416/19 metropolitan of the city, he tried successfully to obtain from the Turks milder treatment for his flock and proved to be a distinguished preacher, especially after Byzantine government was restored in 1403. The last of the intellectual metropolitans in Thessalonike was Symeon.²⁸ Born in Constantinople between 1370 and 1390, he was named metropolitan of Thessalonike in 1416/17. In 1423, when the city was handed over to the Venetians, he went for some time to Mount Athos, but soon returned and died in Thessalonike, shortly before its conquest by the Turks in March 1430. He was for a long time only known for his theological work, but since some of his

²² For Tarchaneiotēs cf. F. Tinnfeld, "Demetrios Kydones: His Cultural Background and Literary Connections in Thessalonike," *Macedonian Studies* 6, n.s. 2 = 3 (1989): 33–43, at 37; idem, *Briefe*, 1.1: 218–21. For Rhadenos: idem, "Freundschaft und παιδεία: Die Korrespondenz des Demetrios Kydones mit Rhadenos (1375–1387/8)," *Byzantion* 55 (1985): 210–44.

²³ Cf. G. T. Dennis, *The Reign of Manuel II Palaeologus in Thessalonica, 1382–1387* (Rome, 1960); Tinnfeld, *Briefe*, vol. 3, passim; Dennis, *Letters*, nos. 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11.

²⁴ Cf. Tinnfeld, *Briefe*, 3: 115, no. 265.

²⁵ Cf. Dennis, *Letters*, XLVI.

²⁶ B. Ch. Christophorides, "Ο Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Θεσσαλονίκης Ἰσίδωρος Γλαβᾶς καί τὰ κοινωνικά προβλήματα τῆς ἐποχῆς του," *Ἐπ. Ἐπ. Θεο. Σχο. Παν. Θεσ.* 29 (1986–89): 517–91. Christophorides (*ibid.*, 532) names Glabas in a line of intellectual bishops (λόγιοι ἐπίσκοποι) of Thessalonike together with Eustathios (12th century), Gregory Palamas, Neilos Kabasilas, Gabriel, and Symeon (*ibid.*, 532).

²⁷ Dennis, *Letters*, XLII–XLIV.

²⁸ D. Balfour, "Saint Symeon of Thessalonike as a Historical Personality," *GOTR* 28 (1983): 55–72.

other writings on different subjects were published by David Balfour in 1979,²⁹ we know more about his pastoral and political activity.

After this brief outline I will try to specify the contributions of the Thessalonian intellectuals in different fields of activity, beginning with some remarks on the exchange of letters. A contemporary of John Pothos Pediasimos and his colleague in the ecclesiastical service was John Staurakios, a hagiographer who appears in a document of 1284 as *chartophylax* of the *metropolis* of Thessalonike in that year. Thirteen letters addressed to him by his friend Patriarch Gregory of Cyprus have survived. He not only copied a manuscript of Plato for him, but also was author of an *encomium* of St. Demetrios.³⁰ From the scholar Thomas Magistros we have only twelve letters.³¹ The report in the form of a letter which he addressed to Joseph the Philosopher³² is of special interest. Here he praises Joseph not only as his teacher, but also for his commitment toward the social problems of Thessalonike, at the time when Joseph had just left for Constantinople in the winter of 1307/8.

The assumption of Jean Verpeaux that the letters and works of the statesman Nikephoros Choumnos were read in a circle of intellectuals in Thessalonike, assembled by Theodore Xanthopoulos, is obviously erroneous. The letter of Choumnos quoted by Verpeaux alludes to such a circle, but there is no mention of Thessalonike, and since Choumnos complains that Xanthopoulos did not visit him when he was ill, it is much more probable that both of them lived in Constantinople, the more so since there is no positive evidence at all that Theodore ever lived in Thessalonike.³³ So it is also probable that Choumnos' other letters to Xanthopoulos³⁴ were sent to an address in Constantinople. That he lived in Constantinople is also confirmed by a poem of the statesman Theodore Metochites dedicated to Theodore Xanthopoulos.³⁵

Rich evidence about intellectuals in Thessalonike is available in the correspondence

²⁹ D. Balfour, *Politico-Historical Works of Symeon, Archbishop of Thessalonica (1416/1417 to 1429). Critical Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary* (Vienna, 1979).

³⁰ Cf. Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 36 note 21, 121 note 40, 127. Staurakios also composed a rhetorical metaphorical work (late 9th century) on Theodora of Thessalonike (9th century): E. Kurtz, *Des Klerikers Gregorios Bericht über Leben, Wundertaten und Translation der heiligen Theodora von Thessalonich nebst der Metaphrase des Joannes Staurakios* (St. Petersburg, 1902). Cf. the review of P. Maas, *BZ* 12 (1903): 620–23 (with critical remarks on the style of Staurakios).

³¹ PG 145: 403–26, 429–46; Skalistes, *Μάγιστρος*, 186–216. On the letter addressed to the abbot Isaac in Thessalonike which contains a report on an embassy of Magistros to Constantinople, cf. Skalistes, *Μάγιστρος*, 190–98, and M. Treu, “Die Gesandtschaftsreise des Rhetors Theodulos Magistros,” *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* Suppl. 27 (1902): 5–30, at 5–18.

³² J. F. Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca e codicibus regiis*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1830; repr. Hildesheim, 1962), 212–28, reprinted, with faulty Latin translation, in PG 145: 431–46; cf. Treu, “Der Philosoph Joseph,” 47 f (with critical remarks on the quality of the edition). Skalistes, *Μάγιστρος*, 186–89 (at 187, the year 1309).

³³ J. Verpeaux, *Nicéphore Choumnos: Homme d'état et humaniste byzantin (ca. 1250/1255–1327)* (Paris, 1959), 68; J. F. Boissonade, *Anecdota Nova* (Paris, 1844; repr. Hildesheim, 1962), 36–38, no. 31. According to *PLP* 20816, Theodore Xanthopoulos lived in Constantinople. Cf. also A. Sideras, *Die byzantinischen Grabreden* (Vienna, 1994), 288–90.

³⁴ Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, nos. 2, 3, 31–35, 124 f, 130, 131, 137–41, 145–47, 150.

³⁵ The poem has been edited, with English translation, by J. Featherstone, “Theodore Metochites's Eleventh Poem,” *BZ* 81 (1988): 253–64. Metochites refers to frequent conversations between Metochites and Xanthopoulos (p. 254 f, lines 1–34), undoubtedly in Constantinople where Metochites used to live, and also tells us that Theodore passed his days in the church of Hagia Sophia at Constantinople (p. 259, lines 212–43).

of the outstanding scholar and author Nikephoros Gregoras.³⁶ In the following I give an overview of his most important correspondents. The sequence of his correspondence with Thomas Magistros, reconstructed by Leone,³⁷ is the following. In 1331/32 Gregoras wrote a letter in a very learned style to him, to win his friendship. Magistros answered with enthusiastic warmth and assured him that he had been already for a long time his friend because of his extraordinary reputation. In his answer of 1332, Gregoras accepts and returns this expression of friendship. But from two later letters we learn that Gregoras in vain had waited for further correspondence.³⁸ Had Magistros' enthusiasm so soon cooled off, or were there other reasons for his silence, for instance, an illness? We do not know.

From Gregoras' two letters to Joseph the Philosopher³⁹ we learn that the latter had returned from Constantinople to Thessalonike early in 1326. The first of these letters (dated 1326/28) is testimony of the high reputation Joseph enjoyed by that time. This is particularly documented by the remark that, if Joseph threw with closed eyes a stone into any crowd of people, he would surely hit one of his admirers. Furthermore, Gregoras here expresses his reverence for Joseph's main work, the "Synopsis of Sciences." Also the second letter, written no later than 1330, is a witness to Gregoras' reverence for Joseph.

Gregory Akindynos' admiration for Gregoras was aroused by his friend Balsamon, when he showed him in summer 1332 a letter from the scholar, containing learned information on astronomy. Sometime before Akindynos had come from Pelagonia to Thessalonike to study with Thomas Magistros and the archdeacon Gregory Bryennios,⁴⁰ Akindynos wrote a letter full of admiration to Gregoras and called him a "sea of wisdom."⁴¹ Gregoras' reaction was an appropriately warm one, and he even made a pun on the name "Akindynos" with an allusion to Pindar.⁴² In a second letter to Gregoras from Thessalonike, Akindynos expressed his delight at Gregoras' promise to be his friend.⁴³ Sometime after 1336, Gregoras sent one of his works to Akindynos' teacher Bryennios and asked him to hand it over to Magistros.⁴⁴ There is also a letter of Bryennios from the late 1330s which confirms receipt of Gregoras' *encomium* of Emperor Andronikos III. Here Bryennios stresses that he himself and other people, particularly "the *didaskalos* who extremely reveres your works," admire the speech; this "teacher" is very probably Thomas Magistros.⁴⁵ The *protonotarios* Nicholas Lampenos, author of an *encomium* of St. Demetrios, sent

³⁶ P. A. M. Leone, *Nicephori Gregorae Epistulae*, vol. 2 (Matino, 1982); idem, "La corrispondenza di Niceforo Gregora," *Quaderni del Siculorum Gymnasium* 8 = *Studi di filologia bizantina* 2 (1980): 183–232.

³⁷ Leone, "La corrispondenza," 203 f.

³⁸ Leone, *Epistulae*, 243–47, no. 91 (Gregoras); 388 f, no. 3 (Magistros); 348, no. 142 (Gregoras). Gregoras in vain waiting for letters: 161 f, no. 49 (Gregoras); 163, no. 51 (Gregoras).

³⁹ Leone, "La corrispondenza," 197 f; idem, *Epistulae*, 71–76, no. 22; 157–60, no. 46.

⁴⁰ A. C. Hero, *Letters of Gregory Akindynos* (Washington, D.C., 1983), p. x. For Bryennios, *sakelliou*, archdeacon, and *dikaiophylax* in the *metropolis* of Thessalonike 1328–51, cf. *PLP* 3253. For Balsamon of whom a letter to Gregoras has survived (Leone, *Epistulae*, 403 f, no. 11) cf. *PLP* 2112.

⁴¹ Leone, *Epistulae*, 390 f, no. 4; Hero, *Akindynos*, 2–5, no. 1. On the question of which letter of Gregoras Akindynos alludes to, cf. *ibid.*, 309 f.

⁴² Leone, *Epistulae*, 257–60, no. 99; cf. Leone, "La corrispondenza," 215. Allusion to Pindar, *Ol.* 6.9 (ἀκίνδυνοι δ' ἀρεταί): no. 99, line 15.

⁴³ Hero, *Akindynos*, 4–10, no. 2.

⁴⁴ Leone, *Epistulae*, 347, no. 141.

⁴⁵ Leone, *Epistulae*, 404 f, no. 12. For the *didaskalos* cf. *ibid.*, line 26.

his work to Gregoras for review.⁴⁶ Perhaps identical with this Nicholas is Lampenos Tarchaneiotos, an unreserved admirer of Gregoras' style, who praises Gregoras' speech on the same saint.⁴⁷ There are four letters of Gregoras to his fatherly friend and mentor Maximos, abbot of the Chortaïtes monastery in Thessalonike, who like Gregoras was a native of Herakleia in Pontos.⁴⁸

The four letters of Gregory Akindynos to the Calabrian monk and humanist Barlaam deserve special mention. In 1331 in Thessalonike the young Akindynos met him for the first time, when Barlaam had left Constantinople after his disputation with Gregoras. Although Akindynos maintained an amicable relationship with Barlaam, he never was his disciple, and both of them stayed in Thessalonike for only a short time.⁴⁹

The correspondence of Demetrios Kydones with his friend Tarchaneiotos and with Emperor Manuel in Thessalonike has already been mentioned in the general survey. From the correspondence of metropolitan Isidore Glabas with learned people of his time, clerics and laymen, only eight letters have survived.⁵⁰ But there is also one letter of Demetrios Kydones addressed to him,⁵¹ from which we learn that Glabas had criticized the conversion of Kydones to Roman Catholicism as well as his antihesychastic point of view and had in vain attempted to win him over for the orthodox and hesychastic position.

We have two letters of Emperor Manuel to the metropolitan Gabriel, dating from 1408–10 and 1411 respectively.⁵² The first of these is a typical sample of an intellectual correspondence: Manuel is sending him his oration "On Sin and Penance" to have it judged by him, but his point is not the theological content; he apologizes only for the low stylistic level in comparison to ancient literature and at the same time defends contemporary literary activity, although the quality of ancient style could never be reached any more. Demetrios Chrysoloras, a member of Manuel's literary circle in Constantinople, was named *mesazon* of John VII in Thessalonike in autumn 1403 and stayed there until September 1408.⁵³ From his correspondence with Manuel II in Constantinople during that time we have five letters of the emperor.⁵⁴ In letter 43 Manuel teases Chrysoloras about a noble horse he had newly acquired and which would perhaps prevent him from continuing his philosophical studies, a concern typical for the correspondence of intellectuals.

I now turn to the scholarly work of intellectuals insofar as it is likely to have been carried out in Thessalonike. This seems to be true for a number of philological editions of and

⁴⁶ Leone, *Epistulae*, 383 f, no. 1. The text of this speech seems to be lost (Leone, *ibid.*, 303, note on line 26). For Lampenos cf. *PLP* 14431. For other speeches in honor of St. Demetrios see above, text with note 30; below, note 105, (1); text with notes 110, 111, 113, and in addition an *encomium* on St. Demetrios, composed by Patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos, born in Thessalonike, ed. D. G. Tsames, *Φιλοθέου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως του Κοκκίνου Ἀγιολογικά ἔργα* (Thessalonike, 1985), 31–60.

⁴⁷ Leone, *Epistulae*, 411–14, no. 17. For Lampenos Tarchaneiotos, perhaps identical with Nicholas Lampenos, cf. *PLP* 14432.

⁴⁸ Leone, "La corrispondenza," 196 f; *idem*, *Epistulae*, 65 f, no. 20b; 67–71, no. 21; 260–62, no. 100a; 262–64, no. 100b. For Maximos cf. *PLP* 16785.

⁴⁹ Hero, *Akindynos*, XI–XIII. On Barlaam cf. *PLP* 2284. Letters of Akindynos to Barlaam: Hero, *ibid.*, 20–54, nos. 7–10.

⁵⁰ Christophorides, "Γλαβᾶς," 523, 532 f.

⁵¹ Tinnefeld, *Briefe*, 3: 46–53, no. 244.

⁵² Dennis, *Letters*, 148–50, no. 52; 160–63, no. 57.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, xxxiv f.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 116 ff, nos. 43, 44, 46, 48, 50.

commentaries on ancient authors. So we can assume that John Pothos Pediasimos here commented on Aristotle's *Analytica Priora* and *Posteriora* and on *De interpretatione*.⁵⁵ Also two outstanding experts of textual philology seem to have lived and worked, at least for the most part, in Thessalonike, Thomas Magistros and Demetrios Triklinios, although for Magistros the evidence for residence there is more certain than for Triklinios. Both scholars revised and commented on texts of the following ancient authors: Hesiod, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, Pindar, and Theokritos.⁵⁶

Is it probable that they had at their disposal in Thessalonike the texts they edited and wrote commentaries on? Our evidence on contemporary libraries in Thessalonike is very scarce. Nikephoros Blemmydes remarks in his *curriculum vitae* that on a journey in 1239 he found rare books in Thessalonike as well as in other places;⁵⁷ but we have only one specific allusion to a library in the city around 1270, a list given in cod. Vat. gr. 64.⁵⁸ We can, however, be sure that this library was not the only one in the city. At least Magistros very probably had his own private library which he enriched by copies made for the special purpose of commenting on the ancient authors. In the case of Pindar, for instance, Irigoin has postulated a codex Thessalonicensis, written before 1138, which can be reconstructed from the later manuscript tradition.⁵⁹ This manuscript was the ancestor of the Pindar manuscript which Magistros used for his own edition, preserved in full copy in the later manuscript Vind. phil. gr. 318. The manuscript Magistros used is lost, but Vat. gr. 41 (first quarter of 14th century) seems to be a copy from this manuscript at a time before Magistros entered his *scholia*.⁶⁰ There is also evidence that Demetrios Triklinios copied ancient authors for his own use. Three autographs from his hand have survived:⁶¹ Neapol. II. F. 31 (Aeschylus, early 14th century), Oxon., New College 258 (Aphthonios, Hermogenes, dated August 1308), and Venet. Marc. gr. 464 Z (Hesiod: part one, 20 August 1316; part two, 16 November 1319).

Of the two philologists, Triklinios seems to have been by far the more qualified; by present-day scholars he has been called "the first modern textual philologist."⁶² As for Magistros, I quote Alexander Turyn on his recension of Euripides: "Thomas' changes do not contribute much to the glory of their author. Thomas did not understand adequately the classical versification of iambic lines and the classical prosody. In many cases, he was simply actuated by a desire to reduce a line of more than 12 syllables to a dodecasyllable. The results were generally bad."⁶³ There is no doubt, however, that Magistros had a high

⁵⁵ Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 122.

⁵⁶ Aubreton, *Triclinius*, 19; J. Irigoin, *Histoire du texte de Pindare* (Paris, 1952), 331. The third outstanding contemporary philologist, Manuel Moschopoulos, seems to have lived in Constantinople, where he began his work as a student of Maximus Planoudes (Irigoin, *ibid.*, 270).

⁵⁷ Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 13.

⁵⁸ According to Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 143, cod. Vat. gr. 64 contains a list of manuscripts, whose owner states that he lived in Thessalonike and gives the date 1270. The voluminous codex itself contains texts of epistolographers and other prose writers, including Dionysios of Halikarnassos. The list specifies ten volumes of theological works and ca. twelve volumes with a mixture of medical and classical texts, including Homer, Sophocles, and Euripides. Unfortunately the owner of the library does not reveal his name.

⁵⁹ Irigoin, *Pindare*, 146–56.

⁶⁰ Irigoin, *Pindare*, 180–85.

⁶¹ A. Turyn, *The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Aeschylus* (New York, 1943), 102 f; Aubreton, *Triclinius*, 21.

⁶² On the excellent evaluation of Triklinios by modern scholars, see F. Tinnefeld, "Neue Formen der Antike-rezeption bei den Byzantinern der frühen Palaiologenzeit," *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 1 (1995): 19–28, at 23 f.

⁶³ A. Turyn, *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides* (Urbana, Ill., 1957), 179.

opinion of his own ability as a philologist. This is documented by his remarks in his *scholia* to ancient authors, where he arrogantly calls earlier scholiasts, his predecessors, ignoramuses (ἀγνοοῦντες) or uneducated people (ἀμαθεῖς) and introduces his own interpretation with ἐγὼ δὲ οὕτω(ς). In comparison with him, other contemporary scholiasts, for instance Manuel Moschopoulos, show a more modest attitude.⁶⁴

Two important works on law also seem to have been composed in Thessalonike. There is first the canonist Matthew Blastares,⁶⁵ monk and priest in the monastery of Kyr Isaac in Thessalonike. In 1335 he completed his principal work, called *Σύνταγμα κατὰ στοιχείων* (Alphabetical Treatise), an attempt at reconciling canon and civil law to a greater degree than in the preceding *nomokanones*. Since he used several legal sources for his work, he must have had a specialized library at his disposal. We know that his teacher was the educated clergyman Iakobos, founder of the Isaac monastery and later metropolitan of Thessalonike, who may have encouraged Blastares to compose his work.⁶⁶ Ten years later, Constantine Harmenopoulos completed his *Πρόχειρον νόμων* (Handbook of Laws), a compilation of secular law for easier reference. In a document from Chilandar monastery of 1345 we find his signature, where he calls himself σεβαστός and κριτής τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης.⁶⁷ There seems to have been a tradition of legal studies in Thessalonike before Blastares and Harmenopoulos, since already in 1295 the *dikaiophylax* George Phobenos, a friend of John Pediasimos, composed two legal texts and a short dictionary of legal terms.⁶⁸ The anonymous compiler of the *Hexabiblos aucta* (late 14th century) had perhaps an even more substantial library at his disposal,⁶⁹ but unfortunately we have no evidence whether he worked in Thessalonike or in Constantinople.

As for important works of theology of the late Byzantine period, we cannot say for certain whether any of them were composed in Thessalonike. There is, for instance, no doubt that the learned contribution of Neilos Kabasilas to the debate on Western scholasticism⁷⁰ was composed in Constantinople. The same seems to be true for the main works of his nephew Nicholas Kabasilas.⁷¹ So we can only say that these outstanding theologians contributed to the honor of Thessalonike, since they were born and brought up there.

⁶⁴ Th. Hopfner, *Thomas Magister, Demetrios Triklinios, Manuel Moschopoulos. Eine Studie über ihren Sprachgebrauch in den Scholien zu Aischylos*, SBWien 172, H. 3 (1912), 10, 15 f, 55.

⁶⁵ On Blastares, see *ODB* 1: 295.

⁶⁶ Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 127 and note 83.

⁶⁷ K. G. Pitsakes, *Κωνσταντίνου Ἀρμενοπούλου Πρόχειρον Νόμων ἢ Ἐξάβιβλος* (Athens, 1971), p. ιγ' note 1, argued for "etymological and grammatical" reasons for "Armenopoulos." But in the signature of a Chilandar record (L. Petit, *Actes de Chilandar = VizVrem* 17, *Prilozhenie* [1911], record no. 134, p. 282), the author of the *Hexabiblos* spells his name Ἀρμενόπουλος (Harmenopoulos). This personal record should be more relied upon, provided that the reading of the edition is correct; this cannot be checked until the new edition in the Archives de l'Athos is complete (only the first volume, ed. M. Živojinović et al. [Paris, 1998], has been published so far). On the dating of the work to 1345, cf. M. Th. Fögen, "Die Scholien zur Hexabiblos im Codex vetustissimus Vaticanus Ottobonianus gr. 440," *FM* 4 (1981): 256–345, at 268–75.

⁶⁸ Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 120 f, 127 and note 81, with a reference to the manuscript (*Codex of the Metochion of Panagios Taphos* 25) in which the dictionary, unpublished so far, is preserved. For Phobenos (Φοβηνός) cf. also *PLP* 30004.

⁶⁹ M. Th. Fögen, "Hexabiblos aucta. Eine Kompilation der spätbyzantinischen Rechtswissenschaft," *FM* 7 (1986): 259–333; on the library: 267–77.

⁷⁰ See above, note 17.

⁷¹ Νικόλαος Καβάσιλας, *Εἰς τὴν θεῖαν λειτουργίαν καὶ Περὶ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ ζωῆς*, ed. P. Chrestou (Thessalonike, 1979); Nicolas Cabasilas, *La vie en Christ*, ed. M.-H. Congourdeau, 2 vols. (Paris, 1989–90).

There is also no doubt that most of the late Byzantine contributions to science were written in the capital. But there seems to be at least some evidence that Isidore Glabas composed his “Method of Calculating the Easter Cycle” when he was metropolitan of Thessalonike.⁷² About the place where he wrote his astronomical work “On the Eclipses of Sun and Moon” we are not sure since, as we saw, he also lived for some time in Constantinople.⁷³ But perhaps we should not waste our time with endeavors promising few results to “rescue” one or another late Byzantine work for Thessalonike, since there still remain to be discussed two categories of intellectual life closely related with the society of the city: teaching and public speeches and sermons.

As for teaching, the first to be mentioned after the reconquest of Thessalonike in 1246 is again John Pediasimos. The clearest allusion to this activity of the scholar can be found in the obituary letter of Constantine Akropolites already quoted. Here we read that the deceased was even a teacher of the teachers (παιδευτῶν παιδευτής), and, furthermore, that he was not only an outstanding scholar and philosopher, but also distributed his knowledge to many others and so made the cities more honorable and the citizens flourishing. Although Akropolites speaks about cities in the plural, it is clear that he means particularly Thessalonike, since from there, as he says, came the news about John’s demise to the “city of Constantine.”⁷⁴

There cannot be any doubt either that Thomas Magistros worked a long time as a teacher in Thessalonike. Clear testimonies of his teaching activity can be found in letters of Gregory Akindynos. In one letter, Akindynos terms himself a student of Magistros and calls Magistros his father and teacher,⁷⁵ and in another letter of 1347, the last document which attests Magistros to be alive, he calls him the “admirable.”⁷⁶ From a treatise written by Demetrios and Prochoros Kydones we know that the future patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos was also a student of Magistros.⁷⁷ But we have no evidence that Demetrios or Prochoros Kydones was taught by him at any time.

Two persons are known who more or less can be called teachers of Kydones: Neilos Kabasilas and Isidore Boucheir. The one who most influenced his intellectual skills seems to have been Neilos Kabasilas. There is a passage in the so-called Apology 1 of Kydones which, although it does not give a name, undoubtedly refers to Neilos.⁷⁸ Kydones says that this man, who was the most wise of his contemporaries, had been his friend from his early youth (ἀπὸ νεότητος εὐθύς). He was the first to teach him rhetoric and, when he became

⁷² Christophorides, “Γλαβᾶς,” 532 and note 19.

⁷³ For both works cf. B. Christophorides, “Ἡ χειρόγραφη παράδοση τῶν συγγραμμάτων τοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης Ἰσιδώρου Γλαβά,” *Ἐπ. Ἐπ. Θεο. Σχο. Παν. Θεσ.* 25 (1980), 429–43, at 441 f.

⁷⁴ R. Romano, *Costantino Acropolita, Epistole*, 215–17, no. 121, lines 6–8, 30–32, and 1 f. Cf. Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 124.

⁷⁵ Hero, *Akindynos*, 234, no. 56, written 1345, line 75 f (cf. *ibid.*, 408).

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 296, no. 74, line 40 f; for the date of the letter cf. *ibid.*, 434.

⁷⁷ Mercati, *Notizie*, 302, line 204–303, line 222; cf. also 248 f. For the text referred to, cf. Tinnefeld, *Briefe*, I.1: 72, no. 3.2.

⁷⁸ Mercati, *Notizie*, 390, line 1006–394, line 1088. Particularly the information that the man was an expert on Thomas Aquinas (*ibid.*, 391, line 1028 f) is an important clue to Neilos Kabasilas (see note 17 above). Mercati (390 note 6) also refers to a parallel passage in the unedited treatise of Kydones in defense of Thomas Aquinas (see note 17 above) to confirm that no one other than Neilos could have been the teacher to whom Kydones refers.

older, shared with him his studies of the λόγοι.⁷⁹ We have no explicit evidence as to where Neilos taught Kydones, but it is very probable that their first contacts go back to a time when they both lived in Thessalonike. On the other hand, we have a letter from Nicholas Kabasilas, probably written shortly after 1347, which attests that love for his admirable uncle and for his studies convinced him to go to Constantinople.⁸⁰ So we can assume that at least sometime before this letter Neilos had come to reside in the capital. From a letter of Kydones to be dated to 1356 we learn that Neilos probably had served for some time at the imperial court and still lived in Constantinople.⁸¹ This letter documents an incipient crisis in the relationship between Kydones and his teacher, since Neilos tried to refute Western theology, whereas Kydones admired and defended its results.⁸²

Another man who had some influence on Demetrios Kydones, without doubt in Thessalonike, was the future patriarch Isidore Boucheir. This man, probably born sometime before 1300, already in his youth began teaching in his native Thessalonike, then became a monk and lived for some time on Mount Athos. But when the holy mountain became more and more threatened by pirates, he returned to Thessalonike around 1325. There we hear about his activities as a teacher, but he probably imparted more spiritual than intellectual instruction.⁸³ A letter of Demetrios Kydones, written in 1346 in a small town in Thrace, is the only testimony of their relationship. Here Kydones does not say explicitly that he was his student, but that he had already for a long time trusted in him as a person of wisdom and knowledge, and in an unpleasant situation hoped to get his spiritual advice and consolation.⁸⁴

The period of the Zealots (1342–49)⁸⁵ had without doubt a negative influence on the intellectual atmosphere of Thessalonike. Certainly our knowledge with regard to teaching in Thessalonike after 1350 is very scarce. An obituary on George Synadenos Astras in a letter of Kydones from 1365 refers only to a literary circle which Astras used to assemble in his house during the short time he had lived in Thessalonike.⁸⁶ We know from an encomiastic text⁸⁷ that the metropolitan Gabriel received a classical education in his hometown of Thessalonike, but this source is not reliable enough to derive from it any solid conclusions on teaching in Thessalonike. We have also evidence of a certain Constantine Ibankos who had taught Emperor Manuel II for some time, but we do not know whether this was in Constantinople or Thessalonike. In any case, Ibankos is attested as a judge in the latter city between ca. 1402 and 1420, and he also taught there in a school of higher level which was

⁷⁹ Mercati, *Notizie*, 390, line 1006–391, line 1018.

⁸⁰ Enepekides, “Briefwechsel,” 29, no. 1, line 1 f. For dating this letter to a time shortly after 1347, see above, note 17.

⁸¹ Tinnefeld, *Briefe*, 1.1: 257–61, no. 40, line 20 f and note 6, according to which the interpretation of the passage on Neilos’ imperial service is not quite sure.

⁸² Kydones describes the controversy in his *Apology 1*, ed. Mercati, *Notizie*, 391, line 1018–394, line 1088.

⁸³ For his biography cf. Tinnefeld, *Briefe*, 1.1: 158–63.

⁸⁴ Tinnefeld, *Briefe*, 1.1: 155–58, no. 16.

⁸⁵ On the revolt and regime of the Zealots in Thessalonike, cf. R. Browning, “The Commune of the Zealots in Salonica, 1341–1350,” *IP* 6 (1950): 509–25 (in Bulgarian), but especially the recent article by K.-P. Matschke, “Thessalonike und die Zeloten,” *BSI* 55 (1994): 19–43. For fuller bibliography, see the article by J. W. Barker in this volume.

⁸⁶ Tinnefeld, *Briefe*, 1.1: 379, no. 64, lines 25–30.

⁸⁷ L. Syndika-Laourdas, “Ἐγκομιον εἰς τὸν ἀρχιεπίσκοπον Θεσσαλονίκης Γαβριήλ,” *Μακεδονικά* 4 (1955–60): 352–70, at 354 f.

perhaps oriented to law.⁸⁸ Furthermore, we know that John Argyropoulos, born in Constantinople ca. 1393, after losing his parents at an early age, came about 1403/4 to Thessalonike to live with his uncle who sent him to the ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία (secondary school) of Alexios Phorbenos (ὁ Φορβηνοῦ). After he had finished the secondary level about 1407, however, he returned for higher studies to Constantinople.⁸⁹ From this we may conclude that in the early fifteenth century opportunities for higher education were scarce in Thessalonike.

In connection with Thessalonike's inner tensions and external threats, a very important activity of its intellectuals still remains to be described: rhetorical addresses to the citizens, during an earlier period in speeches, later in sermons. The first speaker in our period was not a native Thessalonian but the Byzantine statesman Nikephoros Choumnos, born between 1250 and 1255, who in 1309 had been appointed governor (κεφαλή) of Thessalonike, when the city had just escaped the threat posed by the Catalan Company and was in a difficult political situation. He stayed there no longer than one year, but during this short time he proved to be a successful administrator. Shortly after his return to the capital he wrote a Συμβουλευτικός περὶ δικαιοσύνης (Speech of Counsel on Justice) addressed to the citizens of Thessalonike. The main subject of the speech, which was never delivered in public but only sent to his friends in Thessalonike, is the problem of the internal tensions in the city, although it begins with a long *encomium* of the city and its citizens, which has the function of a *captatio benevolentiae*.

The *encomium* includes a short *ekphrasis* of the city. Choumnos begins with the forests and rivers in the plain west of the city, the springs, lakes, and fertile farm and pasture land to its east, and the easy access to the city from both land and sea. Within the city he praises its rich stock of trees and vines. Then he passes on to the fortifications, the city wall and the Akropolis: "The Akropolis on the top looms up hugely and is visible from a far distance. It appears to those who suddenly catch sight of it as if it were itself the whole city. But the great city descends from there and spreads far away, as if it wanted to join the sea. And indeed its wide circle gets the object of its desire and joins the sea; it spreads along its shore, offers the best harbors, and leaves its admirers wondering whether such a wide circle ever could be filled with people." Then he passes over to the buildings inside the city, especially its churches which he calls more beautiful and splendid than in any other town, but he also praises the height and technical perfection of the houses and the numerous population which makes the circle of walls look small. In the second part of the speech, Choumnos calls upon the citizens to practice more justice in order to secure harmony and peace. Although his argumentation is mostly theoretical, he also touches upon current problems of the city, such as the venality of the judges and the lawyers and the despair of the exploited. So the sociopolitical tenor of the speech is unmistakable.⁹⁰

⁸⁸ Dennis, *Letters*, XLVI; P. Canivet and N. Oikonomidès, "[Jean Argyropoulos], La Comédie de Katablattas. Invective byzantine du XVe s.: Édition, traduction et commentaire," *Δίπτυχα* 3 (1982–83): 5–97, at 11 f.

⁸⁹ Canivet and Oikonomidès, "Comédie," 15–18. On Alexios ὁ Φορβηνοῦ, cf. *PLP* 30015.

⁹⁰ Text of the speech: J. F. Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, 2: 137–87. Copy of this edition: B. Nerantze-Barmaze, *Ἐγκώμια τῆς βυζαντινῆς Θεσσαλονίκης* (Thessalonike, 1999), 86–96; modern Greek trans.: *ibid.*, 97–105; introduction: *ibid.*, 42 f. Description (*ekphrasis*) of the city: ed. Boissonade, *ibid.*, 139–43. Cf. the comments of Verpeaux, *Choumnos*, 20 (no. xx), 49 f, 99 f. The *ekphrasis* is also mentioned by H. Hunger, "Laudes Thessalonicenses," *Ἐορταστικός Τόμος 50 Χρόνια, 1939–1989, Ἐταιρεία Μακεδονικῶν Σπουδῶν* (Thessalonike,

There are three rhetorical addresses of Thomas Magistros with political content. The first on the duties of an emperor clearly shows the form of a speech; the second on the duties of subjects is of an ambiguous nature.⁹¹ It starts like a treatise, but after a while the author several times uses an address in the second person, as if there were listeners.⁹² But these texts have no special relationship with Thessalonike. So I will not dwell on them for long and will refrain from a thorough interpretation, laying stress only on one aspect: Thomas Magistros shows that he is a true intellectual when he develops a proper political program of education. In his speech to the emperor, he recommends that he should give an order that learned studies should be carried out everywhere in the world and that scholars should be honored. It would also be desirable if the emperor himself were a learned man, but being concerned with the government, he would perhaps not find the time for intense studies. Nevertheless, he would deserve to be called a wise man if he organized education (*παιδεία*) in all the towns of his empire and kept companionship and had discussions with wise men. To arouse a general desire for learned studies, he should convince everyone that he could be a friend of the emperor only if he was a friend of the Muses. So, finally, the empire would be a theater of the Muses and a hearth of studies, and the emperor would be revered as the instigator of this development.⁹³ No less in his treatise on the duties of subjects in a state, Magistros develops a program of education: he recommends the choice of responsible teachers to restrain young people from wicked desires and make them rejoice in virtue, take interest in learned studies or in practical skills (*τέχναι*), and consider these more desirable than dice and theaters. To achieve this result, it is necessary, he says, that the parents, too, should be concerned about a good education for their children.⁹⁴

Only Magistros' third political text, the treatise or speech "On Harmony," is clearly ad-

1992), 99–113, at 108. As encomiastic *topoi* for Thessalonike in speeches of the late period, Hunger mentions the label "the first after the first" city (sc. after Constantinople) (*ibid.*, 101), the pun with the name Thessalonike = "victorious city" (*ibid.*, 103), and the concept of Thessalonike as a "support of Constantinople" in a speech of Metropolitan Symeon (103 f). There is another *ekphrasis* which refers only to one building in Thessalonike, the Theotokos Acheiropoietos church. It is inserted in an *encomium* by the lawyer Constantine Harmenopoulos (for his last name, see note 67 above) of St. Demetrios, delivered in this church. Edition: Demetrios Gkines, "Λόγος ἀνέκδοτος Κωνσταντίνου Ἀρμενοπούλου εἰς τὴν προεόρτιον ἑορτὴν τοῦ ἁγίου Δημητρίου," *Ἐπ. Ἐτ. Βυζ. Σπ.* 21 (1951) 145–62, at 151, line 56–153, line 106. Cf. also A. Xyngoropoulos, "Αἱ περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς Ἀχειροποιήτου Θεσσαλονίκης εἰδήσεις τοῦ Κωνσταντίνου Ἀρμενοπούλου," *Πανεπιστήμιον Θεσσαλονίκης, Ἐπιστημονικὴ Ἐπετηρὶς τῆς Σχολῆς Νομικῶν καὶ Οἰκονομικῶν Ἐπιστήμῶν* 6 (1952) = *Τόμος Κωνσταντίνου Ἀρμενοπούλου*, 1–26. Furthermore, there is a short encomiastic passage on Thessalonike in the monody of Demetrios Kydonos on the noblemen killed by the Zealots in 1345; see PG 109: 640–52, at 641–44 (copy: Nerantze-Barmaze, *ibid.*, 108–10; modern Greek trans.: *ibid.*, 111–13; introduction: *ibid.*, 44–47); Eng. trans.: J. W. Barker, "The Monody of Demetrios Kydonos on the Zealot Rising of 1345 in Thessaloniki," in *Μελετήματα στὴ μνήμη Βασιλείου Λαούρδα* (Thessalonike, 1975), 285–90, at 292 f. (For some excerpts, see the introduction to J. W. Barker's article in this volume.) In this passage, Kydonos first praises the city's size, beauty, piety, agricultural fertility, churches, its busy marketplace, harbors, and walls (§ 2), then the devotion of its citizens and the role of St. Demetrios as its effective protector (§ 3), and also its intellectual life, especially its orators and philosophers, who make it "a veritable school of general studies" (§ 4). Finally, there are two encomiastic passages on Thessalonike from hagiographical works of Patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos, of which Nerantze-Barmaze, *ibid.*, reproduces the edition (*ibid.*, 116–18) and gives a modern Greek translation (*ibid.*, 119–22). Cf. Tsames, *Φιλοθέου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τοῦ Κοκκίνου Ἀγιολογικά ἔργα*, 64 f, 162–64.

⁹¹ *Περὶ βασιλείας*, PG 145: 447–96; *Περὶ πολιτείας*, PG 145: 495–548.

⁹² PG 145: 520A, 521B–524A, 525D.

⁹³ PG 145: 492 A–C.

⁹⁴ PG 145: 544 A–B.

dressed to the Thessalonians.⁹⁵ It was dated by a number of scholars to the time of the civil war between Andronikos II and his grandson Andronikos III (1321–28), but Skalistes offers convincing arguments to date it to the period of the Zealots (1342–49). It is true that in no period was the call for harmony among citizens more related to the current situation of the city than during that time.

As for funeral speeches preserved from the late period, most of them were delivered in Constantinople. The first to be given in Thessalonike were the four monodies by Alexios Lampenos, composed in 1307 and sometime after, on the demise of John Palaiologos, the eldest son of Emperor Andronikos II and his second wife, Irene-Yolanda of Montferrat.⁹⁶ A monody which was also without doubt delivered in Thessalonike was that of a certain Staphidakis on Emperor Michael IX, who died there in October 1320. Staphidakis refers expressly to Thessalonike as Michael's residence, says that he died there, and reflects the mourning of the city on his sudden demise.⁹⁷ We also know that Michael was buried in Thessalonike,⁹⁸ so it seems that this monody was delivered there, and not in Constantinople.

Demetrios Kydones first appeared in public when he delivered, most probably during a funeral ceremony in Berroia, a monody on the nearly one hundred supporters of John Kantakouzenos who were killed in 1345 in Thessalonike as a result of the Zealot revolt.⁹⁹ This monody is also a political speech in which Kydones expresses his deep concern for the destiny of his hometown under the regime of the Zealots. Another monody, composed by Theodore Potamios, has recently been related to the burial of Emperor John VII in 1408.¹⁰⁰

Nicholas Kabasilas in 1351 addressed a memorandum to Empress Anna of Savoy and her son John V in Thessalonike, in order to obtain the reintroduction of a former law which had mitigated the situation of a certain group of debtors.¹⁰¹ Sometime between 1352

⁹⁵ B. Laourdas, "Θωμά Μαγίστρου τοῖς Θεσσαλονικεῦσι περὶ ὁμονοίας," *Ἐπιστημονικὴ Ἐπετηρὶς Σχολῆς Νομικῶν καὶ Οἰκονομικῶν Ἐπιστημῶν Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης* (1969) = *Ἀφιέρωμα εἰς Χαράλαμπον Φρανγκίσταν*, 751–75. Cf. Skalistes, *Μάγιστρος*, 172–78.

⁹⁶ Sideras, *Grabreden*, 274–77. John was first buried in Thessalonike, but later transferred to Constantinople. There is also a monody on the death (ca. 1317) of John's mother, Irene-Yolanda of Montferrat, composed by Lampenos in Thessalonike, although she had died in Drama and was transferred to Constantinople (Sideras, *ibid.*, 256–58, 279).

⁹⁷ A. Meschini, *La Monodia di Stafidakis* (Padua, 1974), 20, line 13 f (residence of Michael in Thessalonike), 14, line 34; 18, line 23 (his sudden death); 20, lines 8–12 (his death in Thessalonike and the mourning of its citizens). Cf. also the remarks on this speech by Sideras, *Grabreden*, 280–82. Another monody on the demise of Michael IX, composed by Theodore Hyrtakenos, was delivered in Constantinople; cf. Sideras, *ibid.*, 259. Also the poems on the death of Michael by Nikephoros Choumnos and Theodore Metochites were written in the capital. For both cf. Verpeaux, *Choumnos*, 106 f. For Metochites cf. also Sideras, *ibid.*, 58 f, 281.

⁹⁸ P. Schreiner, *Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken (Chronica byzantina breviora)*, 3 vols. (Vienna, 1975–79), 1:76, Chronicle 8, no. 11c (καὶ κατετέθη ἐκεῖσε).

⁹⁹ See above, note 90; cf. Tinnefeld, *Briefe*, 1.1: 9; Sideras, *Grabreden*, 302–4.

¹⁰⁰ The speech which is ascribed to a certain Theodore Potakios by the manuscripts, and was first edited by S. Lampros in 1885, had already tentatively been connected with Theodore Potamios by K. Sathas in 1872. Lampros proposed its dating to the burial of John V in 1391. The first to ascribe it, in a short remark, to the burial of John VII in 1408 was G. T. Dennis, "The Letters of Theodore Potamios," in G. T. Dennis, *Byzantium and the Franks* (London, 1982), no. XII (first publication), 2 and note 6. His article was obviously not known to P. Agapitos when he confirmed this opinion with detailed arguments in "Kaiser Ioannes VII. Palaiologos als Adressat einer Monodie des Theodoros Potamios," *BZ* 90 (1997): 1–6.

¹⁰¹ R. Guiland, "Le traité inédit 'Sur l'usure' de Nicolas Cabasilas," in *Εἰς μνήμην Σπυρίδωνος Λάμπρου* (Athens, 1935), 269–77; for the date cf. Loenertz, "Chronologie," 220–24 or 317–20 respectively. The title of Guiland's article refers to a treatise, but actually the text is a memorandum. There is also a treatise, in which Kabasilas principally argues against any income from interest (PG 150: 727–50), but we do not know where it was composed.

and 1354 he wrote, at the instigation of his father, an *encomium* of Empress Anna in the form of a letter, which he sent from Constantinople to Thessalonike.¹⁰²

During the years 1382–87 Manuel II stayed in Thessalonike in order to defend the city against the Turks. In fall 1383 he delivered a speech of counsel to the citizens to encourage them to defend their freedom against the Turkish aggression.¹⁰³ Demetrios Kydones received a personal copy of the speech from Manuel and congratulated him in a letter, where he also expressed his regret that only a few of the emperor's audience were educated enough to understand the refined style of the speech.¹⁰⁴ This judgment by a son of the city can be taken as an unfavorable testimony to the intellectual situation in Thessalonike during these late years.

But a contemporary of Manuel, the metropolitan Isidore Glabas, had perhaps a better chance to reach the souls of the citizens through his more popular sermons.¹⁰⁵ Already in the first homily which he delivered to his flock in 1380,¹⁰⁶ he reverts to the problem of harmony among the citizens which had, as we saw, also been a subject of earlier political speeches. From his point of view, social harmony is guaranteed and secured now through the church and Christian charity, but he also points to the important role of civil servants and judges. In his second occasional sermon he tackles the very acute problem of the so-called unholy marriages between Byzantine women and Turks. He not only urges avoidance of such marriages, but also their dissolution if such a marriage had taken place.¹⁰⁷ Also in other sermons he called upon the citizens of Thessalonike to fight against the “infidels,”¹⁰⁸ but his major concern remained the situation of the poor and powerless people, as can be shown by quotations from several of his sermons.¹⁰⁹ During the time of his absence from Thessalonike (1384–89), the city was conquered by the Turks, in 1387. Nevertheless, Isidore returned to his see in the summer of 1389 and tried to cope with the difficult situation of a Christian bishop under Muslim rule. From this later period date his five

¹⁰² M. Jugie, “Nicolas Cabasilas, panégyriques inédits de Mathieu Cantacuzène et de l’Anne Paléologine,” *IRAIK* 15 (1911): 112–21. On the date cf. Loenertz, “Chronologie,” 224–26 or 320–22 respectively.

¹⁰³ B. Laourdas, “Ο Συμβουλευτικός πρὸς τοὺς Θεσσαλονίκεις τοῦ Μανουὴλ Παλαιολόγου,” *Μακεδονικά* 3 (1955): 290–307.

¹⁰⁴ Tinnefeld, *Briefe*, 3: 112–18, no. 265.

¹⁰⁵ Editions of sermons: (1) B. Laourdas, *Ἰσιδώρου Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης Ὁμιλίας εἰς τὰς ἐορτὰς τοῦ ἁγίου Δημητρίου*, *Ἑλληνικά*, Παράρτημα 5 (Thessalonike, 1954) (5 sermons on St. Demetrios); (2) K. Tsirpanles, “Συμβολή εἰς τὴν ἱστορίαν τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης. Δύο ἀνέκδοτοι ὁμιλίας Ἰσιδώρου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης,” *Θεολογία* 42 (1971) 548–81; (3) B. Christophorides, “Ἰσιδώρου Γλαβὰ Περιστασιακές ὁμιλίες,” *Ἐπ. Ἐπ. Θεο. Σχο. Παν. Θεσ.* 32 (Thessalonike, 1981); (4) B. Ch. Christophorides, *Ἰσιδώρου Γλαβὰ Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης Ὁμιλίες*, vol. 1 (Thessalonike, 1992) (edition of 13 homilies from Vat. gr. 651; see 7 f, on the sermons unedited so far); (5) PG 139: 11–164 (4 sermons on the holy Virgin). On the two manuscripts of Isidore's homilies (vol. 1: Paris. gr. 1192; vol. 2: Vat. gr. 651) and their contents, cf. A. Ehrhard, *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche*, vol. 3.1. *Die späteren Homilien* (Leipzig, 1943), 709–13.

¹⁰⁶ Ed. Christophorides 1981 (see note 105, no. 3), 37–43; abstract of the sermon: Christophorides, “Γλαβᾶς,” (as in note 26), 538 f.

¹⁰⁷ Ed. Christophorides 1981 (see note 105, no. 3), 44 ff; discussion of the sermon: Christophorides, “Γλαβᾶς,” (as in note 26), 540 f.

¹⁰⁸ Christophorides, “Γλαβᾶς,” (as in note 26), 552–54.

¹⁰⁹ Christophorides, “Γλαβᾶς,” (as in note 26), 541–44; for quotations from cod. Paris. gr. 1192, which contains the homilies nos. 1–28 (plus three unnumbered homilies), unedited so far, see Christophorides 1992 (see note 105, no. 4), 7 f.

sermons on St. Demetrios.¹¹⁰ Here he summons the people of Thessalonike to be patient and points to the fact that the Byzantine officials, both diplomats and civil servants, have no less difficult a time getting along with the Turkish governors. As a source on this first period of Turkish rule in Thessalonike, these sermons are of invaluable importance. Also from his successor, Gabriel (1397–1416/19), a collection of sixty-six sermons has survived, but as far as can be concluded from the seven on St. Demetrios which have been published so far, they are of a more spiritual character.¹¹¹ The most interesting of the St. Demetrios sermons from the political point of view is the one which celebrates the defeat of the Ottomans by Tamerlane near Ankyra in 1402 as an outstanding historical event.¹¹²

The last of the metropolitans whose works are important sources for the latest period of Thessalonike was Symeon (1415/16–29). Apart from some encyclical letters, four texts in particular show his concern for the political situation of his diocese: first, in a long discourse, completed shortly before his death, he praises St. Demetrios as a miraculous protector of Thessalonike and gives, to illustrate this, a very interesting survey of Turkish-Byzantine relations from 1387 to 1427.¹¹³ The other three texts worth mentioning in this connection are: a defense of his “flight” to Mount Athos and Constantinople in 1422¹¹⁴ and two “advisory” proclamations exhorting the Orthodox to resist the attacks of the Turkish “Antichrist” on Christian faith and morals.¹¹⁵

At this point a few words should be said on these sermons, their significance, and their understanding. Thessalonike was undoubtedly fortunate to have three such prominent preachers during a very difficult period of time, when the city was in danger of conquest by the Turks, and also afterward, under the Turkish occupation. Isidore, Gabriel, and also Symeon were able to comfort the suffering populace during these years of troubles and were very well accepted by their flocks. Nevertheless, there is reason to ask how they could be so popular although they obviously gave their sermons not in the spoken, but in the artificial “Attic” language of educated writers. This problem is significant not only for the late period, but also for earlier periods of Byzantium. As was pointed out in a recent collection of papers,¹¹⁶ “the levels of education, or to be more precise, oral and literate understanding, in audiences can only be guessed at in most periods. . . . The majority of preachers, however, seem to have assumed a reasonable degree of understanding in their audiences; we can only guess whether this reflected the actual abilities of most members of the audience or whether homilies were generally directed only to an educated few.” This statement is also true for the sermons under discussion. But since they deal to a great extent with current problems of the citizens, we can assume that at least their general contents were accessible to a majority of the audience, and the details were perhaps imparted by oral exchange.

¹¹⁰ Ed. Laourdas, *Ὁμιλῖαι* (see note 105, no. 1). Discussion of the sermons: Christophorides, “Γλαβᾶς,” (as in note 26), 571–78.

¹¹¹ Unique manuscript of the homilies: cod. Chalki 58. Edition: B. Laourdas, “Γαβριήλ Θεσσαλονίκης ὁμιλῖαι,” *Ἀθηνᾶ* 57 (1963): 141–78. Cf. also Ehrhard, *Überlieferung*, 714–17.

¹¹² Ed. Laourdas, “Γαβριήλ,” 164–68; comments on the sermon; *ibid.*, 177 f.

¹¹³ Balfour, *Symeon*, 39–69 (Greek text), 101–91 (commentary).

¹¹⁴ Balfour, *Symeon*, 70–76 (text), 193–99 (commentary).

¹¹⁵ Balfour, *Symeon*, 83–90 (text), 207–10 (commentary).

¹¹⁶ *Preacher and Audience. Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics*, ed. M. B. Cunningham and P. Allen (Leiden–Boston–Cologne, 1998), 14 f (in the editors’ introduction).

From the time immediately after the final conquest of Thessalonike by the Turks in 1430, we have several texts which describe and deplore this event: a report and a monody of John Anagnostes,¹¹⁷ and three anonymous works—two monodies in strange hexameters and a fragment of a monody in prose.¹¹⁸

I began my discussion of the intellectuals in late Byzantine Thessalonike with a general survey of their most important representatives, then tried to give an impression of their connections with other intellectuals as can be shown by their correspondence, touched upon the question of their scholarly and teaching activities, and commented on their public addresses either on special occasions or containing general remarks about the political situation of the city. But before concluding this paper we should attempt to answer the intriguing question, what was the role of Thessalonike in intellectual life as compared with Constantinople? At least some educated natives of Thessalonike were convinced that their hometown could compete with the intellectual level of any other city. Thus Demetrios Kydones claimed in his monody that no other city had “larger or finer ensembles of orators and philosophers,” and Nicholas Kabasilas maintained a similar conviction.¹¹⁹ But those statements are undoubtedly exaggerated and caused by local pride. Neither in the late period nor very probably at any earlier time were the opportunities for intellectual development in Thessalonike equal to those in Constantinople. The main reason is that two institutions in the capital granted it an unrivaled precedence over any other city in the empire: the imperial court and the patriarchate. Although we can say that the influence of the emperor and the patriarch on higher education has been exaggerated by earlier Byzantinists—there was very probably never an “imperial university” nor a “patriarchal academy” either¹²⁰—we cannot doubt the fact that at least from time to time there were emperors and patriarchs who promoted and patronized higher education, and this is also true for the late period. Under several Palaiologan rulers, especially Michael VIII, Andronikos II, and Manuel II, the imperial court gave an important incentive to teaching, delivering orations, and other intellectual activities, and also several late Byzantine patriarchs were anxious to have well-educated clerics.¹²¹ Even some monasteries in Constantinople profited from this atmosphere to develop some intellectual activities and assemble modest libraries.¹²² This stimulus of patronage was almost totally absent in Thessalonike; although personal initiative was the principal impetus for intellectual activities also in Constantinople, it seems to have been the only one in Thessalonike.

But in the late period we also find a second reason for the lower intellectual level of Thessalonike: its political situation was less stable and consistent than that in the capital.

¹¹⁷ G. Tsaras, ed., *Διήγησις περὶ τῆς τελευταίας ἀλώσεως τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης. Μονωδία ἐπὶ τῇ ἀλώσει τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης. Εἰσαγωγή, κείμενο, μετάφρασι, σχόλια* (Thessalonike, 1958). Shortcomings of the edition are criticized by J. Irmscher, *BZ* 52 (1959): 364–67.

¹¹⁸ Sp. Lampros, “Τρεῖς ἀνέκδοτοι Μονωδίαι εἰς τὴν ὑπὸ τῶν Τούρκων ἄλωσιν τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης,” *Νέος Ἑλλ.* 5 (1908): 369–91.

¹¹⁹ Kydones, *Monody* (see note 90 above), 644; trans. Barker (see *ibid.*), 293; for Kabasilas, see above, text after note 3.

¹²⁰ According to Matschke and Tinnefeld, *Gesellschaft*, 302 and 311, it is recommended to speak only of schools or institutions of higher education.

¹²¹ Cf. *ibid.*, 301–10 (imperial court), 310–16 (patriarchate).

¹²² Cf. *ibid.*, 316–19.

After it had been the capital of a crusader kingdom, from 1224 Thessalonike was governed by Epirote rulers until it was recaptured by the “Byzantine” emperor John III in 1246. Then it had almost a hundred years of relative peace, which facilitated the development of intellectual activities. This prosperous phase was interrupted soon after 1340 by the Zealot revolt, and we can say that after the end of this period of troubles in 1350 the city’s intellectual life never recovered.¹²³ Without doubt the first conquest of the city by the Turks in 1387 can be understood as another heavy blow against a free development of intellectual activities. The situation was different in the capital. Although after 1350 Constantinople suffered more and more from the tense foreign situation, it enjoyed a political continuity until the end of the empire, which turned out to be favorable also for intellectual life.

For these reasons it is no wonder that most of the relatively few literati who can be assigned to Thessalonike (as, for instance, John Pothos Pediasimos, Joseph Rhakendytes, Isidore Boucheir, Neilos and Nicholas Kabasilas, and Demetrios Kydones) preferred to study or reside temporarily (or for a longer time) in Constantinople. As a consequence, there were fewer chances of finding a teacher in Thessalonike than in Constantinople. A man like Thomas Magistros who continuously taught in Thessalonike seems to have been an exception. There is no evidence on any continuity of schools in the city, and we have only scattered information on teaching. Also the monasteries of Thessalonike were obviously less important as places of intellectual activity than a number of monasteries in Constantinople or on Mount Athos. The lawyer Matthaios Blastares was a monk of the monastery of Kyr Isaac in Thessalonike, but can we therefore say that this monastery was an intellectual center? Makarios Choumnos founded the Nea Mone monastery in Thessalonike soon after 1360,¹²⁴ but he ended up as an abbot of the Stoudios monastery in Constantinople.¹²⁵ The later metropolitan Gabriel, who was the successor of Makarios as the abbot of the Nea Mone, was, as we have seen, a productive preacher and doubtless an intellectual, but this does not necessarily mean that his fellow monks shared his literary interests.

Another factor was that theological controversies tended to be waged in Constantinople (or sometimes on Mount Athos) rather than in Thessalonike. This is especially true for the two most important theological disputes in late Byzantium, the one between the hesychasts/Palamites and their opponents and that between Unionists and Antiunionists. Thessalonike was, of course, affected by the resonance of these quarrels, but it was never their main scene of debate. Even natives of Thessalonike like Demetrios Kydones and Neilos Kabasilas lived in Constantinople when they debated on Western scholasticism.¹²⁶ Also Neilos’ nephew Nicholas Kabasilas, who likewise originated in Thessalonike, seems to have lived mostly in Constantinople in later years.¹²⁷

¹²³ Cf. *ibid.*, 323: “Die Wirren des 1342 ausgebrochenen Zelotenaufstandes führten in den folgenden Jahren offenbar auch zu einem Niedergang des Geisteslebens.” Cf. also the judgement of Demetrios Kydones on the intellectual level of the Thessalonians during the presence of Emperor Manuel II in the city (see above, text with note 24).

¹²⁴ On this monastery cf. R. Janin, *Les églises et les monastères des grands centres byzantins* (Paris, 1975), 398 f.

¹²⁵ On Makarios Choumnos cf. *PLP* 30956. He was abbot of the Stoudios monastery from 1368 until his death ca. 1380.

¹²⁶ See above, text with note 17.

¹²⁷ He was a good friend of Kydones, and it deserves mention that their friendship was never affected by his moderate inclination toward hesychasm, which Kydones detested.

From these considerations we can draw the conclusion that Thessalonike was never more than a second city of the empire after Constantinople, also with regard to its intellectual life. This was even more true in the latest period, when Mistra gained more and more significance as a second political and intellectual center. Nevertheless, Thessalonike's existence was important as a stimulus for the intellectuals in Constantinople, as can be shown especially by the correspondence between intellectuals of both cities, proof of a vivid exchange of views in late Byzantium. The outstanding examples are the correspondence between Gregoras and intellectuals in Thessalonike¹²⁸ and the remarkable exchange of letters between Demetrios Kydones in Constantinople and Emperor Manuel, when the latter made a last but eventually unsuccessful attempt to avert the first conquest of Thessalonike by the Turks in 1387.¹²⁹

Institut für Byzantinistik der Universität München

¹²⁸ See above, text with notes 36–48.

¹²⁹ See above, text with note 23.