

WAS THERE A STREAM OF GREEK HUMANISTS IN THE LATE RENAISSANCE?

It is commonly accepted that Greek intellectuals made an important contribution to the rise of what we call the Renaissance, that is, the cultural revival which started in Italy in the early fourteenth century and which by its end in the early seventeenth had spread across the whole of Western Europe. Learned émigrés from Byzantium, like Chrysoloras, Argyropoulos, Bessarion, Trapezountios, among others, are credited, quite rightly, with consolidating the knowledge of the Greek language and literature which was very limited in the West during the Middle Ages¹, but which was crucial to the development of Renaissance culture. More specifically, this knowledge was essential to the formation of what we now call humanism, that is, the aspect of Renaissance culture concerned with learning and education². Since the central idea of humanism was that true learning is to be retrieved from classical antiquity rather than created anew, the knowledge of Greek was just as indispensable as Latin in achieving this ideal. The study of philosophy, medicine, geography, or theology, for instance, amounted basically to the study of the original texts of Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Galen, Pliny, Ptolemy, and the Bible respectively. And, as is widely known, Greeks played an important role in this cultural movement during the 15th and early 16th century as teachers of Greek, operating primarily in Italy but also in France and Spain. Some of them held the newly founded chairs of Greek in the medieval universities, others taught privately, sometimes in royal courts, most prominently in that of the Medici in Florence, while others were hired by the first publishers,

This paper was first presented in the Modern Greek seminar at the University of Oxford (January 2000) and at Cambridge. I have profited much from the comments of their conveners, Professor P. Mackridge and Dr. D. Holton, and the criticism of the audience. I gratefully acknowledge the hospitality of the Greek Institute of Venice where much of my research was carried out. Discussions with my friend Tasos Kaplanis have helped me to improve my argument. I am also indebted to Mr. N. Wilson and to Professor G. Kechagioglou who read a draft of this paper and made useful remarks and to Dr Helena Thomaidis for several stylistic improvements and insightful comments.

1. One must note, though, first that Greek was not entirely ignored in the Latin West during the Middle Ages, as the translation of writings like those of Ps-Dionysius suggest, and secondly that Leontius Pilatus was teaching Greek in Florence before Chrysoloras. See R. Weiss, *The Dawn of Humanism in Italy*, London 1947, pp. 18-20.

2. The notion of Renaissance humanism has been much debated and there is a rich literature on it. See the balanced account of P. O. Kristeller, «Humanism», in Q. Skinner & E. Kessler (eds), *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, Cambridge 1988, pp. 113-137, esp. 113-117.

such as Aldus Manutius, to advise on the production of editions of Greek texts.

The story of the revival of Greek in Renaissance Italy is fascinating and quite well known. Byzantine-Greek émigrés feature in almost any book on Renaissance culture and have also become the object of detailed study³. Quite clearly this story is very much the story of the impact of Byzantine learning on Europe. Of course the situation is more complex than this because the Greek émigrés adapted to the new cultural environment and used their skills to satisfy the needs of a different culture. But whatever the complexities, this story is often considered to be an exhaustive answer to the question of the extent of the Greek contribution to the Italian Renaissance⁴. Yet there is another side to this question. To investigate it, it is first essential to note that verbs like «contribute», «advance», or «promote» can mean at least two things, (a) «be instrumental in», «actively help», but also, (b) «play an essential role», «take part in something». The difference between meanings (a) and (b) is not only about the extent of the contribution, but also about its nature. The typesetter of a book published by Oxford University Press containing papers on Humanism, for instance, does considerable work, perhaps no less than the authors of the volume, but only the latter are entitled to be called «contributors» to the volume, because only they contribute to what the book is essentially about, that is, scholarship on Humanism. The two different meanings of words like «contribute» give rise in the same way to two different questions about the role of Greek scholars in the development of Renaissance humanism. The one most discussed is that of the extent they were instrumental to the emergence of this movement, and is answered by the story of the impact the Byzantines had, which I have referred to above. But there is also the question as to whether, and to what extent, Greek scholars took part and sustained Renaissance humanism throughout its development on an equal footing with the others in the movement. This question does not inquire into the extent to which Greeks helped in setting the stage for humanism, but whether they were also actors on it.

This question has been largely neglected. This is because it has always

3. See especially D. Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice*, Cambridge, Mass. 1962; idem, *Byzantine East and Latin West*, Oxford 1966, and N. Wilson, *From Byzantium to Italy*, London 1992.

4. See, for instance, K. Setton, «The Byzantine Background to the Italian Renaissance», *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 100, 1 (1976) 1-76, Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice*, op.cit., pp. 279-301, P. O. Kristeller, «Italian Humanism and Byzantium» in his *Renaissance Thought and Its Sources*, New York 1979, pp. 137-150, D. Zakythinos, «Τὸ πρόβλημα τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς συμβολῆς στὴν Ἀναγέννηση», in his *Μεταβυζαντινὰ καὶ Νέα Ἑλληνικά*, Athens 1978, pp. 228-243.

been assumed that the Greeks helped in the formation of Renaissance humanism but did not really follow its development which surely set such very standards, and in the sense that they fell short of what contemporary humanists were able to do, they could not be deemed truly equal members of the humanistic movement. This assumption becomes evident in most books on humanism when we move from the figures of the 15th and early 16th century to those of a generation or two later, that is, to the humanists of the late Renaissance, i.e. of the 16th and early 17th centuries. Quite remarkably the interest in Greek intellectuals vanishes, while the interest in humanists who were closely related to them remains strong, if not stronger. Thus we hear of Bembo but never of Leonicos Thomaeus; we hear of Crusius and Hoeschel but never of Margounios; we hear of Casaubon but rarely of Portos; we hear of Zabarella and Cremonini but never of Kottounios, and so on. While modern studies on European humanism hardly ever refer to Greek scholars of the late Renaissance, if we look, for instance, at the relevant chapters of Sathas' book on eminent Greeks of these centuries⁵, we are struck by the fact that there were so many active in Italy and other western European countries, the very places where humanism flourished, and that they were engaged in projects typical of humanists, such as editing classical texts, commenting on Aristotle, or composing epigrams in Greek and Latin. Among the most important ones are Matthaios Debaris, Leonicos Thomaeus, Iason Denores, Maximos Margounios, Frangiskos Portos, Nikolaos Sofianos, Leon Allatios, Ioannis Kottounios. Many of them, as will be seen, were much respected for their erudition among contemporary humanists. So why are they neglected now? And how are we to explain the fact that so much is written on the first generation of Greek scholars, mostly Byzantine émigrés, whereas the later ones are hardly ever mentioned?

There seem to be two reasons for this situation. The first is, as I have just said, the view that these Greek intellectuals are not equal to western humanists, such as Valla, Erasmus, Budé, Crusius, or Scaliger, and are thus best only

5. N. Sathas, *Νεοελληνική Φιλολογία. Βιογραφίαι τῶν ἐν τοῖς γράμμασιν διαλαμπάντων Ἑλλήνων ἀπὸ τῆς καταλύσεως τῆς Βυζαντινῆς Αὐτοκρατορίας μέχρι τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ἐθνικογερσίας (1453-1821)*, Athens 1868. For a bibliographical report see É. Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique ou description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés par des Grecs aux XVe et XVIe siècles*, vols I-IV, Paris 1885-1906, idem, *Bibliographie hellénique ... au XVIIIe siècle*, vols I-V, Paris 1894-1904. For the same period one should also consult the rich relevant section of B. Knös, *L'Histoire de la littérature néo-grecque*, Uppsala 1962, and the recent work of E. Layton, *The Sixteenth Century Greek Book in Italy. Printers and Publishers for the Greek World*, Venice 1994. A useful catalogue of the European humanists which includes some of the Greek intellectuals I examine here, one finds in the work of J.-F. Maillard - J. Kecskeméti & M. Portalier (eds), *L'Europe des Humanistes (XIVe-XVIIe siècles)*, Brepols 1995.

occasionally acknowledged as teachers of Greek. This leaves us with the impression that the role of the Greeks in Renaissance humanism is confined to the transmission of Byzantine, i.e. Medieval Greek scholarship alone, an impression which is reinforced when we are told that this was the contribution not only of Byzantine exiles, but also of later Greeks, such as Ianos Lascaris or Maximos Margounios. Knös, for instance, considers both as representatives of the Byzantine tradition, and, as the title of his book on Lascaris already suggests, he discusses Lascaris in these very terms⁶. But why is Lascaris (1445-1535) an ambassador of the Byzantine culture, while his contemporaries Erasmus (1469-1536) and Budé (1468-1540) are conceived as humanists, and why does Margounios (1549-1602) represent the Byzantine tradition when his German friend David Hoeschel is standarily regarded as humanist? Surely there is an issue here as to what precisely the term «humanist» means, which I will address below, but clearly the above difference in terminology aims to divide humanist scholarship and Byzantine learning into two separate camps, and put Lascaris, Margounios, and their like in the latter. The underlying idea of this approach, which can be found in the work of some leading scholars in the field,⁷ seems to be that there may have been some overlap between Byzantine scholarship and humanism, but at a more mature stage the latter becomes a movement in which Greeks did not play any major role.

The second reason which accounts for the neglect of these Greek intellectuals has to do with the way scholars traditionally approach humanism. Given the expansion of the Renaissance and humanism, more especially, from Italy to the rest of Western Europe, scholars tend to talk of Italian, French, German, or Dutch humanism and see these as regional variants of the

6. See B. Knös, *Un ambassadeur de l'Hellénisme: Janus Lascaris et la tradition gréco-byzantine dans l'Humanisme français*, Uppsala 1945, pp. 218, 221, and passim, and on Margounios, idem, *L'Histoire de la littérature néo-grecque*, op.cit., p. 287.

7. We detect this approach especially in Geanakoplos. See e.g. Geanakoplos, *Greek East and Latin West*, New York 1966. The second part of it, entitled «Byzantium and the Renaissance», treats Greek scholars as ambassadors of the Byzantine tradition, as the titles of his chapters suggest: «The Greco-Byzantine colony in Venice and its significance in the Renaissance», «The Cretan role in the transmission of Greco-Byzantine culture to western Europe via Venice», «An overlooked post-Byzantine plan for religious union with Rome: Maximos Margounios the cretan humanist-Bishop and his Latin library bequeathed to Mount Athos». Cf. also L. Vranoussis, «L'hellénisme postbyzantin et l'Europe», in *XVI Internationaler Byzantistenkongress*, Wien 1981, pp. 1-32. But the Byzantine legacy is only one aspect of the intellectual profile of these Greek scholars. In this connection I would like to suggest that we should think over the much used term «post-byzantine» and consider whether it can be applied justifiably to some aspects of the intellectual life of the contemporary Greeks (like, in my view, in art), or it merely justifies the prejudice of a continuous Byzantine tradition (as I think it does, when it applies to the work of contemporary Greeks on classical scholarship, philosophy, and theology).

same movement. Since most of Greece was under Turkish rule at the time with learning and education rating very low, the question of a Greek humanism does not even arise. The first thing to remember here, though, is that Crete, Cyprus, and many other islands, which were under Venetian rule at the time, foster a cultural activity similar to that in western Europe. Yet no book on European humanism that I know of, discusses Cretan humanism at length, while specialized studies on Renaissance Crete tend to separate its literature, which, they admit, is in many regards a Renaissance literature, from other aspects of Renaissance culture pertaining to learning and education,⁸ in which Crete closely follows western humanist trends, as many studies have shown⁹. The second thing to remember is that Greek intellectuals who were active outside Greek-speaking territories, such as in Italy or in France, tended to become integrated into their local humanistic culture, that is, into Italian or French humanism¹⁰. Their intellectual attachment to local culture is actually taken for granted when certain aspects of humanism, such as philology, are examined; histories of Classical scholarship talk about the French, the Italian, or the Dutch school in this respect, and if any Greek is ever mentioned, he is classified under one of them¹¹.

This very feature, however, begs the question of Greek identity at the time. How can someone who spent most of his life in Venice or in Geneva be considered Greek? This question of identity is as difficult to answer as for any other period of Greek history. One may say that some indeed presented themselves as Greeks, and some were expressly considered as such by their contemporaries, which is remarkable given that several of them were not

8. This separation is typical in older handbooks, but still occurs, although it is regretted, in recent work on the subject, such as that of D. Holton (ed.), *Literature in Renaissance Crete*, Cambridge 1991; see esp. Holton's preface in this volume and his essay «The Cretan Renaissance», *ibid.*, pp. 1-16. Similar is the situation with the scholarship about the Cypriot Renaissance; see for instance, D. Holton, «Κύπρος και Κρητική αναγέννηση: Προκαταρκτική μελέτη ορισμένων πολιτισμικών διασυνδέσεων» and «Μία ιστορία παραμέλησης: Η Κυπριακή γραμματεία την περίοδο της Βενετοκρατίας» in D. Holton, *Μελέτες για τον Ερωτόκριτο και άλλα νεοελληνικά κείμενα*, Athens 2000, pp. 209-236, 237-266 (with further literature on the subject).

9. I primarily refer to the work of the late Prof. N. Panagiotakis, who has done much to show the similarities between the Cretan and the Italian intellectual life of the period (see pp. 45-46).

10. For instance, B. Weinberg, *A History of Literary Criticism in the Italian Renaissance*, vol. 1, Chicago 1961, p. ix, states that he took as «Italian» the works not only of Italians but also of foreigners published there, and he thus includes Greeks like Portos, on whom see below, pp. 27-30.

11. R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, vol. II, Oxford 1976, p. 102, for instance, discusses Lascaris in connection with the French Renaissance and Budé, in particular, but he leaves out scholars of the calibre of Portos. J. Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship*, vol. II, Cambridge 1908, p. 124, classifies Lascaris and Portos under the Italian school of scholarship, but he hardly discusses them.

Orthodox but Protestant or Roman Catholic¹². Clearly, though, the issue is far more complicated and cannot be settled here, although a further remark will be made towards the end of this paper. Yet the difficulty in settling this should not deter us from inquiring into the role of these intellectuals, and this for two main reasons. First, because clearly it is no less difficult to determine the identity of Italians, French, or Germans of the time, but in their case such a question rarely arises because they operate in the territory of their present national states. Secondly, because what interests me here is not only to show that next to western European humanists there were also Greeks who are neglected in modern European accounts, but also to argue that some well known Greek intellectuals of the time must be studied *as* humanists. I thus want to take issue also with modern Greek scholarship which, quite generally, hardly ever studies them in their contemporary intellectual context, which is that of western humanism¹³, but rather tends to classify them under the general and misleading heading of the so-called *λόγια παράδοση*, the classizing tradition, together with much later Greeks who write in archaizing style¹⁴. Even when the scholars in question are termed «humanists» in modern Greek accounts, this does not necessarily mean much, because the issue is not the terminology but rather what it should entail, which is that their activity has to be studied as a whole, since it is motivated by the ideology of humanism.

My first aim here is to argue that some Greek intellectuals of the 16th and 17th centuries must be considered as humanists and studied as such. Secondly, I would like to address the question of whether those Greeks who qualify as humanists make up a distinct current, and if so in what sense. In order to proceed in our inquiry, however, we first need to be clear about what being a humanist amounts to and what precisely we mean by this term.

As I already said at the beginning, humanism was that aspect of Renaissance culture which had to do with learning, broadly defined, and education more specifically, and its dominant spirit was that of reviving ancient

12. Kottounios, for instance, presents himself (*natione Graeco*) in his *Oratio Liminaris* in the University of Padova, Patavii 1638. Also D. Bembo presents Marjounios as «di nazion Greco»; Legrand, *op.cit.*, XV-XVI siècles, vol. 2, p. LXI.

13. This is clearly the case with studies like that of B. N. Tatakis, *Γεράσιμος Βλάχος ὁ Κρήσις*, Venice 1973. See below pp. 26-27.

14. See e.g. the presentation of those figures in the anthology of G. Kornoutos (ed.), *Λόγιοι τῆς Τουρκοκρατίας*, vol. A'-B', Athens 1956, together with Anthrakitis and Maurokordatos. Cf. I. K. Chasiotis, *Μεταξὺ Οθωμανικῆς κυριαρχίας καὶ Ευρωπαϊκῆς πρόκλησης. Ὁ Ἑλληνικὸς κόσμος στα χρόνια τῆς Τουρκοκρατίας*, Thessaloniki 2001, esp. pp. 142-146. Some, like A. Karathanasis, *Ἡ Φλαγγίνειος σχολὴ τῆς Βενετίας*, Thessaloniki 1986, p. 7, go as far as to consider them as precursors of the greek Enlightenment!

knowledge. Given this spirit, the study of classical texts was a major concern of all humanists, even when some significant contemporary scientific discoveries, such as that of Copernicus, revealed the limitations of the ancients¹⁵. While other professionals, such as logicians, doctors and engineers, almost invariably had to be reasonably competent in comprehending the classical texts in order to practise their profession well, since these texts were fundamental for any branch of learning concerning the disciplines of man (the so-called *studia humanitatis*), and thus all had to be philologists to some degree¹⁶, humanists specialized precisely in this: they were able to detect a corrupt text, translate it, and properly edit it from the manuscript. Given their expertise, humanists helped others study the classical authors as teachers of classical languages and cultures¹⁷, and a large part of their scholarly output, such as editions of classical texts, translations, and commentaries, was aimed precisely at serving their teaching.

The other characteristic feature of humanists was their bent for rhetoric. To understand this, we must bear in mind that for humanists the cultivation of ancient languages was not merely the means to explore ancient learning but valuable in themselves. This is why they practised them as if they were living languages, composing in Greek and Latin sermons, letters, or epigrams on various occasions, such as to dedicate a book, to congratulate, to praise, or to sympathize¹⁸. And by doing so, they sought to exhibit their proficiency in the ancient languages and thus present themselves as competent teachers of them.

15. Two classic examples of this critical attitude towards the ancient texts are Pico della Mirandola and Kepler; see A. Grafton, *Commerce with the Classics. Ancient Books and Renaissance Readers*, Michigan 1997, chs. 2 & 5.

16. In the Renaissance the study of classical antiquity was not a specialized subject, and this remained so until the 18th century. The decision of the University of Cambridge to reform the undergraduate course in the 18th century by separating the classics as a special subject was regarded as a modernisation which the University of Oxford still resisted; see M. L. Clarke, *Classical Education in Britain 1500-1900*, Cambridge 1959, pp. 67-68.

17. Humanism shaped a sophisticated educational system with provisions about the order and the method of teaching classical texts. It is quite telling that two of Erasmus' acclaimed writings were the *Program of Studies (De ratione studii)* and *The education of boys (De pueris instituendis)*. On the education that humanists provided see E. Garin, *Il pensiero pedagogico dello umanesimo*, Florence 1958, and A. Grafton & L. Jardine, *From Humanism to the Humanities: Education and Liberal Arts in Fifteenth and Sixteenth Century Europe*, London 1986.

18. For the various aspects of the composition of epigrams at the time of the Renaissance see L. Bradner, «Das neulateinische Epigramm» in G. Pfohl (ed.), *Das Epigramm*, Darmstadt 1969, pp. 197-211, J. Hutton, *The Greek Anthology in Italy to the Year 1800*, Ithaca - New York 1935, idem, *The Greek Anthology in France and in the Latin Writers of the Netherlands to the Year 1800*, Ithaca - New York 1946, and Clarke, *The Classical Education in Brittain*, op.cit., p. 66, and passim.

Finally, we must note that humanists, quite generally, were also characterized by strong philosophical and theological concerns. Those with philosophical interests aimed to expound the views of Plato and Aristotle in the same way that the ancient commentators had done¹⁹, while their theological preoccupations turned them to the meticulous study of the original Biblical text²⁰.

From the above outline we can see how complex the identity of a humanist is. In essence being a humanist amounts to a particular intellectual orientation towards retrieving and imparting ancient knowledge, and involves a certain web of skills indispensable for this enterprise, which include a high degree of competence in both Greek and Latin. But we must remember that within this profile there was certainly much room for diversity, depending on individual inclinations. Let us now go back to Greek intellectuals of the time and see how much they conform to this humanist outlook, that is, to what extent, if at all, they meet the new standards of scholarship.

Several Greeks of the time were active in projects like the ones I have described above. Several of them, for instance, were able teachers and editors of Greek and Latin classics, wrote scholarly treatises in Greek or Latin, and enjoyed the admiration of their contemporaries. Taking some figures at the turn of the fifteenth century, we know that Ermolao Barbaro admired Gazes' erudition and Erasmus had much respect for Thomaeus' literary and philosophical skills²¹; Erasmus also acknowledged the proficiency in Latin of Gazes, Musuros, and I. Lascaris²². But are such qualities enough to qualify them as humanists? It is time, then, to set some criteria. This is not entirely arbitrary. Humanists themselves appear to evaluate their peers with certain criteria, and these seem to me to include the following: (a) the extent to which intellectuals were engaged in all these activities, (b) the quality they achieved in them, (c) their engagement with questions being discussed by contemporary humanists, (d) the ties they had with them, and (e) the degree to

19. On the approach of humanists to philosophy see J. Krayer, «Philologists and philosophers», in J. Krayer (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*, Cambridge 1996, pp. 142-160.

20. See J. Bentley, *Humanists and the Holy Writ*, Princeton 1983, and D. K. Shuger, *The Renaissance Bible*, Berkeley 1994, esp. pp. 11-53. Humanists like Valla, Erasmus, and Beza studied with much zeal the Biblical text from the manuscripts and argued for a particular interpretation.

21. See Krayer, «Philologists and philosophers», op.cit., pp. 144, 156, and Erasmus praise of Thomaeus in H. M. Allen (ed.), *Opus Epistolarum V*, Oxford 1924, pp. 590-591.

22. Erasmus in a letter to Gaverus says of Musuros that he was *latinae linguae usque ad miraculum doctus, quod vix ulli Graeco contigit praeter Theodorum Gazaeum et Johannem Lascarem*. This is quoted by J. Whittaker, «Janus Lascaris at the court of the Emperor Charles V», *Thesaurismata* 14 (1977) 76-109, 83 n. 28.

which their work was appreciated.

How many Greek intellectuals of the 16th and early 17th centuries, then, do qualify as humanists? Unfortunately we know very little about most of them. Their works and correspondence remain largely unedited, we know little about their connections with contemporary humanistic circles, and we are unable to appreciate fully the impact they had. We happen, though, to be in a better position regarding some of them. In the following I will look closely at some individuals and I will argue that their intellectual concerns, activities, and the skills they bring to them are very similar to those of well known contemporary humanists and qualify them as such.

The first one I would like to discuss is Frangiskos Portos (1511-1581). Portos was a distinguished Hellenist of his time²³, but today he is little appreciated and much less well known than one of his students, Isaac Casaubon, the editor of several classical texts²⁴. Indeed, it has been argued that our respect for Portos is due mainly to his contribution to the education of Casaubon²⁵. We have reasons to believe, though, not only that Casaubon owed his excellent editorial skills partly to his teacher, but also that he was significantly indebted to Portos for part of his personal editorial achievement. As far as the text of Aeschylus is concerned, for instance, Martin West has shown that several critical restorations which occur in Casaubon's apparatus criticus of his Aeschylus' edition in fact go back either to Portos or to Aurtus²⁶. But also independently of such comparisons, Portos turns out to be a prolific and highly skilled editor of particularly demanding classical Greek texts, such as the *Iliad*, the tragedies of Aeschylus and Sophocles, and other

23. For a portrait of Portos see H. Voutieridis, *Ιστορία τῆς Νεοελληνικῆς Λογοτεχνίας*, Athens 1924, pp. 297-306, M. Manoussakas & N. Panagiotakis, «Ἡ φιλομεταρρυθμιστικὴ δράση τοῦ Φραγκίσκου Πόρτου στὴ Μόδενα καὶ στὴ Φερράρα καὶ ἡ δίκη του ἀπὸ τὴν Ἱερὰ Ἐξέταση τῆς Βενετίας (1536-1559)», *Thesaurismata* 18 (1981) 7-118, O. Reverdin & N. Panagiotakis, *Οἱ Ἑλληνικὲς σπουδὲς στὴν Ἑλβετία τοῦ Καλβίνου*, Athens 1995, pp. 55-91.

24. See his classic biography by Marc Pattison, *Isaac Casaubon*, London 1875.

25. This was argued by Pattison, *Isaac Casaubon*, op.cit., p. 9 and especially by Oliver Reverdin in Reverdin & Panagiotakis, op.cit., p. 38, who says: «Ἄν λοιπὸν τρέφουμε μεγάλη ἐκτίμηση γιὰ τὸν Πόρτο, αὐτὸ συμβαίνει κυρίως ἐπειδὴ ἐπέδρασε στὴ διαμόρφωση ἐνὸς σπουδαίου λογίου». Reverdin goes on to contrast them in terms of teaching method and originality and claims that Casaubon «revived» classical studies. But, to begin with, Portos' contribution to classical scholarship has so far not been appreciated as much as that of Casaubon, so their comparison is not made on solid ground. Noticeably neither Sandys nor Pfeiffer discuss Portos as a classical scholar in their histories of the subject.

26. M. West, *Studies in Aeschylus*, Stuttgart 1990, pp. 361-364. For other successful readings which must also be credited to Portos see H. Kallergis, «Die kritische Arbeit des Humanisten Franciscus Portus am Text des Aischylos», *Wiener Studien* 107-108 (1994-95) 639-646, and, idem, «Φραγκίσκου Πόρτου, Ὑπόμνημα στὸν Αἰσχύλο», *Ἀριάδνη* 2 (1984) 69-87, esp. 79 n. 5 and 83-85.

texts which I mention below. His critical acumen in the preparation of the text was renowned at his time. West has recently confirmed it, when he shows that Portos' rate of success in restoring Aeschylus' text is impressively high²⁷. In general Portos' editorial achievement is suggested by the fact that his name features often in the apparatus of modern editions of the authors he edited.

Portos used to accompany his editions with extensive prolegomena and/or commentaries in Latin aiming to clarify the text. As it becomes clear from Portos' notes and comments, such works emerged through his teaching practice which they also aimed to serve²⁸. We should note here that many of Portos' comments concern the style and aesthetic value of the work he studies. This tendency stems from Portos' general scholarly orientation towards appreciating ancient poetic and rhetorical theory. This orientation may explain why he edited and studied the ancient rhetorical handbooks of Aphthonius and Hermogenes, why he commented on Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, on Apollonius Dyscolus' *Lectures on Syntax*²⁹, and on Longinus' *On the Sublime*³⁰. All these treatises, especially that of Aphthonius, were much used at the time, especially in schools (usually in Latin translations), as handbooks of style. Their wide use reflects the attraction these treatises exerted upon humanists, which is manifested in the composition of long commentaries on such ancient works by humanists such as Daniele Barbaro and Joannes Vives³¹. The strong preoccupation of contemporary humanists with poetic theory also becomes evident when we recall that it was then that Robortello published his commentary on Aristotle's *Poetics* (1548), as did many others, and Julius Scaliger his massive *Poetices libri septem* (1561), to name the most

27. See West, *Studies in Aeschylus*, op.cit., p. 377. In his text of Aeschylus, West adopts 78 of Portos' readings. On this scale Portos comes third after Turnebus and Hermann.

28. I mention his prolegomena to Sophocles, Francisci Porti Cretensis, *In omnes Sophoclis tragoedias prolegόμενα ut vulgo vocantur*, Morgis 1584. This work was published posthumously by his son Aemilius. For his (unfinished) commentary on Aeschylus, see Kallergis, «Φραγκίσκου Πόρτου, Ὑπόμνημα στὸν Αἰσχύλο», op.cit., pp. 72-73, and idem, «Ὁ Κρητικὸς φιλόλογος Φραγκίσκος Πόρτος ὡς σχολιαστὴς τοῦ Αἰσχύλου», *Πεπραγμένα Ἡ Διεθνoῦς Κρητολογικοῦ Συνεδρίου*, vol. B₁, Irakleio 2000, pp. 293-305, esp. 294-295.

29. Frangiskus Portus, *Apollonii Alexandrini, De syntaxi seu constructione orationes*, libri III, Francoforti 1590. The work is prefaced by Fr. Sylburgius.

30. Portos also writes on tragic and comic poetic style in his prolegomena to Sophocles (see n.). For an evaluation of Portos' work on ancient poetic theory next to that of his contemporaries see Weinberg, *A History of Literary Criticism*, op.cit., vol. 1, pp. 156-200, esp. 188-194 and 564-565.

31. See L. Green, «Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and Renaissance Views on the Emotions» in P. Mack (ed.), *Renaissance Rhetoric*, London 1994, pp. 1-26, and P. Mack, «Humanist Rhetoric and Dialectic» in Krayer (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*, op.cit., pp. 82-99.

prominent works in the field³². Portos' scholarly projects must have been motivated by similar interests, and these were presumably inspired by the work of his contemporary humanists. This must also be the case with Portos' compilation of a Greek-Latin dictionary. The production of such dictionaries was common among humanists of the time, such as Robertus Stephanus and G. Budé, and Portos, we learn, was also involved in the revision of Budé's own dictionary³³.

Portos also wrote several epigrams in Greek, as did most of his contemporary humanists³⁴. But humanists were also able to write verses in Latin, and this required a special skill which Portos, like most contemporary Greeks, may have lacked. This is actually suggested by the fact that he sent his epigrams to Joseph Scaliger, one of the most remarkable humanists of his time, with the request to translate them into Latin³⁵. This instance is quite telling: it shows Portos' concern to conform with the humanist ideal of verse-writing in both classical languages and also his concern for his reputation as epigrammatist, which apparently was considerable – we know that Crusius asked for his epigrams³⁶. Publishing Greek epigrams without a Latin version could be taken as a sign of inability to compose such a version at a time when several humanists managed to do this with proficiency. There was indeed a strong trend among contemporary humanists to write epigrams in two versions, that is, Greek and Latin, thus exhibiting their complete mastery of both classical languages. Poliziano was one of the first to write such epigrams, and Musuros apparently was the first Greek to follow him. In the sixteenth century this skill was widely practised by humanists like Crusius, Scaliger, Auratus, and Casaubon who wrote epigrams in two or even three versions (elegiacs or hexameters in Greek and Latin, and also Greek or Latin iambics or trochaics). It was probably Portos' desire to conform with such a trend which led him to have his epigrams translated into Latin.

But this needs to be put into the right context. More than merely

32. For a discussion of works of humanists on poetics see Weinberg, *A History of Literary Criticism*, op.cit., vol. 1, pp. 388-398 (on Robortello's commentary), and vol. 2, pp. 715-796. Cf. J. Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship*, op.cit., vol. II, pp. 134-135. Noteworthy is the case of the little known Greek Iason Denores who publishes a *Poetica* in Italian in 1588 (see Weinberg, *ibid.*, pp. 786-790, also 672-676).

33. See Reverdin & Panagiotakis, «Οἱ Ἑλληνικὲς σπουδὲς στὴν Ἑλβετία τοῦ Καλβίνου», op.cit., pp. 42-47.

34. See N. Panagiotakis, «Φραγκίσκου Πόρτου ἐπιγράμματα», in *Αντίχαρη. Αφιέρωμα στον καθηγητὴ Στ. Καρατζά*, Athens 1984, pp. 335-354.

35. We have Portos' letter to Scaliger in which he expresses this request; see Legrand, op.cit., XVII siècle, vol. 3, p. 125, Panagiotakis, «Φραγκίσκου Πόρτου ἐπιγράμματα», op.cit., pp. 337, 352.

36. See M. Crusius, *Turcograeciae libri octo*, Basel 1584, p. 516.

following a contemporary fashion, this forms one side of Portos' humanistic profile which Portos consciously cultivated. In fact there is enough evidence to suggest that he was motivated by what we could call the principles of the humanistic movement. In one of his speeches, Portos says that he is happy to use Latin for the sake of his audience who is proficient in it, although to him this is a foreign language which he was never taught³⁷. In this context Portos argues strongly for the educational value of both Greek and Latin, and holds their knowledge to be indispensable for mastering any branch of learning, such as mathematics, medicine, philosophy or law³⁸. He also says that he considers his role as a scholar as basically residing in the education of others, and this, in his view, is achieved by interpreting ancient texts³⁹. Portos apparently raised his son Aemilios, later professor in Heidelberg, according to this humanist ideal. This can be inferred from the fact that Aemilios was an expert in both classical languages but he confessed that he knew little modern Greek⁴⁰.

It must be the same commitment to the humanist ideal which accounts, at least partly, for Portos' strong connections with contemporary humanists and also for their respect for him. Portos was familiar with the work of humanists like H. Stephanus, Victorius, Joseph Scaliger, Budé, and Auratus, and corresponded with several of them. Portos' work was well known to the community of humanists and was much appreciated by some of the most erudite of them; Crusius, Beza, and Casaubon, for instance, expressed their admiration for it⁴¹. And Calvin was so impressed with Portos' scholarship that he appointed Portos professor of Greek in Geneva, where the latter spent most of his life. Quite crucial to this appointment was also Portos' sympathy with the ideas of the Reformation – he was indeed brought before the Catholic inquisition for his religious beliefs⁴². Much is still to be learned about Portos' activity and scholarly work, but already from the above outline it should be fairly clear that he was completely immersed in the humanist culture of his time and that he was a skilled and widely respected humanist.

Another figure who qualifies as a humanist of the highest level is Maximos

37. See Francisci Porti Cretensis, *Orationes*, published together with his prolegomena on Sophocles' cited above; *Oratio sexta*, p. 82 «...ausus sum ego homo alienigena et ingenio exercitatio neque nihil fere instructus Latine vobis coram dicere, iis scilicet in Latino sermone nati sunt et educati.»

38. *Ibid.*, pp. 86-87.

39. *Ibid.*, pp. 84-85.

40. Crusius, *Turcograeciae*, *op.cit.*, pp. 519-521.

41. See Voutieridis, *Ιστορία της Νεοελληνικής Λογοτεχνίας*, *op.cit.*, pp. 301-306.

42. See Manoussakak & Panagiotakis, «Η φιλομεταρρυθμιστική δράση του Φραγκίσκου Πόρτου...», *op.cit.*

Margounios (1549-1602)⁴³. Born in Crete at the time of its Venetian occupation, Margounios received an excellent education there. He studied Greek and Latin from a very early age, the latter under the learned Catholic bishop of Sitia, Gaspare Viviano. Like many other educated Greeks of the time, he later studied philosophy and medicine at the University of Padua where his good friend Meletios Pigas was also studying⁴⁴. In 1578 Margounios returned to Crete to be ordained and some years later was elected Bishop of Kythera, an island under Venetian rule at the time. However, the Venetian council did not approve Margounios' appointment and instead offered him a post as teacher of Greek and Latin in Venice with a good salary.

Margounios' activity in Venice was remarkable and comprised work on theology, philosophy, and rhetoric⁴⁵. To begin with, he edited and translated several ancient and byzantine texts in those fields. At the age of twenty-three he discovered the dialogue against the Manicheans of St. John of Damascus, translated it into Latin, and had it printed by the Paduan printer Lorenzo Pasquati in 1578. Later on he turned to study seriously philosophical and theological texts. He prepared two commentaries of Aristotle's *Categories* and Porphyry's *Isagoge* in dialogical form, both of which remain unpublished⁴⁶. Moreover he translated [Aristotle's] *Liber de coloribus*, also printed in Padua (in 1575), translated Gregory of Nyssa's commentary on the Psalms, while also editing works of Byzantine authors like Kamariotes and Gennadios Scholarios⁴⁷. Apart from his personal editorial achievement, Margounios also played an important role in assisting the projects of several other humanists, as he had close ties with humanist circles in his native Crete,

43. On Margounios' life and work see Sathas, *Νεοελληνική Φιλολογία. Βιογραφίαί τῶν ἐν τοῖς γράμμασιν διαλαμπάντων Ἑλλήνων*, op.cit., pp. 212-218, Knös, *L'Histoire de la littérature néogrecque*, op.cit., pp. 283-287, Geanakoplos, *Byzantine East and Latin West*, op.cit., chs. 4, 6, Layton, *The Sixteenth Century Greek Book in Italy*, op.cit., pp. 388-394. For a more detailed study of Margounios, especially his theological views, see G. Fedalto, *Massimo Margounio e il suo commento al De Trinitate di S. Agostino* (1588), Brescia 1968.

44. See G. Fabris, «Professori e scolari Greci all' Università di Padova», *Archivio Veneto* 62 (1942) 121-165, esp. 132.

45. For an account of Margounios' activity in Venice see G. Schiro, «Missione umanistica di Massimo Margounio a Venezia», *Rivista di studi Bizantini e Neollenici*, n.s. 4 [14] (1967) 159-187.

46. See Legrand, op.cit., XV-XVI siècles, vol. 2, pp. lxxi-lxxii, and Th. Papadopoulos, *Η Νεοελληνική Φιλοσοφία από τον 16ο έως τον 18ο αιώνα*, Athens 1988, pp. 88-89.

47. Margounios edited the treatise of Gennadios Scholarios on predestination, the *Rhetoric* of Kamariotes, and the fragments of the Peripatetic Andronicus of Rhodes. For Margounios' scholarly output see Legrand, op.cit., vol. 2, pp. LXV-LXXVII, Sathas, *Νεοελληνική Φιλολογία*, op.cit., pp. 216-218, Knös, *L'Histoire de la littérature néogrecque*, op.cit., p. 286.

in Italy, especially in Padua and Venice, and also in Germany⁴⁸. Especially noteworthy here also is his connection with the eminent German editor of classical texts David Hoeschel⁴⁹, who was operating in Augsburg, a city with a long humanistic tradition. Margounios resorted to him for the provision of some ancient works which were rare in Italy at the time (e.g. Clement's *Stromateis*). Hoeschel also edited some of Margounios' theological works and a collection of his religious poems, the *Poemata sacra*⁵⁰. On the other hand Margounios assisted Hoeschel in some of his editorial projects by sending him the manuscripts he needed. This is certainly the case with Hoeschel's edition of some treatises of Maximos Confessor (1599) and of Photius' *Bibliotheca* (1601)⁵¹. For the latter edition in particular, Margounios carried out a considerable amount of work on the manuscripts, presumably the two most important ones, initially owned by Bessarion and later preserved in the library of St. Mark's in Venice⁵², of which he prepared copies. Margounios had a special interest in the work and personality of the patriarch Photius, whom, from what we know, he considered as a model of humanist theologian and tried to emulate in all regards. This interest is confirmed by the fact that Hoeschel's edition opens with an epigram of Margounios in praise of Photius⁵³.

Hoeschel was not the only one who profited from Margounios' assistance in scholarly projects. We know that Margounios revised the Homeric Index of Ascanio Persio, professor at the University of Bologna, that he was asked by Pardi Bembo to check the Greek text of Plato from which Bembo was

48. See P. Enepekides, «Maximos Margunios an deutsche und italienische Humanisten», *JÖB* 10 (1961) 94-145. Margounios had close relations with members of the Academy of Stravaganti like Andreas Cornaros and Markos Contaratos. On this see Panagiotakis «Ἐρευναὶ ἐν Βενετία», *Thesaurismata* 5 (1968), 45-118, esp. 62

49. On David Hoeschel see briefly Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship*, op.cit., vol. II, p. 272, Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, op.cit., vol. II, p. 141. Both Sandys and Pfeiffer mention some sources of assistance to Hoeschel's editions (such as Scaliger), and to his edition of Photius in particular, but neither of them refers to Margounios. On the relations between Margounios and Hoeschel see Geanakoplos, *Byzantine East and Latin West*, op.cit., pp. 174-175. Some of Margounios' letters to Hoeschel are edited by Legrand, op.cit., XV-XVI siècles, vol. 1, pp. 2-21, vol. 2, pp. LXI-LXII, LXVII-LXVIII.

50. *Maximi Margunii, episcopi Cytherensis Poemata aliquot sacra: Graece nunc primum publicata studio et opera D. Hoeschelii*, Lugduni 1592.

51. On these editions see D. Harlfinger (ed.), *Graecogermania. Griechischstudien Deutscher Humanisten*, Wolfenbüttel 1989, pp. 359, 365-366.

52. See Wilson, *From Byzantium to Italy*, op.cit., p. 161.

53. This is published by B. Botfield, *Praefationes et epistolae editionibus principibus auctorum veterum praepositae*, Cambridge 1861, pp. 643-44, and Legrand, op.cit., XV-XVI siècles, vol. 2, p. LXVIII; cf. Margounios' letter which was prefaced in this edition, Legrand, op.cit., XVII siècle, vol. 1, pp. 2-3; cf. *ibid.*, XV-XVI siècles, vol. 2, pp. LXVII-LXVIII.

preparing his Italian translation, and that he also collaborated with the English hellenist Henry Savile on the edition of the works of John Chrysostom, an edition which eventually appeared without Margounios' editorial collaboration due to his premature death⁵⁴. Further, as I already said, Margounios had strong connections with Paduan and Venetian humanists who had much respect for his abilities. A Venetian official document of the time speaks of him as «very expert in both Greek and Latin with few equals in all Greece in erudition»⁵⁵. This respect and admiration explains why Italian humanists often asked for Margounios' collaboration in various humanistic projects. Indeed, Margounios seems to have been well known especially for his ability to write epigrams, as is suggested by the fact that dedicatory epigrams of his are found in Venetian books written by local humanists⁵⁶. These epigrams are mostly in Greek, and only occasionally in Latin, as is the case of an epigram of his addressing the Venetian senate, which he writes in both Greek and Latin⁵⁷. Margounios did know Latin well enough to translate Greek prose into it and to write prefaces, letters, and comments⁵⁸, but, as I said in the case of Portos, the composition of Latin verses required special training and, like Portos, he presumably did not feel entirely at home with this practice. This is suggested by the fact that a book of his with verses in Greek was passed to one of his close friends, the German humanist Conradus Ritterhusius, for translation into Latin⁵⁹.

This book of verses deserves some attention. It contains religious poems written in anacreontic metre, which to our taste appear rather dull and uninspired⁶⁰. Yet in writing them Margounios follows the fashion of his contemporary humanists for composing anacreontic poems, a fashion following the discovery of a manuscript containing the corpus of anacreontic poems

54. See Legrand, op.cit., XV-XVI siècles, vol. 2, pp. LX-LXI, Layton, *The Sixteenth Century Greek Book in Italy*, op.cit., p. 391, Geanakoplos, *Byzantine East and Latin West*, op.cit., p. 176. Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship*, op.cit., vol. II, pp. 333-335, and Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, op.cit., vol. II, p. 144, devote a note to Henry Savile and his «fundamental edition of Chrysostom». Sandys states that Savile was helped by several scholars, but neither he nor Pfeiffer mentions Margounios' significant role in it.

55. Cited by Geanakoplos, *Byzantine East and Latin West*, op.cit., p. 169.

56. See G. Karamanolis, «Ἀνέκδοτα ἐπιγράμματα τοῦ Μαξίμου Μαργουνίου», *Thesaurismata* 28 (1998) 197-207.

57. See *ibid.*, pp. 202-205.

58. Margounios translated into Latin [Aristotle's] *On Colours*, the dialogue of John of Damascus against the Manicheans, and Psellus' paraphrase of the second book of Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics*.

59. See the letters of Ritterhusius to Hoeschel regarding the Latin translation of Margounios' poems in Legrand, op.cit., XVII siècle, vol. 1, pp. 4-8.

60. *Maximi Margunii episcopi Cytherorum hymni anacreontici, cum interpretatione latina Conradi Ritterhusii*, Augustae 1601.

and the publication of its content in Paris by Stephanus in 1545. The imitation of the style of these poems became so widespread across all Renaissance Europe in the 16th and 17th centuries that such poems are almost characteristic of the age⁶¹. It is exactly this fashion that Margounios follows.

Margounios not only was in tune with a poetic trend of his time, but his poems apparently also had some impact. This is suggested by the fact that an anthology of Greek poetry published in 1614 containing excerpts from ancient and medieval Greek poets includes several of Margounios' anacreontic ones⁶². This is quite striking in view of the fact that Margounios is the only author included in the anthology after Manuel Philes, and that this anthology was published only thirteen years after the first publication of Margounios' poems. Obviously his reputation as a humanist-poet must have been consolidated by that time.

Yet today these poems have not been appreciated in the correct light, and we still find them only in the *editio prima* of 1601. Most Histories of Modern Greek Literature either neglect them or make harsh judgements about their value⁶³. But, as is usual with the output of humanists, they are mostly judged by the wrong criterion, namely that of literature as we, moderns, think of it. This is also the case with the epigrams that humanists compose in archaizing style. They are equally dismissed usually with disparaging remarks about their vanity and display of exhibitionist erudition⁶⁴. But what has not been appreciated is exactly what these people were attempting, and this is crucial if we are to do any justice to the intellectual history of the period. The humanists were not poets or even classical scholars like the modern ones, but rather professional rhetoricians, to some extent heirs and successors of the medieval ones, who were convinced that the best way to achieve eloquence and impress with their compositions was to imitate classical models. Their verse-making was part of their teaching of poetry rather than the activity of a poet in the modern sense, since humanists taught

61. For this fashion of anacreontic imitations see D. O'Brien, *Anacreon Redivivus*, Michigan 1995.

62. *Poetae Graeci Veteres Corpus*, Coloniae 1614, vols. I-II. Margounios' poems are printed in the second volume (pp. 192-210) which contains lyric and epigrammatic poetry.

63. K. Th. Dimaras, M. Vitti, and L. Politis do not even mention these poems, while Knös, *L'Histoire de la littérature néogrecque*, op.cit., p. 285, does not think highly of them. Exceptional is the long and positive presentation of them by Voutieridis, *Ιστορία τής νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας*, op.cit., pp. 438-442.

64. See Voutieridis, *Ιστορία τής νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας*, op.cit., p. 237 and especially Panagiotakis, «Φραγκίσκου Πόρτου έπιγράμματα», op.cit., pp. 335-336, 338, who criticizes them for their low poetic value. His view is shared by others, e.g. M. Plastira-Valkanou, «Έπιγραμμα ήρωσελεγείον 'Ιππολύτου Χίου», *Thesaurismata* 28 (1998) 209-221, esp. 219-220.

poetry both by commenting on it and by instructing how to imitate it. So classical learning was not incidental to their verse composition but its actual driving force, and the exhibition of this learning their main end. Their concern, then, was not so much the content but the style, and for them a good style amounted to imitating that of a classical author⁶⁵. It was by the quality of their imitation and emulation of classical models that they were judged by their contemporaries, and modern scholars who criticize their verse-creations as vain learned pyrotechnics by arguing that literature is not only form, but both form and content, and invoke literature theorists in support, simply miss the point⁶⁶.

Let us return for a moment to Margounios. As I mentioned before, Margounios, who entered holy orders and was also elected bishop, had a strong interest in theological and ecclesiastical matters. He was exceptionally well read in the Latin fathers like Augustine and Ambrose and, though himself Greek Orthodox, showed a strong sympathy for the Roman Catholic dogma, like other Greek humanists of the time. Indeed Margounios devoted much energy in showing the affinity between Orthodox and Catholic doctrine on some controversial theological issues, like that of the nature and emanation of the Holy Spirit. His argument, to which I will refer later on, is to be understood as a reaction against Lutheran and Calvinist views, which were gaining ground at the time, and as an attempt to contrast them with the original doctrine of the ancient Church⁶⁷. This, however, does not mean that Margounios distanced himself from the Orthodox faith, despite some contemporary allegations (most importantly by Gabriel Severos) to this effect. As we will see below, quite the opposite was the case.

I now pass to my final example of a Greek intellectual who, in my view, qualifies as a humanist and deserves to be studied as such. I refer to Ioannis

65. On this point see P. Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought*, New York 1961, pp. 98-109. This kind of poetry has been appropriately characterized «eine an der Antike ausgerichtete Bildungsdichtung» by A. Buck, *Rezeption der Antike in den romanischen Literaturen der Renaissance*, Berlin 1976, p. 27.

66. Thus H. Kallergis, «Μετρικές παρατηρήσεις σὲ ἀρχαιογλωσσὰ ἐπιγράμματα Ἑλλήνων λογίων», *Thesaurismata* 28 (1998) 222-237, esp. 235-36. Kallergis argues that «at the time these epigrams must have had an appeal not only to their addressees but also to the wider public; otherwise we cannot explain how they were so fashionable.» But these epigrams were not written to move anybody in the first place, let alone the wider public, which was unable to appreciate the skill behind them.

67. Margounios' theological views are discussed by Geanakoplos, *Byzantine East and Latin West*, ch. 6, and more extensively by G. Podskalsky, *Die griechische Theologie in der Zeit der Türkenherrschaft*, Munich 1988, pp. 135-151, and Fedalto, *Massimo Margunio*, op.cit. Margounios' views were taken seriously into account by Humanists like Crusius who is known to have studied them; see Fedalto, *Massimo Margunio*, op.cit., pp. 54-55, and below p. 44.

Kottounios (1572-1657), who was born in Verroia in Macedonia and made a career in Italy⁶⁸. Kottounios studied first in the Greek college in Rome, like several other Greeks at that time, and then went on to study in Padua. Later on he held the post of a professor in the universities of Bologna (1617-1629) and Padua (1637-1657), where Chalcocondyles and Thomaeus had taught before him. More specifically, Kottounios became a professor of Greek in Bologna and professor ordinarius of philosophy in Padua⁶⁹.

Kottounios had a wide range of interests but he is primarily to be distinguished by his keen interest in science and philosophy, two areas which, were closely interrelated and as I said above, attracted much interest among humanists in the 16th and early 17th century. This is the time that important scientific discoveries, such as that of Copernicus (1473-1543) in astronomy, or of Vesalius (1514-1564) in anatomy, challenged the work of ancient authorities like Aristotle, Ptolemy, and Galen. Galileo (1564-1642) and Kepler (1571-1630), both contemporaries of Kottounios, questioned further the validity of the ancient world-view, and triggered much discussion about the role of empirical knowledge in understanding the world. Kottounios was immersed in this intellectual framework. The university of Padua, where he studied philosophy and medicine, was renowned for its scientific orientation, and its medical school, most particularly, fostered some of the most progressive thought in science. Similar in spirit was the university of Bologna where first Kottounios taught. It is noteworthy that the first official anatomy room was built in Bologna, but it was in Padua that anatomy really became a subject for study in the 16th century, after the publication of Vesalius' pioneering work on human anatomy in 1543. Indeed the rise of the medical school of Padua in the 16th century is associated with a strong emphasis on anatomy, and Vesalius himself taught there for some time at the end of his life. Padua was also the place where Galileo spent several years. On the other hand, from quite early on this university fostered the study of Aristotle's philosophy, and already Chalcocondyles, who was one of the early holders of the chair of Greek there, taught Aristotle's scientific works⁷⁰. Eventually

68. On Kottounios see Sathas, *Νεοελληνική Φιλολογία*, op.cit., pp. 301-302, Voutieridis, *Ιστορία τῆς νεοελληνικῆς λογοτεχνίας*, op.cit., pp. 366-370, A. Stergellis, «Νέα βιογραφικά στοιχεία γιὰ τὸν Ἰωάννη Κωττούνιο», *Thesaurismata* 5 (1968) 249-257, Z. N. Tsirpanlis, *Οἱ Μακεδόνες σπουδαστές τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Κολλεγίου Ρώμης καὶ ἡ δράση τους στὴν Ἑλλάδα καὶ στὴν Ἰταλία*, Thessaloniki 1971, pp. 125-161, Papadopoulos, *Ἡ Νεοελληνική Φιλοσοφία*, op.cit., pp. 201-206.

69. See Fabris, «Professori e scolari Greci all'università di Padova», op.cit., pp. 145-147, and Iacobi Philippi Tomasini, *Gymnasium Patavinum*, Utini 1654, pp. 307, 457.

70. See Geanakoplos, *Interaction of the Sibling Byzantine and Western Cultures in the Middle Ages and the Italian Renaissance*, New Haven 1976, p. 251.

Padua became renowned for its Aristotelianism, thanks to a series of eminent Aristotelian philosophers who taught in the local university, such as Niccolo Vernia, Pietro Pomponazzi, Jacobo Zabarella, and Cesare Cremonini⁷¹. Kottounios followed in their footsteps: he studied under Cremonini, probably also at the same time as Theophilos Korydaleus (1560-1645), the other important Greek Aristotelian of the time⁷², and eventually succeeded Cremonini to the chair of philosophy⁷³. We do encounter Cremonini quite frequently in histories of Medicine and of Renaissance philosophy, but his successor, Kottounios, is hardly ever mentioned⁷⁴. Yet the evidence shows that at this time Kottounios enjoyed wide recognition for his learning, and his many writings commanded much respect⁷⁵.

Let us look more closely at Kottounios' place in his contemporary intellectual context. Like Zabarella and Cremonini, Kottounios was a committed Aristotelian, that is, he endorsed and advocated Aristotle's philosophical views, as he understood them, and his philosophical works are basically commentaries on Aristotelian treatises. He wrote commentaries on the *De anima*, the *Meteorologica*, the *De generatione*, and the *Physics*, as well as a handbook of Aristotelian logic⁷⁶ and a treatise on Aristotelian psychology with the title *De triplici statu animae rationalis*. In writing these works Kottounios clearly follows the tradition of his predecessors, whose views he often cites in order to approve or criticize. He agrees, for instance, with Cremonini's view of how Aristotle's treatises should be ordered, but criticizes

71. On the Aristotelian tradition in the Renaissance which basically flourished in Padua see Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought and Its Sources*, op.cit., pp. 32-49, and B. Copenhaver & C. Schmitt, *Renaissance Philosophy*, Oxford 1992, pp. 60-126.

72. On Corydaleus see Cléobule Tsourkas, *Les débuts de l'enseignement philosophique et de la libre pensée dans les Balkans. La vie et l'oeuvre de Théophile Corydalée*, Thessaloniki 1967, and Papadopoulos, *Η Νεοελληνική Φιλοσοφία*, op.cit., pp. 119-150, 163-180.

73. More precisely, Kottounios succeeded Cremonini after an interval of four years, when Ioannes Ziliolus Perusinus held the chair. Cremonini taught in this chair from 1601 to 1633; Kottounios from 1637 to his death in 1657. See Tomasini, *Gymnasium Patavinum*, op.cit., pp. 307, 453-457.

74. See Andrew Wear, «Early Modern Europe, 1500-1700», in L. I. Conrad et al. (eds), *The Western Medical Tradition, 800 BC to AD 1800*, Cambridge 1995, p. 292, Copenhaver & Schmitt, *Renaissance Philosophy*, pp. 73-74, Tsourkas, *Les débuts...*, op.cit., pp. 191-195, and C. Schmitt, *Cesare Cremonini. Un Aristotelico al tempo di Galilei*, Venice 1980. It is noteworthy that in this short study of Cremonini, Schmitt does not even mention Kottounios, while he refers to several other contemporary Aristotelians.

75. Tomasini, *Gymnasium Patavinum*, op.cit., p. 307, reports that Kottounios' salary was raised twice, obviously in recognition of his services, and describes him as «vir voce et scriptis celeberrimus, cuius copiosa et erudita commentaria extant in universam fere naturalis scientiae ab Aristotelie traditae doctrinam...».

76. *Expositio lucidissima universae logices*, Patavii 1651. This work also contains a short commentary on the *Categories* (pp. 169-351) and the *Posterior Analytics* (pp. 352-442).

Zabarella's claim that for Aristotle principles and causes are identical. Kottounios' philosophical contribution has been completely neglected nowadays even in specialized works in Renaissance philosophy, but even a brief account, which I give below, will suffice to show how much his work was integrated into Paduan Aristotelianism.

As I have already said, one set of questions concerned the role of empirical or scientific knowledge and also the role of mathematics in understanding external reality⁷⁷. Like other Renaissance Aristotelians, such as Zabarella and Cremonini, Kottounios disputed the value of quantitative science which was advancing at the time, and considered the role of mathematics in understanding the world to be limited. In his view, mathematics expresses only one aspect of reality, the quantitative, and represents an abstraction of only the material and formal causes out of the four Aristotelian ones⁷⁸. Hence, he argues, mathematics does not advance metaphysical reasoning, and this, in his view, is why Aristotle does not give it a primary role in his *Metaphysics*⁷⁹. Kottounios was not only against quantitative physics, which was much cultivated in the university of Padua in his time, but also against the novel cosmology of Copernicus and Galileo, whose position he rejected in favour of the Aristotelian picture of the world, arguing that this is also in accordance with the Biblical view⁸⁰. Kottounios' arguments against Copernican cosmology cannot be presented here, but it is pertinent to make at least two comments: first that, much as his position appears conservative or even reactionary to us, it was upheld by many contemporary Aristotelians, such as Cremonini and his circle including Korydaleus⁸¹, for instance, and secondly that Kottounios offers a long critical discussion of the views he disagrees with, rather than simply dismisses them.

One other set of questions that Paduan Aristotelians were seriously discussing concerned the human soul, a central set being about the immortality of the soul, an issue which clearly had some religious significance and hence

77. For a good survey of the discussion and the contributions of Kottounios' predecessors see J. Randall, *The School of Padua and the Emergence of Modern Science*, Padua 1961, pp. 20-74, and N. Jardine, «Epistemology and the Sciences» in Skinner-Kessler (eds), *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, op.cit., pp. 685-711. For the different scientific methods of the Paduan Aristotelians and Galileo see C. Schmitt, «Experience and Experiment: A Comparison of Zabarella's view with Galileo's *De motu*», *Studies in the Renaissance* XVI (1969) 80-138, esp. 83-100.

78. See his *Commentarii in octo libros De Physico auditu*, Patavii 1648, p. 60.

79. *Ibid.*, p. 61; cf. *ibid.*, pp. 351-356.

80. *Ibid.*, pp. 702-710, and *In Primum Aristotelis librum De Meteoris*, Bononiae 1631, pp. 76-80, 87-97, 286-288, 293-294. I plan to discuss Kottounios' arguments against the Copernican theory in a future paper.

81. See Papadopoulos, *Η Νεοελληνική Φιλοσοφία*, op.cit., p. 122.

some bearing on contemporary theological discussions⁸². Pomponazzi, Nifo, Zabarella, and Cremonini had strong views on this, which incline towards well known positions on the matter taken by Aristotelians such as Alexander of Aphrodisias, Philoponus, Averroes, or Thomas Aquinas⁸³. One widely held view was that Aristotle, given his argument in *De anima* III.4-5, had upheld the immortality of the intellect, and this is not at odds with his controversial view that the soul is the form of the living body (*De anima* II.2). This is because, it was argued, the soul is essentially the intellect, and since for Aristotle this is a separable substance, the Stagirite, it was thought, had propounded the immortality of the soul in this specific sense, namely that only the mind survives death while the rest of the soul perishes. This position, which can be traced back to Neoplatonists (e.g. Porphyry, Philoponus, Simplicius), was held by Thomas Aquinas and adopted by the Catholic Church, but was rejected by Pomponazzi, Zabarella, and Cremonini. Yet while Pomponazzi basically follows Alexander's view, according to which the immortality of the soul (i.e. of the intellect) was not an Aristotelian doctrine, Zabarella and Cremonini maintain that for Aristotle the intellect can be said to be immortal, but only in the sense that it knows immortal truths; and for such knowledge it depends on the active intellect (*De anima* III.5), which is divine and represents the truth. In this way Zabarella, in particular, focuses his argument on the nature and the potential of the human intellect, thus heading in the direction that Descartes will later take. Kottounios, however, argues for a slightly different position in his long commentary on the *De anima* and in his equally thorough *De triplici statu animae rationalis*. He agrees with his predecessors that according to Aristotle the human intellect is dependent on the active one, which is the principle of all thinking and immortality, but he still considers the individual human intellect to be separable and immortal as such⁸⁴. This view is closer to that of Aquinas, whom he often cites in this connection, than the views of Zabarella and Cremonini. What is more, Kottounios argues that for Aristotle the immortal nature of the soul bears on morality, that is, it determines moral principles.

82. For a brief survey of the range of views on the matter from the antiquity to the Renaissance see Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought and Its Sources*, op.cit., pp. 181-196; more focused on Renaissance Aristotelians is E. Garin, *L'umanesimo Italiano*, Florence 1964, pp. 156-170, Tsourkas, *Les débuts...*, op.cit., pp. 185-191, and Copenhaver & Schmitt, *Renaissance Philosophy*, op.cit., pp. 106-111.

83. See Randall, *The School of Padua and the Emergence of Modern Science*, pp. 76-114, and more fully E. Kessler, «The intellectual soul», in: Skinner-Kessler (eds), *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, op.cit., pp. 485-534.

84. *Commentarii lucidissimi in tres libros Aristotelis De anima*, Patavii 1657, pp. 450-457.

He thus makes Aristotle compatible with the ethics of the Catholic Church⁸⁵. Hence Kottounios opposes the efforts of Pomponazzi and Zabarella to divorce philosophy from Christian faith.

Yet Kottounios was not only a philosopher. Like Musuros, Laskaris, Portos, and Margounios, he composed epigrams in Greek and Latin, but unlike them and indeed most humanists who published such epigrams as pièces d'occasion, he published two entire books containing epigrams in two versions, Greek and Latin. Kottounios also wrote a theoretical treatise on how to compose epigrams⁸⁶, which was published when several works of this kind were already in circulation, most importantly Robortello's short treatise on the epigram.⁸⁷ Kottounios' treatise is fairly thorough. He briefly reviews the history of epigrammatic poetry in its various forms (Chapters 1-8), and then turns to presenting the various aspects of the art of writing epigrams (Chapters 9-28). Noticeably most of his examples of epigrams come from Latin authors, such as Catullus and Martial, while the few specimens of the Greek epigram are always accompanied with a Latin translation. This clearly suggests that Kottounios intended his work to be a manual for teaching mostly Italian students how to write epigrams; his own books of epigrams probably complemented this by offering some illustration of how the principles of the epigrammatic art should be applied.

Quite apart from his written work and his teaching, Kottounios appears to have been strongly committed to the humanist educational ideal and tried his best to encourage contemporary Greeks to study. For this purpose he founded a college in Padua, which was named after him, for young Greeks to study. The existing evidence about the curriculum in his college suggests that the education offered there conformed with the humanistic ideal of studying the antiquity, as was the case in similar institutions across Europe⁸⁸.

On the whole Kottounios represents an ideology which had run its course. The 17th century will cease to venerate the ancients and will give rise to Kepler's astronomy, Cartesian philosophy and Newton's cosmology; the humanist erudition will be criticized (especially by Descartes) and eventually abandoned. We have to remember, though, that this change of intellectual paradigm, as it were, is clear only from the present point of view. In fact their

85. *De triplici statu animi rationalis*, Bononiae 1628, pp. 211-216.

86. *De conficiendo epigrammatis*, 1632 (loc. non stat). On the fashion of writing treatises of this kind and Kottounios' own see J. Hutton, *The Greek Anthology in Italy to the Year 1800*, op.cit., pp. 55-73.

87. See Weinberg, *A History of Literary Criticism*, op.cit., vol. 1, pp. 185-187, 399-401.

88. See A. Stergellis, *Τὰ δημοσιεύματα τῶν Ἑλλήνων σπουδαστῶν τοῦ Πανεπιστημίου τῆς Πάδοβας τὸν 17ο καὶ 18ο αἰῶνα*, Athens 1970, pp. 46-52.

critics (like Descartes) relied much on the the contribution of the humanists in one way or another, and this is why these still deserve serious study. For my present concerns, though, it is important to stress that, as the evidence shows, Kottounios represented humanism as much as Zabarella, Cremonini, or Campanella did, and that he served the humanist curriculum with success, as several teachers also did even after him⁸⁹.

We see, then, that all three intellectuals I discussed above were deeply involved in the thought-world of their contemporary humanism: they appear to be strongly committed to the principles of humanism and their intellectual work was motivated by concerns and interests typical of humanists. Besides, as has been seen, all three of them were well connected with contemporary humanists and enjoyed their respect. The actual extent of their contribution is not always easy to appreciate because there is still much work to be done. Yet, from what we know, they appear to be among the protagonists. This is strongly suggested by the editorial achievements of Portos and his succesful career as a professor of Greek in Geneva, by Margounios' significant contribution to editorial projects and contemporary theological discussions, and by Kottounios' long and productive philosophical career in the University of Padua.

From what I have said so far, it should now seem quite plausible that some Greek intellectuals were in the forefront of European humanism in its later stages. This picture can be considerably amplified since, apart from the three figures I have examined above, several other Greeks, such as Devaris, Denores, or Allatios, on close inspection may well appear to qualify as humanists, but so far there has been very little effort to assess their activity and work vis-à-vis that of other contemporary humanists, Greeks and others alike. As a result, their connections with other humanists have not been clearly worked out or have not been fully appreciated. Very little work, for instance, has been done on Leonicos Thomaeus (d. 1531), who seems to have had connections with several humanists and who was an important Aristotelian scholar of his time⁹⁰. Similarly there is still much to do in order to appreciate the work of Iason Denores, the Cypriot scholar who was well acquainted with Venetian humanist circles and had much in common with

89. The overlap of the humanist tradition and the scientific spirit is examined well by A. Grafton, «The new science and the traditions of humanism», in Krayer (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*, op.cit., pp. 203-223.

90. See D. Geanakoplos, «The career of the little-known Renaissance Greek scholar Nicholas Leonicos Tomaeus and the ascendancy of Greco-Byzantine Aristotelianism at Padua university», *Βυζαντινά* 13.1 (1985) 357-371. Among other texts of Thomaeus edited or/and translated into Latin Aristotle's *Parra Naturalia*, *De partibus Animalium* and Ptolemy's, *Inerrantium stellarum significaciones*.

other Greek humanists, such as his interest in ancient rhetorical handbooks, a liking for the composition of epigrams in Greek and Latin, and a strong philosophical orientation with a predilection for Aristotle⁹¹. To take the case of Gerasimos Vlachos, Tatakis in his monograph makes no effort to place Vlachos' work in the contemporary intellectual context or to relate it to the work of other Greek scholars. Yet given Vlachos' philosophical interests and his residence in Venice, one wonders how much he knew of the work of Corydaleus or of Kottounios; the existing evidence suggests that he was under the influence of both⁹². Tsourkas' work on Corydaleus, on the other hand, does indeed discuss him as part of his contemporary Paduan Aristotelianism, but it does not deal with the relationship between Corydaleus and Kottounios, who, as I have said, co-existed for some time in Padua⁹³.

Questions of this kind have not been addressed seriously so far, since scholars focus on specific aspects of the intellectual contribution of humanists, but clearly are crucial for determining whether a current of Greek humanism existed in the late Renaissance. For all we know, though, many Greek humanists in the 16th century had connections with each other and influenced each other. We know, for instance, that many of the alumni of the Greek College in Rome were in contact with each other and that Sofianos, who was one of them, was systematically trying to correspond with those of his generation. Margounios also kept up his good contact with a number of Greek churchmen and humanists and asked for their advice. So a communication network between Greek humanists plainly existed, but we still lack many pieces of the jigsaw to construct a clear picture of exactly how far this network of Greek humanists extended and whether they make up a distinct current.

Yet it seems to me that one way to approach such a question is to ask ourselves whether Greek humanists could be characterized by some common intellectual features. This approach is quite typical of the scholarship on humanism. If we are to talk of the humanism in the Low Countries, for instance, we have in mind certain characteristic features like an emphasis on the

91. On Iason Denores see Weinberg, *A History of Literary Criticism*, op.cit., vol. 1, pp. 26-28, 316-319, 621-626, vol. 2, pp. 672-676, 786-790, 1075-1085, N. Panagiotakis, «Γάσων Δενόρες: Κύριος θεωρητικός του θεάτρου (c. 1510-1590)», *Αριάδνη* 3 (1985) 50-87, Holton, «Κύπρος και Κρητική αναγέννηση», op.cit., pp. 221-223, 232-235. Denores' treatises, such as those on Aristotle's rhetoric and cosmology, have attracted little attention so far.

92. See Papadopoulos, *Η Νεοελληνική Φιλοσοφία*, op.cit., pp. 224-225.

93. More recent surveys, such as that by Papadopoulos, op.cit., do not discuss how the two men were connected and how their philosophies compare.

philological examination of the Bible⁹⁴, while French humanism seems to be characterized by a hostility to some forms of thought and art emanating from Italy and a greater sense of continuation with the Middle Ages⁹⁵. Now, given that Greek humanists lived in different places in Europe and, as we have seen, tended to adjust to specific trends and requirements of their environment, one wonders whether these intellectuals could be characterized by any such common features, and could then be seen as constituting a definite movement within European humanism.

I would like to argue that some such features indeed characterize Greek humanists, despite their adherence to regional variants of humanism. One such feature is a common concern for their contemporary Greek culture. This concern appears to take two main forms. First, Greek humanists show a concern for their contemporary Greek language and have views on it. We should not expect them to agree on this. Several, like Portos for instance, find the vernacular inferior to the ancient language and emphasize the need to return to the latter. Portos, we learn, gave lectures in Ferrara in 1554 as a member of the Academy of Filareti stressing the importance of the Greek language⁹⁶, and we know that he opposed Erasmus' views on the pronunciation of Greek and presumably also of Latin. Yet Portos' views were challenged. Nikolaos Sofianos, for example, upheld that demotic Greek is to be used freely by the Greek people, although it should be polished and enriched. He thus undertook a project of translating ancient words and some ancient Greek treatises into demotic Greek, and he also wrote a Grammar of modern Greek⁹⁷. Antonios Eparchos and Alexandros Noukios seem to agree largely with Sofianos in this respect⁹⁸. Margounios, Pegas, and Kritopoulos took a similar position. They valued the ancient language and wrote in it, but also wanted to enrich the vernacular one, and for this reason they translated

94. See J. Cameron, «Humanism in the Low Countries», in A. Goodman & A. Mackay (eds), *The Impact of Humanism on Western Europe*, London - New York 1990, pp. 137-163.

95. See J.-C. Margolin, «Humanism in France», in *The Impact of Humanism on Western Europe*, op.cit., pp. 165-201.

96. See Manoussakak & Panagiotakis, «Η φιλομεταρρυθμιστική δράση του Φραγκίσκου Πόρτου», op.cit., 42.

97. On the career and the work of Sofianos see Layton, *The Sixteenth Century Greek Book in Italy*, op.cit., pp. 460-471, Papadopoulos, *Η Νεοελληνική Φιλοσοφία*, op.cit., pp. 51-63, and especially Th. Papadopoulos (ed.), *Νικολάου Σοφιανού Γραμματική τῆς Κοινῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων Γλώσσης*, Athens 1977, pp. 15-165.

98. See N. Ziogas, «Μία κίνηση πνευματικῆς ἀναγεννήσεως τοῦ ὑποδοῦλου Ἑλληνισμοῦ κατὰ τὸν 16ο αἰῶνα (1540-1550)», *Ἑλληνικά* 27 (1974) 50-78, esp. 52-53, 68-73, and K. Th. Dimaras, *Ἱστορία τῆς Νεοελληνικῆς Λογοτεχνίας*, Athens ⁵1972, pp. 88-91, Papadopoulos, *Η Νεοελληνική Φιλοσοφία*, op.cit., pp. 83-95. On Eparchos see the study of E. Giotropoulou-Sisilianou, *Αντώνιος ο Ἐπαρχος. Ἐνας Κερκυραῖος ουμανιστής του ΙΣΤ' αἰῶνα*, Athens 1978.

several ecclesiastical works into the vernacular or wrote sermons in it⁹⁹.

Further, Greek humanists share a common interest in transmitting some European ideas to their compatriots in the belief that this would be beneficial for them. This tendency becomes quite clear when it comes to religious matters. Margounios, as I have said above, was very close to Catholic dogma, Eparchos took similar position, Kottounios and Allatios, like several other Greeks before them, converted to Catholicism, while Portos, Sofianos and Kritopoulos adopted Protestant views. Greek theologians often look on such cases with some contempt. But this is a mistake. The reasons underlying the sympathies of Greek humanists with Catholic or Protestant doctrine are presumably to be found in the new approach of humanists to the study of the Bible and the early church. We must also remember that Greek humanists were invited to take sides in the contemporary theological debates between Catholics and Protestants. Characteristic is the case of Margounios who has an elaborate argument about the Holy Spirit. His study of the early Latin Fathers like Ambrose, Augustine, and Jerome convinced him that at that stage there were no actual differences between the two Churches regarding the Holy Spirit; the differences, he argued, arose later out of misunderstandings in the subsequent tradition and to him seemed bridgeable, because, in his view, the early Christian Fathers had distinguished between the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit through the Father and the temporal one through the Son. I oversimplify Margounios' elaborate argument here, but one of his main points was that his contemporary Greeks actually ignored the Latin tradition and that the doctrinal differences they stressed were not as strong as they appeared¹⁰⁰. It would seem, then, that it is for this reason that Margounios bequeathed his library, which consisted mainly of Latin classics and works of the Latin Church fathers primarily to the Monastery of Iviron on Mount Athos but also to other Greek Orthodox monasteries, that is because he clearly wanted the Greek Orthodox monks to come in contact with the Latin theological tradition which all European theologians knew but

99. Margounios, for instance, translated lives of saints in the vernacular (Legrand, *op.cit.*, XVII siècle, vol. 2, p. 47). See also Kornoutos (ed.), *Λόγιοι τῆς Τουρκοκρατίας*, vol. A', pp. 299-310, G. Kechagioglou (ed.), *Η Παλαιότερη Πεζογραφία μας*, vol. B₁, Athens 1999, pp. 385-386, and Layton, *The Sixteenth Century Greek Book in Italy*, *op.cit.*, pp. 421-423.

100. Maximos expresses his view clearly in his letter to the council of Constantinople, in P. Enepekides, *Χρηστομάνος, Βικέλας, Παπαδιαμάντης, Ἐπιστολαὶ Μάξιμου Μαργουίνου Ἐπισκόπου Κυθήρων*, Athens 1970, letter 21, pp. 246-255. His position becomes clearer in several other letters to clergymen, especially to Severus, and in his letter to the Holy Synod. See Fedalto, *Massimo*, *op.cit.*, pp. 64-65. For a list of Margounios' Latin books see in Geanakoplos, *Byzantine East and Latin West*, *op.cit.*, pp. 183-190.

the Greeks basically ignored¹⁰¹. Margounios' idea was apparently that only after a careful study of the entire early Christian tradition one can come to a conclusion about how things really stood, an idea which fits well with the humanistic way of thinking. As regards those who sympathized with Protestantism, again they did not want to sacrifice the Orthodox faith but rather to reconcile it with some Protestant views. Kritopoulos, who studied in Oxford, argued quite strongly for this. Here is not the place to discuss this issue, but perhaps one reason behind such sympathies with Protestantism was the Protestant idea of returning to the original text of the Bible. This must have exerted considerable attraction to a philologist like Portos. But of course anyone's sympathy with Protestant doctrine at the time must have had something to do with one's views on the Catholic Church.

Religion was not the only field in which Greek humanists tried to enlighten their compatriots. They also showed quite a strong concern to raise the level of education among their contemporary Greeks. Clearly it is such a motivation that lies behind the efforts of Sofianos to translate ancient vocabulary into the vernacular and compose the latter's grammar, behind the translations of ecclesiastical literature by Margounios and Pigas and their writing of sermons in demotic Greek, behind the foundation of a college specifically for young expatriate Greeks by Kottounios, or behind the compilation of dictionaries of Greek and Latin, or of Greek, Latin and Italian by Portos and Vlachos. But there is even clearer evidence about this. Many Greek humanists express openly and frequently their concerns for the culture of their compatriots in their letters or prefaces. To the above mentioned we should add the names of Korydaleus and Eparchos¹⁰². This attitude of Greek humanists seems to be distinct and characteristic of their spirit.

There is also another sense in which one can speak of a distinct current of Greek humanism, namely in terms of the origins of most Greek humanists. It is not accidental that most of those who are active in Europe in the 16th and early 17th centuries came from Crete and to a lesser extent from Cyprus, both of which were under Venetian rule. To take the case of Cretans, those from well-off families in particular received a very good education from an early age. They had private tutors in Greek and Latin and were trained according to the humanist ideals in Western Europe. Besides, in Crete there

101. From his letters it emerges that Margounios deplored the ignorance of Greek people and sought to cure this situation. See briefly Knös, *L'Histoire de la littérature néo-grecque*, op.cit., pp. 285-286.

102. See Papadopoulos, *Η Νεοελληνική Φιλοσοφία*, op.cit., p. 121, Legrand, op.cit., XVI-VII siècles, vol. 1, pp. CCXI-CCXXVII, & 277-281, Giotopoulou-Sisilianou, *Αντώνιος ο Επαρχος*, op.cit., pp. 189-194, 239-253.

were several very active humanist circles with important activity, the Academies, which were quite widespread in Renaissance Italy¹⁰³. The studies of the late Professor Panagiotakis have shown that rhetorical contests comparable with those in Western Europe often took place there¹⁰⁴. Many Cretan humanists, like Margounios, for instance, had close ties with these Academies throughout their lives and were honoured by them. It would be interesting to know in detail to what extent Cretan humanists were in contact with each other abroad and with other European humanists, and to what extent they had similar intellectual concerns.

Clearly at the moment we are not able to determine whether a definite current or a school of Greek humanism existed within European humanism, but from what I have said above some conclusions seem to emerge. The first is that we are not dealing with some occasional and isolated Greek humanists but rather with a group of them. Secondly, and quite importantly, the concerns of these figures suggest that they share a common cultural identity. This evidence might be useful in addressing our earlier question about the Greek identity of these individuals. If we believe, as I tend to, that national identities are primarily cultural, concerns of that kind are quite important and show a good way to approach the whole question. Finally, such common concerns suggest that Greek humanists may well form a particular component within European humanism, that is a current with certain common characteristics which admittedly need to be further specified.

The best way to do this is to study Greek humanists properly, that is, not only thoroughly and systematically, but more especially from the right angle. This involves studying their various activities not only separately, that is, in the relevant sections of histories of theology¹⁰⁵, literature, philosophy¹⁰⁶, or education¹⁰⁷, as has been done so far, but also together, exactly because the motive force behind all of them is the same, that is, the humanist ideal. This is the way European humanists like Valla¹⁰⁸, Erasmus¹⁰⁹, Bude¹¹⁰, Scaliger¹¹¹,

103. On the Italian Academies see briefly Wilson, *From Byzantium to Italy*, op.cit., pp. 54-55, and more fully Panagiotakis (see next footnote).

104. See N. Panagiotakis, «Νέα στοιχεία για την Ἀκαδημία τῶν Stravaganti», in *The-saurismata* 7 (1970) 52-81 (repr. in *Ὁ ποιητὴς τοῦ Ἐρωτοκρίτου καὶ ἄλλα Βενετοκρατικὰ μελετήματα*, Iraklio 1989, pp. 112-138).

105. Cf. Podskalsky, *Die griechische Theologie in der Zeit der Türkenherrschaft*, op.cit.

106. Cf. Papadopoulos, *Ἡ Νεοελληνική Φιλοσοφία*, op.cit.

107. Cf. Tsirpanlis, *Οἱ Μακεδόνες σπουδαστὲς τοῦ ἑλληνικοῦ Κολλεγίου Ρώμης καὶ ἡ δράση τους στὴν Ἑλλάδα καὶ στὴν Ἰταλία*, op.cit.

108. See, for instance, S. Camporeale, *Lorenzo Valla: umanesimo e teologia*, Florence 1972.

109. For instance, by Lisa Jardine, *Erasmus. Man of Letters: The Construction of Charisma in Print*, Princeton 1993.

110. See J. Bohatec, *Budé and Calvin: Studien zur Gedankenwelt des französischen*

Casaubon¹¹², and others have been studied for years. Such a study of the second and third wave of Greek humanists quite crucially involves the examination of their work and their ideas in comparison with that of their contemporary western and central European humanists, whose work, as has been seen, they clearly know, address, criticize, or approve. Only then will it be fully appreciated why these figures take the views they do, why they are interested in cosmology and the human soul, why they are so much involved in theological debates, and why they become engaged in activities such as the writing of commentaries on Aristotle, the composition of epigrams in classical Greek and Latin, or the compilation of dictionaries. It is exactly this kind of approach which will enable us to understand fully their intellectual profile and their place in cultural history and thus assess correctly their work and their contribution to the Greek and European culture.

Keble College, Oxford

GEORGE KARAMANOLIS

Frühhumanismus, Graz 1950.

111. See Anthony Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger*, vols. I-II, Oxford 1983-1993.

112. See Marc Pattison, *Isaac Casaubon*, op.cit.