

# The Historical Review/La Revue Historique

Vol 9 (2012)

Seas, Islands, Humanists

The Historical Review  
La Revue Historique



VOLUME IX (2012)

Département de Recherches Néohelléniques  
Institut de Recherches Historiques / FNRS

Department of Neohellenic Research  
Institute of Historical Research / NHRF

**Appealing to the Authority of a Learned Patriarch:  
New Evidence on Gennadios Scholarios' Responses  
to the Questions of George Branković**

*Machi Paizi-Apostolopoulou*

doi: [10.12681/hr.291](https://doi.org/10.12681/hr.291)

## To cite this article:

Paizi-Apostolopoulou, M. (2013). Appealing to the Authority of a Learned Patriarch: New Evidence on Gennadios Scholarios' Responses to the Questions of George Branković. *The Historical Review/La Revue Historique*, 9, 95–116.  
<https://doi.org/10.12681/hr.291>

APPEALING TO THE AUTHORITY OF A LEARNED PATRIARCH:  
NEW EVIDENCE ON GENNADIOS SCHOLARIOS' RESPONSES  
TO THE QUESTIONS OF GEORGE BRANKOVIĆ

*Machi Paizi-Apostolopoulou*

---

**ABSTRACT:** The article discusses the responses given by the Patriarch Gennadios Scholarios to the Serbian leader Djuradj [George] Branković, in an era critical not only for his country but for the entire eastern borders of Europe, in the mid-fifteenth century. In his appeal, Branković sought the opinion of the learned leader of the Orthodox Church on a range of matters of canonical and liturgical content. The responses are widely known; nevertheless, the identification of five as yet unknown responses and the addition of a further four documents to the manuscript tradition of the text justify a new critical edition, which aims to present the entire number of Gennadios' responses, some among them concerning the legality of moving the Serbian Patriarchate's see from the captured Peć to Smederovo.

---

The Serbian leader Djuradj [George] Branković, in an era critical not only for his country but for the entire eastern borders of Europe, sent a letter to Gennadios Scholarios, who two years earlier had taken on the duties of the first Patriarch of Constantinople following the fall of the city to the Ottoman Turks and the subsequent re-establishment of the Patriarchate within the framework of the Ottoman Empire. In his appeal to the religious leader of the Orthodox Church, Branković sought his opinion on a range of matters of canonical and liturgical content.

The Serbian despot's letter to Gennadios has not been preserved. We know, however, that the two men were in contact from the text containing the Patriarch's responses, through which we learn the questions posed to him by the Serbian leader. Many of these responses are widely known and have been published. Nevertheless, the identification of five as yet unknown responses of the Patriarch to questions arising from this crucial period in Serbia's history and, what is more, the addition of a further four documents to the manuscript tradition of the text, justify in my view a new critical edition that aims at presenting the entire number of Gennadios Scholarios' responses (at least, as many as we presently know), as preserved in what today amount – with these latest additions – to seven manuscripts.

Before embarking on the philological part of this study, with our presentation of the manuscript tradition of the text as it now stands in the light of these new findings, and the new edition based on all the sources, it is worthwhile to review briefly the historical context of the text, and the

events that caused the Serbian despot<sup>1</sup> to appeal to the authority, wisdom and pragmatism of the first Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople after the Ottoman conquest.

## I

None of the manuscripts preserving the answers states when the questions were submitted or the exact date of the Patriarch's responses. There are, however, two clear termini which, to begin with, can set the time frame we are seeking: the two protagonists can only have been in communication between 6 January 1454, when Gennadios became Patriarch, and 24 December 1456, when Branković died. In addition, since Gennadios, in all probability, had assumed the role of Patriarch at the time he sent his responses, the *terminus ante quem* can be established prior to the end of his first term as Patriarch in early 1456.<sup>2</sup>

On a first reading, the questions posed by Branković in search of the Patriarch's responses, or opinions, are of canonical and liturgical content. The response, however, to one of the questions reveals that the Serbian despot appealed to Gennadios at a critical moment for his realm; for at this time, the Ottoman forces of Mehmed II were tightening their grip on his territory, whilst the death of Patriarch Nikodemus of Peć in autumn 1455 had left the Serbian ecclesiastical throne vacant. Branković sought to fill this gap, in the belief that the presence of a religious leader would boost the morale of the Serbs during the dramatic moments they were experiencing. However, the see of the Patriarchate of Peć as well as Zitsa were now situated outside the boundaries of the rest of Serbia, and accordingly the new "Patriarch of Peć" would have to move his base, as he could no longer function in that location. Smederovo was a fortified city, a fitting home for the Serbian Patriarchate, but it was already a metropolis, the see of the Metropolitan Athanasios. Of course, we know today that Branković would not live long enough to elect

---

<sup>1</sup> On Branković, see the monograph by Momčilo Spremić, *Despot Djuradj Branković i njegovo doba*, Belgrade 1994, 1999, and *id.*, *Djuradj Branković, 1427-1456*, Belgrade 2006. See also G. Podskalsky, *Theologische Literatur des Mittelalters in Bulgarien und Serbien, 865-1459*, Munich 2000, pp. 92 and 265-266.

<sup>2</sup> Antonios Aimilios Tachiaos, with a thorough knowledge of the Serbian bibliography, in his study "Περί καταργήσεως των αρχιεπισκοπικών Αχρίδος και Πεκίου επί Γενναδίου του Σχολαρίου" [On the abolition of the Archbishoprics of Ohrid and Peć at the time of Gennadios Scholarios], *Γρηγόριος ο Παλαμάς* 46 (1963), pp. 202-211, clarified and emended a number of points (which, until then, ignored the evidence of reliable sources) regarding the Patriarchate of Peć and the date when it came under the authority of the Archbishopric of Ohrid, basing his case in part on the text of the responses of Gennadios to Branković.

a new Serbian Patriarch; Arsenius II would be elected in 1457, an election never to be learned of by Branković, just as he would never learn of the total conquest of Serbia by the Ottomans in the winter of 1459 – his death on 24 December 1456 spared him the pain of this knowledge.<sup>3</sup> Yet, while he still believed that he could save his country and that the election of a successor to the late Patriarch Nikodemus of Peć would prove beneficial, he appealed to Gennadios, seeking his knowledge and advice. Accordingly, the time frame in which we need to place this exchange between the two men must be set in the early part of 1456, in other words before Gennadios' first Patriarchate expired and before the death of Metropolitan Athanasios of Smederovo on 17 March of the same year.<sup>4</sup> This latter time limit is set by Gennadios' eighth response, referring to the matter as to whether a Patriarch can take up office in a city in which there is already a prelate;<sup>5</sup> the question obviously concerns the Metropolitan of Smederovo, then still alive.

The Serbian despot could naturally make the decision on his own as to where it would be preferable for the new Serbian Patriarch to have his seat, given the state of war prevailing in his country. Yet, he considered it appropriate to appeal to the Patriarch of Constantinople: Gennadios' powerful personality and his prestige throughout the entire Orthodox world motivated Branković to turn to the Patriarch of Constantinople for a solution to the problems that concerned him.<sup>6</sup> Besides, the same reasons had a few months earlier also led the monks of Mount Sinai to appeal to Gennadios, so that he might enlighten them on similar matters of a liturgical nature, as well as problems arising from the adverse historic environment.<sup>7</sup> It is worth noting, however, that

<sup>3</sup> Podskalsky, *Theologische Literatur*, pp. 92–93.

<sup>4</sup> Gojko Subotić, “Pećki patrijarh i Ohridski arhiepiskop Nikodim”, *Zbornik Radova Vizantoloskog Instituta* 21 (1982), pp. 218–224, examined the confused state of affairs that prevailed during this period in Serbia, and placed the date of the “correspondence” of Branković with Gennadios in the period between the end of 1455 and the end of March 1456.

<sup>5</sup> See the text published here below and p. 102.

<sup>6</sup> Tachiaos, “Περὶ καταργήσεως”, p. 206, suggested that relations of the Patriarchate of Peć with Constantinople and the Ecumenical Patriarchate were not strong, and that only during the time of Gennadios, “steadfastly true to the Orthodox spirit”, did they revive.

<sup>7</sup> Contained in the lengthy *pittakion* sent from Gennadios to Monk Maximos (who in his lay-life was known as Sofianos) and his brethren in St Catherine's Monastery; see the recent edition by Machi Paizi-Apostolopoulou and D. G. Apostolopoulos, *Επίσημα κείμενα του Πατριαρχείου Κωνσταντινούπολεως. Τα σωζόμενα από την περίοδο 1454–1498* [Official documents of the Patriarchate of Constantinople: surviving texts from the period 1454–1498], Athens: NHRF / INR, 2011, pp. 55–67.

Gennadios responded immediately to the Serbian despot's request, as Serbia was in dire straits.<sup>8</sup> Indeed, this may explain why the Patriarch's discourse, as a rule carefully crafted in all his writings – sometimes even to an exaggerated degree – is laconic in the case presented here, without extensive elaboration of the responses and without concern for literary embellishment.

Gennadios decreed that, “It is possible for the lord of the region and the synod of bishops to appoint as Archbishop and Patriarch, someone whose previous diocese was not in the same region.” As for the simultaneous presence of a prelate in Smederovo, he also provided a measure to preclude this: “In the place where the Archbishop or Patriarch is, it is not possible for there to be another legitimate bishop; such a bishop must either be transferred to another church, if there is a vacant see, or, lest he become *trisepiskopos*, he must step down for the common good.” He cited a few examples, such as Kiev and Nafpaktos, which would in all probability be of use to Branković as arguments in the event that anyone doubted the legality of the Serbian Patriarch's move from the captured Peć to Smederovo.<sup>9</sup>

## II

Gennadios' responses to the Serbian despot became known in 1882, when Manuel Gedeon first discovered the text of a number of responses in a manuscript document in the library of the Monastery of St John the Theologian on Patmos, in Codex 540. Folios 23r-24r contain a text with the title “Matters and questions posed by the most pious despot of Serbia, George, to His Holiness the Ecumenical Patriarch, Gennadios Scholarios: The responses of the Patriarch”. The manuscript contains the text of 14 such “matters” in the form of pairs of questions and answers; 13 of these

---

<sup>8</sup> See Subotić, “Pećki patrijarh”, pp. 218-224.

<sup>9</sup> Response No. 8 of the text published here below and previously published by Dobschütz. On the question of the *trisepiskopos* [thrice-bishop], see Constantin G. Pitsakis, “Canonica byzantino-serbica minora, I. Le trisépicopat: une ‘perversion’ serbe?”, *Βυζάντιο καὶ Σερβία κατά τον ΙΔ' αιώνα* [Byzantium and Serbia in the fourteenth century], International Symposium 3, Athens: NHRF / IBR, 1996, pp. 279-280; *id.*, “Οι μεταβυζαντινοί ‘τρισεπίσκοποι’ (Με αφορμή την περίπτωση του αρχιεπισκόπου Σάμου Ανθίμου: 1648)” [The Post-Byzantine “thrice-bishops” (the case of the Archbishop of Samos, Anthimos: 1648)], *Η Σάμος από τα βυζαντινά χρόνια μέχρι σήμερα. Πρακτικά συνεδρίουν* [Samos from Byzantine times to the present: conference proceedings], 1, Athens 1998, p. 246; *id.*, “Οι Κύπριοι ‘τρισεπίσκοποι’. Ένα παράδοξο στην ορολογία του βυζαντινού κανονικού δικαίου” [The Cypriot “thrice-bishops”: a curioso in the terminology of Byzantine canon law], *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference of Cypriot Studies*, Nicosia 2001, pp. 95-96.

were published by Gedeon in 1882 in the journal *Έκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια*.<sup>10</sup> Gedeon did not publish the fourteenth response, because, as he claimed in a subsequent publication, he doubted its authenticity. When, however, he later discovered the fourteenth “matter” in another manuscript, he was assured of its authenticity and included it in 1899 in a subsequent study, which was published in the same journal.<sup>11</sup>

The second scholar to publish Gennadios’ responses was the German philologist E. von Dobschütz, who came across the text of questions and answers between Branković and Gennadios in a manuscript in the Sächsische Landesbibliothek in Dresden, catalogued as MS A 187, pp. 512-516. In his edition of the Dresden text, published in 1905, a further, fifteenth, question and answer pair was added to those already published by Gedeon (13 + 1).<sup>12</sup> The German scholar took it upon himself to number the “matters”, a feature which does not appear in the Dresden or other manuscripts. Moreover, since he divided the text of the first response into three separately numbered sections, a total of 17 responses appear in his edition, while when tallied with those published by Gedeon there are 15. The new response contained in the Dresden manuscript, which was not included in either of the manuscripts consulted by Gedeon, answers the question, “What is meant by ‘pure spikenard of great value’ [John 12:3]?” and describes the ingredients of the myrrh Jesus used to anoint the prophets.<sup>13</sup>

The editors of Gennadios’ complete works, aware of the three mutually complementary editions discussed above, published all of Gennadios’

<sup>10</sup> M. Gedeon, “Τοῦ Γραικορωμαϊκοῦ Νομίμου τὰ παραλειπόμενα” [Unpublished sections of the Graecoromaikos Nomimos], *Έκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια* 3 (1882-1883), pp. 171-172 [= *Κανονικαὶ Διατάξεις τῶν πατριαρχῶν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* (Canon law provisions of the Patriarchs of Constantinople), Vol. I, Istanbul 1888, pp. 26-30].

<sup>11</sup> *Id.*, “Αποσπάσματα τοῦ Νομοκάνονός μου” [Fragments from my edition of the Nomokanon], *Έκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια* 19 (1899), p. 231: “One of the responses I had not edited for publication until now, as I was hoping to discover the existence of these responses in other manuscripts as well. Fortunately my *Nomokanon* includes some of the responses... I publish this one here, thus supplementing my earlier edition.”

<sup>12</sup> E. von Dobschütz, “Ein Schreiben des Patriarchen Gennadios Scholarios an den Fürsten Georg von Serbien”, *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 27 (1905), pp. 247-252.

<sup>13</sup> On the holy myrrh, see the studies by the Metropolitan of Sweden and All Scandinavia Paul Menevisoglou, *To Ἅγιον Μύρον εν τῇ Ὁρθοδόξῳ Ανατολικῇ Εκκλησίᾳ* [The holy myrrh in the Orthodox Eastern Church], Thessaloniki 1972, and *Μελετήματα περὶ αγίου Μύρου* [Studies on the holy myrrh], Athens 1999.

responses known up to that time, noting in their apparatus any differences that they identified in previous editions.<sup>14</sup>

Research into Patriarch Gennadios' responses to questions put to him by the Serbian despot had thus reached this point until today. Before, however, reporting on the new findings, it will perhaps be helpful to provide briefly some background on the manuscripts used for the editions so far published.

Manuscript Patmiensis 540, used by Gedeon for the first edition of the text, was described by Ioannis Sakkelion as a “Nomokanon” in his volume on the library of the Monastery of Patmos.<sup>15</sup>

As regards the second manuscript used by Gedeon as his source for the fourteenth response, its fate is unclear, since in discussing its provenance Gedeon noted (in deliberately vague terms, “so that”, as he liked to say, “the plagiarizers in Greece are kept on their toes”) that it was once owned by a certain *lampadarios* of the Great Church and that this manuscript, “purchased by me”, as he noted, came into his possession.<sup>16</sup> This manuscript, to the best of my knowledge, has not as yet been located.

As for the Dresden manuscript, we have the description published by the editor himself of Gennadios' responses, Dobschütz, in 1906 in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*.<sup>17</sup>

Now, to these three manuscripts, we can add the four described below:

In the library at the Monastery of St John on Patmos, besides MS 540 used by Gedeon, I came across yet another containing Gennadios' text, the title of which states the following: “Matter of the most pious despot of Serbia, George, addressed to Patriarch Gennadios Scholarios of Constantinople”. This manuscript is catalogued as Patmiensis 447, and on folios 353v-354v we find some of the Patriarch's responses. Ioannis Sakkelion noted that it is a “Nomikon [Collection of legal texts]...written in the sixteenth century”.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Γενναδίου Σχολαρίου, Ἀπαντα τὰ εύρισκόμενα / *Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, ed. L. Petit, X. A. Sideridès and M. Jugie, Vol. 4, Paris 1935, pp. 208-211.

<sup>15</sup> Ioannis Sakkelion, *Πατμιακή Βιβλιοθήκη, ἡτοι ἀναγραφὴ τῶν ἐν τῇ βιβλιοθήκῃ τῆς κατὰ τὴν νῆσον Πάτμου γεραρᾶς καὶ βασιλικῆς Μονῆς τοῦ Ἅγιου Ἀποστόλου καὶ Εὐαγγελιστοῦ Ἰωάννου τοῦ Θεολόγου τεθησαυρισμένων χειρογράφων τευχῶν* [The Patmos Library: catalogue of the manuscripts in the Monastery of John the Theologian], Athens 1890, pp. 233-234.

<sup>16</sup> Gedeon, “Ἀποσπάσματα τοῦ Νομοκάνονός μου”, p. 192.

<sup>17</sup> E. von Dobschütz, “Ein Sammelhandschrift des 18. Jahrhunderts, Dresden MS A 187”, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 15 (1906), pp. 243 et seq.

<sup>18</sup> Ioannis Sakkelion, *Πατμιακή Βιβλιοθήκη*, pp. 201-202. I would like to take this opportunity to thank Abbot Antipas and librarian I. Melianos of the Monastery of St John the Theologian on Patmos for kindly facilitating my research in the library of the monastery.

The second manuscript, hitherto unknown to contain Gennadios' responses to Branković, is MS 1609 of the Monastery of St Catherine of Sinai. Its miscellaneous material includes on folios 424v-426v the text that concerns us here. V. Beneševic's catalogue dates the manuscript to the fifteenth century.<sup>19</sup>

The third manuscript that I found to contain Branković's questions and Gennadios' responses is in the Library of St Mark's in Venice: Marc. Gr. III. 5 (coll. 1077), olim Nanianus CCXXIX. It is a manuscript containing miscellaneous legal texts dating back to the sixteenth century. The questions and responses appear on folios 247v-248r and 402r.<sup>20</sup>

Last, I discovered the same text on folios 255v-256v, 266v, 267r and 267v of MS 22 of the Monastery of Agios Stephanos in Meteora. Dimitris Sofianos, in his catalogue of the manuscripts of Meteora, dates it to the sixteenth century.<sup>21</sup>

Having discovered these previously unexploited witnesses to the text under consideration, it is clear that the matter needs to be reassessed in light of the new manuscript evidence.

### III

As previously mentioned, all the manuscripts we have today at our disposal are later copies which reproduce a text in which the Serbian despot's questions are interwoven with Gennadios' responses, and, as far as I know, neither Branković's original letter containing the "matters" he set before the Patriarch nor Gennadios' official *pittakion* in which he sent his responses have survived.

The six manuscripts containing the text of questions and responses and to which I had access (Gedeon's second manuscript, as we noted above, is missing) present the text underneath roughly the same heading: "Matters and questions of the most pious despot of Serbia, George, addressed to His Holiness and Ecumenical Patriarch Gennadios Scholarios. The responses of the Patriarch". One detail, however, in the wording betrays not only the fact that they are copies, but also that the original they were copied from cannot have been contemporary with the two persons who were in communication. Gennadios, it seems, did not wish, during the difficult times after the capture

<sup>19</sup> V. Beneševic, *Catalogus Codicum manuscriptorum qui in monasterio Sanctae Catharinae in monte Sina asservantum*, Hildesheim 1965, Vol. 3, pp. 77-105; for the section on the responses, see p. 91.

<sup>20</sup> Elpidio Mioni, *Bibliothecae Divi Marci Venetarium, Codices Graeci Manuscripti*, Vol. 1, pp. 156-168; for the section on the responses, see p. 161.

<sup>21</sup> Dimitrios Z. Sofianos, *Τα χειρόγραφα των Μετεώρων*, 3. *Τα χειρόγραφα της μονής Αγίου Στεφάνου* [The manuscripts of Meteora, 3. The manuscripts of the Monastery of Agios Stephanos], Athens 1986, pp. 46-64.

of Constantinople by the Ottoman Turks, to sign his name using the high-sounding title, “by the mercy of God, Archbishop of Constantinople, the New Rome, and Ecumenical Patriarch”; instead, he preferred the title “servant of the children of God” or “of the paupers of Christ”. Accordingly, if the copy of the text had been made in his time, he would surely not have allowed himself to be referred to as “Ecumenical Patriarch”.

MS Patmiensis 447 is the only manuscript to present the text containing the responses under the heading “Matter of the most pious despot of Serbia, George, addressed to the Patriarch of Constantinople Gennadios Scholarios”. The nomenclature in the heading seems to be closer to Gennadios’ wishes: “Patriarch of Constantinople” rather than “all-holy Ecumenical Patriarch”, and it appears to convey a manuscript tradition older than that of the other manuscripts. Indeed, comparison with the other six manuscripts indicates that Patmos 447 derives from a different manuscript tradition: it presents only eight pairs of questions and answers, three of which are encountered in the other manuscripts, while the other five were hitherto unknown to us. Indeed, in Patmos 447 the first question/response corresponds to the eighth in the other manuscripts. It is the question headed “On Archbishop and Patriarch”; Gennadios’ response explains how a prelate can “have his see” in another city when his own see has been occupied by enemy forces. We can assume, perhaps, that it came first in this manuscript because its content was of primary importance at that moment in time for the despot of Serbia, since due to the pressure of the Turkish military presence there was urgent need to move the Patriarch of Serbia.

Then follows the ninth response answering the question whether a bishop can administer the sacraments without a deacon attending. Clearly, the question had arisen as a result of the unusual circumstances of the historical moment, in view of the planned installation of the Patriarchate of Peć, which as yet was still bereft of personnel. However, before the scribe goes on to the twelfth question/response, he inserts the text of the two questions and responses that do not appear in the other manuscripts. While questions 8 and 9 focus on matters relating to bishops,<sup>22</sup> a further question is formulated in very vague terms, “On a bishop” and when he can be transferred to another metropolis. The answer is, of course, as expected, and simply confirms the express prohibition of the late Byzantine era on transferring a prelate to a third ecclesiastical province, to ensure he would not be considered *trisepiskopos* [thrice-bishop].

---

<sup>22</sup> See the text published here below.

The next question (the eleventh) is also vaguely worded: “On bishops” (this time in the plural). The response explains when and how a bishop can impose punishment:

The bishop may only punish spiritually, not physically or by monetary means. He may only confine and imprison the malefactor for the latter’s benefit, until he gives assurance of his repentance. If the transgression of the said person is impiety towards the faith and the Church, then the accused shall be automatically delivered to the secular authorities and they shall decide punishment in accordance with the laws.

The first part of the response reproduces Balsamon’s comment on title 9 (Ch. 25) of the Nomokanon in 14 titles, which states that “canon law is unacquainted with corporal punishment, which is dispensed by secular law”.<sup>23</sup> As regards the prohibition on imposing monetary penalties, this can only be indirectly deduced from the comment by Zonaras on the seventh rule of the Seventh Synod, which states that the penalty for a metropolitan who demands a monetary penalty will be to pay this amount four-fold.<sup>24</sup> However, I was unable to find the rest of the text of Gennadios’ response in any nomocanonical collection: “If the transgression of the person is impiety towards the faith and the Church, then he shall be automatically delivered to the secular authorities and they shall decide punishment in accordance with the Laws.” It goes without saying that in the case in point, the secular authority is the Christian despot of Serbia, who we can regard as corresponding, indirectly of course, to the Byzantine Christian secular authority, the emperor [*basileus*]. Seen in this light, it comes as no surprise that Gennadios argues that he can impose punishment for “impiety toward the faith”.

This erstwhile unknown response of Gennadios supplies us with information that is of particular importance: a) It verifies the fact that the Patriarchate had some kind of prison where transgressors were confined. Heretofore, we were aware of this by virtue of later sources.<sup>25</sup> Now, however,

<sup>23</sup> See G. A. Rallis and M. Potlis, *Σύνταγμα τῶν θείων καὶ ἱερῶν κανόνων* [Collection of the divine and holy rules], Vol. 1, Athens 1852, p. 191.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 578.

<sup>25</sup> The use of the noun *φυλακή* [prison], when associated with the evidence I cite below, appears indeed to mean a place of forced detention. In an unpublished work dating from before 1815, preserved in a manuscript of the NHRF / INR collection there is a mention of a prison used by the Patriarchate (on this manuscript, see Machi Paizi-Apostolopoulou, “Τια τα οικονομικά του ανώτατου κλήρου. Το χφ KNE 2: η διττή σημασία μιας αθησαύριστης

our sources take us back several centuries, since the Patmos manuscript dates to the early years of Ottoman rule, that is, the mid-fifteenth century; b) We are informed that the Church could impose only penalties that involved “social exclusion”, such as excommunication for the laity and suspension of duties or defrocking for the clergy.<sup>26</sup> In the event, however, that the secular authority was of the same faith, as in the case of Branković, it could impose punishments that the Patriarchate did not have the power to impose.

The text of Patmiensis 447 then continues with issues that have nothing to do with bishops. This is the text of the twelfth “matter” that we are familiar with already from the other manuscripts: “On taking the tonsure against the wife’s wishes”. After giving the response, the text continues with three hitherto unknown questions and responses regarding priests’ conduct: “a) Another matter: Regarding priests; b) Regarding drunken priests administering the sacraments; c) The worship of God shall be conducted facing East”.<sup>27</sup>

In the table below, I list by their number the matters, noting (✓) the manuscripts in which the relevant texts are preserved. It is clear that the fullest text is that in the Dresden manuscript. This is followed by Patmos 540, Agios Stephanos of Meteora 22, the Marcianus manuscript and Sinai 1609. The latter four appear to belong to the same manuscript tradition. Gedeon’s missing manuscript recorded – if, that is, Gedeon published in 1899 all the responses that were contained in his manuscript – only four responses found also in the other manuscripts. The circles in the table (◎) indicate the matters preserved in MS Patmos 447 that were hitherto unknown and which are published here for the first time.

---

πηγής τον 1815” [On the economic status of higher-ranking clergy: Ms. KNE 2: the dual significance of an unexamined source of 1815], *Έγνατια* 15 (2011), pp. 101-107). For the nineteenth century we have the account of Metropolitan Ignatius of Hungaro-Wallachia, who stated that, “The Patriarchate has its own prison, where the accused are detained... until their case is tried and their fate decided.”, *Απολογία Ιστορική καὶ Κριτική ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἱεροῦ κλήρου τῆς Ανατολικῆς Ἑκκλησίας κατὰ τῶν συκοφαντιῶν τοῦ Νεοφύτου Δούκα, συγγραφεῖσα παρὰ Κυρίλλου Κ. [Ignatius of Hungaro-Wallachia?], κατ’ ἐπίμονον ζήτησιν τῶν ὁμογενῶν* [Historical and critical defense of the clergy of the Eastern Church versus the slander of Neofytos Doukas, by Kyrillos K., and an urgent request of our fellow Orthodox], [Pisa] 1815, p. 40.

<sup>26</sup> See the relevant discussion in P. D. Michailaris, *Αφορισμός. Η προσαρμογή μιας ποινής στις αναγκαιότητες της Τουρκοκρατίας* [Excommunication: adapting a punishment to the needs of the era of Turkish rule], Athens: NHRF / INR, Institutions and Ideology in Modern Greek Society, <sup>2</sup>2004, pp. 167-204.

<sup>27</sup> Ezekiel 21:2: “Son of man, set thy face toward Jerusalem...”.

One question, however, remains unanswered: why the Patmos 447 manuscript, which seems to be closer to the original text, preserves only part, and not all, of the questions and responses. The loss of the entire quire that follows, which in all probability contained the next part of the text, most likely explains why “matters” nos 17-20 are missing. However, an explanation for the absence of the first seven “matters” from MS Patmiensis 447 is still pending. If the lost “Nomokanon” used by Gedeon is ever rediscovered – although we probably should not expect any surprises, since Gedeon would surely have published any other questions/responses that were not previously known – and if a manuscript is identified as containing the entire range of questions/responses, then we shall have a full picture of the questions put by the Serbian despot to the leader of the Great Church just two years after the conquest of Constantinople, and of the responses given by the learned Patriarch.

| Matters | Dresden | Patm. 540 | Patm. 447 | Meteor. | Marc. | Sinait. | Gedeon |
|---------|---------|-----------|-----------|---------|-------|---------|--------|
| [1a]    | ✓       | ✓         |           | ✓       | ✓     |         |        |
| [1b]    | ✓       | ✓         |           | ✓       | ✓     | ✓       |        |
| [1c]    | ✓       | ✓         |           | ✓       | ✓     |         |        |
| [2]     | ✓       | ✓         |           | ✓       | ✓     | ✓       |        |
| [3]     | ✓       | ✓         |           | ✓       | ✓     | ✓       |        |
| [4]     | ✓       | ✓         |           | ✓       | ✓     | ✓       | ✓      |
| [5]     | ✓       | ✓         |           | ✓       | ✓     | ✓       |        |
| [6]     | ✓       | ✓         |           | ✓       | ✓     | ✓       | ✓      |
| [7]     | ✓       | ✓         |           | ✓       | ✓     | ✓       |        |
| [8]     | ✓       | ✓         | ✓         | ✓       | ✓     | ✓       | ✓      |
| [9]     | ✓       | ✓         | ✓         | ✓       | ✓     | ✓       |        |
| [10]    |         |           | ◎         |         |       |         |        |
| [11]    |         |           | ◎         |         |       |         |        |
| [12]    | ✓       | ✓         | ✓         | ✓       | ✓     | ✓       |        |
| [13]    |         |           | ◎         |         |       |         |        |
| [14]    |         |           | ◎         |         |       |         |        |
| [15]    |         |           | ◎         |         |       |         |        |
| [16]    | ✓       | ✓         |           | ✓       | ✓     | ✓       |        |
| [17]    | ✓       | ✓         |           | ✓       | ✓     | ✓       |        |
| [18]    | ✓       | ✓         |           | ✓       | ✓     | ✓       |        |
| [19]    | ✓       | ✓         |           |         | ✓     | ✓       | ✓      |
| [20]    | ✓       |           |           |         |       |         |        |

## Text

*Matters and questions of the most pious despot of Serbia, George, addressed to Patriarch Gennadios Scholarios of Constantinople: -*

*Responses of the Patriarch*

5 [1a] *Regarding your question on the exegesis of Theophylact, Archbishop of Bulgaria: this has been endorsed by the Church. For what he says is not in fact his own invention, but has been stated by other saints, and moreover by Chrysostom. Indeed, he was a wise and Orthodox prelate. If there is anything in the Serbian books that may seem to be unsound, this may be due to ignorance resulting from bad translation or poor copying.*

10 [1b] *The book by Xanthopoulos has been approved by the Church. If it seems in parts not to state matters properly or in accordance with Orthodox doctrine, perhaps it has not been translated well into Serbian. For in our language, the entire book is Orthodox.*

[1c] *The diplokatechoumena are only recited in the liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts. The blessing of Holy Epiphany is made before the giving of the antidoron.*

15 [2] *Question. On the blessed bread of Holy Thursday.*  
*Response. The reference to the blessed bread is made in accordance with the custom of the other days, though from the bema, not the altar. For it is kept and used for the sacraments before the giving of the antidoron.*

[3] *Question. On Judas.*  
 20 *Response. Judas lived for a short while after his act of betrayal, until his death as recounted in the Acts.*

[4] *Question. On an altar that has been polluted.*  
*Response. The altar that has been polluted should first be consecrated, and afterwards can be used for the sacraments. If 40 or more days have passed, it can be used freely and without more ado for the Mass.*

25 [5] *Question. On priest and layman drinking water at night.*  
*Response. There are various reasons why a priest drinks water at night: if he is thirsty because he has eaten excessively or become drunk in the evening, he cannot administer the sacraments; if he has drunk water out of weariness and was unable to sleep, then he is able to administer the sacraments. The layman, if he has drunk water six hours beforehand, though not because he is ill, may partake of the blessed bread of communion, that is, the antidoron. He who abstains from the sacraments out of respect for these rules will derive greater benefit than he who partakes of the sacraments, though impeded in some way.*

## Το κείμενο

Ζητήματα καὶ ἑρωτήσεις τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου δεσπότου Σερβίας κὺρ Γεωργίου πρὸς τὸν πατριάρχην κὺρ Γενναδίον τὸν Σχολάριον Κωνσταντινουπόλεως: -  
Ἀποκρίσεις τοῦ πατριάρχου.

[1α] Ἡρώτησας περὶ τῆς ἔξηγήσεως τοῦ Θεοφυλάκτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Βουλγαρίας. Καὶ αὕτη ἐστέρχθη παρὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας· σχεδὸν γὰρ οὐδὲν λέγει ἵδιον αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ πάντα εἰσὶν ἀλλων ἀγίων καὶ μάλιστα τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου· καὶ ἣν σοφὸς καὶ ὁρθόδοξος ἀρχιερεύς. Εἰ δὲ εὐρίσκεται τι ἐν τοῖς βιβλίοις τοῖς Σερβικοῖς, ὅπερ δοκεῖ ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ὑγιές, ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγνοίας ἔστι τοῦ μεταγλωττίσαντος ἡ μεταγράψαντος.

5

[1β] Τὸ δὲ βιβλίον τοῦ Ξανθοπούλου ἐστέρχθη παρὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας· μήποτε δὲ μετεγλωττίσθη εἰς τὸ Σερβικὸν οὐ καλῶς, ἐὰν δοκῇ ἐν τινὶ οὐ καλῶς καὶ ὁρθῶς λέγειν· ἐν γὰρ τῇ φωνῇ ἡμῶν ὅλον ἔστι τὸ βιβλίον ὁρθόδοξον.

10

[1γ] Τὰ δὲ διπλοκατηχούμενα ἐν μόναις ταῖς προηγιασμέναις λέγονται. Τὸ δὲ ἀγίασμα τῶν ἀγίων Θεοφανειῶν λαμβάνεται πρὸ τοῦ ἀντιδώρου.

[2] Ἐρώτησις. Περὶ τῆς παναγίας τῆς Μεγάλης Πέμπτης.

15

Ἀπόκρισις. Ἡ ἀναφορὰ τῆς παναγίας ἡ ἐν τῇ Μεγάλῃ Πέμπτῃ ὑψονυμένη γίνεται κατὰ τὴν συνήθειαν τῶν ἀλλων ἡμερῶν πλὴν ἐν τῷ βῆματι, οὐκ ἐν τῇ τραπέζῃ τῆς τροφῆς. Διὸ καὶ φυλάττεται καὶ μεταλαμβάνεται, ὅτε χρεία, πρὸ τοῦ ἀντιδώρου.

[3] Ἐρώτησις. Περὶ τοῦ Ἰούδα.

Ἀπόκρισις. Ὁ Ἰούδας ἐπέζησε μετὰ τὴν προδοσίαν ὀλίγον, ἔως οὐ ἐτελέσθη, ὁ λέγεται ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τῶν Πράξεων.

20

[4] Ἐρώτησις. Περὶ θυσιαστήριον μολυνθέντος.

Ἀπόκρισις. Τὸ θυσιαστήριον, χωρὶς τῶν συμβάντων δι' ὅποια συμπτώματα, γίνεται πρῶτον ἀγιασμός, εἴτα θυσία· ἐὰν καὶ τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέραι καὶ πλείους παρέλθωσιν, ἀνεμποδίστως καὶ ἀδιακρίτως λειτουργεῖται.

25

[5] Ἐρώτησις. Περὶ ἱερέως καὶ κοσμικοῦ πίνοντος ὕδωρ ἐν νυκτὶ.

Ἀπόκρισις. Τὸ ἐὰν πίῃ ὕδωρ ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐν νυκτὶ, ἀπὸ πολλῶν αἰτιῶν ἔστιν· εἰ μὲν οὖν δίψαν ἐκ πολυφαγίας καὶ μέθης ἐσπερινῆς ἔσχεν, οὐ δύναται θυσιάσαι· εἰ δὲ ἀπὸ ἀσθενείας, καὶ μὴ κοιμηθείς, δύναται θυσιάσαι. Ὁ δὲ λαϊκός, εἰ πρὸ ἔξ ὥρῶν πίῃ τὸ ὕδωρ, πλὴν ἔξ ἀσθενείας, δύναται λαμβάνειν τὸν εὐλογημένον ἄρτον ἦτοι τὸ ἀντιδώρον. Πλὴν ὁ ἀπεχόμενος ἀγιασμοῦ δι' εὐλάβειαν πλέον ὠφελεῖται τοῦ ἀγιαζομένου, ἐὰν καὶ τὸ τυχὸν ἐμπόδισμα ἥ.

30

35 [6] *Question. On whether a priest who fails to arrive on time together with the other priests to administer the sacraments shall be allowed to conduct the liturgy.*

*Response. The priest who arrives after the sacraments have been administered cannot conduct the liturgy, although some wrongly do so and even shamelessly join the proceedings even by the time of the first eisodos.*

40 [7] *Question. On the Cross.*

*Response: Those who claim that the wooden Cross ascended into heaven do not know what they are talking about.*

[8] *Question. On Archbishop and Patriarch.*

45 *Response. It is possible for the lord of the region and the synod of bishops to appoint as Archbishop and Patriarch someone whose previous diocese was not in the same region. The Metropolitan of Nafpaktos resides in another city because Nafpaktos is now under Latin control and does not accept his presence, yet we still call him Metropolitan of Nafpaktos. The Metropolitan of Russia is known as being “of Kiev and All Russia”, yet he has his see in Moscow, because Kiev is currently under 50 Latin control and does not allow the Orthodox rite. And there are many other such examples. When Constantinople fell under Latin control for 63 years, Patriarchs of Constantinople were nevertheless appointed successively, and named such, yet had their see in Nicaea, since the realm was based there. In the place where the Archbishop or Patriarch is, it is not possible for there to be another legitimate prelate; such a bishop must either be transferred to another church, if there is a 55 vacant see, or, lest he become trisepiskopos, he must step down for the common good.*

[9] *Question. On whether a bishop or Patriarch can administer the sacraments without a deacon.*

60 *Response. A bishop can administer the sacraments alone and without a deacon if he has an altar within his own cell and is alone, no one else being present to assist him. But if he is in view of many onlookers in his church or even in his cell, he cannot administer the sacraments without at least one deacon in attendance.*

[10] *Question. On a bishop.*

65 *Response. A bishop may be promoted to the office of metropolitan and transferred there, and the metropolitan be transferred to another metropolis or Patriarchate, just once. If this is not observed, he shall be deemed trisepiskopos, and in breach of the rules.*

[11] *Question. On bishops.*

70 *Response. The bishop may only punish spiritually, not physically or by monetary means. He may only confine and imprison the malefactor for the latter’s benefit,*

[6] Ἐρώτησις. Περὶ ἵερέως, ὅταν μὴ ἔλθῃ μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἵερέων τῶν τὴν προσκομιδὴν ποιησάντων, εἰ δύναται λειτουργῆσαι.

Ἀπόκρισις. Ό νύστερήσας ἵερεὺς μετὰ τὴν προσκομιδὴν οὐ δύναται λειτουργῆσαι, εἰ καὶ τινες κακῶς ποιοῦντες καὶ ἀναιδῶς καὶ μέχρι τῆς πρώτης εἰσόδου προστίθενται καὶ αὐτοί.

[7] Ἐρώτησις. Περὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ.

Ἀπόκρισις. Τὸ σταυρικὸν ξύλον οἱ λέγοντες ἀναληφθῆναι εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν οὐκ οἴδασιν τί λέγουσιν.

[8] Ἐρώτησις. Περὶ ἀρχιεπισκόπου καὶ πατριάρχου.

Ἀπόκρισις. Δύνανται ὁ αὐθέντης τοῦ τόπου καὶ ἡ σύνοδος τῶν ἐπισκόπων ποιῆσαι ἀρχιεπίσκοπον καὶ πατριάρχην καὶ μὴ συνισταμένου τοῦ τόπου, ἐν ᾧ ἦν πρότερον ἡ καθέδρα αὐτοῦ. Ό μητροπολίτης Ναυπάκτου κάθηται ἐν ἄλλῃ πόλει διότι τὸ Ναύπακτον Λατινικόν ἐστιν καὶ οὐ δέχονται αὐτόν, καὶ ὅμως ὀνομάζεται καὶ ἐστὶν Ναυπάκτου. Ό Ρωσίας ὀνομάζεται καὶ ἔστι Κυέβου καὶ πάσης Ρωσίας καὶ ὅμως κάθηται ἐν τῷ Μοσχοβίῳ, διότι τὸ Κύεβον ἐστὶ Λατινικόν καὶ οὐ χωρεῖ αὐτὸν ὅντα ὀρθόδοξον· καὶ ἐπὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν. Ότε ἐκρατεῖτο ἡ Κωνσταντινούπολις ὑπὸ Λατίνων ἦτη ἐξήκοντα τρία, ἐγένοντο πατριάρχαι Κωνσταντινουπόλεως κατὰ διαδοχὴν καὶ οὕτως ὀνομάζοντο καὶ ὅμως ἐκάθηντο ἐν τῇ Νικαίᾳ· ἐκεῖ γὰρ τότε ἦν τὸ βασίλειον. Πλὴν ὅπου ἐστὶν ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀρχιεπίσκοπος ἡ πατριάρχης, οὐ δύναται εἶναι ἐκεῖ ἐπίσκοπος ἄλλος γνήσιος, ἀλλ᾽ ὁ εὐρισκόμενος ἡ μετατίθεται εἰς ἄλλην ἐκκλησίαν, [εἰ] ἐστιν ἐκκλησία χηρεύουσα, ἢ, εἰ μὴ μέλλοι γενέσθαι τρισεπίσκοπος, ιδιάζει διὰ τὸ κοινὸν συμφέρον.

[9] Ἐρώτησις. Εἰ δύναται ἐπίσκοπος ἡ πατριάρχης χωρὶς διακόνου λειτουργῆσαι.

Ἀπόκρισις. Πᾶς ἐπίσκοπος δύναται θυσιάσαι μόνος καὶ χωρὶς διακόνου εἰ ἔχει θυσιαστήριον ἴδιον ἐν τῷ κελλίῳ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἰδίως, μηδενὸς ἄλλου παρόντος εἰ μὴ τοῦ ὑπηρετούντος αὐτῷ. Φανερῶς δὲ ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει αὐτοῦ ἡ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ θυσιαστηρίῳ πολλῶν ὄρώντων οὐ δύναται, χωρὶς διακόνου ἐνὸς τὸ ἔλαττον.

[10] Ἐρώτησις. Περὶ ἐπισκόπου.

Ἀπόκρισις. Ἐρα δὲ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος δύναται προβιβασθῆναι εἰς μητροπολίτην καὶ μετατεθῆναι καὶ ὁ μητροπολίτης μετατεθῆναι εἰς ἑτέραν μητρόπολιν ἡ πατριαρχεῖον, πλὴν ἄπαξ. Εἰ δὲ μή, ἔστι τρίς ἐπίσκοπος καὶ οὐ δέχονται αὐτὸν οἱ κανόνες.

[11] Ἐρώτησις. Περὶ ἐπισκόπων.

Ἀπόκρισις. Ό ἐπίσκοπος πνευματικῶς κολάζει μόνον, οὐ σωματικῶς, ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲ χρηματικῶς, ἀποκλεισμὸν μόνον καὶ φυλακὴν δύναται ποιεῖν, εἰς ὡφέλειαν τοῦ

*until he gives assurance of his repentance. If the transgression of the said person is impiety towards the faith and the Church, then the accused shall be automatically delivered to the secular authorities and they shall decide punishment in accordance with the laws.*

75 [12] *Question. On taking the tonsure against the wife's wishes.*

*Response. He who takes the tonsure, though bound by marriage, against his wife's wishes commits a sin. The case of the person thus tonsured shall be investigated by the bishop and, if he is deemed to have been motivated by obstinacy or quarrelsomeness, he must resume his life with his wife; if he did so out of genuine religious desire, he shall not be required to remove the monastic habit.*

80 [13] *Another matter. On a priest.*

*The home of a priest must not be a tavern. Nor can a priest be a trader, buying and selling. He is, however, allowed to sell of his own produce. He cannot be a customs official or hold any other kind of post in public services.*

85 [14] *Regarding drunken priests administering the sacraments.*

*Response. In the words of the Apostle: and drunkards will not inherit the kingdom of God, for drunkenness is a mortal sin. Let the priest then desist from committing such a sin, and not touch the holy vessels (used for the sacraments) and not administer the sacraments.*

90 [15] *Question.*

*[Response]. We worship God facing the East. For it is written, "God came from Teman, and Teman [...]."*

[16] *Question. On polluted vessels.*

95 *Response. If the polluted vessel is worth much, it should be re-sanctified. If it is of no worth, it should be discarded. The same applies to edible items: they too should be discarded if polluted.*

[17] *Question. On whether one who has vomited can partake of Communion.*

100 *Response: He who has vomited today is allowed to take Communion tomorrow. If it is very urgent and there is risk that he may die and not live to take Communion the next day, then he can take Communion on the same day. If the patient is so sick that he cannot hold down the bread, then it is not necessary to insist that he eat it. Because God's grace, understanding man's weakness, supplements what he has not consumed for the Eucharist, provided He accepts the repentance and confession of the man in question. But if the vomiting has been caused by drunkenness, and not by illness, and there is no danger of the person dying, or if it happens to be at a time of fasting, after waiting some days, and having shown repentance, let the person in question then partake of the sacrament, at the discretion of the greater priest.*

πταίσαντος, ἔως μεταμέλειαν ὑπόσχηται. Εἰ δὲ τὸ ἀμάρτημα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔστιν ἀναισχυντία διὰ τῆς πίστεως κατὰ τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, αὐτονοήτως παραδίδωσιν αὐτὸν τῇ κοσμικῇ ἀρχῇ καὶ ἐκείνη κολάζει κατὰ τοὺς νόμους.

[12] Ἐρώτησις. Περὶ τοῦ ἀποκείραντος ἔαυτὸν χωρὶς θελήματος τῆς συζύγου.

70

Ἀπόκρισις. Ό ἀποκείρων ἔαυτὸν δεδεμένος γάμῳ χωρὶς θελήματος τῆς συζύγου, ἀμαρτάνει. Τὸ δὲ πρόσωπον τὸ ἀποκαρὲν ἐξετάζει ὁ ἐπίσκοπος καὶ, εἰ μὲν κατὰ πεῖσμα καὶ φιλονεικίαν ἀπεκάρη, πάλιν συνάπτει αὐτὸν μετὰ τῆς συζύγου· εἰ δὲ κατὰ θεῖον σκοπόν, οὐκ ἀποβάλλει τὰ μοναχικά.

[13] Ἐτερον ζήτημα. Περὶ Ἱερέως.

75

Οὐ δύναται ὁ οἶκος τοῦ Ἱερέως εἶναι καπηλεῖον, οὔτε δύναται ὁ Ἱερεὺς εἶναι πραγματευτής, καὶ πωλεῖν καὶ ἀγοράζειν. Δύναται δὲ πωλεῖν ἐκ τῶν ιδίων καρπῶν, οὐ δὲ δύναται τελωνεῖν, ἢ ἄλλοις ὑπηρετήμασι δημοσίοις ὑπηρετεῖν.

[14] Περὶ Ἱερέως μεθύοντος καὶ Ἱερουργοῦντος.

80

Ἀπόκρισις. Τοῦ Ἀποστόλου λέγοντος: καὶ μέθυσοι βασιλείαν Θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομήσουσι, ἡ μέθη θανάσιμος ἔστιν ἀμαρτίᾳ· οὖν πανέσθω ὁ Ἱερεὺς τοῦ τοιούτου ἀμαρτήματος ἢ μὴ ἀπτέσθω τῶν ἀγίων, μηδὲ ὑπηρετήτω τοῖς μυστηρίοις τῆς ζωῆς.

[15] Ἐρώτησις.

[Ἀπόκρισις]. Εἰς τὴν ἀνατολὴν ποιοῦμεν τῷ Θεῷ τὴν προσκύνησιν, διότι γέγραπται ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ Θαιμὰν ἥξει, Θαιμὰν δὲ [...].

85

[16] Ἐρώτησις. Περὶ μιανθέντος σκεύους.

Ἀπόκρισις. Τὸ μιανθὲν σκεῦος εἰ μὲν τίμιον ἔστιν, ἀγιάζεται, εἰ δὲ εὐτελές, ἀχρειοῦται. Όμοίως καὶ τὰ βρώσιμα ἀχρειοῦνται ἄν μιανθῶσιν.

[17] Ἐρώτησις. Περὶ τοῦ ἐμέσαντος, εἰ δύναται μεταλαβεῖν.

Ἀπόκρισις. Ό ἐμέσας σήμερον δύναται αὐριον μεταλαβεῖν· εἰ δὲ κατεπείγει, καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐὰν πρὸς θάνατον ὑπάρχῃ ἡ ἀσθένεια καὶ οὐκ ἔφθασε πρὸ τούτου μεταλαβεῖν. Εἰ δὲ τοιαύτην ἀσθένειαν ἔχει ὡς τὸ ἐμεῖν ἀπαν τὸ προσλαμβανόμενον, οὐδεμία ἀνάγκη· ἡ γὰρ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τὴν ἀδυναμίαν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀναπληροῖ τὸ ὑστέρημα τῆς μεταλήψεως, εἰ τὴν μετάνοιαν καὶ τὴν ἐξομολόγησιν ἐδέξατο τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Εἰ δὲ ἐκ μέθης ὁ ἐμετός καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἀσθενείας καὶ οὐδὲ θάνατος κατεπείγει ἡ καὶ ἐν νηστίμοις ἡμέραις, ἀργῶν ἡμέρας τινὰς καὶ μετανοῶν εἴτα κοινωνείτω, κατὰ τὴν διάκρισιν τοῦ μείζονος.

90

95

[18] *Question. If one can eat the meat of an animal killed by wild beasts.*

110 *Response: The meat of animals eaten or killed by wild beasts, or whatever has been killed by children, need not be confused with carrion. If killed by a woman, it should not be eaten.*

[19] *Question. On the third heaven.*

115 *Response. The third heaven, to which the blessed Paul was caught up, is the third way of beholding God. The first way of beholding God is by viewing images of God, that is, the things he has created, just as Paul himself says: "Ever since the creation of the world invisible though they are, – his eternal power and divine nature – have been understood and seen through the things he has made". The second way of beholding God is through natural intellect, when the mind separates itself from looking on the world and the things in it and from bodily exertion, and devotes itself instead to the contemplation of the divine and eternal in accordance with the precepts of faith and the laws of God. Then he becomes illuminated by the divine light, and some even perceive the things of the future, like the prophets. The third way of beholding God is through supernatural intellect, when the mind is raised by the will of God to the revelation of things yet more divine and heavenly,*

120 *such as that future day will reveal to the worthy, and it beholds these things not by virtue of faith, but by virtue of direct knowledge and understanding. But to be more accurate, the third heaven is that which is also termed paradise – the outer and final heaven. Thus there are three heavens: the incandescent, which contains the stars; the second, crystalline, being the firmament; and the third, or outer, sphere, to where rise up the souls of the saints, and from where they descend at the Second Coming in order to assume their bodies that shall at that time be resurrected, in order to achieve perfection. For now, although they enjoy heavenly bliss, they yet remain incomplete because they lack their bodies. For man is not comprised only of the soul, but of soul and body. Nor did God join the rational soul to the body in vain, only to separate the two, once and for all, and never let them reunite; rather, the soul shall be reunited with the body when the latter has become incorrupt. Accordingly, it was to this third and last heaven and intelligible paradise, where are the angels and the soul of Paul saying: I desire "to depart and be with Christ", and the spirits of the other saints, that the soul of Paul was raised.*

125 *One may ask whether the soul rose up with the body or without it, not because one thinks that the body can be raised up together with the soul, since one knows that it was impossible for this to happen because he still possessed a corrupt body; when the body becomes incorrupt and weightless and shining, just like the body of Christ after the Resurrection, then it will rise up together with the soul to the*

[18] Ἐρώτησις. Εἰ χρὴ τὰ θηριόβρωτα ἐσθίεσθαι.

Ἀπόκρισις. Τὰ θηριόβρωτα ἢ θηριοφόνεντα οὐκ εἰσὶ θνησιμαῖα, οὐδὲ τὰ ὑπὸ παιδῶν κτεινόμενα. Γυναικὸς δὲ φονευούσης οὐ δεῖ ἐσθίεσθαι.

100

[19] Ἐρώτησις. Περὶ τοῦ τρίτου οὐρανοῦ.

Ἀπόκρισις. Ὁ τρίτος οὐρανός, εἰς ὃν ἡρπάγη ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος, ἔστιν ὁ τρίτος τρόπος τῆς θεωρίας τοῦ Θεοῦ. Πρώτη γάρ θεωρία ἔστιν ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰκόνων τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἥγουν τῶν ποιημάτων αὐτοῦ, καθὼς ὁ Παῦλος αὐτὸς λέγει, ὅτι “τὰ ἀόρατα”

105

τοῦ Θεοῦ “ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου διὰ τῶν ποιημάτων νοούμενα καθορᾶται” παρ’ ἡμῖν. Δευτέρα ἔστιν νοερὰ φυσική, ὅταν ὁ νοῦς χωρίζῃ ἑαυτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς θεωρίας τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τῶν τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τῶν προσπαθειῶν τοῦ σώματος καὶ δόλος ἐνασχολῆται τῇ μελέτῃ τῶν θείων καὶ ἀιδίων κατὰ τὰς ὑποτυπώσεις τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῶν νόμων τοῦ Θεοῦ. Καὶ τότε φωτίζεται ἐκ τοῦ θείου φωτὸς καὶ τινὲς προβλέπουσι τὰ μέλλοντα ὡς οἱ προφῆται. Τρίτη ἔστιν νοερὰ ὑπὲρ φύσιν, ὅταν

110

ὁ νοῦς κατὰ θέλημα Θεοῦ ὑψωθῇ πρὸς ἀποκαλύψιν πραγμάτων θειοτέρων καὶ οὐρανίων, ἀπερ ἡ μέλλουσα ἀποκαλύψει ἡμέρα τοῖς ἀξίοις, καὶ ἵδη αὐτὰ οὐκ ἐν πίστει ἀλλ’ ἐν γνώσει καὶ καταλήψει. Άλλὰ τὸ ἀληθέστερον ἔστιν, ὅτι τρίτος οὐρανὸς ἔστιν ὃν καὶ παράδεισον λέγει, ὁ ἔξωτερικὸς οὐρανὸς καὶ τελευταῖος.

115

Τρεῖς γάρ εἰσὶν οἱ οὐρανοί· ὁ ἔμπυρος, ἥγουν ὁ ἔχων τοὺς ἀστέρας, ὁ δεύτερος ὁ κρυστάλλινος, ἥγουν τὸ στερέωμα, τρίτος ἡ ἔξω σφαῖρα, ὅπου ἀνέρχονται αἱ ψυχαὶ τῶν ἀγίων καὶ ἀφ’ οὗ κατελεύσονται ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ παρουσίᾳ εἰς τὸ ἀναλαβεῖν τὰ σώματα ἀναστησόμενα τότε, ἵνα τελειωθῶσιν· νῦν γάρ, εἰ καὶ ἀπολαύουσι τῆς οὐρανῶν μακαριότητος, ἀλλ’ ἀτελεῖς εἰσὶ διὰ τὸ ἐλλείπειν αὐτῶν τὰ σώματα. Οὐ γάρ ἀνθρωπος οὐχὶ ψυχὴ μόνον ἔστιν, ἀλλὰ ψυχὴ μετὰ σώματος, οὐδὲ μάτην ὁ Θεὸς τὴν λογικὴν ψυχὴν συνέδησεν μετὰ σώματος ἵνα χωρισθεῖσα ἀπαξ μηκέτι ἐνωθῇ, ἀλλὰ δεῖ αὐτὴν ἐνωθῆναι τούτῳ ποτὲ γενομένῳ ἀφθάρτῳ. Ἐκεῖ τοίνυν εἰς τὸν τρίτον καὶ τελευταῖον οὐρανὸν καὶ νοητὸν παράδεισον, ἐν φερετὸν εἰσὶν οἱ ἄγγελοι καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ Παύλου ἡ λέγουσα· ἐπιθυμῶ “ἀναλῦσαι καὶ σὺν Χριστῷ εἰναι” καὶ τῶν ἀλλων ἀγίων τὰ πνεύματα, ἐκεῖ ἡρπάγη ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ Παύλου. Άπορει δέ, ἄρα μετὰ σώματος ἡ χωρὶς τοῦ σώματος, οὐχ ὅτι ὑποπτεύει μήποτε καὶ τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ἡρπάγη μετὰ τῆς ψυχῆς εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν· ἐγίνωσκε γάρ ὅτι τοῦτο ἀδύνατον ἦν τότε, ἐπειδὴ σῶμα φθορᾶς εἶχεν ἔτι· ὅταν δὲ ἀφθαρτὸν γένηται καὶ ἐλαφρὸν καὶ λαμπρόν, οἷον ἦν τὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν, τότε ἀναβήσεται καὶ αὐτὸ μετὰ τῆς ψυχῆς εἰς τὸν οὐράνιον παράδεισον, ὃς ἔστιν ὁ τόπος τῶν μακαρίων.

120

Άλλὰ ἀπορεῖ, ἄραγε ἡ ψυχὴ ἔχωρίσθη τοῦ σώματος πρὸς καιρὸν καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὸν νεκρὸν ἔως οὗ πάλιν ὑπέστρεψε κατὰ θαῦμα, ἡ ἐμενεν ἐντὸς τοῦ σώματος, ἡρπάγη δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ ἦν ὅμοι ἐν τῷ σώματι φυσικῶς καὶ ἐν τῷ


130

145 heavenly paradise, the place of the blessed. One may also ask whether the soul could be divided from the body for a time, leaving the body lifeless until it returned miraculously to it, or whether it remained within the body, though raised to heaven, being at one and the same time in the body as natural substance and in heaven as energy, thereby unveiling the mysteries of heaven for the benefit of the world, this 150 being a greater miracle than the former.

[20] Question. What does “costly perfume made of pure nard” mean?

Response. In the time of Moses the precious ointment [= nard] myrrh was said to be made of four ingredients, and was used to anoint the priests from head to foot, in accordance with the words of the prophet David, “the precious oil on the head running down upon the beard” and so on; and for this purpose Moses established 155 that the preparation of the ointment be carried out only by special experts. This, then, is what pure spikenard is, as interpreted by those who know. The ingredients used were as follows: myrrh blossom, sweet-smelling cinnamon, iris, sweet-smelling calamus and olive oil.

20-21 cf. Acts 1:16-20 | 86-87 cf. 1 Corinthians 6:10 | 91-92 cf. Habakkuk 3:3 | 113-114 cf. Corinthians 12:2 | 115-116 “God’s invisible qualities...have been clearly seen”: Romans 1:20 | 138-139 “to depart and be with Christ”: Philippians 1:23 | 151 “costly perfume made of pure nard”: John 12:3; cf. Mark 14:3 | 154-155 “the precious oil... upon the beard”: Psalms 133[132]:2



MS Patm. 447, f. 354r (detail).

οὐρανῷ κατ' ἐνέργειαν, ἵνα ἀποκαλυφθῇ τὰ μυστήρια τῶν οὐρανῶν εἰς ὀφέλειαν τῆς οἰκουμένης, ὅπερ ἐστὶ μεῖζον θαῦμα τοῦ προτέρου.

135

[20] Ἐρώτησις. Τί σημαίνει “νάρδον πιστικῆς πολυτίμου”;

Ἀπόκρισις. Τὸ παλαιὸν ἔδωκε Μωϋσῆς ἐκ τεσσάρων εἰδῶν γενέσθαι τὸ μύρον τὸ λεγόμενον πολύτιμον, δηλειφε τοὺς ἱερεῖς ἀπὸ κεφαλῆς ἔως ποδῶν, περὶ οὐλέγει ὁ προφήτης Δανιὴλ· “ώς μύρον ἐπὶ κεφαλῆς τὸ καταβαῖνον ἐπὶ πώγωνα” καὶ τὰ ἔξης· καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις ἔστησεν ἐπιστήμονας ὁ Μωϋσῆς τούτους μόνους ἐργάζεσθαι αὐτό, καὶ τοῦτο ἐρμηνεύει τὸ πιστικῆς πολυτίμου, τὸ ἐξ ἐπιστήμης δηλονότι γενόμενον. Τὰ δὲ εἰδὴ εἰσὶν ταῦτα· ἀνθος σμύρνης, κιννάμωμον εὐώδες, ἥρις, κάλαμος εὐώδης καὶ ἔλαιον.

140

### Sigla

Α= Dresd. A, 187, σ. 512-516

Β= Marc. gr. III. 5, φ. 247v-248r, 402r

Γ= Patm. 540, φ. 23r-24v

ΠΙ= Patm. 447, φ. 353v-354v

Μ= Meteor. Ἀγίου Στεφάνου 22, φ. 255v-256v, 266v-267v

Σ= Sinait. 1609, φ. 424v-426v

Ε= χφ Μ. Γεδέων

Γ= Μ. Γεδέων, “Τοῦ Γραικορωμαϊκοῦ Νομίμου τὰ παραλειπόμενα”, *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια* 3 (1882-1883), 171-172 [= *Κανονικαί Διατάξεις τῶν πατριαρχῶν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*, τ. 1, *Κωνσταντινούπολη* 1888, σ. 26-30].

Δ= E. von Dobschütz, “Ein Schreiben des Patriarchen Gennadios Scholarios an den Fürsten Georg von Serbien”, *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 27 (1905), σ. 247-252.

Ρ= Γενναδίου Σχολαρίου, *Ἄπαντα τὰ εύρισκόμενα. Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, (ἐκδ. L. Petit, X. A. Sideridès and M. Jugie), τ. 4, Παρίσι 1935, σ. 208-211.

(On the “Matters” in each MS, see Table, p. 105)

1 Ζητήματα: Ζήτημα Π | καὶ ἐρωτήσεις: ομ Π | Σερβίας: Σερβίας Α, Β, Γ, Μ, Σ, Δ, Ρ | 2 πατριάρχην: παναγιώτατον καὶ οἰκουμενικὸν πατριάρχην Α, Β, Γ, Μ, Σ, Δ Ρ | Γεννάδιον: Γενάδιον Α, Γ | Κωνσταντινουπόλεως: ομ Α, Β, Γ, Μ, Σ, Δ, Ρ | 3 Ἀπόκρισεις: Ἀπόκρισις Γ· ομ Π | 4 Θεοφυλάκτου: Θεοφιλάκτου Α, Γ· Θεοφυλάκτου Δ | 7 εύρισκεται τι: εύρισκεται Α, Σ | βιβλίοις: βίβλοις Β, Γ | 8 ὅπερ: τι ὅπερ Α, Β, Γ, Σ | ἔστιν: ἔστι Β | 10 Τὸ δὲ βιβλίον: Ἀπόκρισις. Τὸ βιβλίον Β | δέ: ομ Μ | 11 μετεγλωττίσθη: ἐμετεγλωττίσθη Μ | τινι: τι Γ | 12 λέγειν: λέγη Μ | 13 Τὰ δέ: Ἀπόκρισις. Τὰ Β | μόναις: μόνες Μ | δέ: ομ Β, Μ | 15, 16 Πέμπτης, Πέμπτη: Ε<sup>η</sup>, Ε<sup>η</sup> Α, Β, Γ, Μ, Π, Σ | 20 ἐπέζησε: ἐπεζήτησε Γ | 21 τῶν Πράξεων: τ[vacuum] Γ | 23 θυσιαστήριον: [vacuum] ιον Γ | 24 πρῶτον ἀγιασμός: αὐν ἀ[vacuum]μδς Γ | τεσσαράκοντα: μα' Γ | ήμέραι: ήμέρας Α, Β, Γ, Μ, Σ | 26 κοσμικοῦ: κοσμ[vacuum] Γ | 27 ἐν: τῇ Β | ἀπό: vacuum Γ | 28-29 εἰ δέ ... δύναται

θυσιάσαι: ομ Α, Γ | 30 ἥτοι: ἥτι Μ | 31 ἀγιασμοῦ: τοῦ ἀγιασμοῦ Μ | 33 μῆ: ομ Μ | τῶν: ομ Μ | 35 ὑστερήσας: ὑστερίσας Μ | 36 πρώτης: αὐτῆς Γ | 39 ξύλον: ἄγιον ξύλον Μ | 39-40 οὐκ οἰδασιν: οὐδὲν Μ | 41 ἀρχιεπισκόπου καὶ πατριάρχου: ἀρχιεπισκόπων καὶ πατριαρχῶν Π | 42 Δύνανται: Δύνανται γὰρ Π | αὐθέντης: ἀφθέντης Β, Μ | ἐπισκόπων: ἐπὶ σκόπων Π | 43 συνισταμένου: συννύσταμένου Π | ἥν: ἥν Π | 44 Ό: Ὁ γὰρ Π | τό: τὸν Α, Γ, Μ· γὰρ τὸν Π | 45 δέχονται: δέχοντε Π | καὶ ἔστιν: ομ Α, Β, Γ, Μ, Σ | 46 καὶ ἔστι: ομ Γ | 47 κάθηται: κάθητε Π | Κύεβον: Κυέβον Α, Γ, Σ | καὶ οὐ: οὐ Α, Γ, Σ | χωρεῖ: χωρῆ Π | 48 ὅντα: ὅταν Γ | ἐκρατεῖτο: ἐκρατήτω Π | Κωνσταντινούπολις: Κωνσταντίνου πόλις Β· Κωνσταντινούπολεις Π | 49 ἐξήκοντα τρία: ξύγιον: ἐξήκοντα τράπια | 50 ὀνομάζοντο: ὀνομάζοντο Γ, Π | 51 ἥν: ἥν Π | Πλήν: πλείν Π | 52 δύναται εἶναι: δύναται [vacuum] Γ· δύνατε εἶναι Π | ἐπίσκοπος: πίσκοπος Π | ἀλλ': ἀλλὰ Β, Π | εὐρισκόμενος: εὐρισκόμενος Π | μετατίθεται: μετατίθεται Π | 53 [εἰ]: ἡ Μ, Π | εἰ ἔστιν... χηρεύουσα: ομ Α, Γ, Σ | γενέσθαι: γίνεσθαι Μ | 54 τρισεπίσκοπος: τρίς ἐπίσκοπος Π | ιδιάζει: ἡ ιδιάζει Μ· ἡ ιδιάζει Π | 55 Εἰ δύναται: Ἀραγε δύνατε Π | λειτουργῆσαι: λειτουργῆσαι Γ | 56 εἰ: ἡ Π | 57 εἰ μῆ: ἡ μῆ Π | 58 ἡ καί: [vacuum] τυχὸν Γ | 59 ὄρώντων: ὄρδωντων Β | ἔλαττον: ἔλατον Μ | 61 προβίβασθῆναι: πρὸ βιβασθῆναι Π | 62 μετατεθῆναι: μετὰ τεθῆναι Π | πατριαρχεῖον: π(ατ)ριάρχιον Π | 63 Εἰ δέ: ἡ δέ Π | δέχονται: δέχωνται Π | κανόνες: κανώνες Π | 66 ἀποκλεισμόν: ἀπὸ κλεισμὸν Π | ποιεῖν: ποιεῖν Π | 67 ἔως: [vacuum]ως Π | μεταμέλειαν ὑπόσχηται. Εἰ: μεταμέλλ[vacuum]ς ὑπόσχη[vacuum]ι Π | 68 ἀναυσχυντία: ἀνεῳσχυντία Π | διὰ τῆς: διὰ τῆς Π | πλότεως: πλότ[vacuum]ς Π | 70 ἔαντόν: αὐτὸν Γ· ἔαντόν Π | θελήματος: θέλημα Μ· ομ Π | 71 ἀποκείρων: ἀπὸ κείρων Π | ἔαντόν: ἔαντὸν δὲ ἔλυπεν Π | δεδεμένος: δεδεμένον Μ, Π | γάμῳ: vacuum Γ | θελήματος: θέλημα Μ | τῆς: τοῦ Π | 72 ἀποκαρέν: ἀπὸ καρέν Β | καὶ εἰ: vacuum Γ | 73 πεῖσμα: πῆσμα Π | φιλονεικίαν: φιλονεικίαν Π | τῆς: τοῦ Α, Β, Μ, Π· τῆς Δ | 74 ἀποβάλλει: ἀποβάλεται Π | μοναχικά: μοναχικά Π | 76 οὐτε: οὐτε Π | ἰερεύς: ἰερεὺς Π | 77 πραγματευτής: πραγματευτής Π | πωλεῖν: πωλήν Π | 79 μεθώντος: μεθώντος Π | 80 Ἀποστόλον: Ἀπό[vacuum]λον Π | 80-81 κληρονομήσουσι: κληρονομίσουσι Π | ἰερεύς: ἰερεὺς Π | 82 ἀπέσθω: ἀπέσθω Π | ζωῆς: ζωῆς Π | 84 διότι: διότι Π | 85 ἥξει: ἥξει Π | 86 μιανθέντος: τοῦ μιανθέντος Μ | 88 Ὄμοίως: Ὄμως Α, Γ | 89 ἐμέσαντος: ἐμμέσαντος Γ | 90 δέ: ομ Μ | 91 ὑπάρχῃ: ὑπάρχει Β | 92 ἔχει: ἔχῃ Σ· ἔχει[ν] Α, Γ | 95 καί: ομ Μ | 101 τοῦ: ομ Σ | 102 ἥρπαγη: ἥρπαγη Γ | τρίτος: γυρτος Γ | 106 ἔστι: ἔστιν Β, Γ | 110 προβλέποντο: προβλέποντον Α | ἔστι: ἔστιν Α, Γ | 112 ἀποκαλύψει: ἀποκαλύψῃ Γ | 113 καταλήψει: καταλείψῃ Α· καταλήψει Δ | 114 οὐρανός: [vacuum]ανός Γ | 115 γάρ: vacuum Γ | δεύτερος: [vacuum]υτερος Γ | 116 αἱ: vacuum Γ | 117 δευτέρᾳ: βῃ Γ | 118 σώματα ἀναστησόμενα: [vacuum]στησόμενα Γ | 119 μακαριότητος: μακαριώτητος Α· [vacuum]ώτητος Γ | 120 οὐχί: vacuum Γ | 121 συνέδησεν: συνέδησε Σ | ἀπαξ μηκέτι: ἀπαξ[vacuum]έτι Γ | 122 γενομένῳ: γε[vacuum] Γ | 123 ἐν φῷ: εἰς φῷ Α | 125 ἥρπαγη: ἥρπαγει Ι | 138 ἥλειφε: εἰληφε Α· ἥλειφε Δ | 139 πώγωνα: πόγωνα Α· | 141 πιστικῆς: πιστικὴ Δ | πολυτίμον: πολυτίμον Α | ἐξ ἐπιστήμης: ἐξεπιστήμης Α | 142 ἀνθος: ἀνθον Α | ἥρις: ἥρεως Α | κάλαμος εὐώδης: καλάμον εὐώδους Α

20-21 πβ. Πράξεις 1, 16-20 | 80-81 πβ. Πρὸς Κορινθίους Α, 6, 10 | 84-85 πβ. Ἀββακοὺ 3, 3 | 102-103 πβ. Πρὸς Κορινθίους Β 12, 2 | 104-105 Τὰ ἀόρατα... καθορᾶται: Πρὸς Ρωμαίους 1, 20 | 124 ἀναλῦσαι.... εἶναι: Πρὸς Φιλιππησίους 1, 23 | 136 “νάρδον πιστικῆς πολυτίμου”: Ιωάννης 12, 3· πβ. Μάρκος 14, 3 | 139 ὡς μῆρον... πώγωνα: Ψαλμοὶ 132, 2

Translated by John Davis