

The Demetrios Chrysoloras' Project: The Critical Edition of His Unpublished Oeuvre

↘ by Georgios D. Panagopoulos, Patras/Ioannina

Since 1969 when H. Hunger asserted that Demetrios Chrysoloras „zu jenen byzantinischen Autoren gehört, die wir gut zu kennen glauben, aber seine Schriften sind zum Großteil unediert”,¹ that is, Demetrios Chrysoloras belongs to those Byzantine authors, who seem to us well-known, but his work remains still unedited, little has been done concerning the long-expected critical edition of his extant work; nevertheless it seems also that Hunger's statement about our knowledge of Demetrios' person and activity is a bit exaggerated. This is said not only because modern scholars, such as A.-M. Talbot, point out that little is known about D. Chrysoloras's Biography,² but also because it would be risky to maintain that we have an accurate biographical survey of a personality whose work remains in major part unpublished.

The task of our project³ is to prepare as soon as possible the critical edition of Chrysoloras' still unedited works in order to be able after that to fulfil the gaps of our knowledge and to remove uncertainties related to his literary activity. Our final task is to provide the first critical biography of this unfairly forgotten figure of the political and intellectual history of late Byzantium.

In the following pages after having referred to the main biographical data of Demetrios we'll be discussing two main points: a) First of all we'll give a survey of the literary product of our author. We will refer firstly to his already edited works and then we'll recount all those still unedited. b) Our interest will be dedicated to the first stage of our editorial undertaking, that is, the edition of 4 Chrysoloras' festive-religious Orations, by summarising the problems we have to deal with and the conclusions we have already come to. Last but not least we undertake to give a preliminary account of the perspectives of our research after the accomplishment of the planned edition.

A concise of biographical data

Demetrios Chrysoloras, orator, theologian and politician, was probably of the same age as Emperor Manuel II (1391- 1425) and he was a highly esteemed member of the elite literary group at Manuel's court. It is nowadays quite certain that he was not a brother of the distinguished humanist Manuel Chrysoloras.⁴ Between the ruler and Demetrios there was a close relationship and the two men exchanged their writings. Manuel himself felt an

¹ H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, Bd. I: Philosophie, Rhetorik, Epistolographie, Geschichtsschreibung, Geographie (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft XII 5, 1-2), München 1978.

² A.-M. Talbot, Chrysoloras Demetrios, in: *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, Vol. I, New York - Oxford 1991, p. 454.

³ In the Project's team participate also the colleagues M. Vantaraki and Sp. Panagopoulos.

⁴ G. Cammelli, *I doti byzantini e le origini dell' umanesimo*. I, Manuele Chrysolora, Firenze 1941, pp. 198-201. G. T. Dennis, *The Letters of Manuel Palaiologus*, Text, Translation, and Notes, Washington D. C. 1977, XXXIV; see however A. Fyrigos, Chrysoloras Demetrios, in: *LThK* 2, 1191 and W. Buchwald - A. Hohlweg - O. Prinz, *Tuclum Lexikon griechischer und lateinischer Autoren des Altertums und des Mittelalters*, München 1963, s.v.; cf. also F. C. Bizzaro (Hg.),

enormous delight from receiving and reading in his literary coterie writings of highly literary value.⁵ The great esteem in which the two men held each other did not diminish even when Chrysoloras had been put in political charge by the Manuel's nephew and rival Joannes VII first, at an early time, in Silymbria (about the end of the 14th c.) and later on (1403-1407) in Thessaloniki, where Demetrius served Joannes as *mesazon*. During Manuel's journey (1400-1403) to the European courts Demetrius remained in the Byzantine capital and experienced the last terrible phase of the city's siege by the Ottomans (1394-1402). The two last notices about his life concern his attendance as member of the Senate and *oikeios*⁶⁷ of the Emperor in the synod of 1409 which excommunicated the former bishop Macarius of Ancyra, a notorious enemy of Manuel II,⁸ and also his attendance of the synod of 1416 which was summoned to elect a new Patriarch of Constantinople and to reach a settlement about the rights of Emperor within the Church.⁹

The literary output

The literary output of Chrysoloras consists in religious-theological writings on the one side and in secular ones on the other side, which in their turn are divided into those of *stricto sensu* rhetorical-political kind and one of astronomic character.

According to a widespread view, the first scholar who dealt with Demetrius in an attempt to draw up a list of his writings was Sp. P. Lambros (an outstanding Greek philologist, historian and for a brief period prime minister of Greece).¹⁰ He was followed by the Swedish scholar Lundström, who 1906 undertook to complete the Lambros' list with detailed references to the manuscript tradition of Demetrius works.¹¹ For the history, however, it would be unfair

Demetrio Chrysolora, *Cento Epistole a Manuele II Paleologo*. Testo critico, introduzione, tradizione commentario, Napoli 1984.

⁵ See F. C. Bizzarro, *Cento Epistole*, p. 28: "Manuele II, tipico uomo colto del suo tempo, si entusiasma nel ricevere queste lettere e le legge pubblicamente in una cerchia di amici dotti, come egli stesso ci attesta nella risposta al suo confidente"; cf. J. W. Barker, *Manuel II Palaiologus (1391-1425): A Study in Late Byzantine Statesmanship*, New Brunswick / N. Jersey 1969, 410.

⁶ Cf. J. Verpeaux, *Les oikeioi*. Note d'histoire institutionnelle et sociale', *REB* 23 (1965) 89-99. and H.-G. Beck, *Byzantinisches Gefolgschaftswesen*, in: *Ideen und Realitäten in Byzanz* (Variorum Reprints), London 1972, XI 8.

⁷ Cf. J. Verpeaux, *Les oikeioi*. Note d'histoire institutionnelle et sociale', *REB* 23 (1965) 89-99. and H. -G. Beck, *Byzantinisches Gefolgschaftswesen*, in: *Ideen und Realitäten in Byzanz* (Variorum Reprints), London 1972, XI 8.

⁸ See J. W. Barker, *Manuel II Palaiologus (1391-1425): A Study in Late Byzantine Statesmanship*, New Brunswick / N. Jersey 1969.

⁹ *Ismael Roca Melia*, *Demetrio Chrysoloras y su homilia inedita sobre la dormition de Maria Helmantica* 35 (1960) 236, on the basis of a misunderstood passage of Syropoulos, is inclined to claim that our author attended the council of Ferrara Florentia in the entourage of Emperor Ioannis VIII. This is, as already G. Cammelli, *Manuele Chrysolora*, p. 198, had proved, not the case. As a matter of fact the Syropoulos' evidence relates to the council of 1416 mentioned above. See P. Gautier, *Action de grace de Démétrius Chrysoloras a la Théothocos pour l'anniversaire de la Bataille d'Ankara* (28 Juillet 1403), *REB* 19 (1961): *Melanges Raymond Janin*, 341; cf. G. Sphrantzis, *Chronicon minus*, PG 156, 1026. The wrong claim of Roca Melia is repeated by E. Konstantinou, *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. II, München 2003, col. 2051).

¹⁰ Sp. P. Lambros, *Die Werke des Demetrius Chrysoloras*, BZ 3 (1894) 599-601.

¹¹ V. Lundström, *Ramenta Byzantina*, *Erano. Acta Philologica Suceana* 6 (1905/06) 50-54.

to fail to mention that already in the second half of the 19th century a nowadays forgotten Greek scholar and Orthodox priest, Andronikos Demetracopoulos, had undertaken pioneer research of manuscripts of Chrysoloras' work.¹²

As far as it concerns the current *Stand der Forschung* it must be pointed out that the main rhetorical writings of our author have been edited. By this we mean the *Comparison between the old and new Rulers*, (a Praise of Emperor Manuel II in the form of *comparison* edited by Lampros¹³ and attributed to Chrysoloras by Treu) the *100 Epistles* addressed to Emperor Manuel (a work, edited by the Italian scholar Bizzaro, that integrates at a great length passages from the previous and belongs to the literary genre of the laconic Epistles¹⁴) and the funny *Praise of a Flea* (a rhetorical plaisanterie preceded by the example of the great M. Psellos¹⁵. An *Oration* about a problem posed by Antonio d' Ascoli, in which the question of the being and the not being in its relation to the Good is treated from a philosophical point of view, was already edited by J. Tromba in the 17th c. and then once more by J. Basilicos¹⁶ at the beginning of the 20th c.

Unlike the secular writings the theological ones still remain to a great extent unedited. Although the *Logos Synoptikos contra Latinos*, a summarised reproduction of the main points of Neilos Kabasilas' work against the *filioque* doctrine, has been edited by Ass. Prof. Koutsouris in 1998,¹⁷ the Demetrios' *opus magnum*, i.e., the *Dialog contra Demetrium Cydonem* has not yet been published. It is however noteworthy, that a young Cypriot scholar, V. Passiourtidis, has been already engaged in the preparation of the critical edition of this work and the result of his research will be apparently available to the scholars community by 2013.

Then we come - as one could say- to the religious-theological *opuscula*. It concerns his panegyric *Orations* to various religious feasts, saints, or events. It is precisely the edition of this part of Chrysoloras' literary output the purpose of our project is focused on. Except for three *Orations*, one to *Virgin's Dormition*,¹⁸ a *Thanksgiving* to Theotokos (Mother of God) on occasion of the Ottomans' defeat in the battle of Ankara (28, July, 1402),¹⁹ and the *Praise* to St. Demetrios of Thessaloniki, which have been edited decades ago, there are five other ones

¹² See the *Andronikos Demetracopoulos'* unpublished concise of patristic literature, which is transmitted by a 19th century manuscript of the Taxiarches' Monastery of Aigion/Greece.

¹³ Σύγκρισις παλαιῶν ἀρχόντων καὶ τοῦ νῦν αὐτοκράτορα [Μανουὴλ Παλαιολόγου], ed. *Sp. P. Lamprou*, Παλαιολόγεια καὶ Πελοποννησιακά, vol. 3, Athens 1926, pp. 225-245.

¹⁴ See *F. C. Bizzaro* (Hg.), *Demetrio Chrysolora*, Cento Epistole a Manuele II Paleologo. Testo critico, introduzione, tradizione e commentario, Napoli 1984, p. 28.

¹⁵ Ed. *Gr. de Andres*, *Demetrio Crisoloras el Palaciego*, Encomio de la pulga, in: *Helmantica* 35 (1984), 51-69. Cf. *H. Hunger*, *Johannes Hortasmenos* (ca. 1370-1436/37). Briefe, Gedichte und kleine Schriften. Einleitung, Regesten, Prosopographie, Text, Wien 1969, p. 92. *G. T. Dennis*, *The Letters of Manuel II*, p. 144.

¹⁶ *J. Tromba Lascaris* (in Latin), Florence 1618. *J. Basilicos*, Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια 29 (1909) 159f. Cf. *H. A. Fabricius*, *Bibliotheca Graeca* 11, pp. 413-414. Also *H.-G. Beck*, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*, München 1959, p. 751. Cf. also *C. Cartagena Carreno*, *Demetrio Chrysolora y sus homilias ineditas a la Natividad y Resurreccion del Senor*, *Helmantica* 8-9 55 (1967) 5-54, hier 8-9, who relates to some others *opuscula* of Demetrios.

¹⁷ *D. G. Koutsouris*, Δημητρίου Χρυσολωρᾶ, Κατὰ Λατίνων λόγος συνοπτικός ἀφ' ᾧ ἐποίησεν ὁ ἀγιώτατος Νεῖλος ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Θεσσαλονίκης, Athens 1998.

¹⁸ Ed. *Ismael Roca Melia*, *La Asuncion de Maria en Demetrio Crisoloras*, Salamanca 1961.

¹⁹ *P. Gautier*, Action de grace de Démétrius Chrysoloras a la Théothocos pour l'anniversaire de la Bataille d'Ankara (28 Juillet 1403), *REB* 19 (1961): Melanges Raymond Janin, 340-357 (the text

that are still waiting for their editor: The *Oration to Virgin's Annunciation*, the *Demonstration of the miracle of Theotokos Hodegetria* (ἐν τοῖς ὁδηγοῖς), the *Oration to the sacred Burial of Christ*, to the *Birth of Christ*,²⁰ to the *Transfiguration*²¹ and to the *Resurrection*.²² The main codex which transmits these writings is *Escor.* 164 T-III-4, a codex entirely dedicated to Chrysoloras' *Orations*.²³ But for two *Orations* (*Oration to the Miracle of Hodegetria* and *Oration to the Virgin's Annunciation*) it is also *Flor. Laur. Plut.* X 31 that should be taken into consideration²⁴, although compared to *Escor.* it is obviously of less value for the *traditio texti*. In one case (*Oration to the Christ's Resurrection*) we have also to consult the *Cod. Dionysios' Monastery* 228.²⁵ To these writings must be added a short treatise against the primacy of the Pope (transmitted by *Oxf. Sedleianus Laud.*, gr. 73) and an *opusculum* of astronomical character (transmitted in *Vat. gr.* 1059). After these seven unpublished writings having been edited and also the Passiourtidis' edition having been accomplished our further purpose is to provide the first critical account of Chrysoloras' life and work taking especially into consideration his theological doctrine.

What follows concerns mainly the first stage of our undertaking, i.e. the edition of three of the 5 *Orations* already referred to: The *Oration to Virgin's Annunciation*, this one to the *miracle of Theotokos Hodegetria*, and the *Oration to the sacred Burial of Christ*. First, the preliminary conclusions we have arrived at so far.

a) Stylistic elements

The main stylistic feature of Chrysoloras' work, which Carreno²⁶ had already stressed in his Spanish translation of two still unedited *Orations* of our author (*Birth and Resurrection of Christ*), is the periodic style. This could be mainly observed in the skilful use of the rhetoric scheme of *antithesis*, that also constitutes the architectural framework of the three *Orations* which we are about to edit (*Virgin's Annunciation, Sacred Burial of Christ, Miracle of Hodegetria*). Chrysoloras transforms in this way a rhetoric feature into a structural element, a fact that gives to his already studied *Orations* an undisputed coherence and a real sense of homogeneity in spite of the theological deviation that frequently seems to interrupt the *Orations'* panegyric character. In this context Chrysoloras' preference for the so-called *ethopoia* deserves a special

in 348-356). Cf. M. Vassilaki (ed.), *Images of the Mother of God. Perceptions of the Theotokos in Byzantium*, Humpshire - Burlington 2004, p. 270.

²⁰ Fr. Halkin, *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca* (= BHG), vol. III, Bruxelles 1957, 1117p, 1074q, Nr. 1893.

²¹ Fr. Halkin, BHG, vol. III, 1977; see also *Analecta Bollandiana* 72 (1954) 338-339.

²² Contrary to Koutsouris' claim (Δημητρίου Χρυσολωρᾶ, Λόγος κατὰ Λατίνων, 35) this *Oration* has not yet been published. It is transmitted by *Cod. Escor.* 164 T-III-4, 39r-45r and *Dionysios' Monastery* 228, 36v-40r.

²³ P. A. Revilla, *Catalogo de los Codices Griegos de la biblioteca de el Escorial*, Madrid 1936, pp. 510-513.

²⁴ A. M. Bandini, *Catalogus Codicum manuscriptorum bibliothecae mediceae laurentianae*, Vol. 1, Leipzig 1961, p. 495.

²⁵ Sp. P. Lampros (ed.), *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos*, vol. I, Cambridge 1895, Nr. 3762, p. 375.

²⁶ C. Cartagena Carreno, *Demetrio Chrisoloras y sus homilias ineditas a la Navidad y Resurrección del Señor*, *Helmantica* 55 (1967) 19 f.

mention.²⁷ A lost one is known to us only by a reference in a *Letter* of the emperor Manuel II to our author²⁸. Also a short *eidolopoia* takes up a significant place in the *Oration to the sacred Burial of our Lord Jesus Christ*.²⁹ It is about a fictitious *dispute* between the Devil and the saints Prophets headed by St. John the Baptist just before the Christ's descent to Hades, the content of which has been obviously inspired by a much earlier apocryphal tradition³⁰ about the Baptist's preaching in Hades. Chrysoloras has also the habitude to integrate in his works longer or shorter passages from his earlier works. This is the case, already attested by Treu, in the so-called *100 Epistles* addressed to the emperor Manuel II,³¹ but also in the *Thanksgiving* to Theotokos, an *Oration* in which appear whole phrases from the unedited *Oration to Virgins' Annunciation*. Nevertheless the rhetorical ability and charm of Chrysoloras' works cannot be diminished because of this practice, as H. Hunger has already argued with regard to the *100 Epistles* just mentioned above. A more accurate study of his whole work would lead most probably to a reconsideration of the Chrysoloras' literary competence which has been called into question by some scholars in the past.³²

b) Lukianus renaissance

Until quite recently, the only available evidence of the special attraction Chrysoloras felt to the idiosyncratic author of Late Antiquity, Lucian, derived from his *Praise-Oration to St. Demetrios* of Thessaloniki.

In her recent dissertation Myrto Hatzaki³³ pointed out the way in which Dimitrios in his encomiastic *Oration to St. Dimitrios* of Thessaloniki (edited by V. Laourdas in 1957) transformed the Lucians Dialogue *Imagines* (an unparalleled work of appreciation of important art historical monuments of antiquity) into a discourse on the nature of deity between St. Demetrios and his executor, Emperor Maximian. It takes the form of a new dramatic dialogue on the representations of divine beauty and, as it is a Byzantine re-working, its super-imposed Christian meanings.³⁴ The editor of this writing, V. Laourdas, impressed by this "strange antiquarian show",³⁵ as he says, suggested that it could be possible to find similar exhibitory references to ancient authors in others unedited Chrysoloras' works. Laourdas was right: We come now to add to the former evidence one more provided by the unedited *Oration to Virgins' Annunciation*. However, it is in the *Oration to the miracle to Thotokos Hodegetria*, where our author returns to his beloved Lucian and especially to the *Imagines*: his extensive

²⁷ R. Webb, *Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice*, Humpshire - Burlington 2010, p. 43.

²⁸ G. T. Dennis, *The Letters of Manuel II*, (*Letter* 46), p. 137.

²⁹ *Escor.* T-III-4, 22r-39r.

³⁰ Cf. *Evangelium Nicodemi*; *Hippolyt of Rome*, De Antichristo, 45. *Epiphanius of Salamis*, Hom. in divinis corporis sepulturam, PG 43, 453f. *Eusebius of Emessa*, De adventu et annuntiatione Joannis (Baptistae) apud inferos: PG 86, 509 – 526.

³¹ M. Treu, *Demetrios Chrysoloras und seine hundert Briefe*, BZ 20 (1911) 106-128, hier 115-123.

³² P. Gautier, *Action de grace*, p. 340.

³³ M. Hatzaki, *Beauty and the Male Body in Byzantium: Perceptions and Representations in Art and Text*, New York 2009.

³⁴ Eugenia Russel, *Review of Beauty and the Male Body in: Byzantium: Perceptions and Representations in Art and Text*, (review no. 907), URL: <https://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/review/907>.

³⁵ V. Laourdas, Τὸ Ἐγκώμιον τοῦ Δημητρίου Χρυσολωρᾶ εἰς τὸν Ἅγιον Δημήτριον, *Γρηγόριος Παλαμᾶς* 343-354, hier p. 354.

rhetorical description of the miracle alludes apparently to paintings' and sculptures' descriptions provided by Lucian in the work mentioned above.

On this account we have, in our opinion, sufficient reason to affirm Hungers' claim about the emerging of a so-called Lucian renaissance in the late Byzantine decades. At least in the case of Demetrios Chrysoloras this seems to be verified.

c) A special case: The Oration to the Miracle Theotokos ἐν τοῖς ὁδηγοῖς (Hodegetria Monastery) contained in Flor. Laur X 31 ff. 139v-148v

Chrysoloras' *Oration to the Miracle of the Mother of God at the Monastery of Hodegetria* represents the unique Greek source which provides us with a detailed description of the miraculous religious procession that took place every Tuesday in the area around of the *Hodegetria* monastery in the Byzantine capital. The ritual procession included a special act, during which the excessively heavy Icon of Theotokos *Hodegetria* was carried on the shoulders of a single man. Chrysoloras takes it for granted that not even three men might be able to raise the icon from the ground; hence in the eyes of our witness this event appears us a clear miracle of the Mother of God. The two others detailed accounts have been supplied by two foreign travellers in Constantinople, the Russian Stephen of Novgorod (1355) and the Spanish Pero Tafur (15th c.), while Antony of Novgorod and Maximos Kavsokalyvites relate to the event as a clear miracle without going into details.³⁶

d) Theological teaching

The aspect of the Chrysoloras we have especially to deal with is his theological teaching. It is well known that Demetrios Chrysoloras belonged to the anti-Latin theological party. The two works mentioned above (*The Contra Latinos* which constitutes a concise report of the Neilos Kavasilas' refutation of the *filioque* defence of Dimitrios Cydonis and the fictitious dialogue *Contra Cydonem* whose edition is now prepared by V. Passiourtidis in London) bear a clear witness to this fact. But it is also in his *Orations*, especially in those still unedited, where before us emerges an outstanding theological personality that is concerned not only with the polemical purposes, but understands to combine the rhetoric – panegyric features with deep insights in theological matters as the original sin, the soteriological meaning of the Death and the Resurrection of Christ. His account, as we hope to show in a special paper, give us the opportunity to talk about a theologian of the purest Hesychastic-palamitic tradition, who nevertheless understands well to deal with the Latin theological tradition and even dared to correct *tacite* theological views even of such a great theologian of the sacred past of the Church, as Gregory of Nyssa.

Conclusion

In conclusion we will discuss the perspectives of our research after the completion of the planned edition.

a) On the basis of Chysoloras' fervent interest in the *Miracle of Theotokos at the Monastery of Theothokos Hodegetria* we think we are justified to assume a special relation between our

³⁶ R. Janin, *Le Géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin, Première partie: Les sièges de Constantinople et le Patriarcat oecuménique*, tom. III: *Les églises et les monastères*, Paris 1964, pp. 203-206; cf. С. Ю. Житинев, *История русского православного паломничества в X-XVII веках*, Moscow 2007, p. 173 f.

author and this renowned Monastery of Constantinople. This suggestion would be more than plausible on account, none the less, of the famous Scriptorium that functioned in this monastery. It is obviously that a literary man of the range of Dimitrios Chrysoloras should be mostly concerned with the diffusion of his literary output; that he found in the *Hodegetria* Monastery's Scriptorium a highly specialised team for such a purpose is, for our opinion, beyond any doubt. But it would be of particular interest to investigate more accurately the Chrysoloras' collaboration with the copyist Joasaph, who was copyist in the Scriptorium during the time of the literate activity of our author. A cross-section (of manuscripts copied with certainty by Joasaph could allow us by means of collation at least to suggest that the *Escor* 164 T-III-4, (the main witness of the manuscript tradition of Chrysoloras' festive religious Orations we deal with) is a product of Joasaph's scriptorial activity.

b) Moreover, the problem of Chrysoloras' ancient sources should be considered as a specific question. Beyond Lucian's case, Chrysoloras seems to have access to a wide range of the ancient literature. In addition, it should be meaningful to seek eventual similarities and differences concerning the use of ancient sources between Chrysoloras and other scholars of his days. An adequate analysis of this problem could shed more light on the wide philological interests of a distinguished intellectual of the East Roman Empire in the last decades of its existence.

c) Another important issue is the presumed pro-Ottoman attitude of Chrysoloras. The limits of our representation do not permit us to relate extensively to this highly complex question. In this context let us make only the following remark: Although it cannot be disputed that during the last Byzantine decades a clear pro-Ottoman party had been formed within the walls of the capital, which also had gained a strong popular support, and despite the fact that around the turn of the 15th century the leading figure of the pro-Ottomans Greeks was the nephew and rival of the Emperor Manuel II, Ioannes VII, with whom Chrysoloras was closely associated firstly in Selymbria, but also later on in Thessaloniki, where our author served Ioannes as his *mesazon*, it still remains obscure if Demetrios also shared the pro-Ottoman orientation of his master and so sided with the pro-Turkish party. Neither the interpretation of Manuels' *Letter* 33 to Demetrios proposed by Dennis,³⁷ nor the suggestions of Ducellier³⁸ allow us to include Demetrios among the supporters of the pro-Turkish policies. As to this issue perhaps we will never arrive at a once-and-for all conclusion nevertheless so long the critical edition of the whole work of Demetrios remains a *desideratum*, one is in no position to make any more than weak suggestions, no matter whatever insights one gains from other sources.

³⁷ See The Letters of Manuel II Palaiologus, (Letter 33), p. 92.

³⁸ A. Ducellier, *Chrétiens d'Orient et Islam au Moyen Age VIIe-XVe siècle*, Paris 1966, p. 400.