

Refugees and International Networks after the Fall of Constantinople (1453-1475)*

During the fifteenth century, as the Ottoman empire absorbed much of the Balkans, Christian refugees from the area began to appear to western Europe. Their numbers increased dramatically after May 1453 when the Ottomans conquered Constantinople, the old capital of the Byzantine empire and a city of some 50,000 inhabitants. For a long time, these Byzantine émigrés attracted the attention of historians mainly because a few of them played a part in the development of Greek studies during the Italian Renaissance.¹ More recently, however, wider aspects of the phenomenon have received attention. It has been shown that the refugees included a range of social groups, not just intellectual elites, and that while some settled permanently, the majority were passing supplicants gathering money for the ransoms of their families.² Perhaps most important of all, it has now been established that the migration was not restricted to lands that were geographically close to the Balkans, such as Italy, or culturally linked to Byzantium, such as Russia. The refugees were in fact to be found all over Europe, as far west as Flanders, Scandinavia and the British Isles.³

Their presence over such a wide area raises an important question. Was their decision to make for a distant country simply a random choice or was there some factor in particular that inclined them to go there? Given the difficulty of travelling in the fifteenth century, the latter seem most likely. This article will investigate whether the deciding consideration might have been the personal contacts already established by Byzantine ambassadors to western courts. That link has already been touched on in previous scholarship but the focus has been on Italy and on two particular groups. One was the intellectuals mentioned above who were welcomed in Italy for their linguistic skills. The other was the wealthy businessmen who had a significant stake in the trading

networks centred on Venice and Genoa. Both groups have been shown to have made useful contacts in Italy through participating in diplomatic missions for the emperor. Those contacts could later be exploited by members of their families after the fall of Constantinople.⁴

After summarising the findings of previous scholarship, the first section of this article will extend the enquiry to another, less well-known individual who sought refuge in Italy and it will consider whether he too was exploiting an earlier contact. In the second section the discussion will move further afield and assess whether the same connection can be traced beyond the Alps. Refugees can certainly be found making for an area that had earlier been visited by an ambassador bearing the same surname, one example being France.⁵ Here the focus will be on England, on the visits of Emperor Manuel II and other envoys to the country between 1398 and 1456 and on the refugees who arrived there from early 1455 onwards. It is a particularly valuable example because the added difficulty of getting there via a sea crossing suggests that any of the refugees who did so must have had a good reason. The third section considers whether the experiences of the envoys may have been behind the decision of the refugees to make the journey. The fourth section will argue that one of the deciding considerations may have been the establishment of links during the diplomatic visits with one particular English noble family, the Nevilles.

Given the limited nature of the evidence, the conclusions are tentative and inevitably to some extent speculative. That said, in the course of making its main point, the article highlights a by-product of the diplomatic contacts and refugee exodus: the surprisingly prominent place that England occupied in the political and cultural imagination of late Byzantine Constantinople which almost amounts to a kind of

Anglomania. That raises wider questions about the place of both England and Byzantium in the wider world of the fifteenth century.

I

From 1394, faced with the first determined effort by the Ottoman sultan to capture Constantinople, the Byzantine Emperor Manuel II Palaiologos (1391-1425) and his advisers decided to make an appeal to the Christian powers of the west for help. They despatched numerous embassies to Italy with a view to enlisting the support of the pope, the king of Naples, the maritime republics of Venice and Genoa and the other city states. They continued to do so even after the siege was lifted in 1402, right up to the last months before the Byzantine capital was finally captured by the Ottomans in 1453. Generally drawn from the city's monied and educated elite, these envoys often took the opportunity while they were in Italy to conduct business of their own as well as that of the state.

One well-known example is Manuel Chrysoloras (c.1350-1415) who visited Italy frequently on behalf of Manuel II and at the same time made use of his excellent knowledge of ancient Greek language and literature to establish contacts among the Italian humanists. While he was in Venice in 1396, he was invited by Coluccio Salutati (1331-1406), the chancellor of Florence, to teach Greek grammar and literature at the *Studium*, Florence's university. This he did for three years before resuming his role as an envoy. Some of the foremost figures of the revival of Greek studies, including Pallas Strozzi (1372-1462), and Guarino da Verona (1374-1460), were among his pupils.⁶ A similar example is John Argyropoulos (d. 1487) who probably first went to Italy in 1438-9 as part of the Byzantine delegation to the Council of Ferrara-Florence.⁷ He was certainly there in the years immediately afterwards, teaching at the university of

Padua and helping the exiled Pallas Strozzi with his Greek, before returning to Constantinople in 1444.⁸

Such personal contacts were not quickly forgotten on either side. When the government of Florence appointed Bettino Bartoli as its ambassador to the Byzantine emperor in 1416, it specifically recommended that when he reached Constantinople he should make contact with a member of the Chrysoloras family and others who had visited Italy as ambassadors.⁹ Conversely, the contacts proved extremely useful to the envoys and their families after Constantinople fell. John Argyropoulos escaped from the city to the court of Thomas Palaiologos, brother of Emperor Constantine XI (1449-1453), at Patras. Early in 1456, Thomas sent him to Italy once more as an envoy to the pope and to the duke of Milan. Argyropoulos seems to have carried out his mission conscientiously enough but at the end of it, he did not return to his homeland. Instead he took up the offer of Chrysoloras' chair of Greek at the *Studium* and remained in Italy for the rest of his life, bringing his family to join him there. His earlier stay in Padua had clearly made him well known and paved the way for his appointment.¹⁰

The contacts made by an envoy could also be exploited by members of his family many years after the visit. Even though Manuel Chrysoloras had been dead for nearly forty years by the time Constantinople fell, the memory of his time in Italy was still very much alive. In October 1455, the Milanese humanist Francesco Filelfo (1398-1481) wrote to the marquis of Mantua, Ludovico III Gonzaga (1412-1478), recommending a refugee called Michael Dermokaites Chrysoloras. He took pains to point out that the bearer of the letter was a relative of the same Manuel Chrysoloras who had revived the study of fine arts among the Latins and he urged the marquis to receive him kindly on that account.¹¹

Recent scholarship has demonstrated that the making of contacts by envoys and their later exploitation by refugees was not something restricted to intellectual circles. Nicholas Notaras (d. 1421), who was in Venice and Siena for Manuel II in 1398-9, was an entrepreneur who had built his fortune by trading in goods through the Genoese colony of Pera, opposite Constantinople. He already held honorary citizenship of Pera but, while he was engaged in his diplomatic mission, he received the same honour in Venice. It is not difficult to see why he sought it: thanks to a long-standing treaty with the Byzantine emperor, Venetian citizens enjoyed almost complete exemption from paying tariffs on the goods that they imported to and exported from Constantinople. More to the point is how Notaras obtained this rare privilege which was usually only accorded to highly favoured individuals who had a significant financial stake in the republic's trade. He clearly had influential friends with a voice in the senate who could push him to the front of the queue.¹²

The contacts made in Genoa and Venice by Nicholas Notaras proved to be a lifeline for several members of his family after the fall of Constantinople. He himself was dead by then and his son Loukas and some of his grandsons had been executed on the orders of the sultan a day or two after the city was taken. The government of Genoa still felt itself obliged by the family's links with Pera to take steps to secure the well-being of any of its surviving members. In March 1454, some Genoese envoys in Constantinople were instructed to seek for any of the grandchildren of Nicholas Notaras and if they found them to do anything they could to ameliorate their condition. Two granddaughters and a grandson were ultimately located, ransomed and brought to Italy. The Venetians seem also to have remembered their link with the family for it was in Venice that Nicholas' surviving grandchildren lived out the rest of their lives.¹³

In the cases discussed so far, the link between the earlier embassy and the later refugees is clear and it has been noted in previous scholarship. The discussion will now turn to an example of a less well-documented refugee. Here the link might well have been a factor but the nature of the surviving evidence means that it can only be suggested as a possibility. Demetrius Laskaris Leontaris (1418-c.1480) had been part of Constantinople's wealthy elite before 1453 and was connected to the ruling Palaiologos dynasty by marriage. After the fall of Constantinople, he toured Europe collecting alms to raise the ransom of his family before settling at Otranto in the kingdom of Naples.¹⁴ It might simply have been chance that drew him to that final location but there is some evidence to suggest that it was not.

In 1451, a Byzantine envoy called Andronicus Bryennios Leontaris had stopped off in Naples during his attempt to solicit Italian help as Ottoman intentions to attack Constantinople became clear.¹⁵ Andronicus was clearly related to Demetrius Leontaris in some way so that it is possible that Demetrius was able to take advantage of some contact made at the Neapolitan court. There is evidence to suggest who it might have been. Like many dispossessed educated Byzantines, Demetrius Leontaris earned his living by copying Greek manuscripts, both classical and religious texts. His productions included a copy of Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* which was completed in 1474. In the colophon, Leontaris wrote that he had produced the work for two Neapolitan officials, one of whom was Antonello de Petrucci da Aversa (d. 1487).¹⁶ Antonello held high office under both Alfonso the Magnanimous (1416-1458) and Ferrante (1458-1494), and he is known to have helped at least one other Byzantine refugee: he was the first patron of the poet Manuel Maroulllos (c.1453-1500) whose parents had escaped from Constantinople.¹⁷ He may have encountered the ambassador Andronicus Leontaris in the earlier days of his career and that might explain his later association with Demetrius. It is

by no means unlikely, given the evidence regarding the Chrysoloras, Argyropoulos and Notaras families discussed above.

II

While its wealth, geographical position and the historical and commercial links between some of its cities and Constantinople made Italy the obvious target for Byzantine embassies after 1394, they were also despatched to the rulers of France, England, Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Aragon, Castile, Navarre, Portugal, Hungary, Lithuania, Russia and Poland.¹⁸ Ambassadors from Constantinople first visited England during the period of crisis at the end of the fourteenth century, when two individuals who will be discussed in further detail below pleaded the Byzantine cause at the court of Richard II (1377-1399). This initial diplomatic feeler was followed in late 1398 by a Genoese called Ilario Doria who was the son-in-law of Emperor Manuel II, having married the emperor's illegitimate daughter Zampia. He remained into the first few weeks of 1399. Following the deposition of Richard II, his successor Henry IV (1399-1413) hosted the Byzantine emperor Manuel II himself who, with his retinue, was the king's guest during December 1400 and into the early weeks of 1401.¹⁹ The emperor and his advisers doubtless thought it was worth extending their appeal to England in view its high military reputation following the spectacular successes in the Hundred Years War which had not gone unnoticed in Constantinople.²⁰

It has already been shown that Manuel Chrysoloras, John Argyropoulos and Nicholas Notaras all used their time in Italy to make lasting local contacts so it needs to be considered whether anything similar occurred in England. The envoys certainly seem to have been warmly welcomed there. Emperor Manuel II received numerous gifts from Henry IV who bore the expense of entertaining him and his suite and laid on public events in his honour, such as a tournament and a masquerade.²¹ Nevertheless, their

reception in England was very different from that in Italy. In the latter, they often had intellectual and commercial interests in common with their hosts. At the English court, in so far as is known, there was no one in the early fifteenth century who had any interest in ancient Greek literature of the kind that secured patronage for Chrysoloras and Argyropoulos in Florence.²² Nor could England provide the financial opportunities that Venice and Genoa offered to Nicholas Notaras, although there were apparently a few Greek merchants operating through the port of London.²³ Yet there were other elements of common ground. According to Adam of Usk and other accounts, the English courtiers expressed a genuine sympathy for the plight of Constantinople in the face of the Ottoman threat. They also showed a polite curiosity about Byzantine religious practices, eagerly asking the priests in Manuel II's retinue whether the Greek of the Orthodox liturgy and scriptures was the same language as that spoken by the people. They were fascinated by the appearance of their exotic visitors whose dress was apparently more restrained than English fashions and whose long beards were a source of wonder. This curiosity probably reflected contemporary local concerns. The emphasis on dress may have been prompted by Richard II's sumptuary laws. The interest in the language of the scriptures and liturgy may have stemmed from the response of the English Church to Lollardy.²⁴ Above all, the questioning suggests that considerable personal interaction was going on during the visits, in spite of the language barrier.

That impression is reinforced when the first Byzantine embassy to England is scrutinised in detail. Unlike the visit of Manuel II a few years later, it is not mentioned at all in English chronicles and the details have to be reconstructed from isolated pieces of information. Only when these are analysed can its true significance be appreciated. The first indication that it took place at all is an undated letter of Richard II in which he replied to a communication that he had received from Manuel II the previous April,

outlining the perilous situation in besieged Constantinople and asking for the king's help. No year is given in the letter but given the complaints about civil dissension that Richard makes in the text, it is usually assigned to 1398. There is also some uncertainty as to who delivered the letter. Richard II says that he received it from 'nobilem virum Anthonium Notara'.²⁵ It is likely that this was, in fact, Nicholas Notaras, since 'Anthony' Notaras is attested nowhere else. In any case, Notaras had been in France the previous year, so it is not surprising that from there he took the next step and crossed the channel. He was probably accompanied by another envoy, Theodore Palaiologos Kantakouzenos (d. 1410). The latter is known to have been in England around this time for the records of the French treasury for 1397/8, preserved in the work of the seventeenth-century Byzantinist Charles du Cange, indicate that Kantakouzenos was given two payments to cover his expenses for the journey.²⁶ However, the record does not say exactly when it was that he made the crossing so that October 1397 has been suggested as a possible date. That seems unlikely, as October was when he arrived in France.²⁷ The journeys of Notaras and Kantakouzenos to England will therefore be treated as one and assigned to the spring and early summer of 1398, although it is impossible to tell whether they travelled together or separately.

The next point to note about these two envoys is their very high status in their home city. Notaras, thanks to his extensive commercial dealings with the Genoese that have already been mentioned, was one of the richest men in Constantinople.²⁸ Kantakouzenos was also very wealthy. His substantial residence in the south-western corner of the city was lauded for its opulence by the poet John Chortasmenos (c.1370-c.1436).²⁹ It is likely that much of his wealth, like that of Notaras, came from commercial collaboration with Italians. When he was travelling back from England in late 1398, Kantakouzenos stopped in Venice, presumably to take a ship from there to

Constantinople. During his stay, he too was granted citizenship.³⁰ Unlike Notaras, on the other hand, Kantakouzenos was a close relative of Emperor Manuel II. The Byzantine sources sometimes describe him as the emperor's uncle (θείος) but that is rather inaccurate. As a grandson of Emperor John VI Kantakouzenos (1347-1354), he was Manuel II's cousin although he was older enough to be taken for an uncle.³¹ That two such prominent figures should have been sent is a measure of the importance that the Byzantines attached to the mission.

Two events took place during Notaras and Kantakouzenos' stay in England that suggest that they developed a particularly friendly relationship with members of the English court. It seems to have been in around June 1398 that Richard II made a promise to pay 3,000 marks to assist with the defence of Constantinople.³² This undertaking has previously been dated to the following year, 1399 but that does not seem to be correct. The document itself is only dated to June with no year given but the date of the previous entry in the calendar is 'viii die Junii anno regni regis Ricardi Secundi post Conquestum vicesimo primo'. The twenty-first year of Richard II ran from 22 June 1397 to 21 June 1398, suggesting that Richard's promise was given in this period, at the time when Notaras and Kantakouzenos were most likely to have been in England.³³ In any case, in June 1399, Richard II was in Ireland where there would have been no Byzantine envoy to receive his undertaking.³⁴ In the event, the emperor received little or none of this gift. A year later a Genoese merchant called Reginald Grille was instructed to transmit the sum and recoup it from the customs duties of the port of Southampton but that does not seem to have happened.³⁵ As regards the question under discussion here though, that is irrelevant. All we need to note is that the generous promise was probably made to Notaras and Kantakouzenos so that that their negotiations in England were going well at that stage. Moreover, in his letter in

reply to Manuel's, which was probably taken to Constantinople by Notaras or Kantakouzenos, Richard promised to send troops the following year.³⁶ The king of France had not offered so substantial a gift or made so concrete a commitment.³⁷

The second event is known only from a warrant for issue from the National Archives in London. It orders the reimbursement of John Macclesfield for services rendered when he was keeper of the wardrobe. One of Macclesfield's services had been to pay the fee of a certain John Bridbrooke when Richard II knighted 'the cousin of the emperor of Constantinople' at Lichfield. Unfortunately, the warrant does not give the name of the man honoured in the ceremony, nor does it disclose when it took place. Dated 18 February 1401, it was issued under Richard's successor, Henry IV, doubtless as part of a general settling of accounts left over from the previous reign.³⁸

The warrant's vagueness on these points leaves plenty of room for interpretation. Donald Nicol argued that the knighting must have taken place in December 1398, when Richard II is known to have been at Lichfield. Not only did Richard hold court there at Christmas but he apparently had with him 'the brother of the emperor of Constantinople'.³⁹ Manuel II did have a living brother, called Theodore (1355-1407), but he was in the Peloponnese at the time, not the English Midlands. Presumably the English chroniclers, unaware of the exact degree of kinship, were referring to some other relative. Nicol, not unreasonably, interpreted this 'brother' as being, in fact, Manuel's son-in-law, the Genoese Ilario Doria. Doria definitely was in England in December 1398, and Nicol argued that it was he who received the knighthood.⁴⁰

Yet while Doria may well have been with Richard II at Lichfield in December 1398, that does not necessarily mean that the knighting took place then or that he was the beneficiary. The warrant makes it perfectly clear that it was the cousin of the emperor who was honoured which would, of course, suggest Theodore Kantakouzenos.

That does not clinch the argument in his favour. The very correctness of the warrant in the matter of Theodore's relationship to the emperor is in itself suspicious, for as we have seen he was usually referred to as the emperor's uncle, both by the Byzantines themselves and in the accounts of his earlier visit France.⁴¹ Moreover, by December 1398 Theodore had probably left England, so he cannot have been the 'brother' who spent Christmas with Richard II.⁴² On the other hand, Richard was in Lichfield on at least two other occasions during 1398: between 24 and 27 May and between 22 and 26 June (and possibly longer).⁴³ These were both times when Theodore might well have been in England. Although the issue cannot be resolved definitively, it is more likely that a knighthood would have been conferred on a blood relative of the emperor rather than one merely by marriage to an illegitimate daughter. If the knighting ceremony did take place at Lichfield in June 1398, then it would have happened at around the same time that Richard II made his promise of 3,000 marks for Constantinople. If so, then that moment marked the culmination of a very successful mission, in which the envoys had been well received by the English court.

The immediate threat to Constantinople faded following the Ottoman defeat by the Ikhanid ruler Timur in 1402 but Byzantine envoys continued to be welcomed in England. A new embassy arrived in October that year and remained until the spring of 1403 although there is no record of what was discussed.⁴⁴ Manuel Chrysoloras crossed the Channel for a short time in 1409 and he is known to have visited London and Salisbury.⁴⁵ There was then a gap of more than forty years: perhaps the policymakers in Constantinople had finally realised that the obsession with the war in France made the likelihood of help from England very remote. Theodore Karystinos, who was in Flanders in 1442, apparently made no attempt to cross the Channel.⁴⁶ After the fall of Constantinople, the envoys returned, coming either on behalf of the Byzantine rulers of

the Peloponnese or of the pope to urge English participation in the planned crusade to retake the city. Nicholas Agallon arrived in September 1454 and John Argyropoulos was in London in 1456 as part of his embassy on behalf of Thomas Palaiologos, though his stay seems to have been brief. Frankoulios Servopoulos was sent twice by the pope in 1456 and 1459. On the latter occasion, he harangued the court of Henry VI (1422-1461, 1470-1471) at Westminster, urging that Christians should unite and drive back the infidels.⁴⁷

These later envoys were as well received as their predecessors being given generous gifts that went far beyond merely covering their expenses. Nicholas Agallon was given fifty marks, while Frankoulios Servopoulos was presented with fifty marks and a collar of gold worth ten marks.⁴⁸ Moreover, as in the case of the earlier envoys, there is evidence of personal interaction between them and members of the English court. This time the discussions seem to have been more on the political situation in England which by then was rapidly spiralling into civil war. On his second visit in 1459, someone took Servopoulos aside and explained to him why Henry VI's court was so poorly attended.⁴⁹ Agallon was in England longer than any of the other envoys, staying for about eight months between September 1454 and spring the following year. That must have given him a unique opportunity to get to know the country and to make contacts there. He was certainly very well informed by the time he left, giving the French royal council a clear picture of England's waning military capability in May 1455.⁵⁰

Contact and dialogue with members of the English court is also suggested by the detailed information about the country which seems to have been picked up by the envoys. Manuel II wrote a letter from London in early 1401, describing stay in 'Britain the Great' (Βρετανίας τῆς μεγάλης) and Manuel Chrysoloras also wrote about his

experiences, describing in a letter a procession in honour of Saints Peter and Paul which he had witnessed while in London in 1409.⁵¹ Neither letter is particularly informative but it is likely that experiences would have been shared by word of mouth. That would account for the broadly accurate description of England that is found in the history of Laonikos Chalkokondyles (1427-c.1480) who himself never went there. Although padded out with segments derived from classical literature, the passage includes an account of the latter stages of the Hundred Years War, of the military use of longbows and of London's position as a trading hub. It notes correctly that while the country did not produce much fruit or wine, it did have plenty of wheat, barley, honey and wool.⁵² Historical information seems to have been picked up and retained too. The members of a Byzantine delegation in Rome in 1405 reminded a Welsh priest whom they met there that Constantine the Great (306-337), the founder of Constantinople, had been proclaimed emperor in Britain.⁵³ Not all the envoys were so ready to show an interest in another country. Makarios (d. 1415), metropolitan of Ankara, who accompanied Manuel II to London, recalled only the dubious religious practices and erroneous doctrines that he had come across.⁵⁴ Nevertheless, it is quite clear that the Byzantine envoys did not just arrive in England, deliver their message and leave. They entered into a dialogue with their hosts which involved weighing up each other's religion, politics, customs and culture.

III

The next question to be considered is whether the experiences of the Byzantines envoys may have been behind the decision of the post-1453 refugees to travel to England. Two points will be considered in this section. First, there is evidence that the stories brought back by envoys were remembered in Constantinople many decades later and they may have influenced a subsequent generation. Secondly, some of the refugees appear to have

been from the same family as one or more of the earlier envoys, just as some of those in Italy had been, raising the possibility that an earlier contact was being exploited.

Refugees from Constantinople are first attested in England in February 1455 and they continued to appear regularly in the country up to the end of the century and beyond. Most were gathering funds to pay the ransoms of their families who were still in Constantinople. Some of them received donations from the royal treasury, and the ecclesiastical authorities issued letters of indulgence on their behalf, offering remission of penance to those who gave alms to contribute to the ransoms.⁵⁵ In accounting for their appearance there so soon after the fall of Constantinople, one factor that has to be taken into consideration is what can only be described as a kind of Anglomania that can be discerned in Byzantine educated circles from the later fourteenth century.

It has already been noted that information brought back by envoys probably formed the basis of Laonikos Chalkokondyles' description of England but the phenomenon went much further than that. There are several completely unnecessary but undoubtedly deliberate references to the country or to the British Isles as a whole in Byzantine literature of the time. The *History of Belisarius*, a narrative poem in vernacular Greek composed in the 1390s, recounts the adventures of the sixth-century general Belisarius. For some reason, the scene of his conquests is shifted from North Africa and Italy to England (νησῖν τοῦ Ἑγγλητέρως).⁵⁶ Similarly, the historian Michael Kritovoulos (d. 1470) opened his work by declaring that he was writing in the classical Greek language because it was understood so widely even by those who inhabit the British Isles (τὰς Βρετανικὰς Νήσους).⁵⁷ Most poignant of all are the jottings on the margins of manuscripts. A thirteenth-century collection of Greek psalms, canticles and prayers preserved in Lucca has a number of Middle English words and phrases written

out phonetically in Greek characters in a fifteenth-century hand. For example, ‘ὀή κἀνετ σπέκ οἶνο ἡγγλοῖσ’ (sic) apparently renders ‘I cannot speak any English’.⁵⁸

Significantly, some of the allusions present England as a place from which help and salvation might come. One example is a letter written by Manuel II’s nephew, John (c.1370-1408) to King Henry IV in June 1402. John renewed Manuel’s appeal for Henry to contribute to the defence of Constantinople and backed up the request by praising the vital role supposedly played by gallant English volunteers, past and present. ‘Truly’, he wrote, ‘it is nothing new of most illustrious England to produce such fruit’.⁵⁹ There is nothing to substantiate John’s claim for English participation in the defence of Constantinople and it might have been dreamed up for purposes of flattery. Even so, the letter illustrates the perception of England as a likely source of assistance.

In the same way, England is sometimes referred to as a potential place of refuge from the current threatening situation. The monk Joseph Bryennios (c.1350-c.1430) counselled those who wished to escape from Constantinople to ‘to get money, to sail to Tanais and the British Isles, after risking your lives’.⁶⁰ After the fall of the city, Constantine Laskaris (1434-1501), who had found refuge in Naples and Sicily, wrote in a letter that he longed to go not only to the bright lights of the cities of northern Italy but even to the British Isles.⁶¹ Their words should not be taken too literally. England and the British Isles could have been used here simply as synonyms for ‘a long way from here’, a conventional and rhetorical paradigm of remoteness. Tanais played a similar role for it was a Genoese colony at the eastern end of the Sea of Azov in Russia. In the same way, Demetrius Kydones (c.1324-c.1398) spoke of fleeing to ‘Italy, Cadiz or beyond the pillars [of Hercules]’.⁶² Nevertheless, these remarks show that England was now on the mental horizons of educated Byzantines as a far-off place of refuge.

This perception is likely to have had its origin in the first-hand experiences of the envoys. After all, in his letter from London in early 1401, Emperor Manuel II had extolled the country, describing it as ‘a second civilised world’ (τῆς δευτέρας ... οἰκουμένης). The word οἰκουμένη was one that the Byzantines used to describe their own state so the emperor was paying England the ultimate compliment of calling it a second Byzantium. He had also claimed that Henry IV had promised to provide ‘soldiers, archers, money and ships to transport the army where it is needed’.⁶³ If Henry had made such a promise, it was never fulfilled. Nor were those of Richard II in 1398. Even Manuel’s letter and other reports might well have fostered the idea of England as a source of salvation and place of refuge.

Another possible reason for choosing to travel as far as England might have been the memory of earlier contacts. It is noticeable that, just as in Italy, some of the refugees had the same surname as that of a previous envoy. To take one example, in April 1456 a ‘Manuell Crisolars de Gracia’ was in England where he received a gift of forty shillings from the treasury.⁶⁴ He was evidently a member of the Chrysoloras family and we have already seen that Francesco Filelfo referred back to the famous Manuel, in spite of the length of time that had elapsed since his death, when he recommended Michael Dermokaites Chrysoloras to the marquis of Mantua in 1454. In the same way, there may have been a memory of Manuel Chrysoloras’ visit to England in 1409 and his scholarly reputation is likely to have been remembered because John Free (c.1430-1464/5) and others travelled to Italy around this time to study with his pupil, Guarino da Verona.⁶⁵

The name that crops up most frequently among the refugees is that of the Byzantine royal family, Palaiologos, which raises the question of whether their presence was connected with the earlier visits of Theodore Palaiologos Kantakouzenos in 1398 and Emperor Manuel II in 1400-1. For example, in late 1455 and early 1456, a

Demetrius Palaiologos, who claimed to be related to the last emperor Constantine XI, was in London raising money for ransoms. He received a donation from Henry VI and an indulgence was issued on his behalf by the bishop of Salisbury. He then travelled Genoa, where he might have made use of connections of the kind made by Nicholas Notaras.⁶⁶ Then in 1460, an individual calling himself George Palaiologos was in England. He had earlier been in France where he had claimed to be the nephew of Constantine XI and thus a grandson of Manuel II.⁶⁷ In October, King Henry VI ordered that a gift of £10 be paid to him, although apparently this was the second time that he had given the order. The previous Lord High Treasurer James Butler (1420-1461), earl of Wiltshire, had failed to make the payment.⁶⁸

While at first sight a connection with the earlier visits might be assumed here, there is need for some caution. After all, apart from the name, there is nothing to link the Manuel Chrysoloras of 1456 with the envoy of the same name. The Palaiologoi are particularly problematic. Merely because someone used the name did not necessarily mean that they had a close connection with the emperor and his immediate family. They may have been a remote relative by marriage who tacked the royal moniker onto their own to increase their prestige so that it became a very common surname. There are far too many instances of a refugee called Demetrius Palaiologos in Europe between 1453 and 1465 for them all to be the same man.⁶⁹ Even George Palaiologos' claim to be a nephew does not hold much water for, as far as is known, none of Constantine XI's brothers and sisters had a son called George. One of Constantine's nephews did visit England but he was called Andreas and he did not arrive until 1491. He would only have been seven in 1460.⁷⁰ Nor are there any grounds for connecting George with the envoy of 1398, Theodore Palaiologos Kantakouzenos. Theodore's eldest son was called George but he had died in around 1458, before the refugee of the same name is attested in

England.⁷¹ All that can be said is that the word ‘neveu’ here may have been used in a loose sense as someone related to the emperor in some way, perhaps by marriage. Like Theodore, George may well have had another surname but he probably wisely stuck to the one that his hosts would have known and been impressed by. There is therefore no demonstrable connection between these refugees and Theodore Kantakouzenos and Manuel II, although it is still perfectly feasible that there was one.

If the refugees and envoys cannot be connected on the Byzantine side, there is another potential line of enquiry on the English side. The vital piece of information is the name of any prominent member of the English court whom the Byzantine emissaries of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth century might have retained as a contact for the future. Frustratingly, those names are by no means obvious. Nowhere is it recorded who was present when Theodore Kantakouzenos was knighted at Lichfield, who questioned Manuel II’s retinue about the language of the liturgy, or who warned Frankoulios Servopoulos about the divisions in the court of Henry VI. One of the very few identifiable people, apart from the kings, who is known to have been closely associated with a Byzantine embassy was Peter Holt, the prior of the Hospital of St John of Jerusalem in Ireland, who helped to arrange Manuel II’s visit in 1400. But Holt spent much of his subsequent career outside England and he was not someone who could later provide a contact point there.⁷² It has been suggested that it was Thomas Bekynton (c.1390-1465), future bishop of Bath and Wells, who drew up Richard II’s reply to Manuel II’s letter in 1398 and so might have established a connection with Nicholas Notaras and Theodore Palaiologos Kantakouzenos. Bekynton certainly did have contact with Byzantine refugees at a later stage but he would have been too young to have been in royal service in 1398 and is unlikely to have drafted the letter.⁷³ Yet

although there is no obvious English name that connects envoys with refugees, the case can be made for one family being involved with both groups.

IV

Early in his pontificate, Pope Sixtus IV (1471-1484) learned that the archbishop of York, George Neville (*c.*1432-1476), had been arrested and imprisoned in the castle of Hammes near Calais on the orders of the king of England, Edward IV (1460-1483). Sixtus was understandably concerned at the incarceration of a major prelate and he may have hoped that his recently appointed legate to France, Burgundy and England, Cardinal Bessarion (1403-1472), would pursue the matter. After all, part of the legate's mission was to obtain the freedom of Jean Balue (*c.*1421-1491), cardinal bishop of Evreux, who had fallen foul of the French king, Louis XI (1461-1483) in much the same way. But Bessarion died at Ravenna in November 1472 on his way back from France without having taken any action on the Neville case.⁷⁴ So in June the following year, Sixtus dispatched a certain George Hermonymos (*c.*1430-1508) to England to negotiate the archbishop's release.⁷⁵

The choice of this rather obscure envoy is puzzling. There is no evidence that Hermonymos himself had any previous links with the Yorkist court that might have given him any influence there. He was unlikely to have been chosen on linguistic grounds as he probably did not speak English or French at that stage, although he certainly knew Latin. The only possible pre-existing link with England that might have played a part in his selection comes through Hermonymos' connection to the legate in France, Cardinal Bessarion. Both men were Byzantine Greeks. Bessarion had begun his career as archbishop of Nicaea. His strong advocacy of union between the Orthodox and Catholic Churches at the Council of Ferrara-Florence in 1438-9 had secured his promotion to cardinal and he had resided in Italy since 1440.⁷⁶ Hermonymos was

originally from Mistra in the Byzantine Peloponnese and had moved to Rome in around 1467. The pair became closely connected there when Hermonymos gained employment as a scribe in Bessarion's household.⁷⁷

The association between Bessarion and Hermonymos in turn leads to a connection with Archbishop George Neville. According to a despatch issued in 1472 by Pietro Aliprando, the Milanese ambassador in France, Neville and Bessarion were good friends.⁷⁸ The statement is difficult to credit at first sight because it is extremely unlikely that the two ever met. Bessarion never crossed the Channel and, as far as is known, Neville only ever set foot outside England to be incarcerated at Calais. There are two possible explanations for Aliprando's comment. One is that Neville and Bessarion became acquainted through Englishmen studying in Italy who acted as intermediaries and that they subsequently corresponded. The other is that the connection between them was much older, having been established through earlier Byzantine embassies to England.

Turning to the first possibility, Neville was related to two people who spent time in Italy and who were acquainted with humanist circles there. One was William Grey (c.1414-1478), bishop of Ely, whose mother, Alice Neville, was the archbishop's great aunt. Grey had lived in Italy between 1441 and 1453 and, for part of the time, he had studied at Ferrara under Manuel Chrysoloras' pupil, Guarino da Verona. He also seems to have been acquainted with Bessarion for he had been able to secure a place for his secretary, Niccolò Perotti (1429-1480), in the cardinal's household so that he could learn Greek.⁷⁹ The other relative with humanist connections was John Tiptoft (1427-1470), earl of Worcester. Here the connection was by marriage. Tiptoft's wife's aunt Cecily was Archbishop George's sister. Tiptoft had studied at Padua and Ferrara in 1458-61 and had probably encountered Guarino da Verona. He had once even

made a special trip to Florence to hear a lecture by John Argyropoulos.⁸⁰ It is perfectly possible that Neville and Bessarion may have corresponded after being introduced through an intermediary even if the letters do not survive. This seems to have been how Thomas Bekynton and the Italian humanist Flavio Biondo (1392-1463) became acquainted.⁸¹ A relationship of this type may have been what Aliprando was referring to and it may provide the reason why a member of Bessarion's circle was sent to England in 1473. The weakness in the theory is that such a connection with Bessarion would not have given Hermonymos any particular advantage in his negotiations for Neville's release at the court of Edward IV. The second possibility therefore needs to be considered: that the connection was older and arose from the earlier Byzantine embassies to England and the reports that they brought back.

Bessarion certainly knew two of the post-1453 Byzantine ambassadors to England: John Argyropoulos, with whom he corresponded, and Frankoulios Servopoulos with whom he shared an interest in a plan to set up a Greek settlement in Sienese territory.⁸² So it might be thought that either of them could have been the link between Neville and the cardinal. That theory can, however, be quickly dismissed for Neville was not in the right place to meet any of the three envoys who arrived after 1453. When Nicholas Agallon was in London between September 1454 and spring 1455, Neville would have been in Oxford, where family connections had secured him the chancellorship of the university, in spite of his youth.⁸³ Argyropoulos was in England in July 1456 and Servopoulos the following October. By that time the court had moved to Coventry and, thanks to their Yorkist sympathies, George Neville and other members of his family were no longer welcome and did not attend.⁸⁴ When Servopoulos arrived for his second visit in the spring of 1459, the court was back at Westminster but it was sparsely attended and George Neville was certainly not there to hear Servopoulos'

fervent plea.⁸⁵ In any case, even if the link could be shown to have come about that way, it still would not have been a reason for sending Hermonymos to England.

It could be argued, however, that the link was not so much with George Neville himself but with his family as a whole and that it dated back to the earlier embassies of 1398 to 1409. After all, up to 1471, the Nevilles had been one of the politically most important clans in England. The founder of its fortunes was the archbishop's grandfather, Ralph Neville (c.1364-1425), lord of Raby, who had succeeded in weathering the stormy politics of the 1390s. He became prominent at the court of Richard II who made him first earl of Westmorland in September 1397: the king may have wanted to use the Nevilles as a counterweight to the powerful Percy family of Northumberland. Then in the summer of 1399, Ralph deftly transferred his allegiance to the usurper Henry IV, choosing exactly the right moment to allow him to become as influential under the new regime as he had been under the old.⁸⁶ Ralph's son, Richard (1400-1460), fifth earl of Salisbury, was likewise a central figure at Henry VI's court but he came increasingly to be aligned with the king's enemy and claimant to the throne, the duke of York. The apex of the family's influence came under Richard Neville's son, Richard, earl of Warwick (1428-1471), known as 'the Kingmaker'. In 1470, he temporarily dethroned King Edward IV, only to lose control of events and perish at the battle of Barnet the following year. Once Edward was restored to power in 1471, it was only a matter of time before he settled accounts with other members of the family. That was why George Neville, the Kingmaker's brother, was arrested in April 1472.

Given how central the family was to political affairs of the time, some of its members must have had contact with the Byzantine envoys who visited the English court. In the case of George Neville's father, Richard, earl of Salisbury, it is certain that

he did. When Nicholas Agallon arrived in London in September 1454, King Henry VI was suffering from his first attack of mental illness, so the country was governed by a council headed by Richard, duke of York. Salisbury was chancellor and a member of the council so he is listed as one of those who heard Agallon's proposal for united action against the Ottomans.⁸⁷ Neville's grandfather, Ralph, earl of Westmorland, cannot be as directly connected with the envoys of 1398-1409 but he was frequently at court in that period. He was certainly at Westminster in January 1401 when Manuel II was in the country and so he can hardly have failed to have met the emperor and his followers. He attended the parliament which met at the end of September 1402 and which was still sitting when another Byzantine delegation arrived in October.⁸⁸ Not only was Westmorland present and in a position of influence, there is also evidence to suggest that he may have been one of the English courtiers who plied the members of Manuel II's retinue with questions about their language and religious services. He had a close family connection with someone associated with the Lollards, who were pressing for the Bible to be made available in English. Sir William Neville (c.1341-1391), who is generally included in the list of Lollard knights, was his uncle.⁸⁹

This is, of course, all circumstantial. There is no specific evidence that Ralph Neville made any lasting contacts among the Byzantine delegations of 1400-2 although he apparently had both the opportunity and motive to do so. There is even the possibility that the Byzantines who arrived from 1398 onwards were already acquainted with his family. In 1391, Ralph's uncle, William Neville, had set out from England in company with another knight of Lollard sympathies, Sir John Clanvowe. They arrived in Genoese Pera, only to die within a week of each other during October.⁹⁰ Neither the Westminster Chronicle nor their surviving tombstone gives any indication as to why they made the journey. They may have just been in transit to somewhere else or it may have been that

they, like many others who were dissatisfied with the state of the western Church, were curious to find out whether the Byzantine Church had preserved the authentic teaching of Christ and the Apostles. It is not recorded that Neville and Clanvowe crossed the Golden Horn to Constantinople but their presence may not have gone unnoticed in the Byzantine court. So when they arrived in 1398, Notaras and Kantakouzenos may already have known the name.⁹¹

If some connection had been made with the Neville family, it is likely to have been the kind of information that was brought back to Constantinople by returning envoys. As a young man, Bessarion had moved in court circles, had probably been presented to Manuel II and he knew enough about the emperor's life to write a funeral eulogy for him.⁹² He may well have been aware of who it was that the emperor and his retinue had spoken to while in London. So his relationship with George Neville, that was reported by the Milanese ambassador, may have been a continuation of a link established by the previous generation. If that were indeed the case, it provides a more cogent reason for the choice of Hermonymos as the pope's envoy in 1473. Even though the Neville family was now in disgrace, Bessarion and his circle had a longstanding connection not just with Archbishop George but to the English court as a whole and to the Yorkist faction that was by then in power.

Regardless of the precise way in which the connection was established, it might well account for the presence of some of the post-1453 refugees in England. Archbishop George Neville was connected with a number of them. Before his arrest and imprisonment, he had employed a scribe called Manuel of Constantinople, in the same way that Antonello de Petrucci had Demetrius Leontaris. In 1468, Manuel completed a manuscript containing selections from the works of Demosthenes, Aeschines and Plato and dedicated it to the archbishop in the colophon. Several others survive in his hand,

although they have no dedication or colophon.⁹³ Manuel may well have travelled to England to seek out Neville on Bessarion's recommendation. The cardinal is certainly known to have provided a letter of recommendation for two other Byzantine refugees. Their names were Thomas Eparchos and George Diplovatatzes and they reached England in 1455, although there is no indication that Bessarion directed them towards a particular individual.⁹⁴ Some two and a half years after Bessarion's death, two more refugees arrived in England, Demetrius Dragomeros and Theodore Stanikios. They are only known through an entry in George Neville's archiepiscopal register which records that he issued letters of indulgence on their behalf in March 1475.⁹⁵ Again, there is a strong possibility that they came to England specifically to seek Neville out.

Following his release in November 1474, thanks to George Hermonymos' efforts, Neville seems to have been the patron of three other Byzantine émigrés for the two remaining years of his life. One was Hermonymos who remained in England once his mission was complete, working as a copyist for the archbishop.⁹⁶ Neville was probably also the employer of Demetrius Kantakouzenos who is known only from a manuscript of selections from Herodotus now in the Bibliothèque Nationale. According to the colophon, Kantakouzenos completed it in London in October 1475 but there is no indication of whom the manuscript was for. Indeed as it is incomplete, it may have been only for personal use.⁹⁷ Nevertheless, this scribe can still be associated with Neville because what is probably Kantakouzenos' handwriting appears on manuscripts that were in the possession of Hermonymos while he was in England.⁹⁸ Lastly, there is Andronikos Kallistos (c.1400-c.1476) who is also known to have been in London at this time. While there is no evidence that Kallistos copied books for Neville, he was a close friend of Hermonymos for they had both been attached to Bessarion's household. They therefore may have travelled to England together.⁹⁹

To sum up, Neville's association with so many Byzantine émigrés may have arisen from a recent acquaintance with Bessarion established through intermediaries. It may equally have arisen from an earlier contact inherited from his grandfather. If it was the latter, it would have been another example of the phenomenon noted in Italy where the visits of Manuel Chrysoloras and Nicholas Notaras were long remembered and exploited later by members of their families.

V

This article has surveyed the possibility that Byzantine refugees in western Europe after 1453 were able to make use of contacts established by an earlier generation who travelled there as envoys. Previous scholarship has shown that this was the case in Italy. Further afield, the envoys and the refugees were both present so the existence of a link between the two is perfectly feasible. The difficulty lies in providing direct evidence of any such link. Using the example of England, this article has shown that Byzantine diplomatic missions between 1398 and 1459 apparently enjoyed very cordial relations with the English court which in turn led to a very positive image of England in ruling circles in Constantinople. On the link between the embassies and the subsequent refugees in England, it has shown that one particular English noble family, the Nevilles, had a connection with Constantinople from as early as 1391 and could well have been involved in discussions with members of the visiting delegations. After 1453, a number of Byzantine émigrés are found associated with one member of the family, the archbishop of York, so that their presence in England might be accounted for through the exploitation of the earlier connection. As stated at the outset, these conclusions are tentative and further investigation is needed. What can be said at this stage is that both the outlook and the contacts are extremely likely to have had some influence on the waves of refugees after 1453, even if the precise details cannot now be retrieved. At the

same time, it has been established beyond doubt is that the mental horizons and the international contacts of the late Byzantine elite had come to include a society with which they had had little to do in the past but which adverse circumstances had forced them to explore, analyse and appreciate.

Royal Holloway, University of London

JONATHAN HARRIS

Footnotes

* This article has been written as part of the EU Commission funded project ‘A Comparative Diachronic Analysis of Post-Byzantine Networks in Early Modern Europe, 15th-18th centuries’ (no. 747857). I am indebted to Charalambos Dendrinos, Peter Marshall, Brian McLaughlin, Nigel Saul, Craig Taylor, Chris Wright, Nada Zečević and two anonymous reviewers for their advice and suggestions.

¹ Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. D. Womersley (3 vols., London, 1994), iii. 900-5; N.G. Wilson, *From Byzantium to Italy: Greek Studies in the Italian Renaissance* (London, 1992); P. Burke, ‘The Myth of 1453: Notes and Reflections’, in M. Erbe et al., eds., *Querdenken: Dissens und Toleranz im Wandel der Geschichte* (Mannheim, 1996), pp. 23-30.

² T. Ganchou, ‘La famille Koumousès (Κουμούσης) à Constantinople et Négrepont, avant et après 1453’, in C.A. Maltezou and C.E. Papakosta, eds., *Venezia-Eubea, da Egripos a Negroponte* (Venice and Athens, 2006), pp. 45-107; J. Harris, *Greek Emigres in the West, 1400-1520* (Camberley, 1995), pp. 18-21; J. Harris, ‘Two Byzantine Craftsmen in Fifteenth-Century London’, *Journal of Medieval History*, xxi (1995), pp. 387-403.

³ J. Harris, ‘When did Laskaris Kananos Travel in the Baltic Lands?’, *Byzantion*, lxxx (2010), pp. 173-87, at 176-81; H. Taparel, ‘Notes sur quelques refugies byzantins en Bourgogne après la chute de Constantinople’, *Balkan Studies*, xxviii (1987), pp. 51-8.

⁴ See for example I. Thomson, ‘Manuel Chrysoloras and the Early Italian Renaissance’, *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, vii (1966), pp. 63-82; J. Barker, ‘Emperors, Embassies and Scholars: Diplomacy and the Transmission of Byzantine Humanism to Renaissance Italy’, in D.G. Angelov, ed., *Church and Society in Late Byzantium* (Kalamazoo, MI, 2009), pp. 158-79; T. Ganchou, ‘Le rachat des Notaras

après la chute de Constantinople ou les relations “étrangères” de l’élite byzantine au XVe siècle’, in M. Balard and A. Ducellier, ed., *Migrations et diasporas méditerranéennes (Xe-XVI siècles)* (Paris, 2002), pp. 149-229; K.-P. Matschke, ‘The Notaras Family and its Italian Connections’, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, xlix (1995), pp. 59-72.

⁵ J. Harris, ‘Byzantine medicine and medical practitioners in the West: the case of Michael Dishypatos’, *Revue des Études Byzantines*, liv (1996), pp. 201-20 at 204; Harris, *Greek Emigres*, pp. 175-80.

⁶ Wilson, *From Byzantium*, pp. 8-9; L. Thorn-Wickert, *Manuel Chrysoloras (ca. 1350-1415): Eine Biographie des byzantinischen Intellektuellen vor dem Hintergrund der hellenistischen Studien in der italienischen Renaissance* (Frankfurt-am-Main, 2006), pp. 39-50.

⁷ Doukas, *Historia Byzantina*, ed. I. Bekker (Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae, Bonn, 1834), p. 214; English trans. by H.J. Magoulias, *Decline and Fall of Byzantium to the Ottoman Turks* (Detroit, MI, 1975), p. 180 is the only evidence for his being there.

⁸ C. Zonta and G. Brotto, eds., *Acta Graduum Academicorum Gymnasii Patavini* (2nd edn., 2 vols., Padua, 1970), i. 187; Vespasiano da Bisticci, *Le Vite*, ed. A. Greco (2 vols., Florence, 1970-6), ii. 159-60; English trans. by E. George and E. Waters, *The Vespasiano Memoirs: Lives of Illustrious Men of the XVth Century* (New York, 1963), p. 243; Wilson, *From Byzantium*, p. 86.

⁹ G. Müller, ed., *Documenti sulle relazioni delle città toscane coll’oriente cristiano e coi Turchi* (Florence, 1879), no. CI, pp. 149-50: ‘ti mandiamo con questa lettera sopra questa materia e di credenzia in te alla Supereminentia dello imperadore et a messer Nicola Notara et a messer Demetrio Gadelli, a messer Ilario Dora et a messer Giovanni Crissolora ...’.

- ¹⁰ Harris, *Greek Emigres*, pp. 47, 56; Wilson, *From Byzantium*, pp. 86-7.
- ¹¹ Francesco Filelfo, *Collected letters: Epistolarum libri XLVIII*, ed. J. De Keyser (4 vols., Alessandria, 2015), ii. 631: ‘Manuelis illius Chrysolorae necessarium, qui extincta bonarum artium studia in lucem ad Latinos revocavit’. Filelfo was also connected to the Chrysoloras family by marriage: T. Ganchou, ‘Les ultimae voluntates de Manuel et Iôannès Chrysolôras et le séjour de Francesco Filelfo à Constantinople’, *Bizantinistica*, viii (2005), pp. 195–285.
- ¹² J. Barker, *Manuel II Palaeologus (1391-1425): A Study in Late Byzantine Statesmanship* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1969), pp. 486-7 (Appendix XII); Matschke, ‘Notaras family’, p. 63; J. Chrysostomides, ‘Venetian Commercial Privileges under the Palaeologi’, *Studi Veneziani*, xii (1970), pp. 267-356; D. Jacoby, ‘Between the Imperial Court and the Western Maritime Powers: the Impact of Naturalizations on the Economy of Late Byzantine Constantinople’, in A. Ödekan et al., eds., *The Byzantine Court: Source of Power and Culture* (Istanbul, 2016), pp. 95-103.
- ¹³ Matschke, ‘Notaras Family’, pp. 67-8; Ganchou, ‘Rachat’, pp. 151-8, 196-225; D.M. Nicol, *The Byzantine Lady: Ten Portraits, 1250-1500* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 96-109; C.A. Maltezos, *Άννα Παλαιολογίνα Νοταρά. Μια τραγική μορφή ανάμεσα στον βυζαντινό και τον νέο ελληνικό κόσμο* (Venice, 2004).
- ¹⁴ J. Harris, ‘Demetrius Leontaris: Constantinople to Otranto’, *The Patristic and Byzantine Review*, xviii-xix (2000), pp. 27-40.
- ¹⁵ F. Cerone, ‘La politica orientale di Alfonso di Aragona’, *Archivio Storico per le Province Napoletane*, xxvii (1902), pp. 3-93, 384-456, 555-634, 774-852, at 592-3; C. Minieri Riccio, ‘Alcuni fatti di Alfonso I di Aragona dal 15 aprile 1437 al 31 maggio 1458’, *Archivio Storico per le Province Napoletane*, vi (1881), pp. 1-56, 231-58, 411-61, at 413.

- ¹⁶ É. Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique des XVe et XVIe siècles* (5 vols., Paris, 1894-1903), i. clix-clx; M. Vögel and V. Gardthausen, *Die griechischen Schreiber des Mittelalters und der Renaissance* (Leipzig, 1909), pp. 103-4.
- ¹⁷ Giovanni Antonio Summonte, *Dell'istoria della città e regno di Napoli* (4 vols., Naples, 1675), iii. 508-9; E. Scarton, 'La congiura dei baroni del 1485-87 e la sorte dei ribelli', in F. Senatore and F. Storti, eds., *Poteri, relazioni, guerra nel regno di Ferrante d'Aragona. Studi sulle corrispondenze diplomatiche* (Naples, 2011), pp. 213-90, at 225ff; Michael Maroullou, *Poems*, ed. and trans. C. Fantazzi (Cambridge, MA, and London, 2012), pp. viii-ix, 22-3, 72-3; C. Kidwell, *Marullus: Soldier Poet of the Renaissance* (London, 1989), pp. 106, 120-2, 124, 129.
- ¹⁸ J. Harris, *The End of Byzantium* (New Haven, CT, and London, 2010), pp. 15-18, 73-5.
- ¹⁹ Barker, *Manuel II*, pp. 154, 158-9, 178-81; D.M. Nicol, 'A Byzantine Emperor in England: Manuel II's Visit to London in 1400-1401', *University of Birmingham Historical Journal*, xii (1969-70), pp. 204-25, at 213-19; D.R. Carlson, 'Greeks in England, 1400', in R.F. Green, ed., *Interstices: Studies in Middle English and Anglo-Saxon Texts in Honour of A.G. Rigg* (Toronto, 2004), pp. 74-98.
- ²⁰ Nikephoros Gregoras, *Byzantina Historia*, ed. L. Schopen (Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae, 3 vols., Bonn, 1829-30), ii. 689; Manuel II Palaeologus, *Funeral Oration on his Brother Theodore*, ed. and trans. J. Chrysostomides (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 26, Thessalonica, 1985), pp. 174-7; A.A. Vasiliev, 'La Guerre de Cent Ans et Jeanne d'Arc dans la tradition byzantine', *Byzantion*, iii (1926-7), pp. 241-52.
- ²¹ Thomas Walsingham, *Historia Anglicana*, ed. H.T. Riley (Rolls Series, xxviii, 2 vols., London, 1863-4), ii. 247; C.L. Kingsford, ed., *Chronicles of London* (Oxford,

1905), p. 267; Carlson, 'Greeks in England', pp. 88-93.

²² Weiss, *Humanism*, pp. 13-21.

²³ Harris, 'Two Byzantine Craftsmen', pp. 397-8.

²⁴ *The Chronicle of Adam Usk, 1377-1421*, ed. C. Given-Wilson (Oxford, 1997), pp. 118-21; Carlson, 'Greeks in England', pp. 76-7; J. Harris, 'Manuel II Palaiologos (1391-1425) and the Lollards', *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, lvii (2012), pp. 213-34, at 214-19.

²⁵ G. Williams, ed., *Official Correspondence of Thomas Bekynton (Memorials of the Reign of Henry VI)* (Rolls Series, lvi, 2 vols., London, 1872), i. 285-7; A.R. Myers, ed., *English Historical Documents, IV: 1327-1485* (London, 1969), no. 75, pp. 174-5; Nicol, 'Byzantine emperor in England', p. 206; N. Saul, *Richard II* (New Haven, CT, and London, 1997), pp. 312, 386; M. Bennett, *Richard II and the Revolution of 1399* (Stroud, 1999), pp. 124-5.

²⁶ Charles du Fresne du Cange, *Historia Byzantina Duplici Commentario Illustrata* (Paris, 1680), p. 238: 'Theodorus Palaeologus, qui Theodoric Paleologon et patruus Imperatoris Constantinopolitani appellatur in Computo Subsidiarum pro defensione Christianitatis anni MCCCCXCVII quod asservatur in Camera Computorum Parisiensi: ex quo docemur Theodorum venisse sub haec tempora in Franciam et Angliam, regumque Carolum VI diplomate XXIX Januarii eodem anno MCCCCXCVII CCC primum, allisque deinde XVIII Aprilis et XXIV Maii anno subsequente exaratis, CCCC et MM Francos aureos ex ipso subsidio percipiendos eidem indulsisse, in sui et sociorum et in Angliam itineris expensas'.

²⁷ Bennett, *Richard II*, p. 110 but see *Chronique du Religieux de Saint-Denis*, ed. M.G. Bellaguet (Collection des documents inédits sur l'histoire de France, 6 vols., Paris, 1839-52), ii. 558-9; Barker, *Manuel II*, pp. 154-7.

- ²⁸ Matschke, 'Notaras Family', pp. 62-3; Ganchou, 'Rachat', pp. 160-1.
- ²⁹ Johannes Chortasmenos, *Briefe, Gedichte und kleine Schriften: Einleitung, Regesten, Proposopographie, Text*, ed. H. Hunger (Vienna, 1969), pp. 190-1; U. Peschlow, 'Die befestigte Residenz von Mermerkule. Beobachten an einem spätbyzantinischen Bau in Verteidigungssystem von Konstantinopel', *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik*, li (2001), pp. 385-403.
- ³⁰ Archivio di Stato, Venice, Privilegi, Reg. 1, f. 129v.
- ³¹ D.M. Nicol, *The Byzantine Family of Kantakouzenos (Cantacuzenus)* (Washington, DC, 1968), no. 57, pp. 165-6; D.M. Nicol, 'The Byzantine Family of Kantakouzenos. Some Addenda and Corrigenda', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, xxvii (1973), pp. 309-15, at 312-13.
- ³² F. Palgrave, *The Antient Kalendars and Inventories of the Treasury of his Majesty's Exchequer* (3 vols., London, 1836), ii. 58.
- ³³ Palgrave, *Antient Kalendars*, ii. 57. For the 1399 date, see Nicol, 'Byzantine Emperor in England', pp. 208-9.
- ³⁴ *Chronicle of Adam Usk*, pp. 50-1; Saul, *Richard II*, pp. 288-9.
- ³⁵ F. Devon, ed., *Issues of the Exchequer from King Henry III to King Henry VI Inclusive* (London, 1837), p. 272; A. Steel, *The Receipt of the Exchequer, 1377-1485* (Cambridge, 1954), pp. 80-1; Nicol, 'Byzantine Emperor in England', pp. 217-19.
- ³⁶ Williams, *Official Correspondence of Thomas Bekynton*, i. 286.
- ³⁷ D. Lalande, *Jean II le Meingre, dit Le Boucicault (1366-1421): étude d'une biographie héroïque* (Geneva, 1988), p. 83n, citing Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, ms nouvelle acquisition française 20027, no. 180.
- ³⁸ TNA E404/16/373: 'vyngt souldz par le dit Johan Macclesfield paieez a Johan Bridbrooke clerck pur son fee a la creacione du cousin de lempereure de

Constantinople par nostre dit cousin [Richard II] en chivalier a Lichefeld deins le temps suisdit’.

³⁹ Ranulph Higden, *Polychronicon*, ed. C. Babington and J.R. Lumby (Rolls Series, xli, 9 vols., London, 1865-86), viii. 506: ‘Kynge Richarde kepede this Cristmasse at Lichfeld, with whom mony straunge lords were, as the broþer of the emperoure of Constantinople ...’; *Historia Vitae et Regni Ricardi II Anglie Regis*, ed. G.B. Stow (Philadelphia, PA, 1977), p. 151: ‘Istud Natale rex tenuit apud Lichefeld, in palacio episcopi Lichefeld’. Fueruntque cum illo plures domini extranei, uidelicet frater imperatoris Constantinopol[itani]’.

⁴⁰ Nicol, ‘Byzantine Emperor in England’, p. 207.

⁴¹ *Chronique du Religieux*, ii. 558-62; A. Champollion-Figéac, *Louis et Charles, ducs d’Orléans, leur influence sur les arts, la littérature et l’esprit de leur siècle* (3 vols., Paris, 1844), iii. 26; *Le livre des faicts du Mareschal de Boucicaut*, ed. J.F. Michaud and J.J.F. Poujoulat (Nouvelle collection des mémoires pour servir à l’histoire de France, ii, Paris, 1836), pp. 215-32, at 247; English trans. by C. Taylor and J.H.M. Taylor, *The Chivalric Biography of Boucicaut, Jean II le Meingre* (Woodbridge, 2016), p. 78.

⁴² On 17 September 1398, the Venetian Senate had authorised his homeward transport to Constantinople: F. Thiriet, *Régestes des délibérations du sénat de Venise concernant la Romanie* (3 vols., Paris, 1958-61), i. 221.

⁴³ N.H. Nicolas, ed., *Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council* (7 vols., London, 1834-7), i. 79-80; M. Jones, ed., *Recueil des actes de Jean IV, duc de Bretagne* (3 vols., Paris, 1980–2001), ii. 674-5; J.T. Gould, ‘Lichfield and Richard II’, *Staffordshire Archaeological and Historical Society Transactions*, xxxix (2001), pp. 16-21, at 18-19.

- ⁴⁴ The National Archives, London [hereafter TNA] C81/1357, no. 24 and E101/404/21, f. 39v; *Calendar of the Close Rolls: Henry VI, vol. 2 (1402-1405)* (London, 1929), p. 43; J.L. Kirby, ed., *Calendar of Signet Letters of Henry IV and Henry VI (1399-1422)* (London, 1978), no. 116, p. 43; J.H. Wylie, *History of England under Henry IV* (4 vols., London, 1898), iv. 200.
- ⁴⁵ R. Weiss, *Humanism in England during the Fifteenth Century* (3rd edn., Oxford, 1967), p. 11; Thorn-Wickert, *Manuel Chrysoloras*, p. 77.
- ⁴⁶ Olivier de la Marche, *Mémoires*, ed. H. Beau and J. d'Arbaumont (4 vols., Paris, 1882-8), ii. 287-8, iii. 4-5; Jehan de Wavrin, *Recueil des chroniques et anciennes istories de la Grant Bretagne*, ed. W. Hardy and E.L.C.P. Hardy (Rolls Series, xxxix, 5 vols., London, 1864-91), v. 22-3; 'Le Livre des faits du bon messier Jacques Lalaing', in Georges Chastellan, *Oeuvres*, ed. K. de Lettenhove (8 vols., Geneva, 1971, reprint), viii. 1-259, at 33-4.
- ⁴⁷ J. Harris, 'Byzantine Refugees as Crusade Propagandists: The Travels of Nicholas Agallon', in N. Housley, ed., *The Crusade in the Fifteenth Century: Converging and Competing Cultures* (Abingdon and New York, 2016), pp. 34-46; J. Stevenson, ed., *Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Wars of the English in France during the Reign of Henry VI* (Rolls Series, xxii, 2 vols., London, 1861-4), i. 367-8; Harris, *Greek Emigres*, pp. 47-8, 106-8.
- ⁴⁸ Harris, 'Byzantine Refugees as Crusade Propagandists', p. 38; Harris, *Greek Emigres*, p. 48n.
- ⁴⁹ Stevenson, *Letters and Papers*, i. 368.
- ⁵⁰ N. Valois, 'Fragment d'un registre du Grand Conseil de Charles VII (mars-juin 1455)', *Annuaire Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire de France*, xix (1882), pp. 273-308, at 285.
- ⁵¹ Manuel II Palaiologos, *Letters*, ed. G.T. Dennis (Corpus Fontium Historiae

Byzantinae, viii, Washington, DC, 1977), no. 38, pp. 100-4; Manuel Chrysoloras, 'Epistola ad Joannem Imperatorem', in J.-P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Ser: Graeco-Latina* (161 vols., Paris, 1857-66), clvi. 23-54, at 33.

⁵² Laonikos Chalkokondyles, *The Histories*, trans. A. Kaldellis (2 vols., Cambridge, MA, and London, 2014), i. 143-51.

⁵³ *Chronicle of Adam Usk*, pp. 198-201; O. Kresten, 'Correctiunculae zu Auslandsschreiben byzantinischer Kaiser des 15 Jahrhunderts', *Römische Historische Mitteilungen*, xli (1999), pp. 267-310, at 293-307.

⁵⁴ C. Dendrinis, 'Manuel II Palaeologus in Paris (1400-1402): Theology, Diplomacy and Politics', in M. Hinterberger and C. Schabel, eds., *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History 1204-1500* (Leuven, 2011), pp. 397-422, at 415-18.

⁵⁵ J. Harris, 'Publicising the Crusade: English Bishops and the Jubilee Indulgence of 1455', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, l (1999), pp. 23-37, at 33; Harris, *Greek Emigres*, pp. 4, 22-3, 200; H.L. Gray, 'Greek Visitors to England in 1455-6', in C.H. Taylor, ed., *Anniversary Essays in Medieval History by Students of Charles Homer Haskins* (Boston, MA, 1929), pp. 81-116; J. Harris, 'Despots, Emperors and Balkan Identity in Exile', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, xlv (2013), pp. 643-61, at 645-9.

⁵⁶ W.F. Bakker and A.F. Gemert, eds., *Ιστορία τοῦ Βελισσαρίου* (Athens, 1988), p. 153.

⁵⁷ Michael Kritovoulos, *Historiae*, ed. D.R. Rheinsch (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, xxii, Berlin and New York, 1983), p. 5; English trans. by C.T. Riggs *History of Mehmed the Conqueror* (Princeton, NJ, 1954), p. 4.

⁵⁸ S.P. Lambros, 'Σύμμικτα', *Νέος Ἑλληνομνήμων*, v (1908), pp. 479-91, at 482-3. Cf. C.N. Constantinides, 'A Marginal Note on Britain and the Britons in an Athonite Manuscript of Michael Glykas', in C. Stavrakos et al., eds., *Hypermachos: Festschrift für Werner Siebt zum 65. Geburtstag* (Wiesbaden, 2008), pp. 16-23.

⁵⁹ Barker, *Manuel II*, pp. 213-14, 500-3, at 501: ‘Nec enim clarissimae Angliae novum est producere tales fructus’.

⁶⁰ Joseph Bryennios, ‘Τοῦ αὐτοῦ πρὸς Κρη̃τας ἐξιτήριος’, in Bryennios, *Τὰ Παραλειπόμενα*, ed. T. Mandakasos (3 vols., Thessaloniki, 1991, reprint), iii. 63-71, at 64: ‘Ἡ χρῆ ἐνίους μὲν ὑμῶν, χρημάτων ἔνεκεν, πλεῖν ἐπὶ Τάναιν, καὶ τὰς Βρεττανικὰς, καὶ κινδυνεύειν πολλάκις περὶ τὸ ζῆν’.

⁶¹ Letter to Giovanni Pardo (c.1480) in Biblioteca nacional, Madrid ms 4620, f. 147v; J. Iriarte, ed., *Regiae Bibliothecae Matritensis Codices Graeci Mss* (Madrid, 1769), p. 290: ‘Οὐ μόνον Μεδιόλανον καὶ τὰς ἐκεῖσε πόλεις ποθῶ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς βρεττανικὰς νήσους καὶ εἰ βούλει γε τὰς μακάρων’.

⁶² Demetrius Kydones, ‘Oratio de Non Reddenda Callipoli’, in Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, cliv. 1009-36, at 1013: ‘πρὸς Ἰταλίαν, καὶ Γαδεῖρα, καὶ τὴν ἔξω Στηλῶν’.

⁶³ Manuel II, *Letters*, pp. 102-3.

⁶⁴ TNA E403/807; E404/70/3/66; Gray, ‘Greek Visitors’, p. 83.

⁶⁵ Weiss, *Humanism*, pp. 107-10.

⁶⁶ TNA E403/806; Wiltshire County Record Office, Trowbridge, Register of Richard Beauchamp, vol. 1, 2nd series, ff. 43v-44: ‘serenissimi quodam principis miserabilis urbis Constantinopolis consanguineus’; Gray, ‘Greek Visitors’, p. 83; L. Balletto, ‘Greci a Genova dopo la conquista Turca di Costantinopoli’, in S. Kolditz and R.C. Müller, eds., *Geschehenes und Geschriebenes: Studien zu Ehren von Günther S. Heinrich und Klaus-Peter Matschke* (Leipzig, 2005), pp. 351-65, at 360-1.

⁶⁷ Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, ms français 32511, f. 191: ‘Georges Paleologo neveu du feu empereur de Constantinople’; A. de la Grange, ‘Extraits analytiques des registres de consaulx’, *Mémoires de la Société Historique et Littéraire de Tournai*, xxiii (1893), pp. 1-396 at 246.

⁶⁸ TNA E404/71/5/22 : ‘We have graunted unto our welbeloved George Palaologi knyght Greek X li sterlinge to be taken by you oure said tresorer of England nowe beyng. For so moche as th’erle of Wiltshire late oure tresorer havynge in commandment from us here before to pay unto the said George X li of our gift payed it not unto hym as it was oure wille’. Wiltshire had been replaced as treasurer by Henry Bouchier, earl of Essex, on 28 July 1460: E.B. Fryde et al., eds., *Handbook of British Chronology* (3rd edn., London, 1986), p. 107.

⁶⁹ Harris, *Greek Emigres*, pp. 5, 19.

⁷⁰ J. Harris, ‘A Worthless Prince? Andreas Palaeologus in Rome, 1465-1502’, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, lxi (1995), pp. 537-54, at 551.

⁷¹ D.M. Nicol, *The Immortal Emperor: The Life and Legend of Constantine Palaiologos, Last Emperor of the Romans* (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 114-17; Nicol, *Byzantine Family of Kantakouzenos*, no. 67, pp. 176-9; Nicol, ‘Byzantine Family of Kantakouzenos’, pp. 312-13.

⁷² J. Chrysostomides, ed., *Monumenta Peloponnesiaca: Documents for the Study of the Peloponnese in the 14th and 15th Centuries* (Camberley, 1995), no. 274, pp. 573-4; C.L. Tipton, ‘Peter Holt, Turcopolier of Rhodes and Prior of Ireland’, *Annales de l’Ordre Souverain Militaire de Malte*, xii (1964), pp. 82-5; Nicol, ‘Byzantine Emperor in England’, pp. 211, 218-19.

⁷³ Carlson, ‘Greeks in England’, p. 85; J. Harris, ‘Greek Scribes in England: the Evidence of Episcopal Registers’, in R. Cormack and E. Jeffreys, eds., *Through the Looking Glass: Byzantium through British Eyes* (Aldershot and Burlington, VT, 2000), pp. 121-6, at 124.

⁷⁴ P. Ourliac, ‘Louis XI et le Cardinal Bessarion’, in Ourliac, *Études d’histoire du droit médiéval* (Paris, 1979), pp. 491-505, at 492, 496, 502.

- ⁷⁵ Archivio Segreto Vaticano Reg. Vat. 662, f. 50; Andronicus Kallistos, 'Epistola ad Georgium', in Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, clxi. 1017-20, at 1017.
- ⁷⁶ J. Gill, *The Council of Florence* (Cambridge, 1959), pp. 168-9, 224-5, 234-5, 318, 356.
- ⁷⁷ M.P. Kalatzi, *Hermonymos: A Study in Scribal, Literary and Teaching Activities in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries* (Athens, 2009), pp. 39-43.
- ⁷⁸ A.B. Hinds, ed., *Calendar of State Papers (Milan)* (London, 1912), i. 169; M. Lowry, 'John Rous and the Survival of the Neville Circle', *Viator*, xix (1988), pp. 327-38; Weiss, *Humanism*, pp. 141-8; Harris, 'Greek scribes in England', pp. 125-6; P. Botley, 'Literature in Exile: The Books of Andronicus Callistus, 1475-1476', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, lxxii (2018), pp. 181-96, at 186.
- ⁷⁹ Vespasiano da Bisticci, i. 309; George and Waters, *Vespasiano Memoirs*, p. 185; R.M. Haines, 'Grey [Gray], William (c.1414-1478)', in H.C.G. Matthew and B. Harrison, eds., *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (60 vols., Oxford, 2004), xxii. 891-2; Weiss, *Humanism*, pp. 87-90.
- ⁸⁰ Vespasiano da Bisticci, i. 418; George and Waters, *Vespasiano Memoirs*, p. 336; B.G. Kohl, 'Tiptoft [Tibetot], John, First Earl of Worcester (1427-1470)', in Matthew and Harrison, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, liv. 833-6, at 834.
- ⁸¹ Weiss, *Humanism*, p. 72.
- ⁸² L. Mohler, *Kardinal Bessarion als Theologe, Humanist und Staatsmann* (3 vols., Paderborn, 1923-42), iii. 545-6; G. Cecchini, 'Anna Notara Paleologa - una principessa greca in Italia e la politica senese di ripopolamento della Maremma', *Bollettino Senese di Storia Patria*, ix (1938), pp. 1-41, at 28-41.
- ⁸³ Weiss, *Humanism*, p. 141.
- ⁸⁴ R.A. Griffiths, *The Reign of Henry VI: The Exercise of Royal Authority*,

1422–1461 (London, 1981), pp. 816-17; Harris, *Greek Emigres*, pp. 47-8, 56; Gray, 'Greek Visitors', p. 83.

⁸⁵ Stevenson, *Letters and Papers*, i. 367-8; B. Wolffe, *Henry VI* (London, 1981), p. 315; Harris, *Greek Emigres*, pp. 106-8.

⁸⁶ C. Given-Wilson, ed., *Parliament Rolls of Medieval England* (16 vols., Leicester, 2005), iii. 355; *Chronicle of Adam Usk*, pp. 36-7. A. Tuck, 'Neville, Ralph, First Earl of Westmorland (c.1364–1425)', in Matthews and Harrison, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, xl. 516-21.

⁸⁷ Valois, 'Fragment d'un registre', p. 285; Harris, 'Byzantine Refugees as Crusade Propagandists', p. 38; Fryde et al., *Handbook of British Chronology*, p. 87.

⁸⁸ His presence is recorded in Given-Wilson, *Parliament Rolls of Medieval England*, iii. 459, 486.

⁸⁹ J.A.F. Thomson, 'Neville, Sir William (c.1341-1391)', in Matthews and Harrison, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, xl. 545-6.

⁹⁰ *Westminster Chronicle, 1381-94*, ed. and trans. L. C. Hector and B. F. Harvey (Oxford, 1982), pp. 480-1; S. Düll, A. Luttrell and M. Keen, 'Faithful unto Death: Tombslab of Sir William Neville and Sir John Clanvowe, Constantinople 1391', *Antiquaries Journal*, lxx (1991), pp. 174-90.

⁹¹ Harris, 'Manuel II Palaiologos and the Lollards', pp. 220-2.

⁹² Bessarion, 'Μονωδία ἐπι τῷ μακαρίτῃ καὶ ἀοιδίμῳ βασιλεῖ κυρῷ Μανουῆλ τῷ Παλαιολόγῳ', in S.P. Lambros, *Παλαιολογία καὶ Πελοποννησιακά* (4 vols., Athens, 1912-30), iii. 284-90.

⁹³ Weiss, *Humanism*, pp. 144-5; Harris, 'Greek Scribes', p. 125.

⁹⁴ Borthwick Institute, York Reg. 20, f. 168; Harris, *Greek Emigres*, p. 194.

⁹⁵ Borthwick Institute, York, Reg. 21, ff. 7A-7Av.

⁹⁶ Kalatzi, *Hermonymos*, pp. 55-65; Harris, *Greek Emigres*, pp. 143-4.

⁹⁷ Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, ms grec 1731, f. 178: ‘Δεμήτριος ὁ Καντακουζηνὸς ὁ Βυζάντιος ... ἐν τῶν Βρετανικῶν νήσῳ ἐν τῇ πόλει τῇ καλουμένη λούντρα (sic)’. Vögel and Gardthausen, *Griechischen Schreiber*, p. 102.

⁹⁸ Kalatzi, *Hermonymos*, pp. 20n, 205.

⁹⁹ Botley, ‘Literature in Exile’, pp. 182, 186-8; E. Russell, *Literature and Culture in Late Byzantine Thessalonica* (London and New York, 2013), pp. 105-38, at 124-32; Kalatzi, *Hermonymos*, p. 40.