

Manuel Chrysoloras and the Early Italian Renaissance

Ian Thomson

FROM AT LEAST the eighteenth century, when scholars first began to discuss the "Italian Renaissance" as a cultural phenomenon, the importance of Manuel Chrysoloras, the first notable professor of Greek in Western Europe, has been widely recognized. Writers such as Carlo Rosmini, Jacob Burckhardt, John Addington Symonds, and Remigio Sabbadini have given him deservedly honorable mention as the teacher of a number of influential humanists, whose interest in classical studies did much to bring about the Renaissance as a whole. It was not until 1941, however, that Professor G. Cammelli produced a full-length study of Chrysoloras' career and its effect upon the early Renaissance.¹ This excellent work has made information on the external events of Chrysoloras' life, especially for the period 1397–1415, readily accessible.

The purpose of this article is two-fold: first, to assess the extent of Chrysoloras' influence on his pupils and the nature of their admiration for him, with particular reference to Guarino da Verona; second, to suggest a possible motive for his coming to Italy which has received little or no attention from historians.

Chrysoloras was not without honor in his own lifetime, as is well attested in the letters and orations of his pupils and friends.²

Indeed, during the eighteen years between his arrival in Florence in 1397 and his death at or near Constance on April 15, 1415, his considerable intellectual gifts and excellence as a teacher won him almost universal respect and inspired in some of his pupils a sense of gratitude that survived him for almost half a century.

¹ G. Cammelli, *I dotti bizantini e le origini dell'umanesimo*, I: *Manuele Crisolora* (Florence 1941). Before 1941, the most important work was R. Sabbadini: "L'ultimo ventennio della vita di Manuele Crisolora," *Giornale ligustico* 17 (1890) 321ff, which established the main chronology of Chrysoloras' life from 1395–1415.

² See Carlo Rosmini, *La vita e disciplina di Guarino Veronese* (Brescia 1805) I 3–8; II 29ff; R. Sabbadini, *La scuola e gli studi di Guarino Veronese* (Catania 1896) 14–16, 213–20.

His most direct contribution to the Revival of Learning was made in the years 1397–1400, during which he taught Greek to a small number of humanists in Florence.³ These men not only set the cultural tone of their own city but were able eventually to make their influence felt all over Italy. It should be noted that since Petrarch and Boccaccio there had existed among the more intellectually radical scholars in Florence and throughout northern Italy at least a theoretical desire to learn Greek, but few of them did much about it.⁴ Guarino, we are told by the so-called Anonymous Veronese,⁵ was “urged by the wise men whose company he often sought” to learn Greek, but he was the first important scholar intrepid enough to visit Constantinople for that specific purpose.⁶ Many scholars paid lip service to Greek as an interesting and harmless bagatelle, but the majority of professors and students were simply not interested or were actively averse. At the end of the fourteenth century only Coluccio Salutati, Palla Strozzi, Niccolò Niccoli and a few others—probably no more than ten in number—were really enthusiastic about learning Greek. Mere numbers, however, are unimportant; what matters in cultural history is breadth of influence and contribution ultimately recognized.

Leonardo Bruni, for instance, contributed to the spread of Greek culture by a series of important translations.⁷ He had cut his teeth as a translator of Greek with Latin versions of Basilus’ *Homilia* and Xenophon’s *Hieron*. By 1403 or 1404 he had produced a translation of Plato’s *Phaedon*. The list continued to grow over the next three dec-

³ R. R. Bolgar, *The Classical Heritage and its Beneficiaries* (Cambridge [Eng.] 1954) 403, gives the following list of Chrysoloras’ pupils: “Guarino, Giacompo di Scarperia (sic), Roberto Rossi, Niccolò Niccoli, Leonardo Bruni, Carlo Marsuppini, Ambrogio Traversari (?), Vergerio, Uberto Decembrio, Poggio.” (On p. 269 he notes that Poggio “had not been properly speaking his pupil”). All but Guarino and Decembrio were pupils at Florence.

⁴ For the lack of response to Greek in Italy, see Denys Hay, *The Italian Renaissance in its Historical Background* (Cambridge [Eng.] 1961) 86–88. As for Petrarch, there is no doubt that he could have progressed beyond the Greek alphabet if he had really wanted to; see D. J. Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1962) 21 n.27.

⁵ A pupil of Guarino, otherwise unknown, who delivered a spirited defense of the latter in 1424. The speech was published by Sabbadini, “Documenti Guariniani,” *Atti dell’Accademia di agricoltura di Verona* 18 (1916) 232–242.

⁶ Other Italians before Guarino went to Constantinople to learn Greek. In Guarino, *Epistolario* ed. R. Sabbadini, I (Venice 1915–1919) 1, of ca. 1405, we hear of two—Carlo Lottino and “Marcellus, a man long versed in Greek”—who were resident aliens. Lottino and Guarino exchanged letters in Greek to improve each other’s grasp of the language. After Guarino, a fair number of other scholars, such as Filelfo (1420–27), visited Constantinople but did so only after the advantages of knowing Greek had become obvious through the success of such men as Bruni and Guarino.

⁷ Cf. H. Baron, *Humanistic and Political Literature in Florence and Venice* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1955) 114–125, “Bruni’s development as a translator from the Greek.”

ades, and embraced versions of Aeschines, Plutarch, Demosthenes, and Aristotle. Already by 1418 he was able to boast in a letter: *Tam multa etiam ex Platone, Demosthene, Plutarcho, Xenophonte in latinum traduximus*.⁸ His most important translations were those of the *Ethica* (before 1416), *Politica* (1438), and *Oeconomica* of Aristotle, Book I of the (pseudo-) Aristotelian *Oeconomica* being completed on March 3, 1420, and Book II being added between March 25, 1420 and March 24, 1421.⁹

Roberto Rossi also translated Aristotle, although his work was not as influential as Bruni's. The only extant version by Rossi is that of the *Analytica Posteriora*.¹⁰ It is worth noting, however, that in 1411 Guarino praised Rossi's translations of Aristotle and spoke of them as being in use throughout the "gymnasia" of Italy (Guarino, *Epistolario* I.6.12–24). Rossi may also have turned his hand to other Greek authors, for in the dedication to the *Analytica Posteriora* he says: *Nec quod restet Platonis, com (sic) transtulerimus quaedam et alii alia, si vita olim dabitur et transferendi facultas, negligemus. Tum etiam Thucydidem . . . atque dignissimos alios aggrediemur*. Rossi may therefore have been somewhat more influential in his own time than has been supposed, but his real significance in cultural history rests upon his collection of Greek manuscripts.¹¹

In 1404 Pier Paolo Vergerio wrote his famous essay *De ingenuis moribus et liberalibus studiis adolescentiae*,¹² the very title of which suggested a break with the traditions of mediaeval education. Vergerio proposed a return to the balanced, liberal curriculum of later Greek education—in effect, to the so-called *enkyklios paideia*, although he does not use that term—in which the individual's physical and mental aptitudes were to be equally developed. By giving physical education such prominence and by insisting that the cultivation of good morals

⁸ *Leonardi Bruni Arretini Epistolarum Libri VIII*, ed. L. Mehus, vol. II (Florence 1741) 231 (Ep. X.26).

⁹ For the date of the *Oeconomica* see Baron, *op.cit.* 120, 167–8. Other translations by Bruni were: Aeschines' *Pro Diopithe* (1406), *In Ctesiphontem* (1412), *De falsa legatione* (before 1421); Demosthenes' *De Chersoneso* (1405), *De corona* (1407), *Olynthiacs I–III*, *De pace*, *De falsa legatione* (last three before 1421) and two *Philippics* (before 1444); Plato's *Gorgias* (1409), *Crito* (1423/7), *Apology* (1424/8), *Phaedrus* (part, 1424), *Epistulae* (1427) and *Symposium* (part, 1435); Xenophon's *Hellenica* and *Apologia Socratis* (both paraphrased before 1440). See Bolgar, *Classical Heritage* 434–5.

¹⁰ Sabbadini reports that this translation is extant in the Marcian Library at Venice (codex Marcianus latinus Z.231) and dates it posterior to 1406 (Guarino *Epistolario* III.13).

¹¹ See R. Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli XIV e XV*, I (Florence 1905) 15, 63.

¹² Translated by W. H. Woodward in *Vittorino da Feltre and Other Humanist Educators* (Cambridge [Eng.] 1905).

was the sovereign aim of education, Vergerio pointed the way that Barzizza, Guarino and Vittorino were to follow. Admittedly so far as intellectual training was concerned, his "revised" curriculum, consisting of syntax, dialectic, rhetoric, poetry, music, mathematics, astronomy, natural history, drawing, medicine, law, ethics, and theology, is little more than a rehashed list of the subjects of the mediaeval *trivium* and *quadrivium*; nor does Vergerio add any recommendations as to how these subjects should be taught, or for how long, or in what order. But he did show that a balanced education designed to produce a whole man was desirable; and the inspirational effect of this upon the great humanistic educators cannot be doubted. What was implicit in Petrarch was explicit in Vergerio.

It is possible to argue, as Bolgar does (*Classical Heritage* 258) that Vergerio's treatise owes nothing to the teaching of Manuel Chrysoloras and that "we may reasonably assume that he was putting on paper the principles that had guided him throughout his career," but there is no evidence to support such an assumption, except for a disputed dating of the *De ingenuis moribus*.¹³ Vergerio spent most of his life teaching logic, and never opened an independent school in which he could have implemented his ideas. It is more reasonable to regard the *De ingenuis moribus* as Vergerio's reaction to the teaching of Chrysoloras, especially since he is able to cite Greek authorities directly. It is hard not to sense an echo of Chrysoloras in Vergerio's citation of Aristotle, *Politica* 8.3: *erant autem quattuor quae pueros suos Graeci docere consueverunt: litteras, luctativam, musicam et designativam*, for these words contain in essence the Greek concept of education as *mousikē* and *gymnastikē*. Through Vergerio, then, Chrysoloras may be said to have given educationalists in the West a new and clearer inspiration to implement the ideals of Greek education, which led to the translation by Guarino in 1411 of Plutarch's *De liberis educandis* and the remarkable experiments by Barzizza at Padua (1408–1420), Vittorino at Mantua (1423–1446), and Guarino at Venice (1414–1419), Verona (1420–1429), and Ferrara (1430–1460).¹⁴

¹³ C. A. Combi, *Epistole di Pier Paolo Vergerio Seniore* (Misc. Publ. della R. Deputazione Veneta di Storia Patria, SER. IV, V [Venice 1931] p. xix, dates it 1392. W. H. Woodward, *op.cit.* 113, dates it 1404, and this is generally accepted.

¹⁴ These educators each interpreted Vergerio's general recommendations in his own way. Barzizza and Guarino lectured on ancient texts from a linguistic and literary standpoint. Vittorino attempted to cover all the subjects in Vergerio's list but did not teach all the subjects himself. Barzizza neglected physical education, but all three sought to inculcate good morals.

There can be no dispute, moreover, about the effect of Chrysoloras' teaching methods upon Bruni, for the latter's *De studiis et litteris* (ca. 1425)¹⁵ addressed to Battista Malatesta, daughter of the count of Urbino, was the first detailed exposition of the new pedagogic technique that Chrysoloras had brought from Constantinople. This technique stressed accurate pronunciation, the use of mnemonics, constant and regular revision of subject matter and the preparation of copious notes under the headings of *methodice* (grammar, syntax and vocabulary) and *historice* (what we should call "background material"). Bruni recommended minute attention to linguistic detail and imitation of classical models through the use of these techniques. Chrysoloras left no account of his methods, the culmination of centuries of Byzantine experience, but we know what they were from Bruni's treatise, and in even finer detail from Battista Guarino's *De modo et ordine docendi et discendi*,¹⁶ which was read and approved by his father Guarino in 1459. Guarino himself wrote nothing on educational method save for sundry recommendations scattered throughout his letters; the honor must go to Bruni for having been the first humanist to summarize Chrysoloras' ideas in a convenient form.

Chrysoloras' work at Florence had yielded excellent fruit in Bruni, Rossi and Vergerio, not to mention such minor contributions to learning as Jacopo Angeli da Scarperia's translations of Plutarch's lives of Brutus (1400) and Cicero (1410) and Ptolemy's *Chorographia*.¹⁷ But his influence cannot be measured only in tangibles. Such men as Poggio, Traversari, Salutati, Marsuppini, Niccoli and Palla Strozzi acquired, in addition to some knowledge of Greek, a deeper understanding of antiquity and an increased confidence in themselves. It would be mistaken to underestimate the force of this self-confidence in shaping the political and humanistic literature that glorified Florence as true heir of republican Rome and the champion of popular liberty in Italy.

Those pupils who benefited from Chrysoloras' instruction at Florence naturally expressed their gratitude. One indication of the value they attached to him was the fact that his salary was raised on two occasions, the final sum in 1400 standing at 250 gold florins. More important, however, was the devotion they expressed in letters, the

¹⁵ Leonardus Aretinus, *De studiis et litteris* ed. H. Baron, in *Leonardo Aretinos humanistische und philosophische Schriften* [Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte der Mittelalter und der Renaissance] I (Leipzig 1928) 7–10.

¹⁶ Translated by W. H. Woodward, *op.cit.*

¹⁷ See Guarino, *Epistolario* III pp. 18, 30.

literary form most favored by the humanists. Vergerio, for instance, in a letter of 1406,¹⁸ deplors the possibly permanent loss of Chrysoloras to students in Italy and refers to him as “the best and most learned man whom your city (Florence) had called from the heart of Greece to disseminate Greek studies in Italy” (Vergerio, *Epistolario* p. 244). Poggio, too, was conscious of a deep personal debt to Chrysoloras and expressed as much in letters to other scholars. The same is true of the other Florentine pupils, with the possible exception of Niccoli.¹⁹ On the whole, however, the Florentines’ praise of Chrysoloras did not run to luxuriance. They were grateful for his willingness to answer their call for a good teacher of Greek, and aware of the benefits they had reaped from his instruction, but they did not make a cult of him, as did Guarino. This may have been because they were a proud breed of men, over-partial to their own achievements and given to intellectual pretensions that often irritated the citizens of other states. But more probably their political pre-occupations had something to do with it. As Baron has pointed out, the dramatic struggle in the war against Giangaleazzo Visconti produced a series of humanistic works glorifying Florence and her political and cultural heritage. The Florentine attitude to great men varied with the political climate. For example, Salutati’s treatise *De Tyranno*, written in 1400, was a defense of Julius Caesar and the rule of a single man, but the *Invectiva in Antonium Luscum Vicentinum* shows that within the next few years he had radically altered his opinions.²⁰ Again, in Bruni’s *Dialogus ad Petrum Paulum Histrum I* Niccoli is depicted as a militant classicist with little time for Dante, Petrarch and Boccaccio, and Bruni himself seems ranged on Niccoli’s side, whereas in the *Dialogus II*, composed about three years later, in 1403 or 1404, Bruni, Niccoli, and Salutati join in defending the Trecento tradition.²¹ As is well known, Bruni later produced lives of Dante and Petrarch in Italian. The immense pride felt by the Florentines in their cultural tradition may

¹⁸ Ep. 86 in Vergerio, *Epistolario* ed. L. Smith, in *Fonti per la storia d’Italia* 74 (Rome 1934) 243–246. For the date, see Baron, *Humanistic and Political Literature* 107–113.

¹⁹ Niccoli seems to have been an ungracious man, who offended many of his contemporaries (see Sesto Prete, “Leonardi Bruni Aretini Carmen,” *CW* 56 [1963] 280–83). It is difficult to assess Niccoli, however, since he wrote very little. His only extant letter is one to Cosimo dei Medici of March 20, 1426 (published in *Le Carte Strozziiane del R. Archivio di Stato in Firenze* SERIE PRIMA I [Florence 1884] 590). It was said that his jealousy drove Chrysoloras out of Florence, but G. Zippel, *Niccolò Niccoli* (Florence 1890) 75–91, maintains that Niccoli’s malice was aimed at John Chrysoloras.

²⁰ See E. Emerton, *Humanism and Tyranny* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1925) 25–70.

²¹ Cf. Baron, *Humanistic and Political Literature* 124.

have detracted somewhat from their appreciation of Chrysoloras. It certainly saved them from the excesses of Guarino da Verona.

Guarino did not begin his study of Greek until after Chrysoloras had ceased to be active as a teacher in Italy. In March or April of 1403, the latter had returned with the Emperor Manuel II Palaeologus to Constantinople.²² Guarino followed him shortly afterwards,²³ and studied under Manuel and his nephew John until about 1406.²⁴ Manuel was absent for part of the time,²⁵ but one cannot doubt that his was the guiding spirit of the school,²⁶ and that he made an overwhelming impression upon his young Italian student. By the end of 1407, Manuel moved permanently to the West²⁷ and Guarino returned to Italy in 1408. Thereafter, the two men seem to have remained in touch, although at probably sporadic intervals. The extant correspondence between them is limited to three letters,²⁸ one in Latin from Guarino and two in Greek from Chrysoloras. It is known, however, that they met in Italy on at least two occasions.²⁹

In the first of Manuel's Greek letters, dated January, 1412, he congratulates Guarino on his success in disseminating in Italy what he had learned in Greece, and refers to the *Σύγκρισις τῆς παλαιᾶς καὶ νέας Ῥώμης*³⁰ which Guarino had received from him in October of the

²² Cammelli, 123.

²³ Sabbadini, *La scuola e gli studi di Guarino* 10–11, maintained that Guarino sailed with Chrysoloras and that he accompanied the imperial flotilla. But this view, still frequently repeated, was disposed of in Guarino, *Epistolario* III p. 5, where Sabbadini pointed out that a "magister Guarinus de Guarinis" appears in a list of witnesses to a Venetian document dated August 21, 1403 (E. Bertanza and G. della Santa, *Maestri, scuole e scolari in Venezia fino al 1500* [Venice 1907] 245, in *Documenti per la storia della cultura in Venezia* I); and Guarino himself says that he went to Constantinople at the expense and under the guidance of Paolo Zane (*Epistolario* II.758.25–33; 873.14–19).

²⁴ Except where otherwise noted, I rely for events in Guarino's life on Sabbadini, "Vita di Guarino da Verona," *Giornale ligustico* 18 (1891).

²⁵ He was in Venice in December, 1404, spent most of 1405 in Constantinople, returned to Italy before January, 1406, and was home again by the end of that year (Cammelli, 140–142).

²⁶ It is difficult to determine if it was a school in the regular sense. F. Fuchs, *Die höheren Schulen von Konstantinopel im Mittelalter* (Leipzig–Berlin 1926, repr. Amsterdam 1964) sheds no light on the question. The school may, after all, have been only a coterie of scholars who gathered at the house of the Chrysolorae, and Guarino need not have been a pupil in the regular sense.

²⁷ Cammelli, 140–145.

²⁸ Guarino, *Epistolario* I, Ep. 7, 9 and 11, of October, 1411; January, 1412; and July, 1412, respectively. Ep. 7 opens: *Quod si rariores fortasse quam velles a me litteras accipis . . .*

²⁹ In Ep. 11, Chrysoloras talks of a meeting with Guarino, which Sabbadini guesses took place at Florence in April, 1411 (*Epistolario* III p. 18). The other meeting occurred when Guarino accompanied Chrysoloras on a journey from Bologna to Venice in July, 1414, referred to in one of Guarino's *commentarioli* published by Sabbadini in *La scuola e gli studi* 173.

³⁰ Published in *Scriptores historiae bizantinae* (Paris 1655) 107. Actually a Greek work, it is sometimes referred to by the Latin title *Epistulae III de comparatione veteris et novae Romae*.

previous year (Guarino, *Epistolario* I.7). It appears that Guarino had been distributing copies of this work—a comparison between Rome and Constantinople, designed in essence to foster good relations between the East and West—throughout Northern Italy. Chrysoloras was signally grateful for this service, but Guarino probably felt that he was only fulfilling the demands of *pietas*. Most humanists felt obliged to spread the fame of their friends and teachers as widely as possible.³¹ For that reason, Guarino rarely missed an opportunity, both during and after Chrysoloras' lifetime, of reminding his fellow scholars in letters, conversation, orations, and lectures of their debt to Chrysoloras.³²

It is noteworthy, however, that in his correspondence, in which the bulk of these tributes appears, Guarino seldom refers to Chrysoloras specifically as a teacher of Greek, but rather as the one man most responsible for the restoration of the "best studies" to Italy. By "best studies" (*optima studia*), the "rebirth of letters" (*renata humanitas*) and other such expressions the humanists—and Guarino was no exception—generally meant that critical approach to the content of ancient literature and the close, prescriptive study of classical Latin³³ which we associate with the Revival of Learning. At first sight, then, Guarino's praise seems paradoxical, for Chrysoloras' reputation in cultural history rests upon his success as a teacher of Greek. It is known that he never mastered Latin as well as did some of the Greek émigrés later in the fifteenth century,³⁴ and certainly could never have taught it at a professorial level to Italians. Guarino must have been thinking more

³¹ Cf. Guarino, *Epistolario* I.7.68–70: *Est vero benignum et plenum ingenui pudoris fateri per quos profeceris, ut conterraneus meus Plinius ait, an echo of Pliny, NH Praefatio 21. Examples of this sentiment in humanistic literature could be multiplied.*

³² See in particular Guarino, *Epistolario* I, Ep. 7, 25, 27, 47, 49, 54; II. Ep. 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 892, 893.

³³ Among the humanists the prescriptive study of classical models was more marked in Latin scholarship than in Greek, possibly because there was no dominant model for Attic prose, such as Cicero was bound to be for classical Latin. It is true, as Geanakoplos points out in *Greek Scholars in Venice* 292, that the Greeks in Italy "emphasized reading, memorization and imitation of the style of the original texts" and that Plato, Aristotle and Plutarch emerged as the authors most generally imitated; but the Atticizing movement did not appear in Italy until the Greeks had established themselves there by the middle and latter part of the fifteenth century. With the exception of Guarino and Filelfo, the early humanists confined their writing of Greek to a few safe snippets—usually direct quotations—with which to decorate their Latin letters; and even the few samples of original Greek composition by Guarino and Filelfo strike one as influenced by the habits of Latin syntax and markedly un-Attic.

³⁴ The one extant Latin letter by Chrysoloras is poorly composed (Sabbadini, "L'ultimo ventennio della vita di M. C." 330). In Lombardy he produced a Latin version of Plato's

of the good effect that Chrysoloras had exerted upon classical studies in general. He believed, undoubtedly, that Chrysoloras had given the Italians much more than a narrow specialty. Further, he believed that a proper understanding of Latin could not be achieved without a knowledge of Greek. To illustrate both of these points, three quotations will perhaps suffice.

The first is from a letter written by Guarino in 1452: *Quae illius (Chrysoloras) cura et diligentia latas adeo sparsit per Italiae regna radices grandesque et uberes fructus disseminavit, ut Italorum studia immo vero Latinitatis disciplina cuncta quae dudum per inextricabiles vagabantur umbras et errores, Chrysolorae ductu et luminis accensione illustrata et directa perdurent* (Guarino, *Epistolario* II.861.45–49). The second occurs in a letter to his son, Niccolò: *Longa itaque desuetudine infuscatus ante latinus sermo et inquinata dictio Chrysolorinis fuerat pharmacis expurganda et admoto lumine illustranda* (Guarino, *Epistolario* II.862.68–70). The third quotation is from a letter of Guarino's youngest son, Battista, and it shows, incidentally, how thoroughly he had absorbed his father's veneration for Chrysoloras: *Nam cum graecas ipse (Chrysoloras) doceret, a quibus nostrae, ut Quintilianus ait, effluxere tunc demum nostri veram latinarum cognitionem habere easque cognoscendo exercere et in lucem revocare coeperunt* (Guarino, *Epistolario* II.863.134–137). It seems that both Guarino and his son thought that the Latin and Greek languages, not merely their literatures (which is certainly what Quintilian meant in *De Institutione Oratoria* I.1.12), are more intimately related than modern philologists would concede; but this does not invalidate the point that to them Chrysoloras appeared to have made possible a fuller understanding of the Latin tongue itself. It was natural for Guarino to see the spread of Greek as marking the dawn of a new era in Latin studies and to invest Chrysoloras with a special significance, as not merely having supplied a knowledge of Greek, but also the humanizing spirit and sovereign stimulus needed to rouse Italian scholarship out of its long sleep.

Republic, but the style had to be improved by Uberto Decembrio and later by Pier Candido Decembrio (Cammelli, 16, 123). The later Greeks Theodorus Gaza, Musurus, Bessarion, Lascaris, and Georgius Trapezuntius were excellent Latin scholars (Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice* 299). The latter, for example, had only *primorum elementorum confusa cognitio* in 1418 (Guarino, *Epistolario* II.707.36–37) but by 1434 knew enough Latin to produce his impressive *Rhetoricorum libri V* (publ. Basle 1522).

Guarino's insistence that Chrysoloras had been the harbinger of a new age did not go without notice. In the first place, his prestige as a scholar enabled him to command the attention of the educated public. Although his letters were not collected and edited for publication in his own century, they were nevertheless passed around as models of style and collectors' items.³⁵ Any praise of Chrysoloras contained in them was thereby assured of a fairly wide circulation. This helped to keep the name of Chrysoloras alive in the later fifteenth century and brought it again to the fore in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when Guarino's letters began to be collected and published in small batches.³⁶ Second, and perhaps more important, is the fact that from 1436 at least, Guarino was the most influential teacher in Italy, if not in Europe.³⁷ He was in a unique position to pass on his reminiscences to large numbers of young students who could never have seen or met Chrysoloras. Some of these pupils were inevitably affected by Guarino's admiration for Chrysoloras and referred to him in their own writings. For example, Janus Pannonius describes him thus in his *Sylva Panegyrica ad Guarinum* 135–139:

*Vir fuit hic patrio Chrysoloras nomine dictus,
candida Mercurio quem Calliopaea creatat,
nutrierat Pallas, nec solis ille parentum
clarus erat studiis, sed rerum protinus omnem
naturam magna complexus mente tenebat.*

These lines, written in 1454 when the poet was still a young man, seem remarkably like an echo of Guarino's words in the lecture room or around the supper table. Examples of such tralatitious praise of Chrysoloras are not uncommon in the writings of Guarino's pupils.

³⁵ Guarino, *Epistolario* III pp. vii–x.

³⁶ *Ibid.* pp. i–iii.

³⁷ For the popularity of his teaching at Ferrara, see Janus Pannonius, *Sylva Panegyrica ad Guarinum* (Venice 1553) 320–321:

*Curritur ad bifidi suavissima flumina fontis,
atria nec capiunt studiosas ampla catervas*

and 339–341:

*Omnis conditio, sexus simul omnis et aetas
accelerant, plebi stipatur curia, mixti
primaevae canis, maribus sedere puellae.*

Lodovico Carbone says much the same in his funeral speech on Guarino published by E. Garin in *La letteratura italiana: Storia e testi*, XIII: *Prosatori latini del quattrocento* (Milan 1952) 382–416 (see especially pp. 392, 394).

Shortly after Chrysoloras' death, Vergerio suggested to the Venetian Niccolò Leonardi, a physician with humanistic leanings, that their common friend, Guarino, ought to write a formal *commemoratio* of the great Byzantine. Guarino, however, claimed that his own powers were unequal to such an undertaking, and referred it to Vergerio himself (Guarino, *Epistolario* I.25). Vergerio composed a very fine epitaph,³⁸ and the Venetian Andrea Zulian wrote a funeral speech which had a wide circulation and is extant in many manuscripts.³⁹ The lack of some worthwhile memorial to Chrysoloras, however, weighed upon the consciences of his pupils and friends for many years. Guarino, for example, wrote in July, 1416, to Giacomo dei Fabbri: "Many a time I have set myself to write a splendid work in praise of this man . . . for I think it unfair and a mark of ingratitude that he whose industry helped us not merely to speak but to speak with eloquence, should be immersed in silence . . . but I am overwhelmed by the amount there is to say and the importance of the subject, and I give up." He goes on to praise the funeral speech by Zulian, and concludes: "After Zulian, silence would seem the better course, unless one had a mind to unfold in detail the life of the aforesaid Manuel from the cradle up" (Guarino, *Epistolario* I.54). No one, however, wrote the projected biography, perhaps because details of Chrysoloras' earlier life were lacking,⁴⁰ but more likely because most scholars did not consider him important enough to warrant a detailed biography. It is perhaps surprising that Guarino never fulfilled his own suggestion. Poggio shared something of Guarino's hero worship of Chrysoloras, and as late as June, 1455, was still sufficiently disturbed by his own failure to write at length in praise of Chrysoloras that he confessed to Guarino: "As to your writing of a rumor that I had composed a laudation of the late brilliant and learned gentleman, Manuel Chrysoloras—I wish it were true!"⁴¹

³⁸ Guarino, *Ep.* I.54, 77–84: *Ante aram situs est dominus Manuel Chrysoloras, eques Constantino-politanus ex vetusto genere Romanorum qui cum Constantino imperatore migrarunt: vir doctissimus prudentissimus optimus, qui tempore generalis concilii Constantiensis diem obiit ea existimatione ut ab omnibus summo sacerdotio dignus haberetur. XVI Kalendas maias conditus est anno Incarnati Verbi MCCCCXV.* Sabbadini notes in his *apparatus criticus* that the actual inscription reads *Chrissolora miles for Chrysoloras eques* and *die XV aprilis conditus est MCCCCXV* for *XVI Kalendas maias conditus est anno Incarnati Verbi MCCCCXV*. Poggio also wrote an epitaph for Chrysoloras (*Jovii Elogia* [Venice 1546] p. 16).

³⁹ It was published by Don A. Calogera, *Raccolta d'opuscoli XXV* (Venice 1728–57) 325ff.

⁴⁰ Perhaps for the same reason, Cammelli concentrates on the period after 1397, in which year Chrysoloras was in his mid-forties. The *Vita Chrysolorae* by Pontico Virunio in *Chrysoloras' Erotemata* (Venice 1502) is so short as scarcely to merit consideration.

⁴¹ *Poggii Epistulae* ed. T. Tonelli, III (Florence 1832) 178. In the same letter, Poggio says: *Laudassem illum (Chrysoloras) cum defunctus esset Constantie; ego autem otiosus essem, si licuisset*

Guarino did, however, make some reparation by collecting a series of works about Chrysoloras, which he edited and disseminated in 1452 under the title of *Chrysololina*.⁴² This collection helped to preserve the fame of Chrysoloras, as did the fact that his *Erotemata*, a Greek grammar that followed the usual method of question and answer, continued to be widely used until well into the sixteenth century. Its first printing was at Venice in 1484, but it had been used in manuscript long before that; in fact, until the publication of Constantine Lascaris' *Erotemata* at Milan in 1476, it had been the sole Greek grammar in general use in Italy.⁴³

In a letter to Vergerio in 1415 Guarino remarks that Chrysoloras had provided the perfect example to follow in leading "the good and blessed life," and even advances the extravagant notion that if Homer had been fortunate enough to have had Chrysoloras as his hero in the *Iliad* instead of the bloodthirsty and uncouth Achilles, he would have been inspired to write a better poem (Guarino, *Epistolario* I.27.28–29 and 45)! Ludicrous as this may seem to us, Guarino probably meant it seriously, for he subscribed to the ancient and mediaeval notion that the aim of literature is moral edification and for that reason interpreted the *Aeneid* and the Homeric epics allegorically. Thirty-eight years later, Guarino's devotion had not been diminished, for in complimenting his son Battista on a literary sketch of Chrysoloras he says: "You set him before my eyes in such a way that as I behold Manuel's stature, expression, beard, complexion, mannerisms, and the whole set of his body, I almost shout for joy, 'even such his eyes and hands, and such the face he showed'."⁴⁴ It is not perhaps surprising that a man capable of such loyalty should have exaggerated his master's true importance.

It is interesting to note that in the entire epistolary of Guarino, which runs to over 700 letters from him and about 200 from others to him, there is no mention of Dante or Boccaccio, and only one passing reference *per Cincium romanum eiusdem discipulum, qui eius laudandi munus sibi desumpsit—sed et ipse nihil edidit et mihi scribendi sustulit facultatem*.

⁴² It comprised the letters listed in n.32, two other letters now lost, the funeral speech by Zulian, and two of Guarino's *Commentarioli* about Chrysoloras (Guarino, *Epistolario* III. 460).

⁴³ Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice* 286.

⁴⁴ *Epistolario* II.864.24–27. There is no detailed description of Chrysoloras' appearance in humanistic literature, but one gathers that it was majestic. Girolamo Guarino refers to him thus: *veneranda corporis dignitate qua praestitit . . . veste pretiosa qua fuit usus . . . opibus amplis quibus floruit* (Guarino, *Epistolario* II.865.26–27). Battista Guarino says that Chrysoloras was of medium height, had a red beard, fresh complexion, and a cheerful, yet serious expression (*Ibid.* II.863.55–70).

erence to Petrarch (Guarino, *Epistolario* II.826.19–20). Any reader of Guarino's letters must be struck by the fact that he was either blind to or willfully ignorant of the achievements of scholars in the fifteenth century. Presumably he had read some at least of Petrarch's works, but his silence prompts one to conclude that he did not consider them important. Nor does he ever mention that other great precursor of the Renaissance, the celebrated Giovanni Conversino da Ravenna, to whom he probably owed a great deal.⁴⁵ Typical of Guarino's patronizing attitude to scholars of the previous century is the sneer he casts at the Latin style of Salutati's mentor, Pietro da Muglio: *Adeo enim inepte, obscure et inusitate dicit, ut non tam loqui quam mugire videatur*.⁴⁶ There is here a play upon "Muglio" and *mugire*. The fact is that to Guarino and many of those he influenced, their predecessors seemed little better than cattle lowing in the darkness. The figure of Chrysoloras, by contrast, assumed the proportions of a colossus ushering in a new and better age.

Historical perspective has enabled us to assess Chrysoloras' contribution to learning more accurately. His instruction in Greek certainly led to the translations made by the Florentine pupils and by Guarino,⁴⁷ and in a less direct way helped to stimulate the recovery of lost manuscripts⁴⁸ and the study of Latin; but it could be argued that these advances would have been made in any case. Further, there was a demand for Greek in Florence and if the Florentines had not secured Chrysoloras they would probably have found some other teacher of Greek. If Chrysoloras made a unique contribution to the humanistic movement, it surely lay in the protreptic force of his personality and the educational methods to which he introduced the

⁴⁵ He definitely seems to have taught a notarial course to Guarino at Padua in the early 1390's. He is frequently confused with Giovanni dei Malpighini da Ravenna, the teacher at Florence and one-time amanuensis of Petrarch, since both men are commonly called "John of Ravenna" in English, or "Giovanni da Ravenna" in Italian. This confusion would not arise if he were referred to as "John of Buda," after the place of his birth. See E. M. Cosenza, *Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Italian Humanists* V (Boston 1962) col. 934.

⁴⁶ *Epistolario* I.34.57–59. For Pietro da Muglio see E. Wilkins, *Life of Petrarch* (Chicago 1962) 188, 193, 250.

⁴⁷ Up to 1416, Guarino had translated Lucian's *Calumnia*, Plutarch's *De pueris educandis* and lives of Flaminius, Marcellus, Alexander, Caesar, Coriolanus, Dion and Brutus (*Epistolario* I.47.88–93); Isocrates' *In Nicoclem* (*Epistolario* III p. 6) and (pseudo-) Isocrates' *Ad Demonicum* (*Epistolario* I.2).

⁴⁸ All the important discoveries were made by 1430 and the best of them, with the exception of the *codex Ursinianus* of Plautus and Tacitus' *Agricola*, *Germania*, and *Dialogus*, by 1422. For a convenient list of the discoveries, see Raoul Morçay, *La Renaissance* I (Paris 1933) 18–19.

Italians. He obviously used those methods in his teaching at Florence, because Bruni refers to them, but none of his pupils there, except for Vergerio, was a practising teacher, and if Guarino had not passed on the methods to Vittorino⁴⁹ and others they might not have become widespread; but as it was, thousands of students in the Renaissance were enabled to absorb massive amounts of grammar, syntax and cultural background. The fountain-head of all this activity was Chrysoloras. Bolgar is surely right when he says that in the last analysis the difference between the age of Petrarch and that of Guarino was “the appearance and widespread adoption of a pedagogic technique” (*Classical Heritage* 268).

It remains to ask why Chrysoloras came as a teacher to Italy. The answer seems obvious: he came because the Florentines wanted a teacher of Greek. But this explanation may be altogether too facile. In what follows, I hope to indicate that Chrysoloras may have had a political motive aside from his teaching activities.

Chrysoloras first came to Italy in 1394 to implore aid for the Eastern Empire in its struggle against the Turks. The diplomatic mission failed, but his intellectual verve and interest in education attracted favorable notice in Florence. In 1395, Coluccio Salutati sent Jacopo Angeli da Scarperia to Constantinople to contact Chrysoloras.⁵⁰ On March 28, 1396, Salutati wrote Chrysoloras with a definite offer of employment. Chrysoloras accepted, and arrived at Venice in August, 1396, and at Florence on February 2, 1397. He remained in Florence for almost three years. So much for the external circumstances of his visit. We should, however, examine what his real inducements were, or could have been. Did he come out of an altruistic desire to introduce the Greek alphabet to Florentine bankers, or did he have some deeper purpose in mind? To find the answer, we must examine first the political situation at Constantinople and second Chrysoloras' own position there.

The political scene in 1395 was dark indeed.⁵¹ Osman's victory over the Empire in 1301 at Baphaion had secured vast areas of its Asian territories for the Turks. His successor, Orhan (1326–1362), had by 1340 advanced the banners of Islam right up to the Empire in Europe.

⁴⁹ Vittorino was Guarino's pupil at Venice from 1418–1419.

⁵⁰ See Roberto Weiss, “Jacopo Angeli da Scarperia c. 1360–1410,” *Medioevo e Rinascimento, studi in onore di Bruno Nardi II* (Florence 1955) 803–837.

⁵¹ See Bernard Lewis, *Istanbul and the Civilization of the Ottoman Empire* (Norman 1963) ch. 1.

In 1345, John VI Cantacuzenus fought a civil war with John Palaeologus, in which he used Turkish mercenaries, who went home with tales of the riches to be had by further conquest. Murad I (1362–1389) took the hint and attacked the Balkans. Following a victory at Kosovo Polje, by 1389 the Turks had control of Serbia. By 1394, Bayezid I ruled practically all of what had been the Eastern Roman Empire, except for Constantinople itself. He declared himself “Sultan of Rum,” thus laying claim to the throne of the Caesars; and in 1395 he began to blockade Constantinople.

The ruling classes of Constantinople knew that the empire must find armed support or perish. The only aid they could hope to get lay in the West. But East and West in the old Roman Empire had been politically divorced since A.D. 476, and now the Holy Roman Emperor of the West had too many problems of his own to be concerned with what probably seemed to him and the other great powers of Europe a meaningless, sentimental appeal for rescue. Much more serious than the political division was the Great Schism between Rome and the Eastern Church, which had existed since 1054. The Papacy was obdurate in its claim for spiritual supremacy and would neither end the schism nor do much in the way of inciting political assistance except at its own price, which was total submission. To those who were genuinely of the Eastern persuasion, this was repugnant.

There were men in the West far-sighted enough to realize that the safety of Constantinople was strategically important to the West, but they were unable to make their voices heard with enough authority. It was therefore left to the East to take the initiative. The obvious move was to send embassies, such as the one in which Chrysoloras participated in 1394, to ask for troops or money. The situation was desperate enough for the Emperor himself to come in 1400, and he spent two years touring the courts of Europe in a vain attempt to drum up support. The West had proved notoriously laggard in responding to straight appeals for help. Something more than arguments and appeals was needed, and I believe that Salutati’s invitation to Chrysoloras may have suggested a secondary approach to him and his friend the Emperor.

It would encourage them to find a spark of interest in things Greek in Florence, for in general the Western Europeans were ignorant of or indifferent to Greek culture. But would they not also be quick to see in Salutati’s invitation an opportunity to promote Eastern interests?

If someone, somehow, could convince the right people in the West that the East had something worth saving—the entire heritage of Greek learning—then perhaps help would be forthcoming.

Florence was a major power and virtually the financial capital of Europe, with an influence out of all proportion to her size. Further, some of the financial magnates, such as Palla Strozzi, were the very men who were showing an interest in Greek. Strozzi and Salutati himself, the chancellor of the republic, were Chrysoloras' chief sponsors. Chrysoloras was a diplomat, a patriot and a scholar; he could not have failed to appreciate the possible advantages of conciliating such men. Admittedly, one is here in the realm of speculation—there is no evidence that Chrysoloras ever discussed the matter with Manuel Palaeologus but it would seem so obvious a move that one must suppose that such a conference took place.

The suggestion that Chrysoloras' visit was politically inspired seems even more plausible when one considers his social position in Constantinople. He was of noble rank and had access to court; he was the acknowledged head of a coterie of scholars who met in his beautiful house with its cypresses and hanging garden; he was neither poor nor unsuccessful. All this we know from the reminiscences of his pupil, Guarino.⁵²

The financial inducement of 150 gold florins could hardly have been enough to tempt a man in middle age to leave a comfortable home, a flourishing school, high social standing and the company of kindred spirits in the most civilized city in Europe, and commit himself to a teaching post he did not require in a foreign land whose manners and religion were alien to his whole background. There is no indication that he knew Italian, although he had taught himself Latin as an aid to diplomacy. Anyone who expected to deal with the West would naturally learn Latin.⁵³

The original terms offered in February, 1396, were a salary of 100 gold florins and a ten-year contract. Chrysoloras stipulated 150 gold florins and a five-year contract.⁵⁴ The raise of salary can be explained as a "prestige" increase, but why a five-year contract? The tendency with émigrés is to provide long-term security for themselves.

⁵² See in particular *Epistolario* I.25; also Girolamo Guarino's words (n.46 above).

⁵³ Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice* 47 n.48: "We know that Planudes was sent to Venice because he knew Latin."

⁵⁴ See Cammelli, 40–41.

Could it have been that he had no wish to commit himself for ten years to what might prove an abortive undertaking? Another condition imposed by Chrysoloras was the right to teach students in his own home rather than from a public platform in the university. Does this not suggest that he wanted a more intimate relationship with small groups of leading citizens? To convert them was to convert the effective power of Florence to the Greek cause; and how better to proselytize than in the congenial atmosphere of a home? Chrysoloras does not seem to have been much interested in uninfluential students.

In coming to Florence, moreover, he must have realized the risk of lowering his social status—a risk one would scarcely take whose motives were not strong. Patriotism and loyalty to his emperor, I believe, were his motives. Manuel Palaeologus could not have chosen a better emissary to win over the West on the cultural front, for Chrysoloras united in himself the best of Greek scholarship with the sharpest of Byzantine diplomacy.

His three years in Florence led to a stir of interest in Greek but not in the Greek cause. It seems to me, indeed, that he left Florence when he finally realized his failure to arouse the kind of support his country needed. Before his five-year contract had expired he left Florence on March 10, 1400, despite every effort on the part of the citizens to keep him, and virtually defected to the court of Giangaleazzo Visconti, the bitterest enemy of Florence.

Why did he leave? It used to be said that Niccoli's jealousy drove him out; but this reason is derived from invectives against Niccoli by other humanists,⁵⁵ and evidence drawn from invectives is always questionable. Besides, the carpings of one malcontent would hardly have been enough to drive Chrysoloras into the arms of Giangaleazzo Visconti, who had a reputation for being himself a ferocious individual. Vergerio attributed Chrysoloras' departure to "fear of the onrushing wars," but Cammelli (pp. 100–101) dismisses this. Nor could plague have been to blame. Admittedly, one occurred in Florence at the end of 1399, from which Chrysoloras took shelter in the villa of Palla Strozzi. But he then went on to Pavia, which at that time was also stricken.⁵⁶ Guarino tells us that Chrysoloras went to Pavia because

⁵⁵ See n.19 above.

⁵⁶ The studio had moved to Piacenza in 1398 because of plague at Pavia and did not return until 1403 (Magenta, *I Visconti e gli Sforza nel castello di Pavia* I [Milan 1883] 252; II 85, 87; also R. Maiocchi, *Codice diplomatico nell' università di Pavia* I [1905] 392, 408).

“the duke himself was unbelievably desirous of glory” (*Epistolario* II.862.78–79), a rather vague reason which can only be half the story.

Giangualeazzo was the rising power in Italy in 1400 and seemed poised to wrest power and prestige from Florence. Perhaps Chrysoloras reasoned that where he had failed in Tuscany he might succeed in Lombardy; and this accords with Cammelli’s statement (p. 128) that the real reason for Chrysoloras’ departure was the arrival of the Greek emperor in Italy. If Chrysoloras’ primary purpose had been to teach the Florentines Greek, his loyalty would have been to his pupils. Instead, he broke his contract and placed himself under the protection of their worst foe.

His subsequent career was almost entirely that of a diplomat. He did not remain constantly in Pavia from 1400–1402 but moved around in Lombardy trying to raise support for the emperor, for whose return he was paving the way. Cammelli points out (p. 117) that he remained in constant touch with the emperor, and also states: “Possiamo d’altra parte stabilire per mezzo di prove sicure che . . . l’imperatore lo aveva chiamato con uno scopo ben diverso, quello cioè di trovare in lui un efficace cooperatore alla missione per cui egli stesso si era deciso ad intraprendere il viaggio, e venuto in Italia, sul punto di partirne per la Francia, gli aveva affidato il preciso incarico di raccogliere denaro e procurare aiuti di ogni genere alla patria per la lotta contro il Turco.”⁵⁷

When Giangualeazzo Visconti died unexpectedly in September, 1402, Chrysoloras seems to have lost interest in remaining in Lombardy. The Florentines would have welcomed him back, but he had no desire to continue as a teacher in Italy. Manuel Palaeologus arrived in Venice about March 21, 1403, and was joined by Chrysoloras. Disappointed in their hopes, they returned to their capital.

In the next twelve years, Chrysoloras travelled extensively in Europe on diplomatic missions. From 1407–10 he visited Venice, Genoa, Paris, London, Salisbury, Spain and Bologna; from 1411–13 he was based in Rome but visited Florence with Pope John XXIII; in 1413 he was sent to the Emperor Sigismund to select a place for the Church Council, rejoined the Pope at Florence in 1414 and arrived in Constance as representative of the Greek Church on October 28 of that year.

⁵⁷ See also Guarino, *Epistolario* III p. 462, where Sabbadini comments that Chrysoloras went to Lombardy to win sympathy for the Greeks against the Turks.

Andrea Zulian tells us in the funeral speech that Chrysoloras invariably refused the offers of European princes to live with them; after visiting almost all the courts of Europe he returned to Greece “preferring to fulfill his true task, which was to save his country from danger rather than give delight to Italy.”⁵⁸ It seems that his true purposes in Italy were an open secret to the discerning. It might also be added that Vergerio’s phrase “fear of the onrushing wars” could easily refer to Chrysoloras’ growing anxiety over the imminent threat from the Turks to Constantinople.

One cannot leave this matter without dealing with his conversion to the Latin rite at the end of 1405. Dr. Baron (p. 111) cites a letter of Vergerio of 1406 in which Chrysoloras is mentioned as wanting to become a Latin: *cum cupiat esse Latinus*. It seems better to interpret this not as a desire to become a permanent resident of Italy but as a willingness to celebrate mass according to the Latin rite. At the end of 1405, Chrysoloras applied from Constantinople—his location is perhaps significant—for permission of Pope Innocent VII to take holy orders in the Western Church. His conversion was perhaps sincere, but it is also possible to see it as yet another conciliatory move to win favor in the West. If so, it was well-timed, for in 1406 Gregory XII took his famous oath to end the Great Schism. Chrysoloras was, after all, a famous man in Italy and a servant of the Eastern Crown, so that his submission could have been expected to oil the wheels of diplomacy. It need not surprise one that Chrysoloras could have indulged in an act of political expediency. Friedrich Heer has discussed political expediency on the part of the East and lists a number of political conversions to Rome.⁵⁹ Could Chrysoloras have been encouraged by the Eastern Emperor to gain the confidence of the Western Church? It is perhaps rash to speculate whether his eventual aim was the Papacy itself;⁶⁰ but anything could have happened in the melting pot at Constance, and in this connection it is worth pondering Vergerio’s words in the epitaph for Chrysoloras: “He died at the time of the General Council of Constance in such esteem that he was considered by all fit for the supreme office of priesthood.” This may have been merely a pretty compliment, or it may reflect a genuine feeling at Constance that Chrysoloras would have made a good pope. It is

⁵⁸ Cited by Rosmini, *La vita e disciplina di Guarino* I 67.

⁵⁹ *The Mediaeval World* (Eng. trans. Mentor Books, 1962) 128–130.

⁶⁰ A Greek Cretan, Alexander V, had been elected pope in 1409 at the Council of Pisa.

interesting to wonder what might have happened had Chrysoloras been elected.

The evidence, though largely circumstantial, is enough to make us consider a political motivation for Chrysoloras' visit, which we should view against the wider background of international affairs. No doubt Chrysoloras derived some satisfaction from his teaching activities in Italy, but his chief purpose may well have been, as Andrea Zulian says, "to save his country from danger rather than give delight to Italy."

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

January, 1966