A new Byzantine source concerning the reception of the Council of Florence: Theodore Agallianos' Dialogue with a monk against the Latins (ca. 1442).

Marie-Hélène Blanchet

LAUDATOR TEMPORIS ACTI
STUDIA IN MEMORIAM
IOANNIS A. BOŽILOV

VOL. II

IUS, IMPERIUM, POTESTAS, LITTERAE, ARS ET ARCHAEOLOGIA

На корицата: миниатюра от Codex Græcus Matritensis Ioannis Skyllitzes Synopsis Historiarum (MS Graecus Vitr. 26-2), f. 55v, съхраняван в Biblioteca Nacional de España
Източник: http://bdh-rd.bne.es/viewer.vm?id=0000022766

ISBN 978-619-176-130-2

ИНСТИТУТ ЗА ИСТОРИЧЕСКИ ИЗСЛЕДВАНИЯ
БЪЛГАРСКА АКАДЕМИЯ НА НАУКИТЕ

LAUDATOR TEMPORIS ACTI

STUDIA IN MEMORIAM IOANNIS A. BOŽILOV

Vol. II
IUS, IMPERIUM, POTESTAS
LITTERAE
ARS ET ARCHAEOLOGIA

curavit I. A. Biliarsky

Serdicae MMXVIII

СЪДЪРЖАНИЕ

IUS, IMPERIUM, POTESTAS

LITTERAE

ARS ET ARCHAEOLOGIA

Marie-Hélène Blanchet (Paris)

A NEW BYZANTINE SOURCE CONCERNING THE RECEPTION OF THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE: Theodore Agallianos' *Dialogue with a monk against the Latins* (ca. 1442)[1]

While the sequence of events of the council of Ferrara-Florence is fairly well known because a large number of narrative sources and archive materials have been published and studied[2], the same does not apply to the reception of this council inside the Byzantine Empire from 1440 onwards. Traditional historiography has tended to consider that the Union of Florence was doomed to be rejected by the Orthodox. However, it seems that opposition to the Florentine decree was set up quite slowly within the Byzantine Empire: the Synaxis, a party hostile to the Union of the Churches, was not really active before 1445, whereas in the early 1440s the Byzantine Church, headed by the new patriarch Metrophanes II, still remained faithful to the Union of Florence.

In this prospect, sources issued by anti-unionists from 1440 onwards deserve very careful consideration: they allow us to understand how the Orthodox opponents to the Union interpreted the recent events and which strategy they imagined in order to prevent the implementation of the Florentine decree. From this point of view, Theodore Agallianos' *Dialogue with a monk against the Latins* appears to be a key-text: this short work was composed in 1442, thus it is one of the earliest sources written by a representative of the anti-unionist tendency. Agallianos briefly recalls what happened in Florence and extensively comments on the consequences of the Union: he considers it a complete failure, not only as far

[1] I am very grateful to Clive Sweeting who kindly proofread the English language of this article.

[2] See especially the documents edited within the series Concilium Florentinum. Documenta et scriptores, Rome, 1940–1977 (11 vol.). For the history of the council of Florence, see J. Gill, *The Council of Florence*, Cambridge, 1959 ; K. Setton, *The papacy and the Levant (1204–1571)* 2. *The fifteenth century*, Philadelphia, 1978, 39–137; J. Meyendorff–A. Papadakis, *The Christian East and the rise of the Papacy. The Church 1071–1453 A.D.*, Crestwood [NY], 1994, 455–490.

as the council of Florence itself is concerned, but also as regards the very idea of reuniting the two Christian Churches.

Before coming to the content of Agallianos' *Dialogue*, let us shortly present the author and raise the question of the history of the text. Theodore Agallianos was born in Constantinople at the very beginning of the 15th century[3]: he was the very near contemporary of George Scholarios and Sylvester Syropoulos, and, like Sylvester, he made a career in the Patriarchate. In the course of the 1430s, he became a hieromnemon and thus took responsibility for ordinations and church consecrations[4]. Although he should have been a member of the Byzantine delegation which left for Ferrara in November 1437, in the event he did not join his fellow countrymen because of a sudden illness: therefore, he is one of the rare patriarchal officials not to have taken part in the council nor to have endorsed its result.

Agallianos seems to have written nothing significant before the *Dialogue with a monk against the Latin*s, whereas he would subsequently compose several treatises, firstly anti-unionist works, but also opuscules on the soul, and anti-Jewish pamphlets[5]. According to C. Patrinelis, the *Dialogue* was thus his first work, and went virtually unnoticed. There is today only a single manuscript, *Mosquensis gr.* 248[6], in which the *Dialogue* occupies approximately 20 folios, and nothing indicates that this text was read and quoted by its contemporaries. It sank into oblivion until it was published by Dositheos of Jerusalem in 1705, as an anonymous work[7], and

[3] For Agallianos' biography, see PLP n° 94; see also C. Patrinelis' introduction in Χ. Πατρινελης, *Ὁ Θεόδωρος Ἀγαλλιανὸς ταυτιζόμενος πρὸς τὸν Θεοφάνην Μηδείας καὶ οἱ ἀνέκδοτοι λόγοι του*, Athens, 1966, 26–42.

[4] For the office of hieromnemon, see J. Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les ὀφφίκια de l'Église byzantine*, Paris, 1970, 368–373.

[5] About Agallianos' works, see Πατρινελης, *Ὁ Θεόδωρος Ἀγαλλιανὸς*, 43 and M.-H. Blanchet, Bilan des études sur Théodore Agallianos : 1966–2011, *Ο Ερανιστής*, 28, 2011, 25–48, here 28–32. From the same period as the *Dialogue* date also the two letters to the metropolitan Pachomios of Amaseia: see *ibid.*, 38–40.

[6] See Архим. Владимир, *Систематическое описание рукописей Московской Синодальной (Патриаршей) библиотеки* 1. *Рукописи греческие*, Moscow, 1894, 332. For the history of this manuscript, see Б. Л. *Фонкич*, Иерусалимский патриарх Досифей и его рукописи в Москве, *ВВр*, 29 (1968), 275–299.

[7] *Δοσιθεος Ιεροσολυμων*, *Τόμος χαρᾶς*, Rimnik, 1705, 610–631. Dositheos had not discovered the identity of this „hieromnemon".

even then it gave rise to very few comments, including in the contemporary era. I have completed the critical edition and the translation into French[8].

The *Dialogue* features two characters: a monk who comes from Anatolia, more exactly from the region of Pontos, and Agallianos himself, referred to by his office of hieromnemon. The didactic aim of the text is obvious: the monk, who is very badly informed about the recent events connected with the Union of Florence, relies on rumours which he has heard, whereas Agallianos speaks authoritatively, corrects his errors and explains to him what, as a good Orthodox, he ought to think. Thanks to this stratagem, the author manages to present two points of view, that expressed by the monk and which we may consider popular, and the other echoed by a well-read cleric representative of the anti-unionist trend. Only the first part of the work is dedicated to the council of Florence: the following focuses on the Union of Lyons and also includes theological and ecclesiological developments. The whole treatise aims to show that the Union of the Churches is impossible and has to be rejected.

AN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF FAILURE

Agallianos' judgment on the Union which has been signed in Florence is very harsh. He thus writes: „But however, things being what they were, the above mentioned council was gathered. What was the result, as high as all these beginnings? I, actually, see nothing good: instead of union, rupture; instead of friendship, hatred; instead of harmony, discord"[9]. He ironically contrasts the noble goals which were set by the instigators of the Union with the poor results they eventually obtained.

Some explanations for this failure are proposed in the *Dialogue*. Agallianos expresses the general opinion that the Byzantine should on no account have gone to Italy and tried to achieve the Union, because they were obviously too weak. „But the idle head of our nation and the leaders of our Church did not look at their own weakness and did not understand

[8] Theodore Agallianos, *Dialogue avec un moine contre les Latins (ca. 1442). Édition critique, traduction et commentaire*, ed. M.-H. Blanchet (Byzantina Sorbonensia), Paris, 2013.

[9] *Ibid.*, 81.743–746: Ἀλλ' ὅμως οὕτως ἐχόντων συνεκροτήθη καὶ ἡ λεγομένη σύνοδος. Τί τὸ τέλος αὐτῆς τῶν προηγησαμένων πάντων ἐπάξιον ; Ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐ συνορῶ τι ἀγαθόν· ἀντὶ ἑνώσεως, διάστασις· ἀντὶ φιλίας, μῖσος· ἀντὶ ὁμονοίας, διχόνοια.

to which miserable extremity they had been reduced, nor that they lacked everything at the same time, territories, cities, nations, islands, East and West, and also money, properties, troops – troops on the land and on the sea –, power, wealth, splendour, not to say even their own bodies, possibly because of our sins"[10]. His lucidity is striking: as it is well-known, the Byzantine Empire in the middle of the 15th century no longer represented a powerful state, capable of negotiating on equal terms with the European and Asian powers which surrounded it. It only included the Constantinople area, between the strait of Gallipoli and Bosphorus, the coast of the Black Sea up to Mesembria and a large part of the Peloponnese; but the Balkans and the whole Anatolia were in the hands of the Turks since the end of the 14th century, so as Thessaloniki since 1430, whereas it had been the second major city of the Empire[11]. The Byzantine Empire was actually reduced to a small territory, without any strong army and without money.

Nevertheless, emperor John VIII Palaiologos went on displaying his diplomatic skills and hoped to be able to conclude the Union with the pope on worthwhile conditions. His state of mind before going to Ferrara is described by Agallianos as follows: „As they believed they could do more that the saints or the angels or the divine power itself, they conceived the idea of embarking to Italy in order to rectify the faith of the nations of these regions"[12]. In his *Memoirs*, Silvester Syropoulos ascribes to the emperor nearly the same words on the occasion of a preparatory meeting of the council in 1435. According to Syropoulos, John VIII would then have said: „if [the Union] is achieved, we shall correct the Church of the Latins

[10] *Ibid.*, 79.715–720: Ἀλλ' ὁ τοῦ ἡμετέρου ἔθνους ἀργηγὸς καὶ οἱ τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐκκλησίας προστάται, μὴ πρὸς τὴν οἰκείαν ἀσθένειαν ἀπιδόντες, μηδὲ συνιέντες ἐν οἵᾳ τῶν δυστυχιῶν ἐσχατιᾷ κατηνέχθησαν, μηδ' ὅτι πάντων ἁπαξαπλῶς ἐστέρηνται, τόπων, πόλεων, ἐθνῶν, νήσων, ἀνατολῆς καὶ δύσεως, ἔτι δὲ χρημάτων, κτημάτων, στρατευμάτων, τῶν κατ' ἤπειρον στρατευμάτων, τῶν κατὰ θάλασσαν, δυνάμεως, πλούτου, φαντασίας, ἵνα μὴ καὶ τῶν ἰδίων εἴπω σωμάτων, διὰ τὰς ἡμετέρας ἴσως ἁμαρτίας.

[11] See especially I. Djurić, *Le crépuscule de Byzance*, Paris, 1996, 239–382, and recently R. Estangüi Gómez, *Byzance face aux Ottomans. Exercice du pouvoir et contrôle du territoire sous les derniers Paléologues (milieu XIV^e^ –milieu XV^e^ siècle)* (Byzantina Sorbonensia 28), Paris, 2014.

[12] Theodore Agallianos, *Dialogue avec un moine*, 79.727–728: Πλέον δυνήσεσθαι οἰηθέντες ἢ οἱ ἅγιοι ἢ ἄγγελοι ἢ αὐτὴ ἡ θεία δύναμις, ἐς Ἰταλίαν ἀποπλεῦσαι διενοήθησαν ἐπὶ διορθώσει τῆς πίστεως τῶν ἐκεῖσε ἐθνῶν.

in numerous points“[13]. He was plainly unconscious of the terms of the theological debate: if the Byzantines had formerly outclassed the Latins in the religious controversy, there had been a role reversal since the development of scholasticism in the West, so that the orthodox theologians were now unable to refute properly the arguments of the Latins[14]. Agallianos alludes to the very low level of the Byzantine representatives who were in Florence: „Except for the saint metropolitan of Ephesus indeed, who was credited with both a holy life and the knowledge of letters, and some very few others who claimed to live a decent life, while being uncultivated, all the others, to remain decent in my comments, were widely unfit for such works and did not have the slightest experience“[15]. This poor opinion of the Byzantine theologians is fully confirmed by his contemporaries, both Syropoulos and Scholarios[16].

Not only were the Byzantine metropolitans incompetent, but they were also likely to let themselves be corrupted. This accusation was very widespread, as testifies also the famous sentence that Doukas attributes to the metropolitans themselves when they returned to Constantinople on February 1st, 1440: „we have sold our faith“[17]. Agallianos focuses in the

[13] *Les « Mémoires » du Grand Ecclésiarque de l'Église de Constantinople, Sylvestre Syropoulos, sur le concile de Florence (1438–1439)*, ed. V. Laurent (Concilium Florentinum. Documenta et scriptores 9), Rome–Paris, 1971, 150.22–24 and 151: Εἰ γοῦν γένηται, εἰς πολλὰ μέλλομεν διορθώσειν τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν ἐκείνην.

[14] See T. Kolbaba, The orthodoxy of the Latins in the twelfth century, in A. Louth–A. Casiday (ed.), *Byzantine orthodoxies*, Aldershot, 2006, 199–214, and J. A. Demetracopoulos, Thomas Aquinas' Impact on Late Byzantine Theology and Philosophy: The Issues of Method or „Modus Sciendi“ and „Dignitas Hominis“ in A. Speer–P. Steinkrüger (ed.), *Knotenpunkt Byzanz. Wissensformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen, 37. Kölner Mediaevistentagung, Köln, 14–17 September 2010* (Miscellanea Mediaevalia 36), Berlin, 2012, 333–410.

[15] Theodore Agallianos, *Dialogue avec un moine*, 79.731–734: Πλὴν γὰρ τοῦ ἁγίου τοῦ Ἐφέσου, ὅτι καὶ βίῳ ἁγίῳ καὶ σοφίᾳ λόγων κεκόσμητο, καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν λίαν εὐαριθμήτων βίου σεμνότητα δῆθεν μετερχομένων, ἀλόγων δέ, οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες, ἵνα σεμνότερον εἴπω, ἦσαν ἀνάρμοστοι τοῖς τοιούτοις ἐκ πολλῶν καὶ πείρας οὐδ' ἡστινοσοῦν μέτοχοι.

[16] See Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, 452.13–19 and 453; *Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, ed. L. Petit, X. A. Siderides and M. Jugie, Paris, 1936, 4, Lettre 2, À ses élèves, 403–410, especially 406.16–20.

[17] Ducas, *Istoria Turco-Bizantină (1341–1462)*, ed. V. Grecu, Bucharest, 1958, 271: […] οἱ δὲ ἀπεκρίνοντο· 'Πεπράκαμεν τὴν πίστιν ἡμῶν'.

very beginning of the *Dialogue* on the financial question, more exactly on the suspicion of accepting bribes which the members of the Byzantine delegation have incurred. The monk repeats the rumours that he has heard and presses on with his charges, without hesitating to utter the word „bribery" (δωροδοκία): „Believe, as I imagine it from what I hear, that bribery was not missing either, even if they [the Latins] did not press gifts on them all – that was not possible –, but it seems to me, however, that they bribed their leaders: because Latins would not have been able to succeed in such a feat"[18]. Actually, the most efficient Byzantine unionists were well and truly rewarded by the pope: for instance Bessarion and Isidore of Kiev were named cardinals on December 18th, 1439[19].

Agallianos does not give a precise account of the council of Florence: on the contrary he makes a very biased report in order to convince his reader that the Union was a wrong idea, a kind of trap into which the Byzantine State as well as the Church have together fallen.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE UNION

When asked by the monk in another part of the text about the current situation, Agallianos alludes clearly to an internal schism within the Byzantine Church because of the Union: „It is exactly what you previously said, as you noticed schisms and divisions among those who received the priesthood, and that the current patriarch is honoured by some and rejected by others: in itself, it shows that the Church has split"[20]. The argument is quite commonplace in the anti-unionist writings of the time: it

[18] Theodore Agallianos, *Dialogue avec un moine*, 37.97–100: Πίστευσον, ὡς εἰκάζω ἐξ ὧν ἀκούω, ὡς οὐδ' ἡ δωροδοκία ἀπῆν, εἰ γὰρ καὶ μὴ πάντας μετῆλθον τοῖς δώροις, οὐ γὰρ δυνατόν, ἀλλά γε τοὺς προὔχοντας αὐτῶν δοκεῖ μοι διαφθεῖραι· οὐ γὰρ ἂν τοσοῦτον πρᾶγμα κατορθῶσαι τοῖς Λατίνοις ἐξεγένετο.

[19] Isidore was invested with the rank of cardinal-priest of Saints Marcellinus and Peter, and Bessarion with the rank of cardinal-priest of the Twelve Holy Apostles: about Isidore, see C. Hannick, Isidore de Kiev, *DHGE*, 26, 1997, 197–201; about Bessarion, see recently G. Coluccia, *Basilio Bessarione. Lo spirito greco e l'Occidente*, Florence, 2009, here 67.

[20] Theodore Agallianos, *Dialogue avec un moine*, 39.121–123: Αὐτὸ τοῦθ' ὅπερ ἔφθης εἰπών, ὅτι τεθέασαι σχίσματα καὶ διαιρέσεις τῶν ἱερᾶσθαι λαχόντων, καὶ τὸν νυνὶ πατριάρχην ὑπὸ μὲν τῶν τιμώμενον, ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν ἀθετούμενον· αὐτὸ τοῦτο δηλοῖ μεμερίσθαι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

consists of the idea that if one tries to solve the schism between the Latins and the Orthodox, one will thus create another schism, even worse, within the Orthodox themselves[21]. By focusing on the ecclesiastical conflicts in Constantinople, Agallianos points out what he considers the most negative consequences of the Union for the Byzantines.

It is true that the metropolitans, when they returned from Florence to Constantinople in the beginning of 1440, had to face the hostility of the members of the orthodox clergy who had not gone to the council. The situation rapidly resulted in a split inside the Church. None of those who had remained free from any compromise agreed to take part nor even to attend liturgical celebrations presided by united clerics[22]. This measure applied in the first place to the new patriarch of Constantinople from May 1440 onwards, Metrophanes II, the former metropolitan of Cyzicus, who was present at Florence and a signatory of the bull of Union[23]: a part of the Byzantine clergy refused to recognize him and thus broke with the institution, even if it meant relinquishing their offices[24]. Agallianos reports: „Actually, each camp pushes the other away, or rather we are the ones who reject them and refuse to be in communion with those who accepted Latinism; but they move heaven and earth by all means in order to convince us to receive them in our communion"[25]. According to Agallianos, this resulted in the coexistence of two Churches, the one united with Rome and the other faithful to traditional Orthodoxy.

Agallianos pretends indeed that „another Church"[26] has been created by the unionists, as „they have conceived by themselves the structure of

[21] See for instance G. Dagron, Byzance et l'Union, in *1274 – Année charnière – Mutations et continuités*, Paris, 1977, 191–202.

[22] See Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, 546–549.

[23] About Metrophanes II (4/5 May 1440 – 1st August 1443), see PLP n° 18069.

[24] As in the case of Syropoulos and the great chartophylax Michael Balsamon, who both resigned from their offices in the Patriarchate: see Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, 560.27–28 and 561. As for him, Agallianos was suspended by the patriarch.

[25] Theodore Agallianos, *Dialogue avec un moine*, 39.124–126: Ἑκάτερον γὰρ μέρος ἀποστέργει θάτερον, μᾶλλον μέντοι ἡμεῖς ἀποσειόμεθα καὶ οὐ θέλομεν κοινωνῆσαι τοῖς τὸν λατινισμὸν καταδεξαμένοις· αὐτοὶ δὲ *πάντα λίθον κινοῦσιν* οἱῳδήτινι τρόπῳ καταπεῖσαι ἡμᾶς εἰς κοινωνίαν αὐτοὺς δέξασθαι.

[26] *Ibid.*, 39.120: Καὶ συνέστη νῦν ἑτέρα ἐκκλησία; („You mean that another Church has just been established?"). This „other Church" contrasts with „our Church": ἡ γὰρ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐκκλησία (*ibid.*, 45.209).

another Church, entirely Latin, which they completed with an archbishop, bishops and clergy"[27]. Actually however, the united Church headed by Metrophanes II was on no account „entirely Latin": it consisted of all the Byzantine clergy who held office before the Union and who, if they did not deny the Florentine decree, were henceforth in communion with Rome. Contrary to what the hieromnemon wants his reader to believe in the *Dialogue*, the „Latinization" produced by the Union of the Churches was essentially spiritual, so that the changes which had arisen were barely perceptible: the institution remained unchanged, as well as the liturgy, since the *Filioque* had not to be introduced into the Orthodox *Credo* because of the Union. There was no alteration to the previous ecclesiastical ritual apart from the addition of the commemoration of the pope[28]. Except for the last point, no innovation may be attributed to the unionists; on the contrary anti-unionists were those who parted from the Byzantine Church and founded afterwards a rival institution, the Synaxis – but this did not exist yet at the time when the *Dialogue* was written in 1442[29].

In this situation of open conflict, the official Church was obviously far more powerful than the anti-unionists. Agallianos got himself involved in the resistance to the implementation of the Union of Florence,

[27] *Ibid.*, 43.185–187: Οἳ δὴ καὶ καθ' ἑαυτοὺς ἑτέρας ἐκκλησίας συνεστήσαντο σύστημα, λατινικῆς πάντως, ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ τε καὶ ἐπισκόποις καὶ κλήρῳ ταύτην ἀπαρτίσαντες.

[28] The mention of the pope in the diptychs and his commemoration during the liturgy were introduced by patriarch Metrophanes II: see G. Hofmann, *Orientalium documenta minora*, Rome, 1953, 46–47.

[29] Agallianos does not hint at any organization which could be identified with a rising anti-unionist party. About the controversial question of the beginnings of the Synaxis, see J.-L. van Dieten, Der Streit in Byzanz um die Rezeption der Unio Florentina, *Ostkirchliche Studien*, 39 (1990), 160–180; G. E. Demacopoulos, The popular reception of the Council of Florence in Constantinople 1439–1453, *St Vladimir's theological quarterly*, 43 (1999), 37–53; Τ. Κιουσοπουλου, Ἡ κοινωνικὴ διάσταση τῆς σύγκρουσης ἀνάμεσα στοὺς ἑνωτικοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἀνθενωτικοὺς τὸν 15ο αἰώνα, *Μνήμων*, 23 (2001), 25–36, here 29–36; M.-H. Blanchet, L'Église byzantine à la suite de l'Union de Florence (1439–1445). De la contestation à la scission, *BF*, 29 (2007), 79–123, here 93–97; M.-H. Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios (vers 1400 – vers 1472). Un intellectuel orthodoxe face à la disparition de l'Empire byzantin*, Paris, 2008, 406–410 and 414–419.

so that he was first suspended[30], and then had to go into exile: it is unclear whether he had to leave Constantinople or was put under house arrest. He states: „they blamed me and returned so many times to the attack that I was compelled to choose flight and to send myself willingly into exile"[31]. Agallianos describes the repressive policy carried out by the Byzantine authorities, first of all by the patriarch: he refers to an organized repression, apparently well targeted, and hints at an atmosphere of widespread suspicion, a true system of spying[32]. Faced with these threats, which were certainly real[33], although perhaps somehow exaggerated, the only way, according to Agallianos, was to resist without fear as far as martyrdom, in imitation of the saints.

It is thus clear that the completion of the Union of Florence hardened the opposition between the pro-Latin trend and the anti-unionists in Constantinople. Each camp became more and more radical and came to express his point of view with a harsh and uncompromising tone.

THEORIZING ABOUT THE SEPARATION OF THE CHURCHES

Until 1439, reuniting the Church, the very body of Christ, appeared as an ideal and a moral duty for every Christian, whether Latin or Orthodox. After the council of Florence however, this idea was no longer prevailing in the Byzantine world. The anti-unionists, among which Agal-

[30] Theodore Agallianos, *Dialogue avec un moine*, 39.132–133: Χάριν τούτου με τοῦ ἱερᾶσθαι ἤδη δεύτερον ἔτος ἀπείργουσιν („for that reason, it is already the second year that they prevent me from celebrating").

[31] *Ibid*, 39.139–140: Τοσοῦτον ἔπνευσαν πάσαις ὁρμαῖς κατ' ἐμοῦ, ὡς ἀναγκασθέντα με φυγὴν ἀνθελέσθαι καὶ ἑκοντὶ τὴν ἐξορίαν αὐτὸν ἑαυτῷ διαπράξασθαι.

[32] *Ibid.*, 47.240–241: Πρὸς δὲ καὶ οὐκ ἀκίνδυνόν ἐστι τὸ περὶ τούτων διεξιέναι („moreover, it is not safe to expound those things"). *Ibid.*, 47.253–255: Εἴ πού τιν' ἐφεύρωσι τὰ περὶ τούτων διεξιόντα ὡς αὐτοὺς προσαγγέλλοντα, κἀκεῖνοι τὰς δεινοτάτας τῶν ἀπειλῶν ἐπισείουσι λίαν ἀπηνῶς μετελεύσεσθαι τοῦτον („if by chance they catch somebody denouncing them while expounding those questions, they brandish the most terrible threats to the effect that they will mercilessly hound that person").

[33] Let us mention Mark of Ephesus' exile to Lemnos: see L. Petit, Note sur l'exil de Marc d'Éphèse à Lemnos, *Revue de l'Orient chrétien*, 23 (1922–1923), 414–415. Mark's brother, John Eugenikos, also seems to have been exiled: see D. Zakythinos, *Le despotat grec de Morée [2]. Vie et institutions*, ed. C. Maltezou, London, 1975, 334–336.

lianos, elaborated from then on a theory according to which the Churches had to be and to remain separate.

In the second part of the *Dialogue*, Agallianos tackles the question of sanctity and, generally speaking, divine signs sent by God to the faithful. He claims to be able to observe that nobody in the Latin Church has been sanctified by God since the schism and he then argues from this statement that God dismisses the Latin Church. On the contrary, many signs are supposed to show that He favours the Orthodox Church. Agallianos thus writes: „God, as He appreciates the righteousness of the dogmas of our Church, produces divine signs through her and her children, while they are still in life as well as after their death, by revealing the holy relics; no such thing does exist in the Church of the Latins, because God turns completely away from her and feels disgusted with her because of her wrong doctrine"[34].

According to Agallianos, the Latin doctrine was indeed responsible for this estrangement on behalf of God: as they introduced the *Filioque* into the *Credo* and thus started to confess that the person of the Spirit proceeded both from the Father and the Son, the Latins undermined the person of the Spirit, in a way which amounted to blaspheming. As a result, the grace of the Spirit was definitely lacking within the Latin Church, and this was the reason for the absence of divine signs. „How indeed would it be possible that the power of the divine Spirit should be acting among them while he is blasphemed by them?"[35] It ensued also that even the pope of Rome should be deprived of the grace of the Spirit. Agallianos applies himself to proving by several examples that it is really so: he states that the pope has neither the power to excommunicate, nor to set someone free from an excommunication, as allegedly shows the case of Michael VIII Palaiologos, who could not be freed by the pope from the excommunication of patriarch Arsenios[36]. Agallianos concludes: „everyone can infer

[34] Theodore Agallianos, *Dialogue avec un moine*, 75.651–655: Ἀρεσκομένου τοῦ Θεοῦ τῇ τῶν δογμάτων ὀρθότητι τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐκκλησίας, δι' αὐτῆς καὶ τῶν αὐτῆς τροφίμων τὰς θεοσημείας ἐργάζεται, καὶ ζώντων καὶ μετὰ θάνατον, καὶ τῇ τῶν ἁγίων λειψάνων ἀναδείξει· ὧν οὐδέν ἐστιν ἐν τῇ κατὰ Λατίνους, ὡς ἀποστρεφομένου πάντως τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ μυσαττομένου ταύτην διὰ τὴν κακοδοξίαν αὐτῆς.

[35] *Ibid.*, 77.709–711: Πῶς γὰρ ἐνεργήσῃ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἡ τοῦ θείου Πνεύματος δύναμις τοῦ βλασφημουμένου παρ' αὐτῶν ;

[36] *Ibid.*, 67.534–539. About Arsenios, see PLP n° 1694. About Michael VIII' excommunication, see Georges Pachymérès, *Relations historiques*, ed. and tranl. V. Laurent and A. Failler (CFHB 24), Paris, 1984–2000, 1, 266–271.

that the grace of the Spirit is not on him [the pope] neither to bind, nor to loose"[37]. He thus challenges the very legitimacy of the pope and the ecclesiological foundations of the Roman Church, which were based on the words of Christ to Peter.

In this prospect, trying to reunite the Churches would not only prove to be impossible, but even damageable for the Orthodox. Agallianos presents the Latin Church as corrupted by a doctrinal error and, in the end, as infected by a heretic ferment. He thus wants to convince his reader to avoid any contact with the Latins or the pro-Latin trend in Constantinople and manages to be efficient in his proselytizing.

Only a few aspects of Agallianos' *Dialogue* were tackled here, whereas this source could also be examined more thoroughly in many other directions. It appears anyway that this text allows us to clarify our knowledge concerning the conditions of the reception of the council of Florence in the Byzantine Empire. The Union of the Churches was interpreted by Agallianos as a foreseeable disaster, a complete failure due to the weakness of the Byzantine rulers, especially John VIII Palaiologus. Faced with that situation, the anti-unionists refused to agree on any compromise with the pro-union trend within the Byzantine clergy and, despite the sacrifices it implied, cut all ties with the official Orthodox Church. Agallianos focuses on this internal schism which he considers an immediate consequence of the Union of Florence: whereas two tendencies previously coexisted in Constantinople, everyone had now to choose clearly one's camp. However, in 1442, when the *Dialogue* was composed, the balance of power between the two sides was still in favour of the unionists, so that the anti-unionists had to set against them more radical arguments. They began therefore to bring into disrepute the project of the Union of the Churches in itself and to harden their anti-Roman views: Agallianos' *Dialogue* perfectly reflects this new form of propaganda against the Latins.

[37] Theodore Agallianos, *Dialogue avec un moine*, 67.533–534: Ἐξ ὧν ἔξεστι παντὶ συνάγειν ὅτι χάρις Πνεύματος παρ' αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστι *τοῦ δεσμεῖν ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τοῦ λύειν*. Italics stand for a well-known quotation of the Gospel of Matthiew (16, 19), where Jesus institutes the Church and names Peter responsible for her: „whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven".