

# Mendicant Friars between Byzantium and Rome – Legates, Missionaries and Polemists (XIII<sup>th</sup>-XV<sup>th</sup> Centuries)

From the 1230s until the conquest of the Byzantine Empire by Mehmed II, Greeks and papal officials sent each other embassies on a recurrent basis because there was a need for them while the circumstances were favourable. The contacts between the Church of Rome and the Greek authorities, with the aim of narrowing the schism, were frequent. The mendicant friars, mostly Dominicans and Franciscans, were instrumental in that regard, as this period coincided with the emergence and development of these orders in the West, on the one hand, and with their implantation in the Orient on the other.

This study will be based mainly on Latin sources, out of the Curias of the Holy See and of the Mendicant Orders<sup>1</sup>. They show that the relations between the two Churches would occasionally reach high points – not only when official meetings were being prepared, but also when attempting to renew the frequently interrupted dialogue. Thus, during this long interval of three centuries, the exchanges never stopped completely and, quite often, it was at the friars' initiative that talks resumed. Sources also show that there were two distinct periods: for most of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, the Franciscans were predominantly involved, but after the Council of Lyon (1274) the Dominicans became the principal mediators. The friars were usually sent by the pope (although the emperor did send them as well) as nuncios or legates in order to reconcile the two main Christian communities, but they also intervened in diplomatic affairs, since political and religious issues were usually linked.

We will thus endeavour, based on these sources, to determine the place and the role of the mendicant friars in the relationship between Rome and Byzantium. We will also try to understand why the Franciscans seemed to be more present in the 13<sup>th</sup> century, while the Dominicans became more prominent in the following period.

## Setting the scene

### Favourable circumstances

The first decades of the 13<sup>th</sup> century were decisive for the development of the relationship between Rome and Constantinople. First, this came as a consequence of the Fourth Crusade (1204) and of the invasion by the Franks of a large part of the Byzantine Empire, through which Frankish authorities and a Latin ecclesiastical hierarchy were set up. That Crusade came about as a result of the growth of the commercial establishments of the Italians, mainly Pisan, Genoese and Venetian, whose rivalries and interventions in the dynastic quarrels in Byzantium had had such an effect on the stability of the empire. Besides, these interventions continued to occur and played a large part, in addition to the Crusade, in weakening imperial power<sup>2</sup>.

Constantinople became the capital of the Latin Empire, led by Baldwin of Flanders and his successors. The Villehardouins ruled in Achaëa, and the Lusignans had been granted Cyprus before the Fourth Crusade. Several families of the Byzantine aristocracy founded Greek states. The Laskaris family went to Anatolia and founded a new capital, Nicaea. From there, the Byzantine Empire would rediscover its central principle: public authority resting with the emperor, who is the source of all laws and the keeper of the orthodoxy<sup>3</sup>. A new dynasty, the Palaiologos, took power in 1258 and negotiated for the support of the Genoese in reconquering the Greek capital and in putting an end to the Latin Empire in 1261.

It is also during this period that the mendicant orders emerged: they were at once active proselytizers of the Latin doctrine in the Orient and staunch supporters of Papal authority. The political situation created conflicts for which the friars, being missionaries in Greek lands, were asked to find

1 About the Orient, the most useful edition, even if it is not perfect, is CICO. We therefore also used the edition of the École Française de Rome via BEFAR.

2 Balard, *Latins VII-VIII*. – Nicol, *Derniers siècles 434-435*. – *Monde byzantin* 314-315.

3 Patlagean, *Moyen Âge VII*. – *L'empire pluriel* 287.

solutions. They would mediate religious disputes between Rome and Constantinople in a strictly ecclesiastical context – but not exclusively, because of the essential role played by the emperor in the Orthodox Church. Therefore, the discussions between the friars and the Greek were at the same time official and informal, integrated as they were in daily life.

### The Crusade and the end of the schism

In the context of the relationship between the pope and the Greek authorities, these two questions were closely linked<sup>4</sup>. As writes F. Cardini about the pontificate of Nicholas IV, the dichotomy between mission and crusade is a non-issue<sup>5</sup>. The various popes that succeeded each other during this period considered themselves keepers of the peace that had to prevail over the Universal Church. From their perspective, the return of the Greeks under Roman dominion was essential to peace. Ending the schism was therefore necessary in order, first, to protect the Christian world and the Holy Lands, and then the Greek Empire, against the Muslim leaders<sup>6</sup>. Thus the pope could only organize a Crusade if the Greeks saw fit to end the schism. The issue of military aid to the West was at the heart of the discussions during the whole of the 14<sup>th</sup> century, as the pope declared the return of the Greeks under his rule the prerequisite for a Crusade against the Turks<sup>7</sup>.

### The religious disagreement, dogmatic positions and the issue of rites

The disagreement between Rome and Byzantium arose during the 9<sup>th</sup> century, following the emergence of the Carolingian Empire, which put an end to the universal Roman Empire and had numerous political and religious consequences. The Greeks were very attached to their traditions and the role of the emperor was redefined towards the end of the 9<sup>th</sup> century by a text of a constitutional nature, the *Eisagoge*<sup>8</sup>. The Patriarch Photios, who compiled it, tried to clarify the powers of the two heads of the empire, the emperor and the patriarch, with the intention of asserting the supremacy of the Patriarchate<sup>9</sup>. However, even in this context, the emperor is defined as the pious keeper of orthodoxy; from then on, this role is included in the list of official imperial titles. This outcome came as the result of a long tradition, dating to the reign of the first emperor, Constantine the Great, who had been forced to convene the first ecumenical council in Nicaea in 325 in order to keep the civil peace. From then on, any religious divergence had to be reconciled by a council, an assembly of all the prelates of the empire legally convened by the emperor himself. Under Carolingian rule, the power

of the pope, in Rome, had been established and gradually affirmed during the papacies of Nicholas I and Adrian II. Photios had to specify his own role in relation to the emperor but also in relation to the pope. According to the Greeks, the last ecumenical council took place during his patriarchate. The council convened in Constantinople by the Emperor Basil I in 879-880 ended the first schism between Rome and Constantinople. Photios, who had been condemned by a previous council in 870 at the request of the pope, was rehabilitated. Nevertheless, important questions remained unanswered, such as the right to appeal to the Roman jurisdiction (indeed, the Roman Church was not recognized as »head« of all Churches, despite the instructions given by the pope to his legates) and the *Filioque*. In fact, the reverse is true, as the Council of 880 sanctioned once again the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed and forbid any addition or modification to this »ancient definition of faith«.

None of these issues had actually been resolved and the debates, in the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries, concerned two points that were central to the conflict between Rome and Constantinople: obedience to Rome and the place of the pope in the ecclesiastic hierarchy, on the one hand, and the addition of the *Filioque* to the creed – the organization, therefore, of the Trinity – on the other.

First, the Greeks thought of the Church as a collegial organization, which was a legacy of the apostolic era. Again, Photios was the one who theorized these points, because he wanted to assert the authority of Constantinople against the pope in Rome. He promoted what is called the Pentarchy. According to this theory, the Church should be ruled by five patriarchs, successors of the Apostles: Peter had founded Antioch and Rome, Mark, Alexandria, James, the see of Jerusalem; as far as Constantinople is concerned, the Greeks claimed that Andrew, based on the hagiography and his *Life*, had founded the see of Byzantium. Thus, decisions had to be made by a gathering of apostles, met in council, and the pope, being Peter's successor, would only be one among them.

As far as the *Filioque* is concerned, the Greeks accused the Latins of making an illegal innovation. According to them, a detail had been added to the definition of the Council of Constantinople I (381), as expressed in the Creed stated at the Council of Nicaea (325) and clarified at the Council of Constantinople I (381). Actually, that innovation had first appeared in the Carolingian Church in the 9<sup>th</sup> century; it introduced a modification in the organization of the Trinity, since the Holy Spirit was created equally by the Father and the Son (*Filioque*). The Greeks were attached to the definition of 381, which said that the Holy Spirit came from the Father and was due the same adoration and glory as the Father and the Son.

4 See Geanakoplos, Michael Paleologos. – Setton, Papacy.

5 Cardini, Niccolò IV 14-17.

6 In July 1274, after having sworn an oath of union with Rome, the ambassadors of Michael VIII promised the help of the empire in defending the Holy Lands, CICO V 1, no. 49.

7 Delacroix-Besnier, Revisiting.

8 Regesten der Kaiserurkunden 2 no. 505b (dat. 885/6).

9 Dagron, Empereur 236-241.

Since the times of Photios, the Greeks had compiled lists of the errors made by the Latins, and these lists had been getting longer and longer<sup>10</sup>. They covered rituals, such as the use of unleavened bread by the Latins, or even dogma, the concept of Purgatory for example. Therefore, the Greeks had always accused the Latins of »guilty« and illegal innovations with regard to the Canons, particularly since they only recognized as authoritative the Canons of the first seven ecumenical councils and the Church Fathers. Indeed, the Greeks considered the Council of 869-870 to be illegal. They judged that the only way to end the schism was to respect the traditions of the Church, and to convene an ecumenical council where all the prelates of Christendom would meet. Only they could debate the disagreements and settle them. The Greeks never ceased to ask that it be convened<sup>11</sup>.

### **The conflicts between the two ecclesiastical hierarchies and the place of the mendicants in their resolution**

The occupation of Greek territories by the Latins was another point of dispute. A Latin hierarchy had been superimposed on the hierarchy of the Greek Church and, beyond conflicts of authority, this resulted in the spoliation of the goods and property of the Greek clergy<sup>12</sup>.

After 1204, an accord was reached that negotiated the sharing of power in Constantinople: the Venetians were granted the patriarchate and the Franks received the imperial throne. But the Venetians also got what had been their priority: a monopoly on commerce, the control of navigation in the straits and access to the Black Sea. The other Oriental patriarchates were also given a Latin titular, even in Alexandria, which was under Muslim rule<sup>13</sup>. All clergymen were, in theory, to follow their discipline. The popes had to send legates on a regular basis to settle disputes between the Latin authorities and the clergymen of the Oriental rite. Studies of lists of these legates have shown that mendicant friars played an increasing role in these after the 1240's. Before then, the pope's envoys were generally cardinals, or a patriarch from Jerusalem. The example of Cyprus helps understand the efforts of the friars with the Oriental Christian communities, because of the strained relations and of the legation of two mendicant friars, Lawrence of Portugal OFM in the 13<sup>th</sup> century, and Peter Thomas in the 14<sup>th</sup> century<sup>14</sup>.

### **Friars, nuncios and legates attempt to resolve local disputes: the example of Cyprus**

Richard the Lion-Heart conquered Byzantine Cyprus in 1191. He then sold the island to Guy of Lusignan, who had been deposed as King of Jerusalem when Saladin took the Holy City in 1187. The Lusignan dynasty ruled Cyprus until 1474. During the Latin conquest, the majority of the population belonged to the Greek Chalcedonian Church, but other Oriental Christian communities lived in Cyprus, as well as Syrians of many different creeds and Armenians. The number of Christians kept increasing even as the Turkish conquest advanced in Syria and in Palestine. One need only think of the capture of Acre in 1291 and of Ayas, in Armenian Cilicia, in 1337. This influx of non-Chalcedonian Christians made matters more complicated, by creating a kind of triangular relationship; the jurisdiction of these communities was claimed both by their traditional tutelage, the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and by the new Latin hierarchy established by the pope after the conquest. The formation of the Latin hierarchy gave rise to several rounds of conflicts and negotiations, all the more so as debates concerned also the jurisdiction of non-Chalcedonian communities. There were lengthy talks between the Greek and Latin hierarchies; civil authorities were also involved in mediation, with the double aim of protecting Latin interests and maintaining social peace.

Lawrence of Portugal OFM was sent by Pope Innocent IV between two bouts of strife, the first of which, during the reign of Alice of Lusignan (1220-1222), led to an initial compromise. The second resulted in the promulgation of the *Bulla Cypria*.

According to the Limassol agreement, the Church of Cyprus would be ruled by only one archbishop, with its seat in Nicosia and belonging to the Latin hierarchy. All other prelates, both Greek and Latin, would have to take an oath of fealty; yet the oath, coming from the Occidental tradition, was unthinkable for the Greek clergy. The number of Greek prelates would go from 13 to 4. These measures provoked grave conflicts. The legation of the Franciscan Lawrence of Portugal lasted about two years (1246-1248); he made important concessions to the Greeks and, because he had to protect the monks of Saint-Margaret of Agros from Latin brutality, he stepped in between the Latins and the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Robert of Nantes. He also negotiated the return from exile of the Greek Archbishop Neophytos, who had fled

10 Particularly those of Keroularios: Kolbaba, Lists 12.

11 Nicol, Requests.

12 Voisin, Monastères grecs.

13 Fedalto, La Chiesa 2; about the Alexandrian Patriarchate: 34-35.

14 Schabel, Religion. – Schabel, Martyrs.

to Armenia because he feared for his safety. He and his suffragans took advantage of Friar Lawrence's indulgence and asked for the abolition of this jurisdiction and the restoration of the thirteen Greek bishoprics, in exchange for their direct obedience to the Holy See. The tithes collected by the Latins would also be given back to them. Pope Innocent IV deemed these concessions excessive, and so he sent a new envoy in 1249, Cardinal Eudes of Chateauroux, to investigate the situation. The pope agreed to the election of a new archbishop after the death of Neophytos in 1251, and he validated the results. The new legate promulgated two important pieces of legislation, the Institutions in 1249 and a Constitution in 1254. He thus carried over the politics of tolerance of Innocent IV, both on the level of ecclesiastical discipline and of rites. The requests sent by the pope to his legate in 1254 were moderate; he did not want to Latinize their practices, just to restrain some of them. However, the issue of the independence of the Greek hierarchy was not resolved and the Latin Archbishop of Nicosia, Ugo di Fagiano, was strongly opposed to this conciliatory attitude. Further papal interventions were therefore necessary. As early as 1255, Alexander IV tried to place the Greek hierarchy back under the authority of the Latin Archbishop of Nicosia, and the *Bulla Cypria* was promulgated in 1260.

Tensions continued to run high, notably in 1313 during the legation of Pierre Pleinecassagne, Patriarch of Jerusalem, who opposed the prostration of the Greeks before the Host prior to its consecration. The legate had to confront the mob that had followed the Greek bishops, coming to his residence to discuss with him the various disagreements between them. The archbishop's palace could have been burned to the ground if the forces of the constabulary had not intervened. The bishops were imprisoned for a while for inciting the crowd to attack the legate. To calm things down, Pope John XXII offered a very moderate solution: the bishops were to teach the faithful about this issue. They should not forbid them from showing their devotion to the priest while he was celebrating the Eucharist – rather, the priest himself should inform the attendants when the Host had been consecrated so that they could then kneel. While these events were occurring, the Archbishop of Nicosia was John, a Dominican friar. He held that post for at least 20 years (1312-1332) and it is possible that he favoured moderation<sup>15</sup>. His generosity left quite an impression, since Cypriot chroniclers still talked about it in the 15<sup>th</sup> century. He had instituted an annual ecumenical procession, on the day of the anniversary of a deadly flood, so that God could protect the population<sup>16</sup>.

But conflicts kept recurring, and Peter Thomas was sent in turn to try improving relations. His legation in the Orient

lasted a long time (1356-1364) and was complex, because the mission was at once diplomatic, military and religious. It is indicative on many levels of the Oriental policies of the papacy, just as it is representative of the religious history of Cyprus under Frankish rule. When he left for Constantinople in 1356, he had to bring significant military reinforcements to fight the Turks who had just landed on the European shore of the Bosphorus, near Gallipoli. The pope was thus responding to the request of John V Palaiologos, who promised in return the obedience of the Greeks. The war between Venice and Hungary prevented a league against the Turks from being formed. The first stage of Peter Thomas' mission had been to put an end to this war, but he failed. The following year, he received a declaration of Catholic faith from the emperor, who also pledged to take part in the process of ending the schism. The legate, sent in 1359, had several tasks to tackle at once: he organized the defence of Smyrna, tracked Latin heretics in Candia and debated with some Greeks, even persuading them, according to his biographer, to convert. His stay in the Orient was most likely long enough to allow him to fully listen to the Orientals.

He was in Cyprus in 1360 when he called the Greek clergy to meet in Saint-Sophia Cathedral in Nicosia, hoping to convince them to agree to comply with Rome. The Greek priests then opened the doors of the church and let in the mob that was shouting death threats at the legate. This violent incident brought to mind the siege of the archbishop's palace in 1313; this one ended similarly, with the constabulary forces restoring order. Peter Thomas then revived the tradition created by John, the Archbishop of Nicosia, who had organized, after the incident of 1313, an ecumenical procession. Like John, Peter Thomas walked among the crowd; he then realized that all Christians, Roman Catholic, Orthodox and non-Chalcedonian, formed a single community of faith<sup>17</sup>. Peter Thomas eventually became Patriarch of Constantinople. In that role, he gave his support to the King of Cyprus, who was planning a Crusade against the Mamelukes.

One could point out that these violent acts coincided, at least for two of them, with the presence of a pontifical legate. However, upon closer inspection, two facts should be noted: when he arrived in the Orient, the legate would adhere strictly to the instructions in the letter of his legation. But over the duration of his stay, his stance would become more and more moderate. Furthermore, these two legates were mendicant friars and close to the pope (Lawrence was penitentiary to Innocent IV and Peter Thomas was a Master Theologian appointed to the pontifical school); they both lived a long time among the Greek population. These two elements can probably explain the softening of Papal policies.

15 Fedalto, *La Chiesa* 2, 174.

16 Delacroix-Besnier, *Dominicains* 40.

17 Schabel, *Religion* 157.

## A Franciscan 13<sup>th</sup> century: the revival of the union and the Council of Lyon

### From Nicaea to Constantinople

Dominicans and Franciscans appear in the pontifical archives, sometimes together – as during the Nikaia-Nymphaion negotiations – but mostly separately. However, the Friars Minor were very much involved and the friary of Constantinople played an important part.

After the shock of the Fourth Crusade, the two capitals of Christendom renewed relations during the 1230s. Talks with Rome were initiated by four Friars Minor coming from the Holy Land in 1232<sup>18</sup>. Patriarch Germanos II, who received them, requested that the pope send more envoys in order to continue them. Four nuncios, two Franciscans and two Dominicans, Haymo of Faversham and Rodolph of Reims OFM, Peter of Sezanne and Hugo OP, all Masters of Theology, arrived in January 1234 in Nicaea, capital of the Greek Empire after its withdrawal into Anatolia. This first stage was important because right from the start, the characteristics of all meetings to follow over the next two centuries became evident: the topics that would be broached, the pursuit of a compromise by the emperor, the tensions, the irritations and the inflexible positions held by both parties. The talks between the nuncios and the Greek prelates lasted several months, until May. The accounts that they wrote identify two phases. The first took place in the imperial palace or in the patriarch's mansion, in Nicaea, and the second in Nymphaion, which was the imperial resort, in the house of the patriarch. This second phase shows that this was indeed the first step of a conciliar project, as both parties officially discussed the possibility of a council to be convened by the emperor and which would bring together the nuncios and four patriarchs. The text also shows that, 30 years after the fall of Constantinople, the Greeks were still deeply resentful: they reminded their counterparts that the churches of the capital had been plundered. But the Emperor John III Doukas Vatatzes insisted several times on a moderate approach, because he wanted the two delegations to come to an agreement. The most keenly debated issue was the question of the procession of the Holy Spirit; it occupied all of the first phase, until the middle of March. When the council was convened in Nymphaion after Easter, Patriarch Germanos II wanted to continue the previous discussion, but the nuncios preferred to debate the question of unleavened bread instead, as they had already asked in January. As the debates came to a close and the nuncios said they wanted to leave, the emperor tried and failed to bring them to an agreement: all should adopt Rome's position on the question of unleavened bread and the Greeks' on the procession of the Holy Spirit. However, both parties refused to

budge. The nuncios' report describes the irritation the Greeks felt in connection with the use of syllogism; it also reports how difficult it was for them to defend their positions – these two points recur frequently in the Greek sources.

Once again, it was the Greek authorities who insisted that talks resume in the 1240s. Aware of the rapprochement between the papacy and the Mongols in the wake of the first Council of Lyon (1245), the Emperor John III Doukas Vatatzes requested that Pope Innocent IV send nuncios. It seems that his daughter Maria, wife of King Bela IV of Hungary, was instrumental in this decision. At the end of 1246, she had sent to the Curia two Franciscan friars from her retinue, James, Minister of the province of Hungary, and Roman, the King's confessor, to ask the pope if it was possible to reopen negotiations. The pope answered favourably on 30 January 1247<sup>19</sup>. The Emperor then asked the Constantinople friars for advice; they recommended that he send the envoy of the Minister General of the order, John of Parma, to the pope. Two friars from Constantinople, Salimbene and Thomas, reader of the friary, had gone to Lyon to make this request. They were both perfectly fluent in Latin and in Greek. They brought with them two letters, one from the emperor, the other from the Patriarch, Manuel II. In May of 1249, Innocent IV named John of Parma head of the legation, which then left for Nicaea, along with the friars from Constantinople and several other Friars Minor: Dreux, theologian and preacher, Minister of the province of Burgundy, Bonaventura of Iseo who had been Minister of the provinces of Genoa, Bologna and the March of Treviso. It is probable that Gerardo of Borgo San Donnino was also there, and many others whose name is not known. The legate could convene a council to force the Greeks to accept the Creed of the Roman Catholic Church<sup>20</sup>. It seems that he was also given a secret diplomatic mission: to break up the alliance between the emperor and Frederick II<sup>21</sup>. The legation likely arrived in Nicaea in the winter of 1249-1250. John of Parma called for a synod, to which the emperor and the patriarch participated. The topics that were debated were the issues of the *Filioque* and the use of unleavened bread by the Latins – two key points of discord. The talks lasted well into the spring, and the legation was able to return to Lyon accompanied by the imperial *apocrisarii*, the Archbishops of Kyzikos and of Sardis, the Count Angelos, as well as Theophylaktos, the great translator. Innocent IV was delighted that they came, because it meant the end of the schism was near<sup>22</sup>. It seems, however, that the conclusions of the negotiations were not so clear-cut<sup>23</sup>. In any case, the documentation shows that a text was written after the debates between the two Churches. The death of John Vatatzes did not end the talks, which resumed as soon as his successor, Theodore II Laskaris (1254-1258), was named. William of Rubruck

18 Disputatio Latinorum.

19 CICO IV 1, no. 34.

20 CICO IV 1 no. 70-71.

21 Roncaglia, Frères mineurs 105.

22 CICO IV 1 no. 76.

23 According to G. Golubovich, John of Parma's legation ended happily, Golubovich, Biblioteca 227-228. – Roncaglia, Frères mineurs 113, believes that the legation did not come to an agreement.

OFM, while he was on his way to the Mongol Empire, met in Nicaea with two Friars Minor, Bartholomew of Cremona and friar Thomas, Minister of the province of Romania. It is also probable that the Bishop of Orvieto, Constantine OP, of whom we will say more later, had gone to Nicaea as well at the beginning of Theodore Laskaris' reign. It thus appears that the missionaries and the friaries of the Orient played a remarkable role, as early as the 1240s, and were essential to the development of the relationship between the Pope and the Greek Emperor.

Soon after Michael VIII Palaiologos reconquered the Greek capital in 1261, talks resumed once more at the request of the Greek emperor. An embassy arrived in the early summer, bringing letters to the pope translated in Latin<sup>24</sup>. It was composed of a monk, Maxim Alubardes, and of two lay people, Andronikos Muzalon and Michael Abalantes. The pope responded to the emperor by acknowledging the arrival of his embassy and by sending it back with a memorandum on the primacy of the pope. In his letter, the pope at once condemned the Genoese for having helped Michael Palaiologos put an end to the Latin Empire and appealed for peace and unity among all Christians. He also announced the coming of his *apocrisarii*, four Friars Minor, Simon of Auvergne, Peter of Moras, Peter of Crest and Boniface of Ivrea, whom the letter describes as angels of peace, erudite and humble men<sup>25</sup>. A few days later, on 28 July 1263, the pope signed another letter for his envoys, granting them the authority of legates »of the Apostolic See«. It seems that the friars' departure was delayed for an unknown reason, and Michael Palaiologos, who was impatient to have the talks begin, sent Nicholas, Bishop of Cortona, an Italian from the South and thus bilingual. Both parties recognized him as an authority, because he had written the treatise *Libellus de fide*, at the request of Theodore II Laskaris in 1255, and then sent it to Michael VIII Palaiologos. It had been translated into Latin in preparation for the talks between the two Churches. In 1262 or 1263, Pope Urban IV gave a copy to Thomas Aquinas who then wrote *Contra errores Graecorum* which he dedicated to him<sup>26</sup>. That treatise therefore seemed to be widely circulated in the Curia and the Byzantine court, at a time when everyone wished for the dialogue to be re-established. After meeting with Nicholas of Cortona, the pope became convinced both of the willingness of the emperor to restore the union between the two Churches, and of the compatibility of the Greek and the Roman faiths. The Bishop of Cortona returned to Constantinople, carrying a letter from the pope dated 23 May 1264, and accompanied by two new pontifical nuncios, the Friars Minor Gerard of Prato and Rainier of Siena. In his letter, the pope went over the arguments the emperor used to explain the

deadlock that broke up the talks, namely, that it was difficult to understand one another without an interpreter. Nicholas had thus become, as translator, essential to the progress of the negotiations; the pope said of him that he was a true preacher of the Catholic faith and that he could explicate the Holy Scriptures with great intelligence<sup>27</sup>. So, Gerard of Prato and Rainier of Siena left with him for Constantinople; the emperor handed them a somewhat ambiguous declaration of faith, but with very favourable conditions added. Meanwhile, Pope Urban IV had died and his successor did not respond to the emperor until March 1267, when he asked the emperor to give him a more explicit declaration of faith<sup>28</sup>. This latest exchange between the pope and the emperor was interrupted by the death of Clement IV in November 1268, and by the lengthy power vacuum that followed. Gregory X was only elected in 1271.

The new pope got to work with zeal and from Palestine, where he had been when he learned of his election, he sent friars, most likely Franciscans, to inform Michael VIII that he wished the negotiations to resume quickly. The emperor chose John Parastron, a Greek friar from the friary of Constantinople, to carry imperial letters to the pope<sup>29</sup>. He probably arrived in Orvieto in 1272. The pope answered in October of 1273 by sending a legation which announced the convening of a council of union. The members of the legation were four Friars Minor who were probably chosen by Bonaventura of Bagnoregio, then Minister General of the order. It was led by Girolamo d'Ascoli, the future Pope Nicholas IV. The three friars with him were: Raymond Berenger, Bonagratia of San Giovanni in Persiceto and Bonaventura of Mugello<sup>30</sup>. John Parastron and Girolamo d'Ascoli who were leading the negotiations both spoke Greek, making the discussions easier. In his letter to the emperor, Gregory X invited the emperor to attend a general council, to be held in May 1274<sup>31</sup>. Meanwhile, the legates were to discuss the conditions of the union and the pope sent the declaration of faith of Clement IV, a document which was likely to be amended. Once the terms of the accord were determined, the council would validate them. But the debates dragged on and Girolamo d'Ascoli decided to send friars Raymundus Berengar and Boniface of Mugello back to the Curia to inform the pope of the state of the negotiations<sup>32</sup>. The main obstacle was the addition of the *Filioque* by the Latins but John Parastron was optimistic and thought it could be overcome. He knew the Greeks well because he had frequently attended their services in Constantinople, and the Greeks appreciated his piety<sup>33</sup>. He also knew how hostile they were to that addition to the Nicaean Creed. Girolamo d'Ascoli did share that optimism in the report that he gave to the friars to deliver to

24 CICO V 1 no. 6. – Regesten der Kaiserurkunden 3 no. 1911.

25 CICO V 1, 14-25.

26 Dondaine, Nicolas de Cotrone.

27 CICO V 1, no. 10.

28 CICO V 1, no. 23.

29 CICO V 1, no. 32. – Regesten der Kaiserurkunden 3 no. 1986.

30 CICO V 1, no. 33.

31 CICO V 1, no. 32.

32 Roncaglia, Frères mineurs 154.

33 Roncaglia, Frères mineurs 150, quoting George Pachymères.

the pope<sup>34</sup>. In Constantinople, he had met one of those in favour of the union, George Metochites, and they had gotten on quite well. Despite Patriarch Joseph's firm opposition, the negotiations did succeed. Michael VIII sent his nuncios with the task of confirming the union<sup>35</sup>. The council convened in Lyon<sup>36</sup>. Gregory X had summoned all the greatest theologians so that they might give their opinion on the positions of the Greek Church. Thomas Aquinas OP died while he was on his way, but he had already given his opinion on these issues when he had examined Nicholas of Cortona's *Libellus de fide*. Humbert of Romans OP had devoted a part of his *Opus tripartitum* to the Greek problem, recommending in particular that the friars learn Greek. Albertus Magnus OP and Peter of Tarentaise OP were also present. Above all, Bonaventura of Bagnoregio, the great Franciscan theologian, who had been put in charge of writing a summary that would be acceptable by all, died from exhaustion on 15 July 1274. In accordance with their mandate, the envoys of Michael VIII recognized the primacy of Rome and the truth of the Roman faith<sup>37</sup>. The council ended with a solemn service celebrated on 6 July in Saint-John's Cathedral. But the union still had to be accomplished factually, and the opposition to it in Constantinople remained considerable. There is no need to delve too deeply into this matter, but suffice it to say that the emperor had to depose Patriarch Joseph, who had become the champion of the anti-unionist cause, and resorted to persecuting the opponents to silence them. During those years, several Roman legations in succession came to see Michael VIII and his son Andronikos, who was close to the throne, in order to secure from them clear and definite declarations of allegiance to the Roman faith, since George Akropolites' oath, who was a lay person, had been neither. Friars Minor, who had already done so much, kept going back and forth between Rome and the Greek capital. In May 1276, Innocent V named once again Girolamo d'Ascoli head of one of those legations; three other Friars Minor were with him: Guido, Minister of the province of Rome, Angelo di San Francesco and Gentile di Bectonio<sup>38</sup>. The death of the pope put an end to the legation, and his successor, John XXI, entrusted it instead to a group of Dominicans, as we shall see later.

In other words, there were exceptions during this mostly Franciscan century: the first was the legation, in 1256, of Constantine OP, Bishop of Orvieto. For that year in the pontifical archives there is a hefty file about his mission, but without any precise dates except for the year of issue<sup>39</sup>. Included in it are the conditions necessary to realize the union between the two Churches, as negotiated in 1250 by the delegation led by John of Parma OFM and the Emperor John Vatatzes, the instructions given by Pope Alexander IV to his legate,

the pope's convocation to the Curia to the Bishop of Orvieto so that he be sent off to Nicaea, and the letter of recommendation to the Emperor Theodore Laskaris. The previously negotiated concessions were quite significant. In exchange for the admission by the Greek Church of the primacy of Rome and of the right to appeal to its jurisdiction, Innocent IV had agreed to a full restitution of rights to the Greek clergy and consented to uphold the Creed in its Nicæan form. The pope also claimed to be willing to return the Greek Empire to the emperor. While not reneging on these concessions, the pope did ask his legate, however, to proceed cautiously; if the circumstances proved favourable, then Constantine could convene a general council. The mission was indeed delicate and Alexander IV had picked a man he trusted for it. Constantine had been made a bishop of his city by Pope Innocent IV while he lived there. As a preacher and a native of Orvieto, it is likely that this meeting was crucial<sup>40</sup>. In the letter that Pope Alexander IV sent him in 1256, it is suggested that he had already participated in the negotiations toward the union of the Churches with the envoys of the Emperor John Vatatzes, at the request of his predecessor<sup>41</sup>. Because of his role in these negotiations, the pope had therefore asked him to come to the Curia, with the objective of entrusting him with the leadership of a legation that would continue the discussions with John's successor, the Emperor Theodore II Laskaris – at the former's insistence. In his letter to the emperor, the pope recommended his legate on the basis of his qualities as scholar and theologian<sup>42</sup>. The Bishop of Orvieto went first to Thessaloniki, where he died after a stay of three months, leaving his mission unfinished.

The second Dominican legation took place twenty years later, in 1276-1277, when the Girolamo d'Ascoli's second legation was unable to leave – that is, at the time when Pope Innocent V was trying to organize a Crusade against the Mamelukes to save the Holy Lands. He hoped to get help from the Greek Emperor. To achieve that goal, it was necessary to restore peace between the rulers of the Occident and the Orient, and to obtain from the Greeks assurances that they would return under Roman obedience. The pope wrote several letters, addressed to Michael VIII, to his son Andronikos, and to Greek prelates, informing them of the impending visit from Girolamo d'Ascoli<sup>43</sup>. These letters were actually given to the Dominican legation by Pope John XXI, after the deaths of Innocent V and of his successor, Adrian V<sup>44</sup>. The legates, all Dominicans – Bishops Jacobus of Ferentino and Gaufrido of Turin, along with Rainierus of Viterbo and the reader Salvo of Lucca – came back to the Curia after having finished their mission, accompanied by the emperor's envoys, but they only arrived after the death of John XXI on 20 May 1277.

34 Roncaglia, *Frères mineurs 156-157* (edited text).

35 CICO V 1, no. 45. – Regesten der Kaiserurkunden 3 nr. 2008.

36 1274, *Année charnière*. – Roberg, *Union*.

37 Oath of George Akropolites, leading member of the embassy: CICO V 1, no. 48.

38 CICO V 2 no. 3-4.

39 CICO IV 2 no. 28. 28a. 28b.

40 Kaeppli/Panella, *SOPMA 4*, 63-65. – De Marco, *Costantino*.

41 CICO IV 2 no. 28a.

42 CICO IV 2 no. 28b.

43 CICO V 2 no. 2-11. – Regesten der Kaiserurkunden 3 no. 2026-2029.

44 CICO V 2 no. 7.

The following year, Nicholas III gave new instructions to a Franciscan legation<sup>45</sup>. The friars reported that Michael VIII confirmed having recognized the truth of the Roman faith in October 1278.

Between those two legations, Pope Clement IV had written to the Master of the Dominicans to tell him he was sending three friars qualified to conclude the negotiations with the Greeks, who then seemed sincerely ready to accept the union<sup>46</sup>. Files from 1267 show that this pope was preparing a new legation as the previous one had revealed some problems: the imperial *apocrisarii* did not know Latin and had to use interpreters, which slowed down the dialogue<sup>47</sup>. John XXI gave the Dominican legation more detailed instructions and gave them permission to be their own interpreters<sup>48</sup>.

In short, during the 13<sup>th</sup> century, popes predominantly sent Friars Minor to lead the union negotiations with the Greeks. The death of Michael VIII in 1282 probably prevented it from being realized but there were many other obstacles. Opposition to union had become gradually stronger in the aristocracy as well as in the clergy during the last few years of his reign, and the first political act of Andronikos II upon ascending the throne was to denounce the return of the Greeks under Roman obedience<sup>49</sup>. It seems that one of the reasons the popes of the 14<sup>th</sup> century chose Dominicans for this mission may be the failure of all the previous attempts. The negotiations that took place then would have to bear this anti-unionism in mind. It should also be noted that the last legations had all been led by bishops: Constantinus of Orvieto, the Dominicans Jacobus of Ferentino and Gaufridus of Turin in 1276<sup>50</sup>, the Franciscan Bartholomew, Bishop of Grosseto<sup>51</sup>. Is it possible that should was hoping for greater efficiency?

## The great Dominican era: towards an ecumenical council

### The Dominican polemicists and interlocutors of the Greek elites

During the 14<sup>th</sup> century, until 1378, the relations between Rome and Byzantium were intense, in part because papal diplomacy, based in Avignon, was quite dynamic, but also because of the constant weakening of the Greek Empire, due to internal tensions and to Ottoman pressure. The Dominican friary of Pera, founded under the reign of Andronikos II near the Golden Horn, in Genoese territory, became a remarkable centre of debates. Missionaries to the Orient would stop there on their way to the Curia. All spoke Greek, to a certain extent – an issue that had often been raised in the previous century.

The empire, at that time, was under the constant threat of dynastic crises. The most serious of these occurred in 1347. The empire was then ruled by Anna, mother of John V. She was a Princess of Savoy and betrothed to Andronikos III. The Latin party was quite powerful in the imperial court, and the authority of the empress was being questioned. John V's uncle, after a civil war and the victory of the Greek party, took power under the name of John VI Kantakouzenos, and stood until December 1354, when he retired to a monastery. One of the causes of the dissensions in the imperial palace was Byzantium's position concerning the Church of Rome. The issue at hand was the keeping of the orthodox tradition, and opposition to a rapprochement with Rome was still very strong among the Greek clergy. The new emperor was in favour of a rigorous orthodoxy and so began by deposing Patriarch John Kalekas, who argued for a closer relationship with Rome. A related topic was much debated by the clergy and the intellectual elite: the influence of a form of Aristotelian philosophy reinterpreted by the Latins and widely disseminated by Barlaam, a monk from Calabria, by certain Greek philosophers, as well as by the Preacher Friars, who were on a mission in Greece and promoters of Thomism. The rigorist tendencies, called Palamism, were then prevailing and Gregory Palamas, its leader, was elected Archbishop of Thessalonica. But the Turkish threat loomed larger and larger. During the offensive of 1329, Orhan had captured Nicaea and Nicomedia and all through the 14<sup>th</sup> century, the Ottomans seized large parts of the empire, thus making more and more urgent the need for Occidental military aid. Missions and Crusades were always linked.

The friars of the friaries of Constantinople and Pera have left us sufficient archives to appreciate their actions in the capital. Thanks to their manuscript tradition, a portion of their correspondence with their Greek contemporaries is available. They have also left polemical treatises, the first of which, the *Contra Grecos* of 1252, remained anonymous. The great polemical period took place in Pera between 1290 and 1359. The main writers were Bonaccursius of Bologna and William Bernard of Gaillac, the founder of the friary of Pera. One of the friars, Philip of Pera, wrote two great works between 1357 and 1359, most likely at the urging of Peter Thomas, of whom we spoke earlier<sup>52</sup>. His writings show that he was in touch with the Byzantines, the aristocrats and the monks, but also with the ordinary people.

In the correspondence written in Greek by the friars, one can currently read four letters from Simon of Constantinople (before 1299), one sent by a friar James to the Emperor Andronikos II between 1318 and 1325<sup>53</sup>, another from Jo-

45 CICO V 2 no. 35. 45.

46 CICO V 1 no. 26.

47 CICO V 1 no. 23.

48 CICO V 2 no. 11, note 1 on p. 18.

49 There are allusions to the rise of the opposition in the memorandum given by Nicholas III to the Franciscan legation in October 1278, CICO V 2 no. 35. – About the reinforcement of the external and internal tensions at the end of

Michael VIII's reign and the pontifical policies, the following is a convenient source: Nicol, *Derniers siècles* 82-86.

50 CICO V 2 no. 14-15.

51 CICO V 2 no. 35. 45.

52 Kaeppli, *Nouveaux ouvrages* 171.

53 *Iacobi epistula*. – Ioannes de Fontibus, *epistula*.



hannes de Fontibus (also known as Jean de Gaillefontaine) addressed to the Superior and his monks, dated 1350<sup>54</sup>. However, many texts are missing, among them the treatise from one of the friars that Johannes de Fontibus mentions in his letter to the monks in Constantinople.

The letters from Simon of Constantinople have been studied by M. H. Congourdeau<sup>55</sup>. One was addressed to the Emperor Andronikos II, another to the *protosynkellos* Manuel Holobolos about the procession of the Holy Spirit, a third one to the monk Sophonias, and a last one to Ioannes, the *nomophylax* (director of the law school). Friar Simon was thus trying to convince the emperor and two important personages of his court, the *protosynkellos*, head of the Church along with the patriarch, and the guardian of the law. As to Sophonias, he was a Greek monk that Simon had met during his exile in Euboea. While talking to him, Sophonias suggested that he read a letter from Basil of Caesarea, in which the arguments seemed to agree with the Roman doctrine. It seems then that the friars were looking, in their treatises as well as in their correspondence, to convince the leaders of the empire and the monks, who were quite influential in Byzantine society, by using their own language.

The writings of Philip of Pera show that the friars were in touch with the people as much as with monks. These texts, written in Latin and aimed at the friars who wished to convince the Greeks of the error of their ways, also allude to discussions with officials of the court, such as Demetrios Kydones, with whom he worked just as Simon had worked with Sophonias, but also with many other monks and ordinary Greeks that he met in the streets of the capital. In fact, in his *De oboedientia Ecclesiae Romanae debita* (1358), the author describes a relationship that was often fraught. He brought up with the Greeks the issue of the rite of Communion using the two species, claiming that this rite did not conform to the traditions of the Early Church, but they only mocked him, and even blamed him and damned him. He also writes that the Greeks made fun of the Latins for putting salt in the holy water, saying ironically that they did it so that no maggots would appear in it<sup>56</sup>. But Philip of Pera had been able to observe a real change in their attitudes. Around ten years before, the Greek bishops, priests, monks and even ordinary people avoided the friars as if they were heretics and excommunicates, but then, after discussing with them, they had all become closer and could casually eat and drink together<sup>57</sup>. The account of these conversations, however, shows that a large rift existed between the elites, which seemed, according to the author, ready to accept the Roman doctrine, and the

populace, firmly set in its own convictions<sup>58</sup>. He condemned the cowardice of the elites in view of the popular reaction<sup>59</sup>. The archives of the imperial Chancellery indicate that the emperor felt the same fear, as we shall see later.

The friars of Pera also enjoyed close relationships with some members of the Byzantine aristocracy. Starting around 1350, a group was formed with the aim of putting an end to the schism<sup>60</sup>. It united behind the secretary of the emperor, who basically acted as Prime Minister and principal aide to the emperor, Demetrios Kydones<sup>61</sup>. A friar would go regularly to the imperial palace to teach him Latin. He collaborated with Philip of Pera, who was looking for Greek texts that he could translate into Latin, such as the acts of the Eighth Ecumenical Council<sup>62</sup>. Several members of the aristocracy joined in, such as the Laskaris and the Angelos families, Michael Strongylos who was one of the emperor's greatest diplomats, and Philip Tzycandiles, who had married a Princess. The former spoke both Latin and Greek, like Demetrios who had translated Thomas Aquinas' *Summa contra Gentiles*. This influence also touched the intellectuals; thus George the Philosopher was apparently converted to Catholicism by Philip of Pera, according to Demetrios Kydones<sup>63</sup>. Several members of this group went with John V to Rome in October 1369; it was during this trip that the emperor stated the Creed of the Roman Rite, including the *Filioque*<sup>64</sup>. Manuel Sgouropoulos, an employee of the imperial Chancellery, was giving in 1374 Latin lessons to Manuel Kantakouzenos, despot of Morea<sup>65</sup>.

But for the Greeks, union had to be discussed within the framework of an ecumenical council, considered the only solution to end the schism. Therefore, Dominican friars and Calabrian clerics worked together throughout the 14<sup>th</sup> century to try to bring about an ecumenical council.

Just like the Friars Minor in the 13<sup>th</sup> century, the Preachers in the 14<sup>th</sup>, who quite often were missionaries, were very active as diplomatic agents during the negotiations between Rome and Byzantium<sup>66</sup>. They travelled incessantly between the Curia of Avignon and the friaries of the Orient, where the friars were in charge of the bishoprics. The dynamism of the papal diplomacy can be explained by the initiative shown by the friars. The 14<sup>th</sup> century can be divided in three parts. The first attempt at re-establishing contacts took place in the 1320s. Andronikos II had sent a Dominican from Pera, Andreas Doto, to deal with the King of France Charles IV in the hope of receiving aid. The King, with the permission of Pope John XXII, chose another Dominican, Benedict of Cumae OP, as legate to the emperor. He probably left for the Orient in the fall of 1326<sup>67</sup>. Philip of Pera described in his *Libellus* the friar's

54 Delacroix-Besnier, Frères prêcheurs, corpus 166.

55 Congourdeau, Frère Simon. – Delacroix-Besnier, Manuscrit FX 28.

56 Philip of Pera, De Oboedientia fol. 21<sup>r</sup>, 7<sup>v</sup>, edition forthcoming.

57 Kaeppli, Nouveaux ouvrages.

58 Philip of Pera, De Oboedientia fol. 86<sup>r</sup>.

59 Philip of Pera, De Oboedientia fol. 73<sup>r</sup>.

60 C. Delacroix-Besnier, Conversions constantinopolitaines.

61 Ryder, Demetrius Kydones.

62 Kaeppli, Nouveaux ouvrages 164-165.

63 Loenertz, Fr. Philippe 273.

64 Halecki, Un Empereur.

65 Demetrios Kydones, Briefe no. 110. 118 (Tinnefeld, Bd. I 2, 564-566. 588-590).

66 Gay, Pape Clément.

67 Kaeppli, Benedetto.

meeting with Andronikos II. He was staying at the friary of Pera and reported there the conversation they had had. The emperor seemed to be ready to come to an understanding with the pope, but feared a coup<sup>68</sup>. In fact, the failure of the legation was much more obvious than Philip of Pera suggested<sup>69</sup>. The fears of the emperor were well founded, since his grandson, with the support of several young aristocrats, forced him to abdicate in 1328. The letters from the pope, dated August and September 1326, show that friar Benedict's legation focused on political as well as religious questions, and that he was accompanied by a Greek priest from Brindisi to serve as interpreter<sup>70</sup>.

The second part was more fruitful, especially considering the fact that the new emperor, Andronikos III, was not as opposed as his grandfather to the union, nor that a Latin party hovered about the empress, Anna, Princess of Savoy, as we saw earlier. From 1333 until 1339, a project for an ecumenical council became more and more concrete, so much so that Barlaam the Calabrian took it up with the Curia in 1339. Barlaam was a Greek monk from Calabria<sup>71</sup>. In 1327, he had been named abbot of a monastery in the capital and had become a teacher at the university. He enjoyed privileged access to the imperial palace, where the Latin party was quite powerful at the time. In his teachings, he brought to Constantinople a Latin Aristotle, natural philosophy, the dialectics of Occidental universities, as well as scholastics and the use of syllogisms. These imports amounted to a real cultural shock as far as theological questions were concerned: could one use reason to reach God? This question vexed Greeks intellectuals, steeped as they were in Platonic spiritualism. However, Barlaam was invited by Patriarch John Kalekas to take part in a discussion with two Latin bishops who had come to the capital in 1334 to talk about the conditions for ending the schism. These two Latin bishops were envoys of Pope John XXII, both Preacher Friars: Richard the Englishman OP, Bishop of Cherson in Crimea, and Francis of Camerino OP, Bishop of Vospro, also in Crimea<sup>72</sup>. The patriarch did not know Latin and his bishops were thoroughly ignorant, according to Nikephoros Gregoras, one of the great philosophers of the capital and opponent of Barlaam. Nikephoros had also been invited to the meeting. The patriarch had asked him to take part in the discussions, even though he was a layperson. Nikephoros advised against such discussions, because tradition held that a debate about the procession of the Holy Spirit could only take place during an ecumenical council, which was not the case of the Council of Lyon. He describes in detail the arguments that he used

before the patriarch and a few handpicked bishops. In his opinion, the Latins were men of little account who thought that the mysteries of theology could be discovered by anyone, as long as he based his reasoning on the art of the syllogism. Nikephoros Gregoras knew the Latin Aristotle very well and he had frequently debated about it with Barlaam. According to him, on matters of theology one should refer to Plato, who claimed that God could not be expressed through words<sup>73</sup>. The discussion turned to the procession of the Holy Spirit, but just as Nikephoros had thought, it came to nothing. Nevertheless, this discussion reached an important stage and Barlaam was sent by the emperor to outline a project for an ecumenical council<sup>74</sup>. A difficult dialogue had been renewed.

A series of letters from John XXII, dated 4 August 1333, show that a Byzantine embassy had originated this new start to the talks. A Franciscan friar, Garcia Arnoldi of Aquitaine, who had been a missionary in Armenia and was well known in the court, was sent to Avignon to ask the pope to send »Catholic doctors« to discuss the terms of the union. At first, John XXII had picked the Minister General of the order, Geraldus Odonis of Aquitaine, but he changed his mind (the sources do not say why) and sent Richard the Englishman OP and Francis of Camerino OP instead<sup>75</sup>. They both had been, just like friar Garcia, missionaries in the Orient; they had come to the Curia in 1333 to request reinforcements for the missions while keeping the pope informed of their progress: Mileno, Prince of the Alans, and the leader of Zichia had converted<sup>76</sup>. The friars also told of the good feelings of Emperor Andronikos III towards the union of the Churches; thus they were asked, upon their return, to look into ways to bring about the end of the schism<sup>77</sup>. The pope also wrote to the patriarch and the emperor<sup>78</sup>, so that the dialogue started again the following year in Constantinople. It continued even while the pope attempted to prepare a crusade in the Orient. And while he was outlining his project for a council, Barlaam negotiated a deal stipulating that they would get back three or four of the big cities that the Turks had conquered<sup>79</sup>.

A few years later, in 1343, John of Florence, Bishop of Tiflis, came to the Curia while Pope Clement VI was trying to start the process of union again and the expedition that would eventually capture Smyrna in October 1344 was being organized. It is likely that he took part in the preparations. A series of letters sent by the Chancellery encouraged the emperor, the aristocracy and all of the Greek people to work towards union<sup>80</sup>. Indeed, the pope had sent a legation to Constantinople. John V had not come of age yet, and his

68 Edited text in Kaeppli, *Nouveaux ouvrages* 173-174. – A slightly different version can indeed be found in Philip of Pera, *De Oboedientia* fol. 87<sup>v</sup> (not 89 as indicated).

69 Letters of 1327, addressed by the Emperor to the legate and to Charles IV, kept in the French National Archives and published by Omont, *Projet de réunion* 1-4.

70 CICO VII 2 no. 88. 88a. 94.

71 Talbot, Barlaam.

72 CICO VII 2 no. 133-136.

73 Nikephoros Gregoras, *Historia Rhomäike* X 8 (Schopen I 508, 9-15). – Delacroix-Besnier, *Rencontres*.

74 CICO VIII no. 43.

75 According to the *Chronicon XXIV generale*, friar Garcia had apparently converted Andronikos III and the two Preachers were called »old missionaries«, s. Matteucci, *Missione* 158.

76 CICO VII 2 no. 131.

77 CICO VII 2 no. 133-134.

78 CICO VII 2 no. 136.

79 CICO VIII no. 42.

80 CICO IX no. 25-26. – *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden* 5 no. 2890.

mother Anna of Savoy had asked friar Manente Francisi da Fabriano OFM and the loyal squire to the empress, Philip of Saint-Germain, a fellow Savoyard, to go to Avignon. Clement VI initially thought about sending the Minister General of the order but decided instead to give this mission to Henry of Asti, Latin Patriarch of Constantinople, along with his vicar, Bartholomew of Rome. We do not know why he changed his mind<sup>81</sup>. The pope recommended his legate to the Greek and Latin authorities of the capital, and to the friars of the Franciscan and Dominican friaries of Pera<sup>82</sup>. But the civil war between the partisans of John V and those of John Kantakouzenos was not really favourable this sort of undertaking.

The process did regain some vigour when John Kantakouzenos took power in 1347. The vicar of the Latin Patriarch of Constantinople had discussed it with John VI Kantakouzenos in the fall and the emperor sent a Greek embassy to Avignon the following year. The three ambassadors were George Spanopoulos, *protobestiarios*, Nicholas Sigeros, great interpreter, and Francis of Pertuis, who belonged to the Latin party close to the empress<sup>83</sup>. The account of this renewal of the dialogue says that the ambassadors managed to secure military aid from the Latins in exchange for the promise of a union, the terms of which would be debated in a council, seen as the only way to reach an accord between the two Churches<sup>84</sup>. The mendicant friars then became involved.

The pope kept up the contacts by sending two bishops, Gasbert of Orgueil OP and William Emergavi OFM. They only arrived in 1350<sup>85</sup>. The first was Bishop of Ceneda, in northern Italy, and Master of Theology at the pontifical Curia. The second was Bishop of Kissamos, in Crete<sup>86</sup>. John Kantakouzenos recounts in his *History* the pleasure he felt engaging in daily conversations with them during their stay<sup>87</sup>. These men, wrote the Emperor, were as dedicated to virtue as they were well versed in profane literature. It seems that the two bishops managed to assuage John Kantakouzenos' fears, and the fears of the Greeks concerning the fate of their own rite, and that the emperor had reminded them of his project of union after discussions between equals and within the framework of a council<sup>88</sup>. Because he did not want the dialogue between Rome and Byzantium to end, John VI sent in 1353 a Preacher Friar from the friary of Pera and, as he writes in his *History*, one whom he considered a friend<sup>89</sup>. It was most likely the author of the letter to the monks of Constantinople. As a specialist in negotiations with the Greeks, he had probably discussed the issue with the emperor and so brought back to

Innocent VI an encouraging answer, as the emperor claimed to be willing to embrace the Catholic faith, which delighted the pope<sup>90</sup>.

Even after he retired to a monastery, John Kantakouzenos continued to work towards his project of an ecumenical council, and his network of relations had retained some influence over John V who was now in power. A new embassy, led by Nicholas Sigeros, went to Avignon and then a new project for a council was prepared and taken to the pope in 1356<sup>91</sup>. The legate Peter Thomas came to talk about this in 1357. Paul of Smyrna, a Bishop from Calabria, who had come to Avignon with Sigeros, assisted the legate and served as interpreter. The Greek account of these discussions states that the two parties kept reaching the same deadlock<sup>92</sup>. The points discussed were always the same: the union in exchange for a league against the Turks on the pope's side, while the Greeks made the opposite proposal. Furthermore, the pope remained reluctant about the form of the ecumenical council.

These very long preliminaries seemed on the verge of leading to a result in 1367, when Pope Urban V sent Paul of Smyrna, who by then had become Patriarch of Constantinople, to accomplish an union »in keeping with ecclesiastical order« and that was not obtained »through force and tyranny«, as were the wishes of the ex-emperor<sup>93</sup>. Paul even suggested that the council meet in Constantinople, although John Kantakouzenos had preferred, during the previous round of negotiations, selecting a port city equally distant from the Orient and the Occident. Things thus seemed to be moving in the right direction, when events took an unforeseen turn: John V went to Rome in October 1369 and delivered a declaration of Latin faith before the pope. A council was no longer being discussed. A new political situation may explain this change. John V hoped to forge an alliance with Louis of Hungary, who demanded in exchange that the emperor convert to Catholicism. In the documentation produced by the Chancellery in November 1367, Pope Urban V no longer mentions the council as a way to end the schism<sup>94</sup>.

Pope Gregory XI did try to revive the talks during the years 1374-1375, in response to a request for aid by Demetrios Kydones and John Laskaris in June 1373 on behalf of the Greeks<sup>95</sup>. The pope selected a new legation, asked Gasbert of Orgueil to provide a scriptural file and a report on the discussions with John Kantakouzenos in 1350<sup>96</sup>. This file was brought to Constantinople by four monks, two Hospitallers, one Preacher, Thomas of Bozolasco, and a Friar Minor, Bar-

81 Matteucci, *Missione* 147. – Loenertz, *Ambassadeurs* 189-190.

82 CICO IX no. 25-28. – G. Matteucci only mentions the Franciscan friary, Matteucci, *Missione* 147.

83 Delacroix-Besnier, *Revisiting* 161. – Regesten der Kaiserurkunden 5, no. 2930.

84 Weiss, *Joannes Kantakouzenos* 61. – All the documents were published by Loenertz, *Ambassadeurs*.

85 CICO IX no. 161.

86 *Ioannes de Fontibus*, epistula 169-171 (Loenertz). – About Gasbert of Orgueil, Master of Theology in Avignon, Kaeppli, *SOPMA* 2, 11.

87 *Joannes Kantakouzenos* 53-55 (Schopen). – Transl.: *Joannes Kantakouzenos*, *History*.

88 Weiss, *Joannes Kantakouzenos* 62.

89 *Ioannes de Fontibus*, epistula 165 and note 6 (Loenertz).

90 CICO X no. 21. – Regesten der Kaiserurkunden 5 no. 3010.

91 CICO X no. 84. – Regesten der Kaiserurkunden 5 no. 3056.

92 Darrouzès, *Conférences sur la primauté du pape*.

93 Meyendorff, *Projet de concile*.

94 CICO XI no. 131. 131a-d. – Many documents and analyses in Halecki, *Un Empereur*, s. in particular no. 9. – Regesten der Kaiserurkunden 5 no. 3115. 3120. 3122. 3126.

95 CICO XII no. 77.

96 Halecki, *Un Empereur*, no. 26.

tolomeo de Cherracio<sup>97</sup>. With them was Simon Atumanos, who served as an interpreter<sup>98</sup>. The latter was a monk from the Monastery of Stoudios, in Constantinople, who had converted in 1348 and had been named Archbishop of Thebes in 1366<sup>99</sup>. The report of these new discussions was brought to the Curia by a Dominican missionary, John of Rouen, Bishop of Tabriz, a great supporter of the strengthening of the mission in Armenia<sup>100</sup>. It had been translated into Latin by a sympathizer close to the Preachers of Pera, Manuel Sgouropoulos. Gregory XI thanked the Bishops of Maragheh and Nakhchivan, two Preacher Friars who had convinced the Greeks to end the schism, as reported to the pope by John of Rouen<sup>101</sup>. The discussion had taken place in Constantinople and Pera, most likely at the Preachers' friaries. The pope could rejoice at the conversion of the Greeks but the situation had truly changed; John V, tired of waiting for military aid from the Occident, had signed a truce with the Turks to provide some respite to the empire. Furthermore, the Papal Schism (1378-1417) put a stop for decades to all relations between Rome and Constantinople.

It is therefore important to emphasize the role played by the mendicant friars, who often were preachers and missionaries, in maintaining relations with the Greek authorities and in the development of the process that led to the council of Florence (1439). The friars, who kept in contact with the Christian communities of the Orient in the context of the rise of Muslim power, argued that Christians should come together in a single community of faith; they also campaigned for the use of Oriental languages in the celebration of the Roman Rite. Many Catholic priests who were bilingual, such as Paul of Smyrna, and Barlaam before him – both of them Calabrians –, or Simon Atumanos, a Greek convert, played a decisive role.

### **The Greek Preacher Friars and the realization of the project in the 15<sup>th</sup> century**

The process started up again right after the election of Martin V. An important Greek delegation, consisting of sympathizers to the cause of the union, came to him. Among them was Manuel Chrysoloras, who was close to the Emperor Manuel II and to the Preachers; he had translated the Dominican Missal into Greek; he was also gathering indulgences to form a league against the Turks. He died in Konstanz during the council that ended the Papal Schism and was buried in the friary of the Preachers<sup>102</sup>. Andreas Chrysoberges, a Greek

Preacher Friar from Constantinople, backed the election of Martin V. The Greek delegation had arrived as early as 1416. All worked to put an end to the Great Schism, which was necessary to restore relations with the papacy. In 1418, negotiations led to the writing of a common statement, which friar Andreas translated<sup>103</sup>. Without going into details, the discussions continued for twenty more years, and the mendicant friars played a key role, the brothers Chrysoberges, Andreas and Theodore, but also Greeks who had not converted but were convinced that the union was necessary. The Friars Minor also participated in the negotiations: in 1422, Martin V sent to Constantinople a delegation led by Antonio da Massa OFM, a Master of Theology and a Provincial Superior in Tuscany<sup>104</sup>. With him came five other friars, all of them Masters of Theology, one of whom was named John. The point, as with every pontifical legation, was to negotiate both for military aid and for the conditions leading to the end of the schism. The Franciscans of Pera helped them with access to the palace. To the Emperor Manuel II, the legate sent friars John and William, confessor and chaplain of the Empress Sophia of Montferrat, wife of John VIII who was associated as co-Emperor with his father. The account of the discussions was translated into Latin and then presented by friar Antonio before the Council of Siena in 1423<sup>105</sup>. The report recommended that a small council be held, similar to the one that took place in Lyon in 1274, but the Greeks, in accordance with their traditions, demanded an ecumenical council<sup>106</sup>. At the end of his legation, Antonio da Massa was elected head of his order. Thus, Franciscans, already part of the entourage of the empresses of Latin culture, became involved in the discussions between Rome and Constantinople.

Next, in 1426, Andreas Chrysoberges was sent by Martin V to see the Emperor John VIII, without any tangible results<sup>107</sup>. More discussions were planned but the emperor, like his father Manuel II, knew how difficult it would be for the return under Roman obedience to be accepted. The rivalry between the fathers of the Council of Basel and Pope Eugene IV made it finally possible to convene the long-awaited council, and the support that the Greeks gave the pope was instrumental in achieving this. Friar Andreas next played a key role during the council of 1438-1439, through his interventions in the discussions with the Greek delegation. The preceding year, he had written a letter in Greek, addressed to the Archbishop of Nicaea, Bessarion, in which he tried to prove that Thomism was valid<sup>108</sup>. Other friars created dossiers, using the Greek documentation that the friars in Pera had collated in preparation to the arguments with the Greeks. The manuscript

97 BEFAR no. 2769 (Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Registrum Vaticanum 270, fol. 47<sup>v</sup>).

98 BEFAR no. 2770 (Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Registrum Vaticanum 270, fol. 47<sup>v</sup>).

99 Talbot, Atumano.

100 CICO XII no. 136.

101 CICO XII no. 137-138.

102 Delacroix-Besnier, *Les Dominicains* 192.

103 Delacroix-Besnier, *Les Dominicains* 295-296.

104 Matteucci, *Missione* 182-187.

105 Matteucci, *Missione* 186-187, gives a list of all the signatories of the text, including the caretaker of the friary in Constantinople.

106 Delacroix-Besnier, *Les Dominicains* 296.

107 Delacroix-Besnier, *Les Dominicains* 302-303.

108 Delacroix-Besnier, *Les Dominicains* 356. 288.

tradition holds traces of this: the copy of Philip of Pera's *De Oboedientia*, for instance, is followed by the Latin translation by Demetrios Kydones of the acts of the »Eighth Council«<sup>109</sup>. After several very long debates, the decree of union was signed and promulgated in the Cathedral of Florence in July 1439. Andreas Chrysoberges was present at the ceremony.

Thus the mendicant friars played an essential role in the relationship between Rome and Constantinople, from the 1240s until the Council of Florence. The pope, at first, chose Occidental friars, most often Italians, to go to Constantinople to meet with the religious and political authorities; then missionaries in the Orient, living in the capital or in bishoprics further away, were asked to intervene. They were therefore more tightly engaged in Greek affairs, being integrated within Greek society on a daily basis. In the 14<sup>th</sup> century, they were mostly bilingual friars born in the Greek Empire, and then Greek converts, who were better able to debate with the Greeks. The fact that they had access to the imperial palace

meant that they could be much more efficient – for example, the Franciscans friars in the court of Mary of Hungary, and then in the retinue of the empresses of Latin culture, such as Anna of Savoy and Sophia of Montferrat. The Preacher Friars had relations within the court, but rather to learned men such as Philip of Pera and Demetrios Kydones. Furthermore, these friars brought a different perspective to the Greek problem, as they were more attached to the dogmatic issue of the *Filioque* than to the question of rites. The rise and influence of Dominican theology after Thomas Aquinas also played a role in the relationship between Rome and Constantinople, since it both irritated and fascinated the intellectual elites of the Greek capital, John VI Kantakouzenos included. Several different clues thus allow us to explain the relative eclipse of the Franciscans after the Council of Lyon II. These clues also allow us to better understand the progression of the project of an ecumenical council, which finally met in Florence in 1439, the results of which are well known.

## Bibliography

### Sources

BEFAR: *Ut per litteras apostolicas ...*: Les lettres des papes des XIII<sup>e</sup> et XIV<sup>e</sup> siècles. CD-ROM LITPA 1-3 (Turnhout 2002-2012).

CICO: Pontificio Commissio ad Redigendum Codicem Iuris Canonici Orientalis, Fontes, Series 3, 15 vol. (Rome 1943-1991).

Demetrios Kydones, Briefe: Demetrios Kydones, Briefe, 3 Bde. Ed. F. Tinnfeld. Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur 12, 16, 33 (Stuttgart 1981-1991).

Disputatio Latinorum: Disputatio Latinorum et Graecorum seu Relatio apocrisiorum Gregorii IX de gestis Nicaeae in Bithynia et Nymphaeae in Lydia (1234). Ed. G. Golubovich. Archivum Fratrum Historicum 12, 1919, 418-470.

Iacobi epistula: R. J. Loenertz, Iacobi praedicatoris ad Andronicum Paleologum maiorem epistula. Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum 29, 1959, 73-88.

Ioannes Kantakouzenos: Ioannes Kantakouzenos, Historiae. Ed. L. Schopen. CSHB I (Bonn 1828-1832).

History: The History of John Cantacuzenus (Book IV), text, translation and commentary. Ed. T. S. Miller (Washington, D.C. 1975).

Ioannes de Fontibus, epistula: R. J. Loenertz, Ioannis de Fontibus O. P. epistula ad abbatem et conventum. Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum 30, 1960, 163-195.

Nikephoros Gregoras, Historiae Byzantinae: Nikephoros Gregoras, Historiae Byzantinae, 3 vol. Ed. L. Schopen (vol. 1-2) / I. Bekker (vol. 3). CSHB I (Bonn 1829).

Nikephoros Gregoras, Historia Rhomäike: Nikephoros Gregoras, Rhomäische Geschichte, Historia Rhomäike, Zweiter Teil (Kapitel VIII-XI), 2. Halband. Transl. J. L. van Dielen. Bibliothek der Griechischen Literatur 9 (Stuttgart 1979).

Philip of Pera, De Oboedientia: Philip of Pera O. P., De Oboedientia Ecclesiae Romanae Debita, Ms Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale di Firenze, Conventi soppressi C 7. 419.

### References

1274, Année charnière: 1274, Année charnière: mutations et continuités. Paris, 30 septembre-5 octobre 1974. Colloques internationaux du CNRS 558 (Paris 1977).

Balard, Latins: M. Balard, Les Latins en Orient (Paris 2006).

Cardini, Niccolò IV: F. Cardini, Niccolò IV e la Crociata. In: E. Menestò (ed.), Niccolò IV: un pontificato tra Oriente ed Occidente, Ascoli-Piceno, 14-17 dicembre 1989 (Spoleto 1991) 135-155.

Congourdeau, Frère Simon: M. H. Congourdeau, Frère Simon le Constantinopolitain. REB 45, 1987, 165-174.

Dagron, Empereur: G. Dagron, Empereur et prêtre: étude sur le »césaropapisme« byzantin (Paris 1996).

Darrouzès, Conférences: J. Darrouzès, Conférences sur la primauté du pape à Constantinople en 1357. REB 19, 1961, 76-109.

<sup>109</sup> Philip of Pera, De Oboedientia. – An edition with commentary is currently under preparation.

- De Marco, Costantino: *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 30 (1984) 332-335 s.v. Costantino (M. De Marco).
- Delacroix-Besnier, *Conversions*: C. Delacroix-Besnier, *Conversions constantinopolitaines au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle. Mélanges de l'École française de Rome* 105/2, 1993, 715-761.
- Dominicains: C. Delacroix-Besnier, *Les Dominicains et la chrétienté grecque aux XIV<sup>e</sup> et XV<sup>e</sup> siècles* (Rome 1997).
- Frères prêcheurs: C. Delacroix-Besnier, *Les frères prêcheurs dans l'Orient grec, du dialogue à la polémique*. In: M. Hinterberger / C. Schabel (eds), *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History (1204-1500). Recherches de théologie et de philosophie médiévales, Bibliotheca 11* (Leuven, Paris, Walpole MA 2011) 151-167.
- Manuscrit FX 28: C. Delacroix-Besnier, *À propos du manuscrit FX 28 de la Bibliothèque communale de Sienne. Mélanges de l'École française de Rome* 113/2, 2001, 735-766.
- Rencontres: C. Delacroix-Besnier, *Rencontres entre théologiens grecs et latins et les échanges culturels sous les règnes de Jean VI Cantacuzène et Jean V Paléologue*. In: I. M. Damian / I.-A. Pop / M. S. Popović / A. Simon (eds), *Italy and Europe's eastern Borders (1204-1669)* (Frankfurt 2012) 95-108.
- Revisiting: C. Delacroix-Besnier, *Revisiting Papal Letters in the fourteenth century*. In: I. Bueno (ed.), *Medieval Encounters* 21 (Leyden 2015) 150-168.
- Dondaine, Nicolas de Cotrone: A. Dondaine OP, *Nicolas de Cotrone et les sources du Contra Errores Graecorum de Saint Thomas. Divus Thomas* 28, 1950, 313-340.
- Fedalto, La Chiesa: G. Fedalto, *La Chiesa latina in Oriente*, 2 vol. (Verona 1976).
- Gay, Pape Clément: J. Gay, *Le pape Clément VI et les affaires d'Orient (1342-1352)* (Paris 1904).
- Geanakoplos, Michael Paleologos: D. J. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Paleologos and the West. A Study on Byzantine-Latin Relations* (Cambridge MA 1959).
- Golubovich, Biblioteca: G. Golubovich, *Biblioteca bio-bibliografica della Terra santa e dell'Oriente francescano* 1 (Quaracchi 1906).
- Halecki, Un Empereur: O. Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance à Rome* (Varsovie 1930; Variorum Reprints: London 1974).
- Kaeppli, Benedetto: Th. Kaeppli, *Benedetto di Asinago da Como. Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 11, 1941, 83-94.
- Nouveaux ouvrages: Th. Kaeppli, *Deux nouveaux ouvrages de Fr. Philippe Incontri de Péra OP. Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 23, 1953, 163-183.
- SOPMA 2: Th. Kaeppli, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum Medii Aevi (SOPMA), vol. 2: G-I* (Rome 1975).
- Kaeppli/Panella, SOPMA 4: Th. Kaeppli / E. Panella, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum Medii Aevi (SOPMA), vol. 4: T-Z* (Rome 1993).
- Kolbaba, Lists: T. M. Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists. Errors of the Latins (Urbana/ Illinois 2000)*.
- Loenertz, Ambassadeurs: R. J. Loenertz, *Ambassadeurs grecs auprès du pape Clément VI. OCP* 19, 1953, 178-196.
- Fr. Philippe: R. J. Loenertz, *Fr. Philippe de Bindo Incontri OP du couvent de Péra, inquisiteur en Orient. Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 18, 1948, 265-280.
- Matteucci, Missione: G. Matteucci, *La missione francescana di Costantinopoli* 1 (Firenze 1971).
- Meyendorff, *Projet de concile*: J. Meyendorff, *Projet de concile œcuménique en 1367: un dialogue inédit entre Jean Cantacuzène et le légat Paul. DOP* 14, 1960, 147-177.
- Monde byzantin: V. Déroche / S. Métivier / V. Puech / G. Saint-Guillain (eds), *Le monde byzantin 750-1204, économie et société* (Paris 2007).
- Nicol, *Derniers siècles*: D. M. Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium* (1972), *Les derniers siècles de Byzance (1261-1453)* (Paris 2005).
- Requests: D. M. Nicol, *Byzantine Requests for an Oecumenical Council in the XIV<sup>th</sup> Century. Annuaire Historiae Conciliorum* 1 (1969) 69-95.
- Omont, *Projet de réunion*: H. Omont, *Projet de réunion des Églises grecque et latine. Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* LIII (Paris 1892).
- Patlagean, *Moyen Âge*: E. Patlagean, *Un Moyen Âge grec. Byzance IX<sup>e</sup>-XV<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris 2007).
- Regesten der Kaiserurkunden 2: F. Dölger / A. Müller / A. Beilhammer, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des Oströmischen Reiches, Teil 2. Regesten von 867-1025* (München 2003).
- 3: F. Dölger / P. Wirth, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des Oströmischen Reiches, Teil 3. Regesten von 1204-1282* (München 1977).
- 5: F. Dölger / P. Wirth, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des Oströmischen Reiches, Teil 5. Regesten von 1341-1453* (München 1965).
- Roberg, *Union*: B. Roberg, *Die Union zwischen dergriechischen und der lateinischen Kirche auf dem II. Konzil von Lyon* (Bonn 1964).
- Roncaglia, *Frères mineurs*: M. Roncaglia, *Les frères mineurs et l'église grecque orthodoxe au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle (1231-1274). Biblioteca bio-bibliografica della Terra Santa e dell'ordine francescano*, s. 4, 2 (Cairo 1954).
- Ryder, *Demetrius Kydones*: J. R. Ryder, *Divided Loyalties? The Career and Writings of Demetrius Kydones*. In: M. Hinterberger / C. Schabel (eds), *Greeks, Latins, and intellectual History (1204-1500). Recherches de théologie et de philosophie médiévales, Bibliotheca 11* (Leuven, Paris, Walpole MA 2011) 243-261.
- Schabel, *Martyrs*: C. Schabel, *Martyrs and heretics, intolerance of intolerance: the execution of thirteen monks in Cyprus in 1231*. In: C. Schabel (ed.), *Greeks, Latins and the Church in Early Frankish Cyprus* (Farnham, Burlington 2011) 1-33.
- Religion: C. Schabel, *Religion*. In: A. Nikolaou-Konnari / C. Schabel (eds), *Cyprus: Society and Culture 1191-1374* (Leyden 2005) 157-218.
- Setton, *Papacy*: K. M. Setton, *The Papacy and the Levant (1204-1571)*, 3 vol. (Philadelphia 1976-1978).
- Talbot, *Atumano*: ODB 1 (1991) 231 s.v. Atumano, Simon (A. M. Talbot).
- Barlaam: ODB 1 (1991) 257 s.v. Barlaam of Calabria (A. M. Talbot).
- Voisin, *Monastères grecs*: L. Voisin, *Comme un loup poursuivant un mouton. Les monastères grecs sous domination latine (XIII<sup>e</sup>-XV<sup>e</sup> siècles) [Unpubl. Thes. Univ. Rouen 2011]; *L'Ancienne ou la Nouvelle Rome: les monastères grecs sous domination latine entre Rome et Constantinople (XIII<sup>e</sup>-XV<sup>e</sup> siècles). Revue d'Histoire de l'Université de Balamand* 28, 2013, 7-24.*
- Weiss, *Joannes Kantakuzenos*: G. Weiss, *Joannes Kantakuzenos, Aristokrat, Staatsman, Kaiser und Mönch in der Gesellschaftsentwicklung von Byzanz im 14. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden 1969).