

East and West: Cultural Dissonance and the “Great Schism of 1054”

Margaret Trenchard-Smith, Loyola Marymount University

Perception is an overwhelming force. Collective perceptions can be contra-factual. The memories of individuals, of institutions, often magnify the inconsequential, distort or omit. A failure of memory can be total, through accident or deliberate oblivion. Shared recollections and the narratives they form shape perceptions. Yet even when these things are faulty, they can have as much force as if they were sound—just as the effects of a rumor can be as damaging when false as when founded in fact.¹

The “Great Schism of 1054” is perceived by many to be the momentous event that resulted in the permanent sundering of the “Western” Roman Catholic and “Eastern” Orthodox branches of Christendom.² Factually, however, there is a problem with this perception, since it can plausibly be argued on technical and practical grounds (and has been argued by scholars like Francis Dvornik and Steven Runciman) that no schism occurred in 1054—certainly not the “Great Schism.”³ The perception of schism came about through cultural dissonance and alienation East and West which grew until at last the divorce became reality. When precisely that happened, however, is unclear. If not in 1054, when did the formal schism of the Great Church occur? Did it occur? From whose perspective, and by what criteria? There is no scholarly consensus on these questions.⁴ Please bear in mind that this paper has been written by an historian, not a theologian.

These were the circumstances of the so-called “Great Schism of 1054.” Early that year, tensions East and West prompted Pope Leo IX to charge Humbert, Cardinal of Silva Candida,

and a papal delegation to travel to Constantinople to negotiate with its Patriarch, Michael Kerouliarios (Cerularius).⁵ In the imperial capital, relations swiftly deteriorated, and on July 16th, 1054, Cardinal Humbert left a bull of excommunication on the altar of the Hagia Sophia.⁶ Sub-deacons of the church ran after the papal legates with the bull, begging them to take it back. The document was cast to the pavement.⁷ When it was retrieved and delivered, Patriarch Michael Kerouliarios retaliated in kind. Days later, he publicly burned a copy of the bull and anathematized Cardinal Humbert and the other legates.⁸

Schism could not technically have resulted from these actions. Pope Leo IX had died earlier in the year, in mid-April.⁹ The authority of the legates terminated with his death; the bull was nullified.¹⁰ In addition, the objects of excommunication were personal—on the one hand, the Patriarch Michael Kerouliarios and a few collateral victims of this wrangle, on the other, Cardinal Humbert and the papal legates.¹¹ In other words, these were not general excommunications involving the entire clergy and laity on either side.¹² Furthermore, among the charges made against the Church in the East was that it had omitted the *Filioque* formula from the Nicene Creed—a charge that Rome has long since admitted was erroneous.¹³ (More will be said on the *Filioque* shortly.) Michael Kerouliarios appealed for the support of the other Eastern Patriarchs—of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem. Peter III of Antioch's response to the irate Patriarch of Constantinople was that, apart from the *Filioque*, these were matters of relative indifference (*ἀδιάφορα*), mere misunderstandings.¹⁴

How then, historically, did matters arrive at the point of the perceived sundering of the Church? This is a great question, which cannot be fully addressed. What I can say, however, is that this was essentially a process of gradual cultural estrangement, one in which the alienation of religious sensibilities played a prominent, but not the only, role. Consider that

one cannot easily separate secular and religious matters in the medieval period. This clash of cultures, East and West, entailed administrative, political, linguistic, cultural, ritual, theological, ecclesial and doctrinal differences. Of these differences, language was the most decisive; of the many religious issues involved, the *Filioque* and the question of papal primacy were lasting.¹⁵ To place “1054” in context, it will be necessary to take the more than thousand-year history of the East Roman, or “Byzantine,” Empire from its inception to its end.

DIVISION OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE: The clash began in Late Antiquity, when Christianity was a persecuted minority religion within the Roman Empire under the emperor Diocletian. To make the unwieldy empire easier to rule, Diocletian bisected the Mediterranean, separating the *pars occidentalis* (the West) from the *pars orientalis* (the East) in governance and administration and setting up a “rule of four,” the Tetrarchy. Satisfied with his work, Diocletian retired voluntarily in 305 (he wanted to grow cabbages). Civil war followed, out of which the first Christian Emperor Constantine the Great emerged sole ruler in 324.

Second only in significance to Constantine’s very conversion to Christianity was his dedication in 330 of the former Greek colony of Byzantium as the imperial capital of East Rome. Initially called *Néa Ῥώμη*, “New Rome” and later, after him, Constantinople, the city created a center of gravity for East Rome, which would counterbalance and soon eclipse the West. The divergent development of the Roman Empire East and West was confirmed at the end of the century, when in 395 Theodosius the Great divided it between his sons Arcadius and Honorius. In the following, the fifth, century, the West would break up into Germanic successor kingdoms, but East Rome, Byzantium, would endure.

THE PATRIARCHATES: The Church, however, was one; in the West, it was the only institution of the former *pars occidentalis* to survive intact.¹⁶ Yet the notion persisted that the *oikumene* (*οἰκουμένη*), the lands inhabited by Christians, and the empire, were meant to be one and the same.¹⁷

This belief had determined the Episcopal structure of the Church and the jurisdiction of its highest bishops, the Patriarchs. Francis Dvornik identified two principles that governed the relationship of the bishops of the great imperial cities. One was the “principle of apostolicity.”¹⁸ The founding of the Christian community in Rome by Saint Peter meant that the Bishop of Rome was accorded precedence and especial honor.¹⁹ The “principle of accommodation” required the leadership of the Church to conform to the political and administrative divisions of the Roman Empire.²⁰ This principle underlay canons which elevated Constantinople and gave its Patriarch a status second in rank to the Pope.²¹ The Patriarchal Sees were: Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem. This Episcopal arrangement is known as the Pentarchy, the “rule of five” Patriarchs.

The Arab Muslim invasions of the mid-seventh century, by removing from East Rome its provinces of Egypt, Syria and Palestine, affected the functioning of the Pentarchy. The Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem persisted after the invasions, but diminished and under Islamic control.²² Previously, there had been competition between the various Patriarchs, as much between the Sees of Alexandria and Antioch as between Constantinople and Rome. With the removal of three eastern Sees from the empire in the seventh century: “The rivalry between the Patriarchs became simply the rivalry between Rome and Constantinople.”²³ This, in brief, is the background to later strife over papal primacy.

LANGUAGE: Mutual incomprehension is fundamental to cultural dissonance. Greek was the chief language of the Church in East Rome, as Latin was in the West. By 600, few persons were bilingual in Latin and Greek. Christians had forgotten one another's languages.

Naturally, this had a determining effect on the culture of the Church East and West. Like the binary relationship that developed between the Sees of Rome and Constantinople after Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem were taken into the Islamic Caliphate, so did the consequent marginalization of the Coptic and Syriac languages place Latin and Greek in stark contrast. Christians in the "Greek East" and "Latin West" read disparate authorities—different Church Fathers, Doctors and Confessors of the Church. Central to Byzantine theology were the Cappadocian Fathers: Saints Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa and Basil the Great; core patristic authorities read in the West were Saints Ambrose, Augustine and Jerome. Separate bodies of liturgy and canon law evolved; and at the popular level, of hagiography, saints' lives. Distinctive church cultures developed. For centuries, these divergences were accepted, and shared Christian identity maintained; in large part because of the emerging spiritual principle of *oikonomia* (οἰκονομία) – Christian charity, benevolence and tolerance of acceptable difference.²⁴

The Church was one, as was its doctrine, but the inflections thereof diverged over time East and West. Christians were pondering the same mysteries, but differently, because of the shaping effect of language. It is a commonplace to contrast the "legalistic and authoritarian" character of concrete, practical Latin to the mystical, "individualistic and philosophical" character of subtle, sinuous Greek.²⁵ While these linguistic differences can be overstated, they did generate conceptual variations.²⁶ These would increasingly contribute to misunderstandings over time, as in the matter of the *Filioque*.

FILIOQUE: A digression is necessary here to explain the term *Filioque*. The Visigoths, like most other Germanic groups that had taken over the West, had initially converted to a form of Christianity known as Arianism. In Arianism, Christ was subordinate to God the Father. At the Church Councils of the fourth and fifth centuries—at Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus and Chalcedon—Arianism and certain other Christological variants which had arisen in sympathy with or in reaction against it, were found to be heresies. In the 580s, the Visigoths in Spain turned away from Arianism and united with Rome. To render unambiguous their newfound belief in the co-eternality, co-equality and consubstantiality within the Trinity of the Persons of God the Son and the Father, the Metropolitan Bishop of Toledo convened a council in 589 at which the word *Filioque* (“and from the Son”) was interpolated within the Creed.²⁷

What did this mean? The crucial section of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed in Greek and in the altered Latin appears in blue:

Πιστεύω εἰς ἕνα Θεόν, Πατέρα, Παντοκράτορα, ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀορατῶν. Καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων· Φῶς ἐκ Φωτός, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο. Τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς Παρθένου καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα. Σταυρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ παθόντα καὶ ταφέντα. Καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ τὰς Γραφάς. Καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Πατρὸς. Καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος. **Καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, τὸ κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιόν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, τὸ σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν. Εἰς Μίαν, Ἁγίαν, Καθολικὴν καὶ Ἀποστολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν. Ὁμολογῶ ἕν Βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. Προσδοκῶ Ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν, καὶ Ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος. Ἀμήν.**

“And in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the Giver of Life, Who proceeds from the Father...” And in the Latin:

Credo in unum Deum, Patrem omnipotentem, factorem caeli et terrae, visibilium omnium et invisibilium. Et in unum Dominum Iesum Christum, Filium Dei unigenitum, et ex Patre natum ante omnia saecula. Deum de Deo, Lumen de Lumine, Deum verum de Deo vero, genitum non factum, consubstantialem Patri; per quem omnia facta sunt. Qui propter nos homines et propter nostrum salutem descendit de caelis. Et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine, et homo factus est. Crucifixus etiam pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato, passus et sepultus est, et resurrexit tertia die, secundum Scripturas, et ascendit in caelum, sedet ad dexteram Patris. Et iterum venturus est cum gloria, iudicare vivos et mortuos, cuius regni non erit finis. *Et in Spiritum Sanctum, Dominum et vivificantem, qui ex Patre Filioque procedit.* Qui cum Patre et Filio simul adoratur et conglorificatur: qui locutus est per prophetas. Et unam, sanctam, catholicam et apostolicam Ecclesiam. Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum. Et expecto resurrectionem mortuorum, et vitam venturi saeculi. Amen.

“And in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of Life, Who proceeds from the Father and from the Son...”

The addition of the word *Filioque*, “and from the Son,” suggests a conception of the Trinity which would develop into the Catholic doctrine of the “double procession” of the Holy Spirit.²⁸ Yet it must be said that divergent doctrines on the operation of the Holy Spirit did not come about only through this interpolation, but were inherent in the original Creed as it was received in Latin and Greek.²⁹ The Latin version of the Nicene Creed (before its modification in 381 at the Council of Constantinople) stressed the unity of the Godhead.³⁰ In the Greek, the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed did not alter after 381; in the Latin, the practical effect of the processes of translation and revision was to leave the Creed open to further alteration.³¹ Complementary Trinitarian ideas that would contribute to the *Filioque* dispute were being articulated as early as the late-fourth and early-fifth centuries by Saints Gregory Nazianzen in the East,³² and Augustine in the West.³³

...the Western view is that the unity of God is absolute and the Persons of the Trinity are relative within it, while the Eastern view is that the three Persons have each a distinctive property but are joined in a hypostatic union.³⁴

These views arose independently of the need of the Visigoths to distance themselves from Arianism, and even precede their articulation in the writings of the Latin and Greek Church Fathers, deriving from something more fundamental. Simply put, Greek and Latin function differently; they elicited and continue to elicit distinct cognitive, emotional and aesthetic responses, all of which come into play in conceptualization. Fine shades of meaning were and are lost in translation.

For example, in the New Testament (John 15: 26) and in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed in the Greek, the verb *ekporeuesthai* (ἐκπορεύεσθαι) connotes “coming forth from an original source.” Its Latin counterpart, *procedere*, connotes coming forth “from any source,” making it easier to conceive of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son as well as the Father.³⁵ Trinitarian theological terminology, as it developed, posed further difficulties.

Joseph Gill has pursued one line of misunderstanding in this respect: The Greek *ousia* (οὐσία) was translated into Latin as *substantia*; this was problematic, because *substantia* was the closest Latin equivalent to *hypostasis* (ὑπόστασις), which then had to be paired with the Latin *persona*. *Persona* had as its nearest Greek equivalent *prosopon* (πρόσωπον), the connotations of which suggested semblance over reality—not an ideal word to apply to the Persons of the Trinity.³⁶ Conceptual divergence accelerated through the increasing abstraction of Latin “... as dogma was developed into theology;” Greek remained relatively concrete,³⁷ its subtlety intrinsic, due to the breadth of its vocabulary and complex verbal system.

At any rate, the *Filioque* formula caught on among the Germanic peoples.³⁸ It appealed even to the Franks, who had never been Arian and were from the mid-eighth century the defenders of Rome.³⁹ Having promoted it at the Synods of Frankfurt (794) and Friuli (796), Charlemagne himself tried to insist on the inclusion of the *Filioque* in the Creed as normative

practice in Rome in 809.⁴⁰ However, Pope Leo III—the Pope who had made Charlemagne emperor—resisted the interpolation,⁴¹ as it would be “...a mistake to depart from the version of the Creed that had been universally accepted by Christendom.”⁴² To impress upon contemporaries his point and to preserve it for posterity, the Pope had the original Latin and Greek versions of the Creed inscribed upon silver plaques placed within Saint Peter’s.⁴³

THE PHOTIAN SCHISM: By the mid-ninth century, the *Filioque* had become such a divisive issue for Pope and Patriarch that it contributed to a short-lived schism, despite the fact that it was not yet officially adopted by Rome. These were the circumstances. The Byzantines were rapidly recovering from Iconoclasm; the Triumph of Orthodoxy had occurred in 843. Rome enjoyed the protection of the Franks. Both parties looked outward and sought to convert pagans and increase jurisdiction. Tensions rose between Rome and Constantinople over the conversion of the Slavs.⁴⁴ Since the Franks were attached to the *Filioque* formula, Pope Nicholas I permitted Frankish missionaries to the Bulgars to insert the word into the Creed.⁴⁵ Subsequently, when in Constantinople a gifted layperson, Photios, was rapidly elevated to the Patriarchal throne, Pope Nicholas objected on canonical grounds.⁴⁶ Photios shot back with a list of counter-accusations. Antagonisms flared, and the *Filioque* was made an issue in the mutual anathematization of Pope and Patriarch (the so-called “Photian Schism”).⁴⁷ Photios was deposed as Patriarch. Yet when a decade later, Photios was reinstated (877), Rome and Constantinople were reconciled and Rome still refrained from using the *Filioque*.⁴⁸

THE TENTH AND EARLY ELEVENTH CENTURIES: Matters remained relatively cordial between Pope and Patriarch in the tenth century—but distantly so.⁴⁹ Chaos prevailed in Rome in the tenth century, as in the West generally; it was an “age of lead” for the Latin Church.⁵⁰

In tranquil times, Patriarchs of the great Sees (including Rome) would acknowledge one another by name on official lists—the Patriarchal diptychs. This practice lapsed in Byzantium in the early eleventh century. The last Pope to be listed on the diptychs of Constantinople was John XVIII (1004-1009).⁵¹ This break in tradition is most likely to have resulted from a failure of communications, was not at the time regarded as important and seems to have been perpetuated in Constantinople through sheer forgetfulness and inertia.⁵²

Rome for its part forgot at this time that the *Filioque* formula was an innovation, permitted to some and for certain purposes, but resisted by Rome itself. Rome first used the *Filioque* in 1014 at the coronation of German Emperor Henry II.⁵³

1054: At last, the discussion has arrived at the year 1054. Readers are to be commended for their patience. What was the immediate context of the so-called “Great Schism of 1054”?

After a period of relative isolation in the tenth and early eleventh centuries,⁵⁴ a period in which the West was in disarray but Byzantium had entered a phase of economic strength and military might (the “Macedonian Renaissance”), a rapid shift in the power differential East and West occurred that altered the identity and perceived identity of each side. Byzantines were accustomed to having the upper hand. Then, in the mid-eleventh century, the West rose relative to the East. The incipient maturation of Western Europe and the elevation of Papal ambitions, combined with Byzantine political ineptitude, resulted in greater parity between

Rome and Constantinople than had been known for centuries. Parity meant renewed rivalry. A longstanding contest over which side was properly “Roman,” which properly “Christian,” intensified.⁵⁵ Previously, the rivalry was familial—now it was as if between strangers.

The power of the Papacy had surged in the first half of the eleventh century—indeed, the very word “Papacy” dates from this time, reflecting the sudden upward trend in Rome’s self-perception.⁵⁶ This was, in part, a reaction against the low state of Rome in the previous century.⁵⁷ Consider the papal reforms of the mid- to late-eleventh century, opposing simony, promoting clerical celibacy, demanding higher monastic standards.⁵⁸ The immensely wealthy and powerful Benedictine Abbey of Cluny and its priories peppered Western Europe. This was not the degraded, chaotic Latin Church of the previous century.

Byzantines were taken aback. This was unexpected. Renewed relations, after centuries of divergent development in secular and in Church culture, revealed estrangement.

Christians East and West had long seen one another stereotypically—as “barbaric” Latins, “effete” Greeks. To Byzantines, as for Hellenes in antiquity, “barbarian” was at its base a linguistic designation for non-Greek-speaking peoples.⁵⁹ Emperor Michael III (ninth century) was reported to have said that the Latin tongue itself was barbarous—worse, “Scythian.”⁶⁰ Byzantine Princess Anna Komnene (twelfth century) used “barbarian” as the standard epithet for any non-Byzantine (“Latins” included); “Scythian” was the term she employed if she considered a group especially “primitive” (like the Cumans and Pechenegs) or when she really wanted to insult.⁶¹ Her estimation of the character of “Latins” was that they were all money-hungry opportunists who would sell off what they most cherished for a single obol.⁶² On the Western side, “Latins” saw Byzantines as lacking in *virtus*, initially in the sense of masculine excellence, increasingly in its moral sense. Bishop Luitprand of Cremona (tenth century),

frustrated in his mission to obtain for the Ottonians a purple-born Byzantine princess (and purple raiment), fumed:

How insulting it is, that [Byzantine] weaklings, effeminate, long-sleeved, hat-wearing, veiled [dandified] liars, eunuchs and idlers step about clothed in purple, when [you] heroes [Liutprand's Ottonian lords], truly powerful men, who know how to conduct warfare, are filled with faith and charity, deputies for God, filled with virtues, can't!⁶³

In the twelfth century, the Abbot Guibert of Nogent would refer to Byzantines as “...miserable, puny Greeks, feeblest of men...”⁶⁴ These secular cultural prejudices, seeping into the Church, corroded the united identity of Christians, destroying *oikonomia*, charitable tolerance.

Add to this already dynamic situation a rogue element—the Normans.

Much of southern Italy was Greek in language and cultural orientation, and had been since antiquity; many of its churches observed the liturgy and rites of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Political and ecclesiastical jurisdiction over southern Italy had long been a point of bitter contention East and West.⁶⁵ Now, in the mid-eleventh century, the Normans successively defeated Byzantine and papal forces in southern Italy and, establishing a foothold there, imposed Latin practices on the Greek clergy, including the use of unleavened bread for the Eucharist. It was rumored that, in retaliation, the Patriarch of Constantinople, Michael Keroularios, had closed Latin churches in the Byzantine capital,⁶⁶ although Cardinal Humbert, the man who would excommunicate Keroularios, would later acknowledge that these stories may have been no more than “hearsay.”⁶⁷

At this critical juncture (1053), Bulgarian Archbishop Leo of Ohrid aggravated tensions by writing to John of Trani in Apulia (southern Italy) to protest the suppression of Greek practices and criticizing the unleavened bread of the Latin Eucharist (*ἄζυμα*) as “Judaizing”: “For they

[Jews] were commanded to maintain observance of unleavened bread and [fasting on] the Sabbath by Moses; but our Paschal Offering is Christ...’’⁶⁸ This came to the notice of Rome.

To restore cordial relations, with a view to cementing the papal/imperial alliance on southern Italy against the Normans, Byzantine Emperor Konstantine IX Monomachos requested that Pope Leo IX send a legation to Constantinople.⁶⁹ Patriarch Michael Keroularios also wrote to the Pope, offering to place his name on the diptychs.⁷⁰

Once the legates were in Constantinople, however, there was no meeting of minds. This was a turf war. Milton Anastos thought that Cardinal Humbert may have negotiated from the start in bad faith, intent upon justifying the seizure of “... of the Greek churches in southern Italy for the papacy.”⁷¹ For his part, Patriarch Michael Keroularios was suspicious and incommunicative.⁷² Little contact had occurred in Constantinople between Humbert and Keroularios when the bull of excommunication (again, technically invalid, since Pope Leo IX had died) was placed on the altar of the Hagia Sophia and the legates shook the dust from off their feet. They swiftly departed the capital and there were no subsequent negotiations.⁷³

The rhetoric of excommunication is dire:

*Quicumque fidei sanctae Romanae et apostolicis sedis ejusque sacrificio pertinaciter contradixerit, sit anathema, Maranatha, nec habeatur Christianus catholicus, sed prozymita haereticus. Fiat, fiat, fiat.*⁷⁴

May whosoever speaks against the faith of the holy, Roman and Apostolic See and its sacrifice [of the unleavened Eucharist] be “anathema Maranatha” and may he not be held to be a Catholic Christian but a “prozymite” heretic. Let it be done, let it be done, let it be done.

The pressing issue of the day was whether the Eucharist was leavened or unleavened.⁷⁵ What else did the bull contain? There is no diplomatic way to say this: It contained polemics, errors great and small, deliberate misconstructions and *ad hominem* attacks.⁷⁶ The bull was, in sum, a most imperfect document. It contained only one doctrinal issue of lasting significance—the

Filioque, and misrepresented its history. Cardinal Humbert had forgotten or never knew that Rome had itself refrained from the use of the formula for centuries, and now accused Constantinople of omitting the Greek equivalent of *Filioque* from the Nicene Creed, getting the matter entirely backwards.⁷⁷ A failure of individual and institutional memory contributed to a permanent misunderstanding.

But not to schism, not at this time. Certainly, the events created a stir. Riots followed Patriarch Michael Keroularios' disclosure of details of the bull of excommunication, forcing the emperor Constantine IX Monomachos to take a harder line than he may have wished against the papal legates.⁷⁸ As for Michael Keroularios, his letters to Peter III, the Patriarch of Antioch, reveal the depth of his offense and themselves contain egregious errors.⁷⁹ Keroularios' letters, too, are imperfect documents. In response, Peter III remonstrated with Keroularios, suggesting, in effect, that the Patriarch of Constantinople had overreacted.⁸⁰

When the dust had settled, the empire and the Papacy normalized relations.⁸¹ It was only later that the opinion formed that schism had started under Michael Keroularios. 1054 was fixed upon retrospectively as the date of the "Great Schism" after the processes of cultural dissonance and alienation were complete. This perception formed earlier in the West than in the East; in Byzantium, not until perhaps the fourteenth century.⁸² It is easy to see how, centuries later, Michael Keroularios might be regarded as the agent of the "Great Schism," in view of his personality and later ambitions. The Patriarch was imperious and could be impetuous. When the Emperor Isaac I, whom Keroularios had helped to install, behaved independently, Keroularios is said to have threatened: "I set you up, you oven, and I can knock you down!" The Patriarch was also given to wearing sandals in the imperial red.⁸³ However, the "Great Schism" did not occur during his time.

So when did it occur, and how, and by what evaluative criteria? A “top down,” legalistic definition would be that schism occurs when a counter-hierarchy is set in place.⁸⁴ Yet such schisms can end when differences are resolved. For schism to be permanent, alienation would have to run through the entire clergy and laity on either side. This is a corporate, “bottom up” definition. In the words of Steven Runciman:

In fact, the state of schism only came into being when the average member of each church felt it to be there; and that feeling developed slowly over a period of years and cannot be attached to any single date.⁸⁵

What 1054 did “achieve” was to move longstanding secular cultural prejudices East and West onto the field of religion. Lists of “Latin errors” began to be written by Byzantines after 1054. “Latins” were said to eat “unclean” creatures—beavers, jackals, wolves, porcupines, dormice and others—and to “[baptize] infants in saliva.”⁸⁶ The West soon reciprocated with lists of “Greek errors.”⁸⁷ But it was through the Crusades that rancor became general and enduring.⁸⁸ Ultimately, two issues of difference would persist— the *Filioque* and the question of papal primacy.

PAPAL PRIMACY / PAPAL SUPREMACY: To those Byzantines who accepted it (and many in this period did), “primacy” meant precedence in honor; now, to Rome, it meant supremacy.⁸⁹

...to the Romans, Church union meant the submission of the Eastern Churches to Rome, but to Byzantines it meant that the Roman bishop should resume his place as the senior of the Patriarchs and be mentioned once more in the diptychs and be accorded all the deference and honorific titles due to him.⁹⁰

Increasingly, clashing opinions on the meaning of primacy would alienate Christians East and West.⁹¹ Within Byzantium, a spectrum of Byzantine responses to the question of papal authority would emanate from the prism of later events.⁹²

THE CRUSADES: Byzantine Emperor Alexios I Komnenos' appeal to Pope Urban II for military aid against the Seljuk Turks and the Pope's positive response in 1095 indicate the continuing unity of Christendom after 1054.⁹³ However, the Crusading project thus begun, by forcing Christians East and West into close proximity, served to aggravate cultural prejudices on either side and further to associate them with religion.⁹⁴ Grievances piled up.

Mutual ill-will and distrust increased with each succeeding crusade.⁹⁵ East and West were in closer contact than before during the Second Crusade. It is an (apparent) irony that antagonisms intensified during the time of Emperor Manuel I Komnenos, as no Byzantine emperor was more open to Western influence.⁹⁶ For a spell, the West was allured by Manuel's glamour. At one point, Manuel even suggested to Pope Alexander III that he take up the seat of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate—and the Pope briefly considered it.⁹⁷ But Manuel's political machinations, commercial tensions in the capital and mutual grievances during the Second Crusade battered Christian unity.⁹⁸ Then the hollowness of Byzantine power was exposed by a devastating loss to the Turks at Myriokephalon (1176).⁹⁹ Not long after Manuel's death, in 1182, his notorious cousin Andronikos Komnenos exploited popular anti-Western resentment in Constantinople to advance a power grab, inciting the massacre of Pisans, Genoese and Franks residing in the capital.¹⁰⁰

Fellow-feeling among Christians East and West was nearly defunct during the Third Crusade.¹⁰¹

“Latin” Christians at the popular level considered the “Greeks” schismatic by the end of the 12th century. The chief issue now was papal primacy.¹⁰² Their contempt is unconcealed in a tune sung a few years later in Angers:

Constantinopolitana
*Civitas diu profana...*¹⁰³

(City of Constantinople, which has been profane *for so long...*)

On the Byzantine side, when at this time Patriarch Mark of Alexandria asked Theodore Balsamon: “Should we continue to communicate with the Latins?” the canonist replied:

For many years, the Western Church has been divided from communion with the other four Patriarchates and has become alien to the Orthodox... So no Latin should be given communion unless he first declares that he will abstain from the doctrines and customs that separate him from us, and that he will be subject to the Canons of the Church, in union with the Orthodox.¹⁰⁴

It was in this climate of alienation and mutual disdain that the Fourth Crusade took place.

THE FOURTH CRUSADE: The Fourth Crusade came about through a “perfect storm” of converging ambitions: those of the crusaders themselves, of Pope Innocent III, of the Venetian Doge Enrico Dandolo and of an exiled Byzantine prince named Alexios. I will not recount here the series of misunderstandings that led to the Christian crusader attack on Christian Constantinople from the 6th to the 12th of April, 1204, in the fires of which a great deal of the patrimony of ancient and medieval civilization was reduced to ashes. Atrocities perpetrated by the “Latins” against its populace during the Sack of Constantinople also reduced to ashes any chance of the reconciliation of Christians East and West.¹⁰⁵

Pope Innocent III responded variously to news of the Fourth Crusade. Receiving reports of the Latin “success,” he approved and rejoiced;¹⁰⁶ hearing of the atrocities, he censured and sorrowed.¹⁰⁷ It was his approval that would be bitterly remembered in the East.¹⁰⁸

LATIN OCCUPATION: When did the Great Schism occur? It occurred *de facto* in the aftermath of the Fourth Crusade, during the 57-year period of the Latin occupation of Constantinople and Byzantine exile. Francis Dvornik thought that the decisive moment was when a Latin, Thomas Morosini, occupied the Patriarchal throne in the Hagia Sophia.¹⁰⁹ That would put the date at 1204. Yet this is a “top down,” legalistic definition; and again, by this criterion, schism need not become permanent.¹¹⁰ Defining schism from the “bottom up,” the alienation of Christians East and West became general after the Fourth Crusade. I agree with Steven Runciman and others that the process of schism was completed during the period of Latin Occupation, on no fixed date.¹¹¹

There was an attempt at this time to patch up differences, to recover *oikonomia*. A Council was held at Nymphaion in 1234. It ended in farce. Insistence that the Byzantines submit to papal authority meant that Unionist efforts were doomed from the outset.¹¹²

In the end, the Latin monks withdrew from the debating-chamber in a rage, while the Greek bishops shouted at them: “You are heretics. We found you heretics and excommunicates and we leave you heretics and excommunicates.” And the Latins shouted back, “You are heretics, too.”¹¹³

RECOVERY OF THE CAPITAL: By a seeming miracle, the Byzantines recovered Constantinople with little violence in 1261.¹¹⁴ A new (and final) imperial dynasty, the Palaiologan, was established. However, the period of Latin Occupation had shattered the Byzantine state and society. From this point, Byzantium would face implacable external enemies and mounting catastrophes—civil war, plague, impoverishment, fragmentation, brief vassalage and siege.

ATTEMPT AT UNION: Appealing for assistance from the West, emperors repeatedly sought Union with Rome,¹¹⁵ notably at the Second Church Council at Lyons in 1274¹¹⁶ and the Council of Ferrara-Florence in 1438-39.¹¹⁷ The *Filioque* and papal primacy were the chief issues. Although Articles of Union were signed at both councils, they were rejected by the majority of Byzantines, who reviled the signatories. On his return to the capital from Ferrara-Florence, Emperor John VIII seems to have recognized the futility of the effort.¹¹⁸ Union was not publicly proclaimed in Constantinople during his lifetime.¹¹⁹ If one accepts the idea that schism could only persist through popular feeling, it would be reasonable to conclude that only popular feeling could undo it—East and West.

THE OTTOMAN CONQUEST OF CONSTANTINOPLE: Thirteen years later, the Ottoman Turks were intent on the conquest of Constantinople and what little remained of the empire.

The Decree of Church Union that had been negotiated at Ferrara-Florence was read on December 12, 1452 at a solemn liturgy in the Hagia Sophia attended by the Emperor and nobility.¹²⁰ Many Byzantines now refused to enter the Great Church, which they regarded as defiled.¹²¹

The Ottoman attack began in earnest the following spring. For more than seven weeks, the once impregnable walls of Constantinople were pounded with heavy cannon.¹²² Then the Turkish bombardment ceased, and an ominous silence prevailed.¹²³ Everyone knew that the end had come.¹²⁴

On May 28th, 1453, the eve of the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople, a final “miracle” occurred: *Oikonomia* was restored; “Greeks” and “Latins” resolved their differences. Together

they processed with the relics and icons.¹²⁵ All now gathered at the Hagia Sophia, and the Mass was concelebrated by Greek and Latin clergy.¹²⁶ Then, the last Byzantine Emperor Konstantine XI Palaiologos approached the bishops present and asked for pardon and the remission of his sins from each one.¹²⁷

I like to imagine that in the eyes of those who remained to keep vigil in the Great Church that night, looking up to the apse mosaic, the Virgin Mary Theotokos and the Christ-Child gazed down upon them with infinite compassion.¹²⁸

CONCLUSION: The “Great Schism” did not occur in 1054; yet the later perception of schism, by providing a date for what had come into being through a long process, reifying what had not then occurred and giving it form, was equally damaging.

If the study of history has any use beyond the delight of the mind reflecting on the human past, it is that by mastering the past, we may overcome it.

¹ My thanks go to Michael Huffington and to the Huffington Ecumenical Institute under its Director, Father Dorian Llywelyn, as well as to the Basil P. Caloyeras Center, for sponsoring this event. I thank the Hellenic University Club for its generosity. Especial thanks are due the Interim Director of the Huffington Ecumenical Institute, Demetrios Liappas, who suggested that I take up this inquiry, and who provided constant, detailed support.

For the sake of simplicity, the rich world of medieval Christendom has in this paper been reduced to two Episcopates: the See of Rome under the Pope, and all the lands within its jurisdiction, and the See of Constantinople within the East Roman Empire, known as “Byzantium,” under its Patriarch. The many peoples in each jurisdiction will at points in the paper be called, in the West, “Latins” and in the East, “Greeks.” This is problematic, since many distinct populations inhabited the Medieval West, and as for the Byzantines, they almost never called themselves “Greeks” (heaven forbid! that meant “pagan”), or “Byzantines,” for that matter, but “Romans” (Ῥωμαῖοι). However, Christians East and West did call one another “Latins” and “Greeks,” particularly when in polemic mood. Also, this paper would be hopelessly muddled if I had written of conflict between “Romans” and “Rome.”

Due to the magnitude of the topic, it was necessary to rely heavily on others’ scholarship. Sir Steven Runciman and Francis Dvornik, S.J. were trustworthy guides through the eleven centuries of this complex history. Other scholars to whom I am deeply indebted include Milton Anastos, John Meyendorff, Joseph Gill, S.J., Andrew Louth and Tia M. Kolbaba. However, any mistakes or misjudgments in these pages are my own.

Let me conclude these remarks with a few words from Sir Steven Runciman’s preface to *The Eastern Schism*:

It is difficult to treat a controversial subject without incurring disagreement and resentment. But I hope that none of my words will cause offence to followers of either the great Church of Rome or the Churches of the East. If my personal sympathies incline towards Byzantium, it is because I have tried to understand the Byzantine point of view.

² Among recent articles in which “1054” is viewed as a definitive rupture, see Vassios Phidas, “Papal Primacy and Patriarchal Pentarchy in the Orthodox Tradition,” p. 65; V. Nicolae Dură, “The ‘Petrine Primacy’: The Role of the Bishop of Rome According to the Canonical Legislation of the Ecumenical Councils of the First Millennium, an Ecclesiological-Canonical Evaluation,” p. 167; Ioannes Zizioulas, “Recent Discussions on Primacy in Orthodox Theology,” p. 231. All are in *The Petrine Ministry: Catholics and Orthodox in Dialogue*, ed. by Cardinal Walter Kasper; trans. by The Staff of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity (New York, 2006).

³ For scholars who do not regard “1054” as the date of the “Great Schism,” see: Francis Dvornik, *Byzantium and the Roman Primacy*, “Preface” (New York, 1966), pp. 7 and 18 (Dvornik’s book first appeared as: *Byzance et la primauté romaine*, vol. 49 of *Unam sanctum*, Éditions du Cerf, 1964.); Sir Steven Runciman, *The Eastern Schism: A Study of the Papacy and the Eastern Churches during the XIth and XIIth Centuries* (Oxford, 1955; repr. 1956), pp. 50-51. See also Milton V. Anastos, “Constantinople and Rome: A Survey of the Relations between the Byzantine and Roman Churches,” in *Studies in Byzantine Intellectual History* (London, 1979), pp. 35, 50ff.; Andrew Louth, *Greek East and Latin West: The Church AD 681 to 1071*, *The Church in History*, vol. 3, (Crestwood, New York, 2007), pp. 8-9 and 316; J.M. Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire* (Oxford, 1986; repr. 1990), pp. 135-37; *The Quest for Unity: Orthodox and Catholics in Dialogue*, “Introduction: From Estrangement to Dialogue” [no author is cited], eds. John Borelli and John H. Erickson, Documents of the Joint International Commission and Official Dialogues in the United States, 1965-1995 (Crestwood [NY] and Washington, D.C., 1996), p. 5; Tia M. Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists, Errors of the Latins*, Illinois Medieval Studies (Urbana and Chicago, 2000), p. 8 and “Byzantine perceptions of Latin religious ‘errors’: Themes and Changes from 850-1350,” in *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, eds. A.E. Laiou and R.P. Mottahedeh, (Washington, D.C., 2001), pp. 117-143; Mahlon H. Smith III, *And Taking Bread: Cerularius and the Azyme Controversy of 1054*, *Théologie Historique* 47 (Paris, 1977), pp. 18-9. Interestingly, John Meyendorff saw “1054” as unimportant to the schism because it had occurred *before* this date: John Meyendorff, *The Byzantine Legacy in the Orthodox Church* (Crestwood [NY], 2001), p. 29. Jaroslav Pelikan was close to Meyendorff on this question: *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine, Vol. 2: The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600-1700)* (Chicago and London, 1974), pp. 146-47.

⁴ No consensus exists on what schism *per se* entails. This will be taken up later in the paper. See Anastos, “Constantinople and Rome,” p. 67, n. 1.

⁵ Louth, *Greek East*, p. 307.

⁶ Cardinal Humbert, *Incipit Brevis et Succincta Commemoratio Eorum Quae gesserunt apocrisarii sanctae Romanae et apostolicae sedis in regia urbe, et qualiter anathematizati sunt Michael cum sequacibus suis* (hence, *Bull of Excommunication*), PL 143: 1001-1004.

⁷ Patriarch Michael Keroularios (Cerularius), *Edictum Synodale*, PG 120: 735-48; these actions are described in col. 741; the edict is also in Johannes Dominicus Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, etc., 53 vols. in 58 (Paris, 1901-1927; first published 1758-1798, 19: 811 and Cornelius Will, ed., *Acta et scripta quae de controversiis ecclesiae graecae et latinae saeculo XI extant* (Leipzig, 1861), 11.

⁸ Sunday, July 24th. The bull was anathematized together with the legates by imperial order and a copy publicly burned after riots broke out in the capital: Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, pp. 49-50; Martin Jugie, *Le Schisme byzantin: Aperçu historique et doctrinal* (Paris, 1941), pp. 208-11.

⁹ April 19, 1054 (Runciman reported the date as April 15th: *Eastern Schism*, p. 45).

¹⁰ Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, pp. 45-6: "...legates cannot represent a dead Pope..." according to canon law. Cf. Joseph Gill, S.J., *The Council of Florence* (Cambridge [UK], 1959), pp. 5-6; Anastos, p. 52. Joan Hussey, on the other hand, considers that the legates' actions were nonetheless "...probably valid [italics mine]. In any case, they represented views acceptable in western ecclesiastical circles": Hussey, *Orthodox Church*, p. 134. On this technical point I come down on the side of Runciman (and others) and against Hussey (and others).

¹¹ On the Western side, the excommunicates were legates Cardinal Humbert, Frederick of Lorraine, Chancellor of the Roman See (and the future Pope Stephen IX), Peter, Archbishop of Amalfi and an imperial representative in Italy, Argyros; on the Eastern side, Patriarch Michael Keroularios, Patriarchal Chancellor Michael Konstantine and Leo of Ohrid. Humbert, *Bull of Excommunication*, PL 143: 1001-1004; Keroularios, *Edictum Synodale*, PG 120: 748. Cf. Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 49; Anastos, "Constantinople and Rome," p. 52; Louth, *Greek East*, pp. 308 and 316-17.

¹² ...*Christianissima et orthodoxa est civitas*. Cardinal Humbert fulsomely praised the orthodoxy of the City and its inhabitants, limiting excommunication to the Patriarch and his "followers" (*cum sequacibus suis*): Humbert, *Bull of Excommunication*, PL 143: 1003A.

¹³ Humbert, *Bull of Excommunication*, PL 143: 1003.

¹⁴ Patriarch Michael Keroularios to Peter of Antioch, *Epistolae*, PG 120: 781-96 and 816-20. Peter III to Michael Keroularios, PG 120: 795-816 (for all relevant correspondence, PG 120: 752-820). See also Will, nos. 12-17. Cf. Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, pp. 52-3; Louth, *Greek East*, p. 310; Tia M. Kolbaba, "Orthodoxy of the Latins," in *Byzantine Orthodoxies*, Papers from the Thirty-Sixth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Durham, 23-25 March 2002, ed. by Andrew Louth and Augustine Casiday, Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies 12 (Aldershot, [Hants.], 2006), pp. 200-201.

¹⁵ This is not to minimize the importance to medieval Christians of other religious and cultural differences, but to stress that the *Filioque* and papal primacy were the issues of enduring concern. See the remarks of Tia M. Kolbaba, *Byzantine Lists*, pp. 3-4.

¹⁶ Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 8.

¹⁷ *Quest for Unity*, "Introduction," p. 6.

¹⁸ Dvornik, "The Principle of Apostolicity," *Primacy*, pp. 40-58.

¹⁹ Other cities of apostolic foundation were Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, and Ephesus. According to tradition, Saint Peter had lived in Alexandria and Antioch, and had founded the community in Antioch as well as that of Rome. Peter was not, *strictu sensu*, the first Bishop of Rome; Linus was. However, Rome was the only city in the West of apostolic origin. Its prestige was also derived from being the city in which Saints Peter and Paul were martyred: Dvornik, "The Principle of Apostolicity," *Primacy*, pp. 40-58; Pelikan, *Spirit of Eastern Christendom*, p. 162. Yet Rome had itself been made subject to "the principle of accommodation" at Nicaea (Canon 6), irrespective of its apostolicity: Dvornik, "The Principle of Accommodation" and "The Principle of Apostolicity," *Primacy*, pp. 27-39 and pp. 40-58; Anastos, "Constantinople and Rome," pp. 10-11. For further perspectives on this question, see: Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, pp. 12 and 64; Anastos, "Constantinople and Rome," pp. 5 and 56; Raymond E. Brown and John P. Meier, *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity* (New York, 1983), p. 164. In *The Petrine Ministry: Catholics and Orthodox in Dialogue*, see: Theodore Stylianopoulos, "Concerning the Biblical Foundation of Primacy," p. 60; Durā, "The 'Petrine Primacy,'" p. 178; Jean-Claude Larchet, "The Question of Roman Primacy in the Thought of Saint Maximus the Confessor," pp. 195-96.

²⁰ Dvornik, "The Principle of Accommodation," *Primacy*, pp. 27-39.

²¹ These were Canon 3 of the Second Ecumenical Council at Constantinople and Canon 28 of the Fourth Ecumenical Council at Chalcedon. The latter canon reads: *...ut Constantinopolitanus Episcopus habeat honorem*

& primum locum post Romanam sanctissimam Sedem, eo quod etiam Constantinopolis sit nova Roma... (“... that the Constantinopolitan Bishop should have honor and the first position after the most holy Roman See, because Constantinople is New Rome...”): Mansi, 6: 178. Previously the Bishop of Byzantium had been a suffragan to the Archbishop of Heraklea: Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, pp. 13 and 15; Phidas, “Papal Primacy and Patriarchal Pentarchy,” p. 73; Dvornik, *Primacy*, pp. 32-33; Pelikan, *Spirit of Eastern Christendom*, op. cit., pp. 162-63; Anastos, “Constantinople and Rome,” pp. 56-7. Canon 36 of the Quinisext Council placed in order the Pentarchy: Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem.

Pope Leo I objected to Canon 28 of the Council of Chalcedon because of the enlargement of the jurisdiction of Constantinople, now placed over the dioceses of Thrace, Asia and the Pontus and made second in precedence: Mansi, 6: 178. The complaints of Leo I appear in his letters to Empress Pulcheria and Emperor Marcian and to Patriarch Anatolius: *PL* 54: 994-1009; Mansi, 6: 182-207. These are discussed in Dvornik: *Primacy*, pp. 47-8. Apostolicity was not mentioned in Canon 28 of Chalcedon: Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 14. Leo’s objection stalled, but did not prevent, promulgation of Canon 28 of Chalcedon through Canon 36 canon of the Quinisext Council and at the Fourth Lateran Council in the West (1215): Anastos, “Constantinople and Rome,” pp. 16-17.

Appellate jurisdiction, whether of Rome over all other Sees or of Constantinople over the other Eastern Patriarchates, was and is disputed. Canons 9 and 17 of the Fourth Ecumenical Council at Chalcedon pertain to the latter. See Anastos, “Constantinople and Rome,” pp. 3, 9-10, 15-17 and 57-9; Pelikan, *Spirit of Eastern Christendom*, pp. 166-67. Anastos also made the point that the terms “Pope” and “Patriarch” were once applied to all the top hierarchs of the Church. The title “Æcumenical Patriarch” was taken by the Patriarch of Constantinople, John the Faster, in the year 595, to the objection of Gregory the Great. But “Æcumenical” referred to the capital of the Christian Empire (*οἰκουμένη*), and was not a claim of universal jurisdiction. Anastos, “Constantinople and Rome,” pp. 25-6; Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, pp. 18-19; Meyendorff, *Byzantine Legacy*, pp. 19-20.

²² Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 19; Anastos, “Constantinople and Rome,” p. 31; Meyendorff, *Byzantine Legacy*, p. 22.

²³ Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 18; Anastos, “Constantinople and Rome,” p. 59.

²⁴ “What is at stake [in the application of the principle of *οἰκονομία*] is not only an exception to the law, but an obligation to decide individual issues in the context of God’s plan for the salvation of the world. Canonical strictures may sometimes be inadequate to the full reality and universality of the Gospel, and, by themselves, do not provide the assurance that, in applying them, one is obedient to the will of God. For the Byzantines—to use an expression of Patriarch Nicholas Mystikos (901-907, 912-925)—*oikonomia* is ‘an imitation of God’s love for man’ and not simply ‘an exception to the rule’”: John Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology: historical trends & doctrinal themes* (New York, 1974; rev. ed. 1983), p. 89. Cf. Langford-James, *A Dictionary of the Eastern Orthodox Church* (London, 1923), pp. 47-50; John H. Erickson, “*Oikonomia* in Byzantine Canon Law,” in K. Pennington and R. Somerville, eds., *Law, Church and Society: Essays in Honor of Stephan Kuttner* (Philadelphia, 1977), pp. 225-36. See also the *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. 3, “*Oikonomia*,” pp. 1516-17: “Its purpose was to avoid the severity of the law, to eliminate the obstacle to salvation caused by a rigid legalistic implementation.” In the West, the most approximate term was *dispensatio*, “...denoting simple exception or dispensation from a law.”

²⁵ There is an implicit gendering in these characterizations. For example, see Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, pp. 8 and 169.

²⁶ *Quest for Unity*, “Introduction,” p. 6.

²⁷ This matter is by no means straightforward. The Visigothic alteration to the formula *qui ex Patre procedit* was not the only, nor even the first, to be made in this direction. For references to versions from Gaul and North Africa, see Peter Gemeinhardt, *Die Filioque-Kontroverse zwischen Ost- und Westkirche im Frühmittelalter*, *Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte* 82 (Berlin and New York, 2002), n. 88, pp. 66-7. The Visigoths were little influenced by Rome and Constantinople, due to their distance from both and enmity with the latter: Gemeinhardt, *Filioque-Kontroverse*, p. 52.

The *Filioque* interpolation was made at the Third Council of Toledo. King Reccared had made the Metropolitan Bishop of Toledo, the royal city, head of the Church in Visigothic Spain: Dvornik, *Primacy*, p. 37; Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 29. Only Church authorities from within Spain attended. Arianism was repeatedly anathematized, and formerly Arian Visigothic representatives of the Church and laity publicly recanted. The interpolation was derived from the Athanasian Creed (as *et filio*) and then applied to the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed. See Judith Herrin, *The Formation of Christendom* (Princeton [NJ], 1987), pp. 228-29; Gemeinhardt, *Filioque-Kontroverse*, p. 69. Richard Haugh argues that Saint Augustine had provided the

theological basis for the *Filioque* centuries before the formula was used in Spain; also, that the interpolation of the *Filioque* happened through transposition from the Athanasian Creed. Richard Haugh, “Conclusion,” *Photius and the Carolingians: The Trinitarian Controversy* (Belmont [MASS], 1975), pp. 159ff; cf. Gemeinhardt, *Filioque-Kontroverse*, pp. 56-65.

These are convincing points. To them it might be added that the Franks, who had no need to react against Arianism, would also adopt the *Filioque*. However, I do not see that these arguments are incompatible with the idea that the Visigoths chose to adopt the formula in order to repudiate Arianism, especially in view of their public rejection of Arianism at the Council. In 1054, this was Patriarch Peter III of Antioch’s understanding of the background to the *Filioque* addition: *PG* 120: 805-6.

The objections of Orthodox Christians to the *Filioque* addition are twofold. The first has to do with a disagreement about the validity of the doctrine of the “double procession” that developed from (and with) the *Filioque*; the second has to do with its lack of canonicity, in that the interpolation was not agreed upon at an Ecumenical Council of the Church. To Byzantines, this was not just uncanonical and unconciliar, but amounted to denying the inspiration in council of the Church Fathers: Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 33.

²⁸ For a recent discussion of the development of the *Filioque* from a Catholic perspective, see Dennis Ngien, *Apologetic for Filioque in Medieval Theology* (Waynesboro [GA] and Milton Keynes [UK], 2005).

²⁹ Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 31. Peter Gemeinhardt stresses the importance to the background of the *Filioque* controversy of the reception of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed in Latin translation after Chalcedon: *Filioque-Kontroverse*, especially pp. 39 and 46-9.

³⁰ Gemeinhardt, *Filioque-Kontroverse*, p. 53.

³¹ *Das läßt nun aber den Schluß zu, das nicht nur – wie im Osten—die verschiedenen Bekenntnisse von Nizäa und Konstantinopel als inhaltlich übereinstimmend angesehen wurden, sondern daß im lateinischen Westen auch die jeweils divergierenden Texte dieser Formeln nicht als sakrosankt betrachtet wurden*: “But this now permits the conclusion that not only—as in the East—were the diverse confessions of Nicaea and Constantinople seen as in formal agreement, but also that in the Latin West, the [various] diverging texts of these formulas were not regarded as sacrosanct”: Gemeinhardt, *Filioque-Kontroverse*, p. 49.

³² See Ioannes Zizioulas, “The Doctrine of the Holy Trinity: The Significance of the Cappadocian Contribution,” in *Essays on Divine Being and Act*, ed. by C. Schwöbel, Trinitarian Theology Today (Edinburgh, 1995), pp. 44-60; Peter Gemeinhardt, “Geboren aus dem Wesen des Vaters,” *Studia patristica*, vol. 38 (Leuven, 2001), pp. 153-68.

³³ Saint Augustine: *De Trinitate*, VI, 5,7, in *De Trinitate Libri XV*, ed. by W.J. Mountain, 2 vols., *CCL* 50-50A (Turnhout, 1968); in *Joannis, Tractatus* 99, *PL* 35: 1888-90.

³⁴ Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 30. Or, as John Meyendorff put it: “The question was whether tri-personality or consubstantiality was the first and basic content of Christian religious experience”: *Byzantine Theology*, p. 94.

For further discussion of these points, consult: Meyendorff, *Byzantine Legacy*, pp. 27 and 154-58; Philip Sherrard, *The Greek East and the Latin West: A Study in the Christian Tradition* (London, 1959), pp. 61-72; Timothy (Kallistos) Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 2nd ed. (London, 1993), p. 48; Aristeides Papadakis, *Crisis in Byzantium: The Filioque Controversy and the Patriarchate of Gregory II of Cyprus (1283-1289)* (New York, 1983), pp. 63-4; John Behr, “Faithfulness and Creativity,” in *Abba: The Tradition of Orthodoxy in the West, Festschrift for Bishop Kallistos (Ware) of Diokleia*, eds. John Behr, Andrew Louth, Dimitri Conomos (Crestwood [NY], 2003), pp. 174-77; Ngien, *Apologetic*, p. 24; Donald Fairbairn, *Eastern Orthodoxy through Western Eyes* (Louisville [KY] and London, 2002), pp. 56-9.

³⁵ Joseph Gill, S. J., *The Council of Florence*, (Cambridge [UK], 1959), p. 193. Even when goodwill was involved, the linguistic clash created distance. In the late eleventh century, Theophylact of Ohrid wrote to relieve “Latins” of the charge of heresy through discussing the relative “poverty” of the Latin language. The verb *ἐκπορεύεσθαι*, he wrote, translated in Latin as *procedere*, conveys an idea that might be expressed in at least three other ways in Greek (as *χεῖσθαι*, *διαδίδοσθαι*, *προβάλλειν*): P. Gautier, *Théophylacte D’Achrida: Discours, traités, poesies* (Thessalonike, 1980), pp. 247-257. Cf. Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 73; Kolbaba, “Orthodoxy,” pp. 201-202; *The Quest for Unity*, “Introduction,” p. 6.

³⁶ Gill, *Council of Florence*, pp. 191-93. Cf. Gemeinhardt, *Filioque-Kontroverse*, p. 59. Saint Augustine was fully aware of the Trinitarian implications of the linguistic divide. Cf. Hilary of Poitiers: *Exposita, Charissimi, unius substantiae, quae graece ‘omousion’ dicitur*: *PL* 10: 530B; also, 536A-B.

³⁷ Gill, *Council of Florence*, pp. 192-92.

³⁸ Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 29.

³⁹ The loss to the Lombards in 751 of the last Byzantine imperial outpost in the West, the Exarchate of Ravenna, had momentous effects: Rome turned to the Franks as its defenders, gave legitimacy to the new Carolingian Dynasty, and received the donation of Pippin, the core of the Papal State. Byzantine sovereignty did persist in parts of Campania, Apulia and Calabria until the eleventh century.

Gemeinhardt hypothesizes that Theodulf of Orleans represented the Visigothic (*spanische*) tradition of the Creed in its diffusion to the Franks: *Filioque-Kontroverse*, p. 73.

⁴⁰ Gemeinhardt, *Filioque-Kontroverse*, pp. 41, 65-74, 146-48; Ngien, *Apologetic*, p. 22; Herrin, *Formation*, pp. 439-440.

⁴¹ Dvornik, *The Photian Schism, history and legend* (Cambridge [UK], 1948), p. 122.

⁴² Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 30. I now understand that although Leo III resisted alteration to the Creed, he was sympathetic to the doctrine of the “double procession”: *Spiritus sanctum a Patre et a Filio aequaliter procedentem, consubstantialem coaeternum Patri et Filio. Pater plenus Deus in se. Filius plenus Deus a Patre genitus, Spiritus sanctus plenus Deus a Patre et Filio procedens* (“The Holy Spirit proceeding equally from the Father and from the Son, [is] consubstantial and co-eternal [with] the Father and the Son. The Father is in Himself fully God. The Son begotten from the Father is fully God, the Holy Spirit, fully God, [proceeds] from the Father and from the Son.”) Pope Leo III, *Symbolum orthodoxae fidei Leonis papae*, PL 129: 1260B. See Gemeinhardt, *Filioque-Kontroverse*, p. 145; Haugh, *Photius and the Carolingians*, pp. 165-66; Pelikan, *Spirit of Eastern Christendom*, p. 187; Ngien, *Apologetic*, p. 22.

⁴³ Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 30; Gemeinhardt, *Filioque-Kontroverse*, pp. 144 and 148.

⁴⁴ This was involved in a larger territorial struggle between Rome and Constantinople over the jurisdiction of Illyricum, Sicily and Calabria.

⁴⁵ Meyendorff, *Byzantine Legacy*, p. 28. The Bulgars’ desire to conduct the liturgy in their own language, impermissible to Rome, helped to tip the balance toward Constantinople: Anastos, “Constantinople and Rome,” pp. 37-8.

⁴⁶ Milton Anastos claimed that Patriarch Ignatios, whom Photios displaced, abdicated voluntarily. It is usually reported that Ignatios was deposed unwillingly: Anastos, “Constantinople and Rome,” p. 36.

⁴⁷ Photios excommunicated Pope Nicholas I and condemned certain Latin differences (the doctrine of the “double procession,” the unleavened Eucharist, and clerical celibacy). See Photios, *Epistulae et Amphilochia*, ed. B. Laourdas and L.G. Westerink (Leipzig, 1988), 1: 43.

⁴⁸ There was no “Second Photian Schism.” Francis Dvornik brilliantly discredited that misconception in *The Photian Schism*. In 880, Pope John VIII annulled “anti-Photian decrees” and condemned the interpolation of *Filioque*. A Council was held at Constantinople that restored ties between Constantinople and Rome, and which declared anathema anyone who would add to the Nicene Creed. The papal legates did not object, for the simple reason that Rome itself did not yet endorse the *Filioque*. However, the canonist Gratian would efface the rehabilitation of Photios as “discordant” from the *Concordantia discordantium canonum* of the mid-twelfth century: Cf. Dvornik, *Ecumenical Councils*, pp. 43-6; Anastos, “Constantinople and Rome,” pp. 38-9; Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 26; Meyendorff, *Byzantine Legacy*, p. 29; Kolbaba, “Byzantine perceptions,” p. 121; Gemeinhardt, *Filioque-Kontroverse*, pp. 165-298.

⁴⁹ It was the Byzantine Empire itself, rather than the Patriarchate, that had troubled relations with Rome in the tenth century, over such matters as the claim by Pope John XIII that Otto I was “Emperor of the Romans” and Nikephoros Phokas “The Emperor of the Greeks,” as well as political and ecclesiastical control of southern Italy. This conflict is [in]famously recorded by Liutprand of Cremona in the *Relatio de legatione Constantinopolitana ad Nicephoram Phocam*. See Anastos, “Constantinople and Rome,” pp. 45-6 and 49. There were to be “no serious clashes” between Pope and Patriarch from the early-tenth until the mid-eleventh century: Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 27.

⁵⁰ “. . .the degradation of the Papacy during the tenth and early eleventh centuries had been ruinous for Roman prestige”: Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 66; also, p. 55.

⁵¹ Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, pp. 2-3; Anastos, “Constantinople and Rome,” p. 50. This remains a mysterious matter—why did the Patriarch Sergios II omit the name of Pope Sergius IV from the patriarchal lists? Another mystery (for me) is whether at this time the Patriarch of Constantinople was being recognized in Rome. This never seems to come up in the scholarship on the alienation of the Church East and West, the East being placed in a defensive position in the discussion.

⁵² It is possible that Systatic Letters, declarations of faith made at the time of accession, that might have prompted recognition in the diptychs of Constantinople, were not sent.

At a synod in 1089, it was admitted that the Popes' names had been omitted not deliberately (*οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀπὸ κρίσεως*) but "mindlessly" (*ἀσυντηρήτως*): W. Holtzmann, "Unionsverhandlungen zwischen Kaiser Alexios I. und Papst Urban II. im Jahre 1089," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 28 (1928), p. 60. Cf. Louth, *Greek East*, pp. 316-17; Kolbaba, "Orthodoxy," pp. 203-205. Pope Urban II had not sent his Systatic Letter to Constantinople when Emperor Alexios I offered to place his name on the diptychs *kat' oikonomian* (*κατ' οἰκονομίαν*, according to the principle of *oikonomia*) after its receipt and scrutiny: Holtzmann, "Unionsverhandlungen," p. 62. This reference was in Kolbaba, "Orthodoxy," p. 205. Cf. Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, pp. 61-2 and 140; V. Grumel, "Jérusalem entre Rome et Byzance: Une lettre inconnue du patriarche de Constantinople Nicolas III à son collègue de Jérusalem," *Échos d'Orient*, vol. 38 (1938), pp. 114-15.

⁵³ Berno of Reichenau, *Bernonis libellus de quibusdam rebus ad missae officium pertinentibus*, PL 142: 1059B-61D. See Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 30; Anastos, "Constantinople and Rome," p. 50; Louth, *Greek East*, p. 315.

⁵⁴ The impression made by Liutprand's vivid testimony may perhaps inflate the degree of interaction East/West in the latter half of the tenth century in historians' minds. "... Byzantium was engrossed by civil wars and wars of reconquest in the East and the Balkans. It took no active interest in Italy, except when the Germans tried to invade its provinces in the south": Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 28.

⁵⁵ See Kolbaba, "Byzantine perceptions," esp. pp. 121-23.

⁵⁶ "Papacy," *papatus*, was first used in 1047 by Clement II, suggesting a level above the Episcopacy, *episcopatus*: Louth, *Greek East*, p. 298. Cf. Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 58; Phidas, "Papal Primacy and Patriarchal Pentarchy," pp. 65-6.

⁵⁷ "Cardinal Humbert of Silva Candida was an early proponent and perhaps even the chief architect, of the vision of a supreme, independent and reforming papacy that Germanic churchmen brought to Rome when the Saxon emperor, Henry III, sought to rescue the fortunes of the Holy See from the license and internecine feuding that had disgraced it for a century": Smith, *And Taking Bread*, p. 35.

⁵⁸ Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 28. Pope Leo IX supported Papal Reform and was associated with Cluny: Gemeinhardt, *Filioque-Kontroverse*, pp. 324-25.

⁵⁹ The Greek verb *barbarizw* (*βαρβαρίζω*) essentially meant to burble unintelligibly, like a foreigner.

⁶⁰ Pope Nicholas I, *Ad Michaelem Imperatorem*, PL 119: 932A: *In tantam vero furoris abundantiam prorupistis, ut linguae Latinae injuriam irrogaretis, hanc in epistola vestra barbaram et Scythicam apellantes...* ("In fact, you broke out in such an outburst of frenzy, that you inflicted injury [on] the Latin tongue, calling it 'barbaric' and 'Scythian' in this letter of yours...")

⁶¹ Among "barbarians" in the *Alexiad* are so-called "Celts," Cumans, Franks, "Latins," Muslims, Normans, Pechenegs, Turks, Varangians, etc.

⁶² *τοιούτων γὰρ τὸ Λατίνων ἅπαν γένος ἐρασιχρήματόν τε καὶ ὀβολοῦ ἐνὸς πιπράσκειν εἰωθὸς καὶ αὐτὰ δὴ τὰ θίλτατα* ("For so avaricious is the entire race of Latins that they would even sell [this may be a play on words, as *πιπράσκειν* could also mean "sell out, betray"] their best-beloved for a single obol"): Anna Komnene, *Annae Comnenae Alexias*, eds. Deither R. Reinsch and Athanasios Kambylis, *CFHB* 40.1 (Berlin, 2001), p. 180.

⁶³ *Quod quam contumelios sit, molles, effeminatos, manicatos, tiaratos, teristratos, mendaces, neutros, desides, purpuratos incidere; heroas vero, viros scilicet fortes, scientes bellum, fidei charitatisque plenos, Deo subditos, virtutibus plenos, non!* Liutprand of Cremona, *Relatio de legatione Constantinopolitana ad Nicephoram Phocam*, PL 136: 909.

⁶⁴ Guibert of Nogent (late-11th-early 12th centuries), *Historia Hierosolymitana*, vol. 4, *Historiens Occidentaux* (Paris, 1844-95), p. 154.

⁶⁵ Emperor Leo III had ceded Illyricum, Sicily and Calabria to the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate in 732-33; Nikephoros Phokas ordered that the liturgy be celebrated only in Greek in the late tenth century. Anastos, "Constantinople and Rome," pp. 29 and 47-8, 53; Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 44; Louth, *Greek East*, p. 306; Gemeinhardt, *Filioque-Kontroverse*, pp. 322-327.

⁶⁶ Humbert, *Bull of Excommunication*, PL 143: 1004A.

⁶⁷ Tia Kolbaba makes a compelling argument against the closure of Latin churches by Patriarch Michael Keroularios: "Byzantine perceptions," pp. 136-37.

Later in the eleventh century, a similar accusation would be made (at the time of Emperor Alexios I Komnenos). Patriarch Nikolaos III Grammatikos, however, denied the charge: *... οὐδαμῶς ἀπείργονται τῶν θείων ναῶν ...* ("... by no means are they [Latins] shut out from the holy churches..."): Holtzmann, "Unionsverhandlungen," p. 63. Kolbaba, "Orthodoxy," pp. 202, n. 3; Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 61; Louth, *Greek East*, pp. 306-7.

⁶⁸ Τὰ γὰρ ἄζυμα καὶ τὰ Σάββατα ἐκεῖνοι φυλάττειν παρὰ Μωσέως ἐνετάληθσαν· τὸ δ' ἡμέτερον Πάσχα ὁ Χριστός ἐστιν... Leo of Ohrid, *Epistola ad Ioannem Episcopum Tranensem*, PG 120: 835-844. For this reason, the Archbishop of Ohrid was anathematized with Patriarch Michael Keroularios in Cardinal Humbert's bull of excommunication: Louth, *Greek East*, p. 307. See John Skylitzes: *Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis Historiarum*, ed. Johannes Thurn, *CFHB* 5 (Berlin, 1973), pp. 433-34: Μιχαὴλ ... ὁ πατριάρχης... τὸν πάπαν Ῥώμης τῶν διπτύχων ἐξέβαλε (sic), τὸ τῶν ἀζύμων ζήτημα ἐπενεγκὼν αὐτῷ τῆς ἐκβολῆς αἴτιον. ("The Patriarch Michael... struck the Pope of Rome off the diptychs (sic), attributing to the question of the azymes the cause of the removal by him [of the Pope's name]"). Skylitzes' comments are inaccurate, as no Pope had been named in the diptychs since 1009.

Concern about the Eucharist was heightened in Byzantium because of tensions between Byzantine and Armenian Christians: Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, pp. 40-41; Smith, *And Taking Bread*, pp. 128ff, 173; Kolbaba, *Byzantine Lists*, p. 25 and "Byzantine perceptions," pp. 122-25. Christians in the West were anxious about the Eucharist at this time as well.

As Byzantine polemical literature in the form of lists of Latin "errors" increased, many listed practices (real or imagined) were characterized as "Judaizing." See Tia Kolbaba's discussion of this: *Byzantine Lists*, pp. 23, 34-5.

⁶⁹ Emperor Konstantine IX Monomachos seems to have been irenic in his intentions; his contemporaries thought that one of his flaws was the desire to please everyone. Yet he was blamed retrospectively for the schism, as in this anonymous Venetian verse, written after the fall of Constantinople: <O> *Monomachos, falso imperadore / Eretico principio di risia! / Costui è stato via / Di metter sisma nella ghiesa sancta*: Anonymous Venetian, "Questo è 'l lamento de Costantinopoli," in *La Caduta di Costantinopoli*, Vol. 2: *L'eco nel mondo*, ed. and annotated by Agostino Pertusi (Place of publication not given: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, 1976), p. 299; from A. Medin and L. Frati, *Lamenti storici dei secoli XIV, XV e XVI*, vol. 2 (Bologna, 1888), pp. 127-46.

⁷⁰ The communications from Konstantine IX Monomachos and Patriarch Michael Keroularios to the Pope are lost, but can be inferred from the responses of Leo IX (January, 1054): Mansi, 19, 667ff.; *PL* 143: 773-81. Cf. Beresford James Kidd, *The Churches of Eastern Christendom: From A.D. 451 to the Present Time* (London, New York, Bahrain, 2006; originally published 1927), p. 211; Hussey, *Orthodox Church*, p. 132.

⁷¹ See Anastos, "Constantinople and Rome," pp. 49-52.

Was Dvornik right to assume that Pope Leo IX sent envoys "... in an effort to reach an understanding with the Emperor against their common enemy, the Normans, who had occupied southern Italy" (Dvornik, *Ecumenical Councils*, pp. 48-9)? It doesn't stand to reason. The conundrum was well expressed, but not satisfactorily solved, by Mahlon Smith:

The immediate situation made harmony expedient, for both parties needed the other's aid to check the Norman uprisings in southern Italy. Yet neither mundane expediency nor their common heritage was able to provide a sufficiently broad platform for Roman and Byzantine cooperation: Smith, *And Taking Bread*, p. 22.

I follow Anastos' lead in this explanation: Pope Leo IX was captive to the Normans until just before his demise. The Normans were in a position to persuade the Pope to enter into common cause on southern Italy. Further, the alliance with Byzantium on southern Italy was recent; papal and Byzantine strife over Italy, however, went back centuries. The papal loss at Civitate, which Pope Leo IX experienced personally, may well have opened his eyes to the *Realpolitik* of the situation. Finally, the Normans, "unruly and troublesome" though they were, were Roman Christians; their possessions would fall into papal jurisdiction.

Rather than the Papacy later being "... forced to make the best bargain open to it..." (Hussey, *Orthodox Church*, p. 135) when, in 1059, it recognized the Normans in southern Italy as its vassals, I must agree with Milton Anastos that it was clearly in its interest to alter its allegiance after the loss to the Normans in June of 1053. The consideration that Rome might thereby gain southern Italy would trump passing loyalties (as to the Byzantines).

This argument must also take into account the authenticity of the papal letters to the emperor and to Michael Keroularios. If they were from the Pope, changed policy would explain their tone and intransigence, and that of the papal legation. This *contretemps* may well have been motivated on the Roman side by the need to justify a planned shift in its allegiance to the Normans. In this construction, the papal mission did not "fail." It accomplished its aim. (Perhaps it would be worthwhile recalling here that a precipitating factor in the "Photian Schism" had been the refusal of Pope Nicholas I to recognize Photios' Sycastic Letter until Byzantium had ceded Illyricum and Sicily to the jurisdiction of Rome: Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 23.)

However, Michael Keroularios doubted the letters' authenticity. Due to their unexpected sternness, Michael Keroularios suspected that they were forgeries (... μήτε παρὰ τοῦ πάπα ἀποσταλέντες - "... no way were these sent by the Pope!"), and had been tampered with by an imperial representative in command of Byzantine military

forces in Italy, the Lombard catepan Argyros. This is highly dubious. Yet might they have been written by Humbert, as historian Anton Michel claimed on the basis of a stylistic analysis and comparison with the Cardinal's other writings (see. n. 72)? If so, the legation lacked any legitimacy.

At any rate, the successor to Pope Leo IX, Victor II, entered into a truce with the Normans; later, Pope Nicholas II settled a treaty with them on southern Italy. Turning over its churches to Rome following the Council of Malfi in 1059, Robert Guiscard frankly ruled Apulia and Calabria under the Roman See: Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, pp. 37, 42 and 56-7; Anastos, "Constantinople and Rome," pp. 49-50. Southern Italy would remain a sore point in East/West relations, accelerating disaffection: Kolbaba, "Orthodoxy," p. 206.

That the papal legates were motivated by this consideration would not mean that others were unimportant to them, e.g., to advance the slate of reforms that had been taken up by the Papacy. What I doubt is that the legation was at any point intent upon improving relations.

⁷² Why Keroularios suspected Argyros is unclear to me. Was he Keroularios' "archenemy," as Anastos thought? Or was he a "safer target" than Humbert would have been? Keroularios, *Edictum Synodale*, PG 120: 711, *Epistola*, PG 120: 796-97. Cf. Anastos, "Constantinople and Rome," pp. 51-2; Jugie, *Le Schisme byzantin*, p. 225; Anton Michel, *Humbert und Kerullarios, Studien*, vol. 1 of 2 (Paderborn, 1924-30), pp. 30-32; Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 45; Louth, *Greek East*, p. 308.

⁷³ They departed on the 18th of July. Konstantine IX Monomachos at first suspected that the Patriarch had misrepresented the contents of the bull of excommunication, but sent a messenger who met with the legates at Selymbria and obtained a copy of the document in the Latin, which proved to correspond with Keroularios' Greek version. The emperor then ordered the legates to return to Constantinople to answer to a synod. They refused. Michael Keroularios, *Edictum Synodale*, PG 120: 746. Cf. Kidd, *Churches of Eastern Christendom*, p. 213; Hussey, *Orthodox Church*, pp. 133-34; Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 49.

⁷⁴ Humbert, *Bull of Excommunication*, PL 143: 1004B.

⁷⁵ Language was again crucial in the "azyme controversy." The Greek New Testament and the Latin Vulgate differ at Galatians 5:9 as to whether leavening "leavens" or "spoils": μικρά ζύμη ὅλον τὸ φύραμα ζυμοῖ ("A bit of leavening leavens the whole lump [of dough]"); *modicum fermentum totam massam corrumpit* ("A bit of leavening spoils the whole lump [of dough]"). Tia Kolbaba notes that Michael Keroularios saw this as a deliberate mistranslation, meant to justify the unleavened Eucharist: Kolbaba, *Byzantine Lists*, p. 37 and n. 31, p. 74.

Incendiary at the time, this issue was insignificant later: Smith, *And Taking Bread*, pp. 24-5.

⁷⁶ Despite opening the bull with assurances that the emperor, clergy and people of Constantinople were "most Christian," Humbert threw the book at them, charging that the Greeks were "prozymites" (used leavened bread for the Eucharist) and committed a host of crimes (like simony) and heretical errors (Arianism, Donatism, Nicolaitism, Pneumatomachism or Theomachism; that they were Sevenians and Manichaeans, and more), attaching these categories to Greek practices (e.g., Nicolaitism to clerical marriage): Humbert, *Bull of Excommunication*, PL 143: 1000-1004. Francis Dvornik saw in these charges the elements of Papal Reform: Dvornik, *Ecumenical Councils*, p. 49.

⁷⁷ Humbert, *Bull of Excommunication*, PL 143: 1003.

Was this a "deliberate" forgetting? Mahlon Smith writes that: "Cardinal Humbert of Silva Candida was apparently too embroiled in his debates with the patriarchal representatives to check the conciliar records when he became aware of the discrepancy (on the *Filioque*)" (Smith, *And Taking Bread*, p. 23). That's possible. Yet if it were the case that the legation wanted to justify in advance a shift in alliance from the Byzantines to the Normans, might it not equally be possible that Humbert brought up a moribund quarrel and deliberately misrepresented its history in order to provoke the truculent Patriarch of Constantinople? Cf. Gill, *Council of Florence*, p. 6; Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 48; Louth, *Greek East*, p. 309.

⁷⁸ Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, pp. 49-50; Jugie, *Le Schisme byzantin*, pp. 208-11.

⁷⁹ Keroularios claimed, for example, that Popes had not been recognized on the Constantinopolitan diptychs since Vigilius (false) and that Vigilius had been Pope at the time of the Sixth Ecumenical Council (it was the Fifth). His factual errors are not the only troubling aspect of Keroularios' writings of the time. His synodal edict reveals resentful astonishment at the actions of Humbert and the legation; his subsequent correspondence, rising wrath: Patriarch Michael Keroularios to Peter III of Antioch, PG 120: 781-96; see also, 816-20.

The Patriarch's anti-Latin criticisms are as extreme as the anti-Greek criticisms of the Cardinal, and equally unreliable (see especially cols. 789-92).

⁸⁰ Peter III to Michael Keroularios, PG 120: 795-816. Peter corrected Michael Keroularios's errors in ecclesiastical history (cols. 797-800), and attempted to calm the enraged Patriarch of Constantinople, enjoining

him to adopt *oikonomia*. Peter reasoned that certain differences in practice (*ἀδιάφορα*) had been allowed by the Church Fathers. The doctrinal difference on which Peter did not bend was the *Filioque* (cols. 803-806): *Κακὸν... καὶ κακῶν κάκιστον* ([It is bad, and of all evils the worst...]). These points are discussed in Pelikan, *Spirit of Eastern Christendom*, pp. 171 and 185.

⁸¹ Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 55; Anastos, "Constantinople and Rome," p. 52; Hussey, *Orthodox Church*, pp. 135-36.

⁸² Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, pp. 50-51. Andrew Louth would put the perception on the part of Byzantines that "1054" had been the effective date of the schism in the late-13th century, at the time of the Second Church Council of Lyons: Louth, *Greek East*, p. 317.

The reputation for being the principle cause of the schism has clung to Michael Kerouliarios almost to the present. Martin Jugie referred to this episode as *le schisme de Michel Cérulaire* and to the entire East/West divorce as *le schisme byzantin*; Louis Bréhier saw the "schism" in 1054 as stemming almost wholly from Kerouliarios, part of his "grand design" to use demagoguery to establish a kind of "republican theocracy" (?) in which he possessed both imperial and patriarchal powers: "... *il résolut d'accomplir le grand dessein dont la poursuite donne une véritable unité à cette vie si étrange que, malgré la distance et les différences des milieux, elle évoque tout à la fois le machiavélisme d'un cardinal de Retz et l'ascétisme d'un Grégoire VII*" ("He [Michael Kerouliarios] resolved to accomplish [that] grand design, the pursuit of which gives a veritable unity to that odd life which, despite the distance and the differences in environments, at once calls to mind the Machiavellianism of a Cardinal of Retz and the asceticism of Gregory VII"): Louis Bréhier, *Le Schisme Oriental du XI^e Siècle* (New York, 1899; repr. 1968), p. 273; also 125 and 274-75. Mahlon Smith's book on the azymite controversy was an early and welcome corrective to this attitude: "...there is a certain ambiguity in suggesting that the senseless excesses of a few individuals were all that disrupted the harmony of Christian fellowship while maintaining at the same time that there are mysterious reasons that would keep the Church divided even in the midst of surface accord": Smith, *And Taking Bread*, p. 19.

⁸³ Michael Attaliotes, *Michaelis Attaliotae Historia*, ed. I. Bekker (Bonn, 1853), pp. 56-7; Skylitzes, *Synopsis Historiarum*, pp. 412 and 433-34; Skylitzes Cont., p. 105 (CB, II, pp. 643-44); Michael Psellos, *Chronographia*, Book 7 [65]; Michael Psellos, *Michaelis Pselli Scripta Minora*, I. ed. by E. Kurtz, (Milan, 1936), pp. 232-328; Louis Bréhier, *Un discours inédit de Psellos: accusation du Patriarche Michel Cérulaire devant le synode (1059)* (Paris, 1904).

⁸⁴ This would be a formal criterion for schism, favored by Francis Dvornik: *Primacy*, p. 7. So when Bohemond in Antioch drove into exile its Chalcedonian Patriarch, replacing him with a Latin prelate, there was, in a formal sense, a state of schism between Rome and Antioch, as there were now two rival Antiochene Patriarchs: Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, pp. 91-2. Yet a schism of this kind could be quickly undone, in the absence of general disaffection between Christian communities. In the case of Antioch, for some time, "...the cleavage was not absolute," as Runciman put it: *Eastern Schism*, p. 97.

⁸⁵ Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 4. Cf. Anastos, "Constantinople and Rome," p. 52. See also the remarks of Deno John Geanakoplos, *Byzantine East and Latin West: Two Worlds of Christendom in Middle Ages and Renaissance*, Studies in Ecclesiastical and Cultural History (New York, 1966), pp. 79-80.

⁸⁶ Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, pp. 51-2; Kolbaba, *Byzantine Lists*, pp. 35-6, 154.

On the other hand, when in 1090, a deacon had written Theophylact of Ohrid to rule on the "errors of the Latins," the bishop expressed regret that trivial issues (for example, the leavening or not of the bread of the Eucharist) were being framed as important. Like Peter III of Antioch, Theophylact judged that the only "Latin error" of consequence was the *Filioque*: Theophylact of Ohrid, *De Iis in quibus Latini Accusantur*, PG 126: 221-250. Also see Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 72.

⁸⁷ The West became increasingly sophisticated in these criticisms. By the 13th century, certain "Latins" were capable of using Greek authorities to contradict "Greek errors," as in the *Contra errores Graecorum* written by Dominican friars in Constantinople in 1252: Michael Angold, "Byzantium and the west 1204-1453," in *The Cambridge History of Christianity, Vol. V: Eastern Christianity*, ed. by Michael Angold (Cambridge [UK], New York, 2006), pp. 55-6.

Both Tia Kolbaba and Michael Angold argue that the targets of these lists were not just external; that challenges to identity from within impelled the definition of religious boundaries. Kolbaba has made this argument in more than one publication cited in these notes; Angold, "Byzantium and the west," pp. 58-9. Rome for its part had increasingly to deal with heresy in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

⁸⁸ See Judith Herrin's discussion of these frictions in *Byzantium: The Surprising Life of a Medieval Empire*, chapter 24, "The Fulcrum of the Crusades" (Princeton and Oxford, 2007), pp. 255-265. To the crusades, Milton

Anastos added continued Norman aggression and the commercial privileges granted to “Latins” in Constantinople as precipitating factors in East/West alienation: “Constantinople and Rome,” p. 52.

⁸⁹ The terms “papal primacy” and “papal supremacy” are sometimes used interchangeably but are in fact distinct in meaning, force and effect.

⁹⁰ Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 58; also 73 and 121. To this should be added Meyendorff’s comments that: “On the Byzantine side, the official position of the church was always that differences between churches were to be solved only by councils,” and that despite Rome’s honorary primacy, the Pope was bound by conciliar rulings: Meyendorff, *Byzantine Legacy*, p. 29.

⁹¹ Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology*, p. 91: “...there could be no agreement on the issues themselves, or on the manner of solving them, as long as there was divergence on the notion of authority in the Church.”

⁹² Tia Kolbaba thinks that Byzantine opinions were solidly against papal primacy until after 1204. I’d put it slightly differently, that there was solid disagreement with papal *supremacy* before that date. Opinions split during the period of Latin Occupation: “Byzantine perceptions,” pp. 127-29. Some Byzantines believed that primacy belonged to the See of Constantinople: Anastos, “Constantinople and Rome,” pp. 2-3 and 57-9.

⁹³ Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 61.

Gregory VII had excommunicated Emperor Alexios I; Urban II lifted the excommunication and worked to establish warm relations with the emperor and with Patriarch Nikolaos III Grammatikos. Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, pp. 62, 66-7 and 71-2. In Constantinople, a synod of 1089 had found that the Latins were not heretics and were in communion with the Patriarchate: Kolbaba, “Orthodoxy,” p. 202.

In Ralph-Johannes Lilie’s judgment, Latins regarded Byzantine Christians as “schismatic” at least as early as the First Crusade: “Once conquered, the region must be held and it was to be expected that the conquerors would not leave this to the schismatic Greeks...” Ralph-Johannes Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States, 1096-1204*, trans. by J.C. Morris and Jean E. Ridings (revised ed. Oxford, 1988), p. 2. Yet would Urban II’s appeal for aid to Christians in “Romania” (Byzantium) at Clermont in 1095 have been so compelling as to set in motion both the formal crusade and Peter the Hermit’s popular movement, if the generality of Christians in the West had at that time regarded Byzantine Christians “schismatic”? This attitude was in formation, but had not hardened by 1095.

Even as late as the twelfth century, opinions on the standing of Byzantine Christians differed in the West. Hugh of Amiens, Pelikan noted, thought that the “Greeks” were schismatic, even heretical; however, his contemporary, Anselm of Havelberg, considered the Byzantine Christians merely “dissenting catholics”: Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine, Vol. 3: The Growth of Medieval Theology (600-1300)* (Chicago and London, 1978), p. 230. Cf. Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 77. The primary sources in question are: Hugh of Amiens, *Contra Haereticos*: 1.2, PL 192: 1258D-59B: *Contra haereticos ista proponimus, et auctoritate divina firmamus...quia vero ex Patre est Filius, et ex utroque Spiritus sanctus...* (“We put forward these [statements] against heretics, and affirm them with divine authority... that truly the Son is of the Father, and the Holy Spirit from each...”). Anselm of Havelberg emphasized commonalities among “Latins” and “Greeks”: *De diverso Eucharistiae ritu Graecorum et Latinorum, videlicet azymi et fermentati, et de auctoritate Romanae Ecclesiae: de concordia sapientum Graecorum et Latinorum, Dial. 3.22, PL 188: 1248: Universi clamantes dixerunt: Doxa soi, o Theos... quod est, Gloria sit Deo...* (“Crying out all together, they [the “Greeks”] say, ‘Glory be to you, God,’ ...which is, ‘Glory be to God...’ ”)

⁹⁴ Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 77 and Chapter IV, “The Church and the Crusades,” pp. 78-101; Kolbaba, “Byzantine perceptions,” p. 118.

⁹⁵ The rise of heresies and sectarian movements in Western Europe in the twelfth century, like internal challenges within Byzantium, aggravated perceived differences East and West: Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Growth of Medieval Theology*, pp. 231-32. Cf. Kolbaba, “Byzantine perceptions,” pp. 122-25.

⁹⁶ Those who are interested in Manuel I Komnenos might wish to read Paul Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143-1180* (Cambridge, 1993) and Michael Angold, *Church and Society under the Comnenoi, 1081-1261* (Cambridge, 1995).

⁹⁷ Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, pp. 120-21.

⁹⁸ *Ibid*, p. 135.

⁹⁹ Lilie argues that “The direct consequences of the battle were limited...” inasmuch as the Byzantine army remained intact and the stability of the Byzantine Empire was not undermined by it. Yet its psychological consequences were damaging, both within Byzantium, and in its external relations. Among other effects, it further weakened already tenuous Byzantine suzerainty over Jerusalem, Antioch and Iconium: Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States*, pp. 214-15; 228-29.

¹⁰⁰ “The massacre of the Genoese and Pisans in Constantinople in 1182 turned these groups into implacable enemies of the Empire”: Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States*, p. 227. Primary sources: William of Tyre, *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum, R.H.C. Occ.*, vol. 1, 22, 10-13, pp. 1079ff; Niketas Choniates, *Nicetae Choniatae Historia*, ed. J.-L. van Dieten, *CFHB* vol. 11, 1-2 (Berlin and New York, 1975), pp. 250-51. Cf. Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 131; Anastos, “Constantinople and Rome,” p. 53; Joseph Gill, S.J., *Byzantium and the Papacy 1198-1400* (New Brunswick [NJ], 1979), pp. 4-5.

¹⁰¹ “From the outset [of the Third Crusade] there were misunderstandings, overreactions to hostile provocation, and open conflicts which can be blamed equally on both sides”: Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States*, p. 241.

¹⁰² Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 140.

It is Joseph Gill’s opinion that there was “... little sense of urgency...” on the question of papal supremacy before the Fourth Crusade: Joseph Gill, S.J., *Byzantium and the Papacy 1198-1400* (New Brunswick [NJ], 1979), p. 12. I wonder. Consider a letter identified by V. Grumel as having been written by Nikolaos III Grammatikos (1084-1111) to the Patriarch of Jerusalem, in which the Patriarch of Constantinople opposes the *Filioque*, azymes and papal supremacy: Grumel, “Jérusalem entre Rome et Byzance,” pp. 105-8. Cf. Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 66.

¹⁰³ This was sung on the occasion of the reception into Angers of relics robbed from Constantinople during the Fourth Crusade; in Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 141, taken from *Sequentia Andegavenensis*, in Riant, *Exuviae sacrae Constantinopolitanae*, vol. 2, p. 45.

¹⁰⁴ Trans. Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 139, from Theodore Balsamon, *In canonem Concilii Carthaginensis*. Theodore Balsamon was not a disinterested party; he had been elected Patriarch of Antioch but had been prevented from occupying the See by the “Latins.” Runciman considered him the Byzantine most responsible for facilitating schism.

¹⁰⁵ In the immediate aftermath of the Fourth Crusade, Niketas Choniates, who witnessed the events, could conceive of no common bond with the “Latins”: Μέσον ἡμῶν καὶ αὐτῶν χάσμα διαφορὰς ἐστήρικται μέγιστον καὶ ταῖς γνώμαις ἀσυναφεῖς ἔσμεν καὶ διάμετρον ἀφεστήκαμεν (“The widest gulf exists between us and them. We have not a single thought in common. We are poles apart.”). Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, pp. 301-2. The translation is George Dennis’, from his article: “Schism, Union and the Crusades,” in *Meeting of Two Worlds: Cultural Exchange between East and West during the Period of the Crusades*, ed. by Vladimir Goss (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1986), p. 182. These references are from Christopher Livanos, *Greek Traditions and Latin Influence in the Work of George Scholarios: Alone against All of Europe*, “Introduction” (Piscataway [NJ], 2006), p. 3.

¹⁰⁶ Innocent III, *Letter to Latin Emperor Baldwin*, PL 215: 454C: When Innocent III received a (self-serving) report on the conquest of Constantinople from Baldwin of Flanders, the first Latin Emperor, the Pope’s response was approving: *Litteras imperatoriae dignitatis quas nobis per dilectum filium, Barochium, Fratrem militiae Templi, tua devotio destinavit, paterna benignitate recipimus, earumque tenore plenissime intellecto, gavisus sumus in Domino...* (“We received with fatherly kindness the letters from your imperial dignity which were sent to us with your devotion through our beloved son Barochius, a brother of the Knights Templar; when their import was fully understood, we rejoiced in the Lord...”)

¹⁰⁷ Innocent III, *Letter to Peter, a Legate of the Roman See*, PL 215: 701A-B: *Quomodo enim Graecorum Ecclesia, quantumcunque afflictionibus et persecutionibus affligatur, ad unitatem ecclesiasticam et devotionem sedis apostolicae revertetur, quae in Latinis non nisi perditionis exemplum et opera tenebrarum aspexit, ut jam merito illos abhorreat plus quam canes?* (“How indeed will the Church of the Greeks, however much it is shattered with afflictions and persecution, turn back toward ecclesiastical unity and devotion [for] the Apostolic See, [when it] saw nothing except an example of destruction and works of darkness among the Latins, so that it now justly hates them more than dogs?”)

¹⁰⁸ Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, pp. 151-52; Anastos, “Constantinople and Rome,” p. 53.

¹⁰⁹ Dvornik, *Primacy*, p. 7: “[The annulment of the mutual excommunications of 1054 by Pope Paul VI and Patriarch Athenagoras on December 7, 1965], however, cannot heal the schism between East and West, completed, not in 1054, but after 1204 when Constantinople was conquered by the Latin crusaders, and a Latin Patriarch [Thomas Morosini] enthroned in Hagia Sophia.” The Greek Patriarch, John Kamateros, had not resigned before his death in 1206: Cf. Dvornik, *Ecumenical Councils*, p. 58; Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 154.

Factions seeking to reclaim Constantinople formed at Epiros, Nicaea and Trebizond; of these, the Nicaean faction would succeed. At Nicaea, a Patriarchate-in exile was established at the court of the Imperium-in-exile. Michael Angold credits Patriarch Germanos II of Nicaea (1223-40) with the maintained cohesion of the Orthodox Church in this period, which might without him have fragmented into various autonomous churches, reflecting the political fragmentation of the time: Angold, “Byzantium and the west,” p. 54.

¹¹⁰ From the perspective of the Papacy, Runciman thinks, the schism became formal when Byzantines in exile elected their own Greek Patriarch (1206): Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, pp. 154-56 and 160.

¹¹¹ Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 4; Anastos, "Constantinople and Rome," p. 52.

¹¹² Kolbaba, "Byzantine perceptions," pp. 129-30.

¹¹³ Runciman, *Eastern Schism*, p. 157. From Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles*, 4.2, pp. 1569-72.

¹¹⁴ For an account of the recovery of the capital, see Donald M. Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium, 1261-1453*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge [UK], New York, Melbourne, 1993), pp. 35-6.

¹¹⁵ Unionist negotiations were conducted approximately thirty different times in this period, according to L. Bréhier: "Attempts at Reunion of the Greek and Latin Churches," *Cambridge Medieval History, Vol. IV: The Eastern Roman Empire* (1936-49), planned by J.B. Bury, ed. by H.M. Gwatkin and J.P. Whitney, p. 594ff. Estimates vary. See Anastos, "Constantinople and Rome," pp. 109-111, n. 240 for references to pertinent scholarship.

¹¹⁶ Pope Gregory X urged Emperor Michael VIII to send a delegation to a Church Council planned for Lyons in France. Considering what was at stake (the threatened annihilation of the empire), it was a virtual ultimatum. The articles of union were signed on May 7, 1274, and union was concluded on July 6, 1274. Union under Rome's terms, as most Byzantines saw it, set off a severe social crisis in the empire. For details, see Donald Nicol, *Last Centuries*, pp. 54-7 and 62-5. Milton Anastos astutely noted that, in view of imperial political theory, the support of Unionist efforts by Byzantine emperors entailed a substantive sacrifice of their sovereignty: "Constantinople and Rome," pp. 59 and 64.

¹¹⁷ Pope Eugenius IV presided over the Council of Ferrara-Florence (when Ferrara was struck by plague, the venue was moved to Florence). Seven hundred attended from the east at papal expense; among the Byzantine participants were Emperor John VIII Palaiologos, Patriarch Joseph II, representatives of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem, Alexandria and Antioch, Bessarion, the Bishop of Nicaea, the lawyer, philosopher and theologian George Scholarios, the philosopher George Gemisthos Plethon, and the Metropolitan of Ephesos, Mark Eugenikos. The *Filioque* was the chief doctrinal point of difference, but papal primacy, the Eucharist, Purgatory and other matters were also negotiated. Union was proclaimed in Florence on July 6, 1439. Mark Eugenikos refused to sign the Document of Union and was received in Constantinople as a hero for Orthodoxy. Gill, *Council of Florence*, pp. 163, 267, 270-304, 327-33 and 353-65; Nicol, *Last Centuries*, pp. 352-61; Anastos, "Constantinople and Rome," p. 62.

¹¹⁸ At the time of the Council of Ferrara-Florence, Benozzo Gozzoli painted an image of the penultimate Byzantine emperor, John VIII Palaiologos, who attended. The portrait appears in the southern wall fresco of the Chapel of the Magi at the Palazzo Medici-Riccardi. In it, the emperor's expression does not appear to me to be hopeful; rather, resigned.

¹¹⁹ Steven Runciman, *The Fall of Constantinople, 1453* (Cambridge [UK], 1965), pp. 69-70.

¹²⁰ The Proclamation of Church Union that had been negotiated in Florence had been delayed until this point; that it was now publicized was due to the activities of Isidore, the former Metropolitan of Kiev. At the Council of Ferrara-Florence, Isidore had become a convinced Unionist, was subsequently ordained Cardinal, and was now a legate to Constantinople for Pope Nicholas V. Isidore of Kiev remained throughout the siege of the City and personally aided its defense; he was wounded, captured, ransomed and eventually escaped. In 1459-60, he attempted to raise a crusade for the recapture of Constantinople: Angold, "Byzantium and the west," p. 53; Joseph Gill, S.J., *Personalities of the Council of Florence and other Essays* (New York, 1964), pp. 72-76; Gill, *Council of Florence*, pp. 372-76; Dvornik, *Ecumenical Councils*, p. 77; Nicol, *The Immortal Emperor: The life and legend of Constantine Palaiologos, last Emperor of the Romans* (Cambridge [UK] and New York, 1992), pp. 57-61; Nicol, *Last Centuries*, p. 371 and 376-77; Runciman, *Fall of Constantinople*, p. 71.

¹²¹ Runciman, *Fall of Constantinople*, pp. 69-72 and 131; Gill, *Council of Florence*, pp. 383-87; Nicol, *Immortal Emperor*, pp. 57-61; Nicol, *Last Centuries*, p. 377.

On the designation of the Hagia Sophia as the "Great Church," a term extended also to the Patriarchate of Constantinople, see Meyendorff, *Byzantine Legacy*, p. 19.

¹²² The bombardment began on April 6, 1453, and from April 11th to May 28th was continual: Runciman, *Fall of Constantinople*, pp. 96-7; Nicol, *Immortal Emperor*, p. 66.

¹²³ At first, the silence threw the defenders into confusion. Kritovoulos (Critobulus), *Critobuli Imbriotae Historiae*, ed. D. R. Reinsch, *CFHB* 22 (Berlin and New York, 1983), p. 66: Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ σιωπὴν τοσαύτην ἐν τῇ στρατιᾷ καὶ ἡρεμίαν ὁρῶντες παρὰ τὸ ξύνηθες ἐθαύμαζόν τε τὸ πρῶγμα καὶ ἐς διαφόρους λογισμοὺς καὶ ἐννοίας ἐπέπιπτον, οἱ μὲν νομίζοντες ἐτοιμασίαν εἶναι ἐς ἀναχώρησιν οὐκ ὀρθῶς δοκοῦντες, οἱ δὲ, ὅπερ καὶ ἦν, παρασκευὴν ἐς τὸν πόλεμον

καὶ ἐτοιμασίαν ... (“And the Romans [Byzantines], noting such unaccustomed silence and calm in the [Turkish] army, were astonished and fell upon various reasons and ideas [to explain] the fact, some thinking that it [signified] readiness for a withdrawal (not judging correctly), others (correctly) that it was preparation and readiness for warfare...”)

¹²⁴ Leonard of Chios, “Letter to Pope Nicholas V,” *PG* 159: 923-44. Runciman, *Fall of Constantinople*, pp. 126-28; Nicol, *Immortal Emperor*, p. 67.

¹²⁵ Runciman, *Fall of Constantinople*, pp. 129-30.

¹²⁶ See Georgios Sphrantzes (Georgius Phrantzes), *Chronicon*, 3.7 and 3.8, ed. E. Bekker, *CSHB* (1838), pp. 279 and 290. Runciman, p. 131: “At this moment there was union in the Church of Constantinople.”

¹²⁷ Nicol, *Immortal Emperor*, p. 69; Nicol, *Last Centuries*, pp. 386-87.

¹²⁸ The vigil was cut short, in the early hours of May 29th: Sphrantzes, *Chronicon*, pp. 279, 289-90; Kritovoulos, p. 71; Leonard of Chios, “Letter to Pope Nicholas V,” *PG* 159: 941-42. Cf. Runciman, *Fall of Constantinople*, pp. 127 and 147; Nicol, *Last Centuries*, pp. 387 and 389.

For a collection of the chief 15th century accounts in Greek of the capture of Constantinople, see Nikolas Tomadakes, *Δούκα – Κριτοβούλου – Σφραντζή – Χαλκοκονδύλων. Περί ἀλώσεως τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως (1453), Συναγωγή κειμένων μετὰ προλόγου καὶ Βιογραφικῶν μελετημάτων περὶ τῶν τεσσάρων ἱστοριογράφων* (Athens, 1953).