

This is an extract from:

*The Crusades from the Perspective
of Byzantium and the Muslim World*

edited by Angeliki E. Laiou and Roy Parviz Mottahedeh

published by

Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection

Washington, D.C.

© 2001 Dumbarton Oaks

Trustees for Harvard University

Washington, D.C.

Printed in the United States of America

www.doaks.org/etexts.html

Byzantine Perceptions of Latin Religious “Errors”: Themes and Changes from 850 to 1350

Tia M. Kolbaba

In 1339 Emperor Andronikos III Palaiologos (1328–41) sent the bilingual Calabrian monk Barlaam (ca. 1290–1348) to Avignon. There Barlaam delivered two speeches to Pope Benedict XII (1332–42) about the necessity of a united Christian front against the Turks and the ways in which a reunion of the churches might be achieved. To the pope’s demand that reunion of the churches precede military aid from the West, Barlaam gave the following reply: “It is not so much difference in dogma that alienates the hearts of the Greeks from you, as the hatred that has entered their souls against the Latins,¹ because of the many great evils that at different times the Greeks have suffered at the hands of Latins and are still suffering every day. Until this hatred has been removed from them, there cannot be union. In truth, until you have done them some very great benefit, neither will that hatred be dispelled nor will anyone dare to breathe a word to them about union. . . . Know this too, that it was not the people of Greece that sent me to seek your help and union, but the Emperor alone and secretly. Until help is sent to these parts, he cannot let his people see that he wants union with you.”²

Barlaam thus highlighted the most obvious impact of the Crusades—especially the Fourth Crusade and the Latin occupation of Constantinople from 1204 to 1261—on religious life and religious literature in Byzantium. Everyone agreed that the union of the churches was, in principle, desirable, because everyone knew that Christ’s body, the church, should not be dismembered. But the violent conflict of the Crusades and attempts to force papal primacy on Greeks after 1204 meant that few Byzantine churchmen could negotiate for such a union with any measure of trust and goodwill. So, too, it comes as no surprise that the most scurrilous, least sophisticated kinds of anti-Latin literature increased over time. When Constantine Stilbes (fl. 1182–1204) connects his seventy-five-item list of Latin errors to a list of the atrocities committed in the sack of 1204, the connection seems natural.³ Such a reaction makes sense. That the Crusades

¹ As do most Greek writers of his time, Barlaam uses the term *Latin* as a general term for Westerners. I use the term *Latins* throughout this paper to refer to Western Europeans who were members of the church that used Latin as its liturgical language. This does *not* mean that Byzantines themselves always called Westerners “Latins”; see Alexander Kazhdan’s contribution to this volume.

² *Acta Benedicti XII, 1334–1342*, ed. A. L. Taütu, *Fontes* 3, vol. 8 (Vatican City, 1958), doc. 43. Cited and translated in J. Gill, *Byzantium and the Papacy* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1979), 197–98.

³ J. Darrouzès, “Le mémoire de Constantin Stilbès contre les Latins,” *REB* 21 (1963): 50–100.

led to an increase in the number of virulently anti-Latin texts and in the number of people who agreed with them has been recognized at least since Barlaam's time.

This study, then, goes beyond that obvious effect to investigate whether the Crusades had an impact on more moderate religious texts written by churchmen who negotiated or debated with the Latins. Because there are many Byzantine responses to the Crusades in secular texts, from Anna Komnene's *Alexiad* to Doukas' chronicle of the fall of the City, one might expect to find direct responses to the Crusades in theological literature as well. But a survey of religious discussions with and polemic against the Latins from the middle of the eleventh century through the end of the empire unearthed no reasoned refutation of the idea of holy war and no theological discourses against such Western innovations as the crusade indulgence or monastic knights.⁴ In short, if the Crusades altered religious literature, they did so indirectly. This study attempts to identify such indirect influence by analyzing some characteristics of Byzantine theological material contemporary with the Crusades. The conclusion will return to the question of whether and how these traits are related to the Crusades.

My primary thesis is that Byzantine religious texts that discuss Western Europeans emphasize different issues at different times. To many historians, such a claim may seem obvious, even trite. After all, the cultural gap between Byzantine East and Latin West; the kinds and degree of contact Byzantines had with Latins; the relative wealth, poverty, military power, and sophistication of the two cultures—all of these things changed immeasurably in a millennium or so. Yet an assumption of eternal verities pervades the history of Byzantine religious disagreements with the Western church. For example, many studies assume that the Filioque⁵ is always the central issue for moderate, reasonable men. But it was not. Concerns changed as the times changed.

Furthermore, when placed in their historical context, the issues raised are often related less to the explicit targets of the polemic, the Latins, than to the polemicists themselves and their world. An issue becomes one of the crucial issues in the Greek theological literature only when it becomes a matter for debate within the Orthodox world. This connection removes the Latins from the center of the picture and reveals the extent to which debates explicitly about Latins were implicitly about Byzantines. In other words, a difference between Greeks and Latins became a source of anxiety and the subject of numerous treatises and debates only when Byzantine opinion was divided. Debates about Latin practices and beliefs grew fierce and polarized less because of the intrinsic importance of the issue being debated than because of fundamental doubts about what

⁴ Such issues do arise *rarely* in the unreasonable polemic. See, e.g., Darrouzès, "Mémoire," para. 27, 38, 60, 61.

⁵ Starting in Spain in the 6th century, various Western churches added a phrase to the Nicene Creed. Where the creed originally stated, "We believe in the Holy Spirit . . . who proceeds from the Father," these churches added "and the Son" (Latin: Filioque). This addition was accepted in Frankish areas by the 8th century and in Rome in the early 11th century. Eastern theologians objected both to the unilateral addition to the creed (which could not, they maintained, be amended without an ecumenical council) and to the theological implications of that addition. Discussions of the theology, including theological polemic from both East and West, can be found easily. Good introductions: J. Pelikan, *The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600–1700): The Christian Tradition 2* (Chicago, 1974), 183–98, and J. Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes* (New York, 1974), 91–94, 180–90.

it meant to be an orthodox, imperial Christian—what it meant to be, as they would have put it, a pious Roman.⁶ Negotiations and debates within the Empire of the Romans about how to distinguish “us” from “them” were not new in the tenth, or even the eighth, century. From the beginning, Christians were defining themselves against other groups, distinguishing “followers of Christ” from “Jews”; “Orthodox” from Arians, Nestorians, and Monophysites; righteous and orthodox venerated icons from heretical iconoclasts. None of these distinctions between “us” and “them” was established in a day or even in a decade. All of them took some time and caused some casualties. Some people who considered themselves orthodox Christians had to be thrown out of the church; the tares could not, after all, be allowed to grow with the wheat. In the period of the Crusades, it became important to distinguish “us” Christians of the empire from “them” Latins from the West. But that distinction did not come easily, either. People argued about it for centuries, and their arguments can be partially reconstructed from the materials studied here.

The second part of this study discusses the tone of anti-Latin texts. This, too, changes over time, but the change is not a simple descent from moderate, intelligent discussion to hateful, radical polemic. Moderate works exist and exert some influence down to the end, revealing a growing ambivalence about Latin culture and the western world.

What this study presents as a matter-of-fact outline still has gaps, and other scholars who study these texts will correct and refine it on points of detail and interpretation. Still, it is time to attempt a survey of the theological literature from these centuries precisely because a great body of work makes it possible to do so with some assurance. We need to draw together what we already know before we can make further progress. The current level of knowledge owes much to the works of Jean Darrouzès, Joseph Gill, and a long list of other scholars. The sources cited below should indicate my debt to their erudition and painstaking labor. Darrouzès noted thirty-two years ago that “the history of dogma can only profit from a more exact knowledge of historical context.”⁷ He spent most of his life establishing that context, and his work especially has taught us a great deal about which issues dividing East and West were important in which period. Without it, this study would be impossible.

Changing Issues

The Ninth Century

Photios (patriarch of Constantinople, 858–867 and 877–886) introduces this study, but not because anyone accepts that the “Photian Schism” was permanent and irrevocable; Francis Dvornik refuted that idea fifty years ago. Rather, Photios’ era can reveal the

⁶ Vocabulary is a problem here—these were debates about what it meant to be Byzantine and Orthodox. Still, we need to keep in mind that these are modern terms; people at the time called themselves “Romans,” “Orthodox,” “pious” (εὐσεβής)—never “Byzantine,” unless they were distinguishing residents of the capital from other “Romans.”

⁷ J. Darrouzès, “Les documents byzantins du XIIe siècle sur la primauté romaine,” *REB* 23 (1965): 43.

possibilities for a relationship between Rome and Constantinople which was, if not exactly peaceful, certainly different in kind from the relationship of the later Middle Ages.

Most importantly, differences with the Western church were not the crucial canonical or theological issues during Photios’ patriarchate. The burning issue was still iconoclasm. From our perspective, a kind of foreshortening makes it obvious that iconoclasm was dead and not to be resurrected. But Photios and his contemporaries knew how the first “restoration of Orthodoxy” had been followed by a revival of iconoclasm. Most had personal memories of that revival. All were still being dragged into arguments about how to punish iconoclasts—some advocating severe sanctions, while others called for *oikonomia* and forgiveness.⁸ The quarrels over this issue affect every other quarrel of the period, including the “Photian Schism” with Rome. Beyond iconoclasm, Photios himself joined many other men in writing about other “heretics”: Paulicians, Armenians, Muslims, Bogomils, Monophysites, and others.⁹ So the quarrel with Rome is only one issue among many in ninth-century Byzantium.

Moreover, the Photian Schism did not arise from differences over dogma. Nobody claimed that the pope was not qualified to render a judgment because he was a heretic. Instead, the issue was the canonical authority of the pope within the Eastern church—a question that neither began nor ended with Photios. His predecessor, Ignatios, had had similar problems during his first patriarchate (847–858).¹⁰ In the controversy over the legitimacy of Ignatios’ deposition (or resignation) and Photios’ elevation to the patriarchate, both sides appealed to the pope. Photios’ refusal to accept the pope’s judgment was based not on some challenge to the pope’s legal authority, but rather on the pope’s failure to hear any representative of Photios’ side of the case before he made his decision.¹¹ This recognition of Rome’s jurisdiction, with its assumption of Rome’s orthodoxy, is more like the church of the iconoclast period or even of John Chrysostom’s time, than like the church of Michael VIII Palaiologos. In the later period, Rome’s jurisdiction will be challenged on the grounds that the popes, who used to have the authority of a first among equals, lost that authority when they fell into heresy.¹²

Nevertheless, Photios and some of his contemporaries did object to the Filioque (and other Latin “errors”). Those who maintain that the Filioque has always been the most important issue for thoughtful, moderate men begin with Photios, for he did explicitly state that the Filioque was a heresy and the weightiest issue outstanding between Constantinople and some Westerners: “Moreover, they have not only been discovered transgressing the law in all the above, but they have progressed to the crown of all evils, if there is such a thing. . . . They have also tried, with spurious reasoning, interpolated argument, and an excess of impudence, to adulterate the divine and holy creed which has its impregnable strength from all the synodical and ecumenical decrees (Oh, the subtle deceptions of the Evil One!), for they have added new words, that the Holy Spirit

⁸ F. Dvornik, *The Photian Schism: History and Legend* (Cambridge, 1948; repr. 1970), 6 ff.

⁹ H.-G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich, 1959), 520–30.

¹⁰ Dvornik, *Photian Schism*, 19–32.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, part 1, chaps. 2–8.

¹² E.g., see the polemicists cited by F. Dvornik, *Byzantium and the Roman Primacy*, trans. E. A. Quain (New York, 1966), 159–62.

proceeds not from the Father alone, but also from the Son.”¹³ But before we portray this statement as the earliest example of Byzantine awareness of Roman heresy, we need to look carefully at its context. Photios discussed the Filioque in an encyclical letter to the Eastern patriarchs (quoted above) and in his *Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit*. These texts were not attacks on the whole Western church, but refutations of the teaching of Frankish missionaries in Bulgaria. The latter had taught the Bulgars the addition to the creed and quarreled with Byzantine missionaries about it. In fact, the Filioque was not yet being chanted in Rome. When Photios wrote his treatises against the double procession of the Holy Spirit, he had good reason to think that the popes did not accept the doctrine.¹⁴ Nor did he challenge the pope’s authority on the grounds that he was a heretic. Both of these things differentiate his position from later opinions.

Finally, anti-Latin arguments do not develop sequentially from Photios to 1453. An examination of the transmission of texts shows that Photios’ writings against the Frankish missionaries had little impact. Nobody adopts his arguments on these issues, and few people even refer to his opinions, until late in the thirteenth century. At that time, the Filioque is central to Byzantine polemic for other reasons, to be discussed below.¹⁵

The Eleventh Century

Anti-Latin arguments do, however, have a continuous life from 1054 on. In the middle of the eleventh century, Byzantine polemicists raised many issues, some of which already had a history. Photios had complained, for example, about Latin Lenten observances and the Latin rite of confirmation, and Michael Keroularios (patriarch of Constantinople, 1043–58) raised these same issues.¹⁶ But the most prominent complaint of the middle of the eleventh century had not surfaced in Photios’ period. Among the “Roman” errors Keroularios mentioned is the use of unleavened bread (azymes) in the eucharist. Other texts of the period echoed the theme. In terms of number of words written, or number of treatises written, azymes far outstrip the procession of the Holy Spirit.¹⁷ Some who mentioned the Filioque—Peter III of Antioch (1052–56), for example—maintained that the addition was more important than unleavened bread, but their actions belied these words. Peter wrote far more about azymes than about the Filioque.

To explain this emphasis, one needs to look behind Byzantine relations with the Western church to stresses within the empire. In general, the eleventh century saw a number of challenges to the definitions of “orthodox” and “Roman.” These were not purely external challenges—enemy attacks on the outer boundaries of Byzantium—but civil wars, causing disagreements among the powerful even at the heart of the empire. In

¹³ Photius, *Epistulae et Amphilochia*, ed. B. Laourdas and L. G. Westerink (Leipzig, 1988), 1:43.

¹⁴ Dvornik, *Photian Schism*, 122.

¹⁵ This is one of the themes of Dvornik, *Photian Schism*; see esp. part 2, chaps. 5–6.

¹⁶ Details of the complaints about Lenten observance, confirmation, and other issues can be found in T. M. Kolbaba, “Meletios Homologetes ‘On the Customs of the Italians,’” *REB* 55 (1997): 137–68.

¹⁷ J. H. Erickson, “Leavened and Unleavened: Some Theological Implications of the Schism of 1054,” *SVThQ* 14.3 (1970): 156–58. The best introductions to the azyme controversy are *ibid.*, 155–76, and M. H. Smith III, *And Taking Bread . . . Cerularius and the Azyme Controversy of 1054* (Paris, 1978).

other words, this was one of those periods in Byzantine history, like the sixth century and the iconoclast period, in which people fought over who had the right to define "orthodox" and "Roman."

Ironically, success had caused these fierce fights—the success of Byzantine armies, which had reconquered parts of southern Italy and huge areas of Asia Minor and Mesopotamia in the ninth and tenth centuries. These victories brought peoples into the empire who had been beyond its borders for a century or more. Their reintegration "posed a demographic problem, which the eleventh century transcribed and prolonged into a religious problem—that is to say, into a crisis of identity (for such is certainly the ultimate sense of Orthodoxy for the Byzantines)."¹⁸ The groups who reentered the empire considered themselves orthodox, catholic, apostolic Christians, but theologians in the great capital on the Bosphoros tended to label some of them as heretics. Others, considered orthodox, were not quite "Roman." Armenians and Syrians, for example, might be neither "Roman" nor "orthodox" (meaning, to a Constantinopolitan, Chalcedonian in their theology). Then again, they might be "orthodox" but not Roman. Some Armenians had even become both "Roman" and "orthodox," although this group probably did not include the recent immigrants. Only time would answer questions about the identity of these people—"foreign" or "Roman," "orthodox" or "heretical," "us" or "them." Meanwhile, fierce struggles ensued. Most importantly for the evolution of Byzantine views of Latins, three of these questionable groups in the empire raised the issue of unleavened bread.

The Armenians were the most important of the three. Armenia had been under Muslim rule until the ninth century. Then the decline of Abbasid power had allowed a period of independence. Then, in the second half of the tenth century, as Byzantium expanded eastward, Armenia was annexed to the empire, becoming the theme of Iberia in the early eleventh century. From 1045 to 1071 (battle of Manzikert), Armenia was ruled by the Byzantine Empire. Initially, the emperors involved in the annexation and integration of Armenia and Armenians into the empire were fairly tolerant of religious differences. Because Nikephoros II Phokas (963–969) and John Tzimiskes (969–976) wanted to repopulate eastern regions of Anatolia, they welcomed Armenian noble families who migrated into Cappadocia and southeastern Anatolia. These Armenians settled themselves and their ecclesiastical hierarchy within the empire.¹⁹ But this sort of tolerance would not last. After the annexation of Ani in 1045, when the last independent Armenian area fell to the armies of Constantine IX Monomachos (1042–55), relations between Armenian communities and their Greek Chalcedonian neighbors worsened. Very soon after the conquest, Monomachos began to crack down on Armenian heterodoxy. In 1048 Peter I, katholikos of the Armenian church, traveled to Constantinople for discussions. Discussions were friendly enough (at least the katholikos managed to stay out of prison), but in general both the emperor and his patriarch, Michael Keroularios, were

¹⁸ G. Dagron, "Minorités ethniques et religieuses dans l'orient byzantin à la fin du Xe et au XIe siècle: L'immigration syrienne," *TM* 6 (1976): 177–79.

¹⁹ G. Dédéyan, "L'immigration arménienne en Cappadoce au XIe siècle," *Byzantion* 45 (1975): 41–116.

determined to wipe out the Armenian species of Monophysitism (as they saw it). They would soon begin to act on that determination.²⁰

Thus, in the decade before the more famous events of 1054, a group of anti-Chalcedonian, “azymite” Christians debated with Chalcedonian, leavened-bread Christians. From these debates came some of the first treatises against azymes.²¹ This battle with the Armenians had a negative impact on discussions with Latins, for when the Greeks discovered that Latins were using unleavened bread, they “often seem[ed] too preoccupied with contemporary Armenian and Jewish polemics to evaluate properly the Latin position.”²²

The same series of tenth-century conquests that made Armenia part of the empire also reintegrated Syria and its capital, Antioch, a competitor with Constantinople for ecclesiastical and even imperial preeminence.²³ As they had encouraged the Armenians, the emperors also encouraged the Syrian Monophysites to repopulate imperial territories, especially northern Syria.²⁴ This influx of foreign heretics was decried by Chalcedonian churchmen, and conflict ensued between those who advocated or at least practiced tolerance and coexistence and those who would not tolerate the “heretics.” The history of competition between Chalcedonians and Monophysites in these territories was ancient and bloody. As it had with the Armenians, imperial tolerance dissolved after the death of Basil II (976–1025). In 1029 the non-Chalcedonian patriarch John VIII Bar Abdoun was summoned to Constantinople. After a chance to state his views, he was condemned, excommunicated, and exiled by the synod. But worries about heterodoxy in the region of Melitene continued for some years.²⁵ In Antioch in the 1050s, there were some fearful fights, including the burning of Orthodox churches.²⁶

The link between Syrian Monophysites and the azyme controversy is not direct, for they use leavened bread in the eucharist. Still, their presence in the empire influenced the eleventh-century azyme controversy in two ways. First, the conflict with these herodox Christians added to the general crisis of identity within the empire. Indeed, the documents regarding their status open for us one of the few windows onto such a crisis, through which we get not only a clear view of those whose definitions of “orthodox” and “Roman” won in the end, but also a fleeting glimpse of their opponents. Those opponents seem to have acted more than they spoke. We can only guess at their motives.

²⁰ J. Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire* (Oxford, 1986), 131.

²¹ Knowledge of later events has often led to the conclusion that these treatises originate with the Latin-Byzantine conflicts of the 1050s. As Mahlon Smith, Jean Darrouzès, and John Erickson have pointed out, however, the earliest anti-azyme treatises were ammunition in the debates *with the Armenians*. J. Darrouzès, “Trois documents de la controverse gréco-arménienne,” *REB* 48 (1990): 89–153; idem, “Notes: Un faux Περὶ τῶν ἀζύμων de Michel Cérulaire,” *REB* 25 (1967): 288–90; Smith, *And Taking Bread*, 128 ff, 173; Erickson, “Leavened and Unleavened,” 175.

²² Erickson, “Leavened and Unleavened,” 175.

²³ Dagron, “Minorités,” 205–7.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, passim.

²⁵ V. Grumel, *Les registres des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople*, rev. ed. J. Darrouzès, vol. 1, fasc. 2–3 (Paris, 1989), nos. 838–40, 846. Dagron, “Minorités,” 200–204.

²⁶ *The Chronicle of Matthew of Edessa*, trans. A. E. Dostourian, *Armenia and the Crusades, Tenth to Twelfth Centuries* (Lanham, Md., 1993), 2.2, 84–86; Dagron, “Minorités,” 208; Smith, *And Taking Bread*, 111.

Some emperors, for example, apparently conceived of the empire as an ecumenical body, capable of integrating heterodox Christians in the short run and of converting them to Chalcedonian orthodoxy later. On this side of the debate, too, were the bishops and imperial officials around Melitene whom the patriarchal synod reprimanded for excessive tolerance of the "Jacobites," as they called the Syrians. Among other things, these officials were accused of tolerating marriages between orthodox people and heretics and of accepting the testimony of heretics in court.²⁷ One would like to know more about this largely unrecorded segment of the population for whom, it seems, the lines between "orthodox" and "heretic" were less clear or less important than they were for the members of the synod. On the other side of the debate were those whose voices have come to us in a multitude of texts. These men thought that the heretics would never convert. It was a self-fulfilling prophecy, especially since, as time passed, they tended to give heresy "a definition more geographic and ethnic than dogmatic."²⁸ For these men, the definition of orthodox Romans included not only a Chalcedonian dyophysite creed, but also a set of rituals and customs that were, in fact, the rituals and customs of only part of the empire. Latins, Armenians, Syrians, and many others who might consider themselves both orthodox and Roman were excluded.²⁹

The second link between Syrian Monophysites and the azyme controversy was in the minds of these same orthodox adherents of the Council of Chalcedon, for they did not always distinguish Armenians from "Jacobites." They were encouraged in this conflation by the actions of the groups themselves, who sometimes forgot their differences in their common hatred of the imperial-orthodox establishment and its attempts to enforce conformity.³⁰ So, for example, Syrians and Armenians did occasionally collaborate in violent opposition to imperial attempts to shut down their churches. Thus, although a direct link between Jacobites, who use leavened bread, and polemic against users of unleavened bread is questionable, it is significant that the first eleventh-century figure to write a treatise against azymes was Patriarch Peter III of Antioch, a city where clashes between non-Chalcedonians and Chalcedonians had recently resulted in the burning of several Chalcedonian churches.

Meanwhile, Jews, the group with the longest history of challenging Christian identity and self-definition, had not disappeared either. The number of Jews within the empire was increased by the return of areas of southern Italy to imperial control in the ninth century. Bari and Oria, for example, had substantial Jewish communities.³¹ After sporadic persecutions in the same century, renewed imperial tolerance for Jews encouraged many to migrate into the cities of the empire, especially into Constantinople, from further east.³² The status of these Jews in the empire remained ambiguous. On the one hand,

²⁷ Grumel, *Regestes*, no. 846.

²⁸ Dagron, "Minorités," 213.

²⁹ Dagron, "Minorités," 204: "The synod is alarmed, and we sense that there is a complete divorce between the orthodox, centralizing ideas of Constantinople and the political, social, and economic life of a region that is perhaps also 'Byzantine' but in a way different from the capital."

³⁰ Smith, *And Taking Bread*, 110–11.

³¹ A. Sharf, *Byzantine Jewry from Justinian to the Fourth Crusade* (London, 1971), 2.

³² *Ibid.*, 107–16.

imperial laws from the period continued the Byzantine tradition by which Jews were second-class citizens. For example, the laws spelled out the penalties a Jew should suffer if he should manage—by influence or bribery, for he could not do it legally—to attain a civil or military office in the government. On the other hand, such laws indicate that some Jews had sufficient influence and wealth to circumvent the laws and that some Christians were willing to help them do so.³³ In the years leading up to the quarrel between Cardinal Humbert and Keroularios in 1054, Jews had also come to the attention of imperial authorities in more negative ways. In 1042 they had participated, with Armenians and other “foreigners,” in the riots that accompanied an attempt to depose the empresses, Zoe and Theodora.³⁴ In 1051 the Jews of Bari revolted, and the Christian citizens of the town retaliated by burning down the Jewish quarter.³⁵

All of this is relevant to the azyme issue because Byzantines associated unleavened bread with the Jewish commemoration of Passover. Here Byzantines made all sorts of connections that modern historians find unconvincing, but our skepticism does not mean that the Byzantines themselves were not honestly convinced. Byzantine polemicists argued that using unleavened bread was in itself a “Judaizing” practice, indicating a lack of recognition that the New Testament had, in all ways, superseded the Old. From this perspective, Christians who used unleavened bread in the eucharist revealed that they were too attached to the Old Testament world of shadows and types, and not convinced of the grace of the new dispensation.³⁶ Byzantine conviction on this point was reinforced by their belief that Armenians “Judaized” in other ways as well. They maintained a hereditary priesthood and they offered sacrificed meat within the sanctuary of the church—both practices that the Council in Trullo had condemned as “Jewish customs.”³⁷ Although these arguments are not accepted by modern historians and were not accepted by Jews, Armenians, and Latins at the time, they were nonetheless strongly felt by some Byzantines.

So we see that the early eleventh century had been a period of debate about orthodox identity, especially about who was to be excluded from the category of “orthodoxy.” In that debate, unleavened bread had been used as a marker—the symbol that distinguished nonorthodox “them” from orthodox “us.” When some of the same men who had excluded Armenians for this reason became aware that Latins, too, used unleavened bread, they concluded that Latins, too, were heretics. But other orthodox churchmen did not agree. Thus Leo of Ohrid’s letter against azymes, which is usually seen as the first volley in the war between Michael Keroularios and Humbert of Silva Candida, was addressed *not* to the pope or his cardinal, but rather to one of Leo’s acquaintances, John, bishop of Trani. Trani is in southern Italy and was at that time under Byzantine authority. John

³³ *Ibid.*, 112–13.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 116–17.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 123.

³⁶ Erickson, “Leavened and Unleavened,” 165–69.

³⁷ Trullo 33 and Trullo 99—P.-P. Joannou, *Fonti. Fascicolo IX: Discipline générale antique (IIe–IXe s.)*, vol. 1.1, *Les canons des conciles oecuméniques* (Rome, 1962), 166–67, 235–36 [= G. A. Rhalles and M. Potles, *Σύνταγμα τῶν θείων καὶ ἱερῶν κανόνων* (Athens, 1852–59), 2:379, 2:543]. See also G. Dagron, “Judaïser,” *TM* 11 (1991): 365.

was “a Byzantine sympathizer” and “an honorary member of the hierarchy of the Great Church in Constantinople.” Leo wrote to John because he had heard that this otherwise orthodox bishop was accepting azymes in his church.³⁸

In sum, the quarrel about azymes and Latins became fierce because it was internal—not a simple matter of “us” versus “them,” but a debate about the very definition of “us.”

The Twelfth Century

In the early years of the Komnenoi, the main concern remained azymes, even for those whose lives were disrupted by the Crusades.³⁹ Patriarch John IV of Antioch (1089–98) saw the First Crusade capture his city. Initially he stayed in Antioch, where he presided over both Greek and Latin clergy, but he later quarreled with the Latin rulers, fled to Constantinople, and abdicated. Around 1112 he wrote a tract on azymes in which he explicitly stated that he saw azymes as the most important error of the Latins: “The principal cause of the division between them and us is in the matter of azymes. . . . The matter of azymes involves in summary form the whole question of true piety; if it is not cured, the disease of the church cannot be cured.”⁴⁰ John represents Byzantine churchmen who were convinced that the use of azymes was itself heretical. Other Orthodox theologians disagreed. Around 1090, Theophylact, archbishop of Ohrid (1088/89–post 1126), reproached those who raised trivial issues, including azymes, against the Latins: “It seems to me,” he wrote, “that a man versed in church tradition and aware that no custom is important enough to divide the churches, except for that which leads to the destruction of dogma, will not” agree that the Westerners “commit unpardonable sins” in matters such as azymes.⁴¹ This issue, then, was still debated because it was still not settled.

Taking second place after azymes in the twelfth century was the issue of papal primacy.⁴² For example, in one of his texts written for debates with papal envoys in the capital in 1112, Niketas Seides (fl. first half of the 12th century) named twelve Latin errors, but insisted that only three were truly important: the procession of the Holy Spirit, azymes, and not calling Mary Theotokos. The importance of primacy is demonstrated by his first treatise, for although he began by saying that his concern was the three doctrinal issues, he ended up writing a refutation of the claims of the papal legates that Rome is the Mother of the churches.⁴³ From that refutation, he moved to doctrinal matters by arguing that even if Rome were the Mother of the churches, mothers deserve to be followed only if they are faithful to God. His example of how Rome had not been faithful, and the subject of his second discourse, was azymes. The emphasis on papal

³⁸ Smith, *And Taking Bread*, 91, 91 n. 47, 114–18.

³⁹ Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur*, 610.

⁴⁰ B. Leib, *Deux inédits byzantins sur les azymes au début du XIIe siècle* (Rome, 1924), 245 [113], cited and trans. in Pelikan, *Spirit of Eastern Christendom*, 177.

⁴¹ Theophylact of Bulgaria, Προσλαλία τιμι τῶν αὐτοῦ ὁμιλιτῶν περὶ ὧν ἐγκαλοῦνται Λατῖνοι, ed. P. Gautier, *Théophylacte d'Achrida: Discours, traités, poésies. Introduction, texte, traduction et notes* (Thessaloniki, 1980), 279.

⁴² Darrouzès, “Documents,” *passim*.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 55.

primacy in Seides' work, and in that of his contemporary, Theodore Smyrniaios (fl. 1080–1112), had two roots. First, it was a direct response to papal pretensions. In a letter to Emperor Alexios I, Pope Pascal II (1099–1118) had indicated that acceptance of Rome's primacy, in matters of doctrine as in all else, was a prerequisite for ecclesiastical peace.⁴⁴ Seides, Smyrniaios, and others had been assigned by the emperor to refute such claims. So, too, Patriarch John X Kamateros' (1198–1206) later refutation of papal primacy was a direct response to Innocent III's (1198–1216) assertion of that primacy.⁴⁵

The second reason for Byzantine interest in papal primacy in the twelfth century relates directly to the Crusades. When Latin Crusaders conquered Antioch (1098) and Jerusalem (1099), they installed Latin patriarchs in both places. Those patriarchs owed at least nominal allegiance to the pope; at most, as was often the case, they were actually appointed by the pope. Constantinopolitans had not exactly been enthusiastic about the independence of the other Eastern patriarchs before the Crusades, and the patriarchs of Constantinople had been known to interfere in the other patriarchates. Nevertheless, they were quick to denounce Rome's attempts to control them.

Still, Joseph Gill's assessment of Byzantine denials of papal primacy before 1204 rings true: they lack heat. John Kamateros' debate with Innocent III is "largely academic" in tone, with "little sense of urgency."⁴⁶ Lists of Latin errors, the lowest and most rabid kind of polemic, do not raise the issue of papal authority until after 1204.⁴⁷ The question is crucial in high-level negotiations with Rome, but it is not contested *within* the Byzantine church. Debates about papal primacy have Greek-speaking, Orthodox people on one side, Latins on the other. Even if the Latins score points in a debate, papal primacy is not going to be applied to the East. There is no identity crisis here. "They" believe in papal primacy; "we" do not. As with other issues, it is only when papal primacy becomes an issue within Greek circles that it generates some heat, and that happens only after 1204.

Finally, the Filioque reemerges in the Komnenian period. It scarcely seemed important in the furor about azymes around 1054, but by the late eleventh century Theophylact of Ohrid and others returned to Photios' claim that this was the truly horrible error. A century later, Innocent III called for the return of the Greek "daughter" church to her "mother," the Roman church. Patriarch John Kamateros responded that it was the Roman church, in fact, that left, by teaching a heresy and adding to the creed.⁴⁸

In sum, Byzantines in the Komnenian period worried about many of the same issues as in the time of Keroularios, especially azymes. They were also increasingly troubled by papal claims to *plenitudo potestatis* and all that that meant. Among other things, the

⁴⁴ Letter 437, PL 163:588–89. Darrouzès, "Documents," 51–54, 57.

⁴⁵ A. Papadakis and A.-M. Talbot, "John X Camaterus Confronts Innocent III: An Unpublished Correspondence," *BSI* 33 (1972): 26–41. Also published in part in PL 214:325–29, 756–72, and in J. Spiteris, *La critica bizantina del Primato Romano nel secolo XII* (Rome, 1979), 324–31. Discussion of these letters, with further bibliography: T. M. Kolbaba, "Barlaam the Calabrian: Three Treatises on Papal Primacy," *REB* 53 (1995): 43–44.

⁴⁶ Gill, *Byzantium and the Papacy*, 12.

⁴⁷ The first reference to papal primacy in such texts is in Constantine Stilbes' list, compiled after 1204: Darrouzès, "Mémoire," para. 4, 44.

⁴⁸ Papadakis and Talbot, "John X Camaterus," 34–35.

Byzantines were beginning to realize that they could not openly discuss differences with the Latins if the Latins were not willing to give up the idea that the pope could do things alone, without the approval of the other patriarchs.

1204–1261

The next major development in Greco-Latin relations was traumatic and unlikely to endear Latins to theologians or any other Byzantines. The Fourth Crusade ended in the Latin army’s sack of Constantinople on 12 April 1204. Pope Innocent III hoped that the establishment of a Latin emperor in Constantinople might lead to reunion of the churches. On the contrary, it stiffened resistance to Latins within the Greek-speaking churches of Nicaea and Epiros. The Latin conquest did, however, change the priorities of Byzantines who criticized Latin doctrines and practices. Although azymes remained important and the Filioque was growing in importance,⁴⁹ the dominant issue was now papal primacy.⁵⁰

Texts from this period emphasize the role of the pope in the church and do so in ways that are not at all “academic.” For example, in discussions held between Greeks and Latins in the capital after the appointment of Thomas Morosini as Latin patriarch in 1204, the issue of papal primacy was central. In December 1204, the papal legate Peter Capuano held discussions with Greek clergy. He asked them to submit to the pope, but most of them refused. In 1206 most of the Greek clergy in the capital were still refusing to accept Morosini as their patriarch. In August, September, and October of that year, Patriarch Morosini and the papal legate Benedict, Cardinal of St. Susanna, debated with Greek clergy. The discussion laid out the arguments for and against papal primacy in what had, by then, become a formula. The Greeks remained adamant. They wanted their own, Greek patriarch.⁵¹

These events from early in the period of Latin rule reveal the first reason for the centrality of papal primacy in this period: in the areas they controlled after 1204, the Latins insisted that Greek clergy and bishops take an oath of obedience to the pope or be deposed from their churches. Moreover, they were quite open about the implications of that oath, for they refused to separate theological issues from papal primacy. If the pope was indeed the head of the church, if Rome was the mother of all the other churches—if, in short, all the Western claims for papal primacy in law and doctrine were true—then the only solution to the schism was for the daughter church to return to the mother, the schismatics to return to the catholic church. All other issues were subsumed

⁴⁹ For example, in discussions between Greek theologians and papal legates in 1234, the Greek representatives insisted that the Filioque was the most important issue, while the Latins condemned the Greek refusal to accept unleavened bread in the eucharist. Gill, *Byzantium and the Papacy*, 65–72.

⁵⁰ See, e.g., the letter of Patriarch Germanos II to the clergy on Cyprus (1229), PG 140:613–21; summary in Gill, *Byzantium and the Papacy*, 60. It might be possible to count up the number of references to any given topic in all the extant texts of the era, but it would not be particularly useful. Most texts that survive do so because later eras are interested in their content. Based on my reading of surviving theological texts and on the accounts of historians, I have reached the conclusion that papal primacy is the central issue in most debates; that judgment, while defensible, remains subjective.

⁵¹ Gill, *Byzantium and the Papacy*, 32–34. For typical Greek arguments against papal primacy, the best summaries are Darrouzès, “Documents,” 42–88, and Spiteris, *La critica bizantina*.

under the issue of papal primacy.⁵² So the Latins gave the Greeks good reasons to think that this issue must be settled before any others could be. The Greeks learned the lesson well. When, in 1253, John III Vatatzes (1221–54) sent an embassy to the pope, seeking reunion of the churches, his proposals began with an acknowledgment of papal primacy, including the right of appeal to Rome in all church matters.⁵³

But some Greek clergy and people were less adamant than the debaters of 1204 or 1206. Around 1205 the bishops of Rodosto and Negroponte submitted to papal authority.⁵⁴ Papal letters from the pontificates of Innocent III and Honorius III (1216–27) reveal a number of monasteries that submitted to the pope and received, in return, papal protection for their rights and properties.⁵⁵ In 1214 Patriarch Theodore Irenikos of Nicaea (1214–16) wrote to the people of Constantinople, exhorting them to remain true to their faith and not to vow obedience to the pope: “For how would your faith be preserved and safe-guarded, if you should agree to be one of the pope’s faithful?”⁵⁶ Often cited as an example of Greek resistance, this letter is equally an indication that some of the people were wavering, possibly because of the “conciliatory policy towards the Greeks” that the second Latin emperor of Constantinople followed.⁵⁷ Later, the case of the clergy of Cyprus reveals a similar ambivalence within the Orthodox community outside the City. Cyprus had been under Latin rule since 1191, and the Greek clergy there could not agree among themselves about the best way to coexist with the Latins. To what extent should they compromise? Could they take an oath of obedience to the pope and/or to the Latin bishop without compromising their orthodoxy? They quarreled about this issue for years, arguing about the limits of *oikonomia*. Asked for guidance, Patriarch Germanos II (1223–40) and his synod in Nicaea also failed to agree. They first ruled that the clergy of Cyprus could compromise with the Latin archbishop in various ways without betraying their faith, but later, under pressure from a more radical element from Constantinople, they modified this decision. Thus they added confusion to the situation instead of alleviating it.⁵⁸

In light of this evidence, it is fair to say that past scholarship has often overemphasized the Greek clergy and bishops who fled to Nicaea and Epiros rather than take an oath of obedience to the pope. Most Greeks did resist the Latins, but some did so passively, while others compromised. The important point is that the compromisers existed; they must have had reasons for their actions. When their opponents admit that they exist, they

⁵² Examples of this Latin emphasis on Roman primacy can be found in nearly every piece of papal correspondence from the period. For examples, see Gill, *Byzantium and the Papacy*, 65, 67, 89, 93.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 92–95.

⁵⁴ J. Richard, “The Establishment of the Latin Church in the Empire of Constantinople (1204–1227),” in *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204*, ed. B. Arbel, B. Hamilton, and D. Jacoby (London, 1989), 47–48.

⁵⁵ Gill, *Byzantium and the Papacy*, 52–53; Richard, “Establishment of the Latin Church,” 54.

⁵⁶ Cited in Gill, *Byzantium and the Papacy*, 40.

⁵⁷ Henry of Hainault reigned from 1206 to 1216 in Constantinople. See G. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, trans. J. Hussey (New Brunswick, N.J., 1957), 381.

⁵⁸ J. Gill, “The Tribulations of the Greek Church in Cyprus, 1196–c. 1280,” *ByzF* 5 (1977): 78–80; Hussey, *Orthodox Church*, 201–6; M. Angold, “Greeks and Latins after 1204: The Perspective of Exile,” in *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204* (as in note 54), 72–75.

claim that they were merely weak or evil, willing to sell their souls for safety or political preference. Maybe some were craven traitors, but we need not take their opponents' word for it. It is equally likely that some men honestly believed that an oath of obedience to the pope was no stain on their orthodoxy. That belief, however, made their definition of orthodoxy quite different from that of the anti-Latin, anti-papal rigorists. Their compromise goes a long way toward explaining the heat with which other men attacked papal pretensions. Those who opposed Western ideas and Western authority—whether we call them intransigent or steadfast—were so fierce in their opposition because their definition of the boundaries of orthodoxy was not universally accepted. They were trying either to convince the compromisers that they were wrong or, failing that, to convince the rest of their contemporaries that the compromisers should be anathematized.

The Palaiologan Period

In 1261, in a serendipitous accident that many considered miraculous, a small army from Nicaea recaptured the city of Constantinople. No longer in exile, Michael VIII (1259–82) and the other leaders from Nicaea proceeded to reestablish the Roman Empire of Constantinople. But the question of reunion of the churches of Rome and Constantinople would not evaporate along with the Latin Empire. In fact, for Michael VIII, the question was perhaps more urgent than for any of his predecessors because various Western enemies proposed a “crusade” against the “schismatic Greeks” to recover the empire for catholic Christendom. To fend off these attackers, Michael opened and maintained negotiations with the papacy for reunion of the churches. For these negotiations, even more than for those during the Empire of Nicaea, papal primacy was the dominant theme, and for many of the same reasons. The popes still insisted that this was the fundamental issue,⁵⁹ and Byzantines still disagreed among themselves about compromise. In the collection of documents related to the Second Council of Lyons (1274) published by Vitalien Laurent and Jean Darrouzès, the dominant issues remain papal primacy, the right of appeal to the papacy, and the commemoration of the pope in the Byzantine liturgy.⁶⁰

But the Filioque continued to grow in importance. It became the central issue sometime around the Second Council of Lyons. Many will challenge the idea that it was around 1274—and *only* then—that the Filioque became the crucial issue. After all, it was the most important issue for Photios, for Theophylact of Ohrid, for Greek theologians at Nicaea in 1234, and for theologians of the Palaiologan period. It remains the most important issue for many theologians today. It is quite natural to conclude that it has always been the most important issue, at least for thoughtful Christians. But it has not. The disputants of the 1050s hardly mentioned it. Treatises on the topic, including the statement composed by the Nicene synod in 1234,⁶¹ appear in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, but they are far less common than discussions of azymes and papal prim-

⁵⁹ See Kolbaba, “Barlaam the Calabrian,” 43–48, esp. the letter of Clement IV quoted there.

⁶⁰ V. Laurent and J. Darrouzès, *Dossier grec de l'Union de Lyon (1273–1277)*, Archives de l'Orient chrétien 15 (Paris, 1976).

⁶¹ Gill, *Byzantium and the Papacy*, 72.

acy.⁶² This does *not* mean that the Filioque was not important to many people and at some times before 1274. Certain men of a philosophical bent seem always to have been troubled by the implications of double procession, while men who were concerned with authority within the church often challenged the unilateral character of the addition to the creed. But the Filioque was not the subject of more treatises, more debates, or more invective than papal primacy or azymes before 1274.

So we should be more surprised than we are when we see how the issue dominated the Palaiologan period. This dominance can be seen in a number of ways. For example, a rough count of the authored works listed in the Greek Index Project reveals that about 70 percent of all the polemical works written in the Palaiologan period were against the Latins. Of those, about half were about the procession of the Holy Spirit.⁶³ For another example, Barlaam the Calabrian wrote twenty-one anti-Latin treatises. Fifteen of these are concerned in some way with the relations of the persons in the Trinity; ten explicitly mention the procession of the Holy Spirit in their titles.⁶⁴ This dominance needs explaining. We cannot simply claim that the Filioque is the most important issue in an absolute, philosophical sense; such a claim cannot be proven or verified. More to the point, even if it is the most important issue, it was not always seen and treated as such in Byzantium.

As was true of azymes and papal primacy, the Filioque became a burning issue only when it became an issue within the Eastern church. There were no Byzantine defenders of the Filioque before the 1270s. It was not necessary to write treatises to convince other Byzantines that the addition to the creed was illegitimate and possibly heretical. Within Byzantium—and therefore within most theological discussions in Byzantium—the belief that the Spirit proceeded from the Father alone could be assumed; it did not have to be defended.

Moreover, in general, when the question did come up in arguments with the Latins, its theology was seldom discussed systematically. The error of the Latins in this matter came primarily from their unilateral addition to the creed, as Theophylact of Ohrid expressed so clearly: “But the Symbol of the faithful must be the Symbol freed from all alteration . . . for not even the axe-wielders of Ezekiel spared those marked with the sign if they did not observe that their sign was not counterfeit.”⁶⁵ Perhaps the Latins had simply not thought through or were not capable of thinking through the theological implications of this novelty. Theophylact surmised that the Latin language had no way of distinguishing the “procession” of the Holy Spirit from the Father from his “having been sent” by the Son. He assumed that if he simply showed the Latins their misunder-

⁶² I base this statement on a close study of the polemical works catalogued in H.-G. Beck's *Kirche und theologische Literatur*, as well as on more recent studies of the theological debates of the period.

⁶³ R. E. Sinkewicz and W. M. Hayes, *Manuscript Listings for the Authored Works of the Palaeologan Period* (Toronto, 1989). The other half is divided among the following, in roughly descending order: treatises entitled generally “Contra Latinos” or “De unione” or something similar; treatises against purgatory, against azymes, against papal primacy; and miscellaneous single occurrences, such as a treatise “Against Thomas [Aquinas].”

⁶⁴ For a list of Barlaam's works, see R. E. Sinkewicz, “The Solutions Addressed to George Lapithes by Barlaam the Calabrian and Their Philosophical Context,” *MedSt* 43 (1981): 185–94.

⁶⁵ Theophylact, Περὶ ὧν ἐγκαλοῦνται Λατῖνοι, 251.

standing and explained how dangerous the theological implications of this addition were, they would concede the point.⁶⁶ During the discussions held at Nicaea and Nymphaeum in the period of the Latin Empire of Constantinople, that condescension was less evident. Latins came to discussions armed with both a knowledge of Greek and manuscripts of the writings of the Greek fathers of the church. Still, the Greek theologians involved in those debates stressed the Filioque precisely because it was the area where they felt the firmest ground beneath their feet. They were utterly convinced of the rightness of their position, and nothing the Latins said changed any of their minds.

But the firm ground began to shake in the period around the Council of Lyons. In late 1273 or early 1274, John Bekkos (born ca. 1230, patriarch of Constantinople 1275–82), an important Constantinopolitan churchman, became convinced that the Latin position on the Filioque was theologically defensible. From his time on, there was a debate *within* Byzantium about the Latin position. The unionist defenders of the Filioque adduced quite sophisticated arguments, based not only on logic but also on the writings of Greek and Latin church fathers. The anti-unionist, anti-Filioque people were caught off-guard by this, at first, and did not always do a good job of defending their position. Although some partisan historians still dismiss him with a few scathing words, Bekkos was *not* obviously and self-evidently wrong. He may not have been the most subtle theologian in history, but he convinced many other men of his position. He also became patriarch after the Council of Lyons and the union manufactured there. Later, when that union was repudiated, the first synod convened to condemn Bekkos and the other unionists was more a lynch-mob than a thoughtful discussion. The second synod, convened years later, was unable to convert Bekkos and his supporters to the anti-Filioque opinion.⁶⁷ Patriarch Gregory II of Cyprus (1283–89) produced strong, reasoned refutations,⁶⁸ but Bekkos had his supporters, both at the time and down to the end of the empire.

Changing Tone

John Bekkos did not convert to Roman Catholicism; he merely believed that the theologians who argued in favor of the double procession of the Holy Spirit were correct and in agreement with the fathers of the church. In the centuries after his death, several prominent Byzantine intellectuals would reach a broader conclusion: that Latin theologians and philosophers were right about many things. Some of these intellectuals would convert; the most famous example is Cardinal Bessarion (ca. 1399–1472).⁶⁹ Demetrios Kydones, a fourteenth-century convert to Catholicism, put it best when describing how,

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 253–55.

⁶⁷ Hussey, *Orthodox Church*, 247.

⁶⁸ Hussey, *Orthodox Church*, 247–49; A. Papadakis, *Crisis in Byzantium: The 'Filioque' Controversy in the Patriarchate of Gregory II of Cyprus (1283–1289)* (New York, 1984).

⁶⁹ The most thorough study of his life and work is L. Mohler, *Kardinal Bessarion als Theologe, Humanist und Staatsmann*, 3 vols. (Paderborn, 1923–42). A more accessible and up-to-date survey is J. Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence* (New York, 1964), 45–54.

in his youth, he began to study Thomas Aquinas and other Latin theologians: “Now it would become apparent that the Latins too had people capable of the highest intellectual attainments—something that had not been widely known in the past among the Byzantines. . . . For too long, my Byzantine countrymen had been content to hold on to the staid old notion that mankind was divided into two groups: Greeks and Barbarians. . . . The Latins could not be credited as being capable of anything worthy of human beings.”⁷⁰ This awareness of Latin theological sophistication brings us to the second major point of this paper: between Photios and Bekkos there had been a fundamental shift in how Byzantine intellectuals perceived their Western European brethren, a shift reflected in the changing tone of anti-Latin texts.

The Ninth Century

Photios and others after him manifested the classic middle Byzantine attitude toward Western “barbarians.” Photios claimed that Pope Leo (III?) had made Christians in Rome say the creed in Greek because Latin was such an inferior language that it “often render[s] false notions of the doctrines of the faith.”⁷¹ Photios was willing to blame most Western errors on ignorance and lack of education. Even when he descended to name-calling and aspersions, his epithets did not resemble later polemic. Rather, he used the classic terminology of heresy and heretics: arrogance, rashness, insolence, impudence, pride. In *The Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit*, for example, he described the advocates of the Filioque in ways that echo talk about heretics throughout history. For example, he wrote of “the arrogance of those contentious men who hold fast to unrighteousness and strive against the truth.”⁷² He referred to their “rash impudence,” “brutal and insolent attacks,” and “lawlessness.”⁷³ “When all is said and done,” he wrote, “it comes down to the same unending pride.”⁷⁴ We would err if we put too much weight on these descriptions as indications of what Photios thought of “Latins.” If we compare these epithets to Photios’ synopsis of the ecumenical synods in his letter to the Khan of Bulgaria, we see striking parallels. Arios was also proud; he had “an overweening attitude” and refused to “see something that is true of everything and self-evident.”⁷⁵ Makedonios, too, ignored the obvious and was “arrogant” and “insolent.”⁷⁶ This is an old story: heretics are proud and devil-inspired, refusing to see what any honest, humble, praying man would see. They are mad, arrogant, insolent, blasphemous, and willfully blind. When Photios described

⁷⁰ Demetrios Kydones, *Apologia 1*, ed. G. Mercati, in *Notizie di Procoro e Demetrio Cidone, Manuele Caleca e Teodoro Meliteniota ed altri appunti per la storia della teologia e della letteratura bizantina del secolo XIV*, ST 56 (Vatican City, 1931), 364; trans. J. Likoudis, *Ending the Byzantine Greek Schism* (New Rochelle, N.Y., 1983), 26. See also F. Kianka, “The Apology of Demetrios Cydones: A Fourteenth-Century Autobiographical Source,” *ByzSt* 7.1 (1980), 57–71; eadem, “Demetrios Cydones and Thomas Aquinas,” *Byzantion* 52 (1982): 264–86.

⁷¹ Photios, *Λόγος περὶ τῆς τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος μυσταγωγίας*, PG 102:376, trans. J. P. Farrell, *Saint Photios: The Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit* (Brookline, Mass., 1987), 103.

⁷² PG 120:280; trans. Farrell, 59.

⁷³ E.g., see PG 120:297–301; trans. Farrell, 66–68.

⁷⁴ PG 120:324; trans. Farrell, 80.

⁷⁵ Photios, *Epistulae et Amphilochia*, 1:5; trans. D. S. White and J. R. Berrigan Jr., *The Patriarch and the Prince* (Brookline, Mass., 1982), 42.

⁷⁶ Photios, *Epistulae et Amphilochia*, 1:6; trans. White and Berrigan, 43–44.

Frankish missionaries in Bulgaria in such terms, he was not commenting on the ethnic or racial characteristics of Westerners; he was describing heretics.

The Eleventh Century

The tone of the arguments in 1054 was a bit worse than at the time of Photios. Yet it was nowhere near as acrimonious as generally assumed. That general assumption rests on a reading of only what Humbert of Silva Candida and Michael Keroularios wrote. In the balance against these writings we need to put not only the oft-noted irenic position of Peter of Antioch, but also a multitude of other texts from the period. In these texts, Byzantine writers still condescended to their Western brothers. Both Peter of Antioch and Leo of Ohrid assumed that the Latins had wandered from the true path out of ignorance, and that if they were corrected by their more learned, wiser Eastern brethren, they would return to the straight and narrow.⁷⁷ Latins were barbarians, ignorant of doctrine. The superior orthodox Christians must be patient with them.

Byzantine disputants also limited their instruction to a part of the Western church; they did not maintain that the whole Western church had fallen into error. Keroularios, for example, although he was inconsistent on this point, usually insisted that the pope was not to blame for the errors of the West or for his dispute with Humbert. He distinguished between the pope, with whom he wanted an alliance, and the "Franks," including his archenemy and the Byzantine governor in southern Italy, the Lombard Argyros. Keroularios' synod in 1054 did not condemn the pope or Westerners in general, but claimed that Humbert and the other legates were impostors bearing forged letters altered by Argyros.⁷⁸ Peter of Antioch defended Westerners on the basis of his knowledge of them, and insisted that if some Westerners were violating canon law (by eating strangled things or marrying within forbidden degrees), they must be doing so without the knowledge of the pope.⁷⁹

Behind this last comment, and fundamental to our understanding of the events of 1054, was an awareness that the West was not a monolith. Peter of Antioch, Leo of Ohrid, and Michael Keroularios did not live in a world where the division of East from West was clear and all-important. Instead of that bipolar world—Rome facing Constantinople—that dominates modern accounts of 1054, we find different groups, with different interests, involved in ecclesiastical negotiations and disputes. In Italy alone the actors included the pope, the German emperor, the Normans in southern Italy, the Lombards in southern and central Italy, and the indigenous Italians of the same region, some of whom still considered themselves subjects of the emperor in Constantinople. Sometimes a single individual embodied this complex world: Argyros, whom Keroularios blames for the whole fiasco, was a Lombard of the Latin rite. He had lived in Constantinople. In 1054 he was the Byzantine imperial governor in southern Italy. Other examples

⁷⁷ E.g., Peter of Antioch, Letter to Michael Keroularios, PG 120:805: "For they are our brothers, even if it happens that, through rusticity and lack of education, they have often fallen from what is proper."

⁷⁸ Synodal Judgment, PG 120:741.

⁷⁹ Letter to Keroularios, PG 120:808.

of this multilateral world include the recipients of two of the earliest and most important anti-azyme texts: Dominic of Grado and John of Trani.

Peter of Antioch wrote to Dominic, bishop of Grado, probably in the spring of 1054.⁸⁰ No one who studies the events of 1054 overlooks this text, for it is one of the earliest.⁸¹ One aspect of its context, however, is seldom explicitly noted. As a result, it is generally presented as a straightforward example of a letter from an “Eastern” patriarch to a “Western” bishop, as if the distinction were as clear-cut as it would be in the thirteenth or fourteenth century. But history had made Grado an odd sort of liminal place. For reasons too complicated to discuss here, the metropolitans (or patriarchs, as they came to call themselves) of Grado sat on a cathedra not on the island of Grado but in Venice. Now, in hindsight, we see clearly that Venice had gained political independence from Constantinople in the course of the tenth century. But its cultural independence could not have been so clear. Dominic of Grado, the recipient of Peter’s letter, built the “new” church of San Marco, the one we see today. He imported architects and skilled craftsmen from the East to do so, which explains the fundamentally Byzantine character of San Marco.⁸² So the geography of Venice, between Byzantium and the West, was reflected in its culture, as it always has been. Leo of Ohrid’s treatise on azymes illuminates another section of this multicultural world. Leo’s addressee, John, bishop of Trani, was a representative of the Byzantine church in southern Italy, and he was “asked to call these matters to the pope’s attention only after he [had] ‘corrected himself.’”⁸³

Aware of the ethnic and religious diversity of Western Europe, eleventh-century authors of Byzantine religious texts did not yet engage in the kind of name-calling that would characterize later anti-Latin polemic. For them (if not for the contemporary historians),⁸⁴ Westerners were not barbarian “Franks” or “Kelts.” Usually they were called “Romans,” even when they erred. Thus Keroularios told Peter of Antioch about Roman errors (Ῥωμαϊκῶν σφαλμάτων).⁸⁵ Peter replied, speaking also of “Romans,” whom he distinguished from “Vandals,” although he feared that the Romans might have been influenced by the Vandals.⁸⁶ When tribal names of barbarians appear, it tends to be in what we would call secular contexts. Keroularios, for example, wrote about his desire to form an alliance with the pope against the “Franks,” by which he meant the men we call “Normans.”⁸⁷

Put simply, Byzantines were not yet constructing a world in which the “Latins” or “Franks” from the West were a monolithic, threatening group. Keroularios was the only person to imply that the Western church as a whole was in a state of schism. Although

⁸⁰ PG 120:755–82.

⁸¹ Smith, *And Taking Bread*, 54–59, 134, 157, 173, 178–79.

⁸² *DHGE* 21 (1986), s.v. “Grado.”

⁸³ Leo of Ohrid, Letter to John of Trani, PG 120:835–44. Quote from Smith, *And Taking Bread*, 114. For other information regarding Leo’s letter, see Smith, 106–8, 156–57, 173, 174.

⁸⁴ See Alexander Kazhdan’s contribution to this volume.

⁸⁵ PG 120:789.

⁸⁶ PG 120:805.

⁸⁷ Letter to Peter of Antioch, PG 120:784.

he usually maintained that they had nothing against the popes, and that his only quarrel was with the "false" envoys and their "forged" papers, Keroularios did tell Peter of Antioch that: "From the sixth holy and ecumenical council to the present, the commemoration of the pope has been excised from the sacred diptychs of our holy churches. [This is] because the pope of that time, Vigilius, did not want to come to that council, nor to anathematize what Theodoritos wrote against the orthodox faith and against the twelve chapters of St. Cyril, or the letter of Ibas. And from that time to the present the pope has been cut off from our holy and catholic church."⁸⁸ But Peter rebuked Keroularios for this statement, pointing out that it was wrong both in its central point and in its knowledge of history:

I was ashamed of these latter things contained in the letter of Your Honor, nor do I know what to say, believe me. . . . For before examination and complete understanding, from vain rumor you have set forth that which never happened as if it had happened. . . . For Vigilius was at the fifth council . . . , but he was not at the sixth council. The interval between these two synods was 139 years. It did happen, for a brief while, that commemoration was cut off on account of [Vigilius] contending with the most holy patriarch Menas and subjecting him to demotion. [This schism lasted] until the archbishops made peace and were reconciled with one another. At the sixth holy synod, the pope was the priest Agathon, a worthy and divine man, wise in divine things. Read the acts of the sixth council, as it is customary to do on the Sunday after the Exaltation of the Venerable Cross. For you will find there that the aforementioned Agathon was gloriously acclaimed in that holy council.⁸⁹

Even later writers who copied and expanded Keroularios' list of Latin errors tended to leave off his erroneous introduction. The idea that the popes were heretics who had been in error for centuries was not commonly accepted in 1054. Keroularios' claim that they were was idiosyncratic.

Two other pieces of evidence are often adduced in support of the idea that something radically different and more hostile took place around 1054. First, it is often asserted that Keroularios closed the Latin churches in Constantinople.⁹⁰ However, as Mahlon Smith has noted, this statement is based on slim evidence. Humbert of Silva Candida alleged on several occasions that Keroularios persecuted Latin churches. This persecution seems mostly to have taken the form of "mocking" the Latins by calling them "azymites."⁹¹ Humbert claimed only once that Keroularios actually closed Latin churches in the capital, and even then he qualified his statement as hearsay. Later, when he was in Constantinople, he reformed the practices of certain churches there. These must have been churches founded for the Westerners in the city; neither Keroularios nor any other

⁸⁸ PG 120:788–89.

⁸⁹ PG 120:797–800.

⁹⁰ For example, it is stated in passing as a fact by Hussey, *Orthodox Church*, 132. Grumel, *Regestes*, no. 863, "Ordre de fermer les églises Latines de la capitale," assumes that such a document once existed but notes that no such document is extant.

⁹¹ PL 143:759.

Greek in the city would have let him “reform” a Greek church. If Humbert “reformed” Latin churches in Constantinople, those churches must have been open.⁹²

Second, it is often asserted that Keroularios stirred the common people up to join his conflict with the emperor and Western envoys, and that he found it easy to do so because the people harbored a xenophobic hatred for Westerners.⁹³ A closer look makes this assertion even more questionable than the first. Evidence for popular anti-Latin sentiment in this period is meager. Keroularios did indeed raise the rabble on more than one occasion, but the people’s rage seems to have had other roots: unhappiness with Constantine IX Monomachos, as well as the general malaise of this period of instability in Byzantium.⁹⁴

In sum, the events of 1054 were insignificant for the short run. They received little attention in the empire at the time. The first known references to a “schism” between Keroularios and Humbert date from the early twelfth century.⁹⁵ As in the time of Photios, much of the conflict was more individual than general—Humbert versus Keroularios, rather than Rome versus Constantinople. Many of the features of later relations between Byzantium and Latins were not yet evident. Perception of the West as a unity and a threat; anxiety about Latin theological sophistication; popular antipathy—all of these would emerge later.

The Twelfth Century

During the Komnenian period (1081–1204), Latin penetration of the empire grew exponentially. This has been discussed too often and too well by other scholars to need elaboration here.⁹⁶ But this was *not* the impact of an active, vibrant, potent, masculine Western force on a passive, decadent, impotent, effeminate Eastern despotism. Byzantine emperors and their subjects reacted to Western pressures and exerted their own pressures on Westerners. To read Paul Magdalino’s account of Manuel I’s empire (1143–80) or Ralph-Johannes Lilie’s account of Byzantine relations with the Crusader kingdoms of Syria and Palestine is to see Byzantine emperors both exerting great influence on Westerners and adopting Western ideas and methods.⁹⁷ The central dichotomy of Alexios I’s (1081–1118) or his grandson’s world was not as much between “Rhomaioi” and “Latinoi” as between “those who are for me” and “those who are against me”; not between “Roman” ways of doing things and “Latin” ones, but between “what works” and “what does not.” The borders were permeable, and both sides were changed by extended contact.

⁹² For a fuller statement of this argument, with citations of the primary texts, see Smith, *And Taking Bread*, 119–21.

⁹³ Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, 297; Hussey, *Orthodox Church*, 134.

⁹⁴ Héléne Ahrweiler concurs: “Recherches sur la société byzantine au XIe siècle: Nouvelles hiérarchies et nouvelles solidarités,” *TM* 6 (1976): 121.

⁹⁵ A. Michel, *Humbert und Kerullarios*, *Studien*, vol. 1 (Paderborn, 1924), 30–33.

⁹⁶ Even to survey the bibliography of this topic would be a monumental task. See the bibliography in P. Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180* (Cambridge, 1993), or in M. Angold, *Church and Society under the Comneni, 1081–1261* (Cambridge, 1995).

⁹⁷ Magdalino, *Manuel I*; R.-J. Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States, 1096–1204*, trans. J. C. Morris and J. E. Ridings (Oxford, 1993).

This two-way flow of men and ideas is a recurring theme in recent histories of the politics, economy, and warfare of the empire. In contrast, the theological sphere in this period is generally portrayed as impermeable. Adopting the view our Byzantine sources would like us to adopt, we tend to see Orthodoxy as a kind of fortress with outer walls of slippery-smooth marble. Latin theological ideas, recognized as novelties and dangerous heresies, bounced off this marble without so much as leaving a smudge. In the end, however, the same sources inadvertently show us a rather different Byzantium, and we cannot quite believe their explicit message of a faith untouched by Western ideas. Perhaps Byzantine theologians remained truly unaffected by Latin ideas in the time of Photios, for at that time their theological and philosophical training was superior to that of anyone in the West. By the twelfth century, however, such superiority was melting away. The Latins were catching up, and some Greeks knew they were. Given the acrimonious *ad hominem* attacks of 1054, it is unlikely that Humbert's logic impressed them. In contrast, when Alexios I listened to debates regarding the procession of the Holy Spirit between a Latin bishop and some Greek theologians (1112), he was convinced by the Latin arguments and sent his own theologians back to the drawing board. The extant account of this debate was written by the Latin bishop, so we should be skeptical. Yet it is true that various Greek theologians worked very hard at refuting Latin arguments around 1112. One senses that their confident condescension had been shaken.⁹⁸

Still more interesting is the controversy, in the time of Manuel I, over the Gospel phrase, "The Father is greater than I." The trouble began when an imperial ambassador, Demetrios of Lampe, returning from the Latin West, brought with him ideas about the relations of the persons in the Trinity. He reported that he had heard Latins say that the Son was at the same time inferior to and equal to the Father, and he proclaimed that opinion ridiculous. Emperor Manuel differed with Demetrios and deputed Hugo Eteriano, a Pisan theologian and friend, to argue against him. Probably most of the churchmen of Constantinople supported Demetrios, in part because they believed that his opinion was the traditional, native one, while Hugo's was a Latin innovation.⁹⁹ However that may be, the emperor dominated the council that decided the matter in 1166, and so Demetrios' position was anathematized in the Synodikon of Orthodoxy and Hugo's inscribed on enormous marble tablets attached to the walls of the Great Church.¹⁰⁰ The doctrine that had been criticized by a Greek and defended by a Latin became official dogma within the Greek church.¹⁰¹

⁹⁸ Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur*, 616; *ODB*, s.v. "Grossolano, Peter," 2:885.

⁹⁹ Magdalino, *Manuel I*, 287–90.

¹⁰⁰ On the tablets, see C. Mango, "The Conciliar Edict of 1166," *DOP* 17 (1963): 317–30.

¹⁰¹ The sources for this controversy have been studied very carefully, and much has been learned from rather scanty material. Still, it may be worthy of another study; ideas about the import of Latin influence in the Komnenian period have changed a great deal since the last careful study of the origins and meaning of this conflict. My analysis of the events is based on a quick reading of the primary sources and on reflections inspired by Magdalino's version of the events in P. Magdalino, "The Phenomenon of Manuel I Komnenos," in *Byzantium and the West, c. 850–c. 1200*, ed. J. D. Howard-Johnston (= *ByzF* 13; Amsterdam, 1988); repr. in *Tradition and Transformation in Medieval Byzantium* (Aldershot, 1991), no. iv, 196–98. The most thorough article on the controversy, with publication of texts, is P. Classen, "Das Konzil von Konstantinopel und die Lateiner," *BZ* 48 (1955): 338–68. See also G. Thetford, "The Christological Councils of 1166 and 1170 in Constantinople,"

Although many details of the case elude historians, its broad outlines reveal three important features of Byzantine relations with Latins in the twelfth century. First, the intellectual boundaries between East and West were permeable. Demetrios traveled west and picked up a controversy there. Hugo Eteriano, an Italian, lived in Constantinople and entered the lists as the emperor's champion. This permeability complicates historical reconstruction of the boundaries between East and West, Greek and Latin, Orthodox and Catholic. Even what initially seems like the simplest question has no answer: Which was the "Latin" position here? At first glance, it seems clear that Hugo's was the "Latin" opinion. But the answer is probably more complex than that. According to the historian John Kinnamos, Demetrios' position was imported, for he had "returned from [the West] full of drivel."¹⁰² We cannot unquestioningly believe Kinnamos, however, who was ever-supportive of the emperor and ever-contemptuous of Latins; he omitted any mention of Hugo's role and presented the emperor's opinion as wholly self-generated. In the end, it seems that both sides of the debate were inspired by Western concerns, but that their accounts after the fact were anxious to hide Western influences.¹⁰³ When we read between the lines, Orthodox Constantinople's walls look more like a cellular membrane than a marble castle.

Second, Byzantines continued to disagree among themselves about the definition of orthodoxy and specifically about whether that definition included Latins. On the one hand, around this time a list of Latin "errors," which had probably been circulating for a while, surfaces in the historical record. This, the most scurrilous kind of anti-Latin polemic, reveals the existence of a virulently anti-Latin contingent in Constantinople.¹⁰⁴ On the other hand, there is obviously a problem with concentrating too much on the anti-Latin crowd. At least in the controversy surrounding Demetrios of Lampe, they seem to have lost. Hugo and Manuel won; it was their position that became the orthodox position. The marble tablets in the Great Church remained there until 1567.¹⁰⁵ Besides, that list of Latin errors was written to convince fellow Byzantines, not to convince Latins. In other words, the list reveals the existence of Byzantines who were *not* convinced that Latins were filthy heretics, as well as the existence of those who were.

Third, it was necessary for each side to downplay the role of Western influence in these events. Demetrios and his supporters saw and portrayed themselves as diligent polishers of the smooth marble walls of Orthodoxy, trying to rebuff all things Latin, while

SVThQ 31 (1987): 143–61; A. Dondaine, "Hugues Ethérien et la concile de CP de 1166," *HJ* 77 (1958): 473–83; J. Gouillard, "Le Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie," *TM* 2 (1967): 76–80, 216–26; L. Petit, "Documents inédits sur le concile de 1166 et ses derniers adversaires," *VizVrem* 11 (1904): 465–93.

¹⁰² John Kinnamos, *Deeds of John and Manuel Comnenus*, trans. C. M. Brand (New York, 1976), 189, book 6.2; Ioannes Kinnamos, *Epitome rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis gestarum*, ed. A. Meineke, CSHB (Bonn, 1836), 251.

¹⁰³ Magdalino, "Phenomenon," 196–97.

¹⁰⁴ Hugo Eteriano translated such a list into Latin sometime before 1178. Hergenroether published both Hugo's translation and a Greek list that mostly corresponded to it, entitled: Περὶ τῶν Φράγγων καὶ τῶν λουπῶν Λατίνων: J. Hergenroether, *Monumenta graeca ad Photium eiusque Historiam Pertinentia* (Ratisbon, 1869), 62–71. See also A. Argyriou, "Remarques sur quelques listes grecques énumérant les hérésies latines," *ByzF* 4 (1972): 13–15; Darrouzès, "Mémoire," 54–55.

¹⁰⁵ Mango, "Conciliar Edict," 317–21.

Kinnamos did not mention Hugo Eteriano's role and portrayed Demetrios' heresy as an imported product.

A summary of these mixed messages is difficult. Given that it was desirable for both sides to hide any "Latin" connection in their teaching, it seems that anti-Latin sentiment was strong and getting stronger. Yet the presence of Latins in the empire and frequent embassies of Greeks to the West allowed both friendly and unfriendly interaction, as well as mutual influences that usually went unrecorded in contemporary sources. This was still the empire of the Komnenoi, with their ties of blood and friendship to Latins, and with subjects who had not yet experienced the traumatic events of 1204.

1204–1261

After 1204 the opinion that Latins are Christian brothers was modified, even in the most pro-Latin circles. Everyone took the separation of the churches for granted. The period was characterized by one attempt after another to reunite the churches. It also saw both violent resistance to these efforts and a kind of openness to Western ideas. Paradoxically, the openness was often a result of the division. Some Byzantine scholars thought they had to learn more about the Latins before they could refute them. In the end, these trends led to a wide spectrum of opinion.

At one end of the spectrum is the most scurrilous kind of polemic against the Latins, which became popular. Lists of Latin "customs" or "errors" circulated widely. These included not only theological issues such as the Filioque and liturgical issues such as azymes, but also disgust at the things Latins ate and the clothes they wore.¹⁰⁶ In this way, opponents of church union sought to undermine the advocates of union by associating them with filthy heretics. For example, the anti-unionists could not acknowledge that John Bekkos might have reached a conviction of the orthodoxy of the Filioque by reading patristic texts. He must, rather, be a servant of the pope. One of the most infamous anti-Latin texts, the "Dialogue of Panagiotes with an Azymite," dates to around the Second Council of Lyons. It begins with a description of the arrival of a papal envoy in Constantinople. He is met by John Bekkos, who wears a miter and a ring, which, the author assures us, are symbols of the pope. The papal envoy is leading a mule with a basket on its back. In the basket is an image of the pope. Both Bekkos and Emperor Michael VIII perform acts of submission in front of this mule. Michael actually leads it by its bridle, an idea familiar to Western medievalists and an allusion to Michael's earlier, hypocritical submission to Patriarch Arsenios.¹⁰⁷ An even more striking example of this sort of condemnation-by-association is the case of Patriarch Gregory II of Cyprus. In spite of being the person who finally defeated Bekkos, in spite of his sophisticated elucidation of the Greek doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit, he ran into trouble. His enemies accused him of heresy in that very elucidation, and more than one of them

¹⁰⁶ See, e.g., Darrouzès, "Mémoire," para. 30, 63, 65, 66, 75.

¹⁰⁷ D. J. Geanakoplos, *Interaction of the 'Sibling' Byzantine and Western Cultures in the Middle Ages and Italian Renaissance, 330–1600* (New Haven, Conn., 1976), 158. Greek text ed. A. Vasiliev, *Anecdota graeco-byzantina* (Moscow, 1893), 179.

implied that his error came from his origins on Latin-dominated Cyprus.¹⁰⁸ He may have been deposed from the patriarchate for entirely political reasons, but a good way to justify such a deposition was to portray him as a “Latin.”

At the other end of the spectrum, some intellectuals of the Palaiologan period admired Latin learning and considered it superior to Greek. This shift is symbolized most vividly by the year 1274, for 1274 is not only the date of the Second Council of Lyons but also the date of the death of St. Thomas Aquinas. In other words, Latin theologians were reaching their peak. Popular opposition to the Latins was not significantly changed by this, but the opposition of intellectuals took on a different tone. Unlike Photios, Theophylact of Ohrid, or Peter of Antioch, intellectuals of the Palaiologan period were not certain of their own superior theological reasoning. Some among them even decided that the Latins had surpassed them.¹⁰⁹ The Greek delegation at the Council of Florence (1438–39) was not condescending; it was defensive. The complaint used to be Latin barbarism; for the opponents of reunion at Florence, the complaint was that the Latins were oversubtle.¹¹⁰

Conclusion

Byzantine identity was not a simple matter. Modern historians struggle for ways to describe what made Byzantine people Byzantine. Was theirs an “ethnic” identity? a religious identity? an imperial identity? Perhaps, instead of searching for a single definition that works once and for all, we need to acknowledge that our confusion is justified. A group of people defines itself and is defined as much by whom it excludes as by whom it includes. In both senses, the people we misleadingly call Byzantines did not always agree on a definition of themselves. Even where they did agree, the definition had to be refined more than once in their thousand-year history. That refinement of definition was always contested. Despite histories written by the victors, which often pretend that

¹⁰⁸ Nikephoros Gregoras, *Byzantina Historia*, ed. L. Schopen, CSHB 19, vol. 1 (Bonn, 1829), 165. German trans. and comm., *Römische Geschichte*, J. L. van Dieten, Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur 4, vol. 1 (Stuttgart, 1973), 148. Hussey, *Orthodox Church*, 248–49.

¹⁰⁹ I. Ševčenko, “Intellectual Repercussions of the Council of Florence,” *ChHist* 24 (1955): 294; repr. in idem, *Ideology, Letters and Culture of the Byzantine World* (London, 1982), no. IX, with new pagination, 6. Since Ševčenko’s seminal article, a great deal has been published regarding Greek reception of Latin theology in the Palaiologan period. A full bibliography is not possible here, but the interested reader might begin with the following: H. Hunger, *Prochoros Kydones, Übersetzung von acht Briefen des Hl. Augustinus* (Vienna, 1984); F. Kianka’s articles on Demetrios Kydones (note 70 above); R. Flogaus, “Der heimliche Blick nach Westen: Zur Rezeption von Augustins *De trinitate* durch Gregorios Palamas,” *JÖB* 46 (1996): 275–97.

¹¹⁰ Ševčenko, “Repercussions,” 298 (repr. 10). Demetrios Kydones complained that his fellow Greeks, rather than learn Latin positions and refute them intelligently, said, “‘The Latins are sophists. They attack us with sophistry, and when one refutes their sophisms, then there is nothing left but blasphemy and absurdity. We, however, stand by the folly of the evangelical message and the simplicity of fishermen. We did not receive Divine Revelation clad in worldly wisdom and we do not intend to surrender it to such wisdom, lest we strip the Cross of its Christ’” (ed. Mercati, 388; trans. Likoudis, 53).

the challenge came from without, the crucial problems were debates within the empire, among those who considered themselves heirs of Rome and children of Christ.

The iconoclast controversy, for example, despite all efforts to attribute it to Jewish or Islamic influences, seems most likely to have originated within the Christian Roman Empire. Doubts about the use of icons were certainly related to external influences, especially to the Arab invasions that threatened the very existence of the empire in the early eighth century. Still, the earliest iconoclasts were Christian bishops in Asia Minor. The history written a century later by the victorious iconodules portrays a true church, staunchly in favor of icons, oppressed by a minority of evil men who tried to force an alien doctrine and practice upon the orthodox, but modern historians doubt such an account, pointing to evidence that the iconoclasts were popular and that their beliefs were sincerely held and theologically justified. If iconoclasm had been, as its opponents claimed, an alien and obviously heinous belief, it would not have caused more than a century of strife within the empire. Nor would icon veneration have been enshrined at the center of the Orthodox definition of themselves if it had been uncontested.¹¹¹

Western European Christians presented another sort of question of identity, for they had been citizens of the Roman Empire as recently as the time of Justinian I (527–565) and they were Christians. Nominally, then, they were included in the Byzantine definition of “us.” Minimal contact with Westerners in the eighth to tenth centuries enabled this status to stand. It was recognized that Westerners were not quite up to Constantinopolitan standards. They were rustic cousins, baptized barbarians—but, then, so were people in other provinces of the empire. Contact with mercenary soldiers from Scandinavia simply reinforced this comfortable semi-inclusion and superiority.

But then these rustic cousins began to penetrate the empire in other ways—not just as mercenary soldiers overawed by the empire’s wealth and as occasional papal or imperial legates, who had contact with few Byzantines. The Crusades and the ambitious ventures of Italian merchants revealed to the Byzantines that their country cousins were strong and self-confident (“arrogant,” the Byzantines tended to say). Sometimes they acted like enemies. Even when they did not, they had ideas above their station: they actually claimed to have their own emperor of the Romans! This awareness of Latin difference brought Latins into the center of the ongoing debates about the boundaries of Byzantine society. It did so at a time when other groups were presenting similar challenges, especially the Armenians and Syrians who reentered the empire with the conquests of the tenth century.

If all Byzantines had agreed that Westerners were excluded from the ecumenical empire and church, there would have been relatively little Greek literature about Latin beliefs and customs. Probably for the average Constantinopolitan going about his daily business, it was taken for granted that Westerners were different simply because they spoke different languages and wore different clothes. For the hierarchy of the church, however, the problem was more profound. They could not merely adduce the obvious ethnic differences. The church, as Christ’s body, is not supposed to make distinctions

¹¹¹ For a recent account of the iconoclast controversy that involves this sort of analysis, see J. Herrin, *The Formation of Christendom* (Princeton, 1987), 306–43, esp. 331–43.

based on ethnicity, “for you are all one in Christ Jesus.”¹¹² Within the church, then, the status of Latins needed clarification. Were they included in the orthodox, catholic Christian church, in spite of their strange customs and odd clothing? Or were they excluded by their own beliefs? Were they, in a word, heretics? It was not an easy question to answer. As a result, the literature for and against Latin heresy began to pile up. Not surprisingly, that literature began with issues and definitions that had been used earlier on other groups, hence the centrality of azymes in the 1050s.

The impact of the Crusades on the evolution of Byzantine attitudes toward Latins was indirect but important. The Crusades made Western Europeans and one’s attitude toward them crucial issues for all Byzantines, from highly educated Constantinopolitan theologians to peasants in the Morea. Eastern hostility toward the Latins, including their status as the favorite target of religious polemic, is a result of the Crusades, a “radicalization” caused by the behavior of their Latin “brothers.” For most people, the Latins became a threat to body before they were a threat to soul; religious aversion followed violent conflict. It is a paradoxical conclusion, but it seems to fit the facts: anti-Latin polemic in the period of the Crusades is intimately linked to the Crusades, and yet it hardly ever mentions them.

Princeton University

¹¹² Gal. 3:28.

