

# *Unum in catholica fide:* Latin Attitudes to the Greeks in the Long Twelfth Century

The issue of Greek-Latin relations in the Middle Ages has long troubled scholars. The long twelfth century in particular has attracted special attention as it climaxed in the disastrous outcome of the Fourth Crusade of 1204, which has often been interpreted as the result, to a great extent, of the emerging ecclesiastical schism between the Latin and Greek Churches. According to this theory, »the events of 1204, when Constantinople was taken and sacked by the Fourth Crusade, were the culmination of a century of ill-feeling for which in the end the Greeks had to pay dearly« since they had come to be seen by the Latins as »religious deviants« and »not really Christians«<sup>1</sup>.

The evidence from the Latin world that has been usually employed to show that the Latins viewed the Greeks as religious Others comes from a number of crusader sources, annals and theological treatises. This interpretation of Latin attitudes towards the Greeks is convenient as it appears to render 1204 much more intelligible. Moreover, the modern thesis that the Byzantine Empire was seen by the Latins »not as one more individual Christian power alongside a range of other individual powers, but as a partially alien outsider alongside a single Latin community« agrees with the Byzantine intellectual elite's presentation of twelfth-century Europe in terms of a united West against Byzantium<sup>2</sup>. Besides, this understanding of Latin attitudes towards the Greeks sat well with a generation of scholars who had lived in a century when Europe was almost permanently divided into two camps: Entente vs Central Powers, Allies vs Axis, East/War-saw Pact vs West/NATO.

The notion of Latin West vs Greek East in the twelfth century is, however, misleading. While scholars who have favoured the thesis of growing hatred between two camps have fallen back on a corpus of Latin anti-Greek sources for support of their argument, they have neglected a larger body of evidence that provides a different insight into Latin

attitudes to and perceptions of the Greeks during the long twelfth century. In fact, twelfth-century Christendom was not an entity consisting of two opposing groups, the Latins and the Greeks, but rather resembled a mosaic of ethnically and linguistically different powers with conflicting interests. The Byzantine Empire was one of these powers, a state firmly assimilated to the political system of Christendom<sup>3</sup>. This paper shows that hostility on religious grounds formed only a part of a much larger and complex picture. Since the scope of the subject is enormous and the available primary evidence vast, this contribution limits itself to several representative primary sources<sup>4</sup>.

## **The Revival of Christian Affinity: the Holy Empire of Constantinople and the Greek Christians**

Following the Byzantine defeat at the Battle of Manzikert in 1071, the Saljūq Turks unleashed a flood of raids in Asia Minor. Between 1071 and 1081, Turkmen warriors and nomadic groups succeeded in establishing themselves in significant numbers over large areas of Anatolia<sup>5</sup>. Reports about the ravages of the Turkish invasions of Asia Minor soon spread throughout Western Europe<sup>6</sup>. Pope Gregory VII (1073-1085) was determined not to remain inactive in the face of the Saljūq threat. He was much taken with the idea of mobilising a military force for the defence of the Byzantine Empire; thus, he could project himself as a protector of all Christians and mend fences with both Constantinople and the other Eastern Churches<sup>7</sup>.

Over the course of 1074, Gregory sent several letters to princes throughout Western Europe as well as encyclical letters to Latin Christians endeavouring to drum up support for an expedition to assist the Eastern Christians against the

1 Riley-Smith, *Crusades* 555; Constable, *Fourth Crusade* 338; Barber, *Two Cities* 451.

2 Wright, *Margins* 60; Neocleous, *Attitudes* 127 with n. 127; 242; Neocleous, *Μισορώμαιοι* 171-173.

3 Neocleous, *Attitudes* 242.

4 For a full treatment of the subject, see: Neocleous, *Attitudes*.

5 Angold, *Byzantine Empire* 117-120; Beihammer, *Byzantium* 212, 214-215, 224.

6 Gregory VII's response was elicited by reports transmitted to the West by common people, rather than diplomatic exchanges with the Byzantine government.

See: Cowdrey, »Crusading« *Plans* 30-31, 34-35; Cowdrey, *Gregorian Papacy* 154-155; Cowdrey, *Gregory VII* 484.

7 Frankopan, *First Crusade* 97-98; Neocleous, *Attitudes* 7. See also: Harris, »Schism« of 1054, 1-20 esp. 16-17. In his discussion of the events of 1054 and their aftermath, Harris correctly points out that »the reformed papacy showed every sign in the later eleventh century of wishing to normalize relations with the Byzantine emperor. [...] There is little sign of animosity in the relations between Rome and Constantinople in the later eleventh century«.

Turks. The language employed was emotive. Having »learnt [...] that a race of pagans [...] strongly prevailed against the Christian empire (*christianum imperium*, i.e., the Byzantine Empire)«, the pope invited the Christians of the West to »deeply grieve for the pitiable plight of so great an empire and for so great a carnage of Christians [i.e. Byzantines]«. The pontiff went even further and instructed the Western Christians to imitate Christ: »the example of our Redeemer and the debt of fraternal love demand of us that we lay down our lives for the liberation of our brothers (i.e., the Byzantines) [...] who live across the sea in the Constantinopolitan Empire (i.e. the Byzantine Empire)«. Gregory articulately explained that »as he [Christ] laid down his life for us, we also should lay down our lives for our brothers«<sup>8</sup>.

Through Gregory's letters and general summons, the Western Christians became more aware of the situation of Byzantium and the Saljūq threat. Gregory's plan for an expedition to the East seems to have had a considerable appeal among Westerners. By the end of the year, the pope seems to have had enough evidence to »believe that many knights support us in such a task«<sup>9</sup>. It should be stressed, however, that, despite their persuasive appeal, Gregory's letters did not create, but rather enhanced a pre-existing image of the Eastern Christians as the Westerners' brothers in Christ. The tenth and first half of the eleventh centuries represent the peak of the presence, and often settlement, of Greek prelates and monks in Western Europe. Greek clerics and monastics were cordially welcomed by Western princes at their courts and hospitably received by Latin clergy and monks, especially abbots of reformed monastic houses. Some of these Greeks even settled with ease into the life of Latin coenobitic communities and were greatly respected by the Latin monks among whom they lived. The spirituality of certain Greek monastic settlers in the West resulted not only in their being admired in their life-time but also in their veneration as saints after their death<sup>10</sup>.

The Greek ascetic tradition and spirituality were profoundly esteemed by all sections of Western society and exercised quite an influence on the life of the Latin Church<sup>11</sup>. Eleventh-century writers like the Aquitanian Ademar of Chabannes (d. 1034), or the Burgundian Ralph Glaber (d. ca. 1046) were full of praise for Greek Christians. Ademar extolled the Sicily-born Greek ascetic Symeon Pentaglottos (d. 1035) and his fellow monks who travelled to southern France in 1027 as »upright in character, abounding in catholic doctrine, distinguished in life in all respects [...] [and] perfectly learned in Greek and Latin letters«<sup>12</sup>. Ralph, although

he was scathing about the patriarch of Constantinople's claim to be called »ecumenical«, described the Byzantine Empire as the »holy empire of Constantinople« (*sanctum imperium Constantinopolitanum*) and did not hesitate to admit that »the Greeks [...] have always kept the Church's observance scrupulously«<sup>13</sup>.

Pope Gregory VII's emotional appeals seem to have catered to an audience favourably predisposed toward Eastern Christians. Notwithstanding the pope's efforts, however, his crusading plans eventually fell through, since the situation as it developed in Western Europe with the outbreak of the Investiture Contest in 1075 did not favour their realisation<sup>14</sup>. Nonetheless, the ground had been prepared and the seed sown: Gregory's project would be brought to fruition by his successor's successor, Pope Urban II (1088-1099). Following a plea from the Byzantine Emperor Alexios I (1081-1118) for assistance against the Saljūqs, pope Urban preached the First Crusade at the council of Clermont in November 1095. The liberation and protection of the Eastern Christians against the Muslims was one of the two primary objectives of the First Crusade – the second goal being the recovery of the land where Christ had trod. In all six versions of Urban's preaching of the First Crusade, the need to aid fellow Christians in the East was stressed<sup>15</sup>.

The most dramatic among the six versions of Urban's preaching at Clermont is preserved in the *Historia Jerosolimitana* of Baldric (d. 1130), abbot of Bourgueil and later Archbishop of Dol<sup>16</sup>. Baldric, who may have been an eyewitness to the council, relates that Urban illustrated to the Westerners »by how many disasters, how many troubles, what dreadful despondency our Christians, our brothers (*Christiani nostri, fratres nostri*), the limbs of Christ (*membra Christi*), are being scourged, oppressed, and injured in Jerusalem, in Antioch, and the other cities of the East«. According to the same author, the pope described the Eastern Christians to his Western hearers as »your own full brothers (*germani fratres vestry*), your comrades in arms (*contubernales vestry*), sons of the same mother (*couterini vestry*)«, explaining that they were both »sons (*fili*) of the same Christ and the same Church (*eadem Ecclesia*)« and stating dramatically that »Christian blood is being spilt, that was redeemed by the blood of Christ; and Christian flesh, of the same blood as Christ's flesh, is being sold into the hands of wicked and stupid men and abominable slavery«. Eventually, as Baldric reports, Urban assured the Western Christians that »it is uniquely good, since it is also charity, to lay down our lives for the brethren (*pro fratribus*)«<sup>17</sup>.

8 Gregory VII, Register 1.49, 2.37, ed. Caspar 75. 173; trans. Cowdrey 55. 127-128.

9 Gregory VII, *Epistolae vagantes* 5, ed. and trans. Cowdrey 12-13.

10 Hamilton/McNulty, *Orientalis Lumen* 181-216; Ciggaar, *Travellers* 163-164. 189-190. 195-196. 208.

11 Hamilton/McNulty, *Orientalis Lumen* 211. 215.

12 *Acta concilii lemovicensis* 1363.

13 Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum libri* 4.2-4, 5.7, ed. and trans. France 172-177. 224-225.

14 Neocleous, *Attitudes* 9 with n. 13.

15 The six eyewitness versions of Pope Urban II's preaching are found in the accounts of Fulcher of Chartres, Robert the Monk, Baldric of Bourgueil, Guibert of Nogent, William of Malmesbury, and Orderic Vitalis. See: Neocleous, *Attitudes* 12 with n. 26.

16 Cowdrey, *Pope Urban* 177.

17 Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia* 1, ed. Biddlecombe 6-7. 9; trans. Edgington 45. 49.

Although Baldric may well have dramatised the papal speech, his version achieves great significance when examined in the context of the Christian brotherhood between Western and Eastern Christians. Baldric saw the Christian Church as one unified family encompassing the Christians of the East and the West; his description of the Eastern Christians as *membra Christi* recalls the precepts of the patristic fathers and especially Augustine of Hippo, who described the Christian Church as »the body of Christ (*corpus Christi*)«, in which every Christian is »a member (*membrum*)«<sup>18</sup>. Baldric's version of the papal speech at Clermont is echoed by a second sermon put in the mouth of an unnamed churchman by Baldric and allegedly delivered to the crusader army before the walls of Jerusalem in 1099. The preacher, who may have been an orator influenced by the papal sermon at Clermont or more probably a fictitious person, rhetorically asked the crusaders »if a stranger strikes one of your own, do you not avenge your own blood?« only to answer his own question by arguing that »much more you should avenge your God, your Father, your Brother, when you see Him reproached, proscribed, crucified; when you hear Him crying out and abandoned and begging for help«<sup>19</sup>. In both Urban's and the unnamed preacher's sermons, Baldric is at great pains to portray the Western and the Eastern Christians as members of one spiritual family, the *familia Christi*<sup>20</sup>. The Western Christians were therefore bound by familial obligation to bring aid to their spiritual kin.

Urban's emotional cry for military assistance for the Eastern Christians and for the liberation of the Churches of the East was propagated by bishops, priests, and preachers across Latin Europe. The pope himself remained in France in 1095 and 1096 and moved from town to town, addressing the faithful<sup>21</sup>. The papal sermons and preachings exerted a forceful and profound influence on Western Christians. A close examination of letters and primary accounts composed in the immediate aftermath of the sermon and up to the eve of the Second Crusade (1145-1149) demonstrates that the Eastern Christians were perceived and portrayed by their Western counterparts and their chroniclers as the Latins' Christian brothers; remarkably, this image is not only confined to crusade literature<sup>22</sup>.

The Byzantine Empire was described as the »holy empire of Constantinople (*sanctum imperium Constantinopolitanum*)« or »the most holy empire of the Greek Christians (*sanctissimum imperium Christianorum Graecorum*)« by authors such

as William of Apulia (fl. late eleventh century) in southern Italy, Orderic Vitalis (d. 1142) in Normandy, and the re-worker of Alexios's letter to Robert the Frisian, count of Flanders (1071-1093)<sup>23</sup>. The Byzantine ruler Alexios was praised by Western princes, prelates, and chroniclers not only as »magnificent (*magnificus*)«, »most renowned (*nominatissimus*)«, and »most glorious (*gloriosissimus*)«, but also as a »venerable (*venerabilis*)«, »pious (*pious*)«, »Christian (*Christianus*)«, and even »most Christian (*Christianissimus*)« emperor<sup>24</sup>. His son and successor John II (1118-1143) was extolled by Peter the Venerable, abbot of Cluny (1122-1156), as the »glorious and magnificent emperor of the city of Constantinople«, who was »exalted [...] over all the princes of Christendom (*super omnes Christiani nominis principes*)« and was eulogised by Orderic Vitalis's King Fulk of Jerusalem (1131-1143) as a »Christian emperor with great power (*Christianus enim est imperator magnaue potentiae*)«<sup>25</sup>. Even those First Crusade chronicles – mainly the *Gesta Francorum* and its derivatives – which fulminate against the Byzantine Emperor Alexios, denouncing him as »malicious (*iniquus*)«, »most wicked (*nequissimus*)«, or »perfidious (*perfidus*)«, do not nevertheless challenge his Christian identity<sup>26</sup>. More importantly, contemporary writers, especially the chroniclers of the First Crusade, fully acknowledge the *Christianitas* of the Eastern Christians and their affinity with the Latins and portray the crusade leaders and knights as invoking this »Christian status (*Christiana conditio*)« on several occasions<sup>27</sup>.

## Theological Controversies between the Churches of Rome and Constantinople in the Early Twelfth Century

In the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries, the main points of theological controversy between the Churches of Rome and Constantinople were the *azyme* (unleavened bread) issue and the *filioque* clause unilaterally added to the Nicene Creed by the Latins<sup>28</sup>. Concrete knowledge of these issues was largely the preserve of learned scholars and theologians. Obviously, the Benedictine abbot Guibert of Nogent-sous-Coucy (d. ca. 1125), the only chronicler of the First Crusade who attempted a review on the issues dividing Western and Eastern Christendom, was not among the most erudite Latin theologians<sup>29</sup>. In his work, after summarily denouncing the early Christian heresies of Arianism, Eunomianism, Eu-

18 Augustine of Hippo, Tractatus 1645. See a detailed discussion in: Biddlecombe, Introduction xxxix. xliii. l-liv.

19 Baldric of Bourgueil, Historia 4, ed. Biddlecombe 109; trans. Edgington 147. See also the discussion in: Biddlecombe, Introduction l-liv.

20 Baldric of Bourgueil, Historia 4, ed. Biddlecombe 108. The phrase *familia Christi* is used by the anonymous preacher.

21 Frankopan, First Crusade 104.

22 Neocleous, Attitudes 16-25. 27. 40-41. 43. 48-50.

23 William of Apulia, Gesta 1.477, 1.515, 2.487, 4.87, ed. and trans. Mathieu 124-125. 126-127. 158-159. 208-209; Orderic Vitalis, Historia 7.5, 10.20, 11.24, ed. and trans. Chibnall 4.14-15, 5.332-333, 6.102-103; Epistolae 1, ed. Hagenmeyer 130-131. See also: Neocleous, Attitudes 10 with n. 17; 16. 25-26.

24 Stephen of Blois, Epistolae 887; Albert of Aachen, Historia 1.13, 15, 2.16, 4.40, 8.3, ed. and trans. Edgington 28. 30. 84. 310. 588; Gesta episcoporum Tullensium 48, ed. Waitz 647.

25 Peter the Venerable, Letters 75, ed. Constable 208; Orderic Vitalis, Historia 13.34, ed. and trans. Chibnall 6.508.

26 Gesta Francorum 1.3, ed. and trans. Hill 6; Robert the Monk, Historia 1.13, eds Kempf/Bull 12; Guibert of Nogent, Dei gesta 2.11, 3.5, ed. Huygens 128. 143.

27 Neocleous, Attitudes 16-27.

28 Kolbaba, Byzantine Perceptions 121-127.

29 For a detailed recent discussion of Guibert of Nogent's attitudes to the Greeks, see: Neocleous, Attitudes 29-36.

tychianism, and Nestorianism, which flourished among the »Easterners (*Orientalis*)« in the »East and Africa«, Guibert proceeds to discuss contemporary controversies between the Western and Eastern Churches regarding »the preparation of the Eucharist« and »the *processio* of the Holy Spirit«. The Greeks used leavened bread in the Eucharist in contrast to the Latins who offered unleavened bread, yet »making the sacrament out of leavened bread is defended with the appropriate or apparently reasonable argument that using yeast is not harmful when it is done in good faith«, records Guibert<sup>30</sup>. In this, the Benedictine chronicler recalls important contemporary ecclesiastics and theologians of the stature of Pope Gregory VII, Anselm of Canterbury (d. 1109), Anselm of Havelberg (d. 1158) and Alger of Liège (d. 1131/1132), who were ready to accept the Greek use of leavened bread since »it seems that what the Greeks do is not contrary to the Christian faith«<sup>31</sup>.

On the issue of the *filioque* Guibert was much less informed. While being aware of the existence of an »altercation (*altercatio*)« between Greeks and Latins on the »procession (*processio*)« of the Holy Spirit, the chronicler does not use the word *filioque* anywhere in his work nor was he aware of the fact that while the Latins argued that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father and the Son, the Greeks insisted that it proceeded only from the Father. In contrast, the Benedictine chronicler seems to have mistakenly thought that the Greeks »contend that the Holy Spirit is less (*minorem*) than the Father and the Son in accordance with the vestiges of the Arian heresy«. Guibert proceeds to explain that »arguing that any of the three [i. e., the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit] is less than the other is to argue that he is not God«<sup>32</sup>. Guibert's statements testify to his poor knowledge of the debated issue of the procession of the Holy Spirit and of the theological debates of the early Christian centuries. First of all, the Greeks did not argue that the Holy Spirit was less than the other two Persons of the Trinity. Secondly, the Arians had denied the full divinity of the Son, *not* that of the Holy Spirit, as Guibert mistakenly thought<sup>33</sup>.

Guibert's muddled account of the *altercatio* between Greeks and Latins on the *processio* of the Holy Spirit not only attests to the chronicler's ignorance of the *filioque* controversy, but also reflects a wider ignorance of the debate in the West at the turn of the twelfth century. Only learned theologians of the standing of Anselm of Canterbury seem to have been aware of the precise details of the *filioque* debate with the Greeks but, far from adopting an aggressive

approach toward them, preferred to point to the common ground between Greeks and Latins<sup>34</sup>. In his *De processione Spiritus sancti*, completed in 1101, Anselm of Canterbury stressed that »although the Greeks deny that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son«, they nonetheless »together with us [...] revere the Gospels; and [...] they believe about the trine and one God exactly the same thing as do we. [...] Indeed, the Greeks believe that God is one and unique and perfect, that He has no parts, and that He is as a whole whatever He is. They also confess that He is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit«<sup>35</sup>.

Importantly, although Guibert criticises the Easterners' alleged deviation »from faith in the Trinity«, he still acknowledges them as »Christians (*Christiani*)« and »men of our own faith (*nostrae fidei homines*)«<sup>36</sup>. Guibert's rendering of Pope Urban's speech at Clermont concludes by asserting that the Christians »owe the greatest reverence to that [Byzantine] Church from which we received the grace of redemption (*gratia redemptionis*) and the origin of all Christianity (*totius origo Christianitatis*)«<sup>37</sup>. Guibert's testimony is in line with Baldric of Dol's redaction of Urban's speech, according to which the pope declared to the assembled crowd at Clermont that the Eastern Church »is this Church from which the joys of your entire salvation have arisen, which dripped into your mouth the words of divine milk, which gave you to drink the sacred teachings of the Gospels«<sup>38</sup>. As regards the Constantinopolitan Church in particular, Robert the Monk of Reims (d. 1122), who was also present at Clermont and was influenced by Urban's speech, affirms that Constantinople »should indeed be equal to Rome in the dignity of what it protects [i. e., the sacred relics] and the excellence of its royal dignity«, even though Rome was still the »head and chief of all Christendom« as it »is elevated by the presence of the pope«<sup>39</sup>.

Perhaps the most vociferous critic of the Eastern Church in Western Europe in the early decades of the twelfth century was Rupert (d. 1129), a Benedictine theologian and abbot of Deutz, who hailed from Liège. Rupert himself was a controversial figure: he faced criticism for his theological works several times and was even charged with heresy at least twice, coming within a breath of being judged a heretic when he was tried<sup>40</sup>. In his work *De divinis officiis*, Rupert discusses the Greek Church's use of leavened bread in the Eucharist and invokes the frequent heresies that had disturbed the Church of Constantinople – the »mother of many heresies (*multarum haeresium genitrix*)« – throughout history, contrasting them with the indefectible authority of the Roman Church. This was his surest argument for the righteousness of the Latin

30 Guibert of Nogent, *Dei gesta* 1.2, ed. Huygens 90-93; trans. Levine 30-31.

31 For a detailed discussion of the views of these theologians on leavened bread, see: Neocleous, *Attitudes* 30. 48-49. 77-81. Present quotation from: Anselm of Canterbury, *Epistula* 1.1, ed. Schmitt 223-224; trans. Hopkins/Richardson 515-516.

32 Guibert of Nogent, *Dei gesta* 1.2, ed. Huygens 92; trans. Levine 31.

33 See a detailed discussion in: Neocleous, *Attitudes* 31-32.

34 Neocleous, *Attitudes* 32.

35 Anselm of Canterbury, *De processione* 1, ed. Schmitt 177-178; trans. Hopkins/Richardson 466. 467.

36 Guibert of Nogent, *Dei gesta* 1.2, 2.9, ed. Huygens 92. 123; trans. Levine 31. 49.

37 Guibert of Nogent, *Dei gesta* 2.4, ed. Huygens 111; trans. Levine 42.

38 Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia* 1, ed. Biddlecombe 9; trans. Edgington 48.

39 Robert the Monk, *Historia* 2.20, eds. Kempf/Bull 21; trans. Sweetenham 102.

40 Van Engen, Rupert of Deutz 109. 131. 164. 169. 176-177. 337-338. 341; Neocleous, *Attitudes* 46-48.

41 Rupert of Deutz, *Liber* 2.22, ed. Haacke 52-53.

custom (*consuetudo*) and the wrongness of the Greek one<sup>41</sup>. In contrast to his fellow Benedictines Anselm of Canterbury and Guibert of Nogent, the Liégeois theologian considered the use of leavened bread as a heresy. What is of particular importance, however, is the fact that Rupert's bitter diatribe against the Greek use of leavened bread was triggered as a defensive response to the Greek Church's own intolerance against the Latin usage. The theologian introduced his invective by stating that »the Greeks [...] greatly abhor the custom of the Roman Church« and »called the Latins *azymitas*«, a complaint in fact echoed by several Latin theologians in the twelfth and thirteenth century<sup>42</sup>.

When it comes to the *filioque* debate, in his *Commentaria in Evangelium Sancti Johannis*, completed in 1116, Rupert criticises »certain among the Greeks« who argued that »the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, not from the Father and the Son«<sup>43</sup>. Going a step further, the Benedictine theologian denounces these »certain Greeks« as »heretics (*quidam Graecorum haeretici*)«<sup>44</sup>. Significantly enough, the *Commentaria in Evangelium Sancti Johannis*, a work that came under attack by Rupert's theological opponents as soon as it was completed, was to remain almost unknown outside Liège<sup>45</sup>. In his later *De glorificatione Trinitatis*, composed between 1127 and 1128, Rupert insists that »there were (*fuere*) several among the Greeks (*nonnulli maxime Graecorum*), who asserted (*dicerent*) that the Holy Spirit proceeds only from the Father and not from the Son«<sup>46</sup>. In contrast to his earlier *Commentaria in Evangelium Sancti Johannis*, in the *De glorificatione Trinitatis* the Greeks are not denounced as »heretics« and Rupert uses the past tense to refer to them and their view on the procession of the Holy Spirit, as if the doctrinal controversy with the Greeks on the matter was now over. More importantly, the polemical language used by Rupert of Deutz against the Church of Constantinople was uncommon in twelfth-century Western Christendom. In general, most Latins were more anxious to defend their own use of unleavened bread and *filioque* addition than to condemn the Greek leavened bread or the original Greek text of the Nicene Creed<sup>47</sup>.

The moderate Latin attitude toward the Greeks is well reflected in the *Theologia christiana*, the main work on systematic theology by Peter Abelard (d. 1142), one of the most important figures for the birth of scholasticism and the revival of intellectual life in the twelfth century. Against Greek objection to the *filioque* and insistence »that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, not from the Son«, the French theologian fell back on the »testimonies (*testimo-*

*nia*)« of the Greeks' own »Church fathers (*doctores*)« who »teach that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son as well«<sup>48</sup>. To demonstrate that the tradition of affirming that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son did exist in the writings of the Greek doctors, Abelard quoted Athanasius of Alexandria (d. 373), Didymus (d. 398), Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444) and John Chrysostom (d. 407)<sup>49</sup>. Taking his argument a step further, Abelard stated that the Latin father Hilary (ca. 300-ca. 368), bishop of Poitiers, »holds that the Spirit proceeds from the Father, through the Son (*a Patre per Filium*), rather than from the Father and the Son«<sup>50</sup>. Having in mind the Greek doctors of the Church who had affirmed that the Spirit proceeds ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ (from the Father through the Son) – a phrase the Greek father Maximus the Confessor (d. 662) had explicitly identified with what the Latin theologians denote by the *filioque* – Abelard eventually concluded that »if the Greeks understand the Spirit to proceed from the Father alone in this way ... there is no controversy about doctrine [between Latins and Greeks], but only a difference of terminology«<sup>51</sup>. Thus, the significance of the *filioque* debate was downplayed by the French theologian and philosopher.

Neither did Peter the Venerable believe that there was a division between Greek and Latin Christians. In 1138/1139 the abbot of Cluny reassured the patriarch of Constantinople that despite the physical distance and the different language that separated Greeks and Latins, they were nonetheless united in »one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one fraternal affection (*unus dominus, una fides, unum baptismum, una caritas*)«<sup>52</sup>. A letter of Peter the Venerable to Bernard of Clairvaux (d. 1153) speaks volume of the Cluniac abbot's outlook on the relationship between Greeks and Latins. Peter was adamant: »the known diversity (*nota varietas*) in the Christian sacrifice between Greeks and Latins is not able to damage the brotherly love (*charitas*) or beget a schism in the unity (*schisma aliquod unitatis*)« between Western and Eastern Christians<sup>53</sup>.

## The Principality of Antioch and Religious Propaganda Against the Greeks

Although differences between the Churches of Rome and Constantinople in doctrine and practice clearly did not trouble the vast majority of Latin theologians and clergy in the first decades of the twelfth century, these differences were nevertheless exploited for political purposes by the Byzantine

42 Rupert of Deutz, Liber 2.22, ed. Haacke 52-53; Schabel, Unleavened bread 98-99. 102-103; Neocleous, Attitudes 234-235.

43 Rupert of Deutz, Commentaria 12, ed. Haacke 671.

44 Rupert of Deutz, Commentaria 12, ed. Haacke 671.

45 Van Engen, Rupert of Deutz 109. 131. 164. 169. 176-177. 337-338. 341.

46 Rupert of Deutz, De glorificatione 29. See also: Van Engen, Rupert of Deutz 362.

47 Neocleous, Attitudes 48.

48 Peter Abelard, Theologia 4.120, 127, ed. Buytaert 325. 328.

49 Peter Abelard, Theologia 4.127-130, ed. Buytaert 328-330.

50 Peter Abelard, Theologia 4.136, ed. Buytaert 334; Hilary of Poitiers, De trinitate 464-465.

51 Peter Abelard, Theologia 4.136, ed. Buytaert 334.

52 Peter the Venerable, Letters 76, ed. Constable 209-210. See: Ephesians 4.5.

53 Peter the Venerable, Epistola 403.

Empire's enemies throughout the century, beginning with the Norman leader Bohemond of Taranto (d. 1111). During the First Crusade, the creation of the Norman Principality of Antioch by Bohemond, in territory claimed by the Byzantine Empire as its patrimony, would lead to friction between the Byzantines and the Franks of Antioch<sup>54</sup>. Already on 11 September 1198, a letter was sent from Antioch to Urban II which, in addition to inviting the pope to Antioch to lead the crusade towards Jerusalem, denounced the Greek, Armenian, Syrian and Jacobite Christians as »heretics (*haereticos*)«<sup>55</sup>. While the letter was composed in the names of all the important barons of the army, in fact, on closer examination it becomes clear that Bohemond, who claimed Antioch for himself, was behind the missive, and that its author was undoubtedly a clerical adviser attached to the Norman leader. The Norman leader's aim was to poison the pope's mind against the Eastern Christians and justify the need for the creation of a Latin principality in Antioch. However, Bohemond's propaganda against the Eastern Christians must have fallen on deaf ears, given Urban's commitment to a *rapprochement* between the Western and Eastern Churches<sup>56</sup>.

In early 1100, a Byzantine army was sent to recover the ports of Cilicia and northern Syria from Bohemond, and thus isolate Antioch. In the autumn of 1103, Alexios dispatched another expedition to northern Syria after reiterating demands for the return of the city. Byzantine pressure was becoming very strong. Thus, in August 1104, leaving Tancred in charge of Antioch, Bohemond sailed for Western Europe to prepare a diversionary attack on the Western provinces of the Byzantine Empire, to relieve Alexios's pressure on Antioch<sup>57</sup>. In Rome, the Norman leader persuaded pope Paschal II (1099-1118) to proclaim a new crusade. In 1966, John Gordon Rowe argued that Bohemond, in fact, deceived the pope into sanctioning what was ostensibly a new crusade against the Muslims, but which the Norman leader planned to turn against Alexios<sup>58</sup>. Rowe's argument is compelling, but even if we accept – as Brett Edward Whalen rightly remarked in 2010 – that »the attack on Alexios was sanctioned by the papacy and could be declared a just war against a tyrant, this did not make it a crusade against the Byzantine Empire or a holy war against »schismatic Greeks«<sup>59</sup>.

During his journey to France in 1106, Bohemond launched a propaganda campaign against Alexios. Contemporary chronicles indicate that the Norman's propaganda against the Byzantine ruler was twofold: first, he accused Alexios of usurpation. He had seized the imperial throne in 1081 by deposing the previous emperor, Nikephoros III Botaneiates

(1078-1081). On his tour of France, Bohemond was accompanied by a Greek pretender to the Byzantine throne, allegedly a son of the Byzantine Emperor Romanos IV Diogenes (1068-1071), and other eminent Byzantines – information, largely ignored by historians, which attests to the fact that Bohemond's propaganda was anti-Alexian, not anti-Byzantine<sup>60</sup>. The second, and more serious and sensational, accusation thrown at Alexios was that he was responsible for the ill-treatment of pilgrims who passed through his empire on their journey to Jerusalem<sup>61</sup>.

Bohemond's army crossed the Adriatic and landed in Epirus on 9 October 1107. After capturing Avlona, Bohemond's troops laid siege to Dyrrachium. The Norman leader's ambitious plans, however, never came to fruition. Almost immediately, the Byzantine fleet cut off his communications with southern Italy and thus supplies ceased to reach his army. In the summer of 1108, Bohemond's military position at Dyrrachium was desperate<sup>62</sup>. At around this time, he wrote a letter to pope Paschal trying to defend himself against those who, as he recorded, accused him »of having taken arms unjustly (*iniuste*) against the Christian Emperor (*imperator Christianus*)«, namely Alexios<sup>63</sup>. Evidence of Latin disapproval of Bohemond's attack on the Byzantine Empire is also found in Orderic Vitalis's *Historia ecclesiastica*. In Book XI, the chronicler quotes Bohemond's knights as confessing that

»we are paying the penalty of our presumption, for we have embarked on a proud undertaking which is more than our birthright and beyond our strength, and have dared to raise a hand against the holy empire (*sanctum imperium*). [...] Because God is not mocked and does not overturn justice or destroy what is just, he has lent a favourable ear to the prayers of just men [the Byzantines] who cry out to him against us in Greece and has scattered our armies, weakening them not by war but by famine«<sup>64</sup>.

Likewise, in Book V of his history Orderic relates that:

»by the just providence of God the attempt of men greedy to seize the property of their neighbours was brought to nothing, so that the proud army of ambitious men secured none of the things that they had vainly imagined to be within their grasp«<sup>65</sup>.

Owing to the criticism against him for attacking »the Christian emperor«, Bohemond had gone to great pains to defame the Byzantine ruler in the eyes of the pope. The Norman accused Alexios of usurpation of the imperial throne and of mistreatment of crusaders travelling to Jerusalem through

54 Lilie, *Byzantium* 61-67. 70-72.

55 *Epistulae* 16, ed. Hagenmeyer 164; trans. Barber/Bate 32-33.

56 For a detailed discussion of the letter, see: Neocleous, *Attitudes* 37-38.

57 Lilie, *Byzantium* 72-74.

58 Rowe, *Paschal* 176-202.

59 Whalen, *God's Will* 122.

60 Orderic Vitalis, *Historia* 11.12, ed. and trans. Chibnall 6.70-71. See also: Neocleous, *Attitudes* 39 with n. 154.

61 Having gained ground and wide circulation, this allegation against Alexios found its way into several contemporary chronicles. See: Neocleous, *Attitudes* 39-40 with n. 155.

62 Lilie, *Byzantium* 74-75.

63 Bohemond, *Epistola* 281. For the dating of the letter, see: Rowe, *Paschal* 192-193.

64 Orderic Vitalis, *Historia* 11.24, ed. and trans. Chibnall 6.103-105.

65 Orderic Vitalis, *Historia* 5.19, ed. and trans. Chibnall 3.183.

his empire. These are the same two accusations Bohemond had levelled against Alexios during his tour of France. What is more, Bohemond went a step further and, in an attempt to strike a responsive chord with the pope, accused Alexios »and his people of dissenting from the Roman Church«<sup>66</sup>. The cleric who composed Bohemond's letter was well aware of the issues dividing the Churches of Constantinople and Rome. In a tone reminiscent of his letter of September 1098, Bohemond invited the pope to provide for »the removal of schisms, heresies and diverse traditions (*scismata et haereses et diversae traditiones*) which exist in the Church; of the procession of the Holy Spirit, of Baptism, of the Eucharist and of marriage in ordained priests«<sup>67</sup>. For his propaganda purposes Bohemond conveniently exploited not only the *filioque* and the Eucharist, but also the priestly celibacy imposed by the Latin, but not the Eastern, Church, as well as the rite of baptism whereby the Latin Church, in contrast to the Greek, separated confirmation (or chrismation), which could only be performed by a bishop, from the infant baptismal rite. In reality, the Greek baptism ritual and rejection of celibacy for priests were never singled out by the official Latin Church as major issues dividing the two Churches. Despite all the rhetoric, Bohemond's endeavours were bound to remain fruitless. A favourable response from the pope seems never to have come, and eventually the Norman was compelled to sue for peace from the emperor<sup>68</sup>.

## The Second Crusade and its Aftermath

The Antioch issue remained a thorn in Franco-Byzantine relations. In 1136 Constance, heiress of Prince Bohemond II of Antioch (1111-1130), was given in marriage to Raymond of Poitiers, the uncle of Eleanor, Queen of France. The first decade of Raymond's and Constance's joint rule was marked by conflicts with the Byzantine Empire. In 1137, 1142, and 1144, the military campaigns of Emperor John II and his successor Manuel (1143-1180) against Antioch forced prince Raymond to declare himself a vassal of the Byzantine emperor and agree to install a Greek patriarch in the city<sup>69</sup>. The installation of a Greek patriarch and other Greek prelates in the Principality was resented by its Frankish settlers not so much on religious grounds as on ethnic and political ones. The Franks of *Outremer* naturally desired their spiritual leaders to be elected from their own people. The Greek bishops were not only separated from them ethnically, but they were also seen as agents of the expansionist Byzantine Empire which threatened their political independence and territorial integrity<sup>70</sup>.

The Komnenian emperors' aggressive policy toward the Principality of Antioch in the late 1130s and the first half of the 1140s must logically have resulted in the cultivation of anti-Byzantine sentiment among the Frankish settlers of the principality. Due to the close ethnic affinity between the Franks of Antioch and of the Kingdom of France as well as the existence of close ties of kinship between Raymond of Poitiers-Antioch and the French queen Eleanor, reports on Byzantine aggression toward the city soon began filtering through from the Latin East to the Kingdom of France. Besides, the Antiochene embassy to France in 1145-1146 must have reported on Byzantine attempts for expansionism at the expense of the Principality of Antioch. Unsurprisingly, this led to the formation of an anti-Greek party in France<sup>71</sup>. While the French expedition of the Second Crusade was in the Byzantine Empire in 1147, the anti-Greek party among the army tried to inflame anti-Greek sentiment and attempted to instigate an attack on Constantinople three times. This militant party, which represented only a minority of the French crusading army and never prevailed, sought to disseminate jingoistic propaganda and to inflame anti-Byzantine hatred by playing upon the French sense of allegiance to the papacy, loyalty to the king of France, and empathy with the Franks of Antioch. Religious propaganda formed part of their rhetoric, accusing the Byzantine emperor of substituting Latin prelates with Greek »heretical« bishops in the Principality of Antioch, and thus portraying the Greeks as heretics<sup>72</sup>.

Odo of Deuil, author of our main narrative for the Second Crusade, was an adherent to the militant party. The differences between the Latin and Greek Churches »concerning the practice of the sacrifice (*mos sacrificii*) [i. e. the Eucharist] and the procession of the Holy Ghost (*processio Spiritus sancti*)« are mentioned only in passing and without details by the chronicler, with any reference to the leavened/unleavened bread and the *filioque* being totally absent from his work. However, the deeply offensive and scandalous practices of Greek rebaptism of Latins who were to marry Greeks and of washing of altars on which Latin priests had celebrated mass were given considerable weight and were strongly condemned. »O dreadful thing! (*pro nefas!*)«, exclaims Odo, when referring to rebaptism<sup>73</sup>. These two practices must have become known to the French anti-Greek party through the Franks of Antioch who had experience with Greek clerics. The two Greek customs – which, in fairness, did not represent the official line of the Greek Church – were considered so insulting by the Latins that they were repeatedly condemned by Latin clerics and theologians such as Anselm, a theologian and bishop of Havelberg, Hugo Eteriano (d. 1182), a

66 Bohemond, Epistola 281.

67 Bohemond, Epistola 280.

68 Neocleous, Attitudes 41-42; Kolbaba, Byzantine Lists 43-44. 192; Kolbaba, Closing of the Churches 45; Harris, Byzantium 84.

69 Lillie, Byzantium 144-145. 155 n. 52; Magdalino, Empire 42.

70 Neocleous, Attitudes 52.

71 Phillips, Odo of Deuil's *De profectio* 85-86; Neocleous, Attitudes 52-53 with n. 6.

72 Odo of Deuil, *De profectio* 1, 3, 4, ed. and trans. Berry 12-13. 58-59. 68-71. 78-81. For a detailed discussion, see: Neocleous, Attitudes 53-58.

73 Odo of Deuil, *De profectio* 3, ed. and trans. Berry 56-57.

Pisan theologian at the court of Manuel Komnenos, James of Vitry (d. 1240), a theologian and bishop of Acre, and pope Innocent III (1198-1216)<sup>74</sup>. Innocent III, in particular, while accepting Greek »customs and rites« at the Fourth Lateran council in November 1215, did not consent to these two practices since they »bring danger to souls and detract from ecclesiastical honour«<sup>75</sup>.

Despite its polemical vehemence, the anti-Greek party of the French crusading expedition failed to convince the rest of the French army with its arguments. In response to the aggressive faction's accusation of heresy against the Byzantines, the majority of the French replied that »about their faith we are not able to judge, being ignorant of the law«<sup>76</sup>. The main counterargument of the moderate party was that the Greeks were Christians and therefore action against them was not legitimate. The majority of the French rhetorically challenged the militant minority to assail the Greeks and their imperial capital, »the richest city of the Christians (*urbs Christianorum ditissima*)«, only »if slaughtering Christians (*caedes Christianorum*) wipes out our sins«. As the majority faction declared, »we are marching against the pagans (*contra paganos*); with Christians (*Christiani*) let us be at peace«<sup>77</sup>. For the Latin Christians in general, the symbol of the cross was the most powerful visual emblem of professed Christianity shared between them and the Eastern Christians, while diversities of dogma or rites were a matter of indifference, at least to secular Westerners. As the Jacobite patriarch Michael I (1166-1199), known as Michael the Syrian, wrote in his Syriac chronicle, »the Franks considered as Christian anyone who worshipped the cross, without investigation or examination«<sup>78</sup>.

While the French crusaders were in Constantinople, emperor Manuel spared no effort not only to please and impress his distinguished guest, king Louis VII of France (1137-1180), and his retinue, but also to stress the religious affinity between Greeks and French. On 9 October 1147, on the Feast of Saint Dionysios (Saint-Denis), celebrated by Greeks as well as Latins, Manuel sent a group of his clergy over to Louis<sup>79</sup>. Even the vehemently anti-Greek Odo recounted that the Byzantine clergy, »although [they] differed from ours as to the words and organ, [...] made a favourable impression because of their sweet chanting; for the mingling of voices [...] softened the hearts of the Franks. Also, they gave the onlookers pleasure by their graceful bearing and gentle clapping of hands and genuflexions«<sup>80</sup>. The Greek clergy had succeeded in impressing the French crusaders.

Even though several chronicle accounts, based on hearsay from the rank and file of the crusading army, accused the Byzantine emperor and guides of leading the German contingent of the Second Crusade astray, the ignominious end of the expedition did in fact spark the warming of relations between the Byzantine and Hohenstaufen Empires<sup>81</sup>. The German abbot Wibald of Stavelot, one of the most influential advisers to the German king Conrad III (1138-1152), sent a letter to the Byzantine ruler Manuel extolling the Byzantine Empire as the »holy empire (*sanctum imperium*)« and praising it for its »observance of divine [i. e., Christian] religious practice (*divinae religionis cultus*)«<sup>82</sup>. The work, however, which provides the greatest insight into the attitudes of twelfth-century Western thinkers and theologians toward the Greeks is the *Antikeimenon* or *Dialogi*, written in 1149/1150, by Anselm, bishop of Havelberg. In his work, Anselm records the dialogues between a speaker whom he names as himself and a Byzantine, archbishop Nikētas of Nikomēdia. Modern scholars concur that, although fictitious, the dialogues do reflect the general tenor of the actual public debates held in Constantinople in 1136 between Anselm and his Greek interlocutor<sup>83</sup>.

In his *Antikeimenon* the speaker Anselm ventures to defend the sixth-century addition of the *filioque* clause to the Latin translation of the (Greek) Nicene Creed, and criticises Greek objection to it, but at the same time the author Anselm exonerates the Greeks from any charge of »blasphemy against the Holy Spirit« by having the speaker Nikētas explain, in a tone reminiscent of Anselm of Canterbury, that

»in no way do we [the Greeks] offend the holy and undivided Trinity, but like good catholics we truly venerate it in the unity of its substance with the honour due its divinity. [...] Nor do we [...] separate the Holy Spirit from the deity by calling him a creature. [...] Nor do we blaspheme by attacking the Holy Spirit. [...] Indeed, we adore God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit, three persons, one deity undivided in glory, honour, power, and substance. [...] Since we hold and teach such things about the Holy Spirit, we are confident that we are not guilty of any unforgivable blasphemy«<sup>84</sup>.

Later in Book II of *Antikeimenon*, to the speaker Anselm's question, »do you believe that each of the persons of Holy Trinity is the one true God, complete and perfect?« the speaker Nikētas answers: »I do believe because I am catholic (*catholicus sum*) [...] and this is the correct faith of believ-

74 Neocleous, *Attitudes* 59-61. 81-84. 164-165. 217. 228; Kolbaba, *Closing of the Churches* 45-47.

75 *Decrees* 235.

76 Odo of Deuil, *De profectione* 4, ed. and trans. Berry 70-71.

77 Odo of Deuil, *De profectione* 4, ed. and trans. Berry 70-71. 78-81.

78 Michael the Syrian, *Chronique* 16.1; trans. Chabot 222. See also: Neocleous, *Attitudes* 24. 205.

79 For the Feast of Saint-Denis and the liturgical relations between the monastery of Saint-Denis in Paris and the Byzantine world, see: Mayr-Harting, Odo of Deuil 238-240.

80 Odo of Deuil, *De profectione* 4, ed. and trans. Berry 68-69.

81 Neocleous, *Conspiracies* 262-265; Neocleous, *Graecorum perfidia* 154-160.

82 *Monumenta Corbeiensia* 246, ed. Jaffé 368-369.

83 Whalen, *Dominion* 86; Hyland, *Preface* vii-viii; Criste/Neel, *Introduction* 20-21; Kolbaba, *Closing of the Churches* 43; Lees, *Otherness* 226-227.

84 Anselm of Havelberg, *Dialogi* 2.12-13, cols 1181-1183; trans. Criste/Neel 113-115. For a full discussion, see: Neocleous, *Attitudes* 72-75.

ers«<sup>85</sup>. In response to the inquiry, »do you also believe the Holy Spirit is true God, whole and perfect, coequal and coessential with the Father and the Son?« the Greek interlocutor is made to reply: »what you have said is indeed the catholic faith (*fides catholica*), confirmed after the Macedonian heresy«. The catholicity of the Greeks is asserted and, at Nikētas's words, the speaker Anselm exclaims approvingly: »you believe well, you worship well, and you speak well (*bene credis, bene adoras, bene dicis*)«<sup>86</sup>.

During the discussion of the Greek use of leavened bread, although the speaker Anselm does defend the unleavened bread of the Roman Church as the better ritual practice, Anselm the writer, through the mouth of Nikētas, concedes that »the integrity of the faith is preserved [...] [and] no danger to the right faith will arise whether we offer either unleavened or leavened bread«<sup>87</sup>. Interestingly, Anselm the author, through the Greek character of his *Antikeimemon*, mentions two contemporary congregations of Greek monks, namely the flourishing Greek monastery of Saint Caesarius within the walls of Rome and Grottaferrata outside the walls, which offered »leavened bread without any scandal to the Roman pontiff, or even the Latins among whom they live, and with whom they too take communion«. While this information must have become known to Anselm during his several sojourns in Italy and was used in his defence of the validity of the Greek leavened bread, it was probably not available to the historical Nikētas of Nikomēdia<sup>88</sup>.

Anselm the author's reference to Saint Caesarius and Grottaferrata does not only serve the purpose of endorsement of the Greek leavened bread, but also demonstrates his esteem for Greek asceticism. As already noted, Greek ascetic tradition and spirituality were greatly respected in the West. Anselm was no less impressed by Eastern monasticism during his visit to Constantinople in 1136 where he »was an avid observer and zealous investigator of different kinds of religious life [...] [and] saw many forms of Christian religious practice (*multi ordines Christianae religionis*)«. Regarding the »various types of religious orders (*diversa [...] genera religiosorum*) [...] in the Eastern Church«, the Latin bishop observes that even though »they differ greatly from one another in customs, pattern of life, dress, food, and practice of psalmody, [...] they are in harmony in the one catholic faith (*in una quidem fide catholica concordant*)«. Lavish in his praise for the Greek monks, Anselm concludes that »they are most learned men, serving faithfully (*doctissimi viri devote militantes*)«<sup>89</sup>.

Predictably, the issue of Rome's primacy and supreme authority in the universal Church was not absent from the debate between the Latin and Greek prelates. To uphold the dogma of »the primacy of authority (*auctoritatis primatus*)« of the Roman Church, Anselm the debater's ecclesiology draws on the Roman tradition of the primacy of Peter, »the prince of the apostles«. Matthew 16:18-19, John 21:17, and Luke 22:32, the three scriptural texts that refer to Christ's commission to Peter *par excellence*, are explicitly cited by Anselm the speaker to illustrate and support the dogma of the apostolic primacy of Peter and, by extension, his successors, the popes<sup>90</sup>. Anselm's defense of Roman primacy is asserted on three grounds: Petrine citations from the Scriptures, the non petrinity of the Church of Constantinople, and the Constantinopolitan see's heretical past<sup>91</sup>.

The twenty-eighth canon of the Ecumenical council of Chalcedon (451) had confirmed that Constantinople ranked second only to Rome while nonetheless enjoying »equal privileges« (ἴσα πρεσβεῖα) – with it the canon essentially attributed to Constantinople primacy throughout the East, over Antioch and Alexandria, effectively reducing the status of the Church of Rome to that of the patriarchal see of the West<sup>92</sup>. On this basis, Nikētas advocated that Constantinople, the »younger and new Rome, had primacy after it [Rome]«, but Anselm, unwilling to allow Constantinople's claims, invoked the epistle of pope Leo I (440-461) who, although he had approved the doctrinal work of the council of Chalcedon, had declined to ratify its controversial twenty-eighth canon. For Anselm, who echoes the reforming papacy's views of monarchical government of the Church, »the head of the Church on earth must be one – namely Rome – and not two«<sup>93</sup>.

In fact, what actually turned the, according to Anselm, »fraternal« discussions into a heated argument was neither the question of the Eucharistic bread nor the *filioque*, nor even the issue of Rome's primacy, but rather the Greek practice of rebaptism, which the enraged speaker Anselm, in line with authors such as Odo of Deuil, described as »a most flagrant heresy (*manifestissima haeresis*)« and denounced as »abominable, detestable, and execrable (*abominabile, et [...] detestabile et exsecrabile*)«<sup>94</sup>. Anselm the author, however, has the Greek bishop protest that this did not represent the official practice of the Greek Church and explain that »we do have certain rituals of purification by unction with sacred oil. When foreigners come to us – whether they are men or women wishing to pass over into our rite and our society –

85 Anselm of Havelberg, *Dialogi* 2.22, col. 1198; trans. Criste/Neel 138-139. In the long 12<sup>th</sup> c. – and in the context of *Antikeimemon* – the term *catholicus* (catholic), derived from the Greek word καθολικός (*katholikos*), meaning »universal,« designates all members of the singular body of the Christian Church.

86 Anselm of Havelberg, *Dialogi* 2.22, col. 1199; trans. Criste and Neel 139-140. The Macedonians had denied the full divinity of the Spirit. See: Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church 1018. 1303.

87 Anselm of Havelberg, *Dialogi* 3.19, col. 1240; trans. Criste/Neel 200. For a full description, see: Neocleous, *Attitudes* 77-81.

88 Anselm of Havelberg, *Dialogi* 3.13, col. 1230; trans. Criste/Neel 187 with n. 69; von Falkenhausen, *Greek Monasticism*.

89 Anselm of Havelberg, *Dialogi* 1.10, col. 1156; trans. Criste/Neel 73.

90 Anselm of Havelberg, *Dialogi* 3.1, 3.2, 3.4-5, 3.6, 3.9-10, cols 1209. 1211. 1213-1214. 1217. 1221-1222; trans. Criste/Neel 157. 159. 163-164. 168. 174-175.

91 Neocleous, *Attitudes* 75-77.

92 Decrees 99-100. See also: Acts 71-72.

93 Anselm of Havelberg, *Dialogi* 3.7, 3.9, 3.12, cols 1217. 1218. 1220-1221. 1224; trans. Criste/Neel 169. 170. 173-174. 179.

94 Anselm of Havelberg, *Dialogi* 3.21, col. 1246; trans. Criste/Neel 208.

we anoint them with sacred oil because we do not know if they have earlier received the sacrament of unction»<sup>95</sup>. As already noted, the Latin Church, in contrast to the Greek, separated anointing with chrism from the infant baptismal rite; chrismation was reserved to the bishop to be conferred in a later, distinct sacramental rite. Nikētas of Nikomēdia is made to conclude that »by no means do we rebaptise those who we are aware have already been baptised, nor do we even anoint those who, we have no doubt, have been already anointed«, a clarification that satisfies Anselm the speaker and dispels his suspicions about »the wise nation of the Greeks (*Graecorum sapientissima gens*)«<sup>96</sup>.

The main conclusion of the *Antikeimenon*, summarised in the words put in the mouth of Nikētas of Nikomēdia by Anselm the author, is essentially that »we [Greeks and Latins] truly seem to differ somewhat not in great matters but in small things (*non in magnis, sed in minimis*)« and »we have always been one in our catholic faith (*semper fuimus unum in catholica fide*)«<sup>97</sup>. The faith of the Greeks was orthodox (*orthodoxa Graecorum fide*) and Nikētas of Nikomēdia was lauded by his Latin interlocutor for his »wisdom, eloquence, holiness, [...] clemency, modesty, devotion, [...] piety, perfection«<sup>98</sup>. Anselm of Havelberg's treatise is a testament to the fact that in the mid-twelfth century the Greeks were still considered by learned Latin ecclesiastics as the Latins' brethren in faith.

Indeed, at the time Anselm composed his *Antikeimenon*, his contemporary Peter Lombard (d. 1160) compiled his four books of the *Sententiae*, which were to become the standard theology textbook in the Middle Ages, influencing all subsequent theological teaching<sup>99</sup>. In Book I, the bulk of which deals with the mystery of the Trinity, Peter offers no condemnation of the Greeks for not accepting the *filioque*, but rather endeavours to justify the Latin addition, presenting it as aiming at clarifying the Nicæan Creed, not contradicting it<sup>100</sup>. In Peter Lombard's own understanding, the Greeks, in fact, »seem to agree in the same understanding of faith with us (*in eandem nobiscum fidei sententiam*), even though they disagree as to the words«<sup>101</sup>. The Greeks were not perceived by Peter Lombard as heretical but rather as sharing the same faith with the Latins: the Greeks simply misunderstood the Latins and the *filioque*, due to a confusion of terminology, a view already encountered in Peter Abelard<sup>102</sup>.

## The Later Decades of the Twelfth Century

Despite the deterioration of German-Byzantine relations in the 1160s, the last three decades of Manuel's reign saw the thawing of relations between Constantinople and other areas of the Latin world, namely the Latin East, France, England, Pisa, Genoa, and the papacy<sup>103</sup>. Manuel was praised by several Latin authors in those quarters as »the venerable«, »great«, »most blessed«, »most pious«, and »most holy emperor« of Constantinople, and as »the most powerful of all the Christians«<sup>104</sup>. His death in 1180 was widely mourned. In their annals, the Genoese lamented that »as a result of his [Manuel's] death, all Christianity (*christianitas universa*) has sustained the greatest ruin and loss«, while in his obituary notice of the late emperor, the historian of the Latin East William (d. ca. 1186), archbishop of Tyre, asserted that »the most munificent of all the princes of the land laid aside the burden of the flesh and rendered his soul to heaven. His memory will ever be held in benediction by all the assembly of the saints«<sup>105</sup>.

Not only was the Byzantine Empire seen as a power firmly assimilated to the political system of twelfth-century Christendom, but also a marriage alliance with Constantinople was much sought after by virtually all other Christian states in both the Latin West and the Latin East. From the mid-twelfth century, during Manuel's reign, to the turn of the thirteenth century intermarriages between the Byzantine imperial house and Latin royal houses reached an unprecedented peak. The marriage alliances between members of the Byzantine imperial house and Latin princes or princesses exerted such a romantic appeal to Western Europeans that they eventually became a motif in medieval French literature<sup>106</sup>.

In the chanson de geste *Doon de la Roche*, dating to the late twelfth century, the Western hero, Landri, nephew of king Pepin of France, enters the service of the »good« (*bons*), »rich« (*riche*), and »valiant« (*vallant, ber*) emperor Alexander of Constantinople and eventually marries his daughter, who is extolled as »the most beautiful woman in Christendom« (*la plus bele fame de la crestienté*)<sup>107</sup>. In the chanson de geste *Girart de Roussillon*, composed soon after 1180, Drogon, a vassal of the Frankish king Charles Martel, arranges a marriage alliance of his son Girart and of king Charles with the

95 Anselm of Havelberg, *Dialogi* 3.21, col. 1247; trans. Criste/Neel 210.

96 Anselm of Havelberg, *Dialogi* 3.21-22, col. 1247; trans. Criste/Neel 210.

97 Anselm of Havelberg, *Dialogi* 3.19, 3.22, cols 1241. 1247-1248; trans. Criste/Neel 201. 210.

98 Anselm of Havelberg, *Dialogi* 3.21-22, cols 1247-1248; trans. Criste/Neel 210-211.

99 Silano, Introduction xiii.

100 Peter Lombard, *Sententiae* 1.11.1, ed. Brady 115; trans. Silano 62-63; Neocleous, *Attitudes* 86-87.

101 Peter Lombard, *Sententiae*, 1.11.2, ed. Brady 116; trans. Silano 64.

102 Neocleous, *Attitudes* 86-87.

103 Neocleous, *Attitudes* 89-93; Magdalino, *Empire* 62-66. 83-95; Angold, *Byzantine Empire* 209-215; Lilie, *Byzantium* 293. 296-297; Vasiliev, *Manuel Comnenus; Harris/Tolstoy, Alexander III* 308-311. In 1159 and 1160, the Byzantine and German emperors still exchanged embassies with the purpose of facilitating military cooperation against the Norman kingdom of Sicily. However,

within a year Manuel had supported Pope Alexander III (1159-1181) against Frederick I Barbarossa's anti-pope, Victor IV (1159-1164). This led to the end of the Byzantine-German alliance. Interestingly, to win over the Byzantine emperor Alexander III had flirted with the idea of transferring the imperial title *Imperator Romanorum* from Frederick to Manuel.

104 Roger of Hoveden, *Gesta* 255; Ralph of Coggeshall, *Chronicon* 75; Otoboni scribae *annales* 99; Robert de Clari, *Conquête* 18, ed. and trans. Noble 20-21; Rigord of Saint-Denis, *Gesta* 146, ed. and trans. Charpentier/Pon/Chauvin 376-377; *Liber Pontificalis* 415. 434-435. For a detailed description of Manuel's image in Latin sources, see: Neocleous, *Attitudes* 89-93.

105 Otoboni scribae *annales* 99; William of Tyre, *Historia* 22.5, ed. Huygens 1012; trans. Babcock/Krey 452.

106 Neocleous, *Attitudes* 66-69. 242.

107 *Doon de la Roche* 56. 59. 86. 120. 127, eds Meyer/Huet 55. 72. 105. 107. 108. 155. 164; trans. Reniers-Cossart 63. 78. 103. 143. 150.

two daughters of the Byzantine emperor<sup>108</sup>. The emperor is commended for his »sense, generosity and pleasant manner«; his eldest daughter is presented as being not only of immense beauty and gentle speech but also learned in Greek, Latin and Hebrew so that »none could find her equal in the world«, while her younger sister had »a lovely and virginal body and so dignified a presence that the wisest remained silent, marvelling at her beauty«<sup>109</sup>.

In the romance *Cligès* by Chrétien de Troyes which has been ascribed to the period 1176-1177, »the handsome and valiant« (*li biax, li preuz*) Alexander, a »Christian« (*reçui crestianté*) prince, son of »the powerful in richness and honour« (*puissant de richesce et d'enor*) Byzantine emperor and his »very noble« (*molt noble*) empress, travels to the court of king Arthur in Britain where he defends the king against a rebellious vassal and wins as his bride Arthur's niece, Soredamors<sup>110</sup>. In the meantime, Alexander's brother, Alis, who succeeds their father to the Byzantine throne, sends an embassy to the German court requesting the hand of the German emperor's daughter. The German ruler

»[...] could not have been happier,  
Agreeing at once to give them [the Greek ambassadors]  
His daughter, for this was a noble  
Match that enhanced his prestige«<sup>111</sup>.

Obviously, a marriage alliance with the Christian empire of Constantinople was considered by Latin rulers as carrying great honor.

In the meanwhile, Latin interest in Greek authorities and a movement to translate them, which had been steadily gaining momentum in the West since the eleventh century, reached a peak in the second half of the twelfth century. Latin clerics and theologians with an interest in Greek patristics visited Constantinople in search of Greek texts<sup>112</sup>. The German theologian Hugh of Honau (d. after 1180), who visited Constantinople on two occasions in the 1170s, ascribed his interest in Greek texts to the fact that »all the teachings of the Latins flowed from the sources of the Greeks«<sup>113</sup>. In 1167, the scholar and theologian William Medicus of Gap, the future abbot of Saint-Denis (1173-1186), visited Constantinople and »brought back Greek books«, among them the *Vita* of Secundus the Philosopher, which he himself translated from Greek into Latin, and a manuscript containing Michael Synkellos's ninth-century encomium of Saint Dionysios the Areopagite, who was misidentified with his namesake Saint

Dionysios (Saint-Denis), first bishop of Paris<sup>114</sup>. Between 1169 and 1172, the encomium was translated into Latin by another monk of Saint-Denis, also called William – the secretary and biographer of Abbot Suger (1122-1151) – and was dedicated to abbot Ivo II (1162-1172). At around the same time Greek prayers were introduced into the liturgy of the monastery of Saint-Denis<sup>115</sup>. Latin visitors to the Byzantine Empire were not only keen to gather Greek books but also to discuss theological issues with the Greeks, as, for example, the clerics in the retinue of Duke Henry the Lion of Saxony (1142-1180), who visited Constantinople in 1172<sup>116</sup>.

Five years after Manuel's death, the Komnenian imperial dynasty came to an end with the ascension of Isaakios II Angelos (1185-1195, 1203-1204). Isaakios's rise to power brought to an end the isolation that beset the empire during the authoritarian rule of Andronikos Komnenos (1183-1185)<sup>117</sup>. One of the new ruler's first diplomatic moves was to secure a foreign bride for himself. The subsequent marriage with Margarita, the daughter of King Bela III of Hungary (1172-1196), led to the normalisation of relations between the empire and the Hungarian kingdom<sup>118</sup>. However, Isaakios's reign was to witness the meltdown of relations between the Byzantine and Hohenstaufen Empires. The ruler's handling of the German expedition of the Third Crusade, which marched through the Byzantine Empire on its way to the Holy Land in 1189-1190, was a diplomatic fiasco for the Byzantines<sup>119</sup>.

Despite reassurances by the German emperor Frederick I Barbarossa (1155-1190) that his sole intention was to journey to Syria, Isaak was convinced that the real motivation of the Germans was to seize his empire and he therefore determined to halt them<sup>120</sup>. Byzantine provocations resulted in an open conflict between the German crusading army and Isaakios's troops. Although Frederick was offered military assistance from Byzantium's enemy Stephen Nemanja, grand Zupan of Serbia, to fight Isaakios, he rejected the Serb's proposal proclaiming that »he had undertaken the arduous pilgrimage against the oppressors of the land of Jerusalem for love of Christ, [and] he was plotting no evil against any Christian king (*christianus rex*) [...] nor indeed against the king of Greece«<sup>121</sup>. Even though unrelenting Byzantine hostility eventually forced Frederick to contemplate an attack on Constantinople as an unavoidable evil, the German ruler simultaneously endeavoured to reach a peace agreement with Isaakios, whom he described as »our brother (*frater noster*)«, a testament to the fact that he regarded him as

108 Chanson de Girart de Roussillon, eds and trans. Combarieu du Grès/Gouiran; Devereaux, Constantinople 71-72. 75-86.

109 Chanson de Girart de Roussillon 16-17. 21, eds and trans. Combarieu du Grès/Gouiran 58-61. 62-63.

110 Chrétien de Troyes, *Cligès* 1-5. 12-13; trans. Raffel 2-5. 12-13.

111 Chrétien de Troyes, *Cligès* 94-95; trans. Raffel 84-85.

112 Hamilton, *Eteriano* 110; Ciggaar, *Travellers* 84. 89. 176. 263. 271. 291; Neocleous, *Attitudes* 95-97.

113 Hugh of Honau, *Liber* 1.4, ed. Häring 121. On Hugh of Honau's missions to Constantinople, see: Ciggaar, *Travellers* 89-90; Berschin, *Grammata* 345-346.

114 Delisle, *Traductions* 726-730. See also: Ciggaar, *Travellers* 97; Berschin, *Grammata* 365-366; Mayr-Harting, *Odo of Deuil* 239. On Saint Dionysios the Are-

opagite's misidentification with Saint Dionysios of Paris, see von Mosheim, *Institutes* 98-99; Bogdanović, *Dionysian Legacy* 116.

115 Delisle, *Traductions* 730; Berschin, *Grammata* 366; Mayr-Harting, *Odo of Deuil* 239; Weiss, *Studio* 426-438; Brennan, *Guide* 19.

116 Arnold of Lübeck, *Chronica* 1.5, ed. Lappenberg 119-120. See also Neocleous, *Attitudes* 75.

117 Angold, *Byzantine Empire* 297-302; Neocleous, *Andronikos*.

118 Choniates, *Historia* 12, ed. van Dieten 368; trans. Magoulias 203-204; Varzos, *Genealogia* 815; Angold, *Byzantine Empire* 304.

119 Tyerman, *God's War* 422-425.

120 Neocleous, *Opponents* 101-102; Neocleous, *Conspiracies* 265-266.

121 *Historia de expeditione* 31; trans. Loud 62.

a fellow Christian ruler. Similarly, when the Vlach chieftain Peter, one of the two leaders of the Vlach-Bulgarian rebellion against the Byzantine Empire, offered strong military support against Constantinople, again the German emperor kindly rejected the proposal. His principal concern was »to hasten to the aid of the land beyond the sea«, i. e., the Holy Land, not »to delay in Greece in order to claim for himself another's empire«<sup>122</sup>. According to the *Historia de expeditione Friderici imperatoris*, the most important eyewitness account of the German expedition of the Third Crusade, Frederick »inwardly detested the shedding of the Christian blood (*christiani sanguinis effusio*), which had, nevertheless, whether he [Frederick] wished it or not, to be spilt in these dangerous encounters«; that is, during the battles between Byzantines and Germans<sup>123</sup>.

It is little wonder Isaakios received widespread condemnation by contemporary historians and chroniclers for his unprovoked aggression against the Germans. What is surprising, however, is to find criticism of Frederick's conduct. The English historian William of Newburgh (d. ca. 1198) records that »the Latin emperor [Frederick] sought from the Greek emperor [Isaakios], i. e., as a Christian from another Christian (*Christianus scilicet a Christiano*)«, permission to pass through his empire. Isaakios is excoriated by William because, although a »Christian monarch« (*Christianus princeps*), he failed to assist the crusade, »this most Christian affair« (*negotium Christianissimum*), and to provide Frederick with safe passage. At the same time, however, the historian criticises Frederick for opening his »way with the sword«. Even though »those Christians [the Greeks] acted in a manner far from brotherly (*fraterne*) [...] [and] refused to concede a harmless passage to Christians [the German crusaders]«, »I am of the opinion«, affirms William, »that this movement and attack on Christians [the Greeks] by Christians [the Germans] who had taken arms against pagans can by no means be approved«<sup>124</sup>.

To support his view that Frederick should have avoided attacking the Greeks, William turns to the Old Testament. According to the Old Testament's Book of Numbers, Moses twice asked permission from the king of Edom to pass through his territories, but the Edomite king refused. Therefore, the Israelites bypassed Edom, thus avoiding an attack on the Edomites, who were the descendants of Esau, the fraternal twin brother of Jacob, the forefather of the Israelites<sup>125</sup>. As William of Newburgh states, although the Israelites »twice suffered a repulse from their brethren (*fratres*), the sons of Esau, [...] they were not impelled by that fraternal (*fraternus*)

affront to seek revenge, or to open a passage with the sword; but wisely, as if they did not remember the injury, they turned away from their ungrateful brethren (*ingrati fratres*)«<sup>126</sup>. By drawing an analogy between Latins and Greeks on the one side and Israelites and Edomites on the other, William makes his point clear: even though the Greeks were *ingrati*, they were still the fraternal twin brothers of the Latins and, therefore, attacking them was deplorable. True to his reputation as a historian of »critical acumen« and »judicious impartiality«, William firmly and clearly opines that »the Christian emperor [Frederick] would have acted more wisely if he had turned away from the emperor [Isaakios], who, though disobliging, was yet a Christian; and had sought another passage into Syria«<sup>127</sup>. William of Newburgh's discussion of the notion of Christian brotherhood between Latins and Greeks turns out to be the most masterly elaboration of the subject in twelfth-century historiography<sup>128</sup>.

The most prolific Latin writer of the last quarter of the twelfth century, and one who dealt extensively with the Greeks in his works, was the Calabrian abbot Joachim of Fiore (1135-1202). In Joachim's theology of history, the Greeks occupied a very important place<sup>129</sup>. In his works, Joachim fulminates against the patriarchs and emperors of Constantinople, whom he regards as the culprits for the rift between »the Church of Peter«, i. e. the papacy, and »the Churches of the Greeks« which, according to the Calabrian abbot, were »placed not by right but by tyranny« under the authority of Constantinople<sup>130</sup>. The accusations of heresy and even the teaching of heresy that had haunted the Church of Constantinople since the early Christian centuries are not absent from Joachim's work. From the abbot's perspective, the promulgation of heretical teachings was the result of the Church of Constantinople's breach with Rome<sup>131</sup>.

Joachim was no less scathing about his contemporary Greeks, avowing that »very many of the Greeks (*plurimi Graecorum*) are turning away from the Latins, unwilling to join with them in learning except in case of great need, and believe that the Latins abominate them in the same manner in which they abominate the Latins, and keep away from them as if from unclean things«<sup>132</sup>. Many Greeks, especially clerics and monks, undeniably resented the Latins whom they viewed with suspicion and antagonism, and indeed a close investigation of Byzantine sources vindicates Joachim by revealing that, in their writings, Byzantine intellectuals propagated the idea that the Latins were *μισορώμαιοι*, haters of the Romans, i. e., of Byzantines<sup>133</sup>. However, the Calabrian

122 *Historia de expeditione* 40. 58; trans. Loud 70. 84; *Historia peregrinorum* 149.

123 *Historia de expeditione* 57; trans. Loud 84. For Frederick's commitment to the ideal of Christian brotherhood, see Neocleous, *Attitudes* 113-116.

124 William of Newburgh, *Historia* 4.13, ed. Howlett 326-327; trans. Stevenson 573-575.

125 Numbers 20.14-21.

126 William of Newburgh, *Historia* 4.13, ed. Howlett 328; trans. Stevenson 574-575.

127 William of Newburgh, *Historia* 4.13, ed. Howlett 328; trans. Stevenson 575. For William as a historian, see: Gransden, *Historical Writing* 264-265.

128 Neocleous, *Attitudes* 118-120.

129 Whalen, Joachim of Fiore 107; Neocleous, *Attitudes* 123-124.

130 Joachim of Fiore, *Liber* 2.1.32, 3.2.3, ed. Daniel 136. 292; Joachim of Fiore, *Tractatus* 3.16, ed. Buonaiuti 278; trans. Pellegrini/Potesta 208. See also: Joachim of Fiore, *Liber* 2.1.8, 4.1.7, ed. Daniel 73. 337-338.

131 Neocleous, *Attitudes* 125.

132 Joachim of Fiore, *Tractatus* 3.16, ed. Buonaiuti 283; trans. Pellegrini/Potesta 211.

133 Neocleous, *Μισορώμαιοι* 159-185.

abbot was right not to generalise this attitude to all Greeks. Although *plurimi*, these Greeks still may not have represented the majority<sup>134</sup>.

Despite the fact that Joachim inveighed against the Church of Constantinople and its patriarch and pummelled the »many Greeks« who loathed the Latins and avoided them, nonetheless his attitude toward the Greeks was not necessarily one of intolerance and antagonism<sup>135</sup>. In his *Liber de concordia*, while condemning the former heresies of the patriarchs of Constantinople, Joachim relates that there were »among the people of the Greeks great hermits and abbots (*in populo Graecorum magni heremitae et abbates*) with many disciples in the monastic perfection (*in monastica perfectione*)«<sup>136</sup>. Respectful of Eastern-rite monasticism, the Calabrian abbot placed Greek monasticism on a conceptual par with the Latin, praising »the life of the pious monks who shone« in both the Latin Rule of Saint Benedict (*regula sancti Benedicti*) and the Greek Rule of Saint Basil (*regula sancti Basilii*)<sup>137</sup>. Joachim did not hesitate to acknowledge that »the regions of the Greeks« were endowed with »most holy hermits (*heremitae viri sanctissimi*)« and »monks of holiness (*monachi sanctitatis*)«, whose »high standards of life we are more able to admire than to emulate«<sup>138</sup>.

In his *Tractatus super quatuor Evangelia*, Joachim acknowledges the fact that the Greeks preceded the Latins in faith (*ad fidem*) and that, in fact, »the Latins were led to the knowledge of the truth for the first time through the Greeks«, specifically »the Greek doctors«, »the Greek bishops« and »the Greek spiritual fathers«, »who were the first in spiritual doctrine and monastic discipline« and »among whom were the divine books«<sup>139</sup>. This notwithstanding, the Calabrian abbot insists that the Latins were »preferred to the Greeks in grace«. To prove that the Latins, although »younger in calling«, were accorded »the dignity of greater grace«, Joachim draws two parallels with the apostles. Peter was the foremost (*primus*) among the apostles despite his brother Andrew being the first-called of the apostles, while Paul was »senior to Barnabas in grace« even though Paul was led to the apostles by Barnabas. These analogies were by no means intended to diminish either the Greeks or Andrew and Barnabas. The Calabrian abbot states unequivocally that »in Andrew and Peter are denoted the pastors of the Holy Church, which is one (*una*) in the faith of the Greeks and the Latins (*fides Graecorum et Latinorum*)«<sup>140</sup>. The fact is, the Greeks and the Latins were one in faith, and it is worth underlying that the Greeks are recorded first. Significantly, Joachim writes *fides*

*Graecorum et Latinorum* and not *fides Latinorum et Graecorum*, since »the Greeks preceded in faith (*in fide*), [and] the Latins followed«<sup>141</sup>.

## The Time of the Fourth Crusade

At the end of the twelfth century, the Byzantine Empire was still seen as an integral part of Christendom and was, therefore, expected by Pope Innocent III to take part in his grand pan-Christian crusade for the liberation of Jerusalem. In a series of letters to both the Byzantine emperor and patriarch, dated between 1198 and 1202, Pope Innocent III endeavoured to draw Constantinople into his crusade against the Muslims under the banner of the papacy and to obtain assurances of ecclesiastical union<sup>142</sup>. Innocent exhorted emperor Alexios III (1195-1203) »to run to the aid of the Holy Land« and »restore it to its former liberty« and thus »to be sharing in the remission and protection we have granted the other Christian princes«<sup>143</sup>. From the pope's perspective, the Byzantine emperor, just like the »other Christian princes«, had a duty to fight for the liberation of Jerusalem. In his letters to the emperor and patriarch of Constantinople, Innocent also called for Church union under papal leadership, to wit »the returning of the Church of the Greeks to the unity of the Apostolic See (*ad sedis apostolicae unitatem*)«<sup>144</sup>. The papal letters were a firm reassertion of the notions of Rome's supreme authority in the universal Church and status as »head and mother of all the Churches (*caput et mater omnium Ecclesiarum*)«. Innocent made it clear that ecclesiastical union involved – or rather consisted of – the Church of Constantinople's obeying the Church of Rome as its head, in other words accepting its jurisdiction and supremacy, *regardless* of »disparity in rites« or »diversity in doctrines«<sup>145</sup>. Despite all his words and efforts, however, Innocent's expectations of Alexios III for ecclesiastical union and Byzantine support for the upcoming crusade were to meet with frustration.

In the summer of 1202, before Innocent's crusade set sail for the East, the Frankish crusaders found themselves in dire financial straits, owing the Venetians 34 000 marks by contract. The Frankish crusaders' debt was exploited by the German king Philip of Swabia (1198-1208) and his Italian cousin and vassal Boniface of Montferrat (d. 1207), leader of the crusade, to install on the throne of Byzantium a German Hohenstaufen puppet, Prince Alexios, son of the deposed Byzantine emperor Isaakios and Philip's brother-in-law. Philip

134 Eustathios of Thessalonikē, *Alōsis* 128-129; Choniates, *Historia* 10, 17, ed. van Dieten 301. 551; trans. Magoulias 167. 302. For a detailed discussion, see: Neocleous, *Attitudes* 100-104. 126-127. 231.

135 Neocleous, *Attitudes* 127-131.

136 Joachim of Fiore, *Liber* 2.1.32, ed. Daniel 136.

137 Joachim of Fiore, *Liber* 4.1.16, ed. Daniel 351.

138 Joachim of Fiore, *Liber* 3.2.3, ed. Daniel 292-293.

139 Joachim of Fiore, *Tractatus* 1.9, ed. Buonaiuti 178. 182-183; trans. Pellegrini/Potestà 135. 137-138

140 Joachim of Fiore, *Tractatus* 1.7, 1.9, ed. Buonaiuti 139. 178-180; trans. Pellegrini/Potestà 107. 134-136.

141 Joachim of Fiore, *Tractatus* 1.9, 3.16, ed. Buonaiuti 180. 291; trans. Pellegrini/Potestà 136. 215.

142 For a full discussion, see Neocleous, *Attitudes* 132-141.

143 Innocent III, *Register* 353, ed. Hageneder 1.526-527.

144 Innocent III, *Register* 353, ed. Hageneder 1.527.

145 Innocent III, *Register* 200 (209). 202 (211), ed. Hageneder 2.388-389. 396-397.

and Boniface of Montferrat manipulated the debt-laden Frankish leaders bound by the earlier contract with Venice, together with their vassals and comrades, into agreeing that the young Alexios should be placed on the Byzantine throne, in return for generous financial rewards. Therefore, in 1203, despite the general opposition to the proposal for the diversion to Constantinople, the majority of the French leading barons concluded the Treaty of Zara with Prince Alexios. The 200 000 marks stipulated as payment to the crusaders would undoubtedly contribute to the successful outcome of an expedition to Egypt and Syria but, first and foremost, would enable the cash-strapped Frankish crusaders to pay their outstanding debt of 34,000 marks to the Venetians<sup>146</sup>.

The diversion to the Byzantine capital had been highly controversial and deeply divisive. Innocent, who remained committed to his peaceful negotiations with Alexios III, had repeatedly opposed it as a war against »brothers« (*fratres*)<sup>147</sup>. Likewise, a party within the crusade also vehemently objected to the detour. Through their spokesperson, Abbot Guy of Vaux-de-Cernay, the opponents of the diversion plan »declared they would never give their consent, since it would mean marching against Christians«<sup>148</sup>. The main arguments of those favouring the detour were the need for Alexios's promised assistance and the (supposed) legitimacy of the pretender's claim to the Byzantine throne. Neither was the *Christianitas* of the Greeks challenged by the diversion party, nor did the rift between the Churches of Rome and Constantinople feature during the heated debates about whether or not to accept prince Alexios's offer. In fact, the subjection of the Church of Constantinople to that of Rome was used by Philip of Swabia and the pro-diversion barons of the Fourth Crusade through their clerical advisers *only* in their dealings with the papacy. Their goal was to persuade pope Innocent to consent to the detour against the Byzantine capital to place prince Alexios on the throne. More significantly, although a clause on the submission of the Church of Constantinople to that of Rome was included in the Treaty of Zara, this was only intended as a face-saving formula for the papacy. The clause went actually unmentioned by several accounts reporting on the Treaty of Zara, including the eyewitness chronicle of Robert of Clari and, more astonishingly, the histories of two bishops who participated in the Fourth Crusade, namely Conrad of Halberstadt (1202-1208) and Nevelon of Soissons (1176-1207)<sup>149</sup>.

On 23 June 1203, the crusading fleet eventually entered the Bosphorus and on the night of 17-18 July Alexios III fled from Constantinople<sup>150</sup>. Following prince Alexios's successful assumption of the throne as Alexios IV (1203-1204) in

August 1203, letters from the crusader leaders and Alexios brimming with rhetoric about the submission of the Eastern Church were sent to Rome<sup>151</sup>. Trying to make the best out of a bad situation, the outmanoeuvred Innocent accepted the *fait accompli* and demanded signs of the promised Church union that would allow the crusaders to »reduce guilt and punishment« for defying his orders<sup>152</sup>. Nonetheless, in early February 1204, six months after Alexios IV's elevation to the Byzantine throne, an anxious and embittered Innocent was still waiting in vain for the new emperor to formally acknowledge his obedience to the Church of Rome. Neither Alexios nor the crusaders tried to implement this purely cosmetic provision of the treaty of Zara<sup>153</sup>.

Innocent's letters of early February 1204 to Alexios IV and the crusading leaders and clergy that called for signs of the promised ecclesiastical unity were composed and dispatched pointlessly<sup>154</sup>. By February 1204, the situation in the Byzantine Empire had changed radically. In late January, Isaakios and Alexios IV, who still owed large sums to the crusaders, had been overthrown and imprisoned by Alexios Mourtzouphlos who proclaimed himself emperor as Alexios V (1204) and refused to pay the crusaders their dues<sup>155</sup>. After Alexios IV's assassination on the night of 8-9 February, the leaders, the prelates, and the doge of Venice reached the decision to stay and capture Constantinople<sup>156</sup>. There was, however, a major obstacle: how could the conquest of a Christian city by a crusading army be justified?

After some examination of the situation, the crusader clergy ruled that the war against the Byzantines was »lawful and just (*droite et juste*)« for two reasons. First, since Alexios V was guilty of Alexios IV's murder, he »had no right to hold lands«, while the Byzantines »who consented to such a thing [the murder] were accomplices in the crime«. Second, »the Greeks had removed themselves from obedience to Rome«<sup>157</sup>. The supposed withdrawal of the Greeks and their Church from obedience to Rome, which had hardly been mentioned during the crusaders' earlier discussions about whether they should travel to Constantinople in the first place, was now fully exploited for propaganda purposes to legitimise an attack on the city. The crusading clergy further reassured the leaders that »if you have the right intention of conquering this land [Constantinople] and placing it in the obedience of Rome, all those of you who die after confession will have the indulgence (*pardón*) which the pope has granted you«<sup>158</sup>. This was completely at odds with Innocent's intention. The crusading clergy's assurances were a perversion of Innocent's wishes and prohibitions<sup>159</sup>.

146 Queller/Madden, Fourth Crusade 40-100; Phillips, Fourth Crusade 102-141; Tyerman, God's War 524-543; Neocleous, Motives 186-191. 204-206.

147 Innocent III, Register 101, ed. Hageneder 6.165.

148 Geoffrey of Villehardouin, Conquête 95, ed. and trans. Dufournet 86.

149 Neocleous, Attitudes 146-148; Neocleous, Motives 186-200.

150 Phillips, Fourth Crusade 142-144. 160-183.

151 Neocleous, Attitudes 151-153.

152 Innocent III, Register 229 (230), ed. Hageneder 6.389; trans. Andrea 89.

153 Neocleous, Attitudes 153-156. 172.

154 Neocleous, Attitudes 153-156.

155 Phillips, Fourth Crusade 224-225. 234; Tyerman, God's War 549.

156 Geoffrey of Villehardouin, Conquête 224, ed. and trans. Dufournet 156. See also Queller/Madden, Arguments 463; Angold, Fourth Crusade 98.

157 Geoffrey of Villehardouin, Conquête 224-225, ed. and trans. Dufournet 156; trans. Shaw 85.

158 Geoffrey of Villehardouin, Conquête 224-225, ed. and trans. Dufournet 156; trans. Shaw 85.

159 Neocleous, Attitudes 157-158.

The crusading clerics were well aware that their decision to attack Constantinople was illegal and contrary to papal orders. They knew that the papal indulgence they had promised was void, and that their declarations were a complete distortion of Innocent's directives and constituted a radical departure from the pope's policy toward the Greeks. They knew that the war against the Byzantines was not as *droite et juste* as they proclaimed. Under such pressures, the crusading clergy sought to have Constantinople conquered with the fewest possible lives lost<sup>160</sup>. The crusaders were instructed that, »insofar as it was possible, they should stay their hands from blood«<sup>161</sup>. They were also »made [...] to swear on relics that [...] they would not use force on any woman or rob her of her clothes [...] [and] that they would not lay a hand on any monk or cleric or priest, unless he were under arms«. Offenders would face the death penalty<sup>162</sup>. Obviously, even on the eve of the crusader conquest of Constantinople, the Greeks were still silently acknowledged as the Latins' Christian brothers. Even the notoriously anti-Greek chronicler Gunther of Pairis (d. ca. 1210), while inciting the crusaders to »break into the city [Constantinople] [...] crush cowards [...] instil terror«, simultaneously exhorts them »to spare the blood« and »remember they [the Byzantines] are brothers (*fratres*)«<sup>163</sup>.

On 9 April 1204, the crusaders attacked Constantinople. While the Byzantines suffered almost no casualties, the Westerners had heavy losses<sup>164</sup>. The crusaders were dismayed and lost heart. The clergy immediately used its influence to boost their spirit. To exhort the demoralised army to fervour, there remained one resort: to step up their anti-Greek polemic. To this end, the clerics vehemently denounced Greek disobedience to and utter contempt for the Church of Rome and those who accepted its spiritual authority:

»The bishops and the priests in the camp conferred together, and their opinion was that the battle was just and it was right to attack them [the Byzantines]. For in times past the people of the city had obeyed the creed of Rome, and now they were disobeying it, when they said the Roman creed had no value and that all those who believed in it were dogs. And the bishops said that in the circumstances it was their duty to attack them and that it was in no way a sin, rather it was a great work of charity«<sup>165</sup>.

Since a new attack on Constantinople was planned for Monday 12 April, the crusading clergy used the Sunday sermon the previous morning to »prove to the pilgrims that the battle was just (*droituriere*)«. Having first accused the Greeks of disloyalty and murder of their rightful lord, the clergy proceeded

to demonise them, de-Christianise their image, and make them the enemy of Christianity. The clerics declared that the Greeks »were worse than Jews (*pieur que juis*). [...] The bishops commanded the pilgrims to confess and take communion very devoutly, and not to be at all afraid to attack the Greeks, for they were the enemies of God (*enemi damedieu*)«<sup>166</sup>. In addition to the villainisation and demonisation of the Byzantines, the bishops of the crusading army – the eyewitness Robert of Clari reports – »said that in the name of God and the pope they were absolving all those who attacked them [the Greeks]«<sup>167</sup>. According to the anonymous monastic author of the fourth continuation of the Trier chronicle, which was written in the aftermath of the Latin conquest of Constantinople, the bishops further »asserted that this [capture of Constantinople] was acceptable to God, just as if the holy city of Jerusalem had been captured«<sup>168</sup>. The war against Constantinople was thus transformed into a crusade.

The proclamations that the conquest of the Byzantine capital was acceptable to God, the (unauthorised) papal absolution, and the denunciation of the Greeks as *enemi damedieu* must have come as a surprise to the majority of the crusading army who, a few days earlier, had been »made to swear on relics that they would not lay a hand on any [Greek] monk or cleric or priest«, and who had been ignorant of both the alleged disobedience of the Greeks to the Church of Rome and of the fact that one of the ostensible reasons for the detour of the Fourth Crusade was to effect a union of the Roman and Greek Churches<sup>169</sup>.

On 12-13 April 1204 Constantinople succumbed to the crusaders. Pope Innocent accepted what appeared to him to be the working of God's Providence to bring about the union of the Churches, to which Alexios III had evaded committing himself, and which Alexios IV had promised to effect but never delivered. After 1204, for the first time, the papacy clearly defined the pro-1204 status of the Greeks as schismatics, thus justifying the unanticipated Latin conquest of Constantinople as ending a schism<sup>170</sup>. At the same time, however, Innocent insisted that »we [the Latins] acknowledge them [the Greeks] as brothers, comrades, and friends«<sup>171</sup>. The pope was ready to tolerate Greek rites and customs which were not contrary to Roman canonical practices. Besides, Innocent tried to maintain Greek bishops »in devotion to the Apostolic See« in their sees<sup>172</sup>. It was, however, the pontiff's commendation and patronage of Greek monasticism in former Byzantine lands that best demonstrates his esteem of Eastern Christianity. Innocent's letter of 17 January 1214 sent to the monks of Mount Athos speaks volumes about his attitude to Greek ascetic traditions:

160 Neocleous, *Attitudes* 158-159.

161 Gunther of Pairis, *Hystoria* 18, ed. Orth 156; trans. Andrea 107.

162 Robert of Clari, *Conquête* 68, ed. and trans. Noble 84-85.

163 Gunther of Pairis, *Hystoria* 17, ed. Orth 155; trans. Andrea 105-106.

164 Queller/Madden, *Fourth Crusade 177-179*; Phillips, *Fourth Crusade* 241-244.

165 Robert of Clari, *Conquête* 72, ed. and trans. Noble 86-87.

166 Robert of Clari, *Conquête* 73, ed. and trans. Noble 88-89.

167 Robert de Clari, *Conquête* 73, ed. and trans. Noble 88-89.

168 Gestorum Treverorum *Continuatio* IV 2, ed. Waitz 392.

169 Neocleous, *Attitudes* 162.

170 Neocleous, *Attitudes* 171-173.

171 Innocent III, *Register* 203, ed. Hageneder 7.356; trans. Andrea 134.

172 Andrea, *Byzantine Rite* 121; Richard, *Establishment* 47; Van Tricht, *Renovatio* 321. 332; Neocleous, *Attitudes* 192-194.

»it [Mount Athos] is adorned with three hundred monasteries and a glorious multitude of religious men leading a strict life of poverty; up to the present time it has flourished with such excellence of virtue and has reflected such brilliance of exceptional religious life that, with Jacob, anyone can rightly say of this [mountain] with admiration: This place is really holly, because here is the house of God and, in a certain way, a gate of heaven«<sup>173</sup>.

In the meantime, the anti-Greek propaganda unleashed and disseminated in April 1204 by the clerics of the Fourth Crusade in order to legitimise the attack on Constantinople and, subsequently, the city's crusader conquest seems to have made the rift between the Churches of Constantinople and Rome more widely known in the West and done more harm to the reputation of the Greeks than any other piece of writing hitherto composed<sup>174</sup>. Again, this statement should not be exaggerated; in the Latin West, 1204 received rela-

tively little press and was occasionally greeted with scepticism and even criticism. While a number of authors welcomed the return of »the Eastern schismatics (*scismatici orientales*), namely Constantinople with its territories, which is the greatest part of Christendom (*est pars maxima Christianitatis*) to the bosom of the universal Church«, others deplored the »theft (*rapina*) carried out against a Christian people [the Greeks]« and expressed their doubts whether the conquest of Constantinople was the working of God himself or only a human deed performed with God's permission<sup>175</sup>. In his curia, Innocent, at times baffled by the outcome of his crusade but unwilling to pass judgement on what appeared to him to be the result of Divine Will, had recourse to the Pauline epistle to the Romans, 11:33: »Oh, the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How incomprehensible are His judgments and unfathomable His ways!« Pope and chroniclers alike agreed that only the fullness of time would reveal the hidden purposes of God<sup>176</sup>.

## Bibliography

### Sources

Acta concilii lemovicensis: Acta concilii lemovicensis. In: PL 142, 1353-1400.

Acts: The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon 1. Eds R. Price / M. Gaddis (Liverpool 2005).

Albert of Aachen, *Historia*: Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana / History of the Journey to Jerusalem*. Ed. and trans. S. B. Edgington (Oxford 2007).

Anselm of Canterbury, *De processione*: Anselm of Canterbury, *De processione Spiritus sancti*. In: S. Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi opera omnia 2. Ed. F. S. Schmitt (Edinburgh 1946) 175-219.

trans. Hopkins/Richardson: Anselm of Canterbury, *The Procession of the Holy Spirit*. In: *Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury*. Trans. J. Hopkins / H. Richardson (Minneapolis 2000) 466-514.

*Epistula*: Anselm of Canterbury, *Epistula de sacrificio azimi et fermentati*. In: F. S. Schmitt (ed.), *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi opera Omnia 2* (Edinburgh 1946) 223-232.

trans. Hopkins/Richardson: Anselm of Canterbury, *The Sacrifice of Unleavened and Leavened Bread*. In: *Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury*. Trans. J. Hopkins / H. Richardson (Minneapolis 2000) 515-522.

Anselm of Havelberg, *Dialogi*: Anselmi Havelbergensis episcopi dialogi. In: PL 188, cols 1139-1248.

173 Innocent III, *Recipiuntur sub protectione sedis apostolicae* 957. See also: *Genesis* 28.17

174 Neocleous, *Attitudes* 215-216.

trans. Criste/Neel: Anselm of Havelberg, *Anticimemon: On the Unity of the Faith and the Controversies with the Greeks*. Trans. A. Criste / C. Neel. *Premonstratensian Texts and Studies 1* (Collegeville 2010).

Arnold of Lübeck, *Chronica*, ed. Lappenberg: *Arnoldi Abbatis Lubecensis Chronica*. Ed. J. M. Lappenberg. In: *MGH SS 21* (Hannoverae 1869) 100-250.

Augustine of Hippo, *Tractatus*: Augustinus, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus CXXIV*. Ed. R. Willems. *CCSL 36* (Turnhout 1954).

Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia*: *The Historia Ierosolimitana of Baldric of Bourgueil*. Ed. S. Biddlecombe (Woodbridge 2014).

trans. Edgington: Baldric of Bourgueil, »*History of the Jerusalemites*«: *A Translation of the Historia Ierosolimitana*. Trans. S. B. Edgington (Woodbridge, Suffolk 2020).

Bohemond, *Epistola*: Bohemond of Antioch, *Epistola ad Paschalem II papam*. In: W. Holtzmann (ed.), *Zur Geschichte des Investiturestreites (Englische Analekten II)*. 2: Bohemund von Antiochien und Alexios I. *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 50, 1935, 270-283.

Burchard of Ursperg, *Chronicon*: *Die Chronik des Propstes Burchard von Ursperg* Ed. O. Holder-Egger / B. von Simson. *MGH SS rer. Germ.*, 16 (Hannoverae 1916).

*Chanson de Girart de Roussillon*: *La chanson de Girart de Roussillon*. Eds and trans. M. de Combarieu du Grès / G. Gouiran (Paris 1993).

175 Matthew of Rievaulx, *Mélanges* 47; Burchard of Ursperg, *Chronicon* 87-88; Arnold of Lübeck, *Chronica* 6.19, ed. Lappenberg 223. For a detailed discussion, see: Neocleous, *Attitudes* 205-224.

176 Innocent III, *Register* 134 (133), ed. Hageneder 8.247; trans. Andrea 175; Arnold of Lübeck, *Chronica* 6.19, ed. Lappenberg 223.

- Choniates, *Historia*: Nikētas Choniates, *Historia*. Ed. J.-L. van Dieten. CFHB 11 (Berlin 1975).
- trans. Magoulias: *O City of Byzantium: Annals of Niketas Choniates*. Trans. H. J. Magoulias (Detroit 1984).
- Chrétien de Troyes, *Cligès*: Chrétien of Troyes, *Cligès*. Eds S. Gregory / C. Luttrell. *Arthurian Studies* 28 (Cambridge et al. 1993).
- trans. Raffel: *Chrétien of Troyes, Cligès*. Trans. B. Raffel (New Haven 1997).
- Decrees: *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*. 1: Nicaea I – Lateran V. Ed. N. P. Tanner (Washington, D.C. 1990).
- Doon de la Roche, eds Meyer/Huet: *Doon de la Roche: Chanson de geste*. Eds P. Meyer / G. Huet (Paris 1921).
- trans. Reniers-Cossart: *Doon de la Roche: Chanson de geste de la fin du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle*. Trans. N. Reniers-Cossart (Paris 2011).
- Epistulae: *Epistulae et chartae ad historiam primi belli sacrae spectantes*. Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088-1100. Eine Quellensammlung zur Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzuges mit Erläuterungen. Ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Innsbruck 1901).
- trans. Barber/Bate: *Letters from the East: Crusaders, Pilgrims and Settlers in the 12<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> Centuries*. Trans. M. Barber / B. Keith (Farnham 2010).
- Eustathios of Thessalonikē, *Alōsis*: Eustathios of Thessalonikē, *The Capture of Thessaloniki*. Ed. and trans. J. R. Melville-Jones. *Byzantina Australiensia* 8 (Canberra 1988).
- Geoffrey of Villehardouin, *Conquête*: Geoffroy de Villehardouin. La conquête de Constantinople. Présentation, établissement du texte, trad., notes, bibliogr., chronologie et index J. Dufournet (Paris 2004).
- trans. Shaw: *Geoffrey of Villehardouin, The Conquest of Constantinople*. In: *Chronicles of the Crusades*. Transl. with an introd. M. R. B. Shaw (London 1963) 29-160.
- Gesta episcoporum Tullensium: *Gesta episcoporum Tullensium*. Ed. G. Waitz. MGH SS 8 (Hannoverae 1848) 631-648.
- Gesta Francorum: *Gesta Francorum: The Deeds of the Franks and the Other Pilgrims to Jerusalem*. Ed. and trans. R. Hill (London 1962).
- Gestorum Treverorum Continuatio IV: *Gestorum Treverorum Continuatio IV*. Ed. G. Waitz. MGH SS 24 (Hannoverae 1879) 390-404.
- Gregory VII, Register: *Das Register Gregors VII*. 1: Buch I-IV. Ed. E. Caspar. MGH Epp. sel. 2 (Berlin 1920).
- trans. Cowdrey: *The register of Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085: an English translation*. Trans. H. E. J. Cowdrey (Oxford 2002).
- Epistolae vagantes: *Gregory VII, The »Epistolae vagantes«*. Ed. and trans. H. E. J. Cowdrey (Oxford 1972).
- Guibert of Nogent, *Dei gesta*: Guibert de Nogent. *Dei gesta per Francos: et cinq autres textes*. Ed. R. B. C. Huygens. CCCM 127A (Turnhout 1996).
- trans. Levine: *Guibert of Nogent, The Deeds of God Through the Franks*. Trans. R. Levine (Woodbridge 1997).
- Gunther of Pairis, *Hystoria*: Gunther von Pairis, *Hystoria Constantinopolitana: Untersuchungen und kritische Ausgabe*. Ed. P. Orth (Hildesheim, Zürich 1994).
- trans. Andrea: *Gunther of Pairis, The Capture of Constantinople: The »Hystoria Constantinopolitana«*. Trans. A. J. Andrea (Philadelphia 1997).
- Hilary of Poitiers, *De trinitate*: *La trinité*, 3: (Livres IX - XII) Hilaire de Poitiers. *Texte critique*. Ed. P. Smulders. SC 462 (Paris 2001).
- Historia de expeditione*: *Historia de expeditione Friderici imperatoris*. In: *Quellen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzuges Kaiser Friedrichs I*. Ed. A. Chroust. MGH SS rer. Germ. N. S. 5 (Berlin 1928) 1-115.
- trans. Loud: *The History of the Expedition of the Emperor Frederick. In: The Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa: The History of the Expedition of the Emperor Frederick and Related Texts*. Trans. G. A. Loud (Farnham 2010) 33-134.
- Historia peregrinorum*: *Historia peregrinorum*. In: *Quellen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzuges Kaiser Friedrichs I*. Ed. A. Chroust. MGH SS rer. Germ. N. S. 5 (Berlin 1928) 116-172.
- Hugh of Honau, *Liber*, ed. Häring: *Hugh of Honau, Liber de diversitate naturae et personae*. Ed. N. M. Häring. *Archives d'Histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen-âge* 37, 1962, 103-216.
- Innocent III, *Recipiuntur sub protectione sedis apostolicae*: *Sancti Athanasii caeterisque abbatibus et monachis Montis-Sancti: Recipiuntur sub protectione sedis apostolicae*. In: *Innocentii III Romani pontificis opera omnia* 3. PL 216, 956-958.
- Register, ed. Hageneder 1: O. Hageneder / A. Haidacher (eds), *Die Register Innocenz' III*. 1: 1. Pontifikatsjahr (Graz, Köln 1964).
- Register, ed. Hageneder 2: O. Hageneder / W. Maleczek / A. A. Strnad (eds), *Die Register Innocenz' III*. 2: 2. Pontifikatsjahr (Rom, Wien 1979).
- trans. Andrea: *Innocent III, The Registers*. In: *Contemporary Sources for the Fourth Crusade*. Trans. A. J. Andrea (Leiden 2000) 7-176.
- Joachim of Fiore, *Liber*, ed. Daniel: *Joachim of Fiore, Liber de Concordia Novi ac Veteris Testamenti*. Ed. E. R. Daniel. *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 73/8, 1983, 3-422.
- Tractatus*, ed. Buonaiuti: *Tractatus super quattuor Evangelia di Gioacchino da Fiore*. Ed. E. Buonaiuti (Roma 1930).
- trans. Pellegrini/Potestà: *Gioacchino da Fiore. Trattati sui quattro vangeli*. Trans. L. Pellegrini / G. L. Potestà. *Opere di Gioacchino da Fiore. Testi e Strumenti* 11 (Roma 1999).
- Liber Pontificalis*: *Le Liber pontificalis: Texte, introduction et commentaire* 2. Ed. L. Duchesne. *Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, second séries* (Paris 1892).
- Matthew of Rievaulx, *Mélanges*: *Matthew of Rievaulx, Les mélanges de Mathieu, préchantre de Rievaulx au début du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Contenus dans le ms. Paris, BnF, lat. 15157, fols. 35-129). Ed. A. Willmart. *Revue Bénédictine* 52, 1940, 15-84.
- Michael the Syrian, *Chronique*, trans. Chabot: *Chronique de Michel le Syrien Patriarche Jacobite d'Antioche (1166-1199)*. Ed., trans. J.-B. Chabot (Paris 1910).
- Monumenta Corbeiensia*, ed. Jaffé: *Monumenta Corbeiensia*. Ed. Ph. Jaffé. *Bibliotheca rerum Germanicarum* 1 (Berolini 1864).
- Odo of Deuil, *De profectioe*, ed. and trans. Berry: *Odo of Deuil, De profectioe Ludovici VII in orientem*. Ed. and trans. V. G. Berry (New York 1948).
- Orderic Vitalis, *Historia*, ed. and trans. Chibnall: *Orderic Vitalis, The Ecclesiastical History*, 5 vols. Ed. and trans. M. Chibnall (Oxford 1969-1980).
- Otoboni scribae *annales*: *Otoboni scribae annales*. Ed. G. H. Pertz. In: MGH SS 18 (Hannoverae 1863) 96-114.

- Peter Abelard, *Theologia*, ed. Buytaert: Peter Abelard, *Theologia christiana*. Ed. E.-M. Buytaert. CCCM 12 (Turnhout 1969).
- Peter Lombard, *Sententiae*: Peter Lombard, *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae*, third edition, vol. 1.2: Liber 1 et 2. Ed. I. Brady. *Spicilegium Bonaventurianum* 4 (Grottaferrata 1971).
- trans. Silano: Peter Lombard, *The Sentences, Book 1: The Mystery of the Trinity*. Trans. G. Silano, *Mediaeval Sources in Translation* 42 (Toronto 2007).
- Peter the Venerable, *Epistola*: Peter the Venerable, *Epistola CCXXIX ad Bernardum Abbatem*. In: PL 182, cols 398-417.
- Letters, ed. Constable: Peter the Venerable, *The Letters*, vol. 1. Ed. G. Constable (Cambridge 1967).
- Ralph of Coggeshall, *Chronicon*: Ralph of Coggeshall, *Chronicon Anglicanum*. Ed. J. Stevenson. RS 66 (London 1875).
- Rigord of Saint-Denis, *Gesta*, ed. and trans. Charpentier/Pon/Chauvin: Rigord of Saint-Denis, *Gesta Philippi Augusti / Histoire de Philippe Auguste*. Ed. and trans. É. Charpentier / G. Pon / Y. Chauvin (Paris 2006).
- Robert of Clari, *Conquête*, ed. and trans. Noble: Robert of Clari, *La conquête de Constantinople*. Ed. and trans. P. Noble (Edinburgh 2005).
- Robert the Monk, *Historia*, eds Kempf/Bull: Robert the Monk, *Historia Iherosolimitana*. Eds D. Kempf / M. G. Bull (Woodbridge 2013).
- trans. Sweetenham: Robert the Monk, *History of the First Crusade*. Trans. C. Sweetenham (Aldershot 2005).
- Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum libri*, ed. and trans. France: Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum libri quinque*. Ed. and trans. J. France (Oxford 1989).
- Roger of Hoveden, *Gesta*: *Gesta regis Henrici Secundi Benedicti Abbatis: the chronicle of the reigns of Henry II. and Richard I.; A. D. 1169-1192; known commonly under the name of Benedict of Peterborough* 1. Ed. W. Stubbs. *Rolls Series* 49 (London 1867).
- Rupert of Deutz, *Commentaria*, ed. Haacke: *Rupertus Tuitiensis. Commentaria in Evangelium sancti Iohannis*. Ed. R. Haacke. CCCM 9 (Turnhout 1969).
- De glorificatione: *Rupertus Tuitiensis, De glorificatione Trinitatis et processione Spiritus Sancti*. In: PL 169, 13-202.
- Liber, ed. Haacke: *Rupertus Tuitiensis. Liber de divinis officiis*. Ed. R. Haacke. CCCM 7 (London 1967).
- Stephen of Blois, *Epistolae*: Stephen of Blois, *Epistolae*. Ed. Academie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. In: RHC: *Historiens occidentaux* 3 (Paris 1895) 885-890.
- William of Apulia, *Gesta*, ed. and trans. Mathieu: *William of Apulia, Gesta Roberti Wiscardi / La geste de Robert Guiscard*. Ed. and trans. M. Mathieu (Palermo 1961).
- William of Newburgh, *Historia*, ed. Howlett: *William of Newburgh, Historia rerum Anglicarum: Libri I-IV*. Ed. R. Howlett. *Chronicles of the reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I. Rolls Series* 82,1 (London 1884).
- trans. Stevenson: *William of Newburgh, The History*. Trans. J. Stevenson (London 1856).
- William of Tyre, *Historia*, ed. Huygens: *Willelmi Tyrensis Archiepiscopi chronicon* 2. Ed. R. B. C. Huygens. CCCM 63A (Turnhout 1986).
- trans. Babcock/Krey: *William of Tyre, A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea* 2. Trans. E. A. Babcock / A. C. Krey (New York 1943).

## References

- Andrea, *Byzantine Rite*: A. Andrea, *Innocent III and the Byzantine Rite, 1198-1216*. In: A. E. Laiou (ed.), *Urbs Capta: The Fourth Crusade and Its Consequences / La IV<sup>e</sup> Croisade et ses conséquences: Proceedings of an International Conference Organized by the Academy of Athens and Held March 9-12, 2004* (Paris 2005) 111-122.
- Angold, *Byzantine Empire*: M. Angold, *The Byzantine Empire, 1025-1204: A Political History*, second edition (London et al. 1997).
- Fourth Crusade: M. Angold, *The Fourth Crusade: Event and Context* (Harlow 2003).
- Barber, *Two Cities*: M. Barber, *The Two Cities: Medieval Europe, 1050-1320*, second edition (London et al. 2004).
- Beihammer, *Byzantium*: A. D. Beihammer, *Byzantium and the Emergence of Muslim-Turkish Anatolia, ca. 1040-1130* (London et al. 2017).
- Berschin, *Grammata*: W. Berschin, *Ελληνικά γράμματα και λατινικός Μεσαίωνας: Από τον Ιερώνυμο ως τον Νικόλαο Κουσανό*. Trans. D. Z. Nikētas (Thessalonikē 1998).
- Biddlecombe, *Introduction*: S. Biddlecombe, *Introduction*. In: S. Biddlecombe (ed.), *The Historia Ierosolimitana of Baldric of Bourgueil* (Woodbridge 2014) xi-cv.
- Bogdanović, *Dionysian Legacy*: J. Bogdanović, *Rethinking the Dionysian Legacy in Medieval Architecture: East and West*. In: F. Ivanović (ed.), *Dionysius the Areopagite: Between Orthodoxy and Heresy* (Newcastle upon Tyne 2011) 109-134.
- Brennan, *Guide*: M. Brennan, *Guide des études Érigéniennes: Bibliographie commentée des publications 1930-1987 / A Guide to Eriugenian Studies: A Survey of Publications 1930-1987* (Fribourg 1989).
- Ciggaar, *Travellers*: K. N. Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople: The West and Byzantium, 962-1204, Cultural and Political Relations* (Leiden 1996).
- Constable, *Fourth Crusade*: G. Constable, *The Fourth Crusade*. In: G. Constable (ed.), *Crusaders and Crusading in the Twelfth Century* (Farnham 2008) 321-347.
- Cowdrey, «Crusading» Plans: H. E. J. Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII's «Crusading» Plans of 1074*. In: B. Z. Kedar / H. E. Mayer / R. C. Smail (eds), *Outremer: Studies in the History of the Crusading Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Jerusalem 1982) 27-40.
- Gregorian Papacy: H. E. J. Cowdrey, *The Gregorian Papacy, Byzantium, and the First Crusade*. BF 13, 1988, 145-169.
- Gregory VII: H. E. J. Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085* (Oxford 1998).
- Pope Urban: H. E. J. Cowdrey, *Pope Urban II's Preaching of the First Crusade*. History 55, 1970, 177-188.
- Criste/Neel, *Introduction*: A. Criste / C. Neel, *Introduction*. In: *Anticimennon: On the Unity of the Faith and the Controversies with the Greeks*. Trans. A. Criste / C. Neel. *Premonstratensian Texts and Studies* 1 (Colleville 2010) 1-39.

- Delisle, Traductions: L. Delisle, Traductions de textes grecs faites par des religieux de Saint Denis au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle. *Journal des savants* 1900, 725-739.
- Devereaux, Constantinople: R. Devereaux, Constantinople and the West in Medieval French Literature: Renewal and Utopia (Cambridge 2012).
- von Falkenhausen, Greek monasticism: V. von Falkenhausen, Greek Monasticism in Campania and Latium from the Tenth to the Fifteenth Century. In: B. Crostini / I. A. Murzaku (eds), *Greek Monasticism in Southern Italy: The Life of Neilos in Context* (New York 2018) 78-95.
- Frankopan, First Crusade: P. Frankopan, *The First Crusade: The Call from the East* (London 2012).
- Gransden, Historical Writing: A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England, c. 550 to c. 1307* (London 1974).
- Hamilton, Eteriano: B. Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States: The Secular Church* (London 1980).
- Hamilton/McNulty, Orientale Lumen: B. Hamilton / P. A. McNulty, *Orientale Lumen et Magistra Latinitatis: Greek Influences on Western Monasticism (900-1100)*. In: B. Hamilton (ed.), *Monastic Reform, Catharism and the Crusades (900-1300)* (Aldershot 1997) 181-216.
- Harris, Byzantium: J. Harris, *Byzantium and the Crusades* (London 2014).  
»Schism« of 1054: J. Harris, *The »Schism« of 1054 and the First Crusade*. *Crusades* 13, 2014, 1-20.
- Harris/Tolstoy, Alexander III: J. Harris / D. Tolstoy, *Alexander III and Byzantium*. In: P. D. Clarke / A. J. Duggan (eds), *Alexander III (1159-81): The Art of Survival* (Farnham 2012) 301-313.
- Hyland, Preface: W. P. Hyland, *Preface*. In: *Anticimenon: On the Unity of the Faith and the Controversies with the Greeks*. Trans. A. Criste / C. Neel. *Premonstratensian Texts and Studies* 1 (Collegeville 2010) vii-viii.
- Kolbaba, Closing of the Churches: T. M. Kolbaba, *On the Closing of the Churches and the Rebaptism of Latins: Greek Perfidy or Latin Slander?* *BMGS* 29, 2005, 39-51.  
*Byzantine Lists*: T. M. Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists: Errors of the Latins* (Urbana 2000).  
*Byzantine Perceptions*: T. M. Kolbaba, *Byzantine Perceptions of Latin Religious »Errors«: Themes and Changes from 850 to 1350*. In: A. E. Laiou / R. P. Mottahedeh (eds), *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World* (Washington, D.C. 2001) 117-143.
- Lilie, Byzantium: R. J. Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States, 1096-1204*. Trans. J. C. Morris / J. E. Ridings (Oxford 1993).
- Lees, Otherness: J. T. Lees, *Confronting the Otherness of the Greeks: Anselm of Havelberg and the Division Between Greeks and Latins*. *Analecta Praemonstratensia* 68, 1992, 224-240.
- Magdalino, Empire: P. Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143-1180* (Cambridge et al. 1993).
- Mayr-Harting, Odo of Deuil: H. Mayr-Harting, *Odo of Deuil, the Second Crusade and the Monastery of Saint-Denis*. In: M. A. Meyer (ed.), *The Culture of Christendom: Essays in Medieval History in Memory of Denis L. T. Bethel* (London 1993) 225-241.
- von Mosheim, Institutes: J. L. von Mosheim, *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History, Ancient and Modern* 2. Trans. J. Murdock (New Haven 1832).
- Neocleous, Andronikos: S. Neocleous, *Andronikos I Komnenos: Tyrant of Twelfth-Century Europe*, *Medieval History Journal* 22, 2019, 92-130.  
*Attitudes*: S. Neocleous, *Heretics, Schismatics, or Catholics? Latin Attitudes to the Greeks in the Long Twelfth Century*. *Studies and Texts* 216 (Toronto 2019).  
*Opponents*: S. Neocleous, *The Byzantines and Saladin: Opponents of the Third Crusade?* *Crusades* 9, 2010, 87-106.  
*Conspiracies*: S. Neocleous, *Byzantine – Muslim Conspiracies Against the Crusades: History and Myth*. *Journal of Medieval History* 36, 2010, 253-274.  
*Graecorum perfidia*: S. Neocleous, *Graecorum perfidia? The Failure of the Second Crusade and the Attribution of Blame*. *Βυζαντινός Δόμος / Domus Byzantinus* 27, 2019, 147-171.  
*Μισορώμιοι*: S. Neocleous, *Μισορώμιοι? Some Thoughts on the Image of the Latins in Twelfth-Century Byzantine Secular Literature*. *Bizantinistica* 21, 2020, 159-185.  
*Motives*: S. Neocleous, *Financial, Chivalric or Religious? The Motives of the Fourth Crusaders Reconsidered*. *Journal of Medieval History* 38, 2012, 183-206.
- Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church: F. L. Cross (ed.), *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, third revised edition E. A. Livingstone (London 1997).
- Phillips, Fourth Crusade: J. Phillips, *The Fourth Crusade and the Sack of Constantinople* (London 2004).  
*Odo of Deuil's De profectio*: J. Phillips, *Odo of Deuil's De profectio Ludovici VII in Orientem as a Source for the Second Crusade*. In: M. Bull / N. Housley (eds), *The Experience of Crusading 1: Western Approaches* (Cambridge 2003) 80-95.
- Queller/Madden, Arguments: D. E. Queller / T. F. Madden, *Some Further Arguments in Defense of the Venetians on the Fourth Crusade*. *Byzantion* 62, 1992, 433-473.  
*Fourth Crusade*: D. E. Queller / T. F. Madden, *The Fourth Crusade: The Conquest of Constantinople* (Philadelphia 1997).
- Richard, Establishment: J. Richard, *The Establishment of the Latin Church in the Empire of Constantinople (1204-1227)*. In: B. Arbel / B. Hamilton / D. Jacoby (eds), *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean After 1204* (London 1989) 45-62.
- Riley-Smith, Crusades: J. Riley-Smith, *The Crusades, 1095-1198*. In: D. Luscombe / J. Riley-Smith (eds), *The New Cambridge Medieval History* 4,1: c. 1024-c. 1198 (Cambridge 2004) 534-563.
- Rowe, Paschal: J. G. Rowe, *Paschal II, Bohemund of Antioch and the Byzantine Empire*. *Bulletin of John Rylands Library* 49, 1966, 165-202.
- Schabel, Unleavened bread: C. Schabel, *The Quarrel Over Unleavened Bread in Western Theology, 1234-1439*. In: M. Hinterberger / C. Schabel (eds), *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History, 1204-1500* (Leuven 2011) 85-127.
- Silano, Introduction: G. Silano, *Introduction*. In: Peter Lombard, *The Sentences 1: The Mystery of the Trinity*. Trans. G. Silano. *Mediaeval Sources in Translation* 42 (Toronto 2007) vii-l.
- Tyerman, God's War: C. Tyerman, *God's War: A New History of the Crusades* (London 2006).
- Van Engen, Rupert of Deutz: J. H. Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz* (Berkeley 1983).