

COMITÉ FRANÇAIS DES ÉTUDES BYZANTINES

ACTES DU VI^e CONGRÈS
INTERNATIONAL
D'ÉTUDES BYZANTINES

PARIS

27 JUILLET - 2 AOUT 1948

TOME I

Publié avec le concours du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique

AU SECÉTARIAT DU COMITÉ :
ÉCOLE DES HAUTES ÉTUDES, A LA SORBONNE
RUE DES ÉCOLES, PARIS-V^e

—
1950

ADHEMAR OF LE PUY AND THE EASTERN CHURCHES

There are many gaps in our knowledge of the early history of the First Crusade ; and none is more remarkable than that which concerns the relations of the Western Church with the Eastern Churches up to the time of the establishment of the Crusaders in Syria. The chroniclers, both Latin and Greek, who give detailed, if sometimes contradictory, accounts of the political relations of the Eastern Emperor with the Western knights, have nothing to say on religious affairs ; and their silence is all the more unexpected if we take the conventional view that one of Pope Urban II's chief motives in preaching the Crusade was his desire to heal the schism of 1054 and to bring the Eastern Churches under his authority. Modern research has taught us to minimize the importance of the schism of 1054 ; but the silence of the chroniclers on what must seem to us today a matter of the greatest interest needs some further explanation.

It is not my intention to review the whole story of the events of 1054. The works of M. Gay¹, Dr. Michel², Dr. Leib³, M. Jugie⁴, and, recently, Mr. Every⁵ have put it into a truer perspective. But I must briefly recapitulate the sequence of events in the relations of Rome and the East during the eleventh century. The points at issue were, first, doctrine, secondly, usages, thirdly administrative frontiers and, finally, authority. None of these points were new, but they now required a new urgency, owing to the German influence at Rome, which established the insertion of the *filioque* clause in the creed there ; owing to the Norman conquest of Southern Italy, which brought up the question of the ecclesiastical allegiance of the province ; and owing to the reaffirmation of the claims of the Papacy to be the universal authority in the Church.

1. J. Gay, *L'Italie Méridionale et l'Empire Byzantin*, Paris, 1904 : *Les Papes du XI^e siècle et la Chrétienté*, Paris, 1926.

2. A. Michel, *Humbert und Kerullarios*, Paderborn, 1934-40.

3. B. Leib, *Rome, Kiev et Byzance*, Paris, 1924.

4. M. Jugie, *Le Schisme de Michel Cérulaire*, in *Échos d'Orient*, vol. XXXV, 1937 pp. 440-478 : *Le Schisme Byzantin*, Paris, 1941.

5. G. Every, *The Byzantine Patriarchate*, London, 1947.

The first « incident » of the century occurred in 1009, or soon afterwards. It proved to be a decisive incident in the history of the Churches ; but the détails are unfortunately obscure. It seems that Pope Sergius IV in his Systatic Letter to the Patriarchs of the East included the *flioque* in his declaration of faith. The patriarch Sergius II thereupon refused to put his name on the commemorative diptychs of the Patriarchal churches of Constantinople¹. Historians have not clearly understood what this meant in the eyes of the Christians of the time. To the Eastern Christian, who was unaccustomed to the notion that a Patriarch had supreme doctrinal authority over his flock, the absence of the Pope's name from the diptychs was an affair that only concerned the Pope's person. He was not strictly orthodox and therefore he could not be commemorated. It did not affect the orthodoxy of the Western Church in their eyes. But in the West the notion was already well developed that the Pope did possess doctrinal authority, — the notion to be crystallized centuries later as the Doctrine of Papal Infallibility. Anyone that labelled the Pope as unorthodox must therefore include the whole Western church in his condemnation. He must himself be a heretic, or at least a schismatic. The refusal to commemorate the Pope was a far more serious thing in Western eyes than in Eastern eyes and was particularly scandalous at a time when the Papacy was reasserting its claim to universal doctrinal authority.

There is no evidence that the Patriarchs of Jerusalem and Alexandria followed the lead of Sergius of Constantinople ; and such evidence as exists suggests that the Patriarch of Antioch definitely did not do so. Even at Constantinople there seems to have been a feeling that the Patriarch should not have gone so far without consulting the other Patriarchates².

The names of Pope Sergius IV's successors were not restored to the diptychs at Constantinople, presumably because their Systatic Letters were considered unsatisfactory. We have evidence that the *flioque* was inserted into the Creed at Rome from the time of the coronation of Henry II there in 1014³. It was doubtless because of the known desire of the Popes to be again commemorated in the diptychs that the Emperor Basil II and the Patriarch Eustathius of Constantinople considered it opportune

1. For this incident see the discussion in Michel, *op. cit.*, vol. I, pp. 20-40.

2. This, I think, is clear from the report of the Synod of September, 1089 (See below, p. 305).

3. Berno, *Libellus de Officio Missae*, in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. CXLII, coll. 1061-2.

to send an Embassy to Rome in 1024 to Pope John XIX, asking him to accept a formula on respective authority of Rome and Constantinople, which embodied the general Byzantine point of view. This was that « with the consent of the Roman pontiff, the Church of Constantinople might be accounted universal in her sphere, as that of Rome was in the universe ». In return we may assume that John's name would be inserted in the diptychs. John was prepared to acquiesce ; but the Burgundian reforming party in the Western Church forbade him. The Abbot of Saint Benignus at Dijon wrote to him that the power to bind and loose in heaven and on earth belonged solely to the office of Saint Peter and his successors and urging the Pope to show more vigour in his government of the universal Church. The negotiations broke down ; and Constantinople must have become aware of the more intransigent attitude of the Papal court¹. It is possible that Constantinople made a similar demarche in 1043, when the troubles of Pope Benedict IX, himself no reformer, offered a suitable opportunity².

During the next decade political events made it advisable for Byzantium and the Papacy to conclude an alliance against the Norman invaders of southern Italy. But at the same time the reformers who had by now acquired a dominant influence at Rome, were eager to standardize usages throughout the west and to abolish clerical marriage. Amongst the usages which they wished to change were many followed by the Greek churches in the south of Italy and copied in churches as far north as Milan ; while Eastern custom approved of the marriage of the secular clergy. Meanwhile Michael Cerularius, who had become Patriarch of Constantinople in 1043, was equally eager to standardize usages in his Patriarchate. It has been suggested that his original motive was to absorb the churches of the newly occupied Armenian provinces, where divergent customs, such as the use of unleavened bread, were practised³. This desire for standardization not only affected the Latin churches in Byzantine Italy but also those that existed in Constantinople for the benefit of merchants,

1. Radulf Glaber, *Historiarum sui Temporis Libri V*, in Bouquet, *Recueil des Historiens de la France*, vol. X, pp. 44-5. No Greek source mentions this episode, but there seems to be no reason for doubting it.

2. See Hefele, *Histoire des Conciles transc.* Leclercq, vol. II, p. 1091, n. 2. The only evidence for this is provided by one MS. of Cedrenus, which implies that the Pope's name was then removed from the diptychs. It seems to me more probable that another attempt to replace the name broke down.

3. By Every, *op. cit.*, p. 166.

pilgrims and the Varangian Guard. When these latter churches refused to conform, they were closed by the Patriarch. At the same time a number of tracts were issued by the Patriarchal Court denouncing the usages of the Latins.

The dispute was one of usages. Cerularius was not apparently interested in the theological issue. He seems to have been willing to insert the Pope's name into the diptychs in return for reciprocal treatment without raising the question of the *filioque*¹. But the question of usages raised the question of the frontier between Rome and Constantinople in Italy, a question that the Norman invasions made more acute; for the Normans were Latin Christians and would naturally prefer the religious authority of Rome. Negotiations were set on foot on the advice of the governor of Byzantine Italy, the Lombard Argyrus, a Byzantine subject who followed the Latin rite. He had the confidence of the Emperor but Cerularius inevitably distrusted him. The actors on both sides behaved unhelpfully; but the breakdown of the negotiations was due rather to the sequence of events. Pope Leo IX was captured by the Normans in 1053, before any appointment was made of legates to go to Constantinople. When the legates actually arrived there, in January 1054, led by Cardinal Humbert of Silva Candida, the Emperor received them with all honour, but Cerularius questioned their authority. He had reason to doubt whether in fact the Pope had appointed them, and he must have wondered whether a captive Pope could carry out any decisions that were made. In April, 1054, Leo died; and a year elapsed before his successor was elected. The legates thenceforward had no official backing; and no one could tell what policy the next Pope might adopt. The Patriarch's refusal to deal with them can well be understood. In spite of the Emperor's desire for an accord, tempers ran high, till at last the legates departed, leaving in Saint Sophia a bull excommunicating the Patriarch and his advisers but explicitly admitting the Orthodoxy of the Byzantine Church. In return, the Patriarch held a synod condemning the bull as the work of three irresponsible persons, deploring the addition of the *filioque* to the Creed and the perse-

1. Jugie, *Le Schisme Byzantin*, p. 188, interprets the references in Leo IX's letter to Cerularius (Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. CXLIII, coll. 773-4) and in Cerularius's letter to Peter of Antioch (Migne, *Patrologia Graeco-Latina*, vol. CXXX, col. 784) to mean that Cerularius would restore the Pope's name to the diptychs in every church in his diocese if his name was commemorated in one church in Rome. There is surely no reason to doubt his good faith. The points at issue were completely different. See Every, *op. cit.*, p. 167.

cution of married clergy, but making no mention of the Roman Church nor of the other usages in dispute. There was in fact no change at all in the situation, except that some ill-feeling had been aroused.

The Churches of Alexandria and Jerusalem apparently took no part in the episode. The Patriarch of Antioch, Peter III, definitely thought that Cerularius was acting unwisely. His Church had continued to commemorate the Popes' names in its diptychs; and he saw no reason why that practice should cease. He probably knew Cerularius to be an ambitious man and feared for the independence of his see. Also he probably sympathized with the political aims of the Emperor. Moreover, he could not approve of a policy of standardization of usages; for his diocese contained churches where a Syriac liturgy was almost certainly in use, and many of them lay beyond the frontiers of the Empire. He had not the power to enforce conformity there, even had he wished. The events of 1054 do not seem in any way to have altered Antiochene policy¹.

Michael Cerularius was deposed in 1059. On his disappearance the Patriarchate modified its policy, and the Latin churches in Constantinople were reopened. In 1073 Gregory VII became Pope. He was more outspoken than his predecessors in proclaiming the universal claims of the Papacy; and a symptom of this was his failure to send a Systatic Letter on his accession to the Eastern Patriarchs². Meanwhile the Seljuk invasions of Asia Minor had begun. The Emperor Michael VII, who was in desperate need of soldiers, may have found the recruitment of westerners to serve in his army difficult so long as relations with the western church were strained. He decided to send the new Pope an embassy conveying him his cordial congratulations. Gregory was pleased, and at the same time he learnt about the situation in the East. He was worried about the welfare of pilgrims bound for Jerusalem. Historians are apt to forget that the success of the pilgrim-traffic depended enormously upon the state of the Byzantine Empire; for few pilgrims were rich enough to journey to Palestine by sea. In Palestine itself conditions had been difficult for pilgrims for some years before the Seljuk invasions. The decline of Fatimid power there had resulted in the emergence

1. Peter of Antioch's motives must remain conjectural; but his attitude is clear from his correspondence and Cerularius's. See their letters in Migne, *Patrologia Graeco-Latina*, vol. CXX, coll. 756-820.

2. I accept Dvornik's suggestion to this effect, made in his review of Jalland, *The Church and the Papacy*, in *Blackfriars*, February, 1945.

of a number of small lawless emirates, each levying heavy tolls on travellers. But it was not impossible to reach Jerusalem. But now the routes across Asia Minor were practically closed. Owing to his long friendship with Cardinal Humbert Gregory probably also exaggerated the quarrel between the Churches. He therefore promulgated a scheme for sending an army to clear the Turks out of Asia Minor and for accompanying it himself in order to hold a Council at Constantinople where all the Eastern Churches would be reconciled and would admit the supremacy of Rome. We have no evidence to tell us whether Michael VII was informed of this scheme ; but in any case Gregory's troubles in the West obliged him to lay it aside¹.

But Gregory never lost his interest in the East. As late as 1080 we find him writing to an Armenian archbishop². In 1078, when his friend Michael VII was deposed by Nicephorus Botaniates, he not only excommunicated the new Emperor but lent his support to an adventurer who appeared in Italy claiming to be Michael. When Nicephorus in his turn was deposed by Alexius Comnenus, in April 1081, Gregory excommunicated him also. In June, 1081, Alexius wrote to him to restore better relations and to secure his help against Robert Guiscard but met with no success³. It seemed clear at Constantinople that the Pope was supporting the Normans in their invasion of the Empire. Alexius found a more promising ally in Henry IV of Germany. In the meantime, he closed the Latin churches in Constantinople⁴.

This long prologue is necessary to explain the situation when Urban II became Pope in 1088. Relations between the Churches were strained. The Pope's name was not mentioned in the dip-tychs at Constantinople, — nor, probably, since Gregory's failure to send a Systatic Letter, in those of the other Eastern Patriarchates. — The Emperor was excommunicated. The Latin churches at Constantinople were closed. There had been a certain amount of polemical writing on both sides about the rival usages of the Churches. The dispute over the *filioque* clause was smouldering. Byzantium was half-aware and resentful of the reasserted

1. See Gregory's letters in Jaffe, *Monumenta Gregoriana (Bibliotheca Rerum Germanicarum, vol. II, Berlin, 1865) Registra I, 46, 49, II, 37*. The Patriarch Dominicus of Venice visited Constantinople in the summer of 1073 as Papal legate (*ibid.*, I, 18, pp. 31-2).

2. *Ibid.*, VIII, 1, pp. 423-4.

3. Anna Comnena, *Alexiad*, X, 1 (éd. Leib, vol. I, pp. 132-4).

4. Malaterra, *Historia Sicula*, in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. CXLIX, col. 1192.

pretensions of the Papacy. But the main quarrels were personal and administrative. It cannot be said that there was a Schism.

With Pope Urban's accession matters at once improved. Partly this was because the Normans were now more conciliatory, after their failure in Epirus¹; but it must have been chiefly due to Urban's own personality. He soon opened negotiations with the Emperor, and in September, 1089, at the Council of Melfi, where ambassadors from the Emperor were present, he lifted the ban of excommunication against Alexius. In the same month Alexius held a synod at Constantinople, which found that the Pope's name had been omitted from the diptychs « not by any canonical decision but, as it were, from carelessness »² and offered to restore it on the receipt of a Systatic Letter. It added that there was nothing that should cause a difference between the Churches, and recommended that the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem should be consulted. The Patriarch of Antioch as a Byzantine subject was present at the Synod³. The Patriarch Nicolas III at Constantinople wrote to the Pope informing him of these decisions and asking him to send his Systatic Letter within eighteen months and assuring him that the Latin churches in Constantinople were free to follow their own usages⁴. The *filioque* issue was not mentioned. This was not to the liking of the Imperial ambassadors in Italy, Basil, Metropolitan of Trani and Romanus, Archbishop of Rossano, who were alarmed by Papal encroachments into their territory and had been shocked when the Pope claimed, with some historical justification, that his diocese ought really to include Thessalonica. They would have preferred Alexius to support the anti-Pope, Clement III⁵. But Alexius had decided which was the better man, and was realist enough to accept the

1. Count Roger I of Sicily, now the most powerful of the Norman princes, was anxious to placate the Greeks in his dominions and was moreover on cool terms with his nephew Bohemond, the heir of Guiscard's policy. The Pope was at this time in close co-operation with him.

2. This must mean that the Patriarch Sergius II had acted in 1009, without referring the matter to a synod or consulting the other Patriarchs. I cannot accept Every's suggestion that the anti-Pope Honorius II had been commemorated (*op. cit.*, pp. 175-6). Constantine X's recognition of Honorius II rests on dubious evidence, (see Dölger, *Corpus der Griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters: Regesten der Kaiserurkunden*, vol. II, pp. 14-5). In any case, it is clear that commemoration in the diptychs depended on the receipt of a Systatic Letter.

3. The report of the synod is given in Holtzmann, *Unionsverhandlungen zwischen Kaiser Alexios I und Papst Urban II im Jahre 1089*, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, vol. 28, pp. 60-2.

4. *Ibid.*, pp. 62-4.

5. *Ibid.*, pp. 64-7.

loss of Byzantine Italy. Nor can Clement have pleased his Greek friends when a few months later he held a council at Rome which condemned clerical marriage¹.

Urban did not in fact ever send a Systatic Letter, perhaps because he did not wish to raise the theological issue. But good relations were restored. The Byzantine point of view was well illustrated about now by Theophylact, Archbishop of Bulgaria, who published a wise and tolerant treatise in which he begged his readers not to exaggerate the importance of uniformity in usages and, while he condemned the addition of the *filioque* to the Creed, he explained that the poverty of the Latin language in theological terms was apt to cause misunderstanding. He did not take seriously the Papal claims of supreme authority. He clearly saw no reason why a schism should develop². Nevertheless polemical writing on usages continued, though it was usually moderate in tone. Amongst the writers was the Patriarch Symeon II of Jerusalem, whose treatise against the use of unleavened bread was firm but in no way acrimonious³.

Imperial ambassadors visited the Pope in 1090 and again in 1095 when he was holding a Council at Piacenza. Their presence was due to the desire of Alexius to recruit soldiers in the West; and they were allowed by the Pope to address a recruiting speech to the assembly. In it they emphasized the danger provided by the Turkish menace to all Christendom so as to rouse western sympathies, though in fact the troops were needed rather more on the Balkan frontiers of the Empire. Historians used to interpret this demarche as a Byzantine request for a Crusade, but it was no more than an appeal for auxiliaries to serve in the Byzantine army. Nor did the Pope interpret it otherwise⁴.

1. *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, éd. Jaffé and re-ed. Loewenfeld, vol. I, p. 652.

2. The treatise is published in Migne, *Patrologia Graeco-Latina*, vol. CXXXVI, coll. 222-50.

3. Published by B. Leib, *Deux Inédits Byzantins sur les Azymes*, Pontificio Istituto Orientale, Rome, 1922. Leib doubted Symeon's authorship, as the treatise seems to answer one written by Bruno of Segni in about 1108, after Symeon's death. But Michel (*Amalfi und Jerusalem in griechische Kirchengeschichte, Orientalia Christiana*, vol. 89) has shown that the treatise answers the letter of a certain Laycus, which Bruno plagiarized. Symeon was in Constantinople for the Council of Chalcedon in 1086, but had left by 1089. The more acrimonious treatise on the same theme by John IV of Antioch may possibly date from this time, though Leib (*op. cit.*, p. 59-60) more convincingly dates it after 1101, probably about 1112.

4. See Chalandon, *Règne d'Alexis I^{er} Comnène*, pp. 155-6, also D. C. Munro in *American Historical Review*, vol. 27, pp. 731-3. The letter of Alexius to Robert of Flanders was in its original form a similar request for mercenaries. See Chalandon, *op. cit.*, pp. 325-35.

But later in the year Urban moved to France, where he stayed at Cluny and other monasteries of the order. The Cluniacs were deeply concerned in the pilgrim traffic, and their recent news was not encouraging. The Emir Ortok of Jerusalem had died in 1094. He was a capable ruler and had not oppressed the Christians. But his sons' rule was disorderly; and the Christians suffered. The Patriarch himself was obliged to retire to Cyprus. For pilgrimages now to continue it was necessary not only to clear the routes across Asia Minor but to ensure an orderly government in Syria and Palestine.

At Clermont, in November, 1095, Urban preached the Crusade. We cannot assess his motives. Undoubtedly he wished to implement the Truce of God by diverting the bellicose energy of Western knights into a holier channel. Undoubtedly he wished to enable the pilgrimage to Jerusalem to be resumed. Undoubtedly, too, he was moved by the plight of the Christians on the East. That he expected to please Alexius and obtain his full cooperation is shown by his choice of Constantinople as the Crusaders' meeting-place. But, unlike Gregory VII, he showed no intention of combining military operations with a Council that would establish his supremacy over the Eastern Churches; nor, as we shall see, is there any reason to suppose that he intended to found a territorial patrimony for Saint Peter in the Holy Land. He wished, rather, to restore to the local Churches all their rights and privileges in any city reconquered for Christendom¹. But the Roman Church was to direct the Crusade through a Papal legate.

As legate Urban appointed his friend Adhemar de Monteil, Bishop of Le Puy. Raymond of Saint-Gilles, Count of Toulouse, claimed to be military commander², but was never in fact able to assert any authority over other Crusader leaders. He remained in the closest touch with Adhemar, with whom he set out for the East. Of Adhemar we know very little, but we must assume that he understood Urban's intentions and enjoyed his complete confidence. He already had some experience of the East, having made the pilgrimage to Jerusalem about ten yaers before³. He was a good preacher and a man whom all could respect; and

1. See Chalandon, *Histoire de la Première Croisade*, p. 45.

2. According to Baudri (*Historiens des Croisades, Historiens Occidentaux* vol. IV, p. 16). Raymond saw himself as playing Moses to Adhemar's Aaron. But Urban, as in his letter to the people of Flanders (Hagenmayer, *Die Kreuzzugsbriefe*, p. 136), considered Adhemar as supreme leader.

3. *Chronicon Sancti Theofredi*, in Chevalier, *Cartulaire de Saint-Chaffre du Monastier*, éd. Paris, 1881, pp. 13-4.

events showed him to be persuasive and tactful. His actions must be taken as our key to Urban's policy.

Unfortunately, an early accident removed Adhemar's influence when it was most needed. Straying from the road in Macedonia he was wounded by the Petcheneg auxiliaries of the Emperor and was obliged remain some time in Thessalonica to recover. Hitherto relations between Raymond's troops and the Byzantines had been good, but without Adhemar's restraining influence the former got out of hand and fighting ensued. Raymond arrived at Constantinople furiously resentful; but his refusal to swear allegiance to the Emperor may not have been entirely due to anger and pride. Partly he wished to differentiate himself from the other Crusaders; and partly he was at a loss, without Adhemar's advice, to know whether the oath was consonant with his obligations to the Pope. The matter was settled by a compromise before Adhemar arrived; but the reconciliation between Alexius and Raymond, which seems to have followed, was probably due to Adhemar's tact¹. Of Adhemar's own activities in Constantinople we know nothing. Presumably he was in contact with Greek hierarchy; and presumably there were no awkward quarrels. Had there been controversy, Anna Comnena, who loved such things, could not have failed to mention it. As it was, she regarded the Crusaders as complete fellow-Christians. She has hard words to say of the Papacy but mentions no Pope by name; and her strictures were in fact directed against Gregory VII and, later, Paschal II, both opponents of her father. She never attacks Urban². The Crusaders on their side still regarded the Greeks as fellow-Christians; and though they might destroy heretic towns theoretically shocked at the idea of harming an Orthodox they were community³.

It was at Antioch that Adhemar's policy became clear. He played a prominent part throughout the Crusaders' sojourn there, composing differences between the leaders, exhorting the troops and showing a wise mixture of caution and realism over the

1. The episode of Raymond and the oath was perhaps exaggerated by the western chroniclers. Raymond d'Aquilers, *Historiens Occidentaux*, vol. III, pp. 237-8: *Gesta Francorum*, éd. Bréhier, p. 32. Anna Comnena says that her father and Raymond were on good terms at once, (*Alexiad*, XI, 9, éd. Leib, vol. II, pp. 234-5); while Albert of Aix's informant, whoever he may have been, reported that Raymond swore allegiance to the Emperor, with out reservation (Albert of Aix, *Historiens Occidentaux*, vol. IV, p. 314.

2. See Buckler, *Anna Comnena*, pp. 307-14.

3. *Gesta Francorum*, éd. Bréhier, pp. 20-22.

episode of the Sacred Lance. But it was in Church affairs that his statesmanship was most remarkable. The Patriarch John IV had returned to Antioch some years previously and was there during the Frankish siege, when the Turks persecuted him and even hung him in a basket over the walls, while his cathedral had been desecrated. On the capture of the city the Franks, under Adhemar's direction, cleansed the cathedral and reinstated the Patriarch¹. John of Oxia was a Greek. Even if he had not yet written his sharp treatise against unleavened bread he was notoriously devoted to Greek usages². Yet the Crusaders had no hesitation in placing him over the Greek and Latin clergy serving in the area; and when Raymond of Toulouse appointed a Latin bishop for a town that he captured from the Saracens, it was the Patriarch John who consecrated him³. It is clear that Adhemar's policy was not to upset the religious *statu quo* in the East.

His negotiations with the Patriarch of Jérusalem show this with equal clarity. He had established contact with Cyprus, where the Patriarch was living. Symeon was eager to co-operate with the Crusaders and sent them gifts, principally of food, which was very welcome. In October, 1097, a letter was sent to the faithful in the west in the name of the Patriarch Symeon and of the Bishop of Le Puy from the camp before Antioch⁴. The Patriarch was mentioned first in the letter, but Adhemar as Papal legate was admittedly the principal author⁵. The letter reported progress and appealed for more recruits. In January, 1098, another letter was sent from Antioch, this time in the name of the Patriarch Symeon and all the bishops, Greek and Latin, now in the East, again asking for more aid⁶. Symeon may have sent a rough draft on the letter from Cyprus but in the form in which it was sent it must have been the work of Adhemar. In it the Patriarch speaks in a tone of high authority. He is « apostolicus »; he threatens with excommunication westerners

1. Albert of Aix, *Historiens Occidentaux*, vol. IV, p. 435.

2. See above, p. 306, n. 3. In his treatise he speaks of his efforts on behalf of Greek usages against the « Italians ».

3. *Gesta Francorum*, éd. Bréhier, pp. 167-9, says that the new bishop was taken to Antioch to be consecrated. This was in November, 1098, after the death of Adhemar.

4. Hagenmayer, *Die Kreuzzugsbriefe*, pp. 141-2.

5. « S(imeon) patriarcha Hierosolymitanus et H(ademarus) de Podio S. Mariae episcopus et ille præcipue qui ab Urbano papa suscepit curam Christiani exercitus... », *ibid.*, p. 141.

6. *Ibid.*, pp. 146-9.

who fail to carry out their vow to proceed with the Crusade. It is the language of a proud and independent hierarch, not of a servant of the Papacy. The Crusaders as a whole followed Adhemar's lead. They considered both John and Symeon as legitimate Patriarchs and eulogized their characters¹. Yet Symeon, whose position Adhemar thus exalts, had already expressed himself openly against Latin usages.

The only possible deduction is, I think, that Urban, having established good relations with the Orthodox churches of the East, was not going to upset them by any drastic declaration of his claims. He envisaged Latin churches in the East operating freely under the legitimate local Patriarchs, just as the Latin churches now did at Constantinople, but on a larger scale. He was not worried by divergence in usages; he allowed the Greek churches in Italy when they submitted to him at Bari in 1098 to retain all their rites². He trusted Adhemar to see to it that matters evolved harmoniously. Perhaps he dreamed that later, when all would be going well, a general Council would admit his claim of supremacy. But he certainly was not going to rush into controversy. Unfortunately we do not know what civil government he expected to be set up in Syria and Palestine nor, if indeed he envisaged Crusader principalities³. I believe that there too Adhemar was to be left with a free hand to act as he thought best.

But fate conspired against the peace of Christendom. On August 1st, 1098, Adhemar died at Antioch, deeply mourned by everyone. His death left the Crusaders without a spiritual leader and without the one man that understood the intentions of the Pope. There was no one to calm the quarrels between the leaders nor to unify their policy. Urban himself died next year, a few days after the Crusaders had entered Jerusalem. A few weeks previously the Patriarch Symeon had died in Cyprus⁴.

At Bari Urban had unwisely appointed as Adhemar's successor the Archbishop of Pisa, Daimbert, who despite a distinguished career was both ambitious and corrupt and soon showed himself

1. Albert of Aix calls John « vir Christianissimus » and Symeon « fidelis servus Christi. » (*Historiens Occidentaux*, vol. IV, pp. 433, 489.) William of Tyre calls John « verus confessor » (*ibid.*, vol. I, p. 274).

2. But the Greeks had to accept the *flitioque*. (*Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, vol. I, p. 694.) The Byzantine court does not seem to have protested.

3. But he must have known that Raymond of Saint-Gilles, for one, intended to remain in the East.

4. All the chroniclers report Adhemar's death. Symeon's is given by Albert of Aix (p. 489.)

hostile to the Eastern Christians. Urban himself was succeeded by a less wise man, Paschal II. As Patriarch of Jerusalem the Crusaders, without referring to Rome, appointed a Latin, the intriguer Arnoul de Rohes, whom the Eastern Christians distrusted. But they were worse off when he was replaced by Daimbert. The real villain of the story is Bohemond of Taranto, whose past life and whose ambitions for Antioch made him a fierce enemy of the Greeks, and who strongly influenced Daimbert¹. I cannot go into the details of the breakdown of Urban's hopes, but certain landmarks should be noted. In Palestine itself, though relations almost at once deteriorated, the Orthodox Eastern clergy accepted the Latin Patriarchs right up till the capture of Jerusalem by Saladin. But when the Latin Patriarch Heraclius fled, and died soon after the fall of the city, the Byzantine government persuaded Saladin to allow the election of a Greek as Patriarch in Jerusalem; while a Latin successor to Heraclius was appointed in Tyre. The schism in the Church of Jerusalem dates therefore from soon after 1187. In Antioch the open rupture came sooner. Bohemond distrusted John IV as a Greek and in 1100 obliged him to leave the city. Frankish historians, anxious to prove the legitimacy of his Latin successors, say that his retirement was voluntary. But such an abdication would have been doubtfully canonical; and John clearly regarded himself as Patriarch after that date². When he resigned, a Greek successor was appointed in Constantinople. Meanwhile a Latin line had been established in Antioch. The schism there therefore dates from 1100. The subsequent attempts by the Byzantine emperors, sometimes successful, embittered the situation. In Constantinople there was no official schism till 1204, when the Frankish conquerors appointed a Latin Patriarch, ignoring the legitimate Patriarch, John Camaterus. Till that time there had been no definite breach between Pope and Patriarch, though relations had been irreparably damaged by Paschal's official support of Bohemond in his attack on the Empire in 1107 and by his insistence, echoed by his successors, on the universal authority of the Papacy, and finally ruined by the massacre of the Latins in Constantinople

1. I do not take seriously Bohemond's reference to heretic Greeks in his letter of September, 1098, to the Pope (Hagenmayer, *op. cit.*, p. 164). This probably refers to Greek-speaking Paulicians.

2. He calls himself Patriarch in his treatise on the azymites, probably written, as we have seen above, p. 306, n. 3, in 1112. William of Tyre's account (*Historiens Occidentaux*, vol. I, p. 274), shows a great anxiety to make the episode appear legitimately correct.

in 1182. Whatever the official position might be, Eastern and Western Christians learnt in the course of the twelfth century to regard each other as schismatic.

But that story still, I think, needs writing. My intention here has been to emphasize the calm and tolerant statesmanship that Urban and his legate Adhemar showed in the delicate question of the Eastern Churches, a statesmanship which, had it been continued by their successors, might have averted or at least modified the greatest tragedy of medieval Christendom.

Steven RUNCIMAN.
