

RETHINKING THE SCHISM OF 1054: AUTHORITY, HERESY, AND THE LATIN RITE

BY BRETT WHALEN

In the year 1053, at the request of the Byzantine patriarch, Michael Kerullarios (1043–58), Archbishop Leo of Ochrid denounced the “priesthood of the Franks and the reverend pope” for observing Jewish rites through their celebration of the Eucharist with azymes, the same kind of unleavened bread used for Passover. Leo made these accusations in a letter addressed to John, archbishop of Trani in southern Italy, a region of coexisting Latin and Greek religious traditions that had been destabilized by the recent invasion of the Normans.¹ The epistle was subsequently passed along to papal confidante Humbert of Silva Candida, who translated it into Latin and presented it to Pope Leo IX (1048–54). Around that same time, the two churchmen also heard news that the Greek patriarch had anathematized all those observing the Latin rite in Constantinople. A flurry of inconclusive correspondence ensued between the pope, the patriarch, and the Byzantine ruler, Constantine IX Monomachos (1042–55). In response to this persistent crisis, Pope Leo dispatched a legation to Constantinople that included Humbert, Frederick of Lorraine, and Peter of Amalfi. On 16 July 1054, after a series of acrimonious debates, the legates deposited a bull of excommunication against Kerullarios and his supporters on the high altar at Hagia Sophia. The patriarch responded in kind by excommunicating Humbert and his followers.²

For generations of modern scholars, these events were the “thunderbolt” that caused the formal and lasting division of the Latin and Greek churches.³ Although this evaluation of the eleventh-century confrontation

¹ Both the Greek version and Latin translation of this letter are published in Cornelius Will, ed., *Acta et scripta quae de controversiis ecclesiae Graecae et Latinae saeculo undecimo composita extant* (Leipzig, 1861), 56–64. On the Norman invasion of southern Italy and its impact on relations between the Latin and Greek churches, see Richard Mayne, “East and West in 1054,” *Cambridge Historical Journal* 11 (1954): 133–48, and Peter Herde, “Das Papsttum und die griechische Kirche in Süditalien vom 11. bis zum 13. Jahrhundert,” *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 26 (1970): 1–46. This article, which first took shape as part of my Stanford University dissertation, owes a great deal to the insights and assistance of Philippe Buc, Stanford University, Brad Gregory, University of Notre Dame, and Jehangir Malegam, George Washington University.

² For this exchange of letters and the bull of excommunication, see Will, *Acta et scripta*, 65–92, 153–54.

³ Edward Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. David Womersley, 3 vols. (London, 1994), 2:659. There is a rich and sometimes confessional tradition of scholarship on the schism of 1054. Among the more important titles, see the analysis of Louis

between Rome and Constantinople has been greatly tempered and qualified over the last fifty years, the events of 1054 still assume a place of prominence in the master narrative of Christendom's division. "It was in 1054," noted Richard Southern about the strained relations between the churches, "that all the elements of disunity which had come to light over the centuries were first concentrated into a single event."⁴ Even Yves Congar, who persuasively argued that the "estrangement" of the two Christian peoples was the product of a slow cultural, political, and religious alienation rather than the result of a single event, still appraised the date of 1054 as "a fatal one, since it seems to mark one of the greatest misfortunes that have ever befallen Christianity."⁵ To the present day, historians of medieval Europe commonly invoke the schism of 1054 as a symbol of the lasting divergence between the Catholic and Orthodox churches. This development, in turn, contributed to the "birth" or "making" of a distinctly Latin or Western Christian Europe, one which had turned its back on the Eastern empire and the Greek church.⁶

In this present article, it is not my intention to revisit the origins and causes of the schism between the Latin and Greek churches, or to determine precisely where 1054 fits into the long-term trajectory of their division. Instead, I would like to focus on a subject that has been largely lost in the

Bréhier, *Le schisme oriental du XI^e siècle* (New York, 1899); Anton Michel, *Humbert und Kerullarios*, 2 vols. (Paderborn, 1924–30); Steven Runciman, *The Eastern Schism: A Study of the Papacy and the Eastern Churches during the XI and XII Centuries* (Oxford, 1955), 28–54; George Every, *The Byzantine Patriarchate, 451–1204* (1947; repr., London, 1962), 144–58; Francis Dvornik, *Byzantium and the Roman Primacy* (New York, 1964), 124–48; George Every, *Misunderstandings between East and West*, *Ecumenical Studies in History* 4 (Richmond, 1966), 9–25; and Henry Chadwick, *East and West: The Making of a Rift in the Church from Apostolic Times until the Council of Florence* (Oxford, 2003). For the most recent monograph devoted to the events of 1054, see Axel Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit: Das sogenannte Morgenländische Schisma von 1054* (Böhlau, 2002). Bayer, *ibid.*, 1–7, surveys the historiography of the topic.

⁴ Richard Southern, *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages* (Harmondsworth, 1970), 67–68.

⁵ Yves Congar, *After Nine Hundred Years: The Background of the Schism between the Eastern and Western Churches*, trans. Paul Mailleux (1954; repr., New York, 1959), 73.

⁶ See Christopher Dawson, *The Making of Europe: An Introduction to the History of European Unity* (1932; repr., New York, 1952), 183; *idem*, *The Formation of Christendom* (New York, 1967), 261; Bronislaw Geremek, *The Common Roots of Europe*, trans. Jan Aleksandrowicz et al. (Cambridge, 1996), 89; William Chester Jordan, "Europe' in the Middle Ages," in *The Idea of Europe from Antiquity to the European Union*, ed. Anthony Pagden (Cambridge, 2002), 75; Michael Mitterauer, *Warum Europa? Mittelalterliche Grundlagen eines Sonderwegs* (Munich, 2003), 152–53; and the entry for the year 1054 in the timeline in Jacques le Goff, *L'Europe est-elle née au Moyen Age?* (Paris, 2003), 272: "Schisme définitif entre l'Église romaine latine et l'Église grecque orthodoxe."

historiography of the schism — why the dispute over the use of unleavened bread for the Eucharist became such a charged issue for the followers of the Roman church in the mid-eleventh century. When modern historians of medieval Europe mention the controversy at all, they have tended to view the dispute over the Latin rite as camouflage for the rough-and-tumble world of ecclesiastical politics. In these terms, the Byzantine patriarch used the difference between the Greek and Latin rites as a wedge-issue, a means of garnering support for the ambitious assertion of his rights and prerogatives at the expense of the Roman papacy and its Latin followers.⁷ In the eucharistic squabble, according to one Catholic appraisal, Kerullarios had found “an effective battle cry, well calculated to infuse into the breasts of his unreasoning partisans that hatred and defiance of the Latins which filled his own breast.”⁸ Secular historians, approaching the problem from a less confessional stance, have expressed their astonishment that Pope Leo allowed a “secondary question of ritual” to spoil his attempts at a political alliance with Constantinople against the Norman invaders of southern Italy.⁹ Such perspectives on the azymes controversy flow from a common consensus that the schism of 1054 was really “not ecclesiological or religious in nature, but rather the result of political rivalries.”¹⁰

⁷ In addition to the analysis of Bréhier, *Le schisme oriental*, 147–65, see Dawson, *Formation of Christendom*, 261; Every, *Misunderstandings*, 30–31; and Harry Magoulias, *Byzantine Christianity: Emperor, Church and the West* (Chicago, 1970), 112–13. U.-R. Blumenthal (*The Investiture Controversy: Church and Monarchy from the Ninth to the Twelfth Century*, 2nd ed. [Philadelphia, 1992], 64–105), never mentions the azymes controversy in her discussion of 1054. See also Anton Michel, “Schisma und Kaiserhof im Jahre 1054: Michael Psellos,” in (*1054–1954*) *L'Église et les églises: neuf siècles de douloureuse séparation entre l'Orient et l'Occident* (Paris, 1954), 377, who argues that Kerullarios chose the Eucharistic difference because he had a “sharp eye” for a visible point of liturgical difference and lacked the theological sophistication of his predecessor in dissent, the ninth-century Byzantine patriarch, Photios (of Photian schism fame).

⁸ This quotation is from the first (and superseded) edition of *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York, 1907), 12:43–46.

⁹ Gerd Tellenbach, *The Church in Western Europe from the Tenth to the Early Twelfth Century*, trans. Timothy Reuter (Cambridge, 1993), 191–92.

¹⁰ Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, 209: “Das Morgenländische Schisma war in erster Linie nicht ekklesiologischer oder religiöser Natur, sondern die Auswirkung politischer Rivalitäten.” Typical of this disregard for the Eucharistic dispute, Bayer (*ibid.*, 214–21) deals with the azymes controversy in a brief appendix to his main work. By contrast, scholars of Byzantine history taken the theological implications of the azymes controversy more seriously. See Mahlon H. Smith III, *And Taking Bread: Cerularius and the Azymes Controversy of 1054* (Paris, 1978); and John Erickson, “Leavened and Unleavened: Some Theological Implications of the Schism of 1054,” *Saint Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 14 (1970): 155–76. As noted by Erickson (*ibid.*, 156), the debates about whether the lasting schism started in the mid-eleventh century or not “share at least one characteristic: a tendency to neglect or underestimate the religious questions raised in 1054.” In one of the

Such dismissive appraisals of the controversy over azymes miss the opportunity to explore notions of authority, heresy, and religious conformity during a pivotal period in the historical development of the Roman church. As is well known, the middle of the eleventh century marked the early stages of the so-called ecclesiastical reform movement in Western Europe. Scholars use the label of “reform” as shorthand for a sweeping effort by the papacy and its supporters to separate the laity from the clergy, to purify the priesthood of perceived pollution, and to establish firmly the primacy of Rome over the offices, doctrine, and sacraments of the universal Church.¹¹ The most famous episode associated with the development of the reform movement is the Investiture Conflict, a clash that started between Pope Gregory VII (1073–85) and Emperor Henry IV (1084–1105) over the investment of bishops with the symbols of their office. The implications of reform, however, preceded and transcended this limited struggle over investiture. The religious and social transformations called for by the reformers, sometimes described as a veritable revolution in the medieval world order, had a critical impact on the development of “Latin Christendom,” envisioned as a coherent community of believers tied together by its common rite, common sacred language, and common sense of obedience to Rome.¹² As observed by Collin Morris, the concept of Christendom as formulated during the eleventh-century reform was crucial for the development in Europe of an “inter-

more intriguing analyses of the Eucharistic dispute from the Byzantine side, Tia Kolbaba has suggested that the confrontation with the Latins over azymes reveals less about Greek attitudes toward the Latins themselves, and more about the formation of orthodox identity within the Byzantine church, defined against Latins, Jews, and also Armenians, all of whom sacrificed with unleavened bread. See Tia Kolbaba, “Byzantine Perceptions of Latin Religious ‘Errors’: Themes and Changes from 850 to 1300,” in *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, ed. Angeliki Laiou and Roy Parviz Mottahedeh (Washington, DC, 2001), 117–43; and Tia Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists: Errors of the Latins* (Chicago, 2000).

¹¹ On the Investiture Controversy, along with Tellenbach, *The Church in Western Europe*; and Blumenthal, *The Investiture Controversy*; see Augustin Fliche, *La réforme Grégorienne*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1924); Gerd Tellenbach, *Libertas: Kirche und Weltordnung im Zeitalter des Investiturstreites* (Leipzig, 1936), available in partial English translation as *Church, State and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Contest*, trans. R. F. Bennett (1948; repr., Toronto, 1991); Walter Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages* (1955; repr., London, 1965), 262–309; Beryl Smalley, *The Becket Conflict and the Schools: A Study of Intellectuals in Politics* (Totowa, NJ, 1973); and Ian Robinson, *Authority and Resistance in the Investiture Contest* (Manchester, 1978).

¹² See John Van Engen, “Faith as a Concept of Order,” in *Belief in History: Innovative Approaches to European and American Religion*, ed. Thomas Kselman (Notre Dame, 1991), 19–67; and Robert Bartlett, *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization and Cultural Change, 950–1350* (Princeton, 1993). Bartlett (*ibid.*, 5), defines Latin Christendom as “that area of Christendom that recognized papal authority and celebrated the Latin liturgy.”

national culture which increasingly bound together the divers, often hostile, peoples into one Christian people or *populus Christianus*.¹³

This sense of inclusion for some involved exclusion for others. Morris himself rightly recognizes this divisive aspect of the eleventh-century reform, adding that the “new international culture” of the era “had a fragmenting as well as unifying impact, for it stamped new divisions upon society, between clergy and laity, *Latins and Greeks*, and papacy and empire.”¹⁴ The Latin response to the controversy over azymes allows us to see how some of those new divisions were stamped upon the Latin and Greek communities. The Western defense of the Latin rite was embedded in a broader transformation of clerical cultural and intellectual life, through which the supporters of reform sought to defend the catholic Christian community and the authority of the Roman papacy over it. According to these contemporaries, the pope was in a unique position to define the sacraments of the Christian faith and to safeguard them against those who threatened to disparage, destroy, or pollute their efficacy (including, notably, Jews and heretics). By accusing Rome and its Latin followers of religious error, the Greek patriarch and his partisans had stepped over the line of orthodoxy at the same moment it was being redrawn and fortified by the advocates of a new order in Christendom. From the perspective of the papacy and its supporters, notions of papal primacy, orthodox doctrine, and the proper form of the Christian rite mutually reinforced each other. Power, belief, and discipline were interwoven threads — tug on one, and there was a danger that the entire tapestry might unravel.

Although the origins and development of the ecclesiastical reform movement are debated, there is general agreement that the papacy of Leo IX brought the impulse for reform into the heart of the Roman church.¹⁵ Leo’s denunciations of simony and Nicolaitism, as well as his willingness to act against those who were judged guilty of such offenses, quickly made their

¹³ Collin Morris, *The Papal Monarchy: The Western Church from 1050–1250* (Oxford, 1989), 3. In addition to Morris, see Gerd Tellenbach, “Die Bedeutung des Reformpapsttums für die Einigung des Abendlandes,” *Studi Gregoriani* 2 (1947): 125–49.

¹⁴ Morris, *Papal Monarchy*, 4 (emphasis mine). For comments about the Latin “denigration” of non-Latin Christian cultural and intellectual traditions (including those of the Greek church) starting during the second half of the eleventh century, see R. I. Moore, *The First European Revolution, c. 970–1215* (Oxford, 2001), 146.

¹⁵ In addition to Tellenbach, *The Church in Western Europe*, 187–92; and Blumenthal, *Investiture Controversy*, 64; see R. I. Moore, “Family, Community and Cult on the Eve of the Gregorian Reform,” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th series, 30 (1980): 49–69. See also Tellenbach, *The Church in Western Europe*, 157–58, who provides some important caveats about casual usage of expressions such as “reform movement” and “reform program,” which make the period’s diffuse agitation for social and ecclesiastical change sound too monolithic.

mark among his contemporaries. Perhaps even more than Pope Leo, the name of his advisor, Humbert of Silva Candida, is firmly linked to the early stages of the reform program and its uncompromising assertion of Roman papal authority, based on the church of Rome's foundation by Saint Peter, whom Christ had commissioned to build his Church (Mt. 16:18).¹⁶ This theory of papal primacy, of course, was nothing new at the time. During the middle of the eleventh century, however, Leo, Humbert, and a circle of like-minded churchmen began to make Rome's claims to apostolic primacy their mantra, repackaging scriptural, conciliar, and patristic traditions that stressed both the unity of the Church and the universal authority of the Roman papacy over it.¹⁷ It is no stretch of the imagination to see how this emphasis on the apostolic primacy of the papacy, a cornerstone of the program to liberate the church from lay power and pollution, generated a heightened level of institutional and juridical antagonism between Rome and Constantinople. Again, this tension between the two sees was nothing new in the eleventh century, but it assumed a new urgency.

Scholars of the schism commonly point to this renewed and intensified pressure over papal primacy as a primary cause of Rome's falling out with Constantinople in 1054.¹⁸ The principles of the reform program, however,

¹⁶ See Blumenthal, *Investiture Controversy*, 70–79; and Walter Ullmann, “Cardinal Humbert and the Romana Ecclesia,” *Studi Gregoriani* 4 (1952): 111–27.

¹⁷ Collections of canon law that assembled long-standing claims of Roman primacy were an important vehicle for the reformers' platform. For example, see the *Diversorum patrum sententiae sive Collectio in LXXIV titulos digesta*, ed. John Gilchrist, *Monumenta iuris canonici* series B: corpus collectionum 1 (Vatican City, 1973), 21, 32. Although scholars no longer ascribe its authorship to Cardinal Humbert, John Gilchrist convincingly insists that its sentiments reflect the environment of the early reform period in the 1050s. See John Gilchrist, “Canon Law Aspects of the Eleventh-Century Gregorian Reform Programme,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 12 (1961): 21–38. For additional reform-era statements of universal Roman authority, see the two textual fragments in Percy Schramm, ed., *De sancta Romana ecclesia*, in *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1929), 2:120–36; along with the analysis by J. Joseph Ryan, “Cardinal Humbert *De s. Romana ecclesia*: Relics of Roman-Byzantine Relations,” *Medieval Studies* 20 (1958): 205–38.

¹⁸ In third canon of the Council of Constantinople (381), Constantinople was awarded a place in the pentarchy (the five major sees of the ancient world, also including Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem) that was second only to Rome due to its status as the new imperial capital. See the *Conciliorum oecumenicorum decreta*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo et al., 3rd ed. (Bologna, 1973), 32. This change in status, rejected by Rome, was repeated in the twenty-eighth canon of the Council of Chalcedon in 451 (*Conciliorum oecumenicorum decreta*, ed. Alberigo, 99–100). According to chronicler Ralph Glaber, this source of contention between Rome and Constantinople had resurfaced as recently as 1024, when the Greek patriarch, Eustathius, sought papal recognition of Constantinople's universal authority through generous “gifts” to the apostolic see. See Ralph Glaber, *Historiarum libri quinque* (*The Five Books of the Histories*), ed. and trans. John France (Oxford, 1989), 172–73. For some general observations about this dispute over the ecclesiastical hierarchy, see

went beyond a zealous restatement of papal jurisdiction over other churches, including the capital of the Byzantine Empire. Turning for support to the Bible and the examples of the past, infusing their exegesis with a new vitality and polemical purpose, the advocates of reform sought to clarify the boundaries around the orthodox Christian community by vociferously identifying its enemies. This process involved a sharp emphasis on the unique place of the Roman church in ecclesiastical history as a defender of orthodoxy and guardian of proper religious practice. In this environment, defining and defending the nature of catholic sacraments were critical for the formulation of Christendom as a community of right-believing and right-practicing Christians with the church of Rome at its head.¹⁹ In particular, the campaign against simony generated a considerable problem for the reformers: were sacraments administered by simoniacal priests valid? Modern historians point to Cardinal Humbert and his contemporary Peter Damian as representing two poles of opinion about this question. Peter, another leading intellectual and advocate for the papal vision of reform, insisted that an individual's state of grace did not matter in the administration or reception of the sacraments.²⁰ Humbert, by contrast, emphatically argued that the sacraments administered by simoniacal clerics were an empty, outward sign that lacked the sanctification of the Holy Spirit.²¹

Within this field of dispute, the supporters of Rome agreed upon one thing — the ultimate authority possessed by the see of Saint Peter to settle such questions of orthodoxy. Outside the Roman church lay heresy and other forms of heterodoxy and non-belief. Heretics such as simoniacal priests, Humbert once declared, were “worse than pagans and Jews.”²² He viewed the Holy Spirit as the “glue” that bound together the mystical “body of Christ,” that is, the Church itself, the community of catholic believers.²³

John Meyendorff, “Rome and Constantinople,” in *Rome, Constantinople, Moscow: Historical and Theological Studies* (Crestwood, NY, 1996), 7–26.

¹⁹ The anonymous reform-era *Epistola de sacramentis haeticorum*, ed. Ernst Sackur, MGH, *Libelli de lite imperatorum et pontificum saeculis XI. et XII. conscripti* 3 (Hannover, 1897), 14, lists a five-fold hierarchy of enemies ranged against the Church: 1) pagans, 2) heretics, 3) schismatics, 4) Jews, and 5) “carnal” Christians.

²⁰ Peter Damian, *Liber gratissimus*, ed. Louis de Heinemann, MGH, *Libelli de lite imperatorum et pontificum saeculis XI. et XII. conscripti* 1 (Hannover, 1891), 33–34.

²¹ Humbert of Silva Candida, *Libri III adversus simoniacos*, ed. Friedrich Thaner, MGH, *Libelli de lite imperatorum et pontificum saeculis XI. et XII. conscripti* 1 (Hannover, 1891), 174.

²² *Ibid.*, 116.

²³ See Amy Remensnyder, “Pollution, Purity, and Peace: An Aspect of Social Reform between the Late Tenth Century and 1076,” in *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000*, ed. Thomas Head and Richard Landes (Ithaca, 1992), 280–307.

By sinning against the Holy Spirit, simoniacal priests attacked the Church at its core. The Bible provided the churchmen such as Humbert with a powerful template to distinguish between the “concord of catholic believers” and “discord of heretics,” foreshadowed in the schism between the kingdoms of Israel and Judah after the death of Solomon.²⁴ Looking into the future, Humbert associated heresy with the dragon of the Apocalypse (Rev. 12:3) and predicted that the devil would raise a “profane Trinity,” consisting of “Satan among the gentiles, Antichrist among the Jews, and a pseudo-prophet among the heretics.”²⁵ That heretical “pseudo-prophet” would represent the most pernicious threat, since he would bind Christians to himself.

Baptism was not the only sacrament that needed defending from heretics. The papacy of Leo IX also marked the beginning of a eucharistic controversy within the Roman church over the teachings of Berengar of Tours.²⁶ According to his opponents, Berengar emphasized the symbolic nature of the bread and wine as sacraments of the Lord’s sacrifice, a stance that called into question the belief — still not well established — that they changed essentially or “substantially” into the body and blood of Christ.²⁷ In 1050, Berengar’s arguments were condemned in absentia by Pope Leo, yet another example of the pontiff’s eagerness to place the see of Saint Peter on the front lines of defending orthodoxy. Berengar was condemned at Tours in 1054 and again in person at Rome in 1059. Four years after his involvement in the contentious legation to Constantinople, none other than Humbert of Silva Candida formulated an oath that Berengar was compelled to take in 1059, rejecting his own teachings and confirming that the Eucharist after consecration was the “true body of Christ.”²⁸

²⁴ Humbert of Silva Candida, *Adversus simoniacos*, ed. Thaner, 214. Humbert later reiterated this exegesis (*ibid.*, 219–20). See also the *Epistola de sacramentis haereticorum*, ed. Sackur, 14.

²⁵ Humbert of Silva Candida, *Adversus simoniacos*, ed. Thaner, 194–95: “Quibus utique principantur et carmina inspirant tres illorum auctores: gentilibus videlicet satanas, Iudaeis antichristus, hereticis autem pseudopropheta.”

²⁶ See Jean de Montclos, *Lafranc et Bérenger: La controverse eucharistique du XI^e siècle* (Louvain, 1971); Gary Macy, *The Theologies of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic Period: A Study of the Salvific Function of the Sacrament according to the Theologians c. 1080–1220* (Oxford, 1984); H. E. J. Cowdrey, “The Papacy and the Berengarian Controversy,” in *Auctoritas et Ratio: Studien zu Berengar von Tours*, ed. Peter Ganz et al. (Wiesbaden, 1990), 109–38; and Charles M. Radding and Francis Newton, *Theology, Rhetoric, and Politics in the Eucharistic Controversy, 1078–1079: Alberic of Monte Cassino against Berengar of Tours* (New York, 2003).

²⁷ See, for example, the accusations against Berengar in Hugh of Langres, *Tractatus de corpore et sanguine Christi*, PL 142:1327.

²⁸ See Radding and Newton, *Theology, Rhetoric, and Politics*, 19–20. See also Brian Stock (*The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* [Princeton, 1987], 231–345), who examines the intersections

Surprisingly, scholars of the schism have rarely observed the fact that the controversy over azymes developed at precisely the same moment as this dispute over the Eucharist within the Latin church.²⁹ In this sort of environment, minor disagreements about rites could assume a major significance. Unlike modern scholarship on 1054, contemporary Latin accounts viewed the Greek charge against the use of azymes as central — not peripheral — to the religious confrontation with the Greek patriarch and his supporters. For example, Pope Leo's biographer referred to the "heresy of the leavened-breaders" that "slandered the holy Roman see, nay, the entire Latin and Western church for offering the vivifying sacrifice to God from azymes."³⁰ Another account by Panteleo of Amalfi declared that Michael Kerullarios, better known as "a heresiarch rather than a patriarch," had attacked the Roman church by claiming that "the sacrifice of the Greeks is better than that of the Latins, since they make an offering of leavened bread, and the Roman church makes an offering of azymes, as it had learned from the apostles."³¹ Still another anonymous author, writing shortly after the events of 1054, declared that the Greek attack on azymes made them worse sinners than the Jews, since they had crucified Christ in ignorance of his divine nature, but the Greeks attacked the body of Christ knowingly.³²

of authority and competing "interpretative traditions" in the controversy over Berengar's teachings.

²⁹ One exception in this regard is J. R. Geiselmann, *Die Abendmahlslehre an der Wende der christlichen Spätantike zum Frühmittelalter* (Munich, 1933), 21–72. See also Macy (*Theologies of the Eucharist*, 35–43), who cites Geiselmann's observations that Humbert and his fellow reformers might have viewed the Greek attack on azymes as a common threat with Berengar's Eucharistic teachings.

³⁰ *La vie du Pape Léon IX (Brunon, évêque de Toul)*, ed. Michel Parisse, trans. Monique Goulet (Paris, 1997), 106: "Ea tempestate orta est haeresis fermentaceorum, quae calumniator sanctam romanam sedem immo omnem Latinam et occidentalem ecclesiam de azimis vivificum Deo offerre sacrificium."

³¹ "Der Bericht des Pantaleo von Amalfi über den kirchlichen Bruch zu Byzanz im Jahre 1054 und seine angebliche Sammlung der Aktenstücke," ed. Anton Michel, in *Amalfi und Jerusalem im griechischen Kirchenstreit (1054–1090)*, Orientalia Christiana Analecta 121 (Rome, 1936), 53: "erat quidem Michael Constantinopolitanae sedis patriarcha, actibus et intellectu stultissimus, qui, prout verba eius attestantur, haeresiarcha potius quam patriarcha esse monibus innotuit. Hic levitate sui cordis exactus, sanctae Romanae sedis eucharistiam nefanditer infamabat, tractans secum, quod melius esset Graecorum sacrificium quam Latinorum, eo quod ipsi fermentatum et Romana ecclesia, ut ab apostolis acceperat, azymum sacrificat."

³² *Fragmentum disputationis adversus Graecos*, ed. Will, *Acta et Scripta* (n. 1 above), 256: "Minus enim peccaverunt Judaei manus impias in Jesum mittentes et daemones impellentes et milites crucifigentes. Per ignorantiam etiam fecerunt: si enim cognovissent, nunquam Dominum gloriae crucifixissent: vos autem et vidistis et odistis et, secundum prophetam, odio Dominum gratis habuistis."

Certainly, the reaction of Rome and its supporters to this accusation reveals much more than the intransigent personality of Humbert of Silva Candida. Modern historians of the schism have described the cardinal as “combative,” “stiff-necked,” “hot-tempered,” and “excitable,” presenting him as a zealot who disliked the Greeks and who was personally responsible for the worsening of the schism.³³ Scholars have commonly assumed that Humbert wrote all of the texts in response to the Greek patriarch and his supporters, including several letters ascribed to Pope Leo and several polemical tracts addressed either to the Greek emperor, Michael Kerullarios, or his supporters, including the Greek monk Nicetas Stethatos.³⁴ This tendency to attribute texts of uncertain authorship to Humbert, however, is not necessarily sound. Margit Dischner has persuasively argued that these compositions in defense of the Latin church might best be thought of as “communal” efforts, overseen perhaps by Humbert, but reflecting input by Pope Leo, as well as by Peter of Amalfi and Frederick of Lorraine, who were Humbert’s fellow legates to Constantinople in 1054.³⁵ In these terms, the collective response to the azymes controversy reveals more than just the hot temper of one man. The Roman defense of the unleavened Eucharist provides us with insight into the clerical culture of the eleventh-century Latin church, at the very moment when it was being transformed by the advocates of a new order in Christendom.

The initial letter of response to Leo of Ochrid’s charges was addressed to Michael Kerullarios later in the year 1053.³⁶ This epistle, sometimes called Pope Leo’s *Libellus*, is famous among scholars of the reform papacy due to its uncompromising assertion of papal prerogatives and secular dignities. In part, Rome’s position of primacy was legitimated by associating the Roman church with Constantine I (306–37), whose status as the first Christian

³³ For these evaluations, see Fliche, *La réforme Grégorienne* (n. 11 above), 273; Runciman, *Eastern Schism* (n. 3 above), 44; Congar, *Nine Hundred Years* (n. 5 above), 71; and Chadwick, *East and West* (n. 3 above), 215.

³⁴ In addition to the sources cited above (nn. 1–2), the primary Latin documents for 1054 include the *Dialogi*, ed. Will, *Acta et scripta*, 93–126 (a fictive dialogue composed in direct response to Leo of Ochrid’s letter); the *Responsio sive contradictio adversus Nicetae Pectorati libellum*, ed. Will, *Acta et scripta*, 136–52 (part of the “pamphlet war” at Constantinople); and the *Rationes de Spiritus Sancti processione*, ed. Michel, in *Humbert und Kerullarios* (n. 3 above), 1:97–111 (a brief tract on the *filioque* controversy).

³⁵ Margit Dischner, *Humbert von Silva Candida: Werk und Wirkung des lothringischen Reformmönches* (Neuried, 1996), 51–67. The attribution of reform-era texts to Humbert’s authorship without clear evidence is due largely to the work of Anton Michel. For criticism of this tendency, see Blumenthal, *Investiture Controversy*, 91; and Morris, *Papal Monarchy*, 91.

³⁶ *Epistola C*, ed. Will, *Acta et scripta*, 65–85. It is not clear when or if this letter was actually sent to Kerullarios.

emperor and legendary deference to the bishops of Rome made him into one of the most popular and contested historical figures of the later eleventh century.³⁷ The epistle's proof-text for the fact that Constantine had bestowed "imperial power and dignity" on the bishops of Rome was the so-called "Donation of Constantine" (*Constitutum Constantini*).³⁸ According to this famous forgery of the late eighth or early ninth century, Pope Sylvester I (314–35) had baptized Constantine and cured him of leprosy. Out of gratitude, the Roman ruler granted the pope and his successors authority over the Western parts of the empire. The emperor confirmed the Roman church's primacy over the other major sees of the ancient world, including Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem and, anachronistically, Constantinople (a city that did not yet exist by that name when the supposed donation occurred). In addition, he transferred his imperial power to a new capital at Byzantium out of respect for Rome's divinely ordained role in the governance of the Church. The letter to Kerullarios included lengthy excerpts of this document to defend Rome's temporal privileges and to reinforce the claim that Constantine's "transferral of empire" from Rome to Constantinople was made out of respect for the Roman church's role in ecclesiastical governance.³⁹

The fascination of scholars with this infamous forgery has detracted attention from the other arguments marshaled in the letter to the Greek patriarch specifically to defend the Roman rite.⁴⁰ In this case, it was the Roman church's connection with Saint Peter, and through Peter to Christ, that guaranteed the orthodoxy of the Roman sacrifice against the heretics who attacked it. The letter reiterated the basic argument for Rome's apostolic primacy, Christ's blessing of Peter, the "rock" upon which the Church was founded. This linkage extended specifically to Peter's special discern-

³⁷ See the observations of H. E. J. Cowdrey, "Eleventh-Century Reformers' Views of Constantine," in *Conformity and Non-Conformity in Byzantium*, ed. Lynda Garland (Amsterdam, 1997), 63–91.

³⁸ *Das Constitutum Constantini (Konstantinische Schenkung): Text*, ed. Horst Fuhmann MGH, *Fontes iuris Germanici antiqui in usum scholarum* 10 (Hannover, 1968).

³⁹ Large sections of the *Constitutum* were incorporated into the letter to the *Epistola C*, ed. Will, *Acta et scripta*, 72–74. See H.-G. Kraus, "Das Constitutum Constantini im Schisma von 1054," in *Aus Kirche und Reich: Festschrift für Friedrich Kempf*, ed. Hubert Mordek (Sigmaringen, 1983), 131–58.

⁴⁰ It is not clear exactly when the Western churches began to use unleavened bread for the sacrifice, although there is evidence that this was the practice by the Carolingian era. See, for example, the liturgical commentary by Carolingian churchman Hrabanus Maurus, *De institutione clericorum libri tres*, ed. Detlev Zimpel (Frankfurt, 1996), 332. There are no signs, however, that the ritual difference was a point of contention between the two churches before the mid-eleventh century.

ment of the sacraments, something that the Greek patriarch and his supporters did not understand:

You do not weigh carefully how very impudent it is to say that the Father, who is in heaven, hid the worship or rite of the visible sacrifice through the dispensation of his only-begotten Son from Peter, the prince of Apostles, to whom he deigned to reveal himself fully, the ineffable mystery of the invisible divinity of his Son. The Lord of angels and prophets made his promise to him not through an angel or a prophet, but by his own mouth, with the following words: "I say to you that you are Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church."⁴¹

In his life, ministry, and death as a martyr, Peter had demonstrated his role as the foundation of the Church. Against Peter, the "gates of hell," that is, the arguments of heretics, could not prevail. Scripture equally made it clear that Peter had a unique role to play in revealing the sacramental mysteries of the faith. With references to the New Testament, the letter highlighted Peter's activity as a prime mover of the universal mission to both the Jews and the Gentiles in the primitive church, stressing his authority to remove the "burden of circumcision" and the "yoke" of the Jewish law from the Gentiles.⁴² "On this account," the epistle proclaimed:

Now come to your senses from such madness and cease mockingly calling the truly catholic Latins, closer disciples of the most eminent Peter and more devout followers of his teaching, *Azymites*. Stop denying them their churches and stop inflicting the torments, as thus you have begun to do, if you wish now and forever to have your peace and portion with Peter.⁴³

As the Apostolic See, it was the role of Rome to defend the faithful and confound the illicit teachings of all heretics. Constantinople, by contrast, was a seedbed of heresies that came from the East or among the Greeks.⁴⁴ Well versed in the annals of ecclesiastical history, the letter's authors asso-

⁴¹ *Epistola C*, ed. Will, *Acta et scripta*, 68: "Non ergo perpenditis quanta impudentia dicatur Pater, qui est in coelis, abscondisse a principe apostolorum, Petro, cultum, sive ritum visibilis sacrificii, per dispensationem Unigeniti sui, cui semetipsum plenissime revelare dignatus est illud ineffabile arcanum invisibilis divinitatis ejusdem Filii sui. Et cui non per angelum, nec per prophetam, sed proprio ore, ipse Dominus angelorum et prophetarum sic repromittit in sequentibus: 'Et ego dico tibi, quia tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam.'"

⁴² *Ibid.*, 75.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 76: "Quapropter a tanta amentia jam respicite et Latinos vere catholicos atque maximi Petri familiariores discipulos institutionisque ejus devotiores sectatores cessate subsannando azymitas vocare, aut ecclesias illis denegare, seu tormenta, sicut coepistis, inferre, si vultis nunc et semper pacem et portionem cum Petro habere."

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 68–69: "Praeterimus nominatim replicare nonaginta et eo amplius haereses ab Orientis partibus, vel ab ipsis Graecis, diverso tempore ex diverso errore ad corrumpendam virginitatem catholicae ecclesiae matris emergentes."

ciated the Greek patriarch with infamous Eastern heresiarchs of the early Church such as Arios, Macedonios, Nestorios, and Eutychios, whose heresies had been opposed by the first ecumenical councils and the authority of Rome. Past prelates of the Greek church had also been complicit in the destruction of holy icons (i.e. iconoclasm) and in the illegal deposition of the rightful patriarch, Ignatios, by the usurper Photios (i.e. the Photian schism). The current attack by the Greek patriarch fit into this pattern of abuse. Like a daughter who had rejected her mother, Constantinople had exhibited a history of arrogance and rebellion against the Roman church since the era of the Constantinian peace, when the pagan persecutions against the martyrs of the Church were succeeded by the internal threat of heresy.⁴⁵

The Greek charge against azymes was placed under more scrutiny in the *Dialogues*, written shortly before or during the legation to Constantinople.⁴⁶ According to Leo of Ochrid's letter, as translated by Humbert, the pope of Rome along with the priests, monks, and people of the Franks were observing the Mosaic law and keeping practice with the Jews through their use of azymes. The *Dialogues* responded to this accusation first by marshaling scriptural testimony from the Old Testament that mandated the sacrificial use of unleavened bread (including Exod. 12:18, Lev. 23:5, and Num. 28:16). At the same time, those passages forbade a host of other practices, such as keeping leaven in the home for a week. The Latins, who continued to eat leavened bread throughout the year, did not observe this Old Testament prohibition. "In what way," the text queried, "do we keep observance with the Jews?"⁴⁷ The text also defended the Latin sacrifice by pointing out that it followed the example of Christ, who came not to abolish the Law, but to fulfill it (Mt. 5:17). Therefore, Christ must have used azymes when he celebrated Passover with his disciples.⁴⁸ In addition, the *Dialogues* pointed out there were numerous passages in the Bible associating leaven with sin and evil (e.g. Amos 4:5 and 1 Cor. 5:6).

The weight of the text's argument, however, lay in its claim that the Latin sacrifice with azymes followed the Old Testament law spiritually (*spi-*

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 78–79: This reference invokes a basic scheme of Church history based on the seven seals of the Apocalypse, namely that there were four successive persecutions by Jews, pagans, heretics, and false brothers before the remaining three seals, which would mark the persecutions of Antichrist at the end of time. See Wilhelm Kamlah, *Apokalypse und Geschichtstheologie: Die mittelalterliche Auslegung der Apokalypse vor Joachim von Fiore* (Vaduz, 1965).

⁴⁶ *Dialogi*, ed. Will, *Acta et scripta*, 93–126.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 96: "In quo ergo communicamus Judaeis? Et in solemnitate azymorum custodimus?"

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 94–96, 100.

ritualiter) and not carnally (*carnaliter*) as did the Jews.⁴⁹ This line of defense built upon the basic Christian premise that the religion of the Hebrews foreshadowed the future faith of Christianity. This fundamental pattern of God's divine dispensation was revealed through the succession from the Old to New Testaments, which patristic commentators configured into an almost inexhaustible series of progressive relationships: from Jew to Christian, Synagogue to Church, and flesh to spirit, to name a few. The Old Testament, as Christians considered it, had been revealed first to the Jews, but they had apprehended only its exterior, literal meaning and failed to understand its inner mysteries, which pointed toward the coming of Christ. Christians were the second to receive God's word, but were the first to penetrate its spiritual significance, as fully revealed in the New Testament.⁵⁰ Matching this progression from the Old to the New Testaments, history revealed a series of transitions from the age before the law (*ante legem*) through the age of the Mosaic law (*sub lege*) to the age of Christian grace (*sub gratia*). Patristic theologians devoted particular attention to the establishment of the priesthood among the Jews and its transferal to the Christians with the coming of Christ and the New Covenant during the age of grace. Among other implications, this process of transition from the Levitical priests to the priesthood of Christ shaped the manner in which early Christians viewed their own sacraments and liturgy, leading them to argue that Jewish carnal rituals (*carnalia*) of the Old Testament, such as circumcision, prefigured Christian spiritual sacraments (*sacramenta*), such as baptism.

In 1054, this basic view of salvation history was called upon to defend the Latin church and its sacrifice. According to Cardinal Humbert's translation of the Greek charges, azymes were "accursed" (*maledicta*) and "abandoned" (*derelicta*).⁵¹ "Should the womb pregnant with the Spirit of God be cursed," the *Dialogues* asked in response, "that from the beginning gave

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 96.

⁵⁰ See M.-D. Chenu, "The Old Testament in Twelfth-Century Theology," in *Nature, Man and Society in the Twelfth Century*, trans. Jerome Taylor and Lester Little (Chicago, 1968), 146–61. As Chenu (*ibid.*, 146–47) observes, this hermeneutical interpretation was fundamental to a Christian conceptualization of sacred history "that presupposed a single economy of salvation developed across two periods, the Old Covenant and the New, with the former seen as preparing and prefiguring the latter." See also Gilbert Dahan, *Les intellectuels chrétiens et les juifs au moyen âge* (Paris, 1990); and Paula Fredriksen, "Excaecati Occulta Justitia Dei: Augustine on Jews and Judaism," in *Christianity in Relation to Jews, Greeks and Romans*, ed. Everett Ferguson (New York, 1999), 37–62.

⁵¹ *Dialogi*, ed. Will, *Acta et scripta*, 110: "Azyma vero neque commemorationem habent Domini neque mortem illius nuntiant, sicut Mosaica et ante mille quadringentos annos ex lege constituta, et per Novum Testamentum, hoc est, per sanctum evangelium et per Christum maledicta et derelicta." There were, in fact, some problems with Humbert's translation of this passage. See Erickson, "Leavened and Unleavened" (n. 10 above), 168.

birth to all the sacraments of Christ and the church, and that brought forth the Gospel, which must be preached everywhere until the end of time?"⁵² As made clear by numerous passages from the Old Testament, the Law mandated the use of unleavened bread for Passover, which prefigured the Christian celebration of Christ's own sacrifice on the Cross. If one maligned those foundations, as the Greeks were doing, one also maligned the New Testament, the structure that was erected upon them. According to the *Dialogues*, the progressive relationship between the Old and New Covenants was made clear during the wedding feast at Cana, when the Lord, the "bearer of both Testaments," could have filled the six empty jars with wine *ex nihilo*, but rather

for the sake of an undoubted mystery, he first wanted the jars to be completely filled with water by the servants of the feast, and afterwards by his simple command to become miraculous wine. In this farsighted deed of our Redeemer, we say that the water did not change its substance, but its qualities (that is, taste, color and things of that kind), so we might discern that the Lord himself did not void but renewed the Old Testament, by which he had filled up six ages of the world through the ministry of the earlier fathers, nor did he diminish it after that by his disapproval, but displayed that which lay hidden within it by his approval. For certain things the Law and Gospel proclaim in concord, making allowance only for the change and variation of the times.⁵³

From this perspective, the stakes were high in the Greek failure to recognize the historical workings of salvation and the intimate link between the rites of the Old Testament that had been transformed into the sacraments of the New. The *Dialogues* further clarified this transformative process with a reference to Heb. 8:11–12: "For when there is a change in the priesthood, it is also necessary that there be a change in the law."⁵⁴ These words attributed to Saint Paul regarding the failure of the Levitical priesthood and the coming of new Christian priests after the order of Melchizedek was a key

⁵² *Dialogi*, ed. Will, *Acta et scripta*, 111: "Maledicendusne ergo est uterus ille, qui Spiritu Dei gravidatus ab initio parturivit omnia sacramenta Christi et ecclesiae tandemque in fine saeculorum peperit ipsum evangelium praedicandum ubique?"

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 112: "Hoc utique Dominus utriusque Testamenti lator intelligi volens, cum posset omnipotenti voluntate vacuas sex hydrias in nuptiis vino de nihilo repente creato implere, maluit tamen certi mysterii gratia prius aqua easdem hydrias a festi ministris usque ad summum impleri et post solo nutu suo mirabile vinum fieri. In quo provido Redemptoris nostri facto dicimus aquam non substantiam suam, sed qualitates id est saporem et colorem et si qua sunt huiusmodi permutasse, ut animadvertamus ipsum Dominum Vetus Testamentum, quo sex mundi aetates per ministerium priorum patrum repleverat, non evacuassee, sed inovasse, nec inde quidquam reprobando minuisse, sed quod ei inerat et latebat approbando exhibuisse. In quibusdam enim sola permutatione temporum seu varietate excepta lex et evangelium idem concorditer clamat."

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 113–14.

passage for exegetes who sought to explicate the transference of God's covenant from the Jews to the Gentiles.⁵⁵

For the representatives of the Roman church in 1054, Christian theology of history confirmed that the Latins were not acting like Jews through their use of azymes, which God had transformed into the Eucharistic sacrifice with the coming of the New Dispensation. Christ, the *Dialogues* asserted, was the "consummation, rather than destruction, fulfillment, rather than annihilation, completion, rather than emptying" of the written Law.⁵⁶ If this were not the case, it was asked in the text, if the old had not "progressed" but had "lapsed," what about the temple, the altar, the sacrifice, the candelabra, along with all the other sacerdotal vestments and ornaments employed by Christians?⁵⁷ In these terms, the Latin authors of the *Dialogues* emphasized the continuity of the two covenants and the progressive nature of the Lord's dispensation. Never did they claim that the Greek sacrifice with leavened bread was illicit. The Latin Christian sacrifice with azymes, however, was more in tune with the marvelous progression from the Old Covenant to the New Dispensation.

This vision of God's dispensation was at once conservative and innovative. The basic premises of anti-Jewish polemics, which had been used for centuries to define what was *Christian* as opposed to *Jewish*, were employed with a new subtlety to define in tandem what was *Latin* as opposed to *Greek*.⁵⁸ This logic defended the Roman use of azymes against the heretical Greeks, while confirming the basic Christian reading of history as a progression from the Jewish forms of the faith to Christian sacraments. As evident in their use of unleavened bread for the Eucharist, so the defenders of the Roman rite argued, the followers of the Latin church understood the workings of salvation better than the Jews and better than their fellow Christians.

⁵⁵ On the idea of *translatio sacerdotii*, see the insightful appendix in Werner Goetz, *Translatio Imperii: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Geschichtsdenkens und der politischen Theorien im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit* (Tübingen, 1958), 378–81.

⁵⁶ *Dialogi*, ed. Will, *Acta et scripta*, 114: "accipiamus necesse est Christum finem legis, consummantem, non consummentum: perficientem, non annihilantem: complementem, non evacuantem."

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 116: "Denique si vetera non proficiendo, sed deficiendo transierunt, unde vobis templum, altare, sacrificum, candelabrum, et caetera sancti ministerii vasa seu ornamenta aut vestimenta sacerdotalia?"

⁵⁸ See Amos Funkenstein, "Basic Types of Christian Anti-Jewish Polemics in the Later Middle Ages," *Viator* 2 (1971): 373–82; Albert Bat-Sheva, "Adversus Iudaeos in the Carolingian Empire," in *Contra Iudaeos: Ancient and Medieval Polemics between Christians and Jews*, ed. Ora Limor and Guy Strousma (Tübingen, 1996), 119–42; and Miriam Taylor, *Anti-Judaism and Early Christian Identity: A Critique of the Scholarly Consensus* (Leiden, 1995).

Leo of Ochrid's letter contained other charges against the Roman church and its followers, including the accusation that they ate unclean foods and neglected to sing *Alleluia* at the Mass during Lent.⁵⁹ While the papal legates were at Constantinople in 1054, additional issues of religious contention between the two Christian peoples were raised, including their different positions on clerical marriage and their dispute over *filioque* (the Latin doctrine that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and from the Son, not just the Father alone).⁶⁰ It was the Eucharistic problem, however, that clearly fired the imagination and indignation of Humbert and his fellow reformers. The importance of azymes during their confrontation with the Greeks was once again demonstrated by the bull of excommunication, which the legates deposited in Hagia Sophia on 16 July 1054. In addition to a list of other errors, the chief rebuke against the patriarch was that he had closed churches using the Latin rite and called the Latins "Azymites." On this account, the bull condemned Kerullarios and labeled whoever opposed the Roman sacrifice in this matter a "Prozymite heretic."⁶¹

Revisionist appraisals of 1054 point out that the mutual excommunications of Humbert and Kerullarios made little impact on contemporaries, judging by their failure to take notice of it in ecclesiastical histories and chronicles.⁶² This was undeniably the case. There are no signs that contemporaries believed a lasting schism had begun in 1054. Such an argument is somewhat misleading, however, since it fails to account for the fact that the azymes controversy in 1054 did make a considerable and lasting impression on Latin churchmen. This problem would persist throughout the late eleventh century and beyond. In some cases, Latin churchmen feared or faced a direct confrontation with Greek clerics, who persisted in questioning the

⁵⁹ Humbert, *Epistola ad Ioannem translata*, ed. Will, *Acta et scripta*, 63–64.

⁶⁰ The Roman practice of fasting on Saturdays and the prohibition of clerical marriage were attacked in 1054 by Nicetas Pectoratus, *Libellus contra Latinos editus et ab apocriariis apostolicae sedis Constantinopoli repertus*, ed. Will, *Acta et Scripta*, 127–36. The legates responded with the *Responsio sive contradictio adversus Nicetae Pectorati libellum*, ed. Will, *Acta et scripta*, 136–52. Apparently, Humbert and his companions were the first to raise the *filioque* problem. In addition to the *Rationes de Spiritus Sancti processione*, ed. Michel (Humbert und Kerullarios, n. 3 above), 1:97–111; see the *Excommunicatio qua feriuntur Michael Caerularius*, ed. Will, *Acta et scripta*, 153, which (erroneously and somewhat amazingly) accuses the Greeks of removing *filioque* from the original creed. On the *filioque* controversy, see Peter Gemeinhardt, *Die Filioque-Kontroverse zwischen Ost- und Westkirche im Frühmittelalter* (Berlin, 2002); and Bernd Oberdorfer, *Filioque: Geschichte und Theologie eines ökumenischen Problems* (Göttingen, 2002).

⁶¹ *Excommunicatio qua feriuntur Michael Caerularius*, ed. Will, *Acta et scripta*, 154: "Quicunque fidei sanctae Romanae et apostolicae sedis ejusque sacrificio pertinaciter contradixerit, sit anathema, Maranatha, nec habeatur Christianus catholicus, sed prozymita haereticus, fiat, fiat, fiat."

⁶² As recently discussed by Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit* (n. 3 above), 210–11.

Western use of azymes. In others, Latin authors addressed the topic in non-polemical venues, that is to say, in texts that were not directly about the Eucharistic controversy, including liturgical commentaries and tracts on the sacraments — in those cases, Latins talking with other Latins about their sacrifice and its significance for their own sense of religious community.

The strong position taken against the Greek attack on azymes in 1054 found echoes in the immediate aftermath of the initial conflict. In a letter written around 1070, for example, a cleric identified as Laycus of Amalfi gave his advice to Sergius, a Latin abbot in Constantinople, about how to defend the sacrifice with azymes against Greek accusations.⁶³ In his epistle, Laycus marshaled scriptural passages in support of azymes and argued that Christ had offered up unleavened bread at the Last Supper.⁶⁴ The Greeks might assert that the Old Law mandating unleavened bread had passed away, but they were wrong to accuse Latins of sacrificing in a Jewish manner. Their interpretation of the New Dispensation, Laycus implied, was flawed:

If the law of the Old Testament was a sign, it prefigured our times, and that which was hidden in shadow, then shone brightly in the light of the New Testament. Therefore, those things ought to be observed faithfully by those on whose account they were set forth. For just as the passion of our Redeemer was prefigured in the sacrifice of the lamb, baptism in the Red Sea, the Holy Spirit in the pillar of cloud, the gift of heavenly grace in manna, Christ in the rock which followed them [i.e. the Israelites in the desert], so certainly the sacrifice of our times is prefigured in the azyme bread.⁶⁵

Laycus concluded his tract with an appeal to the church of Rome's special status as the universal see founded by Christ and commissioned to Peter. With respect to the Lord's sacrifice, Laycus asserted, there was a chain of transmission that stretched from Christ to Peter, and from Peter down through his apostolic successors, including Pope Silvester, who had baptized the first Christian emperor, Constantine. From this perspective, Rome and its followers held a unique position of privilege in the interpreta-

⁶³ Laycus of Amalfi, "Epistola Layci clerici missa Sergio abbati ad defendendum se de azimis contra Graecos," ed. Michel, *Amalfi und Jerusalem* (n. 31 above), 35–47. Michel (*ibid.*, 5–8) argues that Laycus's position was largely determined by his familiarity with the *Dialogi*. Laycus was most likely familiar with the text, but his composition shows considerable originality.

⁶⁴ "Epistola Layci," ed. Michel, *Amalfi und Jerusalem*, 38–42.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 38: "Si veteris testamenti lex figura erat, ergo nostra tempora portendebat et quod in umbra latebat, in luce novi testamenti iam praefulgebat, ac propter quos descripta erant, ab ipsis etiam fideliter observanda erant. Nam quomodo in agni immolatione passio nostri prefigurabatur redemptoris et in mari rubro baptismum, in columpna nubis spiritus sanctus, in manna caelestis gratiae donum, in petra, que eos sequebatur, Christus: ita nempe in azimo pane nostris temporis ostendebatur sacrificium."

tion of God's eucharistic dispensation, as was demonstrated through its sacrifice with unleavened bread.⁶⁶

Concern over azymes was not limited to Latins who faced direct questions or criticism by Greeks in the immediate aftermath of 1054. North of the Alps, the German monk Rupert of Deutz addressed the controversy around the year 1110 in his commentary on the Christian liturgy, the *Book on the Divine Offices*.⁶⁷ A passionate supporter of the ecclesiastical reform movement, Rupert composed one of the first detailed commentaries on the liturgy since the Carolingian period, manifesting the reformers' concern with standardizing and explicating the Roman liturgy.⁶⁸ His commentary on the Mass declared that the Roman prohibition of leaven in the sacrifice was worthy of inquiry "since up to now all of Greece opposes this practice."⁶⁹ Familiar with the events of 1054, Rupert did not find it surprising that Greece, "leavened with many heresies," sacrificed with leavened bread, nor that a heresy-ridden Constantinople refused to concede to the authority of Rome on this issue.⁷⁰ By contrast, Rupert stressed the special place of the Roman church in defending orthodox belief and practice: "The Roman church," Rupert noted, "founded high atop the rock of apostolic faith, has stood firmly and has always confounded the heretics of both Greece and the entire world, passing a sentence of judgment handed down from the loftiest court of the faith." According to Rupert, the use of azymes was established by the authority of both the Law and the Gospel in the sacrifice of Passover and the Lord's sacrifice, respectively. The Roman sacrifice was foreshadowed in the Old Testament rite, just as other forms of worship mandated in the written law of the Jews had been transformed into spiritual Christian sacraments and customs. The sacrifice with unleavened bread, he stated in

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 42–45. Laycus's letter found at least one prominent admirer. Around 1110, it was redacted with minor changes by Bruno of Segni (*De sacrificio azymo*, PL 65:1087–90), who addressed it to Leo, a Latin monk living in Constantinople. See Réginald Grégoire, *Bruno de Segni* (Spoleto, 1965), 102–3; and Graham A. Loud, "Montecassino and Byzantium in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries," in *The Theotokos Evergetis and Eleventh-Century Monasticism*, ed. Margaret Mullet and Anthony Kirby (Belfast, 1994), 30–58.

⁶⁷ Rupert of Deutz, *Liber de divinis officiis*, ed. Hrabanus Haacke, CCM 7 (Turnhout, 1967), 52–56. On Rupert's career and his composition of this liturgical commentary, see John Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz* (Berkeley, 1983), 58–67.

⁶⁸ See the comments of Roger Reynolds, "Liturgical Scholarship at the Time of the Investiture Controversy: Past Research and Future Opportunities," *Harvard Theological Review* 71 (1978): 109–24; and Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz*, 58–60.

⁶⁹ Rupert, *De divinis officiis*, ed. Haacke, 52.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 53: "Tanta autem haerisibus fermentata est Graecia, ut mirum videri non debeat hoc, quod de fermentato immolat." Rupert (*ibid.*, 54–55) mentions as a source of information the *Epistola ad Michelem Constantinum Monomachum*, ed. Will (*Acta et scripta*, 85–89).

conclusion, was supported by a direct chain of transmission from Christ to Peter, and from Peter to the bishops of the Roman church, which stood as an “impregnable wall against all heresies.”⁷¹

Rupert’s discussion of azymes was more than just a word in passing on “daily matters.”⁷² His observations about the Latin sacrifice reveal some of the central concerns for the supporters of the reform movement; namely, their drive to clarify orthodox belief and practice, their emphasis on the authority of the Roman church as a safeguard against heresy, and their self-proclaimed duty to defend the body of the faithful from deviance and pollution. Rupert was not unique in this regard. Writing around the same time as Rupert, Anselm of Bec also wrestled with the significance of the azymes controversy, which he may first have encountered while attending the Council of Bari in 1098. His declared reason for writing a letter on the topic was in response to inquiries by Walram, bishop of Naumburg.⁷³ Anselm, who noted that the Greek disagreement over azymes seemed inconsequential “to many reasonable catholics,” did not deny the efficaciousness of the Greek sacrifice, but he did insist that the use of azymes was “more appropriate,” “more pure,” and “more scrupulous.” With a more moderate tone than Rupert, he defended Latins against the charge of Judaizing within a broader discourse about the relationship between Jewish law and Christian grace. The sacrifice with azymes, he noted, was not made to serve “the antiquity of the law” but the “truth of the Gospel.”⁷⁴ The use of unleavened bread demonstrated how the Passover rites of the Jews prefigured the Christian sacrament, which was made without the “corruption of leaven.”⁷⁵

Modern scholars have recognized both Rupert and Anselm as exactly the sort of outspoken ecclesiastical authors who sought to set clear markers around the life-giving bonds of the Christian community during the early stages of the reform movement.⁷⁶ Scholars of anti-Judaism have argued that these two churchmen took a particularly strong stance against the Jews as a

⁷¹ Rupert, *De divinis officiis*, ed. Haacke, 53–56.

⁷² Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz*, 61.

⁷³ *Epistola de sacrificio azimi et fermentati*, ed. F. S. Schmidt in *Anselm: Opera Omnia* (Edinburgh, 1946; repr., Stuttgart, 1968), 2:223–32.

⁷⁴ Anselm, *De sacrificio azimi et fermentati*, ed. Schmidt, 226.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 227–28.

⁷⁶ See Anna Abulafia, “The Ideology of Reform and Changing Ideas concerning Jews in the Works of Rupert of Deutz and Hermannus Quondam Iudeus,” *Jewish History* 7 (1993): 43–63; and David Timmer, “Biblical Exegesis and the Jewish-Christian Controversy in the Early Twelfth Century,” *Church History* 58 (1989): 309–21; along with Anna Abulafia, “St Anselm and Those outside the Church,” in *Faith and Identity: Christian Political Experience*, ed. D. M. Loades and Katherine Walsh (Oxford, 1990), 11–38; and Dahan, *Les intellectuels chrétiens* (n. 50 above), 366. More generally on Anselm’s attitudes toward Juda-

group that was *not* being bound up into the ecclesiastical culture sponsored by the reformers, partly because the Jews did not participate in the Eucharistic sacrifice, and partly because they refused to recognize the transformation of the Old Testament into the New Dispensation. The Greeks and their rejection of azymes presented an analogous but far more ambiguous case of divergence from the Christian norms set by Rome. Neither Rupert nor Anselm openly condemned the Greek church as a whole, nor did they state that the Greek use of leavened bread was improper. At the same time, the Greek attack on the Roman church placed the followers of Constantinople in the ranks of heretics, who, along with Jews, were a threat to the orthodox faith.

Through the azymes controversy, the Greeks were being targeted, at least potentially, as a group that did not fit into the “international order” of Christendom that recognized papal authority, including its role in the determination of orthodox doctrine and religious practice. With that said, however, one must immediately add that there was far from a single attitude toward “the Greeks” in medieval Latin Europe, any more than there was one uncomplicated attitude toward “the Jews.” Ambiguities remained and would persist regarding the dispute over the Eucharist with the Greeks. As far back as the 1050s, Peter Damian had dismissed the difference between leavened and unleavened bread for the sacrifice as insignificant.⁷⁷ Dominique of Grado, writing to Peter of Antioch during the crisis between Rome and Constantinople, also avoided an inflammatory tone when directly addressing the azymes controversy. Both sacrifices, he asserted, were equally meritorious: The sacrifice with leaven by the Eastern churches revealed the “substance of the Word incarnate,” while the sacrifice with azymes by the Roman church represented Christ’s “purity of human flesh.”⁷⁸ Dominique rejected the Greek accusation that Rome had cut itself off from union with the universal church, but did not claim to the contrary that the Greeks were themselves guilty of heresy.

From yet another perspective, the difference in the two eucharistic breads was effectively a moot question. According to orthodox Roman doctrine, largely worked out in order to refute Berengar of Tours, after conse-

ism, see Gilbert Dahan, “Saint Anselme, les juifs, le judaïsme,” in *Les mutations socio-culturelles au tournant des XIe–XIIe siècles*, ed. Jean Pouilloux (Paris, 1984), 521–34.

⁷⁷ Peter Damian, no. 41, ed. Kurt Reindel, *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*, MGH, *Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit* 2 (Munich, 1988), 1.

⁷⁸ Dominique of Grado, *Epistola ad Petrum Antiochensem*, ed. Will, *Acta et Scripta*, 205–8 at 207: “Nam fermenti et farinae commistio, qua Orientis utuntur ecclesiae, incarnati Verbi declarat substantiam, simplex vero massa azymorum, quam Romana tenet ecclesia, puritatem humanae carnis, quam placuit divinitati sibi unire, citra controversiam repraesentat.”

cration *there was no bread on the altar*, only the body of Christ and the outward appearance of the bread. An insistence on substantial change led Lanfranc of Bec to emphasize that there was one catholic body of believers sharing a faith in the transformation of the Eucharist, including Greeks and Armenians.⁷⁹ He did not mention the dispute over azymes. Decades later, in his letter to Walram of Naumburg, Anselm of Canterbury (who was Lanfranc's former student) himself observed that leavened bread and unleavened bread did not differ substantially.⁸⁰ Both were bread and both were transformed into the life-giving body of Christ. In another commentary on the sacraments written against Berengar in the early twelfth century, Alger of Liège defended the legitimacy of azymes but also made the point that consecration changed the bread and wine into the body of Christ. The color or outward appearance of the bread did not matter for the efficacy of the sacrament, any more than did the personal state of grace of the one administering the sacrament.⁸¹ In this case, somewhat ironically, the effort to refute one heresy from within the Western church provided a loophole to defuse another source of heresy coming from outside of it.

Through an emphasis on the divinely wrought transformation of carnal rites into spiritual sacraments, the Roman defense of azymes in 1054 performed a double duty, defining what was Latin (not Greek) and what was Christian (not Jewish) about the Latin Christian sacrifice and the theology of history that gave it meaning. In both cases, that boundary of religious difference between Latin Christians and those "outsiders" left the door open for persistent questions and uncertainties. Sometimes, as we just saw with Alger of Liège, that boundary could disappear all together. As a marker of identity, azymes were somewhat ambiguous. After all, even the Jewish and Christian economies of salvation could not be diametrically opposed and sealed off, since the Latin justification for using unleavened bread necessitated an emphasis on the progressive continuity of God's sacramental dispensation from the (Jewish) Old Testament to the (Christian) New Testament. As for the Greeks, they remained fellow Christians who recognized Christ and sacrificed in his name. The Latin defense of azymes implied that the Greeks and their sacrifice lay somewhere along a spectrum between the two poles of the Old and New Dispensations, ranging from the superseded

⁷⁹ Lanfranc of Bec, *De corpore et sanguine Domini adversus Berengarium Turonensem*, PL 150:440–41: "Omnes enim qui Christianos se et esse et dici laentur, veram Christi carnem verumque ejus sanguinem, utraque sumpta de Virgine, in hoc sacramento se percipere gloriantur. Interroga universos qui Latinae linguae nostrarumque litterarum notitiam perceperunt. Interroga Graecos, Armenos, seu cujuslibet nationis quoscumque Christianos homines; uno ore hanc fidem testantur habere."

⁸⁰ Anselm, *De sacrificio azimi et fermentati*, ed. Schmidt, 223.

⁸¹ Alger of Liège, *De sacramentis corporis et sanguinis dominici*, PL 180:827–30.

carnalia of the Jews to the more perfect, spiritual Latin *sacramentum*. In this sense, the opposition of the Latin and Greek sacrifices shaded into something more complex than a case of “us” versus “them,” harder to grasp, and less easily invoked as a determinant between orthodoxy and heresy.

The fact that less compromising voices in the Roman church nevertheless seized upon the Eucharistic controversy to draw a line in the sand between “catholic” Latins and “heretical” Greeks should hardly provoke surprise. For the supporters of the reform papacy, the dispute over the unleavened Eucharist was linked to definitions of orthodoxy and authority within their own religious community, as well as their universalist vision of Rome’s primacy over the universal Church. Their rejection of the Greek position on azymes and celebration of the Latin rite was not just a pretext for Rome’s claims to ecclesiastical authority over Constantinople. It was a dramatic example of *what* the Roman church’s apostolic foundations meant for its unassailable position of supremacy over the faithful, including the definition and defense of sacramental orthodoxy. Among the more rigorous adherents to the reform program, there was no room for deviance from the orthodox principles of biblical interpretation as they related to the consecration of the Eucharist. Like Berengar of Tours, the Greek patriarch and his followers had challenged Rome’s interpretation of the Eucharistic sacrifice and its reading of salvation history. Both were rejected as heretics, whose attack on catholic Christendom was repulsed by the bishops of Rome. In these terms, the azymes controversy was more than just a minor liturgical squabble. It was one component of a broader “authorizing process” by which the reform papacy claimed in quite revolutionary terms the right to determine what constituted proper behavior and proper belief for members of Christendom.⁸²

The notion that Christendom formed an earthly society of Christian churches, kingdoms, and peoples that were assembled under the leadership of the Roman papacy was not invented in the eleventh century. It was not until the period starting around 1050, however, that Christendom began to occupy a meaningful and highly visible place in the Latin clerical culture of Western Europe. As noted at the beginning of this article, scholars have long recognized that the reform movement of the later eleventh century was the key contributor to a more concrete and less abstract definition of Christendom as an international community with frontiers like any other — Christendom, in this case, meaning the properly ordered Christian community that recognized papal leadership, followed Roman doctrine, and prac-

⁸² On the role of rites and symbols in such an “authorizing process,” see Talal Asad, “The Construction of Religion as an Anthropological Category,” in *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam* (Baltimore, 1993), 27–54.

ticed the Roman rite. Although the reality looked quite different, in principle every land and every Christian people were a part of Christendom. The dispute in 1054 with the neighboring Greek church exposed a gap between the effective limits of papal authority and the theory of an idealized world order. Over the following centuries, during the height of the so-called papal monarchy, the Roman church would never insist that the Greek church abandon its use of leavened bread for the Eucharist, but it did demand that the Greeks recognize the legitimacy of using unleavened bread for the same purpose. After all, how could the members of the Greek church acknowledge the apostolic primacy of Rome if they continued to insist that its followers did not even know how to perform properly the central rite of the Christian faith? In the High Middle Ages, liturgical diversity was one thing; questioning the successors of Saint Peter was becoming something else entirely.

University of North Carolina