



Intellectual Repercussions of the Council of Florence

Ihor Sevcenko

Church History, Vol. 24, No. 4. (Dec., 1955), pp. 291-323.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0009-6407%28195512%2924%3A4%3C291%3A%3E2.0.CO%3B2-O>

Church History is currently published by American Society of Church History.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/asch.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

INTELLECTUAL REPERCUSSIONS OF THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE*

IHOR ŠEVČENKO, *University of Michigan*

I.

At Ferrara and Florence, Western intellectuals met with the greatest Greek scholarly and theological delegation that ever came to Latin soil. The Greeks did not come empty-handed. They brought with them *de luxe* editions of Greek sacred and, above all, secular authors—coveted treasures for Renaissance Italians. To judge by the letters in which Ambrogio Traversari announced the arrival of the Greeks, Christian Humanists were as much interested in the codices of Plato, Plutarch, Euclid and Ptolemy, brought by the Emperor and Bessarion, as in the cause which brought the Greeks to Italy.¹

Personal encounters proved as stimulating as leafing through manuscripts, and for the same reasons. Leonardo Bruni noted with satisfaction the presence of many eminent laymen in the Greek ranks, well versed not only in sacred, but also in secular letters. Pletho, the venerable old man and the most learned head among the Byzantines, conversed with the Humanists and reciprocated their admiration for him by a benevolent judgment of their intellects, although he balanced it by pointing out their lack of sound learning and of qualifications to appreciate Plato and Aristotle. It was in Florence that Pletho lectured on Plato before a Humanist audience. It was there that he wrote his treatise on the differences between Aristotle and Plato, perhaps for the benefit of a group of his Italian admirers, and he was said to have inspired Cosimo Medici to found the Florentine Academy.² These Humanistic contacts bore other tangible fruits. The increased number of translations from ancient Greek authors, towards the middle of the fifteenth century, can be connected with the western sojourn of the Greek conciliar delegation.³

Still, proficiency in classical lore accounted only for one part of the Byzantine impact. While conversing with the Byzantine on classical subjects, their humanistic interlocutors may have found in them people so erudite as to be worthy of their ancient forebears.^{3a} But when looked at, these turbaned, bearded and long-robed Platonists appeared more like the denizens of Susa than of Athens. In the art of the *Quattrocento*, where the Council of Florence left notable traces, the Byzantines served as prototypes for exotic Old and New Testament figures. When represented in their own role, Greek delegates appeared as bizarre Levantines. The presence of the Greek delegation in Italy

strengthened the shortlived vogue for Oriental things, reflected in contemporary art, perhaps as much as it furthered the renewal of classical studies in the West.^{3b}

Moreover, the Greeks came to Florence not to acquaint the West with Antiquity but to bring about the Union of Churches. The Council itself, the philological discussions at some of its sessions notwithstanding, did not appreciably alter the course of Humanism.⁴ Nor was it the Council that determined the religious obedience of Byzantine savants teaching in the West. Greek professors had been active and admired in Italy since the very end of the fourteenth century and kept coming to occupy professorial chairs after the Council. Their position as loyal foreign teachers carried with it their adherence to the Union. Both Manuel Chrysoloras and later John Argyropulos were Uniates. Sometime before the Council, Georgios (Gennadios) Scholarios, later a staunch anti-Unionist and the first patriarch of Constantinople approved by the Turk, thought of expatriating himself from Constantinople—where, so he claimed, intellectuals were despised—perhaps to Italy, where they were recognized and enjoyed social prestige.⁵ He may have coveted a professorial chair there.⁶ It is significant that at the time of his emigration plans, Scholarios should have shown suspect pro-Unionist inclinations.

As for native Hellenists, Italy could boast them previous to the Council. In 1420, Filelfo went to Constantinople to brush up his Greek (how admirably he succeeded we can judge from his voluminous Greek correspondence) and married into a Greek professorial family. When the Byzantines set foot in Italy to negotiate the Union, the Pope could enlist the services of Guarino, Bruni and Traversari. All of them bilingual, they were able to prepare speeches in Greek to greet the Emperor and the Patriarch. As for translations from Greek, the Council of Florence served only to give a new impetus to them. By the time it convened, Homer and Plato had long been accessible to Latin readers.

II.

The contributions of the Council of Florence to the Renaissance will not concern us further. We shall aim, rather, toward conveying an impression of the various intellectual attitudes that prevailed during and after the Council and examining some of the instances in which this Council has been used by intellectuals as a major element in their ideological constructions up to the present time.

The primary cause for which the Union was to be concluded, so pro-Unionist speeches at the Council of Florence expressly state, was to avert the Turkish danger.⁷ But by the time of the Council, the Ottoman nightmare had hung over the Empire for over a century. The

political stage for the last important act in the intellectual battle around the Union before the fall of Byzantium had been set in the course of the fourteenth century for both the Greek and the Latin sides.

In 1366 Demetrius Cydones pronounced a hortatory speech in which he advocated seeking help from the West rather than creating a coalition of the Orthodox Balkan peoples. This speech contained a theme which was to be mirrored exactly in the pro-Unionist standpoint at the time of the Florentine Council. The theme is that of the community of culture and the continuity of historical tradition between the Old and the New Rome. The two should therefore unite to repel the enemy of civilization.⁸ If they did not, Cydones had written a short time before his speech, the Turk after taking Constantinople would not stop before overrunning Italy and the Rhineland. His task would be all the easier in that he would be joined by the conquered and embittered peoples of the East.⁹ This was a way of suggesting that the Byzantines held the balance in the East-West struggle. But it was mainly Cydones' adversaries at the Byzantine Imperial court who advocated the doctrine of the balance of power in preference to leaning towards the too-powerful Latins.¹⁰ Inconsistently enough, the same people showed considerable scepticism as to the effectiveness of Frankish and Roman help. How could the Pope assist Constantinople if he was unable to help his own Latin co-religionists, for instance in Cyprus?¹¹ In vain did Cydones thunder against the idea of peace with the Turk at any price.¹² Many prominent officials of his time deemed the Turkish yoke lighter and more lucrative than the Latin one.¹³ Political attitudes exemplified by the famous *bon mot* attributed to Lucas Notaras, a Byzantine minister closely involved with the Unionist negotiations at the time of Florence and afterwards, were denounced among his predecessors some eighty years earlier.¹⁴

The Latin side, which both in Florence and afterwards had its extremists and moderates, could also look back to spiritual ancestors in the past century. In 1332, the Dominican Guillaume d'Adam had addressed a tract to the French king in which he proved that the conquest of Byzantium was the only realistic solution to both the problem of the Union and the *passagium* to liberate the Holy Land.¹⁵ D'Adam was an intellectual fossil from a past age, but attitudes he and his like represented had lasting effects. Thus Cydones, thirty years later, had to vaunt the selflessness of the Latins to allay the mistrust of his opponents who suspected that Western help would be only a prelude to their conquest of the Empire.¹⁶ And in the early fourteen sixties it was alleged that the Greek repudiation of the Council of Florence was motivated by fear of those Latins who might want to follow d'Adam's way of thinking. At that time, Ubertino Puscuro,

the obscure author of a Vergilian poem on the fall of Constantinople, imputed to the Greek prime minister Notaras advice to disavow the Union of Florence, since the approaching "Latin" armies of King Ladislaus, the tragic hero of Varna, were more interested in conquering Byzantine lands than in liberating them.¹⁷

It is more difficult to find a fourteenth century Western counterpart to Latin moderates at the Council.¹⁸ This century did not produce its Humbert de Romans who, on the eve of the Council of Lyons (1274), preached for better understanding between the two rites through greater knowledge of each other. Perhaps Barlaam of Calabria and Paul, Archbishop of Smyrna and later Latin Patriarch of Constantinople, approached in their conciliatory spirit the mildness of the book-loving Ambrogio Traversari.¹⁹ And Paul's program (if, indeed, it was his) for promoting the Union through the establishment of colleges for instructing sons of Greek magnates in Latin lore and through appointing a Papal legate to Constantinople²⁰ was an anticipation of Traversari's projects submitted to the Pope on the eve of the Council of Florence.

In questions of doctrine, it was a matter of general belief that the Orthodox adversaries of the Council relied heavily upon the writings of fourteenth century Byzantine theologians.²¹ For this they were chided by Greek pro-Unionist propaganda. In their turn, pro-Unionist writings of the previous two centuries helped the Latins to prepare the Council of Florence.²²

III.

Although the various stands taken at the time of the Council and soon afterwards by Greek and Latin were foreshadowed by the trends of the fourteenth century, one difference must be kept in mind. In the late thirteen twenties, a Greek polymath Nicephorus Gregoras could grapple with the Westerner Barlaam in a dialectical dispute and with Latin Astrologers in a scientific one on equal terms. A century later such confidence was absent from Byzantine ranks. By that time, a few of the most brilliant Byzantines had gone over to the Catholic camp.²³ Scholarios often deplored the low state of learning among his compatriots in things literary and Divine and seemed to touch upon a point of common conviction when he mentioned Byzantine intellectual inferiority in front of his colleagues at the Council.²⁴ Even the mighty Pletho appears to have held rather pessimistic views on the chances for an Orthodox victory in the conciliar dialectical disputes.²⁵

But if the Byzantines were only "remains of the Hellenes," all was not desperation. They still could invoke all of the great minds of their glorious past. Even in their own day some could be considered

superior in learning to the Westerners for, so it was said, no Latin professed Greek while Greeks taught Latin.²⁶ Finally, if the Byzantines were hard pressed, so was the Pope by the Council of Basle. Not only high Byzantine church and court dignitaries realized this from lengthy negotiations of the fourteen thirties and last minute contacts at Venice. All were aware of the Pope's plight, even ignorant Orthodox monks in Crete.²⁷ Attempting a Union and obtaining its benefits were therefore worth trying.

IV.

The expressed purpose of Greeks and Latins in coming to the Council had been to discover the Truth for Christian teaching.²⁸ But in fact both sides came together already possessed of the Truth. The Greeks, with three exceptions, did sign the *decretum* of Florence, but a comparison of these signatures with the annotated list of Greek signatories compiled some ten years later by Scholarios shows that everyone of them but four must have lost—or regained—the Truth again.

In matters of Union, as distinguished from the quest for Truth, Traversari appears as the most likeable of Latin protagonists at Ferrara and Florence. Full of reverence for ancient Greek religious customs, he exhorted the Pope, the prelates and Cosimo Medici to treat the Greeks with tolerance and liberality, since those treated well would propagate the cause of the Union and those brushed off in a haughty manner would do the cause harm. He even found a compliment for Mark of Ephesus. But he had to compete constantly with impatient—and numerous—extremists of the Catholic camp who, rather than he, might get the papal ear.²⁹ He must patiently plead with them not to take offense at trifles interpreted by many as Greek vanity, such as the Patriarch's calling the Pope brother and the Greeks not uncovering their heads before the papal legate.³⁰ Trifles indeed! This was the core of the matter and in this respect uncouth Byzantine monks and the ignorant authors of Muscovite anti-Florentine tracts assessed the emotional situation better than this learned Latin Humanist.

Traversari's plans for dealing with the Orthodox world³¹ may have become the basis for future policies of the Roman Curia. But his conciliatory overtures to the Byzantines at the Council remained unrequited. One of them, while granting him some education in Greek letters, called him "crafty and cunning, all the while putting on an act of reverence."³² In the Muscovite tracts, always more blunt, Traversari fared even worse. There, Mark of Ephesus prophesied for him an untimely death, inasmuch as the Latin "spoke badly of the seven Councils."³³

The Greek pro-Unionist position at Florence continued the program evolved by Cydones in the previous century. Scholarios spoke of "similarity in way of life and customs," "communion," "proximity," "enjoying each other's way of life," "close ties in the domain of learning and letters" as between Greek and Latin.³⁴ In modern terms, pro-Unionist appeals consisted in advocating the restoration of European ideological unity, anchored in a common way of life and in the close cultural ties between Latin and Greek. Such a union would first of all save Byzantium by insuring papal help. But union with Europe would achieve more than just salvation for Constantinople. It would be beneficial to all Christendom,³⁵ for it would stem the expansion of an Empire which strove to enslave the whole civilized world. The image of Italy, or even all Christian lands, overrun by the hordes of Murad—or later Mehmed, reportedly the emulator of Alexander the Great and Caesar³⁶—was repeatedly depicted by Greek pro-Unionists until after the fall of Constantinople, both to their Greek brethren and to Italians.³⁷ The Latins who used this argument, like Jean Germain, the Chancellor of the Order of the Golden Fleece, may have learned it in Florence.

V.

This pro-Unionist conception of Constantinople's salvation, whatever its practical value, was clear, enticing and consistent. How did it happen, then, that the anti-Unionists, who offered almost no positive solution to the question of averting the Turkish conquest, were victorious? The cardinal flaw of the pro-Unionist argument was not even that it was based on the erroneous assumption of Western military possibilities—although the anti-Unionists were quick to point that out.³⁸ The Latins, however divided, were capable of seriously threatening the Turk—King Ladislaus' campaign was almost a success. This conception's chief weakness and the one which proved to be its undoing, lay in its purported strongest point. It insisted on reason.³⁹ It offered a plausible "terrestrial" answer to the problem of saving Constantinople, but it seemed to traffic its "celestial" aspect away. After all, the end of the world was approaching, a belief which itself was a projection of dim forebodings of the end of the Byzantine empire.⁴⁰ What was a message worth which, against immense odds, promised the preservation of earthly goods but threatened to compromise the Heavenly Salvation of the individual soul? Shortly before the fall of Constantinople, Scholarios had an easy task in deriding those partisans of a religious *combinazione* who said "If this and that (meaning Western help) happen, we will mention the Pope's name in the liturgy, but if this and that do not happen, we will not." To him, political opportunists ready to tamper "a little bit" with Orthodoxy and to accept this lesser evil in the hope of checking the dreaded Turk were simply

revealing their religious indifferentism. There was no middle way in matters of faith as there is none in matters of truth and falsehood.⁴¹

What was the anti-Unionist reply as to how the Empire was to be saved, if the Latins were to be considered not only as schismatics but as heretics? The ultimate answer was a "celestial" one, an appeal to God's help. In the past, the Byzantines owed their survival to the Mercy of the Heavens, not to illusory hopes of Papal assistance invoked in vain in moments of supreme danger. God's wrath should not be stirred by the betrayal at Florence of the pure original faith. It was diabolically insane to assume that one could save the faith by destroying it and that God would let the Byzantines bring the Union to fruition and thus cause His own disgrace. It was better to suffer anything than deny ancestral beliefs. What had the fear of the Turk to do with religious matters? Even if the refusal to come to terms with the Latins should imperil Byzantium, the best way to avert the fall of the City was to face boldly its possibility and to be ready, in a true martyr spirit, for the death of the body. Then the Lord would not let the Byzantines suffer at the hands of infidels. God willing, the Empire will be saved, as it was saved so often in the past, but only provided it remains Orthodox. Did not the battle of Ankara (1402), which brought such relief to Constantinople, occur in the time of Manuel II, an Orthodox ruler? Was not the rejection of the Union followed by the death of Sultan Murad (1451), an event which, so it was hoped, would usher in a period of lessened tensions for Byzantium? Did not, on the contrary, the situation of the city deteriorate when the Unionist negotiations were taken up later?⁴² Not that the anti-Unionists were entirely oblivious to the "terrestrial" plane. But there, their attitudes were mostly negative—to rely upon Byzantium's own resources, to be skeptical about the potentialities of Western help, not to move towards the Latins for fear of precipitating the final Turkish attack, in short to be the third force between Europe and Asia.⁴³

Maintaining the balance of power was a program advocated by the anti-Unionists and associated with the anti-Unionist forces by their Latin contemporaries.⁴⁴ Sphrantzes, a staunch Orthodox, presents it as the political testament of Manuel II bequeathed to his son John VIII, the disobedient Emperor who repudiated it at Florence.⁴⁵ But in the sixties of the fifteenth century, Ubertino Pusculo made the same John VIII express his fear that the Latins might completely expel the Turk from Europe. He attributed to the Byzantine ruler the Machiavellian, though short-sighted, decision to "extend our right hand to the falling Murad" in 1444, of course, by breaking off the Union of Florence.⁴⁶ Historically, this is a manifest falsehood, but for our purposes, an indication of what the anti-Unionist policy was believed to have been.⁴⁷

VI.

In Constantinople, the pro-Unionists "earthly" conception met the fate of all programs which fail to neutralize emotional resistance with equally potent emotional appeal. As a result, the Unionists could rely on the Emperor and a segment of higher officialdom but had to face the hostility of those whose dearest emotional attachments were put to test: the lower clergy, the monks, the faithful. In former centuries the imperial authority might have imposed its will. Now John VIII was not even a Michael VIII. Repeated imperial attempts at making anti-Unionism innocuous by bribing an anti-unionist leader with a polluted patriarchal throne failed. The emperor did not control the Church; he also had to take public opinion into account.⁴⁸

Among the cultivated this public opinion was, at least superficially, not all emotional. The Truth, as they saw it, was defended with arguments which no amount of Latin dogmatic subtleties could ever shake. No matter how much the more speculative Latins may have insisted upon the truth of the *doctrine of filioque*, the Greeks, more historically minded, stuck to the texts, and to the Seven Councils.⁴⁹ It still remained that this addition to the Symbol of Faith was a Latin innovation introduced under unclear circumstances—had the Orthodox known the attitude the Papacy adopted towards this addition in the beginning of the ninth century they would have doubly rejoiced. Furthermore, the Council had forbidden any changes in the Symbol of Faith. To the Orthodox that meant changes in wording. Some Fathers of the Church, including John of Damascus and Maximus Confessor, both of whom the Latins also of course quoted to bolster up their stand, explicitly stated that the expressions "through the Son" and "from the Son" were not equivalent. They also said that the Son is not the cause of the Holy Ghost and found the formula $\piνεῦμα \acute{\epsilon}κ υιοῦ$ inadmissible. As for the Latin fathers, the Orthodox were not interested in them and freely admitted, perhaps even exaggerated, their ignorance.⁵⁰ When faced with a passage supporting the Latin position, they shouted "Forgery!" Sometimes they were right; sometimes wrong.

But even among the cultivated, rational arguments were only a cover for suspicion and resentment. At an earlier point in his career, Scholarios had to ward off anonymous accusations calling his loyalty to the country in doubt, because he was learning Italian or Latin, talking with the Latins and not speaking badly of them. This was ominous, his accusers maintained, and revealed his pro-Latin leanings. In vain did Scholarios point out that almost everybody in Constantinople spoke Turkish; did it make the Byzantines friends of Mohammedanism? In Italy, he asserted, where so many people were eagerly learning Greek, things were different. Everybody praised the Humanists for

their endeavors and no one thought of accusing them of leanings towards Orthodoxy. As for talking to Latins, how could one learn to speak a foreign language if not by conversation? All this to no avail. Scholarios' zeal was declared unpatriotic and proof of his ungratefulness to the Fatherland.⁵¹

Among the common faithful, emotion was everything.⁵² They were told to shun the Unionists as one does a snake⁵³ and they obeyed the appeal, turning their backs on those who were near to the traitors of the Byzantine way of life. Syropulos, a great popular narrator, the author of the best memoirs Byzantium had produced since Psellos, tells the story of a perfectly Orthodox priest who had never seen the enthronement of a patriarch and so he came to look at the procession connected with the consecration of the pro-Unionist patriarch Metrophanes. Later the same day he found that not one member of his parish appeared for Divine services. The next day also the church remained empty. Finally, the priest learned that his parish had rejected him because, so they said, "thou hath concelebrated with the Patriarch and become a Latin." The poor priest tried to explain that he was simply an onlooker. To no avail. They granted him the point but added: "But thou wert the Latinists' fellow traveler." The priest had to promise by taking an oath that he would not come near those who were associated with the Patriarch. Syropulos closes this description of the hapless priest's plight with the following words, which may also serve as justification for our including this *scène de genre* here: "Surely the previous remarks were inserted into my treatise under the guise of a condiment. Still, anyone may best gather from them the attitude our most Christian people take in matters of sound ecclesiastical truth and how they loathe and reject spurious and foreign doctrines."⁵⁴

In such a climate the Union with Rome could hardly thrive. Two years before the fall of the city, the anti-Unionists were so strong that they could pose as *the* Church and conduct negotiations for a Union of their own—with the Utraquists of Bohemia. Nothing came out of it, partly because their attitude towards the anti-papist Bohemians was as unbending as that of Eugene IV had been towards themselves. The arrival of the Bohemian representative, whom the Greeks called Constantine the Englishman, provided at least a fine opportunity for a popular anti-papal demonstration in the Church of St. Sophia.⁵⁵

But at the eleventh hour, late in 1452, Byzantine politicians realized that their schemes for holding the balance of power had only led to their country's isolation in face of the Eastern enemy.⁵⁶ The people, too, changed their uncompromising stand. A substantial part

of the urban masses, however much they may have disliked the Latins, did not heed the anti-Unionist manifesto of Scholarios, directed at them, and posted in at least twenty-five places throughout the city.⁵⁷ To Scholarios' disappointment they supported the papal legate Isidore. But it was the Turk, well aware of the Unionist negotiations in Florence and their aftermath,⁵⁸ who decided the fate of the Union.

VII.

Ultimately, the Unionist's cause, with its "earthly" promise, came to stand or fall with the success or failure of anti-Turkish action. The three eastern patriarchs may have repudiated the Union in 1443 but Pusculo, a Latin contemporary, connects the disavowal of the Union by the Imperial Court of Constantinople with the Battle of Varna which occurred a year later.⁵⁹ That defeat, frustrating the plans to relieve Constantinople, and later the fall of the City itself sealed the fate of the Union. What remained for the intellectuals was to assign the responsibility for the disaster.

In the eyes of the Orthodox the disaster was Divine retribution for Byzantine sins and the conclusion of the Union was foremost among them.⁶⁰ Already on the eve of 1453 Orthodox writings abound in obscure hints portending calamity, were the Union to be resumed.⁶¹ The Latins, too, saw the operation of Divine justice in the fall of Constantinople. For them it was punishment for the heretic and two-faced Greeks for their treacherous behavior after the Council.⁶² In the punning formulation of Leonard of Chios, a Latin prelate and eyewitness to the siege of the City, it was not *unio facta*, as the Greeks maintained, but *unio ficta* that brought about the end of Byzantium.⁶³ Furthermore, was not the blossoming of Old Rome as opposed to the plight of the New not a proof that the Greek faith had been vanquished by the Gates of Hell for its disobedience to Rome?⁶⁴ It was weak reasoning. It may have caused some embarrassment to the monk Philotheus in Russia, but it was easily refuted by the Greeks and no less a man than Martin Luther, both of whom pointed out that it amounted to saying that the Martyrs were vanquished by the Gates of Hell.⁶⁵ This type of polemic centering about the Council of Florence would be resuscitated towards the end of the sixteenth century at the time of the Union of Brest, and its mild echo is audible in a papal pronouncement dating from our time.⁶⁶

The Unionist cause was lost in conquered Byzantium but those who espoused it remained either in Latin-held Greek territories or in Italy, where their ranks were increased by refugees from the catastrophe of 1453. As in the fourteenth century, some of the outstanding Byzantine intellects were among the friends of the Union, but often their lot was the unenviable one of *émigrés* or supporters of a foreign re-

ligion and authority, mistrusted by their compatriots. Some of them succeeded in life, like Plusiadenos, one of the twelve Catholic priests of Greek rite subsidized by Pius II in Crete.⁶⁷ Some did not, like another learned man of Crete turned informer, Michael Apostolis, who was ostracized by the Orthodox society of the island and never obtained his coveted professorial position in Italy.⁶⁸ Cardinal Bessarion's death deprived many of their subsidies and left some bitterly bemoaning their fate, unable to adjust to the Italian milieu, refusing to learn the tongue of the country, still feeling that assistance on the part of the Italians was their due, and resenting the "natives."⁶⁹ The "natives" were resentful too. In the second part of the fifteenth century, the attitude of Italian Humanists—grown sure of their learning—towards Greek scholars became progressively more ambivalent, for the latter's superciliousness hurt their susceptibilities. Even those among the Greeks who had fought nobly for Union and their fatherland and who narrowly missed reaching the pinnacle of the Roman Church, had their moments of humiliation. Bessarion himself was attacked at the conclave of cardinals as a recently naturalized member of the Catholic community and an unshaven foreigner.⁷⁰ "Westernized" Greeks who strove to bring the two Churches closer together while keeping their Orthodox faith, met a similar fate. In the sixteenth century Maximos Margunios, another native of Crete educated in Italy, saw his conciliatory attitude rewarded by attacks coming from Orthodox Greek prelates and Rome alike.⁷¹

VIII.

Before Eugene IV closed the Council of Florence in the Lateran (1445), representatives of various Eastern Churches other than the Orthodox signed acts of Union with Rome. The immediate results of their adherence were as ephemeral as the "reduction" of the Greek Church.^{71a} But for the Papacy discussions at the Council and its decisions proved of considerable long range service. The Curia relied on the *Florentinum* in two respects—in its relations with the Christian East and within the Catholic community—although success in one of them involved a setback in the other.

In dealings with "schismatics," the Council provided the Papacy with a basis for action and a model to be followed on almost all occasions from the fifteenth century to the nineteenth, when Eastern Christians, from Ethiopia to the Ukraine, were summoned or led to unity with Rome.⁷² In this sense, the intellectual history of the Council of Florence merges with the Roman Curia's unionist activity. The Union of Brest furnishes the best illustration for this interdependence, as the polemics which it occasioned are one of the most interesting moments in the Council's history. This Union (1596-1946), the greatest and

most lasting gain for the Catholic Church, was proclaimed as a continuation of that of Florence for the territories of Poland-Lithuania inhabited by Orthodox Ukrainians and Byelorussians. Among those two peoples, the immediate reverberation of the Council of Florence had been curiously small, considering that the Union was to be implemented in a Catholic state. True, a few papal breves and some royal ordinances affecting the "Ruthenians" of Poland-Lithuania were called forth by the Florentine Union. One of its decrees was also used there as a basis for papal decisions on the question of rebaptizing the Ruthenians.⁷³ But these were official charters of administrative or canonical character. Except for one document disputed as to date and authenticity,⁷⁴ there was a striking absence of *intellectual* repercussions of the Florentine *decretum* in the Ukrainian and Byelorussian lands until the latter part of the sixteenth century.

This relative unanimity of indifference can be explained. In Poland-Lithuania, Pope Eugene IV's Union was to no one's great liking. It was not until 1447 that official Poland switched from its support of the Council of Basle, hostile to Eugene IV, back to Rome and Eugene's successor. From the early fourteen-thirties to the fourteen-fifties, governmental circles showed a great deal of ambivalence toward the Union. The Catholic hierarchy in Poland-Lithuania's Orthodox lands stood for union, but usually it interpreted the term in the sense of outright catholicization. It did not want to resign itself to equality with the despised *vladicæ* of oriental rite. The *vladicæ*, too, clung to their "errors." In the opinion of Catholic experts, ranging from a fifteenth century Cardinal Oleśnicki to Possevino, Rome's great authority on Eastern Europe who wrote on the eve of the Union of Brest, the Orthodox of Poland-Lithuania were far from willing to abandon their superstitions; they snickered at the short-lived Florentine Union, which they did not help to formulate, and had never been willing to adhere to its principles.⁷⁵ A pro-Unionist Greek, ordained metropolitan of Kiev by the Unionist Patriarch of Constantinople residing in Rome (1458), resumed relations with the Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople and was confirmed by him about ten years after his arrival in his Kievan diocese. But even when in 1500 the metropolitan of Kiev made unionist overtures in Rome, Alexander VI treated him with reserve. Some hundred years later, these overtures were forgotten both in Kiev and in the Curia. By 1501, the Union of Florence in Poland-Lithuania was considered defunct by the Pope.⁷⁶

A more vigorous attitude on the part of one of the Churches was necessary to put an end to this placidity. When such a change was initiated on a broad scale by the Roman Curia in the fifteen-seventies, Florence came again to the fore. It was hardly a coincidence that the

year 1577 should be the date of the publication in Rome of the pro-Unionist *Acta Graeca* of the Council of Florence, that of the foundation of *Collegio Greco*, Traversari's old dream, by the Pope, and that of the appearance in the Lithuanian city of Vilna of the treatise "On the Unity of God's Church" by the great Polish Jesuit Peter Skarga. A large section of this forceful work, and of other books by Skarga was devoted to the history of the Council of Florence where, so the author insisted, the Union was concluded on a fully voluntary basis.⁷⁷

Already towards the middle of the sixteenth century, when the half-Ukrainian Catholic writer Orzechowski, a friend of Orthodoxy and the Union, rebuked those Roman canonists who "put the Christian Church exclusively in a corner of Latium," he only echoed Byzantine prelates who, arguing against the Council of Florence, maintained that it was "in bad taste . . . to circumscribe the Church by the boundaries of Rome."⁷⁸ In the last quarter of the century and the beginning of the next, no major work of the extensive polemical literature, a part of which was later to spread to Moscow, could leave the Council unmentioned.⁷⁹ As the new union was to be a renewal of that of Florence, the Council was vigorously defended and just as vigorously attacked. Original and spurious documents and works touching upon the Florentine Union were unearthed and printed by pro-Unionists, new "histories" of the Council appeared, both of the apologetic and the blood-curdling variety. In the latter case for once the Ukrainian and Byelorussian camps made use of the Muscovite propaganda material of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.⁸⁰

The arguments used in these works were mostly old stuff. Pro-Unionists made fun of the Orthodox *dictum* "our fathers would be damned if we united with you," at least as ancient as Scholarios' and Plusiadenos' polemics.⁸¹ They were as old-fashioned themselves when they quoted Leonard of Chios to show that the fall of Constantinople was God's revenge for rejection of the Union, and Patriarch Joseph II's famous letter purportedly written *in articulo mortis* to prove that the Eastern Church voluntarily bowed to Rome in Florence.⁸² Adversaries of the Union adduced ingenious arguments to expose the spuriousness of the letter and indulged, after the fashion of Mark of Ephesus, in general considerations on the greater authenticity of the Greek texts.⁸³ To anti-Unionists, as to Luther somewhat earlier, the fall of Constantinople, far from being proof that "light went out in the East," meant that the Orthodox Church was the true Church bearing Her Cross. God himself undid the Union of Florence and preferred to let the Turk have Constantinople than to allow the papal apostate in His temple.⁸⁴ For less exigent readers, there was the usual wonderment at the "eighth or ninth" council, about which nothing

was written in the right books, while the decisions of seven Oecumenical Councils were to be observed forever.⁸⁵ It was for the same palates that Mark of Ephesus' remarks on the effeminacy of people with shaven faces were warmed up and spiced with the legend of Papissa Ioanna.⁸⁶

IX.

In 1868, when Pope Pius IX was about to convoke a council intended as oecumenical, he summoned Orthodox bishops to participate in it and thus to follow the example set by their ancestors in Lyons and later at the Council of Florence.⁸⁷ In the eyes of some Catholic prelates the new Council was to resume the great enterprise of Eugene IV and to improve upon it.⁸⁸ This invitation to those not in communion with Rome was in line with a centuries old tradition. So was the Orthodox refusal.⁸⁹ But it was within the Catholic community that the Union of Florence played its most important part at the Vatican Council of 1870. When Rome thought of strengthening its position by proclaiming as dogma the infallibility of the Pope's teaching office, it based its doctrine on the clauses of the *Florentinum* concerning Papal primacy. The new dogma was to be only an explicit reformulation of what the Council of Florence had implicitly asserted. Hence the anti-infallibilists, too, turned their attention to the Council of Florence, interpreting it in their own way.

It was the misfortune of the learned Catholic opposition to the principles of the Vatican Council that it chose to wage one of its major skirmishes on the Papacy's own grounds. The dispute took a scholarly form. Not that some of the polemical tracts which fed on it lacked vigor. They reminded one of lampoons of more distant times.⁹⁰ But in a century where philology reigned supreme, the controversy centered on the discussion of a passage in the Florentine decree. In its vulgate Latin version, this passage stated that the Pope was the father and teacher of all Christians and had full authority to rule the Church "as is also contained (*quemadmodum etiam . . . continetur*) in the acts of Councils and in the sacred Canons." When von Döllinger, Germany's greatest Catholic historian of the Church, issued an open declaration of war on the infallibilists in a newspaper article, he devoted half of it to the Council of Florence.⁹¹ By so doing, he made his case depend on the success of his arguments touching upon this Council. In the various documents submitted by the Pope or by preparatory commissions as a basis for deliberations at the Vatican Council, Döllinger complained, the Florentine decree was quoted in a truncated form, without the *quemadmodum . . . continetur* clause; this amounted to a falsification. More than that, the word *etiam* itself was a sixteenth century forgery. The original of the decree had *quemadmodum et in*

gestis . . . conciliorum et in . . . canonibus continetur, thus defining the rights of the Pope "in the manner contained" both in the acts of the Oecumenical Councils and in the Canons. In the true version the Greeks saw to it that the Papal authority would be circumscribed by the rules of the Councils and by the Canons. The small *et*, attested in our best source, the first printed edition of the acts of the Council of Florence (all the five original copies of the decree having disappeared)⁹² took all the ground from under the infallibilists. Finally, the Council of Florence, that case of blackmail, was not oecumenical, since one of its lay participants, Amirutzes, denied its oecumenicity. Döllinger's article precipitated a series of open letters adorned with over a hundred professorial signatures, praising him for his erudition and what was termed his scientifically irrefutable remarks.⁹³

The professors were too easily overwhelmed. Döllinger's attempt was honest, his stand in the controversy, noble, but it is difficult to decide whether the genre to which his address belonged was that of scholarship or of conciliar polemics. He was right concerning the suppression of the *quemadmodum . . . continetur* clause in some of the preconiliar *schemata*, constitutions and petitions, which even zealously added the words *et iudicem supremum* to the Florentine definition of papal primacy.⁹⁴ This may have been a case of doctoring up a text; it was hardly a falsification since the reason for the omission was stated and the clause later appeared in one of the final conciliar Dogmatic Decrees.⁹⁵

On his main points Döllinger was wrong. There was no need to discuss whether the *Florentinum* as read by him—and supposedly understood by the Greeks in 1439—really put the Pope's authority within conciliar boundaries.⁹⁶ The papal side had no difficulty in producing a learned archivist who conclusively proved—with the one extant original copy of the Florentine decree in one hand and nine other copies in the other—that the correct reading of the controversial word was *etiam*, not *et*.⁹⁷ Thus the disputed clause could plausibly be interpreted as mere conciliar corroboration of papal prerogatives whose source lay elsewhere, above the human sphere. In recent years, Catholic scholarship has once more discreetly repeated its irrefutable, because documentary, proof.⁹⁸

Döllinger's doubts as to the oecumenicity of the Florentine Council could not find support even among the "inopportunist" adversaries of Papal infallibility. As they maintained that the Council of Florence had sufficiently defined Papal primacy, thus making the proclamation of a new dogma inopportune, they had to uphold this Council's authority.⁹⁹ The infallibilists dismissed Döllinger's objections in a somewhat short-tempered but hardly cogent manner.

They ominously wondered at people who declared themselves Catholic and yet asserted that the Council of Florence was not oecumenical; they found it oecumenical, since it was considered as such by the Catholic Church; one archbishop's Dogmatic Postulates even provided an anathema for anyone opposing the Florentine clauses on papal primacy.¹⁰⁰ In a less heated and more leisurely atmosphere the papal scholars would have found the passage of Syropulos, at least as good a contemporary witness of the Council of Florence as was the shifty Amirutzes. The Orthodox Syropulos was no lover of what happened at Florence. Yet to him the oecumenicity of the Council at its initial stage was undeniable.¹⁰¹

The anti-infallibilists were more justified in pointing out that the Papacy's use of the Council of Florence was a setback to the cause for which it was once convened. The introduction of new Catholic articles of faith moved the Churches further apart doctrinally and the attribution of new prerogatives to the Roman Pontiff aggravated the chief objection which the *Orientales* had been raising against the Union. At the Vatican Council, the Greek Melkites, loyal to Rome, were apprehensive of the bad impression the dogma of infallibility would produce on the Orthodox.¹⁰² And soon after the Council, Döllinger, by then the chief spokesman of the Old Catholic Church, observed that to speak any longer of hopes for a future Union would border on madness.¹⁰³

X.

One reaction to the events at Florence occurred in defiance of Rome and Constantinople alike. Its ideological after-effects were the most notable of all produced by the Council. Directly or indirectly, they are felt up to this day. In Moscow, the strongest of Byzantium's daughter Churches, opposition to the Union, outwardly a case of backwoods bigotry, gave the final impulse to presenting claims for which objective conditions had existed for some time. Through these claims Muscovite bookmen removed their city from the periphery of the Byzantine cultural sphere and transformed it into the center of their own new realm, a universal empire illumined by the only unadulterated faith.

During the discussions at Florence apprehension had arisen in the Greek camp that the Union, were it to be concluded, would lead to the loss of the daughter Churches, especially the Church of Moscow whose representatives, it was said, showed a strongly conservative spirit.¹⁰⁴ In the long run, the apprehensions proved true. It is doubtful, however, whether the mood of the Russian delegation at Florence was as intransigent as the Muscovite accounts of the Council have it.¹⁰⁵ In these accounts, the conclusion of the Union is attributed to Greek

greediness for silver. Yet, according to a sterling Greek Orthodox source, the Russian prelates themselves were villainously bribed by their metropolitan, the pro-Unionist Greek Isidore of Kiev, into acquiescing in a dogmatic solution whose implications they could not possibly comprehend. These bribed prelates surely included Bishop Abraham of Suzdal'.¹⁰⁶ Nevertheless, the Muscovite pamphlets—and they alone—state that the villain Isidore forced Abraham to sign the *decretum* of Florence by softening him up with a week's stay in jail—but some later recensions of these same sources also claim that Emperor John VIII's body was eaten by dogs.¹⁰⁷ Moreover, the Orthodox Syropulos reports that Thomas, the envoy of the Prince of Tver', assisted in the washing of the Pope's hands at the solemn liturgy following the conclusion of the Union—an arrangement made especially by Isidore to honor the ruler Thomas represented.¹⁰⁸

The Muscovite pamphlets expressed resentment for the scorn the Uniate traitor Isidore supposedly showed toward Russian ignoramuses. But for all we know from the Orthodox Scholarios, Isidore loyally asked the theological opinion of his delegation and did not adhere to the Unionist position before securing its assent.¹⁰⁹ It is Scholarios who repeatedly derides Isidore's pupils who never dreamt, so he says, of the meaning of such concepts as "cause" or "Son."¹¹⁰ Simeon, a Russian participant in the Council and the author of two accounts of what happened there, repays the compliment on another plane: after listing the three principal speakers for the Papal side, all Italians of course, he adds: "All these philosophers were of Greek origin."¹¹¹

Indeed, about the time of Florence, there was more to Byzantine-Muscovite relations than a common dislike of the Union and a solidarity among the Orthodox. There were also tensions between the Russians and the Greeks. In spite of their reverence for the version of the Greek faith embodied by Mark of Ephesus, the Russians grew impatient with the tutelage of the Byzantines, who to them were not quite trustworthy in their religious demeanor, while their own faith was the purest of all in the world. On the other side, that of the Mother Church, the Greeks resented a situation which amounted to practical autocephaly among the Northern Barbarians.¹¹²

Scholarios' scorn for the Russian conciliar delegates' ignorance was not all slander. Simeon consistently called the city of the Council "*Frolentij*." In spite of the impression he strove to create by inserting a few Greek words into his pamphlets, he knew no Greek or at least could not follow the disputes at the Council directly.¹¹³ The level of the Muscovites' linguistic capacity may be gathered from their assertion that conciliar discussions were conducted in three languages: in Greek, in the tongue of the Franks and "in philosophical."¹¹⁴ For

dogmatic differences Simeon had no interest, but his common sense assessed the situation correctly. What trickled down into his account in the form of the speeches of Mark of Ephesus, full of tedious repetitions, were the rudimentary Orthodox arguments, easy to grasp, still containing the essence of the matter: the Pope called the present gathering the eighth council, he rejected the Seven Oecumenical Councils which forbade any additions (i.e., to the Symbol of Faith); most outrageous, he had his name and that of the overbearing Latins mentioned first, while that of the Orthodox was mentioned last, and he did not refer to other patriarchs as brothers.¹¹⁵ Later Muscovite pamphlets and documents emanating from the princely court are only slightly more *au courant* of what went on at the Council theologically. One of them makes Mark of Ephesus refer to Latin use of purportedly forged texts and upbraids the Latins for dividing the Holy Ghost, a trace of the Orthodox claim that the Latin *ex patre filioque* formula postulated the existence of two principles in the third Person of the Trinity.¹¹⁶ One letter of Prince Vassilij II even paraphrases a passage of the *decretum* of Florence.¹¹⁷ But again, this shocking passage is the one defining the Papal primacy.

What the Muscovite pamphlets lacked in finesse, they offset by the forcefulness of presentation and clarity of purpose. This purpose was to contrast the apostasy at Florence of the shifty Greek Patriarch and the Emperor with the unswerving Orthodoxy of the Muscovite prince.¹¹⁸ It is possible to follow the growth of this anti-Byzantine attitude through the various Muscovite works on the Council. The earliest of them, a travelogue, refers to the Council as holy and oecumenical.¹¹⁹ But in a span of twenty years, ever more gruesome details are inserted into consecutive Muscovite accounts, and the two chief villains, the Pope and the Cardinal Isidore, are joined by another pair, the Patriarch Joseph and John VIII the Emperor.¹²⁰ Finally, the last and most voluminous tract, dating from the early sixties of the fifteenth century, and bearing clear traces of official inspiration, apostrophises and chides the Greek patriarch and the Emperor, opposes to them Vassilij II, the Protector of Truth, and draws the consequence that the Rus' land has reason to rejoice in the whole universe together with Orthodox people, since it is governed by the defender of Orthodoxy, a Tsar of all Rus', crowned by God in order that he might rule over all the Orthodox.¹²¹ From this formulation, a direct line leads to the late fifteenth century letter of Ivan III, where he makes the Patriarch of Constantinople himself confess that "Greek Orthodoxy is by now destroyed" and where he asserts that he and his entourage do not need the blessing of the Constantinopolitan Patriarch, whom they consider "alien and abjured" as a denizen of the Turkish Empire and a prisoner in the hands of the infidels.¹²² The Greeks, so it is claimed in Moscow,

met the just reward of their betrayal; Constantinople, which braved all dangers as long as it remained Orthodox, fell as a result of the conclusion of the Union of Florence. In a curious way, the Muscovite interpretation coincided with that given by the Papists in Rome.¹²³ Not that this explanation occurred to Muscovite propaganda at the very outset: Iona, the first autocephalous Metropolitan of Moscow, is also the first to expound it while defending the canonicity of his ordination about 1459.¹²⁴ And on a later occasion, one of Iona's early successors took up the same argument. Incidentally, for him it is no longer Isidore, but the Byzantines proper who are the villains. He even maintained that Isidore, the evil mastermind of earlier accounts, only *followed* the Emperor and the Patriarch in their apostasy.¹²⁵

In a tactfully curtailed version, the argument had one more crowned proponent. Speaking of the first patriarch of Moscow about 1590, Fedor, Ivan the Terrible's son, declared that Old Rome fell because of the many heresies of its Popes, heresies which were topped by that of Pope Eugene who summoned the Council of Florence and who was refuted by Mark of Ephesus. But in Russia the Church shone in the rays of purest Orthodoxy.¹²⁶ The history of the statement is hazy, the anti-Greek link in the argument is missing, but its intent is discernible. The creation of the patriarchate of Moscow in 1589, an act for which the foundations were laid in Iona's time, was brought officially into connection with the Council of Florence.^{126a}

XI.

The Greek betrayal of the true faith at Florence was one of the two basic elements of the ideological construction formulated by the monk Philotheus of Pskov in the early sixteenth century, that of Moscow, the Third and last Rome, center of the Universal Empire and of pure Orthodoxy. The other element was the fall of Constantinople, from whence the sceptre over the world should pass to Moscow. The two, Constantinople's fall and the Council, were brought by Philotheus into causal relation.¹²⁷ It has recently been asserted that the ideological concepts of sovereignty as held by Muscovite rulers vastly differed from the theory of Moscow the Third Rome, that these rulers were not attracted by a nebulous sovereignty over the whole Orthodox world, and that therefore Philotheus' dream had no official character.¹²⁸ There is some truth in it. But a passage from Philotheus' formula was inserted into the Slavic text of the charter establishing the Patriarchate of Moscow¹²⁹—to be sure, the insertion lacked the anti-Florentine clause, so as not overly to embarrass the Patriarch of Constantinople, by then a docile follower of Moscow, and therefore again called a lord of an ideal "Greek Empire." And Fedor's declaration containing the reference to Florence, was only a distortion of Philo-

theus's. Thus the Pskovian monk's doctrine belatedly received its official endorsement. Such was also the interpretation given to the Muscovite court's attitude by the eastern Patriarchs. In their writings related to the event of 1589 they could not refer to their predecessor's failure in Florence; similar suicidal utterances are attributed to the Greeks only in earlier Muscovite sources.¹³⁰ But both the Patriarch of Constantinople Jeremiah II and that of Alexandria Meletios Pigas alluded to Philotheus' doctrine or at least expressed thoughts common with it.¹³¹

With Patriarch Nikon's Byzantine inspired reforms in the seventeenth century, there was no longer a place for anti-Greek ideas in the official Russian Church. They did not disappear however. They moved to other quarters. To Nikon's adversaries, the Old Believers, his activity smacked of Latinism. In 1656 a simple tailor from the Russian city of Rostov, Silas Bogdanov, preached that the accursed Metropolitan of Rostov and his "father," the patriarch Nikon, had changed truth into falsehood, abolished the Mass, and the Seven Councils, adopted the eighth council and the papist heresy. Questioned on his beliefs and tortured, Silas declared "The one who adds to or takes away anything from the Seven Councils is the Precursor of the Anti-Christ."¹³² Whether this illiterate protomartyr of the Old Believer Church knew it or not, he was only paraphrasing Muscovite anti-Florentine tracts of the fifteenth century and hurling his invectives at the place from whence they had originally come. Later Old Believers explained the fall of Byzantium with the betrayal of the faith by the Greeks and quoted the theory of Moscow the Third Rome in their appeals to the Tsars.¹³³

Of course, as Berdjaev remarked, the Old Believers' Third Rome was an underground one, for to them the actual Third Rome, the Russian Tsardom, was in the claws of the Demon.¹³⁴ In its *literal* form, the doctrine and its anti-Florentine overtones remained underground only to emerge in official ecclesiastical places with the re-establishment of the Patriarchate of Moscow in 1943. Two years after that event, a meeting of Russian bishops in Paris declared that it was high time the oecumenical throne should no longer be occupied by a Turkish subject.¹³⁵ Ivan III's bishops had objected to Constantinople on the same grounds. Soon, a more constructive suggestion was made in Moscow. In 1946 the following passage appeared in the official publication of the Russian Patriarchate: "Moscow the Third Rome continues to be a world-embracing idea, namely that of Union which forms a counterbalance to the Papacy with its autocratic tendencies and insane dreams of ruling over the world. Moscow is the Third Rome—and a fourth there shall not be, as our forefathers declared in Ivan III's time." This was no metaphor, nor a historical reminiscence, but a restatement

of a program in its literal formulation. Still, this was not the official voice of the Patriarchate, but that of an archbishop, eager to prove his loyalty and redeem his politically not quite lucid past.¹³⁶

In July of 1948, many princes of the Orthodox Church gathered in Moscow to celebrate the five-hundredth anniversary of the inauguration of Iona, the first autocephalous Muscovite metropolitan, and to take part in an all-Orthodox conference. There, in his allocution on the opening day, Stephen the Exarch of Bulgaria fulminated against the Byzantine Emperor, whom he called John VI, and the Patriarch Joseph, who both, so he said, threw themselves in the Pope's arms. He hailed the courageous decision of the Russian Church to free herself from submission to Constantinople. Moscow, he continued, became the Third Rome, having occupied the place of the first, which left the Truth, and the second, which slipped from the path of Faith.¹³⁷ The violent tone of the address may have been attributable to a Bulgarian's dislike for the oppressors of his Church under the Turkocracy. But in view of the circumstances, its contents were of official significance. The Patriarch of Moscow, Alexius, declared earlier on the same day that when, towards the middle of the fifteenth century, the Orthodox faith became troubled in the Church of Constantinople, and when the Patriarch and the Emperor joined the Union, the Russian Church found it necessary to go its own way corresponding to the purity of its Orthodox faith. This was a re-statement in a calm and dignified form of Iona's pronouncements of five hundred years earlier.¹³⁸

The representative of the Patriarch of Constantinople was listening to all these harangues and other jibes at his Sec.¹³⁹ When his turn came, he acquitted himself with accomplished grace: his Patriarch, he said, was overjoyed over the decision to celebrate the anniversary. The Great Church of Constantinople was happy to have given the light of the Christian faith to the Russian nation and to have been, for many centuries, the teacher of her spiritual daughter. When the Russian Church, having grown and spread by the Grace of God *received* its autonomy, the Church of Constantinople transmitted to her Her greetings at the occasion of this joyous event.¹⁴⁰ A pedantic historian may raise his eyebrows at this statement; but in another sense, it has historical value, for it is still another expression of the millenary experience of a Patriarchate to which, according to one interpretation, the 28th Canon of the Council of Chalcedon accorded the rule over the barbarian lands.¹⁴¹

In following the reactions to the Council of Florence, whether in Rome or in Pskov, in Crete or in Munich, this paper's main concern has not been with reasons for events in the Council's history or its religious significance. What for another historical purpose might be

put aside as mere coincidence or anecdote has had its necessary place here. For here, we have been dealing with intellectuals and states of mind. Aside from some not too frequent exceptions, most important in human affairs, intellectuals do not pursue truth for its own sake, nor do they create a rational framework. Above all, they contribute to its perpetuation. It seems that the intellectual history of the Council of Florence bears out this view.

*This is an amplified version of a paper read at the December 1954 meeting of the American Historical Association in New York. In collecting material for the paper I was assisted by a grant from the Faculty Research Fund of the Horace H. Rackham School of Graduate Studies of the University of Michigan.

1. Lapo da Castiglione, a secretary of the Curia and a participant of the council at Ferrara, considered the arrival of the Greeks as something unprecedented: *tam celebrem . . . gentium concursum . . . antea numquam auditum aut lectum*. Dialogus de curiae commodis, first ed. in E. Garin, *Prosatori latini del Quattrocento* (1952), p. 192. Texts of Traversari's letters in G. Mercati, *Ultimi contributi alla storia degli umanisti I: Traversariana [Studi e Testi XC (1939)]*, pp. 24-26; L. Mehus, ed., *Ambrosii Traversari . . . epistolae* [to be referred to in subsequent notes as Traversari] I (Florence, 1759), col. 624. A. Diller, "Pletho and Plutarch," *Scriptorium*, VIII (1954), 126, thinks that the MS of Plutarch referred to by Traversari as brought to the Council by the Emperor is the actual *Parisinus Graecus* 1672, a huge *de luce* tome. The extent to which the Council of Florence facilitated the westward migration of Greek manuscripts should not be exaggerated. By somewhat stretching the point, it is possible to connect the growth of Bessarion's library, and consequently of the *Marciana* in Venice founded by him, with the Council. So L. Mohler, *Kardinal Bessarion als Theologe . . . I* (1923), p. 45. In the *Vaticana*, however, the picture is much less exciting. Shortly after the Council and some time before 1443 this library, 340 volumes strong, possessed a number of Greek authors, but they were Latin translations. Both Greek accessions (Boethius, a Psalter) were bilingual texts. Cf. P. Fabre, "La bibliothèque Vaticane," in G. Goyau, A. Peraté, P. Fabre, *Le Vatican, les Papes et la civilisation . . .* (Paris, 1895), p. 675. The influx of Greek MSS starts under Nicolas V (1447-1455).
2. Leonardo Bruni, *Rerum suo tempore*

gestarum commentarius, Rerum Ital. Script. XIX, III (1929), p. 455, 16-19. On Pletho's Humanist acquaintances, cf. p. ex., I. P. Mamalakis, Γεώργιος Γεμισσός Πλήθων [*Texte und Forschungen zur Byzantinisch-neugriech. Philologie*, XXXII (Athens, 1939)], p. 162f. Text of Pletho's opinion on Italian Humanists in W. Gass, *Gennadius und Pletho II* (Breslau, 1844), pp. 55-57, partly reprinted by Mamalakis, p. 157f. On his Platonic lectures and his treatise, cf. the text in Gass, p. 113; Mamalakis, p. 161f. On the question of the Florentine Academy, cf. p. ex. M. Anastos, "Pletho's Calendar and Liturgy," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, IV (1948), p. 186, n. 6.

3. Cf. A. Dain, "Le Concile de Florence et la philologie," *Irénikon*, XVI (1939), 232-236, who especially refers to the expert Greek interpreter at the Council, Nicolaus Secundinus (Sagundino) of Euboea, later at the court of Alphonse of Aragon, to Theodore Gaza and to John Sophianos.
- 3a. The phrase comes from Lapo da Castiglione, ed. E. Garin, *Prosatori . . .* (1952), p. 206.
- 3b. Cf. M. Lazzaroni and A. Muñoz, *Filarete, scultore e architetto del secolo XV* (Rome, 1908), esp. pp. 68-71; 75-82; 98; 125-130 and fig. 57-60; 64-65; 79-82 [on Filarete's extant bronze doors in St. Peter's in Rome completed in 1445 and displaying, among other achievements of Eugene IV's reign, various scenes from the Council's history; on another wooden door in St. Peter's by Antonio da Viterbo, on which scenes from the Council were represented, completed about the same time and destroyed during the pontificate of Paul V; on Filarete's bust of the Emperor John VIII (1439? possibly the earliest dated Renaissance bust); on Pisanello's medal of John VIII]; U. Mengin, *Benozzo Gozzoli* (1908), pp. 36-68, and M. Lagaisse, *Benozzo Gozzoli . . .* (1934), esp. pp. 132-143 [on Benozzo's Three Magi in the Medici chapel in Florence (1460), Byzantine prototypes in Benozzo's paintings and the "orientalism"];

- for the most detailed reproductions of Benozzo's Three Magi, cf. P. Bargellini, *La fiaba pittorica di Benozzo Gozzoli* (Florence, 1946).
4. For a more affirmative judgment, cf. L. Mohler, *Kardinal Bessarion als Theologe* . . . I (1923), pp. 112-115.
 5. On Scholarios' expatriation plans, cf. L. Petit, X. A. Sidéridès, M. Jugie, *Oeuvres complètes de Georges Scholarios* [to be referred to in subsequent notes as Scholarios] I (1928), p. 387, 32-35; IV (1935), pp. 417, 18 (in a letter to the Despot of Mistra, Theodore); 419, 12-17 (in a letter to Bessarion); 432, 35-433, 5; 13-15 (in a letter to Pope Eugene IV). Cf. also R. J. Loenertz, "Pour la biographie du Cardinal Bessarion," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, X (1944), 136f., although I doubt whether the letter to Eugene IV is a "polite refusal" of the Pope's invitation. It remains that Scholarios petitioned the Pope first (cf. 432, 27 ἀναφορὰν ἐκείνην) and that this petition contained the desire to see the Pontiff (cf. 432, 34f.). On divergent attitudes towards intellectuals in Italy and Constantinople respectively, cf. Scholarios, I, pp. 386, 16-387, 17, and IV, pp. 403-410, esp. 405, 10-16; 408, 37 (letter to his students).
 6. About 1430, Scholarios inquired of Filelfo concerning the intellectual atmosphere in Florence. This may be deduced from Filelfo's reply of March 1, 1430, cf. E. Legrand, *Cent-dix Lettres grecques de Francois Filelfe* [*Publications de l'École des Langues Orientales vivantes, IIIe série*, vol. XII (Paris 1892)], p. 10.
 7. Scholarios, I, pp. 300, 37-301, 1 (πρώτων αἰτίων); 304, 2-4; 313, 34-36 (κεφάλαιον), III, p. 79, 34f. Even intransigent Mark of Ephesus makes use of this temporal argument in his letter to Eugene IV, ed. L. Petit in *Patrologia Orientalis* [to be quoted in subsequent notes as *PO*], XVII (1923), 336-341, cf. esp. 337; 339.
 8. D. Cydonès, Ῥωμαίους συμβουλευτικὸς, Migne, *PG*, CXLIV, col. 969Bff; 977D; 980A. For the date of the speech, cf. R. J. Loenertz, *Les recueils de lettres de Démétrius Cydonès* [*Studi e Testi* CXXXI (1947)], p. 111; O. Halecki, *Un empereur de Byzance à Rome . . . Rozprawy historyczne Tow. Nauk. Warszawskiego VIII* (Warsaw, 1930), p. 110; 143, who also gives a good resumé of the speech on p. 143f.
 9. G. Cammelli, ed., *Démétrius Cydonès, Correspondance*, (Paris, 1930), letter 13 (date: 1364, cf. R. J. Loenertz, *Les recueils* . . . p. 110), lines 113-124. Already a quarter of a century earlier, Barlaam of Calabria warned the Pope that soon a time might come when the West would think of defending itself from the Turks rather than of attacking them: *Oratio pro Unione* . . . Migne, *PG*, CLI, col. 1336A. On Pope Benedict XI's fears, cf. his letter in Raynaldus, *Ann. Ecol.*, a. 1304, 29.
 10. Cydonès in Migne, *PG*, CXLIV, col. 998AB.
 11. G. Cammelli, *D. Cydonès, Correspondance*, letter 13, lines 78-91.
 12. Συμβουλευτικὸς . . . περὶ Καλλιπύλεως, Migne, *PG*, CXLIV, col. 1029D.
 13. Migne, *PG*, CLIV, col. 1005A.
 14. But see note 47 below.
 15. Text, ed. M. Ch. Kohler, in *Recueil des historiens des croisades, documents Arméniens* II (1906); cf. esp. pp. 440ff. A detailed analysis of d'Adam's *Directorium* in M. Viller, "La question de l'Union des Eglises entre Grecs et Latins . . . (1274-1438)," *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, XVII (1921), 272ff. D'Adam's kindred spirit was Pierre Dubois. Writing about 1306, he advised Latin princes to attack the Byzantine emperor on their way back from the Holy Land.
 16. Latin altruism: Migne, *PG*, CLIV, col. 981BC; 989C; suspicions of Latin intentions: *ibid.*, col. 985CD; 988D; 989CD (πρόσχημα μὲν εἶναι τὴν βοήθειαν;) 993C; 998A. (πρὸς ἔν τοῦθ' ὅπως ἡμᾶς δουλώσονται πάντ' αὐτοῖς ἀφορᾷ;) 1005C. In 1422, Joseph Bryennios [ed. *Bulgaris* I (1768), p. 482] expressed the same fear in almost identical terms: κἄν γὰρ ποτε παρατάξωνται ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τὸ δοκοῦν, ἐπὶ τῷ τὴν πόλιν δουλώσαι . . . ὀπλιστοῖνται.
 17. Ubertini Pusculi Brixiensis, *Constantinopoleos libri* IV [ed. A. Ellissen, *Analekten der mittel- und neugriechischen Literatur* III (1857)], I, 464-491; 518-520. In subsequent notes, the work will be quoted as Pusculo. The date of the work results from I, 19-32: it is later than the cardinalate of Angelo Capranica (made cardinal in 1460) and anterior to Pius II's death (1464). Thus Pusculo's poem was a product of the same revival of the Eastern question which led to Benozzo Gozzoli's representing John VIII and Patriarch Joseph as the Magi in the Medici chapel in Florence (1460). The Congress of Mantua, organized by Pope Pius II, had met in 1459. On his way there, the Pope passed through Florence and conferred with the Medici. Pius II's crusading propaganda is in the background of both Pusculo's and Benozzo's work.
 18. For in this century the West was on the whole not favorable to the idea of a General Council. Jean Gerson and his speech on the Union, permeated

- with "bonne volonté" towards the Greeks [best edition by J. B. Monnoyeur, *Irénikon*, VI (1929), 721-766], belong to the fifteenth century conciliar movement.
19. Cf. Barlaam, Migne, *PG*, CLI, col. 1335A; 1336BD: the Latins should make the first step by appearing as the Greeks' benefactors. By his own statement, the Italo-Greek Barlaam was an Orthodox by birth. Until 1342, his position was not incompatible with Orthodoxy. The texts adduced by M. Jugie, "Barlaam est-il né catholique?" *Échos d'Orient*, XXXIX (1940), 112 and C. Giannelli, "Un progetto di Barlaam Calabro per l'Unione delle Chiese," *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati III [Studi e Testi CXXIII (1946)]*, pp. 185-208 seem incontrovertible. If this Catholic bishop of later date is classed among the Latins here, it is because he was steeped in Western culture and was considered as a Latin by fourteenth and fifteenth century Byzantines, cf. Giannelli, *art. cit.*, p. 183, n. 41.
 20. Cf. a chrysobull of John V (date: 1355). Text in A. Theiner and F. Miklosich, *Monumenta spectantia ad Unionem Ecclesiarum . . .* (Vienna, 1872), pp. 29-33. Discussion of Paul's role in O. Halecki, *Un empereur de Byzance à Rome . . .*, pp. 33; 35; 37; 142.
 21. Especially of "the Saint" Nilus Cabasilas and the "God-inspired" Nicolaus Cabasilas: Sylvestros Syropulos, *Vera historia unionis non verae inter Graecos et Latinos . . .*, ed. Robert Creighton (Hague, 1660), p. 50. In subsequent notes the work will be quoted as Syropulos. Bessarion (against Mark of Ephesus), Migne, *PG*, CLXI, col. 196A; 507A.
 22. Traversari translated M. Calecas' *Contra errores Graecorum* a few years after the author's death (d. 1410). John Beccos' formula on the procession of the Holy Ghost was adopted by Patriarch Joseph II and in the *Florentinum*.
 23. Scholarios was unhappy about the argument that "the wisest" Byzantines sided with the Latins and he tried to invalidate it, quite speciously. He mentioned Cydones and Calecas. Scholarios, III (1930), p. 93, 24ff.
 24. Scholarios, I, p. 299, 24ff; III, p. 85, 5-7; 92, 30ff; 115, 6ff; 127, 13f; IV, pp. 403-410, esp. 406, 22-35. Scholarios in a letter to Mark of Ephesus, ed. L. Petit, *PO*, XVII (1923), 465.
 25. Cf. Syropulos, p. 155.
 26. B. Laourdas, Μιχαήλ 'Αποστόλη λόγος περί 'Ελλάδος και Ευρώπης, 'Επετηοίς 'Ετ. Βυζ. Σπουδών, XIX (1949), 243. Apostolis' *logos*, posterior to 1453, reflects nevertheless, cf. Scholarios, III, p. 92, 13ff.
 27. John Plusiadenus, Διάλεξις... Migne, *PG*, CLIX, col. 985D.
 28. Scholarios, I, p. 347, 29f; 348, 5f; 361, 30f. Syropulos, p. 119 (Bessarion's words).
 29. Traversari, I, bottom of col. 61. The continued existence of moderate and extremist factions at the Roman Curia is proved by an anonymous treatise on "Whether the Greeks . . . should be Helped by the Latins and Especially the Pope," dating from 1452. Discussion of the text and some extracts from it in L. Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste . . . I* (3rd and 4th ed., 1901), p. 582-85. N. Iorga, *Notes et extraits pour servir à l'histoire des croisades au XV^e siècle IV* (1915), also published parts of it. Cf. furthermore, F. I. Uspenskij, "Filosofskoe i bogoslovskoe dviženie v XIV veke." *Zurnal Min. Nar. Prosvješčenija*, CCLXXIX (January, 1892), 51-53.
 30. For Traversari's pro-Greek feelings, cf. Traversari, I, col. 41, 341, 610; explanation of Greek customs, *ibid.*, col. 194; Mark of Ephesus called as erudite as Bessarion, G. Mercati, *Studi e Testi* XC (1939), p. 26. Analysis of some of Traversari's pro-Greek letters in M. Viller, "La question . . .," *Revue d'Hist. Ecclésiastique*, XVII (1921), 297, n. 3, and L. Mohler, *Kardinal Bessarion als Theologe . . . I* (1923), p. 111f.
 31. Sending a "perpetual legate" to Constantinople; promoting worthy Greeks to the higher ecclesiastical dignities, including the cardinalate; bringing 100 young Greeks to Italy and providing for their instruction in letters and the rites of the Latin Church. Traversari, I, col. 52f (letter to Eugene IV, date: 1437).
 32. Syropulos, p. 184.
 33. V. Malinin, *Starec Eleazarova monastyrja Filofej i ego poslanija* (Kiev, 1901), appendix, p. 96. In subsequent notes this work will be quoted as Malinin.
 34. Scholarios, I, p. 334. This whole page is basic for the fifteenth century restatement of Cydones' program. On channels through which Cydones' ideas may have come to Scholarios, cf. R. Loenertz in *Orient. Christ. Periodica*, X (1944), 142.
 35. Συμφέροι παντί τῷ γένει χριστιανῶν τὴν ἑνωσιν... γενέσθαι, declares a pro-Unionist profession of faith, cf. V. Laurent in *Revue des Études Byzantines*, X (1952), 68.
 36. Some pertinent testimonies in F. Babinger, "Mehmed II der Eroberer und Italien," *Byzantion*, XXI (1951), 138-41 and 153.

37. Scholarios, I, p. 303, 1-6; Bessarion's letter to the Doge Foscarei, ed. L. Mohler, *Aus Bessarions Gelehrtenkreis... [Quellen und Forschungen aus dem Gebiete der Geschichte XXIV (1942)]* p. 476, 31ff; Puseulo, III, 325-328 (words put into the mouth of Emperor John VIII); M. Apostolis, ed. B. Laourdas in 'Επετ. 'Ετ. Σπουδῶν, Βυζ. XIX (1949), 243f; Nicolaus Secundinus, ed. N. Iorga, *Notes et extraits... III*, p. 319. Leonard of Chios, Migne, *PG*, CLIX, col. 944A.
38. Scholarios, I, p. 300, 22ff; III, p. 97, lff; 147, 21ff (if papal help comes at all it will be too little and too late); 149, 35ff (papal help illusory).
39. John V's chrysobull of 1355, ed. Theiner-Miklosich, *Monumenta spectantia... , p. 30*: Union can be achieved only "with wisdom and reasonableness;" Cydones, Migne, *PG*, CLIV, col. 961A: Orthodox listeners invited to view the state of affairs "reasonably;" Scholarios, I, p. 316, 27ff will speak only to those who "listen to reason." Traversari, I, col. 809-10, hopes that the Greeks will be vanquished by reason and mildness. Of course, the anti-Unionists are irrational and benighted by passion: so already Becos, Migne, *PG*, CXXI, col. 20BC; Calecas, Migne, *PG*, CLII, col. 218D; Scholarios, I, 304, 11-13. This insistence is more than a routine prodding which could be applied to any stubborn adversary, for while the argument abounds in pro-Unionist writings, the anti-Unionists hardly ever make use of it. Vladimir Solov'ev's insight of 1883 is worth quoting here: to him, a Union based upon rational considerations of self-interest could not endure, and the Union of Florence was a clear proof of this. Cf. S. L. Frank, ed., *A Solov'yov Anthology* (New York, 1950), p. 96.
40. Both camps shared the belief: Plusiadenos, Migne, *PG*, CLIX, col. 1321-D; Scholarios, III, p. 85, 6f; 94, 27ff; 139, 13; Joseph Bryennios, ed. Bulgari, I (1768), p. 129f. The end was scheduled for the beginning of the eighth millennium, i.e., A. D. 1492-94; Scholarios, III, p. 287, 8ff; IV, p. 511, 30ff. Forebodings of the fall of the Empire: Scholarios, I, p. 290, 7ff; III, p. 94, 27ff; 144, 30-33. The common people knew well the prophecies about the fall of the City; but for the popular mind it was impossible to face the logical consequence of such prophecies. Besides, Constantinople was eternal. In a situation where fears had to be expressed and yet hopes kept alive, a version was adopted according to which the City would fall, but almost in the same breath would be saved by an angel. In such a way the need for Latin help was made to appear less urgent. This prophecy determined people's behavior on May 29, 1453. Cf. Ducas, *Hist.*, 289, 14-290, 10, Bonn.
41. Scholarios, III, p. 94, 34ff; Mark of Ephesus, ed. L. Petit, *PO*, XVII (1923), 461.
42. For "celestial" arguments summed up here, cf. Scholarios, III, p. 149, 30ff; 158, 22ff; 159, 27ff; 161, 29; 162, 29; 183, 28ff; 97, 14-22; 157, 31ff; 96, 20ff; 98, 9ff; 159, 30ff; 163, 18-23; Mark of Ephesus, ed. L. Petit, *PO*, XVII (1923), 463, and the solemn closing sentences of Syropulos, p. 351.
43. Scholarios III, p. 98, 3ff; 157, 17ff; IV, p. 499, 3-12; Puseulo II, 476-79; III, 613f.
44. Puseulo I, 520-524, where Notaras declares: *medios certaminis huius* (i.e., East-West struggle) *||quis regnum Europae caderet fortuna dutores|| nos posuit.*
45. *Chronicon minus*, Migne, *PG*, CLVI, col. 1046C-1047A. In that case, this program would be prior to 1425. However, it may only reflect Sphrantzes' later political credo—all dialogues reported by the only outside witness should be evaluated with caution. Indeed, Sphrantzes is directly contradicted by the Greek envoy to the Council of Basle who maintained in 1435 that on his deathbed, Manuel II "enjoined the present emperor that he pursue with all efforts the conclusion of the Union;" John VIII was "mindful of paternal orders;" cf. J. Haller, ed., *Concilium Basilicense, Studien und Quellen zur Geschichte des Konzils von Basel I* (Basle, 1896), p. 369.
46. Puseulo, I, 419-422; cf. 173-181; 317f, 397-405.
47. In this context, some remarks on Lucas Notaras' *bon mot*, which has adorned almost every article on the last years of Byzantium. The *bon mot* is on preferring the rule of the Turkish turban to that of the Latin tiara over the City. Ducas, *Hist.*, p. 264, 14-16, cf. 291, 3 Bonn (the only source). But Ducas was a pro-Unionist. To my knowledge, no Orthodox source anterior to 1453 explicitly asserted that it would prefer to see the Turk rather than the Latin ensconced in Constantinople; no Orthodox was as outspoken as the Catholic Cydones who stated, in a perfect *pendant* to the winged word attributed to Notaras, "if we have to be enslaved by the Turks, why not rather submit to the Latins? If there is indeed no means of retaining freedom, one's plight is lighter when he is subjected to a better master," Migne, *PG*, CLIV, col. 997D. To be sure, the Orthodox could not help observing the

religious tolerance prevailing in Turkish occupied territories and compare it with what went on in Latin held lands of the Empire, cf. Joseph Bryennios as quoted by G. Th. Zoras, as quoted by G. Th. Zoras, *Αἱ πρό καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἄλωσιν διαμορφωθείσαι ἰδεολογικαὶ κατευθύνσεις* (Athens 1953), p. 25, echoed by Philotheus of Pskov, Malinin, appendix, p. 43. But this fifteenth century attitude is to be juxtaposed with Nicetas Choniates' lament on the sack of Constantinople in 1204, where the tolerant Sarrasins are favorably compared with the bloodthirsty Crusaders. It is important to realize that the saying attributed to Notaras cannot be used as an illustration of the anti-Unionist official standpoint. Even less does it "sum up a whole political program," so H. Evert-Kappesowa in *Byzantinoslavica*, XIV (1953), 245. Such a program is nowhere directly attested. Moreover, in its explicit form, it would be inept and emotionally as unacceptable as the slogan of the union with Latins. What Notaras' *bon mot* does sum up are the numerous accusations made by pro-Unionists against the perverse and traitorous designs of their adversaries. The refusal to come to terms with the West led the pro-Unionists and the Latins to the inescapable conclusion that the Orthodox liked the Turk better, cf. M. Calecas, Migne, *PG*, CLII, col. 239B; Jean Gerson, Sermon on the Union, ed. J. B. Monnoyeur, *Irénikon*, VI (1929), 731 (accusation put in the mouth of "malevolenté," i.e., the Latin extremists); Scholarios, I, p. 387, 22-29; Pusculo, I, 401-405 (John VIII himself is speaking!); II, 376-79. The anti-Unionist programmatic pronouncements must be reconstructed from the works of the anti-Unionists themselves. They are explained by their "celestial" outlook and were best represented by Scholarios. He insisted upon the patriotism of the Orthodox, ready to sacrifice their lives for the fatherland, but exhorted his followers to imitate the martyrs and bravely to face the calamitous eventuality of Constantinople's fall rather than to betray the beliefs of their forefathers, cf. Scholarios, III, p. 96, 5ff; 162, 8-15; IV, p. 215, 13-16. There is a marked difference between this attitude and the supposed words of Notaras. The question of authenticity of the saying attributed to Notaras is of secondary importance. It is not astonishing that the saying should be pinned on him, the prime minister at the time of Greek procrastinations and evasions concerning the Union of Florence. But in a wider sense, the attribution is not true, for the saying does

not fit the anti-Unionist program. Nor does it fit the man's deeds. Notaras was no embodiment of uncompromising Orthodoxy: he was for the Union (surely, of the *combinazione* variety) both in Florence and in 1452, cf. Syropoulos, p. 343; Scholarios, III, p. 170, 19-22; IV, p. 496, 9-17. He fought bravely in 1453.

48. Syropoulos, pp. 330, 332; Pusculo, II, 107-109. For John VIII's tactics at the patriarchal election of 1440: Syropoulos, p. 332f. Change of the emperor's stand about 1441 under pressure of public opinion: Mark of Ephesus, ed. L. Petit, *PO*, XVII (1923), 481.
49. For Mark of Ephesus, Florence was from the very beginning a "pseudosynod" not the Eighth Council, but the notion that there should be no more than Seven Oecumenical Councils took some time to develop. The Orthodox Greek generation of Florence knew of no restrictions as to the number of councils, and p. ex. called the Photian Council of 879-80 "Eighth Oecumenical." Discussion of texts in F. Dvorník, *The Photian Schism...* (1948), pp. 420-426. The Constantinopolitan Council of 1484, which abrogated the Union of Florence, claimed the name of Eighth Oecumenical. In Moscow, the assertion that there should not be more than Seven Oecumenical Councils appears as early as 1458/59. Cf. the letter quoted in note 124 below.
50. Speaking of earlier times, A. Michel, "Sprache und Schisma," *Festschrift Kardinal Faulhaber* (1949), p. 66 regretted that St. Augustine's explanatory formula on the Procession of the Holy Ghost, *principaliter ex patre* (*De Trin.*, XV, 26, 47) had not been made known in Byzantium. He implies (esp. p. 68) that were it not for linguistic ignorance, the split between East and West would have been easier to heal. But Amirutzes, a participant of the Council of Florence, quoted St. Augustine's formula in Greek. For the text, cf. p. ex. the edition by M. Jugie, *Byzantion*, XIV (1939), 93, 4f; cf. *ibidem*, p. 92, 20 for another quotation from St. Augustine. Amirutzes used the Latin father for anti-Unionist purposes. In the last centuries of Byzantium, the Greeks were more familiar with Latin or Italian than they were in the ninth, and yet the cause of religious unity fared worse after the Council of Florence than it did after the Photian councils. Linguistic proficiency may facilitate the meeting of minds. It cannot allay emotions.
51. *Apology Against Accusations of Latinism*, Scholarios, I, pp. 376-389. Cf. *Letter to his Students*, IV, pp. 403-410, from which it appears that shortly before the council of Florence. Scholarios

- “liberal” teaching and “cosmopolitan” attitude met with opposition of nationalist intellectuals whom he considered as resentful frauds. Scholarios got into trouble and had to suspend his teaching activity.
52. Speaking in 1339, Barlaam gave a grim picture of the popular reaction to the Union, should it be concluded by experts alone, rather than at an oecumenical council. Cf. Migne, *PG*, *CLL*, col. 1333 BC. Barlaam’s vision was both prophetic and wrong. The people reacted to the Council of Florence as he foresaw it, down to some details. But the reaction occurred in spite of the Union’s conclusion at a general council. The events following Florence gave some justification to fourteenth century Popes, so unwilling to convoke an oecumenical council to overcome the division of Christendom.
 53. The order was by Mark of Ephesus: cf. his *Encyclical Letter*, *PO*, XVII (1923), 456. It must have become famous, for a pro-Unionist alluded to it: Plusiadenos, Migne, *PG*, *CLIX*, col. 1357B. For some low-brow Orthodox of the time, Latins were not Christians. Some Latins were not much different. The Spanish traveler Peter Tafur, who was in Constantinople in 1437, distinguished between Greeks and Christians. Cf. text quoted in A. Vasiliev, “Pero Tafur...and his visit to Constantinople...,” *Byzantion*, VII (1932), 114. Still, he went to mass at St. Sophia, *ibid.*, p. 103.
 54. Syropulos, p. 337; “fellow-traveler” renders *συνωδοιπόρος* of the Greek.
 55. Pusculo, II, 497ff; Scholarios, III, p. 180, 5f; cf., M. Paulová, “L’empire byzantin et les Tchèques...,” *Byzantinostavica*, XIV (1953), esp. 170ff.
 56. Pusculo, III, 303-305.
 57. The point deserves some attention since in modern literature the Union of 1452 is generally described as lacking all popular support. Yet, cf. Scholarios, III, p. 173, 30-32; 177, 20-24 (δήμου ψήφους); 184,4 (δήμον βόην); Pusculo, III, 668f; 723; but cf. 654f; 739f. The number of copies of Scholarios’ manifesto is to be deduced from Scholarios III, p. 177, 37-40.
 58. Sphrantzes, *Chronicon Minus*, Migne, *PG*, *CLVI*, col. 1047BD; cf. Ducas, *Hist.*, p. 236, 20ff Bonn (words of Murad); cf. Critobulos, *Hist.*, I, 16, 13 (speech of Mehmed), ed. Müller, *Fragm. Hist. Graec.* V, p. 66. Murad II eagerly enquired of Peter Tafur about the circumstances of John VIII’s departure for Italy. Tafur’s text p. ex. in A. Vasiliev, *Byzantion*, VII (1932), 97.
 59. Pusculo, I, 495-545.
 60. Leonardus Chiensis, *Historia Constantinopolitanae urbis...captae*, Migne, *PG*, *CLIX*, col. 926A; Scholarios, III, p. 511, 14f; Sphrantzes, *Chron. Minus*, Migne, *PG*, *CLVI*, col. 1046C, who, however, sees in the Union of Florence the chief political blunder that led up to 1453. These interpretations were widespread in the Eastern world. The fifteenth century Armenian chronicler Abraham of Ankara attributed the fall of Constantinople to God’s wrath; God’s refusal to help the Greeks was the result of the division among the Byzantines caused by the Union of Florence. Russian translation of Abraham’s text in A. S. Anasjan, “Armjanskije xronisty o padenii Konstantinopolja,” *Vizantijskij Vremennik*, VII (1953), esp. 453f. That the conclusion of the Union was the political cause of the fall of the City is implied in the Chronicle of another Armenian, David of Kharberd (Kharput); cf. *ibidem*, p. 449.
 61. Scholarios, III, p. 147, 29; 149, 13 (letter to Notaras; date: 1451); 166, 12-14 (manifesto of November 1452); Ducas develops this thought more bluntly in his paraphrase of the manifesto: *Hist.*, 254, 9f Bonn.
 62. Greeks heretic and two-faced: Plusiadenos, Ἑρμηνεία... τῆς ἐν Φλωρεντία συνόδου..., Migne, *PG*, *CLIX*, col. 1328C; 1337D; Pusculo, I, 381-84; 581-83. Fall of the City caused by betrayal of the Union: Plusiadenos, *ibid.*, col. 1368C; 1372A; Ps.-Sphrantzes, *Chronicon majus*, p. 310f Bonn; Pusculo, I, 76-80; III, 548-551; IV, 1017-1024. For further references concerning the question of responsibility for 1453, cf. M. Viller “La question de L’Union des Églises...” *Revue d’Hist. Ecclésiastique*, XVIII (1922), 59, n. 4; on fourteenth century precursors of the Latin argument, cf. *ibid.*, XVII (1921), 303 and n. 2. It is well known that most Christian Humanists from Enea Silvio Piccolomini to the Polish historian Dlugosz showed no traces of this acrimony after the catastrophe of 1453.
 63. Migne, *PG*, *CLIX*, col. 927B; cf. 925D; 926AB. Cf. Pusculo, I, 145f (*omnia fingis*); George of Trebizond to Mehmed II, ed. A. Mercati “Le due lettere di Giorgio di Trebisonda...,” *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, IX (1943), 94.
 64. Plusiadenos, Migne, *PG*, *CLIX*, col. 1353D; Ps.-Sphrantzes, *Chronicon maius*, p. 322 Bonn. For John Eck, cf. the next note.
 65. Cf. Philotheus in Malinin, appendix, p. 42; Ps.-Sphrantzes, *Chronicon maius*, p. 312 Bonn; Luther during the Leipzig Disputation with John Eck (1519): German text in E. Benz, *Die Ostkirche im Lichte der Protestant-*

- sehen *Geschichtsschreibung*.. (1952), p. 12. The parallel between Luther's and Ps.-Sphrantzes' arguments and the curiously un-Byzantine distinction between Faith and Empire pose an interesting problem which cannot be solved before the chronology of Ps.-Sphrantzes' work is firmly established.
66. *Etenim dum sancta in Unitate permansit mirifice ea floruit Ecclesia*, Allocation of Benedict XV, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* XI (1919), pp. 97-99. Again, Ps.-Sphrantzes, *Chron. maius*, p. 313 Bonn had an answer to this type of argument.
67. On Plusiadenos, his career and literary work, cf. G. Hofmann, "Wie stand es mit der Frage der Kircheneinheit auf Kreta im XV. Jahrhundert?" *Orientalia Christ. Periodica*, X (1944), 99f; 106-111.
68. H. Noiret, *Lettres inédites de Michel Apostolis*... [*Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*, LIV (1889)], pp. 19, 54, 66, 89, 95, 101f.
69. For a classical illustration of this attitude, cf. the Letter of Theodore Gaza to Demetrius Sturopulos (time: 1472-1476), ed. L. Mohler, *Aus Bessarions Gelehrtenkreis*... (1942), pp. 586-89. Cf. also the famous letter of Constantine Lascaris, French translation in E. Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique... aux XV et XVI siècles* I (1885), pp. LXXX-LXXXI.
70. *The Commentaries of Pius II*, transl. and comm. by F. A. Gragg and L. C. Gabel [*Smith College Studies in History*, XXII (1937)], p. 75. Pius II and Bessarion were not the best of friends. But the authenticity of the feelings reported here is beyond doubt.
71. Cf. P. K. Enepekides, "Der Briefwechsel des Maximos Margunios, Bischof von Kythera (1549-1602) . . .," *Jahrbuch der Oesterreichischen byzantinischen Gesellschaft*, I (1951), 16.
- 71a. A century later, the remembrance of these events was so dim in secular Rome, that Vasari, a pupil of Michelangelo and a historian of the art of his own time, did not understand the meaning of the scenes from the history of the Florentine Council which Eugene IV ordered represented on the huge bronze doors of St. Peter's. Vasari wrote in his life of Filarete, the artist who created these scenes, that they were from the Life of Christ and of the Madonna. Cf. M. Lazzaroni and A. Muñoz, *Filarete*... (1908), pp. 5 and 95. Of course, people like Grimaldi (writing about 1619) and the historian of the Council Giustini-ani were better informed, cf. *ibidem*, pp. 83, 88.
72. The present day Catholic spokesmen assess the role of the Council in a similar way: cf. Cardinal Tisserant's preface to G. Smit, *Roma e l'Oriente cristiano. L'azione dei Papi per l'unità della Chiesa*, (Rome, 1944), p. 12. Cf., also, V. Grumel, quoted *ibid.*, p. 211.
73. Cf., in the last instance, A. M. Ammann, "Zur Geschichte der Geltung der Florentiner Konzilsentscheidungen in Polen-Litauen. Der Streit über die Gültigkeit der 'Griechentaufe,'" *Orientalia Christ. Periodica*, VIII (1942), 289-316, esp. p. 304 for the use of the Council by the Catholic moderates.
74. The document is a letter of the metropolitan of Kiev Misail to Pope Sixtus IV, dated in 1476, ed. Golubev in *Arxiv Jugo-Zapadnoj Rossii*, Part I, vol. VII (1887) pp. 123-231. For Hypatius Potij (Pociej) the Uniate metropolitan who unearthed it about 1605, its importance consisted in that "the 8th Council, that of Florence, was written in it," p. 197. The authenticity of Misail's letter has been discussed for the past 350 years. A few years after its publication, it was attacked on "philological" grounds by Rohatyneć, in his *Perestoroha*... cf. *Akty odnosjaščiesja k ist. Zap. Rossii* IV (1851), p. 229b. Among modern scholars opinions vary irrespective of their religious sympathies. Cf., p. ex., Golubev, *Arxiv* . . . , p. XIII; Rev. J. Fijalek, "Le sort réservé a l'Union de Florence dans le Grand-Duché de Lithuanie sous le règne de Casimir Jagellon," *Bulletin international de l'Académie Polonaise des Sc. et des Lettres, Classe de Philologie, Cl. d'Hist. et de Philol.*, nr. 1-3. I-II (January-March 1934), pp. 16-18 (against authenticity); M. Ammann, in *Orientalia Christ. Periodica*, VIII (1942), 300, n. 2 (for it). B. Bučynskij. "Zmahannja do uniji rus'koji cerkvy z Rymom v 1408-1506 rokov," *Zapysky ukrajins'koho naukovoho tovarystva v Kyjivi*, VI (1909), 9ff, 30 dated the letter into 1500 and attributed it to Metropolitan Joseph Bulharynovyč, hardly convincingly. After some hesitation, I have come to consider the letter authentic for the following reason: on p. 227 its signatories declare their hope "always standing on these eight holy and blessed steps [i.e., adhering to the decisions of the eight Oecumenical Councils, including that of Florence] to partake of the blessed expectance of the future eighth millennium." Such a relatively obscure simile can hardly be imputed to a late sixteenth century falsifier. On the contrary the meaning of the "future eighth millennium" was familiar to people living shortly before the crucial year 7000 (A. D. 1492), the date of the anticipated end of the world.
75. Oleśnicki in an often quoted letter to

- Pope Nicolas V (date: 1451), *Codex Epistolaris saec. XV*, I, 2, nr. 116, p. 125. [*Monumenta Medii Aevi hist. res gestas Poloniae illustr.*, II (1876)]. Długosz (Dlugossius), *Hist. Pol.*, Book XII [Vol. I, col. 727 of the 1711 edition]; Possevino in a letter of 1587, ed. by O. Halecki, "Possevino's Last Statement on Polish-Russian Relations," *Orientalia Christ. Periodica*, XIX (1953), 299f.
76. Alexander VI in letters concerning Metropolitan Joseph Bulharynovyč. Cf. A. Ziegler, *Die Union des Konzils von Florenz in der russischen Kirche [Das oestliche Christentum, IV-V (1938)]*, p. 148, with quotations from texts.
77. P. Skarga, *O jedności kościoła Bożego pod jednym Pasterzem...* (Vilna, 1577), reprinted in *Russkaja Istoričeskaja Biblioteka* (to be quoted in subsequent notes as *RIB*), VII (1882), pp. 417, 423, 434, 438.
78. Orzechowski's letter to Górka (date: 1547), quoted in K. Chodynicki, *Kościół prawostawny a Rzeczpospolita polska 1370-1632* (Warsaw, 1934), p. 197, n. 4. Cf. S. Petridès, "Documents sur la rupture de l'Union de Florence," *Échos d'Orient*, XIV (1911), 206.
79. Only a few themes of this polemical literature have been hinted at here, as the subject has been brilliantly treated by A. Brückner, "Spory o unię w dawnej literaturze," *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, X (1896), 578-644. On Ukrainian anti-Unionist works moving to Moscow, cf. *ibidem*, pp. 604, 613. On the whole problem cf. also B. Waczynski, "Nachklänge der Florentiner Union in der polemischen Literatur zur Zeit der Wiedervereinigung der Ruthenen," *Orientalia Christ. Periodica*, IV (1938), 441-472.
80. For textual proof, see B. Bučyns'kyj, "Slidy velykorus'kyx literaturnyx tvoriv pro fl'orentijs'ku uniju ta urjadovoho aktu moskovs'koho pravytel'stva v Istoriji fl'orentijs'koho soboru' 1598 roku," *Zapysky naukovo-ho tovarystva im. Ševčenko*, CXV (1913, vol. 3), 23-28. It may be added that the core of the story on the acts of violence supposedly committed by the Catholics, given in the "history" of the Council of Florence written in 1598 by a cleric of Ostroh ["Istorija o listrikijskom... florenskom sinodě...," *RIB*, XIX (1903), 433-476], is to be read in a Russian sixteenth century *MS*, ed. Malinin, appendix, p. 114. In the "placid" fifteenth century and the first half of the sixteenth, "Ruthenian" lands differed from Moscow: at that time, their relations with Constantinople were maintained and there was no trace of an anti-Greek attitude, nor of translations of pro- and anti-Florentine pamphlets in the Ukraine and Byelorussia. Cf., B. Bučyns'kyj, "Studiji z istoriji cerkovnoji uniji, II . . .," *Zapysky nauk. tov. im. Ševčenko*, LXXXVIII (1909, vol. 2), 15f. Some of the hair-raising details in the "history" of 1598 were no conscious Orthodox mystification, but bookish folklore. Skarga and the Papal nuncio Malaspina shared with the cleric of Ostroh the belief that the Metropolitan of Kiev Isidore was assassinated after the Council of Florence. Compare *RIB*, XIX (1903), p. 469 with *RIB*, VII (1882), pp. 459, 480 and the nuncio's report of 1595, ed. G. Hofmann in *Orientalia Christiana*, III (1924), 163, 165. The reminiscing epithet "robber" (*listrikijskij, razbojničeskij*) given to the Council of Florence by the tract of 1598 had a tenacious life: not only did a "schismatic" repeat it in 1634 [cf. K. T. Skupienski, "Rozmowa albo relata rozmowy dwóch Rusinów . . ." reprinted in *Arxiv Jugo-Zap. Rossii*, part I, vol. VII (1887), p. 698], but it was used by a Russian professor in 1925 [cf. M. d'Herbigny in *Orientalia Christiana*, IV (1925), 135].
81. Cf. A. Brückner, "Spory . . .," *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, X (1896), 625 with Scholarios, III, p. 80, 32-36 (in I, p. 327, 12ff the same argument is put in the mouth of the Latins); Plusiadenos, *Διάλεξις...*, Migne, *PG*, CLIX, col. 1017B.
82. K. T. Skupienski, "Rozmowa . . .," *Arxiv Jugo-Zap. Rossii*, part I, vol. VII (1887), pp. 663, 716; 698; P. Skarga, "O jedności . . ." *RIB*, VII (1882), p. 437f, 465, *passim*.
83. Rohatynec', "Perestoroħa . . ." *Akty otn. k istorii Zap. Rossii*, IV (1851), p. 223; "Istorija o listrikijskom... florenskom sinodě . . ." *RIB*, XIX (1903), pp. 454; 465.
84. The "extinguished light" simile p. ex. in Skarga, "O jedności . . ." *RIB*, VII (1882), col. 507. For texts from M. Smotryc'kyj's writings, cf. A. Brückner, "Spory . . .," *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, X (1896), 603; 611; Rohatynec', "Perestoroħa . . ." as in the preceding note.
85. A collection from the year 1580, ed. A. Popov, "Obličitel'nyja spisanija protiv židov i latinjan," *čtenija v imper. obšč. istorii i drev. pri Moskovskom Universitete*, (1879, vol. I), p. 39.
86. "Istorija o listrikijskom . . . sinodě . . .," *RIB*, XIX (1903), p. 468.
87. Letter *Arcano Divinae Providentiae*. Main texts relative to the Unionist appeals at the time of the Council of the Vatican have been conveniently assembled in French by F. de Wyels, "Le Concile du Vatican et l'Union," *Irénikon*, VI (1929), 366-396; 488-

- 516; 655-686. Pius IX's letter of 1868 (translation, *ibid.*, pp. 389-392) quoted from the Florentine definition, cf. *ibid.*, p. 391.
88. For texts of opinions of Catholic prelates on the goals of the future Council, cf., F. de Wyels, *ibid.*, esp. pp. 369f, 377.
89. In one case, this refusal was motivated by the political character of the short-lived Council of Florence, rejected by the Orthodox Church. F. de Wyels, *ibid.*, p. 494.
90. Significantly enough the most learned of all nineteenth century Catholic studies on the Council appeared in 1869: E. Ceconi, *Studi storici sul Concilio di Firenze* . . . I (the only to appear) *Antecedenti del Concilio*. For titles of polemic pamphlets, cf. p. ex. Th. Frommann, *Zur Kritik des Florentiner Unionsdecrets und seiner dogmatischen Verwertung beim Vaticanischen Concil der Gegenwart* (Leipzig, 1870), first chapter.
91. *Augsburger Allg. Zeitung* of January 21, 1870, reprinted in *Acta et Decreta Sacrosancti Oecumenici Concilii Vaticani*, [*Collectio Lacensis*, VII (Freiburg, 1892)] col. 1474-76, to be quoted below as *Acta*. A year earlier Döllinger had aired much the same arguments in his *Der Papst und das Konzil* which appeared under the pseudonym of Janus. Cf. the American edition *The Pope and the Council* (Boston, 1870), pp. 259-266.
92. The edition was that of 1484 in a work by Flavio Biondo, Eugene IV's secretary. Cf. also Janus (v. Döllinger), *The Pope and the Council*, p. 264, notes 1 and 2.
93. *Acta*, col. 1482-84.
94. *Acta*, col. 430, 571, 613, 913f. The addition first appeared in 1789.
95. *Constitutio Dogmatica Prima de Ecclesia Christi*, cap. III; for English translation with Latin text, cf. W. E. Gladstone — P. Schaff, *The Vatican Decrees in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance* . . . (New York, 1875), p. 159. The clause *quemadmodum . . . continetur* is absent from chapter IV of the *Constitutio*. It was maintained that the clause was omitted because it was needless, cf., p. ex., Cardinal H. E. Manning, *The True Story of the Vatican Council* (London, 1877), p. 175. Cf., also *ibidem*, pp. 172ff, 186, and the discussion in Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles* . . . VII, 2 (1916), p. 1044ff, important for the whole controversy.
96. In his *Zur Kritik des Florentiner Unionsdecrets* . . . (1870), p. 51ff, the Protestant Th. Frommann pointed out that even the Greek version did not necessarily warrant the "restrictive" interpretation of the Florentine decree.
97. The scholar was Eugenio Ceconi of note 90. For his statement and resumé of the article in *Civiltà Cattolica* of February 19, 1870, cf. *Acta*, col. 1477-81.
98. For the "corroboration" theme, cf. p. ex., Cardinal Manning, *The True Story* . . . p. 174. On the text tradition of the *Florentinum*, cf. A. Mercati, "Il decreto d'unione del 6 luglio 1439 nell'Archivio Segreto Vaticano," *Orientalia Christ. Periodica*, XI (1945), 5-44.
99. *Acta*, col. 944-950 and 1493-96 (where the reported existence of similar motives among German bishops is denied).
100. *Acta*, col. 932; 1485; 1489; 922.
101. Syropulos, p. 309: ὅτι μὲν οἰκουμένη συνέστη σύνοδος οὐδεὶς ἀντεῖται. He only objected that the Council's decisions were arrived at in a manner contrary to the practice of Oecumenical Councils. Cf. also p. 270.
102. *Acta*, col. 948.
103. I. v Döllinger, *Lectures on the Reunion of the Churches* (1872), p. 56. In 1923, Metropolitan Xrapovickij, head of the emigré Russian Church declared that the Orthodox would grant the Pope authority over the whole Church if only Catholics gave up their false dogmas, especially that of infallibility, the most absurd among them. Quotation in C. Giannelli, *Studi e Testi CXXIII* (1946), p. 177, n. 34.
104. This results from Scholarios, I, pp. 333-341. The detailed proof must be reserved for another article. Until now, the story of the Russian participation at the Council has been related on the basis of the self-congratulatory Muscovite accounts. Here again, Scholarios proves to be an important, because independent, source for the behavior of the Russians in Florence and the Graeco-Muscovite relations at that time. Scholarios seems to have been completely overlooked, perhaps because one of his pertinent texts does not once mention the Russians by name; the other was first discovered and published in 1930. Cf. Scholarios, III, p. XI.
105. There are some things about Simeon of Suzdal', our chief source on the Russians at Florence, which render his zeal suspect. Why was he not immediately released from imprisonment in the Sergius monastery near Moscow after the Unionist Isidore of Kiev had been gotten rid of? It seems that official circles did not trust him at first. Simeon's anti-unionism as described by himself is a bit too loud, his sufferings, too dramatic. Perhaps he and his colleagues were not such resistance heroes in Florence. F. Delektorskiĭ, "Kritiko - bibliografičeskij obzor drevnje-russkix skazaniĭ o florentijskoj unii," *Zurnal Ministerstva Nar. Pros-*

- vešč., CCC (July 1895), 143 has already voiced some doubts on this point, Scholarios' new testimony strengthens them considerably.
106. Scholarios, III, p. 113, 15 (date of text: about 1443 i.e., in Scholarios' Orthodox period); Abraham, the only Russian bishop at Florence, is meant here, since Isidore is said to have conferred with "fellow bishops" of his delegation.
 107. Cf. p. ex., Malinin, appendix, p. 97 (earliest of pamphlet recensions). This is flimsy evidence. For all that, the imprisonment story continues to be generally believed, cf. A. Ziegler, *Die Union des Konzils von Florenz* (1938), p. 17. On John VIII's sad end, cf. Malinin, notes, p. 71f (date: before 1560s), taken over by *Istorija o listrikijskom . . . sinodě . . .* of 1598, *RIB*, XIX (1903), p. 467. This is one of the instances where the Muscovites agree with their enemies, the Papists: already Puscuro, II, 4-8; 415 saw in John VIII's death God's punishment (of course for *betraying* the Union of Florence).
 108. Syropulos, p. 296 speaks of the "envoy of the Russes," representing a prince ('ρῆξ). Thomas of Tver' was the only princely envoy in the Russian delegation. There is also evidence of good relations between Thomas and the Pope after the Council. Text of the Papal safe-conduct for Thomas ed. N. Karamzin, *Istorija gosudarstva rossijskago*, Notes to vol. V, n. 296. Cf., also Pierling, *La Russie et le Saint Siège*, I (1896), p. 49.
 109. Compare Malinin, appendix, pp. 98f with Scholarios, III, p. 113, 10.
 110. Scholarios, III, p. 113, 13-15. He never thought much of the Russian group: Scholarios, I, pp. 339, 16; 340, 26 (but those were his pro-Unionist days).
 111. Malinin, appendix, p. 90 (already in the earliest pamphlet recension).
 112. Combine Malinin, appendix, p. 91 with Scholarios, I, p. 334, 34-335, 1: "nor do they obey our Church."
 113. Simeon, bewildered at the commotion following a speech by Mark of Ephesus, was told by the weeping metropolitan "Dorotheos": "If you knew what Mark said, you too, would shed tears of joy," cf. Malinin, appendix, p. 92. But in what language did "Dorotheos" enlighten Simeon? I think in Slavic, since he probably was Dositheos, metropolitan of the Macedonian city of Drama, where the knowledge of Slavic was useful. The Russian travelogue lists "Dorotheos" of Drama among the Greek delegates at Florence: Malinin, appendix, p. 81. Simeon was not quite isolated, for some Greek delegates knew Slavic. Patriarch Joseph II himself spoke excellent Bulgarian, cf. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum . . . Collectio* XXIX, col. 657.
 114. Malinin, appendix, p. 117. Even the highest circles showed an innocence of elementary notions. About 1458 the Metropolitan of Moscow Iona accused the Unionist Patriarch of Constantinople of calling himself archbishop of that city. No oecumenical Patriarch before Florence called himself archbishop (*arcibiskup*), Iona exclaimed, cf. *RIB*, VI, col. 622. This was nonsense. Or was it the Polish form of the word that aroused Iona's indignation?
 115. Malinin, appendix, pp. 91, 92, 93, 94, 96. Muscovite accounts have more in common with Greek low-brow arguments, such as the refusal to consider the Latins as Christians, attributing sinister reasons for the transfer of the Council to Florence, and of course, decrying the pro-Unionist greed for money. For the question of precedence of names, cf. Syropulos, p. 270.
 116. Malinin, appendix, p. 118 (the so-called Chronicle Account; it makes use of several official documents, cf. Malinin, notes, pp. 66f, 69).
 117. This has not been seen previously. Compare Vassilij II's letter to Patriarch Metrophanes, *RIB*, VI, col. 533 with the *Florentinum*, ed. p. ex. G. Hofmann, *Epistolae Pontificiae ad Concilium Florentinum Spectantes II [Concilium Florentinum, Documenta et Scriptores, Series A (1944)]*, p. 72.
 118. Malinin, appendix, p. 90; 100f; Iona's letter to Prince Alexander Vladimirovič of Kiev, *RIB*, VI, col. 559f (Malinin, p. 467 dates it "before 1451" but the tone of the letter points rather to 1452-53).
 119. Malinin, p. 449 and appendix, p. 81. The travelogue was recently translated into German by G. Stökl: *Europa im XV. Jahrhundert von Byzantinern gesehen [Byzantinische Schriftsteller, herg. von E. v. Ivánka, II (1954)]*, cf. p. 161. The author of the travelogue was a staunch Orthodox and differentiated between "Latins" and "Christians." Cf., *ibid.*, pp. 154, 155, 167.
 120. An evolution within anti-Florentine tracts has to be asserted against Malinin, p. 457, who thought that p. ex. the second recension of Simeon's tract (*Povest' Simeona, PS*) did not add anything essentially new to its predecessor (*Isidorov Sobor, IS*). All depends on what is meant by "essentially." For, (1) cf. *PS*, Malinin, appendix, p. 104 (where Mark of Ephesus says to the Pope: "you dared convoke the eighth council, which the Holy Fathers forbade") with *IS, ibid.*, p. 91 where the "which-forbade" clause is absent. Cf. above, note 49; (2) Cf. *PS, ibid.*, p. 105 (where "only those Greeks who were Orthodox" remained

- after the speech of Mark of Ephesus) with *IS, ibid.*, p. 92 (where "the Greeks and all the [other] Orthodox" remained); (3) Cf. *PS, ibid.*, p. 106 (where Mark of Ephesus is threatened by the Pope with torture) with *IS, ibid.*, 93 (where nothing of the sort appears in the corresponding passage); (4) Cf., *PS, ibid.*, p. 107 (where Isidore is depicted as a great papal helper in convincing the Greeks to go to Florence) with *IS, ibid.*, p. 94 (where nothing to that effect is asserted); (5) Cf., *PS, ibid.*, p. 109 (where Simeon gets up and runs away from the church in order not to bend his knee before the Pope) with *IS, ibid.*, p. 97 (where he only gets up); (6) Cf. *PS, ibid.*, p. 111 (where it is stated that "at that time there was a great heresy in the Russian land, caused by the Greek Emperor John and the Metropolitan of Moscow, Isidore, and the silver-loving Greeks") with the corresponding passage in *IS, ibid.*, p. 98 (from which this attack is absent); (7) Cf., the so-called Chronicle Account (*Letopisnaja Povest'*), *ibid.*, p. 120 (where Mark of Ephesus lectures the Emperor and the Patriarch that in Constantinople they said that "Latins were not Christians; how could they be Christians . . . but now . . .") with *PS, ibid.*, 106 (where the Emperor and the Patriarch are said only to have asserted in Constantinople that the Trinity should be honored unanimously) and *IS, ibid.*, p. 92 (where they agreed that there should be a return to the pristine Union); (8) finally, it is in *PS, ibid.*, p. 103 that the motif of Isidore's having taken an oath that he would go to Florence only to "confirm the faith" makes its first appearance.
121. Text in A. Popov, *Istoriko-literaturnyj obzor drevne-russkix polemicheskix sočinenij protiv Latinjan* (Moscow, 1875), p. 372, 377, 394f. The whole question of Russian reactions to the Council of Florence was treated by F. I. Delektorskij, "Florentijskaja Unija (po drevne-russkim skazanijam) . . .," *Strannik* (1893, November), 442-458.
 122. Ivan III's letter in *RIB*, VI, col. 711. In an episcopal profession of ca. 1500, the Metropolitan of Kiev Spiridon is abjured as ordained in Constantinople, "in the domain of the impious Turks." Anyone coming from "Constantinople of the Turkish realm" is abjured. Cf. *RIB*, VI, col. 451, n. 3; col. 683, n. 2.
 123. Cf. n. 107 above and n. 141 below. About the middle of the seventeenth century, Arsenij Suxanov berated the degenerate Greeks and said that all good things had migrated from Greece over to Moscow, Malinin, p. 491. Over half a century earlier, the Jesuit Skarga doubted whether the Greeks would be able to help the "Ruthenians," for "learning disappeared from Greece, and all of it went over to the Catholics." *O jedności . . . RIB*, VII (1882), p. 486.
 124. Letter to Lithuanian bishops (dated: 1458-59), *RIB*, VI, col. 623. Cf. Iona, *ibidem*, col. 648f (date: 1460); others followed suit: A. Popov, *Istoriko-literaturnyj obzor . . .* p. 384ff (the passage is a paraphrase of the sentences in Iona's letter of 1460 just referred to). Cf., also, a text quoted in Malinin, p. 483f.
 125. Metropolitan Philip's letter to the Novgorodians (date: 1471), *Akty Istoričeskie*, I (1841), appendix, pp. 513f; another letter to the Novgorodians (date: 1471), *RIB*, VI, col. 729. For the position of the earlier accounts, cf. Malinin, appendix p. 122 and A. Popov, *Istorikolit. obzor*, p. 384 (paraphrasing Iona).
 126. Fëdor's letter to the Patriarch of Constantinople Jeremiah II in N. Novikov, *Drevnjaja rossijskaja višiofika*, XII (2nd ed., Moscow, 1789), p. 353f (text corrupted, to be completed from p. 389f).
 - 126a. Again, some years earlier, papal diplomats made the same connection, yet in a different way. In their dislike for the Constantinopolitan prisoner of the Turkish enemy they, too, favored the creation of an independent Patriarchate in Moscow, even a schismatic one. But they somehow hoped that this act would move the "Ruthenian" neighbors of Moscow to renew the Union of Florence. Cf. an anonymous memorandum by two hands in the Vatican Archives (date: 1576), ed K. Schellhass, "Zur Legation des Kardinals Morone . . .," *Quellen und Forschungen aus Italienischen Archiven . . .* XIII, 1 (1910), 326f.
 127. Pertinent passages of Philotheus' letters in Malinin, appendix, pp. 41, 62.
 128. G. Olšr, "Gli ultimi Rurikidi e le basi ideologiche della sovranità dello Stato russo," *Orientalia Christ. Periodica*, XII (1946), 370, 372.
 129. Malinin, p. 768.
 130. In the "Chronicle Account," Malinin, appendix, p. 117.
 131. Jeremiah II in the Greek version of the Act of 1590, confirming the establishment of the Patriarchate of Moscow: "At present, he (i.e., Fëdor) is the only both great and Orthodox Emperor on earth," ed. V. E. Regel, *Analecta byzantino-russica*, (1891), p. 86; cf. Philotheus, "thou art the only Emperor unto the Christians under the vault of Heaven," ed. Malinin, appendix, p. 50; cf. p. 63. Pigas [in a letter to Fëdor (date: 1593)] alluded to the migration of Empires and found

- that the imperial city of Moscow was in his time what the two Romes had been in theirs. Cf. V. E. Regel, *ibid.*, p. 100. The patriarchs who had a first hand knowledge of the ideological climate in Moscow said what the Muscovite court wanted to hear.
132. Quotations in P. Pascal, *Avvakum et les débuts du Raskol* . . . [Bibliothèque de l'Institut français de Léningrad, XVIII (1938)], p. 289f.
 133. Malinin, p. 767f.
 134. N. Berdiaev, *The Russian Idea* (London, 1947), p. 13.
 135. Quoted in H. Rahner, *Vom ersten bis zum dritten Rom*, Rektoratsrede Innsbruck, (1950), p. 16. Lately it has been hinted that the Patriarchate of Constantinople is not "a true Church of Christ": S. V. Troickij, in *Messenger de l'Exarchat du Patriarche russe en Europe Occidentale*, V (1954), 199. Ivan III's letter had said "strange and alien."
 136. Archbishop A. Marcenko, "Moi vpečatlenija pri vozvraščeenii na rođinu," *Žurnal Moskovskoj Patriarxii*, (1946, nr. 9), 56. It was perhaps more significant that the next instance at which the Third Rome theory was restated in the Journal of the Patriarchate was when one Orthodox church of Helsinki transferred its obedience from the Patriarchate of Constantinople to that of Moscow. Cf. Priest G. Pavlinskij, "Obraščenie . . . k leningradskomu mitropolitu Grigoriju," *Žurnal Mosk. Patriarxii*, (1947, nr. 4), 13. For another Third Rome pronouncement on lower echelons, cf. *ibidem*, (1947, nr. 10), 11f (Priest M. Zernov). The third Rome doctrine and claims to universal religious primacy emerge whenever the Muscovite Patriarchate's relations with Constantinople become strained, as in the twenties of this century. Cf. the article of the Russian emigré Nikanorov, transl. by M. d'Herbigny, *Orientalia Christiana*, IV (1925), 55-57. This was a significant, but unofficial voice.
 137. *Žurnal Mosk. Patriarxii*, (1948, nr. 8), 15f.
 138. *Žurnal Mosk. Patriarxii*, (1948, nr. 8), 6. At the celebrations of 1948, Patriarch Alexius made others revive Philotheus' idea without committing himself. The task of the Patriarchate is delicate: the Orthodox of the whole world have to realize where the leadership in matters of true faith lies, and yet all possible uneasiness about the claims of the Russian Church should be avoided. Even prelates extolling the Third Rome concept added that it was to be understood in the most ideal sense, since the Russian Church did not want to be first among other Churches. Cf., the speech of Timothy, Archbishop of Biaytstok (Poland), *Žurnal Mosk. Patriarxii*, (1948, nr. 8), 18 and the special issue of the Journal on the celebrations, p. 52. Another reason for the Patriarch's reticence may be that lately the State seems to frown upon the theory of the Third Rome. One historian branded this concept as imported from abroad, "alien to the Russian people and imposed upon it" [N. A. Smirnov in *Vizantijskij Vremennik*, VII (1953), 59]. In the sixteenth century, Ivan the Terrible let Philotheus expound his doctrine in a letter addressed to him, but replied to the Jesuit diplomat Possevino that "we do not strive for the universal empire of this world."
 139. By the Catholicos of Georgia Callistratus and that of Armenia, George VI, *Žurnal Mosk. Patriarxii*, (1948, nr. 8), 10, 20.
 140. *Žurnal Mosk. Patriarxii* (1948, nr. 8), 8.
 141. The interpretation (resumed by the Patriarch of Constantinople Meletios IV in 1923) enables the Patriarchate of Constantinople to claim jurisdiction over Orthodox communities in the diaspora. From the seventeenth century on, it has been hotly disputed by whomever challenged Constantinople, no matter what his political or religious faith may have been. For a pro-Uniate text of 1632, claiming that this "Barbary" adjudicated to the Patriarchate of Constantinople did not extend to Rus', cf. A. Brückner, "Spory," *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, X (1896), 627; for the recent jurisdictional competition between Constantinople's "papist concupiscence" and Moscow, which flared up in the nineteen-twenties and nineteen forties, cf. the articles by canonist S. Troickij, first in emigré, then in Soviet publications: resumed by d'Herbigny, *Orientalia Christiana*, III (1924), 59-62 (cf. 65-70; 99-112); texts in *Žurnal Mosk. Patriarxii*, (1947, nr. 11), 34-45; (1947, nr. 12), 31ff; *Messenger de l'Exarchat du Patriarche russe*, V (1954), 192-199.