

Vol. 4 No. 1 Spring 2025

# PIETAS

A Journal of Tradition, Place, and Things Divine



## Feature Articles

Love and Fear in Maimonides's *Guide of the Perplexed*  
by Lewis Fallis

Old Rome versus New Rome:  
Unionist Discourse between the Thirteenth and Fifteenth Centuries  
by Charles C. Yost

Trewest Tricherie and the Corsedest Kyrk:  
Dichotomy in the Fallen World of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*  
by Aaron Thurow

The Counterrevolutionary Thought of C. S. Lewis  
by Joshua Paladino

## Book Reviews

Thomas P. Harmon's *The Universal Way of Salvation in the Thought of Augustine*  
David Beer

Bernard J. Dobski's *Mark Twain's Joan of Ark: Political Wisdom,  
Divine Justice, and the Origins of Modernity*  
Allen Mendenhall

David Hein's *Teaching the Virtues*  
Kevin Slack

David Rieff's *Desire and Fate*  
William Batchelder

# Old Rome versus New Rome: Unionist Discourse between the Thirteenth and Fifteenth Centuries

Charles C. Yost\*

*In assessing the Schism of 1054, historians have tended to focus more on the anti-union rather than the pro-union authors, and in doing so they often neglect medieval or Byzantine realities. This article will highlight this unfairly neglected discourse of union, hoping to show the henotic ideology as a coherent, though not a static, argument for union as well as urge a more balanced understanding of the relations between the two Churches in the later Middle Ages. With the critical influence of Latin, and specifically Thomist, ecclesiology, unionist discourse took on a distinctly pessimistic and Byzantine quality. The irenic and conciliatory idiom of union in the thirteenth century was complicated during the fourteenth-fifteenth century by the unionists' profound sense of alienation from their homeland, and this article will pay especial attention to the thought and writings of Demetrios Kydones (c. 1324–1398) and Manuel Kalekas (d. 1410).*

## I. INTRODUCTION

On August 9<sup>th</sup> of the year 1500, the Ottoman Turks broke through the defenses of the city of Methone—a Greek city located on the extreme southern coast of the Peloponnese—and put its Christian garrison to the sword. Since the thirteenth century, this Greek city had been under the control of the seafaring Republic of Venice, for whom its name was “Modon.” Modon was but one of the many eastern Mediterranean possessions that had fallen to the maritime empire in the aftermath of 1204 and the Latin conquest of Constantinople. But the world had changed much since those days. Constantinople, lost to the Latins in the Byzantine reconquest of 1261, was lost forever to Christendom with the Ottoman conquest of 1453. Nevertheless, the Aegean was not yet a Turkish lake. The Lion of St. Mark, the banner of the Venetian Republic, still waved over islands, cities, and fortresses scattered through the Eastern Mediterranean, including the islands of Crete, Cyprus, the archipelagos of Ionia and Naxos, and the fortresses of the Peloponnese; tens of thousands of Greek Christians throughout this world of water and sunshine owned no lord beside the distant *Signoria* of

---

\* I express my gratitude to the anonymous reviewer for helpful comments and suggestions for improving this article. I dedicate it to the memory of Adam T. Foley, Ph.D.—philologist, philosopher, and friend.

## OLD ROME VERSUS NEW ROME

Venice, and in spite of the burdens they sustained for it—the taxes, submission to Venetian feudatories, and the imposition of religious union with the Roman Church—the tolling of church bells and annual cries of “Christ is risen!” showed that Christendom yet endured in what had been the Byzantine East.<sup>1</sup>

But as the turn of the century showed, this Indian summer of Christendom—where a medieval republic perpetuated the life of a medieval union—was perched perilously in the shadow of the growing Ottoman power that would define the early-modern Mediterranean. In 1499, new hostilities had broken out between the Ottoman Empire, ruled by Bayezid II, and the Republic of Venice. If the Turkish conquest of Modon is hardly mentioned in grand narratives of the rise of Ottoman power, for the Venetian Senate in the year 1500 Modon was a vital interest that must be defended to the death.<sup>2</sup>

And so it was. In the end, among the corpses, was that of an extraordinary man who had finished, in spectacular fashion, an adventurous career. He had been the archbishop of Modon, a Greek born and raised on the island of Crete in the tumultuous mid-fifteenth century. If we credit the report published by the Venetian Senate in the aftermath of the conquest, this Greek ecclesiastic had played a key role in encouraging the Christian garrison to resist the Turks to the end. He had died with his cross in his hands. The archbishop’s name was Joseph Plousiadenos and his legacy consisted not only in a glowing report of the Venetian Senate for gallantry,<sup>3</sup> but an entire literary corpus—as of yet scarcely known outside of specialist circles—which represents the crowning consummation of a medieval and Byzantine discourse that remains among the most misunderstood and maligned phenomena in Christian history, even to the present. The purpose of this article is to contribute to the excavation of this discourse.

---

<sup>1</sup> On Venice’s possessions in the Eastern Mediterranean, see Freddy Thiriet, *La Romanie vénitienne au moyen âge: Le développement et l’exploitation du domaine colonial vénitien (XII–XV siècles)* (Paris: De Boccard, 1959).

<sup>2</sup> On this war and the fall of Modon to the Turks, see Gaetano Cogo, “La guerra di Venezia contro i Turchi (1499–1501),” *Nuovo Archivio Veneto* 18 (1899): 5–76; Colin Imber, *The Ottoman Empire* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 51.

<sup>3</sup> On Joseph/John Plousiadenos, see Despotakis, *John Plousiadenos (1423?–1500): A Time-Space Geography of his Life and Career* (Leuven/Paris/Bristol: Peeters, 2020), especially p. 104 on his death in 1500. See also Manoussos Manoussacas, “Recherches sur la vie de Jean Plousiadénos (Joseph de Méthone) (1429?–1500),” *Revue des études byzantines* 17 (1959): 28–51, esp. 47–51; “Ἀρχιερεῖς Μεθώνης, Κορώνης, καὶ Μονεμβασίας γύρω στὰ 1500,” *Πελοποννησιακά*, 3–4 (1960), 97–100, 136–37. See also Charles C. Yost, “Neither Greek nor Latin, but catholic: Aspects of the Theology of Union of John Plousaidenos,” *Journal of Orthodox Christian Studies* 1.1 (2018): 43–59.

## PIETAS

This discourse is the ideology of *henosis* (ἑνωσις): union. Among the more obvious legacies of medieval Christendom is the schism between the Eastern and Western Churches that has persisted to the present in the division between the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches. Conventional accounts of the history of this division have (wrongly) placed its origin to the year 1054, when confrontation and mutual excommunications exchanged between the legates of Pope Leo IX and Patriarch Michael Keroularios allegedly resulted in the lapse of communion between the two ancient patriarchates of Rome and Constantinople. Of course, the true story of the division is in fact far more complex, tentative, and ambiguous than might be suggested by textbook timelines. In a sense, 1054 as the date of division is both too early and too late: while serious causes of alienation had emerged centuries prior to the encounter of 1054, that encounter itself left relatively little immediate impression in either the imperial archives of Constantinople or in the perceptions of the papacy. Specialist scholars have argued, with greater credibility, that the rupture only really emerged in the classical era of the Crusades (1096-1291), and specifically in the conquest of Constantinople by crusaders in 1204. It is nevertheless unwise even to load the year 1204 with some sort of magical inevitability whereby the division remained final ever after.<sup>4</sup>

And it is equally possible for the historian to tell another story. Dialectically interwoven with the history of schism is the history of union, for from the moment that there was some sense of a rift, there never lacked voices speaking in favor of reconciliation. At the heart of this compelling, though still little regarded, history of union is the discourse mentioned above: the *henotic* or *unionist* discourse created and perpetuated by Byzantine intellectuals, churchmen, and humanists who argued courageously, and often at personal loss, for the need for unity with their Western Christian brethren. Though vocal “unionists” were only ever a

---

<sup>4</sup> The standard account of the “Schism of 1054” is so frequently and casually encountered that it scarcely requires citations. The reader is invited to google “Schism of 1054” and peruse the results, including entries in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Wikipedia, *National Geographic*, and the EWTN (“Eternal Word Television Network”—a Roman Catholic network) online library. For an example of a textbook (otherwise admirable!) that continues to present 1054 as the date of the break, see the timelines in Judith M. Bennett and C. Warren Hollister, *Medieval Europe: A Short History*, tenth ed. (Boston/Burr Ridge/Dubuque: McGraw Hill, 2006), 193, 196. But see Aristeides Papadakis, “Revision in History: The Schism of 1054,” *American Ecclesiastical Review* 157 (1967): 29–35, and (more recently) Yost, “[Doubting the Conventional Narrative about the Schism of 1054](#),” *The Imaginative Conservative*, October 31, 2020. The classic scholarly account of the schism is still Steven Runciman, *The Eastern Schism: A Study of the Papacy and the Eastern Churches during the XIth and XIIIth Centuries* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955). But see also Henry Chadwick, *East and West: The Making of a Rift in the Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2003); Papadakis and John Meyendorff, *The Christian East and the Rise of the Papacy: The Church AD 1071-1453* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1994).

## OLD ROME VERSUS NEW ROME

minority group within the Eastern Church, their influence is out of proportion with their numbers—and in large part this is so because many of these unionists occupied elevated positions within the Byzantine Church and State and cultivated extensive circles of learned contacts linked by epistolary exchange, not only in the Empire, but in Italy and the greater Latin West as well. Moreover, if pro-union Byzantine churchmen were a minority, they were scarcely more so than the inveterately anti-Latin authors fanning the flames of division.<sup>5</sup> The decision of historians, recent or not so recent, to focus more on the anti-union authors rather than the pro-union authors reflect the confessional commitments and priorities of the historians themselves more than medieval or Byzantine realities.

By highlighting this unfairly neglected discourse of union, this essay urges a more balanced understanding of the relations between the two Churches in the later Middle Ages. This article, which will focus on a major thread of this discourse, strives to flesh out (at least in part) henotic ideology as a coherent, though not a static, argument for union. It will give special attention to developments in the critical fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, which I see as a watershed moment for henotic discourse. While asserting the overall coherency of the unionist tradition between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries, this article will emphasize how this tradition was decisively inflected, in response to convulsions of Byzantine Church and State in the late-fourteenth and early-fifteenth centuries, into a negative assessment of Constantinopolitan Church and Greek Christian civilization. If the unionist discourse began in the thirteenth century in an irenic and conciliatory idiom—and never altogether lost this quality so long as the dream of union endured—it became complicated from the fourteenth century onward by the unionists' profound sense of alienation from their homeland in view of the contemporary crises it endured. Without intending to dispute the critical influence certainly exerted on unionist thought by Latin (specifically Thomist) ecclesiology, it may be in this increasing pessimism and bitterness of later unionist discourse that we can see how very “Byzantine” it was after all.

---

<sup>5</sup> Taking this specifically non-confessional approach to the unionists is still in its infancy. See the seminal essay by Yury P. Avvakumov, “Caught in the Crossfire: Toward Understanding Medieval and Early Modern Advocates of Church Union,” in *Stolen Churches or Bridges to Orthodoxy? Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious dialogue*, ed. Vladimir Latinovic and Anastacia K. Wooden (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021), 19–40.

## II. THE UNIONIST TRADITION ON ITS OWN TERMS

The bishop Joseph, beside whose corpse this essay began, represents the culmination of the Byzantine tradition of unionism. In fact, his writings—both as original author and as scribe-copyist—provide the key linkage between the medieval tradition of pro-union thought and its expressions in the modern world, particularly in the Slavic world in the era of the Union of Brest (1596). Unionism as a learned tradition in earnest began in the later thirteenth century, in the era of the first “union” council at Lyons (1274) and during the patriarchate of John XI Bekkos (1275–1282)—the seminal thinker in the unionist tradition. John Bekkos, who has been wrongly labeled as a *Latinophron* (“Latin-Minded”) theologian for his defense of the controversial teaching of the Western Church on the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father *and* the Son (“*Filioque*”), was deposed and imprisoned for his convictions in 1282, then condemned a second time in 1285 at a synod in the Blachernae Palace in Constantinople. The irenic discourse initiated by Bekkos and his associates received new life in the mid-fourteenth century—an age of intellectual and spiritual ferment in Byzantium—particularly as a result of the translations of the thought of Thomas Aquinas made by Demetrios Kydones (c. 1324–1398).<sup>6</sup> Demetrios, who occupied a prime ministerial position during the regimes of Emperor John VI Kantakouzenos (r. 1347–1353)<sup>7</sup> and, for a time, Emperor John V Palaiologos (r. 1341–1391)<sup>8</sup>—and who served as tutor to John’s son and heir, Manuel II Palaiologos—cultivated a circle of like-minded Byzantines who read the writings of Thomas Aquinas with enthusiasm and used his thought not only to argue in favor of ecclesiastical union, but as a key weapon in their arsenal against the controversial teachings of the contemporary theologian Gregory Palamas (c. 1296–1359).<sup>9</sup> Thereafter, opposition to “Palamism”—the theory that there is a real distinction in God between His immanent energies and His transcendent essence—became a key component of unionist discourse. For the followers of Kydones, such as the Chrysoberges brothers, but especially Manuel Kalekas (d. 1410) who fled Constantinople under duress in 1391 and eventually became a Dominican himself, the “heretical” teachings of Gregory Palamas became a principal reason for

---

<sup>6</sup> Frances Kianka, “Kydones, Demetrios,” in *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* (“*ODB*”), 3 vols., ed. Alexander Kazhdan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 2.1161.

<sup>7</sup> Alice-Mary Talbot, “John VI Kantakouzenos,” *ODB* 2.1050–1.

<sup>8</sup> Talbot and Anthony Cutler, “John V Palaiologos,” *ODB* 2.1050.

<sup>9</sup> Papadakis, “Palamas, Gregory,” *ODB*, 3.1560.

## OLD ROME VERSUS NEW ROME

disqualifying the separated Church of Constantinople as a “true Church” and for entering the communion of the infallible Roman Church.<sup>10</sup> From this point, the unionist idiom becomes heavy with denunciations and invectives such as can only be uttered by native sons disappointed in their fatherland. And even as unionist discourse became more and more inflected by an unmistakable savor of bitterness and alienation toward “the Greeks,” it also leaned ever more heavily upon constructions of an idealized West marked by the signs of power and certainty for which they looked in vain in their troubled homeland.

Nevertheless, irenic strands within the unionist discourse endured, as shown by events and figures in the fifteenth century. The subsequent careers of Kydones’s students run up to the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1437–1439), the premier union achievement of the Middle Ages, which saw the formal (though in many places ephemeral) recovery of unity between the papacy and the Byzantine Church at the very twilight of the Byzantine Empire.<sup>11</sup> The most articulate and vocal of the pro-union Byzantines at this council was Bessarion, metropolitan of Nicaea, who became, in the aftermath of the council, a cardinal of the Roman Church and ultimately the unionist titular patriarch of Constantinople. Bessarion himself was a major figure in fifteenth-century Italian intellectual culture and attracted his own circle of followers, key among whom was a Cretan priest named John Plousiadenos.<sup>12</sup> This priest, formerly opposed to the union brokered at the Council of Florence during his youth, became its most ardent defender from the 1460s forward. His fractious ecclesiastical career has been recently much elucidated by Eleftherios Despotakis and the excavation of his worldview—expressed in theological treatises, polemical letters, and liturgical poetry—is in process.<sup>13</sup> But it was this protégé of Cardinal Bessarion who served as the primary copyist of the proceedings of the Council of Florence and wrote the most extensive defenses of that

---

<sup>10</sup> For details on this, see Yost, “Anti-Palamism, Unionism, and the ‘Crisis of Faith’ of the Fourteenth Century,” in *Knighthood, Crusades, and Diplomacy in the Eastern Mediterranean in the Time of King Peter I of Cyprus*, ed. Angel Nicolaou-Konnari and Alexander D. Beihammer (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2023), 517–49.

<sup>11</sup> The classic work is Joseph Gill, *The Council of Florence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959).

<sup>12</sup> On Bessarion, see Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence and Other Essays* (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1964), 45–54; Ludwig Mohler, *Kardinal Bessarion als Theologe, Humanist, und Staatsmann: Fund und Forschungen*, 3 vols. (Paderborn, Germany: F. Schöningh, 1923–1942; reprinted Aalen, 1967). On Bessarion’s interactions with John Plousiadenos and other Cretan priests united to Rome, see Zacharias N. Tsirpanles, *Tò Κληροδότημα τοῦ καρδινάλιου Βησσαρίωνος γιὰ τοὺς φιλενωτικούς τῆς Βενετοκρατουμένης Κρήτης (1439–17ος αἰ.)* (Thessaloniki, 1967).

<sup>13</sup> See Despotakis, *John Plousiadenos*; “Some Observations on the Διάλεξις of John Plousiadenos (1426?–1500),” *Byzantion: Revue internationale des études byzantines* 86 (2016): 129–37. See also Yost, “Neither Greek nor Latin”; “Trampling the Lion and the Dragon: John Plousiadenos (d. 1500) on the Prophetic Power of the Roman Church,” *Speculum: A Journal of Medieval Studies* 101/2 (2026—forthcoming).

Council. Hence, he is the primary transmitter of the legacy of Florence, and thus late-stage unionist discourse, to the modern world. John Plousiadenos is also identical to that bishop who, under the name Joseph (his name in religion), died at the siege of Modon in the year 1500.<sup>14</sup>

Since my more detailed treatment of the thought of John Plousiadenos, the culmination of the medieval unionist tradition, will be treated in greater detail in a forthcoming article, this essay will focus on the unionist discourse on its own terms as articulated by its major representatives, including Demetrios Kydones and Manuel Kalekas, during the particularly decisive fourteenth-fifteenth century watershed. In the past, historians and theologians have assessed Byzantine appeals for union with Rome as the theological arguments of isolated individuals—and have often dismissed these arguments as insubstantial or simply derivative of Latin theology. The unionists themselves, whether they garner admiration or contempt, have usually been seen as idiosyncratic weirdos who do not belong within the “authentic” Byzantine religious landscape.<sup>15</sup> Now over the course of the last couple of decades, a number of studies have appeared that contest, in some cases undermine, or at the very least complicate, these standard views on the unionists.<sup>16</sup> As important as these studies are, they have usually focused on individuals: they have done more to extricate this or that particular figure from the pejorative and dismissive rubric of the *Latinophron* rather than address the

---

<sup>14</sup> On Plousiadenos’s fundamental role as a transmitter of the legacy of Florence to the early modern world, see Gill, *Personalities*, 131–43, and esp. Gerhard Podskalsky, *Griechische Theologie in der Zeit der Türkenherrschaft (1453–1821): Die Orthodoxie im Spannungsfeld der nachreformatorischen Konfessionen des Westens* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1988), 82–85.

<sup>15</sup> For instance, see Papadakis, *Crisis in Byzantium: The Filioque Controversy in the Patriarchate of Gregory II of Cyprus* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1997); Papadakis and Meyendorff, *Christian East*, 318, 385; Tsirpanles, *Κληροδότημα*, 28; Basileios L. Dentakes, *Ιωάννης Κυπρισιώτης ο σοφός και φιλόσοφος* (Athens: 1965), 32; John Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1979), 106, 188, 204. For examples of historiographical evaluations of unionist patriarch John Bekkos, see Alexandra Riebe, *Rom in Gemeinschaft mit Konstantinopel; Patriarch Johannes XI. Als Verteidiger der Kirchenunion von Lyons (1274)* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2005), 33–39 and Peter Gilbert, “Not an Anthologist: John Bekkos as a Reader of the Fathers,” *Communio* 36.2 (2009): 259–304. For critical perspectives on unionist historiography, see above all Yury Avvakumov, “Caught in the Crossfire: Toward Understanding Medieval and Early Modern Advocates of Church Union,” in *Stolen Churches or Bridges to Orthodoxy?* Vol. 1, *Historical and Theological Perspectives on the Orthodox and Eastern Catholic Dialogue*, ed. Vladimir Latinovic and Anastacia K. Wooden (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021), 19–40.

<sup>16</sup> See especially Judith Ryder, *The Career and Writings of Demetrius Kydones: A Study of Fourteenth-Century Byzantine Politics, Religion, and Society* (Leiden: Brill, 2010); Riebe, *Rom in Gemeinschaft*; Gerhard Podskalsky, *Von Photios zu Bessarion: der Vorrang humanistisch geprägter Theologie in Byzanz und deren bleibende Bedeutung* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003); Marcus Plested, *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas: Changing Paradigms in Historical and Systematic Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

## OLD ROME VERSUS NEW ROME

unionist type as such and the phenomenon of unionism in general.<sup>17</sup> We are lacking in more general studies of the unionist discourse as a whole within the context of its broader parameters and its development within those parameters.<sup>18</sup> But without taking this broader view, the unionists—however impressive each individual may be in his own arguments—still appear as a category of isolated cranks sticking out against a background that is assumed to be monolithically “Orthodox” and, therefore, “anti-union.” While this article cannot hope to elucidate the entirety of this fascinating tradition, it will at least endeavor to arrive at a more synoptic view of the phenomenon by connecting a few of the more salient dots between “henotic” thinkers and by considering how this tradition developed across time. By so proceeding, its aim to present this discourse on its own terms, and so show that it was endowed with at least as much coherence as the “anti-union” and “anti-Latin” discourse that has often been assumed to be the “default” setting of religious sentiment in Byzantium. Moreover, I hope that a more holistic understanding will enable us to appreciate unionism as an authentic expression of the Byzantine mind, with its own legitimacy as a field of inquiry.

Setting aside present concerns in favor of those of the past may yield strange results, but it is the first imperative of the discipline of history. Previous assessments of the East-West

---

<sup>17</sup> While Podskalsky, *Von Photios zu Bessarion* and Plested, *Orthodox Readings*, are exceptions in that they are concerned not with individuals but groups, neither is concerned with *unionists* as such. For attempts to take a more holistic view, see Claudine Delacroix-Besnier, “Conversions constantinopolitaines au XIVe siècle,” in *Mélanges de l’Ecole française de Rome: Moyen-âge, Temps modernes*, 105/2 (1993): 715–61; Tia M. Kolbaba, “Conversions from Greek Orthodoxy to Roman Catholicism in the Fourteenth Century,” *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 19 (1995): 120–34. However, both of these authors treat their subjects in anachronistic terms of “conversion” or even “conversion” from “Roman Catholicism to Greek Orthodoxy,” thus taking for granted, and even retro-projecting, modern concepts of denomination and denominational identity that ill-fit the pre-confessional era. See Yury P. Avvakumov, “The ‘Uniate’ Identity and the Construction of ‘Eastern Orthodoxy’: Reflections on the Confessionalization Process in the Christian East,” *The Catholic Historical Review* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2022): 1-44. My thanks to Prof. Avvakumov for sharing this piece with me.

<sup>18</sup> Important exceptions are John Monfasani, “The Pro-Latin Apologetics of the Greek Émigrés to Quattrocento Italy,” in *Byzantine Theology and its Philosophical Background*, ed. Antonio Rigo (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2011), 160–86; Yury P. Avvakumov, “Caught in the Crossfire” could be seen as an inspiring *prolegomenon* to unionist studies, such as this present essay attempts to do in a more granular way.

schism<sup>19</sup> and unionist perspectives<sup>20</sup> have tended to emphasize the theological grounds for the division (e.g., papal primacy, the dreaded *Filioque* clause, etc.). Without denying the importance of theology in historical study, the modern preoccupation with dogmas and theological systems in the abstract—a preoccupation itself reflective of scholarly confessional commitments—has marginalized or even occluded other issues that were vitally important to the unionists themselves. These issues involve considerations of culture and politics. To a far greater extent than has been acknowledged previously, these considerations played a key role in the development of unionist thought during the decisive fourteenth-fifteenth century, when comparisons between the “sibling cultures” of Elder and New Rome became a central thread of unionist discourse.<sup>21</sup> Focusing on such comparisons, in which calculations of cultural dignity and political power weigh heavy, will not only enable us to understand this tradition of thought on its own terms (rather than ours), but should also enable us to fix unionist thought firmly within the tumultuous world of late Byzantium by emphasizing its development in response to contemporary political and theological crises.

---

<sup>19</sup> Exhaustive treatment of theological issues is offered, for example, in the relatively recent publications of A. Edward Sicienski, including *The Filioque: History of a Doctrinal Controversy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010); *The Papacy: Sources and History of a Debate* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017); *Beards, Azymes, and Purgatory: The Other Issues that Divided East and West* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022). An overview of the historiography on schism—vacillating between “theological” interpretations and “political” interpretations is offered by Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists: Errors of the Latins* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2000), 1–8. The most important work on the issue of the unleavened bread, which goes far beyond mere theological analysis to the wide-ranging ramifications of the dispute for the emergence of tolerance in the West, is Avvakumov, *Die Entstehung des Unionsgedankens: Die lateinische Theologie des Hochmittelalters in der Auseinandersetzung mit dem Ritus der Ostkirche* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 2002). Also see Kolbaba, “Byzantine Perceptions of Latin Religious ‘Errors’: Themes and Changes from 859 to 1350,” in *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, ed. Angeliki E. Laiou and Roy P. Mottahedeh (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2001), 117–44. See also Aristeides Papadakis, “The Byzantines and the Rise of the Papacy: Points for Reflection 1204–1453,” Yury P. Avvakumov, “The Controversy over the Baptismal Formula under Pope Gregory IX,” and Chris Schabel, “The Quarrel over Unleavened Bread in Western Theology, 1234–1439,” all of which feature in *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History 1204–1500*, ed. Martin Hinterberger and Christopher D. Schabel (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 19–42, 69–84, and 85–128 respectively.

<sup>20</sup> A flagrant example would be the treatment of Bekkos in Papadakis, *Crisis in Byzantium*, 88–93. See also Papadakis’s review of Riebe’s *Rom in Gemeinschaft*, *Speculum* 83.3: 739–741.

<sup>21</sup> For the concept of “sibling cultures,” see Deno John Geanakoplos, *Interaction of the “Sibling” Byzantine and Western Cultures in the Middle Ages and Italian Renaissance (330–1600)* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1976). Certainly, John Meyendorff emphasizes the role of Hellenism as an “ultimate criterion of wisdom” in the religious attitude of “Latinophrones” such as Demetrios Kydones: see his *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (New York: Fordham University Press, 1979), 106f.

III. A BRIEF CONSIDERATION OF PATRIARCH JOHN BEKKOS (R. 1275–1282)

Although the unionist discourse begins in the thirteenth century, the tradition of comparison between the sees of Rome and Constantinople only begins, in earnest, in the fourteenth century. For instance, it is largely absent from the writings of Patriarch John Bekkos (r. 1275–1282)<sup>22</sup> favoring union. Absent from his appeals to the Greeks who were his countrymen and ecclesiastical subjects was any appeal to the cultural or intellectual superiority of the Latins.<sup>23</sup> Quite the contrary, he forbade, under terrible anathema, any approach to union that involved scorning Greek rites or customs in favor of those of the Latins, or assessing the Latin Church as “more pious” or holy than that of the Greeks: “For anyone who has come to this ecclesiastical peace, as one despising our customs and teachings, and as reckoning the Roman Church to be any bit more pious than ours, let him be cut off from the Kingdom of Christ, and be ranked along with the traitor Judas and his fellows, and the crucifiers of the Savior.”<sup>24</sup> Clearly, Bekkos is here conceptualizing some sort of preference for Rome on the part of would-be unionists as betrayal. Although Bekkos is somewhat unclear about the nature of this preference (it has to do with attitudes toward pious customs and the assessment that Rome is holier than Constantinople), it does not seem improbable that the patriarch saw this betrayal as consisting in Latinizing behavior or assimilation into the Roman Church (e.g., adoption of the Latin rite).<sup>25</sup>

As far as Bekkos’s attitude toward Latin Christian theological culture is concerned, he was largely ignorant of it.<sup>26</sup> Aside from an opportunistic attack on his adversary and successor Patriarch Gregory II of Cyprus for his origin and upbringing in Latin-occupied Cyprus,<sup>27</sup> there is little evidence that Bekkos harbored any animosity toward Latin Christian culture. On the other hand, Alexandria Riebe has convincingly argued that the unionist patriarch was

<sup>22</sup> Talbot, “John XI Bekkos,” *ODB* II, 1055; Papadakis, “Lyons, Second Council of,” *ODB* II, 1259.

<sup>23</sup> See Riebe, *Rom in Gemeinschaft*, 130–216; and see Yost, “Alexandra Riebe. *Rom in Gemeinschaft mit Konstantinopel*, besprochen von Charles C. Yost,” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 105.2 (2012): 872–76.

<sup>24</sup> John Bekkos, *On the Union*, in *Patrologia Graeca* (“PG”), ed. Jacques Migne, 141:20C–21A: “Πᾶς γὰρ τις, ὃς ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ταύτην ἦλθεν εἰρήνην, ὡς τῶν ἡμετέρων ἔθῶν καὶ δογμάτων κατεγνωκῶς, καὶ ὡς τὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν Ἐκκλησίαν πρεσβεύειν διεγνωκῶς εὐσεβέστερόν τι τῆς ἡμετέρας, ἔκπτωτος εἶη τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ βασιλείας, καὶ τῷ προδότη Ἰούδα, καὶ τοῖς κοινωνοῖς αὐτοῦ, καὶ σταυρωταῖς τοῦ Σωτῆρος συντεταγμένος.”

<sup>25</sup> Riebe, *Rom in Gemeinschaft*, 142–48, 195–97, 198–216, 217–310; Yost, “Alexandra Riebe”; Joan Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986; reprinted 2010), 228, 236.

<sup>26</sup> Riebe, *Rom in Gemeinschaft*, 217–310; Hussey, *Orthodox Church*, 228, 236.

<sup>27</sup> This is related in Papadakis, *Crisis in Byzantium*, 38ff.

(to use Joan Hussey’s adverb) “passionately” committed to his own.<sup>28</sup> This attachment can even be seen in Bekkos’s confession of faith to Pope John XXI, wherein the patriarch boldly asserts the legitimacy of the mode of the sacraments in the tradition of the Byzantine rite, even though it may diverge from Latin praxis.<sup>29</sup>

Bekkos did not offer a direct comparison between the Churches of Rome and Constantinople. But he did ruminate on the fate of Byzantine rule and Greek Christianity on the eastern frontiers of the empire in the face of Islamic conquests:

Ah, whence will be given to me fountains of tears that I should bewail—even if unworthily in comparison to the magnitude of the grief—but that I should bewail, nevertheless, the hellish night that has taken hold thence upon our territory, the punishment of our inheritance that has thence invaded the breadth of the Roman [i.e., Byzantine] lands. Wherein our inheritance has been mutilated not only unto the decapitation of our bodily authority by the destruction of many cities and lands, far-flung islands and entire peoples, but has even been punished unto religion itself—if, indeed, the punishment of religion is Muhammed and Mehmed reveling within the holy precincts, and celebrating their rites (alas, the desecration!), where the supreme mystery of Christian mysteries was once celebrated—for to such an extent has the evil of this schism harmed us, and the long time of evil, as is clear not only to us who suffer, but to all the nations of the earth.<sup>30</sup>

Thus Bekkos’s pathetic characterization of the humiliation of the Greeks bereft of their empire in the East by the hordes of Islam, of wretched Eastern Christianity prostrate before Muslim overlords, to whom even the holy places and mysteries are vulnerable. In Bekkos’s view, the Greeks had suffered this fate as a direct consequence of schism. The patriarch’s “lament” is thus a cautionary-tale for those Greeks who—for now—remain free: they will be spared only if they embrace union with the West, from which they may expect military

<sup>28</sup> Riebe, *Rom in Gemeinschaft*, 142–48, 195–97; Hussey, *Orthodox Church*, 236.

<sup>29</sup> John Bekkos, *Letter to Pope John XXI*, ed. Augustinus Theiner and Franciscus Miklosich, *Monumenta spectantia ad unionem ecclesiarum graecae et romanae* (Vienna, 1972), 27–28 (doc. #7).

<sup>30</sup> See Bekkos, *On the Union*, PG 141:16B–17A: “Ὡ πόθεν μοι δοθήσονται δακρύων πηγαί, ὡς ἂν ἀποκλαύσωμαι, εἰ καὶ μὴ ἀξίως, καὶ τῷ τοῦ πάθους μεγέθει ἀνάλογον, ἀποκλαύσωμαι δ’ οὖν ὅμως τὴν ἐντεῦθεν καταλαβοῦσαν τὴν καθ’ ἡμᾶς οἰκουμένην σκοτόμανιαν, τὴν ἐντεῦθεν ἐπελθοῦσαν τῷ πλάτει τῶν Ῥωμαϊκῶν σχοινομάτων ζημίαν τοῦ ἡμετέρου λάχους, οὐ μόνον ἐπὶ τῷ τῆς σωματικῆς ἀρχῆς ἀκρωτηριασμῷ, πολλῶν πόλεων καὶ χωρῶν, νήσων τε μακροδιαστάτων, καὶ ἔθνῶν ὀλοκλήρων ἀφαιρέσει κολοβωθέντος, ἀλλὰ τε διὴ καὶ εἰς αὐτὴν τὴν εὐσέβειαν ζημιωθέντος, εἴ γε τῆς εὐσεβείας ἐστὶ Μωάμεθ καὶ Μουχούμετ, ἔνδον τῶν ἱερῶν σηκῶν ὀργιζόντες, κάκεισε, βαβαὶ τοῦ μύσου! ἐνθιασεύοντες, ὅπου πρὶν τὸ μέγα τῶν Χριστιανικῶν μυστηρίων ἀπετελεῖτο μυστήριον. Ὅτι γὰρ καὶ μέχρι τοσοῦτου ἢ τοῦ σχίσματος τούτου κακία, τὰ καθ’ ἡμᾶς ἔλυμνητο ὁ πολὺς τῆς κακώσεως χρόνος, οὐ μόνους ἡμῖν τοῖς παθοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἀπανταχοῦ γῆς ἔθνεσι δηλον κατέστησεν.” See also Riebe, 143 and n. 39 and her presentation of the text in question (from the edition of Laemmer) and her German translation.

## OLD ROME VERSUS NEW ROME

assistance as a consequence of union.<sup>31</sup> This sad vision of the Greek Church beneath the Islamic yoke will remain a central element in later unionist characterizations of Greek Christianity. However, as we shall see below, in later discourse this bleak image of the Greek Church, besides maintaining the function it served for Bekkos as cautionary-tale against schism and moral imperative for union, will take on a new role: that of negative mirror-image of Elder Rome against which the superiority of the latter is clearly distinguished.

### IV. THE COMPARISON BEGINS: DEMETRIOS KYDONES AND THE POWER, DIGNITY, AND FREEDOM OF THE ROMAN CHURCH

In Demetrios Kydones's first Socratic-style *Apologia pro fide sua*,<sup>32</sup> which he wrote "in the early to mid-1360s, in a period when he occupied a central position in politics and when relations with the West were of great importance,"<sup>33</sup> an explicit comparison between Elder and New Rome is initiated not by Kydones himself but, allegedly, by his Greek interlocutors.<sup>34</sup> After Kydones ruffles some feathers by looking into the question of the procession of the Holy Spirit *ab utroque*—an unwelcome question as far as his countrymen are concerned—Kydones presents his interlocutors as defending the Greek position not with theological rationales, but by having recourse to the grandeur of the city of Constantinople—in very concrete terms evocative of political and economic power—as opposed to the comparative inferiority of Rome in those same regards:

---

<sup>31</sup> See esp. Riebe, *Rom in Gemeinschaft*, 142–48.

<sup>32</sup> For the title of this work, see Judith Ryder, "Divided Loyalties? The Career and Writings of Demetrios Kydones," in *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History 1204–1500*, ed. Martin Hinterberger and Christopher D. Schabel (Leuven, 2011), 243–262, and especially Giovanni Mercati, *Notizie di Procoro e Demetrio Cidone, Manuele Caleca e Teodoro Meliteniota ed altri appunti per la storia della teologia e della letteratura bizantina del secolo XIV* (Vatican City, 1931) as cited in the following two footnotes. Another fruitful avenue, which constraints of space and time do not allow me to pursue here, would be to consider Kydones's comparison alongside that offered by Manuel Chrysoloras (c. 1350–1415). Chrysoloras's assessment is strikingly different from that of his contemporary (see Talbot, "Chrysoloras, Manuel," *ODB* I.454).

<sup>33</sup> Ryder, "Divided Loyalties," 44–45, 255–256 (direct quote on p. 256). On Kydones more generally, see Ryder, "Divided Loyalties" (and see her interpretation of Kydones's *Apologia* here) and *Career and Writings, passim*; see also Pleased, *Orthodox Readings*, 63–72; Hermann Tinnfeld, *Die Briefe des Demetrios Kydones: Themen und literarische Form* (Wiesbaden, 2010); Demetrios Kydones, *Démétrius Cydonès. Correspondance*, 2 vols., Studi e testi, vols. 131, 208, ed. Raymond-Joseph Loenertz (Vatican City, 1947–1960), 1.iii–xvi; Raymond-Joseph Loenertz, "Démétrius Cydonès. I. De la naissance à l'année 1373," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 36 (1970): 361–372; Raymond-Joseph Loenertz, "Démétrius Cydonès. II. De 1373 à 1375," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 37 (1971): 5–39; Frances Kianka, "Byzantine-Papal Diplomacy: The Role of Demetrios Cydones," *International History Review* 7 (1985): 175–213; Frances Kianka, "The Letters of Demetrios Kydones to Empress Helena Kantakouzene Palaiologina," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 46 (1992): 155–164; Frances Kianka, "Demetrios Kydones and Italy," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 49 (1995): 99–110.

<sup>34</sup> See Mercati, *Notizie*, 359–403 (doc. #III: "Apologie della propria fede," 1: "Ai Greci Ortodossi" = *Apologia*).

Therefore [one of my interlocutors] marveled at the wall of [Constantinople-]New Rome and considered it to be so much greater than that of Old Rome, and there was the beauty and number of the churches therein, and another said the harbor was better than any other anywhere on earth by virtue of its safety, and numbered all those who had established themselves there from all over the world; but they even went on with respect to [Constantinople's] positioning, as though it had been founded on the most beautiful spot in the world and was like unto the eye of the universe, and altogether a long discourse was stretched out about the advantages of the city. And the Elder [Rome] was said to be lesser in all of these things, and that on account of them one should not adhere to her nor even call her "Rome," decaying as she was on account of old age, but rather follow New Rome as though she were established on the height, and to have recourse to her as teacher with respect to the divine things, which have been confirmed by the decrees of the presiding emperors and, in agreement with them, the four patriarchs, against whom contradiction is manifest war against God and the Truth.<sup>35</sup>

If we believe Kydones, his adversaries derived their sense of confidence in Constantinople as Church and magisterium, whose teachings have been certified by "the emperors and the four [Eastern] patriarchs," from the economic vitality (i.e., the harbor and the ships) and the imperial grandeur of New Rome, especially compared to Elder Rome, advanced in her dotage and decrepitude. Initially, Kydones appears to dismiss this sort of comparison as essentially un-Christian and absurd. According to this logic, Kydones contends, his interlocutors must prefer the pharisees' Jerusalem to humble Bethlehem, where God was born; or again, to the temple and Ark of the Covenant of Jerusalem, they must prefer the "citharas and tambourines and the golden blasphemy" of Babylon the Great. But then he yields what appears rhetorically as "the benefit of the doubt" to his adversaries—"assuming that the grandeur and majesty of the city does actually matter..."—from which he launches into not only an assertion of Rome's superiority to Constantinople in size and in the extent of its walls, but a claim about the historical derivation of Constantinople's imperial glory from Elder Rome:

---

<sup>35</sup> Kydones, *Apologia*, 367–370: "Ὁ μὲν οὖν κύκλον τῆς νέας Ῥώμης ἐθαύμαζε καὶ τοῦ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας ἀπέφαινε μείζω πολλῶ, καὶ τὸ κάλλος δὲ καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ νεῶν διηγείτο, καὶ τὸν λίμενα δὲ ἔλεγε πάντας τοὺς ὅπου ποτὲ γῆς ἀσφαλεία νικᾶν καὶ τοὺς εἰς αὐτὸν καταίροντας πανταχόθεν ἠρίθμει· ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν θέσιν, ὡς ἐν τῷ καλλίστῳ τῆς γῆς ἴδρυται καὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης ὀφθαλμῶ παρείκασται, προσετίθει, καὶ ὅλως ὑπὲρ τῶν τῆς πόλεως πλενοεκτημάτων μακρὸν κατέτεινε λόγον· τὴν δὲ πρεσβυτέραν τούτοις πᾶσιν ἔλεγεν ἠλαττώσθαι, καὶ δεῖν διὰ ταῦτα μὴ προσέχειν ἐκείνη μηδὲ Ῥώμην ἔτι καλεῖν ὑποδεδωκυῖαν σαφῶς διὰ γῆρας, ἔπεσθαι δὲ τῇ νέᾳ ὡς ἂν ἐπ' ἀκμῆς ἐστηκυῖα, καὶ ταύτη διδασκάλῳ χρῆσθαι περὶ τὰ θεῖα, βασιλέων τε τῶν ἐγκαθημένων ψήφοις κεκυρωμένα καὶ τεττάρων πατριαρχῶν συνεπιψηφιζόντων, οἷς ἀντιλέγειν σαφῆ πρὸς τε Θεὸν καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν πόλεμον εἶναι." (Quote on p. 370).

## OLD ROME VERSUS NEW ROME

The splendor of empire came thence [from Old Rome] to us; for there [in Old Rome] was someone first named ‘Emperor of the Romans,’ and he ruled everything under the sun and subjected all nations to the splendid yoke of that City, which has branded the whole world, like a slave, by her generals, and has given both her monarchy and her name in place of a crown to those that ruled within her, so that if [Constantinople] New Rome is considered worthy of some respect, from [Old Rome] did it come to [New Rome] that she be so esteemed and honored, from [Old Rome] did [New Rome] receive the imperial dignity, the senate, and her great name, to [Old Rome], justly ... should [New Rome] yield superiority, just as colonies do to their metropolises.<sup>36</sup>

From this point forward, we see that what may have at first appeared as a rhetorical sideline now emerges as a main line of attack of Kydones’s argument, wherein the historical derivation of Constantinople’s majesty from Rome, and hence the inferiority of the former to the latter, is but the secular analogue mirroring exactly Constantinople’s relationship to Rome *as churches*, since, Kydones continues:

Anyone could say the same things regarding the priesthood in both [Rome and Constantinople]; for if [Constantinople] holds much of Asia in obedience, and stretches out to the Sea of Azov and the Bosphorus, and even holds a part of Europe, [Rome]—[as is evident] to him who sails beyond the southernmost tip of the Peloponnese—is hegemon of all peoples and cities up to the Straits of Gibraltar. Under her power she has placed the French (Γαλάτας), Spaniards (Ἰβηρας), and the northern Germans (Γερμανοὺς τοὺς ἀρκτίους)—whom they say exceed in number all the rest of the Christians combined—and, indeed, having crossed the Western Ocean, she has been established over the men living on the great islands [i.e., England, Scotland, Ireland], in but a part of which [islands], those who have recorded human dwellings there have revealed them as equal in number to our entire [empire], as much as extends to the Don River and the

---

<sup>36</sup> See Kydones, *Apologia*, 370–72: “...πάλιν δὲ καὶ ταύτης τῆς πόλεως [i.e., Jerusalem] καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ πλακῶν καὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς σκηνῆς καὶ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῆς ἄλλης λατρείας τὰ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι προτιμήσομεν εἶδωλα καὶ τὰς αὐτόθι κιθάρας καὶ σύρριγας καὶ αὐλοὺς καταπλαγέντες τὸ χρυσοῦν προσκυνήσομεν βδέλυγμα· κἄν τις ἡμᾶς τὸ τῆς ἀσεβείας αἴτιον ἔρηται, τὸ μεγίστην πασῶν πόλεων εἶναι τὴν Βαβυλῶνα ἀρκεῖν ἠγησόμεθα πρὸς ἀπόκρισιν, καὶ οὕτω γελοίας ἀντι τῶν ἀληθῶν ἀθροίσομεν δόξας, λίθοις καὶ πλίνθοις πρὸς τὴν ἀπόδειξιν τῆς ἀληθείας προσχρόμενοι. ὅμως εἰ σεμνὸν ὑμῖν ἢ τῶν τειχῶν εὐρυχωρία, καὶ δεῖ διὰ ταύτην ὑμᾶς καὶ ἀληθέστερα λέγειν, καὶ οὕτως τῆς πρεσβυτέρας ἢ νίκη μεγέθους γε ἔνεκα, ὡς ἂν φαῖεν οἱ καὶ ἄμφω τὴν πόλεον περιελθόντες καὶ ἐκμετρήσαντες, οἱ σαφῶς τῇ παλαιᾷ νέμουσι τὴν ὑπεροχὴν. ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ τῆς βασιλείας ὕψος ἐκεῖθεν ἦκεν ἡμῖν· αὐτόθι γὰρ πρῶτον βασιλεύς τις ὠνομάσθη Ῥωμαίων, καὶ τὸ τῆς ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον δὲ πάσης τοῦτον κρατῆσαι καὶ πᾶσιν ἔθνεσιν ἓνα ζυγὸν ἐπιθεῖναι τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης ἀξίαιτον, ἢ τοῖς παρ’ ἐαυτῆς στρατηγοῖς ὡσπερ τινὰ παῖδα τὴν οἰκουμένην ἅπασαν στίξασα τὴν τε μοναρχίαν καὶ τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν αὐτῆς ἀντι στεφάνου τοῖς ἐν αὐτῇ βασιλεύσασι δέδωκεν· ὥστ’ εἴ τι καὶ ἡ νέα σεμνολογεῖται, ἐκεῖθεν αὐτῇ καὶ τὸ φρονεῖν ἐφ’ αὐτῇ καὶ τὸ τιμᾶσθαι, παρ’ ἧς καὶ βασιλείαν καὶ βουλήν καὶ τὴν μεγάλην ἐπωνυμίαν ἐδέξατο, κάκεινη δικαίως ἂν ὡσπερ ἄλλο τι χρῆος τὴν ὑπακοὴν ἀποτίνοι ὡσπερ αἱ ἀποικίαι ταῖς μητροπόλεσιν.”

Pillars [of Hercules]—so that if anyone wanted to judge the dignities of the Churches by the multitude of subjects, he would find that [Rome] much exceeds [Constantinople].<sup>37</sup>

And so here Demetrios Kydones is asserting the superiority of the Roman Church to the Constantinopolitan Church on the basis of the number, and ethnic diversity, of their respective adherents. By setting the Bosphorus as the eastern boundary of Constantinople’s jurisdiction (even if it also claims the allegiance of souls as far as the Sea of Azov to the northeast), Kydones sets the patriarchate within restricted boundaries—a modest jurisdiction reflecting contemporary geopolitical realities, when the Ottomans essentially controlled Asia Minor and had even established a foothold, by 1354, on the European-side of the Bosphorus at Kallipolis.<sup>38</sup> Naturally, it will be pointed out that the patriarchate’s jurisdiction was not coextensive with the emperor’s effective realm.<sup>39</sup> Soon Kydones will address this discrepancy, although, as it will become apparent, he is not much impressed by a jurisdiction over Christians under Islamic rule that he understands as simply notional.

But something must be said as to the nature of this argument based upon the number and diversity of peoples held in obedience. Kydones was not the first proponent of the Roman Church to take this approach. In the eighth century, Pope Gregory II had sent a letter to the iconoclast Emperor Leo III in Constantinople wherein he bolstered his authority by alluding to the “kingdoms of the West” in his allegiance.<sup>40</sup> But Gregory had only vaguely

---

<sup>37</sup> Kydones, *Apología*, 372: “ταὐτὸ δ’ ἂν τις εἴποι καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐν ἀμφοτέραις ἱερωσύνης· εἰ γὰρ καὶ αὕτη πολὺ μὲν τῆς Ἀσίας ὑπήκοον ἔχει, ἐκτείνεται δὲ μέχρι Μαιώτιδος καὶ Βοσπόρου, ἔχει δὲ τι καὶ τῆς Εὐρώπης, ἀλλ’ ἐκείνη εὐθὺς Μαλέα παραπλεύσαντι πάντων τῶν μέχρι Γαδείρων ἔθνῶν τε καὶ πόλεων ἐστὶν ἡγεμών, εἶσω δὲ τῆς ἀρχῆς Γαλάτας καὶ Ἰβήρας καὶ Γερμανοὺς τοὺς ἀρκτίους ποιεῖται, οὓς φασὶ τῷ πλήθει πάντας τοὺς ὑπολοίπους συνελθόντας Χριστιανοὺς ὑπερβάλλειν, καὶ μὴν καὶ τὸν ἐσπέριον Ὠκεανὸν διαβάσα τοῖς ἐν ταῖς μεγάλας νήσοις ἀνθρώποις νομοθετεῖ, ὧν τὴν ἑτέραν οἱ τὰς οἰκίσεις ἀναγράφαντες ἀντίρροπον ἀπέφηναν πάση τῇ καθ’ ἡμᾶς οἰκουμένη, ὅση Τανάιδι καὶ Στήλαις ὀρίζεται· ὥστ’ εἰ τις τῶ τῶν ὑπηκόων πλήθει βούλοιο κρίνειν τὰ τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν ἀξιώματα, πολλὴν ἂν παρ’ ἐκείνη τὴν ὑπεροχὴν οὖσαν εὕροι.”

<sup>38</sup> See George Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, trans. Hussey, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1968; reprinted 1989), 530, 466–551; Talbot, “Byzantium, History of,” “‘Empire of the Straits’ (1261–1453),” *ODB* 1.361; Donald M. Nicol, *Last Centuries of Byzantium, 1261–1453*, 2nd ed. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 253–91. Kallipolis was restored to the Empire in 1367, then lost finally to the Ottomans in 1376 (Alexander Kazhdan, “Kallipolis,” *ODB* 2.1094–1095).

<sup>39</sup> Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, 535–36, 553–54 (the anecdote about the Muscovite Duke Basil and Patriarch Anthony IV; see also Nicol, *Last Centuries*, 299–300); Hussey, *Orthodox Church*, 286–94, at 299: “Such fluctuations in territorial extent of the patriarch of Constantinople were in a sense peripheral to the life and development of the medieval Church within the Byzantine Empire and in no way lessened its claims to authority.” See also Talbot, “Byzantium, History of,” “‘Empire of the Straits’ (1261–1453),” *ODB* 1.361; Papadakis and Meyendorff, *Christian East*, 346–51 (on p. 346 is the anecdote about Patriarch Anthony IV), 392 (the expansiveness of the Greek Church), 412–14 (the endurance of the Church in the face of Byzantium’s collapse).

<sup>40</sup> See J.D. Mansi, ed., *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* 12 (Florence, 1766), col. 968–974, esp. 971D.

## OLD ROME VERSUS NEW ROME

gestured at the might of the Western nations in Roman obedience; Kydones is unprecedented in the detail of his catalogue of the numerosity and diversity of Rome's faithful. Nor was Kydones the last to have recourse to this "quantitative argument." Besides the subsequent unionist tradition in which, as we shall see, this approach will be maintained, Pope Nicholas V took up this same theme in his letter of 1451 admonishing the Emperor Constantine XI to enact the Florentine Union.<sup>41</sup>

What was the point of such descriptions of the number and diversity of adherents to Rome? Far from being a mere boast about the power wielded by a Church based on the number of its subjects—although it certainly is this too—we should consider how such claims brought ecclesiological credibility to the Roman Church. The Roman Church claimed to embody, in a singular and special way, the Church established by Christ and professed as "one, holy, catholic, and apostolic" in the Creed. By claiming that so many diverse peoples living throughout Latin Europe—the expanse and populousness of which would be even better appreciated by the Byzantines later thanks to Emperor Manuel II's extensive tour in the West in 1400-1402, including England<sup>42</sup>—Kydones was undergirding Rome's claim to "catholicity" or "universality"—it is not the Church of this or that ethnic group; it is the Church of the more numerous and noble part of the world.

Then Kydones shifts his focus from subjects to ruler:

But I have heard a man—[who], as Demosthenes says, is not even capable of lying—that [Rome] has allotted overlordship, revenues, and dignities to the other churches, as is fitting for her who has obtained authority from Christ over all—for this has been found written in the archives of the *acta* in Rome (*τοῖς ἀρχαίοις τῶν ἐν τῇ Ρώμῃ πεπραγμένων*). And so whoever he may be—this man has said—be he ever so venerable and puffed up with an arrogant self-esteem, let him account his swelling pride to the Church of Rome, from whom he has received to have what he rules with his arrogant self-esteem. For just as kings unto their subjects, she has honored all [the churches] making them partakers of those things that are her own, so that she not only has more than those who are less than her, but she even enriches others by the things with which she is endowed, for what is already hers become the possessions of all. But she, thus providing for all (*πάντων οὕτω προνοουμένη*) has always appointed teachers—just as is

---

<sup>41</sup> Pope Nicholas V, *Ad Constantinum Romaeorum Imp. Epistola de unione ecclesiarum*, PG 161:1208 (in the Latin and the Greek translation of Theodore of Gaza). On this letter in general, see Nicol, *Last Centuries*, 372; Gill, *Council of Florence*, 377-78.

<sup>42</sup> Charlabos Dendrinis, "Manuel II Palaeologus in Paris (1400-1402): Theology, Diplomacy, and Politics," in *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History, 1204-1500*, 397-422; Jonathan Harris, "Manuel II Palaiologos (1391-1425) and the Lollards," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 57:1-4 (2012): 213-34.

suitable for her who was endowed by Christ with care for everyone—of orthodoxy regarding God, and has sent them out to the boundaries of the world, even now deigning to imitate the Apostles, and putting down laws for all concerning things divine and human through letters, and receiving those who abide by the laws, while not hesitating, for the sake of the security of others, to punish those who are engaged in strife. And similarly [she has] become the promoter of peace and wisdom for all, and exhibits the disposition of a Mother and Mistress to all, because of which things anyone should understand those who are convinced that shamelessness toward her is plainly war against God, and on account of this no one would ever doubt her authority, just as neither would anyone doubt the hegemony of God over all.<sup>43</sup>

Clearly Kydones was impressed with the Roman Church. The qualities he picks out here are as follows. First, Rome’s magnanimity or beneficence as ruler: Kydones maintains—based on what he has heard from his trustworthy informant (probably the Dominican Philip of Pera) and some sort of documentation “found in the Roman archives”<sup>44</sup>—that authority, jurisdiction, and privileges of the other churches are derived from the Roman Church. Hence the ecclesiastical analogue with his previous argument about the derivation of Constantinople’s imperial government becomes clear. The theory that Rome, out of a sense of benevolence, conceived the other four patriarchates by parceling out to them her own overarching and universal *solicitudo* is attested in a number of ecclesiological statements made by the papacy *ad Graecos* from the thirteenth century forward—although this ecclesiological vision had already been formulated in an earlier era and different context (i.e.,

---

<sup>43</sup> Kydones, *Apologia*, 372-73: “ἤκουσα δὲ ἔγωγε ἀνδρός, ὃ φασι Δημοσθένης, οὐδαμῶς οἴου τε ψεύδεσθαι, ὡς αὕτη δὴ ἐστὶν ἢ καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις Ἐκκλησίαις τὰς τε ἡγεμόνας καὶ τὰς προσόδους καὶ τὰ ἀξιώματα νείμασα, ὡς προσῆκον τῇ παρὰ Χριστοῦ τὴν κατὰ πάντων ἐξουσίαν λαχούση, τοῦτο γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις τῶν ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ πεπραγμένων γεγραμμένον εὐρήσθαι ὥστε κἂν ὀπωσοῦν τις, ἔφασκεν ἐκεῖνος, ἧ̄ σεμνὸς καὶ φρονήματος πλήρης, τῇ τῆς Ῥώμης Ἐκκλησίᾳ λογιζέσθω τὸν ὄγκον, παρ’ ἧς αὐτῷ μετὰ τοῦ φρονήματος καὶ τὸ ἔχειν ὧν ἄρξει· τῶν γὰρ ἑαυτῆς ὡσπερ τοὺς ὑπάρχους οἱ βασιλεῖς μεταδοῦσα πάντας ἐτίμησεν, ὡστ’ οὐ μόνον τοῖς μείνασι παρ’ αὐτῇ πλέον ἔχει, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἷς ἐχαρίσατο τὰς ἄλλας πλεονεκτεῖ, αὐτῆς γὰρ ἦδη τὰ πασῶν γίνεται. αὕτη δὲ ἔστηκε δι’ αἰῶνος πάντων οὕτω προνοουμένη ὡσπερ εἰκὸς τὴν παρὰ Χριστοῦ τὰς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀναδεδεγμένην φροντίδας, διδασκάλους μὲν τῆς ὀρθῆς περὶ Θεοῦ δόξης μέχρι τῶν τῆς οἰκουμένης ὄρων ἐκπέμπουσα καὶ τὰ τῶν Ἀποστόλων καὶ νῦν ἀξιούσα μιμεῖσθαι, καὶ πᾶσι δὲ περὶ τε θείων καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων διὰ γραμμάτων νομοθετοῦσα, καὶ τοὺς μὲν τοῖς νόμοις ἐμμένοντας ἀποδεχομένη, τοὺς δ’ ἄγαν φιλονεικούντας ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν ἄλλων ἀσφαλείας οὐ παραιτουμένη καὶ τιμωρεῖσθαι, καὶ ὅλως εἰρήνης καὶ σοφίας πᾶσι πρυτανίς γινομένη καὶ τὰ μητρὸς καὶ δεσποίνης πρὸς πάντας ἐνδεικνυμένη· ὑφ’ ὧν καὶ πάντας ἂν ἴδοι τις πεπεισμένους σαφῆ πρὸς Θεὸν εἶναι πόλεμον τὴν πρὸς ἐκείνην ἀναίδειαν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὐδέποτ’ αὕτη τις τῆς ἀρχῆς ἠμφισβήτησεν ὡσπερ οὐδὲ Θεῷ τῆς ἡγεμονίας τῶν ὅλων.”

<sup>44</sup> See Claudine Delacroix-Besnier, “Les prêcheurs, du dialogue à la polémique (XIIIe-XIVe siècle),” in *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History*, 154-56, referring to archival research undertaken by Kydones on behalf of Philip of Pera *in Constantinople*; on the relationship between Philip and Kydones (and the “investigations carried out by” the former), Ryder, *Career and Writings*, 27, also 187-89, 210-13. Clearly, Friar Philip’s views reflected a Latin ecclesiological tradition reaching back through Thomas Aquinas, Innocent III, and the materials contained in Gratian’s *Decretum*.

## OLD ROME VERSUS NEW ROME

not controversies with the East). Kydones here is endorsing this theory while relying on his trustworthy informant as a rhetorical device. The informant serves in this text not only as a credible authority, I argue, but as a means for Kydones to “buffer” or moderate his own support of Rome’s claims without seeming too subversive. These are the claims of Romanist ecclesiology consisting in the view the Roman Church has the “fullness of solicitude”—full jurisdiction—while admitting other churches, as Rome wishes, to a portion (*pars solitudinis*) of her pastoral oversight, or a partial jurisdiction.<sup>45</sup>

Kydones admires the evangelical energy of the Roman See as observed in its missionary activity. That this aspect was conspicuous to Kydones deserves reflection. It is true that Constantinople’s enthusiasm for proselytizing beyond the boundaries of the empire was historically rather tepid. Even if scholars have demonstrated, in different contexts, that Latin religious abroad were concerned with ministering to expatriate Latins before proselytizing (insofar as they showed interest in this at all),<sup>46</sup> when compared to the lackluster showing of

---

<sup>45</sup> See *Acta Innocentii PP. III: 1198-1216*, ed. Theodosius P. Haluščynskyj, Pontificia commissio ad redigendum codicem iuris canonici orientalis, fontes, ser. 3.2 (Rome, 1944), 188: “Huius etiam primatum Veritas per se ipsam expressit, cum inquit ad eum: Tu vocaberis Cephas, quod etsi Petrus interpretetur, caput tamen exponitur; ut sicut caput inter cetera membra corporis, velut in quo viget plenitudo sensuum obtinet principatum, sic et Petrus inter Apostolos et succesores ipsius inter universos ecclesiarum praelatos, praerogativa praecellerent dignitatis; vocatis sic ceteris in partem sollicitudinis, ut nichil eis de potestatis plenitudine deperiret.” And p. 192: “Dicitur enim universalis Ecclesia, quae de universis constat ecclesiis, quae graeco vocabulo “catholica” nominatur; et secundum hanc acceptionem vocabuli, Ecclesia Romana non est universalis Ecclesia, sed pars universalis Ecclesiae, prima videlicet et praecipua, velut caput in corpore; quoniam in ea plenitudo potestatis existit, ad ceteras autem pars aliqua plenitudinis derivatur.” (Both quotes from letter #9). *Acta Urbani IV et Clementis IV, Gregorii X: 1261-1276*, ed. Aloysius L. Tautu, Pontificia commissio ad redigendum codicem iuris canonici orientalis, fontes, ser. 3.5 (Rome, 1953), 67: “Ipsa quoque sacrosancta Romana Ecclesia summum et plenum primatum et principatum super universam Catholicam Ecclesiam obtinens, quem se ab ipso Domino in beato Petro Apostolorum principe se vertice, cuius Romanus Pontifex est successor, cum potestatis plenitudine recipisse veraciter et humiliter recognoscit.... Sed et in omnibus causis ad examen ecclesiasticum spectantibus ad ipsius potestatem recurri iudicium et eidem omnes Ecclesiae sunt subiectae ipsarumque Prelati et oboedientiam et reverentiam sibi debent, apud quam sic potestatis plenitudo consistit, quod Ecclesias ceteras ad sollicitudinis partem admittit....” (#23—“profession of catholic faith” composed for Emperor Michael VIII—see p. 61). These same clauses would be repeated in the oath sworn in 1369 by Emperor John V, as prepared by Pope Urban V in 1366 (see *Acta Urbani V*, ed. Aloysius L. Tautu, Pontificia commissio ad redigendum codicem iuris canonici orientalis, fontes, ser. 3.11 (Rome, 1964), 174, 170 (#107). On Demetrios Kydones’s role in Emperor John V’s personal submission to the Roman Church, see Ryder, *Career and Writings*, 202–203; *Acta Urbani V*, 283–86 (#167). As Papadakis and Meyendorff, *Christian East*, 51, 221ff., indicate, this particular ecclesiology was articulated already in the twelfth century by St. Bernard of Clairvaux: “The term *plenitudo potestatis* used to describe the papal fullness of power (the pope’s supreme right to intervene in all parts of the Church, according to St. Bernard of Clairvaux) had already become commonplace among western canonists, including of course Gratian who was to publish his *Decretum* in about 1140” (158); see Klaus Schatz, *Papal Primacy: From Its Origins to the Present*, trans. John A. Otto and Linda M. Mahoney (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996), 85–94.

<sup>46</sup> This view is shared by two scholars in their respective fields: see Robin Vose, *Dominicans, Muslims, and Jews in the Medieval Crown of Aragon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), *passim*, e.g. 104–105 (against seeing Dominican *studia* for learning Arabic as functioning principally in support of proselytism), 133–64, 192–221, 222–49 (on Dominicans in medieval Spain and North Africa); Nikiphoros I. Tsougarakis, *The Latin Religious Orders in*

Constantinople in the later Middle Ages, Kydones must have been impressed by the organized presence and directed activity of Latin religious in the Islamic South and, above all, the Greek East.<sup>47</sup> Obviously Kydones was also channeling his (Dominican) informant's inflated esteem for his own order, but the mere fact of Kydones's association with this Dominican and others like him—after all, highly-placed intellectuals like Kydones were preferred targets in what Dominican proselytism *did* transpire in the East<sup>48</sup>—the existence of a multitude of Latin religious communities throughout the Eastern Mediterranean, the service of mendicants as emissaries between the papacy and imperial government in union negotiations (of which Kydones was certainly aware) informed and validated Kydones's impressions.<sup>49</sup> Other developments, such as efforts to institute Latin studies throughout Armenia with the purpose of bringing about a greater cultural rapprochement during the papacy of Pope John XXII, further validated them.<sup>50</sup> Even if it is quite possible to exaggerate

---

*Medieval Greece, 1204–1500* (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2012). See my review of Tsougarakis's book in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 107.1 (2014): 284–89.

<sup>47</sup> See R.J. Loenertz, “Les établissements Dominicains de Pera-Constantinople,” *Échos d'Orient* 34 (1935): 332–49; Delacroix-Besnier, “Les prêcheurs,” *passim*; Claudine Delacroix-Besnier, *Les Dominicains et la Chrétienté grecque aux XIVe et XVe siècles* (Rome, 1997); Tommaso Violante, *La provincia domenicana d'Grecia* (Rome, 1999); Antoine Dondaine, “*Contra Graecos*: Premiers écrits polémiques des Dominicains d'Orient,” *Archivum fratrum praedicatorum* 21 (1951): 320–446. On the comparatively weak concern of the Church of Constantinople (at least after the ninth-tenth centuries), see Timothy E. Gregory and Ihor Ševčenko, “Missions,” *ODB* 2.1380ff.; Ihor Ševčenko, “Religious Missions Seen from Byzantium,” *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 12/13 (1988/1989): 7–27; Sergey A. Ivanov, “*Pearls before Swine*: Missionary Work in Byzantium,” trans. Deborah Hoffman (Paris, 2015), 107–56); Dmitri Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth: Eastern Europe, 500–1453* (New York, 1971), 83–97, though the poor and weak picture Demetrios Kydones paints of the patriarchate, as we shall see, ill fits with robust missionary activity.

<sup>48</sup> On this, see contributions cited in the previous note, but above all, Delacroix-Besnier, *Les dominicains, passim*, but esp. 185–200. See also Delacroix-Besnier, “Les prêcheurs,” 154–56.

<sup>49</sup> The literature here is vast and many key studies have already been cited. I restrict myself to naming a few here: Delacroix-Besnier, *Les Dominicains*; Delacroix-Besnier, “Les prêcheurs”; Delacroix-Besnier, “Manuel Calécas et les freres Chrysoberges, grecs et precheurs,” in *Actes de congress de la Societe des historiens medievistes de l'enseignement superieur public* (Dunkirk, 2001), esp. 153–57; Tsougarakis, *Latin Religious Orders*; Loenertz, “Les établissements dominicains”; Violante, *La provincia domenicana*; Papadakis, *Christian East*, 66; B. Altaner, “Die Kenntnis des Griechischen in den Missionsorden während des 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts. Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte des Humanismus,” *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 53 (1934): 436–93; Dondaine, “*Contra Graecos*”; H. Golubovich, “Disputatio Latinorum et Graecorum seu Relatio Apocrisariorum Gregorii IX de gestis Nicaeae in Bythinia et Nymphaeae in Lydia 1234,” *Archivum franciscanum historicum* 12 (1919): 418–70; Robert L. Wolff, “The Latin Empire of Constantinople and the Franciscans,” *Traditio* 2 (1944): 213–37 (reprinted in *Studies in the Latin empire of Constantinople* (London, 1976) (same pagination); Joseph Gill, *Byzantium and the Papacy, 1198–1400* (New Brunswick, 1979), 78–243 and *passim*.

<sup>50</sup> For documents, see *Acta Ioannis XXII: 1317–1334*, ed. Aloysius L. Tăutu, Pontificia commission ad redigendum codicem iuris canonici orientalis, fontes, ser. 3.7 (Rome: 1952), 26–27 (#15); in general, see Irene Bueno, “Avignon and the World: Cross-cultural Interactions between the Apostolic See and Armenia,” *Rechtsgeschichte – Legal History* 20 (2012), 344–46.

## OLD ROME VERSUS NEW ROME

the consistency of Latin evangelical outreach, it was far in the advance of anything coming out of Byzantium.

Otherwise, the image of Elder Rome that Kydones gives in this passage is that of the “good hegemon”: Rome sends missionaries, enlightenment, and education throughout the world; Rome establishes laws for the enlightened; Rome punishes the transgressors of that law while protecting her law-abiding children. And so it is, indeed, that she appears as a “Mother and Mistress” to her own. Rome is both empowered, even threatening, toward rebels and evil-doers, but maternally loving toward her own faithful adherents. This dual-image of the Roman Church as Mother-Vindicator will recur in subsequent unionist discourse and serve, as it does here, as the positive mirror-image to Constantinople as both weak and aloof—or even cruel—toward her own.

Kydones maintains this theme of Rome as “mother-mistress” and considers it from the vantage-point of Rome’s children, whom he considers now not in their quantity, but according to their qualities. The statesman-intellectual was well aware of the conceit of his fellow Byzantines, who scorned the Latins as a barbaric race of mere merchants, and mercenaries, and sailors. Demetrios Kydones’s own study of the writings of Thomas Aquinas had satisfied him that the Latins had much more to offer than their counterfeit wares, sword-arms, and fondness of drink.<sup>51</sup> But he must have had other sources besides the writings of Thomas informing him about the virtues of the Latins, which he enumerates as follows:

And, indeed, if anyone should deign to look not only to these things, but even to the virtue and good fortune of those who obey [Rome], he will find this [Roman Church] rules exclusively over Christians [who are] entirely unmixed with the enemies of Christ, [who] follow the laws and what is just, who are frightening to their enemies, loyal to their friends, distinguished by wealth and what otherwise pertains to the preeminence of life; [the Roman Church] is even the treasury of all wisdom, surrounded by flocks of philosophers, encircled by crowds of theologians, adorned by ascetics of every sort of virtue, while all venerate her as mistress, all care for her as mother, all are eager to die for Christ’s sake and hers and to wage war ceaselessly on all those who do not honor her.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> Kydones, *Apologia*, 362–66 *passim*, esp. 364–65; see R. Bruce Hitchner and Kazhdan, “Rome”: “The Idea of Rome,” *ODB* 3.1809ff.

<sup>52</sup> Kydones, *Apologia*, 373: “Καὶ μὴν εἴ τις οὐ πρὸς ταῦτα μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς τὴν τῶν ὑποτεταγμένων ἀρετὴν τε καὶ τύχην ἀξιόσειεν ἀποβλέπειν, ταύτην μὲν εὐρήσει Χριστιανῶν ἄρχουσαν καθαρῶς ἀμίκτων παντελῶς τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ πολεμίους, νόμοις ἐπομένων καὶ δίκῃ, φοβερῶν μὲν πολεμίους, φίλοις δὲ εὐνων, πλούτῳ καὶ τῇ λοιπῇ τοῦ βίου περιφανείᾳ λαμπρῶν· ἔτι δὲ σοφίας πάσης ταμεῖον, φιλοσόφων ἀγέλας προβεβλημένην, θεολόγων ἀνδρῶν δῆμοις κεκυλωμένην, ἀσκηταῖς παντοίας ἀρετῆς κοσμουμένην, πάντων ἐκείνην ὡς δέσποιναν

## PIETAS

In his *Politics*, Aristotle maintained that the dignity of the ruling authority is determined by the dignity of the subjects ruled.<sup>53</sup> Kydones essentially had just this principle in mind. By waxing eloquent on the excellences of Rome’s subjects—who, by the way, are true Christians living under Christian princes and not slaves of Islam whose Christian faith is questionable—Kydones demonstrated the superior dignity of the authority of the Roman Church. He described their cordiality toward friends and hostility toward enemies, their enjoyment of a dignified life owing to their possession of wealth and whatever else is needful, their distinction in the areas of philosophy, theology, and sanctity, and, finally, their deep acknowledgment of Rome’s beneficent rule exhibited by their eagerness to fight for Roman supremacy.

Not so for the Church of Constantinople. Complete with his depiction of Elder Rome, Kydones proceeds to its negative mirror-image:

On the other hand, [our] patriarch has little concern at all for his flock, but all [his] zeal seeks what thing he can do to gratify the emperor—for he knows that his leadership of the Church is the gift of the [emperor’s] decision—even though he should fall straight away into a rage [if he heard me saying this]. As a result, he is compelled to act in a servile manner toward the emperor if he will enjoy [his] idol of rule—at least as much [as the emperor will allow him to enjoy it], at any rate. But if he should dare to murmur any little thing, or to rebuke any one of the clergy, or to punish any huckster, or to decree anything that does not please the emperor apart from the most insignificant things, immediately those who have been wronged [by the patriarch] rush to the imperial palace and in all things the patriarch is reduced to powerlessness—even if he should put forth in his defense the Gospels and the Apostles, all the canons and the laws. And except he should fall on his knees begging, not only is he deprived of his throne and his authority, but he is even subject to the laws against traitors or murderers, and in addition he will merit the penalty of impiety. Anyone could see the bride of Christ, to whom belongs boldness of speech (*παρρησία*) and freedom in all things, just as a sort of distinguishing mark (*σύμβολον*), is exposed to so much slavery and shame by our people.<sup>54</sup>

---

προσυνούντων, πάντων ὡς μητρὸς κηδομένων, πάντων ἐκείνην ὡς δέσποιναν προσκυνούντων, πάντων προθύμων Χριστοῦ καὶ αὐτῆς ὑπεραποθνήσκειν καὶ τοῖς αὐτὴν οὐ τιμῶσιν ἀδιάλλακτα πολεμούντων.”

<sup>53</sup> Aristotle, *Politics*, trans. H. Rackham (Cambridge, MA: 1932), 18–19 (1254a 25–30 is where this principle is stated most succinctly).

<sup>54</sup> Kydones, *Apologia*, 373–374: “ἐνταῦθα δὲ τῷ μὲν πατριάρχῃ ὀλίγη πάνυ τοῦ ποιμνίου φροντίς, ἡ δὲ πᾶσα σπουδὴ ζητεῖν τί πράξας χαριεῖται τῷ βασιλεῖ, οἶδε γὰρ ὡς παρὰ τῶν αὐτοῦ ψήφων τὸ τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν ἄγειν δῶρον αὐτῷ, κἂν ἐκεῖνος χολωθῇ εὐθὺς αὐτὸς κρημνισθῆσεται ὥστ’ ἀναγκάζεται τὰ τῶν δούλων εἰσφέρειν τῷ βασιλεῖ εἰ μέλλει τοῦ τῆς ἀρχῆς εἰδώλου μέχρι γούν τινος ἀπολαύσεσθαι. εἰ δέ τι καὶ γρύξαι τολμήσειεν ἢ τι τῶν τοῦ κλήρου μεμψάμενος ἢ τισι τῶν καπήλων δικάσας ἢ τι ἄλλο καὶ τῶν ἄγαν εὐτελεστάτων ἀποφηνάμενος μὴ δοκοῦν βασιλεῖ, δρόμος εὐθὺς ἐπὶ τὰ βασιλεία τῶν ἀλόγτων, καὶ δεῖ πάντων ἄκυρον εἶναι τὸν πατριάρχην, κἂν εὐγγέλια κἂν ἀποστόλους κἂν πάντας κανόνας καὶ νόμους προῖσχηται καὶ εἰ μὴ εἰς γόνυ πεσὼν ἰκετεύσειεν, οὐ τοῦ θρόνου μόνον καὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐκπεσεῖται, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς κατὰ τῶν προδοτῶν ἢ ἀνδροφόνων νόμοις ἐνέξεται καὶ προσέτ’ ἀσεβείας δίκην ὀφελήσεται τοιαύτη δουλεία τε καὶ αἰσχὴν τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ νόμφην ἴδιοι τις ἂν παρ’ ἡμῖν ἐκκεκμένην, ἧς τὴν παρρησίαν καὶ τὴν διὰ πάντων ἐλευθερίαν ὥσπερ τι σύμβολον εἶναι προσήκεν.”

## OLD ROME VERSUS NEW ROME

Here then is the negative mirror-image: the patriarch as cringing creature of the emperor; the patriarch as a power-hungry would-be tyrant serving “[his] idol of rule,” but who cannot even rule over his own clergy properly, because his authority is compromised by the dependence of his status on the imperial mood. The relationship between emperor and patriarch in the Byzantine Empire, though of obvious and fundamental importance, is difficult to characterize. Kydones’s characterization would seem to epitomize the (outmoded) scholarly assessment of the imperial-patriarchal relationship as that of “caesaro-papism”—in short, the subordination of the Church to the emperor—a label that has been rejected, or at least shied away from, by Byzantinists attempting to bring a more nuanced understanding to this relationship.<sup>55</sup>

And yet Kydones was no Westerner, although he was certainly influenced by Latins.<sup>56</sup> Moreover, though obviously exaggerated, and clearly envenomed against the patriarch by personal spite,<sup>57</sup> Kydones’s image cannot be dismissed as pure malevolent fantasy. Kydones could not have gotten away with foisting a wholly false description of the imperial-patriarchal relationship upon his adversaries, and so he presumably would not have attempted to do so, especially if his aim was to persuade.<sup>58</sup> If his account can be called caricature, there is some truth at the bottom of all caricature. Indeed, the emperor exercised the right to choose the patriarch (usually, but not always, from the list of names forwarded to him by the Patriarchal Synod, and emperors sometimes deposed patriarchs who displeased them—though the Patriarchal Synod could theoretically veto such depositions).<sup>59</sup> In Kydones’s immediate context, for instance, the patriarchate bounced back between Patriarchs Kallistos I and Philotheos Kokkinos at the whim of the Emperors John VI Kantakouzenos, John V Palaiologos, and Andronikos IV. For a time, after Kallistos’s first deposition, a schism even

---

<sup>55</sup> Papadakis and Alexander Kazhdan, “Caesaropapism,” *ODB* 1.364ff.; Gilbert Dagron, *Emperor and Priest: The Imperial Office in Byzantium*, trans. Jean Birrell (Cambridge, UK: 2003), esp. 8–10, 282–312; Hussey, *Orthodox Church*, 299–303. Anthony Kaldellis, *Byzantine Republic: People and Power in New Rome* (Cambridge, MA: 2015) decisively rejects Caesaropapism as accurately describing the actual workings of the Byzantine State. For the old view of Byzantium as a theocracy, Runciman, *The Byzantine Theocracy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977).

<sup>56</sup> See Ryder, *Career and Writings*, 29–54; Plested, *Orthodox Readings*, 63–72.

<sup>57</sup> On such envenomed polemic, and its motivation, see Plested, *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*, 73, 75–76 (Kydones’s attitude toward Patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos) and Ryder, *Career and Writings*, 232–38.

<sup>58</sup> On the intended audiences and purpose for Kydones’s *Apologia* here, see Ryder, “Divided Loyalties?” who reads the text as Kydones’s declaration of the “freedom of conscience” and plea for the distinction between political loyalty and conventional, religiously-founded rejection of the Latins.

<sup>59</sup> Hussey, *Orthodox Church*, 312–14; see 299–303 on relations between the emperor and the Church.

existed in the patriarchate when the latter refused to relinquish his claim to the see from which he had, in fact, been forced.<sup>60</sup> Claims aside, such depositions not only attest to the power of the emperor over the chief hierarch of the Greek Church<sup>61</sup> but, in Kydones's own day, they were bound to erode the dignity of patriarchate itself. Although (ironically for Kydones) the scandalous division of the Latin Christendom by rival popes during the Great Western Schism loomed just on the horizon,<sup>62</sup> for a Greek Christian amidst the evident subjection of the Greek Church to imperial majesty, the Roman See in its seeming stability and, above all, independence may have seemed very attractive. Moreover, Kydones's characterization of the patriarch places in relief the quality of the Roman Church he most prized: her liberty. "The bride of Christ"—that is, the Church—Kydones claims, ought to be free. Her "distinguishing mark" (σύμβολον) is her freedom of action and expression in fidelity to the Gospel and her spouse, Christ. Would anyone recognize Christ's Bride, Kydones asked, here "among us," where the Church is "covered with so much slavery and shame?"

This "slavery and shame" applies not only to her interior condition, Kydones states, but even her "outside affairs." This distinction between inside and outside arises from the linkage between the Great Church and the Byzantine Empire.<sup>63</sup> We have already encountered Kydones's rather dismissive review of the patriarchate's jurisdiction—extending as it does in the immediate east only to the Bosphorus (though to the northeast as far as the Sea of Azov). This circumscribed jurisdiction reflects Kydones's sense about Constantinople's actual power, which (in his view) extended as far as the shrunken, and shrinking, boundaries of the Roman Empire, or at least stopped at the gates of the *Dar al-Islam*. Kydones recognized that Constantinople exercised a theoretical jurisdiction over Christians living under Turkish rule in the East (and elsewhere beyond the limits of the empire), but Kydones does not think

---

<sup>60</sup> Ryder, *Career and Writings*, 230–31 (Philotheos likewise refused to give up his claim to the patriarchate after he, in turn, was forced out); Hussey, *Orthodox Church*, 289, 292.

<sup>61</sup> Hussey, *Orthodox Church*, 299–303, offers a much more moderate view (see 312–14), whilst nonetheless maintaining that emperors picked patriarchs and could depose them.

<sup>62</sup> On the Western Schism, see Howard Kaminsky, "The Great Schism," in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. 6, c. 1300–c. 1415, ed. Michael Jones (Cambridge, UK: 2000), 674–96; Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski, *Poets, Saints, and Visionaries of the Great Schism, 1378–1417* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2016); Joëlle Rollo-Koster and Thomas M. Izbicki, eds, *A Companion to the Great Western Schism (1378–1417)* (Leiden, 2009). See also Antony Black, "Popes and Councils," in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. 7, c. 1415–c. 1500, ed. Christopher Allmand (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 65–86.

<sup>63</sup> See Hussey, *Orthodox Church*, 299–303.

## OLD ROME VERSUS NEW ROME

much of this jurisdiction insofar as the subjects over which it extends are unreliable, subversive of Byzantine rule, and at the very least embarrassing. Beyond the Roman *limina*, the bishops are beholden for their revenues and dignities to their Turkish overlords—not the patriarch or even the emperor. The diminishing state of Christianity on the whole is frightening. Conjuring the image of a constant trickle, Kydones observes that Greek Christians are apostatizing and embracing Islam “day by day.” But even when the Greeks do not yield their souls to the Turk, they “draw [his] yoke with their bodies.” “What then is the dignity of our authority,” Kydones asks, “if those over whom we seem to rule serve others instead of us; for if there is anyone [in the Muslim East] perhaps that prefers to look to us, is he not poor and illiterate in addition to his servility and poverty and, as has been said, only suitable for tending goats?”<sup>64</sup> Entirely different from Rome’s “exclusively Christian” subjects distinguished by material and spiritual blessings are these orphans of Byzantium.

And so the character of the subjects reflects back upon the dignity of their (would-be) rulers—in this case, the patriarchate of Constantinople. But Constantinople’s shame is not only in the near East, or because of her inability to exert any maternal despotism over her supposed children there. Her shame is at her very heart, in the abject humiliation of the Queen of Cities:

But these things [i.e., the poverty, ignorance, and subjugation of Christians under Islam] are worthy of beasts far off from the city; but are these things not the same for them who are nearby or inside of it? For, that I might pass over the slavery that is also here, and to what extent we serve the barbarians in as many things as they should order us—where is justice? Where is law? Where the judge? Where is concern for literature? Where is the care for divine things? Where, indeed, is the monastic habit of virtue? Is not our city, upon which we pride ourselves so much, no better than ruined cities, deprived of everything for the sake of which anyone would pray to live—but in lieu of the cities over which it formerly ruled, is it not [now] the metropolis of all misfortune and pain? Do not our emperors act in servile fashion toward the barbarians, and are they not compelled to live according to their whim? Do they not endure humiliation and service for a long time in armies beyond the boundaries of the empire in pursuit of [the Turks’] interests, and in addition to their perils, do they not give taxes, because of which the common treasury is emptied, while the private wealth of the citizens runs short, and the rich first become

---

<sup>64</sup> Kydones, *Apologia*, 374: “...καὶ ὁ μὴδ’ ἂν τις ἄνευ τοῦ φρίττειν ἀκούσειεν, ὅτι καὶ καθ’ ἡμέραν τὸ πλεῖστον ἐπὶ τὴν ἀσέβειαν ὥσπερ ῥεῦμα ἀποχετεύεται...εἰ δὲ τις ἴσως ἐστὶν καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς αἰρούμενος βλέπειν, πένης οὗτος εἶη, καὶ πρὸς τῇ δουλείᾳ καὶ ἀπορίᾳ καὶ ἀμαθίᾳ καὶ, τὸ λεγόμενον μόνον εἰτήδειος αἰπολεῖν;”

## PIETAS

beggars, while others flee the city.... And what would anyone say regarding the poverty and humiliation of those who have been left behind?<sup>65</sup>

Thus the wretchedness of the Greeks in the eyes of Demetrios Kydones. From the meanest slave of the Turks in the East to the patriarch, they are repulsively obsequious to an emperor who is himself a slave, once again, to the Turks. Slavery is branded upon the prostrate Church, along with the empire, unworthy of the name of bride of Christ. Rulers are dignified by the status of their subjects.<sup>66</sup> So much superior, then, to the Church of Constantinople is the Church of Rome, whose subjects “are more able to adorn their rulers and to persuade others to obey [Rome] insofar as they would partake in like possessions, for [the subjects of the Roman Church] are free—they know no other master except for God and the Church and the laws.” Nor, as Kydones goes on to say, has he even yet spoken of Christ’s promises to St. Peter, and Rome’s rights and privileges therefrom and attested to “by decrees of the synods and the edicts of the emperors” and sound reason—rights and privileges including primacy in the Church, the status of final tribunal for ecclesiastical business and doctrinal questions, and the obligation of all the faithful to obey her.<sup>67</sup>

The key element in Demetrios Kydones’s comparison between the two Churches—and between the Christian cultures subject to these two sees—is liberty. This is the key criterion distinguishing them from each other. Confident in her supremacy—essential for her liberty, for she answers to no one—the Roman Church sends forth missionaries, gives laws, threatens

---

<sup>65</sup> Kydones, *Apologia*, 374-75: “Ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν πόρρω τῆς πόλεως ἄξια θρήνων τὰ δ’ ἐγγὺς ἢ καὶ τὰ ἔνδοι ἐκείνοις οὐ παραπλήσια; ἵνα γὰρ παραλίπω καὶ τὴν ἐνταῦθα δουλείαν καὶ τὸ τοσοῦθ’ ἡμᾶς τοῖς βαρβάροις ὑπηρετεῖν ὅσα ἂν ἐπιτάξωσιν, ποῦ δίκαιον; ποῦ νόμος; ποῦ δικαστής; ποῦ λόγων φροντίς; ποῦ τῶν θείων μελέτη; ποῦ σχῆμα γοῦν ἀρετῆς; οὐχ ἡ πόλις ἡμῖν, ἐφ’ ἧς μέγα φρονοῦμεν, τῶν ἀναστάτων οὐδὲν ἄμεινον πράττει, πάντων μὲν ὧν εἵνεκα ζῆν ἂν τις εὐξαιτο στερηθεῖσα, συμφορᾶς δὲ πάσης καὶ ἀηδείας ἀντὶ τῶν πόλεων ὧν πρότερον ἦρχεν μητρόπολις; οὐχ οἱ βασιλεῖς ἡμῖν τὰ τῶν δούλων τοῖς βαρβάροις εἰσφέρουσι καὶ πρὸς τὸ κείνων νεῦμα ζῆν ἀναγκάζονται; οὐ στρατείας ὑπεφορίους ὑπὲρ τῶν αὐτοῖς δοκούντων πολὺν χρόνον ταλαιπωρούμενοι καὶ πονοῦντες ὑφίστανται, προστιθέασι δὲ τοῖς κινδύνοις καὶ φόρους, ὑφ’ ὧν κεκένωται μὲν τὸ κοινὸν ταμιεῖον, αἱ δὲ ἴδιαι τῶν πολιτῶν οὐσίαι ἐπέλιπον, καὶ προσαιτοῦσι μὲν οἱ πρότερον πλοῦσιοι, οἱ δ’ ἄλλοι φεύγοντες τὴν πόλιν ὥσπερ εἰρκτὴν ζητοῦσι παρ’ οἷς οὐ δουλεύουσιν; καὶ τί ἂν τις εἴποι τὴν ὀλιγότητα καὶ ταλαιπωρίαν τῶν περιλειπομένων;”

<sup>66</sup> Aristotle, *Politics*, 1254a25-30.

<sup>67</sup> Kydones, *Apologia*, 375: “Εἰ τοίνυν τὸ σεμνὸν παρὰ τῶν ὑψηλῶν τῷ θρόνῳ, καὶ δεῖ τοῖς πλείοσι καὶ μᾶλλον τοῖς βελτίοσι ἐπεσθαι, ἐκείνοι μὲν πλείους ὅσον οὐδ’ ἂν τις εἰκάσαι, βελτίους δὲ μᾶλλον ἢ πλείους, καὶ ταύτη δυνάμενοι πλέον τούς τε ἡγεμόνας κοσμεῖν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους αὐτοῖς προστίθεσθαι πείθειν ὡς ἂν τοσοῦτων πλενεκτημάτων μέλλοντας κοινωνεῖν, ἐλεύθεροι γὰρ πάντες, πλὴν Θεοῦ καὶ Ἐκκλησίας καὶ νόμων μηδένα ἄλλον εἰδότες δεσπότην· ἡμεῖς δὲ (ἀλλ’ εἴη γε οὕτω τοῖς ἐχθροῖς καὶ δι’ ὧν εἰς τοῦτ’ ἀφίγμεθα τύχης) καὶ τοιαῦτα μονοθεῖν ἠναγκάσμεθα....etc.”

## OLD ROME VERSUS NEW ROME

the impious and cherishes the obedient. She is a “mistress” and a “mother” whose children reciprocate her attention—we are told—by their fierce filial devotion. And there are many children, for she is a “hegemon of nations.” And the glory of her offspring—both material and spiritual—validates the supernal dignity of her rule, for Rome rules maternally over free men.

The opposite of liberty is slavery, and this is Constantinople’s distinguishing mark in Kydones’s imagination of her as the negative of Rome. The Church is beholden to the empire, which is, in turn, beholden to the godless Turks. Under these circumstances, Constantinople lacks the “boldness of speech” and the “freedom of action” that are the necessary adornments of the bride of Christ. Because of her slavery—the result of patriarchal dependence upon the emperor and the reality of Islamic overlordship—Constantinople cannot act as “mother” or “mistress” to her children who, whether inside or outside of the empire, are poor, ignorant, and servile. Furthermore, the conclusion to which these premises lead (under the influence of Aristotelian political philosophy, to which Kydones seems to gesture) is that the Church of Constantinople, as a Church of slaves, is a tyrant.

### V. THE COMPARISON DEVELOPS: MANUEL KALEKAS (†1410) AND THE INDEFECTIBILITY OF THE ROMAN CHURCH

Many of the elements that appeared in Demetrios Kydones’s comparison between Rome and Constantinople feature in the writings of his younger associate, Manuel Kalekas.<sup>68</sup> Indeed, in at least one instance there is reason to believe that Kalekas borrowed certain themes from Kydones directly—something unsurprising given Kalekas’s obvious admiration for Kydones and familiarity with the latter’s writings.<sup>69</sup> But Kalekas also contributed something unique to the unionist discourse of comparison between Rome and

---

<sup>68</sup> On Kalekas, see especially Raymond-Joseph Loenertz, “Manuel Calécas, sa vie et ses oeuvres d’après ses lettres et ses Apologies inédites,” *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* (1947): 195–207; Manuel Kalekas, *Correspondance*, ed. Raymond-Joseph Loenertz (Vatican City, 1950), 16–45; Delacroix-Besnier, “Manuel Calécas et les freres,” 151–64; Talbot, “Kalekas, Manuel,” *ODB* 2.1092.

<sup>69</sup> On the relationship between the men, see Loenertz’s commentary in Kalekas, *Correspondance*, 53; for letters in Kalekas’s correspondence either addressed to, or mentioning, Kydones, nn. 4 (108, 172–73); 5 (108ff., 173ff.); 17 (114, entitled by Loenertz “A un Byzantin émigré (Démétrius Cydonès?”), 189ff.); 25 (118; 199ff.); see “Appendix” no. 7 (162ff., 333ff.) for a letter from Kydones to Kalekas. Also see Gennadios Scholarios’s characterization of Kalekas as the “μoθητής” of Kydones, in George Gennadios Scholarios, *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. Martin Jugie, Louis Petit, and Xénophon A. Sidéridès, 8 vols. (Paris, 1928–1936), 3.94.

Constantinople, and this is his preoccupation with an indefectible magisterium as the single most important criterion distinguishing Elder from New Rome.

The trials endured by the circle of Byzantine intellectuals surrounding Kydones that resulted, principally, from their opposition to the doctrines of Gregory Palamas, and which (along with the straitened circumstances brought about by Ottoman siege) ultimately compelled them to flee Constantinople for exile abroad, negatively inflected Kalekas's views of his countrymen.<sup>70</sup> At the same time, Kalekas's association with "Latinophiles" such as Kydones himself as well as Latin Dominicans—with whom he had taken refuge following his flight from Constantinople in 1396—and his blossoming affinity for Latin theology and even potentially liturgy predisposed him to regard the Latins positively and as friends.<sup>71</sup> This dynamic is evident in the letter that Kalekas wrote from his exile among the Dominicans in Pera (a Genoese-administered suburb north of the Golden Horn) to Kydones, himself an exile in Italy, in the spring of 1397. The letter turns around the conceit of contrasting the happy fortune that Kydones has acquired in Italy—where Kalekas predicts he will be heaped

---

<sup>70</sup> On these trials endured by Kydones, Kalekas, and other anti-Palamite Greeks, see Yost, "Anti-Palamism, Unionism"; Loenertz's sketch in Kalekas, *Correspondance*, 21–46; Loenertz, "Manuel Calécas," *passim*; Timnefeld, *Die Briefe des Demetrios*, 263, entry for "1369 Herbst." See also Claudine Delacroix-Besnier, "Manuel Calécas et les frères," esp. 157–60; Thierry Ganchou, "Dèmètrius Kydônes, les frères Chrysobergès et la Crète (1397–1401): De nouveaux documents," in *Bisanzio, Venezia e il mondo franco-greco (XIII–XV secolo)*, ed. Chrysa A. Maltezou and Peter Schreiner (Venice, 2002), 435–93; Pleded, *Orthodox Readings*, 58–60, 115, 118–20, 221–22; Dentakes, *Ἰωάννης Κυπρισσιώτης*, 11–34; Talbot, "Kyparissiotés, John," *ODB* 2.1162. For the more general historical context of the Palamite controversy, see Meyendorff, *Introduction à l'étude de Grégoire Palamas* (Paris, 1959), 65–170; *Byzantine Theology*, 76–77; Gregory Palamas, *The Triads*, ed. Meyendorff, trans. by Nicholas Gendle (London, 1983), 5–8; Papadakis, *Christian East*, 287–93; Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*, 5 vols. (Chicago: 1971–1989), 2.252–98; Hussey, *The Orthodox Church*, 257–60; Robert J. Sinkewicz, "Gregory Palamas" in *La Théologie byzantine et sa tradition*, II: *XIIIe–XIXe s.*, ed. Carmello Giuseppe Conticello and Vassa Contoumas-Conticello (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2002), 131–37.

<sup>71</sup> Regarding Kalekas and the Dominicans, see Loenertz's sketch in Kalekas, *Correspondance*, 20–31 (esp. 22 on the influence of Thomist thought, mediated through Kydones's translation, on Manuel's earliest theological work); for Manuel's relationship with the Dominican Fr. Elias Petit, see Manuel's Latin letter at App. 4 (159, 323ff.), and Loenertz's comments at 29ff., 91ff.; and see Tsougarakis, *The Latin Religious Orders*, pp. 169–173, 186–189, 198–200; Delacroix-Besnier, *Les dominicains*, *passim*; Claudine Delacroix-Besnier, "Les Prêcheurs, du dialogue à la polémique (XIIIe–XIVe siècle)" in *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History*, 151–67; Loenertz, "Manuel Calécas," 199–203. As a possible testimony to Manuel Kalekas's high esteem, at a relatively early date, for Latin liturgy and possibly even his communion therein, George Dennis draws attention to a letter by Emperor Manuel II Palaiologos that refers to a disgruntled Greek—unnamed—who has embraced Latin religious rites. Dennis suggests that this unnamed Greek is Manuel Kalekas—see *The Letters of Manuel II Palaeologus: Text, Translation, and Notes*, ed. and trans. by George T. Dennis, *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae* 8 (Washington, D.C., 1977), no. 30, pp. 74–79, 78n1. This suggestion is convincing, because the date of Manuel II's letter fits with the chronology of Manuel Kalekas's life, while the man to whom the emperor addressed this letter, Constantine Asanes, was likewise a correspondent of Kalekas and would have known to whom the emperor was referring (on Constantine Asanes as correspondent of Kalekas, see Loenertz's comments at Kalekas, *Correspondance*, (n. 7), 73–76.

## OLD ROME VERSUS NEW ROME

with honors—with the dreary fate he has escaped by leaving wretched Constantinople.<sup>72</sup> Kalekas’s negative image of Constantinople consists not only in the horrors of war—in September 1396, western crusaders who had attempted to relieve Constantinople from the Ottoman siege that it had been enduring for some years were defeated by the Turks at the Battle of Nikopolis—but also in the savagery of the Constantinopolitans themselves.<sup>73</sup> How different it will be for Kydones now, writes Kalekas, in Italy where they will shower him with honors, “not like our people, who do as much evil as they can, praying for your death day by day,” although Kalekas does express hope that the situation will improve in Constantinople.<sup>74</sup>

But Kydones may have also exerted a literary influence on Kalekas’s characterization of Constantinople. In his own *apologia* to the Emperor Manuel II Palaiologos, which Kalekas wrote in self-justification soon after his flight to the Dominicans at Pera, Kalekas penned a scathing critique of the leadership of the Constantinopolitan Church.<sup>75</sup> After describing the defects of the clergy, and alluding to the implications of these defects for the schism between the Churches, Kalekas writes: “And someone has said, that which is better left unsaid, that if anyone of ours subtracts the dignity of the city and the beauty of the churches, that nothing is left.”<sup>76</sup> As Raymond-Joseph Loenertz himself noted, the “someone” (τις) whom Kalekas was thinking of here was Demetrios Kydones himself, who in his own *apologia* (as considered above) encountered and rejected the alleged appeals of his patriotic Greek confreres to the grandeur of Constantinople and, specifically, “the beauty of the churches” as proofs for the truth of the Greek position on the *Filioque*.<sup>77</sup>

But this is a rather minor point and does not convey the force of Kalekas’s critique of Constantinople. As was said above, Kalekas’s possible quotation of Kydones concludes with a critique of the hierarchs of the Constantinopolitan Church. In his *apologia* to the emperor, Manuel Kalekas is much concerned with the Church. He describes the officers of the

---

<sup>72</sup> For this letter, see Kalekas, *Correspondance*, (n. 17), 189ff.

<sup>73</sup> On the battle of Nikopolis in context, see Barbara Tuchman, *A Distant Mirror: The Calamitous Fourteenth Century* (New York, 1978), 567–94. In connection to Kalekas himself, see Loenertz’s comments in Kalekas, *Correspondance*, 16–17, 23–26, 28, 49, 60–61 (in relation to Joseph Bryennios’s letter to Maximos Chrysoberges; see 59 also).

<sup>74</sup> Kalekas, *Correspondance*, (n. 17), 190: “οὐχ ὡςπερ οἱ ἡμέτεροι κακοῦντες μὲν ὄση δύναμις, εὐχόμενοι δὲ σοι τὸν θάνατον καθ’ ἡμέραν.”

<sup>75</sup> Kalekas, *Correspondance*, 308–18 (“Appendix” #1). See also Loenertz’s comments at 27–31.

<sup>76</sup> Kalekas, *Correspondance*, 308–15 (App. #1): “Καὶ τις πρόεηκεν, ὅπερ ἄρρητον ἄμεινον, ὡς εἴ τις ἡμῶν τὸ τῆς πόλεως ἀξίωμα περιέλοι καὶ τὸ τῶν ναῶν κάλλος, μηδὲν εἶναι τὸ λειπόμενον” (315).

<sup>77</sup> See Loenertz’s reference in Kalekas, *Correspondance*, 315n239. See above, sect. 2 and Kydones, *Apologia*, 370–74.

patriarchate—his inquisitors whose demand of a profession of faith impelled him to flee the city rather than yield in theological principle—as petty, self-absorbed, and ignorant. They “have strife among themselves and devour each other.” They are so distracted by their own controversies—and the business of hunting dissenters from Palamite theology such as Kalekas himself—that they neglect to pray for the state of the empire and “what the circumstances demand.” “They do not have the intelligence to be persuaded by those who are knowledgeable,” he continues, “nor coming together do they want to find that which is needful according to reason, [but] by the depravity of their pride they think they exceed everyone—except for themselves, they think everything is nothing—neither man, nor people, nor polity, nor education, nor wisdom, nor art—[they think] nothing of anything, but themselves, [they consider] everything.”<sup>78</sup> Kalekas refers to his antagonists in the Church as those who had “their office as their only proof.”<sup>79</sup> Interestingly, Kalekas claims that it is this sort of hubris that “is the [true] cause of the dissension of the Churches.” And it is clear that Kalekas is referring to the schism between the Greek and Latin Churches since he immediately adds, “For what they say otherwise about the addition is a pretext.”<sup>80</sup> The specific

---

<sup>78</sup> Kalekas, *Correspondance*, 311–15 (App. #1. 4–9); see Loenertz’s French summary at 156. On this moment in Manuel’s life in general, see Loenertz’s biographical essay, 23–26; On the “heresy-hunting activities” and enforcement of orthodoxy under the auspices of the Patriarchal Synod of this time and vis-à-vis the Palamite controversy, see Venance Grumel, *Les Regestes des actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople*, 7 vols. (Paris, 1971–1989), 5.343 (n. 2414—cf. nn. 2470 and 2469 at 393ff.); 344–45 (n. 2415); 347 (n. 2419); 425ff. (n. 2509); 454–58 (n. 2541); 467 (n. 2555); 473 (n. 2562); 522 (n. 2619); 535 (n. 2633). For the entry in the register on Kalekas’s own encounter with the Patriarchal Synod, see 6.285 (n. 3022), which the editor Jacques Darrouzès cobbles together on the basis of references found in the writings of Kalekas himself and Gennadios Scholarios (patriarch of Constantinople, 1454–1464). Although these sources are clearly problematic in terms of bias and (in Scholarios’s case) distance, Darrouzès understands the force of particular words used in these mentions as implying a “[p]rocès synodal.”

<sup>79</sup> See Kalekas, *Correspondance*, 311 (App. #1.4): “Τοῦτο δὴ βουλευθεῖς καὶ περὶ τῶν νῦν λεγομένων ἔχειν, καὶ τοσοῦτω μᾶλλον ὄσω καὶ πολλοὺς τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας εὗρισκον παλαιούς τε καὶ νέους, ἵνα κατὰ τῶν ἐναντίων ἰστάμενος τῇ τε ἀληθείᾳ καὶ τοῖς οικείοις χαρίζομαι—τοὺς τοίνυν ἐκατέρωθεν λόγους ἀκριβῶς διελθὼν οὐκ ἄνευ πάντως τῆς τῶν εὐχῶν συμμαχίας, ἀνερευνῶν δὲ καὶ τοὺς ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑποθέσεως ζῶντας, εἴ τι καὶ λέγειν ἔχοιεν τῶν γεγραμμένων καινότερον, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ὀρῶν πρὸς ἔπος λέγοντας οὐδέν, ἀξιοῦντας δὲ τὰ παρ’ ἐαυτῶν οὕτως ἔχειν οἷον ἂν τις ἐν Ἀθήναις ἠξίωσε τοὺς τοῦ Σόλωνος νόμους, καὶ τοὺς λόγον τινὰ περὶ τούτων προθυμουμένους ἀκούειν περιέργους εἶναι [ἡγουμένους] καὶ τῶν ἐπαράτων ἐγγύς, ἀπόδειξιν δὲ μόνην τὸ ἐαυτῶν προβαλλομένους ἀξίωμα, εἰ δὲ καὶ τι προῖσχοιντο....” The larger context of this passage has a distinctly Kydonian ring to it.

<sup>80</sup> Kalekas, *Correspondance*, 315 (App. #1. 9): “αἴτια ταῦτ’ εἶναι τῆς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν διαστάσεως. τὸ γὰρ τῆς προσθήκης ἀφορμὴν ἄλλως φασὶ.”

## OLD ROME VERSUS NEW ROME

word Kalekas uses here, “addition” (*προσθήκη*), is the usual term for the *Filioque* clause in Byzantine theological discourse.<sup>81</sup>

But this hubris, ignorance, and quarrelsomeness are not the worst part for Kalekas. The problem is a defect that lies at the heart of the Church of Constantinople as a teaching institution, or magisterial authority.<sup>82</sup> According to Kalekas, “If [the Constantinopolitan Church], from the time she was established, never decreed falsehood, but always obtained the truth in all things, then it would hold true that no one would be in any doubt whatsoever concerning the things she speaks. But, if she has pronounced many things that are not true and has often been afflicted by heresies, with the result that, on the one hand, [today] she subjects those who were in agreement with her in the past to insoluble curses while, on the other hand, she now admires as saints those who opposed her [in the past],” how can any of Constantinople’s adherents today be certain that what their Church professes and teaches is, in fact, orthodoxy rather than heresy? According to Kalekas, the faithful are necessarily in a state of doubt, “since there is no magisterium (*διδασκαλία*) [in the Constantinopolitan Church] leading the way and showing what is true and what is false.” The feelings of anxiety resulting from this situation are aggravated by the fact that the inconstancy of Constantinople is not merely a matter of ancient history, but a recent phenomenon, for Constantinople “has decreed contrary things concerning the topic now proposed [i.e., the Palamite doctrine], with the result that it has been placed in doubt [regarding] which of the two [contrary] decrees [that she has made] it is necessary to profess. For it is absurd that she who otherwise proclaims herself to preside over the whole world (*οἰκουμένη*) as teacher (*διδάσκαλον*) does not want to apply her teaching within her own jurisdiction, as though begrudging her own [adherents].”<sup>83</sup> In this indictment specifically—of the Constantinopolitan Church as a

---

<sup>81</sup> This becomes clear from a Thesaurus Linguae Graecae “Proximity Search” including the terms “προσθήκη” and “σύμβολ-”; see Michael Psellos, *Poemata*, ed. Westerink, 76 (#4, lns. 97–98); Germanus II, *Ἐπιστολή Β*, 16 (doc. #3); Kamateros, *Sacred Arsenal*, App. III, sect. “Exhort,” lns. 15–16 (via TLG).

<sup>82</sup> The following two paragraphs, including the last block paragraph, are reproduced—with some small modification—from Yost, “Anti-Palamism, Unionism,” 534ff.

<sup>83</sup> Kalekas, *Correspondance*, 313 (App. #1. 7): “Ἐχει γὰρ οὕτωςί. εἰ μὲν ἐξ οὐπερ αὐτὴ συνέστη τὸ ψεῦδος οὐκ ἐψηφίσαστο, ἀλλ’ αἰεὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐν πᾶσιν ἐτύγχανε, καλῶς ἂν ἔχοι περὶ ὧν λέγοι μηδένα μηδ’ ὅπως οὐκ ἀμφιβάλλειν. εἰ δὲ πολλὰ καὶ τῶν μὴ ὄντων ἐξεῖπε καὶ ταῖς αἰρέσεσι συνεσχέθη πολλάκις, ὥστε καὶ τοὺς [μὲν] αὐτῇ τῆνικαῦτα συμφωνήσαντας ἀραῖς ἀλύτοις ὑπάγειν, τοὺς δ’ ἀντειπόντας νῦν ὡς μεγάλους θαυμάζειν, πῶς ἂν τις τὸ τῆ ἐκκλησίᾳ ταύτῃ νεώτερόν τι δοκεῖν ὡς τι τῶν ἀναγκαίων εἰς ἀπόδειξιν προβαλεῖται, μὴ προηγουμένης διδασκαλίας καὶ δεικνύσης τί μὲν ἀλήθεια τί δὲ ψεῦδος, καὶ τί μὲν ἀναιρεῖται τῶν ὁμολογουμένων τοῦδὲ τινος ὑποτεθειμένου, τί δὲ συμβαίνει; καὶ τοσοῦτω τοῦτο μᾶλλον εἰκὸς ὅσῳ καὶ περὶ τῆς

negligent or even spiteful mother unwilling to teach properly her own children even “within her own jurisdiction”—we are reminded of Demetrios Kydones’s above characterizations of a weak and impotent patriarchate in contrast to Rome as *mater et magistra par excellence*. Constantinople’s historical lapses, no less than her current maddening unclarity regarding the doctrinal controversy of the moment demonstrate the defect of her magisterium (insofar as she can be said to possess one at all): it is fallible. In our unionist’s view, a disqualifying defect.

In no uncertain terms, Manuel Kalekas spells out from what it is that this defect disqualifies the Constantinopolitan Church in the prologue to a treatise on the Palamite controversy that he authored around this time, his *De essentia et operatione*.<sup>84</sup> In the passage in question, and with greater historical concreteness than in his letter to the emperor, Kalekas refers to Constantinople’s alleged self-contradiction on the question of the Palamite Distinction, and from this ‘flip-flopping’ he derives an explicit ecclesial assessment of his Mother See:

....Since there was a time when the church herself, prior to this [later] decree [of 1351], published another contradictory [decree]; and those who still live and were present then in that synod under the Emperor Andronikos bear witness [to this], as do the foregoing synodical *acta* regarding these things, as well as that which has been recorded concerning them; so that there is doubt (ἀμφίβολον) about which of these decrees has truth on its side; for contradictory propositions cannot both be true at the same time, and because *it is impossible* that she who judges and maintains absolutely contradictory things about these important matters of faith—sometimes this way, sometimes the opposite—and issues forth [contradictory] declarations through letters and *acta* with boldness be called and believed to be the catholic Church. For the catholic Church must always speak the truth; since even the Lord decreed that the one disobeying her is a heathen and a publican.<sup>85</sup>  
In particular, Kalekas indicts his ancestral church for its lack of magisterial indefectibility.

---

προκειμένης νῦν ὑποθέσεως ἐψηφίσατο τάναντία, ὥστε νῦν ἐν ἀμφιβόλῳ κεῖσθαι ποτέρα τῶν ἀποφάσεων τίθεσθαι δεῖ. ἄτοπον δὲ καὶ ἄλλως τῆς μὲν οἰκουμένης ἀπάσης διδάσκαλον ἑαυτὴν ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι προκαθῆσθαι, εἴσω δὲ ἑαυτῆς ὡσπερ τοῖς οἰκείοις φθονοῦσαν μὴ βούλεσθαι τὴν διδασκαλίαν ἐκτείνειν....”

<sup>84</sup> Kalekas, *Correspondance*, 27–30. For this text, see PG 152:283–428.

<sup>85</sup> Kalekas, *De essentia et operatione*, PG 152:285A: “...ὡς ἦν καιρὸς, ὅτε ἡ Ἐκκλησία αὕτη τῆς ἀποφάσεως ταύτης πρότερον ἑτέραν ἐναντίαν ἐξήνεγκε· καὶ μαρτυροῦσιν οἱ καὶ νῦν ἔτι ζῶντες τῇ συνόδῳ τότε παραγενόμενοι, καὶ αἱ προβάσαι συνοδικαὶ πράξεις ἐπὶ τούτοις, βασιλεύοντος Ἀνδρονίκου, καὶ τὰ ἱστορούμενα περὶ τούτων· ὥστ’ ἀμφίβολον εἶναι ποτέρα τῶν ἀποφάσεων τούτων ἀληθὲς μεθ’ ἑαυτῆς ἔχει· τὴν γὰρ ἀντίφασιν μὴ δύνασθαι συναληθεύειν, καὶ ὅτι ἀδύνατον τὴν λεγομένην καὶ πιστευομένην καθολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν αὕτην εἶναι, τὴν περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν τῆς πίστεως κεφαλαίων νῦν μὲν οὕτως, νῦν δ’ ἐκείνως τάναντιώτατα κρίνουσαν καὶ κρατοῦσαν, καὶ παρῆρησία γράμμασι καὶ πράγμασιν ἀποφαινομένην. Δεῖ γὰρ τὴν καθολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν ἀληθεύειν ἀεὶ· ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸν παρακούοντα ταύτης ἐθνικὸν καὶ τελώνην ὁ Κύριος εἶναι διωρίσατο.”

## OLD ROME VERSUS NEW ROME

But the fact that the Church of Constantinople lacks this quality not only makes life anxious and unpleasant for her adherents—who are not sure what is orthodoxy—but it also means that Constantinople cannot be the “true Church,” which Kalekas understands as necessarily infallible.<sup>86</sup> With all of this in mind, we are prepared to consider his characterizations of the Roman Church and Latin Christianity, and his direct comparisons between the latter and the Constantinopolitan See.

Kalekas left his refuge among the Dominicans at Pera, and after a brief stint on Crete he considered moving on to the Kingdom of Cyprus. He decided against this move because his contact on Cyprus, though highly placed in the Latin government, was unable to guarantee that Kalekas would enjoy the favors of the king.<sup>87</sup> But Manuel also cites the supposed hostility of the “barbarous” Cypriot Greeks toward men of his theological convictions as another reason dissuading him from this course. Instead, Kalekas followed the path of Kydones and other Greeks of his circle to Italy. There—in Pavia and Milan—Kalekas was deeply impressed by the shrines, monuments, the asceticism, and learnedness of the Latin monks. Now writing from northern Italy in the autumn of 1401, Kalekas confirmed to his friend in Cyprus that he had no regrets about his decision to journey to Italy:

In addition to being among friends and many other worthy men, I saw the wonders and monuments of the cities, the multitudes of Christians untainted by any admixture of unbelievers, and, above all, I honored the graves of the common teachers Augustine and Ambrose, and I have hope of seeing great Rome in order to venerate Peter and Paul, the most divine leaders of the faith. What could anyone say of the choirs of monks, observing diligently the strictest silence, abstaining from food to the greatest extent, and living in all things for God alone, preaching wisdom to the masses and being teachers of these things, whether faith or morals, or [whether they are] teaching human wisdom, and providing altogether the entire form (*εἶδος*) of knowledge and virtue for those desiring it—encountering such folk, is it not possible to compare them to the monastics of ancient times? And I pass over things more unusual, such as are a cause of wonder to those who know them, although they are not easily believed.<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup> Besides Kalekas, *Correspondance*, 313 (App. #1. 7, already quoted above), see *De essentia et operatione*, PG 152:287–92 (#83); *Contra errores Graecorum*, PG 152:248D–249C.

<sup>87</sup> See Loenertz’s comment at Kalekas, *Correspondance*, 39.

<sup>88</sup> Loenertz, *Correspondance*, 276 (#77): “πρὸς γὰρ αὐτῶ [φίλοις] ἀνδράσι καὶ ἄλλοις πολλοῖς ἀξίοις συγγεγονέναι εἶδον κάλλη πόλεων καὶ μεγέθη, καὶ χριστιανῶν πλήθη τῆς τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἐπιμιξίας χωρὶς, καὶ πρὸ πάντων ἐτίμησα μὲν Αὐγουστίνου καὶ Ἀμβροσίου τῶν κοινῶν διδασκάλων τοὺς τάφους, ἐλπίς δὲ καὶ τὴν μεγάλην Ῥώμην ἰδόντα Πέτρον καὶ Παῦλον τοὺς θειοτάτους προσκυνήσειν τῆς πίστεως ἡγεμόνας. τί δ’ ἂν [τις] λέγοι χοροὺς μοναχῶν, τοὺς μὲν ἄκραν σιωπῆν κατορθοῦντας, καὶ τὰ περὶ τὴν τροφὴν ἐς ἄκρον κεκολασμένους, καὶ διὰ πάντων θεῶν μόνῳ ζῶντας, τοὺς δὲ τὴν σοφίαν προβαλλομένους τοῖς [πλήθεσι] καὶ τούτων εἴτε τοὺς τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῶν ἡθῶν διδασκάλους, εἴτε τοὺς τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην σοφίαν διδάσκοντας, καὶ ὅλως πᾶν ἐπιστήμης καὶ ἀρετῆς εἶδος

## PIETAS

Kalekas was evidently impressed with the Italo-Latin culture as he encountered it in Milan (the resting place of St. Ambrose) and Pavia (the resting place of St. Augustine) in the first years of the fifteenth century.<sup>89</sup> Considered generically, many of the things that were salient to Kalekas have featured in Demetrios Kydones's characterization, for instance, the abundance of wisdom and the holiness of the religious. Also, in rhetorical parallel to the "wonders and monuments of the city" (among which, presumably, were the magnificent cathedrals) are "the multitudes of Christians"—again, similar to Kydones, the theme of quantity emerges, and more similar yet is his characterization of these multitudes as "untainted by any admixture of unbelievers." We may remember that Demetrios Kydones had referred to Latin Christians in just this same way, in direct counterpose to the Constantinopolitan patriarchate's subjects in the Islamic East whom Kydones portrayed disparagingly as dangerously mixed up among the Muslims to whom they are corporeally, if not spiritually, subjected. (Although it may also be possible that by "ἀσεβῶν" Kalekas meant the Palamites, of whom the Westerners were likewise free).<sup>90</sup>

In passing, we may note the epithets that Kalekas has given to the saints he has encountered. Ambrose and Augustine are called "common teachers"—that is, their universality as authoritative exponents of the faith is emphasized; they are not portrayed as merely "teachers of the Latins." This is in keeping with the concept of *consensus patrum*, the necessary agreement of the saints, East and West. Previously articulated by Demetrios Kydones, we see here, as elsewhere, that this concept was explicitly maintained by his younger associate.<sup>91</sup> Meanwhile Saints Peter and Paul are hailed as "the most divine leaders of the faith." Although somewhat similar to conventional Byzantine epithets for these apostles as "pillars and chiefs and light-bearers of the ecumene and preeminent heralds of the faith" or "chief teachers of the world,"<sup>92</sup> it is easy to see in Kalekas's use of the specific

---

[συνειλοχότας καὶ] τοῖς βουλομένοις παρέχοντας, οἷς ἐντυγχάνοντι μόνα τὰ τῶν παλαιῶν ἔξεστι παραβάλλειν; καὶ παρὶμι τὰ πορρώτερα, τοῖς εἰδόσιν οὕτω θαῦμα παρέχοντα ὡς μηδὲ ῥαδίως [πιστεύεσθαι]."

<sup>89</sup> See Loenertz's comments, Kalekas, *Correspondance*, 39-40.

<sup>90</sup> In this same letter, a little later on, Kalekas uses this same word to designate the Palamites: *Correspondance*, 276-77.

<sup>91</sup> On the concept of *consensus patrum*, see John Monfasani, "Pro-Latin Apologetics," *passim*, esp. 181; Gill, *Council of Florence*, 255-56, 261; for critical perspectives, Papadakis, *Christian East*, 402, 407; Nicolas Constas, "Tongues of Fire Confounded," in *Conciliation and Confession: The Struggle for Unity in the Age of Reform, 1415-1648*, ed. Howard P. Louthan and Randall C. Zachman (Notre Dame, 2004), 42-43. For this concept in Kydones, see *Apologia*, 367-68.

<sup>92</sup> The first phrase comes from Anastasius of Sinai, *Via dux*, ed. Karl-Heinz Uthemann, *Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca* 8 (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 1981), ch. 12.3; the second from John Chrysostom, *In epistulam ii ad*

## OLD ROME VERSUS NEW ROME

term “leaders” or “hegemons of the faith” (*τῆς πίστεως ἡγεμόνας*) ecclesiological connotations of Roman supremacy<sup>93</sup>—just as Demetrios Kydones had called the Roman Church the “hegemon of nations.”

Then Kalekas had written of the Latin religious orders—“the choirs of monks”—whom he describes as paragons of asceticism (both temperate in speech and in eating) and wisdom. The monks are characterized as possessing knowledge of subjects both sacred (“faith and morals”) and profane, the fruits of which they share freely—by preaching to the people and, it seems, by teaching (“providing altogether the entire form (*εἶδος*) of knowledge and virtue for those desiring it”). It is hard not to think that Kalekas is here offering an implicit contrast between the educational levels attained by Latin and Byzantine monastics respectively.<sup>94</sup>

Then there is that last rather cryptic sentence, about “unusual things causing wonder to those who know them” but that “are not easily believed.” Might Kalekas have been gesturing at the miraculous, for instance, the presence of thaumaturgic relics?

And Kalekas is bitterly aware of a set of persons who would not believe in these sort of “unusual things,” nor that any shred of virtue resides among the detested Latins. These are the Byzantines, of course, who, as Kalekas writes to his friend, even if they should “change city for city, and linger in the *piazze* [of these Italian cities], they would be deaf and blind to the things I’ve told you about, nor capable of acknowledging them, but only mingle with the urban filth—[they] whom the ancient hatred for [the Latins] compels to blaspheme mindlessly.”<sup>95</sup> Kalekas is indicting his countrymen for something more grievous than mere Byzantine snobbery—although he is certainly doing that too—rather, he is characterizing their mentality as spiritually blinded by the force of “ancient hatred,” or prejudice—much in the same way that John Plousiadenos, at the end of the medieval unionist tradition, will

---

*Corinthios*, PG 61:464—there are many other instances in Greek theological discourse, as can be seen through a Thesaurus Linguae Graecae search, of Peter and Paul being referred to as “κορυφαῖοι.”

<sup>93</sup> See Yost, “Anti-Palamism, Unionism,” *passim*.

<sup>94</sup> See Kazhdan, “University of Constantinople,” *ODB* 3.2143, who implies a degeneration of the infrastructure of higher education in Constantinople in the fourteenth century. There is no parallel in the Byzantine East to the academicization of Latin religious during the High Middle Ages.

<sup>95</sup> Kalekas, *Correspondance*, 276: “μη γάρ μοι λεγέτω τις τοὺς τῶν πολλῶν δὴ τούτων καὶ ἡμετέρων, ἐκ πόλεως πόλιν ἀμείβοντας, κὰν ταῖς πλατείαις περιούντες, τῶν μὲν εἰρημένων μηδὲν μήτ’ ἀκούοντας μήθ’ ὀρώντες, μηδὲ δυναμένους ἐπιγινώσκειν, τοῖς δὲ τῶν πόλεων ἀρρωστήμασιν ἀναμειγνυμένους, οὓς καὶ τὸ παλαιὸν μῖσος πρὸς τούτους βλασφημεῖν ἀλόγως προσαναγκάζει.”

characterize the attitude of his anti-union countrymen.<sup>96</sup> This spiritual blindness works in two ways: it both renders the Greeks blind to any virtue among the Latins, while it likewise renders them blind to any faults of their own: “if not scorning the world, they consider themselves alone to be men; while having fallen from the precept of *Know Thyself*, they have declared their blind judgment concerning everything.”<sup>97</sup> Kalekas would return to this theme of prejudice in the lengthy treatise conventionally known as *Contra errores Graecorum libri quatuor*, which he wrote sometime during the last decade of his life. In this work Manuel writes that, from the perspective of his fellow Greeks,

everyone who is annoying is heterodox. And [when the Greeks see] some Christians transgressing the laws, not them only, but even their Church they judge to be heretical and faithless. For having encountered some cheap sailors and rustic fools [among the Latins], they declare that every Latin is similar to them. And since hatred from prejudice (*προλήψεως*) has disposed them [to the Latins] as to enemies, that which they wish [to believe] is the same as what they deem to be the case. But on the whole, that which they do not see, or seeing do not understand on account of the difference of language, they assume not to be the case at all.<sup>98</sup>

Even when they can see with their eyes—Kalekas claims that his countrymen often sit in judgment on Western Europe all the way from distant “Thrace”—they cannot see in truth, blinded as their hearts are by prejudice, or at least impeded as their understanding is by the

<sup>96</sup> See John Plousiadenos, *Disceptatio inter Pium quemdam, Rhacendytan, et unum ex duodecim sacerdotibus unionem amplexi fuerant, praesentibus et aliis tribus, Auditore videlicet, Teste et Dicaocrita de differentiis inter Graecos et Latinos, et de sacrosancta synodo Florentina*, PG 159:965D-968A.

<sup>97</sup> See Kalekas, *Correspondance*, 276: “ὕπὲρ ὧν (καὶ πάντων λέγω τῶν ἡμετέρων) ἐν τοσαύτῃ τῶν καλῶν εὐπορία λυπεῖσθαι μόνον ἔστι, προσλογιζομένους τίνες πότ’ ἂν ἦσαν [καὶ] αὐτοὶ καὶ τὰ καθ’ ἡμᾶς πάντα, εἰ μὴ τῆς οἰκουμένης καταφρονοῦντες μόνους ἑαυτοῦς ἀνθρώπους ἡγοῦντο, καὶ τοῦ γνῶθι σαυτὸν παραγγέλματος ἐκπεζόντες τυφλὴν περὶ πάντων ἀπεφαίνοντο ψῆφον.” On this theme of the Greeks’ spiritual blindness, see 288 (n. 83.4)

<sup>98</sup> Manuel Kalekas, *Contra errores Graecorum libri quatuor*, PG 152:214B-C: “...ab aliquot illorum injurias accepit, eum qui se laesit, circa fidem ultus est. Et hic enim omnis, qui constrictat, malae protinus opinionis efficitur. Si qui vero Christianorum praevancantur leges: non eos solum, verum illorum quoque Ecclesiam haereticam et infidelem putant. Nautis enim et vilibus quibusdam, ac vulgaribus hominibus congregientes, de omnibus, ut sibi similibus, sententiam ferunt. Cumque eos praesumptum odium inimicis animis esse fecerit, quod volunt, id putant esse. Prorsus vero quod non vident, vel videntes propter linguae varietatem non intelligunt, neque esse omnino arbitrantur.” See the Greek text in the manuscript contained in Basel, Universitätsbibliothek MS B.VI. 20, f. 120r: “...γὰρ πᾶς ὁ λυπῶν κακόδοξος· καὶ τοὺς τῶν χριστιανῶν παραβαίνοντας νόμους, οὐκ αὐτοὺς μόνους, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν, αἰρετικὴν καὶ ἄπιστον [Γραικοὶ] ἤγεονται. ναύταις γὰρ καὶ φαύλοις τισὶ καὶ ἀγοραίοις ἐντυγχάνοντες ἀνοῖς, καὶ περὶ παντῶν ὡς ὁμοίων αὐτοῖς ἀποφαίνονται· καὶ τοῦ παρὰ τῆς προλήψεως μίσους διατιθέντος ὡς πρὸς ἐχθρὸς διακεῖσθαι, ὃ βούλονται, τοῦτο καὶ νομίζουσιν εἶναι. καθόλου δὲ, ὅπερ οὐχ ὀρῶσιν, ἢ καὶ ὀρῶντες διὰ τὸ τῆς γλώττης οὐχὶ οἶδασιν διάφορον, οὐκ εἶναι τὸ παράπαν ὑπολαμβάνουσιν.” (Emphasis mine).

## OLD ROME VERSUS NEW ROME

cleavage caused by a difference of culture and tongue.<sup>99</sup> His comment about how the Greeks assume all Latins to be like the few idiots they have encountered at their taverns or the sailors who have cheated them at the marketplaces also recalls Kydones’s deconstruction of anti-Latin biases.<sup>100</sup>

But it would be wrong to characterize Kalekas’s attitude toward his fellow Greeks as unalloyed critique. His attitude was complex, as can be seen from the letter he wrote to a friend in Constantinople around 1403 excusing himself for the brevity of his homecoming there.<sup>101</sup> From Latin-ruled Mitylene, Kalekas wrote to his friend expressing his ambiguous and somewhat tortured feelings for his home: nostalgia and longing mingled with smug contempt and even fear. Though he opens his letter by thanking God for granting to him the power to leave his “fatherland” once again after he had visited it, he assured his friend that he said this not out of hatred or insensitivity to the charms of his home and friends. “For I know that nothing is sweeter than one’s fatherland, and those things our [fatherland] offers everywhere as so many spells, by its natural graces, unto desire, and as an inexorable love-charm to its own people: conversation with friends, grace, and the affinity of those of the same race.” In addition, Kalekas mentioned some honors that he expected to receive among his own—a peculiar expectation, considering his circumstances. “How could anyone not be overcome by all of these things,” Kalekas asks, “unless he were sprung from tree or rock?”<sup>102</sup>

---

<sup>99</sup> Kalekas, *Contra errores Graecorum*, PG 152:212A–B: “Addunt praeterea, qui ita sentient, *Nullum apud Latinos, post schisma signum fuisse*; quod enim non videtur, neque esse putant. Volunt enim ex Thracia, quae in Italia, et Germania, Hispania, et in Galiis, ac Britannicis insulis inspicere, ubi post schisma plurimi virtutibus, atque prodigiis insignes Occidentem illustrarunt totum, non ambiguis quibusdam, et obscuris, sed qualia ab apostolis, eorumque successoribus facta legimus....”—cf. MS B. VI. 20, f. 118v–119r: “Οἱ δὲ ταῦτα ἀξιούντες καὶ προστιθέασι, μηδένα παρὰ τοῖς δυσκοῖς ἄγιον γεγονέναι μετὰ τὸ σχίσμα· ὁ γὰρ οὐχ ὀρώσιν, οὐδὲν νομίζουσιν εἶναι· ἀξιούσι γὰρ ἐκ τῆς Θράκης, τὰ ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ, καὶ Γερμανίᾳ, καὶ Ἰσπανίᾳ, καὶ Γαλλίαις, καὶ ταῖς Βρετανικαῖς νήσοις ὄραν· ὅπου πολλοὶ μετὰ τὸ σχίσμα ταῖς ἀρεταῖς καὶ τοῖς θαύμασι, τὴν δύσιν πᾶσαν περιειλήφασιν· οὐκ ἀμφιβόλοις καὶ ἀμυδροῖς || τισιν, ἀλλ’ οἷα τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν διαδόχων τούτων ἀκούομεν” (Emphasis mine). Note the corruption in the Latin text of the PG that has interpreted ἄγιον as *signum*—Kalekas here was evidently referring to a claim among his countrymen that there had been no saints in the West since the beginning of the schism.

<sup>100</sup> See above in the previous section, and Kydones, *Apologia*, 364–65.

<sup>101</sup> Kalekas, *Correspondance*, 287–92 (#83); and see Loenertz at 43ff. on this letter in the context of Kalekas’s life.

<sup>102</sup> Kalekas, *Correspondance*, 287 (#83. 1): “Καὶ τοῦτο τῆς περι ἐμὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ φιλανθρωπίας ἔργον, τὸ διὰ χρόνον πρὸς τὴν πατρίδα ἐπανελθόντα πάλιν ἐξελεῖν αὐτῆς δυνηθῆναι. Τὸ δὲ οὐχ ὡς ἂν τις εἴποι μισοῦντος, οὐδὲ πρὸς ἐκεῖνα τῶν πραγμάτων ἀναισθητῶς ἔχοντος ὧν ἡ ἀνθρωπίνη φύσις ἡττωμένη ἀπόντων μὲν ἐπιθυμεῖ, τέρπεται δὲ παροῦσιν. Οἶδα γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸς ὡς οὐδὲν ἥδιον ἐῖς πατρίδος, καὶ ταῦτα τῆς ἡμετέρας πολλὰς εἰς ἔρωτα ταῖς φυσικαῖς χάρισιν ἕγγας πολλαχόθεν προβαλλομένης, καὶ τὸ πρὸς τοὺς οικείους ἀπαραίτητον φίλτρον τὴν τε τῶν φίλων ὁμιλίαν καὶ χάριν καὶ τὴν τῶν ὁμογενῶν οικειότητα· προσθεῖην δ’ ἂν καὶ τὴν αὐτῶν σὺν θεῷ φάναι μετρίαν περι ἐμὲ δόξαν καὶ τὰς εικότως ἂν παρ’ αὐτῶν ἐλπιθείσας τιμὰς, οἷς τό γε νῦν ἔχον ἐν τοσαύτῃ τῶν

## PIETAS

It was God alone who steeled his will thus enabling him to forsake his country once more. It was in accordance with divine mercy, lest Kalekas, overcome by the siren-song of nostalgia, yield to the persuasions and assaults of his fellow Greeks and give up his allegiance to the true faith and Church. Kalekas presents his mere presence in Constantinople among his countrymen as facing the alternative between apostasy and scorn: “For either, remaining in [the city], it would be necessary to withhold myself often from speech regarding the truth of the faith, when contradictory things are being said, and, joining together with those who are most hostile to [the truth] in common discussions and prayers, to act against conscience, and, as is the case with many who think that they have become a scandal, to return to my previous, first beliefs (*τὰ πρῶτα*), or, if I speak the truth with boldness, to be placed in a corner, hated by all, deaf to everything that is said and blind to everything that happens....”<sup>103</sup>

Orthodoxy, as Kalekas understood it, is what marks him out from his fellow Greeks to whom he is united by kindred and race, by common speech and even friendship. But, for Kalekas, the truth of the faith must prevail over all other considerations—even flesh and blood.<sup>104</sup> As for those Greeks, who have rejected the basic monotheistic foundation of Christianity by maintaining Gregory Palamas’s distinction between the divine energies and essence, Kalekas wonders: “who is so stupid to call [them] ... the apostolic and catholic Church?”<sup>105</sup> After all, he continues, the Church must be indefectible, lest her adherents be troubled by anxious “doubts” (*ἀμφιβόλοις*) as to whether the faith she professes and the sacraments she offers truly save. For this reason, Christ himself, “who founded her on the rock, prophesied that the gates of hell (the contradictions of the heretics) would not prevail, and he allotted the one not heeding her to be ranked among the pagans and the publicans”—utterances only meaningful if they represented perpetual guarantees about the Church.

---

καλῶν ἀπορία καὶ τὸ μικρὸν μέγα ἂν δόξαι. ὧν ἀπάντων εἰ μή τις ἀπὸ δρυὸς ἢ πέτρης πῶς οὐκ ἂν ἠττηθείη; ἀλλ’ ἦν δῆπου τὸ κινεῖν ἐτέρωθεν μείζον, καὶ οἷον ἔμοιγε μὴ δύνασθαι μετὰ τῶν εἰρημένων συμβαίνειν.”

<sup>103</sup> See Kalekas, *Correspondance*, 287–88 (#83. esp. 2): “ἢ γὰρ ἀναγκαῖον ἐν αὐτῇ μένοντα τοὺς τῆς ἀληθείας περὶ τῆς πίστεως λόγους πολλακίς καὶ τῶν ἐναντίων λεγομένων σιγᾶν, καὶ τοῖς αὐτῇ πολεμιωτάτοις ἐν ταῖς κοιναῖς ὁμιλίαις καὶ προσευχαῖς συμφερόμενον κατὰ τοῦ συνειδότος ποιεῖν, καὶ ἅμα πολλοῖς εἰς σκάνδαλον κεῖσθαι οἰομένοις ἐπὶ τὰ πρῶτα ἐπανελθεῖν, ἢ παρρησιαζόμενον τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν γωνίᾳ καθῆσθαι παρὰ πάντων μισούμενον, πάντων μὲν τῶν λεγομένων ἀνήκοον πάντων δὲ τῶν γινομένων ἀθέατον....”

<sup>104</sup> Kalekas, *Correspondance*, 287–89, see esp. sect. 4 (288ff.).

<sup>105</sup> The rest of this paragraph is found in Yost, “Anti-Palamism, Unionism,” 539ff.

## OLD ROME VERSUS NEW ROME

Indeed, Kalekas understood that guarantee to be Christ Himself, who gave his assurance that “I am with you all days, unto the consummation of the age.”<sup>106</sup>

Constantinople cannot be the Church of Christ’s promise. But this Church must exist somewhere on earth lest Christ’s promise be empty and Christ Himself a liar. Since this is unthinkable, the true Church, the indefectible Church over which heresy has not prevailed and cannot prevail and whose magisterium can thus be trusted by the faithful, is worth being sought out on earth—wherever she is—and being embraced wholeheartedly as the only unfailing beacon of orthodoxy and sure harbor for the faithful struggling amidst the raging storms of heresy and doubt. Thus, although Kalekas was reluctant to say that his identification of this true Church with Rome was merely an *argumentum ex negativo* (i.e., because Constantinople is not the true Church), he did see the integrity of Christ’s promise as dependent upon that very identification.<sup>107</sup>

And yet Manuel Kalekas had positive reasons for championing Rome. Besides her alleged doctrinal inerrancy—something that he believed was rooted in Christ’s unique bequests to the Apostle Peter and validated in Peter’s successors to the Roman see by the witness of history—Kalekas had other reasons to be impressed by the Roman Church. And so, in this same letter to his friend, Kalekas describes himself, orphan of the Church of Constantinople, as happy in his adoption as a son of Elder Rome. In fact, Kalekas sees himself as one of the latest members of a noble company of Greek sages who, down through the ages, were ostracized by their own people for the sake of orthodoxy. And, indeed, has he not gained “so many races of the West as hierarchs and brothers in the faith, [races

---

<sup>106</sup> Kalekas, *Correspondance*, 289–90 (#83. 7, 149 for Loenertz’ summary): Τίς δὲ τοσοῦτον ἀλόγιστος τοὺς ἀνέδην οὕτω τὰς ἀξιολόγους ἀναιροῦντας καὶ κοινοτάτους περὶ θεοῦ ὑπολήψεις καὶ οἷς φασὶ τοῖς τῆς κοινῆς πίστεως διδασκάλους φανερώς μαχομένους, ἀποστολικὴν καὶ καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἀναγορεύειν; εἰ γὰρ τὸ μίαν ἀγίαν καὶ ὅσα περὶ ταύτης ἐξῆς ὁμολογεῖν ὡς ἀναγκαῖον ἐν τῷ συμβόλῳ τῆς πίστεως περιέχεται (ἐν ταύτῃ γὰρ μόνη τὴν πίστιν ἐνεργεῖσθαι δι’ ἀγάπης ἔστιν) εἰ μέλλοιμεν τῶν ἀπ’ αὐτῆς καὶ τῶν κατ’ αὐτὴν μυστηρίων τὴν ὠφέλειαν ἔχειν, τὴν δ’ ἀνάγκη διὰ παντὸς ἐν ταῖς τῆς πίστεως ἀποφάσεων ἀληθεύειν (ἄλλως γὰρ ἐν ἀμφιβόλοις ἂν ἦμεν ὅποτε τῆς ἀληθείας ἐν τοῖς περὶ θεοῦ λόγοις τυγχάνοι καὶ μὴ), ἥς διὰ τοῦτο καὶ πύλας Ἰδαίου (τὰς τῶν αἰρετικῶν ἀντιλογίας) οὐ κατισχύσειν ὁ ταύτην οἰκοδομήσας ἐπὶ τῇ πέτρᾳ προέφη, καὶ τὸν αὐτῆς παρακούσαντα τοῖς ἔθνεσι καὶ τελώναις συντάττειν προσέταξεν, (ἃ δὲ φανερώς ἀεὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἀληθεύειν προὑποτίθει) καὶ ἅμα «μεθ’ ὑμῶν εἰμι πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος» προσέθηκε. Cf. Kalekas, *Contra errores Graecorum*, cols 245C–D, 248A–C.

<sup>107</sup> Kalekas, *Correspondance*, 290 (#83. 7): “καὶ ταῦτά φημι οὐχ ὅτι διὰ τὴν εἰρημένην καινοτομίαν ἀποροῦντας ἐπὶ τὴν τῆς Δύσεως ἐκκλησίαν καταφευκτέον, ἀλλ’ ὅτι καὶ τοῦτο τὴν περὶ πάντα τῶν δογμάτων ἀλήθειαν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ταύτης συναποδείκνυσιν. ἄλλως γὰρ οὐδαμοῦ τῆς γῆς ἂν ἦν πρὸ τῆς συντελείας ἢ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησία, ὅπερ ὡς ἄτοπον καὶ τὴν πίστιν παντελῶς ἀνειροῦν ἀπερρίφθω.”

adorned] with every form of education and wisdom, and representing a Church that has always presided from the beginning and never yielded to falsehood, and thus [they] regard those who contradict them as weaklings, their assaults as ‘the arrows of infants.’ Thence there is much comfort for me,” he concludes, “I lack neither fatherland nor home.” And yet, all of these newfound brethren and patrons did not quite blot out that lingering ache caused by his own, for “though I have many at hand as familiars and friends, one thing alone grieves [me],” Kalekas conceded, “the insensibility of our own people, and the fact that they, having declared war upon truth, have fallen into alien doctrines. I am able to help them in no other way [than] to pray that they come to their senses and knowledge of [the truth], without which they would not be benefited even if they should acquire the empire of the Persians.”<sup>108</sup> Clearly his election of the West had not effaced his concern for his own people—whether we take him at his word as anxious for their salvation, or suspect that these words resulted, at least in part, from hurt feelings because of his own failure to find acceptance among his countrymen—in any case, Kalekas cared for his countrymen, even if he regarded them with a gaze jaundiced by rejection.

In his treatise *Contra errores Graecorum*, Kalekas adds historical depth and detail to his characterizations of the Greek and Latin Churches. While the Greek Church was repeatedly compromised by heresy reaching up to its highest levels, the Roman Church remained unswerving in her commitment to orthodoxy. There may have been individual orthodox Greek saints in the East, but because of their convictions they were persecuted by their ancestral Church and forced to have recourse to the Western Church under Rome. Thus, not only in his own day, but time and again throughout history, it has been shown that Constantinople cannot be that Church appointed by Christ as reliable teacher of the faithful—reliable because of Christ’s guarantee of doctrinal inerrancy. This guarantee, on the other

---

<sup>108</sup> Kalekas, *Correspondance*, 291–92 (#83. 9): “καίτοι τίνι πρὸς εὐδοξίαν οὐκ ἰκανὸν μετὰ τῆς ἀληθείας ἰστάμενον κοινωρεῖν μὲν τῶν μέμψεων τοῖς ἱεροῖς διδασκάλοις, ὑβριζόμενον διὰ ταύτην καὶ συνδιωκόμενον διωθεῖσιν, ἐλπίζειν δὲ παρὰ τοῦ τοῖς τὰ τοιαῦτα φέρουσι τοὺς ἐν οὐρανοῖς μισθοὺς ἐπαγγελλομένου, καὶ προστάτας μὲν καὶ ἀδελφοὺς τῆς πίστεως ἔχειν τὰ τοσαῦτα τῆς Δύσεως γένη, μετὰ παντὸς εἴδους παιδεύσεως καὶ σοφίας, καὶ ἐκκλησίαν ἐξ ἀρχῆς αἰεὶ πρωτεύουσαν μηδεπώποθ’ ὑποπεσοῦσαν τῷ ψεύδει παρέχοντα, οὕτω δὲ τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας ἀσθενεῖς ἔχειν ὡς νηπίων τοξεύματα τὰς ἀπὸ τούτων εἶναι βολάς; ἐντεῦθεν ἔμοιγε πολλαχόθεν παραμυθία, μήτε πατρίδος μήτε οἰκίας ἀποροῦντι· καὶ πολλῶν ὡς οἰκείων καὶ φίλων προσφερομένων ἐν λυπεῖ μόνον, ἢ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἀναισθησία καὶ τὸ πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐκπολεμωθέντας εἰς ἀλλοκότους ἐμπεσεῖν δόξας. Οἷς οὐδὲν ἕτερον δυνάμενος ὠφελεῖν, ἑαυτῶν αἰσθῆσθαι καὶ τὴν ἐκείνης ἐπίγνωσιν εὐχομαι, ἧς χωρὶς οὐδ’ ἂν ὠφέλησεν οὐδ’ ἢ τῶν Περσῶν αὐτοῖς ἀρχὴ προστεθεῖσα.”

## OLD ROME VERSUS NEW ROME

hand, has ever been validated in the Roman Church alone. Otherwise, Christ's promise would have been in vain, and the true Church would exist nowhere on earth, since there is no other church besides the Roman/Western Church and the Constantinopolitan/Eastern Church capable of manifesting that promise.<sup>109</sup>

Although, like Kydones, Kalekas highlighted the numerosity, holiness, and intellectual superiority of the Roman Church and her adherents, magisterial indefectibility—the unfailing orthodoxy of the Church as teaching institution—occupied a central position in his comparison in a way unobserved in that of Kydones. Indefectibility is Kalekas's central criterion according to which he rendered an evaluation about Rome and Constantinople: the latter could not be the one true Church of Christ's promise; the former must be—otherwise the true Church of Jesus Christ cannot be found anywhere on earth. Manuel Kalekas's preoccupation with doctrinal indefectibility as his central criterion in comparing Elder and New Rome was born of his own experiences as a dissenter from Constantinople on the issue of the theology of Gregory Palamas, as well as, without doubt, his own exposure to Latin ecclesiology and perspectives of ecclesiastical history. According to this criterion, Constantinople is characterized as weak—though she postures menacingly at her children, she is incapable of teaching them the true faith clearly, for she has vacillated and still vacillates in her teaching and is thus ecclesiologically impaired. Moreover, the officers of the Church of Constantinople are characterized as squabbling, petty, and imperious; her more humble adherents as almost perversely benighted. Conversely, the Roman/Western Church is presented—historically and in his own time—as the strong and unfailing witness to orthodoxy, as the faithful “ally” for what orthodox Greek Christians remained in their struggle against their wayward ancestral see, as distinguished by holy and wise monastics and theologians, and served by peoples numerous and self-assured<sup>110</sup>—sure of themselves, in a way that the

---

<sup>109</sup> See Kalekas, *Contra errores Graecorum*, PG 152:240D–241B, 244C–245A, 245C–246A, 246C–248–C, 250C (certain passages cited here, MS B. VI. 20, f. 133v, 137v–138r, are worth comparing to the Greek of the Basel manuscript). On Kalekas positioning himself as among the latest in a line of orthodox Greeks who looked to the Western Church as a refuge of orthodoxy in the face of Greek heresy: see Kalekas, *Correspondance*, 289–91 (#83. 5–8, esp. 8) and 325 (App. #5 (a Greek excerpt from Kalekas's *Contra errores Graecorum*, edited by Loenertz from the MS “Vat. gr. 1112”—see Loenertz's note at Kalekas, *Correspondance*, 325n5). On this same note of his self-perception vis-à-vis the tradition of Greek saints who looked westward, see Kalekas, *On the Errors of the Greeks*, PG 152:244C–245A, 245B–C, 250D, and the Basel manuscript B. VI. 20, f. 139v.

<sup>110</sup> See the previous note, but esp. Kalekas, *Contra errores Graecorum*, PG 152:250D and compare with the Basel manuscript B. VI. 20, f. 139v—there remains some question regarding the proper interpretation of these passages. As can be seen from the Latin translation in the *Patrologia Graeca*, the translator Ambrogio Traversari himself may have

benighted children of Constantinople cannot be, because unlike the latter the Westerners know that their Mother always speaks the truth.

## VI. CONCLUDING ASSESSMENT: JOHN PLOUSIADENOS, THE GREEK CHURCH, AND THE GATES OF HELL

This foregoing survey puts us in a good position to conclude by way of briefly considering the view on the patriarchate of Constantinople and the Greek Church articulated by John Plousiadenos—whose perspectives represent the final word of the medieval unionist discourse. Here we can observe how the various contributions articulated by past unionists are assimilated and filtered through the ecclesiological vision afforded by Plousiadenos’s historical vantage-point as a Greek unionist living after the Council of Florence (1439), but in spite of which—as he himself knew well—many Greek Christians remained outside of the union. This created a tension in the thought of John Plousiadenos.

For instance, the fact of the formal union allowed Plousiadenos to present the “official” Eastern Church of his own time as not only united to Rome, but as, together with Rome, constituting one and the same “catholic” Church. This represents a borrowing of the thought of the thirteenth-century unionist John Bekkos—who in the aftermath of the union of Lyons (1274) could represent his own Church as united to the Western Church by a sort of “bilateral” treaty. In the introduction of his *Expositio pro sancta et oecumenica synodo Florentina* (c. 1464), Plousiadenos asserts—within the context of a passage largely borrowed from Bekkos’s *On the Union of the Churches*—that “both [Churches] exist as one Church, and [both Churches] proclaim one faith and piety.”<sup>111</sup> Plousiadenos goes on to maintain that

---

been somewhat unclear about Kalekas’s intended meaning. On Traversari as translator, see the beginning of this work in the PG as presented by the editor and Traversari’s preface (PG 152:11–14) and Loenertz’s introduction in Kalekas, *Correspondance*, 46n1.

<sup>111</sup> Although the words quoted above are not drawn from Bekkos, they occur within a passage heavily drawn from Bekkos, which has already been quoted above. In the following quotation, words drawn from Bekkos are put in bold type: John Plousiadenos, *Expositio pro sancta et oecumenica synodo Florentina*, PG 159:1112C: “ὅμως οὐ διὰ τοῦτο πείσουσιν ἡμᾶς σιωπῆσαι, πρὸς ἐκεῖνον ὀρῶντας, τὸν παντεπίσκοπον ὀφθαλμὸν, καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἀδέκαστον ἐνατενίζοντας ἐκεῖνο δικαιοτήριον, ἐν ᾧ οὐδὲν ἡμᾶς βλάψει ἢ ἀλόγως ἐνταῦθα χεομένη κατηγορία. Οὐ χρεια γὰρ κατηγορῶν ἐκεῖ, ὡς οὐδὲ ἡ τῶν παραλόγως χαριζομένων βοηθήσειε σύστασις· οὐ χρεια γὰρ συνηγῶν ἐκεῖ. Πρὸς γοῦν τὸ ἀλάθητον ἐκεῖνο δικαιοτήριον ἀποβλέποντες, ἡκιστα τῶν λοιδοριῶν φροντίζομεν· ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον τὴν δόξαν ἡμῶν γυμνῆ τῇ κεφαλῇ καὶ παρρησίᾳ κηρύξομεν. Τοῦτο δὲ μόνον πάντας εἰδέναι θέλω περὶ ἡμῶν, ὡς πᾶν εἰ τι παρ’ ἡμῶν ἐπράχθη ἢ ἐρρέθη, καὶ τὰ παρόντα, ἐπὶ συστάσει τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς εἰρήνης πέπρακται· Κύριος οἶδε· καὶ οὐκ ἐπ’ ἀθετήσει οὐδενὸς τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐθῶν καὶ δογμάτων. Ἄλλ’ ὅστις ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ταύτην ἦλθεν εἰρήνην, καὶ τὸν τῆς ἐν Φλωρεντία συνόδου

## OLD ROME VERSUS NEW ROME

the historic and official Eastern Church never anathematized any of the doctrines of the Roman Church now rejected by certain Greeks<sup>112</sup>—an honor-saving statement which, along with his attempt to exculpate most of the Byzantines’ ancestors from responsibility for the schism<sup>113</sup>—appears to be in tension with his awareness of the reality of schism, past and present, and the damning implications in consequence for any ecclesial “limbs” severed from Rome (including, presumably, the Greeks).<sup>114</sup>

But predominant in his thought are the “Kydonian” and especially “Kalekan” negative assessments of the Greek Church—at least as she exists currently in Constantinople and her dependencies—as wretched, fallible, and disqualified from being considered the “true” Church. Like Kalekas, Plousiadenos maintains that the Greek Church fell into error numerous times in the past.<sup>115</sup> Whereas Kalekas used this observation as his basis for disqualifying Constantinople from being the “true” Church, Plousiadenos does this on a basis nearer akin to the assessment offered by Kydones: this is the assessment of liberty, dignity, and holiness. Kydones had reflected on the miserable state of his contemporary ancestral Church, whose chief officer was portrayed as essentially the slave of the emperor, whose bishops are seen as hirelings, whose faithful are presented as largely languishing under Islamic rule. It is precisely by virtue of the fact that 1453 and its aftermath had swept much of the Greek East, including the revived Greek patriarchate, under Muslim authority that Plousiadenos denied that it could be the “true” Church. In his pathos-dripping lamentation for the lost empire of Constantine, Plousiadenos showed himself directly inspired by another unionist not considered above but no less important for himself: the Cardinal Bessarion.<sup>116</sup>

Rather, the true Church can only be identified with Rome, the beauty of whose churches,

---

ὄρον ἐδέξατο, ὡς τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐθνῶν καὶ δογμάτων κατεγνωκῶς, καὶ ὡς τὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν Ἐκκλησίαν πρεσβεύειν διεγνωκῶς εὐσεβέστερόν τι τῆς ἀνατολικῆς τε καὶ ἡμετέρας, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον ἐγνωκῶς τὸ αὐτὸ σέβας ἀπονέμειν ἀμφοτέραις ὡς μιᾷ οὐσαις Ἐκκλησίᾳ, καὶ μίαν κηρυττούσαις πίστιν τε καὶ εὐσέβειαν, ἔκπτωτος εἶη τῆς Χριστοῦ βασιλείας, καὶ τῷ προδότῃ Ἰούδα καὶ τοῖς κοινωνοῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ σταυρωταῖς τοῦ Σωτήρος συντεταγμένος.” See Bekkos, *On the Union of the Churches*, PG 141:20C-21A.

<sup>112</sup> Plousiadenos, *Expositio*, PG 159:1112D.

<sup>113</sup> See John Plousiadenos, *Disceptatio*, PG 159:1017A-1020B.

<sup>114</sup> For John Plousiadenos’s awareness of the reality of schism beyond Florence see, e.g., *Disceptatio*, PG 159:1225B-D; 1225D-1228A; 1021C. See also John Plousiadenos, *Refutatio Marci Ephesini*, PG 159:1092A. and for his ecclesiological view of “severed limbs” see *Disceptatio*, PG 159:1337C-D, 1340A.

<sup>115</sup> Plousiadenos, *Disceptatio*, PG 159:1337C-D; 1341D-1344A; 1345D-1348B. See 1340A (quoting St. Anastasios).

<sup>116</sup> Plousiadenos, *Disceptatio*, PG 159:1353D-1356A, 1368B-C. See Cardinal Bessarion’s *Encyclica ad Graecos*, PG 161:452B-453B. Although Bessarion’s writings represent another promising avenue for further comparisons between Elder and New Rome in unionist thought, space constraints prevent me from including substantive treatment. I hope to treat Bessarion’s views elsewhere.

the dignity of whose priests, and the reverence of whose faithful bespeak the liberty and decorum that are the trustworthy signs of the Church guaranteed by Christ’s unshakeable promise that the “gates of Hell” would “not prevail against her.” The fact that Hell has finally prevailed over Constantinople as a result, it is claimed, of her people’s persistence in schism, reveals not only the dire negativity of Plousiadenos’s final assessment of the patriarchate, but his interpretation of Pope Nicholas V’s letter of warning to Emperor Constantine XI in 1451. This letter threatened calamity against the Greek Empire in the event that its subjects should continue to reject Florence.<sup>117</sup> In the aftermath of 1453, Plousiadenos understood this warning as a prophecy and a revelation of the papacy’s prophetic connection with divine providence: the pope’s anathema is Peter’s curse and, if gone unheeded, the harbinger of divine retribution—thus John Plousiadenos’s mystical assessment of the power of the papacy revealed throughout history, and with frightening reality in his own day.<sup>118</sup>

Past scholarship has tended to assess Byzantine arguments for union with Rome in theological terms. Often, though not always, these assessments have determined that pro-union arguments are essentially derivative of Latin theology—hence giving apparent justification to the charge that the unionists were *Latinophrones*—“Latin-Minded”—rather than true representatives of an “authentic” Byzantine tradition. Moreover, past treatments have tended to treat the unionists on a case-by-case basis. Without denying the substantial contributions of Latin theology and law to henotic thought, I argue that this isolated, and de-historicized, treatment has obscured from our sight a major theme of unionist discourse, particularly as this discourse developed in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. This major theme involved politics and culture, power and dignity, and enshrined at its heart an extended comparison between the Churches of Elder Rome and New Rome and the civilizations they represented respectively. And in that comparison, New Rome consistently fell short of the power, splendor, and magisterial integrity of Elder Rome as cherished in the unionist imagination. Even if issues of ecclesiastical autonomy or cultural strength do not interest today’s theologians or enter into contemporary ecumenical discussions, they nonetheless mattered intensely to the major exponents of Byzantine henotic thought in the fourteenth

---

<sup>117</sup> This letter is found PG 160:1201-1212.

<sup>118</sup> See Plousiadenos, *Disceptatio*, PG 159:1365C-1368C. This is truly a remarkable passage. In an article forthcoming in *Speculum*, I shall examine the argument of John Plousiadenos in detail.

## OLD ROME VERSUS NEW ROME

and fifteenth centuries. Not only does this help us to understand that tradition of thought on its own terms, but it helps us to see, perhaps ironically, how this tradition is authentically “Byzantine”: for it was only within the context of an Empire crumbling before the Islamic advance and a Church convulsed by internal doctrinal controversy that these men could look westward, admittedly with their own jaundiced gaze, and see in the West a Christian society offering them a sense of power, freedom, the psychological security of inerrancy, and dignity—everything for which they looked in vain on their native soil.