
ALESSANDRA BUCOSSÌ – ANNA CALIA (eds.), *Contra Latinos et adversus Graecos. The Separation between Rome and Constantinople from the Ninth to the Fifteenth Century* (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 286 = Bibliothèque de Byzantion 22). Leuven – Paris – Bristol, CT: Peeters 2020. XVI, 586 pp. – ISBN: 978-90-429-3785-7 (€ 110)

- FRANCESCO MONTICINI, Università Roma Tre (francesco.monticini@uniroma3.it)

As ALESSANDRA BUCOSSÌ states in the preface, the idea of this essay collection was inspired by an international conference of the same title, held in Venice in 2016. Indeed, most of the chapters collected in this very handsome volume are reworked versions of the papers presented on that occasion, with the exception of the contributions by CHRIS SCHABEL, MARCO FANELLI, ELEFTHERIOS DESPOTAKIS, and ANNA CALIA. The conference was organized as part of a research project investigating the theological debates between the Orthodox and Catholic Churches in the 11th and 12th centuries.¹ This is the reason why many papers in the volume – eight out of twenty-four – are dedicated to issues dating back to those centuries. As far as the overall topic of this volume is concerned, BUCOSSÌ is definitely right when she affirms at the very beginning of her four-page introduction that “quando la ricostruzione storica si occupa di temi che toccano le corde più sensibili della partigianeria politica o religiosa [...], l’unica salvezza della ricerca scientifica è il ricorrere all’analisi obiettiva e allo studio imparziale del testo scritto” (p. XIII). This is the main goal of the editors and authors of this essay collection and they have successfully reached it. Moreover, this volume has the merit of addressing a topic quite disregarded by a part of the scholarly community, as BUCOSSÌ rightly notes (see p. XVI).

The order of the chapters is roughly chronological. The first one, however, covers almost the entire Byzantine period (5th–15th centuries), discussing the quite general subject of the relationship between the Orthodox Church and the Papacy, with a particular focus on the Eastern responses to the claimed primacy of the Roman See. Its author, A. EDWARD SIECIENSKI, convincingly presents the issue as a phenomenon that is constantly shifting,

1. FIR 2013, “The Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries as Forerunners of a United and Divided Europe: Dialogues and Disputes between the Byzantine East and the Latin West”.

yet he is able to discern three “stages” in the developing Byzantine position (5th–8th, 9th–11th, 12th–15th centuries). SIECIENSKI’s survey is written with clarity and well researched. This paper and NICOLA NACCARI’s – which I discuss below – complement each other well, at least in part.²

The second chapter, written by GIULIO MASPERO, deals with the *Dogmengeschichte* of the Procession of the Holy Spirit in Eastern Patristics, from Origen to the Cappadocian Fathers. This paper is one of the most interesting in the volume. Considering that according to Epiphanius, Gregory of Nyssa, and other Eastern Fathers the Son’s role in the Trinity does not threaten the Father’s monarchy, it is very difficult not to agree with MASPERO’s conclusions: “Sembra paradossale [...] che proprio il pensiero sulla Persona divina che unisce sia causa di divisione fra i cristiani. Di sicuro ciò è segno di una perdita dell’epistemologia autenticamente teologica e di una dimenticanza dei guadagni ontologici faticosamente elaborati dai Padri” (p. 62).

In the third chapter, GIOVANNI CATAPANO discusses the same issue as Maspero, but he approaches it from the Western side, focusing on the fifteen books of Augustine’s *De Trinitate*. As stated by the author (p. 66), his main goal is to provide his readers with a selection of the most relevant Augustinian passages on trinitarian theology. These texts – which, along with the commentary, make up the greater part of the article – are reported in Italian translation, although their original Latin version can be found in the footnotes.

The fourth chapter is by CHRISTOPHE ERISMANN and analyzes Photios’ *Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit*, that is to say, a most important work in which the Byzantine patriarch tackled the issue of the *Filioque*. This is the first Greek treatise on this topic. As ERISMANN states, the article consists of two parts: the first is dedicated to the analysis of Photios’ use of logic (mostly, of syllogistic reasoning), while the second is devoted to a discussion on the reasons why “Photios supplemented the more traditional strategy of relying on Patristic authorities with logical argumentation” (p. 91). The paper is well documented and its conclusions – according to which Photios’ extensive use of syllogisms was due to both the ninth-century philosophical *Zeitgeist* and his Western addressees – are definitely persuasive. The only minor criticism consists in the fact that the author does not

2. In fact, SIECIENSKI refers to NACCARI’s paper (see p. 17, n. 95). In general, all authors are aware of what others in the volume have discussed. This is definitely a merit of the volume.

specify which critical edition of Photios' work he used in his paper.³ As for the English translation of Photios' quoted passages, although ERISMANN says that he used the translation by the Holy Transfiguration Monastery⁴ and that he "often modified it" (p. 91, n. 10), he does not annotate his modifications in the texts.

The fifth and the sixth chapters focus on the Latin West. The article by ERNESTO SERGIO MAINOLDI mostly consists of a thorough analysis of Anastasius the Librarian's letter to Charles the Bald on John Scotus Eriugena's Latin translation of the *Corpus Dionysiacum*. MAINOLDI offers a detailed commentary of the text, paying particular attention to its geopolitical implications, but he limits himself by quoting it in Italian translation.⁵ The article by NACCARI deals with the attempts to "export" the reforms of the Roman Church to the East in the 11th and 12th centuries. NACCARI very appropriately argues that the relationship between the Eastern and the Western Churches in this period should be considered from a dual point of view. A specific passage is worth quoting in this regard: "Sarebbe allora opportuno distinguere due fasi del tentativo del papato d'imporre l'ecclesiologia romana in Oriente: un momento dialettico, dettato prevalentemente dal confronto teologico-dottrinale con il mondo greco, e un momento operativo (o più momenti), in cui si cercò effettivamente di applicare il primato giurisdizionale della Chiesa di Roma" (p. 135).

The author of the seventh chapter of the volume is BARBARA CROSTINI. She discusses a *crux interpretum*, that is to say, a particularly obscure passage that is to be found at the end of Humbert of Silva Candida's *Dialogus*. In this text, Humbert seems to speak about dead men who were crucified as if they were Christ. Unlike some recent art-historical interpretations,⁶ according to which the passage in question refers to a type of image, CROSTINI argues that Humbert's formulation concerns the Eastern practice "of hanging and exposing the bodies of dead people, particularly

3. ERISMANN mentions both existing critical editions of Photios' *Mystagogy* (see p. 91, n. 10) – that is to say, the one published by JOSEPH HERGENRÖTHER in 1857 and the one recently prepared by VALERIO POLIDORI (2018) – but he does not specify which of these (and from which pages) he quotes.

4. Photius, *On the Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit*. Translation by the Holy Transfiguration Monastery. Astoria, NY 1983.

5. In the footnotes, however, one can find a reference to the critical edition of the text.

6. See mainly MICHELE BACCI, *Le rôle des images dans les polémiques religieuses entre l'Église grecque et l'Église latine (XIe–XIIIe siècles)*. *RBPh* 81.4 (2003) pp. 1023–1049.

stylite saints” (p. 181). Although this interpretation is undoubtedly intriguing, I believe that only a complete collation of the manuscript evidence of Humbert’s work will allow a full understanding of this passage and demonstrate whether CROSTINI is right.

The eighth chapter, written by TIA M. KOLBABA, is a very interesting essay dealing with Byzantine anti-Latin texts. KOLBABA convincingly explains in which cases anti-Latin texts should be treated as a single corpus. Moreover, she discusses the Byzantine “anthological mentality” (in this regard, some passages of Photios’ *Epistle 2* and Michael Keroularios’ *Synodal Edict* are quoted in parallel as an appendix. This allows the author to show the *verbatim* correspondences between them). KOLBABA’s dissertation of the topic is interesting. My only quibble is that she should have cited the essay collection PETER VAN DEUN – CAROLINE MACÉ (eds.), *Encyclopedic Trends in Byzantium? Proceedings of the international conference held in Leuven, 6–8 May 2009 (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 212). Leuven – Paris – Walpole, MA 2011*, which also includes one of BUCOSSI’s articles on Andronikos Kamateros’ *Sacred Arsenal* (KOLBABA deals with Kamateros’ work at pp. 190–191).⁷

The ninth chapter, by ALEXEY BARMIN, addresses the relationship between Petrus Grossolanus’ arguments in favor of the Western doctrine that he pronounced before the Byzantine Emperor Alexios I, and their refutation by Eustratios of Nicaea – consisting of his three *Λόγοι ἀντιρρητικοί*. Since Grossolanus’ text reached us divided into two sections – the first one written in Greek and the other in Latin – and a thorough comparison demonstrates that Eustratios’ quotations “correspond to the Latin text of Grossolanus only loosely, unlike the quotations from the Greek text of the Archbishop of Milan” (p. 214), the author argues that Eustratios only had the first part of Grossolanus’ text in front of him when working on his refutation. The following essay approaches the twelfth-century Orthodox-Catholic controversies from the Eastern side. The author of this chapter, LUIGI D’AMELIA, exhaustively examines the prologue of Nicetas of Thessaloniki’s six *Dialogues on the Procession of the Holy Spirit*. His analysis mostly focuses on Nicetas’ use of words (e.g., ἔρις, ἦθος, πλάττω, etc.). D’AMELIA clarifies the reasons why he finds this prologue interesting and refers us to the forthcoming critical edition of Nicetas’ *Dialogues* (p. 239).

7. ALESSANDRA BUCOSSI, *Dialogue and Anthologies of the Sacred Arsenal by Andronikos Kamateros – Sources, Arrangements, Purposes*. In: VAN DEUN – MACÉ (eds.), *Encyclopedic Trends in Byzantium*, pp. 269–284.

I definitely agree with him on the fact that this edition is the *conditio sine qua non* to conduct a more in-depth – and certainly fascinating – investigation of Nicetas’ cultural, historical, and ecclesiastical milieu.

The following three chapters focus on the influence of Greek philosophy on twelfth-century Latin trinitarian theology. The article by LUIGI CATALANI is dedicated to the anonymous and still unpublished *Liber de vera philosophia*, whose author probably belonged to the so-called Porretan school, that is, to the doctrinal heritage of Gilbert of Poitiers. This work is undeniably relevant, considering that – as CATALANI asserts⁸ – its anonymous author “shows his preference for the theology of the Greeks rather than that of Augustinian tradition” (p. 247). The essays by PIETRO PODOLAK and ANNA ZAGO are closely connected.⁹ The first is largely a *Quellenforschung* of Hugo Etherianus’ *De sancto et immortali Deo*: as a result, after a thorough analysis, the appendix presents the list of the Aristotelian and Neoplatonic sources that are to be found in the work. PODOLAK’s very cautious assertion that Etherianus’ ontology was influenced by Platonic metaphysics seems to be supported by the number of Neoplatonic sources the theologian used. ZAGO’s chapter is a real *prolegomenon* of the first critical edition of the *Compendiosa expositio*, that is, the apparatus of glosses apposed in the margins of Etherianus’ *De sancto et immortali Deo*.¹⁰ ZAGO offers a detailed presentation of the manuscript tradition of this exegetical work, as well as an analysis of some glosses.¹¹ She makes no hypothesis about the *Compendiosa expositio*’s authorship, but she cautiously distances herself from ANTOINE DONDAINE, who did not rule out that the author of the work could be Etherianus himself.

The following essay, written by ANGEL NIKOLOV, is the only one in the volume that addresses the issue of Orthodox-Catholic disputes in the medieval Slavic world. In particular, NIKOLOV focuses on a thirteenth–fourteenth-century Bulgarian collection of polemical and dogmatic texts, which attests to the southern Slavs’ increasing interest in anti-Latin works

8. However, he refers to an earlier scholarly work (cf. p. 247, n. 28): PAUL FOURNIER, *Études sur Joachim de Flore, et ses doctrines*. Paris 1909, p. 90.

9. The authors have prepared the critical edition of some of Hugo Etherianus’ works together (see the following footnote).

10. Hugonis Eteriani Epistolae, De sancto et immortali Deo, Compendiosa Expositio, Fragmenta Graeca quae extant. Ediderunt PIETRO PODOLAK et ANNA ZAGO (*Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis* 298). Turnhout 2020.

11. The text of the glosses is quoted in its original Latin version, while an Italian translation is reported in the footnotes.

after the Fourth Crusade. The collection consists of seventeen treatises, but NIKOLOV only examines five of them.

The fifteenth and the sixteenth chapters of the volume, written by JEFF BRUBAKER and MICHEL STAVROU, respectively, deal with the thirteenth-century *disputationes* between the Byzantine and the Roman Churches. BRUBAKER's article focuses on the report of the four Western friars who took part in a debate with the patriarch of Constantinople in Nicaea in 1234. The main aim of the author is to question the disdain of many historians for polemical works. BRUBAKER rather asserts that, in most cases, these texts should be considered as important sources from both a political and a diplomatic point of view. He is perfectly right, in my opinion, when speaking of an "intermingling of secular and sacred concerns in diplomacy between Byzantines and Latins" (p. 315). In the following chapter, STAVROU roughly addresses the same topic as BRUBAKER (in addition, he considers the debate between the Byzantine and the Roman Churches that took place in Nymphaeum in 1250), but through the analysis of Eastern sources, namely, Nicephorus Blemmydes' theological works. In the article, Stavrou quotes only very short passages of Blemmydes' texts – and exclusively in French translation – although he constantly refers to his own published critical editions of them. He concludes that Blemmydes based his theological considerations mostly on the Scriptural and Patristic tradition, using syllogisms with the sole purpose of refuting his adversaries. For this reason, according to STAVROU, Blemmydes felt "profondément étranger à l'égard des nouvelles méthodes propres à la scolastique latine" (p. 358), despite his quite good acquaintance with Aristotelian thought.

The seventeenth chapter of the volume is by CHRIS SCHABEL. His goal is to determine whether the formula on the Procession of the Holy Spirit that was published at the Second Council of Lyon "was promulgated specifically in reaction to Greek criticism of the Latin understanding" (p. 359) or not. SCHABEL proposes and argues both interpretations, but he actually fails to provide his readers with a definitive response to the issue: "It is probably the case [...] that the Lyon II declaration served multiple purposes at once, both *contra (aliquos) Latinos* and *adversus Graecos*, and it is impossible to determine at this point which factors played the most important role" (p. 370).

The eighteenth chapter is by MARCO FANELLI. It consists of the first critical edition and relative prolegomena of Patriarch Callistus I's letter to the Cypriots. In the introductory part of the article, FANELLI describes exhaus-

tively the *codex unicus* containing this text – Stauronikêta 62 (927) [Diktyon 30123] – and convincingly proposes a new dating for the redaction of the missive. The very accurate edition includes two critical apparatuses (an *apparatus fontium* and an apparatus containing FANELLI's emendations of the transmitted text) and is accompanied by an Italian translation.

The nineteenth chapter, written by MARIE-HÉLÈNE BLANCHET, analyzes the anti-Thomist argumentation of Matthew Angel Panaretus. BLANCHET is currently preparing a critical edition of Panaretus' polemical works as part of an international project.¹² This paper's conclusions are unquestionably significant. Indeed, the author succeeds in demonstrating that Panaretus understood and discussed Thomas Aquinas' logical argumentation, although we observe such a skill in Byzantine theologians very rarely.

The twentieth chapter is by PANAGIOTIS C. ATHANASOPOULOS. It is dedicated to Demetrios Kydones' re-use of some Augustinian passages in his unedited treatise *De Processione Spiritus Sancti ad amicum*. The author not only sheds light on many aspects of Kydones' reworking of Western Patristic material, but he also very properly dwells on his Greek translation of the key-terms in the debate on the *Filioque*. Moreover, ATHANASOPOULOS' hypothesis that the fragmentary translation of Augustine's *Epistula* 238, preserved in Marc. gr. Z 156 (coll. 611) [Diktyon 69627], is to be ascribed to Demetrios Kydones is convincing. Nevertheless, it is only the *proekdosis* of *De Processione* that will provide us with further, and perhaps decisive, historical and philological details.

The following two contributions concern the Council of Ferrara-Florence, albeit from different points of view. ALEXANDER ALEXAKIS' chapter discusses the use of Greek Patristic texts at the Council, investigating both Byzantine and Latin readings of such sources. He focuses particularly on the collection of texts conveyed by the manuscript Par. gr. 1115 [Diktyon 50711], to which he has also dedicated earlier publications.¹³ I agree with his conclusion that “we need to further study [...] the Patristic texts in their usually flawed state of transmission. We do not need to know what they should have used or known. The textual errors or alterations may help us understand their reasoning better” (p. 447). RAFFAELE GUERRA's chapter focuses on Mark Eugenikos' refutations of Purgatory in Ferrara and Flo-

12. “Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus”; see pp. 397–398.

13. See mainly ALEXANDER ALEXAKIS, *Codex Parisinus Graecus 1115 and Its Archetype*. Washington, DC 1996.

rence. In my opinion, this is a remarkable contribution for several reasons. GUERRA immediately pinpoints the core of the Byzantine-Latin disagreement on Purgatory, namely, the difference between the Eastern and the Western concept of anthropology and of the human will (θέλησις). Moreover, GUERRA is undoubtedly correct in stating that, on the one hand, the Aristotelian hylomorphic anthropology of Eugenikos prevented him from accepting any possible redemption for the soul that is separated from the body; and that, on the other hand, Latin theologians were totally willing of accepting that the human soul has an individual character and that its retribution in the afterlife is immediately *post mortem*, before the Last Judgment and the general resurrection. Finally, I believe that GUERRA is right when he concludes that Eugenikos' anthropology conformed with the Christological dogma of Chalcedon.

ELEFThERIOS DESPOTAKIS, the author of the twenty-third chapter, begins his contribution by presenting an English translation of a letter by the Venetian doge Nicolò Tron addressed to Cardinal Bartolomeo Roverella, archbishop of Ravenna, on the death of Cardinal Bessarion in 1472.¹⁴ DESPOTAKIS thoroughly analyzes the content of this missive and points out that Tron never mentions Bessarion's main characteristic: his ardent hope for the union of the Churches. This is the starting point for a brief but complete historical survey of the ambiguous Venetian attitudes toward religious politics.

The last chapter of the volume, written by ANNA CALIA, deals with an anti-Latin letter that John Dokeianos addressed to John Moschos of Korone, after the Turkish conquest of Constantinople. CALIA presents the *codex unicus*, Pennsylvaniensis MS 137 (Greek 1 Zacour) [Diktyon 55453], that contains this text very thoroughly (for example, her description includes a paragraph dedicated to the manuscript's antigraphs). She also summarizes the contents of Dokeianos' letter and discusses the historical context of its redaction, before publishing its first critical edition as an appendix. The article is very interesting for at least two reasons: first, CALIA makes available to the international scholarly community the *editio princeps* of an important source, accompanied by an English translation; second, her analysis adds some new details to the current knowledge of the figure of John Dokeianos.

In the last section, the book includes a general bibliography with all the

14. The original version of the document is reported as an appendix.

works that are cited in the chapters. As usual, it is divided into primary sources and secondary literature. It is followed by some short biographies of the editors and the authors, as well as by an index of the Greek and the Latin manuscripts that are mentioned in the papers. At the very end of the book, we find an index of names. All entries are here reported in their English version, even if the chapters where they appear are written in Italian or in French.

It is difficult to find any faults in such a well prepared publication. Its copyediting, too, seems to have been thorough.¹⁵ However, there are some minor criticisms. As stated in the introduction (p. XV), it is a pity that such a work only includes one chapter dedicated to the Slavic world and no essay at all addressing the Armenian anti-Latin texts. Moreover, I wish the book included at least one contribution by an art historian (although CROSTINI's paper partially deals with art-historical concerns) as well as an article by an expert on medieval scripts, who could approach the issue of Eastern-Western cultural interactions from a paleographical point of view. Likewise, I believe that a contribution dedicated to the tenth-century Byzantine-Latin religious disputes would have enriched the volume. It is definitely true that this book covers a period of time even broader than that indicated in its own title, considering that the articles of MASPERO and CATAPANO deal with the patristic period. However, it is a shame that no contribution discusses some of the relevant landmarks of the relationship between the Byzantine and the Roman Churches, such as, for example, the *Tomus Unionis* (920).

Despite such minor criticisms, I believe that both the editors and the authors of this very high-quality volume have attained their goal. Besides its scholarly qualities, such as the inclusion of some newly edited texts and the proposal of innovative approaches to specific issues, this book has the great merit of collecting contributions by both well known professors and early-career scholars. It also contains papers by Western medievalists and Byzantinists in roughly equal measure. Last but not least, this is a trilingual publication, consisting of English, Italian, and French essays. I have no doubt that it will be well received by the international scholarly commu-

15. I only point out two minimal faults. Two articles cited by D'AMELIA are wrongly reported in the bibliography: CLAUDIA RAPP, *Hellenic Identity, Romanitas, and Christianity*. In: K. ZACHARIA (ed.), *Hellenisms: Culture, Identity and Ethnicity from Antiquity to Modernity*. Aldershot 2008 (see p. 558; I miss the pages: 127–147); IOANNIS STOURAITIS, *Roman Identity in Byzantium: A Critical Approach*. *ByzZ* 107.1 (2014) pp. 199–200 (see p. 562; the correct mention of the pages is obviously 175–220).

nity and that it will contribute to the advancement of the Western Medieval and Byzantine studies.¹⁶

Keywords

church history; schism; theological controversies and debates; translation

16. The editor of The Byzantine Review thanks Vasileios Marinis for revising the English text.