was adapted also in Rome, and since then the popes became ever more a party to the ideological self-affirmation of the West against the East.

This led immediately to the clash between Cardinal Humbert of Silva Candida and Patriarch Michael Kerullarios in the year 1054. But as can be gathered from contemporary testimonies, until the end of the twelfth century nobody really thought that the tensions between Rome and Constantinople implied something like an ecclesiastical schisma. Insofar, the year 1054 marks but one step in the gradual estrangement between the two churches, which came to its conclusion not before the thirteenth century. For it was only when the Western crusaders destroyed the Byzantine empire in the year 1204 and, with the encouragement of the popes, tried to westernize the subjugated population, that the schism became a *fait accompli*. Here again, the *filioque* played a pivotal role, since the recitation of the Western Creed was imposed on Eastern Christians as a sign of their loyalty to the new overlords.

The present article thus confirms a long standing thesis of Eastern theologians, according to which the *filioque* was the one decisive reason for the Great Schism. It does not discuss the theological implications of this thesis, deriving from the fact that the Ecumenical Councils of the first seven centuries had explicitly prohibited any alteration of the Creed. But even so, the suggestion appears to be well founded, that today the *filioque* should again be removed from the Creed, if the West really wants reunion with the East.

Rupture between East and West in the Middle Ages

Hans-Jürgen Marx

As historians and theologians now generally recognize, the so-called Great Schism between Eastern and Western Christendom is not really an event whose beginning can be exactly dated. It was something that came about gradually, as the result of a long and complicated process, starting well before the notorious year of 1054, and not completed until some time after. In this long and complicated process not only were religious motivations at work, but cultural differences, political antagonisms and naked economic interests also played a decisive role.

The present article attempts to show that all these theological and non-theological factors can be most adequately summarized by the one word *filioque*, denoting thereby not so much the trinitarian controversy surrounding this clause, but rather the purely formal act by which it was interpolated by the West into the Constantinopolitan Creed.

By way of sketching the historical process which culminated into the final rupture between East and West, it is shown that since the establishment of the Carolingian empire the *filioque* was more or less consciously used as an ideological hall mark for affirming the superiority of the new western civilization over against the old empire of Byzantium. At first, the Roman popes tried to stem the anti-Byzantine tide, by consistently refusing to interpolate the problematical clause into the Roman formula of the Creed. But with the ascent of the German reformers to the See of Saint Peter the new form of the Creed