

Photios the Great replaced Ignatios the New, son of Michael I Rhangabe, as patriarch of Constantinople; Ignatios had been castrated and made a monk on his father's deposition. Ignatios, an austere monk, had lost favor, and was brought to resign (857). With the support of Emperor Michael III (842-67) and Caesar Bardas, Photios was elected to replace him, even though he was a layman. Ignatios' supporters sought the aid of Pope Nicholas I (858-67), a powerful character, convinced he was God's earthly viceregent. Nicholas had resolved as pontiff to establish papal primacy¹ over secular and ecclesiastical power in both the West and East. As his ideological vehicle, Nicholas used the pseudo-Isidorian *Decretals* and effectively exploited political crises in Lorraine, France, Italy, and Byzantium. The Photian-Ignatian struggle gave the pope an excuse to interfere with the Byzantine church's internal struggles. Nicholas hesitated to reinstate Ignatios, then declined to accept Photios as legitimate patriarch and sent legates, Zacharias of Anagni and Radoald of Porto to investigate the matter, but rejected their report in Photios' favor (at the council of 861 in Constantinople). Ultimately at stake was the concept of ecclesiology, the relationship between Rome and New Rome (Constantinople). This exchange was initiated by two closely linked events: (1) the desire expressed by the Emperor Michael III that an ecumenical council be held in Constantinople to finally lay the heresy of iconoclasm to rest; and (2) the enthronement letter written by Photios (860). The papal reply to Michael accepted the idea of the proposed council, but the topic quickly moved to the deposition of Ignatios and the elevation of Photios to the patriarchate, both of which had been accomplished without consultation to Rome. In his letter to Michael, the pope clearly stated his concept of ecclesial authority and his objection from the laity to the Constantinopolitan patriarchate². In concluding his letter, Nicholas referred to the judgment of his predecessors, Leo III and Hadrian I, respecting the elevation of laymen to the higher ranks of the clergy. Hadrian I, writing to Emperor Constantine V, had declared: "Let no layman whatever in the future be ordained in the same Church of yours, Constantinople."

Nicholas' letter to Photios, written at the same time as the letter addressed to Michael, 25 Sept. 860, was extremely brief. It repeated the objection to Photios' ordination, but stated that papal judgment would be reserved until a report had been made to Rome by the papal legates. As noted earlier, the report of Radoald and Zacharias proved favorable to Photios and the matter of Bulgaria did not appear to influence their decision. Pope Nicholas subsequently issued several letters repudiating the action taken by the legates at the Council of Constantinople in 861. In a long letter written to Michael, dated 19 Mar. 861, Nicholas went so far as to imply that the Emperor's salvation might be contingent on his willingness to comply with the pope's wishes concerning the Photios' deposition and Ignatios' reinstatement. "In the closing sentence of his letter, the pope says: "In the future [world] may [God] permit you to have the rewards of eternal happiness for your good deeds and respect for justice, which must be weighed on your scales."

Pope Nicholas, in a letter dated 18 Mar. 862, addressed Photios in a seemingly sarcastic way: "Nicholas, Bishop Servant of the Servants of God, to the most prudent man Photios." He

¹ Noted in his letter to Emperor Michael in 865, "The privileges of this see are perpetual: they were planted and rooted in by God Himself..." as well as requesting Photios and Ignatios to come to Rome.

² "The creator of all things established the primacy of the divine power which he bestowed upon his chosen apostles, upon the solid faith of the Prince of the Apostles, that is to say upon Saint Peter, and determined that his See should be outstanding, nay, rather the very first See in rank.... If by chance some rich man or law student or one in administration is asked for as bishop, he is not to be ordained until he has exercised previously the task of reader and the office of deacon or priest, in order that, if he is found worthy, he might rise by each of the steps to lead to his episcopacy." (Tenth Canon of the Council of Sardica)

then reiterated his notion of papal authority based as before on Matt. 16:18 and followed this with an attack on Photios concerning the means by which he had acquired his office.

Patriarch Photios considered the *filioque* addition to the Creed as a most serious problem. But he also seems to consider these disciplinary differences as serious, as noted in his famous encyclical (PG 102, 721-741) to the 'archepiscopal thrones' of the East. In his Encyclical he interprets the Canons of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, better known as the Quinisext Council, as having "ecumenical" validity, for he attacks the Western customs, appealing to these customs. But in 861/2 in his second letter to Pope Nicholas I (*Bibliotheca* Codex 290; the first letter, Codex 288, appears to be defending his faith) Photios explicitly refers to these different customs, arguing that neither East nor West should impose their customs on each other. Thus in this letter to Pope Nicholas, he did not interpret the canons of the Quinisext Council as being 'ecumenically' binding on the West. The change may very well be prompted by Pope Nicholas' *Responsa ad consulta Bulgarorum* (rather anti-Greek). Photios may only have been attempting to protect the "Byzantine customs" by appealing to these canons as "ecumenical."

But it is clear that Photios considers the above-mentioned problems of a disciplinary rather than a doctrinal nature. The most serious problem, a problem of a doctrinal nature is that the Franks have interpolated the "Holy and Sacred Creeds, which has been confirmed by all the Ecumenical Councils." Photios states emphatically that the "blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, or rather against the entire Holy Trinity, would suffice without a second blasphemy for striking them with a thousand anathemas, even if all the other charges did not exist." That Photios considered the *filioque* as the serious issue is clear from his above-quoted statement, from his later controversy with the West which concentrates only on this triadological issue, and from the Encyclical's preoccupation with this problem. The great part of the Encyclical consists of "brief and incomplete" refutations of the *filioque*.

Nicholas called upon the Eastern patriarchs and their bishops to refuse recognition to Photios in a letter (8 May 862) (and that Rome did not recognize Photios as Patriarch until Ignatios was properly investigated and condemned); at a Roman synod (April 863), Nicholas declared Radoald and Zacharias had exceeded their authority, and that Photios was uncanonically elected, so Photios was deposed and excommunicated. The emperor's protest at this won him a stern papal rebuke and a disquisition on the authority of Rome. Photios, also provoked by anti-Byzantine papal action in Bulgaria, convened a synod in Constantinople (867) excommunicated Nicholas, declaring him deposed. Nicholas writes about Photios' legitimacy and upon the *filioque* clause in his *Epistles (Nicolae primi pontificae, maximi Epistolae et decreta)* 6, 85, 86, and 100 [V, XII, CLII]. Photios responds in his *Mystagogy concerning the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* (5, 75, 85, 86) replying that many popes (Leo I, Gregory I, etc.) and the Fathers and the councils did not teach the *filioque* clause; the last pronounced anathemas upon those who would change the creeds. Photios was convinced that changes to the creed were unwarranted and actually heretical. The Greeks believe that the addition of the *filioque* is a blasphemy against the Holy Spirit; the Latins believe the subtraction is the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, which is unpardonable. Nicholas believed Rome (the papacy, not Councils) should dictate doctrine. Various Latins believe the Greeks are truly mistaken.

Basil I (867-86), co-emperor (since 866) and murderer of Michael III, deposed Photios and reinstated Ignatios. This failed to improve relations with Rome; Ignatios, as resolute as Photios in defence of Constantinople's rights, acted decisively to resolve the conflict between Latin and Greek missions in Bulgaria in favor of the Greeks. Photios was eventually restored to the patriarchal throne after Ignatios died in 879.

The "Ignatian" Council of Constantinople opened on 5 Oct. 869 in Hagia Sophia, presided by 3 legates of Adrian/Hadrian II. During the previous decade some irregularities occurred at Constantinople, including the deposition of Ignatios as patriarch of Constantinople, for Photios. The latter's violent measures against the Rome culminated in the attempted deposition (867) of Nicholas I. A new emperor, Basil the Macedonian desired power; he needed the support of the Ignatian and papal parties. Consequently papal supremacy was recognized, and papal legates were again received in Constantinople. Photios was interned in a monastery; Ignatios was recalled, and friendly relations were resumed with Rome. Both Ignatios and Basil sent representatives to Rome requesting a general council. After holding a Roman synod (June 869) condemning Photios again, the pope sent his legates to Constantinople. Besides Ignatios, representatives of the Patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem were present, and, towards the end, the representatives of the Patriarch of Alexandria. The attendance of Ignatian bishops was small in the beginning, never more than 102 bishops present, and ended 28 Feb. 870.

The legates were asked to exhibit their commission, which they did; they presented to the council members the formula (*libellus*) of Pope Hormisdas (514-23), binding its signatories "to follow in everything the Apostolic See of Rome and teach all its laws... in which communion is the whole, real, and perfect solidity of the Christian religion". The Council members were required to sign this document, which was originally drawn to close the Acacian schism. The earlier sessions read important documents, the reconciliation of Ignatian bishops who had fallen away to Photios, the exclusion of some Photian prelates, and the refutation of the false statements of Photios' 2 former envoys to Rome. In the fifth session Photios unwillingly appeared; when questioned he was deeply silent or answered briefly, imitating Christ's attitude and speech before Caiaphas and Pilate. The next session gave him another hearing through his representatives; they appealed to the canons as above the pope. In the 7th session he appeared again with his consecrator George Asbestos. They appealed again to the ancient canons, refused to recognize the presence or authority of the Roman legates, and rejected Rome's authority, though they offered to render an account to the emperor. As Photios would not renounce the patriarchate and recognize Ignatios, the council renewed the former Roman excommunications of him; he was condemned as a liar, adulterer, parricide, and heretic, and banished to the monastery's dungeon on the Bosphorus, where he continued to denounce the council. The last remnants of iconoclasm and the interference of the civil authority in ecclesiastical affairs were denounced by the council.³ The emperor, his son Constantine, the Bulgarian king, Michael, and the ambassadors of Emperor Louis II attended the last (tenth) session.

The council's 27 canons recorded by Anastasius (vs. 14 in the Greek) deal partly with the Photian situation and partly with general points of discipline or abuses. The decrees of Nicholas I and Adrian II against Photios and in favor of Ignatios were read and confirmed, the Photian clerics deposed, and those ordained by Photios reduced to lay communion. The council issued an encyclical to all the faithful, and to the pope requesting his confirmation of its Acts. The papal legates signed its decrees, but awaited papal confirmation. Rome believes that here for the first time, that Constantinople is second in the pentarchy. Greek pride, however, was offended by the compulsory signature of the aforesaid Roman formulary of reconciliation, and in a subsequent conference of Greek ecclesiastical and civil authorities the newly-converted Bulgarians were declared subject to the Patriarchate of Constantinople and not to Rome. Ignatios wrote the Latin version of these documents and a copy of the Greek Acts of the council which he also translated and to which is due most of our documentary knowledge of the proceedings.

³ <http://www.dailycatholic.org/history/8ecumen1.htm> (and other links within this site contain the canons)

The "Photian" Council of Constantinople was held in Hagia Sophia in Nov. 879⁴, to restore Photios as patriarch of Constantinople. This synod affirmed that Photios had been legally elected, nullified those synods that had condemned him, and ruled against the elevation of laymen to the episcopacy. The Roman Cardinal Peter presided. (In 877, Photios returned to power after the death of Ignatios.⁵) Pope John VIII acceded to Emperor Basil I's request for another council. Pope John sent Photios a letter which stressed that the papal legates (Peter of St. Chrysogonus, Eugenius of Ostia, Paul of Ancona) had special instructions contained in a *Commonitorium*. This *Commonitorium*, the Latin text of which is not extant, was read at the fourth session of the Council of 879-80. Chapter 4 of this *Commonitorium* (which had been sent to the emperor) declares: "'We declare that the synod held at Rome against the most holy patriarch Photios in the time of the most blessed pope Hadrian, as well as the holy synod of Constantinople attacking the same most holy Photios (i.e., in 869-870), are totally condemned and abrogated and must in no way be invoked or named as synods. Let this not happen...'"⁶ This obviously indicates that this synod repudiated the anti-Photian Synod of 869-70, and received the sanction and approval of Pope John VIII (880), who concurred in the annulment and condemnation of the anti-Photian decrees of his predecessors, Nicholas I and Hadrian II. This synod affirmed that Photios had been legally elected, nullified those synods that had condemned him, and ruled against the elevation of laymen to the episcopacy. In exchange for John's favorable verdict, Photios and Basil agreed to turn over Bulgaria to Roman ecclesiastical colonization. The sixth session, held at the Imperial palace conforming rules of Byzantine etiquette, has enormous bearing on the *filioque*. Only Photios, the papal legates and 18 metropolitans and archbishops attended this session. Additionally, Photios finally accomplished what he had long sought: the papal legates signed Photios' carefully worded statements on the prohibition of any alteration of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed. This Creed, without the *filioque* interpolation then follows. The Council then declared that no one could put forward another Creed, that no one could add "unauthentic or falsified expressions" to this ancient Creed. Anyone attempting to deform the "most Holy and Venerable Creed" in any way was to be excommunicated. The Council then

⁴ Rome calls this *Pseudosynodus Photiana*.

⁵ In 878, then, Photios at last obtained lawfully the place he had formerly been accused of usurping. Rome acknowledged him and restored him to her communion. There was no possible reason now for a fresh quarrel. But he had identified himself so completely with that strong anti-Roman party in the East which he mainly had formed, and, doubtless, he had formed so great a hatred of Rome, that now he carried on the old quarrel with as much bitterness as ever and more influence. Nevertheless he applied to Rome for legates to come to another synod. There was no reason for the synod, but he persuaded John VIII that it would clear up the last remains of the schism and rivet more firmly the union between East and West. His real motive was, no doubt, to undo the effect of the synod that had deposed him.

⁶ Since the 10th clause ordered the suppression of the anti-Photian council, which later became the 8th Ecumenical Council, the *Commonitorium* was long considered a forgery. The Dvornik's research has now altered that view. Some people thought that this text was altered by Photios; but in the so-called "unaltered" text of the letter this passage is replaced by dots (...), and the following passage reads: "For the see of blessed Peter, the key-bearer of the heavenly kingdom, has the power to dissolve, after suitable appraisal, any bonds imposed by bishops. This is so because it is agreed that already many patriarchs, for example Athanasius ... after having been condemned by a synod, have been, after formal acquittal by the apostolic see, promptly reinstated". Ivo of Chartres explicitly affirms: "The synod of Constantinople which was held against Photios must not be recognised. John VIII wrote to the patriarch Photios (in 879): We make void that synod which was held against Photios at Constantinople and we have completely blotted it out for various reasons as well as for the fact that Pope Hadrian did not sign its acts". Ivo adds from the instructions John VIII gave to his legates for the 879 council: "You will say that, as regards the synods which were held against Photios under Pope Hadrian at Rome or Constantinople, we annul them and wholly exclude them from the number of the holy synods". Therefore there is no ground for thinking that Photios altered the text.

declared that if anyone "thinks otherwise, he will be considered an enemy of God and of Truth." It is also quite clear, especially from Photios' later writings -- *Letter to the Patriarch of Aquileia* and *Mystagogia* -- that Photios had hoped the Roman legates' signatures to the decisions of this "Ecumenical" Conciliar decision would discontinue the *filioque* in the Western provinces under the Roman Patriarch.⁷ Photios apparently realized that the 879-80 Council's decisions were not as easily enforceable as were the decisions of Niceae II. The council's teaching was affirmed by the patriarchs of Old Rome (John VIII), New Rome [Constantinople] (Photios), Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria and by Basil.

Photios also declared that Bulgaria should belong to the Byzantine Patriarchate but then relinquished it, allowing a victory of King Boris of Bulgaria (a patriarchate for an independent Bulgarian Church). This would take its affinity from the orthodoxy of Constantinople, not from Rome. The fact that there was a great majority for all these measures shows how strong Photios's party had become in the East. The legates, like their predecessors in 861, agreed to everything the majority desired. As soon as they had returned to Rome, Photios sent the Acts to the pope for his confirmation. The acts of this council were apparently approved by Pope John VIII, but without any retraction of his predecessors' condemnations. There are a few other matters regarding the monastic life: for it is said in an ordinance of a synod of Constantinople [Pseudosynod held by Photios in the year 879]: "The monastic life is one of subjection and discipleship, not of teaching, authority, or pastoral care."

John later disowned his own legates and excommunicated Photios again, and thus aroused the open hostility. Photios' Latin critics did not reckon this council as ecumenical.

⁷ Pope John wrote a letter to Photios around the end of the council, concerning the doctrine of the filioque, and there is no evidence that Rome itself added the interpolated filioque to the Creed in Rome. Photios responds by suggesting that they not force anyone to abandon that addition to the creed, but to urge them little by little to give up this blasphemy, and that Photios and John do not share this opinion.

The schism or division of 1054 between the Eastern and the Western churches was a result of several theological and political issues. Although, from the beginning of the *filioque* controversy (8th-9th century), doctrinal elements were involved in the split, so that many, on both sides, spoke of their adversaries' "heresy," there remained, at least until the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438-39), a substantial consensus on the point that the division was "capable of adjustment" and therefore was covered by the concept of schism as defined by Basil of Caesarea. (Basil uses the term schism to those who had separated from the rest for some reasons of church policy and questions of adjustment; he distinguishes schism from heresy, the latter, a division on doctrinal grounds.) This provides the basis for numerous union attempts.

The existence of different interpretations of both the primacy of Rome and the position of other important Christian centers was evident already in the 4th century. The First Council of Constantinople, representing the Eastern view, attributed to the bishop of the new capital "the privileges of honor next to the bishop of Rome, because that city is a New Rome" (Canon 3). A similar sociopolitical definition appears in 451 and is applied to the "old Rome" as well: "The Fathers rightly granted privileges to the throne of old Rome, because it was the imperial city," and now "equal privileges are granted to the most holy throne of New Rome . . . , which is honored with the presence of the emperor and the senate" (Council of Chalcedon, canon 28).

Such statements were obviously incompatible with the view expressed by Roman popes e.g., Damasus (366-84), Leo I (457-74), Gelasius (492-96), and Hormisdas (512-23) that the authority of Rome lies with the words addressed by Jesus to Peter (Mt. 16:18) and not with the political structure of the empire. The estrangement provoked by such differing views of primacy manifested itself repeatedly in connection with several ecclesiastical conflicts, e.g., various positions concerning the resolution of the Arian heresy, and the diverging attitudes towards the Monophysites (Akakian schism, 484-519). Although some Byzantine churchmen (e.g., Maximos the Confessor, Theodore of Stoudios) referred to Roman "apostolicity" to gain Rome's support against Byzantine emperors, the estrangement was deepened by the political involvement of Pope Stephen II (752-57) with the Franks (754) and the *filioque* dispute begun by Charlemagne. The *filioque* issue added a doctrinal dimension to the jurisdictional conflict between Photios and Pope Nicholas I (858-67). Remarkably, however, none of these early confrontations resulted in final schism, because neither side was pushing its position to the point of ultimate rupture.

A substantially new situation prevailed by the mid-11th century. The *filioque* had been added to the creed in Rome itself (presumably in 1014) and the papal throne was occupied by German popes (since 1046). Formal contacts between the patriarchate of Constantinople—at the zenite of its medieval power—and a decadent papacy were allowed to lapse. In southern Italy, Frankish and Greek clergy were in conflict over discipline (cerical celibacy imposed by the Franks) and liturgy (Latin use of *azymes*, unleavened bread in the Eucharist). A reconciliation attempt, sponsored by Emperor Constantine IX, included the invitation of a papal delegation to Constantinople. The total intransigence of both Cardinal Humbert and Patriarch Micahel I Keroularios led to mutual anathemas (1054): Responding to the Greek criticism of the Latin practice of unleavened bread, in 1054, Cardinal Humbert excommunicated Patriarch Micahel I Keroularios and his followers as "prozymite heretics". The Greek theologian Niketas Stethatos responded. The anathemas, however referred to the immediate participants, i.e., the legates and the patriarch, and noto to the churches at large, so that relationships remained unclear for years. The "reformed papacy" of Gregory VII (1073-85) could hardly have improved the situation; neither could it make concessions to Byzantine ecclesiological patterns.

Nevertheless, when the legates of Urban visited Constantinople (1089), the patriarchate, at the request of Emperor Alexios I Komnenos, declared that its files contained no evidence of formal schism and that unity could be restored on the basis of the pope's confession of Orthodox faith. There is evidence that, in the following years, intercommunion was taking place locally between Latins and Greeks and that many still considered the situation as a temporary quarrel between patriarch and pope. In reality, however, the Latin and Greek worlds were drifting apart institutionally, culturally, and theologically.

During the Crusades, the estrangement became open conflict. After conquering Antioch (1098) and Jerusalem (1099) and initially recognizing the authority of the local Greek patriarchs, the Crusaders had them replaced with Latin incumbents. After the Crusaders captured Constantinople in 1204, Pope Innocent III condoned the election of the Venetian Thomas Morosini as patriarch of Constantinople. Thereafter, the schism could be considered as final, since the Greek pretender to the see, Michael IV Autoreianos, elected in Nicaea in 1208, was recognized as legitimate by the entire Orthodox world. However, negotiations for the Union of the churches—made urgent by the Turkish danger—continued, almost without interruption, during the Palaiologan period. The union councils of Lyons and Ferrara-Florence failed to overcome either the theological issues dividing the churches or the cultural animosity that opposed the peoples. Only a handful of Greeks were ready to accept the Latin doctrine of the *filioque*, or the “full power” (*plena potestas*) of the pope, as defined in Florence. The fall of Constantinople to the Turks ended negotiations.

It seems also that there were some other factors, including cultural estrangement: there was a paucity of Greek works in the West (the Latins did not know that much Greek), and a paucity of Latin works in the East (the Greeks thought of themselves as superior). There was some political estrangement as well over the iconoclastic heresy, where the West was always iconodule/iconophile, but the East appeared to be ‘schizophrenic’ (because of constant flip-flopping on the issue) to the West.

Pope Urban II called a discussion at Bari, in Oct. 1098, showing interest in collaboration, if not reunion of the two branches of the Church; reunion of East (Greek Italians) and the West (Franco-Latins) was the theme, and resolution of the difficulties regarding the *filioque*. Urban II had gone to Bari to venerate the relics of Nicholas, bishop of Mira, the holy wonder-worker, and to consecrate the basilica. 183 or 185 bishops assembled, including some Italian "Greeks" and Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, was appointed to set forth the differences with Greeks as the Western apologist, and by the treatments of Aquinas and other theologians. (The Greeks⁸ had questioned the *filioque* clause; the disputation being protracted, the pope called aloud for Anselm, "Anselm, our father and our master, where are you?" Urban II made Anselm sit beside him and his archdeacon, "Let us put him in our immediate sphere, for he is as it were Pope of the other sphere (i.e., of England)," thus given a place of honor and bidden to take the chief part in the discussion. His arguments were afterwards committed to writing in his treatise on this subject -- *De processione Spiritus Sanctus* "On the Procession of the Holy Spirit".⁹) Anselm ably defended the *filioque* of the creed in the East-West controversy on the procession of the Holy Spirit and on the use of unleavened bread for the Eucharist (of which he has a little treatise); Anselm gave such a general satisfaction that all present joined in pronouncing anathema against those that should afterwards deny the procession of the Holy Spirit from both the Father and the Son. Anselm believes the Greeks are mistaken if they deny validity to a Eucharist celebrated with unleavened bread, which was used by Christ and the apostles. The Greeks and Latins are on agreement that bread is used, which is one substance. Most accounts are Norman.

The proceedings of the King William of England next were debated, regarding his simony, his oppressions of the church, his persecution of Anselm, and his incorrigibility, after frequent admonitions, were so strongly represented that the pope, at the instance of the council, was just going to pronounce him excommunicated. Anselm had sat silent throughout all, but at this he rose up, and casting himself on his knees before the pope, asked him to stop the censure. The council had admired Anselm for his parts and learning, was further charmed because of his humane and Christian dispositions in behalf of one that had used him so roughly, and now was interceding for this man. Anselm's petition in behalf of his sovereign was granted. Anathemas were pronounced on those bishops or abbots who received investiture at the hands of laymen. Anselm accordingly refused either to do homage himself for the restitution of the possessions of the archbishopric or to consecrate other bishops who had received ring and crosier from the king. Anselm also highly encouraged celibate clergy. Some writings ventured to suggest that the Greek Orthodox were heretics with the ridiculous.

It seems that the worsening of affairs lie with the person of Boemondos, Prince of Antioch (Syria), since the Crusaders captured Antioch and treated the populace poorly.

⁸ The Greeks objected to the *filioque* both because it was an addition to the creed, and because it was not correct. In their view, it created two origins or principles in the Trinity, Father and Son, and the Father should stand alone in that position. This was a notion heavily dependent on the Pythagorean and Neoplatonist idea that unity is metaphysically better than plurality, particularly strong in the theology of the old Eastern half of the Empire, where the direct study of texts in Greek had continued to be relatively easy.

⁹ Anselm knew nothing of the history of the dispute, either in the eleventh century or earlier. He approached the problem straight-forwardly as one of reason. His argument turns on symmetry. Only if the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son do we have a situation in which each Person of the Trinity has an attribute peculiar to himself and each has an attribute which he shares with the other two. Only the Son has a Father; only the Father has a Son; only the Spirit does not have a Spirit proceeding from himself. But both the Father and the Spirit do not have a Father; both the Spirit and the Son do not have a Son; and both the Father and the Son have a Spirit proceeding from themselves.

Pope Pascal II wrote an aggrieved letter to the patriarch of Constantinople complaining that for some years past no letters or messengers from Rome had been accepted. At a conference in Constantinople in 1112 attended by Archbishop Peter Grossolanus (or Grosolanus, or Gros[s]olano, also known as Petros Chrysolanos in the East) of Milan on his way to the Holy Land for a pilgrimage, the Greeks explained that different customs such as shaven clergy or bishops' rings were minor matters, but major issues were Western scorn for married priests, lack of veneration of the Icons, *filioque*, and above all the unjustified Roman claim to be the mother of all churches and her primacy. The Greeks were represented by Eustratios of Nicaea, John Phournes and Nicetas Seidas (or Seides), Nicholas IV Muzalon (abbot of the Kosmidon monastery), Theodore of Smyrna, Theodore Prodromos and Eutimius Zigabene (or John Zonaras), and of course Emperor Alexios.

Peter discussed differences between the Eastern and Western Churches with these seven, in the presence of the emperor. When Peter read his pamphlet *De processione spiritus sancti* ("On the Procession of the Holy Spirit"), the emperor exclaimed that now wisdom came from the Occident to the Orient and that Peter's treatise made the work of the Greek theologians superfluous. The emperor is supposed to have been so dissatisfied with the responses of his seven court theologians that he returned their *libelli* to them for revision and condensation into one text. A source from Monte Cassino reports that the emperor did not even want to deliver this text to Grossolanus. It remains unclear whether Peter was on an official mission of Pope Paschal II or went to Constantinople as a private individual. Seidas, however, counted 32 discrepancies between the Greek and Latin churches, but concentrated on three major points--the *filioque*, *azymes*, and papal primacy. Phournes rejected the *filioque*, and emphasized the monarchical principle of the deity, against the alleged *ditheia* of his opponent. On the other hand, he and Eustratios of Nicaea stressed the equality of the Son and the Holy Spirit, "The two hands of the same substance and of the same power." Phournes finished his speech by inviting Grossolanus to emigrate to Byzantium. Peter responded by citing as proof for the *filioque* Christ's words near crucifixion, and the Spirit would have interceded with God the Father. Nicholas Muzalon supposedly wrote on the procession of the Holy Spirit, as did Eustratios (the latter wrote 4 writings against Grossolanus). A number of tracts in the East exist as a result of these discussions.

The ambitions of the Norman king Roger in Sicily alarmed both Constantinople and the German emperor Lothair III. Lothair wanted an alliance and sent Anselm of Havelberg. On 10 April 1136 a public disputation began in the Church of St. Irene, but soon attracted such a crowd of listeners that it moved into Hagia Sophia nearby. Anselm debated Nicetas, archbishop of Nicomedia, one of a prestigious group of twelve official Teachers who chose him to be their spokesman. Like Maximus the Confessor, Anselm was aware misunderstandings between Greek East and Latin West often originated in faulty grasp of each other's language: "Some Latins are misled by Greek's words, for they hear only the words, not the sense, and think the Greeks are affirming what they are not, and denying what they do not deny."

Some 15 years later, Anselm composed a freely developed account of the conversations, based on memory and on notes by shorthand writers, but substantially adding new matter, evident from the attribution to Nicetas of statements derived wholly from Latin sources, e.g., *Liber Pontificalis*. He dedicated his work to Pope Eugenius III, to foster more Latin toleration of the Greek churches, and to vindicate himself after unkind suggestions he had inadequately stated the western case for the *filioque*, *azyma*, and papal monarchy. His preface pointedly declares submission to 'apostolic authority' to be a 'necessity of eternal salvation.' The *Dialogues* in 3 books begin from western anxiety about the rivalries in the recent multiplicity of religious orders. Anselm's thesis, derived from Augustine and Gregory the Great, holds diversity of usage to be compatible with unity of faith.¹⁰ Book II asks if the differences between east and west are compatible with one faith, the neuralgic points being the western doctrine of the procession of the Spirit from the Father and Son and the eucharistic bread. On a shadowy margin lay painful questions about Greek hesitations towards Latin baptism. On the *filioque*, Nicetas declared the eastern position: if such Orthodox churches were to accept an addition, it must have the authority of a general council backed by the Pope and allowed by emperors, shown to be consonant with reason, scripture, and conciliar tradition. They wholly rejected 'two first principles' (*duo principia*). Nicetas saw no possibility of reconciliation if the sole western authority for adding to the ecumenical creed of the Council of Constantinople is that of Rome, respected as that is.

Anselm believed that there was room for the *filioque* based on church fathers and considering the Nicene creed.¹¹ The third Dialogue concerns the sacraments, especially the western use of unleavened bread in the mass, a custom which for Anselm represents 'universal

¹⁰ The anxieties he sought to allay were widespread, for the fourth Lateran Council of 1215 prohibited new orders (canon 13, reaffirmed by the Council of Lyon, 1274, canon 23). The Lateran Council felt no difficulty about different rites within a substantially identical faith (canon 9).

¹¹ Anselm's reply disowns two first principles. There is no proposition in scripture of the Nicene creed forbidding one to say that the Son has a partnership in the proceeding of the Spirit from the Father. No text says "from the Father alone." Greeks cannot invoke John 15:26 and say no addition may be made to scripture, when the Nicene Creed self-evidently made such additions. Adding the *filioque* is a clarification, not a different dogma of the Trinity. It belongs in that developing area which the first Church could not grasp but into which the Paraclete has led (John 16:13), much as Gregory Nazianzen could argue for the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit. Ancient councils were good, and manifest a development of doctrine under the Spirit's inspiration with a growth in understanding. Ancient fathers supporting the *filioque* include Cyril of Alexandria, and not only the Latins Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine. To illustrate the point that an orthodox creed can come from a pope without a council, Anselm cited Pope Leo IX (*Dial.* 2.21-22) with a tactful omission of Leo's *filioque*. When Nicetas asks Anselm's opinion of 'proceeding from the Father through the Son' (*per filium*) held by some Greek Fathers, Anselm replies that he has never heard such language and sharply cites a negative paragraph from Hilary of Poitiers *De Trinitate* 12, an author well-respected in the east. The discussion of *filioque* ends, perhaps more cheerfully than the argument would suggest, with the confidence that if one sets aside 'stupid Greeks and arrogant Latins' and 'if only' we can have a general council, mutual agreement could be reached, and then the Greek Christians could accept the *filioque*.

tradition' since the Last Supper. Above all, to continue using leavened bread is defiance of Rome's authority, 'mother and mistress of all', a supremacy created by no councils but by Matt. 16:18ff and sealed by Peter's and Paul's martyrdoms. The two differ over ecclesiology and on the *azyma*.¹²

At a tailpiece, Anselm has a complaint. There is a western grievance when a Greek marries a Latin wife, 'which often occurs among persons of high rank,' before the marriage 'you anoint her with oil and wash her entire body, and to the west that appears as rebaptism.'¹³ The two protagonists end confident of the future because the ancient fathers, both Latin and Greek, enjoyed consensus. Hope for reunion on ground of the shared agreement of Latin and Greek Fathers becomes a standard argument of ecumenists¹⁴. Moreover, Anselm presents both sides as speaking with courtesy and modesty. Nicetas more than once compliments Anselm upon the evidently unusual absence of arrogance in his Latin manner and matter. Nevertheless reflection must observe the intransigence of the partners. Neither yielded an inch of ground on the controversial areas debated. Nicetas is given the last word: "Our disagreements are not in great but in very minor matters and, though not a help to charity, are no hindrance to the salvation of souls.' At a future general council, he repeats, all difficulties can be sorted out and solved. (I.e., they asked for a general synod to settle the differences of the East and West.) That was no doubt true of *azyma*, but less obvious in the case of the two ecclesiologies in confrontation.

¹² While Alexandria and Antioch are also sees associated with Peter, Rome alone has been endowed with special privileges of never departing from true faith (any suggestion that Pope Liberius did so is expressly denied) and of exercising supreme universal jurisdiction. By contrast, bishops of Constantinople have made a home for heresies like a sewer and only repeated papal interventions have saved the situation. Roman usage is therefore to be copied by all other churches. Anselm cited Pseudo-Isidore. Nicetas finds this monarchical doctrine too strong. The great patriarchates are 'sisters', among whom Rome has first place and can be appealed to in cases of doubt. But Roman primacy does not antedate the seventh-century decree granted by Phocas to Pope Boniface III (e.g., *Liber Pontificalis* 68). The authority of New Rome is older, determined by the Council of Constantinople in 381. Moreover, without the assent of the Greek bishops in ecumenical councils, the authority of Rome would have been nothing. Nicetas protests; he is not denying Rome's first place among the patriarchates; but 'in asserting monarchy, Rome separated from us.' 'If the Roman pontiff arbitrarily pronounces without consulting us, that is not brotherly... In the creed we confess the universal Church, not the Roman Church.' Anselm replies with an unqualified assertion that the bishop of Rome is vicar of Peter and of Christ. The upholding of orthodox faith in the Greek churches was not, as Nicetas claims, the achievement of Greek bishops but of the popes. The Council of Nicea, he is sure, was summoned wholly on the initiative of Pope Silvester, not Constantine. It is rewriting history when Anselm claims immemorial usage of *azyma* at Rome; the use of leavened bread (*fermentum*) is attested as authorized by Pope Melchiades and Siricius (*Liber Pontificalis* 33, 40). Moreover, Nicetas has verified that Greek monks at Grottaferrata use leavened bread without scandal to the Roman pontiff. Probably the apostles used either leavened or unleavened bread indifferently. Despite the attachments of long custom, Greeks could be willing to take the same view, Nicetas says: "this indifference continued without controversy until the violent invasion of the 'Roman empire' by Charlemagne. From that time dates the Latin use of blasphemous words about leavened bread, and in retort 'we call them heretics and hold no communion with them, saying *azyma* are unworthy of the altar.'"

¹³ Nicetas, tactfully perhaps, does not explain that western error about the Trinity makes at least some Greeks uncertain about the validity of Latin baptism, a problem that will be mentioned in canon 4 of the Lateran Council of 1215. His answer is to deny this is rebaptism but rather is a purification applied when outsiders join Greek society. (The difficulty in distinguishing it from the baptismal rite being so great, it is obvious that most Greek understood the rite as at least a conditional baptism.) In the eyes of Anselm rebaptizing is a heretical Greek practice, inherited from the Arian bishop Eusebius of Nicomedia, who he supposes, 'rebaptized Constantine the Great after Pope Silvester had conferred orthodox baptism at the time of his conversion.' Anselm rewrites fourth-century history to suit his theory.

¹⁴ e.g., bishop Robert Grosseteste in the early thirteenth century, and prominent at the Council of Florence in the brief union of 1439

The Paulicians were a sect of Armenian origin, threatening the eastern provinces of Byzantium ca. 843-879. At this time, the Paulicians had a separate state; its capital, Tephrike. Under Karbeas, and then Chrysocheir, they collaborated with the Muslims, raided as far afield as Nisaea, and sacked Ephesus (869/70). Later Paulician history from state establishment to its destruction by Emperor Basil I and migration of many Paulicians into Syria, southern Italy, and the Balkans is reasonably well known. Syrian Paulicians were deported to the Balkans (970), combining with the Bogomils. Those in Armenia became identified as the Tondrakeci. They ceased to be a threat after the 11th century. Their earlier history, dates, leaders, and the details of their doctrine remain unclear and controversial; Byzantine and Armenian sources differ. Scholars agree the sect was Armenian in origin, the probable precursor of the Tondrakites, that it was violently iconoclastic, that it especially valued the Gospel of Luke and the Pauline Epistles (referring always to the “Gospel and Apostle”). They rejected the Old Testament; there was no Incarnation, Christ was an angel sent into the world by God, his real mother was the heavenly Jerusalem. His work consisted only in his teaching; to believe in him saves men from judgment. The true baptism and Eucharist consist in hearing his word, e.g., John 4:10; thus the Paulicians rejected the sacraments. But many Paulicians, nevertheless, let their children be baptized by the Catholic clergy, but nevertheless considered baptism of the greatest importance, and rejected the authority and sacraments of the official clergy to follow its own leaders and practices.

The Paulicians’ tenets are rather unknown, largely confined to opponents’ reports (e.g., Photios, Peter of Sicily, one *Letter* of Patriarch Theophylactus, Euthymius Zigabenus in *Panoplia Dogmatica*), historians (e.g., Anna Komnena's *Alexiad*), official documents (a short one, the *Paulician Formula*, consisting of 18 anathemas to be pronounced by the abjuring heretic, an indication of the ritual for reception back into the Orthodox community, contains some of the Paulician doctrine and practice, but little historical information) and a few fragments of Sergios' (Sergios-Tychikos, a Paulician leader) letters. Some scholars trace Paulicians in the Greek sources to a succession of leaders, first appearing in Asia Minor (7th century), founding numerous communities, churches and an independent state. Paulicians met persecution here. The Council of Dvin (719) brought on new persecutions of the Armenian Paulicians, but permissive Isaurian emperors allowed them to flourish and even settled them as allies in Thrace. Renewed persecution caused them to side with the Muslims against Byzantium. These scholars see the Paulicians as Dualists (similar to Gnostics), heirs of Manichaeism, adherents to a Docetic Christology thinking the Incarnation was illusory. They were a link in the transmission of these beliefs from the ancient Near East to the Balkan Bogomils and the Cathars of southern France.

The Armenian sources, e.g., the “Key of Truth”¹⁵ differ; they say nothing of later Paulician history under Byzantium. Paulicians, who are considered followers of Bishop Paul of Samosata, should be traced back to at least the 5th century and were “Old Believers” following early Syrian traditions preceding the Armenian church’s hellenization (4th century). Their leaders, none of whom bore the same names as those listed in Greek sources, were thought to have been similarly adopted and were worshiped as Christs. This original Adoptionist Paulicianism survived in Armenia to the 19th century Byzantium. Docetic and Dualist “Neo-Paulicianism” (the Byzantine variant) a secondary, divergent form, developed in the 9th century, probably under Sergios-Tychikos and under the influence of Byzantine Iconoclasm.¹⁶

¹⁵ It advocates: Adoptionist christology; Christ is not of God; Orthodox baptism is of no avail, rebaptism is not necessary; Jesus’ mother was not a virgin; sect members alone are true Christians; other churches’ followers are mere idolators; holy oil, the eucharist, canons, fasts, confession, intercession of saints and images are absolutely rejected)

¹⁶ Nina Garsoïan, *The Paulician Heresy*, Mouton and Company, 1967.

Bogomilism was a dualistic sectarian movement founded in 10th century Bulgaria, presumably by Pop Bogomil (who is mostly reported by Kosmas the Priest). This was Europe's first great dualist church, and flourished in Bulgaria and the Balkans from the 10th century to the 15th century. The followers of Bogomilism are described by Kosmas as "lamb-like, gentle, modest, and silent, and pale from hypocritical fasting. They do not talk idly, nor laugh loudly, nor give themselves airs. They keep from the sign of men, and outwardly they do everything so as not to be distinguished from Orthodox Christians." Bogomilism subsequently spread over the entire Balkan peninsula and parts of Asia Minor (Byzantine lands), exerted a formative influence over the Cathar movement in Italy and France, and proved for five centuries a determined enemy of the Orthodox Church, including the Incarnation. They imposed, at least on a minority of "elect" initiates, an ascetic life that required abstinence from sexual intercourse (especially with those of other faiths), meat, and wine, and—at least in 10th century Bulgaria—preached civil disobedience and subjection to the secular authority. They also did not believe in war or execution of human beings. They believed that they were the only true faith. Most evidence of their teaching and behavior is in the works of their enemies, especially Kosmas the Priest, Anna Komnenos, and Euthymios Zigabenos, though some valuable information is also found in the *Interrogatio Johannis* (or *Liber Secretus*, i.e., "Secret Book"), the only undeniably authentic product of Bogomil Apocrypha.

Originally, the Bogomil doctrines owed much to the teaching of the Paulicians, who lived alongside of them in the Balkans, and although the Bogomils were less aggressive and less warlike in spirit. The Bogomils' creed, adapted from the Paulicians and modified by other Gnostic and Manichaean sources, is attributed to Theophilus or Bogomil, a Bulgarian priest of the 10th cent. The movement was intensely nationalistic and political, as well as religious, and reflected resentment of Byzantine culture, Slavic serfdom, and imperial authority. They vanished due to persecution and the expansion of Islam, but bits of their ideas and folklore persisted for centuries in Slavic lands. Messalianism, with which Bogomilism was frequently identified in the later Middle Ages, was probably used by Orthodox writers of the time as little more than a label for suspect or heretical mystical currents.

In the 11th century, the sect gained ground in Constantinople where, under its leader Basil the Bogomil, it found converts in aristocratic circles. At the behest of Alexios I Komnenos, Euthymios Zigabenos described its doctrines, rules, and ceremonies at considerable length. The spread of the Bogomilism alarmed Alexios I and he ordered the arrest of their leader Basil. After a summary trial he was condemned to death by burning at the stake (ca. 1110). The persecutions of the Bogomils by Alexios I limited their spread within Byzantine territory. In the 12th century, Bogomilism spread in the empire's Slavic provinces (notably in Macedonia) and also in Asia Minor, where in the 13th century, the Nicaean patriarch Germanos II wrote a treatise against them. Despite continued persecution, votaries of Bogomilism scored notable successes in Serbia, Dalmatia, and especially Bosnia, where under the name of Paterenes they later became the dominant religious group. The Paterenes greatly increased in number and influence in Bosnia after the accession to their faith of Ban Kulin, and gained numerous adherents in the neighboring districts of Croatia and Slavonia and in the cities of the Dalmatic coast. At the beginning of the thirteenth century even the Bosnian bishop was an adherent of the Paterines; Pope Gregory IX, therefore, deposed him in 1233. The Franciscans and Dominicans attempted to bring some of the Paterenes back to the Catholic church. After the Turkish conquest (1483) they disappeared from the Balkans (including Bulgaria).

John Italos and the 1082 Synod; Rationalism and Scholasticism

The main facts of his biography from Anna Comnena and from the records of his trial for impiety under Alexios I. He studied at Constantinople under various teachers, including Michael Psellos, and enjoyed the patronage of Michael VII. Anna says that he betrayed imperial interests, but his delinquency cannot have been too serious, since he subsequently returned to Constantinople to take up an important teaching position, succeeding Psellos as "consul of the philosophers" in the office of the Ὑπατος του φιλοσοφου in the University of Constantinople. Influenced by the works of Aristotle, Plato and of the Neoplatonics, Italos began teaching questionable dogma. Although his teaching provoked Patriarch Kosmas' official enquiry, he was not dismissed or silenced. Evidently he was appointed to ecclesiastical office (which has been entirely overlooked by Byzantinists). A diatribe (1116) against one of Italos' pupils, Eustratios of Nicaea, says that Eustratios was taught by "John, the former chartophylax of Antioch the Great". When the appointment occurred is not clear; nevertheless, the discovery of the connection with Antioch adds a new dimension to Italos' personality, particularly in the light of the trading connection maintained by his fellow Italian Pantaleone of Amalfi. He also had great interest in other cultures.¹⁷ The court milieu seems to have been receptive to men of wealth and talent from southern Italy and northern Syria, and promoted contacts between them. However, the terms and the context in which Anna refers to Italos and Symeon Seth suggest that outsiders were likely to be regarded by the native Constantinopolitans (who ran the bureaucracies of church and state and the great monasteries of the Byzantine world) as undesirable aliens, along with the barbarian "Franks". The exclusive sense of Hellenic cultural identity and Orthodox religious identity which Anna expresses in her *Alexiad* had deep roots, clearly visible a century earlier, in Michael Psellos' cultural and metropolitan snobbery, and in the increasingly confrontational attitudes towards the Armenians and the Latins that were surfacing in some clerical and monastic circles - the same that disapproved of Italos, and Alexios wanted to impress by bringing Italos to trial.

This fact provoked the reaction of the ecclesiastic cycles that gradually became so acute that in 1082 Alexios indicted the Italian in an ecclesiastic tribunal. Italos was charged for several heresies and despite the fact that in most cases he was in position to refute the charges attributed to him, his teachings was convicted and anathematized. The anathemas proclaimed against him at this trial were incorporated into the *Synodikon of Orthodoxy*: "Those who prefer the folly of the so-called wisdom of the profane [pagan] philosophers and follow their teachers and accept the migrations of human souls or that they are destroyed like the souls of the animals and return to nothingness and on account of this deny the resurrection, judgement, and final retribution of the acts of their lives, anathema." His teaching was condemned and anathematized, a victory for the monastic/conservative party. It seems there were dominant anti-Latin feelings at that time in

¹⁷ According to Psellos, Italos one time hit back at his critics, composing a speech in which he lamented the fact that the Greek wisdom had migrated to the eastern barbarians, "to the Assyrians and Medes and Egyptians". This was not just a deft rhetorical rejoinder to the accusation of being a western barbarian; it was a common among Arab intellectuals of the tenth and eleventh centuries, which Italos would have encountered in his contacts with easterners who came to Constantinople to study with Psellos and seek patronage at the imperial court. We know two of these men, the Egyptian astrologer Eleutherios Zebelenos, and the philosopher Symeon Seth, who wrote two treatises on astronomy and one on diet, all dedicated to Michael VII. Later, at the request of Alexios I, he translated the Indian fable *Kalila wa Dimna* from Arabic to Greek as Stephanites and Ichnelates, and according to Anna, he accurately predicted by astrology the date of Robert Guiscard's death. Although very learned in Greek philosophy, his knowledge of Arabic and his surname would seem to indicate a Semitic origin. The heading of his treatise on diet calls him "Antiochene", which suggests that he may have been a native Syriac speaker.

Byzantium. However, they also show the keen interest of his contemporaries for the several philosophical problems in which the Byzantines were interested.¹⁸

The council was originally convened regarding John Italos, but also condemned those who seek to discover exactly how the Word was joined to His human substance, and how the latter was deified; those who introduce Greek doctrines of the soul, heaven, earth, and creation into the church; those who teach *metempsychosis* or the destruction of the soul after death those who say that ideas or matter are co-eternal with God, and those who say that creation is eternal or immutable; those who honor, or who believe that God will honor, Greek philosophers or heresiarchs who taught error above the Fathers of the councils who held to the truth, though these latter may have sinned through passion or ignorance; those who do not accept the miracles of Christ, the Theotokos, and all his saints; those who think Greek philosophy true and try to convert the faithful to their opinions; those who teach that creation is the necessary result of the participation of matter in the ideas, and not the result of God's free will; those who say that it is impossible that we will rise to judgment in these same bodies; the pre-existence of souls; those who deny that creation is created *ex nihilo*; those who say that hell is temporary or that all of creation will be restored; and those who understand the Kingdom of Heaven to be temporary; and all of John Italos' doctrines introduced in opposition to the Orthodox faith.¹⁹

¹⁸ The problem of 'profane wisdom' and Hellenism and their relationship with theology would resurface again and again in Byzantium: e.g., with Michael Psellos (1018-c.1081) and John Italos (c.1025-c.1082), with Barlaam the Calabrian (c.1290-1348), and Byzantine Thomism.

¹⁹ <http://test.ots.utoronto.ca/users/sinkewicz/Italos-Trial.html>

Alexios I Komnenos convened the synod of 1092/1094 in Blachernai in order to resolve the case of Leo of Chalcedon, icons and dedications. Nicolas of Adrianople is a major figure. This is recorded in Anna Komnena's *Alexiad* (Book V) and the minutes of the council. The chronology of the synod is obscure. Some scholars date it in 1092, others at the end of 1094. One scholar dates it to the beginning of 1095. Basil II's innovation of the *charistike*, a state program for the private renovation and financial exploitation of the empire's existing stock of private religious foundations. *Charistike (dorea)* was the donation of monasteries to private individuals for a limited period of time in order to repair, conserve and utilize their immovable property, as well as to protect and preserve their monasterial character. Those favored by this *charistike* were called *charistikarioi* (the emperor, patriarchs, metropolitans, monastery founders and the state's high-ranking officers). Inevitably, the new owners (*charistekarioi*) misappropriated donations and the institutions and made profits from the revenues derived from the administration of the monasterial economy for themselves instead of monastery beautification, abandoning the institutions. During the Komnenean dynasty and especially during Manuel's reign, concessions of state land from the emperors to their subjects increased. This happened within the framework of more general concessions and privileges, characteristic of Komnenian policies in the economic sector. The land concession occurred by means of either older institutions that were more frequently in this period, or those appearing for the first time: *charistike dorea* (gift of grace) and *pronoia*. The *charistike dorea* consisted of a "conditional" concession of several ecclesiastic establishments along with their economic means, to ecclesiastic or secular people. These establishments were monasteries, charitable establishments and other property belonging to the Patriarchate, Emperor or state, being separate *sekreta*. This concession's initial intention was to improve the way monasteries were run along with improving their economic situation. However, these concessions quickly discriminated, being granted to those the emperors and patriarchs favored, and ceased to be advantageous to the establishments themselves.

Alexios had been appropriating *charistike* (and melting down icons) due to the dire financial situation in the 1070's and 1080's and this drew criticism, and thus required reform. Leo of Chalcedon, a prelate who, between 1081 and 1091 opposed the secularization and the melting down of church treasures by Alexios. Leo's opposition forced Alexios to temporarily back down (1082). Resumption of confiscations and the leniency of the patriarch and the bishops toward imperial policies led Leo to break communion with the patriarchate (1084). In 1086, the synod indicted and deposed him, exiling him to Sozopolis in Pontos. Alexios published a decree (*semeioma*) justifying the secularization. Canon law revealed it was permissible to use church treasures to redeem captives. The number of items was very small, and had not been used in the liturgy for some time, and their being left to one side had given rise to sacrilegious robbery and impiety. Eventually, Leo was reconciled at the 1092 council. The conciliar debates involved the decree of the Second Council of Nicaea (787) about worship (*latreia*) due to God alone, and relative veneration (*proskynesis schetike*) due to images. The veneration was seen as ultimately directed to the 'prototypes,' not the materials out of which images were made. Leo maintained, however, that a secular use of the material was equivalent to blasphemous disrespect for the image, and therefore the prototype. By assuming a body, the Logos had assumed a "form," represented materially on an icon. The "form" was thus integrated in his divine person. The council agreed that the unity between Christ and his image is only relative, i.e. homonymic, according to the word of Theodore the Studite. Leo finally accepted the position that since "worship" was not addressed to the material image, along with the council, in 'perfect agreement', and the urgent needs of the state could be met at the expense of church treasures.

A synod of Constantinople was summoned in Blachernai in 1156 and 1157 regarding Basil and Soterichos Panteugenos. There was doctrinal controversy over the implications of John Chrysostom's liturgy for the Eucharist, "Thou art He who offers and is offered and receives". The deacon Basil (i.e., the scholar Nikephoros Basilakes, διδασκαλος την ἐπιστολην), who held the teaching chair of the Gospels, interpreted this to mean Christ was both at once donor and recipient of the sacrifice. To Basil's enemies (namely, Michael, μαιστωρ τῶν ῥητορων) this divided Christ's natures too radically in the manner of the Nestorianism. Constantine IV Chliarenus, patriarch of Constantinople and Russia, presided the council in Constantinople of 22 Metropolitans on 26Jan 1156, dealing with the question whether Christ offered himself on the cross to himself, or to the Father and to the Holy Spirit (since the Trinity is indivisible). In the end a compromise formula was adopted by the synod through its spokesman, Nicholas of Methone: the Word made flesh offered a double sacrifice to the Holy Trinity on the cross and in the Eucharist (which were the one and the same), despite the patriarch of Antioch-elect/deacon Soterichos insisting the sacrifice was made to the Father alone, since the son cannot sacrifice to himself, only to the Father. The council reasoned that the redemptive or "economic" activity of God, of which Christ's oblation was the expression, was a Trinitarian action involving all 3 persons. The council (quoting the liturgical formula of the *Cheroubikon*) argued because of the single hypostatic union of Christ, the Logos both "offers and is offered, receives and is received." Basil sided with Soterichos and wrote a defense (*apologia*) of the disputed dialogue. On 12May 1157, 38 Metropolitans gathered at the Blachernai palace under the presidency of the Emperor Manuel I, reaffirming the previous synod: Christ in his humanity is the donor of the sacrifice and sacrifices himself; the entire Trinity receives, in accordance with the Fathers. Soterichos gave his opinion that the Son sacrifices himself, and the Father accepts the victim. Manuel tried to compel Soterichos, threatening to write an anathema; Basil and Soterichos recanted. The council condemned those who say Christ offered his sacrifice to the Father alone, and not to himself and to the Holy Spirit; those who deny that the daily sacrifice of the priests of the Church is to the Holy Trinity; those who say the sacrifice of the Divine Liturgy is only figuratively the sacrifice of Christ's body and blood; those who deny that the sacrifice in the Liturgy is one and the same as that of Christ on the cross; those who say men were reconciled to the Son through the incarnation and to the Father through the passion; those who think the deification of Christ's humanity destroyed his human nature; those who deny that his deified human nature is worthy of worship; those who deny that Christ reconciled us to Himself though the entire mystery of the economy, and so reconciled us to all of the Holy Trinity, but say instead that we were reconciled to the Son through the incarnation and to the Father through the passion; those who misunderstand and twist the teachings of the Church and Fathers (4th and 6th Ecumenical councils, Athanasius, Cyril, Ambrose, Amphilochius, and Leo of Old Rome); those who think the deification of Christ's humanity destroyed his human nature; those who deny that his deified human nature is worthy of worship; those who say that, since the human nature of Christ was swallowed up into Divinity, his passion was an illusion; those who say that characteristics of Christ's human nature (creaturehood, circumscription, mortality, and blameless passions) exist only hypothetically, when one considers Christ's human nature in abstraction, and not really and truly. Additionally they anathematized the person and the writings of Soterichos, based on an arrangement by the emperor and in agreement by the patriarchs (since Soterichos was not present at the end to defend himself). These are recorded in the *Synodikon of Orthodoxy*. In Aug./Sep. 1157, the new Patriarch Lukas Chrysoberges (1157-1169/1170) signed the synodal tomos against Soterichos Penteugenos.

Emperor Manuel I Komnenos called a council in 1166, involving several meetings, over Constantine the Bulgarian, former Corfu metropolitan, based on his John 14:28 reading, "My Father is greater than I" which Constantine used to refer only to Christ's human nature, taken in abstraction. The origins lie in the active political and ideological relations with the West during Manuel's reign. His ambassador, Demetrios of Phrygian Lampe, a would-be theologian, introduced this controversy in Byzantium (c. 1160) after discussing the question with Western theologians during his missions to Italy and Germany. The Latins held the Son was both less than and equal to the Father. This was an old problem involving human and divine natures of Christ and the hypostatic union. In Constantinople were varying shades of interpretation. Demetrios witnessed the controversy over this scripture in the West, and thought the formula arrived at (Christ was equal to the Father with regard to his Divinity yet inferior with regard to his Manhood) was nonsensical. However, Manuel, perhaps with an eye on the project for Church union, found the formula made sense and was strongly pro-Latin; he also had Italians in his service. Hugh Etherianus of Pisa, a western adviser of Manuel, was involved in the dispute and in the ensuing debates he put the Latin view. Manuel sent for Demetrios but failed to win him over. Demetrios, who had considerable support, tried to counter Manuel's efforts by defiantly circulating a written defence of his position. The controversy roused much discussion among the City's theologians; the majority, moved by anti-Latin feeling as well as by doctrinal arguments, opposed Manuel. Manuel approached the divided episcopate, privately interviewing bishops suspected of supporting Demetrios individually but without result. Hearing that the dissident bishops were banding together against him, he resorted to the synod. Manuel prevailed over a majority in a synod convened to decide the issue (1166); the patriarch Luke Chrysoberges supported him. In the debate, the opposition argued that the Son could not be inferior to the Father because Christ's humanity had been deified and was thus "one" with his divinity. The council found this interpretation close to Monophysitism and unacceptable. Specifically, the reality of Christ's humanity, as concrete humanity—"created and mortal"—was inferior to God. The hypostatic union of Christ's 2 natures (defined by the Council of Chalcedon) did not erase the differences between Christ's humanity and divinity; his divinity was greater. Likewise, in Trinitarian theology proper, the Father was considered "greater" than the Son inasmuch as he is hypostatically the unique cause (*principium divinitatis*) of both the Son and the Spirit. As a result of his Caesaropapist stance Manuel became known as *epistemonarches*, the Church's "Chief scientific expert". The council declared the Fathers use such an abstraction only to explain statements implying servitude or ignorance, and explain the statement "My father is greater than I" in various ways, one of which, the statement refers to the fact Christ's human nature retained its properties in the hypostatic union and that these words referred to the human nature. Finally, the council also found these 3 interpretations unacceptable: 1) the Johannine text separated intellectually Christ's human from his divine nature; 2) it underlined his kenosis, or condescensions, during the Incarnation; and 3) it indicated his position (due to his shared humanity) as God's favored Son. A statement confirming Manuel's position was drawn up, and the council's condemnation of the opposition was subsequently inserted in the Synodikon of Orthodoxy. Anyone maintaining Christ's suffering as fantasy was anathematized. It acclaimed those who held the human nature of Christ by reason of the hypostatic union remained inseparable from God the Word and received like honor and adoration. This council's problems continued to be discussed during the session of Feb. 1170. The council anathematized Constantine the Bulgarian, anyone else who agreed with Constantine, and John Irenicus of Claudiopolis, who held the same view. These anathemas are included in the *Syndikon of Orthodoxy*.

Alexios I called a synod on 11 April 1117 in regards to Eustratios of Nicaea. Eustratios had been a pupil of John Italos, but he had specifically dissociated himself from the heretical views ascribed to Italos. But like Italos he used Proclus and the other neoplatonists. He was a commentator on Aristotle, on *Nicomachean Ethics* and the 2nd book of the *Analytics*. Eustratios proclaimed the importance of logic for theology: even Christ, he wrote, argued with the help of Aristotelian syllogisms. Eustratios developed the concept of the *universalia* as pure "names," whereas he regarded only the individual as existing. According to Eustratios, stressing the limitations of art, asserted the artist could not present the substance, but only the appearance of men and animals, heavenly beings, e.g. angels, could be painted only symbolically. As a leading theologian with anti-Latin views, he was part of the Constantinople discussions with Peter Grossolanus (1112) on the topics of *filioque* and *azymes*. In response to Alexios' request (probably because Alexios was impressed by Grossolanus), he set out to write on the two natures of Christ using dialectic--Anna remarked he prided himself on his use of this method even more than those who frequented the Stoa and Academy.²⁰ In dealing with this sensitive issue he laid himself open to the charge of unorthodoxy and Nestorianism (he distinguished too much between θεσει and φυσει, although his terminology was imprecise)--the Armenians and the Orthodox found his views unacceptable. Eustratios himself appeared to have said his two writings on this subject (some of which was to battle Armenian monophysitism, e.g., against Tigranes the Armenian) were circulated by his enemies in an unrevised draft unknown to him (perhaps stolen or copied from him) and he admitted he had once been led astray by pseudo-Cyrillic work. Nicetas, metropolitan of Herakleia set out the case against Eustratios at length. Despite Alexios' efforts, the charge was pressed and came before the synod in 1117. Opinions were divided and Eustratios' opponents only just got their condemnation through; Seides accused Eustratios of Nicaea of "atheism." Eustratios was accused of heresy: the major charge alleged was his sharp distinction between the divine Logos and Christ incarnated as a slave. (Eustratios seems to have claimed that the divinity of Christ, the Logos, the divine servant, is subordinated to the human, and therefore the human can attain perfection.) Eustratios offered to correct his books if possible, and destroy them if not. A 2nd session, held on 26 April 1117, was held without the emperor to discuss the appropriate penance. The Patriarch John IX Agapetos urged *oeconomia* and *philanthropia*, suggesting the minimum: the retention of rank but suspension of office until the synod should decide otherwise. Considerable animosity was shown in the discussions which ensued, some urging the insertion of Eustratios' name in the Syndikon as a heretic, some even wishing to break off communion with the Patriarch and with those bishops speaking on Eustratios' behalf. Although Alexios and Patriarch John tried to rescue Eustratios, he was condemned and forced to abdicate, despite his assertion that the accusation was based on unfinished drafts stolen from him. Contrary to the hopes of Alexios and John, those who vigorously opposed the use of dialectic in considering doctrinal questions won. Eustratios was suspended for life. It would appear Eustratios' opponents were moved by animosity not towards him, but towards his friend and champion, Alexios. The chartophylax was to keep synod's record so that the rejection of such errors remained always manifest. Anyone who had Eustratios' writings was to present them within 30 days of the council to the Great Church to be burned; whoever kept or hid them would be punished by the civil laws and the ecclesiastical rules.

Rehabilitated after his death, Eustratios was cited as an authority at the council of 1157.

²⁰ As Patriarch John IX Agapetos was to point out in defence of Eustratios that it was all too easy to fall into doctrinal error. In addition, Eustratios also appeared to have been caught up in cross-currents of jealousy and conflicting interests, while his friendship with Alexios was a hindrance rather than a help.

(I believe you wanted the 1117 Council that condemned Eustratios of Nicea in the syllabus, although this is listed as 1175. In the handout on the last day of class, you did put down an entry for the 1170/1171 council, so I will list it here.)

The 1170/1171 Endemousa Synod witnessed a debate/dialogue between Emperor Manuel I Komnenos (1143-1180) and the Patriarch Michael III Anchialos (1170-1178) on the reunion between the East and the West. Manuel had already concluded alliances with Pisa and Genoa. The emperor supported the papal claims, but the Patriarch snubbed Manuel and put down the union negotiations between Manuel with Rome by winning the synod to his opinions, and then deftly getting them to declare anathemas. These were written into a Synodal *Tomos*.

A council met in 1199/1200 under the Patriarch Joannes X Kamateros of Constantinople, regarding Michael (Myron) Sykidites (or Sykidites), who is said to be identical with Michael Glykas. In his theses, he broached the question of the corruptibility (τὸν φθαρτὸν) of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist, the divine mysteries, and he also refuted a certain bishop of Paphos (named Bacchus, according to Nicetas Choniates); this threw the church into some confusion. The emperor, concerned with the peace of the church, with the agreement of the Patriarch and the synod, anathemized and condemned Myron Sykidites and his writings (nobody was to read them to see his opinions or to discuss them) and that one should refer back to the articles of faith, which read in the Sunday of Orthodoxy, neither adding or subtracting anything in word nor in idea. Sykidites was probably reacting to the 1156/1157 councils which condemned Soterichos Panteugenos, as these were again reiterated here in the first anathema: τοῖς ἀκούουσι μὲν τοῦ Σωτῆρος condemns those which say that the daily sacrifice of the Christians in the Eucharist is not the true sacrifice of the body and the blood of Jesus Christ, but is only the image of that of the cross. In other words, the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross did not only involve his body and blood, but his entire humanity, body, soul, and everything, and that the bread and the wine of the Eucharist are not changed into the dead but the risen body and blood of Christ, and that in the Eucharist, the faithful do not partake of the whole incorruptible and risen body of Christ. The second anathema: Τοῖς τὰς χρονικὰς διαστάσεις... condemns those which put intervals in the reconciliation of mankind with the Trinity, by saying that man was initially reconciled with the Word by the Incarnation, and then with the Father by the passion of Christ on the cross. In other words, the reconciliation of the human race with the Trinity was achieved not contemporaneously. And it was ordered that whoever would not conform to this decree would be punished, if it is in the orders, deposition, and, if he is laity, confiscation of his goods and loss of his dignity (of the confiscation of its goods and corporeal punishment: Nicetas Choniates). Michael Autoreianos, chartophylax of the Great Church, states to have, on the order of the emperor, established this *semeiosis* (document) and to have it and the indictment read in the following months.

The Greek government center moved with the patriarchate to Nicaea. Western profiteering adventurers saw Eastern weakness and low morale and desired to capture more of the old empire. The emperor John III Vatatzes calculated his remaining empire's survival depended on restoration of Roman communion, to deprive warlike Normans of motive for further hostilities. Patriarch Germanos' letter to Pope Gregory IX invited the pope to send legates for discussion and correction of mistakes. The pope sent 2 Franciscans and 2 Dominicans, arriving at Nicaea on 15Jan. 1234.²¹ The Greek speakers were two laymen, Demetrios Karykes (the "consul of philosophers") and the young Nikephorus Blemmydes. The legates explained their commission was not to debate doubtful matters but rather to deal with Greek doubts, conversing amicably. In Rome's faith and practice, nothing was open to review or question. Divinely defined (papal) doctrines required obedience, not discussion. The western aim: invite Greek churches to submit to papal authority, as they once did. Central questions were whether the *filioque* and *azymes* constituted reasons for withholding obedience. Westerners wanted *azyma* to be taken first, on 19Jan, in the emperor's palace, but Greeks insisted the primary issue was the *filioque*. The old infirm patriarch awkwardly asked if some addition had been made to the creed, quoting Cyril of Alexandria's insistence on no addition to the Nicene Creed. For the westerners, Cyril constituted no authority; besides, they did not alter the faith and where could the Greeks find authority for their statement the Spirit does not proceed from the Son, which really is an addition to Nicea? When the Creed of Constantinople (381) was read, the Latins observed this creed added to Nicea (325), a very embarrassing point to Greek spokesmen until they conceded it was not an addition insofar as it was expressing the truth. The legates quoted Cyril and other texts supporting the *filioque*. Vatatzes deplored resort to syllogisms in stating articles of faith. On 24Jan., the Greeks made their case in a complex document; from Blemmydes' autobiography (at heart favorable to union), he was certainly the author of the Greek document. He reviewed the Latin arguments for the *filioque*, which was not supported by consubstantiality of the Spirit and Son, for the Father is also consubstantial. Nor, on the ground that the Son sends the Spirit upon the creaturely order. Yet the scripture speaks of the Spirit as being 'of the Son,' and in the Latin view, that must mean that the Spirit proceeds from both Father and Son. Blemmydes thought the Latin arguments wholly unpersuasive. From first principles one cannot deploy logical argument. Christ said, without syllogism, the Spirit proceeds from the Father. However, this authoritative utterance is also logically coherent. Blemmydes deploys his clear comprehension of Aristotelian logic. But the crux of his argument is with the Latin *filioque* the Son shares with the Father in the origination of the Spirit's procession, and that loses the individuality of the hypostases in the holy Trinity. In the divine Triad, the Monad is not prior to the threeness: i.e., not first Monad then a Dyad, and finally a Triad. The Latins makes the first principle a dyad. Discussion on the *filioque* came to a halt, and the *azymes* fared no better. Germanos then invited the friars to Nymphaion (east of Smyrna), where the Greek emperors had a palace. Again, discussions of *azymes* and *filioque* came to a deadlock, although Vatatzes offered a compromise: perhaps Latins could drop the *filioque*, and Greeks accept the validity of *azyma*. The legates declined: the Greeks must make a formal declaration that *azyma* are as valid as leavened bread and confess the *filioque*. The meeting ended with each side condemning for heresy; the case of the *filioque* and *azyma* rested ultimately on the Roman see, which implied an ecclesiology which the Greek east did not share. In 1245, a council at Lyons described Vatatzes as 'the enemy of God.' This council produced a treatise on the *filioque*. Failure in this negotiation (neither side yielded on crucial issues) resulted in the acknowledgement that there was a schism between the West and the East.

²¹ We owe to one of the four a vivid and impassioned account of their experiences.

Pope Gregory X convened the second Synod of Lyons (1 or 7May-17July 1274, which Rome views as the 14th Ecumenical Council) to establish the Union of the Churches and liberation of the Holy Land, with a threefold purpose: "to deal with the withdrawal of the people of the Greeks ... from devotion and obedience to the Holy See, with the complete overwhelming and fearsome destruction of the Holy Land, and with the decadence of morals." The second was the most important for Gregory; union with the Greeks, while good in itself, was for him more a means than an end. It would enormously facilitate a grand crusade. Pope Gregory, like his predecessors, negotiated with the Greek emperor, not with the church, because overtures for parleys always came from the emperor. Unfortunately for Michael Palaeologus, a great part of the Greek Church was already hostile to him for his treatment of the boy John Lascaris and of Patriarch Arsenios. This "union" was little more than the consummation of a political deal between Gregory and Emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos. Political more than religious considerations motivated the negotiations for union between the Komnenian and Palaiologan periods. The Palaiologos dynasty particularly needed military aid to fight the Turks. The papacy, realizing this, demanded total ecclesiastical submission of the Byzantine church in return for military assistance. Unconditional union—not a negotiated settlement—was to precede military aid. Rome was to receive the ecclesiastical submission of the Byzantine church, while in return, Michael was to be rid of Charles I of Anjou and his threat to reconquer Constantinople. The delegates announced the Greek emperor's full acceptance of the Latin creed, including the *filioque* and papal primacy; Michael submitted under the spiritual yoke of the pope. The Apostles' Creed was sung in Greek and Latin. Michael's 3 formally accredited representatives arrived after the council opened (1May), but after their arrival, in the fourth session, on 6July, Michael's letter *Quoniam missi sunt* was read to the pope, containing the required profession of faith and explicit acceptance of the *filioque*: "We believe too in the Holy Spirit, full, perfect and true God, proceeding from the Father and the Son..."—and of the doctrine of purgatory, *azymes* in the eucharist and the Rome's 'supreme and full primacy over the entire church.' (Thus the Council of Lyons first pronounced *filioque* as dogma.) No effective discussion between Greeks and Latins occurred. At a papal mass (29June), Germanos (former Patriarch of Constantinople) and Bishop Theophanes of Nicaea recited the Nicene Creed with the *filioque* devoutly and solemnly, repeating the *filioque* 3 times to ensure they were heard. On 6July the emperor's representative, George Akropolites, after reading the emperor's profession of faith and the letter from the Greek Church leaders, formally pledged the schism's end and the recognition of papal primacy. In the *Constitution on the Procession of the Holy Spirit* was the statement, "We confess that the Holy Spirit proceeds eternally from the Father and the Son, not as from two principles, but as from one; not by two spirations but by one." The Byzantine church, strictly speaking, was never a participant in the negotiations. The council's Byzantine members simply acknowledged a profession of faith previously signed by the emperor alone. Papal delegates were sent to Constantinople to consummate the union, but the Greek clergy rejected the agreement. The emperor was probably more concerned for the permanency of the Greek occupation of Constantinople than for the ecclesiastical union of the East and the West upon which the hearts of popes had been set so long. Predictably, most of the Byzantine population actively opposed the union. Patriarch Joseph retired and John XI Bekkos replaced him (imposed by Michael as Union patriarch), working with Michael to ensure adherence; despite Michael's ruthless persecution, the union was widely and determinedly resisted from all sections of society including monks, laity, and clergy, Arsenites (for religious but also for dynastic reasons), and even members of the imperial family, and eventually failed. Equally hostile were the separatist

Greek states, Serbia, and Bulgaria, to which the emperor's own anti-Unionist sister had fled. These regions quickly became centers of anti-Unionist propaganda. Resistance hardened when Pope Nicolas III (1277-80) tried to impose liturgical use of the *filioque* on the Byzantines. The failure of union led Pope Martin IV to excommunicate Michael VIII (1281). Michael died (1282), Bekkos was forced into retirement by the new Emperor Andronicus II, and the aged Joseph I returned to the Patriarch throne. Joseph soon degraded Bekkos and his unionist supporters, including Theophanes of Nicea. Still, the settlement survived until Michael's death, when Patriarch Gregory II officially repudiated it at the 1285 Council of Constantinople, which culminated a series of synods. Lyons is a dramatic case not only of the limitations of Byzantine imperial influence over religious policy, but of the rigidity of papal diplomacy.

Other important matters before the council were the rule for electing a pope, and the reception of a delegation of Mongols who sought to effect a union against the Mohammedans. Several members of the delegation received baptism. The decree of the Fourth Lateran Council, prohibiting new religious orders, was reaffirmed.

Patriarch Gregory II presided the Synod of Blachernai/Constantinople (5Feb-Aug 1285), also known also as the unionist trials. This council was convoked to decide whether the *filioque* clause (“from the Son”) was equivalent to the patristic phrase “through the Son” advocated by the Unionist ex-patriarch John XI Bekkos, who held the hypostatic existence or procession of the Spirit was διὰ “through” or ἐκ “from” the Son. Before Patriarch Gregory, Patriarch Athanasius of Alexandria, the Emperor with his senate, the Great Logothete, clerics and eminent layment, Bekkos, with Constantine Meliteniotes and George Metochites, was to answer a charge of heresy (later writings show how passionately he resented this); Bekkos deliberately provoked this confrontation in order to publicly vindicate the orthodoxy of his beliefs, which in the travesty of the 1283 trial had been unable to do. All three of the accused openly professed acceptance of the *filioque*, quoting John of Damascus' words “the Father is the emitter or producer, through the Word of the revealing Spirit,” where “emitter” manifestly means “cause.” The Chartophylax George Moschabar, declared the words spurious. The Great Logothete, Theodore of Muzalon, who was conducting the trial, rebuked him and, to rebut the unionists’ conclusion, he claimed that in the quotation “emitter” in respect of the Father certainly means “cause,” but in respect of the Son, only “revealer.” Bekkos pilloried him for giving the same word in the same context two different meanings and continued, daring his accusers to reject the phrase “Through the Son,” which was approved by the Fathers and the seventh council, and telling the Emperor he would never achieve his hoped-for ecclesiastical harmony as long as Gregory was patriarch. After 4 sessions in which opponents could find no answer to Bekkos' arguments, the trial was postponed 6 months. Athanasius tamely ended the embarrassing ordeal in the last session of July by declaring that dogma should not be debated. For confounding the synod Bekkos with his 2 companions were relegated, this time without any pension from the Emperor, to an isolated fortress of St. Gregory in the bay of Nicomedia off Bithynia, guarded by ferocious Celts.

The council pronounced this unacceptable, for the Spirit’s eternal mode of origin is an act of the hypostasis of the Father and not of the essence. Rather than revealing the Spirit’s personal procession, the phrase “through the Son” simply refers to the Spirit’s energetic, eternal manifestation by the Son—an activity common to all 3 divine persons (from the Tomos of the Synod). Only in this sense is the Spirit said to proceed through or even from the Son (*ex patre filioque*). Gregory also proposed that by this phrase the Father is said to be the emitter, not of the being of the Spirit, but only of his eternal revealing. (i.e., denying that the Father caused the Holy Spirit through the Son in the sense that the Holy Spirit received its existence from the Son as well as from the Father. Therefore the Spirit could not ‘proceed’, or get its existence, from both the Father and Son, but was eternally revealed or manifested through the Son.) Besides condemning Bekkos, the assembly formally repudiated the Council of Lyons (1274). Although several ecclesiastics subsequently opposed the synodal Tomos of 1285 (partly fearing another purge if it should turn out to be unorthodox, partly in disapproval of a non-Arsenite patriarch.), penned by Gregory himself, the church never altered or rejected it. Thus it holds a permanent place in Orthodox tradition. The council is of major importance as the only official conciliar reaction of Byzantine to the *filioque*. It should be noted that the same distinctions among energy, hypostasis, and substance, which Gregory made and the council endorsed, were later elaborated and developed by Gregory Palamas. The minutes of the council and the synodal Tome clarified the Orthodox doctrine of the procession of the Spirit in this way:

“It is recognised that the very Paraclete shines and manifests Himself eternally by the intermediary of the Son, as light shines from the sun by the intermediary of rays ...; but that does not mean that He comes into being through the Son or from the Son.”

The Council/Synod of Ferrara-Florence was opened at Ferrara (1438-1439) and was transferred to Florence on account of the Plague. Viewed by Rome as ecumenical, the council aimed at the union of the churches. Its convocation was a concession to the Byzantines, since Rome had previously refused to accept their demands for a free and open council in which both parties would be treated as equals. All the same, East-West antagonism remained. The papacy looked with contempt on the ruined Byzantine Empire and strove for the political subordination of the Greek church, while traditional Byzantine distrust of and frustration and disillusion with the West were very much alive. Besides, the atmosphere was politically conditioned from the beginning. The large Byzantine delegation (including patriarch of Constantinople, Joseph II, and Emperor John VIII Palaiologos) was also seeking military aid against the Turks. The Second Council of Lyons failed to reunite the Greek and Latin churches, but throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the Byzantine emperors renewed contact several times with the papacy. When the Greeks arrived in Ferrara in March 1438, the pope having formally opened the council in January, delicate concessions accommodated the sharply different Latin and Greek notions of protocol. Weak as he was, Patriarch Joseph II of Constantinople refused absolutely to kneel to the pope or kiss his foot. Nonetheless, the seating arrangements were papalist: the patriarch was placed opposite the senior cardinals, while the pope's seat was elevated above that of the emperor, whose throne faced that of the conveniently absent Western emperor. John VIII preserved his dignity by ensuring his feet did not touch the floor as he approached the throne.

Despite the council's prolonged deliberations on the controversial issues—papal primacy, the *filioque* clause, purgatory (at the union councils of Lyons in 1274 and this one, the question concerning a third place was likewise ignored, that is to say, it remained open), *azymes* (leavened [*artos*] vs. unleavened bread [*azymon*])—genuine unity was not achieved. For the first four months, preliminary discussions were committed to a small group of delegates; then public sessions took up the issues.

A session in June dealt inconclusively with purgatory. In October, the council took up the *filioque*, at first debating the legitimacy of the addition. It soon became evident there was a problem of mutual understanding. Few delegates on either side had a sound working knowledge of the other. By mid-December, talk of plague in Ferrara gave Pope Eugene IV the opportunity to reconvene the council in Florence. He was bearing the entire costs of the Greek delegation, and the council was rapidly becoming a financial embarrassment. The Greeks feared an Ottoman attack in Constantinople and were sensitive to living on papal subventions. Despite their grand titles, many of the Greeks were poor. The reconvened council moved more rapidly, the emperor browbeating his delegates into agreement, the Latins arguing forcefully and convincing some who, like Bessarion and Isidore of Kiev, were sympathetic to their approach. On 5 July 1439, the decree *Laetentur Caeli* was signed by all the Greek hierarchs except Mark of Ephesus, and then by the Latins. On the sixth it was solemnly read in Latin and Greek in the duomo. By that time the decree was promulgated, Patriarch Joseph II had died.

The decree proclaims that 'the Holy Spirit is eternally from the Father and the Son' (*Decree for the Jacobites* "The Father is not begotten; the Son is begotten of the Father; the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son") though it adds qualifications to make the decree more accommodating to the Greek sensibilities. It confirms that both leavened and unleavened bread can be used in the eucharist and that a priest should follow the custom of his own church in the matter. It teaches the doctrine of post-mortem purgation by means of *poenis purgatoriis* (purifying punishments) of those who have died 'truly penitent and in the love of God,' and teaches the value of prayers, masses, and intercessions on their behalf. Using the exact words

contained in the profession of faith of Michael VII at Lyons, it affirms that 'the souls of those who die in actual mortal sin or only original sin, forthwith descend to hell, to be punished, however *poenis ... disparibus* [with unequal punishments].'²²

The decree defines the papal primacy in what appears at first to be unambiguous terms: 'true Vicar of Christ, head of the entire Church, Father and Teacher of all Christians ... and that the full power of shepherding, ruling, and governing the universal church was handed to him in Blessed Peter.' There follows, however, a clause in the Latin text that makes the definition mean very different things depending on how one reads its first word, *quemadmodum*, and what one assumes the sacred canons are to which it refers: 'in the manner, moreover, that it is contained in the acts of the ecumenical councils and in the sacred canons'; or is it 'just as, furthermore, it is contained...'; and are the sacred canons those acknowledged by the universal church or the Latin canons?

A further clause of the decree affirms the now traditional order of the patriarchate *salvis videlicet privilegiis omnibus et juribus eorum*. Again, the clause is susceptible of very different interpretations, to refer, e.g., to inalienable rights and privileges of the Eastern Patriarchs, or to such rights and privileges as Rome recognized, or even to such rights and privileges as Rome grants them.

The council also received the submission of clergy from the Armenian Apostolic, Syrian Orthodox, and Ethiopian churches and from the Cypriot colony of the Church of the East. No actual union with any of the Oriental churches as such took place. The various decrees were, however, to be used at a later date as the basis on which Eastern Christian communities were received into full communion with the Roman Catholic church.

John VIII remained loyal to the union, but it was met in Constantinople and elsewhere with furious opposition. Bessarion, his co-operative attitude rewarded with a cardinal's hat, retired in chagrin from Constantinople. Isidor of Kiev and All Russia, also a cardinal, was thrown into prison by Grand Prince Basil II (1425-34, 1434-6, 1437-42), but managed to escape to Italy. George Scholarios, who had supported union at Florence, was convinced by Mark of Ephesus that he had erred and retired to a monastery. On Mark's death, George became the leading anti-unionist. After the fall of Constantinople in 1453, the Ottoman sultan, Mehmet II, was to make him Ecumenical Patriarch, as Gennadios II.

John VIII and his brother and successor Constantine XI both took steps to make the union a reality. Short of wholesale persecution, however, there was no prospect of success. So clear was this that pro-union Patriarch Gregory III Mammas (1443-50) eventually abandoned his throne and exiled himself. The patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem declined to sign the decree.

The pope lived up to his commitment to help John VIII. Eugene worked to organize a crusade with King Ladislas I of Hungary (1439-44) [who was also Ladislas III of Poland (1434-44)], George Branković of Serbia and John Hunyadi, voivode of Transylvania. At first, the crusaders were successful, and Sultan Murat II (1421-44, 1444-51) signed a ten-year truce offering attractive concessions. The pope was horrified. Cardinal Cesarini, his legate, seems even to have absolved Ladislas of his treaty-oath and pushed the crusaders into action again. George Brankovich refused to join the attack and quietly informed Murat. The sultan, who had abdicated in favor of his son, resumed the throne, rushed to attack the oath-breakers, the defiled treaty fastened to his standard, met them near Varna and defeated them with massive slaughter.

²² Primary source, *Concilium Florentinum: Documenta et Scriptores. Editum consilio et impensis Pontifici Institutii Orientalium Studiorum*

Ladislav himself fell in the battle. Since the military crusade promised by Pope Eugenius IV was destroyed at the battle of Varna (1444), a crucial argument for union lost its persuasiveness soon after the council.

Florence left a poisoned legacy. Eastern Orthodox look back with distrust on a council at which their representatives agreed to a diet of what they see as Latin errors. Roman Catholics, on the other hand, who recognize Florence as the seventeenth ecumenical council, have sometimes thought that despite its ultimate failure, Florence offers a possible basis for reunion.

Not surprisingly, the union decree (6 July 1439) of this council proved just as ephemeral as the union of Lyons (1274). The Byzantine church officially repudiated it shortly after the collapse of the empire. Both the *Memoirs* of Sylvester Syropoulos and the acts of the council itself are unofficial compilations, reflecting their authors' individual views and perspectives. This council only served to widen the separation.

Jerusalem 1443²³: On their return, the delegates of Ferrara-Florence were hooted as *Azymites*, the name given in contempt to the Latins for using unleavened bread in the eucharist. Isidore, after making announcement of the union at Ofen, was seized and put into a convent, from which he escaped two years later to Rome. Upon return to East, most bishops renounced agreement which had been forced on them by Emperor John. The union at Ferrara-Florence was rejected by Orthodox faithful throughout Byzantium and Slavic areas. Thus, the first official repudiation of the Florentine Union came in April 1443 when the patriarchs Joachim of Jerusalem, Dorotheos of Antioch, and Philotheos of Alexandria, who never adhered to the false Union of Florence, met in Jerusalem.²⁴ They termed the union and synod uncanonical, since it was effected in unholy, tragic, circumstances, and being obviously contrary to the feelings of the largest part of the Orthodox clergy and faithful. The three oriental patriarchs issued a letter from Jerusalem, 1443, denouncing the council of Florence as “vile” and as a synod of robbers and further denounced the unionist Patriarch Metrophanes of Constantinople as a matricide and heretic. However, the Byzantine Emperor, the Patriarch of Constantinople, and a few other clergy in the capital city remained loyal to the union. In Constantinople, there was a sharp rift between unionist and anti-unionist. The latter refused to take part in unionist services. The Patriarch Metrophanes twice tried to compel Emperor John to take active measures by himself retiring to a monastery, refusing to function unless the union was enforced. Then just before the parties were due to meet in the standing synod, the Patriarch died (1 Aug 1443) and nothing was done (i.e., there was no ‘Ecumenical Synod’ in 1443). The new Patriarch, Gregory III Melissenus (Mammas) had already defended the unionist position before his election which was probably in the summer of 1445.

Another group of prelates rejected the union again in a synod of Constantinople in 1452. A small coterie of Latinizers finally did ratify the union in December 1452, less than six months before the fall of the city, but their ratification had no significance, and was not supported by the people. It was not until the Synod of 1472 that Patriarch Symeon I of Constantinople also repudiated the union.

²³ <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/hcc6.ii.iii.vii.html>

²⁴ The Western sources of this are a little bit more accusatory: “These three Patriarchs (in the Roman Empire) were all under Moslem rule at the time...[Moslem pashas allowed the Christians to keep their bishops and worship undisturbed for the most part.] This is the origin of the Saying commonly heard from Orthodox believers: “Better under the Star and Crescent than under the Slipper of the Pope.” Secure under the Mamaluke sceptre, the three patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, assembled a numerous synod; disowned their representatives at Ferrara and Florence; condemned the creed and council of the Latins; and threatened the emperor of Constantinople with the censures of the Eastern church.”

Council of Constantinople, 1484: Patriarch Symeon (1472-75, 1482-185) summoned a synod in both 1482 and again in 1484 at Constantinople, held in the sacred Church of Pammakaristos. The council issued a *Horos* denouncing the unionist Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438) and its doctrine of the *filioque*, and then published terms through an Acolouthy (service) for the reception of Latin converts (i.e., Roman Catholics), should they desire to enter or return into the fold of Orthodox Church. All four Eastern Patriarchs were present, probably the reason for the synod calling itself Ecumenical. It is the greatest synod summoned in the East against the Uniatism of Ferrara-Florence; denouncing the Council of Florence and decided that "the Latin converts to Orthodoxy should be received into the Church only by Chrismation and by signing an appropriate Libellus of faith which would include denunciation of Latin errors."

The Acolouthy is notable in that it focuses on the *filioque*, and requests that the convert swear to keep the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed in the original form without the *filioque* addition. Then the convert must denounce the Synod of Ferrara-Florence, stay away from Latins and Latin-minded, and azymites -- who are heretics. Latins do not need to be rebaptized (if they had the Apostolic baptism of triple immersion); in fact, some believe that the council forbids baptism of Roman Catholics who have had this Apostolic baptism. As this is a major council in the East, it marks the final breach of any union attempts and thus schism is 'official'.

The Arensites were followers of Arsenios Autoreianos (who died in 1273), being in schism with the patriarchate of Constantinople from 1265. A man of little scholarship, Arsenios was chosen patriarch by the Emperor of Nicaea, Theodore II Lascaris, who hoped that Arsenios, exalted beyond his merits, would be a mere tool in the emperor's hands. But Theodore's expectations were not fulfilled. Arsenios was outspoken on moral issues, thus repeatedly incurred imperial disapproval. Theodore died in 1258, entrusting his son John's minority to George Mouzalon, whom Michael VIII Palaiologus murdered and supplanted. Vainly remonstrating, Arsenios withdrew to the monastery of Paschasius without resigning his authority. Failing to make him either act or resign, the emperor and the court bishops replaced him by Nicephorus of Ephesus, who died after six months. Arsenios had realized by 1260 Michael's ambition for sole rule, and in protest, refused for a year to serve as patriarch. The recovery of Constantinople by the Greeks (July 1261), rendered the choice of a patriarch imperative. His partisans renominated Arsenios, whom Michael accepted, provided he recognize the validity of the orders conferred by Nicephorus. Arsenios agreed but refused to officiate with the new bishops. On his return he crowned Michael for the second time at Hagia Sophia in Aug. 1261, reserving intact, as he imagined, the rights of John IV Laskaris. To make sure John should never succeed him, Michael destroyed his ward (John's) eyes, 25 Dec. 1261. Shocked at this atrocity, Arsenios excommunicated him and demanded his absolute abandonment of the imperial throne. Michael refused, and after two years' contention, a synod led by Michael deposed Arsenios (May 1264) from the patriarchal throne and exiled him to Prokonnesos, an island in the Propontis, beginning rift with his adherents including the emperor's own kinsmen, who termed themselves "the Arsenites," who chose as their motto a sentence of the Apostle Paul: "Touch not ... handle not" (Col. 2:21), i.e. touch not those whom Arsenios has condemned. Arsenios considered his deposition and the ordination of new patriarchs of Constantinople misdeeds which were bringing about the ruin of the church. Arsenios' ideas roused the people and found many partisans among both clergy and laymen. The Arsenites refused to recognize Arsenios' successor, Josephos I, and all subsequent patriarchs until Niphon. Josephos undertook, in 1267, to absolve the emperor from the sentence of excommunication imposed by Arsenios. The Arsenites were a fairly significant schismatics, as a fairly large percentage of the church were Arsenites, and occasionally there were contentions over whether a bishop was Arsenite or not. They gained significant power in the church and often directly opposed the emperor and ideas of union and anything Latin. Following several attempts by Andronikos II (Michael's son) to reconcile the Arsenites (who had permitted the translation of Arsenios' remains to Hagia Sophia in Constantinople in 1284, which was a failed attempt to reconcile), Niphon finally succeeded in negotiating a compromise; the schism officially ended on 14 Sept. 1310 or 11 April 1315 in a dramatic ceremony at Hagia Sophia, but his cult continued into the 15th century.

The Arsenite schism has generally been viewed not only as an ecclesiastical controversy but a part of the political opposition to the upstart Palaiologan dynasty by Laskarid supporters. The Arsenites, who had a strong following among monks and the populace of western Anatolia (the territory of the former Laskarid Empire of Nicaea) supported the revolt of Alexios Philanthropenos in 1295 and the conspiracy of John Drmys in 1305/6. A large proportion of the Byzantines, however, rejected the union and a party opposed to Emperor Michael's religious policy gathered around the so-called Arsenites.

The story of the Arsenites is spread through the thirteen books of Pachymer; the *Anti-arsenite Discourses* of Theoleptos of Philadelphia, and Arsenios' *Testament*. Their union and triumph are reserved for Nicephorus Gregoras, neither loves nor esteems these sectarians.

Gregory Palamas' aim was to solve the real theological problem of God's deification of man, explaining in theological terms as far as possible. The occasion for this was Barlaam's attack on the monks, so the solution had to have particular application to the light (the Light of Thabor/Tabor) that the hesychasts experienced internally, resulting from prayer. Palamas explained the essence of God is absolutely invisible and incommunicable to any creature. So if man is to be "a partaker in the divine nature" (2Peter 1:4), some operation or attribute of God inseparable from God and indivisible from his essence, but really distinct from it, must affect man. Such operations are "energies." They are not substance, for they subsist not of themselves but in the divine essence; nor are they accidents. They are visible and communicable; they are really distinguished among themselves and from the essence, though always united to the essence. As being of God, they are eternal and uncreated, and can rightly be called "divinities." The Light of Thabor is one of the divine energies. It is the beauty of God, deifying grace, making men participators in the divinity; it is eternal and uncreated, and reaches men's soul's directly, though in different degrees according to each's capacity. It is also the reward that the blessed enjoy in heaven, for even there the essence of God will remain hidden from men's eyes.

Palamas and his followers claimed the early Church's teaching (the Cappadocian fathers) founded this theory. Certainly the Fathers wrote much on the transcendence of God and expended much poetic diction on the Light of Thabor, but his opponents denied any place in tradition to his energy-theory. The 1351 synodal *Tome* rebutted the charge that this "should rightly be called an addition to," but allowed that "it is a development of, the sixth council." The introduction to the 1341 *Hagioretic Tome* suggested that, as the Old Testament revelation prepared for the New, so the New Testament prepared for the revelation of the mysteries revealed in prayer. The critics objected also, especially the later critics, on dogmatic grounds, that the exigencies of the theory involved two Gods, indeed a multiplicity of Gods. Nicephorus Gregoras, imprisoned after the synod of 1351, attacked Palamism in a series of writings precisely because he held that hesychastic theology impugned the Godhead's unicity. Procorus Cydones, priest-monk of Mt. Athos, wrote a long and incisive treatise founded on Thomistic theology to the same effect, and was excommunicated and perpetually suspended by a synod in 1368, whose synodical "tome" ended with a decree canonizing Gregory Palamas.

The Palamite controversy was a purely domestic dispute, internal to the Greek Church. Barlaam was not a Roman Catholic, but came from Italy and argued in a Western manner, for eastern minds he implicated the Western Church. Reflection convinced Barlaam that the *filioque* was no proper justification for a schism splitting the universal Church; the matter seemed to him clearly unrevealed and beyond the power of human reason to decide. His practical solution was to recognize that the question can only be in the realms of transcendent mystery. It would be recognizing the ecumenical council of Constantinople if in the liturgy the Church recited the creed in its original form of 381 ('proceeding from the Father') while allowing theologians to affirm the participation of the Son in their informal lecturing and discussion without being accused of heresies. Syllogisms cannot elucidate this issue. We do not know and do not need to know. The Church was once united even when some affirmed the *filioque* and others affirmed the Spirit proceeding from the Father alone. Now, Latins and Greeks constitute factions when the parties begin from divisive language before they have acquired any powers of thinking. Barlaam addressed to the pope in very obsequious language in a pamphlet to this effect. In consequence, opposition to Palamism was for them associated with the Latin Church. Its proponents were called Latinophrones--Latin-minded--and anti-Latin sentiment was deepened. Palamism became the touchstone of orthodoxy and its dissidents were excommunicated and persecuted.

The Synod (Local Council) of Constantinople convoked on 10 June 1341 under the presidency of Emperor Andronikos to resolve the dispute between Gregory Palamas and Barlaam of Calabria. Both Patriarch John XIV Kalekas and the future emperor John VI Kantakouzenos were present. Palamas had written nine treatises arranged in groups of three (*Triads*). In these he defended and developed theosis. He maintained though the uncreated essence of God was unknowable, both here and in the next world man could share in God through uncreated energies bestowed by deifying grace. Barlaam took the offensive as the accuser, speaking first, but he soon entered the forbidden sphere of argument about the energies. He replied to Palamas' second Triad with a *Tract Against the Messalians* implying the hesychast practices were heretical. He then accused Palamas to the Patriarch John Kalekas. The Patriarch ordered to be read the canons of former Councils reserved the power of doctrinal instruction to bishops only. The canons read, Barlaam's official complaint was put in evidence, and Palamas was allowed to defend himself. Then two points in Barlaam's *Against the Messalians* were examined, and thus the latter became the accused instead of accuser:

1. His teaching about the light on Mount Tabor, which he said was created: thus in fact the session began to discuss theology, against the original will of the Patriarch...
2. His criticisms of the 'prayer of Jesus,' which, he asserted, introduced into the church practices of the Bogomils who also recognized only one prayer, the Lord's Prayer. Barlaam had also found another way of attacking the form of the 'prayer of Jesus' then most commonly used ('Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, have mercy on me'): according to him, it did not explicitly assert that Christ was God.

Identical procedure was used to examine both these questions: first some extracts from Barlaam's work were read; then the monks countered with quotations from the Fathers, and finally, the Emperor stated the conclusions from the debate. In two places the *Tome* mentions, as self-evident, the distinction between the 'essence' and 'energy' of God; this occurs first in the preamble, where the accusation of ditheism brought against Palamas by Barlaam, and later to be repeated by Akindynos, is also refuted, and then in the speech of Andronicus III. At the end of the day, Barlaam saw that the atmosphere of the council was clearly unfavorable to him. He asked the advice of his protector, the Great Domestic, who sat by the side of Andronicus III. Kantakouzenos advised him to confess his error, to which he agreed, and Palamas freely pardoned him. Palamite sources (e.g., Philotheos *Encomion*) describe the synod's conclusion in terms of the euphoria at regained peace. Gregoras too praises Andronicus' speech in which he then celebrated the general reconciliation.

The Emperor suddenly fell ill on the day after the Council, and died on June 15th, leaving as heir his son, John, only nine years old. Barlaam, supported by some disciples, started his attack again; then, finally seeing that his ideas had no chance of triumphing at Constantinople, he left the Eastern Empire; Italy and the Renaissance and the Court of Avignon were in fact to prove much more open to his nominalistic humanism; there he taught Petrarch Greek, and was finally raised by the Pope to the bishopric of Gerace in the Greek Uniate Church.

So Gregory of Palamas had won by 10 Jun., 1341. Barlaam was censured for confusing theology by the introduction of a secular philosophy, having spoken "blasphemously and evilly" about the Light of Mount Thabor and for having "blasphemously and evilly" calumniated the monks/holy hesychasts, as the circular letter published by Patriarch John claimed. It was forbidden to all and sundry to discuss dogma, and on pain of excommunication, the inhabitants of Constantinople were to bring Barlaam's works to the patriarchate, and inhabitants of other towns to bring them to the local ecclesiastical authorities to be publicly destroyed.

A second council was convened in the galleries of Hagia Sophia (Joseph Calothetos, *Letter to Kalekas*) in Aug. 1341. John VI Kantakouzenos, who still performed the functions of Great Domestic and in fact ruled the Empire, presided, and all the participants of the Council of June were still present, except the Emperor (who had died days after the June council). The Patriarch summoned Akindynos as the accused, but at first sought, as always, to limit the discussion to simple questions of discipline. To this end he asked Theodore Dexios to read a passage of St. Basil about the impossibility of knowing God; that was the only act of the Patriarch which Akindynos considered favorable to the anti-Palamites (which he writes in his *Report*). For the rest he was ready to support Palamas right to the end; Palamite sources declare he was frankly in favor of the monks against the Calabrian's attacks and utterly disapproved of the attacks, whereas they might have represented him as dissimulating (he could not accept the theology with which his friend, Palamas, defended the monks); that, anyhow, is how they described Akindynos' attitude before June 1341. Apart from the reading from St. Basil, Gregory Akindynos himself does not mention any motion in his favor by the Patriarch: on the other hand, he does complain of the outrages to which he and his supporters were subjected, without any intervention by the Patriarch to protect him. Finally, in a letter of 1342 to George Lapithos, he mentions the anti-Palamism of Kalekas as a *new* factor of the situation. Moreover in his *report* he omits any detailed description of what happened at the Synod of August, and for good reason, for the Synod condemned him too, and made him sign a document in which he accepted the decision of the Synod against Barlaam and rejected his teaching about the light (Palamas, *Against Akindynos*). He did not accept it without reluctance, for the crowd attending the meeting did not disguise its disapproval of him.

This formal condemnation, naturally confirmed by all the Palamite sources, had important consequences at the time of the civil war, between 1341 and 1347. The Empress Anna of Savoy, who, at least at the beginning, raised no objection to the campaign Akindynos had launched against Palamas and his supporters, openly opposed his ordination as a deacon, on the ground that it was no a formally anti-canonical proceeding, since the sentence against him had not previously been rescinded. The condemnation of Akindynos is omitted by the *Tome*, which in general, does not say anything about the second Council in August 1341, but only records the debates of June. The form thus given to the document allowed the anti-Palamites for some time to take no notice of the condemnation of Akindynos, and has allowed some modern historians to speak of a "Palamite *conciliabulum* in the month of August." How can that silence be explained? An anonymous letter from a Palamite, dating from about 1342, attributes it to the desire of the monks to give Akindynos a chance to repent. However, political reasons were certain decisive in shaping the *Tome* as we know it.

Patriarch Calekas signed. Palamas had won. (Akindynos was later excommunicated at the council of 1347 and died in exile. His correspondence provides important insights into the hesychast controversy from an anti-Palamite viewpoint; many of his theological treatises, including the Antirrhethics against Palamas, are still unpublished. Unlike later anti-Palamites, Akindynos was neither a Latin sympathizer nor influenced by Greek philosophy, as his opponents claimed. In his works he did not inveigh against the spirituality of the monks but against the Palamite doctrine of the divine energies, thus expressing the conservative approach to theology of his fellow intellectuals.). The synodal *Tomos* published after the August meeting is unmistakably Palamite in content, reflecting the victory won for Hesychasm. Because it concentrated solely on the June meeting and failed to mention the second council in August, and its formal condemnation of Akindynos, its authenticity has been questioned.

The Synod (Local Council) of Constantinople on the 2 February 1347 (the fourth Hesychast Council) reconfirmed the decisions of 1341, which had settled the controversy between Gregory Palamas and Barlaam of Calabria over Hesychasm. These decisions had been overturned by the regency of Anna of Savoy and Patriarch John XIV Kalekas during the civil war (1341-1347). In spite of the prohibition of the synodal "tomes" of 1341, the Palamite controversy had never ceased. Palamas himself, though confined in a monastery, and Akindynos, released from prison by Kalekas, had continued writing. On 2 Feb. 1347, when Anna Savoy needed Palamas' diplomatic services and desired to depose Kalekas, she summoned a synod. She hoped by that means to strengthen her position *vis-à-vis* Kantakouzenos, who by then was under the walls of the capital. Only anti-Kantakouzenite bishops took part in this Council, while Palamas and the declared supporters of Kantakouzenos were still under arrest. Before meeting, Kalekas received an order not to move from his apartments in the palace. The assembly took place, in his absence, on Feb. 2ⁿ; the Empress and John V Kantakouzenos presided; there were present some bishops, the *protos* of Athos, and many monks and civil officials. First the *Tome* of 1341 was read, then they turned to examine the anti-Palamite *dossier* which Kalekas had presented to Anne and which contained the anti-Palamite interpretation of the events of 1341. Kalekas was condemned and the Synodal *Tome* of 1341 solemnly confirmed: those bishops who had not signed the condemnation of Barlaam had to do so before coming to the meeting of the Council on Feb. 2nd, 1347. Having been deposed both by the Kantakouzenist Council of Adrianople and by the Synod of Constantinople, Kalekas then ceased to be an obstacle to peace between the two opposing factions.

On Feb. 8th, 1347, when Kantakouzenos entered the imperial palace, the ex-Patriarch John Kalekas was shut into his own apartments by the Empress Anna. He refused to recognize his condemnation in his absence. A new Synod was held in the palace, attended by both Anne and Kantakouzenos and several senators and monks, but the Patriarch, summoned also, refused to come. A new *Tome* was issued against him, which, like that of 1341, included the decisions of two Councils, that of February 2nd presided over by Anna alone, and that of the joint council held by Anna and Kantakouzenos. It is expressed as a confirmation of the *Tome* of 1341 and brings Kalekas under the scope of the condemnation which had struck Barlaam. Akindynos was also condemned and excommunicated (and he fled and shortly afterwards died) 'although he was already subject to a previous sentence of the Synod.' The *Tome* of Feb. 1347 was originally signed by 11 bishops, those who were at Constantinople at Kantakouzenos' arrival. In March, he published a decree (πρόσταγμα) confirming the Synod's decision. Some weeks later, the bishops who had taken part of the Council of Adrianople arrived; they were headed by Lazarus, Patriarch of Jerusalem; a new Council was held, this time in the precincts of Hagia Sophia, in the presence of Anne, John V Palaeologus and John VI Kantakouzenos; twenty bishops signed a confirmation of the two *Tomes* of 1341 and 1347 and this confirmation was annexed to the *Tome* of February. Thus within a few weeks three Synods were held at Constantinople to confirm Palamism.

Isidore I Buchiras (1347-49) had been excommunicated by the 3rd synod, was made patriarch. The text gives a Kantakouzenist version of the civil war by blaming Kalekas alone, rather than Anna or Alexios Apokaukos; both viewed as the patriarch's victims. Aside from its "legitimist" interpretation of the war, the *Tomos* also ratifies the doctrinal decisions of the local council of Constantinople of 1341 and lifts Kalekas' excommunication of Palamas. The document contains signatures of three sets of bishops: those present on 2 Feb., those who signed before the enthronement of the new hesychast patriarch Isidore I (17 May), and those who signed afterward, including Palamas as elected archbishop of Thessalonike.

Substantial opposition to Gregory Palamas manifested itself against the election of Isidore as patriarch of Constantinople and the other measures taken by the new government. The opposition by Kalekas and Akindynos in 1347 on the part of some bishops seems to have many motives, among which the doctrinal element was not the chief; in their protest they themselves particularly stress the appointment of Isidore as Patriarch of Constantinople. Kantakouzenos records that three members of the Synod favored Kalekas, while others pressed political claims of their own to accede to the patriarchate; they had all been just as good supporters of Kantakouzenos as Isidore and Palamas had been and, like them, they had suffered for their political convictions. The first three can be identified by the Tome decreeing their deposition; they were Neophytus of Philippi, Joseph of Ganos and Metrophanes of Patras. The others were headed by the aged Metropolitan Matthew of Ephesus, who during the civil war had remained in his diocese under Turkish occupation; he had however come into conflict with the Patriarch John Kalekas and his Synod. Palamas in 1345 ranks him as one of the wisest of his supporters. In Sept. 1346 he signed the appeal to Anne against the Patriarch, but his signature is not found on the *Tome* of February. In May 1347 Matthew belonged to the minority who refused to vote for Isidore, and he carried some other bishops with him, including Chariton of Apro, who had signed both the appeal to Anne and the deposition of Kalekas.

This heterogeneous opposition included 20 bishops, 10 of whom held Councils beginning in May at Constantinople, first in the church of the Holy Apostles, and then at the monastery of St. Stephen Proto-martyr. In July 1347 they published a Tome of excommunication against Isidore and Palamas. The accusations brought against the hesychast leaders, recall those formerly brought against Athanasius I, in particular those concerning the 'profanation' of icons and holy objects in the churches. The accession of hesychast monks to the positions of authority in the Church, their austerity and their anti-formalism aroused the opposition of some bishops. It was among the bishops too that Athanasius had found his bitterest adversaries.

After vain efforts to bring them back to obedience, Isidore and his Synod proceeded in August to depose them in a new Synodal *Tome* countersigned by the Patriarch of Jerusalem (1351). They also took a series of measures concerning the administration of diocese which the rebels had been governing. For the time being, only a provision deposition was in question, for it was still hoped to obtain their concurrence. The *Tome* condemns the metropolitans opposed to the election and to the ordination of Isidore. It goes over the course of history of Barlaam of Calabria, and Akindynos, and condemns those who preach their doctrine. Signed by 23 Metropolitans, and a later addition asked those condemned to repent.

Emperor John Kantakouzenos and Patriarch Kallistos I convened a council on 28 May 1351 at the Blachernai palace, to reaffirm the decisions of 1341 and 1347, because there was no conclusive victory of Palamism (due to political circumstances), despite that the church had approved it as early as the 1341 synod. This was a larger and more solemn assembly than any former 14th century council. Kantakouzenos presided, and with him various officials, the whole Senate, and 25 Metropolitans, 7 bishops, and deputies of 3 absent Metropolitans, who were beforehand favorable to Gregory Palamas, also present at the council. The opposition was represented by 2 Metropolitans, Matthew of Ephesus and Joseph of Ganos, and by less eminent personalities, Theodore Dexios, the *hieromonk* Athanasius, the monk Ignatios, and the young humanist Theodore Atouemis. During the debates, Arsenios of Tyre supported the anti-Palamites, who recorded the debates; he and Nikephorus Gregoras contest their fairness. However, however just this criticism was, anti-Palamites expounded their views at length, and Kantakouzenos made a real effort during the lengthy debates to bring all to agreement before trying measures of which the minority, once condemned, was generally the victim in like cases.

The 1351 Council had 2 distinct phases: meetings hearing both parties in May/June, anti-Palamites first accused, but failed to persuade the assembly to condemn Palamas; in July 'another Synod' assembled without them and pronounced a solemn definition of dogma.

The first meeting was May 28th, discussing the acts of the 6th Ecumenical Council; Palamas claimed his theology was a development (*ἀνάπτυξις*) of that Council's decisions about the two 'energies' or wills in Christ. Nikephoros, previously disavowed Barlaam and Akindynos, accused Palamas of iconoclasm regarding his doctrine of the deified flesh of Christ. This meeting records a success for Nikephoros. On May 30th, anti-Palamites unsuccessfully attacked Palamas' terminology, saying 'God' (*θεός*) and 'Divinity' (*θεότης*), should not be applied to divine *energy*, but only to the essence. Palamas said his terminology was less exact in his writings; his faith was found to be fine. The 3rd and 4th session occurred on June 8th and 9th, discussing the formulas in Palamite writings. The 4th and last session was decisive. The Emperor and the Synod had the 1341 *Tome* read; Palamas then showed his adversaries' writings contradicting the *Tome*; everyone was in principle in agreement with that *Tome*. Several Church Fathers were read, then the Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council. These documents were insufficient to prove Palamas heretical, so Kantakouzenos appealed to his adversaries to recant, and ordered a reading of the *Tome* of deposition prepared in 1347 against Matthew of Ephesus and his colleagues, the stipulations of which had not yet been applied. Then Amparis, the *chartophylax* and 'consul of the philosophers,' solemnly asked the Bishops present to express their opinion in turn about the questions in dispute. All confessed both the unity of God and the necessary distinction between the divine essence and *energy*, both being uncreated. Then Patriarch Callistos expatiated on this doctrine, again called the adversaries to recant, and when they refused, pronouncing the deposition of the Metropolitans of Ephesus and Ganos; condemning their supporters.

A session was held in July, without the condemned anti-Palamites (except the repentant) addressing and approving several questions of Palamite theology. The 1341 *Tome* was read again and compared to the writings of Akindynos. The members of the council with the emperor agreed that Palamos was perfectly Orthodox and his teaching entirely conformed with the tradition of the Fathers. The Synodal *Tome* incorporating these decisions was apparently written by Philotheos Kokkinos of Herakelia, decreeing excommunication against all those who did not accept Palamism as conforming with Orthodoxy. The synodal *Tomos* was signed in August in Hagia Sophia, and then the Emperor Kantakouzenos, having signed the "tome," laid it solemnly on the altar of St. Sophia on 15 Aug. 1351.

Philotheus (Or Philotheos) Kokkinos (1364-1376, Callistus' successor), Patriarch of Constantinople called a synod on 5 April 1368, the seventh synod of Constantinople concerning hesychasm. This was 8 years after Gregory Palamas' death. Prochoros Kydones, the Barlaamite priest-monk of Mt. Athos and opponent of Palamite theology, wrote a long and incisive treatise founded on Thomistic theology, and was excommunicated and perpetually suspended (anathemized) by this synod, whose *Tome* ended with a decree canonizing Gregory Palamas. The synod confirmed the 1351 *Tome* as a "Faultless Canon of the true faith of Christians", and canonized Palamas as a Father and Doctor of the Church. A speculative theologian of importance, Gregory Palamas was also a devoted teacher and pastor. Philotheos, a follower of Gregory Palamas, declared Gregory a saint, established a feast day on 14 November, and ordered a special commemoration and composed a full service (below) for his feast day in 1368, when it was established that his feast be celebrated on the Second Sunday of Great Lent: the Patriarch and Synod inscribed Gregory in the calendar of the 'Great Church' (Hagia Sophia at Constantinople), thus canonizing him. This synod was perhaps anti-Thomistic in attitude, perhaps characteristic of the larger part of the Orthodox hierarchy. The Patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem signed the *Tome*. The *Synodikon of Orthodoxy* was enlarged by a proclamation to the eternal memory to "Gregory [Palamas], the Most Holy Metropolitan of Thessalonica."

(TONE 2) WHAT HYMNS OF PRAISE SHALL WE SING TO HONOR THE HOLY BISHOP,
THE TRUMPET OF THEOLOGY, THE FLAMING MOUTHPIECE OF GRACE,
THE HONORABLE RECEIVER OF THE SPIRIT,
THE UNSHAKEN PILLAR OF THE CHURCH,
THE GREAT JOY OF THE INHABITED EARTH,
THE RIVER OF WISDOM, THE CANDLESTICK OF LIGHT,
THE SHINING STAR THAT HAS MADE ALL OF CREATION BRIGHT! (Twice)

WHAT WORDS OF SONG SHALL WE WEAVE AS A GARLAND,
THAT WE MAY CROWN THE HOLY BISHOP?
HE IS THE CHAMPION OF TRUE DEVOTION,
THE ADVERSARY OF IMPIETY,
THE FERVENT PROTECTOR OF THE FAITH,
THE GREAT GUIDE AND TEACHER,
THE WELL-TUNED HARP OF THE SPIRIT,
THE GOLDEN TONGUE, THE FOUNTAIN FLOWING WITH WATERS
FOR HEALING THE FAITHFUL;
THE GREAT AND HONORABLE GREGORY!

WITH WHAT WORDS SHALL WE EARTH-DWELLERS PRAISE THE HOLY BISHOP?
HE IS THE TEACHER OF THE CHURCH,
THE HERALD OF THE LIGHT OF GOD,
THE INITIATE OF THE HEAVENLY MYSTERIES OF THE TRINITY,
THE CHIEF ADORNMENT OF THE MONASTIC LIFE,
KNOWN BOTH IN ACTION AND CONTEMPLATION,
THE GLORY OF THESSALONICA!
NOW TOGETHER WITH THE GREAT MARTYR DEMETRIUS, FROM THAT SAME CITY,
WHERE HIS RELICS FLOW WITH THE OIL OF HEALING,
HE DWELLS FOREVER IN HEAVEN!

GLORY...

(TONE 6) THRICE-BLESSED SAINT, MOST HOLY FATHER,
EXCELLENT PASTOR AND GREAT SHEPHERD, DISCIPLE OF CHRIST,
YOU HAVE LAID DOWN YOUR LIFE AND SOUL FOR THE SHEEP,
AND NOW, GOD-BEARING GREGORY, BY YOUR INTERCESSIONS, //
PRAY TO OUR FATHER TO BESTOW ON US MIGHTY MERCY!