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The patriarchate of Gregory II of Cyprus (1283-1289) forms some six years of stormy church history. Yet even so, the restoration of Orthodoxy and the formal liquidation of the Union of Lyons under Gregory make his patriarchate an important divide both historically and theologically in the history of the Byzantine Church. Gregory, the one hundred and sixteenth patriarch of Constantinople, was in fact the moving force of the dogmatic decisions embodied in the Tomus of the Council of Blachernae, 1285, that repudiated the unionist theology of John Beccus and the 'peace' of Lyons. And although unionism could never again be ignored in Byzantine intellectual history, the Council did a great deal to heal the Church's ills and mend the division within Byzantium that, according to Pachymeres, had become as profound as that which only yesterday had divided Greeks and Latins.

As is well known, despite the external crisis, political and material exhaustion and instability, the second half of the XIII century witnessed one of the most impressive intellectual outbursts known to Byzantium—the so-called second Byzantine renaissance. Gregory of Cyprus was in the forefront of this revival of antiquity, as were so many other churchmen of the imperial court. His industry, skill and elegance were not unnoticed. Gregoras observes that "he brought to


2 See the posthumous praise of this Council and of Gregory by Joseph Calothetus, Vita Athanasi, ed. A. Pantocratorinus in Θρακικά 13 (1940) 87. This biography, by a hesychast theologian, is a basic source on Gregory's successor, Athanasius.

3 George Pachymeres, De Michaele Palaeologo, ed. I. Bekker, I (Bonn 1835) 401.
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light and, as it were, gave a new lease on life” to the Attic tongue and Greek literature, both of which had been in limbo far too long. Indeed his promotion to patriarch was a measure of the wide respect this professor commanded among his contemporaries. Moreover, the election of a non-monastic was in itself exceptional since in this period the Church was in a very real sense beginning to be monachized. Indeed, the overwhelming number of people who held the patriarchal dignity in the last two centuries of Byzantine history came from the monastic wing of the Church. ⁶

Gregory received his humanist training from the grand logothetes, George Acropolites, Byzantium’s delegate to Lyons, under whom he studied for six years the intricacies of Aristotelian philosophy.⁷ One of his more interesting achievements was his voluminous correspondence; indeed, in an age of letter writers he was one of the most accomplished.⁸ This list of correspondents reads like a ‘who’s who’ in late XIII-century Byzantium. His studious temperament and deep-seated humanism is particularly evident in his Autobiography, possibly intended as an introduction to his collected letters, which was recently described as “a precious witness of the constituent humanism of the Byzantine soul.”⁹ Gregory is one of the few major figures in Byzantine literature—other rare examples are Psellus and Blemmydes—to have left us an autobiography.

⁴ Nicephorus Gregoras, Byzantina Historia, ed. L. Schopen, I (Bonn 1829) 163.
⁵ Gregory was protapostolarius prior to his promotion, that is, he was the assigned reader for the Prophesies and Epistles in the imperial chapel: Pachym. 2.42; for a description of the office see pseudo-Kodinos, Traité des Offices, ed. J. Verpeaux (Paris 1966) 193–94. Consult the brief biographical material on Gregory’s career in Θησαυροί και Ήθοι Ευγενεσπαδεία IV (Athens 1964) cols.731–34 (S. G. Papadopoulos) and Dictionnaire de théologie Catholique VI.1 (Paris 1947) cols.1231–35 (F. Cayré). For an extensive bibliography on Gregory see W. Lameere, La tradition manuscrite de la correspondance de Grégoire de Chypre (Brussels 1937) 1–3 and n.1. See also Dictionnaire de Spiritualité VI (Paris 1967) cols.922–23 (J. Darrouzès).
⁶ See his own Autobiography, ed. with French transl. in Lameere, op.cit. (supra n.5) 185.
⁸ A. Garzya, “Observations sur l’Autobiographié de Grégoire de Chypre,” in Πρακτικά τοῦ Πρῶτου Διεθνούς Κοσμολογικοῦ Συνεδρίου II (Leucosia 1972) 36. For the use of the Autobiography as an introduction to his letters cf. the patriarch’s letter to his friend and grand logothetes, Theodore Mouzalon, in Eustratiades, op.cit. (supra n.7) IV.113 (letter 155) and Lameere, op.cit. (supra n.5) 9.
Gregory, however, was not purely a man of letters remote from the life of the Church. He belongs, like Photius, as much to the history of scholarship as to ecclesiastical history. And, although reluctant because of his unmitigated passion for books (to borrow his own phrase)—ἀνὴρ πένης εἶναι καὶ τῶν βιβλίων κατάκρως ἔφη—he was ordained. He soon found himself deeply immersed in the life and theological issues of his Church. And as he himself said, the exaltation of which he was the object was in inverse proportion to his expectations. He found himself plunged into “difficulties” no other patriarch ever knew. His contribution to these difficulties made him one of the outstanding theologians ever to hold office as patriarch of Constantinople. As scholar, stylist, humanist and seasoned theologian Gregory had few peers.

The difficulties were of course in part the work of the arch-convert John Beccus, who, after his formal deposition and exile (January 1283), continued disturbing the already troubled waters of the Church caused both by Michael VIII’s unionist policy and the Arsenite schism, which was already in its third decade. Actually, during his patriarchate Beccus (1275–1282) had labored to show that the Filioque, and therefore the Union of Lyons, was indeed theologically sound. This he did by calling the synod together and producing quotations from such revered Greek fathers as Maximus the Confessor, Tarasius and John of Damascus. In substance his argument was that the preposition ἐκ (Filioque) used by the Latins was the equivalent of the preposition διὰ found in many of the Greek fathers. They were indeed interchangeable—ὡς ὑπαλλαττομένων τῶν προθέτεων—a fact demonstrated by Scripture which employed the phrase ‘born of a woman’ (ἐκ) to mean through a woman (διὰ), or ‘created through God’ (διὰ) to mean from God (ἐκ). In other words, the Filioque was identical (Ἰκοδόμευμοι) with the Greek patristic formula διὰ νῦν (per Filium) and therefore irreproachable in its orthodoxy; the two traditions were neither exclusive nor contradictory. As Beccus’ friend Metochites was to ask later, “if this is so and the procession of the Holy Spirit

---

9 Autobiography, in Lameere, op.cit. (supra n.5) 189.
10 ibid. 187f.
11 According to Pachym. 1.400, unionism and the schism of Arsenius were the greatest illness and the cause of fatal damage to the permanent and great body of the Church.
12 Pachym. 1.481.
13 So Pachym. 1.481. See also the text published here, fol.176r.
from the Father through the Son is a true and incontrovertible doctrine, where is the innovation?”  

This, however, was only the dress rehearsal, as Pachymeres notes, of the later disturbances in the patriarchate of his successor, Gregory of Cyprus, when Beccus demanded an open and full discussion of his theology. This resulted in the Council of 1285, which eventually condemned the ex-patriarch, his unionist platform and his supporters George Metochites and Constantine Meliteniotes. Clearly Beccus’ arguments were not effective with either the synod or the patriarch. It is not surprising that an attempt by the bishop of Heracleia to introduce the decisions of 1285 into the discussion at Florence called forth the wrath of the unionists, who eventually succeeded in aborting the plan.

The synodal Tomus of 1285, penned by Gregory of Cyprus, contained a carefully thought-out response (within the framework of eleven accusations) to Beccus’ theology. Axiomatic in Gregory’s thought is the idea that the patristic phrase ‘through the Son’ is not synonymous or coextensive with the Latin ex Filio (Filioque) as argued by Beccus. The phrase, in other words, does not in any way imply that the hypostatic causality of the Father is shared with the Son, for the Son is not the cause—either separately or with the Father—of the Holy Spirit. In short, it has nothing to do with the eternal procession (ἐκ παρευσίας), that is, the personal hypostatic existence of the Holy Spirit, which is from the Father alone.

The meaning of the controversial formula is clear and unequivocal. It is the expression of the eternal manifestation (ἐκ παρευσίας ἀειδοκοκ) of the Spirit by the Son. According to the essence of God the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, but the act of eternal self-revelation or manifestation of the Spirit is by the intermediary of the Son. It is through the Son and in the Son that the Spirit, as he accompanies the

---

14 George Metochites, Historia Dogmatica, in A. Mai, ed. Novae Patrum Bibliothecae VIII (Rome 1871) 2,73.
15 Pachym. 1.482 μέντοι γε καὶ εκκριβάλων μεγάλων ἀφορμάς τὰ τοιαῦτα παρέχουν τοῖς ἀστεροῖς.  
17 See Gregory’s De Processione Spiritus Sancti, Migne PG 142, 290c οὐχ ὁτι ἀτελὴς ἢ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς τοῦ Πνεύματος ὑπάρχει.  
18 Tomus, Migne PG 142, 236c οὐ μὴν δὴ καὶ αὐτῶν αὐτῶν τοῦ Πνεύματος ὑπάρχειν ἢ μόνον ἢ μετὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς.
Logos, is sent, shines and is eternally manifest. Differently expressed, it refers to the permanent relationship existing from all eternity between the Son and the Holy Spirit as divine hypostases. In Gregory's own words, "If in fact it is said by some of the saints that the 'Spirit also proceeds through the Son', such a phrase points to the eternal manifestation of the Spirit by the Son; it does not denote (for he has his existence from the Father) the unique personal procession of the Spirit as he emerges into being . . . Admittedly, the Paraclete shines forth eternally and is manifest through the Son, in the same manner that the sun's light shines through the intermediary of the sun's rays."  

In reality Gregory introduced what has been called "a new traditional element" in the Filioque debate and thus went beyond his contemporaries, who were content with the ritual references to the Photian formulations that had remained the hallmark of Orthodoxy for centuries. His theology, in its unfettered boldness, is one of the most successful attempts—an authentic tour de force—to put an end to the centuries-old deadlock, short of capitulation to the Latin doctrine.  

Gregory's difficulties did not end with Beccus' unconditional condemnation, however. A new dispute soon arose, this time the result of a commentary on the Tomus, a work by Gregory's over-zealous supporter, the monk called Mark, a baptized Jew. This commentary is now lost, although we are reasonably well informed about it. It seems that the term προβολεύς, used for centuries by the Church to designate the Holy Spirit's natural existence, his sole origin from the Father (the parallel term for the Son would be γεννήτωρ), was interpreted by Mark as a synonym of the term used to describe the eternal

---

19 ibid. 241A, 240c; see also Gregory's De Processione 290c ἀλλ' ἐκείθεν ἐκ τῆς πατρικῆς ποιήσεως οὐκέτας ὀφειλόμενον, ώς εἰρήτως, τέλειον συμπαραμορφεῖ τῷ Λόγῳ κατά τούς εἰρηκτάς βεβαγούς, καὶ Ἰησοῦν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀποδέχεσαι καὶ πέφηνε κατὰ τὴν προσωπίναν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἂτινον ἔκλαμψεν.  


manifestation ($\pi\rho\beta\omega\lambda\epsilon\varsigma = \varepsilon\kappa\phi\alpha\nu\varsigma\iota\varsigma$). Theologians like Moschabar and John Chilas of Ephesus were quick to point out that such homonymy was confusing and dangerous, for to believe or to write that the term could sometimes designate the existence, sometimes the eternal manifestation or the shining forth of the Holy Spirit, was heretical. The term was an $\acute{\epsilon}k\iota\nu\pi\tau\sigma\zeta$ idiot$\varsigma$ of the Holy Spirit.

Eventually the patriarch and the $T$on$\Upsilon$s came under suspicion as well, since it was Gregory’s fundamental distinctions that Mark endeavored to elucidate and in the process confused. Moreover, those who objected to Mark’s errors disliked the patriarch and wished to bring about his fall. Indeed the offensive they launched eventually cost the patriarch his throne. Moschabar the ex-chartophylax, for example, was embittered ever since the Council of 1285, when he had been taken to task by both Beccus and Gregory for his theological infelicities. In close league with him were two other defectors, the deacon John Pentecclesiotes and Moschabar’s successor, Michael Escamatismenus. These, Pachymeres notes, endeavored to persuade all that what they did was not to avenge their private quarrel but to establish solidly the doctrine of the Church. They were later joined by two members of the higher clergy, John of Ephesus and Theoleptus of Philadelphia. Every one of these had signed the $T$on$\Upsilon$s.

Actually, even before Mark’s publication these individuals had believed that they should not have signed, since the patriarch had made the identification Mark was now accused of making. Indeed he
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22 Pachym. 2.118; as we shall see in a moment, this is also borne out by the text published here, in which the author (Mark?) says, ὁμώνυμον ταύτην ἀνάμακα καθὼς καὶ τὸ γραφέν ὑπ’ ἐμόν γράμμα δειλό (fol.174r). We also know Mark’s views from Gregory’s Ὀμολογία, Migne PG 142, 247–52 (esp. 250a–b), and from John Chilas’ letter, for which see n.23 infra.

23 John Chilas, Migne PG 142, 245c; this letter is edited twice in Migne, see PG 135, 505–08. For a brief discussion of the letter see Troitskii, op.cit. (supra n.21) pt.I 366.

24 Pachym. 2.115–16.


26 Pachym. 2.115–16. Moschabar’s predecessor as grand chartophylax, under Beccus, was Constantine Meliteniotes, who followed the unionist patriarch into exile.


was as guilty as Beccus, who, so they said, had been condemned not for dogmatic reasons but out of malice! Pachymeres adds that they wanted to charge the patriarch formally and present Beccus as another Nessus, who had defeated Heracles even after his death. When they got hold of Mark’s work, the result of the latter’s desire to join the controversy on the side of the patriarch, they thought they had the patriarch cornered; for that which was suspect in the Tomus was now fully disclosed in the commentary written by one of the patriarch’s own disciples. Moreover, the disciple in his own defense was broadcasting the claim that his work had the patriarch’s approval.

It did not take long for the patriarch (who was aware of the defection’s maneuvers) to disassociate himself from his disciple’s questionable commentary—“his babbling letter”—and write a refutation. In this confessio fidei the patriarch noted that he would stand chastized if it could be proved that he taught or wrote anything that resembled Mark’s ideas. He never gave Mark permission to write such errors. Moreover the Tomus, written on behalf of the Church against Beccus, was free of such heresy. The patriarch continued by pointing out that Mark’s commentary should be held against the author; it must not be attributed to him who is not its cause. The patriarch did not scrutinize with great care this labor of a simple layman. At the time it was presented to him it was not possible for him to do so, besieged as he was by numerous problems. His mind was so preoccupied that he even overlooked that which caused the mischief and which he has now condemned.

In brief, in the two compositions known as the Ἰολούλια and the Τετάκιον addressed to Andronicus II we have an emphatic denial by the patriarch of any complicity with Mark’s commentary. Gregory’s testimony agrees fully with Pachymeres, who incidentally had also signed the Tomus. The chronicler informs us that the patriarch had glanced at the commentary, made a few corrections and returned it. Mark, however, took the patriarch’s silence to mean

---

28 Pachym. 2.117. (Nessus the centaur was shot by Heracles with a poisoned arrow, which afterwards became the cause of his own death.)
29 Pachym. 2.118; see also Troitskii, op.cit. (supra n.21) pt.I 342.
30 The text of this Ὑμολογία is in Migne PG 142, 247–52; see 249c for the reference to Mark’s letter; Laurent, Regestes no.1514. See Troitskii, op.cit. (supra n.21) pt.I 370f. The patriarch also wrote to the emperor in late 1288 or early 1289 to protest his innocence. The text of this πιντάκιον in PG 142, 267c–270A also speaks of the φλάσαν τοῦ Μάρκου χαρτίν (col.268A); Laurent, Regestes no.1513.
31 Migne PG 142, 249b–250A.
approval and so proceeded to publish it and to inform people that it had the patriarch's personal *imprimatur.*

At the very end of *Codex Atheniensis* 1217, fol. 174r-176v, published here, there is a document addressed to the synod (fol. 174r') apparently connected with this controversy that in part was responsible for the later resignation of Gregory (1289). Although the document bears no name and the end is missing, it is doubtless the work of the monk Mark, as the internal evidence indicates. The anonymous author twice refers to his former commentary as a *γράμμα* (fol. 174v)—the same word that is employed both by the patriarch and by Pachymeres to describe the monk’s small *oeuvre.*

It is known that after Gregory disowned his disciple a synod was held, which “without hesitation” recognized the patriarch’s orthodoxy. Even so, Gregory was asked to step down for the peace of the Church, and he resigned in June 1289. Pachymeres does not mention whether Mark was present at this synod except to inform us that “almost all the clergy and monks were present.” This would have helped identify the document, which is clearly addressed to the synod and may have been a statement requested of Mark by the bishops. It is possible that Mark made his appearance at another meeting of the synod before the one in which Gregory withdrew, for Gregory is still “patriarch” in the document (fol. 174r'). In any case, the results seem to be comprised in this document, written for the bishops of the synod, in which the monk retracts the errors of his earlier commentary.

The Report to the Synod begins with a brief exposition of the patriarch’s *Tomus* and the distinction between procession and the
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33 Pachym. 2.118 προστάθεις ώς καὶ πατριάρχη ἐμφανίσει τούτο καὶ ἐκεῖνός τινα διορθώσεις, ἐγκαθιστῶν ἐπεῖθεν τὰ τῆς ἐκδόσεως.

34 Migne PG 142, 247, and Pachym. 2.118. It is J. Darrouzès, *op.cit.* (supra n.27) 89 n.5, that first called my attention to the existence of *Atheniensis* 1217. The absence of the missing folia is not a recent development since it was noted long ago by J. Sakkelion, *Κατάλογος τῶν Χειρογράφων τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Βιβλιοθήκης τῆς Ἑλλάδος* (Athens 1892) 221. The MS is dated by Sakkelion to the XIII century. It should be pointed out that a work on stars precedes the Report to the Synod and becomes very confused at the top of fol.174r', where in the middle of the third line a new text dealing with the Holy Spirit begins. The Report to the Synod itself begins at the bottom of the same folio (174v).

35 Pachym. 2.130-31, where Gregory’s λέβολος παρατίθεσις is quoted verbatim; Laurent, *Regestes* no.1517.

36 Pachym. 2.130.

37 The identification of the text as belonging to Mark was first made by Darrouzès, *op.cit.* (supra n.27) 89 n.5. Darrouzès points out that Gregory’s refutation may have been written last, following Mark’s Report to the Synod. It seems to me, however, that his
eternal manifestation. The author continues by saying that the commentary he wrote (γράμμα) had no intention of introducing any novelities, deceiving people or introducing any foreign dogma; its sole purpose was to agree with the patriarchal Tomus—ἀλλ’ ὥς δὴθεν ὁμοφωνών τῷ πατριαρχικῷ τόμῳ (fol. 174v). It was nonetheless rejected by the holy synod and so is now rejected by its author as well.

The writer then proceeds to show that the term ἐκπορευέται must be used to designate the Holy Spirit’s mode of origin from the Father, since it is the Father who is the source of essence, of all divinity. It should not be used as a synonym for something else. For a characteristic is always unique, while an equivocal term is a definition applicable to many and various things; the two are thus mismatched and incompatible: καὶ οὕτως ἀνάμοστα καὶ ἀειμβιάστα ταῦτα. τὸ γὰρ ἵδιον τινος οὐχ ὁμονομον, τὸ δὲ ὁμονομον οὐ πάντως ἵδιον (fol. 175v). To adhere to such confusion would be to fall into the heresy of Macedonius, who denied the Holy Spirit’s mode of existence, or that of Arius, for if the term procession is used ambiguously it could then be applied to the Son’s generation. Tarasius and Maximus the Confessor are then quoted at some length, and the report ends with a rejection (fol. 176r) and refutation (fol. 176v) of Beccus’ errors.

The author’s inability to understand the conceptual clarity achieved by Gregory II is made manifest at the end. In fact he confuses the patriarch’s ideas with those of Beccus and states that the two confirm each other (fol. 176v)! For him the phrase “through the Son” merely indicates the equality and unity (conjoining) of the Son and the Spirit (fol. 176v)—a reversion to a pedestrian if conservative position and interpretation. It is possible that Mark was so afraid and intimidated by the opposition that he had to retreat to this position. Even so, what he actually did is not altogether clear, for (we repeat) the end is missing.

It remains to underline the fact that Gregory’s orthodoxy was vindicated. Eventually it was recognized by the hostile opposition that had campaigned against the patriarch, that is, by Theoleptus of Philadelphia, by John of Ephesus and by the embittered Moschabar and his group.38 Gregory, the Orthodox patriarch, resigned for the

---

38 Pachym. 2.130. Cf. John Chilas’ testimony (written either in 1296 or 1306) in Darrouzes, op.cit. (supra n.27) 400: οὐδὲν τι ἐτερον τὸν τόμον ἐλογιζότοι ή εύσεβείας ἀπάγει καὶ ἀρθροδοξίας ἀσφάλειαν. Also in A. Demetracopoulos, Ἰστορία τοῦ Χίλιατος (Leipzig 1867)
peace of the Church once his orthodoxy was publicly acknowledged.\textsuperscript{39} No retraction was ever made by Gregory or demanded of him by the holy synod. For all its alleged limitations, Gregory’s theology survived all opposition and remained the formal Orthodox doctrine on the procession.

Mark’s Report to the Synod

e codice mutilo Athen. 1217, saec. XIII, fol. 174\textdegree–176\textsuperscript{v}

[174\textdegree] 1. Δεσπόται ἄγιοι: ῥήτων τί τοῦ πατριάρχου ὑπαναγνώσει εἰς τὸν αὐτοῦ τόμον, ἔδοξή μοι ὡς ὅτι διαρεῖ τὴν ἐκπορευόμεθα φωνὴν εἰς τῇ ἄδιον ἐκφαντασμῷ καὶ τῇ εἰς τὸ εἶναι καθαρῶς πρόδοσις τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος· καὶ τῇ μὲν δι’ Ἰσθῆ εἰς ἄδιον ἐκφαντασμῷ\textsuperscript{1} αὐτοῦ ὑπελάμβανον λέγει

[174\textsuperscript{v}] σημαίνεσθαι διὰ τῆς ἐκπορευόμεθα λέξεως | παρὰ τιεὶς ἁγίοις, τῇ δ’ εἰς τὸ εἶναι καθαρῶς πρόδοσις, οὐ. ἐπεὶ γοῦν δύο σημαίνομεν ὑπεν[ ]\textsuperscript{2} ενταῦθα ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκπορευόμεθα φωνῆς, ὁμόνυμον ταύτην ἀνόημα, καθὼς καὶ τὸ γραφὲν ὅπ’ ἐμοῦ γράμματα\textsuperscript{3} δηλοῖ. καὶ γὰρ εἰς τὴν δι’ Ἰσθῆ λέξιν εἴρηκεν ὡς ἄρτι φησὶ σημαίνειν τὴν εἰς ἄδιον ἐκφαντασμῷ καὶ τῆς ἐκπορευόμεθα διὰ τὸν ἑνταῦθα προςεῖθηκε; ποῦ γὰρ ἄλλα χασοῦ ἡ δι’ Ἰσθῆ λέξις γυμνῆ καὶ τῆς ἐκπορευόμεθα ἀνένεα τὴν ὑπαρξίν σημαίνει τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, ὡστε λέγεσθαι οὕτως; ὅτι εἰ καὶ παρ’ ἄλλος, ἡ δι’ Ἰσθῆ λέξις τὴν ὑπαρξίν σημαίνει τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, ἀλλ’ ἑνταῦθα ἐν ἑφήσει σημαίνει, ἐκφαντασμῷ οὕτως δηλοῖ. οὐκ ἦν περὶ τῆς δι’ Ἰσθῆ λέξεως, μόνος ὁ ἐκποτός οὐκ ἦν, ἀλλὰ περὶ τῆς ἐκπορευόμεθα ἑν ἑφήσει σημαίνει διὰ τοῦ Ἰσθῆ τῆς εἰς ἄδιον ἐκφαντασμῷ ἑνταῦθα ἐμφαίνοντος τὸ ἑνταῦθα· ὅτι ἄλλα χασαοῦ ἐν ἑκφαντασμῷ αὐτῇ λέξις τῆς εἰς τὸ εἶναι πρόδοσις σημαίνει τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος, κἂν ἑνταῦθα τὴν εἰς ἄδιον ἐκφαντασμῷ. ἐπεὶ τί βούλεται τὸ ἑνταῦθα κείμενον διαμέσου;

2. ταύτης γοῦν τῆς λέξεως τῇ διανοίᾳ χρησάμενος ἐγών γέγραφα, ὡς ἐπ’ εὔσεβεῖς θεμελίω τὸ προαναγγελθῆν ἡμῖν γράμμα, μαρτύριον δεξάμενος ἀναμφίβολοι, ὡς ἔνομισα μη γεγραμμένος με τοῦ ὅρθοῦ πρὸς τὸν πατριαρχικὸν, καὶ τὸ περὶ τῶν λόγων περιώνυμον αὐτοῦ ὕψος. οὐδὲ γὰρ ὡς κανονύργημα τι τὸ προγράφην μοι γέγονε γράμμα, οὐδὲ πρὸς τὸ διαστρέφων λαὸν ἐπὶ τούτῳ, ὡς ἐπὶ ξένων τινὶ δύσματι μὴ γένοιτο, ἀλλ’ ὅσο δὴθεν

1 The scribe writes ἐκφαντασμῷ everywhere except here. 2 ομα over erasure. 3 See introduction supra p. 234. 4 παρ’ ἐκλίνειν cod.

---

90f. For Moschobar’s change of heart see his letter in Eustratiades, op.cit. (supra n.7) V.500 (=PG 142, 129 with Latin transl.). Cf. Laurent, op.cit. (supra n.25) 157.

\textsuperscript{39} See n.35 supra.
άμοφωνων τῷ πατριαρχικῷ τόμῳ. δὲ δὲ καὶ τὸ γράμμα τῷ πατριάρχῃ προσήχαγον ώς δὲ καὶ παρ’ ἐκείνου ἀποδοχῆς ἥξιώθην· οὕτω καὶ λοιπῶς τις κατ’ ἐπιτροπὴν ἐκεῖ[νου] ἀνεφανεῖθη. ἐπεὶ δὲ παρὰ τῆς ἱερᾶς ταύτης ἀπαγορεύεται καὶ θείας συνόδου πρῶτος αὐτὸ τούτο ἐγὼ ἐκ ἴδιοφυής ἀποβάλλομαι, καὶ οὖν βούλεθαί με τὴν ἀπόδειξιν τῆς ἀποβολῆς τοιαύτην δὴ καὶ ποιήσωμαι.

3. εἰ ὁμώνυμός ἔστι τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος ἡ ἐκπόρευσις, οὐκ ἔστιν τούτῳ ἰδιότης ώς τρόπος τῆς ὑπάρξεως αὐτοῦ· εἰ δὲ ἰδιότης καὶ τρόπος τῆς ὑπάρξεως τοῦ παναγίου <Πνεύματος> ἔστιν ἡ ἐκπόρευσις, ὡσπερ οὖν καὶ ἔστιν, οὗ πάνως ὁμώνυμος ἔστιν ἡ ἐκπόρευσις αὐτοῦ. ὅτι τὸ μὲν ἰδιὸν ἀεὶ καὶ μόνῳ ἔστιν ἐκείνῳ οὗ ἔστιν ἰδιόν, τὸ δὲ ὁμώνυμον, ὄνομα κοινὸν πλείονον καὶ διαφερόντας τὸ ὀνοματικὸν καὶ τῇ ὑπογραφῇ, καὶ οὕτως ἀνάρμοστα καὶ ἀσυμβαίνοντα ταῦτα. τὸ γὰρ ἰδιὸν τινὸς οὐχ ὁμόνυμον, τὸ δὲ ὁμώνυμον οὐ πάνως ἰδιόν.

4. ἡ τις ποτε τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἐφήσει που τῆς ἐκπόρευσεν τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος σημαίνειν ἄλογον τὴν φανεροποίησιν πρὸδον, καὶ ἐκλέγοντος, καὶ ἐνέργειας, καὶ μὴ τὴν ὑπόστασιν καὶ τὸν τρόπον τῆς ὑπάρξεως τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος; εἰ δὲ τούτο, παρρησιάζεται καὶ πάλιν Μακεδόνως ἀδετῶν τὴν τρόπον τῆς ὑπάρξεως τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος, πρὸς ὅν καὶ οἱ θεολόγοι φάσκειν Γρηγόριος: "ποῦ γὰρ ὅθεσε τὸ ἐκπορευτόν, εἰπὲ μοι, Μέσων ἀναφαίνει τῆς σῆς διαφέρεισθαι, καὶ παρὰ κρείσσονος ἤ κατὰ σὲ θεολόγου, <τοῦ> εὐαγγελίου ἡμῶν, εἰςαγόμενον; εἰ μὴ τὴν φωνὴν ἔκεινην τῶν εὖ ἔξειλεν εὐαγγελίων, διὰ τὴν τρίτην σου διαθήκην, "τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, διὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευέται."6 ὃ καθ’ ὅσον7 μὲν ἐκείθεν ἐκπορευέται οὐ κτίσμα· καθ’ ὅσον δὲ οὐ γεννηθάν, οὐχ Υἱὸς· καθ’ ὅσον δὲ ἀγεννήτου καὶ γεννητοῦ μέσου, Θεὸς· καὶ οὕτω σουτ8 σῆς τῶν συλλογισμῶν9 ἀρκεῖ. διαφυγῇ10 Θεὸς ἀναπέφη, σῶς εἰς ἀρχάγγελον ἰχνοστέρος11 καὶ πάλιν· "αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ μὴ γεγεννήθα, καὶ τὸ γεγεννήθα, καὶ τὸ ἐκπροέθεθα, τὸν μὲν Πατέρα, τὸν δὲ Υἱόν, τὸ δὲ τοῦθ’ ὅπερ12 λέγεται Πνεῦμα | ἅγιον προσγραμμέναι, ἕνα τὸ ἀσύγχυτον13 εὐτηταὶ τῶν τριῶν ὑποστάσεων εν τῇ μαῷ φύσει τε καὶ ἔξις τῆς θεότητος."14 καὶ η ὁμώνυμος ἔστι τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος ἡ ἐκπόρευσις, ἔστι δὲ καὶ ὁμόδοξος τῇ τοῦ Υἱοῦ γεννήθη, πάνως ὁμώνυμος ἔστιν καὶ αὐτῇ, καὶ Ἀρείου καὶ πεθανεῖν ἀναζήσει. εἰ δὲ μὴ ὁμώνυμος ἔστιν ἥ τοῦ Υἱοῦ γέννησις, πάνως οὐδὲ ἢ

epsilon per eis tota panagion pneuma. 

5. ἢ τίς ποτε δλως τῶν ὀρθοδόξων Χριστιανών, μὴ τί γε καὶ τῶν τροφίμων τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν καὶ θείων δωμάτων παρὰ πάντων, ἐφησεν τοῦ μὴ εἶναι ἁμα τῆν τε γέννησιν τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τὴν ἐκπορευσιν τοῦ παναγίου πνεύματος, ἢ συνεκπορευέθεια τοῦ Ἰδίου τοῦ Πνεύματος ἁγίῳ, ἢ συγγενέσθαι τῷ Υἱῷ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγίον; ὁ μὲν οὖν θείος Ταράκιος πεπαρρησιακμένος, ὁ θεολογὸς οὕτως ὀμολογεῖ ἐν τῇ μεγίστῃ καὶ ἁγίᾳ ἐβδομή συνώνῳ: “πιστεύω εἰς ἓν Θεόν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, καὶ εἰς ἓν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Θεόν ἡμῶν, γεννηθέντα δὲ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἀχρόνως καὶ άδιως. καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγίον, τὸ Κύριον καὶ ἡμών οὐκομοί, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς δι’ Υἱοῦ ἐκπορευέμενον, καὶ αὐτὸ Θεόν ὑπὸ τοῦ καὶ γνωριζόμενον. Τριάδα ὁμοούσιον, ὁμότιμον τε καὶ ὁμόθρονον, ἀδικίαν, ἅκτυς τῶν πάντων κτιστῶν Δημιουργῶν, μὲν ἀρχήν, μὲν ἁθέτητα καὶ κυριότητα, μὲν βασιλείαν καὶ δύναμιν, καὶ ἐξουσίαν εἰς τριών ὑποστάσεως, ἀδιακατέρρησιν μὲν διαφυσιμένην, καὶ ἕλωμεν ἐπιδιαρρήτως. μή εἰς ἄτελον τριῶν ἐν τῷ τέλειον. ἐκ τῶν τριῶν τελείων ἐν ὑπερτελείᾳ καὶ προτελείᾳ ὡς οὐ μέγας ἐφή Διονύσιος. ὡστε κατὰ μὲν τὴν ἰδιότητα τῶν προσώπων τρία τὰ προκεκούμενα, κατὰ δὲ τὸ κοινὸν τῆς φύσεως εἰς Θεός.” 

6. τί λέγεις, ἐνταῦθα τὴν ὑπόστασιν τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος ὁμολογοῦσιν οἱ θείοι οὗτοι πατέρες, φάσκοντες διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγίον, ἢ τὴν φανεροποίησιν αὐτοῦ πρόδοσαν καὶ ἐκ λαμψίν καὶ ἐνέργεια, πρὸς τῆς ἁλθείας αὐτῆς ἐπὶ καὶ μὴ ἀποκρύψεις τὸ ἁλθεῖς εἰ γὰρ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύμενον, ἢ φανεροποίης ἐκτὸς πρόδοσας καὶ ἐκ λαμψίν, ἐκτι δὲ αὐτῇ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ πάντως τὸ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύμενον καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεσται καὶ ἡ ἱμᾶς, καταθινόν τοις ἁιδῶς καὶ ἡ κακία τοῦ Βέκκου λαμβάνει τὸ κράτος. ἐκεῖνος γὰρ φάσκει καὶ ἐκφυρίζεται τὸ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ

15 τὸ ἐκ τοῦ . . . ἐκπορεύμενον in margin by same hand. 

16 ὡντα cod. 

17 διαρρημενη cod. 

18 ὑπὲρ τελες cod. 


20 Tarasius, Epistola ad Summos Sacerdotes, Migne PG 98, 1461c-d. 

21 Maximus Confessor, Quaestiones ad Thalassium, Migne PG 90, 672c.
ektepevóménon, kai ék tou Ὕιον ἐστίν ἐκπορεύεσθαι, καὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς υπάρξεως τῶν λόγων τίθειν. ἀλλ' οὖν τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Ὕιον ἐκπορεύεσθαι ἐναργῶς ἐκλαμβάνει, καὶ ὁ θέλων καταλύει τοῦτο ἱσχυρῶς ὁ εὖ ἐπιβεβαιοὶ λόγος. ἦ τις ποτε τῶν ἐπὶ εὐσεβείᾳ γνωρίων θείων πατέρων ἔφηςε ποι τὸ διὰ τοῦ Ὕιον ἐκπορεύεσθαι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον, οὗ τὴν εἰς τὸ εἶναι σημαίνει πρόσοδον τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος, ἀλλὰ τὴν φανεροτοιῶν αὐτοῦ ἐλλαμβάνει καὶ ἐνέργειαν; εἰ μὲν οὖν ἔφηςε τις τῶν θείων πατέρων τούτῳ δείξατε, παραστήσατε, καὶ Ἰμηὲς στέρξομεν. εἰ δὲ οὐδεὶς τοὺς τῶν θείων πατέρων ἔφηςε τούτῳ, ἔδακτε καὶ Ἰμηὲς τὰς τοιαύτας ἀνωφελεῖς ἐξήγησεις. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀντιφέρεται τούτῳ πρὸς τὴν τοῦ Βέκκου κακίστην ὁμολογίαν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπιβεβαιοὶ ταῦτην.

7. ἦ δὲ ἀληθῆς πρὸς τὸν Βέκκον ἀντίφρασις ἐστὶν αὐτῇ· εἰ μὲν οὖν οἱ λέγοντες διὰ τοῦ Ὕιον ἐκπορεύεσθαι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον, ἦ καὶ ἐπέρσ τις τῶν θείων πατέρων ἔφακεν καὶ ἐκ τοῦ [Ὕιον] ἐκπορεύεσθαι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον, ἢς ὁ δὲ δεῖ λέγειν καὶ ὁ[μο]λογεῖν τὸ διὰ τοῦ Ὕιον ἐκπορεύεσθαι τοῦ ἄγιον ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, ἐπεὶ ὁ θείος ὄνομα τίς τῶν θείων πατέρων ὁ λ[ ]ει τούτῳ, μάτην ἄρα σεαυτὸν ἀπαύγα τάς μᾶς τὸ διὰ τοῦ Ὕιον ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεσθαι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον ταῦταν ἐστὶ τοῦ ἔκ τοῦ Ὕιον. οἱ δὲ καὶ τὸ διὰ τοῦ Ὕιον εἶναι προβολέα τὸν Πατέρα τὸν ἄγιον Πνεύματος ταῦταν εἶναι λέγοντες τῷ διὰ τοῦ Ὕιον ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεσθαι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον, τὸ συνημμένον καὶ ὁμότιμον τοῦ Ὕιον καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος, τῶν δύο αἰτιατών, ἐν[ἀρ]γὼς παρετάνει. εἰ δὲ καὶ τὸ διὰ τοῦ Ὕιον εἶναι προβολέα τὸν Πατέρα τοῦ ἄγιον Πνεύματος ταῦταν εἶπε τε εἶναι τὸ διὰ τοῦ Ὕιον ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεσθαι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον, πάντως τὸ συνημμένον καὶ ὁμότιμον τοῦ Ὅιον καὶ τοῦ προβολέας ὡς δύο αἰτιατῶν ἁριδῆλως εἶναι διδάκεις. τὸ γὰρ διὰ τοῦ Ὅιον, εἰ μὲν πρὸ<τ>εθῇ τῷ αἰτιατῷ, ἤγουν τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ ἄγιῳ, τὸ συνημμένον καὶ ὁμότιμον τῶν δύο αἰτιατῶν σαφῶς πα[ρὶ]πάνταν. 22 εἰ δὲ προστεθῇ τῷ αἰτιavit, ἤγουν τῷ προβολεῖ, τὸ συνημμένον καὶ ὁμότιμον τοῦ Ὅιον καὶ τοῦ προβολέως ὡς δ[ῦ]να ἀιτ[ὴ]ς σαφῶς ἐκδιδάκεις· ὁπερ εἶπεν ἀτοποῦν, τὸ γὰρ διὰ τοῦ Ὅιον ἐκπορεύεσθαι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον συνημμένος καὶ ὁμοδόξως τῷ Ὅιῳ ἐκπορεύεσθαι ἐστὶ. τὸ δὲ διὰ τοῦ Ὅιον εἶναι προβολέα τὸν Πατέρα... . . .

22 Cf. Athanasius, Quaestiones Aliae, Migne PG 28, 784C λοιπῶν γίνοντες, ὧτὶ ὁ Πατὴρ μόνος ἐστὶν αἰτιατός· δὲ Ὅιος οὐκ ἐστὶν αἰτιατός, ἀλλ' αἰτιατός. ὡστε μὲν αἰτιάς ἐστὶ μόνος ὁ Πατὴρ. τὰ δὲ αἰτιατὰ δύο, ὃς Ὅιος καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα.
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