

Gregory II of Cyprus and an Unpublished Report to the Synod

Aristeides Papadakis

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.¹ And although unionism could never again be ignored in Byzantine intellectual history, the Council did a great deal to heal the Church’s ills² and mend the division within Byzantium that, according to Pachymeres, had become as profound as that which only yesterday had divided Greeks and Latins.³

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

¹ The *editio princeps* of the *Tomus*, based on *Paris.gr.* 1301 fol.87–103, was made by A. Banduri, *Imperium Orientale* II (Paris 1711) 942–49, and reprinted in Migne *PG* 142, 233–46. See also V. Laurent, *Les registres des actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople*, I: *Les actes des Patriarches*, fasc.IV: *Les registres de 1208 à 1309* (Paris 1971) no.1490 [hereafter LAURENT, *Regestes*]. A new edition based on all extant mss is being prepared by the present writer. On the chronology of Gregory’s patriarchate see Laurent, “Mélanges: 1. Les dates du second patriarcat de Joseph Ier (31 XII 1282–av. 26 IV 1283),” *REByz* 18 (1960) 206, and *idem*, “La chronologie des patriarches de Constantinople au XIII^e s. (1208–1309),” *REByz* 27 (1969) 146–47.

² See the posthumous praise of this Council and of Gregory by Joseph Calothetus, *Vita Athanasii*, 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.

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.⁴ 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.⁵

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.⁶ One of his more interesting achievements was his voluminous correspondence; indeed, in an age of letter writers he was one of the most accomplished.⁷ 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.”⁸ 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 Prophecies 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 *Θρησκευτική και Ήθική Έγκυκλοπαίδεια* 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.

⁷ S. Eustratiades, ed. *Ἐκκλησιαστικὸς Φάρος* I (1908) 77–108, 409–39; IV (1909) 5–29, 97–128; V (1910) 213–26, 339–52, 444–52, 489–500. This is a partial edition only (197 letters); cf. Lameere, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 197–203, who lists 242 letters. An incomplete listing is included in Migne PG 142, 421–31. See the useful remarks of J. Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les ὀφφίκια de l’église byzantine* (Paris 1970) 454–56. The three other major collections of letters by patriarchs are those of Photius, Nicholas I and Gregory’s contemporary, Athanasius I.

⁸ A. Garzya, “Observations sur l’‘Autobiographie’ de Grégoire de Chypre,” in *Πρακτικὰ τοῦ Πρώτου Διεθνoῦς Κυπρολογικοῦ 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 ἐρῶν*—he was ordained.⁹ 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.¹⁰ 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.¹¹ 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.¹² 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 προθέσεων*—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*).¹³ In other words, the *Filioque* was identical (*ἰσοδύναμος*) with the Greek patristic formula *διὰ υἱοῦ* (*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.176^r.

from the Father through the Son is a true and incontrovertible doctrine, where is the innovation?"¹⁴

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.¹⁵ 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.¹⁶

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,¹⁷ for the Son is not the cause—either separately or with the Father—of the Holy Spirit.¹⁸ In short, it has nothing to do with the eternal procession (*ἐκπόρευσις*), 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 (*ἐκφανσις αἰδίου*) 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 σκανδάλων μεγάλων ἀφορμὰς τὰ τοιαῦτα παρέσχον τοῖς ὕστερον.*

¹⁶ V. Laurent, ed. *Les "Mémoires" du Grand Ecclésiarque de l'Église de Constantinople Sylvestre Syropoulos* (Concilium Florentinum Documenta et Scriptores, SER.B IX, Rome 1971) 442.

¹⁷ See Gregory's *De Processione Spiritus Sancti*, Migne PG 142, 290c *οὐχ ὅτι ἀτελής ἡ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς τοῦ Πνεύματος ὑπαρξίς.*

¹⁸ *Tomus*, Migne PG 142, 236c *οὐ μὴν δὴ καὶ αἴτιον αὐτὸν 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."¹⁹

In reality Gregory introduced what has been called "a new traditional element"²⁰ 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.²¹

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' ὅτι ἐκεῖθεν ἐκ τῆς πατρικῆς τουτέστιν οὐσίας ὑφιστάμενον, ὡς εἴρηται, τέλειον συμπαραμαρτεῖ τῷ Λόγῳ κατὰ τοὺς εἰρηκότας θεηγόρους, καὶ ἦκει δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπολάμπει καὶ πέφηνε κατὰ τὴν προαιώνιον αὐτοῦ καὶ αἰδίου ἔκλαμψιν.

²⁰ J. Meyendorff, *Introduction à l'étude de Grégoire Palamas* (Paris 1959) 27.

²¹ Consult the recent analysis of Gregory's *De Processione* by O. Clement, "Grégoire de Chypre, 'de l'ekporèse de Saint Esprit'," *Istina* 3-4 (1972) 443-56. See also M. Jugie, *Theologia Dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium* II (Paris 1933) 358-66; and I. E. Troitskii, "K istorii sporov po voprosu ob iskhozhdenii Sviatago Dukha," *Khristianskoe Chtenie* 69 (1889) pt.I 338-77; pt.II 280-352, 520-70. For a discussion of the relations of Palamas' formulations and those of the patriarch see A. Radovic, *Τὸ Μυστήριον τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος κατὰ τὸν Ἅγιον Γρηγόριον Παλαμά* (*Analecta Vlatadon* 16, Thessalonica 1973) 174-76.

manifestation (*προβολεύς* = *ἐκφανσις*).²² 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 *ἀκίνητος ιδιότης* of the Holy Spirit.²³

Eventually the patriarch and the *Tomus* 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.²⁴ 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.²⁵ In close league with him were two other defectors, the deacon John Penteclestes 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.²⁶ They were later joined by two members of the higher clergy, John of Ephesus and Theoleptus of Philadelphia.²⁷ Every one of these had signed the *Tomus*.²⁸

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

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 ὀνόμασα καθὼς καὶ τὸ γραφὲν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ γράμμα δηλοῖ* (fol.174^r). We also know Mark's views from Gregory's *Ὁμολογία*, 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.

²⁵ See especially V. Laurent, "Un polémiste grec de la fin du XIII^e siècle: La vie et les oeuvres de George Moschabar," *EchO* 28 (1929) 129–58.

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

²⁷ One party, formed by John of Ephesus, wanted to judge the patriarch by canon law, while Theoleptus of Philadelphia was an advocate of economy. Pachym. 2.128–29. See J. Darrouzès, *Documents inédits d'ecclésiologie byzantine* (Paris 1970) 89. On Theoleptus' moderate stand consult Meyendorff, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.20) 28 n.8. But see V. Laurent's opposition to Meyendorff's interpretation in "Les crises religieuses à Byzance: Le schisme antiarsénite de métropolitaine Théolepte de Philadelphie († c.1324)," *REByz* 18 (1960) 45f.

²⁸ V. Laurent, "Les signataires du second synode des Blakhernes (Été 1285)," *EchO* 26 (1927) 144, 147, 148.

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.²⁹ 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.³⁰ 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 defec-tion's maneuvers) to disassociate himself from his disciple's question-able commentary—"his babbling letter"—and write a refutation.³¹ 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.³² In brief, in the two compositions known as the *Ὁμολογία* and the *πιττάκιον* 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

²⁹ Pachym. 2.117. (Nessus the centaur was shot by Heracles with a poisoned arrow, which afterwards became the cause of his own death.)

³⁰ Pachym. 2.118; see also Troitskii, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.21) pt.I 342.

³¹ The text of this *Ὁμολογία* 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 *πιττάκιον* in PG 142, 267c–270A also speaks of the *φλύαρον τοῦ Μάρκου χαρτίον* (col.268A); Laurent, *Regestes* no.1513.

³² Migne PG 142, 249D–250A.

approval and so proceeded to publish it and to inform people that it had the patriarch's personal *imprimatur*.³³

At the very end of *Codex Atheniensis* 1217, fol. 174^r–176^v, published here, there is a document addressed to the synod (fol. 174^r) 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. 174^v)—the same word that is employed both by the patriarch and by Pachymeres to describe the monk's small *oeuvre*.³⁴

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 1289.³⁵ Pachymeres does not mention whether Mark was present at this synod except to inform us that “almost all the clergy and monks were present.”³⁶ 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. 174^r). 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.³⁷

The Report to the Synod begins with a brief exposition of the patriarch's *Tomus* and the distinction between procession and the

³³ Pachym. 2.118 *προστίθεις ὡς καὶ πατριάρχῃ ἐμφανίσαιε τοῦτο καὶ ἐκεῖνός τινα διορθώσαιεν, ἐγκαθιστῶν ἐντεῦθεν 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 Ἐθνικῆς 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.174^r, 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 (174^r).

³⁵ Pachym. 2.130–31, where Gregory's *λίβελλος παρατήσεως* 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 novelties, deceiving people or introducing any foreign dogma; its sole purpose was to agree with the patriarchal *Tomus*—*ἀλλ' ὡς δῆθεν ὁμοφωνῶν τῷ πατριαρχικῷ τόμῳ* (fol. 174^v). 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 *ἐκπόρευσις* 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 ἀνάρμοστα καὶ ἀσυμβίβαστα ταῦτα. τὸ γὰρ ἴδιόν τινος οὐχ ὁμώνυμον, τὸ δὲ ὁμώνυμον οὐ πάντως ἴδιον* (fol. 175^r). 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. 176^r) and refutation (fol. 176^v) 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. 176^r)! For him the phrase "through the Son" merely indicates the equality and unity (conjoining) of the Son and the Spirit (fol. 176^v)—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

initial enumeration—Mark's lost commentary, Gregory's refutation, Mark's Report to the Synod—is the more logical and likely.

³⁸ Pachym. 2.130. Cf. John Chilas' testimony (written either in 1296 or 1306)- in Darrouzès, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.27) 400: *οὐδέν τι ἕτερον τὸν τόμον ἐλογίζοντο ἢ εὐσεβείας ἀπάτης καὶ ὀρθοδοξίας ἀσφάλειαν*. Also in A. Demetracopoulos, *Ἱστορία τοῦ Σχίσματος* (Leipzig 1867)

peace of the Church once his orthodoxy was publicly acknowledged.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^r-176^v

- [174^r] 1. Δεσπόται ἅγιοι· ῥητὸν τί τοῦ πατριάρχου ὑπαναγνοῦς εἰς τὸν αὐτοῦ τόμον, ἔδοξέ μοι ὡς ὅτι διαιρεῖ τὴν ἐκπορεύεσθαι φωνὴν εἰς τε τὴν αἰδιδιον ἔκφα<ν>σιν καὶ τὴν εἰς τὸ εἶναι καθαρῶς πρόοδον τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος· καὶ τὴν μὲν δι' Υἱοῦ εἰς αἰδιδιον ἔκφασιν¹ αὐτοῦ ὑπελάμβανον λέγει
- [174^v] σημαίνεσθαι διὰ τῆς ἐκπορεύεσθαι λέξεως | παρά τισιν ἁγίοις, τὴν δ' εἰς τὸ εἶναι καθαρῶς πρόοδον, οὕ. ἐπεὶ γοῦν δύο σημαινόμενα ὑπεν[[]]² ἐνταῦθα ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκπορεύεσθαι φωνῆς, ὁμώνυμον ταύτην ὠνόμασα, καθὼς καὶ τὸ γραφέν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ γράμμα³ δηλοῖ. καὶ γὰρ εἰς τὴν δι' Υἱοῦ λέξιν εἴρηκεν ὡς ἄρτι φησὶ σημαίνειν τὴν εἰς αἰδιδιον ἔκφα<ν>σιν τῆς ἐκπορεύεσθαι δίχα, πῶς τὸ ἐνταῦθα προσέθηκε; ποῦ γὰρ ἀλλαχοῦ ἢ δι' Υἱοῦ αὕτη λέξις γυμνὴ καὶ τῆς ἐκπορεύεσθαι ἄνευ τὴν ὑπαρξίν σημαίνει τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, ὥστε λέγεσθαι οὕτως; ὅτι εἰ καὶ παρ' ἄλλοις, ἢ δι' Υἱοῦ λέξις τὴν ὑπαρξίν σημαίνει τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, ἀλλ' ἐνταῦθα ἦν ἔφησε σημαίνει, ἔκφα<ν>σιν δηλοῖ. οὐκ ἦν περὶ τῆς δι' Υἱοῦ λέξεως, μόνης ὁ σκοπὸς οὐκ ἦν, ἀλλὰ περὶ τῆς ἐκπορεύεσθαι ἦν ἔφησε σημαίνειν διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τὴν εἰς αἰδιδιον ἔκφα<ν>-σι<ν> ἐνταῦθα ἐμφαίνοντος τὸ ἐνταῦθα· ὅτι ἀλλαχοῦ ἢ ἐκπορεύεσθαι αὕτη λέξις τὴν εἰς τὸ εἶναι πρόοδον σημαίνει τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος, καὶ ἐνταῦθα τὴν εἰς αἰδιδιον ἔκφα<ν>σιν. ἐπεὶ τί βούλεται τὸ ἐνταῦθα κείμενον διαμέσου;

2. ταύτης γοῦν τῆς λέξεως τῇ διανοίᾳ χρησάμενος ἔγωγε γέγραφα, ὡς ἐπ' εὐσεβεῖ θεμελίω τὸ προαναγνωσθὲν ἡμῖν γράμμα, μαρτύριον δεξάμενος ἀναμφίβολου, ὡς ἐνόμισα μὴ παρεκκλίνειν⁴ με τοῦ ὀρθοῦ πρὸς τὸν πατρι-αρχικόν, καὶ τὸ περὶ τὸν λόγον περιώνυμον αὐτοῦ ὕψος. οὐδὲ γὰρ ὡς καινούργημά τι τὸ προγραφέν μοι γέγονε γράμμα, οὐδὲ πρὸς τὸ διαστρέψαι λαὸν ἐπὶ τούτῳ, ὡς ἐπὶ ξένῳ τινὶ δόγματι μὴ γένοιτο, ἀλλ' ὡς δῆθεν

1 The scribe writes ἔκφασιν everywhere except here. 2 ομα over erasure.

3 See introduction *supra* p. 234. 4 παρ' ἐκλίνειν *cod.*

90f. For Moschabar'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.

³⁹ See n.35 *supra*.

ὁμοφωνῶν τῷ πατριαρχικῷ τόμῳ. δι' ὃ καὶ τὸ γράμμα τῷ πατριάρχῃ
 προσήγαγον ὡς δὲ καὶ παρ' ἐκείνου ἀποδοχῆς ἠξιώθην· οὕτω καὶ λοιποῖς
 [75^r] τισι κατ' ἐπιτροπὴν ἐκείνου ἀνεφανίσθη. ἐπεὶ δὲ παρὰ τῆς ἱερᾶς ταύτης
 ἀπαγορεύεται καὶ θείας συνόδου πρῶτος αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐγὼ ἐκ ψυχῆς ἀπο-
 βάλλομαι, καὶ οἷαν βούλεσθαι με τὴν ἀπόδειξιν τῆς ἀποβολῆς τοιαύτην δὴ
 καὶ ποιήσομαι.

3. εἰ ὁμώνυμός ἐστι τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος ἢ ἐκπόρευσις, οὐκ ἔστι
 τοῦτο ἰδιότης ὡς τρόπος τῆς ὑπάρξεως αὐτοῦ· εἰ δὲ ἰδιότης καὶ τρόπος τῆς
 ὑπάρξεως τοῦ παναγίου <Πνεύματος> ἐστὶν ἢ ἐκπόρευσις, ὡς περ οὖν καὶ
 ἔστιν, οὐ πάντως ὁμώνυμός ἐστιν ἢ ἐκπόρευσις αὐτοῦ. ὅτι τὸ μὲν ἴδιον ἀεὶ
 καὶ μόνῳ ἐστὶν ἐκείνῳ οὐδ' ἐστὶν ἴδιον, τὸ δὲ ὁμώνυμον, ὄνομα κοινὸν
 πλειόνων καὶ διαφερόντων τότε ὀρισμῷ καὶ τῇ ὑπογραφήῃ, καὶ οὕτως
 ἀνάρμοστα καὶ ἀσυμβίβαστα ταῦτα. τὸ γὰρ ἴδιόν τινος οὐχ ὁμώνυμον, τὸ
 δὲ ὁμώνυμον οὐ πάντως ἴδιον.

4. ἢ τίς ποτε τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἔφησέ που τὴν ἐκπόρευσιν τοῦ πανα-
 γίου Πνεύματος σημαίνει ὅλως τὴν φανεροποιὸν πρόοδον, καὶ ἔλ<λ>αμψιν,
 καὶ ἐνέργειαν, καὶ μὴ τὴν ὑπόστασιν καὶ τὸν τρόπον τῆς ὑπάρξεως τοῦ
 παναγίου Πνεύματος; εἰ δὲ τοῦτο, παρρησιάζεται καὶ πάλιν Μακεδόنيος
 ἀθετῶν τὸν τρόπον τῆς ὑπάρξεως τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος, πρὸς ὃν καὶ
 ὁ θεολόγος φάσκει Γρηγόριος· “ποῦ γὰρ⁵ θήσεις τὸ ἐκπορευτόν, εἶπέ μοι,
 μέσον ἀ<να>φανὲν τῆς σῆς διαιρέσεως, καὶ παρὰ κρείσσονος ἢ κατὰ σὲ
 θεολόγου, <τοῦ> σωτήρος ἡμῶν, εἰσαγόμενον; εἰ μὴ τὴν φωνὴν ἐκείνην
 τῶν σῶν ἐξεῖλες εὐαγγελίων, διὰ τὴν τρίτην σου διαθήκην, “τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ
 ἅγιον, ὃ παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται.”⁶ ὃ καθ' ὅσον⁷ μὲν ἐκείθεν
 ἐκπορεύεται οὐ κτίσμα· καθ' ὅσον δὲ οὐ γεννητόν, οὐχ Υἱός· καθ' ὅσον δὲ
 ἀγεννήτου καὶ γεννητοῦ μέσον, Θεός. καὶ οὕτω σου⁸ τὰς τῶν συλλογισμῶν⁹
 ἄρκυς διαφυγόν¹⁰ Θεὸς ἀναπέφηνε, τῶν σῶν διαιρέσεων ἰσχυρότερος.”¹¹
 καὶ πάλιν· “αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ μὴ γεγενῆσθαι, καὶ τὸ γεγενῆσθαι, καὶ τὸ
 ἐκπορεύεσθαι, τὸν μὲν Πατέρα, τὸν δὲ Υἱόν, τὸ δὲ τοῦθ' ὅπερ¹² λέγεται
 [75^v] Πνεῦμα | ἅγιον προσηγόρευεν, ἵνα τὸ ἀσύγχυτον¹³ σώζηται τῶν τριῶν
 ὑποστάσεων ἐν τῇ μιᾷ φύσει τε καὶ ἀξίᾳ τῆς θεότητος.”¹⁴ καὶ ἡ ὁμώνυμός
 ἐστὶ τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος ἢ ἐκπόρευσις, ἔστι δὲ καὶ ὁμόδοξος τῇ τοῦ
 Υἱοῦ γεννήσει, πάντως ὁμώνυμός ἐστι καὶ αὕτη, καὶ Ἄρειος κἀντεῦθεν
 ἀναζήσει. εἰ δὲ μὴ ὁμώνυμός ἐστιν ἢ τοῦ Υἱοῦ γέννησις, πάντως οὐδὲ ἡ

5 δὲ cod. 6 John 15.26. 7 καθόσον cod. 8 οὕτως σοι cod. 9 συλλογισμῶν cod.
 10 διαφυγῶν cod. 11 De Spiritu Sancto (Oratio V) ed. A. J. Mason, *The Five
 Theological Orations of Gregory of Nazianzus* (Cambridge 1899) 154–55 (Migne
 PG 36, 141A–B). 12 τὸν δὲ τοῦθ' ὅπερ cod. 13 τὸν ἀσύγχυτον cod. 14 Greg.
 Naz. 156 Mason (Migne PG 36, 141D–144A).

ἐκπόρευσις τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος· ὅτι ὁμοδόξως εἰσὶν αἰτιατὰ ἐκ τῆς πρώτης αὐτῶν καὶ φυσικῆς αἰτίας, ἐκάτερον κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ὑποστατικὴν ἰδιότητα καὶ τὸν τρόπον τῆς ὑπάρξεως, ὁ μὲν Υἱὸς γεννητῶς, τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκπορευτῶς.

5. ἢ τίς ποτε ὄλως τῶν ὀρθοδόξων Χριστιανῶν, μή τί γε καὶ τῶν τροφίμων τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν καὶ θείων δογμάτων παρὰ πάντων, ἔφησέ που μὴ εἶναι ἅμα τὴν τε γέννησιν τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τὴν ἐκπόρευσιν τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος, ἢ συνεκπορεύεσθαι τὸν Υἱὸν τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ, ἢ συγγενᾶσθαι τῷ Υἱῷ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον; ὁ μὲν οὖν θεῖος Ταράσιος πεπαρρησιασμένως θεολογῶν οὕτως ὁμολογεῖ ἐν τῇ μεγίστῃ καὶ ἁγίᾳ ἑβδόμῃ συνόδῳ· “πιστεύω εἰς ἓνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, καὶ εἰς ἓνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Θεὸν ἡμῶν, γεννηθέντα δὲ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἀχρόνως καὶ αἰδίως. καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ Κύριον καὶ ζωοποιόν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς δι’ Υἱοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον,¹⁵ καὶ αὐτὸ Θεὸν ὃν τε¹⁶ καὶ γνωριζόμενον· Τριάδα ὁμοούσιον, ὁμότιμόν τε καὶ ὁμόθρονον, ἀίδιον, ἄκτιστον, τῶν πάντων κτιστῶν δημιουργόν, μίαν ἀρχήν, μίαν θεότητα καὶ κυριότητα, μίαν βασιλείαν καὶ δύναμιν, καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἐν τρισὶν ὑποστάσεσιν, ἀδιαιρέτως μὲν διαιρουμένην,¹⁷ καὶ ἠνωμένην διαιρετῶς· μὴ ἐξ ἀτελῶν τριῶν ἐν τι τέλειον. ἄλλ’ ἐκ τριῶν τελείων ἐν ὑπερτελές¹⁸ καὶ προτέλειον’ ὡς ὁ μέγας ἔφη Διονύσιος.¹⁹ ὥστε κατὰ μὲν τὴν ἰδιότητα τῶν προσώπων τρία τὰ προσκυνούμενα, κατὰ δὲ τὸ | κοινὸν τῆς φύσεως εἰς Θεός.”²⁰ ὁ δὲ γε θεῖος Μάξιμος καὶ αὐτὸς οὕτως βοᾷ· “τὸ γὰρ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὥσπερ φύσει κατ’ οὐσίαν ὑπάρχει τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς, οὕτω καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ φύσει κατ’ οὐσίαν ἐστίν, ὡς ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐσιωδῶς δι’ Υἱοῦ γεννηθέντος ἀφράστως ἐκπορευόμενον.”²¹

6. τί λέγεις, ἐνταῦθα τὴν ὑπόστασιν τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος ὁμολογοῦσιν οἱ θεῖοι οὗτοι πατέρες, φάσκοντες διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἢ τὴν φανεροποιὸν αὐτοῦ πρόοδον καὶ ἔ<λ>λαμψιν καὶ ἐνέργειαν; πρὸς τῆς ἀληθείας αὐτῆς εἶπε καὶ μὴ ἀποκρύψῃς τὸ ἀληθές· εἰ γὰρ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον, ἢ φανεροποιός ἐστι πρόοδος καὶ ἔ<λ>λαμψις, ἔστι δὲ αὕτη καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ· πάντως τὸ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεται καθ’ ἡμᾶς, κἀντεῦθεν τὸ ψεῦδος καὶ ἡ κακία τοῦ Βέκκου λαμβάνει τὸ κράτος. ἐκεῖνος γὰρ φάσκει καὶ ἰσχυρίζεται τὸ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ

15 τὸ ἐκ τοῦ . . . ἐκπορευόμενον in margin by same hand. 16 ὄντα cod. 17 διαιρουμένη cod. 18 ὑπὲρ τελές cod. 19 Διονύσιος cod.; locus incognitus but cf. *De Divinis Nominibus* 2.10 ἀτελής δὲ ἐν τοῖς τελείοις ὡς ὑπερτελής καὶ προτέλειος, in S. Lilla, “Il testo tachigrafico del ‘De Divinis Nominibus’,” *Studi e Testi* 263 (1970) 65 (Migne PG 3, 648c). 20 Tarasius, *Epistola ad Summos Sacerdotes*, Migne PG 98, 1461c–d. 21 Maximus Confessor, *Quaestiones ad Thalassium*, Migne PG 90, 672c.

ἐκπορευόμενον, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐστὶν ἐκπορεύεσθαι, κἄν τοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς ὑπάρξεως τὸν λόγον τίθησιν. ἀλλ' οὖν τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι ἐναργῶς ἐκλαμβάνει, καὶ ὁ θέλομεν καταλύσαι τοῦτο ἰσχυρῶς ὁ σὸς ἐπιβεβαιοῖ λόγος. ἢ τίς ποτε τῶν ἐπ' εὐσεβείᾳ γνωρίμων θείων πατέρων ἔφησέ που τὸ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, οὐ τὴν εἰς τὸ εἶναι σημαίνει πρόοδον τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος, ἀλλὰ τὴν φανεροποιὸν αὐτοῦ ἔλλαμψίν τε καὶ ἐνέργειαν; εἰ μὲν οὖν ἔφησέ τις τῶν θείων πατέρων τοῦτο δεῖξατε, παραστήσατε, καὶ ἡμεῖς στέρξομεν. εἰ δὲ οὐδεὶς που τῶν θείων πατέρων ἔφησε τοῦτο, ἔασατε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰς τοιαύτας ἀνωφελεῖς ἐξηγήσεις· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀντιφέρεται τοῦτο πρὸς τὴν τοῦ Βέκκου κακίστην ὁμολογίαν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπιβεβαιοῖ ταύτην.

[176^v] 7. ἢ δὲ ἀληθῆς πρὸς τὸν Βέκκον ἀντίρρησις ἐστὶν αὕτη· εἰ μὲν οὖν οἱ λέγοντες διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἢ καὶ ἕτερός τις τῶν θείων πατέρων ἔφασκεν καὶ ἐκ τοῦ [Υἱοῦ] ἐκπορεύεσθαι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἴσως ἂν εἶχες λέγειν καὶ ὁ[μο]λογεῖν τὸ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι <τ> αὐτὸν εἶναι τῷ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ. ἐπεὶ δ' οὐδαμῶς τις τῶν θείων πατέρων ὄλ[]σε τοῦτο, μάτην ἄρα σεαυτὸν ἀπατᾷς φάσκων τὸ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεσθαι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ταυτὸν ἐστὶ τῷ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ. οἱ δὲ καὶ τὸ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ εἶναι προβολέα τὸν Πατέρα τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ταυτὸν εἶναι λέγοντες τῷ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεσθαι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, γνώτωσαν ὡς οὐκ ἔστι τοῦτο ἀληθές· ὅτι τὸ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεσθαι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ συνημμένον καὶ ὁμότιμον τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος, τῶν δύο αἰτιατῶν, ἐν[αρ]γῶς παριστάνει. εἰ δὲ καὶ τὸ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ εἶναι προβολέα τὸν Πατέρα τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ταυτὸν εἴπειεν εἶναι τὸ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεσθαι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, πάντως τὸ συνημμένον καὶ ὁμότιμον τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ προβολέως ὡς δύο αἰτίων ἀριδῆλως εἶναι διδάσκει. τὸ γὰρ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, εἰ μὲν προ<σ>τεθῆ τῷ αἰτιατῷ, ἡγουν τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ ἀγίῳ, τὸ συνημμένον καὶ ὁμότιμον τῶν δύο αἰτιατῶν σαφῶς πα[ρι]στάνει.²² εἰ δὲ προστεθῆ τῷ αἰτίῳ, ἡγουν τῷ προβολεῖ, τὸ συνημμένον καὶ ὁμότιμον τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ προβολέως ὡς δ[ύο] αἰτ[ί]ων σαφῶς ἐκδιδάσκει· ὅπερ εἰπεῖν ἄτοπον, τὸ γὰρ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον συνημμένως καὶ ὁμοδόξως τῷ Υἱῷ ἐκπορεύεσθαι ἐστὶ. τὸ δὲ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ εἶναι προβολέα τὸν Πατέρα. . . .

22 Cf. Athanasius, *Quaestiones Aliae*, Migne PG 28, 784c λοιπὸν γίνωσκε, ὅτι ὁ Πατὴρ μόνος ἐστὶν αἴτιος· ὁ δὲ Υἱὸς οὐκ ἔστιν αἴτιος, ἀλλ' αἰτιατός. ὥστε μὲν αἴτιός ἐστι μόνος ὁ Πατήρ. τὰ δὲ αἰτιατὰ δύο, ὁ Υἱὸς καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα.