

Oxford Handbooks Online

The Development of the Trinity Doctrine in Byzantium (Ninth to Fifteenth Centuries)

Karl Christian Felmy

The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity

Edited by Gilles Emery and Matthew Levering

Print Publication Date: Oct
2011

Subject: Religion, Theology and Philosophy of Religion,
Christianity, Literary and Textual Studies

Online Publication Date: Jan
2012

DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199557813.003.0016

Abstract and Keywords

This article explores the Byzantine theologies of the Trinity from the ninth through the fifteenth centuries. It discusses liturgical hymnody and art and analyzes the controversy over the *Filioque* with particular attention to the ninth-century Patriarch of Constantinople Photius. It also considers the Trinity doctrine of Patriarch Gennadios II and Gregory Palamas, whose approach was similar to that of Augustine except with regards to the *Filioque* and the divine energies.

Keywords: Byzantine theologies, Trinity, liturgical hymnody, *Filioque*, Photius, Patriarch Gennadios II, Gregory Palamas, divine energies

The Trinity Doctrine within the Framework of Orthodox Tradition

□ □ □ the Council of Nicaea (325) there has been a growing tendency in the East to view the most important Orthodox dogmatic teachings as complete and the questions connected with them as answered. Canon VII of the Council of Ephesus (431) decreed that the decisions made at the Council of Nicaea could no longer be amended, thus prohibiting the formulation of new creeds above and beyond the Symbol of Nicaea. In fact, it was not the Nicene Creed itself, but the Creed of the second Ecumenical Synod of Constantinople (381), which is based on the Nicene Creed, that became the sole symbol of the Orthodox Church, beyond which later Councils may still have formulated their *Æqoi*, but did not dare to establish new symbols of faith.

Even the Byzantine theologian Maximus the Confessor (579/80–662), who was, as Hans-Georg Beck noted in an assessment with a very western slant (Oberdorfer 2001: 143, n. 53, rightly observes how strongly Beck's underlying assessment criteria are influenced by the West), the 'most universal mind of the 7th century and perhaps the last independently thinking theologian of the Byzantine Church' (Beck 1959: 436), when writing his liturgical commentary, shied away from newly interpreting passages of the Divine Liturgy that had previously been interpreted by Dionysius Areopagita, whom Maximus held in high esteem and who was revered as an apostolic authority beyond all doubt (von Balthasar 1961: 367). A general preference—at that time for the most part still (p. 211) shared in the West—for the ancient and traditional over the new, not yet tried and tested, as well as the binding character of the decrees of the Seven Ecumenical Councils for Roman imperial law, always made theological innovations, especially those in the area of the Trinity doctrine or Christology, seem suspicious to Byzantine theologians.

Contrary to a widespread eastern self-image and contrary to western prejudices, eastern theology, in spite of this, was not paralysed, and by no means remained without creativity. Indeed, proposals for new ways of rethinking traditional positions almost always came from outside the Church, or from theologians who challenged whatever consensus had been reached up to that point. Only when it was necessary to defend the traditional against challenges from within or without were new statements risked in theology—though more so in the field of questions on which there were no conciliar provisions, such as was exemplified by St Gregorios Palamas (1296–1359) in the development of the doctrine of the divine energies, or by St Nicholas Cabasilas (c.1320–c.1397), with his theology of mysteries (sacraments).

Complementary to an understanding of theology as a strictly rational permeation of doctrines, there is also, very early in the eastern Church, an understanding of theology as teachings cast in hymns and expressed through pictures. Saint Ephraem the Syrian (c. 306–73) carried out theology predominantly in this vein, and one of the most important writings of Basil the Great (329/30–79), that entitled 'On the Holy Spirit', in reality treats a liturgical question, namely that of the correct doxology of the Father and the Son 'with the Holy Spirit', and repeatedly includes the liturgical tradition as an essential component of historical tradition in his argumentation. After a long phase of diffidence towards ecclesiastic poetry, Byzantine theologians began to compose *kontakia* in the sixth century (Stephan 2001), whose *proemia* mainly treat questions of dogma. Over time, canon poetry, which presumably goes back to the seventh century (Felmy 2001), widely dispelled the *kontakia*. Canon poetry reached its highest point in the eighth century, although canons of the highest poetic and theological quality were still being written in the 9th century, and these repeatedly included the Trinity doctrine. In the ninth century, we have first and foremost Theodoros Graptos (born 775), Theophanes Graptos (775–

843), Theodoros Studites (759–826), and Josef the Hymnographer (816–86), as well as the nun Cassia (born c.910) (Schmalzbauer 1996), who wrote several *idiomela* that are still sung today.

The Pentecostal canon was in fact written earlier, by Cosmas of Maiuma (second half of the eighth century) (Hoffmann 2001; Hörandner 1997). However, the increasing development of this festival from its original purpose, to celebrate the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, into the feast of the Holy Trinity, which later found its conclusion in Russia, is reflected in the *idiomelon* of the Emperor Leon VI the Wise (886–912), which gave the trishagion, originally most likely understood Christologically, a Trinitarian interpretation (Plank 1992, *passim*) and taught the appearance (not the proceeding) of the Holy Spirit in the world through the Son, and sang of the Holy Spirit as He who proceeds from the Father and rests in the Son (Πεντηκοστάριον 218).

The increasing transformation of the Feast of Pentecost into the Feast of the Holy Trinity (in Greek, this feast is to this day called Κυριακή τῆς Πεντηκοστής, *Sunday of Pentecost*, whereas in Russia it is more often called День Святой Троицы, *Day of Holy Trinity*) (p. 212) was also reflected in the growing numbers of the Trinity icon and in its reshaping as the best-known Trinity icon of St Andrej Rublev (1360–1427) in the Russian Church, which at that time was still under the jurisdiction of Constantinople. In a more traditional way than with certain later Byzantine theologians (see below), in this image it is not so much the unity as the independence of the three hypostases of the Trinity linked by love that is portrayed and emphasized (Felmy 2004: 56–63).

The Beginnings of the Debate on the Proceeding of the Holy Spirit

If Byzantine theology rose to meet challenges from within and without, rather than being inclined to follow up, on its own initiative, on issues of the Trinity doctrine that were in principle considered to be closed cases, the West soon presented it with such a challenge, by becoming increasingly fixated on Augustine with his tendency towards a doctrine of the proceeding of the Holy Spirit from the Father *and the Son* (*ex Patre Filioque*). As long as the West, with its new theological orientation, did not affect the text of the creed and, despite Augustine's leaning towards the doctrine of proceeding from the Father *and the Son*, continued to adhere to the proceeding of the Holy Spirit *principaliter* a Patre, which he taught all the same, the East did not react to the tendencies of the West to assume that the Son participated in the proceeding of the Holy Spirit.

Without question, Augustine's contribution was decisive for the development of the doctrine of the proceeding of the Holy Spirit *ex Patre Filioque*, over which the conflict,

and in 1054 the schism, between the eastern and the western Church arose. According to Augustine's teaching, the Father and the Son breathe the Spirit back and forth to one another. The Holy Spirit is thus the Gift of the Father and the Son. It is, as their Gift, the bond of love that connects the Father and the Son with each other (Augustine, *De Trinitate* 5.16). But in doing so, Augustine was not thinking in inner-Trinitarian terms, but he assumed that the Holy Spirit, in the economy of salvation, is a gift and a donation. Because it is given to creation, it also proceeds from the Father and the Son in the sense that it is their gift to each other (Mühlenberg 1982: 430). Therefore we find here for the first time in the Trinity doctrine the axiom, though as yet not explicitly expressed, that there exists not only an outward relationship between the inner-Trinitarian existence and the economical workings of the Holy Trinity, but that the inner-Trinitarian relationship and the outer-Trinitarian workings, essence, and economy of the Trinity are completely identical.

Augustine did not have in mind changing the text of the Nicene Creed. Furthermore, there are still diverse lines in his theological thinking. Alongside what one could call the true Augustine line just sketched, he maintains the old line of thinking according to which the Father is to be thought of as the *principium deitatis*. In order to balance the traditional line with his own new line, Augustine taught the proceeding of the Holy

(p. 213) Spirit *principaliter a Patre et a Filio*. And yet with the new line existing alongside the old, he seemed to have found the solution to a problem for which the Cappadocian Fathers, who shaped the eastern theology, had found none. They were hesitant to specify the difference between the begetting of the only begotten Son and the proceeding of the Holy Spirit. According to Augustine, the main difference between the Son's begetting and the proceeding of the Holy Spirit is that the Son has his origin only in the Father, but the Holy Spirit in both the Father and the Son.

The *Filioque* is taught *expressis verbis* for the first time in a document that in its entire approach is typically western and that probably originates in Augustine's school in Spain: the so-called Athanasian Creed, often called the *Quicumque* after its opening words (Collins 1979: 332).

After a previous synod in Toledo had yet omitted a doctrine of the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son in its profession of faith (Oberdorfer 2001: 131), the third Synod of Toledo in the year 589 imposed the penalty of anathema on all who denied that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father *and the Son*. Evidently, the Fathers of this synod were of the opinion that this was the only way to overthrow once and for all both Arianism, which the Visigoth king Reccared renounced at said synod, and the denial of the divinity of the Holy Spirit as was practised by that king's father, King Leovigild. And yet it seems that the synod did not yet touch the text of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan

symbol itself at that time, but left it in its original version—without *Filioque* (Gemeinhardt 2002: 5–55). This conclusion follows, in any case, from the older of the extant manuscripts of the synodal resolutions. It was not until the eighth Synod of Toledo in 653 that a text was adopted in which the wording of the Niceno-Constantinopolitanum itself was altered (Gemeinhardt 2002: 53–4).

For its further development, the reception of the doctrine and of the formulation of the *Filioque* by the Frankish Church is of crucial significance. At the time a young Church, the Frankish Church sought theological conflict with Constantinople, in order to prove itself a worthy successor to Constantinople as the keeper of the true faith. The ‘suitability’ of the *Filioque* issue for this conflict was not recognized right away, however, and the dispute concentrated initially on the question of icons (Gemeinhardt 2002: 88ff.). But the ‘capitulary’ made at the court of Charlemagne, which in the year 792 was taken to Rome, focuses on the problem in Trinitarian theology of the proceeding of the Holy Spirit, in that it argues against a text by the Constantinopolitan Patriarch Tarasius (784–806) contained in the synodal files of the seventh Ecumenical Council of Nicaea (787), which professes: ‘and in the Holy Spirit, who is the Lord and giver of life, who proceeds from the Father through the Son and who himself is God and is recognized [as such]’ (Concilium Nicaenum II, actio III (Mansi 1766: vol. 12, 1119E–1127A, here at 1121CD)). Though this text has more affinity with the western doctrine in the sense that it speaks of an involvement of the Second Hypostasis in the proceeding of the Holy Spirit, it still met with harsh criticism from the Franks, because by this time the Frankish theologians were convinced that *Filioque* was the original version; they deemed it insufficient that the Second Hypostasis should function as a mere intermediary in the procession of the Holy Spirit. Pope Adrian (p. 214) (772–95), however, essentially decided in favour of the Constantinople party (Gemeinhardt 2002: 108–13).

A first very careful reaction to this special western doctrine is found as early as Maximus the Confessor. He still defended the Latins by attempting to interpret the *Filioque* in the sense of the δι’ υἱοῦ of the Patriarch Tarasius. The Latin Church Fathers, he wrote, in their teaching of the proceeding of the Holy Spirit, did not make the Son the origin (ἀρχή) of the Holy Spirit.

Still entirely without polemic, St John of Damascus (c.650–before 754) rejects the doctrine of the proceeding of the Holy Spirit from the Father *and* from the Son in his *Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith* when he writes:

Therefore we name not three gods the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, but rather one God, the Holy Trinity, for Son and Spirit lead back to *one* principle,

they are not put together or melt together, as Sabellius would have it (for they are unified, as I say, not in that they mix together, but in that they adhere to one another, and have the state of being in one another (ἐν ἀλλήλοις περιχώρησιν) without any mixture or amalgamation). (John of Damascus, *De fide Orthodoxa* I.8; PG 94: 829)

In the exposition of the relationship of the Son and the Spirit to the Father, the completely unpolemical and yet unequivocal rejection of the *Filioque* then follows:

The Son we call neither fundament nor Father, but we say he is from the Father and the Son of the Father; the Holy Spirit, however, we say is from the Father, and we call him the Spirit of the Father. But we do not say that the Spirit is from the Son, and yet we call him the Spirit of the Son ... of the Son, however, we say neither that he is of the Spirit, nor yet from the Spirit. (John of Damascus, *De fide Orthodoxa* I.8; PG 94: 832–3)

This last sentence is important, for it refutes the fear that a creed without the *Filioque* would diminish the honour of the Son. After all, he reasons, the honour of the Holy Spirit is likewise not lessened by the fact that the Son is neither of the Spirit nor from the Spirit.

More crucial, however, is the fact that behind John Damascene's polite rejection of the *Filioque* lurks the wholly diverse eastern approach to Trinitarian theology. He speaks of God's unity because the Son and the Spirit are founded on the same principle, the Father. A *Filioque* in this Trinitarian context would annul the unity of the Trinity!

The insertion of the *Filioque* led to a true clash when Frankish monks used the Niceno-Constantinopolitan creed on the Mount of Olives in the form which had become common in the Frankish realm (i.e. with the addition of *Filioque*). A monk from the monastery of St Sabas in the Kidron Valley subsequently accused the Frankish monks of heresy (Gemeinhardt 2002: 142ff.). An appeal on the pope's judgement ended with success for the eastern side to the extent that Pope Leo III (795–816), as reported by Anastasius Bibliothecarius, 'for the sake of love and of care for the true faith' had 'two silver tablets' made, 'on each of which the Symbol was written, one in Greek letters and the other in Latin, on the right and the left above the entrance to the tomb' of St Peter—without the controversial addition of the *Filioque*. Similar tablets were also installed in the church of San Paolo Fuori le Mura (Gemeinhardt 2002: 163).

(p. 215) **Patriarch Photius and the *Filioque* Conflict**

When considering the developments in the *Filioque* conflict under the patriarchate of Photius (c.810–93/94; Patriarch of Constantinople 858–67, 877–86), we cannot fully disregard the political and Church-political implications (Gemeinhardt 2002: 165–298 treats not only the theological questions, but also the attendant political circumstances and preconditions in great detail; on the topic as a whole see Hergenröther 1867–9).

Photius, one of the most learned members of the Byzantine aristocracy, had been consecrated archbishop and patriarch of Constantinople in the year 858 under Emperor Michael III (842–67) at the instigation of Caesar Bardas. He was the successor of Patriarch Ignatius (d. 877; Patriarch 846–58, 867–77), who after the fall of Empress Theodora II was forced to resign and was banned from Constantinople. Ignatius, who did not acknowledge his deposition, turned to the Roman pope, Nicholas I (858–67), who in a hitherto unusual estimation of his papal competences excommunicated Photius and reinstated Ignatius. Photius, who did not acknowledge the pope's actions, convoked a synod in Constantinople in 867, which declared the pope to be deposed. This led to a schism between Rome and Constantinople. When in the year 866 the Bulgarian khan, Boris I, despite Byzantine efforts decided to take on the Roman version of Christianity, a stormy polemic broke out between Rome and Constantinople in the context of which Patriarch Photius had all western special developments, especially in the liturgy, condemned and polemicized particularly strongly against the introduction of the *Filioque* to the creed. It was in the context of this conflict that Photius wrote his 'Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit' (Photius, *On the Mystagogy*, passim).

This text holds the insertion of the *Filioque* to jeopardize the monarchy of the Father, to invert it into a diarchy, to detract from the honour of the Third Hypostasis and its position in the Trinity; it sees the Holy Spirit as thus being 'blasphemed as being inferior than the Son' (Photius, *On the Mystagogy* 84; PG 102: 313). In Jn 16:14 Christ does not say: the Holy Spirit receives 'of Me', but He receives 'of Mine' (Photius, *On the Mystagogy* 77; PG 102: 300).

Although you do not change the words, yet by subterfuge you commit the crime of changing 'of Mine' to 'of Me', and by this manoeuvre, you accuse the Saviour of teaching that which you believe. You distinctly slander Him of these three things: that He said what He did not say; that He did not say what He did say; and that He professed a meaning of the passage which He not only did not express, but

which, on the contrary, is obviously opposed to His own mystagogy. (Photius, *On the Mystagogy* 79; PG 102: 304)

That the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father is a property of the Father that cannot be transferred from Him to another hypostasis (Photius, *On the Mystagogy* 76; PG 102: 296f.). If the Son as well is attributed with the capability of being an origin (ἀρχή, αἰτία, (p. 216) ἄιτιον), then either the hypostases of Father and Son are modalistically mixed (Photius, *On the Mystagogy* 75; PG 102: 293), or two origins are seen in God, which would amount to a Marcionitic dualism (Photius, *On the Mystagogy* 85; PG 102: 316). In any case, this view fails to recognize the μοναρχία and thereby the unity of God. By the assumption that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, the Holy Spirit is moved farther from the Father than is the Son (Photius, *On the Mystagogy* 87; PG 102: 320). It is not the common nature of the Father and the Son that is the origin of the Holy Spirit, but the person, the hypostasis of the Father (Photius, *On the Mystagogy* 89; PG 102: 325). Photius takes great care in his exposition to properly explain the designation of the Holy Spirit as the Spirit of the Son (Gal. 4:6). If the apostle Paul here were teaching the procession of the Holy Spirit of the Father and the Son, he would contradict and correct the teachings of the Saviour Himself (Photius, *On the Mystagogy* 90; PG 102: 328). But this cannot be the case, says Photius; instead, the Apostle intends to bear witness, with very wisely chosen words, to the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit (Photius, *On the Mystagogy* 91; PG 102: 329).

Paul is demonstrating the identity of the nature, and in no wise does he imply the cause of procession. He acknowledges the unity of essence, but incontrovertibly does not proclaim that the Son brings forth a consubstantial hypostasis; indeed, he does not even hint concerning the origin. (Photius, *On the Mystagogy* 91; PG 102: 329)

It is the Spirit of the Father and the Spirit of the Son, because it is of the same essence as both. It proceeds no more from the Son, as whose Spirit it is designated, than it does from the mental faculties of wisdom, understanding, and recognition, although it is called 'the Spirit of wisdom, understanding, and recognition' (Exodus 31:3) (Photius, *On the Mystagogy* 94f.; PG 102: 336).

In particular, Photius is against taking on the *Filioque* for the mere reason that some of the Fathers appear to have taught it, and against making a dogma out of a point that some of the Church Fathers have taught without claiming dogmatic validity for it. Photius cites unclear thoughts among some of the Fathers, who in spite of this are highly esteemed in the Church, as for example the saints Clement, Irenaeus, and Hippolytus (Photius, *On the Mystagogy* 102; PG 102: 356). Even Basil the Great, he claims, for a time

did not profess the divinity of the Holy Spirit, but this not in order to deny it, but so that it might later be professed with that much louder a voice (Photius, *On the Mystagogy* 103; PG 102: 357).

As Patriarch Photius further states, the *Filioque* also contradicts the witness of several popes, who either did not teach the *Filioque* or even resisted it. This is particularly the case with Pope Leo III (795–816), who had two tablets made on which the Greek text of the Nicene Creed is to be seen without the *Filioque* (Photius, *On the Mystagogy* 112; PG 102: 380). This version of the text was in the end acknowledged as authentic by Pope Adrian III (884–5) as well (Photius, *On the Mystagogy* 112; PG 102: 381).

Photius would not be the great philologist as whom we know him today if he had not added to his expositions on the Latin Church Fathers who taught the *Filioque* contrary (p. 217) to general tradition the complaint that the Latin language was unsuitable for treating dogmatic issues with as much sophistication as is possible in Greek (Photius, *On the Mystagogy* 110; PG 102: 376).

The phrase ἐκ μόνου τοῦ πατρὸς, considered as a typical Photian formulation, does not appear word for word in the ‘Mystagogy’, though its sense is certainly contained here. The title, probably secondary and summarizing the contents of the ‘Mystagogy’, does however contain this wording:

On the Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit. That even as the Son is proclaimed by the Sacred Oracles to be begotten of the Father alone (ἐκ μόνου τοῦ πατρὸς), so also is the Holy Spirit proclaimed by theology to proceed from the same and only cause. He is however said to be of the Son, since He is of one essence with Him and is sent through Him. (Photius, *On the Mystagogy* 67; PG 102: 279f.)

Whether one could somehow still speak of the Holy Spirit as proceeding *through* the Son does not interest Photius, because his focus is on the monarchy of the Father, which, though not necessarily impacted by the phrase ‘through the Son’, would in no case be supported by it.

Yet Patriarch Photius did not see the *Filioque* as the western dogma purely and simply. It is indeed not by chance that he refers to Roman popes, who either did not mention the *Filioque* or even (like Pope Leo III) expressly rejected its addition to the Creed, or at least declined to ascribe any official validity to it. This was why it was possible for him to be reconciled with the successors of Nicholas I without an explicit papal correction of the doctrine of the proceeding of the Holy Spirit. Half a century later the situation was complicated even further by the official insertion of the *Filioque* in the Roman version of the Niceno-Constantinopolitanum. This happened when the German king Henry II

insisted on the insertion of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan symbol in the mass held at his coronation as Roman Emperor in the year 1014, namely, in the form in which it had already been used for some time in the Frankish mass, with the addition 'Filioque' (Jungmann 1948: 579). When the Church was separated in 1054 into East and West the *Filioque* played only a minor part, namely, of all things, in the completely unfounded accusation by the western Cardinal Humbert that the eastern Church had of its own accord left the originally recited *Filioque* out of the creed (Oberdorfer 2001: 169–70). And yet the western insertion of the *Filioque* in the official text of the Mass reflects an estrangement that Pope Leo III had still been intent on preventing.

That estrangement can also be seen in the comparison of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit according to St Symeon the New Theologian (949–1022) with that of his disciple Niketas Stethatos (c.1005–c.1085). There is almost no theologian in whose writing the workings of the Holy Spirit played a greater role than Symeon the New Theologian (Архиеп. Василий (Кривошеин) 1980, *passim*). While in the doctrine of the proceeding of the Holy Spirit he does hold the traditional Orthodox position, it is without a trace of polemic and without being particularly insistent. It is possible that he was not at all familiar with the western special doctrine on the procession of the Holy Spirit *ex Patre Filioque*. Nikethas Stethatos, in contrast, who emphasized the properties of the three (p. 218) divine Hypostases even more than did Symeon the New Theologian, already reacts extremely polemically to the by now official Western *Filioque*:

They overthrow the entire Christian faith by not saying that the One is the principle of the Two [Son and Spirit], but groundlessly introduce a diarchy to the triad. This leads them either to the Sabellian mixture or to the Arianic splitting of the Trinity. They let the Son be the Father. If it is necessary for the Son likewise to give issue to the Spirit, in order to be of one essence with the Father, then the Spirit must in turn also give issue to something, in order to be of the same essence with the Father and the Son. (Cited in Wessel 1982: 357; Sabellius did not make a distinction between persons, but only between 'modi' of the one person's effects, and is therefore designated a modalist.)

'You are the One who Receives and is Distributed' and 'The Father is Greater than I'

In the 'codex Barberini gr 336', the oldest extant manuscript of the Byzantine *euchologion*, which also contains the prayers of the liturgy of St Basil and of St John Chrysostomus, there is a prayer that is missing in many of the more recent manuscripts,

and thus had evidently only been inserted in the liturgy shortly before the codex Barberini was written, but had not yet become widely accepted. It is the only prayer of the Divine Liturgy that is addressed to the Second Hypostasis of the Holy Trinity, and it ends in 'codex Barberini gr 336' with the words addressed to Christ: 'For You, Christ our God, are the Offerer and the Offered, the Hallower and the Hallowed, and to You we give glory' (*L'Euologio Barberini* 62; Parenti and Velkovska 2000: 266).

This last part of the prayer was changed, probably around the time of Emperor Manuel I (1143–80), to read as it does today in the received text of the liturgy: 'For You, Christ our God, are the Offerer and the Offered, the One who receives and is distributed, and to You we give glory' (Ἱερατικόν 87: 127). Christ is, according to this prayer, not only the sacrificer and the sacrifice, but also He who accepts the sacrifice. This means the sacrifice of the *Logos* incarnate was offered not only to God the Father, but also to the Holy Spirit and the Son, the indivisible, single-essence Trinity. Soterichos Panteugenēs, the deacon of Hagia Sophia and patriarch-elect of Antioch, took steps against this view and its expression in the new version of the prayer spoken at the Grand Entrance; he was supported by Eustathios of Dyrrhachion and the deacons Michail of Thessaloniki and Nikephoros Basilakes, all of whom were—disregarding their not yet very high position in the hierarchy—leading theologians (Beck 1959: 623–4; Wessel 1982: 341–4).

A synod was summoned for 26 January 1156, because the monk chosen for the seat of the Metropolitane of Kiev, Konstantinos, wished to have a clear answer for the questions raised before he left for Russia. The synod formulated anathematisms from (p. 219) which the doctrines of Soterichos Panteugenēs and his fellow campaigners can be deduced. Apparently they designated exclusively God the Father as the recipient of the sacrifice of Christ: the Divine *Logos* did not receive the offering of His own body and blood (anathematism 1). In connection with this, Soterichos rejected the idea that the Divine Liturgy be celebrated in honour of the Holy Trinity (anathematism 2). The daily offering of the Eucharist repeats the self-sacrifice of Christ φανταστικῶς καὶ εἰκονικῶς, that is, in mind and in image (anathematism 3). And finally they claim first the Son, upon becoming human, took in the mortals in grace, then the Father did so for the sake of Christ's suffering, and finally, humanity was accepted by the Holy Spirit (anathematism 4).

In contrast to these views, the synod decided in favour of the *textus receptus* of the above-mentioned prayer: Christ's life-giving sacrifice was offered to the entire undivided single-essence Triad, and not to the Father alone. The opposing doctrine that rules out the Son and the Holy Spirit as recipients of Christ's sacrifice, it stated, splits the Trinity and robs the Son and the Holy Spirit of the same honour that is owed them together with the Father.

Against the symbolic reading of the Eucharistic sacrifice it was argued that the Eucharistic sacrifice is in no aspect different from Christ's sacrifice on the cross. For the Orthodox concept of the Eucharistic sacrifice it is essential that one cannot in this context speak of more than *one* sacrifice, but only of one and the same sacrifice, so that in the liturgical sacrifice the sacrifice of Christ on the cross is present in the mind, but the former cannot add anything to the latter, because the two are identical. And against the doctrine of three stages in terms of humanity's receiving divine grace the succinct statement is given that the consubstantial and indivisible Trinity does not allow such a division (Wessel 1982: 344).

Since Soterichos Panteugenēs, in contrast to his associates, did not abide by the resolution handed down by the synod, but rather wrote a paper defending his position, a new synod was called to session in May of 1157, which confirmed the decisions of the synod of 1156. A review of his views that came too late did not protect Soterichos from being stripped of his qualification for high religious office.

A second Trinitarian-Christological dispute during the reign of Emperor Manuel I concerned the right understanding of the word of Christ 'My Father is greater than I' (Jn 14:28). The conflict was initiated by one Dimitrios who had repeatedly travelled to the West as an emissary. He was driven by the question of whether Christ's word from the Gospel of John referred to Christ's divinity or his humanity. The explanation that the western Catholics give, that Christ is lower than God the Father and at the same time equal to Him, does not satisfy Dimitrios. In the writings of the holy Fathers of the eastern Church, he found different statements. (1) With the statement that the Father is greater than He, Christ was thinking only of the origin (ἀρχή) that caused Him, according to His divine nature. (2) According to other sources, Christ had His human nature in mind. (3) Yet other statements indicate that this sentence only referred to the *Logos* in His state of humiliation. The Emperor Manuel I, who (p. 220) dallied in theology, stated that in terms of His humanness, the Second Hypostasis is lower than the Father, but in terms of His divinity, He is equal with Him. A synod convened in 1166 in the palace of Blachern laid a creed before Dimitrios according to which Jn 14:28 refers to the 'flesh of the Saviour, created and capable of suffering' (Wessel 1982: 346).

The Trinity Doctrine of St Gregorios Palamas

Saint Gregorios Palamas (1296–1359) stuck with the received Orthodox doctrine regarding the Trinity in its fundamental traits, and therefore also rejected the *Filioque*. Several years ago, however, Reinhard Flogaus was able to show that Gregorios Palamas had no qualms about borrowing from, of all places, the writings of St Augustine (Flogaus

1997: 146), and that his Trinitarian theology thus was quite different from the established theology. Like Augustine, Gregorios Palamas speaks of analogies between the divinity and the man in God's image. God the Father, he says, corresponds to the human νοῦς, and the counterpart of the Son is the Word which lies embedded in the human νοῦς (λόγος ἐμφύτως ἡμῖν ἐναποκείμενος τῷ νῷ), or the knowledge that is always with him (ἡ ἀεὶ συνυπάρχουσα αὐτῷ γνώσις), respectively, but not the orally spoken word (λόγος προφορικός) or the unspoken word (λόγος ἐνδιάθετος) lying dormant in the human (Flogaus 1997: 143). An analogy between the divine and the human λόγος was also perceived by various eastern Church Fathers. The differences between the four types of human *logos* are found in this manner only in Augustine (Augustine, *De Trinitate* 15.10–15). In Augustine we also find the expositions on the various modes of Logos that were evidently borrowed from him by Gregorios Palamas (Flogaus 1997: 143–6).

What is true of the doctrine of the divine Logos is also true of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. No one who is gifted with the νοῦς could—says Gregorios Palamas following Augustine—think a word without πνεῦμα. ‘The Holy Spirit is Itself certainly neither πνεῦμα in the sense of that breath that accompanies the λόγος προφορικός that is spoken with our lips, nor is it connected with the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος or the λόγος ἐν διανοίᾳ, as this would imply a temporal existence and thus also the potential for change. That πνεῦμα of the most high Word is rather the unspeakable love of the Procreator to the Logos begotten by Him in unspeakable manner, with which the beloved Son as well loves the Father, to the extent that He has already received from the Father this love that proceeds with Him and rests on Him’ (Flogaus 1997: 146).

This interpretation of the Holy Spirit as an inner-Trinitarian love of the Father and the Son can, as Reinhard Flogaus notes, be found in the writings of no other eastern Church Father before Gregorios Palamas, and must therefore be seen as a loan from Augustine, (p. 221) as incidentally the Orthodox theologian Protopresbyter Jean Meyendorff had suspected (Meyendorff 1959: 316). Because analogies to Augustine's *De Trinitate* can be proven in much greater number than previously known, the dependence of St Gregorios Palamas on St Augustine that Jean Meyendorff construed can be claimed without a doubt. Despite the differences in terminological detail Gregorios Palamas is even dependent on Augustine when he describes the Spirit as the common joy of the Father and the Son (Flogaus 1997: 150).

However, whereas in Occidental theology the statements on the Holy Spirit as a bond of love between Father and Son served to support the *Filioque*, Gregorios Palamas at this point diverges from his model. Here it is interesting to note the above-cited statement, among others, that the Son ‘has already received from the Father this love that proceeds with Him and rests on Him’, with which the one equal originality of the Father and the

Son is rejected (see above). Despite his clear dependence on Augustine, Gregorios Palamas declines to follow him not only on the question of the *Filioque*, but also where Augustine declares 'it is the Holy Spirit Itself that is poured out as love in our hearts' (Flogaus 1997: 149). As Palamas sees it, it is not the Holy Spirit Itself that is poured out in the hearts, but the Divine Energies, which he distinguishes from the essence of God.

In this respect, the distinction—which Gregorios Palamas may not have invented, but which he at least developed to a certain conclusion—between the Divine being and the Divine Energies touches on the Trinity doctrine itself. It is not completely unfounded that Dorothea Wendebourg in this context spoke of a 'de-functionalization' of the Holy Spirit (Wendebourg 1980), a charge that could in fact be aimed at Augustine for even more cogent reasons. And yet even the Russian priest and religious philosopher Pavel Florenskij, himself under no suspicion of harbouring any all too great western sympathies, raised a charge similar to that expressed recently by Wendebourg. 'Unnoticed and gradually' a tendency had permeated the Church

to speak, rather than of the Holy Spirit, of 'grace', that is, of something already and conclusively impersonal. What we know is usually not the Holy Spirit, but Its gracious energies, Its powers, Its effects and workings. 'Spirit', 'spiritual', 'spirit-giving', 'spirituality', etc. pervade the works of the holy Fathers. But from these works it is also clear that the words 'spirit', 'spiritual', etc., refer to special states of the believer which are called forth by God, but which only slightly if at all have in their sights the personal independent existence of the third hypostasis of the all-holy Trinity. (Флоренский 1914: 123-4)

As applicable as these observations may be, it must nevertheless be emphasized that the Orthodox Church even at the time of St Gregorios Palamas maintained the sanctifying of the Eucharistic gifts through the invocation and effect of the Holy Spirit, and this 'de-functionalization' thus has always remained limited. The theological thinking of the Neopalamitic School of the twentieth century, with its "personalistic" correction of Palamism' (Flogaus 1997: 189, n. 430), furthermore showed that the Palamitic doctrine of energies can also stand in the context of a strongly pneumatologically oriented theology.

(p. 222) **The Trinity Doctrine of Patriarch Gennadios II**

From earliest times the Orthodox Trinitarian theology differed from that of the West essentially in its stronger emphasis of the independence of the three hypostases of the Trinity. For the dialogue with monotheistic Islam this position is not particularly

— (1860), *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia*, in PG 102 (Paris: Migne), 279–400. Reprint 1993 (Turnhout: Brepols).

Ἱερατικόν (1981), Αἱ θεῖαι λειτουργίαι τοῦ Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου, Βασιλείου τοῦ Μεγάλου, τῶν Προηγιασμένων μετὰ τῆς τυπτικῆς αὐτῶν διατάξεως. (Κατὰ τὴν ἔκδοσιν τοῦ Οἰκουμενικοῦ Πατριαρχείου) Καί τινες ἀπαραίτητοι ἱεραὶ Ἀκολουθίαι καὶ Εὐχαί (Athens).

Πεντεηοστάριον, Athens (without date).

Καρμίρης, Ἰωάννης (1968), "Τὰ δογματικὰ καὶ συμβολικὰ μνημεῖα τῆς ὀρθοδόξου καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας, Τόμος I (Graz).

Secondary Literature

□□□□□□□□ □□□□ □ (1961), *Kosmische Liturgie: Das Weltbild Maximus' des Bekenners*, 2nd edn. (Einsiedeln: Johannes Verlag).

□□□□ □□□□ □ (1959), *Kirche und Theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich* (München: Beck).

□□□□□□□□ □□□□ □ (2008), *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios (vers 1400–vers 1472): Un intellectuel orthodoxe face à la disparition de l'Empire Byzantin* (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines).

□□□□ □ R.J. (1979), 'Athanasianisches Symbol', *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, 4: 328–33.

□□□□□□□□ □□ (1970), *The Photian Schism: History and Legend* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1948, reprint 1970).

□□□□□ □□□ □□ (2001), 'Kanon. V. Östliche Dichtung', *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (4th edn.), 4: 771–2.

— (2004), *Das Buch der Christus-Ikonen* (Freiburg: Herder).

□□□□□□□□ □□ (1997), *Theosis bei Palamas und Luther: Ein Beitrag zum ökumenischen Gespräch* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

□□□□□□□□□□ (2002), *Die Filioque-Kontroverse zwischen Ost- und Westkirche im Frühmittelalter* (Berlin: De Gruyter).

□□□□□□□□□□ (1867-9), *Photius, Patriarch von Constantinopel: Sein Leben, seine Schriften und das griechische Schisma*, Nach handschriftlichen und gedruckten Quellen, 3 vols. (Regensburg: G. J. Manz).

□□□□□□□□ M (2001), 'Kosmas von Maiuma', *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (4th edn.), 4: 1706.

□□□□□□□□ □□ (1997), 'Kosmas von Jerusalem', *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* (3rd edn.), 6: 394.

□□□□□□□□ □□□□ (1948), *Missarum Sollemnia: Eine genetische Erklärung der römischen Messe*, vol. 1 (Wien: Herder).

□□□□□□□□□□ (1959), *Introduction à l'étude de Grégoire Palamas* (Paris: Seuil).

□□□□□□□□□□ □□ (1982), 'Dogma und Lehre im Abendland', in Carl Andresen (ed.) *Handbuch der Dogmen- und Theologieggeschichte*, vol. 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 406-566.

□□□□□□□□□□ (2001), *Filioque: Geschichte und Theologie eines ökumenischen Problems* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

□□□□□ □ (1992), 'Das Trishagion. Gotteslob der Engel und Zankapfel der Menschen', *Kirche im Osten*, 35: 111-26.

□□□□□□□□□□□□ □ (1996), 'Kasia', *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* (3rd edn.), 5: 1283.

□□□□□□□□ □□ (2001), 'Kontakion', *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (4th edn.), 4: 1642.

□□□□□□□□□□ (1984), 'Gennadios Scholarios', *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, 12: 375-6.

□□□□□□□□□□ □□ (1980), *Geist oder Energie: Zur Frage der innergöttlichen Verankerung des christlichen Lebens in der byzantinischen Theologie* (München: Kaiser).

□□□□□□□ □ (1982), 'Dogma und Lehre in der orthodoxen Kirche von Byzanz', in Carl Andresen (ed.) *Handbuch der Dogmen- und Theologieggeschichte*, vol. 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 284-405.

Василий (Кривошеин) (1980), архиеп. Преподобный Симеон Новый Богослов, 949-1022 (Paris).

Флоренский, Павел (1914), свящ. Столп и утверждение истины. Опыт православной феодиицеи в двенадцати письмах (Москва).

Karl Christian Felmy

Karl Christian Felmy, Doctor *honoris causa* of the Moscow Theological Academy (2005) and of the Bucharest Theological Faculty (2008), is Emeritus Professor of History and Theology of the Christian East at the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg.

